UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 111—PART 2

JANUARY 28, 1965, TO FEBRUARY 16, 1965
(PAGES 1427 TO 2770)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1965

J
11
.R
v. 111
pt. 2

C [illegible] TED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record
United States of America
PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted the verse of Scripture: Deuteronomy 33: 27: *The eternal God is thy refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms.*

Let us pray.

O Thou God of all grace and goodness may we be conscious of Thy presence and power as we endeavor to meet bravely life's stern duties and demands.

We penitently confess that our hearts are often cold and callous and we fail to have a keen sense of our social responsibility and a sincere interest in the welfare of needy humanity.

Grant that in the great adventure of building a better world we may know how to coordinate practical commonsense with lofty idealism.

May we be serenely confident that light will triumph over darkness and that the day is dawning when peace and good will shall be established upon this earth.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

S. 507. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in properties purchased with financing assistance under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 88-271, appointed Mr. JAVITS to be a member of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, vice Mr. Keating.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 146, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 146

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives such sums as may be necessary to pay the compensation for services performed during the thirty-day period beginning January 3, 1965, by each person (1) who, on January 2, 1965, was employed by any standing committee or any select committee of the Eighty-eighth Congress and whose salary was paid under authority of a House resolution adopted during the Eighty-eighth Congress, and (2) who is certified by the chairman of the appropriate committee as performing such services for such committee during such thirty-day period. Such compensation shall be paid such person at a rate not to exceed the rate he was receiving on January 2, 1965.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM McKINLEY, 25TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of and at the request of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who is chairman of our Republican delegation in the House of Representatives as well as our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], to announce that the carnations that we see our colleagues wearing today are being distributed out of respect for a great Ohioan, President McKinley. Each year on McKinley's birthday, which happens to be tomorrow, January 29, we have always seen to it that Members are given these carnations and usually some time is given to permit recognition of the great services of McKinley to our country. I may say that the Republican delegation from the State of Chio has seen to it that the carnations are here this morning. Of course, I do not mean to imply that this is done as a partisan gesture since we have always found a ready, willing, and hearty cooperation, I might say a bipartisan cooperation, in this yearly tribute to President McKinley.

We in Ohio are very proud of McKinley as a statesman, a soldier, a Member of Congress, a Governor, and as President. As a matter of fact, Mr. McKinley served with distinction in the House of Representatives for many years before becoming President. Here he assumed the high office of chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

We are quite proud and happy to take this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the great services of Mr. McKinley to his country.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BETTS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, for myself and I am sure all Members on this side of the aisle, I wish to say we are always appreciative of this occasion which is made possible by our colleagues across the aisle from the great State of Ohio.

On this day we honor the memory of one of the great men in the history of the United States, a man who was tall among his fellows and who stands tall in the annals of our Republic.

The gentleman alluded, and I believe it in order to allude to it again, to the fact that President McKinley served for many years as a Member of this body. He served with great distinction as chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means.

We are reminded now as the body of Sir Winston Churchill lies in state, of what was said by Members of the House of Commons the other day when they were paying tributes to him—that he was "of the House," meaning, of course, that his career had grown out of the House of Commons.

I believe it was the service of William McKinley in the House of Representatives which enabled him to prove his stature, and from this service he became not only a President but one of the great Presidents of our country—a martyred President, a beloved President, a loyal and patriotic American who fought for his country, a statesman of tremendous vision and breadth. While he is sometimes referred to as one of the more conservative Presidents, I believe it can be truly said that he was really a progressive President in that he worked for those things which helped to make America great and prosperous.

I join my colleagues from Ohio in this tribute to a great former Member of the House, a great President of the United States, and a great American who served his day and generation well.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman for his generous remarks and also for associating the life of President McKinley with the life of Winston Churchill, to whom we are also paying tribute at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has always taken an interest in these occasions, because President McKinley represented the district in Congress which the gentleman today represents.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life and service of former President McKinley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, within the past week our attention has been called again to the need for a clearly established policy relating to Presidential disability.

All of us are most gratified by the prompt recovery of President Johnson from his minor illness. But this should not minimize the importance or the urgency of the issue.

The danger inherent in our failure to make this necessary revision to the Constitution are known to all of us. Even when the oceans provided buffers of time and space the need existed. The passage of the years has only served to emphasize this need.

At the same time we make this revision we can also make certain the office of Vice President will be promptly filled if any vacancy should occur in the future. During the past two decades this office has been vacant for 5 years. During the history of our Nation the office has been vacant on 16 different occasions totaling more than 37 years.

If we act promptly on this matter it is possible this most necessary amendment to our Constitution could be effected within this year. Forty-seven of our State legislatures are either in session or will be in session during 1965. I am certain the members of those legislative bodies also are aware of the urgency of the issue.

If there are those who do not believe there is a need for such an amendment they have been silent. And I am certain those who share the belief there is such a need are in a great majority.

The problem is recognized. The solution is clear. Action is demanded. The time to act is upon us.

LONG ISLAND'S CHALLENGE—FROM ARSENAL OF DEFENSE TO ARSENAL OF PEACE

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker—

> The vast defense industry in this Nation is a creature of conscious Government policy. Nowhere in Government at the present time do we have an agency with the mandate and the resources adequate to insure defense-oriented communities and individuals' alternative economic opportunities.

Those were the opening remarks of Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, from South Dakota, made in 1964 in defense of the Economic Conversion Commission, May 1964. I concur with the statements; however, let us review briefly some obvious facts. Long Island has recently been confronted with some very serious economic problems, primarily as a result of a marked reduction in defense spending in our area. Just recently—October 4, 1964—the New York Times reported that Dr. Seymour Melman, of Columbia University, a serious student of the problems of economic conversion, made the estimate that approximately 71,000 workers are employed in defense-related industries located in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. When compared to total manufacturing employment in these two counties, this means that more than 50 percent of total manufacturing force in Long Island is employed in defense-related activities. Based on this fact alone, it must be recognized that even a minor cutback in defense activity in Long Island can have major effect upon the economy.

Following my election to Congress, I immediately began to study this problem in great detail. Moreover, in the process, I have done everything within my power to find out what the Government is doing to alleviate the situation. Unfortunately, I must say at the outset that my investigation to date has shown that the Federal Government to date has not made any major attempt at setting up a comprehensive program to deal with this very pressing national problem in a truly effective manner.

During the course of my investigation, I found only one organization in the Federal Government which is devoting its entire attention to the problem. This organization, known as the Office of Economic Adjustment, was established by Secretary McNamara in 1961 for the purpose of assisting those communities throughout the United States which have been adversely affected by the Defense Department's decision to eliminate or reduce activities at installations located in those areas. Since it operates with a staff of only eight people, and since most of its activities have been devoted to problems associated with the closing of installations rather than problems associated with reduced defense business, you can well see that this organization alone cannot begin to coordinate a comprehensive national program for economic conversion. I might add, however, that the Office of Economic Adjustment, with its limited resources, has done an outstanding job in the area in which it has devoted most of its attention.

In addition to the activities of this organization, President Johnson in December of 1963 did establish a study group known as the Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament. This Committee is composed of representatives of the Defense Department, NASA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Office of Emergency Planning, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Department of Labor, Budget Bureau, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Department of Commerce. When he established this body, the President stated:

> The Committee will be responsible for the review and coordination of activities in the various departments and agencies designed to improve our understanding of the economic impact of defense expenditures and of changes either in the composition or in the total level of such expenditures.

In June of last year, Gardner Ackley, presently the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and also Chairman of this Committee was already in the process of conducting several studies related to the problem of economic conversion and he hoped that the findings of these studies would be forthcoming in the near future. Unfortunately, to date, we have heard very little from this Committee. And, moreover, after careful study of the activities of the Committee, it is evident that this body, too, because of limited staff and the lack of funds, has more responsibilities than it can possibly handle effectively.

It is apparent to me and to many other colleagues in both the House and the Senate, that it is imperative that the Federal Government promptly initiate a highly efficient and comprehensive program for economic conversion and that Congress must act on this matter at the earliest possible date.

In this connection, 29 Members of the House and 15 Members of the Senate cosponsored legislation in the last Congress which called for the immediate establishment of the National Economic Conversion Commission which would be composed of the heads of the nine governmental agencies having a direct interest in conversion problems. The legislative proposal would seek to fulfill three objectives:

First. The Commission is to institute a comprehensive study of the appropriate policies and programs to be carried out by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government to facilitate conversion. The findings of this study in turn should be submitted to Congress and the President within 1 year after the enactment of said legislation.

Second. The Commission shall consult the various State Governors and all interested local officials on the subject of conversion and shall convene a National Conference on Industrial Conversion and Growth within a year after the enactment of the act. In short, this Conference should consider the problems arising from a conversion to a civilian economy, and encourage appropriate planning and programing by all sectors of the economy to facilitate the Nation's economic conversion capability.

Third. And finally, this act would provide that all defense contractors, who have more than 25 percent of their employees engaged in work under any defense contract, must establish an industrial conversion committee. Such a committee shall be charged with planning for conversion to civilian work arising from a possible curtailment or termination of such contracts or grants.

Shortly after its introduction, the administration stated that, although it subscribed to the overall objective of the legislation, such legislation was unnecessary at this time since, in its opinion, the President's Committee on the Impact of Defense and Disarmament was already fulfilling the major purpose of this proposal.

That this type of activity is necessary is indicated by the fact that many small and large defense firms are already finding it very difficult to convert to civilian activities or find additional defense business, most of the major defense contractors have failed to take the initiative in the way of long-range planning for conversion, and thousands of highly trained and skilled workers recently laid off by defense firms are having such difficulty in finding work commensurate with their abilities.

Although convinced that the Federal Government can be of great assistance to Long Island in dealing with our problem of economic conversion or economic adjustment to reduced defense spending, we must realize that it is up to the community itself to shoulder some of this responsibility. It must work diligently to attract an increase in Federal business and in private business as well.

In doing so, it must certainly engage in some long-range planning. It should seek to attract many more new industries—especially those which are rapid growth industries—through an aggressive program of industrial development. Another solution may be in the development and expansion of the export possibilities. American know-how and American labor have proven they have relatively few equals in the area of skilled technology and mass productivity. Our efforts are imitated but rarely equaled by other nations quick to realize the potential growth possibilities of these products. As an advocate of substitution of foreign trade for foreign aid, our energies could thus be channeled to the transition from the arsenal of democracy in war to the arsenal of democracy in peace.

I am happy to learn that my suggestion of a trade mission in Long Island to promote our wares in the international field has been taken up by the Long Island Association. This is a much needed effort. As this is a plan I set forth during the recent campaign, I can assure the industry and the Long Island Association of the complete support of the U.S. Department of Commerce in assisting its implementation. I applaud the initiative of the Long Island Association in setting up this program. It is this type of aggressive private enterprise activity coupled with a helping hand from Federal authorities and aggressive leadership evidenced by our county executive, Eugene Nickerson, that will reverse the down trend in Nassau and other affected areas and bring increased business and return to use the economic climate that has made Nassau, America's fastest growing business community.

I hasten to report that industry is still moving into our area at a record rate. As the Area Development Council of Long Island Association reported last November, for the fifth consecutive year more than 100 firms have built new plants or purchased new sites for plant construction in our area. For the 12-month period ending with October 1, 1964, 156 companies opened new manufacturing facilities in Nassau and Suffolk and 118 firms expanded in their present locations or moved to larger quarters in the area. Altogether they represent 58 different industrial categories.

Therefore, in light of these and many other encouraging developments, it seems that we have now come to grips with the problems confronting us, and it is now my hope that the future will show that the current period of economic change is just a temporary interruption in the long-term growth of the Long Island economy. I am confident that the Federal Government will become an increasingly effective partner in this endeavor.

ASSIGNMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO VARIOUS SUBCOMMITTEES THEREOF

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the House of the assignment of members of the Committee on Appropriations to the various subcommittees. The assignments are as follows:

Subcommittee on Agriculture: Messrs. Whitten, Natcher, Hull, Morris, Michel, Langen.

Subcommittee on Defense: Messrs. Mahon, Sikes, Whitten, George W. Andrews, Flood, Thomas, Lipscomb, Laird, Minshall.

Subcommittee on the District of Columbia: Messrs. Natcher, Giaimo, Smith of Iowa, McFall, Davis of Wisconsin, McDade.

Subcommittee on Foreign Operations: Messrs. Passman, Rooney of New York, Natcher, Hansen of Washington, Cohelan, Long of Maryland, Shriver, Conte, Andrews of North Dakota.

Subcommittee on Independent Offices: Messrs. Thomas, Evins of Tennessee, Boland, Shipley, Giaimo, Jonas, Minshall, Rhodes of Arizona.

Subcommittee on the Interior: Messrs. Denton, Kirwan, Hansen of Washington, Marsh, Reifel, McDade.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare: Messrs. Fogarty, Denton, Flood, Matthews, Duncan of Oregon, Farnum, Laird, Michel, Shriver.

Subcommittee on the Legislative: Messrs. George W. Andrews, Steed, Kirwan, Slack, Flynt, Langen, Reifel.

Subcommittee on Military Construction: Messrs. Sikes, McFall, Patten, Long of Maryland, Cederberg, Jonas.

Subcommittee on Public Works: Messrs. Kirwan, Fogarty, Evins of Tennessee, Boland, Whitten, Rhodes of Arizona, Davis of Wisconsin, Robison.

Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary: Messrs. Rooney of New York, Sikes, Slack, Smith of Iowa, Flynt, Joelson, Bow, Lipscomb, Cederberg.

Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office: Messrs. Steed, Passman, Addabbo, Cohelan, Yates, Conte, Robison.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide comprehensive medical, surgical, and hospital benefits for all citizens age 65 and over, to be administered by private insurance carriers, and financed by Federal-State funds, on a matching basis.

This bill, identical to the bipartisan measures submitted yesterday by the gentleman from Missouri, Representative TOM CURTIS, and the gentleman from Florida, Representative SIDNEY HERLONG, of the House Ways and Means Committee, provides for a sliding scale of Federal-State subsidies, depending on the individual States and on each individual's income bracket. For persons under a minimum established by each State, Federal and State funds would pay the entire cost of the premiums, with partial payment for those with middle incomes, and the privilege to purchase at the reduced group rate for all others.

The bill would provide comprehensive health-care benefits tailored to individual need, rather than the limited hospital benefits under the King-Anderson bill, which represents only a fraction of total medical costs.

I believe it is a reasonable approach to the problems which all agree exist. The bill also includes special tax incentives included in previous legislation to permit deductions of medical costs by persons who contribute such help, regardless of the degree of dependency. I believe good legislation can be developed through compromise so long as basic principles are not abandoned.

A key provision of my bill is that it would dispense with the so-called means test now required by State welfare departments under the Kerr-Mills law, and would require, instead, only a simple certificate of income by the recipient. The bill would provide complete protection for senior citizens against the severe costs of catastrophic illness, a protection not afforded under the King-Anderson bill, which covers only a specified number of days in the hospital.

A comparison of the King-Anderson and the Hall bills is attached:

Comparison of King-Anderson Bill and Hall Bill for Health Care

	KING-ANDERSON BILL	HALL BILL
General description	Compulsory Federal Program Establishes a compulsory payroll tax under social security to furnish limited (hospital and minimal "extended care") benefits to all persons 65 and over, who are eligible to receive social security, and certain other select groups among the aged.	Voluntary Federal-State Program Establishes comprehensive medical, surgical and hospital benefits under State's administration for all citizens over 65, with voluntary, private insurance—sliding scale of Federal-State subsidies, depending on income. For persons with income under State-set minimum, Federal and State funds would pay entire cost of insurance, partial subsidies for those with middle incomes, and "privilege" to "purchase" for all others.
Scope of benefits	Quarter Coverage Inpatient hospital care limited to 60 days per benefit period, and subject to deductible of an amount equal to one day's hospital charges. Post hospital "extended care" (skilled nursing facility services) only up to 60 days in a benefit period after transfer from a hospital, provided the institution can meet standards set by HEW.	Full Coverage Comprehensive health care benefits rather than the limited benefits under King-Anderson, which represents only a fraction of total medical costs. Benefits could include not only payment of hospital and nursing home charges, but also payment of medical, surgical, drug, and other costs. No limit to duration of coverage, thus providing protection against catastrophic illness.
	"Home health services," up to 240 visits a year—if there is a Visiting Nurses Association available. (Presently existent in only one-eighth of the counties of the United States.)	No such limitation.
	"Outpatient diagnostic services," subject to a deductible each 30-day period.	No such limitation.
	Institutional benefits limited to those with "agreement" with HEW.	No such limitation.
	Omitted are surgical-care, physicians—care in home or office, drugs and medicine, outside the hospital, most nursing home care and private nursing duty.	No such limitation.
Who is eligible for benefits?	All persons who are age 65 or over and are eligible to receive social security or Railroad Retirement benefits. All persons not insured under social security or Railroad Retirement who either: (a) have reached age 65 before 1968; or (b) have reached age 65 after 1967 if they have three quarters of coverage for each year elapsing after 1965 and before the year they reach age 65.	Eligibility for benefits determined quickly and readily without need for welfare department type of "investigation." Determined on basis of applicant's simple income statement.
Who administers it?	Federal Through the Social Security Administration.	Federal-States Through established private insurance carriers (Blues and commercials) by utilizing them for administration.
How is it financed?	Tax Increase to Worker, Employer, and Self-Employed Increases tax rate on employers and employees and self-employed. Wage base, now $4,800, would be increased to $5,600. Total FICA tax rises to 8.5 percent in 1966–67; 10 percent in 1968–70; 10.4 percent in 1971 and after. For self-employed, rises to 7.8 percent by 1971.	Federal General Funds Matched by State Funds (Federal range, 52.5 to 84 Percent) Persons over 65 would purchase wide range of medical, surgical, and hospital benefits through private insurance carriers. They would pay all, part, or none of the premium costs, depending on income as determined by State plan.
How much will it cost?	First year $2 billion; more thereafter.	Would depend on State's utilization, but far less than King-Anderson, even if fully used.
Medical personnel participation	Involuntary Servitude (13th Amendment, U.S. Constitution) Would require some 55,000 doctors (anesthesiologists, physiatrists and X-ray specialists) whose services are included in hospital billing to accept Government-determined "fee schedule."	Voluntary Participation Participation by medical personnel voluntary, with doctor having option of agreeing to schedule established by each State . . . similar to Federal negotiations with physicians to provide medical care for dependents of servicemen.
Changes in tax code	None.	Greater Deductions for Medical Expenses Permits tax deductions for prepaid health insurance to become effective after age 65. Permits tax deductions for any individual who contributes to medical expenses of a person over age 65, regardless of the amount of support received by such individual from such taxpayer.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the administration recently announced their intention of closing 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals and 4 domiciliaries involving approximately 6,000 beds. Despite protests from many of my colleagues in the House and Senate and despite the announced intention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to hold hearings to determine the propriety of the closing order, the Veterans' Administration is proceeding with great haste to effect the hospital closings at the earliest possible date. To prevent such precipitous action until this body has had an opportunity to look into the matter, I have today introduced a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that none of the Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries should be closed until the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has completed hearings and reached a determination as to whether the proposed closings are in the best interest of this Nation and its veterans. I sincerely urge my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle to support this nonpartisan resolution.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman on what he is trying to do within his Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I think the gentleman has taken the most effective step that can be taken under the circumstances confronting us. He seeks to give an opportunity for Members of Congress to be heard before his committee to present our position on this matter, in order that we might call attention to those in the administration who are closing these facilities to the detriment that would eventually occur to the veteran populations throughout the areas affected. To say the least, we in Congress who speak for the people should have a right to be heard before such far-reaching action as this is taken.

Mr. Speaker, again I say I appreciate what the gentleman is doing, and I hope the committee will take expeditious action.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION UNWARRANTED CLOSING OF VETERANS HOSPITALS

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I join in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

I, too, strongly protest the unwarranted and unfair decision of the Veterans' Administration to close 11 veterans hospitals throughout the country.

It seems to me that this is an inappropriate time to close these marginal hospitals.

To my mind, the closing of these hospitals would work a tremendous hardship to our veterans and their families.

We must bear in mind that our 22 million veterans are advancing in age and, if anything, will need even more hospital facilities in coming years.

The $23 million to be saved is not nearly enough to justify the hardship imposed.

It should be crystal clear that our veterans are the last people who should bear the brunt of economy drives. We are doing little enough for our veteran population as it is.

I urge the adoption of the Adair resolution which proposes to stay the closing of any hospital until our Veterans' Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, has had an opportunity to hold hearings that will bring these unjustifiable plans under the cold glare of public scrutiny.

CONGRESSIONAL MOONLIGHTING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when the pay increase bill kiting the salaries of Members of Congress to $30,000 a year was being considered there were long and loud arguments that it was necessary if moonlighting on the part of Members was to be stopped.

This morning I read the statement of a Member of the House, who, although now drawing $30,000 a year, is an active member of a law firm which apparently is doing a thriving business representing corporations which are also doing a thriving business on Government contracts.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that congressional moonlighting will go on no matter what the salaries of some Members and the costs to the taxpayers.

It appears to be the old, old story of "them that has gits. Them as has not gits not."

TO STIMULATE INVESTMENT INTO NEW ENTERPRISE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, under section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code a loss is deductible for amounts spent in searching out and investigating a potential business or investment only where the taxpayer has entered into the transaction under contemplation and the loss has resulted from the abandonment of the project. This interpretation of the section came into prominence in 1957 in the Internal Revenue Service's Revenue Ruling 57-418.

Prior to 1957, the expenditures for preliminary investigations of business or investment opportunities were allowed as deductions even though the taxpayer did not, eventually, enter the transaction. I have today offered a bill which would in effect overrule Revenue Ruling 57-418 and reinstate the earlier rule as set out above.

The basis of this amendment is to encourage taxpayers to investigate new ventures and investments. Requiring that a taxpayer materially commit himself to the development of a particular undertaking before the expenses of investigating it in order to weigh its possibilities are allowed as a tax deduction limits the scope of ventures into which careful and responsible taxpayers will look for possible development and this, in turn, limits the development potential of our economy.

Living as we do in a period of rapid technological change and innovation, I feel it is wiser for us to stimulate the activities of those who would move us into new fields by exploring their economic possibilities than to hobble their efforts to help America move forward.

TAX CREDIT TO ENCOURAGE BASIC RESEARCH

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in 1957, the National Science Foundation, in a report to the President, indicated that America's basic research efforts must be substantially increased. Progress in the modern world is intimately linked to the efforts of basic research and to maintain America's scientific and industrial preeminence we must encourage basic scientific research in this country.

To this end, I have today reintroduced legislation which would permit tax credits to individuals and corporations for their contributions to basic research. For individuals, contributions to universities or nonprofit organizations for basic research would be treated as a credit against taxes. By the provisions of the bill, the individual taxpayer could claim 90 percent of his contribution as a credit against his tax liability, up to a total of 5 percent of that liability. For businesses which undertake basic research, there would be a credit of 75 percent of the contribution made up to a total of 3 percent of the tax liability.

The control of the incidence of the tax burden has proven to be an effective way to encourage certain activities and discourage others. What it does, in effect, is tell the individual or corporate taxpayer, "We will not order you to make certain expenditures and not others, for this is the legitimate area of personal choice; the disposition of your funds is in your hands alone. We will, however, recognize expenditures which contribute to the general welfare, we will encourage better exercise of your right to do with your funds as you see fit, and we will do this by making the amounts so spent or some part of them free from taxation." The legitimate right of choice remains with the taxpayer, both in the question of how to spend his money and its exact distribution among the competing areas of basic research.

Such a system would be, in my estimation, far preferable to a program by which the Federal Government would underwrite these costs. Guarantees of the good faith of the research expenditures would be left in the hands of the universities and nonprofit organizations where they are involved and in the hands of a certifying board of scientists where corporations are concerned. This bill would foster our national progress in the context of individual freedom which has been so important to our growth in the past.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR PAYMENT OF PARENTS MEDICAL EXPENSES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced a bill which would allow

States to bargain with private health insurance carriers for a benefit package that would be available to all the elderly over 65. I have entitled that bill the Eldercare Act of 1965, and I hope that it will be favorably acted upon by the Ways and Means Committee.

That bill also had a feature in it which would allow those under 65 to take a tax deduction for the amount paid in premiums on noncancelable health insurance which would continue in effect after retirement of the individual.

The bill that I am introducing today is an extension of the two principles above. This bill would offer a tax break for those who bear the medical expenses of their parents, when those costs are over and above the amounts available under the Kerr-Mills vendor payment plan, or even when the costs are over the benefit amounts that would be borne by a statewide health insurance plan such as I envisage in the eldercare bill. At present, we have some provision for the deduction of costs when a parent is an actual dependent upon the taxpayer, and this has been extended by giving broader interpretation to dependency than is normal. This has also been liberalized with respect to the 3-percent limitation which exists for regular medical deductions.

My proposal today would further extend the group of taxpayers who might benefit by the deduction when they have paid their parents' medical costs. Now the law covers those situations of actual dependency under the tax laws—where a taxpayer may take his dependent parent as an exemption on his personal income tax—and dependency but for the $600 income limitation—where a taxpayer pays over half of his parent's expenses but cannot take the parent as an exemption due to the fact that the parent has an income of more than $600. Under my bill, a deduction would be allowed when a taxpayer underwrites the medical expenses of his parents who would be eligible for assistance under the medical assistance to the aged provision of the Kerr-Mills Act.

Under Kerr-Mills, help is given through a State-Federal program to those elderly who, although able to meet their normal day-to-day expenses out of their retirement income, cannot stand up to a large medical expense. Aid is given in this one area where it is needed and the individual is not called upon to face the cruel choice of going without help which is needed or, by accepting it, losing entirely his former way of life. Kerr-Mills is a liberalizing step in the welfare field, and by coordinating with this law a tax deduction for the assistance of this same elderly group, another significant step can be taken to alleviate the real problem which exists in the financing of health care for America's senior citizens.

It might be in order at this time briefly to review the progress that has been made in this important area of public interest. The starting point for an examination of the cost problem in health care is an understanding of the dramatic, and costly, progress which has been made in the health sciences. Many of the diseases which were looked upon with dread in the last century and even in the earlier years of this century are no longer a threat in this country. Years have been added to the life expectancy of Americans, 10 to 15 years in the time since those of my age were born. Miracle drugs and miracle cures are commonplace now; no aspect of our health sciences has been without progress of the most awe-inspiring kind. But, as I have noted, progress in the health sciences costs a great deal, just as progress in any field is costly. Much of our present problem resolves around the increased cost of our modern medical care, especially to the elderly who have a greater health care burden than other age groups, and the fact that extra years have been added onto the lives of all of our citizens, years which were not expected and for which no financing plans had been made.

Progress has been made, as well, in the procedures for financing health care costs, but this progress is only now catching up with the costs of health science advances. We have but recently seen tremendous strides forward in health insurance, and these are continuing as the scope and quality of coverage improves. Special plans for the elderly, including noncancelable and prepaid policies and catastrophic illness coverage, are now available. State legislatures in a number of States have given permission to the insurance companies operating within the State to band together, spreading the risks of providing health insurance for the elderly and enabling insurance protection to be made available to the elderly at more reasonable rates. The Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans of various States have also taken steps to provide special low-cost coverage to the elderly. Health insurance is growing in popularity and companies are offering an ever-increasing number of policies allowing a wide range of choice and permitting the individual to find the coverage which best suits his needs.

In the public sector we have been moving ahead also. In older days the form of welfare which society provided its indigents was the county poor farm. Great strides were made in welfare by the initiation of old-age assistance which allowed the individual to remain in his community although a great deal of the control of his life passed into the hands of welfare workers who budgeted the money which he received. The OASDI approach in social security represents another step forward. Here the individual receives aid but is allowed, nonetheless, to control his own life and budget his income as he sees fit. Kerr-Mills, as I have noted, moves us forward again, providing needed aid in the health care sector of the individual's life without disturbing his everyday life outside of this sector.

But welfare is not the only area in which the Government has worked to help provide for the medical needs of the elderly. We, through our Federal Government, assist in the construction of health care facilities; hospitals under the Hill-Burton program, and nursing homes through the FHA loan guarantee program. I am proud to say that I sponsored the legislation which made FHA assistance possible for nursing homes. We assist in the training of personnel in the health sciences and the related technical fields through the National Defense Education Act and through the Practical Nurse Training Act, whose extension I cosponsored. Through our tax structure we encourage gifts to medical charities by making such gifts deductible; we permit corporations to deduct the cost of health benefits provided under employee pension plans, an amendment to the pension sections of the Internal Revenue Code which I sponsored in the last Congress; we permit, as noted above, the deduction of some of a taxpayer's parents' medical expenses paid by the taxpayer.

This is not an exhaustive statement of what we have done in our society, both through the Government and through private initiative, to help meet the problem of medical costs for our elderly. This is a dynamic area, with progress and innovation the norm. We have not achieved a final solution in this area, but we have made substantial and meaningful progress and we are continuing to do so. I believe that the proposal which I have offered today is another beneficial change that will help in reaching the goal which we all desire, that of assuring that our elderly, and indeed all of our people, can enjoy the full benefits of the unparalleled medical care available in our society.

CARDINAL-DESIGNATE LAWRENCE JOSEPH SHEHAN, ARCHBISHOP OF BALTIMORE

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a great honor has been bestowed on the United States and the State of Maryland by the designation of Lawrence Joseph Shehan, archbishop of Baltimore, as a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church.

Cardinal-designate Shehan is the only American bishop among the 27 new Cardinals named by Pope Paul VI. In accepting the honor, Archbishop Shehan stated this honor was given him chiefly because the two major goals of his life have been Christian unity and racial justice. He said to the press:

> The Pope and the whole church are interested in racial justice.

Since 1961, Cardinal-designate Shehan has been head of the Baltimore archdiocese, the first bishopric established in the United States by the Vatican. In the 4 years of his leadership in the archdiocese, he established the Commission on Christian Unity, the first of its kind in the United States, and issued a pastoral letter condemning racial segregation and prejudice in his archdiocese.

The first Bishop of Baltimore was Bishop John Carroll, cousin of John Carroll, of Carrollton, signer of the Declaration of Independence. Bishop Carroll was founder of Georgetown University. The archdiocese of Baltimore has had one other cardinal, James Cardinal Gibbons, the friend of labor in the years when the labor unions were coming into existence in our country. Cardinal-designate Shehan has already proved himself a worthy successor of his distinguished predecessors in the see of Baltimore.

Cardinal-designate Shehan is a native of Baltimore and belonged to the same parish to which James Cardinal Gibbons belonged in his boyhood. He is a graduate of St. Charles Seminary, in Catonsville, and received his theological training at the elite North American College in Rome. While Washington was still part of the Baltimore diocese, he became assistant pastor of St. Patrick's Church in the Nation's Capital and spent 18 years there. He was also director of Catholic Charities.

Marylanders are proud of the elevation of this distinguished clergyman to the College of Cardinals. We congratulate him, and we wish him long and fruitful years in the service of God and country.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 1, 1965

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order to ask the majority leader if he can give the Members any information as to what we might expect, if anything, next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma; yes.

Mr. ALBERT. We are not in a position as yet to announce whether there will be any legislative business next week.

We have no further legislative business this week, and it will be my purpose to ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

We do have yet pending the economic report and I believe one other report from the White House.

Mr. ARENDS. Should something unexpectedly develop the gentleman will give the Members as much advance notice of such as possible?

Mr. ALBERT. We will give as much advance notice as possible.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

BAN ON COMMODITY SHIPMENTS TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, January 25, the day before the House voted a ban on commodity shipments to the United Arab Republic, I prepared the following open letter to the Secretary of State:

January 25, 1965.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: This letter is to express the hope, which I know is strongly shared by a very large number—probably the majority—of my constituents, that no further aid of a type which can be translated into resources for external aggression and adventurism should be extended to the United Arab Republic so long as it pursues its present policies.

I have reached this conclusion after a great deal of thought and not without difficulty. At the time that I was Deputy Administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration (point 4), I frequently had occasion to argue with representatives of the State Department that assistance for underdeveloped countries should not be given nor withheld for political reasons. I still believe that, in most cases, the purpose and objective of our development assistance programs should be economic and social, rather than political; that is, that we should attempt to assist developing countries to solve their economic and social problems, both because, as President Kennedy said, it is "right" to do so and because we believe that nations that are making progress economically and socially will tend to be better neighbors in an ever shrinking world, and specifically will cling to their independence and freedom against the false temptations of communism. All of us who have taken part in aid programs know that a country cannot buy the friendship of other countries with aid, and that it is better not to try.

Alongside these general principles, however, there are certain other factors which have entered into the formulation of our aid program and, I believe, quite properly so. In the last decade or more, we have directed the great bulk of our aid funds to certain countries whose survival and progress we have considered to be of a special strategic and political importance. We have not considered extending aid to countries, however underdeveloped, which have consistently proclaimed and followed a policy of hostility to us and our friends, such as Communist China, Albania, and Cuba. We have, on the other hand, largely for political reasons, extended certain types of aid to Communist countries, such as Poland and Yugoslavia, who were not acting toward us in a hostile way and who we felt could be encouraged to follow policies divergent from the Soviet Union. We have cut down to a mere trickle our assistance to a country such as Indonesia, which has consistently followed policies adverse to our own and injurious to the security of its area. Accordingly, much as ideally we should like to say that our aid is nonpolitical in nature, we must in all honesty recognize that in many cases (probably the majority, dollarwise) it is not.

Our aid to the United Arab Republic likewise has been carried on for many years for a variety of reasons, partly to assist the people of Egypt to make economic and social progress and so, hopefully, to be better neighbors, and partly in an effort to maintain "a bridge" to Nasser, i.e., in an effort to exert a restraining influence upon him.

I have come to the conclusion that our aid to Nasser has been a failure on both counts. Economically and socially, it has not achieved its objectives because Nasser has diverted such disproportionate resources to his military preparations and adventures. The failure politically is even more obvious.

For years, Nasser has been proclaiming the ultimate destruction of Israel with fervor, but it is only comparatively recently that he has been devoting substantial resources to the development of a missile capability, with the assistance of German scientists, the presumed target for which would be Israel. Even more recently, the Egyptian Government has actively promoted the inauguration of a scheme whose announced purpose is to deprive Israel of its rightful share of the Jordan waters, a clearly hostile act. In addition, Nasser has been engaging in an aggressive adventure in Yemen, and has recently brazenly announced his active support for the Congolese rebels, both lines of action being hostile to the peace and stability of the areas concerned. Added to these are the obviously government-inspired anti-American actions in Cairo and Nasser's own nose-thumbing speeches.

I know it is argued that if we cut off further aid to Nasser, he will be left more than ever to follow a pro-Communist policy. As to this, I would say, first, that I believe it is important to Nasser to maintain the posture of nonalinement and neutralism, in order to continue his policy of trying to exercise leadership among the nonalined and neutralist nations, and that the withholding of any further aid from us will not alter this fact. Secondly, I do not believe the past record justifies the hypothesis underlying this argument.

For all these reasons, I hope that you will give the most careful study to the important decisions that lie ahead as regards the extension of further aid to the United Arab Republic. I am sure that you will do so and I hope that you will conclude that the course of wisdom, as well as of justice, is that such aid should not be extended, at least so long as the United Arab Republic continues its present policies.

Sincerely yours,
Jonathan B. Bingham,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, although it was not intended for that purpose, the foregoing letter states the reasons for my vote on Tuesday, January 26, in favor of at least a temporary ban on certain commodity shipments to the United Arab Republic.

In most situations, I would not be in favor of congressional action of this type, limiting the President's freedom of action. However, in this case, I felt the situation was sufficiently extraordinary to warrant such congressional action. I believe it may well strengthen the hand of the President and the Secretary of State in seeking to persuade Nasser to alter his policies in the direction of stability and peace.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 20 U.S.C. 42 and 43, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO COMMEMORATE THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 2D INAUGURAL OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-427 the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee To Commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the 2d Inaugural of Abraham Lincoln the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

IMPROVEMENT PROPOSED FOR KERR-MILLS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, substantial changes to broaden coverage and simplify administration of the Kerr-Mills medical care program are proposed in a bill I have introduced today.

The bill would authorize Federal grants to the States on a matching basis to help persons 65 years of age and older pay the cost of minimum-standard health insurance if they cannot afford it otherwise. It would utilize private insurance companies.

Full medical expenses—hospital, nursing, and doctor—would be covered. States would have discretion in choosing the type insurance desired, but the bill would require that each policy be noncancelable.

To hold down cost and discourage abuse, I recommend that the States specify policies which cover expenses exceeding $350 and with a top limit of $10,000.

Persons financially unable to meet the first $350 of cost, or expenses exceeding $10,000, would be eligible to have these costs met by the States under present Kerr-Mills authority.

My bill would eliminate family responsibility and the complicated formula now used to determine eligibility under Kerr-Mills, and would substitute a simple certificate of income.

Cost of insurance would be borne entirely by the Government for those elderly individuals whose income falls below limits set by each State. For individuals with incomes between the minimum and the maximum, the Government would pay a part of the cost on a sliding scale according to income.

Individuals with income above the maximum would pay the entire cost, but they would have the benefit of an income tax deduction for such payments, as well as statewide bargaining for the noncancelable health care policies.

Under my bill, each State would have wide latitude, but I recommend that the States contract with private companies for insurance with a $350 deductible feature. This figure is about the average annual cost of medical care for those over 65.

My bill would provide that the insurance must be noncancelable. Several private companies already offer policies with a similar deductible feature at an annual cost of about $120, and the broad character of this program would probably result in premiums of still lower cost.

My proposal would provide complete medical care coverage for those over 65, in contrast with the limited scope of the administration's medical care proposal. It would accomplish the complete coverage at about half the cost of the administration plan.

If utilized by all citizens over 65, I estimate the total combined cost to State and Federal Governments would be $2.1 billion a year. Administration officials have estimated that their proposal, which is limited to hospital and some nursing services, would cost $3.7 billion by 1975.

My proposal could be fully implemented and placed in operation this year, while the administration proposal would not start until June 1966, and would not be fully operative until 1967.

The administration proposal would be financed under social security payroll taxes, which hit low-income people hard. My proposal would be financed by general revenues, whose main source is progressive income taxes.

The administration proposal would cause such heavy new burdens as to threaten the solvency of the social security fund. My bill would avoid this hazard.

In order to eliminate completely the possibility that elderly people might become impoverished as the result of a long and expensive illness, I recommend that the State government give consideration to a requirement that each citizen over 65 be covered by a private policy of minimum standard. This could be accomplished through certification of coverage on State tax returns. If an individual over 65 did not certify coverage, the State could buy a policy for him and tax him for the premium cost.

This would meet problems caused by people who, through oversight or neglect, did not take out coverage themselves.

My proposal would eliminate the family-responsibility requirement which has, I believe, proved to be a handicap under the present Kerr-Mills program.

My proposal reflects a long period of study, analysis of health care problems of my own constituents, and consultation with officials of the public welfare services in Illinois and members of the medical profession.

For nearly a year, I have conducted my own medical care referral service for the benefit of my constituents. During that time I have invited constituents to contact me if they know of anyone who is not getting proper medical care.

This invitation has been publicized widely and has been repeated several times. From February 26, 1964, to January 5, 1965, I received 341 letters. Only 10 of these mentioned cases where a lack of medical care might exist. Through the cooperation of local doctors, these cases were checked out immediately. Only two were found to have substance, and care in those cases was provided.

One hundred and three of the letters asked for general information about existing health care services without stating specific problems. Twenty-four took the opportunity to criticize a variety of things, such as social security, public aid, hospital costs, and doctor fees.

The rest of the letters were from people who seemed to be receiving adequate medical care but were struggling to pay hospital and doctor bills or were trying to pay their parents' bills while supporting their own family.

As the result of my referral service, a number of people became eligible for Kerr-Mills who were previously unaware of its existence.

Information gained from the service convinced me that the present Kerr-Mills program is not adequate.

First of all, the eligibility rules are too complicated and undoubtedly frighten many applicants.

Second, the requirement of family responsibility, while a fine moral objective, causes the program to break down in many cases.

Third, the fact that the program is handled through the Public Aid Commission, commonly known as the relief office, keeps some citizens from applying. Kerr-Mills was intended to keep people from going on relief because of medical costs, but it is handled by the same staff that handles relief cases.

A JOINT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Stafford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Lindsay] and other Members who yesterday introduced legislation to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics for Members of Congress and all legislative employees.

This legislation would both set up an interim code of ethics and establish a joint congressional committee whose responsibility it would be to recommend a comprehensive, permanent code.

Such action is needed, I believe for two reasons. First, the people of this great Nation have every right to know of any possible conflict of interest which could possibly affect the vote of any Member of the Congress. Secondly, the members and employees of the legislative branch should have the guidance and protection of standards and conduct reasonably to be expected of them.

It is inconceivable to this Member that any one of us would hesitate to give our full support to putting our own house in order in this respect. It is my hope that the majority party members will join in giving this resolution prompt and affirmative consideration.

STUDY OF COMPENSATION FOR PERSONS AFFECTED BY REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION IN THE FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, a "Study of Compensation for Persons Affected by Real Property Acquisition in the Federal and Federally Assisted Programs" was distributed to all Members of Congress by a select subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works.

As a Member representing a congressional district in which two large Federal reservoirs are under construction, I am acutely aware of some of the shortcomings under the present law. I am most favorably impressed with the subcommittee study, and I am, today, introducing a bill to carry out one of its three major recommendations. I have extracted title II of the proposed bill because it deals with changes in the Internal Revenue Code and would, therefore, be referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means. I believe this bill will be of interest to every Member of the House in whose district any major public land acquisition program is contemplated and, indeed, to all others who have an interest in equity and fair play.

For those who may be interested in cosponsoring similar legislation, I call attention to the following news release explaining the details of the bill I have submitted, as well as a discussion of other recommendations in the select subcommittee study:

Representative Hall Submits Bill To Ease Impact of Federal Land Acquisition Program on Property Owners.

Congressman Durward G. Hall has introduced legislation to carry out one of the major recommendations of a select House subcommittee dealing with compensations for persons affected by real property acquisition in various Federal programs.

The study, recently completed by the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, revealed that provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to involuntary conversions of property often result in sharp inequities for owners of property taken for public use.

Under present law, the owner of land taken for public use can defer any recognition of gain on the compensation he receives only by reinvesting in property of a like kind within a specific period. Otherwise he must pay a substantial capital gains tax. Hall's bill would provide that an owner of property taken for public use may defer any recognition of the gain on the transfer if he reinvests the compensation received for property in (1) any real property, (2) any property used in trade or business, or (3) any property to be held by the taxpayer for investment. The bill follows closely the language suggested by the select subcommittee.

The House study, according to Hall, revealed that in some instances, particularly in large reservoir takings such as are now contemplated at the Kaysinger and Stockton Reservoirs in Missouri, comparable replacement property is not available in the general vicinity and landowners must move considerable distances to reinvest.

"Some owners," he said, "would prefer to remain in their home areas and go into business. Frequently, the owner has reached the age where he doesn't believe it physically possible to start a new farming or ranching life and would prefer to retire.

"The Congress has already recognized the equity of permitting the deferment of gain on the transfer, if the owner purchases replacement real estate. Where real estate is not the most practical means of reinvestment of the funds received for the property taken, it seems only reasonable to permit the owner to reinvest in a business or to buy securities. This recommendation would permit him to do so."

Hall's bill also provides that the period by which this provision shall be effective, shall begin at any time after the owner has reason to believe that his property will be taken.

"Sometimes property owners have good reason to believe that their property will be taken for a public project, and have an opportunity to purchase replacement property before the price rises, which often accompany large reservoir takings. But they're now reluctant to do so because of the uncertainty of the time of threat or imminence of condemnation.

This particular amendment would make it clear that any relocation payments received by a person displaced by a public project after December 31, 1964, pursuant to a law of the United States, will be excluded from gross income.

Another provision of the Hall bill carries out a further recommendation of the subcommittee that taxpayers receiving relocation payments because of displacement by public programs are exempt from payment of the documentary stamp tax (55 cents per $500).

Hall said he believes that other recommendations of the special House subcommittee are equally worthy of enactment, but that he was extracting title II of the proposed bill for submission at this time because it deals with tax changes and must be referred to the House Ways and Means Committee.

Other recommendations made by the subcommittee would (a) insure opportunity for the owner to accompany a Government appraiser, (b) insure full fair value offer for property and reasonable value information to the owner, (c) give the owner first opportunity to remove improvements, (d) establish policy to offer the highest reasonable price for the property, and (e) establish relocation assistance programs and retraining programs.

Citing the select subcommittee study, Hall said "the amount of disruption caused by Federal and federally assisted programs is astoundingly large. The accelerated pace of Government activity, supported by broadened concepts of public use, make any lessening of current activity in the foreseeable future highly unlikely.

"In each of the next 8 years, Federal and federally assisted programs are expected to require the acquisition of real property from 183,000 separate ownerships and the displacement of approximately 111,080 households, 17,860 businesses, 2,310 farm operations.

"The market value standard of just compensation under the fifth amendment requires payment for the property taken, but does not provide for other losses or expenses, however severe, that may be incurred by property owners or tenants because of the taking of property.

"In contrast to the vast amount of displacement and disruption in present-day programs, the market value standard, limiting compensation to the value of the property taken, was adopted by the courts in a comparatively uncomplicated time in our Nation's history, when land was plentiful, and Government acquisitions skirted cities and bypassed homes and businesses, causing few displacements and relatively little damage. Nevertheless, the Federal courts have made it plain that they are bound by the established precedents, and that it is the responsibility of the Congress to determine whether other losses suffered by property owners or tenants should be absorbed by the public.

"The bill I have introduced is intended to be only a first step in carrying out that responsibility. I believe it will, or should, be supported by every Member of Congress whose district is faced with a Federal land acquisition program, whether it be a reservoir, a new highway, urban renewal, or any other Federal activity."

CLEVELAND BILL TO ALLOW CITIZENS THEIR OWN COUNSEL BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to permit all citizens to be represented by their own attorneys in matters before the Federal agencies.

At present, a number of agencies refuse to allow a lawyer to appear before them unless he has specifically been admitted to practice before the agency.

This practice seriously prejudices both lawyers and their clients, especially when the latter unexpectedly become involved in administrative proceedings. Sometimes the necessity of obtaining admission to practice before an agency means a delay, perhaps of several months while the attorney goes through the rigmarole required for admission.

For persons of moderate means, this can mean serious hardship. Matters of critical importance to them may not be of sufficient monetary value to compensate a strange lawyer for the time and effort required to familiarize himself with the case.

Inasmuch as every State requires lawyers to demonstrate their educational and moral fitness before admission to the bar, there is no need for individual agencies to impose additional requirements. It is absurd to suggest that a lawyer who is qualified to try cases in State and Federal courts is not competent to represent clients before administrative agencies.

An important additional benefit of this legislation is that it will help to arrest the drift toward centralism in government. As we are all aware, the growth of Federal power, now touching nearly every facet of life in this country, is producing a tremendous concentration of power here in Washington.

The fact that a citizen often cannot even use his own lawyer to plead his cause before a Federal agency compounds centralization further. A breed of specialists far removed from the average American is being created. These specialists, of course, delight as the rules and regulations in their respective enclaves become more and more complicated, restrictive and exclusive.

It will do these agencies a great deal of good if they are exposed to lawyers from Main Street, U.S.A., where commonsense is still important and where the client's legitimate interest is the most important consideration.

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE BENEFITS TO INHABITANTS OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use or damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952.

This is the identical joint resolution that was recommended by the Secretary of the Army in a letter to the Speaker of this House dated January 8, 1965, and which has been referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee. The resolution is the same, with minor differences, as was introduced by me in the last Congress as House Joint Resolution 1175 and reintroduced by me in the opening days of the present Congress as House Joint Resolution 74. In order to make this a joint effort of the executive and legislative branches, I am withdrawing my proposal and accepting verbatim the proposal which has been made by the Secretary of the Army.

The purpose of this resolution is to rectify a serious omission in the U.S. administration of the Ryukyu Islands and to do justice to hundreds of thousands of the inhabitants whose relatives were killed, or who were injured, or who suffered deprivation of property through the acts of our Armed Forces during the period following the termination of hostilities and prior to the treaty of peace with Japan. The United States exercised direct and exclusive governmental authority at that time, and we had substantial forces in Okinawa in the strategic interest of the United States, not only as a consequence of the war against Japan.

The claims of the people affected have been analyzed and reviewed by a joint committee established by our High Commissioner in the Ryukyus in consequence of which they were scaled down from $43 million, as originally submitted, to approximately $22 million. This includes claims for personal injury and death, for land rentals for the years 1947–50, for restoration of lands released to their owners in damaged condition, for appropriation of water rights, and for damage to buildings and growing crops and trees. Land-use claims are not included for the year 1946 because this was a period of postwar adjustment in which owners had generally not yet returned to their lands and produced crops. No interest is included, although the claims have gone uncompensated for 13 years and more.

As a matter of international law, it is unquestioned that the people of Okinawa are entitled to be compensated for these various acts on the part of the U.S. forces. In the main islands, this was done by the Japanese Government under the supervision of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. In the Ryukyu Islands, there was no financially responsible local government that was able to do this, and the Japanese Government was cut off from all participation. The people of Okinawa have repeatedly presented their claims to the U.S. Government as the administering authority. Since the United States exercised direct and exclusive control during the entire period, there can be no doubt of U.S. responsibility to assure that compensation is effected.

Action on the part of the U.S. Government was delayed by a question with respect to U.S. responsibility in international law to pay the claims, in view of the fact that in the Japanese Peace Treaty, Japan waived all claims of Japanese nationals against the United States arising from the war and the occupation of Japanese territory. The executive branch has recommended that without accepting legal responsibility, compensation nevertheless be made by the United States in the recognition of the facts that the individual claimants were, through no fault of their own, left uncompensated during the 7 years of the occupation, contrary to the practice followed in other occupied areas; that the United States, as the administering authority for the Ryukyus is concerned with the well-being of the people; that such payment would promote the security interests of the United States; and that it would foster respect for the spirit of fairplay and equity of the U.S. Government.

In introducing this bill, I should like to stress just two facts: that these sums have been due to the individual claimants now for many years, and that payment by the United States is an act of simple justice in view of our complete responsibility for what occurred in the Ryukyu Islands since 1945.

I hope that this matter can be acted upon promptly by the Congress with a view to effectuation of payments to the individuals concerned before many more months have elapsed.

PROPOSED CLOSURE OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed when the announcement came from the Veterans' Administration proposing to close a number of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliary homes and Veterans' Administration regional offices. As a past officer of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and a member of other veterans organizations, I strongly protest this move, both as an individual and as a Representative of the people. The alleged savings of $23 million per year is not in my opinion a real saving. When a veteran, his family and friends are required to travel great distances to other Veterans' Administration hospitals the overall cost to the American people will be far more. In addition, the Veterans' Administration will be required to pay ambulance fees and other costs connected with transportation of veterans great distances.

Mr. Speaker, far more important than dollars is the welfare of these deserving veterans. The Marion, Ill., Veterans' Administration Hospital is in my district and I can cite examples where veterans have died because in the past there was no bed space. Turning a veteran away without proper medical attention or requiring him to travel such a great distance that he decides to go without proper medical attention is cruel, to say the least. This so-called economic move is aimed at eliminating rural facilities and concentrating our Veterans' Administration facilities in the urban areas of the country. This is contrary to the President's policy of trying to aid sparsely populated areas who through no fault of their own have lost population because of a lack of job opportunities. Coal mining and agricultural regions of the country are a prime example.

Mr. Speaker, I am receiving scores of letters from interested veterans and citizens of Illinois concerning the proposed closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Dwight, Ill. The arguments I have advanced in my remarks previously, apply to the Dwight Veterans' Administration Hospital, the same as it does to other hospitals throughout the country.

I hope my friends in the Veterans' Administration will reconsider this action because it is a simple case of being penny-wise and dollar foolish.

Under leave extended me, Mr. Speaker, I am including a letter received from the Roy Mitchell Post No. 647 of the American Legion at Du Quoin, Ill. The post commander, post adjutant, and service officer are speaking for the hundreds of veterans in their post and community. It is strange that the Veterans' Administration, who should have the greatest interest in our veterans, seem to be the only group of people who want to close these facilities. A vote by the American people would be overwhelmingly in favor of keeping Dwight Veterans' Administration Hospital and other similar facilities in operation.

I hope the Veterans' Administration will rescind their action in this regard.

The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
ROY MITCHELL POST NO. 647,
Du Quoin, Ill., January 18, 1965.

Re Closing of Veterans' Administration hospital in Dwight, Ill.

Hon. KENNETH J. GRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: Roy Mitchell Post No. 647 of the American Legion, located in Du Quoin, Ill., has read the newspaper and other media that the Dwight Veterans' Administration Hospital and other such hospitals are to be closed permanently between April 1, 1965, and June 30, 1965.

It is our understanding that the Dwight Veterans' Administration Hospital employed nearly 300 and was functioning fully and doing a good job of it.

The closing of that hospital will cause considerable hardship to those who are being hospitalized, as they will have to be hospitalized elsewhere in other hospitals that are already very crowded; and that is not a good thing. It is our understanding that some of those hospitals already have long waiting lists for admissions.

Likewise, it is our understanding that the closing of the Dwight Veterans' Administration Hospital will cause all of those 300 employees to lose their jobs. The employees will be asked to move elsewhere for employment in other veterans' hospitals, but the other hospitals just do not have room to employ additional help, as their lists are filled up.

The closing of that Dwight Hospital will, of course, work a great hardship on the town of Dwight Ill., as it was considered one of the leading employers of that community.

It is too bad that every effort made by the Government to save money has to be aimed at the war veteran and his dependents. Those veterans gave their all and are now entitled to the very best that our Government can provide for them.

Therefore, Roy Mitchell Post No. 647 of the American Legion strongly protests the closing of that Dwight Veterans' Administration Hospital and also any other Veterans' Administration hospitals, wherever located. It is our desire that you exert every bit of your personality and influence to stop the closing of those hospitals.

There is a great need for hospitals at this time. The war veteran is getting older and will need increasing hospital services. It is not proper to close existing hospital facilities at this time and then have to build new facilities later on.

Very truly yours,

TOM MCJELIAN,
Commander.
HAROLD SMITH,
Adjutant.
LESLIE EDEL,
Service Officer.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement of the Veterans' Administration concerning the closing of regional offices, VA hospitals, and domiciliary homes has been a matter of considerable concern to me, as I know it has been to many of our colleagues.

The apparent ground for this action is economy, but in my opinion, there must be close scrutiny to determine whether, in fact, the closing of Veterans' Administration facilities will mean savings in view of the economic impact both on individuals and communities.

The closing of the VA hospital at Castle Point, N.Y., will alone mean the disruption of 250 patients, the loss of 340 jobs, and the loss of a $2,400,000 annual payroll to the community.

Furthermore, the closing of these veterans' facilities appears to be directly contradictory to President Johnson's announced plan to care for the aged, wage war on poverty, and establish experimental centers designed to overcome diseases which have long plagued mankind.

It is worth noting that domiciliary homes, four of which are scheduled for closing, are occupied by veterans without funds, of advanced age, and suffering from crippling diseases.

In addition, the Veterans' Administration policy of not operating hospitals in rural or semiurban areas is sure to work undue hardship on veterans, their families and their friends. At a time when more hospitals are needed in our rural and suburban areas, why close hospitals that would cost $150 million to replace, and then ask for $90 million to build new ones?

Mr. Speaker, any readjustment in the number or operation of our veterans' facilities should be supported by more substantial evidence than has been offered in this instance by the VA, and such action must be demonstrably in accord with the long-range health care objectives of the administration.

IDAHO MEMORIAL AMENDING THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Idaho State Legislature, in its current 38th session, enacted a joint memorial asking that the U.S. Constitution be amended so that one house of a State bicameral legislature be allowed to consider factors other than population in its apportionment. I include the full text of Senate Joint Memorial 1, in the RECORD.

At the present time, the Idaho Legislature is under court order to reapportion itself. The Supreme Court decision of June 22, last year, was very brief, merely citing the decisions in the Baker against Carr and Reynold against Sims cases.

Following the decision in the Hearne against Smylie, I introduced House Joint Resolution 1141, which would amend the U.S. Constitution to reserve to each State exclusive power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof. My purpose in sponsoring the resolution was to restore the principles enunciated by the Supreme Court before the Baker and Sims decisions.

When hearings were called on the proposal I stated that the basis of my sponsorship runs deeper than the inconvenience and impracticality of forcing State legislatures to meet court deadlines at inopportune times. I believe that the above-mentioned decisions are a violation of historical constitutional principles and that it is the duty of the Congress to correct them.

Senate Joint Memorial 1 calls for a constitutional convention on this matter, and I support the aims of this measure.

It is my hope that the Congress will seriously consider the memorial and promptly act upon the application of the Idaho Legislature:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 38th session thereof, do respectfully represent that—

Whereas the Constitution of the United States should not prohibit any State which has a bicameral legislature from apportioning the members of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States should not restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units should be apportioned; and

Whereas in proposing an article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States implementing the above freedom from prohibition, restriction or limitation of apportionment, the article, as proposed, should be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress;

Now, therefore, we your memorialists respectfully make application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to read as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which has a bicameral legislature from apportioning the numbers of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress.": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this memorial prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the U.S. Congress from this State, as being an application of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 11th day of January 1965.

JACK M. MURPHY,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 18th day of January 1965.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial 1 originated in the senate during the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

ARTHUR WILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 147

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress.

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Burleson, Texas; Mr. Hays, Ohio; Mr. Lipscomb, California.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Burleson, Texas; Mr. Jones, Missouri; Mr. Thompson, New Jersey; Mr. Lipscomb, California; Mr. Corbett, Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 20)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to report—

That the state of our economy is excellent;

That the rising tide of our prosperity, drawing new strength from the 1964 tax cut, is about to enter its fifth consecutive year;

That, with sound policy measures, we can look forward to uninterrupted and vigorous expansion in the year ahead.

PROGRESS TOWARD OUR ECONOMIC GOALS

FULL EMPLOYMENT

In the year just ended, we have made notable progress toward the Employment Act's central goal of "useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

EMPLOYMENT

Additional jobs for 1½ million persons have been created in the past year, bringing the total of new jobs since January 1961 to 4½ million.

Unemployment dropped from 5.7 percent in 1963 to 5.2 percent in 1964 and was down to 5 percent at year's end.

PRODUCTION

Gross national product (GNP) advanced strongly from $584 billion in 1963 to $622 billion in 1964.

Industrial production rose 8 percent in the past 12 months.

PURCHASING POWER

The average weekly wage in manufacturing stands at a record $106.55, a gain of $3.89 from a year ago and of $17.50 from early 1961.

Average personal income after taxes has reached $2,288 a year—up 17½ percent in 4 years.

Corporate profits after taxes have now risen continuously for 4 straight years—from a rate of $19½ billion early in 1961 to nearly $32 billion at the end of 1964.

But high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power cannot rest on a sound base if we are plagued by slow growth, inflation, or a lack of confidence in the dollar. Since 1946, therefore, we have come to recognize that the mandate of the Employment Act implies a series of objectives closely related to the goal of full employment; rapid growth, price stability, and equilibrium in our balance of payments.

RAPID GROWTH

True prosperity means more than the full use of the productive powers available at any given time. It also means the rapid expansion of those powers. In the long run, it is only a growth of overall productive capacity that can swell individual incomes and raise living standards. Thus, rapid economic growth is clearly an added goal of economic policy.

Our gain of $132 billion in GNP since the first quarter of 1961 represents an average growth rate (in constant prices) of 5 percent a year.

This contrasts with the average growth rate of 2½ percent a year between 1953 and 1960.

Part of our faster gain in the last 4 years has narrowed the "gap" that had opened up between our actual output and our potential in the preceding years of slow expansion. But the growth of our potential is also speeding up. Estimated at 3½ percent a year during most of the 1950's, it is estimated at 4 percent in the years ahead; and sound policies can and should raise it above that, even while moving our actual performance closer to our potential.

PRICE STABILITY

I regard the goal of overall price stability as fully implied in the language of the Employment Act of 1946.

We can be proud of our recent record on prices:

Wholesale prices are essentially unchanged from 4 years ago, and from a year ago.

Consumer prices have inched upward at an average rate of 1.2 percent a year since early 1961, and 1.2 percent in the past 12 months. Much of this increase probably reflects our inability fully to measure improvements in the quality of consumer goods and services.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS EQUILIBRIUM

The Employment Act requires that employment policy be "consistent" with "other essential considerations of national policy." Persistent balance-of-payments deficits in the 1950's reached an annual average of nearly $4 billion in 1958–60. Deficits of this size threatened to undermine confidence in the dollar abroad and limited our ability to pursue, simultaneously, our domestic and oversea objectives. As a result, restoring and maintaining equilibrium in the U.S. balance of payments has for some years been recognized as a vital goal of economic policy.

During the past 4 years—

Our overall balance-of-payments position has improved, and the outflow of our gold has been greatly reduced.

Our commercial exports have risen more than 25 percent since 1960, bringing our trade surplus to a new postwar record.

The annual dollar outflow arising from our aid and defense commitments has been cut $1 billion, without impairing programs.

Our means of financing the deficit have been strengthened, reducing the gold outflow and helping to build confidence in the dollar.

CONSISTENCY OF OUR GOALS

Thus, the record of our past 4 years has been one of simultaneous advance toward full employment, rapid growth, price stability, and international balance.

We have proved that with proper policies these goals are not mutually inconsistent. They can be mutually reinforcing.

THE ROLE OF ECONOMIC POLICY

The unparalleled economic achievements of these past 4 years have been founded on the imagination, prudence, and skill of our businessmen, workers, investors, farmers, and consumers. In our basically private economy, gains can come in no other way.

But since 1960 a new factor has emerged to invigorate private efforts. The vital margin of difference has come from Government policies which have sustained a steady, but noninflationary, growth of markets.

I believe that 1964 will go down in our economic and political history as the "year of the tax cut."

It was not the first time that taxes were cut, of course, nor will it be the last time. But it was the first time our Nation cut taxes for the declared purpose of speeding the advance of the private economy toward "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." And it was done in a period already prosperous by the standard tests of rising production and incomes. In short, the tax cut was an expression of faith in the American economy:

It expressed confidence that our economy would translate higher after-tax incomes and stronger incentives into increased expenditures in our markets.

It recognized the presence of untapped productive capacity. We cut taxes confident that the economy would respond to increased buying by producing more goods at stable prices rather than the same output at higher prices.

It insisted on getting full performance from the American economy.

The promise of the tax cut for 1964 was fulfilled. Production, employment, and incomes jumped ahead. Unemployment was whittled down steadily.

Since 1960, the balance between budget expenditures and taxes has been boldly adjusted to the needs of economic growth. We have recognized as self-defeating the effort to balance our budget too quickly in an economy operating well below its potential. And we have recognized as fallacious the idea that economic stimulation can come only from a rapid expansion of Federal spending.

Monetary policy has supported fiscal measures. The supply of credit has been wisely tailored to the legitimate credit needs of a noninflationary expansion, while care has been taken to avoid the leakage of short-term funds in response to higher interest rates abroad.

Fiscal and monetary policies to build our prosperity have been buttressed by measures—

To improve the education, skills, and mobility of our labor force;

To stimulate investment in new and modern plants and machinery;

To expand exports;

To assist in rebuilding the economic base of communities and areas that have lagged behind;

To strengthen our farm economy and support farm income;

To conserve and develop our natural resources;

To keep a sound flow of credit moving to home buyers and small businesses;

To redevelop decaying urban areas;

To strengthen our transportation network; and

To offer business and labor a guide for sound and noninflationary price and wage decisions.

Public policies to build a sound prosperity have found their response in equally constructive private efforts.

Our businessmen have controlled their costs, increased their efficiency, and developed new markets at home and abroad.

They have kept their inventories under tight control and have prudently geared their plant expansion to rising markets in an expanding economy.

Consumers have used rising incomes and tax savings to lift their standards of living, while adding to their wealth to assure their future standards of living.

Workers have realized that wage gains which justify employers' raising prices vanish when they take their pay envelopes into the stores—and cost them much when they draw on their savings.

Workers and managers have cooperated to facilitate the adoption of new technology, while solving the human problems it sometimes creates.

As a result of public and private policies, we have come to our present state of prosperity without pressures or imbalances that would foretell an early end to our expansion. Instead, we look forward to another year of sustained and healthy economic growth.

THE UNFINISHED TASKS

Our prosperity is widespread, but it is not complete. Our growth has been steady, but its permanence is not assured. Our achievements are great, but our tasks are unfinished.

1. Four years of steadily expanding job opportunities have not brought us to full employment. Some 3.7 million of our citizens want work but are unable to find it. Up to 1 million more—"the hidden unemployed"—would enter the labor force if the unemployment rate could be brought down just 1 percentage point.

In the next year, 1.3 million more potential workers will be added to our labor force, including a net increase of one-half million below the age of 20.

The more of these 6 million potential workers who find jobs in 1965—

The faster our total output will grow;

The greater will be the markets for the products of our factories and farms;

The larger will be our Federal revenues;

The greater will be the number of our citizens who know they are contributing to our society, not subsisting on the contributions of others;

The smaller will be the number who know the pangs of insecurity, deprivation, even of hunger;

The larger will be the number of teenagers who feel that society has a useful purpose for them.

The promise in the Employment Act of job opportunities for all those able and wanting to work has not yet been fulfilled. We cannot rest until it is.

2. Four years of vigorous efforts have not yet brought our external payments into balance. We need to complete that task—and we will.

The stability of the American dollar is central not only to progress at home but to all our objectives abroad. There can be no question of our capacity and determination to maintain the gold value of the dollar at $35 an ounce. The full resources of this Nation are pledged to that end.

Progress in key sectors of our international payments has been good, but not enough. Gains in trade and savings in Government oversea payments have been offset in large measure by larger capital outflows. As a result our deficit remains far too large. We must and will reduce and eliminate it.

In the process of restoring external balance we must continue—in concert with other nations of the free world—to build an international economic order—

Based on maximum freedom of trade and payments;

In which imbalances in payments, whether surpluses or deficits, are soundly financed while being effectively eliminated;

In which no major currency can be undermined by speculative runs; and

In which the poorer nations are helped—through investment, trade, and aid—to raise progressively their living standards toward those of the developed world.

3. Ceaseless change is the hallmark of a progressive and dynamic economy. No planned economy can have the flexibility and adaptability that flow from the voluntary response of workers, consumers, and managements to the shifting financial incentives provided by free markets.

In those activities entrusted to governments—as in those where private profit provides the spur—the search for efficiency and economy must never cease.

The American economy is the most efficient and flexible in the world. But the task of improving its efficiency and flexibility is never done.

4. American prosperity is widely shared. But too many are still precluded from its benefits by discrimination; by handicaps of illness, disability, old age, or family circumstance; by unemployment or low productivity; by lack of mobility or bargaining power; by failure to receive the education and training from which they could benefit.

The war against poverty has begun; its prosecution is one of our most urgent tasks in the years ahead.

5. Our goals for individuals and our Nation extend far beyond mere affluence. The quality of American life remains a constant concern.

The task of economic policy is to create a prosperous America. The unfinished task of prosperous Americans is to build a Great Society.

Our accomplishments have been many; these tasks remain unfinished:

To achieve full employment without inflation;

To restore external equilibrium and defend the dollar;

To enhance the efficiency and flexibility of our private and public economies;

To widen the benefits of prosperity; and

To improve the quality of American life.

ECONOMIC PROSPECTS FOR 1965

Approval of the fiscal program I have recommended means that GNP in 1965 should expand over 1964's record level and reach—as the midpoint of a $10 billion range—$660 billion for the year.

Carried forward by the momentum of last year's gains and fueled by the continuing stimulus of profits enlarged through tax reduction, private business investment in plant and equipment should grow nearly as much in 1965 as it did in 1964.

Current rapid gains in sales, and slim stocks in 1964, should produce a higher rate of production for inventory in 1965.

Residential construction will remain high.

State and local governments will continue to enlarge their buying.

Consumers' confidence is strong. They will respond to rising earnings, higher social security benefits, and a cut in excise taxes by lifting their purchases, thereby providing a market for a full two-thirds of our expected overall gain in production.

FEDERAL FISCAL POLICY

Private demand will be strong in 1965. It will be further sustained by Federal fiscal measures.

The 1966 budget message outlines my fiscal philosophy. We have four priorities:

To strengthen our national defense;

To meet our pressing human needs;

To maximize the efficiency of Government operations;

To sustain the advance of our Nation's economy.

In these priorities lies the key to our whole strategy of attack on waste:

The waste of lives and property and progress which is the cost of war;

The waste of human potential and self-respect which is the cost of poverty and lack of opportunity;

The waste of excessive government personnel, obsolete installations, and outmoded public services which is the cost of inefficient government;

The waste of men and facilities and resources which is the cost of economic stagnation.

Purposeful expenditures, stimulative tax reduction, and economy in government operations are the three weapons which, if used effectively, can relieve our society of the costs and consequences of waste.

Carrying out these principles, I have submitted a budget which will once again contribute expansionary force rather than restrictive pressure on our economy.

As measured by their effects on incomes and production, Federal expenditures, grants, and transfer payments in calendar 1965 will exceed by $5 billion their amount in 1964. The largest single part of this increase will arise from the 7-percent increase in social security payments I have proposed.

The reduction or elimination of many excise taxes—when fully effective, $1.75 billion a year—partially offset by appropriate new or increased user charges—will accomplish a net tax reduction of nearly $700 million within calendar year 1965. In addition, another $1 billion reduction in corporate income tax liabilities becomes effective this year. So does a further $3 billion reduction in personal tax liabilities—although not in withholding rates.

Should unfavorable developments in the private economy during 1965 unexpectedly make this budgetary stimulus inadequate to maintain a strong pace of expansion, I shall be prepared to consider additional fiscal action.

PROGRESS TOWARD FULL EMPLOYMENT

A GNP of around $660 billion, with expansion throughout the year, will give us our fifth straight year of substantial economic gains—a record without peacetime precedent.

The productive powers of our dynamic economy are now expanding so rapidly that a gain of $38 billion will do little more than keep up with the expansion of our capacity, and will make only modest inroads into the still too heavy unemployment of our human and physical resources. But unemployment in 1965 should average less than the 5.2 percent of 1964.

The road to maximum employment, production, and purchasing power will not be easily or quickly traveled. And it has no final destination. The challenge of maintaining full employment once reached will be as urgent and as difficult as reaching it.

COMBATING RECESSIONS

A time of prosperity with no recession in sight is the time to plan our defenses against future dips in business activity.

I do not believe recessions are inevitable. Up to now, every past expansion has ended in recession or depression—usually within 3 years from its start. But the vulnerability of an expansion cannot be determined by the calendar. Imbalance—not old age—is the threat to sustained advance.

In principle, public measures can head off recessions before they start. Unforeseen events and mistakes of public or private policy will nonetheless occur. Recessions may be upon us before we recognize their warning signs.

We can head them off, or greatly moderate their length and force—if we are able to act promptly.

The stimulating force of tax cuts is now generally recognized.

The Congress could reinforce confidence that jobs and markets will be sustained by insuring that its procedures will permit rapid action on temporary income tax cuts if recession threatens.

Recessions usually arise from a reduction in the intensity of private demand for goods and services. At such a time, it may be appropriate to employ idle or potentially idle resources in sound programs of public expenditure.

The programs which should be considered for expansion at such times would be those—

That meet important public needs;

That are capable of quick acceleration—not just in the assignment of funds but in the hiring of workers and the production of goods;

That in any event would have been increased in the next regular budget, or that are capable of quick and efficient termination when the need has passed.

MONETARY POLICY IN 1965

As in 1964, an expansionary monetary policy will be tempered by the urgency of our balance-of-payments problem. But barring domestic or international emergency, our monetary and debt-management policies can serve—as they have since 1960—to accommodate the credit needs of a noninflationary expansion.

Long-term interest rates, in particular, will continue to be held down by the vast flow of savings into private financial institutions. Long-term borrowers now reasonably plan on the essential stability of long-term interest rates in 1965.

Monetary policy must be free of arbitrary restriction. It must be prepared to move quickly—

If excessive demand should threaten inflation.

If an outflow of liquid funds should unexpectedly worsen our balance of payments.

We expect neither of these in 1965. Rather, we expect a continuation of sound and healthy economic expansion.

The Federal Reserve System must be free to accommodate that expansion—in 1965 and in the years beyond 1965. Such an expansion needs to be supported by further orderly growth in money and credit. But this growth, as it is reflected in Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities, could easily absorb—within 2 years or less, and without the outflow of a single ounce of gold—the present operating margin over the 25 percent "gold cover" required by existing law.

Clearly, we should place beyond any doubt the ability of the Federal Reserve to meet its responsibility for providing an adequate but not excessive volume of bank reserves.

Clearly, we should place beyond any doubt our ability to use our gold to make good our pledge to maintain the gold value of the dollar at $35 an ounce with every resource at our command.

I am requesting the Congress, therefore, to eliminate the arbitrary requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain a gold certificate reserve against their deposit liabilities.

The desirability of prompt action does not arise from any sudden emergency. If required at any time in defense of the dollar, gold could and would be released from the present requirement under the provisions of existing law.

But we should not permit a provision of law framed for the different circumstances of an earlier day to raise any questions about our ability to carry out effective and responsible monetary and credit policies for domestic prosperity with stable prices, and for defense of the dollar abroad.

MAINTAINING WAGE-PRICE STABILITY

The remarkable price stability of 1959–63 persisted throughout 1964. There is good reason to believe that it will continue in 1965.

Yet watchful caution must govern public and private policies in 1965.

Though the margin remains substantial, our economy is now closer to full utilization than at any time since 1957. Despite the general moderation of labor settlements and the general restraint by pricemakers in industries that have price discretion, there have been disturbing exceptions. Moreover, temporary and accidental factors—such as those that affected some nonferrous metals in 1964—could spark price increases in another sector of our economy in the year ahead.

Individual prices will have to rise, where productivity gains are small or materials costs go up. But these should be balanced by price cuts elsewhere.

We can no more afford inflation in 1965 than we could in 1964. Our balance-of-payments problem is not solved. We have only recently begun to regain the competitive edge in international markets that was impaired by the inflation of the mid–1950's.

Federal budgetary and monetary policies must not permit a generalized excess of demand over supply to pull up prices. But, equally, private price and wage decisions must not push up costs and prices.

I count on the sense of public responsibility of our labor leaders and our industrial leaders to do their full part to protect and extend our price stability.

Reasonable price and wage guideposts are again spelled out in the accompanying report of the Council of Economic Advisers. I commend them to the attention of the American public and leaders of labor and industry.

With the help of the Council and of other agencies of Government, I intend—

To maintain a close watch on wage and price developments;

To draw public attention to those private actions which threaten the public interest;

To ask, as I have recently done in the case of steel prices, for special, detailed analysis of price or wage increases in key sectors of the economy; and

To oppose legislative enactments that threaten to raise costs and prices and to support those that will stabilize or reduce costs and prices.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICIES

RESTORING BALANCE IN OUR EXTERNAL PAYMENTS

Continued cost and price stability is fundamental to correction of our balance-of-payments deficit; it is the foundation on which we must build our entire effort to achieve external equilibrium. In addition, we must continue and intensify more specific attacks on the problem.

We are continuously reviewing our aid and defense programs to achieve the maximum savings in dollar expenditures abroad. Our aid programs must remain closely tied to exports of U.S. goods and services, until the balance-of-payments problem has been eliminated.

We must continue and strengthen measures to promote U.S. exports.

We will be alert to restrain any persistent outflow of short-term private funds in response to relatively high short-term interest rates in foreign countries.

To increase our ability to attract foreign investment in U.S. securities, legislation will be proposed to improve the tax treatment of such investments.

More broadly, we need to reassess the adequacy of existing programs to deal with the balance-of-payments problem. The results of this reassessment will be set forth in a separate message to the Congress.

BUILDING A STRONGER WORLD ORDER

Through expanded trade: In the Kennedy round of trade negotiations now underway at Geneva, we are working intensively for a broad liberalization of world trade in both industrial and agricultural products.

A successful outcome can be of crucial benefit not only to the industrialized countries but also to the developing countries of the world.

Through improved international monetary arrangements: We take pride in our leadership in the building of the postwar system of international monetary cooperation. We find reassurance in the wholehearted resolve of the industrialized countries of the free world to avoid repeating the costly mistakes of the 1920's and 1930's. The strength of international monetary cooperation was demonstrated dramatically in 1964 in repelling speculative attacks on the Italian lira and the British pound.

We will continue to pursue orderly growth at home and abroad—

On the basis of stable convertible currencies and the fixed $35 price for gold;

Through a wide network of bilateral and multilateral credit arrangements; and

Through frequent consultation between countries.

But we still have more to learn about—

How best to share the burden of making necessary mutual adjustments when countries run persistent deficits or surpluses in their balances of payments; and

How best to meet the need of insuring orderly growth in world liquidity to finance expanding world trade.

We will continue to seek agreement on these problems with other countries; we are confident that effective solutions will be found. We look toward early agreement on an increase in the resources of the International Monetary Fund, which will further strengthen the international monetary system.

Through helping to raise incomes in less developed countries: U.S. foreign assistance programs further three basic American aims. By helping to advance the economic growth of the less developed nations, they—

Create the kind of world in which peace and freedom are most likely to flourish;

Bring closer a world economic order in which all nations will be strong partners;

Simultaneously, give a major stimulus to U.S. exports both in the present through direct financing of U.S. goods and services and for the future by developing the recipient's ability to buy and his preference for American products.

MANPOWER POLICIES FOR A FLEXIBLE ECONOMY

Fiscal and monetary measures have the primary responsibility for furnishing "employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking to work."

But the creation of jobs is not enough. Job opportunities and men must be matched. Workers must have the requisite skills—and the opportunity to gain new skills if advancing technology finds less use for their old ones.

To a substantial degree, strong demand for labor will bring workers and jobs together. But sole reliance on strong demand would place price stability under an unnecessary threat. And the time needed for such adjustments would place unnecessary burdens upon displaced employees and new entrants to the labor market.

To reduce human costs, raise productivity, and make possible full employment without inflation, this administration is developing an active manpower policy.

U.S. EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

An efficient labor market brings together employers and potential employees—matching workers and jobs over time, space, and occupations. Most man-job matches occur unassisted, but a strong Federal-State employment service can make the difference between an effective and an inefficient labor market.

The efficiency of the U.S. Employment Service has improved in recent years, but further strengthening is required for truly efficient labor markets. My budget provides for that strengthening.

MANPOWER TRAINING

The Manpower Development and Training Act was passed in 1962 and broadened in 1963. Its purpose is to supply skills to those who, whether for lack of wisdom or lack of opportunity, failed to acquire them earlier. It aims to make possible retraining of those who would otherwise bear the burdens of society's technological progress.

We intend to improve and expand our training programs in 1965. We will give special attention to basic training and basic education for those at the bottom of the ladder of skills.

PRIVATE PENSION AND WELFARE FUNDS

Spectacular growth has occurred in postwar years in private pension and welfare plans. They provide a vital supplement to public programs to assist older workers, disabled workers, and workers who lose their jobs. But potential problems have become evident.

Failure to give the worker a right to his pension if he should change his employment hampers labor mobility. And in some instances, absence of full funding has imperiled the retirement incomes of the affected workers.

I have asked several groups to study these and other difficult problems. I am now releasing—for consideration by unions, employers, the public, and the Congress—the report of my Committee on Corporate Pension Funds and Other Private Retirement and Welfare Programs.

MAINTAINING INCOMES OF THE DISADVANTAGED

Not every person can share fully in the fruits of our progress through his own daily productive effort. Large numbers of our retired and handicapped cannot work. Many workers still suffer unemployment. Even in prosperous times, some receive wages below our standards. And the poverty of one-fifth of our families traps too many of our children in lives without opportunity or aspiration.

I am proposing new programs and extensions of old ones to meet more effectively our obligation to the weak and disadvantaged.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Cash benefits must be increased to provide adequate support for the aged. I urge a 7-percent rise in social security benefits this year, retroactive to January 1, financed by an increase next January in the covered wage base and in the combined employer and employee contribution rates. Increases in public assistance payments to the needy aged, blind and disabled, and to needy children, should be enacted. We must continue to maintain the financial soundness of the social security system, at the same time taking care that its financing avoids the "fiscal drag" which could endanger our prosperity.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY

We can and must assure improved health services for the aged whose health needs are greatest and whose financial resources most meager. A hospital insurance program for the elderly, financed by contributions through social security, will provide protection against the costs of hospital and posthospital extended care, home health visits, and outpatient diagnostic services. I urge the Congress to act promptly on this program.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Improved protection against the risks of unemployment is long overdue. A comprehensive program requires that—

Coverage be extended to additional workers under our Federal-State unemployment insurance program;

Benefits be kept in step with wages;

The duration of benefits be extended beyond the 26 weeks now authorized in most States for workers with a firm and substantial labor force attachment.

I shall recommend such a program.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS

A large number of workers still lack the protection of Federal minimum standards.

I shall recommend coverage for an additional 2 million workers under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

POVERTY

America's efforts to eradicate poverty are quickly taking shape under the Office of Economic Opportunity. Programs of community action, education, training, and work experience will strike at the roots of poverty, especially among our youth. I urge a doubling of appropriations to intensify these efforts.

IMPROVING URBAN LIFE

Our cities are the homes of more than two-thirds of the American people.

They must be communities where men can find security, significance, and fulfillment.

They must be centers of economic strength and commercial vitality.

They must be seats of learning, sources of culture, and centers of scientific achievement.

They must challenge and release the full productive and creative capacities of the people.

Our first task is to recognize that the city and its suburbs—often, indeed, several cities and their suburbs—constitute a single metropolitan area.

The Federal Government has neither wish nor power to abolish the legal boundaries that divide an urban area. But the Federal Government helps cities because many aspects of urban life pose problems of national as well as local concern. We can increasingly require—as a condition for Federal help—that the separate units work and plan together to assure that Federal aid and federally financed facilities will be used effectively in improving urban life.

We must increasingly help our cities to—

Develop unified metropolitan transportation systems;

Supply adequate water and sewage service;

Provide community facilities and neighborhood centers;

Build adequate housing for low- and middle-income families;

Promote more efficient land use;

Set aside open spaces and develop new suburbs;

Replace or rehabilitate slum areas; and

Improve housing codes and code enforcement.

We need a new Department of Housing and Urban Development to strengthen our ability to cope with these problems.

I shall shortly send to the Congress a message containing my recommendations.

OTHER ECONOMIC POLICIES FOR 1965 AND BEYOND

NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

America owes her greatness partly to the large public and private investments made to develop her abundant natural resources. Rapid growth and urbanization require intensified efforts to solve old problems and imaginative approaches to new challenges.

Especially requiring study and action are—

The protection of our environment. We need to strengthen our attack on air, water, and soil pollution.

Water resource programs. We must improve the efficiency, coordination, and comprehensiveness of our major water resource development programs. More realistic charges and user fees will improve equity and strengthen private incentives for efficient use.

Research programs. We must find new and more efficient ways of utilizing available resources. I have recommended increased research efforts in several areas, including the desalting of sea water.

Recreational resources. Urbanization, higher incomes, and expanded leisure time pose new demands for outdoor recreation. New and improved facilities are needed, particularly near metropolitan areas.

STRENGTHENING THE ECONOMIC BASE OF COMMUNITIES

In 1961, the Congress recognized the special needs of distressed areas by passing the Area Redevelopment Act. Since then, hundreds of urban and rural communities have been strengthened by grants, loans, technical assistance, and training programs to help to build or restore their economic base. This program has helped distressed areas to benefit more fully from sustained prosperity.

Redirection of this program can benefit from the experience of the last 4 years. Future assistance should be sufficient to make a significant impact on the economic growth of the communities assisted. Integrated development plans must be devised for larger economic areas with high promise of future viability, and communities must be helped to mobilize public and private leadership in an attack on local blight and depression.

I shall propose measures to achieve these goals, through an extension and strengthening of the Area Redevelopment Act.

I also urge the Congress to enact the special program to assist in redeveloping the Appalachian region.

CONSUMER INFORMATION

Informed consumer choice among increasingly varied and complex products requires frank, honest information concerning quantity, quality, and prices. Truth-in-packaging will help to protect consumers against product misrepresentation. Truth-in-lending will help consumers more easily to compare the costs of alternative credit sources.

TRANSPORTATION

The technological revolution in transportation, and large public and private investments in our highways, railroads, airways, and waterways, have greatly altered the nature of our transportation system. Our national transportation policy should be revised to reflect these changes, particularly by placing greater emphasis on competition and private initiative in interstate transportation. Fair and adequate user fees for our inland waterways, our Federal airways, and our Federal-aid highways will improve equity and efficiency in the use of these public resources.

As part of a well-rounded system of moving goods and people, there is urgent need and opportunity for high-speed, comfortable, and economical passenger transportation on densely traveled routes, such as in the northeast corridor.

I am recommending an enlarged program of research and demonstration projects to determine the best and cheapest way to meet this need.

INDUSTRIAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Department of Commerce—

Has proposed a State technical services program to enable States to join with universities and industry to create new jobs through wider application of advanced technology;

Is establishing a coordinated system for scientific and technical data, to reduce unnecessary duplication of research and lower the costs of obtaining scientific data.

My budget contains funds for these desirable programs.

AGRICULTURE

Americans owe much to the efficiency of our farmers. Their independent spirit and productive genius are the envy of the world. We must continue to assure them the opportunity to earn a fair reward for their efforts.

I will transmit to the Congress recommendations for improving the effectiveness of our expenditures on price and income supports.

Many small farmers cannot expect to earn good incomes from farming. But they—along with other rural Americans—will have an opportunity to share in the fruits of our society through faster economic growth, better education and training opportunities, and improved health and community facilities. We must extend the benefits of American prosperity to all our people, including those in rural America.

EDUCATION AND HEALTH

In my message on education I proposed a program to insure an opportunity to every American child to develop to the full his mind and his skills.

In my message on health I proposed a massive new attack on diseases which afflict mankind.

We value education and health for their direct benefits to human understanding and happiness. But they also yield major economic benefits.

Investments in human resources are among our most profitable investments.

Such investments raise individual productivity and incomes, with benefits to our whole society. They raise our rate of economic growth, increase our economy's efficiency and flexibility, and form the cornerstone of our attack on poverty.

I believe that the Congress will find economic as well as human reasons to support my proposals on education and health.

CONCLUSION

In our economic affairs, as in every other aspect of our lives, ceaseless change is the one constant.

Revolutionary changes in technology, in forms of economic organization, in commercial relations with our neighbors, in the structure and education of our labor force converge in our markets. Free choices in free markets—as always—accommodate these tides of change.

But the adjustments are sometimes slow or imperfect. And our standards for the performance of our economy are continually on the rise. No longer will we tolerate widespread involuntary idleness, unnecessary human hardship and misery, the impoverishment of whole areas, the spoiling of our natural heritage, the human and physical ugliness of our cities, the ravages of the business cycle, or the arbitrary redistribution of purchasing power through inflation.

But as our standards for the performance of our economy have risen, so has our ability to cope with our economic problems.

Economic policy has begun to liberate itself from the preconceptions of an earlier day, and from the bitterness of class or partisan division that becloud rational discussion and hamper rational action.

Our tools of economic policy are much better tools than existed a generation ago. We are able to proceed with much greater confidence and flexibility in seeking effective answers to the changing problems of our changing economy.

The accomplishments of the past 4 years are a measure of the constructive response that can be expected from workers, consumers, investors, managers, farmers, and merchants to effective public policies that strive to define and achieve the national interest in—

Full employment with stable prices;

Rapid economic growth;

Balance in our external relationships;

Maximum efficiency in our public and private economies.

These perennial challenges to economic policy are not fully mastered; but we are well on our way to their solution.

As increasingly we do master them, economic policy can more than ever become the servant of our quest to make American society not only prosperous but progressive, not only affluent but humane, offering not only higher incomes but wider opportunities, its people enjoying not only full employment but fuller lives.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 28, 1965.

REAPPORTIONMENT

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has inherited an extraordinary obligation which cannot tolerate delay. Now that the inauguration of the President and Vice President is over and the preliminary business of the new House has largely been accomplished, there are compelling reasons why Congress must act as quickly as possible on the matter of amending the Constitution to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population.

The issue had every reason to be resolved in the 88th Congress and per se is a warning against legislative procrastination that has come to prevail on Capitol Hill during the spring and summer months. The trifling with a question of such significance has already created an atmosphere of confusion in a number of States which sought to comply with the shocking dictate of the Supreme Court and in other States which even now are in the process of attempting to conform without completely destroying the system of representation that has served from the forming of the Constitution.

In its approval of a bill to deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction over apportionment of State legislatures, the House last year went on record in support of the philosophy expressed in a vigorous dissent by Justice Potter Stewart, who said that the majority decision "makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States." While this House action offered encouragement to areas of the country which would be deprived of proper representation under the court verdict, failure of the Senate to meet the issue headon during the rush toward adjournment left responsible State authorities in a dilemma of dilatant proportions which today persists in State capitols throughout the Nation.

The House majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], has explained the chaos visited upon his State by the Supreme Court action. After Oklahomans voted overwhelmingly in a referendum for a reapportionment plan for the State legislature, the Supreme Court handed down a decision "telling Oklahomans that the referendum reapportionment plan would not do, regardless of how big it carried in the referendum, regardless apparently if even 100 percent of the people approved it." In his concluding remarks in protest against the Court's action, he said:

> My case rests on the unsuitability of having the Federal judiciary superintend legislative apportionments. These apportionments are deeply bound to the traditions of American politics, not of American courts.
>
> Not only does the judiciary lack the means of affording adequate relief to persons aggrieved by the equality of votes standard, it is repugnant to American traditions to allow appointed magistrates to wield such great political power.
>
> I am strongly in favor of action leading to a return of the apportionment power to the people of this country, where it has been since the founding of this country.

I applaud the majority leader for this frank protest. The Court decision on apportionment is not an interpretation of the Constitution; it is an amendment to the Constitution by judicial edict. Nor is there any historical or moral justification for the opinion which holds that State legislatures must have membership based on population alone.

The framers of our Constitution wisely provided for representation in the House of Representatives to be based on population, with geography or State lines the controlling factor in Senate representation. The Supreme Court's notorious decision on apportionment would nullify that concept in State legislatures and would subordinate the interests of less-populated counties and other political districts to the whims and dictates of urban politicians and—ultimately and inevitably—to the whims of big city bosses.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues that in just 7 years the State legislatures will be charged with the redistricting requirements that shifting populations will bring about through the 1970 census. Left to urban-controlled State legislatures, that redistricting would strip many important geographic and economic entities of a voice in the House of Representatives of the United States as well as in the State houses. I for one do not intend to wait for that day when our rural people are deprived of fit and full representation by what in effect amounts to judicial gerrymandering.

Because of the large number of resolutions that have already been introduced for the purpose of nullifying the Supreme Court's decision on apportionment, I am confident that there will be ample support when the measure comes before the House, but we need to act fast. Already many legislatures in session at the present time are looking to Washington for the protection they need against despoilment of their representative systems. We must not fail them this time.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat of January 12, 1965, at the conclusion of my remarks. It commends Governor Scranton for his efforts to have the general assembly of our State undertake to adopt a constitutional amendment. With this demonstration of the feeling among citizens of our land on so vital a subject, I am confident that there will be ample support for our position once Congress takes action.

The editorial follows:

THE CONSTITUTION

Governor Scranton has joined the political leaders of a number of other States in supporting a Federal constitutional amendment on legislative reapportionment. Such an amendment would permit States to apportion one of the two branches of their legislatures on a geographical basis instead of on population alone.

The present Pennsylvania constitution, now ruled unconstitutional by this State's supreme court in line with rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court, requires that each county have one member in the State house of representatives, no matter how small the county. Under the new court rulings, this would not be permitted; nor would Pennsylvania be allowed any longer to limit the number of senators from any single county to one-sixth of the whole.

The senatorial change would not materially alter the State's general assembly, since only one county—Philadelphia—would be affected and it would gain a single seat. But in the house the change would be substantial, since numerous counties fall short of population equal to the average for all of the 67 counties in Pennsylvania. Heretofore each of these has elected its own member of the house.

There are sound reasons for giving each county a representative in the State legislature, since they have problems which are distinct from those of most other counties. And if the purpose of a legislature is to secure a consensus, rather than to obtain special consideration for the politically more powerful counties, it is served by the present system.

Governor Scranton may not be able to persuade the divided general assembly to endorse this proposal, but it just might be that there are enough legislators whose constituents, irrespective of party, want to avoid big-county domination of the State, to get it approved. At least, we hope so.

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, all private organizations and interested citizens desiring to take part in the hearings scheduled on immigration legislation are requested to notify the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality in writing on or before February 22, 1965.

As announced yesterday, the hearings will open on February 16, at 10 a.m., with spokesmen from the executive branch of Government who will testify on changes made in the original administration proposal and on which hearings were held during the 88th Congress. Immediately thereafter representatives of private organizations and interested citizens will be scheduled to be heard.

I invite particular attention to the date of February 22, 1965, the date by which all requests to be heard must be filed in writing with the subcommittee.

WORLD'S MOST EXPENSIVE OFFICE BUILDING IS OWNED BY THE TAXPAYERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, two reporters for the Chicago Daily News, Mr. James McCartney and Mr. Charles Nicodemus, have written a most interesting series of articles on the structure known officially as the Rayburn Building in Washington, D.C.

The articles were published in the Daily News last fall after the adjournment of Congress. It is for the reason that they bring together in one place many facts and figures that I offer them for printing in the RECORD for the benefit of Members of Congress and the public.

It seems impossible that so much money could have been spent on one building to serve so few. It seems impossible, too, that in this day of modern construction it could have taken 10 long years, a full decade, for the construction of an office building.

Many of the reasons for the incredible cost and the time element will be found in the following:

THE WORLD'S MOST EXPENSIVE BUILDING

(By James McCartney and Charles Nicodemus)

(NOTE.—"Mistakes" have run the cost of plush new quarters for Congressmen up, up, and up—to $95 million.

(Most of the records of this fantastic Government goof-up are being kept under wraps. And Congressmen are afraid to talk about it.

(But it's no secret who made 10-percent profit on all the costly mistakes: Matthew H. McCloskey, now under investigation on kickback charges in the Bobby Baker probe.)

WASHINGTON.—This is the untold story of the world's most expensive building—the $95 million Rayburn Building for Congressmen on Capitol Hill.

It's a story of million-dollar mistakes—and multimillion-dollar miscalculations, of spiraling costs and delays running into the years.

And now, as the building is nearing completion—4 years behind schedule—another long shadow is falling across its marble facade.

It's the shadow of its principal contractor, Matthew H. McCloskey, who is under investigation in the Senate on kickback charges in the reopened Bobby Baker probe.

He has been accused of helping to finance the 1960 Democratic campaign with a tax-free $35,000 kickback on construction of a new home for the Washington Senators baseball club.

McCloskey's firm has been a beneficiary of mistakes and miscalculations made by the Rayburn Building's planners. McCloskey is a former treasurer of the Democratic National Committee.

From the beginning the Rayburn Building has been in trouble, at least partly because of its opulence. No building in history has provided so much for so few.

It is costing over $40 million more than the new State Department wing, which has more usable floor space and was started at about the same time. That building—criticized widely as too plush when it opened 4 years ago—cost $54 million.

Comparisons with other buildings are different because of changing building costs, but for the record the Empire State Building cost $42 million in 1931 and Chicago's Merchandise Mart $32 million the same year.

The Empire State Building, tallest in the world, has space for more than 20,000 tenants. The Capitol Architect's Office says the Rayburn Building will house about 2,800 tenants.

In the Rayburn Building, parking space for Congressmen and their aids has cost more than $10,000 a car.

Office furnishings, at $10,000 a congressional suite, come to nearly double the tab in outfitting a top Government executive.

Sixty elevator operators will pilot the building's shiny new automatic elevators—while the rest of the Government is engaged in an automation program to save money by getting rid of operators.

The massive building is twice as big as both of the office buildings that have sheltered the entire House of Representatives for the last 30 years.

Yet it will hold only a third of the Members of the House plus nine committees and their staffs.

It has three times the floor space of the Capitol itself.

But perhaps more importantly, the story of the Rayburn Building is a story of a way of life in Congress.

And where McCloskey is involved now, it's a life of fear.

"Go away from me," a veteran Congressman told Daily News reporters inquiring about the Rayburn Building. "I don't want to talk to you."

"I don't want to talk about that building to anybody."

This is a Congress that demands the facts from the executive branch of Government, and then proceeds to hide its own records.

It is a Congress in which powerful politicians operate virtual fiefdoms with public funds—feeling no responsibility to tell the public how public money is spent.

For the records of the Rayburn Building—the checks, the invoices, the vouchers—lie in shadows, beyond the reach of public and press.

No outsider can say what the possibilities for payoffs in this shadowy world of politicians and contractors might be.

This is the world on Capitol Hill in which Matthew McCloskey and his firm, McCloskey & Co. of Philadelphia, have competed—and competed well.

In this world, million-dollar contracts mushroom by 50 percent, with a 10-percent profit on the changes.

The McCloskey firm made $700,000 clear profit on changes in two major Rayburn Building contracts alone—at a time when McCloskey was working overtime as a fundraiser for the Democrats.

Who ordered those changes, and why—and the records of those changes—are matters that congressional leaders prefer to keep to themselves.

At the very least the story of the Rayburn Building provides an object lesson on what can happen when Congress writes a blank check to anyone—but particularly when it writes one to itself.

For the Rayburn Building was a blank check proposition from the day it was born in secrecy in 1955.

And the figures on that blank check have risen over the years on virtually every contract involved.

It all began on the quiet afternoon of March 18, 1955, when Sam Rayburn, the late, great Speaker of the House, unexpectedly took the floor and said, "Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment."

He proposed a $2 million appropriation, added to a money bill, to build "an additional fireproof office building for the House of Representatives"—plus "such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out this act."

The House at the time had two office buildings, one completed in 1903, the other in 1933. The size of the House of Representatives has not changed in the last 50 years, but staffs and committees have grown.

Speaker Rayburn's proposal was a departure from normal House procedure. No plans had been prepared for the building he suggested, no studies made, no hearings held, no site selected.

Furthermore, he proposed to put full authority for providing funds for the building in the hands of the existing House Office Building Commission with dictatorial powers—which he headed himself.

In his bill there was not so much as a vague estimate on what those "additional sums" might be.

But his Commission was empowered to provide them—outside normal appropriation channels.

There were immediate complaints that Rayburn was violating House rules.

But Sam Rayburn was the venerated Speaker—and it was what he wanted.

And he got it, with whimpers, only, from former Representative Clare Hoffman, the conservative Republican from Michigan, and his sidekick, Representative H. R. Gross, of Iowa.

Asked Gross, characteristiclly: "What is the emergency * * * and what is going to be the cost?"

He got no answer.

And there is no firm one yet—9 years later.

What is certain is that more funds have been pumped into the Rayburn Building project than any building project ever started on Capitol Hill.

And if a Congressman begins to ask too many questions he is told that he is desecrating the memory of Sam Rayburn.

Many—in fear—are remaining quiet.

From the very beginning there was trouble. It started with the selection of a site.

The Senate, in building a new office building a few years before, had chosen a modest location behind its original office building.

The House, under prodding by Rayburn, decided to plunk its new home in a prominent spot dominating the entire southwestern side of Capitol Hill, even though it didn't balance with what the Senate had done.

It proved to be an all but tragic decision.

The first major contract was to rebuild a giant sewer on the building site. The sewer rebuilders say that they found the soil wasn't quite what it seems to be from tests ordered by the Architect of the Capitol.

Their job was scheduled to take 8 months. It took almost 3 years and the courts are still listening to arguments about who is at fault.

"Nobody knows why it took so long to build it," says Representative Tom Steed, Democrat, of Oklahoma, who heads the subcommittee responsible for coughing up money voted by the House Office Building Commission.

Lawyers for the sewer contractors say they have lined up geological experts to testify in court that tests of the soil were not adequate.

The sewer problem was only the beginning. Soon afterward work began on the foundation and excavation. The contractor: McCloskey & Co.

The original bid: $6,666,000.

In putting in the foundation McCloskey, too, ran into trouble with the soil—but now of an even more complex nature.

Somehow, water was flowing underground that hadn't been anticipated.

Every Washington history book mentions Tiber Creek, flowing from Capitol Hill. It once ran down the famous mall.

For some reason it wasn't expected to show up at the new building site. But apparently it did.

McCloskey & Co. had to put up special shoring materials to hold back sliding dirt. It cost $996,000. Today McCloskey is seeking to collect the sum from the Government, but no final decision has been made.

While this problem was still being fought a more serious one was discovered. The plans for the foundation and excavation on which McCloskey based its bid for the contract were found to be inadequate.

Somebody had goofed.

As explained today by Philip L. Roof, the executive assistant to Capitol Architect J. George Stewart, who has managed construction on the building, the mistake was a result of a gamble.

Roof says that a desire to expedite construction led to a decision to start building the foundation before plans for the superstructure were completed.

It was a gamble, however, that failed, according to Roof.

Too late, it was discovered that pressures on the foundation, well below the water level, were heavier than anticipated.

The superstructure, as designed, would not, as Roof puts it, "be heavy enough to hold the foundation in place."

If the original plans had been followed, according to Roof, the building, built over a sewer, might, literally, have floated away.

He said it became a question of whether to add weight to the superstructure or to the foundation—and the decision was made to add weight to the foundation.

Tons of concrete were poured into the foundation, as a result, to anchor the building.

It was a mistake that cost $1,500,000 and Roof is not clear, even yet, who should be held responsible, although he hints darkly that the House Office Building Commission is at fault.

As it worked out, the $1,500,000 in work was done by the contractor already chosen for the foundation—McCloskey & Co. There was no competitive bidding for the job.

Thus McCloskey & Co. became the chief beneficiary of the most costly mistake in the early stages of the construction of the Rayburn Building. It was not to be the last time the company would prosper.

How McCloskey Reaped Profits

(By James McCartney and Charles Nicodemus)

Washington.—"Somebody up there likes me" might well have been the theme song of Matthew H. McCloskey, big builder, big Democrat, and main erector of the giant Rayburn House Office Building.

In the troubled construction of that $95 million showplace, most of what worked out wrong for others seemed to work out right for McCloskey, who had two-thirds of the job.

Whether the "somebody up there" smiling was merely Dame Fortune, or someone of more substance on Capitol Hill, is a question raised by an examination of what few records are open to the public on this world's most expensive office building.

An alleged miscalculation on the foundation design added $1,500,000 to the bill—and a tidy 10 percent of that total to McCloskey's profits.

The Capitol Architect's Office took pity on the quarry subcontractors providing marble for the building, and paid McCloskey to pay them in advance—taking that normal financial burden off McCloskey.

An unpredicted influx of eaters materialized in the Capitol area. That forced the installation of a costly cafeteria that supposedly was to have been postponed for years—boosting McCloskey's profits more.

House leaders after great soul-searching decided to install a plush swimming pool to "keep up with the Senate" (which had had its pool for 2 years) and McCloskey's contract shot up still further.

Hidden from public view are dozens of other changes that represent manna for McCloskey. Capitol Architect J. George Stewart, supervising construction, acknowledges their existence, but refuses to list them.

"The next thing you'll do is ask us to justify them," said Stewart's administrative assistant, Philip L. Roof.

Equally important is whether a man with McCloskey's political connections would have had advance access to information that sizable changes might be made. That's dope that industry experts agree would enable a contractor to keep his original bid low—knowing he could make up his profits later on lucrative changes.

The Senate Rules Committee began investigating the pattern of design changes on another McCloskey project last week as it reluctantly reopened its investigation into the good life and influential times of former Senate Democratic Majority Secretary Bobby Baker.

McCloskey has been accused by Senator John J. Williams, Republican, of Delaware, of making a $35,000 kickback in connection with construction on the new, $17 million District of Columbia Stadium.

The payoff, allegedly arranged by Baker, is the main focus of the investigation.

But Chairman B. Everett Jordan, Democrat, of North Carolina, said his group will also scrutinize another Williams suggestion:

That changes in the stadium design may have been intentionally delayed until McCloskey got the award with a rockbottom bid, so he could later enhance a reduced profit margin with the noncompetitive extra work.

The changes increased the stadium price $3 million—or 22 percent.

Concern that the same thing might have happened in connection with the Rayburn Building was voiced earlier this year by Representative Charles S. Joelson, Democrat, of New Jersey, during the annual hearings of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee. It votes funds for the project.

Joelson told Stewart that "if you have public bidding and (then) the contract is subject to change orders (like that), then the public bidding does not give the protection it is designed to give."

Contractors profit doubly from change orders because:

They're generally guaranteed a flat 10-percent profit on such work, whereas their profit margin on the basic contract is often pared to 5 percent or less, to "get in under" competition.

In negotiating the cost of work performed under change orders, contractors invariably propose high prices, since there's no competition to contend with.

On the Rayburn Building, technical changes were approved by the Capitol Architect.

Virtually all major design changes originated with the powerful but secretive House Office Building Commission, manned by the House Speaker (originally Sam Rayburn of Texas, but now John McCormack of Massachusetts), venerable, prestigious Representative Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia, and Representative James Auchincloss, Republican, of New Jersey. The latter two are retiring from Congress.

These men have unprecedented blank check authority on cash and policy. Their meetings and minutes are secret.

But here's the pattern on change orders and other treatment accorded McCloskey, as revealed by investigation and the few available documents:

1. McCloskey won two major awards with low bids—the excavation contract for $6,660,000 in May, 1958, and the superstructure job for $50,793,000 in March 1960.

Soon after the awards, design changes began coming through which Stewart now estimates will total $7 million.

The average value of change orders in Federal building construction is 5 to 7 percent, according to the General Services Administration, the biggest Federal builder.

Changes on the Rayburn Building skyrocketed the excavation contract price 32 percent and the superstructure contract 10.1 percent.

2. Besides the $2 million in change orders already approved for the excavation contract, McCloskey has put in for another $996,000.

About the time congressional clamor over the building's cost began to mount, Stewart bucked the claim to an appeal board.

A Stewart fiscal aide told the appropriations subcommittee last March that in preparing a list of anticipated "obligations"—on which Stewart's annual request for money is based—his office had not included the $996,000 claim.

To do so, the aide said, "would be tantamount in our opinion to conceding the validity of the claim, which the Architect has denied."

Yet buried in the committee's hearing record, in the last paragraph of nine pages of fine print material submitted by Stewart, are facts and figures showing clearly that Stewart has listed the $996,000 as an obligation and he received a sufficient appropriation to cover it.

3. Stewart's office at one point got enough money from Congress to cover first-year payments to McCloskey for an unprecedented 70 percent of his $50 million superstructure contract.

After Representative Frank T. Bow, Republican, of Ohio, then a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee questioned the strategem—and the project continued to meet interminable delays—most of the scheme was dropped.

However, James Banks, second assistant architect, said Stewart's office did approve multimillion-dollar advance payments for marble, months—and sometimes years—before the material was used.

This was a clear departure from normal Government construction practice. That calls for paying only for "work in place (complete) or materials (stored) on site."

Stewart's assistant, Roof, said the Architect's office ruled that a nearby railroad yard where McCloskey leased storage space for some of the marble could be considered "on site."

The marble costs involved exceeded $4,500,000. Banks said the advance payments "took a real burden off McCloskey and the quarriers."

Ordinarily, such problems are the responsibility of the contractor, not the Government, other Federal building experts noted.

More important, there are numerous indications that several of the design changes that benefited McCloskey so handsomely could have been covered in the original specifications.

The major change on the superstructure contract was the cafeteria. Roof estimates its cost above $1 million.

Examination of the plans shows that the "rough" plumbing for the facility was included in the original contract. But not covered were the major costs of erecting and equipping the facility.

"The demand was unpredicted," Roof contended.

He said the House Office Building Commission believed that another new cafeteria then nearing completion, in the adjoining Longworth House Office Building, would serve the House's needs "for 10 or 12 years."

Available evidence indicates otherwise.

The Longworth cafeteria opened for business in January 1959. Its operating records show it was swamped almost from its first month.

At that point the Commission was also preparing plans that entailed demolition of other nearby restaurants—making the problem even clearer.

Twelve months elapsed between the opening of the Longworth cafeteria and the submission of bids on the superstructure contract. That would appear to have been ample opportunity to work in the change ahead of time—particularly since seven other last-minute changes delayed opening of bids by 1 month, until February 1960.

Further insight is provided by a visit to the cafeteria. Its floor-to-ceiling picture windows run nearly the full length of one side of an elaborate courtyard designed as the building's showcase entrance.

What was to be done with that showy space if it were not used as a cafeteria for 10 or 12 years?

Said Roof: "We'd have used it for storage."

Roof also contends the decision to put in the swimming pool was long delayed—although not 1 Congressman in 50 will tell you there was any doubt after 1958 that the pool would be built.

In 1958—nearly 2 years before McCloskey's contract was let—the Senate opened its new building, with a pool.

The Rayburn pool—twice as large—was supposedly carved out of space originally planned as part of the giant parking garage, according to Second Assistant Banks.

But examination of early plans shows that the exact space where the pool, lockers and showers eventually turned up was cryptically designated "unassigned space"—not garage space, like all its surrounding area.

The Architect's Office refused to permit examination of the original specifications which would have disclosed any provision for the pool's unique "support" facilities—special stairways, a special elevator, and a special "sneak" outside entrance.

Equally curious is the $1,500,000 change order in the foundation contract that added tons of raw concrete for extra weight allegedly needed.

Roof said that to speed construction of the building, the foundation was designed first and put under contract, and the superstructure plans were completed later—the reverse of normal practice.

But when the superstructure plans were nearly finished, Roof said, it was discovered that the upperstructure in effect wouldn't be heavy enough to hold the building down in the ground because of upward pressures from below.

Those pressures came from underground water—which Roof acknowledges the designing architects were aware of from the start.

Why was the extra weight, if needed, added in the foundation—which was then already half done by McCloskey? Why not in the yet-to-be-let superstructure, which today impresses any visitor with its oversized corridors, immense stairwells, and vast garage and storage spaces?

"That was a policy decision," Roof answered. "We didn't want to sacrifice any of the valuable space upstairs."

Capitol Architect's Building Estimate Missed by $31 Million

(By James McCartney and Charles Nicodemus)

Washington.—Capitol Architect J. George Stewart was $31,050,000 off in 1957 when he officially estimated the cost of the new Rayburn House Office Building. He was about 50 percent off.

Yet he insisted in testimony at the time that his estimate was "firm."

As late as 1958 Stewart was still talking about the building as costing $64 million. It's actually going to cost at least $95 million, probably more.

This is just one sample of the accuracy of Stewart's estimates—and it's not, by any means, the most extreme.

Stewart has had no better luck in his official guesses on how long it would take to get jobs done—or on how much money he would need to pay for work year by year.

This is all part of a picture of skyrocketing costs, lengthy delays, and strange methods of providing appropriations that have characterized the Rayburn project throughout its 9-year history.

No serious study of the way it has been managed, by Stewart, could fail to raise questions.

Yet the evidence is that no one has carefully monitored the operation.

Stewart's office has operated as a congressional fiefdom, immune from investigation, its operations largely secret.

As it stands now, the Rayburn Building, which will house nine committees and a third of the House of Representatives, is 4 years behind the original schedule. Estimates on how long jobs would take have been off by anywhere from a few months to 2 years.

When he first started talking about a subway to connect the building to the Capitol, Stewart said it would cost about $5 million. It's going to run at least $7,700,000.

Even on small jobs he has been astonishingly inaccurate. One job related to the project, to make a new post office for the House, started at $100,000. It wound up costing $145,782.

Then there is the strange world of Stewart's appropriations to finance the Rayburn Building.

When asking for funds from a House appropriations subcommittee to finance the building, Stewart has often overestimated his needs by 300 or 400 percent.

In fiscal 1960 he asked for more than $40 million—and got it, as he always has, from a docile subcommittee.

When the year was over it turned out that he needed only $7 million.

Daily News reporters showed a top Treasury Department budget expert a table illustrating the pattern of Stewart's appropriations.

"I'd hate to see the rest of the Government ask for appropriations that way," he said. He added that the effect of this kind of appropriating could be to take funds away from other Government programs. He mentioned urban renewal, housing, or possibly welfare programs.

Shown the same table an official in Stewart's office said: "On the face of it, these figures are incredible. I'd have to do some research to explain them."

In trying to piece together the story of the Rayburn Building one of the problems revolves around the figures made public by Stewart. Often they seem to be designed to confuse rather than to explain.

Figures put out one year can't be compared with those put out other years. Items covered are grouped in different ways so that comparisons—by laymen or experts—are impossible.

Often figures on what things have cost differ in the same yearly report. It is not unusual to find differences involving thousands of dollars, sometimes tens of thousands.

In this year's report, for example, he says that the remodeling of one of the House office buildings (the Longworth Building)—a part of the overall Rayburn project—has come to $2,993,406.

Yet if you add up figures he has previously provided on what individual parts of this remodeling have cost you find that the total falls almost $200,000 short of the figure he uses this year.

No explanation is provided.

It is significant that Congressmen rarely ask about these inconsistencies. Even they often can't find out what things cost.

Trying to assess responsibility for million-dollar mistakes, or gambles is even tougher.

Stewart's office has admitted that the Rayburn Building was, in effect, designed "upside down"—the foundation was designed before the superstructure, to speed up construction.

This turned out to be a mistake that cost $1,500,000 and months of delay.

The Capitol Architect's Office tends to suggest that the blame rests entirely with the House Office Building Commission, whose key figure now is Representative Carl Vinson (Democrat, of Georgia), the venerable and brilliant head of the Armed Services Committee.

Representative Vinson says this isn't true. "We took our advice from the architects and engineers," he says. Representative Vinson is aware of criticism directed at Stewart and his office.

"I know we have had a lot of delays and that costs have gone up," he says, "and I don't like it either. Sam Rayburn (former Speaker) and I used to talk about whether we'd both be alive to see it finished.

"He didn't make it. And I'm not getting any younger." Vinson is 80 and is retiring from Congress.

Asked if he has confidence in Stewart, Vinson replied: "Let's not talk about that."

Stewart has been widely criticized, particularly on the Senate side of the Capitol, where Members still are complaining about the New Senate Office Building he built in the late 1950's.

One contractor who has worked on the Rayburn project told the Daily News:

"I've never had a job that was so messed up.

"The planning in the Architect's office was so poor that the price on our job increased by 50 percent. They didn't seem to know what they were doing.

"I'll never do another job for the Architect's office. I want no part of them."

The contractor asked not to be identified.

In general, the Architect's office has had a tendency to blame contractors when things have gone wrong. Yet the Architect's office has been responsible for the selection of the contractors.

A spokesman for the office, when asked about delays running to years on the contract to rebuild the sewer under the Rayburn Building, said the contractor wasn't capable of doing the job.

But he didn't say why the Architect's office wasn't able to discern this until the contractor ran months behind schedule.

The office is proud of its force of inspectors. There have been as many as 60 on the job at once.

James Banks, Stewart's second assistant, says: "You have to catch the mistakes while they're being made—not afterward."

Yet buried in Stewart's discussion of difficulties over the sewer contract is his charge that the contractor exercised "imprudent supervision and performance."

Later Stewart said McCloskey & Co., the foundation contractor, caused delays.

McCloskey "failed to have the foundation surface sufficiently cleaned" and has "misalined anchor bolts" on which the key steel columns would sit, Stewart said. He also said McCloskey "bent or kinked over (steel) bar dowels" used to reinforce walls.

But Stewart did not explain where his huge force of inspectors was when all this was happening.

In studying the record of the building, however, nothing becomes more confusing to follow than the rising costs.

They go up in strange ways. What's counted one year isn't counted in the same place the next.

For example, a distinction is made between the Rayburn Building itself and the so-called Rayburn Building project. The project includes remodeling the other two House office buildings, constructing new underground garages and acquiring new land on Capitol Hill, among other things.

If you studied the hearings of the appropriations subcommittee this year you could easily get the idea that the total cost of the project is going to be $122 million. That's the top figure mentioned, seemingly carefully itemized. In fact it does not include about $18 million in remodeling that is still planned as soon as possible after the Rayburn Building is occupied in January.

So, $140 million is going to be the project cost—at least.

Controversial Capitol Architect: He's No Architect at All

(By Charles Nicodemus and James H. McCartney)

Washington.—Capitol Architect J. George Stewart, the man handed the job of building the new Rayburn House Office Building, has been steeped in controversy since he won the post 10 years ago.

He has been praised as a "visionary," a man "whose integrity you could never question," one of "the grand old guys around Capitol Hill."

He also has been attacked on the Senate floor as "incompetent, irresponsible, unqualified," and an "empire builder."

Stewart has always "thought big." And the things he builds have a way of ending up bigger than he or anyone thought.

Although few, if any, of the 10 million tourists a year who invade Capitol Hill have ever heard of him, much of what they see bears Stewart's imprint.

Attacks on Stewart's qualifications are rooted in the fact that the Architect of the Capitol—who has bossed a Capitol Hill building program exceeding $200 million—is no architect at all.

He says he's a civil engineer. And his biography reads: "University of Delaware, class of 1911, B.S. in engineering."

Actually, he quit the university after 3 years. The degree was given him by the school in 1958 for his "distinguished service and accomplishments."

After school, Stewart worked his way up to the presidency of his father's construction firm, which, Stewart said, built everything from public buildings and roads to estates for the Du Pont family.

He also dabbled in Republican politics and served one term, in 1935, as a Delaware Congressman-at-large.

After retiring from business, Stewart went to Washington in 1947 as chief clerk of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, then headed by an old friend, Delaware's GOP Senator, C. Douglas Buck.

Stewart was axed by the Democrats in 1952. But through two friends he met while working with the Republican National Committee—Chairman Leonard Hall and Representative Charles Halleck, of Indiana—he got a job as consultant on land appraisals for the Justice Department.

And in September 1954, when the incumbent Architect, David Lynn, retired, Hall and Halleck persuaded President Dwight D. Eisenhower to name Stewart to the post.

Stewart is now 74, stooped and graying, glaring out defensively from behind the thick-lensed glasses he has had to wear since cataract operations.

But 10 years ago he swept into his job with a flourish that has helped change the face of Capitol Hill—whether for better or worse depends on to whom you're talking.

Until Stewart came along, the Architect had been a glorified groundskeeper and maintenance man. Stewart immediately began pushing for a start on a new Senate Office Building.

It was in the planning stages and had a $10 million price tag when he stepped in.

When it was done, it cost $26,500,000 and had more "bugs" than the bottom of a wet rock.

The controversial renovation and extension of the Capitol's historic east front jumped from $17 to $24 million.

A new subway to the Senate offices featured cars that wouldn't work, or made too much noise when they did.

Despite such problems, Stewart displayed two capabilities that endeared him eternally to congressional giants such as Sam Rayburn, Democrat, of Texas; Senator Styles Bridges, Republican, of New Hampshire; and Rep. Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia.

They believed that the Capitol should be preserved and expanded in "grand manner," and money and methods be damned.

Stewart learned to—Keep plans secret (his critics said his decisions "were made in a broom closet").

Sneak through projects that the leadership didn't want publicized.

He built a Senate office swimming pool with leftover funds from a plumbing appropriation.

And—while building the Senate subway—he secretly had concrete footings and structural steel installed to set up a connection for the Capitol to a $40 million underground parking garage that he hopes will be built someday beneath the spacious east plaza.

Stewart also has urged extending the west front of the Capitol (cost $25 million); building an added Library of Congress facility ($30 million); adding another subway to the House offices ($40 million or more), and numerous other projects.

"Frosting" Hikes Cost of Rayburn Building

(By James McCartney and Charles Nicodemus)

Washington.—The pattern in building the giant new Rayburn House Office Building for Congressmen here has been to pay more—and get less.

It's a building in which more space is allotted to extras than to the basic function of the building.

It's a case where the frosting is thicker than the cake.

Only 935,000 of the 2,375,000 square feet of floor space in the building is considered usable for official business.

Even the cars in the Rayburn Building have been furnished more space than cars in other Government buildings.

The purely decorative marble on the building is twice as thick as the marble on two other new Government buildings a few blocks down Independence Avenue.

But the pattern of what has happened in constructing the Rayburn Building, with a blank check, comes through most sharply when the building is compared with other major office buildings around the country.

Take, for example, the huge Merchandise Mart in Chicago, completed at a cost of $30 million in 1931.

A spokesman for the architectural firm that designed the building said it would have cost about $75 million to build it in 1955, when the Rayburn Building was conceived, and perhaps $96,900,000 at today's prices.

The Rayburn Building is costing about $95 million, including subways and tunnels to other Capitol Hill buildings.

But the Merchandise Mart has 3,300,000 square feet of rental office space—compared to the Rayburn Building's 935,000 square feet of usable space. The Merchandise Mart houses 25,000 workers, compared to the Rayburn Building's 2,800.

Or compare the Rayburn Building to the 102-story Empire State Building in New York, the world's tallest building.

By a formula accepted as valid by the builders of the Rayburn Building, the Empire State Building would cost about $84,292,000 to build today. The building itself cost $24,718,900 when completed in 1931.

The Empire State Building houses more than 20,000 workers and has 2,158,000 square feet of rentable space—more than twice the usable space in the Rayburn Building.

The contrast with the more modern Prudential Building in Chicago, 41 stories tall, is even sharper.

The successors to the architectural firm that designed the Prudential Building say the building cost $41 million. It was completed in 1955. They say it would cost about $57 million today. It has 1,011,390 square feet of rental space—also more than the Rayburn Building.

In a way the story of the vast parking garage in the Rayburn Building tells much of the story of the building.

For this is the biggest "extra." It accounts for 1,002,000 square feet in the building—about 42 percent.

The Capitol Architect's office, which is building the building, says that 1,600 cars will be parked in the space.

A private parking operator in Washington, with dozens of parking facilities, says he could park 2,800 cars in the same space, using the same park-it-yourself system planned for the building.

If he could hire attendants to park the cars, he says, he could get 5,000 cars in the same space.

A breakdown of the figures shows that the Rayburn Building's planners have allowed more than 600 square feet for every congressional car—while the cars of more ordinary mortals require only 350 to 400 square feet.

That includes ramp and aisle space, prorated to each vehicle, as well as the actual space for parking.

The General Services Administration, which builds most Government buildings, says it allows 350 to 400 square feet for each car in its buildings. The private operator says he allows 325 to 350.

The House of Representatives has already announced that it plans to build two new underground parking garages, at a cost of $9,300,000, to help further in solving the parking problem on Capitol Hill.

But the private parking operator says that all the cars intended to be parked in the new underground garages could be parked in the Rayburn Building if space were better used.

The vast space in the parking garage of the building, however, has been used by the Capitol Architect's office as a means of watering down the cost per square foot of the building as a whole.

The Architect's office likes to include the garage space in computing that figure. It comes up with a cost per square foot of $33.85—which is not high for a building of this general type.

However, the Architect's office winces when it is pointed out that this would mean that each parking space in the building has cost $21,198.

There is no accurate way to apportion the cost of the parking garage and the rest of the building, but it would certainly be fairer to blame the garage for no more than about 20 percent of the building's cost.

That would bring the cost per parking space down to about $11,000—which is only about 2 or 2½ times what parking costs in other Government buildings.

In addition, that gives a more realistic cost for the office space—something upward of $50 a square foot.

The General Services Administration built an office building right down the street, with a marble exterior, for $19.40 a square foot.

A new home for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in Washington, completed in 1963 with many extra touches to please the bankers with whom the FDIC deals, cost $22.90 a square foot.

Chicago's new Federal court skyscraper cost $25.90 a square foot and a new building for the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, $38.80.

A careful study of the apportionment of space in the Rayburn Building shows that the ostensible purpose of the building—to provide new office space for Congressmen—seems almost to have been forgotten.

Less than 300,000 square feet in the building—out of the 2,375,000 total number—is actually Congressmen's office space.

Some of the rest of the usable space is for needed facilities for committees.

But most of it is for gaping stairwells and spacious corridors, with ceilings treetop tall; gymnasiums (two); recording studios; barber shop; beauty parlor; a large cafeteria; a swimming pool; storage and service areas—and of course the garage.

Making allowance for the parking areas, each Congressman's office in the building cost about $200,000.

That doesn't include the furnishings which, at $10,000 per three-room suite, run nearly twice the cost of outfitting similar space for a top-level official in the executive branch.

And the $10,000, in turn, doesn't cover the huge, built-in safes in every suite, which Brinks, Inc., might well envy; or such touches as the decorative chair-rail molding and the marble baseboards found in each office.

Or the 250-plus polished, carved, solid walnut doors—giant, double panels, with shiny bronze fittings—that can be found everywhere, even at the entrance to basement service rooms.

The cost per person housed in the building comes to at least $25,000.

No discussion of the building's opulence would be complete, however, without further mention of the swimming pool.

It was supposedly added as an afterthought, but it looks right at home.

Finding it in the bowels of the building is like finding a speakeasy in the 1920's.

There is what might be called a secret entrance from the outside—a flight of special stairs located unobtrusively off the building's main plaza.

You enter a locked door and then go down two more flights of stairs, leading only to the pool—and to a garage entrance to the pool.

Finding the pool from the inside is just as secretive a proposition.

A set of special stairs leads two flights downward to the pool from a room off the men's gymnasium.

Less energetic Congressmen can take a private elevator that the public will never see from the gym to the pool.

And if, after a hot drive to the office, a Congressman wants to take a quick dip before facing his public, there's that special, locked entrance direct from the garage.

The pool's most curious feature, however, is its ceiling.

It's so low that if a diving board is installed—even at floor level—any Congressman taking even the slightest bounce would doubtless crack his cranium on the plaster above.

Yet the pool has a deep end—10 feet in depth—which, if not constructed expressly for diving, would scarcely seem to have any utility except for imperiling Congressmen who haven't learned how to keep their heads above water.

RAYBURN BUILDING: STONE, SECRECY

(By James H. McCartney and Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—Its chief builder is silent. Its supervising architect hides its records and shuns the press. The men who ordered it built say "we won't talk—now." Even its critics are gagged.

That's the giant, $95 million Rayburn House Office Building, the plush new palace of the people's representatives.

Its visible facade is marble and granite. But there is an added mantle of secrecy and deception, bulwarked by a foundation of fear.

Aside from the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Defense Department, never has so much public cash been poured into so large a project about which the public could learn so little.

The attorney for top Democrat Matthew H. McCloskey, the main contractor, says Senate and FBI probes of his client's liaison with Bobby Baker made it "inadvisable" for McCloskey to talk to anyone about any thing.

Capitol Architect J. George Stewart, in charge of the project, won't even meet with the press to discuss it. He slams down the phone when called by reporters.

And he refuses to let "outsiders"—including most Congressmen—see any of the vouchers, checks, or other records of the building. Even the original plans and specifications are kept secret, though they were public property when building contracts were let.

The three men on the House Office Building Commission, who have unfettered power to erect the building, won't discuss it. Their key member, the venerable Representative Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia, says:

"It's a great, great building. We're all proud of it. But I don't make any more public statements now. The General Accounting Office is investigating, you know."

Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, who replaced the late Sam Rayburn, Demorcrat, of Texas, as commission chairman, "is not available" to discuss it. Aging Representative James Auchincloss, Republican, of New Jersey, the GOP member, says frankly:

"I'd rather not talk about it. I'm retiring from Congress and I don't want anything stirred up."

The chairman of the subcommittee that has voted the steadily soaring appropriations to finance the building's interminably delayed construction says on one day that "everything should be out in the open."

"I'll get answers to all your questions," promised Representative THOMAS J. STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, a former newspaperman.

Answers to key questions still haven't come.

Critics of the building declare that it is a "monstrosity," as Representative JAMES A. HALEY, Democrat, of Florida, charged earlier this year—while preparing to vote for its appropriation.

But only a handful of Representatives out of 435 display the courage needed to jab penetrating questions at the project's handlers. Even then, straight answers aren't to be had.

A junior Democrat had the temerity earlier this year to ask Stewart about design changes that benefited builder McCloskey.

Shortly afterward, he was called down by Speaker MCCORMACK and accused of "desecrating the memory of Rayburn—the man who conceived the project and ramrodded it forward until his death in late 1961.

The critical young Congressman now refuses even to discuss the matter for publication.

"What can I do?" he asks, spreading his hands helplessly. "I have to get along around here."

This need to "get along" with the House power structure is what keeps most critical mouths shut and the public coffers open.

To understand this climate of secrecy and fear, you have to understand the House itself. It's run by the Speaker, who can exercise near-dictatorial powers in some areas.

Sam Rayburn, one of the greatest Speakers in House history, was no dictator. Just a benevolent despot.

A Speaker has immense power to punish Congressmen, great and small, with ways devious and subtle or obvious and embarrassing.

"Mr. Sam" used that power sparingly, but unhesitatingly when needed. So people gave Rayburn anything he dearly wanted. And the thing he wanted most dearly was a new House Office Building.

It was to be a monument, capping his long, distinguished career.

Without advance notice, without plans or hearings, Rayburn showed up on the floor March 18, 1955, and railroaded through—in clear violation of House rules—an amendment to the Legislative Appropriation Act. It gave his House Office Building Commission unlimited, blank check authority. to put up a new building.

Over in the Senate, he quietly had the initial funding raised from $2 to $5 million and the Commission's powers broadened.

When it was sent back to the House, the revised version was never discussed on the floor. It was passed by voice vote amid a bloc of other Senate appropriation amendments.

This sort of secrecy and deception—with the House misinformed and uninformed, particularly on price—was to set the tone for the project's entire development.

The House itself couldn't learn what Rayburn and Architect Stewart had cooking for 2 years.

In its annual hearings on May 16, 1956, the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee asked Stewart for a progress report.

He demurred, saying plans and timetables weren't finished.

The next day Rayburn's Commission met in secret—as the Commission always does—and approved all of Stewart's proposals for the project, which hadn't been ready the day before.

In this shadowy atmosphere, safe from public view, there flourished favoritism and worse.

Architectural and engineering assignments crucial to the project were dispensed in most cases as political plums—which the Architect's office blandly admits.

The man tapped to design a fitting building was John Harbeson, a nationally respected Philadelphia architect. He was a friend of Stewart's who had worked on other Capitol and U.S. projects.

He was also a friend of long standing of fellow Philadelphian Matthew H. McCloskey, treasurer and chief fund raiser for the Democratic Party.

At the time of Harbeson's appointment it was common gossip on Capitol Hill and in the trade that Harbeson got the job with McCloskey's recommendation.

That was long before McCloskey's construction firm got two Rayburn building contracts, now expected to total $64 million—and long before he began benefiting from "unpredicted" design changes that will eventually boost his contracts $7 million and jump his profits an estimated $700,000.

Rayburn himself recommended the retention of his friend, Dallas Architect Roscoe Dewitt, to handle the related, high-fee assignment of renovating the Cannon (old) House Office.

And in 1959, when work on the new building project was moving into high gear, Marion Campioli, an architect who had worked on the Capitol for Dewitt and two associates was put in as Stewart's first assistant and Rayburn project manager.

Representative Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia, the brilliant chairman of the Armed Services Committee, exercised similar prerogatives.

A team of Atlanta architects, Jesse Shelton and A. P. Almond, was retained to design the tunnels and subway to the new building. They estimated the cost at $5 million.

At the moment, it's past $7 million and the cost (and architect fee) is still rising.

Another Atlanta firm, Dalrymple & Sowers, was retained to analyze test borings made of the soil where the new building was to rise.

Several of the major construction problems that cropped up later involved soil conditions not disclosed or predicted. Two contractors are now involved in formal proceedings in which the adequacy of the soil analyses and tests are a key issue.

The superstructure specifications were designed so that possible sources of marble were limited to two firms—one of them in Georgia. McCloskey bought two-thirds of the marble there.

It's impossible to tell how many others, similar maneuvers could be spotlighted. The records are kept locked in Stewart's office in the basement of the Capitol, even though all the contracts are let by public bids and are paid for with public money.

Shielded from public scrutiny—by a Congress that opposes any secrecy by the executive branch—are:

The list of change orders granted McCloskey, the cost of those changes and their justification.

The original plans and specifications for all contracts.

Details on the reported shortcomings of McCloskey's performance.

These are alluded to briefly in a 1961 Stewart report explaining delays in the building. But Stewart's aids refuse to give details.

All these records, and the secrets locked within them, might have remained permanently hidden had it not been for the persistence of a lone GOP Congressman, Representative Oliver Bolton, of Ohio.

Alarmed by the Rayburn Building's secrecy and soaring costs, he campaigned in 1963 and 1964 to pry the lid off many of the previously secret fiscal records of Congress—including the books of the Architect of the Capitol.

Stewart opposed the legislation bitterly and, for a long time, successfully. Bolton couldn't even get a hearing on his bill.

Bolton wanted Stewart's office subject to the same General Accounting Office audits that regularly face executive branch departments and agencies.

Stewart contended his office was too small (he controls more than 1,500 employees), his staff too busy, to permit snooping by auditors. And besides, he said, his records didn't need auditing.

Finally, on April 10, after repeated failures (including defeats on a point of order and four separate votes earlier that day) Bolton outmaneuvered the House leadership and forced a rollcall on one form of his proposal.

Facing his compatriots with the choice of supporting the bill or going officially on record in favor of secrecy, Bolton carried the day 188–131—despite intense leadership opposition.

In the Senate, Republicans and sympathetic Democrats resisted administration efforts to delete the proposal and a revised form of the so-called Bolton amendment was signed into law August 20.

The General Accounting Office, itself an agency of Congress, is now faced with one of the toughest jobs in its long and distinguished history:

The compilation of a report on Stewart's office and the Rayburn Building that may reflect unfavorably on high-ranking Democrats and Members of Congress—from whom Comptroller General Joseph Campbell gets his paycheck.

Said Lawrence Powers, Assistant to the Comptroller:

"We didn't ask for the job. But you can be sure we'll do it right."

BUILDER CLAIMS LOSS ON RAYBURN BUILDING

(By James McCartney and Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—Instead of the tidy profit that most people assume, Matthew H. McCloskey's firm may be losing $3 million on its $64 million in contracts for the new Rayburn House Office Building.

Or so McCloskey reportedly is telling several of his close friends.

Innuendos that he has made a bundle as the building's chief contractor therefore embarrass him, he laments.

So do reports that he reaped a 10-percent profit from the numerous change orders that have thrown the $95 million showplace 4 years behind schedule—and have boosted his contract prices far above their original low-bid figures.

The Philadelphia builder tells his confidants that his profit margin on change orders was something less, and that all the delays have tied up his men and equipment, compounding the losses.

Exactly what McCloskey's profit or loss is can't be learned because the former finance chairman of the Democratic Party and his lawyers here and in Philadelphia turn aside all calls from the press.

Mum's the word, they say, until the former Ambassador to Ireland makes his appearance before the Senate Rules Committee.

That Democratic-controlled group is exploring McCloskey's relations with former Senate Staffer Bobby Baker, the moneymaker.

McCloskey says it was merely an alliance of convenience—that when he wanted "information on Capitol Hill," Bobby Baker was the man he went to.

But strait-laced Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, the Senate's best known independent investigator and moralist, charges something more sinister.

He has presented affidavits alleging that McCloskey anted up a $35,000 kickback to Baker—with $25,000 of it earmarked for the Democrats' 1960 campaign coffers—after McCloskey won the contract to build the new District of Columbia Stadium.

The value of that contract, like his two on the Rayburn Building, jumped after he got the job—from $14 to $17 million.

Although it's not generally known, McCloskey also has a claim in on that job for an additional $1 million—expenses he said he incurred while pouring concrete in cold weather, to speed completion.

The firm also has a $996,000 claim pending on his $8,830,004 foundation contract for the Rayburn Building—a contract that started out at $6,660,000.

Any claims on his $50,793 million superstructure job—which the Capitol Architect estimates will hit at least $55,500,000 before it's done—won't be filed until the work on this world's most expensive office building is wound up sometime in 1965.

The increases in contract prices result from "change orders"—revisions in the specifications due to changes in design made after the contracts were awarded.

And contrary to what McCloskey tells his friends, the Capitol Architect's office and the General Services Administration both say that 10 percent of the cost of the extra work is the margin generally allowed a contractor for change orders in Federal construction.

Elsewhere in the construction industry, there is doubt that McCloskey may have found the giant Rayburn project a money-losing proposition.

Said a vice president of one large general contracting firm that often competes with McCloskey for east coast work:

"Matt's outfit is well known in our business as one of the sharpest computers of cost there is.

"They're good builders; they figure things tight, then they hold their costs down to bare minimum—and sometimes even lower."

Actually, McCloskey no longer runs the day-to-day business of the firm. That's been turned over to a son, Thomas D.

HARD-LUCK MCCLOSKEY

Leafing through our clipping file on Matthew H. McCloskey, we got to feeling downright sorry for the man. McCloskey is the Philadelphia contractor who had multimillion-dollar troubles in building the New House Office Building in Washington, the costly edifice being scrutinized in a series of articles by Daily News Correspondents James McCartney and Charles Nicodemus.

Every time you turn over a clipping, McCloskey is wallowing in woe. If it isn't a river running through the foundation of the Rayburn Building, it's cracking walls and crumbling concrete in buildings already completed.

There are compensations of course. Every time the Rayburn Building cost another dollar, McCloskey made another dime on his cost-plus-10-percent contract. But he has expenses, such as defending himself in the civil suit filed by the Justice Department over repairs to the Veterans' Administration hospital near Boston. The walls started bulging, soon after it was finished, and repairs cost $4 million.

Then there are the other complications. Some Republicans have been unkind enough to charge that McCloskey kicked back $35,000 to the Democratic National Committee in

> 1960 on a contract to build a new stadium for the Washington Senators, baseball variety. The stadium walls cracked.
>
> Bobby Baker, the eminent fixer, figured in that story. Another famous name—Billie Sol Estes—became linked to McCloskey when it was revealed that Billie Sol frequently phoned McCloskey about the time he was building his fertilizer empire. Come to think of it, the walls came tumbling down on that one, too.
>
> The fact that McCloskey was financial chairman of the Democratic Party got him a lot of publicity, but here again the Republicans have marred the image by contending that the building business and fundraising for the party were curiously linked. Only one Republican would vote to confirm him when he was proposed as U.S. Ambassador to Ireland in 1962. But the Democrats did, and he served as Ambassador for a while.
>
> Now there seems a good chance that the Senate may dig behind the secrecy that has surrounded the McCloskey contracts, and discover why the Rayburn Building cost so much. If in the process the probers find out why McCloskey had such rotten luck with his buildings and such excellent luck within the Democratic Party, it will be none too soon.

TO ASSIST THE HOMEOWNER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, again in this Congress I shall press for laws granting the homeowner some meaningful measure of tax relief.

I do this because here is an area so obvious in need that it escapes attention. The homeowner, like the consumer, is unorganized. He is not unified to bring pressure upon the legislative branch.

Yet the homeowner, his problems and inclinations, represents the core of the country. His real interests have far too long been swept under the rug.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two bills aimed at helping the homeowners. I very much hope that my colleagues in the House will join me in pressing for the enactment of these measures.

The first of this legislation would provide depreciation allowances for the wear and tear of the taxpayer's home. This privilege is now enjoyed by owners of property in trade and business. My bill envisages a home depreciation allowance based on reasonable value and estimated life of the residence.

The second bill provides a tax deduction of up to $500 for expenses incurred by the homeowner-taxpayer on repairs and improvements of his residence. In a sense, this is the core of my program.

The heart of these recommendations is not only that they aid the homeowner. The fact is that they will greatly enhance community upkeep; they will spur home improvement; they will give the individual an incentive to make necessary repair; the whole community stands to gain.

I am sure that others are struck by the growing ugliness of communities throughout the Nation. In view of the rising expenses, and their burden particularly upon lower income families, I am not prepared to place all the blame upon the owners.

I think there is a multiplier effect to home deterioration. If the money is not available over a long period of time to expend regularly for upkeep, deterioration will set in at a steadily quickening pace until the point of diminishing returns is reached. Thereafter costs become prohibitive. And this is precisely the situation affecting hundreds of small communities and townships throughout the country, as well as urban and suburban areas.

The home is a pillar of the American community; its preservation should be effectively encouraged.

The Bureau of the Census in 1960 reported that only 74 percent of the housing in America could be deemed in sound condition. The rest was deteriorating or dilapidated.

I fervently urge that the House consider enactment of my legislative recommendations. They are valid and urgently required.

RULE OF LAW

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a quarter of a century ago Henry L. Stimson wrote a letter to the New York Times in which he said:

> There is an increasing number of people who feel that, in the face of the situation abroad, our Government should follow a policy of far-sighted, affirmative action rather than one of drift and negation.

These words were written just a few months before Europe was plummeted into a disastrous world war. It is fitting to recall that it was Winston Churchill who led that great fight for liberty and freemen. His magnificant contributions are all the more important in light of the problems that still face us today.

Unfortunately, the words of Henry Stimson 25 years ago have application to our present situation. I have watched with increasing concern the growing number of crises throughout the world. Our attention is occupied not only in Vietnam, but in the Congo, the Middle East, and Latin America. During the adjournment, I had an opportunity to talk with a great many people about the world scene today. I was struck by the uneasiness of the people, an uneasiness born of the great complexity of foreign policy issues, and nurtured by the seeming inability of the United States to conform our foreign policy with our ideals.

One of the traditional characteristics of the people of the United States is to live in accord with law. As James Madison expressed this thought in his inaugural address in 1809:

> Indulging in no passions which trespass on the rights or the repose of other nations, it has been the true glory of the United States to cultivate peace by observing justice.

This concept of the rule of law was not visionary. On the contrary, it was a practical guide for the ordering of the affairs of nations as well as of men. It was a vital conservative principle which recognized the advantage of evolution within a framework of order over revolution which destroys order. This concept is still responsive to the desire of freemen of all nations to advance their spiritual, cultural, social, political, and economic goals within a world at peace.

The objective of a world governed by the rule of law has been kept alive throughout our history. Some of its principal advocates have been the leaders of the Republican Party.

At the beginning of the 20th century when the United States moved for the first time onto the world stage, one of our principal concerns was the success of The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907. Secretary of State Elihu Root, who served in the Cabinet of President Theodore Roosevelt, fought for the establishment of a permanent World Court.

In pointing out the need for institutions to advance the concept of peaceful settlement of world disputes, Root advocated courts "where judges acting under the sanctity of the judicial oath pass upon the rights of countries, as judges pass upon the rights of individuals, in accordance with the facts as found and the law as established."

In 1916, when the United States was at the edge of World War I, Root told the New York Republican Convention:

> Peace and liberty can be preserved only by authority and observance of the rules of national conduct founded upon the principles of justice and humanity; only by the establishment of law among nations, responsive to the enlightened public opinion of mankind.

At the same time three of the leading Republicans of that decade, ex-Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft and Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell, of Harvard, established The League To Enforce Peace. They urged the formation of a league of great nations with the power to require nations to submit justiciable questions to a world tribunal. They also favored developing the body of existing international law by calling regular codification conferences. Throughout the 1920's Chief Justice Taft, Root, and Charles Evans Hughes continued to advocate American leadership in the formation of an effective world judicial tribunal.

Stimson, who served the United States as Secretary of State in years of turmoil and travail, asked on the eve of conflict in 1939:

> How can we expect to keep alive in our citizens the principles which have produced our civilization and upon the continuance of which rests the hopes of a future role of law and justice in the international world, if we now sacrifice those principles to a motive of timid expediency and a desire to make the present easier at the expense of both the safety and the moral character of the future?

In the midst of World War II, Senator Arthur Vandenberg saw the danger of future global strife and the need for preventive institutions. He early advocated a "United Nations" when he declared:

> Prevention of another war requires the creation of a world court to which we shall agree to submit all justiciable questions. I heartily favor it. It requires the creation of a new body of international law. * * * I want a new dignity and a new authority for international law.

At the United Nations Charter conference in San Francisco, Vandenberg succeeded in getting the word "justice," which had been omitted from the Dumbarton Oaks draft, into the charter. He did this over the indifference of the State Department, and at one point he even complained to an associate, "Is the State Department eternally allergic to the word 'justice'?"

In the postwar years, Senator Robert A. Taft enunicated his concern for international order when he said:

> It seems to me that peace in this world is impossible unless nations agree on a definite law to govern their relations with each other and also agree that, without any veto power, they will submit their disputes to adjudication and abide by the decision of an impartial tribunal.

Republican efforts to make the United Nations a viable force for world peace, begun by Vandenberg and Taft, continued when President Eisenhower in his inaugural address in 1953 pledged to make the United Nations "not merely an eloquent symbol but an effective force."

The late John Foster Dulles, an international lawyer of high repute, spelled out President Eisenhower's intentions in his conduct of the office of Secretary of State. For example, in a 1958 address to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, he said,

> We seek honestly to follow policies that will sustain the basic principles of world law which we believe to be the indispensable foundation for peace.

Secretary Dulles was aided in his task by the American Bar Association. In 1957 a special committee of the ABA was established, based on a report by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey which urged that lawyers work on the codification of international law, on the strengthening of international tribunals, and for repeal of reservations to World Court jurisdiction, and that they strive for greater public support for the rule of law. Since that time, the ABA's special committee on world peace through law, under the dynamic leadership of former ABA President Charles S. Rhyne, has held four conferences of lawyers in the United States, four regional conferences in Costa Rica, Nigeria, Japan, and Italy, and a world conference in Athens in July 1963.

Dulles encouraged this healthy trend. When he spoke before the New York bar in 1959, he said:

> Now, we are seeking to establish world order based on the assumption that the collective life of nations ought to be governed by law—law as formulated in the Charter of the United Nations and other international treaties, and law as enunciated by international courts. There is no nobler mission that our Nation could perform. Upon its success may depend the very survival of the human race. We can, therefore, dedicate ourselves to this mission with supreme confidence that we shall thus fulfill our national destiny.

The tragic death of Secretary Dulles in 1959 brought another champion of international world order into the post of Secretary of State. Christian A. Herter, former Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, pinpointed the U.S. interest in the principle of the rule of law when he said:

> We seek to move toward a world of law, not as a remote and abstract goal, but as something that we are beginning to accomplish now through tangible and specific steps.

One of the most dramatic of these steps had been President Eisenhower's atoms for peace proposal to the United Nations. He recognized that advancing technology and the terrible new weapons of modern warfare necessitated a new system of world order. We have come to take for granted the orderly flow of international mail, and the operation of international trade agreements. President Eisenhower knew that we must remain alert to new areas for the application of law and to new opportunities for the application of existing law.

Here in the House, Republicans have taken the initiative in extending the application of the rule of law. In 1962 our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman JOHN BYRNES, during the debate on the U.N. bond issue, proposed an amendment that would have required that the General Assembly of the United Nations adopt the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the financial obligations of members of the U.N. This opinion, you will recall, advised that the financial obligations of members extended to the support of international peacekeeping operations. A revised amendment to this effect was passed by the House.

The American Bar Association has continued its great work in this field. The work of Charles Rhyne has brought credit to the American legal profession all over the world.

The World Rule of Law Center at Duke University has also exercised positive leadership. The center's director is Dr. Arthur Larson, a member of the White House staff under President Eisenhower, and a former Director of the U.S. Information Agency. One of the most active supporters of the center has been Henry R. Luce, of Time, Inc. Mr. Luce has made the creative suggestion that a modern "Justinian code" be drafted to order the relations among nations. The wisdom of this suggestion is demonstrated by the fact that the first Justinian code is still the basis of law for most civil law nations.

We have also witnessed the growth of regional judicial institutions with a functional orientation. The judicial structure of the Common Market, for example, and the European Court on Human Rights and its inter-American counterpart reflect this trend. In addition, they point the way for a greater emphasis on the rule of the individual as a party to international legal proceedings.

All of these developments are hopeful ones, but in my judgment the United States has failed to take appropriate steps to encourage and accelerate this trend.

There are, however, a number of concrete steps which the United States, and in particular, the Congress, can take to regain the initiative and lead the way toward a world community governed by law.

We must accept the principle that the nation state operates not above the law but within it.

We must join with other nations in the world to explore the common foundations of the law of nations and to restate existing law. Mr. Rhyne, for example, has proposed a World Rule of Law Institute, with an ample staff of competent legal scholars and the means to develop an adequate system of information coding and retrieval. Clarifying the hazier aspects of international law is an imperative we cannot neglect.

We must continue our efforts to develop public understanding of the rule of law among nations. The ABA has done fine work in this regard already. The Presidential proclamation of Law Day, initiated by President Eisenhower, has been notably helpful. Members of Congress can do much to create public acceptance of the world rule of law concept.

In addition, we should strengthen and expand existing programs of exchanges of students and professors and the provision of legal materials to foreign law schools.

It is time for us to review the United Nations Charter. In this 20th anniversary year of the signing of the charter, it would be particularly appropriate for Congress to conduct a full-scale study of charter revisions with a view toward developing U.S. recommendations for changes that will reflect the profound developments in the world in the past two decades. The U.N. is far from perfect, but our job is to perfect the institution, not neglect it.

In this connection we should increase U.S. participation in the work of the International Law Commission and the U.N.'s Sixth Legal Committee. These bodies can do much to develop a framework of law for the ordering of space and ocean beds. If possible, these areas should be codified in advance of technological developments.

Six years ago, Vice President Nixon advocated an insistence by the United States in international treaties that the parties be bound to the adjudication of disputes arising under them. This is as sound now as it was then.

It is also time for us to reexamine our national posture on the Connally reservation. We must discuss this matter openly and in a spirit of reason. This provision has raised doubts about U.S. adherence to the principles of international law and has provided other nations with an excuse to avoid its jurisdiction.

These are only a few of the steps we can take to reaffirm our tradition of respect for the rule of law in the family of nations. I am proud that the Republican Party has historically upheld this principle and I believe that our party has a great opportunity and a unique responsibility to apply these principles to the perplexing problems that face us today.

I am not unaware of the difficulties we face in achieving the world rule of law long advocated by distinguished American leaders. The refusal of both Communist China and France to ratify the test ban treaty indicates that both communism and doctrinaire nationalism will be obstacles to the achievement of world order.

Yet we must persevere, for the goal of our foreign policy is noble and majestic. That goal, as I see it, is to help create an environment on this earth in which men can live in liberty with an opportunity to achieve their highest spiritual, cultural, social, economic, and political aspirations. This is the goal for which men of Massachusetts answered the call of Paul Revere and the goal for which American men fought and died in two World Wars and in Korea. They are dying for it right now in the mud of Vietnam.

We can do no less than to exert our every effort toward the application of the fundamental ideals of liberty and justice to the problems of mankind.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication and enclosure:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1965.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By letter dated January 13, 1965, I submitted to the Honorable Donald S. Russell, Governor of South Carolina, my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Second District of South Carolina, the resignation to become effective upon such date as the Governor might set for a special election to fill the vacancy. You were advised of this action by letter of the same date.

It now clearly appears that the Governor intends no affirmative action on this matter. Therefore, I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to him my resignation effective upon the adjournment of the House on Monday, February 1, 1965.

A copy of my letter to the Governor is attached.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT WATSON,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 27, 1965.

Hon. DONALD S. RUSSELL,
Governor of South Carolina,
Columbia, S.C.

DEAR GOVERNOR RUSSELL: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the Second Congressional District of South Carolina, the resignation to become effective upon the adjournment of the House on Monday, February 1, 1965.

I have also informed the Speaker of the House of Representatives of this action.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT WATSON,
Member of Congress.

INCREASED BENEFITS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], in introducing a bill to increase benefits provided under the present social security laws.

We recall that, due to the administration's insistence upon attaching a medicare program to similar legislation which was approved by the 88th Congress, it was not possible to obtain final enactment of these needed improvements last year.

It is my hope, which I believe is shared by most Members of this House, that we can proceed as rapidly as possible to act upon the social security amendments embodied in the measure I am introducing today—without at the same time becoming involved in the so-called medicare controversy.

We will have ample opportunity to consider the question of providing medical care on its own merits without further delaying the provision of increased benefits for our retired citizens under existing laws.

HARRY JAMES CARMAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, when Dean Harry J. Carman died we lost a great scholar and a generous spirit. The "Bicentennial History of Columbia University" said of him that—

> He was one of the best loved and best known teachers of his generation. As nearly selfless as a man can be, he has served the city, State, and Nation with the sure faith that tomorrow will be better if "folks will only try to see each other's point of view." In addition to scholarly activity which produced volume upon volume of published history, he can boast a shrewd and downright political sense that gives him great weight on the New York City Board of Education, as well as on numerous labor and other boards.

He was born in Greenfield, N.Y., in 1884, taught in the local school system from 1903 to 1905, received the Ph. B. degree from Syracuse University in 1909, and taught at Syracuse from 1914 to 1917. He then became an instructor in history at Columbia and received his Ph. D there in 1919. He was appointed an assistant professor in 1921, an associate professor in 1925, professor in 1931, and Moore collegiate professor in 1939. He became dean in 1943 and dean emeritus in 1950 when he resumed teaching. His long life was one of scholarly achievement and civic participation.

His books have been well known for years. His "History of the American People" became a classroom classic. The range of his interests extended from "The Patronage Under Lincoln" to "Street Surface Railway Franchises of New York City." He made a significant contribution to the planning and teaching of a cause that was soon famous. Called "contemporary civilization," it became the prototype of the broad-based humanities courses introduced in most American colleges.

He said of his work as a teacher and dean that—

> The first thing I wanted to do was to help the students discover themselves. I wanted them to discover their own potentialities. And along with this process of discovery goes something else. The something else is: to free them of superstition and crazy notions which they may have inherited from the past. Now a lot of their past is very important—but not all of it. So I try to free them and then to get them to discover themselves, their potentialities, and their interests and the rest of it. I also want our students to get as broad an education as possible. I want them to have an appreciation of how the present came to be. And I want them to know something about scientific methods. I want them to be able to communicate well, both orally and in writing.

He would say that "the object of education"—quoting Montaigne—"is to make not a scholar, but a man."

Even after his retirement he worked a 14-hour day. He was chairman of Bard College at Annadale-on-Hudson, head of Freedom House, and an adviser to the New York Public Library. He was a trustee of many institutions and concerned with a score of international good will projects. During the last year of his life he was a member of a panel seeking jobs for Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the building trades. For his services to the city and to education, Mayor Wagner last May awarded him the Medal of the City of New York.

Seton Hall, Hobart College, and Yeshiva University were among the many institutions of higher learning that granted him honorary degrees. Columbia established the Harry J. Carman Fellowship Fund for Columbia College seniors.

Mr. Speaker, Harry J. Carman will be honored forever in the hearts of those who knew and loved him.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD an obituary which was published in the New York Times on December 27, 1964, as well as an editorial of January 7, 1965, from the West Side News and Morningsider, the community newspaper serving the Columbia University area where Dean Carman is deeply missed:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 27, 1964]

DEAN CARMAN, 80, OF COLUMBIA, DIES—SOCIAL HISTORIAN AND LEADER IN AMERICAN STUDIES WAS CHAMPION OF HUMANITIES

Harry James Carman, who started as a teacher in a one-room school and became one of the best known educators in the United States, died early yesterday morning at Mount Sinai Hospital.

He was 80 years old and lived at 21 Claremont Avenue and had a farm near Schuylerville, N.Y.

Dr. Carman, dean emeritus of Columbia College and for many years one of the country's leading historians and a pioneer in American studies, had been ill for 5 weeks after suffering a cerebral hemorrhage.

Dr. Carman was a familiar figure in New York life for more than 40 years. His interests ranged from the most erudite scholarship to the mundane task of helping building trades apprentices find and keep jobs. He was always ready to lend his time and labor to causes he considered important.

Heavy-set until he slimmed in recent years, with a shock of reddish brown hair, Dean Carman would come to a meeting of citizens with similar interests, put everyone in an informal mood with a few stories, then start a constructive session. His enthusiasm would grow as he worked. A thorough liberal, he won the respect of conservatives by his consideration for opposing viewpoints, and he often won their support as well.

In class, Dr. Carman's informal way of recounting the development of historical situations made them come alive for his students and made historical investigation an exciting enterprise. He made many recruits to history teaching and historical scholarship. But he was always concerned with the use of the past to control the present and shape the future. This attitude made all his students conscious of history.

Probably his most notable achievement was his part in developing Columbia's contemporary civilization courses, which became a model for humanities programs throughout the country.

Dean Carman was born January 22, 1884, in Greenfield, N.Y., in Saratoga County. He was education there in a one-room school.

When he had completed 12 grades, he wanted to take the high school board of regents examinations at Saratoga. The school superintendent there opposed the request. The principal, who was friendly, took the student's side, and the boy took the tests.

TAUGHT AT $7.50 A WEEK

He passed and thus became, at the age of 16, eligible to enter a teachers' training school, which granted certificates to teach in rural schools. He returned to the one-room schoolhouse, as its teacher at $7.50 a week.

The second year, his pay was raised to $8 a week. Then, in 1905, Mr. Carman entered Syracuse University. He was graduated in 1909, then served 4 years as principal of the Rhinebeck (N.Y.) High School.

Again he saved his money and returned to Syracuse as a graduate student. He received a master's degree in 1914 and taught history and political science at the university until 1917. Then he became a doctoral candidate at Columbia. After receiving his degree in 1919, he joined the department of history.

Dean Carman specialized in studies of American history and civilization, hardly a delinerated field at that time but one now widely cultivated here and abroad.

In those days funds for serious research, particularly in the humanities, were almost nonexistent. Dean Carman, who for several terms was executive secretary of the American Historical Association, decided to do something about it.

He set up what was called a national endownment for historical research, begged for contributions and got them. Although other initiatives were needed to bring historical studies nearer their potential, Dr. Carman thus helped make up part of the deficiency.

QUESTIONED TEACHING'S AIMS

He attacked the problem from another direction. With other young faculty members, he later recalled, he was "impressed by the fact that during World War I the American people seemed very ignorant—and even our own students were ignorant—of historical backgrounds." Columbia College students were taking limited narrowly specialized courses, even in their early years.

These young teachers asked, "Couldn't we develop one course that cuts right across all of those frontiers?" The answer was a new course, contemporary civilization. Dean Herbert E. Hawkes supported its establishment over the objections of traditionalist faculty members.

It became the prototype of the broad-based humanities courses introduced thereafter in most U.S. colleges and universities.

Dean Carman adopted the approach of social history, which had been developed in Europe and was promoted here by such scholars as Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia, for the study of American history. He combined with the traditional study of political and diplomatic events the economic and sociological analysis that helps explain rather than merely report.

A scholar with a felicitous style, Dean Carman was the author of many works, mostly about American history and culture.

Recently, he was coauthor of "Lincoln and the Patronage," "A History of the American People," "Preparation for Medical Education in the Liberal Arts College," and "A History of the State of New York." He also wrote "Jesse Buel, Agricultural Reformer."

With Rexford G. Tugwell he was editor of the Columbia University Studies in the History of American Agriculture, the Columbia University Studies in the History of American Culture and of the "Guide to the Principal Sources for American Civilization."

While pursuing his career as a scholar, Dean Carman was also serving with outstanding success as a teacher. He was an assistant professor of history from 1921 to 1924 and associate professor from 1925 to 1930, becoming a full professor in 1931. He held the Moore chair in American history from 1939 until 1952.

Once, when asked what he tried to do as teacher and dean, Dr. Carman said:

"The first thing I wanted to do was to help the students discover themselves. I wanted them to discover their own potentialities. And along with this process of discovery goes something else.

"The something else is: to free them of superstition and crazy notions which they may have inherited from the past.

"Now a lot of their past is very important—but not all of it. So I try, as I say, to free them and then to get them to discover themselves, their potentialities and their interests and the rest of it. I also want our students to get as broad an education as possible.

"I want them to have an appreciation of how the present came to be. And I want them to know something about scientific methods. And I want them to be able to communicate well, both orally and in writing."

A man of infectious enthusiasm, he chatted informally with his classes rather than lectured, building among his auditors a love for history and culture equal to his own. Tall, gangling, a man with no trace of pompousness, he was interested in each student as an individual and made the learning process an exciting adventure.

His approach and that of others of the school of social historians was to combine the professional competence of the economist and the sociologist with the methods of the historian, which required enormous erudition. But Dean Carman carried his intellectual baggage so easily that his hearty, friendly manner seemed more suited to the farmer of Schuylerville that he had been than to the outstanding educator he was.

In consequence, for 7 consecutive years he won the annual poll among Columbia College seniors as Columbia's most popular professor.

His career as an educational administrator was equally noteworthy. He served as assistant to the dean during the tenure of Dean Hawkes from 1925 to 1931. In 1943, after Dean Hawkes' death, he succeeded to the post, serving until 1950, when he was 66 years old.

MEMBER OF CITY BOARD

He also served the city as a member of the board of higher education, planning for the city's colleges, for 24 of the last 26 years. During the tenure of Mayor Vincent Impelliteri he was dropped from the board.

He had been on the boards of Atlanta University, Earlham College, the Parsons School of Design, and the Free University in Exile. He was a trustee of the Institute of International Education and chairman of the board of the National Scholarship Fund and Service for Negro Students.

At Columbia, Dean Carman was an easily recognized figure as he strode quickly from building to building, usually without hat or coat.

When General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower became president of Columbia in 1948, he was advised to see Dean Carman. He met the dean 30 minutes after taking office. They became close friends.

When he was teaching, Dean Carman had an office in Hamilton Hall. The door was always open, and it was a busy place, with students dropping in frequently.

After his retirement, he moved to an office in the Nicholas Murray Butler Library. There he continued to counsel students.

He criticized those who had a dour outlook on life, once recommending that pessimists "should try living a month or even a week with 2,500 American boys who inhabit the Columbia College quadrangle on Morningside Heights."

"I defy them to do that and emerge with long faces and tidings of woe," he said. "A good look at these young men will take the pessimism out of them in a hurry."

Dean Carman was equally active in civic posts. He was chairman of the humanities division of the John Hay Whitney Foundation which helps public school teachers get postgraduate training. He sponsored the employment of retired professors at small colleges lacking outstanding teachers.

He was a director of the Japan-American Cultural Exchange Program and the Urban League of New York, became executive director of the Ellis Phillips Foundation in 1962 and held many similar posts.

INTERESTED IN LABOR

Dean Carman had a keen interest in labor affairs and in workers education and adult education, serving for 12 years on the board of the Adult Education Council. He was a member of the State's board of mediation from 1941 to 1955 and in 1953 served as chairman of the minimum retail wage board. He had been a member of the American Arbitration Association and, in World War II, of the War Labor Board.

He advised local No. 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers on the organiaztion of its educational program for union members, and supervised the joint electrical industry labor-scholarship program.

The Yale-Columbia football program in October carried a special tribute to Dean

Carman. It called him one of the "busiest retired educators."

Last year he accepted an appointment from Mayor Wagner as a member of what was called an action panel to seek jobs for Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the building trades. He joined a committee for the reelection of Senator Kenneth B. Keating in October.

For his services to the city and to education, Mayor Wagner awarded him the Medal of the City of New York on May 22. Dean Carman also received many academic honors from institutions here and abroad.

He leaves his second wife, the former M. Margaret Carscadden, whom he married in 1953, and a brother, William, of Mechanicville, N.Y. Dean Carman's first wife, the former Cathryne M. Barrett, whom he married in 1910, died in 1943.

The body will lie at Frank E. Campbell's, on Madison Avenue at 81st Street today and tomorrow. It will be taken to Dr. Carman's home in Schuylerville, and will be there Tuesday and Wednesday.

A requiem mass will be held at the Roman Catholic Church of the Visitation in Schuylerville on Thursday morning at 11. Burial will follow in St. Mary's Cemetery.

A memorial service will be held at St. Paul's Chapel on the Columbia campus on January 22, which would have been Dr. Carman's 81st birthday.

[From the West Side News & Morningsider, Jan. 7, 1965]

HARRY J. CARMAN

Throughout his busy life Harry J. Carman, who died last week at the age of 80, concerned himself with the schooling and promise of young people. As a young historian, he was one of the maverick scholars who helped organize the widely heralded general education curriculum at Columbia College where he served as dean from 1943 to 1950.

Appointed to the New York City Board of Higher Education by Mayor La Guardia he played a major role for 24 years in the development and staffing of the city's network of free-tuition colleges. And whenever educators or college presidents or young scholars became disillusioned because of low budgets or lack of scholarships, somehow Harry Carman was there and somehow the iron-willed dirt farmer from upstate New York would figure out a way "to get everyone going again."

Harry Carman was the fellow who could get the powerful and the wealthy to do something good and lasting for the schools and the young people in them. And on occasion, when he couldn't, it was Dean Carman himself who gave the anonymous gift enabling the young, impoverished scholar to continue his studies.

Harry Carman will long be remembered as a scholar, a historian and a teacher. We hope that he will also be particularly remembered and honored as a friend of the ghetto children of the Upper West Side and Harlem. At his death, Dr. Carman served proudly as board chairman of Manhattanville Community Centers, Inc., which serves thousands of children on the West Side and which Dr. Carman helped found.

Manhattanville Community Centers' main building is at 530 West 133 Street. Perhaps some of our readers will see fit this week to send a check to that address in affirmation of the life of Dr. Carman and in support of the great work of the centers' staff.

We also hope that the board of education will give consideration in naming its new school in Morningside Park for one of the great men of Morningside, Harry J. Carman.

CUTTING OFF AID TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I add my endorsement to the action of the House on Tuesday, January 26, 1965, cutting off any further aid to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480.

During debate on this question in 1964, there was a move in Congress to shut off all assistance to the United Arab Republic, without qualification or consideration. At that time I argued that discretion should remain with the administration. My substitute amendment, which was passed, called upon the President to bar aid to any country unless he could certify that it was not an aggressor against any nation with which we have diplomatic relations and was not using our funds for purposes inimical to our foreign policies.

On December 28, 1964, I wrote to the President urging the administration to take immediate action to terminate all further aid to the United Arab Republic. This was prompted by continuing anti-U.S. statements and actions made and condoned by President Nasser. These statements and actions have been set forth by certain of my colleagues and leave no possible question that continued aid to the United Arab Republic is illegal; for that country is engaged in a campaign of aggression against some of our best friends in Africa, and a campaign which is completely inimical to our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present I would have lent my wholehearted support to the decision by my colleagues in the House to cut off aid to the United Arab Republic, and would have voted with them to end this futile and self-defeating policy of aid to an ungrateful, deceitful, and dangerous recipient of America's bounty.

It is my sincere hope that the other body will support the House action which I firmly believe expresses the clearly prevailing attitude of Americans.

THE CLOSING OF VA HOSPITALS

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming.

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the proposed closing of many Veterans' Administration facilities and hospitals has stirred up a great deal of community interest and righteous indignation among veterans, their families, and friends. Recently a Buffalo newspaper sent an investigator and reporter to the veterans hospital and domiciliary at Bath, N.Y., a distance of less than 100 miles, to see what could be learned about its complete operation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to include a report of Miss Margaret Fess' findings as it appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on January 17, 1965:

IMMINENT CLOSING OF VA HOSPITAL CLOAKS BATH IN GLOOM AND ANGER

(By Margaret Fess)

BATH.—Gloom, despair, and anger hang over this once tranquil little village.

Announcement of the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital here struck like a bombshell. Patients and residents, some of whom have called the facility home for more than 20 years, are distraught at being uprooted.

Employees, mostly homeowners with children, are in despair. Village and town officials are angry over the economic blow to the community.

PATIENTS DEFIANT BUT BEWILDERED

Robert E. Porteous of New York City, a Princeton graduate, who has been a wheelchair patient there for 12 years, sums it up this way:

"It isn't just the closing of the facility. It is the way it is done. Our Congressmen are elected to represent the people. They have a right to know what is happening, but they were not informed in advance of this.

"This rule by directive is not democratic. It smells of fascism.

"My only living relative is a brother in New York City. Traveling in a wheelchair isn't easy, but I can manage the 300 miles from here to New York occasionally. If I am shipped off to some remote spot, seeing my brother will be impossible."

Hammond Douglas, a World War II veteran from the Bronx, suffering from a hip injury, has been a resident of the facility since 1959. He is assigned to part-time work in the admissions office. This is his feeling:

"I don't care for myself. I've learned to take things as they come.

"But I do fear for some of the older residents. I think that the emotional upset of being moved to a strange place could send them over the brink mentally.

"Right now, nearly all of the older men are in a highly emotional state—crying and bewildered.

"They should have been prepared for this gradually—say over a 5-year period. And, another thing. I have been informed that some of these domicile facilities to which transfers will be made have no hospitals. These men are reaching an age when they need medical attention."

In spite of zero temperatures, John Geyer, 76, a native of Buffalo, was wandering around the village streets trying to figure the whole thing out.

ORPHANAGE TO ARMY TO HOSPITAL TO—?

"This is the worst thing that has ever happened to me," he said. "My life hasn't been easy. I was brought up in the Buffalo orphanage, went into the regular Army and was in World War I. Later, I lived in New York City.

"I just love it here. This place is like home. I don't know what I am going to do. I might go back to New York. I just don't know what to do."

Seated in the McDonnell Tavern, Anthony McKee, 56, of Rochester, World War II veteran, and Percy Stansfield, 69, of Providence, R.I., World War I, hashed the thing over.

"They've treated us very well here," said McKee. "We all like the facility and the town people have been wonderful to us. I'm a trumpeter in the band. I suppose I won't have a chance to play when I get kicked out of here."

Stansfield, who has lived in the facility for 20 years, said he was broken up.

BUSINESS PEOPLE FEAR LOSSES

Brendan McDonnell, the young tavern owner, had tears in his eyes. His place of business is located near the grounds of the VA hospital.

"This wipes me out of business," he said.

"My grandfather started this business in 1897. My dad ran it for years, until he died last May. Then I took it over. I love Bath, and so does my wife and three children. These veterans have been fine people to deal with."

Down the road several blocks, Mrs. Floyd Gay stood behind a counter in her husband's gas station.

"This will wipe out half of our business," said Mrs. Gay. "We know nearly all of the employees and they are good customers. And we like the veterans. They are a nice bunch of old men and, as they walk past here, they always wave in such a friendly way."

HOSPITAL EMPLOYEES BITTER, CONFUSED

The only topic of conversation in the crowded canteen was the closing. Gerald Keeney, a carpenter, who has worked at the facility for 7 years, said:

"We're being treated like statistics—just something you would run through an IBM machine. I have six kids and own my own home.

"One girl is going to Syracuse on a full scholarship. I suppose I'll have to pull her out. I've already paid the entrance fee for another child to enter the Corning Community College next fall. Now that will probably be out the window."

The whole thing was summed up as a "dirty, sneaky deal" by Henry G. Masti, another carpenter, also a homeowner and the father of four children. Masti, who has worked at the facility for 6 years, denounced the fact that the employees had been given no advance warning so that they could look for other jobs.

"The Government wouldn't have dared do this before election," he said.

George A. Hedren, a painter, who spent 6 years in the Marines and 16 working for the Veterans' Administration, said:

"I thought I had my life all figured out. I would keep on working here, take care of my family in this nice, quiet village and eventually retire on a Government pension. Now I don't know what I will do."

Another painter, who has been with the VA for 10 years, said he felt the residents and employees had not yet realized the full impact of the closing.

"There are going to be a lot of hardships ahead for all of us," he commented. "The residents like it here and are all upset about moving. The employees probably will all have to take lesser jobs."

EXPECTS 400 HOMES TO GO UP FOR SALE

Another employee, who did not want his name used, pointed to the scarcity of available jobs in the vicinity of Bath and predicted that about 400 homes would be put on the market at the same time.

He also cited the loss of business to a community created by relatives and friends visiting the veterans.

Miss Tina Aschett, secretary to the Director, who has worked at the VA for 24 years, was in the same boat—undecided.

"We all feel as if the rug has been pulled out from under us," she said. "I was born here in Bath and love this section of the State. I just don't know what I will do."

MAYOR FEARFUL OF TOWN'S FUTURE

The mayor of Bath, Dr. Frank Nicklaus, a dentist, felt that the reasons given for closing were "flimsy," including the lack of auxiliary medical personnel.

"The doctors love it here," said Dr. Nicklaus. "We have our country club, plenty of means of recreation, a good school system, a fine class of inhabitants, and little crime.

"Two years ago there was talk of closing the hospital, but after a conference with officials we were assured that there would be no major changes in the forseeable future.

"This closing will affect every phase of village life—business, the school system, social, and political life. The VA employees are among our finest residents.

"I am flabbergasted that the Government would abandon such an excellent set of buildings. We haven't had time to look into bringing something else here to be housed in the buildings. But we would welcome a college, hospital, or something along that line."

Dr. Nicklaus said that, because of the finality of recent decisions in Washington, he had little hope that the order to close would be rescinded.

FINAL HOPE LIES WITH BANDED VETERANS

If there is any change in policy, he said, it would probably be sparked by the powerful veterans' organizations who are swinging into action all over the State.

The Bath facility consists of 53 buildings on 223 acres. Buildings and equipment are valued at $20 million. Included in the buildings are residences which now house about 740 veterans. The hospital has 273 beds.

There are four chapels, four libraries, a guardhouse, and fire station, store, canteen, baseball diamond, administration building, and other structures. Several of the residences have been closed because the Government has not alloted money for needed repairs and improvements.

However, in 1959 the Government built a new theater at a cost of $1,200,000. This also contains a leisure room, quarters for music practice, sports section with lockers, billiard tables, shuffle board, craft, and hobby shops.

This year's operating budget is $4,764,625. About $3.5 million, or 79 percent, is for the payroll. Supplies are purchased by competitive bid, with most of the bids going to local concerns.

A number of the veterans have small social security or other forms of pension. Most of these funds are spent among village merchants.

The institution is steeped in tradition. Back in 1877, the State built the old GAR building as a residence for aging Civil War veterans. On Christmas Day, that year, 25 veterans arrived as the first residents of the home. This building has recently been redecorated.

From atop a hill, tombstones can be seen as far as the eye can reach. More than 7,000 veterans are buried in this cemetery. Each Memorial Day, an elaborate service is held here.

The grounds are replete with stately old trees, and Chocton Creek forms a border on one side. The men fish and swim in the creek. A favorite pastime for the veterans is watching baseball games during the summer. Junior leaguers or other local teams play there on weekends.

The facility serves veterans from six New England States and part of Pennsylvania.

Members of the domicile section are men who are ambulatory, able to dress, feed themselves, make their own beds, and take care of their lockers. However, all have disabilities which prevent them from being able to earn a living. All need custodial care, and some are blind.

About 50 percent of the patients in the hospital were once domicile residents.

EVICTION ORDERED BY END OF JUNE

The Veterans' Administration in Washington has issued orders that all residents and patients be moved out of the facility by June 30, the end of the fiscal year.

Residents of the domicile buildings will be transferred to VA facilities at Wood, Wis., Dayton, Ohio, and Hampton, Va. Patients in the hospital will be transferred to VA hospitals in Syracuse, Buffalo, and Canandaigua.

Thoughout the country 11 VA hospitals are being closed, and 17 regional offices. Officials claim the move will save about $23 million a year.

I also wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the same paper, dated January 21, 1965, adding further to the conclusion that the decision to close these facilities could not have taken into consideration the economic and human factors involved within the communities affected:

FACILITY LOSS HEAVY BLOW TO BATH

The scheduled closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital and domicile at Bath is hard to understand in the face of the concern in Washington over combatting poverty.

The 600 employees, most of whom are rearing and educating children, buying homes, and saving for the future, feel that a cruel hand in Washington has pulled the economic rug out from under them.

The loss of the $3½-million payroll, second largest in the village, will affect practically every business in Bath. The employees pay rent, taxes, mortgages, buy automobiles, clothing, food, gasoline, and even pay parking tickets.

Every one of the people they do business with in the village of 6,000 inhabitants will feel the pinch.

It has been estimated that 400 homes might be placed on the market at the same time. This could devaluate the entire real estate market for Bath and the surrounding section.

The veterans' facility spends about $1,250,000 for supplies and operating costs. The majority of the purchases are made locally.

Most of the veterans receive small social security benefits or pensions and spend their money with Bath merchants. Friends and relatives coming to see the veterans bring more money to Bath.

Veterans' Administration officials in Washington have stated that the closing of various facilities, hospitals, and offices throughout the country will result in savings of $23 million.

This has been questioned by Assemblyman Charles D. Henderson, of Hornell, who also has criticized the manner in which the closing order was issued without advance notice, hearings, or specific information.

Seventy-nine percent of the Bath facility budget is for the payroll to give custodial and hospital care to the veterans. No matter where they are transferred they will require adequate care.

Before the United States wipes out 600 jobs, placing a village in economic jeopardy, and uprooting 1,000 veteran patients and residents, New York's Senators and Congressmen should insist on full and open review of the Veterans' Administration directive that all veterans must be out of the facility by June 30.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCOME LIMITATION INCREASE DUE

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to raise the outside earning limitation allowed those drawing social security in order that beneficiaries under the system may increase their incomes without suffering losses in their benefits. My proposal would increase the present $1,200 ceiling on annual income to $2,400 as the maximum earnings permitted each year without deductions in social security benefits.

According to information received from the Social Security Administration it can be estimated that this year some half-million senior citizens in America will lose all or part of their social security benefits because they earned over $1,200. This hardship seems unjust to me. At a time in life when a person needs some outside income to supplement his social security benefits, or may be physically able to work and enjoy working, the present social security system imposes financial difficulty on him by cutting his benefits because he earns more than $1,200 on his own.

It should also be emphasized that the existing program is contrary to the American system of encouraging people to support themselves. If an individual wants to use his initiative he should not be penalized as the present situation provides. Clearly some new balance must be struck.

The social security program contributes a great deal to the well-being of millions of Americans. Yet many of the Nation's senior generation are not content to accept full retirement. Through longer life expectancy and American initiative a growing number of Americans approaching retirement age still want to share in the economic prosperity of the Nation. They should be allowed to do so without being penalized by losses in benefits from a fund which their own earnings have helped to build.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gross) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Halpern, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Morse, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Weltner (at the request of Mr. Roncalio), for 30 minutes, on Monday, February 1; to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Polanco-Abreu and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Gross) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Horton.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

S. 507. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in properties purchased with financing assistance under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 1, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

437. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

438. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that certain appropriations have been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

439. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

440. A letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1964, pursuant to the act of June 11, 1878, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

441. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the inadequate determination of indirect cost allowances under certain research project grants awarded and administered by the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

442. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

443. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the disposal of certain foreign excess property in accordance with section 404(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377, 399), (40 U.S.C. 514); to the Committee on Government Operations.

444. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal pursuant to 57 Stat. 380, as amended; to the Committee on House Administration.

445. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to define the word 'owner' "; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

446. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

447. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

448. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a certified copy of amendments to the regulations governing the numbering of undocumented vessels, promulgated by the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, pursuant to subsection 7 (a) of 46 U.S.C. 527d; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

449. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report relative to positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in certain grades of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to section 503(a) of title V of Public Law 84–854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 146. Resolution authorizing payment of compensation for certain committee employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 3). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 203. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases; without amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 214. A bill to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 228. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein; with amendment (Rept. No. 6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 3779. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 3780. A bill to amend chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit fees in excess of $10 for attorneys and agents in connection with certain claims filed with the military departments by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 3781. A bill to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 3782. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3783. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain forms of nickel be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 3784. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to proceedings against certain witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 3785. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 3786. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3787. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 3788. A bill to revive and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3789. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses incurred for the medical care of his parents if they would be eligible for medical assistance for the aged under title I or XVI of the Social Security Act, even though they are not actually dependent upon him; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3790. A bill to amend section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the deduction of certain expenses paid or incurred in a search for a business or investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3791. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage basic research in science by the allowance of a tax credit for contributions and other expenditures for basic research in science; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 3792. A bill to provide for the case of inability of the President or Vice President or interim successor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3793. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3794. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make available to students in all elementary and secondary schools textbooks selected by such schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3795. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3796. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3797. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 3798. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3799. A bill for the relief of the city of Bakersfield, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 3800. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 3801. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 3802. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 3803. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3804. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the special provisions relating to marriages; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3805. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize special consideration for certain disabled veterans suffering deafness; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3806. A bill to amend section 721, and section 757 of title 38, United States Code, to limit review of insurance extra hazards determinations by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to 2 years from the date of original decision; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3807. A bill to amend section 107 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the benefits authorized therein shall be at a rate in pesos as is equivalent to $0.50 for each dollar authorized and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 3808. A bill to authorize the improvement for navigation of Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 3809. A bill for the relief of Caruthersville, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 3810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income and documentary stamp tax treatment of certain real property condemnations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 3811. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 3812. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 3813. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of structural defects in properties purchased with financing assistance under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 3814. A bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 3815. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3816. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress, research, and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3817. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that family dislocation allowances received by members of the Armed Forces shall not be included in their gross income for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 3818. A bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 3819. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3820. A bill to require that a portion of Government parking facilities at national monuments and memorials and Government buildings be reserved for use by visitors confined to wheelchairs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 3821. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of certain assistance to the United Arab Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 3822. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, so as to provide authorization of up to 2 years' constructive service credit to those Medical Service Corps officers now on active duty with the uniformed services who are required to have advanced training beyond the 4-year college level as a precondition to their appointment, and that those Medical Service Corps officers hereinafter appointed be so credited; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3823. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3824. A bill to amend section 218 of the Social Security Act so as to enable States, through Federal-State agreement, to provide further opportunity for certain State employees to elect coverage under the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 3825. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 3826. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of podiatrists; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3827. A bill to amend the act concerning gifts to minors in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 3828. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 3829. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3830. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3831. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the provisions thereof with respect to furnishing of drugs and medicines to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3832. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the authorization of appropriations for grants to assist construction of State home facilities for furnishing nursing home care to war veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 3833. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3834. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 3835. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests heretofore acquired by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 3836. A bill to amend section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to continue the indemnity payment program for farmers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 249. Joint resolution to provide for an urban renewal code enforcement project in the Adams-Morgan area, and to encourage and assist rehabilitation of homes and businesses in such area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.J. Res. 252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 253. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.J. Res. 255. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 256. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 257. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. Res. 148. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the proposed closing of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Res. 149. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 3837. A bill for the relief of Luisa Pono Parinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3838. A bill for the relief of Jean Chen Pan (Pan Chu Jean-Chen); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3839. A bill for the relief of Aurora Aduviso Kostner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3840. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3841. A bill for the relief of Salvatore LoIacono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3842. A bill for the relief of Abraham Kiali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3843. A bill for the relief of Despina Kouloumoundras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3844. A bill for the relief of Anna Stabile Bevilacqua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3845. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Payne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 3846. A bill for the relier of Liberato Cornacchione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3847. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chariklia Laikopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 3848. A bill for the relief of Mary Bernadette Linehan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 3849. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. Mikolaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 3850. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Colella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 3851. A bill for the relief of Mrs. M. S. Chiu and her son and daughters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3852. A bill for the relief of Alfredo M. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 3853. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cimino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER (by request):

H.R. 3854. A bill for the relief of Uldarico Paraskevas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3855. A bill for the relief of Meropi Paraskevas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3856. A bill for the relief of Maria Smereczynska Yarasezsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3857. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Schlaak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3858. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Giammo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3859. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Danovaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3860. A bill for the relief of Irini Vasiliadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3861. A bill for the relief of Efraz Arsaguli Istepanyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3862. A bill for the relief of Salomon and Etelca Friedmann Falus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3863. A bill for the relief of Calogero Davi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 3864. A bill for the incorporation of the Merchant Marine War Veterans Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3865. A bill for the relief of Corrado Fronte and Sebastiana Fronte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3866. A bill for the relief of Liborio Tortorici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3867. A bill for the relief of Giacomo La Corte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3868. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Filingeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3869. A bill for the relief of Francesca Maria Arcuri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3870. A bill for the relief of Stephan Simon Jordan and Elisabeth Jordan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3871. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3872. A bill for the relief of Cesarina Sesini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3873. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Giuliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 3874. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giovanna Iacobelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3875. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Panagiota Vastakis and Soteros Vastakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 3876. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Antonia Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3877. A bill for the relief of Char Ming Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 3878. A bill for the relief of Berta Gulnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 3879. A bill for the relief of Ernest Buillet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 3880. A bill for the relief of Donald McCallum Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 3881. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy Sybil Denniston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 3882. A bill for the relief of Maria Garzia Lo Piccolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3883. A bill for the relief of Christina Kazub (also known as Krystyna Kazub); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3884. A bill for the relief of Carmela Santoro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3885. A bill for the relief of Jose and Maria Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3886. A bill for the relief Giuseppina Gesualdi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3887. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Arsena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 3888. A bill for the relief of Maria Desimone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 3889. A bill for the relief of Thomas Valdivia Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 3890. A bill for the relief of Cleopatra A. Palmejar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 3891. A bill for the relief of Mario Fernando Gomes DeCarvalho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3892. A bill for the relief of Michele Bongiardina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3893. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Pitino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3894. A bill for the relief of Maria Fanetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3895. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Felicisima B. Dumlao; to the Committee on Judiciary.

H.R. 3896. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Evangelista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3897. A bill for the relief of Compton B. Theirens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 3898. A bill for the relief of Sarolta Szentmiklosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 3899. A bill for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3900. A bill for the relief of Jong Wan Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3901. A bill for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 3902. A bill for the relief of Dr. Donald Liu and his wife, Emilie Chua Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3903. A bill for the relief of Dr. Madjid Yaghmai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 3904. A bill for the relief of Mario Antonio Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3905. A bill for the relief of Bibi Daljeet Kaur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 3906. A bill for the relief of Francesco Todaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3907. A bill for the relief of Hansel L. Steele, Christopher W. Steele and Celine Y. Steele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3908. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anthony C. Nassif; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3909. A bill for the relief of Rozalia Takacs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3910. A bill for the relief of Marija Pust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 3911. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in seventy-nine and one hundred and eighty-four one-thousandths acres located near Orangeburg, S.C., to Allen E. Dominick, the owner of such property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

84. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the clerk of council, city of Lakewood, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress and other agencies of Government to immediately enforce laws for the prevention and prohibition of the destruction of our freedoms by Communist activities, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1965

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INOUYE).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, all the ways of our need lead to Thee. Our futile attempts by ourselves to solve life's problems but tell us that all is vanity. Our deepest cravings but drive us to Thy everlasting arms.

May the spiritual verities by which we really live assert their sovereignty and ascendance over our hearts and minds, as with unbroken vigil we keep the perpetual light of faith burning over the inner shrine of the soul.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom those who have been trusted with responsibility and authority in these troublous times. For the preservation of liberty, for the defeat of all tyranny, for the redemption of democracy from its failures, for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in all the earth, we lift our hearts to Thee, O God of our salvation.

In the dear Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. INOUYE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 27, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 20)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the Economic Report of the President, together with the annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers, which was referred to the Joint Economic Committee.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Tuesday, January 26, 1965, the following report of a committee was submitted on January 27, 1965:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 3. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs, and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region; (Rept. No. 13).

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

COOPERATION OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE WITH STATES AND PUBLIC AGENCIES IN USE OF CERTAIN LAND

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN MATERIALS FROM SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of chromium metal, acid grade fluorspar, and silicon carbide from the supplemental stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT THAT FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS MAINTAIN CERTAIN RESERVES IN GOLD CERTIFICATES AGAINST DEPOSIT LIABILITIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President and members of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that government, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON INADEQUATE DETERMINATION OF INDIRECT COST ALLOWANCES UNDER CERTAIN RESEARCH PROJECT GRANTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate determination of indirect cost allowances under certain research project grants awarded and administered by the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON SALES AND TRANSFERS OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Acting Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the sales and transfers of foreign excess property, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN TRACKING EQUIPMENT

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, of certain tracking equipment at Esselen Park, Johannesburg, South Africa; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT AT OAK BOTTOM SITE IN THE WHISKEYTOWN RESERVOIR AREA, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract at the Oak Bottom site in the Whiskeytown Reservoir Area, California (with accompany papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 797. A bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 798. A bill to establish qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 799. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Manouchag Partoghian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 800. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK):

S. 801. A bill to improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 802. A bill for the relief of Jillian Vera Griffiths Hussey;

S. 803. A bill for the relief of Ching Zai Yen and his wife, Faung Hwa Yen; and

S. 804. A bill for the relief of Wie Lie Bong and Jenny Kim-Yang (nee Lie) Bong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 805. A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 806. A bill to promote the utilization of Indian-owned resources by Indians of the three affiliated tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 807. A bill for the relief of Lubomira Chodakiewicz (Luba Hodakievic); and

S. 808. A bill for the relief of Evangelia Georges Tsounos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 809. A bill to revive and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 810. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Herbert Hoover National Monument in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Miller when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gore, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 811. A bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Moss, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Harris, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, and Mr. McIntyre):

S. 812. A bill to provide for the use of public works and other economic programs in a coordinated effort to aid economically disadvantaged areas of the Nation; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 813. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a reserve of at least 500 million ounces of silver for national defense purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dominick when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 814. A bill to require Federal Reserve banks to maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 10 percent against its deposits and not less than 15 percent against its notes in circulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 815. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for refreshment, service, and merchandise at roofgardens, cabarets, and similar places; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 816. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by a contractor of the Forest Service who were not paid for their services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 817. A bill to authorize a Little Dell project in the State of Utah for flood control, water supply, and recreational purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bennett when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 818. A bill for the relief of Joao Andre Senos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 819. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit child's insurance benefits to continue after age 18 in the case of certain children who are full-time students after attaining such age, and to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits to which they are entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 820. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. Ervin):

S. 821. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jordan of North Carolina when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 822. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public land in Wyoming to Clara Dozier Wire; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 823. A bill for the relief of Luigi Filippo LoCicero, Michael Anthony LoCicero, and Domenic Louis LoCicero;

S. 824. A bill for the relief of Mayrani Tozan and Araksi Tozan;

S. 825. A bill for the relief of Daroslava Martinovich Bulatovich;

S. 826. A bill for the relief of Har Gobind Khorana;

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Kam Yuet Moy; and

S. 828. A bill for the relief of Cha Mi Hi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 829. A bill for the relief of Enrico Agostini and Celestino Agostini;

S. 830. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Atoynatan and Agatoniki Atoynatan; and

S. 831. A bill for the relief of Francis Zerjav; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 832. A bill for the relief of Jung Soon Choi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 833. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Kreysa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 834. A bill for the relief of Julianna Rado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 835. A bill for the relief of Ante Cibilic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. Dodd):

S. 836. A bill to amend the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to exclude from the provisions of that act wool products with respect to which the disclosure of wool fiber content is not necessary for the protection of the consumer; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 837. A bill for the relief of Elena Savino Coviello;

S. 838. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Zeytinoglu, Zeynep Zeytinoglu, and Fusun Zeytinoglu;

S. 839. A bill for the relief of Araxie Puzant Tekeyan;

S. 840. A bill for the relief of Christos Stratis;

S. 841. A bill for the relief of Maria-Asuncion Pernas Fanego;

S. 842. A bill for the relief of Maria Pimentel De Sousa;

S. 843. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shiro Shimosato;

S. 844. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francisco B. deCarvalho;

S. 845. A bill for the relief of Luis Aguiar Duarte;

S. 846. A bill for the relief of Joal Claudio Pavao;

S. 847. A bill for the relief of Patrick K. Yen and family;

S. 848. A bill for the relief of Lillian Chu Sung;

S. 849. A bill for the relief of Arminda Padua Viseu;

S. 850. A bill for the relief of Samuel L. McCoy;

S. 851. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 852. A bill for the relief of Susan A. Tikiryan; and

S. 853. A bill for the relief of Charles N. Legarde and his wife, Beatrice E. Legarde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 854. A bill for the relief of Bogoljoub Voukovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 855. A bill for the relief of Doris Annie Buston Lucas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. Bass):

S. 856. A bill for the relief of the estate of R. M. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 857. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Styliiani Papathanasiou;

S. 858. A bill for the relief of Chang Ah Lung;

S. 859. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Toros Torosian;

S. 860. A bill for the relief of Aziza (Susan) Sasson;

S. 861. A bill for the relief of Alva Arlington Garnes;

S. 862. A bill for the relief of Woo Zee-Ching;

S. 863. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Schillaci;

S. 864. A bill for the relief of Roza Feuer;

S. 865. A bill for the relief of Mannor Lee;

S. 866. A bill for the relief of Angelo Coppola;

S. 867. A bill for the relief of Young Wai;

S. 868. A bill for the relief of Mother Azucena de San Jose (nee Carmen Hernandez Aguilar);

S. 869. A bill for the relief of Yom Tov Yashayahu Briszk;

S. 870. A bill for the relief of Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff;

S. 871. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Enzo Russo;

S. 872. A bill for the relief of Vasil Laci;

S. 873. A bill for the relief of Toni Schwarz;

S. 874. A bill for the relief of Palmerina Caira and her minor children, Mauro Caira and Ciazio Caira;

S. 875. A bill for the relief of Wilfredo R. Emano;

S. 876. A bill for the relief of Maggiorina Magnante;

S. 877. A bill for the relief of Jacob, Malka, and David Kalkstein;

S. 878. A bill for the relief of Mother Estella Mary de San Jose (nee Matilde Gandarillas Sigler);

S. 879. A bill for the relief of Kim Sa Suk;

S. 880. A bill for the relief of Caterina Cona;

S. 881. A bill for the relief of Apostol Christoforides;

S. 882. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose L. Cabezon;

S. 883. A bill for the relief of Maria Panagiotis Boutsalis;

S. 884. A bill for the relief of Eleftharios Georgalos;

S. 885. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Gigante;

S. 886. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Pulitano;

S. 887. A bill for the relief of Aglaia Giannatos Efthymiou;

S. 888. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fiannaca; and

S. 889. A bill for the relief of Loukia Vouxinou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 890. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Manuel De Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Holland, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Dirksen):

S. 891. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hickenlooper when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on Presidential power and succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pastore when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS RELATING TO BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Jordan of Idaho) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) to express the sense of the Congress that achievement of balance of payments equilibrium is essential and that the United States should take the initiative in calling for an international economic conference, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Javits, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS RELATING TO MORE EFFECTIVE MEANS TO RESTRAIN THE OUTFLOW OF PRIVATE CAPITAL

Mr. JAVITS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) to express the sense of the Congress that to develop more effective means to restrain the outflow of private capital the President should establish an Advisory Committee on Capital Export Policy, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Javits, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULES TO REQUIRE ROLLCALL VOTES ON PASSAGE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. STENNIS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 67) to amend the rules of the Senate to require rollcall vote on passage of proposed amendments to the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Stennis, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 68) continuing the authority of the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operation of the Government, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. McClellan, which appears under a separate heading.)

ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT THAT FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS MAINTAIN CERTAIN RESERVES IN GOLD CERTIFICATES AGAINST DEPOSIT LIABILITIES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in keeping with the statement I made Tuesday, I introduce, by request, the administration's bill to amend the gold reserve requirements of the United States.

The bill reads as follows:

A bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 413), is further amended by striking out "reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 per centum against its deposits and".

Sec. 2. The eighteenth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 467), is further amended by substituting a period for the comma after the word "notes" and striking out the remainder of the paragraph.

The bill was transmitted to the Senate by a letter which reads as follows:

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities."

The proposed legislation, which is designed to implement the recommendation made by President Johnson in his Economic Report, would eliminate the present requirement that every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its deposits. No change would be made in the requirement that every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation.

By the end of 1964, the ratio of Federal Reserve gold certificate reserves to the aggregate note and deposit liabilities had declined to below 28 percent, a drop of more than 2 percent in the space of a year. This decline in the ratio primarily reflected the growth both in Federal Reserve notes in circulation and in Federal Reserve deposits that accompanied the expansion of the economy. Based on recent rates of increase in currency in circulation and in deposits with Federal Reserve banks, the legal minimum reserve would be reached within about 2 years even without any reduction in our holdings of gold. Continuation of the present reserve requirement could thus artificially impede the orderly expansion of money and bank credit essential to support future domestic growth and prosperity.

Continuation of the present requirement could also raise unnecessary doubts over our ability and willingness to make our gold wholly available if required to meet our pledge to defend the present gold value of the dollar at $35 an ounce, notwithstanding assurances that the gold cover requirement would be temporarily suspended if necessary for this purpose.

We have concluded, in consultation with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, that an appropriate way to meet this problem would be to eliminate the requirement for the maintenance of reserves against deposits while retaining it against Federal Reserve notes. The deposits in Federal Reserve banks represent primarily reserves of member banks of the Federal Reserve System. They will not be affected in any way by the elimination of the requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain reserves in gold certificates against them. This approach will reduce the required reserve from about $13 billion of gold to about $8 billion.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

There is enclosed for your convenient reference a comparative type showing the changes in existing law that would be made by the proposed bill.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas Dillon.

Comparative Type Showing Changes in Existing Law Made by Bill

Changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets):

The first sentence of the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 413):

"Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain [reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 per centum against its deposits and] reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 per centum against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation: *Provided, however,* That when the Federal Reserve agent holds gold certificates as collateral for Federal Reserve notes issued to the bank such gold certificates shall be counted as part of the reserve which such bank is required to maintain against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

The 18th paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 467):

"Deposits made under this section standing to the credit of any Federal Reserve bank with the Board of Governors of the Federal

Reserve System shall, at the option of said bank, be counted as part of the lawful reserve which it is required to maintain against outstanding Federal Reserve notes [, or as a part of the reserve it is required to maintain against deposits].

At the present time, a 25-percent gold reserve is required to back up Federal Reserve notes and deposits in Federal Reserve banks. The bill would preserve the 25-percent gold reserve requirement behind the Federal Reserve notes, but it would eliminate the reserve requirement for deposits in Federal Reserve banks.

At the President's request, I have also agreed to hold hearings promptly, and I have announced that hearings will begin on this bill on February 2, 1965.

I have introduced this bill and set these hearings in accordance with my policy that major administration bills which the President considers of top urgency should be considered promptly, carefully, and responsibly, without regard to my personal views with respect to such proposals.

In introducing this bill, I should like to comment briefly on the matter.

The United States now holds more than $15 billion in gold, three times as much as any other free world nation, and more than one-third of the free world's gold. The U.S. dollar is the most sought currency in the world and all things considered is, I think, the soundest currency in the world. America's industrial products and agricultural commodities are in great demand around the world, as our substantial trade surplus shows. No one at home or abroad should take the President's request for action as an indication of distress or emergency.

The administration is presenting this bill because our gold reserve is now not much more than the current gold reserve requirements. Our "free gold" is now down to less than $2 billion. There are two reasons for the decrease in our gold reserve ratio. First, our gold supply has declined from its postwar high of $22 billion, largely because our foreign aid program and our military commitments around the world over the past 20 years have been tremendous. They have, indeed, eliminated the "dollar gap" which was the original basis for the Marshall plan. Second, our domestic requirements for gold reserve for currency and Federal Reserve deposits have increased partly as the result of growth of our population, the present "good times," and the substantial measure of domestic inflation since the end of World War II. These reserve requirements may be expected to continue to show a normal rate of growth.

These factors make it necessary for us to consider the President's proposal to amend our gold reserve requirements. We must at the same time consider carefully the factors which have caused our gold supply to decline and have made this action necessary. We must consider carefully the proposals the President is making, and take vigorous action to eliminate the deficit in our balance of payments. It is better to do this now than when all of our gold is gone. We must also take all appropriate steps to preserve a sound domestic economy and to preserve the value of the dollar. To do this, an independent Federal Reserve Board is essential.

I should like to close by emphasizing once again the fact that the United States has the biggest supply of gold in the world and the soundest currency in the world. The Congress, I am convinced, will join in the President's pledge to keep a sound economy and a sound dollar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 797) to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON (by request) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia whether hearing dates have been set.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A hearing date has been set for 10 o'clock next Tuesday. I have scheduled the distinguished minority leader as the first witness, because under protocol we give priority over Cabinet officers and everyone except the President—who does not come up—to Members of the Senate. I have been told that the distinguished minority leader proposes to support the administration's proposal but to oppose the Douglas bill which would take all the coverage off.

Consequently, on the morning of next Tuesday, at 10 o'clock, we will open hearings, and if agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, he will be the first witness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

APPROPRIATIONS DURING FISCAL YEAR 1966 FOR PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, by request, for myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and for the research, development, test, and evaluation activities of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter of transmittal requesting introduction of the legislation and explaining its purpose be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. RUSSELL is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation "to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes." This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of the proposal would be in accord with the program of the President.

This proposal is identical in form to the provisions of Public Law 88–288, approved March 20, 1964, providing authorizations for appropriations as required pursuant to section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149, as amended.

As in the case of previous legislation, this proposal would provide for the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1966 in two major areas. It includes authorization for appropriations for the procurement in each of the categories of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for each of the military departments in the amount of the new obligational authority being requested for such purposes in the President's budget for fiscal year 1966. In addition, the proposal would provide fund authorization in amounts equal to the new obligational authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1966 in total for each of the research, development, test, and evaluation appropriations for the military departments and the defense agencies. The amounts requested for fund authorization have been developed on the same basis as, and are comparable to, the amounts for which fund authorizations were granted in fiscal year 1965.

The action of the Congress in providing fund authorization for these major programs in the Department of Defense on this basis, coupled with the agreed upon reprograming procedures, has resulted in the achievement of essential flexibility without diminishing congressional control in the execution of the programs. The understanding and cooperation of the cognizant committees in dealing with program changes in the past have been invaluable in the accomplishment of these programs.

The Committees on Armed Services will be furnished, as in the past, detailed information with respect to each program for which fund authorization is being requested in a form identical to that submitted in explanation and justification of the budget requests. Additionally, the Department of Defense will be prepared to submit any other data required by the committees or their staffs.

It is expected that the Armed Services Committees will desire that top civilian and military officials of the Department of Defense be prepared to make presentations explaining, and justifying their respective programs as in the past.

For ready reference, there is attached a table showing, by category, and by service: (1) the amounts authorized for fiscal year 1965; (2) amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1965; and (3) the amounts requested for fund authorization for fiscal year 1966.

Sincerely,

CYRUS VANCE, *Deputy.*

TO AMEND THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE UNITED STATES TO PARTICIPATE IN AN INCREASE IN THE RESOURCES OF THE FUND FOR SPECIAL OPERATIONS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of the Treasury, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury dated January 18, 1965, to the President pro tempore of the Senate in regard to it.

The Committee on Foreign Relations will begin public hearings on this important legislative proposal on Friday, February 5, in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building, commencing at 10 a.m. with testimony from executive branch officials. Those wishing to testify on the bill are invited to inform the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 805) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 805

A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Inter-American Development Bank Act (73 Stat. 299; 22 U.S.C. 283–283l) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 14. (a) The United States Governor of the Bank is hereby authorized to vote in favor of the resolution entitled 'Increase of Resources of the Fund for Special Operations' proposed by the Governors at their annual meeting in April 1964 and now pending before the Board of Governors of the Bank. Upon the adoption of such resolution, the United States Governor is authorized to agree, on behalf of the United States, to pay to the Fund for Special Operations of the Bank the sum of $750,000,000 in accordance with and subject to the terms and conditions of such resolution.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for the United States share in the increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Bank, the sum of $750,000,000."

The letter presented by Mr. Fulbright is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank."

At the annual meeting of the Governors of the Inter-American Development Bank in April 1964, the Governors unanimously agreed to recommend to their governments that appropriate steps be taken to permit adoption of a proposed resolution to enlarge the Fund for Special Operations (FSO) of the Bank. The resolution would provide for an increase in the resources of the FSO by the equivalent of $900 million, of which $750 million would be contributed by the United States and the equivalent of $150 million by the Latin American members of the Bank. This increase would be for the 3-year period, calendar 1965, 1966, and 1967, and would be payable in equal annual installments. It was originally contemplated that the first installment—of which the U.S. share would be $250 million—would be payable on or before December 31, 1964. It is now contemplated that this installment will be due on June 30, 1965. Early enactment of both authorizing and appropriating legislation will be necessary to enable the United States to make this payment when due.

The Inter-American Development Bank was established at the end of 1959 and began operations in the fall of 1960. Its establishment represented the fruition of long-standing hemispheric aspirations toward a working partnership between the United States and Latin America to advance the economic development of the area. In the 4 years since it began lending operations, the Bank has developed an experienced and able staff and has assumed an active and increasingly important role in the economic and social development of the region. Today, as the "Bank of the Alliance," it is the spearhead for efforts of self-help and mutual cooperation among the American Republics, and provides international leadership for Latin America's development.

The FSO has formed an integral and vital part of the Inter-American Development Bank's operations since the inception of the Bank. It has been so recognized by the Congress, as demonstrated by its action authorizing and appropriating funds for a replenishment of the resources of the FSO for 1964.

From its outset, the FSO was designed to supplement the Bank's ordinary operations by making sound development loans on easy repayment terms—an approach consistent with the needs of Latin America and comparable in this regard to the arrangement between the International Development Association and the World Bank.

The present proposal results from the study I referred to in testimony before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on July 11, 1963. I stated at that time in support of legislation to increase our subscription to the FSO by $50 million, that the proposed increase represented approximately 1 year's needs, that the future of the FSO and its potential need for additional resources would be the subject of special study, and that consideration would be given to the advisability of combining operations then conducted through the FSO and the Social Progress Trust Fund.

In the interests of the strength and efficiency of operations of the Bank, the present proposal would expand the financing formerly carried out through the Social Progress Trust Fund, established in 1961 in recognition of the urgent need for social and economic progress in the developing countries of Latin America, which would henceforth be the responsibility of the FSO. As U.S. Governor of the Bank, I made clear to the Governors at the annual meeting in April 1964 that the United States would not in the future contribute to the Social Progress Trust Fund, which would gradually be liquidated. Instead, we would concentrate in the FSO all of our funds for loans on easy repayment terms administered by the Bank. Thus our enlarged contribution to the FSO would replace the funds previously contributed both to the FSO and to the Social Progress Trust Fund. The emphasis placed on social reform under the trust fund as an essential element in the fulfillment of the Alliance for Progress would be continued in the operations of the FSO.

It is now estimated that the funds presently committed to the FSO and the Social Progress Trust Fund will allow the Bank to continue lending operations on easy repayment terms at an adequate rate only through the early months of this year. Early replenishment of resources for these purposes is therefore required.

The U.S. contribution of $250 million a year over the next 3 years is required to meet the legitimate aspirations of the other American Republics, and in order to give the Bank sufficient assurance of future funds to permit the continued orderly conduct of lending operations. We can do no less if we are determined, along with our Latin American friends and neighbors, to see the Alliance for Progress move on to further successful accomplishments.

The contribution of the Latin American members of the Bank would approximately double their previous contribution—an affirmation on their part of faith in the Bank's ability to lead in promoting the development of Latin America.

The draft bill would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote in favor of the proposed resolution. The draft bill would also authorize the U.S. Governor, on behalf of the United States, to agree to pay to the Fund for Special Operations over a 3-year period, in accordance with the terms of the resolution, the sum of $750 million, as the U.S. share of the increase, and authorize the appropriation of this sum. I urge the Congress to act favorably on this legislation which represents such an important further step in inter-American cooperation under the banner of the Alliance for Progress. Subject to approval of the proposed legislation, an appropriation of the first installment of $250 million will be sought as soon as possible.

A special report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems relating to U.S. participation in an increase in the Fund for Special Operations was submitted to Congress in July 1964, together with a draft of proposed legislation similar to the enclosed draft bill. The report and draft legislation were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the report was printed as House Document No. 316, 88th Congress.

It would be appreciated if you would lay this proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

ESTABLISHMENT OF HERBERT HOOVER NATIONAL MONUMENT IN STATE OF IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the establishment of the Herbert Hoover National Monument in the State of Iowa. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, that it be printed, and that it be appropriately referred.

I should like to point out that considerable preliminary work has been done by the Herbert Hoover Birthplace Foundation in reviewing the properties available for establishment of such a national monument and in coordinating the program with the Hoover family, with the city officials of West Branch, Iowa, and county officials of Cedar County, with the West Branch Heritage Foundation, and with the Cedar County Historical Society. I am confident that the Secretary of the Interior and the officials of the National Park Service will meet with wholehearted cooperation from everyone concerned in carrying out this program.

Those of us who were privileged to attend the graveside services at West Branch last fall, following President Hoover's sorrowing death, could not help but recognize the need for a Herbert Hoover National Monument such as this bill would authorize. The thousands of people present on that occasion bore testimony of the deep love and affection our people had for this great humanitarian.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 810) authorizing the establishment of the Herbert Hoover National Monument in the State of Iowa, introduced by Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 810

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire on behalf of the United States by gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, all right, title, and interest in and to such lands, together with any improvements thereon, as the Secretary may deem necessary for the purpose of establishing a national monument commemorating the birthplace and burial place of Herbert Hoover, the thirty-first President of the United States on the site located in Cedar County in the State of Iowa.

SEC. 2. (a) The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be designated as the Herbert Hoover National Monument and shall be set aside as a public national memorial. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such monument, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935, as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of such national monument, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and maintain therein such markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 18 other Senators, Senators BAYH, CLARK, DOUGLAS, GORE, GRUENING, HART, HARTKE, LONG of Missouri, MCGOVERN, MORSE, MOSS, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PELL, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Older Americans Act of 1965."

This bill has been introduced, in identical form, in the other House, by the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY and I offered essentially the same bill during the 88th Congress. Hearings were held, and our bill was favorably and unanimously reported out by the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. The committee's bipartisan and unanimous support testified to the soundness of the approach we proposed.

The Older Americans Act has a dual purpose: It will establish an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and it will authorize a 3-year program of Federal grants to the States and to public and nonprofit private agencies for research, training, community planning, and demonstration projects relating to aging.

The bill also creates a new position of Commissioner on Aging, appointed by the President and subject to confirmation by the Senate, to be head of the Administration on Aging.

In addition, the bill provides for a 16-member Advisory Committee on Older Americans, consisting of citizen members who have experience and interest in the special problems of the aging.

Under the terms of this bill, a total of $6½ million would be authorized the first year, $11 million in each of the second and third years, and such sums as the Congress may authorize during the fourth and fifth years. The sums required are relatively modest, but the return will be incalculably meaningful, in terms of the well-being of all older Americans.

Mr. FOGARTY and I are introducing this legislation because we feel that there is an urgent need for a high-level agency that will command the respect and pay full attention to the needs of our elderly, so that the social and economic problems of the Nation's 18 million older citizens receive the attention they deserve.

We also believe there is a great need for the Federal Government to participate financially in efforts at the State and local levels to solve the problems of the aging.

I would point out that this proposed legislation implements the findings of the almost 3,000 delegates who participated in the 1961 White House Conference on Aging.

In addition, it represents the considered judgment of informed leaders in the field of aging throughout the country.

Mr. President, the Report of the Education and Labor Committee—No. 1477 of the 88th Congress—contains an excellent statement of the need for the Older Americans Act. I ask unanimous consent that the section of the report entitled, "Need for the Legislation" be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, along with a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

Mr. President, I also ask that my bill be held at the desk for 5 days so that such other Senators as may want to join me in cosponsorship may have that opportunity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section of the report, and section-by-section analysis of the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 811) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging," introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The section of the report and section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MCNAMARA, are as follows:

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The need for this legislation is supported by the careful analysis of the findings of several committees of both Houses of Congress—committees which, incidentally, have developed, assembled, and published what is undoubtedly the largest and most authoritative body of information on older citizens of this Nation.

The Federal programs affecting older persons cut across the responsibilities of many departments and agencies, yet at the present time these programs are without a central core of direction and coordination. The programs are now being administered by the Office of Aging, under the jurisdiction of the Commission of Welfare in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The General Subcommittee on Education report on the "Problems of the Aging," dated October 1962, stated:

"It was readily apparent, from the initial field hearing in Sacramento, Calif., through our final hearing in Washington, that there exist confusion and frustration in this field.

The need for coordination at the Federal level as well as at the State level is acute. The need for dynamic leadership was quite apparent."

The report of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, "Developments in Aging," Report No. 8, dated February 11, 1963, expressed its views on the need for effective organization of Federal programs in aging as follows:

"The measures taken with respect to coordinating, highlighting, and giving drive to a multiplicity of Federal programs in aging, have been sporadic, spasmodic, piecemeal, hesitant, and futile.

"Responsibility for developing programs to serve the needs of older persons is, of course, a shared responsibility. It involves the Federal Government, the States and their communities, and voluntary agencies and organizations at all levels. This partnership of governmental and voluntary agencies is in accord with our time-tested American tradition; it best takes advantage of the essential contribution the individual himself must make in creating a secure, healthful, and meaningful climate for the later years.

"The opportunity to share in this responsibility has caught the imagination of many of the States and scores of communities and organizations over the past decade. The variety of approaches and programs developed is almost infinite, reflecting the many-faceted nature of older people and the older population, the needs perceived by sponsoring agencies, and the knowledge and resources available to them. While these developments have come rapidly and while they reach across the entire country, they are nevertheless spotty, often inadequately conceived, and generally undernourished.

"Our committee's recent field hearings provided ample evidence of the desire of the States and communities to carry out their vital roles in this partnership. Effective performance of their roles, however, is dependent on effective performance of those functions which are the responsibility of the Federal partner. And our hearings made it clear that we lack anything even approaching effective performance on the part of the Federal partner."

This legislation constitutes a double-barreled answer to these problems. First, it would establish a high-level agency—an Administration on Aging—that would devote its full attention to the developments of solutions to their social and economic problems. This agency would function not only as a sympathetic and respectful ear and voice for the elderly, but would function positively in terms of serving as a clearinghouse of information on the problems of the aged and aging; assisting and advising the Secretary on the manifold matters affecting the elderly; administering the grants provided by the act; developing, conducting, and arranging for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging; providing technical assistance and consultation to State and local governments and private organizations; preparing and publishing educational materials dealing with the problems and potentials of older persons; gathering statistics in the field of aging; and stimulating more effective use of existing resources and available services.

Secondly, the bill authorizes funds for a 5-year period for programs designed to promote the well-being of our older citizens. The major portion of this appropriation would be authorized for grants to the States for community planning, demonstration projects, training of personnel, and related programs. A smaller percentage of the appropriation would be used for grants to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions for research, training, and demonstration projects in the field of aging.

The establishment of an Administration on Aging will not automatically solve the problems of our older people. But establishment of such an organization, providing it with the personnel, funds, and the authority necessary to give full attention to those problems, will be a major advance in devising the means of dealing with them.

The Administration on Aging, headed by a Commissioner appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate, would have coequal status with the Social Security and Welfare Administrations. Thus, the older population would be meaningfully repsented in the upper echelons of the Federal Government.

The proposed Administration on Aging would establish a specific high-level agency with power and responsibility to take action. It would have full-time responsibility, backed by professional knowledge and ability, and the strong desire to represent effectively in the Federal Government our 18 million older Americans.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This section provides that the act may be cited as the "Older Americans Act of 1965."

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF OBJECTIVES: DEFINITIONS

Section 101—Declaration of objectives for older Americans: This section contains a congressional finding and declaration that the older people of the Nation are entitled to, and it is the responsibility of the governments at all levels to enable our older people to secure, equal opportunity to the full and free enjoyment of objectives in the following areas:

1. Adequate income in retirement.
2. Best possible physical and mental health.
3. Suitable housing.
4. Restorative service.
5. Opportunities for employment without discrimination on account of age.
6. Retirement.
7. Meaningful activity.
8. Efficient community services.
9. Benefits of research knowledge.
10. Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives.

Section 102—Definitions: This section contains the definitions of several terms as used in the bill. "Secretary" will mean the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Commissioner" will mean the Commissioner of the new Administration on Aging. The term "State" will include the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and American Samoa. The term "nonprofit institution or organization" will mean one which is owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of whose net earnings inures to the benefit of any private person.

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

Section 201—Establishment of Administration: This section establishes an Administration on Aging within the Department of HEW. It provides that the new Administration will be under the direction of a Commissioner on Aging who will be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Section 202—Functions of the office: This section describes the duties and functions of the Administration. The Administration will serve as a clearinghouse for information related to the problems of the aged and aging; assist the Secretary in matters pertaining to the problems of the aged and aging; administer the grants provided under the act; provide for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging; give technical assistance and consultation to States and their political subdivisions with respect to programs for the aged and aging; prepare, publish, and disseminate educational materials dealing with the welfare of older persons; gather statistics in the field of aging; and, finally, stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the aged and aging.

TITLE III—GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING, SERVICES, AND TRAINING

Section 301—Authorization of appropriations: This section, as amended by the committee amendment, provides that the program of grants provided for by this title will be carried on for 5 fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. The section authorizes $5 million for the first fiscal year of the program and $8 million for the second fiscal year. However, the bill provides that for the last 3 fiscal years of the program only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

The sums appropriated to carry out this title may be used by the Secretary to make grants to States for projects for the following purposes:

1. Community planning and coordination of programs for carrying on the purposes of this act.
2. Demonstration of programs or activities which are particularly valuable in carrying out such purposes.
3. Training of special personnel needed to carry out such programs and activities.
4. Establishment of new or expansion of existing programs to carry out such purposes, including the establishment of new or expansion of existing centers providing recreational and other leisure time activities, and information on health, welfare, counseling, and referral services for older persons and assisting such persons in providing volunteer community or civic services. No cost of construction, other than for minor alterations and repairs, may be included in the establishment or expansion referred to in this paragraph.

Section 302—Allotments: Subsection (a) of this section describes the manner in which sums appropriated for grants under this title will be allotted among the several States. These allotments will be made as follows: First, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa will be allotted an amount equal to one-half of 1 percent of the sum appropriated, and each other State will be allotted an amount equal to 1 percent of such sum. Then the remainder of the sum appropriated will be allotted among the several States pro rata on the basis of the relative number of persons in each State who are 65 or over.

Under subsection (b), if a State notifies the Secretary that some of the funds allotted to it for a fiscal year will not be required for carrying out its State plan (if any), such funds will be available for reallotment from time to time to other States which need funds for carrying out their State plans in excess of those previously allotted to them, and will be able to use such excess amounts for projects approved by the State during the period for which the original allotment was available. These reallotments will be made on the basis of the State plans so approved, after taking into consideration the population age 65 and over. Any amount reallotted will be deemed part of the State's allotment under subsection (a).

Subsection (c) provides that the State's allotment for a fiscal year may be used for grants to pay part of the cost of projects described in section 301 and approved by the State prior to the end of the year (or prior to July 1, 1967, in the case of the first year's allotment). To the extent permitted by the State's allotment, the payments with respect to a project will be equal to 75 percent of the cost of the project for the first year of the duration of the project, 60 percent of such cost for the second year, and 50 percent of the cost of such project for the third year. However, at the request of the State such payment may be less than such percentages and grants may not be made under this title for any project for more than 3 years or for any period after June 30, 1972.

Section 303—State plans: This section prescribes the requirements which a State plan must meet for approval. These are the following:

1. It must provide a single State agency to be the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the plan. This agency must be the one primarily responsible for coordination of the State's programs and activities related to the purposes of the act.

2. It must provide for such financial participation by the State or communities within the State as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe in order to assure continuation of desirable activities and projects after termination of Federal financial support.

3. It must provide for the development of programs and activities for carrying out the purposes of the act. These will include the furnishing of consultative, technical, or information services to public or nonprofit private agencies, and for coordinating the activities of such agencies and organizations to the extent feasible.

4. It must provide for consultation with, and utilization of, the services and facilities of appropriate State or local public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations in the administration of the plan and the development of such programs and activities.

5. It must provide for such methods of administration as are necessary or appropriate for the proper and efficient operation of the plan. These must include methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, but no authority is given the Secretary to exercise any authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual.

6. It must set forth principles for determining the relative priority of projects within the State.

7. It must provide for approval of projects of only public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations and for a hearing before the State agency for any applicant whose application is denied.

8. It must provide that the State agency will make such reports to the Secretary as may reasonably be necessary to enable him to perform his functions under the title and for the keeping of the appropriate records.

The Secretary may not finally disapprove any State plan without first affording the State reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

Subsection (b) provides that when the Secretary finds that a State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements described in the preceding paragraph, or that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such requirement, he may, after appropriate notice and hearing, discontinue further payments to the State until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply.

Subsection (c) provides that any State which is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action in failing to approve a State plan or in withholding payments may obtain judicial review of his action in the U.S. court of appeals. Such review will be in conformity with the substantial evidence rule. The decision of the court of appeals will, in turn, be subject to review by the Supreme Court on certiorari.

Section 304—Costs of State plan administration: 10 percent of each State's allotment for a fiscal year (or $15,000, whichever is larger) will be available for paying one-half of the costs of the State agency in administering its plan.

Section 305—Payments: Payments under the title will be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

TITLE IV—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Section 401—Project grants: This section authorizes the Secretary to make grants or contracts for the following purposes:

1. To study current patterns and conditions of living of older persons and identify factors which are beneficial or detrimental to the wholesome and meaningful living of such persons.

2. To develop or demonstrate new approaches, techniques, and methods (including multipurpose activity centers) which hold promise of substantial contribution toward wholesome and meaningful living for older persons.

3. To develop or demonstrate approaches, methods, or techniques for achieving or improving coordination of community services for older persons.

4. To evaluate these approaches, techniques, and methods, as well as others, which may assist older persons to enjoy wholesome and meaningful living and to contribute to the strength and welfare of the Nation.

Grants under this section may be made to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution, and contracts may be entered into under this section with any of the foregoing, and also with individuals.

Section 402—Payments of grants: In carrying out this title the Secretary may, as he deems it appropriate, require the recipient to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project. Payments under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in installments and on such conditions as the Secretary may determine.

TITLE V—TRAINING PROJECTS

Section 501—Project grants: The section authorizes the Secretary to provide for the specialized training of persons employed or preparing for employment in carrying out programs related to the purposes of this act. This may be accomplished through grants or contracts with any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution.

Section 502—Payments of grants: This section provides that the Secretary may, where appropriate, require the recipient of any grant or contract under the title to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project. Payments under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions as the Secretary may determine.

TITLE VI—GENERAL

Section 601—Advisory committees: This section creates in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Advisory Committee on Older Americans for the purpose of advising the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on matters bearing on his responsibilities under this act and related activities of his Department. The Committee will be composed of the Commissioner, who will be Chairman, and 15 persons, not otherwise in the employ of the United States, appointed by the Secretary without regard to civil service laws. The appointive members must be persons who are experienced in or have demonstrated particular interest in the special problems of the aging.

The term of office of Committee members will be 3 years except that the terms of office of the members first appointed will be so adjusted that an equal number of new members will be appointed each year.

The Secretary is also authorized to appoint technical advisory committees for advising him in carrying out his functions under the act.

Members of the Advisory Committee or of any technical advisory committee will receive the usual per diem and travel and subsistence allowances.

Section 602—Administration: In carrying out the purposes of the act the Secretary may provide consultative services and technical assistance to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions; he may provide short-term training and technical instruction; he may conduct research and demonstrations; and he may collect, prepare, publish, and disseminate special educational or informational materials.

The Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of other Federal agencies and other public and nonprofit agencies in accordance with agreements with them.

Section 603—Authorization of appropriations: This section, as amended by the committee amendment, provides that the programs provided for in titles IV and V of the act will be carried out for the 5-year period beginning with the fiscal year 1966. For the fiscal year 1965, this section authorizes the appropriation of $1,500,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the appropriation of $3 million. However, for the next 3 fiscal years of the program the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators RANDOLPH, YOUNG of Ohio, MUSKIE, MOSS, METCALF, INOUYE, BAYH, MONTOYA, HARRIS, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, and McINTYRE, I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

This proposed legislation would authorize the President to establish regional commissions to aid in the economic development of areas which have long suffered from a lack of economic growth.

It is introduced at the request of members of the Senate Committee on Public Works—nine of whom join me as cosponsors—and grew out of committee discussions during consideration of the Appalachian regional development bill.

It is evident by the committee's action in favorably reporting S. 3, the Appalachian bill, that the majority of the members favor assisting this economically depressed area.

Yet, we are not unmindful of the fact that other regions of the Nation have equal—if not greater—suffering and that similar, coordinated attention must be given them.

This concern is shared, I know, by many other Senators as well as members of the Public Works Committee.

Therefore, a new bill was prepared which would permit the President to establish other regional commissions similar to the original Appalachia organization.

We do not spell out the specific commissions that would be created. However, it is expected that the criteria to be used to determine an area's eligibility would cover such regions, for example, as the northern Great Lakes, upper New England, the Ozarks, and the Northern Plain States.

Each commission would develop an action program recommending steps that could be taken on the local and State levels, as well as suggesting areas of need requiring Federal assistance.

The bill calls for an appropriation of $20 million. Of this amount, $15 million would be used by the Secretary of Commerce to provide technical assistance to the commissions. The other $5 million could be allocated to local development districts within the regions for administrative expenses and program planning.

Our major goal is the creation of a coordinated national approach to economic development—with regional commissions as the foundation. I am sure the administration is working generally along these lines.

Therefore, I think it would be helpful to authorize the establishment of regional commissions now so that they can begin their work while the overall attack on economic distress is prepared.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie on the desk until the close of business February 4 so that other Senators wishing to cosponsor may have an opportunity to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 812) to provide for the use of public works and other economic programs in a coordinated effort to aid economically disadvantaged areas of the Nation, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 812

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Regional Development Act of 1965".

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that while the Nation as a whole has been undergoing an unparalleled period of peacetime prosperity, the benefits of this prosperity and the rate of economic growth have been spread unevenly and inequitably throughout the Nation. In some regions economic stagnation stubbornly resists the efforts of State and local governments and private initiative. Some of such regions comprise areas of several States, in other instances areas within a single State, but in almost all instances such regions need remedies which lie beyond the reach of local and State resources. Whether due to the decline of agriculture, the depletion of natural resources, the migration of industry, a shifting technology, or the impact of cutbacks in national defense facilities, the economic conditions engendered in these regions bar the development of a vigorous and self-sustaining pattern of local growth, depress the quality of life of many American communities, and impede the advancement of the national economy. Therefore, recognizing the interdependence of the national economy with the economic vitality of local and regional sectors, the Congress declares it the purpose of this Act to establish a flexible framework for Federal, State, and local planning efforts to meet the varied problems of economic development, expand the opportunities for employment, provide the basic community facilities necessary for the growth of industrial, commercial, and recreational and cultural activities, and to achieve lasting improvement and enhancement of the domestic prosperity by establishment of stable and diversified local economies and improved local living conditions.

ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONS

SEC. 3. (a) Upon receiving a request from the Governors of two or more contiguous States for the establishment of a development region for the purposes of this Act within such States, the President is authorized to establish such region after giving consideration to the following matters within such region:

(1) the relationship of the areas within such region, geographically, culturally, historically, and economically;

(2) the rate of unemployment in comparison to the national rate;

(3) the extent to which the median level of family income is significantly below the national average;

(4) the level of housing, health, and educational facilities;

(5) the dominance of a single-industry economy;

(6) the rate of outmigration of labor or capital or both;

(7) the effects of changing industrial technology; and

(8) the effects of changes in national defense facilities or production.

REGIONAL COMMISSIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The President is authorized to establish a regional commission for each region established pursuant to section 3. Each such commission shall be composed of one Federal member, hereinafter referred to as the "Federal cochairman", appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and one member from each participating State in the region. Each State member may be the Governor, or his designee, or such other person as may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The State members of the commission shall elect a cochairman of the commission from among their number.

(b) Except as provided in section 9, decisions by a regional commission shall require the affirmative vote of the Federal cochairman and of a majority, or at least one if only two, of the State members (exclusive of members representing States delinquent under section 9). In matters coming before a regional commission, the Federal cochairman shall, to the extent practicable, consult with the Federal departments and agencies having an interest in the subject matter.

(c) Each State member of a regional commission shall have an alternate, appointed by the Governor or as otherwise may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an alternate for the Federal cochairman of each regional commission. An alternate shall vote in the event of the absence, death, disability, removal, or resignation of the State or Federal cochairman for which he is an alternate.

(d) The Federal cochairman to a regional commission shall be compensated by the Federal Government from funds authorized in section 9(b) at level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. His alternate shall be compensated by the Federal Government from funds authorized in section 9(b) at not to exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and when not actively serving as an alternate for the Federal cochairman shall perform such functions and duties as are delegated to him by the Federal cochairman. Each State member and his alternate shall be compensated by the State which they represent at the rate established by the law of such State.

FUNCTIONS OF REGIONAL COMMISSIONS

SEC. 5. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, each regional commission shall, with respect to its region—

(1) develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region.

(2) conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including an inventory and analysis of the resources of the region, and, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth;

(3) review and study, in cooperation with the agency involved, Federal, State, and local public and private programs and, where appropriate, recommend modifications or additions which will increase their effectiveness in the region;

(4) formulate and recommend, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and work with State and local agencies in developing appropriate model legislation;

(5) encourage the formation of local development districts;

(6) encourage private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects;

(7) serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for region programs;

(8) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and establish and utilize, as appropriate, citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences; and

(9) formulate for the Congress a program of development projects with proposals for Federal participation in their funding.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

SEC. 6. In developing recommendations for programs and projects pursuant to this Act, and in establishing within those recommendations a priority ranking for such programs and projects, each regional commission shall follow procedures that will insure consideration of the following factors:

(1) the relationship of the project or class of projects to overall regional development including its location in an area determined by the State to have a significant potential for growth;

(2) the population and area to be served by the project or class of projects including the relative per capita income and the unemployment rates in the area;

(3) the relative financial resources available to the State or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof which seek to undertake the project;

(4) the importance of the project or class of projects in relation to other projects or classes of projects which may be in competition for the same funds;

(5) the prospects that the project, on a continuing rather than a temporary basis, the opportunities for employment, the average level of income, or the economic and social development of the area served by the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SEC. 7. Each regional commission may, from time to time, make additional recommendations to the President, and recommendations to the State Governors and appropriate local officials, with respect to—

(1) the expenditure of funds by Federal, State, and local departments and agencies in its region in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, education, training, health and welfare, and other fields related to the purposes of this Act; and

(2) such additional Federal, State, and local legislation or administrative actions as the commission deems necessary to further the purposes of this Act.

LIAISON BETWEEN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND REGIONAL COMMISSIONS

SEC. 8. The President shall provide effective and continuing liaison between the Federal Government and each regional commission and a coordinated review within the Federal Government of the plans and recommendations submitted by such commission pursuant to sections 5 and 7.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF REGIONAL COMMISSIONS

SEC. 9. (a) For the period ending on June 30 of the second full Federal fiscal year following the date of the establishment of any regional commission pursuant to this title, the administrative expenses of such commission shall be paid by the Federal Government. Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid equally by the Federal Government and the States in the region. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal cochairman shall not participate or vote in such determination. No assistance authorized by this Act shall be furnished to any State or to any political subdivision or any resident of any State, nor shall the State member of such commission participate or vote in any determination by the commission while such State is delinquent in payment of its share of such expenses.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS OF REGIONAL COMMISSIONS

SEC. 10. To carry out its duties under this Act, each regional commission is authorized to—

(1) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its functions;

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the commission to carry out its functions, except that such compensation shall not exceed the salary of the alternate to the Federal cochairman on the commission, as provided in section 4, and no member, alternate officer, or employee of such commission, other than the Federal cochairman on the commission and his staff and his alternate, and Federal employees detailed to the commission under clause (3), shall be deemed a Federal employee for any purpose;

(3) request the head of any Federal department or agency (who is hereby so authorized) to detail to temporary duty with the commission such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as the commission may need for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status;

(4) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

(5) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating State government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for, or continue in, another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel, and the Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with such commission for continued coverage of commission employees, who at date of commission employment are Federal employees, in the retirement program and other employee benefit programs of the Federal Government;

(6) accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

(7) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation;

(8) maintain a temporary office in the District of Columbia and establish a permanent office at such location as it may select and field offices at such other places as it may deem appropriate; and

(9) take such other actions and incur such other expenses as may be necessary or appropriate.

INFORMATION

SEC. 11. In order to obtain information needed to carry out its duties, each regional commission shall—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable, a cochairman of such commission, or any member of the commission designated by the commission for the purpose, being hereby authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath;

(2) arrange for the head of any Federal, State, or local department or agency (who is hereby so authorized, to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law) to furnish to such commission such information as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency; and

(3) keep accurate and complete records of its doings and transactions which shall be made available for public inspection.

PERSONAL FINANCIAL INTERESTS

SEC. 12. (a) Except as permitted by subsection (b) hereof, no State member or alternate and no officer or employee of a regional commission shall participate personally and substantially as member, alternate, officer, or employee, through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise, in any proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter in which, to his knowledge, he, his spouse, minor child, partner, organization (other than a State or political subdivision thereof) in which he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial interest. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

(b) Subsection (a) hereof shall not apply if the State member, alternate, officer, or employee first advises the regional commission involved of the nature and circumstances of the proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter and makes full disclosure of the financial interest and receives in advance a written determination made by such commission that the interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the Commission may expect from such State member, alternate, officer, or employee.

(c) No State member of a regional commission, or his alternate, shall receive any salary, or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on such commission from any source other than his State. No person detailed to serve a regional commission under authority of clause (4) of section 10 shall receive any salary or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on such commission from any source other than the State, local, or intergovernmental department or agency from which he was detailed or from such commission. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(d) Notwithstanding any other subsection of this section, the Federal cochairman and his alternate on a regional commission and any Federal officers or employees detailed to duty with it pursuant to clause (3) of section 10 shall not be subject to any such subsection but shall remain subject to sections 202 through 209 of title 18, United States Code.

(e) A regional commission may, in its discretion, declare void and rescind any contract or other agreement pursuant to the Act in relation to which it finds that there has been a violation of subsection (a) or (c) of this section, or any of the provisions of sections 202 through 209, title 18, United States Code.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide to the regional commissions technical assistance which would be useful in aiding such commissions to carry out their functions under this Act and to develop recommendations and programs. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for economic growth of such regions, and research on improving the conservation and utilization of the natural resources of the region.

(b) Such assistance may be provided by allocation of funds authorized for this section to other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes by the Secretary or the regional commissions.

(c) The Secretary may make grants to the regional commissions for the purposes of this section.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section $15,000,000. Not more than 20 per centum of the total appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall be made available for assistance in any one region.

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS—CERTIFICATION

SEC. 14. For the purposes of this Act, a "local development district" shall be an entity certified to a regional commission either by the Governor of the State or States in which such entity is located, or by the State officer designated by the appropriate State law to make such certification, as having a charter or authority that includes the economic development of counties or parts of counties or other political subdivisions within the region. No entity shall be certified as a local development district for the purposes of this Act unless it is one of the following:

(1) a nonprofit incorporated body organized or chartered under the law of the State in which it is located;

(2) a nonprofit agency or instrumentality of a State or local government;

(3) a nonprofit agency or instrumentality created through an interstate compact; or

(4) a nonprofit association or combination of such bodies, agencies, and instrumentalities.

GRANTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS AND FOR RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized—

(1) either directly or through arrangements with the appropriate regional commission, to make grants for administrative expenses to local development districts. The

amount of any such grant shall not exceed 75 per centum of such expenses in any one fiscal year. No grants for administrative expenses shall be made to a local development district for a period in excess of three years beginning on the date the initial grant is made to such development district. The local contributions for administrative expenses may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services; and

(2) either directly or through arrangements with appropriate public or private organizations (including a regional commission), to provide funds for investigation, research, studies, and demonstration projects, but not for construction purposes, which will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the purposes of this section.

ANNUAL REPORTS

SEC. 16. Each regional commission established pursuant to this Act shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report each fiscal year to the Congress with respect to such commission's activities and recommendations for programs. The first such report shall be made for the first fiscal year in which such commission is in existence for more than three months. Such reports shall be printed and transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the calendar year following the fiscal year with respect to which the report is made.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MCNAMARA is as follows:

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—PARAGRAPH-BY-PARAGRAPH ANALYSIS

Section 1 cites the short title, "Regional Development Act of 1965."

Section 2 declares that while the Nation as a whole has been undergoing prosperity, this prosperity and the rate of economic growth are spread unevenly so that certain multi-State regions are economically disadvantaged. Advises that the aid to such regions by State and local governments and private initiative is not broad enough to reverse the trend because the causes stem from a much broader geographic area than a single county or State. Declares the purpose of this act is to provide a flexible framework for Federal, State, and local efforts to meet the problem of economic development.

Section 3 lists the criteria which the President should use to determine whether a request from the Governors of two or more contiguous States for the establishment of a development region should be granted.

Section 4 authorizes the President to establish a regional commission for each region created, such commissions composed of a single Federal member and one member from each participating State. Provides that decisions by the commission require the affirmative vote of the Federal member and a majority of the State members. Provides for alternates to the members and fixes the salary levels of the Federal member and his alternate.

Section 5 sets out the functions of the regional commissions, including the development of plans and programs sponsoring investigations, research and studies, and presenting the Congress with a program of development projects.

Section 6 sets out the criteria for program development so that the relationship of projects to overall regional development is considered, as well as consideration being given to the population and areas to be serviced, the financial resources available in an area and priority of projects, and the long-term value of projects.

Section 7 provides for the making of additional recommendations by the Commission to the President and to the State Governors and local officials on the expenditure of funds and local legislation or administrative actions.

Section 8 requires effective liaison between the Federal Government and each regional commission.

Section 9 makes available appropriations for the administrative expenses of regional commissions.

Section 10 sets out the administrative powers of the regional commissions so that they may hire personnel, rent office space, buy supplies, and carry on the work of the Commission.

Section 11 allows the commissions to hold hearings and to obtain information from other government agencies.

Section 12 provides for the prevention of conflict of interest by setting out the limitation on personal financial interests in activities carried out under this act.

Section 13 allows the Secretary of Commerce to provide technical assistance to the regional commissions, either through personnel and programs of Federal agencies, or by contracts entered into with non-Federal organizations. Allows for direct grants to the commissions in order for the Commission to contract for assistance. Makes available $15 million with not more than 20 percent of the total appropriated to go to any one region.

Section 14 provides for the establishment of local development districts and requires that they be nonprofit.

Section 15 provides for grants to the local development district for administrative expenses and program planning. Authorizes $5 million for such grants.

Section 16 requires an annual report.

PROPOSAL TO SET ASIDE NOT LESS THAN 500 MILLION OUNCES OF SILVER AS A RESERVE FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE PURPOSES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference. The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a reserve of at least 500 million ounces of silver for national defense purposes.

Mr. President, I request that the bill lie on the table until the close of business on Tuesday next for additional cosponsors.

I have a feeling that the bill is extremely important. I should like to make only a few observations in relation to it.

First, in 1963 the United States used 110 million ounces industrially and 111,300,000 ounces for coinage or a total of 221,300,000 ounces. During that same year other countries used 137 million ounces industrially and 60,900,000 ounces for coinage or a total of 197,900,000 ounces. Thus, total world use of silver in 1963 was 419,200,000 ounces. World production of silver in 1963 was 210,500,000 ounces or about one-half of the consumption. U.S. production accounted for only 36 million ounces of this figure. The Department of Interior has tried to take steps to increase our production. In September of 1964 they increased the percentage of Federal financial assistance from 50 to 75 percent of the total cost of new private silver exploration ventures. But most experts agree that this will not begin to stimulate enough increased production to help the situation. Figures for 1964 are not yet available but generally consumption has greatly increased while production remains fairly constant.

Second, we are experiencing a serious silver coin shortage. As a result, both of the mints are working on a 24-hour basis. The Denver Mint continues to carry the major burden while plans are completed to build a new mint in Philadelphia. Last year the Congress directed the Treasury to mint some additional silver dollars but to date none have been minted.

Third, in 1963 Congress passed a law repealing the Silver Purchase Act and providing for the redemption and eventual retirement of all silver certificates. Many of us, particularly those of us from the Western States, opposed this move for we saw it as a convenient method for the Treasury to depress and control the market price of silver. Our worst predictions have come true and silver continues to flow out of the Treasury to industrial users under the guise of redeeming silver certificates. Latest available figures show that over 60 million ounces have in effect been "sold" for this purpose and the end is not yet in sight. In fact, the Treasury, in its frenzy to keep the price down, has been exporting silver over the past year at a rate greater than our imports. In January through July of 1964 we imported 32,103,664 ounces and exported 32,172,130 ounces. Thus, at a time when we need silver so desperately, we exported 68,466 more ounces than we imported.

Fourth, an adequate supply of silver is necessary to our defense effort and these needs have greatly expanded. A special study conducted by the Bureau of Mines at the direction of Secretary Udall recently concluded: "New uses for silver in solid fuel rockets, supersonic jets, and special use batteries, added to conventional strategic uses, make any shortage of silver a potential threat to national security."

The bill that I am introducing directs itself to the factor involving defense needs. A potential threat to the national security is of utmost importance and should not be taken lightly. At the present moment it is estimated that we have about 1.1 billion ounces of silver remaining in the Treasury. It now appears that another round of speculative buying has begun. It has been reliably reported that most of the 64 millon ounces sold by the Treasury in October and November of 1964 went to speculators who are looking for a price increase. This further contributes to an already shaky situation. At this point we do not know what the Treasury proposes to do. We hear rumors that they will call for a reduction of silver content in our coins or perhaps a complete removal of silver.

Amid all of the speculation and rumor, one fact remains clear, we must first provide a reserve of silver sufficient to take care of minimum defense and national security needs. My bill would do simply that.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. President, in this connection I made a speech before the American Mining Congress in September of last year. I ask unanimous consent that the speech and the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Colorado, and the speech to which the Senator has referred will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 813) to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a reserve of at least 500 million ounces of silver for national defense purposes, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 813

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall maintain the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of not less than 500,000,000 ounces of silver as a reserve for national defense purposes. Such silver shall be in addition to any other silver which the Secretary is required by law to maintain, and shall be available only to meet military and other defense requirements in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary, with the approval of the President, shall by regulation prescribe.

The speech referred to is as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR PETER H. DOMINICK, AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS, PORTLAND, OREG., SEPTEMBER 14, 1964

Mr. Chairman, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a pleasure to have the chance to meet with those men and women whose daily business activities fall into the highest of all categories, productive creativity. Without the development of our natural resources, from water to uranium, this country, and in fact the world, would still be existing in the Dark Ages. It is a privilege for me to have the opportunity of discussing with you some problems of your industry which daily become more difficult to solve as we seem to continue the trend toward an all-powerful Central Government.

I am reminded of the problem of the patrolman who watched a covered pickup truck slowly descending a mountain road. Every 100 yards the driver would stop, get out, pick up a stick and beat on the side of the truck. The actions were so bizarre that the officer went over, stopped the driver and checked his license and registration. Everything seemed in order and he was about to let the truck go on when the driver picked up a rock and heaved it at the side of the truck. The officer, admitting that it was none of his business, said, "Would you tell me why you are beating up your truck in that way?" The driver replied, "Well, it is not really your business but I will be happy to tell you. I have a 1½-ton truck here, 3 tons of canaries in it and I have to keep half of them flying all of the time."

Now it strikes me that the Federal Government instead of trying to keep half of you flying all the time has been going out of its way to prevent half of you from flying. In every mining field there are constantly increasing Federal controls over your activities.

Let us just outline a few. In the lead-zinc field, continued State Department pressures have prevented passage of realistic legislation to cut back import quotas and provide support for the domestic industry. As a result, the country becomes more and more reliant on foreign supplies.

In the gold mining field, constant and fierce resistance has been expressed by the executive departments of the Federal Government to all efforts to explore programs to revitalize the gold mining industry. Opposition has been sharply expressed even to holding hearings on the problems and as a result, no legislation has been possible.

In the uranium field, the Government entered into long-range contracts to purchase concentrate from South Africa and Canada. Then it provided economic exploration stimuli for U.S. production and very soon we had enough supplies in this country to supply foreseeable needs.

At that point the Federal Government started cutting back on domestic uranium procurement, limited milling contracts, and decimated the domestic uranium mining industry while leaving a few companies in a position to stay alive perhaps long enough to enter the private industrial field. In the meanwhile the foreign contracts were stretched out and we continue to buy foreign uranium concentrates.

In the shale oilfield the Interior Department has created more complexities than a Philadelphia lawyer could invent. I have just attended the reopening of the Rifle oil shale facility for research and development of this fabulous natural resource, the reopening representing the culmination of years of intensive effort by legislators and private industry against an array of Federal executive opinion. But this reopening, while a significant step forward, is only the first of a series of steps that need to be taken. The Solicitor's office has raised a myriad of problems with respect to patent applications on oil shale lands. Recent decisions of the Department, in fact, raise questions which might well deter even the most resolute from trying to establish a valid discovery in any type of mineral. It now seems to be their position that no mining location can be patented unless the applicant can prove that the mineral is commercially profitable at the very moment of the decision. The fact that it might be a valuable mineral in the ordinary sense of the word, or that it might have been commercially operable a month before presentation or might be commercially operable 1 month later with an anticipated change in price or technology is apparently not enough. This, of course, effects all minerals but is even more pointed when directed at oil shale where commercial development has not yet occurred. In addition, despite a horde of suggested rules and regulations submitted to Interior at its request by private industry and educational research groups, no visible progress has been made in developing programs for leasing of public lands for oil shale research and development.

Without trying to detail all the problems, which are probably better known to you than to me, I do want to outline for you what can only be called a crisis—to put it mildly the silver situation is a mess. The industry has been urging the Treasury for more than 3 years to develop programs to handle the problem but to no avail. It affects every person who wants to get a cup of coffee, a coke, or a pack of cigarettes from a vending machine. It affects the manufacturers of photographic equipment, batteries, and other items to which silver is an essential ingredient. It affects our dollar bills, our banks, and our national defense. It has been tentatively discussed by Treasury officials and some witnesses for industry before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the House Committee on Government Operations. It has involved the Federal Reserve System in disputes with its own members and has led to a flurry of activity in the mints.

The confusion is so great that it reminds me of the apocryphal story of the Italian general in World War II. After a disastrous battle he stood on a hill with his aid and saw his troops streaming over the countryside in all directions. He turned to his aid and cried, "Where are they running? Where are they running? I am their leader and must run in front."

The law of supply and demand and the efforts to avoid its effect are certainly key factors in the situation. A few figures will make this crystal clear.

As of the end of 1963, consumptive demand for silver is estimated as follows in million ounces:

	United States	Other countries	Total
Industrial	110.0	137.0	247.0
Coinage	111.3	60.9	172.2
Total	221.3	197.9	419.2

Against these totals production for the same period is estimated at:

United States	36.0
Other countries	174.5
Total	210.5

From this you can see that total world production in 1963 was 11 million ounces less than U.S. demands alone and approximately one-half of total demands. In addition, you will note that U.S. silver production was about one-sixth of U.S. consumption.

To offset this imbalance the United States had a major supply of silver, located at West Point and San Francisco, estimated at the end of 1963 to be 1½ billion ounces. Obviously, this amount even at the noted rate of depletion would suffice for a considerable period of time but as anticipated by many industry leaders and legislators, consumptive pressures have risen sharply and changed the picture.

As we all know silver coins in the United States have become more and more scarce. It has been necessary to offset this with crash programs to provide more pennies, nickels, dimes, quarters, and half dollars. New presses have been dug out of Defense warehouses, contracts have been given by the mint to private suppliers for the necessary metallic strip, and productive capacity of our two mints had been sharply increased. It is estimated that by the fall of 1964, U.S. coin production will have tripled over the comparative period of 1963. This, of course, is a necessary and highly commendable effort by the mint officials to meet the needs of all Americans. At the same time it can be seen that our use of silver for coins will increase at a tremendous rate and there is every indication that the need for this increased use of silver for coinage will continue.

In April 1964, the Treasury informed me that for the 10-month period, June 1963 to April 1964, 91 million ounces of silver had been set aside for coinage and added that there was on hand sufficient silver for coinage requirements to 1972. Once again, as anticipated and noted above, the demand has far exceeded the hearing estimates.

In 1963, the Silver Purchase Act was repealed and provision made to retire all $1 silver certificates and replace them with Federal Reserve notes. Silver certificates in bulk have been presented to the Treasury for silver bullion and for the period June 4, 1963, to April 2, 1964, the Treasury has informed me that $215.5 million worth of silver certificates were redeemed.

At that time there remained outstanding $1.9 billion of silver certificates and redemptions of these continue at an accelerated rate.

These pressures in turn have steadily increased the silver price on the open market until it threatens to break through the silver value of $1.29 in a silver dollar. If the price should push as far as $1.38, approximately equal to the silver content in lesser coins, considerable fear has been expressed that all U.S. coins will be melted into silver bullion and drive coinage wholly out of circulation.

Hence, the Treasury releases silver from its supply in amounts approximately equal to silver certificates returned to the Federal Reserve system and to date has held the price to $1.29-plus to protect its coinage.

From this brief summary you can see that we have a mess. The law of supply and demand wants to raise silver prices substantially. The Treasury releases have prevented this. The time is not far off when Treasury supplies will not be sufficient to hold the price and supply silver for coinage. The vending companies want to keep present coinage as their machines use them at an annual rate of $3.2 billion. Industrial users want to continue to get silver at cheap prices. Producers recognize that silver output cannot be substantially increased without a substantial price rise.

The situation at the moment can only be compared to an overheated pressure cooker with a blocked release valve. Everything is cooking but no one has yet turned off the flame or rigged a substitute relief valve. Reliable estimates now indicate that the whole matter will explode in or before 1966 unless solutions are found.

Some of your industry have been working hard on the problems and various trial balloons have been floated by the Treasury. These have ranged from doubling the monetary value of existing coins, to calling back all existing coins and replacing them with nonsilver alloys. The former would automatically increase silver prices to the users and, hence, is being resisted strenuously. The latter would involve not only opposition from the vending companies which would have to revamp all their machines at enormous cost, but the political reaction of the American people to demonetization, particularly by an administration which has often been termed fiscally irresponsible.

I suggest that a number of solutions to the silver problem are feasible.

We need silver for defense. Then let's set aside within existing Treasury supplies an amount sufficient to meet these needs—perhaps 300 to 500 million ounces.

We need relief for our coinage. Perhaps this could be worked out with less capital dislocation to industrial users by issuing a new series of coins in 20, 30, 40, and 70 cent pieces containing a lower silver content. Sooner or later under Gresham's law these would drive out existing coins but it might give needed time relief by letting silver prices rise to stimulate production without introducing nonsilver coins.

I do not pretend to have a pat solution for all of these problems but there are some facts which stand out.

Production of silver is artificially low because of governmental restraints on the operation of the law of supply and demand.

Production of lead-zinc is artificially low because of governmental insistence on improving the economy of other countries.

Production of gold is artificially low because of governmental enforcement of a 1935 price setting order.

Production of oil from oil shale is being sharply hampered because of governmental legal and policy restrictions.

As a result of these governmental policies, the mining industry has been forced into programs calling for subsidies and the creation of artificial markets for its products. I know that you do not like this, but you have been forced to agree in many cases in order to survive, even on a limited basis.

The American mining industry has an astounding resilience. My faith in it leads me to believe that these problems can and will be solved. Almost all solutions will require some kind of Federal legislative action or the pressure cooker will explode. Needless to say, I look forward to working with you in finding these solutions.

JAVITS URGES BROAD INTERNATIONAL MONETARY MEASURES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk three measures designed to make broad reforms in the international monetary system and to deal with the grave problem of our balance-of-payments deficits.

The first is a bill which would reduce the gold requirement against both Federal Reserve deposits and Federal Reserve notes in circulation, in the one case from the present 25 to 10 percent, and in the other case from the present 25 to 15 percent.

The administration's bill would eliminate the 25-percent gold reserve requirement with respect to Federal Reserve deposits only.

I believe we must face it far more realistically than the administration contemplates.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 814) to require Federal Reserve banks to maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 10 percent against its deposits and not less than 15 percent against its notes in circulation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the second measure which I submit on behalf of myself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], is a concurrent resolution which would request the President to issue a call for an International Economic Conference in order to establish a new basis for international credit, which we urgently need if the whole world is not to be plunged into some new mancreated depression because we do not have the wit to keep abreast of the expanding demands of world trade as compared with the sharp limitation upon the mining of gold in the world, which should not be a restraint upon that trade any more than it is in this country, where we have our Federal Reserve System. I am pleased to note that on Monday, January 25 the identical resolution was introduced in the House by Representative Thomas B. Curtis, a ranking Republican on the Ways and Means Committee and Representative William B. Widnall, ranking Republican on the Banking and Currency Committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 14

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), Whereas the United States has had a deficit in its international balance of payments every year, except one, since 1950; and

Whereas largely as a result of these deficits, United States short-term dollar liabilities to foreigners totaled an esitmated $27,976,000,000 at the end of October 1964; and

Whereas these liabilities constitute a potential claim against the United States gold stock of $15,200,000,000, of which less than $1,400,000,000 is "free gold" not required to serve as backing for our currency; and

Whereas the health of our domestic economy and strength of the dollar and its ability to serve as a key international reserve currency depends upon the early elimination of the balance-of-payments deficit and the creation of improved arrangements to serve the liquidity needs of an expanding international trade and payments system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that achievement of balance-of-payments equilibrium in a manner consistent with the dollar's role as a key international reserve currency should receive the highest priority in the formation of national economic policy; and be it further

Resolved, That the maintenance of equilibrium in its international accounts should be a continuing and major goal of United States international economic policy; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States take the initiative to devise new and improved methods of permanently strengthening the international monetary and credit mechanism in order to provide (a) improved means of financing balance-of-payments deficits until basic corrective forces restore equilibrium, and (b) sufficient liquidity to finance future increases in world trade and payments; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be requested to call for an International Economic Conference to review the long-term adequacy of international credit; to recommend needed changes in existing financial institutions; to consider increased sharing of economic aid for development and military assistance; and to consider other pressing international economic problems placed before it by a preparatory committee for such Conference.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, finally I submit a concurrent resolution for appropriate reference which would call upon the President to appoint an advisory committee on capital export policy in view of the fact that right now it is very clear that the interest equalization tax has been ineffective in dealing with continued high outflows of private capital. Even more capital is flowing out now—not under the same headings—that went out before the tax was imposed. Heretofore we had problems caused by foreign bond issues and other foreign securities that were sold to Americans. The outflow on this account has been cut down very drastically by the interest equalization tax. What has happened since the tax became effective is that other types of capital outflow, such as long-term and short-term loans, have risen, and direct investments have remained at high level.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 15

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in order to develop more effective and acceptable means for restraining the outflow of capital from the United States as a necessary and positive step toward the elimination of the balance-of-payments deficit, it is the sense of the Congress that an Advisory Committee on Capital Export Policy should be established by the President; that such committee should consist of twelve persons of outstanding qualifications who are collec-

> tively representative of the banking community (commercial and investment) and of industry; and that such committee should report its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress not later than ninety days after its establishment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall now go into the basic details for the actions which I have described.

The failure of the administration's remedies to deal effectively with our balance-of-payments problems has been underscored once again by the latest report on the state of our balance of international payments.

According to preliminary reports during the final quarter of 1964, the overall deficit in our international payments shot up to an annual rate of $4 billion or 50 percent above the actual deficit for 1963, and double the average for the first three quarters of 1964.

The size of the U.S. Treasury gold stock has declined to $15,187 billion as of January 20, 1965. The ratio of gold certificate reserves to Federal Reserve notes and deposit liabilities now totals 27.8 percent, down from 29.5 percent at the end of 1963 and from 32.2 percent 2 years ago.

Our gold supply fell by $125 million in 1964 and officials estimate the loss of another $500 million worth of gold in 1965.

The outflow of private capital also continues at an unacceptably high rate, offering convincing proof that the administration's measure—the interest equalization tax—has been ineffective.

Our balance-of-payments deficit is caused by a variety of reasons: a high rate of private capital outflows, increasing imports, U.S. foreign economic aid grants and credits, military aid, and the need to maintain a large Military Establishment overseas.

THE NEED TO REDUCE THE GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENT

A substantial modification in the current 25-percent gold reserve requirement is necessitated; first, to indicate to the world that our entire gold supply is available in the defense of the dollar; and second, to permit the expansion in our money supply required by our expanding economy.

The United States abandoned the gold standard in 1933 and since the enactment of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 has been on what has been called an international gold bullion standard. Under the present U.S. system no gold coins are minted, no U.S. currency is redeemable in gold and private holdings of gold is unlawful. The dollar is no longer convertible into gold except for transactions with foreign governments and central banks, therefore the need for a specified domestic cover is outdated. Since June 12, 1945, there is a legal gold reserve requirement of 25 percent against Federal Reserve notes and deposits. From 1913 until that time, the legal gold reserve requirement was 40 percent against notes and 35 percent against deposits.

When reserves fall below 25 percent under present law, the Federal Reserve Board may temporarily suspend this reserve requirement. This has occurred only three times in the history of the Federal Reserve System: for a 10-day period in 1919 and 1920 and for a 30-day period in 1933. When reserves fall below 25 percent, a penalty tax is levied against Federal Reserve banks which must at a certain point be added to the discount rate. Under a longstanding interpretation of section 11(c) of the Federal Reserve Act, the tax need not be added to the Federal Reserve banks' discount rate until the reserve deficiency falls below the reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes. In other words, our present gold reserves could fall by $5 billion before a penalty tax would be added to the discount rate. In a situation such as this, the tax would not act as a deterrent against further gold outflows or an increase in the money supply until it is too late.

Due partly to external demands for gold—mainly from European countries—and partly to the expansion of our money supply, gold available to meet further external demands—so-called "free gold"—has reached dangerously low proportions. Of the Federal Reserve's gold certificate reserves of $14,880 million on January 20, 1965, $13,150 million is required as cover for Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities, leaving only $1.7 billion in "free gold." In contrast, in early 1958, $10.5 billion was available in "free gold." By November 1963 such reserves declined to $2.8 billion.

Until about 2 years ago the main factor in the decline of the gold reserve ratio had been the decline in the U.S. gold stock, which in turn was the result of large deficits in the U.S. balance of payments, which were accompanied by gold outflows. Since that time the decline of the gold reserve is mainly attributable to an accelerated expansion of Federal Reserve notes. During 1964 Federal Reserve notes expanded by about $2.5 billion, and Federal Reserve deposit liabilities—which are mainly the reserves of commercial banks—increased by another $500 million. In the first 10 months of 1964 the money supply increased at the annual rate of 4.2 percent, which represents an unusualy large increase which may continue in 1965. The December 1964 "Monthly Letter" of the First National City Bank of New York draws the following conclusions from these developments:

> At the present rate of monetary expansion and even if the United States were not to sustain any further gold losses, the ratio of gold to the combined Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities appears likely to fall to the required legal minimum in something like 2 to 3 years.

My proposal to reduce the reserve requirement to 15 percent against Federal Reserve notes and 10 percent against Federal Reserve deposit liabilities would provide, as of January 20, 1965, an additional $6.1 billion in "free gold," offering positive proof to the world that the United States is ready to defend the dollar at any cost. This change would also permit a substantial expansion of our money supply as required by our expanding economy and the national commitment to a policy of full employment.

This does not mean that I am in favor of an unrestricted expansion of the money supply. The Federal Reserve Board determines under present law what the money supply requirements of the economy are and can expand or contract that supply—within the limitations of the gold reserve requirement—through open market operations, changes in the reserve requirements of commercial banks, changes in the discount rate, etc. I am opposed to delaying action on a long overdue change in the gold reserve requirement until the point is reached where action must be taken under emergency conditions.

Less than one-half of the central banks in the world have legal reserve requirements against their note and deposit liabilities. Aside from the United States, there are only three countries where the statutory reserves must be held exclusively in gold—Belgium, the Republic of South Africa and Switzerland. In many countries, these requirements were repealed or suspended at the outbreak of World War II. A number of central banks established since the war, including the German Bundesbank, have no such reserve requirement.

The Federal Reserve Board's power to suspend the reserve requirement should also be extended to 1 year from the present limit of 30 days, with renewals permitted for successive 15-day periods. Suspensions under present procedure take on an air of emergency which tend to dramatize the situation rather than alleviate it.

I also propose the elimination of the penalty tax provision of the gold reserve requirement because it is an anachronism, a corrective mechanism that acts only when it is too late.

In a letter dated November 5, 1963, to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board describes the functioning of the penalty tax. It supports my contention that the tax would be ineffective until there was a substantial loss of gold reserves, if even then.

Chairman Martin states the situation as follows:

> Under the present schedule of penalty rates, if reserves fell all the way through the first "layer" (reserves required against deposit liabilities) the annual taxes on the reserve deficiency (using $18 billion as the figure for deposits) would be something under $300 million a year. Payment of these taxes would diminish net earnings of the Federal Reserve banks and reduce by an equal amount their payments to the Treasury as interest on Federal Reserve notes, which amounted to $800 million in 1962. It should be understood that the total payment to the Treasury would not change; it would simply be divided into two parts adding to the same total, one part labeled "tax on reserve deficiencies" and the other labeled "interest on Federal Reserve notes". In the example, the total payment would still be $800 million but $300 million would be in the form of a tax and $500 million would represent the interest on notes.
>
> If reserves continued to fall, so that a deficiency occurred in the reserve against Federal Reserve notes, with a consequent additional penalty tax for that deficiency, the statute would require the Reserve banks to "add an amount equal to said tax" to the rates they charge on advances to borrowing member banks. While the statute is not at all clear on the mechanics of imposing this added charge, perhaps the most reasonable

method would be to raise the discount rate by the same number of percentage points as the penalty tax rate on the note reserve deficiency. For example, if the gold certificate reserves fell to 20 percent of Federal Reserve notes—or to about $6 billion—the penalty tax under present rates for the not reserve deficiency would be one-half of 1 percent (or $10 million). Adding the penalty tax rate to the present discount rate of 3.5 percent would result in a discount rate of 4 percent. Again, it should be understood that the Board could establish a different penalty tax rate in this case; the statute simply requires that it be "not more than 1 percent per annum." The statutory minimum penalty tax rate would come into effect only if reserves fell below this point.

The need to modify the gold reserve requirement has been widely advocated among economists and bankers for many years. The Commission on Money and Credit in its 1961 report urged that the requirement be repealed. The conservative Bank for International Settlements in its 1963 annual report took the following position on this issue:

> The fact that a substantial part of the U.S. gold stock is legally designated as cover against the internal money supply, where it serves no function, naturally increases the doubts about the adequacy of the gold stock to fulfill its essential function in settling international balances.

The Joint Economic Committee in its 1964 report on the U.S. balance of payments took the position—after extensive public hearings—that the U.S. gold stock should be freed immediately of its domestic reserve function and made fully available for international monetary purposes. The highly respected Committee for Economic Development issued a statement on January 24 urging that the gold reserve requirement be eliminated to strengthen international confidence in the dollar.

THE NEED TO REDUCE THE OUTFLOW OF PRIVATE CAPITAL

Throughout the extended debate on the interest equalization tax bill, I stated repeatedly that the tax would be ineffective as a measure designed to limit the outflow of private capital. I regret to say that statistics bear out my prediction. A comparison of private capital outflows between the 5 quarter periods prior to July 1, 1963, and the subsequent 5 quarters indicates that the outflow of private capital increased from $5,114 million to $5,501 million. Although there was a $1.2 billion decline in the sale of new securities and a modest inflow resulting from transactions in outstanding securities since the tax became effective, there was a net increase in the outflow of all types of private capital totaling close to $400 million. The outflow of "other long-term capital"—mostly bank loans—increased by $1 billion and there was also a $1 billion rise in the outflow of short-term capital. The outflow due to sales of new securities remained at a quarterly average of $145 million. Direct investments were unaffected by the tax and remained at the quarterly average of $465 million.

It is apparent that no restrictive measure will have any effect if it applies to less than the entire group of channels through which flow private U.S. capital export.

I therefore recommend that the President appoint an Advisory Committee on Capital Export Policy to advise him—within 90 days—on appropriate measures to limit the outflow of all types of private U.S. capital, not directly related to the financing of U.S. foreign trade. This Advisory Committee would be small, not exceeding 12 representatives from commercial and investment banking and industry. With their advice in hand, the President will be in a better position to act.

THE NEED FOR WORLD MONETARY REFORM

We need a new international monetary system—one that is not based on U.S. balance-of-payments deficits. In the resolution I am introducing today for myself and on behalf of Senator JORDAN, of Idaho, and Senator MILLER, I urge the convocation of a well-planned and well-organized international monetary conference to adopt a basic solution to this problem. The limited results of the deliberations of the Group of Ten and that of Western financial leaders in Tokyo in 1964 only underscore the need for such a conference.

The basic flaw in the existing international monetary system—a flaw that must be corrected—is that it depends for additional liquidity or credit on continuance of the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States which add dollars and gold to finance rapidly growing international finance and trade transactions. This deficit in the last 3 years has added close to $7 billion to international reserves, including $1.4 billion worth of gold. To the extent that we eliminated our balance-of-payments deficit, we also removed the major source of new liquidity from the system.

At the present time, imbalances in international payments take years to eliminate and require, particularly on the part of deficit countries, measures which hamper their economic growth and the expansion of world trade. The existing adjustment mechanism does not place equal burdens on surplus and deficit countries, giving the former a temporary advantage to impose policies on the latter which at times are contrary to the best interests of all concerned.

The international conference I propose should, as a minimum, consider the following:

First. The optimum management of the world's supply of international credit.

Second. The functioning of the adjustment mechanism under the existing international monetary system.

Third. The renewal of the 1962 arrangement of the Group of Ten to make available to the IMF multibillion dollar standby credit; the contribution of each participating country to be materially increased.

Fourth. The expansion of long-term, low-cost credit to the developing nations.

In addition, new forms of organization and new methods of channeling private capital to developing countries must be found if private enterprise is to retain a major role in the economic development of less developed countries. The example provided by the recently organized, multinational investment company called Adela—the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America—should be ample proof that given sufficient energy and determination new devices and methods can and will be found.

The alternative to basic reform is the continuation of the existing system with more stringent forms of financial "discipline" added. The free world has already paid a high price for the existing system in terms of unnecessary high levles of unemployment, slower rates of growth, restrictions on trade and capital movements—such as the U.S. interest equalization tax—and in Government procurement policies which are undermining 30 years of progress toward trade liberalization.

A well-functioning and adequate international monetary system is as vital to the survival and well-being of the United States and the free world financially as an unquestioned nuclear deterrent capability is militarily. And yet, the governments and financial leaders of the industrial nations are not facing the critical problem that must be solved if this system is to support those needs indispensable to the success of the free world.

The international monetary system has an enormous impact on economic conditions in both the developed and developing nations of the non-Communist world, on the well-being of their citizens and on their ability to meet the many and varied challenges of Communist power. It determines to a large degree our freedom to pursue policies of economic expansion and it has a major impact on domestic political stability in many Western nations.

A well-functioning and flexible international monetary system has a major impact of our ability to supply an ever-increasing volume of economic assistance to the developing nations which is essential to insure them a satisfactory rate of economic growth in a democratic framework.

We must begin devising an international payments system which takes cognizance of changes in the world economy since the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944 and which will be flexible enough to fit into the economic order of 5 to 10 years from now. A well-planned international monetary conference, in my view, would be a necessary—and vital—first step toward such a workable system.

I make these proposals today with the full realization of the basic strengths of the United States in the world economy. Our private investors own nearly $72 billion in earning assets abroad. In addition, the world owes the U.S. Government the principal and interest on $22.8 billion in loans. While foreign assets and investments in the United States add up to about $53 billion, the United States is left with a substantial—$41.8 billion—credit in its favor. In the final analysis, the entire productive capacity of our economy stands as backing for the dollar. Yet, the difficulties, though manmade, are real and man should be wise enough to surmount them.

I ask unanimous consent that certain materials related to my statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the materials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 15, 1965]

U.S. Gold Stocks Dip $200 Million: Reduction Appears in Part To Reflect the Recent Purchase by France—Decline Was Expected—Business Loans by City Banks Drop $108 Million—Savings Deposits Up

(By Edward Cowan)

A $200 million decline in the Treasury's gold balance was reported yesterday by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

It appeared that the reduction reflected for the most part a purchase by France. The French Government said last week that in addition to its regular gold purchases—which have been running about $34 million a month—it would purchase an extra $150 million.

In light of this forewarning, the decline reported yesterday came as no surprise to the financial community. It was expected to have far less impact than the French announcement, which was followed by a surge of private gold buying in Paris and elsewhere.

"FIXING" PRICE RISES

At the "fixing" by London gold dealers yesterday, gold was quoted at $35.12⅞, up one-eighth of a cent from Wednesday.

The Reserve bank's weekly report on financial developments also showed:

A strong demand for reserves by major New York City banks, and heavy lending to them by banks elsewhere.

A jump in the commercial banking system's free reserves to a daily average of $153 million, up $106 million from $47 million in the week ended January 6. The latter figure represented a revision of an initial estimate of $135 million.

Business loans by 14 leading New York City banks fell by $108 million, contrasted to a decline of $140 million in the like week a year ago. Since mid-1964, these loans have expanded by $1.51 billion compared with a rise of $788 million in the like period a year earlier.

Savings deposits at the 14 banks rose by $23 million, as against a dip of $13 million in the like week of 1964.

Strictly speaking, all the decline in the Treasury gold balance—which, the figures indicated, occurred Tuesday—meant was that the Exchange Stabilization Fund, a bookkeeping entity, had bought the gold.

BASIS OF REPORTS

In practice, the fund buys such large amounts of gold from the Treasury to sell to foreign central banks, such as the Bank of France. The United States is committed to sell gold on demand to foreign official buyers at the official price of $35.0875 an ounce. This commitment is the keystone of the international financial system.

The precise amount sold by the fund may never be known. The fund's gold holdings are reported only on a month-end basis, 30 days later. Thus, individual transactions during 1 month tend to be obscured because the month-end figure shows only the results of all purchases and sales during the month.

The $200 million reduction lowered the Treasury's gold balance to $15,188 million. It was the largest single transfer since the week of October 22, 1961, when Britain was buying gold and the Treasury reported a $300 million decline.

Only two reductions occurred in 1964: $75 million in the week ended November 25, and $50 million in the week ended February 5. An irregular but persistent decline in the Government's gold holdings from $22,857 million in 1957 has been a direct consequence of a chronic deficit in the U.S. international accounts—an excess of dollars going abroad over dollars coming home.

Shrinking that deficit has been a major objective of two administrations. Only limited success has been achieved.

Pressed for funds, eight large New York City banks added $100 million to their day average borrowings from the Reserve bank, raising the level to $161 million.

They also borrowed $828 million a day from other banks above what they lent to them.

On a daily average basis, the Federal Reserve made no change in its outright holdings of Treasury securities. It reduced its holdings under repurchase agreements by $242 million a day.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 4, 1965]

Monetary Gold Supply Fell $125 Million in 1964, One-Fourth the 1963 Loss: It Was Steady in Latest Week; Total U.S. Gold Holdings Slid $30 Million in First 11 Months

New York—The Nation's gold loss slowed markedly in 1964. The Treasury's monetary gold supply, which chiefly backs the Nation's currency, declined $125 million from the end of 1963, about a quarter of the $465 million outflow in 1963.

But total U.S. gold holdings in the first 11 months, including those in a separate fund for international transactions, were down only $30 million from December 31, 1963, to $15,566 million.

Federal Reserve figures for the week ended Wednesday showed the monetary reserve itself unchanged in the week at $15,388 million, down from $15,513 million a year earlier.

SEVEN ANNUAL DECLINES

The monetary reserve has declined in each of the past 7 years, with the annual drop from 1958 through 1962 ranging from $878 million to $2.2 billion. The continuing gold drain results from the balance-of-payments deficit the United States has incurred in each of those 7 years. A deficit occurs when the amount the United States lends, spends, and gives away abroad exceeds the total amount it receives from abroad.

As these excess dollars accumulate in foreign countries they go to the central banks. These banks then can convert dollars to gold through purchases from the U.S. Treasury. The slowing in the gold drain in 1963 and 1964 reflects a modest improvement in the U.S. payments situation.

The Treasury sells gold on demand to foreign governments and central banks at a fixed rate of $35 an ounce, plus a service charge of 8.75 cents an ounce. It also buys newly minted gold at that price and sells the metal to licensed industrial users. But the major transactions are foreign. Its willingness to buy dollars for gold is one of the prime factors in international currency stability. The United States is the only nation that will exchange gold for its currency held by foreigners.

TWO-PART OUTFLOW

The gold outflow in 1964 came in two parts, $50 million in early February and $75 million around Thanksgiving, when the United States and other nations were moving to shore up the British pound.

In both cases the outflow was technically in the form of a sale to the U.S. Exchange Stabilization Fund, the separate kitty of the Treasury through which all sales and purchases of gold between the United States and foreigners are made. The gold in the fund totaled about $180 million at the end of November. During the month the $75 million was added to the fund and about $40 million was drained out of it, partly as a result of the British sterling crisis. At the end of 1963 the fund's gold holdings totaled $83 million. The total in the fund at the end of each month is reported by the Federal Reserve 1 month later. The yearend figure will be disclosed at the end of January.

Although the monetary gold reserve is used to settle the Nation's international payments, Federal law requires that a portion of it be maintained as a reserve against part of the domestic money supply. Under the law, Federal Reserve banks must keep a gold reserve equal to 25 percent of their notes outstanding and 25 percent of the deposits they hold for commercial banks. At the end of the latest statement week, the composite gold ratio for the Federal Reserve System was 27.7 percent. It was 29.5 percent at the end of 1963 and 32.2 percent at the end of 1962. If it approaches or goes below 25 percent, the FRB may suspend the reserve requirement. The 25-percent rule ties up $13.4 billion of the U.S. gold stock, leaving $1.9 billion to meet foreigners' claims against the dollar.

Early last week, Robert V. Roosa, retiring as Treasury Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, commented on the 25-percent ratio rule. He said that in "a year or two" the administration and the Federal Reserve will have to ask Congress to sever or loosen the legal link between gold and U.S. currency, mainly because of the growth in notes and deposits, rather than a loss of U.S. gold.

France May Buy U.S. Gold

France is considering switching some part of its $1.3 billion of U.S. dollar holdings into gold, according to reports in London. U.S. officials noted that France in the past has been a substantial purchaser of gold from the U.S. stock.

The London reports couldn't be confirmed. Two weeks ago, one French finance minister official refused to comment on the possibility his government might make such a switch.

Such action, however, would be in line with conservative thinking in French financial and monetary circles.

COULD ADD TO DRAIN

Any major conversion of French dollar holdings into gold could add to the U.S. gold drain and put new stresses on the stability of the dollar. It could also limit American ability to give Britain further help, if that proves necessary, in supporting the pound.

In recent years, the United States has urged foreign governments to move cautiously in changing dollars into gold and has been able to persuade some central banks to hold larger stocks of dollars than conservative bankers would prefer.

Yet U.S. spending abroad has been so great that dollars in foreign hands exceed the amount of U.S. gold available to redeem them if they all should come back at once.

Any French demand for large-scale redemption wouldn't be enough by itself to deplete the U.S. gold stock. But if other countries also decide to raise the proportion of gold to foreign money in their currency reserves, this could be embarrassing, as the international financial world at present shows little confidence in the other major reserve currency, the pound sterling.

FRANCE'S VIEW

French spokesmen at international monetary meetings often express the view that too much of their country's reserves is held in dollars. They usually make such comments with resigned sighs, suggesting that France is making a sacrifice toward world stability by following that policy.

U.S. Treasury and Federal Reserve figures show that France in the past 3 years bought far more gold than any other country from the United States. Its purchases have exceeded $400 million a year. It took $101 million in each of the first three quarters of 1964, with the fourth quarter report yet to come. It drew $518 million in 1963 and $456 million in 1962.

At the end of October, France's total reserves were $5.4 billion. Of that amount, $1.3 billion, or 24 percent was in foreign currencies, chiefly dollars, and the rest in gold. Total dollar assets held by the French, including both governmental and bank holdings, are estimated at $1.5 billion by the International Monetary Fund.

Some French financial conservatives contend that as Britain, Switzerland and the Netherlands try to maintain a 90 percent gold ratio in their reserves, France should do likewise. A 90-percent ratio would require about $750 million more gold than the present 24 percent.

In Washington, officials said they had no knowledge of any imminent French moves to seek U.S. gold in such a large amount, but they conceded they are aware there is some sentiment in France in favor of stepping up the proportion of gold in the reserve. Even if France were to make a large-scale demand, U.S. authorities said they are confident other nations would regard this merely as an expression of a French desire to put more reliance on gold, rather than as a lessening of confidence in the dollar that could touch off a "run" on the U.S. gold stock.

London financial circles are inclined toward pessimism about French monetary cooperation, especially where the pound sterling is concerned. Memories of President de Gaulle's veto of British entry into the Common Market are still strong. Some authorities believe General de Gaulle feels that British monetary troubles could help France in a perverse way—that a weak British economy could prevent Britain from doing much to block French political goals in Europe.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1965]

REFORM DEBATED IN MONEY SYSTEM: BRITAIN'S STERLING PROBLEMS AND FRANCE'S GOLD MOVES STIMULATE REAPPRAISAL—NO ACCORD IS IN SIGHT—PARIS AND WASHINGTON SPLIT ON PLAN—CENTRAL BANKERS ARE SHOWING CONCERN

(By Richard E. Mooney)

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND, January 24.—The winter's money crises—first Britain's problem and then the aggravation of France's gold maneuvers—have stimulated serious new thought and talk about permanent reform of the world's money system.

But on the basis of a recent canvassing of opinion in three financial power centers—Paris, Frankfurt and here in Zurich—an agreement is still nowhere in sight.

There was some urgent agitation for action at this month's meeting of European central bankers in Basel two weeks ago. Nothing came of it and nothing is foreseen.

The basic split on reform is between Paris and Washington. It is a political split as much as a division between financial experts.

INDEPENDENCE SOUGHT

Politically and financially the French want a money system under which France and Europe would be more independent of the American dollar and the United States would be more disciplined. Naturally and philosophically, the United States disagrees.

A technical committee of financial officials from 10 countries will report this spring on how the various reform plans would work. But this committee was not assigned to pick out the best plan, and it hasn't.

When the committee reports, the reform issue will return to the policymakers. If someday Paris and Washington came to terms, the rest of the world would doubtless follow. But as of now the rest of the world is not even convinced that action is needed.

GERMAN VIEWPOINT

The Germans talk scornfully of the thought that somehow a flawless new system can be devised.

The Swiss say that they see no need for change yet.

The Swiss also take a rather relaxed attitude toward the continuing deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments—more money flowing out than in—which originally provoked the reform question. The Swiss feel that the U.S. deficit should be reduced, but that it need not be balanced.

As one private banker in Zurich observed, if the dollar outflow is stopped completely, the world will need some substitute arrangement to expand liquidity, and the substitute arrangement might be something supranational, overexpansive, and distasteful.

The Germans, on the other hand, say that the United States should finally and completely bring its payments into balance quickly. So do the French.

On the second issue of the day—augmenting the International Monetary Fund—it is said that agreement is close.

The disagreement in this case has been more time consuming than important, and again it has basically been France versus the United States. The question is how the member countries can increase their subscriptions to the Fund without making too big a dent on the American gold supply.

France wants strict adherence to the standing rule that every country pays one-quarter of its subscription in gold. It is agreed that the major countries will use their own gold for their payments, and not take from the United States. But many small countries do not have the gold they would need and would have to buy it from the United States. Thus, Washington has pushed various schemes to relax the gold requirement.

The compromise solution that is said to be in the works would spare the United States somewhat, but not altogether. It would, at the same time, adhere to the one-quarter gold rule by using the Fund's own gold supply to help cover the need.

If all goes well, a decision could be announced by the IMF in Washington within the next week or two.

Net outflow of U.S. private capital, July 1962 to September 1964

[Seasonally unadjusted annual and quarterly data by major area; in millions of dollars]

Period	1962				1963					1964			
	II	III	IV	Total, year	I	II	III	IV	Total, year	I	II	III	Total, I-III
1. Transactions with all areas:													
Portfolio:													
New issues	312	133	461	1,076	486	513	166	85	1,250	127	284	71	482
Outstanding issues	15	15	−49	96	79	72	−15	−87	49	−94	−40	−37	−171
Direct investment	496	324	538	1,654	563	509	145	671	1,888	453	623	422	1,498
Redemptions	−28	−58	−34	−203	−43	−50	−52	−50	−195	−54	−38	−38	−130
Other long-term capital	60	34	−33	258	199	128	114	320	581	243	122	500	865
Short-term capital	−92	73	200	553	−61	532	−99	362	734	607	587	203	1,397
Total	763	521	1,083	3,434	1,043	1,704	259	1,301	4,307	1,282	1,538	1,121	3,941
2a. Transactions with areas subject to interest equalization tax:													
Portfolio:													
New issues	--------	63	32	296	107	236	71	39	453	--------	11	--------	11
Outstanding issues	--------	17	−34	39	27	64	8	−63	36	−72	−59	−18	−149
Direct investment	--------	216	186	921	433	230	96	307	1,066	328	410	356	1,094
Redemptions	--------	−11	−5	−37	−9	−6	−18	−14	−47	−18	−12	−12	−42
Other long-term capital	--------	43	69	190	49	148	116	299	612	227	107	140	474
Short-term capital	--------	43	163	429	−70	309	−34	356	561	245	322	64	631
Total	--------	371	411	1,838	537	981	239	924	2,681	710	779	530	2,019
2b. Transactions with Canada:													
Portfolio:													
New issues	--------	41	294	457	348	260	61	24	693	86	187	44	317
Outstanding issues	--------	−3	−37	−79	−10	3	3	−33	−37	−15	19	−27	−23
Direct investment	--------	51	150	314	119	55	54	111	339	68	−56	34	46
Redemptions	--------	−38	−23	−83	−27	−30	−27	−23	−107	−30	−18	−18	−66
Other long-term capital	--------	5	8	37	−19	−33	26	9	−17	−4	29	293	318
Short-term capital	--------	108	−98	64	57	195	−131	−145	−24	236	147	−72	311
Total	--------	164	294	710	468	450	−14	−57	847	341	308	254	903
2c. Transactions with areas not subject to interest equalization tax:													
Portfolio:													
New issues	--------	29	135	323	31	17	34	22	104	41	86	27	154
Outstanding issues	--------	1	22	136	62	5	−26	9	50	−7	(1)	8	1
Direct investment	--------	57	202	419	11	224	−5	253	483	57	269	32	358
Redemptions	--------	−9	−6	−83	−7	−14	−7	−13	−41	−6	−8	−8	−22
Other long-term capital	--------	−14	−110	31	−11	13	−28	12	−14	20	−14	67	73
Short-term capital	--------	−78	135	60	−48	28	66	151	197	126	118	211	455
Total	--------	−14	378	886	38	273	34	434	779	231	451	337	1,019

Net outflow of U.S. private capital, July 1962 to September 1964—Continued

[Seasonally unadjusted annual and quarterly data by major area; in millions of dollars]

Period	1962				1963					1964			
	II	III	IV	Total, year	I	II	III	IV	Total, year	I	II	III	Total, I-III
3a. Transactions with Western Europe:													
Portfolio:													
New issues	--------	15	7	195	65	154	19	34	272	--------	11	--------	11
Outstanding issues	--------	6	−38	16	16	35	2	−56	−3	−66	−52	−13	−131
Direct investment	--------	211	160	867	407	146	92	242	887	269	373	308	950
Redemptions	--------	−8	−4	−33	−2	−3	−10	−8	−23	−3	−7	−7	−17
Other long-term capital	--------	8	34	84	29	134	83	258	504	155	91	103	349
Short-term capital	--------	77	139	185	−87	171	−47	33	70	17	243	16	276
Total	--------	309	298	1,314	428	637	139	503	1,707	372	659	407	1,438
3b. Transactions with Japan:													
Portfolio:													
New issues	--------	48	25	101	42	65	52	5	164	--------	--------	--------	--------
Outstanding issues	--------	11	4	23	10	15	8	−4	29	−4	−3	−2	−9
Direct investment	--------	5	26	54	13	35	15	5	68	28	11	18	57
Redemptions	--------	−3	−1	−4	−5	−1	−3	(1)	−9	−13	−1	−3	−17
Other long-term capital	--------	33	36	108	21	5	39	55	120	61	19	24	104
Short-term capital	--------	−36	29	245	12	134	9	308	463	237	65	40	342
Total	--------	58	119	527	93	253	120	369	835	309	91	77	477

[1] Less than $500,000.

Source: U.S. Office of Business Economics. Survey of Current Business; issues of June, September, and December, 1964.

REMARKS

Area data for 1962 are not strictly comparable to those for later years due to a change in geographic coverage in the source. In 1962 Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa are included in areas not subject to the interest equalization tax (IET) while in 1963 and 1964 they are included in areas subject to IET.

Moreover, attention must be drawn to the fact that, in the source, the following countries are included in Western Europe, hence in an area subject to IET, while they are tax exempt under the Interest Equalization Tax Act: Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Portugal, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. On the other hand, Hong Kong, statutorily subject to the tax, is included in source in "Other countries in Africa and Asia," hence in an area generally not subject to IET.

By an Executive order, issued under the authority of sec. 4914(a) of the Interest Equalization Tax Act, purchases of Canadian new portfolio issues, but not Canadian outstanding securities, are IET exempt.

Negative figures indicate net inflows.

THE GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENT: SHOULD IT BE ELIMINATED?

(Address of Dr. Charles E. Walker, executive vice president, the American Bankers Association, before the bank management appreciation dinner of the Houston chapter of the American Institute of Banking, Houston, Tex., January 20, 1965.)

Should the 25-percent gold reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes and deposits be eliminated? In recent years monetary growth and reductions in our gold stock have combined to pull the actual ratio below 28 percent. According to newspaper reports, President Johnson plans to ask the Congress to reduce or eliminate the requirement.

Advocates of removal or reduction of the requirement argue that it threatens the sustainability of the economic advance in this country and undermines the strength of the dollar abroad. Those who favor such a requirement maintain that it serves a highly useful purpose as an ultimate check against the excessive monetary expansion which could destroy domestic prosperity and undermine the dollar abroad.

It may surprise you to learn that I agree with both of these viewpoints: The requirement, at its present level, does threaten the sustainability of the economic advance and may hurt the dollar internationally. But it is equally true that such a requirement has in the past and can in the future serve a useful purpose.

In short, the gold reserve requirement should and must be changed. But it should be relaxed, not removed. And such a reduction should be effected only if the American people are assured that the discipline enforced by the requirement will be maintained.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

At the present time, Federal Reserve banks are required to maintain a gold-certificate reserve equal to at least 25 percent of their note and deposit liabilities.[1] Legislative requirements that the banks maintain a minimum gold reserve equal to a specified proportion of these liabilities dates from the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. Originally, Reserve banks were required to hold a gold reserve of 40 percent against notes and a reserve of gold and/or other lawful money of 35 percent against deposits. Despite the intervening suspension of domestic convertibility, these requirements remained in effect until 1945. By that time the actual gold coverage of Federal Reserve notes and deposits, which had been as high as 91 percent in 1941, had declined to slightly less than 50 percent. Uncertainties concerning the postwar requirements for monetary expansion, as well as the direction and magnitude of gold flows, led to congressional reappraisal of the gold reserve requirement in that year. As a result, the requirement was reduced to 25 percent and made uniformly applicable to both note and deposit liabilities of the Reserve banks. This requirement remains in effect today.

The gold reserve requirement is not absolutely rigid. The Board of Governor of the Federal Reserve System is empowered to suspend it for as long as 30 days, and to renew such suspensions for up to 15 days. There is no stated limit as to the number of times that a suspension may be renewed. However, in the event of the requirement's suspension, the Board of Governors is required to establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the gold-certificate reserve may be permitted to fall below the 25 percent level.[2]

The present urgency of the problem posed by the gold reserve requirement reflects an accumulation of developments. First, postwar monetary expansion in this country has produced a gradual increase in the amount of gold required as a legal reserve. Second, and parallel to this growth in the amount of gold required to meet the legal requirement, U.S. gold holdings have declined steadily as a result of the persistent deficit in our international accounts. These divergent trends have produced a sharp decline in the Nation's stock of free gold, or gold in excess of the amount necessary to meet the reserve requirement, and at the present time the amount of free gold held is only $2 billion.

In view of the absence of prospects for near-term elimination of our balance-of-payments deficits, it is clear that our stock of free gold can be expected to decline further, and perhaps disappear altogether, in the months and years ahead. As it declines, this key question becomes more urgent: Is the U.S. commitment to continuing convertibility of the dollar backed only by its $2 billion of free gold, or is it backed by the entire gold stock of $15 billion? The answer to that question can have a profound impact on international confidence in the dollar.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONFIDENCE IN THE DOLLAR

Maintenance of confidence in the dollar—in its continued convertibility into gold at the rate of $35 per ounce—is the key to the stability and viability of the international monetary system. This is because the international payments mechanism which has evolved in the postwar period has been built around the dollar as a supplement to gold in the monetary reserves of free world nations. Suspension of dollar convertibility into gold at the $35-per-ounce price could well lead to collapse of the international payments system. Moreover, the reduction in international liquidity which would result from the suspension of dollar convertibility also could generate worldwide deflationary tendencies. Much of the postwar progress in restoring a system of multilateral trade and payments might be sacrificed, and the strength and unity of the free world could be strained severely.

---

[1] Gold certificates, which are owned by the Reserve banks, must be backed dollar for dollar by gold owned by the Treasury. Therefore, the term "gold reserve requirement" is synonymous with "gold-certificate reserve requirement."

[2] Section 11(c) of the Federal Reserve Act provides that "when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes falls below 25 percent, the Board of Governors shall establish a graduated tax of not less than 1 percent per annum upon such deficiency until the reserves fall to 20 percent, and when said reserve falls below 20 percent, a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ percent per annum upon each 2½ percent or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 20 percent. The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

This tax is applicable to deficiencies in the reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes, but not against deficiencies in the reserves held against Federal Reserve deposits. Presumably, therefore, the tax could be avoided, or at least reduced, by "assigning" all gold certificates to the reserve against notes, allowing the deficiency to be registered in the reserve against deposits. This, in turn, would mean that automatic increases in discount rates could be reduced, or perhaps eliminated altogether.

It is in this context that the existing gold reserve requirement must be viewed, for Government action or inaction with respect to the requirement is certain to be scrutinized by foreign observers for implications concerning future dollar convertibility.

THE GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENT: THE CASE FOR ITS RETENTION

In some circles, there is a tendency to regard the Nation's gold stock as "backing" for the domestic money supply, and there frequently is the implication that the value of money is in some way derived from the gold collateral which is pledged to secure it. Many of those who hold this view advocate a strengthening of the ties between currency and gold—that is, the restoration of domestic gold convertibility—as the most effective means of assuring a sound monetary system. They oppose, consequently, steps which would sever or weaken the remaining domestic relationship between gold and currency.

While this view often reflects a mystical confidence in the merits of gold as a currency base, sound reasons underlie it. Principal among them is the fact that the existence of a close relationship between currency and gold serves as an ultimate check against excessive monetary expansion. Under conditions of domestic currency convertibility, the capacity of the monetary authorities to expand the money supply is limited by the supply of gold, for excessive monetary expansion can shake public confidences and lead to internal gold drains. In the absence of domestic currency convertibility, internal gold drains cannot lead to a check against excessive monetary expansion. As a substitute, therefore, principal reliance is placed upon statutory requirements which limit monetary expansion to a given multiple of the value of the gold supply on hand.

Most observers agree that the United States should not hesitate—as, in fact, it has not hesitated—in pledging its entire gold stock to the defense of the dollar. This does not answer the question, however, as to whether the gold reserve requirement should be retained with the understanding that it may be suspended if necessary, whether it should be retained in relaxed and modified form, or whether it should be eliminated altogether.

The advocates of a gold reserve requirement do not necessarily suggest that the gold required for currency backing be made unavailable for settling international claims. They recognize that although the absence of domestic convertibility prevents internal gold drains from arresting excessive monetary expansion, such expansion nevertheless will give rise to an external gold drain arising from unfavorable balance-of-payments developments.

Implicit in this argument is the belief that a nation should not exhaust its entire "free gold" stock before initiating the required action with domestic economic policies, particularly monetary policy. Rather, it is felt, changes should be made gradually and with due regard to trends in gold holdings. Thus, the gold reserve requirement may be viewed as an instrument for ultimately enforcing a harsh adjustment only if earlier indications of the need for adjustment have been ignored.

There can be little quarrel with the crux of the argument advanced by advocates of a gold reserve requirement: that a nation which provides international convertibility of its currency—especially a key-currency nation—must sooner or later submit to the discipline of the balance of payments. In effect, a gold reserve requirement is an arbitrary device for insuring that their adjustments take place sooner than otherwise. As such it has the merits as well as the shortcomings of other arbitrary control devices, such as the public debt ceiling.

Advocates of a gold reserve requirement would also argue that the declining margin of free gold in recent years has provided a very strong inducement to actions which would relieve our balance-of-payments deficit. Abandonment of this requirement, they believe, would tend to relieve the sense of urgency with which the international payments problem has been viewed, thereby resulting in the postponement of remedial action already overdue.

Viewed in this context, the gold reserve requirement plays an important role in our economy. Proposals to remove or change the requirement should, in this view, be assessed with the utmost care.

THE GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENT: THE CASE FOR ITS REMOVAL

Arguments for elimination of the gold reserve requirement proceed from the fact that the principal role of gold is to serve as a source of international liquidity. As such, a nation's gold reserve provides maneuvering room—or time during which to adjust internal policies to international requirements—when its currency comes under international pressure.

Critics of the gold reserve requirement argue that it serves to prevent the functioning of gold as a source of international liquidity. By pledging gold as collateral to secure domestic claims which legally cannot be exercised, the requirement leaves only a small margin of gold to satisfy claims which, in fact, can be exercised freely. As a result, uncertainty exists concerning both the availability of U.S. gold to satisfy foreign claims and the extent of the U.S. commitment to dollar convertibility. In view of the fact that "free gold" holdings have declined to less than $2 billion and indications point to continued international payments deficits, such uncertainty could have disturbing consequences.

Elimination of the gold reserve requirement, by pledging the entire gold stock behind the commitment to dollar convertibility, would remove uncertainty concerning the availability of U.S. gold to satisfy foreign claims and, it is believed in many quarters, thereby relieve a source of the gold drain. Moreover, such a step would give the United States greater maneuverability in working toward long-range solutions to its international payments problem.

Removal of the gold reserve requirement can, in the current situation, be supported on domestic grounds. The normal growth in the Nation's monetary needs in the months and years ahead will require expansion in Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities, thereby requiring additional gold backing. Maintenance of the gold reserve requirement at the present level could hinder such growth and thus impede domestic economic expansion.

As a substitute for the requirement, advocates of its removal point to the judgment and integrity of the monetary authorities—those officials of the Federal Reserve System who formulate and carry out the policies which influence the rate of monetary growth. These officials, it is argued, can be depended upon to prevent monetary expansion from becoming excessive. In effect, therefore, the administrative decisions of the monetary authorities would be trusted to substitute adequately for the type of statutory discipline afforded by the gold reserve requirement.

A SUGGESTED COURSE OF ACTION

As I noted at the outset, both of these sets of arguments have considerable merit. The gold reserve requirement does serve as a check on excessive monetary expansion and, as the volume of free gold declines, spurs actions to correct a balance-of-payments deficit. On the other hand, the requirement ties up gold that could, and at times should, be used to support the dollar internationally, and it can contribute to an artificial shortage of reserves that may deter domestic expansion by hampering normal and desirable growth in the money supply. Now below 28 percent, the actual ratio is approaching the danger point. And it should be noted that the recent sharp drop in the ratio has not resulted primarily from gold outflows, which have diminished in the past few years, but from growth in the currency and deposits required by a rapidly growing economy.

How to solve the dilemma? The best course of action seems to me to be to relax, but not to remove, the requirement. Retention of the discipline, even if at a lower level, would preserve many of its advantages. But any easing of the limit should be effected only if we can be certain that the monetary discipline which the requirement helps maintain continues to be assured.[3]

It is in this respect that we must rely on the integrity and good sense of the Federal Reserve authorities. The financial community, both domestic and foreign, has great faith in that integrity and good sense, and would be willing to rely on the Federal Reserve to carry out a sound and flexible monetary policy even if the gold reserve requirement were relaxed. This confidence reposes, however, in a Federal Reserve System operating independently within Government, unhampered by political considerations. Anything that restricted that independence could undermine the confidence of the financial community in the ability of the Federal Reserve System to carry out a monetary policy flexibly adjusted to the needs of the economy. Unfortunately, there is legislation pending before the Congress which would restrict this traditional independence and the sponsors of these measures intend to push them strongly.

It is highly regrettable that this challenge to Federal Reserve independence should occur at the same time the administration is seeking a change in the gold reserve requirement. As the financial community appraises the desirability of such a change, it cannot but be impressed with this fact: One set of legislative proposals would, if enacted, sharply increase our national reliance on sound and discretionary monetary policy as a means of protecting the public interest in national and international economic stability. The second set of legislative proposals, if enacted, would expose the monetary authorities to political pressures which, if history is a guide, would impair their ability to adjust monetary policy flexibly to the needs of the economy.

With heavy Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, the attitude of the administration toward the legislative proposals to restrict the independence of the Federal Reserve System will be of great importance. In this respect, recent statements by Administration officials are encouraging. In March 1964, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon represented the administration in testifying on similar bills and, although he did endorse coterminous terms of office for the president and the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board (as has, in fact, Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin), he strongly supported independence within Government of the Federal Reserve as conducive to sound monetary policy.

---

[3] There are various ways in which the requirement could be relaxed while still preserving its basic discipline. The approach believed to be favored by the administration—removal of the requirement against Federal Reserve deposits but retaining it against notes—has much to commend it. This action would raise the volume of free gold to more than $6 billion but would retain the traditional linkage between the public's paper money and the Nation's gold reserve.

During the past year President Johnson has at least twice referred to the independence of the Federal Reserve System. In a speech to business leaders last April, the President expressed his confidence in "the independent Federal Reserve" as a line of defense against either inflation or adverse balance-of-payments developments. In October, the President stated that the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations had maintained "the Federal Reserve's traditional independence within the Government." He went on to say that "our monetary system must remain flexible." He added "if inflation develops, or if excessive outflows of funds occur, the Federal Reserve System is in a position to do what is necessary."

These statements seem to me to imply that the administration recognizes the importance of an independent Federal Reserve System and intends to protect that independence. It would be conducive to strong support in the financial community, however, if the President's request for a change in the gold reserve requirement were accompanied by reaffirmation of the statements of last year. Such a statement would serve to remove any lingering doubts that relaxation of the discipline of the gold reserve requirement would be followed by elimination of still another safeguard against excessive monetary expansion—the independence within Government of the Federal Reserve System.

Inasmuch as any action to reduce the gold reserve requirements also relaxes a statutory pressure toward balance-of-payments correction, support for relaxation of the requirement could also be broadened and strengthened if the administration would at the same time make it clear that efforts to bring our international accounts back into balance will be intensified. Although some progress in reducing the deficit has been made, it is believed to have risen sharply in the last quarter of 1964, and the prospects for further substantial progress are not encouraging. It is to be hoped that this necessary intensification of balance-of-payments policies will reflect a fundamental understanding of the need to minimize the dollar outflows on Government account and, rather than to rely on arbitrary selective controls, to use policies that work through market processes and encourage, rather than obstruct, the free flow of goods, services, and capital among nations.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Statutory limitations can cause trouble, but they can also provide an important discipline to bolster and support administrative decisions that are vital to the interests of the American people. The test of leadership is to know when such limitations, because of their blunt and nondiscriminating nature, should be relaxed. It seems clear to me that now is the time to relax, but not to remove, the 25-percent gold reserve requirement.

Opinions within the financial community differ with respect to the desirability of changing the requirement. However, if the administration moves only to relax and not to eliminate the restriction, and if the financial community becomes convinced that the independence within Government of the Federal Reserve System will be continued, and that balance-of-payments policies will be intensified, the proposal to increase the volume of free gold available to protect the dollar should gain a broad base of support.

LITTLE DELL PROJECT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize construction of the Little Dell project near Salt Lake City, Utah, for flood control, water supply, and recreational purposes.

PROJECT HISTORY

Congressional authorization for the Little Dell Dam proposal was originally obtained with the addition of my bill, S. 1045, as an amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1960. However, the Salt Lake City commissioners, for several reasons, decided to reject the proposal, and the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City then called in an independent firm of consulting engineers, Berger & Associates of Salt Lake City, who conducted a study under the direction of Mr. E. O. Larson, former regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation in Salt Lake City, and submitted a report in December 1962. Whereas the original project was limited to flood control, the new proposal calls for a comprehensive water development and flood control plan.

In order to reauthorize the Little Dell project, a review investigation by the Army Corps of Engineers of the enlarged project was necessary, and such a review was authorized by the Senate Public Works Committee at my request in May of 1963. The Army Corps of Engineers Sacramento district has submitted its findings in a preliminary report dated December 10, 1964, which accepted almost intact the project as outlined by Berger Associates.

The proposal calls for a combined Federal-district project to be built by the Corps of Engineers at an estimated cost of $18.5 million. It consists of a 50,000-acre-foot multiple-purpose reservoir on Dell Creek, and the diversion of water to the reservoir from Emigration Creek; from Lamb's Creek, a tributary of Parley's Creek; and from Mill Creek. The former proposal was for an 8,000 acre-foot reservoir for flood control purposes only, to be built at an estimated cost of $6,060,000.

PROJECT BENEFITS

The water benefit of the project is, of course, most important for the expanding Salt Lake metropolitan area. It is estimated that by conserving high water runoff and enabling more efficient water regulation, enough additional water will become available to supply another 100,000 population, which will assure an adequate water supply for 20 to 25 years, depending on the rate of population growth. At the present rate of growth in the area, the possibility of a water shortage by 1970 is very likely. Thus the need for early approval and construction of the Little Dell project is apparent.

The project's flood control and recreation proposals will also provide substantial benefits. The project will materially alleviate the flood hazard to Salt Lake City and to areas south of the city from damaging high flows originating on Emigration, Parleys, and Mill Creeks. Recreational value will be tremendous, particularly in view of the close proximity of the reservoir to the city and its nearness to Interstate 80.

PROJECT COSTS

Based on the preliminary report of the Corps of Engineers, the total project cost would be $18,500,000, of which $9,138,000 for water supply would be repaid to the Federal Government by the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City. The remainder allocated to flood control and recreation benefits would be nonreimbursable.

REAPPRASIAL OF FLOOD CONTROL AND RECREATION ALLOCATIONS

The Corps of Engineers differs from the Berger Associates study in the allocation of costs to flood control and recreation. In the Berger report it was estimated that approximately $7 million should be allocated to flood control and approximately $2 million to recreation. The preliminary report of the Corps of Engineers, however, allocates only $3,984,000 to flood control and almost triples the estimate for recreation benefits, to $5,378,000.

Representatives of the Corps of Engineers and the metropolitan water district of Salt Lake City met together on December 17 to discuss the preliminary report, and the district strongly recommended that the flood control and recreation allocations be reviewed and more consideration be given to flood control measures. The district feels that the $7 million figure recommended in the Berger report represents a more comprehensive approach to flood control needs in the area. The district fully realizes the tremendous recreation value of the proposed reservoir; however, it feels that the original ratio of approximately $7 million for flood control measures and approximately $2 million for recreation is more realistic and desirable. In light of similar projects, an allocation of $7 million to flood control does not seem unreasonable. Moreover, it is my understanding that the Corps of Engineers surveyed flood control benefits in Parleys Canyon only and has not surveyed flood control needs in Emigration and Mill Creek Canyons, as did Berger Associates, which comprehensive study I am sure would reveal a need for additional flood control measures.

IMPORTANCE OF SPEEDING LITTLE DELL AUTHORIZATION AND CONSTRUCTION

The timetable of the Sacramento district office calls for preparation of the final report and submission to the division engineer by December 15, 1965. I realize that it will take some time to evaluate the preliminary studies and to complete the additional investigations, but I cannot overemphasize the importance of speeding congressional approval of the Little Dell project, and I want to do everything possible to move it forward. I am, therefore, today introducing a bill to authorize the project.

The rapid increase in population and industrial development along the Wasatch Front and the apparent need for more water to serve Salt Lake City within the next few years points up the importance of prompt approval and speedy construction of the Little Dell project. The project's flood control and recreation purposes likewise offer substantial benefits. The Little Dell project will be a great boon to the people of the Salt Lake metropolitan area.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 817) to authorize a Little Dell project in the State of Utah for flood control, water supply, and recreational purposes, introduced by Mr. Bennett, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

THE DOCTORS' ELDERCARE PROGRAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill and ask that an analysis of it and my remarks on it be printed in the Record.

The doctors' eldercare program was drawn up by physicians, who care for the elderly, and know their health problems and medical needs.

It offers more benefits for people 65 and over—who need care and cannot pay for it—than any other legislation now before Congress.

It provides a wide range of benefits—physicians' care, surgical and drug costs, hospital and nursing home charges.

Eligibility for benefits would be determined quickly—before illness strikes—and without a welfare department type of investigation.

Citizens 65 and over would obtain a policy for medical care. Some would pay nothing for it. Others would contribute a part of the cost of their policy, depending on the level of their income.

To apply for the policy, the elderly would submit a simple statement of income. That is all.

The doctors' eldercare program would be financed with Federal-State matching funds. It would not require any increase in payroll taxes.

Blue Cross-Blue Shield and health insurance companies would be utilized—assuring experienced administration.

Furthermore, the doctors' program would offer free choice of physician and hospital—without Federal bureaucratic interference. And it would provide medical care in a manner that is in keeping with the high standards and quality of our present health care system.

The doctors' eldercare program offers better care than medicare.

By contrast, the Federal medicare tax scheme would cover only hospitalization and some nursing home care—a fraction of the cost of illness.

Medicare would call for higher payroll taxes on all wage earners to pay benefits for everyone over 65—the rich as well as the needy.

And what is more, the $5,600-a-year worker would be forced to pay as much tax as the $56,000-a-year executive.

The medicare tax plan would permit the Federal Government to exercise an undesirable degree of direct control over hospitals and doctors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 820) to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged introduced by Mr. Tower, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The analysis presented by Mr. Tower is as follows:

Analysis of Eldercare Act of 1965

HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE UNDER MAA

This bill would amend title I (old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged) and title XVI (aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, or such aid and medical assistance for the aged) of the Social Security Act to add a new section under which a State with an MAA program would be authorized, in its discretion, to provide the MAA in the form of premium payments for health insurance coverage under voluntary private health insurance plans in addition to providing the assistance in the manner authorized under existing law. A State wishing to participate in the program would be required to enter into contracts or other arrangements with private insurance carriers as it deems appropriate.

The contracts would have to: (1) Be guaranteed renewable; (2) provide benefits which, together with MAA benefits authorized in existing law, include both institutional and noninstitutional care; (3) establish enrollment periods not less often than once a year; and (4) contain such other provisions as the State agency determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of the program.

If a State provides an MAA program in the form of health insurance coverage, the same coverage would have to be available to all individuals who reside in the State and who are 65 or over. In the case of old age assistance recipients (or aged recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled under title XVI), at the discretion of the State, the coverage may be in lieu of or in addition to aid provided in the form of medical or remedial care under existing law. The bill provides that premium payments for such coverage would constitute medical or remedial care for aged recipients under the two titles.

The bill provides that premiums for coverage of any individual under an insurance plan would be paid by the State agency with the following two exceptions. The State agency could establish a maximum income level at least equal to the highest level at which an individual may qualify under the MAA program in the State. If the individual's income is above this level, the premiums would be paid in part by the individual and in part by the State agency in proportions based on the individual's income as the State agency may determine up to a higher income level as the State agency determines to be appropriate. If the individual's income is above the higher level, he would be required to pay the premium in full. Income standards for eligibility would have to be "reasonable."

For the purposes of the bill, "income" would include gross income as defined under the Internal Revenue Code and all other income which is not includible in gross income for tax purposes.

Each individual covered under an insurance plan under the program would be required to certify his income to the State agency in a manner and at such times (but at least once a year) as the State agency may require. The State agency would be required to accept the certification as conclusive. The certification would be subject to the penalties for fraud under the Social Security Act (a fine of up to $1,000, or imprisonment for up to 1 year, or both).

The bill would provide that medical assistance for the aged would be provided in behalf of individuals who are not recipients of OAA but whose income (rather than income and resources) is insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical services.

The bill provides that, notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, if a State plan under title I or XVI includes both MAA and old age assistance or aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, the State could designate one State agency to administer or supervise the portion of the plan that relates to old age assistance (or aid to the aged, blind, or disabled), and a separate State agency to administer the medical assistance for the aged plan.

The bill would modify the prohibition in existing law against enrollment fees by providing an exemption for a State plan which provides medical assistance for the aged in the form of health insurance coverage.

The bill would amend the provisions of titles I and XVI which describe the purposes of appropriations to include encouragement for "each State to provide medical assistance for all aged individuals through the utilization of insurance provided by private insurance carriers."

The bill provides that States which provide MAA through the use of health insurance plans would have their Federal contributions increased by 5 percent (to 52.5–84 percent rather than 50–80 percent) of sums expended for medical or remedial care. A State which provides medical care using the health insurance plan under the old age assistance program or the combined program of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, would also have its Federal contribution increased by 5 percent (to 52.5–68.25 percent rather than 50–65 percent).

Further, the Federal Government would contribute toward the cost of administration of the health insurance program on the same basis as it does under the OAA and MAA programs.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FOR MENTALLY ILL AND TUBERCULOUS

The bill would amend title I (old age assistance and medical assistance for the aged) and title XVI (aid to the aged, blind, or disabled and medical assistance for the aged) of the Social Security Act to authorize money payments to, or medical care in behalf of, needy individuals who are 65 years of age or over unless the individual is an inmate in a public institution other than a patient in a medical institution.

Thus, payments or care could be provided to any needy individual who is a patient in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease. Payments could be made to an individual who has been diagnosed as having tuberculosis or psychosis and who is a patient in a medical institution as a result thereof, and care could be provided to an individual who is a patient in a medical institution as a result of a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis without regard to the 42-day limitation contained in existing law. However, under the combined program of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled (title XVI), such payments or care could not be made or provided to or in behalf of any individual in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease if he is under age 65.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AMENDMENTS

The bill would make the following amendments to the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to medical expense deductions.

1. If neither the taxpayer nor his spouse has attained the age of 65, they would be authorized a deduction equal to:

(a) The uncompensated amount spent for medical care for any dependent who has attained the age of 65;

(b) The amount paid for accident or health insurance for the taxpayer or his spouse which by its terms would become effective when either has attained the age of 65; and

(c) Uncompensated medical expenses incurred on behalf of the taxpayer, his spouse, and other dependents which exceed 3 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income.

2. If the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65, there would be no limitation of the deduction for uncompensated medical expenses incurred in behalf of the taxpayer, his spouse, or dependents over age 65. However, the deduction in behalf of dependents under age 65 would continue to be subject to the 3-percent limitation.

For the purposes of the above amendments, a dependent over age 65 would mean any individual who is related to the taxpayer, or who is a member of the taxpayer's household (as defined by the Internal Revenue Code) regardless of the amount of support the individual receives from the taxpayer. (A dependent under existing law is one who receives over half his support from the taxpayer.)

The amendments relating to the health insurance program would become effective July 1, 1966, but a State could make them effective any time after the first day of any quarter after the date of the bill's enactment. The amendments relating to the income tax deductions would become effective for taxable years after the bill's enactment.

Mr. TOWER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill on medicare which I introduced today, Senate bill 820, may be permitted to lie on the table for 10 days for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJUSTMENT OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PRODUCTION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A CROPLAND RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators ANDERSON, AIKEN, HOLLAND, ALLOTT, BENNETT, DOMINICK, HRUSKA, JORDAN of Idaho, LAUSCHE, MILLER, MORTON, SCOTT, SIMPSON, TOWER, and DIRKSEN, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk for 1 week, for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 891) to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 891

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Declaration of policy

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that the production of excessive supplies of wheat and feed grains depresses prices and the income of farm families, constitutes improper land use, and is wasteful of our natural resources. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965 to bring the supplies of wheat and feed grains into line with current demand in order to (a) increase per family farm income; (b) reduce the surplus of wheat and feed grains; and (c) decrease the public costs of maintaining farm programs. To effectuate the policy of Congress and the purpose of this Act, programs are herein established to assist farmers in (1) diverting a portion of their cropland from the production of excessive supplies of wheat, feed grains, and other commodities; (2) carrying out a voluntary program of soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation; and (3) obtaining commodity prices in the marketplace higher than levels at which commodity loans are made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

TITLE I—LAND RETIREMENT AND SOIL CONSERVATION

Annual determination—Voluntary land retirement—Rental payments in cash

SEC. 101. Beginning with the 1966 crop year the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish and carry out a cropland retirement program. In formulating and administering such program—

(a) The Secetary shall each year make and announce an annual determination of—

(1) the estimated total cropland available for the production of crops in the United States in that year;

(2) the total acreage of farm cropland necessary to be retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses in order to bring the total estimated annual production plus the anticipated release from the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks into balance with the estimated annual disappearance of soil-depleting commodities; and

(3) the acreage that can be retired effectively and economically in the respective year.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts covering periods of three or more years with producers determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms covered by the contracts, if such producers agree to retire and devote to soil-conserving uses any or all farm cropland. The Secretary shall determine and announce the period within which such contracts will be entered into. This period shall be of sufficient duration to provide an opportunity for maximum producer participation. The Secretary shall encourage the retirement of whole farms and shall provide full opportunity for producers of all commodities to participate voluntarily in the cropland retirement program: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall place a maximum limitation on the percentage of total cropland which may be retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses in any State or county or community area if he finds that such action is necessary to prevent the cropland retirement program from having an unduly disruptive effect on the economies of any such area counties and local communities: *And provided further,* That any cropland retired and devoted to soil conserving uses under the cropland retirement program established pursuant to this title shall be deemed in subsequent years to have been planted cropland for the purpose of establishing cropland history.

(c) The Secretary shall make an annual rental payment to producers who: (1) retire and devote cropland to soil-conserving uses with proper management pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and (2) otherwise comply with the cropland retirement program as set forth in this title.

The Secretary shall determine the rate of rental payments that will provide producers with a fair and reasonable annual return on the land retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses after taking all relevant factors into consideration, including (1) the incentive necessary to achieve voluntary participation in the program, (2) the loss of crop production on the retired acres, (3) any savings in cost which result from not planting crops, (4) the estimated profit margin of crop production on the designated acres, (5) continuing farm overhead expenses, (6) the cost of establishing a conservation practice on the retired acres, (7) the value of the land for production of commodities customarily grown on such kind of land in the county or area, and (9) drought, flood, or other abnormal condition.

The rate on lands determined in accordance with the preceding paragraph shall be adjusted on a State, county, and individual farm basis in such a manner as the Secretary determines will facilitate the practical administration of the program. The lands to be covered by contracts shall be determined by a competitive bid procedure whereby a producer wishing to obtain a contract shall specify the percentage of the rental rate applicable to his farm which he is willing to accept.

(d) The Secretary shall compensate producers for participating in the cropland retirement program through annual cash payments.

In order to assist producers in the establishment of soil-conserving uses on cropland retired under the cropland retirement program, the Secretary shall coordinate such program with the agricultural conservation program established pursuant to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (49 Stat. 163; 16 U.S.C. 590 et seq.).

Terms and conditions of contracts with producers

SEC. 102. (a) Under any cropland retirement contract the producer shall agree—

(1) to establish and maintain with proper management for the contract period protective vegetative cover (including but not limited to grass and trees), water storage facilities or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses (excluding orchards and vineyards) on an acreage of land which is specifically designated at the time the contract is entered into and which has been regularly used in the production of crops (including crops such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers), which do not require annual tillage;

(2) to allow to remain fallow, idle, and in the production of crops (including tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers) which do not require annual tillage throughout the contract period, an acreage of the remaining cropland on the farm which is not less than the acreage normally allowed to remain fallow, idle, and in the production of crops which do not require annual tillage on such remaining acreage;

(3) not to harvest any crop from the acreage established in the protective vegetative cover, excepting timber (in accordance with sound forestry management) and wildlife or other natural products of such acreage which do not increase supplies of feed for domestic animals;

(4) not to graze any acreage established in protective vegetative cover;

(5) not to adopt any practice, or divert lands on the farm from conservation, woods, grazing, or other noncropland use, to any use specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice or use which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

(6) to abide by regulations prescribed by the Secretary with respect to the planting of crops during the contract period for later harvest or use; and

(7) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the cropland retirement program, including provisions relating to control of insects, rodents, and noxious and other objectionable weeds.

(b) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract (including the prohibition of grazing on retired acreage) at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm and that such violation is of such a substantial nature as to warrant termination of the contract, the producer shall forfeit all rights to payments or grants under the contract, and shall refund to the United States all payments and grants received by him thereunder. In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract but that such violation is of such a nature as not to warrant termination of the contract, the producer shall accept such payment adjustments, and make such refunds to the United States of payments received by him, under the contract, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

SEC. 103. The Soil Bank Act, as amended (70 Stat. 188; 7 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), is amended as follows:

Administrative and judicial remedy

(1) The first sentence of section 107(d) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1831(d) is amended by adding after the words "paragraph (6) of the subsection (a)" the phrase "or under section 102(b) of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Effect on other programs

(2) Section 112 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1836) is amended by adding after the words "under this subtitle" each time it appears therein the phrase "or under title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Geographic applicability

(3) Section 113 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1837) is amended by adding after the words "subtitle B" the phrase "and title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Reapportionment prohibited

(4) Section 115 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by adding after the words "conservation reserve programs" the phrase "or the cropland retirement program established pursuant to title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Utilization of local and State committees

(5) Section 117 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1805) is amended by adding after the words "this title" the phrase "or title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Utilization of other agencies

(6) Section 118 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1806) is amended by adding after the words "this title" the phrase "or title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Utilization of land use capability data

(7) Section 119 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1807) is amended by adding after the words "this title" the phrase "or Title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Finality of determinations

(8) Section 121 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1809) is amended by adding after the words "this title" the phrase "or under title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Protection of tenants and sharecroppers

(9) Section 122 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1810) is amended by adding after the words "this title" the phrase "or under title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Penalty for grazing or harvesting

(10) Section 123 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1811) is amended by adding after the words "section 103 or 107" the phrase "or under title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Pooling or cropland retirement land

(11) Section 126 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1814) is amended by adding after the words "conservation reserve program" the phrase "or in the cropland retirement program pursuant to title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Incorrect information furnished by the Government—Marriage of producers

(12) Section 128 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1816) is amended by adding after the words "conservation reserve program" the phrase "or the cropland retirement progam established pusuant to title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Authorized period of contract and expenditure—Appropriations

SEC. 104 (a) The Secretary is authorized to formulate and announce programs under this title and to enter into contracts thereunder with producers during the three-year period 1966–68 to be carried out during the period ending not later than December 31, 1973, except that contracts for establishment of tree cover may continue until December 31, 1978.

(b) The period covered by any contract shall not be less than three years and shall not exceed five years, except that contracts for the establishment of tree cover may extend for ten years.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including amounts as may be required to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its actual costs.

Termination and modification of contracts

SEC. 105. The Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest. The Secretary may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the cropland retirement program.

Regulations

SEC. 106. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE II—REPEAL OF AUTHORITY FOR ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS, MARKETING QUOTAS AND MARKETING CERTIFICATES ON WHEAT AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS ON CORN—PRICE SUPPORT ON WHEAT, CORN, OATS, RYE, BARLEY, AND GRAIN SORGHUM

SEC. 201. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective with the 1966 crops of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum, sections 321 through 339 of parts II and III of subtitle B and section 379(a) through 379(j) of subtitle D of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 31; 7 U.S.C. 1281 et seq.), are repealed. Parts IV, V, and VI of subtitle B are redesignated as parts II, III, and IV respectively, and subtitle F is redesignated subtitle D.

SEC. 202. Effective with the 1966 crop of wheat, the Act of May 26, 1941, as amended (Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, 55 Stat. 203), is repealed.

SEC. 203. Effective with the 1966 crops of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum, sections 327 and 328 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–703, Eighty-seventh Congress) are repealed.

SEC. 204. Effective with the 1966 crops of corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum, section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1441 note), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 105. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1966 crop, price support shall be made available to producers for each crop of corn at 90 per centum of the average price received by farmers, excluding payments in kind made by the Secretary, during the three complete marketing years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for such crop begins, adjusted to offset the effect on such price of any abnormal quantity of low-grade corn marketed during any of such years: *Provided,* That the level of price support for any crop of corn shall not be less than 50 per centum of the parity price therefor.

"(b) Beginning with the 1966 crop, price support shall be made available to producers for each crop of oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum at a level which relates to the level at which price support is made available for corn as the feed value of such commodity relates to the feed value of corn."

SEC. 205. Effective with the 1966 crop of wheat, section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1445(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 107. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1966 crop, price support shall be made available to producers for each crop of wheat at the United States farm price equivalent, as determined by the Secretary, of the average world market price during the three complete marketing years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for such crop begins, with premiums and discounts as indicated by the market to reflect milling and baking quality: *Provided,* That the level of price support for any crop of wheat shall not be less than 50 per centum of the parity price therefor."

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Federal irrigation, drainage, and flood control projects

SEC. 301. Section 211 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1860), is amended (1) by striking "three years" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "thirteen years", and (2) by adding after the words "soil bank provisions of the Act" in subsection (b) the phrase "and under title I of the Wheat and Feed Grain Act of 1965".

Restrictions on sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation

SEC. 302. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1427), is amended—

(a) By changing the period at the end of the fourth sentence to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided,* That beginning July 1, 1965, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make any sales (except sales offset by equivalent purchases) of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, or flaxseed at less than 125 per centum of the current support price for any such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges.", and

(b) By deleting the seventh sentence.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION ON PRESIDENTIAL POWER AND SUCCESSION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, at the request of Justice Michael A. Musmanno of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, I introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on Presidential power and succession.

This joint resolution embodies the so-called Musmanno plan. It is identical with House Joint Resolution 118, introduced in the House by Mr. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, on January 5 of this year. It is similar, also, to Senate Joint Resolution 155, which the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] introduced during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

Justice Musmanno's plan in essence provides that the House and Senate Judiciary Committees will constitute a permanent Commission on Prevention of Lapse of Executive Power. Under such rules as the Congress shall prescribe by concurrent resolution, the Commission shall determine by a two-thirds vote all questions concerning the inability or disability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and shall determine when such inability or disability ceases.

I am aware that I am a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 1, introduced on January 6 by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. I still support Senate Joint Resolution 1 in every respect.

The joint resolution which I have introduced will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I understand that Justice Musmanno, a noted authority on the Constitution, will appear before the committee on Friday of this week to testify concerning the problem of Presidential succession. It will assist the committee to have before it the Musmanno plan. I offer this joint resolution for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 34) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on Presidential power and succession, introduced by Mr. PASTORE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROCEDURES IN CONNECTION WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a Senate resolution to require that the passage of a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote upon a call of the roll of the Senate. If adopted, this resolution would amend the standing rules of the Senate:

Article V of the Constitution provides, in part, that:

> The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing amendments.

The significance of proposing changes in our basic law is self-evident, Mr. President; it is a duty which the Congress should exercise with the greatest care. I became deeply concerned during the last session of Congress, however, with the manner in which the Senate considered and adopted Senate Joint Resolution 139. That resolution proposed very basic changes in our Constitution with reference to Presidential inability and succession, and yet it was considered on the floor of the Senate and adopted at a time when only nine Senators were present. There was no rollcall vote and the RECORD does not even reflect the presence of a quorum at the time of the voice vote, although a quorum was present earlier in the day. When this situation came to my attention, I moved to reconsider the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 139 had been adopted. By agreement of the majority leader, this motion was passed and the resolution was subsequently adopted on a rollcall vote of 65 yeas and 0 nays.

I emphasized on the floor of the Senate during consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 139 that the constitutional provisions and the rules of the Senate had been technically followed. In my opinion, however, the Constitution does not contemplate the adoption of a resolution proposing an amendment when only nine Members of the Senate are in attendance.

To the contrary, I believe the spirit of the Constitution requires that the RECORD affirmatively reflect not only the actual presence of a quorum and the names of those constituting the quorum, but also the fact that two-thirds of the Senators present voted in favor of the resolution.

A vote thus recorded is itself a strong recommendation to the States that the proposed amendment be adopted.

The Congress has no greater responsibility, Mr. President, than that of considering proposed changes in our basic and fundamental law. The amending process is not often used, but when it is extreme care should be exercised. The adoption of the resolution I now introduce would insure such consideration. I strongly urge its immediate consideration by the Committee on Rules and adoption by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:
>
> "RULE XLI
>
> "The question of the passage of a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote upon a call of the roll of the Senate."

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

AMENDMENT NO. 7

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if adopted, the amendment would prohibit the use of any money which would be authorized in the bill, S. 3, for the rehabilitation of strip-mined land belonging to private individuals until a study authorized in the bill is completed on July 1, 1967. The bill contains language calling for a study of the ravages of strip-mined land. The study would make recommendations as to how to solve the problem. I completely concur with that part of the bill. But the bill contains a paradox. While the study is being made, money would be authorized for the leveling of private land, I suppose, provided that it would be devoted to public use. My purpose is to make the study first, find out what might be done, and then begin appropriating money for the rehabilitation of land.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], and myself, I send to the desk a proposed amendment to S. 3. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed and lie on the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 8) was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the amendment would add a new chapter to S. 3, the Appalachia bill, entitled "The Ozark Development Act of 1965."

The amendment would create the Ozark Development Commission, composed of seven members, three appointed by the President from the participating States, three appointed by the Governors of the States, one each from the States of Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma; and the seventh to be appointed at the discretion of the President, to serve as chairman and full-time executive officer of the Commission.

The Commission would provide for the continuing development of comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs, including those for land and public works, and establish priorities therefor; conduct investigations, research, and studies, including inventory and analysis of the resources of the region. The Commission would also sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth.

The Commission would prepare detailed plans, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, for scenic highways in the region, to include planning for the development of recreational sites in such regions.

The Commission would review and recommend modifications or additions to existing Federal, State, local, and private programs to improve their effectiveness, and assist in their financing. It would be authorized to recommend interstate compacts and cooperation; to work with State and local agencies to develop model legislation; support existing local development districts and encourage formation where needed and make grants for professional assistance to these locals; encourage private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects; and to serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Federal, State, and local programs in the region.

The Commission would provide a meaningful forum for consideration of problems of the region and propose solutions thereto, using citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences.

The Commission could also designate such other counties in the States covered as deemed necessary to carry out the purposes of the Ozark region legislation; and recommend to the President for transmittal to the Congress a program of development projects, with proposals for Federal participation in their funding as the Commission deems warranted by studies.

The bill would authorize the expenditure of $7.5 million.

We feel that some areas of our Nation meet the criteria for the proposed development of the Appalachia region, and we in the Ozark area feel that the Ozarks should be included in any program of assistance that is proposed and involved in S. 3.

If we are to have a program of this kind and select areas of our country that are in distress or that are having some economic problems, those of us who are sponsoring the amendment to which I have referred feel that the program should be made applicable to areas and sections of the country in which we are interested and where some of our people live as well as other sections of the Nation. We do not feel that our States and our areas should be discriminated against, omitted, or excluded from the character of the legislation proposed, if it is deemed to be wise and a part of the responsibility of the Federal Government.

AMENDMENT NO. 9

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] and myself, I submit and send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] to S. 3, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and lie on the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will lie on the desk.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> On page 4, after line 23, insert the following new subsection:
>
> "(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator shall designate that portion of the States of Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma as is commonly known as the Ozark region, as a region for the purposes of this Act."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this is an amendment to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] to S. 3. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] is designed to assist no more than six economically depressed regions to meet their special problems and to promote their economic development by helping to develop policies and programs for Federal, State, and local efforts essential to an attack upon common problems through a coordinated and concerted regional approach.

His amendment, in essence, is designed to lead to the development of six Appalachia-type regions and starts with the planning, coordinating, developing, and recommending stages.

The amendment we are now submitting to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] would merely specify the Ozark region as one of the six regions to be designated under the proposed legislation. If accepted, it would mean that the Ozark region would qualify for up to $2½ million for the development of a regional plan for the area.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3, surpa, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PREVENT FEDERAL SUBSIDIES FOR CATTLE PRODUCTION IN APPALACHIA (AMENDMENT NO. 11)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Curtis, Dominick, Mundt, Tower, Bennett, Simpson, Miller, and Lausche, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to Senate bill 3, the Appalachia bill, which if adopted, will strike section 203 from the Appalachia bill. Section 203 is the section dealing with special assistance to the Appalachia region by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Last year the corresponding section of the bill was entitled "Pasture Improvement and Development." It provided for a direct program of assistance in building up the cattle industry of the region.

In this year's bill as reported by the committee, section 203 is entitled "Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control." The new language carefully avoids any mention of pasturage, or of cattle or any other kind of livestock. The language has been completely recast after the model of the Great Plains conservation program and all the emphasis is on conservation.

Last year, section 203 was stricken from the bill by the Senate on the basis of protest from indignant cattlemen all over the country. Although the language has been rewritten, it is suggested that the authority contained in this section should still be a cause for concern by the American cattle industry, and the Senate should stand by its guns and strike it out again.

This position is taken for the following reasons. First of all, the new section 203 still gives to the Secretary of Agriculture all the same authority to make grants and to lend special assistance to the farmers of Appalachia that was contained in the language of section 203 of the bill last year, S. 2782 of the 88th Congress. The bill would authorize grants to landowners in the amount of 80 percent of the cost of the work to be undertaken in conserving and developing the land. In last year's bill, such assistance could be given on not more than 25 acres for each landowner; in this year's bill, the limit has been raised—to 50 acres per landowner.

Last year the Secretary of Agriculture advised us that the only hope of salvation for the farmers of the Appalachia region lay in the development or expansion of cattle production. That was the only real opportunity for improvement in the agricultural productivity of the region. We were told that no other agricultural industry could be expanded to a degree that would be of any real help to those farmers.

If that was the case last year, I see no reason to believe that the situation has changed this year. We must conclude that such improvements as would be accomplished under the provisions of this rewritten section 203 would be mainly in the direction of expanded cattle production.

Thirdly, it is to be noted that exactly the same sum of money, $17 million, would be authorized in this year's bill as in last year's bill.

Our opposition to this proposal is not due to any lack of sympathy for the problems of the small farmers of the Appalachia region. We understand those problems and would help with them if we could. But we cannot afford to grant discriminatory assistance to the cattle industry of one part of the country at the expense of our own producers. We cannot be expected to acquiesce in a proposal directed squarely against the livelihood of our own people.

Mr. President, surely Senators have not forgotten the uphill struggle of American cattlemen during these past 2 years, to keep their heads above water, to maintain the solvency and the productivity of the American cattle industry. American cattlemen suffered severely from the sharp price declines of 1963 and 1964. Initially, prices of fed cattle dropped as much as 30 percent on the major livestock markets. Choice slaughter steers in Chicago which were over $30 a hundred in the latter part of 1952, averaged between $21 and $22 a hundred during much of last year. Although a part of this price drop has been recovered, it is only a part and prices are still distressingly low.

The plans announced for the Appalachia region were in terms of feeder cattle rather than fat cattle. The picture in this respect is even more depressing. Feeder cattle are still far below the prices even of last year. In Omaha during the week ended January 23, according to the Department of Agriculture, choice feeder steers averaged only $21.50 per hundred, compared with $24.25 per hundred at the same time last year.

It would be my hope that whatever action the Senate takes, it will not inflict another blow on the American cattle industry. Last year, the Secretary of Agriculture went up and down the land proclaiming that the problems of the cattle industry were due primarily to our own overproduction. It is inconsistent, in fact it is ridiculous for him to recommend and for us to take action to stimulate further beef production through the use of special Federal subsidies on a basis which discriminates in favor of one section of the country and against all other sections.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF S. 5

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 5, the higher education bill, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF COLUMBUS DAY AS A LEGAL HOLIDAY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 108) making Columbus Day a legal holiday, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO AUTHORIZE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND A PUBLIC COLLEGE OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, S. 293, authorizing the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia, the names of my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] be added as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A FLOOD CONTROL INSURANCE STUDY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 408, the bill I have introduced to authorize a flood insurance study, the names of Senators McGee, Hart, Javits, and Pell be added as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVISION OF OUR IMMIGRATION LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] be added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill carrying out the President's recommendations for revision of our immigration laws.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UPPER NIOBRARA RIVER COMPACT, WYOMING AND NEBRASKA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, a mistake was made as to the sponsors of S. 553. This bill calls for the consent to the Upper Niobrara River Compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska.

A similar bill was introduced during the 88th Congress by myself, Senator Hruska, Senator Curtis, and Senator McGee. The bill, as introduced on January 15, 1965, should have had the same cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent to have the names of the two Senators from Nebraska and Senator McGee added to the bill at the next printing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 19, 1965, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill and joint resolution:

S. 602. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956: Senators Allott, Bennett, Bible, Burdick, Church, Kuchel, McGee, McGovern, Morse, Mundt, and Simpson.

S.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget: Mr. Hruska and Mr. Thurmond.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON S. 672, A BILL TO AMEND THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations will schedule hearings on February 22, 1965, on S. 672, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations.

A draft of this bill was transmitted to the Senate by the President of the United States on January 15 and was introduced by me on January 22, 1965. The Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Mr. William C. Foster, will appear on behalf of the administration, and subsequently the committee will hear such others as ask to testify.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 20 U.S.C. 42 and 43, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Mahon, of Texas; Mr. Kirwan, of Ohio, and Mr. Bow, of Ohio, as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-427, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Price, of Illinois; Mr. Denton, of Indiana; Mr. Bray, of Indiana; and Mr. Findley, of Illinois, as members of the Joint Committee To Commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the 2d Inagural of Abraham Lincoln, on the part of the House.

SENATOR AIKEN ON APPORTIONMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on December 9, 1964, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] addressed the American Farm Bureau annual meeting at Philadelphia. In his remarks he laid great emphasis on the issue of apportionment and reapportionment. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Senator George D. Aiken, American Farm Bureau Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pa., December 9, 1964

On July 4, 1776, the sparsely settled American Colonies, having long endured the injustice of paying taxes to the more populous British Crown Government, while having no representation in the British Parliament, declared their independence of England and took up arms in defense of liberty.

In 1787, having won the war against Great Britain, representatives of the emerging Colonies met at Philadelphia to write a workable constitution for the United States.

The job was not easy.

Populous States, like New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, held that the Congress should consist of a single house with representation based on population alone, although there was some suggestion that wealth should also be taken into consideration as a basis for representation.

Other States, with smaller population, but with great potential for future growth, and which were already the source of much of the wealth which was centered in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, protested vigorously and threatened to leave the Constitutional Convention if representation in the Congress were to be based on population alone.

Had they done this, there would have been no organization of the United States.

To make a long and torrid story short, it was finally decided that the U.S. Congress should be comprised of two Houses, the Representatives of one to be based on population alone, while the other, the Senate, would have two Members from each State, regardless of population.

To guard against possible injustice by the smaller, more numerous States, however, it was provided that all bills relating to revenue should originate in the House.

It has also been accepted by tradition that all appropriation bills should also originate in the House.

The Senate was given the responsibility for approving all major appointments of the President.

Besides providing for a Congress, the Constitution also provides for an executive branch and a judicial branch of the Government.

The provisions for the appointment of Supreme Court Justices and a general definition of their powers is found in the Constitution.

The authority for establishing lower Federal courts and defining their powers and limitations is vested in the Congress.

The provision for balancing the powers of Government in three separate branches has served us well for over 175 years.

Since I have been in public service, I have seen each of the three branches undertake to infringe on the authority of another, though none of the previous forays has been quite as bold as the current efforts of the judiciary to assume legislative powers and remake the structure of our Government.

The American law section of the Library of Congress says that the power of the Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution and acts of the legislative branch was first laid down by Chief Justice Marshall in 1803 (*Marbury* v. *Madison*).

However, Marshall's claim has never been supported by legislation.

The matter of conferring such power on the Court was discussed at the Philadelphia Convention and was never granted by the Constitution, thus implying that it was a subject for the legislative branch to deal with.

The following year (1804), Thomas Jefferson wrote: "The Constitution meant that its coordinated branches be checks on each other. But the opinion which gives the judges the right to decide what laws are constitutional, and what not, not only for themselves in their own sphere of action, but for the legislative and executive also in their spheres, would make the judiciary a despotic branch."

And after 160 years, we can see the justification for Jefferson's analysis.

The opinion of the Supreme Court which holds that State legislatures, whether unicameral or bicameral, must have membership based on population alone is founded on the contention that the 14th amendment of 1866 justified such decision.

Yet, Justice Harlan in a vigorous and scholarly dissent from the majority opinion of the Court shows conclusively that the 14th amendment was never intended to interfere with the States right to control legislative representation within their own borders.

Should the assumption of power by the Supreme Court be permitted to stand and that body become permanently vested with authority to not only repeal acts of the legislative branch of the Government but to alter the structure of government itself, then the United States would be in the unique and unenviable position of being virtually the only nation where the desires of the people can be stifled by a politically appointed tribunal.

If the Supreme Court ruling in the case of *Reynolds* v. *Sims* is fully implemented, the result will be that except for a few small nations where unicameral legislatures are in effect, the United States will be about the only nation where representation in legislative bodies is based on population alone while area and other factors are disregarded.

Therefore, the decision of the Supreme Court can only be regarded as a judicial "coup d'etat" resulting in a weakening of the power of the States to regulate suffrage on the local basis and a further assumption of the power of government by the judiciary.

Leaving further discussion of the legal and constitutional aspects of the situation to the lawyers, I would now like to discuss the probable effect of the Court's decision, particularly as it may affect rural America.

First, let us recognize the fallacy of any belief that the battle in which we are now engaged is essentially a conflict between the people of the urban areas and the people who live in the smaller towns and cities and the farflung rural areas of America.

We, who live on the farms, hold no monopoly on devotion to the democratic principles of government.

A goodly percentage of the protests against the Court's decision comes from urban areas.

To be specific, we are engaged in a struggle between the powerful political machines of the great cities and the people of the United States.

Make no mistake about it—this is a battle for the political control of the Nation and with that control goes the power to tax, the power to spend, and the power to enact programs which will affect the lives and welfare of every living person for generations to come.

What makes a nation great?

What makes its economy expand?

Not the concentration of people and of wealth in already overcrowded cities, but the expansion of industry and commerce and people into the less developed areas, where there is opportunity and resources and room.

It was this type of expansion across the Alleghenies—across the prairies—across the Rockies to the broad Pacific—that made the United States the greatest nation in the world.

And every foot of that progress was made over the objection of the early counterparts of those who would seize the reins of political power today.

There is no question but what both area and population being represented in the legislature of each new State was one of the most cogent reasons for the rapid growth and development of the United States, just as the same formula for the U.S. Congress was also a mighty influence to the same end.

Now this formula for progress has been declared unconstitutional.

Unless this backward turn toward the days of King George III can be corrected, what results can be expected?

When the requirement that membership in both houses of a State legislature be based on population alone, as laid down by the Supreme Court in *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, is fully implemented not only the rural areas of the United States but the Nation itself can anticipate adverse results.

Once both houses of the State legislatures are apportioned in accordance with the rule, control of fully half the States will pass to an urban majority, leaving the rural areas of a State as a minority or possibly without representation at all.

Having achieved control of the legislature, the urban majority will then have the power to embark upon a legislative program designed to provide the greatest possible benefits to their urban constituents.

The adverse effect on the rural area will come in three stages.

During the first stage, some State legislatures will immediately move to alter or curtail many present State functions.

There are many programs now in operation benefiting the rural areas that can reasonably be expected to be terminated or substantially reduced so as to leave more State revenues for urban use.

A prime example in some might be the farm-to-market road programs.

Obviously, an urban area is more interested in the construction of more freeways, expressways, and improved city streets and sidewalks than it is in constructing farm-to-market roads that are used less frequently by urban dwellers.

Yet, these farm-to-market roads which require tax dollars to construct and maintain are frequently the sinews by which the strength of the whole community is maintained.

Does anyone doubt that a greater portion of the road funds, both State and local, would be siphoned off for urban use?

In the education fields, the need for additional funds in the cities and in the rapidly burgeoning suburbs is readily acknowledged.

Today, in well-balanced State legislatures, educational funds are distributed on a fairly equitable basis.

An urban dominated legislature could certainly be expected to reorganize existing procedure so as to provide a greater share of the funds for urban use and particularly to provide more State funds for the construction of suburban schools.

This alteration could take various forms.

It might well be to deny State funds to schools with less than a certain minimum daily attendance, one that could easily be met by urban schools but would force further consolidation of rural schools in order to qualify for State assistance.

This procedure could even be extended to deny recognition to schools with less than the minimum number of required students.

Certainly, a change in curriculum could be anticipated as a means of conserving funds for urban use.

This, for many States, would undoubtedly mean a greatly restricted vocational agriculture program.

The present home economics program operated under the vocational education system could also be in jeopardy.

The emphasis on vocational education could be expected to be shifted to urban oriented programs designed to prepare students for employment in industry or commerce.

One of the more devastating actions that could be taken by an urban dominated legislature would be in the field of taxation.

Certainly, the amount of taxes paid by farmers would be increased substantially, even though they would be distributed in such a manner that the major portion would go to the urban areas.

This change could come in various ways.

Real estate, less improvements, could be taxed at a much higher rate than at present.

Sales taxes could be imposed upon farm sales.

And even more burdensome tax might well be the much-discussed value added tax.

Of all taxpayers, except professional people, farmers would be hardest hit by an across-the-board application of a value added tax.

These illustrations I have given represent but a few of the immediate steps that an urban controlled legislature could take.

More devastating action will come later during the second stage of rural adversity.

In all probability, in most States where county government prevails, the farmer will feel the next effect of the *Reynolds* v. *Sims* decision when there is a forced reorganization of county government units either by court action or by action of an urban dominated legislature.

Most counties today operate under a township form of government.

That is to say the governing body of the county is the board of trustees, elected one from each township, regardless of the population of the township.

This method of selecting members cannot possibly survive the *Reynolds* v. *Sims* decision.

Membership of the board will be based on population and it requires no oracle to determine where the majority resides.

It is not on the farm.

Having gained control of county governments, the urban power will operate in much the same fashion as the urban dominated legislature, except it will be on a local scale.

The result, so far as the farmer is concerned, will be the same.

The third and most disastrous stage of the application of the *Reynolds* v. *Sims* rule will probably come in 1972 when urban dominated legislatures, assuming complete reapportionment by then, undertake to create new congressional districts in accordance with the 1970 census.

Here will come the real blow to rural representation in the Congress of the United States.

Although not mentioned in the Supreme Court decision, the State legislature does create new congressional districts following each decennial census.

It requires little imagination to visualize the districts that will be created by an urban controlled legislature in many States.

Certainly, they will not be drawn in such a manner as to favor the rural people.

Undoubtedly, they will have equal population but their shape might be something else again.

Having lost representation in the Congress as a direct result of the Supreme Court decision, agriculture would then lose much of the protection and services it now receives under Federal law.

An urban controlled Congress would be interested in food and fiber of the highest quality at the cheapest price for the city constituents, regardless of how or where produced.

Certainly, price support programs, which are already opposed by many city Congressmen would be abandoned and many of our dwindling number of farmers could not survive in the battle of markets that would ensue.

In like fashion, other agricultural programs that have been developed over the years would likely be rapidly terminated.

These are but a few of the possible consequences of the decision announced by the Supreme Court of the United States on June 15, 1964, when it handed down its decision in the case referred to as *Reynolds* v. *Sims*.

Now, the question arises—Do we take this change in our constitutional form of government lying down?

Do we roll over on our backs and whine and admit we are licked?

Or, do we rise up on our hind legs and fight this infringement of our democratic rights?

I say "let's fight"—for democratic principles are hanging in the balance.

But right now, I would like to make a few factual statements; call them concessions if you wish.

1. There is no question but what the legislatures of many States are malapportioned in one or both houses.

In some cases, this is due to the rapid population growth of the State and the timelock on amendments to the State constitution.

2. There is no reason to believe that in most State legislatures reapportionment will not be fairly conducted.

3. There never has been any constitutional prohibition against any State basing representation in its legislature on population only, although, at this time, only one State is currently operating on a unicameral basis.

My own State of Vermont, for 50 years functioned under a unicameral legislature before deciding that it was better to have two houses—one based on area and the other on population.

4. There is absolutely no reason why any qualified person in this Nation should be denied the right to vote.

5. There is no reason whatever why any person should be denied the right to representation in the legislative bodies of the State and the Nation.

6. There is no doubt that if the Supreme Court's ruling in the case of *Reynolds* v. *Sims* is carried out literally as ordered by the lower Federal courts, it would be possible to deny a substantial percentage of the voters of the Nation equal representation in their legislative bodies.

On the other hand, it is not reapportionment by itself that should give us most concern.

What we must be most concerned with is: (1) The assumption of legislative powers by the judiciary, thus upsetting the balance of government; and (2) the denial—up to date—of the right of the people to decide for themselves the method of representation in their State legislatures and eventually in the U.S. Congress.

In the normal course of events, it would be a simple matter for the Congress to submit to the States a constitutional amendment providing that each State could decide for itself whether it desires both houses of its legislature to be based on population alone or whether other factors might be considered.

Such an amendment could be acted upon either by the legislature of the State or by State convention as directed by the Congress.

Under the convention method, all voters of the State would be permitted to express themselves on this subject without the complications attendant to the election of a legislature.

During the last session of Congress, constitutional amendments were proposed.

Efforts to submit an amendment or to postpone reapportionment orders until an amendment could be submitted were blocked by parliamentary maneuvers, even though both Houses of Congress clearly favored the submission of such an amendment.

Effective though far-reaching legislation did pass the House but in the Senate the move to let the people decide for themselves was effectively blocked.

According to ancient history, King Leonidas and 1,000 Spartans and Thespians, armed only with bows, swords, and spears, for 3 days kept almost 200,000 Persians from getting through the pass at Thermopylae.

According to more recent history, a half dozen U.S. Senators armed only with a filibuster kept 190 million Americans from getting through the impasse of Washington in order to exercise their constitutional right of expressing themselves through the votes of their duly elected representatives to the U.S. Senate.

History also records that King Leonidas and his troops after their initial success were eventually overwhelmed and annihilated.

The strategy of the filibusterers was clear.

They were sure that an amendment voted upon by presently constituted State legislatures would be quickly approved by more than three-fourths of the States or more than the required number.

They were equally sure that an amendment voted upon by State legislatures elected under the population-only ruling would not get the support of enough States to put it into effect, since legislators would be inclined to stick by the system under which they themselves had been elected.

And our filibusterers were equally opposed to the Constitutional Convention method of considering an amendment since they feared that, if given the opportunity, the people themselves would overturn the Supreme Court ruling.

It is significant that virtually all of the Senators taking part in the filibuster were from States with cities of 1 million and over; cities that are overwhelmingly in debt and are constantly seeking new sources of revenue either from taxes or public grants; cities whose demand for Federal appropriations can never be adequately met and which may be driven by desperation to seek further benefits from the more prudent rural areas once they get the opportunity.

During the debate on the civil rights bill, this same group bitterly assailed the filibustering tactics of others.

The civil rights bill affected only part of our population.

The reapportionment ruling affects every man, woman, and child in this Nation.

There may be some who say that the Court's decision applies only to the States and will not affect the Federal Government.

This may be true for the present, but the advocates of city control over State legislatures have already made it plain that they believe the U.S. Congress to be improperly constituted.

During the course of the debate last session, they bitterly lamented the fact that small States have equal representation in the U.S. Senate.

If the structure of State government can be so preemptorily shattered, as in the *Reynolds* v. *Sims* case, is there any reason to doubt that a move to reorganize the U.S. Senate on a population-only basis is not far off?

The time to act to protect the rights of our communities, our States, and the people of our country is right at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

There are two things which common justice demands that we do.

First, let a constitutional amendment be submitted and let us fight to a finish to see that all the people of the United States get a chance to pass on it.

If we could spend 5 months in breaking a filibuster against legislation that affected the rights of only part of the people, we should spend all the next session, if needs be, in breaking any filibuster aimed at restricting the rights of all the people.

Secondly, the Congress should settle once and for all the question of the powers and limitations of the U.S. Supreme Court.

If this is not done, if we supinely acquiesce in the Court assumption of powers not authorized by the Congress, we may expect further encroachments upon the legislative branch of Government.

And, mind you this and mind it well, Members of Congress cannot win the battle alone.

We must have the backing of the people actively supporting us at all levels of Government.

The extent of that backing will depend upon how well the American Farm Bureau Federation and other organizations devoted to the principles of democratic government do their work.

The task is tremendous—the conflict is inevitable—the reward will be a well-balanced Government and a self-governing people.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS TO PRACTICE THEIR PROFESSIONS IN AREAS WHERE SHORTAGES EXIST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have cleared with interested Senators a bill which I should like to bring before the Senate at this time. It is a minor bill which was passed last year, unanimously, I believe. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 6, Senate bill 576.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 576) to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as the sponsor of S. 576, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and to the members of his committee for their prompt action in reporting this bill to the Senate. I am also grateful to the majority leader for scheduling it for Senate consideration with so little delay.

As Senators are aware, this bill is identical to S. 2220, which I and other Senators introduced in the 88th Congress and which passed the Senate December 3, 1963. Unfortunately, the bill failed to pass the House of Representatives on September 3, 1964, by a vote of 140 to 160.

The aim of the bill is to encourage doctors who have received some Federal loans for their medical education to practice in rural areas and other sections of the country where there is a shortage of doctors. Specifically, the bill permits a forgiveness of the principal and interest on the Federal loans for doctors who agree to practice their profession in areas certified by State health officials as being in need of physicians. The loan forgiveness would be in the amount of 10 percent per year up to 5 years. In other words, 50 percent of the Federal loan could be forgiven for physicians who practice for 5 years in shortage areas.

The problems of a shortage of doctors in many remote and rural areas is not an academic one. It is a literal matter of life and death of many, including some in parts of New Hampshire who must travel great distances to get medical attention.

There are some 99 counties in this country today in which not a single doctor lives or practices medicine. A study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare brought to light the fact that there were three times as many doctors per 1,000 people in metropolitan counties than there were in isolated rural areas.

As is true with other Senators, I know from firsthand experience of the suffering, the pain, the anguish and hardship which results in many of our remote areas and small towns because of the absence of doctors.

But something more than pain and hardship is involved. There are more than a few cases on record where people with heart attacks have died in automobiles on their way to distant hospitals because a physician was unavailable to administer the emergency measures to keep them alive.

I think compassion alone compels us to do everything in our power to encourage a solution to this problem.

This certainly is not a complete answer, but it is a sure step in the right direction. It is the least we can do.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 576) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 741 of the Public Health Service Act is amended (1) by redesignating subsections "(f)", "(g)", and "(h)" thereof as subsections "(g)", "(h)", and "(i)", respectively, and (2) by adding immediately after subsection (e) thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Where any person who obtained one or more loans from a loan fund established under this part—

"(1) engages in the practice of medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy, in an area in a State determined by the appropriate State health authority, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to have a shortage of and need for physicians or dentists; and

"(2) the appropriate State health authority certifies to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in such form and at such times as the Secretary may prescribe that such practice helps to meet the shortage of and need for physicians or dentists in the area where the practice occurs; then 10 per centum of the total of such loans, plus accrued interest on such amount, which are unpaid as of the date of such practice begins, shall be canceled thereafter for each year of such practice, up to a total of 50 per centum of such total, plus accrued interest thereon, except that regulations prescribed pursuant to clause (1) may also provide for a minimum period of service as a condition to application of this subsection."

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, having in mind the Senate activities of tomorrow, Friday, I am asking unanimous consent of the Senate to be excused from attendance at the Friday session. This is in order that I may pay my last respects to a very close and very dear friend and honored Rhode Island public servant, State Representative Anthony Tarro, whose untimely death has cast a gloom on the community.

The Senate will have under consideration S. 4, a bill to amend the Federal Walter Pollution Control Act, S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; and S. 408, to provide flood and earthquake insurance.

All these bills have my support, and I have no doubt they will all be passed by good margins. However, in the event that they should come up for yea-and-nay votes, I would hope that the leadership will provide me with a live pair so that my stand in favor of the legislation may be fully recorded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance at the session of the Senate toworrow, Friday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR CLAYTON DOUGLAS BUCK, OF DELAWARE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it is with sorrow that I join my distinguished colleague from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], in calling the attention of Senators to the death yesterday of former U.S. Senator and Governor of Delaware, Clayton Douglass Buck.

He served in the Senate from January 3, 1943, to January 3, 1949, and during that time was chairman of the District of Columbia Committee as well as very active as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. He served as acting chairman of this committee for a period while the chairman was ill.

He was a man of many talents. From 1922 to 1929 he served as chief engineer of the State of Delaware, and developed a nationwide reputation as a roadbuilder as he laid the foundation for Delaware's modern road system of today.

Elected Governor in 1929, he served two 4-year terms with distinction.

After his service as a Senator he consented to serve as State tax commissioner from 1953 to 1957, during my first term as Governor of Delaware.

Along with his many other interests, he was also a trustee for many years of the University of Delaware. In addition to his career as an engineer, he was active as a banker.

My personal debt to him is great.

After my service in World War II, I was serving as a judge in Delaware's family court when Senator Buck invited me to see him one day. He was also Delaware's national Republican committeeman at the time.

He suggested to me that I consider giving some of my time to public service and specifically recommended that I run for Congress that year, 1946. He was the first one to suggest elective public office to me, and all these years since was a loyal supporter, friend, and counselor.

It can well be understood, then, that it was with the deepest regret and sense of personal loss that I learned of the passing of this great Delawarean. His outstanding public services brought honor and respect to him, his family, and his State. In addition to his record of public accomplishment, he was also wonderful company and a person sensitive to the needs and problems of others.

Mrs. Boggs and I extend our deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Delaware in expressing regret over the death late yesterday of former Senator C. Douglass Buck, of Delaware.

Senator Buck's passing is especially sad for me to note, for it was to him that I looked for and received invaluable guidance when I first arrived in the Senate back in 1947. Senator Buck was then entering his fifth year as a Member of the Senate and he could not have been joined by a colleague greener than I. I shall ever be grateful for the assistance which he and his fine staff offered me during the 2 years we were together in the Senate.

Senator Buck's public service to the people of Delaware was not, however, confined to the one term he served as a Member of this body from January 1943 to January 1949. Prior to his election to the Senate, Senator Buck served as the chief engineer of the Delaware State Highway Department and was elected twice to the office of Governor of Delaware, where he served from 1929 until 1937. He was also a member of the Republican National Committee from 1930 to 1937.

Upon leaving the Senate in 1949, Senator Buck returned to the banking business, but in 1953 he was called again into public service, this time to be State tax commissioner, a post which he held with distinction until 1957.

I am deeply saddened this morning to hear the news of his passing, and I know that the thousands of Delawareans who knew him and were associated with him both in business and in public life share the same feeling of loss.

Mrs. Williams joins me in extending to all members of the Buck family our deepest sympathy in this hour of sorrow.

WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President—

> For Heaven's sake, let us sit upon the ground,
> And tell sad stories of the death of Kings.

Saturday, they bury Sir Winston Churchill with no less the pomp and honor with which were buried Wellington and Marlborough; and this is fitting, for Churchill was no less than they.

His was a life of heroism and leadership, lived in the full glory of historical perspective. Churchill and the triumph of the Battle of Britain stand proud and sure with Nelson at Trafalgar and Marlborough at Blenheim. Churchill's greatness and his victory, and Britain's greatness and Britain's victory—for they were one and the same—will last for a thousand years, and the name of this splendid man will never be forgotten.

The beginning of all things, says the Bible, is with the word. All that Churchill was and all that he did were wrought with words. His supreme power was in his language. It is words that cause a man to rise up or that cast him down. It is language that inspires, that leads, and directs. No man writing in the English language—at least, in this century—has better understood or made better use of the power of our language.

It is a mawkish thing for us who live after to attempt to pay full and lasting tribute to Sir Winston. We cannot do it. He has done it for us. What he meant and what he was are seen in his words during those agonizing months in 1940. Those words have already taken their place with the greatest speeches ever addressed by leader to Nation.

Three times, in modern times, the enemy stood at English gates, and England was outnumbered and ill prepared. Three times, great men have come forth, and, using English as their weapon, have triumphed.

In 1415, young King Henry addressed his troops on the eve of Agincourt:

> This day is call'd the Feast of Crispian:
> He that outlives this day, and comes safe home,
> Will stand a tip-toe when his day is named,
> And rowse him at the Name of Crispian.
> He that shall see this day, and live old age,
> Will yeerely on the Vigil feast his neighbours,
> And say, to morrow is Saint Crispian.
> Then will he strip his sleeve, and shew his skarres:
> Old men forget; yet all shall be forgot:
> But hee'le remember, with advantages,
> What feats he did that day. Then shall our Names,
> Familiar in his mouth as household words,
> Harry the King, Bedford and Exeter,
> Warwick and Talbot, Salisbury and Gloucester,
> Be in their flowing Cups freshly remembered.
> This story shall the good man teach his sonne:
> And Crispine Crispian shall ne're goe by,
> From this day to the ending of the World,
> But we in it shall be remembered;
> We few, we happy few, we band of brothers:
> For he to day that sheds his blood with me,
> Shall be my brother: be he ne're so vile,
> This day shall gentle his Condition.
> And Gentlemen in England, now a bed,
> Shall thinke themselves accurst they were not here;
> And hold their Manhoods cheape, whiles any speakes,
> That fought with us upon Saint Crispines day.

In 1588 Elizabeth, the Virgin Queen, addressed her troops as the greatest armada in the history of nations bore down upon the island people:

> My loving people, we have been persuaded by some that are careful of our safety, to take heed how we commit ourselves to armed multitudes, for fear of treachery; but I assure you, I do not desire to live in distrust of my faithful and loving people. Let tyrants fear. I have always so behaved myself that, under God, I have placed my chiefest strength and goodwill in the loyal hearts and goodwill of my subjects; and therefore I am come amongst you, as you see, at this time, not for my recreation and disport, but being resolved, in the midst and heat of the battle, to live or die amongst you all; to lay down for God, for my kingdom, and for my people, my honour and my blood, even in the dust. I know I have but the body of a weak and feeble woman; but I have the heart and stomach of a king, and a king of England, too, and think it foul scorn that Parma or Spain or any prince of Europe, should dare to invade the borders of my realm; to which, rather than any dishonour should grow by me, I myself will take up arms, I myself will be general, judge, and rewarder of every one of your virtues in the field.

And in 1940, after Dunkirk, the King's First Minister, Winston Churchill, stood before the Parliament, and said:

> What General Weygand called the Battle of France is over. I expect that the Battle of Britain is about to begin. Upon this battle depends the survival of Christian civilization. Upon it depend our own British life and the long continuity of our institutions and our empire. The whole fury and might of the enemy must very soon be turned on us. Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this island or lose the war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. But if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, including all that we have known and care for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age, made more sinister, and perhaps more protracted, by the lights of perverted science. Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will say, "This was their finest hour."

Churchill's speeches—like that Shakespeare gives Henry before Agincourt, like Elizabeth's before the coming of the armada, or Nelson's before Trafalgar—have the force of a thousand atom bombs; but they do not destroy—they create; they give formulation to the nameless—and, until then, wordless—yearning of the national soul for the greatness of which it is capable and the courage of which it is shaped. By giving form to this force, they make it real; and, made real, it becomes invincible.

Churchill in 1940 made freedom invincible.

SUPPRESSION OF CIRCULATION OF OBSCENE LITERATURE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that Prosecutor James V. Barbuto, of Summit County, Ohio, has called together the law enforcement officials of 17 cities and villages. The purpose of the assembly is to map ways and means to suppress the circulation of obscene literature.

My purpose in speaking today is to commend Mr. Barbuto and his associates. I have great difficulty in reconciling the Federal Government's spending money, ostensibly for the purpose of helping youth escape delinquency, while, at the same time, pornographic, obscene, licentious literature is being indiscriminately sold on the public newsstands, and thus made available to our youth. I know that where poverty exists, the number of crimes may increase because of that fact. I likewise know that the morality of our youth is being poisoned by television shows which constantly portray violence as a heroic exhibition of goodness.

I likewise know that youth, when it has accessibility to prurient and obscene literature, is likely to depart from the path of righteousness and be precipitated into a life of crime.

Mr. President, Ohio State University had, in its Law Review, a chapter on obscene radio shows, and devoted considerable time to a program which was imported from a foreign country, for the purpose of being shown within the United States. The name of the motion picture was "The Mark of Cain" and the picture was supposedly taken from a biblical happening. When Cain slew Abel, there appeared on Abel's body the mark of the murderer. That theme was used in the motion picture. I was shocked to read that there was question as to whether certain phases of the picture were prurient and obscene.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The time available to the Senator from Ohio in the morning hour has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I proceed for 2 more minutes?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, certain phases of the motion picture, as reported in the book, in my opinion are obscene. The motion picture is now before the courts.

Mr. President, here on the floor of the Senate we can talk all we want about driving juvenile delinquency out of life, but that goal will never be reached by merely spending money. The cause must be reached; and the way to do that is to stop the panderers from exploiting the human weaknesses of our people.

I commend the prosecutor in Akron for his efforts to make the drive. If the prosecutors in the 88 counties of my State would enter into a vigorous fight against that type of exploitation of innocent people, we might reach some level of propriety and morality in our youth.

I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSECUTOR SEEKS BAN ON SMUT

AKRON.—Summit County Prosecutor James V. Barbuto, with the approval of law enforcement officers from 17 cities and villages, has declared war on obscene literature.

Barbuto will seek a permanent injunction in common pleas court next week against an unnamed newsstand operator who is selling what the prosecutor considers obscene paperback novels.

Meeting with law directors and solicitors from throughout the county yesterday afternoon, Barbuto said a favorable ruling could lead to an all-out war on so-called smut literature throughout the county.

Barbuto said a survey by his staff shows the obscene-type novels have penetrated 75 percent of the county. "If we don't attack it, it will destroy us," he remarked.

Barbuto declined to specify in which community he would attack the problem first. But he assured the law agents he would not move into their territory without notifying them in advance and asking for their cooperation.

Barbuto said a favorable court ruling under the injunctive procedure could prevent a retailer permanently from selling any of the paperbacks which would be submitted and ruled on by the court.

MRS. MARY SIPOS TO RECEIVE AWARD FOR HEROISM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have read a newspaper article which states that Mrs. Mary Sipos, 36, of Brunswick, Ohio, is to be the recipient of a Carnegie Medal for heroic conduct. Her neighbor's house was on fire, about 250 feet from her own. She heard screaming. She left her home, ran the 250 feet into the smoke-filled and burning house, and took an infant out of a crib; and as she left the building, she was enveloped in flame, and was seriously burned.

Mr. President, it is a great delight to read of heroic conduct of this type, especially in the face of the morbidness that is constantly before us. As a Senator, I—and I am sure my colleague [Mr. YOUNG] will join me in doing this—express our commendation and joy and our respect for this distinguished lady.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I gladly join my colleague in doing so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. SIPOS TO GET TOP HERO AWARD

Mrs. Mary Sipos, 36, a Brunswick housewife who rescued a 22-month-old neighbor boy trapped in his flaming bedroom last September 28, will receive the Carnegie Medal for heroism this weekend, the Plain Dealer learned last night.

Mrs. Sipos has been accepted by the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission of Pittsburgh, for the award for the rescue of David Dissette, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Dissette, 652 West Drive, Brunswick, it was reported.

She reportedly will receive about $900 for her heroism.

The medal was recommended by Fire Chief Carlton F. Erdman of Brunswick. Several others also recommended her after her exploits had been publicized.

Mrs. Sipos, who is awaiting the birth of her third child, said last night she had not heard about the award.

In the rescue of the Dissette boy she ran 250 feet from her home to the home of the boy, after she heard her neighbor screaming for help.

She fought her way through the smoke to reach the bedroom of David, who was crying for help. She snatched the boy from his crib and ran outside with her dress flaming. She was burned seriously.

She lives at 645 West Drive.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DECISION WHICH PERMITTED THE RUSSIANS TO CAPTURE BERLIN DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I deny that former President Dwight D. Eisenhower was responsible for the decision which permitted the Russians to capture Berlin near the close of World War II.

The charge by a columnist, as published today in the Washington Post, that General Eisenhower made the unfortunate decision to let the Russians take Berlin is both historically inaccurate and grossly unfair to the supreme commander of our forces in Europe at that time.

In the summer of 1947, General Eisenhower told me that the decision to let the Russians take Berlin was made by President Roosevelt, who, of course, was his Commander in Chief.

The conversation in which General Eisenhower made that statement occurred on a Pennsylvania Railroad train when he and I were returning from the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Princeton University. I was a member of the Commission on arrangements for that observance, at which the university conferred an honorary degree on General Eisenhower.

Being greatly disturbed over a divided Berlin and the problems that had arisen over access to the section of the city that had been assigned to us and our allies, and the fact that we were required to keep a large body of troops in West Berlin for its protection, I asked General Eisenhower why it was he could not have taken Berlin before the Russians got there. He replied that he could have taken Berlin 2 weeks before the Russians arrived and earnestly desired to do so, but that permission was denied by President Roosevelt, who instructed Eisenhower to "stay where you are and let the Russians have the credit for taking Berlin."

When General Eisenhower returns from representing our Nation at the funeral Saturday of Sir Winston Churchill, I shall ask him to confirm the statement that he made to me in 1947, and perhaps at that time he can get access to the official records which I am confident will support the Eisenhower version of what happened.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on this 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence we pay tribute to a courageous, fearless people dedicated to the principles and ideals of freedom.

It is fitting that we should honor Urkainians from the world-renowned forum of democracy. In their homeland, Ukrainians have never permitted the erosion of their identity as a separate nation and people within the Soviet Union. They have been proud of their heritage, a heritage that extends far back into the earliest period of east European history. And despite a historical experience of tragic subjugation, they have resisted successfully the abrasive forces of both Russification and Sovietization.

It is fitting that we honor Ukrainians for another reason: and it is that they have taken their place among the many European people who had fled tyranny in Europe and have come to our country to begin life anew. They have contributed immensely to national greatness. America is a better nation for their presence, and to the many hundreds of thousands of descendants of Ukrainians, all America owes an enduring debt of gratitude.

Our hopes and prayers go out to the people of the Ukraine on this anniversary of their independence that their aspirations for self-determination will one day become a political reality.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEAL NAMED TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I learned of the appointment of Representative MASTON O'NEAL, the new Congressman from the Second District of Georgia, to the House Committee on Agriculture. It is indeed a high honor for Congressman O'NEAL to be appointed to this very important committee even though he is a freshman Member of the House of Representatives.

Moreover, inasmuch as the Second District of Georgia is the most diversified agricultural area in the State of Georgia, it is also extremely fitting that he be given this assignment. I know he will render outstanding service and, as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee myself, I am looking forward to working with him on legislative matters which vitally concern the farmers of Georgia and the Nation.

Mr. President, there appeared in the January 23, 1965, issue of the Moultrie, Ga., Observer an editorial commending Congressman O'Neal on this appointment. This is a splendid tribute, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Moultrie Observer, Jan. 23, 1965]

A Voice in Agriculture

The Second Congressional District of Georgia, recognized as the most diversified and richest farming area in the State, and its new Congressman have been signally honored by the appointment of Representative Maston O'Neal to the powerful House Agriculture Committee.

O'Neal, although beginning his first term as Congressman from this district, finds himself in the enviable position of being the 14th ranking member of the Agriculture Committee of 35 already—a most unusual climb under the general plan of seniority.

The quick rise in rank by O'Neal came about by a series of changes in Congress at the outset of the current session, and the course of events has given the second district a well-deserved voice in the Nation's agricultural policies and programs.

It so happens that within the second district three of the five basic crops under Federal control are grown—tobacco, cotton, and peanuts. The district is also noted for its developing livestock program, corn, vegetables, sugarcane, forestry, and other products—a diversity of agriculture which few areas of the world can equal.

It is most important, therefore, to the farm economy of this district and to the national agricultural program that a Georgian—and a Representative from this outstanding farm section—sit on the powerful Agriculture Committee. Maston O'Neal, although devoting his time for a quarter century to legal matters in the district, was reared in a rural background, knows the problems of agriculture and what it takes to develop and maintain a strong farm economy. He and the district have been honored by the appointment to the House Agriculture Committee, but the national agricultural program stands to gain from his knowledge and direct grassroots contact with farming.

"TOMORROW'S AIR TRANSPORTATION"—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM M. ALLEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Mr. William M. Allen has been the president of the Boeing Co., since 1945. Under his direction, Boeing has grown to become one of the world's largest industrial firms. I feel particular pride in the accomplishments of Mr. Allen, because he is a fellow Montanan. He is a graduate of the State university of my State. But I also have pride in Mr. Allen as an American. Under his leadership, his company has played a leading role in world commerce, through its production of jet aircraft. Boeing jets are in use all over the globe. Boeing's contributions to our defenses are many. Mr. Allen's company has helped make us strong in the face of our adversaries.

Mr. President, on January 27, Mr. Allen addressed the National Defense Transportation Association on the subject of "Tomorrow's Air Transportation." The address was delivered at the Willard Hotel, here in Washington, D.C.

I believe what Mr. Allen had to say will be of interest to all of my colleagues, and particularly his comments on the supersonic transport. I believe he makes some new and significant points concerning the economies of this extraordinary airplane. His address is an excellent summary of a subject much discussed and much written about. He corrects a great number of the misconceptions of this program.

I commend to Congress the text of Mr. Allen's address, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tomorrow's Air Transportation

(Talk by William M. Allen before the National Defense Transportation Association, Washington, D.C., January 27, 1965)

I am aware that the assigned subject matter of my talk, "Tomorrow's Air Transportation," is enough to keep us here through the afternoon, which I hasten to assure you is not my intention. The title was simply made broad enough to cover at least two major questions which are currently being raised. First, what is the status of the supersonic transport? Second, what may be the significance of a large military logistics transport development in terms of future commercial application? A third question is implicit. Are these two directions of development mutually exclusive; will one or the other preempt the field in the future? By future I mean the period of the 1970's.

Actually I was asked to talk primarily about the supersonic transport. But in order to examine this subject meaningfully I felt it was necessary to do so in terms of the larger situation in the air transport field. I still intend to spend the major part of my time on the SST. In doing this I wish in no sense to imply any less interest on our part in the CX–HLS type development—the very heavy logistics transport more recently designated the C–5A. On the contrary, the latter has a top priority in the Boeing Co. I am frank to say that we want to build this military airplane, which we regard as extremely important to our national defense.

As I am sure you know, the C–5A is approximately twice the size of the largest present jet transports. It is intended to give our ground forces full mobility, with a capability of carrying all of the heavy equipment, supplies,, and personnel of an Army division, over intercontinental ranges, and of delivering them to semiprepared fields in advance areas. A possible commercial derivative, which has received only secondary study because the initial project objective is military, could carry a 120-ton load of cargo or up to 700 economy passengers, or a deckload of cargo and another of passengers, or any other combination which might fit airline requirements.

We have explored the commercial C–5A possibility with the airlines, and although they are attracted by the low seat-mile costs, there are many questions which will of course require a great deal more study on their part as well as on our own. The answers will no doubt emerge during the next 2 to 5 years. There would have to be determinations, for instance, as to the number of routes and schedules on which traffic density would absorb aircraft of this size, load factor predictions, and the overall economics of integrating such craft into an operation, as well as considerations of the competition to be offered by supersonic or other transports.

Fortunately, the case for the C–5A airplane does not rest upon such determinations. It rests, rather, on a present clear military need, against which the airplane has been designed. We at Boeing believe unequivocally in the C–5 method of logistics transportation. It offers dramatic improvement in our military mobility.

As to the basic questions I have cited, our feeling is that the SST and C–5A type developments are not competitive but complementary. If we assume that the SST will go forward, we find not only the military need for the C–5A but also the probability of a valid application of a C–5A type derivative to the commercial field. If we assume a commercial version of the C–5A, we still find economic justification for building the supersonic transport. They will serve different purposes in the market.

While much public attention has recently been focused on the C–5A, there have been some very significant developments in connection with the supersonic transport. In the past few months, the prospects for this airplane have come forward rather spectacularly, we think—particularly with respect to operating economics. As a result of improvements made, we find that the supersonic airplane will operate as economically, on long range routes, as present jet transports.

I would like to review with you, very briefly, what has been happening in this program, and at the same time perhaps correct some common misconceptions about the SST development. The first misconception is that we are in a "crash" program and that this has been entirely occasioned by the competitive challenge of the British-French Concorde. Certainly the European competition has been a stimulus, and a healthy one; but the fact is that our effort, begun before the Concorde program came into existence, has been an orderly and logical one, and is still being pursued on this basis.

Our first Boeing study of a supersonic transport was made in 1952. Preliminary design effort was started more seriously in 1956 and 1957. Then in 1958 the SST became a major engineering project and it has continued in that status ever since, involving many of our top engineers.

From the start of our effort to the present, design determinations have come in an orderly and unhurried progression, as a result of the integration of mountains of test data, much of it worked out in close conjunction with NASA laboratories which, incidentally, deserve the sincere thanks of the American people for their pioneering work in this field.

In the process we explored 290 configurations, and completed wind tunnel testing on 56 different high-speed wings. From the beginning, our SST design teams were given two clear goals. The first was that we must have a practical flying machine capable of being operated day in and day out on the airlines. The second was that the cost and earning potential of the airplane had to be acceptable to the commercial airlines. It was the combination of these economic and performance goals and a developing bakground of wind tunnel tests which caused us in 1960 to turn our major emphasis to the development of variable sweep wings. The variable sweep is accomplished by ring pivots having the same structural integrity as the wings themselves, and permitting the advantage of both the arrow wing for high speed cruise and the straight wing for docile, slow landing. In between these two extremes, a conventional jet sweepback position can be used during subsonic operation in and around airports and while climbing to the heights at which supersonic boom effects would not be objectionable. We believe the variable sweep provides a simple, straight-forward solution to the problem of operating at a wide range of speeds, as mechanically logical as the variable pitch propeller, or the automatic transmission in an automobile.

Along with this configuration development, we carried forward manufacturing research and structural studies which led us to a conventional box form of wing structure, utilizing the advantages of high strength titanium alloys. Production costs can thus be brought into line.

In mid-1963 we entered the phase 1 SST proposal competition sponsored by the Federal Aviation Agency. By January of 1964 we had been able to meet each of the aerodynamic requirements laid down in this competition, but our economic goals were not yet satisfied. Since that time we have concentrated heavily on the economic side, with a body size change and design refinements that have improved payload by 50 percent with but 17-percent increase in gross weight. Now we find that the airplane can operate with a lower break-even load factor than existing subsonic transports on all but the shorter ranges—even after including amortization of prototype development and testing as part of the direct cost of operation per passenger mile.

We have come down an orderly path to this point in the airplane's development. Nor do we propose any rush into production. Rather we propose that the program should proceed to the next orderly steps—prototype construction, testing, proving, gaining of actual flight experience.

So much for the airplane itself. What about the public on the ground? We have found that two things are working in our favor in the supersonic transport as far as noise is concerned. First, the performance of the airplane gets it away and to altitude much faster than present jets; second, the arrangement of the supersonic intake suppresses the air intake noise. The combined result is that although there is somewhat greater closein noise for operating personnel on the airport, there are actually lower decibel levels of noise to be heard by the public than with existing jet transports.

As for sonic boom effects, we know that transoceanic operation will not be a problem. We hope that overland flying will prove satisfactory as well. FAA tests show no structural damage on the ground under the conditions for which we have designed. The altitude and distance to be acquired by the aircraft before emitting the pressure change effect will reduce the boom from the sharpness of a rifle crack to a sound of distant thunder. Admittedly there will be the question of public familiarization and acceptance of a new sound phenomenon, as has been the case in the past with other new applications of power.

What about the air passenger? Does he really need to get there in 3 hours instead of 7? We do not have to go very far back to recall similar questions being asked about the forthcoming jet transport, with a different set of figures. The fact was that, when offered the alternative of the faster schedule, the passenger chose it over the slower, as has always been the case. Some wonder, however, if the time difference is getting too short to have meaning, especially in light of slow ground travel to and from airports. Certainly there is much to be done in modernizing transportation to terminals. There is need for further speeding up and simplifying the whole matter of ground transfer. But there still remains the desire to shorten trip times aloft.

We are entering an age where mobility has become a part of both business and personal life. The out-in-the-morning and back-the-same-night business trip is an example of it. On transoceanic and transcontinental trips the SST schedule advantage is significant—saving a business day that is otherwise cut in half, or leaving an evening for rest or personal pleasure. As the demands on a man's working time increase, he places a higher value on his personal time—in the evening, on the weekend, on vacations.

What value, if any, does the supersonic transport have to the nontraveling public? There may be several. Each advance in transportation has made travelers out of more and more of the nontraveling public. But there are the broader economic effects to be considered: the stimulus to business, the adding of a new dimension to the economy—which has its growth, we find, mainly through this process of adding new dimensions—the jobs and payrolls involved, the contribution to balance of payments resulting from export sales—of which our U.S. aircraft industry has been contributing a substantial part—the capability of our Nation as a whole, with its direct bearing on our status and position in the world in time of peace, and our national defense in event of war. There is a tax return to the Government, also, in this type of growth.

What about the concept that we are in the race because of prestige or the spur of foreign rivalry; that if the European Concorde bogs down the pressure is off? I have tried to examine the subject on its own merits without reference to European or potential Soviet competition. However, this fact must be kept in mind: when there is an advance in the so-called "state of the art" in any given technology, it generates its own pressures. If we can demonstrate that a supersonic transport is a technically and economically feasible piece of equipment, we know that someone else, in Europe, or Russia, can do it also. Our technology has advanced into supersonic speeds. The SST has become inevitable.

Now I would like to get back to the juxtaposition of the SST and the C–5A developments. There have been three interrelated trends in air transport: toward increased speed—with which has gone increased convenience and comfort—toward greater economy, and toward continued traffic growth. The increase in economy has come from both increase in airplane size, as traffic warranted, and in speed. As an illustration of the interchangeability of speed and size, it is interesting to note that the SST and the C–5A would have roughly the same work capacity—the SST making up in speed for what it lacks in number of passengers. In the past, each major increase in speed has proved a means to greater economy, the simple explanation being the airplane's capability of doing more work per minute.

Market growth has accompanied these gains. Because the jets aroused passenger demand, they became the predominant equipment of the airlines. With further design refinement and particularly engine improvement, they became actually the most economical to operate. Increased demand brought higher load factors than anticipated, increasing the profitability of operations for the airlines, and enabling them to recover sooner their investment in the new equipment.

The jets very quickly have almost totally replaced piston-engine planes in the medium- and long-range market. Now, with new designs, they are in the process of penetrating the short-range market as well.

Looking to the future, it is quite evident that we have by no means reached the end of the line in any one of the three past directions of progress—in speed, economy, or traffic growth. Reduced fares over the Atlantic have been proved a success, and have brought additional hundreds of thousands of people into the foreign travel market. In pursuit of further economy, both the Douglas Co. and ourselves are studying new long-body versions of the DC–8 and the 707, respectively, for transatlantic and other high-density markets, to reduce direct seat-mile operating costs.

The consideration of adapting the still-larger C–5A type airplane to future commercial operations, whether for cargo or passengers, is an extension of this quest of economy through increased capacity. As I have said, traffic and load factor considerations will determine how far to go in this direction, whether to the long-body versions of the present airplanes, to the giant C–5A, or somewhere in between. Any further lowering of fares may be expected to add to the growth of the market above present predictions. This in turn would add to the possibility of greater diversity of equipment to meet the varying requirements of the market.

The technical progress to date in the supersonic development makes it evident that the road to greater speed is likewise open. This, too, may be expected to add to the growth of the market, developing new usage. If this should result, as in the case of the jet introduction, in higher load factors than projected for the SST, the economics of the faster airplane are such that profitability for the airline operator climbs rapidly to make the SST look very good indeed.

Beyond this must be considered the growth factor traditionally allowed for in a new design—in aerodynamic, structural or powerplant advancements, any or all three of which could further lower supersonic operating costs.

In short, tomorrow's air transportation, assuming continued growth in the national and world economy, faces favorable outlook in terms of opportunity for further gains in speed, economy and traffic growth, with the two programs we are considering providing the impetus. To create these new equipment stimuli fits the pattern of desired national economic growth.

Lastly, we come to the question of financing and business risk. By reason of the very magnitude of an SST program, it has been recognized by all who have concerned themselves with it, that government participation in the financing and in the risks involved is essential. In this connection, it has been repeatedly emphasized that the contractors involved must have a real financial stake in the enterprise. Apparently there has been a feeling in some quarters that industry is endeavoring to place all of the risk upon the Government.

Directing my remarks only to the airframe prime contractor's portion of the program (although I would expect that they would be generally applicable to the engine manufacturers), it is important to recognize that under any expected contractual arrangements between the contractors and the Government, the inherent characteristics of an SST program are such that there are unavoidable risks on the part of the contractor which are very large.

In the first place, it would be from 12 to 15 years before there could be any hope of a return from the production program. With the 707, it was 12 years after start of prototype before we arrived at a break-even point on the program, and this without considering interest on the investment during the period. Secondly, during this long period, a large number of the contractor's most skilled personnel would be required by the program. Thirdly, we estimate that new facilities, consisting principally of machines and equipment required to work and test the materials used in a supersonic transport, would involve an expenditure of approximately $40 million. Furthermore, the assignment of existing plant and equipment, with a replacement value in excess of $250 million, would be required through prototype and production manufacture. These figures are not fanciful estimates. We consider them real.

It will, therefore, be seen that even if the program ultimately proved to be a financial success (and we would expect that it would be), nevertheless, a contractor would have a considerable part of its resources in the form of people, plant, and equipment, dedicated to the SST program for probably a decade and a half without any return on its investment or effort. It therefore appears to me that the concern which has been expressed that the industry is not ready to assume a proper amount of risk is without foundation. The very magnitude and nature of the program is such that substantial risks on the part of a contractor are unavoidable.

In my opinion, the action that should now be taken is for the Government, at such time as it has completed its evaluation process, to proceed to contract for the construction of prototypes. The program has reached that stage. There is a limit to how much further gain can be made in the wind tunnel and on paper. There is need for hardware—for a flying article. We need to get it flying and obtain by actual experience the remaining information required for sound planning on the part of the airlines, the FAA, the CAB, and the public. Although the construction of prototypes would involve considerable expense, they will more than pay for themselves over the life of the program. In my opinion, it would be definitely unwise to launch into a production program without the benefit of prototype experience.

What type of contractual arrangement should the Government make through the prototype stage? In this month's Technology Review of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Prof. Secor Browne and William Barclay Harding propose that the Government should "finance the entire development program on the basis of a mutually agreeable cost, plus a profit. If the manufacturer exceeded his estimates, the overrun would come out of his profits, possibly wiping out his profit completely, but his risk would not go beyond that point. As protection against his cost estimates being too high it should be agreed that his profits would be limited to a predetermined figure. But there should be some incentive compensation to encourage efficiency."

Another approach would be to reimburse the contractor for its costs, with a fee sufficient only to cover costs not recognized under Government procurement regulations. In my view, the stake of the contractor in the form of investment of people, new facilities, and existing plant equipment is of such magnitude that there is ample incentive to do the most efficient job possible. If there is a desire to be more specific, a dollar investment on the part of the contractor could be negotiated, crediting against such amount the contractor's investment in new facilities required to perform the contract, plus its cost under cost-sharing contracts with the Government previously negotiated. I would hope that a realization of the great importance of the SST program to the Nation would motivate all parties involved to arrive at a basis for proceeding with prototype construction that is fair to the Government and not unduly burdensome on industry.

I feel that it would be a mistake to endeavor at this time to determine the basis upon which the production program would be carried out. Let us first get a tangible concept of the flying article that we are going to build, its performance capabilities and probable market, as well as information on various operational problems. Who is omniscient enough to determine the terms under which a production program should proceed 5 years hence? Clearly, this can be more intelligently worked out during the prototype phase, when we have established a design which meets production and operational requirements. The production plan should be developed as soon as the manufacturers and the airlines reach a point of confidence in the program which would justify production planning and implementation. The first step, however, is to get a prototype or prototypes. An effort to solve all problems from the "cradle to the grave" is not feasible and will only delay the program.

Finally, I would like to comment upon one last misimpression that has, I believe, been prevalent concerning the proposed program. It should not be thought of in terms of subsidy but rather a commercially repayable investment on the part of the Government. If the program is successful and the airplane is profitable for the airlines to operate, which we are confident it can be, the Government's investment can be returned.

In summary, I think the country has a real opportunity before it. Here is a program that should be undertaken in addition to the C-5A military transport. We should not be dependent on the stimulus of foreign competition or on prestige rivalries in this undertaking, although without doubt these will continue. The SST has developed a convincing case in its own right. We have a market to go after. It involves jobs, payrolls, foreign exchange to be earned through continued export sales in the next decade. We cannot accomplish this national goal in the period of the 1970's unless we act in the present period. Tomorrow never comes except in terms of what we do today.

I hope I have left the impression that we are enthusiastic about the possibilities that exist for the SST. We are. I think we have reason to be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

SWEET WATER DEVELOPMENT CO., DALLAS, TEX.—ROBERT G. BAKER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on Tuesday I discussed certain phases of two contracts which have been awarded to the Sweet Water Development Co.

These contracts, the first of which was awarded May 1, 1962, and the second on September 2, 1963—effective April 27, 1963—dealt with the development of a process for the desalinization of water. In the course of this presentation I quoted from a letter dated December 15, 1964, from the office of Weisman, Celler, Allan, Spett & Sheinberg, 1501 Broadway, New York City. The quotation from this letter is as follows:

> We were retained by Sweet Water Development Co. of 2808 Southland Center, Dallas, Tex., to render it legal services. This client was referred to us by Tucker & Baker. Upon receipt of payment from the client for the legal services rendered, we sent our check in the sum of $2,500, representing 25 percent of our fee, to Tucker & Baker, the forwarding attorneys.
>
> We made no other payment of any kind at any time to Robert Baker or Tucker & Baker.

Subsequent to my remarks Congressman CELLER issued a statement to the effect that his law firm had not rendered any legal service to the Sweet Water Development Co. concerning its Government contracts but that they had received a $10,000 retainer from the company and that $2,500 of this fee had been paid to Tucker and Baker as forwarding attorneys. I understand that this retainer covered legal services from September 1961 to September 1962.

Congressman CELLER said that services of his firm had been primarily on giving advice on real estate operations and the possibility of establishing a helium storage plant.

To keep the record straight I will review the chronological record of the important dates of the operation.

March 7, 1961: Notes in the Department files indicate that there was a patent issued to V. C. Williams.

March 16, 1961: The Sweet Water Development Co. was organized and chartered under the corporate laws of the State of Texas, with authorized common stock of 100,000 shares with a stated par value of $1 per share. Of this amount 15,000 shares were issued.

September 1961: The law firm of Weisman, Celler, Allan, Spett & Sheinberg was retained by the Sweet Water Development Co. at a $10,000 annual retainer fee. This legal retainer was to cover the period from September 1961 to September 1962.

November 30, 1961: Check No. 65040, amount $2,500, payable to Tucker & Baker, and drawn on the Sterling National Bank & Trust Co. of New York, was issued by the Weisman, Celler, Allan, Spett & Sheinberg law firm. This was the forwarding fee mentioned in the letter previously referred to.

December 14, 1961: This check, endorsed "deposit to the account of Tucker & Baker," was deposited in the joint account of Tucker & Baker at the McLachlan Banking Corp. An analysis of this account indicates that Mr. Baker had not written any checks on this joint account during the years 1960 and 1961 until after the deposit of this $2,500 check on December 14, 1961.

Following this deposit the following checks were drawn for Mr. Baker's use:

Date	Amount	Check No.	Explanation
Dec. 14, 1961	$884.27	623	Check drawn by Baker payable to Robert Thompson.
Do	593.43	624	Check drawn by Baker payable to the Senate restaurant.
Dec. 22, 1961	[1] 300.00	625	Check drawn by Tucker payable to the C T Corp. System, "On account for Potomac Vending Machine Corp."
Dec. 26, 1961	25.00	626	Check drawn by Baker payable to Playboy Clubs International.
Do	503.00	627	Check drawn by Tucker payable to Tucker, endorsed by Tucker, "Pay to Robert G. Baker." Noted on the face of the check is "Expense for Baker." There is evidence that this check was deposited by Baker at the American Security & Trust Co. on Dec. 28, 1961.

January 6, 1962: The records indicate that the Sweet Water Development Co. submitted its first proposal to obtain a Government contract. This proposal was for an engineering study for the desalinization of water.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

---

[1] It is not quite clear whether this check was solely for the benefit of Mr. Baker and his associates, but the record shows that Mr. Tucker, Mr. Baker's partner, had handled the incorporation of the Potomac Vending Co. The Potomac Vending Co. was the predecessor of the Serv-U Corp., which corporation was owned or controlled by Mr Baker; so it is reasonable to assume that the benefits of this check likewise accrue to Mr. Baker and his associates.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, May 1, 1962, final negotiations were completed and contract No. 14–01–0001–259 was officially signed providing for a total expenditure of $75,000. This was the contract which was ultimately expanded through a series of amendments followed by the negotiation of a second contract a year later which, as I outlined in the RECORD on Tuesday, ultimately expanded into expenditures of around $1 million.

In my remarks of Tuesday when discussing the operations of the Sweet Water Development Co. I made no effort to describe the type of legal services that had been rendered, nor am I today engaging in any debate as to the type of these services, or for that matter, whether any services at all were rendered. Let us not muddy the water with a lot of denials of something that has never been said. The point is—this company, the Sweet Water Development Co., owned and controlled by the Tecon Corp., a Murchison company did pay the law firm referred to, and Mr. Robert Baker while serving as an employee of the U.S. Senate did receive $2,500 of this fee, and the most of this $2,500 can be traced to his personal use.

The record stands that the Sweet Water Development Co. did obtain two related Government contracts which started at $75,000 and which ultimately were expanded to over $1 million.

The Army's audit report was highly critical of the expenditures—traveling expenses, legal expenses, and so forth—that were made by the Sweet Water Development Co. and which they attempted to charge to the cost of the contract.

What the Senate is interested in and the question which remains unanswered is—why did the Murchison interests feel it necessary to engage Mr. Baker while he was an employee of the U.S. Senate, and if the services for which he was paid were not in return for this particular contract, then what service did he render to them to justify the $2,500 payment?

Let us not overlook the fact that this is not the first payment that has been made by the Murchison interests to Mr. Baker. Several strange financial arrangements between an official of this group and Mr. Baker can be found in Mr. Robert F. Thompson's testimony as appearing in the Rules Committee report of January 28, 1964, part 10.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Delaware for his constant attention to what is going on in the case which he has been discussing. I look forward to hearing his statements in his attempt to bring before the Senate practices that obviously have gone on for a long time and which indicate definite corruption. I thank the Senator for the great service that he is rendering to the Senate and to the people of the United States, and for the vigilance which he is showing with respect to this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I join him in saying that I feel very strongly that the Senate itself is on trial in this particular case. We have no choice except to proceed through to a thorough and complete disclosure of all questionable matters. There can be no possible circumstances, in my opinion, under which any private citizen or private company wishing to do business with the Government should be employing Members of Congress or employees of the Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We talk about juvenile delinquency and how we are going to cure it. We certainly will not cure it if we condone conduct of the type described beneath the dome of the Capitol of the United States. What type of example are we setting? What shall we expect of our youth?

MAINTENANCE OF PRICE STABILITY

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the steel industry has been under substantial criticism in the last few months for certain isolated price increases. I do not hold the steel industry up as a paragon of virtue. Those who are responsible for its management have—as all of us have—made certain mistakes. On the other hand, I do not like to see one great American industry become the whipping boy or the fall guy for every real or imagined weakness in our general economic system.

This subject was put into perspective admirably on Tuesday by Mr. Roger F. Blough, the chairman of the board of United States Steel. He held a press conference and, in response to many questions, he issued a statement, speaking for his own company and for all companies in the industry. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y., January 26.—In response to queries from the press, the following statement was made today by Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp.

Today when our Government faces many thorny fiscal problems and when the purchasing power of the consumer's dollar is shrinking at a slow but steady pace, the Nation is deeply concerned about the need to maintain overall price stability. That concern is understandable, and I share it fully.

In recent weeks, however, so much has been said and written about steel prices, and so much attention has been given to the few scattered price changes which have recently occurred, that one all-important fact has been almost totally obscured.

That fact is that there has been practically no change in the average price of steel during the past 6 years.

The Government publishes a monthly index of finished steel prices which is compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. At the end of 1958—following the general steel price increase that occurred during the late summer and fall of that year—this index stood at 102.3. And last November the index still stood at 102.3—exactly where it was 6 years ago.

This means that the widely publicized price increases that took place in 1963—increases reportedly covering 75 percent of all steel products—were offset completely by numerous and little publicized price decreases effected under the competitive pressures of the marketplace.

As for the few minor price changes that have occurred since the November index was published, these were—with one exception—attempts to restore, in part at least, price reductions that had previously been made. The one exception was in the case of galvanized sheets which are steel sheets coated with zinc; and the net effect of this change was an increase of less than $6 per ton on this product. For United States Steel the increase averaged about 2 percent or $4 per ton which is one-fifth of a cent per pound. By way of perspective, it might be noted that the price of zinc has risen $60 per ton—or 26 percent—since the last price action in galvanized sheets occurred in April 1963.

The effect of all of these recent changes can be seen in the Government's weekly index of finished steel prices which is compiled on a spot-check basis by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Last week, on January 19, this index stood at 102.9 as compared to 103.1 in the corresponding week a year ago. Thus the Government's figures now show that the average price of finished steel has risen six-tenths of 1 percent in a little over 6 years, and has declined by two-tenths of a percent in the past 12 months despite the recent price increases that have attracted so much public attention.

It should be noted, moreover, that the Government index exaggerates the actual cost of steel to the consumer, because it is based on published prices which in many cases are higher than those actually charged under competitive market conditions.

Furthermore, these Government statistics do not take into account at all the improved quality of today's steels. Since it now takes fewer pounds of these improved steels to do almost any given job, and since steel is generally sold by the pound, the result, in many cases, is a definite, though hidden, reduction in the cost to the consumer. For example, it is calculated that with today's steels, the Empire State Building could have been 13 stories taller without increasing the weight of the steel used in the present structure.

One factor which has undoubtedly contributed to the widespread misunderstanding of these facts about steel prices is that there are more than 10,000 different finished steels which sell at varying prices. Among all of these products, prices are changing frequently, upward and downward, in accordance with the competitive forces exerted in the marketplace.

But while public attention has been focused on increases of $5 or $10 a ton in some of these items, much larger decreases in a broad range of steel products such as wire and wire rods, concrete reinforcing bars, line pipe, oil country goods, and stainless steels have gone almost unnoticed. In the past 6 years, for example, the prices of at least a dozen different stainless steel products have declined by amounts ranging from $200 to $315 per ton.

Another factor which contributes to public misunderstanding, probably, is the popular belief that steel prices have some special, magic, multiplying effect upon prices generally. The fallacy of this belief can be illustrated by the case of a typical refrigerator which retails at $225 and contains a little more than 200 pounds of steel. Few people realize that all the steel in this refrigerator sells for about $17.50—or 8½ cents per pound.

Thus a 1-percent increase in the price of this steel would add only 17½ cents to the material out of which the appliance is made. And in saying that, I should emphasize that this is merely cited as an example. Also that apart from the day-to-day price changes that will inevitably occur in a competitive market, United States Steel has no out-of-the-ordinary price actions under contemplation.

Considerable misunderstanding also seems to exist concerning the heralded improvement in steel profits since 1962 when the industry's profit rate fell to the lowest levels since World War II. But a look at these profit rates over the past 10 years will quickly dispel the widely held impression that steel profits are soaring.

Studies of 41 leading industries, published annually by the First National City Bank of New York, show that in 1955 steel ranked in 14th place, and that its return on net worth was just equal to the average for the group as a whole. But the latest study, published last year, shows that in 1963, steel had dropped to 38th position and that its profit rate was 37 percent below the average for all 41 of these industries.

In 1964, the industry broke all production records, topping the 1955 record by some 10 million ingot tons. But while the profit results, when available, will show encouraging improvement, they will still be far below the 1955 rates despite the fact that the industry's capital expenditures for plant and equipment amounted to more than $12 billion during this period. Last year alone they were $1.8 billion and next year they are expected to be at least as great.

These heavy capital expenditures are necessary, of course, if the steel industry is to remain competitive, if it is to continue to provide jobs for its 575,000 employees, and if it is to contribute fully to the physical and fiscal strength of the Nation.

But the ability to provide capital sums of this magnitude is greatly influenced by investor confidence in the companies; and this confidence in turn depends heavily upon profits and dividends. It is important to note, therefore, that dividends in a number of steel companies have been reduced in recent years. In United States Steel's case, its dividend—which had not been increased since 1956—was cut by 33⅓ percent in 1962 and this cut has not yet been restored.

In the light of all these facts, therefore, it is difficult to understand why steel—among all the industries of the Nation—has been singled out for the special scrutiny and attention it has received in connection with prices. And those who seek to pinpoint the cause of the inflation which has increased the cost of living by nearly 8 percent in the past 6 years will obviously have to look elsewhere for an explanation.

RESTON COMPLAINT ON INADEQUATE JOB STATISTICS—VALID FEDERAL, STATE, PRIVATE GROUPS NOW AT WORK ON PROBLEM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, I was concerned by a recent remark by James Reston in his column in the New York Times:

> At the present time there is not even a satisfactory census on jobs now available, let alone a plan to find new jobs that might be made available.

Mr. Reston, of course, is quite correct. But it should be noted that the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics reported recommendations on statistics on employment and unemployment—February 2, 1962. On page 6 our recommendation to remedy this gap in our statistics was put forth as strongly as it could have been written:

> Research should be undertaken directed toward development of a regular monthly survey of job opportunities or vacancies to illuminate the demand side of the labor market in the way the present series measures the supply of labor. Experience here and abroad indicates that substantial difficulties must be overcome before a statistical series on vacant jobs can become operational but past success in using survey techniques to solve some other difficult data-gathering problems suggests that a useful program may be practical. In any event, the data from such a survey would be so useful in analyzing labor markets, in operating employment services, and developing practical worker training and retraining programs, that expenditure of some funds on research into this problem would be warranted.

In the same vein, the President's Committee to Appraise Employment and Unemployment Statistics recommended in September 1962 that work go forward on developing such a statistical series on unfilled jobs. Subsequently, research was initiated in the Department of Labor which is still underway and, in addition, research has been undertaken by the Illinois Bureau of Employment Security and by the National Industrial Conference Board under a grant from the Ford Foundation. All of this work is going forward but has not yet produced a workable plan for producing such statistics on a regular monthly basis.

Progress has been substantial, however, represented by the fact that the National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., of New York has felt it useful to sponsor a conference on "The Measurement and Interpretation of Job Vacancies" to be held February 11–13, 1965, in New York City.

Both Government and private agencies are eager to see the problems conquered that face anyone who tries to collect these statistics on a regular basis. As soon as some satisfactory scheme can be developed, a proposal will be presented to the Congress for regular collection. Some pilot collections, as indicated above, are already underway in and out of Government.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY, A GREAT MILITARY LEADER

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, next Monday, at noon, I expect to be present at the White House when the President of the United States will present the Distinguished Service Medal to Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, of the U.S. Air Force.

It is a fortunate and often noted fact of the history of this country that periods of crisis have seen the rise of men of foresight, courage, and determination into positions of great responsibility. No one can review the story of the early years of the United States without being impressed by the talents and the strengths of those who brought the Nation through those dangerous years.

Time after time after time, the greatness of individuals has provided the rest of us with the leadership and inspiration needed to enable us to come through a period of torment, of potential catastrophe—not only to survive, but also to emerge from the trial with unprecedented strength and a more solid confidence in the future.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay is one of those individuals. Can any of us here today look back upon the grim postwar years of Stalin and the Berlin airlift or the threatening intransigeance of Khrushchev, without recognizing that one of the most potent factors in the maintenance of peace and the survival of freedom was the great deterrent strength of the U.S. Air Force?

General LeMay is a man who understands war and peace. He understands that power in the hands of the unscrupulous, the uncivilized, the "unsane," must still in today's world be met by greater power in the hands of men of good will; and for nearly four decades he has devoted his life to the singleminded purpose of making peace his profession and that of the hundreds of thousands of men and women of the U.S. Air Force.

Throughout those years, no man has worked harder for these men and women—in peace or war—than has General LeMay. He has come to Congress year after year, not only to talk about missiles and bombers, but also to seek the enactment of legislation to provide for the welfare of his people, for, in understanding peace and war, he understands the need to demand much from his people; and from us he has loyally demanded, in return, their due.

We could talk endlessly of his World War II leadership, of his building of the SAC, of his direction of the Air Forces around the world. We could extol his devotion, his wisdom, and his loyalty to the United States. But, with all the words, one unassailable fact stands above all others: today all of us and our wives and children are safer, more secure, and face a brighter future, because of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay.

I am glad his Commander in Chief is going to say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," when he presents to him, next Monday, the Distinguished Service Medal.

TRIBUTE TO THE WIND RIVER MOUNTAIN MEN

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I would like to express my appreciation, and that of the Senate, to the Wind River Mountain Men of Fremont County, Wyo., for representing the State of Wyoming in the inaugural parade in honor of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

I would like to stress the authenticity of costume and weaponry adhered to by these men, who undertook the long journey from their homes in Fremont County to Washington, with their mounts, under trying circumstances. Their determination to honor the President and Vice President of the United States brought them to our Nation's Capital and won for them the hearts of many.

The Wind River Mountain Men, though rather recently organized, also carry on a tradition of historical importance to Wyoming, the West, and, indeed, the entire Nation. The men they honor—the original mountain men of the West—were by and large responsible for opening the routes to the Pacific and thereby making these United States a nation which spans a continent. In carrying on their commerce in furs and pelts, the original mountain men also developed a close working relationship with the Indians of the West. Today, the Wind River Mountain Men carry on this tradition, too, and include members of the Arapahoe and Shoshone Tribes from the Wind River Indian Reservation among their number.

The historical traditions being kept alive by Wyoming's representatives in the recent inaugural parade have a special meaning this year, too, because 1965 is a year of historical importance for Wyoming. Our State is 75 years old and celebrating its diamond jubilee.

Mr. President, the Wind River Mountain Men provided just a taste of the color Wyoming offers the public this year. In conjunction with the diamond jubilee celebration, the cities and towns of Wyoming—virtually every one of them—will be holding local celebrations throughout the year. We hope Americans everywhere will come and help us celebrate 75 years of statehood.

PROPOSALS ON GOLD

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in my remarks in the Senate last Friday, I questioned the view of Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, who, while supporting the proposal to relax the legal reserve gold requirements, stated that they should not be removed altogether.

Our monetary system is dependent, not on gold reserves, but on the productivity of the United States and the strength and stability of our Government. I recommend that we take out of cold storage not just the $5 billion in gold now being held against deposits in the Federal Reserve System, but also the additional gold being held as reserves behind Federal Reserve notes.

Such action would release approximately $13 billion in gold, which could strengthen the dollar, provide greater liquidity in the trading area which depends primarily upon the dollar, and strengthen our hand in the economic cold war.

I am pleased to find that a New York Times editorial of Monday of this week also questions Mr. Walker's proposal. The Times editorial recommends that the administration eliminate the gold cover, and also that it adopt a series of other measures to reduce the dollar drain and the pressure on the gold stock. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Proposals on Gold," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1965]

PROPOSALS ON GOLD

The proposal to eliminate the domestic gold cover so that the Nation's gold stock will be freely available to meet the demands of foreign creditors has met the objection that the gold cover is essential as a check against excessive monetary expansion.

But if the domestic gold cover remains at the present legal minimum of 25 percent, the monetary authorities will be unable to increase the money supply to meet the legitimate demands of a growing economy. If the gold lobby prevails, foreign demand will doubtlessly increase, lowering the gold stock to the minimal 25 percent level.

A compromise solution suggested by C. E. Walker of the American Bankers Association calls for reducing rather than eliminating the gold cover. Mr. Walker admits that a change must be made to permit a necessary increase in the domestic money supply and to reassure foreign creditors. Bue he fears that removing the cover entirely would lead to a relaxation in the administration's efforts to defend the dollar.

Mr. Walker's proposal for keeping a small link to gold is more likely to induce complacency than do away with it. The gold cover has been reduced in the past without instilling a need for discipline; if it is reduced again, the natural tendency will be to sit back and relax until the gold stock erodes to whatever new minimum is set. But with no cover at all, the administration will be forced to step up its disciplinary measures to safeguard currency strength.

The idea that nothing should be done about removing the cover until new steps are taken to reduce the deficit also is a mistake. For it would create fresh doubts in Europe and, at the same time, provoke concern about the adequacy of the domestic monetary supply. The administration can best allay fears by combining a request to eliminate the gold cover with a series of other measures designed to reduce the dollar drain and the pressure on the gold stock.

THE FUTURE OF DROPOUTS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in recent years, this Nation has become more and more aware of the critical problem of students who fail to complete elementary school or high school.

Indeed, the word "dropout" has become one with which virtually every American is familiar. But although the public is aware that many students quit school every day, I often wonder whether we fully realize the life to which the dropout commits himself.

More important, I wonder whether the student who is considering quitting school realizes the bleak future he faces.

Today, we often speak of poverty and its causes and effects. Last week, the President spoke again of poverty, in his message on full educational opportunity, when, after noting that if the present rate continues, 1 student out of every 3 now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school, he said:

> Poverty has many roots, but the taproot is ignorance.

Later in the message, the President underscored the relationship between poverty and lack of education, when he said:

> Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation.

There is no doubt, Mr. President, that we must attack the dropout problem at every level. Many programs to meet this problem have been established; but I can think of no better way to begin than to expose to the potential dropout the life to which he is doomed. In this regard, mass communication media can be a tremendous assistance to the student, his parents, and the community, by studying and reporting the myriad of problems faced by the dropout.

Mrs. Patricia Glendon, of the Reno Evening Gazette, recently wrote a penetrating and revealing series of articles on school dropouts in Washoe County, Nev.

If every student who is considering quitting school and if his parents were to read this excellent series, I am convinced that a most significant number of students would realize the great harm—often irreparable—they would incur by failing to complete their education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several of these excellent articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Dec. 12, 1964]

JOBS DIFFICULT TO FIND, SCHOOL DROPOUTS LEARN ALL TOO SOON

(By Patricia Glendon)

What happens to the teenager who drops out of school before receiving a diploma? How does he fare on the labor market?

Not very well, both dropouts and businessmen agree.

The school dropout who decided that earning money is more important than acquiring a high school diploma discovers that jobs with good pay are scarce, and employers do not want unschooled teenagers in their employ.

Jobs requiring less than a high school degree decrease at least 25 percent every year, E. A. Haglund, deputy superintendent of the Nevada Department of Education says.

"The economic outlook for the school dropout is bleak as he enters the ranks of the unemployed," he adds.

POTENTIAL FAILURE

The school dropout is a potential economic failure, school officials say. "He is unqualified, unschooled, and unskilled," Roger Corbett, director of a study on the Washoe County dropout situation says.

Most school dropouts discover that industry and business reject them as thoroughly as they rejected school.

And for this reason, many dropouts return to night school to make up credits for a diploma.

Here's what five dropouts say:

A married, 25-year-old man, now employed, who had been a dropout at age 17: "I thought there were more important things than getting a high school diploma. I was wrong."

An 18-year-old returnee who had spent 2 years working but is now unemployed:

"I quit school because I was bored. Lack of imagination on the teacher's part and the standard routine day after day also influenced me. I dislike and rebel against strict discipline and sitting all day."

NIGHT SCHOOL

A 20-year-old unmarried man who had left at 17:

"I wasn't doing well and wanted to get a job and see if I could get along. I enrolled in night school to get a high school diploma. I found it hard to get a decent job without high school or even college."

Another returnee who left at 16 said: "I wasn't interested in school. I thought that it was unimportant. Now I am in night school to try for a diploma so I can enter the apprentice program offered by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers."

More boys than girls quit school, the Washoe County Dropout Study shows.

The girls who do leave school prematurely list "marriage" as the prime reason for abandoning classes. However, of 33 women dropouts interviewed by the dropout study committee, 32 of these brides were working at full-time jobs. Marriage does not necessarily mean the teenager has dropped from the labor market.

The school dropout too often finds that the grass is not as green in the labor market as he supposed and returns to school under conditions which are more difficult than when he was a full-time high school student.

The basic problem still remains: How can potential dropouts be stopped from throwing away their education? Can the students be guided into courses which will be more interesting to them than academic subjects?

Monday: Job chances slim.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Dec. 14, 1964]

Dropouts Find Job Market Limited Without High School Diploma

(By Patricia Glendon)

School dropouts ride a dead end street without a high school diploma.

This is what school counselors say.

But it is also repeated at the State employment office—by the people who get teenagers jobs.

"There is very little we can do for them," Mrs. Lorabell Hume, in charge of the youth program, said.

"We can get the girls jobs as babysitters. The boys can work as bag boys for the supermarkets or in car wash places. But that's about all."

Mrs. Hume said that teenagers without high school diplomas are kept out of almost all apprentice programs.

"A high school diploma is required for these," she added.

NOT FOR DROPOUTS

Are there jobs available for young people in Reno? "Oh, yes," She answered, "but not for the dropouts."

One gas station owner said he would not hire a school dropout as an attendant. "I question the boy's reliability," he said. "If he hasn't the stuff to stick it out through school, I don't think he'll stick here."

To give special help to the young men and women who have left school, the State employment office has a special youth service.

It works this way: Each month the Nevada Department of Education gives a list of the local school dropouts to each employment office in the State.

SOME WAIT

The local offices, in turn, try to reach the dropouts and have them come to the employment office.

"Some of them wait a month before coming down. Others appear the day they quit school," Mrs. Hume said.

The teenagers are given aptitude and counseling services.

"We urge them to go back to school," she explained. "We try to show them the lack of job opportunities they face without a high school diploma.

"Some of the boys and girls who have to work, enroll in the adult education division and finish up, get their diplomas that way," she added.

"The only advice we can give the teenagers is, Don't drop out of school. We don't have a job available for you," Mrs. Hume said.

"Most of the teenagers who drop out of school have no job field in mind," she added. "Although the majority of boys say they like to work on cars, unfortunately, we can't get the boys jobs working on cars. The best we can do for them is to get them the car wash jobs.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Dec. 22, 1964]

Bleak Future Awaits School Dropouts: Chance for Change Slim

(By Patricia Glendon)

The bleak future awaiting the school dropout will not change for the better in the next few years.

As jobs become more technically skilled, the dropout will find fewer and fewer jobs, officials say.

But the dropout is helping potential dropouts. Because of him, school officials, employment officers, and just plain citizens have taken a new look at the cause of the dropout problems.

TECHNICAL PROGRAMS

In Washoe County, school officials are working to develop more technical programs in the high schools.

Reno High School will build a half-million-dollar shop to be used in teaching auto mechanics, electronics, sheet metal, welding, woodworking, and mechanical drawing.

At Earl Wooster High School, there are courses in data processing, auto mechanics, electricity, electronics, industrial mathematics, mechancial drawing, metal fabrication, and woodworking.

Sparks High School offers industrial arts, metal and wood, vocational metal, electronics, electricity, and radio courses.

George Brighton, school administrator, has prepared a technical program, with its own school building which would begin on the junior high school level and continue through 2 years of post-high school work.

School officials are recognizing not only the need for more technical training but also, fulfilling the demand by industry for such workers.

Graduates of these technical courses can enter apprentice programs in unions, school officials say.

No decision has been made on this program by the school system.

"In view of the dropout studies, here and nationwide, we have begun to look more into doing all that we can, and offering courses for terminal students," Washoe County School Superintendent Procter Hug, Sr., said.

SECOND LOOK

"We're taking a second look to see what we can do to take care of this type of student more adequately," he added.

Evening courses in the adult division of the school system are offering training under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1963, he said.

These courses are set by the State employment security office which determines job needs in Washoe County. They also try to find students who need retraining, Hug said.

Alan Dondero, director of the adult division, has six programs from welding to clerk and bookkeeper to service station techniques underway at the present time.

With funds from the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, a youth opportunity center will be located in Las Vegas to help school dropouts or disadvantaged youth.

"It is hoped that the program will expand to include a counselor for the Washoe County area," Bruce Barnum, executive director of the employment security office and director of the job corps program adds.

"The school dropout will not be motivated to finish school until the public, the people of Washoe County, is aware of the full extent of the problem," Al Peevers, temporary chairman of a citizens action committee working on young adult and youth programs, says.

"That's when the situation will change and the problems be solved."

FISHERY PROBLEMS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the face of the increasingly mounting complications of the international fisheries situation, I should like to call the attention of the Congress to the speech made January 26, 1965, before the 58th Annual Convention of the National Canners Association in San Francisco by the Honorable William C. Herrington, Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife to the Under Secretary of State. Because his was such a lucid presentation of different aspects of U.S. involvement in the international fisheries, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks before the convention be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Some U.S. International Fishery Problems and International Rules Dealing With Fisheries

(Speech by William C. Herrington, Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife to the Under Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State, at the Fishery Products Program ("Three Views of the American Fishing Industry") at the 58th Annual Convention of the National Canners Association, San Francisco, Calif., January 26, 1965)

Today, early in the new year, I am not going to attempt to give you solutions to any of our numerous high seas fishery problems; I would like a little more time for that. I am only going to outline some of these problems and the circumstances that affect them. Furthermore, I am going to steer clear of the problem of imports and exports. For the time being I will leave these to the trade experts and economists. However, I assure you that this leaves plenty of problems for me to talk about today.

KINDS OF PROBLEMS

An overwhelming proportion of the problems that land in my office are concerned with fishery conservation and fishery jurisdiction, separately or with various degrees of intermixture. There is much confusion in popular thinking dealing with these issues, with jurisdiction often presented as conservation. This confusion of concepts is encouraged by the fact that "conservation" in the public mind has something of the status of "peace" and "motherhood," while jurisdiction tends to be identified with selfish, self-serving actions. No statesman, be he national or international, can afford to oppose conservation, whereas often he can be a hero by opposing (or supporting) jurisdiction. In general, conservation can be defined as concerned with maintaining and increasing the productivity of a resource without regard to who gets the catch, while jurisdiction deals with who gets or controls the catch. I include under this heading any provisions which determine the share of the total catch each or any country gets.

PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

Since the high seas are not subject to the jurisdiction of individual countries, the actions taken on the high seas by the United States and other countries should conform to international law or practice. Therefore, as a background for this review of U.S. high seas fishery problems it should be useful to briefly outline the present international system dealing with conservation of, and jurisdiction over fishery resources.

There is a considerable assortment of bilateral and multilateral conventions dealing with conservation, the United States being a party to eight of them. Some of them also deal with jurisdiction, i.e., how the catch of fish should be divided up, but this is a secondary consideration and presumably is included only because it was necessary to resolve this issue in order to secure an effective conservation agreement. Examples are the North Pacific Fur Seal Convention and the Fraser River Salmon Convention. Some of these conventions go back 30 to 40 years.

At the U.N. Conference on Law of the Sea, held in Geneva in 1958, many of the ideas which had been developing through experience gained in the operation of the fishery conventions were brought together to provide the basis for a world convention that would stimulate and guide the development of international law on fisheries. Modifications from past practice were developed to meet the changing needs and views of the participating countries. The Geneva Fisheries Convention received the overwhelming support of the Conference with 45 votes in favor, 1 against and 18 abstentions. The terms of the Convention include:

(1) The right of all states to engage in fishing on the high seas subject (a) to their treaty obligations, (b) to the interests and rights of coastal states as provided for in the convention; and (c) to the conservation provisions of the Convention; (2) the duty of all states to adopt necessary conservation measures and to cooperate with other states in conservation programs; (3) the definition of conservation; (4) the special interests of coastal states in the maintenance of the productivity of the resources in the high seas adjacent to their territorial sea and the special privileges which go with this, one of these being the right to adopt unilateral measures of conservation provided negotiations with other states concerned have not led to agreement within 6 months and provided that there is an urgent need for such measures, that they are based on scientific findings and that they do not discriminate against foreign fishermen; and (5) a procedure is included for settling disputes regarding the need for conservation measures and the kind of measures to be applied.

The United States and Canada worked vigorously for the inclusion of the "abstention" principle or procedure in this convention. Wide support for this concept was obtained in the fisheries committee of the Conference, the supporting vote in committee being over two-thirds. However, in plenary session it became involved with other issues and failed to obtain the two-thirds vote required for adoption.

All four of the conventions coming out of the 1958 Law of the Sea Conference at Geneva include provisions dealing with jurisdiction. The Convention on the High Seas states:

"ART. 2. The high seas being open to all nations, no state may validly purport to subject any part of them to its sovereignty. Freedom of the high seas is exercised under the conditions laid down by these articles and by the other rules of international law. It comprises, inter alia, both for coastal and noncoastal states:

"1. Freedom of navigation;

"2. Freedom of fishing;

"3. Freedom to lay submarine cables and pipelines;

"4. Freedom to fly over the high seas.

"These freedoms, and others which are recognized by the general principles of international law, shall be exercised by all states with reasonable regard to the interests of other states in their exercise of the freedom of the high seas."

The Convention on the Territorial Sea defines the situations where straight baselines may be drawn, sets out the criteria to be observed in their construction, states the criteria to be met in constructing the closing lines for bays, and sets out the rules governing innocent passage.

The Continental Shelf Convention is the most specific in extending the jurisdiction of the adjacent states to cover species not previously considered within their jurisdiction. This convention states (art. 2, pars. 1 and 4 and art. 3):

"1. The coastal state exercises over the Continental Shelf sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources.

"4. The natural resources referred to in these articles consist of the mineral and other nonliving resources of the seabed and subsoil together with living organisms belonging to sedentary species, that is to say, organisms which, at the harvestable stage, either are immobile on or under the seabed or are unable to move except in constant physical contact with the seabed or the subsoil.

"ART. 3. The rights of the coastal state over the Continental Shelf do not affect the legal status of the superjacent waters as high seas, or that of the airspace above those waters."

The formula in article 2(4) developed out of an intense controversy as to where to draw the dividing line between resources of the shelf and those of the superjacent waters, and the drafting of criteria which in practice could be effectively applied. Meanwhile, research has shown that the king crab of the North Pacific meet these criteria. This has led to discussions during recent months with Japan and the Soviet Union whose fishermen conduct fisheries for king crab on the U.S. Continental Shelf in eastern Bering Sea. The Continental Shelf Convention also defines the Continental Shelf as (art. 1):

"* * * The term 'Continental Shelf' is used as referring (a) to the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to the coast but outside the area of the territorial sea, to a depth of 200 meters or, beyond that limit, to where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the said areas; (b) to the seabed and subsoil of similar submarine areas adjacent to the coasts of islands."

Incidentally, the Continental Shelf Convention was adopted by a vote of 57 for, 3 against, and 8 abstentions.

I have briefly outlined the present system of international law or developing international law covering fishery conservation and jurisdiction. The provisions of the conventions to which I referred are being interpreted and put into practical effect by countries acting unilaterally or through agreements with other concerned countries.

U.S. POLICY

It is U.S. policy to work out our international fishery problems, like other international problems, in accordance with international law and practice. When solutions are not provided by present international law or practice, we seek to negotiate agreements with the concerned countries which will provide acceptable solutions. When neither international law nor negotiated agreements are adequate, we have in the past, and I expect may again in the future, seek to modify international law by means of such procedures as the 1958 Law of the Sea Conference. Of course, to consider such a move we must have modifications in mind which are reasonable and which we are quite sure will receive wide international support.

SOME INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED STATES

I now propose to briefly review some of our principal international fishery problems in the field of conservation and jurisdiction. I will begin with the North Pacific, since this is an area where fisheries are of great importance to the economy of the coastal communities and where for many years the survival of certain stocks of fish of great importance to the area has been particularly dependent on research and stringent regulations conducted and applied by the United States and Canada. Furthermore, the fishery problems of this region appear to be uncommonly numerous and persistent.

The salmon problem involves both conservation and jurisdiction. Before the development of the high seas salmon fishery, the problem was essentially domestic since, with the principal exception of the Fraser River run, the United States and Canada each managed and fished the runs from their own rivers. There are some partial exceptions to this which I will not go into now. Since World War II a high seas salmon fishery by foreign nationals developed but the abstention provisions of the North Pacific Fisheries Convention maintained the status quo except for the Bristol Bay red salmon run. The far-ranging migrations of the Bristol Bay reds into the area of western Bering Sea and south of the Aleutians, where they intermix extensively with Asian salmon, has made them vulnerable to Japanese high seas fishing. Since the expiration of the minimum 10-year term of the Convention Japan has been seeking modifications that would eliminate the abstention provisions and now or in the future make more than Bristol Bay salmon accessible to Japan's high seas fishery. The United States has been seeking more protection for the Bristol Bay salmon during their migrations in western Bering Sea. There have been three meetings of the parties, Canada, Japan, and the United States of America, to work out a new convention. A fourth meeting will be held this year. The results of these negotiations will be crucial to the U.S. salmon industry.

The halibut problem in substantial degree is similar to salmon. The relation of the early life history to internal waters is lacking, but the economic survival of the stocks has been equally dependent upon the research and management efforts of the adjacent countries, the United States, and Canada. Since the yield is being fully utilized, any substantial participation in the fishery by a third party would displace the equivalent United States-Canadian fishing effort. Since World War II this fishery has been protected from the expanding Japanese fishery in the eastern North Pacific by the aforementioned abstention provisions of the North Pacific Fisheries Convention. In the case of halibut, as in the case of salmon, Japan seeks a convention modified to provide for Japanese participation in the fishery. The U.S.S.R. fishes for groundfish in both the eastern Bering Sea and the Gulf of Alaska, but operates in such a manner that halibut are not substantially affected.

In the case of groundfish, U.S. fishermen do not exploit the stocks in Bering Sea and only to a limited extent in the southeastern gulf of Alaska. U.S. concern regarding these stocks is primarily related to conservation. We wish to be sure that the countries which exploit these stocks will apply conservation measures adequate to maintain their maximum sustainable productivity so that they will remain available to our fishermen should the latter one day find it feasible to exploit them.

I am going to comment on a fourth problem, fur seals, primarily as an example of a problem that has been resolved, at least for the time being. The solution involves both conservation and jurisdiction. The conservation program is worked out among the four countries that share in the yield—Canada, Japan, U.S.S.R. and the United States. The measures are carried out by the countries having jurisdiction over the area where the measures are applied. The yield is shared among the four countries on the basis of a formula worked out years ago which gave consideration to actual participation in the fishery prior to the first agreement.

Solution of a fifth problem, king crab, now appears to be well underway as the result of the Continental Shelf Convention and bilateral negotiations with Japan and the U.S.S.R.

As we move south in the eastern Pacific we come to an area where the tropical tuna fishery generates our greatest problem of the eastern tropical Pacific. This, by far the largest and most valuable of our long-range fisheries, depends primarily on the yellowfin and skipjack tunas which migrate over great distances to the north and south and, we suspect insofar as the skipjack is concerned, from east to west. Some 16 years ago before the tuna fishery had grown to its present size, foresighted representatives of Government and industry anticipated the time when industry would expand to make full use of the tuna resource and, if not controlled on the basis of extensive scientific knowledge of the conditions of the stocks, could deplete or destroy the resource and with it the industry which depended upon it. They also recognized that because of the tuna's wide ranging migrations off the coasts of many countries, and because the fishery was conducted by a number of countries, effective research and management must be an international operation. Prompted by these considerations the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Convention was negotiated with Costa Rica in 1949. It is an open-ended convention to which Panama, Ecuador, and Mexico have since adhered. Research by the Commission's excellent staff has shown that in recent years the yellowfin stock has been too intensively fished and that limitations on the catch are necessary to prevent further overfishing and to restore the stock to the level that will produce the maximum sustainable yield. It is clear that to make such limitations effective all countries which fish this stock, nonmembers as well as members of the IATTC, must cooperate in regulating their fishermen. Otherwise, the limitations on the catches of the fishermen of one country would provide a stimulus to increase the efforts of the fishermen of the noncooperating country to supply the markets which normally depended on the catches of the regulated fishermen. Accordingly, the Governments of the United States and other IATTC member countries have been most assiduously attempting to enlist the cooperation of the nonmember countries. So far the effort has not been successful because we have not been able to obtain assurance of the cooperation of one of the nonmember countries. The problem is complicated by questions of jurisdiction since that country claims jurisdiction over the high seas extending to a distance of 200 miles or more from its coast. The end of this problem is not in sight and meanwhile the conservation problem continues unresolved to the detriment of everyone.

Moving now to the Northwest Atlantic, to the waters off the coast of New England, we find problems which have increased greatly in seriousness in recent years. Until recently the international problem was one of conservation measures to assure the continued maximum productivity of groundfish stocks, primarily haddock, ocean perch, and cod. The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention was negotiated in 1949 to accomplish this. This Commission has done some excellent work in determining and applying minimum mesh size regulations to protect small haddock and cod. However, with the increasing number of countries involved and the complexity of the problems, the delays in implementation and problems of enforcement grow. Furthermore, the greater number of countries and amount of gear operated in areas of historic U.S. fisheries is threatening the survival of these fisheries since in many cases the yield is limited and an increase in catch from the new operations of foreign fishermen means an equivalent decrease in the U.S. catch. Means to ameliorate this situation are being studied but the solution is not easy or clear.

In the waters off the South Atlantic and Gulf States the international problems of the shrimp and menhaden people are partly current and partly potential. The American shrimp fisherman operating on the high seas off the coasts of Central and South America is very much concerned over any moves to extend jurisdiction without regard to international law or accepted international practice. If the uncertainties of his oversea operations force him back to compete in the already fully exploited shrimp fisheries along the U.S. coast, then both he and the fishermen that he joins suffer from the increased competition. On the other hand, the problem of the menhaden fisherman is potential since his fishery is inshore and he is not now faced with competition from foreign fishermen for the limited supply. However, he is concerned that such a threat should sometime develop in waters outside the present fishery. You will note that moves to help reassure the menhaden fishermen may stimulate increased hazards for the shrimp fishermen, and vice versa.

As I stated earlier, I am not going to attempt at this time to propound solutions to these problems. I would like to remind you, however, that the problems are conflicting, they are highly complex and they involve an extensive intermixture of conservation and jurisdiction.

You may be interested in how these problems are handled in Washington. In the Department of State my office has the primary responsibility on most fishery problems. If they are essentially legal they may go to the legal adviser's office, if primarily trade, to the Department's economic section. My immediate superior is the Under Secretary. He may designate his deputy to coordinate the work of my office with other areas of State. At the moment Governor Harriman is coordinating the work of my office. Depending on the nature of the problem my office works with the geographic bureaus which have overall responsibility for the affairs of the countries concerned, with the legal adviser's office, and the economic section.

We work closely with the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior, and with the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The Department of State has a Fishing Industry Advisory Committee which also includes representatives of State governments concerned with international fishery problems. This committee meets once a year, or more often if circumstances warrant it, to consider with State and Interior Department representatives government policy on international fishery problems and specific courses of action on particular problems. This provides the industry advisers with information on the ramifications of the fishery problems, much of which is not public knowledge, and provides government with information on the details of industry operations and the impact on these operations of various courses of action that might be considered. The information and advice of this group has been invaluable in shaping government policy and, where the interests of various segments of the industry are conflicting, finding a course of action which best reconciles the various interests and which all can support. Many Members of Congress are interested in these problems and their assistance is invaluable in many of the actions we undertake.

Taking these activities all together I think one can conclude that international fishery problems do get a considerable amount of attention in Washington. The object of all this activity, of course, is to find solutions which further U.S. interests and which are consistent with international law and accepted international practice.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in a recent article for one of the fine newspapers of New Jersey, the Newark Star-Ledger, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey outlined his legislative program for the coming session.

Although he is especially well known for his deep knowledge of urban affairs, his interests are wide. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, he has waged a valiant fight to improve the lot of the forgotten Americans who harvest our crops; and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Frauds and Misrepresentations Affecting the Elderly, he has done fine work in exposing the frauds and quacks who prey on our senior citizens.

In this interesting article, Senator WILLIAMS eloquently discusses these and other problems. Most important, he shows his profound concern with building and improving our educational system, surely the cornerstone of the Great Society.

I am sure his thoughts will be of interest to all Senators; and I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Newark Star-Ledger be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Jan. 24, 1965]

TIME RUNNING OUT ON OUR URBAN AREAS

In the exciting opening days of the new session of Congress, the Great Society has ceased to be a good campaign slogan and has become a tangible and practicable goal. In his state of the Union message and his health and education messages, President Johnson has already outlined some of the important legislation which will provide the building blocks for the Great Society of tomorrow.

The legislation on which the Congress will act in the coming months will be of tremendous importance to the citizens of New Jersey. As the Senator from a rapidly growing and highly urbanized State, I was greatly encouraged by the Johnson administration's awareness of the needs and problems of our great cities. More than 85 percent of New Jersey's population lives within metropolitan areas, and in the years ahead the vast majority of all America's population will live in cities. The Congress and the President know that time is running out for our great urban areas, and unless we act now, future generations will spend their lives in an ugly amalgamation of asphalt and concrete.

New Jersey lies in the heart of the supercity which will one day spread from Boston to Washington. My chief goal as a Senator from New Jersey will be to make sure that our cities are beautiful, healthful, and happy places in which to live and work. As President Johnson phrased it so eloquently in his state of the Union message:

"An educated and healthy people require surroundings in harmony with their hopes.

"In our urban areas the central problem today is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community where he can find security and significance."

This will be the central theme of my work in Congress.

The major legislation which the President has proposed so far strikes directly at the problems of our cities. In his education message, President Johnson has proposed bold and imaginative answers to the educational needs of our children. This $1.5 billion package will pour more than $24 million into New Jersey's school system and of this almost $18 million will be used for the education of children of low income families. Money will be allotted to those school districts where large number of families are living on poverty level incomes.

In addition, preschool programs will be started to enable the slum child—often a year behind the average child in academic achievement—to receive the most benefit from his formal schooling. Three million dollars will go toward improving school libraries and for making more and better textbooks available to New Jersey schoolchildren. Supplementary education centers, which will provide specialized services in language and science training, guidance counseling, programs for the handicapped, and social work services will be established through grants to the State totaling more than $3 million. I have joined with Senator Morse in cosponsoring a bill, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which will go far toward accomplishing this necessary strengthening and improving of the educational quality and opportunities of our Nation's schools.

WIDE COVERAGE

The education program covers the entire spectrum of educational need. In this age of automation, a high school diploma is no longer a luxury, it is a necessity. The poverty act work study programs, to provide part-time employment to keep potential high school dropouts in school, are already at work in New Jersey. But we must make sure that the talented high school graduate is able to go on to college or to a technical school.

Last year, I offered a bill to provide scholarships and low-cost, guaranteed loans to students. Under this proposal, the Government would have paid part of the student's interest costs. I am happy that the administration has now adopted this approach to college student aid, and the President has recommended similar legislation to the Congress in this session.

There are two other educational proposals in which I have a deep interest. While the cold war continues, many of our young men will have their education interrupted by military service and they will all too often serve their country's defense at the risk of their own lives. Therefore, during my service in the Senate, I have continually fought for a "cold war GI bill" which will allow today's veteran to continue and to complete his education.

Only a small percentage of our youth ever have to perform military service. Their contemporaries are able to begin their careers or pursue their education without this interruption. The cold war GI bill would enable the veteran to make up for his lost time, and to begin his working life on an equal footing with the nonveteran. Again in this session, I have sponsored legislation to create an education program for cold war veterans.

DIRECTION NEED

The increasing participation of the Federal Government in our Nation's education has created a need for a high-level position to direct and coordinate our educational activities. At present, almost 42 different government agencies administer various educational programs. I have joined with my colleague, Senator Ribicoff, a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in sponsoring a bill to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Education. The new Secretary of Education would coordinate and supervise the educational efforts of the Government and undertake the long-range planning necessary for the Government to work closely with States and local communities to improve our educational systems.

The Nation's health is another area into which we can and must channel our vast resources. An adequate, soundly financed program of medical care for our elderly combined with a rise in social security benefits, will ease the financial burdens of retirement which now weigh so heavily on our 18 million citizens over 65.

More than half of our elderly citizens now have no health insurance at all, and many of the private policies for old-age health insurance pay inadequate benefits. Medicare will protect the savings and incomes of the elderly from being wiped out by crushing medical expenses, and will prevent parents from imposing tragic financial demands on their children.

To me one of the most exciting health measures to come before the Congress is the proposal to create regional medical centers. Under a 5-year program, these regional centers would provide specialized services for the treatment of major killers such as heart disease, strokes, and cancer. Affiliated with medical schools, these centers could develop and try out new techniques for eliminating these age-old destroyers of life. They would be centers for a coordinated and concentrated attack on disease.

With our renewed determination to improve the life of our cities, I am confident that a Cabinet-level post to deal with urban affairs will be established this year. I was most encouraged that the President called for the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development in his state of the Union message. Such a department would make our efforts to build better housing, and better commuter transit systems even more effective.

One bill of the greatest importance to me as a Senator from New Jersey is the Immigration Reform Act. New Jersey is a State where citizens from many lands live and work together; the national heritages of these different countries have made a vital contribution to our progress and our culture.

As this brief review has indicated, this session will be busy and active. This is a time of hope for America. Although we must continue to resist vigorously the encroachment of communism on the free world, cold war tensions are gradually easing. Defense spending has leveled off, and this year will be reduced by about $300 million. Although this poses problems for some industries, it will mean that in the years ahead we can devote an increasing share of our national wealth to meeting the health, education, and housing needs of our great Nation. Although it will be a long time before we reach a truly peaceful world, at long last we can begin to beat our swords of war into the ploughshares of peace.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the citizens of the United States share the loss of the people of Great Britain in the death of Winston Churchill, and join them in public acknowledgment of his contributions to our times. His leadership at a time of great danger to the freedom of nations and men is a matter of history and his place in it is secure.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial tribute to Winston Churchill, the wartime leader and the man, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1965]

Sir Winston Churchill

The power and the glory are gone, the soaring oratory, the eloquent pen, the cherubic face, the impish twinkle in his eyes, the jaunty cigar, the vitality that sparked a world.

One measure of Churchill's greatness is that no one today, now that the blaze of his genius has subsided into dust and ashes, need explain or describe or grope for words. He is one of those rare figures in history who stand like skyscrapers above the merely great. Usually history waits to recognize its supreme leaders, but there is no need to wait in Churchill's case.

He was Britain's glory in a special way, for he somehow managed to personify what is magnificent in the English race, and what is most appealing—John Bull with imperfections and eccentricities, but with the courage, the doggedness, the loyalty, the strength. Many who sought to isolate the essential quality of his greatness fastened upon the astonishing vitality. Never was there a man so durable, so indefatigable, so indomitable. It is almost incredible that there was a man among us yesterday who rode in the charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman and was a Member of Parliament under Queen Victoria, who served as his nation's Prime Minister as late as 1955.

Yet, durability and vitality are not in themselves a guarantee of greatness. They only assured him life and dominance at a moment of history when all his gifts and those of his people could combine to produce the miracle of Britain in the Second World War.

There was some quality of anticlimax about the rest. When the Great War was won, Winston Churchill was rejected as his nation's leader. A few of his military commanders were critical in their memoirs of some of his wartime decisions—as an earlier generation had been critical of his Gallipoli campaign in 1915–16.

A decade ago his work was done, in the sense that he no longer had the strength to carry on in his beloved House of Commons, although he remained a Member of Parliament almost to the end. In some ways the whole of his life was devoted to the House of Commons. He did go on writing and, in fact, the fourth and last volume of his monumental "History of the English-Speaking Peoples" was published only in 1958. Writing for him was always an avocation although for years he had to make a living out of it and wrote superbly.

He was, too, an orator whose speeches were never dull and sometimes reached the most inspiring heights of which our language is capable. Like Shakespeare, he will be "full of quotations" so long as the English language lives. But no one in later generations will ever recapture the thrill that came to us, listening over the radio in moments of glory and agony, as we heard Winston Churchill speak of "blood, toil, tears and sweat," of "their finest hour," of fighting on the beaches, in the fields, in the streets, of so much being owed by so many to so few.

In the sweet, sad process of looking back we have the consolation of these memories. A man like Winston Churchill makes everyone a part of his life, as if a little of that greatness were shared by each of us. That he should have been half-American as well as "all English" was a special source of pleasure to Americans. Nowhere beyond his native land will he be more sincerely mourned than throughout the length and breadth of these United States.

Winston Churchill was the glory of a tremendous era in history encompassed by the two World Wars. He leaves one feeling that an age has gone into history with him. Years ago he wrote that he gave "sincere thanks to the high gods for the gift of existence." We, too, have reason to be thankful for that gift.

One would like to think of his passing in terms jotted down in a notebook by another supremely great human being, Leonardo da

Vinci: "Just as a day well spent brings happy sleep, so a life well spent brings happy death."

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the cruelty with which man will treat his fellow man often overwhelms me. In recent years we have seen too many tragic examples of cruel oppression, of snatching long fought for and hard won freedom from nations that were just beginning to learn what this greatest of possessions really means.

Forty-seven years ago the determined nation of Ukraine finally won its independence after several hundred difficult, strife-filled years. This liberty was well earned. Only a people dedicated to the principles of freedom and stouthearted enough to persevere years of fighting and torment could have mustered the strength to bring their great dream of freedom into being. The determined and strong people of the Ukraine had these qualities. On January 22, 1918, the word was spread across this brave little nation, "Freedom had come."

Freedom, indeed, had come, but it was short lived. A mere 2 years after their precious achievement, the bold people of the Ukraine felt the iron gauntlet of the Soviet Union and every vestige of freedom in their land was destroyed.

The ruthless and imperialistic oppression of the people of the Ukraine by the Communist dictators in Moscow has not and will not be forgotten. The people of the Ukraine will not be stopped in their desire for freedom by the point of the Soviet sword.

On this 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, it is the obligation of all freedom-loving peoples to rededicate themselves to the task of freeing all captive peoples throughout the world and ending once and for all time the enslavement of our fellow men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 5, Senate bill 4, the Water Quality Act of 1965, which was made the unfinished business yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I support the amendment added by the House of Representatives to the supplemental appropriation bill.

It is long past time for the Congress to legislate the policy under which foreign aid and food for peace is administered. In fact, Congress tried to avoid this very situation 2 years ago by adding the so-called "aggressors" amendment to the foreign aid bill. In it, aggression was defined so as to bring about a termination of aid when a recipient undertook aggressive adventures against other recipients of our aid.

But the executive branch has ignored the letter and the purpose of that amendment. "Don't mention countries" they always tell us when we review aid legislation. So we did not mention any countries in the "aggressors" amendment, whereupon they have simply ignored it.

Had the administration followed the directive of extending no aid and making no sales under Public Law 480 to a nation guilty of aggression against other nations friendly to the United States we would not be compelled now to specify the United Arab Republic. The refusal of the administration to enforce the aggressor amendment requires Congress to take further action.

Interference in the President's direction of foreign policy? That is the objection raised by the administration. Such an objection is unsound. This is not a foreign policy matter for which the President is responsible under the Constitution.

This is a statute. I say most respectfully that there is a crying need for a refresher course in the State Department on the very elementary principles of the setup of this form of government. They apparently do not comprehend the meaning of the separation-of-powers doctrine. They apparently do not comprehend the meaning of government by law. They apparently do not comprehend what they teach the children from the grade schools through their postgraduate courses in college, that this is a system of government by three coordinate, coequal branches of government. This is not a government of presidential supremacy, of executive supremacy. The American people must be on guard against this trend in this Republic. Year after year, we are marching farther down the road toward a government by presidential supremacy in the United States. People should read their history. When societies in the past followed that course of action, they ended by losing the freedom of the people. They moved into a police state, taking one form or another of executive supremacy.

As we move into the historic debate on foreign aid this year, this is one Senator that will continue to fight to place checks upon the executive branch of the Government in connection with the administration of foreign aid. Foreign aid rests upon a statute. Senators in this body cannot continue to abdicate their responsibility to direct the executive branch of this Government in the administration of foreign aid. Why, for the past 2 years, we received committee reports from the Committee on Foreign Relations which set out one criticism of foreign aid after another. But the Foreign Relations Committee has refused to do anything about their own criticisms. The overwhelming majority of the Foreign Relations Committee, in committee reports for the past 2 years, has said to the executive branch of the Government: "If you do not do something about these criticisms, you are going to be in trouble in your next foreign aid bill."

Here is one member of the Committee on Foreign Relations who will challenge the Committee on Foreign Relations this year to do something about its own criticisms of foreign aid. I shall insist that they stop passing the buck to the executive branch of the Government with a slap on the wrist and saying: "If you do not do something about it, you are going to have trouble with foreign aid."

Let me say to this administration that it is in trouble over foreign aid across this country from hamlet to hamlet. The issue that has been raised by the House of Representatives presents to us now the first call to action in carrying out what I consider to be the responsibilities of Congress—to protect the rights of the American people in the administration of all types of foreign aid.

We are dealing with a statute. It is the responsibility of Congress to see that the policy and purpose of the statute are clearly set forth and carried out. Without a statute authorizing the President to administer Public Law 480, there would be no sales to the United Arab Republic or to anyone else.

Congress has created the program, and Congress can end the program without interfering one whit in the President's foreign policy functions.

Let no one tell me that it is a matter of tying the President's hands. It is a matter of fulfilling our own responsibilities.

The concept that Congress can create and maintain by law an international aid program, and then wash its hands of responsibility for the results is not going to be accepted by the voters who sent us here.

A repudiation of our commitment under Public Law 480? That is what the administration was alibiing as of yesterday afternoon. I say that when Colonel Nasser spit in the eye of the United States he terminated the commitment. The longer we allow Nasser to wipe his feet upon us, the more we prove he is right when he claims that aid from the West is a right, yes, a right, of the less developed nations.

There is being developed in the world today, on the part of the less developed nations, propaganda that they are entitled, as a matter of right, to aid from this country. Taking this position, Nasser's insults, his open aggression against our friends, and his attacks upon American property, public and private, are Nasser's way of proving to his own people, to the Arab world, and to all the undeveloped nations that those who demand tribute from the United States will get it.

The Department of State has been helping him to prove his case. It insists that there should be no standards for food for peace. The State Department has been Nasser's patsy, as it has been Sukarno's. But Congress is not. And only in Congress acts by adopting the House amendment will we establish that the American people are not, either.

Unless we are firm on this matter, we of Congress are going to confirm that any and all smalltime Mussolinis of this world have a claim to American food and to American aid with no obligation whatsoever on their part to use it wisely or in conformity with American objectives.

This amendment is no interference with the affairs of another nation. Nasser is free to run his country and its foreign affairs as he likes. But we do not have to help him do it. That is the test. We do not have to help every government do whatever it takes a fancy to. Nasser can tell us to go jump in the lake, he can burn our libraries, invade Yemen, and aid the Congo rebels. But we do not have to subsidize all these things.

Unless we act now, we are going to have all the Nassers of the next hundred years in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East putting in their claim on American money and food as their rightful due.

The time has come for the Congress, as the House has already done, to file a caveat in the form of the amendment adopted by the House. The State Department is trying to sell the propaganda to the American people that in some way, somehow, we are under some kind of contractual commitment. It is an elementary principle of contract law that when one party to a contract follows a course of action that violates the terms of the contract, that party abrogates the contract.

In my judgment, the course of conduct of Nasser constitutes an abrogation of any commitment which the State Department alleges the U.S. Government has made in this matter.

The time has come for the Congress to meet this issue, and I am ready to have it met. I am ready to have the Members of Congress cast their vote. If Congress wants to follow a course of action that I consider to be an abdication of our responsibility under the legislative responsibility it took unto itself when it passed the authorization bill, let those who will so vote answer to the people who sent them here.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr.MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the purpose of information, what is the present language of Public Law 480 with respect to the discretionary right of the administration to send food to the various nations of the world? Secondly, why was the House amendment necessary?

Mr. MORSE. I cannot give the Senator from Ohio, off the top of my head, the exact language. But clearly any discretionary language would in no way prevent Congress from exercising its function by stopping the delivery of food when a country with a little dictator follows such a course of action as Nasser has followed against the United States. I do not see how we could possibly justify sending to Egypt at the present time food of the great value called for in the aid program until Nasser mends his ways.

In my judgment, we cannot permit these little dictators to turn the United States into a shoewiping rag, but that is what they are doing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. About 2 weeks ago, I made a statement on the floor of the Senate, after the newspapers had repeatedly carried stories about our libraries, embassies, and properties being destroyed in foreign lands. My statement related to the assault upon our honor and the destruction of our property in Egypt. At that time, I stated that unless we did something about it we would be giving encouragement to people all over the world—in spite of our generosity in helping them—to tear down our flag, to destroy our embassies, to burn up our libraries, and we would do nothing about it.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With regard to Egypt, I have felt that Nasser wanted to take our aid, but at every critical moment he declares himself to be in favor of the course of action followed by our enemies.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Ohio is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Oregon has just mentioned that Egypt is being used as a corridor to send Red Chinese and Russian equipment into the Congo.

Mr. MORSE. It is also a training center area.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is sending in military equipment to Algeria, Egypt, Ghana, and the Sudan, which is creating a new problem for us.

Mr. President, I cannot understand it. We believe that by suffering these slaps in the face, by suffering the repudiation of our principles and still allowing our bounty and generosity to become the source of aid to them, we are helping our country.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from Ohio. Let me say to him that I intend to speak only briefly today on this situation. I have made this brief statement which is my answer to the propaganda drive of the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, on yesterday, to try to persuade Congress to abdicate what I consider to be its responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States in regard to lawmaking.

I shall speak at much greater length, from time to time, during this session of Congress, as we move into the historic debate on foreign aid, because I happen to believe that this is the year in which Congress must return to its exercise of the authority available to it in regard to the foreign aid program.

In one of those early speeches—and I am working on one now—I shall discuss developments in Latin America. I shall speak as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs. But there are certain forces in Latin America that seem to feel that they should be considered now as being entitled to aid from us in regard to certain kinds of aid as a matter of right.

Watch out for it, because they will try to single us out and hold us up to the world as a country walking out on some kind of obligation.

This year, we had better make it perfectly clear that in connection with foreign aid we are going to help those willing to help themselves in cooperation with us.

We are willing to help with loans on sound investments. Of course, we are going to carry out our great humanitarian obligations to be of assistance to people in times of great tragedy or of starvation, and so forth; but we had better watch out, the way the Public Law 480 program is being handled, to make certain that we do not establish certain precedents of policy that we will rue in the not too distant future.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that Congress has altogether too frequently been abdicating its responsibility and transferring it to the executive branch under the guise of the use of discretionary power; that is, we write into laws a broad authority for the executive branch to adopt a course that is inconsistent with what was initially intended in the passing of those laws. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that this abdication of responsibility does not only reside in the foreign aid program; it resides in countless other programs when we give broad power to the various agencies of the executive branch of the Government to practically become legislative bodies through regulations.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator can say that over and over again. He is so right. It is one phase of the march down the road toward government of executive supremacy in this country. I am for checking it.

BORROWINGS IN THE UNITED STATES BY THE WORLD BANK AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL MONETARY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few days ago I spoke on the floor of the Senate in some criticism of the policies of the U.S. Treasury Department in connection with borrowing in the United States on the part of the World Bank and other international monetary organizations.

I have received a very much appreciated letter on this subject from Representative Henry S. Reuss. His letter and the enclosure in it show that Representative Reuss is concerned about some of the same phases of the same problem that I mentioned.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Congressional Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement which Representative Reuss released in the form of a press release on January 15, 1965, entitled "Reuss 'Regrets' World Bank Borrowing in United States."

I highly commend Representative Reuss' comment, and I want him to know that I associate myself with his views.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reuss "Regrets" World Bank Borrowing in United States

The United States must make additional efforts to eliminate its balance-of-payments deficit, Representative Henry S. Reuss, chairman of the House Subcommittee on International Finance and of the Joint Senate-House Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments, said today.

Despite the interest equalization tax in effect throughout 1964, Reuss said, "capital outflow from the United States to the surplus reserve and payments countries of Western Europe is still too large. We ought to be doing everything possible to discourage capital outflow from this country to areas like the Common Market. If need be, we must curb long-term bank loans and ballooning private direct investments in such countries. It is the countries of Western Europe, not the United States, who should currently be doing the major job of capital export."

Reuss also said: "Our basic balance-of-payments position has shown steady improvement, with a record merchandise trade surplus currently running nearly $7 billion per year. The high fourth quarter overall deficit estimated to have been at the annual rate of $4 to $5 billion was due almost entirely to a bunching of Canadian borrowing, exempt from the interest equalization tax, and the deferral of payments by Britain on a U.S. loan. A major part of the remaining basic deficit of $2 to $2.5 billion (annual rate) is due to a sustained high volume of private capital outflow from this country and the absence of an equalizing outflow from the surplus rich countries of Europe.

"Under these circumstances, I think it unwise for the U.S. Government to allow the World Bank to sell its $200 million bond issue in New York this week. When I first heard of this proposed borrowing last summer, I urged the Treasury to deny the World Bank access to our capital market at this time. Though it had the clear power to do so, the Treasury disagreed with me.

"While some part of the new $200 million bond issue can result in increased U.S. exports, there is a substantial net addition to our deficit. Because World Bank money is lent only as 'hard loans' to creditworthy borrowers, including relatively well-off countries like Japan and Norway, it could afford to borrow money from the European capital market at higher interest rates, and it would be welcome there as it has been in the past. By confining its bond borrowing to Europe, the World Bank could help to reduce the payments imbalance between the United States and Europe as well as to increase its lendable capital.

"It should be part of our balance-of-payments program on limiting capital outflow to divert borrowers like the World Bank or the developed countries to other capital markets. We also have an equal responsibility to save our capital resources for countries which could not qualify for World Bank or private capital loans and for those in balance-of-payments difficulties."

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 4 to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on October 16, 1963, the Senate considered S. 649, a bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. It was a bill which had been subject to rigorous and extensive hearings, producing over 1,000 pages of testimony. It had been subjected to intensive study by the members of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution and the members of the full Committee on Public Works. Members of both parties worked on revisions in the legislation. The final product, as reported to the Senate, retained the original objectives of the bill, but incorporated significant changes which were responsive to the hearing testimony and to the flow of ideas and discussions in the subcommittee. The bill was debated in some detail on October 16, being tested by Members of the Senate who had sincere doubts as to some of its provisions.

Following debate, the Senate passed S. 649 by a vote of 69 to 11, and of the 20 Members not voting, 15 announced themselves as favoring its passage. The House Public Works Committee reported an amended version during the closing days of the 88th Congress. However, no further action was taken by the other body.

In the months and weeks before the opening of the 89th Congress, the members of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution and others interested in the Water Pollution Control Act reviewed S. 649 and the needed changes in the program. S. 4, which is now before the Senate, represents the consensus of that group. It has been cosponsored by 31 of my colleagues, including all members of the subcommittee in the 88th Congress. A hearing was held on the legislation, January 18, 1965. As reported to the Senate, it is identical with S. 649, with two deletions and several perfecting amendments which were adopted by the committee. I shall comment on those changes later in my remarks.

I believe S. 4 is a sound and meaningful legislative approach to the enhancement of the quality of our national water resources. I believe its adoption will strengthen our pollution control and abatement program and will contribute to expanded and more effective efforts at the regional, State, and local level.

I want to express my appreciation to my colleagues who have made a substantial contribution to the development and perfection of S. 4. The chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], created the special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution and has given the subcommittee his backing and support. The ranking majority member of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], has devoted considerable time and effort to the legislation, offering many helpful suggestions.

The ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], has been a creative and constructive partner from the very beginning. His patience and good will and his determination to achieve a reasonable meeting of the minds were essential to our success in the 88th Congress and today.

The exchanges on S. 649 and S. 4 have been healthy. The senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], whose disagreement with the majority of the committee has been recorded in our reports and in the debate, has contributed to a more complete understanding of the issues involved.

The development of S. 4, the Water Quality Act of 1965, has been a rewarding experience for me. It is, in my opinion, the product of creative dialog and legislative craftsmanship.

S. 4 is consistent with and supports the objectives outlined by President Johnson in his state of the Union message, in which he called for an expanded conservation program as part of our effort to achieve the Great Society:

> For over three centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage. In a fruitful new partnership with the States and cities the next decade should be a conservation milestone. * * *
>
> We will seek legal power to prevent pollution of our air and water before it happens. We will step up our effort to control harmful wastes, giving just priority to the cleanup of our most contaminated rivers. We will increase research to learn much more about the control of pollution.

These objectives and approaches stated by the President are reflected in S. 4.

As I mentioned previously, this legislation is, with the exception of two deletions and some perfecting amendments, identical to S. 649, as approved by the Senate on October 16, 1963, by a vote of 69 to 11. The two sections deleted were those relating to the control and abatement of pollution from Federal installations and the problem of nondegradable detergents.

The Federal installations section was eliminated from this bill because similar problems with respect to Federal installations are present in the field of air pollution, as well as water pollution. In addition, there were other matters relating to Federal activities in both fields which require separate and more complete consideration. Because of these factors it was decided to cover these matters in separate legislation.

The detergents section was deleted because the members of the soap and detergent industry have reported changes in their schedules for supplying the market with detergents which will degrade more readily than those presently on the market. In view of this change it was considered advisable to conduct additional hearings on the detergent problem to determine the type or need of corrective legislation.

S. 4 includes the following proposals:

First. To establish an additional position of Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to help the Secretary to administer the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Second. To create a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to administer sections 3, comprehensive programs; 4, interstate cooperation and uniform laws; 10, enforcement measures; and, 11, to control pollution from Federal installations, of the act.

Third. To authorize appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for 3 succeeding fiscal years in the amount of $20 million a year for grants for research and development to demonstrate new or improved methods for the control of combined storm and sanitary sewer discharges.

Fourth. To increase grants to individual sewage treatment projects from $600,000 to $1 million, and to allow multimunicipal combinations grant increases from $2,400,000 to $4 million.

There is also a provision which provides a 10-percent bonus on construction grants for treatment plants where such construction is part of a comprehensive metropolitan plan.

Fifth. To provide procedures for the establishment of water quality standards applicable to interstate waters.

Sixth. To authorize action by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate abatement proceedings where he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution of interstate or navigable waters and actions of Federal, State, or local authorities.

Seventh. Provisions for audits where Federal funds are utilized under the act, and provisions, under the Water Pollution Control Act, for appropriate application of the authority and functions of the Secretary of Labor with respect to labor standards.

The two perfecting amendments to the bill, as adopted by the committee, relate to the quality standards section of the bill. The first clarifies the procedure relating to the revision of water quality standards, so that the same provisions for hearings and consultation, followed in establishing standards in the first instance, will be followed in the revision of those standards. There is, connected with that amendment, another amendment which provides a more logical sequence of paragraphs in the standards section.

The second committee amendment requires the hearing board, under the enforcement procedure, to give consideration to "the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable." This language is identical with that added to the court review section of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, in S. 649 in the 88th Congress. It is considered a clarification of a protection the committee intended to be present in the enforcement provisions of the act.

I have outlined, Mr. President, the provisions of S. 4, its origins, its development, and its senatorial sponsorship and support. In addition, this year, it has the support of the administration, as indicated in the January 18, 1965, letter to Chairman McNamara from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In that letter he wrote, in part:

> The overall purposes of S. 4 are highly desirable, particularly insofar as they are consistent with the President's goals and objectives noted above. We favor, therefore, the enactment of this legislation as necessary for the effective conduct of the national water pollution control program and the accomplishment of its important aims and purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Secretary's letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1965.

Hon. Pat V. McNamara,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This letter is in response to your request of January 11, 1965, for a report on S. 4, a bill, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

In his state of the Union message, delivered to the Congress on January 4, 1965 (H. Doc. No. 1, 89th Cong.), President Johnson set forth important national goals and objectives for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution. The President proposed "that we end the poisoning of our rivers," and to this end he recommended legal power to prevent pollution before it happens and further asserted that we will step up our effort to control harmful wastes, giving first priority to the cleanup of our most contaminated rivers and will increase research to learn much more about the control of pollution. We view the purposes of S. 4 as consonant with these goals and objectives and therefore highly desirable.

The provisions of S. 4 are identical with those of S. 649, 88th Congress, passed by the Senate on October 16, 1963, except for the deletion of the provisions for permits for waste discharges from Federal installations and for measures for the control of synthetic detergents. Our comments on these identical provisions were submitted to you in our letter of October 11, 1963.

As stated therein, we fully support the provision of an additional Assistant Secretary position for this Department. This important provision will contribute to the necessary strengthening of the Office of the Secretary and will benefit all the Department's programs.

The proposed program of grants to assist municipalities in the development of projects which will demonstrate new or improved methods of controlling discharges of sewage and wastes from storm sewers and combined storm and sanitary sewers will aid greatly in resolving this very critical pollution problem. A recent report prepared by the Public Health Service, entitled, "Pollutional Effects of Stormwater and Overflows from Combined Sewer Systems; a Preliminary Appraisal," reveals the following significant aspects of this problem: Approximately 59 million people in more than 1,900 communities are served by combined sewers and combinations of combined and separate sewer systems. Storm water and combined sewer overflows are responsible for major amounts of polluting material in the Nation's receiving waters, and the tendency with growing urbanization is for these amounts to increase. Both combined overflows and storm water contribute significant amounts of pollutional materials to watercourses. These discharges affect all known water uses adversely in the receiving watercourses. Complete separation of storm water from sanitary sewers and treatment of all waste is the ultimate control measure to provide maximum protection to receiving waters. Total costs for complete separation based on scattered information are estimated to be in the $20 to $30 billion range. The report recommends demonstration projects identical in purpose with those specified in S. 4 as an attack on the problem and to provide information for future action. While we fully endorse the objectives of this provision of the bill, we wish to advise the committee that the administration will be proposing a community facility grants program. The organizational and coordinating arrangements for this and related existing programs are still under consideration, and will be dealt with in future recommendations to the Congress.

We agree with the desirability of increasing the existing dollar ceiling limitations on the amount of a single project grant from $600,000 to $1 million and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a project in which two or more communities jointly participate. This amendment will provide a more equitable measure of assistance to those projects involving disproportionately higher costs and substantially stimulate the construction of necessary waste treatment facilities by larger communities, where the attendant needs are commensurately greater.

The bill provides that the amount of a grant for a project may be increased by 10 percent of that amount if the project is certified as conforming with a comprehensive plan for the metropolitan area in which the project is to be constructed. We believe that a direct financial incentive such as this is desirable to encourage municipalities to coordinate and conform, if practicable, to the facility plan for the metropolitan or regional area, both in the interests of effective water pollution control and because of the substantial savings in expenditures that may be realized to all levels of government as a result of such area coordination. This provision of S. 4 and the proposed increases in the dollar limitations for any single or joint construction project implement the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its October 1962 report on "Intergovernmental Responsibilities for Water Supply and Sewage Disposal in Metropolitan Areas."

The provisions for establishment of standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters would appear to have for their purpose the prevention of pollution before its inception. Sound water quality standards are capable of serving as valuable guidelines for municipalities and industries in providing for effective treatment and disposal of their wastes so as to prevent pollution situations from arising. We are in agreement, therefore, as to the necessity and desirability of these provisions.

Such industries as the commercial shellfish and fishing enterprises, which are importantly engaged in the shipping and marketing of seafood products, are particularly susceptible to the deleterious effects of pollution. In addition to the immediate health hazards involved, the uncontrolled discharges of waste matters in proximity to shellfish bed and commercial fish habitat areas inflict grave economic losses upon these industries through the resultant necessary closing of such areas to harvesting operations. The proposal of S. 4 directing the application of enforcement authority and procedures in such instances would provide corrective relief measures presently unavailable to those operators whose economic livelihood is imperiled through such pollution.

The overall purposes of S. 4 are highly desirable, particularly insofar as they are consistent with the President's goals and objectives noted above. We favor, therefore, the enactment of this legislation as necessary for the effective conduct of the national water pollution control program and the accomplishment of its important aims and purposes.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY CELEBREZZE,
Secretary.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the provisions of S. 4 also have the support of the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, by resolutions adopted by the Board on June 12, 1963, and November 10, 1964. This distinguished panel of public-spirited citizens maintains a continuing relationship with the water pollution control program and has an intimate knowledge of its operation within the Public Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names and titles of the members and the resolutions of the Board relating to the creation of a Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

Chairman, ex officio: Hon. James M. Quigley, Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Executive secretary: Mr. Robert C. Ayers, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Earle G. Burwell, former member, Wyoming State Stream Pollution Committee, Casper, Wyo.

Mr. M. James Gleason, commissioner, Multnomah County, County courthouse, Portland, Oreg.

Mr. Raymond A. Haik, attorney-at-law, Minneapolis, Minn.

Mrs. Burnette Y. Hennington, national secretary, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Northside Station, Jackson, Miss.

Mr. Gerald A. Jackson, vice president, Champion Papers, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Lee Roy Matthias, executive vice president, Red River Valley Association, Shreveport, La.

Mr. Blucher A. Poole, director, bureau of environmental sanitation, State board of health, Indianapolis, Ind.

Mr. William E. Towell, director, Missouri Conservation Commission, Jefferson City, Mo.

Mr. William E. Warne, director, California Department of Water Resources, Sacramento, Calif.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD ON JUNE 12, 1963

Whereas the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board was created by Congress and members are appointed by the President for the purpose of reviewing the water pollution problem of this country, appraising public opinion on the subject and making recommendations which would lead to the formation of policies which would effectuate better water pollution control throughout the Nation; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress legislation which would transfer the administration of the Federal water pollution control program out of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

Whereas there is also pending before the Congress legislation which would establish a separate administrative agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Federal water pollution control program; and

Whereas this Board is previously on record in favor of the establishment of such a separate administrative organization within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Now be it

Resolved—

1. That considering the availability of highly qualified water pollution control personnel now in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and considering the wealth of knowledge and experience accumulated within that Department in this area this Board strongly urges and recommends that the administration of water pollution control be retained within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

2. This Board specifically endorses and urges the adoption either by administrative action by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or by congressional enactment, that section of S. 649 and H.R. 3161 (or similar pending bills) which relates to the establishment of a separate administrative agency for water pollution control within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chairman of this Board is requested to bring the contents of this resolution to the attention of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Water and Air Pollution and the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and Public Works so that they may be fully appraised of this Board's deep concern for the need of the immediate upgrading of the water pollution control program within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

RESOLUTION CREATING A WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Resolved, That the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, in executive session this 10th day of November 1964, at Chicago, Ill., recommends the creation of a separate Water Pollution Control Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the proposed legislation has the support of the distinguished Governor of California, Edmund G. Brown, who testified before the committee. It is supported by the U.S. Conference of Mayors and other civic organizations. It is supported by the National Wildlife Federation and other conservation groups. Industrial representatives who appeared before the committee and who consulted with us have indicated that while they may not agree with all of its provisions, they believe S. 4 is reasonable in its approach.

Mr. President, I believe S. 4 deserves the high priority accorded it by the administration and by the Senate leadership. Two years have passed since its basic provisions were presented to the Senate. A year and a quarter has passed since the Senate approved S. 649. The improvements that this legislation offers are needed today more than ever.

The need for the acceleration of sewage treatment plant construction and for the correction of the problem of combined sewers is no less urgent than when I introduced S. 649 in January of 1963, or when it passed the Senate in October of that year. As a matter of fact, the delay in enactment of legislation has created a greater backlog of needs in correcting the Nation's water pollution problems.

The committee recognizes that the increased authorizations in S. 4 do not go as far as some members would like. We are conscious of the problems confronting our larger cities where even the $1 million project authorization contained in S. 4 will not approach 30 percent of the project cost. We are also conscious of the growing needs of smaller communities, where the cost of collection sewers—not eligible for aid under the Water Pollution Control Act—is often larger than that of the sewage treatment works. There are many other fiscal and developmental problems connected with the sewage treatment grant program which must be examined. But none of these questions can be considered adequately without giving attention to the problem of overall grant authorizations. It is the committee's intention to give timely and intensive study to this problem. The views of all interested parties will be solicited in an effort to arrive at a sound and fair total authorization and to correct any inequities which exist in the present grant program.

Today our older cities are faced with the necessity of separating their combined storm and sanitary sewers, or devising means whereby the discharge of runoff from city streets is gradually fed through treatment plants to prevent overloading of treatment systems and the discharge of untreated sewage into public waterways. The correction of the problem of combined sewers requires huge expenditures on the part of communities. Current estimates place the cost of separation in the order of $30 billion. The $20 million annual authorization in S. 4 would help launch a research and development program to find improved methods of dealing with the combined sewage problem. Hopefully, this program will also cut the costs of corrective action.

For the program of sewage treatment facilities to be of greater benefit to our larger communities, the limitation on individual and multimunicipal grants needs to be raised. The present ceilings are unrealistic when applied to the considerably greater expenditures which a larger city must bear in installing necessary treatment works. In application, the grants approximate as little or less than 10 percent of the costs involved, and thus they fail to achieve what is at once a primary and necessary objective of the grant program—the incentive to develop local projects for the control and abatement of water pollution.

S. 4 would authorize the establishment of an additional Assistant Secretary to help in the responsibility of the Department to oversee this important sphere of activities. There would also be authorized a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to carry out certain functions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, thus accomplishing two purposes:

First, the new Administration would elevate the status of our water pollution control and abatement programs to a more appropriate and effective level in the Department.

Second, it would free the Public Health Service to concentrate on its primary concern with health in the water pollution field, as it is in other areas.

The importance of establishing water quality standards in our interstate water system is gaining more recognition and support. While this would be a new provision in Federal legislation, it is by no means a new or novel approach to aiding in the improvement of water quality and in the proper management of our water resources. We all recognize that the availability of water of good quality is a necessity for our economic and industrial growth. It is essential to the achievement of the Great Society.

The development and application of water quality standards would enable us to establish objectives and guidelines on the use of our waters and to prevent the misuse and abuse of this vital resource.

Water quality standards would provide techniques which could, in many instances, help us to avoid the necessity for enforcement action. Under present law and procedures nothing is done until pollution has reached the point where it endangers the health or welfare of many people when there then are imposed unconscionable burdens upon industry and others responsible for dealing with it. Then abatement action is taken and efforts are made to correct a situation which could have been prevented if standards of water quality had been established; municipalities and industries could develop realistic plans for new plants or expanded facilities, without uncertainties about waste disposal limitations which may be imposed.

In my own State, as in others, our previously abundant shellfish producing waters have been immeasurably harmed through disposal of deleterious wastes. The economic losses to shellfishermen have been catastrophic. S. 4 could provide them with effective protection for the first time.

These, Mr. President, are the basic provisions of the Water Quality Act of 1965, as amended by the committee. I urge the Senate to approve S. 4 as a major contribution to the quality of American life.

WATER POLLUTION MORE SERIOUS EACH YEAR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I strongly support this legislation being brought before the Senate by the leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

Water pollution is high on the list of our urgent national priorities. Increasing population and industry will necessarily increase water pollution; increasing reuse of the scarce water supplies of a basin will compound pollution problems.

A recent survey showed a national backlog of over $2 billion of waste treatment works needed to be built now; several hundred millions of dollars should be spent annually to keep population growth from increasing water pollution.

The bill before the Senate today is another modest improvement in the water pollution effort the Federal Government has been engaged in for several years. It provides research and development grants for work on the problems of combined storm-sewage systems, increases the maximum grants possible to communities under the sewage treatment works construction program, and improves the administrative authority over the water pollution program including procedures for establishing quality standards for interstate waters. All of these are reasonable and prudent steps that represent progress. Pure water is necessary for a healthy people. Impure water lowers the health level of a people, and increases the death rate. Clean water makes for clean people.

For all of us who labor here in Washington, the need for faster progress in water pollution prevention is illustrated by the Potomac River that so enhances the majesty of this great city. The Potomac is a beautiful river—until one gets close to the stinking thing. So far as I am concerned, none of us can feel content with what has been done against water pollution until there are again bathing beaches on the Potomac within sight of the Capitol. Then we can feel that the needed job is being done.

I commend my colleagues who have labored so diligently in this field; I assure them of my support for continued efforts to combat water pollution across the Nation.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the very able junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], in the remarks he has just made regarding S. 4, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1965. I also want to express my appreciation to him and other members of the committee for the great amount of work which has gone into the preparation of this legislation and its ultimate referral from the committee to the Senate floor for action.

As the Senate knows, an almost identical bill to this passed the Senate in the last Congress but, unfortunately, did not receive final consideration by the other body. The bill presently before the Senate is the result of many days of work by members of the committee and many conferences held between State governments, industries, and Federal officials. It is my considered opinion that in this legislation we have a good bill which will go a long way in protecting the wise use of our water resources.

As I think everyone is well aware, the waters of our Nation are one of our most precious natural resources. They are in fact essential to all aspects of our well-being.

With the population growth and the increasing uses of our available waters, their essentiality is becoming more and more evident.

I think it is also well to keep in mind, Mr. President, that commendable progress in pollution control has been made by industry, municipalities, States, regional authorities, and the Federal Government; and it is only because of the scope, number, and complexity of the problems of pollution that I feel this legislation is timely and provides for a more realistic and effective water pollution control program.

As the distinguished Senator from Maine has pointed out, it provides for an "effective national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

Much concern has been evidenced over the standards section of this legislation; therefore, I would like to make this comment. It is my firm belief that the establishment of standards as provided for in this legislation will reduce the need for enforcement proceedings and facilitate treatment programs because full knowledge would be available as to water quality needs. This authority to establish standards in appropriate cases does not extend the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over water not now covered by existing law. In fact, Mr. President, the members of the committee and the staff have worked diligently in preparing language to make it abundantly clear that the States, interstate agencies, and industries will be fully protected from any arbitrary action by a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding established standards. Senators will note that the report as well as the language of the bill make it abundantly clear that the review authority contained in existing water pollution control laws shall take into consideration the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable.

(At this point Mr. TYDINGS took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to mention one further thing, Mr. President, and that is the fact that the proposed legislation, unlike S. 649 of the past Congress, does not include a section dealing with water pollution control at Federal installations. Both the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Maine, and I, along with others, have introduced a separate piece of proposed legislation dealing with pollution abatement at Federal installations. I feel very strongly that legislation to control pollution at Federal installations is a "must," and that we at the Federal level must place our own house in order before we can expect others to do likewise. I would hope and believe that the Federal installations bill would receive early consideration by the subcommittee and that we would see it enacted into law in this Congress.

Again, Mr. President, let me most sincerely commend the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the chairman of our subcommittee, for his leadership in this field of water pollution control and for the many kindnesses and courtesies, he has extended to me during all of our deliberations in the creation of a meaningful proposal in the field of water pollution control.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to consider this proposed legislation most favorably, and look toward its passage. This proposed legislation will be a reasonable and practical step toward the protection and wise use of our water resources.

I thank the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, for yielding to me.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank my good friend the Senator from Delaware for his helpful and useful statement, lucid as always, and for his kind, personal remarks.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. First, I commend the Senator from Maine for his excellent statement on the pending bill. The Senator will recall that last year, when a similar bill was considered by our Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution Control, a considerable amount of attention was devoted to what might be called the problem of judicial review, with a view to making very clear the procedure that would be followed if the bill became law. I should like to ask the Senator a few questions.

On page 9, the bill contains a provision indicating that violations are "subject to abatement in accordance with the provisions of this section." The section reference is to section 10 of the basic Federal Air and Pollution Control Act, a part of which is amended, along with additions, by the pending bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. The present section 8 will become section 10, if the bill is passed.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Let us assume that action for abatement were taken because of what appeared to be a violation by some individual. What would be the first step involved?

Mr. MUSKIE. The first step would be the calling of a conference, notice of which would be given to States, State agencies, interstate agencies, industries, and municipalities. Any parties in interest would be brought into the conference for the purpose of considering all matters dealing with the problem of pollution in the waters involved. I emphasize that the waters must be interstate waters, under the act.

Mr. MILLER. If the conference procedure, which I presume would be relatively informal, did not result in an abatement, what would be the next step?

Mr. MUSKIE. The conference procedure would be informal. It would not be an adverse procedure in any sense at that point. Its purpose is to establish a factual basis upon which the Secretary may determine whether or not to proceed with an abatement order. The conference would make its report to the Secretary. The Secretary, following the conference, would be required, under the law, to prepare and forward to all water pollution agencies attending the conference a summary of the conference discussions.

In effect, this is a notice to the agencies involved, State and interstate, of the findings of the conference on this very point.

The Secretary is then required to allow at least 6 months for the States or interstate agencies to act upon any recommendations he may make in connection with the conference report. The period is at least 6 months.

If at the conclusion of the period which he allows—and that period is stated, so that all parties are on notice—such remedial action has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held before a hearing board appointed by the Secretary.

Mr. MILLER. Do I understand that in the proceedings before that hearing board, it would be expected that the procedure would indeed be an adversary type procedure?

Mr. MUSKIE. Let me read the provision of the act. I am speaking of the present law, and not of S. 4. It reads:

> Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the Hearing Board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the Hearing Board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, called to attend the aforesaid hearing and the alleged polluter or polluters. On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the Hearing Board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the Hearing Board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution. The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution, and shall also send such findings and recommendations and such notice to the State water pollution control agency and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate.

I have read the provisions of the present law in detail in order to emphasize the point that the hearing board, established by the Secretary, does not in itself have the power to direct enforcement action against a polluter. The board is to hear the case as it is developed up to the time when the case is presented to it. Then the board is to make recommendations based upon its findings.

Mr. MILLER. The recommendations are to go to the Secretary. The Secretary, if he thinks such action is indicated, I presume, could then refer the matter to the Department of Justice for enforcement.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. The provision for not less than 6 months' notice, is to give a State or interstate agency an opportunity to move in with its own enforcement board. If they fail to act, in the case of a pollution of waters which is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than those in which the discharge or discharges take place, the Secretary may request the Attorney General of the United States to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to seek abatement of the pollution.

Mr. MILLER. In that action, there would be what might be termed a judicial review. Is that not correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. This is the first adversary proceeding in the whole process, in the sense that we lawyers understand the term "adversary proceedings." It is at this point that the polluter is confronted with the enforcement power of the Government.

Mr. MILLER. At that stage of the proceeding, it would be proper for the person aggrieved and the person against whom the abatement action is being brought to argue the reasonableness of the standards under which the abatement action had been taken?

Mr. MUSKIE. Precisely.

Mr. MILLER. I understand further that in this bill, we have specifically written in another matter than can be considered. It provides on page 10, subsection (d), that the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable is also relevant matter. Is that not correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. I ought to explain what the provision in the bill which the Senator has just read means. Under S. 4 as originally drawn and S. 649 as passed by the Senate, the court was given the power to consider the practicability of complying with the act. This language would give like power to a hearing board in connection with the functions we have described. I think the board had that power under S. 4 as written, but to make it clear, we have inserted it in the language in the section dealing with the powers of the hearing board.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the Senator's extended reply to my question. It will help in making clear what the legislative intention of this language is.

One further observation. The Senator has said that at least a 6-month delay must occur to give State agencies an opportunity to proceed in an abatement action. I assume that the procedures under the State laws involved would embrace judicial review. Is that correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. I did not hear the last part of the question.

Mr. MILLER. I assume that the procedures under the State laws involved would admit of judicial review.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. So, either way, the aggrieved person, whether it be in a procedure before a State agency or a procedure under the law proposed by S. 4, has the assurance that there will be an opportunity for judicial review under which the reasonableness of the standards and practicability of compliance therewith will be considered?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper].

Mr. COOPER. I say to my friend from Iowa that the amendment which I will propose goes to the very point that has been discussed. I shall not discuss it at this time. I disagree wholly with the thesis on which the Senator from Maine bases his argument.

Mr. MUSKIE. I have been reading from the provisions of the present law. I have not interpolated any words of my own.

I yield now to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly on another matter, but before I do so, I congratulate the Senator from Maine for taking up this very important issue. Increasingly we have interstate problems in dealing with water pollution. The Mississippi is a polluted stream, but eight or nine States are involved in the pollution, and it is difficult to obtain united action on this problem. The same problem exists on lower Lake Michigan as between Indiana and Illinois. The Senator from Maine has made a fine contribution to the solution of this problem.

NOMINATION OF NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a few moments ago the President sent to us the name of Nicholas Katzenbach to be Attorney General of the United States. I rise to commend this appointment. Mr. Katzenbach has had a distinguished academic and legal career. He is a graduate of Princeton University, of Oxford, and the Yale Law School. He had the good sense to come to Illinois, and for a number of years was professor of law at the University of Chicago, of which faculty I was once a member. Here he made a very enviable academic record and won the respect of all.

When Mr. Robert F. Kennedy became Attorney General, Mr. Nicholas Katzenbach became an Assistant Attorney General. Then upon the appointment of Deputy Attorney General White to the Supreme Court he was appointed by President Kennedy to that office. Here he bore for several years the burdens of that responsible position. So far as I can tell, he has administered the office with great courage and fairness.

Since the resignation and subsequent election to the Senate of Robert F. Kennedy, Mr. Katzenbach has served as the Acting Attorney General and has done a fine piece of work in that office.

This appointment by President Johnson recognizes demonstrated merit and will prove to be an excellent step forward in the administration of justice in this country.

On behalf of the State of Illinois, I say to the President "Well done." And to Mr. Katzenbach "Congratulations and heartfelt thanks for intelligent devotion to the public welfare." The Justice Department will be in safe and honorable hands.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a comment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I join the Senator from Illinois in hailing the appointment of Mr. Katzenbach for another reason, aside from those the Senator has mentioned. Many Senators have had direct and personal experience with Mr. Katzenbach during the days of the civil rights struggle, and I, for one, have been greatly impressed by seeing a man move up through the ranks and achieve a top Cabinet office. No one deserves this as much as Mr. Katzenbach. The appointment will be such a great morale builder for the whole efforts of those who serve the United States that it should be especially noted by the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for the opportunity to make these comments.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, it is with the greatest of pleasure that I received the news that the President of the United States has nominated Nicholas deB. Katzenbach as Attorney General of the United States.

As Assistant Attorney General, then as Deputy Attorney General and as Acting Attorney General, Nicholas Katzenbach has exhibited the highest qualities of mind, devotion, and will. His performance at the Department of Justice over the last 4 years demonstrates his eminent qualification for this new appointment; and its guarantees the distinction with which he will fill it.

Mr. Katzenbach's qualities were apparent at an earlier age. He left college to enlist in the Air Corps during World War II. Shot down and captured, he determined to turn his enforced inactivity to advantage. Studying by himself, with Red Cross books but without the aid of instructors, he gave himself the equivalent of a college education. On returning to the United States after the war, he convinced the university to give him his final examinations, and was awarded his degree magna cum laude. He then went to law school, where he again graduated with high academic honors. He practiced law, and then began to teach. Again he distinguished himself in a short time.

From the campus, he came to the Department of Justice. As Attorney General I witnessed his performance at firsthand. In the most difficult situations, in the most intricate of legal problems, and in the most profound of national crises, his performance was beyond duplication and above reproach. No one was more committed than he to the ideals of freedom and justice upon which this country rests. In the pursuit of these ideals, he shed the light of intelligence, reason, and commitment. But he never allowed the heat of personal feeling, nor even the conviction of ultimate rightness, to obscure his judgment or to place himself in judgment over others.

In short, he is the ideal judicial officer. Under him, the Department will be what its name demands—an agency dedicated to the principle that the Government wins its case when justice is done.

For the post of Deputy Attorney General, the President has made another excellent choice. Ramsey Clark served with brilliance as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division. Among his many achievements was a sharp lowering of the length of Government condemnation proceedings. He willingly assumed many duties beyond those nominally assigned to him; and these duties he performed with like distinction. Mr. Clark will be of inestimable value to the new Attorney General as they continue their work, with the dedicated men and women of the Department, for freedom and justice for all Americans.

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 4 to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, let me congratulate the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] and the members of the Senate Public Works Committee for the speed with which they have considered and reported S. 4. Abatement of water pollution and improved standards of water quality control are most worthy objectives.

In Missouri, we are proud of the fact that we have made great progress in construction of sewage treatment plants, and thus the abatement of pollution of our interstate waters.

In this effort, however, some of our communities, particularly smaller communities such as Caruthersville, Mo., are finding it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to finance the necessary sewage collection and treatment plants.

A community in an economically depressed county, Caruthersville is a city of approximately 8,600 with a high rate of unemployment. Of the 10,443 households in the county, 1,013 are on welfare and 3,518 have been receiving surplus food.

This city is under order from the Missouri Water Pollution Control Board to stop dumping raw sewage into the Mississippi River. The citizens want to meet this requirement. In fact, in August of 1963, they voted by a majority of 659 to 4 to authorize the sale of revenue bonds to pay $484,000 of the estimated cost of $908,000 for construction of the sewage treatment plant, interceptor and outfall mains, plus some extension and modernization of the present sewage system.

The city was counting on the accelerated public works program for grants of $424,000 to pay the balance of the cost. Unfortunately money was exhausted before these worthy applications could be approved.

The city has filed an application for 30 percent of the cost of interceptor, outfall and treatment works, a cost estimated at $657,000; but it does not appear that such a grant would provide sufficient funds to do the job.

Mr. President, I can understand that in the effort to move rapidly on this present bill, S. 4, the Public Works Committee did not go into problems such as that presented by the city of Caruthersville.

I do note, however, that on page 7 of the committee report—Senate Report No. 10—on this bill that the committee states:

> It is the intention of the committee to give early and thorough attention to the financial and technological problems confronting communities, large and small, as they endeavor to control and abate municipal sewage.
>
> The committee is confident that out of the experience we have gained under the present act and from information derived from hearings and technical studies it will be able to develop a sound and expanded program of pollution control and abatement grants designed to meet realistic goals of water quality enhancement.

I would ask the distinguished Senator from Maine if this means that consideration will be given to an increase in the percentage of the allowable grant on the cost of sewage treatment plants and the necessary interceptor and outfall sewage mains connected thereto?

Mr. MUSKIE. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that it is our desire and intent to go into that question. So far as the larger States are concerned, they are not getting a sufficiently large proportion of the total cost of sewage treatment projects from the Federal Government. I believe that is a legitimate concern. In the development of this program, we have moved toward higher and higher ceilings in that respect, but we still have a problem.

Then there is the question of the percentage of Federal support, particularly in distressed areas. That has been a problem.

The accelerated public works program has been of great assistance in this connection. We have been able to generate Federal grants of 50 percent or more in the past. That experience will be useful to our committee in considering changes in the formulas in the Federal Pollution Act itself.

I assure the Senator from Missouri that it is the full intention of the committee to go into this subject thoroughly, in the hope of developing proposals which will help relieve communities and States, to an even greater extent than in the past, of the burden of dealing with this problem.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Maine. May I ask if this is planned to be done fairly soon?

Mr. MUSKIE. We intend to do it in this session.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In this session?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the chairman. I appreciate his courtesy in acceding to my request in this particular case, and I am sure that will be true in other cases that will arise in the State of Missouri.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes; and I expect to hear other remarks on this subject today.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I, too, commend the Senator from Maine and his subcommittee and the full committee for the very fine work they have done on this timely subject and troublesome question, to which some solution must be found.

GOLD AND FISCAL WEAKNESS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the administration's budget message for fiscal year 1966, beginning July 1, was sent to Congress January 25. I am advised that the economic message, and recommendations with respect to amending the requirement that currency in circulation and Federal Reserve deposits be backed by gold to the extent of 25 percent, will be sent today, or shortly.

I think analysis of all of these will clearly show Federal fiscal weakness and breakdown in fiscal discipline on the part of the Federal Government.

To assist in analyzing the reports I have mentioned, and others, I shall ask unanimous consent to make the following insertions in the RECORD:

First, a table showing from 1930 to date: (a) Federal debt; (b) interest on the debt; (c) budget surpluses and deficits; (d) value of the dollar; (e) balance of international payments; (f) U.S. gold stock; (g) Federal Reserve Bank reserves, in gold; (h) Federal Reserve liabilities subject to gold requirements—Federal Reserve notes and deposits; and (i) ratio of Federal Reserve gold reserves to combined deposits and notes in circulation.

Second, an article under the heading, "Trade Trouble: Imports Exceed Exports in Many Key Industrial Lands Besides Britain; but United States Piles Up Surplus; Rising Prices Hurt Sales of Foreign Nations' Goods; Uncle Sam's Capital Outflow." This article was written by Alfred L. Malabre, Jr., and it appeared on page 1 of the January 27 edition of the Wall Street Journal.

It has been suggested that the Senate Finance Committee be briefed by the Treasury Department, and others, on various fiscal and monetary problems now confronting the Nation, including the gold situation and extension of the Tax Equalization Act. The chairman of the Finance Committee is giving this suggestion serious consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the insertions to which I have referred be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the table and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal debt, interest on the debt, budget surplus or deficit, value of the dollar, balance of payments, U.S. gold stock, and total reserves, note liabilities and deposits of Federal Reserve banks, showing reserve ratio—1930 to date

Year	Gross public debt and guaranteed obligations (fiscal year)	Interest on the public debt (fiscal year)	Budget deficit or surplus (fiscal year)	Value of dollar (calendar year) 1939=100 cents	Balance of international payments (calendar year)	U.S. gold stock[1] (fiscal year)	Total reserves, note liabilities and deposits of Federal Reserve banks, showing reserve ratio				
							Total reserves[1] (all gold since June 12, 1945)	Liabilities subject to reserve requirements			Reserve ratio
								Federal Reserve notes	Federal Reserve bank deposits	Total, note and reserve liabilities	
	Millions	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Cents*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*
1930	$16,185	$659	+$738	83.2	+$598	$4,535	$3,174	$1,424	$2,455	$3,879	81.8
1931	16,801	612	−462	91.4	+1,132	4,956	3,576	1,723	2,504	4,227	84.6
1932	19,487	599	−2,735	101.7	+726	3,919	2,777	2,795	2,028	4,823	57.6
1933	22,539	689	−2,602	107.4	+323	4,318	3,813	3,093	2,494	5,587	68.2
1934	27,734	757	−3,630	103.8	+1,140	7,856	5,022	3,101	4,138	7,239	69.4
1935	32,824	821	−2,791	101.2	+1,174	9,116	6,426	3,258	5,406	8,664	74.2
1936	38,497	749	−4,425	100.2	+896	10,608	8,385	4,034	6,585	10,619	79.0
1937	41,089	866	−2,777	96.7	+1,053	12,318	9,159	4,206	7,278	11,484	79.7
1938	42,018	926	−1,177	98.5	+1,482	12,963	11,041	4,149	9,247	13,396	82.4
1939	45,890	941	−3,862	100.0	+1,915	16,110	13,874	4,511	11,701	16,212	85.6
1940	48,497	1,041	−3,918	99.2	+2,890	19,963	18,120	5,199	15,213	20,412	88.8
Depression years		8,660	−27,643								

See footnote at end of table.

Federal debt, interest on the debt, budget surplus or deficit, value of the dollar, balance of payments, U.S. gold stock, and total reserves, note liabilities and deposits of Federal Reserve banks, showing reserve ratio—1930 to date—Continued

Year	Gross public debt and guaranteed obligations (fiscal year)	Interest on the public debt (fiscal year)	Budget deficit or surplus (fiscal year)	Value of dollar (calendar year) 1939=100 cents	Balance of international payments (calendar year)	U.S. gold stock[1] (fiscal year)	Total reserves, note liabilities and deposits of Federal Reserve banks, showing reserve ratio				
							Total reserves[1] (all gold since June 12, 1945)	Liabilities subject to reserve requirements			Reserve ratio
								Federal Reserve notes	Federal Reserve bank deposits	Total, note and reserve liabilities	
	Millions	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Cents*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*
1941	$55,332	$1,111	−$6,159	94.4	+$1,119	$22,624	$20,583	$6,724	$15,863	$22,587	91.1
1942	76,991	1,260	−21,490	85.3	−205	22,737	20,830	9,376	13,957	23,333	89.3
1943	140,796	1,808	−57,420	80.3	−1,979	22,388	20,582	13,872	14,022	27,894	73.8
1944	202,626	2,609	−51,423	79.0	−1,859	21,173	19,287	18,899	15,386	34,285	56.3
1945	259,115	3,617	−53,941	77.2	−2,737	20,213	18,055	23,019	17,188	40,207	44.9
1946	269,898	4,722	−20,676	71.2	+1,261	20,270	18,103	24,191	18,206	42,397	42.7
World War II years	----------	15,127	−211,109	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1947	258,376	4,958	+754	62.2	+4,567	21,266	20,039	24,154	17,748	41,902	47.8
1948	252,366	5,211	+8,419	57.8	+1,005	23,532	22,258	23,752	20,176	43,928	50.7
1949	252,798	5,339	−1,811	58.3	+175	24,466	23,245	23,373	19,246	42,619	54.5
1950	257,377	5,750	−3,122	57.8	−3,580	24,231	22,982	22,921	18,316	41,237	55.7
Post-World War II years	----------	21,258	+4,240	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1951	255,251	5,613	+3,510	53.5	−305	21,756	20,514	23,630	20,598	44,228	46.4
1952	259,151	5,859	−4,017	52.3	−1,046	23,346	22,143	24,826	20,559	45,385	48.8
1953	266,123	6,504	−9,449	51.9	−2,152	22,463	21,286	25,831	20,396	46,227	46.0
1954	271,341	6,382	−3,117	51.7	−1,550	21,927	21,239	25,588	20,808	46,396	45.8
Korean war years	----------	24,358	−13,073	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1955	274,418	6,370	−4,180	51.9	−1,145	2,1678	20,994	25,868	19,268	45,136	46.5
1956	272,825	6,787	+1,626	51.1	−935	21,799	21,109	26,367	19,575	45,942	45.9
1957	270,634	7,244	+1,596	49.4	+520	22,623	21,945	26,682	19,630	46,312	47.4
1958	276,444	7,607	−2,819	48.1	−3,529	21,356	20,767	26,705	19,883	46,588	44.6
1959	284,317	7,593	−12,427	47.7	−3,743	19,705	19,416	27,402	18,832	46,234	42.0
1960	286,471	9,180	+1,224	46.9	−3,881	19,322	19,029	27,505	19,126	46,631	40.8
1961	289,211	8,957	−3,856	46.4	−2,370	17,550	17,256	27,778	17,694	45,472	37.9
1962	298,645	9,120	−6,378	45.9	−2,203	16,435	16,158	29,021	18,445	47,466	34.0
1963	306,466	9,895	−6,266	45.4	−2,644	15,733	15,457	30,670	18,188	48,858	31.6
1964	312,526	10,666	−8,226	44.8	([2])	15,461	15,185	32,835	18,250	51,085	29.7
Post-Korean war years	----------	83,419	−39,706	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total, 1930-64	----------	153,822	−287,291	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Latest	[3] 320,006	----------	----------	----------	[2] −2,260	[3] 15,188	[4] 14,880	[4] 34,837	[4] 18,597	53,434	[4] 27.8
Estimate:[5]											
1965	316,900	11,200	−6,281	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1966	322,500	11,500	−5,287	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

---

[1] The difference between U.S. Treasury gold stock and Federal Reserve bank reserves represents gold held in Treasury cash, of which $156,000,000 constitutes a reserve against U.S. notes.

[2] 3d quarter (only) 1964. Full year not yet available.

[3] Jan. 21, 1965 (Treasury Department).

[4] Jan. 20, 1965 (Federal Reserve).

[5] Budget document for fiscal year 1966.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 27, 1965]

Trade Troubles—Imports Exceed Exports in Many Key Industrial Lands Besides Britain—But United States Piles Up Surplus; Rising Prices Hurt Sales of Foreign Nations' Goods—Uncle Sam's Capital Outflow

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

In a massive turnabout of trade, nearly all the world's great industrial nations now import far more than they sell abroad.

The single mighty exception: The United States, whose multi-billion-dollar trade surplus is the envy of foreign capitals.

Recent worry over the soundness of the pound sterling has riveted world attention on Britain's trade plight. Month after month, Britons have been buying far more abroad than they have been able to sell, and the subsequent outflow of funds has tended to deplete the nation's sagging currency reserves. From Paris to Tokyo, the cry has gone up: "The British must work harder and modernize their factories. They must learn to compete more effectively in international trade."

A close inspection of the record, however, discloses there's nothing very unique about Britain's sickly trade deficit of more than $3 billion yearly. Latest International Monetary Fund statistics—based on three quarters of 1964—show combined exports of the eight leading industrial nations of continental Europe, plus Japan, are lagging some $6 billion annually behind imports.

Not entirely by coincidence, this deficit almost exactly matches the magnitude of the U.S. trade surplus, and it is a far cry from the $317 million surplus registered by the same nine nations as recently as 1959. (The industrial nations of continental Europe, by IMF definition, are the six Common Market countries, plus Sweden and Switzerland.)

Many of these nations admittedly have long sustained trade deficits. The record clearly demonstrates, however, that lands which once sported fat trade surpluses have seen their surpluses shrivel, and other nations traditionally plagued by imbalanced trade have seen their deficits grow larger.

The trade deficit of France—a nation not hesitant to proffer financial advice to its distressed British neighbor—is nearing $1 billion annually, IMF figures indicate. Only 4 years ago, France had a trade surplus of nearly $600 million.

Four years ago West Germany's trade surplus exceeded $1.7 billion. In the third quarter of 1964 the same country had no trade surplus at all—its climbing volume of imported goods exactly matched its sagging export volume.

JAPAN'S DEFICIT GROWS

Japan's trade deficit totaled $143 million in 1959. IMF statistics show the Asian nation's third-quarter deficit in 1964, on an annual basis, was nearly four times that amount.

At a time of much official fretting over U.S. competitiveness in world markets, the record of recent years helps make clear Uncle Sam's fundamental strength in the no-holds-barred battle of international trade.

The picture could change, of course; IMF figures, in fact, show some narrowing of the U.S. trade surplus in recent months.

Moreover, the road ahead is dotted with perplexing imponderables. To cite just one, protective farm policies taking shape within the Common Market seem bound eventually to crimp America's $1 billion a year sales of agricultural products to the economic bloc. For the present, however, as an IMF economist puts it: "It's plain nonsense to talk about the United States not being able to hold its own in international commerce."

Sidney Homer, a partner and economist of Salomon Bros. & Hutzler, a New York securities firm, adds: "Five or six years ago we were told that the United States had become noncompetitive in world markets, that the new factories of Europe and Japan, with their cheap labor, had all but destroyed our ability to sell abroad. We now know that while there was a germ of truth in this warning, the facts were vastly exaggerated."

CAPITAL FLOW PROBLEM

The record also demonstrates the degree to which the nagging U.S. balance-of-payments deficit is rooted in matters of capital flow, rather than trade. It further underscores how very little the rising exchange reserves of such lands as France have to do with the economics of commercial competition.

The nine industrial countries whose combined trade balance so drastically deteriorated between 1959 and late 1964 in the same span managed to add $10 billion to their combined supply of gold and reserve currencies. Reserves of the U.S. trade colossus in the same period plunged $5 billion.

What has happened is that the U.S. trade surplus, despite its great size, has been insufficient to offset a cascading outflow of U.S. capital—dollars for investment abroad, for foreign aid and for the defense of most of the free world. By one recent estimate American investment abroad—much of it in the very industrial lands whose trade balance has deteriorated—now approximates the staggering sum of $100 billion, nearly twice the total investment of all foreigners in the United States.

"If the United States ever decides, because of its gold losses, to clamp strict controls on this outflow of capital, a lot of foreign countries besides the United Kingdom would find themselves in a financial squeeze," warns the economist of a large New York bank. "They would have to try to get their trade balances into much healthier condition than is now the case."

Such effort would doubtless entail a good deal more economic conservatism than most industrial lands have exhibited in recent years—again, the United States is the great exception.

The table below, based on IMF data, traces what has happened to the cost of living—the generally accepted yardstick of inflation—in key industrial countries since 1959:

Living-cost rise since 1959

	Percent
Japan	34
Italy	26
France	23
United Kingdom	15
West Germany	13
United States	7

In view of the cost-of-living record, it's not surprising that in most industrial lands the average price level of exports has been moving up; in France and Germany, for example, the export price level has climbed roughly 10 percent since 1959. Nor is it surprising that the average price of U.S. exports has barely budged in recent years.

It's true that U.S. prices are measured from a comparatively high base; in absolute terms, the cost of many U.S.-produced goods still exceeds that of foreign-made merchandise. Nonetheless, the record since 1959 suggests there is a significant tie between the relatively high degree of inflation abroad and the foreigners' deteriorating trade posture.

A few statistics on money supply—demand deposits plus currency in circulation—help point up the economic conservatism that underlies Uncle Sam's stable price record. Between 1959 and last year, according to the IMF, the U.S. money supply rose 9 percent. In the same span, the money supply in Germany climbed 40 percent, and that was a mild rise by some standards. Italy's money supply increased 77 percent in the period, France's rose 78 percent and Japan's rocketed 121 percent above the 1959 level.

BEHIND BRITAIN'S PLIGHT

Why, among the great industrial nations, is only Britain in such financial straits? Since 1959, its trade deficit has roughly doubled, but the record clearly shows this is the rule, not the exception.

Much of the answer appears to lie in Britain's rejection from the Common Market. In the 4 years through 1962, before French President de Gaulle dashed British hopes of joining the bloc, U.S. direct investments in the United Kingdom averaged $286 million yearly. Since then, this annual investment rate has dropped to about $150 million.

In the 4-year span before the De Gaulle rejection, U.S. direct investments in Britain amounted to 75 percent of all U.S. direct investments elsewhere in Europe. Since then, the rate has dropped to about 20 percent.

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 4, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to propose an amendment to the bill S. 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate must first dispose of the committee amendments.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOWER. Have not the committee amendments been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 14, it is proposed to strike out the word "and"——

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

There being no objection, the committee amendments were considered and agreed to en bloc, as follows:

On page 7, line 14, after the word "and", to strike out "in"; after line 19, to strike out:

"(2) The Secretary shall also call such a public hearing on his own motion or when petitioned to do so by the Governor of any State subject to or affected by the water quality standards set pursuant to this subsection for the purpose of considering a revision in such standards."

At the beginning of line 25, to strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)"; on page 8, line 1, after the word "health". to strike out "and" and insert "or"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "(4)" and insert "(3)"; in the same line, after the word "promulgate", to strike out "the"; in line 8, after the word "to", to insert "paragraphs (1) and (4) of"; in line 12, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)"; after line 14, to insert:

"(4) The Secretary shall also call a public hearing after reasonable notice on his own motion or when petitioned to do so by the Governor of any State subject to or affected by the water quality standards promulgated pursuant to this subsection for the purpose of considering a revision in such standards. The Secretary may after reasonable notice and public hearing and consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other Federal agencies, with State and interstate water pollution control agencies, and with municipalities and industries involved, prepare revised regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof."

On page 9, line 6, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "(4)" and insert "(3)"; in line 8, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)"; on page 10, after line 2, to insert:

"(d) Redesignated subsection (f) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by inserting after the words 'such hearing,' in the fourth sentence thereof, the words 'including the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable'."

At the beginning of line 9, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)"; and on page 12, after the numerals "11", to strike out "(a)"; so as to make the bill read:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) (1) section 1 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466) is amended by inserting after the words 'section 1.' a new subsection (a) as follows:

"'(a) The purpose of this Act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution '

"(2) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) thereof as (b) and (c), respectively.

"(3) Subsection (b) of such section (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: 'The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this Act called "Secretary") shall administer this Act and, with the assistance of an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by him, shall supervise and direct the head of the Water Pollution Control Administration created by section 2 and the administration of all other functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to water pollution. Such Assistant Secretary shall perform such additional functions as the Secretary may prescribe.'

"(b) Section 2 of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953, as made effective April 1, 1953, by Public Law 83-13, is amended by striking out 'two' and inserting in lieu thereof 'three'; and paragraph (17) of subsection (d) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 is amended by striking out '(2)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(3)'.

"SEC. 2. Such Act is further amended by redesignating sections 2 through 4 and references thereto, as sections 3 through 5, respectively, sections 5 through 14, as sections 7 through 16, respectively, by inserting after section 1 the following new section:

"'FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

"'SEC. 2. Effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this section there is created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Administration"). The head of the Administration shall be appointed, and his compensation fixed, by the Secretary, and shall, through the Administration, administer sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of this Act and such other provisions of this Act as the Secretary may prescribe. The head of the Administration may, in addition to regular staff of the Administration, which shall be initially provided from personnel of the Department, obtain, from within the Department or otherwise as authorized by law, such professional, technical, and clerical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the Administration's functions and may for that purpose use funds available for carrying out such functions.'

"SEC. 3. Such Act is further amended by inserting after the section redesignated as section 5 a new section as follows:

"'GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"'SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

" 'Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by an appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve as a useful demonstration of a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any water of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes.

" 'There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose of making grants under this section. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. No grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 5 per centum of the total amount authorized by this section in any one fiscal year.'

"SEC. 4(a) Clause (2) of subsection (b) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 8 is amended by striking out '$600,000,' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,000,000,'.

"(b) The second proviso in clause (2) of subsection (b) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by striking out '$2,400,000,' and inserting in lieu thereof '$4,000,000,'.

"(c) Subsection (f) of such redesignated section 8 is redesignated as subsection (g) thereof and is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z 15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).'

"(d) Such redesignated section 8 is further amended by inserting therein, immediately after subsection (e) thereof, the following new subsection:

" '(f) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary may increase the amount of a grant made under this section by 10 per centum for any project which has been certified to him by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency empowered under State or local laws or interstate compact to perform metropolitan or regional planning for a metropolitan area within which the assistance is to be used, or other agency or instrumentality designated for such purposes by the Governor (or Governors in the case of interstate planning) as being in conformity with the comprehensive plan developed or in process of development for such metropolitan area. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "metropolitan area" means either (1) a standard metropolitan statistical area as defined by the Bureau of the Budget, except as may be determined by the President or by the Bureau of the Budget as not being appropriate for the purposes hereof, or (2) any urban area, including those surrounding areas that form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential, governmental, institutional, and other activities, which in the opinion of the President or the Bureau of the Budget lends itself as being appropriate for the purposes hereof.'

"SEC. 5. (a) Redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by redesignating subsections (c) through (i) as subsections (d) through (j).

"(b) Such redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is further amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

" '(c) (1) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may, after reasonable notice and public hearing and consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other Federal agencies, with State and interstate water pollution control agencies, and with municipalities and industries involved, prepare regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof.

" '(2) Such standards of quality shall be such as to protect the public health or welfare and serve the purposes of this Act. In establishing standards designed to enhance the quality of such waters, the Secretary shall take into consideration their use and value for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

" '(3) The Secretary shall promulgate the standards pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (4) of this subsection with respect to any waters only if, within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so, the appropriate States and interstate agencies have not developed standards found by the Secretary to be consistent with paragraph (2) of this subsection and applicable to such interstate waters or portions thereof.

" '(4) The Secretary shall also call a public hearing after reasonable notice on his own motion or when petitioned to do so by the Governor of any State subject to or affected by the water quality standards promulgated pursuant to this subsection for the purpose of considering a revision in such standards. The Secretary may after reasonable notice and public hearing and consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other Federal agencies, with State and interstate water pollution control agencies, and with municipalities and industries involved, prepare revised regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof.

" '(5) The discharge of matter into such interstate waters, which reduces the quality of such waters below the water quality standards promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection or established by the appropriate State or interstate agencies consistent with paragraph (2) of this subsection (whether the matter causing or contributing to such reduction is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into tributaries of such waters), is subject to abatement in accordance with the provisions of this section.

" '(6) Nothing in this subsection shall (a) prevent the application of this section to any case to which subsection (a) of this section would otherwise be applicable, or (b) extend Federal jurisdiction over water not otherwise authorized by this Act.'

"(c) Paragraph (1) of redesignated subsection (d) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by striking out the final period after the third sentence of such subsection and inserting the following in lieu thereof: ', or he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution referred to in subsection (a) and action of Federal, State, or local authorities.'

"(d) Redesignated subsection (f) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by inserting after the words 'such hearing,' in the fourth sentence thereof, the words 'including the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable'.

"(e) Redesignated subsection (h) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by inserting after the words 'of practicability' in the second sentence thereof, the words 'of complying with such standards as may be applicable'.

"SEC. 6. The section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act hereinbefore redesignated as section 12 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

" '(d) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

" '(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act.'

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 7(f)(6) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'section 6(b)(4)' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 8(b)(4)'.

"(b) Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'section 5' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 7'.

"(c) Section 10(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'subsection (g)' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (h)'.

"(d) Section 10(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'subsection (e)' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (f)'.

"(e) Subsection 11 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'section 8(c)(3)' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 10(d)(3)' and by striking out 'section 8(e)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 10(f)'.

"SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the 'Water Quality Act of 1965'."

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT TIME

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request without the Senator from Texas losing his right to the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the Tower amendment in the nature of a substitute there be a time limitation on debate of 1 hour, 30 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and 30 minutes to be under the control of the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENTS BY MR. TOWER

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That (a)(1) section 1 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466) is amended by inserting after the words 'Section 1.' a new subsection (a) as follows:

" '(a) The purpose of this Act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution.'

"(2) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) thereof as (b) and (c), respectively.

"(3) Subsection (b) of such section (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: 'The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this Act called the "Secretary") shall administer this Act and, with the assistance of an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by him, shall supervise and direct the head of the Water Pollution Control Administration created by section 2 and the administration of all other functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to water pollution. Such Assistant Secretary shall perform such additional functions as the Secretary may prescribe.'

"(b) Section 2 of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953, as made effective April 1, 1953, by Public Law 83–13, is amended by striking out 'two' and inserting in lieu thereof 'three'; and paragraph (17) of subsection (d) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 is amended by striking out '(2)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(3)'."

SEC. 2. Such Act is further amended by redesignating sections 2 through 4 and references thereto, as sections 3 through 5, respectively, sections 5 through 14, as sections 7 through 16, respectively, by inserting after section 1 the following new section:

"FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 2. Effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this section there is created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Administration'). The head of the Administration shall be appointed, and his compensation fixed, by the Secretary, and shall, through the Administration, administer sections 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 11 of this Act and such other provisions of this Act as the Secretary may prescribe. The head of the Administration may, in addition to regular staff of the Administration, which shall be initially provided from personnel of the Department, obtain, from within the Department or otherwise as authorized by law, such professional, technical, and clerical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the Administration's functions and may for that purpose use funds available for carrying out such functions.

"SEC. 3. Such Act is further amended by inserting after the section redesignated as section 5 a new section as follows:

" 'GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

" 'SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

" 'Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by an appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve as a useful demonstration of a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any water of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes.

" 'There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose of making grants under this section. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. No grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 5 per centum of the total amount authorized by this section in any one fiscal year.'

"SEC. 4. (a) Clause (2) of subsection (b) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 8 is amended by striking out '$600,000,' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,000,000,'.

"(b) The second proviso in clause (2) of subsection (b) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by striking out '$2,400,000,' and inserting in lieu thereof '$4,000,000,'.

"(c) Subsection (f) of such redesignated section 8 is redesignated as subsection (g) thereof and is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c).'

"(d) Such redesignated section 8 is further amended by inserting therein, immediately after subsection (e) thereof, the following new subsection:

" '(f) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary may increase the amount of a grant made under subsection (b) of this section by an additional 10 per centum of the amount of such grant for any project which has been certified to him by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency empowered under State or local laws or interstate compact to perform metropolitan or regional planning for a metropolitan area within which the assistance is to be used, or other agency or instrumentality designated for such purposes by the Governor (or Governors in the case of interstate planning) as being in conformity with the comprehensive plan developed or in process of development for such metropolitan area. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "metropolitan area" means either (1) a standard metropolitan statistical area as defined by the Bureau of the Budget, except as may be determined by the President as not being appropriate for the purposes hereof, or (2) any urban area, including those surrounding areas that form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential, governmental, institutional, and other activities, which in the opinion of the President lends itself as being appropriate for the purposes hereof.'

"SEC. 5. (a) Redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by redesignating subsections (c) through (i) as subsection (d) through (j).

"(b) Such redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is further amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

" '(c)(1) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may, after consultation with officials of the State and interstate water pollution control agencies and other Federal agencies involved, and with due regard for their proposals, prepare recommendations for standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof. The Secretary's recommendations shall be made available to any conference which may be called pursuant to subsection (d)(1) of this section, and to any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (f) of this section; and all or any part of such standards may be included in the report of said conference or in the recommendations of said hearing board.

" '(2) The Secretary shall, when petitioned to do so by the Governor of any State su ject to or affected by the water quality standards recommendations, or when in his judgment it is appropriate, consult with the parties enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection concerning a revision in such recommended standards.

" '(3) Such recommended standards of quality shall be such as to protect the public health and welfare and serve the purposes of this Act. In establishing recommended standards designed to enhance the quality of such waters, the Secretary shall take into consideration their use and value for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

" '(4) The Secretary shall recommend standards pursuant to this subsection with respect to any waters only if, within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so, the appropriate States and interstate agencies have not developed standards found by the Secretary to be consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection and applicable to such interstate waters or portions thereof.

" '(5) No standard of water quality recommended by the Secretary under this subsection shall be enforced under this Act unless such standard shall have been adopted by the Governor or the State water pollution control agency of each affected State.

" '(6) Nothing in this subsection shall (A) prevent the application of this section to any case to which subsection (a) of this section would otherwise be applicable, or (B) extend Federal jurisdiction over water not otherwise authorized by this Act.'

"(c) Paragraph (1) of redesignated subsection (d) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 as amended by striking out the final period after the third sentence of such subsection and inserting the following in lieu thereof: '; or he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution referred to in subsection (a) and action of Federal, State, or local authorities.'

"(d) Redesignated subsection (h) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by inserting after the word 'practicability' in the second sentence thereof, the words 'of complying with such standards as may be applicable'.

"Sec. 6. The section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 11 is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 11.' and by inserting at the end of such section the following:

"'(b) No interceptor drain shall be constructed or financed, in whole or in part, by any department, bureau, agency, or instrumentality of the United States to carry waste drainage water or treated sewage effluent from the service area of any reclamation project constructed in whole or in part by the Secretary of the Interior within the State of California to a termination point in the San Francisco Bay, the San Pablo Bay, the Suisun Bay, the waters of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, or any channels lying between these bodies of water, unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has first made a determination, based upon a study, that the anticipated discharge water from such interceptor drain will not, in the foreseeable future, pollute or increase the salinity, chloride, or pesticide content or impair usability for domestic, industrial, or irrigation purposes of the receiving water in the vicinity of the location where the interceptor drain is terminated, and Congress is given notice of such determination. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall consult with the California regional water pollution control boards for the San Francisco Bay region and the Central Valley region before making the determination and shall give consideration to the recommendations and findings of such regional boards.'

"Sec. 7. The section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act hereinbefore redesignated as section 12 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(d) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"'(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act.'

"Sec. 8. (a) Section 7(f)(6) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'section 6(b)(4)' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 8(b)(4)'.

"(b) Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'section 5' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 7'.

"(c) Section 10(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'subsection (g),' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (h)'.

"(d) Section 10(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'subsection (e)' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (f)'.

"(e) Section 11(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'section 8(c)(3)' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 10(d)(3)' and by striking out 'section 8(e)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 10(f)'.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An Act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize recommendations for standards of water quality, and for other purposes.'"

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I intend to make only a brief presentation. I intend to ask for the yeas and nays; therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the Tower amendment in the nature of a substitute, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I intend to be relatively brief; however, other Senators may wish to speak on the amendment, so I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, my proposal is identical with S. 649, as reported from the House Committee on Public Works last year.

The substitute can be easily described and understood. It simply removes from the Secretary the authority to promulgate standards of water quality. The Secretary is, however, granted authority to make recommendations for these water quality standards, although no such standard may be enforced under the act unless the standard has been adopted by the Governor or State water pollution agency of each affected State.

Mr. President, as the minority views on S. 4 point out, the proposed Federal Water Pollution Control Act, particularly with the discretionary authority conferred up the Secretary, is opposed by a large number of States.

Further, State water control agencies have not had ample opportunity to express their views before the Senate Public Works Committee.

Mr. President, the matter of water quality standards is one that depends on State and regional circumstances, thus basically, the setting of such standards is a function for State and regional agencies.

The Texas Water Pollution Control Board is opposed to S. 4 because of the vast power that would be given to a new Federal agency. The Texas Water Agency fears the encroachment into an area that has always been reserved to State and local agencies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, with accompanying material, the statement of Joe D. Carter, chairman, Texas Water Pollution Control Board, accompanied by David E. Smallhorst, executive secretary, Texas Water Pollution Control Board, made before the House Committee on Public Works. Many other State agencies have expressed similar opinions.

There being no objection, the statement and accompanying material were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Joe D. Carter

I have with me today Mr. David Smallhorst who is the executive secretary of the Texas Water Pollution Control Board who can field some of these difficult questions that you all toss out every once in a while.

Mr. Wright. Mr. Smallhorst, we are glad to have you with us, sir.

Mr. Smallhorst. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Carter. The State of Texas, not being blessed with an abundance of water as some other States, has traditionally held water in high regard and great respect, adhering to the philosophy that water should be maintained in as high a degree of purity as possible.

Texas has been and is continuously moving to assume the responsibility of pollution control within its boundaries and cooperating with its neighboring States on border streams.

The preponderance of testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power of the Committee on Government Operations at the Southwest regional hearing, December 6–7, 1963, in Austin, Tex., indicated quite strongly that "no additional Federal water pollution control legislation is needed at this time."

The Texas Water Pollution Control Board concurs in this, and therefore, submits this statement in opposition to S. 649 and related bills.

The Texas Water Pollution Control Board is opposed to S. 649 because it unquestionably would place a great deal of power and authority in the hands of a new Federal agency which would have far-reaching effects threatening encroachment into a governmental area heretofore reserved to the State and local agencies.

Since the beginning of the current Federal water pollution control law in 1956, administration of the program has been competently carried out by the U.S. Public Health Service, and Texas has always enjoyed excellent working relationships with that agency. It is difficult to rationalize, therefore, the advantage which might be gained by any such drastic change in administration as authorized in S. 649.

The Texas Water Pollution Control Board is seriously concerned about and is opposed to the proposal in S. 649 which would authorize the Federal Government to establish standards of water quality. This is a matter depending entirely upon State and regional circumstances and is, therefore, basically a function of State and regional agencies.

Texas is proud of the close cooperation always received from the neighboring States when interstate waters become involved, and such situations have always been handled in a most friendly and effective manner.

It is obvious that quality standards which would be applicable to a "water rich" State would certainly not be applicable to a "water poor" State. There looms, therefore, the very difficult and time-consuming problem of establishing adequate water quality standards on any given stream, not to mention the gigantic task this implies when imposed on a nationwide basis.

The Texas Water Pollution Control Board is charged by the legislature to issue permits for all waste discharges in the State, and an elaborate surveillance and enforcement program has been developed to back up this permit system. Hence, if this Federal law were passed, it would appear there would be a duplication of effort and a needless expenditure of Federal funds. This does not appear to be consistent with the present economy move of the administration, nor would it be conducive to unification of effort.

Pollution abatement is something that cannot be achieved instantaneously but tremendous inroads have been made during recent years, and the machinery for reaching a solution to this problem is currently operational. Inasmuch as amendments were made to the Federal water pollution control law as recently as 1961, it is believed the present act, as amended, has not been in effect a sufficient length of time to indicate the need for further "patch work." Obviously, changing the basic "ground rules" at such frequent intervals does not contribute to a healthy administrative atmosphere. Drastic administrative revisions as proposed in S. 649 might result in retrogression and possibly confusion in the entire program rather than a desirable acceleration of progress.

It is for these reasons the Texas Water Pollution Control Board recommends that no action be taken on S. 649 and related bills which proposes to amend the present Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Carter, I note that you have appended to your statement a copy of the testimony presented to Jones subcommittee in Austin on December 6 and 7.

Mr. CARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WRIGHT. Since that is a subcommittee of another committee of the House, I wonder if it would not be appropriate for us simply to make this additional statement a part of our record at this point.

Mr. CARTER. I would appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, and would like to incorporate our entire statement by reference.

Mr. WRIGHT. Without objection, then, it will be so ordered.

Mr. WRIGHT. Joe—may I call you Joe?—I would like to ask you one thing here. I notice that you are basically in opposition to what you refer to as patchwork. You do feel that the present program is working effectively?

Mr. CARTER. We feel it is in Texas, Congressman WRIGHT. I do not know how it is working in the other States. We feel we have an effective program in cooperation with other Federal agencies in Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. When the grants program was first inaugurated, there was some apprehension expressed in the committee and on the floor of the House, based on the fear that the presence of Federal matching funds to assist in the most severe cases might in fact discourage some communities and municipalities undertaking a solution of their own problems individually and slow down, rather than accelerate, the cleaning up of our streams. You do not feel that that has been the case, do you?

Mr. CARTER. No, sir.

Mr. WRIGHT. Would you say that the programs as such as accelerated and encouraged and stimulated a great deal of activity which has been needed for a great many years?

Mr. CARTER. Unquestionably.

Mr. WRIGHT. Now, with respect to further amending the law at this time, I have in question that your basic objection, like that of so many representatives of agencies of our States, relates primarily to the establishment of broad national standards and the conferring upon the Secretary the power to make those unvarying standards.

Is this really the crux of your opposition?

Mr. CARTER. That is really the crux of our argument, Congressman WRIGHT.

Mention was made earlier, I believe by Mr. BLATNIK, with respect to the fact that the Secretary was only going to set these standards if the State or local agencies weren't doing a good job. That might be the intention but the language of the act is such, as was brought out by Congressman HARSHA, that he is the sole judge on this. The big print in the bill might leave that impression but the little print kind of takes it away.

Mr. WRIGHT. In other words, the provision as is presently contained in the bill would vest in the Secretary, the authority to determine whether, in his judgment, the States had done a good job?

Mr. CARTER. Dictatorial powers.

Mr. WRIGHT. This does give him the power to set standards, of course.

With respect to the general proposal in section 12 of the bill, I would like to get your views and those of Mr. Smallhorst about the need for additional liaison between the Secretary and the national manufacturers of detergents and with respect to increasing efforts to find detergents with greater decomposibility.

Mr. CARTER. I might say, Mr. WRIGHT, that there is no legislation needed for such a program. That could be handled by your Health, Education, and Welfare agency now in cooperation with industry. I see no need for Congress to take action.

Mr. WRIGHT. This authorizes the creation of a technical committee.

Mr. CARTER. That could be created by appointment of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in cooperation with the industries of the States.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am not certain of the breadth of his authority in that regard. It might be that he could create an additional secretary now.

Mr. CARTER. The point I mention is that he could call industry and say, Let others get together and try to work out this problem of detergents. They are doing it now. Industry is working on this problem. They have found a solution to it. It is just a question of getting this new formula they have worked out into operation. I think industry will solve this problem very shortly.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am sure we do applaud the efforts on the part of industry and any other scientists who may be involved in eliminating this particular problem as soon as possible.

Are there any questions?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I have one.

I wish to commend the gentleman for his fine statement and position on this problem. I know you are wary of Federal Government authority to establish standards of water quality. Now, you have that right in the State of Texas?

Mr. CARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You establish the standard.

Will you give that to us so that we will have that part of the record?

Mr. CARTER. We are very much like Michigan. Our standard is a policywide standard in the sense that all applications for permits which we pass on we are dedicated to the proposition of maintaining the purity of the stream. Under any permit we issue to an industry or municipality, the effluent they contribute to the stream must not deteriorate the quality of the stream from its existing condition.

Then we propose later to come in with those industries and municipalities whose effluent is not quite up to the quality we would like to see and we will move in and amend the permits they have at the present time to require a better quality of effluent.

I might say on standards with respect to municipal effluent, Mr. Smallhorst can probably give you the answer.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I wish you would continue on that. This is a very important aspect.

Mr. SMALLHORST. The board since its creation in 1961 has followed the policy of requiring what we call complete treatment, producing an effluent of a quality to get technical here, of 20 parts per million BOD, 120 parts total solids and chlorination of 15 parts per million residual after 30 minutes contact. The board is taking this across the board on a statewide basis.

I might say also that as far as Texas is concerned, every city in the State that has a sewage system has some type of sewage treatment plant with the exception of three. This is mentioned in our Jones committee statement. The three towns that do not have a treatment plant, the total population is about 30,000 and they now have active plans underway to correct this situation.

So that our problem, you might say, is more of one not of building plants but to prevent the discharge of raw sewage, but to keep the plants that we have up to date and adequate for the population explosion that we are experiencing in the area.

Does that answer your question, sir?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes. Your policy, then, is one of maintaining the present quality of the water in the streams?

Mr. CARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. There are areas, especially in Iowa, where we need to improve the water and with this kind of program this would not do this. I ask you, you probably have this kind of situation in Texas, what do you do about those areas where you need improvement?

Mr. CARTER. We propose to move in the trouble areas as soon as possible and require not only the municipalities but also the industries to improve the quality of the effluent they are now discharging.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. What is your policy with reference to industry? Do you force them to do it right now or do you give them a period of time?

Mr. CARTER. We give them a period of time, of course. We try to be rational about it. As Mr. Smallhorst pointed out, this pollution legislation in Texas is rather new. They had a grandfather clause in it which permitted those making discharges to continue to do so as of the type they were discharging in 1961.

We propose to come into those trouble areas, as I pointed out, and try to correct what we consider bad situations.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. At the present time, it has to be mostly by negotiation, though, doesn't it? Or do you have a law?

Mr. CARTER. We have a law. It is $200 a day fine for continuation of any discharge which the pollution board says they should not be discharging. And we have the injunction process, too.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. What do you do in a situation like this where an industry has moved in because of an invitation from the community with certain assurances about disposal over a period of years?

Mr. CARTER. We have run into that problem when Campbell Soup came into Paris, Tex., with an effluent discharge program that did not quite meet the standards we thought should be met. Through discussions with the management, we worked out what we consider an acceptable practice.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. In that case, you resorted to negotiations

Mr. CARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You probably could not resort to law, then, in that case?

Mr. CARTER. We could have, had the negotiations failed. But we feel it is best to talk these things out with folks.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Carter, as I understand, it is the position of the Texas Water Pollution Control Board that no amendments are necessary at this time to the Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. CARTER. Exactly.

Mr. HARSHA. If amendments are to be made to it, would you favor amendments that expand the research program under that act and possibly increase the construction grants but not go any further than that?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. HARSHA, personally, I do not see why legislation would be needed. That would come under the heading of appropriations.

Mr. HARSHA. There are some limitations under the construction grant, the amount that a grant may be, and to certain types of areas. Then there is a limitation on the amount of grant. I think that is 30 percent of the construction project.

Mr. CARTER. I would answer that and this is my personal answer and not for the pollution board. We are doing very well under the program. I see no reason to change it.

Mr. HARSHA. Thank you.

I have one other thing: What is Texas doing in the oil-field brine situation?

Mr. CARTER. That is my biggest headache.

The pollution board at the present time is issuing permits for the disposal of oilfield brine. We sent out 70,000 applications here a few weeks ago to the oil operators who in turn are returning them indicating how much oilfield brine each well is producing, how they are disposing of it, and so forth. We are in the process of holding hearings with a view of what we term "no pit law," you can't put the salt water you are disposing of into an open unlined pit.

One area that we are having our biggest hearing on is what we call the area overlaying the Ogallala formation in west Texas which covers around 47 counties. These hearings are in progress.

We have been working closely with the oil industry, Mid-Continental Oil & Gas Association, and all the representatives of the oil companies, trying to come up with procedures to get rid of this salt water by injection primarily, and that is not the solution to the problem in its entirety because you must be very careful in injecting this brine into the subsurface. You must have these injection wells properly cased. You must be careful about the pressure under which this salt water is injected.

We have closed two counties, three counties, issued orders where they cannot use these open pits for salt water disposal purposes. It is a tremendous job. With 70,000 less, producing less.

Mr. HARSHA. Is there any research program going on, either conducted by the State or industry to develop a method of disposal?

Mr. CARTER. The State and industry are working together to come up with what we consider proper injection procedures. We have just about got together on it. There is a little area of disagreement. We feel that through this cooperative effort we will arrive at a solution to the problem. It is a tremendous job.

Mr. HARSHA. Thank you.

I have no further questions.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you very much, Mr. Smallhorst. We greatly appreciate your having come and given us the benefit of your experience and following and background.

Mr. SMALLHORST. Thank you.

TEXAS WATER POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

(Abstract Statement presented to the Jones Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power of the Committee on Government Operations, southwest regional hearing, December 6–7, 1963, Austin, Tex.)

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF TEXAS AFFECTING WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

In order to fully appreciate some of the water quality or water pollution control problems of Texas, some knowledge of the physical characteristics of the State itself is desirable.

1. Texas is big. Over 264,000 square miles in area. This presents obvious administrative problems in surveillance and water quality monitoring activities and dictates the type of cooperative program which has been developed over the years.

2. Texas is a water-scarce State, with average annual rainfall ranging from less than 10 inches on the west to about 50 inches on the east. This is a wide variation and profoundly affects surface runoff in Texas river systems.

3. Evaporation rates exceed rainfall rates. This indicates generally arid conditions with resultant water losses due to evaporation and definitely affects water quality.

4. Most of the river systems of Texas are intrastate, with the Canadian, the Red, the Sabine, and the Pecos being the only interstate rivers and the Rio Grande being an international boundary. Interstate compacts are in effect on the Pecos and Sabine Rivers; a commission is developing an agreement on the Red River, and the waters of the Rio Grande are under the immediate control of the International Boundary and Water Commission.

5. In general, the river systems of Texas head in the western areas of the State—the most arid areas—and flow in a southeasterly direction to the gulf. In some of the western headwater areas natural minerals tend to contribute to deterioration in quality of the runoff water.

6. Texas relies heavily upon its underground water resources. Protection of the quality of this water supply source is of vital importance. Also the effect of return flows from these underground sources upon the quantity and quality of surface river systems is a matter of interest.

7. In Texas, areas of population concentration are located at, or near, the headwaters of some of the major river systems. This feature complicates the water quality control picture not only as to furnishing these areas with adequate water supply sources, but also concerning the downstream effect of return "used" waters upon the river system.

8. The production of oil and gas in Texas has been developed generally on a statewide basis so that the disposal of the byproducts of this industry (oil- and gas-field waste) is a matter of interest in every river basin of the State.

9. Concentration of the major manufacturing industries of Texas is along the gulf coast with waste discharges to tidal waters, hence the resultant problem is different than where such discharges are to fresh waters.

TEXAS WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM

The initial water pollution control statute of Texas was passed in 1917 vesting the authority for enforcement primarily with the State health department. In 1961, the State legislature enacted a new law codified as article 7621d creating a water pollution control board comprised of three ex officio members and three appointive members.

This law also established a permit system wherein all wastes discharged into or adjacent to the waters of the State must be in accordance with a valid permit issued by the board. This board is now completing its second year of operation, and in this relatively short time, considerable progress has been made and some general observations can be made as to the effectiveness of this type of administration.

1. The initial phase of setting up the machinery for operation under the new law is just now being completed—after establishing rules, regulations, and modes of procedure for obtaining permits—in that most all "statutory" or "grandfather" permits have been issued for municipal and industrial discharges. Applications for oil and gas waste discharges have been issued by the board. In this process it has been noted that numerous corrective measures are being obtained by mutual agreement and the planning of needed improvements is being initiated.

2. Water-pollution-control committees of interested groups have proved to be invaluable in assisting the board in setting up this basic machinery. These groups included the Texas Water and Sewage Works Association, the Texas Water Pollution Control Association, the Texas Water Conservation Association, the Texas Manufacturers Association, the Texas Chemical Council, the Texas Society of Professional Engineers, and the Texas Public Health Association. Close communication with these groups is deemed vital in assuring the cooperation required for a successful program.

3. By relying upon the cooperating State agencies (water commissions, parks and wildlife, and the health department) for technical and field services, duplication of effort and service is eliminated, with a considerable financial saving to the State.

4. In its short period of operation the board has held public hearings and has issued orders relative to municipal, industrial, and oil- and gas-field waste discharges. The board has initiated a survey of the Galveston Bay waters to obtain needed basic data for the establishment of water quality objectives in this vast area involving some 511 square miles of water surface. One small segment of this survey is the Clear Lake watershed which includes the NASA development complex, and another area is the industrial complex along the Houston ship channel.

5. Clear Lake has been determined by the board to be conserved as a recreational lake and intensive studies are underway toward this end. Determinations will be considered by the board in June or July of 1964 as to the desired water quality objectives in the ship channel, following completion of the first phase of the survey.

PRESENT STATUS OF THE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM IN TEXAS

Probably one of the most outstanding achievements of the past water-pollution-control program has been in the field of municipal waste treatment and disposal. An active partner in this endeavor has been the Texas Water and Sewage Works Association—an association of almost 4,000 members, all of which are intimately connected with the municipal waste treatment field. This association has gained national and even international recognition for its intensive operator training program as well as its never-ending efforts to broaden the scope of technical advances in waste-water treatment knowledge. The association has been influential on the local level in bringing about needed construction and elevating the status of local operators. As a result, it is with considerable pride that the board reports that every city within the State of Texas having a sewage collection system has some type of sewage treatment facilities with the exception of three small municipalities located along the gulf coast. The 1960 population of these three municipalities was only about 30,000, and each of them is now actively engaged in abatement programs.

Indicative of the high regard Texans have for water is the extensive use of waste water for irrigation purposes. Presently 119 municipalities utilize sewage plant effluents for the irrigation of cotton, cattle feed crops, and pasture land.

Coupled with the development of these irrigation systems, Texas pioneered in the application of holding ponds (now called sewage oxidation or waste stabilization ponds) as a type of inexpensive but efficient secondary treatment unit. These ponds are being used by 284 municipalities in Texas.

The application of sewage plant effluents for industrial uses was begun in Texas in the late 1930's. At the present time three refineries are using municipal effluent for cooling water, and one of these further uses the refinery waste water for flooding operations in the oil production industry.

Texas has 998 municipal waste-water treatment plants; consequently, apprising municipal officials of the status of their facility, the need for planning, financing, and constructing plant enlargements to keep abreast of population growth and the proper maintenance and operation of the treatment works is one of the principal functions of the enforcement agency. Construction grants made available under Public Law 660 have proven of tremendous aid. One hundred and thirty-one projects have been completed and an additional 110 projects are under construction or have been approved. Of the 110 projects just mentioned, 22 are under the accelerated public works program.

There is an active water quality monitoring program underway. This consists of monthly samples being obtained at 276 points located on the rivers and major tributaries of the State. This program has been in effect since 1957 as a cooperative activity between the health department and the parks and wildlife department. Evaluation of data discloses water quality conditions to be generally good with evidence of mineral contamination affecting rather large areas of three river systems, whereas organic contamination is locally confined below major areas of population.

Utilizing the framework of the statewide monitoring program, samples were taken and the baseline radioactive levels of the surface waters of the State were determined.

Under provisions of article 7621b, V.C.S., the Texas Water Commission, in close cooperation with the water pollution control board, administers a permit system for the disposal, by subsurface injection, of municipal and industrial wastes.

Since most of the major industries are concentrated along the gulf coast, the problem of industrial waste disposal is not one as acute as it might be if these industries were located inland. Under the new permit system water quality objectives for tidal water will be established by the board in the near future.

The permit system for oil- and gas-field wastes is in the early stages of establishment with some 70,000 applications for permits having been mailed to operators.

Studies of the control of natural pollution sources are well advanced by the U.S. Public Health Service and the Corps of Engineers.

Status of permits issued by the board to date is as follows: Municipal, 542 statutory issued, 167 being processed, 41 regular issued. Industrial, 1008 statutory issued, 59 being processed, 19 regular issued. Oil and gas, 70,000 applications for permits mailed to operators. Hearings held on permits, et cetera, 41 municipal, 19 industrial, 10 oil and gas.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL NEEDS

Due to the general water-scarce characteristics of Texas and the deep respect of the average citizens toward water, there is no public apathy toward support of the water pollution control program. With the type of approach being taken by the board, and in view of trends observed during the short time of its operation, it seems that the water pollution control program of Texas is receiving full support from all interested groups. On this basis, therefore, the "can-do" spirit is becoming more and more apparent in State-local relationships. Of primary importance at this time is the ability to furnish the know-how leadership for keeping pace with the rapidly increasing economic, industrial, and population growth of Texas. Most of these problems are local in nature and will be resolved through State-local cooperative endeavors. Others, however, are not limited to matters of this nature, and consequently, involve areas of Federal contribution to the program. A few suggestions of such problem areas are as follows:

1. Being on the threshold of increased water reuse in Texas, it is becoming more urgent that techniques in the art and science of waste-water treatment be drastically broadened and improved.

2. There is a need for the development of reasonably priced, portable, and reliable instruments, recording devices, and data transmission systems for water quality monitoring networks and close surveillance.

3. Better and more quickly determined parameters of water quality are needed.

4. More information is required concerning bioassay tests on salt water fishes, shellfish, and other marine life.

5. Studies are needed on methods and materials to assure the construction of a "tight line" from the house to the treatment plant.

6. Consideration could be given to a program which would encourage plant operators and superintendents to conduct studies and applied research on waste-water treatment process improvements.

In conclusion, the State enforcement agencies, in effect, represent the frontline troops fighting the battle against pollution but are relying upon the logistic support of the Federal Government to develop new and advanced equipment and techniques. If the States receive this kind of support, then certainly they will be in better position to meet and conquer the common enemy, water pollution.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President. the adoption of my amendment in the nature of a substitute would not hinder water pollution control. Indeed, my amendment merely recognizes that the primary responsibility for pollution control lies with the affected States.

Too often there is a tendency to face up to a problem by creating some sort of new authority that places arbitrary discretion in only one person. That is what I believe has been done in this instance. I do not believe that any one person should possess such power.

I should like to express commendation and appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for having the perception to point out to Senators the inherent danger in the enactment of legislation of this kind. He has said that it would give the administrator the authority virtually to zone practically every body of water that feeds into a navigable stream. The significance of such vast power should and must be understood. Furthermore, conceivably at some time such power could be used as a political bludgeon.

So I urge the Senate to give favorable consideration to my amendment in the nature of a substitute. It has already been acted on by the House committee. It is, in effect, the work of the House committee, which was broadly representative and had considered the various angles. It was a committee that possessed a large Democratic majority at the time the report was made.

I urge the Senate to adopt my amendment because I believe it is a sound and sane solution of what I believe is an inherent and fatal weakness in the bill. At the same time, I do not believe my amendment would narrowly proscribe what we are trying to do in trying to mitigate the pollution of our streams. Certainly something must and should be done in that field, but let us do it in the right way. Let us not run roughshod over the Federal system.

Let us recognize that Governors and State agencies are conscious of the needs, the problems, and the ramifications of the enforcement and other provisions of the act in their own areas and, therefore, should have a decisive voice in the establishment of water quality standards.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, later I shall speak in more detail on this subject in connection with an amendment I shall offer.

In 1963, a bill almost identical to S. 4 was presented to the Senate. I raised in the Senate then, some of the issues which have been discussed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. I pointed out that vast powers were proposed to be given to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—powers which, in my judgment, would be greater than any powers now given to any other official in the Federal Government. That bill as S. 4, now before us, did not assure to the States, to interstate compacts, to municipalities, the right to participate fully in the development of water quality standards.

It is questionable whether any right of judicial review is provided to the States by S. 4. The bill confers vast power, one which would enable the Secretary, as stated by the Senator from Texas, to zone every body of interstate water in the United States, and to prescribe the uses of such waters or portions thereof. Nothing like this has ever been proposed before.

In 1963, my efforts were rejected, and the bill went to the House. A different situation obtained there.

During the 1963 hearings in our committee, no Governor was called, some but not many State water authorities were called. But Governors and State water authorities were called in the House. Without exception, the Governors and State authorities who testified before the House committee, protested the ultimate grant of power to one man to fix water quality standards. The House Public Works Committee rejected the Senate bill. In its place, it substituted the measure which is now proposed by the Senator from Texas. I would support S. 4 if there were some provisions in it for the effective participation of the States in the preparation of proper quality standards and for their proper judicial review.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Kentucky as he may require.

Mr. COOPER. I support the amendment of the Senator from Texas. If the amendment should be rejected—and I am not suggesting that it will be, although I know the great fighting spirit of the Senator from Maine—I shall offer an amendment that will at the least assure that States, municipalities, and individuals will have the right to have the action of the Secretary reviewed by a court. I support the pending amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the interesting aspect of the chore that I have had for almost 2 years in dealing with this bill and the arguments against it is that I am often in the position of trying to explain what the bill is and how irrelevant the arguments against the bill are, before I can proceed to deal with the arguments advanced against the bill.

I am interested in the argument of the Senator from Kentucky that the bill gives the Secretary vast powers that are greater than the power given to any official of the Federal Government. This is a form of exaggerated statement that does not stand up. I can illustrate that by referring to the Secretary's power in this very field. It is a power that was considered at the hearings. That is the power of the Secretary to absolutely prohibit from shipment in interstate commerce shellfish which the Public Health Service finds deleterious to health. This is an absolute prohibition which can put a man out of business, as it has done in my State, in the case of the clam diggers and shellfish harvesters along the coast of Maine. There is no recourse whatsoever to the Federal Government for protection against that type of calamity.

The statement of the Senator from Kentucky that the powers asked for on behalf of the Secretary are greater than any powers now existing does not stand up. I am sure that the Senator would agree with me if he were to give the subject further thought.

The proposal presented to us by the Senator from Texas is very interesting. He is saying that the Senate, rather than accept the recommendation of its own committee—a recommendation sponsored by all members of the subcommittee, dealing with the subject, Republicans and Democrats, and reported by the Subcommittee on Water Pollution—should accept the recommendation of a House committee, not of this Congress, but of the previous Congress.

It is a recommendation that the House itself never acted upon. The Senator from Texas is asking us to accept this proposal, not only against the recommendation of our own committee, but also against the action of the Senate itself in October 1963 when it passed this bill, and particularly this section, in almost exactly the same form by a vote of 69 to 11, with 15 Senators not voting, but expressing their favorable position on it.

We are asked to take the position that this vehicle of the House committee, never acted upon by the House, should be given that weight in the Senate merely because the action of the Senate as a whole was rejected.

I have never found that the Senate was willing to concede its own prerogatives in any time past, and I doubt that it will concede its own prerogatives now.

The substitute offered by the Senator from Texas differs from the Senate bill in one important respect, which I think is at the heart of his proposition. That is with respect to the water quality standard section of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself such additional time as I may require.

The House bill, for all practical purposes, eliminates any power of the Secretary to establish water quality standards on interstate streams, and substitutes for it the dubious right to make recommendations for standards of water quality.

Under the House bill, the Secretary could not even make recommendations on standards under the provisions of the present law, prior to such time as an enforcement action is begun by a conference. If he should undertake to give consideration to an interstate waterway, in which case he thought a little preventive medicine might avoid a great deal of economic hardship—which is the position now taken by industries and communities—if he should feel that he ought to recommend certain standards of water quality which may apply to preventive measures to the interstate or State agencies involved, under the House version of the bill, he could not make recommendations to anybody. So in the House bill, he is not even given full and clear authority to recommend standards.

On page 22 of the proposed substitute, there is this interesting language:

> No standard of water quality recommended by the Secretary under this subsection shall be enforced under this Act unless such standard shall have been adopted by the Governor of the State Water Pollution Control Agency of each affected State.

That language, "each affected State" means not only the State being injured, but the State doing the injury. Is it conceivable that in this type of situation, the Governor of a downstream State which has been injured by its pollution would seemingly accept such a standard if pressures were brought to bear upon him within his own State, by industrial polluters of the waterway, not to accept such standards? Is it conceivable that a Governor or a legislature which had found it impossible to generate a public policy or program within its own State to deal with that situation would willingly accept the recommendation of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in such circumstances? I doubt it.

It has not happened before. It is because it has not happened before and because these problems have accelerated and accumulated, that it is before the Senate today. It is because it has not been done before that the bill passed the Senate 2 years ago. And it is because it has not happened before that the need has been so clearly recognized by so many people, many of whom I have referred to already in my remarks today.

Mr. President, I shall sum up with one or two observations about S. 4 on the question of water quality standards.

The standards would be pertinent in two different kinds of situations. One situation would be one in which already there is pollution which endangers the health or welfare of any person. I use that language because that language is found in the present law, which gives the Secretary the right to move into such situations without any standards whatsoever. The proposed standards in that kind of situation would be a warning to people, in advance of enforcement proceedings, that there was a situation requiring corrective action.

The other kind of situation in which water quality standards would be needed is a situation in which there is no pollution at the present time but in which a little preventive medicine is called for, not only in the interest of those who like to use water for recreation, or for drinking, or for water skiing, but in the interest of industry. There have been instances in my State in which we could not allow an industry to settle on the banks of a stream because there was no more oxygen left in the stream. So it would serve the industrial health of that community to have water quality standards established to avoid the expenditure of that oxygen so that the water will be available not only for recreation, but for industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. For those reasons, which could be expanded ad infinitum, I urge the rejection of the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes. I should first like to comment on the contention of my friend, the Senator from Maine, that we should accept the work of the Senate committee and reject that of the House committee. I recall reading of an incident which occurred when Mr. Thomas Jefferson returned from France after the Constitution had been framed. He called on George Washington. They were having a cup of coffee. He said to Mr. Washington, "Tell me, Mr. Washington, why do you have a bicameral Congress?" Mr. Washington said to Mr. Jefferson, "Why are you pouring coffee from your cup into your saucer?" Mr. Jefferson said, "To cool it." Mr. Washington said, "That is why we have a bicameral Legislature. We pour legislation from one Chamber to the other to cool it."

The proposed legislation certainly needs cooling. I am not disparaging the work of my friend, the Senator from Maine, whom I hold in high esteem. It is with great trepidation that I take him on, because he is skillful, he has great knowledge, and he has worked zealously to accomplish a very desirable goal.

It appears that the States and State agencies are willing to take their chances in a mutual veto arrangement. Those agencies which opposed the measure, who either appeared or filed statements, include the Delaware Water Pollution Commission, the Texas Water Pollution Control Board, the Alabama Water Improvement Commission, the Tennessee Stream Pollution Control Board, the American Association of Professors of Sanitary Engineering—some of these are not State agencies—the Florida State Board of Health, the Kansas Department of Health, the State of New York Water Resources Commission, the Kentucky State Water Pollution Control Commission, the Kentucky Department of Health, the North Carolina State Stream

Sanitation Committee, the Pennsylvania State Health Department, the Governor of Maryland, the Arkansas Water Pollution Control Commission, the California Water Pollution Control Association, the Maine Water Improvement Commission—the agency from the Senator's own State testified in opposition to the bill—the Oklahoma State Department of Health, and the Oregon State Board of Health.

I could continue and include agencies from Rhode Island, Utah, Virginia, and many other States.

I should like to read into the Record at this time a statement made by the Governor of Texas, Hon. John Connally, at the County Judges and Commissioners Association conference held at Corpus Christi on October 5, 1964, which I think typifies the attitude of responsible and forward-looking State governments:

> One point I want to make clear: Texas is going to determine its own destiny in the development of its water resources. These goals will not be realized by chance nor by blind dependence upon the wisdom of the Federal agencies. We must accept our own responsibilities.

I reject the notion that State governments and State agencies are going to be irresponsible or incompetent.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **TOWER**. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I reject the notion that State governments and agencies are going to be less competent and fail to recognize that water pollution problems exist; or that they are going to be more loath and reluctant to do something about it.

It is time to stop downgrading State officials and governments. We have in America today some of the best State officials we have ever had, even though most of the Governors are Democratic. I am willing to leave it to them to take care of this problem. This power should be left in the States, rather than in the hands of a single man or administration.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. The Senator from Texas referred to Maine. The Governor has his own water pollution committee. I do not yield to the Senator, despite the differences in our views, in my appreciation of the very great need of strong local and State government actions. I have served at all levels of State government. I have served in the legislative branch in two levels and the executive branch in two levels.

One of our efforts has been to create every opportunity for the exercise of initiative and for the discharge of responsibility, for the acceptance of the burden involved in the problem, by State and local governments. Over and over again, in the enforcement procedure, in the procedure for setting standards, our State and local governments and interstate agencies have been given an opportunity to come in and do the job.

Just as the Federal Government, in its vast bureaucracy, includes people who are not as wise or as responsible as they ought to be, or who do not always meet the requirements of the public interest as they should, so on the local and State levels is that true. Neither has a monopoly on virtue, ability, or regard for the public interest.

What we have tried to do in this bill—and I think we have succeeded, certainly to the satisfaction of the Republican Members, as well as the Democratic Members, on the subcommittee—is to achieve a cooperative partnership among the State, local, and Federal governments in dealing with a problem that is not only a State and local problem, but a national problem.

The substitute recommended by the Senator from Texas would be a step backward from this objective in that, even with respect to making recommendations, the proposed substitute would dilute the power that the Secretary has under existing law.

Mr. **TOWER**. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. I yield back my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. **TOWER**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **TOWER**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD** (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "nay."

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 62, as follows:

[No. 5 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Bennett
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Hickenlooper
McClellan
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Robertson
Simpson
Talmadge
Tower

NAYS—62

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Miller
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—23

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Eastland
Gruening
Hayden
Hruska
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Pearson
Prouty
Ribicoff
Smathers
Thurmond
Yarborough

So Mr. Tower's amendment was rejected.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open for further amendment.

THE PROBLEMS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last week the Washington Post carried a series of excellent articles on the problems of public education in this country. I believe they establish quite conclusively the enormous pressures on our educational systems, both present and potential, and thereby emphasize the need for action by this Congress in the field of education.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles written by Gerald Grant and Maurine Hoffman be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our No. 1 Business: Education Quality Varies in U.S. School Districts

(First in a series)

(By Gerald Grant and Maurine Hoffman)

America provides equal educational opportunity, someone once said, for every fourth or fifth child. These are the children in Westchester County, N.Y., Arlington, Va., Berkeley, Calif., and other affluent school districts.

They attend modern schools with the tools and topflight teachers to provide the kind of education that assures success in our accelerating society.

In varying degrees, the other three or four out of that five do not receive such an education.

South Carolina spends an average $240 a year on each school child. The quality of its education is reflected by two salient facts: Only 48 percent of those who take the relatively simple selective service mental test in South Carolina pass it. And only half the State's eighth graders complete high school.

California puts $515 into the education of every child and 85 percent pass the selective service exam. Nearly 9 out of every 10 eighth graders will finish high school in California.

These statistics are one indication of the range in quality of education in the United States but they are State averages that tend to obscure the have-not districts in every State.

In adjacent Bristol City and Buchanan County school districts in Virginia, for instance, these disparities exist: The city spends a third more per pupil and its dropout rate is only one-third of the county's. Nearly 98 percent of the city's teachers are college graduates but less than half the county's have a degree.

Have-not schools and school districts add up to severe national shortcomings. Here are some of them:

Susan Ludy attends a one-room school in central Missouri that provides the first and most important 8 years of schooling for 20 children. Their teacher is paid $3,375 a year and has less than 2 years of college. But how many qualified teachers would be willing to work in a school wtih no running water, only a few textbooks, and no science equipment?

One out of every five teachers in the United States fails to meet full certification standards and nearly a fifth of all elementary teachers do not have a college degree.

Harold Baxter was one of 77 students in the top sixth of a class of 440 students who graduated in June 1963, from a high school in a blighted area of Detroit. Thirty-seven of those 77 received scholarships. Harold was among the 40 who did not go on to college for lack of funds, counseling, or motivation.

Nationally, 200,000 out of the 600,000 students who graduate in the top third of their class fail to go on to college, principally for lack of funds.

Monroe Bryant is one of 12,000 Boston schoolchildren who attend dismal, poorly heated, and in some instances firetrap schools—all built more than 70 years ago.

Such schools may be found in urban slums across the land. In Philadelphia recently, 117 children were given hospital treatment after coal gas seeped from a faulty furnace in the Hartranft School, built in 1890. In Washington, the replacement of the still overcrowded Shaw Junior High School—with its leaky roofs and converted basement classrooms—was called for nearly 20 years ago.

The U.S. Office of Education reports that 124,300 new classrooms were needed last year—64,900 to replace substandard facilities and 59,400 to relieve overcrowding.

Raoul Barnes, a 12-year-old, leaves his suburban home near St. Louis before daylight each morning in order to reach Hazelwood Junior High School by 6:30 a.m. Raoul attends school on the early shift. Those who come for the afternoon session attend classes until 7:10 p.m.

Throughout the United States, 409,000 pupils attended school for less than a normal schoolday last year. Many were in suburban areas like Hazelwood where schools have not been able to keep up with surging population growth.

If a child is born crippled, blind, deaf, or retarded, schooling may not only be unequal but altogether lacking. Seventeen States have no special facilities for the education of deaf children. Three times as many mentally retarded children need special classes as are in them. In most cities there are two children on waiting lists for special classes for every child in such classes.

U.S. Office of Education statistics reveal a shortage of 150,000 teachers of the retarded and handicapped.

President Johnson has put the righting of some of these most critical education wrongs at the top of his agenda. "Nothing matters more to the future of the country," he declared in his message to Congress Tuesday, "than better education for all up to their ability to receive it."

Education, the President stressed, must be the Nation's No. 1 business.

The President's school aid program, with $1.5 billion earmarked for the first year, would concentrate two-thirds of the funds on the 5 million children whose families earn less than $2,000.

In addition to the $1 billion allocated to poverty impacted schools, the President's program proposes $150 million for preschool training, $100 million for supplementary centers that would provide services ranging from reading clinics to art classes, and $100 million for textbooks and improved libraries. Nonpublic school students would be included in many programs.

Mr. Johnson has also proposed $260 million for higher education for Federal scholarships and guaranteed reduced interests loans, college library aid, and help for small colleges with a growth potential.

The President's program is a major step toward closing the gap of educational inequality. But it will leave many areas—such as teacher salaries and construction needs—largely untouched. First-rate schooling for all children will require vastly increased sums for education at all levels in the years ahead.

This series of articles will discuss some of these needs, the question of what share of the Nation's school burden the Federal Government should bear, and the history of past attempts to provide Federal aid to education.

Our No. 1 Business, III: Pupils Who Need Attention Most Start School With an Unbeatable Handicap

(By Maurine Hoffman and Gerald Grant)

"We look into the schools of Harlem and we find that our young people can't read and they can't write."

"The children are not taught anything. They are just slapped around and nobody bothers to do anything about it."

"They need to get rid of all these slummy buildings. The children can't live in these buildings. They need better schools. They need a whole lot."

These tape-recorded comments of a schoolteacher and two angry young mothers were gathered by Harlem Youth Opportunities, Inc. (Haryou) for a now-famous study "Youth in the Ghetto." But they apply with equal force to ghettos in every big city in the United States.

Salvaging the lives of the children in these ghettos is one of the prime goals President Johnson had in mind when he said that education must become the Nation's No. 1 business.

A youngster born into such a slum has only half the chance of surviving infancy that the average child has. He is twice as likely to become a juvenile delinquent and six times as likely to contract venereal disease.

He starts school with a huge cultural gap and falls progressively further behind. Studies of Harlem children show they are an average 1 year behind in academic achievement in the first grade, 2 years behind by the sixth grade, and 2½ years behind by the eighth.

He has only half the chance of finishing high school. More than 60 percent of students entering 10th grade in the inner city high schools of the Nation's 15 largest cities will drop out—compared to a national dropout rate of 30 percent.

Failure is expected and defeat permeates the classroom.

Schools are like factories: grimy, decaying, overcrowded, and understaffed.

At Shaw Junior High School in downtown Washington, students are packed into converted locker rooms and basement storerooms.

Commenting on the high truancy rate, a teacher whose class is in a dimly lit, made-over basement shop, asked: "Would you want to come to school here?"

"These kids should have cheery, bright rooms," he said. "Many of them live in this kind of a dungeon. They shouldn't have to come to school to it."

Shaw's roof leaks and the showers in the gymnasium don't work.

ELEVEN PERCENT SLOW LEARNERS

In Washington as a whole, 11 percent of the schoolchildren are in basic track classes for the slow and academically retarded. But in 18 inner city schools, 28 percent are in the slow track. At Shaw, more than a third are.

"Will you tell me why this rich country of ours should have 3 percent of our children mentally retarded while Sweden has 1 percent?" President Kennedy asked in a California speech in June 1963.

"The reason of course is that they grow up in slums, that the mothers do not have prenatal care, they do not have special teachers," the late President said.

They not only do not have special teachers, they are most likely to get the least experienced and unqualified teachers, and the shabbiest equipment.

ONCE THEY WERE BEST

But this was not always the case. Some of the schools that now have the highest dropout rates and the lowest academic achievement records were among the best schools of the Nation 30 years ago.

Big city school systems paid the highest salaries, drew the best teachers, and had the most lavish equipment.

But vast shifts in population have occurred in recent decades. Unskilled rural families, primarily Negro, have moved into the decaying centers of the big cities. Middle income whites have moved to the suburbs.

Schools in the cities are getting a smaller share of the tax dollar as costs of other municipal services have risen. In most big cities only 30 cents of the tax dollar is spent for education. In the suburbs, the schools get 70 percent of the tax dollar.

The Institute of Administrative Research at Columbia University's Teachers College recently reported that New York City schools would need $200 million more this year to maintain the level of financial support the city schools achieved in 1944–45.

The decline in support is most evident when the schools are measured against those in suburban areas.

A team of Harvard University consultants who studied Washington's inner city schools concluded that $10,000 would have to be spent on each inner city family to provide the same kind of educational opportunity that is available in affluent suburbs.

GAP IS ENORMOUS

The Harvard experts readily admitted that such a sum was unrealistic but stressed that it is an indication of how "enormous * * * the gap is between our least favored public school systems and our most favored systems."

In some suburban school districts on Long Island, they pointed out, children come from homes where the average income is $15,000 a year and average per pupil expenditures range between $1,500 and $1,800.

In the inner city of Washington, where many earn less than $3,000, less than $500 is spent on each child.

The $1 billion that President Johnson has proposed for the first year of his program to aid the 5 million children whose families earn less than $2,000 is an important step toward closing the gap.

SLUMS NEED MORE

But many educators believe that huge sums beyond this must be pumped into slum schools: for public nursery school programs, smaller classes, better teachers, psychological, guidance, and social services, after-school study centers, cultural and remedial programs, modern equipment and new buildings.

As one Harlem mother said: "It is not a small thing they have to do and they are taking too much time in doing it."

Our No. 1 Business; IV: Many Talented Young People Lack Means To Pay Soaring College Costs

(By Maurine Hoffman and Gerald Grant)

Increasing throngs of students are swarming over college campuses, but some of the Nation's most talented young people have been forgotten.

These are the youths who should be in college but aren't * * * the youths unable to finance the higher education necessary for them to make contributions to society equal to their potential.

President Johnson has said that more than 100,000 of our brightest high school graduates annually will not go to college—"if we do nothing."

The President is seeking a three-pronged plan aimed at helping more needy high school students gain access to higher education.

Of the total $260 million he is asking for higher education, about half would go for student aid. This would take the form of scholarships, expansion of work study programs, and Government-backed low-interest loans.

Project Talent, a study by the Office of Education and the University of Pittsburgh, found that 45 percent of American high school youths scoring in the top 20 percent in scholastic aptitude fail to enter college.

About half were from families with annual income under $6,000, while only about one-fifth came from families with incomes of $9,000 or more.

Take Linda, for example, a Negro girl with a B average at a downtown Washington high school. Linda's mother, a widow, works as a cook to support her five children. How could she possibly afford to send Linda to college? So Linda, who wanted to become a doctor, settled for a job as a practical nurse.

Or consider Juan, a Spanish-American boy in a Texas high school. His teachers said he has great talent in writing. But his family barely makes ends meet running a struggling little restaurant. After high school Juan had to go to work washing dishes instead of developing his talent.

The Lindas and Juans in this country are not the ones who receive most of the private scholarship funds. A recent study found that for every college scholarship awarded to a pupil from a family with an income under $3000, four were given to students from families with incomes above $11,000.

In particular, the opportunities to attend college have been limited for Negroes and other minority-group members. Almost 12 percent of white adults (ages 25 to 29) have completed college, as against only 5.4 percent of the comparable nonwhite group.

COLLEGE COSTS UP

Today, increasing college costs are putting a burden even on well-to-do families. College costs this year are estimated at $1,560 for public institutions and $2,370 for private institutions.

But by 1980, when college enrollment is expected to double its current record figure of 5,320,294 students, college costs will have zoomed still higher. The annual costs of public colleges are expected to rise to $2,400 and those of private colleges of $3,640.

The Federal Government is already providing some assistance in meeting college costs. Under the National Defense Education Act, $163.3 million in certain types of loans and fellowships will be available to students this year. Students who teach for 5 years after graduation have to pay back only half of their loans.

The antipoverty program passed last year included funds to help 150,000 needy college students by paying them for part-time work on campuses or in their communities.

The new Johnson proposal would broaden this program, placing it under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would supplement National Defense Education Act loans by making loans available on a wider basis.

COLLEGE TEACHER SHORTAGE

Increased financial aid probably would encourage more students to enter graduate school and indirectly help fill higher education's critical teacher shortage.

The total of new college teachers needed now is almost 32,000. Yet the annual output of Ph. D.'s, backbone of the college teaching staff, is less than 14,000. Fewer than half of these enter teaching.

Colleges and universities received help with construction needs in 1963 when Congress voted the Higher Education Facilities Act, giving grants and loans for academic buildings, laboratories, and technical schools. This legislation is due for renewal in 1966 when higher education is expected to seek expanded construction aid.

But as colleges expand, tremendous strains are being put on their research and library facilities.

The "overwhelming majority of academic libraries are understaffed, poorly housed, and ill-equipped," the Office of Education reports.

Only half of 4-year colleges meet minimum standards for library collections (50,000 volumes for 600 students, and 10,000 volumes for every additional 200 students) set by the American Library Association. Less than 20 percent of 2-year schools meet minimum ALA standards.

In spite of heavy spending increases on college libraries (up 67 percent from 1959–60 to 1963–64), the national ratio of 51.9 volumes per student has actually declined to an estimated 48 volumes because of enrollment upsurges.

President Johnson is seeking legislation to purchase books and library materials and to train more librarians.

Other categories of his higher education program are aid to smaller colleges which are battling for survival because they lack accreditation, and grants for university extension programs to fight city social problems.

"Higher education is no longer a luxury but a necessity," the President commented. While Federal aid has helped colleges and universities greatly in the past, "we need to do more," Mr. Johnson said.

Our No. 1 Business, II: Inferior Schools Blight Education in Urban Slums and Rural Squalor

(Second of a series)

(By Maurine Hoffman and Gerald Grant)

The Negro youth in Harlem and the white boy in the shack in Appalachia have much in common.

Both are poor and both are likely to be receiving the kind of education that tends to keep them that way.

As the 1964 Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers put it, "For the children of the poor, education is a handicap race; many are too ill-prepared and ill-motivated at home to learn at school. And many communities lengthen the handicap by providing the worst schooling for those who need the best."

Much has been written on the defects of urban slum schools. In his book, "Slums and Suburbs," James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University, pointed out that the contrasts between schools in wealthy suburbs and large cities "jolt one's notions of the meaning of equality of opportunity."

The expenditure per pupil in wealthy suburban schools is as high as $1,000 per year, but it is less than half that amount in some big city schools.

But little attention has been paid to the schools in poor rural areas. These country schools have deficiencies similar to those in city slums. Rural school problems are compounded by their isolated locations.

President Johnson's program recognizes this fact. In calling for a push forward in education—"the No. 1 business of the American people"—the President has proposed a billion-dollar program of grants to impoverished school districts.

"Low-income families are heavily concentrated in particular urban neighborhoods or rural areas," the President noted.

In the past people tended to stay where they were born, so it made little difference if education in rural areas lagged behind that in the rest of the Nation. There was plenty of farm work in those days that did not demand a trained mind.

CONDITIONS DIFFERENT

But today agriculture is mechanized and the farm population dwindles steadily. So the graduate of a rural high school in Louisiana is likely to end up on the relief rolls in Chicago unless he has sufficient education for employment.

A visit to a combination grade-high school in Ellsinore, a village of 500 in a depressed area of the Missouri Ozarks, gives a good picture of the barebones education meted out to thousands in underfinanced rural schools.

LIBRARY OUTDATED

At Ellsinore the academic diet is extremely meager. Foreign languages, chemistry, physics and modern methods in mathematics are not taught. Practice in English composition is infrequent since the lone overworked English teacher has little time to grade them.

The library consists of a few bookcases, containing some outdated volumes, in the corner of a dark classroom. There is some new science equipment, supplied with Federal funds, but there is no place to put it in the outdated building.

Classrooms in the dingy, overcrowded school are constructed around a gymnasium, which means constant distracting noise throughout the building.

The district desperately wants a new school, but it cannot raise the money, so it tries to make do in the present structure. English classes are taught in an old one-room school that was moved to the main schoolhouse grounds.

TEACHERS SCARCE

Finding teachers is a major problem since the village is miles from cultural centers, lacks modern rental housing, and offers low pay ($4,000 for beginning teachers) with little promise of raises. Often teachers come only to gain experience to move on to better paying jobs.

Yet the Ellsinore school repesents all that most of its nearly 400 pupils will ever know of formal education.

Higher education is completely out of the question for most of its graduates. Perhaps as many as half of the families in the school district are on welfare or eke out a marginal existence, often cutting cordwood.

The best many of its boys can hope for is an assembly line job in St. Louis, while the girls seek clerical work there or in surrounding towns. Yet the growth of automation threatens the existence of these types of jobs.

"We do the best we can with what we have, but we need help," Ellsinore's school superintendent, L. W. Kingen, said. "Our people are paying all they can and we don't get enough State aid."

Kingen longs for Federal aid. Most of his district is National or State forest preserve with a consequently small property tax base. Now even more property is being taken off the tax rolls for a national waterways monument but the last Congress turned down a provision to give aid to the affected school districts.

In other rural areas 19th century education is still being given to 20th century children. There are still thousands of one-room schools in operation, especially in the Middle West.

At the last count in 1961–62 by the U.S. Office of Education 13,333 of these remnants from horse-and-buggy days were being used to teach space-age youth.

Our No. 1 Business, V: States Seen Failing on Education Despite Soaring Property Taxes

(Last of a series)

(By Maurine Hoffman and Gerald Grant)

Do future needs of the schools demand increased Federal contributions or can the States and localities foot the bill?

Expenditures for public schools and colleges will rise from about $27 billion this year to $35 billion by 1970, according to U.S. Office of Education projections. In the next 5 years, 400,000 new classrooms and 800,000 new teachers will be needed.

WILL IT BE ENOUGH?

Property and other local taxes which have risen sharply in recent years will go up still more. But will this be enough?

Some argue that Federal dollars are not needed. The quality of education in the States has been rising steadily, it is asserted. States and localities can raise needed revenues through income taxes and other levies, especially if the Federal Government did not take such a large slice of the tax pie.

On the other hand, Federal aid proponents say that inequities are severe and that only the Federal Government can collect the money where the wealth is and distribute it where the children are.

DISPARITY IN SPENDING

Some States spend three times as much per pupil as others. In one State, 76 percent of the high school teachers have masters degrees, in another only 8 percent. Average teacher salaries vary from a low of $3,610 in one State to $7,350 in the highest.

President Johnson who wants to end these inequities, says improvement of the schools must become the Nation's No. 1 business.

Federal contributions have been rising slowly, accounting for about 1.8 percent of school expenditures in 1940, 2.9 percent in 1950, and 4.4 percent in 1960. It is estimated that Federal contributions under the impacted areas program, National Defense Education Act, and other measures accounted for about 5 percent last year.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS

But most of this aid has been categorical—for such special purposes as improving science and mathematics instruction or training teachers of the retarded.

Federal aid proponents say that it should be much more widespread and account for a greater share of school expenditures. A summary of their arguments on fiscal grounds follows:

The States and localities once collected two-thirds of all taxes but now the Federal Government collects more than two-thirds of all revenue. Thus it is argued that the degree of Federal support for education should be much higher than 5 percent.

Taxes have been increased greatly at local and State levels in recent years, but inequalities persist. It is unlikely that States, which try to keep taxes low to attract industry, and cities, which are suffering homeowner resistance to higher property taxes, will be able to raise the revenue that will be needed.

Other local needs such as welfare and transportation, are competing for dollars and not all local tax increases will go for schools.

Needs are exaggerated and the schools are improving. Pupil-teacher ratios are lower, teachers are better prepared and better paid (up 164 percent since 1946) and school expenditures have climbed at a faster rate than enrollment.

While many pupils are on part-time sessions and housed in substandard classrooms, construction is catching up because the postwar crop of babies has moved through the schools and the annual growth rate will be lower in the decade ahead.

State and local governments have the taxing power and the ability to pay for quality schooling. Roger Freeman, in his book, "Taxes for the Schools," argues that those who believe that the property tax will not yield substantially more revenue "disregard that during the 1960's over $400 billion worth of new private construction will be completed and vast areas of low-value land converted to high-value use."

Local governments will not make the extra effort if the Federal Government is going to support the schools. (President Johnson said in his education message, however, that Federal funds to poor school districts should be granted only on the condition that they are not used to reduce local and State efforts.)

If national taxes were reduced sufficiently, States could enact income and other taxes to meet their school needs.

Experts on both sides of the question admit that their case can't be proved conclusively from statistics.

But when all the arguments have been rehashed, the question may be this: Perhaps the States could do the job, but the record shows they aren't doing it and can we afford to wait?

PROTECTING AGRICULTURE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Monday the Washington Post carried an excellent editorial entitled "Protecting Agriculture," commenting on the rather cool treatment which agriculture seems to be receiving from some architects of national policy. The budget which we received on Monday contains substantial cuts in various agricultural programs. To be specific, the support price on cotton recently set by the Secretary of Agriculture is 1 cent lower than in the past crop year, the support price for rice is also lower, and many other items, such as the Soil Conservation Service technical assistance program, have been cut. This trend is disturbing to me.

I believe it is shortsighted to sacrifice the interests of rural America to the increasingly heavy demands of urban areas. In fact, hasty and ill-conceived cuts in the agriculture budget and the resulting lower prices on agricultural commodities may well hasten the migration of people from rural areas into the urban slums, a prospect which is not attractive in view of the many difficulties we are now experiencing because of urbanization. The migration of Americans from rural to urban areas is a prominent feature in recent American history. It should be our purpose to aid this trend insofar as it promotes the best interests of the American people, but the new skills required of the people involved must be cultivated, the cities must be built, and our agricultural system must be protected in the process.

These facts of life about American agriculture and its relation to the other sectors of our economy were further reviewed in the lead editorial in yesterday's Washington Post which I commend to my colleagues and other readers of the Congressional Record who are concerned not just with economic trends but more fundamentally about the people whom they affect.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials to which I have referred, and a fine column by Leland DuVall from the Arkansas Gazette, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 25, 1965]

Protecting Agriculture

With the growth of Federal expenditures politically constrained many a cold eye in the executive branch is cast on the older programs. And since the expenditures of the Agriculture Department rank second only to Defense in size, they are attracting their share of attention. There are few Federal programs that cannot be trenched upon without courting disaster, but before subjecting the agricultural programs to indiscriminate cutting, an effort should be made to weigh their costs and benefits.

By the end of the current fiscal year about $3.5 billion will be spent in supporting agricultural commodity prices. The price-support programs have been criticized on the grounds that they neglect the welfare of the small "dirt farmer" and result in higher prices to consumers. It is, indeed, tempting to add to the direct Federal outlays a much larger figure representing the difference between current prices for food and what it would cost consumers in an absolutely free market.

But calculations of that type tacitly assume that farm prices can somehow be permitted to find their "natural" levels without serious economic dislocations. In a highly interrelated economy, such an assumption is highly dubious. According to the new input-output study recently completed by the Office of Business Economics, every dollar of agricultural products that is delivered for final demand requires about 78 cents in the products and services of nonagricultural industries. So any disruption in the agricultural sector would be transmitted immediately to all other sectors of the economy and would be magnified.

If the United States faced the predicament of France where farms absorb 25 percent of the labor force, the protection of agriculture would have the untoward effect of retarding the growth of the industrial labor force, raising wages, and boosting costs. But with only 7 percent of the labor force on farms and an uncomfortably high level of unemployment in urban areas, the social costs of protecting agriculture are considerably reduced. In fact a good case can be made for retarding the migration of poorly educated young people from farms to cities.

None of the foregoing considerations vitiate the need to reexamine the agriculture programs and to broaden them in such a way as to improve all aspects of rural life. Government programs are increasingly geared to the 75 percent of the population that lives in urban areas. But a Great Society cannot ignore the welfare of the other 25 percent.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 27, 1965]

Moving Misery Around

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in his address to the American Institute of Planners which met here Monday, made some points that ought to figure in any planning of agricultural policy. It is to be hoped that his ideas will be reflected in the agricultural message soon to go to Congress.

The Secretary told the planners that half the poverty of the country is concentrated in rural areas where 30 percent of the people live—a proportion of poverty twice as high as is found in cities and suburbs; that there are more substandard, dilapidated, and deteriorating homes in rural America than in all the cities of the Nation put together.

And yet, the Federal budget message proposes a half billion dollar reduction in agricultural appropriations, most of it in price support funds. The budget message, moreover, declares that "in view of the market outlook for farm commodities at home and abroad, farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than 1 million farm families, even with continued Government assistance." The message asserts that "many low-income farm families will have to find other means of earning a living, or other sources of income to supplement their modest farm earnings, if they are to share in our national prosperity."

This is an unexceptionable statement, so far as it implies increasing farm incomes where the farmers are, but it does not hold out much hope to low-income farm families if they have no future in rural communities. Most of them are not equipped by training or provided with resources necessary to make a socially acceptable readjustment to urban life. We now have some 3½ million farm families of which 1 million are large commercial operators with gross income of $10,000 a year or more; 1½ million low-income commercial farmers, and 1 million part-time farmers. It is the 1½ million farmers who earn less than $10,000 whose fate seems to be mostly involved. Of this group, some 821,000 have incomes less than $5,000 and the rest average between $5,000 and $10,000. Given the fact that many of these farmers lack any preparation for urban employment, migration may not be the best solution either for them or for the society as a whole. Little is to be gained by moving them out of agriculture, which at least provides a subsistence, and onto urban welfare rolls.

Farm population declined 4 percent a year in the 1960's. In the 25-year period after 1929 more than 18 million farm people moved out of agriculture. This is a staggering rate of depletion. As Secretary Freeman told the planners, "rural poverty has been moved en masse to the cities to become urban poverty—and the inherent evils of poverty have been compounded by congestion and the family disorganization that takes place when people are uprooted."

The Secretary declared himself in favor of an orderly migration of the well-prepared and opposed to a disorderly, forced migration of the ill prepared. He rightly said there has been too much of the latter. And he rightly supported, as an alternative, "the creation of economic opportunity in rural America that will enable people who want to stay in their home communities to make a decent living there."

Secretary Freeman is calling for a "rural renaissance" and that is exactly what is going to be required. That renaissance might give the 2½ million farmers outside the highest income commercial group a decent standard of living in the rural areas where they now live. If the means are provided in rural areas to produce educated, capable, and self-dependent people, they will move into urban industry as rapidly as positions are available to them. No enlightened government could contemplate a policy of inducing the disadvantaged and ill prepared, by the naked coercion of want and poverty, to move into great urban centers which cannot provide the jobs for employable people already there and which cannot cope with the social problems of the unemployables already on their welfare rolls.

Nothing is to be gained by just moving human misery around from one sink of degradation to another. And that is what we are going to be doing if we simply cut agricultural appropriations in the expectation that the market system will cut the farm population down to the number that can find profitable employment in high-income commercial agriculture.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Jan. 17, 1965]

Plans Look Good, Save for Skimping, for "Great Society"

(By Leland DuVall)

One of the parables tells the story of a foolish man who built his house on a sand foundation. When the rain descended and the floods came and the winds blew and beat upon that house, it fell "and great was the fall of it."

In a slightly different context, the United States is drawing the blueprint for the Great Society but there are indications that the designers are tempted to skimp on the foundation. The announced purpose of the parsimony is to save money with which to finance the cost of the facade and pay for the interior decorations and the playroom.

The detailed plans on how and where the money will be spent will be revealed later but there are indications that the architects of the Great Society plan to trim such essential programs as the logical method of saving money with which to finance innovations.

Specifically, the often-hinted suggestion that the Government cut back on its long-term investments in research and conservation in agriculture to help pay for such projects as rural recreation site development would be as stupid as installing a weaker and less expensive foundation in order to pay for a pool table in the playroom.

In broad terms, no one could argue with the conclusions of President Johnson when he said:

"An austere budget need not be and should not be a standstill budget. When budgetary restraint leads the Government to turn its back on new needs and new problems, economy becomes but another word for stagnation. But when vigorous pruning of old programs and procedures releases the funds to meet new challenges and opportunities, economy becomes the companion of progress."

While agreeing with this broad objective, it should be remembered that some of the old programs demonstrated their essential nature forcefully and expensively before they were established in the first place and the Nation has not outgrown the need. Consequently, it would be a little foolish to prune these programs on the ground that they were old; such a move would show us quickly just how new they really are.

The Soil Conservation Service is one of several examples in which a major budget reduction—carried to a point that it would reduce the efficiency of the organization—could be the most expensive kind of false economy. The great civilizations of history drew their strength from the roots embedded in 6 inches of fertile topsoil. When the land was eroded and the roots were washed bare, the civilizations died. The United States is fully as dependent on its topsoil as were the ancient nations that rose and fell but by the time we depleted the natural resource to a point that was endangering our future we also had accumulated enough technical knowledge and political sophistication to tackle our problem intelligently. The "black dusters" and deep gullies of the 1930 decade were interpreted correctly as omens that the famine was coming. The Nation responded by offering an erosion control program on a farm-to-farm basis, then filled in the blank spots so that virtually all of the farming regions are under conservation practices.

Now there is some danger that, in the interest of economy, the Federal Government will trim its technical staff, reduce the cost-sharing provision, and cut back on its total conservation program. Under the present system, which has proved successful in the past 30 years in halting the waste of natural resources and restoring the fertility to our soil, the SCS provides technical assistance while the actual administration is under the control of local soil and water conservation districts. The districts, which are organized under charters of the various States, are composed of the landowners where the conservation work is planned and accomplished. The ASCS, which is a different Government agency, provides assistance to the landowners in carrying out the recommended and planned practices.

Under this local-State-Federal table of organization, the soil and water resources of the country have been maintained at a more-than-adequate level. The abundance of food and fiber has provided the argument that the country would be taking no chance with its future if it reduced spending in this area in order to save money for new—and perhaps more appealing—programs.

Budget Director Kermit Gordon, writing in a recent issue of Saturday Review, explained the situation this way:

> "We need more education and better education, from the primary grades through graduate and professional schools. We should expand our job training and retraining programs for the unskilled and for those whose skills are obsolete. We must intensify the war on poverty. We need improved outdoor recreation facilities, efficient urban mass transportation, and better mental health facilities. We need to bring the benefits of medical research discoveries to more people more quickly. We should step up our attack on air and water pollution."

All these are laudable objectives and several of them are new, so far as their inclusion in Federal responsibility are concerned. Each, in its turn, can be justified on social or economic grounds and (admittedly) each has a political appeal to a specific and important group.

In the light of the growing population of the United States, the shrinking area of land suitable for farming, and the increasing market for food and fiber throughout the world, no single new facet of the Great Society can be ranked above the conservation of natural resources on the scale of pressing future needs.

Officials have not released target figures but reports from Washington hint that the budget planners hope to "save" $20 million by reducing the technical staff of the SCS by one-third and trimming various other parts of the program. The money saved by this maneuver could pay for a considerable amount of "improved outdoor recreation facilities" but, in the long run, the country might find itself with some of the finest picnic tables in the world—and a shortage of food in the lunch basket.

A similar case could be made against the proposal to cut back on the amount and quality of certain types of agricultural research and the sometimes-heard suggestion that extension education should be curtailed.

Perhaps the most pressing problem of all is the need for a national understanding of the long-term value of conservation, research, and extension education—not just to agriculture but to the whole economy. Urban people may support a Federal-State water pollution control program enthusiastically because they understand that it can open the way to industrial development and assure ample water in the city reservoir. It may be a little harder to see that we also need to assure ourselves a continuing supply of food by saving the natural resources from which the raw materials are manufactured.

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 4 to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning with line 12 page 7, it is proposed to strike out all to and including line 2, page 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (c) (1) In order to carry out the purpose of this act, the Secretary may, after reasonable notice and public hearings and after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other Federal agencies, with State and interstate water pollution control agencies, and with municipalities and industries involved, to obtain the views of such officer and such agencies, municipalities, and industries, prepare proposed regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof.
>
> (2) Standards of quality prescribed by regulations adopted under paragraph (1) shall be such as to protect the public health and welfare and carry into effect the purposes of this Act. In establishing such standards with respect to any waters, there shall be taken into consideration (A) the use and value of such waters for public water supplies, agricultural, industrial, and commercial use, the propagation of fish and wildlife resources, recreational purposes, and other uses of significance in the public interest, and (B) the practicability and economic feasibility of attaining such standards.
>
> (3) Such proposed regulations shall be published in the Federal Register, and copies thereof shall be transmitted to all Federal, State, and interstate water pollution control agencies, municipalities, and industrial organizations affected. Upon request made within ninety days after publication of such proposed regulations by one or more of the States, interstate agencies, municipalities, and industrial organizations (referred to hereinafter as "interested parties") affected, the Secretary shall conduct public hearings upon such proposed regulations at a place convenient to the interested parties. In any such hearing, interested parties shall be accorded adequate opportunity to obtain and present necessary evidence in support of their contentions, and shall be entitled to propose revisions and modifications of the proposed regulations. Upon the basis of all evidence received in any such hearing, the Secretary shall prepare and transmit to each party to the hearing his report thereon, which shall contain a full and complete statement of his findings of fact and his conclusions with respect to issues presented at the hearing. The Secretary may, thereupon, affirm, rescind or modify in whole or in part such proposed regulation.
>
> (4) Except as otherwise specifically provided by this Act, hearings and determinations under this Act shall be made, and subject to administrative and judicial review, in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.
>
> (5) Regulations under this subsection shall become effective only if, within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so, the appropriate States and interstate agencies have not developed standards found by the Secretary to be consistent with paragraph (2) of this subsection and applicable to such interstate waters or portions thereof.

On page 9, line 3, strike out "(5)", and insert in lieu thereof "(6)".

On page 9, line 13, strike out "(6)", and insert in lieu thereof "(7)".

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING OF REPORT BY PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations receive an extension of time until March 1, 1965, to file a report by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The report to which I refer deals with Organized Crime and the Illicit Traffic in Narcotics.

Last week a draft of this report was sent to the subcommittee members and they have not had adequate time to review and study it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 68) was read, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the investigative authorizations provided by S. Res. 278 of the Eighty-eighth Congress are hereby continued through February 28, 1965, inclusive.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The resolution is necessitated by the fact that the resolution the Senate adopted last year will expire on Sunday, and we shall have no authority to act after that. It is not anticipated that we will get to the resolution to continue this authority until sometime later next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 4, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT TIME

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] wishes to speak for about 3 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the statement to be made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], an hour be allocated to consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], 30 minutes to be under his control and 30 minutes to be under the control of the Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. MUSKIE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ACREAGE-POUNDAGE CONTROLS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF TOBACCO

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in allowing me time to introduce a bill. It is a bill in which he is also interested because it relates to tobacco.

On behalf of myself and Senator ERVIN, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill which is of vital interest to the future of our tobacco farm program.

The bill would set up the machinery under which farmers—if they so choose—could establish a combination system of acreage-poundage controls for the production of tobacco.

I would like to emphasize that the bill specifically requires that the farmers themselves—in a referendum—must approve the acreage-poundage system before it can be put into effect.

As everyone knows, the tobacco program has operated for many years as the most successful of all of our farm commodity programs, but in recent years we have come upon very grave problems. I sincerely feel that some basic adjustments need to be made in the program if it is to survive.

Those of us who represent the tobacco-producing areas of the Nation have always taken great pride in the fact that the tobacco program has always operated at a minimum cost to the Government and at the same time has provided good income for the farmers who produce tobacco.

In recent years, we have found that acreage controls alone are not in fact effectively controlling the production of tobacco. No one is more aware of this than the growers themselves. Each year the yield per acre continues to increase in spite of repeated reductions in the number of acres planted. Despite a 10-percent reduction in the 1964 crop, yield per acre increased from 1,975 pounds in 1963 to 2,203 pounds in 1964—an increase of 11½ percent per acre—and resulted in a greater production than in 1963.

The bill which I am introducing relates specifically to flue cured tobacco, but it is written in such a way that other types of tobacco can be included in the program when the need arises.

I think the provisions of this bill have very special significance for flue cured tobacco growers who will be forced to take a 19.5 percent acreage reduction for the 1965 crop year unless a system of acreage-poundage controls is put into effect. If this bill is enacted into law and if the flue cured growers approve acreage-poundage controls, then about 14.5 percent of the 19.5 percent acreage reduction will be restored for the 1965 crop.

This would be done by putting a ceiling on the total number of pounds each farmer is permitted to sell under an acreage-poundage system.

Without going into any great detail about the formulas involved, the bill provides that each farmer would receive an acreage allotment and a poundage allotment based on the average production of his 3 highest producing years between 1959 and 1963. There are allowances made in the bill for those farmers who fall below the county average yield and provisions for those who go above the county average yield. There are also provisions in the bill for those farmers who have crop failures or for other reasons fall below their poundage quota in any one year. These provisions would permit farmers who fall below their poundage quota to add the deficit to the next year's quota.

All in all, this bill provides ways and means to set up a system which will give each farmer a fair share of the total tobacco market in terms of pounds as well as acres.

If this system is approved by the farmers, it will permit all tobacco growers to concentrate on producing high quality tobacco rather than continuing the present headlong rush to increase per acre yield each year at the cost of quality. The program will go a long way toward stabilizing the entire tobacco industry at a time when its very existence is at stake.

I fully realize that there are many and varied opinions as to how to best solve the problems facing tobacco. I am introducing this bill as a starting point and as a working draft in the hope that all of those interested in the future of tobacco can agree on a program that will once again bring stability to the tobacco producing industry.

In the past few years, the surplus stocks of tobacco have soared to volumes which are completely out of reason and which cannot be justified. This proposal offers the growers themselves an opportunity to make a choice as to the course they choose to follow in the future.

If this program is approved by the growers and put into effect this year, it will mean a savings to the U.S. Treasury of upwards of $200 milllion on the 1965 crop.

This proposed program has been developed over a period of many months of hard work on the part of many leaders in the tobacco industry and it represents the thinking of leaders in every segment of the industry. I have no way of knowing what decision the growers themselves will make concerning an acreage-poundage program, but I do know that they are deeply concerned over the future of their program as it exists today. I also know they feel that some adjustments must be made if the program is to survive. I do not think—with the supply and demand situation as critical as it is—that it would be fair to deny the farmers themselves an opportunity to vote on the question of adopting an acreage-poundage system of controls.

The primary purpose of my introducing the bill is to give the growers themselves an opportunity to choose between the existing program and an acreage-poundage program, and I will respect their choice. I would like to point out that the bill as introduced calls for an approval of at least two-thirds of the growers voting in a referendum before acreage-poundage controls can be put into effect. There has been considerable discussion as to whether this figure should be two-thirds or a simple majority, and I am confident this is something that can be worked out as the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considers the matter.

I am hoping that we can have early hearings on this bill because time is of the essence, and I sincerely feel that the farmers themselves should have an opportunity to make a choice before they begin planting their 1965 crop.

I appreciate very much the opportunity which the Senator from Kentucky has given to me to introduce the bill. As the Senator well knows, time is short if we are to accomplish anything in 1965.

Mr. COOPER. I shall be glad to study the measure, because it concerns tobacco.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 821) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, introduced by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. ERVIN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 4, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered is much more limited in its scope than the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and which was voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Kentucky yield to himself?

Mr. COOPER. I yield myself 15 minutes. At the outset I wish to make clear to Senators who are present the essential purpose of my amendment. In the event that the pending bill, S. 4, should become law, my amendment would assure that if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare promulgates water quality standards, then all States, States joining in compacts, municipalities, and water control agencies who would be affected, would be assured the right of full administrative and judicial review.

The distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the distinguished ranking minority member from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and the members of his Subcommittee on Water Pollution Control have worked hard to bring the Senate a bill providing for more effective water pollution control policies. I congratulate them. I am interested in their objectives. In 1947 and 1948, when I served on the Committee on Public Works, we approved, and Congress later approved, the first Water Pollution Control Act, an act introduced by Senator Taft and Senator Barkley. I was happy to support it. In the years following that, I have supported other amendments to make the act more effective in the interest of water pollution.

Last year, I stated in the debate on the floor, my reasons for opposing the bill reported by the Committee on Public Works, and earlier in this debate I have outlined my reasons for opposing S. 4.

But now I come to the purpose of my amendment. Section 10 of S. 4, which is before the Senate, provides, among other things—and this is essentially the thrust of the bill—that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be authorized to promulgate water quality standards for every interstate body, or navigable water adjacent to one or more States. So at the beginning, let me say that in its geographical scope, it is not a small bill that we are considering; it is a bill which affects every State and countless miles of waters, waters upon which are located great and small cities and many industries, waters whose purity, and whose use for agriculture, industry, water supply, recreation, and the propagation of fish and wildlife, concern us as we look to the future.

The bill is broad not only in its geographical scope; it is broad in the effect that it could have upon every State, every municipality, and thousands of industries, and farms throughout the Nation. I do not believe I would have to argue to the members of the Committee on Public Works, especially the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], that I do not speak in that committee or on the floor of the Senate for any special interest, and I do not do so now. The point I wish to make is that the bill gives to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare tremendous authority and power, a power which I will say again is not matched, in my opinion, by the power of any other official of the Federal Government. I doubt whether the President of the United States has such power, except with respect to foreign affairs. It is a power that would enable the Secretary to promulgate water quality standards. It is an authority that is given him to take measures to abate any nuisance, which is defined in the bill as any discharge into the water which would reduce the water quality standards he has established.

The bill gives him the power to zone interstate waters, and navigable waters adjacent to States, reaching our lakes and the ocean itself. I do not say it will be used; nevertheless, it is a power which would enable the Secretary to determine what portion of a stream should be set aside for industry, what portion should be used for agricultural purposes, what portion for recreation, and what portion for the development of fish and wildlife, and for such other uses as he may determine.

This is a new legislative concept. If there were proper precautions drawn about the proposal, which would give States, municipalities, and others concerned an adequate role in the development of the standards which affect them and, finally, the right of judicial review, I would not oppose this concept. It does look ahead to a better, purer water supply for the Nation, a more beautiful country, and the general public interest as the Senator from Maine has said.

The Senator from Maine will argue, as he has—and very effectively, at least to the Senate—that all of these rights are preserved in the bill. I disagree with him. I have not been able to convince him. I was not able to convince the Committee on Public Works or the Senate last year. Nevertheless, I hold to my views, derived from my study of the bill.

Before the Secretary can promulgate standards, he must consult with the States, municipalities, and others concerned, and must hold public hearings. But that does not affect his sole and ultimate authority to promulgate and make effective water quality standards.

It is true also that after he promulgates the regulations, public hearings can be held upon the request of a Governor. The Secretary would have the authority to revise or modify original standards that had been promulgated. That is a fair procedure, but it does not affect his essential authority to promulgate the standards.

The Senator from Maine will argue against my insistence that there be written into the bill provisions guaranteeing to the parties affected the right to resort to the courts. He will say, in my judgment, as he said in committee, that this right is assured under its enforcement procedures. I make the point that the enforcement sections apply to the abatement of a nuisance and provide procedures to be followed after a nuisance occurs.

My amendment insists that after the standards are promulgated and before the nuisance occurs that States, municipalities, and individuals actually affected by the standards, and showing cause to courts, would have the right to be heard.

I shall discuss the specifics of my amendment, then I shall be finished.

The first section, section (c) (1) is essentially the same as provided by S. 4.

Subsection (2), of my amendment, prescribing the criteria under which the Secretary would act in proposing and promulgating water quality standards, is essentially the same as contained in S. 4 with one distinction.

I propose criteria in addition to the criteria of S. 4. I refer to the practicability and economic feasibility of attaining such standards. This is practical and necessary and fair.

The criteria of S. 4 includes the value of such waters for public water supplies, industrial use, propagation of fish, wildlife resources, and recreational resources.

I have added another factor: "the practical and economic feasibility of attaining such standards" which is a necessary factor, in all commonsense.

Subsection 3 of my amendment is very much like the language in S. 4, which authorizes a public hearing after the regulations are proposed by the Secretary. My amendment is somewhat more specific.

My amendment would require that regulations be published in the Federal Register, copies be transmitted to the States and other agencies which would be affected, and then all parties affected would be given 90 days in which to prepare for public hearing, and then the right to present their views if they believe revision is indicated.

This is an important distinction between my amendment and S. 4. Hearings under S. 4 are limited to the request of Governors. My amendment opens hearings to all parties affected. This is elemental justice.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I shall yield in a few moments. S. 4 would permit only the Governor of a State to ask for a public hearing, to ask for modifications and revision. My amendment would not limit this power to the State, but would extend it also to municipalities that might be affected, great cities such as Cincinnati and Cleveland.

I think of those cities because I see the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] in the Chamber. I am not trying to persuade him to vote for this amendment on that account. But, municipalities all over the country would be concerned.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I shall yield later. I would like to finish first. I have never had the chance to present my position in whole to the Senate.

I learned a great deal from the Senator from Maine. My amendment contains the same provision as S. 4, which is that the Secretary could not put into effect his standards until the States have had an opportunity to promulgate their own water quality standards. Again, I know that the Senator will argue, "We are giving the States a chance."

I say that it is a fictitious chance because the standards that they would be required to establish must be identical with the standards that the Secretary would promulgate or consistent with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, no matter what is said, in essence, the ultimate and complete power is given to one man to fix water quality standards for every interstate stream in the country, including zoning, if he so determined. I shall read the last provision of my amendment and I do not see how anyone could be opposed to it. It reads:

> Except as otherwise specifically provided by this Act, hearings and determinations under this Act shall be made, and subject to administrative and judicial review, in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

The Administrative Procedure Act provides for adequate administrative review. It provides also that after a final rule is made, an affected party may obtain a review in the circuit court of appeals. The review would not go into the question de novo, but would go to the abuse of discretion by the official or agency entering the order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 1009, title 5, of the Administrative Procedure Act, subsection 19, United States Code, 1958 edition, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

§ 1009. Judicial review of agency action.

Except so far as (1) statutes preclude judicial review or (2) agency action by law committed to agency discretion—

(a) Right of review: Any person suffering legal wrong because of any agency action, or adversely affected or aggrieved by such action within the meaning of any relevant statute, shall be entitled to judicial review thereof.

(b) Form and venue of proceedings: The form of proceeding for judicial review shall be any special statutory review proceeding relevant to the subject matter in any court specified by statute or, in the absence or inadequacy thereof, any applicable form of legal action (including actions for declaratory judgments or writs of prohibitory or mandatory injunction or habeas corpus) in any court of competent jurisdiction. Agency action shall be subject to judicial review in civil or criminal proceedings for judicial enforcement except to the extent that prior, adequate, and exclusive opportunity for such review is provided by law.

(c) Acts reviewable: Every agency action made reviewable by statute and every final agency action for which there is no other adequate remedy in any court shall be subject to judicial review. Any preliminary, procedural, or intermediate agency action or ruling not directly reviewable shall be subject to review upon the review of the final agency action. Except as otherwise expressly required by statute, agency action otherwise final shall be final for the purposes of this subsection whether or not there has been presented or determined any application for a declaratory order, for any form of reconsideration, or (unless the agency otherwise requires by rule and provides that the action meanwhile shall be inoperative) for an appeal to superior agency authority.

(d) Relief pending review: Pending judicial review any agency is authorized where it finds that justice so requires, to postpone the effective date of any action taken by it. Upon such conditions as may be required and to the extent necessary to prevent irreparable injury, every reviewing court (including every court to which a case may be taken on appeal from or upon application for certiorari or other writ to a reviewing court) is authorized to issue all necessary and appropriate process to postpone the effective date of any agency action or to preserve status or rights pending conclusion of the review proceedings.

(e) Scope of review: So far as necessary to decision and where presented the reviewing court shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of any agency action. It shall (A) compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and (B) hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be (1) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; (2) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; (3) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right; (4) without observance of procedure required by law; (5) unsupported by substantial evidence in any case subject to the requirements of sections 1006 and 1007 of this title or otherwise reviewed on the record of an agency hearing provided by statute; or (6) unwarranted by the facts to the extent that the facts are subject to trial de novo by the reviewing court. In making the foregoing determinations the court shall review the whole record or such portions thereof as may be cited by any party, and due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error. (June 11, 1946, ch. 324, § 10, 60 Stat. 243.)

EFFECTIVE DAYS

Section as effective three months after June 11, 1946, see section 1011 of this title.

CROSS REFERENCES

Section applicable to functions exercised under International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, see section 1642 (1) of title 7, Agriculture.

Section applicable to judicial review of any agency action under the Atomic Energy Act of 1964, see section 2231 of title 42, the Public Health and Welfare.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall not misquote the Senator from Maine. The Senator made the statement in committee that my amendment would open the doors to everyone, whether or not they had an interest. Section 1009, subsection (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act defines those persons affected and the reasons for giving parties the right to go to the courts. So, I would say that there is no strength to that argument.

Last year, the committee held hearings for 6 days. No Governor testified before the committee. Few State water control commissioners were represented before the committee. It went to the Committee on Public Works of the House after the bill passed the Senate. The committee considered the bill. It heard the testimony of about 25 Governors and State water pollution control boards. All raised the questions that I have raised here today. The committee refused to accept S. 4, with respect to the authority to be given the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I close by saying that if the protections I seek can be included in the present bill respecting the formulation of standards and the assurance of judicial review, I would support the concept of water quality standards. But, I could not vote for the bill, in the form it has been presented to the Senate, without these proper safeguards.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an additional 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in reading the amendment, I note that prior to the promulgation of the rule, hearings are to be conducted. The Secretary then has the right to promulgate a rule. May I ask whether the amendment would afford the affected parties a right to be heard after the rule is recommended, and before adoption?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I must say that we are in accord on that.

Mr. MUSKIE. S. 4 does that also.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, after the regulation has been published—and my amendment would require publication and notice—then a public hearing could be requested.

The distinction between the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine and my amendment is that the amendment of the Senator from Maine would allow only the Governor of a State to request a public hearing, unless the Secretary wanted to do it on his own motion. My amendment would permit any affected public party to ask for a public hearing. This is in accord with principles of justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, touching the last point first——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. MUSKIE. Fifteen minutes.

Touching the last point first, so that my reply may be close to the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky, let me say that the procedures set up in the rulemaking and policymaking authority given in S. 4 are subject to the Administrative Procedure Act. The Senator has said that S. 4 gives only the Governor the right to appeal from any water quality standard established by the Secretary. That is not so. S. 4 provides, following the promulgation of the standard, that the Governor may then petition, in accordance with the procedure followed in establishing the standard in the first instance, for a revision of the standard; but in addition to the provision in S. 4 is this provision of the Administrative Procedure Act. We have gone over this in the committee, and the matter is plain and clear:

> Every agency shall accord any interested person—

Any interested person—

> the right to petition for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of a rule.

So the provision of S. 4 must be read in connection with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

If there is any doubt in the Senator's mind or that of any other Senator that the Administrative Procedure Act is applicable, I shall be happy to accept an amendment to this effect: All action taken under this section for the adoption of standards and the promulgation of rules and regulations shall be taken in conformance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

There is no question in my mind, or that of any other lawyer who has addressed himself to this question, that the Administrative Procedure Act will be applicable to this bill if it is passed. But if there is any doubt, I shall be happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to ask the Senator from Maine, if that safeguard is already provided for in the Administrative Procedure Act, what his objection was to accepting the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky. It seems to me it would be better to have a duplication of this authority than to take a chance on some definition which might be placed on the various sections of the law later. I wondered what his objection was. I am sorry I have not been on the floor long enough to have heard all the argument.

Mr. MUSKIE. First of all, the provision of S. 4 with which we are dealing is the product of 2 years' work, careful refining and polishing, so that members of the committee on both sides know what it means and what its implications are. There is no doubt in our minds about it.

The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky has been presented to me in its present form for the first time in the past 30 minutes. From such examination as I have been able to give it in that time it does not seem to me that it changes sufficiently to make different, in my judgment, the provisions or objectives of S. 4. It says the same thing, in language that has not had the kind of testing and refining that the language in the bill has.

For example, the Senator's amendment provides that the regulations shall be published in the Federal Register. That is a requirement of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. AIKEN. My question is: Does the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky do violence to S. 4, the bill itself?

Mr. MUSKIE. I cannot be sure. The Senator from Kentucky obviously feels it does, or he would not have offered it. He is not in the habit of offering frivolous amendments. And because of that conviction, I must be careful when I say that in my judgment it does not differ from S. 4.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason I ask the question is that I know the Senator from Kentucky is not in the habit of offering amendments that do violence to a worthy bill. I wondered what the objection was. Perhaps the Senator from Kentucky can explain what his amendment would do which the Senator from Maine has not been able to discern up to now.

I have a great deal of respect for both the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Kentucky. I dislike to vote against either of them. Therefore, I must get down to the merits in making up my mind.

Mr. MUSKIE. I agree.

In the first place, the Senator's amendment is presented in the context of the argument which he has made; and the argument which he has made includes what he considers to be a list of dangers in S. 4. He leaves the implication that his amendment will deal with this matter. Otherwise, the argument has no relevance.

For example, he has said that this amendment is designed to protect the right to judicial review which, somehow, S. 4 has presumably jeopardized.

S. 4 does not jeopardize the right to judicial review. But if it does, the Senator's amendment does nothing different from S. 4 to correct that weakness.

Secondly, the Senator from Kentucky expresses concern about the vast geographical scope that S. 4 would give to the Secretary's control over the waters of the Nation.

Here, again, if that is a danger in S. 4, the Senator's amendment does nothing to correct it. Moreover, the bill does not enlarge by a cubic inch of water the jurisdiction of the Secretary under present law. So the jurisdictional territory does not change under S. 4. But if it did, the Senator's amendment does not correct that point.

Third, the Senator complains that S. 4 is too broad in its effect over States, municipalities, and industries. If, indeed, S. 4 does go beyond reasonable bounds in this respect, again the Senator's amendment does not touch the point in any different way than does S. 4.

The Senator from Kentucky speaks of the vast authority and power S. 4 gives to the Secretary.

I have indicated that S. 4 provides ample protections. But if it does not, the Senator's amendment does not change the bill, if it is adopted, in its effect in that respect.

The fifth point the Senator makes is that S. 4 gives the Secretary power to zone all our waters. I do not believe that is true. But if it is true, it is true as a result of the powers the Secretary now has.

For example, under section 2 of the present law is this language, and the title of the section: "Comprehensive Programs for Water Pollution Control":

> The Secretary shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or develop comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries thereof and improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters.

This is a power the Secretary now has. S. 4 does not enlarge it in any way. But under S. 4 it is required that the Secretary, in advance of any attempt on his part to use enforcement powers which the law gives him, to establish standards so that industrial and other users and interstate agencies may understand in advance what is expected of them. He cannot exercise even this much authority without the safeguards which have been outlined in that section, which I shall be happy to discuss in detail.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator's only objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is one of doubt in that the meaning may not be clear, would he not be willing to take the amendment to conference? I am sure all of us believe the question will be cleared up there. I expect to vote for the measure, as I did previously.

It seems to me it is better to state a certain position of authority twice than it is to run the risk of leaving it out, if it is a desirable matter.

Mr. MUSKIE. If there were a way to bring the Senator's language into the bill, in addition to the committee's language, I would have no particular objection to the surplusage, but he offers it as a substitute. Therefore, the Senator from Vermont puts us in the position of saying that, as between two versions which say essentially the same thing, we are to take something developed in the past 6 hours rather than something which has been developed over the last 2 years.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not saying, I am asking. I am not saying.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any specific language in S. 4 giving the right to an aggrieved party to avail himself of the Administrative Procedure Act and to appeal to the courts, in the event he believes that his rights have ben violated by the finding made? Is there any specific language in S. 4 to that effect?

Mr. MUSKIE. In the first place, S. 4 does not deal with the enforcement authority of the Secretary, that is, with the procedure for using that enforcement authority. It deals only with the question of establishing standards of water quality in advance of any enforcement situation.

If the enforcement powers are invoked, they are spelled out in present law and are not changed by S. 4, except to insert the test of practicability on standards. Otherwise, the enforcement powers are not changed. If they are invoked, there is ample protection for the individual.

First of all, the Secretary must call a conference. At that conference, all interested States, interstate agencies, industries, and municipalities are parties. A case is made for the factual basis, for the consideration of the Secretary. The conference then reports to the Secretary with recommendations, if it chooses.

In a report to State and interstate agencies, the Secretary then provides for a minimum of 6 months to act in accordance with the conference report. If they fail to act, the Secretary can then convene a hearing board.

Each of the States involved can appoint a member of the hearing board. The Federal Government is also represented. The hearing board then hears all the interested parties. At the conclusion of its deliberations, it files a report with the Secretary indicating what, if anything, the hearing board concludes as to the state of pollution; what, if anything, it concludes about steps to be taken to alleviate the situation; and also what, if anything, it recommends for additional action.

The Secretary then sends those recommendations to the States and the interstate agencies and gives them no less than 6 months to do something about it. If they fail to act, he then asks the Attorney General to invoke the judicial process.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Kentucky suggests that we write into the bill the applicability of the Administrative Procedure Act and the right to appeal. Is there any specific language in S. 4 stating that the Administrative Procedure Act applies, and that a party who believes himself to be wronged may go to court?

Mr. MUSKIE. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If it is not, what is wrong with putting it into the bill and resolving the question positively, so that it does apply and the right to go to court exists?

Mr. MUSKIE. I would be happy to accept the language of the suggestion and insert the following language:

> All action taken under this action for the adoption of standards in the promulgation of rules and regulations shall be taken in conformity with provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

I have no objection to such a provision. I believe it is unnecessary, but I would be happy to accept that language.

Mr. President, I offer that amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that before doing so it will be necessary to obtain unanimous consent.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am sorry—I withdraw my suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's request is withdrawn.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One further question. The Senator from Kentucky has stated that in his amendment there is certain following language which is not in S. 4—namely, that in determining the quality standards and what shall be done to procure them, there shall be considered the practicability and economic feasibility of obtaining such standards.

Will the Senator discuss what his proposal provides on that item, and what his position is on it? On page 10 there is some language relating to the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable. Is that in here?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

The language about which the Senator from Ohio inquires is found in two places; first, in the provision which to do with the standard that the court shall use in evaluating not only the standard, but also the practicability of the abatement orders which it is considering.

Thus, the court is given that authority under S. 4.

Second, in addition to the language which the Senator has just brought to my attention at the top of page 10, it gives the hearing board—to which I referred earlier in my colloquy with the Senator—the same mandate to consider the practicability of applying such standards as may be applicable.

Obviously the mandate to the court and the mandate to the hearing board which establishes the size of the opening at one end of the pipe would control what goes on at the other end of the pipe.

The Secretary must consider, as he frames these standards, that they will be subject to the test of practicability, first by the hearing board and second by the court, so the test is clearly set out. There is no question about it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. If the Senator from Maine will allow me to proceed, I wish to answer the arguments the Senator has made respecting my statement supporting my amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thought the Senator rose to answer a question.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Maine stated a few minutes ago that he was about to respond to the propositions I had made in my statement. I desire to answer his argument.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky on his own time.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. The statement was made that my amendment is a new one, and had not been made until a few minutes ago. It is correct that I reduced in form the amendment I offered in the committee, which spelled out in detail the right of affected parties for review in the circuit court of appeals of any regulation the Secretary might promulgate.

In place of such specific detail I have put this language in my pending amendment:

> Except as otherwise specifically provided by this act, hearings and determinations under this act shall be made, and subject to administrative and judicial review, in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

This in substance, is exactly what I have been arguing for in committee for 2 years. I have offered the substance of this language—the right of judicial review in hearings and the last time, only yesterday. The distinguished Sentaor from Maine would not accept it. He would not agree to it. The committee would not agree to it and voted it down.

The second response I make is this: The Senator has referred to the additional criteria which my amendment proposes "the practicability and economic feasibility of attaining such standards". The Senator has stated that this language is contained in S. 4 with respect to abatement proceedings. That is an entirely different matter. It is correct that when proposals for abatement are considered and recommendations are made by the hearing board, the question of the practicability and economic feasibility of abatement plans may be considered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on my time?

Mr. COOPER. I shall yield in a moment. But the criteria I offer goes to the development of the water quality standards. That is entirely separate from their application in our statement proceedings.

Third. My amendment relating to public hearings is not limited to a Governor making a request, but gives the right to any affected party, anyone affected within the terms of the Administrative Procedure Act.

The Senator from Maine argues that the Administrative Procedure Act applies, even without its specific mention in the bill. Even if it is correct that it does apply, without a specific provision in the act saying it is applicable, yet if there is language in the act which contradicts the language of the Administrative Procedure Act, as S. 4 does, of course the language of the bill would supersede the Administrative Procedure Act.

I shall not detain the Senate longer. I have stated my position. I was rather interested to hear the distinguished Senator from Maine say, after 2 years of work on this subject, that the bill does not give any additional authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I ask, then, what is the purpose of the bill?

I have great respect for the Senator. He is an able debater. That is the great problem I have with him in committee, and on the floor. When we reach a specific point for debate and answer, he raises some other point. This makes matters difficult.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not the Senator from Kentucky trying to make sure that in this vast new power which is being given to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Governor of a State and the States themselves will be assured of an opportunity of a public hearing in court, if necessary?

Mr. COOPER. The right would be given to any affected party

Mr. President, my amendment does not meet all the objections in the bill. I am offering it as a minimum assurance that the parties will have their day in court.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I believe I should make this point so that the RECORD will be very clear. I shall not go beyond it, unless I am asked some questions. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would change S. 4 in one further important respect, and that is in the procedure which is established in S. 4 for a revision of standards once they have been promulgated.

The Senator from Kentucky would rely wholly upon the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act for that purpose. The committee felt it important 2 years ago that there be clearly spelled out in the bill an opportunity to test the standards that had been promulgated by the Secretary, and that that test be applied by all the agencies which the Senator is interested in protecting, and the interests that he is interested in protecting.

The provisions set out in S. 4 do this very thing. The day after the Secretary promulgates his standards, the Governor of any State can question them, not only under the Administrative Procedure Act, which is open to any interested party, but also in his own right under the provisions of S. 4, and test them in any way he wishes to test them, and to suggest modifications or outright repeal

There is one other point that should be made. What we are talking about is the establishment of standards, not as a preliminary action, but as an enforced action. There is a very important distinction. When we are talking about enforcement action, we are talking about something that impinges on someone or has a direct impact.

When we are talking about standards, I have in mind, for example, the possibility of the standards of a pure stream not being defiled by any industrial user.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MUSKIE. From what basis of fact could a determination be made as to whether the standard required in that kind of situation is practicable or economic or feasible as to some future use, which has not been identified or defined?

When we are talking about established standards, where there is no indicated need for enforcement, we are talking about a situation which would call for the wisdom of Solomon to apply the practicability standard at that point.

Therefore, understandably, the practicability standard is established and clearly established in the law by S. 4 in the enforcement section of the law, where it ought to be, in the place where the people's rights are being affected by the proposed abatement order of the Secretary.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few questions?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it correct to say that the fact that a stream is navigable brings it under the proposed act, even though it is an intrastate stream and not an interstate stream?

Mr. MUSKIE. In my judgment, the stream must cross a State boundary to be covered by the provisions of the bill; that is, by the standards section. Under current law, the Secretary is given authority to move into intrastate streams when requested to do so by the Governor of a State.

However, the bill (S. 4) provides no authority for the Secretary to establish standards on any intrastate stream when he is invited in by the Governor. The standards section is clearly limited to interstate streams.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, on the request of the Governor of a State, having a large intrastate stream which passes various industries and various cities, the Secretary would have no authority whatever under the proposed act to set standards of purity? Is that correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. None whatever under these provisions. He has general authority under the present law to suggest programs. He could use that authority in making recommendations to the Governor of the State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

But the Secretary cannot go in in advance on an intrastate stream.

Mr. HOLLAND. In my State, the St. Johns River runs north for approximately 200 miles, to the city of Jacksonville, and then turns east and flows into the Atlantic Ocean. It is a large stream, and navigable for at least 150 miles of its length. The stream passes various cities, such as Sanford, Palatka, Green Cove Springs, and Jacksonville, to name only a few. The stream is now receiving, and probably will in the future continue to receive, the effluence from a mill at a certain point lying between certain of these cities. Assuming that the Governor of the State should ask the Secretary to come in and set standards as to this stream, would the Secretary have the authority to set standards for that stream?

Mr. MUSKIE. Not under this section.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under any section?

Mr. MUSKIE. I should like to read to the Senator the language in the present law bearing upon the Secretary's authority.

Under section 2 of the present law, under the title "Comprehensive Programs for Water Pollution Control," the present act provides:

> SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or develop comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries thereof and improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters.

That would give him the authority, as I understand, to recommend programs which might include standards of use. But that is not the kind of authority which would permit him to go on from there and actually promulgate standards that would have the force of law on anyone in that State.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no provision in the bill that would give the Secretary the right in such a case to prescribe compulsory standards of purity of water in such a stream?

Mr. MUSKIE. I would think not. I have one caveat on that point. Is there any tributary of the stream to which the Senator has referred which crosses the State border?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The border between the State of Florida and the State of Georgia is itself another river, the St. Marys River, so that streams that would come from the north would begin inside the State of Florida.

Mr. MUSKIE. Then it is my impression that in that situation the only authority the Secretary would have with respect to standards would be the recommending authority in the language of the present law, which I have just read. S. 4 would not expand the authority.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Governor made a request of the Secretary of the Interior in such a matter, how far could that request go and how far could the Secretary go in fulfilling it?

Mr. MUSKIE. That would be under present law. Under present law the Secretary has instituted enforcement actions of a type which can be brought only when there is an endangerment to health and welfare in, I believe, roughly 30 to 35 instances. I believe that a few of those may have involved intrastate waters and have been brought at the request of the Governor. I think there has been only a handful of those. Other than those, I believe most of the actions taken by the Secretary have involved interstate streams.

With respect to comprehensive programs—the language to which I referred earlier—the Secretary is undertaking river basin studies of the major river basins of the country with a view to development, with the assistance of interstate and intrastate agencies, of programs for the cleanup of the waters. But they are subject, of course, to the cooperative efforts of the States.

Mr. HOLLAND. With reference to the substitute amendment which the Senator has offered, if standards could be imposed by the Secretary in such a case as I have recited, would it clearly give the right to the mayors of the various cities, to the industries that were involved, and to property owners who were involved, to take the contrary positions, and would it give them the right in court to take those positions?

Mr. MUSKIE. As I understand, the Administrative Procedure Act provides only for administrative review of the regulations. Judicial review is provided when enforcement action is undertaken but in the establishment of rules and regulations only administrative review is provided. I am not an authority on the Administrative Procedure Act—except insofar as the sections are relevant.

Mr. HOLLAND. In any event, under the Administrative Procedure Act, if the Secretary should attempt to set standards in such a case as I have recited, could the mayors of the various cities having contradictory rights, and property owners and industries having contrasting rights, take an opposite position and be heard under the Administrative Procedure Act?

Mr. MUSKIE. As I understand that section, they could.

Is the Senator from Kentucky prepared to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. On this question the yeas and nays have ben ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the

Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 6 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Aiken
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Stennis
Talmadge
Tower
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—54

Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Miller
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Allott
Carlson
Eastland
Gruening
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Magnuson
McGovern
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Pearson
Prouty
Ribicoff
Smathers
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

So Mr. COOPER'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the motion by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered on passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, as I indicated in the discussion on the Cooper amendment, I offer an amendment. All this amendment would do would be to make all of the authority exercised by the Secretary under S. 4 subject to the Administration Procedure Act. I personally think that it would be subject to it anyway, but to clarify the matter, I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Between lines 17 and 18 on page 9 it is proposed to insert:

> (7) All action taken under this section for the adoption of standards and the promulgation of rules and regulations shall be taken in conformity with provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 7 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Miller
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—25

Allott
Bennett
Carlson
Clark
Curtis
Eastland
Gruening
Hayden
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGovern
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Smathers
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

So, Mr. MUSKIE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 5, between lines 10 and 11, to insert the following:

> No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act involving any scientific or technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions effective to insure that all information, copyrights, uses, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will be made freely available to the general public. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity, without his consent, of any right which that owner may have under that patent.
>
> Whenever any information, copyright, use, process, patent, or development resulting from any such research or development activity conducted in whole or in part with appropriated funds expended under authorization of this Act is withheld or disposed of by any person, organization, or agency in contravention of the provisions of the preceding paragraph, the Attorney General shall institute, upon his own motion or upon request made by any person having knowledge of pertinent facts, an action for the enforcement of the provisions of the preceding paragraph in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which any defendant resides, is found, or has a place of business. Such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such action, and to enter therein such orders and decrees as it shall determine to be required to carry into effect fully the provisions of the preceding paragraph. Process of the district court for any judicial district in any action instituted under this paragraph may be served in any other judicial district of the United States by the United States Marshal thereof. Whenever it appears to the court in which any such action is pending that other parties should be brought before the court in such action, the court may cause such other parties to be summoned from any judicial district of the United States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, S. 4 authorizes the expenditure of public funds for research and development to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

The research to be financed by these funds is intended to benefit the public to the greatest possible extent. It is natural, therefore, that the results of the research should be available to those whom the research is intended to benefit in the first place: The United States, the individual States, the general public, and the populations of many areas where water pollution problems are now serious or are expected to be serious in the future. The proposed amendment is an assurance and mandate that the intent and purpose of this legislation will be carried out.

This amendment is similar to the provision unanimously approved by the Senate for the Coal Research and Development Act, the Helium Gas Act, the saline water bill, the disarmament bill, the mass transit bill, and the water resources bill. An additional provision has been added, however, to assure that the Government in any action for the vindication of its rights will not be denied adequate relief because of procedural obstacles.

What we are talking about is that when the Government makes $20 million available in grants to States and municipalities for them to do research, those people are not going to give away private patent rights with the Government's money, with the result that the private contractor would then be in a position to deny every other municipality in America, including the one that signed the contract, the benefit of the Government's $20 million in research money.

What has been happening to this research money is so bad that the men who signed the contract should be in jail.

I have before me a publication of the General Accounting Office showing, on page 6, that the Department of Defense awarded a contract to one of the biggest corporations in America, receiving many millions of dollars of Federal money, and taking out private patents which put them in a position to deny everyone the benefit of the Government's own research money. The Government is supposed to be licensed so that it can license someone to work in behalf of research for the Government, or on national defense.

Although these people are supposed to be permitted private patents to their own advantage, they seek a patent monopoly and they do not even tell the Government what they are developing.

At the time of the review, for example, we found that LMSC—which is the Lockheed Co.—had refused to discuss information on 58 subjects of interest to the Government. That was done under a contract which requires disclosure. Lockheed would not disclose information to the Government on 340 other subject inventions which had been delayed from 6 to 46 months—as long as 4 years after the inventions were reported to the contractor, or by the employee inventors.

Imagine that. We give those people $12 billion for research. What do they do? They will not even tell the Government what it will get for the $12 billion.

Suppose they are trying to build a missile to shoot down an attack vessel. We would need to know what those people have discovered with our own money. We cannot find out. They will not tell the Government.

Director Webb is signing the contracts—in my judgment, in violation of the law. If they have the power to get away with this, such administrators violate the law in this giveaway.

We must put it expressly into law that this research will be for the benefit of 180 million Americans, when it is made with Government money. Otherwise, we shall not be able to protect the Government's money.

I am happy to say that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] put amendments into the saline water research bill to see to it that the Government's rights in these discoveries would be for the benefit of all the people in America. Great headway is being made. If we find a way to convert salt water into fresh water it will be done for the benefit of everyone in America and the world.

We will not have some robber baron getting the benefit of the Government's money, but it will be for the benefit of 180 million people, done with the benefit of their tax money.

This amendment should be in the bill, just as it was in the saline water research bill. It should be included in this bill, just as it was in the bill on coal research, and in the bill which was passed on helium, which was in charge of the Senator from New Mexico.

In my judgment, this is one of the serious faults in Government where it raises the point: Are these tax moneys to be spent for the benefit of the public in general, or are they to be spent for private gain?

In my judgment, taxing the American people for the private gain of an individual is corrupt and should be prevented.

I know that the Senator in charge of the bill does not want that to happen. The best way to see that it does not happen is to take the provision which is patterned after all the provisions adopted previously in other bills to which Senators have agreed.

It is essential that this money be spent on research, and not be given away to some private individual at the expense of the public interest.

I believe that the Senator from Maine is willing to accept the amendment. I hope very much that he will fight for it, in the event that we have some difficulty persuading the House to take it.

Mr. MUSKIE. In response to the statement made by the Senator from Louisiana, the amendment was not considered at the committee hearings, so we did not have an opportunity to study it. Nevertheless, the fact is that the pattern has been established, in some instances, particularly with respect to the saline water research bill, and I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference, subject to such questions and discussions as we may have on the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask some questions. To what extent was this amendment considered in the committee?

Mr. MUSKIE. As I have just stated, Senator, it was not considered at all.

Mr. AIKEN. No witnesses at all were heard on the bill?

Mr. MUSKIE. No witnesses were heard.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it important?

Mr. MUSKIE. It is important.

Mr. AIKEN. Then why was it not considered in committee, if it had been considered in other committees at other times? Why was it not considered in committee at this time? Is not this amendment more important than the Cooper amendment to which the Senator from Maine has taken strong exception?

Mr. MUSKIE. It is of the utmost importance, as the Senator from Louisiana has stated so eloquently.

Mr. AIKEN. But it comes in at the last minute. The Senator from Louisiana spoke of the robber barons. He spoke with reference to the oil companies, the uranium companies, and the helium companies. It seems to me ridiculous to vigorously oppose an amendment such as the one offered by the Senator from Kentucky on the ground that it duplicates the provisions in the Administrative Procedure Act, and yet accept the far-reaching amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. It is nonsense. It is ridiculous. We wonder who is back of it?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is implying that I am speaking for someone who is hidden in the mists of obscurity. I am doing no such thing. So far as the Senator from Kentucky is concerned, I was not opposing his amendment vigorously. He was opposing my bill vigorously, and I was undertaking to defend it against the allegations which he made as to its merit. That is all. I did not pillory the Senator from Kentucky, did not intend to do so, and do not intend to do so. What I did, in the case of the Senator from Kentucky, has no relevance to this question. I have indicated my attitude. The Senator can disagree with it or not. I see no reason for him to question my motivation concerning it. I stated that there was no hearing held on this point.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question the Senator's motivation.

Mr. MUSKIE. I stated, in addition to that question, that there has been a pattern of some sort set in this respect in research programs sponsored with the Government's money, and that I was willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference for such consideration as the conference wished to make. I am not an advocate of the amendment. I could not be, because I have no basis for it.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Maine is willing to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on almost the same basis that he was willing to reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, on the ground that there is already provision for it, and that the precedent is established. I merely ask, what is the reason for bringing it in at this time when it was not proposed before the committee, and no one had been notified that the bill was coming up? I suspect that I will support the amendment. I am pretty sure that I would support the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana if it were offered on its own merits, but I will admit I am not happy about the manner in which it is being brought up at this time.

I am not an advocate of the oil companies, the helium companies, or the uranium companies. I believe that the amendment is probably a good one, but it should be offered in its own right and not sprung upon the Congress or the Senate without any previous consideration being given to it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, several years ago I conducted hearings on the subject and informed the Senate that any time a bill came before the Senate which would provide for research, I proposed to raise this issue: Is this research going to be for the benefit of 180 million Americans, or for the benefit of one private corporation?

If we are going to tax the American people for the private gain of some company or a single individual, I propose to raise that issue.

Now we are about to authorize a research program. In 1947, 17 years ago, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was a sponsor of an amendment along exactly the same principles I am for, on all Government research. He was fighting to defend the public interest in exactly the same way I see it.

An amendment was proposed in the National Science Foundation Act concerning this research, in order to protect the Government.

I salute the Senator from Vermont for having acted in the national interest in this fashion.

I raised this same issue on the coal research bill, and on the urban transit bill. I raised the same issue on the disarmament bill, and I am not in a position to know what these requests are going to accomplish.

Whenever a research bill is brought before the Senate the junior Senator from Louisiana can be expected to offer such an amendment and to raise the question whether the research will be for the benefit of the 180 million people of the country who pay for it, or whether it will be used exclusively for the benefit of private groups.

Something has been said about oil companies. I am not embarrassed to be called an oil Senator. Anyone who wishes to do so can call me an oil or gas Senator. I will continue to look after the interests of the State of Louisiana, just as I expect every other Senator to look after the interests of his own State. The oil industry does its own research. It has never asked the Government to finance its research. It has never come to Washington to ask for money with which to conduct its research. If it ever does come I will offer my amendment to any bill of that kind that may be proposed. No one has any right to use Government money for his own advantage.

Who proposes to defend this practice? The Lockheed Corp. has been holding out on the Goevrnment for 4 years on discoveries it has made with Government money. Who wants to defend a practice like that? Who wants to justify it? That research was paid for by taxpayer money.

Senators know that today we do not have a missile that can shoot down a Russian missile aimed at the United States. The reason could well be that important technical and scientific information has been withheld. The Lockheed Corp. will not tell us what it has found out in its research financed with tax money. They will not tell us what they have discovered with that money. If they can get away with this in dealing with the Federal Government, they can do this in dealing with the individual States.

The only way to stop this thing is to spell it out in the law by stating that they cannot get away with this sort of thing. What I propose has been done before. We did it in the Atomic Energy Act. It has created no problem in connection with that act. Frankly, Mr. President, if we look in the areas where the Government research has been in the public interest, with no private patents granted, we find that those are the areas in which we are ahead. In atomic energy, we are ahead. That research is available to everyone. No one can hold out on the results of research in that field.

In the field of agriculture we have had a research program without private patents. In that field we are far ahead of the Russians. They cannot possibly catch up with us, even with our help. That is how far ahead we are in areas where we did it in the public domain.

Whenever we let certain individuals keep research results for as long as 4 years and have private patents, we cannot keep up with the Russians.

Here it is proposed to go on with a new research program which can allow someone to use his power with a Governor to see to it that Federal money is used for his private advantage, instead of in the public interest.

The Senate has acted on this issue time and time again during the past 2 years. Its answer has been consistent. Its answer today should be consistent also.

We are dealing with a new research program that is proposed to be established. The States will handle Federal money. If they discover something worthwhile, it should be available to every citizen in the country. The public should be given the benefit of its tax money.

I hope my good friend from Vermont will support the amendment, because he sponsored a similar amendment 17 years ago.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have no doubt that I would support the proposal of the majority whip if it were properly offered. I object to the manner in which it is proposed and the manner in which it is brought before the Senate. We hear a great deal about precedents. I realize that there are many precedents. We have found some of them to be useful. However, most of our precedents have been established after mature thought and consideration.

What I am trying to do now is to ask that the Senate not establish the precedent of ramming major legislation down the throat of the Senate without previous notice or consideration. That is all I am asking.

I do not believe this is the place for this sort of amendment. No notice was given. The amendment was not printed. Let us not establish another precedent under which anyone in authority can ram major legislation down our throats without notice and without consideration.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The amendment is very simple. All that the amendment provides is that when taxpayers' money is used in research, anything that is discovered belongs to all the people. It is as simple as that. I cannot understand that we would be setting a precedent that should alarm anyone. It is a simple amendment.

What the Senator from Louisiana is doing is saying that where taxpayers' money is used in a research project the result that is discovered belongs to all the people because all the people gave money to the discoverer in order to have the opportunity to make the discovery. That is how simple the issue is.

I do not see why anyone should be alarmed about any precedent being established. I shall wholeheartedly support the amendment, in good conscience.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not opposing the principle set forth by the Senator from Louisiana. I am opposing the method by which it is being put forth. I object to anyone in official standing or even the whole party across the aisle ramming major legislation down the throats of Senators without previous notice or consideration. That is all I am saying.

Mr. PASTORE. We do it every time. We do it all the time.

Mr. AIKEN. It should not be done. I know it is done, but it should not be done.

Mr. PASTORE. It is done every time.

Mr. AIKEN. I know, but it should not be done.

Mr. PASTORE. It is no novel idea to bring up an amendment unexpectedly and by surprise. That is how a Senator can get his name on the front page.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island has said that this is a very simple amendment. That is the difficulty with the amendment. It is too simple. It is not just a matter of whether or not we take taxpayers' money and turn it over to a private contractor to be used entirely for research purposes and the contractor does not spend any of his own money. We have no problems with that kind of situation. At least, I do not have any difficulty with it. It is not as simple as that. In some cases a contractor would receive $100,000 from the Federal Government and he would put up another $100,000, or perhaps $200,000, $300,000, or $400,000.

Are the Senators from Rhode Island and Louisiana willing to say, because the Federal Government put up $100,000 and the private contractor put up $300,000, that it is fair that the whole result should go to the Federal Government?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I shall yield in a moment. Are they willing to say that all of the benefit should go to the Federal Government? Last year there was a hearing before the Joint Economic Committee. The distinguished Senator from Illinois will recall that this very problem was raised and discussed at length by some of the witnesses. It was indicated that there were difficult problems in the allocation with respect to the results of research.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. In some cases a 50-50 division might be fair. In other cases an allocation of 100 percent to the Federal Government might be fair. In some cases it might be fair to give one-third, while in other cases it might be fair to give two-thirds. The problem is not as simple as that. That is the difficulty I have with the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator from Iowa know how the administrators use their discretion? Wherever administrators have had discretion, they have given it all away.

Mr. MILLER. I would not want to apologize for what the administrators did in these matters. The Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Louisiana probably could get together on a fair and equitable allocation where it was indicated. The difficulty with the Senator's amendment is that, merely because $1 of Federal money goes into some research project, the entire result would have to go to the Federal Government. I do not believe that is fair.

All of this is raising an increasingly serious problem. The Joint Economic Committee went into this subject last year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment states in effect: "If you have some background that you have obtained, we will protect your use of it." The provisions of the amendment are contained in the Agricultural Act, in the Atomic Energy Act, in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, and in a great many other acts. Everyone who has been affected by it likes it very much. Those in Government who have had experience with it say that people come to them and put pressure on them. They may be people who have made large political contributions. They come and ask the administrators to give away the Government's rights. The Government can say, "No; we cannot do that."

That is how interested parties look at it. They do not want that type of discretion because there is so much in it for some contractors. The discretion would be used to give it all away. I make that statement because when administrators have had the discretion they have given it away. A proposal was made that before patent rights could be given away, a study should be made to determine the value of the right and knowledge of what would be given away.

Do Senators know what administrators would do? They would give away the results of research no matter what the right would consist of, for that is what has happened when discretion has been given to them. If the Senate wishes to give the administrators discretion, we might as well give it all away and be done with it.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator has said, "I have not read the proposal," and then he refers to background patent protection. I am not talking about background patent protection. I am talking about patent developments that may grow out of specific research, the background patents to the contrary notwithstanding. We are not talking about the same problem. If the Senator wishes to refer to the background patents, all I am saying is that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana—and, incidentally, I think it would be most beneficial if all Senators had a copy to look at—had provided that instead of all of the benefits going to the Federal Government, language something like "the Federal Government's fair and equitable share in the information, copyrights, uses, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will be preserved," then I think we would have a fair and equitable amendment.

So far as uniformity with respect to other laws is concerned, I grant that the proposal is in line. But that does not mean that those provisions are right. Last year we had hearings before the Joint Economic Committee which indicated that serious problems were arising because of these other uniform provisions.

The Senator from Louisiana, I believe, could make a contribution if he would modify his amendment and let the House of Representatives look it over to see whether or not the proposal might be a step in the right direction in getting away from these harsh results. I believe it would be an improvement to do so, and I would support an amendment with that modification in it, because I think it would be an improvement. But I do not think that we ought to take a meat-ax approach to everything that happens as a result of research.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, my friends on the other side of the aisle start by saying that the amendment ought to be studied, and that such a proposal should not be brought before the Senate as a surprise.

I point out that the procedure proposed has been adopted by Congress with relation to every research bill that has been passed during the past 4 years. We have done it repeatedly. It is identically the same language, so far as the requirements in the contracts are concerned, that we have voted for time and time again.

It is the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa that is on trial. That is the one that has not been tried. No one knows what his suggestion would do. We all know how my proposal would work.

Atomic Energy Commission contracts include a requirement that the result of research be available generally. Admiral Rickover has said that there has never been a problem. He has said he has too many contractors to do research for him. He has said that the difficulty is that he does not have enough contracts to go around.

Parallel work is being done on salt water conversion. That activity is almost identical with what we would attempt to do under the bill. We are trying to clean up water. The same problem in water control is involved. There has been no problems, however, with respect to the provision which I have proposed. It works fine.

The type of provision proposed, word for word, in the controlling section is identical with what has been the law for 50 years. If we insert similar language into the bill now before the Senate, we know how it will work. If we did it the way the Senator from Iowa has proposed, no one knows how it would work. If we inserted a provision permitting discretion, let us face it: We might as well give the results of the research away.

Let us include a provision that we know has worked in the past.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I am not saying that my proposal is perfect. But I do think that it is pretty difficult to refute the point that the Federal Government is entitled only to its fair and equitable share, and to nothing more and nothing less.

The difficulty with the Senator's amendment is that he is proposing that the Government be entitled to everything. He falls back on the fact that a similar uniform provision appears in some other acts. But that does not make it right.

I am sorry that the proposal was not before the subcommittee for hearings. The subcommittee did a very fine job on what it had to work with. The bill is most complex. I would regret to see the bill go back for further hearings with respect to the Senator's amendment.

But what I would like to suggest is that the Senator either modify his amendment or be content to file it as a bill and let the bill before the Senate stand on its own two feet. Let us get it going. I am sure that the Senator could see to it that proper action would be taken on this bill. Let us do a job in this area for once.

I think the amendment needs study. I believe it needs hearings. I think it needs action, too, because the uniform provisions to which the Senator has referred have caused a considerable amount of difficulty.

If we say that administrators have abused their discretion and therefore we will not give them any discretion, I do not know how we are ever going to move. Great discretion is given to administrators. We have to respose a certain amount of confidence in their discretion, regardless of who the administrators may be. I believe it would be proper to give them discretion in cases such as the one we are now considering; and if there are abuses, we shall clean them up, too.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator from Rhode Island correct in assuming that the money which will be devoted to research projects under the bill would be all public money?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is what we have in mind.

Mr. PASTORE. No private moneys would be involved?

Mr. MUSKIE. It is conceivable that we might find some situation in which some person has put his private money into a project, although that is not likely. But in the past we have had research programs in which a contractor would do the research——

Mr. PASTORE. How would it be conceivable that an individual would put his own private money into such a project?

Mr. MUSKIE. It is conceivable that private money would be involved. For example, with relation to the program involving the separation of storm and sanitary sewers, it is conceivable that some private organization might be interested in contributing a solution, a technique, or a formula, and would be willing to put up some of its money and some of its efforts provided it got some assistance from Federal, State, or local governments. In that event some private funds would be involved. I agree that it is not likely that it would be involved.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is one slight difference between the proposal and existing law in other areas. Most of the statutes to which reference has been made that prevent the giveaway of patent rights provide that the information shall be freely and fully available. At the request of some departments the word "fully" has been omitted, so that a distinction could be made between the ideas that some people had already developed with their own private money and that which they might develop with the Government's money. So if a contractor should desire a Government contract, he could come in and say, "This is what we know now. This is what we have done. We would like to protect our rights with respect to what we have developed."

But what will be done with Government money will be freely available to everyone in the country. I do not think we would desire much more flexibility than that. Otherwise we would get into the prospect of doing something of the kind that we have discussed, in which an administrator signs away the Government's rights entirely. That being the case, we have that much flexibility and do not want any more.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I have suggested to the Senator from Rhode Island that he consider the language in the second paragraph of the amendment. It would be helpful to us if we had printed texts. The language states:

> Whenever any information, copyright, use, process, patent, or development resulting from any such research or development activity conducted in whole or in part with appropriated funds.

That means that if there is $100,000 spent by the researcher and $100,000 by the Government, the whole amount would have to be mandatorily disclosed to everyone—to the public—regardless of the contribution of the private researcher, regardless of security considerations, or anything else. That is the plain language contained in the first paragraph of the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator has not read the rest of that section. If there is any question about who has the rights stated, the Attorney General can go into court. The reason for that section is so that, for example, he can subpena someone in New Jersey to come to Louisiana, if need be, in order to testify to what he knows about a situation. Otherwise, difficulty in subpenaing witnesses might be encountered. The controlling section is the one prior to the section to which the Senator referred. That section would put teeth into the provision. There might be witnesses in New Jersey, Illinois, California, or other States. The provision would give the Attorney General the right to go into court and determine who possesses the rights, so that the Attorney General could subpena a witness to come from, let us say, New Jersey to Louisiana in order to testify.

The procedural provisions are modeled after section 5 of the Sherman Act and section 15 of the Clayton Act. So the Attorney General, in trying to handle antitrust matters—and this is parallel to that situation—can send his witnesses from one place to another to testify to the facts. That is all that is sought to be done.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is any consideration given, in the first paragraph of the amendment, to matters which would enter the security field? Many research contracts are executed in the research field and might involve security. Is there some safeguard?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are talking about water pollution. Can the Senator from Nebraska tell me what security item is involved in water pollution? What is there about cleaning up water that is secret?

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not know.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have seen the old red herring dragged out on many occasions. But when Senators talk about cleaning up sewers, I do not see what that has to do with the national defense, except that cleaning up the water enables people to be healthier; and I do not know what is wrong with letting the Russians know about that.

Incidentally, the Russians invented a sleep machine. By putting electrodes over the eyes, a person can go to sleep. It might be useful when one has experienced a frustrating session in the U.S. Senate. I am told that 2 hours of sleep under that machine is the equivalent of as much as 6 hours of natural sleep. The Russians obtained a patent on it, but did not raise a security question. So what is secret about how we clean up sewers? That is absolutely beyond me.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Paragraph (3) starting on page 2 of the committee report, asserts that the bill authorizes among other things:

> Research and development grants in the amount of 50 percent of the estimated reasonable cost of projects which will demonstrate new or improved methods of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or

> other wastes from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other waste. Authorize appropriations of $20 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the next 3 succeeding fiscal years for the purpose of making demonstration grants. A grant for any single project shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount authorized for any 1 fiscal year.

If that is a correct analysis of the provisions of the bill, the bill contemplates that local governmental subdivisions and others will contribute at least 50 percent of the money for all the research projects in this area. Despite the great veneration the Senator from North Carolina has for his leader, the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from North Carolina cannot conceive that it is fair to expect local subdivisions of government and others to put up at least 50 percent of the cost of research projects and then allow the exclusive rights to the patents on them to be given to the Federal Government, which puts up only 50 percent or less.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This section does not say anything about "50 percent." I do not see anything about "50 percent" in this section. I am seeking to amend section 6.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator's amendment apply to the entire bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us look at the other side of the picture. Suppose a grant were given to Podunk, La., to conduct research, and that Podunk put up some money. Suppose it signed a contract that provided that when the contractor conducted research, he would be entitled to a private patent. Then suppose the contractor developed something good. He has the privilege of saying, "I found it. I found it first with your money." He would get the benefit of the law that would deny the Government the benefit for 17 years. He could say, "It is a fine thing, but I am not going to let anyone use it because I have the patent rights on it." He would have the right to license anybody to use it, if he wanted to.

Does not the Senator from North Carolina have some qualms about allowing $20 million of Government money to be used and not permitting the public the use of the benefits?

Mr. ERVIN. The purpose of the bill is to encourage local subdivisions of government, and even private individuals and private industry interested in ridding our waters of pollution, to participate in the program to the extent of putting up at least 50 percent of the cost of research projects. In my judgment, the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana would discourage local subdivisions of government and private individuals and private industry from participating in the program if we say they will have to put up at least 50 percent, while the Federal Government would take all the benefits from the research.

Furthermore, there are many people with brains who have spent many years of study and research in the purification of water and the elimination of pollution from the streams of this country. The Senator's amendment would discourage those people from contributing their brains to research projects in this field, if there is written upon our law books a statute that the Federal Government would take the benefit of not only the part of the research funds put up by the Federal Government and private individuals and private industry, but also the benefit of the brains of those people. Merely because the Federal Government contributes a portion of the cost, the amendment clearly contemplates that the Federal Government will take everything, so far as any discovery is concerned.

I favor the principle that the Senator is seeking to implement with his proposal, but I believe what has been said emphasizes the fact that this question ought to be dealt with by the Subcommittee on Patents of the Committee on the Judiciary in connection with an overall bill, where all possible arguments can be weighed according to their worth and value and where all interested officials and communities and individuals can be heard.

While I would support the Senator's amendment if it were restricted to instances where the Federal Government puts up all the money, I am unwilling to have the Federal Government require other States, municipalities, private individuals, and private industry to put up at least 50 percent of the money for research and then allow the Federal Government to take as its exclusive possession everything that is discovered.

The Senator's proposal ought not to be offered as an amendment to this bill, but ought to be considered by the appropriate committee, so that a general policy might be adopted. If the Senator's amendment comes to a vote as an amendment to this bill without any committee consideration, I shall have to vote against the amendment. The Senator's idea is a good one, but it ought to be carefully considered, and all objections should be weighed.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I went before a subcommittee. I do not know whether I went before the proper subcommittee, but I went before some subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary 3 years ago—in 1961. I went to great efforts to explain my proposal, but nothing happened. That being the case, I felt that the committee would not report the bill. I decided that if it would not report the bill, I would offer an amendment on the floor of the Senate. That is what I have been doing for the past 3 years. If any Senator does not know by now how to get a committee to consider a research proposal, he ought to offer an amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Repeatedly, the managers of bills have offered to take my amendments and support them, and do what they could with them. That is what the manager of this bill has offered to do in this instance.

If the Senator from North Carolina wishes to invoke the procedure of a yea-and-nay vote, that is all right; we will then see how the Senate stands.

My proposal does not seek to have the Federal Government take anything away from anybody. It merely provides that if the Federal Government contributes $20 million, whether a city or a State contributes anything or not, the benefits should all be freely available to every city, State, and municipality, so that they can all have the benefit of the $20 million to eliminate sewage pollution.

If a different procedure is followed, we shall be opening up the prospect of what I have just described. The General Accounting Office or some other agency will discover something that has been done improperly.

In the field of atomic energy, for 4 years that great man, Admiral Rickover, has been saying that the plan I am proposing has been working, and working well. It offers no problem or difficulty. The only trouble is that there are not enough contracts.

Mr. President, I read now from a committee print of the Small Business Committee's Subcommittee on Monopoly, of which I am chairman. This print is the text of a conference on Federal patent policies at which Admiral Rickover testified in 1960. He told me at that time:

> We have had no difficulty in the Atomic Energy Commission getting contractors, large and small, to do research and development work. In fact, many of them are constantly urging us to give them such work. Further, a number of companies have built their own facilities, with their own money. Many businesses want Government research and development work in order to develop a strong position. They now wish to extend this to the atomic energy and the space fields.

So, you can see, Mr. President, as I have stated before, where the Government retains patent rights for the benefit of all the public, there is no lack of contractors wishing to do the research. Instead, there is just a lack of contracts to go around to all of the contractors.

I am not saying that there is not someone who might not wish to conduct Government-financed research. That may well be. I salute anyone who does private research. But if such people want Government money, they ought to make the benefits of their research available to the United States.

I challenge anyone to show me where any information has been withheld, where any chicanery has been involved under the procedure I propose. Admiral Rickover told us on one occasion that the time lawyers take in preparing patent applications means that from the time one discovers something until the time he applies for a patent averages 4 years before a patent application can be filed.

This is information which the public needs for its own benefit, but some individual may be fooling around with papers to tie up the patent, so that no one can get the benefit except the private company.

On the other hand, if we say that the Government shall have the patent rights when the Government pays for the research, the information will circulate much more freely.

Mr. President, I felt that since the manager of the bill offered to take the amendment—which has been done time and time again—if there is going to be any opposition to it, then I suppose we shall have to have a rollcall vote on it, if we cannot agree on a voice vote.

So, I suppose I shall have to suggest the absence of a quorum and ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator answer a question before doing that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator stated that the language used was exactly the same as has been used in a number of other laws. I have found an example in the atomic energy law which is relevant to this matter.

Section 152 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1958 reads as follows:

> An invention or discovery, useful in the production of utilization of special nuclear material or atomic energy, made or conceived in the course of or under any contract, subcontract, or arrangement entered into with or for the benefit of the Commission, regardless of whether the contract, subcontract, or arrangement involved the expenditure of funds by the Commission, shall be vested in, and be the property of, the Commission, except that the Commission may waive its claim to any such invention or discovery under such circumstances as the Commission may deem appropriate, consistent with the policy of this section.

There are other examples such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act of 1958 and the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

I know what the Senator said to NASA Administrator Webb. I, too, as Senator LONG did, sat in on the hearings before the Senate Small Business Committee. But, may I say as a lawyer—and Senator ERVIN has spoken as a lawyer—that the trouble with the amendment is that it is an immediate directive to the public domain.

This may sound appealing. But, it could work out very badly because the race would go to the swift rather than to the just.

The question that I put to my colleague, in view of the questions that are raised, is this: Even if a conference committee is to take the measure and try to do what they can do with it, should not the purpose of the Senate be to have such patents and inventions vested in the Secretary, or whatever the operative Government agency is under this particular bill, rather than an immediate dedication to the public domain with some of the dangers which I have just spelled out? The financial involvement of the Government in a particular contract is an extremely important factor in a determination of patent rights under a contract; however, it is not the only factor. Whether the contractor has contributed substantial experience, background, and funds on his own and whether the invention would have been a probable result of his acquired skills, experience, and own funds should also be taken into consideration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is hard to satisfy all Senators. Senator MILLER just got through agreeing that we ought to have more flexibility in the provision. Now the Senator from New York reads a provision which he apparently seems to like, which is a stricter section.

The amendment that I offer is almost identical to the amendment which I offered on the Coal Research Act, which is the law, the Helium Act, which is the law, the saline water bill, which is the law, the disarmament bill, as passed in the Senate, and the mass transit bill as it was passed in the Senate and sent to the House, and the Water Resources Act.

This is what we have voted on time and time again. The section to which the Senator refers is in the Atomic Energy Act. In that case they do not waive background patents. The reason that the act did not waive background patents is that the Government had all the background, anyway. No one else had any. So we did not waive the background patents. In this instance, we have no problem.

I think we have discussed the amendment sufficiently. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which is an amendment to the Senator's amendment. I would like to have it read, and perhaps we can discuss it. I would appreciate it if the Senator would see fit to accept it. But I would like to have the amendment stated at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment of Mr. MILLER reads as follows:

> Strike out lines 7 and 8, through the period on line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Federal Government's fair and equitable share in the information, copyrights, uses, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity, will be preserved."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Senators may note that what this does is to change the language which now states that all information, copyrights, uses, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will be made freely available to the general public.

Instead of saying "all," I have simply said that the Federal Government's fair and equitable share will be preserved in all of these things. I think it is a much more reasonable approach than the approach which the Senator's amendment uses.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, nobody under the sun would know what that would mean. For example, suppose a contractor has put up 1 percent of the cost, and the Federal Government and the State government have put up the other 99 percent. It could well be construed, from the Senator's amendment, that that fellow, because he has 1 percent of his own money invested, has the right to deny anyone the right to use it.

As the Senator knows, if I have an interest in a business and the Senator has an interest in the same business, both of us must agree in order that the information may be made available for anyone to use it.

The Senator has no answer to the problem. No one under the sun would know what we are talking about here. If we use the Government's money to do the research, and if this is a Government contract, then the information should be free and available, to be used by everyone.

We have had some of these instances in which discretion was allowed to be used.

I submit that I do not know what that means. If we want that amendment, we may just as well vote against my amendment and be done with it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there are many provisions in bills which have been passed by this body which have used the phrase, "fair and equitable." The people administering the laws are the ones whose discretion we trust in the matter of determining what is fair and equitable.

I would not be quite as sanguine about this as the Senator from Louisiana.

Who else would do it except the Administrator? But what would happen under this kind of provision is that it would give the Administrator the discretion to sit down and negotiate such things. Certainly, if all of the research funds are going to come from the Federal Government, there will not be any negotiations. It is all going to go to the Federal Government. That is all there is to it. But, if there are very substantial funds to be put up by the private contractor, then this would give discretion to negotiate a fair and equitable share.

I do not know why we should have so much difficulty over this. I think it is a fair amendment. It is certainly infinitely more fair than the one that the Senator has now offered.

I am trying to be helpful. I am not trying to hinder anyone.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator wants to help, he would withdraw his amendment. As far as this Senator is concerned, I would just as soon withdraw my amendment as to have that amendment. We would have happen what happens when an administrator is given discretion. That happened when we gave discretion to the Administrator in the Space Agency. What happened? He just signed a paper saying that it is all given away, without taking a second look. And when we give them discretion, sooner or later they will get an administrator in there who will find it easier to give everything away. I would not be surprised if they do not use pressure on the President to name an administrator who would give it to them.

Nobody has to take Federal money, but if they do take the Federal money, they are told of certain terms and conditions with which they must comply.

When they passed the civil rights bill, against which I voted, they did not say, "Under section 6, because the Federal Government is putting up half of the money, or two-thirds of the money, if you want some of the money, you must integrate one-half or two-thirds, according to the amount of money that is being paid." The bill provides that if the State wants the money, they must comply with certain conditions. No one is going to make us take the Federal money. But, if we do take the Federal money, we must comply, the same as all of the other researchers are made to comply with the law, which states that the information will be freely available for the use and benefit of 180 million people.

I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment and vote against my amendment so that his position will be clear.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall be willing to withdraw my amendment if the Senator from Louisiana is willing to withdraw his amendment. But, his amendment is what generated the whole controversy. I shall be fair about this. The Senator has a point. But he is going too far. I think that the reference to the Civil Rights Act is not at all analogous. Under the Civil Rights Act, it was determined by Congress that as a matter of public policy, if there is a project that is tainted, then the whole project is tainted. But, this is not the same situation that we are talking about here.

The Senator's amendment is, in effect, saying that because one-tenth or one-third or one-half of the money is put up by the Federal Government, therefore all the results must go to the Federal Government. I do not think that is fair.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER. I yield

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Was this amendment prepared by the legislative counsel?

Mr. MILLER. This amendment was prepared by a legislative counsel; namely, myself, here on the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But it was not done by the men we employ to do that work. It was not done by the legislative counsel.

Mr. MILLER. How much time did I have to prepare it? I saw this amendment for the first time only 30 minutes ago.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Has the Senator discussed his amendment with any of the departments? Has he discussed it with the Department of the Interior?

Mr. MILLER. I have not had any more discussion with them than has the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have discussed my amendment with those who will have to administer it. The Senator from Iowa offers his amendment when he has not discussed it even with his own legislative counsel and says this is what I would like to have adopted, when he does not know what will be the effect of the amendment. The one I have offered is one that the departments understand. This is the one that every department which would be handling this section of the bill is familiar with. There is a similar section of the law which the departments are complying with now. They advise that this is the way to do it.

The amendment of the Senator from Iowa would do nothing but completely confuse the matter and destroy the whole purpose of the measure, and he offers it on the floor at this time.

If he insists on having it voted on, we can do it, but it is my judgment that when the people of this country spend the money for research, they should have the benefits of it. I think we should vote on that issue one way or the other.

Mr. MILLER. I hope we are not getting ourselves into a position of deciding the merits of an issue on the basis of who drew the amendment or how little time there was or when it was drawn. Let us look at the merits of the proposed legislation. I am not the only one who has drafted amendments. The Senator from Louisiana has. I guess every other Senator has. It would not have been necessary if the Senator from Louisiana's amendment had not suddenly popped up on the floor with no copies available for Senators to read. I am trying to do the best I can under the circumstances. I am not trying to hurt the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. I am trying to do what is fair. I think my concept of what is fair and the Senator's concept of what is fair do not coincide, but I am sure we are both sincere.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of my amendment to the amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the objective of the bill is to create a great cooperative effort among the Federal Government and local governments and private industry to clean up the streams of America; and nothing should be put in this bill which has a tendency, or which could possibly have a tendency, to defeat the objective of the bill, which is to create a cooperative effort.

I feel that the amendment offered by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana would have a tendency to defeat the objective of the bill. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana would properly fit a program in which the Federal Government puts up all the money for research. But it does not fit this particular bill, because under the bill the Federal Government is not to put up more than 50 percent of the money for research. At least 50 percent of it is to be put up by local governments and by private industry or private individuals. To put such an amendment in this bill, without any more consideration than we are able to give to it on the Senate floor and without any more analysis than we are able to make on the Senate floor as to the effect of the amendment on the purpose of this bill, would be a tragic mistake.

We have delayed too long already one of the most important tasks which confront the American people, and that is the removal of pollution from the streams of this country.

Certainly it is not just, it is not fair, for the Congress of the United States to say to the States, to municipalities, to private industry, and to private individuals that the Federal Government is going to take all of the benefits of any discoveries made in the course of carrying out this cooperative program.

I do not know what effect the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana would have on this program, but I think it might possibly have a disastrous effect. Certainly, we should pass the bill in such a form as will enlist the cooperation of the States and local subdivisions of the States and the private individuals and industries who will have to put up at least 50 percent of the cost of the research.

Certainly, it would do no harm to pass the bill in its present form—and it is in excellent shape—and let the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana be studied by the appropriate committee to see what its effect might be, and to give all who are interested in this matter an opportunity to be heard by the committee before action such as this is taken. Surely the greatest deliberative body in the world ought not to act on the spur of the moment, without previous committee consideration and without Senators even having copies of the amendment to read with their own eyes for the purpose of making an analysis of it.

The amendment is appropriate in the saline water bill, because there the Federal Government puts up all the money. It would undoubtedly fit some other programs in which the Federal Government puts up all the money. But it is not only drawn for a program which requires at least 50 percent of the money for research projects to be put up by States or local subdivisions of States or private industry or individuals.

Let us not, in a moment of haste and impatience, jeopardize not only the passage of a bill which is very meritorious, but also jeopardize its possible efficacy to perform the task for which it is designed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the point has been made here that this proposal has been brought up on the floor by whim or caprice or without study. The committee had 2 days to work on the bill. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has handled similar bills and studied the same proposal. The Department which already handles such matters is already bound by the same language contained in the amendment. The Senate has voted on this question time and time again. It has voted not to give away to a private contractor the benefits of Federal research money.

The Senator made the point that cities and counties will be contributing money. If my amendment is not adopted, we shall be opening the door to letting a city take Federal money, do the research, find a way to clean up sewage more effectively than at present, and then be able to deny to 180 million people the benefit of that process for 17 long years—deny it to the people who paid for that research with their own money.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable that we would let that happen. I am reminded of Ogden Nash's poem that "Rape is a crime unless you rape the voters a million at a time."

It is proposed to give up the taxpayers' money to a private contractor and permit the contractor to say to a little mayor: "Mr. Mayor, I was your best campaign contributor. I put up half your campaign money. But you have the money around this contract drawn up so that if I discover something, whether it affects the cleaning up of sewage or anything else, I get the benefit of all of it, I can charge the public a fortune for the 17 years and make a million dollars, and no one can say anything to me regarding the contract."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] has just informed me that Chicago has developed the best method yet devised for cleaning up sewage, and that the city would be "tickled pink" if everyone in America could have the benefit of that method.

If Chicago is willing to do that, to make its discoveries available to the world, why should any other city wish to take Federal money and give it to a private contractor who could deny the public the benefit of it?

Mr. President, I should like to ask for the yeas and nays——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. The amendment to the amendment will be disposed of before the Long amendment is voted on.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long].

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. **ERVIN.** Mr. President, I should like to speak for approximately 1 minute.

I believe that one of the analyses referred to in the bill is on page 5, lines 3 to 10 which provides:

> There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose of making grants under this section. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

I especially invite the attention of the Senate to this part:

> No grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 5 per centum of the total amount authorized by this section in any one fiscal year.

It will therefore be a small amount of money that the Federal Government will contribute to each project. Yet, we are about to vote on an amendment to discourage other people from participating in a program which would require them to put up the overwhelming bulk of the money for each project.

Mr. **MILLER.** Mr. President, I do not wish to delay Senators any longer than is necessary, but I understand that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] wishes to say something on this question and that he is expected here momentarily.

Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **KUCHEL.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL.** Mr. President, I thank Senators for holding this matter up for a few moments. I shall not now make a speech on the patent bill. I have introduced a bill which is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] had a bill filed a year ago. The Senator from Arkansas told us that he would give hearings on these bills at the last session, but he was unable to do so because of press of business.

Certainly a patent bill, a law to change the rights of individual patentees, should not be considered without very careful consideration and thoughtful hearings.

At the present time, there is one method used by the Defense Department with relation to the rights of the Government. There is also one method used at NASA, where many patents are pending.

I sincerely hope that no amendment on patents to this bill will be adopted at this time. It should be carefully considered by the Subcommittee on the Judiciary which was appointed last year to study this subject, and will be appointed again.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I hope that the Long amendment will be adopted. It has been adopted many times before. It is a necessary safeguard until the distinguished chairman and his Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], reports a bill.

I am certain he intends to do this as expeditiously as possible so that this matter can be settled on an overall basis, rather than on a bill-by-bill basis as has been the case up to this time.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. The yeas and nays have been ordered——

Mr. **McCLELLAN.** Mr. President, I wish to make one observation. Bills on this subject were before the Senate in the previous year. We have one this year for general revision of the patent law. It is being included along with other important proposed legislation.

In the previous year, of course, as all Senators remember, we found it difficult to hold committee hearings because of the long debate which occurred on the civil rights bill, at which time we were unable to hold hearings.

The bills have been reintroduced this year, and we expect to hold hearings and hope to report some well-recommended legislation.

I cannot give anyone assurance as to what that proposed legislation will be, or as to what the provisions of the bill will contain. This year, however, we hope to hold hearings and to report a bill covering not only this aspect of reforms in the patent laws, but also other important aspects.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] would each vote "yea."

Mr. **KUCHEL.** I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Fong
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy, Mass.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—28

Aiken
Bennett
Boggs
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick

Ervin
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Tower
Young, N. Dak

NOT VOTING—22

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Eastland
Fulbright
Gruening
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Magnuson
McGovern
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Pearson
Prouty
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

So the amendment of Mr. LONG of Louisiana was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], I send to the desk amendment No. 4, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read, but printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD. is as follows:

On page 5, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. (a) Subsections (b) and (c) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 8 are amended to read as follows:

" '(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 30 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost: *Provided further*, That in the case of a project which will serve more than one municipality the Secretary shall, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable, allocate to each municipality to be served by such project its share of the estimated reasonable cost of such project, and shall then apply the limitation provided in this clause (2) to each such share as if it were a separate project to determine the maximum amount of any grant which could be made under this section with respect to each such share; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project is in conformity with the State water pollution control plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 7 and has been certified by the State water pollution control agency (A) as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs, or (B) for reimbursement pursuant to subsection (c).

" '(c) In determining the desirability of projects for treatment works and of approving Federal financial aid in connection therewith, consideration shall be given by the Secretary to the public benefits to be derived by the construction and the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the works to the public interest and to the public necessity for the works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for such Federal financial aid for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof. The sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (d) for any fiscal year shall be allotted by the Secretary from time to time, in accordance with regulations, as follows: (1) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, and (2) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the urban population of each State bears to the urban population of all the States. Sums allotted to a State under the preceding sentence which are not obligated within six months following the end of the fiscal year for which they were allotted because of a lack of projects which have been approved by the State water pollution control agency under subsection (b) (1) of this section and certified under subsection (b) (4) of this section, shall be reallotted by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, to States having projects approved under this section for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds: *Provided, however,* That whenever a State has funds subject to reallocation and the Secretary finds that the need for a project in a community in such State is due in part to any Federal institution or Federal construction activity, he may, prior to such reallocation, make an additional grant with respect to such project which will in his judgment reflect an equitable contribution for the need caused by such Federal institution or activity. Any sum made available to a State by reallotment under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State under this Act. The allotments of a State under the second and third sentences of this subsection shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this section, for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this section, except that in the case of any project constructed in such State after the date of enactment of the Water Quality Act of 1964 which meets the requirements for assistance under this section but was constructed without such assistance, such allotments shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if such project had been approved pursuant to this section and funds available. For purposes of this section, population, including urban population, shall be determined on the basis of the latest decennial census for which figures are available, as certified by the Secretary of Commerce.'

"(b) Subsection (d) of such section 8 is amended by striking out the colon preceding the word '*Provided*' and all after such colon to the period at the end of such subsection."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if Senators will give me their attention for a moment, I shall explain the amendment.

Mr. President, my amendment would:

First. Eliminate the existing limitation of $600,000 for a single project or $2.4 million for a joint project involving several communities on grants for construction of waste treatment facilities. It would also authorize an across-the-board Federal contribution of 30 percent of the cost of constructing these facilities.

Second. Eliminate the existing requirement that half of all construction grant funds be used for municipalities of 125,000 people or less.

Third. Establish a more meaningful standard for the allocation of funds for construction of sewage treatment facilities in urban areas of need. The amendment would set up a standard based on the ratio of the urban population in one State to the urban population in all States, replacing the existing criterion based on per capita income. Such a standard would bring about a more equitable distribution of funds to highly populated areas where major water pollution problems exist.

Fourth. Authorize the Federal Government to subsequently reimburse States and municipalities that have spent their own funds for treatment facilities when a Federal construction grant, which has been approved, cannot be immediately allocated because of inadequate Federal funds.

I point out that this proposed new allocation standard is different from the present law, which makes 50 percent available on the basis of population ratio and 50 percent available on the per capita income ratio.

Mr. President, the reason for making these proposals is as follows:

The primary problems in water pollution in the United States are in areas of large concentrations of people. I understand the normal feeling of the Congress with respect to favoring the small places and the places of sparser population. But unfortunately that it not where the major problems reside. As the dangers of pollution exist far more pressingly in centers of population than they do in the less populated areas, it seems most ill advised—and experience has demonstrated it—to require mandatorily in the law, first, a distribution of the funds which does not bear a relation to the concentration of the problem and the need for Federal assistance, and secondly dollar limitations on individual projects which limitations inhibit some of the largest and most meaningful projects that could be undertaken in the United States.

For example, my State of New York is prepared to undertake a $1 billion program, provided that certain limitations are removed, so that the Federal Government may contribute a straight 30 percent share, which in round figures would be approximately $513 million.

Therefore the amendment would be a meaningful contribution to the overall results which this bill, if enacted, could bring about. Yet efforts like New York's and those of many other States are inhibited by the restrictions which are imposed by the dollar limitations incorporated in the existing Federal law, and which prevent these States from shooting at the target, which is where the water is polluted; namely, in heavily populated areas.

A single pollution control project in the city of New York has cost $87.6 million. So we cannot even begin to think about meaningful attacks on the problem within the limitations of the present law.

However we may feel—and, as I have said, I know the normal feeling which generally obtains; some Senators wish to be sure that the smaller communities get their share—the fact is that on this question we would not be hitting at the complete problem.

I support the increase of the dollar limitations in this bill. But more can be done. Governor Rockefeller has pointed out the enormous scale of works which can be undertaken in our State if we are enabled to do it by a law which really directs itself at the fundamental target which is involved.

I realize that the proposal represents a very major and a very important orientation of the impact of the bill. So I have discussed the subject with the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, and I hope very much that he will give us assurances that the subject will have the kind of detailed and earnest consideration and hearings by his subcommittee, within a very short time, which this matter deserves, now that we have brought the matter so sharply to the attention of the Senate and the country.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, speaking for myself, and I believe for the other members of the subcommittee on both sides, we have assigned to the problem which the Senator has raised the highest possible priority. We intend to hold hearings during this session, and early enough so that we can get into thorough hearings on the question of the adequacy of the limitation on individual projects, on the allocations to the States, and on the overall authorization. What we are talking about, as I understand the Senator, is not only the question of how the present pie shall be divided, but how can we get a bigger pie to assure that we deal with the whole problem adequately.

The problems include not only those stated by the Senator, toward which I have the utmost sympathy, but also the problems related to the smaller communities in the cost of the projects. For example, sewers are not eligible at all. Many times the cost of sewers is greater than the cost of the sewage treatment plant itself. The whole question of Federal aid in dealing with this problem financially is pertinent. I assure the Senator that I share with him the propriety and urgency that he has, and will press for early meetings. And I believe I am in a position to assure him that we will have such prompt hearings.

Mr. JAVITS. Is there any inhibition—sometimes it is a kind of unwritten rule which is understood—that the pending legislation (S. 4) is the only legislation that there will be in the anti-water-pollution field at the present session? Do we face any such inhibition, or is the committee virtually free to do whatever it, in its best judgment, deems desirable to be done with respect to this important program, notwithstanding the fact that we are now about to enact a set of amendments to the existing water pollution control law?

Mr. MUSKIE. I cannot, of course, speak for the attitude of the other body or even the administration. The Senator understands that. But so far as the committee is concerned, the question is one of the highest priority. When we began hearings on S. 649, the present fiscal authorization was only 2 years old. So we had not had the experience to justify attempting that problem when we began.

The bill (S. 4) is merely a reintroduction of S. 649 in the form that it took.

We are now in the 4th year of that program. I think it is time that we should get into the questions which the Senator has raised. As the Senator knows, we have progressively increased the ceilings from $50,000 in the original bill to $600,000 in the 1961 amendments, and to $1 million in S. 4. Ten percent incentive for metropolitan areas would give an effective ceiling of $1.1 million, and on combined projects, $1.4 million. So I believe we have made a gesture in S. 4 that should give relief.

For example, in New York, the increase of $600,000 to the $1 million limit would have brought 17 of New York's projects up to the 30 percent ceiling if those ceilings had been in effect when application was made for assistance for those projects. So this has a meaningful relationship; but I believe we must open up the whole question and come forth with a meaningful answer. I assure the Senator from New York of my cooperation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Maine. As it is very clear to me that this is an effective way to resolve the question in terms of getting the most mileage for the problems which our State has, on the basis of these assurances which the Senator from Maine has so graciously given us, I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York withdraw his amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I do.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEMS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, for several years, responsible Government officials, Members of Congress, bankers, and business leaders have been concerned about our apparent inability, if not unwillingness, to solve our balance-of-payments problem.

Some have feared that American industry was no longer able to compete in the markets of the world, and have talked and acted as though U.S. commodities had, as it was so often put, "priced themselves out of world markets." This, of course, has always been sheer nonsense, and I, for one, have always said so.

We have continued to have, and still have, a substantial surplus of exports over imports. Indeed, we are the only industrialized nation able to make this boast, if boasting it is.

For reasons of national security, we have continued a foreign-aid program. This necessarily contributes to our balance-of-payments problem. We cannot solely on that account, terminate foreign aid.

Our military commitments around the world have added to our woes. Here, too, good and sufficient reasons exist—or at least are adjudged to exist by those who make policy in this area—for continuing to back our global responsibilities with reasonable military commitments. We can hardly do otherwise so long as the responsibilities are assumed.

Tourist expenditures, also, have added to the outflow of dollars and gold. We have placed restrictions on the amount of duty-free purchases our people can make abroad, but have not felt it in keeping with our philosophy of individual freedom of movement to impose bars to travel abroad.

The area, then, which remains troublesome, and about which we can do something without damage to ourselves or to our friends abroad, is the outflow of private captital.

It had been hoped that 1964 would see a dramatic improvement in the balance of payments. That improvement apparently did not take place to the degree expected. Our deficit was reduced from about $3.3 billion on regular transactions in 1963 to about $2.5 billion in 1964.

But in the troublesome area of private capital flows, there was a serious worsening.

The official figures are not yet published, but from presently available information it would appear that the total outflow of private capital actually increased from some $4.3 billion in 1963 to approximately $6 billion in 1964. And the fourth quarter of 1964 approached disastrous proportions.

Last year the Congress enacted the Interest Equalization Tax Act which was designed to slow down to bearable proportions the outflow of capital. But two large loopholes were purposely left in the act. I refer to the exemption for Canadian transactions and the exemption for bank loans.

I fought hard to close off the loophole for bank loans. I foresaw, as all Senators who gave serious thought to this matter in the light of ordinary human acquisitiveness surely also must have foreseen, that many securities transactions would be shifted to bank loans.

Here again, statistics will bear this out. Although the figures are not yet fully analyzed, I think they will show that long-term loans by banks to foreigners increased from some $585 million in 1963 to over $1 billion in 1964.

To those who felt—and I include Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon—that the banks would "play ball," I must say that human nature has once again prevailed.

The only way to bring the big banks into conformity with the national interest in this regard is to require it by law.

Fortunately, the Congress did last year adopt an amendment to the Interest Equalization Tax Act, which I offered, which vested in the President standby authority to invoke the terms of the act so as to apply them to certain bank loans.

The time has now come—indeed it is long overdue—to invoke this standby authority. Congress granted this authority for use in case it should be needed. I call on the President to do this without further delay.

William Jennings Bryan long ago inveighed against crucifying mankind upon a cross of gold. I say that we must not sacrifice our entire domestic economy for the benefit of a few international bankers and "hot money" artists, who put personal and corporate gain above the common good.

Mr. President, I hope the President will immediately call into play the provisions of the Interest Equalization Tax Act as it applies to bank loans to foreigners. I understand that such a course of action is now under consideration. I hope so, and I hope the action will be taken quickly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I serve on the Committee on Finance with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I can say that what he has narrated is the absolute truth. He has pointed out the danger that the interest-equalization tax on foreign bonds could be circumvented by short-time loans and long-time loans to banks in foreign countries, which would then make the loans. He stressed this point accurately and fully. He made a magnificent fight for it. I was happy to play a minor part in supporting him. I regret that the proposal was not adopted.

Mr. GORE. It was adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not as a mandatory feature, but as a standby power. I, too, hope that these powers and responsibilities may be assumed by the administration.

Mr. GORE. I thank my distinguished and able friend for his most generous remarks. I am proud that the Senate foresaw this danger and acted. Fortunately, the House, in conference, was persuaded to agree with the Senate, and the President signed the bill. The act is now available to the United States as a weapon in times of international economic emergency. I believe and hope that it will now be used.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I share the pride expressed by the Senator from Tennessee that we have the largest balance of trade of any nation in the world. I believe that last year it amounted to $6 billion.

Unfortunately, I do not share his conclusions that none of the money that we loaned abroad came back to us and was for our good. How did nations abroad buy $6 billion worth of goods from us more than they sold to us, if we did not lend them any money?

I am glad that the Senator's committee will go into that. The Committee on Banking and Currency will have its hands full with another phase of the balance-of-payments problem. We shall apply what I call an aspirin tablet to sort of ease the pain and take off part of the gold coverage.

The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] wants to take it all off. But the disease will still be there, because we are sending abroad in foreign aid, military expenditures, and what not, more dollars than we are getting back in goods.

But when the Senator from Tennessee starts his hearings to cut off all of these loans, he will receive testimony from at least one big New York bank that between 80 and 90 percent of those loans to foreigners has come back to us in orders for goods.

We must figure out how much we are going to cut the trade. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot vote a $6 billion surplus in what they are buying from us and then cut off what they are going to buy with.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator may have misunderstood my remarks.

I was not in any sense referring to loans by the Export-Import Bank. I was in no sense referring to that category of loans. I am referring to investment of capital abroad, which is accomplished through commercial bank loans. The problem was thoroughly debated a year ago. Fortunately, Congress acted. I am only asking now that the President invoke the standby authority which Congress has already vested in him to meet the kind of situation that now prevails.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was referring to the commercial loans, not the loans to the Export-Import Bank. The commercial loans are coming back to us. I know of at least one big bank in New York that claims that a large percentage of those loans has come back to us in orders for goods.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have not talked with representatives of a big bank in New York. But I do know that the provision which I offered last year, which the Senate agreed to, which Congress adopted, which the President signed into law, and which I now ask him to invoke, provided a specific exemption to export-related loans, so that my distinguished friend has misconstrued the situation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We cannot settle it tonight. Really, it did not have any urgent place in the discussion of this matter.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I shall be brief. To ask Senators to restrain themselves and then to drop a bomb on the floor and ask them to let it lie because it is too late in the day is asking too much. The Senator has referred to the President and the Secretary of the Treasury immediately invoking the powers of the Gore amendment.

I say the President would be unwise and it would be mischievous on the American economy to do so without at least having hearings by the Finance Committee. This country is a great giant, which sustains the world's economy. Fifty percent of the world's productive capacity is here. When a rope is tied on a giant, he is going to burst out in another direction. If too much pressure is put on him, he will break through and take the roof with him.

I hope the President and the Secretary of the Treasury will stop, look, and listen before they jump on this one.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield, so that there may be a third reading of the pending bill, on the way to final passage?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for the purpose of third reading, without losing my right to the floor.

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 4, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishing of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read a third time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I say that the proceedings of the past 20 minutes make it abundantly clear that we need a more rigorous rule of germaneness in this Chamber than at present. Many Senators are sitting around, waiting to go home. I have already missed two airplanes, and I am about to miss a third plane. The entire matter that has been under discussion has had nothing to do with the bill.

I would like to ask the Senator from Maine a question which is pertinent to the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. I should be glad to answer it.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator knows that one of the witnesses who appeared before the committee was Mr. James Wright, executive director of the Delaware River Basin Commission. Mr. Wright requested the committee to insert a provision in the bill to make it clear that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was not authorized to promulgate standards applicable within a river basin which is under the jurisdiction of a Federal-interstate agency created by a compact to which the United States is a signatory party and vested with the authority to set and enforce water quality standards for such basin.

The proposed amendment appears on page 90 of the hearings. Mr. Wright gave four rather cogent reasons as to why that amendment should be adopted. The committee, in its wisdom, declined to adopt that amendment. However, in the report—and it appears on page 10—the statement is made:

> Where the Congress has established multi-State compacts such as the Delaware River Basin compact with authority to establish standards of water quality it is not the intent of the committee that the Secretary's authority supplant that of the compact commission. Rather the authority in this measure to set standards should be held in reserve, for use only if the commission fails in its responsibilities.

I ask the Senator from Maine whether it is not clear, and can we not make it clear as a matter of legislative history, that the Interstate-Federal Delaware River Basin Commission, created pursuant to an interstate compact, in which the four States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware joined, is free under this act, as it was before, to move ahead with all the authority given it by the interstate compact, to set its own standards?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. May I ask also whether the only way in which the bill would affect that authority would be if, in the opinion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Delaware River Basin Commission was derelict in its duties in setting standards, then the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could, under this bill, move in and set his own standards?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Delaware River Basin Commission serves the Department of the Interior of the Federal Government. I wonder whether the Senator would take any exception to my comment that it would be an unusual case in which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would intervene to supersede the Secretary of the Interior, representing the Federal Government, or an interstate commission, unless the State members of that commission had gone against the strong desires of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. MUSKIE. I think it is a fair comment. I think it would be useful also for me to say that throughout S. 4, as in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, there is a clear intention that primary responsibility for dealing with the problem shall rest at the State and local level, and that the purpose of the bill is to provide incentive, proper safeguards, and protection, and to stimulate action in this field, so that agencies, like the Chesapeake Bay Agency, are clearly vested with the primary and fixed responsibility of exercising initiative in this field.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is no intention to have the Federal Government, acting through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, supersede the existing State and Federal agency, created by Congress.

Mr. MUSKIE. No.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield. I have the floor, but I think the Senator from Tennessee wants to take exception to what I said.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, since the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania himself spoke out of context in the current debate, by making reference to Senate rules by way of leveling a criticism at the senior Senator from Tennessee, I do ask him to yield very briefly.

It so happens that the senior Senator from Tennessee thinks there are few problems which face the country and Congress that are of greater importance than the balance of payments and the outflow of capital. In the fourth quarter of 1964 it reached dangerous proportions, if not disastrous proportions.

I believe that it is as much a duty of a Senator to call the attention of the Senate to this problem as it is for the senior Senator from Pennsylvania to catch a plane to some place at 5:30.

I suggest to the Senator that when the time has come that a Senator cannot use 5 minutes to call attention to a problem as serious as the balance-of-payments problem, which threatens our very position in international economics and the well-being of our domestic economy, without having one of his friends level a barb at him, then I say it is time for the Senator who so deports himself to catch his plane or train.

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 4, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishing of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I know practically every Member of the Senate desires to vote and go home, I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I want to pose a question of the Senator from Maine, concerning the thoughts expressed by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I am sure the Senators from West Virginia and Virginia and all the States in the Ohio River sanitation compact are interested in what the answer of the Senator from Maine will be to my question. The signatories to the Ohio River sanitation compact are all of the States in the Ohio River Basin. The U.S. Government is also a signatory. That sanitation compact has done an extraordinary job in eliminating pollution in the basin.

Following the thought expressed by the Senator from Pennsylvania, my question is, Will the Ohio Valley sanitation compact be permitted to go forward with the elimination of the problem that is involved in the bill pending before the Senate without interruption from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare except when the compact signatories fail to perform their duty?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is my understanding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And is the answer of the Senator from Maine to my question identical with the answer given to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MUSKIE. The only reservation I make is that I do not know the charter of the Ohio River Basin compact, but if the situation is the same, the answer is the same.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I assume, considering the States involved, the purpose is the same—to create an agency dealing with waters that cross State lines. It is that individual States having no jurisdiction over the waters that are beyond the State lines may create a regional compact.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Department of Health of the State of Nebraska sent me a copy of a letter dated January 20, 1965, addressed to the Honorable EDMUND S. MUSKIE, chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, and signed by Dr. E. A. Rogers, director of health, in which it is stated that the board is unanimously opposed to S. 4.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is my intention to vote against this bill, not only for the reasons expressed so well in the letter, but also because of the fact that the Cooper amendment was rejected by the Senate, which is highly essential to a meaningful and wise bill.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Lincoln, Nebr., January 20, 1965.

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: Information has been submitted to us that you and several of your associates have introduced a water pollution bill identified as S. 4, similar to the bill S. 649 of the last Congress.

The water pollution control program in Nebraska is proceeding at a favorable rate, and is meeting current conditions to the satisfaction of both water users and those persons who are abating pollution by the construction of waste water treating plants to serve municipal and industrial wastes. At the present time there are approximately 30 sewer outlets that are discharging into Nebraska waters without treatment, and we have assurance from the municipal officials of these communities that they will attempt to meet our target date of July 1, 1966, at which time all wastes will be treated.

At the same time we have enjoyed a pleasant relationship with industry in the treatment of their wastes to such degree that no major source of industrial waste is now being discharged without treatment.

We are, therefore, fearful of any changes to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act that will change the program that is so well known to Nebraska citizens, and that is progressing in a satisfactory manner.

We are especially concerned over the creation of a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration which will administer comprehensive programs, interstate cooperation and uniform laws, enforcement measures, and pollution from Federal installations. We realize that these are all important sections of the Water Pollution Control Act, but we are of the opinion that the progress that we have made in the last several years is justification for maintaining the current program, and that any changes will, of course, create new methods of administration, a loss of communication between the various municipalities, industries, and State and Federal regulatory agencies, and even set up different means of procedures, all of which will tend to delay the ultimate goal of stream pollution abatement.

The Nebraska Water Pollution Control Council has adopted water quality standards, a copy of which is enclosed. These standards are being used continuously, are accepted, and, again, we are fearful that if Federal water quality standards are set up which might be inconsistent with our State standards, a delay during debate and explanation will ensue.

The Nebraska State Board of Health, at its January 18 meeting, considered the new water pollution bill and is of the opinion that the operations of Public Law 660, with its amendments, has been a great benefit to Nebraska citizens in the various details of administration, especially the Federal grants to municipalities.

The board is unanimously opposed to the creation of a new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, and the preparation and adoption of regulations on standards of water quality, interstate streams, or portions thereof.

Yours truly,

E. A. ROGERS, M.D., M.P.H.,
Director of Health,
Secretary to the Board.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, no Member of this body is more interested in clear water, either from the standpoint of health or recreation, than is the Senator from Virginia. No one has been more active in that field. Over 40 years ago I organized an anti-water-pollution commission to try to clean up the streams in the State, but I think this effort should be controlled by the States. I supported the Ohio Valley Compact, but that was under our control. I have supported research. I would gladly vote for the bill if it provided for research and for advice of Federal officials, but I would not want them to be able to put a small town out of "business" because it had a papermill located there or because they were not satisfied with what they were doing. If we had adopted the Tower amendment, Federal officials could give research and advice, but the final action would be for the States, and I would have voted for the bill. But I am not voting to put Virginia under direct Federal control.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am delighted by the speed with which the Senate Public Works Committee has acted in reporting S. 4, the water pollution control bill.

The Senate passed essentially this same measure in 1963 by a vote of 69 to 11, but the bill died in the House when Congress adjourned last October.

Since water pollution is of increasing rather than diminishing national concern, I hope that we will now see prompt action by both Houses in rising to meet this problem head on.

No nation has ever risen to prominence, ever built a complex agricultural and industrial economy, or ever adequately fed its people without a plentiful supply of water. Indeed, wars have even been fought over this most precious of our natural resources.

Our country has been generously endowed with great rivers, lakes, streams, harbors, and a plentiful rainfall. Yet today we are faced with a serious crisis in regard to our water supply.

The problem itself is essentially a simple one: while our water supply remains basically constant, our needs and demands are increasing very rapidly year by year. It is estimated that in the near future our daily industrial, domestic, and other needs will exceed the greatest amount of water we can ever hope to make available through modern engineering and technology. This necessarily means that we must be able to use each gallon of water more than once. The present efforts to develop an effective and efficient means of desalinating sea water also point to the fact that in the future we must be able to turn to an additional source of supply.

While this constructive work is underway, the supply of water on which we now rely has become subject to many varied and serious forms of pollution. Municipal and industrial organic wastes, pesticides and toxic chemicals, infectious agents, sediments, and radioactive pollution are being discharged into our waterways. These contaminants reduce the quality of our water, making it often unsuitable for reuse, and create a nuisance and a menace to health.

We now recognize water pollution as a serious national problem and have instituted programs of prevention and control. The 1956 Water Pollution Control Act and the 1961 amendments have given important impetus to action by all levels of government, and to cooperation between communities, States, and the Federal Government to combat pollution.

Nonetheless, in looking at our waterways across the country, it is evident that our efforts have not kept pace with the growing pollution problem.

One does not have to venture far here in Washintgon to find visible evidence of this. The beautiful Potomac River, winding through some of the most scenic countryside in the Nation, presents one of our most shameful and serious examples of this problem.

My own State of Connecticut has scenic lakes and rivers which are an integral and necessary part of our industrial complex. But here too we are plagued by pollution problems, even though programs of prevention and control have been established and in operation for some time.

Many people write to me about this, and I often see similar pleas in letters to the editors of our many newspapers—"Please do something to help clean up our rivers and streams and stop this shameful waste."

Pollution affects industry, urban and rural residential areas, sports and recreation areas, and the health and beauty of the Nation. It is imperative that greater steps be taken to expand the existing pollution control program and to prevent further contamination.

There are these three main aspects of pollution control which must be given serious nationwide attention. We need, first, more funds for the construction of new waste treatment facilities and the modernization of old systems; second, more intensive research into the effective treatment of new contaminants, those undesirable byproducts of our continuing technical progress; and, third, more effective administration and application of enforcement programs to control pollution.

This bill now before us would create a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, thus providing a broader base and a national scope to the pollution control program.

It would increase the Federal grants for research and development of new sewage treatment facilities, and increase the construction grants to individuals and municipal areas. These additional funds would provide the necessary stimulus for more intensive efforts by businesses, individuals, and State and local governments in coping with the problem.

The bill would also provide procedures for establishing quality standards for interstate waters, and would authorize certain abatement action when the shellfish industry suffers economic injury due to water pollution.

The water pollution problem, in the last analysis, must be dealt with locally. But it is evident that the seriousness of the situation and the size and expense of the project ahead demand national attention. The Federal Government must expand its efforts, must bear a greater portion of the costs than before, and must be in a position to coordinate all of the work and research in this area.

This bill before us today is one of the most important and far reaching water pollution proposals ever considered by Congress.

I hope and expect that it will receive overwhelming approval by the Senate, and that through greater authority for the Federal Government to set and enforce standards, through increased grants and assistance, and through continued and improved local, State, and Federal cooperation we will be able to combat more successfully water pollution and assure this country an ample supply of clean water for the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], are absent because of illness.

I further announce that Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah

[Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Miller
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—8

Bennett
Cooper
Curtis
Hruska
Robertson
Simpson
Stennis
Tower

NOT VOTING—24

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Eastland
Fulbright
Gruening
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Magnuson
McGovern
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Pearson
Prouty
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

So the bill (S. 4) was passed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 4 as passed by the Senate be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MUSKIE

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation and thanks to the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] for the very able leadership he provided in the handling and the passage of the Water Quality Act of 1965.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 7, S. 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the Senate that no votes will be taken on this bill tonight.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the majority leader as to the schedule for tomorrow, and the schedule for Monday and Tuesday, if possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. After consulting with as many Senators as we could, the leadership wishes to inform the Senate that the business tomorrow will be the Appalachia bill. We hope later this evening, and very shortly, to take up S. 408, in which the Senators from Alaska and New Jersey are interested.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF RULE XII

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the provision of rule XII, providing for a quorum call prior to the propounding of a unanimous-consent request be waived.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR VOTE ON PASSAGE OF S. 3, APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on final passage of S. 3, the Appalachia bill, be taken at 3 p.m. on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That the Senate vote on final passage of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region, at 3 p.m. on Monday, February 1, 1965.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall wish to have at least 1 hour on the Appalachia bill in the presentation of an amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without question the Senator will have that time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to be assured that I shall have that time provided for me even thought the unanimous consent has been entered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I say without qualification that the distinguished Senator from Ohio will have an hour or longer tomorrow, if he wishes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after we have disposed of the Appalachia bill, it is our intention to bring up the Coffee Agreement.

Furthermore, shortly thereafter we will bring up the nomination of Mr. Driver to be Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

I assume also that next week some of the money resolutions for committees will be reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] will receive ample notice. I am sure that the Senate will debate these resolutions at some length.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader with respect to amendments that may be offered on Friday, and whether votes on those amendments can be put over until Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will give that every consideration, if a rollcall vote is demanded.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have an amendment which will take a minimum of an hour to consider. I should like to reserve time on the same basis that was extended to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the Senator will offer it tomorrow, so that we may get going on it.

Mr. HRUSKA. I have offered it today, and it will be ready for debate tomorrow. I am talking about the time for a vote on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate that.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire is a little disturbed. He recognizes, of course, the position in which the majority leader finds himself and the problems he must handle. He is always accommodating. However, he leaves us in the air a little because he has indicated that consideration will be given to votes on amendments. We could easily have half a dozen votes on amendments late tomorrow. While he has been very considerate in putting over until Monday the vote on the passage of the bill, I am wondering if he can give us a little more indication of his feelings about votes on amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no reason why the Senate cannot vote on amendments tomorrow, and we will do our best to do so. However, if any Senator feels he is being inconvenienced by having a vote tomorrow, we shall try to arrive at an agreement to vote at a time certain on Monday.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from New Hampshire does not wish to put his own convenience ahead of the convenience of the Senate, but ordinarily at this time in the session it is safe to make speaking engagements for Saturday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is.

Mr. COTTON. My colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] and I have an engagement to address the New Hampshire Bar Association at noon on Saturday. To do so we must leave late in the afternoon tomorrow. I should not like to be caught and lose votes on my amendment, particularly in view of the fact that I have received information that one of those amendments will concern the interests of New England.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will do our best to see that the Senator from New Hampshire is not caught, and we wish him and his colleague well in their speeches before the New Hampshire Bar Association.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ADELA INVESTMENT CO.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the Adela Investment Co., which was launched in 1962 by the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, of which I have been chairman for many years, and with the great aid of the then Senator, now Vice President Hubert Humphrey.

The company held its first board of directors meeting in Paris on September 30, 1964, selected its officers, and announced that more than $16 million has already been subscribed. Today, Adela's capital subscriptions have risen to $31 million, with $13 million subscribed by U.S. firms, $3 million each by Canadian and Spanish firms, $2.5 million by Swedish corporations, and $2.1 million by Swiss companies, with lesser subscriptions by corporations and banks from 12 other nations. Adela's 54-member corporations today include companies from Belgium, Denmark, Finland, West Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Britain, Canada, and the United States.

At its January 22 meeting in Brussels representatives of firms associated with the Adela effort met to organize an international program of private financial and technical assistance for Latin America. The company already received more than 50 requests for investment or technical cooperation. One investment, totaling $500,000 in a Colombian steel plant, has already been approved.

The significance of the Adela Investment Co. stems from the fact that it is the first major effort of leading elements of private business and banking in Europe, the United States, and Latin America, to come to the aid of the private enterprise system in a vitally important underdeveloped area of the world, Latin America. It signals a partnership between private enterprise of the industrially developed and the underdeveloped world which, I am convinced, holds within itself, the key to success of the free world.

I ask unanimous consent that the report on its meeting in Brussels, as published in the New York Times, be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1965]

Private Aid Group Maps Latin Loans: Business Leaders Meet in Brussels To Plan Global Investment Program

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

Brussels, January 22.—Leading industrialists and bankers of the non-Communist world met here today to organize an international program of private financial and technical assistance for Latin America.

Representatives of 121 bluechip corporations in North America, Western Europe and Japan began a 2-day review of more than 50 requests for financial assistance that have been submitted by Latin-American enterprises since last September.

The aid requests cover proposed projects that will require hundreds of millions of dollars in new investment capital.

Last fall, the business and financial communities of most major industrialized nations joined forces to create a new private investment group known as Adela. The name is an acronym for the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America. The group's goal is to promote the flow of private investment capital into Latin America.

CONCERNS FROM 15 NATIONS

Business and banks from 15 nations were represented at today's meeting here at the head offices of Petrofina, the big Belgian petroleum company.

Besides Belgian corporations, Adela's 54 members include companies in Denmark, Finland, West Germany, Italy, Japan Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Britain, Canada, and the United States.

The list of Adela members reads like a "Who's Who" of world business. Total assets of the members exceed $200 billion.

To date, Adela's capital subscriptions total $31.15 million. The authorized initial capitalization is $40 million. Capital contributions at present are limited to a maximum of $500,000 and a minimum of $100,000 for each member.

PROVISIONS FOR EXPANSION

Provision was made in Adela's corporate charter for expanding the initial capitalization as the circumstances might dictate. Adela, whose administrative offices are in Zurich, Switzerland, and Lima, Peru, was incorporated as the Adela Investment Co. in Luxembourg last September 24.

The chairman of the new private investment company is Marcus Wallenberg, vice chairman of the Stockholms Enskilda Bank of Sweden. Vice chairman is Howard C. Petersen, president of the Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co. Both were elected today to the executive committee.

Fourteen additional members of the executive committee also were elected. United States committee members include:

Emilio G. Collado, a vice president of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey); William Blackie, president of the Caterpillar Tractor Co.; David M. Kennedy, representing the Continental International Finance Corp., overseas investing subsidiary of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, of which he is chairman, and George S. Moore, of the First National City Overseas Investment Corp., the foreign investment arm of the First National City Bank of New York.

Capital subscriptions from the United States total $13.25 million, which is the biggest national subscription. Spanish and Canadian companies are next with $3 million in subscriptions from each, followed by Swedish corporations with $2.5 million and Swiss corporations with $2.1 million.

Mr. Moore, who is president of the First National City Bank, during a breakfast interview this morning said that Adela already had approved a $500,000 participation in a new $10 million steel plant in Colombia.

He indicated that many more participations will be approved now that Adela has been officially organized.

"While we are prepared to put Adela funds into any worthwhile Latin American enterprise," Mr. Moore said, "an equally important result should be the stimulative effect each Adela investment will have on Latin American investment capital."

He added that Adela would cooperate with Latin American entrepreneurs and with national and international industrial, banking, and financial institutions in projects that promised to be useful and significant for the economic development of Latin American countries.

Mr. Moore commented, "Of course, Adela investments will be business investments, not charitable gifts. Therefore, we will tend to favor those countries where the investment climate is hospitable and where there is reasonable stability."

He said potential Adela investments were now being considered in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Peru, Mexico, and several other Latin American nations.

Basic to the Adela investment philosophy is the goal that local capital complement any investment made by the group.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have every reason to be proud of the initiative, and welcome the assistance which our friends abroad are prepared to give American private enterprise in connection with the acceleration of the objectives of the Alliance for Progress.

A STUDY OF METHODS TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS OF FUTURE FLOOD DISASTERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 3, the Appalachia bill, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 4, S. 408.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 408) to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE PRESIDENCY, AND PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1787, Benjamin Franklin remarked near the conclusion of the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, "It astonishes me, sir, to find this system approaching so near to perfection as it does."

One hundred and seventy-eight years later the relevance of that Constitution of 1789 to our society of 1965 is remarkable. Yet it is truly astonishing that, over this span, we have neither perfected the provisions for orderly continuity in the Executive direction of our system nor, as yet, paid the price our continuing inaction so clearly invites and so recklessly risks.

I refer, of course, to three conspicuous and long-recognized defects in the Constitution relating to the office of the Presidency:

1. The lack of a constitutional provision assuring the orderly discharge of the powers and duties of the President—Commander in Chief—in the event of the disability or incapacity of the incumbent.

2. The lack of a constitutional provision assuring continuity in the office of the Vice President, an office which itself is provided within our system for the primary purpose of assuring continuity.

3. The lack of a constitutional provision assuring that the votes of electors in the electoral college shall without question reflect the expressed will of the people in the actual election of their President and Vice President.

Over the years, as I have noted, we have escaped the michief these obvious omissions invite and permit. Our escape has been more the result of providence than of any prudence on our part. For it is not necessary to conjure the nightmare of nuclear holocaust or other national catastrophe to identify these omissions as chasms of chaos into which normal human frailties might plunge us at any time.

On at least two occasions in our history, and perhaps others, American Presidents—James Garfield and Woodrow Wilson—have for prolonged periods been rendered incapable of discharging their Presidential duties. On 16 occasions in our 36 administrations, the office of Vice President has been vacant—and over the two perilous decades since the end of the Second World War, that vital office has been vacant the equivalent of 1 year out of 4. Finally, over recent years, complex but concerted campaigns have been openly undertaken—fortunately without success, as yet—to subvert the electoral college so that it would register not the will of the people of individual States but, rather, the wishes of the electors themselves.

The potential of paralysis implicit in these conditions constitutes an indefensible folly for our responsible society in these times. Commonsense impels, duty requires us to act—and to act now—without further delay.

Action is in the tradition of our forebears: Since adoption of the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments to our Constitution—9 of the 14 subsequent amendments have related directly either to the offices of the Presidency and Vice-Presidency or to assuring the responsiveness of our voting processes to the will of the people. As long ago as 1804 and as recently as 1964, Americans have amended their Constitution in striving for its greater perfection in these most sensitive and critical areas.

I believe it is the strong and overriding will of the people today that we should act now to eliminate these unhappy possibilities inherent in our system as it now exists. Likewise, I believe it is the consensus of an overwhelming majority of the Congress—without thought of partisanship—that effective action be taken promptly. I am, accordingly, addressing this communication to both Houses to ask that this prevailing will be translated into action which would permit the people, through the process of constitutional amendment, to overcome these omissions so clearly evident in our system.

I. PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

Our Constitution clearly prescribes the order of procedure for assuring continuity in the office of the Presidency in the event of the death of the incumbent. These provisions have met their tragic tests successfully. Our system, unlike many others, has never experienced the catastrophe of disputed succession or the chaos of uncertain command.

Our stability is, nonetheless, more superficial than sure. While we are prepared for the possibility of a President's death, we are all but defenseless against the probability of a President's incapacity by injury, illness, senility, or other affliction. A nation bearing the responsibilities we are privileged to bear for our own security—and the security of the free world—cannot justify the appalling gamble of entrusting its security to the immobilized hands or uncomprehending mind of a Commander in Chief unable to command.

On September 29, 1964, the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 139, proposing a constitutional amendment to deal with this perplexing question of Presidential disability—as well as the question, which I shall discuss below, of filling vacancies in the office of Vice President. The same measure has been introduced in this Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 1 and House Joint Resolution 1. The provisions of these measures have been carefully considered and are the product of many of our finest constitutional and legal minds. Believing, as I do, that Senate Joint Resolution 1 and House Joint Resolution 1 would responsibly meet the pressing need I have outlined, I urge the Congress to approve them forthwith for submission to ratification by the States.

II. VACANCY IN THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Indelible personal experience has impressed upon me the indisputable logic and imperative necessity of assuring that the second office of our system shall, like the first office, be at all times occupied by an incumbent who is able and who is ready to assume the powers and duties of the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief.

In our history, to this point, the office of the Presidency has never devolved below the first clearly prescribed step of constitutional succession. In moments of need, there has always been a Vice President, yet Vice Presidents are no less mortal than Presidents. Seven men have died in the office and one has resigned—in addition to the eight who left the office vacant to succeed to the Presidency.

We recognized long ago the necessity of assuring automatic succession in the absence of a Vice President. Various statutes have been enacted at various times prescribing orders of succession from among either the presiding officers of the Houses of Congress or the heads of executive departments who, together comprise the traditional Cabinet of the President. In these times, such orders of succession are no substitute for an office of succession.

Since the last order of succession was prescribed by the Congress in 1947, the office of the Vice-Presidency has undergone the most significant transformation and enlargement of duties in its history.

Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy have successively expanded the role of the Vice President, even as I expect to do in this administration.

Once only an appendage, the office of Vice President is an integral part of the chain of command and its occupancy on a full-time basis is imperative.

For this reason, I most strongly endorse the objective of both Senate Joint Resolution 1 and House Joint Resolution 1 in providing that whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President, provision shall exist for that office to be filled with a person qualified to succeed to the Presidency.

III. REFORM OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

We believe that the people should elect their President and Vice President. One of the earliest amendments to our Constitution was submitted and ratified in response to the unhappy experience of an electoral college stalemate which jeopardized this principle. Today there lurks in the electoral college system the ever-present possibility that electors may substitute their own will for the will of the people. I believe that possibility should be foreclosed.

Our present system of computing and awarding electoral votes by States is an essential counterpart of our Federal system and the provisions of our Constitution which recognize and maintain our Nation as a union of States. It supports the two party system which has served our Nation well. I believe this system should be retained. But it is imperative that the electoral votes of a State be cast for those persons who receive the greatest number of votes for President and Vice President—and for no one else.

At the same time, I believe we should eliminate the omission in our present system which leaves the continuity of the offices of President and Vice President unprotected if the persons receiving a majority of the electoral votes for either or both of these offices should die after the election in November and before the inauguration of the President.

Electors are now legally free to choose the President without regard to the outcome of the election. I believe that if the President-elect dies under these circumstances, our laws should provide that the Vice-President-elect should become President when the new term begins. Conversely, if death should come to the Vice-President-elect during this interim, I believe the President-elect should, upon taking office, be required to follow the procedures otherwise prescribed for filling the unexpired term of the Vice President. If both should die or become unable to serve in this interim, I believe the Congress should be made responsible for providing the method of selecting officials for both positions. I am transmitting herewith a draft amendment to the Constitution to resolve these problems.

Favorable action by the Congress on the measures here recommended will, I believe, assure the orderly continuity in the Presidency that is imperative to the success and stability of our system. Action on these measures now will allay future anxiety among our own people—and among the peoples of the world—in the event senseless tragedy or unforeseeable disability should strike again at either or both of the principal offices of our constitutional system. If we act now, without undue delay, we shall have moved closer to achieving perfection of the great constitutional document on which the strength and success of our system have rested for nearly two centuries.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 28, 1965*.

COMMENTS ON THE MESSAGE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the very pointed message which we have just received from the President of the United States, in which he very capably, as is typical of him, points out the great need of dealing with problems which have existed in this country for almost two centuries so far as continuity in the executive arm of our Government is concerned.

He dealt with three major areas: First, the area which has been frequently discussed on the floor of the Senate—the area of Presidential inability; second, the need to provide some continuity in the office of Vice President; third, the need to deal with the whole area of electoral college reform, and to deal with the problem which would be presented if the President or the Vice President died after being elected and prior to being sworn into office.

I should like particularly to call to Senators' attention the strong support which the President of the United States gave to Senate Joint Resolution 1, which is cosponsored by 75 of my colleagues, on which we are holding hearings tomorrow, and which I hope can be quickly sent to the floor of the Senate and acted upon again as it was in the last session, when it was passed 65 to 0. I hope that we can get similar action by the House and then start the rather long journey of getting three-fourths of our State legislatures to ratify the amendment.

It is my hope that Senators will join me in their concern for the third part of the message dealing with the electoral college and the eventualities in case of the death of the President or Vice President after their having been elected and prior to their being sworn into office, and that they will be as cooperative as they have been in dealing wtih the first two parts. For that reason I shall ask them to join in the effort which I hope we can start in the next day or two.

STUDY OF METHODS TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS OF FUTURE FLOOD DISASTERS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 408) to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be added as cosponsors of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Those sponsors bring to a total of 26 the number of Senators who have cosponsored the proposed insurance study authorization, a bill that has been thoroughly considered on two prior occasions by the Senate and passed unanimously on both occasions.

The bill would authorize the Housing and Home Finance Agency to conduct a study of providing adequate insurance protection for the victims of flood and other natural disasters. As my colleagues well know, at this time there are no practical means available to private citizens for obtaining insurance against flood and water damage. The Congress has long recognized the necessity of filling this gap. In 1956, the Federal Flood Insurance Act established a program of Federal flood insurance in the HHFA. However, no funds were appropriated to carry out the purposes of the act, and since 1957 it has remained a dead letter.

Subsequently, the Senate twice passed bills similar to S. 408, calling for an HHFA study of various means of flood insurance. Neither bill was acted on by the House of Representatives.

Events of the past few years have only served to emphasize the need for this type of study, which would lead ultimately to an adequate and effective insurance program. In March of 1962, the east coast was severely battered by a winter gale, which caused millions of dollars of damage to public and private property. A little or none of this damage was covered by insurance. And 1964 was a year of severe hardship for citizens in many States. In March Alaska was ravaged by a violent earthquake which cost losses which have been estimated to run as high as half a billion dollars. Almost none of this staggering loss was covered by insurance. And the floods which swept across the Western States this fall caused nearly $600 million in uninsured damage. The need is clear. Some form of insurance can and must be found against this type of loss.

Federal emergency programs and small business disaster loans simply cannot do the task unaided. I am confident that the study authorized by this bill will produce an effective means of providing the needed insurance.

In committee, one significant change was made in this year's bill. The language of the bill was expanded to authorize the study of providing insurance not only against flood and water damage, but damage caused by other natural disasters. The specific intention of the committee was that the HHFA develop ways of insuring against earthquake losses. This language was added at the request of the Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who support this measure and have been most helpful in its preparation. It is my understanding that the earthquake study will require 3 years to complete. The bill as written would require that the HHFA submit a report not later than 9 months after its enactment. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] will offer an amendment to allow a longer period of time for the submission of the earthquake study, and I am hopeful that the Senate will accept this useful amendment.

During committee deliberations, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] suggested that the Administrator of the HHFA appoint an advisory committee, composed of representatives of the insurance industry and other interested parties to assist in developing means of insurance. In its report the committee has endorsed this most helpful suggestion, and it is my understanding that the Administrator would establish such a committee.

Mr. President, the importance of this study is demonstrated by the fact that

26 of my colleagues joined me in sponsoring this bill. It is my hope that speedy passage by the Senate will prompt equally swift action by the House. Surely, this study should be underway before this year, which will inevitably bring damaging floods and storms, is out.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to dispose of the committee amendments prior to the offer of the amendment by the Senator from Alaska. The first committee amendment will be stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as new text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the committee amendments were agreed to, as follows:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "flood", to insert "and other natural"; in line 7, after the word "Federal", to strike out "flood" and insert "disaster"; on page 2, line 9, after the word "of", to strike out "flood"; in line 15, after the word "initiating", to strike out "a flood"; and, in the same line, after the word "insurance", to strike out "program" and insert "programs"; so as to make the bill read:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall undertake an immediate study of alternative programs which could be established to help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in flood and other natural disasters, including alternative methods of Federal disaster insurance, as well as the existing flood insurance program, and shall report his findings and recommendations to the President for submission to the Congress not later than nine months after the enactment of this Act or the appropriation of funds for this study, whichever is later. The report shall include, among other things, an indication of the feasibility of each program studied, an estimate of its cost to the Federal Government and to property owners on the basis of reasonable assumptions, and the legal authority for State financial participation. With respect to each method of insurance considered, the report shall include an indication of the schedule of estimated rates adequate to pay all claims for probable losses over a reasonable period of years, the feasibility of Federal flood plain zoning for the purpose of selecting areas which may be excluded from insurance coverage, and the feasibility of initiating insurance programs on an experimental basis in designated pilot areas. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Alaska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, it is proposed to add the following:

Provided, however, That the findings and recommendations on earthquake insurance shall be reported to the President for submission to the Congress not later than three years after the enactment of this Act or the appropriation of funds for this study, whichever is later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from New Jersey in his efforts to breathe life into the Federal flood insurance law. I am happy to be a cosponsor of the bill with him.

In 1956 the Congress passed a law which would authorize Federal action to furnish flood insurance against damage from rising waters. That bill was enacted under the leadership of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, the late John F. Kennedy. We have been unable, in any of the three succeeding Congresses, to implement that law. There have been objections by the Budget Bureau.

I have had conferences with representatives of four departments of the Government. They thought that the proposal was too difficult to apply. I thought it should be easier to apply than fire insurance, because it would merely involve a question of contour lines. It was said that the insurance would vary depending on the number of feet above sea level, or the grade of the river valleys where there is a probability of floods. Anyway, we have never been able to get funds from the Congress to implement the law.

Since we have tried unsuccessfully, the best approach now is that sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

There is no insurance of the type discussed available in America now through public or private companies to insure against flood loss caused solely by rising waters from natural causes.

A person may obtain insurance for tornado damage. It is foolish to say that it is feasible to insure against damage done by rising wind but not by rising waters. It is a great deal easier to estimate where there might be damage from rising waters than where there might be damage from rising winds. The chances are 99 to 1 that damage from rising waters will be in some river valley, below some dam, on some lake, ocean, gulf or bay shore. It is easier to estimate.

Mr. President, we should have such insurance in America. I predict that once the proposed study is made and we have some public insurance to spark the program, it will be like hail insurance. We could never get private insurance companies to write hail insurance in this country until during the Roosevelt years in the 1930's public hail insurance was authorized. As soon as private companies saw that such insurance was feasible, they practically took over the field of hail insurance.

I predict that the situation will be the same with relation to rising water insurance. It will be like hail and fire insurance. Once there is public action to guide private companies into action, they will take over the field. They are too timid to do it now.

It has long been a matter of surprise to my constituents, looking for help and assistance after one of the hurricanes that sometimes ravages our coast, to learn that there is a law on the books that purports to establish a Federal flood insurance program. This law was passed in 1956 under the leadership of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the then junior Senator from Massachusetts John F. Kennedy. However, no funds were appropriated by Congress to implement it, and the then administration ceased any effort to effectuate the law. No insurance against property damage loss caused solely by rising waters from natural causes is now available in America.

I have made several personal efforts to interest the Housing and Home Finance Agency in making an effort to begin this program. I regret that the Agency has not seen fit to exercise some initiative and leadership in getting this program started. A person may obtain insurance from tornado damage now. It is foolish to say that it is feasible to insure against damage done by rising wind, but not from rising waters.

Since this law was passed in 1956, many thousands of my constituents have suffered losses from floods uncompensated for by any existing plan of private insurance. Here is an area where the field of leadership is clearly in the hands of the Federal Government; here is a possibility for showing the feasibility of insurance coverage such as was done in hail insurance. I urge passage of this bill, and assure the Senator from New Jersey that I shall support every effort to put this program into full operation.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will speedily pass the proposed legislation and send it to the House of Representatives.

As the Senate knows, a large area of my State has been almost continuously inundated by ravaging floods during the last many weeks and months, accumulating a frightful toll of life and wreaking damage in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Several weeks ago, with my western colleagues representing States where flood damage has occurred, I wrote to the President of the United States requesting that a study be made in the executive branch of the possibility of a Natural Disaster Act which, were it passed, would permit the executive branch to accelerate the assistance that might be available under Federal law where acts of God took place and damage resulted.

I remember when the tragedy of the great earthquake overcame the State of the two beloved Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING]. No legislation was on the statute books under which appropriate assistance by the people of the United States might immediately have been given; and thus the legislative process, with all its slowness and difficulties, had to be used in order to pass legislation to provide appropriate assistance to the people of Alaska.

By the same token, on a long-range basis, where great floods take place in any section of the country, it is difficult to bring maximum assistance in good time to the people who are damaged. I believe the Senator from New Jersey has presented to us an excellent piece of proposed legislation, one which will provide for an appropriate study by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of the question of insurance, which never has been studied as thoroughly as it might be.

Under these circumstances, I am delighted to be in the Senate at a time when the Senator's bill is being considered and will unquestionably pass. For all these reasons, I join him and other Senators who have joined him in sponsoring this kind of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 408) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future natural disasters."

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING OF REPORT BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the filing of a report by the Special Committee on Aging be extended from January 31, 1965, to March 15, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the order previously entered, until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, January 29, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 28, 1965:

ATTORNEY GENERAL AND DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Attorney General.

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Deputy Attorney General.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hydrographic and Oceanographic Surveys in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, of the U.S. Department of Commerce, that an oceanographic venture will be conducted by the ocean survey ship *Explorer*, of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, during a 4-month period commencing February 2, 1965.

The scheduled activities of the *Explorer* and the description of its mission, I think, will be of interest to all the Members and to the public in general, tend to dispel any fears that the United States is not alert to the great rewards which will flow from a knowledge of the sea. The *Explorer* is an example of our efforts to forge ahead in this important field of science.

An abbreviated form of the information I have received follows:

The ocean survey ship *Explorer*, of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, U.S. Department of Commerce, will sail next week from Norfolk, Va., to conduct extensive hydrographic and oceanographic surveys in the Caribbean on a voyage which is expected to last for 4 months.

The *Explorer* will weigh anchor on February 2 for its 3,000-mile round trip from the Coast and Geodetic Survey's Atlantic ships base. Five to ten days later it will arrive in San Juan and will work in the vicinity of Cape San Juan on the east coast of Puerto Rico, Vieques Sound, San Juan Harbor, and possibly Charlotte Amalie Harbor in St. Thomas, V.I.

It is a 1,900-ton, 220-foot vessel, commanded by Comdr. Marvin T. Paulson, of Hatton, N. Dak. It will be carrying a complement of 15 officers and 73 crew.

The surveys to be undertaken by the *Explorer* are a part of a program commenced in 1962 to revise nautical charts for the Puerto Rico-Virgin Islands area. Present charts are based on surveys in the early part of the century. Since then, currents, waves, and storms have shifted shallow areas, eroded the coastline, built up coral reefs, and altered the configuration of the ocean bottom.

The ship will conduct hydrographic surveys and will map the ocean bottom in offshore areas where the water is deep enough to permit safe navigation. In the shallow, inshore areas, launches will be employed to locate coral reefs and shipwrecks, and to determine the configuration of the ocean bottom.

The area to be surveyed is approximately 50 square miles.

Water depth will be measured with a fathometer, a device which transmits sound impulses to the ocean floor and converts the time it takes the impulse to return to the ship into a water depth. To locate the horizontal position of the *Explorer* relative to land, the ship will employ electronic and visual control. An electronic positioning system will be used in offshore areas. In shallow, inshore areas, markers will be established on land as reference points with the aid of triangulation and aerial photography. Aerial photographs will also be used to determine the position of charted features, such as emerging rocks, prominent landmarks, and the shoreline.

A 29-day survey will be made by the *Explorer* at the entrance to San Juan Harbor. In this period, the moon will make a full orbit around the earth, thereby causing a full cycle of spring and neap tides.

Four-day surveys of the current will be made, first, southeast of Ramos Island; second, San Juan Harbor; and third, Vieques Sound between Point Salado and Point Este.

Many different forms of tides characterize the ocean waters in the Caribbean. To study these tidal characteristics, portable tide gages will be placed at different localities, including Playa de Fajardo, Ensenada Honda, Iota Mulas, and Punta Este on the Island of Vieques. These gages measure rise and fall of the tides.

On its way to Puerto Rico, the *Explorer* will study the profile of the ocean bottom to determine the location of undersea mountains, valleys, depressions, and other features.

After completing its work in the Puerto Rico-Virgin Islands area, the *Explorer*, en route home, will make samples at 14 separate locations to determine at various depths the temperature, salinity and oxygen content of the sea water. To oceanographers, these are the "fingerprints" of the various water masses that comprise the sea. Knowledge of the temperature and salinity makes it possible to determine the origin of the water. The dissolved oxygen content tells researchers the biological life to be found in that part of the ocean.

En route home to Norfolk, the *Explorer* will parallel Puerto Rico's northern shoreline, turn north at Tortuga Island, continue through Caico Passage between Mayaguana Island and the Caico Islands, and then north to Norfolk, which it should reach in late May or early June.

Paul H. Rutherford—American as Business and Baseball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join his many friends and colleagues in paying well-deserved tribute to my constituent, Paul Rutherford, as he retires from his present job on the last day of this month. But knowing Paul Rutherford as well as I do, I am confident that retirement for Paul really means commencement—commencement to start doing some of the many things he has always wanted to do and at last has time to do.

For truly Paul Rutherford has been a busy man all his life. He has earned every step on the long road to the position of one of America's leading industrial managers by dint of hard work, persistence and dedication to duty.

Already as a boy he had to help his mother, who was widowed when he was only 6, in making ends meet. He sold newspapers at a downtown street corner in Pomona, Calif., and had a paper route in the evening besides. While in high school, he struggled through a summer job with a plumbing company, working from 2 in the afternoon till midnight, 7 days a week for $30 a month. All the time Paul was looking ahead. He went on to college, working his way through the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, from which he graduated in 1922 as an electrical engineer.

Four years later he joined General Motors, the company to which he has devoted his working days for nearly 40 years. He started out in GM's Dayton Engineering Laboratories Division. By 1936 he was chief engineer and in 1940 he became plant manager in Dayton. Two years later, in 1942, he was in Detroit on General Motors personnel staff. While there, he handled GM wage dispute cases which went before the War Labor Board and other work on job and wage classifications. After the end of the war, in 1946, he spent about a year as special assistant to the vice president in charge of the Dayton household appliance group. The following year he came to Rochester, where he has been associated with GM's Delco Appliance Division ever since, for a year as assistant general manager and beginning on August 1, 1948, as general manager. He has held this position for 17 years and thus has served as a general manager in the General Motors organization longer than any other GM general manager at the present time. This is a record of which he may be justly proud and for which I join in saluting him.

Perhaps as much as any man, Paul Rutherford brought about home air conditioning as an accepted goal for the American family. He persuaded builders and developers throughout our Nation that cooling a home was no longer a rich man's luxury.

Most men would be more than content to have just this career to look back upon. But Paul Rutherford has been far more than a successful American businessman. He has a deep social conscience. He has concerned himself with parolees in industry. He has been a leader in the movement to bring about greater acceptance of ex-convicts as workers in American factories. As he has said:

> At Delco we have hired a goodly number of parolees. Most of them have done a good job for us. * * * When a man has paid his debt he deserves an opportunity to show that he really is rehabilitated.

He has worked for the victims of multiple sclerosis.

He is vitally concerned with sound community growth and development.

He has a keen interest in the education of young Americans.

Perhaps most of all he has been a lifelong fan of that most American of all sports—baseball. At one time his interest in this and other sports was so strong that he wanted to become a sportswriter. He has a knowledge of big league baseball as few if any do who are not players on the diamond. He has never lost his devotion to the game. I trust that now he will be able to really enjoy the sport season after season as he has not been able to do fully for many a busy year.

So I congratulate Paul Rutherford on his outstanding service to American industry and to the healthier and more comfortable American home. At the same time, I want to wish him well in the years that lie ahead, years that will continue to be rewarding to a man who has always had a broad sweep of interests and sympathies, a man who is characteristic of the best that is American today.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 1965

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, our spirit's home, again we seek Thy comfort and strength. Grant us, we beseech Thee, a vision of Thy righteous will, that we may be stripped of pride, and made humble and penitent.

Confront us now, we pray, with Thy light on our ways, with some shining ray of Thy guidance piercing our darkness; and grant us at the beginning of this day a transforming experience of Thy grace that will leave us contrite, forgiven, and cleansed.

The world is full of the clamor of the violent, the boasting of those who have not Thee in awe, and the agony of fettered peoples. We would be valiant in a day when the hearts of many turn to water. Renew our valor, that as undefeated souls we may sustain the shocks of life, master its handicaps, and, at last, make even the wrath of men serve Thee.

We ask it in the name of the One who illumined life and conquered death. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 28, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Authorization for Checks To Be Drawn in Favor of Banking Organizations for the Credit of a Person's Account Under Certain Conditions

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of banking organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendments to Regulations Governing Numbering of Undocumented Vessels

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, amendments to the regulations governing the numbering of undocumented vessels, to be published in the Federal Register (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Communications Act of 1934, as Amended

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission authority to prescribe regulations for the manufacture, import, sale, shipment, or use of devices which cause harmful interference to radio reception (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Legislation Relating to the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay expenses of members of the Metropolitan Police Department for attending pistol matches (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to furnish discharge gratuities to persons released from imprisonment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to furnish cash gratuities to needy patients of the Glenn Dale Hospital (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Balance Sheet of Potomac Electric Power Co.

A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a balance sheet of that company, as of December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Fees for Services Performed in Connection With Private Aircraft or Private Vessels Arriving in or Departing From the United States

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a flat fee for services performed in connection with the arrival in, or departure from, the United States of a private aircraft or private vessel, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Unnecessary Cost to the Government Through the Leasing of Electronic Data Processing Systems by Lockheed Missiles & Space Co.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report of Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated January 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Extension of Time for Secretary of the Interior To Make Certain Fisheries Loans

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Section 1498, Title 28, United States Code

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to define the word "owner" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Applications for Writs of Habeas Corpus by Certain Persons

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico

A letter from the Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, El Paso, Tex., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Positions in Grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

Report of U.S. Atomic Energy Commission

A letter from the Chairman and members, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Resolution 11 of the State of Montana

"A joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, the Congress of the United States, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, the Honorable William Driver, and the Montana congressional delegation protesting the announced closure of the Veterans' Administration hospital located at Miles City, Mont.

"Whereas the State of Montana is the fourth largest State in the Nation and has at the present time only 260 hospital beds for the 88,000 veterans who reside in the State; and

"Whereas the closing of Miles City Veterans' Administration facility will reduce the number of hospital beds available for Montana veterans to 160; and

"Whereas the facility at Helena, Mont., known as Fort Harrison, Mont., is already overcrowded with more patients than it can handle without use of a waiting list; and

"Whereas the closure of the Miles City hospital will require disabled and sick veterans to travel additional hundreds of miles for hospital care, thus creating a situation which would be intolerable and dangerous to their health and welfare; and

"Whereas there is no evidence that the operation of the Miles City Veterans' Administration facility has been at less than capacity in the past several years and, to the contrary, it is evident that this hospital has been used to full capacity by the thousands of veterans who live within a radius of said facility; and

"Whereas the hospital today has only one empty operating bed; and

"Whereas the veteran population is becoming older—with the average World War I veteran now 69 years of age, the average World War II veteran 44 years of age, and the average Korean veteran 34 years of age; and

"Whereas with increased age the incidence of illness and dentistry care also increases; and

"Whereas the need for more facilities rather than less is indicated by all Veterans'

Administration statistics: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana,* That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana request the President of the United States to review the decision made by his Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the closing of the Veterans' Administration facility at Miles City, Mont., and request the Congress of the United States to investigate this decision with the idea of canceling said order; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States, and to the Montana delegation of Congress.

"RAY J. WAYRYNEN,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"TED JAMES,
"*President of the Senate*".

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts):

Two resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE RUTLAND HEIGHTS HOSPITAL

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Massachusetts House of Representatives that the medical-surgical facilities of the Veterans' Administration located at Rutland Heights in the Commonwealth will be closed effective June 30 of the current year; and

"Whereas the closing of this facility is in direct conflict with the general philosophy behind veterans' benefits in the United States as it has evolved over a long period of years and will result in derogation of veterans' benefits; and

"Whereas the removal of this hospital will work a particular hardship on the veterans of the Commonwealth and the present facilities should be retained to serve those who have served so well: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the veterans' facilities at Rutland Heights; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States rescind the order providing for the closing of the medical-surgical facilities located at Rutland Heights; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Surgeon General of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, January 20, 1965.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL IN THE BRIGHTON DISTRICT OF BOSTON

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Massachusetts House of Representatives that the U.S. Public Health Service hospital in the Brighton district of Boston will be closed; and

"Whereas more than 60,000 outpatients, many of whom are fishermen engaged in New England's oldest industry, are treated annually in this facility; and

"Whereas if the Rutland Heights Hospital of the Veterans' Administration is closed, the load on remaining U.S. hospitals for inpatient service will be increased: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in the Brighton district of Boston; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States rescind the order providing for the closing of said hospital; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, January 20, 1965.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 892. A bill to repeal retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appeared under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. GRUENING and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 893. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 388), as amended, relating to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 894. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and the spouse and children of such specialists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 895. A bill to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INOUYE (by request):

S. 896. A bill to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. INOUYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MONDALE):

S. 897. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

REPEAL OF CERTAIN RETAIL EXCISE TAXES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in 1941, Congress levied a number of retail excise taxes on furs, jewelry, luggage, and cosmetics. These taxes had a twofold purpose. Obviously, one purpose was to raise revenues to aid the war effort. The other was to discourage the purchase of such items so that the materials involved might be devoted to war purposes. That was 24 years ago; and at the time these taxes were approved, there was a pledge that they would be removed with the end of hostilities. That war ended 19 years ago. Still another conflict, sometimes referred to as World War II½, in Korea, came and went. Still another conflict, in Vietnam, came and is still here. So are the retail excise taxes. Like Tennyson's brook, once such levies are placed on the statute books, they go on forever and forever.

For the consumers of the Nation, these taxes are a direct burden on their purchasing power. For the retailers, they constitute an administrative burden, since forms must be filed, records must be kept, and remittances made to the Treasury Department.

Sporadic efforts have been made in Congress to have these taxes repealed, but without success. On January 23, 1964, I offered a series of amendments to a revenue measure then pending before the Committee on Finance to repeal these taxes, and every one of those amendments was approved by a vote of 2 to 1, or more.

At that point, I deemed it a good day's work for the consumers and retailers of the country. It would leave hundreds of millions of dollars in the hands of the consumers, to be spent as they saw fit, and would also energize business at every level. But I counted the chickens before they were hatched.

A few days after the Committee on Finance took this action, a motion to reconsider was made; and when the vote was counted, the repeal amendments, instead of carrying by votes of 2 to 1, were torpedoed by a vote of 9 to 8. I failed to reckon with the power of the "Texas twist." The same amendments were offered on the floor of the Senate, and when the smoke of battle cleared away, they had been defeated by a margin of three votes.

But I felt that the retailers and the consumers had a good case, and I was fully prepared to make a further effort in the present Congress to bring about a repeal of these onerous taxes. I was therefore quite delighted that the President, in the course of his state of the Union message, should say:

> More money will be left in the hands of the consumers by a substantial cut in excise taxes.

I merely antedated the President by a number of months.

The Republican minority made this very point a year ago, but without success. Now, however, the President has seen the light, and I believe we may confidently expect early action in this field. While action on the repeal of these taxes must originate in the House, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill for the complete repeal of existing excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage, the text of which can be used as an amendment if the need arises.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 892) to repeal retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in full at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) effective with respect to articles sold on or after the first day of the first month which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, the following subchapters of chapter 31 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to retailers excise taxes) are repealed:

(1) Subchapter A (jewelry and related items).

(2) Subchapter B (furs).

(3) Subchapter C (toilet preparations).

(4) Subchapter D (luggage, handbags, etc.).

(b) The table of subchapters for such chapter 31 is amended by striking out the following:

"Subchapter A. Jewelry and related items.
"Subchapter B. Furs.
"Subchapter C. Toilet preparations.
"Subchapter D. Luggage, handbags, etc."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the indefatigable leadership in the field of Federal taxation, given by the Republican leader in the Senate, is, I believe, a splendid example of the kind of constructive opposition the great American party to which we belong can achieve and thus help the processes of democracy.

Republicans in this Chamber followed our leader. We believed then, as we believe now, that the entire excise tax field historically has been, as it should be, part of the structure available for the States of the American Union to utilize, if in their judgment they desire to utilize it. Surely, when they originally became a part of the Federal law, under the announced needs of an international crisis, it was always with the thought in mind the taxes would be temporary in character and not permanent. They have, as our great Republican leader has indicated, become almost permanent.

Last year, following a good, sound Republican Party backing, the junior Senator from Illinois achieved a victory in the Committee on Finance, which regrettably was a pyrrhic one. Thereafter, he gave the Senate an opportunity to sit in judgment on those proposals.

I join my colleague in congratulating the President of the United States on adopting this sound Republican policy as part of the program which will be presented to the Senate this year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am grateful to my distinguished friend from California for his amplification of this whole matter. What he has to say about the attitude of the minority party in this field is so very correct. I trust, therefore, that, with the cooperation of the President, we shall consummate this task in the 89th Congress, which we failed to consummate in the 88th.

Mr. KUCHEL. And without, I am sure, the hazards to the Members of Congress of a type of political bursitis which has been manifested in this Chamber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year, in the Committee on Finance, I offered amendments to repeal the excise taxes which were imposed in 1941. They dealt with luggage, jewelry, cosmetic preparations, furs, ladies' handbags, and all those things that are no longer regarded as luxuries, but necessities in this world.

Strangely enough, the amendments all carried. They carried by a vote of 13 to 2, and then by a vote of 10 to 5. But somehow, in a very interesting manner, an effective force intervened within a day or two. I sometimes call it the "Texas twist." In any event, there was quite a change. On a motion to reconsider, I suddenly discovered that the amendments had been rejected by a vote of 9 to 8. But I am happy to know that the President has provided in his state of the Union message, and in other messages, that he proposes a repeal of excise taxes in the gross amount of roughly $1.75 billion.

I have reason to believe that the bill will probably include all retailers. If the taxes are not entirely repealed, I shall offer an amendment to repeal them entirely. One of the most burdensome things about the tax is that every small retailer in the country who sells a handbag, a bottle of perfume, or a suitcase of any kind must make a return to the Treasury Department. The bookkeeping, the reporting, and the remittances are not the least part of the burden by any means. In addition, the repeal of this tax would leave perhaps from $400 to $500 million in the hands of the American families to energize the expanding economy. Obviously, that is the essential theme today in expanding the economy. This merely gives it another jolt.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1485 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO THE TRANSPORTATION OF REMAINS OF CERTAIN DECEASED DEPENDENTS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter of transmittal requesting introduction of the legislation and explaining its purpose be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 896) to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. INOUYE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. INOUYE is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., January, 5, 1965.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation would provide the same authority for the transportation, at Government expense, of the remains of a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces as is now provided for a living dependent.

Section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, presently authorizes transportation at Government expense of the remains of a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces who is on active duty at a place outside the United States, if such dependent dies at or while traveling to or from, such place of active duty.

Under the authority of sections 406 and 411 of title 37, United States Code, members of the Armed Forces are entitled to transportation of their dependents in the event of a change of permanent duty station, retirement, or in the event of a death of a member.

The proposed amendment would authorize essentially the same transportation for a dead dependent, regardless of the geographical location of the member's active duty station, that would be authorized if the dependent were living.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The estimated costs of the proposal for fiscal year 1965 are as follows:

Army	$193, 788
Navy	147, 700
Marine Corps	38, 850
Air Force	287, 280
Total	667, 618

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN AILES,
Secretary of the Army.

THE ST. CROIX NATIONAL SCENIC WATERWAY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, for myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway. The St. Croix marks the boundary between Wisconsin and Minnesota for some hundred miles north from the Mississippi.

It would designate the northern St. Croix River and its Wisconsin tributary, the Namekagon, as the Nation's first "wild river," and set aside the lower St. Croix as an intensive outdoor recreation area protected by zoning.

The wild river portions of the waterway were included among the 22 rivers across the Nation studied by the joint Interior-Agriculture wild river study team.

The bill is designed to provide a Federal "umbrella" under which State, county, and municipal, as well as Federal development of the scenic and recreational potential of this unique river valley can go forward in an orderly and cooperative manner.

The St. Croix is the last large clean river near a major population center in the Midwest. The beginnings of industry on the lower St. Croix make it imperative that we move to protect as much of it as possible as a national asset.

A dispute over whether to industrialize the lower St. Croix or reserve it for the recreation broke into the open last May when a power company announced plans to construct a huge coal fired steam electric generating plant on the river at Oak Park Heights, Minn.

The extraordinary wide support gained in Minnesota and Wisconsin by those seeking to save the river for recreation, and the extensive national and even international press coverage of the dispute is gratifying to those of us who have been working over the years for sound conservation policy.

The lower St. Croix, a clean, undeveloped river, lies within easy driving distance of the growing Twin Cities area. It is already one of the most popular boating waters in the country.

The Twin Cities, now boasting some 1.7 million in population, will have expanded to 4 million in the next 35 years; the St. Croix will be practically downtown. The Twin Cities even now have only 30 percent of the public recreation area which experts say they need.

But as the area grows the need for clean water for industrial purposes grows too, and naturally the St. Croix looks like an attractive proposition.

Commerce or recreation for the St. Croix? Who is to decide? There is no governmental unit specifically charged and empowered to make that crucial decision.

There is an ample supply of undeveloped industrial sites near at hand on the Mississippi. It seems to us only commonsense that the St. Croix be set aside for recreational development. Many agree.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial from the January 20, 1965, edition of the Minneapolis Star. It makes these points quite clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] and I have drafted this bill to provide a Federal "umbrella" of protective authority under which all levels of government can cooperate in the preservation and development for conservation and recreation of the St. Croix Valley.

I ask unanimous consent that a detailed, section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed along with the bill at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. NELSON. At this time let me just summarize the proposed bill.

First, I want to make it clear that the bill would not affect the local zoning permit granted by Oak Park Heights, Minn., for construction of the $68 million powerplant.

And I think it only fair to point out that the Northern States Power Co. has owned and preserved in a primitive condition the land on both banks of the St. Croix for some 70 miles north of Taylors Falls.

The "wild river" portions extend 102 miles along the St. Croix north from Taylors Falls, Minn., to Gordon, Wis., and along the Namekagon from its meeting with the St. Croix north 87 miles to Lake Namekagon.

Nearly all the area to be given the "wild river" designation is in a primitive state. The bill is intended to leave undisturbed the few private cottages along these stretches of the St. Croix and the Namekagon. On these properties scenic easement acquisition would be ample protection for the purposes of the bill.

Zoning rather than land acquisition and easements would be used to protect the intensive outdoor recreation area portion, which is south of Taylors Falls. This portion of the St. Croix has several communities along its banks, including Hudson and Osceola, Wis., and Stillwater, Marine, and Oak Park Heights, Minn.

Acquisition in the recreation area would be limited to small, key parcels needed for public access to the water and adequate parking facilities.

Zoning to protect the recreation area would require approval of the Secretary of the Interior. New commercial or industrial uses not in harmony with recreational use or the river's environment would be excluded.

The zoning approach has been successfully used in the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

One section of the bill provides that owners of noncommercial, residential property acquired by the Secretary of the Interior would be issued either a transferable 25-year use and occupancy right to the property or a nontransferable lifetime right to use and occupancy.

The bill includes these provisions designed to facilitate cooperation of Federal, State, county, and local authorities.

State land within the waterway will not be acquired by the Secretary of the Interior without consent of the State involved, and the Secretary may agree not to acquire any land which either State plans to acquire and develop.

City, town, and village land within the waterway would not be acquired as long as accepted zoning ordinances for the protection of the river and its environment remained in force.

Provisions for cooperative planning of the recreational and conservation development of the waterway between all levels of government are written into the bill.

The St. Croix River is an excellent example of the kind of land use crisis we face coast-to-coast as pressure for recreation uses and industrial sites grow with increasing wealth and population.

It is our hope that this bill, with its idea of Federal, State, and local cooperation, will prove an excellent example of what reasonable people can do to solve this kind of problem.

EXHIBIT 1

SHOULD ST. CROIX BE SAVED?

The application by Northern States Power Co. to build a powerplant on the St. Croix River raises questions of great importance to the future overall development of this metropolitan area.

On technical grounds—that is, as to safeguards offered against air and water pollution—it would be hard to oppose NSP's application. But "the great St. Croix debate" has made us all conscious of some very special opportunities offered by the valley.

The opportunities are enormous. What the Minneapolis lakes and Lake Minnetonka have meant for the quality of life in this area, or White Bear Lake for the people of St. Paul, the St. Croix can mean to a metropolitan area expected to double in population—to a staggering 4 million—within the next 35 years.

It may not, in the end, be decided to reserve the St. Croix primarily for recreational and residential development. But the community should take the time and put forth the effort to make a thoughtful decision.

Thus, we hope that NSP can be persuaded to withdraw its St. Croix application and undertake its present round of plant expansion at Prairie Island (near Red Wing) instead. That is where—we understand—NSP plans to locate its next plant after the St. Croix installation. (The company must roughly double its capacity every 10 years in order to meet the power needs of this area.)

This switch in locations could not be made without cost. An additional $5 million in capital costs might be immediately entailed. And transmission costs from Prairie Island would be somewhat greater than from Bayport. These added costs would not mean an increase in electric power rates, but they probably would mean a delay in future rate reductions.

If NSP or its ratepayers are asked to pay this cost, it should be on one very clear understanding, however. It must not be done for the benefit of a few private home and summer-home owners in the St. Croix area. It must be for a wider, public benefit.

So if the States involved (Minnesota and Wisconsin) and the adjacent communities have not meanwhile developed an enlightened, recreational, park use program for the valley, no objection should be raised if the company seeks to build at Bayport in the future.

If NSP can be persuaded to build now at Prairie Island instead of Bayport, work should begin immediately on a public decision regarding the future use of the St. Croix.

Perhaps the Minnesota Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission can prepare a plan for recreation and residential development: for public access, for camp grounds and picnic areas, for parkways, for control of neon signs on the bluffs, for forestation, and for standards under which private, taxpaying residential and commercial development can proceed.

Needed also is a study of the economic effect of reserving the valley primarily for recreational and residential development; including suggestions as to how the local governments may raise the revenue they expect to get in taxes from NSP.

This won't be easy. But it isn't impossible, either—if NSP, all the governmental bodies involved, and interested citizen groups will cooperate.

EXHIBIT 2

ANALYSIS OF THE ST. CROIX NATIONAL SCENIC WATERWAY BILL TO BE INTRODUCED IN THE SENATE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 1965, BY SENATORS NELSON OF WISCONSIN AND MONDALE OF MINNESOTA

The St. Croix National Scenic Waterway bill embodies the concept of a mixed-ownership, multiple-use, scenic recreation area in which State, county, municipal, and private ownership exist in harmony under the protection of a Federal umbrella.

Federal protection under the bill would cover a strip about one-quarter mile deep on both banks of the waterway.

The waterway would consist of two kinds of areas:

A wild river, to be kept as primitive as possible on 102 miles of the St. Croix north of Taylors Falls, Minn., and along the 87 miles of the Namekagon tributary in Wisconsin. Purchase of scenic easements and acquisition where essential of up to 320 acres per mile (the equivalent of a strip one-quarter mile deep on both banks) would be authorized in this section. The States would be entitled not only to keep the park land under their administration but encouraged to expand it. County ownership would be preserved on county land managed according to a plan acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior.

An intensive outdoor recreation area along the 57 miles of the St. Croix south of Taylors Falls, protected by zoning rather than land acquisition of easements. Acquisition would be limited to small, key parcels needed for public access and adequate park facilities. Jurisdiction on this stretch of the river would draw up zoning ordinances, with the aid of regulations developed by the Secretary of the Interior, to exclude new commercial or industrial uses not in harmony with the purposes of the act.

A specific section of the bill would provide for Federal, State, county and local cooperation in the drawing up of plans for the conservation and recreational development of the waterway.

Zoning cannot be retroactive, therefore the proposed Northern States Power Co. plant at Oak Park Heights, which has already received local permits, would not be legally affected by the legislation.

Section 1(a) states that it is the purpose of the bill to establish the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway to preserve as a wild river the portion of the St. Croix from the dam at Taylors Falls north to the dam near Gordon, Wis., and its Namekagon tributary, as wild rivers and the St. Croix south of Taylors Falls for intensive recreational use "for the enjoyment of all the American people."

Section 1(b) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands and waters and interests (such as scenic easements) therein:

1. Not more than 640 acres including not more than 2 miles of lake frontage on the lake formed behind the dam at Taylors Falls.

2. From the north end of that lake to the dam near Gordon, Wis., up to 320 acres per mile (the equivalent of a strip one-quarter mile deep on both banks).

(This formula is designed to give the Secretary flexibility in laying out the waterway. It is intended that wherever possible the Secretary will use easements rather than outright purchase so as to disturb the land ownership pattern as little as possible while preserving the primitive character of the waterway.)

3. On the lower St. Croix, from the dam at Taylors Falls south to the Mississippi River, the Secretary is granted the same acquisition authority, however the "authority shall be suspended so long as the appropriate local zoning agency shall have in force * * * a duly adopted * * * zoning ordinance * * * satisfactory to the Secretary."

In order to provide public access to the lower St. Croix and to provide adequate park facilities the Secretary, despite the zoning provisions, is authorized to acquire not more than 1,600 acres including not more than 5 miles of river frontage on the 57-mile stretch of river from the dam to the Mississippi.

4. The same 320-acres-per-mile formula is applied to the Namekagon from its confluence with the St. Croix to the dam at Lake Namekagon, except that along the lake behind the dam at Trego, Wis., the Secretary is limited to acquiring 640 acres including not more than 2 miles of lakeshore (the same amount as permitted on the lake behind the dam at Taylors Falls).

Section 1(c): The Secretary is given the customary authority to acquire land by "donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange or otherwise."

Section 1(d) provides that State-owned land within the waterway may only be acquired with the consent of the State. Further it provides for agreements between the States and the Secretary under which the Secretary would refrain from acquiring land that the States plan to acquire.

Section 1(e): The Secretary's authority to acquire land is suspended with respect to lands in incorporated villages and cities that have zoning ordinances in force satisfactory to the Secretary.

Section 1(f): His authority is suspended on county-owned lands where the county is following "a plan for management" satisfactory to the Secretary.

Section 1(g) spells out the rights of the owners of improved property acquired by the Secretary under the terms of this act.

Owners of "detached, noncommercial, residential family dwellings, the construction of which began before January 1, 1965," that are acquired by the Secretary may reserve for themselves either a transferable 25-year right of use and occupancy or a life right of use and occupancy.

Section 2 details zoning procedures and regulations. The Secretary shall issue regulations for zoning designed to promote the protection and development of the waterway and to prohibit new commercial or industrial uses not compatible with a scenic and recreational waterway. The Secretary is required to approve local ordinances that meet the standards set out in the regulations. If approved regulations lapse, are violated, or are not in force the suspension of the Secretary's powers of condemnation "automatically cease."

Section 3 provides for an agreement between the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture on the administration of that corner of the waterway that lies in the Chequamegon National Forest in Wisconsin, near Lake Namekagon.

And for cooperative agreement, at the pleasure of the tribe, for the protection and development of the lands of the St. Croix Indian Reservation near Danbury, Minn., that lie within the waterway.

Section 4 provides that the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior "with such statutory authority * * * as may be available to him * * * for the conservation and management of natural resources."

Section 5 provides for cooperation between the Secretary and the States, their political subdivisions and other Federal agencies in "formulating and implementing * * * comprehensive plans for the use, development, and conservation of the outdoor resources" of the waterway.

Section 6, the standard park bill hunting and fishing permission clause, provides for the applicability of State hunting and fishing laws and for consultation with the "appropriate State agency" before prescribing any restrictions.

Section 7 forbids the Federal Power Commission from licensing any "dam or other structure" the Secretary determines would adversely affect the waterway. Disagreements to be referred to the Congress for resolution.

Section 8 restricts the Army Engineers in the same way section 7 restrains the Federal Power Commission.

Section 9 provides for cooperation between the Secretary and State and Federal water pollution agencies for the "elimination or diminishing" of pollution in the waterway.

Section 10 authorizes to be appropriated "such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

S. 897

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) for the purpose of preserving the portion of the Saint Croix River, beginning at the dam near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, and extending upstream to the dam near Gordon, Wisconsin, and its Namekagon tributary in Wisconsin, as a wild river in a primitive condition, or restoring it as nearly as possible to such condition, in order to conserve its unique scenic and other natural values;

(2) for the purpose of promoting broad recreational use and more intensive types of recreational use of the portion of the Saint Croix River downstream from the dam near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, to its confluence with the Mississippi River; and

(3) for the purpose of protecting, developing, and making accessible the nationally significant outdoor recreation resources of such river segments for the use and enjoyment of all of the American people, the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway is hereby established.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may acquire lands and waters or interests therein for the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway as follows:

(1) Along the lake created by the dam on the Saint Croix River near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, the Secretary may acquire not more than six hundred and forty acres which may include not to exceed two miles of lake frontage;

(2) From the north end of the lake created by the dam on the Saint Croix River near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, upstream to the dam near Gordon, Wisconsin, the Secreary may acquire an average of not more than three hundred and twenty acres per mile;

(3) From the dam on the Saint Croix River near Taylor Falls, Minnesota, down-

stream to its confluence with the Mississippi River, the Secretary may acquire an average of not more than three hundred and twenty acres per mile: *Provided*, That the Secretary's authority to acquire lands by condemnation, with the exception of not more than one thousand and six hundred acres which may include not to exceed five miles of river frontage that the Secretary determines are needed for public access to the river, shall be suspended so long as the appropriate local zoning agency shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary;

(4) On the Namekagon tributary of the Saint Croix River, from the dam at Lake Namekagon downstream to its confluence with the Saint Croix River, the Secretary may acquire an average of not more than three hundred and twenty acres per mile, except that not more than six hundred and forty acres which may include not to exceed two miles of lake frontage may be acquired along the lake created by the dam at Trego, Wisconsin.

(c) The Secretary may acquire lands and waters or interests therein pursuant to subsection (b) by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise.

(d) Lands owned by the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota may be acquired by the Secretary only with the consent of such States, and the Secretary may agree with said States to refrain from exercising any authority to acquire lands not owned by the said States that are within the boundaries of an area administered by them, or proposed for such administration, for such time and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the best interests of the preservation and development of the area.

(e) The Secretary's authority to acquire lands by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to any lands within the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway which are located within an incorporated city, village, or borough when such entities shall have in force and applicable to such lands a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(f) The Secretary shall not exercise any authority to acquire county-owned lands within the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway as long as the county is following a plan for the management and protection of such lands that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(g) (1) Any owner or owners (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as "owner") of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain for themselves and their successors or assigns a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial purposes for a definite term not to exceed twenty-five years, or, in lieu thereof, for a term ending at the death of the owner, or the death of his spouse, or the death of either of them. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(2) A right of use and occupancy retained pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to termination by the Secretary upon his determination that such use and occupancy is being exercised in a manner not consistent with the purposes of this Act and upon tender to the holder of the right and amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(3) The term "improved property", as used in this subsection, shall mean a detached, one-family dwelling, the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1965 (hereinafter referred to as "dwelling"), together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the land so designated.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the provisions of section 1, the Secretary shall issue regulations, which may be amended from time to time, specifying standards that are consistent with the purposes of this Act for zoning ordinances which must meet his approval.

(b) The standards specified in such regulations shall have the object of (1) prohibiting new commerical or industrial uses other than commercial or industrial uses which the Secretary considers are consistent with the purposes of this Act, of all property within the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway, and (2) promoting the protection and development for purposes of this Act of the land within the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements.

(c) Following issuance of such regulations the Secretary shall approve any zoning ordinance or any amendment to any approved zoning ordinance submitted to him that conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of adoption of the ordinance or amendment. Such approval shall remain effective for so long as such ordinance or amendment remains in effect as approved.

(d) No zoning ordinance or amendment thereof shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provisions that he considers adverse to the protection and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway; or (2) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under, or any exception made to, the application of such ordinance or amendment.

(e) If any property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended according to the provisions of this Act, is made the subject of a variance under, or becomes for any reason an exception to, such zoning ordinance, or is subject to any variance, exception, or use that fails to conform to any applicable standard contained in the regulations of the Secretary issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of the passage of such ordinance, the suspension of the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation shall automatically cease.

SEC. 3. Any portion of the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway which is within a national forest shall be administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. Lands owned by an Indian tribe may be included in the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway with the consent of the Indian tribe involved, and with respect to such lands the Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the Indian tribe to encourage the protection and development of such lands in accordance with the purposes of this Act. The cooperative agreement may provide that the Indian land will be developed and administered in accordance with the laws and rules applicable to the recreation area, subject to any limitations specified by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. The Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway shall be administered, protected, and developed in accordance with such statutory authorities as may be available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources; utilizing to the fullest extent such authorities he finds will best further the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 5. In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, their political subdivisions, and other Federal agencies in formulating and implementing, through agreements or otherwise, comprehensive plans for the use, development, and conservation of the outdoor resources of the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the boundaries of the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway in accordance with the appropriate laws of the State in which the lands and waters are located to the extent applicable, except that he may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations prescribing any such restrictions shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting and fishing activities.

SEC. 7. The Federal Power Commission shall not have authority under the provisions of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), to license the building of any dam or other structure which the Secretary determines would adversely affect the segments of the Saint Croix and Namekagon Rivers included in the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway unless the application is referred to the Congress and the issuance of the license is expressly authorized by statute. Any application referred to the Congress shall include the objections of the Secretary.

SEC. 8. The Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and the Secretary of the Army shall not have authority to issue permits for, or to undertake directly, the construction of any dam, dike, structure, or activity which the Secretary determines would adversely affect the segments of the Saint Croix and Namekagon Rivers included in the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway unless the proposal is referred to the Congress and is expressly authorized by statute. Any proposal submitted to the Congress shall include the objections of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with the appropriate State water pollution control agencies, to prepare and develop agreements for eliminating or diminishing the pollution of waters within the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 897) to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MONDALE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, earlier this session I introduced, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from

Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], a bill for the relief of a constituent that was numbered S. 82 and was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Since the bill was in the nature of a private claim, I have been informed that it should have been more suitably referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965 (AMENDMENT NO. 12)

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 19, 1965, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill and joint resolution:

S. 622. A bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia; to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes: Senators Brewster, Pell, Randolph, Robertson, Scott, and Talmadge.

S.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water commercial fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions: Senators Brewster, Fong, and Hart.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 26, 1965, I gave notice in the Record that hearings would be held before the Banking and Currency Committee beginning February 2, 1965, on the administration bill to amend the Nation's gold reserve requirements—which I introduced on January 28, 1965, as S. 797—and on Senator Douglas' bill to repeal the gold reserve requirements (S. 743).

Yesterday, Senator Javits introduced a bill, S. 814, which, like the administration bill, would amend the gold reserve requirements, but differs from the administration bill in the technique which would be used. This bill was referred to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and the hearings beginning February 2, 1965, will also include consideration of this bill.

Persons who wish to appear and testify before the committee are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225-3921.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT NO. 7 TO S. 3

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], be added as a cosponsor to my amendment No. 7 to S. 3, the Appalachian bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TECHNOLOGY AND THE CITIZEN

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, one of the best addresses I have read recently was delivered by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover before the Publishers' Lunch Club of New York on January 7, 1965.

The address is entitled "Technology and the Citizen." In making the address, Admiral Rickover displayed his expert knowledge of man, government, and technology; and, it seems to me, he undertakes to put each in its proper sphere. Since the address ought to be required reading for Members of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Technology and the Citizen

(By Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, at the Publishers' Lunch Club, New York, N.Y., January 7, 1965)

Your invitation honors me. I am delighted to be here. But I do have some misgivings as to my qualifications to address this meeting.

Speakers, I understand, are chosen because they have important things to say about publishing or some related form of communications. As you know, my job is to build nuclear warships and atomic power stations; my extracurricular interest is to see American education brought up to par with education in countries of comparable civilization; neither of these activities makes me an expert on publishing. So I shall not be able to deliver the kind of speech you expect on these occasions.

The subject I propose to discuss—"Technology and the Citizen"—has no direct bearing on the practical problems you encounter in your field of work. It does, however, concern you, as it concerns me, because it has to do with our liberties as citizens of a free society. Our political philosophy, our form of government have their raison d'être in the American commitment to individual liberty. Conversely, this philosophy, this political system will not survive unless the individual in our society remains autonomous, for only freemen can make a success of democracy.

Citizens have private liberties and public responsibilities. In an oversimplified way, one can say they safeguard their private liberties by discharging their public responsibilities; contrariwise, it is because they are free, self-determining human beings that they are able to perform citizenship functions. Any diminution, whatever its cause, of individual liberty or of citizenship capabilities, makes our society less free, our political system less viable. My purpose is to show that current attitudes toward technology, and some of the uses to which technology is being put, do in fact encroach on our liberties. Let me explain:

A society is free when it centers on man; that is, when it gives paramount consideration to human rights, interests, and needs. Powerful forces are driving us toward a pattern of life in which technology, rather than man, would be central to the purpose of our society. The evidence is all around us. There is a marked propensity to regard technology as an end in itself, when actually it is no more than a means to ends that man determines. There is a tacit assumption, whenever technology contravenes human desires, that man must adapt himself to technology instead of technology being made to serve man. It is symptomatic of this worshipful attitude toward technology, this insensitivity to human needs that those who utilize technology for their private purposes have been able to propagate the preposterous notion that whatever is technically feasible is eo ipso right and lawful; hence to regulate the use of technology in the public interest would improperly restrict the liberty of the user. When technology is viewed in this lopsided fashion, it becomes a threat to our free society. We have allowed this threat to arise; it is now up to us to overcome it.

I recently came upon an editorial, written by James Russell Lowell during Lincoln's election campaign of 1860. He observed that "in a society like ours, where every man may transmute his private thought into history and destiny by dropping it into the ballot box, a peculiar responsibility rests upon the individual. Nothing can absolve us from doing our best to look at all public questions as citizens, and therefore in some sort as * * * rulers."

How to resolve the antithesis between technology and individual liberty; how to insure that technology will be beneficial, not harmful, to man, to society, and to our democratic institutions—this, I would say, is a public question. I raise it here because I believe the members of this audience are particularly well qualified to explore this problem. In your business the conflict between technology and liberty—so prevalent everywhere else in our society—is muted, if not absent altogether.

Improvements in the mechanics of producing and selling books have not diminished the importance of the author. Your success still depends on him. He cannot be rendered obsolete by automation. The human factor therefore continues to outweigh the technical. As in the past, your main function is to discover talent and help bring it to fruition. You know that liberty enhances creativity, that men with a special competence must be allowed to follow their own judgment. While you will encourage authors, help them with syntax and spelling—I suspect you do a better job of teaching English composition than most schools—give them the benefit of your experience, you do not impose your own literary judgment on a writer who disagrees with you, nor do you insist unduly that he accommodate himself to commercial considerations.

The respect you show for the professional liberty of productive people sets you apart not only from most businesses but from other communications enterprises as well. Take the entertainment industry. It is common practice there for authors to be subjected to literary dictation by those whose position in the industry gives them power to do so, though they may be artistically incompetent. Or take the mass media. They are so dependent on advertising that, with the best will in the world, they cannot accord their writers as much freedom as you do.

My appraisal of your business is no more than a layman's opinion, but as a sometime writer and an avid reader of books I find myself marginally within your orbit. Let me say here that my contacts with you, as author to publisher, have been the most pleasant and fruitful I have ever had with anyone whose cooperation and help I needed to get a piece of work done. Moreover, since I depend on books, not only for enjoyment but also to keep me au courant with the world of ideas and with happenings all around the globe, I am grateful that you publish books on any subject under the sun; that you publish controversial books and books that appeal to limited audiences, though you know full well they may bring you no profit. Here you follow a concept of professional service that is like that of good physicians whose practice habitually includes patients too poor to pay their medical bills.

Your business is conducted more nearly as a profession than any other business I know. I assume this is due, in part, to the kind of work you do; in part, to the human scale of your enterprises. So far, you have avoided the organizational giantism that is so prominent a feature of American life.

Huge organizations have difficulty maintaining a professional viewpoint; chiefly because, in our country at least, such organizations are customarily run not by the people who do the productive work but by a special category of career men whose particular metier is to rule large-scale enterprises—the "pure" administrators. To them, the decisive consideration is the good of the organization, by which they nearly always mean whatever enhances its power and profit. Administrators are rarely receptive to the professional viewpoint which has an ethic of its own; an ethic that, to professional people, supersedes material considerations.

It is then perhaps not surprising that when communications enterprises grow overlarge, and therefore succumb to the rule of "pure" administrators, they tend to interpret freedom of speech and the press as an economic right; the right of communications media to decide what to say or print and, conversely, what to play down or omit entirely. All too often, the determining factor will be profit, not principle. In contrast, you see more clearly that freedom of speech and of the press is a great constitutional right and has as its correlative the obligation to give the public the truth in all matters—all of the truth, no matter how controversial, how distasteful to powerful pressure groups. Book publishing is today the main bulwark of freedom of speech and the press, in the original sense of the expression which meant not an economic but a human right—the right to be informed and the right to be heard. I hope you will never grow so large that you lose your basic professionalism.

At this point I should like to register my disagreement with the popular belief in this country that every human activity ought to be conducted as a business. Whatever the validity of this viewpoint may have been at an earlier stage of our development, at present technological levels it would be wiser to demand that as many human activities as possible should be conducted as a profession. For one thing, technology is safer when it is in professional hands.

This is so because professions may be practiced only by persons of proven professional competence—obviously a protection when potentially dangerous technologies are being used. Furthermore, professions operate under a code of ethics which puts the human needs of persons they serve above all other considerations. We owe the concept of professional ethics to Greece where it was first incorporated in the Hippocratic Oath. This was nearly 2,500 years ago, but medical graduates in all countries of Western civilization still take this oath. The public is better protected against injury caused by misuse of technology when seller-buyer relations follow an ethic similar to the one in this medical oath, instead of the old Roman maxim of caveat emptor. No wonder the technology used by physicians benefits man most and harms him least.

More pertinent to my present inquiry is the fact that where the professional viewpoint prevails, technology does not diminish liberty. I made this point in my appraisal of your business, but it is worth reiterating. Moreover, work in professionally oriented enterprises tends to develop the same qualities of initiative, independence, and responsibility for the decisions one makes that distinguish the self-employed—qualities that grow only in freedom. A free society will be stronger, the more opportunities there are for men to develop the citizen qualities in their daily work.

In presentday America such opportunities unfortunately are rare. Many, perhaps most Americans now work for large, bureaucratically administered organizations. Such work is not good training for citizens; it is more likely to develop human qualities that rulers value in their subjects—as is only natural, since these organizations resemble nothing so much as autocratic semigovernments. Their structure is bureaucratic, hence hierarchial. They are in every respect the obverse of a free society.

In democracy the locus of power is in the people; sovereignty is vested in them; government must have their consent. Public officials are agents of the people and accountable to them for their public acts. In the typical large organization, on the other hand, the locus of power is in the men at the top. Commands are transmitted from the top down through clearly defined levels of authority; accountability rises from the bottom up through the same channels. Unquestioning obedience to superiors is the rule. There is little room for independent judgment based on knowledge or experience. What counts is not competence per se but the position one occupies on the administrative totem pole.

During working hours Americans employed in these organizations are subject to as absolute a government as that of any 18th century monarch. Those who manage or govern such organizations are in fact, if not in law, autocratic rulers for they have no real constituency to whom they are accountable for their actions. From top man to lowliest employee, all who work in these organizations spend a large part of their waking hours in conditions of inequality found nowhere else in our society; conditions of inequality fundamentally at odds with our political philosophy. This inequality does not necessarily reflect unequal human competence; rather it exists because one party has behind him the power of the organization, and uses it to prevail over the other.

The founders of our Nation did not expect this would happen to Americans. They intended ours to remain a society where no citizen would be ruled by anyone who had not received a popular mandate, who did not have to account to the people for his actions. This is evident in the language of our two basic charters and in the writings of the Founding Fathers, especially in the Federalist.

Thus, careful reading of the Declaration of Independence shows that our society pivots on the free citizen. Observe the order of precedence of the following basic axioms: First, there is the statement that all men are born equally endowed with "inalienable" rights and some of these are listed; then, the Declaration notes that governments "are instituted among men" in order to "secure" these rights; finally, it is stated flatly that government derives its "just powers" from the governed.

The founders were well aware that democracy is the most difficult kind of government. They knew that to make a success of it, people must have political sagacity as well as what the ancients called "public virtues"—a combination of independence, self-reliance, and readiness to assume civic responsibilities. But they believed Americans possessed these qualities; that life in America developed just the type of man who would know how to make democracy work; that the land, the people and the political system were made for each other.

Among the advantages favoring democracy, the founders counted the fact that Americans were for the most part independent farmers, artisans, and merchants; being used to managing their own business, such men would know how to manage the affairs of the Nation. They expected there would be free land for generations and generations to come. Scarcity of population and abundance of land and resources would prevent formation of a propertyless class dependent on others for employment; real equality among our people would thus support the political equality basic to our political system.

But today the self-employed have dwindled to less than 10 percent of the working population and their number decreases each year. Free land lasted only a hundred years. Instead of a scarcity of people, we now have a surplus—in terms of available jobs. Our population has multiplied a hundredfold in but two centuries, and 70 percent now live in urban conglomerates. This would have dismayed the founders who judged Europe's crowded urban masses unfit to govern themselves.

Early visitors to America were amazed that we had neither paupers nor very rich men—now we have both. The richest 1 percent of our population owns 28 percent of the national wealth, the poorest one-tenth owns 1 percent. The gap is greater here than in many democracies abroad. We have some of the worst slums; one-fifth of our people live in want; and a substantial percentage are so poorly educated that we can find them no jobs they are competent to fill.

The special advantages on which the Founding Fathers counted to guarantee the success of their political experiment are nearly all gone. They began to disappear when the industrial revolution came to our shores roughly a century ago; we have been losing them at an accelerated rate since the full impact of the scientific revolution hit us two decades ago. Directly or indirectly, their loss has been a result of the technology flowing from these revolutions. This technology has made us rich and our Nation powerful, but the good things produced by technology have come at a cost: Today conditions of life in this country are no longer as uniquely favorable to democracy as they were in the days of the Founding Fathers.

It is pointless to indulge in nostalgia for a past irrevocably gone. I suggest we take note of what we have lost and get busy and counteract the loss of these advantages. I see no other way than by raising the competence of citizens through education.

It is strange this is never mentioned in the optimistic forecasts periodically presented to the American people—forecasts that paint a glowing picture of a pushbutton world where everyone will be rich and comfortable. There seems to be a tacit assumption that man can aspire no higher than to be a pampered and compulsive consumer. But unless we become more competent, hence better able to control not only our Government but our technology as well, this rosy consumer paradise will lack the one indispensable prerequisite to happiness—liberty.

With the closing of the frontier a way of life came to an end which was simple and uncomplicated, therefore comprehensible to everyone. To make the wilderness habitable took a vast amount of rough work, so there was always demand for the kind of labor most people are able to perform. Book learning was not necessary for success in life. Men were scarce, so they felt needed and therefore important. Public issues could be understood by ordinary men; de Tocqueville was astounded by the lively interest in politics he found here. "If an American were condemned to confine his activity to his own affairs, he would be robbed of one-half of his existence," he wrote in the 1830's.

Today it is more difficult for ordinary Americans to be successful. Technology imposes educational requirements that call for greater intellectual effort than most people find congenial. To obtain a good job and be a good citizen one has to possess competencies that are harder to come by than were the competencies that sufficed in the past. Take job qualifications:

The technology of the society in which we live determines the range of occupational skills for which there is demand. In preindividual America, this range corresponded closely to the inclinations and actual capabilities of average people; today it is at odds with them. Men had to work harder in years gone by, but they needed less formal schooling. Many people have trouble meeting educational qualifications that are essential at today's level of technology.

The minimum now is a high school diploma—not an excessive requirement since it can be obtained in this country for educational accomplishments that abroad are merely the compulsory minimum every normal child must attain and which, in fact, virtually everyone does attain. But at the snail's pace of American education this takes 12 years. Forty percent of our youth are unwilling to spend that many years in school. They drop out before they get the diploma—40 percent. Their prospects are dismal. Good jobs are beyond their reach. With so little education, what kind of citizens will they be?

The educational requirements for effective citizenship have risen; again, because of technology which complicates life and makes it difficult for uneducated citizens to understand and evaluate public issues. In preindustrial America, life itself developed in most Americans the wisdom and experience to deal effectively with such issues. Today, this is not enough. Citizens must have a good general education, and supplement it with much reading throughout their lives. Neither appeals overmuch to average Americans. Compared with other industrial countries, we are undereducated and we read much less, especially books, as I need hardly tell this audience. Unless this is changed we shall not be able to meet the challenge of technology.

Technology places in the hands of man the means to do enormous harm to fellow human beings, to society at large, to generations as yet unborn. Individually we are helpless; we must ask Government to enact laws that will prevent technological injuries. But when the people turn to Government for help, they encounter large and powerful organizations that interpose themselves between the citizen and the men he elects to public office. Technology is for the most part in the hands of these organizations which oppose any legislation that would prevent them from using it as they pleace. So great is their power and influence that normally the interest of these organizations in continuing harmful but profitable practices outweighs the interest of the sovereign people in getting protective laws enacted and enforced. At times, only a catastrophe causing a public outcry will get action—the tragic case of the thalidomide babies comes to mind. One could cite numerous examples of delayed or emasculated legislation and of inadequate enforcement of existing laws; as, for instance, against sale of foods and drugs containing ingredients not properly tested for side effects; against dangerous pesticides and weed-killers which poison fish, plants, and wildlife, and upset the ecological balance of nature; against air and water pollution, etc.

This should not be surprising. Those who control technology are well organized and constantly on guard against any move to restrain them by law. The public is unorganized and only intermittently interested in preventing misuse of technology. No wonder the voice of the people tends to be drowned out by the public relations and lobbying activities of powerful organizations with unlimited funds.

But what is surprising is that these organizations often succeed in brainwashing the public with arguments and slogans that have no merit. Take the assertion that enactment of laws to prevent technological injuries would violate the freedom of the user and therefore contravenes basic tenets of our society—a spurious claim on the face of it. No axiom is more firmly established in law than what Charles Evans Hughes called the mutuality of liberty: One man's freedom ends where it harms another. "Freedom of action," he said, "would be a barren privilege, if it did not also connote freedom from injurious action by others." Only self-centered, immature minds equate freedom with absence of all legal restraint; with the untrammeled right to pursue one's own objectives, regardless of the effect this may have on others. "To be free," said Voltaire, "implies being subject to law alone"; it does not mean being subject to no law.

Or, consider the specious agrument constantly used to defend practices the public wishes to outlaw or to regulate: Technology, it is claimed, demands these practices; you can't stop progress. Is it not disturbing that the people are so easily pressured by purveyors of technology into permitting so-called technical progress to alter our lives, without attempting to control it—as if technology were an irrepressible force of nature to which we must meekly submit.

There is something topsy-turvy about the constant exhortation to go out, be patriotic and buy, or the economy will collapse. Does man exist for the economy or does the economy exist for man? Has our national purpose shrunk to the single objective of digging out our limited capital of nonrenewable natural wealth, turning it into goods that will quickly become obsolescent, so that more wealth can be dug out and more goods produced and so on ad infinitum until all our natural capital is gone? The implication is that technology dictates human behavior and we must obey its commands.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Technology is a product of human effort. How then can it have any purpose other than to benefit man—man in general, not merely some men; man in the totality of his humanity, encompassing all his manifold interests and needs, not merely some one particular concern of his—as to make money, to exercise power, or to simplify his work?

Are we condemned forever to a type of television that denies us the fullness of its great potential for human enlightenment and enjoyment because, in its present form, it is immensely profitable to those who control it? Must our right as free citizens to privacy in personal life be yielded, whenever an employer wants to use lie-detector tests on job applicants? Quite apart from the dubious validity of these tests, does anyone have the right to subject another human being to this indignity—as a routine employment practice? Is there no recourse against being compelled to go through life with an assigned number—as if one were the inmate of a prison—because this facilitates the use of computers by the bureaucrats handling social security and income tax returns? Must we let highway departments browbeat us into meekly accepting their argument that the technical advantage of straight-line highways always outweighs tradition, esthetics, solemn promises to preserve an area as a national park, or the passionate desire of human beings that their community remain intact and nature unspoiled?

In these examples, which could be multiplied many times, we see the rights of those who wish to use technology for private gain triumph over basic human rights; even over rights that in our political system are deemed "inalienable." The founders of our Nation made a distinction between rights men must give up in order to obtain a government that enables them to live together in peace and prosperity, and rights they should not be asked to give up. The latter are rights considered so intimate a part of the dignity of man that, were he compelled to relinquish them, he would be diminished in his humanity. The distinction between alienable and inalienable rights is perhaps the greatest American contribution to the concept of democracy as a viable system of government.

This may come as a shock to some people, but economic rights are not among those deemed "inalienable"; they are not even mentioned in our political charters. In a conflict between "inalienable" human rights—perhaps the right to life, or to the pursuit of happiness—and rights claimed by organizations to use new technologies the public considers injurious, should not, on principle, the inalienable right prevail, simply because in our political system it is recognized as being a higher kind of right?

If we continue to exalt technology above man, it will in time become a Frankenstein destroying our free society. At a recent Conference on Cybernetics and Society, convened by Georgetown University, one of the speakers (Robert Theobald) warned of this. He said if we continue to regard fundamental human values as of minor importance compared to the benefits to be extracted from technology, the generalized use of computers will destroy "all the present rights of the individual."

It cannot be said too often that technology is a tool, a set of artifacts fashioned by modern industrial man to increase his powers of mind and body. Like any tool, it must be used in accordance with the principles that govern human behavior and human relations in our society. We should reject out-of-hand the absurd, though widespread notion that, since it changes life, technology renders obsolete the principles we found good in the past. Technology is not concerned with principles; they belong to a different order of things. Technology is for utilizing the external resources at our disposal; principles are for marshaling our inner, our human resources. Technology is a tool we use to shape our physical environment; principles establish standards for our personal life and our relations with fellow human beings. The two have nothing to do with each other.

Let us reject the notion that man is no longer master of his own and his society's destiny. Let us put him back in the center of the stage and do some hard thinking about the kind of life technology has created for us and how we might improve it. It should be obvious that, if ours is to remain a free society, the people must have ultimate control not only over their government but over their technology as well. It would be difficult to say which of the two—government or technology—has the most profound effect on the citizen's ability to shape his own destiny.

How to make technology most useful to ourselves and our society, yet prevent it from controlling our lives—that is the problem. The problem is aggravated by the bureaucratization of American life, itself largely a result of technology. We must devise ways to limit the power of the giants now controlling nearly every aspect of American life. The founders of our Nation established no safeguards against this kind of power, simply because it did not exist in their day. When our political charters were written, there existed but 7 corporations in all the 13 Colonies; there were no labor unions, professional associations, organized pressure groups, or even political parties. Government itself had no large bureaucratic agencies. The political system the founders devised was based on direct confrontation of the citizen and the men he elected to public office.

The founders saw the problem of limiting power so men might be free execlusively in terms of limiting governmental or public power. But the problem is perennial and cumulative. No sooner is society organized to control one kind of power than new ones appear, ranging themselves alongside the old power. Liberty is never established for once and for all. Each generation must win it anew. Each must defend it against new perils. These perils arise because men, being endowed with free will, continually alter the condition of life. Countless decisions made in pursuit of private objectives may bring about a transformation of society which renders ineffective institutions that once adequately protected human liberty. If liberty is to be preserved, new safeguards must be erected.

The problem we now must solve is to find a way to prevent the power of bureaucratic organizations from diminishing individual liberty and from undermining the democratic process. Unless we succeed, we shall lose our precious heritage of freedom. It therefore behooves all thinking Americans who value liberty to give serious thought to the problem. I hope you will do so. Not only do you have the capacity to make a contribution to the solution of the problem, you are also vitally involved since, in final analysis, your own business depends on survival of the free and independent individual in our society. I have always thought it significant that when Asinius Pollio founded the first public library in Rome he placed it in the Temple of Liberty.

INDUSTRY AND WORKERS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on January 26, Mr. Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., issued a statement setting forth the economic situation pertaining to the steel industry. He has especially discussed in the statement the relative profits made by the various industries of the country.

In Ohio 179,300 persons are employed in the primary steel industry, while 104,800 are employed directly in the blast furnaces and steel mills. The plants are located in Lorain, Cleveland, Youngstown, Warren, Portsmouth, Middletown, and the Steubenville area. It is our second largest industry from the standpoint of the number of persons who are employed in it.

I point out also that our largest industry is the machine tool business, which employs 189,100 people. From the standpoint of blast furnaces and steel mills, Ohio is the second in the country in production and employment, exceeded only by Pennsylvania. Ohio is first among the States in the production of machine tools and the number of persons it employs.

I rise to make this statement today because, so far as my State is concerned, I wish it definitely understood that we desire to create an environment for businessmen and workers which will make both understand that our purpose is that they shall all have a square deal. I am not one who believes that by the destruction of the employer we would improve the lot of the worker. The steel industry in Ohio, in its primary productivity, employs 179,300 persons. What the total payroll amounts to I am not able to say.

I always grieve when I read about the misfounded judgment prevailing in many places, that by the weakening of the employer, we will strengthen the country or strengthen the position of the worker. There cannot be economic progress and improved welfare without an honest and fair chance being given to industry to live.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio be permitted to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, without attempting to prove or disprove what that statement contains, I say that in my judgment it is one that ought to be read and studied. In the statement the president of the United States Steel Corp. proceeds to show that the earnings of the steel industry place it in about the 38th position among 41 leading industries in relation to earnings.

Mr. Blough asks, "Why are all the attacks made upon us?" In a measure, I can answer that question. Prices of all things are related in a substantial degree to the cost of steel. But Mr. Blough does justifiably point out that the profits made by other industries percentagewise exceed by far those earned in the steel industry.

Our country will be in a sad state if we continue to deal with one segment of the economy in a different manner than we deal with all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y., January 26.—In response to queries from the press, the following statement was made today by Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp.:

Today when our Government faces many thorny fiscal problems and when the purchasing power of the consumer's dollar is shrinking at a slow but steady pace, the Nation is deeply concerned about the need to maintain overall price stability. That concern is understandable, and I share it fully.

In recent weeks, however, so much has been said and written about steel prices, and so much attention has been given to the few scattered price changes which have recently occurred, that one all-important fact has been almost totally obscured.

That fact is that there has been practically no change in the average price of steel during the past 6 years.

The Government publishes a monthly index of finished steel prices which is compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. At the end of 1958—following the general steel price increase that occurred during the late summer and fall of that year—this index stood at 102.3. And last November the index still stood at 102.3—exactly where it was 6 years ago.

This means that the widely publicized price increases that took place in 1963—increases reportedly covering 75 percent of all steel products—were offset completely by numerous and little-publicized price decreases effected under the competitive pressures of the marketplace.

As for the few minor price changes that have occurred since the November index was published, these were—with one exception—attempts to restore, in part at least, price reductions that had previously been made. The one exception was in the case of galvanized sheets which are steel sheets coated with zinc; and the net effect of this change was an increase of less than $6 per ton on this product. For United States Steel the increase averaged about 2 percent or $4 per ton which is one-fifth of a cent per pound. By way of perspective, it might be noted that the price of zinc has risen $60 per ton—or 26 percent—since the last price action in galvanized sheets occurred in April 1963.

The effect of all of these recent changes can be seen in the Government's weekly index of finished steel price which is compiled on a spot check basis by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Last week, on January 19, this index stood at 102.9 as compared to 103.1 in the corresponding week a year ago. Thus the Government's figures now show that the average price of finished steel has risen six-tenths of 1 percent in a little over 6 years, and has declined by two-tenths of a percent in the past 12 months despite the recent price increases that have attracted so much public attention.

It should be noted, moreover, that the Government index exaggerates the actual cost of steel to the consumer, because it is based on published prices which in many cases are higher than those actually charged under competitive market conditions.

Furthermore, these Government statistics do not take into account at all the improved quality of today's steels. Since it now takes fewer pounds of these improved steels to do almost any given job, and since steel is generally sold by the pound, the result, in many cases, is a definite, though hidden, reduction in the cost to the consumer. For example, it is calculated that with today's steels, the Empire State Building could have been 13 stories taller without increasing the weight of the steel used in the present structure.

One factor which has undoubtedly contributed to the widespread misunderstanding of these facts about steel prices is that there are more than 10,000 different finished steels which sell at varying prices. Among all of these products, prices are changing frequently, upward and downward, in accordance with the competitive forces exerted in the marketplace.

But while public attention has been focused on increases of $5 or $10 a ton in some of these items, much larger decreases in a broad range of steel products such as wire and wire rods, concrete reinforcing bars, line pipe, oil country goods, and stainless steels have gone almost unnoticed. In the past 6 years, for example, the prices of at least a dozen different stainless steel products have declined by amounts ranging from $200 to $315 per ton.

Another factor which contributes to public misunderstanding, probably, is the popular belief that steel prices have some special, magic, multiplying effect upon prices generally. The fallacy of this belief can be illustrated by the case of a typical refrigerator which retails at $225 and contains a little more than 200 pounds of steel. Few people realize that all the steel in this refrigerator sells for about $17.50—or 8½ cents per pound.

Thus, a 1-percent increase in the price of this steel would add only 17½ cents to the material out of which the appliance is made. And in saying that, I should emphasize that this is merely cited as an example. Also, that apart from the day-to-day price changes that will inevitably occur in a competitive market, United States Steel has no out-of-the-ordinary price actions under contemplation.

Considerable misunderstanding also seems to exist concerning the heralded improvement in steel profits since 1962 when the industry's profit rate fell to the lowest levels since World War II. But a look at these profit rates over the past 10 years will quickly dispel the widely held impression that steel profits are soaring.

Studies of 41 leading industries, published annually by the First National City Bank of New York, show that in 1955 steel ranked in 14th place, and that its return on net worth was just equal to the average for the group as a whole. But the latest study, published last year, shows that, in 1963, steel had dropped to 38th position and that its profit rate was 37 percent below the average for all 41 of these industries.

In 1964, the industry broke all production records, topping the 1955 record by some 10 million ingot tons. But while the profit results, when available, will show encouraging improvement, they will still be far below the 1955 rates despite the fact that the industry's capital expenditures for plant and equipment amounted to more than $12 billion during this period. Last year alone they were $1.8 billion and next year they are expected to be at least as great.

These heavy capital expenditures are necessary, of course, if the steel industry is to remain competitive, if it is to continue to provide jobs for its 575,000 employees, and if it is to contribute fully to the physical and fiscal strength of the Nation.

But the ability to provide capital sums of this magnitude is greatly influenced by investor confidence in the companies; and this confidence in turn depends heavily upon profits and dividends. It is important to note, therefore, that dividends in a number of steel companies have been reduced in recent years. In United States Steel's case, its dividend—which had not been increased since 1956—was cut by 33⅓ percent in 1962 and this cut has not yet been restored.

In the light of all these facts, therefore, it is difficult to understand why steel—among all the industries of the Nation—has been singled out for the special scrutiny and attention it has received in connection with prices. And those who seek to pinpoint the cause of the inflation which has increased the cost of living by nearly 8 percent in the past 6 years will obviously have to look elsewhere for an explanation.

PROPOSAL TO CLOSE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY AT MILES CITY, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the order given by the Veterans' Administration to close the Veterans' Administration facility at Miles City, Mont., by June 30, 1965. I would ask my colleagues in considering Miles City to keep in mind the following factors:

First. Geography: This hospital serves an area covering eastern Montana, the western Dakotas, and northern Wyoming, which is considerably larger than all the New England States combined.

Second. Patient load: Figures presented to the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee, show that over the past 5 years it averaged more than 80 percent and that on the day the order went out directing the closure of this hospital there was one vacancy.

Third. Cost per patient: In figures brought to the attention of the veterans subcommittee, it was shown on the basis of hearings held by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee last year that Miles City ranked well into the lower half on this basis and that only one other western Veterans' Administration facility, in Fresno, Calif., was lower in cost per patient. The difference between Fresno and Miles City was $5 per patient.

Fourth. The veteran and his family: If Miles City is closed down, it will mean that distances will be increased for families wishing to visit the veteran member who is in the hospital. As of now, they come from anywhere up to 450 and 500 miles, and if Miles City is closed down, that area will be considerably extended and the hardships on the veteran's family increased, the visits decreased, and the therapeutic value—and it is great—lost thereby.

Fifth. Obsolescence: Miles City is a relatively new hospital built in 1951, is modern in all its aspects and can be increased to at least a 200-bed hospital with little additional cost.

Sixth. Veterans' Administration employees number roughly 130: It has been stated that all of them would be provided for if the facility was closed down. The actual figures show that only 33 will be provided for and that figure was also placed in the record of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee.

Seventh. The human factor: Congress by law has stated that the veterans of this country would be given the best of medical treatment when they returned from the wars. Nothing was too good for these veterans who gave from 2 to 6 years out of their lives in time of great national emergency and the promises made that they would be looked after were unanimous and the laws enacted by the Congress fulfilled that pledge. On the basis of justice and equity these veterans are entitled to the best possible care, which they are getting in Miles City, at a hospital reasonably close to their place of livelihood, be it in a small town, a large city, a ranch or a mine. They were not told they would have to seek admission to a hospital many more hundreds of miles away because they lived in an area which did not have the kind of medical research facilities which the Veterans' Administration desires, nor do they believe that they should be penalized because they come from a sparsely settled area. It is very hard to understand the purposes behind this order, issued I am certain by the Director of the Budget, whom I hold chiefly responsible, because the factors involved just do not bear out the reasons for the proposed liquidation of this facility.

Eighth. Medical staffing: The Miles City Veterans' Administration has a medical staff which compares with that of any Veterans' Administration facility in the Nation, and the veterans from the Dakotas, Wyoming, and Montana are more than satisfied with the treatment which they have been receiving.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD five letters from extremely well qualified doctors who have a firsthand knowledge of the situation as it exists at Miles City and who advance logical reasons why this proposal by the Veterans' Administration to liquidate this facility is mistaken in every aspect.

Before the chair passes on my request, I would like to state that in regard to the proposal contained in the letter from Dr. W. J. Super, the answers have already been given to me in the form of over 2,000 telegrams, letters, and telephone calls which I received from veterans who have been in the Miles City facility, as well as from their families.

I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana protesting the announced closure of the Veterans' Administration hospital located at Miles City, Mont.

There being no objection, the letters and the joint resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILES CITY CLINIC,
Miles City, Mont., January 12, 1965.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: I was more than amazed when I heard over the radio that they were going to close our veterans hospital. I just want to add my voice to those who are raising their's in protest at closing this hospital in Miles City. Being so much closer to the situation than the average individual, I think I am speaking from firsthand knowledge.

When our airbase closed the community didn't say a word as we realized that this type of installation can become outmoded. However, this hospital is a different situation entirely. If the 70 or 80 veterans who are in this hospital month after month are entitled to the care they are getting, where are they going to get their care if they close the hospital? As long as the installation is here and being used at that capacity then I think it must be needed. Few hospitals across the country will show a better census per bed. The whole Nation worries about population explosion and the same thing is true of the veterans hospital. There will be more and more veterans in the future needing hospital facilities and the World War II group are just getting to the age where sickness is more prevalent. In addition to this, when the hospital was built the footings are there for another two stories, so instead of closing it, it could easily be enlarged. I think it is time Montana Representatives in the Nation's Capitol dug in their heels and started fighting for Montana. I hope that we can count on you as one of our friends. Certainly if something is not done Miles City will become not only a "poverty area" but also a forgotten area.

With very best personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
E. H. ROWEN, M.D.

MILES CITY CLINIC,
Miles City, Mont., January 13, 1965.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I want to use this media as a protest to the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Miles City. It is inconceivable to me how an institution with an 80- to 100-percent average occupancy can be closed for economic reasons. If every hospital in the system were at this level we could use them all. It's one thing to talk of economy but another thing is false economy. The patients that are here will have to be taken care of somewhere else and an additional cost will encrue with transportation. The families involved will have a greater problem with expenses in visits and thereby work an unnecessary hardship both financially and psychologically on an otherwise already indigent family. They make puns about machines running men and from the information received here it sounds like the computers have now accomplished this. The differences in area, transportation, patient needs, etc. are now going to be ignored by people who use machines and statistics. People in the east have no conception of Montana people and their problems.

It would indeed be a tragedy if this directive on closure of our VA hospital were to become fact. It would be even more so if you as our voice in Washington did not use every political device known to see that this hospital stays.

Sincerely yours,

GERALD E. ROWEN, M.D.

JANUARY 15, 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senator from Montana,
U.S. Senate.
LEE METCALF,
Senator from Montana,
U.S. Senate.
JAMES F. BATTIN,
Representative from Montana,
House of Representatives.
WILLIAM J. DRIVER,
Director,
Veterans' Administration.
OLIN TEAGUE,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Action by a Federal agency can sometimes affect others unbeknown to the agency as well as the thousands directly affected by the action. This will attempt to bring to your knowledge such a case. Certainly it points to the idea held by many that Government is too large and powerful—and has become the master rather than the servant of the people.

This is addressed to you because of recent action taken by a Federal agency which will affect thousands of citizens in this area, a whole community life and economy, as well as the health of its people. Most directly it will affect thousands of veterans in the States of Montana, North and South Dakota, and Wyoming. Indirectly it will affect myself, my family, and many others. As an interested party to this action it is not only my right but it is my duty to inform you of certain facts which are incidentally related to the Federal action—but to myself, the community, the medical societies, and the veterans are important facts which Washington should know.

Citizens from Montana will readily understand much of what I have to relate, but those of you not of our State will not, unless you have knowledge of our geographical location, the vastness between small, isolated towns of our sector, our economy, the sparse population in the four States, and yes, even our weather. Of necessity, therefore, perhaps it would be best if you men in Washington not from Montana would spread before you a map, census tables of population, and economy charts of the area, as well as weather information related to this community as well as other communities which I will mention.

Background information now follows. For many years great difficulty has been experienced in the smaller towns in Montana of obtaining medical men to serve in these small towns. Even the town of Miles City with almost a population of about 10,000 had trouble in obtaining and then retaining the services of a qualified radiologist. The first radiologist in this Miles City came in 1951 at the same time as the Veterans' Administration hospital opened its doors. His work was primarily at the private hospital (Holy Rosary) with wages on a percentage basis, but he also served the VA hospital on a salary-contract basis. VA center records should show that from 1951 to 1962 four different radiologists served both hospitals on the same arrangement, with different lengths of time served before each one moved on to greener pastures undoubtedly for a variety of reasons as locations more suitable to their liking, more populous regions, better income possibilities.

When the radiologist that was here in 1961 informed the hospitals that he was leaving, I was contacted about the opening so I investigated the same. The officials at both hospitals wanted my services and both urged me to accept the open position. My investigation showed that there was certainly a need here for a radiologist. The VA unit was paying a radiologist to come up from Billings only 1 day a week for his 1-day-only service. I found that with the salary received from the VA on the contract plus the percentage wage from the private hospital one could almost earn an average fee received by radiologists, with the possibility that with work the private practice could be built up so that average could be realized in time. With further negotiations with both hospitals and at their request I left my private practice in Missouri and accepted the position here in January 1962.

I am the only radiologist (qualified) between Billings, Mont., and Rapid City, S. Dak. The closest qualified radiologist is in Billings, 150 miles west of Miles City, and the distance is as great and even greater to areas over the Dakota State line to the east. There is no radiologist to the north to the Canadian border, and to the south the closest is in Sheridan, Wyo. This is indeed a vast area, as you can appreciate.

Since I arrived the evaluation checks according to VA standards in my X-ray department at the VA hospital have been rated as excellent, and area center has never made any recommendations in the department. Delay toward patient care hardly ever occurred in my department in 3 years. Every one of the veterans requiring my services received the same promptly, and frequently on the same day of admission to the hospital. We have never had a backlog of patients waiting to be X-rayed. In fact, frequently, by planning we were able to complete two different examinations on the same patient the same day, in order to save him a return trip to the department and to speed up his care at least in my department. On most working days, I made two trips to the hospital, in order to keep current. Frequently the attending physician had my X-ray report on the same day that the veteran was examined (like in private hospitals). This helped him considerably since many times what I had to report determined whether the patient required further hospital care or could be discharged.

I feel that I ran a good department and did my best toward my fellow veterans. I know of other VA units of which I am familiar that there is delay and backlogs in X-ray, and little consideration is given toward a prompt report.

This backlog and the delayed reporting not only occurs in the larger VA hospitals with VA radiologists but also in certain units having contract men such as I. In the interest of economy, perhaps this aspect should be first investigated in all VA hospitals.

I am bitter about how I learned that our VA hospital was to be closed. I heard it on a radio news spot. And I think it is one he—— of a way for the VA to say a word of thanks to a contract radiologist. Being on contract I realize that I will lose this job. The monetary loss to me will be $7,000 a year, which in turn amounts to one-third of my gross income for many months. This will be of considerable loss to me. With five children to educate the way I choose for them to be educated, I am now forced to change plans toward building my own home here (renting, at present) but more importantly, I will now be seeking a new location. For not only do I lose my VA salary, but the economic blow to the area will decrease my private practice. So once again this vast area will be without a radiologist, and it is my frank opinion that it will be extremely difficult for medical circles here to obtain another on one-third to one-half less than the average radiologist can make elsewhere.

It is my duty as a physician to point out other facts. Many of my patients were referred to me from doctors in other towns without radiologists. They came from border areas in the Dakotas, and from Sidney, Baker, Terry, Ekalka, Circle, Broadus, Jordan, Forsyth, Ashland, Roundup, and even Glendive and Harlowton—all in Montana, and even Belle Fouche in S. Dak. These patients came for special examinations requiring their presence, as fluoroscopic exams for early detection of cancer, peptic ulcers, etc., requiring a trained and skilled radiologist. These areas will no longer have my services, and this includes not only the veteran, but his wife, children, and parents. In this respect, not only will the veteran be affected but also his family.

One-half of my patients treated with radiation therapy came from outside of Miles City. In the towns above, most with one or two doctors, it has been my policy that at any time they had difficult films to interpretate—in other words puzzling diagnostic X-rays requiring a radiologist, all they had to do was to send these films to me and as a courtesy or favor to them and to their patients I was happy to render my interpretation of the film with no fee charged to either the doctor, the hospital, or the patient. Many took advantage of this, to my agreement since I realize how difficult it can be at times to practice medicine in such isolation. This policy is a most unusual thing in the practice of radiology elsewhere—but it was one way I could express myself in action that if people are left alone they will in some way take care of the needs.

Another aspect, Miles City has never had a pathologist. Holy Rosary Hospital has been trying for some time to have one, and recently have increased efforts to obtain one. Initial negotiations were started with the VA so that perhaps the day would come that the same pathologist could receive a contract to serve the VA as I have considering future VA budgets. These plans have now been dashed to the ground and this area will continue to be without a pathologist. What does it mean to be without a pathologist? For your medical information this means that often a patient has to be operated on twice for the same condition instead of once. Example: if your wife lived here and had developed a lump in the breast, the first operation would be a biopsy with the tissue removed sent to a pathologist, who determines if the lump is cancer. Since there is not a pathologist here to do a frozen section study in a matter of minutes for the answer, the tissue must be sent to Billings. After several days the pathologist there can determine if it is cancer and inform the surgeon of his findings. If it is cancer, the second operation would be to remove the breast.

Last, and most important, what about the veteran? He will no longer be able to receive his care here at this relatively new hospital, but will have to travel many times an additional 300 miles to Fort Harrison, Cheyenne, or Fargo. His family will have to travel the same distance to visit him. And our weather can be very extreme here, as hot as in some places he fought in, or as cold as in some places he served during World War II.

And area transportation facilities here are limited and getting worse. And as the veteran becomes older, he will need more care. What can one possibly say or think when one realizes that certain veterans who work on ranches had closer medical aid facilities in many cases behind the frontlines in World War II than they have today and now in peacetime even that distance is going to be increased? Surely we all realize how important it is for one to have as quick as possible medical aid, when for instance as an example a patient suffers a coronary thrombosis. These veterans would like to have a hospital close by, for none of them know when they will suffer such an attack. But they can't go just around the corner, or even across town. They must travel miles and miles and miles on rough ranch roads before they even get a smooth ride on a highway, sometimes when it is 110° or −40°. And reaching the highway—their trip has just begun. And gentlemen, this is the same veteran who fought to make the Great Society possible. And he wants to live in that Great Society, be a part of the same. Or for the ill veteran is this society intended only for the veteran who lives in or near great cities, the more populated areas of this Nation? Do not forget, the Montana soldier fought for the wide open spaces and the big sky country just as much as he fought for our Nation's great cities and towns. And just because he is at times rugged, living as he does in areas within the wide open spaces, gives no license to any Federal agency to treat him differently than any other veteran.

Seventy-five percent of the veterans hospitalized here came within 200 miles of Miles City. Now some will have to travel an additional 300 to 400 miles. And after such a trip, many will be told that their X-rays remain negative, or their bone injuries due to shrapnel remains stabilized. Or after the trip, are told there is no change in their rating examinations. In these three cases as an example, where will something be saved in the interest of economy? Answer, please.

The VA hospital here is small, but not obsolete. In fact, it was built to be expanded. God help us if the Great Society forgets that there are thousands of small hospitals in our Nation, outnumbering the large institutes by great numbers in any future medical plans for that society. Logic tells us a small hospital is better than none. And if recruitment of professional staff is difficult, certainly it is not the veteran's fault but does give an indication of the efficiency of the central offices, in Washington and elsewhere, whose task it is to recruit.

Closing the radar base here could be and was understood as in the interest of economy, even though such closure will deliver a small economic blow to the community. But the veteran cannot be compared to the radar base. The base was no longer needed, but the need of the veteran is not obsolete for he will require more and more medical care.

Our Government is of the people, by the people, and for the people. Is it too old fashioned to still believe that Government should serve as a servant, not a master? I would now like to make the following proposal:

Proposal: Give the veteran in this area with a service-connected medical problem or disability only—proven cases of the same only (since many believe only such cases should receive VA care) a chance to speak up with his opinion. Those with only service-connected problems or disability could be contacted by mail in order to ask them to answer the following questions:

1. Do you agree with the closing of the Miles City VA hospital?

2. When you were a patient at that hospital, did you find your medical treatment to be good, fair, or poor?

This inquiry could be made promptly, long before the closure date, in fact in the next 3 weeks. The veterans' answers could be mailed to a committee picked from members of the areas veterans service organizations (American Legion, VFW, etc.) who would then on a certain date tabulate the replies, with VA officials in attendance at that time. The cost of such an inquiry could be raised by funds collected the same service organizations as well as from the rest of the communities concerned on a voluntary basis for two reasons: (a) the inquiry by mail would not cost the Government a cent, (b) the success of the voluntary collection would serve as a gage measuring service organizations and other people in the area sentiment towards the local hospital since every contributor would be listed as well as the amount donated.

The VA—with the veteran as the basis for its existence—in serving the veteran as it should do would supply the list of such veterans to be contacted.

If the inquiry should disclose that in general veterans agree with the closure, this information would be forwarded to Washington so that the Government would then continue to serve its role as a servant. If the veterans should disagree with the closure, this information broken down percentagewise of those in disagreement as well as those in favor—plus a list of contributors to the fund, would be sent to Washington so that the Government would have more of a concrete basis for possible reconsideration of its action other than the multiple communications sent there mainly by those in opposition to the closure. Washington could then act accordingly depending on the philosophy of the Great Society as to the proper role of Government—servant or master. Of necessity, our representatives in Government from Montana, would have to give encouragement to such a plan, so that we, the veteran and others, could give them this assistance in their role as they represent us. If you gentlemen in Washington from Montana will give encouragement to this plan, we who you represent could get the ball rolling on this as soon as we receive your encouragement.

As an interested party, I repeat, it has been my duty to my fellow veterans, my patients, veterans' families, our community, our area—that I add my protest to those you have already received and in turn have offered a proposal.

Sincerely,

W. J. Super, M.D.

Miles City Clinic,
Miles City, Mont., January 25, 1965.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mansfield: This closing of the VA hospital has been quite disturbing as you well know. However, I think some more basic things are involved than are readily apparent. You were just reelected to represent Montana and one of the arguments in your favor was the position you had obtained and the political power inherent in such a post. If you cannot bring a reversal of this decision by a bureau of the Government it would then seem that your position is worse than none at all.

What else can you do for Montana now that we have no more silver dollars, our military installations cut down and our veterans' hospital services cut by 50 percent? It becomes a question of whether the bureaus are to dictate the running of the Government or is the Congress.

It is said that the House may appropriate the funds and the hospital would then remain open. Who's kidding who? Several years ago the Congress appropriated several millions for some airplanes they deemed necessary but the money was not spent, nor were the airplanes delivered. If Mr. Driver doesn't want to spend the money he will not do so.

In a nutshell it appears from what is printed in the news that the Veterans' Administration will do as they please and Congress be damned. Does this fit the cliche—the tail is wagging the dog?

To be specific about medical care which has evidently been one of the subjects concerned, Miles City VA hospital has had board certified surgeons, internists, ophthalmologists, otolaryngologist, radiologist, and orthopods on the staff. There isn't a VA hospital in the United States that is better than this. The cases that require more specialty training have immediately been referred to Minneapolis or Denver for treatment. If their argument about medical care is true then every doctor in Montana should leave and go to the city. I'll personally challenge any medical board of inquiry, to a test in court if necessary, that even suggests that the quality of medical care in this hospital is anything but on the highest standard. I remain,

Sincerely yours,

Gerald E. Rowen, M.D.

Miles City Clinic,
Miles City, Mont., January 25, 1965.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mike: Since writing you last in regards to the veterans hospital, it has come to my attention through the newspaper media that the quality of care at our Veterans' Administration hospital in Miles City is substandard and that this is one of the reasons given for closing the institution. Mike, this really comes right down to the quality of medical care in Miles City as many of us have, and still are, consultants to the hospital. Just for example in the eye, ear, and throat field, we are better prepared to take care of patients here than at Fort Harrison. My son is the eye consultant and is board certified. Dr. Harlowe is the ENT consultant and he is board certified. I, myself, in their absence act as consultant and am board certified in ear, nose and throat. Helena itself is without the services of a specialist in eye, much less the VA hospital in the same community.

When certain groups start castigating our medical integrity I think it is time for a full-scale hearing and let the medical experts state the facts out in the open. Many cities in the United States would do well to have the quality of medical care that Miles City affords its residents. If you are going to represent Montana, let's make Mr. Driver and his associates substantiate this charge of quality of medical care with some facts. It seems that he is ill-informed medically. Just 1 to 2 weeks prior to this announcement the area medical director was in Helena attempting to get a well-qualified doctor in the VA, to be chief of professional services in Miles City. This was to replace a man who had been here 15 years and who I think is very, very highly qualified, yet according to their thinking if he is so poorly qualified why is he being transferred to the Milwaukee VA hospital where he will teach at Marquette University. If this man was giving poor care then why is he going to teach medical students how to give this poor care?

I hope that you exercise some of your power and prestige as a representative of the State of Montana and make some of these easterners sit up and take notice. The facts are on your side, Mike, not Mr. Drivers, and I hope you can be more determined and insistant of your orders and that of Congress than he is. After all who runs this country—Congress or the bureaus of Washintgon?

With very best regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

E. H. Rowen, M.D.

STATE OF MONTANA,
SECRETARY OF STATE,
Helena, Mont., January 26, 1965.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In accordance with the mandate of the 39th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, I attach for your information and such action as you may deem necessary a copy of House Joint Resolution No. 11.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK MURRAY,
Secretary of State.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 11

A joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, the Congress of the United States, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, the Honorable William Driver and the Montana congressional delegation protesting the announced closure of the Veterans' Administration hospital located at Miles City, Mont.

Whereas the State of Montana is the fourth largest State in the Nation and has at the present time only 260 hospital beds for the 88,000 veterans who reside in the State; and

Whereas the closing of Miles City Veterans' Administration facility will reduce the number of hospital beds available for Montana veterans to 160; and

Whereas the facility at Helena, Mont., known as Fort Harrison, Mont., is already overcrowded with more patients than it can handle without use of a waiting list; and

Whereas the closure of the Miles City hospital will require disabled and sick veterans to travel additional hundreds of miles for hospital care, thus creating a situation which would be intolerable and dangerous to their health and welfare; and

Whereas there is no evidence that the operation of the Miles City Veterans' Administration facility has been at less than capacity in the past several years, and, to the contrary, it is evident that this hospital has been used to full capacity by the thousands of veterans who live within a radius of said facility; and

Whereas the hospital today has only one empty operating bed; and

Whereas the veteran population is becoming older—with the average World War I veteran now 69 years of age, the average World War II veteran 44 years of age and the average Korean veteran 34 years of age; and

Whereas with increased age the incidence of illness and dentistry care also increases; and

Whereas the need for more facilities rather than less is indicated by all Veterans' Administration statistics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana request the President of the United States to review the decision made by his Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the closing of the Veterans' Administration facility at Miles City, Mont., and request Congress of the United States to investigate this decision with the idea of canceling said order; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States, and to the Montana delegation of Congress.

RAY J. WAYRYXEN,
Speaker of the House.
TED JAMES,
President of the Senate.

THE ELEVATION TO CARDINAL OF ARCHBISHOP LAWRENCE J. SHEHAN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on Monday last the archdiocese of the city of Baltimore was afforded a singular honor, the announcement by Pope Paul VI that Archbishop Lawrence J. Shehan had been elevated to cardinal, a prince of the Roman Catholic Church.

In choosing Archbishop Shehan, the Pope has chosen a man who does not fear to speak out on vital issues of the present day. In 1963, the archbishop shattered precedent by addressing 100 Episcopal clergymen in a Protestant church. He has repeatedly predicted closer relationships of the church with non-Catholics. In that same year, he vigorously condemned racial segregation and prejudice in his archdiocese, saying that is "the minimum that is required of us as members of Christ's church in this archdiocese."

A native of Baltimore, Lawrence J. Shehan served as auxiliary to the archbishop of Baltimore from 1943 to 1953. In 1961 he was recalled to Baltimore, and in December of that year he became the archbishop. He becomes the sixth cardinal in the United States and the second man in the history of the Baltimore archdiocese to be named a cardinal. He will be formally elevated on February 22, the birthday of John Carroll, the first Catholic bishop in the United States, also from Baltimore.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point appropriate editorial comment published in the Baltimore Evening Sun, of Monday, January 25, 1965, entitled "The Cardinal," and the Baltimore News American of Tuesday, January 26, 1965, entitled "The New Cardinal."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, Jan. 25, 1965]

THE CARDINAL

Baltimoreans of all faiths will rejoice over the announcement that Archbishop Shehan has been elevated to the rank of cardinal by Pope Paul VI. This signal honor is all the more notable in light of the fact that Cardinal-designate Shehan is the only American among the 27 new princes of the church named in the announcement from the Vatican and only the second cardinal in the long history of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, successor in that high rank to the great James Cardinal Gibbons of beloved memory who died in 1921.

His Eminence was appointed coadjutor in 1961 with the right of succession and automatically succeeded Archbishop Keough on the latter's death only a little more than 4 years ago. The great esteem in which he has been held by the Pope had already been clearly indicated by appointments to the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity and to a place on the Commission for the Revision of Canon Law. A prelate who has been described as "priestly, scholarly, the essence of courtesy and tact," Cardinal-designate Shehan may be said in that respect to resemble Cardinal Gibbons. His labors as the spiritual leader of nearly half a million Roman Catholics in Maryland have been paralleled by the role he has played in the recent sessions of the Vatican Ecumenical Council. He has held an outstanding place in his church and in the affections and deep respect of the city, State and Nation.

With his elevation at the official consistory in Rome next month he will become a member of a Sacred College of 103. The recognition thus bestowed upon him is a memorable and splendid event in the history of this community, one that is profoundly welcomed here and indeed throughout the country.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Jan. 26, 1965]

A NEW CARDINAL

In naming Archbishop Lawrence J. Shehan as the sixth U.S. member of the College of Cardinals, Pope Paul VI has chosen a prelate who fully and uniquely has exhibited the revivified ecumenical spirit in the Roman Catholic Church.

Baltimore is the oldest Catholic diocese in the Nation. Elevation of the archbishop, a native son, is a matter of keen gratification to his spiritual flock. They consider him a worthy successor in the line of distinguished prelates beginning with Archbishop John Carroll and including the venerated Cardinal James Gibbons.

Pope Paul's action in strengthening U.S. participation in the College of Cardinals is an honor, too, to this Nation and recognition of the important role American Catholicism plays in the world.

The new cardinal-designate exhibited notable breadth of viewpoint and leadership of a group of prelates in ecumenical council sessions dealing with progress in what he called harmonizing of two forces—the truth of Christ and the needs of the present.

He was the only American among 70 consultors appointed to the Commission for Revision of Canon Law.

He was chosen to represent all the American bishops in speaking at the council against the wording of a proposed statement on relations between church and state.

In Baltimore, Archbishop Shehan addressed 100 Episcopal clergymen on a better understanding among Christians. It was the first time a Catholic archbishop had addressed the group.

Also, in an exchange of letters with Jacob Blaustein, industrialist and honorary president of the American Jewish Committee, the archbishop discussed the bond of charity which he said should exist between Christians and Jews today.

Those familiar with the new cardinal-designate's personality and record are mentioning him in the same breath with the great Cardinal Gibbons, whose wisdom and charity were recognized by all mankind. No further tribute is needed to indicate his stature.

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT ON APPOINTMENTS OF NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH AND RAMSEY CLARK

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it was with a great sense of personal pleasure that I received the news yesterday of the appointments made by the President to the two highest posts in the Department of Justice. During the nearly 3 years when I served as the U.S. attorney for the district of Maryland, from 1961 to 1963, I had the pleasure and opportunity to work closely with Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, the new Attorney General designate, and Ramsey Clark.

In naming Mr. Katzenbach Attorney General, President Johnson has recognized ability and proven service over the past 4 years in the Department of Justice. Mr. Katzenbach has compiled an enviable record. A 43-year-old native of Philadelphia, raised in Trenton, N.J., he distinguished himself with honors at Princeton University and Yale Law School. He was a Rhodes scholar at Oxford. Prior to his service in the Department of Justice, Mr. Katzenbach was an associate professor of law at Yale Law School and a professor of law at the University of Chicago.

In 1961, Mr. Katzenbach was appointed Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice. Later he was appointed Deputy Attorney General and since last September he has served as Acting Attorney General.

To serve as Mr. Katzenbach's Deputy Attorney General, President Johnson has named the distinguished son of a distinguished father—Ramsey Clark, a 37-year-old native of Texas and the son of Mr. Justice Tom Clark, himself a former Attorney General. In his selection of Mr. Clark, the President again has recognized an outstanding record of prior service within the Department. For the past 4 years, Mr. Clark has held the post of Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division. During that time, under Mr. Clark's direction and leadership, the Lands Division has tried and settled more condemnation cases than it did during the previous two decades.

Mr. President, I applaud the merit of both appointments. Attorney General Katzenbach will be an outstanding addition to the President's Cabinet. He, and the Department of Justice, will be ably served by Mr. Clark as Deputy Attorney General.

I commend to Congress the text of editorials which appeared this morning in the Baltimore Sun and in the Washington Post dealing with the outstanding quality of Mr. Katzenbach's appointment. These editorials are entitled respectively, "Attorney General," and "A Good Appointment." I ask unanimous consent to have them printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Jan. 29, 1965]

Attorney General

Merit is plainly the motive for President Johnson's appointment of Nicholas deB. Katzenbach to be Attorney General. He has been Acting Chief of the Justice Department since early in September. Before that he was a skilled, quiet and dedicated administrative officer. His conduct of the civil rights business of the Federal Government was firm but not provocative, always with quiet insistence on due process under the older law and the new statutory enactments.

Mr. Katzenbach is a tie with the Kennedy past but comes as his own man and without any particular aura of politics. He knows as a skilled lawyer and perceptive citizen that the pattern of federalism in the United States is going through one of those resilient adjustments by which constitutions acknowledge the facts of change. As chief law officer of the executive branch he will have decisive influence on the Government's role in this momentous adaptation. The Senate will undoubtedly confirm Mr. Johnson's view that he has the qualities required.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 29, 1965]

A Good Appointment

The appointment of Acting Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach to the post of Attorney General will keep an able and conscientious public servant at the helm of the Justice Department. It is good to have the status of "acting" chief ended so that the Attorney General can proceed with confidence to the dispatch of business that requires advance planning and continuity in office.

The President, under our system, is confronted with few choices more important than his choice of Attorney General. The post has come a long way from the days when the Government was just an important client of an eminent lawyer. The Department of Justice is now a vast administrative establishment the direction of which requires great managerial capacity and skill. It is as well, intimately involved in the making of administration policy, in its own field and elsewhere.

Administrations have dealt differently with the office. Some have tried to find men primarily suited as the President's personal legal adviser. Some have used leading politicians. But the more fortunate have sought a combination of legal talent and administrative ability. The Department of Justice cannot be wholly separate from the rest of an administration but its responsibilities as the great enforcement arm of Government are so enormous, and dangerous, that the reputation of the Attorney General for independent judgment must be high indeed. The President has made a good choice that will be applauded by the legal profession and praised by all who put a high estimate on the importance of having the Department of Justice in good hands. It will be applauded as well by a staff of remarkably able young men who have lifted the Department generally to high levels of performance and who have confidence in the chief who now takes full title to the job.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator in the remarks which he has just made about the announced appointment of Mr. Katzenbach and Mr. Clark. I think they have both proved themselves in their present positions. Their records are outstanding. They are both fair, impartial, and just men. They have not always operated under the easiest of circumstances.

I join the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland, the son of a distinguished father, and add my commendation to the President on his nomination of these two men.

FINANCIAL HOLDINGS OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on December 3, 1963, I submitted for the Record the history of my financial holdings from the time I was first elected to the Senate in August 1957 until December 1963.

In order to bring the full record up to date I submit herewith the history of my financial holdings since December 1963.

Late in 1963 I sold all of my stockholdings, and since that time I have held virtually all of my investable funds in U.S. Treasury bonds and notes.

In addition I continue to have checking accounts with small balances in one Washington and two Madison, Wis., banks; a savings account at the Credit Union National Association in Madison; ownership of my home and furnishings in Madison from which I still receive $150 monthly rental income; ownership of my home and furnishings in Washington; and ownership of one 1962 automobile.

I have trust custody over a small savings account for my son, Ted, and daughter, Elsie, over 11 shares of stock in the Milwaukee Braves, and 10 shares in American Motors for my son, Ted.

I owe mortgages to the Credit Union National Association in Madison on my home in Madison and to the Perpetual Building Association of Washington, D.C., on my home in Washington.

At the time of my last Record report 14 months ago, my net worth was less than $200,000. In the past 14 months the value of my financial holdings and my net worth have been reduced by about $14,000.

To the best of my knowledge, this is an accurate record of my financial holdings and obligations.

TRIBUTE TO SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, yesterday at Washington Cathedral there was held a memorial service for Sir Winston Churchill. Some 3,500 foreign diplomats, Government officials, and ordinary citizens attended.

In the course of the service U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Adlai Stevenson delivered a memorial address. Many of us in the Washington area heard portions of Ambassador Stevenson's remarks replayed over radio last evening. In this morning's Washington Post the full text is printed.

I ask unanimous consent that this deeply moving tribute to the greatest Englishman of this century be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Memorial Address by Ambassador Stevenson

Today we meet in sadness to mourn one of the world's greatest citizens. Sir Winston Churchill is dead. The voice that led nations, raised armies, inspired victories and blew fresh courage into the hearts of men is silenced. We shall hear no longer the remembered eloquence and wit, the old courage and defiance, the robust serenity of indomitable faith. Our world is thus poorer, our political dialog is diminished and the sources of public inspiration run more thinly for all of us. There is a lonesome place against the sky.

So we are right to moun. Yet, in contemplating the life and spirit of Sir Winston Churchill, regrets for the past seem singularly insufficient. One rather feels a sense of thankfulness and encouragement that throughout so long a life, such a full measure of power, virtuosity, mastery, and zest played over our human scene.

Contemplating this completed career, we feel a sense of enlargement and exhilaration. Like the grandeur and power of the masterpieces of art and music, Churchill's life uplifts our hearts and fills us with fresh revelation of the scale and reach of human achievement. We may be sad; but we rejoice as well, as all must rejoice when they "now praise famous men" and see in their lives the full splendor of our human estate.

And regrets for the past are insufficient for another reason. Churchill, the historian, felt the continuity of past and present, the contribution which mighty men and great events make to the future experience of mankind; history's "flickering lamp" lights up the past and sends its gleams into the future. So to the truth of Santayana's dictum, "Those who will not learn from the past are destined to repeat it," Churchill's whole life was witness. It was his lonely voice that in the thirties warned Britain and Europe of the follies of playing all over again the tragedy of disbelief and of unpreparedness. And in the time of Britain's greatest trial he mobilized the English language to inspire his people to historic valor to save their beleaguered island. It was his voice again that helped assemble the great coalition that has kept peace steady through the last decades.

He once said: "We cannot say the past is past without surrendering the future." So today the "past" of his life and his achievement are a guide and light to the future. And we can only properly mourn and celebrate this mighty man by heeding him as a living influence in the unfolding dramas of our days ahead.

What does he tell us for this obscure future whose outlines we but dimly discern? First, I believe, he would have us reaffirm his serene faith in human freedom and dignity. The love of freedom was not for him an abstract thing but a deep conviction that the uniqueness of man demands a society that gives his capacities full scope. It was, if you like, an aristocratic sense of the fullness and value of life. But he was a profound democrat, and the cornerstone of his political faith, inherited from a beloved father, was the simple maxim—"Trust the people." Throughout his long career, he sustained his profound concern for the well-being of his fellow citizens.

Instinctively, profoundly, the people trusted "good old Winnie," the peer's son. He could lead them in war because he had respected them in peace. He could call for their greatest sacrifices for he knew how to express their deepest dignity—citizens of equal value and responsibility in a free and democratic state.

His crucial part in the founding of the United Nations expressed his conviction that the Atlantic Charter he and President Roosevelt audaciously proclaimed at the height of Hitler's victories would have to be protected throughout the world by institutions embodying the ideal of the rule of law and international cooperation.

For him, humanity, its freedom, its survival, towered above pettier interests—national rivalries, old enmities, the bitter disputes of race and creed. "In victory—magnanimity; in peace—good will" were more than slogans. In fact, his determination to continue in politics after his defeat in 1945 and to toil on in office in the 1950's to the limit of health and endurance sprang from his belief that he could still "bring nearer that lasting peace which the masses of people of every race and in every land so fervently desire." The great soldier and strategist was a man of peace—and for the most simple reason—his respect, his faith, his compassion for the family of man.

His career saw headlong success and headlong catastrophe. He was at the height. He was flung to the depths. He saw his worst prophecies realized, his worst forebodings surpassed. Yet throughout it all his zest for living, gallantry of spirit, wry humor, and compassion for human frailties took all firmness out of his fortitude and all pomposity out of his dedication.

Churchill's sense of the incomparable value and worth of human existence never faltered, nor the robust courage with which he lived it to the full. In the darkest hour, the land could still be bright, and for him hopes were not deceivers. It was forever fear that was the dupe. Victory at last would always lie with life and faith, for Churchill saw beyond the repeated miseries of human frailty the larger vision of mankind's "upward ascent toward his distant goal."

He used to say that he was half American and all English. But we put that right when the Congress made him an honorary citizen of his mother's native land and we shall always claim a part of him. I remember once years ago during a long visit at his country house he talked proudly of his American Revolutionary ancestors and happily of his boyhood visits to the United States. As I took my leave I said I was going back to London to speak to the English Speaking Union and asked if he had any message for them. "Yes," he said, "tell them that you bring greetings from an English Speaking Union." And I think that perhaps it was to the relations of the United Kingdom and the United States that he made his finest contribution.

In the last analysis, all the zest and life and confidence of this incomparable man sprang, I believe, not only from the rich endowment of his nature, but also from a profound and simple faith in God. In the prime of his powers, confronted with the apocalyptic risks of annihilation, he said serenely: "I do not believe that God has despaired of his children." In old age, as the honors and excitements faded, his resignation had a touching simplicity: "Only faith in a life after death in a brighter world where dear ones will meet again—only that and the measured tramp of time can give consolation."

The great aristocrat, the beloved leader, the profound historian, the gifted painter, the superb politician, the lord of language, the orator, the wit—yes, and the dedicated bricklayer—behind all of them was the man of simple faith, steadfast in defeat, generous in victory, resigned in age, trusting in a loving providence, and committing his achievements and his triumphs to a higher power.

Like the patriarchs of old, he waited on God's judgment and it could be said of him—as of the immortals that went before him—that God "magnified him in the fear of his enemies and with his words he made prodigies to cease. He glorified him in the sight of kings and gave him commandments in the sight of his people. He showed him his glory and sanctified him in his faith."

A NEW HONOR FOR ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, yet another honor has befallen Alaska. Wednesday afternoon the results of the 24th annual talent science search were announced. There were over 2,900 fully qualified entrants from all the 50 States. From these an honor group of 300 was chosen and from the 300, 40 top winners have now been selected.

From among these 40, and for the first time in the 24 years of the talent search, Alaska is represented: Patricia Lynn Ader, of West Anchorage High School, Anchorage, Alaska. She is one of the finalists. Miss Ader brings great honor to her high school, her city, and her State, and I am pleased to salute her today on her signal achievement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a biography of Miss Ader and a description of her science project may be made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Patricia Lynn Ader, 17, of 30–360–G Cherry Drive, Edwards Air Force Base, Anchorage, investigated a theory that small arctic mammals may have a faster growing rate than those in temperate zones because of the short summer. By breeding a species of arctic vole, a small rodent, and its southern counterpart she was able to determine that the northern species developed faster and had to reach independence quickly during the short arctic growing season. Patricia's varied activities include membership in science and math clubs, the Girl Scouts, and the rifle team at West Anchorage High School. She is also interested in microphotography, ceramics, and horseback riding. She has won medals in English and biology, and plans to attend Arizona State College to study biological sciences. Patricia is the first science talent search winner to come from Alaska. The daughter of Maj. Mercer W. Ader, U.S. Air Force, and Mrs. Ader, she feels it is most important for a scientist to have the ability to communicate his findings.

THE AMERICAN FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, those in attendance at the 58th Annual Convention of the National Canners Association meeting in San Francisco this week were privileged to have had an opportunity of being addressed by Mr. Donald L. McKernan, Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. McKernan made such an interesting and comprehensive report on the present status of the American fishing industry that I am pleased to ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The American Fishing Industry, 1964

It is a great honor to address this distinguished group of industry leaders but it is a dubious pleasure to follow two such experienced public speakers, and experts in the field of fisheries, as Senator Bartlett, and Bill Herrington, to this stand. Some of you may believe me particularly solicitous toward the senior Senator from Alaska in recognizing him as a leading authority in fisheries. However, his deep interest and study of North Pacific and world fisheries problems probably antedates that of most of us in this room. We are all aware of Bill Herrington's lifetime of study of fisheries on both coasts of our country and in Japan as well.

Thus, the task of following these two men is not an easy one; nevertheless, since I can reasonably assume that everyone here this morning, paying $3.50 for breakfast, has more than a passing interest in fish and fisheries, I approach the task of discussing the American fishing scene with enthusiasm. I promise not to argue too strongly my point of view, but I shall try to impart to you—from my vantage point in time and space—a somewhat different point of view.

This morning, in the few minutes allotted to me, I should like to look at our domestic fisheries and their makeup, both in relation to other domestic industries, and in relation to world fish production. With this background perhaps we can piece together what is happening to our domestic fisheries—for better or worse—and speculate what is likely to happen in the future.

The world fish catch is now about 100 billion pounds, it has been increasing rapidly as Senator BARTLETT has pointed out and, in fact, more than doubled during the last decade. At the same time, the U.S. catch has increased a scant 10 percent from about 4.5 billion pounds to about 5 billion. Contrast this, if you will, with the Soviet catch of 3.9 billion pounds in 1950, and a catch of 11.4 billion pounds in 1964, an increase of almost 200 percent; or Japan with a catch of about 8 billion pounds in 1950, and a 1964 catch of about 16 billion pounds.

The number of people employed in our fishing industry remains in excess of 500,000 people, and the number of vessels in use remains over 70,000. While the consumption of fish per person varies between 10.5 and 11 pounds per person, the total consumption of fishery products in the United States has risen to over 11 billion pounds.

It certainly is not news to this group that the imports of fisheries products has increased rapidly in recent years and is now about 58 percent of our total supply. Canned fish production in the United States has risen about 25 percent over the past 10 years, largely due to the increase in the pack of tuna. Even here, however, large amounts of the raw product are imported fish.

Senator BARTLETT pointed out that most of our domestic production comes from close to our shores. This is true; it is also true that literally hundreds of large modern trawlers belonging to foreign countries are fishing with increasing effort off our coasts and on and above our Continental Shelf. The Senator suggests that we approach the growing problems of international character first by seeking the implementation of the 1958 Fishery Convention and, if this fails, he suggests considering increasing our jurisdiction over the resources of fish of major interest to the United States as a means of insuring our rights to these fisheries. Mr. Herrington has pointed out some of our international fisheries problems and has suggested solutions to them by other means. These suggestions are positive and, although the jurisdictional question is somewhat controversial, nevertheless it deserves careful consideration. I'm not going to give this question the attention it deserves this morning.

I should like to go one step further and discuss some other aspects of our domestic fisheries problems.

Until recently, and by recently I mean the recent post-World War II years, we had little competition either on our fishing grounds for raw fish or at the marketplace for the finished product. The major canned products, salmon, sardines, shrimp, and tuna, enjoyed ready acceptance and a unique place on the market shelf. Fresh fish was harvested and sold in the markets near the landing ports.

The only foreign vessels encountered were a few—and very few indeed—small vessels out of Mexico or vessels of Canada, our neighbor to the north. The exception to this was when our larger New England trawlers traveled north and east to the Grand Banks in the Atlantic for cod; there they fished side by side with Canadian and European vessels, but the competition was not very keen. Our vessels were as good, or better, than our competitors on the offshore banks, and if we didn't make good catches to the north, we could always top off our loads on Georges Bank, which then was more or less our own private fishing ground.

All this has changed. The postwar development of ultramodern fishing fleets by the North European nations, Canada, U.S.S.R., and Japan has left most of our fleets obsolescent. Distant-water trawlers of modern design, fleets of trawlers with factory motherships and supply vessels have appeared in ever-increasing numbers on our favorite fishing grounds. Simply the competition for space on the fishing grounds has caused difficulties, but our major concern, as was pointed out by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], is the matter of conserving the resource. Another matter of no small concern, however, is the loss of the privilege of complete, or almost complete, monopoly of the available catch. This must now be shared.

The advent of frozen fillets and blocks; the development of the canned salmon and tuna industries in foreign countries; and the long developing policy of the United States for lower world wide trade barriers have multiplied to put heavy pressures upon our industry at the marketplace. Where before, our domestically produced products competed, it is true, with competing forms of meat and poultry, all of a sudden we are faced with another source of serious competition in the form of high-quality, attractively packaged fish products from abroad; we're finding them side by side with our products on the grocer's shelves.

In the early postwar years there were great disparities in cost of production between our products and theirs—foreign fisheries products. We were ill-equipped to reduce costs—quite the contrary, our costs were rising at an alarming rate. Many of us were badly hurt; the New England groundfish industry is perhaps the classic example. Many of the biggest and more progressive companies in New England simply sold their interests in vessels and purchased imported fillets or blocks, or set up affiliates in Canada, where production costs were cheaper.

The tuna industry felt the blow of competition sharply when Japanese tuna in brine hit our markets. So did the salmon industry and others.

Many segments of the industry have responded vigorously. Some have gone overseas for their source of raw fish; some elements of the fishery have broadened their scope—canning or otherwise processing other species and developing new markets. Still others, like the tuna fishery, developed new and more efficient gear and began to invest in oversea sources of tuna, with considerable success from their point of view, I might add. Tuna canners developed a Japanese source of supply of tuna in the tropical Pacific; they developed, to their advantage economically, canneries in Puerto Rico and Samoa and moved to the west coast of Africa and on to the Indian Ocean in search of sources of raw material at economical prices.

In the frozen fish field, American industry developed fish sticks and later fish portions, both of which use almost exclusively imported frozen blocks and have received wide consumer acceptance throughout this country.

Of course, this fierce competition for the consumer's dollar has not entirely been caused by foreign fishery products by no means; the rapid development of the broiler industry and the increasingly efficient production of meat in this country have been important negative factors suppressing the growth of American fisheries. We ate 32 billion pounds of meat in 1963; 33 percent of the total world supply. Our people ate 167 pounds of meat per person in sharp contrast to the 10.6 pounds per person of fish we consumed.

As I mentioned before, it is obvious that some segments of the industry have responded vigorously to the challenge of competition; others have not. The Great Lakes industry—once a vigorous and profitable fishery close to the major markets of America—has not responded and continues to dwindle in size. The Maine sardine industry, hit with fluctuating supplies of sardines and heavy competition here and abroad from other sources of canned sardines, has been in economic difficulties. The west coast mackerel production has not prospered. Some segments of the canned salmon industry have had great difficulty, with several years of favorable packs behind them, in forcing their way back on the grocery shelves in a more favorable position.

But, as one might expect, the domestic fisherman has had the greatest difficulty. He has three problems: (1) increasing costs of operation; (2) restricted supplies of the raw materials in the range of his often obsolescent vessel; and (3) the competition at the marketplace must, to some degree at least, be borne by him. Thus, we see the fishermen in large segments of the American industry—on one hand struggling ineffectively with insufficient supplies of fish and competing on the fishing grounds with modern foreign vessels, and on the other hand fighting to hold down the price of his product in spite of outmoded equipment and high costs of production. In some cases, this battle has ended with the loss of production from the older, obsolete U.S. vessels carrying on in an uneconomic fashion and on a marginal basis.

These are all negative features working against the growth and prosperity of American fisheries. It is quite obvious that when the economic return on invested capital is low, 2 or 3 percent per annum, the capital will flow in other directions. The return on capital invested in some segments of fisheries has been this low, or even lower, and thus there has been a lack of risk capital with which to rebuild modernize the fleets and plants.

Well, so what. People have sung the blues about the fishing industry almost since its beginning; plenty of records are available to show that people along the eastern seaboard of our country were complaining about the scarcity of fish in the early 19th century. Laws were passed by State legislatures to conserve the resources almost before the first catch. I suppose this will continue.

There can be no question but that the fishing industry of the United States is changing and changing fast. In the past 20 years, we've turned to an increasing extent to the fisheries of other countries for our raw supply. To some extent this has stimulated the growth of foreign fishing fleets, but, of course, other factors are at work as well, some of them of a positive nature. One doesn't need the wisdom of Solomon to see the mad scramble for fish in all seas; nor does one need to be very wise to see that our fishermen seem to be losing out. Some people say that this trend will continue, and that the domestic fishery, except for a small coastal catch, will be a thing of the past by the turn of the century.

I'm not so sure; there are some other factors at work which may counter this trend and just might portend a rebirth of interest in a domestic fishery. What are these ingredients? Well, for one thing, the interest in this country for a variety of reasons in ocean research. The payouts of this exceedingly rapid increase in the worldwide study of the oceans are not yet evident. But without question they will become increasingly so in a very short time because I am one of those who believe that we have the scientific and engineering know-how in this country to translate this knowledge to useful ways of improving our fish-catching ability and efficiency.

The understanding of the ocean as an environment and the studies on the behavior of fish within this environment is beginning to be understood and to be used by fishermen to locate, catch, and predict sources of fish.

The great interest—again worldwide—in new products from fish, products such as fish protein concentrate, will lead to the use of the heretofore unused fish stocks on and above our Continental Shelf. This seems inevitable and has already begun.

The development of new and expanded markets for fish, especially in Europe but also in Africa and Asia, is making supplies of tuna, shrimp, frozen fillets, and blocks scarce and expensive. This will alter substantially the economic return to U.S. vessel owners and should bring needed capital investments into the U.S. fishing fleets.

Furthermore, the enlightened policies of the Congress, and the Executive, stimulated by Senators such as Bartlett and Magnuson, are putting the weight of Government behind a policy of reconstructing the U.S. fishing fleet. Granted the beginning is small, but when I see for the first time eight new trawlers enter the New England trawling fleet in about 2 years, the first in two decades, I become more optimistic.

Another thing, the ease by which fish and fish products fit into modern sophisticated living leads me to believe that the consumption of fish will rise substantially in the years ahead. This means markets and profits, and I can't see American industry passing these by or putting themselves at the mercy entirely of foreign suppliers, especially when there is an abundant supply of fish close to our plants.

The international problems are undoubtedly going to multiply as our interest in using more of the latent resources increases. I'm not convinced—and Senator Bartlett is obviously not either—that our present form of bilateral or multilateral form of fishery conservation is adequate to protect these developing interests of ours. On the other hand, I'm not convinced at the moment, at least, that increased jurisdiction, except in special cases, is the answer. It seems to me that our best approach for the immediate future, the approach which is in our best interest, is to consider each problem as it comes along, watching the growth and development or the lack thereof, of the U.S. fishing fleet, with the view toward protecting coastal fisheries by international agreement when necessary, and holding in abeyance moves for more extreme jurisdiction which would hamper the development of a new and enlarged distant-water fleet of fishing vessels.

Domestically, I see the need for moves toward radical new product development; also with the help of Government, it seems clear that we should begin to sell more of our fish abroad and capture some of the developing markets for processed fish in Europe and elsewhere. We must begin producing frozen fillets and blocks in greatly increasing amounts from domestically caught groundfish. The market for the fish stick-fish portion type of product seems almost limitless right now.

New gear developments, such as midwater trawls and fish-locating devices—if picked up by boatowners and developed further, will affect in a positive manner the balance sheet for the U.S. vessel owner.

Essentially, my argument is this: Parts of the U.S. fishing industry are in bad shape; they may get worse. It may well be that the "crepe hangers" are right—that the U.S. fishing industry as an important factor in our economy is dead. But, even with the problems here at home that we've had the past couple of years—problems such as botulism; salmon that we've had difficulty in selling; a failure of the menhaden supply 2 years in a row; and with the growing international conflicts—still, our knowledge is that there are probably 20 billions of pounds of fish that can be taken from around our own coast, coupled with the development in the laboratories of a fish protein concentrate. These signs and the increasing markets for fisheries products in this country and abroad lead me to optimistically conclude that we're a long way from being dead as an industry.

I am foolish enough to think that the U.S. industry is going to continue to grow and that there is a good chance that the rate of growth will be substantially greater in the next 20 years than in the past 20. It may well be that the character of the industry will be quite different from at present. Be that as it may, the demand for protein foods will increase, and the potential for economic gain will be ever present. The land, on the other hand, for food production is shrinking. It simply makes good sense for this country to turn to the sea, compete more actively for its living resources, and remain a leader in the development of one of the earth's few remaining frontiers.

STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Record a statement of assets and liabilities of my wife and myself, as of the end of 1964, and of our income for that year. At the end of 1963, I placed a similar statement in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Case

Assets

Mrs. Case and I have a joint checking account with the National State Bank, Rahway, N.J., branch. We each have savings accounts with the Seamen's Bank for Savings, New York City; Lincoln Savings & Loan Association, Los Angeles; and Fidelity Savings & Loan Association, in Berkeley, Calif. I also have a savings account with Rahway, N.J., savings institution.

I have life insurance policies and/or annuity contracts with: Federal employees retirement system, U.S. group life insurance, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, College Retirement Equities Fund, Aetna Life Insurance Co., Connecticut Life Insurance Co., Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co., Continental Assurance Co., Equitable Life Assurance Society, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Philadelphia, Travelers Insurance Co.

I am contingent beneficiary of a small trust fund, of which Case Manhattan Bank of New York City is trustee. No income was received from this trust during 1964.

We jointly own residential property in Rahway, N.J., and Washington, D.C.

We own securities of the following: American Electric Power Co., American Natural Gas Co., American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Cities Service Co., City Products Corp., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Detroit Edison Co., General Electric Co., General Motors Corp., Investors Mutual, Inc., International Business Machines, Madison Gas & Electric Co., Marine Midland Corp., Merck & Co., Tri-Continental Corp., Union County (N.J.) Trust Co., U.S. Treasury, Warner-Lambert Pharmaceutical Co.

Liabilities

None, except for balance of 1964 Federal income taxes and mortgage on house in Washington, D.C.

Income, 1964

Senate salary and allowances, $23,975.46, less expenses allowed as income tax deductions (actual expenses considerably exceed this figure), $7,047.36—$16,928.10.

Interest and dividends on accounts and securities, $9,812.34.

Fees for articles, lectures and speeches from American Assembly, Antioch College, Bridgeport University, Brookings Institution, Cleveland Civil Liberties Union, Moravian College, Pageant magazine after expenses, $2,977.51.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO KIWANIS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, 50 years ago this month, a group of young, energetic businessmen in Detroit gathered together to form a fraternal and business cooperative organization. They selected as the name of the new organization the Indian word "Kiwanis," which means "we gather together for self-expression" or "we trade." That connotation fitted the ideals of that organization at that time; but at a later date the members more appropriately chose, as the official slogan of Kiwanis, "We Build."

For the past 50 years, Kiwanis has built. It has not only built itself into a great service organization, with club members meeting together at noon once a week, to exchange ideas for business cooperation and for community betterment; but Kiwanis has also built better cities and towns, better education and charitable institutions, better opportunities for the needy; and, last and best, it has built human beings into finer and better citizens.

I suppose that I am particularly partial to Kiwanis, since I have been a member of that organization for 38 years. The Kiwanis Club in my hometown, Madison, S. Dak., has honored me by giving me an honorary membership. For many years before I came to Congress, I was active in its organizational work; and I have never engaged in any activity which was more heart-warming and rewarding. After serving as president of my hometown club, I served as lieutenant governor and then as governor of the Minnesota-Dakotas District of Kiwanis.

For me, there is no greater thrill than to get together at a noon luncheon with the fellows from my hometown, to sing for a while, to visit with one another, and to listen to an inspirational discussion. In Kiwanis, as in all the great service clubs in America, the inner urge to do something constructive, to help others, is the motivating force that inspires and encourages these men.

In 1920, Kiwanis had the good fortune to get a young man from Washington, D.C., to be editor of the official publication of Kiwanis. Roe Fulkerson coined the motto "We build"; and in one of the early articles in the magazine of which he was editor he wrote the following words:

> We Build in Kiwanis. Twenty-five thousand men welded into one band with one single purpose today—tomorrow 50,000 and another day a hundred thousand means an influence for good in the world which can and will build a sentiment in favor of the Kiwanis idea which will permeate every cranny and corner of our civilization and be big work, good work, God's work.
>
> Yes, we build.

Kiwanis is no longer an organization of 25,000 men; it is now an organization of 265,000 men. It is no longer confined to the United States and Canada; it has become truly international in scope. A Kiwanian who is away from home can fulfill his obligation to attend a weekly meeting in such far-off places as Manila, Vienna, Oslo, Aruba, Brussels, or Curaçao. Kiwanis has taken its message to the world, and has found that the hearts of men everywhere respond to its challenge of community service.

Kiwanis is not a stagnant organization; it seeks new ways to promote the welfare of the communities, the citizens, and the country. I call particular attention to the list of objectives as printed in the anniversary issue of Kiwanis magazine:

1. Build, defend, and preserve our heritage of freedom, our belief in God, and the dignity of man in his human and spiritual relationships.
2. Build international understanding by demonstrating the basic principle of the Golden Rule, using as an example Canada-United States goodwill.
3. Build an understanding of and appreciation for the private ownership of property by educating ourselves and our youth in the principles of a free capitalistic system.
4. Build responsible government by insisting upon worthy and competent men in all positions.
5. Build the highest standards of morality and integrity by encouraging organizations, businesses, professions, labor, and news media to adhere to self-regulated codes of ethics.
6. Build youth for leadership through Circle K and Key Clubs and other worthy youth organizations, and create a desire to achieve excellence.
7. Build a more abundant existence by effective programs to preserve natural resources.
8. Build safer communities and preserve life.
9. Build opportunities for retiring and retired persons by developing programs which will enable them to make use of their skills and abilities.
10. Build pride of Kiwanis membership by dramatizing the golden anniversary and telling the Kiwanis story.

A glance at this outline discloses the high nature, the good purpose, and forward-looking programs of this great service club.

Mr. President, a grateful Nation salutes Kiwanis as it reaches the midcentury mark on its ladder of achievement. It will prosper, it will expand, it will continue to shower its benevolence.

On this day, its birthday, America offers congratulations and Godspeed to the 265,000 Kiwanians who serve and build for a better nation and a better world.

EMPLOYMENT IN CIVILIAN AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, during the recent period when Congress was adjourned, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures published several committee reports including one on "Federal Employment and Pay—Fiscal Years 1954–65."

This report, published November 20, 1964, is a 10-year review of Federal civilian employment and pay in the executive branch of the Federal Government. It brings up to date, through 1964, information published in a previous committee report covering the 5-year, post-Korean war period 1954–59.

The report shows average employment in civilian agencies of the Government was increased more than a quarter of a million, or 22.2 percent, in the 10-year period fiscal years 1954–64, and the payroll costs for these agencies rose $4.5 billion, or nearly 93 percent, over the same period.

The increased employment in civilian agencies was nearly offset by a decrease of some 210,000—or 16.8 percent—in civilian employees of the military agencies during the 10 years following the Korean war. But with this decrease in employment, civilian payroll costs of military agencies rose by more than $2 billion, or 48.6 percent.

The average civilian employment in all Federal agencies over the 10-year period was increased by more than 52,000, or 2.1 percent, and the total civilian payroll costs increased by $6.8 billion, or 71.4 percent.

Figures in the report were compiled from official Federal agency reports certified to the committee. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in these remarks two tables summarizing the report, and an explanatory statement with respect to the detailed tables in the report.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Period	Average employment			Payroll (in millions)		
	Civilian agencies	Military agencies	Total	Civilian agencies	Military agencies	Total
5-year period 1954–59:						
Fiscal year 1954	1,183,389	1,252,775	2,436,164	$4,865	$4,588	$9,453
Fiscal year 1959	1,266,566	1,085,676	2,352,242	6,564	5,766	12,330
Change, 1954–59	+83,177	−167,099	−83,922	+1,699	+1,178	+2,877
Percent change	+7.0	−13.3	−3.4	+34.9	+25.7	+30.4
5-year period 1959–64:						
Fiscal year 1959	1,266,566	1,085,676	2,352,242	6,564	5,766	12,330
Fiscal year 1964	1,445,813	1,042,552	2,488,365	9,387	6,818	16,205
Change, 1959–64	+179,247	−43,124	+136,123	+2,823	+1,052	+3,875
Percent change	+14.2	−4.0	+5.8	+43.0	+18.2	+31.4
10-year period 1954–64:						
Fiscal year 1954	1,183,389	1,252,775	2,436,164	4,865	4,588	9,453
Fiscal year 1964	1,445,813	1,042,552	2,488,365	9,387	6,818	16,205
Change, 1954–64	+262,424	−210,223	+52,201	+4,522	+2,230	+6,752
Percent change	+22.2	−16.8	+2.1	+92.9	+48.6	+71.4

Average civilian employment and payroll costs for each of the fiscal years in the 10-year period 1954–64, broken to show the civilian agencies, the military agencies, and totals, follow:

Fiscal year	Average employment			Payroll (in millions)		
	Civilian agencies	Military agencies	Total	Civilian agencies	Military agencies	Total
1954	1,183,389	1,252,775	2,436,164	$4,865	$4,588	$9,453
1955	1,182,663	1,184,627	2,367,290	4,921	4,700	9,621
1956	1,189,458	1,174,584	2,364,042	5,359	5,167	10,526
1957	1,219,836	1,174,263	2,394,099	5,602	5,399	11,000
1958	1,242,942	1,104,403	2,347,345	6,040	5,415	11,455
1959	1,266,566	1,085,676	2,352,242	6,564	5,766	12,330
1960	1,331,605	1,054,740	2,386,345	6,877	5,760	12,637
1961	1,335,089	1,037,356	2,372,445	7,622	6,026	13,648
1962	1,385,132	1,058,676	2,443,808	7,978	6,318	14,296
1963	1,429,654	1,063,720	2,493,374	8,743	6,603	15,347
1964	1,445,813	1,042,552	2,488,365	9,387	6,818	16,205

INCREASE IN PAYROLL COSTS

Pay raises by legislation and wage-board action were the principal reasons why civilian payroll costs in the executive branch went up 71.4 percent while the employment increase over the 10-year period 1954–64 was 2.1 percent.

There were four rounds of major pay raise legislation between 1954 and 1964 applying to classified, postal, foreign service, scientific, etc., positions. They were enacted in 1955, 1958, 1960, and 1962 and are summarized as follows:

Public Law 84–68, enacted June 10, 1955, retroactive to March 1955, increased postal salary rates an average of 8.4 percent.

Public Law 88–94, enacted June 28, 1955, retroactive to March 1955 increased classified and certain other salary rates an average of 7.5 percent.

Public Law 85–426, enacted May 27, 1958, and Public Law 85–462, enacted June 20, 1958, retroactive to January 1958, increased postal salary rates an average of 10.3 percent.

Public Law 85–462, enacted June 20, 1958, retroactive to January 1958, increased classified and certain other salary rates an average of 10 percent.

Public Law 86–568, enacted July 1, 1960, increased classified and other salary rates an average of 7.7 percent and postal salary rates an average of 9.4 percent.

Public Law 87–793, enacted October 11, 1962, raised salary rates in two steps as follows: Effective upon enactment increased classified and certain other salary rates an average of 5.5 percent, and postal salary rates an average of 8.6 percent; and effective January 1, 1964, increased classified and certain other salary rates an average of 4.1 percent and postal salary rates an average of 2.6 percent.

In addition to the increased payroll costs resulting from specific legislation, other pay raises were granted from time to time during the period to other executive branch personnel whose pay is fixed by wage boards, by administrative determination, etc., in accordance with local prevailing wages.

TABULAR MATERIAL

The detailed tables in the report show average employment and payroll cost figures for executive branch agencies for fiscal year 1954 and fiscal years 1959 through 1964.

During the 10-year period since 1954 numerous reorganizations, transfers, etc., among the reporting agencies have been effected; agencies have been created; and agencies have expired. Such changes have been noted in the tabulations where appropriate.

Detailed tabular material is presented in three tables under the following titles:

Table 1: Average Federal civilian employment in executive branch, by agency, for fiscal year 1954 and fiscal years 1959–64 (showing 10-year comparison of fiscal year 1954 and fiscal year 1964, and 5-year comparison of fiscal year 1959 and fiscal year 1964).

Table 2: Federal civilian payroll costs in executive branch, by agency, for fiscal year 1954 and fiscal years 1959–64 (showing 10-year comparison of fiscal year 1954 and fiscal

year 1964, and 5-year comparison of fiscal year 1959 and fiscal year 1964).

Table 3: Average Federal civilian employment and payroll costs in executive branch, by agency, for fiscal year 1954 and fiscal years 1959–64.

SECURITY AND SPACE RISK BY BUDGET ELIMINATION OF FUNDS FOR LARGE ROCKET DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am greatly disturbed that funds for the continuation of the large solid rocket engine program have been eliminated from the 1966 budget for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The decision to eliminate this important program—if allowed by this Congress to stand—will cause considerable economic distress in the coastal area of my State where a part of the work is being performed. The Thiokol Chemical Corp. has invested more than $10 million of its own funds in a modern facility near Brunswick, Ga., as proof of its faith in the potential of solid-fueled space boosters.

But, more than the economic hardship, I am concerned about the effect that the proposed termination of this program will have over our long-range space effort and upon the security of the country. For it will cut off, at a particularly inappropriate time, a crucial research and development program that already has shown significant potential for fulfilling future space booster needs—for both defense and nondefense purposes. This is particularly true for launching large payloads and missions into deep space that are contemplated in the not-so-distant future.

The booster technology and capability that we are developing under the large solid rocket engine program could become a vital factor in preventing the Russians from achieving a position of dominance in space.

We know that the Soviet Union has been using essentially the same launching vehicle for all of its space shots, beginning in 1957. The engines for its booster were developed even earlier, probably by about 1952.

As Dr. Charles S. Sheldon II, of the National Aeronautics and Space Council recently pointed out, it is difficult to believe that the Soviets would have dismissed their engine designers back in 1952, while continuing to push ahead vigorously with virtually all other aspects of space flight. Dr. Sheldon thinks it is reasonable to conclude that the Soviet Union has made advances in propulsion during the past 12 or 13 years; the only surprise is that they have not as yet been used in orbital flight.

This circumstance could change at any moment. Indeed, there are many who believe that the Russians even now may be on the verge of unveiling a powerful new rocket with a weight-lifting capacity ahead of anything that we now have. We shall be taking a calculated risk to our security if we now abandon the impressive start that has been made in the development of large solid-fueled rocket engines.

One of the most significant facets in the discussion of the large solids program has been the outstanding technical success that it has enjoyed to date. Mr. Webb, the Space Administrator, has personally assured me that the program is meeting its objectives, and holds great promise for the future.

The President's own report to Congress on the Nation's space activities, delivered on Wednesday, states that full-scale tests of the 156-inch engine have been "highly successful," and that tests of the 260-inch engine are scheduled for the middle of this year.

I am advised that a 156-inch engine, capable of generating 3 million pounds of thrust, is scheduled to be fired for the first time next month at the Thiokol facility, in my State. If this test is successful, this engine will be the most powerful rocket motor ever to be fired in the United States or elsewhere in the free world.

Mr. President, it is painfully apparent to me that this vital program is being eliminated for arbitrary budgetary considerations. I think this is a cause for great alarm if we are serious about attaining our ambitions in space, for if we do mean to achieve supremacy in space, the abrupt termination of the large solid rocket engine program must be classified as false economy of a most reckless sort.

Indeed, the decision to terminate this program appears to be a direct contradiction of Mr. Webb's own views, as expressed as recently as Tuesday of this week to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. He said unequivocally that space missions contemplated for the next decade and beyond will require "new launch vehicles and new space vehicle developments." He said our experience with the Apollo moon program has shown that "a policy of support for the development of carefully selected advanced propulsion systems must be followed if we are to assure they will be available when needed."

It is highly inconsistent—to say the least—to speak boldly of exploring the moon, reaching and charting the planets, establishing manned stations in space, and extending our national strength into the space dimensions, while at the same time killing off one of the most promising programs for the achievement of these very goals. The American people and this Congress should be told how it is proposed to achieve these lofty and laudable goals, reaffirmed by the President, if essential and successful advanced development programs are to be scuttled.

Mr. President, an excellent analysis of the effect of the elimination of the large solids program on future space plans appeared in the Atlanta Constitution of January 27, in an article by Editor Eugene Patterson. Editor Patterson's article is appropriately entitled "Pinchpenny NASA Risks Too Much." I commend his article to the Members of this body and to those responsible for the decision to kill this important space program. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PINCHPENNY NASA RISKS TOO MUCH

(By Eugene Patterson)

Waiting nose down in a deep, dry well in south Georgia, the most powerful rocket engine ever to be lit on earth is primed for firing. Late next month a Matador missile will ignite the monster with its whole exhaust and then shoot clear, riding a vertical railroad, as the blast of the upside-down rocket thunders and blazes up to the sky.

From the 156-inch cylinder will erupt 3 million pounds of thrust, a volcanic rocket force such as no man has ever seen. After 4 years of work in Camden County, Thiokol Chemical Corp. has its large solid-propellant space booster ready to start.

And just at this moment, the money for it stops.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration needs money for the Moon and Mars. It thinks liquid-fueled boosters will get its spacecraft there, and they will. But then what? NASA has jettisoned development funds for large solid boosters from its 1966 budget. It's a mistake. It ought to be righted. The history of military missiles should have taught us that.

Liquid-fueled missiles like Atlas and Titan held defense centerstage for a time. But the simpler, solid-propelled Minuteman and Polaris missiles taught us new lessons about both economy and reliability.

Is NASA really going to forget that lesson in space propulsion? The space gap developed because U.S. boosters couldn't lift the great weights that Russia's bigger engines could lift. At a cost of billions that gap is closing. Shall we now relax and let the Russians reopen the big-engine gap?

"The relative situation is such that we can, if we will, maintain a lead in the solid and nuclear aspects of propulsion," said Dr. Edward Welsh, Executive Secretary of the National Space Council, only 6 months ago.

"It should be noted," he said, "that solid fuel rockets have done so much to eliminate the missile gap, they should be a major factor in dissolving the space gap as well."

That should, indeed, be noted. "When you need a propulsion system, you don't just go out and put your hands on it," says Thiokol's Georgia plant manager, Walter Berry. His experimental work near Brunswick is designed not for an immediate mission, but to create a big-engine technology so that when the Nation does need a large solid booster, the need can be met.

The day is foreseeable when the expensive and complicated liquid boosters will need the help of, if not replacement by, dependable, more powerful and less costly solids. Solid first stages to blast spacecraft out of gravitational pull and high performance upper stages—nuclear, perhaps—can be expected someday.

Thiokol has a contract to fire three engines in its test pit—the 156-inch rocket and two larger ones of 260 inches diameter. After that, NASA doesn't seem to be interested, even though the development cost is relatively small. The stakes are too high for this letdown of effort.

PORNOGRAPHY MUST BE CURTAILED

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, who shall be the censor of what shall be published for the general public to read? Who shall make the determination that one book is obscene, and another is not? Who shall say that certain pictures have artistic merit, and that others are pornographic?

These questions stand out—stark and realistic. The demand for controls on the publication and distribution of lewd materials is growing daily, from parents, from religious leaders, and from law-enforcement officials. Yet, those of us who are urging that something positive be done to curtail the insidious spread of obscene works know that without setting up reasonable guidelines we may overstep and may engage in pursuits which may work adversely in connection with the entire effort.

That is why, in the last four Congresses, I have introduced a bill to provide for a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Materials. It seems to me that the experts in the field who know the problems ought to be able to come up with answers which will help shut down the operations of the smut peddlers, without interfering with the legitimate output of reputable publishing firms.

The proposed legislation I introduced has been passed by the Senate on two occasions. The present bill which I have introduced—S. 309—has a total of 30 sponsors. I believe that the Members of this body realize that the creation of such a Commission is the necessary first step in determining the extent of the problem and the correct means for fighting it.

Criticism is hurled at the courts for decisions which make it possible for questionable books to be circulated. I say that the best thing we can do is to give the courts adequate laws on which they can base their decisions. Legal definitions are found wanting when cases involving obscenity are called before the bench.

The entire dilemma of those who are fighting the spread of pornographic literature is ably set out in an article published in the Wall Street Journal for January 27. The author, Elliot Carlson, has done a thorough job of analyzing difficulties facing both those who are attempting to curb the sale of salacious literature and those who are trying to publish materials which meet the demands of a modern public.

Again I say that unless we determine the correct way to fight the spread of obscene literature and materials, we may do more harm than good. I believe that the discerning article by Mr. Carlson points this out; and I ask permission to have the article printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sex and Censorship—Wide Opposition Stirred by High Court's More Liberal Obscenity Stand—New Jersey Group Threatens Magazine Stand Boycott; Candy Faces Court Test—Defending Tropic of Cancer

(By Elliot Carlson)

The controversy over obscene literature, which has raged periodically in this country for about 100 years, now seems to be getting hotter than ever.

Fueling the controversy are a series of U.S. Supreme Court decisions, made in the past few years, which have cleared a number of books, magazines, and motion pictures of obscenity charges. These decisions have emboldened some publishers to cross into previously unprintable areas of sexual candor. At the same time, the High Court's rulings have spurred some public officials and private groups to use legal action or economic pressure to try to stem what they regard as "a floodstream of filth."

"The evolving attitude of the Court toward obscenity resembles the civil rights situation," says Barney Rosset, head of Grove Press, Inc., publisher of such controversial books as "Tropic of Cancer" and "Tropic of Capricorn," both by Henry Miller. "As the area of freedom is expanded," says Mr. Rosset, "the intensity of reaction deepens."

FOR DEFENSE, $250,000

Grove estimates that in the past 3 years it has spent $250,000 defending "Tropic of Cancer" alone against obscenity charges in about 100 court cases. The book was cleared by the Supreme Court last June, but some Florida courts ignored the decision until this month when Grove instituted successful action to get State courts to lift longstanding injunctions against the book.

"It's blatantly obvious we're entering a period of harassment," says Mr. Rosset.

"We spent more money and were involved in more litigation in 1964 than in any previous year," says Richard T. Gallen, legal counsel for Dell Publishing Co., which laid out about $50,000 last year defending its books. Sidney M. Stern, president of United News Distributing Co., which distributes books and magazines in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, says: "Censorship efforts never have been more vigorous and more effectively organized than they are today."

Most efforts are concentrated at the local level, against book dealers or distributors, although often publishers are drawn into court fights to help protect their outlets. In Milwaukee, however, the county district attorney is acting directly against a book itself, by seeking to have the local circuit court declare it obscene. The book in question is "Candy," regarded by some people as an elaborate spoof of pornography and by others as just elaborate pornography.

FAST GROWING GROUP

One of the fastest growing and most active of the private groups campaigning against what they consider obscene literature is Citizens for Decent Literature (CDL), a nonsectarian organization. CDL, founded as a local group in Cincinnati in 1957, now counts some 300 chapters scattered around the country.

Charles H. Keating, Jr., the lawyer who founded CDL, and is now its chief legal counsel, says its purpose is to fight "the floodstream of obscene publications flowing through this country, publications which advocate the overthrow of our Judeo-Christian principles." A CDL movie called "Perversion for Profit" claims the "smut industry" is a $2-billion-a-year business which is sapping this country's "resistance to the onslaught of the Communist masters of deceit."

Mr. Keating travels extensively on behalf of CDL, addressing rallies of local chapters and meetings of parent-teacher associations, fraternal, civic, and church groups. Wherever he goes, says Mr. Keating, he tries to "create public awareness" of the nature and scope of pornography, citing as examples various "girlie" magazines, nudist publications, and paperback books. In just 1 month last fall he covered 10,000 miles and spoke in 14 cities.

In his speeches, Mr. Keating offers instructions on filing complaints with police against merchants selling allegedly obscene material and suggests ways to create what he calls "an atmosphere conducive to law enforcement." The CDL "stands for law—the law which prohibits obscenity," says Mr. Keating. "We urge the public to encourage public officials to enforce these laws."

The arrest last year of a Chicago book dealer for selling the novel "Fanny Hill, The Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure," grew out of a campaign partly inspired by the Chicago CDL. His trial on obscenity charges is pending.

LITTLE LOCAL CONTROL

The CDL opposes private censorship and pressure tactics, says Mr. Keating, and he cautions local chapters against asking merchants to voluntarily remove objectionable material from their shelves. Mr. Keating concedes, however, that CDL headquarters has little control over the activity of local chapters and some of them attempt to put pressure on local bookstores and magazine dealers.

"We don't go in for booklists or boycotts," says William H. Davidson, chairman of the Springfield, Mass., CDL. "However, we do tell merchants that if they persist in selling objectionable material, it might be that people will refrain from buying there because they wouldn't want to be subject to that sort of thing."

Some chapters have been considerably more aggressive. In the neighboring towns of Penns Grove, Upper Penns Neck, and Oldmans, N.J., the local CDL put out a list of 139 magazines it disapproved, including Gent, Escapade, and Playboy. The local chairman announced: "We are prepared to boycott and/or picket those merchants who do not cooperate by clearing their stands of smut." The chapter awarded prizes to high school students who designed the best "seal of approval" window stickers, which were then awarded to merchants who agreed to CDL demands.

As a result of the chapter's activities, United News Distributing, which distributes some magazines on the local CDL list, filed suit against the chapter, asking $100,000 in compensation for loss of sales. The suit was withdrawn after the chapter backed off from its boycott threat.

While the list used by this New Jersey CDL was limited to magazines, an agency of the Catholic Church in the United States, called the National Office for Decent Literature (NODL), distributes a list which includes not only about 200 magazines but also about 350 books it objects to on grounds of obscenity. The NODL gives this list of "publications disapproved for youth," to about 10,000 local groups scattered around the country, non-Catholic as well as Catholic.

Last spring a committee from the Holy Name Society of St. Catherine's Church in Cedar Grove, N.J., persuaded 9 to 10 retailers in town not to handle material on the NODL list. The one holdout, Allen A. Orner, owner of Plains Pharmacy, suggested as a compromise that he sell the listed books to adults only. Mr. Orner carried seven of the listed paperback books including "Another Country," by James Baldwin, "Catch-22," by Joseph Heller, and some books by John O'Hara.

But the Holy Name committee rejected the compromise proposal, and Mr. Orner says he soon became known around town as "the 1 in 10." About two dozen customers canceled their accounts in his store. Mr. Orner refused to give in, however, because he felt his "principles were involved very deeply." He wrote a letter to the local paper explaining his position and since then, he says, his business has returned to normal.

A SHERIFF'S COMMITTEE

In addition to the thousands of private groups, semiofficial organizations have been springing up because of the controversy over obscene literature. Last year the Duarte, Calif., City Council created a Committee for Review of Literature of Social Importance, and the Gastonia County, N.C., sheriff set up a Sheriff's Committee on Decency in Literature and Movies. Both groups occasionally recommend that dealers or theaters don't handle certain material.

New York Mayor Robert Wagner has established a Citizen's Anti-Pornography Committee which is supposed to try to influence public opinion against publications it regards as obscene. The commission, which has no official power, already has singled out as obscene 23 magazines and 3 novels, "Lady Chatterley's Lover," "Fanny Hill," and "Tropic of Cancer."

The basic problem that confronts all these groups, as well as the publishing industry and the courts, is the difficulty of defining obscenity. "Who's to presume to say what's obscene?" says Hymen Schwartz, legal counsel for United News Distributing Co. "Even Supreme Court Justices can't agree."

Many people believe that any definition of obscenity should reflect contemporary standards of taste and behavior. Such standards obviously have changed a good deal since the post-Civil War years when the question of obscenity in literature first seriously engaged the Nation's attention. Anthony Comstock, who headed the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, led the fight for censorship and was largely responsible for prodding Congress into passing a law in 1873 banning obscene material from the mails.

COURT'S 1957 RULING

This so-called Comstock law was upheld by the Supreme Court as recently as 1957, when it ruled that "obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech and press." The Court also provided for the first time a standard for defining obscenity: "Whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest."

Some people took this to mean that the Court would leave it up to each community to apply its own standards for obscenity. But over the next few years the Court seemed to move away from this position. It reversed a number of lower Federal and State court rulings that certain works were obscene and struck down some State antiobscenity statutes as unconstitutional. Then, last June, in deciding that the movie "The Lovers" was not obscene, the majority of the Court declared that "the constitutional status of an allegedly obscene work must be determined on the basis of a national standard."

Some legal authorities believe that the Court's recent decisions are part of a long-range trend toward encouraging greater freedom of expression in literature. But others agree with Chief Justice Earl Warren who dissented from the majority in "The Lovers" case.

The Chief Justice warned that, by relying on a national standard instead of community standards, the High Court was in danger of becoming a "supercensor of all the obscenity purveyed throughout the Nation." He argued that the Court should exercise only limited power of review in dealing with obscenity cases, such as determining whether a lower court ruling was supported by sufficient evidence.

GOLDEN SPIKE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it was my privilege on January 8 to introduce a bill (S. 330) to establish a Golden Spike National Monument. My bill is similar to legislation I sponsored in the prior two Congresses, except that the proposed boundary has been expanded, based on recent studies of the National Park Service which recommended an area of 2,176 acres. The proposed Golden Spike National Monument would include the present 7-acre National Historic Site at Promontory Summit, Utah, and adjacent areas.

GREAT HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Permit me to review briefly the great historic event which took place at Promontory Summit nearly 100 years ago—the driving of the golden spike, uniting the two halves of the first transcontinental railway. President Abraham Lincoln signed the bill which created and financed the great Union Pacific Railway and authorized construction of a railroad and telegraph line from Council Bluffs, Iowa, to the west. The Central Pacific Railroad—now the Southern Pacific—was also created and financed, and began building eastward from Sacramento. Thus began the greatest railroad building race in all history. It was estimated the railroad would take 12 years to build, but it was finished in 6½ years—from 1863 to 1869—with the use of hand labor, at a cost of $180 million. Each company was eagerly seeking the rich land grants and bonds that came with each completed mile of road. Finally the Government set the meeting point at Promontory Summit, but still the crews raced. A world's record of 10 miles of track laid in one single day was set, which record remains unbroken.

The great day of completion arrived on May 10, 1869, when the golden spike was driven by Leland Stanford of California. The continent was linked with a railroad from east to west.

AREA NOW A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

It was not until 1957 that this great historic saga was recognized officially by the designation of about 7 acres of land in non-Federal ownership at Promontory Summit as a national historic site. This small site, which comprises a segment of the old railroad right-of-way and the place where the golden spike was driven, is presently administered by the Golden Spike Association of Box Elder County, Utah, and the State of Utah pursuant to a cooperative agreement entered into with the Department of the Interior.

PARK SERVICE STUDIES

In 1960 I asked the National Park Service to make a survey of the area near Promontory, Utah, to determine whether the site would be suitable for inclusion within the National Park Service in some way. As a result of that study the Park Service Advisory Board, in September 1960, recommended that the present national historic site be enlarged by the inclusion of adjacent stretches of the original rights-of-way, roadbeds, and related features, which include impressive physical remains of the original cuts, fills, and trestle sites of the 1869 period, and such additional lands as might be required for preservation, interpretation, and public use of the site. The Board recommended that such lands and features be acquired by the United States.

The National Park Service has since conducted studies to determine what lands and features should be included in the enlarged area, and my bill is based upon the recommendations of the Park Service, as depicted on drawing No. NHS–GS–7100A, dated February 1963. The proposed area consists of 2,176 acres, of which approximately 590 acres are owned by the State of Utah and the remainder by the Southern Pacific Co. and by various private owners.

I have certain reservations concerning the proposed area depicted in the Park Service drawing. It sets up long, narrow corridors of land, following the route of the railroad grade, which I feel might pose administrative problems. I know both the National Park Service and the Interior Committees will give this matter further study.

DELAYS ENCOUNTERED

The Southern Pacific Co. has offered to donate to the United States its interest in approximately 730 acres of the included lands, which offer has been under study by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice for some time. In fact, one reason for the delay in designation of the area as a national monument has been a legal tangle over the title along the roadbed held by the Southern Pacific Railroad. It appears now that it will be necessary for the United States to acquire certain outstanding interests for the purpose of clearing title to the roalroad right-of-way.

Additional delay has resulted from conflicting views among National Park Service planners as to the type of development which should take place at Golden Spike. The National Park Service has written to the regional office and asked them to revise, if necessary, and update at least the last study report and consider perhaps one or two alternative plans for administration and management of the area. It is my hope that the bill which I have introduced will speed things up.

NATIONAL MONUMENT STATUS MERITED

There was also disagreement as to whether it should be a national monument or a historic site. My bill is in keeping with the request made by the local people and is based on the thought that greater development and status would be given if it is made a national monument.

Last May, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall informed the Interior Committees in the Senate and House that he intended to designate 2,176 acres of land in Box Elder County as a new national historic site. However, because the great bulk of the acreage involved is owned by the State of Utah and private landowners, it would be inappropriate to designate the area by Executive order. Legislation is required to permit the Federal Government to buy the land. Moreover, I feel that national monument status, rather than the lesser status of a national historic site, is fully merited. The driving of the golden spike was one of the most significant events in our Nation's history, linking the continent for the first time.

I have reintroduced by bill in an effort to persuade the Interior Department to agree on a plan and work more rapidly than it has done thus far. When this is accomplished and the Department submits its report to Congress, I feel certain that the legislation will receive early consideration and approval.

There is a definite time factor involved, for the centennial celebration of the driving of the golden spike is to be held May 10, 1969. If the area could be designated now as a national monument this would give the Park Service 4 years in which to carry out a program of development which would have the site in suitable condition for the centennial celebration.

THE MOBILE JAYCEES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Mobile Junior Chamber of Commerce is one of the outstanding organizations of young men in the United States. This week of January 25 to 31 the group observes its local Jaycee Week and its 40th anniversary year. In connection with the celebration, the Mobile Junior Chamber of Commerce will be host to the annual State Jaycee winter conference this weekend.

The Mobile Junior Chamber of Commerce has become internationally known for its many worthwhile projects benefiting the local community and reaching across the world. Earlier this month I was pleased to participate in ceremonies connected with one of the Mobile Jaycees' newest projects—the adoption of the Central American country of Guatemala as a sister nation. The Mobile Jaycees, working with other groups and interested individuals in their area, in the past 6 months have contributed to the people of Guatemala a registered Red Angus bull for improving beef cattle production, a reconditioned bookmobile, and funds for the construction of a public school building in a rural school district.

People throughout the Nation are familiar with other projects of the Mobile Jaycees. They sponsor the nationally known Mobile Azalea Trail, a tour of the most beautiful private and public garden spots of the area. Many Members of the Congress met the 1965 queen of the Azalea Trail, Miss Linda Brantley when she appeared here during preinauguration ceremonies earlier this month. Later this spring, the Nation will have an opportunity to view on network color television the hour long final part of America's Junior Miss Pageant, a nationwide search for the outstanding high school senior girl in America. This is another Mobile Jaycee project.

Mobile Jaycees also conduct the Greater Gulf State Fair, the annual Alabama Deep Sea Fishing Rodeo attended by sportsmen from throughout the Southeast, the local soap box derby, safety programs, youth sports programs of tennis, golf, track and field, and many other community projects. All these projects named are sponsored, planned, and carried out by the approximately 500 members of the Mobile Junior Chamber of Commerce working on a volunteer basis.

Last spring the Jaycees were cosponsors of a benefit art auction for which they obtained art objects from all over the world and every Christmas they join some 2,000 Jaycee chapters throughout the world in conducting the orphans Christmas shopping tour. This heartwarming project was originated by Mobile Jaycees. It provides a small sum of money for use by orphans and underprivileged children in purchasing gifts for their friends and loved ones.

The accomplishments of this unusually active group of young men merit special congratulations to Mobile Chapter President Arthur Smith III and his executive committee. State Jaycee President Bill Buffaloe, from Florence, Ala., and National President Stan Ladley, now living at the Jaycee "little white house" at Tulsa, Okla., will be guests of the Mobile Jaycees at the State meeting in Mobile this weekend.

The initiative, enthusiasm, and outstanding work of these young men make them a credit to their city, to my State of Alabama, and to the United States.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON IN TRIBUTE TO SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief statement by him, together with the text of an address by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, at yesterday's memorial service for Sir Winston Churchill, at the National Cathedral.

There being no objection, the statement and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONRONEY

The American of greatest eloquence has given one of the finest and best biographic reviews of one of the great statesmen of our century. Adlai Stevenson quite properly has spoken, in tune with the sad heart of the Nation, of a leader who led us as well as his own country through the darkest days of World War II.

TEXT OF STEVENSON'S REMARKS

Today we meet in sadness to mourn one of the world's greatest citizens. Sir Winston Churchill is dead. The voice that led nations, raised armies, inspired victories and blew fresh courage into the hearts of men is silenced. We shall hear no longer the remembered eloquence and wit, the old courage and defiance, the robust serenity of indomitable faith. Our world is thus poorer, our political dialog is diminished and the sources of public inspiration run more thinly for all of us. There is a lonesome place against the sky.

So we are right to mourn. Yet, in contemplating the life and spirit of Winston Churchill, regrets for the past seem singularly insufficient. One rather feels a sense of thankfulness and encouragement that throughout so long a life, such a full measure of power, virtuosity, mastery, and zest played over our human scene.

Contemplating this completed career, we feel a sense of enlargement and exhilaration. Like the grandeur and power of the masterpieces of art and music, Churchill's life uplifts our hearts and fills us with fresh revelation of the scale and reach of human achievement. We may be sad; but we rejoice as well, as all must rejoice when they now praise famous men and see in their lives the full splendor of our human estate.

And regrets for the past are insufficient for another reason. Churchill, the historian, felt the continuity of past and present, the contribution which mighty men and great events make to the future experience of mankind; history's "flickering lamp" lights up the past and sends its gleams into the future. So to the truth of Santayana's dictum, "Those who will not learn from the past are destined to repeat it," Churchill's whole life was witness. It was his lonely voice that in the thirties warned Britain and Europe of the follies of playing all over again the tragedy of disbelief and of unpreparedness. And in the time of Britain's greatest trial he mobilized the English language to inspire his people to historic valor to save their beleaguered island: It was his voice again that helped assemble the great coalition that has kept peace steady through the last decades.

He once said: "We cannot say the past is past without surrendering the future." So today the "past" of his life and his achievement are a guide and light to the future. And we can only properly mourn and celebrate this mighty man by heeding him as a living influence in the unfolding dramas of our days ahead.

What does he tell us for this obscure future whose outlines we but dimly discern? First, I believe, he would have us reaffirm his serene faith in human freedom and dignity. The love of freedom was not for him an abstract thing but a deep conviction that the uniqueness of man demands a society that gives his capacities full scope. It was, if you like, an aristocratic sense of the fullness and value of life. But he was a profound democrat, and the cornerstone of his political faith, inherited from a beloved father, was the simple maxim—"Trust the people." Throughout his long career, he sustained his profound concern for the well-being of his fellow citizens.

Instinctively, profoundly, the people trusted "good old Winnie," the peer's son. He could lead them in war because he had respected them in peace. He could call for their greatest sacrifices for he knew how to express their deepest dignity—citizens of equal value and responsibility in a free and democratic state.

His crucial part in the founding of the United Nations expressed his conviction that the Atlantic Charter he and President Roosevelt audaciously proclaimed at the height of Hitler's victories would have to be protected throughout the world by institutions embodying the ideal of the rule of law and international cooperation.

For him, humanity, its freedom, its survival, towered above pettier interests—national rivalries, old enmities, the bitter disputes of race and creed. "In victory—magnanimity; in peace—good will" were more than slogans. In fact, his determination to continue in politics after his defeat in 1945 and to toil on in office in the 1950's to the limit of health and endurance sprang from his belief that he could still "bring nearer that lasting peace which the masses of people of every race and in every land so fervently desire." The great soldier and strategist was a man of peace—and for the most simple reason—his respect, his faith, his compassion for the family of man.

His career saw headlong success and headlong catastrophe. He was at the height. He was flung to the depths. He saw his worst prophecies realized, his worst forebodings surpassed. Yet throughout it all his zest for living, gallantry of spirit, wry humor and compassion for human frailties took all firmness out of his fortitude and all pomposity out of his dedication.

Churchill's sense of the incomparable value and worth of human existence never faltered, nor the robust courage with which he lived it to the full. In the darkest hour, the land could still be bright, and for him hopes were not deceivers. It was forever fear that was the dupe. Victory at last would always lie with life and faith, for Churchill saw beyond the repeated miseries of human frailty the larger vision of mankind's "upward ascent toward his distant goal."

He used to say that he was half American and all English. But we put that right when the Congress made him an honorary citizen of his mother's native land and we shall always claim a part of him. I remember once years ago during a long visit at his country house he talked proudly of his American Revolutionary ancestors and happily of his boyhood visits to the United States. As I took my leave I said I was going back to London to speak to the English Speaking Union and asked if he had any message for them. "Yes," he said, "tell them that you bring greetings from an 'English Speaking Union.'" And I think that perhaps it was to the relations of the United Kingdom and the United States that he made his finest contribution.

In the last analysis, all the zest and life and confidence of this incomparable man sprang, I believe, not only from the rich endowment of his nature, but also from a profound and simple faith in God. In the prime of his powers, confronted with the apocalyptic risks of annihilation, he said serenely: "I do not believe that God has despaired of his children." In old age, as the honors and excitements faded, his resignation had a touching simplicity: "Only faith in a life after death in a brighter world where dear ones will meet again—only that and the measured tramp of time can give consolation."

The great aristocrat, the beloved leader, the profound historian, the gifted painter, the superb politician, the lord of language, the orator, the wit—yes, and the dedicated bricklayer—behind all of them was the man of simple faith, steadfast in defeat, generous in victory, resigned in age, trusting in a loving providence and committing his achievements and his triumphs to a higher power.

Like the patriarchs of old, he waited on God's judgment and it could be said of him—as of the immortals that went before him—that God "magnified him in the fear of his enemies and with his words he made prodigies to cease. He glorified him in the sight of kings and gave him commandments in the sight of his people. He showed him his glory and sanctified him in his faith * * *."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

APPALACHIAN REGION DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill, S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, it being understood that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Wednesday, January 27, I reported from the Committee on Public Works the measure, S. 3, with amendments, the bill being designated as the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

This measure would authorize $1,092,400,000. The proposed expenditure is higher than the funds authorized in S. 2782, the legislation similar to the proposed legislation we now begin to consider, which passed the Senate on September 25, 1964, by more than a 3½-to-1 majority, the actual yea-and-nay vote being 45 to 13.

The proposed legislation presented to the 89th Congress is substantially the same as the Appalachian Redevelopment Act of 1964.

However, there are certain differences; and where there are significant features in the bill as contrasted with the bill of the previous year, it is my desire and purpose to have these features discussed thoroughly during consideration of the bill, and to have all the provisions of S. 3 made a matter for consideration during the debate.

The three significant areas in which there are changes or modifications that we believe to be improvements in S. 3 as against S. 2782 are these: Provisions for roads, for soil conservation, and for strip mine reclamation.

First, I refer to section 201, which would authorize $840 million in Federal assistance for the construction of 2,350 miles of developmental roads and 1,000 miles of local access roads.

The change to which I direct the attention of the Senate, is an increase from 500 miles of local access roads authorized in the bill of the previous year to 1,000 miles, authorized by the pending measure. The funds for this section remain the same as those authorized by S. 2782.

The committee has been informed that the 1,000 miles of access roads can be built within the budget of $50 million previously allocated for 500 miles. We consider this a realistic estimate of the cost of construction for this type of road.

Let me say, in good humor that this is in reverse of the usual practice of governmental estimates for highway construction. I say this in the presence of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and a former member of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that in 1961, when the report of the cost of the interstate system was presented by the Secretary of Commerce to Congress, we believed that the sum would approximate $41 billion.

Within recent days a new estimate has come to the Congress in the amount of $46.8 billion, an increase of $5.8 billion beyond what was anticipated in 1961.

I believe at this point—although I did not mean to discuss this matter—we should realize that it was not only increased costs of acquisition of rights-of-way, but that Congress in 1963 determined that these roads, for purposes of safety and of providing for increased traffic, should be built for the traffic loads anticipated 20 years after approval of construction of the highway.

Therefore, Congress itself is chargeable, and properly so, when we are dealing in terms of safety and highways of longer life, for doing these things which have added to the expenditures of highway funds.

I mention this only because in this particular instance we find the realistic figures which allow the committee to recommend to the Senate 1,000 miles of access roads where we had previously spoken in terms of only 500 miles.

Mr. President, the second feature in the pending bill which is different from S. 2872 of last year is the substitute amendment for section 203.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The question is directed particularly to the highway system. Is the financing to be on a 100-percent basis by the Federal Government, or on a participating basis?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In reply to the Senator from Ohio, the financing of the 3,350 miles of roads is to be on the ratio of 70 percent Federal and 30 percent State participation.

To return to the substitute amendment for section 203, we retain the same funds which were authorized in Senate 3 as it was offered. However, in the Public Works Committee we have broadened the program, and it is oriented more specifically toward soil conservation, land improvement, and erosion and sediment controls.

I emphasize the fact that the committee amendment provides no assistance for beef raising, and it is not a pasture program. It is patterned—I am sure that if the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] were in the Chamber at this time he would agree with me—on the program in the Great Plains. That is a program that has been operative for 8 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I ask about the Great Plains program? How does the subsidization of this program by way of percentage compare with the subsidization in the Great Plains program? I believe there is a difference, and the RECORD should show it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct in calling these matters to the attention of the Senate. Instead of the 50–50 participation as in the Great Plains program, in the Appalachian region we carry forward the program up to 80 percent of Federal participation.

In all these programs it is important—and this was made very clear last year—to note that a sliding scale of Federal participation not only to one section, but to all sections. In up to 80 percent of the cost applies to all of the grant programs in the bill, except in the matter of the highway programs, and where the ratio is 70–30.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have the fear, if the contribution for soil rehabilitation is 80–20 as a maximum in Appalachia, that it will set a precedent for asking that the 50–50 relationship in the great plains be also made 80–20. Has there been any discussion of that point in committee? The danger is that the Great Plains people will say, "If you are giving 80–20 in Appalachia, why not give 80–20 in the Great Plains?"

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is important for us to realize that we bring the proposed legislation to the Senate because the need is great in that region. I do not find fault with those who believe that we should not give this added incentive to the region. I believe it to be not only a valid percentage breakdown, but also a necessary breakdown. It applies, as I stated earlier to the Senator from Ohio, to all these provisions. We are dealing in terms of the added incentive.

The Governors who testified, including Governor Sanders, of Georgia, who is chairman of the Conference of Appalachian Governors—were asked by the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], I believe—we will make the Record clear on this point later—"If you have these incentive programs, will you let down your efforts in all these areas which you are now carrying forward at the State level?"

Without exception, they stated what I believe to be a fact, that these programs would in no way be used to supplant the other programs; that the States would use the moneys that have been provided as an incentive to further effort by the States, I would add, because it is important for the Senator from Ohio to understand, and I am sure he does understand—that this program is not proposed for 20 years or for 10 years, but is proposed for only 2 years.

Later, I believe Congress must reexamine the program when the Appalachian Regional Commission comes back for funds after 2 fiscal years. Congress not only will have the right but also the responsibility to examine very carefully what has been done and the benefits which have been achieved.

I hope in part that statement answers the Senator's question.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. First, I should like to say that during the hearings last year on Senate bill 2782 and this year on Senate bill 3 no member of the Committee on Public Works was more assiduous in following the proceedings and working not only for the enactment but also the improvement of the proposed legislation which we have brought before the Senate today than my cherished friend, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper]. I wish the Record to show that the Senator from Kentucky was present at the hearings this year every minute that witnesses were being heard. I think that fact should be stated.

I now yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to join with the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] in support of S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as the debate begins. I must be honest in saying that I am much interested in it because my own State of Kentucky is affected, but I also believe its programs and purposes are in the national interest.

At the opening of the debate, before amendments are considered, I will comment only on its essential features. The bill as reported authorizes $1,092.4 million for the basic development of 360 counties in 11 States of the area; $840 million is authorized to be spent over a period of 5 years for the construction of an interstate network of 2,350 miles of primary roads and 1,000 miles of short access roads. The remainder of $252.4 million is authorized for a 2-year period for multicounty health facilities, land improvement, better timber practices, research and rehabilitation affecting strip mining, a survey of the water resources in the region, the establishment of local development districts, and supplemental grants-in-aid for existing Federal programs such as construction of airports, small watersheds, vocational education centers, sewage facilities, libraries, and other public facilities.

I make these comments on the concept of this program.

First, while it is a regional program, it is a program of national importance. It is designed to bring, in time, this area toward parity with other more developed areas of the United States, and thus contribute to the national strength.

Second, it is not primarily a job-creating program. Its purpose is to provide the basic requirements I have outlined above—roads, health facilities, land improvement, flood protection, and water use—without which its development cannot proceed. Their provision will bring confidence to the people of the area, induce greater local investment, and perhaps encourage investment from all around our country. While the programs included in the bill will provide some temporary employment, the purpose of the bill is to secure the basic development which will provide better use of the resources of the region, steady employment for its people, and thus raising the living standards and opportunities of all who live there.

Third, it is not exclusively a Federal program. It has been formulated by the States. All projects must be initiated locally or by the States, and approved by a majority of the 12-member Commission upon which the 11 Governors or their delegates sit. A substantial financial contribution to this program in addition to the leadership of local individuals will be made by the States and by local governmental bodies, and no State can secure the benefits of the bill if it fails to maintain its expenditures for the programs in the area at the average level of its expenditures in the 2 fiscal years preceding the enactment of the bill.

I live in this area, and know it well. Naturally I have local interest in its enactment, but I am sure that as the Senate considers this bill, it will find, as has the Committee on Public Works, and as did the Senate last year, that this legislation is in the national interest.

Directing particular attention to the question which the Senator from Ohio has asked, I invite the Senator's attention to Part C on page 35 of the bill under "Maintenance of Effort." Section 221 provides in part as follows:

> Sec. 221. No State and no political subdivision of such State shall be eligible to receive benefits under this Act unless the aggregate expenditures of State funds, exclusive of Federal funds, for the benefit of the area within the State located in the region are maintained at a level which does not fall below the average level of such expenditures for its last two full fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

The language provides that should any State involved reduce its expenditures for programs embodied in the act, it could not enjoy the benefits of the act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mondale in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So that there may be no misinterpretation, I am asking these questions to obtain information. Generally I favor the bill. But if there are inconsistencies or inequities in it, even though my State would benefit, I would not wish to approve them because such inequities or unjustified benefits which might come to Ohio would subsequently have to go to other States in order to create a general equilibrium in what is being attempted.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. I understand the constructive approach of the Senator from Ohio. By the same reasoning, he would desire the benefits that come to areas in Ohio to be beneficial to his State or areas within his State, so that the strengthening of the economic base and the well-being of the people in his State might contribute to the strengthening of the economic base and well-being of all people throughout the Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if my good friend from West Virginia would point to any program in the bill that could not be obtained under existing law by the States which would benefit through the Appalachian program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. If the Senator will turn to page 13 of the bill, it might be helpful as we continue the colloquy. Title 2 of the bill has to do with special Appalachian programs. Part A covers the new programs. Section 201(a) deals with the developmental highway system.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do we not now have laws on the statute books which would permit States to cooperate with the Federal Government in building highways wherever the department of highways of a State might designate?

Mr. RANDOLPH. We have general highway legislation, through which the Federal and State Governments cooperate in constructing primary and secondary roads and the Interstate and Defense Highway System, but roads constructed under such programs are undertaken on the criteria of traffic counts. We are now discussing developmental roads and local access roads. There is a very real difference. I am sure that while the Senator from Louisiana might not agree with what we are attempting to do, he believes that such roads would fall into a different category.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not a question of whether I agree with what the Senator is advocating. It is the preference that the Senator would give to certain States which I fear might establish a precedent for other regions.

As I recall, the bill was first suggested because in West Virginia and other States throughout the Nation, automation had put a great many people out of work and abject poverty had resulted. The tax base of the areas affected was low. Therefore, the local people could not make a go of it.

In my own State, in the northern part of Louisiana, people in the cotton industry have been put out of business. I know many people there who need jobs as badly as coal miners in any part of West Virginia need them. In my judgment, those people would be as much entitled to assistance as are the people the Senator is trying to help in his State, Kentucky, or other areas.

I again ask the question: Is there any program proposed in the bill that could not be obtained by the respective States through an expansion of existing law?

Mr. RANDOLPH. There are these programs——

Mr. ELLENDER. Which ones?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have named one.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean access roads?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes, and the developmental road system.

Mr. ELLENDER. That work could be undertaken by the States. It is now done by all States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator inquired whether these programs are not covered by existing law. They are not. Any program embodied in the measure before the Senate could be undertaken by any State if it had the money or the means to do it. We would place an incentive—or, if the Senator desires, we might use the word "preference"—at a ratio which is not embodied in other programs. But we are attempting to establish this program to stimulate economic activity.

As to the point of people needing help, it is true in Louisiana; people need help also in Arkansas and other States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia. I am now talking about the cotton farmers.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. I know what the Senator is talking about. In the Appalachian region, 9 States originally and finally 11 States have come together to undertake the program proposed. They did not do so quickly. They did it over a period of more than 4 years. The bill that we have presented did not originate in Washington, D.C. It originated with the Governors of the States. Both our former great President, Mr. Kennedy, and our great President, Mr. Johnson, brought forward the machinery through which a Federal-State commission could work. It would be a valid approach if two or more contiguous States proposed a program, and after consultation with the Governors the President should provide an authority to accomplish that end. The approach is envisioned in the proposed legislation which was presented yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

In other words, if a case can be made—and I believe a case can be made for certain other regions—I think we have a responsibility, if a case can be made, to come to grips with the problems in these areas.

Mr. ELLENDER. It has been my privilege to travel through various parts of West Virginia. There is no doubt that West Virginia has areas that are in need of assistance. So has Kentucky. But to include a State like Virginia, which is one of the richest States in the Nation——

Mr. RANDOLPH. We do not bring in the whole State.

Mr. ELLENDER. But some parts of it are brought in. Virginia is well able to do its part. Ohio is well able to do its part. North Carolina can do its part.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Governor of Ohio, not the President of the United States, has, within the last few days, asked that four counties in Ohio be added. This was not done at Washington; it was done by the Governor of Ohio, Mr. Rhodes. So there are needs in these States and they are expressed by the Governors.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why do they not proceed by forming compacts, as was demonstrated yesterday in respect to the water pollution bill? All the States along the Ohio River have formed compacts under existing laws. They are working together; they are coordinating their efforts. It would seem to me that the same thing could be done in this instance, without having to create a Federal commission to be in charge of this operation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. This would not be a Federal commission; it would be a regional commission composed of the Governors of the participating States and a Federal cochairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it would be federally controlled.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; it would not be federally controlled. There would be a partnership. I believe that expression could be supported. It is a partnership among the States and the Federal Government to construct the administrative machinery and provide the technical assistance and funds to meet the developmental needs of an area where 15 million persons live.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it contemplated that any of the States included in the regional development will contribute to one another, or will contributions be made entirely by the Federal Government and the respective States for whatever work is done in their own States?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They will contribute one to another, through their respective contributions to the solution of regional problems.

Mr. ELLENDER. But not to another State? In other words, the whole work will be done and coordinated under the supervision of the commission?

Mr. RANDOLPH. To solve the interstate problems.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know; but does that cover everything that is to be done under the program? It even covers hospitals, does it not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It covers the multicounty hospitals and the diagnostic and outpatient clinics as well.

I do not wish to labor this point, but there is one county in this region having a population of 12,000 persons. There is only one doctor to serve them, and he is a general practitioner, 84 years of age. Not only is there no hospital in that county; there is not even a clinic. The closest one is 55 miles away. I believe that the Senator from Louisiana would want to join to help the development in that area of adequate health facilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that were the only area in the country so affected, I should say yes; but many other areas are similarly situated. A bill has already been passed by the Senate to provide loans to doctors and dentists who will agree to serve in certain areas.

Mr. RANDOLPH. For those who have received Federal aid in their education.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That program is intended to meet the problems about which the Senator is now talking. That is one way to accomplish the purpose.

As I said, I have read the bill very carefully two or three times. I do not know of any program that the Commission could put into effect in cooperation with the States that could not be done today under existing law.

Preference is being shown in this bill because there has been quite a large amount of unemployment due to automation in the mines. That was the genesis of the problem, as I remember, 2 or 3 years ago. There is much unemployment there; there is no doubt about it. Congress has provided special programs for West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Just as Congress has provided them for Louisiana and for areas of the West and Far West.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly. But the Appalachian area has programs in existence now; why are they not used, and expanded as necessary?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They are being used.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is here proposed is supplemental to what already exists. That is the point.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct. If a disaster occurs in Louisiana, Congress steps forward and meets that problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it any less the responsibility of Congress to step forward and to meet a problem that has been chronic over long years? If Congress is to provide relief quickly in the case of disasters resulting from hurricanes, tornadoes, or floods, has it not a responsibility to take care of a problem that has been growing?

My reply to the Senator from Louisiana is that automation was not the genesis of this problem. Appalachia has been recognized—I hesitate to say it, but it is true—as a problem region since Congress began to consider the matter in 1933.

Mr. ELLENDER. What caused the condition? I wish the Senator would tell us.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Isolation is one cause. There is a lack of roads and a lack of highways, which is what we are attempting to overcome by this legislation. That would certainly be one of the reasons for the legislation. The dieselization of our railroads and consequent loss of a large part of our coal market was another. Foreign competition with our ceramics and glass industry is another cause.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to address myself to the question asked by the Senator from Louisiana. He called attention, at the outset of his remarks, to the road program which the bill emphasizes. It is correct that a major portion of the money which would be authorized under the bill would go to the construction of roads. As the Senator will remember, $840 million is authorized as the Federal Government's part for the network of roads to be constructed in the 11-State area. A minimum of $360 million would be provided by the States, if the limit of 70 percent of the funds allowed by the bill is provided by the Federal Government, with the remaining 30 percent provided by the States. So that does change the ratio from the 50–50 proportion followed in the regular Federal highway program.

I should like to tell the Senator what I believe to be the rationale of the proposal. As the Senator from West Virginia has said, this area of 11 States is marked, so far as road construction is concerned, by some problems and difficulties. I do not say that the same difficulties might not obtain in certain other regions of the United States, but I would say that the problems are peculiar to this 11-State area. First, I should like to tell the Senator what the problems are.

The first is isolation, which has continued since almost the beginning of the Republic. These areas have been isolated from the main channels of commerce and even of travel, because the mountains, while they are not the highest in this land, are made up of precipitous hills, narrow valleys, and rapid streams running through them. In addition to the rough terrain, these conditions make necessary the construction of innumerable bridges at high cost. So we have a situation in which the cost of construction of the average mile of Federal-aid highway, under the 50–50 proportion, which requires the States to contribute half, is double the cost in such great States as Missouri, Illinois, and Indiana, and parts of Ohio.

When we have our biennial bill, the Senator, who is familiar with the problems from his distinguished service as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and who has been very helpful, knows that money is made available to all of the States and is then apportioned to the States on certain criteria. When the money is made available to the State, the State highway commission makes its decision as to the distribution of that money in a particular State.

If I remember correctly—the State of Kentucky is receiving over $16 million this year under the Federal aid highway program. This money, of course, does not include interstate highway program funds, but it is to be used for the construction of its primary and secondary roads, and it is to be used on a 50–50 basis. In that situation, the State would have to supply an additional $15 million. If the State would take all of its money which is authorized to be expended for this purpose and spends it in this rough section of the State, there would be nothing left for the rest of the State, or very little at best.

If the State Commission distributes the money evenly over the State, as most State highway departments try to do, the mileage of roads which can be built in the mountainous, inaccessible areas is very small. This has been true throughout the years, and even with efforts to distribute construction money fairly and proportionately, the roads in the flat parts of my State have increased in mileage and quality, while up in the mountainous areas, very few miles of road have been constructed. That situation continues to contribute to the isolation and poverty of that area.

Long ago, I served, as county judge, and as the head of the governing body of the county, was charged with some responsibility for the road building programs. Although the responsibility was much different from the heavy burdens faced by Governors, I learned something about the cost of building roads, and the necessity for and utility of these roads.

I think no one would disagree on the proposition that there is very little chance for the development of any area unless there are means of communication. The building of roads is an essential requisite for the development of an area, and for the raising of the living standards of those people.

Perhaps years ago the Bureau of Public Roads could have developed different criteria for the distribution of its funds throughout the State. I have suggested several times that perhaps those criteria should be based upon the average cost in each State of building a mile of road. In that way they would equalize the road building construction throughout the States.

I am sure that the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Indiana, and the Senator from Illinois would not agree to that. It would mean a reduction in the proportionate amount that their States would receive each year. But I think this approach would be fair, and it would help end the inaccessibility of particular sections of these States, and so contribute to the overall national interest by improving the economy and the living conditions.

The only way in which we can approach this problem is to provide that a larger Federal share, 70 percent, be made available for a reasonable time, as the 5 years proposed, to this area. It would give time in this area to catch up on road construction with the other areas of the 11 States and with the other States of the Union. Because of these practical and natural problems, connected with road construction, I believe the proposal is essentially fair. I have served with the Senator on committees. I know his broad knowledge of these measures concerning public works. I believe it is essential and fair to have this provision contained in the bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I think it is an important question that has been raised by the Senator from Louisiana in stating that conditions are certainly different under the programs that are now in operation. I believe the committee considered this question very carefully.

The testimony shows that this area needs certain extra assistance. Various programs have been in operation throughout the country. But, despite the existence of the programs, despite the use of the programs in the Appalachian area, the use of the programs is still insufficient. As has been stated by the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Kentucky, this is a long-standing area of depression. This additional information is needed. That is the reason that the Committee on Public Works made this recommendation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I appreciate the comment of the distinguished chairman.

This area of the country must catch up with the country as a whole. This is not a program, except for 5 years as it relates to highways, and 2 years as to other programs. We must continue to emphasize that.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the purpose of my questions will be to get into the RECORD a comparison of what the present percentage of contributions is under the various programs in the Nation generally and what the contribution will be in the Appalachian program.

Is my understanding correct that generally throughout the country in the building of highways such as are contemplated here, the matching basis is 50 percent contributed by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the State government?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, under this bill, in the Appalachian region, the Federal Government would be allowed to contribute up to 70 percent, with the State government putting up 30 percent?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with regard to the program of rehabilitating the land, which we discussed a moment ago, the Great Plains program envisions rebuilding the land. It is especially adopted to cover the States of the Great Plains, west of the Mississippi?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that, with respect to those States, the Federal Government puts up 50 percent and the States 50 percent?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct as to the ratio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with regard to Appalachia, for example, and that general type of program, the Federal Government will put up not to exceed 80 percent, with the State governments putting up 20 percent?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct. It should be pointed out that in the Great Plains, there is a difference in the standards from those which would be applied to the Appalachian region. In the Great Plains area, there is no acreage limitation. In the Appalachian region, the farmer who puts up 20 percent would receive 80 percent Federal grants for improving not more than 50 acres. I think it is important to point that out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a third program concerns the hospital service. I do not recall what contribution is made under the Hill-Burton Act by the Federal Government as related to the money that the local people must put up in building a hospital under the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Fifty-fifty.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. There could be a 75-percent contribution by the Federal Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the Hill-Burton Act?

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. McNAMARA. It can go that high.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we are not referring primarily to hospitals in this bill, but to clinics and regional diagnostic and treatment centers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, what is the percentage of contribution in the building of health centers and hospitals?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Up to 80 percent in the case of clinics and diagnostic centers. We feel that there is a difference in the building of a large hospital.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall assume that under the Hill-Burton Act, unless it is indicated to the contrary, the proportionate contribution is up to 75 percent by the Federal Government and 25 percent by the local government, but that can vary.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But under this program, it will be 80 percent as against 20 percent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Up to 80 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. According to my recollection, there is no other program in which there is a matching basis for capital improvements. I refer to vocational rehabilitation, and timber. I know those items are in the bill. There is an item for sewage treatment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the item for sewage treatment?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Six million dollars for sewage treatment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And on what basis is the participation? Is it a 100-percent program?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It could go, as in the other instances, up to 80 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the community facilities program, is the staff assistant able to inform us what the percentage is in that program, which is separate and apart from this program? A separate law provides money for sewage disposal construction and for water services.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The community facilities program is not a grant program; that is a loan program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So we have no other program making grants for such construction?

Mr. RANDOLPH. We have other construction programs under section 214.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What I fear is that, in spite of the argument being made today that this is a unique situation, which cannot be found elsewhere in the country, and therefore it must be dealt with uniquely, that argument will be rejected on the Senate floor, probably this week, but certainly later, when the Ozark Mountain proposal will be made and the Mesabi Range proposal will be made. I know that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] already has proposals for unique treatment of six regions. How are we going to take care of those arguments?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I recall that I said on September 25, 1964, that if there were a need which could be documented for a region which had, let us assume, two or more contiguous States, if there was a common denominator—and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I know there is a common denominator in this 11-State region—such proposal should be considered. These are investments—and I use the word advisedly—which we place into a region—not welfare expenditures merely to sustain or perpetuate existing conditions. We are not dealing with that type of program. We are dealing with the natural resources of an area, in an endeavor to strengthen the economy of the area, so that it can become prosperous and contribute not only to the local tax base but to the tax base of the Nation. All the programs which have been set forth in this legislation have been designed for that purpose, and that purpose alone.

I said last year that when the representatives of an area could make a case and document it as to its need, it was the responsibility of Congress to consider that matter. I repeat it today.

I would not foreclose any of the four or five areas mentioned by the Senator, with respect to other Senators demonstrating the need for regional development programs for their respective areas. I would not foreclose them from that opportunity. I do not think the Senator from Ohio would want to foreclose the opportunity of those persons to make a case.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator for the answers he has given. I interrupted him just as he was about to conclude on land stabilization and was about to go into timber development.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. I wish to address myself to the criticisms of the provisions with which the Senator concerned himself day before yesterday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before the Senator goes into that matter, will he yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago I discussed with the Senator from West Virginia the power of the Appalachian Regional Commission. I notice on page 3 of the bill that the Commission shall require the affirmative vote of the Federal Chairman and a majority of the State representatives. Suppose a majority of the States favor a proposal and the Federal Chairman does not. What will happen?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The affirmative vote of the Federal Cochairman is required for a Commission recommendation. If the Federal Government puts up the portions of money which we have discussed—70 percent in roads and 80 percent in the other categories—it is a fiscal responsibility which we would require the Federal Government to exercise. But I return to what I said previously, that it is a partnership agreement; and the majority of the States participating need not encounter that difficulty.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the point is that this Commission would be more or less dominated by the Federal Government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not believe it would be so dominated, because there would be 11 States represented through their Governors, with only one representative of the Federal Government. I cannot believe it would be controlled by the Federal Government. I do not believe that would be true.

Mr. ELLENDER. But under the proposed act, as I understand, if the States were to be unanimous in a proposal and the Federal representative said, "No," the answer would be "No." If that is not Federal control, I do not know what is.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not believe that the former Commission, the President's Appalachian Regional Commission has been federally controlled. I do not think it can be said that Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., has controlled or dominated the actions which have been taken by the Governors of the respective States or their representatives.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is a departure from the way it has been done. The law provides for the States getting together and forming a compact to coordinate their efforts in certain fields; but here——

Mr. RANDOLPH. The States have asked for that in this instance.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. We are proposing the formation of a new commission for the purpose of coordinating the functions of the States in a certain region. Personally, I think it would be better to leave it under the States rather than to let it be dominated by the Federal Government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We are in a changing world. I know it is easy to say that. I doubt that we can straitjacket ourselves in the pattern of yesterday and say that those methods are sufficient to take care of the problems of today or tomorrow.

I will mention to my cherished friend from Louisiana that I remember my grandfather saying to me, "Jennings, there are two sides to a question." I, frankly, cannot say that to my son. There are more than two sides to a question. There are two sides, it is true, but there are many, many more than two sides in addition. These are problems that have developed over a long period of time, and we must try to meet them, as well as the problems generated by a new technology. Their solutions require greater resources than are available to a mere compact among the States—though such a compact might well arise after this act terminates in 1971.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator trying to say that 60 years ago I was much smarter than I am now, that I then knew all things, and I do not know them now?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, we have always stated that the sophomore in college has all the answers, but the senior receives his degree, and he wonders.

Let me say that I do not appear here as an expert. I am a student of this subject, and that is all. Sometimes I think that an expert is a man who is seldom right, but never in doubt. I sometimes have doubts. Yet I feel that we are on the positive side. That is why I promised to make this proposed legislation as effective as I can. And I commend the senior Senator from Ohio for his efforts in this respect also.

(At this point Mr. Montoya took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I address myself to two criticisms of the provision in which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] is interested. On the day before yesterday, he referred to the measure as one which would—and I quote his language:

> Give to each farmer in Appalachia $500 to increase cattle population.

I wish the Senator from Ohio were in the Chamber at this moment so that he will not misunderstand, but that statement is not correct. That interpretation is not a valid one.

The program would not do what the Senator from Ohio has stated. I believe that if he has studied the bill—and he has studied it, because he is always careful in the consideration of proposed legislation, but if he has read the committee report—and I am sure that he has looked at it—there is no justification whatsoever for the interpretation which he has placed upon this section and the language which I have just quoted.

Section 203 in the proposed legislation would provide grant assistance, up to 80 percent of the cost, for improving 50 acres. As I previously stated, in the Great Plains area there is no limitation on acreage, in accordance with a schedule to be agreed upon by the individual farmer and the Soil Conservation Service.

Such a program would include the planting of grass as well as the planting of trees, the building of ponds to contain necessary water, and the terracing of stripped areas where we can bring into being strip crops, and also maintain, at least in degree, what I call a cropland treatment for watershed development in these areas of the United States.

The second argument, or principal contention, of the Senator from Ohio against section 203 is based on the recent cuts of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the Soil Conservation Service.

This argument attacks the expenditure of funds in Appalachia when programs were cut last year. I reply that I deplore the budget cuts in soil conservation programs. I join other Senators and I am pledged to them to restore these cuts in the Soil Conservation Service.

But as I see it, this argument does not justify the elimination of a program designed to meet the needs of many years, and not merely a few years—in the Appalachian region because of our accumulation of neglect and the difficult topography. This is a common denominator which courses from upper Pennsylvania down through Georgia and Alabama. If such logic as my dear friend from Ohio has expressed were to be applied to this entire bill—and he has said that he hopes to support the bill, or at least he says he hopes he can support the bill—we would eliminate a program on which the Senate in the previous year placed its imprint affirmatively by a vote of more than 3½ to 1.

The third charge which has been made against the pending measure, as I have listened, and as I have read, has to do with the measure which had its concept in part in a real attempt to do away with the acidity which is coming from the mines partly now in operation, and more generally, those which are now abandoned.

The amendment offered by the two Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott and Mr. Clark]—I presented it in the committee—would broaden the authority included in the legislation of the previous year in section 205, to allow the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to the States of not more than 75 percent of the cost of restoring and rehabilitating the strip-mined lands.

Approximately 75 percent of this land—some 200,000 acres—is what we can call abandoned land. It is land from which the strip mining operator has departed. He has moved on to another location. He no longer has the responsibility for the land which he was mining.

I am aware of the objections of the Senator from Ohio—he has expressed them on the floor of the Senate, and also to me in conversation—to the provisions which would come into being with an action program.

I feel that the very real needs in Appalachia—not only national needs, but also those in Appalachia—are going to be intensified.

Thus, when we think of restoration—the action program in connection with these lands—this restoration would come about as our studies determined that there were reasons why certain sections of land should be rehabilitated.

In other words, when we have the interim reports, we would recommend that work be done for certain specific areas.

Since 50 percent of the surface bituminous coal mined in the United States is in 8 of the 11 Appalachian States, I believe that the $15 million authorized is a realistic and conservative figure. In 8 of the 11 Appalachian States, or parts of those States, 50 percent of all the surface-mined bituminous coal in the country is located.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us how the $15 million will be used?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The $15 million?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It would be used over a 2-year period. The language of the amendment calls for land reclamation and rehabilitation. The treatment of those areas would be for the improvement of watersheds, for recreational areas, perhaps for industrial parks as well as other uses. The details will be established by the respective States and development districts.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator said that there were 200,000 acres in eight States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct, approximately 200,000 acres, of which about 75 percent are so-called abandoned lands.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that in West Virginia or in the entire region?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In the entire region.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is this land owned by individuals or corporations, or does any of it belong to the States?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is owned by individuals, small owners who have leased their mineral rights; some of it is owned by State and local governments, some by corporations; some of it is located on the national forests, and much of it is in a tax delinquent status.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the program would envision an agreement between the owners of the land, if they chose to enter into one, with the Federal Government?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct. The work would be done in cooperation with the Department of the Interior.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Department of the Interior?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, I am glad that the Senator has brought that point up, because all these programs would be carried out under the supervision of the Federal Government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the supervision of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the highway department, or HEW. That is what made me say a while ago that the Commission, although not composed of a majority of Federal officials, would be dominated by the Federal Government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I understand the contention of the Senator; I do not share his concern. I know of no Member of the Senate who follows with greater interest legislation of all types, than does the Senator from Louisiana.

I have been privileged to come before the Appropriations Committee, where he has been of great understanding, help, and leadership in our flood control projects in West Virginia, as well as in other States. I appreciate that action. But to reply to the Senator's contention that this program will be federally dominated, I point out that every project must be sustained by the appropriate State member of the Commission. I believe the record should indicate that fact.

Finally, Mr. President, I call attention to the criticisms which have been made against the pending measure, on the ground that it would, presumably, give preferential treatment to the Appalachian region. We have discussed this aspect in colloquies with the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Ohio. I feel constrained to say that S. 3 does not give preferential treatment to the Appalachian region.

I think it is necessary treatment. It is an all-out effort to meet the problems which have accumulated over the years of economic plight and neglect.

As the committee report has pointed out, the Appalachian area has 8.5 percent of our population, but is receiving less than 5 percent of the expenditures of the Federal Government, exclusive of trust funds.

Therefore the preferential treatment argument is not a bona fide argument against the bill.

I come now to S. 812, which was introduced yesterday by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. It now has 18 cosponsors with the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee.

The bill would provide for the establishment of regional commissions in other areas of the country. Although the Senator from Michigan is not in the Chamber, I believe the authorization figure is $20 million, for planning. The bill is at the desk and will remain there for 6 days. It was introduced yesterday, and unanimous consent was given for it to lie at the desk for 7 days.

I say to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] that hearings will be conducted expeditiously, so that other regions of the country may have their Senators appear before the Public Works Committee. In that way they will have an opportunity and responsibility—which I know they will assume—of bringing to the attention of the committee the needs of the States which they represent.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that if S. 3 becomes law, as I believe it will, 15 million persons will receive new hope in the United States. These 15 million persons have been assured that the Congress is not only intent on helping an 11-State region, but that the Congress, through the sponsorship of 35 Senators, both Democratic and Republican, will enact a measure to assist an area which has lagged behind all the other sections of the country in the general level and forward thrust of prosperity.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I have the deepest respect for my colleagues from the area of Appalachia, and for that reason it is with some reluctance that I speak out against S. 3, the Appalachia bill. I hold them all in the highest regard, and it is my pleasure to serve on committee with some of them.

But my conviction that the bill represents a far-reaching and dangerous precedent, one which will open the floodgates for countless segments of the United States to come in—region after region, or six at a time, as has been suggested already here—and ask the Federal Government for additional and special Federal aid, leaves me no choice but to make these few remarks.

It is not necessary to spell out in detail the predictable sequence if this bill is passed. One after another we will have other areas presenting similar plans, and votes may be cast with a conscious regard for the need for mutual support of these programs. There will be no stopping the procession of programs of more or less value. The bulk of the country, I expect, will eventually be involved in one regional plan or another. These plans might well operate at cross purposes as they seek to develop one region in competition with another. In considering Appalachia we simply have not looked far enough ahead to what its passage could mean to the country.

In expressing this opposition to S. 3 I do not want to be misunderstood on two points.

First, my position is taken without passing on the merits or demerits of the situation in Appalachia or the situation in any other region of the United States which may be interested in additional and special Federal economic aid. I have a deep sympathy for the problems of Appalachia and of all other underdeveloped areas of this country.

Second, I support the regional concept for attacking problems—and realize that this is a good and sound approach—beyond the scope or control of a single State. The Delaware River Basin compact, which I supported and worked for years ago, is an example of a group of States banding together to meet a common problem, and in conjunction with the Federal Government, I might add.

With these points emphasized, my opposition to the present bill, and similar bills which may follow, is based on the lack of an effective "needs test," as well as a conviction that there is a better alternative to meeting regional problems, an alternative which would be of greater long-range benefit to the States and to the Federal Government as well.

This needs test could be met by States forming regional compacts. As legal entities they could pool common resources to meet common problems. After a regional compact of States had planned together, and worked together on a development program, it would then be appropriate for the region to come to the Federal Government for supplementary assistance if the resources of the region still fell short of what was needed to develop the region economically.

If this procedure, or something similar to it is not followed, there will be a gushing of Federal funds with only minimal restraints.

Passage of the Appalachia bill, along with the buildup of other areas poised to apply for similar additional and special Federal aid, would, in my opinion, be bound to create the biggest long-rolling opportunity ever conceived. Easy Federal money would be within the reach of region after region.

I say this with no thought of disparaging the judgment of my colleagues, but I think they will agree with me that my comment is only an expression of obvious political fact.

My position comes down to this.

Do the Governors and legislatures of the States concerned need assistance acutely enough to organize into compacts and thus show the Federal Government that help is being asked only after the region's resources have been utilized to the fullest extent possible in meeting the region's needs?

If the regions do not want to exert themselves to this extent to pool their own resources for their own benefit, it would seem that they do not have reasonable grounds for asking the Federal Government for additional and special economic aid.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Delaware on his attendance at the committee hearings on the proposed legislation. I know that his individual views filed with the majority report reflect his considered judgment on the question.

I hesitate to say what I shall now say. I thought to make the statement last autumn. In remarking about certain States—and I know he was thinking of West Virginia—the Senator from Delaware said that they receive more money from the Federal Government than they pay into the Federal Government. He will recall his remarks in that instance.

I remind him that the wealth which is drawn out of West Virginia contributes to the wealth of corporations doing business in West Virginia but which have their corporate bodies in the State of Delaware. Delaware looks good with the tax returns of corporations incorporated in Delaware. But the money earned by those corporations was made in West Virginia. Yet often the credit comes to the corporation incorporated in another jurisdiction.

I must make that statement in defense of States like West Virginia, which contribute their wealth to the Nation; and yet sometimes we forget that those States do not have the benefit of the tax returns of corporate bodies which reflect the profit which has come from the resources—timber, coal, oil, gas, and so forth—in a State like West Virginia.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to speak for one further moment, then I shall be happy to yield.

The Senator spoke about the Governors and the possibility of compacts between the States. I remember that the Senator from Delaware asked Governor Scranton the following question:

> You have no reservations in your mind as a Governor that this is superimposing the national concept on our Federal-State concept?

Governor Scranton replied:

> May I say to you, sir, that from the beginning we have tried very hard in our efforts.
>
> Incidentally, if you will let me digress, I have two of the State officials most interested in this with me today, the secretary of commerce, Mr. Tabor, and Mr. Amann in his department, who have worked very closely with the Federal Government, and may I say

very amiably and in very good concert on this matter.

We have from the beginning tried to inject the responsibility of the States into this program.

I wish the Record to reflect the opinion of the Governor from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who has given the subject thorough consideration and who has participated in the conference of Appalachian Governors over a period of years. He has wrestled with the problem. I do not believe he ran to Washington, D.C.; I do not believe he came in for the logrolling of which the Senator has spoken. I think he came because he felt that there was a real need which had to be met by the partnership of the States and the Federal Government.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BOGGS. First, I thank him for his generous remarks. I could not be happier or more privileged to serve on a committee than I am to serve on the Committee on Public Works with my good friend from West Virginia, whom I hold in the highest esteem. I always find it a pleasure to work with him. I understand his dedication, his interest, and his hard work in support of the bill, about which I know he has strong convictions because it means so much to his area.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BOGGS. I wish to comment, first, about the wealth of resources of his great State of West Virginia. I have many friends in his State. My own daughter goes to college in West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. What is the name of the institution?

Mr. BOGGS. It is Bethany College. We visit there quite often. We love all the people we have had the privilege and pleasure of meeting.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That institution of learning is presided over by Dr. Perry Gresham.

Mr. BOGGS. He is one of the greatest among our educators.

Mr. RANDOLPH. He is one of the greatest educators in the country. The denominational background of Bethany is the Disciples of Christ, which includes in its membership the distinguished President of the United States.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct; and we are very proud of that, too.

But we are also aware of the great natural resources, as well as the human resources, of West Virginia. I am happy that corporations that may be incorporated in the State of Delaware may also have offices in the State of West Virginia and have facilities and plants to create employment and work in that great State.

That proves the point I am trying to make concerning the needs test and the formalizing of a compact. It sounds difficult until we get to the point; then it is not difficult.

This area is rich in natural and human resources; there is no question about it. But it has not been pulled together as a region and the great human and natural resources planned for use and development as a region. It has not been put together, as it could be under the finalizing of a compact entity and the promotion and capitalization on the region's resources.

Consider the great wealth of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I was amazed when I learned from the distinguished Governor of Pennsylvania that, geographically speaking, three-fourths of Pennsylvania would be in the compact. In the great State of Maryland, as I understand, only three counties would be in it.

But in all of this great area, all the way down to the great State of Alabama, there are tremendous natural and human resources in areas of great wealth and potential for development. To capitalize on them and use effectively the resources that are already there would require the formalizing of a compact legal entity for planning, operation, and promotion.

That is as clear as anything in my mind. It is simple. It can be done and can be made effective. Then, where supplemental Federal economic assistance was needed, Congress, in my judgment, would be most willing to go along and have no reservations or regrets about it.

I have no further comments at this time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I was hoping to have the attention of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, but I observe that he is not in the Chamber at the moment. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds, will he yield to allow me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I should have made the request at the end of my own remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill, as amended, be treated as original text for the purpose of further consideration and amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 23, after the word "is", to strike out "the greatest" and insert "a significant"; on page 8, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "Commission" and insert "Commission, his staff,"; on page 10, line 4, after the word "such", to insert "a central and appropriate"; on page 11, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "inspection." and insert "inspection, and for the purpose of audit and examination by the Comptroller General or his duly authorized representatives."; on page 13, line 20, after the word "region", to strike out "(not to exceed a total of three thousand three hundred and fifty miles in length of which total not to exceed one thousand miles shall be local access roads that will serve specific recreational, residential, commercial, industrial, or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program)" and insert "(the length of which shall not exceed two thousand three hundred and fifty miles. In addition thereto, there are authorized to be constructed not in excess of one thousand miles of local access roads, that will serve specific recreational, residential, commercial, industrial, or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program)"; on page 14, line 15, after the word "highway", to strike out "system." and insert "system, and the local access roads."; on page 17, after line 18, to strike out:

"LAND IMPROVEMENT AND EROSION CONTROL

"Sec. 203. (a) In order to promote the conservation and fuller utilization of the region's important land and water resources, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make grants to landowners to assist in the improvement and development of land for pasture and erosion control in the region. Grants to any landowner under this section shall not exceed 80 per centum of the cost of improving and developing twenty-five acres of land owned by such landowner. Such improvement and development of land shall be carried out under the provisions of an agreement to be entered into by the landowner and the Secretary of Agriculture, for such period not to exceed ten years as the Secretary may determine, which shall include such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section and to assure that such improvement and development of land will be properly established, and adequately maintained during the period of agreement, in accordance with technically sound standards and procedures."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"LAND STABILIZATION, CONSERVATION, AND EROSION CONTROL

"Sec. 203. (a) In order to provide for the control and prevention of erosion and sediment damages in the Appalachian region and to promote the conservation and development of the soil and water resources of the region, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into agreements of not more than ten years with landowners, operators, and occupiers, individually or collectively, in the Appalachian region determined by him to have control for the period of the agreement of the lands described therein, providing for land stabilization, erosion and sediment control, and reclamation through changes in land use, and conservation treatment including the establishment of practices and measures for the conservation and development of soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation resources.

"(b) The landowner, operator, or occupier shall furnish to the Secretary of Agriculture a conservation and development plan setting forth the appropriate and safe land uses and conservation treatment mutually agreed by the Secretary and the landowner, operator, or occupier to be needed on the lands for which the plan was prepared.

"(c) Such plan shall be incorporated in an agreement under which the landowner, operator, or occupier shall agree with the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the land uses and conservation treatment provided for in such plan on the lands described in the agreement in accordance with the terms and conditions thereof.

"(d) In return for such agreement by the landowner, operator, or occupier the Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to furnish financial and other assistance to such landowner, operator, or occupier in such amounts and subject to such conditions as the Secretary determines are appropriate and in the public interest for the carrying out of the land uses and conservation treatment set forth in the agreement: *Provided*, That grants hereunder shall not exceed 80 per centum of the cost of carrying out such land uses and conservation treatment on fifty acres of land occupied by such owner, operator, or occupier.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture may terminate any agreement with a landowner, operator, or occupier by mutual agreement if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of agreements previously entered into hereunder as he deems desirable to carry out the purposes of this section or to facilitate the practical administration of the program authorized herein.

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture, to the extent he deems it desirable to carry out the purposes of this section, may provide in any agreement hereunder for (1) preservation for a period not to exceed the period covered by the agreement and an equal period thereafter of the cropland, crop acreage, and allotment history applicable to land covered by the agreement for the purpose of any Federal program under which such history is used as a basis for an allotment or other limitation on the production of such crop; or (2) surrender of any such history and allotments.

"(g) The Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to issue such rules and regulations as he determines are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

On page 20, at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(h)"; on page 21, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(i)"; on page 22, line 18, after the word "products", to insert a comma and "or for physical consolidation of small timber holdings authorized by (1) (B) above except for the establishment of demonstration units"; on page 23, after line 2, to strike out:

"(1) make financial contributions to States in the region to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 15, 1955 (30 U.S.C. 571 et seq.) without regard to section 2(b) thereof (30 U.S.C. 572(b)) or to any provisions therein limiting assistance to anthracite coal formations, or to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Grants under this paragraph shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"(1) make financial contributions to States in the region to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines, and to reclaim and rehabilitate existing strip and surface mine areas, in accordance with provisions of the Act of July 15, 1955 (30 U.S.C. 571 et seq.), to the extent applicable, without regard to section 2(b) thereof (30 U.S.C. 572(b)) or to any provisions therein limiting assistance to anthracite coal formation, or to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Grants under this paragraph shall be made wholly out of funds specifically appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this Act.

On page 24, line 25, after the word "thereof.", to strike out "Strip mine restoration projects shall be carried out only on lands, public or private, on which there is provided access and use by the public to assure an adequate public benefit." and insert "Projects shall be approved for assistance under subsection (a) only where expected public benefits are found to justify estimated Federal and State costs; access to and use of restored lands by the public is provided where appropriate steps are taken, including, in appropriate cases, requirement for contributions to the cost of the project, which are adequate in the judgment of the Secretary to assure that individual property owners or mine operators do not receive undue financial benefits from the project. In selecting projects for financial assistance, priority shall be given to those projects which are shown to be part of the development or implementation of a State program giving reasonable promise of obtaining a permanent solution of the problem dealt with."; on page 28, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$21,500,000" and insert "$36,500,000"; on page 32, line 20, after "following:", to insert "to States participating in planning for Appalachian regional programs, for expenses incurred in the course of such planning,"; on page 34, line 15, after the word "of", to strike out "1965." and insert "1965; National Defense Education Act of 1958."; on page 36, line 4, after the word "program", to insert "and projects"; in line 7, after the word "program", to insert "and projects"; in line 10, after the word "program", to insert "and projects"; in line 11, after the word "program", to insert "and projects"; on page 37, line 1, after the word "have", to strike out "the greatest" and insert "a significant"; in line 17, after "(b)", to strike out "Nothing in this Act shall authorize any assistance" and insert "No financial assistance shall be authorized"; in line 21, after the word "working", to strike out "capital;" and insert "capital, or other industrial facilities or to enable plant subcontractors to undertake work theretofore performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors;"; on page 39, after line 23, to insert; "(b) Recipients of Federal assistance under the provisions of this section shall, in accordance with regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce, maintain accurate and complete records of transactions and activities financed with Federal funds and report thereon to the Secretary of Commerce. The records of the recipient shall be available for audit with respect to such grants by the Secretary of Commerce and the Comptroller General, or their duly authorized representatives."

On page 40, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)"; on page 41, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out $237,200,000" and insert "$252,400,000"; on page 42, line 11, after the word "Jefferson,", to insert "Lauderdale,"; on page 43, line 15, after the word "Brown,", to insert "Carroll,"; in the same line, after the word "Clermont,", to insert "Coshocton,"; in line 16, after the word "Hocking,", to insert "Holmes,"; and in line 18, after the word "Scioto,", to insert "Tuscarawas,"; so as to make the bill read:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the 'Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965'.

"Findings and Statement of Purpose

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the Appalachian region of the United States, while abundant in natural resources and rich in potential, lags behind the rest of the Nation in its economic growth and that its people have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity. The region's uneven past development, with its historical reliance on a few basic industries and a marginal agriculture, has failed to provide the economic base that is a vital prerequisite for vigorous, self-sustaining growth. The State and local governments and the people of the region understand their problems and have been working and will continue to work purposefully toward their solution. The Congress recognizes the comprehensive report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission documenting these findings and concludes that regionwide development is feasible, desirable, and urgently needed. It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to assist the region in meeting its special problems, to promote its economic development, and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward providing the basic facilities essential to its growth and attacking its common problems and meeting its common needs on a coordinated and concerted regional basis. The public investments made in the region under this Act shall be concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth, and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest. The States will be responsible for recommending local and State projects, within their borders, which will receive assistance under this Act. As the region obtains the needed physical and transportation facilities and develops its human resources, the Congress expects that the region will generate a diversified industry, and that the region will then be able to support itself, through the workings of a strengthened free enterprise economy.

"TITLE I—THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

"Membership and Voting

"SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established an Appalachian Regional Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') which shall be composed of one Federal member, hereinafter referred to as the 'Federal Cochairman', appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and one member from each participating State in the Appalachian region. The Federal Cochairman shall be one of the two Cochairmen of the Commission. Each State member may be the Governor, or his designee, or such other person as may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The State members of the Commission shall elect a Cochairman of the Commission from among their number.

"(b) Except as provided in section 105, decisions by the Commission shall require the affirmative vote of the Federal Cochairman and of a majority of the State members (exclusive of members representing States delinquent under section 105). In matters coming before the Commission, the Federal Cochairman shall, to the extent practicable, consult with the Federal departments and agencies having an interest in the subject matter.

"(c) Each State member shall have an alternate, appointed by the Governor or as otherwise may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an alternate for the Federal Cochairman. An alternate shall vote in the event of the absence, death, disability, removal, or resignation of the State or Federal representative for which he is an alternate.

"(d) The Federal Cochairman shall be compensated by the Federal Government at level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. His alternate shall be compensated by the Federal Government at not to exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS–18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and when not actively serving as an alternate for the Federal Cochairman shall perform such functions and duties as are delegated to him by the Federal Cochairman. Each State member and his alternate shall be compensated by the State which they represent at the rate established by the law of such State.

"Functions of the Commission

"SEC. 102. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Commission shall—

"(1) develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region.

"(2) conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including an inventory and analysis of the resources of the region, and, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth;

"(3) review and study, in cooperation with the agency involved, Federal, State, and local public and private programs and, where appropriate, recommend modifications or additions which will increase their effectiveness in the region;

"(4) formulate and recommend, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and work with State and local agencies in developing appropriate model legislation;

"(5) encourage the formation of local development districts;

"(6) encourage private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects;

"(7) serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Appalachian programs;

"(8) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and establish and utilize, as appropriate, citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences; and

"(9) advise the Secretary of Commerce on applications for grants for administrative expenses to local development districts.

"Recommendations

"Sec. 103. The Commission may, from time to time, make recommendations to the President and to the State Governors and appropriate local officials with respect to—

"(1) the expenditure of funds by Federal, State, and local departments and agencies in the region in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, education, training, health and welfare, and other fields related to the purposes of this Act; and

"(2) such additional Federal, State, and local legislation or administrative actions as the Commission deems necessary to further the purposes of this Act.

"Liaison Between Federal Government and the Commission

"Sec. 104. The President shall provide effective and continuing liaison between the Federal Government and the Commission and a coordinated review within the Federal Government of the plans and recommendations submitted by the Commission pursuant to sections 102 and 103.

"Administrative Expenses of the Commission

"Sec. 105. (a) For the period ending on June 30 of the second full Federal fiscal year following the date of enactment of this Act, the administrative expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the Federal Government. Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid equally by the Federal Government and the States in the region. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal Cochairman shall not participate or vote in such determination. No assistance authorized by this Act shall be furnished to any State or to any political subdivision or any resident of any State, nor shall the State member of the Commission participate or vote in any determination by the Commission while such State is delinquent in payment of its share of such expenses.

"(b) Not to exceed $2,200,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"Administrative Powers of Commission

"Sec. 106. To carry out its duties under this Act, the Commission is authorized to—

"(1) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its functions.

"(2) appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions, except that such compensation shall not exceed the salary of the alternate to the Federal Cochairman on the Commission as provided in section 101. No member, alternate, officer, or employee of the Commission, other than the Federal Cochairman on the Commission, his staff, and his alternate and Federal employees detailed to the Commission under paragraph (3) shall be deemed a Federal employee for any purpose.

"(3) request the head of any Federal department or agency (who is hereby so authorized) to detail to temporary duty with the Commission such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as the Commission may need for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

"(4) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency.

"(5) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating State government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for, or continue in, another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel. The Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with the Commission for continued coverage of Commission employees, who at date of Commission employment are Federal employees, in the retirement program and other employee benefit programs of the Federal Government.

"(6) accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible.

"(7) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation.

"(8) maintain a temporary office in the District of Columbia and establish a permanent office at such a central and appropriate location as it may select and field offices at such other places as it may deem appropriate.

"(9) take such other actions and incur such other expenses as may be necessary or appropriate.

"Information

"Sec. 107. In order to obtain information needed to carry out its duties, the Commission shall—

"(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable, a Cochairman of the Commission, or any member of the Commission designated by the Commission for the purpose, being hereby authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the Commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath;

"(2) arrange for the head of any Federal, State, or local department or agency (who is hereby so authorized to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law) to furnish to the Commission such information as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency; and

"(3) keep accurate and complete records of its doings and transactions which shall be made available for public inspection, and for the purpose of audit and examination by the Comptroller General or his duly authorized representatives.

"Personal Financial Interests

"Sec. 108. (a) Except as permitted by subsection (b) hereof, no State member or alternate and no officer or employee of the Commission shall participate personally and substantially as member, alternate, officer, or employee, through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise, in any proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter in which, to his knowledge, he, his spouse, minor child, partner, organization (other than a State or political subdivision thereof) in which he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial interest. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"(b) Subsection (a) hereof shall not apply if the State member, alternate, officer, or employee first advises the Commission of the nature and circumstances of the proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter and makes full disclosure of the financial interest and receives in advance of a written determination made by the Commission that the interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the Commission may expect from such State member, alternate, officer, or employee.

"(c) No State member or alternate shall receive any salary, or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on the Commission from any source other than his State. No person detailed to serve the Commission under authority of paragraph (4) of section 106 shall receive any salary or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on the Commission from any source other than the State, local, or intergovernmental department or agency from which he was detailed or from the Commission. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other subsection of this section, the Federal Cochairman and his alternate on the Commission and any Federal officers or employees detailed to duty with it pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 106 shall not be subject to any such subsection but shall remain subject to sections 202 through 209 of title 18, United States Code.

"(e) The Commission may, in its discretion, declare void and rescind any contract, loan, or grant of or by the Commission in relation to which it finds that there has been a violation of subsection (a) or (c) of this section, or any of the provisions of sections 202 through 209, title 18, United States Code.

"TITLE II—SPECIAL APPALACHIAN PROGRAMS

"Part A—New programs

"Appalachian Development Highway System

"Sec. 201. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to assist in the construction of an Appalachian development highway system serving the Appalachian region (the length of which shall not exceed two thousand three hundred and fifty miles. In addition thereto, there are authorized to be constructed not in excess of one thousand miles of local access roads, that will serve specific recreational, residential, commercial, industrial, or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program). The system, in conjunction with the Interstate System and other Federal-aid highways in the region will provide a highway system which will open up an area or areas with a developmental potential where commerce and communication have been inhibited by lack of adequate access. The provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to Federal-aid primary highways, and which the Secretary determines are not inconsistent with this Act, shall apply to the Appalachian development highway system, and the local access roads.

"(b) As soon as feasible, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary its recommendations with respect to (1) the general corridor location and termini of the development highways, (2) the designation of local access roads to be constructed, (3) priorities for construction of the local access roads and of the major segments of the development highways, and (4) other criteria for the program authorized by this section. Before any State member participates in or votes on such recommendations, he shall have obtained the recommendations of the State highway department of the State which he represents.

"(c) The Secretary shall have authority to approve in whole or in part such recommendations or to require modifications or revisions thereof. In no event shall the Secretary approve any recommendations for any construction which would require for its completion the expenditure of Federal funds (other than funds available under title 23, United States Code) in excess of the appropriation authorizations in subsection (g). On its completion each development highway not already on the Federal-aid primary system shall be added to such system and shall be required to be maintained by the State.

"(d) In the construction of highways and roads authorized under this section, the States may give special preference to the use of mineral resource materials indigenous to the Appalachian region.

"(e) For the purposes of research and development in the use of coal and coal products in highway construction and maintenance, the Secretary is authorized to require each participating State, to the maximum extent possible, to use coal derivatives in the construction of not to exceed 10 per centum of the roads authorized under this Act.

"(f) Federal assistance to any construction project under such project, unless the Secretary determines, pursuant to the recommendation of the Commission, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, but in no event shall such Federal assistance exceed 70 per centum of such costs.

"(g) To carry out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $840,000,000.

"Demonstration Health Facilities

"Sec. 202. (a) In order to demonstrate the value of adequate health and medical facilities to the economic development of the region, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for the construction, equipment, and operation of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers, and other facilities necessary to health. Grants for such construction (including initial equipment) shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291–291z) and the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (77 Stat. 282), without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceiling or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law.

"(b) No grant under this section for construction (including initial equipment) shall exceed 80 per centum of the cost of the project. Not to exceed $41,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 shall be available for construction grants under this section.

"(c) Grants under this section for operation (including equipment other than initial equipment) of a project may be made up to 100 per centum of the costs thereof for the two-year period beginning on the first day such project is in operation as a health facility. For the next three years of operations such grants shall not exceed 50 per centum of such costs. No grants for operation of a project shall be made after five years following the commencement of such operations. Not to exceed $28,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act shall be available for operating grants under this section.

"Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control

"Sec. 203. (a) In order to provide for the control and prevention of erosion and sediment damages in the Appalachian region and to promote the conservation and development of the soil and water resources of the region, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into agreements of not more than ten years with landowners, operators, and occupiers, individually or collectively, in the Appalachian region determined by him to have control for the period of the agreement of the lands described therein, providing for land stabilization, erosion and sediment control, and reclamation through changes in land use, and conservation treatment including the establishment of practices and measures for the conservation and development of soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation resources.

"(b) The landowner, operator, or occupier shall furnish to the Secretary of Agriculture a conservation and development plan setting forth the appropriate and safe land uses and conservation treatment mutually agreed by the Secretary and the landowner operator, or occupier to be needed on the lands for which the plan was prepared.

"(c) Such plan shall be incorporated in an agreement under which the landowner, operator, or occupier shall agree with the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the land uses and conservation treatment provided for in such plan on the lands described in the agreement in accordance with the terms and conditions thereof.

"(d) In return for such agreement by the landowner, operator, or occupier the Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to furnish financial and other assistance to such landowner, operator, or occupier in such amounts and subject to such conditions as the Secretary determines are appropriate and in the public interest for the carrying out of the land uses and conservation treatment set forth in the agreement: *Provided*, That grants hereunder shall not exceed 80 per centum of the cost of carrying out such land uses and conservation treatment on fifty acres of land occupied by such owner, operator, or occupier.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture may terminate any agreement with a landowner, operator, or occupier by mutual agreement if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of agreements previously entered into hereunder as he deems desirable to carry out the purposes of this section or to facilitate the practical administration of the program authorized herein.

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture, to the extent he deems it desirable to carry out the purposes of this section, may provide in any agreement hereunder for (1) preservation for a period not to exceed the period covered by the agreement and an equal period thereafter of the cropland, crop acreage, and allotment history applicable to land covered by the agreement for the purpose of any Federal program under which such history is used as a basis for an allotment or other limitation on the production of such crop; or (2) surrender of any such history and allotments.

"(g) The Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to issue such rules and regulations as he determines are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(h) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall utilize the services of the Soil Conservation Service, and the State and local committees provided for in section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590(b)), and is authorized to utilize the facilities, services, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation shall not make any expenditures to carry out the provisions of this subsection unless funds specifically appropriated for such purpose have been transferred to it.

"(i) Not to exceed $17,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"Timber Development Organizations

"Sec. 204. (a) In order that the region shall more fully benefit from the timber stands that are one of its prime assets, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to—

"(1) provide technical assistance in the organization and operation, under State law, of private timber development organizations having as their objective the carrying out of timber development programs to improve timber productivity and quality, and increase returns to landowners through establishment of private nonprofit corporations, which on a self-supporting basis may provide (A) continuity of management, good cutting practices, and marketing services, (B) physical consolidation of small holdings or administrative consolidation for efficient management under long-term agreement, (C) management of forest lands, donated to the timber development organizations for demonstrating good forest management, on a profitable and taxpaying basis, and (D) establishment of a permanent fund for perpetuation of the work of the corporations to be composed of donations, real or personal, for educational purposes.

"(2) provide not more than one-half of the initial capital requirements of such timber development organizations through loans under the applicable provisions of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1926 et seq.). Such loans shall not be used for the construction or acquisition of facilities for manufacturing, processing, or marketing forest products, or for physical consolidation of small timber holdings authorized by (1)(B) above except for the establishment of demonstration units.

"(b) Not to exceed $5,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"Mining Area Restoration

"Sec. 205. (a) In order to further the economic development of the region by rehabilitating areas presently damaged by deleterious mining practices, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to—

"(1) make financial contributions to States in the region to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines, and to reclaim and rehabilitate existing strip and surface mine areas, in accordance with provisions of the Act of July 15, 1955 (30 U.S.C. 571 et seq.), to the extent applicable, without regard to section 2(b) thereof (30 U.S.C. 572(b)) or to any provisions therein limiting assistance to anthracite coal formations, or to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Grants under this paragraph shall be made wholly out of funds specifically appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this Act.

"(2) plan and execute projects for extinguishing underground and outcrop mine fires in the region in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 31, 1954 (30 U.S.C. 551 et seq.), without regard to any provisions therein relating to annual appropriation authorization ceilings. Grants under this paragraph shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act.

"(3) expand and accelerate fish and wildlife restoration projects in the region in accordance with the provisions of the Act of September 2, 1937 (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), and the Act of August 9, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 777 et seq.), without regard to any provisions therein relating to apportionments among the States and to limitations on the availability of funds. The expenses of projects under this paragraph shall be paid solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the apportionments among the States pursuant to any other provisions of law.

"(b) For the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of mining area restoration projects carried out under subsection (a) of this section and conducted on lands other than federally owned lands shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total cost thereof. Projects shall be approved for assistance under subsection (a) only where expected public benefits are found to justify estimated Federal and State costs; access to and use of restored lands by the public is provided where appropriate steps are taken, including, in appropriate cases, requirement for contributions to the cost of the project, which are adequate in the judgment of the Secretary to assure that individual property owners or mine operators do not receive undue financial benefits from the project. In selecting projects for financial assistance, priority shall be given to those projects which are shown to be part of the development or implementation of a State program giving reasonable promise of obtaining a permanent solution of the problem dealt with.

"(c) The Congress hereby declares its intent to provide for a study of a comprehensive, long-range program for the purpose of reclaiming and rehabilitating strip and surface mining areas in the United States. To this general end, the Secretary of the Interior shall, in full cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other appropriate Federal, State, and local departments and agencies, and with the Commission, make a survey and study of strip and surface mining operations and their effects in the United States. The Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the President his recommendations for a long-range comprehensive program for reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mining areas in the United States and for the policies under which the program should be conducted, and the President shall submit these to the Congress, together with his recommendations, not later than July 1, 1967. By July 1, 1966, the Secretary shall make an interim report to the Commission summarizing his findings to that date on those aspects of strip and surface mining operations in the region that are most urgently in need of attention. Such study and recommendations shall include, but not be limited to, a consideration of the following matters—

"(1) the nature and extent of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and the conditions resulting therefrom;

"(2) the ownership of the real property involved in strip and surface mining operations;

"(3) the effectiveness of past actions by States or local units of government to remedy the adverse effects of strip and surface mining operation by financial or regulatory measures, and requirements for appropriate State legislation, including adequate enforcement thereof, to provide for proper reclamation and rehabilitation of areas which may be strip and surface mined in the future.

"(4) the public interest in and public benefits which may result from reclamation, rehabilitation, and appropriate development and use of areas subjected to strip and surface mining operations, including (A) economic development growth, (B) public recreation, (C) public health and safety, (D) water pollution, stream sedimentation, erosion control, and flood control, (E) highway programs, (F) fish and wildlife protection and restoration, (G) scenic values, and (H) forestry and agriculture;

"(5) the appropriate roles of Federal, State, and private interests in the reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mining areas and the relative costs to be borne by each, including specific consideration of (A) the extent, if any, to which strip and surface mine operators are unable to bear the cost of remedial action within the limits imposed by the economics of such mining activity, and (B) the extent to which the prospective value of lands and other natural resources, after remedial work has been completed, would be inadequate to justify the landowners doing the remedial work at their expense; and

"(6) the objectives and the total overall costs of a program for accomplishing the reclamation and rehabilitation of existing strip and surface mining areas in the United States, giving adequate consideration to (A) the economic benefits in relation to costs, (B) the prevention of future devastation of reclaimed and rehabilitated areas, (C) the avoidance of unwarranted financial gain to private owners of improved property, and (D) the types of aid required to accomplish such reclamation and rehabilitation.

"(d) Not to exceed $36,500,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"Water Resource Survey

"SEC. 206. (a) The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the Appalachian region, giving special attention to the need for an increase in the production of economic goods and services within the region as a means of expanding economic opportunities and thus enhancing the welfare of its people, which plan shall constitute an integral and harmonious component of the regional economic development program authorized by this Act.

"(b) This plan may recommend measures for the control of floods, the regulation of the rivers to enhance their value as sources of water supply for industrial and municipal development, the generation of hydroelectric power, the prevention of water pollution by drainage from mines, the development and enhancement of the recreational potentials of the region, the improvement of the rivers for navigation where this would further industrial development at less cost than would the improvement of other modes of transportation, the conservation and efficient utilization of the land resource, and such other measures as may be found necessary to achieve the objectives of this section.

"(c) To insure that the plan prepared by the Secretary of the Army shall constitute a harmonious component of the regional program, he shall consult with the Commission and the following: the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Federal Power Commission.

"(d) The plan prepared pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Commission. The Commission shall submit the plan to the President with a statement of its views, and the President shall submit the plan to the Congress with his recommendations not later than December 31, 1968.

"(e) The Federal agencies referred to in subsection (c) of this section are hereby authorized to assist the Secretary of the Army in the preparation of the plan authorized by this section, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary to the preparation of this plan and on such terms as he may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation.

"(f) The plan to be prepared by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to this section shall also be coordinated with all comprehensive river basin plans heretofore or hereafter developed by United States study commissions, interagency committees, or similar planning bodies, for those river systems draining the Appalachian region.

"(g) Not to exceed $5,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"Part B—Supplementations and modifications of existing programs

"Vocational Education Facilities

"SEC. 211. (a) In order to provide basic facilities to give the people of the region the training and education they need to obtain employment, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for construction of the school facilities needed for the provision of vocational education in areas of the region in which such education is not now adequately available. Such grants shall be made in accordance with the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (77 Stat. 403), without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law.

"(b) Not to exceed $16,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"Sewage Treatment Works

"SEC. 212. (a) In order to provide facilities to assist in the prevention of pollution of the region's streams and to protect the health and welfare of its citizens, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for the construction of sewage treatment works in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.), without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States pursuant to any other provision of law.

"(b) Not to exceed $6,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"Amendments to Housing Act of 1954

"SEC. 213. (a) Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 461(a)) is amended by striking the word 'and' at the end of paragraph (7), by substituting for the period at the end of paragraph (8) the phrase '; and,' and by adding a new paragraph (9) to read as follows:

" '(9) the Appalachian Regional Commission, established by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, for comprehensive planning for the Appalachian region as defined by section 403 of such Act.'

"(b) Section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 461(b)), is amended by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ', to States participating in planning for Appalachian regional programs, for expenses incurred in the course of such planning, or to the Appalachian Regional Commission'.

"Supplements to Federal Grant-in-Aid Programs

"Sec. 214. (a) In order to enable the people, States, and local communities of the region, including local development districts, to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, pursuant to specific recommendations of the Commission approved by him and after consultation with the appropriate Federal officials, to allocate funds appropriated to carry out this section to the heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of such Federal grant-in-aid programs. Funds so allocated shall be used for the sole purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to projects under such programs above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such project otherwise authorized by the applicable law. Funds shall be so allocated for Federal grant-in-aid programs for which funds are available under the Act authorizing such programs. Such allocations shall be available without regard to any appropriation authorization ceilings in such Act.

"(b) The Federal portion of such costs shall not be increased in excess of the percentages established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce, and such regulations shall in no event authorize the Federal portion of such costs to exceed 80 per centum thereof.

"(c) The term 'Federal grant-in-aid programs' as used in this section means those Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by this Act for the construction or equipment of facilities, and all other Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized on or before the effective date of this Act by Acts other than this Act for the acquisition of land and the construction or equipment of facilities, including but not limited to grant-in-aid programs authorized by the following Acts: Federal Water Pollution Control Act; Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; title VI of the Public Health Service Act; Vocational Education Act of 1963; Library Services Act; Federal Airport Act; part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934; Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; National Defense Education Act of 1958. The term shall not include (A) the program for the construction of the development highway system authorized by section 201 of this Act or any other program relating to highway or road construction, or (B) any other program for which loans or other Federal financial assistance, except a grant-in-aid program, is authorized by this or any other Act.

"(d) Not to exceed $90,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"Part C—General provision

"Maintenance of Effort

"Sec. 221. No State and no political subdivision of such State shall be eligible to receive benefits under this Act unless the aggregate expenditures of State funds, exclusive of Federal funds, for the benefit of the area within the State located in the region are maintained at a level which does not fall below the average level of such expenditures for its last two full fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this Act. In computing the average level of expenditure for its last two fiscal years, a State's past expenditure for participation in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways shall not be included. The Commission shall recommend to the President or such Federal officer or officers as the President may designate, a lesser requirement when it finds that a substantial population decrease in that portion of a State which lies within the region would not justify a State expenditure equal to the average level of the last two years or when it finds that a State's average level of expenditure, within an individual program, has been disproportionate to the present need for that portion of the State which lies within the region.

"Consent of States

"Sec. 222. Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State to engage in or accept any program under this Act without its consent.

"Program Implementation

"Sec. 223. A program and projects authorized under any section of this title shall not be implemented until (1) the Commission has consulted with the appropriate official or officials concerned with such program and projects as may be designated by the Governor or Governors of the State or States involved and has obtained the recommendations of such official or officials with respect to such program and projects and (2) plans with respect to such program and projects have been recommended by the Commission and have been submitted to and approved or modified by the President or such Federal officer or officers as the President may designate.

"Program Development Criteria

"Sec. 224. (a) In developing recommendations on the programs and projects to be given assistance under this Act, and in establishing within those recommendations a priority ranking of the requests for assistance presented to the Commission, the Commission shall follow procedures that will insure consideration of the following factors:

"(1) the relationship of the project or class of projects to overall regional development including its location in an area determined by the State to have a significant potential for growth;

"(2) the population and area to be served by the project or class of projects including the relative per capita income and the unemployment rates in the area;

"(3) the relative financial resources available to the State or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof which seek to undertake the project;

"(4) the importance of the project or class of projects in relation to other projects or classes of projects which may be in competition for the same funds;

"(5) the prospects that the project for which assistance is sought will improve, on a continuing rather than a temporary basis, the opportunities for employment, the average level of income, or the economic and social development of the area served by the project.

"(b) No financial assistance shall be authorized under this Act to be used (1) in relocating any establishment or establishments from one area to another; (2) to finance the cost of industrial plants, commercial facilities, machinery, working capital, or other industrial facilities or to enable plant subcontractors to undertake work theretofore performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors; (3) to finance the cost of facilities for the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy; or (4) to finance the cost of facilities for the production, transmission, or distribution of gas (natural, manufactured, or mixed).

"TITLE III—ADMINISTRATION

"Local Development Districts—Certification

"Sec. 301. For the purposes of this Act, a 'local development district' shall be an entity certified to the Commission either by the Governor of the State or States in which such entity is located, or by the State officer designated by the appropriate State law to make such certification, as having a charter or authority that includes the economic development of counties or parts of counties or other political subdivisions within the region. No entity shall be certified as a local development district for the purposes of this Act unless it is one of the following:

"(1) a nonprofit incorporated body organized or chartered under the law of the State in which it is located;

"(2) a nonprofit agency or instrumentality of a State or local government;

"(3) a nonprofit agency or instrumentality created through an interstate compact; or

"(4) a nonprofit association or combination of such bodies, agencies, and instrumentalities.

"Grants for Administrative Expenses of Local Development Districts and for Research and Demonstration Projects

"Sec. 302. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized—

"(1) either directly or through arrangements with the Commission, to make grants for administrative expenses to local development districts. The amount of any such grant shall not exceed 75 per centum of such expenses in any one fiscal year. No grants for administrative expenses shall be made to a local development district for a period in excess of three years beginning on the date the initial grant is made to such development district. The local contributions for administrative expenses may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services; and

"(2) either directly or through arrangements with appropriate public or private organizations (including the Commission), to provide funds for investigation, research, studies, and demonstration projects, but not for construction purposes, which will further the purposes of this Act.

"(b) Recipients of Federal assistance under the provisions of this section shall, in accordance with regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce, maintain accurate and complete records of transactions and activities financed with Federal funds and report thereon to the Secretary of Commerce. The records of the recipient shall be available for audit with respect to such grants by the Secretary of Commerce and the Comptroller General, or their duly authorized representatives.

"(c) Not to exceed $5,500,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"Project Approval

"Sec. 303. An application for a grant or for any other assistance for a program or project under this Act shall be made only by a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a local development district. Each such application shall be made through the State member of the Commission representing such applicant, and such State member shall evaluate such application for approval. Only applications for programs and projects which are approved by a State member as meeting the requirements for assistance under the Act shall be approved for assistance by the Commission.

"Annual Report

"Sec. 304. Not later than six months after the close of each fiscal year, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Governor of each State in the region and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on the activities carried out under this Act during such year.

"TITLE IV—APPROPRIATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Authorization of Appropriations

"Sec. 401. In addition to the appropriations authorized in section 201 for the Appalachian development highway system, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the period ending June 30, 1967, to be available until expended, not to exceed $252,400,000 to carry out this Act.

"Applicable Labor Standards

"SEC. 402. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction, alteration, or repair, including painting and decorating, of projects, buildings, and works which are financially assisted through the Federal funds authorized under this Act, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267, 5 U.S.C. 133—133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

"Definition of Appalachian Region

"SEC. 403. As used in this Act, the term 'Appalachian region' or 'the region' means that area of the eastern United States consisting of the following counties (including any political subdivision located within such area):

"In Alabama, the counties of Bibb, Blount, Calhoun, Chambers, Cherokee, Chilton, Clay, Cleburne, Colbert, Coosa, Cullman, De Kalb, Elmore, Etowah, Fayette, Franklin, Jackson, Jefferson, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Limestone, Madison, Marion, Marshall, Morgan, Randolph, Saint Clair, Shelby, Talladega, Tallapoosa, Tuscaloosa, Walker, and Winston;

"In Georgia, the counties of Banks, Barrow, Bartow, Carroll, Catoosa, Chattooga, Cherokee, Dade, Dawson, Douglas, Fannin, Floyd, Forsyth, Franklin, Gilmer, Gordon, Gwinnett, Habersham, Hall, Haralson, Heard, Jackson, Lumpkin, Madison, Murray, Paulding, Pickens, Polk, Rabun, Stephens, Towns, Union, Walker, White, and Whitfield;

"In Kentucky, the counties of Adair, Bath, Bell, Boyd, Breathitt, Carter, Casey, Clark, Clay, Clinton, Cumberland, Elliott, Estill, Fleming, Floyd, Garrard, Green, Greenup, Harlan, Jackson, Johnson, Knott, Knox, Laurel, Lawrence, Lee, Leslie, Letcher, Lewis, Lincoln, McCreary, Madison, Magoffin, Martin, Menifee, Monroe, Montgomery, Morgan, Owsley, Perry, Pike, Powell, Pulaski, Rockcastle, Rowan, Russell, Wayne, Whitley, and Wolfe;

"In Maryland, the counties of Allegany, Garrett, and Washington;

"In North Carolina, the counties of Alexander, Alleghany, Ashe, Avery, Buncombe, Burke, Caldwell, Cherokee, Clay, Davie, Forsyth, Graham, Haywood, Henderson, Jackson, McDowell, Macon, Madison, Mitchell, Polk, Rutherford, Stokes, Surry, Swain, Transylvania, Watauga, Wilkes, Yadkin, and Yancey;

"In Ohio, the counties of Adams, Athens, Belmont, Brown, Carroll, Clermount, Coshocton, Gallia, Guernsey, Harrison, Highland, Hocking, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lawrence, Meigs, Monroe, Morgan, Muskingum, Noble, Perry, Pike, Ross, Scioto, Tuscarawas, Vinton, and Washington;

"In Pennsylvania, the counties of Allegheny, Armstrong, Beaver, Bedford, Blair, Bradford, Butler, Cambria, Cameron, Carbon, Centre, Clarion, Clearfield, Clinton, Columbia, Crawford, Elk, Erie, Fayette, Forest, Fulton, Greene, Huntingdon, Indiana, Jefferson, Juniata, Lackawanna, Lawrence, Luzerne, Lycoming, McKean, Mercer, Mifflin, Monroe, Montour, Northumberland, Perry, Pike, Potter, Schuylkill, Snyder, Somerset, Sullivan, Susquehanna, Tioga, Union, Venango, Warren, Washington, Wayne, Westmoreland, and Wyoming.

"In South Carolina, the counties of Anderson, Cherokee, Greenville, Oconee, Pickens, and Spartanburg;

"In Tennessee, the counties of Anderson, Bledsoe, Blount, Bradley, Campbell, Carter, Claiborne, Clay, Cocke, Coffee, Cumberland, De Kalb, Fentress, Franklin, Grainger, Greene, Grundy, Hamblen, Hamilton, Hancock, Hawkins, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Loudon, McMinn, Macon, Marion, Meigs, Monroe, Morgan, Overton, Pickett, Polk, Putnam, Rhea, Roane, Scott, Sequatchie, Sevier, Smith, Sullivan, Unicoi, Union, Van Buren, Warren, Washington, and White;

"In Virginia, the counties of Alleghany, Bath, Bland, Botetourt, Buchanan, Carroll, Craig, Dickenson, Floyd, Giles, Grayson, Highland, Lee, Pulaski, Russell, Scott, Smyth, Tazewell, Washington, Wise, and Wythe.

"All the counties of West Virginia.

"Severability

"SEC. 404. If any provision of this Act, or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"Termination

"SEC. 405. This Act shall cease to be in effect on July 1, 1971."

AMENDMENT NO. 12

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk for printing an amendment to the pending bill, and I also ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table; and, without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

On page 44, between lines 22 and 23, insert a new section as follows:

"LIMITATION

"SEC. 404. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds authorized in this Act, other than those authorized in section 201, shall be expended for any program or project except to the extent such program or project is carried out in a "redevelopment area", designated as such by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. With respect to funds authorized in section 201, in the case of areas covered by this Act which are not designated "redevelopment areas", Federal funds shall be furnished on the same basis as in the case of all other areas not so designated."

On page 44, line 24, in lieu of "Sec. 404." insert "SEC. 405.".

On page 45, line 5, in lieu of "Sec. 405." insert "SEC. 406.".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, first I commend the fine statement of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]. It was my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Public Works in the last session of Congress; and also it was my privilege to serve on that committee with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia at the time the first Appalachia bill was considered and reported to the Senate. I regret very much that, in good conscience, I had to vote against that bill when it passed out of the committee to the Senate floor last year. One of the reasons why I voted against it was the failure of the committee to accept any amendments to the bill. The amendment I have just sent to the desk is substantially like an amendment I filed last year.

If I might have the attention of the Senator from West Virginia, I would appreciate it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I certainly want to give my attention to my majority leader and also to my friend from Iowa. It is a little difficult to do both at the same time. But I am very happy to direct my attention to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. If anyone can do it, the Senator from West Virginia is able to do it. I should like to discuss the amendment and make a few comments, and I shall certainly welcome the reaction of the Senator from West Virginia.

What prompted my interest in filing an amendment like this one last year was the revelation in the minority views of the House report that many of the counties embraced in the Appalachia area, and specifically listed in the bill now under consideration, are not "distressed" counties at all. They are in just as good financial and economic condition as many other counties throughout the country. It seemed to me that to include them in the Appalachia area coverage for special treatment constituted rather unfortunate, discriminatory consideration.

Granted that many of the counties, and perhaps most of the counties, embraced by the bill are, in fact, counties which are suffering from a below-average economic condition, my amendment merely provides that only the counties listed in the bill which are, in fact, "distressed" counties be given preferential treatment. Those counties which are not "distressed" will not receive preferential treatment.

The minority views contained in the House report last year, which the minority in the Senate adopted as its views, stated:

> The highway program contained in the bill—which comprises almost 80 percent of the money authorization in the bill—is particularly discriminatory against other portions of the country, for it authorizes an additional highway program for the Appalachian region almost as large as the annual program for construction of Federal aid primary and secondary highways and their urban extensions in all of the 50 States, plus Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, including Appalachia.

This particular part of the bill is title II, starting on page 13, section 201. It seemed to me that if we were going to agree to an amendment which would make sure that only those counties which are in fact distressed counties would receive preferential treatment under this bill, the best place to start is the section that involves 80 percent of the program, and that is section 201.

My amendment provides that, notwithstanding any other provision of the bill, no funds authorized in this bill, other than those authorized in section 201, which relates to the highways, shall be expended for any program or project except to the extent that such program or project is carried out in a redevelopment area, designated as such by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act defines such areas. And it is quite clear from reading section 5 that they must be distress-type areas in fact.

I ask unanimous consent that section 5 of the Public Law 87-27, 87th Congress, S. 1, May 1, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

Standards

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall designate as "redevelopment areas" those areas within the United States in which he determines, upon the basis of standards generally comparable with those set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2), that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. There shall be included among the areas so designated any area—

(1) where the Secretary of Labor finds that the rate of unemployment, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 per centum or more and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in paragraph (2); and

(2) where the Secretary of Labor finds that the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least—

(A) 50 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

(B) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

(C) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years.

The Secretary of Labor shall find the facts and provide the data to be used by the Secretary in making the determinations required by this subsection.

(b) The Secretary shall also designate as "redevelopment areas" those areas (including Indian reservations) within the United States which do not meet the requirements set forth in subsection (a) but which he determines are among the highest in numbers and percentages of low-income families, and in which there exists a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection and before extending any financial assistance as the result of designations under this subsection, the Secretary shall, by regulation, prescribe detailed standards upon which the designations under this subsection shall be based. In the formulation of such standards the Secretary shall consider, among other relevant factors, the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are of the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the families in each such area to the general levels of income in the United States, the extent to which "rural development" projects have previously been located in any such area under programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, the availability of manpower in each such area for supplemental employment, the extent of migration out of the area, and the proportion of the population of each such area which has been receiving public assistance from the Federal Government or from the State or States in which such area is located or from any municipality therein. In making the designations under this subsection, the Secretary shall endeavor to distribute the projects widely among the several States, so far as is feasible and proper, in order that actual experience with this program may be had in as many States and in as many areas and under as many different circumstances as possible. In making these determinations the Secretary shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

(c) Upon the request of the Secretary, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and such other heads of agencies as may be appropriate are authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Secretary such data as the Secretary may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in subsection (b) of this section. The Secretary shall reimburse when appropriate, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Secretary as a redevelopment area.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I said that none of the counties which cannot qualify as "distressed" counties would be allowed to receive any preferential treatment under this amendment except with respect to section 201. That is the highway section. With respect to that section, my amendment does enable such "nondistressed" counties to receive some assistance. The amendment provides that Federal funds shall be furnished to those particular counties which are not "distress" counties, but only on the same basis as in the case of other areas in the country not so designated.

There is a reason for permitting "nondistressed" counties to come in under this bill, at least to the extent that I have provided. I can understand how there might be three counties in a row through which a highway program should be advanced. The upper county and the lower county are distress counties. The middle county is a county that is in a reasonably good economic condition, and can not qualify as a "distress" county. In order to develop this program, we would have to have the highway go through all three counties. My amendment would provide that we would permit the highway to go through all three counties, but that the middle county, which is not a "distress" county, shall not receive any more Federal aid on this highway program than any other county enjoying a similar economic position in some other part of the country. I do not think this is an unreasonable provision.

Some say that to single out Appalachia with its distressed counties alone is discriminatory with respect to other areas of the country. The majority views contained in the committee report deny that. But perhaps it can be argued that there is a certain amount of preferential treatment involved.

I would hope that the committee, and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, would not push this preferential treatment to the extent of including counties which are not "distress" counties at all, and would not undertake to give such counties just as much benefit and just as much coverage under the bill as the "distress" counties.

We pointed out in our minority views last year a table of the counties which shows that 67 of the 355 Appalachian counties are not even eligible for grants under the Accelerated Public Works Act. That indicates a good share of such counties are, by the nature of things, not qualified for this type of preferential treatment by Congress.

I recognize that the highway program is a large part of this program, and that in order to have a coordinated program, we must build a highway through counties that are not "distress" counties, but are at least average or above average in economic growth.

My amendment is designed to permit this to be done, with the provision, however, that the Federal assistance for highways in such "nondistressed" counties be on exactly the same basis as it would be in counties anywhere else in the United States which are not "distressed" counties.

I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia to comment on this point. The Senator knows that I value his opinion most highly. He is a most dedicated, hard-working Senator. He is not the kind of person to seek preferential treatment without reason. I want the Senator to know that this amendment is being offered in the utmost of good faith. It is not designed to harm the program. It is designed to make sure that the money, which will be considerable—that goes into the Appalachian region will go only or at least primarily to "distressed" counties.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I thank my able colleague, who shared membership with me on the Committee on Public Works prior to the 89th Congress. Sometimes I wish that he were still on the committee so that he would be able to assist me. The Senator is most constructive in his approach.

However, I remember times when he has offered, not one amendment, but so many amendments to legislation which was being considered in the committee that it caused me some discomfort and some concern.

Mr. MILLER. Even to the extent that the Senator believed that in good conscience he had to accept one or two of them on occasion.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, this is not an area redevelopment bill. This is a regional development bill. It has program criteria, rather than what we designate in the ARA as county eligibility criteria. The amendment which is being discussed by the Senator from Iowa would reject this regional concept. That concept is the heart of the proposed legislation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to make it abundantly clear that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa does not reject this concept at all. The amendment was meticulously drawn so that the concept would be preserved, not only with respect to the distressed counties, but also with respect to other counties—of which there must be at least 70—which could not possibly qualify as distressed counties.

All this amendment proposes is to provide that, while preserving the concept, the money goes to the "distressed counties," as far as singling them out for preferential treatment is concerned. But the money that goes to the nondistressed counties cannot be on any other basis than money going to other nondistressed counties in other areas.

I repeat that I am not attempting by this amendment to destroy the concept. I am trying to preserve the concept.

I say to my friend the Senator from West Virginia, that when I first started looking into this matter, I had an amendment drafted that would have precluded any aid whatsoever to any nondistressed county under this bill. But, after consulting some of the members of the committee, including the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I was persuaded that the major portion of this program would deal with highways, and that we cannot have a highway program and say that we shall have a checkerboard approach. We must consider the entire area.

So I want to preserve it. I simply do not want the county in the middle, to use the example I used earlier, to have any better treatment than any other county that is enjoying equal economic prosperity.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I was about to say, when the Senator asked to be recognized again, and rightly so, that the amendment the Senator is discussing recognizes the intercounty concept of the nature of our highway construction. He also knows full well that streams do not stop at county lines, and he knows that bad health conditions do not abruptly end at county lines. He knows that the treatment of what we call watersheds must embrace multicounty areas. One of the major conceptional differences between this bill and the ARA program is the establishment of multicounty development districts. I do not see how you could eliminate some 70 counties from the provisions of the bill and retain these districts.

I point out that, in my opinion, the amendment, if it is to be offered, should not be agreed to by the Senate.

I call attention to the program development criteria contained in section 224, on page 36 of the bill, in which it is stated:

> (1) the relationship of the project or class of projects to overall regional development including its location in an area determined by the State * * *

It could be determined to have a potential growth or a significant potential for growth.

This is a question for determination by a State. Would the Senator think that might be a reasonable assumption?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, indeed. I have no difficulty with this approach at all. All I want to do is to make sure that when we go into this area, a county which is enjoying average or better than average economic prosperity will put up the money it would have to put up if it were located in Iowa or Nebraska or any other State because it happens to be enjoying average or above average economic prosperity.

So far as the watershed program is concerned, we have many millions of dollars going into watershed programs which are completely unrelated, so far as the law is concerned, to the pending legislation. If there is a watershed program and a distressed county needs some money, it can obtain money under this bill. If it happens to tie into a nondistressed county, it could obtain money from the watershed program. So I do not see that the area approach would be jeopardized at all.

Mr. RANDOLPH. If the amendment were offered and adopted it might cut off one of the counties where there was a growth potential. I would not want that to happen. It could happen.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps I have misread the purpose of the legislation, but as I understand it, we are interested in growth potentials of areas enjoying below average economic prosperity.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Sometimes the economically healthy county can be the magnet to draw the less economically healthy counties into development programs. It may be the anchor county which is vital to the success of an entire program of a developmental district.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator may have a point, but the only trouble is that that point was rejected by the Congress and the President when the area redevelopment program was adopted. At that time we refused to recognize the polarization theory with respect to above average counties. I voted against the Area Redevelopment Act because I found provisions in it which I felt would be inequitably applied.

I believe the thrust of the Appalachia program, certainly from the press reports and reading the majority report on the bill, is that we are trying to reach the low economic average areas and give them vitality so that they will grow. We are not talking about wealthy counties or average economic areas. We are talking about below average economic counties. Without that we would not have the bill. I cannot understand why this program could not be carried out by concentrating on the distressed areas.

So far as the unique money treatment is concerned, let the other counties which are enjoying normal prosperity do just as any other normal county has to do so far as the Federal Treasury is concerned. I presume there would be a great incentive for other counties, if they saw the Federal Treasury putting great amounts of money into marginal or below-average counties adjacent to them.

I hope the Senator will study the amendment, because my amendment is not designed to draw the teeth from the bill. It is not designed to harm the bill. But it is hard for me to tell people living in counties which, unfortunately, are below average economically, and who yet are still paying taxes, that we are expending some of their tax money—not for a county which is in a similar economic condition, but for a county which is enjoying economic prosperity.

That is what will happen if the bill passes in its present form.

I thank the Senator for yielding. I hope he will think hard and deeply on this amendment, because I know he is a most conscientious person. I hope he will study it in the full realization that the amendment is designed to be constructive and helpful.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall give it thoughtful consideration. It was a matter of concern last year. It was a matter of study again this year. I am grateful for the contribution the Senator has made to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MILLER. If the amendment cannot be accepted, I will probably ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Would the Senator like a vote on it now?

Mr. MILLER. I understand that there is a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the bill at 2 o'clock Monday.

Mr. RANDOLPH. At 3 o'clock.

Mr. MILLER. At 3 o'clock next Monday. Many Senators are absent. There was some sort of gentleman's agreement that there would not be rollcalls this afternoon. My amendment is not printed. I would much prefer to have my amendment printed and on the desks of Senators before I ask for a rollcall, but I wanted an opportunity to have a brief discussion on it before any rollcall on my amendment on Monday before the Senate reached the point of voting on the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I hope it will be a very brief discussion, because possibly there will be many votes on Monday. The distinguished majority leader said last evening that he did not desire to inconvenience any Senator, but it was never indicated that there would be no rollcalls today.

Mr. MILLER. I realize that nothing has been stated on this point. I hope the Senator will understand that if there is to be a yea-and-nay vote this afternoon, in fairness to the Senate, it should be on amendments printed and on the desk rather than on an amendment which I have just submitted, which will not be printed and on the desk until Monday next. I had intended to develop my remarks this afternoon so that if there is to be a yea-and-nay vote on Monday, these remarks will be in the RECORD.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct. Senators could read the colloquy between the two Senators.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The statement by the Senator from Iowa could be made, it would seem to me, in a few minutes, prior to the yea-and-nay vote, if it were to be laid over until Monday until his amendment is printed.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from West Virginia has my assurance that my comments will be brief. I hope, however, that he understands why the amendment should be printed and lie over until Monday.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I understand.

Mr. MILLER. Especially when other amendments are printed now.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator has made a reasonable request, and I thank him.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as was true a year ago, I have listened very carefully to the discussion and explanation offered to the Senate by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Last year, I voted in support of the creation of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. I have every intention of voting in support of the Appalachian Regional Development Act which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] again presents to the Senate. It is not alone that the facts are compelling and persuasive, but because of the effective style and manner of presentation by the Senator in charge of the bill, which lend additional support to the position I intend to take.

I have carefully read the Senate report on S. 3. I am delighted to see in the committee report a statement which I know is the opinion of the Senator from West Virginia, that—

> The committee is aware of the economic conditions in the Ozark Mountain area, in the upper Great Lakes region, and in pockets of poverty of varying size elsewhere in the United States.

The committee report goes on to advise that the administration intends to promptly request congressional action for dealing with regional problems in other areas.

The committee confirms what all of us interested in other regions have established by informal conversation with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], that the committee intends to give early consideration to other regional development problems.

Incidentally, I share the attitude expressed by the committee report, that merely because there are other areas of concern with acute need is no reason to reject the proposal now before the Senate.

In addition, I am delighted that my senior colleague from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, introduced yesterday the bill which now bears Senate No. 812.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Do I correctly understand that not only has the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] presented the bill with other cosponsors, but also that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] has joined as a cosponsor?

Mr. HART. I was delighted to support the bill introduced by my colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], to the extent of becoming a cosponsor to lend it any support it might need; but his own standing and experience in this area and his position on the committee, I believe, speak eloquently about all that needs to be said on the subject. However, it does represent a further response to the expressions of concern by those of us who represent regions which are comparable in many respects to Appalachia.

Today, therefore, I believe that it would be useful, even though briefly, to outline a proposal that was made to the Committee on Public Works by several of us representing such a region—namely, the region of the upper Great Lakes.

Last week, when the Committee on Public Works held hearings on S. 3, it was my privilege to appear before the subcommittee of which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is chairman, to present a proposal which was in the form of a suggested amendment. On behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the two Senators from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Mondale], our amendment proposed the creation, on enactment of the Appalachia Act, of an Upper Great Lakes Development Act of 1965.

Although the members of the committee stated their genuine concern for the problems of the area and, as I have indicated, their intention to come to grips with the problems, it has not seen fit, at this time, to report the amendment.

For this reason, I believe that it would be desirable there be some discussion of the need for additional regional authorities able to move expeditiously on the economic revitalization of regions, such as that in Appalachia, which have been bypassed by the general prosperity of the Nation.

The sponsors of the upper Great Lakes proposal believe that economic distress within this 80-county area of northern Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota can best be relieved by coordinated regional action. We believe further that Federal and State assistance aimed at bringing new economic life to these communities and their people can best be channeled through such regional action.

At this stage, our proposal does not contemplate major public works expenditures. We are concerned with the establishment of a regional authority with adequate powers and resources to assist in the training, resource development, and public works planning that will be necessary to bring to our upper Great Lakes communities the full benefits of expanding and viable economic growth.

We speak for a region with unemployment that has averaged some 20 percent higher than the unemployment rate of Appalachia.

We speak of a region where depletion of some of the natural resources have left many of the same problems that we find in Appalachia. This is an area of closed iron mines, underutilized timber resources, inadequate highways, and remoteness; but where there is also great potential for recreation and the fuller utilization of the timber, low grade iron, water resources, and human resources of the region.

Much preparation, much thought, and much groundwork has occured on which we argue that we now should find Congress reacting to the preliminary studies and recommendations. We feel that Congress should include in its legislative program this session, the enactment, along with the Appalachia bill, of our proposal for an Upper Great Lakes Development Authority.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with local development groups, State resource agencies, and many private interests, has held conferences and maintained a continuing liaison between private and public agencies within this region. In 1963, highlighted by President Kennedy's speech, an inclusive conference was held in Duluth. The need for regional cooperation and coordination was manifest.

Today, Mr. President, those of us who propose this amendment do not wish to stand in the way of legislative action on Appalachia. We are grateful for the tremendously important groundwork that has been laid by the congressional Members from the Appalachian States over these several years, culminating in the approaching vote in the Senate, which I have every confidence will support the recommendations with respect to Appalachia.

We believe that an Appalachian type authority is an important pilot undertaking that will help other regions draw on its work and experience. We are hopeful that quick and expeditious committee hearings will be held on specific proposals, such as ours, so that another year will not pass while we wait for efficient and effective regional action.

We have noted the encouraging report that funds will be allocated for assisting with regional development programs in the new ARA authorization. But there are still unanswered questions—questions to which it is essential we have answers if a useful and effective program of regional development is to be undertaken.

Included in these questions, of course, would be the concern as to whether there will be administration support for additional regional authorities and Federal-State organizations. Will this be the main vehicles for channeling Federal assistance for roads and the public roads into coordinated regional development?

We believe we have some of the answers that best fit this 80-county region in our proposal for the Upper Great Lakes Authority. We are hopeful that when this later proposal comes to the Senate it will receive support from Members of the Senate who represent Appalachian States and are today receiving the support of those of us who have equal concern for our remote areas.

Finally, Mr. President, so that the Record may be clear on the amendment for an Upper Great Lakes Regional Development Act that was considered in the Public Works Committee, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a copy of the amendment, a section-by-section summary and tables which accompanied my testimony, and which outline some of the persuasive reasons why this 80-county area in the northern portions of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota should be the next region on which Congress acts.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On page 1 strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"CHAPTER 1—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"Short title

"Section 1. This chapter may be cited as the 'Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965', and all references in this chapter to the words 'this Act' shall be held to refer to 'this chapter'."

At the end of the bill add the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 2—UPPER GREAT LAKES REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"Title V—Short title and statement of purpose

"Short Title

"Sec. 501. This chapter may be cited as the 'Upper Great Lakes Regional Development Act of 1965'.

"Findings and Statement of Purpose

"Sec. 502. As a result of changes in the nature of its resource base and changing requirements of the national economy, the upper Great Lakes region of the United States lags behind the Nation in its economic growth, and its people have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity. The region's historical reliance on the extractive industries of metals mining and lumbering has resulted in depletion of its high grade natural resources, and it has not found the means to adapt fully to the exploitation of its lower grade resources. Upgrading the human and natural resources and their uses, and development of the region's recreation potential are prerequisites for vigorous and self-sustaining growth. Such a needed revitalization can come only through extensive participation by State and local authorities along with the Federal Government in implementing development programs tailored to the needs and resources of the region. Congress recognizes that a large body of research by Federal, State, and private organizations has established the feasibility, the desirability, and the urgent need for regionwide development. It is, therefore, the purpose of this chapter to assist the region in meeting its special problems, to promote economic development, and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward making the adaptations and advances essential to growth on a coordinated and concerted basis. As the region obtains the needed technologies and infrastructure and the requisite human resources to guide and operate its new activities, Congress expects that the region will then be able to participate more effectively in the national free enterprise economy.

"Title VI—The Upper Great Lakes Development Authority

"Membership and Voting

"Sec. 601. (a) The Upper Great Lakes Development Authority (referred to as the 'Authority') shall be composed of seven members, four appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and three appointed by the Governors of the States, one from each participating State. No member of the Authority shall be the holder of a full-time public office in either State or Federal Government. Of the Presidential appointments, one shall be made from each of the participating States; the fourth shall be at the discretion of the President and shall serve as Chairman and full-time executive officer of the Authority.

"(b) Decisions by the Authority, unless delegated to the Chairman, shall require the affirmative vote of the Chairman and three others.

"(c) The Chairman shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. There shall be a Deputy Chairman appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the Authority, who shall serve as his alternate and who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and when not serving as an alternate for the Chairman shall perform such duties as are delegated to him by the Chairman. Other members of the Authority shall receive compensation at a rate of $75 per diem for each day on which they are engaged in the performance of duties of the Authority, and shall be reimbursed by the Authority for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"Functions of the Authority

"Sec. 602. In carrying out the purposes of this chapter the Authority shall—

"(1) develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs, including those for land use and public works, and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region;

"(2) conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including where necessary, inventory and analysis of the resources of the region, and, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth;

"(3) review and study, in cooperation with the agency involved, Federal, State, and local public and private programs and, where appropriate, recommend modifications or additions which will increase their effectiveness in the region and assist in their financing;

"(4) formulate and recommend, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and work with State and local agencies in developing appropriate model legislation;

"(5) support existing local development districts and encourage their formation where needed by providing technical assistance and participating in the financing of professional staff and administration;

"(6) encourage private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects;

"(7) serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Federal, State, and local programs in the region;

"(8) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and establish and utilize, as appropriate, citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences; and

"(9) formulate for the Congress a program of development projects with proposals for Federal participation in their funding.

"Administrative Powers of the Authority

"Sec. 603. To carry out its duties under this chapter, the Authority is authorized to—

"(1) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its functions;

"(2) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Authority to carry out its functions, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949;

"(3) request the head of any Federal department or agency (who is hereby so authorized) to detail to temporary duty with the Authority such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as the Authority may need for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status;

"(4) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

"(5) accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

"(6) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation;

"(7) establish a permanent office at such location as it may select and field offices at such other places as it may deem appropriate; and

"(8) take such other actions and incur such other expenses as may be necessary or appropriate.

"Title VII—Special programs for upper Great Lakes region

"Natural Resource Development

"Sec. 701. (a) In order to promote the conservation and fuller utilization of the natural resources of the region, the Authority is authorized to contract with or make grants to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, any State or political subdivision, agency or instrumentality thereof, any public or private educational institution or any private research organization to carry on basic and applied research on improving techniques for extracting, processing, transporting, and marketing of such resources.

"(b) Not to exceed $3,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 801 of this chapter shall be available to carry out this section.

"Training Assistance

"Sec. 702. (a) In order to assure continuing and orderly planning and implementation of economic development programs within the region, the Authority is authorized to award fellowships for graduate study in resource development, industrial development, community development, area economic planning, economic and physical planning, and such other areas of study as the Authority determines will carry out the purposes of this chapter.

"(b) Not to exceed $500,000 of the funds authorized in section 801 of this chapter shall be available to carry out this section.

"Recreational Development: Lake Superior Scenic Highway

"Sec. 703. (a) In order to develop and coordinate the recreational resources of the region, the Authority, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall prepare detailed plans for a scenic highway in the region to be known as the Lake Superior Scenic Highway. Such plans shall include land use planning in the impact areas of the highway with emphasis on sites for recreational development and provision for the control over the use of such sites.

"(b) Not to exceed $2,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 801 of this chapter shall be available to carry out this section, of which 10 per centum shall be available for the land use planning referred to in subsection (a) of this section.

"Local Development Districts: Certification, Financial Assistance

"Sec. 704. (a) For the purpose of this chapter, a 'local development district' shall be an entity certified to the Authority either by the Governor of the State or States in which such entity is located, or by the State officer designated by the appropriate State law to make such certification, as having a charter or authority that includes the economic development of counties or parts of counties or other political subdivisions within the region. No entity shall be certified as a local development district for the purposes of this Act unless it is one of the following:

"(1) A nonprofit incorporated body organized or chartered under the law of the State in which it is located;

"(2) A nonprofit agency or instrumentality of a State or local government;

"(3) A nonprofit agency or instrumentality created through an interstate compact; or

"(4) A nonprofit association or combination of such bodies, agencies, and instrumentalities.

"(b) The Authority is authorized to make grants to certified local development districts for the costs of technical staff and consultant assistance to such districts. The amount of any such grant shall not exceed 90 per centum of such costs in any one fiscal year. The Authority may delegate staff members to assist certified local development districts to prepare requests for grants under this section.

"(c) Not to exceed $2,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 801 of this chapter shall be available to carry out this section.

"Title VIII—Miscellaneous

"Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 801. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the period ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $10,000,000 to carry out this chapter, and for fiscal years thereafter such amounts as the Congress shall hereafter authorize.

"Annual Report

"SEC. 802. Not later than six months after the close of each fiscal year, the Authority shall prepare and submit to the Governor of each State in the region and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on the activities carried out under this chapter during such year.

"Consent of States

"SEC. 803. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be interpreted as requiring any State to engage in or accept any program under this chapter without its consent.

"Definition of Upper Great Lakes Region

"SEC. 804. As used in this chapter, the term 'Upper Great Lakes region' or the 'region' means that area of the midwestern United States consisting of the following counties (including any political subdivision located within such area):

"In Minnesota—Aitkin, Beltrami, Carlton, Cass, Clearwater, Cook, Crow Wing, Hubbard, Itasca, Koochiching, Lake, Lake of the Woods, Pine, Roseau, St. Louis, and Wadena;

"In Wisconsin—Ashland, Bayfield, Burnett, Douglas, Florence, Forest, Iron, Langlade, Lincoln, Marinette, Menominee, Oconto, Oneida, Price, Rusk, Sawyer, Taylor, Vilas, and Washburn;

"In Michigan—Alcona, Alger, Alpena, Antrim, Arenac, Baraga, Benzie, Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Chippewa, Clare, Crawford, Delta, Dickinson, Emmet, Gladwin, Gogebic, Grand Traverse, Houghton, Iosco, Iron, Kalkaska, Keweenaw, Lake, Leelanau, Luce, Mackinac, Manistee, Marquette, Mason, Mecosta, Menominee, Missaukee, Montmorency, Newaygo, Oceana, Ogemaw, Ontonagon, Osceola, Oscoda, Otsego, Presque Isle, Roscommon, Schoolcraft, and Wexford."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian Region and to provide the planning and coordination needed to assist the economic development of the Upper Great Lakes region."

UPPER GREAT LAKES REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT PRESENTED AS AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO S. 3

TITLE V—SHORT TITLE AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Section 501: The short title of this chapter shall be "Upper Great Lakes Regional Development Act of 1965."

Section 502 sets forth the findings that the upper Great Lakes region lags behind the Nation in economic growth as a result of changes in the nature of its resource base and the requirements of the Nation's economy, and that revitalization can come only through extensive participation by State and local authorities along with the Federal Government in implementing development programs tailored to the region. The purpose of this chapter is to promote the economic development of the region and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts to this end.

TITLE VI—UPPER GREAT LAKES DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Section 601 establishes the Upper Great Lakes Development Authority to be composed of seven members, four appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and three appointed by the Governors of the States, one from each State. Of the Presidential appointments, one shall be from each State, and the fourth to be at the discretion of the President shall serve as Chairman. Decisions of the Authority shall be by vote of the Chairman and three others.

Section 602: The functions of the Authority shall be: (1) To develop comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs and priorities, including those for land use and public works; (2) conduct and sponsor investigations, research and studies, and in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects to foster regional growth; (3) review, study, recommend modifications of, and additions to, Federal, State, and local public and private programs; (4) formulate and recommend interstate compacts and other forms of intertsate cooperation; (5) encourage the formation of, and support existing, local development districts with technical assistance and financing of staff and administration; (6) encourage private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects; (7) serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Federal, State, and local programs; (8) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions; and (9) formulate for the Congress a program of development projects with proposals for Federal participation in their funding.

Section 603 sets forth the administrative powers of the Authority.

TITLE VII—SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR UPPER GREAT LAKES REGION

Section 701 authorizes the Authority to contract with or make grants to any agency of the United States, any agency of any State or local government, any public or private educational institution, or any private research organization to carry on basic and applied research on improving techniques for extracting, processing, transporting, and marketing of the natural resources of the region, and makes available $3 million for this purpose.

Section 702 authorizes the Authority to award fellowships for graduate study in resource development, industrial development, community development, area economic planning, economic and physical planning, and other areas determined by the Authority, and makes available $500,000 for this purpose.

Section 703 authorizes the Authority, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, to prepare detailed plans for a Lake Superior Scenic Highway, including land use planning with emphasis on sites for recreational development, and makes available $2 million for this purpose, 10 percent of which shall be available for land use planning.

Section 704 authorizes the Authority to make grants to certified local development districts for not more than 90 percent of the costs of technical staff and consultant assistance to such districts, and makes available $2 million for this purpose.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 801 authorizes $10 million to be appropriated for fiscal year 1966 to carry out the purposes of this chapter.

Section 802 directs the Authority to prepare annual reports on its activities to be submitted to the Governors of the States and to the President for transmittal to the Congress.

Section 803 stipulates that no State shall be required to engage in any program under this chapter without its consent.

Section 804 defines the upper Great Lakes region as those 80 counties in the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan set forth in this section.

SEVENTY-NINE COUNTIES IN THE UPPER GREAT LAKES REGION—MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, AND WISCONSIN

TABLE I.—*Percent employed in selected occupations, 1960*

Occupation	79 counties	45 counties in Michigan	16 counties in Minnesota	18 counties in Wisconsin
All employed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture	10.8	8.1	9.9	17.7
Forests and fisheries	.5	.5	.5	.7
Mining	8.7	5.7	10.7	1.0
Construction	6.0	7.1	5.3	5.0
Manufacturing	20.4	22.6	15.7	22.5
Entertainment and recreation	.7	.7	.7	.6
Eating and drinking places	3.6	3.5	3.0	4.4
Retailing (except food)	9.6	10.0	9.4	9.0
All other	39.7	41.8	44.8	39.1

TABLE II.—*Land area and population*

	Land area		Population				
	Square miles	Percent of United States	Total, 1960	Percent of United States, 1960	Total, 1950	Percent of United States, 1950	Percent change, 1950-60
United States	3,548,974	100.0	179,323,175	100.0	150,697,361	100.0	18.5
Total, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin	191,733	5.4	15,188,835	8.5	12,788,824	8.5	18.8
79 counties, upper Great Lakes	81,282	2.3	1,472,885	.8	1,455,899	1.0	1.2
Percent of 3 State area		42.4		9.7		11.4	
Michigan	57,019	1.6	7,823,194	4.4	6,371,766	4.2	22.8
45 counties	32,793	50.9	696,202	.4	690,049	10.5	.9
Percent of Michigan		57.5		8.9		10.8	
Minnesota	80,009	2.3	3,413,864	1.9	2,982,483	2.0	14.5
16 counties	30,719	.9	478,531	.3	449,354	.3	6.5
Percent of Minnesota		38.4		14.0		15.1	
Wisconsin	54,705	1.5	3,951,777	2.2	3,434,575	2.3	15.1
18 counties	17,770	.5	298,142	.2	316,496	.2	−5.8
Percent of Wisconsin		32.5		7.5		9.2	

TABLE III.—*Employment and the labor force*

	Employed			Unemployed				Civilian labor force		
	1960	1950	Percent change, 1950–60	1960	1950	Percent change, 1950–60	Percent of labor force 1950–60	1960	1950	Percent change, 1950–60
United States	64, 668, 731	56, 239, 449	15.0	3, 475, 348	2, 832, 206	22.7	5.1	68, 144, 079	59, 071, 655	15.4
Total, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin	5, 430, 312	4, 892, 729	11.0	326, 723	219, 481	48.9	5.7	5, 757, 085	5, 112, 210	12.6
79 counties, upper Great Lakes	461, 503	479, 891	−3.8	45, 038	32, 418	38.9	8.9	506, 571	512, 311	−1.1
Michigan	2, 728, 154	2, 393, 574	14.0	202, 194	136, 486	48.1	6.9	2, 930, 348	2, 530, 060	15.8
45 counties	210, 876	208, 007	1.4	21, 854	16, 209	34.8	9.4	232, 760	224, 218	3.8
Minnesota	1, 234, 017	1, 143, 872	7.9	64, 948	41, 895	55.0	5.0	1, 298, 965	1, 185, 767	9.5
16 counties	152, 080	162, 338	−6.3	15, 973	9, 851	62.1	9.9	168, 053	172, 189	−2.4
Wisconsin	1, 468, 141	1, 355, 283	8.3	59, 581	41, 100	45.0	3.9	1, 527, 772	1, 396. 383	9.4
18 counties	98, 547	109, 546	−10.0	7. 211	6, 358	13.4	6.8	105, 758	115, 904	−8.8

TABLE IV.—*Manufacturing—Value added*

[Dollars in thousands]

Region or area	1958	1947	Percent of United States, 1958	Percent change, 1947–58
United States	$141, 380, 886	$74, 425, 825	100.0	90.0
Total, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin	$14, 373, 556	$8, 479, 498	10.2	69.5
79 upper Great Lakes counties	[1] $554, 165	[1] $315, 672	.4	75.6
Percent of 3-State area	3.9			
Michigan	$8, 363, 614	$5, 196, 338	5.9	61.0
45 counties	$247, 609	$156, 161	.2	58.6
Percent of Michigan	3			
Minnesota	$2, 050, 405	$1, 022, 586	1.4	100.5
16 counties	$156, 575	$78, 199	.1	100.2
Percent of Minnesota	7.6			
Wisconsin	$3, 959, 537	$2, 260, 574	2.8	75.2
18 counties	$149, 981	$81, 312	.1	84.5
Percent of Wisconsin	3.8			

[1] Information withheld to avoid disclosure of individual establishments on 5 counties in 1958 and 4 counties in 1947.

TABLE V.—*Wholesale sales*

[Dollars in thousands]

Region or area	1958	1948	Percent of United States, 1958	Percent change, 1948–58
United States	$285, 726, 904	$185, 276, 781	100.0	54.2
Total, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin	$22, 674, 671	$14, 167, 330	7.9	66.0
79 upper Great Lakes counties	[1] $968, 307	[1] $792, 975	.3	22.1
Percent of 3-State area	4.3			
Michigan	$11, 600, 435	$6, 485, 958	4.1	78.5
45 counties	$342, 236	$210, 599	.1	62.
Percent of Michigan	3			
Minnesota	$6, 538, 039	$4, 934, 363	2.3	32.5
16 counties	$430, 202	$375, 594	.2	14.5
Percent of Minnesota	6.6			
Wisconsin	$4, 536, 197	$2, 747, 009	1.6	65.1
18 counties	$195, 869	$206, 782	.1	−5.3
Percent of Wisconsin	4.3			

[1] Information withheld to avoid disclosure of individual establishments on 3 counties in 1958 and 9 counties in 1948.

TABLE VI.—*Retail Sales*

[Dollars in thousands]

Region or area	1958	1948	Percent of United States, 1958	Percent change, 1948–58
United States	$200, 370, 378	$129,963,114	100.0	54.1
Total, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin	$17, 329, 215	$12, 069, 306	8.6	43.6
79 upper Great Lakes counties	$1, 575, 938	$1, 162, 767	.8	35.5
Percent of 3-State area	9.1			
Michigan	$8, 897, 661	$5, 941, 538	1.3	49.8
45 counties	$750, 399	$522, 304	.4	43.7
Percent of Michigan	8.4			
Minnesota	$3, 976, 493	$2, 896, 613	2.0	37.3
16 counties	$494, 123	$380, 580	.2	29.8
Percent of Minnesota	12.4			
Wisconsin	$4, 455, 061	$3, 231, 155	2.2	37.9
18 counties	$331, 416	$259, 883	.2	27.5
Percent of Wisconsin	7.4			

TABLE VII.—*Agriculture—Value of farm products*

[Dollars in thousands]

Region or area	1959	1945	Percent of United States	Percent change, 1945–59
United States	$30, 492, 721	$18, 108, 132	100.0	68.4
Total, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin	$2, 795, 813	$1, 786, 902	9.2	56.5
79 upper Great Lakes counties	$223, 040	$197, 402	.7	13.0
Percent of 3-State area	8			
Michigan	$622, 960	$413, 404	2.0	50.7
45 counties	$90, 642	$84, 430	.3	7.4
Percent of Michigan	14.6			
Minnesota	$1, 211, 750	$709, 861	4.0	70.7
16 counties	$58, 067	$53, 090	.2	9.4
Percent of Minnesota	4.8			
Wisconsin	$961, 103	$663, 637	3.2	44.8
18 counties	$74, 331	$59, 882	.2	24.1
Percent of Wisconsin	7.7			

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like again to refer to the report filed by the Public Works Committee on the Appalachian bill. As one reads the report, he is struck many times by the similarity in need and potential between the Appalachian region and the upper Great Lakes region. I believe the creation of the Appalachian authority will be good both in the short term and long term, not alone for the people of that region, but also for all of the country.

I believe the criteria which have been established are valid. I believe they will be useful in the appraisal of subsequent applications for regional consideration. I believe that the opportunities for all of America and its economic growth, which are reflected in the Appalachian development proposal, likewise can be fruitful and useful to all of America, when those of us from the upper Great Lakes Basin come to the Senate with our proposal.

Mr. President, I do not take the position that because there are regions with equal or greater need we should reject what is now an available tool at hand; namely, the creation of the Appalachian authority. I hope that the creation of the Appalachian authority will not subsequently be used as a reason why members of the Senate should not respond to equally needy regions elsewhere in the country.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Should not such a response now to a present need serve as a reason or justification for or an encouragement to provide for additional needs as they may occur?

Mr. HART. I believe the Senator has suggested what logic would compel us to do.

I have heard the argument made that if we do this, the floodgates will be opened. That is not so, any more than that we should say if an earthquake occurs today in California we should not do anything about it because the day after tomorrow an earthquake may occur somewhere else. The test is the need.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have heard a great deal about floodgates. How would the Senator characterize floodgates? If by floodgates is meant that we have a government with a heart and that Congress and the President are responsive to the needs of the country and the will of the people, then let us have more floodgates.

Mr. HART. Yes. The Senator from Michigan wishes he had the ability to express in so short a statement the point made by the Senator from Tennessee. Too often the term "floodgate" is applied to the use of public money for any region or area other than one's own. There is a sort of law of inverse something or other. The farther one gets away from a public works project the more it looks like a boondoggle. The closer to home it is the more value it contributes to the national economy. We have all experienced these things.

I believe we will respond maturely to the recommendations before us from the Committee on Public Works, to do that which will be good for all America, and create this authority. Those of us who are in the Great Lakes Basin area feel that for reasons which are similar we shall soon be in the position of having the Public Works Committee make the same request with respect to our region, and we hope the judgment will be on the same basis.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I commend the Senator from Michigan. I say to him that the Public Works Committee will give very careful and prompt consideration to the needs envisioned in the bill to which he has referred. I compliment the Senator from Michigan. I say to him again what I said earlier during his excellent testimony at the hearing, that where need can be documented, it is the responsibility of Congress to move forward and give prompt consideration, and possibly take favorable action on those proposals.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read, but that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

(c) No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act involving any scientific or technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions effective to insure that all information, copyrights, uses, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will be made freely available to the general public. Nothing contained in this subsection shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity, without his consent, of any right which that owner may have under that patent. Whenever any information, copyright, use, process, patent or development resulting from any such research or development activity conducted in whole or in part with appropriated funds expended under authorization of this Act is withheld or disposed of by any person, organization, or agency in contravention of the provisions of this subsection, the Attorney General shall institute, upon his own motion or upon request made by any person having knowledge of pertinent facts, an action for the enforcement of the provisions of this subsection in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which any defendant resides, is found, or has a place of business. Such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such action, and to enter therein such orders and decrees as it shall determine to be required to carry into effect fully the provisions of this subsection. Process of the district court for any judicial district in any action instituted under this subsection may be served in any other judicial district of the United States by the United States marshal thereof. Whenever it appears to the court in which any such action is pending that other parties should be brought before the court in such action, the court may cause such other parties to be summoned from any judicial district of the United States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is the same amendment that I offered yesterday. The issue has been voted on. The amendment provides that the benefits of the research authorized by the program shall be made available for the benefit of all sections of the Nation and for the enrichment and benefit of the 180 million people of our country.

I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from West Virginia, the distinguished Senator in charge of the pending bill. He voted for a similar amendment yesterday, and he has assured me that he felt my amendment was a proper amendment to be added to the pending bill.

I believe that the issue was decided yesterday. I believe the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is willing to accept the amendment and use his best efforts to prevail with it in any conference held with Members of the House of Representatives. I do not believe it requires any further discussion.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Louisiana, I would say that the Senate placed its stamp of approval upon a similar amendment to another bill yesterday. The Senate therefore set down its intent. I have every reason to believe that if we were to take a vote again on the issue, today, tomorrow, or the next day, the result would be approximately the same. The issue has been resolved. The arguments have been made. So on behalf of the committee, I accept the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, before that is done, I must suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator wishes a vote on the question, I would be glad to withhold my amendment until Monday. I feel confident that the amendment will carry by a bigger vote on Monday than it carried yesterday. But if the Senator would like to have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, I should be glad to withhold it until then.

I believe it will win by a larger vote on Monday than it did yesterday.

Mr. COOPER. That is the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator would like to have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, I will withhold the amendment and bring it up on Monday.

Mr. President, I withhold the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky withdraw his request for a quorum call?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my suggestion of an absence of a quorum be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is withdrawn.

Does the Senator from Louisiana withdraw his amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment. I should like to give notice that I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I now wish to say that on Monday I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I have a purely technical amendment to propose.

On page 25, lines 5 through 11, ending with the word "project," contain what is essentially a typographical omission. The language starting in italic on line 3 and ending with the word "with" on line 16 was presented by my colleague [Mr. SCOTT] and myself to the subcommittee which is presided over by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] at the request of Governor Scranton of Pennsylvania. The proposed changes deal entirely with projects having to do with strip mining. When I read the language this morning more carefully, as I should have done earlier, I thought it did not parse in English. We called Harrisburg and found that there had been a typographical mistake. I have discussed the question with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

I ask unanimous consent to amend the language appearing in line 4 through line 16 on page 25 as follows:

On line 4, after the word "where," and before the word "expected," insert in parentheses arabic "1."

On line 5, after the semicolon, following the word "costs," and before the word "access," insert in parentheses arabic number "2."

On line 7, at the end of the word "appropriate," insert a semicolon and immediately thereafter insert the word "and" and, in parentheses, arabic "3."

Those changes would make clear what was intended and would remedy the typographical error to which I referred. I hope my friend from West Virginia will accept the amendment since, as I have said, it is purely technical.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am prepared to accept the amendment. The amendment has been discussed with Senators, including the Senator from Ohio, who has a particular interest in this subject.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may we have a vote on the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 25, line 4, after the word "where" insert "(1)";

On page 25, line 5, after the semicolon, insert "(2)";

On page 25, line 7, after the word "appropriate" insert the following: "; and (3)."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have been recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield the floor?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I would like to know who has the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I sought recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Pennsylvania yield the floor?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Louisiana would permit me to yield briefly to the Senator from Ohio, if he wishes to speak in reference to the amendments I have proposed——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will yield, but I think we are all entitled to equal consideration on this floor whether the Senator speaking is the leader of the majority or not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I asked for recognition. The Senator from Ohio did not ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Louisiana that the Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield the floor?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the interest of international amity I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I thought I had recognition. If I have now been recognized, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether he wishes me to yield to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; I shall obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, let me put my colleagues on notice that yesterday I submitted an amendment to S. 3, the proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. That amendment has been printed and lies at the desk. It attempts to do for the Appalachia bill what the Senate voted yesterday 50 to 28 to do for the Water Quality Act of 1965; that is, to provide that patents resulting from any research under the legislation shall be freely available to the general public. I intend to call this amendment up at an appropriate time during the discussion of the Appalachia bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my remarks will be directed to the Senator from West Virginia. I invite his attention specifically to page 23 of the bill, in its treatment of the rehabilitation of anthracite coal mine lands and strip-mine lands. The original bill as it went to the committee was changed in committee, as I understand.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There was added to the original bill the provision, under that paragraph, that "The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reclaim and rehabilitate existing strip- and surface-mine areas." Those are the words in line 15.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does that language in paragraph (1) give to the State of Pennsylvania any special rights that are not given to the other States in the Appalachian region?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It does not. It gives to the States within the Appalachian region the assistance which had been extended to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the act of 1955. In other words, we broaden the provision to make available to the other States and the bituminous coal regions of Appalachia, the same assistance previously available only to Pennsylvania for its anthracite region.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, under the act of July 15, 1955, as set forth in 30 U.S.C. 571, special applicability was given to the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It applied only to Pennsylvania.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The language as now written in the bill contemplates making applicable the provisions of this bill——

Mr. RANDOLPH. To Ohio and the other States in the region.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The other States in Appalachia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct in his statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate this elucidation of the meaning of the language.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several weeks ago, I introduced a bill which, if passed, would authorize the making of a comprehensive, long-range study of strip mining, its ravages, and its cures. In conversation with a representative of the Department of the Interior, I was asked if I would have any objection to the inclusion of the text of my bill in the Appalachia bill. I told the representative of the Department of the Interior that I had no objection. The main part of my bill, calling for a study of strip mining, is now included in the Appalachia bill. I should like to discuss what the bill proposes, because I believe the RECORD ought to show it. This information will be of interest to Ohioans and to persons residing in every State in which strip mining is now being done.

My bill, and now the Appalachia bill, call for a study under which consideration would be given to the following matters: First, the nature and extent of the strip and surface mining operations in the United States and the conditions resulting therefrom. Anyone who has moved through Ohio by automobile south of U.S. Route 40 and east of the Scioto River, where the strip mining has been done, and has seen the results that have come to the land because of the strip mining operation, has, I am sure, bowed his head in a bit of shame and grief to behold what the human hand has done with the lovely, rolling, beautiful lands that once distinguished that area.

Ohio has a county named Harrison, in which is located the town of Cadiz. By the way, it was the home of Clark Gable, and General Custer was born there. At one time it was the richest sheep-growing county in the United States. It had rolling hills covered with grass and an ample water supply for the cattle and sheep. But now it is a barren land that has been stripped from the north to the south boundary and to the east and west. Some reclamation has been done, but most of it has been along the highways, where the eye of the traveler is supposed to see that there has been restoration.

But if one departs from the main highways and goes into the interior, he sees a bleak, sterile land from which wildlife has moved, where the water table has become lowered, and vegetation is no longer present, but a barren desert exists.

To make things worse, the strip miners, with 100-foot booms, pick up in one bite huge amounts of top soil and top land, including vegetation. When I was Governor it was 50 tons; I think it is 100 tons now. This has left vertical walls that rise, in some instances, 100 feet into the air.

I have received a statistical table showing the number of acres of coal lands stripped in the United States. It discloses that in Ohio more than 180,000 acres have been stripped, and less than 150,000 acres reclaimed. Whatever reclamation was done, was done in pursuance of laws which I, with the expenditure of the greatest of energy possible, got a reluctant legislature to pass, and thus, in a measure, disobey the commands of the strip miners. But the law was never adequate. It is not adequate now.

Mr. President, if one can imagine a piece of rural land with the shale and the rock exposed, the vegetation down below the shale, and, at various intervals, 100-foot cliffs, one will get an idea of what use that land might be put to: no use whatsoever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing areas of coal land strip mined and areas reclaimed be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Areas of coal land strip mined and areas reclaimed

[Acres]

State	Strip mined	Reclamation		Reclamation required by law
		Voluntarily	By State	
Alabama	5,189	(1)	(1)	No.
Alaska	230	0	0	No.
Arkansas	4,480	(1)	(1)	No.
Colorado	900	(1)	(1)	No.
Georgia	165	(1)	(1)	No.
Illinois	94,080	0	3,178	Yes.
Indiana	75,182	(1)	(1)	Yes.
Iowa	3,500	0	0	No.
Kansas	49,000	0	2,728	No.
Kentucky	47,000	5,150	[2] 26,850	Yes.
Maryland	640	341	102	Yes.
Missouri	33,344	0	0	No.
Montana	1,200	0	0	No.
New Mexico	60	0	0	No.
North Dakota	5,000	0	0	No.
Ohio	183,134	23.000	119,327	Yes.
Oklahoma	17,920	(1)	(1)	No.
Pennsylvania	111,744	0	[2] 113,908	Yes.
South Dakota	160	(1)	(1)	No.
Tennessee	15,554	(1)	(1)	No.
Virginia	14,021	(1)	(1)	No.
Washington	300	0	0	No.
West Virginia	103,100	0	[2] 63,300	Yes.
Wyoming	600	0	0	No.
Total	766,503	28,491	329,393	

[1] Unknown.

[2] Approximately 25 percent of this total acreage is non-coal-bearing land covered by contour coal-stripping operations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Legislature of Ohio is now considering the enactment of a law that would have some semblance of restoring the land to a topography having a reasonable relationship to the land as it was before the strip mining began. The proposed law would require the covering of the land with trees, grass, and whatever other vegetation might grow thereon.

I hope that those who are promoting the law will have greater success than I have had. I do not mind saying that never did I suffer such frustration in attempting to achieve what I thought every reasonable mind would subscribe to than I did in witnessing the deafness and indifference of the men who had it within their power to adopt the law and insure in some measure that prosperity would bequeath to the land some semblance of the scenic beauty with which it was vested by the Maker of the earth.

While I am on that subject, though it may not sound well, I cannot help but think of the Biblical narration on the creation of the earth, that the Lord created grasses upon the earth and they were good. Grasses were created on the lands of Ohio. They were good, but they are no longer there.

That applies to the trees, the flowers, the shrubs, the fowl of the air, and the four-legged animals of the earth, which have been driven out.

In southern Ohio, there is a newspaperman by the name of Milton Ronschien from Cadiz, in Harrison County. We also have a very lovable editor and writer by the name of Mattson in Morgan County. These men have lived in that area for years. They know what the land once was. And they know what it is today. I only wish that they could testify to the people of the Nation as to what happens when the strip mining boom begins to operate.

The Washington Post had an editorial about 6 weeks ago which expressed its judgment that the State of Maryland was in error in leasing its State parks and part of its State land to strip mining operators.

The people who did that have no concept of what will happen to their parks. I believe that there is not a single Senator who has traveled through the strip-mining areas who will not subscribe to what I am saying. But the damage does not come only to the land that is stripped. When we expose coal to the air and to the water, a poison is generated. Then that poison is moved down through the creek and into the streams. So, not only the people living within the area, but also those living adjacent to it are affected by what is done.

I shall read the first paragraph again. It reads:

> A study shall be made to ascertain the nature and extent of strip and surface mining operations in the United States, and the conditions resulting therefrom.

The second requirement is that it be ascertained as to what the ownership of the real property involved is. I made inquiry of the Department of the Interior in a letter which I wrote a month ago—but I did not get an answer until yesterday or today—as to how much land belonging to the United States has been strip mined. There have been 5,000 acres. I must say, however, that the major part of it was strip mined prior to 1948. But, even then, it should not have been done and should not have been allowed by any Secretary of the Interior who had a real devotion to the preservation of our natural resources.

This paragraph, requiring a study of the ownership, will become particularly important. The Appalachia bill, which I anticipate will be passed, will permit the United States to go into the strip-mining areas and spend money to rebuild the land.

The bill as originally introduced—and I was shocked by the proposal—intended that we should rebuild the land of private owners. In the first place, they butchered it. And now it is proposed that we spend the taxpayers' money to replant the land. This is proposed, with the proviso, of course, that it may then be used by the public. But the ownership would still be in the private owner.

I can visualize the great glee of the large strip-mining companies when they are told, "Now that you have ruined and devastated the land, the taxpayers of the United States will spend their money to repair the wrong which you did. They will allow you to keep the ownership of the land."

Therefore, this mandate will be materially helpful in determining what shall be done when the study is completed.

The third requirement of the study is that the study shall ascertain the effectiveness of past action by States or local units of government to remedy the adverse effects of strip and surface mining operations by financial or regulatory measures and requirements for appropriate State legislation, including adequate enforcement thereof, to provide for proper reclamation and rehabilitation of areas which may be strip and surface mined in the future.

This mandate, Mr. President, is of extraordinary importance, because it directly states that the agency that makes the study shall recommend what the States will have to do with respect to the adoption and enforcement of adequate laws as a prerequisite to the right to receive the benefits of the Appalachia bill and such other bills as may be passed in the future.

I can well envision that after this study is completed on July 1, 1967, a bill may be written which will provide that unless there is an adequate law, properly enforced, to restore the land, there shall be no benefits under this act.

No. 4: The State shall determine the public interest and the public benefits which may result from reclamation, rehabilitation, and appropriate development and use of areas subjected to strip the surface mining operations.

There is other material in this paragraph which I shall not read. I would prefer that we spend no moneys on the reclamation project as contemplated by S. 3 until the study has been completed. However, I realize that my voice is one crying in the wilderness when I ask, "Do not do anything now. Do not spend the taxpayers' money now until we find out what the study shows."

It has been indicated to me, however, by the sponsors of the bill, that they are willing to accept an amendment that will prohibit the spending of any money under this bill to reclaim and rehabilitate privately owned land, as distinguished from lands owned by the U.S. Government, the States, and the local subdivisions of government.

I believe that is a rather substantial improvement, which would protect the interest of the taxpayer, giving the Congress an opportunity, after July 1, 1967, to pass laws that will conform with the recommendations made in the study.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. If we follow a policy, in effect, of serving notice on private owners of coal mines that they can continue to devastate the landscape and we will follow behind them with Federal money to restore the land, what is going to be the consequence?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Every one of us ought to be kicked down Constitution Avenue and kicked into the Potomac River if we did that. I realize that that is not answering the question. The question of the Senator is extremely pertinent.

If we now proceed to spend the taxpayers' money to reclaim this land, privately owned, we merely tell the strip miners, "Go ahead, do the damage. The responsibility for paying for the damage, in dollars, will be assumed by the taxpayers." That is my interpretation.

Mr. NELSON. I had occasion to fly over a part of Ohio in a private plane, as well as over Kentucky. It was 2 days after a rainstorm. As I flew over that countryside, looking at it, there were giant gaps in the landscape for miles and miles and miles, where the coal had been pulled out, and the overburden left lying on the landscape. With each rainfall there was erosion of soil. As far as one could see the streams and rivers were the color of clay.

The State governments have not moved ahead with the appropriate legislation to require restoration by the companies that are desecrating the landscape, and having peripheral effect for hundreds of miles around, by way of erosion and destruction of water basins. The State governments will never have the courage to tax this kind of activity in order to restore the overburden and enable the land to be used.

Is it not about time that we levied some Federal tax on the extraction of these ores? They are going over interstate boundaries; they are polluting streams; they are leaving the countryside devastated, to the extent that it will never be able to be lived on. Is it not time that we required the imposition of taxes for the restoration of the overburden and of the landscape so that the waters of the river valleys are not polluted?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator for his sympathetic expression of the problem facing the States in which strip mining is done.

About 3 weeks ago I listened to the "Today" program. There was a showing of a strip-mining operation in Illinois. A huge machine, with a boom of more than 100 feet, was shown. It was described that with each bite 100 tons was picked up, according to my recollection. Then, to my great surprise, the narrator stated that an economic boom has been brought to southern Illinois by the reawakening of the coal business and employment and the reduced price that the producers can charge for the coal obtained by strip mining.

If only 1 or 2 cents of that reduced price were invested in the restoration of the land, we could feel that we had not robbed the land, and had done something about making it available for those who will follow us.

I frequently think of the Mediterranean lands, where our youth fought in World War II. They were once a paradise. There was verdure and vegetation there, but now it is barren land. Unless we are careful, we shall be doing the same thing with our lands in the United States. That, in my judgment, is contrary to sound economics. It is violative of good conscience. It certainly is not consonant with principles of a decent American.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his sympathetic expression of how this problem ought to be solved.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have been listening with great interest to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, as well as the interpolation of the Senator from Wisconsin. I know that at some time the Senator from Ohio will be proposing ideas as to what should be done with this section of the bill.

The discussions of the bill as to those purposes were directed toward the same end the Senator is seeking. I know he and other Senators took the lead in this field by introducing a bill which would cause an investigation of this subject, in order to move toward correcting the consequences of strip mining. I had the same experience and observations the Senator from Wisconsin had with respect to the situation in other areas and in my own State of Kentucky.

In the eastern part of the State where what is called strip mining is carried on, the drillers go into the side of a hill, and the mining companies have circled the hills as they stripped the coal from the easiest places where the seams can be reached. But in the western part of Kentucky, where the land is flat, where there are great coal resources, the mine operators with their great shovels simply turn over a whole county and leave it with the subsoil and the poor soil lying there where the richer surface soil, built up over many years, once lay.

Last year, I received a letter from an official in one of these counties, declaring that the whole county had gone and asking what they could do. Of course, we are faced with the fact that the landowners allow the strip mining, and it becomes a private matter. If no action is taken on the part of the State to correct the situation by rehabilitation, that land is gone for at least a great many years.

I ask the same question about this situation that the Senator has raised, whether we are permitting the Federal Government to assume a burden which is properly a responsibility of the State, and certainly of the private owner under certain laws in many of our States.

I believe that the report and the language in the bill answer at least in their intention the questions which the distinguished Senator has raised. If land is owned publicly, it would seem that the Federal Government or the State government should never have allowed this practice to exist without proper provision being made for rehabilitation. I do not believe that the National Park Service would allow strip mining. But if it does, it requires rehabilitation, as should be the case on lands under other Federal agencies.

There may be lands which the Forest Service or other national agencies have acquired, which were already affected by strip mining when they were purchased. Then looking again at the situation with respect to privately owned land in many States, including the one I represent—and Kentucky has adopted legislation which is designed to assure the rehabilitation of land which has been strip mined, requiring bonds before such an operation is started, and requiring certain sums to be applied toward rehabilitation—I do not believe the State laws would be fully adequate.

I also agree with the Senator from Wisconsin in his doubt that this kind of legislation is strictly enforced. But if private lands were stripped before legislation became applicable, and they are now owned by small operators who do not have the resources to rehabilitate the land, and further, if that land affected the water and affected the public interest, I believe that this section would be properly applicable to assist in the correction of abuses in the public interest, because the private owner does not have the resources.

I would ask these questions in accordance with the responses given and in accordance with the report. It is intended that the administrator of the program will not allow it to become a substitute for State action, or for private responsibility. But when there is a lack of ability on the part of the small owners to rehabilitate their land, and where the public interest is affected, I believe it is perfectly proper, in that case, that this section should apply.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not believe that we can overemphasize what the Senator said a moment ago, that we do not wish the proposed law to become a substitute for what the States and the coal-mining companies should do toward rehabilitation. The Department of the Interior and the Commissioner who will have charge of the administration of the proposed law should know that it is not intended to be a substitute for the responsibilities of others. It would be an unjustifiable travesty to say, "You do the damage. The Federal Government will pay for the damage."

I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his comments.

Mr. COOPER. Let me say, also, that if there is a State development program underway—such as exists in my State, and I am sure in other States—taking into consideration the factors just mentioned in regard to the responsibility of States and private owners, I should think at that point, if all combined to effect such a rehabilitation to protect the public interest, it would be perfectly proper to supplement those efforts with funds provided under this section. After all factors are considered, owing to the limited amount of money available, these kinds of effort must be considered almost as part of a demonstration project. Thus, both in the authority provided the Federal Government in cooperation with the States, and in the authorization for a survey, there is great value connected with the objectives which the bill, we hope, will assure.

While we are discussing this section of the bill and this subject, I would add one further comment. It is very difficult, especially for some of the smaller companies, to undertake this vast job of rehabilitation, because it is a costly enterprise. In weighing this need, I do not know how one easily balances the need for employment and the need for production of coal. Against those reasons, and considering the great public interest, I believe that the public interest is superior.

I know of companies with great resources. I know of one in particular, in western Kentucky, which supplies millions of tons of coal to the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is one of the biggest companies in the United States, but it is literally tearing up counties in that part of Kentucky. Although its operations are subject to State laws, I do not believe this company, the Peabody Coal Co., has made any great effort on its own to correct the situation. While a company such as this one may follow the law—and I am sure it obeys the law—the results of its operations often show that State legislation is not strong enough to compel it to do anything, although it has the resources to mine all this coal. This kind of operation leaves areas of the State despoiled, and it results in land being left unfit for agricultural pursuits or other purposes, and it gives an example of the situation this bill seeks to begin to correct in the interest of the people and communities throughout this Appalachian region, and in the national interest.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Peabody Coal Co. also operates in Perry County, Ill. That is the company that sponsors the "Today" program.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I have not expressed an opinion on that section of the bill. I am inclined to support any reasonable proposal that would result in a restoration of the land in this country. If this will serve as an experimental proposal, on which some ideas can be developed as to what we can do for restoration, I am for it. I was attempting to raise the question with the Senator from Ohio to point out that it would be a tragic thing if we gave the coal companies the idea that they should be able to continue desecrating the landscape and that the Federal taxpayer will continue to follow them, from now on into the future, and clean up the messes which they will create.

It is about time that we addressed ourselves to some creative solution at the national level—I understand what the political problem is at the State level—the States appear unable to act. Therefore we should address ourselves to that issue. If it is a valid exercise of Federal power, we should levy taxes for restoration purposes, if the companies are not willing to do it themselves.

This is only one part of a scheme for the exploitation and destruction of the countryside. The timber people did it first. They are still at it in the Far West.

Industry has polluted our rivers so that, so far as I know, there is not a single major city in America which has a clean river running through it.

The Great Lakes are well on their way to pollution. We are on the way to polluting them with sewage from our cities and industrial waste. We in fact are destroying all of our resources in a senseless fashion—all in the name of economic progress.

This business of permitting the extractive industries, such as the coal industry, to move on, leaving a situation in which only English sparrows and rodents can survive ought to be halted now.

I make the point that this is a part of the whole scheme of water pollution, soil destruction, and forestry destruction, to which this Congress ought to address itself with a great deal more creativity and a great deal more money than it has done thus far.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky is of the opinion that we are not authorizing the spending of much money. I believe $37.5 million would be authorized in the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I meant that not much money was being applied to the problem.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. It would require hundreds of millions of dollars to rehabilitate this land.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe we are putting too much money into this whole enterprise, because we will give encouragement to the strip miners to go ahead. We would authorize $36,500,000 of taxpayer money to pay for the damage done by the strip miners. I cannot see it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I strongly support the provisions in the pending bill which deal with strip mining, to repair the devastation done by the coal industry in Appalachia over the last several generations. The provisions I refer to are in section 205 of the bill, starting at page 22 and running down to the middle of page 28.

I ask unanimous consent that the very cogent justification for these provisions, enabling the ravages of strip mining to be repaired, at least to some extent, with financial assistance from the Federal Government, which appear on pages 16 to 20 in the committee report may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL

The fundamental problems that have arisen from the mining of coal in Appalachia demand solutions as part of any serious attempt to improve the Appalachian economy.

Despite drastic reductions of employment in the past two decades, the production and transportation of coal still remains as the single largest source of employment in Appalachia. Nevertheless, automation in the mines and shrinking markets have worked together to reduce coal employment by hundreds of thousands of jobs in the past 15 years.

The severely depressed economic conditions that exist in many sections of Appalachia are invariably the direct result of the decline of the coal industry. The mechanization of the industry has brought about a technological revolution in Appalachia, to which the painful period of adjustment has not yet been completed.

But the production of bituminous coal in the region can exert a stabilizing influence on the Appalachian economy. Thus, as part of the economic development plan for Appalachia, the State and Federal Governments should take every measure to encourage the production of bituminous coal.

Much of the Appalachian landscape has been ravaged by the mining of coal. Former practices of both strip mining and deep mining operations have eroded the hillsides, polluted the streams, and endangered the lives of thousands of people. Though present enlightened management practices have made great progress over former years, the abuses of past coal mining practices serve as a major deterrent to industrial and recreational development in Appalachia.

Local and State governments have not had the necessary resources to repair the widespread damages caused by coal mining. Strip mining in the region causes substantial erosion and polluted streams both locally and many miles downstream. Many Appalachian cities and towns are threatened by subsidence of lands into the coal mines that lie beneath, threats to all who are exposed to them. Unsealed underground mines have leaked enormous quantities of acid into Appalachian streams and rivers, creating serious water pollution problems. The reclamation of lands damaged by past mining operations is crucial to stimulating economic development in Appalachia. This committee therefore endorses the administration's recommendations for a comprehensive program to restore and reclaim the land and water resources of Appalachia which have been damaged by past mining practices.

Section 205 of the bill expands federally authorized programs which now make available limited funds to meet some of these problems.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to repair damage caused by mine subsidence throughout Appalachia on a scope greater than that provided under existing legislation.

The existing mine-fire-control program has had its appropriations limitation increased and the Fish and Wildlife Service has been authorized additional funds to restore areas damaged by mining practices.

The Federal contributions to all programs referred to in section 205(a) are established at not to exceed 75 percent by the bill. Furthermore, these new appropriations will not be counted in any computation of apportionments to the States under the existing national programs. In order to insure that private landowners do not receive a windfall from strip-mine reclamation, such projects will be carried out only on those lands to which the public has access or from which a public benefit will result.

The Secretary of the Interior will undertake a strip-mine study in full cooperation with appropriate Federal, State, and local departments and agencies and the Commission. The Secretary is to submit to the President, and the President to Congress, by July 1, 1968, detailed recommendations for a long-range comprehensive program for reclamation and rehabilitation of strip- and surface-mined areas in the United States and for the policies under which the program should be conducted. The Secretary is further required to make an interim report to the Commission summarizing his findings with regard to those aspects of strip- and surface-mining operations in the region most urgently requiring attention.

The study will consider the nature and extent of strip mining and its results; the effectiveness of State and local control over strip-mining activity including the enforcement of State legislation; the public interest and public benefits resulting from reclamation activities; the appropriate cost-sharing roles of Federal and State Governments and private interests, and other relevant topics.

The committee would emphasize that private landowners wil not be unjustly enriched under the proposed reclamation and rehabilitation program, and that all reclamation and rehabilitation work will proceed under authority of present statutes. Pending submission to the Congress of the results and recommendations of the study authorized in section 205(c), all fish and wildlife restoration of strip-mined areas will be confined to pilot projects which will be part of the study itself.

The committee has given careful deliberation to the above issues, during its prior consideration of S. 2782, and on August 12, 1964, received specific assurance from the Secretary of the Interior regarding the administration of the proposed reclamation and rehabilitation program. The letter from Secretary Stewart L. Udall follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1964.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: In response to your inquiry about the provisions of section 205 of H.R. 11946, the proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964, which would provide, among other things, programs for mining area restoration, we are happy to give you our understanding with regard to the language of the bill and with regard to the role of this Department in carrying out the proposed programs.

All of the programs provided under section 205, subsections (a) and (b), are either extensions of existing authority now exercised by this Department, or the provision of additional funds to accelerate such departmental activities in the Appalachian region.

Section 205(a)(1) extends the scope of the act of July 15, 1955, regarding the sealing and filling of voids in abandoned coal mines from the anthracite region of Pennsylvania to the entire Appalachian region.

Section 205(a)(2) removes the $500,000 limit contained in the act of August 31, 1954, on annual expenditures for control of fires, insofar as fires in inactive coal mines in the Appalachian region are concerned.

Section 205(a)(3) permits the allocation of funds for fish and wildlife restoration in the Appalachian region under the provisions of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act of 1937 and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act of 1950.

Each of these programs has been in operation for some time, and each has carefully been managed to serve the public interest. No private landowners will be unjustly enriched by the activities proposed.

In the filling and sealing of voids to prevent surface subsidence, the Department always requires that work be done underground only where title to the underground coal has been assigned to a local public body—usually a city or county. No further mining is, therefore, permitted to undo the subsidence control work. Surface land is, of course, benefited by the prevention of caveins, but this serves to protect innocent property owners, public and private, rather than to enrich them.

In the controlling of mine fires, only fires in inactive deposits may be controlled under the program. No fire is extinguished until title to the coal measures is obtained by the Government. Ordinarily, title is given to the Government because burning coal seams are of little value to the owners of the mineral rights. Fire control is accomplished by introducing nonflammable materials, primarily sand and gravel, into the voids surrounding the burning coal, thus cutting off the oxygen supply. Such control eliminates the hazards to health and safety created by such fires, but generally renders the coal seam unfit for further mining operations. Surface title to land over a mine fire is not obtained and does not seem necessary to accomplish the public purposes intended. There is no profit to any private landowner from the fire control work. There may, of course, be protection from threatened damage—as in the case of preventing cave-ins.

The fish and wildlife restoration work intended in the first 2 years of the program would be a pilot project in a surface mined area in Appalachia—to be undertaken by the appropriate State conservation agency. The mines involved will have to have been abandoned—with no legal recourse available to oblige the former mine operators to undertake restoration work. Biological, economic, and other data obtained from this experiment will indicate the feasibility of using the grant-in-aid program for fish and wildlife restoration by the States to mitigate the deleterious consequences of surface mining in the Appalachian region. This program has been used successfully to restore surface mined areas in less mountainous areas in Midwestern States. Care will be taken to prevent private enrichment from the program by requiring permanent easements for public fishing and hunting on all property to be rehabilitated and by agreements on the part of property owners to maintain the restored conditions. Although some owners, conceivably, may be able at some future time to realize a higher sale value for their land because of its enhanced beauty, the public right to hunt and fish and the ecological conditions promoting hunting and fishing will be secured. Inasmuch as these constitute a sufficient public benefit to undertake the improvements and since the easements will extend to all future owners of the property, we do not believe the affected property owners will be directly enriched at public expense.

This pilot project will contribute to the overall value of the national study of surface mining which it is proposed that the Department also undertake.

In testifying before the House Committee on Public Works on May 6, 1964, I observed:

"An active program to remove the scars of surface mining is more complex. The largest coal mining States in Appalachia now have laws designed to regulate future surface mining and to induce mine operators to restore the land. We do not propose continuously to sweep up after tomorrow's surface miners. We believe the States can and will insist that the mine operators do that job themselves.

"The chief problem lies in the surface mines which were abandoned before State statutes were passed. Many of these were occasioned by the emergency of the Second World War, when the urgent need for coal and the shortage of labor led to hasty surface mining without planning to control the consequences. Surely the Nation has an obligation to help heal these sores.

"Such restoration work however, raises thorny policy problems. Much of the ravaged land is privately owned. Ownership often is divided between a surface owner—who usually holds a small acreage—and the owner of mineral rights—usually a large mining company. In its present condition, the land is virtually worthless, although more coal seams lie beneath some of it.

"If land is restored to productive use, who is to benefit from the increased value? Should the surface owner be free to use the land or to sell it at a substantial profit without contributing to the cost of its restoration? We think not. What, then, is the extent of his obligation to support the restoration? Costs of restoration may run from $50 to $600 per acre, or even more. In many instances this cost is far above the present value of the land and exceeds the probable value of the land after restoration.

"Yet to leave such sores unrepaired will mean continued destruction of other land, pollution of water supplies for towns and cities downstream, elimination of recreational values for citizens of a wide area, and other evils. We believe, therefore, that a reasonable formula must be devised to determine the fair proportion of restoration costs which the surface owner can afford to pay—either at time of restoration or when such land is sold.

"But what of the owner of the mineral rights? Is he to remain free to return for coal still deeper in the earth? How are we to prevent destruction of the restoration effort by future surface mining in the restored area? Are we to depend upon existing control statutes to protect the public investment? We hope that we can, but a careful determination of that prospect must be made.

"What return should the public expect for its investment in restoration on private land? For example, should public access for fishing and hunting be a condition where land is restored primarily for fish and wildlife benefit?

"These and other similar questions cannot be settled here today. They will require a systematic study of the extent of the surface-mining problem of Appalachia, a careful examination of the policy issues, the proposal of effective techniques for reclamation and of equitable procedures for its accomplishment—thorough discussion of the proposals with the people of the affected States, and then the consistent adherence to agreed upon policies by all participating Federal and State agencies in the execution of the restoration program. For that reason, the bill * * * proposes such a study by the Department of the Interior in full cooperation with other appropriate Federal agencies and the President's Appalachian Regional Commission."

We intend in submitting our report on surface mining in the United States to recommend appropriate concerted action by the Federal Government, the States, local governments, and private parties to meet the surface-mining problem intelligently in the public interest.

We appreciate this opportunity to explain our understanding of section 205 of H.R. 11946. If we can be of further help please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

As the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, has testified, and as is acknowledged by all authorities in the field, one of the principal deterrents to the industrial, commercial, and recreational development of many areas of Appalachia is the blight of a land scarred by abandoned strip-mine operations. Accordingly, the committee reports amendments to section 205 authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make financial contributions to the States for reclamation and rehabilitation of surface and strip-mined areas. Such work will be limited to public lands and private lands from which public benefits will accrue. The bill provides firm safeguards against the reaping of undue financial benefits by private landowners or mine operators.

A total of $36,500,000 is authorized for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 to carry out the purposes of this section.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, another major problem which confronts us in the coal-mining States—anthracite as well as bituminous—is the very serious and as yet unsolved problem of acid mine drainage. We do not know the technical answer to the acid mine drainage problem. Research is underway. There should be more of it.

In order to give some understanding to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the problem involved, I ask unanimous consent that a synopsis, which appears in a report prepared by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, on the subject of acid mine drainage, published April 19, 1962, may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the synopsis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYNOPSIS

Acid mine drainage is a longstanding water pollution problem and continues to grow in magnitude. The chemical quality of water is altered when acid mine drainage is discharged into streams in quantities sufficient to overcome the natural neutralizing capacity of the streams. Many of the damages are tangible and can be estimated in monetary terms. Others are intangible and difficult if not impossible to evaluate. Acid mine drainage destroys fish and fish food organisms, damages recreational and esthetic values, causes corrosive damage to transportation equipment, structures, and all equipment exposed to the water, and requires extra and expensive treatment when the polluted resources are utilized for municipal and industrial water supplies. Acid mine water is associated not only with active coal-mining operations but also with inactive and abandoned workings which continue to produce acid for an indefinite period after mining is discontinued.

It is estimated that 3.5 million tons of acid is discharged into the streams of the United States annually, resulting in major damage to more than 4,000 miles of streams. Available data on the magnitude and extent of the problem is largely outdated and needs updating and revision for a proper evaluation.

Many methods to reduce acid mine drainage have been developed, but high cost and technical failure in field applications have resulted in most attempts being abandoned. Extensive mine sealing has been performed under past Federal- and State-supported programs. Both air and water sealing offers promise of abating acid drainage from drift and slope mines. Complete inundation of deep shaft mines can reduce acid formation, providing it does not create safety hazards for adjacent active mining operations. Uniform pumping of drainage from active deep mines lightens the acid load on many streams.

Control of acid mine drainage would restore the quality of large quantities of water resources and make such waters useful for all legitimate purposes. Reclamation of the acid-polluted streams for recreation and fisheries purposes would provide great benefits and in some instances create an entirely new recreational industry for many economically depressed areas located in or adjacent to densely populated areas.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, my position is shared by my Republican colleague in the Senate [Mr. SCOTT] who cosponsored with me the amendments which appear in italic in the bill under consideration as a part of section 205.

We were joined in our concern by the Governor of Pennsylvania, William W. Scranton, who reflects most ably the very strong concern with the matter of the ravages done by the coal industry, and which his two Democratic predecessors, Governor Leader and Governor Lawrence, also shared.

Governor Scranton came to Washington and testified in support of the Appalachian bill generally, and specifically to request an amendment, which I am happy to say the Committee on Public Works agreed to, which increases the authorization for Federal assistance in remedying the ravages of strip mining by $15 million.

I am glad that Senator SCOTT and Governor Scranton and I were able to persuade the committee to make this change.

I ask unanimous consent that a prepared statement of Governor Scranton before the committee, which appears at page 110 of the hearings, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GOV. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to appear here today.

You know that I supported the Appalachian bill which passed the Senate last year. The new bill, S. 3, is substantially the same as the original bill. I therefore support the new legislation also.

Today may I emphasize two changes which have been included in the new bill, and one that thus far has not been included, but should be.

First, the new bill expands the local access roads of the proposed Appalachian development highway system from 500 to 1,000 miles. These access roads will serve specific recreational, residential, commercial, industrial, and other facilities. In Pennsylvania, some roads would be constructed to provide access to State forests for harvesting timber. Such access roads, generally, will benefit Appalachia. I therefore support this change in the law.

Second, new section 303 provides that all applications for an Appalachian program or project shall be approved by the State member on the Appalachian Regional Commission before it may be approved by the commission.

This further clarifies the duty and responsibility of each State in selecting the projects and programs within its boundaries. It assures the unique State-Federal partnership approach which is proposed in this legislation, and which is essential for a successful operation of this program.

We strongly support this addition to the law also.

In my testimony before the House Committee on Public Works last year, five scars in the coal mining areas of Appalachia which cause and perpetuate unemployment and even danger to human health and safety were discussed.

These problems include:

(1) Mine subsidence and surface caving.

(2) Underground mine fires.

(3) The ravages of abandoned strip mine operations.

(4) Culm piles which are unsightly or, if on fire, cause a serious air pollution hazard.

(5) Water pollution from acid mine drainage.

A full description, in words and pictures, of these problems is contained in a pamphlet which I have distributed to you today.

S. 3 contains authorizations for sealing and filling voids, for extinguishing underground mine fires, and for leveling nonburning culm piles. I understand that funds will be available through supplementary appropriations to existing programs for projects to eliminate burning culm piles and to begin to solve the problems of mine drainage pollution.

S. 3, however, does not include adequate authorization for reclaiming strip mined areas for reforestation purposes.

There is tremendous need for such a program and plenty of experience and knowledge to do the job, now. All we need is more money. This program can supply that.

The Appalachian program as now contemplated authorizes $1.5 million to be used by the Fish and Wildlife Service over the years. Of this amount, $250,000 is to be spent for a pilot study in the first year. That's fine.

Another $1.5 million is authorized for the Forest Service for strip mine reclamation projects in national forests. None of that is to be used in the first year.

The Appalachian program should be expanded to make possible immediate strip mine reclamation projects for forestry purposes in national forests, on other publicly owned lands, and on lands with public access guaranteed. Such a program will do an enormous amount to rehabilitate our land for tourism and industry, thus providing jobs and beauty in place of unemployment and ugliness. And it will do it now—dramatically and visibly. If you wish to help solve a major problem of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania—I urge you to amend this bill to provide for strip mine reclamation for forestry projects.

Millions of dollars could be used in Pennsylvania alone during the first year for such a program. I am sure sizable amounts could be so employed in West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, and almost every Appalachian State.

I urge you to make this program effective now, this year, by authorizing more money for immediate use.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my entire statement before the committee, which starts at page 119 of the hearings and runs down to the middle of page 123, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Senator CLARK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your courtesy in permitting me to come before you this morning.

I would like to make two points, and then introduce for consideration of the committee an amendment which Senator SCOTT and I have agreed upon with Governor Scranton and Mr. Tabor, his secretary of commerce.

In the first place, I am impressed, as a cosponsor of this bill, with the bipartisan nature of this approach. I have no doubt it is true in the other States of Appalachia, but it is certainly true in Pennsylvania that regardless of our political affiliations we work together for this program which can be so helpful to our State.

I would like to commend the Governor for the leadership he has taken in this regard, and without appearing unduly egotistical, I think the two Senators from the State of Pennsylvania have contributed their share in the effort, as well.

Secondly, I would like to point out in the record, what the chairman already knows, the very close relation between the Appalachian programs and problems of manpower and employment which Senator RANDOLPH and I are dealing with in other committees.

The study which your committee made last year, I think, emphasizes the particular need for a Federal effort in the Appalachian area, as well as in other parts of the country. Hopefully, this can become a precedent.

So there is a close tie between the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so this can bring up the level of the standard of living and education, so they can reap the benefits of the Great Society. I think this is worth noting.

I would particularly like to stress and concur on the Governor's need to strengthen this bill to give us a little more authority in the area of strip mining. Senator SCOTT and I have been in close touch with Secretary Tabor, and through him with Governor Scranton.

On behalf of Senator SCOTT and myself, I would like to offer to the committee two amendments to the bill, one to section 205(a), and another to section 205(b), and then changes in the amount authorized in the bill by sections 205(d) and 401.

Unless we could get this strip mining rehabilitation program, and, almost equally important, the elimination of acid mine drainage from our coal mines cleared up in our State, there will be a broad area of Appalachia in Pennsylvania, and I suspect, Mr. Chairman, in West Virginia, too, where the people will not be able to reap the fruits of the increased economic development which the bill would otherwise make possible.

A few years ago the Forest Service estimated there were about a million acres of abandoned strip mining land in Pennsylvania alone. They lie unproductive and idle. They produce vast quantities of acid mine drainage pollution, which sterilizes 2,000 miles of waterway in my Commonwealth alone.

And this, I know, is of interest to Senator MUSKIE, who is working on a clear streams program, which I have been happy to support.

In fact, it is fair to say, is it not, Governor, that the acid mine drainage ruins the Susquehanna River in terms of fish, wildlife, and is a constant threat to the sanitary health of the whole community?

Governor SCRANTON. It certainly does not quite, yet, but it could, if we do not solve that problem.

Senator CLARK. Abandoned deep mines also produce this pernicious pollution, and in many areas mine subsidence and mine fires of deep mines undermine Appalachian communities, eating away their economic prospects for the future.

When I say "undermine," I mean it literally, because you have towns which are falling into abandoned coal mines as a result of the negligence of past generations.

And for this reason, on behalf of Senator SCOTT and myself, I would like to offer to the committee the amendments which I have mentioned.

I thank the chairman for his courtesy in permitting me to make this statement.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you, Senator CLARK. Your prepared statement will appear at this point in the RECORD.

(The statement is as follows:)

"PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

"Mr. Chairman, S. 3, the Appalachian regional development bill, provides a superb vehicle for the States of Appalachia, with the Federal Government as a partner, to launch a concerted program for revitalizing the economy of the magnificent Appalachian region.

"The bill puts first things first and attempts to solve some of the pressing resource and transportation problems holding the region back from developing its full potential.

"But as a cosponsor of the bill and a longtime supporter of the legislation, I would like to suggest that the section addressed to the rehabilitation of strip-mined areas and the elimination of acid mine drainage pollution should be strengthened. Otherwise, there are broad areas of Appalachia that will be unable to reap the fruits of the increased economic development which this bill makes possible.

"A few years ago, the U.S. Forest Service estimated that there were a million acres of abandoned strip-mined land in Pennsylvania alone. These ravaged acres blight the environment of nearby communities. They lie unproductive and idle. They produce vast quantities of acid mine drainage pollution which sterilizes 2,000 miles of waterway in my Commonwealth alone. Barren of aquatic life, these streams have been rendered practically useless as municipal and industrial water supplies.

"Abandoned deep mines also produce this pernicious pollution. And in many areas mine subsidence and mine fires in deep mines undermine Appalachian communities, eating away at their economic prospects for the future.

"For this reason, on behalf of Senator SCOTT and myself, I offer an amendment to section 205(b) of S. 3, which increases the funds allotted for the correction of these problems in the bill and increases the financial assistance to the States to fill abandoned coal mines, control acid mine drainage pollution, and reclaim strip mines.

"Suggested amendments to S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965

"1. Section 205(a): Strike paragraph 1, lines 6 through 15, page 20. Add the following paragraph:

" 'make financial contributions to States in the region to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines, to control acid and other noxious drainage from abandoned mines or sections thereof, and to reclaim and rehabilitate existing strip and surface mine areas, in accordance with provisions of Act of July 15, 1955 (30 U.S.C. 571 et seq.), to the extent applicable, without regard to section 2(b) thereof (30 U.S.C. 572(b)) or to any provisions therein limiting assistance to anthracite coal formation, or for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Grants under this paragraph shall be made wholly out of funds specifically appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this Act.'

"2. Section 205(b): After the word 'thereof' on line 16, page 21, strike all through line 19. Add the following:

" 'Projects shall be approved for assistance under subsection (a) only where expected public benefits are found to justify estimated Federal and State costs; access to and use of restored lands by the public is provided where appropriate steps are taken, including in appropriate cases, requirement for contributions to the cost of the project, which are adequate in the judgment of the Secretary to assure that individual property owners or mine operators do not receive undue financial benefits from the project. In selecting projects for financial assistance, the Secretary shall give priority to those projects which are shown to be part of the development or implementation of a State program giving reasonable promise in the opinion of the Secretary, of obtaining a permanent solution of the problem dealt with.'

"3. Section 205(d): Page 24, line 14, delete '$21,500,000' and add '$36,500,000'.

"4. Section 401: Page 37, line 2, delete '$237,200,000' and add '$252,200,000'."

Senator RANDOLPH. Governor Scranton made reference to the amendments which you and Senator SCOTT offered to the committee, and we will give, of course, very careful consideration to these proposals.

You have mentioned the seriousness of this problem. I recall a recent article in the Washington Post which pointed out the very tragic situation, and it is that, in many areas, of the Appalachian region.

Senator COOPER. Governor, as you know, there are existing programs which directly affect the Appalachian area, as well as other areas in the United States; programs such as the Area Redevelopment Act, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the manpower development and training program.

I think it is very important that this Commission, if it is established, develop procedures to assure that there will not be a duplication of activities or overlapping in any way, and make certain that all of these programs will be coordinated for the maximum development of this region.

I wonder if the Governors in their meetings thus far have given any thought to this necessary coordination of all of these programs.

Governor SCRANTON. Yes, they have, sir.

This partly I touched on in answer to Senator BOGGS' question. Not only have they done that, but it was at their insistence, so to speak, that some of the things were changed in this bill, which you, the Senate, and the House, too, concurred in last year.

Frankly, I would state this to you. As you know, I am quite familiar with the Area Redevelopment Act and Economic Opportunity Act, and the others to which you refer, and I would say unequivocally that this is the most specific act of all of them. It outlines more clearly what can be done and what cannot be done, and why, better than any of them. This was done primarily because the gubernatorial group and people working with them in the administration wanted it this way, and thought it would pinpoint the problem.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you, Governor Scranton.

The committee would wish at this time to have Herbert S. Richey, the president of the Valley Camp Coal Co., make what comment he would believe to be appropriate, since we have been stressing this problem.

Governor SCRANTON. May I add just one thing, sir. I do want to say that I am very grateful for this hearing, and appreciate the time you have given us.

Senator RANDOLPH. Governor Breathitt will testify very shortly, and Governor Smith, and others, and I call attention to the rather full schedule of witnesses this morning.

Senator MUSKIE, do you wish to address a question to Governor Scranton before he leaves the witness table?

Senator MUSKIE. Mr. Chairman, in connection with Senator CLARK's proposed amendment, I think maybe our witness now can enlighten us.

I am interested in having something in the record on technological developments that are involved in controlling acid mine drainage pollution. I would like something in the record on that problem, because of the general interest in water pollution and the impact of acid mine drainage.

Governor SCRANTON. In all frankness, sir, of all the things in what I call the mining area section of this bill, the acid mine drainage one is the one in which we have advanced less technologically than any of the others. Accordingly, the bill itself indicates that there will be primarily study and project operations here, which, frankly, I think are quite correct.

We would like to be further along than we are, but we just are not there yet. There have been a great many thoughts recently propounded in this field which have, may I say, great hope for the future, including even what you would think would be a far-out proposition of using the desalination operation that was studied at one time likewise for taking acid mine drainage and changing it into fine water again.

This and many other experiments are presently going on, but we have not yet come up with frankly an overall program that we can inject into this area and say we can solve acid mine drainage.

However, as Senator Clark pointed out to you, the very point that he is making in his amendment would help a great deal here, because it would close up those areas that are strip mined already to collect acid mine drainage and then pour them into our streams, sir.

Senator Muskie. I take it our next witness, too, could give us something on this point.

Thank you, Governor.

Senator Randolph. I invite attention to the presence of Herbert S. Richey, the president of the Valley Camp Coal Co., in the committee hearing room. This company has very considerable operations in the State of West Virginia and some in other States as well.

Mr. Richey, I presume you have been here for the inaugural.

Mr. Richey. Absolutely.

Senator Randolph. Mr. Richey, I believe you can contribute at this point to our discussion, and the committee will be glad to hear you at this time. You might give us an outline of your company operations and discuss other coal industry facts, if you will, please. We would appreciate it if you would address the problem of acid mine drainage.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no apologies to make for the changes made by the committee, nor for the strong support given to the solution of a problem which is current and important, not only to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania but also to the people of West Virginia, Kentucky, and the people of a number of the other States in Appalachia.

I should like to make this point crystal clear. There is nothing in the bill—not one word, not one syllable—which would permit Federal money to be spent to pay off opulent coal miners, individual or corporate, in order to reimburse them for damages which they have done to the surface of the land by their operation or to relieve them of 1 nickel of obligation that they have under State law to repair ravaged areas, where strip mining has damaged the topography. There is nothing in the bill that would help them.

The bill would help repair strip mining damage done to public land and to private land where the owners have taken the coal, scuttled the ship, and run away, and cannot now be found, leaving whole cities to subsist in the abandoned coal mine regions.

It should be made abundantly clear that not 1 nickel will go or could go to swell the treasuries of coal miners, individual or corporate, who are perfectly able to comply with existing law in order to rehabilitate the land and leave it the way they found it.

With respect to the bill in general, of which I am happy to be a cosponsor, I should like to say that the bill gets to the heart of many of the problems plaguing the distressed regions of Pennsylvania and the other States in Appalachia.

This is a region which has been bypassed by modern transportation. The bill corrects that situation by providing the highways that will open up the region to the world.

Appalachia is a region suffering from the abuses of the past—the sterile and idle ravages of coal mining, the pernicious stream pollution of acid mine drainage. The committee has wisely and graciously accepted amendments offered by Senator Scott and me directing a massive attack against these twin problems.

This is a region possessing superb resources for the development of new forest and recreation industries. The bill provides the assistance needed to tap new growth possibilities.

This is a region which desperately needs improved health and educational opportunities. The bill goes a long distance toward providing them.

This is a region suffering from one of the most recrurring flood problems in the Nation, and yet a region whose rivers can provide new economic growth. The bill would accelerate flood control and the development of Appalachia's rivers. This program can be the first comprehensive economic development ever undertaken in the United States. There is no place that can put such a program to better use than Appalachia, including the major part of my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

TO PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A BYPASSED AREA: THE NEED FOR AN UPPER GREAT LAKES REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am again happy to cosponsor legislation to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. We have had ample evidence that this region has been bypassed by our country's prosperity. We have read the statistics and heard the testimony which details the destitution and despair existing in many communities of Appalachia.

Last year we witnessed the opening of the President's war on poverty with the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This year we can extend the battlelines with the early approval of this bill.

The 11-State Appalachian region is not, of course, the only region which needs assistance. President Johnson recognized this in his state of the Union address when he proposed "a new program to develop regions of our country that are now suffering from distress and depression."

Appalachia is, perhaps, the largest area to require a regional assistance program, but other smaller areas also require this coordinated approach. The three-State area of the upper Great Lakes is one of these regions. Northern sections of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota make up this region. It, too, has been bypassed by prosperity.

Since it also is a bypassed region, I urge that the Senate amend the Appalachian bill to permit the establishment of an Upper Great Lakes Regional Authority similar to the Appalachian Regional Commission.

I have been concerned about this area for years. Many others in the Congress, in the Federal Government, and at the State and local level have tried to find ways to help this beautiful but economically depressed region. Conferences have been held, reports written, and industrial development groups formed. The Area Redevelopment Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency are some of the Federal agencies which have provided loans or grants or technical assistance. Many of these efforts have paid off in job creation and the restoration of natural resources which have been plundered in the past.

Nevertheless, much remains to be done. Unemployment much higher than the national average persists. An unemployment rate three times the national average is not uncommon in this region in the winter months. A years ago the Upper Peninsula of Michigan had an unemployment rate of 14.6 percent. The last detailed census figures taken in 1960 showed a regional unemployment rate of 8.6 percent compared to 7.1 percent for Appalachia, a rate 20 percent above that of Appalachia. Families in the poverty class—under $3,000 in annual income—are 25.9 percent of the population as compared with the national share of 21.4 percent.

Because of the fall in job opportunities, the younger people are leaving the north woods. The aged remain. In my own State of Wisconsin, current estimates show that over 80 percent of the area included in the upper Great Lakes region lost population in the last 5 years. This area now has only about 7 percent of the population of Wisconsin, yet its share of the number of recipients of State public assistance for the aged is 17 percent.

Figures for last year show that the overall dependency rate for this area is 5 percent higher than its share of the State population. These figures do not show, however, how hard it is for the people of the north woods to turn to public welfare. They have always been proud of their homes and schools and communities. Their homes only now are beginning to show signs of neglect due to lack of funds. But the decline of an area's major industry inevitably spreads blight and poverty. The railroad stops operations and more men are out looking for nonexistent jobs.

The economic decline experienced in the upper Great Lakes regions is similar in some ways to that experienced by Appalachia. Its wealth was concentrated in timber, fishing, and iron ore as Appalachia's was concentrated in coal. The exhaustion of these resources of the area combined with foreign competition have had tremendous impact. The timber of this region can no longer be counted a resource which can generate added employment, and although valuable mineral resources remain, rapid advances in mining techniques limit the possibilities for a large-scale recovery in mining employment. For example, the opening of new taconite plants which make use of low-grade ore will undoubtedly raise employment in the region, but not as much as once was claimed. As the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis said in its May 1964, monthly review:

> When taconite pellets were first produced in commercial plants, it was estimated that 2½ times as much labor would be required to produce a ton of pellets as was required to produce a ton of natural ore. But with the rapid rise of labor productivity in taconite plants, it now takes no more man-hours to produce a ton of taconite than a ton of high-grade ore upgraded by an elementary method benefication.

Technology has, of course, also affected agricultural employment. The typical trend in agriculture across the country has been toward fewer and larger farm units employing fewer farm workers. The upper Great Lakes region differs from this trend in that there has been substantial abandonment of farmland. Unlike the fertile southern part of the Great Lakes States, the land is poor and difficult to combine into large economic units.

The farmers do not have the steep slopes of Appalachia to contend with, but they must skirt lakes, bogs, and rock outcroppings. The growing season is relatively short and cool. The soils are not noted for their fertility. The small farmers eke out chronically low farm incomes.

When first settled for farming, the land was filled with charred stumps left over from the unrestrained activities of the lumbering companies and ensuing brush fires. Nevertheless, land speculation preyed upon the pocketbooks of the land hungry. Hopeful and hardy people undertook to fight the stumps and rocks. In the 1920's, an attempt was even made to have the Federal Government provide free dynamite to the settlers to help remove the stumps and boulders.

Some of the problems of the area today can be traced to the encouragement of farming on land which might best have been allowed to return to forest. As in Appalachia, early settlers attempted to grow crops on steep hillsides which the Indians had wisely left to the forest.

Now we realize that in both regions forest products and tourism may well be the most productive cash crops that may be harvested from the land. But both crops will require a good deal of cultivating. Damaged land must be recovered and reforested. Streams must be cleared of pollution.

The Appalachia bill recognizes the need for resource rehabilitation. It provides help to renew Appalachia's forests, water, and land. Financial assistance is provided to fill voids in abandoned coal mines and to repair the ravages of strip mining. The upper Great Lakes region has not been strip mined, but mines have been abandoned and in certain places the land is sinking because of the deep holes which riddle the earth. It needs similar help.

The upper Great Lakes region is more fortunate in its water resources than Appalachia. Its myriad lakes and streams provide over 3 million acres of water surface which is relatively clean. But the region is in danger of seeing its blue waters exploited as its other great natural resources have been exploited in the past. At one time the supplies of virgin timber in the northern parts of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota were thought to be limitless. It took 60 years to harvest the tremendous stands of white pine, birch, hemlock, and maple but our ancestors did the job with great thoroughnes leaving a virtually barren land. We must prevent careless or cynical exploitation of our water resources which are also touted as "limitless." No one locality or one State can protect the purity of its waters by itself. A regional approach must be used to protect and renew this great resource.

This region is near great and growing metropolitan areas where millions are imprisoned by concrete and steel and deafened by the roar of traffic and commerce. The north woods can find new economic vitality by developing its possibilities for outdoor recreation. Its clear waters and green forests can provide countless numbers with relaxation and inspiration. As President Johnson has said:

> For over three centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and enlarged our vision.

In mid-1963, the six Senators representing the three States of this region began discussions with local business and civic leaders looking towards a new development approach. Vice President HUMPHREY was one of these Senators. On September 25, 1963, President Kennedy addressed a Land and People Conference called by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in Duluth. He stated:

> I would like nothing better than to sit down with the leaders of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan to discuss a regional program for economic development in the Upper Lakes area * * *. Our goal must be a cooperative effort. It must cut across Federal jurisdictions and State boundaries.

Shortly before his death, definite plans were made for a meeting of the President with the Governors and Senators from this region. President Kennedy's tragic death cut short the planning for a conference on the needs of this area. However, the necessity for action still remains.

The people of the upper Great Lakes area are ready to act now. If we are to vote aid for Appalachia, there is no reason that our region should wait.

The amendment I am today urging, with the cosponsorship of Senators HART, MCCARTHY, and MONDALE, would permit us to move forward immediately. It would include authority for:

First. Creation of the Upper Great Lakes Development Authority of seven members—four appointed by the President, three appointed by the Governors with one from each of the three States.

Second. The Authority charged with developing and coordinating programs for land use, public works, resource development, and authorized to finance and conduct research and studies; supported with technical assistance and grants with existing and new local development districts; promote industrial and commercial and recreational projects; and coordinate State, Federal, and local programs, and stimulate the private enterprise economy of the region.

Third. A series of special programs are authorized under the terms of the bill and include:

Three million dollars for contracts to various public and private agencies and educational institutions for basic and applied research on improving the extracting, transporting, processing, and marketing of the region's resources.

Five hundred thousand dollars for special educational projects and fellowship grants on industrial and community development and area economic planning of special importance to the region.

Two million dollars for initial planning and engineering of a Lake Superior Scenic Shoreline Highway.

Two million dollars to provide technical assistance, and grants and staffing of local development districts working on industrial, commercial and recreational development.

The total appropriation for the first fiscal year, including the above special programs, is set at a maximum of $10 million. Additional authorizations as necessary for continuing years is provided.

I am sure that the upper Great Lakes region can be a showplace in a more beautiful America. It can also become a rural slum. The choice lies in large measure with us in the Congress. For this reason I urge that a comprehensive regional approach be adopted to solve the problems of this area which I have outlined. I urge that the Senate amend the Appalachian bill and establish an Upper Great Lakes Regional Authority.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

DOMINO THEORY WITH RESPECT TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the able and knowledgeable columnist, Joseph Alsop, has a most perceptive article on the domino theory with respect to South Vietnam in today's Washington Post.

Those whose euphoria causes them to hope the domino theory will somehow go away would do well to read this article.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOMINO THEORY

(By Joseph Alsop)

As was predictable, the Vietnamese crisis has entered another phase of acute inflammation. Political deterioration will inevitably continue until and unless President Johnson takes strong measures to reverse the military trend.

As was also predictable, the Republicans have begun their preparations to exploit an expected disaster in southeast Asia. In a speech obviously intended to make a record for the future, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon has called on President Johnson to take whatever measures may be needed to end the war by winning it.

In short, the specter of a catastrophic American defeat looms larger and larger, and it becomes clearer and clearer that the inquest on this defeat—if it is permitted to occur—will poison our national life. In these circumstances, the aimless drift that afflicts our Vietnamese policymaking calls out for explanation. Part of the explanation is clearly to be found in a question sometimes put to callers at the White House.

"Do you still believe in the domino theory?" is the question.

It is asked in a tone so scornful and accusing that little doubt remains about the current unpopularity of the domino theory in White House circles. The President has evidently persuaded himself, or at least three-quarters persuaded himself, that a great defeat in Vietnam need not have the grave consequences outside Vietnam predicted by the domino theorists.

It would be comforting if there were any solid evidence on this side of the argument. Unhappily, however, recent developments have produced a mass of evidence to sustain the domino theory. The following sets of facts are of particular importance.

Item: The situation in northeast Thailand is beginning to show marked resemblances to the situation in South Vietnam when the Communist guerrillas were first ordered to take the offensive. Village chiefs loyal to the Government are being murdered more and more frequently. A rather high Central Government official was also assassinated by the Communist underground in the considerable town of Nakhon Phanom.

The circulation of Communist tracts and pamphlets, both in the northeast and also in Bangkok itself, has also been greatly stepped up. The pressure is on, in short. The aim is to be ready to exploit a U.S. defeat in Vietnam—after which the Thai Government will be urgently and menacingly requested to change its political alinement.

Item: In the Philippines, the Communist guerrillas, the Hukbalahaps, have resumed aggressive activity after years of quiescence. They have an immune stronghold in Pampanga Province, and now number about 2,000 fighting men.

In parallel, Communist propaganda in Manila is bearing more and more important fruits, in the form of anti-American protest meetings, burnings in effigy of the U.S. Ambassador, and so on. Again, these are preparations to exploit an expected American defeat—after which the Philippine Government will more and more tend to sound like Sukarno's Indonesian Government.

Item: Extremely disturbing signs have appeared in Taiwan. The chief Chinese intelligence operative in Macao, Gen. Ch'eng I-ming—the Taiwanese equivalent of the CIA station chiefs in Bonn, Berlin, Vienna, and Moscow, all rolled into one—has defected to the Chinese Communists. Another fairly important military figure, Gen. Chao Chih-hua, has been arrested for subversive public talk.

At least four outbreaks of local dissidence in Chinese Nationalist Army units have had to be forcibly suppressed. In consequence, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has taken the fairly grave step of giving the key post of Minister of Defense to his son, Gen. Chiang Ching-kuo, who is also the head of the government police.

The aim of Chiang Ching-kuo's appointment, quite obviously, is to have a strong hand on the helm of the armed forces, in the event of further trouble. Yet in Taiwan, every thinking Chinese Nationalist long ago made the outcome in Vietnam the unique touchstone of American strength of will. Hence even the strongest hand is unlikely to be able to contain the trouble that will result from a final American defeat in the Vietnamese war.

All this and other evidence indicate that the Chinese Communists are not merely hoping for an American defeat. They are already preparing to take advantage of it, through their rather considerable agent net. The confident expectation of an American defeat is also the key to the mountebank goings-on of Prince Sihanouk in Cambodia, to the violence of President Sukarno in Indonesia, and even to the recent policy shifts of General de Gaulle.

In the circumstances, dismissal of the domino theory is premature, to put it rather mildly.

THE POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the February 9 issue of Look magazine there is a very timely and well documented article by John D. Rockefeller III, entitled "The Hidden Crisis," which discusses the population explosion problem. I commend the article to all who are interested in the subject; and I believe all people should be. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIDDEN CRISIS

(By John D. Rockefeller 3d)

All last summer, every 12 seconds, the number changed on the huge "demograph" at the New York World's Fair as it recorded the latest gain in the population of the United States. When the fair opened in April, it read 191,510,364; when it closed in October, it read 192,974,586; when it reopens this April, it will read approximately 194,100,000.

Advertisements in New York subways urged visitors to the fair to "see the exciting story of the population explosion." I am sure millions marveled at this dramatic display of the constant growth of our Nation—an America that every dozen seconds was "bigger and better" than ever.

We are bigger, yes. But is America the better for increased population? I think not. In fact, while we watch the "exciting story of the population explosion," we may, like characters in Greek tragedy, be witnessing our own decline. For unchecked population growth—in our country as elsewhere—threatens, if not human life itself, then surely life as we want it to be.

The problem of population growth is as important as any facing mankind today—and its solution is as difficult. Until recently, I regarded control of nuclear weapons as man's paramount problem. Yet, there is justifiable hope that these weapons will never again be used. An enormous increase in world population, however, seems inevitable.

Both nuclear weapons and population growth endanger mankind. The threat of one is the sudden danger of an act of violence. The other threatens with the erosive quality of a wasting illness. The tragic difference is that the world worries about arms control, while population control seems to be the problem the world would rather forget.

Population growth has a grim arithmetic. The accelerating pace of growth causes the most concern. It took mankind all of recorded time until the 1840's to achieve a population of 1 billion. It took less than a century to add the second billion, 30 years to add the third. And at today's rate of increase, by 1975 the world population will reach 4 billion.

Figures like these surprise many Americans, although "the population explosion" is part of the vernacular of our time. As James Reston writes, "Probably never in history has so obvious and significant a fact been so widely evaded."

The National Academy of Sciences reported last year: "Not only must the current continued increase in the rate of population growth cease, but this rate must decline again. There can be no doubt concerning this long-term prognosis: Either the birth-rate of the world must come down or the death rate must go back up."

We can be sure that man will not willingly surrender the degree of death control he has already won. The solution of the population problem, therefore, is a lower birthrate. The problem's complexity lies in the necessity of communicating effectively with literally hundreds of millions of people. As Arnold Toynbee has put it, "Myriads of minds will have to be enlightened, and myriads of wills will have to be induced to make myriads of difficult personal choices."

These myriads of personal choices are the root of the population problem. Its solution, and mankind's future, depends upon enough of these choices being the right choices: right for the parents, right for the family, right for society. Unfortunately, more often than not, these individual decisions are decisions by default—vital decisions made in default of adequate knowledge.

Large masses of people, even today, simply do not know that they can determine the number of their children. They do not know that means—safe, effective and acceptable means—exist to limit family size. Most important, they are unaware of the facts upon which decisions on family size should be based, of the physical, social, and economic advantages of planned families.

These facts must somehow be communicated; these myriads of minds must be reached. And despite all our recent strides in behavioral sciences, who knows with certainty how to reach and influence even one complex human being?

NEW HOPE FOR SUCCESS

The task is formidable, but I am convinced that in its achievement lies one of the great humanitarian opportunities of our day. We must not be distracted by difficulty. Major developments in recent years present solid reasons for hope that the world's population growth will be stabilized—and in time to preserve the kind of life we know today.

One development I regard as most encouraging is the widespread and rising recognition of the existence of the population problem by government officials, religious leaders and private citizens. The subject of population control, upon which so many were so long silent, is no longer spoken of in whispers, but is being freely and boldly discussed, argued and examined.

The most significant recent recognition of the question was the attention given to it at the latest session of the Ecumenical Council. That followed the announcement last summer by Pope Paul VI that the Catholic Church was giving "wide and profound" study to the problem of birth control. This "extremely grave" problem, the Pope said, "touches on the mainsprings of human life."

Mohamed Ayub Khan, president of Pakistan, is giving vigorous support to a national population-control program in his crowded country. During a visit to the United States, he said: "All the effort that is being mounted in new countries like mine will be wasted if we can't keep our population within reasonable bounds."

An even more tangible reason for my hope that population can be stabilized is the emergence of an improved technology for contraception.

One example is the development and testing of steroid pills, the long-sought oral contraceptive. Although effective, the pills do not meet other requirements of the ideal contraceptive. They are often too expensive for the people who need them most, and they require considerable motivation and good memory, for they must be taken every day for 20 days of every month.

More capable of wide and effective use is the new intrauterine device, sometimes called the coil or loop, which many doctors and demographers believe may be the best contraceptive yet invented.

Since the 1920's, it has been known that a small device (at first, it was a silver ring) placed within the human uterus would prevent a pregnancy. The discovery is credited to a German doctor, although it is said that Arabs prevented breeding of camels by such a technique centuries ago. During the 1950's, experiments with the intrauterine device were repeated, and its design modified in Israel and Japan.

Successful in continuing tests, the device is capable of mass manufacture in plastic. It requires a medically trained person for its insertion, which will help assure responsible use. Among its advantages are that it costs but a few pennies to make, requires only a single motivation and lasts for months and even years. And it can be removed at any time that the user wishes to bear a child. This tiny piece of plastic may symbolize the beginning of a new era of hope for all who concern themselves with the future well-being of man and the world in which he lives.

Still another reason for my hope is the beginning of significant action in several countries. India, Pakistan and South Korea have adopted national policies of limiting population and have programs underway. Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey and Egypt are considering policies or developing programs. Ceylon, Hong Kong and Malaysia are subsidizing privately organized efforts. The governments of half the people in the underdeveloped world now officially favor family planning. However, every attempt to introduce family planning among a large population encounters a defeating lack of knowledge in two crucial areas. There is no sure way to motivate couples to plan their families; nor is there enough tested knowledge of how to organize, staff, finance and administer an effective program within the limitations of the developing nations. This needed know-how, essential to the solution of the population problem, is the purpose of a growing number of important pilot projects in several countries. If they are successful, they will offer the most solid basis for confidence.

On a visit to Taiwan, I had the opportunity of seeing one of these projects in action in the city of Taichung. Conducted by the provincial health department with the support of the population council, it offers an excellent illustration of the approach and scope of these pioneer knowledge-seeking efforts. Set up in a city of 300,000, the Taichung project is one of the most extensive and elaborate social-science experiments ever conducted. The project's experts seek to learn if fertility control can be accepted on a large scale in a developing area, and at what cost in money, time, and personnel.

A preproject survey developed important findings on attitudes toward family planning. It showed that 90 percent of Taichung's wives (and their husbands, too, according to the wives) wished to limit the size of their families. Most wanted only four children, recognized the economic advantage of a small family, did not object in principle to family planning, and did not believe the number of children should be left to "providence" or "fate." The women were aware of the decline in infant mortality and understood that, unlike their parents, they did not need to bear five to seven children in order to have three or four survive to adulthood. The salient message was that in Taichung, people have more children than they want.

To measure how much effort is necessary to control population growth, the Taichung project staff experimented with various kinds and degrees of communication. The city was divided into about 2,400 neighborhoods, and each received one of four kinds of "treatments." In order of increasing effort, the treatments were designated "Nothing," "Mail," "Everything (wives only)," and "Everything (wives and husbands)." The city as a whole was exposed to only two aspects of the program: a general distribution of posters pointing out the advantages of family planning, and a series of meetings where program workers described the program to community leaders and sought their advice and support. The "Nothing" neighborhoods received only the posters and the meetings. The "Mails" had the addition of a direct-mail campaign to newlyweds and parents of two or more children. The "Everything" neighborhoods had home visits by nurse-midwives, who arranged appointments at local health stations, offered a choice of contraceptives, answered questions, and did whatever was necessary to satisfy a couple's desire for guidance.

WHAT ONE TEST PROVED

The results are still preliminary, but greatly encouraging. The effectiveness of word-of-mouth was shown: More than half the women accepting contraceptives came to the health station without personal contact by a program worker; about a quarter came from outside the city where there was no organized effort. The new intrauterine device was the choice of 78 percent of the women accepting contraceptives, and 80 percent of the devices were still in place after 6 months. Reduced to a single statistic, a before-and-after survey showed that one-fifth fewer women were pregnant—a substantial success in any short-term effort to check population growth. The Taichung project demonstrated that, at least in a setting where literacy is relatively high and medical clinics are available, a well-organized effort will generate its own momentum and produce significant results at a reasonable cost, given a convenient and effective contraceptive method. Plans are now being made, with government support, to extend throughout Taiwan the procedures devised and tested in Taichung.

Such projects represent a significant beginning. From them is emerging a background of knowledge and experience. And in them we are training a growing number of personnel, testing our technology and formulating a strategy of approach. They are the first steps on a long journey.

We have seen the seriousness of the population problem, and some reasons that allow us to hope that we may eventually succeed in its solution. Now, we must ask ourselves what is the measure of success. We fumble for an answer. We fumble because I believe that we, and others all over the world, fail to recognize the population problem in its full and true dimensions. From the days of Malthus, we have inherited a tendency to think that the successful solution lies in striking a healthy balance between numbers of people and quantities of food. To the difficult question of how much is enough, this allows a simple answer. But too often it is a wrong one, because it equates man with animal and food with fodder. The population problem is not one of two dimensions, but of three. The third dimension touches the very essence of human life—man's desire to live as well as to survive.

We may, in days to come, bring more acres under cultivation and vastly increase the yield of each acre. We may reap unimagined harvests from our oceans. We may at last free all mankind from hunger. But even this, I maintain, is not enough.

Man is more than animal, and the needs of his life are far more than bread alone. There are the precious intangibles that make life worth living, that give life quality. There is knowledge, for one, and the satisfaction earned by well-used leisure. There is the quiet joy of appreciation of nature and art, and the abiding strength that comes from moral and spiritual values.

Human needs such as these go far beyond the bare necessities, the creature comforts, mere material resources. They are the third dimension of which I speak. The opportunity to fulfill these needs for himself and for his children should be every man's birthright. Every man deserves at least the chance to lead a life of satisfaction and purpose, to achieve in life more than mere survival.

THE HIGH COST OF GROWTH

This emphasis on the quality of life is, for us in this favored land, the heart of the matter. Unchecked population growth will ultimately place this third dimension beyond our reach, even in America. Indeed, it can be demonstrated that "it can happen here"—and is happening. By thousands of small, seemingly insignificant inroads, the growth of population is eroding what we have come to know as "the American way of life."

For illustration, examine but a few of the consequences of population growth. Consider our land itself. It stretched before the eyes of our forefathers in vast, unexplored reaches. The wealth of its resources was unimaginable, its westward horizons unlimited. Once we beckoned immigrants to help us settle the land. The Northwest Ordinance and the Homestead Act were milestones of national policy designed to put land into the hands of the people. Today, we hold back the immigrant while we strive for a broader policy of conservation. We seek now not to sell land to the people, but to buy it from them; not to promote its use, but to protect it. Today, we treasure the remaining stretch of lonely beach and the still-virgin forest. The land has filled up, the unlimited was found to have a limit, and the infinite distances to be finite indeed.

The Population Reference Bureau predicts that if our population increase continues, "outdoor recreation in these United States will have become a nostalgic memory, even perhaps before the babies born today have children of their own." The Bureau's report suggests that it may become necessary to "resort to rigid rationing of the use of national parks, permitting each citizen a brief, uncrowded holiday once every 5 years, then even 10, 15, or 20 years as population increases."

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has written an eloquent plea for conservation. "America," he says, "today stands poised on a pinnacle of wealth and power, yet we live in a land of vanishing beauty, of increasing ugliness, of shrinking open space, and of an overall environment that is diminished daily by pollution and noise and blight."

Our natural resources are dwindling, too. Americans, with our high standards of living, expend resources and energy at a prodigious rate. Minerals and most sources of energy are nonrenewable. When we spend them, we spend capital, not income; when they are gone, they are gone forever. Even our water supply is a worry in many areas. More than 1,000 American communities have been forced to curtail water service.

At present rates of growth, America's population will double in less than 50 years. Think of the impact of this growth on your hometown. Imagine what it will mean to our schools to have twice as many pupils in the lifetime of our children—and four times as many in the lifetime of our grandchildren. Imagine what will happen to our libraries, museums, all our cultural and recreational institutions, as well as to our hospitals, welfare agencies, penal institutions and other public services. In innumerable communities, budgets are already strained or in deficit. Many communities are approaching financial crisis—and the outlook as population grows is for crisis doubled and redoubled.

Such is the pace of our growth that we will have to do in the next few decades what it took centuries to accomplish in the past. In New York State, for example, a new 60-year development plan estimates that in the next 20 years, public and private builders will construct more physical facilities—schools, factories, highways, homes—than existed in the entire State in 1940.

In metropolitan city and suburban village, population growth is already severely challenging our ability to maintain and expand the community institutions and public facilities that contribute so much to the quality of our way of life. Without reasonable population stabilization, the coming decades can only see a further erosion of their excellence.

Some may question whether the American population growth constitutes a population "crisis." I believe the word "crisis" is justified: Its dictionary meaning is "a time for decision." The consequences of population growth in America are far different in kind and magnitude from those in less-developed nations. But because the problems of others are greater, we should not ignore our own. The toll of population growth on the quality of life is a loss to us and to the life we will pass on to our children. Therefore, we should recognize that action to resolve our population problem is in our interest. The choice is no longer whether population stabilization is necessary, but only how and when it can be achieved.

THREE STEPS WE CAN TAKE

The questions we, as responsible citizens, must ask ourselves are: What can we—you and I—do about it? How may we as individuals act constructively? Let me suggest three practical opportunities for action that are open to us.

First, we should inform ourselves more fully about the population problem. We can try to see it in full perspective, in all its dimensions. The range of its implications is wide, far beyond a threat to material resources. We should know and appraise its effects on our community and its institutions, and on the cherished and vital intangibles of life.

Social progress in a democracy is best served by informed discussion. We should try to clarify our thinking about population stabilization. When our attitudes are better defined, we can better consider the views of others. Such dialogs in living rooms and meeting places will illuminate the wide areas of agreement that exist among people of different backgrounds and different faiths. On a subject as vital as this, there is no longer excuse to whisper.

As we inform ourselves, we should work so others may be informed. We should encourage our information media to present the population problem and its ramifications to the widest possible audience. The right to know is important to Americans.

No one can or should be forced to practice birth control, or to advocate it against his conscience, but neither should he be denied the right to know the facts and to decide for himself. I agree with those who maintain that hospitals and social service and welfare agencies should not withhold family-planning information until it is specifically requested. This discriminates against the less informed and indigent, because they are the most likely to need help and the least likely to know it is available.

Second, we should encourage and support greater governmental action on population matters.

It is surely only reasonable that government on every level—Federal, State and local—should make greater efforts to learn the facts and the full implications of population trends. This information should be a fundamental basis for long-range planning and freely available to the public.

Private organizations have a significant role in attempts to resolve the population problem. They contribute much in the way of research, specialized knowledge and trained personnel. Their work deserves our time and our resources. Yet the population problem, in America and elsewhere, is so ramified, so important and so immediate that only government can attack it on the scale required. But government cannot easily take initiatve on questions so politically sensitive. Government moves most effectively when need has been demonstrated, when public opinion has begun to form. As citizens, we have the opportunity to summon our leaders to imaginative and immediate action, and to muster public opinion to support their efforts.

Often, in a democracy, we are prone to evade individual responsibility on such large questions. We rationalize inaction on grounds that the problem is too complex, and the end result beyond our ability to influence. But we should remember that we, the individual citizens of a free society, hold the final responsibility. It is we who are America; our Government is the sum of ourselves. Its attitude is our expressed thought; its policy is our manifested will.

Third, in planning the size of our own families, we should weigh carefully the collective effect of our decisions upon the future well-being of our communities.

DECISIONS BY DEFAULT

Decisions on family size are always based on the self-interest of the family. In poorer lands, the factors of decision are more food, decent shelter, better health, better economic and educational opportunities. But we in the United States and elsewhere, who already have these basic necessities in relative abundance, should also take into account life's higher objectives, the third dimension to which I have referred. In planning how many children we will have, we should consider not only ourselves and our immediate family, but also the impact of continued population growth upon our community and the society in which we live.

We too can be guilty of decisions by default. We are in default of adequate knowledge if we do not fully realize the many-faced threat of overpopulation. True, most people in our sophisticated society know the rudimentary facts about how to control birth. But the facts of which none of us are well enough aware are the consequences of population growth on the quality of our life.

The concern for the total well-being of the community is a new consideration in family planning. The changed and changing circumstances of our day force it before us. Since the beginning of recorded time, man has had large numbers of children "lest the people perish." This was accepted as necessary for the survival of the family, the tribe, the race. In most cultures, fertility was a blessing, a true gift from the gods to be sought by prayer and sacrifice.

The population pressure of our day leads us to this new concept of "responsible parenthood"; parenthood responsible not only to the immediate family, but to the broader community. The phrase "responsible parenthood" is gaining circulation among religious leaders and others concerned with man's place in the social order. Father William J. Gibbons, S.J., of Fordham University, has said that the size of the family "should take into account the physical and mental health of the parents, their economic condition, and the society in which they live."

Judaism has always stressed the high duties of parenthood. Rabbi David H. Wilce includes the well-being of society among the determinants of family size: "The concept of the sanctity of life is enhanced and the holiness of marriage is given a new dimension when parenthood is freely elected, when children are born wanted, and when family size is determined by conditions of health and well-being for the individual family and for society." Protestant theologians also have frequently emphasized responsible parenthood and the claims of society in the consideration of the size of a family.

A NEW ETHIC FOR PARENTS

Margaret Mead, the anthropologist, says: "As parents, cherishing and enjoying our children, we can see the need for a new ethic of parenthood. We can no longer say that everyone should have a child, that families should have as many children as they can afford, that all couples have a right to have as many children as they wish, that parenthood excels all other virtues and is to be commended above all other ways of life. We cannot now, as a people, continue to extol a way of life which—however much we enjoy it in the present—will all too soon destroy what we have worked so long to achieve * * *." "Above all," she concludes, "we must recognize that the time to limit the size of our families is now, that the living must take precedence over the unborn now, if future generations are to be born into a livable world."

Thus we Americans should reexamine many of our attitudes toward population. It is no longer "somebody else's problem," a phenomenon that concerns only people in far-off countries or in pockets of poverty here at home. Nor should as-many-as-we-can-afford be the criterion of how many children we should have.

Our primary thoughts should be for the dignity of the individual and for the quality of life.

Our times give us a new imperative: that we realize that family planning is not only for the poor; it is for all whose lives are being made poorer by its lack.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY AND REFORM OF ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate received from the President his message on the succession to the Presidency and the Vice-Presidency and on the reform of the system of electing national leaders. On both of these subjects many Senators have been interested in depth for a considerable period. In both areas the sense of urgency prevails, even now, as rarely before.

In his message, President Johnson pointed out that the possibility exists—indeed, has been threatened in recent months—that the electors chosen by each State might not actually vote as the constituency voted and that, therefore, there could be an emergence of a consequence not dictated by the voters at large. I strongly concur in the President's desire to make certain that such a possibility is foreclosed.

For several sessions of Congress, I have been the sponsor of a constitutional amendment which would retain for all the States the present formula for counting votes on an electoral formula basis, thus preserving the balance of power between the large-population and small-population States, as intended by the Founding Fathers; but, at the same time, my amendment would eliminate the actual selection of electors and, therefore, absolutely foreclose the possibility in any way of electors not following the dictates of the voters in their States. It seems to me that with all the ramifications of this proposal that have been made and the various approaches that have been suggested, this is the simplest and most direct way to solve the problem that would be posed in such an eventuality.

In our modern day, the necessity to elect the actual persons to be named as electors is a rather excessive indulgence, particularly in times when the procedure is ordinarily routine or a ceremony, and nothing more, and when out of such a routine or mere ceremony could still arise the possibility of an overturning of constituent intent. It only adds to the necessity for clearing up this problem forthrightly and now.

I invite special attention to an amendment to the Constitution, which I have submitted at nearly every session of Congress since I became a Member of this body. It is a real pleasure that we note that the disposition at this time seems to be to move at once on this subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks on this particular question the joint resolution I first introduced on this subject, and which still rests with the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 11

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of four years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution. No person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible for that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress. There shall be held in each State an election to determine what candidates for the offices of President and Vice President shall receive the electoral votes of that State. The voters in such election shall vote for the candidate of a political party for President and for the candidate of the same political party for Vice President. The candidate for President receiving the greatest number of popular votes in any State shall receive all of the electoral votes of that State for President, except that if the candidates of more than one political party receive an equal number of popular votes in any State and such number is greater than the number received by any other candidate, the electoral votes of the State shall be divided equally among the candidates of such parties. The candidate for Vice President of a party whose candidate for President receives electoral votes of a State for President shall receive the same number of electoral votes of such State for Vice President. If, in any State, the candidate of any political party for President receives popular votes as the candidate of more than one political party for President and different persons are the candidates of any of such parties for Vice President, the electoral votes of such State for Vice President shall be given to the candidate for Vice President of the political party as the candidate of which the candidate receiving the electoral votes of such State for President received the greatest number of popular votes. The voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The places and manner of holding such election shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. The Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States, and, unless otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of President and Vice President is to begin.

"SEC. 3. Within forty-five days after the election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists showing the number of votes cast in such State for each of the candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, the names of the candidates receiving the electoral votes of such State, and the number of such electoral votes, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate. On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January, the President of the Senate shall in the presence of the House of Representatives open all the certificates and the result of the election shall then be ascertained. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be the President, if such number is a majority of the whole number of the electoral votes; and if no person has such a majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those receiving electoral votes for President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. In choosing the President the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice. The person receiving the greatest number of electoral votes for Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such number is a majority of the whole number of the electoral votes; and if no person has such a majority, then from the persons having the two highest numbers on the list of those receiving electoral votes for Vice President, the Senate shall choose the Vice President. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any person who, except for his death, would have been entitled to receive a majority of the electoral votes for President or Vice President.

"SEC. 4. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 5. This article shall apply to the election of Presidents and Vice Presidents whose regular terms begin more than two years after its ratification.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to comment in a general way on the other section of the President's concern in his message; namely, that of the succession to the Presidency. I suppose that as one who at one time, at least, trod the paths of the classrooms within the walls of ivy, I could confess to having a change of mind on some of my views of government, of updating the machinery of democracy, and that sort of thing. Whereas I subscribed many years ago to the existing presidential succession system, I feel now, in hindsight and upon further reflection and study, that we were closer to a more effective, a more balanced, and a more meaningful formula 10 or 15 years ago when, under the old succession act, the members of the Cabinet, in the order of the creation of their departments, would, in fact, succeed to the Presidency.

It seems to me that in the interest of the times in which we are trying to provide the leadership and the momentum in a government such as ours, it must now be obvious that the sense of the President's intent, the direction of the President's policies, and the apprisement of what has been going on attendant to all those facets of the Government more logically repose within the members of the Cabinet, close to the President, than they would necessarily in the particular Members of Congress.

Likewise, the system under which we operate at present, which provides that in the event of an extreme crisis, one that would remove both the President and the Vice President, the Speaker of the House would accede to the White House, in effect serves the purpose of contradicting another one of our constitutional intents, that intent being the separation of the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

So, adding both these considerations together, I would urge the favorable consideration of a return to the old Presidential Succession Act, which, following the Vice President, would place the Secretary of State in line, then the Secretary of the Treasury, and so on down through the Cabinet posts. I believe that this system would more truly reflect the intent of the voters, as well as the policy direction most recently to pass the test of a national referendum, namely, the last presidential election. And thus believes the new President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, with his sense of urgency and his insistence upon moving likewise in that direction.

Finally, in terms of a vacated Vice-Presidency, I should like to join my voice with those who would accord to the Vice President, upon his acceding to the Presidency, or in the event of anything happening to the Vice President while the President was still in command, the privilege of letting the President personnally select the Vice President for the remainder of that term, subject to the approval of this body of Congress, as is the case in other types of Presidential appointments. It seems to me that this is most consistent with the intent of Executive responsibility and the testing of that responsibility directly, in that he must then go to the voters for his ultimate sanction if there is any question about his selection.

These, then, would be direct moves in upgrading and modernizing the machinery of democracy and keeping us apace with the tempo of change in current times.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, several Senators have remarked today, during the consideration of the pending measure, that they intend to offer amendments to the bill on Monday and request yea-and-nay votes. They have postponed their requests for the immediate consideration of their amendments and the votes thereon in order to permit an affirmative presentation of the entire bill today. However, they have presented this afternoon, in great part, the merits of their individual amendments.

In view of this fact and the prospect of yea-and-nay votes on several of the amendments prior to the vote on the passage of the bill at 3 o'clock on Monday next, I propose the following unanimous consent request, with the full concurrence of the distinguished minority leader:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that effective at 11 a.m. on Monday, February 1, 1965, debate on any amendment to the pending bill shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of the amendment and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator in charge of the bill; provided, further, that on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], amendment No. 11, the time allotted shall be 40 minutes, 30 minutes to be allocated to the mover of the amendment [Mr. HRUSKA] and 10 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator in charge of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent request, reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, February 1, 1965, beginning at 11 o'clock and during the further consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region, debate on any amendment (except in amendment by Senator HRUSKA, numbered 11, which shall be debated for 40 minutes with 30 minutes under control of Senator HRUSKA and 10 under control of Senator RANDOLPH), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Senator RANDOLPH: *Provided*, That in the event Senator RANDOLPH is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That the Senate vote on final passage of the bill at 3 p.m. on Monday, February 1, 1965.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK MONDAY MORNING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the timing of these amendments will still make it possible to have a final vote on the bill at 3 o'clock, as originally proposed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. This is an accommodation within the unanimous-consent agreement passed on by the Senate on yesterday. For the information of the Senate, it is not anticipated that there will be a morning hour on next Monday.

PROPOSED FEDERAL STIMULATION OF BEEF PRODUCTION IN THE APPALACHIAN REGION SHOULD BE STOPPED

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as all Senators will recall, the cattle industry of this country was forced to struggle through most of last year's session of Congress to get a bare minimum of relief from the depressing weight of imported beef on our price structure. When the matter could finally be brought to a vote in the Senate on its merits, the Senate by a vote of 72 to 15 passed legislation to place limits on this flood of imported beef.

Now the cattle industry in this country seems to be under attack from another corner. By the terms of the Appalachia bill, it is proposed to grant Federal subsidies up to 80 percent for purposes described as land stabilization, conservation and erosion control. Although there is no mention of pasturage or of cattle in the bill, the provision is virtually the same as section 203 of the 1964 bill.

It will be recalled that section 203 of last year's bill was deleted by the Senate. Its opening sentence read:

> In order to promote fuller utilization of one of the region's important natural resources, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make grants to assist in the "improvement and development of pastureland for livestock in the region."

The quoted portion of this language does not appear in the 1965 version of the bill. But in the testimony given at hearings, it was stated that section 203 will provide to eligible farmers such improvement as will make it economically feasible for livestock production." Within a very few years this would mean the improvement of 3.3 million acres, a witness testified.

The section in last year's bill, which was deleted, was the subject of testimony of Secretary Freeman, which in part reads as follows:

> The principal opportunity for enhanced income from agriculture in Appalachia lies in a further expansion of livestock production.
>
> We calculate that by 1972, with the full development of Appalachia's pasture resources, farmers in the region could raise their total annual income to a level about $230 million above its present level.

If such testimony were true last year, it is obviously still applicable this year; $230 million worth of additional cattle marketings is equivalent to somewhat more than 1 billion pounds of livestock.

Thus the very section in last year's bill, which was stricken by this body of the Congress, has found its way back into the bill with continued disastrous impact on the U.S. cattle industry as last year, if it is retained.

My amendment No. 11 would delete the entire section 203 as was done last year. The cosponsors of the amendment support the same action as taken last year, too.

Our opposition to this proposal is not due to any lack of sympathy for the problems of the small farmers of the Appalachia region. We understand those problems and would help with them if we could. But we cannot afford to grant discriminatory assistance to the cattle industry of one part of the country at the expense of our own producers. We cannot be expected to acquiesce in a proposal directed squarely against the livelihood of our own people.

Mr. President, surely Senators have not forgotten the uphill struggle of American cattlemen during these past 2 years, to keep their heads above water, to maintain the solvency and the productivity of the American cattle industry. American cattlemen suffered severely from the sharp price declines of 1963 and 1964. Initially, prices of fed cattle dropped as much as 30 percent on the major livestock markets. Choice slaughter steers in Chicago which were over $30 a hundred in the latter part of 1952, averaged between $21 and $22 a hundred during much of last year. Although a part of this price drop has been recovered, it is only a part and prices are still distressingly low.

The plans announced for the Appalachia region were in terms of feeder cattle rather than fat cattle. The picture in this respect is even more depressing. Feeder cattle are still far below the prices even of last year. In Omaha during the week ended January 23, according to the Department of Agriculture, choice feeder steers averaged only $21.50 per hundred, compared with $24.25 per hundred at the same time last year.

It would be my hope that whatever action the Senate takes, it will not inflict another blow on the American cattle industry. Last year, the Secretary of Agriculture went up and down the land proclaiming that the problems of the cattle industry were due primarily to our own overproduction. It is inconsistent, in fact it is ridiculous for him to recommend and for us to take action to stimulate further beef production through the use of special Federal subsidies on a basis which discriminates in favor of one section of the country and against all other sections.

Amendment No. 11 should be approved so that section 203 will be deleted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the State of Ohio ranks 35th in area among the States of the Union, 5th in population, and second to none of the 50 States in scenic beauty.

In fact, Ohio has sometimes in the past been called the United States in miniature for the reason that in reality my State represents a complete cross section of all American life, with the exception, of course, of the high mountains such as those in the State of our majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and in the other Western States, and also with the exception of the arid territory of the Southwest.

With those two exceptions, Ohio has almost every type of terrain. There are great sweeps of rolling farmland, vast forests, beautiful valleys interlaced with rivers and lakes, and the flat land of the Corn Belt. One-fifth of the population in my State is engaged in agricultural activities. We are proud of the family farmers of Ohio.

However, I know, as does everyone who has flown over my State, or who has traveled through the State of Ohio on our fine thoroughfares, that the great natural beauty of a large part of Ohio has been desecrated by strip mining of the coalfields. This is also true, of course, in some other States.

My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio, as Governor of our State and as a Senator, has been a leader in the fight to compel the mineowners and the coal operators in the State of Ohio to do something toward the restoration of the beauty of nature which has been desecrated by them.

In the operation of the strip mines in Ohio, the coal operators, to pursue their private purposes and seek profit, have removed the topsoil. They have removed the beautiful trees, the grass, the shrubs. In their place, they have left shale and rock, on which nothing will grow. Barren, unsightly earth, and acid-poisoned holes are what remain after the mineowners and the operators of the strip mines in the State have done their job.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I attended hearings and listened to the testimony of witnesses. I was present and my vote was cast, along with the votes of others, to bring this administration measure to the floor of the Senate. I intend, of course, to support this fine legislative proposal. Nevertheless, it is the intention of the junior Senator from Ohio to support the amendment offered by his colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio.

We must, by our action, and by our vote in the Senate, manifest that it is neither the intention nor the policy of Congress to be idle and acquiesce in the desecration of beautiful landscapes and the poisoning of the soil in the State of Ohio and in other States, and then provide that those guilty of this desecration would be put to no expense whatever in the restoring of the land to the condition in which they found it. It would be unthinkable to place that burden entirely on the taxpayers of our country.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio, as the Governor of Ohio, urged the legislature of our State time and time again to right this wrong that has been committed by the strip mine owners and operators in Ohio.

In the Senate he has urged the appointment of a commission to study strip coal mine operations. He has taken exactly the position he took as Governor of our State when he urged the legislature to crack down on those who destroyed the land and fertile soil and ravished the beauties of nature for the sake of profit.

We should stop, look, and listen before we ask that Federal funds be expended to rehabilitate land ravished by strip mine operators in Ohio and other States. It is a ridiculous paradox to permit this.

So it is that, while I want this administration proposal to be enacted into law, for the sake of future generations of Americans it is high time that the Federal Government began to have a real interest in a situation which permits the destruction of so much of our Nation's land and so much of the beauty that the Almighty has given to us in the United States.

I feel, as does my colleague from Ohio, and as I am certain many, if not the majority of Senators feel, that the State legislatures owe a duty to provide remedial legislation and that we in the Congress also owe that duty.

I am glad to follow the leadership of my colleague from Ohio and intend to support his amendment. I hope it will be adopted.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. MONTOYA assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the proposed Appalachia Regional Development Act, which I am cosponsoring. Tennessee is one of the 11 States included in Appalachia, having 49 out of its 95 counties located within the region. Forty-five percent of the State's inhabitants live, work, and raise their families there. However, unless more opportunities are provided for the region's young people, a good number of these people will not raise their families in the land of their fathers. Nor will their talents and energies contribute to the area. In the decade between 1950 and 1960, for example, 63 percent of Tennessee's outmigration came from the 45 percent of the people in Tennessee Appalachia. This, of course, represents, in large part, the cream of our young people, who have concluded that life's struggle was difficult enough without having to face the extra burden of inadequate opportunity.

In Appalachia as a whole, one in three families have an annual income of less than $3,000 as compared with one and five families in the balance of the country. In Tennessee Appalachia, one in every 2½ families have an income of less than what President Johnson considers to be the minimal family income above poverty. Per capita income in Appalachia as a whole is $1,405, while in the Tennessee portion it only amounts to $1,257. We have approximately 35,000 people on the unemployed rolls in this area of our State, resulting primarily from an employment decline of 57 percent in mining during the decade of the fifties.

Of course, this situation is made worse by the fact that 16 percent of the adult population in the Tennessee Appalachia has less than 5 years of education, as compared with 11.6 percent in the entire region and 8 percent in the United States. And, as a result of these conditions, these Tennessee families make up a sizable portion of the people in Appalachia receiving $41 million per month in Federal welfare payments. This amounts to almost half a billion dollars annually. The attorney-writer, Harry Caudill, of Whitesburg, Ky., in his statement to the Committee on Public Works made a very enlightening observation concerning these welfare programs when he stated:

> The cash and food sustain life but create nothing constructive. In the 7th decade of the 20th century, the American Government applies to the white Kentucky (and Tennessee) highlander the same ruinous techniques it has applied so long and with such spectacular lack of success to the conquered Plains Indians. In effect, it has created a vast paleface reservation in the southern mountains where tens of thousands of once proud and independent men and women and their progeny are left to rot in idleness, frustration, and despair.

The proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act is designed to attack, on a regional basis, this idleness, frustration, and despair. If successful in its purpose, the act will abolish the need for a welfare program on any scale near the present one.

The frontline of this attack presents a regional commission which would initiate comprehensive plans for regional development and coordinate action between the 11 States and the Federal Government. Each State and the Federal Government are to be represented on the Commission. The bill establishes its own checks and balances system by providing that Federal money will not be recommended to be spent without the approval of the Federal member and that no State shall have foisted upon it any program that it does not first approve. As a matter of fact, as a further protection to the individual State rights, an application for assistance under the act can reach the Commission only through the State representative sitting on the Commission. This Commission will constitute the first overall regional planning and coordination group in the history of the region; a region so rich in resources and potential, yet so eroded by neglect and lack of foresight and so famished by lack of far-sighted development.

The highway program is the largest single proposal in the bill. The report of the President's Commission stated:

> The remoteness and isolation of this region lying directly adjacent to the greatest concentrations of people and wealth in the country, is the very basis of the Appalachian lag. * * *
>
> Its [Appalachia] penetration by an adequate transportation network is the first requisite of its full participation in industrial America.

This quote is particularly applicable to Tennessee Appalachia. In the Cumberland Plateau region there is one good highway bisecting the plateau running east and west, but no decent highways running north and south. The same is true for the areas between Knoxville and the State of Kentucky. Among the five areas listed by the President's Commission as having accessibility in one direction and no access to and from other directions, Tennessee was involved in three: First, an area at the intersection of Georgia, Tennessee, and North Carolina; second, an area at the intersection of southeastern Kentucky, southwestern Virginia, and West Virginia, and northeast Tennessee; and, third, the Cumberland Plateau area of Tennessee.

While certain suggested highway corridors were contained in the President's Appalachian Regional Commission's report, the bill leaves it up to the Commission established in title I to make recommendations on the locations of these various highways. State highway departments have to be consulted by the State representatives prior to making recommendations. The Secretary of Commerce is given authority to pass on the Commission's recommendations or make whatever modifications he sees fit. Normal relationships between the Secretary of Commerce and various State highway departments as set out in existing law is to be followed then in implementing these recommendations.

In the past the criteria for determining future highways is based on projected traffic needs. This in effect has meant that areas with highways and much traffic received more highways. The philosophy behind the building of roads under this bill, however, is to create traffic where none now exists.

Provided the Commission's recommendations follow generally the President's Commission report—and it is assumed that this will be true to a large extent—Tennessee would receive 328 miles out of the proposed 2,350 miles of highways. This amounts to 13 percent of the total and is exclusive of the 1,000 miles of access roads authorized by the bill. Among the roads to be located in Tennessee is a route connecting Chattanooga, Tenn., with Interstate 75 south of Lexington, Ky. This would run directly through the Cumberland highlands. Another highway would connect Chattanooga with Interstate 40 just west of Asheville, N.C. Atlanta would also connect into this. A road would cross upper east Tennessee to connect Asheville with Columbus, Ohio, another connecting Interstate 75 north of Knoxville with Charleston, W. Va. This latter, when completed, would be the most direct route from Chattanooga or Knoxville to Pittsburgh, Washington, and Baltimore.

In addition to the benefits derived from the completion of the highways in alleviating transportation problems, the program would produce an estimated 30,000 man-years of on-site employment. Approximately 5,170 of these man-years of employment would be created in Tennessee. While the bill does not require it, the Senate Public Works Committee report urges the Secretary of Commerce to promulgate regulations which will insure the maximum feasible employment of local labor.

A total of $840 million is authorized as the Federal Government's contribution to this program. Using the ratio of mileage set out above, Tennessee would receive approximately $116,760,000 of these Federal funds and would have to match this with about $35 million of State funds. This is based on the 70–30 formula of Federal-State contributions.

This highway provision of the bill has been criticized on the grounds that it authorizes an additional highway program for the Appalachia region almost as large as the annual Federal highway aid program. It should be pointed out that in the first instance the proposed road network is only one-eighth as large as the annual Federal-aid A–B–C highway program.

In the second instance, much of the present program does not reach Appalachia because of the underlying philosophy of building to aid traffic congestion. The present proposal will there augment, rather than compete with the regular highway program. By providing needed connections between the Interstate System and the remote and underdeveloped areas of Appalachia it also augments the interstate highway program.

In many sections of Appalachia, the low income impairs a reasonable support of private medicine and the tax base necessary for even rudimentary public health facilities is nonexistent. For instance, as late as 6 years ago, there were at least 11 counties in Tennessee Appalachia which did not even have a hospital and another 7 which had less than 2 hospital beds for each 1,000 residents. At least 4 east Tennessee counties only had 1 doctor for more than 6,000 residents. Four more counties have only 1 doctor for each 4,500 residents.

The provision in the bill providing for multicounty demonstration health facilities including hospitals, regional health, diagnostic and treatment centers, and other necessary health facilities are therefore sorely needed in Tennessee.

Timber is considered, in economic terminology, to be a prime multiplier. The Forest Service estimates the value of sawtimber on the stump is increased 25 times as it is transported, processed, manufactured and sold as end products. The report of the President's Commission points out that, in Appalachia, this multiplier affect on the harvested timber is too often lost, as the veneer logs are shipped out of the region for processing.

The total loss from this source can be seen more clearly when it is noted that three-fifths of the total land area of Appalachia is forested. Some 48,000 people are employed annually in harvesting this timber which is valued at $86 million on the stump. For each two men employed in harvesting, another five work in primary and secondary wood processing. Using the multiplier of 25 this means that the finished product of this timber is worth in excess of $2 billion. The problem therefore is to prevent most of this $2 billion from escaping Appalachia.

The problem is complicated by the fact that 70 percent of these timber stands are in tracts averaging less than 50 acres and owned by about a million small private owners. These people have neither the know-how nor the individual financial resources to properly care for, and develop, this timber and its potential.

Through the approach of timber development organizations the bill proposes to alleviate this lack of technical knowledge and shortage of funds. These units will allow a number of small landowners in a given locality to band together into a single management unit. This will permit a cooperative effort at better management, including the consolidation of small holdings into efficient management units and the establishing of harvesting and timber marketing practices. The funds available to carry out this program are to be loaned; they are not for grants. These funds can be used for the construction of facilities necessary for timber growing, such as access roads, boundary markings, and other similar facilities. These organizations are not to be federally directed; their direction and management will come through existing private and State rather than Federal channels. They are also to be nonprofit, State incorporated organizations. Aside from the loan program, the Federal Government's participation is limited to supplying technical assistance designed to aid local people in establishing wood-using complexes.

Tennessee, with 13½ million acres of forest land, most of which is in Appalachia, would receive valuable assistance under this program.

Tennessee Appalachia has long been the scene of marginal farming and eroded lands. The Tennessee Valley Authority while making considerable inroads within its provinces, has been hampered by budgeting limitations to get into this area except along the immediate runoff areas of its lakes. Under section 203 of this bill, land improvement and erosion control are made possible. The steep slopes of Appalachia have, for too long, remained unproductive because of erosion and their unsuitability to row crop farming. This program will provide the means to establish an adequate vegetative covering for this eroded land or assist in converting it to pastureland capable of supporting economical livestock operations.

There are approximately 23,800 farms in Tennessee Appalachia and 1,749,000 acres of pasture. It is believed that during the life of this program some 15,000 farms and 290,000 acres of land would receive assistance in Tennessee.

Practices of both strip mining and deep mining operations have eroded the hillsides, polluted the streams, and endangered the lives of thousands of people. For example, it is estimated that at least 4,000 miles of Appalachian streams are polluted by acid or alkaline mine drainage. This provision will make a limited amount of funds available to reclaim some of this land. In order to insure that private landowners do not receive a windfall at Government expense from the reclamation of strip mines, the bill provides that such projects will be carried out only on those lands to which the public has access or from which a public benefit will result.

The bill also calls for a comprehensive study of strip and surface mining operations by the Secretary of Interior. After completion of this study the Secretary is to submit a recommended long-range program for reclaiming and rehabilitating mining areas, a program which is recognized as sorely needed by anyone who has ever driven through a strip-mined area.

Because of its topography, much of the land area of Appalachia is unsuitable for urban, industrial, and agricultural activity. For instance, only 30 percent of the region's land area is in soil capability classes I to III as compared to the national average of 44 percent. To compound the problem in Appalachia of the land suitable for development, approximately 23 percent is located on or adjacent to a flood plain and is therefore subject to flooding. While this problem is not as acute in Tennessee as in other parts of the region due to the work of TVA, there are still areas which need attention. Additionally, there is the stream pollution problem which is far from being under control. As an example, the Tennessee River, just below Knoxville, has been cited as rivaling the Potomac in pollution.

The water resources survey authorized by the bill requires the Corps of Engineers to conduct a thorough and comprehensive survey of the entire region and requires this to be done in consultation with the Appalachian Regional Commission and all appropriate Federal and State agencies. Concern from some sources of the possibilities for hydroelectric power generation has been noted. The committee report states that it was not intended for this aspect of water planning to take more or less precedence over the other facets of the program, but noted that a comprehensive plan would not be comprehensive without the study of every aspect of water resource development.

Supplementing and modifying existing programs, part B of title II of the bill provides $16 million for construction of vocational education facilities under the Vocational Education Act: $6 million for construction of sewage treatment control facilities under the Water Pollution Control Act; $90 million for Federal grant-in-aid projects found in other acts including the Federal Airport Act, the Higher Educational Facilities Act, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, title VI of the Public Health Services Act, and the Library Services Act. These grants can amount to 80 percent of the total cost of the project regardless of the formula contained in the existing acts.

In Tennessee Appalachia 21 of the 49 counties included have a population which, on the average, completed less than 8.1 school years. In Campbell, Scott, and Union Counties, for instance, the average person over 25 years old has completed 7.7 years, 7.4 years, and 7.5 years, respectively. Sixteen percent of the adult population in Tennessee Appalachia has less than 5 years of school as compared with 11.6 percent in the whole region and only 8 percent in the balance of the United States. The need to alleviate this problem then is obviously pressing. The bill strikes at this through the provision for construction of vocational education facilities. At present the only vocational schools in the Tennessee portion of the region are believed to be in Knoxville and Chattanooga.

Inadequate sewage treatment and pure water facilities are major problems in Appalachia. The provision of the bill states that these special authorizations are not to be affected by the authorization ceilings or allotments among the States otherwise provided in the Water Pollution Control Act.

The lagging economy in many sections of Appalachia has resulted in Federal grant-in-aid programs not being fully utilized by communities most in need of them, simply because they cannot produce the matching funds required. Therefore, the bill contains authority to allocate funds to eligible locations for the sole purpose of increasing the Federal contribution above the fixed maximum portion of the cost authorized by applicable law. These funds are limited to grants and cannot be used for any loan or other federally assisted program. They can be used only for construction and equipment of facilities.

This entire "part B" has been termed by the bill's opponents as "a backdoor reenactment of the discredited and ineffectual Public Works Acceleration Act for the 355 counties in Appalachia." In rebuttal to the charge that the accelerated public works program was discredited and ineffectual, it can be noted that through April 15, 1964, a total of $15,007,000 in grants had been made to Tennessee Appalachia. These grants included such diverse purposes as water and waste treatment facilities, road construction, reforestation, recreation facilities, fire stations, airports, hospital facilities, and strip mine reclamation and were made to 37 out of 49 of the Appalachia counties—only 42 counties were eligible—as of July 1, 1964. Projects under this ineffectual act had produced a total of 25,931 man-months of employment on 96 separate projects; that is the equivalent of 112,372 workweeks of 40 hours each. Certainly this contributed something toward relieving the unemployment problem in Tennessee Appalachia.

I hope we can obtain congressional approval of this important legislation and have it put into effect, not only for the assistance of Appalachia, but for the benefit and the raising of the living standard of all Americans.

RECESS TO 10 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 10 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate recessed until Monday, February 1, 1965, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29, 1965:

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Walker E. Morris, Cherokee, Ala., in place of E. B. Reid, retired.

L. D. Stapp, Epes, Ala., in place of H. P. Welch, retired.

ALASKA

Nina A. Lie, Kotzebue, Alaska, in place of H. B. Lie, resigned.

ARIZONA

James Kennedy, Jr., Williams, Ariz., in place of H. J. Kielhorn, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Frank J. Noli, Madera, Calif., in place of L. W. Hartwell, retired.

Mary E. Rogers, Summit City, Calif., in place of T. H. Stackhouse, resigned.

Thomas J. McCaffrey, Vallejo, Calif., in place of R. F. Hawkins, deceased.

DELAWARE

Albert B. Carter, Camden-Wyoming, Del., in place of W. H. Draper, retired.

Alfred R. Smith, Greenwood, Del., in place of J. L. Smith, deceased.

FLORIDA

Robert H. Wetzel, Sr., Babson Park, Fla., in place of M. J. Cook, retired.

Philip A. Crannell, Titusville, Fla., in place of H. E. Wattwood, retired.

GEORGIA

Lillie T. Boswell, Greensboro, Ga., in place of O. A. Moorhead, retired.

Edward P. Anderson, Grovetown, Ga., in place of E. M. Gibson, resigned.

Lowell D. Morgan, Springfield, Ga., in place of R. R. Beckwith, retired.

Ralph C. Martin, Uvalda, Ga., in place of W. O. Wolfe, retired.

ILLINOIS

Shirley E. Long, Argenta, Ill., in place of R. W. Adams, removed.

Robert W. Mowbray, Bradford, Ill., in place of B. G. Finnegan, retired.

Walter J. Malackowski, Calumet City, Ill., in place of Charles Smith, retired.

James C. Stanley, Fairfield, Ill., in place of J. C. Stanley, removed.

George B. Murphy, Odin, Ill., in place of G. M. Farthing, retired.

Edward A. Schroeder, Pekin, Ill., in place of R. S. Preston, retired.

Roman J. Mazurowski, Tinley Park, Ill., in place of H. J. Dean, retired.

INDIANA

Stanley P. Switt, Westville, Ind., in place of R. J. Schirr, deceased.

IOWA

Evelyn P. Lupkes, Kesley, Iowa, in place of F. D. Lursen, resigned.

Wallace L. Sheehy, Lawler, Iowa, in place of Florence Goss, retired.

Lawrence G. Phillips, Stratford, Iowa, in place of Hannah Nelson, retired.

KANSAS

Willena J. Martin, Chase, Kans., in place of D. L. Kirsch, removed.

Joseph F. Pendergast, Frankford, Kans., in place of R. C. Barrett, retired.

J. Ernestine Cannon, Latham, Kans., in place of M. D. Haring, retired.

Loyd L. Baughman, Longton, Kans., in place of F. G. Burford, retired.

Paul W. Wade, Mayfield, Kans., in place of J. I. Goodrum, retired.

Earl D. Medlen, Rantoul, Kans., in place of F. E. Betz, retired.

Robert A. Franken, Troy, Kans., in place of A. W. VanBebber, retired.

KENTUCKY

Bobbie T. Hunter, Providence, Ky., in place of T. C. Thomson, retired.

James P. Edwards, Russellville, Ky., in place of G. M. Beasley, deceased.

Doris K. Burns, Sanders, Ky., in place of M. V. Garvey, retired.

LOUISIANA

Roger Frere, Madisonville, La., in place of L. S. Behrens, resigned.

Henry L. Parham, Mangham, La., in place of A. C. Brunson, retired.

MARYLAND

Albert A. Phillips, Hampstead, Md., in place of E. M. Belt, retired.

Margaret A. Stotler, Hancock, Md., in place of M. L. Shives, retired.

Nicholas S. Price, Sparks, Md., in place of W. E. Ensor, deceased.

Thomas H. Wallace, Street, Md., in place of C. W. Glasgow, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Frank Zalot, Jr., Hadley, Mass., in place of R. H. Horton, deceased.

James I. Keyes, Sharon, Mass., in place of A. F. King, retired.

Lawrence B. Connelly, Sherborn, Mass., in place of J. C. Jackson, retired.

John J. Kelley, Jr., Truro, Mass., in place of M. E. Joseph, retired.

MICHIGAN

Kenneth G. Kienitz, Ithaca, Mich., in place of H. H. Alverson, retired.

Robert C. Clark, Lupton, Mich., in place of M. G. Cox, removed.

James M. Stubbert, Mason, Mich., in place of L. B. Palmer, deceased.

Theodore Russ, New Buffalo, Mich., in place of J. M. Littlejohn, resigned.

John L. May, Paris, Mich., in place of F. B. Munn, retired.

Donald F. Gillard, Spruce, Mich., in place of Velma Gillard, retired.

MINNESOTA

Michael C. Rooney, Benson, Minn., in place of W. G. Swanson, retired.

Marcellus J. Simonson, Wood Lake, Minn., in place of Joseph Trojohn, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

William E. Peets, Brookhaven, Miss., in place of A. M. Coker, retired.

M. Deaton McAuley, Byhalia, Miss., in place of E. E. Perry, retired.

Julian W. McLeod, Pascagoula, Miss., in place of A. V. Smith, retired.

Mattie C. Kyzar, Ruth, Miss., in place of C. C. Clark, retired.

MISSOURI

Emmet R. Carey, Brookfield, Mo., in place of G. F. Breen, retired.

Wilson S. Tally, Clinton, Mo., in place of W. B. Menefee, retired.

Robert F. Reddick, Crystal City, Mo., in place of A. A. Fults, deceased.

Janet K. Lewis, Des Arc, Mo., in place of N. A. King, retired.

Martha F. Mead, Harrisburg, Mo., in place of T. R. Long, retired.

Thomas G. Williams, Lathrop, Mo., in place of M. C. David, deceased.

Don O. Baker, Newburg, Mo., in place of Roy Southern, retired.

MONTANA

Nels O. Peterson, Nashua, Mont., in place of M. M. Baker, retired.

NEBRASKA

Roy E. Boham, Bassett, Nebr., in place of F. C. Diehl, deceased.

Ella E. Jackson, Crookston, Nebr., in place of G. J. Brown, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Raymond A. Saulnier, Whitefield, N.H., in place of M. A. Laughery, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Virginia A. Korbobo, Bloomsbury, N.J., in place of C. K. Sheets, resigned.

James Luciano, Florham Park, N.J., office established January 5, 1963.

Rudolph J. Kuchta, Linden, N.J., in place of C. F. Vanderwall, retired.

Clair J. Nenno, Riverside, N.J., in place of Herbert Schneider, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Howard Young, Bakersville, N.C., in place of J. F. Greene, resigned.

Paul E. Buck, Burnsville, N.C., in place of G. L. Hensley, retired.

Ann F. Watts, Germanton, N.C., in place of R. T. Beck, retired.

Annie B. Collins, Laurel Springs, N.C., in place of A. O. Clark, retired.

Elma P. Drew, Magnolia, N.C., in place of J. C. Chesnutt, transferred.

Mildred A. Crowder, Peachland, N.C., in place of J. R. Crowder, deceased.

James W. Jenkins, Pendleton, N.C., in place of R. W. Davis, retired.

Sybil M. Biconish, White Oak, N.C., in place of R. C. Johnson, retired.

OHIO

Miles S. Snyder, Jr., Brookfield, Ohio, in place of R. W. Steuart, retired.

Thomas R. Armstrong, Mendon, Ohio, in place of E. D. Severn, retired.

Thelma M. Schneider, Middle Bass, Ohio, in place of H. A. Heise, retired.

C. Thomas Sharp, Pleasant Plain, Ohio, in place of A. O. Sharp, retired.

OREGON

Mabel E. Pounds, Adrian, Oreg., in place of Glenwood Pounds, retired.

Max E. Gardner, Springfield, Oreg., in place of S. V. Ward, retired.

Lavonne H. Moe, Sweet Home, Oreg., in place of N. G. Haven, retired.

Elizabeth A. Barber, Ukiah, Oreg., in place of M. V. Arbuckle, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Walter G. Carney, Armagh, Pa., in place of R. O. Trexler, retired.

David E. Best, Callensburg, Pa., in place of E. P. Heeter, deceased.

John S. L. Halenar, Coatesville, Pa., in place of C. H. Conner, retired.

Paul B. Robinson, Concordville, Pa., in place of B. S. Robinson, retired.

Edwin V. Strohl, Hellertown, Pa., in place of T. K. Hagey, retired.

Herbert A. Hall, Lakewood, Pa., in place of C. G. Reynolds, retired.

Ernestine C. Buttorff, Millmont, Pa., in place of H. R. Sampsell, transferred.

Ralph S. Meyer, Pocopson, Pa., in place of D. L. Meyer, deceased.

George Novak, Sayre, Pa., in place of A. F. Vosburgh, retired.

Lloyd S. French, Starrucca, Pa., in place of H. S. Glover, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Douglas E. McTeer, Early Branch, S.C., in place of A. F. Foy, retired.

Farrell E. Rodgers, New Ellenton, S.C., office established November 1, 1963.

Milledge D. Penn, Ward, S.C., in place of M. S. Hallman, retired.

TENNESSEE

Joe F. Corlew, Bruceton, Tenn., in place of W. I. Easley, retired.

Mary B. Marlin, Christiana, Tenn., in place of M. I. O'Brien, retired.

TEXAS

Sam A. Kelley, Alvarado, Tex., in place of E. P. Robinson, retired.

Edwin Zajicek, Buckholts, Tex., in place of E. B. Hyer, retired.

Walter Kutzer, Comfort, Tex., in place of Arthur Bergmann, deceased.

Otis S. Bowers, Corpus Christi, Tex., in place of A. C. McGloin, retired.

Evaline W. Bartlett, Glen Flora, Tex., in place of L. A. Williams, resigned.

Leonard W. Pierce, Gordon, Tex., in place of Sue DeFord, retired.

Katherine B. Carter, Hawley, Tex., in place of Tommie Wood, retired.

Loralee J. Simmons, Magnolia, Tex., in place of Wilora Damuth, retired.

Charles E. Lindsey, Memphis, Tex., in place of J. H. Vallance, retired.

Sammie O. Smith, Telephone, Tex., in place of W. H. Castleberry, deceased.

VERMONT

Francis H. Eddy, East Wallingford, Vt., in place of N. E. Graves, retired.

VIRGINIA

E. Trigg Harrison, Chesapeake, Va., office established January 1, 1963.

Agnes M. Allen, Goshen, Va., in place of G. D. Condon, retired.

Norman J. Hogge, Hayes, Va., in place of L. B. Williams, retired.

Charles R. Jordan, Haymarket, Va., in place of R. C. Smith, retired.

Louise H. Miller, Topping, Va., in place of C. M. Revere, deceased.

Stuart M. Petke, West Point, Va., in place of J. F. Walsh, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Lottie G. Moore, Durbin, W. Va., in place of J. C. Gum, retired.

Charles G. Robison, Fairview, W. Va., in place of M. L. Michael, retired.

Glenn W. Hammer, Weston, W. Va., in place of Ross White, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Lawrence J. Vandehey, Auburndale, Wis., in place of T. J. Weiler, retired.

Vernon A. Plamann, Greenville, Wis., in place of R. C. Trauba, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted these words of the Psalmist: *Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him; and He shall bring it to pass.*

Let us pray.

Almighty God, may the legislation which is proposed and enacted by the Congress during this session redound to Thy glory and bring blessedness to our Republic and humanity everywhere.

Grant that the Members of this legislative body may be endowed with clear judgment and wise decision and always find their minds and hearts sustained by the assurance that righteousness shall prevail.

Inspire them with that moral and spiritual stamina and courage which will never permit them to take a neutral or negative attitude toward life's loftiest principles.

We humbly and penitently acknowledge that we cannot achieve the fulfillment of the high aspirations which we cherish, unless we commit ourselves to Thy grace and guidance.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 28, 1965, was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes;

S. 408. An act to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future natural disasters; and

S. 576. An act to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians and dentists.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 65-7.

JUSTICE FOR ALL CITIZENS IN WAR CLAIMS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to eliminate a grave injustice. In 1962 Congress passed Public Law 87-846 amending the War Claims Act of 1948 to authorize settlement of several classes of World War II claims which were not covered by the original law or its subsequent amendments. But that law provided for compensation of war claims only if the claimant and all predecessors in interest were nationals of the United States on the date of the loss. Those who fled the horrors of Nazi Germany to seek a refuge of freedom in this country were not entitled to recover for property lost in their native land if, as happened so often, the Nazis confiscated and destroyed the property before they could become U.S. citizens.

Pointing out the inherent discrimination in not compensating all citizens for their war claims, I offered an amendment when the bill was on the floor in 1962 to include those citizens who suffered losses and later became American citizens. Later I introduced a bill to accomplish this result.

Again today I am introducing a bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to allow the filing of claims by citizens of the United States who would be eligible to file for compensation under the present law except for the fact that they were not citizens at the time of their loss.

The present law creates in effect two classes of citizenship and constitutes an affront to our democratic principles. It says in effect that the United States owes a greater obligation to those who became citizens earlier than their fellow citizens.

This is a question of the obligation of the U.S. Government to its people and not a matter of international law. The assets from which war claims are paid are U.S. assets.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot tolerate two classes of citizens. Citizens by choice are entitled to equal treatment with citizens by birth.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to make an announcement.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, has advised that he will bring up, under unanimous consent, three bills reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on tomorrow, as follows:

H.R. 203, funds for research on diseases;

H.R. 214, repeal of mustering-out payments; and

H.R. 228, increased compensation for service-connected disabilities.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am advised that identical or very similar bills were reported in the 88th Congress and passed the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it my understanding that these bills have been reported out unanimously by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs?

Mr. ALBERT. That is the report that I have. They were reported out unanimously last year and passed the House unanimously last year.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so I may answer the question of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. These bills were passed out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs unanimously.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the majority leader.

BEN COLE

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in commendation of a fellow Hoosier who has just been elected to the congressional standing committee of correspondents.

Mr. Ben Cole is chief of the Washington bureau of the Indianapolis Star, the Muncie Star, and the Arizona Republic. He has been associated with the Indianapolis Star since 1944, serving as Statehouse reporter and city editor. He has been chief of the Washington bureau since 1949.

Ben Cole is typical of those in the Capitol who help so much in keeping the public informed about Washington happenings. The standing committee of correspondents does an excellent job in facilitating the operation of reporters in the Capitol and it also polices their activities to see that everything is carried on with fairness and appropriate decorum. I know that Ben Cole will be a valuable addition to this group. I commend the correspondents on their wise selection.

I have known Ben Cole for many years. He represents the very finest in our great fourth estate. This honor could not have happened to a "finer feller."

It is also of note that the chairman of the committee is Mr. Robert N. Branson, a great reporter, who represents, among others, the Lafayette Journal and Courier and the Marion Chronicle, and Leader Tribune, other fine Hoosier newspapers.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to the fact that it was 30 years Friday that the gentleman from Indiana, CHARLES HALLECK, was sworn in as a Member of this body. Few men have contributed more to our country than has CHARLIE HALLECK. I hope he will be around for 30 years more to give new Members the benefit of his very fine advice.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for yielding to me.

As I look back over these last 30 years, they have been quite something. As a matter of fact, after the 1936 elections I think we only had 88 Republicans in the House of Representatives. We are not quite that bad off now, but I well remember that for 4 years I was the lone Republican from Indiana. You people over there ought to cheer that. But it was kind of a desperate situation with us back there.

In any event, I want to add my word of commendation to these people from our area, particularly Bob Branson, who is chairman of the joint committee. He is a Michigander by birth, and represents newspapers up there. He also represents the Lafayette Journal and Courier in my district in Indiana, as well as the Idaho Statesman out in Boise.

He is one of the young, up-and-coming hardworking journalists. He works at his profession, he is proud of his profession, and he does a great job.

With reference to Ben Cole, who came from the Indianapolis Star, and who heads their bureau here, as the gentleman from Indiana has said for these many years, I welcomed him to Washington when he came here. He has been everything I had hoped he would be here. He is a topnotch reporter, and being a topnotch reporter, he is imaginative and witty and a great writer of features.

Bob and Ben have been fine in every respect. They have been fair in their objectiveness. These gentlemen, in my opinion, are a great credit to their profession.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 30, many of us sat before our television sets paying final tribute to Sir Winston Churchill, one of the greatest men in the world's history.

As we watched a barge carrying Sir Winston's casket depart from London Tower and make its way along the Thames to Waterloo Station, a familiar voice came through for the world to hear. It was the voice of our own beloved former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Although, as he said, he had no charter to speak for the American people, no person more deserved the honor; no person could have more truly represented the deep and personal feeling we, as Americans, have for Sir Winston Churchill.

Along with millions of other Americans I am proud that a man of Dwight D. Eisenhower's stature spoke for me, which indeed he did.

Former President Eisenhower's words of final tribute to Sir Winston Churchill well express the feelings of all Americans:

REMARKS BY GENERAL EISENHOWER

> Upon the mighty Thames, a great avenue of history, move at this moment to their final resting place the mortal remains of Sir Winston Churchill. He was a great maker of history, but his work done, the record closed, we can almost hear him, with the poet, say:
>
> "Sunset and evening star,
> And one clear call for me.
> Twilight and evening bell
> And after that the dark.
> And may there be no sadness of farewell
> When I embark."
>
> As I, like all other freemen, pause to pay a personal tribute to the giant who now passes from among us, I have no charter to speak for my countrymen—only for myself. But, if in memory, we journey back two decades to the time when American and Briton stood shoulder to shoulder in global conflict against tyranny, then I can presume—with propriety I think—to act as spokesman for the millions of Americans who served with me and with their British comrades during those 3 years of war on this sector of the earth.

CHURCHILL WAS BRITAIN

> To those men, Winston Churchill was Britain—he was the embodiment of British defiance to threat, her courage in adversity, her calmness in danger, her moderation in success. Among the Allies his name was spoken with respect, admiration, and affection. Although they loved to chuckle at his foibles, they knew he was a stanch friend. They felt his inspirational leadership. They counted him a fighter in their ranks.
>
> The loyalty that the fighting forces of many nations here serving gave to him during the war was no less strong, nor less freely given, than he had, in such full measure, from his own countrymen.
>
> An American, I was one of those allies. During those dramatic months, I was privileged to meet, to talk, to plan and to work with him for common goals.
>
> Out of that association an abiding—and to me precious—friendship was forged; it withstood the trials and frictions inescapable among men of strong convictions, living in the atmosphere of war.

VICTORIES AND DEFEATS

> The war ended, our friendship flowered in the later and more subtle tests imposed by international politics. Then, each of us, holding high official post in his own nation, strove together so to concert the strength of our two peoples that liberty might be preserved among men and the security of the free world wholly sustained.
>
> Through a career during which personal victories alternated with defeats, glittering praise with bitter criticism, intense public activity with periods of semiretirement, Winston Churchill lived out his 4 score and 10 years.
>
> With no thought of the length of the time he might be permitted on earth, he was concerned only with the quality of the service he could render to his nation and to humanity. Though he had no fear of death, he coveted always the opportunity to continue that service.
>
> At this moment, as our hearts stand at attention, we say our affectionate, though sad, goodby to the leader to whom the entire body of freemen owe so much.

CHAMPION OF FREEDOM

> In the coming years, many in countless words will strive to interpret the motives, describe the accomplishments, and extol the virtues of Winston Churchill—soldier, statesman, and citizen that two great countries were proud to claim as their own. Among all the things so written or spoken, there will ring out through all the centuries one incontestable refrain:
>
> He was a champion of freedom.
>
> May God grant that we—and the generations who will remember him—heed the lessons he taught us; in his deed; in his words; in his life.
>
> May we carry on his work until no nation lies in captivity; no man is denied opportunity for fulfillment.
>
> And now to you, Sir Winston—my old friend—farewell.

HAS THE PRESIDENTIAL OATH BEEN CHANGED?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, when the oath of office was administered to the President on January 20, there was a departure from the form prescribed by the Constitution. Both the Chief Justice and the President referred to "the office of the Presidency of the United States" whereas the Constitution directs that the President-elect swear to faithfully execute "the office of the President of the United States."

This alteration I supposed to be an inadvertence. A respected columnist, David Lawrence, now suggests the change was deliberate. He writes:

> After all, it seems unlikely that members of the Supreme Court would ever countenance for one moment the idea that anything a Chief Justice said in reading the Constitution could possibly be due to a misprint or be a misreading of the text.

The phrase "the office of the Presidency" connotes an establishment, broader, more encompassing than the original constitutional form. Mr. Lawrence hints the change in language was part of the "modernizing" which the present Court engages insofar as the Constitution is concerned—amendment by interpretation rather than by the people in the prescribed way.

If this was a deliberate and not an inadvertent change, and if it is acquiesced in as inconsequential, here is a precedent for further judicial change in the form of the oath. If the Court may control the form of the oath, may it not also dictate its substance? If so, might not the Court in the end prescribe the conditions under which the President assumes his office? It truly appears the Court is setting itself above the Constitution.

CLOSURE OF VETERANS HOSPITALS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of New Mexico, at the end of my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of this body once again the cruel and heartless act of closing veterans hospitals throughout this Nation.

Economy certainly cannot be used to justify these closings when you examine the new budget and find $260 million included for the implementation of the Hill-Burton Act to build new hospitals. Over $20 million has been asked to build new hospitals for the military—and the whereabouts of these new hospitals is still a secret. Funds have even been requested to build new veterans hospitals and an item of $61 million has been included for the operation of public health hospitals. Also, over $66 million is in the budget for hospital health service under the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

When we have such a shortage of hospitals and hospital beds, it seems ridiculous to me to even think of closing these vitally needed hospitals.

I might add that the Fort Bayard Veterans Hospital in New Mexico has been in use serving the people of that area for over 100 years and is still desperately needed.

I once again hope that the great and distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and the chairman of the Hospital Subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of this House, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], will give the Members of the Congress and the people a chance to be heard with regard to this cruel action.

Mr. Speaker, the letter to which I referred earlier is as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE
UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT OF
NEW MEXICO,
Alburquerque, N. Mex., January 22, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS G. MORRIS,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRIS: I have delayed correspondence with you on two subjects.

1. A vital concern in this State is the Administrator's announcement of the closure of Fort Bayard Veterans' Administration Hospital.

TOM, according to statistics released by the Veterans' Administration, Fort Bayard hospital had 215 operating beds; and on November 30, 1964, had an ADPL of 156. It has been announced that the hospitals involved were considered marginal hospitals, and that transportation and staffing problems existed in this hospital. I know of no staffing problems in the Fort Bayard hospital; as I saw a recent publication from the hospital that they had hired just recently a Dr. Wilson, former professor of medicine at the University of Minnesota and Wisconsin. To hire a man of this caliber does not appear to me to be a basis for stating difficulty in finding doctors to go to Fort Bayard.

As you already know, Fort Bayard covers two-thirds of the southern part of New Mexico, the western part of Texas, and the eastern part of Arizona. The over 36,000 veterans in El Paso, Tex., and its surrounding area rely on the facilities at Fort Bayard for treatment. It has already been experienced that those servicemen retiring in El Paso area and Albuquerque-Roswell areas are having to seek hospitalization in VA facilities because of what we understand is insufficient facilities in service hospitals.

The closure of Fort Bayard Veterans' Administration Hospital is going to deny many many World War I veterans who have service connection for pulmonary diseases; and who moved to the area shortly after World War I; and who are requiring to have more and more treatment for residual pulmonary diseases. It would appear impossible to get a seriously disabled veteran into a VA facility, such as here in Albuquerque, from the Fort Bayard area if an emergency arises because of being over 250 miles away from the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

The transportation costs and the cost of emergency hospitalization in a hospital in the Silver City area will have a great effect on the budget allocated for the Veterans' Administration in this State. I cannot understand how this can be termed any improvement toward service to service-connected disabled veterans; and those veterans eligible for treatment in a Veterans' Administration facility.

The department commanders of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and Disabled American Veterans have met in Albuquerque and they on behalf of the combined membership of these organizations also vigorously protest the closing of the Fort Bayard Veterans' Administration Hospital.

I have heard that since the announcement January 12, 1965, of the closing of Fort Bayard, that a veteran traveling through the southern part of the State required emergency hospitalization. Because the hospital had been told to close operations, they were unable to admit this veteran even on an emergency basis.

It has already been established that numerous veterans and families travel across the Southwest; and emergencies have arisen which require emergency hospitalization; as the veteran under the law is entitled to make application for hospitalization and our existing facilities are overtaxed. It is difficult to understand why such an action was taken.

I might further state that every existing non-VA hospital in the State of New Mexico are already overloaded with patients, and inadequate facilities to take care of those patients. Even beds in hallways has not kept up with the growing population of this State.

Many, many people cannot afford the high cost of hospitalization; and many do not have the income to purchase any type of hospital protection; therefore, the veteran population, we believe, should be given due consideration as a veteran toward adequate treatment in VA facilities in this State.

Tom, you already know that our hospital in Albuquerque is experiencing extreme difficulty in attempting to stay within an allocated budget. You already know the city of Albuquerque alone has been forecast to increase its population from approximately one-fourth million to 700,000 by 1970 or thereabouts. The facility that we have at this time will not in any way take care of the veteran population coming in by that time.

By the same token, the facility in the next 2 years, at the rate of the increase of seriously disabled veterans in this area must—and I emphasize this—result in more funds to adequately operate our hospital. I am sure that the Congress has attempted to appropriate adequate funds to the Departments of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration to adequately support the hospital program.

Nevertheless, I don't believe that those responsible for allocating funds understand the situation that this hospital in Albuquerque was facing prior to the notice of the reduction in force that was instigated at our hospital because of budget allocations. We have had as many as 404 to 405 patients needing treatment in the hospital. Prior to January 12, 1965, because of the budget problems, a ceiling of 470 average daily patients was set up for this hospital. Since this time, because of seriously disabled veterans applying for admittance, the admission has gone up as high as 495 patients. Surely these veterans who are in need of emergent treatment or are service connected must be taken care of. Therefore, it appears to me inconceivable that this hospital will be able to operate within its budget unless everything is cut to the bone.

I have been advised as of this date that this hospital is down to 458 patients with the anticipation of approximately 50 patients being transferred in from Fort Bayard Hospital. Adding this together leaves me with a figure of 510 patients. At the same time, the waiting list is approximately 200 already.

Since the cutback some time ago and with the reduction in personnel and staff at the hospital, I do not understand how adequate summaries and reports can be handled with the already short staffed personnel to properly adjudicate cases for benefits to which veterans in the State are entitled. I can only say we have a delay in summaries. This delay will be greater than ever before.

In conclusion, Tom, all I can say is that I strongly support the department commanders and the organizations in the protest in keeping Fort Bayard open to care for the sick and disabled veterans of the southern part of the State of New Mexico.

Yours very truly,
JOHN R. KLOTZBACH,
Department Service Officer.

DO WE REALLY WANT EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have heard many voices raised both here and in the other body in criticism of the Veterans' Administration and Mr. William J. Driver, its most able Administrator, as a result of the VA's plan to streamline its operations and to effect economies in its field structure.

Much of this criticism is unjust and is based on unsound or inaccurate information, and some of it must be placed in the category of "economy is fine but don't practice it in my State or district."

I wish to address myself to two basic points: First, my own experience with recent VA consolidations which I have closely observed and, secondly, to the matter of the qualifications of Mr. William J. Driver, whose confirmation as VA Administrator is now pending before the Senate.

The past decade has seen many changes in all programs of the Veterans' Administration. Many of the benefit programs established to assist veterans in readjusting to civilian life are phasing out and will terminate in the not too distant future. Indeed, some have already done so; and, as is to be expected, participation in many of these programs has dropped sharply. In the medical programs, there have been significant breakthroughs in medical science which have greatly altered the type and nature of medical care and the facilities necessary for providing such care.

In order to adjust to these changing conditions and in furtherance of the administration's policy of reducing unnecessary Government spending, the Veterans' Administration plans to streamline its operations and make adjustments and consolidations in its field structure. These changes will provide for continued high quality service to veterans and savings to taxpayers in administrative and/or overhead cost amounting to some $23,500,000 in fiscal year 1966.

I have firsthand knowledge of the benefits realized by the consolidation of two VA regional offices, which are typical of the purposes of the present plans of the VA; namely, to streamline operations and reduce costs. In December 1963 the VA regional office in Waco, Tex., was the receiving station in a merger with the VA regional office of Dallas. I am reliably informed that this was one of the most successful consolidations of its kind ever undertaken by the VA and the experience gained in this consolidation has been invaluable in formulating VA's current plans. I have solicited all the information available on the achievements and savings realized in this highly successful consolidation of offices. They are of such magnitude that I feel they should be placed in the RECORD:

First, salary savings: This consolidation resulted in annual payroll savings exceeding $360,000, excluding savings in fringe benefits costs. This consolidation resulted in a savings of 45 positions. The combined average employment in the Dallas and Waco offices in July 1963, 6 months prior to consolidation, totaled 385. By June 1964, 6 months after consolidation, the average employment had been reduced to 340 employees.

Second, space savings: Prior to consolidation, the two offices occupied a total of 81,920 square feet costing $355,700. The present space occupied by the combined office is 71,657 square feet with an annual rental of $171,685. Net savings to the Government in rental cost is $184,000 annually and a reduction in space of 10,263 square feet. The General Accounting Office report to the Congress of the United States on this consolidation estimated annual savings in lease cost as about $69,000. The actual results are 2½ times as good as the estimate.

Third, performance: It was, of course, uppermost in the minds of the responsible officials of the Veterans' Administration that service to veterans and their beneficiaries not be diminished. My information leads me to the conclusion that in reality service rendered by the combined regional office at Waco has, in fact, improved over that previously rendered by the separate offices in that—

(a) Based on 100 percent as the highest attainable score, the Waco office is presently assigned a 95-percent ranking in the performance index system used in measuring the efficiency of all regional offices. This compares with a preconsolidation ranking of 90.11 in Waco and 90.34 in Dallas. The Waco office now ranks among the top 5 of 66 regional offices of this Nation;

(b) The Veterans' Administration uses productivity as an important measure in the proper utilization of its employees. The productivity of the two offices during the 12 months immediately preceding the consolidation was 77 percentile. In the 12 months immediately following consolidation the Waco office productivity had increased to 83 percentile, an increase of 6 points or a percentage increase of 9.3 percent;

(c) In December 1964, the manager of the Waco regional office was presented a Presidential citation "in special recognition of an outstanding contribution of greater economy in Government in the field of personnel management." Only two such awards were made to VA regional offices; and

(d) The timeliness of processing in the consolidated office at Waco has shown considerable improvement resulting in more expeditious service to veterans, an increase in productivity and an increase in the quality index measurement system used by the VA central office. Remember too that this was all done with 45 fewer people.

Fourth, employee morale: Several morale indicators are of particular significance in the Waco office and include the following:

(a) Every permanent employee of the Waco office participates in the U.S. Savings Bond payroll deduction program;

(b) Every employee participated in the Kennedy library fund;

(c) There was 100 percent participation in the Greater Waco United Fund Campaign, leading all Federal agencies in the area;

(d) Employee attitude surveys under conditions where employees' answers were anonymous and secret unto themselves reveal that 95 percent of all questions were favorably answered evoking the following evaluation: "Overall management-employee relations indicating high morale"; and

(e) There were no appeals from employees from personnel actions taken as a result of consolidation.

Fifth, management: The General Accounting Office report No. B-152355, dated November 29, 1963, which is a report on the proposed move of the VA regional office from Dallas, Tex., to Waco, Tex., contains a statement on page 21 as follows:

> Effective management will play a significant role in the overall effectiveness of the consolidated office.

As we look back from the time of consolidation of these offices to the present, this is a particularly meaningful observation since every measure of the effectiveness of management and efficiency applied by the VA central office to its 66 regional offices reflects that the management of the combined office at Waco, Tex., is operating in a highly efficient manner. The Waco office is providing the highest type service to veterans and their beneficiaries not only with significant savings each year but with many compliments on the part of those being served, giving thanks and words of appreciation for the manner in which they were treated and the attention their individual cases received. Some representative comments from Congressmen, businessmen, organizations, and individual beneficiaries are as follows:

> My husband and I sent a registered letter to Governor Connally commending your interest and special kindness.

> Thank you for your good service that always comes from your office.

> I thank the entire staff of the Veterans' Administration of Waco for courteous treatment.

> I appreciate your tireless efforts and enthusiasm during the United Fund Campaign.

> Sincerest gratitude for time and effort you spent in my behalf.

Mr. Speaker, the Waco office is alert to any complaint concerning its service and there is no record of receipt of a complaint attributable to the consolidation of the two offices. A contingent of those activities of the Waco regional office having direct contact with the veteran public is physically located in the VA office at Dallas to perform this direct service. As Congressman, I have not received one complaint alleging that this consolidation has made it any more difficult for any veteran to make a needed contact with the Veterans' Administration

Sixth. In summary I wish to point out that an annual savings exceeding $544,000 has been realized by this consolidation. The Waco office is performing at a high level of efficiency by every standard of measurement applied by the Veterans' Administration. The pending workloads in the Waco office were brought to a manageable level immediately after consolidation and have continued well within established tolerances. Employee morale is excellent. Service to veterans in the Waco regional office territory is rendered efficiently and expeditiously.

I would like for the record to show the names of the responsible officials of the VA regional office at Waco who along with their dedicated staff have played such an important role in the success of that office: Glyndon M. Hague, manager; G. J. Coker, assistant manager; Wooten D. Simpson, personnel officer; O. D. Goodwin, management analysis officer; Thomas E. Ball, chief attorney; Paul F. Barnett, finance officer; J. Paul Board, chief outpatient clinic; W. H. Moore, contact officer; Bryan W. Ready, loan guaranty officer; and L. A. Townsend, adjudication officer.

I submit that this consolidation has proven to be in the interest not only of economy but also of efficiency and service to the veterans. I see no reason to feel that the pending consolidations will not have a similar result.

And now to my second point, the qualifications of Mr. William J. Driver to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Driver is the first career Federal employee to be appointed to that position. He has been with the Veterans' Administration since February 1946, with the exception of 2 years during the Korean conflict when he returned to active military service.

He served in the Contact and Administrative Services, the Compensation and

Pension Service, and then later directed the entire benefits program as Chief Benefits Director before becoming Deputy Administrator. Mr. Driver brings to his new assignment a more thorough understanding of the VA program than any of his post-World War II predecessors.

He holds the Veterans' Administration's two highest awards, the Exceptional Service Medal and the Meritorious Service Medal. In 1964, he attained national prominence when he was awarded the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League.

His wartime service brought him other awards. He served during World War II as a commissioned officer with Headquarters, Adjutant General, European Theater of Operations, from 1942 until his separation from active duty in 1946. His military decorations include recognition from Great Britain and France as well as the United States. He holds the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, the Order of the British Empire, and the Croix de Guerre.

During the Korean conflict he served with the office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, U.S. Army. He returned to the VA in August 1953.

Mr. Driver came with the VA in February 1946 as special assistant to the Assistant Administrator for Contact and Administrative Service. He later served as Director of the Records Management Service; Director of the Planning and Field Supervision Service, and special representative to the Assistant Administrator, all in the Contact and Administrative Services.

It was during this period that he attended law school at George Washington University at night and earned his LL. B. degree in 1952. He was admitted to the bar in the District of Columbia that same year.

Following his Korean conflict service, he became staff assistant to the Chief Benefits Director, and in February 1956 he was named Director, Compensation and Pension Service, an office responsible for the disbursement annually of approximately $3.5 billion in benefit payments to more than 3 million veterans or their dependents.

In January 1958 he became Acting Chief Benefits Director, and in February 1959, he was named to the post of Chief Benefits Director. He was named Deputy Administrator, second in command of the VA, in February 1961.

Mr. Driver was born May 9, 1918, in Rochester, N.Y., and received his high school education in that city. He underwrote his college education at Niagara University by employment with a Rochester insurance firm and received his degree in business administration, cum laude, from Niagara in 1941.

He married the former Marian McKay, the daughter of professor emeritus of economics, Marion K. McKay, of the University of Pittsburgh, where Professor McKay is also chairman of the civil service commission.

The Drivers have two sons, Joe, 13, and Kellie, 9, and make their home in Falls Church, Va.

Mr. Driver has been principally responsible for many of the important achievements that have occurred in the Veterans' Administration in recent years. These include:

The veterans pension law, Public Law 86–211, which is more equitable to veterans and taxpayers;

The work measurement and performance standards program which provides knowledge essential in improving operations and the quality of service;

Effective planning, not only to anticipate and meet organizational problems, such as declining workloads in certain areas, but also to improve organizational effectiveness as such; and

The large-scale application of automatic data processing and the establishment of a new department of data management to provide a completely coordinated agencywide approach which will enable VA to realize more fully the potentials of ADP personnel skills and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, seldom is the best qualified man in the Nation appointed to head a great agency of the Federal Government. The appointment of Mr. Driver to head the Veterans' Administration is one of those rare instances where, truly, the best qualified man in America has been appointed to that important position. I know that my colleagues who have been privileged to deal with Mr. Driver over the past years in veterans affairs join me in praising the remarkable abilities and outstanding leadership qualities of this man. I know that this view of Mr. Driver is shared by my esteemed colleague and friend, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE.

It is my earnest hope that the Senate will speedily confirm the President's nomination of Mr. Driver as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

PENNSBORO'S RINEHART

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the keys to the success of any Federal program is local initiative. The most enduring form of progress is achieved through citizens at the grassroots working together, sparked by local leadership. Such leadership has been effectively provided in the town of Pennsboro, W. Va., by Mayor J. Carl Rinehart.

Built on a hillside in rugged Ritchie County, Pennsboro has a population of about 2,000. In recent years, people were leaving Ritchie County because jobs just were not available. The young people were moving out just as soon as they had finished school—and many before they finished. That was before a remarkable bundle of energy, enthusiasm, and imagination, Mayor Rinehart, began to stir Pennsboro to cooperative action.

First, he started a community building program, and coaxed and prodded everybody to pitching in with their own hands and tools to build a firehouse, a community hall and gymnasium, and a medical building. Then he burned up the telephone wires and traveled to many different States at his own expense to stir the interest of small industries to move to Pennsboro. With the help of local capital, he induced the town fathers to build and remodel on industrial sites as a lure for small business to set up shop in Pennsboro. And it worked, too, as a new garment factory and several other new plants started operations in Pennsboro.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE HELPS

The remarkable story of achievement in the development of the Bond's Creek watershed project is another bright chapter in Pennsboro's progress. The U.S. Soil Conservation Service, working with the local and county people, developed a flood control and recreation project which annually attracts many visitors to Pennsboro to enjoy the fishing and hunting around the lake.

Mr. Speaker, the lessons to be learned from Pennsboro's experience can be applied anywhere in the United States. Mayor Rinehart has shown what local leadership and cooperation can do. His record was so remarkable that it has attracted attention in Canada, as indicated in the following editorial and article which appeared in the November 19, 1964, issue of Family Herald, Canada's national farm magazine:

DON'T LEAVE IT FOR GEORGE

Many of our communities are divided into many little cliques, each with its own goals and often cut off completely from other groups. In other communities several groups may lean heavily on the same people for support and direction. Either way, keeping an organization alive is often such a task that little energy is left for achievement. Often, loyalty may be the only reason for continuing membership. When this is so, loyalty might be more usefully employed in other ways, such as promoting the welfare of the whole community.

In few places do we need to look very far to see something that needs to be done. What amenities are there for old folks? What is there to channel young people's energies into creative lines instead of frustration and destruction? How could jobs be provided locally so that, when there are more people on a farm than it can rightly support, they can find suitable employment without leaving the home community? What can be done to wipe out eyesores and to make the most of beauty spots?

A single group may be able to do little to provide practical answers to these questions. But with the ideas and energies of several groups rolled together, some excellent solutions may be found, and it may be possible to accomplish far more than anyone has dreamed possible.

Of course, someone has to start the ball rolling, and as long as everybody is willing to leave that distinction to someone else, nothing will be done. Whose responsibility is it to get things moving? That question can be debated at great length, without settling anything.

What is the answer, then? It is so simple that it can easily be overlooked. The easiest answer is that nobody should wait for anyone else to start the ball rolling. In fact, we should not worry about what other people are doing or not doing; but when we see something that really needs doing, do what we can ourselves. Then, inspired by our example, other people are likely to pitch in.

That is the sort of thing that has happened in Pennsboro, W. Va., as described on page

19. Why? Because Pennsboro has a mayor who is not afraid of putting effort into things, and who does not wait for other people to start before he will do anything. Like people anywhere, those in Pennsboro had to learn how to do things; and they would never have been able to organize the Bond's Creek flood control project if they had not amassed a lot of experience at working together, and gained a great deal of confidence in their ability to tackle large projects.

Most communities in this country have people quite as capable of working together as those in Pennsboro. Some of them have already accomplished a great deal through their joint efforts. For others, it is time to stop dwelling on differences and to start concentrating on getting at jobs that need to be done for the common good.

The Town That Tamed a Creek

(By J. S. Cram)

A friend says Mark Twain's remark about the weather applies equally to the common good—everybody talks about it but nobody ever does anything. After meeting certain people on my Appalachian trip, I don't believe this cynical remark.

One of them was J. Carl Rinehart, the mayor of Pennsboro, W. Va. "We do things for ourselves in Pennsboro," says Mayor Rinehart. It's true, too.

When something needs doing Pennsboro people don't hire somebody else to do it with tax money while they swap stories about the good old days when people did things for themselves. And they're not above helping out the friends and neighbors through working with them on community projects. They roll up their sleeves and go to work side by side, townsman and farmer. As a result, the townspeople understand something of farm problems; and when active help is needed, they're eager to give it.

Pennsboro has changed a lot since 1955. The city was on the skids then. Industries had closed down, businesses were going bankrupt, people were leaving the district because there was nothing left to do but get into trouble. The three-cell jail was full almost every night, and the town council seemed able to do nothing to improve things. Then Carl Rinehart ran for mayor as a reform candidate and was elected. Immediately he started the task of cleaning up the city and putting it back on the map. Stimulated by his enthusiasm and inspired by his example, the citizens, rich and poor, laborer and professional, young and old, went to work to rebuild their city. Donating materials and doing the work with their own hands they built things the community needed, such as a firehall, a community hall and gymnasium, a medical building to house two doctors and a dentist. The jail fell into disuse; nobody had time to get drunk and disorderly. Encouraged by offers of factory space rebuilt to suit particular needs, industries began to come in, expanding employment and teaching new skills: a glass works, a garment factory, a plant turning out playing marbles, a metal stamping plant for aluminum awnings.

By last summer population had reached 2,000, double what it was 8 years ago.

Town-county cooperation flowered in the project to tame Bond's Creek. This little stream usually appeared quite tractable; but after a heavy rainstorm it would swell to a fury and play havoc with farms for miles along its course before spilling its silt-laden waters into the Ohio River about 20 miles northwest of Pennsboro. In a 12-month period in 1957–58 the waters went on the rampage 13 times, flooding bottom land, depleting soil fertility, washing away recent applications of lime and fertilizer, carrying off hay, destroying fences and damaging farms and out-buildings. Bursting out of the shallow channel of Bond's Creek the floodwaters crept up into meadows, fields, and gardens, carrying a load of silt and sand torn from fields higher up the watershed. And when they receded they deposited much of this material, smothering crops and lowering the future productivity of the land. Not all of the sediment was left on farms. Some of it plugged the creek channel, slowing down the runoff so still more sediment was deposited and more water overflowed, striking a random course across the flood plain and scouring the bottom land.

DOUBLE-BARRELED CHANCE

The local grange, led by Harold F. Vincent of Highland, had been trying for some time to arouse general interest in controlling Bond's Creek. He found an ally in Mayor Rinehart, who served with him on the Ritchie County Redevelopment Committee. Although Bond's Creek flooding did not affect Pennsboro directly, some of its headwaters were in a city-owned park, and Mayor Rinehart saw a chance of a double-barreled effort—not only helping farmers, but providing recreation facilities where there are no natural lakes.

A preliminary flood control survey of the Bond's Creek area had already been made by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service under its small watershed project. It recommended putting in a dam high up in the Bond's Creek watershed, to slow the passage of floodwaters, and channel improvement below the dam, to permit surplus water to get away faster and reduce the chance of overflow. These engineering studies showed that although an improved stream channel and a dam would not solve all the farmers' flooding problem, most damage could be averted if individual farmers used approved practice to protect woodlands, improve pastures and meadows, reforest steep areas and improve management of cropland.

With this information before it and spurred on by the 1957–58 spate of floods the Little Kanawha Soil Conservation District, which is the regional operating authority in that part of West Virginia, considered going ahead with the project, but it seemed a lot for a few farmers to undertake. Then Mayor Rinehart put in his oar. The city of Pennsboro would cosponsor the project if it could be assured of a fair-sized lake for recreation.

Plans were reworked and it was found that to make a 12-acre lake would cost $92,000—$23,000 more than for a straight flood control structure. The U.S. Soil Conservation Service would pay half of this for flood control, and share the next 25 percent equally with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. That left another quarter of the total to be divided equally between the Fish and Wildlife Service and the city of Pennsboro—$11,500 each.

That was a lot of money for a city of 2,000 people to raise. Mayor Rinehart was thinking of the enjoyment people could get almost right away from boating and fishing on the lake, and of how the reservoir might also be useful as a municipal water supply when the city had outgrown its present one. But he didn't want to borrow money for the job if he could help it. So he had an engineering firm make an estimate of clearing and stabilization work that could be done by hand or with small equipment, and suggested that Pennsboro people would perform the work instead of paying for it.

"It can't be done like that—it never has," was the reaction of the Soil Conservation Service. But Mayor Rinehart finally convinced them that it could be done like that—and it was. Week after week the citizens of Pennsboro felled trees, grubbed roots, burned brush, and seeded slopes to grass. Finally the job was finished and approved in December 1962 and the city took over the cost of maintaining the reservoir—about $4,000 a year. That meant a continuing effort at money raising.

WHAT THE FARMERS DID

The farmers still had plenty of responsibility left to them. In March 1960 they set up the Bond's Creek Watershed Improvement District, to sponsor their end of the project. Its object was "meeting the requirements outlined by the Soil Conservation Service for establishing, repairing, and maintaining dams, adequate creek channels, and antierosion program in order to provide uniform drainage of Bond's Creek watershed, and thereby minimize damage to lands in said territory from floods and erosion."

Each farmer was required to sign an agreement to undertake improvement measures on his land, as listed in the box. After the 1957–58 floods, it wasn't hard to get their cooperation, as they realized that without this project they would soon be broke and their farms ruined. They also had to sign a trust agreement putting a lien on each farm for 50 years, to insure maintenance of the project; and to put up an emergency fund of $2,000 so critical work could be done when required. A good start toward the $2,000 was made by a $50 donation from each of the 2 dozen farmers whose land adjoined the creek. The balance was raised by fish fries, auctioning high-powered rifles, and raffling a pony—events supported by the whole community.

The Soil Conservation Service picked up the biggest tab. It paid for the materials and use of heavy equipment in making the dam and for the improvements to the stream channel—improvements which included widening, deepening, and straightening the creekbed where necessary, to contain the runoff from all but unusually heavy storms.

Now the dam has been built, the channel cleared, and the high-priority land measures undertaken, and farmers along Bond's Creek are getting used to living without a crisis every time there's a storm. With flooding under control and land management improved meadows are producing 2 or 3 tons of hay where previously farmers were lucky if they got one off. And hillside pastures are supporting several times as many animals as they did before—and doing it without overgrazing.

Pennsboro, with water assured for recreation and future growth, is forging ahead on improvements to its 375-acre park complete with picnic tables, fireplaces, and shelters. It's trying to coax more industries in to join those it already has. It wants to keep on expanding so that local boys and girls, even if they can't all stay on the farm, can make a living and enjoy life without leaving the old hometown.

HOW BOND'S CREEK WAS TAMED

These were the control measures agreed on by the local land treatment committee, the West Virginia Conservation Commission and the U.S. Forest Service.

Forest land: Owners of forest land in the watershed were required to undertake the following measures, with technical assistance provided by the U.S. Forest Service.

1. Tree planting: Artificial reforestation of 80 acres of appropriate open land, needed to adjust land use to meet the needs and to reduce runoff and erosion by developing a protective cover and an absorbent forest floor sponge of humus and litter. Under such conditions the soil is protected, infiltration rates improved, soil moisture and storage capacity increased and the land put to its best use.

2. Hydrologic cultural operations: On 350 acres tree management would be aimed at improving absorption of water by the soil through thinning, weeding, improvement, and harvest cutting of existing stands, to encourage growth of trees most suitable for the purpose.

3. Woodland grazing control: Installing 5 miles of fencing to protect 500 acres of woodland from grazing of livestock, thus

preventing damage to the land's water-absorbing ability.

4. Skid trail and logging road erosion control for 2 miles: Simple ditches with pole or earth diversions, known as water bars, would be installed at regular intervals to slow down and divert water so it wouldn't gully the trails. Some eroding areas need replanting to hold the soil in place.

5. Other technical services: Individual management plans were prepared for at least 30 forest landowners, outlining practices and measures to be applied in the immediate future to maintain and improve forest hydrologic conditions.

Open land: The following land treatment measures were to be established with technical help from the U.S. Soil Conservation Service:

1. Contour farming on 150 acres: Laying out sloping fields in contour strips, with terraces and diversion ditches where required, would make it possible to plow, plant, and cultivate them on the level instead of up and down the slope, thus improving their water-retaining ability.

2. Hay land planting on 500 acres: Establishing long-term stands of grasses and legumes would anchor the soil, provide good moisture-absorbing capacity, and put the land to its best use.

3. Pasture treatment on 100 acres: Lime and fertilizer would be applied in accordance with approved recommendations on pasturelands, to increase the amount of vegetation for the control of soil erosion and runoff as well as to provide better grazing.

4. Farm ponds in 20 places: Impounding water by constructing a dam across a watercourse or a natural basin, or by excavating a pit or dugout, would lessen the floodwaters reaching the creek and make supplies available to farmers.

5. Streambank planting: Establishing 500 rods of perennial vegetation on streambanks to hold ground in place and shelter wildlife.

Wildlife: Measures undertaken with technical help from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:

1. Hedgerow planting: A 500-rod hedgerow of trees and shrubs within, across, or around fields to shelter wildlife.

2. Wildlife food planting: Establishing 4 acres of perennial, biennial, or annual plants in fields, odd areas, or strips.

3. Wildlife area improvement: Establishing 30 acres of wildlife habitat by providing protective cover, food plants, and protection from grazing.

SELECTION OF A NEW VICE PRESIDENT WHEN A VACANCY OCCURS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, events of the last few years, and specifically the assassination of President Kennedy, have caused Americans to take a long second look at our legal structure providing for Presidential succession and the selection of a Vice President, if a vacancy in that Office occurs. Many of us have given serious thought to the need to fill this gap.

I have today introduced a bill calling for the selection of a new Vice President whenever a vacancy occurs in that office more than 30 days before the expiration of the term for which the Vice President was elected. I suggest that procedure for such selection should be for the person discharging the powers and duties of President to convene the Senate and the House of Representatives in joint session to select a person to act as Vice President.

The Speaker of the House shall preside over the joint session and a quorum of both Houses of Congress shall be present. The selection should be made by majority vote of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives present and voting, each Member having one vote. The person discharging the powers and duties of the President shall have the right to veto any selection so made within 3 days.

Should the President veto any selection, the joint session shall make another selection under the same procedure. If the selection is vetoed, that person shall not again be eligible for selection so long as the President is the same person who vetoed such selection.

No person constitutionally ineligible to the Office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President. Such a new Vice President would act until the end of the term for which the Vice President or Vice-President-elect whom he succeeds was elected.

GEN. CURTIS E. LeMAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, one of the greatest living soldiers of this century, will retire this afternoon as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force. The distinguished general's retirement ceremony will take place at Andrews Air Force Base.

The people of the United States, and indeed the people of the free world, owe General LeMay a great debt of gratitude. No one has been more vigilant in the defense of freedom in his native land and abroad than General LeMay. His outstanding career of active military service witnessed the growth of the U.S. Air Force into the most powerful military deterrent in the world. We must give to General LeMay the credit for building our air arm into a global shield against world Communist domination.

General LeMay's entire career has been distinguished by a high sense of patriotism and an untiring zeal to strengthen the defenses of the United States. Nearly every important event which has taken place in the Air Force during the past 35 years has borne the imprint of General LeMay. In peace and in war he has been the outstanding exponent of airpower and a balanced Military Establishment.

The general was born in Columbus, Ohio, on November 15, 1906. He secured his education in the public schools of Columbus and at Ohio State University, where he was graduated with a degree in civil engineering. In 1928 he began his military career as a flying cadet at Kelly Field, Tex. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Air Corps Reserve in 1929 and received his Regular commission in January of 1930.

General LeMay's entry into the military service was no accident. He had an early desire to enter military aviation. The Air Force has been the general's life.

His first assignment in the Air Force was with pursuit squadrons. In 1937 the general was assigned to the 2d Bomb Group at Langley Field, Va., where he came in contact with the Air Corps' first four-engine bomber. Thereafter, the name of General LeMay and the manned heavy bomber were to be inseparably linked.

Prior to World War II General LeMay did everything possible to demonstrate the superiority of the manned bomber in warfare. In 1938 he participated in the first mass flight of B–17 Flying Fortresses to South America. This flight won for his 2d Bomb Group the Mackay Trophy for outstanding aerial achievement.

Prior to the outbreak of war in 1941 the general surveyed and established new air routes over the South Atlantic to Africa and over the North Atlantic to England. These routes were to be invaluable during World War II in ferrying thousands of aircraft to Europe, the Middle East, and India, Burma, and China.

World War II offered General LeMay a broad stage upon which his many talents could be put to maximum use in the defense of his country. As a proficient celestial navigator, technical observer, combat observer, and command pilot, General LeMay was well prepared to meet the demands which were to be made upon him during the war years.

He took the 305th Bomb Group and its famed B–17's to England and joined the 8th Air Force. He developed bombing procedures which enabled the B–17's and their crews to reach maximum effectiveness with the least loss of life and property. Less than 1 year after LeMay reached Europe he was the youngest major general in the Air Force, commanding the 3d Bombardment Division. His famous raid against Regensburg with its vast destruction of German industrial power did much to hasten the end of World War II.

The general was transferred to the Pacific in 1944 when victory in Europe was rapidly becoming a reality. Always a heavy bomber man, the general took charge of the B–29 heavy bombardment activities of the 20th Bomber Command in the China-Burma-India theater. He was later to command the 21st Bomber Command with headquarters on Guam and to become Chief of Staff of the Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific.

When World War II ended, General LeMay returned to the United States in characteristic style. He piloted a super fortress on a nonstop record flight from Hokkaido, Japan, to Chicago, Ill.

In 1947 the general was selected to command the U.S. Air Force in Europe. It was during this tour of duty that the Russians decided to close off access to Berlin. The general organized the famous Berlin airlift. He and his men used every available aircraft they could fly, and the Russians failed in their first major attempt after World War II to intimidate the United States. Resourcefulness, the dynamic leadership of General LeMay, and the indomitable courage of his men made the airlift possible. The world will long remember this humanitarian effort to come to the aid of a besieged people heroically resisting communism.

It was as commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command that General LeMay was to make his greatest postwar military contribution. For nearly 10 years he was to command the most destructive force on earth. He was to make the airpower of the United States respected and feared by friend and foe around the globe.

He came to the Strategic Air Command when it had about 50,000 people, 20 bases, and less than 1,000 aircraft. When the general left SAC it numbered 224,000 officers and men stationed at 40 bases in the United States and 25 bases overseas. Its 2,500 aircraft included all jet B-47's and B-52's, KC-135 tankers, and B-36's. SAC was about to receive its first intercontinental ballistic missiles when Curtis LeMay became Vice Chief of Staff in 1957.

In 1961 the general became Chief of Staff of the Air Force. His tenure as chief of staff has been marked by a desire to strengthen all components of our Defense Establishment. He has fought for the heavy manned bomber as he believes that we must have a balanced defense structure.

The general feels that it would be unwise and dangerous for the United States to place its security on the missile alone. He believes there is no substitute for the human mind and the precision that can be obtained through the manned bomber. The general has not adopted the view that airpower alone can deter war or win the peace. His entire military philosophy has been based upon the balanced concept of weapons and services.

The general firmly believes that there is, and will continue to be, a place in the military structure for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. He is a realist, however, and knows that the nuclear power of the United States can, by the very nature of things, be delivered more rapidly and more effectively in time of emergency and great crisis by airpower.

Mr. Speaker, I have followed the career of General LeMay down through the years. It has been said that he has become a legend in his lifetime. This, in a sense, is true. The legend of General LeMay and the story of his devotion to his country and its military power will be an inspiration to other soldiers, sailors, and airmen in the decades ahead.

As he retires today from active duty he takes his place among other American military heroes with the realization that he played an active, vigorous, and effective role upon the military stage of his country, and indeed the entire world.

I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that we have not heard the last of General LeMay. He must not let his great talents remain idle. His country needs his counsel, experience, and dynamic leadership. There are more victories to be won in the fight for technological superiority and political, social, and economic freedom. General LeMay will, I feel sure, make himself felt and heard in all those broad areas of civilian endeavor which mean so much to the survival of our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, we extend our best wishes on his retirement. He has brought to its close a distinguished career in which he and his fellow Americans can take a just and lasting pride.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina for bringing to the attention of the Congress of the United States the retirement of one whom I consider to be one of the most outstanding soldiers this country ever had. General LeMay has been an outstanding spokesman for what he believes is and was necessary for the proper defense of this Nation. At times he has been a controversial figure. This is because of the fact that he has been outspoken and has tried to tell the American people what he thought was necessary for the defense of this country.

He leaves the service with the confidence of the American people. I, too, join the gentleman from North Carolina in hoping that the abilities and outstanding service that this fine soldier has rendered to this country will not be lost. I hope that there is some way that the tremendous abilities he has will be used in the future, because I think they are very badly needed. Certainly his advice and counsel are needed at this time in the history of our great Nation.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from Florida. I would say with reference to his remarks that General LeMay has at times appeared to be controversial, that in my judgment this was because of the absolute mental integrity of this man who has served his country well not only in time of war but at other times by expressing views which he thought were necessary to be stated if we were to maintain our freedom.

Mr. HALEY. I thoroughly agree with the statement that the gentleman just made.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend and compliment my able colleague from North Carolina for bringing to the attention of the House of Representatives, the Congress, and the country the fact that General LeMay will retire today. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, that I know of no one in the last 15 or 20 years who has served the cause of freedom better than General LeMay. He came at a time when Communist Russia had a preponderance of military strength with an overwhelming land, artillery, and tank force with which to overrun Western Europe, Africa, and all of Asia. It was General LeMay and SAC, the Strategic Air Command, that gave this country and the free world the protection so urgently and desperately needed during that critical time. When SEATO was being born and when NATO was being born his force was indeed an umbrella protecting these forces and giving these forces the opportunity to develop.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE OTHER GUY GOT THE ULCERS—LEMAY'S GRUFF, TOUGH LEGEND COMBINES FACT AND FICTION

(By John G. Norris)

There is a curious mixture of fact and fiction in the living legend of Curtis E. LeMay, the famed Air Force general who retires Monday.

His public image is that of a tough, able World War II hero, builder of the mighty Strategic Air Command and a somewhat warlike bomber general who publicly challenged current defense policy during last fall's election campaign. A closer look at this most prestigious American still in uniform modifies the picture a bit.

There is no question about LeMay's toughness and ability as a commander. He probably was the outstanding combat airman of his time, not just during the war but afterward in making SAC the most powerful and ready fighting force of all time.

Many of the stories of the LeMay legend probably are apocryphal, such as the one about the time he stepped out of an airplane with a lighted cigar—his trademark—in his grim mouth.

"That plane might blow up," whispered a nearby airman.

"It wouldn't dare," replied an old flight sergeant.

HOW TO EARN A STAR

A well-documented and more revealing anecdote about the man was told recently by Lt. Gen. Ira Eaker, U.S. Air Force, retired, who was LeMay's commander in England in 1942. Eaker said that while LeMay's bomb group earned a reputation as a well-trained, well-led outfit always over the target, high in bomb accuracy, and generally back with low losses, he soon received an inspector's complaint that "this guy wasn't human." After his crews returned from a long, hard mission, the inspector charged, LeMay sent them out to practice gunnery and formation flying.

Eaker says he went to see LeMay and received an explanation that ran like this:

"Yesterday German fighters flew by my plane so close I could have hit them with a Colt .45. My gunners must have fired a thousand rounds, but most of the ME109's escaped. If we don't shoot better than that tomorrow, we won't come back. These crews are great kids and I want to bring them back alive.

"So this evening, the gunners are down at the range learning how to hit a moving target, and some of the pilots who flew raggedly on the mission today are now out practicing formation flying. I don't mind being called tough, since I find in this racket it's the tough guys who lead the survivors."

Impressed, Eaker promoted the inhuman colonel to brigadier general at age 36. On the eve of his retirement, LeMay has been a general officer for 21 of his 35 years in uniform, the past 13 as a four-star officer.

Eaker tells another story which he doesn't vouch for but it is in the LeMay tradition. It seems that a flight surgeon told LeMay he was working too hard, worrying too much, smoking too many cigars and flying too many missions. "If you keep up this pace," he warned, "you'll wind up with ulcers."

LeMay's reply: "Doctor, I don't get ulcers, I give them."

NEW AIR TACTICS

This was the combat commander who led the tough raids, such as Regensburg, and devised new bombing tactics: straight runs over the target instead of taking evasive tactics to avoid flak. There was more chance this way of getting hit, but the bombs did not miss and bombers did not have to go back and repeat the mission with additional losses.

LeMay also devised successful new tactics for bombing Japan. His planes came in at 4,000 instead of 20,000 feet and used firebombs on the flimsy Nipponese cities.

As SAC commander for nearly 10 years, he devised the force and tactics that made American jet bombers the predominant military force in the world.

Some consider LeMay too warlike. It is true that in 1948 when the Russians blockaded Berlin, he favored sending an armed column into the city instead of launching the airlift, which he scorned. "A crock of stuff," he told me. And he has favored bombing North Vietnam to help resolve the southeast Asian war. But other top military men, considering America's great power, have backed bold action (although not necessarily bombing) in the conviction that it would win out without major war—as it did for President Kennedy in the Cuban crisis.

It is noted in this connection that LeMay supported, with some misgivings, the limited nuclear test ban treaty at Senate ratification hearings.

AND MISSILES, TOO

The term "bomber general" applied to LeMay implies more than that he is a champion of building new long-range bombers. It harks back to the term "battleship admiral" and suggests that LeMay opposed missiles, as many Navy and Army leaders opposed airpower before Warld War II. In fact, he has pushed development of ICBM's as the now predominant element of SAC, and he fought for more Minuteman ICBM's than Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara would approve in the same way that he battled for a new bomber. He believes both weapons are needed for the indefinite future to give the United States the deterrent power it needs.

There seems to be a widespread opinion that LeMay carried his Pentagon fight over the bomber, more missiles, and a greater military role in space, to the public, and that he slipped material to Barry Goldwater last year to assist him in the GOP campaign against the administration's defense policy.

All the evidence—including the fact that the Republican defense attack seemed badly advised and missed the real issues involved—is to the contrary.

It is clear that LeMay never broke the longstanding rules of conduct for a military leader in fighting for a cause. They are that an official should keep the fight within the Pentagon and express his personal views only when asked for them by congressional committees. The retiring Air Force Chief of Staff closely adhered to these rules, though he characteristically spoke more bluntly than most other military men have under a similar congressional examination.

All of his published comments taking issue with administration policy came from published closed door testimony that was cleared before release. Nor did LeMay aides plant questions with Congressmen or leak his case to the press, as have others who lost battles within the Pentagon.

LeMay, in fact, always held the press at more than arm's length, as he did almost everyone else. Newsmen, like others, respected him, but few, if any claimed his confidence or affection. They regarded him as a great man, but not as a friend.

THE WRONG SLOT

But the record of the nonpareil air commander suggests to some that LeMay should have been left in field command and never brought to Washington at all.

LeMay himself once commented to a woman guest who stood with him at the picture window of his Fort Myer quarters admiring the view of Washington: "I hate it."

Gen. Thomas D. White, now retired as Air Force Chief of Staff, brought LeMay from SAC in 1957 as his chief deputy. He wrote recently in Newsweek: "He did not relish Washington. He suffered tortures, because, as a long-time field commander, he had acquired the simple virtue of being able to resolve the pros and cons of a problem into black and white.

"At the far more complicated level of the Washington top command, new elements such as political considerations, public relations, budget planning, and philosophies had an important bearing on the decisionmaking process. What seemed to LeMay like a black-and-white affair often ended up as a shade of gray which was unpalatable to his practical and initially uncomplicated views.

"When LeMay himself became Chief of Staff of the Air Force 4 years later, he had learned much, broadened and, to a degree, mellowed. But he never compromised his convictions. His gruff and undiplomatic manner alienated him from Secretary of Defense McNamara and Air Secretary Zuckert. A man with more tact might possibly have succeeded in holding both his convictions and the good will of his civilian superiors."

But how could President Eisenhower in 1957 and President Kennedy and McNamara in 1961 have passed over LeMay for top Air Force command in light of his record both overall and as Air Force Vice Chief of Staff.

While long a champion of strategic airpower, he now took a leading part in recognition of the new role of tactical airpower and air-insurgency forces and of modern cost accounting and computerized planning as leadership tools.

LeMay, however, still held the war-experienced view that combat probably would not turn out the way elaborate planning visualized. And he worked, as always, for better pay and living conditions for Air Force personnel.

THE SUCCESSOR

His successor, able Gen. John P. McConnell, 56, probably will be more effective as U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff than LeMay was. He is of the new breed of U.S. military leaders, trained in joint staffs and commands and thus more broad gaged, and also more articulate in putting Air Force views to McNamara and his chief aides.

No yes-man to McNamara, McConnell is not as aloof as LeMay and already is on first name and casual drop-in terms with top Pentagon scientists and "whiz kids." Pentagon history shows that smoother service chiefs who follow more controversial leaders often slide their programs through.

What of LeMay, who at 58 still is vigorous and not ready for retirement? He is considering some job offers and may write a book, but has no intention of running around advocating his rejected views. There will be no farewell statement and no acceptance of invitations to appear on TV press panels. He wants to buy a small airplane and continue his sport car, wood- and leather-working, hunting, target shooting and other hobbies.

One thing is sure: he won't enter politics. Back after V-J Day, Ohio-born-and-bred LeMay, then the youngest of the big-name World War II combat leaders, was offered a seat in the U.S. Senate by then Ohio Gov. FRANK LAUSCHE to fill a vacancy left by the appointment of Senator Harold Burton to the Supreme Court. He turned it down and can be counted on to decline any similar offers now.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina for reserving this time and calling to the attention of the Congress and the United States the retirement of a very great general, one who has served his country well and who has been a prophet.

Yes, he sometimes was controversial but only in this way can you prove your greatness. He is the father of SAC and he has added much to the defense of our Nation. His contribution will long be remembered.

He has earned his retirement, and I am very happy to join my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] in extending congratulations and good wishes to a brave and courageous individual, General LeMay.

I am sure that even though he has retired from active service, he will continue to serve our Nation in the years to come. His advice and counsel will always be valued by his countrymen as we face the challenges of the future.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for bringing to the attention of the House today the fact of the retirement of one of the alltime greats in the military annals of this Nation. I, too, have followed the career of General LeMay with much interest and enthusiasm. He was truly a legendary figure. His contributions to the military affairs of this Nation and indeed to the entire world will not soon, if ever, be equaled.

He is the father of the Strategic Air Command. He has probably contributed more to world peace than any other individual in the military history of these times. His contributions to this country have been of benefit to all of us. It is often said that service is the price we pay for the rent of the room we occupy here on earth. Certainly General LeMay, through his service to his country, has paid that price.

I hope that we will have the benefit of his advice and sound judgment, from which we have profited so much, in the days to come. We all wish him well.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his remarks. I am sure all of us have the same feeling of indebtedness to this great man who has at a young age served our country in so many outstanding ways.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank my distinguished colleague from North Carolina for reserving this time to pay a tribute to Gen. Curtis LeMay. General LeMay is truly one of the outstanding generals this country has ever produced. The legend of General LeMay will go down in history and show him to be one of the outstanding generals and military men of our country. His contributions to world peace, to the development of superior air power in this country, are something we may be proud of and that he may be proud of. In Gen. Curtis LeMay we have a truly great American.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of knowing General LeMay for a number of years and particularly have had the opportunity of listening to his testimony before the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. I can say without hesitation or qualification that he is one of our foremost military experts. His knowledge and experience go further than his particular interest in the Air Force. It has been my observation that he has contributed significantly to our total military thinking, admittedly with more emphasis, perhaps, on air power than otherwise. And I have heard him make recommendations which he felt were right and proper for the country but which were not necessarily those of his civilian superiors.

This I think is a good indication of his complete, his total devotion to the country, not necessarily to his own personal success.

In my judgment we need more top military leaders such as General LeMay who have this total dedication to the country and who are unafraid to speak their mind, even though their views may differ from other military or civilian leaders in the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, it has also been a great privilege to be on several trips with General LeMay and to enjoy his hospitality and his friendship. I can say that his record in every respect is one to which we can all point with pride. It is a record of military leadership that will be hard to match by anyone.

Mr. Speaker, we all wish General LeMay the very best. We all express, I am sure, our lasting gratitude for his efforts and accomplishments and our regret that he is leaving active service.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. I too would like to join in this well-deserved tribute. Having had the opportunity to serve on the Committee on Armed Services during some of the years that General LeMay has served in the very top leadership of the Air Force I have had an opportunity to observe the courage and the judgment which he has brought to his task.

Mr. Speaker, it has been very reassuring to have a man of General LeMay's capabilities in that very important job. I appreciate the fact that he is retiring at a relatively early age. But we can be confident that he will be on the scene to guide and counsel in this field to which he has given his life.

Mr. Speaker, we can be proud that a man like Curtis LeMay has come into this period of our Nation's history when we have been going through a transition in military power and development of new and sophisticated weapons, that he was present to speak forthrightly from the background of his knowledge and to guide us in these important decisions which we have had to make.

I know that it has been the purpose of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] in reserving this time today so that we Members of the House of Representatives may take notice of what is occurring today and record our admiration and respect for a great leader. I thank the gentleman for making this possible.

Mr. WHITENER. I certainly express to the gentleman from New York my deep appreciation for his remarks. I know that when he speaks of courage in connection with this great man he would agree with me that when we speak of the "legend of LeMay" that we could actually put it in one word, and that would be "courage."

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago we had the great pleasure of attending a presentation at the White House on which occasion Gen. Curtis LeMay was given the Distinguished Service Medal, with a third oak leaf cluster.

Mr. Speaker, during the 16 years that I have been on the Committee on Armed Services I have known Gen. "Curt" LeMay and the great work which he has done toward making this the greatest and the strongest military country in the world today. He is a man who spoke his mind forcefully, never with provocation but with a sense of assertion and a sense of righteousness so that one always knew, Mr. Speaker, where "Curt" LeMay stood. Yet, there were easier paths to follow, and there were other men that he might have followed. Nevertheless, he told us what he thought, based upon his tremendous native capacity and his wide experience.

So. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Armed Services was a better committee because it listened to the words and wisdom of "Curt" LeMay. Today, Mr. Speaker, the United States of America and the free world are better because we have had such a distinguished military leader as General LeMay serving the cause of liberty.

I submit as a part of this record the citation by the President of the United States:

> Gen. Curtis E. LeMay distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the United States in positions of great responsibility as Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, from July 1, 1957, to June 29, 1961, and as Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force from June 30, 1961, to January 31, 1965. In these two highest military offices of the Air Force, and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General LeMay consistently manifested a high degree of dedication, combining outstanding professional knowledge with leadership of the highest caliber. His vision and direction have given the Air Force a flexibility that provides the capability for controlled response to aggression at any level of conflict from guerrilla operations to strategic nuclear warfare. During a time of unprecedented change in weapon systems, he directed the introduction of intercontinental ballistic missiles into the Air Force weapons inventory as an effective segment of our strategic deterrent force. His interest in and knowledge of communications have been in great measure responsible for the development of the Air Force worldwide communications systems. Realizing the necessity for the United States to lead in space, he helped create a strong foundation for activities in space by the Air Force, and achieved increasingly effective cooperation with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. His personal concern led to major improvements in the housing, pay, promotion, and medical care of Air Force personnel. General LeMay has consistently demonstrated professional qualities which are in the best tradition of military service, and his accomplishments and leadership have contributed substantially to the security of the United States and the free world. His singular achievements as Chief of Staff of the Air Force culminate a long and distinguished career of more than 35 years in the service of his country. They reflect the highest credit upon himself and upon the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. WHITENER. I commend the gentleman for his fine remarks which come from an abundance of association with this great American to whom we are paying tribute today.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services it was also my privilege, along with members of the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of this House, to represent the House of Representatives at the White House where General LeMay received the Distinguished Service Medal. That within itself is a rarity.

This man has been much decorated, and justly deserves it. He is a paragon of virtue of rugged principle. He has stood alone in organizing the great deterrent that this Nation has afforded the entire world against aggressors in the interest of maintaining peace. He was the founder of the Strategic Air Command, and the Chief of Staff of a great Air Force, the introducer of more "eggs in our basket," as he so well likes to refer to it, in the interest of deterring aggression.

He stated in great humility and with much emotion on this occasion today that he leaves, certainly with emotion, but without fear, because he leaves in the hands of the Commander in Chief what he considers to be the greatest staff that has ever been built, ever ready to defend this Nation, and to always act as a deterrent against those who might seek aggression, that individuals might gain for their sovereign nations. In addition to that he has performed great humanitarian missions whenever the Commander in Chief desired.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for giving many of us an opportunity to pay our tribute to General LeMay. Although I am not a member of the great Committee on Armed Services, I too share with my colleagues their admiration for this outstanding American. His ability and his patriotism have endeared him to all of his fellow citizens.

I wish to join with the gentleman from North Carolina and others in expressing to this distinguished general our heartfelt thanks for the magnificent service he has rendered his country.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my other colleagues who have joined in this expression of appreciation for the life and service already performed by Gen. Curtis LeMay. I know we will all look forward to many more years of outstanding service in the cause of freedom and of peace in the world. While his name will not be on the active roll of the military, I am sure it will be on the active roll of dedicated and patriotic Americans. Again, I salute this great American. Gen. Curtis LeMay, as he retires from active military duty.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the last of the great wartime figures is leaving the military service. Gen. Curtis LeMay, whose name was for years synonymous with Strategic Air Command and who subsequently has been charged with command responsibility for the entire Air Force, is retiring today as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force.

After 35 years in uniform, 22 of them as a general officer, he has earned all the blessings of retirement. As he leaves the service he carries with him the plaudits of a grateful Nation to which he has contributed much.

A perfectionist, he insisted on untmost precision and efficiency in every command—and he achieved it. Much of the Nation's immediate striking power since the Korean war has been in his hands and it was always maintained at the highest state of readiness.

There are not many Curt LeMays. He is a great warrior—one of the greatest of all.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, a great American is retiring from active service in the Armed Forces today. He is one of the true giants who has made the service of his country his lifelong career.

The distinguished record and the many contributions of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay will long be remembered by every American citizen who has acquainted himself with the defense and national security problems of our country.

His World War II record was an outstanding one but he will probably be remembered best for his achievements as Commander of the Strategic Air Command. As Commander of SAC for nearly 10 years, General LeMay was largely responsible for making the American jet bombers the predominant military force in the world today. His outstanding contributions to the defense needs of our country in its most critical period have earned him the gratitude of millions of Americans.

Great men who retire do not often fade away. It is to be expected and hoped for that the experience and counsel of General LeMay will long be available and utilized by his successors.

Mr. Speaker, General LeMay appeared often before our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in recent years. He was always knowledgeable, but even more importantly he was a straightforward witness. His insights into the problems we face and the forces we need as we look into the future were extremely valuable to me and to the other members of our committee.

The Air Force and our country are losing the full-time services of a career officer whose every action was dictated by conviction, dedication to our national interest, and love of country. It is to be hoped that his valuable knowledge and experience will continue to be available for years to come.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of this Nation's most courageous military leaders retired this week after a distinguished career of service. On behalf of a grateful citizenry, I want to express appreciation and extend a most deserved "well done" to Gen. Curtis E. LeMay from the people of my congressional district in Kansas. We are indeed indebted to General LeMay for his monumental contributions to the freedom, defense, and security of the United States and the free world.

We will never forget the genius and vision of this man who contributed so much to America's formidable strength in the air. General LeMay was the father of the Strategic Air Command. There is no doubt that the power of SAC has served as America's greatest deterrent to war. General LeMay waged a determined effort to build a flexible weapons arsenal including both missiles and manned bombers.

Curtis LeMay certainly is not a "yes man." His leadership and counsel were based upon 38 years of military experience in hot and cold wars. He fought for what he believed was necessary to keep America strong. General LeMay believed that only through strength can we prevent war. On February 4, 1964, he told the House Armed Services Committee:

> It is my personal belief that only by being strong enough to win a war will our desire to prevent war have a true meaning.

He knows and understands communism; and I believe he demonstrated a know-how for stemming Communist aggression and ambitions. In those same hearings a year ago, he stated:

> The Soviet Union has periodically proclaimed peaceful coexistence and a gradual political change as the goal of international communism. But in the past, these proclamations have been followed by new forms of aggression.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation will always require the advice, counsel, and service of such leaders as General LeMay. We need such voices as his to speak out even though others in positions of leadership may not be in agreement. I know that General LeMay will continue to contribute to the greatness and strength of the United States. I believe the following excerpt from a recent editorial in the Wichita, Kans., Eagle may account for General LeMay's retirement as U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff at age 58; but it also points up the debt which all Americans owe to General LeMay:

> LeMay will be missed. His service to our Nation has been considerable over the years. And, while his nonconformism may have caused difficulties for the Defense Department and the administration, there is a certain value in having a man who is not afraid to speak his mind in the upper echelons of our Defense Establishment. Our Nation's defense is too important to have nothing but "yes men" running it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 1, a great American, a great patriot, and a great general—Gen. Curtis LeMay—retired from active service. I would like to add my tribute to the many already spoken for this outstanding man.

General LeMay's career speaks for itself. Entering the armed services as a flying cadet in 1928, he retires this year as Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

These 37 years of service saw so many achievements—the development of bombing techniques and the many bomber commands in World War II, the Regensburg raid, command of Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific, the Berlin Airlift—and the command and development of our Strategic Air Command.

General LeMay's influence and contributions to our air defense are unmeasurable. As commander of SAC, he built, from the remnants of World War II, an all jet manned bomber force, and supervised plans for the development and integration of an intercontinental ballistic missile capability.

As Commander of SAC, and as Chief of Staff, the general has always stressed the importance of maintaining a balanced military concept of manned bombers and missiles. He knows the danger of discounting the precision of the manned bomber and placing our reliance on the missile alone as a peacekeeping deterrent.

For his philosophy, his leadership, his ability—America and the entire free world are indeed indebted to Gen. Curtis LeMay. As he retires, Mr. Speaker, may I add my good wishes to the many he has already received, and my fervent hope that General LeMay will continue to lend his counsel, experience, and advice to a grateful nation.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respects to a great American of whom President Johnson just recently said "all freemen are in your debt." I am speaking of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, of the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fortunate and often noted fact of our history that during periods of crisis we have seen the rise of men of foresight, courage, and determination come to the forefront.

Time after time, the greatness of individuals has provided the rest of us with the leadership and inspiration needed to enable us to come through a period of torment, of potential catastrophe—not only to survive, but also to emerge from the trial with unprecedented strength and a more solid confidence in the future.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay is one of those individuals. Today America is safer, more secure and faces a brighter future because of the leadership he gave us as U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should invite General LeMay to address a joint meeting to give us and the Nation a summation of a lifetime of dedicated service in defense of freemen the world over.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on General LeMay, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION ASSURING THE ORDERLY DISCHARGE OF THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 64)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1787, Benjamin Franklin remarked near the conclusion of the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, "It astonishes me, sir, to find this system approaching so near to perfection as it does."

One hundred and seventy-eight years later the relevance of that Constitution of 1789 to our society of 1965 is remarkable. Yet it is truly astonishing that, over this span, we have neither perfected the provisions for orderly continuity in the Executive direction of our system nor, as yet, paid the price our continuing inaction so clearly invites and so recklessly risks.

I refer, of course, to three conspicuous and long-recognized defects in the Constitution relating to the office of the Presidency:

1. The lack of a constitutional provision assuring the orderly discharge of the powers and duties of the President—Commander in Chief—in the event of the disability or incapacity of the incumbent.

2. The lack of a constitutional provision assuring continuity in the office of the Vice President, an office which itself is provided within our system for the primary purpose of assuring continuity.

3. The lack of a constitutional provision assuring that the votes of electors in the electoral college shall without question reflect the expressed will of the people in the actual election of their President and Vice President.

Over the years, as I have noted, we have escaped the mischief these obvious omissions invite and permit. Our escape has been more the result of providence than of any prudence on our part. For it is not necessary to conjure the nightmare of nuclear holocaust or other national catastrophe to identify these omissions as chasms of chaos into which normal human frailties might plunge us at any time.

On at least two occasions in our history, and perhaps others, American Presidents—James Garfield and Woodrow Wilson—have for prolonged periods been rendered incapable of discharging their Presidential duties. On 16 occasions in our 36 administrations, the office of Vice President has been vacant—and over the two perilous decades since the end of the Second World War, that vital office has been vacant the equivalent of 1 year out of 4. Finally, over recent years, complex but concerted campaigns have been openly undertaken—fortunately without success, as yet—to subvert the electoral college so that it would register not the will of the people of individual States but, rather, the wishes of the electors themselves.

The potential of paralysis implicit in these conditions constitutes an indefensible folly for our responsible society in these times. Commonsense impels, duty requires us to act—and to act now, without further delay.

Action is in the tradition of our forebears. Since adoption of the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments to our Constitution—9 of the 14 subsequent amendments have related directly either to the offices of the Presidency and Vice-Presidency or to assuring the responsiveness of our voting processes to the will of the people. As long ago as 1804 and as recently as 1964, Americans have amended their Constitution in striving for its greater perfection in these most sensitive and critical areas.

I believe it is the strong and overriding will of the people today that we should act now to eliminate these unhappy possibilities inherent in our system as it now exists. Likewise, I believe it is the consensus of an overwhelming majority of the Congress—without thought of partisanship—that effective action be taken promptly. I am, accordingly, addressing this communication to both Houses to ask that this prevailing will be translated into action which would permit the people, through the process of constitutional amendment, to overcome these omissions so clearly evident in our system.

I. PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

Our Constitution clearly prescribes the order of procedure for assuring continuity in the office of the Presidency in the event of the death of the incumbent. These provisions have met their tragic tests successfully. Our system, unlike many others, has never experienced the catastrophe of disputed succession or the chaos of uncertain command.

Our stability is, nonetheless, more superficial than sure. While we are prepared for the possibility of a President's death, we are all but defenseless against the probability of a President's incapacity by injury, illness, senility, or other affliction. A nation bearing the responsibilities we are privileged to bear for our own security—and the security of the free world—cannot justify the appalling gamble of entrusting its security to the immobilized hands or uncomprehending mind of a Commander in Chief unable to command.

On September 29, 1964, the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 139, proposing a constitutional amendment to deal with this perplexing question of presidential disability—as well as the question, which I shall discuss below, of filling vacancies in the office of Vice President. The same measure has been introduced in this Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 1 and House Joint Resolution 1. The provisions of these measures have been carefully considered and are the product of many of our finest constitutional and legal minds. Believing, as I do, that Senate Joint Resolution 1 and House Joint Resolution 1 would responsibly meet the pressing need I have outlined, I urge the Congress to approve them forthwith for submission to ratification by the States.

II. VACANCY IN THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Indelible personal experience has impressed upon me the indisputable logic and imperative necessity of assuring that the second office of our system shall, like the first office, be at all times occupied by an incumbent who is able and who is ready to assume the powers and duties of the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief.

In our history, to this point, the office of the Presidency has never devolved below the first clearly prescribed step of constitutional succession. In moments of need, there has always been a Vice President, yet Vice Presidents are no less mortal than Presidents. Seven men have died in the office and one has resigned—in addition to the eight who left the office vacant to succeed to the Presidency.

We recognized long ago the necessity of assuring automatic succession in the absence of a Vice President. Various statutes have been enacted at various times prescribing orders of succession from among either the Presiding Officers of the Houses of Congress or the heads of executive departments who, together, comprise the traditional Cabinet of the President. In these times, such orders of succession are no substitute for an office of succession.

Since the last order of succession was prescribed by the Congress in 1947, the office of the Vice Presidency has undergone the most significant transformation and enlargement of duties in its history.

Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy have successively expanded the role of the Vice President, even as I expect to do in this administration.

Once only an appendage, the office of Vice President is an integral part of the chain of command and its occupancy on a full-time basis is imperative.

For this reason, I most strongly endorse the objective of both Senate Joint Resolution 1 and House Joint Resolution 1 in providing that whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President, provision shall exist for that office to be filled with a person qualified to succeed to the Presidency.

III. REFORM OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

We believe that the people should elect their President and Vice President. One of the earliest amendments to our Constitution was submitted and ratified in response to the unhappy experience of an electoral college stalemate which jeopardized this principle. Today there lurks in the electoral college system the ever-present possibility that electors may substitute their own will for the will of the people. I believe that possibility should be foreclosed.

Our present system of computing and awarding electoral votes by States is an essential counterpart of our Federal system and the provisions of our Constitution which recognize and maintain our Nation as a union of States. It supports the two-party system which has served our Nation well. I believe this system should be retained. But it is imperative that the electoral votes of a State be cast for those persons who receive the greatest number of votes for President and Vice President—and for no one else.

At the same time, I believe we should eliminate the omission in our present system which leaves the continuity of the offices of President and Vice President unprotected if the persons receiving a majority of the electoral votes for either or both of these offices should die after the election in November and before the inauguration of the President.

Electors are now legally free to choose the President without regard to the outcome of the election. I believe that if the President-elect dies under these circumstances, our laws should provide that the Vice-President-elect should become President when the new term begins. Conversely, if death should come to the Vice-President-elect during this interim, I believe the President-elect should, upon taking office, be required to follow the procedures otherwise prescribed for filling the unexpired term of the Vice President. If both should die or become unable to serve in this interim, I believe the Congress should be made responsible for providing the method of selecting officials for both positions. I am transmitting herewith a draft amendment to the Constitution to resolve these problems.

Favorable action by the Congress on the measures here recommended will, I believe, assure the orderly continuity in the Presidency that is imperative to the success and stability of our system. Action on these measures now will allay future anxiety among our own people—and among the peoples of the world—in the event senseless tragedy or unforeseeable disability should strike again at either or both of the principal offices of our constitutional system. If we act now, without undue delay, we shall have moved closer to achieving perfection of the great constitutional document on which the strength and success of our system have rested for nearly two centuries.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 28, 1965.*

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 66)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Fourth Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In this report, submitted pursuant to law, the Agency describes its activities for the calendar year 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1965.*

MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-256, the Fulbright-Hays Act) I transmit herewith the annual report on the international cultural exchange program for the fiscal year 1963.

This report deals with the influence for peace and progress which exchange-of-persons activities have become in the world of the 1960's.

The varying stages of nationhood in the world today require a varying range of relationships on our part. I am convinced that exchanges of persons are uniquely appropriate and unusually effective activities for the needs and opportunities of these times. Such exchanges touch our societies at many points—involving students, teachers, professors, research scholars, athletes, government leaders, judges, economists, labor leaders, social workers, actors, authors, coaches, and many others—a broad panorama of professions and the arts.

In the single year covered by this report, some 10,000 people were overseas from this country, or here from other countries, in the friendly, constructive interchange the United States now sponsors. This exchange involved more than 130 countries and territories.

Congress can take particular and proper pride in this program. Since World War II—with full bipartisan support, as in Public Law 87-256—Congress has fathered and fostered this activity. Many Members of both Houses have a special knowledge of the vital role which exchanges now play in our relations and understandings with other nations. All along the way, the articulate leadership of the Congress has been a major strength for the program's success.

The warm and strong support of the American people likewise deserves our praise. The volunteer services and family hospitality which our citizens and communities give to thousands of students and visitors from other countries is of incalculable value to the interest of international understanding.

I hope that our exchange activities, public and private, may grow. An enlarging investment means an enlarging return—not merely from the understanding others may acquire of us, but from the understanding we acquire of those with whom we share the hopes of these times and the destiny of this planet.

We in the United States have an abiding faith in the value of education to our own society's success, and we are affirming that faith with a new and strengthened commitment to education in America. But education as a force for freedom, justice, and rationality knows no national boundaries—it is the great universal force for good. Our efforts in the exchange program give that force added strength and justified support. For when we help other peoples achieve their highest and best aspirations, we truly work for understanding, for progress, and for peace. In this work, let us continue with new enthusiasm and confidence, for out of the understandings among peoples will grow peace among nations.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1965.*

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College the following members on the part of the House: The gentleman from New York, Mr. CAREY, and the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. NELSEN.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 85-874, as amended, the Chair appoints as members ex officio of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts the following members on the part of the House: Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. THOMPSON, of New Jersey; and Mrs. REID, of Illinois.

LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88-630, the Chair appoints as members of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MORRIS, of New Mexico; Mr. RIVERS, of Alaska; Mr. BERRY, of South Dakota; and Mr. SKUBITZ, of Kansas.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, United States Code, section 715a, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; Mr. CONTE, of Massachusetts.

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, United States Code, section 513. The Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following members on the part of the House: the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLMER, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 6, Public Law 754, 81st Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission the gentleman from California, Mr. MILLER.

PUBLIC LAND REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88-606, the Chair appoints as members of the Public Land Law Review Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ASPINALL, of Colorado; Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York; Mr. WHITE, of Idaho; Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania; Mr. BURTON, of Utah; Mr. MORTON, of Maryland.

ST. AUGUSTINE QUADRICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87-586, the Chair appoints as members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MATTHEWS, of Florida; Mr. CRAMER, of Florida.

UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(b), Public Law 88-271, the Chair appoints as members of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York; Mr. MORTON, of Maryland.

UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; Mr. HAYS, of Ohio; Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87-364, the Chair appoints as members of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey; Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title 6, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas; Mr. KING of California; Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. THOMAS, of Texas; Mr. BOW, of Ohio.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CELLER, of New York; Mr. FEIGHAN, of Ohio; Mr. CHELF, of Kentucky; Mr. POFF, of Virginia; Mr. MOORE, of West Virginia.

U.S. DELEGATION OF THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Mexico from February 11 to February 18, 1965, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. NIX, of Pennsylvania, chairman; Mr. McDOWELL, of Delaware; Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. JOHNSON of California; Mr. CAMERON, of California; Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia; Mr. GONZALEZ, of Texas; Mr. DERWINSKI, of Illinois; Mr. SPRINGER, of Illinois; Mr. MORSE, of Massachusetts, Mr. HARVEY, of Michigan; Mr. BELL, of California.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KU KLUX KLAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the year 1965 marks the 100th anniversary of the Ku Klux Klan. In December, a century ago, six young men formed a secret society in Pulaski, Tenn. The weird panoply of the order—along with the rigors of that day—quickly changed the Klan into a vehicle of terror. Soon excesses compelled its leaders to order it dismembered.

That was in 1869. For almost five decades thereafter, the Ku Klux Klan was but a memory. Then, in 1915 a new order arose in Atlanta, based upon old hatreds and fears.

The revised Klan found fertile ground, not only in the old Confederacy, but North, East, and West alike.

In 1921, the House Committee on Rules considered several resolutions calling for an investigation. Nothing happened. By 1924, membership in this "invisible empire" reached 4 million. Its influence touched courthouses and State houses, national conventions of both major parties, and Congress itself.

It grew and prospered on mystery and malice, changing the cross from the symbol of hope to a sign of hate.

For over a quarter century following its rebirth, the Klan was a potent factor in American life. But the Second World War brought sharp decline to the "invisible empire." Once again it slumbered—until the Supreme Court's decision of 1954. Since that date, but most significantly during the past 2 years, Klan manifestations have increased throughout the South. There are now visible signs of a westward spread.

Mr. Speaker, all this comes at a critical time for the South. We are rising to our full potential. We are struggling for orderly progress. We are turning to real problems and solid opportunities.

Yet, once again, this madness is in our midst. It impugns a lawful and generous people. It impairs compliance with the law. It impedes administration of justice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what shall be done? Shall we in the Congress ignore the veil of fear descending upon whole communities?

Shall we permit faceless men, under cover of robes and darkness, to imperil the liberties of our people?

I believe I speak for a vast majority of southerners in calling for action. For in doing nothing, we will inaugurate a second century for the Ku Klux Klan.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is charged to investigate "the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States." Honest men may differ on the precise limitations of the word "un-American." But, surely, all agree that activities which by force and violence seek to deprive others of rights guaranteed them by the Constitution are un-American.

The weapons of the Klan are secrecy, rumor, and fear. Plain fact and simple truth, amply imparted to the public, are adequate remedies. This committee can provide these remedies by thorough and detailed investigation.

Let us turn upon this "invisible empire" the light of public scrutiny. Let us examine in full its extent, character, and objects. Let us reveal for all to see the men behind the masks.

The boast of the Klan, "Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow" is true in part. For the Klan of yesterday is the Klan of today. Its means and methods remain unchanged. It will plague us tomorrow unless we quash it today.

The year 1865 witnessed the birth of the Ku Klux Klan. Let the year 1965 witness its final demise.

Mr. GRIDER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER].

Mr. GRIDER. Madam Speaker, I think it is fitting and appropriate that another southern Member of this body rise to endorse the excellent words of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER]. The gentleman from Georgia has said that "the weapons of the Klan are secrecy, rumor, and fear. Plain fact and simple truth, amply imparted to the public, are adequate remedies."

Madam Speaker, we in our community of Memphis, Tenn., and Shelby County have had a demonstration of that. We have a great newspaper there, the Commercial Appeal. In 1924 this newspaper was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for its exposure of the methods of the Ku Klux Klan.

Partly as a result of this, our city of Memphis, Tenn., is the only large southern city that has never had any major racial violence in all of the troubles that have come to the South since 1924. I believe that this is a proper subject for the House Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate, and I heartily endorse the suggestion of my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WELTNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

CHEATING SCANDAL AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY—AND THE IMPACT OF ATHLETIC PROFESSIONALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRIFFITHS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Madam Speaker, last Monday I brought to the attention of this House some of the facts surrounding the Air Force Academy cheating scandal, pointing out specifically that the very large percentage of varsity athletes who were involved in this scandal indicated, in my judgment, that we had reached a time when it was necessary for us to put an end to the kind of athletic professionalism which has characterized all three of our service academies, the Air Force Academy situation indicates that some of the pressures that athletes are under at all these academies have made them particularly susceptible to the opportunities for cheating that had apparently been created both at the Air Force, and, back in 1951, at the Military Academy.

I advised the House that I had requested the Secretary of Defense to take steps to eliminate these practices in our three service academies. Today I rise, Madam Speaker, to advise the House that the Secretary of Defense informed me just this morning by means of a communication from Assistant Secretary of Defense Norman Paul that he will not make any comment on these matters until the current investigation of the Air Force Academy has been completed, sometime around the 10th of February. However, I might say, Madam Speaker, that since I spoke, there have come to me a number of comments on this general subject and a number of expressions of support for the position which I took.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning, February 1, commenting on the fact that the new Air Force Board appointed to look into the cheating scandal has already been requested to examine the whole proper role of intercollegiate athletics at the Academy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

ACADEMY INVESTIGATION

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert has acted with commendable dispatch in convening a special committee to investigate the Air Force Academy in the light of the current crisis over cheating that has led to the resignation of more than 90 cadets. Further, the proposed scope of the inquiry, an examination of the entire system of cadet life and the role of athletics at the Academy in addition to the immediate conflict over the cadet honor system, shows a determination not to dismiss the incident as merely a case in which a few "bad apples" tainted the chivalrous young warriors in Air Force blue.

The committee, headed by former Air Force Chief of Staff Thomas D. White, is fortunate in having the services of Hardy Dillard, dean of the law school at the University of Virginia, an institution that possesses one of the oldest and most successful collegiate honor systems. But they will need to look much deeper than the cheating incidents themselves and the allegations of parents that their sons only tolerated cheating on the part of others. The service academies' curriculum, facilities and emphasis on bigtime athletics have all been criticized from time to time, often with justification. The White committee, if it uses the full scope of its directive, may be able to provide a guide for change and revision that will benefit the service academies and, ultimately, the officers who man our Defense Establishment.

Mr. STRATTON. May I also add, Madam Speaker, that although Secretary McNamara, unfortunately, is ill at the moment, I intend to examine him on the whole subject when he testifies before our Armed Services Committee, without waiting for any February 10 deadline.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. Yes. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and commend him for the stand he has taken. I would also like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House that this morning at a meeting of the Committee on Armed Services, the very first meeting our committee has had, the gentleman did raise this very point there very forcefully. Again I commend him for it.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank my distinguished friend from Michigan for his very welcome support.

Madam Speaker, some people have said to me personally, and some have commented in the press, "What do you mean by athletic professionalism? What is going on in our service academies that you are opposed to?" I would like very briefly, if I may, to spell out some of these things which I think most Members of the House are aware of, which have been going on, which I do think have impaired the effectiveness of these taxpayer-supported institutions to accomplish their mission, and which I would regard as "athletic professionalism."

Basically athletic professionalism involves an overemphasis, an emphasis well beyond any proper function which might play in service education, on intercollegiate athletics. Let me spell out just one or two examples of this which I think Members who have served in the Congress before are well aware of.

First of all, we have members of the academy coaching staffs spending a certain amount of time out on the road scouting for athletes. Some members of the academy staffs may tell you these coaches are not really looking just for athletes alone, that they are looking for all-around boys. But I submit, Madam Speaker, that if the football coach, let us say, is out looking for all-around boys he is much more likely to come up with one who demonstrates excellence in football or some other sport, than in the field of physics or nuclear energy.

Most young men who apply to us for appointment to the Academies are eagerly interested in a service career. They have a high degree of motivation.

Now what happens when members of the athletic staffs spend time—and I am not sure how much time they spend or whether their expenses are paid by the Academy or by the alumni—out scouting prospects? If the prospect is an athletic star, perhaps he may already be interested in another school. He may have no particular interest in a service career, no real motivation. But the coach endeavors to sign him up. In such circumstances is he really motivated for a military career?

I, for one, do not think it should be the job of the coaching staff to be out scouting candidates for the Academies, whether athletes or nuclear physicists. Perhaps some properly organized and regulated scouting or recruiting procedure for qualified candidates might be justified, but it should not be the prerogative of the coaching staff.

Now, secondly, Madam Speaker, we are all aware that members of these coaching staffs also spend a certain amount of time going up and down the corridors of the House Office Buildings at certain times of the year, trying to find appointments for some of these individual athletes whom they have scouted.

This too is athletic professionalism, and it is, in my judgment, improper.

In fact, Madam Speaker, I brought to the attention of the House back in 1962 a case where an athletic coach from West Point had specifically promised an appointment to a young man and actually delivered on that appointment without the applicant ever seeing the appointing Member.

Coaches have absolutely no business in the House Office Buildings soliciting appointments from Members of Congress, and certainly not trying to get some Member from State X to appoint a prospective athlete from State Y, a process that is both illegal and improper.

Then, Madam Speaker, there is a third thing which I mean by "athletic professionalism." That occurs when these individuals are recommended for appointment and find they cannot pass the college board examinations, which comprise the entrance requirements academically for all three of the service academies. One has only to score 500 on these examinations, as we know to be accepted, which is a score, incidentally, that is considerably less than is required to get into Harvard, let us say, or Yale or Princeton.

But if you do have a lad who is a good halfback who cannot score even this 500 minimum, then in some of our service academies there is an alumni association which will underwrite the bill to send these prospective athletes to some kind of a cram school, some kind of service academy preparatory school, if you will, in order to beef them up so they can achieve the minimum marginal passing grade to get in.

So this is how you can have athletic professionalism, Madam Speaker, even in a situation where all candidates have to pass a minimum college board requirement. The minimum is low in the first place, and some promising athletes get special tutoring to meet it.

In some academies I understand the authorities have required that only a certain percentage of those sent to "cram" school by the alumni can be prospective athletes. But I still find it hard to see alumni raising much money to send prospective nuclear physicists to a "cram" school.

Mr. **HÉBERT**. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **STRATTON**. If the gentleman will let me complete my comment on this point I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Finally, the fourth specfic point which relates to athletic professionalism is the very heavy schedules which are usually booked for each of our service academies. They go out of their way to compete with colleges which admittedly have placed a heavy emphasis on athletics and have prided themselves over the years in building championship teams. If you are going to play ball in this kind of league you have to spend a lot of time preparing for the games. You have to do a lot of recruiting. You have to take away from your varsity athletes a lot of the time they would normally spend on the other aspects of their job.

That is what I mean by athletic professionalism. I do not know whether it has any place in the private college or not, but I submit it certainly does not have any place in the basic role of the service academies, especially when the taxpayers of the country underwrite the college education of the future leaders of our military forces. These are the things that should be brought to an end by the Secretary of Defense, who has made so much progress in other aspects of reform within the military services.

Madam Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article from the February 8 issue of the U.S. News & World Report, which came across our desks this morning, and which describes in summary form an analysis which recently appeared by Columbia University on cheating on U.S. campuses in general.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

THE AMOUNT OF CHEATING ON U.S. CAMPUSES

Just how much cheating goes on in colleges and universities? Far more than most college officials realize, according to a new nationwide study by Columbia University. Of the students questioned in the 99-college survey, more than half admitted having cheated.

Basic findings of the study are outlined in the chart on this page.

At the time when these results were released, a major cheating scandal was being investigated at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado.

This scandal centered on theft and sale of examination papers. An official statement said it appeared to involve more than 100 cadets, including 30 football players. Twenty-nine cadets resigned at once, more later. Most said their violation was not cheating, but a breach of the honor system, which required that they report known cheaters. A full inquiry followed. All implicated cadets are being dismissed or asked to resign.

In civilian colleges, according to the Columbia survey, only a few of those who cheat are caught and punished, and "only relatively lenient punishments are imposed for academic dishonesty at most schools. Seldom are students suspended or dismissed."

Some ways to reduce cheating are indicated in the survey, based on questionnaires returned by 5,422 college students, 626 deans, and 502 student-body presidents. Conclusions include:

Colleges with honor systems, the study finds, "are less apt to have a high level of cheating than those with other arrangements for control."

Schools with high academic quality also are found to have relatively little cheating. Quality yardsticks: A large proportion of students living on campus, a selective admission system, a high ratio of faculty to students.

The attitude toward cheating instilled in the student body, however, appears to be the most influential deterrent to cheating. Where student disapproval is high, the frequency of cheating is low, and vice versa, the survey shows.

Overall, the student least likely to cheat in college is pictured thus: A girl attending a small, all-female college on an academic scholarship, with good grades and a record of not cheating in high school, taking tests under an honor system run by students, and aware of a tradition of strong disapproval of cheating by the student body.

The worst cheating risk: A young man attending a large university on an athletic scholarship, making poor grades and surrounded by an atmosphere of leniency toward cheating in the classroom.

WHO ARE THE CHEATERS IN COLLEGE?

Based on a survey of 5,422 students at 99 colleges and universities, coast to coast

Fraternity and sorority members cheat more than nonmembers:

Students:	*Percent who cheat*
Where no fraternities exist	46
Nonmembers where fraternities exist	49
Fraternity, sorority members	52
Members who live in fraternity or sorority houses	61

Students with lower grades tend to cheat more:

Grade average:	*Percent who cheat*
A	37
B	43
C	54
C or below	57

Family income or occupation has little to do with cheating:

Father's occupation:	*Percent of students who cheat*
Professional	45
Executive, managerial	49
Other white-collar	51
Blue-collar	54

Those with scholarships cheat less—except for athletes:

Scholarships based on—	*Percent who cheat*
Financial need	41
Academic ability	45
Students without scholarships	51
Athletic ability	74

Fewer cheat when student opinion disapproves of cheating:

Where disapproval is—	*Percent who cheat*
Very strong	23
Fairly strong	36
Moderate	50
Fairly weak	59
Very weak	69

Cheating is more common in coed colleges:

Type of school:	*Percent of colleges with a high level of cheating*
All female	19
All male	50
Coeducational	61

Source: Study by Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research.

Mr. **STRATTON**. I invite the attention of the Members to the fact this analysis points out 74 percent of those with athletic scholarships in our colleges cheat, compared to only 41 percent of those on scholarships based on financial need, and with 45 percent for those on scholarships based on academic ability.

Commenting on this same study in yesterday's Sunday New York Times, Mr. Fred L. Heckinger wrote: "Despite angry denials by coaches and football-minded alumni, the dishonesty ratio among athletes is staggeringly high—largely in the words of the study—because athletes are often in college 'for reasons totally unrelated to their academic abilities.' In fairness to the athletes—especially at the Military Academies where they must meet high entrance requirements—it should be added that they devote much of their time and energies to a college-sponsored enterprise of public entertainment as modern gladiators."

Mr. HÉBERT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. In this particular instance you are using this survey which points out that those of athletic ability cheat more than those on scholarships.

Mr. STRATTON. That particular report refers to colleges all around the country. We have nothing in our service academies comparable to the scholarships in other colleges. But the cadet who is recruited for his athletic ability and is allowed to cram to get in would be in a comparable position.

Mr. HÉBERT. Everybody in the service academy is there under the same conditions, on scholarships, so to speak. They are all on scholarships. If more are found to be cheating on athletics, we have to say that the people who do not participate in athletics cheat more than those others do because they are all on scholarships.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman brings out the fact there is not a direct correlation between academic scholarships in our private schools and service academies. But I have already suggested that in the service Academy the cadets who are specifically recruited for their athletic ability as a result of scouting by an Academy coach would be in a roughly comparable position to a civilian student on an athletic scholarship.

In the case of the Air Force Academy you have the situation where three-fourths of the varsity football team was involved, and I think more than a third of those involved in the overall scandal, according to the scanty figures we have, are engaged in athletics or varsity athletics. Surely this is a figure that raises some serious questions.

Mr. HÉBERT. I do not want to use all the gentleman's time. In using the word "professionalism" in athletics particularly, as related to our academies, let us keep in mind that these are the finest young men in the country who are recruited to get an education and to become officers of our military services. When they enter that Academy they enter the Academy as the purest you can find in this country, and they are screened.

When they enter that Academy they enter that Academy as the best young men in the country. If anything happens to them, which is most unfortunate here, and which we do not condone, let us not point the finger of accusation at the individual, let us point the finger of accusation at the circumstances that may have developed.

For instance, if a baby is born in a foreign country and comes to this country when he is 2 or 3 months old and becomes a racketeer, do you blame the country from whence he came or do you blame our own country? This is a matter in which we have to look into the system and what it means. There is the place to put your finger.

Remember this, this young man is not just becoming an athlete at a college, he sacrifices his professional career, he sacrifices his chance to make money. He is first recruited, and we expect that our boys in our academies should be the finest in the country. And they are made to qualify specifically. I do not believe the academies should have two standards of entrance, one for the man on the football team and the other for the man who is going to blow a horn.

Mr. STRATTON. I agree with the gentleman and he agrees with me. I am not directing my remarks to any individual or any Academy. This is a system which existed before the gentleman or I came to Congress. When you put a lad at the Air Force Academy or at West Point or Annapolis in a situation where he has been recruited because of his athletic ability, and in the case of the academies with an entering requirement lower than is required at places like Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and other colleges, and then require that lad to play against teams like Minnesota or even LSU, you are putting this young man who is trying to become one of the Nation's military leaders in a position that is almost impossible and which obviously makes him an easy prey to the kind of cheating ring that has been discovered at the Air Force Academy. I welcome the gentleman's support of my remarks but I must continue.

Mr. HÉBERT. Let me offer this one further thought. The individual who becomes a professional athlete can capitalize on that. But let us return to the system. If a boy wants to go to a college where the emphasis is on going to Oxford, on becoming a Rhodes scholar, I think the temptation, the challenge there is just as much on him to digress from the rules so that he may become a Rhodes scholar as an all-American. Do not put the blame on athletics. It is not the athletics, it is the system.

Mr. STRATTON. I brought this to the attention of the House 3 years ago, and I think the gentleman was here at that time. I commented then that where you had a system in which a young man got into one of the academies as a result of a procedure that was irregular if not downright illegal at the very outset, how could you then expect the young man to follow a code of honor that, as the gentleman knows, is much more rigid than anything that exists in any of our civilian colleges.

Mr. HÉBERT. I definitely agree with the gentleman. I think I was responsible more than any other one individual for the policy of not making an academy try to make a boy break his word. Because I think it is repulsive so far as I am concerned to get a high school kid to sign a contract and then have somebody try to make him break that agreement.

But the academies today do not do that. They have an agreement that any time any boy has signed a letter of intent to go anyplace else, they do not touch him. The gentleman and I are in full agreement and I am glad that he brought that out.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman and I have worked together to get through some changes in legislation which he so capably steered through the House last year increasing the appointments to the academies. We put these provisions, which the gentleman refers to, in the legislation. I just want to carry that fight a little bit further. I welcome the gentleman's support because he is one of the most effective and formidable Members of this body.

Mr. HÉBERT. I do not want to cast a shadow just over athletes. We are all under the same tent.

Mr. STRATTON. I agree. I think we ought to recognize the particular pressures that are on athletes and some of the circumstances under which they are recruited, so that in the future we do not put these athletes in this kind of untenable position. I have nothing against athletics. I think athletics are a great thing. I think athletics have a real place in college life. But I do not think this kind of high-powered, overemphasized professional athletics has any place in our service schools.

Mr. HÉBERT. Would the gentleman then deny the right to recruiting of potential scientists?

Mr. STRATTON. All I can say to the gentleman is that I doubt very much that our athletic coaches in their travels around the country are recruiting very many scientists whatever the officials may tell us.

Mr. HÉBERT. But the academic people are recruiting them.

Mr. STRATTON. Madame Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana bringing out this point because it underlines what I have been trying to say; namely, that I, too, am concerned with a system which I think is guilty of bringing unusual and improper pressures upon any young man. I am not opposed to athletics. I am not opposed to the Air Force. I am not opposed to our Academies. But I do think that over the years we have allowed, with very little vocal opposition in this House—except for the bill to which the gentleman refers, and except for some very effective discussion on this matter on the floor of the other body 3 years ago by the junior Senator from the gentleman's home State, the Senator who has just been appointed as the majority whip—we have allowed a tradition to grow up, whose tragic consequences are now reflected in the developments that have taken place at the Air Force Academy. Is it not time that we paused to look at this tradition and see whether we really mean to support activities of this kind in institutions where we are trying to train, at taxpayers' expense, the leaders who will guide our Armed Forces in an increasingly complex and highly technical world?

Surely we must recognize that brains have their place in military activity as well as brawn, and at this point I would like to include in my remarks, Madam Speaker, an article which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post on January 30 under the headline "Layton Says Police Needs Brains Not Brawn." Chief Layton of the District Police Department says that policemen today need specialized intelligence to do their jobs.

It is not enough, he says, for them just to have brawn. Certainly if this holds true for policemen, it holds true for our military leaders.

I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

LAYTON SAYS POLICEMEN NEED BRAINS, NOT BRAWN

(By Jack C. Landau)

District Police Chief John B. Layton gave his first major policy speech yesterday since taking the chief's office and said that the future of the Washington police force depends or more brains, not more brawn.

Speaking to the graduating rookies at the Washington Police Academy, Chief Layton emphasized that urban law enforcement officers must go to school to keep abreast of the latest sociological research into the causes of crime and to learn about scientific techniques used by criminals.

"Average intelligence and general ability, which have long represented the minimum standards for selection (of policemen) cannot suffice much longer," Layton said.

"High school diplomas, undergraduate work, and, in time, college degrees will become requisites in the evolution of police officer selection."

Layton said that recruitment should not only eliminate those men who are physically, morally, and psychologically unfit; but should "exclude those whose limited formal educations cause them to function at a level below that required by the increasing demands of law enforcement."

"If we are to compete with the criminal, who now uses modern technological methods, we cannot rely on a bare basic education," Layton added.

"Only through education and training can we approach an understanding of so complex a problem as modern crime in urban communities."

Chief Layton told the young police officers that they "must seek education, not only in technical or vocationally oriented subjects. They must be trained in the humanities—law, medicine, psychology, sociology, philosophy, and other subjects that indicate not only the 'how' but also the 'why'."

"Nothing is so futile as the treatment of symptoms," Chief Layton said. "Only where causes are known and understood can inroads be made. Diligent study must be given the causes of crime, and these causes must be attacked directly and indirectly wherever they appear."

Chief Layton also pointed out that newly hired Washington policemen, who are not required to have college educations, earn salaries that are approximately $1,000 a year more than starting salaries for Federal employees with college degrees. Higher police officials, also not required to have college degrees, are paid salaries comparable to those paid other Government officials with equal responsibilities.

After the half-hour speech, Chief Layton personally congratulated the 1 woman and 48 men in the graduating class.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am glad to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman is opposed to the system used at all academies, whereby the alumni conduct an athletic association and conduct activities in connection with the construction of stadiums, having the interests of the various schools at heart? Is the gentleman opposed to that system, whereby they try to induce athletes to come to the schools? Is that what the gentleman is opposed to?

Mr. STRATTON. I believe I can answer my good friend from Colorado best by going over what I have already said about what I regarded as athletic professionalism and what I regarded as having no proper place in our academies; namely, a process whereby paid members of the athletic staff go out to recruit athletes; a process in which they "shop around" in the House Office Buildings for appointments, oftentimes not even in the proper district from where the prospective appointee comes; a process whereby, if it turns out that a prospective athlete cannot meet the relatively modest qualifying college board score of 500 certain alumni underwrite his stay in a "cram" school for a year or so to get by the college board examination.

All of this I believe to be detrimental to the basic mission of the academy and puts the kind of undue pressure on these boys which leads readily to the cheating that has now been uncovered.

If there are alumni who wish to build a stadium, I cannot see any objection to that. I would certainly have no objection to those being built in the gentleman's own State. But I do not believe we ought to allow those who build the stadiums to set the athletic and academic policy of the academies.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I can assure the gentleman that under no circumstances has any athletic association, at least at the Air Force Academy, set any of the policies as they deal with the academic situation. We have a Dean the name of General McDermott, who, as pointed out by the gentleman from Louisiana, is interested in seeing how many Rhodes Scholars he can get and how many boys he can induce into getting masters degrees. He puts the pressures on them to see if he can obtain educational quality from those who graduate.

With respect to the question of activities as they relate to recruiting, I refer again to the question I raised with the gentleman. Is the gentleman opposed to the activities of these alumni associations, which I understand are the ones who do the recruiting? Does the gentleman have evidence of the fact that people on the payroll of the Air Force have been loitering in the halls and recruiting these boys?

Mr. STRATTON. I believe we are all aware that this goes on in respect to all our academies. From time to time, perhaps, one academy stresses one aspect more than another academy.

To answer the gentleman's questions specifically, I am opposed to a condition under which this emphasis on championship intercollegiate athletics interferes with the mission of the Academy. The kind of thing to which the gentleman refers does as a practical matter lead to pressures on the academic staff, on the faculty, and on the students themselves to come up with championship teams. We all know that well-meaning alumni are not going to raise money to build a stadium if they are not also going to be able to see championship teams play in that stadium.

This I believe is the kind of thing that has no proper place in our service academies, and which I should like to see eliminated.

I wish I could yield further to the gentleman, but my time is running short.

Mr. HUNGATE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will permit me to complete my statement, then, if there is any time remaining, I will be very happy to yield to him.

Madam Speaker, I might mention in connection with the point the gentleman from Louisiana was raising a moment ago that on the front cover of Time magazine today we have a picture of the members of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. The slogan at the top says, "Thinkers and managers replace the heroes." Certainly we do need thinkers and managers today if we are going to develop an adequate defense of our country and, if need be, wage warfare and wage it effectively. I do not think that we help ourselves if we forget that that after all is the basic mission of our service academies, not turning out a team which can regularly beat Notre Dame or Minnesota or Pitt or even LSU.

Madam Speaker, I was delighted to read in the announcement made the other day by the Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert regarding the appointment of a special committee to investigate the unfortunate scandal at the Air Force Academy, that one of the questions this distinguished committee will look into is the entire role of intercollegiate athletics at the Academies. This, I think, makes it perfectly clear that Mr. Zuckert himself also recognizes that when three-quarters of the varsity football team are involved in this current scandal, there is at the very least a red flag waving with respect to varsity athletics that deserves very careful consideration and concern.

There is one other aspect of this situation, Madam Speaker, which also disturbs me; namely, the fact that the Air Force continues to refuse to give out any information about the progress of its investigation, except for announcing a daily box score of resignations. Frankly, I think the attitude of top Air Force officials in trying to suppress all details of the current investigation, even to Members of Congress, is indefensible, shortsighted and, in the long run, far more harmful to the Academy itself. As other bureaucrats have discovered before, attempts to suppress the truth just to cover administrative embarrassment only lead to the wider and more vigorous circulation of even more damaging rumors.

Particularly ridiculous is the attempt to put a "classified" label on the whole investigation except for the current box score of resignations. National security is certainly not involved here; but apparently what the Air Force is trying to do is to sweep the whole matter under the rug until its own handpicked board comes up with a report and a recommendation. However distinguished may be the membership of this board it certainly cannot replace full public disclosure and discussion of the case. Nor can it replace the primary responsibility of Congress for the soundness and effectiveness of our system of military tax-supported education.

What is particularly disturbing to me, Madam Speaker, is that at the very time the Air Force refuses to give out any information on the progress of its investigation inspired news reports disclose that it is seriously considering hiring high-priced public relations counsel, presumably at taxpayers' expense, to produce some kind of television spectacular to "improve the image," we are told, of the Academy.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial from the New York Times of January 30 on this particular subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY MESS

Many worrisome questions are raised by the cheating scandal now rocking the Air Force Academy. The Academy is one of the elite educational institutions of the country, charged with preparing officers who will have the character and knowledge required to defend the United States with the most modern and destructive of weapons. That students being prepared for such heavy responsibility should steal examinations and then conspire to sell them to fellow cadets must arouse shock as well as puzzlement about every phase of the Academy's life and organization. The special committee now appointed by Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert to study the Academy has a responsibility that runs beyond an inquiry into the honor system alone. The country will expect it to examine everything from the criteria for selection through the methods of indoctrination and instruction.

Yet even as that committee prepares to begin its work there is disturbing evidence that some influential forces in the Air Force are primarily concerned with protecting the "image" of the Academy. This is suggested by the ridiculous lengths to which Academy officials are going to try to enforce secrecy. Their demand that cadets resigning because of the scandal pledge themselves not to speak about "classified information"—that is, their knowledge of the affair—to anyone, including their parents, represents a new low in bureaucratic obtuseness.

The sole justification for classifying military information is to protect national security, not to conceal administrative embarrassments. There is no need to add to the shame of individual cadets by putting a permanent stain on their future, but that is no excuse for an official blackout of detail on what happened and why. The effort to dam the flow of information is already showing predictable signs of breaking down as irate parents of ousted cadets express their outrage and start telling their sons' side of the story.

The national interest in this unhappy situation would be best served by ending any further abuse of "classification" and providing full opportunity for all concerned to state their views. The present policy only leads to suspicions that hurt the Air Force, its Academy, and the Nation.

Mr. STRATTON. Madam Speaker, I have myself now run into this paper curtain around the progress of the cheating investigation. I called up the Secretary of the Air Force last Thursday and asked him if he would give me a briefing on the progress of the investigation. He very kindly consented to do so and said, "I will send an officer over to see you." On Friday a brigadier general of the Air Force, the Deputy Chief of Legislative Liaison, came to my office in response to that request. I asked him to give me a report on the status of the investigation. He told me that all they knew was that as of last Friday 91 cadets had resigned and the investigation is continuing. Even that, incidentally, as it turned out, was incorrect information because the official box score as of Friday was really 93. That was all he would tell me. It was clear to me that the Air Force was trying to give me a "snow job" on the Academy situation.

When I protested to the general and then later to Secretary Zuckert, he informed me very curtly that he would not tell me anything unless I sent him my questions in writing in advance.

I suppose Secretary Zuckert's demand for questions in writing may have stemmed from irritation over my suggestion last week that it was time for all three of our academies to get away from athletic professionalism and concentrate on training career military leaders for a complex and technical world. But after all, the Secretary himself, as I have already pointed out, recognized the validity of my charge when he directed his own board to inquire not merely into details of the cheating scandal but also into the whole role of intercollegiate athletics at the Academy.

Madam Speaker, as a Member of the House and a member of the Committee on Armed Services I resent this attitude on the part of the Secretary of Defense. Surely we should be able to get information from a service Secretary without having to submit questions in writing in advance. This is not a press conference and it is not a British parliamentary question period. Nevertheless I submitted the questions and I am now waiting for the answers.

These are the specific questions I have sent to the Secretary for his reply. Members may find them of interest.

First. How many cadets in all are believed by Academy officials to have been involved?

Second. How did this ring get started and how did it operate?

Third. How was the existence of the ring discovered, and what steps did Academy officials then take to deal with it?

Fourth. How many of those involved in the scandal were guilty because they failed to report the existence of the cheating ring, as compared with how many were involved because they actually cheated?

Fifth. I understand that some of the cadets involved, who had been attempting to sell the exam questions to their fellow cadets, actually attempted to intimidate fellow cadets into purchasing the examination questions. Please give me the details of this aspect of the case.

Sixth. Is it true, as reported in the press, that new locks are now being put on file cases containing prospective examination papers? Does this mean that examinations previously were not safeguarded at the Academy in the same way that valuable papers would be safeguarded in the Pentagon?

Seventh. Please give me the full report on the action you took yesterday in establishing a special commission under General White to look into this matter.

Eighth. Does the Academy give the same examination on different days? If so, is not this too great a temptation to dishonesty?

Ninth. How many students have been separated from the Academy purely for academic reasons based in whole or in part on grades attained on the examinations in which cheating was involved?

Tenth. Were cadets separated from the Academy because of cheating given honorable discharges with the warning that if they talked to reporters about the cheating scandal their discharges would be downgraded?

I think Members of the House have a right to know the answers to these questions and the public does, as well.

May I conclude, Madam Speaker, by pointing out to the House that there appeared in the New York Times this morning a story by Martin Arnold, datelined Colorado Springs, which gives a detailed account of the entire scandal and answers some of the questions I asked the Secretary last Friday. Well, here is a perfect example of the truth that no matter how much you try you just cannot prevent the facts from coming out. If the Air Force had discussed the matter frankly and fully with Congress and with the public this would have been a much better way to improve the image of the Academy and the mission of the Academy than would be the hiring of a special television counsel.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

AIR CADET STOLE TESTS IN SPRING: HE FOILED SECURITY SYSTEM TO ENTER LOCKED BUILDING

(By Martin Arnold)

Colorado Springs, January 31.—The sequence of events that led to the uncovering of the large-scale examination cheating at the Air Force Academy goes back to May, when a junior cadet first thought up a plan to steal test papers.

It involves secret after-midnight forays into the Academy's academic building, electronic tampering with an elevator, and the shutting off of an alarm system that would have summoned the Air Police.

The events came to a crashing end 8 months later when the cadet decided to expand his operation to make some money.

This sequence was pieced together today from a series of telephone interviews with a number of parents of cadets who have resigned in the cheating scandal. All gave remarkably similar accounts.

So far, 93 cadets have resigned from the Academy as a result of its official investigation. That number is expected to rise to about 120. All cheated on the tests or were involved in the theft and sale of papers.

OTHERS FACE PUNISHMENT

Another group of cadets, presumably much smaller in number, face expulsion from the Academy or other punishment for knowing about the cheating but not reporting it, as is required by the cadet honor code.

As told by the parents, this is the development of the cheating and its method of operation:

In May the cadet—described by one parent as "very clever" and by another as "an adventurer, not a criminal"—decided to steal and have copies made of the spring-semester final-examination papers.

They were to be used by himself and a few close friends, and at this time there was no thought of making money with them.

The examinations are kept, mostly locked in file cabinets, on the top floor of Fairchild Hall, where the Academy's faculty and the dean of the faculty Brig. Gen. Robert F. McDermott, have their offices.

Fairchild Hall, like all the Academy buildings, is spare and functional in design. It is steel and aluminum, glass and white marble, and it is six stories high. It actually consists of two nearly separate buildings, which are connected on the first two floors and on the fourth, fifth and sixth floors.

Besides the faculty offices, this academic complex houses 168 classrooms, 45 science laboratories, an engineering laboratory, and 5 lecture halls. The school library is in the southern portion of the building.

The cadet who wanted to cheat acquired a key to the locked cabinets containing the examination papers in May.

He then was confronted with the problem of gaining access to the top floor of Fairchild Hall late at night or early in the morning.

The elevator in the library section of Fairchild Hall is operated to the upper floors of the building all night, but in the evening it is adjusted by special keys so that it does not stop on the second floor.

That is because there is an easy walkway connecting the library at the second floor to the northern part of Fairchild Hall, where much of the valuable laboratory equipment is kept and all the faculty offices are situated. This is the only way a cadet could get from one building to the other at night.

The cadet was unable to obtain the special key that would allow him to get off the elevator at the second floor at night and walk to the other part of the building.

He discovered, however, that between the first and second floors the power would go off in the elevator if he pushed the emergency button. The elevator would then glide to a stop on the second floor.

The doors would not open automatically with the power off, but he found that he could push them apart with his hands.

ALARM DISCONNECTED

It was also relatively simple for the cadet—all cadets are thoroughly trained in the sciences, including electronics—to disconnect the alarm-bell system, which automatically summons help when the elevator power goes off. At night, that help would have included Air Police.

From the second floor, the cadet walked to the northern side of the building and went up the four flights of steps to the faculty area, where the examination papers were kept. He made his first midnight raid in May, after the examination papers were prepared for spring semester finals. The spring semester ends early in June.

The papers taken then were used only by the junior and his close friends, said to have been about five or six cadets.

It is not clear whether, after the first raid on the papers was made, more than one cadet actually took part in the foray. Presumably this small group could easily have completed the junior and senior years and graduated from the Academy without being caught, had the cadets not decided to make some money out of the operation.

In December, however, when the semester finals were again coming up, the junior cadet again started to raid the file cabinets. This time he and his small band—grown now to 10 or 12—decided to sell the questions to carefully selected cadets.

They knew which cadets were having troubles with their grades, and with great caution and subtlety they approached them. To those who indicated a willingness, the prices ranged from about $5 to $10 a paper, depending on the financial resources of the purchasers.

Some of the cadets who were involved were said by Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, the Academy superintendent, to have been "topnotch" students.

Presumably, they were too lazy to study, he said.

About 30 football players are involved.

Some of the cadets who were approached but did not make purchases have testified before the investigation board that they were threatened with bodily harm if they reported the theft ring to authorities, parents of cadets have said.

Presumably, these latter cadets all fall in the so-called tolerator category, and the final dispensation on their cases will be made by the Academy's 24-cadet honor board members, who collectively in groups of 8 have the power to demand resignations and to grant varying degrees of forgiveness.

BUSINESS WAS GOOD

Business was good at first. Early in January, however, two cadets in the junior class were approached. They did not purchase papers and they were not frightened of physical harm. Instead they respected the honor code and on January 8 reported what they knew to authorities.

This code not only prohibits cheating, lying, and stealing, but also the toleration of any cadet who does lie, steal or cheat.

From the mightiest general down to the newest second lieutenant, the Air Force Academy is the great symbol of the Air Force itself.

Because of this misdeed, there was such great shock and almost disbelief on the part of the Academy administration when the first report was made on January 8.

A quiet investigation was begun and presumably at least some of the instigators were not aware that they had been turned in. A week later, on January 15, a Friday, two first-year cadets were approached about buying papers.

They were frightened. They apparently did not buy the papers, but they spent a disquieting weekend wrestling with whether or not they should report what they had learned to authorities.

On Monday, January 18, they told what they knew, and on the following day the Academy announced that it was investigating the cheating.

OPTIMISM VANISHED

Once the first-year cadets' accounts had been told, and verified, investigators from the Air Force Office of Special Investigation were flown in to conduct the investigation under the direction of General Warrren. This investigation is expected to be completed by about February 10. The status of the cadets who instigated the cheating scandal is not now known.

In another action, Secretary of Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert has set up a special committee to investigate the entire Academy program, including its honor-code system, its curriculum, and its intercollegiate athletic program.

The shock at the dimensions of the scandal has not been confined to the Air Force or even the military.

The Air Force has been reluctant to give out the details of the investigation, and today sources at the Academy have refused to deny, confirm or even comment on the sequence of the events unfolded in this scandal.

A group of five local residents, however, placed a quarter-page advertisement in today's issue of the Colorado Springs Gazette-Telegraph, a daily newspaper. It said:

"The merchants of misery are among us. Headline-hungry newsmen are busily shouting the unfortunate problems of the Air Force Academy. Their condemnations are on the front page, their praises are buried. Now is the time to stand up and be counted. The people of Colorado Springs should reaffirm their faith in the great majority of the cadets who have always maintained the highest standards of moral integrity. The cadet wing, the faculty, and the staff are valued neighbors in our community."

Mr. HUNGATE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Missouri and I shall now be happy to do so.

Mr. HUNGATE. Would the gentleman from New York advise, since the Academy bands have been mentioned in connection with this, whether the gentleman is aware of any instances of recruiting for musicians of the same nature described for athletes?

Mr. STRATTON. I did not mention the service academy bands and I am not familiar with that aspect of it.

Mr. PIKE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am very happy to yield to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. The gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is well aware that on many occasions I have stuck my neck on the line in his behalf to extoll him for what he is doing. This is one occasion, however, when I am obliged to say that I am not sure I do not have mixed emotions about this.

The Washington Post, for example, today stated that the Secretary of the Air Force had moved with admirable speed to constitute this board of inquiry and to look into this more thoroughly. In view of this it might be appropriate to wait until this board does look into it and examines the facts before we start castigating them on the floor of the House.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me say to my good friend from New York that I am well aware of the support he has given to me on many occasions and I am deeply grateful to him for it. I am well aware of the fact that he is a man of independent views and that I am most fortunate when his views do happen to coincide with mine.

My only point was that I said last Monday that one of the real areas for concern in this whole investigation should be the role of intercollegiate athletics in our service academies. Since Secretary Zuckert has now directed his own board to examine this very subject he has apparently agreed with us that it does deserve looking into. In fact it may well be that my own comments last week prompted his action.

But I think we, too, in this Congress have a responsibility for the operation of our service academies. I do not accept the gentleman's view that we must remain silent until some board selected by the executive branch has first made its own report. To do so would be to abrogate our responsibilities as a Congress, something I am sure no member of the great Committee on Armed Services would ever propose.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mrs. Griffiths). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. **HÉBERT.** Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Madam Speaker, it is distressing to me, as I am sure it is to many Members of Congress, that before we have been officially informed about the Air Force Academy cheating scandal that Academy football and indeed all service academy football has been indicted as professional, sordid and the cause of a blight which will plague for years the Air Force Academy as it did its sister Academy, West Point.

To this day the American public has accepted the West Point investigations of the early 1950's scandal with a measure of skepticism. Two of the four classes received less than cursory investigation and though 90 were discharged the total involvement of the varsity football squad permitted a less than forthright discussion of the facts by creating the impression that this was the only group involved. Few have believed that this was confined to the football players but more have reasoned that Army ranks were closed, and Congress was requested not to investigate. I dare say that an unknown number of violators remained to graduate and serve their country well both in Korea and Vietnam.

It always seemed a paradox to me that if football corrupted the corps why did West Point continue this game with the emphasis undiminished by the scandal unless the authorities were convinced football was incidental to the cause of a breakdown of their honor system. To believe West Point continued football knowing that the game destroyed the character fiber of the corps is to suggest that Academy authorities were more venal than the accused cadets.

I review the West Point sad incident only in the light that it is headline material to condemn college football and to hang the present Air Academy scandal on a game which with all its faults is good for the youth of this country whether participants or not.

In my years of congressional service never have I known a case where any Academy has lowered the academic and character requirements in order to permit an athlete to be admitted. If it were otherwise the Members of Congress would be aware of any such dereliction. In fact, to compromise the entrance requirements by the admissions committee for any appointee would be a more damning indictment than the present charge against the air cadets.

The charge of football professionalism against the service academies is sheer nonsense. An air cadet arises at 6:30 every morning, spends the major part of every day in study or class, has little free time, and takes an academic course equivalent to 150 hours which is far more than is required in any college of this country in a curriculum which would do justice to a combined Harvard and MIT course.

Now I get to the essence of the past, present and future scandals involving honor violations. Undoubtedly there are a few bad characters who should have been dismissed. But before this is a wholesale exodus a civilian academic board of inquiry should be appointed by Congress to determine whether the ever increasing academic load carried by the cadets, the pressure from within, and the onus of failing from without has become so great as to cause a lessening of acceptance of academy standards. No internal faculty or officer group of inquiry will admit to such fact.

The extra burden to the athlete who carries the same academic course as all cadets leads me to ask who in this body buys the superficial statement that football at the Air Academy is professional and corruptive?

When large numbers are involved in a service academy violation the entire corps becomes suspect as who knows who else would have been involved if the opportunity arose. The service academies are made up of the Nation's top boys who are highly recommended and come from wonderful American families. When large numbers of such boys are involved in a scandal we must either indict their home communities or families which are so proud of them or indict a system which has failed to inculcate the honor code of which the academies often too fervently boast.

Gentlemen, the breakdown of the Air Force honor code has no genesis whatsoever in academy sports. It is rather, by the very number of fine young Americans involved—athletes and nonathletes—a failure to accept a system with deep conviction, a system which was borrowed from West Point where it had been badly breeched even though steeped in tradition. I do not excuse any infraction but I do regard the interpretation of all cases as either black or white just as unrealistic as the cavalry charge with fixed bayonets. And to believe otherwise is to condemn a generation of young America—as most assuredly the large majority of these involved represents a cross section of our finest and are measured by their home communities as superior young Americans.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. **ALBERT.** Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Madam Speaker, I apologize to the gentleman for asking him to yield at this point for a unanimous-consent request, but I do so at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit while the House is in session this afternoon and also, Madam Speaker, that this request be printed in the Record following the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mrs. Griffiths). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROCEDURAL IMPROVEMENTS IN CONTEMPT CITATION CASES

Mr. **HUTCHINSON.** Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Speaker, on January 14, 1965, I introduced two bills in conjunction with the gentleman from New York, John Lindsay, to provide for procedural reforms in congressional contempt citation cases. The first bill, H.R. 2795 would set up new procedures in the House for the investigation and referral to the House of circumstances leading to possible contempt of Congress citations. The second bill, H.R. 2794, would amend judicial procedures by allowing courts to return declaratory judgments in these matters.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTEMPT CITATIONS

One of the necessary powers of this, or any other, legislative body is to protect itself against acts designed to undermine and contravene its functions. The means by which the American Congress protects itself is through the invocation of the contempt procedure, a process which calls to the attention of the Congress the act which threatens it and provides for punishment of the offender, either through the courts or before the bar of the House against which the contempt has been directed.

Most contempts today arise from actions of those called before committees of the Congress as witnesses. These actions range from refusal to cooperate to active obstruction of the committee's work. There is no need to call attention to the importance of our committee structure and the fact that the detailed legislative and investigative work which is done by the Congress is accomplished through committees. This is all clearly understood. The point to which I wish to address attention is the procedure by which contempts are brought to the attention of the parent body, the House or the Senate, by committes which have encountered such witnesses.

At present, it is the practice for the committee which has been the subject of the act of contempt to serve as first judge of the matter. It is the committee itself which reports the matter to the parent body, acting at once as victim and prosecutor. I question the soundness of this form of proceeding and the bill, I have introduced, would change this procedure. Basically, this bill provides a screening committee to which the complaint of contempt is brought and it is this screening committee, not the committee which has been subject to the action complained of, which would act as the agency reporting the matter to the parent body.

This new procedure commends itself because it places in the hands of an impartial body the investigation of the charge of contempt and does so in a manageable way. Surely the House or Senate could be considered impartial bodies to investigate the charge, but considerations of time prevent this and there is no practical way in which outside witnesses could be heard on the question of guilt if the entire House or Senate heard the matter. There is real question if the committee which complains of contempt can properly be charged with the responsibility of impartially weighing the evidence to determine if a contempt should be reported to the parent body.

This committee to investigate contempt charges would be named by the presiding officers of the House and Senate respectively and would serve as a special committee. The committee would have seven members and be divided four to three along party lines. The creation of this committee, and its operation in the important area of protecting the Congress and its proceedings from the interference of those wishing to undermine its effectiveness, would provide a strong safeguard of the rights of those charged with contempt and would make more meaningful this type of protection for the Congress.

JUDICIAL PROCEDURES

I have also joined with my very able colleague from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] in supporting legislation which would provide for a declaratory judgment mechanism in connection with congressional contempt proceedings. These two proposals would represent a great step forward in the way in which the Congress deals with the contumacy of witnesses appearing before its committees.

The provisions of the declaratory judgment bill would be highly beneficial in that they would permit the clarification of the very difficult issues that often underlie potential contempt situations without resort to the difficult quasi-criminal procedure surrounding an actual contempt citation. Often the underlying point in a contempt situation is lost by concentration on the contumacy of the witness and not on the issue upon which the refusal to testify or produce papers is based.

Many recall, I am sure, the contempt citations offered against officials of the Port of New York Authority in 1960. It would have been far better had we been able to raise the issues of Federal-State relations that lay at the heart of the matter for consideration by a Federal court, through the declaratory judgment procedure, rather than using, as we did the criminal contempt mechanism that was necessitated when a witness refused to produce the information requested by the committee.

This declaratory judgment procedure would be open only to the Congress and not to witnesses. It would serve as a means of expediting congressional action, and could not be used as a means to deter the proper functioning of the Congress or its committees. Further, the use of the declaratory judgment's mechanism is optional and need not be invoked. Of course, there will be many contempt situations that will not raise issues calling for immediate determination by the courts. However, many situations do arise where there is a need for a clarification of the underlying issue of contempt without concern for the fact that the witness has failed to divulge information.

Linking this with my other proposal to establish a special committee in both Houses of the Congress, to consider contempt situations, it would be the function of that committee, not only to make recommendations as to whether a contempt citation should issue, but whether the Congress should obtain from a court of the United States, a declaration of the legal relations between the Congress and the recalcitrant witness. The House of Congress concerned would then be free to act on the recommendations of the committee as it sees fit.

With the tremendous workload facing the Congress there is a great need for improving the procedures of the House of Representatives. These two proposals on which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] and I have joined represent substantial steps forward in the field of contempt procedures, increasing both the speed and the skill with which the Congress can deal with contempt situations.

BANK OF AMERICA REALLY IS THE BIGGEST

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Madam Speaker, in my remarks last Tuesday concerning the status of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I indicated that the CCC, a taxpayer-owned financial institution, is actually the biggest bank in the world.

In doing so, I did grave injustice to the Bank of America. I have since been supplied with a financial statement for the year 1964 which indicates that at the close of business on December 24, the total assets of the bank amounted to $15.5 billion. This is $1 billion more than the approved capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and therefore an apology is in order to the officers of the Bank of America. This I humbly offer.

MANY VERSIONS OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Madam Speaker, it is interesting that we are now beginning to get many versions of the Great Society and historically considerable information of how this same philosophy has been advanced by various rulers and economists in the past.

I was particularly struck with the analysis of this subject made by James S. Kemper, Jr., president of the Lumbermen's Mutual Casualty Co. of Chicago in an address before the Chartered Property & Casualty Underwriters all-industry conferment luncheon at Hamden, Conn., on December 3 of last year. In particular, I was interested in one of his final statements which was:

> Those of us who are skeptical, are skeptical only because we are concerned with the means by which these objectives are to be achieved, and with the danger that a gradual drift to a Socialist philosophy and economy may shatter great dreams of the future and destroy the Great Society we already have.

His full address follows:

THE GREAT SOCIETY

(An address before Chartered Property & Casualty Underwriters all-industry conferment luncheon, Hamden, Conn., December 3, 1964, by James S. Kemper, Jr., president, Lumbermen's Mutual Casualty Co.)

THE GREAT SOCIETY

This invitation to address a great professional society offers me an opportunity to make some observations above the concept of the Great Society about which we have heard so much and read so much during recent months.

First I am going to talk about the Great Society we already have, and the part the private insurance industry has played in creating it.

The people of the United States enjoy more material blessings than the people of any other country in the world, or of any other society in all recorded history. The concept of freedom from want for all our people is at the threshold of realization. We do not have a perfect society in this respect, or in any other respect, but I think even Plato would agree, were he alive today, that we have almsot succeeded in turning the goals of his philosophical abstraction into reality.

Private entrepreneurs, operating in a free enterprise system based upon the profit motive, are responsible for this achievement. Private enterprise has given us more and better food, clothing, housing, transportation, recreation, and luxuries, and longer life and better health, than would have been dreamed possible even a generation ago; and the distribution of these benefits of the free enterprise system has extended to the overwhelming majority of our population.

Without a strong and creative private insurance industry these fruits of the private enterprise system would not have been possible. This is a fact not understood by most people. If every producer of goods and services were required to maintain his own financial reserves to protect himself against loss by damage, destruction, and legal liability, billions of dollars of capital would be frozen in nonproductive sterility. It has been the existence of professionally managed pools of money, spreading the risk of loss over millions of entrepreneurs, which has freed the capital to speed our progress, to create the products of an abundant economy, and to pay the wages which have permitted an ever-increasing number of our people to participate in our prosperity.

Insurance against loss is just as important to the consumer as to the producer. As the material abundance of our free economy brought more possessions to more people, the private insurance system filled the need for protection of the owners of these possessions from loss. I think it is to the particular credit of the insurance industry—although hardly a matter for rejoicing on our part—that we have provided protection to the consumer-owner for a rate of profit that would be considered ridiculously small by the standards of any other industry; and in recent years for no profit at all.

In general, the fine record of the private insurance industry with respect to the insurance of things is neither widely understood nor particularly challenged by anyone.

It is in the realm of insurance of people that our record, while equally good, is definitely challenged.

For example, in recent years there has been a growing political clamor for cradle-to-the-grave health insurance, financed by taxes instead of premiums, and administered by the Federal Government. But what is the record of private insurance? I think our industry can be proud of its contribution to this important element of the Great Society we already have.

Last year more than $10 billion was paid out by private insurance companies for medical payments of all types under health and accident, workmen's compensation, and automobile bodily injury policies. Seventy percent of our population is covered under private health and accident insurance plans, economically administered with over 80 percent of every premium dollar going into direct benefits to policyholders. More than half of the 18 million people over 65 years of age now have health insurance, and the number is growing rapidly. This is hardly a record that calls for apology or for a violent change in the system.

So in considering the Great Society we already have, and the part played by our industry in bringing it to pass, I think we have done a good job, one to be proud of; and I think our big task in the future will be to maintain a record of strength and creativity which measures up to and continues the rate of progress of the past.

Now let's take a look at the concept of the Great Society that has been so widely discussed in recent months, and its possible impact upon the people of the United States and upon the private insurance system in particular.

So far most of the public statements have been generalizations. But these generalizations will soon be translated into specific programs and offered for action at the next and future sessions of Congress. No one can disagree with the stated objectives: peace and prosperity, a good education for everyone, removal of discrimination based upon personal prejudices, urban improvement, elimination of poverty, and an increase in the personal financial security of all individuals. Nor do I believe that the President of the United States, or the Vice President of the United States, or any responsible Member of Congress would deliberately lead the United States down the road to socialism in an effort to achieve these objectives. I do believe there is real danger that the laudable desire to bring about the millenium of the Great Society, accompanied by an impatient push toward greater centralization of power in the Federal Government, may well lead toward socialism in general. So far as our industry is concerned, there is already a discernible trend toward absorption by government of the functions performed by insurance companies in the insurance of people: i.e., a form of socialism in particular. So the private insurance industry is directly involved in all aspects of the blueprint for the Great Society which deal with the provision of financial security to the individual.

For example, some form of health insurance program for the elderly is at the top of the agenda. There is nothing new about this kind of proposal. As early as 1697, the author, Daniel Defoe, suggested a "pension office." Laborers of "honest repute" were to deposit 4 shilling a year into "a great chest locked with 11 locks"—1 for each trustee of the fund. Victims of accident or sickness (except those hurt while drunk or quarreling) would receive pensions of 12 pence a week. The fund would also provide for those too old or too ill to support themselves by putting them in special government institutions. It was Defoe's idea that this plan would "forever bannish beggary and poverty out of the Kingdom."

Almost 200 years later, toward the end of the 19th century, Chancellor Bismarck of Germany obtained enactment by the Reichstag of three compulsory insurance bills, one for sickness, one for accidents, and one for old-age pensions.

In more recent years a variety of health insurance plans has been adopted by many countries. As far as I have been able to determine, not one of these programs has worked out as anticipated; some of them have gone bankrupt; and all of them have cost several times the initial estimates of the planners.

Some discussion of the Canadian program may be appropriate. Canada has had a partial health insurance program for about 6 years, which has cost approximately double the original estimates. Now the Royal Commission on Health Services has recommended a full cradle-to-the-grave program. The Canadian Tax Foundation estimates that program will cost $4.5 billion a year by 1971. Considering the population difference, and the higher cost of health services in the United States, if such a program were enacted here the estimated cost would be approximately $60 billion per year.

My point is not that we have immediately to deal with a program of this comprehensive and expensive nature. It is, however, an historical fact that once a country adopts a mild or modest or partial program for Government health services financed by taxes rather than by premiums, public and political pressures inevitably expand the program to the point where it becomes an economic catastrophe. Are we so immune to such pressures in the United States that the administration in power, Republican or Democrat, will be able to hold a Government health insurance program within its original limitations?

Other programs, still in the suggestion stage and not yet blue-printed, point to the danger both to the public and to the insurance industry of pursuing the wrong road to achieve the Great Society. I read recently of a plan sometimes referred to as the "Reuther Formula." This is a proposal that the Federal Government reinsure or borrow from the $66 billion now held in private pension funds, in order to get money to finance the "War on Poverty" and other welfare projects which comprise part of the legislative program for the Great Society. If adopted, this plan could partially circumvent congressional authority over appropriations, postpone the inevitable day of repayment, and tend to conceal from the taxpayer the real cost of these projects.

There are other projects already enacted or on the drawing board which tend either to put the Federal Government into the insurance business or to gain access by the Federal Government to the policyholders' money. As an industry we will oppose bad projects; but the outcome will depend not upon our opposition as such, but upon our ability to demonstrate to the American people and to public officials at the Federal level that our opposition is not selfish, but is soundly based and consistent with the welfare of the public and the proper functioning of a free American economy.

We must make people understand the truth, which is that we are just as much interested as anyone else in providing for the poor, the stricken, and the elderly; that in the great majority of cases the private insurance industry can do the job more economically and more efficiently than the Federal Government; and that it can best do so under the present system of State regulation with a minimum of intervention and control at the Federal level. We all believe these things to be so—the problem is to get our story across to the Government and to the public. It is a problem primarily of demonstration and of communication.

I have four specific proposals to make.

First. Within our own companies, individually and competitively, let us redouble our efforts, through research and product development, to improve the quality and breadth of the services we sell to the public. Competition in this function should be fierce, uncompromising, and with no quarter asked or given. The public is entitled to the best service and the broadest protection which it is economically feasible to provide, and if we believe in the free enterprise system it is our duty to provide it.

At the same time let us pool our brains and our experience on an industrywide basis in the property and casualty fields to develop the best possible statistical and actuarial information upon which we can then individually, or through bureaus, develop competitive rates which permit a reasonable profit on our insurance operations. In this connection I was distressed to see the instant negative reaction on the part of spokesmen for some segments of the industry to the recent proposal by the presidents of 12 stock agency companies for a new actuarial and statistical organization. Whether or not this turns out to be the most desirable answer to our statistical needs, it is a proposal which deserves the most careful and serious consideration by all of us.

Second. I propose that we encourage each one of the 1,200,000 people employed by the private insurance industry to constitute himself a one-man public relations agent for our industry. We simply do not tell our story at the times and in the places where it will be both welcome and effective. I have particularly in mind the opportunities to engage in local community activities, directly related to the insurance industry and at the same time in the public interest. This is the practice of personal involvement, so impressively described by Governor Dempsey of this State in his talk before the recent annual convention of the National Association of Independent Insurors.

Today most crimes are crimes against property, and 90 percent of them are covered by insurance; we know from recent FBI reports that more than 50 percent of all serious crimes are committed by youngsters; therefore, is it not appropriate for insurance people to become active in their local communities in such projects as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Boys Clubs, and other groups teaching our young people the principles of good citizenship? We know that traffic safety bears a direct relationship to automobile insurance rates which go up and up and are still so desperately and consistently inadequate; therefore, is it not appropriate for insurance people to take an active part in traffic safety work in their own communities? These efforts will be welcome; they will be effective; and they will represent an individual contribution of high importance both to the insurance industry and to the public welfare. This is the kind of thing that will enable us to get our story across to our neighbors, and to make them understand that our objectives and theirs are identical.

Third. At the management and association level there is a great diffusion of effort in the whole area of relationships with the public and relationships with Federal Government officials. We coast along until some crisis appears on the horizon; then we scurry around indignantly complaining that this congressional committee or that Government agency is about to take some action harmful to the insurance industry. We have no central planning in the vitally important field of public affairs.

On no occasion except a CPCU conferment do we see a microcosm of the entire insurance industry, with every line of insurance and every system of producing and selling it represented by people gathered together in one room. Certainly we should have equally broad representation in our deliberations on public affairs of great consequence to the future of our industry.

I, therefore, propose the creation of a public affairs council, the members to be chairmen or presidents of insurance companies, serving without right of substitution and representing all major segments of our industry, and to be appointed individually by the present chairman or president of each major life, health, and property and casualty association. Additional members might be the incumbent president and vice president and the immediate past president of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and the incumbent presidents of the principal agents' associations.

I visualize this as a group large enough to represent the entire insurance industry but small enough to function effectively as a working organization. It would have a small, highly competent paid staff of people experienced in public affairs and social and economic research. It would meet at least twice a year, and preferably quarterly, to consider and act appropriately upon the relationships of the insurance industry to the public and to the Federal Government in their broadest aspects.

It is not my idea that this Council would serve as a focal point of opposition to measures of the type I have described as implicit in the concept of the Great Society. Rather it is my thought that it would seek ways in which the insurance industry might make an important and responsible contribution to the further sound development of the Great Society which we already have.

Fourth. The idea of a Public Affairs Council leads directly to the fourth proposal. I propose that this Council, when formed, consider asking President Johnson to appoint an Insurance Advisory Council to the President. The members of the Public Affairs Council would serve de jure, as members of the President's Council, augmented by the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the chairmen of appropriate committees of the Senate and the House, and such additional Federal Government personnel as the President might wish to appoint. The Insurance Advisory Council to the President would meet at least once a year, and preferably twice a year, to discuss all Federal legislation and all other significant matters involving the relationship among the Federal Government, the private insurance industry, and the public.

I do not envision this group as a sounding board for anyone, or as a platform for people to make speeches. I picture it as an actual working entity, offering the opportunity for an exchange of views and philosophies in an atmosphere of reason.

In his Thanksgiving message last week to the Armed Forces, President Johnson said: "Freedom is always in the midst of peril." Indeed it is. The peril from without is socialism by conquest. The peril from within is socialism by default.

As I said earlier, I believe that the objectives of the Great Society have been propounded in good faith. Those of us who are skeptical, are skeptical only because we are concerned with the means by which these objectives are to be achieved, and with the danger that a gradual drift to a Socialist philosophy and economy may shatter great dreams of the future and destroy the Great Society we already have. No part of our national economy is more directly involved in the plans for the Great Society than is the insurance industry. Our stake is as great as, and in fact is the same as, the stake of all Americans. Let us not lose it by default.

If these proposals, particularly the last two proposals, are worth discussion, I hope they will be widely and critically discussed by those in our industry who are concerned about our position in the American economy of the future. The time is short, if we are to make our proper contribution and to play our proper role in the great free society of tomorrow.

A BILL TO PROHIBIT FOREIGN PROCESSING VESSELS FROM OPERATING IN U.S. WATERS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to prohibit freezing, packing, or other processing of fish by foreign vessels in the territorial waters of the United States. This is similar to the bill I introduced last year just prior to adjournment.

Last year Japanese freezer ships, paying their nationals 33 cents per hour, operated in the vicinity of Cordova, Alaska. American pay scales exceed $3 per hour for similar work and Americans cannot meet the foreign competition.

Officials of the Cordova Aquatic Marketing Association now are using the competition of Japanese floating cannery operators to whipsaw American cannery operators in negotiating over the price of fish. According to reports a breakdown in negotiations between the Cordova fishermen and American fishpackers has occurred and the Japanese may be asked to return this year. This situation could occur not only in this one area but in the other areas of Alaska as well. In short, it could spell the doom of the entire Alaskan fishpacking industry because no bank will loan money to an industry unless it has assurance that the borrower can operate economically and at a profit. As a result, the jobs of thousands of American workers who work seasonally in Alaska in the fishing industry are jeopardized.

Of course, Madam Speaker, most of the American companies who operate canneries in Alaska also buy canned salmon from the Japanese. Perhaps these businessmen do not stand to lose so much but the workers and various skills that are engaged in the processing of fish could lose out completely.

How long, Madam Speaker, must American citizens stand by and see foreign nationals undermine their livelihoods?

Yet your State Department apparently feels under no obligation to protect them.

NEW HAMPSHIRE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PROTESTS VA CUTBACKS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Madam Speaker, the New Hampshire House of Representatives adopted a resolution on January 20 protesting the plans of the Veterans' Administration to cut back its regional offices in Manchester, N.H., and at White River Junction, Vt. Under unanimous consent, I offer a copy of this resolution for the RECORD.

This document speaks for itself. It expresses the displeasures and alarm felt by the distinguished House of Representatives of New Hampshire over the abrupt announcement by the Veterans' Administration. The New Hampshire House, like this House, is deeply concerned for the welfare of our veterans. I congratulate the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], for its decision to investigate the VA's plans in public hearings. Until the Congress has had an opportunity to look into the entire matter, I strongly believe that the VA, in recognition of the general concern felt by the States and the Congress, should delay execution of its plans until it has presented a full explanation to the Congress. It is for this reason that I have introduced a resolution calling on the President to delay all VA changes until hearings have been held by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a written report is filed.

The resolution by the New Hampshire House of Representatives is as follows:

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has ordered a cutback in the regional offices of veterans affairs at both Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt.; and

Whereas this action might cause a cutback in veterans services and the loss of employment at these facilities; and

Whereas although the Federal Government has justified the cutback of the offices on the grounds that it would reflect economy without affecting the services of veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives of the 1965 session of the General Court of New Hampshire strongly protest this cutback in the offices at Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt., because of the result of poorer services to veterans and hardship to people employed at these facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Veterans' Administration and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN THE SOUTH

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Madam Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an article by Holmes Alexander on the Republican Party in the South. The article follows:

SOUTHERNERS IN THE GOP

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—We keep reading and hearing about Candidate Goldwater's "sordid" and "squalid" southern strategy, but that must be because the commentators are looking for adjectives instead of evidence.

Any honest eye can see that Barry's formula for republicanizing the Old Confederacy is the only strategy that worked at all. Had his conservative message been as ineffective below the Potomac as it was practically everywhere west of the Chesapeake Bay, he would have been beaten worse than Landon, carrying only Arizona, leaving the GOP hardly an acre to reseed itself.

The reseeding commenced, although hardly noted in the national press which was focused on the defrocking of GOP chairman Birch, almost as soon as Republican House Members found their seats in the 89th Congress. At a meeting of the Republican conference on January 14, the GOP survivors passed a succinct but significant resolution which read:

"That the conference committee vice chairman and secretary be considered a part of the leadership with defined duties."

What significance? Well, the vice chairman is WILLIAM CRAMER of Florida and the secretary is RICHARD POFF of Virginia. By enlarging the official leadership to seven members, the House Republicans were moving two southerners into positions of party command. Their defined duties are to steer GOP policy in conference, enunciate it on the floor and perform the loyal opposition of heckling Democrats. Never within memory—and only because of Goldwater's good southern showing—have southerners been raised to party leadership.

Shortly after Congress convened, ALBERT WATSON, of South Carolina, switched parties and became a Republican—his State, his district and his junior Senator having followed Goldwater at the national election. The GOP leadership took account of its astonishing gains in House seats from the erstwhile solid South. Mississippi and Georgia, thanks to Goldwater, each contributed a Republican Congressman. Alabama contributed five. In all, the South now has an historically remarkable delegation of Republicans: two from Virginia, two from North Carolina, two from Florida, three from Tennessee, one from Kentucky, as well as the recruits from South Carolina, Mississippi, and Alabama. There are two semi-Southerners from Maryland and one from West Virginia.

If the GOP is to rise again, it will be because the South is rising as a two-party region. If these southern Republicans are to win reelection and build seniority, it will be because they make good in their jobs. In order to give the newcomers every chance to shine, the GOP leadership went out of its way to place them on major and suitable committees.

Contrary to derogatory comment, the southern rookies—I think I have met them all at least once—are easily equal and often superior to the Democrats they replaced. The country has a right to know that these new Republicans are not freaks or cornpone comedians.

GLENN ANDREWS, of Alabama, Princeton 1931, was district manager of Eastman Kodak and gained appointment to the Education and Labor Committee at his own request. JOHN H. BUCHANAN, JR., of Alabama, formerly a Baptist pastor, goes to the Un-American Activities Committee. JACK EDWARDS, of Alabama, a prominent railroad lawyer with many appearances before Federal commissions, asked and got a position on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee because he comes from the port city of Mobile.

JAMES MARTIN, of Alabama, past president of his local chamber of commerce, president of his own oil company, goes to the Public Works Committee that will handle most of the Appalachian rehabilitation. WILLIAM DICKINSON, of Alabama, for almost 5 years a circuit court judge and president of his chamber of commerce, goes to the Government Operations Committee.

HOWARD CALLAWAY, of Georgia, is a West Point graduate, class of 1949, with outstanding Korean war combat service and is assigned to Government Operations Committee. JOHN J. DUNCAN, of Tennessee, twice mayor of Knoxville, is assigned to the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Dr. TIM LEE CARTER, of Kentucky, is a medical physician and former teacher with assignment to the Commerce Committee, which handles food, drug, and public health legislation. PRENTISS WALKER, of Mississippi, owner of a poultry business and a Baptist church deacon, was assigned to the Agriculture Committee.

All the new southern Republican Members are positioned where they can do their best work, and the Nation has gained this much from Goldwater's southern strategy.

HORTON BILL TO REPEAL TELEPHONE TAX

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, I wish to make a few brief comments in support of the bill which I have introduced to repeal the Federal excise tax imposed on communication services and facilities.

At the present time this tax is levied at the rate of 10 percent on general and toll telephone service, telegraph, cable and radio messages and leased wires, and at 8 percent on wire and equipment service.

With the exception of the tax on local telephone service, which was instituted in 1941 to discourage telephone use during the war effort, these taxes have been in effect on a permanent basis since 1932.

At this time when we in the Congress are giving serious consideration to the elimination of various excise taxes, repeal of these discriminatory communications taxes should receive top priority.

While other utilities or modes of communications such as electricity, gas, water, or rail transportation enjoy exemption from this excise levy, these taxes on telephone calls, telegraph messages, and so forth, still remain as part of our revenue system imposing an unjust burden upon these industries and their consumers alike.

Taxation of these services cannot in any sense be justified on the grounds they are luxuries, for each and every one of us realizes they are absolutely essential for modern-day living. For example, not only is the telephone necessary in business and in everyday community life, but it is highly essential in reporting emergencies which will bring police, firemen, or doctors to our assistance when we need them most.

Such taxes must be borne by the consumer. They add to the cost we pay for these facilities and services. It also adds to the costs of business which again have to be passed on to the consumer in higher prices charged for goods and services.

Elimination of these taxes are even more imperative when we consider their regressive effects. They take a larger proportion of income from those at the lower income levels and bear most heavily upon those individuals who can least afford to pay them. Hence, they are restrictive and limit fuller usage of these services. At the present time, about 20 percent of American households are without telephones. Repeal of these taxes would enable more Americans to afford the convenience of such service.

These taxes bring in nearly $1 billion annually in revenues to our Federal Treasury. In the latest fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1964, tax collections from these excises totaled $910,196,000. In my own district, the Rochester Telephone Corp. collects for the Federal Government some $3.9 million a year alone in excise taxes from the citizens of the communities served. We can well imagine what elimination of these taxes will do for the people of the Rochester area, as well as of the entire country by releasing into their hands this additional purchasing power.

Even though the Federal Government will lose revenues should my measure be enacted, I am firmly convinced that such a loss would soon be offset by higher income tax revenues made possible by rising incomes generated by increased consumer demand and higher productivity.

We must delay no longer in removing these unfair and economically self-defeating taxes. Their repeal will give our citizens much needed relief from these taxes and will give our economy the stimulus it needs to keep our Nation moving forward.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Madam Speaker, the President has submitted a budget which will request new spending authority of almost $100 billion for fiscal year 1966. Already there is on the books an additional $100 billion of unspent appropriations which we have authorized in prior years. It should be quite obvious to this body, that if this Congress grants the President's requests—and my guess is that it will—the Federal agencies will have the authority to spend $200 billion.

As every Member of the House knows, once spending authority is given to the executive branch of the Government, the Congress loses control.

It should not be necessary for me to tell this body that unless we place an annual limitation against all expenditures, including current appropriations and unexpended balances, we will never be able to determine whether there is a deficit or a surplus.

I am, therefore, introducing a resolution, today, that would provide that the Congress place an annual expenditure limitation on every spending account. This is a companion resolution to one that has been introduced by Senator BYRD of Virginia.

In my opinion, this resolution is one of the most important measures that will come before this Congress. It should be obvious to every Member of this body that to escape fiscal insolvency, to stabilize the purchasing power of our dollar, Congress must regain control of expenditures.

It is not enough to talk economy and pay lipservice to the necessity of maintaining a balanced budget. Five straight deficits and a national debt of $318 billion demands action.

To delay any longer effective expenditure control is to invite fiscal disaster and amounts to irresponsibility on the part of Congress to face up to its obligations.

PROPOSED REVIEW OF THE ADEQUACY OF LOCAL AIRLINE SERVICE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution for a congressional review of the adequacy of local airline service. Along with others in this body, I am deeply concerned about present policies of the Civil Aeronautics Board which threaten more than 100 communities with the loss of scheduled airline service, bringing with it a loss of flow of business and employment-creating opportunities.

The city of Jackson, Mich., which I represent, is among those threatened by these policies. It is clear that the intent of Congress should be made known in order that the members and staff of the CAB may be guided by broad considerations of national policy in its decisions, which too often result in 3–2 divisions over policies which have never been made clear to us in Congress nor to the people who depend on airline service for their livelihood.

Local members of the Local Airline Service Action Committee in Jackson have expressed to me their interest in such a resolution, and I am pleased at this time to introduce legislation calling for a thorough review of the needs for airline service by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in order that a new interpretation of the law may soon be passed on to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

THE BUSINESS OF BASEBALL AND ANTITRUST LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRIFFITHS). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Madam Speaker, apparently today is sports day in the House. The gentleman from New York addressed his remarks to professionalism in sports at our Military Academies. I wish to call attention of the House to shortcomings in professional baseball.

On the opening day of this 89th Congress I introduced legislation which would strip organized professional baseball of its exemption from the Sherman-Clayton antitrust laws. This measure, H.R. 6, has been sent to the House Judiciary Committee where it currently is pending.

Today, Madam Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of this body the reasons which have caused me to sponsor this bill. Some will say it is a severe and sweeping attack on the privileged status of the baseball industry.

I believe, however, that stringent measures are necessary if public confidence is ever to be restored to what once was our "national pastime." Events of the past few months have convinced many observers that baseball is "sick" and badly in need of some bitter medicine if it is to be restored to health.

Among those events, two stand out: The purchase of the New York Yankees by the Columbia Broadcasting System, and the announcement that the Braves will leave Milwaukee after next season for a new home in Atlanta, Ga.

I personally am most familiar with, and concerned about, the latter situation. Milwaukee County Stadium, the "Home of the Braves" was located in my congressional district until the redistricting which took affect in 1965. The threatened loss of the team is causing serious repercussions in our community and in our State.

My bill, however, was not introduced as a means of blocking the move of the Braves from Milwaukee. If enacted, it would not affect that situation. It is only through court action that the transfer of the franchise to Atlanta can be prevented.

My proposal, introduced more in sorrow than in anger, simply seeks to end the legal fiction that baseball is somehow sacrosanct as an industry and must be privileged with an exemption from our antitrust regulations. It would point up the fact that baseball is first a business and only second a sport—and should be regarded as such under U.S. statutes.

If H.R. 6 is enacted, however, it could bear on the future of baseball in Milwaukee and other metropolitan areas. Should baseball lose its exemption from antitrust regulation, there is little doubt that its reserve clause arrangements, by which players are bound to their teams, and territorial assignments would be challenged in the courts as violating the Sherman Act. Should these two practices be declared invalid, there is a strong likelihood that moves would be made to establish a new, third big league. Or, to forestall such a move, the present leagues probably would be forced to expand.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that the gentleman's bill, H.R. 6, only applies to baseball? Or would it apply to football and basketball?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Baseball is the only sport at the present time that is exempt from the antitrust laws. Football today does not have the privileges that baseball has. These privileges are based, as I intend to expound in my remarks, on Supreme Court decisions.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman will recall that about two sessions ago we passed legislation which would permit the combination of these leagues in entering into contracts with television stations, and with radio stations, saying that they would not violate the antitrust laws. We approved that portion of the amendment to the antitrust law so that contracts have now been entered into, as an example, the Columbia Broadcasting System entered into a contract with one of the football leagues to pay $28 million or $30 million over a certain period of time.

The question I would like to ask the gentleman is this: Do you intend to repeal the exemption that we gave to football people, and not permit them to enter into these contracts with the television and radio stations, as they have done as a result of that legislation?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I believe there should be a thorough review and study in this field, because there is no doubt that the sports of baseball and football, all sports, have been hurt. They are no longer sports, they have become big business. If this is the situation, I certainly hope that the legislation I have proposed will do just that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I have been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary throughout the time that all of this legislation dealing with football, baseball, and other sports has been before us as relates to antitrust violations. During that period of time it was represented to us just as it has been stated by the gentleman that baseball was something more than sports, it was big business, with the result that they represented to us, together with football and other major sports, that unless they found this protection under these laws they could not carry out the businesses in which they were engaged.

Does the gentleman intend to disrupt the exemption from the antitrust laws as it deals with sports and put them back in the same category as any other businesses that may be trying to go together and violate the antitrust laws?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If we do not do that we are contributing to the detriment of baseball and football as sports. If they are big business, then they should come under the antitrust laws. Does not the gentleman agree that most clubs are organized not for sports but for profit?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Let us be realistic. Nobody ever paid men to play baseball without hoping to make a profit, otherwise they would not last. It is the same with football. Football came before our committee and said, "We are trying to develop professional football, and we are getting on the way. If you will give us this protection you will get better football games, but you have to exempt us from the antitrust laws."

As previously mentioned, some of the larger companies, the networks, have entered into contracts. We did not anticipate they would be that large. They have made it possible in the smaller areas—I say "smaller areas," and I mean in areas where the professional baseball team was not paying off—by the sums that they would get from television it would be possible for them to continue the operation. The problem the gentleman and I will have to meet is, are we going to put them back on the same basis as they were? Why does not the gentleman introduce a bill that just repeals this legislation we approved two or three Congresses ago? Then we are in the same category as we were before, before we put the cloak of protection around them. Are you going to repeal that or apply it to baseball alone?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Baseball at the present time is the only sport that is blatantly violating the antitrust provisions of the Sherman-Clayton antitrust laws. I will certainly agree with my colleague from Colorado that baseball certainly is operated for a profit, but I am sure he would agree that it is not good for baseball, that large baseball clubs use their monopoly in such a way that public confidence is destroyed.

What step must we take to prevent this? If we, two Congresses ago, made the error in giving professional baseball that added protection, then we ought to undo that action.

As the gentleman knows, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], a very able Member of the House, introduced similar legislation in the 82d Congress but it failed to pass. All that my proposal, as provided in the bill, H.R. 6, is intended to do, is exactly what Chairman CELLER proposed to do.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then whatever was introduced last time, as I understand it, has no relation to the TV and radio broadcasting or their combination because they enter into what is absolutely a violation of the antitrust law by saying, as an example, and we provided, that they be permitted to black out within certain areas and that until we approve it was admittedly a violation of the Sherman antitrust law. Now I understand from what the gentleman has to say that you are not trying to repeal that part of it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But only that part that deals with baseball in the contracts they have with the players.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. And certain regulations and restrictions that they have as to geographic locations—that part of it and I do believe that although the bill, H.R. 6, does not specifically negate the action of the 87th Congress, I firmly believe that we should review and restudy the privileges we gave baseball in regard to making radio and TV broadcasting contracts.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would you include in that this agreement that exists in the football leagues whereby they agree to draft or give the privilege of first drafting of certain athletes throughout the United States? Would you repeal that as it relates to football?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Or are you just confining yourself to baseball alone?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. To baseball alone. It is the only professional team sport which the courts have adjudged exempt from antitrust regulation.

May the gentleman from Wisconsin ask the gentleman from Colorado this question? Do you think it was good for baseball as a sport to have a situation where the Columbia Broadcasting System buys the Yankee baseball team? Does this not point up that baseball is losing its sport image and has become a business?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say to the gentleman, this is only made possible by virtue of the fact that Congress did authorize these agreements under which, if the New York Yankees wanted to make a contract with the Columbia Broadcasting System—although now that they own them they probably will not have to make the contract—but if they wanted to make a contract to say, "You and you alone will have the exclusive right to broadcast any games that the New York Yankees have and you alone shall make the determination if they are playing away from New York as to how far the blackout should go—and whether it should be blacked out at all or whether it should comply with the provisions of the law." Now those are the privileges that we gave them. Do you feel that these privileges are such that the broadcasting people and the baseball people have abused the privileges?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I submit that the action taken by the Columbia Broadcasting System indicates that the privileges that the Congress gave in Public Law 87-331 may have been abused and that we ought to review the situation. If H.R. 6 is taken up and hearings are had on it, it will be possible to ascertain the extent to which organized baseball has used and abused its exemption from antitrust regulation to make larger profits and flaunt the public interest.

If I may conclude, then I shall be glad to yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

In either case, Milwaukee—with its reputation as a good baseball town—would be a prime candidate to receive a team. Other cities, such as Oakland, Dallas, and Denver, could also qualify as "big league" cities.

Of all professional team sports, baseball alone is spared the full application of the Nation's antitrust laws. This favored position results from a series of rulings by the U.S. Supreme Court. The first of these was in the case of Federal Baseball Club of Baltimore against National League of Professional Baseball Clubs, decided in 1922. In that case, the Baltimore club, a member of an eight-team professional baseball league, brought suit against the American and National Leagues, charging that those leagues had conspired to monopolize the business of baseball with the result that the competing Federal League was destroyed.

The Supreme Court held that baseball was not subject to the antitrust laws on the ground that the business of presenting baseball exhibitions, was a "personal effort, not related to production, is not a subject of commerce" and the interstate transportation connected with the exhibitions was "a mere incident, not the essential thing."

This decision was reaffirmed in 1953 with the ruling in Toolson against New York Yankees. In that case, three baseball players brought separate suits against the baseball commissioner and against the owners of various member clubs in baseball. They challenged the legality of the defendants' restrictive practices and asked for treble damages.

The Supreme Court, without reexamining the underlying question, ruled that the suits did not lie under the antitrust laws, citing the previous Federal baseball decision. To this day, therefore, professional baseball retains its freedom from the antitrust laws.

It is interesting to note the dissent by Justice Burton, with Justice Reed concurring, in the Toolson case. It held that the development of radio and television and the growth of the farm system had made baseball into an industry engaged in interstate commerce.

This view is similar to one held by the New York Court of Appeals in Gardella against Chandler. In this case, Daniel Gardella, an outfielder for the New York Giants, violated the reserve clause by playing baseball in a Mexican league. Subsequently he was barred by the baseball commissioner, A. B. Chandler, from playing in the United States for 5 years. Gardella sued Chandler for treble damages under the Sherman Act. Although the trial court ruled against him, the New York Court of Appeals reversed the decision.

The respected jurist, Judge Learned Hand, wrote the opinion favoring Gardella. He based his ruling primarily on the lucrative radio and television contracts which the clubs held. He believed that the players, radio, television, clubs in general, and the public make up "an indivisible unit as much as actors and spectators in a theater, and are participating in interstate commerce."

The case was appealed to the Supreme Court, but was never heard because Gardella dropped his damage suit. It later was disclosed that he had settled the claim out of court for $60,000. It is my opinion that Gardella's decision was unfortunate since it did not settle the basic question for all involved in the sport. The size of the settlement indicates, however, that someone in baseball thought Gardella had justice on his side. Commissioner Chandler has been quoted saying that the settlement was "a cause of real rejoicing on our part."

The ruling by Judge Hand and the dissent by Justice Burton are important because of their concurrence on one significant point: that the radio and television contracts held by organized professional baseball have essentially altered the nature of that industry. These lucrative contracts have turned what once was primarily a sports activity into an adjunct of the entertainment business.

No close observer of the world of sports can deny the enormous impact which the growth of the broadcasting industry—particularly television—has had on organized baseball.

It primarily has been the televising of major league baseball games which has dealt a lethal blow to the minor leagues. As the minor leagues have collapsed one by one so has the farm system which once was the training ground for future big leaguers. This year, bowing to the reality that the majors can no longer depend on the minor leagues to provide talent to them, both the American and National Leagues have adopted a draft system for obtaining players. It marked a significant departure from traditional baseball procedures.

Another effect of television is seen in the decline of attendance at major league ballparks. Although the population of the country and of the big metropolitan areas where major league teams play has increased rapidly in recent years, baseball attendance has sagged. The reason seems obvious: when a man can sit in the comfort of his living room and watch a major league game on television, there is little reason for him to go to the ball park.

Team owners have not been slow to grasp this fact. The fan in the stands has been replaced by the fan in the armchair as first in their affections. Baseball today is being operated not so much to quicken the clicks of the turnstiles as to influence the clicks of TV channel selectors.

The situation is epitomized in the attempt to move the Braves from Milwaukee to Atlanta. It is not the fact that Atlanta is building a new stadium for the team that has caused this attempted franchise transfer. Milwaukee's county stadium is relatively new, well kept, provides easy access from all parts of the city and has ample close parking.

The motive of the Braves management is not Atlanta's reputation as a good "baseball town." In that regard Atlanta is an unknown quantity where Milwaukee has long since proved its support of the national pasttime. It was, after all, in Milwaukee that the National League alltime attendance record was set. Although the attendance figure for 1964 did not approach the record, it was close to 1 million—a respectable amount in any league.

Therefore, I repeat, Madam Speaker, it is not the new stadium or prospective attendance which has lured the Braves owners to Atlanta. It is the lure of extremely lucrative contracts for radio and television broadcasting of future Braves games.

Atlanta is the focal point of a large area of the South which has been relatively untouched by the growth and proliferation of professional team sports. There is a large potential market for the broadcast of the games.

In that respect, Milwaukee is at somewhat of a disadvantage. To the south lies Chicago with two major league clubs. To the east is broad Lake Michigan. To the northwest is Minneapolis-St. Paul with an American League team. Further, there are other popular team sports, such as professional football, to vie for the television sports advertising dollar.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the dollar has become all important in the operations of organized baseball. It is, I venture to say, behind the purchase of the New York Yankees by the Columbia Broadcasting System. It may be the reason that persons with substantial radio and/or TV interests have been, and are, board chairmen and presidents of major league clubs.

There is nothing wrong with advertising. There is nothing wrong with televising baseball games. But there is something wrong in claiming an exemption from antitrust laws as a sport and then using that exemption to promote strictly business interests.

Organized baseball cannot have the best of both worlds. Either it is primarily a sporting activity, or it is strictly a profitmaking adjunct of the entertainment industry.

With one or two notable exceptions, baseball owners have demonstrably chosen profit over pride. Recognizing their choice, let us in Congress act quickly to strip baseball of special privileges extended while baseball was still being operated as a sport.

H.R. 6 would take away baseball's exemption from the Sherman-Clayton antitrust laws. It has been referred to the House Judiciary Committee and its Antitrust Subcommittee. I have contacted the esteemed chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], on this matter several times in the past. As the former sponsor of similar legislation early in the 1950's, Mr. CELLER has been favorable to the proposal and I am hopeful that early hearings can be arrranged.

Through these public hearings it will be possible to ascertain the extent to which organized baseball has used—and abused—its exemption from antitrust regulation to gain larger profits and flaunt the public interest.

I also have written to Chairman E. William Henry of the Federal Communications Commission, suggesting that the use of radio and TV advertising revenues to induce a sporting attraction to move from one city to another may not be in consonance with the intent and purpose of the Federal Communications Act.

He replied that he has directed his staff to look into the matter and that he will advise me of the findings when the study is completed.

Madam Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court in 1953 suggested that it was up Congress to legislate national policy on organized professional baseball. In the years which have followed, several attempts have been made—none successfully.

I am happy that my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconson, the Honorable LYNN STALBAUM, as well as other Members of this House and the other body have expressed their interest and concern in baseball's antitrust status. The legislative measures they have introduced are most welcome and demonstrates the need for action.

Now the time has come to take action. We must work to restore sanity to our national pastime.

I am delighted to yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I assume, from what the gentleman stated a moment ago, if it should develop in a hearing that the broadcasting people, both of television and of radio, have abused the privilege we granted to them as an exemption under the antitrust laws, the gentleman would have no objection to amending H.R. 6 to rectify that mistake.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would have no objection, but in the present form H.R. 6 does not deal with radio and television and does not negate the action taken two Congresses ago.

My bill simply would wipe out an exemption to the antitrust laws which was given to professional baseball, and to no other organized team sport, by the U.S. Supreme Court, not by Congress. It would affirm that in the view of Congress all professional team sports are businesses and that baseball has no claim to a privileged position.

Then having put all professional team sports on the same plane, Congress could act to grant exceptions from antitrust regulation for all of them as the need is seen.

I do not object to having the bill amended; not at all.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman did state he had called upon the Chairman of the FCC to make a study of this matter to see whether the revenues from advertising have resulted in a transfer of franchises.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I have; yes. If he advises that they have not, the gentleman from Colorado is asking me if I would accept an amendment to H.R. 6 which would exempt baseball and other sports from radio and television privileges they now have; is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It goes a little further than that. We authorized them to enter into certain agreements by the actions two or three Congresses ago, which admittedly without the legislation would have been in violation of the antitrust laws.

Does the gentleman believe that since we did permit them to enter into these agreements, these agreements resulted in abuse by baseball as related to player contracts or the transfer of franchises from one city to another? Does the gentleman believe that any part of the legislation resulted in those actions?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I submit that the matter needs study to determine if, indeed, those or other abuses have resulted.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If it has, that is the thing the gentleman wishes to correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes. I want abuses corrected.

BASEBALL AND ANTITRUST LEGISLATION

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman Zablocki, for the courtesy of allowing me to join him in expressing my views on this subject which is of great concern to the people of the State of Wisconsin.

This proposal is badly needed to place organized baseball in its correct perspective within the realm of the sports world and the laws of our land. It is an accurate fact that baseball, as it exists today, is a business venture first, and a sport second.

The scheduled more of the Braves from Milwaukee to Atlanta affects many people in our State. More directly, it involves taxpayers who invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in the construction of a vast baseball stadium only a few years ago.

This, I feel, gentlemen, is an important reason for all of us to examine more closely the attempt to pass off big-league baseball as a sport. I have the greatest admiration for the athletes but voice growing doubt about the manner in which responsibility is handled by the management. There has been a seeming lack of integrity by club owners in this regard. Publicly they attempt to hide behind a facade of being a sport to avoid antitrust regulations; yet, privately, and in their scheme of things, they have no qualms about acting in concert to make any move which will return them even greater profit, with no regard for the public's interest.

I feel, like other sports fans across the Nation, and indeed the world, that we have been unfairly "dusted off" by those who purport to be the leaders of this great game.

I am therefore, pleased to associate myself with my distinguished colleague, Mr. Zablocki, by introducing my own bill, H.R. 3412, to show that all of us in Wisconsin are concerned by the present turn of events in major league baseball.

VA ORDER CLOSING FACILITIES SHOULD BE RESCINDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Speaker, the recent decision of the Veterans' Administration to close 31 facilities under its jurisdiction has caused much reaction, and rightly so. The $23 million saving which the VA claims will result from this action will certainly be welcomed by all fiscally responsible citizens, provided decreased services for deserving war veterans is not the price.

Unfortunately, knowledgeable letters from interested leaders in my district and my own investigation indicate that just the opposite is true and that the closing of additional facilities will be at the expense of service to needy veterans. For example, one veterans' post commander, in commenting on the merger of the Cincinnati regional office with that of Cleveland, states:

> Due to an already heavy load at the Cleveland regional office, it often takes months to process claims for benefits for our comrades and their dependents, and in many instances it causes a real hardship on the veteran and/or his dependents as they may be depending on this grant for the necessities of life.

Another post commander writes:

> It is the experience of this post, as with every other veteran-minded agency, that it is ever increasingly difficult to obtain benefits for the veteran and his dependents due to an already overburdened VA regional office staff, and in many cases it is only after a long waiting period that we are able to obtain hospitalization for our ill veterans due to long waiting lists at overcrowded Veterans' Administration hospitals.

If such is the situation prevailing at the present time, how does the Veterans' Administration hope to improve it with the closing of 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and 16 regional offices?

If a contact office replaces the present Cincinnati office, how long will it be before this office is closed as has happened with 187 other contact offices throughout the country?

In the light of past performances, veterans and their dependents are entirely justified in being apprehensive about the proposed program.

On August 12, 1963, the Administration authorized the activation of 2,000 nursing care beds to help alleviate the urgent need for hospitalized veterans who are, for the most part, bedridden, thus making available more beds for active hospital cases. The conversion of existing facilities for nursing care beds was stressed by the President.

So important was the utilization of existing facilities in the proposed program that former Administrator James S. Gleason stated that he would request $5 to $6 million to convert such facilities to accommodate nursing care patients.

However, when Public Law 88–450, authorizing a sum of $25 million over a 5-year period for 4,000 nursing beds, was enacted in August 1964, the urgency and advisability of converting existing facilities somehow lost its force. The Commissioner informed the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs that although a "mere redesignation of existing space would, of course, have been quicker and easier," it "would not have produced the necessary standards of nursing home care."

Is it any wonder, then, in view of the existing confusion, that out of the several thousand beds authorized, as of late 1964 only 46 new beds were in operation? Are the 11 hospitals and 4 domiciliaries totally beyond repair as far as conversion to nursing care beds is concerned? This possibility should be fully explored before the VA's phaseout program is put into effect.

At present, of the 2,909 hospital beds affected by the order, 2,183 are now occupied. Of the 3,220 domiciliary beds involved, the patient load is 3,101. The closing of these hospitals and domiciliaries would not only be a tremendous hardship upon these patients and their families, but could have a harmful effect on millions of the Nation's veterans.

Although we are assured that the reorganization will be carried out without impairment of essential services, promises and reassurances leave much to be desired. It was only a year ago that former Administrator James S. Gleason appeared before a House Subcommittee on Appropriations and assured the members that the new nursing care program would not mean a further phaseout of domiciliary facilities.

What happened?

On January 13 of this year the new Administrator announced that 4 domiciliaries would be closed, and the members of these domiciliaries would be relocated in the remaining 14 facilities.

If increased operating efficiency and reduced spending is the prime mover behind the VA's program, I trust the recommendations made by the General Accounting Office in its 1964 report on the Veterans' Administration have been fully implemented.

For instance, one such recommendation involved a double standard for the payment of compensation benefits to veterans with essentially the same disabilities. The GAO estimated that between $63 and $182 million will be paid by the VA in excess of the amount which would have been expended if a single disability standard applied to all.

I have strongly protested the closing of these hospitals, regional offices, and domiciliaries. Fortunately, Chairman Teague, of the House Veterans' Committee, has responded to the many protests throughout the country and has promised to hold hearings on this so-called economy move. I trust that after these hearings bring the facts to light, America's veterans will not be shoved around in this arbitrary and unnecessary move.

TEXT OF AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON'S REMARKS AT MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Madam Speaker, on January 28 the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson delivered a magnificent and fitting tribute to the late and great Sir Winston Churchill at the memorial service at the National Cathedral.

This eloquent and moving address will stir and stimulate all who read it as it did those of us who were privileged to hear it. Hence, for my colleagues in the Congress and the citizens of the country who will read this Record I take particular pleasure in submitting it for incorporation in the body of the Record:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 29, 1965]

Text of Stevenson's Remarks

Today we meet in sadness to mourn one of the world's greatest citizens. Sir Winston Churchill is dead. The voice that led nations, raised armies, inspired victories and blew fresh courage into the hearts of men is silenced. We shall hear no longer the remembered eloquence and wit, the old courage and defiance, the robust serenity of indomitable faith. Our world is thus poorer, our political dialog is diminished and the sources of public inspiration run more thinly for all of us. There is a lonesome place against the sky.

So we are right to mourn. Yet, in contemplating the life and spirit of Winston Churchill, regrets for the past seem singularly insufficient. One rather feels a sense of thankfulness and encouragement that throughout so long a life, such a full measure of power, virtuosity, mastery and zest played over our human scene.

Contemplating this completed career, we feel a sense of enlargement and exhilaration. Like the grandeur and power of the masterpieces of art and music, Churchill's life uplifts our hearts and fills us with fresh revelation of the scale and reach of human achievement. We may be sad; but we rejoice as well, as all must rejoice when they "now praise famous men" and see in their lives the full splendor of our human estate.

And regrets for the past are insufficient for another reason. Churchill, the historian, felt the continuity of past and present, the contribution which mighty men and great events make to the future experience of mankind; history's "flickering lamp" lights up the past and sends its gleams into the future. So to the truth of Santayana's dictum, "Those who will not learn from the past are destined to repeat it," Churchill's whole life was witness. It was his lonely voice that in the thirties warned Britain and Europe of the follies of playing all over again the tragedy of disbelief and of unpreparedness. And in the time of Britain's greatest trial he mobilized the English language to inspire his people to historic valor to save their beleaguered island. It was his voice again that helped assemble the great coalition that has kept peace steady through the last decades.

He once said: "We cannot say the past is past without surrendering the future." So today the "past" of his life and his achievement are a guide and light to the future. And we can only properly mourn and celebrate this mighty man by heeding him as a living influence in the unfolding dramas of our days ahead.

What does he tell us for this obscure future whose outlines we but dimly discern? First, I believe, he would have us reaffirm his serene faith in human freedom and dignity. The love of freedom was not for him an abstract thing but a deep conviction that the uniqueness of man demands a society that gives his capacities full scope. It was, if you like, an aristocratic sense of the fullness and value of life. But he was a profound democrat, and the cornerstone of his political faith, inherited from a beloved father, was the simple maxim—"Trust the people." Throughout his long career, he sustained his profound concern for the wellbeing of his fellow citizens.

Instinctively, profoundly, the people trusted "good old Winnie," the peer's son. He could lead them in war because he had respected them in peace. He could call for their greatest sacrifices for he knew how to express their deepest dignity—citizens of equal value and responsibility in a free and democratic state.

His crucial part in the founding of the United Nations expressed his conviction that the Atlantic Charter he and President Roosevelt audaciously proclaimed at the height of Hitler's victories would have to be protected throughout the world by institutions embodying the ideal of the rule of law and international cooperation.

For him, humanity, its freedom, its survival, towered above pettier interests—national rivalries, old enmities, the bitter disputes of race and creed. "In victory—magnanimity; in peace—good will" were more than slogans. In fact, his determination to continue in politics after his defeat in 1945 and to toil on in office in the 1950's to the limit of health and endurance sprang from his belief that he could still "bring nearer that lasting peace which the masses of people of every race and in every land so fervently desire." The great soldier and strategist was a man of peace—and for the most simple reason—his respect, his faith, his compassion for the family of man.

His career saw headlong success and headlong catastrophe. He was at the height. He was flung to the depths. He saw his worst prophecies realized, his worst forebodings surpassed. Yet throughout it all his zest for living, gallantry of spirit, wry humor and compassion for human frailties took all firmness out of his fortitude and all pomposity out of his dedication.

Churchill's sense of the incomparable value and worth of human existence never faltered, nor the robust courage with which he lived it to the full. In the darkest hour, the land could still be bright, and for him hopes were not deceivers. It was forever fear that was the dupe. Victory at last would always lie with life and faith, for Churchill saw beyond the repeated miseries of human frailty and larger vision of mankind's "upward ascent toward his distant goal."

He used to say that he was half American and all English. But we put that right when the Congress made him an honorary citizen of his mother's native land and we shall always claim a part of him. I remember once years ago during a long visit at his country house he talked proudly of his American Revolutionary ancestors and happily of his boyhood visits to the United States. As I took my leave I said I was going back to London to speak to the English Speaking Union and asked if he had any message for them. "Yes," he said, "tell them that you bring greetings from an English Speaking Union." And I think that perhaps it was to the relations of the United Kingdom and the United States that he made his finest contribution.

In the last analysis, all the zest and life and confidence of this incomparable man sprang, I believe, not only from the rich endowment of his nature, but also from a profound and simple faith in God. In the prime of his powers, confronted with the apocalyptic risks of annihilation, he said serenely: "I do not believe that God has despaired of his children." In old age, as the honors and excitements faded, his resignation had a touching simplicity: "Only faith in a life after death in a brighter world where dear ones will meet again—only that and the measured tramp of time can give consolation."

The great aristocrat, the beloved leader, the profound historian, the gifted painter, the superb politician, the lord of language, the orator, the wit—yes, and the dedicated bricklayer—behind all of them was the man of simple faith, steadfast in defeat, generous in victory, resigned in age, trusting in a loving providence and committing his achievements and his triumphs to a higher power.

Like the patriarchs of old, he waited on God's judgment and it could be said of him—as of the immortals that went before him—that God "magnified him in the fear of his enemies and with his words he made prodigies to cease. He glorified him in the sight of kinds and gave him commandments in the sight of his people. He showed him his glory and sanctioned him in his faith * * *."

HUDSON HIGHLANDS NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY BILL GETS SUPPORT

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ako I introduced H.R. 3012, a bill to establish a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in four counties of New York State. At that time I described the measure as part of a new conservation effort—an effort not only to protect and develop old resources, but to create new ones—not only to save our vanishing wilderness areas, but to preserve the green spaces and scenic river valleys near our metropolitan areas.

I am pleased to report that in the 14 days since I introduced H.R. 3012, the citizens of New York State from both political parties and from all walks of life have expressed overwhelming support for this measure. Most gratifying has been the enthusiastic bipartisan support received from people who have devoted their lives to conservation problems and to the Hudson Valley.

New York State Senator R. Watson Pomeroy, a Republican, and one of the State's most distinguished conservationists, recently made the following statement on my bill:

> I welcome any assistance from the U.S. Congress in preserving scenic resources. I am very pleased that these steps have been taken to preserve the natural beauty of the Hudson Gorge. The New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Natural Resources has also prepared a bill for consideration and introduction in the near future before the New York Legislature. This bill, which calls for the establishment of a Lower Hudson Valley Heritage Commission, strives for the same goal as H.R. 3012 and will have bipartisan sponsorship in the State Legislature. As for the Con Edison project on Storm King, I welcome delay so that all angles of the project may be studied further.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Pomeroy is intimately familiar with the problems of the Hudson River. As an assemblyman last year he was chairman of the Joint Legislative Committee on Natural Resources. Under his leadership, that committee held the first and only true public hearings on the problems of the river. I was pleased to be represented among the 107 witnesses who appeared to testify as to the urgent need for legislation to protect the Hudson highlands from decay and misuse.

TO ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. The purpose of this proposal is to provide Congress with a means by which it can reevaluate and revise certain of its outmoded methods and procedures.

There has been much discussion in recent years of the pressing need for congressional reorganization. The suggested joint committee—composed of six Members of the House and six Members of the Senate—would initiate a thorough review of the operations of Congress by Congress itself.

It has been nearly 20 years since the last major study and reform of our congressional system. In this time immense changes have taken place all about us, changes and developments which have resulted in ever-increasing pressures and responsibilities on the legislative branch of government.

If it is effectively to discharge its responsibilities in today's complex society, it is essential that Congress bring its own internal organization up to date. The machinery of government is meant to facilitate decisive action by Congress; we must not allow the machinery to impede the legislative process.

I am pleased, therefore, to join several of my colleagues in both the House and Senate in proposing this Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. I strongly urge early approval of this resolution as a sensible and highly useful approach to the need for congressional reorganization.

TO HELP NEEDY AND QUALIFIED STUDENTS OBTAIN A COLLEGE EDUCATION

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill designed to strengthen America's colleges and universities and to help needy and qualified students obtain a college education.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I join my colleagues, Chairman POWELL and the gentlewoman from Oregon, Representative GREEN, in introducing the Higher Education Act of 1965—legislation which incorporates the college aid proposals recommended by President Johnson in his January 12 education message.

One of the several significant new proposals included in this bill is a program of scholarships for up to 140,000 qualified high school graduates who could not otherwise afford to continue their education. I strongly endorse this much needed program which, as chairman of the Advisory Group on Higher Education of the House Education and Labor Committee, I recommended 3 years ago, in early 1962.

Other new proposals in the bill call for special assistance for smaller, less developed colleges, including a program of faculty exchanges between these struggling institutions and our leading universities; and a significant program of university extension and adult education to serve the needs of our growing urban communities. Just as the Land-Grant College Act was enacted to help what was in the last century a predominantly rural America, I am sure that the extension proposal in this bill will effectively assist the 70 percent of our population which today lives in America's cities.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 would also provide grants to help colleges and universities obtain books, periodicals, and other needed library materials, and would provide insurance and partial payment of interest on loans to college students under certain conditions.

As well as initiating these new efforts, the legislation would strengthen existing programs to help build college classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

This legislation represents a significant advance in the direction of full educational opportunity at the college level for qualified young Americans. Through helping able but needy students with scholarships and loan guarantees and by improving our college and university facilities, it will mean wider educational horizons for today's students—the leaders of tomorrow.

A summary of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has been prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Education and I would like to include the text of this summary and fact sheet at this point:

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Authorization for fiscal 1966

	Million
Title I: University extension and continuing education	$25
Title II: College library assistance and library training and research	65
Title III: Strengthening developing institutions	30
Title IV: Student assistance:	
(a) Undergraduate scholarships	70
(b) Insured, reduced-interest loans	15
(c) College work-study program extension and amendments	[1] 45
(d) Extension of national defense student loan program (no additional cost	----
Total	250

[1] In addition to $84 million contained in budget request for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452).

Estimated Federal payments under the Higher Education Act of 1965

State	Total estimated Federal payments	University extension and continuing education	Scholarships	College work-study programs
United States and outlying areas	$219,000,000	$20,000,000	$70,000,000	$129,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	214,646,115	19,626,115	68,600,000	126,420,000
Alabama	5,033,521	360,004	1,643,951	3,029,566
Alaska	269,685	118,869	53,051	97,765
Arizona	1,976,867	216,755	619,135	1,140,977
Arkansas	3,137,404	246,483	1,016,907	1,874,014
California	17,555,551	1,450,697	5,665,025	10,439,829
Colorado	2,321,636	247,716	729,520	1,344,400
Connecticut	2,397,545	309,097	734,630	1,353,818
Delaware	540,358	136,967	141,896	261,495
Florida	5,702,179	525,972	1,820,776	3,355,431
Georgia	5,681,445	424,774	1,849,080	3,407,591
Hawaii	828,825	152,756	237,813	438,256
Idaho	922,441	152,910	270,690	498,841
Illinois	9,786,575	899,574	3,126,080	5,760,921
Indiana	5,143,069	468,057	1,644,476	3,030,536
Iowa	3,682,710	312,178	1,185,614	2,184,918
Kansas	2,886,872	270,743	920,246	1,695,883
Kentucky	4,406,573	340,750	1,430,189	2,635,634
Louisiana	5,174,073	363,008	1,692,334	3,118,731
Maine	1,131,676	175,937	336,189	619,550
Maryland	3,218,435	358,156	1,006,128	1,854,151
Massachusetts	5,658,360	507,874	1,811,729	3,338,757
Michigan	8,361,732	718,511	2,688,570	4,954,651
Minnesota	4,451,308	368,938	1,436,010	2,646,360
Mississippi	4,299,709	276,057	1,415,355	2,608,297
Missouri	5,304,563	437,636	1,711,985	3,154,942
Montana	938,454	153,988	275,943	508,523
Nebraska	1,934,464	213,059	605,519	1,115,886
50 States and District of Columbia—Con.				
Nevada	$349,499	$129,959	$77,226	$142,314
New Hampshire	747,404	149,598	210,284	387,522
New Jersey	4,918,123	604,759	1,517,264	2,796,100
New Mexico	1,346,436	175,937	411,733	758,766
New York	15,713,873	1,462,865	5,012,917	9,238,091
North Carolina	7,378,367	468,673	2,430,546	4,479,148
North Dakota	1,105,428	149,675	336,194	619,559
Ohio	9,686,866	870,155	3,101,355	5,715,356
Oklahoma	3,392,171	287,995	1,091,921	2,012,255
Oregon	2,201,872	242,633	689,180	1,270,059
Pennsylvania	11,309,619	979,901	3,633,569	6,696,149
Rhode Island	984,852	168,698	287,089	529,065
South Carolina	3,993,122	292,847	1,301,604	2,398,671
South Dakota	1,154,353	154,527	351,698	648,128
Tennessee	5,525,596	388,577	1,806,992	3,330,027
Texas	12,720,907	887,714	4,162,430	7,670,763
Utah	1,529,921	174,782	476,681	878,458
Vermont	639,289	131,191	178,728	329,370
Virginia	4,914,858	429,780	1,577,666	2,907,412
Washington	3,367,720	328,043	1,069,233	1,970,444
West Virginia	2,670,941	239,629	855,236	1,576,076
Wisconsin	4,613,333	413,145	1,477,453	2,722,735
Wyoming	475,340	126,108	122,845	226,387
District of Columbia	1,160,195	161,458	351,315	647,422
Outlying areas	4,353,885	373,885	1,400,000	2,580,000
American Samoa	------------	26,625	------------	------------
Guam	------------	30,114	------------	------------
Puerto Rico	------------	289,458	------------	------------
Virgin Islands	------------	27,688	------------	------------

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Title I. University extension and continuing education

Background

Fifty years ago, when most Americans were engaged in agrarian occupations, the Nation looked for a way to enlist higher education in the important assignment of making farm families more productive and their lives more rewarding.

Congress responded with the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which made instruction, research, and extension services widely available through the land-grant colleges. Doubtless more than any other factor, this three-sided program has been responsible for the unparalleled progress of our farm and rural areas.

Today 70 percent of the people live in urban areas. Much work lies ahead to fully examine the meaning to the Nation of this shift in homes, occupations, and social problems. While land-grant colleges still provide the best schools of agriculture, few adequate programs exist that meet head-on the problems of urban life.

As it did with rural life, higher education can help find the answers. The unique and invaluable resources of the Nation's great universities can deal with such contemporary problems as poverty and community development.

"The role of the university," President Johnson said, "'must extend far beyond the ordinary extension-type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many department of the university—all should be brought into play."

"This is a demanding assignment for the universities, and many are not now ready for it. The time has come for us to help the university to face problems of the city as it once faced problems of the farm."

Proposal

Title I proposes a 5-year program to assist in the solution of community problems in such areas as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use. It does so by making grants and contracts to help colleges and universities develop more effective methods and teaching in their continuing adult education and extension programs, and to strengthen their public service resources.

University-operated programs described in a State plan approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education might include professional retraining and refresher programs; training and consultative services to local, State, and Federal Governments; training in leadership and program planning for voluntary associations; continuing adult education, including special programs for culturally disadvantaged adults leading to better employment opportunities; educational services relating to aging; programs for women preparing to enter or reenter the labor market; and other training, demonstration, and public service programs.

A National Advisory Committee on Extension and Continuing Education would advise the Commissioner on policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans and of grants and contracts for special experimental approaches. During 1968, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would appoint a Review Council on Extension and Continuing Education to review the administration of this program and to make recommendations for needed improvements.

Eighty percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned as follows: $25,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands; and $100,000 to each of the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Funds not consumed in this 80 percent distribution would be apportioned among the States and territories based on their population. Federal funds would cover 90 percent of the costs of the programs in fiscal year 1966; 75 percent in fiscal year 1967; and 50 percent in fiscal years 1968–70. Up to 5 percent of the expenditures for which Federal payment is made could be for developing and administering the State plan.

Twenty percent of the funds appropriated would be reserved for the Commissioner to use for grants or contracts with institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of experimental approaches to extension and continuing adult education related to the solution of community problems. These funds could also be used to augment grants made for programs under the State plan.

First-year authorization would be $25 million.

Title II: College library assistance and library training and research

Background

More than ever, excellence in teaching and research depends on an adequate selection of books, periodicals, scientific journals, and documents. Yet 50 percent of our 4-year institutions of higher learning and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted minimum standards in the number of volumes in their libraries.

Moreover, current national statistics show a decline in the number of college and university library books per student. The reason is that enrollments are increasing faster than per student expenditures for books. Today, an estimated $226 million is needed merely to stock the shelves of our universities with the books needed for the present student and faculty population. Meanwhile, rising college and university enrollments are expected to swell from today's 4.8 to 6.9 million by 1970.

Beyond the need for bringing libraries of institutions of higher learning up to minimum standards, there is the additional task of providing vastly improved library resources for an increasing number of students engaged in research for advanced degrees. The number of doctoral degrees is doubling every 10 years. Yet at least 15 universities which offer a Ph. D. degree in a variety of fields have libraries with fewer than 150,000 volumes—barely enough for a small liberal arts college. This inadequacy is further exaggerated by the 6 million professionals whose careers depend directly upon the availability of superior library resources.

A growing population with growing needs for library services will also create additional pressures for more librarians. To meet minimum staffing standards for the expanding system of school, public, and university libraries, an estimated 125,000 additional librarians are required. However, library schools are graduating only about 3,000 new professionals each year, and even at that, 50 percent of these schools are unable to meet minimum accreditation standards for lack of operating funds. Thus, these schools—which must somehow supply a vastly greater number of trained librarians—are still functioning at a level far below the immediate need.

The price for this lack of training facilities is paid ultimately by the Nation's schoolchildren. In the public schools, the ratio of qualified librarians to pupils is 1:1,254; the accepted national standard is 1 trained librarian to 300 pupils.

In 1962–63, only 30,000 school librarians were employed in our public elementary and secondary schools. Of these, 22 percent had completed fewer than 15 semester hours of college work in library science.

In 84 percent of our elementary schools, there are no school librarians at all, and professional librarians are lacking in one-third of the State departments of education.

Proposal

Title II proposes a 5-year program to help institutions of higher education acquire library materials needed for their expanded responsibilities in research, teaching, and student use; to encourage new and enlarged college and university training programs to prepare individuals for service in the information sciences and in libraries; and to promote research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries and the library and information sciences.

The proposal is divided into two parts. The first would authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants to colleges or combinations of colleges for the purchase of books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials.

Institutions submitting appropriate applications would receive a basic grant of up to $5,000. The Commissioner would also be authorized to make supplemental grants, not to exceed $10 for each full-time student. Supplemental grants would be made on the basis of such criteria as size and age of the library collection, student enrollment, and endowment and other financial resources. Only the basic grant would be matched by the institution. Each institution or combination of institutions would provide assurance that their previous year's expenditure for materials would be maintained.

Twenty-five percent of the funds appropriated for this part would be used by the Commissioner to make special grants. These special grants might be made, for example, to institutions of higher education which demonstrate a special need for additional library resources; or to institutions which engage in meeting special national or regional needs in the library and information sciences; or to combinations of institutions which need special assistance in establishing joint facilities.

An Advsory Council on College Library Resources would be established to assist the Commissioner in the development of criteria for making of supplemental grants and special purpose grants.

First-year authorization for this part would be $50 million.

The second part authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education for training students in librarianship, including the training of communications specialists in the biomedical, physical, and social sciences. The Commissioner would also be authorized to make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations; and with individuals for research and demonstration projects and for the dissemination of information derived from this research and demonstration. However, no grant would be made to a private group other than a nonprofit one. The Commissioner would appoint panels of experts to evaluate various types of research and demonstration projects.

First-year authorization for this part would be $15 million.

Total first-year authorization would be $65 million.

Title III: Strengthening developing institutions

Background

Enrollments in institutions of higher education doubled in the 10-year period from 1954 to 1964 (2.4 to 4.8 million) and are expected to go up at least another 50 percent in the next decade. During that same period, enrollments in junior colleges increased 2½ times. The postwar years have, to be sure, brought a substantial increase in the number of American institutions of higher education—from 1,686 in 1946 to more than 2,100 in the fall of 1964.

The pace at which these institutions are increasing, however, lags far behind the rate at which students are seeking to enter. Moreover, many of our institutions of higher learning urgently need strengthening. Almost 10 percent of the colleges which grant baccalaureate or higher degrees are still unaccredited by appropriate regional or professional associations. Several hundred others lack essential research apparatus and teaching personnel. As recently as the 1961–62 academic year, one-fourth of the faculty members in our public liberal arts undergraduate colleges were paid $6,000 or less, and one-fourth of the faculty members in our private liberal arts undergraduate colleges were paid $5,870 or less.

Many of our developing institutions of higher education are striving for higher standards of quality but are short of the means to achieve them. They could be appreciably assisted in raising their standards through academic relationships with larger and stronger institutions. Such relationships will better enable the colleges to share fully and equally in the responsibilities ahead.

Proposal

Title III proposes a 5-year program to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life.

The Commissioner would be authorized to pay part of the cost of planning and carrying out cooperative arrangements for strengthening the academic programs of qualified developing colleges. These cooperative arrangements might be between developing institutions, between developing institutions and other colleges, and between developing institutions and organizations, agencies, and business entities.

The cooperative projects might include: exchange of faculty or students, including visiting scholars; faculty improvement programs; introduction of new curriculums; development of cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of academic study and employment; joint use of facilities such as libraries or laboratories; and other arrangements which offer promise of strengthening the academic programs of developing colleges.

The Commissioner would also be authorized to award national teaching fellowships to graduate students and junior faculty members to encourage them to teach at developing institutions.

An Advisory Council on Developing Institutions would assist the Commissioner in identifying qualified developing institutions and in establishing priorities for use in approving applications for grants.

First year authorization would be $30 million.

Title IV: Student assistance

(a) Undergraduate scholarships.

(b) Insured, reduced-interest loans.

(c) College work-study program extension and amendments.

(d) Extension of the national defense student loan program.

Background

Since the end of World War II, the percentage of all 18-to-21-year-olds who enroll in college has risen from 22 percent to 40 percent. Twice as many young people are enrolled in colleges and universities this year as were enrolled 10 years ago. If projections prove correct, the present figure of 4.8 million students will rise to 6.9 million by 1970. There have been three main aspects of this upsurge in higher education enrollments: more students compete for the scholarship and loan assistance available at each college, more students compete for the part-time jobs available on or near each campus, and more students are being drawn from middle- and low-income families.

It is in the national interest that more of the country's young people have the opportunity to acquire better training and education. In a practical sense, opportunity comes in three forms: scholarships, loans, and work-study programs.

The present average cost for attending a public college or university for 1 year is $1,560 and for attending a private institution, $2,370. This is up from the $1,190 and $1,700 respectively in 1954–55. It is currently estimated that by 1970 the cost of attending a public institution for 1 year will reach $1,840 and for attending a private institution $2,780. Sums of this magnitude inevitably discourage many worthy young men and women of low-income families from pursuing their education after high school.

In 1960, there were 1,079,000 high school graduates who did not go on to college. Forty-two percent indicated that finances played a role in their decision not to go; of these, nearly half flatly said they could not afford to consider college at all. Thus, some 217,000 high school graduates who would have liked to have continued their education were prevented from doing so by financial inability. Of the number of young people who did go on to higher education, 22 percent dropped out by the end of the first year. Of these, 28 percent gave lack of money as the prime reason for dropping out.

These statistics are chiefly an expression of the plight of low-income families and their children. The relationship between family income and college attendance is clear: in 1960, for example, 78 percent of all high school graduates whose families had incomes of $12,000 or more per year went on to college. By contrast, only 33 percent of students in the $3,000-or-less family income bracket went on to higher education.

The problem of financing higher education is not limited to low-income families. Families of average income trying to provide a college education for their children also face a serious situation. The most serious difficulty occurs for such middle-income families when there are two or more children attending college at one time. Upon the enrollment of the oldest child as a college freshman, the family commits a large part of its resources to education for an extended period of time. When the second child arrives as a college freshman, expenditures double, and the family must meet costs of $5,000 or more a school year.

Students from middle-income families often find it difficult to obtain financial relief. The family's income may be too high for them to qualify for many scholarship or loan programs; but insufficient to carry the full burden of support for children in college. In addition, interest rates on loans are often too high to permit middle-income families to make long-term commitments. That the pinch is already being felt can be seen in the fact that three out of every four families now taking part in some kind of federally supported student loan program have brothers and sisters of college age.

Existing loan programs are under strong pressures with more than 600,000 students having borrowed approximately $453 million from the national defense student loan funds set up in 1,574 colleges and universities. Before the enactment of this program in 1958, most institutions of higher education had never made a student loan; not more than 100 institutions had loan programs that totaled more than a few thousands of dollars annually. Today, rising numbers of students are asking for the aid of this program to help them stay in school; in addition, new colleges are being created— 500 new institutions in the past 18 years—and each one is a potential subscriber to the NDSL program, requiring the Federal contribution. The 88th Congress, recognizing the increasing pressures on these federally supported student loan funds, authorized $163.3 million for the current fiscal year, $179.3 million for fiscal 1966, $190 million for fiscal 1967, and $195 million for fiscal 1968.

The third method of assisting needy students in colleges and universities is by making available to them part-time employment. College-paid undergraduate employment now totals about $145 million a year and provides 425,000 students with average earnings of $350 a year each. The work-study program of the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964 is underway with present grants to institutions totaling $71 million annually; but there is also much evidence that this is insufficient support to meet the demands of work needed by students, particularly those students from families of low income.

Proposal

Title IV proposes a 5-year program of student financial aids to make the benefits of higher education available to academically qualified students in need of financial assistance. The title provides four types of assistance: (1) undergraduate scholarships to qualified high school graduates from low-income families; (2) insured reduced-interest private loans to both undergraduate and graduate students through approved commercial lenders and certain State and nonprofit programs; (3) an expanded work-study program to provide part-time employment; and (4) extension and expansion of the National Defense Student Loan Program.

(a) Undergraduate scholarships:

The undergraduate scholarship program would provide grants of up to $800 per academic year for qualified high school graduates from low-income families. A student may receive the scholarship on an annual basis for a period of up to 4 years while pursuing a full-time undergraduate course of study at an eligible institution of higher education. It is not intended that this scholarship would be the sole financial support of the recipient. Loans under the National Defense Education Act and work-study opportunities could be combined in such a manner as to provide appropriate financial assistance—dependent upon the need and capabilities of each student.

In order for the student to qualify for the scholarship, he must be under 21; must be from a low-income family; must be capable of maintaining good standing at an institution of higher education; must have been accepted as a full-time student; and must have made application demonstrating his need for financial assistance. The selection of recipients would be made by the institution in which the student was enrolled. Preference would be given to students entering upon their freshman year and to students entering 4-year schools after have been graduated from 2-year institutions of higher education. In determining whether a student is from a low-income family or not, the institution would make an appropriate review of the student's entire financial status.

The amount of a scholarship would be determined by the institution on the basis of criteria or schedules provided by the Commissioner of Education. The scholarship could not exceed $800, nor could it exceed the cost of the student's education.

Student scholarships would be provided through institutions of higher education which have made agreements with the Commissioner. Institutions eligible would be those which have in operation agreements for loans under the National Defense Education Act and for employment under the college work-study program.

The Commissioner of Education would make an agreement with an institution of higher learning requiring the institution to make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths from low-income groups and encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school. Colleges would establish close working relationships with secondary schools and could make tentative commitments of scholarships to qualified students enrolled in grade 11 or lower and to secondary school dropouts. Up to 5 percent of the funds received could be spent by the institutions for the administrative costs involved in this identification and encouragement program. An institution would also be required to maintain its efforts in its own scholarship and loan program.

Scholarship funds would be apportioned among the States in the following manner:

1. One-third on the basis of the number of full-time students enrolled in institutions of higher education in each State in relation to the total number of such students;

2. One-third on the basis of the portion of secondary school graduates in each State; and

3. One-third on the basis of the portion of children under age 18 from families with annual incomes of less than $3,000.

Up to 2 percent of the total appropriations could be allocated to Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

It is also provided that the Commissioner could enter into contracts, not to exceed $100,000 per year, with State and local educational agencies and other public or nonprofit organizations for the purpose of (1) identifying qualified youths from low-income families and encouraging them to continue their education, (2) publicizing existing forms of financial aid, and (3) encouraging secondary school dropouts to reenter educational programs.

The first-year authorization would be $70 million.

(b) Insured reduced-interest loans:

Insured, reduced-interest student loans would be provided by the establishment of the student loan insurance fund which would enable the Commissioner to insure eligible lenders against losses on loans made by them to students in eligible institutions who do not have reasonable access to similar loan programs. It is also provided that the Commissioner would pay a portion of the interest (up to 2 percentage points) on such loans and on certain other loans which are insured under a State program or by a nonprofit private organization or institution.

Students would be able to borrow up to $1,500 annually in order to pursue a course of study at an eligible institution. The aggregate insured unpaid principal amount could not exceed $9,000 in the case of a graduate or professional student or $6,000 in the case of any other student. The maximum amount of interest paid by the borrower would be set by the Secretary on a national, regional, or other appropriate basis.

Repayment of the loans would begin 1 year after the student ceases to carry at least one-half of a normal full-time workload or course of study. The period of repayment could not exceed 10 years and the complete term of the loan could not exceed 15 years.

A student would be eligible to obtain an insured loan if he (1) has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible institution; (2) if he carries at least one-half of a normal full-time workload; or (3) if he is already enrolled at an eligible institution and maintains good standing.

Eligible institutions in this program would be (1) institutions of higher education which are fully accredited and which offer courses creditable toward a bachelor's degree; or (2) business, vocational, and technical schools which are accredited and which admit only students who have completed or left secondary school. A student could borrow from an eligible institution of higher education or from any participating commercial lender which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or any State.

The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance would not exceed $700 million in fiscal year 1966, $1 billion in fiscal year 1967, and $1.4 billion in fiscal year 1968 and each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

First-year cost would be $15 million.

(c) College work-study program extension and amendments:

The work-study program under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 would be transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education.

This program provides for contracts between the Commissioner of Education and institutions of higher education in which part-time employment opportunities are encouraged. The proposed amendments would expand the opportunities for part-time employment particularly for students from low-income families.

The period during which the Federal share of the compensation of students employed may not exceed 90 percent would be extended for 1 year, through June 30, 1967.

Authorization for fiscal year 1966 would be $129 million. Of this amount $84 million is carried in the budget requests for the Office of Economic Opportunity, $45 million for the Office of Education.

(d) Extension of national defense student loan program:

Title IV–D would extend the authorization of the National Defense Student Loan Program (title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended) for an additional 3 years with the following authorizations: $225 million for fiscal year 1969, $250 million for fiscal year 1970, $275 million for fiscal year 1971.

STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise. Its proposed title is the State Technical Services Act of 1965. A similar bill was introduced on January 25 by the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, as part of the President's program.

My State of California, and indeed the entire Nation, has a profound and justified interest in using the results of our modern science and technology for the benefit of the people and our businesses and industries. The bill would give grants to States in support of plans for infusing existing scientific and technological information into the lifestream of our civilian economy, thus helping to create more jobs, enhance industrial development and improve the means for making this knowledge more readily available to businesses, both small and large.

At a time when military expenditures are leveling off, it is imperative that we find ways to encourage free enterprise to use science for the vast segment of the economy, not related to the space or defense mission. The provisions of this bill could be of invaluable assistance in this respect.

The Department of Commerce, which developed the proposal, is to be congratulated for its foresight in identifying and seeking to remedy this imbalance in our uses of science and engineering information. I am particularly impressed that the administration has recognized the essential need for universities to be actively engaged in furnishing this science and engineering information for the benefit of our commerce and industry.

REALISTIC, HUMANE IMMIGRATION POLICY IS LONG OVERDUE

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Speaker, as in the past, I am proud to join in the sponsorship of legislation to bring immigration policy in line with the inscription beneath the Statue of Liberty proclaiming to all nations, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

I am not, however, proud that it is necessary to introduce remedial legislation every session. Substantive changes in our immigration law should have moved through the U.S. Congress many years ago.

When President Truman vetoed the Immigration Act of 1952—known as the McCarran-Walter Act—he was, in fact, vetoing racism and injustice as landmarks of American thinking.

This law, unfortunately upheld by Congress, actually is a codification of all the restrictive immigration enactments of previous years, compounded by many new and severer restrictions and injustices under the soporific excuse of national security.

The words of President Truman in his veto message still remain a correct indictment of the 1952 restrictive, racist immigration law; that is, the law "discriminates, deliberately and intentionally against many peoples of the world."

Then 2 years later we heard the late, great Senator Herbert Lehman put it on the line when he stated:

> The system presupposes that persons born in one country are better suited to immigrate here and become American citizens than persons born in another. As reflected in our immigration quotas, an individual born in Britain is presumed to be 13 times more acceptable to America than one born in Italy and 200 times more acceptable than one born in Greece.
>
> This assumption is not only utterly false on the face of it; it is basically repulsive to the very spirit and tradition—to the meaning—of America.

And just a short time ago, Madam Speaker, we were privileged to hear in this Chamber, President Johnson in his state of the Union message, declaring, "We must open opportunities to all our people," including "to those in other lands that are seeking the promise of America, through an immigration law based on the work a man can do and not where he was born or how he spells his name."

I fully agree with the President's goal. In short, I respectfully submit that our immigration law should not be based on a national quota system, but based on a person's need, talent, and above all, our commitment to democratic concepts in judging others. I would hope that the pending immigration legislation, in line with this administration's objectives, would be a priority item for this Congress.

Madam Speaker, may I jog our collective national memory for just a moment by pointing out that way back in 1787, during the Constitutional Convention, James Madison said:

> That part of America which has encouraged them [the foreigners] has advanced more rapidly in population, agriculture, and the "art."

History has proved him right and we in Congress have an obligation to go along with the healthy tide of history by repealing the 1952 discriminatory immigration act as part of the law of the land.

FIFTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Speaker, the week of February 7 through February 13 commemorates the 55th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. In our present-day society, when from all sides, we hear voices raised in concern against the rising tide of discontent that seems to affect so many of our young people, it is pleasant and somehow reassuring to take notice of this fine and upstanding group of young men and boys, each of whom has pledged himself to the betterment of the world he lives in, with this simple oath:

> On my honor I will do my best; to do my duty to God and my country, and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

The Boy Scouts of America was incorporated on February 8, 1910, and the organization was granted a charter by the Congress on June 15, 1916, with the President of the United States as honorary president. Since 1910, 36 million American youths have become members. Since 1910, 36 million American youths have become better Americans.

Today, the national membership stands at 4 million boys and 1,500,000 adults. Today, in Cub packs, Scouting groups and Explorer posts, Scouts of all ages, under the capable guidance of their leaders, work toward character development, physical fitness and outstanding citizenship. And finally, today, as were the Scouts of more than one-half century ago, they are even mindful of the opening phrase of their oath:

> On my honor I will do my best.

No more can we ask of anyone.

The Boy Scouts of America are in the finest American tradition. America has always needed young men of strength and character—young men who know the value of good citizenship and who realize the responsibilities that are involved. Perhaps never before in the history of our democratic processes has this been more true. Scout training and adherence to the principles of scouting have had a profound effect upon the development of our future citizens and it is for this reason that I am more than happy to pay tribute to the Boy Scouts of America, who are, through the heritage of their organization, sincerely devoted to the concepts of courage, self-reliance, and patriotism.

I am grateful for and proud of the Scout groups in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky which I have the honor to represent. I consider these young people among our finest resources, and, at the same time, I want to recognize the quality of the leadership that these youths have received and the caliber of those who have given so tirelessly to this cause. The men and women who have contributed countless hours to perpetuate the teachings of this movement, do, indeed, deserve our respect.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to salute the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of their 55th anniversary. I want to congratulate them upon their achievements of the past and to wish them every success on their program for the future. We can depend upon the Boy Scouts of America to do their best.

VANISHING SILVER

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Madam Speaker, the concern of our colleague, the gentleman from Idaho, Representative COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., for the future of silver in our subsidiary coinage in the United States is well known and shared by Members of this body. It becomes more apparent each day that Congress must act with dispatch to insure a stable future for this vital metal, and the counsel of the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman WHITE, must be sought and given full consideration before a decision is reached on this urgent national problem.

A fine interpretation of Congressman WHITE's position as an expert on this matter is contained in an editorial published in the Washington Star on January 28. I submit this editorial for the RECORD:

VANISHING SILVER

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., of Idaho, stirred a good deal of talk the other day with a proposal to reduce the silver content in our coins. If his plan should become law, the Treasury would be authorized to cut down the amount of the precious metal to a third of its present 90-percent content.

Probably nothing will be done in Congress until the Treasury's own current study of the problem is released, but Mr. WHITE has given voice to rather widespread concern. Total world consumption of silver is now double the rate of production. Unless something is done, the Treasury's stockpile of silver will be exhausted within 4 or 5 years.

The reason lies largely in technology; silver enjoys a steadily widening range of uses in industry, space technology, and in expanding coinage to feed the vending machines, pay telephones, and parking meters.

Americans cannot help feeling a vague uneasiness about diluting the silver content in their money. They remember schoolbook stories about the "shinplaster" paper money of the early 19th century and the ancient Roman debasement of the coinage that went hand in hand with economic decline.

Yet most modern European countries have managed to prosper without a high silver ratio. German, Italian, British, and French coins under $1 in value are now made without any silver and even their larger denominations use a lower ratio than ours. The German 5-mark piece, for example, worth $1.25, contains only 62½ percent silver—yet no one suggests that nation's currency is ailing.

The truth is that coins, like paper money, are symbolic in their value, backed by the credit of their nation and its economic strength. And with our gross national product running at a record annual rate of $634 billion, both the economy and the currency looks healthy indeed. If symbolism is good enough for a $5 bill, why not for a 50-cent piece?

The Government a few months ago announced it would pay up to 75 percent of exploration costs to expand silver production, a sharp increase from the previous 50-percent subsidy. But it seems clear the only way to make the metal available for industrial use in ample quantities is to stop locking it up in those shiny coins.

FORT UNION TRADING POST NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Madam Speaker, at the confluence of the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers in my State of North Dakota near the Montana border, lie the remains of Fort Union, one of the most important fur-trading posts of the 19th century.

When I was a young boy, I passed the Fort Union area many times and I was always curious about it. All I could see was the outline of the fort's foundations, a few humps and mounds of earth and depressions in the ground. I would ask my father, "Why are there no buildings?" My curiosity was never satisfied.

Today I am introducing a bill that would redevelop Fort Union and acquaint the current generation and future generations with its significant role in opening up the West.

Following reports from Lewis and Clark about the rich fur-bearing potentials of the region, the American Fur Co., headed by John Jacob Astor, selected the Missouri-Yellowstone confluence area as a base for its activities, because the travel of the Indian tribes and the free trappers converged there. The American Fur Co. built a post named Fort Floyd in 1828; 2 years later the name was changed to Fort Union. In its early years Kenneth McKenzie, known as the "King of the Missouri," was in charge of the post.

For many years Fort Union was the head of navigation on the Missouri River, and it became the stopping place for nearly every important western explorer, frontiersman, trader, soldier, and traveler. The famous names included Jim Bridger, Stephen W. Kearny, Jedidiah Smith, Father Pierre-Jean De Smet, John J. Audubon, George Catlin, Prince Maxmilian of Wied, Manuel Lisa, and Karl Bodmer.

The importance of Fort Union diminished with a declining demand for beaver pelts; in 1865, it was sold to the Northwestern Fur Co. A year later the Army established Fort Buford nearby, and in 1867, purchased Fort Union to provide building material for the new Army post. Fort Buford, incidentally, was the post where Sitting Bull surrendered in 1881.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the local enthusiasm for re-creating the color and drama of this great historic crossroads. A group of citizens in the Williston, N. Dak., area has reestablished, on an honorary basis at their own expense, the 6th Infantry Unit, which was stationed at Fort Buford, complete with uniforms, rifles and Indian scouts. In addition, the group has devoted many hours of research in the effort to broaden public understanding of the need to preserve the fort area. Last year, the 6th Infantry Unit made an appearance at the World's Fair at New York.

My bill would enable the National Park Service to acquire the remains of Fort Union and to construct a visitors' center, administrative facilities and roads, as well as suitable markers and exhibits.

This project should be undertaken to help us understand the role of the fur trade in settling the West and of early relationships between the white man and the Indian.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the text of my bill to be reprinted at this point in the Record:

H.R. 3957

A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, North Dakota, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to commemorate the significant role played by Fort Union as a fur trading post on the upper Missouri River, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or otherwise, the historic remains of Fort Union located in Williams County, North Dakota, and Roosevelt County, Montana, and such additional lands and interests in lands as he may deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 2. When the site of historic Fort Union and other required lands and interests in lands have been acquired by the United States as provided in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall establish such area or areas as the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer, protect, develop, and maintain the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 353), as amended and supplemented, and the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

HUMANITIES FOUNDATION WOULD BE CORNERSTONE OF GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Speaker, 3 weeks ago I introduced a bill to create a National Humanities Foundation to help to redress the imbalance which has developed in American education.

Nearly 90 Members, of both parties, have joined with me in introducing similar or identical bills and more than 40 Senators are sponsoring similar legislation.

The bills are substantially the same as the bill, H.R. 12406, which I introduced near the end of the 88th Congress and which in turn was based on the report of the Commission on the Humanities produced under the sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

Partly as a result of sputnik, this country has made a national commitment to promote education in the sciences. Out of the Department of Defense, out of NASA, out of the National Institutes of Health have poured billions of dollars for scientific research and education. Symbolic of the broadest and best of all this scientific ferment has been the National Science Foundation.

Even as we praised the magnificent work done in the sciences we began to realize that a purely materialistic outlook cannot provide an adequate basis for human life.

Yet our young people looking about them see that in national policy our country is dedicated to promoting only the sciences.

For the good of our country we must redress this imbalance. We must inspire the education of generalists who can understand and articulate the critical values that give compelling meaning and a sense of direction to human life, who are as skilled in devising a general program of peace and progress as the specialists are in creating engines of destruction.

A symbol of our national decision is needed—a symbol no less visible than the National Science Foundation.

For this purpose I propose the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation "to promote progress in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes."

The bill, the National Humanities Foundation Act of 1965, has 15 sections after the title.

Section 2 expresses the congressional findings and declaration in seven subsections. The Congress would find that there is a social, cultural, and educational imbalance in the country, and that because of this, the encouragement and support of the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government.

To carry out these findings, section 3 establishes an independent agency known as the National Humanities Foundation consisting of a Board and a Director.

Section 4 states the purpose of the Foundation in general terms to be "to develop and promote a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts."

Section 5 defines "humanities and the arts" in the broadest possible terms. As used in the bill, "humanities and the arts" includes, but is not limited to, the study of languages, literature, history, and philosophy; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts; the history of law, religion, and science; the creative and performing arts; and those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods.

Section 6 is a specific prohibition against Federal Government interference in the operation of the act.

Section 7 in five numbered subsections sets forth the functions of the Foundation.

Subsection (1) gives general policy guidance to the Foundation.

Subsection (2) provides for assistance to individual scholars, teachers, and artists at any stage of their growth.

While not so specifically limited, it is expected that programs for assistance to teachers in primary and secondary schools would be provided under this subsection and it is expected that the Foundation would consult with the Commissioner of Education, who is an ex officio member of the Board, in developing programs of this type. Similarly, where programs for creative and performing artists are involved, it is expected that the Foundation will consult with the National Council on the Arts in developing programs of this type.

Subsection (3) provides for assistance to public and other nonprofit corporations to enable each institution to develop its own program for promotion of the humanities and the arts.

Subsection (4) provides for individual scholarships, fellowships, and grants, and while not so specifically limited, would probably not be designed for teachers in primary and secondary education.

In carrying out the purposes of subsection (4), it is expected that the Foundation will work in consultation with private and semiprivate institutions such as the Smithsonian Institution, and the American Council of Learned Societies which are presently carrying on programs of fellowships, scholarships, and grants. The Secretary of the Smithsonian is an ex officio member of the Board.

Subsection (5) authorizes assistance for the improvement of library and museum resources. It is expected that in carrying out the purposes of this subsection, the Foundation will, in the case of libraries, work in consultation with the Library of Congress and, in the case of museums, with the Smithsonian Institution. The Librarian of Congress and the Secretary of the Smithsonian are both ex officio members of the Board.

Subsection (b) states that one of the objectives of the Foundation should be to encourage the spread of excellence in the humanities and the arts throughout the United States and its possessions.

Subsection (c) requires the Foundation to render an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress.

Section 8 establishes a Board for the Foundation of 25 members with 20 members appointed by the President for 6-year terms by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and 5 ex officio members. Section 8 requires that the public members shall be eminent in the fields of the humanities or the arts selected solely on the basis of established records and in such a manner as to provide comprehensive representation of views of the humanities and the arts throughout the United States. The ex officio members are the Director of the Foundation, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts.

Section 9 creates the office of Director of the Foundation and provides that he shall receive the same compensation as the Librarian of Congress.

Section 10 authorizes the Board to create an executive and other committees.

Section 11 grants general legal powers to the Foundation and specifically authorizes the Foundation to receive and use donated funds.

Section 12 contains miscellaneous provisions such as the hiring of personnel, per diem for members of the Board, and permits the transfer from other departments and agencies of the Government of funds available to them for development of the humanities or the arts.

Section 13 contains loyalty provisions modeled on those applicable to the National Science Foundation.

Section 14 authorizes the use of counterpart funds for programs in the humanities and the arts outside the United States.

Section 15 authorizes the appropriation of $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for years thereafter such sums as Congress may determine.

I think there is a new climate—a fundamental change in the attitude toward intellectual and cultural life in the United States. I think the time is right for the Federal Government to take steps to encourage this changing attitude. It would be of great help if members of the academic community would communicate with their own Senators and their own Representatives to enlist their support for the National Humanities Foundation.

The humanities are concerned with the improvement of the quality of life and an improved quality of life is the essence of the Great Society. I believe that the creation of the National Humanities Foundation by the Congress can be the cornerstone of the Great Society.

The Members of the House of Representatives who have introduced bills calling for the creation of a National Humanities Foundation include:

Mr. Eugene J. Keogh, of New York.
Mr. Ray J. Madden, of Indiana.
Mr. James G. Fulton, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Melvin Price, of Illinois:
Mr. Harold D. Donohue, of Massachusetts.
Mr. Edward A. Garmatz, of Maryland.
Mr. Abraham J. Multer, of New York.
Mr. Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio.
Mr. George Rhodes, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Peter W. Rodino, Jr., of New Jersey.
Mr. John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. John C. Kunkel, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Leo W. O'Brien, of New York.
Mr. James A. Byrne, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Ed Edmondson, of Oklahoma.
Mr. Samuel N. Friedel, of Maryland.
Mr. John E. Moss, of California.
Mr. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Mr. Elmer J. Holland, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Thomas L. Ashley, of Ohio.
Mr. Kenneth Gray, of Illinois.
Mr. Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin.
Mr. James Roosevelt, of California.
Mr. B. F. Sisk, of California.
Mr. Jim Wright, of Texas.
Mr. Glenn Cunningham, of Nebraska.
Mr. John H. Dent, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Robert N. C. Nix, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Al Ullman, of Oregon.
Mr. John Brademas, of Indiana.
Mr. Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts.
Mr. Emilio Q. Daddario, of Connecticut.
Mr. Dominick V. Daniels, of New Jersey.
Mr. Jacob H. Gilbert, of New York.
Mr. Seymour Halpern, of New York.
Mr. Ken Hechler, of West Virginia.
Mr. Ralph J. Rivers, of Alaska.
Mr. J. Edward Roush, of Indiana.
Mr. Herman Toll, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Hugh L. Carey, of New York.
Mr. Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas.
Mr. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland.
Mr. Lucien N. Nedzi, of Michigan.
Mr. Arnold Olsen, of Montana.
Mr. William F. Ryan, of New York.
Mr. Fernand J. St Germain, of Rhode Island.
Mr. Stanley R. Tupper, of Maine.
Mr. Morris K. Udall, of Arizona.
Mr. Mark Andrews, of North Dakota.
Mr. George E. Brown, Jr., of California.
Mr. Laurence Burton, of Utah.
Mr. Ronald Brooks Cameron, of California.
Mr. James C. Cleveland, of New Hampshire.
Mr. Don Edwards, of California.
Mr. Richard Fulton, of Tennessee.
Mr. Sam Gibbons, of Florida.
Mr. Augustus F. Hawkins, of California.
Mr. Frank J. Horton, of New York.
Mr. Robert L. Leggett, of California.
Mr. Joseph M. McDade, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Spark M. Matsunaga, of Hawaii.
Mr. John M. Murphy, of New York.
Mr. William L. St. Onge, of Connecticut.
Mr. George F. Senner, Jr., of Arizona.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson, of California.
Mr. Walter H. Moeller, of Ohio.
Mr. Donald J. Irwin, of Connecticut.
Mr. Brock Adams, of Washington.
Mr. Frank Annunzio, of Illinois.
Mr. Clair Callan, of Nebraska.
Mr. Tim Lee Carter, of Kentucky.
Mr. John Conyers, Jr., of Michigan.
Mr. Ken W. Dyal, of California.
Mr. John J. Gilligan, of Ohio.
Mr. Stanley L. Greigg, of Iowa.
Mr. Henry Helstoski, of New Jersey.
Mr. Rodney M. Love, of Ohio.
Mr. Richard D. McCarthy, of New York.
Mr. Roy H. McVicker, of Colorado.
Mr. Hervey G. Machen, of Maryland.
Mr. Richard L. Ottinger, of New York.
Mr. John A. Race, of Wisconsin.
Mr. Joseph Y. Resnick, of New York.
Mr. Gale Schisler, of Illinois.
Mr. John R. Schmidhauser, of Iowa.
Mr. Robert E. Sweeney, of Ohio.
Mr. Joseph P. Vigorito, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Weston E. Vivian, of Michigan.

FEDERAL CHARTER LEGISLATION FOR MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues a very fine article which appeared in the January 25, 1965, issue of the United States Investor concerning my bill H.R. 14, which would provide for Federal charters for mutual savings banks.

It should be noted that both Chairman A. WILLIS ROBERTSON in the other body and Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN in this House indicated last year that they were introducing similar legislation by request.

The article follows:

IT IS SHOWDOWN TIME FOR THE FEDERAL MUTUAL SAVINGS BILL

So far as the Federal mutual savings bank bill is concerned, it is showdown time. This important piece of legislation has been hanging around Congress for 8 years since it was first introduced on February 4, 1957, by Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York.

The first National Association of Mutual Savings Bank-supported Federal chartering bill was introduced in both branches of Congress, and with bipartisan support in 1960. The bill finally reached the hearing stage in late 1963 when the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance of the House Banking and Currency Committee, under the chairmanship of Representative MULTER, held 3 days of hearings.

EDUCATIONAL CAMPAIGN

When the industry bill was first introduced, it was not the intent of either its congressional sponsors or NAMSB that it be pushed immediately. The purpose of its introduction at that stage was to obtain comments and criticisms from Government agencies and other interested parties on the bill as it was then drafted. Meanwhile, a broad educational campaign was initiated to win Government and private support.

The first real break came when the Commission on Money and Credit endorsed Federal charters for mutual savings banks. The CMC report—the first comprehensive survey in half a century of public and private financial institutions, policies and practices in the United States—stated:

"At present, commercial banks and savings and loan associations may obtain Federal charters. Since only 17 States now provide for the establishment of savings banks, it is not possible to establish savings banks in two-thirds of our States. Federal charters for savings banks would permit operation in any State, and this would stimulate competition and enterprise among financial institutions, improve the banking facilities in some communities and, perhaps, encourage greater conventional mortgage lending activity in all areas."

SECOND MAJOR BREAK

The second major break for the bill came in April 1963, when the President's Committee on Financial Institutions—the so-called Heller Committee—unanimously concluded that "voluntary Federal charters should be available for mutual savings banks subject to adequate supervisory standards and safeguards." However, the Committee stressed that its support of the principle did "not imply endorsement of any particular bill in Congress."

The culmination of the industry's educational drive came last summer with the introduction of administration approved Federal chartering legislation by Chairman A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat of Virginia, of the Senate Banking Committee and Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, of the House Banking Committee. The legislation was drafted by the FHLBB and proposed by the Board.

In a letter of transmittal to Congress, FHLBB Chairman Joseph P. McMurray stressed that it had been developed in cooperation with other Federal agencies which would be affected or interested in the legislation. These included the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Council of Economic Advisers—with Bureau of Budget acting as coordinating agency.

That bill has been reintroduced by Representative MULTER as H.R. 14. It is understood the Federal Home Loan Bank Board will again resubmit its request for the legislation with a few minor and some technical changes; but H.R. 14 is, essentially, the administration bill.

Meanwhile, NAMSB has been actively soliciting the support of other industries. So far, the National Association of Home Builders, the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, as well as individual savings and loan officials and others have added their support to the quest for Federal chartering.

And it is now time for legislative action.

The forces arrayed against the bill are formidable. The two largest and strongest financial trade associations—the American Bankers Association and the United States Savings and Loan League—are opposed to it. These two groups undoubtedly will work together to defeat the bill which, in the words of CMC, "would stimulate competition" among existing financial institutions. Also, the politically powerful National Association of Supervisors of State Banks has in the past taken the position that there is no need for federally chartered mutual savings banks.

This means that the drive for enactment of the bill is uphill all the way. This fact, plus the limited geographical support the industry enjoys in Congress, could give rise to the strategy of more study in the hope that more savings and loan support can be generated. It is true, for example, the National League of Insured Savings Associations had not gone on record in opposition to the proposal and, in fact, has expressed interest in the idea.

THE LEGISLATIVE TEST

But there comes a time when an industry—especially one whose almost entire legislative interest centers on one bill—must commit itself to action. Congress expects it, and Congress may lose interest in a proposal if after a reasonable time the measure is not put to the legislative test.

We, of course, would not presume to dictate strategy nor do we mean that the bill will not eventually be enacted if not passed by the 89th Congress. The decision of when to press for action is one only an industry itself can make. And, as the last 5 years have illustrated, it is sometimes good strategy to delay an encounter with opponents. The proof of this is the success of NAMSB's educational campaign.

Whenever industry leaders decide to go to the mat with the Federal chartering bill—whether this year, next year or the next—they will require the full and active support of the industry. With such support, there is a chance the bill can be enacted; without it, there is almost no hope for passage. This is why we say it is showdown time for the Federal mutual savings bank bill.

PROPOSED SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY OPERATION OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Madam Speaker, I have just introduced a House resolution to create a select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all aspects of the operation of hospital facilities by the Veterans' Administration, the Public Health Service, and the armed services.

On January 19, within a few minutes after I had received notification that seven Public Health Service hospitals were to be closed, I pointed out on the floor of the House some of the items in the letter of transmittal and the press release which disturbed me greatly. It seemed clear that the alleged study of the closing of these facilities either had not been made or had not developed a true picture of hospital facilities available to those who have a statutory right to hospitalization and treatment in Government hospitals. The Veterans' Administration and the Public Health Service are proposing to close a total of 17 hospitals, the Department of Defense has a program for replacing 50 obsolete hospitals. I would be surprised if some new hospitals were not proposed by the Department of Defense.

I have discussed the resolution which I have introduced with the three distinguished chairmen of the committees which have the major responsibility for the three types of hospitals to which I have referred. The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee has announced his intention to begin hearings on the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospitals. The chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], has indicated his willingness to look into the proposed closings of the Public Health Service hospitals; and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee this morning referred to a special subcommittee on military hospitals which he chaired in the last Congress and announced his continuing interest in this important matter.

But the whole problem is one which cuts across the jurisdictional lines of these three committees. It is for this reason that it seems appropriate that this whole subject be considered by a select committee, whose membership is made up from among the members of the major committees responsible for these facilities.

Madam Speaker, I hope that this resolution may be given prompt consideration in order that this important work can be begun immediately.

LET'S SEARCH OUT THE REAL FACTS ABOUT VA CLOSINGS

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Madam Speaker, the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has indicated he will soon hold hearings on the proposed closing of veterans' hospitals, domiciliaries, and regional offices. This will provide Members of the House an opportunity to make these hearings meaningful and productive, rather than perfunctory and mechanical.

We all know that Members of Congress are perpetually disadvantaged in dealing with the executive branch on questions of cost and efficiency. VA officials will doubtless come armed with reams of facts and figures selected to defend alleged economies generated from their proposals. Members of Congress do not have staffs of sufficient size or access to enough privileged information to dig out all the statistics necessary for effective rebuttal.

But this situation need not work totally to our disadvantage. If we cannot come up with the facts and figures ourselves, we can at least prepare questions detailed enough to pin down the exact reasons for each and every decision to close down a veterans' facility. The public deserves a detailed record of the reasons for all 32 decisions. Let us find out how many were arbitrary and unwarranted.

Every Member of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Ohio as well as Congressmen from the Dakotas, Wyoming, and Nevada whose district will suffer from this proposal should be present at these hearings to meet the challenge of the VA head-on. It is my hope that these Members will prepare rebuttals showing that the false economies derived from these short-sighted proposals are insignificant when compared with the human needs of the aging veterans involved. We are entitled to know whether any of these proposed terminations were worked out by a computer without consideration of the human element involved. In dealing with the sick and disabled we are not dealing with commodities. Human beings should not be treated as holes in a punch card. My fellow Members can make the new Administrator and his aids realize that these "economies" simply shift the cost of an adequate veterans' program from the Government to the shoulders of aging veterans who cannot afford such additional burdens.

It is true Members who do not serve on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee cannot cross-examine witnesses appearing before that committee. But I urge those Members who are affected by the VA announcement prepare questions for cross-examination of the VA witnesses by members of the committee. In such a way perhaps we may be able to obtain the kind of substantial evidence that should have been made public by the Veterans' Administration well in advance of their recent closure announcement.

SPECIAL MERIT AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING COOPERATION IN FURTHERING ZIP CODE TO TIME, INC.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Madam Speaker, Time, Inc., was the recipient last week of the Post Office Department's first Special Merit Award for outstanding cooperation in furthering the zip code program. In presenting the citation, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski expressed his pleasure on being able to make the award and said that while it was the first of its kind, "we hope it won't be the last."

> Time, Inc.—

He added—

> has gone out of its way to cooperate with the Department in carrying out its various programs. In many ways, Time, Inc., has been the Post Office Department's testing ground for new postal ideas and programs.
>
> Certainly—

He concluded—

> no one has helped us more than Time, Inc., in carrying out the zip code program or cooperated to a greater extent in testing and giving effect to other programs designed to improve the mail service. It is with a great deal of pride and thanks, therefore, that I present this award to Time, Inc.

Somewhat over a year ago, it was my privilege, Madam Speaker, together with other members of the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to visit Time, Inc.'s computer and production center in Chicago. At that time, we all were impressed with the great strides being made by that large publishing firm in the presorting and preparation of all of their mailings, so as to eliminate many handling operations formerly performed by the Post Office Department at great expense.

Based on my personal observation, I cannot help but agree with General Gronouski that the award is richly deserved. I commend General Gronouski and his staff for making the award and it is my hope that it will lead to greater cooperation between other large users of the mail and the Post Office Department to the end that even greater economies and additional improvements in the mail service will result.

Madam Speaker, I submit the following official press release of the Post Office Department concerning the award to be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

> Postmaster General John A. Gronouski today presented Time, Inc., with the Post Office Department's first Special Merit Award for outstanding cooperation in furthering ZIP code.
>
> "Each of the billion pieces of mail annually put into the postal system by the publishing organization is ZIP coded," he said, "Time, Inc., presorts mailings by ZIP codes, thus saving the Post Office thousands of dollars each week."
>
> The Postmaster General also noted that for many years the company has served as a testing laboratory for new postal ideas.
>
> "Time, Inc., has participated, along with other publications, in our customer education program by including advertisements in all of the firm's magazines promoting the use of ZIP codes among the public. The organization has contributed significantly by encouraging other members of the business community to convert to ZIP coded mailings.
>
> "Nearly every major user of the mails knows the Time-ZIP code case history, and Time people have been generous in sharing their knowledge with other firms to assist them in cutting corners during their conversion to ZIP code."
>
> David W. Brumbaugh, executive vice president and treasurer, Time, Inc., accepted the award in the Postmaster General's office.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1 OF THE IDAHO LEGISLATURE

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Madam Speaker, out of deep concern for future development of the vast and vital natural resources of Idaho, the 38th legislature of my State has memorialized the Congress and President to proceed with haste to provide an adequate forest service highway system into these areas of public domain. I include it and my full endorsement of its purposes as a part of the RECORD:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1 OF IDAHO LEGISLATURE

> *To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:*
>
> We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:
>
> Whereas an adequate transportation system is necessary in the proper harvest and use of our natural resources; and
>
> Whereas the lack of an adequate transportation system is the greatest deterrent to the full use of our natural resources in the State of Idaho; and
>
> Whereas, under the present rate of road construction, it will take 100 years to complete an adequate forest highway transportation system: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America, to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact legislation requiring all Government agencies involved to make sufficient funds available to expedite completion of an adequate transportation system on the main roads of national forests and public domain; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Rep-

resentatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

Passed the house on the 15th day of January 1965.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate on the 18th day of January 1965.

JACK M. MURPHY,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

ROBERT K. REMAKLUS,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SCHOOL PROBLEMS IN AMERICA'S LARGE CITIES

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Madam Speaker, the other evening many of us here in Congress had the pleasure of attending a dinner sponsored by the Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement. This fine organization represents school administrators and school board members of more than 15 of the Nation's large cities, and its principal purpose is to make studies of unique problems faced by the great cities in an effort to meet the comprehensive public school needs of the citizens therein and to coordinate projects designed to provide solutions to these problems.

This unique organization has already proven itself of invaluable assistance to us here in Congress and in particular to many members of the House Education Committee. The extraordinary research carried on by this organization has been helpful in formulating legislation dealing with school problems and the legislation submitted by the President reflects, in many instances, the views of the members of this research council.

The president of this very impressive organization is Dr. Benjamin Willis, who is superintendent of schools in Chicago and who is recognized throughout America and the free world as one of the truly great school administrators and educators.

I should like today to call my colleagues' attention to the pointed remarks delivered by Dr. Willis at the banquet last Thursday. He has put into dramatic form the problems confronting America's educational system, but, in particular, it is significant to note that out of 179 million residents of the United States, according to the 1960 census, 125 million lived in urban areas as compared to 54 million in rural areas.

Dr. Willis quite properly points out that the educational problems of our large cities can no longer be ignored.

Dr. Willis' excellent analysis follows:

The frontier of these United States is in the great cities of America. No longer do the problems of rural America represent the problems of 90 percent of our population. Gradually there has emerged two Americas, that which is in the metropolitan centers, and that which is not. During the decade from 1950 to 1960, more than 90 percent of the total increase in population in continental United States occurred in the great metropolitan areas. In 1960 the Bureau of Census reported that of the 179 million residents of the United States, 125 million lived in urban areas as opposed to 54 million in rural areas. Thus the problems of the great cities—New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, and the others—require and must receive the concerted action of good government.

The school systems of the large cities of America have experienced a decade of incredible increases in enrollments. In one large city, the public school enrollment increased more than 100,000 between 1950 and 1960, while the total city population decreased by 70,000. Increased annual number of births, continued in-migration of young and large families from economically and educationally deprived rural areas, and returned dropouts and increased holding power of the school contributed to this phenomenon. In addition to the ever-increasing number of children, the school systems of the large cities have been called upon to serve an expanding diversity of children's needs and to incorporate new knowledge and newer instructional methods and techniques, and this last during a period of national shortage of teachers and one of escalating costs. Dramatic stresses have occurred from changes in educational programs to meet the knowledge and technological explosion of our society.

Within the city, shifting population, changes in industrial needs, social trends, and economic factors influence demands on school space, especially in high density areas. Population explosions often result in the almost immediate enrollment of hundreds of additional children in a given school which are analagous to those which occur in federally impacted areas. Industrial needs, expressway construction, and public housing projects change school facility requirements in a particular city-community in a short span of time.

The great cities of America are confronted with the effects of four major factors shaping our society today: The tremendous mobility of our people, the mounting urbanization of the country, technological advances, and the social tensions of today's world. Each poses a challenge to education in the great cities. The large cities have risen to meet these challenges individually and as a group. The organization of the Research Council itself is an example of such group action.

I would like to tell you just briefly about the origin and history of the cooperative effort of the cities represented here to provide a quality education for their young people. The Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement is an organization of the large cities of the United States whose primary purpose is to make studies of unique problems faced by the great cities in their efforts to meet the comprehensive public school needs of their citizens, to coordinate projects designed to provide solutions to these problems, and to sponsor the implementation of the results and findings of studies to promote the improvement of education in the great cities.

The Research Council was organized in 1956 for the purpose of studying educational problems which were of special concern and interest to large cities. The initial meetings were attended by superintendents and board members, from 11 large cities. A major concern in these original conversations was the area of vocational education. From these very useful meetings developed The Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement which was incorporated on February 27, 1961, as a not-for-profit organization.

The original membership of 11 cities has been expanded to 15. The following large cities are now members of the research council: Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Houston, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, New York City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C.

The first study undertaken by the council was in the area of vocational education, "Preparation for the World of Work." Each city studied a different facet of vocational education, sharing its findings with other member cities.

Early in 1958 the great cities began to explore the educational needs of children whose backgrounds were so meager or so different from those of the prevailing urban culture that the children were handicapped in their classroom learning. Individual cities have conducted projects in these "gray areas" of the large cities, again each city sharing its findings with other member cities.

Studies in fiscal policies were initiated by the great cities late in 1960. The initial project consisted of a preliminary estimate of the immediate fiscal needs of the great cities, an estimate of the probable future revenue from fiscal policies, and an examination of tax sources as avenues for adequate funds. A second study in this area is now underway.

Teacher education for urban areas was examined by the council in the spring of 1962. The cities decided to study the unique problems related to the recruitment, preparation and retention of professional personnel, and there is now moving forward a program in this field of urgent need.

The rapid economic and social changes in America have created problems requiring new approaches to education and demanding bold action. The urgency and the dimensions of the problems facing the great cities have united us—city, State, or national leaders—in a common concern for education and a dedication to work toward a solution of these crucial problems. Your continued concern and dedication to action is required if the young people of this country are to realize the full development of their capabilities and make their maximum contribution to the advancement of the American way of life.

BAD BUOYS OF THE SEA

Mr. BOB WILSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Madam Speaker, the Russians have long been inventing things that are commonplace in American life. It has become a standing joke. No so funny, however, is the latest Russian caper, which consists simply of stealing U.S. equipment.

While L.B.J. talks sweetness and light with the Reds, the Communists have been raiding our scientific stations at sea. Prof. John Isaacs, director of the Scripps marine life research program, disclosed this week that a Navy radar picket ship chased a Russian fishing trawler away from an anchored buoy off Point Conception, 150 miles north of San Diego. The Russians had stripped the buoy of instruments before steaming away. Recently another buoy was found adrift, with equipment removed.

Professor Isaacs said:

> We shouldn't be surprised by all of this. The Russians are in a full speed race to learn the secrets of the sea. They know we are ahead of them in many aspects of oceanographic technology and they want to learn our methods. One easy way to do it, quite obviously, is to frisk our ocean buoys, take the instruments and copy them.

The Scripps project is a vast one, utilizing 5 weather station buoys which contain instruments for recording data on temperatures, winds, and currents. The data is radioed to shore stations and automatically recorded. Professor Isaacs said the buoys contain radar reflectors and are easy to find.

The loss of U.S. technical leadership to the Reds has been a sorry chapter in our history. The secrets of the atom were stolen by Red spies. Security risks were allowed to work in sensitive places. Espionage and subversion have been a steady profession in the United States. In Alaska, the Russians are running roughshod through our fishermen's nets, while L.B.J. entertains Red diplomats who assure him that they want better relations.

Perhaps it is high time for U.S. toughness—which might go a lot further than sweet talk and the plethora of promises that the Russians have offered.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 408. An act to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future natural disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 576. An act to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians and dentists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. **Stratton**, for 45 minutes, today.

Mr. **Zablocki**, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. **Ashbrook** (at the request of Mr. **Hutchinson**), for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Hutchinson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. May.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. O'Neal of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Marsh.
Mr. Bandstra.
Mr. Dingell.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 2, 1965, at 12 o' clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Committee on Agriculture

January 15, 1965.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	General counsel	$11,015.71
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	11,015.71
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	11,015.71
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	10,295.03
George Misslbeck	Printing editor	6,085.44
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	5,690.46
Betty M. Prezioso	do	5,690.46
Peggy J. Lamm	do	5,253.30
Martha S. Hannah	do	5,253.30
Jane C. Wojcik	do	5,060.74
Investigating staff:		
Robert C. Bruce	Assistant counsel	5,690.46
Marjorie B. Johnson	Staff assistant	3,348.54
R. Carolyn Windsor	do	2,711.79
Losie V. Watkins, Jr.	Staff assistant (July, August, and September).	1,650.75
M. Allen Paul III	Staff assistant (July, August, November, and December).	3,124.95
Thomas J. Kraeft	Staff assistant (August).	428.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	35,229.83
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	17,639.41
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	52,869.24
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	22,130.76

Harold D. Cooley,
Chairman.

Committee on Appropriations

January 15, 1965.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth Sprankle	Clerk and staff director.	$10,999.98
Paul M. Wilson	Assistant clerk and staff director.	10,999.98
Carson W. Culp	Staff assistant	10,999.98
Robert M. Moyer	do	10,999.98
Jay B. Howe	do	10,999.98
Ross P. Pope	do	10,999.98
Frank P. Sanders	do	10,999.98
G. Homer Skarin	do	10,999.98
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	10,999.98
Robert L. Michaels	do	10,999.98
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	10,295.03
Robert P. Williams	Editor	9,206.10
George E. Evans	Staff assistant	9,017.94
Francis G. Merrill	do	9,017.94
Earl C. Silsby	do	8,393.46
Samuel R. Preston	do	7,778.46
Keith F. Mainland	do	6,849.54
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	5,909.88
George A. Urian	Clerical assistant	5,011.68
Stephen B. Miller	do	4,607.52
James E. Moore	do	4,607.52
Austin G. Smith	do	4,567.62
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	2,937.06
Isabelle Gladney	Clerk to the majority.	6,323.09
Mabel E. Hammett	Clerk-stenographer	767.92
Grace W. Beirne	do	4,607.52
Patrick W. Hayes	do	4,607.52
Ruth V. Hedgecock	do	4,607.52
William J. Neary	do	4,442.39
Harry E. Reynolds	do	4,607.52
John E. Ringwald	do	3,972.60
Mary L. Schwarzmann.	do	4,607.52
Mary H. Smallwood	do	4,607.52
Janice J. Stalcup	do	4,607.52
Phyllis N. Troy	do	4,368.07
Mary F. Wilson	do	3,735.30
George S. Green	Clerk to the minority	3,431.67
Jack W. Watson	do	6,863.36
Agnes Ainilian	Clerk-stenographer	4,607.52
William J. Baroody, Jr.	do	4,607.52
Alice Beach	do	2,832.24
James H. Bersie	do	3,782.77
Josephine Birdsall	do	4,607.52
Jessemine A. Falls	do	4,607.52
Catherine L. Kennett	do	4,607.52
Sophia Moreland	do	3,901.43
Geoffrey L. Nichols	do	3,972.60
Clara B. Posey	do	4,607.52
Bernice R. Lynch	do	1,416.12

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	$307,906.87

George Mahon,
Chairman.

Committee on Appropriations (Investigations Staff)

January 15, 1965.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Rowland C. Halstead	Director, surveys and investigations staff.	$9,084.42
Leo E. Conroy	do	9,621.06
Charles Bolz	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff.	9,339.99
Lillian M. Mackie	Stenographer	4,505.76
Mary A. Sauer	do	4,230.42

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Agriculture, Department of:		
Canada, T. C	Investigator	$6,843.40
Sherman, J. I	do	3,043.20
Atomic Energy Commission:		
Moore, J. R	do	6,441.93
Commerce, Department of:		
Bershad, Max A	do	1,056.72
Jenkins, W. B	do	7,330.21
Krevor, N	do	2,874.82
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Bennett, C. L	do	7,955.52
Billings, C. G	do	4,329.52
Byrnes, R. C	do	7,479.68
Carson, W. D	do	8,166.48
Currall, W. G	do	7,781.28
Flatley, J. M	do	6,874.56
Franklin, R. M	do	7,312.80
Hayes, E. J	do	7,975.68
Health benefits		773.65
Ivy, C. M	Investigator	7,523.52
Law, W. C	do	6,042.96
Life insurance		454.45
McCloskey, J. J	Investigator	6,849.36
McDowell, L. L	do	7,734.48
McEliece, R. F	do	4,873.44
Magee, E. H	do	7,781.28
Murphy, P. J	do	7,312.80
Reproduction of staff exhibits.		81.90
Retirement fund		8,788.62
Shannon, A. J	Investigator	7,955.52
Sullivan, J. V	do	7,479.68
Use of automatic data processing facilities.		305.00
Van Wagoner, R. L	Investigator	7,955.52
Welch, W. H	do	8,194.08
Wood, H. B	do	7,955.52
Federal Communications Commission:		
Carey, R. B	do	4,859.98
General Services Administration:		
Chapman, H. K	do	7,219.16
Collinet, P	do	8,251.27
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Duffy, H. C	do	3,523.31
Interior, Department of the:		
Ulmer, S	do	2,928.44
Library of Congress:		
Rose, J. K	do	5,251.39
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:		
Carey, B	do	6,277.04
Navy, Department of the:		
Murray, W. S	do	5,138.64
Post Office Department:		
Petitt, R. E	do	4,942.36
Reclamation, Bureau of:		
Stradley, H. E	do	6,967.00
Standards, Bureau of:		
Tipson, S	do	977.00
Veterans' Administration:		
Austin, W. C	do	8,032.42
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		62,421.95

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$700,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	347,099.19
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	352,900.81

GEORGE MAHON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JANUARY 4, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John R. Blandford	Chief counsel	$10,999.98
Philip W. Kelleher	Counsel	10,999.98
Frank M. Slatinshek	do	10,999.98
William H. Cook	do	10,160.16
Earl J. Morgan	Professional staff member.	10,160.16
Oneta L. Stockstill	Executive secretary	6,766.68
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	5,909.88
L. Louise Ellis	do	5,909.88
Edna E. Johnson	do	5,909.88
Dorothy R. Britton	do	5,909.88
Doris L. Scott	do	3,948.90
James A. Deakins	Bill clerk	4,427.94

SUBCOMMITTEE FOR SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 84, 146, AND 607, 88TH CONG.)

John T. M. Reddan	Counsel	$10,999.98
Walton Woods	Investigator	9,651.78
Phyllis Seymour	Secretary	5,629.56
Rose Beck	do	3,972.60
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	3,806.52
Jerome K. Small, Jr	Messenger	267.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 146, 607, and 833)	$154,990.56
Amount of expenditures previously reported	88,553.72
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	31,548.93
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	120,082.65
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	34,907.91

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 11, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John R. Stark	Clerk and staff director.	$10,999.98
John E. Barriere	Professional staff member.	10,999.98
Orman S. Fink	Minority professional staff member.	10,999.98
Alvin Lee Morse	Counsel (as of Aug. 1, 1964).	7,344.60
Paul Nelson	Economist-assistant to the chairman (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	$1,575.20
Katherine M. Greene	Assistant counsel (as of Nov. 1, 1964).	2,505.94
Roger J. Brown	Editor (through Nov. 30, 1964).	6,183.40
Jane M. Deem	Administrative assistant.	5,629.56
George C. Hill	Assistant clerk (from July 15 through Nov. 30, 1964).	3,514.09
Paul F. Jessup	Economist (from July 1 through July 31, 1964).	789.98
Mary W. Layton	Secretary of minority.	6,320.16
Margaret H. Moorhous	Assistant clerk (from July 1 through July 15, 1964).	390.45
Curtis A. Prins	Staff investigator (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	1,166.66
Regina Swanner	Assistant clerk (from July 1 through Oct. 31, 1964).	3,123.64
Donald G. Vaughn	Assistant clerk	5,625.30
Total		77,168.92

INVESTIGATING STAFF (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 547 AND H. RES. 833)

Beller, Charles S	Counsel, Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance.	$10,426.49
Benston, George J	Economist (from Mar. 15 through June 30, 1964, $2,474.64; and from July 1 through Nov. 30, 1964).	2,824.69
Brown, Roger J	Editor (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	1,236.68
Clark, James D	Research assistant (through Sept. 7, 1964).	974.78
Frank, Walter S	Economist (from Sept. 1 through Sept. 30, 1964).	325.18
Fulton, Wilbur D	Minority professional staff member (through Sept. 30, 1964).	5,499.99
Hayden, Helen E	Assistant clerk	4,368.07
Hill, George C	Assistant clerk (from July 1 through July 15, 1964, and as of Dec. 1, 1964).	1,171.36
Hill, Stephen P	Assistant clerk (through July 4, 1964).	55.58
Holstein, Charles B	Professional staff member, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs.	10,999.98
Holt, Shirley W	Assistant clerk (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	440.35
Jacobs, Donald P	Economist	2,401.44
Jessup, Paul F	Economist (from Aug. 1 through Sept. 30, 1964).	1,579.96
Johnson, Janice L	Secretary (as of Oct. 26, 1964).	1,280.33
Kennedy, Stephen D	Research assistant	3,557.35
Lumer, Marc A	Assistant clerk (through Nov. 6, 1964).	1,833.17
Mitchell, Mildred S	Assistant clerk	4,421.99
Morse, Alvin Lee	Counsel (through July 31, 1964).	1,468.93
Nelson, Paul	Economist (from Oct. 15 through Nov. 30, 1964).	2,415.31
Pontecorvo, Giulio	Economist (through July 31, 1964).	257.61
Roberts, Harriet L	Staff assistant (through Oct. 25, 1964).	2,790.72
Robinson, Donald L	Professional staff member, Subcommittee on International Finance.	4,739.88

INVESTIGATING STAFF (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 547 AND H. RES. 833)—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Schulkin, Peter A.	Research assistant (through Sept. 15, 1964).	$1,120.29
Scott, Ira O., Jr.	Economist (through Sept. 15, 1964).	1,952.27
Swanner, Regina	Assistant clerk (as of Nov. 1, 1964).	1,561.82
Taylor, Patricia A.	Assistant clerk, Subcommittee on International Trade (as of Aug. 1, 1964).	1,798.40
Terry, Patricia A.	Clerk-typist (from Sept. 1 through 30, 1964).	430.64
Watson, Winston Lee	Research assistant (through Sept. 7, 1964).	931.42
Whitaker, Gilbert R., Jr.	Economist	2,401.44
Young, Doris M.	Assistant clerk, Subcommittee on International Trade.	4,607.52
Total		79,873.64

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 735 AND H. RES. 833)

Battle, Virginia Anne	Secretary (from July 20 through Sept. 15, 1964).	$770.96
Burrows, Kenneth W.	Housing economist	10,999.98
Hamilton, Eleanor	Research assistant	4,194.48
Ireland, Casey	Minority staff member.	10,160.16
Leary, Margaret J.	Secretary	4,685.42
McEwan, John J., Jr.	Deputy staff director-housing economist.	10,999.98
Perry, Grady, Jr.	Chief clerk	10,721.01
Tucker, Margaret E.	Secretary	5,519.82
Weintraub, Robert E.	Senior economist	6,670.50
Total		64,722.31

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$703,202.14
Amount of expenditures previously reported	438,685.29
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	171,718.47
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	610,403.76
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	92,798.38

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 7, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel	$10,295.03
Clayton D. Gasque	Staff director	8,174.40
Donald J. Turbridy	Minority clerk	7,452.66
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator	7,344.06
James T. Clark	Clerk	$10,999.98
Ellen M. Coxeter	Assistant clerk	5,017.73
Jennie H. Cavanaugh	Assistant clerk (resigned Oct. 30, 1964).	2,959.96
Jean Quarles	Assistant clerk	4,439.94
Frances D. Noland	Clerk	4,284.16
Cynthia Potts Corbin	Typist (resigned Sept. 10, 1964).	789.03
Total		61,756.95
Thomas M. Owen III	Employed as special investigator for Subcommittee No. 4 at gross salary of $639.36 per month.	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures for 88th Cong	$25,000.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	3,826.26

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Chief clerk	$10,999.98
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff director	10,999.98
Deborah Partridge Wolfe.	Chief of education (to Oct. 31, 1964).	7,333.32
Leon Abramson	Chief counsel for labor management.	9,484.63
Odell Clark	Chief investigator	8,157.96
C. Sumner Stone	Special assistant to the chairman (from Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1964).	3,000.46
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant.	5,072.10
Jeanne E. Thomson	do	5,072.10
Corrine Annette Huff.	Secretary	4,905.99
MINORITY		
Philip Ray Rodgers	Minority clerk and counsel.	10,999.98
Charles W. Radcliffe	Minority counsel for education.	8,157.96
Total		84,184.46

Amount of expenditures previously reported Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	$215,426.76
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	84,184.46
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	299,611.22

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donald Louis Anderson.	Assistant labor counsel.	$4,776.48
Goldie A. Baldwin	Administrative assistant.	3,561.28
Donald F. Berens	do	5,072.10
Nicholas Delgado	Assistant counsel (from Oct. 1 to Nov. 30, 1964).	1,100.50
Aurora E. Harris	Secretary	4,272.30
Grace S. Jackson	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 31, 1964).	1,067.19
Sandra L. Paxton	Secretary (to Oct. 15, 1964.)	2,237.76
Michael Schwartz	Assistant labor counsel (from Aug. 1, 1964).	3,888.64
Mary L. Shuler	Secretary	3,563.28
John Everett Warren	Assistant clerk	1,527.69
Harriet W. Ziskin	Assistant to education chief (to Dec. 15, 1964).	3,801.05
MINORITY		
Annette S. Guibord	Secretary	2,583.85
Crawford C. Heerlein	Administrative assistant.	6,531.48
Richard H. Missner	Associate counsel (from Sept. 1 to Sept. 30, 1964).	333.61
Robert D. Olson	Minority associate counsel.	5,017.73
Phyllis P. Schweickert.	Staff assistant (from Sept. 1, 1964).	2,106.96
James W. Shue	Staff assistant (to Aug. 31, 1964).	789.03
Total		52,230.93

GENERAL SUCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 1 (CARL D. PERKINS, CHAIRMAN)

Freda Tuttle	Secretary	$3,901.43
Hartwell Duvall Reed, Jr.	Counsel	10,545.43

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$52,156.20
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	14,446.86
Other expenses	3.45
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	35,341.55
Total amount expended Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	49,791.86
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	2,364.34

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 2 (JAMES ROOSEVELT, CHAIRMAN)

Adrienne Fields	Clerk	$5,597.82
John D. Schuyler	Counsel	7,688.64
Margie Mae Powell	Secretary (from Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1964).	2,082.27
Carol T. Foreman	Assistant to counsel (from Nov. 16 to Dec. 31, 1964).	1,056.11

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$61,148.60
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	16,424.84
Other expenses	7,903.57
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	34,152.37
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	58,480.78
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	2,667.82

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 3 (EDITH GREEN, CHAIRMAN)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William F. Gaul	Counsel	$6,782.10
Marilyn Rae Stapleton.	Clerk (from July 1, 1964).	3,474.30

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$50,941.36
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	10,256.40
Other expenses	401.47
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	34,839.24
Amount expended, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	45,497.11
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	5,444.25

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 4 (FRANK THOMPSON, JR., CHAIRMAN)

Mary E. Corbin	Secretary (to October 11, 1964).	$2,323.35
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk.	9,906.76
Anne G. Thompson	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to August 31, 1964).	753.74
Lelia W. Troup	do	753.74
Mark Morris	Assistant clerk (to July 15, 1964).	50.39

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$52,043.98
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	13,787.98
Other expenses	286.61
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	36,119.52
Amount expended Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	50,194.11
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	1,849.87

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 5 (JOHN H. DENT, CHAIRMAN)

Gordon Clagett	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 15, 1964).	$396.48
A. R. Kelley	Assistant clerk	1,585.92
Eleanor Carson Keown.	Clerk	3,260.34
Kassian A. Kovalcheck, Jr.	Assistant clerk (to Sept. 15, 1964).	988.50
Harry L. Wright	Director	6,243.90
Barbara Crissey Dash.	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 1 to Nov. 30, 1964).	607.26

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$51,343.76
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	13,082.40
Other expenses	3,315.26
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	32,885.89
Amount expended Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	49,283.55
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	2,060.21

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 6 (ELMER J. HOLLAND, CHAIRMAN)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Curtis G. Aller	Director (to Sept. 15, 1964): reappointed (from Dec. 15 to Dec. 31, 1964).	$4,951.70
Edward Lee Dale	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 15, 1964).	272.63
Walter James Graham, Jr.	Clerk	3,871.79
Richard Wilson	Assistant clerk (from Aug. 17 to Aug. 31, 1964).	132.33
Robert E. L. Knight	Director (from Sept. 1, 1964).	$5,001.00
Norman Hartness	Assistant clerk (from Dec. 14 to Dec. 31, 1964).	396.71
Regina M. Ridder	Assistant clerk (from Nov. 5 to Dec. 31, 1964).	884.87

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$52,075.82
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	15,511.03
Other expenses	1,818.90
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	31,061.21
Amount expended Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	48,391.14
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	3,684.68

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE—A NATIONAL RESEARCH DATA PROCESSING AND INFORMTION RETRIEVAL CENTER NO. 7

(ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, CHAIRMAN)

Patricia Marie Matthews, clerk	$1,915.11
Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense Aug. 26, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	10,700.00
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	1,915.11
Other Expenses	188.73
Amount expended and previously reported from Aug. 26, 1963, to June 30, 1964	6,962.11
Amount expended, Jan 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	9,065.95
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	1,634.05

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL NO. 8

(DOMINICK V. DANIELS, CHAIRMAN)

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Oct. 22, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$5,000.00
Amount expended from July 1, 1964:	
Salaries	None
Other expenses	None
Amount expended and previously reported, Oct. 22, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	4,002.66
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	997.34
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	154,669.08
Amount of expenditures previously reported, Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	83,477.57
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	[1] 57,088.59
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	140,566.16
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	14,102.92

[1] Salaries, $52,230.93; other expenses, $4,884.66.

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 12, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator	$10,999.98
Roy J. Bullock	Senior staff consultant.	10,999.98
Albert C. F. Westphal.	Staff consultant	10,999.98
Franklin J. Schupp	do	10,999.98
Robert F. Brandt	Investigator-consultant.	10,999.98
Harry C. Cromer	Staff consultant	10,709.70
Philip B. Billings	Special assistant	9,017.94
Marian A. Czarnecki	Staff consultant	10,233.24
Melvin O. Benson	do	9,862.43
June Nigh	Senior staff assistant.	8,802.48
Helen C. Mattas	Staff assistant	7,420.08
Helen L. Hashagen	do	7,262.58
Mary Louise O'Brien	do	7,086.66
Mary Medsger	do	4,836.49
Doris B. McCracken	do	5,909.88
Jean E. Smith	do	3,836.16
Robert J. Bowen	Clerical assistant	4,697.58

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$220,741.14
Amount of expenditures previously reported.	132,485.74
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	53,273.15
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	185,758.89
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	34,982.25

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to January 2, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, July 1, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965:	
Full committee (expenses)	$1,910.30
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	54,468.97
Military Operations Subcommittee	45,706.74
Government Activities Subcommittee	32,894.89
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	48,610.57
Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee	46,485.22
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee	55,841.71
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.	28,123.07
Special Government Operations Subcommittee	2,792.23
Total	316,833.70

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Salaries, full committee, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:		
Christine Ray Davis.	Staff director	$10,999.98
James A. Lanigan	General counsel	10,999.98
Miles Q. Romney	Associate general counsel.	9,484.63
Earl J. Wade	Staff member	7,778.46
Dolores Fel'Dotto	do	5,349.18
Ann E. McLachlan.	do	5,241.24
Patricia Maheux	do	5,241.24
Charlotte C. Bickett.	do	4,770.06
John Philip Carlson.	Minority counsel (July 1 to Sept. 15, 1964.	3,910.15

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Rodney F. Moulton	Minority counsel (Sept. 16 to Dec. 31, 1964).	$4,121.36
Raymond T. Collins.	Minority professional staff member.	8,157.96

FULL COMMITTEE EXPENSES, JULY 1, 1964 TO JAN. 2, 1965

(HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, CHAIRMAN)

Travel, publications, telephone, stationery supplies, etc	$1,910.30

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, CHAIRMAN)

Elmer W. Henderson	Counsel	$10,822.99
Arthur Perlman	Investigator (July 1 to Dec. 30, 1964).	8,924.04
Louis I. Freed	Investigator	8,911.46
Barney A. Bradshaw	Research analyst (Oct. 15, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	2,927.08
Francis J. Schwoerer	Staff member	6,140.56
Peter S. Barash	Assistant counsel	5,073.48
Veronica B. Johnson	Clerk	4,823.06
Mabel C. Baker	Stenographer (Sept. 7, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	2,587.38
John L. Dodson	Clerical staff	2,718.58
Expenses		1,540.34
Total		54,468.97

MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. CHET HOLIFIELD, CHAIRMAN)

Herbert Roback	Staff administrator	$11,127.45
John Paul Ridgely	Investigator	7,143.68
Douglas G. Dahlin	Staff attorney	6,805.95
Daniel W. Fulmer	Staff attorney (Aug. 2, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	4,957.74
Robert J. McElroy	Investigator	5,482.57
Catherine L. Koeberlein.	Research assistant	5,165.10
Mollie Jo Hughes	Clerk-stenographer	4,823.06
Expenses		201.19
Total		45,706.74

GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. JACK BROOKS, CHAIRMAN)

Ernest Cornish Baynard.	Staff administrator.	$10,143.18
Daniel L. Power	Investigator	5,445.62
William David Allred	Research assistant (July 1 to Oct. 3, 1964; Nov. 4, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	3,956.61
Roland J. Williams	Investigator	4,471.12
Irma Reel	Clerk	4,543.75
Lynne Higginbotham	Clerk-stenographer.	3,986.77
Expenses		347.84
Total		32,894.89

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN, CHAIRMAN)

James R. Naughton	Counsel	$10,011.77
Delphis C. Goldberg	Professional staff member.	10,011.77
George O. Serini	Investigator	7,502.53
William Donald Gray	Research analyst	6,805.95
Eileen M. Anderson	Clerk-stenographer	4,823.06
Bebe B. Terry	do	4,537.68
Herbert B. Warburton	Minority Counsel, July 1 to Sept. 30, 1964.	4,692.18
Expenses		225.63
Total		48,610.57

NATURAL RESOURCES AND POWER SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. ROBERT E. JONES, CHAIRMAN)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Phineas Indritz	Counsel	$10,409.42
Sidney McClellan	Professional staff member.	8,710.40
Harry V. Lerner	Assistant counsel (Sept. 1, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	5,771.45
George L. Milstead	Investigator	5,975.55
Richard P. Crane, Jr	Legal analyst (Oct. 13, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	1,357.60
Catherine L. Hartke	Stenographer	4,823.06
Josephine Scheiber	Research analyst	3,872.78
Francine Shacter	Clerk-stenographer	3,872.78
Expenses		1,692.18
Total		46,485.22

FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE (HON. JOHN E. MOSS, CHAIRMAN)

Samuel J. Archibald	Staff administrator	$10,409.42
Vincent J. Augliere	Chief adviser	9,972.01
David Glick	Chief counsel	9,466.12
Jack Matteson	Chief investigator	8,894.71
Benny L. Kass	Assistant counsel	5,692.11
Helen K. Beasley	Stenographer	4,823.06
Glenna G. Donat	Secretary	3,872.78
Dorrie Bosley	Clerical assistant (July 1 to Sept. 30, 30, 1964).	1,143.84
Expenses		1,567.66
Total		55,841.71

LEGAL AND MONETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. DANTE B. FASCELL, CHAIRMAN)

M. Joseph Matan	Staff administrator	$10,011.77
Charles Rothenberg	Counsel	9,229.52
Clara Katherine Armstrong.	Clerical staff	4,313.71
Millicent Y. Myers	Stenographer	4,416.60
Expenses		151.47
Total		28,123.07

SPECIAL GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, CHAIRMAN)

Norman G. Cornish	Staff administrator (Oct. 26, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	$2,792.23

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, H. Res. 80, H. Res. 615, H. Res. 833, 88th Congress	$1,239,045.96
Amount of expenditures previously reported	777,694.21
Amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963, to June 30, 1964	777,694.21
Total amount expended from July 1, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965	316,833.70
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 2, 1965	144,518.05

C. E. GALLAGHER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 12, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	$10,999.98
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	9,651.78
David S. Wolman	Personnel analyst	4,289.68
Louis Silverman	Assistant clerk	6,554.94
Mary F. Stolle	do	4,607.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	1,483.37
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	2,290.46
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	3,773.83
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	1,226.17

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JANUARY 14, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland.	Professional staff director and engineering consultant	$10,999.98
T. Richard Witmer	Counsel and consultant on national parks.	10,743.72
John L. Taylor	Consultant on territorial and Indian affairs.	10,743.72
Milton A. Pearl	Consultant on mining, minerals, and lands.	10,743.72
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	9,451.20
Dixie S. Barton	Clerk	5,102.28
Patricia Ann Murray.	do	5,102.28
Virginia E. Bedsole	do	4,866.72
Patricia B. Freeman.	do	4,499.76
Susan A. Whitener	do	4,224.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	40,450.92
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	7,915.87
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	48,366.79
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	11,633.21

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 21, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	$11,000.00
Kenneth J. Painter	First assistant clerk	9,284.00
Marcella Fencl	Assistant clerk	5,508.00
Glenn L. Johnson	Printing editor	7,669.00
Joanne C. Neuland	Clerical assistant	4,548.00
Mildred H. Lang	do	4,548.00
Mary Ryan	do	4,548.00
Elsie M. Karpowich	do	4,548.00
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	4,308.00
Marion M. Burson	Staff assistant (minority).	9,969.00
Helen M. Dubino	Staff assistant (minority) (H. Res. 17 and H. Res. 588)	9,018.00
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	11,000.00
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	11,000.00
William J. Dixon	Professional staff member.	10,778.00
James M. Menger, Jr.	do	11,000.00
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 17 and H. Res. 588:		
Gladys Johnson	Clerical assistant	5,361.00
William T. Denman III.	Staff assistant (Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics).	6,871.00
John A. Canfield	Staff assistant (Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance) (to Aug. 15, 1964).	1,717.50
Clark Crocker de Schweinitz.	Staff assistant (Subcommittee on Communications and Power) (to Aug. 31, 1964).	912.00
William W. Gauldin.	Staff assistant (Submittee on Public Health and Safety).	5,909.00
Rosalee Ann Peterson.	Minority clerical assistant (to Aug. 18, 1964).	795.44
Carolyn Sue Browning.	Minority clerical assistant.	3,616.00
Diana L. Dewey	Minority clerical assistant (from Aug. 24, 1964).	2,296.00
Lewis E. Berry, Jr.	Minority counsel	11,000.00
Charles L. Honey, Jr.	Staff assistant	6,132.00
Wallace L. Briscoe	Staff assistant (to Oct. 15, 1964).	4,005.00
Isaac Wilson, Jr.	Messenger (from July 1 to 31, 1964).	417.05
Patrick Westbrook Murphy.	Messenger (from Aug 1 to 31, 1964).	417.05
William Boyd Ward.	do	417.05
Special Subcommittee on Investigations:		
Charles P. Howze, Jr.	Chief counsel	11,000.00
George W. Perry	Associate counsel	10,777.70
Herman Clay Beasley.	Subcommittee chief clerk.	9,194.94
Stuart C. Ross	Consultant	11,000.00
Zelig Robinson	Staff attorney (to Oct. 31, 1964).	4,580.92
Elizabeth G. Paola	Clerical assistant	4,547.67
Catherine C. McLees.	do	4,457.67
Mary E. Bainbridge.	Stenographer-clerk	4,188.49
Dorothy Dimpel Howze.	do	4,188.49
Victoria Williams	Clerical assistant	4,188.49

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, 1964	$319,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	110,958.04
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	132,391.96
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	243,350.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964 (approximate)	75,650.00

Oren Harris,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	$10,999.98
William R. Foley	General counsel	10,999.98
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant (to Sept. 15).	4,583.33
Murray Drabkin	Counsel	10,999.98
Stuart H. Johnson, Jr.	do	10,999.98
Garner J. Cline	Assistant counsel	7,955.34
William H. Copenhaver.	do	8,305.86
Carrie Lou Allen	Clerical staff	4,993.62
Lorraine W. Beland	Clerical staff (from Aug. 7).	3,609.41
Anne J. Berger	Clerical staff	7,344.06
Gertrude C. Burak	do	5,544.23
Jane C. Caldwell	do	5,422.32
Frances F. Christy	do	6,320.16
Mary Dematteis	Clerical staff (to Aug. 6).	731.07

SALARIES PAID PURSUANT TO H. RES. 36, H. RES. 100, H. RES. 587, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.

Appel, Leonard	Assistant counsel	$9,428.94
Beland, Lorraine W	Clerical staff (through Aug. 6, 1964).	902.35
Benn, Donald G	Assistant counsel	6,935.94
Cors, Allan D	Deputy associate counsel.	5,204.94
Dobriansky, Lev E	Consultant (Nov. 1 through Nov. 30, 1964).	1,502.99
Eisenberg, Roberta E	Clerical staff	4,607.52
Fuchs, Herbert	Counsel (through Aug. 31, 1964).	3,498.16
Greenwald, Andrew E.	Clerical staff (through Aug. 28, 1964).	735.44
Haardt, Alma B	Clerical staff	3,853.98
Hall, Patricia J	do	3,634.49
Harkins, Kenneth J	Special consultant (as of Aug. 14, 1964).	8,372.21
Jett, R. Frederick	Counsel	9,428.94
Kelemonick, Michael	Clerical staff	4,248.36
Lee, Charles R	Messenger	2,995.86
Levy, Joseph M	Clerical staff (through Oct. 31, 1964)	4,048.62
McGrady, Florence	Clerical staff	3,972.60
Marcus, Philip	Associate counsel	10,420.80
Meekins, Elizabeth G	Clerical staff	4,607.52
Reast, Ann W	Clerical staff (as of Aug. 12. 1964).	2,136.43
Rosenman, Louis	Associate counsel	8,741.70
Shattuck, William P	Counsel (through Aug. 31, 1964).	3,431.67
Toppins, Juanita	Clerical staff (through Sept. 15, 1964).	1,415.50
Zelenko, Benjamin L.	Assistant counsel	7,778.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$466,235.06
Amount of expenditures previously reported	284,474.04
Amount expended from July 1 through Dec. 31, 1964	113,735.84
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963, through Dec. 31, 1964	398,209.88
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	68,025.18

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE, SALARIES PAID PURSUANT TO H. RES. 35, H. RES. 497, H. RES. 653, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Baskir, Lawrence M	Counsel (as of Oct. 26, 1964).	$1,553.59
Breslow, Jerome W	Assistant counsel	5,570.03
Broussard, Geraldf	Clerical staff	3,084.01
Cohen, Felice D	Counsel (as of Nov. 16, 1964).	$1,075.56
Cooley, Alford W	Clerical staff (as of Oct. 1, 1964).	1,808.34
Durand, Gerard F	Clerk (as of Nov. 1, 1964).	757.28
Faircloth, John W. F.	Counsel	7,512.37
Haik, Theodore, Jr.	Clerical staff (through Aug. 21, 1964).	768.39
James, Raymond K	Clerical staff	4,096.64
Lane, Esther C	do	3,634.49
McGrath, James P	do	3,634.49
Melville, Robert F	Senior economist (July 20 through Oct. 18, 1964).	4,689.62
Partridge, Anthony	Counsel (through Nov. 8, 1964).	6,744.63
Randazzo, Toni Marie.	Clerical staff (through Aug. 17, 1964).	708.12
Rigler, Douglas V	Clerical staff (through Sept. 4, 1964).	1,401.94
Spirt, Linda E	Clerical staff	2,814.45
Sutherland, David A	Counsel	9,484.63
Toppins, Juanita	Clerical staff (as of Sept. 16, 1964).	1,981.70
Zeifman, Jerome	Counsel	7,512.37

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditures	$355,277.98
Amount of expenditures previously reported	200,948.36
Amount expended from July 1 through Dec. 31, 1964	70,610.78
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963, through Dec. 31, 1964	271,559.14
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	83,718.84

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1964	$437.52
Legislative Appropriation Act, 1965	150,000.00
Total	150,437.52
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	13,859.68
Balance, Dec. 31, 1964	136,577.84
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1964	2,949.47
Legislative Appropriation Act, 1965	100,000.00
Total	102,949.47
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	16,500.48
Balance, Dec. 31, 1964	86,448.99
C. Revision of the laws, 1964:	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1964	930.65
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	149.81
Balance, Dec. 31, 1964	780.84
D. Revision of the laws, 1965:	
Legislative Appropriation Act, 1965	20,765.00
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	11,031.98
Balance, Dec. 31, 1964	9,733.02

Emanuel Celler,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

DECEMBER 31, 1964.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry	Chief counsel	$10,999.98
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	10,607.76
Ned P. Everett	Assistant counsel	9,367.62
W. B. Winfield	Chief clerk	10,845.66
Frances P. Still	Assistant clerk	6,108.90
Ruth E. Brookshire	do	4,770.06
Edith W. Gordon	Secretary	4,770.06
Vera A. Barker	do	4,770.06
E. M. Tollefson	Minority clerk	5,788.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$37,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	23,482.28
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1964	10,010.68
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963 to Dec. 31, 1964	33,492.96
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	4,007.04

H. C. BONNER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

DECEMBER 31, 1964.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	$10,999.98
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member.	10,999.98
John H. Martiny	Counsel	10,999.98
William A. Irvine	Professional staff member.	10,607.76
Lillian H. Hanninen	Assistant clerk	6,554.94
John B. Price	do	5,422.32
Lucy K. Daley	do	5,422.32
Elsie K. Thornton	Secretary	5,253.30
Barbara M. Wells	do	5,011.68
Blanche M. Simons	do	4,830.47

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$127,219.90
Amount of expenditures previously reported	73,887.61
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1964	34,971.41
Total amount expended from Feb. 27, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	108,859.02
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	18,360.88

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 1, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	$10,999.98
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant.	10,999.98
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	10,999.98
Edward J. McNeal	Staff director (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	1,833.33
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	7,778.46
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	9,017.94
Helen A. Thompson.	do	7,884.13
Dorothy A. Beam	do	6,666.00
Sterlyn B. Carroll	do	4,176.53
Florence C. Waters	Staff assistant (through Sept. 30, 1964).	3,435.69

STANDING COMMITTEE—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1964, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, H. RES. 566, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.

John A. O'Connor, Jr.	Subcommittee clerk	$5,909.88
William B. Short	do	5,909.88
Audrey G. Warren	do	5,909.88
James R. Phippard	Subcommittee clerk (through Aug. 31, 1964).	2,106.72
Maurice B. Tobin	Subcommittee clerk (as of Sept. 15, 1964).	3,680.43
Paul R. S. Yates	Minority staff assistant.	7,922.46
Erla S. Youmans	do	5,458.91
Milton Weil	Staff assistant (through Nov. 26, 1964).	5,952.42
Marina M. Gentilini	Staff assistant	4,258.08
Salig L. Bendit	Staff assistant (as of Nov. 1, 1964).	1,501.92
Murray S. Pashkoff	Investigator	2,907.67
Randal C. Teague	Minority clerk	3,397.20
Flavil Q. Van Dyke, Jr.	Minority clerical assistant.	3,853.98
Martin Baker	Legislative assistant (through Aug. 20, 1964).	550.91
Nancy R. Beiter	Clerical assistant (through Aug. 31, 1964).	1,061.32
M. Rae Olsen	Clerical assistant	1,918.86
John Williams	Clerical assistant (through Sept. 30, 1964).	959.55
Charles R. O'Regan	Clerical assistant (as of Oct. 4, 1964).	927.45

H. Res. 236	$110,000.00
H. Res. 566	125,000.00
H. Res. 833	7,823.91
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	242,823.91
Amount of expenditures previously reported	159,681.78
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	69,817.06
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	229,498.84
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	13,325.07

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1964, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, H. RES. 566, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.

Walter R. May	Chief counsel	$10,000.98
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel.	10,636.08
Robert L. May	Minority counsel	10,562.46
George H. Martin	Administrative assistant.	9,562.62
John N. Dinsmore	Associate counsel	8,229.18
Salvatore J. D'Amico	do	8,064.89
John P. O'Hara	do	7,940.45
Robert G. Lawrence	do	7,025.09
Patrick J. Cunningham.	do	4,439.94

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1964, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, H. RES. 566, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	$10,047.84
Sherman S. Willse	Investigator	8,064.89
Richard A. Cordasco	do	7,512.37
Carl J. Lorenz, Jr	do	7,204.58
Edward J. Gilhooly	do	4,439.94
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	5,349.18
Erwin Greenwald	Research assistant	4,776.12
Mildred E. Rupert	Staff assistant	4,374.06
Dolores K. Dougherty.	do	4,242.36
Agnes M. GaNun	do	4,224.41
Sylvia H. Reppert	Minority staff assistant.	4,146.60
Sara L. Vollett	Staff assistant	3,747.18
Shirley R. Knighten	do	3,464.52
Anna S. Rosch	do	2,711.99

H. Res. 236	$340,000.00
H. Res. 566	325,000.00
H. Res. 833	20,118.61
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	685,118.61
Amount of expenditures previously reported	481,211.33
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	167,109.42
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	648,320.75
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	36,797.86

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1964, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 237, H. RES. 609, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.

Ruth M. Heritage	Chief clerk (through July 31, 1964).	$1,362.40
Henry H. Krevor	Chief counsel	10,999.98
Robert J. Bolger	Minority counsel	10,562.46
Joe W. Ingram	Associate counsel	8,103.19
Thomas M. Stewart	do	7,512.37
Rosalyn P. Woodmansee.	Staff assistant (as of Aug. 1, 1964).	6,812.00
Dorothy S. Martin	Secretary	5,428.39
Ruth Butterworth	Minority staff assistant.	5,078.15
Meriam R. Buckley	Staff assistant	4,511.76
Eloise Luckett	Staff assistant (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	283.56

H. Res. 237	$125,000.00
H. Res. 609	150,000.00
H. Res. 833	8,661.92
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	283,661.92
Amount of expenditures previously reported	177,609.39
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	63,799.41
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	241,408.80
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	42,253.12

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JANUARY 7, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
T. M. Carruthers	Counsel (P), standing committee.	$8,393.46
Mary Spencer Forrest	Assistant counsel (P).	5,909.58
Frank E. McCarthy	Minority counsel (P).	5,909.58
T. K. Leachman	Staff assistant (July 1 to Sept. 15, 1964).	1,346.25

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

Committee on Science and Astronautics

JANUARY 5, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel.	$10,999.98
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk and counsel.	10,999.98
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	10,999.98
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	do	10,602.06
W. H. Boone	Chief technical consultant.	10,999.98
Mary Ann Robert	Secretary	4,739.88
Emily Dodson	do	4,535.70
Carol F. Rodgers	do	4,421.99
June C. Stafford	do	4,146.60
Elizabeth M. Fleming	do	4,146.60

INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	$10,602.06
James E. Wilson	Technical consultant.	10,160.16
Peter A. Gerardi	do	10,160.16
Joseph M. Felton	Assistant counsel	4,739.88
Katherine V. Flanigan	Assistant clerk	5,564.23
Denis C. Quigley	Publications clerk	2,984.10
Virginia Robison	Secretary	4,146.60
Elizabeth S. Kernan	Scientific research assistant.	5,349.18
Elizabeth A. Rothman.	Clerical assistant (to Aug. 21).	800.53
Patrick J. Mahoney	do	800.53
Philip Dickinson	Technical consultant (from Oct. 1).	4,500.69

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$325,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	143,128.55
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	121,288.17
Total amount expended from Feb. 27, 1963 to Dec. 31, 1964	264,416.72
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	60,583.28

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman.

Committee on Un-American Activities

JANUARY 13, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Appell, Donald T	Chief investigator	$9,523.62
Gittings, Helen M	Research analyst	5,528.23
Hitz, William	General counsel (transferred to standing committee Nov. 1, 1964).	3,666.66
Joray, Juliette P	Recording clerk	6,957.49
McNamara Francis J.	Director	10,999.98
Nagel, Isabel B	Secretary to counsel	4,607.52
Purdy, Rosella A	Secretary to general counsel.	5,641.74
Tavenner, Frank S., Jr.	General counsel (July 1 to Oct. 21)	6,783.30
Turner, Anne D	Chief of files and reference service.	7,011.30
Veley, Lorraine N	Secretary to investigators.	4,638.01
Wheeler, William A	Investigator	8,907.43

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Baldwin, Beatrice P	Clerk-typist	$3,113.40
Bienvenu, Marcelle R.	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Aug. 14).	662.92
Broussard, V. Kenneth.	Clerk-typist (appointed Sept. 1, 1964).	1,613.84
Brown, Frances Rosalyn.	Information analyst (resigned Dec. 15, 1964).	2,864.67
Buglio, Theresa J	Clerk-typist (appointed Dec. 1, 1964).	455.88
Burke, Gerald F	Clerk-typist	3,189.84
Butler, Daniel	do	2,878.31
Collins, William R	Editor	4,421.99
Cunningham, Anniel	Information analyst	4,776.12
Curll, Jean W	Clerk-stenographer	3,515.83
Doyle, Florence B	Clerk-typist	2,261.22
Edinger, Elizabeth L.	Editor	5,017.73
Ellsweig, Rochelle J	Clerk-typist	2,187.66
Finn, Peter B	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Aug. 21).	768.39
Fivehouse, Cynthia	Clerk-stenographer (resigned Sept. 24, 1964).	803.32
Francis, Emily R	Information analyst	2,878.31
Gaffney, Metje Q	Clerk-typist	2,261.22
Gallagher, James L	Research analyst	5,629.56
Hague, Howard, Jr	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Aug. 21).	132.55
Hitz, William	Counsel (transferred to standing committee Nov. 1, 1964).	7,283.33
Holton, Katherine R	Research clerk	3,231.00
Huber, Walter B	Consultant	9,017.94
Jenkins, Pennye P	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Aug. 21).	768.39
Kelly, Maura Patricia.	Research analyst	3,806.52
Kennedy, Jo B	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Oct. 31).	2,240.59
Kocis, Evelyn M	Secretary to director	4,421.99
McLaughlin, Carol E	Clerk-typist	2,303.58
Manuel, Philip R	Investigator	5,349.18
Margetich, William	do	4,793.88
Masumian, Alberta	Secretary	5,253.30
Monts, Esther L	Clerk-stenographer	3,664.14
Muffley, David E., Jr	Clerk-typist	3,195.72
Nittle, Alfres M	Counsel	9,172.68
Petersen, Neal H	Clerk-typist (July 1-31).	375.32
Pfaff, Alma D	Research clerk	3,242.70
Phillips, Katharine	Switchboard operator.	2,966.46
Randolph, Josephine S.	Research clerk	3,711.60
Riehl, Joseph, Jr	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Aug. 20).	753.32
Russell, Louis J	Investigator	7,172.82
Salathe, Doris R	Information analyst	2,589.71
Stiles, Lela Mae	do	3,545.52
Sweany, Donald I	Research analyst	5,422.32
Valente, Mary M	Secretary	5,751.43
Vernor, Dorothy H	Clerk-stenographer	3,260.34
Walton, Stanley F	Clerk-typist	2,420.77
Wetterman, Neil E	Investigator	6,011.63
Wheeler, Billie	Clerk-stenographer	2,282.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$678,195.86
Amount of expenditures previously reported.	470,790.73
Amount expended from July 1, 1964, to Jan. 3, 1965	$183,406.63
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963, to Jan. 3, 1965	654,197.36
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1965	23,998.50

E. E. WILLIS,
Chairman.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director (P)	$10,999.98
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel (P)	10,999.98
John R. Holden	Professional staff member (P).	9,423.36
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aid (P)	8,064.89
George W. Fisher	Clerk (C)	10,999.98
Helen A. Biondi	Assistant clerk (C)	6,267.36
Carol A. Davis	Clerk-stenographer (C).	5,873.34
Alice V. Matthews	do	5,132.47
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk (C)	5,132.47
Investigative staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	8,377.07
Wilma Jean Johnson.	Clerk-stenographer	4,368.07
Ann L. Loupot	do	834.11
Leila W. Osborne	do	3,830.22
Sharon L. Wright	do	834.11
Susan J. McNeill	do	234.05
John E. Miller	Clerk-messenger	417.05
Joan Phyllis Orringer.	Clerk-stenographer	1,765.51
David C. Thomas, Jr.	Clerk-typist	2,085.25
Philip E. Howard	Investigator	1,220.39

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$145,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	83,851.77
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1964	39,965.44
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to December 31, 1964	123,817.21
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	21,182.79

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

Committee on Ways and Means

JANUARY 10, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leo H. Irwin	Chief counsel (C)	$10,999.98
William H. Quealy	Minority counsel (P).	10,999.98
John M. Martin, Jr	Assistant chief counsel (P).	10,999.98

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Lincoln Arnold	Professional assistant (P).	$1,550.24
John P. Baker	do	8,841.18
Thomas P. Kerester	do	8,813.52
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C)	4,290.24
Virginia Butler	do	5,660.04
William Byrd	do	2,790.12
Mary K. Daniel	do	3,563.28
Grace Kagan	do	5,660.04
June Kendall	do	6,138.24
Max Mehlburger	do	3,972.60
Elizabeth Price	do	3,836.16
Martha Sue Ritner	do	3,942.96
Dolores Rogers	do	3,753.12
Gloria Shaver	do	5,180.82
Eileen Sonnett	do	4,745.88
Susan Taylor	do	6,437.58
Irene Wade	do	5,229.24
David West	do	5,489.34
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk (C)	3,931.08
Walter Little	do	3,931.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$12,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	3,433.95
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	3,531.51
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	6,965.46
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	5,534.54

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

JANUARY 22, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harold J. Warren	Clerk and counsel	$10,295.03
Edward Hart	Professional staff member.	9,651.78
George T. Ault	do	7,172.82
Edward O. McCue III.	Professional staff member (through Nov. 13, 1964).	4,843.37
Janice M. Maguire	Secretary	3,616.69
Susan Talbot	Secretary (through Aug. 31, 1964).	861.29
Patricia Ann Terry	Assistant research clerk (Aug. 1–31, 1964).	430.64
Prudence Mahaffey	Secretary-clerk-typist (through July 7, 1964).	93.47

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$65,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	37,009.90
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	27,990.10

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

JANUARY 13, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Edward M. O'Connor	Staff director	$10,999.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$20,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec 31	10,999.98
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	9,000.02

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to January 1, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Colin F. Stam	Chief of staff (retired July 31, 1964).	$1,833.33
L. N. Woodworth	Chief of staff	10,984.65
Nicholas A. Tomasulo	Attorney	10,182.65
Lincoln Arnold	do	9,166.65
G. D. Chesteen	Corporation auditor	10,036.56
James H. Symons	Statistical analyst	9,969.18
Robert R. Smyers	Attorney	9,929.82
Grace T. Gunn	Statistical analyst	9,194.94
Robert J. Moody	Attorney	8,163.42
James M. LaMarche	Administrative assistant.	7,338.60
Harrison B. McCawley.	Attorney	6,742.97
Joseph E. Fink	Statistical clerk	6,508.01
Carl A. Nordberg	Attorney	4,354.32
Anastasia F. Connaughton.	Statistical clerk	6,508.01
Cleo H. Fonelli	Secretary	4,427.94
Blanche F. Nagro	do	3,960.78
Joanne B. McDermott	do	3,723.48
Jacqueline S. Pfeiffer	do	3,397.20
Ila Coe	do	3,036.96
June M. Matthews	do	3,036.96
Nicki Rae Fairfax	do	2,878.31
Gloria J. McCabe	do	2,878.31
Mildred Feldt	do	2,688.71
Betty L. Balkum	do	2,642.10
Contract personnel:		
P. W. Meekins	Tax consultant	4,500.00
Russell M. Oram	do	4,450.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$344,440.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported (Jan. 1 to June 30, 1964)	139,709.29
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1964	152,533.86
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1964, to Jan. 1, 1965	292,243.15
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1965.	52,196.85

HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

JANUARY 2, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert L. Hopper	Staff director	$10,999.98
Micah H. Naftalin	Deputy staff director and counsel (July 1 to Oct. 18).	5,112.47
Stephen P. Strickland	Chief clerk	8,297.30
William B. Farrington	Science director (July 1 to Oct. 31).	7,230.44
R. Evelyn Alvis	Secretary	3,260.34
David G. Battle	Staff assistant (July 1 to Dec. 15).	7,478.13
Elizabeth B. Bedell	Assistant clerk	4,452.32
Salig L. Bendit	Staff assistant (July 1 to Oct. 31).	4,162.60
Donald P. Cole	Staff assistant (July 1 to Sept. 23).	2,313.72
Davis O. Couch	Clerical assistant (July 1 to Oct. 31).	1,989.40
Bertha L. Davison	Research assistant (July 1 to Dec. 15).	2,988.65
Walter L. Fitzpatrick, Jr.	Staff assistant	8,297.30
Mary P. Flanagan	Secretary	3,836.16
Edward T. Fogo	Staff assistant	8,297.30
Frances M. Geddes	Secretary	3,836.16
Zel M. Lipsen	Staff assistant	5,017.73
Rowena G. Lovette	Administrative assistant.	4,531.30
Edna Ruth McNutt	Clerical assistant (July 1 to Aug. 31).	716.98
Annelle K. Murray	Staff assistant	5,017.73
George Norris, Jr	Assistant counsel	8,157.96
Mary Belle Osborne	Secretary	3,942.96
Helen C. Pigott	Administrative assistant.	4,531.30
Russell Saville	Staff assistant	5,017.73
Leo S. Tonkin	Assistant counsel	6,871.38
Sue G. Jennings	Secretary (Aug. 26 to Dec. 31).	1,867.17
Allie James Quinn	Staff assistant (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31).	3,441.41
Donald F. Bent	Staff assistant (July 1 to July 31).	1,000.20
Mary P. Allen	Staff assistant	6,871.38
Catherine S. Cash	Secretary (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31).	1,650.82
Carl E. Moore	Staff assistant (Sept. 15 to Dec. 31).	3,846.32
Harry L. Selden	Editorial director (Sept. 1 to Dec 31).	8,867.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	[1] $573,881.04
Amount of expenditures previously reported	140,545.34
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	179,025.21
Total amount expended from Sept. 11, 1963, to Dec. 13, 1964	319,570.55
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	254,310.45

[1] Original appropriation, $553,000; supplemental, $20,881.94.

CARL ELLIOTT,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JANUARY 18, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Justinus Gould	Counsel	$9,651.78
Marsha Y. Darrah	Research analyst	2,332.04
Sarah L. Cox	Secretary	3,397.20
Myrtle Ruth Foutch	Clerk	4,487.82
Gertrude M. Dean	Secretary	518.90
Astrid E. Gram	do	3,759.05
Helen C. Hitz	do	4,140.61
Bryan H. Jacques	Staff director	10,999.98
Sylvia U. Keel	Secretary	4,140.61
Maxine La Cava	do	1,698.60
B. C. William	Consultant	1,678.38
Eugene W. Loehl	Assistant minority counsel.	3,046.80
Barbara Wright McConnell.	Secretary	6,671.94
Richard L. Mitchell	General counsel	10,999.98
Charles E. O'Connor	Counsel	9,651.78
Harry Olsher	Consultant	10,840.02
Dorothy M. Perdieu	Secretary	3,638.44
Gregg R. Potvin	Counsel	10,295.03
William H. Reddig	Research analyst	5,629.56
Henry A. Robinson	Counsel	8,813.53
JoAnn L. Sloane	Research analyst	1,166.02
Audrey R. Smith	do	4,830.47
Penelope Walcott	Secretary	4,140.61
John J. Williams	Minority counsel	6,876.77
Ralph Moody	Research analyst (July and August).	760.80
James J. Saxon, Jr	do	557.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$543,181.50
Amount of expenditures previously reported	348,182.20
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec 31, 1964	143,118.20
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963 to Dec. 31, 1964	491,300.40
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	51,881.10

JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1964

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the period from August 1, 1964, to January 2, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 5-month period
John Warren McGarry.	Chief counsel (contract).	$7,000.00
Hal Gerber	Associate counsel (contract).	7,000.00
Charles W. Halleck	Minority counsel (contract).	5,000.00
Ruth M. Heritage	Chief clerk (appointed Aug. 1, 1964).	6,902.83
Barbara H. Bourgeois.	Secretary (appointed Sept. 1, 1964).	2,336.37
Mildred R. Basinger	Secretary (appointed Dec. 1, 1964).	503.23

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount expended from Aug. 1, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965	$29,631.71
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 2, 1965	[1] 5,368.29

[1] Not including current obligations for which bills have not been received.

CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

450. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 21, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Rahway River, N.J., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted September 14, 1955. It is in full response to an item in the Flood Control Act approved June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

451. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 1, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 68); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 11 illustrations.

452. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting report of the actions taken by Federal agencies relative to the 1964 amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act for period August 16, 1964, through December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 7 of Public Law 88-451; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

453. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a quarterly report of the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government as of the end of the second quarter of fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

454. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

455. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to furnish discharge gratuities to persons released from imprisonment"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

456. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

457. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to furnish cash gratuities to needy patients of the Glenn Dale Hospital"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

458. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay expenses of members of the Metropolitan Police Department for attending pistol matches"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

459. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appropriation for the District of Columbia of expenses in case of emergency"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

460. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the 17th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Armory Board and the 7th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the District of Columbia Stadium for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to Public Laws 80-605 as amended and 85-300 as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

461. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co. transmitting a copy of a balance sheet of the company as of December 31, 1964, pursuant to paragraph 14, section 6 of 37 Stat. 979; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

462. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the company for the year 1964, pursuant to chapter 1628, acts of Congress 1904, and a comparative general balance sheet; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

463. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the January 1965 report pertaining to fair labor standards in employment in and affecting interstate commerce, pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

464. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of banking organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

465. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, a report on unnecessary costs incurred because obsolete weight design goal was used for the design, integration, and test of Numbus spacecraft by the Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

466. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overstated requirements for replacement of high-endurance vessels, eastern area, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

467. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on planned disposals of needed automotive repair parts, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

468. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary transportation costs incurred because available Government-owned containers were not used for the movement of household goods, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

469. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs resulting from excessive dental services to hospital patients at general hospitals, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

470. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, transmitting the sixth annual report, pursuant to Public Law 86-380; to the Committee on Government Operations.

471. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of the final valuations of properties of certain carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, pursuant to section 19a of the act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

472. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission authority to prescribe regulations for the manufacture, import, sale, shipment, or use of devices which cause harmful interference to radio reception"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

473. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to venue"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

474. A letter from the Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, transmitting the first report on progress, pursuant to 78 Stat. 481; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

475. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to regulate archeological exploration in the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

476. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report with respect to certain civilian positions during calendar year 1964 established by section 1851, title 10, United States Code, pursuant to section 1582 of the act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

477. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for a flat fee for services performed in connection with the arrival in, or departure from, the United States of a private aircraft or private vessel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

478. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the annual report for 1964 of the Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 3912. A bill to limit the purposes for which funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may be used; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3913. A bill for the relief of Licking Valley Local School District, Licking County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3914. A bill to provide direct aid to the States and territories for educational purposes only for the benefit of the taxpayers and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3915. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3916. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3917. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 3918. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 3919. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 3920. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND (by request):

H.R. 3921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide an addition to the reserve for bad debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 3922. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3923. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3924. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 3925. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of economic assistance to any country which does not grant to the United States most-favored-nation treatment with respect to the admission of our exports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3926. A bill to establish a U.S. Trading Corporation to meet the challenge of attempted Soviet penetration of world markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3927. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3928. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide that button blanks, regardless of state of finish, shall be subject to the same duty as buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 3929. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3930. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $3,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as retirement annuities or pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3931. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 3932. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the naturalization as citizens of the United States of persons over 50 years of age who have been living in the United States for periods totaling at least 20 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3933. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a preliminary survey of the proposed George Rogers Clark Recreation Way within and adjacent to the Shawnee National Forest in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3934. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3935. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain Spanish-American War veterans eligible for pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 3936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit to an individual taxpayer for tuition and fees paid to an institution of higher education, and to allow a tax credit to all taxpayers for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 3937. A bill to provide annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund in additional cases for certain widows and widowers by eliminating the required period of marriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 3938. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for the purpose of prohibiting certain sales below cost; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3939. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3940. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3941. A bill to repeal the Federal taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage and handbags, general telephone service, general admissions, transportation of persons by air, and safe deposit boxes, effective for period after March 31, 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3942. A bill to permit an individual to obtain coverage under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of service which was not covered employment at the time it was performed, if service of that type has since become covered employment and such individual makes payment of the applicable social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 3943. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 3944. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 3945. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 3946. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 3947. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make certain medical institutions and hospitals engaged primarily in furnishing domiciliary care eligible for donations of surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3948. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in every State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3949. A bill to provide that retired Federal officers and employees shall not be required to pay any fee for admission to national parks, forests, and monuments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3950. A bill to amend section 18 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide free transportation on any railroad carrier subject to that act for individuals receiving pensions or annuities under that act, and for their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3951. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the applicability of benefits under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3952. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to authorize the issuance of subpenas by the U.S. Civil Service Commission in connection with hearings under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3953. A bill to amend chapter 71 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the right of a veteran to appeal to the U.S. district court from the decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in compensation and pension claims shall not be abrogated; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 3954. A bill to amend the act prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States by vessels other than vessels of the United States in order to expand the definition of the term "fisheries"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3955. A bill to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the exvessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3956. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for the duty-free entry of certain kinds of limestone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 3957. A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3958. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 3959. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3960. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3961. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3962. A bill to establish a new program of loans to be made from a revolving fund by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to assist in the provision and rehabilitation of housing for middle-income families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3963. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to provide Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for individuals purchasing dwelling units in cooperative housing projects in the same way that such insurance is provided for individuals purchasing other single-family residences; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3964. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to prohibit the construction of luxury housing in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3965. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require the establishment of more effective procedures for the relocation of individuals, families, and business concerns from the area of urban renewal projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3966. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that individuals, families, and business concerns displaced by an urban renewal project shall have a priority of opportunity to relocate in the project area after its redevelopment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3967. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more adequate relocation payments for individuals, families, and business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3968. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to remove the existing 15 percent limit on the amount of assistance which may be provided thereunder for low-rent public housing in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3969. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to remove the existing dollar limit on the amount of annual contributions which may be contracted for by the Public Housing Administration to assist low-rent public housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3970. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to increase by $1,000 per room the statutory limit on the cost of a low-rent housing project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3971. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to permit occupants of dwelling units in low-rent public housing projects to purchase such units; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3972. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide that a tenant in a low-rent public housing project may not be evicted therefrom without a public hearing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3973. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3974. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to provide that the amount of an individual's medical, dental, and related expenses shall be subtracted from his outside earnings before determining under such section the amount of any reduction in his benefits by reason of such earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3975. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the owner of an apartment building or other multifamily structure to establish and utilize a repair, replacement, and maintenance reserve as a condition of the allowance of a depreciation deduction with respect to such structure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 3976. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1956, to authorize the Muscatine Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 3977. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 3978. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 3979. A bill providing for the distribution and viewing within the United States of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 3980. A bill to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3981. A bill relating to rates of postage on certain materials for blind persons; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3982. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer who is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3983. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income dislocation allowances received by members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3984. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of flags of the United States manufactured in foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 3986. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from overpressures generated by U.S. aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3987. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act in order to extend the provisions of that act to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 3988. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3989. A bill to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3990. A bill to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3991. A bill relating to the retirement of judges of the territorial district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3992. A bill to amend section 753(f) of title 28, United States Code, relating to transcripts furnished by court reporters for the district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3993. A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3994. A bill to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling and paying certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. aircraft at Wichita, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3995. A bill to transfer certain functions to the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3996. A bill to amend provisions of law relating to the settlement of admiralty claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3997. A bill to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3998. A bill to increase the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3999. A bill to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4000. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to relieve applicants from certain provisions of the act if he determines that the granting of relief would not be contrary to the public interest, and that the applicant would not be likely to conduct his operations in an unlawful manner; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 4001. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from gasoline-powered or diesel-powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 4002. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to enforce the duty imposed on each carrier to provide adequate services in connection with the transportation authorized by its certificate of public convenience and necessity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 4003. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the present provisions permitting the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4004. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARSH (by request):

H.R. 4005. A bill to fix the boundary of Shenandoah National Park in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 4006. A bill to make permanent the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954 as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 4007. A bill to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4008. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that a survivor annuitant shall not lose his or her annuity by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after attainment of age 62; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4009. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide that a survivor annuitant spouse under such act shall not lose the survivor annuity by reason of remarriage after attainment of age 62; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4010. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that a widow shall not lose her entitlement to benefits under that title by reason of a remarriage which occurs after she attains age 62; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 4011. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 4012. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title 7 of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4013. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase the minimum amount of the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4014. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4015. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze with only four quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4016. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 4017. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration center at Bonham, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Memorial Veterans Center; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4018. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4019. A bill to amend section 204 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to permit adjudication of the claims of additional persons for certain World War II losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 4020. A bill to reduce the price at which feed grain may be sold by the Commodity Credit Corporation in acute distress areas and major disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4021. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit the issuance of marketing orders for onions for canning or freezing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4022. A bill to supplement the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution with a National Transportation Museum in order to make the complete history of transportation available for the benefit of the people of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4023. A bill to authorize and direct the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, and to provide that such building shall be designated "The President James Madison Memorial Library"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.J. Res. 258. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the apportionment of districts from which members of a State legislature or members of governing bodies of subordinate State units are to be elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 261. Joint resolution limiting the height of certain radio and television antenna towers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.J. Res. 262. Joint resolution to provide for a conference consisting of Federal, State, and local officials, and members of public and private groups or organizations to consider and propose methods of, and to coordinate action for, combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 264. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the selection of a new Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in the office of

Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 266. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations shall not exceed revenues of the United States, except in time of war or national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 267. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a method for nominating and electing judges of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution for establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution authorizing a study of the organization and operation of the Congress, and establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution authorizing a study of the organization and operation of the Congress, and establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Con. Res. 156. Concurrent resolution to provide for the U.S. Information Agency film of the late President John F. Kennedy to be shown in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H. Con. Res. 157. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on increasing the authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Con. Res. 158. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution providing for one General Expenditure Authorization Act for each fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TOLL:

H. Con. Res. 162. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the U.S. mission to the United Nations should seek the adoption by the United Nations of a resolution condemning the recent manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 163. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to recent manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and calling upon the Soviet Union to guarantee human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on increasing the bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H. Res. 150. Resolution to prohibit the Civil Aeronautics Board from discontinuing service by local service airlines until after a thorough review by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 151. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct certain studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 152. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 151; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. Res. 153. Resolution providing for a review of the needs for local airline service by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H. Res. 154. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Res. 155. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 156. Resolution to amend rule XXVIII of the rules of the House to permit 1 hour of debate on a motion to agree or disagree to a conference report; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. Res. 157. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the operation of hospital facilities by the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Res. 158. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 159. Resolution providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 42, a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H. Res. 160. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H. Res. 161. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of small business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 162. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H. Res. 163. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Res. 164. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 165. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H. Res. 166. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TOLL:

H. Res. 167. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Res. 169. Resolution to amend rule XVIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that certain information be contained in committee reports accompanying general appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico: Memorial of the New Mexico State Legislature, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to reconsideration on the order closing the Fort Bayard Hospital by the Veterans' Administration, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to urging Congress to proceed to enact legislation requiring all Government agencies involved to make sufficient funds available to expedite completion of an adequate transportation system on the main roads of national forests and public domain; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to drafting appropriate resolutions of condolences in memory of Sir Winston Churchill; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to requesting such actions as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the U.S. Public Health Service hospital in the Brighton district of Boston; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting such action as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the veterans' facilities at Rutland Heights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protesting the announced closure of the Veterans' Administration hospital located at Miles City, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 4024. A bill for the relief of Lewis H. Nelson III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4025. A bill for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4026. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Porter F. Sheldon, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4027. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ted M. Richardson, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4028. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard A. Ingram and Capt. Arthur R. Sprott, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4029. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John E. McRoberts and T. Sgt. Harold C. Fisher, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 4030. A bill to require, in the alternative, delivery and return of property of the estate of John F. Hackfeld, deceased, vested by the alien property custodian, on the basis of ownership by an enemy alien, or the repayment of income and estate taxes to said estate, collected on the basis of American citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4031. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maureen Fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4032. A bill for the relief of Carlo Antonio DeLuca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 4033. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Dal Bo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4034. A bill for the relief of Andriana K. Anagnostopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4035. A bill for the relief of Vlasis Ritsinias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4036. A bill for the relief of Luigi Giovani Borelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4037. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Bakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4038. A bill for the relief of Zaferios Malamis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Persefoni G. Katarahias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4040. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Demirakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4041. A bill for the relief of Theodore Giannopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4042. A bill for the relief of Antonio Catanzariti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4043. A bill for the relief of John Konstas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 4044. A bill for the relief of Roberto Anaya Pulido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4045. A bill for the relief of Manuel Miranda Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4046. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Guerrero Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4047. A bill for the relief of Abel Cruz Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4048. A bill for the relief of Armando Castillo Valencia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4049. A bill for the relief of Luis Gonzalez Capistran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4050. A bill for the relief of Gilberto Perez Medinia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4051. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Gonzalez Arriaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4052. A bill for the relief of Jose Rosario Becerra Estrada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4053. A bill for the relief of Jesus Becerra Estrada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4054. A bill for the relief of Andres Aguirre Cisneros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4055. A bill for the relief of Jaime Pena Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4056. A bill for the relief of Tomas Rodarte Mireles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4057. A bill for the relief of Loreto Castro Lares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4058. A bill for the relief of Brigido Montoya Iniguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4059. A bill for the relief of Salvador Salazar Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4060. A bill for the relief of Cirilo Gracia Tovar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4061. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Caputo and Carluccia Caputo, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 4062. A bill for the relief of Jankiel Borsuk and wife, Sylvia Borsuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 4063. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wanda Zybaczinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 4064. A bill for the relief of Ivana Geriol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 4065. A bill for the relief of Lt. Donald C. Klien, U.S. Navy, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4066. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4067. A bill for the relief of Joseph Aizig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4068. A bill for the relief of Raffaele and Franceschina Piscitelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 4069. A bill for the relief of Clifton M. Chippewa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 4070. A bill for the relief of Dedrick A. Maanum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4071. A bill for the relief of Prof. Visweswara L. Madhysatha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4072. A bill for the relief of Sylvie D. Bouganim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 4073. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Zuchowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 4074. A bill for the relief of Dr. Soo Hyun Nam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 4075. A bill for the relief of John F. Reagan, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 4076. A bill for the relief of Chung Un Bok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 4077. A bill for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4078. A bill for the relief of William L. Minton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4079. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary C. Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4080. A bill for the relief of Shaoul Shammah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4081. A bill for the relief of Maria Persic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4082. A bill for the relief of Kenneth C. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4083. A bill for the relief of Mr. Leonardo Tusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Paola Campo Amorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4085. A bill for the relief of Francesca Santangelo Ardini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 4086. A bill for the relief of Lauria A. Empleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4087. A bill for the relief of Miss Junia Kirton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 4088. A bill for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4089. A bill for the relief of Dante Giovanni Nomellini, his wife, Lina Nomellini, and their minor children, Adolfo Nomellini and Rosella Nomellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 4090. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Christos Pappas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKIE:

H.R. 4091. A bill for the relief of Jamil Hamady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 4092. A bill for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4093. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Soos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4094. A bill for the relief of the estate of Newton Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4095. A bill for the relief of Serrafettin Tombuloglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 4096. A bill for the relief of Lt. William R. Broadwell, U.S. Navy, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 4097. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rizalino M. and Mrs. Natividad Encarnado Buyoc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4098. A bill for the relief of W. R. Wade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4099. A bill for the relief of Charles Sakellaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4100. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Hennessey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4101. A bill for the relief of Susie Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4102. A bill for the relief of Florencio D. Ponce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4103. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4104. A bill for the relief of Leo Arlington Haynes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4105. A bill for the relief of Flora and William Bisof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4106. A bill for the relief of Wie Lie Bong and Jenny Kim-Yang (nee Lie) Bong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4107. A bill for the relief of Stamo Mihalitsianou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4108. A bill for the relief of Theodora Arvaniti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4109. A bill for the relief of Tong Chik Pak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 4110. A bill for the relief of Mr. Antonino Baiardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4111. A bill for the relief of Jolan Steiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4112. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Garma Alony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4113. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marcelle Bean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4114. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Shimon Beatus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4115. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gerard Frank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4116. A bill for the relief of Marcene Sonja Godfrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4117. A bill for the relief of Domenico Perrotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4118. A bill for the relief of Farid Selim Tawfik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 4119. A bill for the relief of Juliana Barrigos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4120. A bill for the relief of Jorge Antonio Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4121. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ivy Rosalia Ferdinand de Richards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4122. A bill for the relief of Seoung Lek Rim and his wife, Chun Hye Rim (nee Choe); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4123. A bill for the relief of Maria Clara Rua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4124. A bill for the relief of Irfan Mavruk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4125. A bill for the relief of Flora Lee (Shih-yu Li); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4126. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yellamaty Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4127. A bill for the relief of Eliahu Haymovitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 4128. A bill for the relief of Joyce Zohelyn Manderson Tillman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4129. A bill for the relief of Phebe Norman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4130. A bill for the relief of Vladimira Saveri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4131. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Thompson Neesham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4132. A bill for the relief of Librande P. Caltagirone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4133. A bill for the relief of Russell D. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 4134. A bill for the relief of Lessie Mae (Saxon) Wilson and Mrs. Beatrice Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4135. A bill for the relief of Chariklia Karakatsani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4136. A bill for the relief of Joanna Stavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4137. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 4138. A bill for the relief of Julio Machado Mendes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 4139. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eugene E. Laird; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

85. By the SPEAKER: Petition of James R. Frankenberry, Bronxville, N.Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the seating by the House of Representatives of the Representative from the 25th Congressional District of New York; to the Committee on House Administration.

86. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting Congress, through the appropriate committee, to publish and circulate a handbook on Federal governmental abbreviations and explanations thereof; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1965

(Legislative day, January 29, 1965)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of our spirits, who hearest prayer: Breathe upon us now, we beseech Thee, the benediction of Thy holy calm, as those in this forum, to whose hands has been committed the stewardship of public affairs, face the demands of another week.

Lift the burdens of drab duty from jaded hearts, changing stern statutes into glad songs. Soothe the anxieties of our baffled minds, so that with the shield of Thy peace and the sword of Thy truth, we may face—free and fearless—whatever tests this day may bring.

If there is any kindness we can show the comrades by our side, may we not neglect or defer it, seeing that we pass this way but once. Spurning and scorning anything unworthy of our best, may we find our joy only in honor untarnished.

We ask in it the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 29, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 66)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Fourth Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In this report, submitted pursuant to law, the Agency describes its activities for the calendar year 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1965.*

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961—Public Law 87-256, the Fulbright-Hays Act—I transmit herewith the annual report on the international cultural exchange program for the fiscal year 1963.

This report deals with the influence for peace and progress which exchange-of-persons activities have become in the world of the 1960's.

The varying stages of nationhood in the world today require a varying range of relationships on our part. I am convinced that exchanges of persons are uniquely appropriate and unusually effective activities for the needs and opportunities of these times. Such exchanges touch our societies at many points—involving students, teachers, professors, research scholars, athletes, government leaders, judges, economists, labor leaders, social workers, actors, authors, coaches, and many others—a broad panorama of professions and the arts.

In the single year covered by this report, some 10,000 people were overseas from this country, or here from other countries, in the friendly, constructive interchange the United States now sponsors. This exchange involved more than 130 countries and territories.

Congress can take particular and proper pride in this program. Since World War II—with full bipartisan support, as in Public Law 87-256—Congress has fathered and fostered this activity. Many Members of both Houses have a special knowledge of the vital role which exchanges now play in our relations and understandings with other nations. All along the way, the articulate leadership of the Congress has been a major strength for the program's success.

The warm and strong support of the American people likewise deserves our praise. The volunteer services and family hospitality which our citizens and communities give to thousands of students and visitors from other countries is of incalculable value to the interest of international understanding.

I hope that our exchange activities, public and private, may grow. An enlarging investment means an enlarging return—not merely from the understanding others may acquire of us, but from the understanding we acquire of those with whom we share the hopes of these times and the destiny of this planet.

We in the United States have an abiding faith in the value of education to our own society's success, and we are affirming that faith with a new and strengthened commitment to education in America. But education as a force for freedom, justice, and rationality knows no national boundaries—it is the great universal force for good. Our efforts in the exchange programs give that force added strength and justified support. For when we help other peoples achieve their highest and best aspirations, we truly work for understanding, for progress, and for peace. In this work, let us continue with new enthusiasm and confidence, for out of the understandings among peoples will grow peace among nations.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1965*.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 33 of the 87th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints the following to be minority members of the Special Committee on Aging: Senators ALLOTT, MILLER, and PEARSON.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ACTIONS TAKEN BY FEDERAL AGENCIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 88-451

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the actions taken by the Federal agencies under authority of Public Law 88-451, for the period from August 16, 1964, through December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED OR DETAILED TO DUTY AT THE SEAT OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of December 31, 1964, there was an aggregate of 2,167 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FINAL VALUATIONS OF PROPERTIES OF CERTAIN CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on final valuations of the properties of certain carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN CRIMINAL LAWS APPLICABLE TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of that company, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overstated requirements for replacement of high-endurance vessels, eastern area, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred because obsolete weight design goal was used for the design, integration, and test of Nimbus spacecraft by the Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on planned disposals of needed automotive repair parts, Department of the Army, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1391, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to venue (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON FAIR LABOR STANDARDS IN EMPLOYMENTS IN AND AFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports pertaining to fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce, dated January 1965 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

A letter from the Postmaster General transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CIVILIAN POSITIONS

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain civilian positions in that Administration, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"House joint resolution applying to Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the senate concurring therein)*, That this legislature respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; be it further

"*Resolved*, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Approved:

"ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
"Governor."

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE RUTLAND HEIGHTS HOSPITAL

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Massachusetts House of Representatives that the medical-surgical facilities of the Veterans' Administration located at Rutland Heights in the Commonwealth will be closed effective June 30 of the current year; and

"Whereas the closing of this facility is in direct conflict with the general philosophy behind veterans' benefits in the United States as it has evolved over a long period of years and will result in derogation of veterans' benefits; and

"Whereas the removal of this hospital will work a particular hardship on the veterans of the Commonwealth and the present facilities should be retained to serve those who have served so well: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the veterans' facilities at Rutland Heights; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States rescind the order providing for the closing of the medical-surgical facilities located at Rutland Heights; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Surgeon General of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, January 20, 1965.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

The petition of Everett N. Gibson, of Ionia, Mich., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MORNING HOUR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no morning hour. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and other Senators have some questions that they would like to ask when the unfinished business is placed before the Senate.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Judiciary Committee and the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I shall yield, but first I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor so that a few additional Senators may come to the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—SUBMISSION OF MINORITY VIEWS ON INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, I announce that at the conclusion of the vote on the Appalachia bill now pending, it is our intention to call up the nomination of Mr. W. J. Driver to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Following consideration of that subject, the Senate will take up the International Coffee Agreement.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to discuss very briefly the plans for scheduling consideration of the International Coffee Agreement. I have prepared minority views on that subject. If it is agreeable to the majority leader and other Senators, I ask unanimous consent for the privilege of submitting those views for printing tonight so that they will be available tomorrow. They are not now available.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to have the Senator do so. I have discussed that subject with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. We have proceeded on that assumption.

Mr. CARLSON. That is satisfactory to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 3 to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I rise in enthusiastic support of the Appalachian regional development bill.

No region has suffered more from economic fate than Appalachia. No people have been more patient. Shut off by their mountains from many of the benefits of the industrialization of America, they have borne their burden like men, and like men have now found a way to remove it.

This bill is in redemption of promises made to the people of Appalachia for many years. It is a constructive and forward-looking approach. Every dollar authorized is a sound investment. We passed it last year. It should be passed, unencumbered, today.

At the same time, Mr. President, I desire to speak for my own region of New England which, though far in advance of Appalachia in most respects, economically, can benefit greatly by a later extension of what we are doing today.

For a number of years it has been evident that the economic growth of New England and the wages and incomes of our people are not keeping pace with the Nation as a whole. There are areas in many of our States which have had unacceptable levels of employment for well over a decade. There are serious pockets of poverty throughout southern New England, and there are whole areas of poverty across our three northern New England States. For instance, parts of southeastern Massachusetts, the Merrimack Valley, and the Berkshires, in my State, have been in the labor surplus category for over 15 years, and between 20 and 30 percent of the families in Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine have an income of less than $3,000 a year. Similar problems exist in Rhode Island and Connecticut.

Much of the land area of New England has no industrial or other productive activity coming from it. In northern New England the industrial structure is limited to a small number of industries, not sufficiently diversified. At the same time, this area's highway and transportation systems, together with its community facilities relating to health, education, sanitation, housing, and vocational training, are in serious need of improvement in order to encourage new industry to settle in the area.

In the Southern New England States—Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut—the new electronic space age industries have been experiencing fluctuations in employment with the changing needs of technology and defense, and many of our traditional industries such as cotton and wool textiles, shoes, nonelectrical machinery, and furniture are continuing to move out, or go out of business altogether. This has led to a substantial decline of manufacturing jobs, coupled with an increase of available workers who are not being sufficiently absorbed into the industrial and service fields. The result is poverty, disillusionment, and regressive growth.

I do not mean to say that the New England economy is in real danger, or in crisis, or faces anywhere near the long road back to health that Appalachia faces. On the whole, our situation is stronger and stabler than 12 years ago, when President Kennedy addressed himself to its problems from this floor. New England continues to enjoy in a number of its areas a good reputation in education and skills, and in the income of many of its people. We are still the research hub of America. But in marking our progress, we must not overlook the basic problem areas which remain.

Like their northern neighbors, the Southern New England States have serious problems of water pollution, sanitation, substandard housing, and manpower training and rehabilitation. These States shoulder a special burden of mass transit and intercity passenger travel by rail and air. In addition, the population explosion has begun to work a crisis in the educational field. This is especially true with respect to the high school dropout, or graduate who does not have the means for further education, but who must seek work in an increasingly technological and intellectual labor market.

The forests of New England are one of the region's richest resources. We need to develop and protect them through modern methods of conservation and technology. Our fishing industry has a tremendous potential with the increased demand for high protein food in our own country and throughout the world. We must embark on programs of ocean engineering and research to improve and modernize the harvest of valuable materials from the sea.

As population increases, there will be a greater demand for agricultural products, such as milk, poultry, potatoes, and various perishable products. The New England farmer has an excellent competitive advantage in being close to his New England markets, and with a good road system, close to other large cities outside New England. We must utilize new farming and marketing techniques to make better use of our unproductive land.

By 1970 there may have to be a doubling of generating capacity to meet New England's power needs. With an increased growth rate, even more capacity will be needed. We must seek the implementation of new power sources, such as Passamaquoddy, nuclear energy and hydroelectric generation, with grid tieins to sources outside New England. At the moment, we should work together in an all-out effort to eliminate quotas on residual oil in order to keep down manufacturers' fuel costs, and the cost of generating electricity for consumers.

The supply of high-quality water is an important industrial and municipal asset of New England. However, increasing abuse over the past years has impaired the quality of many streams and rivers, and in some instances have periled parts of our fishing industry. There is a basic need for a strong multistate water pollution program. Likewise, we need to develop comprehensive programs for the conservation of water, and greater use of our rivers for recreation, navigational and other purposes.

There is a great untapped potential in the vacation business in New England. With an improved transportation network, and roads, the New England seashores and mountains can become a vast year-round retreat for the people who live and work in our northeastern urban centers. There is ample area for expansion throughout New England in this industry.

One of the most important keys to the economic future of New England is an improved transportation network. A coordinated, easy access, high speed interstate expressway will give industry fast truck service to railheads, seaports and air cargo centers. A rejuvenated and modernized rail freight system, both bulk and piggyback, can help New England maufacturers to reach more domestic markets competitively, can improve the use of the port of Boston for export at cost savings to shippers, and to provide for the fast, efficient supply of materials for industry.

The development of a New England regional air network is also fundamental. With the advance of short-range jets, and improved regional airports and electronic guidance and service equipment, commercial and recreational travel will be stimulated and the need for more frequent schedules will be created.

Of strategic importance is the establishment of fast, new rail passenger and rapid transit service to move people safely and efficiently in and out of our major urban areas. Massachusetts has made a splendid initial effort in creating the Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority to relieve the New England railroads of their commuter passenger burden. But beyond mass transit, studies indicate the feasibility of a high speed intercity rail passenger system between Boston and New York and Washington, with possible extensions to other New England cities. Any substantial development in this direction could have great impact on providing incentives to industry to locate in our areas. Such a system, whether mass transit or intercity, logically fits into the development of a regional growth program.

However, the most crucial area for improvement concerns our human resources. We want to see the President's primary and secondary educational school program lift up the quality and opportunity for modern education in our underprivileged and underdeveloped areas. We need a regional program of vocational education centers, an increased number of regional community colleges, and higher education centers, which can provide intellectual and technological talent to attract industry at the growth centers. We must develop a regional approach to job placement, which might help to clear away some of the confusion that exists today in this area.

We must make a thorough review of our hospital facilities and services, with a view toward providing for modern regional psychiatric, medical, and surgical hospital care, and the use of the latest diagnostic equipment, special treatment rooms, an increase in available beds, and the availability of good nursing care. Of great importance should be the improvement and new construction of nursing care facilities and centers for our older citizens who need attention.

DAY CARE CENTERS

We will require a broadening of our welfare services, better programs to combat juvenile crime, and an expanded poverty program, all a vital part of any regional recovery program. Many of our New England cities have begun to take on a new look of progress thanks to the urban renewal program, but much more, especially in the field of housing, has to be accomplished. Logically, the accelerated development and improvement of urban growth areas is fundamental to any long-range growth plan.

Our communities must be helped in meeting their burden of water sewage and sanitation services through coordinated Federal-State assistance programs. The increasing costs to growing communities to build local roads and streets can be offset by more Federal funds for major intercity highways.

All of these basic improvement programs are critical to New England's economic improvement. I speak of them today because we are about to pass a bill that embodies the best possible approach to regional development. What Appalachia has done can be a model for all regions.

Our main concern is to concentrate Federal and State funds in a manner which will do the most good on a long-range basis. This can only mean that we cannot stop at borders of our communities, or of our counties, or even our States, to bolster areas of lagging economy. We must coordinate the potential of regions and subregions to lift up and stimulate the distressed and underdeveloped centers that are the logical ones for future growth.

The need for a special Federal-State economic development program is by no means peculiar to New England, or to Appalachia. It exists in varying degrees in many other sections of the country. It concerns multi-State regions, as well as isolated areas. It involves cities, the poorer suburbs, the rural areas, and underdeveloped lands. President Johnson has indicated his awareness of this need for regional planning in his state of the Union message, when he called for "a regional recovery program to assist the development of stricken areas left behind by our national progress." In a recent speech before the AFL-CIO National Legislative Conference, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] chairman of the Senate's Select Subcommittee on Poverty and its Public Works Committee, recommended that special funds be appropriated to a National Regional Development Council which would then allocate them for expenditure by Federal agencies in accordance with plans approved by regions and local redevelopment districts. Other legislators are coming forward to request that their regions be included in the Appalachia legislation pending before the Congress, both for the purpose of study, and for special aid. This is healthy and necessary. It should not encumber the Appalachia bill. It should supplement it. Indeed, there is very active consideration of regional growth planning at all levels of government, from the city and county planners to the

White House. Now is time for those of us in New England to get busy, and prepare our plans for economic improvement, so that we can be ready to advise the President of our needs when this new legislation becomes effective.

Of particular interest in the anticipation of Federal assistance for growth programs are the projections of Dr. Walter Heller, former Chief of the Council of Economic Advisers, who estimates that up to $6 billion a year in new revenues may be available in the next few years for additional Federal spending. Dr. Heller suggests that this money be returned to the States in the form of a rebate, but I feel that this approach is lacking in both guidelines and control and would be neither politically feasible, nor economically effective. Rather, a better approach to assisting the States in their public improvements and growth might be to apply these additional revenues within the limitations of regional growth programs. Based upon the real needs of the communities and coordinated by Federal authority.

It was President Kennedy who, during his first months as a Senator, called for the "united efforts of the entire New England delegation" to seek and promote solutions for New England's economic ills. The President strongly supported the idea of a New England Governors' conference, and as both a legislator and as President, he gave serious attention to the Governors' recommendations. It was largely through his stimulation that the New England Senators formed a conference group for the discussion of basic problems, and he strongly supported the work of the New England Council, representing some 2,000 New England businessmen, labor organizations, consumer and financial groups.

These have been worthy efforts. All of these organizations have been continuously concerned with New England's economic future, they have done an excellent job; but a broader and more coordinated approach is needed. A New England regional development program, under Federal-State coordination is a logical extension of what we have done in the past.

HOW WE CAN DEVELOP THE PROGRAM

The concept of a broad, regional economic growth program, developed and coordinated by one authority in which all the States of the region participate, is a great step ahead in Government planning.

The first task of such a group would be to make an economic base study and industrial analysis of the New England region and its subregions. It could collect all existing studies of the region, of the States and of the political subdivisions completed during the past 10 years, and identify each of the research projects which are presently in process by Federal, State and local agencies. This information would be analyzed by a broad group of working teams, which could conduct further investigations in order to provide the latest background material for the study. Industry, labor, the consumer, and the academic profession should be asked to participate in this study.

Hopefully, within a year there could be a first report with recommendations as to those basic growth problems which need immediate and special financial assistance, and Federal-State coordination. Its recommendations could be of a regional, or subregional nature, depending upon the extent of the problems. It is most important that study take into consideration local development districts in the framing of regional programs.

In addition, the report could give us preliminary recommendations as to how these programs could be implemented, and suggest new areas of legislation directed to regional development. This regional planning program should be concerned first with the improvement of public facilities and public resources, to assist the underprivileged areas and to bolster the economy. Thus its emphasis initially might be on education, roads, housing, health facilities, transportation, sanitation, or manpower training. However, the program must also be concerned with the private sector, such as methods of improving investment in new industry; better use of our natural resources—water, forests, fisheries, vacation areas—the stimulation of greater export activity; and more effective ways of advertising the advantages of New England to the business community.

We have in our New England States some of the best academic institutions in the world. Many of these schools have departments and programs specifically directed to the study of social and economic problems and their solutions. There are nationally known experts in regional planning presently located in our State universities and in our larger private universities, such as Harvard, Yale, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston College, Boston University, and others. Our State commerce and planning departments have a wealth of information which can be utilized in order to put together the broad picture. We are in excellent shape to begin the task which, I am confident, will be one of the most important things that New England has undertaken in recent years.

NEW ENGLAND MUST ACT NOW

For some time, I have felt that New England should follow the lead of the Appalachian States in moving ahead its own growth plan. As we know, the Appalachian Governors joined with Federal agency representatives and experts to form the Appalachian Regional Commission and make a comprehensive study of the economic and social needs of an 11-State area, reaching from New York to Georgia. Within a year, this group sent to the President a detailed report, together with recommendations for special regional action programs designed to rehabilitate the Appalachian area, and spur its economic growth. This effort, in turn, has led to the bill before us. I think this is a good bill, and I intend to support it.

This cooperative approach of State and Federal experts, legislators, and others to promote an effective regional development plan is a significant example for New England. I feel that now is the time for us in New England to find out where we stand, and how we, as a community of States, mutually dependent and traditionally associated, can develop the great potential of New England for the benefit of all New Englanders. By cooperation, and by organization, I believe that we, too, can fashion an effective regional program, and present our case with the same persuasive enthusiasm as did the Appalachian Governors and their congressional delegation.

I am confident that the administration looks favorably on such a regional program. I have received assurances from the administration that it intends to include, in the new area redevelopment bill, soon to come to Congress, provisions for setting up regional organizations to study, recommend and coordinate broad Federal-State programs of economic improvement for distressed and underdeveloped areas, and that this will include New England.

I am further encouraged by the letter from the Bureau of the Budget, which the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] has submitted for the record indicating further the administration's views on regional development. The letter states in part:

> The President is convinced that we can apply the sound principles of regional economic planning toward assisting in the economic redevelopment of depressed areas throughout the Nation. The proposals which we will submit will provide the authority and funds to accomplish this purpose.

I am hopeful that in the debate in the Senate today on the Appalachia bill we may further clarify the legislative and administrative direction in which we will go in this area of regional economic development, after the Appalachia bill is passed.

I should like to say that I was pleased to cosponsor the legislation introduced last Thursday by the senior Senator from Michigan, providing for the establishment of regional growth studies, which I feel could be a sound first step in moving ahead with realistic regional development programs. I am also looking forward with interest to the development of a broader bill which may be introduced by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], establishing regional commissions patterned after the Appalachia Regional Commission, and providing for special funds for action programs to meet basic regional needs in public improvements and economic recovery.

At the same time, I have been working with my staff with experts to develop various legislative approaches to regional economic development which would be effective in the New England area. These, in essence, would seek the coordination and concentration of existing Federal assistance in programs and in areas where it would be best for long-range growth, and would provide for special assistance to those regional programs which have priority in importance, and need immediate acceleration to be effective. The emphasis of this legislation I am considering is not so much on regional planning as it is on making the plans work. I shall have more to say on this in the near future.

I intend to support and promote this regional approach to economic growth during this Congress. I feel that the Appalachia legislation is a good start, but that those of us from other regions where economic distress and underdevelopment are substantial, should now move rapidly ahead to frame our own programs, and develop legislation which will provide for our basic growth needs.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and a letter be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUSKIE

I commend my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], on his active interest in and promotion of the concept of regional planning for New England. I am convinced that this approach, coupled with regional development based on such planning, offers real hope for economic revival and growth in our region. Economic need is not limited to Appalachia and regional economic unity is as apparent in New England as it is in the 11-State region which has been designated as Appalachia.

New England's identity as a region predates the independence of our Nation. It has continued throughout our history with an accelerating effort to create institutions which recognize and take advantage of our geographic, economic, and social interdependence. We do not always see eye to eye on specific issues, but we recognize that our fortunes are ultimately intertwined.

We also recognize that the pockets of poverty and economic distress cannot be treated as isolated problems. The ills of a single community or group of communities are influenced by, and influence, the health or disability of a region. Furthermore, economic problems tend to repeat themselves throughout a region—as, for example, in the case of the New England textile industry.

I support the Appalachia bill (S. 3) because I believe the Nation has a responsibility toward the people who live in that region and because I believe the Nation's economic health is affected by the problems of Appalachia. In addition, I believe the attention and the treatment being given Appalachia should be applied in New England and in other similar regions.

The administration, through the Budget Bureau, has advised us of its general intention to assist regional planning and development under the Area Redevelopment Act. This has been set forth in a letter I received from Mr. Phillip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, dated January 27, 1965, which I attach to this statement. The details of that approach have not been spelled out, but we anticipate that they should be in a message from the President. Senator McNAMARA, of Michigan, in his regional development bill (S. 812)—which I have cosponsored—suggests a different Federal approach to regional development.

We have not had an opportunity to examine these proposals so as to decide on the best vehicle for regional planning and development which incorporates Federal, State, and local assistance and cooperation. The administration and the Congress should do so without delay. Passage of the Appalachia bill (S. 3) does not relieve us of our regional development responsibilities. Those responsibilities can only be met with a sound Federal program which offers comparable financial and technical assistance for regional planning and for the programs and projects necessary to implement such plans on a regional basis.

I am pleased to join with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and my other New England colleagues in announcing our determination to obtain the same kind of assistance we are supporting for the region designated as Appalachia.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1965.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: During consideration of the Appalachian Regional Development Act (S. 3), a number of Senators have raised questions about the administration's intentions with respect to making provision for redevelopment planning on a regional basis for other areas of the country.

The President is aware of the benefits to be gained from planning and carrying out economic redevelopment along regional lines. For areas outside of Appalachia, however, the appropriate regional groupings vary widely in terms of their size, their economic problems, and their economic resources. As a consequence, the careful definition of regional boundaries and the development of regional plans can best be undertaken as part of a general program for area redevelopment.

With this in mind, the administration intends to propose very shortly, as part of the extension and improvement of the Area Redevelopment program, measures to encourage and assist regional planning for the redevelopment of distressed areas.

The President is convinced that we can apply the sound principles of regional economic planning toward assisting in the economic redevelopment of depressed areas throughout the Nation. The proposals which we will submit will provide the authority and funds to accomplish this purpose.

Sincerely yours,
PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has marked his return to the Senate with a significant statement on the need for a coordinated program to deal with the problems of the New England area. New England's problems cannot be compared to the problems of the Appalachian region in terms of economic severity. My own State of Connecticut is prosperous and growing and we are working on those few pockets of unemployment and underemployment that do occur from time to time. But Connecticut and all of New England—and all the other regions of the Nation—can take a page from Appalachia's book and begin to think and plan for the future in terms of regional growth and development.

This is true and necessary not just in the economic field, but in others as well. Pollution, for instance, is not the problem of one State alone in New England, or anywhere for that matter. Even now a Federal water pollution control enforcement case is pending between the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut. This problem must be attacked on a regional basis if it is to be successfully solved.

Transportation is another example of the need for regional action. Last week the Governors of Connecticut and New York joined together in an effort to solve the desperate commuter problem on the New Haven Railroad. The entire transportation problem requires regional solution. Again, one State alone cannot solve the problem alone.

For these reasons I have joined with the Senator from Massachusetts in cosponsoring S. 812, introduced last week by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] providing for the establishment of regional growth studies. This is a good first step forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Appalachia bill. But, before I do so, let me say how pleased I was to hear the voice of the junior Senator from Massachusetts in the Senate Chamber. We missed him and are very happy to see him back again.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am sorry that I had to be present at a meeting of the Appropriations Committee to hear Under Secretary of State Ball and thus missed the speech of my colleague, Senator KENNEDY. However, I had an opportunity to read the speech that he just delivered. We have many problems in New England.

I intend to vote for the Appalachia bill. I believe that Congress should give consideration to the problems which exist in New England.

I commend the junior Senator from Massachusetts for bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by my colleague. The senior Senator from Massachusetts has been concerned with these problems over a long period of time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for giving me the privilege to join the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in expressing the view that we both share in hearing the junior Senator from Massachusetts speak again in this forum.

It is also gratifying to know that both the Senators from Massachusetts feel that there are problems within that area which demand the cooperative partnership spelled out in the pending proposal.

I assure the Senators from Massachusetts that within the Committee on Public Works, there will be every prompt, yet thorough, effort made not only to study the bill, but also to listen to those persons, including the Senators from Massachusetts, who come before the committee with comprehensive and constructive programs. I believe the programs which exist in many areas of the country—as I have indicated more than once in the Senate Chamber, including September 25, last year, when the Appalachian bill was under debate—should be given attention.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering the Appalachian Development Act of 1965, a legislative measure aimed at helping the mountainous Appalachian region—an area which has been bypassed by America's growing economic prosperity.

The public works and economic development legislation we are considering here today is not a welfare dole for Appalachia. It is a carefully prepared program aimed at helping resourceful people to help themselves.

It has been authoritatively estimated that our gross national product would be $12 billion higher this year if Appalachia's economy was equal to the national level. Our Nation cannot afford to continue supporting such an economic burden. I think this is the reason why so many of my non-Appalachian colleagues are supporting this regional development program.

This legislation is designed to strike at the heart of the cause of Appalachian poverty. Combined with programs initiated by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, it will form a total approach for concerted community action to establish the Great Society.

Frequently I am asked by people unfamiliar with Appalachia what makes it different from other regions of our country?

Appalachia is a 167,000-square-mile rural area, comprising all or part of 11 great States and 355 counties. Only 30 percent of its population live in cities of over 10,000 as compared to 56 percent of our Nation's total population.

The average Appalachian farm produces an annual crop worth only $1,000. Contrast this with the average non-Appalachian farm income of about $4,000. Most Appalachian farmers labor hard to eke out a bare subsistence from their poor hillsides.

Thousands of small communities have not been able to construct badly needed sewer and water systems, decent schools, and hospitals; items that we recognize as essential to the health and well-being of people in a modern technological society. The lack of an adequate tax base frequently makes it impossible for these communities to improve their facilities without outside financial assistance. These communities have been prevented from participating in existing Federal aid programs because they are too poor to raise their share of the needed matching funds.

The major Appalachian industries—mining and agriculture—are declining employers. Vast sections of the region lack any form of manufacturing, particularly in the nonurban areas.

Appalachia's mountainous terrain frequently makes it difficult to locate suitable industrial sites. Much of the flat area requires flood protection before it is usable. Access is a continuing and real problem. Good roads are urgently needed to develop tourism and attract industry. These roads would link the heart of Appalachia with the markets of the eastern seaboard and the Midwest. Additional roads would run north and south through the great mountain valleys. These improvements must be made if Appalachia's disproportionately high rate of unemployment is to be reduced. Improved roads will not do the job alone; there is a need for improved rail and air transportation. Railroads, where they exist, are being permitted to deteriorate while many cities in the area either lack or have unsafe airports.

The mountainous terrain makes it imperative that airports in the region have the best navigation and safety facilities available. Only then will commercially scheduled airlines be able to service them adequately.

Two million people left their Appalachian homes during the past 10 years to join the work forces of the surrounding metropolitan centers. They left seeking greater opportunity. Most were young. Some were the skilled and well-educated—needed to provide the leadership in the impoverished communities they left; many were the unskilled unemployables who added to the burdens of city health and welfare programs. Appalachia is the only region in our country that has experienced a large out-migration during the past 15 years.

The picture is not all bleak however. Wonderful opportunities exist for the people of Appalachia if we provide them with the financial assistance they need to begin on their ambitious and farsighted economic development programs.

Appalachia extends from New York to Georgia, near and across several giant urban complexes. Its natural resources of rainfall, timber, coal, yet undiscovered minerals, farm land, and scenery can and must be properly developed—for the good of our entire Nation.

Coal, the major resource of Appalachia, continues to decline in use as a fuel, but modern research promises new and more profitable uses for it.

New methods of utilizing timber and the rapidly growing need for wood products provides the Appalachian region with an increasing market for its forest products. The United States today has to import millions of dollars worth of wood products each year.

I believe that the development of proper timber farming programs can go far toward meeting our domestic timber needs.

Agricultural employment will continue to decline as it has in the past, but many Appalachian farms can be made more profitable. Perhaps most important is the fact that farmland will play an increasing role in conservation and recreation as our Nation becomes more and more urbanized.

Earlier, I pointed out that Appalachia lies between two giant population centers. In time to come, half of the Nation's population will look to this scenic mountain area as a year-round playground. The creation of lakes, using double purpose dams, will not only serve to increase recreational opportunities but will also insure a constant water supply for a major portion of the Eastern United States. Deep Creek Lake in Garrett County, Md., is a shining example of how an artificial lake can increase the economic opportunities of an area.

We are all aware that many fine colleges and universities are located in Appalachia. Needless to say, their continued growth is essential to the region. I do not need to tell you of the importance of facilities for higher education in an expanding technological society. Increasingly, modern industry is seeking locations convenient to education and research centers.

Appalachia has the potential to be part of President Johnson's Great Society. I am convinced it will be part of that society if we give it the financial assistance necessary to break through the vicious and continuing circle of poverty which has firmly gripped the region.

Maryland's three westernmost counties fall within the purview of Appalachian poverty and within the promises of Appalachian development. The economic future of Allegany, Garrett, and Washington Counties will largely depend upon the passage and successful execution of the Appalachian Development Act.

The Appalachian counties of Maryland are typical of vast areas of the region. Although they represent 15 percent of the State's total land area, they accommodate only 6.3 percent of the State's population.

The economic difficulties of Appalachian Maryland trace back over a period of 40 years. The decrease in coal mining and agriculture and the more recent decline in railroading have all contributed to the existing unhealthy economic situation.

The coal mines which once employed 6,000 provide jobs for only 500 today.

Farming provides employment for one-third of the work force in Garrett County, but in Allegany and Washington Counties for only 5 and 3 percent respectively.

Persistent unemployment coupled with low income and inadequate housing and school facilities in much of the area has resulted in the heavy out-migration typical of the Appalachian region.

In 1963, the per capita income in the State of Maryland was $2,314. During this same year, per capita income in Appalachian Maryland ranged from only $1,272 in Garrett County to $1,935 in Washington County. In other words, per capita income in Garrett County was only 55 percent of that found in the rest of the State.

Unemployment has decreased as a result of the Nation's renewed economic prosperity under the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, but underemployment remains a major problem in the rural area.

The percentage of substandard housing ranges from 20 percent in Allegany County to 39 percent in Garrett County.

Appalachian Maryland does however share in the potential of the entire 11-State region despite its present handicaps.

Our State government has worked hard in cooperation with local and Federal authorities to improve highways going into the area. Other programs dealing with water resource development, new and better housing, new and expanded educational facilities and hospitals, park and recreational development, public utility expansion, and industrial development have been carried as far as existing finances will permit.

I am proud that it was the Governor of my own State who, in 1960, called the first conference of Appalachian Governors to consider what action had to be taken to solve the region's problems.

In Maryland, special attention is focused on our Appalachian counties through the newly created State office of economic opportunity. This office's director also serves as the Governor's representative to the President's Appalachian Regional Commission.

I know from personal experience that there is active leadership in all three counties—Allegany, Garrett, and Washington. They have wrestled with their problems for many years, only to be forced to curtail their plans because of insufficient sources of revenue.

The three counties, having recognized their many common problems, are working together with the State and Federal authorities. An Appalachian Maryland Community Action Committee has been organized under the leadership of my good and very able friend, the Honorable R. Samuel Dillion, Jr. This tricounty group symbolizes the cooperative spirit that I find existing in Appalachia. Each county delegation consists of a State legislator, a county elected official, a representative from business and one from organized labor.

This kind of broad representation is essential if the economic development of Appalachia is to succeed. Government, business and labor must work together to do the job. One billion dollars spread over 167,000 square miles of hills, mountains and valleys will not do very much unless it is carefully spent and unless it results in stimulating the private sector of Appalachia's economy.

I strongly believe that the Appalachian Development Act will help greatly to inspire confidence in the future of the region. This in turn will help to generate hundreds of millions of dollars in private economic activity. Appalachia will not only become a greater producer—but also a greater consumer.

Specifically, what will S. 3 do to help develop Appalachia's potential?

Title II, section A of the bill, creates a number of new programs that the President's Appalachian Regional Commission recommended as necessary to meeting the special problems confronting the region.

Over 80 percent of all the funds authorized—$840 million—will be spent on a 5-year road building program. Federal funds would be provided on a matching basis for a carefully planned network of development and access roads.

Seventeen million dollars is provided for land improvement and erosion control. Grants to any landowner under this section will be permitted up to a maximum of 80 percent of the cost of improving and developing 25 acres.

Five million dollars will be authorized to assist the development of private nonprofit timber development organizations. Such groups will result in the better utilization of existing timber resources.

Twenty-one and a half million dollars will be earmarked for mining area restorations. Such activities may include sealing and filling in abandoned coal mines, and expanding and accelerating fish and wildlife restoration projects.

Five million dollars is authorized for water resource surveys. Such surveys are necessary if a practical plan for efficient water utilization is to be developed.

Title II, section B, supplements and modifies existing programs so that they are better able to meet the real needs of Appalachia.

Sixteen million dollars would be available for the construction of the vocational education facilities needed to train people so that they can obtain employment.

Sixteen million dollars would be authorized to construct sewage treatment works. Such facilities are essential to prevent the continued pollution of the region's streams. The pollution that now occurs almost always takes place above the water intake of most urban areas in the eastern half of our country.

The Housing Act of 1954 is amended to allow for comprehensive planning for the Appalachian region using 701 funds.

Ninety million dollars is authorized to supplement existing Federal grant-in-aid programs. This is a key feature. It would permit many impoverished communities to make necessary improvements that would otherwise be impossible. Many Appalachian communities have previously been denied Federal assistance because they could not raise the needed local contribution. The authorization of this supplemental section is most important.

This legislation is designed to further enhance the partnership of Federal, State, and local governments. It specifically encourages a cooperative effort. Furthermore, it clearly prevents a possible diminution in State financial participation.

I urge the prompt passage of this vitally important legislation so that the development of Appalachia can move forward. The promise of Federal assistance has given the people of the Appalachian Mountains reason for hope with the prospect of a bright future. There is no doubt in my mind that as Appalachia prospers—so will the rest of the Nation.

I am proud to have had a part in the initial consideration of this proposal as a member of the Public Works Committee in the last Congress. I have spoken for its prompt enactment on numerous occasions. I shall cast my vote for it today, and work for its effective implementation in Maryland tomorrow. I urge all my colleagues, Appalachian and non-Appalachian, to do likewise.

Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for the careful hearings that he has conducted and for the leadership role that he has personally undertaken in the development of this program toward the passage of the bill which we all anticipate today.

ACTION FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. **NELSON**. Mr. President, the Senate has had before it two proposed amendments, which I sponsored, one which would create an Upper Great Lakes Regional Development Authority and one which would simply authorize funding for research and planning needed in other depressed regions of the Nation.

I have cosponsored the upper Great Lakes regional development amendment because I believe this region of the country is not only much in need, but because its people are organized, its officials are aware of the region's problems, and because basic research and general planning for the development of this area has already been done. In short, the region is ready to go—and I believe we should move now to establish a development authority and get on with the work of changing, improving, and generally upgrading the region's economy.

But the upper Great Lakes region is not the only one which has lagged behind the Nation. There are many other regions which are not meeting the problems of a growing, changing America. As the President said in his state of the Union address: We should establish and "carry out a new program to develop regions of our country now suffering from distress and depression."

The second amendment before the Senate speaks to this general problem. It recognizes that there are many areas in the country which suffer from regional problems, but which are not ready to go in the sense that all of the preparation has been done for the establishment of a commission and for immediate action. What these areas need is the kind of work which resulted in the detailed, full-blown legislation now being considered for Appalachia. They need support, guidance, and help in the development of immediate action plans.

The second amendment would amend the Appalachia legislation simply to authorize immediate planning for no more than six other regions which generally meet the criteria established in the statement of purpose of the Appalachia bill approved by the Senate last year.

The amendment would not establish new commissions nor authorize major expenditures. It would only provide $10 million for immediate planning which would help other qualified depressed regions to prepare carefully drafted plans and proposals, as was done in the preparation of the Appalachia bill.

No more than $2.5 million could be spent on regional planning in any one area.

The planning would be authorized only if the basic research and public sentiment of the region were sufficiently solid so that a viable action plan for development could be produced in 18 months.

Most important, passage of the amendment would put the Congress on record for immediate regional development action.

In addition to the upper Great Lakes area, the standards in this bill might be met by the Ozarks; the northwestern mountain regions; parts of the New England area; the desert high plateau-Four Corners area of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona; the upper Great Plains area; and parts of the Deep South.

I am a cosponsor of the Appalachia legislation. I believe that now, at the time we approve action for one depressed area of the country, we should also begin to act for the other needy regions of the Nation. There is no reason to wait.

I recognize that the Public Works Committee has before it a bill authored by the chairman, Senator McNamara. This would authorize the President to go beyond my amendment. It would authorize him to establish not only a number of areas for full development work, but regional development commissions along the lines of the Appalachian Commission.

I believe this bill is a good one. It is, in fact, part of a much broader bill described by Senator McNamara in a recent speech proposing a new National Regional Development Council as part 2 in the war against poverty. Both the more limited bill, and the broader one, I believe, are constructive efforts to aid the depressed regions of this Nation. They deserve sympathetic review, and, although I have not yet had a chance to study either measure with care, in principle, I believe they should be supported.

I also recognize that the Bureau of the Budget, through a lower official—Phillip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference—has made commitments to Senator Muskie regarding regional development planning funds through ARA programs. Again, this is all to the good, although I am not satisfied that the commitments are sufficiently specific, nor that they will put the Congress or the administration fully on record in support of the idea of new development authorities with adequate power to carry out planning, development, training, and public works programs designed to alleviate the distress within such regions as New England, the Upper Great Lakes, the Upper Great Plains, the Ozarks, the Four Corners, and others.

Nonetheless, the commitments offered by the Bureau of the Budget are welcome ones. The only question before us is whether the Congress should also make some commitments—more specific ones—and I, for one, feel that it should.

There is no reason, so far as I can see, why Congress should wait to mark with its approval the idea of full development planning for other regions in the Nation. At the time we are voting approval in specific for one region of the country—Appalachia—I think we should also vote approval in principle for other regions. And we should authorize funds for the development of action plans for such regions. There is no reason to wait. Planning can begin immediately. Hopefully, within a year or 18 months, we will have before us solid, specific, carefully designed and practical proposals which will permit us to take a major step forward for other regions such as we are now taking in the case of Appalachia. To wait for further study of proposals which might only involve further study would be to further delay the start of a constructive regional development process which we can begin today.

I do not wish to take the Senate's time with a full description of the problems of all the Nation's regions. But let me sketch out, as examples, the problems of some of the regions.

In my own upper Great Lakes region, there are pockets of extreme poverty. Unemployment much higher than the national average persists. An unemployment rate three times the national average is not uncommon in this region in the winter months. A year ago the Upper Peninsula of Michigan had an unemployment rate of 14.6 percent. The last detailed census figures taken in 1960 showed a regional unemployment rate of 8.6 percent compared to 7.1 percent for Appalachia, a rate 20 percent above that of Appalachia. Families in the poverty class—under $3,000 in annual income—are 25.9 percent of the population as compared with the national share of 21.4 percent.

Because of the fall in job opportunities, the younger people are leaving the north woods. The aged remain. In my own State of Wisconsin, current estimates show that over 80 percent of the area included in the upper Great Lakes region lost population in the last 5 years. This area now has only about 7 percent of the population of Wisconsin. Yet its share of the number of recipients of State public assistance for the aged is 17 percent.

Figures for last year show that the overall dependency rate for this area is 5 percent higher than its share of the State population. These figures do not show, however, how hard it is for the people of the north woods to turn to public welfare.

In my longer presentation last Friday on the need for an Upper Great Lakes Development Authority, I attempted to show how regional development for this region could be implemented—and how, especially, the region's magnificent recreational resources might be wisely and economically utilized. I would like to call the Senate's attention to this longer presentation, for I believe it may speak of the problems not only of my area, but of other depressed areas with similar problems and similar prospects.

Indeed, another such area may well be that of the Ozarks. I would hope that development planning for this region could be started immediately if my amendment were to pass. Senator Fulbright has recently described the problem of the Ozarks in a letter to Senator McNamara supporting my amendment, as follows:

> In justification of a special Appalachian program the Appalachian Regional Commission cited the fact that as of 1960 30.7 percent Appalachian families had an annual income of less than $3,000 against 20.5 percent for the balance of the United States. By the same 1960 census the percentage of families in northern Arkansas with incomes of less than $3,000 was substantially greater. The following counties are representative:
>
> | | *Percent* |
> |---|---|
> | Stone County | 78.0 |
> | Newton County | 76.7 |
> | Fulton County | 70.2 |
> | Searcy County | 69.8 |
> | Madison County | 68.8 |
> | Sharp County | 67.7 |
>
> As you will note from a map of the region these counties constitute the core of northern Arkansas.
>
> The President's Commission also noted the close association between education and economic development. As of 1960 11.6 percent of the persons over 25 years of age in Appalachia had less than a fifth-grade education against 8 percent for the balance of the United States. The overall figure for Arkansas was 15.4 percent and for the Ozark mountain counties to which I have referred as follows:
>
> | | *Percent* |
> |---|---|
> | Stone County | 16.4 |
> | Newton County | 15.5 |
> | Fulton County | 12.4 |
> | Searcy County | 12.3 |
> | Madison County | 14.5 |
> | Sharp County | 14.3 |

Recently, addressing the Senate, like Senator Fulbright, Senator McGovern described problems in his own Upper Great Plains area as follows:

> Economic growth of the region has lagged behind that of the Nation as a whole because of drought, unwise requirement of cultivation of some lands in the early homestead laws, and necessary readjustments, lack of development of economic means for utilizing lignite and similar large but lower grade mineral resources, major dependency on farm income which is depressed, and need for development projects.

Senator McGovern, too, in collaboration with Senators Metcalf, Burdick, and McGee, has urged a regional solution to his area's problems.

And so, too, has Senator Montoya. He must contend with the regional problems of the desert high plateau area where the four corners of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona come together. His region has not participated in the economic growth which is enjoyed by other sections of the Southwest and of the Nation. The people have been left behind as the people of Appalachia have been left behind—trapped in a mire of economic and social problems.

The land of the four corners region is a dry and rugged land with often breathtaking scenery. It is the land of the painted deserts and deep canyons. It is also a land of unemployment on Indian reservations and unemployment in the towns. When farmed, the lands provides a very meager living.

A good portion of the land in this region is in Apache, Navajo, and other Indian reservations. Though much has been done by the Federal Government, and much has been done by the Indians themselves, the economic problems of our Indian Americans in this region is still staggering. In Apache County, in the northwest corner of Arizona, 70 percent of the population is Indian. It is shocking to note that over 52 percent of the families in this county had incomes in 1959 which were under the poverty level of $3,000. This compares to 21 percent for the entire State, in itself a percentage that is disturbingly high.

Figures on education are equally appalling. Fifty percent of the adult population in Apache County had completed less than 5 years of school in 1960, compared to only 10 percent for the State as a whole.

In New Mexico, 35,000 Indians, over 60 percent of the State's total, live in San Juan and McKinley Counties adjacent to Arizona's Apache County. In McKinley County, which is over half Indian, 37 percent of all families had incomes under $3,000. Over a third of the total adult population has failed to go beyond the fifth grade of school.

In San Juan County, which has fewer Indians than McKinley, the county was near the State's income and education level. Among its Indian population, however, less than half of the adults had gone beyond fifth grade and the Indian family income was $1,572.

This region might well be considered for immediate action planning.

These are not the only ones which deserve attention. In a recent speech, Senator Muskie described the problems of New England. A great expert on Federal-State relations, Senator Muskie suggested the vital importance of regional development and interstate cooperation. He emphasized, for his own region, that:

> Citizens of our region have every right to expect—yes, to demand—that public powers and responsibilities be shared to insure that no problems are ignored; that each level of government is equipped to do its part of the job competently; that each problem is dealt with effectively; and that each jurisdiction has enough authority to meet its responsibilities but no more.

Senator Muskie has given me much help in connection with the amendment we are now considering, and I wish here and now to publicly thank him for his support, and to suggest that parts of the New England region deserve the attention of the Federal Action Plan Administrator my amendment seeks to establish.

With time, one could describe the detailed problems of many regions of the Nation. But the information is readily available for all to see. Suffice it to point out, as one further example, that another cosponsor of my amendment is Senator Frank Church. He has made available to me a report, prepared by the ARA, which details some of the problems of his State:

> The Idaho Panhandle area has a diversified economy, but one which is seriously affected by the problem of unemployment and underemployment due to the seasonal nature of its basic industries—lumbering, mining, tourism, and agriculture. The winter months represent the nadir of economic activity and the summer months, the peak.

The ARA study offers much hope for the region—if proper steps are taken to expand and develop recreational activities. But the panhandle is only part of one region—a region which involves the neighboring States of Washington and Montana. Again, I believe this northwestern mountainous area might well meet the criteria for action planning set out in my amendment.

Such are some of the problems of some of the regions of the Nation. I do not claim to be an expert on this question. I do know, however, that my own region and others lag substantially behind the rest of the Nation in economic growth; have an uneven past development which has not permitted self-sustaining growth; have demonstrated that local people and governments are prepared for immediate planning and development; have common problems which make a regional solution feasible.

And because there are regions which meet these criteria—which are the general ones established in the statement of purpose of the Appalachia bill—I believe we should begin to work for them now. My amendment will permit us to do so. And it would authorize a careful review of all relevant information to determine precisely which regions are appropriate and ready for regional treatment.

Perhaps the best way to look at the problem is to recognize that some regions have fallen far behind the Nation as a whole. Others are only now beginning to slip behind. For the first, action now will help pull the regions up. For the second, action now will stop the slide downward and, hopefully reverse it. For both, what is needed is an action plan—a plan which cannot hope to solve all problems, but which can offer hope to begin the solution of many.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], under date of January 22, 1965, by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 22, 1965.

Hon. Pat McNamara,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I know that the Public Works Committee has sought to conclude its consideration of the Appalachian redevelopment bill as soon as possible, and for that reason I have not asked to appear before the committee. I hope, however, that the comments in this letter will receive your careful consideration before the bill is reported to the Senate.

The report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission from which the pending bill was developed is an excellent review of the economic circumstances of the Appalachian region. It is obvious that as an area Appalachia does lag behind the Nation in income, employment, and other indicators of prosperity. The relation between the economic conditions in this region and the national economy is also well documented. The Public Works Committee put it very well in your report on the Appalachian bill last year in saying that "the well-being of the national economy as a whole is dependent on the continued progress of all segments and sectors of the economy."

Credit for the development of the Appalachian program must be given to the Appalachian Governors' conference and to the President's Commission. Only a sustained effort to publicize and analyze the ills of the Appalachian economy could have produced the strong support which exists for the legislation now before your committee. It is unfortunate, however, that the bill now under consideration has been generated as a special relief program for Appalachia rather than in the context of a more comprehensive plan for the development of other sections of the country having similar economic characteristics.

I am particularly concerned with the Ozarks region which includes a substantial portion of Arkansas. We have made substantial progress in recent years in the attraction of new industry and the expansion of old enterprises in my State. Our rate of increase in per capita income is one of the highest in the Nation, and many of our towns and cities are experiencing considerable and healthy growth. But much of the Ozark region continues to suffer from the same deficiences that plague Appalachia—a depreciating tax base, inadequate schools, insufficient public facilities, and a limited road network. Due to the topography of the area, which bears great similarity to the Appalachian chain, subsistence agriculture is no longer feasible in many sections of the Ozarks. Limited water and sewer systems and routes of access have been a deterrent to the development of new industries.

The Federal Government has made a substantial contribution to the region through the construction of a number of Federal reservoirs in north Arkansas and southern Missouri through area development, accelerated public works and other grant-in-aid programs. Through these efforts and the hard work and initiative of local people we are moving ahead. To some extent, however, a maximum return has not been gained on these investments because they have not gone far enough. For example, the potential for tourism in the area which exists because of the great natural beauty of the Ozarks, its impoundments and streams and the very fine people who inhabit the area has not been fully realized because of insufficient highways leading to and through the Ozarks.

It is not my purpose to give the committee a complete résumé of the Ozark region. Its characteristics are familiar to you. I would only point out that its economic problems are in many ways similar to those to be dealt with in the Appalachian regional development bill and that similar attention should be directed to the Ozarks. A gross injustice would be done if a billion-dollar Federal program is voted for Appalachia without equal time for the Ozarks and other areas of the country which do not have a fair share of the Nation's prosperity.

In justification of a special Appalachian program the Appalachian Regional Commission cited the fact that as of 1960 30.7 percent Appalachian families had an annual income of less than $3,000 against 20.5 percent for the balance of the United States. By the same 1960 census the percentage of families in northern Arkansas with incomes of less than $3,000 was substantially greater. The following counties are representative:

	Percent
Stone County	78.0
Newton County	76.7
Fulton County	70.2
Searcy County	69.8
Madison County	68.8
Sharp County	67.7

As you will note from a map of the region these counties constitute the core of northern Arkansas.

The President's Commission also noted the close association between education and economic development. As of 1960 11.6 percent of the persons over 25 years of age in Appalachia had less than a fifth grade education against 8 percent for the balance of the United States. The overall figure for Arkansas was 15.4 percent and for the Ozark mountain counties to which I have referred as follows:

	Percent
Stone County	16.4
Newton County	15.5
Fulton County	12.4
Searcy County	12.3
Madison County	14.5
Sharp County	14.3

It is not my purpose to propose to you immediately an Ozark regional development program. Such an undertaking will require considerable planning and close cooperation between Federal, State, and local officials. It has been determined that the prime need in the Appalachian region is highways, and the bulk of the funds authorized by the legislation which you are considering would be devoted to that purpose. It may be that this is also the principal need in the Ozarks. We will only know when a thorough survey has been completed.

I believe it is incumbent upon the Congress, however, to recognize the needs of other areas while attending to those of the Appalachian region and that this can best be accomplished by the addition of a new title to the Appalachian regional development bill to authorize the planning of additional regional programs, and particularly an Ozarks program. Such an amendment has been introduced by Sentor Nelson. I do not know that it is perfect in every detail, but I believe it offers the basis for discussion and I would be happy to work with you and your committee in devising an addition to the bill which will provide for the proper and orderly planning of further regional development programs.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. W. Fulbright.

Mr. NELSON. There are statistics for the upper Great Lakes region, the Ozarks, and other regions which show that there is a need for regional planning money. But, granted that these three or more other regions in the country did qualify within reasonable standards for planning money and assistance, various Senators have had assurances, including a letter from the Bureau of the Budget and from the leadership. I would like to ask the majority leader if there are at present plans for the provision of regional planning money for other regions in the country with the support of the administration, and whether and how soon such plans would be considered in the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and in line with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] relative to the letters received by either the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and/or the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], after meeting with those two Senators, of the Public Works Committee, and also the Senator from Wisconsin, on Friday afternoon last I had a visit with the President of the United States in which I raised these questions.

The President informed me that the administration intends, as a part of its proposals to extend and improve the area redevelopment program, to emphasize economic planning on a regional basis. Among the proposals being considered is increased cooperation with State and local governments in planning for economic redevelopment along regional lines.

In our view—this is speaking for the President—the Appalachia bill is not the best legislative vehicle for authorizing regional planning in areas other than Appalachia. Aside from Appalachia, appropriate regional groups vary widely from area to area in terms of population, economic resources, and economic problems—as the Senator from Wisconsin brought out. Moreover, unlike Appalachia, regional boundaries appropriate for economic redevelopment planning may not be the same as those appropriate for water resource planning, which in turn may not be coterminous with boundaries suitable for regional highway planning.

In view of these considerations, it is clear that legislative authorization for regional planning can best be developed in the context of a general program of area redevelopment. As indicated earlier, the administration intends to make such proposals a part of general area redevelopment legislation. The details of this proposal are now being worked out, and I am confident it will provide the most desirable framework in which to consider questions of regional development.

Mr. NELSON. Has the majority leader any idea of how soon such legislation may be before us for consideration?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say that they are working on the legislation at the moment, and have been for the past several days at least, to the best of my knowledge. I would anticipate that it would be before us before too many weeks have passed.

Mr. NELSON. Am I to understand from that statement that if another region, or several regions, in the country should qualify by something roughly approaching the Appalachia standards—that is, slow economic growth and high unemployment—planning money will be available for those regions, and if a reasonable plan is proposed it will receive the support of the administration, as it has supported the Appalachia proposal?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding. That is the reason the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] introduced the bill; and I believe intends to introduce another bill shortly.

Mr. NELSON. I have nothing further.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. NELSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan have been confronted with a similar problem arising from diminished economic activity and growth that have faced us in these States.

We are proud of the progress made in Minnesota in our mining areas as a result of cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments, between both political parties, businesses, unions, and the cooperative movement and involving contributions by private citizens, at great personal sacrifice and with a selflessness that has marked one of the finest pages of the history of our great State.

We have been much aided by our great Governor, Karl Rolvaag, who has been helpful in a host of areas, by the now present Vice President of the United States, by Senator Eugene McCarthy and by Representative Blatnik, the best Congressman a distressed area has ever had. They have worked together to see that every possible help has been obtained for this area. Industry, the unions, and cooperative movements have worked together to establish a $1 million study to promote the economy of this area. Such men as Mr. Jeno Paulucci, of Duluth, have contributed both time and money to accomplish things which might have been considered impossible. And Mr. Bob Nickoloff, of Hibbing, has done more through his creativity and energy than I have time to describe.

We have received the help of Mr. Vladimir Shipka, the gifted State administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration, who has shown us the best and most effective way to diversify our economy.

We have banded together to adopt a State constitutional amendment relating to taconite, to assure that Minnesota is a desirable State in which to make a huge investment of money in taconite. For this and other reasons, the taconite industry is beginning to move in a most encouraging way.

Our port of Duluth is beginning to boom, which means an increase of business not only for Duluth, but for the entire Midwest.

But despite these facts and despite the fact that northeastern Minnesota has had the best possible educational program and a highly skilled labor force, and despite other activities too numerous to describe here today, we still have economic problems and substantial unemployment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement on the progress made under the Area Redevelopment Act, as well as a speech made by Mr. Shipka, State Area Redevelopment Act administrator on January 30; and also an address I made to the Hibbing Chamber of Commerce on May 26, 1964, as attorney general of the State of Minnesota, which describes the many efforts made by public and private industry, labor and the cooperative movements, which have contributed to the goal of economic progress and health in northeastern Minnesota.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Progress Report of Area Redevelopment Administration

(The following is a progress report of the Area Redevelopment Administration activities in the State of Minnesota as of December 31, 1964.)

There have been 22 ARA projects approved to date totaling $4,484,571.88. In these projects the Federal ARA has provided $2,913,371, the State ARA $869,114.88, the local ARA agencies $464,345.00, and the applicants have provided $237,741.00. When these ARA projects have been completed and in operation for a year they will provide approximately 670 permanent and full-time jobs.

As of this date there are on file 17 applications in which the Federal ARA is being requested to provide $4,023,748.25, the State ARA $1,330,707.14, the local ARA agencies $920,686.27, and the applicants will provide $373,679.82 totaling $6,648,821.48. If these applications for ARA loans are approved by the State and Federal ARA, they will provide approximately 690 new and permanent job opportunities after a year's operation.

As of August 31, 1964, the Federal ARA has provided $1,408,399.00 for technical assistance for 21 feasibility studies. At present there are five requests for technical assistance funds involving $161,918.00.

Since the inception of the ARA program in Minnesota to the present date there has been a total of 55 ARA projects submitted for requests for funds. Of these submitted projects, 22 have been approved, 17 are on file and 16 have been denied. Denied projects total $987,118.80.

I hope this information is helpful to you.

VLADIMIR SHIPKA,
Administrator, Minnesota ARA.

ARA projects approved

Project	Total	Federal ARA	State ARA	Local funds	Applicant
Tobiason Bros	85, 000. 00	55, 250. 00	17, 000. 00	8, 500. 00	4, 250. 00
H. C. Hill & Sons	455, 000. 00	292, 500. 00	90, 000. 00	45, 000. 00	27, 500. 00
Lutsen Ski Corp	245, 750. 00	149, 750. 00	51, 000. 00	40, 000. 00	5, 000. 00
Mesabi Cores, Inc	100, 000. 00	65, 000. 00	20, 000. 00	10, 000. 00	5, 000. 00
Deerwood Sportswear, Inc	200, 000. 00	144, 000. 00	20, 000. 00	20, 000. 00	16, 000. 00
Kainz Bros. (1st loan)	144, 050. 00	93, 600. 00	20, 000. 00	15, 000. 00	15, 450. 00
Green Forest, Inc	30, 310. 00	18, 000. 00	5, 000. 00	3, 310. 00	4, 000. 00
Sturgeon Lake Industries	70, 000. 00	45, 000. 00	14, 000. 00	7, 000. 00	3, 500. 00
Minnesota Wild Rice Harvesters Association	45, 000. 00	29, 250. 00	9, 000. 00	4, 500. 00	2, 250. 00
Echo Timber Products	80, 000. 00	52, 000. 00	16, 000. 00	8, 000. 00	4, 000. 00
Sun Plant Products, Inc	126, 474. 00	82, 000. 00	25, 000. 00	12, 800. 00	6, 674. 00
Atscott Manufacturing Corp	105, 000. 00	68, 150. 00	21, 000. 00	10, 500. 00	5, 250. 00
Giant's Ridge, Inc	100, 000. 00	65, 000. 00	20, 000. 00	10, 000. 00	5, 000. 00
Kainz Bros. (2d loan)	10, 000. 00	6, 500. 00	2, 000. 00	1, 000. 00	500. 00
McGrath Lumber	20, 000. 00	13, 000. 00	4, 000. 00	2, 000. 00	1, 000. 00
Hibbing Precision Industries	550, 000. 00	357, 500. 00	110, 000. 00	55, 000. 00	27, 500. 00
Carlton Machined Products, Inc	533, 663. 88	346, 450. 00	108, 263. 88	53, 300. 00	25, 650. 00
Quadna Mountain Corp	661, 148. 00	429, 757. 00	132, 216. 00	66, 117. 00	33, 058. 00
Universal Fiberglass Corp	628, 176. 00	408, 314. 00	125, 635. 00	62, 818. 00	31, 409. 00
Taconite Electric Co	135, 000. 00	87, 750. 00	27, 000. 00	13, 500. 00	6, 750. 00
Meritt Plastics, Inc	100, 000. 00	65, 000. 00	20, 000. 00	10, 000. 00	5, 000. 00
Frank Mochet	60, 000. 00	39, 000. 00	12, 000. 00	8, 000. 00	3, 000. 00
Total	4, 484, 571. 88	2, 913, 371. 00	869, 114. 88	464, 345. 00	237, 741. 00

NOTE.—Unallocated balance ARA revolving fund Dec. 31, 1964, $1,209,060.60.

ARA project proposals

Project	Total	Federal ARA	State ARA	Local funds	Applicant
Arrowhead Briquette	287, 000. 00	182, 000. 00	60, 000. 00	30, 000. 00	15, 000. 00
American Power Control	245, 000. 00	159, 250. 00	49, 000. 00	24, 500. 00	12, 250. 00
International Tool & Engineering Corp	46, 313. 11	30, 104. 17	9, 262. 82	4, 631. 41	2, 314. 71
Pal-O-Fab, Inc	97, 700. 00	63, 505. 00	19, 540. 00	9, 770. 00	4, 885. 00
Northern National Peat Co	154, 414. 78	91, 000. 00	28, 000. 00	16, 000. 00	19, 414. 78
Sun Plant Products, Inc	457, 000. 00	297, 050. 00	91, 400. 00	45, 700. 00	22, 850. 00
Grasston Pelleting, Inc	366, 020. 00	237, 913. 00	73, 204. 00	36, 602. 00	18, 301. 00
Sarvie Tool	138, 500. 00	90, 025. 00	27, 700. 00	13, 850. 00	6, 925. 00
Rigid Insulation Co	536, 700. 00	345, 705. 00	109, 140. 00	54, 570. 00	27, 285. 00
Organic Fertilizer Corp	543, 000. 00	325, 800. 00	108, 600. 00	54, 300. 00	54, 300. 00
Lawrence Beier	45, 000. 00	29, 250. 00	9, 000. 00	4, 500. 00	2, 250. 00
Burns Manufacturing	2, 358, 978. 00	1, 415, 386. 00	471, 797. 00	353, 846. 00	117, 949. 00
Sawtooth Mountain Recreation Area	697, 477. 00	348, 744. 00	139, 114. 00	174, 746. 00	34, 873. 00
Industrial rubber applicators	217, 249. 20	141, 211. 98	43, 449. 84	21, 724. 92	10, 862. 46
Penco Truckstop, Inc	170, 469. 39	110, 090. 10	33, 973. 88	16, 938. 94	9, 466. 47
Hunter Como Recreation Area	202, 000. 00	100, 814. 00	40, 325. 60	50, 407. 00	10, 453. 40
Total	6, 562, 821. 48	3, 967, 848. 25	1, 313, 507. 14	912, 086. 27	369, 379. 82

MINNESOTA'S TASK FORCE FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY

(Address to Hibbing Chamber of Commerce by Attorney General Walter F. Mondale, May 26, 1964)

I am happy to be able to discuss with you today some of the facts, problems, and opportunities involved in our common objective of a healthy, expanding, economy for northeastern Minnesota. Since the Iron Range economic downturn which began in the late 1950's, this chamber has distinguished itself as a forum for the discussion of reasonable, progressive ideas for solving our economic problems. I suspect that a compendium of the papers delivered to this body would provide one with the most complete treatment of the subject available in any one place. The activities of the Hibbing Chamber of Commerce, and of Helmer Olson, your active, energetic, and effective secretary, stand as a classic example of what a chamber should do.

I had originally hoped to touch on all the elements which affect the economic revival of this area, but find that such a discussion would exceed the time available to me, exhaust you, and is—in fact—beyond the total comprehension of any one person. When trying to study a problem as complex and interdependent as a functioning free enterprise economy, the best one can do is to try to break the problem into manageable, understandable segments of critical importance and try to deal with them as best you can.

As we all know, the root of our current economic problems is the iron mining industry, where total employment has dropped from a peak of 18,900 in 1957 to 11,200 in 1963, in the face of a steadily increasing population. The resulting human tragedy, skyrocketing welfare costs, rising unemployment insurance costs, the shock to small business all across the range, the out-migration of some of our brightest and most talented young people and older citizens, and the other heartrending results of this economic catastrophe are too well known to all of you to need recounting from me.

Some people argued that nothing could be done, that economic forces must be left to run their pitiless course, even if it meant reducing a prosperous, vital segment of Minnesota to a series of ghost towns. Fortunately, most of us would not surrender because of our firm belief that what men have done, men can change, and because of our limitless faith in the magnificent resources and people of this great area. Our people are as efficient a labor force as exists anywhere in the Nation, the sons and daughters of a people who for generations have believed in and supported the Nation's finest school system. In a time of increasing technological change, we knew and appreciated the value of a skilled, intelligent, people in achieving economic expansion.

We knew that taconite, developed in Minnesota, was revolutionizing the steel industry, and existed in bountiful quantity right here in this State.

We knew that northeastern Minnesota has outstanding recreational features, that the Duluth port, at the head of a 2,400-mile inland waterway, holds great promise for the future as a funnel for the commerce of an 11-State economy, and many other resources and opportunities are known to exist here in this world-famous area.

I predict on this, that those who have faith in the future of northeastern Minnesota will prove correct. I shall go further and predict that within a few short years the economy of this area will be more vibrant and more healthy than at any time in its long and glorious history. What some people saw as the death pangs of this region will soon be interpreted as growing pains.

* * * * *

The worst of the economic dislocations of northeastern Minnesota are over. While serious problems remain, this area is on the move, and the trend is decidedly upward.

Why do I make this prediction? Let us begin with taconite. Last Thursday evening in Virginia, Dr. Richard Klemme, a top economist for the Northern Natural Gas Co., predicted that taconite production in Minnesota will increase fourfold in the next 11 years.

According to the president of the Hanna Mining Co., W. A. Marting, as quoted in the New York Times of November 24, 1963: "It would not be an overstatement to say that there is still a shortage of the most desirable kind of iron ore, that is, high-grade pellets."

On June 3, at Forbes, ground will be broken for the Ford-Oglebay-Norton plant, with an annual capacity of approximately 1½ million tons, and a projected employment of 500 year-round employees. On the State land exchange commission we are currently processing an application by the M. A. Hanna Co. for a proposed magnetic and semimagnetic taconite plant in the Nashwauk-Keewatin area which they hope will go forward in the next few years. We are all aware that United States Steel will build a new taconite plant near Mountain Iron with at least 4½ million tons annual capacity and an employment of 1,200, if the taconite amendment is adopted. It is to be noted that United States Steel, in its announcement, pointed out that the plans for this facility are such as to allow rapid expansion, should the need occur, and I am sanguine that it will occur.

We are also aware of strong interest by Jones & Laughlin in a possible taconite plant near Biwabik, and we recently dedicated the opening by Erie Mining Co. of an attractive and potentially prosperous new ore body in the Dunka River area which will make Erie's operations more profitable and more economically feasible in the event increased output is demanded. So confident am I in the sustained prosperity of this great Nation, that I am certain such increased output can be, and will be, demanded.

I have reason to hope for expansion of both Erie and Reserve within the reasonably near future.

The well-paying jobs created by the taconite industry will be year-round jobs, many—if not most—of which will be located in or near existing population centers, near the heart of the iron range, giving rise to strong reason to believe that not only will dislocation of existing population, and hence existing businesses, be stopped, but that new service industries, notably in rod-and-ball and magnesium cover manufacture, will spring up as satellites of the new plants.

At this juncture, I would like to mention the importance of the taconite amendment to this picture of prosperity. * * * The present amendment, represents to me a good faith compromise in the best tradition of democracy. It pledges only our generation—not the next—for a period of 25 years, not to raise occupation and royalty taxes in an amount greater than the increases imposed upon general business corporations in the State. The production tax is specifically excluded and may be increased to provide for increased local and general government costs, in the discretion of the legislature. Just as importantly, the United States Steel Corp. has pledged it will return this expression of good faith by the immediate construction of its plant—breaking the log-jam on the expansion of taconite in Minnesota.

In supporting this amendment, I am joined by both our Senators, Congressman BLATNIK, Governor Rolvaag, Lieutenant Governor Keith, and by many other leaders, and by resolution of my political party in its last convention. It is of crucial importance to the people of the entire State that this amendment be adopted next November.

In addition to supporting the amendment, the Governor's task force, believe we have aided taconite development in a substantial manner by accelerating land exchanges and water permits, expediting State mineral leases, and by other equally important means.

Having described the critical importance of taconite to the future of this area, I would like just as forcibly to express my view that taconite alone does not, will not, and cannot solve our problems. If we mistakenly think so, we will not only be proven wrong by the facts, but will miss our opportunity to create the balanced, diversified type of economy so essential to the long-range prosperity of any area.

Much of our present problems stem from a sometimes blind reliance upon, and confidence in, a one-product economy—a type of economy which has demonstrably failed to produce true, lasting prosperity in any area of the world where it might exist. It is just as short-sighted, just as foolish, for northeastern Minnesota to rely on taconite to solve all its economic problems as it was—and is—for the citizens of Brazil to rely on coffee. As the saying goes, "there's an awful lot of coffee in Brazil," but it doesn't go on to show how violent fluctuations in the supply and demand for its one product has subjected Brazil to damaging inflations and deflations which have made continuous prosperity impossible.

The need for diversification was recently pointed out in an editorial of May 14, 1964, in the Minneapolis Star. In citing the opinion held by many that passage of the taconite amendment will solve the problems of northeastern Minnesota, the editorial states:

> This is, we feel, an overly optimistic viewpoint of what the amendment will accomplish—a viewpoint that could lead to some disillusionment and dissatisfaction later. Let's not oversell the amendment.
>
> Locally in northeastern Minnesota, the taconite industry will create thousands of jobs that will help make up for those lost through the decline of natural ores. But this doesn't mean that every miner thrown out of work when the natural ore mines shut down will have the skills needed for work in a toconite plant.
>
> Northeastern Minnesota needs taconite. But it also needs further development of recreation, manufacturing and wood products industries for a well-rounded economy.

Even if taconite production reaches 50 million tons by 1975, and assuming that 300 new jobs are created for each million tons produced, this will still provide only about 15,000 iron mining jobs—less than in the peak year of 1957. Thus any predictions which are optimistic about the future of this area—as are my own—rest upon the premise that diversification and balancing of the economy of this area will occur.

In a small southern town, I am told, there is a large statue of a cotton boll weevil, erected by the citizens out of gratitude to this insignificant but dangerous insect. The statue was erected, the story goes, because the boll weevil, by destroying the cotton crop, impressed upon the citizens as nothing else could, the value of diversification. Farmers changed to other crops, industries were brought in, and the resulting prosperity was greater than could ever have been achieved by a reliance on cotton.

If we do as we must, we will look back upon these years of trial as the Iron Range's boll weevil. We will be able to look back and say that, hard as times were, they at least shocked us into the economic reappraisal we so desperately needed, in time for something to be done about it.

We realize the need for this diversification. At the same time we realize that if it is to be sound, if it is to be successful, it must be the product of free enterprise, and of the character and efforts of the local people. Government can provide only the favorable conditions and the necessary pump priming and initial assistance necessary to get the process moving.

And government has been active. Senators HUMPHREY and MCCARTHY have sponsored legislation to help local industry, as Congressman BLATNIK. Our Governor, Karl Rolvaag, sent the first special message on northeastern Minnesota in history to the 1963 session of the legislature, with many carefully thought-out and specific proposals for assisting the people of this great area. By executive order he has created the task force for economic recovery, whose primary task has been to propose and execute programs for the economic improvement of this area. In addition, the Governor created a committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Charles Mayo to urge passage of the taconite amendment, and finally, he has backed and assisted the task force in all its efforts.

It has been the specific task of the task force to bring for the first time, a true, centralized coordination into the many, and sometimes confusing, government programs of assisting so-called distressed areas.

As our work started, we were impressed by what has been said, and sometimes done, both in and out of government, to solve the economic problems of this area. But we also found that, although the Iron Range is probably the most studied, most discussed piece of real estate in the Nation, we still lacked much basic information which was vitally necessary to any thoughtful program of diversification and revivification. We found that while many communities had programs for economic development underway, there was no overall regional program to harness the forces of free enterprise and coordinate information about the richness of the whole area. In a word, we knew entirely too little about too much, and we soon decided we had to take a regional, overall view if we were to do a good job.

To this end, we sent Bob Nickoloff, of Hibbing, to three areas of the United States where it appeared a good job had been done in regenerating formerly distressed areas—one in New England, one in Virginia, and one in upper Mississippi. We found that these areas had organized regional development corporations, hired top experts in economic development, and successfully promoted their areas. As an example, the upper Mississippi Development Council had developed industries hiring some 40,000 new employees in the 15 years of its existence.

It was accordingly determined that such a regional development corporation was needed here to achieve two specific aims:

1. to undertake a specific, detailed inventory of the economic resources of the whole region, and

2. to approach economic development from a logical, areawide approach, where economic, rather than political, boundaries would be put under primary consideration. Such an undertaking, as we all know, costs money.

Last Friday, May 22, it was announced in Hibbing that the NEMDA corporation had been formally organized and funded by at least $1 million of voluntary contributions, to be spent over the next 5 years.

I speak on this point at some length because I fear some may miss the significance of this organization. This is a most impressive example of genuine labor-management cooperation, of submerging of partisan and political differences, in the interests of the common good. Importantly also, it is not another governmental study, but a private group, stimulated by the action of government but not controlled by it, whose members will not be mere passive recipients of information, but members of the community who are powerful enough to put such information to immediate, constructive, practical use.

The corporation is now seeking top-flight economic development talent to head up a similarly top-flight program for this entire region. Its purpose will be to amass the specific facts business must know to locate in the community, and to promote the six counties which make up the northeastern Minnesota economic unit. This group hopefully will provide us what we have always lacked—a sophisticated, organized, and adequately financed promotional agent for the entire area.

In the governmental half of the task force's coordinated program, we have been achieving significant successes in diversifying and expanding the northeastern Minnesota economy. A great deal of credit for these achievements must go to Congressman BLATNIK, whose wholehearted cooperation and effort has been instrumental in the growth of the ARA program.

Minnesota is one of the two States in the Union to have a State ARA agency to assist the Federal authorities. I am happy and proud of having been a part of the effort which brought this about in the 1961 session. I am also happy that Mr. Vladimir Shipka, our State coordinator, has proved to be such a competent and dedicated executive.

The Federal ARA, in cooperation with the State, will lend up to 85 percent of the cost of land, plant, and equipment for new or expanded plants in so-called distressed areas. The Federal money is loaned at slightly over 4 percent, the State money, up to 20 percent of the cost of the projects, costs 3 percent.

From July 1961 to April 1964, some 14 projects have received assistance totaling an investment of $2.9 million. These projects, when in full swing, will employ approximately 444 people. There are currently under consideration another 12 applications which appear to be sound and will, if built, provide another 500 jobs. A prominent financial journal has estimated that for every 100 jobs created in basic manufacturing, another 65 are created in service-related industries, ranging all the way from banks through grocery stores.

Also, the ARA industries are diversified. The Hibbing Precision Industries Co. is one example, and there are also six wood products companies, three machine tool manufacturers, two agricultural products firms, two ski complexes, and a fiberglass manufacturer who have received ARA assistance.

The value of diversification is indicated by the kind of economic activity it generates right within the area of the diversified industries. For example, the Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Commission recently helped purchase equipment for the Minnesota Prosthetics & Orthopedics Co. plant in Virginia. This plant will use cured aspen which, fortunately, is produced by the Kainz Brothers ARA timber plant in Ely. Once in production, the prosthetics plant may require precision equipment which could be ordered from Hibbing Precision, and so on.

In addition to its loan programs, ARA also provides technical studies. Fourteen have so far been approved in Minnesota, involving an investment of $1 million. These studies involve mining, production, and marketing of remaining natural ores, briquetting, transportation rates, the tourist industry, and the timber industry.

For instance, the present cost of transportation is of fundamental importance to northeastern Minnesota. Many firms in this area now producing primarily for local consumption could compete effectively on national markets if freight rates were lower. There will shortly be released a study of our transportation system by a recognized specialist which will show the way to reducing these costs. This study will hopefully be followed by ARA-financed action program to assist local industries in implementing the report in their own businesses. We must look upon transportation as a resource and an important cost factor deserving of study and consideration as an independent factor in the economic equation. This report will be the first step in this long-overdue effort.

We have also been extremely interested, in the Task Force, in the port of Duluth, a natural advantage which is generally overlooked but is of immense long-range importance to this entire area. The port started out slowly in 1959, but it is now in the black and beginning to boom. New records are being established daily. Last season alone 25 new commodities moved through the port for the first time.

A tank farm for fats and oils was doubled in capacity last year and it is already booked for the season. Last year the port produced approximately $13 million in wages and services for Duluth and the area. As tempo picks up, the frequency and reliability of shipping service naturally follows hand in hand. Within a few years, I predict, the port will be seen to be one of the key assets, not just of Duluth, but again of the whole economic region. We have helped on the task force in several concrete ways—obtaining funds for promotion, challenging discriminatory freight practices, challenging water diversion by Chicago and other lake communities which affect water levels and hence shipping capacities, intervening with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other officers to obtain increased use of the port for Government shipping and storage.

We have spoken of shipping and transportation as important cost factors. Another such important factor is fuel, which brings up another activity of the task force. Northern Natural Gas Co. has applied to the Federal Power Commission for authority to build a gas pipeline through the heart of the Iron Range, from Grand Rapids on the west to Hoyt Lake on the east. I will intervene soon before the Federal Power Commission to expedite this application on behalf of the State of Minnesota, and if construction can begin in the fall of 1965, as we hope, it will involve an investment alone of $10 million, not considering the tremendous fuel advantages the pipeline will bring to this area. For not only will natural gas in itself be a cheaper source of fuel, it will bring in a hitherto not present element of competition which should help reduce costs of other fuels both to industry and to the consumer.

I see my time is running short. I wish I could discuss some of the other exciting developments we hope to achieve by a new spirit of genuine and constructive partnership between business and government, and between management and labor. For example, our work with defense and Government contracts generally, to stimulate contracts such as those which employ 800 people at Duluth and 50 at Hibbing in plants of the Duluth Avionics Co.

Last December, for instance, the task force sponsored the Minnesota Industrial Procurement Conference in Duluth, which was well attended and opened up many new channels of Government business for northeastern Minnesota businessmen. You know, it is mighty confusing to do business with an organization as big and as complex as our Federal Government. Conferences such as this are invaluable in achieving the sort of man-to-man rapport you need to do business with anyone, and as a direct means of disseminating concrete, how-to-do-it information to businessmen who have not previously done Government business.

I had also hoped to discuss our work with respect to the tourist industry and the timber industry, where we are attempting to stimulate training programs for tourist trade employees and were successful in obtaining the preliminary approval of $235,000 appropriations for a forest products marketing laboratory at UMD.

We also do not have time to discuss the accelerated public works program, which has brought $22.7 million in urgently needed public improvements into northeastern Minnesota, and produced 22,584 man-hours of work in the process. Nor is there time to discuss the progress which is being made in airport construction, conservation, the natural resources program Governor Rolvaag first advocated before this chamber in 1962, nor the acceleration we have been able to achieve in acquiring right-of-way for the area's Interstate Highway System, nor the progress of manpower retraining, or the other important programs we have initiated, worked with, or coordinated in focusing all possible attention on northeastern Minnesota.

Any program is people, both in and out of government. We all know that. On the private side we have such splendid examples of successful contributions to prosperity as those of this chamber, and of the Hibbing Development Corp., which is so justly famous. We have such individuals as Jeno Paulucci, who has given so much of his heart and his pocketbook to the struggle for an improved economy for this area. It would require another full speech to recount the many contributions he has made to this area. I single Jeno out because I think he typifies the spirit of dedication of hundreds of men of this area, to whom a problem is merely a challenge, and failure is just a word.

And on the Government side we have just the same kind of dedicated people, all committed to finding practical, concrete ways to assist the people of this area in achieving their destiny of prosperity and happiness.

Talking about people, I note that Governor Rolvaag asked the task force to recommend to him proposals for State legislation to aid in our total effort. I am pleased to announce that your own representative Jack Fena has agreed to assume the heavy burden of consulting with the people throughout this entire area to develop preliminary proposals. I don't wish to overwork him, but if any of you have ideas along this line, I strongly urge that you communicate them to Jack.

In closing, I would like to leave with you a summary of our attitudes in Government and what we hope to achieve in northeastern Minnesota. Our fundamental belief is that the public good is best served when all elements of the community are permitted and encouraged to bring their efforts to bear on the solution of common problems. This means, on the Government side, a coordination of programs and a deliberate and continuous effort to make the road to prosperity both clear and easy, and a conscious effort to remove roadblocks to progress, while at the same time keeping the public interest uppermost.

It means the creation of a genuine spirit of partnership, a genuine devotion to programs which, as ARA best exemplifies, truly involve a cooperation, a partnership between business and government with each doing what it knows best how to do.

On the private side, we hope to see increased realization that northeastern Minnesota is not a coalition of separate and possibly hostile regional economies, but an economic unit, a definite region, with problems which cannot be solved by fragmented, uncoordinated local efforts. We hope also to see increased realization that diversification is the only long-range hope for this area, and we hope that we will never again be lulled into the false security of a one-product economy, however prosperous in the short run.

The most exciting thing which distinguished a free people from a slave, a buoyant economy from a totalitarian, is the ability of free men to work together toward the solution of common problems. The present effort in northeastern Minnesota should show, and I firmly believe does show, the type of enlightened cooperation which realizes with Ben Franklin that we must all hang together or we'll all hang separately, and which, if continued, will result in a prosperity hitherto undreamed of both in northeastern Minnesota and in the State as a whole.

Thank all of you—ask for help. We are on the move—let's keep going.

Area Redevelopment in the State of Minnesota

(By Vladimir Shipka, State ARA Administrator, Department of Business Development, St. Paul, Minn.)

The problem of dislocation and displacement of people as a result of changing attitudes and economies is as old as history. Even during times of prosperity such as we have in the Nation today there are always geographical areas whose economies lag behind and where conditions of excessive unemployment and low income persist. These areas represent an intolerable condition of human suffering and eroded self-respect as well as a national waste of potential wealth creation. The acute lack of jobs in these areas is not the fault of the people who live in these areas. Northern Minnesota is one of these areas and is basically no different from the 50 or so other labor surplus areas of the Nation which suffer this continued and persistent unemployment while other areas of the Nation have a relatively continued high rate of prosperity.

All of these areas throughout the Nation with high unemployment are areas in which they are basically dependent upon one industry and the employment has declined and may continue to decline because of the following reasons:

1. The natural resource has been depleted or there has been a technological change in the mining of iron ore, timber, coal, copper, and other natural resource extracting industries in the Nation.

2. Automation of the industry, as in railroading, mining, forestry, and agriculture.

3. Changing consumer buying habits such as in the metal, communications, textile, and food processing industries.

All geographical areas that are subject to these factors will continue to face these problems and possibly at a more dramatic and sudden accelerated rate of change in their economy. All we have to do is look about us and see what tremendous changes are occurring in consumer buying habits, changing production techniques, etc., which dislocate and displace workers in these one industry areas of the Nation. Northern Minnesota, even though it may at the moment have a sudden spurt in its economy because of technological changes that are going on in its basic industry of mining, may again find its economy sagging because of the uncontrolled changes that I have mentioned in that industry.

Therefore, northern Minnesota must never again completely have its economy based exclusively on the extracting and exploiting of its natural resources such as mining, forestry, and agriculture where the basic raw material is exported from that area and manufactured or processed elsewhere. With continued exporting of its natural resources the State must—

1. Establish industries within that area to process or manufacture as much of that natural resource as possible;

2. Develop satellite industries providing the basic industries within the area with services and/or materials; and

3. Development of industries that utilize the talents of the people within the area in the new emerging science oriented industries.

We in Minnesota are fortunate that the 1961 legislature recognized the need of diversification of industry and of creating new job opportunities in the labor surplus areas of northern Minnesota by passing legislation establishing an Area Redevelopment Administration to take advantage of the Federal ARA program. As a result of this legislation, Minnesota is considered more successful than either of our neighboring States or other States throughout the Nation in establishing new industries within the northern part of the State. The ARA law has given Minnesota firms and communities advantages that other States do not provide. These advantages are:

1. An ARA agency within the Department of Business Development which deals directly with labor surplus areas and provides for coordination of efforts between Federal and local ARA agencies in seeking firms to take advantage of ARA loan funds.

2. The appropriation establishing an ARA revolving fund of $2,250,000 to participate with Federal and local ARA loans.

In no other State with the exception of Pennsylvania, does the State contribute loan funds to an ARA project. This has greatly helped local communities in establishing new industries because in the remaining States where there are no State loan funds the local community must provide the entire local participation with Federal ARA funds.

The State has made modest gains toward the goal of diversification of industry in northern Minnesota. Our State executive council has approved 22 loans amounting to $869,114.88 to industries either expanding or locating in northern Minnesota.

The Federal Government has provided $2,913,371, with local and private funds amounting to $702,086. These industries are broken down in the following categories: Two agricultural products industries, three industrial machined parts industries, eight forestry products industries, two satellite taconite service industries, four recreation type industries, two plastic and fiberglass industries, and one textile industry. These industries, when in full operation, will employ approximately 670 people, plus substantial indirect job opportunities.

In addition to these approved loans there are presently 17 loan applications requesting $1,330,707.14 in State funds to establish industrial plants in that northern area. The Minnesota ARA revolving fund at present has approximately $1,200,000 in unallocated funds to match local, private, and Federal funds for new industries in northern Minnesota.

The modest progress indicates that we are making gains toward diversification of industry in northern Minnesota. The goal to provide a healthy economy in northern Minnesota must be a continuing one and this administration will continue to work toward the achievement of this goal. The importance of better understanding the problems of the area and to determine the feasibility of industries which might be located in the area we have, by coordinating our efforts with the various Federal agencies, requested and received technical assistance funds for 21 projects involving $1,408,399 Federal and private funds for research studies in the following areas: 10 mineral feasibility studies, 2 forest products, 1 plastic and chemical industry study, 1 peat feasibility study, 1 transportation study, 1 commercial fishing industry study, 1 wild rice processing study, 1 paper mill, and 2 recreation feasibility studies.

One of the most important studies is the study of transportation in northern Minnesota. This study by Federal ARA technical assistance is conducting studies in many areas of transportation. An example of this is a joint study of package freight on the Great Lakes between the State ARA and W. B. Saunders & Co. This package freight study is for the purpose of determining whether or not a package freight industry could be again revitalized to aid the economy of northern Minnesota. This study will contact and interview firms throughout the Great Lakes area who presently ship their products by means other than Great Lakes package freight. Based on preliminary studies package freight can be shipped more cheaply via the Great Lakes than by other present means of transportation.

I have given you a list of some of the projects and some of the accomplishments under the Federal and State ARA program. We have made a small beginning and it is my opinion that because areas of chronic and persistent unemployment will be a continuing one we must recognize the fact that area redevelopment if properly administered can provide the tools to bring new economic activity to areas such as northern Minnesota. I might add that because of the dramatic changes that go on in our economy, places other than northern Minnesota who are presently enjoying a high level of prosperity may suddenly find themselves with high unemployment and may then be in need of such a program as area redevelopment.

ARA is a comparatively new program only 3 years old and it is important that such a new program as ARA be reviewed and strengthened where experience indicates that there are opportunities to improve it. The ARA program as I indicated is to generate new job opportunities in areas suffering from chronic unemployment and underemployment. It is a vital beachhead in the war against poverty and the essential underpinning of special regional programs.

As administrator of the State ARA program it has been our experience that there are some changes that should be made in both the Federal and State ARA laws. This is a New Frontier program and it has had some problems and has not worked as effectively as administrators such as myself believe that it can.

I would recommend certain administrative changes and amendments to the laws in the following ways:

SUGGESTED ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 87–27

I. Administrative procedure

(A) Processing, approval or disapproval of the ARA project applications done at the ARA and SBA offices rather than ARA offices in Washington for loans which do not exceed a total of $300,000.

Reasons

1. One of the greatest criticisms of the ARA program is the long delay in approving or disapproving of project proposal applications.

2. In many cases the regional office staff has firsthand knowledge and information as to the project including the applicants, the product, the market, etc., and therefore, a decision could be made on the application much more quickly.

3. The applicant is placed at a great disadvantage because of distance in providing the additional information that is requested by the loan processors of the application. As a result there is a great deal of time lost in transmitting to the Washington office the required additional information.

(B) Recreational project proposals: (1) Rescind the order that provides a lower percentage of participation by the Federal ARA on recreational project proposals and allow the Federal ARA to participate up to 65 percent of the cost on recreational projects that provide year-around recreational activity.

Reasons

1. Based on our experience in Minnesota the approved year-around recreational projects are a great stimulus to the economy and are generating many new indirect job opportunities and will prove to be some of our most successful projects.

(C) Greater emphasis and recognition to indirect employment in the processing of an ARA project.

1. ARA approved projects in Minnesota in many cases have provided more indirect job opportunities than direct opportunities.

II. Loans and participation

(A) Local 10-percent equity:

1. Local participating loans should not be placed in an equity position and repayable after the Federal and other financial institutions such as banks are repaid in full. Local 10-percent participation should be paid on a concurrent basis with other Federal and financial institutions.

2. Allow applicants to participate in the local 10 percent in an amount not to exceed 25 percent of the local 10-percent participation.

(a) Alternative: Allow applicant to participate up to 10 percent of the cost of the project and thereby reduce local participation to 5 percent of the total project where hardship is demonstrated by the local redevelopment agency.

Reasons

1. Allowing the local 10-percent participation to be paid off concurrently with the Federal and private institution funds will provide immediate and continued seed capital for future ARA projects within the local development area.

2(a) Because of the difficulty local ARA agencies have in raising the 10 percent local equity some applicants are desirous in placing additional funds in the project where local agencies are not able to raise the funds within the area.

III. Redevelopment areas

(A) Redefine local development areas from a definition based on political subdivisions to a regional economic development area.

Reasons

1. Local development areas defined on a political subdivision basis do not:

(a) Provide for sound planning because the boundaries in many cases have been established on an artificial basis rather than on an economic or trade area basis. (Counties are excellent examples. Many of their boundaries have been established by using lakes, rivers, old logging trails or section lines as boundary lines.)

(b) Provide for broader source of funds for local participation in projects.

(c) Provide for greater selection of talent to serve on the regional economic development agency.

(d) Prevent the duplication of project proposals which presently come from the small local development agencies within the trade area.

(e) Prevent future competition between the small local ARA agencies who sponsor similar project proposals especially in the natural resources and recreational industries.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT 1965 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Proposal I

A legislative act amending the present ARA act to authorize the participation of Area Redevelopment Administration revolving funds with Small Business Administration loan funds as provided for in title 4 of the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964. These loans would be long term to small business such as the tourist industry in the area redevelopment counties of the State of Minnesota.

Reason

Both of these acts would have the effect of providing additional financing to the tourist and resort industry. It is a well-established fact that the present resorts in the State of Minnesota are badly in need of updating and expansions in order to meet the ever-increasing number of vacationers in the Nation. With greater leisure time the number of people seeking vacations will increase and with these additional methods of financing the resorters will have greater opportunities to obtain the necessary financing for the needed expansion and development of their facilities. Presently both private lending institutions and the Small Business Administration in many cases cannot provide loans to resorts because of the limited income the resorters have for the repayment of these loans.

Under these proposals longer term financing could be arranged so that the amortization period is longer and therefore the loans would be made more attractive to the tourist and resort industry.

Proposal II

An amendment to the State ARA Act granting authority to political subdivisions who have established local ARA agencies permissive legislation to reimburse local ARA agency members payment of certain expenses to members of that agency.

Reason

The purpose of this act is to provide certain expenses to members of the agency in the processing of applications and necessary meetings and travel incurred in carrying out the responsibilities as ARA agency members.

Proposal III

The following proposal also provides a method by which ARA agency members can be reimbursed.

An amendment to the State ARA Act granting authority to local agencies to charge the applicant for ARA funds a fee for the processing of ARA loans based on a percentage of the loan or on a flat fee basis.

(NOTE (administrative change).—Allow State ARA revolving funds to be used for capital loans up to 10 percent of the cost of the proposed project with local development corporation and Small Business Administration 502 loan funds.)

Reason

The purpose of this administrative change is to aid local development corporations in meeting their portion of the SBA 502 loan requirements. Under the existing 502 loan program local development corporations can receive up to 80 percent from the SBA for a proposed industry in their community. The requirements on the part of the local development corporation are that they must provide 20 percent of the cost of the project. Therefore by providing ARA revolving funds to local development corporations up to 10 percent of the project it would greatly aid the development of new industries desiring to take advantage of SBA 502 loan funds.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, despite all this, however, I must report that in January of 1964, in Itasca County, in the western part of the Mesabi Iron Range, there was an unemployment rate of 23.8 percent; in St. Louis County in the heart of the Mesabi Range, it was 15.2 percent, and in Lake County the unemployment rate was 15.9 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a tabulation of unemployment statistics for January 1959, 1963, and 1964.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Work force of unemployed and employed by counties, excluding Duluth, for January 1959, 1963, and 1964

	January 1959	January 1963	January 1964
Itasca County:			
Total labor force	13, 300	11, 800	12, 600
Total unemployed	2, 900	3, 300	3, 000
Unemployment rate (percent)	20. 3	28. 1	23. 8
St. Louis County (excluding Duluth):			
Total labor force	40, 400	37, 900	36, 300
Total unemployed	5, 100	7, 800	5, 500
Unemployment rate (percent)	9. 5	20. 6	15. 2
Lake County:			
Total labor force	5, 935	4, 982	4, 261
Total unemployed	658	654	679
Unemployment rate (percent)	11. 1	13. 1	15. 9

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I could cite many other figures to show that persistent unemployment is still with us.

Although the unemployment figures improved during the summer, it is still the case that the seasonal character of much of our work and the unemployment problems persist and remain.

Despite the vast potential of our greatly gifted people, our resources, water, taconite, timber, minerals, and other resources, we still have a great need to diversify, and a compelling need for a regional approach which will help us—somewhat in the fashion of Appalachia—to do a better job than we can do by ourselves. We will continue to make progress—and we will achieve our goals—but this type of aid would be most helpful.

We would like to have a Federal development road stretching from the Vermilion Range in northeastern Minnesota through the great Mesabi and down through the Cuyuna Range. We would like to have assistance in filling the ugly and now abandoned huge, open pit mines, some of which have lost any conceivable economic usability. If they were filled we could use these areas for housing, businesses, industrial parks, or for any number of other purposes—and a serious eyesore would have been removed.

We would like to have technical help in improving the development of our timber industry in terms of both timber processing and marketing. We could use additional help in water resource planning and also in conservation planning. We could use additional help in vocational training, so that we can train our men to occupy the industrial positions which we have created and hopefully will create through ARA, SBA, and other programs, public and private.

I was pleased to hear that the administration will support programs for a regional approach to the upper Great Lakes. The original idea, I believe, for an Upper Great Lakes Development Agency came during a conference held with Mr. Jeno Paulucci and others in northeastern Minnesota. We proposed to the then Kennedy administration that there be created such a regional development organization.

The late, great President Kennedy, in a speech on September 25, 1963, to the Duluth Land and Peoples Conference, proposed and pledged the creation of such a development for the upper Great Lakes.

I am pleased to support and be a sponsor of the Appalachian regional development bill, but I believe it must be understood that many of its provisions which would help Appalachia would also be most helpful to us, even though the basic nature of the problem is different in many respects.

REJECT FEDERAL GRANTS FOR CATTLE IN APPALACHIA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, previously in this debate it has been argued that those of us from the Middle West should not object, because this proposal is tailored after the model of the Great Plains conservation program. That statement is partly true, Mr. President, but only partly. There are significant differences.

In the first place, all we have attempted to do in the Middle West is to stabilize our livestock economy and prevent further deterioration of the soil. We have not tried to use Government money to build up additional beef cattle productivity. In Appalachia, by contrast, the effort is to create new productive capacity, by bringing new land into use. It is certain that such lands would be used for livestock. There is no other use to which improved pasturelands can be put.

Moreover, it is contemplated by the sponsors and advocates of the bill that this use be made of it. Page 12 of the Senate report reads:

> It [sec. 203] offers no special provisions for assisting livestock operations in Appalachia. The committee assumes that after the land is restored and revegetated, the operation of free markets factors, in conjunction with already established Federal programs, will supply this need.

More important, this bill definitely contemplates a Federal contribution of 80 percent. I realize it has been pointed out that the statute governing the Great Plains conservation program does not specify the percentage which would be paid by the Federal Government, and it has been argued that theoretically the Federal contribution in this case, also, might be as much as 80 percent or more. That is pure theory, however. The fact is that the Great Plains program for the most part proceeds on the basis of a Federal contribution of 50 percent, with the landowner paying a full one-half of the cost of the improvement. In a relatively few cases, the Federal contribution has been as high as 60 percent. In recent years, so far as I have been able to determine, the Federal Government in no case has approved a Federal contribution in excess of 60 percent.

In this Appalachia bill, however, the whole spirit of the various programs—not just the program of agriculture improvement, but the other programs as well—seems to be in terms of a Federal contribution of 70 or 80 percent in most cases. The highway grants contemplate a Federal contribution of as much as 70 percent. The health facilities under section 202 provide for 80 percent grants.

section 203, the agriculture assistance permits 80-percent grants, and so on.

Now to return to the program for pasture improvement as originally discussed in the hearings held last year. Both Secretary Freeman and Assistant Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., spoke last year of bringing 9½ million acres into productive use in Appalachia through this program.

This year, speaking for the administration, Mr. John L. Sweeney, Chairman of the Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia, used the figure of 8.6 million acres amount of land requiring erosion control. Either way that is a tremendously large acreage to be added to the land available for beef production. Mr. Sweeney said further that the Government expected to help improve approximately 3.3 million acres during the life of this program or approximately 500,000 acres a year.

It has been argued that this program would not really result in additional production of cattle. On that point, let me read from the testimony of Mr. Sweeney:

> Within the normal program of the Federal Government, primarily through the Farmers Home Administration's loan program, the farmers will have available some loans to increase their herds or put new feeder calf operations into these pastures. But this program contained in S. 3 is primarily patterned after the Great Plains conservation program which helped achieve, in that broad region of the country, the water resource and land treatment improvement that so desperately is needed in the Appalachia region.

Further on Mr. Sweeney said:

> We hope also that the Farmers Home Administration loan program can be increased to provide for better land treatment, and also, where it seems feasible, for the farmer to better utilize that pasture by an increase in his livestock.

A little later he said:

> This can be done by establishing an adequate vegetative covering on some of the land or by turning it into pastureland capable of supporting economical livestock operations. Section 203 will provide to eligible farms, grants covering the cost of 80 percent of the improvement of up to 25 acres of land which either has no protective covering or which needs improvement in order to make it economically feasible for livestock production.

Mr. President, let me remind you that we are now, today, paying farmers in the Midwest and elsewhere to take land out of production through the conservation reserve program. How is it possible to argue that there is no inconsistency here? Why bring land to a state of productivity when we already have national policies based, in effect, on the assumption that there is a surplus of productive land? Certainly, that is the whole theory and justification of the conservation reserve or soil bank.

If we must do something for the farmers of Appalachia, perhaps it would be more sensible to pay those farmers not to improve their land and not to bring it back into production, either with or without Federal assistance. Perhaps that suggestion sounds facetious, but it is more sensible than spending Government money to bring land into production in Appalachia while simultaneously we are spending other Government money to take land out of production elsewhere in the country.

But there is an even more undesirable and disheartening aspect to this program, Mr. President. In fact, it creates and compounds a most cruel hoax on those farmers who would want to avail themselves of the grant of 80 percent of the cost of improving 50 acres of land occupied by such owner, operator, or occupier.

It will raise false hopes that he will be able to make it by entering into the agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture and receiving proceeds of the grant it provides. He would be led to believe that by investing his 20 percent of the cost and "in conjunction with already established Federal programs" he would be able to establish a productive and profitable economic unit.

This just would not be so.

According to Secretary Freeman's testimony, such a result could not be achieved even with the pasture improvement assistance.

Twenty-five acres of pasture in Appalachia would support at most 6 to 8 animal units. Fifty acres would double this to 12 to 16 units. This simply is not enough to do the job. It is not enough to make a cow-calf operation economic. A much larger farm unit would be needed.

Let us consider that we are dealing with an area and a farmer which admittedly are among the most poverty stricken in Appalachia.

Yet, the farmer-owner would be expected to raise a 20-percent contribution to these programs. Where would he get the 20 percent? Very likely he would be helped out in one way or another by the same source which supplies the 80 percent. So the subsidy would be 100 percent—but that would be only for the pastureland which in due time will become capable of producing feeder calves.

But the farmer-owner would then need breeder stock. Granted that he would get the money to prepare the pasture where would he get the capital to get the breeder stock—this farmer-owner who is among the "most poverty stricken in Appalachia"?

The committee report seeks to supply the answer to this by saying:

> The committee assumes that after the land is restored and revegetated, the operation of free market factors in conjunction with already established Federal programs will supply this need.

There is the path and the way.

A grant upon a grant to prepare the land. A further resort to other Federal programs "already established" to get breeding stock and to maintain the operation until it gets into full production.

And when it does get into full cycle, it will be found to be uneconomic and inadequate. This would necessitate a continuance of subsidy into the future and much beyond the scope provided by the bill.

A subsidy to the degree and in a duration it would be highly unfair to those who are not similarly favored and who are trying to make it on their own.

Up to now, Mr. President, I have been talking about the farmer-owner. Last year's bill was limited to landowners.

Not so this year. Something new has been added. The financial and other assistance can now be furnished to any landowner, operator, or occupier of such land. It would be available to the land occupied by such owner, operator, or occupier.

Mr. President, if such a unit is uneconomic to the landowner, it is inevitable that it would be even more uneconomic in the hands of an occupier who does not even own it. Unless, of course, the Federal Treasury will be requested to borrow even more money for a longer period of years to get the job done.

This obvious and inescapable necessity for long time and maybe even indefinite grants or subsidies to the 50-acre Appalachia units, most severely distinguishes it from the Great Plains program, in addition to the points already set out.

But the worst cut of all is that at its very best, and with all the Federal help he can get, the operator or occupier will not have a future to look to. At best, it will be but a submarginal income and a substandard of living.

Mr. President, last year when similar legislation relating to Appalachia was under consideration, the people of this country had adequate warning as to what it contained. The bill was reported in good time, it remained upon the Senate Calendar for a reasonable period, and its terms were matters of widespread public knowledge. Cattlemen and others who might be interested had an opportunity to inform themselves, and to waken public interest and understanding of the implications and consequences of the various provisions of the bill.

As a result, ranchers and cattlefeeders had an opportunity to make their protests heard against the ill-advised proposal to stimulate increased beef production through Federal subsidies. Last year section 203 was stricken from the bill on the basis of those protests.

This year, for reasons that have not been made clear, this bill is being acted upon on a hurry-up basis. We are given to understand that there is some urgent need for the Senate to act upon it immediately, today, although it was not even reported until last Thursday. No doubt it will be argued that we need take no time with it this year, because we have already considered and passed the bill once before, that is, last year. But we did not pass section 203 before; in fact, we specifically rejected it on that previous occasion. It is argued that the new section 203 is totally different, but if so, it deserves full consideration and broad public attention, instead of this hurry-up treatment.

Although this bill is being considered so hurriedly, already I have received a protest from the National Livestock Feeders Association, which reads as follows:

> JANUARY 28, 1965.
>
> Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> The National Livestock Feeders Association is firmly opposed to section 203 of S. 3 which would allow subsidized development of agricultural and livestock production in new areas when supplies are already adequate

and burdensome in some instances. The association objects to legislation which amounts to overriding the free working of economic forces which should determine the existence and development of livestock and agricultural production.

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer,
National Livestock Feeders Association.
OMAHA, NEBR.

Evidently this great national organization feels strongly about the matter. If more time had been permitted for the terms of this bill to become publicly known, no doubt many, many protests from cattlemen and their organizations would have been received. At least, if the proposal is as harmless as its sponsors say it is, there would have been time to debate that argument publicly, and perhaps clear up the matter.

It is my suggestion that if this proposal is meritorious, it be deleted from this bill and introduced by its supporters as a separate bill, instead of being smuggled through as part of a larger measure dealing principally with highway construction for Appalachia. If it were reintroduced separately, it could be referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture for study by those familiar with farm problems.

It will be recalled that all during the long struggle of the past 2 years by the cattle industry to hold its head above water in spite of the distressing level of prices, the Secretary of Agriculture insisted, over and over again, that the great source of our troubles was our own U.S. overproduction. When some of us pointed to the rapid increase and multiplication of imports of beef, we were advised that the American cattle industry should get its own house in order. We were told to cut back on our own production, and thus relieve the market of the great oversupply of beef.

Now we learn that a cutback in cattle numbers produced in the West and Middle West are likely to be replaced by an increase in cattle numbers from the Appalachian region.

If the steel mills of Pittsburgh and Chicago were shut down for lack of sales, would the Federal Government adopt a program of subsidizing the construction of additional facilities for producing steel elsewhere in the country, and then argue that it had created new jobs by doing so? If the coal mines of Kentucky and West Virginia were closed down for lack of markets—as some of them are, I understand—should Federal funds go to help their competitors? Of course not.

Certainly, the situation is the same for beef. New beef production artificially brought into existence in the Appalachian region must certainly displace a corresponding production of beef somewhere else.

Last year we were also told that these additional feeder calves and cattle from Appalachia would substitute for the imported feeders we now receive from Mexico and Canada. What an argument of sophistry that is. Feeder cattle have been imported from Mexico and Canada for a good many years. It is not because we could not produce enough stockers and feeders here at home. The number of beef calves and of feeder steers produced in this country has steadily increased but imports have continued to come in. In practice, Mexico and Canada will continue to send us their surplus feeder cattle and calves as long as our tariff remains low and as long as we place no other impediments in the way of such trade.

Increased supplies of such cattle from Appalachia will not displace these imports. Rather, this will simply add that much supply to the market and compete directly with our own feeders produced in other parts of this country.

It is regrettable that in the presentation of this amendment the issue is made to appear as a sectional conflict, as if one part of our country were opposed to the aspirations of another. If it does so appear, that is not the result of any deliberate intention on my part. Although the cattlemen of my State may be in competition with those of Appalachia or other sections, there is no animosity in our competition. To the farmers of Appalachia, we say, "We wish you well. You are welcome to compete with us, utilizing any means that your skill and your brains enable you to use, in our great American competitive system. We ask only one thing; that the competition be on a fair and equal basis."

Because this proposal is essentially discriminatory against the beef producers of other parts of the country, I ask that the Senate adopt the amendment proposed by me and eight cosponsors, and delete section 203 from the bill. If the program envisioned by section 203 is as sound, worthwhile, and fair as its supporters appear to believe, it is suggested that they reintroduce it as a separate measure so that it can be referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and there be studied, both as to its soundness from the standpoint of agricultural development and conservation, and also as to its effect upon the farm production and price situation, particularly of the beef cattle industry, in other parts of the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point Public Law 1021, 84th Congress, 2d session, which authorized the Great Plains conservation program.

There being no objection, the statute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 11833

An Act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended (a) by inserting "(a)" after the period following "SEC. 16," and (b) by adding the following subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten years with producers in the Great Plains area determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to make, in orderly progression over a period of years, changes in their cropping systems and land uses which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water conservation measures needed under such changed systems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The producer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming operations which incorporates such soil and water conservation practices and principles as may be determined by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located, and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in cropping systems and land use and of the conservation measures which are to be carried out on the farm or ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. Under the contract the producer shall agree—

"(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection;

"(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the farm if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract;

"(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest in the farm or ranch during the contract period to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder unless the transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

"(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

"(v) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration of the program.

In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those conservation practices set forth in the contract for which he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in the public interest. The portion of such cost (including labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the physical installation of the conservation measures under the contract;

"(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

"(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm entered into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

"(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

"(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U.S.C. 1340(6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of wheat under the program carried out under this subsection shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

"(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical services of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in determining the scope and provisions of any plan and the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take into consideration programs of State and local agencies, including soil conservation districts, having for their purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water conservation;

"(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitations, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection: *Provided,* That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed $150,000,000, and for any program year payments shall not exceed $25,000,000. The funds made available for the program under this subsection may be expended without regard to the maximum payment limitation and small payment increases required under section 8(e) of this Act, and may be distributed among States without regard to distribution of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program authorized under this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such area authorized by this or any other Act."

SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with the 1957 crop of wheat, by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(g) If the county committee determines that any producer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county committee not later than December 1, in any area where only winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are grown), that he does not intend to see his full wheat allotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments: *Provided,* That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduction in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U.S.C. 1340(6)), or by reason of producing less than the normal production of the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326(b) of this Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acreage allotment was established."

Approved August 7, 1956.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly and that the rule of germaneness be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the hour is late. The time is at hand for the President to make a change in South Vietnam. I urge that our President replace Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor as U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, nominating Kenneth Keating, of New York, to succeed him in that extremely important diplomatic post.

I began to lose confidence in General Taylor when, as a member of the Committee on Armed Forces, I listened to his testimony as a witness before our committee, that the South Vietnam forces were winning the war against Communist aggression and infiltration from the north. He told of the then new military policy under the instruction of American military advisers of forming defensive compounds behind barricades, and that time after time the Communist guerrillas would attack some of these compounds and be repulsed and leave such and such number of dead; and the defenders suffered a fewer number of dead. Also, sometimes their attacks succeeded, he admitted. General Taylor testified that in this manner South Vietnam was winning the war against the Vietcong.

Frankly, Mr. President, I wondered at the time and I spoke out asking the question: How could any nation win a war by keeping its forces restrained and simply waiting for the enemy to attack then claiming a great victory as they believed the enemy suffered more casualties than they? My view is that the only way the forces of South Vietnam can possibly win the civil war in which they are invaded by their Communist neighbors from the north, is to roll back the invaders by offensive tactics. However, Mr. President, General Taylor is a famed American military leader. I served for 37 months in World War II, most of the time in Italy and North Africa. I was never anything other than a civilian in uniform. Parenthetically speaking, I could never understand the tactics of our great military leaders in World War II invading Italy from the southerly part of the "boot" of that long, narrow peninsula and slowly fighting desperately contested battles over the rough mountain terrain, finally to Rome and to the Po Valley. It was beyond my comprehension why the 5th Army instead of landing at Salerno did not land on the side of Italy north of Naples, perhaps at Anzio and cut across Italy meeting our Allies coming from the other side. In the long history of the world Rome was captured many, many times by enemy armies, but the 5th Army with which I served in a humble capacity was the very first to capture Rome the hard way from the south.

Frankly, Mr. President, I take a dim view of generals, or former generals, serving as Ambassadors of the United States. The Founding Fathers, in writing the Constitution of our country, provided that in the United States of America, civilian authority must always be supreme over military authority. It is, of course, for our President to determine who it is he wishes as Ambassador to South Vietnam. An Ambassador is the personal representative of our Chief Executive. Admittedly, the situation has gone from bad to worse in South Vietnam. In the Washington Daily News of last Saturday, January 30, there was published a most informative statement under the headline "Taylor Is Doing a Poor Job in South Vietnam," written by a news correspondent and columnist, Walt Friedenberg, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, returning from a half year in Saigon where he observed the entire situation in his professional capacity. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAYLOR IS DOING A POOR JOB IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Walt Friedenberg)

Is Maxwell D. Taylor doing a good job as our Ambassador to South Vietnam?

Granted it's like being captain of a leaking ship with a mutinous crew in a stormy sea, the answer, in my judgment, is definitely "No."

The 63-year old general, who performed with distinction as a soldier, has been unable to become an effective diplomat amid the complications and subtleties of Saigon.

He is the clean-cut American over his head operating in Asia.

He is too self-confidently dedicated to the official preset solution to the Communists' guerrilla war.

He is too insensitive to the curves and curlicues of Vietnamese politics.

TOO COOL

He is too cool and aloof toward the Vietnamese generals to become their confidant.

And in General Taylor, the United States has just about put all its Vietnamese eggs in one basket.

Since 1961 when President Kennedy sent him to Saigon for an urgent assessment, General Taylor has been the chief author of the plan.

Since July when he replaced the subtly effective Henry Cabot Lodge, General Taylor has been the executor of the plan.

And inasmuch as General Taylor has forestalled top-level visits by the Secretaries of Defense and State, only he can be the prime judge of his own performance.

HANDICAPPED

From the start, this West Point general was handicapped by his earlier associations.

His admiration for Maj. Gen. Duong Van (Big) Minh, the politically passé Chief of State, ran crossgrain to General Minh's arch rival Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, then Premier, who had dumped General Minh from real power but still suspected his ambitions.

The first Taylor-Khanh public clash came soon over the issue of infiltration from North Vietnam.

General Khanh insisted it was large scale. General Taylor, either because of unsound intelligence or instructions to keep the Vietnam temperature down in an election year, pooh-poohed General Khanh's appraisal.

Also in July, General Khanh publicly called for a "to the north" campaign, partly to deflect attention from his own failures, partly from conviction that American planes and warships ought to be brought into action. General Taylor again put General Khanh down.

INFILTRATION

As it turned out, the United States this week announced that 10,000 Communists infiltrated into South Vietnam in 1964. And General Taylor last November came around to advocating air strikes in Laos and North Vietnam.

Because of these differences, General Khanh did not take General Taylor into his confidence over a new charter he proclaimed in August.

The move roused Buddhists and students and these two factions toppled General Khanh.

To a large degree General Taylor is prisoner of the American idea that any problem can be solved if enough money, men, and machines are applied to it. This is patently not working so far.

General Taylor also has fretted unduly—as has Washington—about the legitimacy of any Saigon government, rather than its effectiveness.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, at this time, we have 12 generals in South Vietnam. We have more than 20,000 men in our Air Force and ground forces in this unhappy civil war-torn country. I have reliable information that the situation there is now even worse than it was when we had but a few hundred military advisers instead of our present Armed Forces in excess of 20,000. Our forces over there are not headed like a conventional American Army with one or two generals but it seems more like the army of a Latin American Republic, top heavy with generals. There is a song in the night clubs of Saigon "O dear what can the matter be, 12 generals and no strategy."

Mr. President, my view is that our President would manifest wisdom and judgment were he to replace Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor with Kenneth Keating, of New York. Former Senator Keating is not a military man other than that he is a general in our Reserves. I have already voiced the fact that I take a dim view of professional generals occupying high official civilian positions in our Government from the Presidency down. History demonstrates that in the main this has not worked out. Kenneth Keating is internationally known as a former Congressman and U.S. Senator knowledgeable in the foreign affairs of our country. He would have the confidence of the American people. That he is a man of good judgment and integrity, loyal to his country and its institutions, personable and tactful is unquestioned. He has the confidence of his colleagues in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, and of high government officials with whom he, as a Member of the Congress, has had contact. It is our international policy that politics ends at the water's edge. Furthermore, the Communists of the Soviet Union and Red China have full knowledge of the actions of former Senator Keating at the time and preceding the time of the Khrushchev and Castro threat to the peace of the Western Hemisphere back in 1962. Kenneth Keating, of New York, was an able U.S. Senator. I believe, Mr. President, that he would prove an exceedingly able Ambassador to South Vietnam.

May I add, Mr. President, that I have had no conversation on this matter whatever, directly or indirectly, with former Senator Keating or with anyone representing him.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has just made an altogether excellent speech on the problems of New England. While our problems may not be as acute or may not be a century old, as are those of Appalachia, they are still burdensome and full of pitfalls and problems.

I, for one, hope to see the establishment of a regional development program in New England with a subregional program that might include the northern part of the State of Rhode Island, northeastern Connecticut, and the southern part of Massachusetts. This is not so large an area as the Appalachian region, but there is misery, hunger, poverty, and illiteracy there too. I thoroughly congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts on the initiative and forward thinking he has shown in this regard. I know that this idea has been germinating in his mind for many months. I look forward to seeing its fruition as soon as possible.

With regard to the Appalachia bill now before this body, it has been the subject of long, painstaking hearings and careful draftsmanship, tailoring legislation to meet the specific and unique economic needs of that region. It is a sound bill, which should set the guidelines for future regional plans. No area, no land, no region is an island unto itself; and for this reason I intend to support the Appalachia bill.

I commend the excellent work that has been done by the chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. MCNAMARA] and the principal sponsor of the bill [Mr. RANDOLPH]. They have taken the lead in promoting a philosophy of regional economic planning and development which I would like to see gain national acceptance.

But I reiterate that my own region of New England, which for generations had enjoyed a high climate of prosperous industrial advance, widespread trade, important commercial fisheries, developed natural resources, and specialized agricultural activities, has been experiencing in recent years serious economic dislocation. Each State in New England has specialized problems, but all of them can be met by cooperative regional planning because of our geographic and economic integration.

I ask such a plan for New England, just as I fully support one to meet the needs of the people and industries of Appalachia. I am confident that our State officials will cooperate in developing a regional plan specifically geared to the character of New England.

My hope is that the near future will see New England returned to its position as a leader in industry and commerce. I intend to do all I can to see this objective reached. I am pleased to see the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] take the lead he has taken in this matter.

THE HUMANITIES AND THE ARTS—ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD BEFORE THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently in New York City, before the annual dinner of the American Council of Learned Societies, Representative WILLIAM MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, spoke on the subject of the humanities and the arts.

This address sets forth in both meaningful and eloquent terms the need for a national foundation which would assist and stimulate the development of both these cultural areas, highly important to our national welfare and the future goals we seek.

As one who has introduced legislation with similar concepts in the Senate, I would like to extend my commendations to Congressman MOORHEAD for his informative and thoughtful presentation, which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues.

Because I feel that this address is very pertinent to the legislation which we will be considering in this session of the Congress to advance our Nation's cultural progress, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Congressman MOORHEAD's remarks entitled "A Great Audience for the Great Society" be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GREAT AUDIENCE FOR THE GREAT SOCIETY

(An address delivered by Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, before the annual dinner of the American Council of Learned Societies, New York City, January 21, 1965)

Walt Whitman: "To have great poets, there must be great audiences, too."

T. S. Eliot: "A religion requires not only a body of priests who know what they are doing, but a body of worshipers who know what is being done."

As I appear before you, in awe of you, in awe of the total learning represented by this distinguished group, I am reminded of the admonition by Alexander Pope:

> "A little learning is a dangerous thing;
> Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian
> spring."

It is a dangerous thing for me who has only tested, to appear before you who have partaken so deeply of the waters of the Pierian spring.

A little learning proved to be a dangerous thing for that Kentucky mountaineer named Joshua who pleaded not guilty before a very learned judge. When the very learned judge heard that the defendant's name was Joshua, he asked, "Are you the Joshua who made the sun stand still?" The reply came, "No, Your Honor, I am the Joshua who made the moonshine still."

A little learning also proved to be a dangerous thing for the repentant sinner who appeared before his priest and confessed that in the 20 years that he had worked for a building supply company he had stolen enough material to build a house for himself and even one for his son and daughter-in-law. The priest, who was shocked, said, "Son, you had better make a novena." The repentant sinner said, "OK, Father, if you've got the plans, I'll supply the lumber."

Dangerous though it may be to talk with this learned assembly about a National Humanities Foundation, I am going to make the venture, first discussing the political situation which this legislation faces and then discussing with you whether the arts, creative and performing, properly belong in, or whether they should be separated from, the National Humanities Foundation.

First, what is the general political climate in the United States today and, second, what are the specific political hurdles which the National Humanities Foundation legislation faces.

I come to you after having endured and enjoyed 4 days of a national political celebration—the inauguration of a President of the United States.

Before the inauguration some of the commentators surmised that it might resemble the inauguration of Andrew Jackson. They had not realized that the change in America inspired, or epitomized, by the late President and Mrs. John F. Kennedy has continued.

Let's look at the inaugural record. On Monday evening the President's special adviser on the arts—an office which, incidentally has been in existence less than 4 years—gave a reception for 50 persons prominent in the arts and letters. Here poets and painters, architects and historians, dancers and actors rubbed shoulders with and talked to Senators and Congressmen, Cabinet officers and members of the White House staff.

This was the political leadership of the country trying to indicate its awareness of the importance of the intellectual and cultural leadership of the country.

It was a tribute by the men of politics to the men of arts and letters—and, let me point out that the arts were not separated from the letters.

Later that evening there was a function—I can think of no other word—called the inaugural gala at which prominent persons in show business—Carol Channing, Julie Andrews, Carol Burnett, and others—charmed a huge crowd. The tickets to the gala were free—distributed by the national committee to deserving political workers. Despite the great wealth of talent, this audience gave its greatest ovation to the ballet performance of Dame Margot Fonteyn and Rudolph Nureyev.

The highlight of Tuesday was a sellout concert at which pianist Van Cliburn and violinist Isaac Stern performed with the National Symphony Orchestra.

This was followed by a reception in the State Department at which the political leaders were given an opportunity to meet and welcome these artists to Washington.

But this froth of inaugural activity is not the only thing indicative of a change. Let us remember that on January 12 of this year when the President sent a massive $1.6 billion aid-to-education message to Congress, the voices of opposition, so strident in the past, were almost silent.

Another straw in the political wind, of particular importance to this group as a sponsor of the Commission on the Humanities, is the fact that on the opening day of Congress, 57 Members of the House of Representatives introduced bills identical to my bill H.R. 334 to establish a National Humanities Foundation. As of now there are more than 80 similar or identical bills.

In the U.S. Senate there are more than 40 Senators cosponsoring legislation for a National Humanities Foundation.

In addition, there are at least three bills in the Congress calling for the creation of a National Arts Foundation.

I am convinced that there is a growing awareness in the United States that an imbalance exists in our educational system and in our commitment to culture. The Congress, I believe, is ready to do something to rectify that imbalance.

But even though the time is ripe for something like the National Humanities Foundation, that does not mean that the legislation will be enacted.

As you know, there are many pitfalls (or should I say pratfalls) between the introduction and enactment of legislation. One of the greatest of these is the danger that * * * infighting among the groups most directly involved will tempt the Congress to say "A plague on both of your Houses, we will do nothing until you settle your own internal differences."

There is just such a danger between men of letters and men of arts.

It is not well enough recognized that while a National Humanities Foundation is broad enough to include the creative and performing arts, a National Arts Foundation is not broad enough to include the other humanities.

One of the questions which must be decided is whether all areas of creativity and learning which are not scientific should be gathered into one foundation or whether the creative and performing arts should be separated from the other humanities.

Politically, of course, it would be easier to obtain legislation for one foundation than for two and it would avoid an unnecessary proliferation of agencies.

At the present time, in the White House, a debate is going on as to whether the administration should support one foundation or two, and if there are to be two, what should be the order of priority.

If the decision is for two foundations, priority will probably be given to an arts foundation. Such legislation has been before the Congress for many years but until this year, the only bill to create a Humanities Foundation was the one I introduced last August.

A decision for two foundations and priority for the arts would probably mean a delay in the enactment of a foundation for the humanities for 2 or more years.

If you agree that there should be no delay in establishing one all-encompassing foundation, I think that the 100,000 scholars you represent should make their voices heard.

From the point of view of the scholar, one foundation seems preferable. Almost everything that scholars study was produced by an artist. Should scholars limit their association with artists to dead artists? I think that most of you would agree that an artist should know something of the history of art. I submit to you that an art historian should know something of the actual work of creative painting.

From the point of view of the artist, the concern is expressed that in competition for funds, artists will be forgotten unless they have their own foundation.

I do not think this concern recognizes the political facts of life. With one broad foundation, charged with support of the humanities and the arts, artists will seek meaningful financial assistance from a board of 25 members, "eminent in the humanities and the arts." Humanists and educators, with their superior organizational resources and advantageous geographical dispersion will be in a better position, politically, to lobby for money. If there are two foundations, the artists will be left to lobby on their own for financial support—they will, in fact, be competing with the NHF for cultural seed money.

But we should be asking ourselves whether one foundation or two are better means of attaining the national goal.

The national goal is twofold in nature.

It is to promote excellence in the creation and the understanding of art or as President Johnson called it, "the love of learning and the capacity for creation."

Great creativity in the arts alone is not enough, the Great Society must have a great audience.

What do I mean by that phrase?

I mean that a great civilization, at least in modern times, must have not only great creativity, but great receptivity. To reach this goal, it is quite clear to me that an arts foundation alone is not enough. By itself, it cannot perform the function of increasing the exposure of the creative and performing arts, but this is to water unplanted soil. The arts and the humanities are only artificially separable.

The humanities not only give us what is beautiful to see or to hear, but they also teach us what to look for and what to listen for. And it is important that an audience know these things. A great civilization needs the man who communicates to us in paint—but it is a greater civilization which can understand that communication to the fullest. And that understanding inspires the artist to even greater heights of creativity.

I conceive it to be a central function of a National Humanities Foundation to promote excellence in the creation and the understanding of art in America—to develop a great audience for great creative artists. Let me explore more fully the ways in which the National Humanities Foundation might do this in the fields of the performing and visual arts.

Because New York City is the theatrical capital of the Nation, let us consider this first in relation to the performing arts. I have in mind two different varieties of ventures which the National Humanities Foundation could support.

The first type of program would have as its primary focus the development and cultivation of "the great audience." As Walt Whitman said of poetry:

"Poetry like a grand personality is a growth of many generations. To have great poets, there must be great audiences, too."

In this task, one has to begin somewhere, and I propose that a good beginning point is with traditional theater productions. I am not suggesting that the National Humanities Foundation mount a full scale Broadway production, but it would support efforts to bring established classics to broader and more diverse audiences.

Last summer, on the street corners of New York, for example, a troupe of young and enthusiastic players brought Shakespeare to a Harlem audience. Most of those in that audience had never seen a play before. Their initial bewilderment changed rapidly to approval and delight. Such an undertaking offers the theater a splendid opportunity to fulfill its traditional function of illuminating for its spectators unfamiliar corners of life; it also begins to develop the potential of a vast and as yet untried audience.

In addition to the anniversary of the Magna Carta, we have been celebrating the 400th year after the birth of Shakespeare. Suppose that out of the wealth of acting talent in New York, there were organized several traveling Shakespearean repertory companies whose visits to communities would be coordinated with high school literature courses so that the students who had been reading and discussing Shakespeare in a humanities course would suddenly have it brought alive to them in a three-dimensional form by professional actors on the stage.

The primary objective of such programs would be to awaken a love for and an understanding of the live theater in the hearts of people throughout the United States.

However, there would also be byproducts beneficial to the theatrical profession. In addition to the opportunities it would offer to the underemployed acting profession, such a program might well bring into the open an acting genius whose talents might otherwise never have been discovered. We would hope that the immediate benefits of such a program in terms of jobs for members of the theatrical profession would be dramatic. But our primary focus in this type of venture, that of educating broad audiences to be willing theatergoers, will have the long-range product of developing the very large audience which is necessary if the theater arts and its practitioners are to flourish in this country.

I mentioned another type of program, which the National Humanities Foundation might appropriately support. I think the National Humanities Foundation could and on occasion would, subsidize a theatrical production thought to be of unusual merit without reference to the audience it would attract. The young performer, the experimental production, the untried director, would be the primary object of such a program. They would be offered a stage on which to develop their craft, a way to obtain recognition of their talents, and also, of course, a way to earn a living in their chosen profession. The focus of these efforts could be actors' workshops, small theaters, or college campuses. For example, in a statement last year to the House Committee on Education and Labor, Walter Caro, the executive director of the Theater Guild-American Theater Society, said:

"Just the other day I attended a production of a new play which could not be produced on Broadway, but for which we finally persuaded the University of Michigan to appropriate some money in order to get the play on the boards. They sustained a loss. It is a new, important, and challenging work. It never would have come to light."

In a university setting, there would be the added advantage of an unusual opportunity to develop the powers of comprehension of the audience and increase their receptivity to the experimental and innovative productions which are the seedbed of future theater. We would be building an audience on which we could depend to support the performing arts in years to come. And this, rather than Government support, should be the economic foundation for the performing arts.

And who knows, in this audience which we are building, we may "strike a spark" of response in a potential Ibsen, Albee, or Brecht.

The primary aim, of course, of subsidizing experimental works of unusual merit would be providing outlets for underemployed professional talents. The primary aim of sponsoring the more conventional efforts, such as the traveling Shakespearean troupes, is the development of a responsive supporting audience. And it is hoped that in the more experimental productions, we would be developing a great audience, as a secondary aim, while the support of the conventional theater, albeit in unconventional ways, would open up many new jobs for actors and directors.

Thus, the two forks of National Humanities Foundation aid to the theater arts are supplementary. Each is necessary, if we are to achieve the twin goals of excellence in creativity and understanding of the arts. I stress both sides of this coin because it is so clear to me that the National Humanities Foundation must aid in the development not only of a great American theater, but also of a receptive and educated audience which will be able to support that theater. And this, a National Humanities Foundation, working with educators and humanists such as yourself, would be uniquely prepared to do.

The foundation would not, of course, confine its attention exclusively to the theater. Additional programs might be of inestimable value to the other performing arts. I can think of fellowships or internships for musicians with symphony orchestras or with the recognized masters of their instruments.

Universities should be encouraged to have poets and composers, musicians, authors, and playwrights in residence. There should be encouragement of conferences which would bring together and stimulate interaction among educators and the visual and performing artists. Exposure to practicing artists in a university setting may stimulate students' interests in music or painting or sculpture, develop a broader and better audience of humanistically trained people, who can appreciate and stimulate an artist's work.

This points up how unnatural it would be to divide artists from other humanists. How would we classify Paul Hindemuth, or Robert Penn Warren at Yale, or Leonard Baskind at Smith.

Insofar as the visual arts are concerned, a National Humanities Foundation can do anything that an arts foundation could do, but it can also do much more. The visual arts, like all other arts, do not exist and never have existed in a social vacuum. They are part and parcel of the history and philosophy of their times, and to be properly appreciated, they must be understood as such. For example, Picasso's "Guernica," viewed in isolation, has a powerful impact, but how much more powerful, how much more moving it is when seen as a vivid and immediate symbol of the intellectual turmoil and disillusion acompanying the ravages of the Spanish Civil War, when we understand the anguish and fury which prompted a disillusioned Picasso to make this comment on the horrors of war.

We do not do the artists a service if we concentrate our efforts only on the artist himself and neglect the people for whom he paints. The visual arts need a great audience, too. In rare instances there may be a Gaugin who must retire from civilization to attain his fullest creative powers, but in most instances, the artist is a part of society and is affected, either favorably, or unfavorably, by the people for whom he paints.

In its report to the Commission on the Humanities, the American Society for Aesthetics said:

"There has been a remarkable growth of interest in the arts in this country since World War I. Unfortunately, this great wave of interest has not been adequately matched by efforts directed toward an understanding of the arts."

I can conceive of support for programs which would bring exhibits of contemporary art and artists, too, to college campuses where the artist might discuss his work with the members of the art department. The exchange would be a rewarding experience for both artist and professor.

Not only would such a program give direct financial assistance to the particular artist but it would also help to establish future support for the arts. Exposure to the practicing artist in a university setting may stimulate students' interest in painting and sculpture, develop a broader and better audience of humanistically trained people, who can appreciate, stimulate, support, and believe in artists' work.

A National Humanities Foundation program of assistance to museums would also mean support for artists and development of an audience for their work.

A National Humanities Foundation would help to bring attention to the valuable potential for museums in the enrichment of American life. There are more than 5,000 museums now in existence in the United States with an annual attendance totaling over 200 million visits. But this asset cannot be fully utilized, mainly because the rapid growth of our museums, spurred on by public interest, has far outstripped the ability of the museum community to provide trained personnel for its scholarly, civic, and educational obligations.

The National Humanities Foundation will encourage training and participation in the arts themselves, giving to some the impetus and training needed to develop their creative talents, and to others, the training in the arts necessary to increase their receptivity.

Above all we should not establish institutions which separate artists from other humanists. As the late T. S. Eliot in his "Notes Toward the Definition of Culture," said:

"Nor does it follow that in a society of whatever grade of culture the groups concerned with each activity of culture will be distinct and exclusive: on the contrary, it is only by an overlapping and sharing of interests, by participation and mutual appreciation, that cohesion necessary for culture can obtain. A religion requires not only a body of priests who know what they are doing, but a body of worshipers who know what is being done."

A great society needs great artists and a great audience. It is my hope that scholars and educators, working with artists and performers can, with the help of the National Humanities Foundation, build that audience, will inspire those artists.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the problems of Appalachia are well known. They are, as was stated by President Johnson, "a challenge to the ingenuity as well as to the compassion of Congress." That challenge has been well met in the provisions of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

I join my colleagues, however, in concern for other areas throughout the country which have similar economic problems. In my own State of Missouri, the economy in certain sections of the southeast and southwest part of the State has faltered and lags far behind that of the Nation as a whole.

Strip mining has left a scarred landscape. Marginal lands bring bare subsistence. Population is sliding. In many counties, median family income falls well below $3,000. This area of Missouri joins that of Arkansas and Oklahoma. Similar topography and similar problems here in this three-State area offer hope of common solution.

It is my feeling that the administration should offer a comprehensive proposal to prepare plans similar to those undertaken on behalf of Appalachia looking forward to development and restoration of other regions capable of development—including the Ozark region of Missouri.

I should like to inquire as to the position of the leadership on this matter.

Are there any plans now along the lines I suggested in the brief statement I have made?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the statement of support of the Appalachian Regional Development Act by the very eminent Senator from Missouri.

Definite efforts will be made in the near future to give careful consideration to the presentation of the Ozark and other proposals. The mechanism for such presentations is embodied in S. 820 now at the desk, where it will remain through the end of business on Wednesday. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri would like to be a cosponsor of such a measure with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] and many other members of the Public Works Committee, who have signed their names as cosponsors. They have indicated, by their signing, that the work will go forward in the committee.

I say to the Senator that any area which can make a case puts the responsibility on Congress to give attention to its proposals.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his remarks. I deeply appreciate the position he takes. It is typical of the fine work he does, not only for his State of West Virginia, but for the people of the country as a whole.

AID TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that there has been a great deal of going and coming with respect to the action of the House in cutting off aid to President Nasser.

I have received a communication from the State Department in which it stated that our aid program with the United Arab Republic is still under consideration to determine whether it is still serving the purpose of advancing U.S. objectives in the United Arab Republic and the Middle East generally.

In my judgment the President of the United States should make the foreign policy of the United States, unless he puts us in a position where it is impossible to feel that he is carrying out the consensus of the country. In that case Congress, as it has done before, will again take the matter into its own hands.

Therefore, if the President of the United States wishes us to leave his hands free on this question of foreign policy, he should make a declaration that we will not aid the United Arab Republic so long as it torpedoes the cause of world peace and the foreign policy of the United States. Otherwise, the President leaves the Senate no alternative but to follow the action of the House. If he wishes to have a free hand, he must act. I hope that he will do so. I say that because I agree that he should have a free hand; but having a free hand does not mean being free from the responsibility to do what the situation demands.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate contains the title "Mining Area Restoration."

Under the language of the bill the Federal Government would be authorized to spend money to restore strip-mining lands. The lands to be restored, under the present language of the bill, would include not only privately owned property but also Federal, State, and local government land holdings.

I am of the opinion that it is imprudent to contemplate spending taxpayers' money at this time on private land for the purpose of breaking down high walls, leveling ridges, and planting grass and trees and shrubs.

I have no objection to the spending of Federal money on Federal, State, and local government property, but the moneys ought not be spent in restoring land owned by the very entities that destroyed the land.

AMENDMENT NO. 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 11 o'clock having arrived, the Senate will proceed under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 25, line 3, beginning with the word "Projects", it is proposed to strike out all through the word "with." on line 16.

On page 28, line 12, following the words "this section.", it is proposed to insert "No moneys authorized by this Act shall be expended for the purposes of reclaiming, improving, grading, seeding, or reforestation of strip-mined areas except on lands owned by Federal, State, or local bodies of government, until authorized by law after completion of the study and report to the President as provided in subsection (c) of this section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. The Senator has available under the unanimous-consent agreement 10 minutes. Ten minutes are available to the opposition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the bill contains a section which would command and authorize the Department of the Interior to make a study of the problem of strip-mined lands. The study is to be completed by July 1, 1967. Heretofore, I have argued on the floor of the Senate that the subject of restoring lands owned by private individuals and companies ought not to be taken up until the study which would be authorized is completed. As I have said, that study will be completed on July 1, 1967.

My amendment would allow restoration of lands owned by the Federal, State, and local governments. It would not allow the restoration with taxpayers' money of lands owned by companies and private individuals, who, as I have previously stated, have destroyed the very lands that we now contemplate reclaiming.

My amendment deals only with privately owned lands. No moneys would be authorized to be spent in the reclamation of those lands until there was specific authorization by law after the study contemplated in the bill is completed.

Mr. President, I believe my amendment is sound. I believe the Senator in charge of the bill looks with favor upon it. A very anomalous situation exists. We are witnessing and tolerating the strip mining of land. That operation is rendering the land useless. Unless my amendment is adopted, the money of taxpayers will be used to reclaim, repair, and make right what the strip miners themselves should have done.

That is my case. I believe it is sound. It would be unjust and the height of folly to take the money of the ordinary taxpayer and spend it on the reclamation of lands, the ownership of which will be in private individuals, even though there would be a provision that such land might be used by the general public.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from West Virginia yield to himself?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, that portion of the bill to which the able Senator from Ohio has directed the attention of the Senate was the subject of study and hearing during consideration of the bill last year as well as this year. It has been the subject of continuing counseling by members of the Committee on Public Works with the Senator from Ohio.

In general, in essence, and in the broad outlook we have agreed with the Senator from Ohio. It has been the purpose of the committee to have provision in the legislation to restore, reclaim, and rehabilitate the strip-mined lands in areas which were public and from which the public would benefit. For a time it was thought that certain private lands might be involved. Those private lands might lend themselves to development into industrial parks or in other uses for which public benefits would be assured. For that reason the language in the bill seemed to be valid.

However, no Senator has had a more intimate knowledge of the subject of strip mining than has the Senator from Ohio, who is a former Governor of his State. We know his efforts while chief executive of Ohio, to improve and redevelop the scarred land that has resulted from strip mining. Both the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from West Virginia know that more than 800,000 acres of land have been strip mined in approximately a dozen States. We also know that there has been a voluntary reclaiming of the lands in some States, and in other States there has been reclamation as a result of the passage of State laws.

We also recognize that this land which has been scarred, eroded, and made ugly was made so because of certain strip-mining operations that of necessity were required to go forward. So we would not make a blanket indictment against strip-mining operations. But we would say only that there has been a failure, in part the result of State law and in part caused by the operator, who oftentimes has been without financial resources, to provide for the reclaiming of the land.

Therefore, today we find that of the approximately 500,000 acres of affected land within the Appalachian area, only a portion of such land has been reclaimed. I believe only about 40 percent of the strip-mined territory of the United States has been reclaimed as of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There was no desire on the part of the committee or the Senator now speaking in any sense to bring a windfall to any corporation. What we desire to do is for the public good. We would do it for the general welfare.

Therefore, because of the constructive suggestion and the broad experience of the Senator from Ohio, and because this is not a point easily arrived at but has been the subject of a considerable number of conferences, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, and the Senator from West Virginia are in a position to accept the language of the amendment as modified by the Senator from Ohio. We will therefore proceed with this work as was intended at the outset, of course, but now it will proceed only on public lands until completion of the study authorized in the pending bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate very much the very sound approach that the Senator from West Virginia has taken to this subject.

Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation showing the dollar value of the coal taken out of the ground in the States of the Union together with a tabulation of the depletion allowance that has been granted to the companies that did the mining.

The coal industry has a 10-percent depletion allowance. That means that 10 percent of the money received for the coal is set aside as nontaxable. The depletion allowance for coal-mining companies in 1960, which is the last tabulation I have, was $44 million. I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated maximum depletion deduction allowable—Bituminous coal, lignite (strip mining), year 1960

SCHEDULE NO. 1

State	Number of strip mines (1)	Production, net tons (2)	Average value f.o.b. mine (3)	Estimated total gross value (4)	Estimated royalty exclusion, at 15 cents per ton (5)	Estimated adjusted gross income depletable (6)	Estimated depletion allowable, at 10 percent rate (7)	Percent total coal production by stripping (8)
Alabama	39	2,558,414	$5.06	$12,945,574.84	$383,762.10	$12,561,812.74	$1,256,181.27	19.6
Alaska	6	655,489	8.90	5,833,852.10	98,323.35	5,735,528.75	573,552.88	90.7
Arkansas	10	296,249	7.30	2,162,617.70	44,437.35	2,118,180.35	211,818.04	72.4
Colorado	7	692,849	3.73	2,584,326.77	103,927.35	2,480,399.42	248,039.94	19.2
Illinois	69	22,670,585	4.01	90,909,045.85	3,400,587.75	87,508,458.10	8,750,845.81	49.3
Indiana	47	10,784,967	3.82	41,198,573.94	1,617,745.05	39,580,828.89	3,958,082.89	69.4
Iowa	25	867,924	3.41	2,959,620.84	130,188.60	2,829,432.24	282,943.22	81.3
Kansas	11	884,690	4.71	4,166,889.90	132,703.50	4,034,186.40	403,418.64	99.6
Kentucky	129	19,672,192	3.34	65,705,121.28	2,950,828.80	62,754,292.48	6,275,429.25	29.4
Maryland	37	487,636	3.32	1,618,951.52	73,145.40	1,545,806.12	154,580.61	65.2
Missouri	23	2,801,937	4.28	11,992,290.36	420,290.55	11,571,999.81	1,157,199.98	96.9
Montana	5	197,430	2.12	418,551.60	29,614.50	388,937.10	38,893.71	63.0
New Mexico	1	45,000	4.59	206,550.00	6,750.00	199,800.00	19,980.00	15.3
North Dakota	31	2,522,552	2.29	5,776,644.08	378,382.80	5,398,261.28	539,826.13	99.9
Ohio	265	23,883,289	3.64	86,935,171.96	3,582,493.35	83,352,678.61	8,335,267.86	70.3
Oklahoma	15	1,093,965	6.29	6,881,039.85	164,094.75	6,716,945.10	671,694.51	81.5
Pennsylvania	553	20,875,533	3.68	76,821,961.44	3,131,329.95	73,690,631.49	7,369,063.15	31.9
South Dakota	1	20,448	4.08	83,427.84	3,067.20	80,360.64	8,036.06	100.0
Tennessee	71	1,763,913	3.36	5,926,747.68	264,586.95	5,662,160.73	566,216.07	29.8
Virginia	35	1,370,864	3.17	4,345,638.88	205,629.00	4,140,009.88	414,000.99	4.9
Washington	1	16,177	9.75	157,725.75	2,426.55	155,299.20	15,529.92	7.1
West Virginia	140	6,754,001	3.66	24,719,643.66	1,013,100.15	23,706,543.51	2,370,654.35	5.7
Wyoming	9	1,713,384	2.80	4,797,475.20	257,007.60	4,540,457.60	454,056.76	84.6
Total	1,530	122,629,664		459,147,443.14	18,394,449.60	440,240,494.36	44,024,049.44	
Overall average			3.74					

NOTES

(1) Col. 1 from table 29, p. 86, Minerals Yearbook, 1960, vol. II, "Fuels," U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(2) Col. 2 from table 28, p. 86, Minerals Yearbook, 1960, vol. II, "Fuels," U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(3) Col. 3 from table 63, p. 137, Minerals Yearbook, 1960, vol. II, "Fuels," U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(4) Col. 5 assumed royalty payments based on estimated average of 15-cent-per-ton royalty, for bituminous and lignite.

(5) Col. 7 maximum percentage depletion allowable on 10 percent of adjusted gross income.

(6) Col. 8 table 15, p. 67, Minerals Yearbook, 1960, vol. II, "Fuels," U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

Estimated maximum depletion deduction allowable—Bituminous coal, lignite (strip mining), year 1961

SCHEDULE NO. 2

State	Number of strip mines (1)	Production, net tons (2)	Average value f.o.b. mine (3)	Estimated total gross value (4)	Estimated royalty exclusion, at 15 cents per ton (5)	Estimated adjusted gross income depletable (6)	Estimated depletion allowable, at 10 percent rate (7)	Percent total coal production by stripping (8)
Alabama	44	2,701,052	$4.79	$12,938,039.08	$405,157.80	$12,532,881.28	$1,253,288.13	20.9
Alaska	4	627,537	8.17	5,126,977.29	94,130.55	5,032,846.74	503,284.67	85.2
Arkansas	10	230,341	6.75	1,554,801.75	34,551.15	1,520,250.60	152,025.06	58.3
Colorado	6	521,368	3.68	1,918,634.24	78,205.20	1,840,429.04	184,042.90	14.2
Illinois	61	22,785,504	3.96	90,230,595.84	3,417,825.60	86,812,770.24	8,681,277.02	50.4
Indiana	40	10,497,306	3.79	39,784,789.74	1,574,595.90	38,210,193.84	3,821,019.38	69.5
Iowa	26	779,600	3.43	2,674,028.00	116,940.00	2,557,088.00	255,708.80	84.1
Kansas	9	661,876	4.67	3,090,960.92	99,281.40	2,991,679.52	299,167.95	99.7
Kentucky	111	21,453,691	3.36	72,084,401.76	3,218,053.65	68,866,348.11	6,886,634.81	34.0
Maryland	33	470,263	3.21	1,509,544.23	70,539.45	1,439,004.78	143,900.48	62.1
Missouri	19	2,867,037	4.25	12,184,907.25	430,055.55	11,754,851.70	1,175,485.17	2.4
Montana	4	271,008	2.04	552,856.32	40,651.20	512,205.12	51,220.51	73.1
New Mexico	1	15,248	5.03	76,697.44	2,287.20	74,410.24	7,441.02	3.7
North Dakota	31	2,724,289	2.25	6,129,650.25	408,643.35	5,721,006.90	572,100.69	99.9
Ohio	260	22,463,370	3.57	80,194,230.90	3,369,505.50	76,824,725.40	7,682,472.54	69.7
Oklahoma	17	882,844	6.18	5,455,975.92	132,426.60	5,323,549.32	532,354.93	85.6

See notes at end of table.

Estimated maximum depletion deduction allowable—Bituminous coal, lignite (strip mining), year 1961—Continued

SCHEDULE NO. 2

State	Number of strip mines (1)	Production, net tons (2)	Average value f.o.b. mine (3)	Estimated total gross value (4)	Estimated royalty exclusion, at 15 cents per ton (5)	Estimated adjusted gross income depletable (6)	Estimated depletion allowable, at 10 percent rate (7)	Percent total coal production by stripping (8)
Pennsylvania	535	20,744,848	$3.60	$74,681,452.80	$3,111,727.20	$71,569,725.60	$7,156,972.56	33.1
South Dakota	1	17,805	4.20	74,781.00	2,670.75	72,110.25	7,211.02	100.0
Tennessee	65	1,761,170	3.39	5,970,366.30	264,175.50	5,706,190.80	570,619.08	30.1
Virginia	36	1,412,341	2.98	4,208,776.18	211,851.15	3,996,925.03	399,692.50	4.7
Washington	1	6,382	9.71	61,969.22	957.30	61,011.92	6,101.19	3.3
West Virginia	154	5,860,083	3.55	20,803,294.65	879,012.45	19,924,282.20	1,992,428.22	5.2
Wyoming	9	2,224,121	2.91	6,472,192.11	333,618.15	6,138,573.96	613,857.40	88.0
Total	1,477	121,979,084		447,779,923.19	18,296,862.00	429,483,060.29	42,948,306.03	
Overall average			3.67					

NOTES

(1) Col. 1, table 30 p. 96, Minerals Yearbook, 1961, vol. II, "Fuels," Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(2) Col 2, table 30 p. 96, Minerals Yearbook, 1961, vol. II, "Fuels," Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(3) Col. 3, table 64 p. 148, Minerals Yearbook, 1961, vol. II, "Fuels," Department of Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(4) Col. 5, assumed royalty payments based on estimated average of 15 cents per ton royalty for bituminous and lignite.

(5) Col. 7, maximum percentage depletion allowable on 10 percent of adjusted gross income.

(6) Col. 8, table 14, p. 76, Minerals Yearbook, 1961, vol. II, "Fuel," Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am ready for the vote on the amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia wishes to point out further that more acres have been strip mined in Ohio than in any other State. We sometimes think of West Virginia and Pennsylvania as the leading coal-producing States; but strip mining has been done more extensively in Ohio than in any other State.

Again, as the Senator in charge of the bill, I say that I am in agreement with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], that the amendment as now modified is acceptable.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio is of tremendous value. We know of the effort he has been making for 2 years to have a survey made of the problems that arise from strip mining.

Two or three years ago, I was informed by the Forest Service, of the Department of Agriculture, that there was little knowledge of the types of things that could be done to correct the ravages resulting from strip mining. Studies have been made of the damages caused in flat country, but the Forest Service said there was little information about the types of vegetation or timber that could be established upon the ravaged lands.

The only research that has been in progress on this problem to date is that conducted by Berea College, in Kentucky, through the efforts made by the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD] and the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON]. Two years ago we were able to secure a small appropriation to permit this investigation to go forward. Now it is necessary to have more money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this morning I asked Mr. Leary, of the Department of the Interior, what experiments had been made concerning the kinds of vegetation that can be grown on the strip-mined lands. He told me that the Department had made two experiments on two small plots of land. I had to chuckle when he gave that answer, because we in Ohio have been conducting experiments for 16 years, trying to find out what kind of trees and grasses will grow and how the ground can be prepared to produce vegetation where the coal has produced a toxic condition when water has fallen on it.

Since we have entered into this discussion, I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that it strengthens my judgment that the only intelligent way to handle this situation is, first, to make a study, and then to formulate a program concerning what shall be done.

Mr. COOPER. Despite the provisions in the bill, unless some support is given to research to determine the types of vegetation that can be produced, how forestry can be conducted, and how the acid water that comes from the strip mines can be treated to make it potable again, all of this action will not mean very much.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, has all time expired?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from West Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I desire to yield myself 1 minute, to complete my remarks.

In furtherance of the colloquy between the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Ohio, I recall inviting the Secretary of Agriculture, last year, to travel with me over some of the strip-mined area in West Virginia. We found that in our conservation districts, headway was just beginning to be made in the development of cover crops that seemed to be, at least in part, successful. But the Department representatives themselves were the first to indicate that a further study in depth was needed in order to solve the problem completely.

So as we proceed with this reclamation work, interim reports will be made. This, I feel certain, is the desire of the Senator from Ohio and of the members of the committee, as well.

Mr. President, I ask that the Chair put the question.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, would it be in order for me to ask unanimous consent to speak on the bill, even though no amendment is now pending?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from South Dakota must ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 5 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I supported the Appalachia bill last year, and I intend to support it again when it comes to a vote this year. But I shall do so with the full understanding that this is the first bill in a list of regional development programs that are to be implemented.

The problems of the Appalachian region are serious. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has brought that situation forcefully to the attention of Congress over a long period. But there are also serious and stubborn problems in other areas of the country. Not the least of them is concentrated in the Great Plains area.

Not wishing to encumber the bill now before the Senate with another amendment, but recognizing, nevertheless, the serious problems of the Dakotas, Montana, Wyoming, and other States of the upper Great Plains area, I introduced a bill a week ago to encourage much the same kind of regional and economic development in that section of the country as is provided for in the Appalachia concept.

I hope that we may count on the assurances that were given this morning from the administration that regional planning and development will go forward in my section of the country, as it will in other parts of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain economic data prepared by my staff relative to economic problems in our area be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC DATA ON SOUTH DAKOTA AND THE NORTHERN GREAT PLAINS

I. From "Family Income and Related Characteristics Among Low-Income Counties and States," Welfare Research Report I, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, September 1964.

(a) South Dakota's median family income is the ninth lowest in the Nation.

(b) Most of the 10 lowest median family income States registered the sharpest improvement in the Nation for median family income from 1949–59. But of the 10 lowest States, South Dakota was an exception with the lowest intercensal improvement (24.6 percent) of any State in the Nation. The national average gain was 50.5 percent over the 10-year period.

(c) Oliver County, N. Dak., registered the largest decline in median family income from 1949 to 1959 among the 10 lowest States, 41 percent.

(d) There are 128 counties which reflect various degrees of economic stagnation that calls for special attention with a minimum of delay. Of the 49 most severe counties, South Dakota has the largest number, 12.

(e) Another measure of significance in relation to the low-income States and counties is the ratio of persons in the dependent ages (under 18 and 65 or over) for each 100 persons in the so-called nondependent ages (18–64). Here, South Dakota's ratio is 96.1, second highest in the Nation.

(f) The aid to families with dependent children recipient rate, based on the number of children under age 18 receiving aid per 1,000 children under 18 years of age, is another good indicator. Among the lowest median family income States, this rate was below the national average in only 3 of the 10 lowest States, one of which was South Dakota.

II. From "Converging Social Trends: Emerging Social Patterns" welfare administration report, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964.

(a) The 20.9 percent of the families in South Dakota have annual income below $2,000.

III. From Department of Commerce report, the Washington World, May 11, 1964.

(a) South Dakota suffered a 6-percent decline in per capita personal income from 1962 to 1963. This was the second highest percentage decline in the Nation. North Dakota suffered the highest, 12 percent.

IV. From "Economic Progress Bulletin," Upper Midwest Research and Development Council, April 6, 1964.

(a) If South Dakota had not had net migration of 94,466 in the 1950–60 period, 2.8 percent could have been added to total personal income.

(b) The national per annum percent of population growth for the period 1950–60 was 1.7 percent. For the upper Midwest it was 0.93 percent. For South Dakota, 0.42 percent. Forty-six of South Dakota's counties showed a decline in population from 1950 to 1960. Only three counties did not show a net migration.

(c) It is estimated that the number of South Dakota farms will decrease from 63,000 in the 1954–58 period to 49,900 in 1975, or a 20.8-percent decline.

V. From "Education and the Upper Midwest Economies," by Jack I. Stone, upper Midwest economic study, a joint undertaking by the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council and the University of Minnesota, January 1964.

(a) Estimates of average salaries of classroom teachers in 1962–63 show that only two States rank lower than South Dakota's $3,950 per year. North Dakota, with $4,275 ranks 43d in the Nation. Montana is 29th with $5,150.

(b) In North and South Dakota, less than one out of five elementary school teachers has a bachelor's degree—far fewer than in any other State in the Nation.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I would find it difficult to support the Appalachia bill if I assumed that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget was speaking for the administration with respect to farm policy. In some of the statements that we read coming from the Budget Director with respect to agriculture policy, not only affecting my State, but all 50 States, there is cause for alarm. When we read, as I did a few days ago in a leading journal, a statement by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that American agriculture can support only 1 million farm families, when in fact 3,500,000 families are now living on the land, that is, indeed, cause for great concern.

I am sure that that does not represent the position of the President. We shall get a message on agriculture from the President later this week. We have good reason to believe that the President will refute the line of reasoning set out by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

This is what the President had to say concerning agriculture when he spoke to a farm audience in Des Moines, Iowa, last October 7. He said:

> This campaign is going to give the people of America a clear mandate for a farm policy that will restore full parity of income and opportunity to all of the American farmers who live on American farms.

That means not just 1 million, but all of the American farmers who live on American farms. That is 3½ million farmers, not 1 million, as one would conclude from the article by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have had great difficulty in reconciling the statement of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that 2½ million farmers ought to leave the land and go to the cities, while at the same time we propose in the Appalachian bill to give up to $500 to each farmer in Appalachia to improve his pasture land for the purpose, in my mind, of increasing the cattle population. The two things just do not go hand in hand.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the point of the Senator may be well taken. But, beyond that there is also the larger problem of how we shall deal with poverty in this country. It does no good simply to transfer rural poverty into the cities, which are already overly congested and troubled with unemployed and poverty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be permitted to speak for 4 minutes, and that he may yield a half minute to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield a half minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I saw the ravages of unemployment in the big cities during the depression. I was on the bench. I saw replevin actions and mortgage foreclosures brought before the courts.

If depression were to strike, I should pray that there would be more people on the farms where they are able to sustain themselves, rather than that they all be in the cities.

If we should ever have a recurrence of what happened and all of the people were to be concentrated in the cities, there would be an unbearable problem.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I think the point of the Senator is well taken. Many of the serious depressions began on the farms. The depression of 1929 had its origin 8 or 10 years before that time, with the very severe depression of income in the agricultural areas.

Mr. President, to further assure our farm families that the philosophy outlined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget does not represent the view of the President, I should like to quote three or four other statements made by President Johnson last October. He said:

> We intend to continue, but to improve, commodity programs. We intend to strengthen farm income.
>
> We intend to assure rural Americans full partnership in the building of our Great Society.

Then he said:

> You can choose our proposal to continue but to improve commodity programs, or you can choose the contrary proposal, to wipe those programs out altogether.

Then the President reveals what would happen if we were to eliminate our farm commodity programs. He said:

> First, net farm income throughout the Nation would be cut in half, or $6 billion. Do you want that to happen?
>
> Second, one out of five farmers would be bankrupt. Do you want that to happen?

The President does not even want 1 out of 5 farmers to be bankrupted, let alone to drive 2½ million farmers out of the total of 3½ million farmers off the land and into the cities to join the unemployed—or to sign up for the Job Corps.

The President then said:

> We know from bitter experiences that depressions are farm-led and they are farm-fed, and I say to you that the Democratic Party under my leadership, as long as I am President, is not going to repeat that experience. * * *
>
> The Democratic goal is parity of income for the farmer.

Mr. President, it is because I believe President Johnson's pledge, which I have just read, that I feel I have the assurance which I think I need to support programs of public assistance for other sections of the country such as Appalachia. The greatest need in my State, among several, is improved farm income. The President's own policy statements, plus assurances in regard to regional development given today, reassure me that South Dakota problems are to be met.

I urgently hope and expect that when the President outlines his views on agriculture to Congress on Thursday, we shall have a strong reaffirmation of his pledge to improve our farm commodity problems, to raise farm income—which is now only about half the national per capita average—and to strengthen in every way that we can the agricultural sections of the country.

Mr. President, there is a very fine letter to the editor in this morning's Washington Post. This is authored by Mr. Leon Keyserling, the distinguished economist. It is entitled "Farmers' Plight." I ask unanimous consent that that letter to the editor may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Farmers' Plight

Your editorial of January 27 deals with the plight of agriculture, challenges any cutbacks in Government efforts to bolster farm income, and focuses upon the low-income commercial farmers, whom you state to be 1½ million, or almost 43 percent of total farm families, of whom 821,000 have incomes of less than $5,000, and the rest average between $5,000 and $10,000. You also refer to about 1 million farm families—almost 29 percent of the total—as large commercial operators with gross income of $10,000 a year or more. I would like to commend the general thrust of your editorials, but add that the farm income problem is far more serious than your figures would indicate.

Among those you class as large commercial operators, a majority have actual (net) incomes of less than half their gross incomes, and many work for substandard wages, after deducting costs of operations and taxes, and interest payments on their burdensome debts. As income is usually measured, in 1963 only 8 percent of farm families (not 29 percent) were at $10,000 or more, contrasted with 20.7 percent of nonfarm families. Meanwhile, 43.4 percent of farm families were under $3,000, contrasted with only 17 percent of nonfarm families; 17 percent of the former were under $2,000, contrasted with only 6.2 percent of the latter; and 11.1 percent of the former were under $1,000, contrasted with only 3.3 percent of the latter. And the $3,000 figure is only a benchmark for poverty, not an acceptable level of income.

Putting aside the 4 percent of all farms which are really large or giant in nature, and which receive far more help from the Government than they need, almost all of the rest of the farm population needs a drastically reoriented farm-income policy, which would also benefit the whole economy.

You are also correct in deploring the misconception that our economic problems can be ameliorated by an accelerated egress of people from agriculture. I estimate that probably a third and maybe a half of total excess unemployment in the United States today is due to reduction of the farm population since 1953; and that, in view of unusually high spending by farmers in ratio to their incomes, at least a fifth of our total national production gap of $590 billion (in 1963 dollars) during the 12-year period 1953–64, was due to deficient farm income.

More important still, and again counter to the general impression, we will need a farm labor force practically as large in 1975 as now, despite the rapid advance in farm technology, if we really intend to provide a nutritious diet for all American families as part of the war against poverty, to meet our domestic food and fiber requirements (including industrial requirements) under conditions of sustained maximum employment and production, and to elevate to appropriate levels our food assistance to the more than half the world's population who are now dangerously underfed.

The farm problem is thus an acute illustration of what happens when we do not project meaningful quantitative estimates of our needs and resources as guides to public policies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Record show that it is the Senator from New York?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Record will so show.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] proposes the following amendment:

On page 44, add to section 403 the following:

"*Provided,* That the Commission is hereby authorized and directed to study and consider the inclusion of such counties of the State of New York as are contiguous to the Appalachian region as defined in this section and counties contiguous thereto, in the "Appalachian region" for the purposes of this Act; and if the Commission shall decide after consultation with the State of New York, that these counties share the social and economic characteristics of the region, and that the inclusion of these counties would further the purposes of this Act as set forth in section 2, then the Commission is authorized and directed to invite the State of New York to participate in the Commission on an appropriate basis: *Provided further,* That the Commission may extend the invitation to the State of New York for inclusion of such of the described counties the inclusion of which would further the purposes of the Act: *And provided further,* That if such invitation is accepted by the State of New York, those counties shall be included in 'the region' or 'the Appalachian region' for the purposes of this Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from New York yield to himself? The Senator has 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, this program has been led by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper].

I commend them for the efforts that they have made.

I spent a good deal of time in the Appalachian area, in both West Virginia and Kentucky. I know the needs that exist there. I commend the two Senators for the efforts which they are making to help and assist the people of that area.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that the Governors of several of the States first invited to participate in the planning of a program for Appalachia did not accept the invitation. As the potential worth of this excellent program became more clear, however, three Governors modified their earlier positions; and their States are now full participants.

The State of New York, however, has never taken part in this program. As a result, no New York counties are included in the "Appalachian region" for the purposes of the act.

This omission, I believe, is contrary to the purpose of the bill to provide true regional planning and development for this needy area. The counties of the southern tier of New York are, of course, immediately adjacent to the northernmost counties of Pennsylvania included in S. 3. Geographically, they are part of the great mountain chain of the Appalachians. Economically, they have many close ties with counties included in S. 3.

And, tragically, these counties share another characteristic trait of the areas now covered by the bill. They are poor. Of the 199,000 families in the 13 counties of the southern tier, for instance, more than 23,000—nearly 12 percent—have incomes of under $2,000 a year, according to the 1960 census. In fact, these New York counties are less free from poverty than many of the counties now included in S. 3. In the Pennsylvania counties to which they are contiguous, for example, only about 11 percent of all families have incomes of under $2,000 a year. And in Allegheny County, Pa., only 5.2 percent of all families are in this unfortunate class.

In several southern New York counties—like Allegany, Otsego, and Delaware—about 15 percent of all families have incomes under $2,000 yearly. These counties are in this repect more like West Virginia—where in many counties about 17 to 18 percent of all families have incomes in this range—than they are to the counties of Pennsylvania which they adjoin.

These facts have many sad consequences. One of the most ominous is that young people are leaving the region in ever-increasing numbers. The birth rate of the region is about the same as that for the Nation as a whole. But while 14.6 percent of the Nation's population is in the vital age bracket from 15 to 24, counties like Steuben and Chautauqua have only 11.6 percent of their population in this group. A region's future, like a Nation's future, is in its youth; if these counties continue to lose their young people, they will have no future.

It is for these reasons that I believe that the inclusion of many of the counties of the southern tier of New York would materially further the purposes of this bill.

Addition of these counties would follow ample precedent. Only as recently as the Senate's consideration of S. 2782 last year did the State of South Carolina ask to participate. South Carolina was then included in the bill. Last week, the committee added four counties of the State of Ohio to the "Appalachian region" for the purposes of the act.

Unfortunately, it would be impossible at this time to include the counties of which I have spoken in the bill. The President's committee has had no opportunity to study the facts I have noted, in an effort to decide whether, and on what basis, these counties should be included in the planning and action programs to be carried out under this bill. Indeed, even if the committee, or Congress, had decided that their participation was appropriate, that participation would not now be possible. For this program is based on voluntary State participation. And the Governor of my State, regardless of the poverty found in these counties, has not seen fit to agree to their inclusion in the bill.

But the door should be kept open. My amendment would direct the Commission to study the inclusion of the counties of the southern tier—defined as "counties—contiguous to the 'Appalachian region'—as now defined in the bill—and counties contiguous thereto"—in the planning and action programs established under the bill. The Commission would have to decide whether any of these counties share the social and economic characteristics of Appalachia and whether their inclusion would further the purposes of the act—whether their inclusion would assist in the regional development of an area which now "lags behind the rest of the Nation in its economic growth," the people of which "have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity."

If the Commission decided that these criteria were met, it would invite the State of New York to participate in the Appalachian Regional Commission proposed to be established by the bill. If the Governor then accepted this invitation, the appropriate counties, as decided by the Commission, would be included in the "Appalachian region" for the purposes of the act.

I would like to stress two points about this amendment.

First, it is not an enlargement of S. 3, nor does it extend S. 3 beyond its original intended bounds. This is a bill for the entire Appalachian region. I do not think there is any question but that southern New York is a part of that region.

Second, the amendment would not allow these New York counties to participate until a majority of the States now represented on the Commission, and the Federal cochairman, decide that their inclusion is appropriate—in light of their needs and the suitability of integrating their planning with counties already participating.

In sum, this amendment would keep open the possibility of correcting the omission of these counties, so sorely in need of regional planning and assistance, from this forward-looking program. It is my hope, as it is the hope of the communities of southern New York, that the Governor will reconsider his position and allow them to develop their lagging economies. Should he do so, the bill should not prevent them.

The counties of New York which I would expect to be affected by this amendment are Allegany, Broome, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Otsego, Schuyler, Steuben, Tioga, and Tompkins.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield back his time?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I wish to reserve my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield time to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I recognize and appreciate the interest and concern of the distinguished Senator from New York in this area of New York, and in the specific counties to which he has referred in his statement, but his amendment gives me some concern. This concern causes me some difficulty because my own State is a beneficiary of this bill. In such a position one is in the danger of being thought to be interested in his particular State and not in other areas.

That is not my reason for opposing the amendment. I believe the amendment to be in contradiction to the history of the development of the act. Also, it contradicts the policy to which the committee has adhered with respect to similar proposals.

Speaking to my first point, the Appalachian bill came primarily from the States. The plan was worked out in specific detail by the Governors of the States and representatives of the Federal Government. After having reached certain conclusions and findings concerning the entire area, the late President Kennedy established the Appalachian Regional Commission to work out the details for an action program.

Subsequently the bill was presented to the Congress. It is an approach based upon the characteristics of the region, and it specifically names the counties which are to be eligible for development. Several counties in States have been added, but they have been added by the action of the committee, and last year they were confirmed by the Congress.

The amendment that has been proposed would not follow this careful procedure. It would delegate to the Commission the authority to review the problems of this particular area in New York and to decide whether the area should be included, contingent upon the consent of the State.

I am sympathetic to the interest of the Senator. It is possible that these counties should have been included. We have had presented no evidence, however, of their specific problems and characteristics which would lead us to include them at this time.

I am concerned that this amendment gives to the Commission, rather than the Congress, the power to add additional areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. May I have one more minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. In addition, to support the amendment would be contrary to the action we have been taking toward other areas that are asking for consideration. We have asked that they present their specific reasons.

It is a matter of some regret that I take this position. I believe, in all honesty, that I must take it. I shall vote against the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the State of New York has heretofore felt, through its Governor, that the Appalachia program was applicable to a region of the country which did not include New York.

Whatever may have been the reasons for that in the past, the amendment which my colleague from New York has now drafted leaves it to the State of New York to determine whether or not it shall enter into this program, because the operative words are "if the invitation is accepted," at the end of the amendment. This is different from the structure of the act as submitted to the State and as submitted to the Governor heretofore.

As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, in this structure of the bill, an invitation to the State is to be accepted as a part of the bill. I do not see that the State should or could properly object to the provision. However, I point out the State can be put in a difficult position by a definition to which it may not be a party, and as to which it may have strong opposition.

Therefore, I have suggested to my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] that I shall be glad to join with him in the amendment which he has proposed if we can make a few changes in it, which I should like to detail now.

Mr. President, if I offer an amendment to the amendment, I am entitled to 10 minutes, am I not?

May I ask the Senator in charge of the bill, if it is agreeable, to ask that time on the amendment be extended by 5 minutes, so we may wrap the whole thing together?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I suggest that we would deal with the fundamentals of the problem if the amendment were revised in the second line as indicated. As I said, I shall join in support of the amendment, with the consent of my colleague from New York, if he accepts these changes. The amendment now reads:

> *Provided,* That the Commission is hereby authorized and directed to study and consider the inclusion of such counties of the State of New York as are contiguous to the Appalachian region.

And so forth.

I suggest, after the word "consider," that the following language be inserted:

to study and consider in consultation with the Governor of the State of New York or an appropriate official or officials designated by him.

Mr. President, I shall send that language to the desk in a moment.

To conform with that change, in the sixth line, the words "State of New York" are no longer necessary, and it should read, "after such consultation," inserting words that go with the provision I have proposed.

Finally, in the 16th line, which provides for the acceptance of the invitation, after the word "is" I would insert the words "duly accepted," so it is in accordance with the constitutional processes of the State.

The words which I first used, "in consultation with the Governor of New York or an appropriate official or officials, designated by him" are words of art. Similar language is to be found on page 36, section 223 of the bill, which refers to consultation with the appropriate official or officials before grants can be made under the program. These words are the result of an amendment which I introduced last session to the pending bill and which was adopted and passed by the Senate on September 25, 1964. They provide a necessary requirement, I believe, for State participation in the Appalachian program.

One other point of qualification with regard to my colleague's proposal. The language contained in the amendment, "as are contiguous to the Appalachian region as defined in this section and counties contiguous thereto," may take us all the way to the Canadian border.

In short, the language itself may be unlimited in terms of the counties to be affected. I therefore suggest to my colleague, not as a part of the amendment—we can leave that to be clarified in conference—that we actually name for the RECORD the 13 counties which my colleague has in mind.

I should be happy to read them, if he wishes me to do so. This will nail down, for the purposes of debate and legislative history, exactly what counties we have in mind, defining or rather implementing the words which might be misconstrued and take us into a much broader area than my colleague has in mind in proposing his amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe the language is quite clear as to what area would be included. I would have no objection, specifically, to including the names of the counties. The amendment was drawn up with some care, so I do not believe that it could possibly be considered as stretching beyond 12 or 13 counties. But I would have no objection to including the names of the counties, as an amendment to my amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall name the counties in this debate, because I do not believe that we need to include them in the amendment. For the purposes of legislative history, they are as follows:

Allegany, Broome, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Otsego, Schuyler, Steuben, Tioga, and Tompkins.

Is this list correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

I have made a study of this proposed legislation, which has been conducted through the Senate with such skill by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. I am impressed with the amount of good which it will do in the areas of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky. I know that the inclusion of these counties will make a vast difference in areas in the State of New York which suffer from the same kind of problem.

Mr. JAVITS. Are we to assume that the Senator has modified his amendment in accordance with the modification which I have just recited?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] agree to modify his amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. JAVITS. If it is acceptable to the Senator, I urge that the Senate adopt the amendment as modified for the reasons set forth, and I thank my colleague for his cooperation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from West Virginia yield himself?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Five minutes. I have 6 minutes remaining; do I understand correctly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Certain counties in the State of New York were originally considered as a part of the Appalachian region, but the State of New York, as was the case with the State of Ohio at a certain point, and also the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of South Carolina, did not originally certificate themselves for membership in the Appalachian region.

Senators know that last year the Committee on Public Works added six counties in South Carolina. This was done at the request of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Governor of that State.

This section was approved last September in the Senate when it passed S. 2782. This year, the Committee on Public Works added four more counties in the State of Ohio, these counties being added at the direct request of the Governor of Ohio. These counties were, therefore, included in the amendments which were submitted from the committee and which were approved en bloc during the consideration of Senate bill 3.

I believe that the amendment which is before the Senate, as submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and now as modified by his colleague, with the coauthorship of the now pending and modified amendment, does not require specific congressional approval or action. I believe that these counties will be the subject, naturally, of close study by the Commission. Also, it shows that initiative must be taken by the State of New York in responding to the invitation of the Commission in connection with the 13 counties which have been named in debate.

Finally, the amendment as modified would assure that the future inclusion of certain counties in the Appalachian area within New York State will be adopted or added only if a majority of the Commission, after study, would agree that it should be done. Of course, there must be concurrence by a Federal member as well as by the Governors or their representatives in the State.

Therefore, I believe that the interests of other States—and specifically now New York—and the Federal Government seem to be adequately protected in the language as modified by the two Senators from New York, [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. Kennedy].

Let me reiterate that the amendment does not automatically include the 13 counties of the State of New York. Therefore, personally, I shall vote for the amendment as offered by my colleagues from New York and modified at the suggestion of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] with the concurrence of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. JAVITS. The language of the amendment in its operative clause is:

Provided further, That the Commission may extend an invitation to the State of New York for inclusion of which would further the purposes of the Act.

The Senator from West Virginia stated that a majority of the Commission must decide that it wishes to extend the invitation, but let me point out that the language may be more restrictive than that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the Senator from New York may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. The amendment provides that the Commission is authorized and directed to invite the State of New York to participate. I am rather concerned about those words "and directed" in terms of actually mandating the Commission, whatever the majority of the Commission might think. I raise that point—as I am sure there will be plenty of opportunity to do, and the Senator may have that in mind—so that the legal points may be resolved. What we have in mind is that the Commission shall, by an exercise of its judgment, decide that it does or does not, based upon this study, wish to invite the State of New York.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe that is correct. The concern voiced can be taken care of by the Commission.

Mr. JAVITS. One other point is understanding whether the counties named are the maximum counties. I understand that with respect to some of them we have had an opportunity to check this point only briefly. They are counties which were distressed areas but which now have come out of the distressed area status. But by at least fixing the county we are talking about, we do, in a sense, make it a maximum one. There are many more counties in New York State which are eligible for accelerated public works funds and ARA aid.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has expired. The Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield time to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the colloquy between the two Senators from New York. I must hold to my view that the amendment is not in harmony with the history of the development of the bill. It is certainly not correct to clothe the Commission with general authority to include counties or areas in the bill. It is the prerogative of Congress to do so.

I maintain my position in opposition to the amendment, not without sympathy for the areas affected.

I hope very much that when the bill goes to the House, the House will hold hearings on the amendment, at which time the Senator from New York may present his arguments for the inclusion of these counties, and if the House finds proper, it will write an amendment specifically naming the counties which should be included. If that were done, it would satisfy my objections. That would be the proper way to consider the amendment.

I make my statement now for the record: I hope that when the House handles the bill, it will include these counties by name, if it wishes to do so. If it does so, it will be acting on established grounds. I must therefore vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senators from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not intend to offer an amendment, but I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes to discuss one phase of the bill which deals with Federal employment and State and local employment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in the proposal before the Senate at this time, several sections deal with the Federal service, Federal employment, and employment that will be carried out jointly between the States, the Federal Government, and the local communities involved.

I refer to section 101 of the bill. The subject is carried through into section 106.

The bill provides that the Federal Government shall make arrangements with the State governments and local communities in regard to the benefits that the Federal employees are to receive.

Before I go any further, I have the very highest regard for the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. He and I are members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, where we deal with these matters all the time.

I wish to make the record clear, however, that in establishing these agencies there is always the danger of increasing Federal employment. There is no limitation in the bill as to the number of employees that shall be engaged. I would be less than frank if I did not say that it could not be spelled out specifically. However, problems are involved. I hope that those who administer the program will keep in mind that these funds are for relief and to help people in these counties, and not to set up as large payrolls as possible—Federal or State or local payrolls.

I have discussed this subject with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I wonder if he has any comment to make.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Kansas, with whom I have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, has brought up the matter of the operation of the Commission.

The proposed legislation would establish one of the most favorable ratios of administrative expenses to program funds that I have seen in any major legislation. It would authorize $1.1 million for administrative expenses of the Commission to oversee a program of $1,092 million. Thus the administrative costs will be only one-tenth of 1 percent of the total authorized. I feel that that consideration is worthy of the attention of the Senate at this time. The cochairman would receive not more than $27,000 in annual salary. The executive director would receive not more than $24,500 a year; presumably there would be a general counsel at a GS-17 rating; and the designated representatives of the States in question would be paid at the rates established by those States.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I expected exactly the response that the chairman of the committee has made. He and I have been working on civil service matters for many years and have been concerned about a situation that may develop. I bring this up because situations like this have developed in the past, though I do not say it will develop with the new agency that is proposed to be established. It has developed in connection with the poverty program. I have before me an article published in the Kansas City Times of last Saturday morning. Kansas City had received $500,000 for the program. I read the first sentence of the article entitled "Poverty Group Stirs Council":

> Costs of $100,000 a year for local coordination of the Federal poverty program set off a city council wrangle yesterday that centered on paying staff salaries up to $31,250 a year.

Quoting further from the article:

> TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS TO DIRECTOR
>
> Under the proposed budget, a director would be paid from $25,000 to $31,250 and an assistant director could be paid from $15,000 to $18,750. Two stenographers would receive $6,000 and $5,000 a year.
>
> In addition, $59,335 would go to a consulting agency to aid coordination and research poverty projects.
>
> Two members of the consulting staff would be paid $15,000 and $12,000 a year and a stenographer would receive $4,000.

I mention this because that is a danger connected with these programs, when we set them up without any limitations or strings attached to them. Here is a half-million-dollar program, of which $100,000 will be paid to Federal employees.

I hope that in connection with the program in Appalachia, which I believe to be the beginning of a large number of regional programs, some attention will be paid to this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BASS in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] I call up my amendment No. 8. I ask that it not be read, but that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

On page 1 strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"CHAPTER 1—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"Short title

"SECTION 1. This chapter may be cited as the 'Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965', and all references in this chapter to the words 'this Act' shall be held to refer to 'this chapter.' "

At the end of the bill add the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 2—OZARK REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"Title V—Short title and statement of purpose

"Short Title

"SEC. 501. This chapter may be cited as the 'Ozark Regional Development Act of 1965'.

"Findings and Statement of Purpose

"SEC. 502. As a result of changes in the nature of its resource base and changing requirements of the national economy, the Ozark region of the United States lags behind the Nation in its economic growth, and its people have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity. The region's historical reliance on a few basic industries and marginal agriculture have failed to provide the economic base necessary for self-sustaining growth. In some cases the uneven distribution of productive Federal expenditures has left the region at a comparative disadvantage. Nonetheless, the State and local governments and the people of the region understand their problems and have been and are prepared to work purposefully toward their solution. It is the purpose of this chapter to assist the region in meeting its special problems and promoting its economic development by helping to develop policies and programs for Federal, State, and local efforts essential to growth on a coordinated and concerted basis.

"Title VI—The Ozark Development Commission

"Membership and Voting

"SEC. 601. (a) The Ozark Development Commission (referred to as the 'Commission') shall be composed of seven members, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: Three members appointed, one from each participating State, from among one or more nominees by the Governor of such State; three members appointed, one from each participating State; and one member appointed at the discretion of the President who shall serve as Chairman and full-time executive officer of the Commission.

"(b) Decisions by the Commission, unless delegated to the Chairman, shall require the affirmative vote of the Chairman and three other members.

"(c) The Chairman shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. There shall be a Deputy Chairman appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the Commission, who shall serve as his alternate and who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and when not serving as an alternate for the Chairman shall perform such duties as are delegated to him by the Chairman. Other members of the Commission shall receive compensation at a rate of $75 per diem for each day on which they are engaged in the performance of duties of the Commission, and shall be reimbursed by the Commission for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"Functions of the Commission

"SEC. 602. In carrying out the purposes of this chapter the Commission shall—

"(1) develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs, including those for land use and public works, and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region;

"(2) conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including where necessary, inventory and analysis of the resources of the region and, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth;

"(3) prepare detailed plans, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, for scenic highways in the region to include planning for the development of recreational sites in such region;

"(4) make grants for graduate fellowships to encourage students in the areas of community and resource development and planning and such other areas of study as the Commission deems will carry out the purposes of this chapter;

"(5) review and study, in cooperation with the agency involved, Federal, State, and local public and private programs and, where appropriate, recommend modifications or additions which will increase their effectiveness in the region and assist in their financing;

"(6) formulate and recommend, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and work with State and local agencies in developing appropriate model legislation;

"(7) support existing local development districts and encourage their formation where needed and make grants for professional and technical assistance to such local development districts as are certified by the Commission;

"(8) encourage private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects;

"(9) serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Federal, State, and local programs in the region;

"(10) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and establish and utilize, as appropriate, citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences;

"(11) designate such other counties in the States of Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma as part of the Ozark region for the purposes of this chapter as the Commission determines necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter; and

"(12) recommend to the President for transmittal to the Congress a program of development projects with proposals for Federal participation in their funding as the Commission deems warranted by the studies begun under this chapter.

"Administrative Powers of the Commission

"SEC. 603. To carry out its duties under this chapter, the Commission is authorized to—

"(1) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its functions;

"(2) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Authority to carry out its functions, in accordance with the civil service laws of the Classification Act of 1949;

"(3) request the head of any Federal department or agency (who is hereby so authorized) to detail to temporary duty with the Commission such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as the Commission may need for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status;

"(4) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

"(5) accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

"(6) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation;

"(7) establish a permanent office at such location as it may select and field offices at such other places as it may deemed appropriate; and

"(8) take such other actions and incur such other expenses as may be necessary or appropriate.

"Title VII—Miscellaneous

"Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 701. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the period ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $7,500,000 to carry out this chapter, and for fiscal years thereafter such amounts as the Congress shall hereafter authorize.

"Local Development Districts: Certification

"SEC. 702. For the purpose of this chapter, a 'local development district' shall be an entity certified to the Commission either by the Governor of the State or States in which such entity is located, or by the State officer designated by the appropriate State law to make such certification, as having a charter or authority that includes the economic development of counties or parts of counties or other political subdivisions within the region. No entity shall be certified as a local development district for the purposes of this chapter unless it is one of the following:

"(1) A nonprofit incorporated body organized or chartered under the law of the State in which it is located;

"(2) A nonprofit agency or instrumentality of a State or local government;

"(3) A nonprofit agency or instrumentality created through an interstate compact; or

"(4) A nonprofit association or combination of such bodies, agencies, and instrumentalities.

"Annual Report

"SEC. 703. Not later than six months after the close of each fiscal year, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Governor of each State in the region and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on the activities carried out under this chapter during such year.

"Consent of States

"SEC. 704. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be interpreted as requiring any State to engage in or accept any program under this chapter without its consent.

"Definition of Ozark Region

"SEC. 705. As used in this chapter, the term 'Ozark region' or 'the region' means that area of the United States consisting of the following counties (including any political subdivision located within such area):

"In Arkansas—Benton, Crawford, Madison, Johnson, Boone, Searcy, Polk, Stone, Baxter, Sharp, Randolph, Washington, Franklin, Carroll, Newton, Marion, Van Buren, Cleburne, Izard, Fulton, Independence;

"In Missouri—Cooper, Cedar, Newton, Stone, Greene, Camden, Cole, Benton, Dade, McDonald, Taney, Polk, Morgan, Miller, Hickory, Lawrence, Barry, Christian, Dallas, Moniteau, Osage, Maries, Laclede, Douglas, Carter, Phelps, Webster, Ozark, Ripley, Shannon, Pulaski, Wright, Howell, Butler, Wayne;

"In Oklahoma—Bryan, Delaware, Adair, Cherokee, Sequoyah, Haskell, Latimer, Le Flore, Pushmataha, McCurtain, Choctaw, Atoka, Coal, Hughes, Johnston, Love, McIntosh, Okfuskee, Muskogee;

"Such other counties in such States as are designated by the Commission under section 602."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region and to provide the planning and coordination needed to assist the economic development of the Ozark region."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This amendment to the Appalachia bill would provide assistance for the Ozark region. The natural beauty of Arkansas is hardly surpassed by that of any other State in the Union. Naturally, this is a constant source of pride to all the people of Arkansas.

Arkansas also is enjoying great prosperity, as is the Nation generally. But the fact remains that some areas of Arkansas, and also of the Ozark region in our neighboring States of Missouri and Oklahoma, lag behind the rest of the country in economic development. This lag is not due to any lack of spirit or determination on the part of the people in the area but, rather, appears to be one of the unfortunate circumstances of our economic life.

In the pending bill, the administration and Congress appear bent on doing something about lagging economic growth. But we seem to be a little nearsighted in that in approaching this problem the pending measure seeks only to look after one spot that needs this kind of legislative attention, namely, the Appalachian area. I have read the economic statistics on Appalachia, but I have also lived with the economic facts of life in the Ozarks. So perhaps I can appreciate the conditions prevailing there a little better than I can those in the Appalachian area.

I remind the Senate that in Arkansas we have our pockets of poverty, too. We have families earning less than $3,000 a year. We have some unemployment. We have people whose education is wanting, as does the area in the section of our country that the pending bill seeks to aid. I cite these facts not to receive sympathy, although I can and do sympathize with those who have similar problems. I cite them to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the problems of Appalachia are not peculiar to that area alone. Our section of the country has like conditions and like problems. If the Senate deems it to be a Federal responsibility to enact legislation to bolster the lagging economy in one area, it should see to it that such legislation is applied to another, similarly situated area like the Ozarks, and the bill should be amended accordingly. That is what the pending amendment seeks to do.

I am aware that the Committee on Public Works has introduced a new bill to authorize the President to establish commissions to aid in the development of other regional areas which suffer from a lack of economic growth. I also understand that the Ozark region will probably qualify under the terms of that bill. Therefore, I assume that the Senate will be asked to pass the Appalachia bill now, and that when it is out of the way we shall attend to the economic problems of other sections of the country, including the Ozarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. President, I have a better idea. Let us amend the Appalachia bill so as to take care of the Ozarks, as is proposed by the pending amendment, before we pass the bill. Or let us send the whole package back to the Committee on Public Works with instructions to report the bill back to the Senate with adequate provisions to assist other sections of the country which have comparable situations, although they may not be so extensive as those that prevail in the Appalachian region.

Mr. President, I submit that the problem in some areas of the Ozarks is no less compelling than it is in some sections of Appalachia.

Mr. President, surely our State, our people, and those of the entire Ozark region are no less deserving.

My distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is necessarily absent today, has joined with me as a cosponsor of this amendment. So has the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. President, I should now like to yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the work that has been done concerning the needs for regional development in the Ozark region by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

I appreciate the opportunity to join with him in bringing the great needs of that area to the attention of the administration, the Senate, and the country.

I appreciate also the understanding of the senior Senator from West Virginia of the problems of other areas throughout the country, and his interest in the development of other areas, and particularly the Ozark region. The Senator from West Virginia has done an outstanding job for his own general area, for those 11 States involved in the program, and for the country as a whole, in bringing the great needs of the people of that area to the attention of the country in a dramatic way, by means of initiating a pilot study which I hope will spread to other areas of the country, in an effort to see that the people of the country who are in poverty in a time of prosperity are not ignored, but that this Government endeavor in helping in a spirit of sympathy, understanding, and assistance to bring together the resources of local, State, Federal, and private institutions, and individuals, in a cooperative way to see that their needs are met.

Mr. President, I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Public Works under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], who, together with the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], has worked toward arriving at some means by which the needs of other areas of the country may be recognized and met.

I join in this amendment as a means of bringing the needs of this area to the attention of all those concerned. I cite briefly the fact that in eastern Oklahoma, as is true also in western Arkansas, there are 18 counties in which more than 50 percent of the families have annual family incomes of less than $3,000.

There are six counties in eastern Oklahoma, in which more than 60 percent of the families have less than $3,000 annual income.

These are needs that we must meet, as we are now meeting them in the Appalachian region.

I heartily join in the proposal of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment by inserting on page 10, line 6, at the end of the line, and after the semicolon:

> Strike out the semicolon and insert the word "Pittsburgh";.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginia and Arkansas were the only two States of the Republic which suffered a loss of population in the years from 1950 to 1960. West Virginia lost its population during that period at an approximate rate of 7.6 percent. The rate of loss in Arkansas was only slightly less.

I cite these figures to indicate the seriousness of the problem which is presented by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, ably assisted in his presentation today by the capable junior Senator from Oklahoma. In so doing, however, I must indicate that with respect to the area contemplated for special attention—I do not call it preferential treatment in that area or any other area where the need is spelled out—the purpose of the Senators from Arkansas and the junior Senator from Oklahoma would be well served by allowing this problem to be presented to the Committee on Public Works within the framework of the legislation which has been introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which proposed legislation is now cosponsored by 23 other Senators.

We hope before S. 812 has been referred to the committee by the Senate that 30 or 35 Senators will have cosponsored the measure.

I say to the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas that the case can be made, and a partial case has already been made. But I would remind those who would propose this amendment that the Appalachian program has been under study and consideration for more than 4½ years. The study brought into being the effort which finally culminated in Senate 2782 being brought before this body last fall, and again in Senate bill 3 this year.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] referred in his remarks earlier today to the needs that exist in the Ozark region and to the problem which we shall have within the Committee on Public Works. With assurance from the administration—which was given earlier in debate by the distinguished majority leader—these problems will be addressed by the Congress at an early date.

I would hope that with this assurance, the amendment would not actually be pressed to a vote. I am thinking in terms of the presentation having been adequate. But it would be better—since the Appalachian bill was the result of more than 4 years of study—to allow the measure introduced by Senator McNAMARA to be taken up within a very short time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator can recognize, I am sure, the awkward, and perhaps untenable position that some of us are placed in with respect to legislation such as this.

The Senator pointed out that in my State for a number of years, as in his State, we lost population. We did have some problems.

I am happy to report, however, that that trend now is reversed. In the last 3, 4, or 5 years, my State has been gaining population.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, may I be permitted 2 additional minutes? I should like for the able Senator from Arkansas to have time to complete his discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Our economic condition is improving. Compared with the other States of the Union, the economic conditions in our State are very favorable today. But if it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to go into any area of a State, or region of a State, or parts of regions of a State, and institute a program of this character, I must insist that, if I support such legislation, other sections of the country should not be ignored wherever those conditions prevail anywhere under the jurisdiction of our Government. My belief is that those areas should be included.

It is somewhat comforting to have the assurance that we are going to look into other areas, but it does not satisfy my idea of how these matters should be authorized. It should be done on a national basis, instead of on a regional basis.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for just 1 minute I shall conclude by indicating, as has been stated often during the debate, that the idea of an Appalachia Regional Commission was not conceived in Washington, but was developed in the States of the Appalachian region by the Governors of those States, and the request was made for the assistance of the Federal Government by those jurisdictions. President Kennedy, and, at the present time, President Johnson, have brought forward the partnerships, as it were, between the Federal Government and the States involved. This is for the purpose of bringing into being a more wholesome climate for economic growth than previously had been possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. President, I am ready for a vote. I hope the Senator will not press for a yea-and-nay vote. However, I will understand, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote, but I think the amendment has been presented and should be voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, as modified.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Does the Senator from West Virginia yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], as modified.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, identified as No. 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with its reading and that the amendment be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (amendment No. 10) offered by Mr. Long of Louisiana is as follows:

On page 36, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act involving any scientific or technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions effective to insure that all information, copyrights, uses, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will be made freely available to the general public. Nothing contained in this subsection shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity, without his consent, of any right which that owner may have under that patent. Whenever any information, copyright, use, process, patent or development resulting from any such research or development activity conducted in whole or in part with appropriated funds expended under authorization of this Act is withheld or disposed of by any person, organization, or agency in contravention of the provisions of this subsection, the Attorney General shall institute, upon his own motion or upon request made by any person having knowledge of pertinent facts, an action for the enforcement of the provisions of this subsection in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which any defendant resides, is found, or has a place of business. Such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such action, and to enter therein such orders and decrees as it shall determine to be required to carry into effect fully the provisions of this subsection. Process of the district court for any judicial district in any action instituted under this subsection may be served in any other judicial district of the United States by the United States marshal thereof. Whenever it appears to the court in which any such action is pending that other parties should be brought before the court in such action, the court may cause such other parties to be summoned from any judicial district of the United States."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment was drafted to apply to the bill as introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How much have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 5 minutes.

This amendment was originally keyed to the bill as introduced, and therefore it should be modified to read as follows:

On page 40, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new subsection:

And the subsection should be renumbered (d).

I wish to modify my amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, my amendment presents identically the same principle, and I believe in identical language, as contained in a similar amendment on which the Senate voted last week, which had to do with assuring that research and development paid for with Federal money under research and development authorized by the bill will be available to all the people.

I do not know whether or not, in using $5½ million of Federal money, something might be developed that would aid other parts of the country; but in the event it should be, it would be fair to see to it that this information would be freely available for the benefit of all the people.

I was happy to note that the Senator in charge of the bill voted for my amendment when I offered it to the water pollution bill, supporting the same position, which he has consistently supported, that when the Federal Government spends money for research and development programs, the benefits of the research should go to all 180 million people of this country and protect ourselves from the possibility that a contractor would undertake to secure patent rights for himself on such information and exercise patent rights to deny the public free use of that which it paid to develop. The benefits of such research should be available freely and generally to all the citizens of the country.

My understanding was that the distinguished manager of the bill was in support of the amendment when I discussed the matter last week. I hoped the amendment could be agreed to. Of course, if there is serious opposition to it and a Senator insists on having a rollcall, I shall be happy and agreeable to having the amendment go to a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. COOPER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the two leaders.

I am under no illusions that the Senate will oppose this amendment, because a similar one was adopted the other day. However, there are a few fundamental thoughts which I would like to express concerning the whole question of patent rights under Government research and development contracts.

I am against the amendment. This is a subject which concerns the proper disposition of patent rights to inventions, uses, processes, and other information realized under Government research and development contracts.

A right has both legal and moral import. Applied to this subject, I think it proper to say that it denotes something to which one has a just claim as the power or privilege to which one is justly entitled. Proper protection of these rights as they relate to Government research and development contracts can be made only upon analysis of facts applicable to specific contracts. They cannot be assured if based upon prior general conclusions applicable regardless of the circumstances surrounding a particular contract.

This amendment would preclude a contractor from receiving any proprietary rights to information, copyrights, uses, processes, patents, and other developments realized from research and development contracts awarded by the Government under the Appalachia program. This absolute prohibition is imposed regardless of the amount of Federal funds involved under a contract. I do not regard this approach as equitable or reasonable.

There is considerable authority both within and without the Government which rejects the proposition that the answer to proper disposition of patent rights under Government research and development contracts can be found either in an absolute title policy or an all license policy on the part of the Government. Illustrative of this is the statement on Government patent policy promulgated by the late President Kennedy in October 1963. There are statutes which contain patent clauses providing for waiver of title to the Government in cases where certain conditions exist and equity requires that waiver be granted under a particular contract.

The President's statement and these statutes reject a policy that would prevent a contractor from ever receiving patent rights under Government research and development contracts. Even in those cases where the Government reserves the right to take title to all inventions realized under these contracts, provision is made for Government waiver of title in behalf of the contractor. Under this arrangement, the Government will retain an irrevocable, nonexclusive, nontransferable royalty-free license. Yet, the amendment under consideration contains no such provision.

The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana and others have recognized the need for legislation to establish a defined Government patent policy. I, too, have introduced legislation during the last as well as in the present Congress which seeks to accomplish this purpose.

To interpolate, I was a member of the Armed Services Committee when we were working out this provision for the Department of Defense. I also worked with the present occupant of the White House, President Lyndon Johnson, on the NASA patent proposal when he brought out that bill.

These bills differ; so, I believe, do the opinions of many Senators concerning this subject. However, the very existence of these differing views confirms the need for hearings by the Senate Judiciary Committee which will give due and careful consideration to this complex subject. We should not be asked by the simple expedient of an amendment to dispose in advance of all rights to any inventions which may be realized under Government research and development contracts awarded under the Appalachia program.

It is not unrealistic to assume that each research and development contract entered into under this program may vary as to the amount of Government financial involvement compared to funds obligated by a contractor or others. There may well be other compelling factors such as background experience, technical know-how, and competence which should be considered. I suggest that these are factors to be weighed and considered under each research and development contract. They should not be ignored which would be the case if this amendment is adopted.

I ask that the amendment be defeated and express the hope that the entire subject with which it deals be considered fully by the appropriate committee.

I realize the Senator from Louisiana states that when final legislation concerning this subject is enacted, that amendments such as the one which he now offers will be subject to that legislation. However, the more we attempt the approach taken by this amendment—and there are numerous other instances—the more difficult it becomes to obtain final legislation.

These are the reasons why I oppose the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, whether we like it or not, experience under Government patent policies has been that where the Government agency handling the money is left with discretion to spend its research money, almost without exception it uses its powers as an agency to give away the rights of 180 million people to a handful of contractors.

In some instances, we find that this has resulted in a complete rape of the public interest, where those rights have been given away.

For example, the Department of Defense has no statute telling it what to do in research. Here are two studies made by the General Accounting Office, one of them on Lockheed Corp., which is a major contractor for defense, and the other the Thompson Ramo Wooldridge which is also a major contractor for the Defense Department.

What do we find?

In both instances, these contractors get literally hundreds of millions of dollars of Government money, and they have been withholding the information which the contracts themselves required them to divulge. They have been withholding it in the hope of making even greater profits than the contracts contemplate.

Not only do they hope to get the patents, but also in order to get the patents on Government research, they are not telling the Government what they are discovering under these Government contracts. But these two contractors have been withholding what they have been finding on Government research for as long as 4 long years. In some instances, they have not divulged some information at all.

The knowledge of these discoveries is needed by Government, in our race to excel our adversaries in space and defense. This is a familiar example of what has happened when the Government's authority has the power to give away patent rights to these individuals. In other cases, we have had so-called flexibility. NASA had some flexibility where they could give patent rights if the Administrator found it in the public interest. What did they do? They just gave them all away. So far as flexibility and discretion which they are supposed to exercise, they wound up, notwithstanding the memorandum to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has just referred, with giving away all the rights contracted without even knowing what rights they were giving away.

We have laws in other fields that keep this kind of thing from happening. We have such a law in the Atomic Energy Commission, where we are ahead of the Russians. We have such laws that bind the Department of Agriculture in its research, where we are so far ahead of the Russians that they cannot even catch up with our aid because the research programs have been so good. This is because we do not give away private patent rights on research.

Where we are behind is in those areas where we have this withholding of information, where we have these people who are encouraged in the hope of making gigantic profits from the taxpayers and the consumers, and by virtue of which hopes they are holding out the information when it is developed and should be available to all the American people so it can be put to use by all scientists in moving to the next frontier of knowledge.

The incentive for people to have private patents historically was the incentive to spend their own money. But, in this instance, we are providing the incentive with the Government's money. This research should be developed for the benefit of the taxpayers. They should be entitled to the benefit that flows from free and full use of the information rather than to have it under these private patents where the contractor can deny the use of the information to the public for 17 long years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me finish my statement, and I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The Department of Agriculture, TVA, the Atomic Energy Commission are bound by such laws as I advocate. Just in the last two Congresses we insisted on such provisions on the Coal Research and Development Act. We did the same on the helium gas, saline water, the disarmament bill, the mass transit bill. We did it on the water resources bill, and this year also on the Water Pollution Control Act.

So this is the position that the Senate has repeatedly taken. It is perfectly correct to vote it on this bill. This is an issue of principle, of whether to spend this money for the benefit of certain private interests or whether we want the Government's money, which is spent by the millions, and in some cases by the billions, to be directed to the benefit of all citizens who are paying taxes.

To me it is a simple issue.

Where this discretionary power has been available, in almost all cases, the rights have been given away without even knowing what was being given away.

In any event, the person actually doing the research has the same incentive. He is not going to get the patent rights. He is a scientist, or an engineer working for a contractor. But in this instance, we wind up with the Government not knowing what the patent rights are it is giving away, and contractors are withholding information on some problems which could result in quicker exploration of space and also in lower costs for new products.

Where this research has been under the Department of Agriculture, under TVA, the Atomic Energy Commission, or the Federal Aviation Agency, where research has been developed without private patent rights, we have had outstanding success, not the sort of corruption I have just pointed out to the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana, as I listen to him, that in those instances where the Government pays for all the research performed under a research and development contract, the Government should receive rights to that which is developed under the contract. I believe, however, that the Senator from Louisiana is weak in his argument that disposition of rights under these contracts can be made before a contract is negotiated. It is only when the contract is let that the parties can know what they are entitled to receive.

Second, we must have——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The other point I make is that it is in the national interest to insure that the best qualified sources are used to perform Government research and development contracts. If we remove all incentive by providing that no rights of any character shall be given to their inventiveness, we limit the opportunity of the Government to establish new facilities and research efforts which will be for the advantage and benefit of all of us. We must have a patent policy, but I do not believe it can be done through this amendment nor the amendment offered to the water pollution bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Where the Government has not given private patents on Government research, we have had outstanding success with the research program. The areas where failure and downright corruption has existed has been in those areas where companies get these big contracts and try to keep the patent rights and withhold the information which should be available for 180 million people.

Our experience has been that, whether we like it or not, we shall get it one way or another. We shall either get the benefits for the 180 million people of our country, or we shall get the kind of conditions that I have been trying to point out on the floor of the Senate for some time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

The Senator from Kentucky has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. COOPER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. I ask the junior Senator from Louisiana whether he does not agree with me that a firm, clear, overall policy with respect to patents, particularly where the Federal Government is putting money into research—and we know it is putting up approximately $12 billion a year for that purpose—would be desirable. There should be an overall, clear policy established between the people who invent and the Government, so that we may establish a clear policy, and not proceed with the kind of catch-all endeavor that is being attempted here.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would like to see a policy established whereby the Government would not permit private patents to be obtained on research paid for by all the people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Kentucky has 3 minutes remaining. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. COOPER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted, out of order, to introduce some bills and make comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from Idaho how much time he is yielding to himself.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to speak for 10 minutes. I believe that will be sufficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STRENGTHENING THE PEACEKEEPING WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as Members of the Senate are aware, President Johnson has proposed that 1965—which the United Nations has officially designated as "International Cooperation Year"—should be dedicated not only to the pursuit of peace but also to new forms of cooperation to promote the welfare of nations that "bypass the politics of the cold war."

The culmination of the U.S. celebration of International Cooperation Year will be a White House conference to be held next fall in which distinguished private citizens from many walks of life will present practical proposals not only on arms control and peacekeeping but also on economic and technical cooperation.

In this connection, I should like to call the attention of Members of the Senate to a new book, "In Pursuit of World Order: U.S. Foreign Policy and International Organizations," which was written especially for International Cooperation Year by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. It offers the American citizen a factual and up-to-date account of the problems and possibilities which the U.S. Government faces in strengthening the peacekeeping work of the United Nations and in the related areas of world law, outer space, trade and aid, human rights, and the population explosion.

Ambassador Adlai Stevenson calls this "a lively and important book for everybody interested in the practical problems of peace in the nuclear age."

I wholeheartedly agree. Perhaps the best introduction to the book is the eloquent foreword written by Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that Cleveland's remarks may appear at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD OF HARLAN CLEVELAND TO "IN PURSUIT OF WORLD ORDER"

In every time and culture, men have perceived the need to build institutions of cooperation, for safety and for the advancement of the interests they share. But only in our time has this urge become global in extent—witness the fact that 1965 is being celebrated the world over as International Cooperation Year. No one who reads this book can doubt that there is already plenty of international cooperation to have a year about.

The trouble is that the thunder and tumult of the cold war has obscured a great spurt in international cooperation in the years since World War II. The polemics of a bipolar world and the awful reality of the nuclear arms race have hidden the foundations of the rising international community. And the notion persists that agreement or disagreement among nations at any given time is total—that you cannot hold opposing views on subject A and simultaneously cooperate on subject B.

This, of course, is nonsense, and the proof can be found between the covers of this book—or wherever else you look. We disagree with the Soviet Union, for example, on Berlin, Vietnam, and Cuba. But, at the same time, we cooperate with the Soviet Union in cultural exchange programs, in allocating radio frequencies, in forecasting the weather, in fighting disease, in studying the oceans, and in dozens of other technical ways. We even cooperate, where we can, on the peaceful settlement of our own and other people's disputes.

International cooperation for survival and welfare has become a plain necessity. An increasing number of subjects of importance to our Nation can only be dealt with on a world basis. If you like long words, you can call this the technological imperative. Or you can simply repeat the truism—which is every day more true—that it's a small world.

Someone recently put it even better. He defined a "typical American" as a fellow who has just driven home from an Italian movie in his German car, who sits on his Danish furniture drinking Brazilian coffee out of an English china cup, writing a letter on Irish linen paper with a Japanese ballpoint pen—a letter complaining to his Congressman about too much American gold going overseas.

The technological imperative, the need to build worldwide technical agencies, stems, of course, from the headlong pace of scientific discovery. Every time that science chalks up another success, a new demand is created for a new institution to tame or exploit the new accomplishment. More and more frequently, it is an international institution. Whenever the scientists achieve a breakthrough in what can be done by man for man, it suddenly seems outrageous not to be channeling the new power that new knowledge confers upon us.

Before we knew how to commit mass murder among the mosquitoes that carry malaria, nobody thought of eradicating malaria from the face of the earth because it couldn't be done. Now that we know it can be done, we are well on our way to the doing of it—even if the task is proving somewhat longer, and the insects more resistant to our attempts to poison them, than scientists thought when they proudly swept every Anopheles mosquito from the island of Sardinia just after World War II.

Before there was radio, we did not need large international conferences to divide up the frequency spectrum. Before there were airplanes flying across frontiers and oceans, we did not need an International Civil Aviation Organization. We are used to the idea that necessity is the mother of invention. But in the technology of international relations, the reverse applies as well: Invention is the mother of necessity.

Nowadays, Congress and the rest of us take international organizations, and the conferences they spawn, as part of a familiar landscape. The United States belongs today to 53 international organizations. We contribute more than a third of a billion dollars to them and to 22 international operating programs, mostly sponsored by these same organizations—and that does not count the activities of international lending agencies. In the past 2 years, the United States has participated in more international conferences than we attended in our entire history from the founding of the Republic to the beginning of World War II.

International organizations exist simply because they are needed; we belong to them simply because it serves our national interest to belong—and because it would damage our national interest to remain aloof. So while nations cling to national sovereignties and national purposes, science is creating a functional international community whether anyone likes it or not.

It is certainly good that, within the frontiers of special areas like agriculture, health, or the physical sciences, we are beginning to demonstrate that men can get along with each other without an intolerable amount of friction and confusion, just as we are beginning to demonstrate within the frontiers of nations that men can get along with each other without an intolerable amount of bloodshed. It is good that scientists can "speak the same language," even through an interpreter; that physicians can cooperate with each other in a global war on disease; that farmers can teach each other how to get higher yields without politics getting too much in the way.

All this is good, but it is not enough. The spawning of new technologies is not always or necessarily beneficent. The technology of nuclear fission and fusion can provide electric power for national development; it can also incinerate all life in the Northern Hemisphere.

The parochialism of each major field of knowledge is not necessarily an improvement on the more familiar parochialism of nation-states, unless the demonstration that experts can work with each other on food and health leads in fact to nations working with each other to keep the general peace.

A civilization that guarantees people enough to eat and a longer life—and then exposes them to lethal radioactivity—is not moving onward and upward. It is moving sideways toward a precipice. If a workable pattern of peace must be constructed patiently by building first its component parts, the parts must in the end add up to international organizations that work for peace and freedom as well as health and welfare.

Beyond the technological imperative, therefore, is a political imperative. It stems from our basic value-system: the kind of safe and open world we want to live in, the kinds of rights and opportunities we want to see secured to every human being. So we naturally are working toward a world of peaceful change under a system of order based on consent in which cooperation is an international way of life. Our belief in diversity and our need for safety together define the goal of American foreign policy: "to make the world safe for diversity."

The first requirement of a foreign policy so defined is to avoid the cataclysm of nuclear war. That is why the administrations of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson have invested so much Presidential time and attention on the attempt to wrap the new-born weaponry of fission and fusion in the swaddling clothes of social constraint and political responsibility.

The United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom—joined now by nearly a hundred other nations—have confirmed by formal treaty that they have a common interest in not polluting the common atmosphere with radioactive particles, and a common interest in putting a brake on the nuclear arms race. They have agreed that this common interest requires such a treaty despite irreconcilable ideologies, incompatible values, and antithetical ways of organizing political power.

What is new and hopeful here is the dawning realization that national rivals can remain rivals and still agree on what is in the interest of both. Mutual suspicion and mistrust are certainly not dispelled, but the nuclear weapons are not poisoning the atmosphere while negotiations proceed on their control and inspection.

Perhaps we are learning that national rivals do not have to kiss and make up before they agree not to annihilate each other. International politics is not what the "war-game" men call a "zero-sum game": A foot gained on one side does not necessarily mean a foot lost on the other.

Perhaps the world is beginning to fumble its way toward a pragmatic modern approach to the ancient dream of peace, toward a manageable, workable system of order based, as President Kennedy said at American University, "not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned."

Beyond the control and reduction of arms, a world safe for diversity requires a wide range of international institutions and procedures to deter the resort to war, and encourage the resolution of conflict without war.

The United Nations is sometimes called a safety valve, a place to let off steam. Much steam is in fact let off there, and the valve has a certain value. It is good that a building exists on the East River in which every nation, large and small, can grumble for the record about his neighbor—and provide his neighbor equal time to grumble about him.

But the Security Council and the General Assembly are not at their best when they are adding heat to an already overheated dispute. They function at their best as devices for recording solutions arrived at by honest—which is to say, quiet—negotiation.

The growing value of the U.N., as peacekeeper and peacemaker to the world, lies not so much in its public debates as in its operating machinery—its mediators, its observers, its inspectors, its truce supervisors, and its emergency peacekeeping forces.

In spite of our great power, the United States cannot alone be policeman to the world. The rest of the world would not like it, and the American people would not stand for it—which is reason enough to build international peacekeeping machinery to take on the sometimes unhappy policeman's lot.

Thus we share with most of the rest of the world an interest in spreading the risk and the responsibility for international peacekeeping. Important as this has been in the past, especially in Korea, Kashmir, the Middle East, the Congo, and Cyprus, it is likely to be much more important in the future. For the nuclear stalemate appears to have loosened the inhibitions that kept the lid on incipient disputes. Having concluded that we may not after all die of a nuclear thrombosis, the world seems to have broken out in a rash of smaller local disputes, each carrying the virus of general war.

How much further can—or should—the U.N. develop its peacekeeping capacity? It is a fair question, but no answer today is certain to make sense tomorrow.

For the U.N. has whatever capacity its members can agree to endow it with, at any given time for any given purpose. Until one knows the nature of a future emergency and then plumbs the will of the U.N.'s majority to act in the face of common danger, one cannot say what the capacity of the U.N. is to act in defense of the peace.

The day before the Korean invasion, the day before the Suez crisis, the day before the army mutiny in the Congo, nobody would have dreamed that the U.N. could or would take on the peacekeeping tasks it did in fact assume. The capacity of the U.N. is the sum of the wills of its members to act together.

Dag Hammarskjold said it well, in remarks which Prime Minister Pearson of Canada quoted in his Hammarskjold memorial lecture: "The basic policy line for this Organization is that the United Nations simply must respond to those demands which must be made of it * * *. The United Nations should respond and should have confidence in its strength and capacity to respond."

Obviously, there is always the question of how great an administrative load can safely be taken on. Obviously, too, there is the sticky and contentious problem of finance, and the always difficult matter of recruiting and training first-rate people capable of doing unprecedented jobs in a fog of controversy and frustration. The U.N.'s small operations in Greece, Palestine, and Kashmir helped to put it in training to climb what Hammarskjold called "the very steep hill of Suez"; in turn, the operation in the Gaza Strip served as calisthenics for the Congo; and what was learned in the Congo deeply affected the mandate, the strategy, and the tactics of the Cyprus operation.

Yet if there is one lesson to be drawn from the 13 alarms to which the U.N. has responded, it is that each peacekeeping task is unprecedented, that the U.N.'s resources are never fixed or exhaustible, that being busy in one place must not preclude being busy in another.

So the measure of future United Nations actions for peace, here and there around the world, is not some predetermined quantum of "capacity to act," but rather the complex circumstances under which the requisite majority of its members can agree to pool their strength and act together for the charter's purposes. This is the real variable in the equation—not the age or experience of the Organization, not the state of its bank account, not the level of its current workload.

The U.N.'s future capacity to act will be deeply affected by the outcome of issues that are unresolved as this is written. To be an effective instrument, its members will have to develop a way of financing peacekeeping operations that does not create a constitutional crisis over each half-billion dollars. The organization will also have to find some way to reflect the political facts of life in the United Nations where equal votes are endowed with unequal influence and unequal responsibility for the consequences of inaction.

This does not imply that the stronger members must lead the less strong around by the nose—any more than that the "one country, one vote" principle subordinates the U.N.'s big-power minority to its small-power majority. It implies, rather, that in a responsible organization, the less strong must have the realism to know the U.N. depends on its stronger members for its capacity to act—and the good sense to know that when the most powerful members can agree, the less powerful are often protected by that agreement.

All this is to say that the United Nations is and will continue to be a political body, and anybody who has worked in a legislature or on a school board or even on a student council knows the limitations imposed by the policies of consent.

International cooperation is uphill work all the way. Nuclear arms—clashing ideologies—conflicting ambitions—contradictory principles—economic interests—territorial disputes—racial, religious, and tribal animosities—personal greed—the lust for power: these, too, are realities. And so is the stubborn addiction of the human race to the ways of the past, its adamant resistance to change, its persistence in prejudice, bias, and hatred.

International cooperation must push against all the traditional, provincial, reactionary instincts of the human race. And if it seems hard for us, let us keep in mind that it is even more difficult for those nursed on dogma, weaned on historical determinism, and schooled on the inevitability of, say, the class struggle.

But we are in a very early stage of the journey toward world order. Both the technical and political pressures for international cooperation will not diminish but rise.

These are some of the reasons why our enthusiasm for what we call "international cooperation" must be grounded in reality and focused on practical expectations. International cooperation does not just happen. It is not an ideal, a spirit, a principle, a wish, or a policy. It is represented by institutions, treaties, laws, negotiations, agreements, and actions—hard, concrete realities that often are difficult to come by.

Peace is not an abstraction: It is an organized system for the peaceful resolution of difference and the peaceful management of needed change. The alternative to missiles is not merely the absence of missiles: The alternative is the presence of workable, reliable institutions—governed by accepted laws and agreed procedures, administered by flesh-and-blood men and women.

A decent world order will only be built brick by brick. Those who wish to help build it, and not merely to talk about building it, will concentrate on the next brick—on how it can be fashioned, where it belongs, how it will fit, when it should be added to the structure.

This book describes some of the main bricks, and indicates where the United States thinks they belong. Its author, Richard Gardner, has helped fashion most of them during the past 4 years as part of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. He understands the process of international institution-building as clearly and deeply as any American of our time.

HISTORY MAGNIFIES GREAT MEN, GREAT IDEAS, AND GREAT EVENTS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the traditional sources of American strength has been the pride of Americans in their collective achievements. De Tocqueville spotted this more than a hundred years ago, and foreign visitors comment on it even today. Yet, one element of our society, the radical right, seems bent upon degrading the path this country has traveled since World War II, and sowing distrust for the leaders of all segments of society. One of the remarkably successful rhetorical tricks they have employed is to misrepresent American history, or idealize it beyond all recognition. The distinguished Pocatello, Idaho, editor, Perry Swisher, has said of them:

> They leap from their belief that we are descended from visionary giants, to the conclusion that the ordinary mortals they see around them are a depraved society ruled by stupid or sinister men.

In a recent issue of Look magazine, I have written:

> To put this world, and the Nation, in a proper perspective for the American people—this is the urgent business of statesmanship today.

Perry Swisher is helping to expedite that urgent business. In a column reprinted in the Aberdeen Times of November 19, he has written:

> History magnifies great men, great ideas, and great events.

His explanation of this statement is certainly worthwhile reading for all those who wish to put American history in perspective and thereby draw strength and pride from the events of today as well as yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column "History Skips the Ordinary, Evil" be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Aberdeen Times, Nov. 19, 1964]

HISTORY SKIPS THE ORDINARY, EVIL

(By Perry Swisher)

The other night I attended a convention session of the State Parent-Teacher Associations. The opening speaker warned in detail against the infiltration methods and blind dogmatism of the extremists. The next speaker sang hosannahs to the greatness, the wisdom and the vision of our forefathers.

The second speaker was defeating the purpose of the first. The victim-members of the John Birch Society, the Billy Hargis crusade and the Smoot-Manion forums have in common a wholly fictitious picture of the past. They leap from their belief that we are descended from visionary giants, to the conclusion that the ordinary mortals they see around them are a depraved society ruled by stupid or sinister men.

History magnifies great men, great ideas and great events. It skips over the masses who for nearly all of history were living—compared to our own times—in poverty, sickness, slavery, illiteracy and in continual fear of all men unlike themselves.

It is because of the Founders' forward-looking faith in a society of men who would be equal before the law that this Nation enjoyed such an incredible birth, so full of promise. The conditions from which the country sprang, and the society into which it was born, did not consist of a society of free and enlightened men. They were, through their leaders, a society in search of freedom, knowledge, and a better life, which is a very different thing.

We would do our children a favor—seeing to it that so many of them do not remain children politically all their lives—if we taught them not merely the greatness of a few men dead but also of the relative which our recent ancestors lived.

At this country's birth you could not vote if you were female, if you owned no land (as most did not), if you were indentured or a slave. Most children didn't go to school as we know school; they were chattel.

In mills and factories and mines, tens upon tens of thousands of children worked for as little as 50 cents a week paid to their parents or to owners-by-indenture. If you were born to such a life, here and more especially in the lands from which our ancestors emigrated, your life expectancy did not exceed 40 years.

Many Birchers are at most the great-grandsons of Irishmen who died for no greater offense than being Irish; Greeks and slaves, guilty of their race; Calvinists, Catholics, Jews, and then Mormons, who lost life or property or citizenship because of their religion or nationality.

Idaho's constitution adopted in 1890 denied the franchise to Mormons and orientals. Foresight? Vision? A hundred years ago our American ancestors were slaughtering each other; less than half that long ago real warfare was waged in the mining camps and railroad yards and in the streets and docks of industrial cities.

In hundreds of communities it was only in the schools, as education became a birthright, that children of different ancestry met—and by no means unanimously, and by no means is the process over—and learned however grudgingly to believe that persons reared differently from themselves might be entitled to the same rights and opportunities as themselves in a free society.

We have come a long, long way. We are freer, happier, healthier, and more knowledgeable and peaceable than any generation of our ancestors. The difference is phenomenal. Many an extremist is simply a child who never learned this, and remains a child.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 12

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 12 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 44, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

"LIMITATION

"SEC. 404. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds authorized in this Act, other than those authorized in section 201, shall be expended for any program or project except to the extent such program or project is carried out in a 'redevelopment area', designated as such by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. With respect to funds authorized in section 201, in the case of areas covered by this Act which are not designated 'redevelopment areas', Federal funds shall be furnished on the same basis as in the case of all other areas not so designated."

On page 44, line 24, in lieu of "SEC. 404." insert "SEC. 405.".

On page 45, line 5, in lieu of "SEC. 405." insert "SEC. 406.".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Iowa yield himself?

Mr. MILLER. I yield myself as much time as is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I discussed this amendment to some extent on the preceding legislative day. I repeat that the amendment is not designed to hurt the bill; neither is it designed to move away from the concept of the bill. It is designed to make it very clear that preferential treatment is not to be given to counties in this area which are not entitled to preferential treatment.

The Appalachia bill has come before the Senate under the aura of being a bill to uplift a distressed area. That there are distressed counties in this area, no one will deny. But when one goes through the list of counties that are covered by the bill, each of which would be eligible for assistance under the bill, one finds at least 67 counties which cannot qualify as distressed counties under the definition of the Area Redevelopment Act. Therefore, I believe we ought not to grant relief under the bill to those counties. If we do, we should let the American people know exactly what we are doing. Let us not try to tease anyone with the thought that this is a bill to aid only distressed counties, because the bill would do no such thing.

I invite the attention of Senators to a table which I have prepared. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Selected examples of counties which cannot qualify as "distressed" but are nevertheless eligible for all benefits under the Appalachia bill

[Figures for 1959]

State and county	Percent of families with income under $3,000	Percent unemployed	Percent of occupied housing units with TV	Percent of occupied housing with automobile
Alabama: Chambers	37.6	4.0	72.8	51.4
Georgia: Catoosa	22.2	3.7	90.6	61.3
North Carolina: Burke	29.0	3.1	84.7	61.7
South Carolina: Greenville	26.4	2.9	86.1	56.6
Tennessee: Sullivan	27.2	4.7	87.0	62.2
Virginia: Smyth	35.0	5.9	80.5	65.0

Source: "County and City Data Book," 1962, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, publication prepared under the direction of Edwin D. Goldfield, Chief, Statistical Reports Division.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it will be noted that I have selected at random certain counties in the States that are covered by the Appalachia bill. For example, in Alabama there is Chambers County. Thirty-seven and six-tenths percent of the families in that county have incomes under $3,000. The rate of unemployment is 4 percent. Seventy-two and eight-tenths percent of the occupied housing units have television. Fifty-one and seven-tenths percent of the occupied housing units have automobiles.

These figures are for 1959. They are the latest figures available. I presume that the percentages with respect to television and automobiles would be much larger as they pertain to the past 5 years.

In Georgia, Catoosa County is listed in the coverage of the bill. In that county, only 22.2 percent of the families have incomes under $3,000. The percentage of unemployed is 3.7. More than 90.6 percent of the occupied housing units have TV, and 61.3 percent of the occupied housing units have automobiles.

In Burke County, N.C., only 29 percent of the families have incomes under $3,000. The rate of unemployment is 3.1 percent. Eighty-four and seven-tenths percent of the occupied housing units have television. Occupied housing having automobiles is 61.7 percent.

In Greenville County, S.C., only 26.4 percent of the families have incomes under $3,000. The rate of unemployment is 2.9 percent; 86.1 percent of the occupied housing units have television; and 56.6 percent of the occupied housing units have automobiles.

In Sullivan County, Tenn., only 27.2 percent of the families have incomes under $3,000. The rate of unemployment is 4.7 percent; 87 percent of the occupied housing units have television; and 62.2 percent of the occupied housing units have automobiles.

In Smyth County, Va., 35 percent of the families have incomes under $3,000. The rate of unemployment is 5.9 percent; 80.5 percent of the occupied housing units have television; and 65 percent of the occupied housing units have automobiles.

The source of this information is the County and City Data Book for 1962, published by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. I am quite sure that a careful review of this book will show that countless counties throughout the United States are in, if anything, much worse condition than these counties. These counties could not qualify as distressed counties; yet they will receive benefits under this bill, unless we do something about it.

In my own State of Iowa, in 17 of the 99 counties more than 40 percent of the families receive incomes under $3,000; 17 counties in Iowa have more than 4 percent unemployment. I cannot in good conscience vote to tax the people of Iowa in order to give preferential treatment to counties in other States which cannot qualify as distressed counties. I do not think I should be asked to do so.

We might consider another viewpoint: Are the States in which these counties are located doing what they should be doing to alleviate their distressed conditions?

Pennsylvania and Ohio are probably the major recipients, aside from West Virginia, of assistance under the proposed act.

I have no brief for West Virginia. West Virginia is a distressed State, in a distressed area. But when we look at Pennsylvania and Ohio, for example, we find some very interesting figures relating to per capita disposable personal income and the State and local tax per capita in those States as compared with other States.

I now refer to a table for 1963, showing the per capita disposable personal income and the State and local tax per capita in a group of States.

The table reads as follows:

State	Per capita disposable personnel increase	State and local tax per capita
Pennsylvania	$2,124	$208.70
Ohio	2,147	207.40
Iowa	2,036	244.75
Hawaii	2,097	256.47
Colorado	2,134	259.48
Kansas	1,973	249.45
Minnesota	2,011	268.57
Montana	1,950	241.41
Rhode Island	2,123	230.71
South Dakota	1,706	223.96
Utah	1,862	221.78
Vermont	1,864	231.66
Washington	2,146	271.28
Wisconsin	2,024	254.01

Mr. President, the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio are not levying enough taxes on their people, when compared to other States.

In my own State of Iowa, the per capita disposable personal income was only $2,036. That is $100 less than the figures for Ohio and Pennsylvania. Yet, the per capita tax was $244.75. There are a great many other States which are levying more taxes per capita. Those States had a smaller per capita disposable personal income than the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio. Yet, it is proposed to tax the people of these various States in order to provide the assistance proposed by this bill.

I wish to make it clear that I would like to be able to support legislation which was aimed at relieving distress, not only in the area covered by the Appalachia bill, but also in other areas throughout the United States.

One naturally wants to assist the distressed areas in his own State. But at the same time, I do not think any of us should be so provincial as to say that unless we have a corresponding amount of assistance under a particular bill for our counties, we will never consider giving assistance to other counties which may be intended to receive it.

My point is that there is no reason to grant assistance to nondistressed counties, as this bill proposes to do. The only argument that possibly can be made against it is, "If we do not allow some of these nondistressed counties to come within the coverage of this bill, we may have difficulty with the road program."

The answer to that argument is that my amendment would specifically exempt that situation and would provide that when highways go through nondistressed counties, the nondistressed counties shall receive benefits in no greater degree than any other nondistressed county throughout the United States.

If, in the case of other nondistressed counties, the States must put up 50 percent and the Federal Government put up 50 percent in constructing highways through those counties, such should be the case in the Appalachian bill, in which area there are nondistressed counties.

I think it is a fair amendment. I think it is designed to do no more and no less than what the proponents of this legislation say they intend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized. How much time does the Senator from West Virginia yield to himself?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa. It is a slightly altered version of the amendment offered last year, which was rejected by the Senate. It was also rejected by the House Committee on Public Works, when the measure was considered there. The bill did not reach the House for consideration. So, we have had the expression of the Senate itself in its Chamber, and the House within its Committee on Public Works.

I indicated last week when I had the privilege of discussing this matter with the able Senator from Iowa that there are limitations and shortcomings inherent in this amendment. I shall summarize them briefly today.

First, the amendment would reject the basic regional concept of the bill. This is not an area redevelopment measure. I must repeat that, as I said last week, it would be fallacious to attach to this measure completely extraneous and, I think, irrelevant criteria which have been developed under the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Second, I do not believe that the privileged treatment which is indicated with respect to the Appalachian area is a valid argument. The proposed amendment would strike out the effectiveness of the multicounty development district as determined in this legislation.

We have noted in committee—and we have called attention to it in the Senate—that the counties of greater economic strength will often be the nucleus, the anchor, as it were, for the development district. Technical assistance funds, as well as projects funds, would frequently be allocated not to single counties but to multicounty development districts.

Third, with respect to the amendment, the provision for allocating funds under section 201, which is the road program, I believe the proposed amendment contains language that is either meaningless or unworkable.

Frankly, I do not know what is meant by the language on page 2, lines 3 and 5, which refers to the highway funds, as the Senator from Iowa set them forth. It reads:

> Federal funds shall be furnished on the same basis as in the case of other areas not so designated.

I do not know what this means. As the Senator said, in all Federal aid highway programs, as in the pending bill, the allocations made by the Secretary of Commerce to the States are not made to the counties. If, on the other hand, the related language is not meaningless, but declares that the funds for assistance in building specific roads would be apportioned differently, as the road program transverses from one county and jumps over another county, such a provision would be completely unworkable. I think that it would be impossible to administer such a provision.

For the reasons I set forth last week and which I reemphasize now, I shall oppose, on behalf of the committee, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa. The Senator is able and conscientious. I understand his concern.

However, I believe that in this instance his argument is not valid.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the rollcall be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 11

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 11, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska for himself and other Senators (amendment No. 11) will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, beginning with line 14, on page 18, strike out through line 12 on page 21.

Renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska must first yield himself time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I understand the Senator from West Virginia wishes me to yield for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that on this amendment, No. 11, the committee, which is opposed to the amendment, shall have an additional 10 minutes. That will give us 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the 10 minutes be taken out of the time before 3 o'clock, or will the time for voting be extended beyond that time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. There is plenty of time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There may be many other amendments.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why not extend the time beyond 3 o'clock?

Mr. RANDOLPH. We cannot do it. The time has already been fixed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from West Virginia will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the Senator from Nebraska is now recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, am I to understand that my 10 minutes starts now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am grateful for the 1-minute "spot."

Amendment No. 11 involves the deletion of section 203 of the bill (S. 3).

In considering this amendment, we are really plowing old ground again, because section 203 was deleted from the similar bill that we considered last year.

The question is whether the revised language of section 203 as contained in the bill this year has been changed from last year's version sufficiently to affect our decision.

It is said that section 203 in its present language is patterned after the language authorizing the Great Plains conservation program. If the 10 Midwestern States think highly enough of the Great Plains program to vote appropriations for it each year, it is argued that we should not prevent the application of the Great Plains program to the Appalachia region.

It is further argued that to refuse approval of section 203 would be regionalism of an extreme form; and that section 203 as revised would be not the slightest threat to the beef-producing States of this country.

As to the first point, that to refuse adoption of the provision would be regionalism of an extreme form, it is argued that section 203 gives to the Appalachia region nothing not already enjoyed by the 10 Midwestern States under the Great Plains program; and that Appalachia as a 50-acre limitation and a $2,500 limitation per farm; whereas the Great Plains program has a limitation of $25,000 on a contract, rather than $2,500 for 50 acres.

I should like to explore for a moment what the Great Plains program is. It is authorized by Public Law 1021 of the 84th Congress. There are some 17,000 contracts under it. The average allowance under those contracts is a little more than $3,600 a contract—not $25,000. Most projects in recent years have been on a level of 50–50 participation, and there are very few providing for as large a Federal contribution as 60 percent.

The average size of the operating unit in the Great Plains program is not 50 acres as a limit, but 2,055 acres.

What does that tell us? That tells us that the conditions in the Great Plains area are the antithesis of what we find in Appalachia.

It is not fair, it is not even common sense, to say that we should apply the Great Plains program to the Appalachia region, and that here are sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and we will lift those out of the Great Plains and put them in a program for Appalachia, which is not comparable in geography, area, or economic conditions.

Some 422 counties, after careful selection, were made eligible for the program, and only 392 of them have projects under it. The Great Plains bill, Public Law 1021, was adopted following action by the appropriate committee. It contained 2,500 printed lines, carefully prepared, with appropriate safeguards, and with provisions that were calculated to meet the circumstances in that 10-State area. That is the handling that I recommend for section 203 of the present bill, so that knowledgeable committees in the Senate and House dealing with agricultural problems will have an opportunity to go into it, and to see that what comes out is a workable bill.

The greatest single difference between the two programs is that in the Appalachian program we are dealing with uneconomic units, held by the most impoverished of the people of the region. Nothing can be accomplished by investing $2,500 apiece in those small units, as grants for land conservation practices, in the hope of making those units self-sustaining from an economic standpoint. Fifty acres will support no more than 12 to 16 head of cattle. That is not enough to do the job.

In my judgment, one of the most cruel hoaxes in this whole situation is that the landowner in Appalachia, when he gets into the program, will be given the idea that the program will enable him to make a living. Under all the laws of economics, he cannot make a living through such a program. All the Federal help he can get will not give him any real future to look toward. It will be a future with a submarginal income and a substandard living.

As to whether the program creates a threat to the beef industry, last year we heard testimony by two administration spokesmen—namely Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and Under Secretary of Commerce, Franklin Roosevelt. The testimony was that the added marketings of beef cattle in Appalachia, with this program of increased production, would amount to $230 million. That comes to a million head of cattle. That means a billion pounds of beef on the hoof.

Is that not a factor?

Is that not plenty of additional competition for the beef industry?

I would say that it is, particularly when Secretary Freeman states that the big trouble with the cattle industry is it is overproducing.

What is his remedy? His remedy is to establish a system subsidized with Federal funds, not only in pasture improvement but also in the buying and maintenance of breeder stock which would increase marketings by a million head of cattle a year. These marketings would be added to an already burdensome overproduction, which the Secretary states is at the bottom of the situation.

It is argued also, "We are importing a million feeder cattle a year from Mexico and Canada. Why not raise them in Appalachia?"

I will go along with that argument. I believe most Senators would. But the administration refuses to put limits on the imports of feeders from Mexico and Canada. We are going to receive them whether we like it or not. Even if Appalachia should furnish a million more head a year, we are going to get them from Canada and Mexico also. Thus, it is not a matter of substituting feeders from the Appalachian area; it is putting them into the market in addition to the surplus feeders from Mexico and Canada which will come in, nevertheless.

I know that the situation in Appalachia is grave. The impoverishment there and the lack of food is not a bright prospect, to say the least.

It is not my position that this program be rejected and then forgotten.

If there is merit to this proposal, let us strike it from the bill now. To determine whether it has merit, let it be put in the form of a separate bill, and referred to the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate for them to process. Let them process it along the same lines as Public Law 1021 was processed in 1956. Have it geared to the problems of the area in which it is to be applied, so that it will stand up as a workable proposal.

Then, if it passes the judgment of those people, I believe it should be considered by each Chamber and then enacted into law, but not on the basis of hearings held on January 19 and 21 of this year, during the very week of the inauguration ceremonies, when many other things were going on in the Capitol; also under circumstances when there was not sufficient time for the cattlemen's associations to come to Washington and prove the points which I have tried to make in the Chamber today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. HRUSKA. This is a hurry-up call. We are told we must pass this bill today. We must vote on it by 3 o'clock. I say that is not fair to the organizations representing the beef producers, who will be seriously affected by a proposal so harmful to their interests. This may be relieving, in part, those in Appalachia, but at the expense of those already in the beef industry who are trying to hang on, in spite of the adverse market conditions in the cattle industry today.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I congratulate the Senator from Nebraska on having offered the amendment dealing with the problem in connection with this bill, which could have very serious and injurious economic consequences throughout the agricultural areas. The Senator has taken a reasonable and moderate approach in trying to correct the situation which, if left in the bill, could create genuine economic distress in widespread areas of the country.

I wonder whether the Senator from Nebraska feels, along with me, that if the bill should remain in its present form, and if his amendment should be rejected—in effect resulting in the enactment and approval of all that is now in the Appalachia bill—it would have the result of transferring pockets of poverty from Appalachia out into the range and cattle country of America, where we already are suffering serious economic consequences.

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no question about that. In the last 2 or 3 years, many persons in our area have been pushed into bankruptcy or near bankruptcy. If we are to have a portion of the industry subsidized in competition with us, of course it will aggravate that situation.

Mr. MUNDT. I see no good economic sense at all in creating new areas of poverty in order to correct existing problems. This is a nation of 50 sovereign States. By moving economically distressed locations from one area on some kind of magic carpet, by impinging upon the agricultural activities of a normally agricultural area of the country, it seems to me we would be walking down the hill toward more poverty, in certain sections of our country, instead of toward a high plane of national prosperity.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his observations.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I feel that the Senator from Nebraska has made a significant contribution to this debate in his forceful statement on his amendment. I offered the same amendment in committee, and for the same reasons the Senator from Nebraska has so eloquently stated.

I feel that the Great Plains area is being discriminated against in this amendment. As the Senator from Nebraska has already pointed out, the cattlemen of my area, and the cattlemen of Nebraska, are suffering from overproduction.

Last year, when Secretary Freeman appeared before the committee, I interrogated him concerning the amendment. It was called the pastureland amendment then. This year "pastureland" has been removed from the amendment each time. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who has been handling the bill in the committee, is to be commended for his frankness and forthrightness in stating that they took the word "pastureland" out, but it applies to the same thing.

It is difficult for me to oppose a soil conservation and a soil erosion amendment, but this amendment, which appears to give special privilege to the Appalachian area at a time when the administration is cutting soil conservation all over the rest of the United States, comes with ill grace

In the budget message, the President proposes a reduction of $20 million for 1966 under legislation authorizing the establishment of a public enterprise revolving fund. The finance report calls for technical services provided to soil conservation districts for soil conservation already in operation, in cooperation with farmers, ranchers, other landowners in the design and layout and installation of planned water and soil conservation practices. The proposal is that a revolving fund be established by the farmers themselves, or by the States, or by the soil conservation districts, whereby to contribute to technical services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in other words, the administration is coming around, on the one hand, with a tin cup, collecting from all the farmers who are participating in soil conservation for their technical service, and then distributing the largess it collects to the people of Appalachia.

The Presidential budget message at page 89 states:

> But in view of the market outlook for farm commodities at home and abroad, farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than about 1 million farm families, even with continued Government assistance. Many low-income farm families will have to find other ways of earning a living.

Mr. President, that means that the administration is saying to Congress that two and a half million of the 3 million farmers in America will have to leave the farms. Then it says that we shall have to give special subsidies and special consideration to return them to the farm in special areas of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I heartily concur in the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska and hope it will be added to the bill.

May I have an additional half minute yielded to to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield another minute to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I have supported this principle in other areas, such as in connection with the Great Plains program. I cannot justify in my mind a program which on the one hand would contribute to further poverty, as has been pointed out, in other areas of the United States, and then take that same poverty to build up something in the Appalachian area.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I hope very much that my colleagues on this side of the aisle will give consideration to the arguments that I am about to make in response to the presentation made by my friend from Nebraska.

All of us are aware of his concern, and of the concern of other Members of the Senate, about the problems of the great cattle-producing States.

Last year many of us joined in support of the efforts of the Senator from Nebraska to secure application of quotas to the importation of beef. But I believe that the Senator and his cosponsors are unduly concerned about the effect on the cattle situation of section 203 of the bill which he seeks to strike.

They assume that this section, if it is used by the small farmers in the Appalachian area, and if they improve their small tracts of land to the limit of 50 acres, that it will go into pasture and all will be used for the production of beef. I say to them that they do not know this area. I say that with great respect for my friends.

The chief purposes of the bill are two. The first purpose is not particularly relevant to the discussion of the amendment, but it is to establish facilities, such as roads, vocational schools, and health facilities, which will in time bring the region into parity with other more fortunate regions of the country.

The second purpose is to assist in the restoration, conservation, and rehabilitation of the natural resources of this region—land, water, and timber. Certainly no resource is more important than land.

The vast areas in the West, acres stretching out in flatlands, bear little comparison with the hills in Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee. It is a rugged country, cut with steep hillsides and narrow valleys. There are a few farms in the bottom lands of the streams, but most are hillside farms. The timber has been cut away. The land has been cultivated in corn, and in other row crops.

It is poor soil with little limestone, and much sandstone. The hills have been gullied, and a great deal of the topsoil has washed away.

The bill provides that these small farmers, with small resources, who have not been able to take advantage of the 50–50 divisions in our farm programs, such as the Soil Conservation Service and the ACP, and so forth, shall be provided opportunity on a ratio up to 80–20, in conservation practice, to develop their small 50 acres.

I can speak with some experience on this subject, as I live in the area and have traveled it many times.

These small farmers will improve their land and use it for gardens. They may keep a cow or two. I hope they will. They may keep some sheep and hogs. They will live on the land cheaply, and have a better way of living.

My friend from Nebraska said a few moments ago that this program would not help those people, because they could not develop a good farm program on 50 acres. Mr. President, it will enable them to live, and that is the important thing. It will not hurt the people in the cattle States. There may be those who may have 5 or 6 cattle, or 10. How many cattle can one raise on 50 acres? These people want to stay where they are. They are miners out of work, or farm families growing poorer all the time. They are afraid to leave their homes, for it is difficult to secure employment. They do not want to lose the land and their homes.

I believe this section of the bill to be one of the most important sections in the bill. It will give these people a chance to live.

They may raise berries, fruit, vegetables, and market them through cooperatives.

I say to my dear friends: Do not be afraid of this section. It is not a cattle-producing section. It will give a better life and opportunity to people who desperately need a better chance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in response to the presentation of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] let me say that 50 acres, multiplied over and over again, may do to the cattle business precisely what less than 15 acres multiplied time and time again has already done to the wheat market.

We have found that when we protect the right of people to raise unlimited wheat on 15-acre tracts, and then are faced with 50,000 farmers in certain States taking advantage of that provision, it has a detrimental effect on the price received by wheat grown throughout the country. The same thing can occur here if we do not add the Hruska amendment to protect our cattle industry against a new form of subsidized competition.

I do not believe it was the purpose of the Appalachian bill to subsidize one section of the country in waging economic war against another section of the country. However, that is exactly what is taking place at a time when parity is already down to 75 percent in the farming areas. I hope the Hruska amendment is adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, last week I spoke on this subject. I expressed the view that I could not bring my judgment to coincide with a proposal which would have the Federal Government paying money to farmers to take land out of production on the one hand, and then, on the other, paying them money to put land into production.

That is the factual situation that exists with respect to the proposed program.

We have a number of programs in which we say to the farmers, "Take your land out of production. If you do so, you will remove the glut in the market. You will help stabilize prices. If you do that, we will pay you for your failure to produce."

That has been the philosophy, and it has been adopted by the Congress. However, in the present instance, completely in conflict with what has been past practice, we would say to farmers, "If you improve your land with fertilizer, tile, irrigation, and fences, so that you will be able to graze your stock better, we will pay you. It will not be a loan; it will be a gift."

It is beyond my ability to reconcile those two programs. One would pay the farmer to take land out of production; the other would pay the farmer to put land into production.

How can Senators reconcile those two programs? One or the other is wrong.

Certain counties in Ohio are involved in the bill. My natural impulse would be to say, "We will go along with the program." But, Mr. President, already it has been pointed out that there will be at least six other "Appalachias." How long can we continue to give money to take food out of production and give money to increase production?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield an additional minute? I am making a good argument.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The prospects are that there will be six new areas of the country which will come under the proposed program. I visualize that within 2 years there will be "Appalachias" in every part of the country. I do not see how we can continue to pay the Great Plains States at a ratio of 50 to 50 and pay others at a ratio of 80 to 20.

I should like to go along with the provision in the bill which we are discussing, but I cannot do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from West Virginia in asking for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the bill has been somewhat reworded compared with the bill passed last year. But I think it is quite apparent that the result would be about the same as it would be under the pastureland section, section 203, of last year's bill. At that time I pointed out that section 203 of the bill was inconsistent with the land retirement provisions under the current feed-grain program. I believe that the same thing can be said about section 203 as it is presently worded.

Additionally, I point out that I believe that Congress is going far afield when it delegates responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture, as this section would do. I quote from subsection (d) on page 19:

> (d) In return for such agreement by the landowner, operator, or occupier the Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to furnish financial and other assistance to such landowner, operator, or occupier in such amounts and subject to such conditions as the Secretary determines are appropriate and in the public interest for the carrying out of the land uses and conservation treatment set forth in the agreement:

Mr. President, that question is not for the Secretary to determine; it is for the Congress to determine and set down guidelines as to what is or is not appropriate, or what is or is not in the public interest. That is merely another example of what I believe is improper language tied in with a very unfortunate section of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to ask how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 7 minutes remaining under his control.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I hope that what I shall say will be taken in good spirit. If we were to talk about preferential treatment—and I do not like the bill to be discussed in those terms—certainly there are areas of our country, including the Great Plains area, which have had attention in the past. I shall not call it preferential treatment, but I say that for 8 years in the Great Plains area they have been carrying forward special programs. In the Great Plains program 341 million acres have been eligible for attention. If the program in the Appalachian region were similar to that in the Great Plains area, we would have approximately 8 million acres eligible for assistance and would hope for treatment of approximately 2.5 million acres over the life of this act. The present funding level of section 203 would treat approximately 350,000 acres.

Mr. President, the committee has attempted very realistically—and I shall say very considerably—to bring in this year a substitute for the amendment which was offered last year to meet the arguments which have been discussed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and others today and prior to today. We are thinking in terms of help within the Appalachian region, not merely for the plains areas. If we had any plains, we would have the production of cattle. But we are thinking, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has said, of orchards which would be developed and of other programs—for example, the production of certain types of berries, as well as livestock production. All of those endeavors would be within the program of conservation, land improvement, and erosion control.

I cannot see how that program would be a threat to the beef industry in the section of the country from which the Senator from Nebraska comes. If the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], cosponsored by other Senators who are interested in the Great Plains States, were agreed to, it would be regionalism in the extreme. We are asking only for what I think is valid.

I quote now from page 1610 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1965. The Senator from Nebraska opposed "special Federal subsidies on a basis which discriminates in favor of one section of the country and against all other sections."

That is a quotation from the statement of the Senator. I accept it at its face value, and reply that section 203 of the pending measure, as reported, offers to the farmers of the Appalachian region nothing that has not been available to the farmers of the designated counties in Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Texas, North Dakota, South Dakota, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Montana since enactment of the act of August 7, 1956, to which reference has been made, and which established the Great Plains program under the administration of the Soil Conservation Service. The maximum allowable grant under the proposed legislation now before the Senate is substantially less than—and would probably average approximately one-tenth of—the maximum allowable assistance under the program in the Great Plains.

I have read with care the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. I have also read the remarks and listened to the statements today of the Senators from Nebraska and Ohio. I say to them with respect—and I respect them highly—that I believe their comments are not responsive to the purpose of section 203 as we have drafted it this year in S. 3. Section 203 does not give special preference to the farmers of the Appalachian region. I invite the attention of Senators to the colloquy on January 29. It was presumed by both Senators that the Great Plains program is operated on a 50–50 basis of participation between the Federal Government, on the one hand, and the farmer, on the other. It has since been brought to my attention that while a 50–50 ratio may prevail in many instances, the law provides for Federal grants up to 80 percent of the cost of each eligible project.

In Nebraska, of the 21 practices installed under the program, 6 are at 80 percent, 10 are at 73 percent, 3 are at 60 percent, and only 2 at 50 percent.

In South Dakota, of the 23 practices installed, 9 are at the ratio of 80 percent, 6 at 75 percent, 9 at 65 percent, and only 2 at 50 percent.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly for a question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. For what years were those projects approved? If they were in the initial years, that statement is true; but in recent years the average has been about 50 percent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Different practices have been instituted and contracted for over the years. The list to which I refer includes all 24 practices installed under the program and has been updated to 1964. The Senator from Nebraska has indicated that these programs have no applicability to Appalachia. This is not a fact. I mention, for example, permanent vegetative cover. Certainly we have reasons for that practice. Then there are the practices of field strip-cropping, contour strip-cropping, contour farming operations, terrace construction, furrowing, ripping, and pitting or listing; also detention of sediment and retention dams; stream-bank or shore protection; construction of dams for irrigation; developing springs; and control of competitive shrubs. All of these stabilization and erosion control practices are applicable to the farms of Appalachia.

I refer Senators to pages 119 and 120 of the Federal Budget for fiscal 1966, in which the Great Plains program, after which this section of the pending measure has been patterned, is discussed. I quote from that section of the budget:

> Program regulations provide that the cost-share rate offered in any contract shall not exceed 80 percent of the average cost of installing each eligible practice within the designated county. * * * There is also a cost-sharing limitation of $25,000 for any one contract.

I emphasize that whereas the comparable program for Appalachia under section 203 is limited to not more than 50 acres, which at the average cost of $50 per acre would be a maximum of $2,500, the Great Plains program limits a single contract to $25,000, or 10 times the amount which would be allowed the Appalachian farmer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The 10 minutes allotted to himself by the Senator from West Virginia have expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield myself 3 minutes.

I find it difficult to understand how Senators could seriously entertain the argument of preferential treatment in Appalachia in the face of the facts which have been presented by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], which I have placed in the RECORD. I do not advocate establishing a 50-acre limitation in the Great Plains. Obviously, in the wide expanses of the Western States, such a limitation would be inappropriate and ineffective. But I do argue for at least equal treatment for the farmers of Appalachia with the farmers of the Great Plains. Equal treatment means the equal, though not identical, application of the resources of our Government to the needs of the farmers.

Should the soil of the farms of West Virginia and eastern Kentucky be allowed to wash away into the Ohio and Big Sandy Rivers, while the soil of the farms of Kansas and Nebraska is protected from erosion? I do not believe that the Senate will adopt an amendment which embodies such apparent inequities as the pending one, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The point we are missing is that the limitation provided in the bill is 50 acres. This is an antipoverty program. As the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has already said, the 50 acres is nothing more than a family farm. We are trying to provide a little sustenance for those people to enable them to provide for their families. It was never intended that industry in any other part of the country should be dislocated. This is an antipoverty program; we must understand that. The reason for the limitation of 50 acres is that it is a family farm program. We are merely trying to assist people to raise some cattle and some food in order to support their families.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Rhode Island is succinct and correct, as always. There is no attempt in the bill to do violence to a program which, for 8 years, has worked effectively in the Great Plains. We know that. But there is a desire to provide equal treatment to the farmers of the Appalachian region, a region of high ridges, steep slopes, and narrow valleys, and where, as has been said by the Senator from Rhode Island, only the small acreages of farmers are under consideration.

Mr. President, I reserve the time I have remaining.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I support the Hruska amendment. I believe that the language in the bill before us is a substitute for the language that was in the bill last year, only it is a little subtle. The language of last year's bill indicated an intention, as part of the Appalachian program, to expand the livestock production of the country, particularly cattle. If through the ingenuity of the sponsors and the use of the help that is extended to all sections of the country, someone wishes to go into the livestock production business, certainly he should not be retarded by the Government. On the other hand, if there is an industry, such as the cattle industry, in which someone is suffering from depressed prices, an industry which has been subjected to excessive foreign import competition, certainly the Treasury of the United States should not be used to build up additional competition for the existing livestock industry.

It is true that the language in the pending bill does not mention livestock or cattle; but I believe it must be admitted that the purpose is the same.

I support the Hruska amendment for another reason. The language in the bill is not necessary. It has been shown that the Appalachian region has not exhausted the possibilities of solving this problem under existing law. I speak primarily of the Soil Conservation Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, would the Senator from West Virginia prefer to finish his debate?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I should like to do so. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I address myself to the argument that we should not raise the investment of funds for one region while the budget has established cuts for other regions. This refers specifically to proposed budget cuts for the Department of Agriculture. While I am sensitive to the problem this poses for Senators from other States, and indeed, I have indicated my resolve to resist such cuts, let us not mix apples and oranges. Let us refer to the budgeted funds for comparable programs.

Section 203 would authorize $17 million for soil conservation and erosion control for fiscal years 1966 and 1967. The budget for 1966 requests for the Great Plains program alone an appropriation of $14,864,000—an annual rate of almost twice that which would be authorized for Appalachia by section 203—and an increase over the 1965 estimate for the Great Plains of $14,744,000 and the 1964 expenditures of $13,617,000.

Mr. President, section 203 would authorize for Appalachia slightly more than half the annual appropriations made for the Great Plains program. Section 203 would authorize assistance to some of the 218,000 farmers in the designated counties of the 11 Appalachian States; the Great Plains program has under contract 17,111 farmers and ranchers in the designated counties of 10 Great Plains States. And section 203 would establish for Appalachia a maximum allowable grant limitation of 50 acres, or approximately $2,500; the Great Plains program authorizes a maximum allowable grant under one contract of $25,000 though I do not know whether a single operator or occupier is limited to one contract.

In the light of these facts, the argument of preferential treatment for Appalachia is, in this Senator's opinion, completely fallacious, and I hope that the Senate will decisively reject the proposed amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I find myself completely in accord with the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. Too many of our Federal programs have encouraged competition against industries which were already severely depressed.

I can think of ski areas being put out of business by new ski areas which were financed by the Federal Government. I can think of wood manufacturing businesses being put out of business by new businesses financed by the Federal Government. I have mentioned just two of many such programs whereby Government-financed businesses have adversely affected businesses established through free enterprise.

It seems to me that in a time and place where we already have a surplus of cattle, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, when the price of cattle is depressed, that we should not enact a bill with a provision such as section 203 whose purpose is to place new areas in competition with another industry which is already in distress, and thereby exaggerate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask for 10 additional seconds.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield that much additional time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am very much persuaded by the arguments of the minority report. I am convinced that the whole concept of the bill, in addition to the defects I see in section 203, is to create an unprecedented opportunity for logrolling. Federal funds will gush forth without the restraint of reason. The necessary "needs" test will become simply a matter of "who is the most adept at rolling his log" instead of "where are the needs most acute in areas that have demonstrated their inability to alleviate their economically depressed condition by attempting self-help to the full extent of their capability prior to requesting Federal assistance." The latter should be the test, not the former.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge the generosity and fairness of the senior Senator from West Virginia for the manner in which the debate has been conducted.

It has been said that section 203 offers nothing to Appalachia that has not been enjoyed for 8 years now by the Great Plains under Public Law 1021.

We have in the Great Plains an area in which the average farm unit is 2,000 acres, compared with 50 acres per farm in Appalachia. That means $18 an acre in the Great Plains as against some $50 plus an acre in Appalachia. That is one great difference.

Another difference is that we have built into section 203 a need for constant and continued subsidies indefinitely into the future.

If the program is started, the units there are uneconomic. They cannot be self-sustaining, even if given all favorable conditions. A total of from 12 to 16 animal units on each one of those 50-acre tracts will not do the job, and that is all those farms are capable of supporting.

Federal grants of 80 percent of the cost to restore vegetation will be necessary, but also breeder stock must be procured and maintained in order that the program may become operational at all.

Will this program do any harm to the existing cattle industry? The addition of 1 million head of cattle marketed per year, within a very few years after this program has been put into effect, will certainly be harmful to the cattle industry. Let us not pretend that this is a program for orchards, gardens, poultry, or a cow or two.

This is how the report reads with respect to section 203:

> It offers no special provisions for assisting livestock operations in Appalachia. The committee assumes that after the land is restored and revegetated, the operation of free market factors, in conjunction with already established Federal programs, will supply this need.

Refer, if it is so desired, to the testimony of Mr. Sweeney, who states the same thing and amplifies it.

This provision is for the purpose of increasing the cattle production capability of those 50-acre units in the Appalachia region. There is no question about it. One million more head of cattle added to the cattle marketings that we have now, 1 billion pounds of beef on the hoof to be added to the market, will have a destructive effect on the market in our free economy.

Let us strike this section from the bill. Let us refer this matter to the Committee on Agriculture. Let them mull over it and see whether the arguments advanced by the cattle industry and other citizens last year are true. They will be verified. In support of the statement that these units are uneconomic and cannot be self-sustaining, we have one of the greatest experts in the business—Secretary Freeman himself.

I do believe, therefore, that we ought to refer this to the House Committee on Agriculture and to the Senate committee, and let them process it as it should be processed.

The amendment should be sustained. I hope the Senate does so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, amendment No. 11.

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 56, as follows:

[No. 10 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Carlson
Church
Curtis
Dirksen
Fannin
Harris
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Mansfield
McClellan
Metcalf
Miller
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Prouty
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak

NAYS—56

Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Byrd, Va.
Dodd
Dominick
Fulbright
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Jackson
Johnston
McCarthy
Moss
Muskie
Pearson
Saltonstall
Scott
Talmadge
Yarborough

So the amendment offered by Mr. Hruska, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have been present during much of the debate on the pending bill. I move to strike out section 405. I will take 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Tennessee restate his amendment?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I take 2 minutes time and move to strike out section 405.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. I have been present during much of the debate on the pending bill. I rise to express my gratitude to and my admiration for the able, adroit, considerate, and effective way in which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] has conducted the debate and piloted this bill to the threshold of passage by the Senate.

The State of West Virginia is in the heart of the region known as Appalachia. Therefore, the citizens of West Virginia can be rightfully proud of the diligence which their senior Senator has displayed in the passage of this bill, rightfully proud of his knowledge of the problems of this great, this beautiful but this blighted area, and rightfully proud of the esteem in which he is held by all Senators.

I congratulate the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and express the appreciation of the people of Tennessee, many of whom are likewise living in the Appalachian region, for the diligence and ability he has shown in bringing this bill to successful passage.

I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield 1 minute to my colleague.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senate is now operating under a unanimous-consent agreement as to time, it will not be my intention to speak at this point except briefly. As a cosponsor of S. 3, I wish to state that I enthusiastically support the bill and that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I shall work to secure adequate funds for the implementation of the programs envisioned by this act. These programs will be very beneficial in that they will provide for the mounting of a regional attack upon problems confronting Appalachia.

I wish to compliment my colleague, Senator Randolph, for the excellent work that he has done in conducting the Senate Public Works Committee hearings on this legislation and in bringing S. 3 to its present stage of development in the Senate. A similar bill passed the Senate under his managership by a large majority during the last Congress, and I am confident that the Senate will today pass the bill presently under discussion.

I commend President Johnson on his support of this legislation, and I hope that the House of Representatives will act quickly to enact the bill in that body so that the President's drive to stimulate the economy of Appalachia may be accelerated and made more meaningful.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We of the Public Works Committee are appreciative of, and I am personally grateful for the generous remarks of my able colleague from West Virginia. He is, indeed, a diligent and effective member of the Appropriations Committee, and I know we can count upon his faithful attention to the need of adequate funding for the Appalachian program. He is a cosponsor of this legislation, as he was of its predecessor last year. His support has been valuable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there are no further amendments——

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed, without regard to the offering of amendments, for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works this measure has been brought to the Senate to aid the Appalachian region.

I wish to express the very sincere appreciation, first of all, to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] for his personal words about me. I shall always cherish this expression from him.

I express my thanks to all the Members of the Committee on Public Works. I commend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], as I commended him last week, for the diligence with which he has pursued this bill to hoped-for final passage within a matter of minutes.

At all times, even though we have had differences, we have had a sincere desire to proceed constructively in the consideration of this bill.

I thank the Members of both the majority and minority within the committee. I express my tribute to the staff members of the Committee on Public Works, the chief clerk, Ron M. Linton, and, at this time to invite the attention of the Senate to the services of Richard B. Royce, the professional staff member, who has stood at my side during the consideration of this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, the passage of the proposed legislation, the further passage of the bill in the House, and final enactment by signature of the President of the United States, I hope by April 1st, will bring not only new opportunities to 15 million people in this region but also will give them the opportunity to realize that it involves more than payments of public welfare, that there are programs of public works and resource development which will be instituted in this area. These programs will bring a new surge of economic development to the area, which will be reflected in the further sustained prosperity of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, if no other Senator desires time, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it has been a great honor and opportunity to work with the distinguished chairman of this committee and its members in the development of this bill. I want to pay tribute to the great work and leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from

West Virginia, and I want to say that his understanding and patience has been reflected in the consideration and deliberation given to this bill by all of the members of the Public Works Committee, and of the Senate.

Although some members of the committee opposed certain features of the bill, I believe that on the whole the debate in committee and on the floor has been very constructive. I believe it is a bill which is national in its purpose, although it is directed toward a region; and I believe that it is a carefully constructed bill which has grown out of much thought and effort in the States and in the Senate over the last 6 years.

I recall that in 1959, when I first introduced a bill looking to the coordination of such programs as are included in this legislation, the concept of area development was just gaining wider interest. If this bill now enjoys the success we hope, it may very well serve, and properly so, as a model after which other parts of our country may seek to develop carefully constructed development programs based on initial effort and consultation and coordination in and by the people and officials of the areas affected.

From my own observation, this has already given hope to the people of this region, as they have looked toward its enactment. I hope very much that the States will continue to give the same creativity and spirit of cooperation to the administration of this program that they have in its development. I believe it could be a model type of program, demonstrating how to achieve the fuller development of what I have called in years past the underdeveloped regions of our country, and I think our debate in the Senate has contributed to the strength of the program on which we now vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as I voted against the so-called antipoverty bill, and as I intend to vote this year, as I did last year, for the pending bill, I should like to preserve in the RECORD a brief statement as to why I regard this type approach as vastly preferable to the shotgun approach—if I may use that term—of the antipoverty bill.

I am familiar with several of the areas covered by the pending bill, particularly the State which is so ably represented by the distinguished Senator who has handled the bill on the floor, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and certain areas in Pennsylvania and eastern Kentucky, as well as other areas where there is no question that poverty is rampant and is holding back the progress of very fine people who are relatively without reasonable opportunity for self-advancement.

I favor this type of approach because it is addressed to an area which very badly needs some of the advantages which are sought to be given, in part, at least, by the provisions of this bill.

I know from personal experience how rugged is much of the terrain and how difficult of access it is.

I particularly approve of the fact that a majority of the money proposed to be used in the bill is to be used in the giving of better highway transportation than has ever been available or even possible under former conditions and present conditions obtaining there.

The other objectives of the bill are good, such as health improvement in the communities, through giving them health facilities; also the emphasis on reforestation, because much of this area will have to depend on reforestation; also land erosion control in steep and inaccessible places; and all the other features of the program, which I shall not mention.

In my judgment this kind of approach, meeting the needs of the region involved—and the whole Nation knows what it is to be suffering from poverty—is the type of approach that we ought to adopt, rather than a broad, general program which will set up an administration from one end of the Nation to the other, with all of the objections that necessarily arise from that kind of administration.

I am glad to support the bill. I hope it will bring—and I believe it will—much better conditions to a large number of American people who by any reasonable standard are now underprivileged as compared with the great majority of our people. I hope the bill will be enacted.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am grateful for the comments of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida and am most appreciative of the support he gives this measure. He has family ties to West Virginia and Appalachia and he knows our people and our problems. We hold him in highest esteem.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, in the closing minutes of the debate on the pending measure, I rise to join my senior colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in paying tribute to the able leadership of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] in the management of the pending bill and the leadership he has shown, not only in committee, but also on the floor of the Senate.

Last year he did an able job in having the proposed legislation passed by the Senate, although it was not passed in the other body. He came back this year with the same diligence and dedication to duty, and has brought it back to the Senate as the first piece of major legislation during this session of Congress.

I believe that the people of West Virginia owe him a separate and individual tribute and vote of thanks for the work he has done.

Not only do the people of West Virginia owe him that vote of thanks, but also the people of Tennessee and the other States in the Appalachian region, as well as all the people of America. They all owe him a vote of confidence and commendation for the work he has done.

He has been patient. He has been able to answer every question that has been asked of him on this very important and technical legislation.

I deem it an honor to be privileged to tender the Senator from West Virginia my personal thanks and the thanks of the people of the State of Tennessee for the work he has done on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The junior Senator from Tennessee continues in this body the distinguished record of service to his State which he established in the House of Representatives. I welcome this occasion to serve with him in advancing the welfare of our region and our Nation, and I am deeply appreciative of his remarks concerning my role in this effort.

REGIONAL AREAS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, many of the problems which have plagued the Appalachian region, and which we rightfully seek to solve, are the same as those which have hindered the economic growth of the State of Wyoming and of the entire upper Great Plains and Rocky Mountain region.

As I mentioned in my remarks on January 22 in support of Senate bill 662, introduced by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], on behalf of himself, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], and me, to create an Upper Great Plains Regional Development Act, the problems of poverty that we face in Wyoming may not be as graphic or as concentrated as they are in Appalachia, but they exist nonetheless.

For example, throughout the United States an average of 21.4 percent of our families must exist on incomes of less than $3,000 a year. Six of Wyoming's 23 counties have a low-income percentage substantially above the national average, reaching as high as 28.5 percent in one instance. These figures represent not only those with low incomes whose jobs do not provide them with sufficient funds to enable them to live on anything other than a marginal scale, but also those who, through unemployment, have no incomes whatsoever.

In addition to the problems of poverty and unemployment, Wyoming, like Appalachia, has seen a flourishing coal industry all but succumb to the technological changes in fuel usage. This industry had a potential to provide a backbone of economic support for industrial expansion and development. That potential now lies moribund.

We in the upper Great Plains also suffer from inadequate transportation and communication networks. Perhaps in Appalachia the distances are measured more up and down than are those in our wide open spaces; but distance and its attendant problems are there, nonetheless.

I would also note, Mr. President, that if the present indications of curtailment of many of the agricultural-support programs and other aids to the small farmer are confirmed, our problems in Wyoming will be severely—and, I should think, unnecessarily—aggravated by the creation of a large number of unemployed who previously had been small farmers, and who had, in addition to supporting themselves and their families, provided the economic backbone to many small agricultural communities across the State and the region.

The picture this situation paints is not a pretty one, Mr. President. Furthermore—and perhaps this is more dangerous—it is not an obvious one, for side by side with this poverty, progress exists. We in Wyoming have a good record for economic growth and development. Many of our people have more than adequate incomes, and have very successfully made the adjustment to space-age technology and economics; but I am convinced that until all our people have bridged this gap, we cannot and we must not claim that we are presently living up to our potential for human and economic progress.

Mr. President, the proposals outlined earlier today by the majority leader [Mr. Mansfield] seem to me to be a reasonable and potentially effective method of establishing the means with which to combat the problems I have mentioned. I am anxiously awaiting an opportunity to examine in detail these proposals, so that we can move ahead as soon as possible with this important work.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the Record a statement by the distniguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], who is unavoidably absent.

Senator Scott was one of the first sponsors and supporters of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. He has proposed helpful amendments. He has brought his broad knowledge to our hearings and to the debate on the floor of the Senate. He has fought hard, effectively, and with sympathy for the people of Pennsylvania, in connection with the development and the passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Scott on Senate Bill 3

I regret that I am unable to vote on the question of the passage of S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, of which I have the honor to be a cosponsor. My absence is occasioned by a longstanding engagement in England, to attend the Ditchley Foundation conference on Anglo-American relations, to which I and a group of Senators and Representatives, headed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Fulbright, were invited by Her Majesty's Government.

Nevertheless, I take this opportunity to reiterate my support of this proposed legislation. The report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission, issued in April of last year, and subsequent hearings in committees of both Houses of Congress have demonstrated convincingly the need for an economic development program to be undertaken by a partnership of the Federal Government, the States, and local communities throughout Appalachia, so that the region can share in the prosperity enjoyed by most of the rest of our great Nation.

I am especially gratified that the Committee on Public Works accepted an amendment to S. 3 jointly proposed by my colleague [Mr. Clark] and me, at the request of the Governor of Pennsylvania, William W. Scranton. As a result, the bill now authorizes funds to assist the Appalachian States in reclaiming and rehabilitating strip mined lands. This new provision in the bill will in no way detract from the desirability or necessity of the strip mine study to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior. My Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, however, has already completed many studies in this field, and is therefore, prepared to move to the action stage.

This feature of Senate bill 3 and the development highway construction program and the assistance to deal with the problems of coal mine subsidence and underground mine fires are of great significance to my Commonwealth. Therefore, I am satisfied with this bill as presently drafted, and urge its passage by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will now vote. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMPSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston]. If present and voting the Senator from Colorado would note "nay" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] has been previously announced.

The pair of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 22, as follows:

[No. 11 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Douglas
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—22

Allott
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Fannin
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Proxmire
Robertson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—16

Dodd
Dominick
Fulbright
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Jackson
Johnston
McCarthy
Moss
Muskie
Pearson
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Talmadge
Yarborough

So the bill (S. 3) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. COOPER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if we may have the attention of the Senate for a moment, I should like to query the majority leader as to what will be scheduled by way of Senate business tomorrow and, so far as he knows, for the remainder of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President with the permission of the distinguished minority leader, I should like to furnish a little background as to what the Senate has been able to accomplish so far.

Thanks to the outstanding leadership shown by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senate was able to pass the water pollution control bill.

Under the management of the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senate has passed a bill to creat a Joint Committee on the Budget.

Thanks to the indefatigable Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], a veterans' housing bill has once again been passed.

A resolution has been adopted for the study of methods to help provide for relief from future flood and earthquake disasters, a measure sponsored by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams]. Both the latter measures were ably aided and abetted by the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. Robertson].

Also, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senate has passed a bill to encourage physicians and dentists to practice in shortage areas, a bill, by the way, which has had the very strong, personal interest of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] for many years.

In addition, under the outstanding leadership of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and his colleague, the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senate has just passed the Appalachian regional development bill.

In addition, the Senate has approved 4,730 nominations.

It is the intention of the leadership shortly to move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of Mr. W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. It is our hope that the nomination can be disposed of this afternoon.

It is our intention, further, if the nomination can be disposed of, to have laid before the Senate the coffee agreement implementing legislation and to make it the pending business before the Senate tomorrow.

I wish to report that the Committee on Armed Services will report, possibly within the next few weeks, on the materials reserve stockpile bill, S. 28, which was approved on January 29, by the Stockpile Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington].

It is my understanding that the Committee on Armed Services has scheduled hearings to start February 9 on the annual military procurement authorization bill.

Tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] expects to start hearings in the Committee on Banking and Currency on the gold-cover bill.

This week, also, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold hearings on four or five bills.

I am hopeful that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary will report shortly to the full committee, and that as shortly thereafter as possible, the bill relating to presidential inability and presidential succession will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My understanding is that a quorum of the committee was present and that the bill was reported to the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Committee on Appropriations will meet at 3:30 this afternoon to consider the disposition of the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the 1st session of the 27th New Mexico State Legislature, 1965, the legislature adopted Senate Joint Memorial 1, asking reconsideration of the order to close the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Memorial 1, as adopted by the New Mexico State Legislature be printed at this point in the Record, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 1 of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico

A joint memorial asking reconsideration of the order to close the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Bayard

Whereas the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Bayard has been of service since 1930 to citizens of New Mexico and the Southwest who served their country in time of need; and

Whereas the closing of this facility would leave veterans of southern New Mexico, southern Arizona, and western Texas without a nearby Veterans' Administration hospital for the first time in 35 years; and

Whereas the closing of this facility would be false economy causing great injury to the welfare of veterans of the Southwest and removing almost $2 million a year from the economy of Grant County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the order closing the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Bayard be reconsidered in the light of the best interests of the veterans of the Southwest and the economy of Grant County; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to each member of the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States.

Mack Easley,
President of the Senate.
Bruce King,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] and myself, I send to the desk a certified copy of a resolution entitled: "Resolutions Memorializing Congress To Draft Appropriate Resolutions of Condolences in Memory of Sir Winston Churchill," adopted by the House of Representatives of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on January 27, 1965.

I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Memorializing Congress To Draft Appropriate Resolutions of Condolences in Memory of Sir Winston Churchill

Whereas it was with great sorrow that the people of the United States learned of the death of Sir Winston Churchill; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States granted him a most unusual honor in 1963 when he was made an honorary U.S. citizen, which citizenship was conferred upon him in absentia by President Kennedy in April of that year; and

Whereas the memory of this great statesman should be perpetuated in the hearts and minds of the people of the free world and particularly of the United States where he was held in such high regard and esteem: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully request that the Congress of the United States draft appropriate resolutions of condolences in memory of Sir Winton Churchill; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, adopted, January 27, 1965.

William C. Maiers,
Clerk.

Attest:

Kevin H. White,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 52).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 10. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations (Rept. No. 14);

S. Res. 12. Resolution to extend the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1966 (Rept. No. 37);

S. Res. 13. Resolution authorizing the continuation of certain studies and the initiation of others by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service (Rept. No. 34);

S. Res. 14. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ one additional assistant (Rept. No. 35);

S. Res. 15. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing (Rept. No. 15);

S. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a history of the Pima Indians and the San Carlos irrigation project (Rept. No. 39);

S. Res. 23. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of certain censuses of the Territory of New Mexico and Territory of Arizona (Rept. No. 40);

S. Res. 24. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters relating to migratory labor (Rept. No. 33);

S. Res. 28. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine and study the foreign policies of the United States (Rept. No. 16);

S. Res. 29. Resolution authorizing the printing of the compilation entitled "Mineral Potential of Eastern Montana—A Basis for Future Growth" as a Senate document (Rept. No. 41);

S. Res. 32. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Select Committee on Small Business (Rept. No. 36);

S. Res. 33. Resolution to print as a Senate document a report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects (Rept. No. 42);

S. Res. 36. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (Rept. No. 20);

S. Res. 39. Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure (Rept. No. 21);

S. Res. 40. Resolution to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States (Rept. No. 22);

S. Res. 41. Resolution to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations (Rept. No. 24);

S. Res. 43. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 23);

S. Res. 44. Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 26);

S. Res. 45. Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system (Rept. No. 25);

S. Res. 47. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 28);

S. Res. 48. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office (Rept. No. 29);

S. Res. 49. Resolution to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny (Rept. No. 30);

S. Res. 51. Resolution to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act (Rept. No. 31);

S. Res. 52. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency (Rept. No. 27);

S. Res. 54. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government (Rept. No. 17);

S. Res. 56. Resolution to provide funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government (Rept. No. 18);

S. Res. 58. Resolution to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to economy and efficiency of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government (Rept. No. 19);

S. Res. 60. Resolution to authorize additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 32);

S. Res. 61. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences (Rept. No. 51); and

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall in the Senate during the 80th and 81st Congresses (Rept. No. 38).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 11. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Public Works (Rept. No. 50);

S. Res. 37. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Armed Services (Rept. No. 44);

S. Res. 42. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments (Rept. No. 47);

S. Res. 46. Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act (Rept. No. 48);

S. Res. 50. Resolution to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States (Rept. No. 49);

S. Res. 57. Resolution to study certain aspects of national security and international operations (Rept. No. 46); and

S. Res. 59. Resolution authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities (Rept. No. 45).

BESSIE V. BOSE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 70) to pay a gratuity to Bessie V. Bose, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Bessie V. Bose, widow of Louis Bose, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LULU M. McDANIEL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 71) to pay a gratuity to Lulu M. McDaniel, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Lulu M. McDaniel, widow of Samuel L. McDaniel, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELEANOR C. JENKINS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 72) to pay a gratuity to Eleanor C. Jenkins, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eleanor C. Jenkins, widow of John F. Jenkins, Junior, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 73) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Jordan of North Carolina; and Mr. Scott, of Pennsylvania.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; Mr. Jordan of North Carolina; Mr. Pell, of Rhode Island; Mr. Clark, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Cooper, of Kentucky; and Mr. Scott, of Pennsylvania.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for use during the 89th Congress, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-ninth Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that one thousand six hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining four hundred and fifty copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

STUDY OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION (S. REPT. NO. 43)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 75) to authorize a study of the Standing Rules of the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and submitted a report thereon, which resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the Standing Rules of the United States Senate.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That if more than one counsel is employed the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2100 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The Committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $87,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CARRYING OUT OF OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, 1962—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 53)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 701) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed together with minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 898. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain period of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 899. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Case, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 900. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 901. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for refreshment, service, and merchandise at roof gardens, cabarets, and similar places; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cannon when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 902. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 903. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers;

S. 904. A bill to amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes;

S. 905. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity;

S. 906. A bill to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes;

S. 907. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; and

S. 908. A bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to adopt improved accounting procedures; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 909. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 910. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.; and

S. 911. A bill for the relief of Jacques Maseri and his wife, Adela Maseri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 912. A bill to extend second-class mailing privileges to certain publications of offices of State secretaries of state; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 913. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 914. A bill for the relief of Estanislao Aranguena-Ortunondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 915. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 916. A bill for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 917. A bill to fix the boundary of Shenandoah National Park in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 918. A bill to permit certain land in Clatsop County, Oreg., to be used for public park and recreational purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 919. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 920. A bill for the relief of Tiang H. Ong and Hian Mio Tan Ong; and

S. 921. A bill for the relief of Angela Nemec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gruening, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. Metcalf):

S. 922. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961 (Public Law 87-383) so as to permit the use within Canada of certain funds appropriated pursuant to such act for the conservation of migratory waterfowl; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hruska when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 923. A bill for the relief of Sperandio Bortot;

S. 924. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John R. Devereux, of Chevy Chase, Md.; and

S. 925. A bill for the relief of William S. Hwang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. Harris):

S. 926. A bill for the relief of Laura Hui-Wei Wong and her children, Janet Wong and Simon Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Monroney when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mrs. Smith) (by request):

S. 927. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 928. A bill for the relief of Teresa Jennie Wu Chien; and

S. 929. A bill to amend section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Allott when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 930. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on luggage, handbags, and similar items; and

S. 931. A bill to repeal or limit certain retailers excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Allott when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate hearing.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. Dominick):

S. 932. A bill to amend section 613 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. Dominick and Mr. Anderson):

S. 933. A bill to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Allott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, and Mr. Simpson):

S. 934. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer a deduction from gross income for water assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Allott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Moss, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Montoya, and Mr. McGee):

S. 935. A bill to authorize the appropriation of the receipts of the Colorado River Development Fund for the purpose of making allowances to the Hoover Dam powerplant for deficiencies in firm energy generation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Allott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. McNamara):

S. 936. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Tydings):

S. 937. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to enforce the duty imposed on each carrier to provide adequate services in connection with the transportation authorized by its certificate of public convenience and necessity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brewster when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. Bible, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Church, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 938. A bill to declare a national policy on conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON:

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote in presidential elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cannon when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to develop proposals for the expansion of trade by the establishment of a high-level advisory council; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATIVE TO THE EXTENSION OF THE WEST GERMAN STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AFFECTING NAZI WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Ribicoff) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) to express the sense of the Congress relative to the extension of the West German statute of limitations affecting Nazi war criminals, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Javits, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

STUDY OF NEEDS OF AIRLINE SERVICE BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Nelson) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 69) to authorize the Committee on Commerce to study needs of airline service and recommend legislation for a progressive national policy, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Proxmire, which appears under a separate heading.)

BESSIE V. BOSE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 70) to pay a gratuity to Bessie V. Bose, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

LULU M. McDANIEL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 71) to pay a gratuity to Lulu M. McDaniel, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ELEANOR C. JENKINS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 72) to pay a gratuity to Eleanor C. Jenkins, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 73) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate manual for use during the 89th Congress, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 75) to authorize a study of the Standing Rules of the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INCORPORATION OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators Bartlett, Brewster, Case, Church, Curtis, Douglas, Fong, Hruska, Inouye, Javits, McIntyre, Prouty, Randolph, Ribicoff, Saltonstall, Scott, Williams of New Jersey, and Yarborough, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for 3 days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 899) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, introduced by Mr. Dirksen (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCORPORATION OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators Bartlett, Brewster, Boggs, Case, Curtis, Douglas, Fong, Hruska, Inouye, Javits, Prouty, Randolph, Ribicoff, Saltonstall, Scott, Williams of New Jersey, and Yarborough, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for 3 days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 900) to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, introduced by Mr. Dirksen (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF CABARET TAX

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the excise tax on refreshments, service, and merchandise paid for in cabarets.

Not long ago, the Senate in its wisdom reduced the cabaret tax from 20 to 10 percent. That action brought about a remarkable expansion of the entertainment business which is an important segment of the economy of my State. Mr. President, the Members of this distinguished body well know that the drastic increases in excise taxes were intended as a temporary wartime expedient to increase Government revenue. Previous reductions in excise taxes and the income tax reductions for corporations and individuals enacted last year have conclusively proved the value of selected tax cuts in stimulating the economy.

In view of all these facts, I respectfully urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to the repeal of the excise tax on cabarets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 901) to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for refreshment, service, and merchandise at roof gardens, cabarets, and similar places, introduced by Mr. Cannon, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PAINTING, ILLUMINATION, AND DISMANTLEMENT OF ABANDONED RADIO TOWERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, together with an explanation of the bill, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 903) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1964.
The Honorable Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 89th Congress a proposal to amend section 303(q) of the Communications Act to require that abandoned radio towers continue to meet the painting and lighting requirements applicable to towers used in connection with the licensed transmission of radio energy, and be subject to dismantlement at the Commission's direction in the event the tower constitutes a menace to air navigation.

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the Committee to which this proposal is referred.

Yours sincerely,

E. William Henry,
Chairman.

Explanation of Proposed Amendment to Section 303(q) of the Communications Act of 1934, Relating to the Painting, Illumination, and Dismantlement of Abandoned Radio Towers

This proposal would amend section 303(q) of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that abandoned or unused radio towers continue to meet the same painting and lighting requirements that would be applicable if such towers were being used in connection with the transmission of radio energy pursuant to license issued by the Federal Communications Commission (47 U.S.C. 303(q)). It further empowers the Commission to direct dismantlement of such towers when the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency determines that there is a reasonable possibility that they may constitute a menace to air navigation.

Concern has been expressed by aviation interests, both Government and non-Government, and by the general public, over the potential air navigation hazards posed by abandonment of tall antenna towers, particularly those over 1,000 feet, left standing unlighted and unpainted. The seriousness of this hazard is aggravated by the current trend toward the construction of more and higher radio antenna towers. Being of latticed construction, radio towers are inherently less visible than solid structures such as buildings, water towers, smokestacks, and the like.

Abandonment can occur by voluntary act of licensee, as when the license is permitted to expire or is submitted for cancellation, or when the licensee fails to contest an order to show cause, in consequence of which the license is revoked. Involuntary abandonment normally results from bankruptcy, death, or other legal disability affecting the licensee. Since the events leading to abandonment normally coincide with expiration, cancellation, or revocation of the station license, the Commission is at this juncture powerless to compel continued obstruction marking by invoking the administrative sanctions normally available to it except in those cases where other radio licenses are outstanding in the name of the same person.

The concern about the potential hazard to aviation safety prompted the Air Coordinating Committee to establish a Joint Industry Government Tall Structures Committee (JIGTSC) to investigate the problems raised in the joint use of airspace by the aviation and broadcast industries and to recommend appropriate action establishing the position of the Federal Government in this matter. One of JIGTSC's recommendation was that "the Federal Communications Commission require the removal or appropriate lighting and marking of unused or abandoned towers if it has such authority, and if such authority does not exist * * * that the Federal Communications Commission seek appropriate legislation to attain this objective."

After study and consideration of the JIGTSC and other parallel recommendations, the Commission, convinced that the public interest would best be served by implementation of such recommendations, submitted a legislative proposal which was introduced in the 85th Congress. That proposal would have amended section 303(q) of the Communications Act to authorize the Commission to require the continued lighting and marking of radio towers although the tower has since ceased to be used for radio transmitting purposes. The same proposal was introduced in both the 86th and 87th Congresses; however, in the 87th Congress the Senate Commerce Committee added an amendment authorizing the Commission to require the owner to dismantle and remove the tower when there is a reasonable possibility that it may constitute a menace to air navigation (S.

Rept. 214, 87th Cong.). The Senate passed the bill, S. 684, 87th Congress, with the Committee amendment.

At present, section 303(q) of the Communications Act of 1934 reads as follows:

"Sec. 303. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the Commission from time to time, as public convenience, interest, or necessity requires shall—

* * * * *

"(q) Have authority to require the painting and/or illumination of radio towers if and when in its judgment such towers constitute, or there is a reasonable possibility that they may constitute, a menace to air navigation."

The subject proposal would amend section 303(q) to read as follows:

"(q) Have authority to require the painting and/or illumination of radio towers if and when in its judgment such towers constitute, or there is a reasonable possibility that they may constitute, a menace to air navigation. The permittee or licensee shall maintain the painting and/or illumination of the tower as prescribed by the Commission pursuant to this section. In the event that the tower ceases to be licensed by the Commission for the transmission of radio energy, the owner of the tower shall maintain the prescribed painting and/or illumination of such tower until it is dismantled, and the Commission may require the owner to dismantle and remove the tower when the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency determines that there is a reasonable possibility that it may constitute a menace to air navigation."

The criteria which have been adopted pursuant to the authority under the present section 303(q) against which aeronautical hazard is gaged in particular cases are set forth in part 17 of the rules of this Commission and entitled "Construction, Marking, and Lighting of Antenna Structures." In general, these criteria provide that radio towers exceeding 170 feet in height require obstruction marking irrespective of location, and under these criteria the number of radio towers that can be approved without obstruction marking greatly exceeds those requiring such marking. The painting and lighting specifications imposed under part 17 provide an adequate vehicle for the protection of aviation interests and otherwise meet the Commission's responsibilities under present law; however, these criteria are applicable at this point only to towers used in connection with authorized radio operation. Accordingly, these criteria would not be applicable under present law and regulations to towers presently not used in connection with the licensed transmission of radio communications. Such abandoned towers constitute the particular problem sought to be remedied by this proposal.

The language suggested is essentially that approved by the Senate in the 87th Congress (S. 684). The sole difference from S. 684 is that the FCC's authority to require that a tower be dismantled is based upon a finding by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency that there is a reasonable possibility that it may constitute a menace to air navigation.

We believe that the proposal constitutes an effective and desirable solution to a problem raised by the joint use of airspace by the broadcast and aviation industries.

(Adopted: December 9, 1964, Commissioner Bartley dissenting and stating: "I know of no necessity for this legislation." Commissioner Lee absent.)

AUTHORITY FOR CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD TO EXAMINE CERTAIN BOOKS AND PAPERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, together with a statement of the purpose and need for the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 904) to amend section 407 (e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1965.
Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes."

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the transmission of the draft bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN S. BOYD,
Acting Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A bill "To amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes."

Section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act provides that the Board shall have access to all accounts, records, and memorandums kept by air carriers and may inspect and examine the same. However, under the language of the section as written there is doubt as to the authority of the Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by an air carrier, under common control with an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers. The activities of such persons and organizations are known to the Board in varying degrees from information presented at hearings and common carrier pooling agreements relating thereto submitted to the Board for approval. The Board has no means of determining the accuracy of financial data relating to such persons included in submissions to it, and, specifically, of compliance with the terms of agreements and the equity of formulae included therein.

The legislation herein proposed would implement the recommendation of the Comptroller General of the United States contained on pages 3 and 91 of his "Audit Report to the Congress of the United States, Civil Aeronautics Board, October 1955."

Accordingly, the Board believes that section 407(e) should be amended to make it clear that the Board's authority under section 407 embraces persons controlled by an air carrier, under common control with an air carrier, and service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers.

There is attached a detailed analysis of the proposed amendments and a comparison with existing law.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 407 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Section 407 of the Federal Aviation Act provides for the filing of reports, the prescription by the Board of the forms of accounts, and for the inspection of accounts and other records of air carriers by the Board. In addition, section 407(e) provides that "the provisions of this section shall apply, to the extent found by the Board to be reasonably necessary for the administration of this act, to persons having control over any air carrier, or affiliated with any air carrier within the meaning of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended."

Thus the provisions of this section are limited in application to (1) air carriers, (2) persons having control over an air carrier, and (3) persons affiliated with any air carrier within the meaning of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act. "Affiliates," as defined in "section 5(8)," now section 5(6), of the Interstate Commerce Act does not specifically make reference to persons controlled by an air carrier, persons under common control with an air carrier, or to associations controlled by groups of air carriers. Consequently, there is doubt as to whether the provisions of section 407(e) extend to such persons or associations.

It is proposed to clarify this matter by amending the last sentence of section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act as heretofore indicated.

Precedent for the enactment of legislation along the lines here recommended may be found in the action taken by Congress relative to the auditing and inspection powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Originally, the accounting and inspection provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to regulation of railroads extended only to rail carriers. In November 1938, the Interstate Commerce Commission recommended to the Congress that noncarrier railroad subsidiaries be brought within its jurisdiction with respect to accounting. See the 52d annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, page 121. In 1940 and 1949, the Interstate Commerce Act was amended so as to greatly enlarge the scope of section 20(5) relating to the keeping of accounts and their inspection. The Commission was given authority to inspect the accounts of carriers, lessors, and associations and to inspect the accounts of any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with any such carrier. Further, "association" was defined in section 20(8) to mean "an association or organization maintained by or in the interest of any group of carriers subject to this part which performs any service, or engages in any activities, in connection with any traffic, transportation, or facilities subject to this act."

These changes were brought about, in part at least, as a consequence of the decision of the Commission in Refrigeration Charges on Fruits, etc., from the South (151 ICC Reports, pp. 649, 651, 693 (1929)). That case involved the Fruit Growers Express Co., which was not a common carrier but all of its stock was owned by 18 railroads. The Commission stated that the express company was not subject to its jurisdiction, and further stated on page 693:

"We are further of the opinion that when the carriers perform a part of their transportation service through a separate agency having a monopoly and not subject to the restraint of competition, they should, as they do here, control that agency, but its accounts and the contracts which it makes with the carriers should be subject to our jurisdiction. The investigation which we have made in this proceeding is essential to the determination of reasonable charges for a special service which by statute has been included in the transportation duties of respondents. Yet this investigation, so far as it involves the accounts and records of the express company, has been made as a matter of favor. Under the present law we have no access to the records of that company which we could have enforced as a matter of legal right. Plainly this is an indefensible situation which ought not to be permitted to continue."

Comparison With Existing Law

TITLE IV—AIR CARRIER ECONOMIC REGULATION

Accounts, records, and reports

Inspection of Accounts and Property

[Stricken matter in black brackets; new matter in italics]

SEC. 407(e). The Board shall at all times have access to all lands, buildings, and equipment of any carrier and to all accounts, records, and memoranda, including all documents, papers, and correspondence, now or hereafter existing, and kept or required to be kept by air carriers; and it may employ special agents or auditors, who shall have authority under the orders of the Board to inspect and examine any and all such lands, buildings, equipment, accounts, records, and memoranda. The provisions of this section shall apply, to the extent found by the Board to be reasonably necessary for the administration of this Act, to persons having control over any air carrier, or affiliated with any air carrier within the meaning of section [5(8)] *5(6)* of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended [.], *to persons controlled by, or under common control with, any air carrier, and to associations or organizations maintained by or in the interest of any group of air carriers which perform any service, or engage in any activities, in connection with any traffic, transportation, or facilities subject to this Act.*

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's letter, together with a statement of the purpose and need for the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 905) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1965.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity," and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Statement of Purpose and Need for Legislation To Authorize the Secretary of Commerce To Employ Aliens in a Scientific or Technical Capacity

The proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity without regard to statutory provisions prohibiting the payment of compensation to aliens. Such employment would be subject to adequate security investigations and to a prior determination that no qualified U.S. citizen is available for the particular position involved.

On various occasions, agencies of the Department of Commerce engaged in scientific or technical work have found that the only persons qualified and available for certain highly specialized positions are not citizens of the United States. However, in many cases these individuals cannot be employed by the Department due to provisions in appropriation legislation which prohibit, with certain stated exceptions, the compensation of aliens from appropriated funds. The current prohibition is contained in section 502 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1965, approved August 30, 1964 (Public Law 88–511) and applies to all appropriations for the current fiscal year.

The need to utilize the services of these talented foreigners is due in part to the general shortage of scientists and engineers in this country. More significant, however, is the fact that some of the Department's technical programs are outside the popular or currently fashionable areas of modern science, and, therefore, are not particularly attractive to American students and scientists. In many such fields, the supply of talent is much more plentiful abroad.

For example, the National Bureau of Standards has experienced great difficulty in recent years in recruiting physicists trained in atomic spectroscopy. At the same time, the demands upon NBS for precise data on atomic properties, obtainable through spectroscopic studies, have increased sharply. Such information is essential in interpreting astrophysical data associated with the space program, in measuring and understanding plasmas such as those involved in thermonuclear fusion research, and in understanding the physical processes involved in rocket propulsion.

Though American universities have been producing few trained personnel in this field, spectroscopy has continued to be an active field of study and research abroad. Among the major producers of atomic spectroscopists is Sweden; however, Swedish nationals may not be employed by the Bureau under the present statute.

A similar situation exists with respect to applied mathematics, where the general shortage of trained mathematicians is aggravated by the lack of individuals interested and qualified in certain specialized branches of mathematics. The Bureau of the Census, for example, recently was denied the services of an exceptionally well qualified statistical consultant with extensive experience in censuses and surveys because the individual was a citizen of Sweden. The National Bureau of Standards has been unable to recruit persons skilled in numerical analysis. This is a relatively new mathematical field in the United States, but is increasingly important because of the applicability of these techniques to the analysis of extremely complex problems in science and technology. One of the most valuable sources of trained personnel in this field is Switzerland, but NBS is precluded from the employment of Swiss nationals.

The varied programs of the Weather Bureau frequently require unique combinations of talent that are extremely rare. For example, the Weather Bureau recently needed physicist-meteorologists with specialized experience in the measurement and analysis of atmospheric ozone. Two well qualified candidates were found to be available—one from Switzerland and one from India. Neither could be employed under the present statute. Sweden, which has produced world renowned meteorologists and has an International Institute of Meteorology, also is out of bounds for recruitment to fill the highly specialized needs of the Weather Bureau.

Numerous other cases might be cited, ranging from a Swedish specialist on the rheological properties of paper, who would have been ideally suited to a position at NBS, to an Egyptian oceanographer, who had exceptional qualifications for general circulation research with the Weather Bureau. The proposed legislation would enable the Department to take full advantage of such unique and long-sought combinations of talent and experience from abroad whenever suitably qualified U.S. citizens are not available.

Authority similar to that here sought was granted by the 88th Congress to the Smithsonian Institution. In earlier action, the Congress exempted the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense from the prohibitions against employment of noncitizens. The Department of Agriculture, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Public Health Service also are among the various agencies authorized by the Congress to employ aliens for certain necessary purposes.

MEASUREMENT OF GROSS AND NET TONNAGES OF CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary, together with a comparative statement showing changes in existing law made by the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 906) to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and comparative print presented by Mr. Magnuson are, as follows:

The Secretary of The Treasury,
Washington, January 14, 1965.

The Honorable Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: A proposed bill is enclosed, "To provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks and for other purposes."

The proposed legislation would aid provisions to and amend existing law so that in measuring vessels for documentation as vessels of the United States certain spaces available for cargo and stores and certain other spaces would be excluded from gross tonnages even though such spaces are closed to the weather in a permanent manner and tonnage openings presently required for exemption are not fitted. The bill is drawn in accordance with recommendations formulated by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization and transmitted to member nations by the Secretary-General of IMCO with a request that the relevant provisions be included in the national tonnage measurement regulations. Enactment will extend safety and tonnage benefits to vessels of the United States comparable to those which will be enjoyed by vessels of other nations upon adoption of the IMCO recommendations. An accompanying analysis and comparative type explain the proposed bill in more detail.

It will be appreciated if you will lay the enclosed draft bill before the Senate. A similar proposal has been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas Dillon.

Comparative Print Showing Changes in Existing Law Made by Proposed Bill

Changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets, new matter is in italic):

Section 4149 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 46, sec. 72):

"Sec. 4149. *The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe how evidence of admeasurement shall be given.* [The officer or person by whom such measurement is made shall, for the information of and as a voucher to the officer by whom the registry is to be made, grant a certificate, specifying the build of the vessel, her number of decks and masts, her length, breadth, depth, the number of tons she measures, and such other particulars as are usually descriptive of the identity of a vessel, and that her name, and the place to which she belongs, are painted on her stern in a manner required by this title; which certificate shall be countersigned by an owner, or by the master of such vessel, or by some other person who shall attend her admeasurement, on behalf of her owner or owners, in testimony of the truth of the particulars therein contained; without which the certificate shall not be valid.]"

Section 4150 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 46, sec. 74):

"Sec. 4150. *A vessel's marine document shall specify such identifying dimensions, measured in such manner, as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.* [The registry of every vessel shall express her length and breadth, together with her depth and the height under the third or spar deck, which shall be ascertained in the following manner: The tonnage-deck, in vessels having three or more decks to the hull, shall be the second deck from below; in all other cases the upper deck of the hull is to be the tonnage-deck. The length from the fore part of the outer planking on the side of the stem to the after part of the main stern-post of screw-steamers, and to the after part of the rudder-post of all other vessels measured on the top of the tonnage-deck, shall be accounted the vessel's length. The breadth of the broadest part on the outside of the vessel shall be accounted the vessel's breadth of beam. A measure from the under side of the tonnage-deck plank, amidships, to the ceiling of the hold (average thickness), shall be accounted the depth of hold. If the vessel has a third deck, then the height from the top of the tonnage-deck plank to the under side of the upper-deck plank shall be accounted as the height under the spar deck. All measurement to be taken in feet and fractions of feet; and all fractions of feet shall be expressed in decimals.]"

Section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U.S.C., 1958 edition, title 46, sec. 77):

"Sec. 4153. *The tonnage-deck, in vessels having three or more decks to the hull, shall be the second deck from below; in all other cases the upper deck of the hull is to be the tonnage-deck. All measurements are to be taken in feet and decimal fractions of feet.*

"The register tonnage of every vessel built within the United States or owned by a citizen or citizens thereof shall be her entire internal cubical capacity in tons of one hundred cubic feet each, to be ascertained as follows: Measure the length of the vessel in a straight line along the upper side of the tonnage-deck, from the inside of the inner plank, average thickness, at the side of the stem to the inside of the plank on the stern-timbers, average thickness, deducting from this length what is due to the rake of the bow in the thickness of the deck, and what is due to the rake of the stern-timber in the thickness of the deck, and also what is due to the rake of the stern-timber in one-third of the round of the beam; divide the length so taken into the number of equal parts required by the following table, according to the class in such table to which the vessel belongs:

TABLE OF CLASSES

* * * * *

REGULATION OF RATES AND PRACTICES OF CERTAIN AIR CARRIERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, together with a statement of the purpose of the bill, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 907) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1965.

Hon. Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes.

The bill implements a recommendation in the Statement on International Air Transport Policy approved by President Kennedy on April 24, 1963, that Congress should enact legislation giving the Civil Aeronautics Board authority, subject to approval by the President, to control rates in international air transport to and from the United States.

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the draft bill would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

Alan S. Boyd,
Acting Chairman.

(Enclosure.)

Statement of Purpose and Need for a Bill To Amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 To Provide for the Regulation of Rates and Practices of Air Carriers and Foreign Air Carriers in Foreign Air Transportation, and for Other Purposes

The draft bill would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to give the Board discretionary authority, subject to approval by the President, to prescribe rates and practices and to suspend tariffs of U.S. and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation under the same ratemaking standards that are applicable to interstate air transportation. In addition, an affirmative duty would be placed on the carriers to establish just and reasonable rates and practices relating to foreign air transportation. Also, the existing powers of the Board over rates and practices in oversea air transportation would be modified so as to correspond with those which it has with respect to interstate air transportation, and which are proposed for foreign air transportation.

The bill implements a recommendation in the Statement on International Air Transport Policy approved by President Kennedy on April 24, 1963, that Congress should adopt legislation giving the Board authority, subject to approval by the President, to regulate rates in foreign air transportation because of the need "for more effective governmental influence on rates" to protect the needs of the traveler and the shipper. This recommendation is consistent with the views of the Board, which has sought legislation of this nature since 1942.

At the present time, the Board has no really effective method by which it can protect travelers and shippers against foreign rates which are too high, or prevent the establishment of rates which are so low as to endanger the financial health of the carriers. Although the Board must approve or disapprove the rates established by the International Air Transport Association (IATA), the basic mechanism for determining rates and fares in the first instance, its power to affect the level of the rates—that is whether they are too high or too low—is not only indirect but ineffective. In fact, the only direct authority which the Board has over rates charged by either United States or foreign air carriers is the power to remove any discrimination found to exist after notice and hearing.

On the other hand, virtually all other countries have authority, derived from decrees, regulations, the constitutional structure of their governments, and bilateral agreements having the effect of law, to suspend and fix the rates of their carriers as well as those of the United States. As a result U.S.-flag carriers, who are generally the low-cost carriers, have been unable to put lower rates into effect even when they desired to do so. Thus, foreign governments have been able to take unilateral action against carriers of the United States, while this Government has not been able to do the same with respect to theirs.

Making the new powers discretionary, and subjecting their exercise to the approval of the President, would give recognition to the foreign policy factors involved in foreign air transportation, as well as assure that such powers would be exercised in conformity with our international obligations and with the overall policy interests of the United States. Moreover, such discretion would provide the necessary flexibility for continuing the International Air Transport Association (IATA) as the basic mechanism for establishing international air transport rates and fares, as recommended in the Statement on International Air Transport Policy.

In summary, giving the Board the power to fix rates and suspend tariffs in foreign air transportation, as it may now do with respect to interstate air transportation, would not only place it on an equal basis with its counterparts in foreign governments, but would also enable it to take effective action in the foreign field for protection of the traveler and the shipper. Moreover, vesting the Board with such authority would be consistent with the objective of the air transport policy of the United States to provide a system of reasonable rates that will take into account both the interests of the carriers and the needs of the consumer.

There is attached a section-by-section analysis of the draft bill, and a comparison of its provisions with existing law.

Section-by-Section Analysis of a Bill "To Amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 To Provide for the Regulation of Rates and Practices of Air Carriers and Foreign Air Carriers in Foreign Air Transportation, and for Other Purposes"

Section 1: Amends subsection (a) of section 404 of the act, requiring air carriers in interstate and oversea air transportation to provide through service, adequate equipment and facilities, and establish just and reasonable rates and practices, by adding provisions making it the duty of air carriers and foreign air carriers to establish just and reasonable rates and practices relating to foreign air transportation. Since the Board is being given the power in section 5 of the bill to pass upon the justness and reasonableness of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, such carriers should have the duty of establishing just and reasonable rates and practices for such transportation.

Section 2: Amends section 801 of the act, subjecting the issuance, denial, etc., of certificates for oversea or foreign air transportation and permits for the latter to Presidential approval, by adding provisions requiring that orders of the Board, other than those relating to the removal of discriminations, directing an air carrier or foreign air carrier to discontinue a rate or practice for foreign air transportation, and actions of the Board suspending tariffs filed by such carriers for such transportation, shall be subject to the approval of the President. Copies of such orders and of statements containing reasons for suspension must be submitted to the President prior to publication. Orders relating to the removal of discriminations have been excluded from Presidential approval since the Board presently has authority to issue such orders without such approval.

Section 3: Amends subsection (d) of section 1002 of the act, authorizing the Board to prescribe rates and practices of air carriers in interstate and oversea air transportation, so as to remove the limitation that the Board may prescribe only a "just and reasonable maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum rate, fare, or charge" for oversea transportation. The amendment is required in order to avoid the anomaly of the Board having less authority over rates and practices in oversea air transportation than it would have in foreign air transportation under section 5 of the bill.

Section 4: Amends subsection (e) of section 1002 of the act, setting forth certain criteria for the determination, among other things, of the justness and reasonableness of rates and fares for the transportation by air of persons and property, so as to make its provisions applicable to foreign air carriers as well as to U.S.-flag carriers. Since section 5 of the bill gives the Board the power to pass upon the justness and reasonableness of foreign air carrier rates, the standards of subsection (e) should be applicable to the rates of such carriers as well as to those of U.S.-flag carriers.

Section 5: Amends subsection (f) of section 1002 of the act, permitting the Board to order an air carrier or a foreign air carrier to remove a discrimination, preference, or prejudice in its foreign air transportation rate structure if, after notice and hearing, such a discrimination, preference, or prejudice is found to exist, so as to give the Board discretionary authority to alter a rate or practice in foreign air transportation to the extent necessary to correct unreasonableness or discrimination. Such authority may be exercised only where the Board is of the opinion, after notice and hearing, that a rate or practice is unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential. The Board also would be given discretionary authority to require discontinuance by the carrier of the unreasonable or discriminatory rate or practice, as well as to prescribe the lawful rate or practice, or the maximum and/or minimum of the rate. As stated in the discussion of section 2 of the bill, orders of the Board under this subsection, except for those relating to the removal of discriminations, are subject to the approval of the President under section 801 of the act.

Section 6: Amends subsection (g) of section 1002 of the act, authorizing the Board to suspend rates and practices of air carriers in interstate and oversea air transportation pending hearing, so as to give the Board the same authority to suspend the rates and practices of an air carrier or foreign air carrier in foreign air transportation pending hearing as the Board now has in interstate and oversea air transportation. Deletion of the words "interstate and overseas" gives the Board authority to suspend pending hearing the operation of any tariff filed by an air carrier, and this would include tariffs to be effective in foreign as well as interstate and oversea air transportation. Insertion of the words "or foreign air carrier" following the words "air carrier" wherever they appear in the subsection, gives the Board authority to suspend the rates and practices of foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation pending hearing. However, as stated in the discussion of section 2 of the bill, actions of the Board suspending tariffs filed by air carriers or foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation are subject to the approval of the President under section 801 of the act.

Section 7: Amends subsection (i) of section 1002 of the act authorizing the Board to prescribe through services and joint rates for interstate and oversea air transportation, so as to remove the limitation that the Board may prescribe only "just and reasonable maximum or minimum or maximum and minimum joint rates, fares, or charges" for oversea air transportation. The amendment is required in order to conform the provisions of the subsection to those of subsection (d) as amended by section 3 of the bill.

Section 8: Provides that the amendments made by the bill shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

Comparison With Existing Law

FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Title IV—Air carrier economic regulation

Rates for Carriage of Persons and Property

Carrier's duty to provide service, rates, and divisions

[New matter in italic; matter to be omitted in brackets]

Sec. 404. (a) (*1*) * * *

(2) *It shall be the duty of every air carrier and foreign air carrier to establish, observe, and enforce just and reasonable individual and joint rates, fares, and charges, and just and reasonable classifications, rules, regulations, and practices relating to foreign air transportation; and, in case of such joint rates, fares, and charges, to establish just, reasonable, and equitable divisions thereof as between air carriers or foreign air carriers participating therein which shall not unduly prefer or pejudice any of such participating air carriers or foreign air carriers.*

* * * * *

Title VIII—Other administrative agencies

The President of the United States

Sec. 801. (*a*) * * *

(*b*) *Any order of the Board pursuant to section 1002(f) requiring that an air carrier or foreign air carrier discontinue demanding, charging, collecting, or receiving a rate, fare, or charge for foreign air transportation, or enforcing any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare, or charge, and any action of the Board pursuant to section 1002(g) suspending the operation of a tariff filed with the Board by an air carrier or foreign air carrier stating a new individual or joint rate, fare, or charge for foreign air transportation, shall be subject to the approval of the President: Provided, That any order of the Board directing an air carrier or foreign air carrier to alter any rate, fare, or charge, or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare, or charge, to the extent necessary to correct any discrimination, preference, or prejudice, and any order that the air carrier or foreign air carrier shall discontinue demanding, charging, collecting, or receiving any such discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial rate, fare, or charge or enforcing any such discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial classification, rule, regulation, or practice, shall not be subject to such approval. Copies of any such proposed orders, and of proposed statements containing reasons for suspension, shall be submitted to the President by the Board before publication.*

* * * * *

Title X—Procedure

* * * * *

Complaints to and Investigations by the Administrator and the Board

Filing of complaints authorized

Sec. 1002(a) * * *

Power to prescribe rates and practices of air carriers

(d) Whenever, after notice and hearing, upon complaint, or upon its own initiative, the Board shall be of the opinion that any individual or joint rate, fare, or charge demanded, charged, collected, or received by any air carrier for interstate or overseas air transportation, or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare, or charge, or the value of the service thereunder, is or will be unjust or unreasonable, or unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential, or unduly prejudicial, the Board shall determine and prescribe the lawful rate, fare, or charge (or the maximum or minimum, or the maximum and minimum thereof) thereafter to be demanded, charged, collected, or received, or the lawful classification, rule, regulation, or practice thereafter to be made effective[:]. [*Provided,* That as to rates, fares, and charges for overseas air transportation, the Board shall determine and prescribe only a just and reasonable maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum rate, fare, or charge.]

Rule of ratemaking

(e) In exercising and performing its powers and duties with respect to the determination of rates for the carriage of persons or property, the Board shall take into consideration, among other factors—

(1) The effect of such rates upon the movement of traffic;

(2) The need in the public interest of adequate and efficient transportation of persons and property by air carriers *and foreign air carriers* at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service;

(3) Such standards respecting the character and quality of service to be rendered by air carriers *and foreign air carriers* as may be prescribed by or pursuant to law;

(4) The inherent advantages of transportation by aircraft; and

(5) The need for each air carrier *and foreign air carrier* for revenue sufficient to enable such air carrier *and foreign air carrier,* under honest, economical, and efficient management, to provide adequate and efficient air carrier *and foreign air carrier* service.

[Removal of Discrimination in Foreign Air Transportation

[(f) Whenever, after notice and hearing, upon complaint, or upon its own initiative, the Board shall be of the opinion that any individual or joint rate, fare, or charge demanded, charged, collected, or received by any air carrier or foreign air carrier for foreign air transportation, or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare, or charge, or the value of the service thereunder, is or will be unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential, or unduly prejudicial, the Board may alter the same to the extent necessary to correct such discrimination, preference, or prejudice and make an order that the air carrier or foreign air carrier shall discontinue demanding, charging, collecting, or receiving any such discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial rate, fare, or charge or enforcing any such discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial classification, rule, regulation, or practice.]

Rates and Practices in Foreign Air Transportation

(f) Whenever, after notice and hearing, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, the Board shall be of the opinion that any individual or joint rate, fare, or charge demanded, charged, collected, or received by any air carrier or foreign air carrier for foreign air transportation, or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare or charge or the value of the service thereunder, is or will be unjust or unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential, or unduly prejudicial, the Board may alter the same to the extent necessary to correct such unjustness, unreasonableness, discrimination, preference, or prejudice and make an order that the air carrier or foreign air carrier shall discontinue demanding, charging, collecting, or receiving any such unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial rate, fare, or charge, or enforcing any such unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, preferential or prejudicial, classification, rule, regulation, or practice. The Board may in the aforesaid order set forth and prescribe the lawful rate, fare, or charge (or the maximum or minimum or the maximum and minimum thereof) thereafter to be demanded, charged, collected, or received, or the lawful classification, rule, regulation, or practice thereafter to be made effective.

Suspension of Rates

(g) Whenever any air carrier *or foreign air carrier* shall file with the Board a tariff stating a new individual or joint (between air carriers, *between foreign air carriers, or between an air carrier or carriers and a foreign air carrier or carriers*) rate, fare, or charge for [interstate or overseas] air transportation or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare, or charge, or the value of the service thereunder, the Board is empowered, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, at once, and, if it so orders, without answer or other formal pleading by the air carrier *or foreign air carrier,* but upon reasonable notice, to enter upon a hearing concerning the lawfulness of such rate, fare, or charge, or such classification, rule, regulation, or practice; and pending such hearing and the decision thereon, the Board, by filing with such tariff, and delivering to the air carrier *or foreign air carrier,* affected thereby, a statement in writing of its reasons for such suspension, may suspend the operation of such tariff and defer the use of such rate, fare, or charge, or such classification, rule, regulation, or practice, for a period of ninety days, and, if the proceeding has not been concluded and a final order made within such period, the Board may, from time to time, extend the period of suspension, but not for a longer period in the aggregate than one hundred and eighty days beyond the time when such tariff would otherwise go into effect; and, after hearing, whether completed before or after the rate, fare, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice goes into effect, the Board may make such order with reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding instituted after such rate, fare, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice had become effective. If the proceeding has not been concluded and an order made within the period of suspension, the proposed rate, fare, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice shall go into effect at the end of such period: *Provided,* That this subsection shall not apply to any initial tariff filed by any air carrier *or foreign air carrier.*

Power To Establish Through Air Transportation Service

(i) The Board shall, whenever required by the public convenience and necessity, after notice and hearing, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, establish through service and joint rates, fares, or charges (or the maxima or minima, or the maxima and minima thereof) for interstate or overseas air transportation, or the classifications, rules, regulations, or practices affecting such rates, fares, or charges, or the value of the service thereunder, and the terms and conditions under which such through service shall be operated[:]. [*Provided,* That as to joint rates, fares, and charges for overseas air transportation the Board shall determine and prescribe only just and reasonable maximum or minimum or maximum and minimum joint rates, fares, or charges.]

AUTHORIZATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO ADOPT IMPROVED ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to adopt improved accounting procedures. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purpose of the bill, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 908) to authorize the Department of Commerce to adopt improved accounting procedures, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1965.

President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To authorize the Department of Commerce to adopt improved accounting procedures," and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Luther H. Hodges,
Secretary of Commerce.

Statement of Purpose and Need for Legislation To Authorize the Department of Commerce To Adopt Improved Accounting Procedures

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to give the various bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce more effective control and better accountability of the services and administrative operations and expenses conducted jointly for two or more appropriations within a bureau or office when the costs are not susceptible of immediate distribution directly to those appropriations. Specific examples of such operations and expenses are: the maintenance of inventories of stores used by several appropriations; utilization of personal services of technicians paid from one appropriation but whose services are partially utilized on programs financed by other appropriations; and the charging of administrative and technical overhead to one appropriation with subsequent distribution and charge to the proper appropriation or fund.

The proposed legislation would permit the Department to realize the benefits of cost accounting and administer its programs on a cost basis. It would facilitate the distribution of overhead charges and permit the recapture of costs for technical services now given to various programs without reimbursement. The legislation would simplify payrolling by permitting a technician's salary to be charged to one appropriation with later distribution of charges to all appropriations benefited by his services. The legislation would permit stores to be purchased from one appropriation and other appropriations to be charged for them upon issue of the stores from inventory.

The Comptroller General has held that under the provisions of section 2678, Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 628), reimbursement and transfer of funds between appropriations are not authorized in the absence of legislation such as is here requested.

The Weather Bureau, which prior to the Comptroller General's decision had been distributing charges to appropriations in the manner which would be authorized by this bill, will be severely handicapped in the effective and economical administration of its programs unless such authority is granted. The Bureau would purchase expendable supplies for inventory and charge them to the various appropriations using them; would charge overhead to a single appropriation with costs later distributed to the benefiting appropriations; and would charge benefiting appropriations for maintenance services performed by technicians paid under another of its appropriations.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey would use the proposed authority to purchase instrumental equipment and general purpose supplies and stores from its salaries and expenses appropriations, and issue such stocks for fitting out new surveying ships. Under present law, because the initial outfit of new ships is required to be borne from the appropriation for construction of the ships, a separate purchase from the supplier must be made. This increases paperwork, slows delivery and loses the Government the advantages of quantity purchasing. A similar situation exists with respect to the equipping of magnetic and seismological facilities which is required to be borne by the appropriation for construction and equipment.

Similar legislation applicable only to the Weather Bureau was requested by the Department during the 88th Congress and introduced as S. 2315 and H.R. 9154. S. 2315 passed the Senate.

The attached draft bill incorporates a technical amendment suggested by the Comptroller General in his letter to Chairman MAGNUSON, of the Senate Committee on Commerce, of December 20, 1963, concerning S. 2315. The Comptroller General's letter is printed in Senate Report No. 1470, 88th Congress.

Since the proposed legislation would be applicable to each Bureau in the Department, it is also proposed to repeal the similar authority for the Bureau of Census enacted during the 87th Congress (Public Law 87-489, 13 U.S.C. 14).

PROGRAM FOR COOPERATION WITH THE STATES FOR THE CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE NATION'S ANADROMOUS FISH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States.

Anadromous fish are those important species of fish which are born in fresh water, migrate to salt water for most of their lives, returning to fresh water again only to spawn and die. Some of the principal species are the Atlantic salmon, striped bass or rockfish, alewives, sturgeon, five species of Pacific salmon, steelhead, American shad, and in some locales, sea run trout.

These fish are an excellent food source and support valuable commercial and recreational fisheries. This bill would further authorize the Secretary of the Interior in accomplishing the purpose of this act to: First, conduct investigations, engineering and biological surveys, and research where necessary; second, construct, install, maintain, and operate devices and structures for the improvement of feeding and spawning conditions and for facilitating free migration of anadromous fish; third, construct, operate, and maintain fish hatcheries; and fourth, purchase, lease, or accept donations of lands and any interest therein. The Secretary would also be authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with Federal, State, public, or private agencies or organizations and colleges and universities to conduct studies, research, investigation, and for such other purposes as may be necessary to accomplish the aim and intent of this act.

This bill would require prior approval of other Federal agencies when activities would be carried out on lands administered by such other agencies.

To carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary shall enter into cooperative agreements with one or more States, and when he deems it appropriate, with other non-Federal interests that are primarily concerned with the development and conservation of anadromous fishery resources. Such agreements shall describe: First, the actions to be taken by the Secretary in cooperation with the States; and second, the benefits that are expected to be derived by these States or other non-Federal interests.

To provide funds for this bill an appropriation of $25 million is authorized for the 5-year life of the bill which has an expiration date of June 30, 1969. The Federal share, including the operation and maintenance of any facilities constructed, shall not exceed 50 percent of such costs exclusive of the value of any Federal land involved. Not to exceed 20 percent of all funds expended or obligated in any fiscal year may be expended in any one State.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior, based on studies conducted pursuant to this legislation and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, to make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the elimination or reduction of pollution when found to be detrimental to fish and wildlife in interstate waters or tributaries thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 909) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SAWTOOTH NATIONAL PARK IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, in the State of Idaho.

Mr. President, the beginnings of three major Idaho rivers—the Salmon, Boise, and Payette—rise in one of the most magnificent and primitive settings in the United States. Jagged, snowy peaks march across the skyline. Beneath them, myriad lakes of turquoise blue lie undisturbed, remote, and aloof from the works of man. This is the high country, a spinelike upthrust of mountains which lends itself appropriately to the name "Sawtooth." They have inspired awe since the first mountain man trapped for beaver in the headwaters of the rivers; and many Idahoans have long believed this most rugged and pristine area to be more than worthy of inclusion in our national park system. Bills proposing the creation of a Sawtooth National Park have been introduced in Congress by the distinguished Senator James P. Pope and the late, great Senator William E. Borah. Creation of such a park was urged in memorials to Congress passed by early Idaho legislatures. Executive interest has been attracted by this great wilderness since the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

Five years ago, to determine the interest of Idaho citizens in a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, I conducted a poll, which drew approval for a feasibility study from four-fifths of those responding. Since then, some of the most enthusiastic backing for such a park has come from the few areas which originally were the most cautious about supporting the feasibility study. Letters and postcards have since increased in their endorsement, reiterating the need to preserve this remarkable primitive area for all time, and to facilitate its enjoyment by vacationers from all parts of the Nation.

During the 88th Congress, I introduced a bill calling for creation of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, but this action was primarily designed to provide the vehicle for a thorough feasibility study by both the Forest and National Park Services. This study is scheduled to be completed early this year. If the reports are favorable, I believe hearings in Idaho on the proposed park should be scheduled, so that the opinion of the people of my State can be fully ascertained.

The park concept which I am now advancing would consist of the present primitive area, subject to an absolute congressional mandate that it be preserved as wilderness, plus additional forest land to include the lakes and wooded areas lying along the base of the mountains. This base area would provide access to the wilderness portion of the park, and space for administrative offices, as well as expanded public accommodations such as lodges and camp and picnic grounds needed for the added number of visitors who would be drawn to a national park.

The majority of visitors will probably camp or stay for a few days along the attractive lower lakes or streams in specially designated areas, basking in the grandeur of the mountains, and entering only briefly the wilderness portion of the park. However, the more adventurous spirits could freely enter the wilderness, on foot or on horseback, and would be asked only to comply with the usual regulations preserving the wilderness character of the environment.

Some ranch owners in the Stanley Basin have expressed fear of expansion of Federal holdings or restrictions throughout the surrounding area, but actually park status would be an advantage over the arrangement under which the area is presently administered, in that the boundaries would be fixed by act of Congress and could not expand into areas presently used for grazing without a further specific act of Congress. Presently the boundaries of the area can be altered and extended by the Secretary of Agriculture. With the park as provided by this bill, the present status of the wilderness area would be maintained, and the future interests of users of adjoining lands would be protected, to a much greater extent than they are now.

The entire State of Idaho would stand to gain from such a national park. Because the proposed park lands are already federally owned their use for park purposes would not remove them from any tax rolls. Increased tourist trade would benefit the economy of all central Idaho and generate more tax revenue. As other Western States have prospered from the display of their scenic resources in national park form, so should Idaho.

Our burgeoning population and the growth of our residential centers emphasize the increasing demand for scenic and recreational resources. More than 72 million persons visited the national parks at the beginning of this decade. and the forecast for 1964 was for 102,544,000 visitors. The National Park Service, concentrating its resources on a limited number of defined areas, can insure full development of this recreational potential for the enjoyment of the greater number of people, and effectively draw attention to the Sawtooth country. The area is also convenient for that great number of summer travelers who want to visit a number of parks during one vacation trip.

Mr. President, Idaho needs the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, as do the people of the United States. The area proposed for inclusion in the national park system comprises less than 1 percent of the 20 million acres of national forest land within the State of Idaho. No economic dislocation would be involved, since no substantial grazing, lumbering, or mining occurs in the area affected.

The funds available to the Forest Service are necessarily spread thin over an immense region, which includes more than a third of the State. The Sawtooth uplands presently fall under a primitive area classification, and I think they fully qualify for designation as a wilderness area, which the Forest Service has proposed. But national park classification would equally preserve the upland wilderness, while more effectively developing the recreational potential of the adjoining baselands. A national park would boost the economy of the State and region, guarantee the integrity of the wilderness, and provide a designation of magnetic attraction to phenomena spiritually uplifting for the thousands who come to view these most beautiful of mountains.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 913) to provide for the establishment of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Church, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That an area in the State of Idaho possessing superlative scenic, scientific, and geological features is hereby authorized to be established as the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park for the inspiration, benefit, and use of the public.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this Act wilderness is defined as an area where earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain, where the land retains its primeval character and influence without permanent improvements or human habitation, and is protected and managed so as to preserve its condition of natural beauty and grandeur. That portion of the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park identified in accordance with subsection (a) of section 3 of this Act, unless expressly provided otherwise by this Act, shall be preserved and administered, in perpetuity, as wilderness.

Sec. 3. The Sawtooth Wilderness National Park shall, subject to valid existing rights, consist of an area in the State of Idaho described as follows:

(a) Beginning at McGowan Peak, located approximately 1¼ miles southerly from the southeast corner of section 32, township 11 north, range 12 east;

thence in a southerly direction along the ridge between Stanley Lake Creek and the head of Crooked Creek to a point directly north of Upper McGowan Lake;

thence in a westerly direction along the main divide approximately one-half mile;

thence southwesterly to Stanley Lake Creek; thence southward up Stanley Lake Creek to a point on the main divide between Stanley Lake Creek and Trail Creek approximately three-fourths mile east of Observation Peak;

thence southward approximately three-fourths mile down Trail Creek to the mouth of the drainage from Trail Creek Lakes;

thence southeastward on the ridge south of Trail Creek Lakes to the main divide between Trail Creek and the North Fork of Baron Creek;

thence following the main divide westerly to a point on the South Fork of the Payette River approximately one-half mile downstream from the mouth of Baron Creek;

thence southwesterly to the main divide between Wapiti Creek and the South Fork of the Payette River;

thence southerly along the main divide to Picket Mountain, located approximately 1⅜ miles easterly from the northeast corner of section 25, township 9 north, range 10 east;

thence in a westerly direction along the main divide between the headwaters of Wapiti Creek and the North Fork of the Boise River to a point in the southeast quarter of section 23, township 9 north, range 10 east;

thence southeasterly along the divide between Ten Mile Creek and North Fork of the Boise River to a point near the center of section 36, township 9 north, range 10 east;

thence southwesterly along the main divide to a point at the head of Lightning Creek in the southeast quarter of section 10, township 8 north, range 10 east;

thence southeasterly along the ridge to a point on the North Fork of the Boise River one-eighth mile downstream from the mouth of Ballentyne Creek;

thence southeasterly along a ridge to Big Buck Mountain;

thence southeasterly crossing Johnson Creek one-eighth mile upstream from the mouth of Cahhah Creek;

thence southeasterly along a ridge to the north end of Tackobe Mountain, which is approximately one-fourth mile due west of Alidate Lake;

thence southerly along the main ridge between Black Warrior Creek and Little Queens River to a point on the Little Queens River, located 300 feet upstream from the mouth of Neinmeyer Creek and approximately one-half mile downstream from the mouth of Scenic Creek and 100 feet north of the point where Forest Service trail numbered 566 crosses Little Queens River;

thence eastward on the ridge to a point approximately 1¾ miles north of the northeast corner, section 5, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along the ridge between Scenic Creek and the Little Queens River to Nahneke Point located approximately one-fourth mile northeastward from northwest corner of section 3, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence easterly approximately one-half mile;

thence southerly along the main ridge on the west side of Queens River to the north quarter corner of section 15, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southerly along a ridge one-half mile crossing Queens River near the center of section 15, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along a ridge approximately three-fourths mile to a point on the main divide approximately 500 feet south of the northeast corner of section 22, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along the main ridge approximately 1¼ miles to a peak in the southwest quarter of section 24, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence northeasterly along the ridge to Greylock Mountain;

thence southeasterly along the ridge to the Middle Fork of the Boise River, crossing the river about one-fourth mile below the mouth of Leggit Creek;

thence easterly up the ridge about one-half mile to a point on the ridge between Leggit Creek and the Middle Fork of the Boise River;

thence in a southerly direction along the ridge between Leggit Creek and Grays Creek to Leggit Mountain, located approximately 1⅝ miles easterly from the southeast corner of section 12, township 5 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along the divide between Leggit Creek and Decker Creek to a peak on the national forest boundary common to the Boise and Sawtooth Forests located approximately three-eighths mile southeasterly from Leggit Lake;

thence northeasterly along the divide between the South Fork of Ross Creek and Leggit Creek to Rossview Peak;

thence northeasterly along the divide being the Camas-Elmore County line between the North Fork of Ross Creek and Mattingly Creek to the point common to Elmore, Camas, and Blaine Counties;

thence northeasterly about 2 miles following the Elmore-Blaine County line to a point on the divide between the heads of Mattingly, Alpine, and Alturas Lake Creeks;

thence northeasterly along the divide between Alpine and Altura Lake Creeks crossing Alpine Creek approximately three-fourths mile above its mouth;

thence northerly along the divide between Pettit Creek on the west and the headwaters of Cabin and Vat Creeks on the east to a point one-fourth mile south of the westernmost end of Pettit Lake;

thence following an arc to the northwest, north, and northeast having a one-fourth mile radius with the point on high waterline at the westernmost end of Pettit Lake as the center to a point one-fourth mile north of the westernmost end of Pettit Lake;

thence due north to a point west of the north end of McDonald Lake;

thence norwestward following the ridge around the head of Mays Creek to a point on the ridge between Mays Creek and Hell Roaring Creek drainages approximately 1 mile southeast of Hell Roaring Lake;

thence north approximately 1⅜ miles to a point 100 feet south of the junction of Forest Service trails numbered 6091 and 6097;

thence northward parallel to and 100 feet west of Forest Service trail numbered 6091 crossing Decker Creek and to a point at the top of the ridge between the Decker Creek drainage and the next unnamed drainage north;

thence southwestward along this ridge approximately 1 mile;

thence northward along the ridge around the head of the first drainage north of Decker Creek and the ridge between this drainage and the drainage into Redfish Lake keeping 100 feet west of Forest Service trail numbered 6091 where it follows this ridge to a point approximately three-fourths mile southeast of the southwest end of Redfish Lake;

thence due west approximately three-fourths mile to a point on an imaginary north-south line passing one-eighth mile west of the southwest end of Redfish Lake;

thence due north approximately 1⅝ miles to a point on the ridge between the Redfish Lake and Bench Lake drainages;

thence northeastward along this ridge to a point one-eighth mile southeast of the lower Bench Lake;

thence due north to the top of the first ridge north of this lake;

thence following this ridge northwestward approximately one-half mile to a point one-fourth mile north of the second highest of the Bench Lakes;

thence due north approximately 1¾ miles to a point 100 feet south of Forest Service trail numbered 2528 where it crosses the section line common to sections 32 and 33, township 10 north, range 13 east;

thence northwesterly parallel to and 100 feet south of Forest Service trail numbered 2528 approximately 8 miles to a point three-fourths mile northeast of McGowan Peak;

thence southwesterly along the ridge approximately three-fourths mile to McGowan Peak, the point of beginning.

(b) Not more than 34,000 acres lying adjacent to the area described in subsection (a) of this section, to be reserved for administrative uses and for such recreational facilities, campsites, picnic grounds, and other accommodations as are required to provide for the needs of visitors to the park.

(c) Within one year from the date of approval of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description of the component parts of the park identified in the foregoing subsections, and he shall thereupon give notice of the establishment of the park.

SEC. 4. Within the area designated for the park, the Secretary may acquire lands and interests in lands by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise. Any lands or interest therein owned by the State of Idaho, or by any political subdivision thereof, may be acquired only with the concurrence of the owner. The Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the park and, in exchange therefor, he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Property so exchanged shall be approximately equal in value: *Provided,* That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in such exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. Federally owned lands and interests in lands within the area designated for the park, or selected in accordance with section 7 of this Act, shall be administered as a part of the park upon its establishment as provided in section 3.

SEC. 5. (a) The grazing of livestock on any Federal lands included within the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, where established prior to the effective date of this Act pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any agency, department, or establishment of the United States, shall be permitted to continue subject to such regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary to protect this area from undue harm or destruction. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands.

(b) The Secretary may, in cooperation with the appropriate Secretary having jurisdiction over these lands, recommend the use of areas within adjacent or nearby Federal lands for grazing purposes, in place of existing grazing lands included within the boundaries of the park.

SEC. 6. (a) In order to provide suitable access to the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park and facilities and services required in the operation and administration of the park, the Secretary may select the location or locations of an entrance road or roads to such park and to points of interest therein, including necessary entrance and related administrative and headquarters sites upon lands located outside the park, and he may select a suitable location or locations outside the park for connections between entrance roads and between roads lying within the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, except that no access or connection roads provided under this section shall be located within that portion of the park identified pursuant to subsection (a) of section 3. When such roads traverse lands within a national forest, the routes or sites selected pursuant to this authority shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of Agriculture. Lands selected pursuant to this section and acquired or transferred in accordance with section 4 hereof as rights-of-way for said entrance roads and connections shall not exceed an average of one hundred and twenty-five acres per mile. Rights-of-way for entrance roads and administrative sites acquired pursuant to this authority shall be administered as a part of the park pursuant to such special regulations as the Secretary may promulgate in furtherance of the purposes of this section.

(b) When title is in the United States, the Secretary may construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain upon the lands or interests in lands selected pursuant to this section, an entrance road or roads and connection of parkway standards, including necessary bridges and other structures and utilities as necessary.

SEC. 7. The Sawtooth Wilderness National Park established pursuant to this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, except that the portion of the park identified in accordance with subsection (a) of section 3 of this Act shall, unless expressly provided otherwise by this Act, be administered and preserved as wilderness wherein the primeval character and influence is retained and wherein there shall be, subject to existing private rights, no commercial enterprise, no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of said portion of the park for the purposes of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such portion.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

EXTENSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR DISPLACED BUSINESS DISASTER LOANS TO ADDITIONAL SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of that act. As it presently stands, Mr. President, section 7(b)(3) authorizes the Small Business Administration to make so-called displaced business disaster loans to small concerns forced to move as a result of urban renewal, highway, or other Federal or federally assisted projects involving land condemnation. It is the purpose of my bill to extend eligibility for such loans to certain groups of small businesses that are not now eligible but which are no less deserving and no less affected, economically, by the activities of their government. It is my further purpose, by this bill, to encourage greater utilization of this important loan program both by those now eligible and those that the bill would make eligible.

The groups not now covered, to which my bill would extend entitlement, are:

First. Small-business concerns not physically displaced, the premises of which have not been condemned and taken, but which nevertheless have suffered substantial economic injury as a result of an urban renewal, highway, or other public project carried on in whole or in part with Federal funds.

Second. Small-business concerns which have suffered substantial economic injury as a result of the actual or threatened loss, through Federal action, of a major source of employment in the area in which they are located. This last refers specifically to the shutdown of a Federal installation, such as a military base, or to cutbacks in substantial Federal procurements made in the area.

In explanation of this legislation, it may be best to begin with a brief background review of the SBA's business and disaster loan programs in general and the displaced business disaster loan program in particular. The Small Business Act, as originally enacted in 1953, set up two main classes of lending operations within the Small Business Administration. The first class, of course, was loans to small-business concerns, under specified criteria and limitations, for ordinary and usual business purposes. Authorization for this activity is now contained in section 7(a) of the amended act. The second class was the so-called disaster loan, now authorized by section

7(b) of the amended act. Disaster loans, in addition to being available to individuals as well as small businesses, may generally be made for longer terms and at lower interest rates than business loans.

From 1953 until 1961, the types of disasters which could entitle small businesses and others to obtain SBA disaster-loan assistance were limited to natural catastrophes, with floods, drought, and excessive rainfall expressly mentioned. For some time prior to 1961, however, recognition had been growing in the Congress that certain types of governmental activity could deal as disastrous an economic blow to small-business concerns as some of the natural catastrophes. The Senate Small Business Committee and the Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Housing, both of which it is my privilege to chair, had long been concerned, in particular, with the problems of small business displaced by urban renewal projects, and other public works projects involving land condemnation. As early as January 1960, in its 10th annual report, the Senate Small Business Committee discussed "Small Business and Eminent Domain" and stated its "aim to discover whether legislative action is required to lessen the impact of such projects upon the small businesses they displace."

In its next annual report, the 11th, issued in February 1961, the Small Business Committee again discussed "Small Business and Eminent Domain" and noted with approbation, attempts—during 1960—by SBA to utilize its existing business loan authority for more flexible aids to condemnation-displaced small business.

After expressing the hope that these programs would be continued under the new administration, we also observed:

> Nevertheless, your committee feels that the severe impact of eminent domain on one-fourth of all the small businesses it affected in the cities studied by [a] University of Connecticut research team cannot lightly be dismissed. Accordingly the committee will continue to work during 1961 for improvement of the treatment of small businesses displaced by public projects.

Just a little over 5 months after that report was issued, the Congress enacted the Housing Act of 1961—Public Law 87–70—which contained another major improvement of the type toward which both the Small Business Committee and the Housing Subcommittee had long been working. Section 305 of the 1961 Housing Act added to section 7(b) of the Small Business Act a new paragraph (3). That new paragraph established for the first time statutory recognition of the principle—so long urged by the Senate Small Business Committee—that displacement by a public project can be as much of a "disaster" to a small-business concern as displacement by a flood. And the new paragraph made these displaced businesses eligible for disaster loans from SBA, if the project was Federal or federally assisted.

These loans differ from the section 7(a) business loans in important respects. The borrower, in a displaced business disaster loan is not required to put up collateral. The loans can be made for 20 years, which is 10 years longer than under the regular business-loan program. The interest rate on SBA's portion of such a loan can be no higher than the average annual rate on all U.S. interest-bearing obligations at the end of the last fiscal year, plus one-fourth of 1 percent. This is currently 3¾ percent. And an amount for working capital can be included in the loan.

Mr. President, I was proud of the displaced business loan program when it became effective in June 1961, and I am still proud of it. But, as often happens with a new program, it has not entirely lived up to the expectations many of us had for it. There has been some disappointment, first, because we have been informed by small-business interests that the program should cover certain situations that it presently does not; and, second, because the program has not been utilized as much as we expected it to be by persons in the situations that it does cover. In the bill I am now introducing, I am attempting to cure both of these disappointments.

This program was set up to assist small-business concerns physically displaced—forced to move—by Federal and federally assisted projects utilizing land condemnation. But small businesses not actually displaced can often be as grievously hurt by such projects as those whose premises are condemned and taken. A simple example would be the case of two gasoline service stations. A Federal highway project takes the premises of one, and that one can get a loan. The same project does not take the other, but the new road diverts most of the traffic on which it depended. The second station owner is in an even worse fix than the first, but he cannot get one of these loans because he is not displaced. My bill would make him eligible.

Recently many of us in this body have become only too familiar with another type of Government action that can portend disaster for hundreds or thousands of small-business concerns, and for whole communities. I refer to the closing of a Federal defense installation, or to the termination of large Federal defense procurement programs that provided heavy percentages of the payrolls and disposable personal income of an area. As I have pointed out in this Chamber previously, the city and county of Mobile, Ala., face a situation akin to disaster with the scheduled closing of Brookley Air Force Base. The base provides 12,000 of a total of about 95,000 jobs in the area. I have protested this closing to the Secretary of Defense. I protest it now, and I shall continue to protest it. But whether Brookley stays open or not, the problems that such actions pose for the economies of cities, counties, and even whole States will be with us yet—very much with us. For Brookley is but one of 669 U.S. defense installations that have been wholly or partially closed or scheduled for closing in the last 4 years. When all of these actions are complete, 149,000 job positions will have been eliminated.

Mr. President, what happens to the small businessman in retailing, wholesaling, of the services when 13 percent of the jobs in his area are abolished? That is the percentage that will apply in Mobile if Brookley is closed. Of course, the same situation will exist whether the job loss is due to the closing of a base or to the termination of a payroll producing defense contract.

Last summer the Senate Small Business Committee started looking into this matter in an effort to find answers to such questions. We held 2 days of public hearings on "the impact of defense spending shifts and curtailments on small business." We also arranged for publication of the proceedings at an American Management Association briefing session on "planning to meet major shifts in defense programs." Our study will continue this year.

During our hearings last June and July, two conclusions emerged in my own mind as I listened to the testimony of small-business witnesses who had watched their defense contracting and subcontracting orders decline drastically: One was that the small manufacturer of defense hardware needs and deserves assistance from Government in finding new markets which he might serve in the nondefense sector of the economy. The other is that he needs capital with which to undertake the conversion of his plant and the retraining of his personnel necessary to compete in such new and strange markets.

We explored with some of the witnesses ideas for possible further aid by Government in meeting the first of these needs, the matching of a defense plant's capital equipment, experience, and personnel skills with existing needs in the civilian marketplace. The committee will continue to explore this subject, and it is my hope that we may be able to come up with helpful legislation. Meanwhile, I offer the present bill to help with the second need—long-term financing.

Just a word now about the second disappointment that I mentioned earlier; that is, the fact that the displaced business loan program has been terribly underutilized. From its inception, June 30, 1961, through December 31, 1964, only 353 loans for $20,890,000 had been approved. This number must be compared with an estimate contained in the recently released, distinguished study of the House Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition. Referring to all past condemnation activity, the report says:

> Displacements for business under all programs totaled 10,900 per year. Nearly all of these, some 10,620, occurred under federally assisted programs. Direct Federal programs accounted for approximately 280 displaced businesses per year.

In the Housing Act of 1964, Public Law 88-560, in section 305, the Congress took note of the tremendous gap between displacements and loans and directed the Small Business Administration to make particular effort to publicize the displaced business loan program to local public agencies administering urban renewal programs, and to small-business concerns. In the bill I am introducing today, I provide for an expansion of this directive to SBA, in line with the views of the House Real Property Acquisition Subcommittee.

I should also mention, in this connection, another important new provision contained in last year's Housing Act—section 314. That section included an amendment proposed on the Senate floor, which I accepted on behalf of the Banking and Currency Committee and successfully carried to conference on behalf of the Senate. The amendment added to the urban planning grant program established under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 a provision that such grants may be made for planning by localities to deal with problems created by the total or partial closing of Federal installations—including defense installations—or by substantial reductions in employment opportunities occasioned by cutbacks in Federal purchases in the locality. The language of section 7(b)(3) of the Small Business Act, as my bill would revise it, follows, in relevant part, the language of last year's conversion amendment to the urban planning grant program.

Mr. President, today's bill is the second in a series of measures I expect to introduce—three or more bills in all—intended to provide assistance to areas hard hit in their local economies by base closings and defense-contract terminations. The first bill in this series, S. 728, to liberalize the Civil Service Retirement Act, was introduced on January 26. The next bill will be introduced soon.

I have directed the professional staffs of both the Senate Small Business Committee and the Housing Subcommittee to review thoroughly all Federal laws that might be used, in their present form or with amendments, to ease the economic impact of shifts and curtailments in our defense programs. I shall introduce at once any further amendments that these continuing studies may from time to time indicate to be necessary or desirable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 915) to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for, and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of that act, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRESERVATION OF WET LANDS IN CANADA FOR MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the preservation of sufficient wet lands for the maintenance of the duck population continues to be a problem of the utmost seriousness, even though progress is being made.

An idea of what has been accomplished to date is given by the most recent annual report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, of which I have the honor to be a member. This report points out that when the Migratory Bird Conservation Act was approved in February of 1929, there were only 44 migratory bird refuges totaling 268,000 acres. As of June 30, 1964, there were 278 migratory bird refuges with a total acreage of 7,318,000 acres, including lands acquired otherwise than through the Commission procedure.

Nevertheless, much remains to be done, particularly since the land in swamps and wet lands is still declining as a result of drainage and filling for agricultural and other purposes. Several years ago, Congress enacted emergency legislation in the form of Public Law 87-383, authorizing a temporary increase in appropriations for land acquisition. Under this program, significant progress has been made.

There has been one major gap in this acquisition program, however. It is limited to lands in the United States, whereas most of the summer nesting areas, the producing areas, are in Canada. Since the purpose of the program is to maintain and increase the production of ducks, the funds should be spent where they will do the most good for that purpose, that is, in Canada in many cases.

Until recently Canada has shown less interest in this problem than we have. Now, however, it is a pleasure to report that the Canadian Government has initiated a pilot program of acquiring wet lands. It is to be hoped that this program will be expanded. Certainly there will have to be cooperation by the United States with the Canadian Government on this matter, since the ducks produced in Canada winter in the United States and American hunters share in the benefits.

Therefore, on behalf of myself, my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I am introducing a bill which would permit the use in Canada, under appropriate arrangements with the Canadians and subject to such limits as may be set by Congress in appropriation acts, of the funds already authorized by the provisions of Public Law 87-383. No additional expenditures would result from enactment of this bill, since it proposes the use only of funds heretofore authorized.

Mr. President, I ask consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of the latest report by the International Migratory Bird Committee, which is composed of representatives of the United States and Canada, and which reports on steps recently taken by Canada to initiate a program of wetlands conservation similar to that followed by this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 922) to amend the act of October 4, 1961 (Public Law 87-383), so as to permit the use within Canada of certain funds appropriated pursuant to such act for the conservation of migratory waterfowl, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The report presented by Mr. HRUSKA is as follows:

SECOND INTERIM REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL MIGRATORY BIRD COMMITTEE

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. HARRY HAYS,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa, Ontario
Hon. ARTHUR LAING,
Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources,
Ottawa, Ontario.

INTRODUCTION

Since the Committee submitted its first interim report of December 15, 1961, it has met at Washington, D.C., on February 20 and 21, 1962; at Regina, Saskatchewan, on May 20 and 21, 1962; at Mattamuskeet, N.C., on December 10 and 11, 1962; at Quebec, Province of Quebec, on June 10 and 11, 1963; and at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on October 21 and 22, 1963.

When the Committee was formed in May 1961, it was directed to lay the groundwork for effective cooperation between Canada and and the United States in migratory bird management. The Committee was to recognize that farmers and sportsmen, as well as governments, are involved in providing habitat for ducks and geese, and that it is a matter of mutual concern to direct to farmers a growing share of income derived from hunting waterfowl and from recreational activities associated with farmlands.

In 1961, as for several years previously, members of North American waterfowl were at a low ebb. Since then, the prairies have had more rain, the potholes have begun to fill up again, and duck production has improved. However, our experience indicates that this improvement in water levels and numbers of waterfowl is only the upward swing of a recurring cycle. The problem of wet lands and waterfowl diminishing in the long term is still with us. The trend of waterfowl numbers over the past 10 years is shown by graph 1 (not printed in the RECORD).

RESULTS OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

Both Governments have acted upon the recommendations made by the Committee in 1961.

1. Expanded information programs are underway.

In the United States general habitat acquisition needs and procedures are described in a new popular style leaflet "Establishment of National Wildlife Refuges." Planning for public support of proposed management of major refuge complexes is illustrated in the popular brochure titled "National Wildlife Refuges of the Klamath Basin." The pamphlet "Duck Stamps and Wildlife Refuges," issued in 1955, is being revised and updated.

The statement of needs for waterfowl research and management investigations in the United States and Canada, prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Canadian Wildlife Service, endorsed by the Committee, has been adapted to a U.S. version and expanded to include an outline of U.S. project priorities. This statement has been distributed to all flyway councils and will provide a common basis for planning by all U.S. agencies interested in waterfowl research.

One hundred and thirty of the 150 national wildlife refuges under active management are now described in 114 individual pamphlets for public distribution.

The Migratory Bird Population Station at Patuxent, Md., has initiated a new administrative report publication series for the purpose of rapid dissemination of waterfowl research and survey findings. The mailing list includes approximately 900 waterfowl technicians and administrators in the United States and Canada.

A multicolored identification pamphlet entitled "Ducks at a Distance" was prepared and then published in July 1963. Approximately 900,000 copies were distributed free to waterfowl hunters in the United States and the pamphlet was made available for sale at a nominal amount by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office.

The process of reproducing and distributing the annual regulatory announcement was speeded up to the extent that supplies of this announcement were made available to post offices selling duck stamps well before the opening of the 1963 waterfowl season with instructions that they be handed out to each individual as he purchased his stamp.

Finally, to facilitate dissemination of local information and to foster a better understanding of the Bureau's programs including waterfowl, an Information and Education Coordinator was recruited for each of the five regional offices during the past year. A program of regional news releases supplements the departmental and Bureau program.

In Canada the brochure "Waterfowl—A Resource in Danger?" was published in September 1963; the edition numbered 150,000 copies in English and 24,000 in French. In that publication, the need to maintain habitat for waterfowl is explained. An illustrated presentation of the same information designed for young readers is being prepared.

An explanatory leaflet on the regulations governing the hunting of migratory game birds has been printed in English (250,000 copies) and French (24,000 copies).

Release to the press of information on waterfowl and their management has been accelerated.

Production of a 20-minute color motion picture on waterfowl and waterfowl habitat has begun. This film is expected to be finished by the end of 1964.

2. Progress has been made in securing the maintenance of duck habitat in the prairie region.

In the United States progress in assuring the preservation of the prairie pothole breeding habitat has been substantial but not as rapid as scheduled. Land acquisition has been delayed by local opposition to purchase which removes these lands from tax rolls. By September 30, 1963, 28,778 acres of these wet lands had been acquired in fee in the two Dakotas, Minnesota, and Nebraska, and an additional 26,839 acres were protected by 20-year, 30-year, and perpetual easements which assured they would not be drained, burned, or filled.

Two new congressional acts have given emphasis to the preservation of these prairie wet lands. The Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1963 prohibited Federal Government assistance for drainage of class III, IV, and V wet lands. (These are the more permanent types.) The Drainage Referral Act of 1962 has the effect of giving the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife the opportunity to make an offer of purchase or easement on all class I's for which drainage assistance was requested if it believed they should be preserved for waterfowl. With the experience of the past 2 years, procedures have been streamlined and a greatly stepped-up easement program is now underway. Although purchase acquisition of migration and wintering habitat is ahead of schedule, it appears unlikely the purchase program to preserve wet lands in this prairie breeding area can reach a significant rate until some means can be found to offset local tax loss.

In Canada, during the first stage of a pilot project, 20-year agreements for the maintenance of potholes were concluded with 11 landowners in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. The agreements cover 1,184 potholes, totaling 1,011 acres scattered throughout 6,560 acres of farmland. Payments offered averaged $13.86 per acre and the total amount spent for pothole easements was $14,029.

3. The means of obtaining improved information on the kill of waterfowl have been considered and limited progress has been made.

In the United States, a waterfowl kill survey was initiated in 1952. The method involves a random selection of post offices where duck stamps are sold, obtaining names and addressses of hunters purchasing stamps at these post offices, and mailing these hunters a questionnaire concerning their kill and hunting activity immediately following the season.

Recent improvements in survey design include a greater degree of control in the geographic distribution of the sample and the development of a ratio estimating procedure using electronic computers for determining the total kill. In 1959, a duck-wing collection survey was initiated for the purpose of measuring species, age, and sex composition of the kill. During 1962 a goose-tail collection survey was initiated for the purpose of obtaining the same information for geese as for ducks. In addition to the waterfowl species, sex, and age data that are obtained, the hunter is requested on each envelope to fill out the place, date, and time the bird was killed. From these data much information has been obtained concerning distribution of hunting effort by time and place and the characteristics of hunting activity in relation to the regulations which were set.

In Canada the Government approved in principle the carrying out of a nationwide waterfowl kill survey. Further implementation has been delayed pending consideration by the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers of a proposal for institution of a Federal migratory bird hunting license.

4. The problem of directing a more economic return to the landowners on whose lands waterfowl breed, nest, rest, and feed is a difficult one.

In the United States the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 authorized a land conversion program administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

A $10 million pilot program in 13 States (41 counties) provides for sharing with the farmer the cost of taking land from production and putting it to recreational or other use. This legislation is broad enough to cover marsh development-hunting lease projects, etc., for individual farmers.

No workable system has yet been evolved for compensating the farmers for the waterfowl values of the wetland areas. A number of proposals have been made whereby conservation agencies might act as information centers to better enable landowners and potential hunter leasees to get together. This approach has not been widely accepted nor implemented. A program of information and education has been established in the regional offices of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife which will call the attention of the farmers to the value of managed wet lands for recreational and for production purposes. An organized study of this approach and the alternatives will begin January 1, 1964. The objective is to find means to make it profitable for the landowner to preserve waterfowl wetland habitat apart from easement or purchase by public agencies or in combination with their program.

In Canada payments made in consideration of the agreements with landowners for the maintenance of waterfowl habitat were calculated on the basis of the market value of the surrounding lands. Sums paid were actually those values discounted at 5 percent for 20 years. During the first phase of the program, 13 landowners were contacted and 11 accepted the agreements. The Canadian Wildlife Service has associated itself with the National Land Capability Survey, sponsored by ARDA. An aspect of that survey will be the development of better methods of evaluation of wildlife and wildlife habitat. This should eventually lead to a greater public knowledge of the value of wildlife and thus help to create better economic return to the producers of wildlife.

5. Research programs and facilities are being extended and improved.

In the United States a new center for research on waterfowl breeding habitat is being developed at Jamestown, N. Dak. It will consist of a combination office and laboratory building on a 500-acre site in the vicinity of Jamestown and a station and a smaller laboratory on a 1,400-acre area of prime pothole habitat near Woodworth, N. Dak. A new building with 10,000 square feet of floor space, which will relieve crowding in the bird banding office at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center is expected to be ready for occupancy by September 1964. A small building and several enclosures are being constructed at the Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge for development of artificial propagation techniques for rare and endangered migratory bird species.

The statement of needs for waterfowl research and management in the United States, mentioned earlier, is expected to provide a common basis for waterfowl research planning.

In Canada, in spite of limitations on expansion of staff, research projects are going ahead with the object of increasing our knowledge of different types of potholes and different types of pothole country. Research is also being carried on which is basic to the development of plans for multiple use of agriculturally marginal lands.

Working plans are being prepared for the construction of a laboratory office building for the Canadian Wildlife Service on the University of Saskatchewan campus at Saskatoon. Construction will begin in the spring of 1964.

6. Improvement in water conditions on the prairies and prohibition of hunting of redhead and canvasback have resulted in some improvement in the status of those two species.

In the United States there has been a closed season on redhead and canvasback since 1960.

In Canada, except in British Columbia and the Atlantic Provinces, a closed season on those species since 1962 followed a progressive reduction in the bag limit begun in 1959.

Studies of the white-fronted goose have been stepped up and information basic to better management has been obtained. In Canada the daily bag limit on white-fronted geese in Saskatchewan has been three since 1962. The daily bag limit for other geese is five.

In the United States a cooperative project between the Bureau and the States in the central flyway has been developed for the purpose of increasing knowledge concerning status and management of the white-fronted goose. These studies have included periodic surveys during the fall migration period, a stepped-up banding program, and the determination of age ratios in the kill by hunters.

FURTHER CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Your Committee believes that the limited action so far taken to maintain and develop continental waterfowl populations for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of Canada and the United States has been properly directed. The Committee also believes that the programs begun must be continued and expanded, especially in Canada, if they are to be of measurable benefit.

Specifically, the Committee now recommends as follows:

1. The nationwide information programs which have been commenced should be continued.

2. The Federal Governments in cooperation with States and Provinces should continue their pilot project program for evaluation of methods of securing waterfowl habitat. In the United States a major program of acquiring waterfowl habitat is now underway. The Committee believes that Canada should begin planning for a major program of controlling waterfowl habitat.

3. A national survey of migratory bird harvest should be established in Canada in order to provide a complete body of information on utilization of the continental resource.

4. The liaison and cooperative action between agricultural and wildlife interests which have been established in both countries should be continued and improved.

SUMMARY

Your Committee would like to take this opportunity to reiterate the conclusions and recommendations stated in its first interim report. One of the concluding statements in that report was as follows: "The management of migratory birds for optimum use * * * should be developed in a coordinated way by all responsible agencies. The United States and Canadian Federal Governments have a responsibility to give leadership in this field, as the populations of birds involved are international. More and better statistics, more research and active cooperation between landowners and all levels of government are necessary if continental waterfowl are to find the necessary breeding, resting, and wintering areas to maintain adequate stocks for the mutual benefit of all people in both countries."

Your Committee seeks approval of the conclusions and recommendations presented herein.

Respectfully submitted.

THE INTERNATIONAL MIGRATORY BIRD COMMITTEE.

For the United States:

FRANK P. BRIGGS,
DANIEL H. JANZEN,
JOHN A. BAKER,
GLADWIN E. YOUNG.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 13, 1964.*

For Canada:

——— ———.
——— ———.
——— ———.

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, *March 2, 1964.*

LAURA HUI-WEI WONG AND HER CHILDREN, JANET WONG AND SIMON WONG

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], at the request of the University of Oklahoma Research Institute and the Department of Physics, I introduce a bill for the relief of Laura Hui-Wei Wong and her children, Janet Wong and Simon Wong.

The bill is a special bill to grant permanent resident status to the widow and two minor children of Dr. Wen Nong Wong, a very able nuclear physicist who joined the physics staff of the university in September 1963, and died on January 24, 1964.

Dr. Wong graduated from the Graduate School of Indiana University. He received a Ph. D. degree in physics in 1959 and was employed for 4 years by Midwestern Universities Research Association at Madison, Wis., until he joined the University of Oklahoma faculty in September 1963.

When Dr. Wong resigned from his position at Midwestern Universities Research Association his first preference classification lapsed. However, upon petition by the University of Oklahoma, it was reestablished on December 26, 1963, and the paroles of his wife and children were extended.

Because of the preference status that the deceased husband enjoyed, I believe it would be fitting and proper to grant this relief to the children and wife who, had the father not died, would have been permanent residents of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 926) for the relief of Laura Hui-Wei Wong and her children, Janet Wong and Simon Wong, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, together with a letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, requesting the proposed legislation, and a sectional analysis of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 927) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mrs. SMITH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of $5,260,000,000, as follows:

(a) For "Research and development," $4,575,900,000 for the following programs:

(1) Gemini, $242,100,000;
(2) Apollo, $2,997,385,000;
(3) Advanced missions, $10,000,000;
(4) Physics and astronomy, $172,100,000;
(5) Lunar and planetary exploration, $215,615,000;
(6) Bioscience, $31,500,000;
(7) Meteorological satellites, $42,700,000;
(8) Communication satellites, $2,800,000;
(9) Applications technology satellites, $28,700,000;
(10) Launch vehicle development, $63,600,000;
(11) Launch vehicle procurement, $194,500,000;
(12) Space vehicle systems, $35,000,000;
(13) Electronics systems, $34,400,000;
(14) Human factor systems, $14,900,000;
(15) Basic research, $22,000,000;
(16) Nuclear-electric systems, $27,000,000;
(17) Nuclear rockets, $58,000,000;
(18) Solar and chemical power, $14,200,000;
(19) Chemical propulsion, $30,000,000;
(20) Aeronautics, $42,200,000;
(21) Tracking and data acquisition, $246,200,000;
(22) Sustaining university program, $46,000,000;
(23) Technology utilization, $5,000,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisitions, $74,700,000, as follows:

(1) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California, $2,749,000;
(2) Electronics Research Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts, $10,000,000;
(3) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, $2,400,000;
(4) John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA, Cocoa Beach, Florida, $8,595,000.
(5) Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, $8,250,000;
(6) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland and Sandusky, Ohio, $867,000;
(7) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, $4,400,000;
(8) George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama, $4,776,000;
(9) Michoud Plant, New Orleans and Slidell, Louisiana, $300,000.
10) Mississippi Test Facility, Mississippi, $2,121,000;
(11) Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Virginia, $1,048,000;
(12) Various locations, $21,624,000;
(13) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, $7,500,000.

(c) For "Administrative operations", $609,400,000.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) contracts may be entered into under the "Administrative operations" appropriation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the fiscal year following that for which the appropriation is made.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed $35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

(h) When so specified in an appropriation Act, any appropriation authorized under this Act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may initially be used, during the fiscal year 1966, to finance work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Administration and appropriate adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Sec. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12), of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed a total of $67,200,000.

Sec. 3. Not to exceed 2 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and when so transferred, together with $30,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (13) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

Sec. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and,

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

Sec. 5. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1966."

The letter and section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. Anderson are as follows:

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Herewith submitted is a draft of a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, together with a sectional analysis thereof. It is submitted to the President of the Senate pursuant to rule VII of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The bill would authorize fiscal year 1966 appropriations to be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the sum of $5,260 million, as follows: (1) for research and development, $4,575,900,000; (2) for construction of facilities, $74,700,000; and (3) for administrative operations, $609,400,000.

Apart from changes in program line item titles and dollar amounts, the major changes from the NASA Authorization Act, 1965 (Public Law 88–369, 78 Stat. 310) are discussed below.

Clause (2) of subsection 1(e) of the bill incorporates a proposal to the effect that when so specified in an appropriation act, any amount appropriated for administrative operations may be available for contracts for maintenance and operation of facilities and other services to be provided during the fiscal year after that for which appropriations would be authorized in this bill.

Under currently applicable law, "administrative operations" appropriations are not available for payments under severable contracts for services rendered at any time after the end of the fiscal year for which the funds were appropriated. In order to obtain such services in the following fiscal year (which might start only a month or two after entering into such contract), either the entire procurement process must be undertaken again, or the initial contract must be entered into on the basis of options or some similar device which still places a further administrative burden on the Government and is unattractive to contractors because of the obvious risks involved. In consequence, contractors' bids will not be as low as otherwise possible, particularly where substantial startup costs are involved; and, as above indicated, such procurements require some form of additional administrative handling at the end of the fiscal year in which the contract is entered into. Thus, the July to June procurement cycle results in excessive administrative costs, scheduling difficulties, and high bids.

Enactment of the proposed language would enable NASA to enter into contracts, during fiscal year 1966, for procurement of maintenance and other services, performance of which may be rendered at any time until the close of fiscal year 1967. Thus, contract administration could be improved and the higher costs of contracting on a July–June cycle could be reduced.

Subsection 1(h) of the bill incorporates a proposal to the effect that any appropriation authorized for NASA under this act may be initially used during the fiscal year 1966 to finance work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Administration, and appropriate adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

The proposed language would provide authority for initially financing such procurements as common-use supplies or services related to approved work or activities from any appropriation available to NASA, with subsequent distribution of the charges to benefited appropriations, such distribution being based on later information as to actual application of charges. The use of this authority would be restricted to situations in which an accurate distribution of such charges is not possible at the time of obligation, but is possible at a later date based on receipt of additional information. This authority would enable NASA to expedite payments to its contractors and simplify its accounting by eliminating the numerous adjustments now necessary to reflect final distribution of charges. For example, under the proposed authority, inventories of common-use supplies, materials, and equipment would be purchased exclusively from one appropriation, with subsequent charges to other appropriations on the basis of stock issues from inventory.

The proposed authority would be particularly useful in connection with many types of consolidated contracts in which the services contracted for are utilized by a number of programs and projects, and for purposes associated with more than one appropriation, such as utilities; computer rentals; contractor furnished support services involving technical support to in-house effort; arts and graphics services; security services; and contract administration services. In each of these contracting situations, the distribution of services received between appropriations cannot be determined accurately at the time of obligation, since such distribution will necessarily be based on demand for these services. Also the information for such distribution may not be available at the time of payment, but would become available later, at which time a final adjustment between appropriations could be made.

All necessary adjustments between appropriations would be made before closing the accounts at the end of each fiscal year, in order to provide, for budget submissions and other purposes, an accurate distribution of all charges to appropriations for the fiscal year.

The authority proposed is comparable to an authority provided the Atomic Energy Commission (Public Works Appropriation Act, 1965, 78 stat. 682, 691–92).

The special interagency transfer authority contained in section 5 of the 1965 NASA Authorization Act (and in identical provisions of the authorization acts of the 3 prior years) has not been requested this year as it has been found to be unnecessary.

The President, in the fiscal year 1965 budget, has recommended appropriations to NASA in the amounts stated above. Section 4 of the act of June 15, 1959 (73 Stat. 73, 75), provides that no appropriation may be made to NASA unless previously authorized by legislation; and it is the purpose of the instant bill to provide such requisite authorization. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration recommends that the enclosed draft bill be enacted. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

Hugh L. Dryden,
Deputy Administrator.

Sectional Analysis of a Bill To Authorize Appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Research and Development, Construction of Facilities, and Administrative Operations, and for Other Purposes

SECTION 1

Subsections (a), (b), and (c) would authorize to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of $5,260 million, as follows: (a) for research and development, $4,575,900,000; (b) for construction of facilities, $74,700,000; and, (c) for administrative operations, $609,400,000. Subsection 1(a) for research and development is further subdivided into 23 line items comprising the various NASA research and development programs. Subsection 1(b) for construction of facilities, is further broken down into 13 line items—11 locational, one consisting of a number of projects at various locations, and one for facility planning and design not otherwise provided for.

Subsection 1(d) would authorize the use of appropriations for research and development for: (i) items of a capital nature (other than the acquisition of land) required for the performance of research and development contracts; and, (ii) grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities. Title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution. Moreover, each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall find necessary to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant.

In either case no funds may be used for the construction of a facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000 unless the Administrator notifies specified committees of the Congress of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

Subsection 1(e) would provide that, when so specified in an appropriation act, (1) any amount appropriated for research and development or for construction of facilities may remain available without fiscal year limitations, and (2) contracts may be entered into under the "Administrative operations" appropriation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the fiscal year following that for which the appropriation is made.

Subsection 1(f) would authorize the use of not to exceed $35,000 of administrative operations appropriations for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses, including representation and official entertainment expenses.

Subsection 1(g) would provide that no funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 1(a) and 1(c) for maintenance, repair, alteration and minor construction may be used to construct any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

Subsection 1(h) would provide that, when so specified in an appropriation act, any appropriation authorized under this act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may initially be used, during the fiscal year 1966, to finance work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Administration and appropriate adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

SECTION 2

Section 2 would authorize the 5-percent upward variation of any of the sums authorized for the construction of facilities line items (other than facility planning and design) when, in the discretion of the Administrator, this is needed to meet unusual cost variations. However, the total cost of all work authorized under these line items may not exceed the total sum authorized for construction of facilities under subsection 1(b), paragraphs (1) through (12).

SECTION 3

Section 3 would provide that not more than 2 percent of the funds appropriated for research and development, may be transferred to the construction of facilities appropriation and, when so transferred, together with $30 million of the funds appropriated for construction of facilities, shall be available for the construction of facilities and land acquisition at any location if (1) the Administrator determines that such action is necessary because of changes in the space program or new scientific or engineering developments, and that deferral of such action until the next authorization act is enacted would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. However, no such funds may be obligated until 30 days have passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to specified committees of Congress a written report containing a description of the project, its cost, and the reason why such project is necessary in the national interest, or such committee before the expiration of such 30-day period has notified the Administrator that no objection to the proposed action will be made.

SECTION 4

Section 4 provides that, notwithstanding any other provision of this act—

(1) No amount appropriated pursuant to this act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences;

(2) No amount appropriated pursuant to this act may be used for any program in excess of the amount acutally authorized for that particular program by subsections 1(a) and 1(c); and

(3) No amount appropriated pursuant to this act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of 30 days has passed after the receipt by each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SECTION 5

Section 5 would provide that the act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1966."

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I also introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The Immigration and Nationality Act now requires that a foreign exchange student reside abroad for 2 years before he or she is eligible to apply for U.S. citizenship, with certain provisions for hardship cases. It does not, however, allow a foreign exchange student to remain here under normal circumstances even when the student's own government has no objection.

The bill which I introduce would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to provid that the Attorney General may waive the requirement of a 2-year residence abroad for foreign exchange students when the government of the student's country files written notification that it has no objection, and the Attorney General finds that the student's admission to the United States would be in the public interest.

I see no valid reason why a person should be required to leave this country for 2 years if it is in the public interest for him to remain here and his own government has no objection to his doing so. I hope that the Congress will see fit to change the law in this respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 929) to amend section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two excise tax bills. Early in the 88th Congress I introduced S. 154, to repeal the excise tax on luggage, handbags, and similar items. Senators will recall that the Senate adopted an amendment to the Excise Tax Rate Extension Act of 1964 which included a repeal of that particular tax. I was greatly gratified by the action which the Senate took on that occasion, but the action did not stand; the amendment was dropped by the conference committee, and the bill as finally adopted by both bodies did not repeal the tax.

Nevertheless, I was heartened by the Senate action, and I believe that the Senate as a whole is convinced now of the inequity of continuing that particular tax. Today I reintroduce the measure to repeal the tax on luggage and similar items, in the confident expectation that in this Congress the wisdom of the Senate will finally prevail.

Included in the amendment to the 1964 excise tax bill, in addition to luggage and other leather goods, were cosmetics and the first $100 of the sales price on furs and jewelry. I was convinced last year that the Senate was right in repealing all those taxes, and I therefore submit a bill which would accomplish that purpose. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table for 1 week to allow other Senators to join as cosponsors, if they so desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bills, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 930. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on luggage, handbags, and similar items; and

S. 931. A bill to repeal or limit certain retailers excise taxes.

DETERMINATION OF BOUNDARIES OF UTE MOUNTAIN AND NAVAJO RESERVATIONS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the bill I introduce today passed the Senate on October 22, 1963, but failed to receive final committee action in the House of Representatives prior to adjournment of the 88th Congress on October 3, 1964.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Ute Mountain Tribe or the Navajo Tribe to commence litigation in a three-judge district court to determine the location of a part of the common boundary between their two reservations. The situs of the disputed boundary is in northwestern New Mexico, and the bill appropriately specifies the U.S. District Court of the District of New Mexico as the judicial forum, and authorizes a direct right of appeal to the Supreme Court. I believe that the three-judge district court is the appropriate judicial vehicle in this instance since the dispute will call into question the treaty of June 1, 1868—15 Stat. 667—and a Federal statute—28 Stat. 677, February 20, 1895.

It seems that the boundaries established by the treaty and the statute overlapped; however, the dispute did not become active until recent years when oil and gas was discovered in the area and indeed under the very lands in controversy—a strip of land 2 miles wide and 10½ miles long. The Navajo boundary, as established by the 1868 treaty, was surveyed and monumented in the following year, but the monuments cannot now be located.

In order that mineral development could continue in this area, the Navajo and the Ute Mountain Tribes entered into an agreement on May 9, 1957, which had the approval of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The agreement permitted joint leasing of the area with the revenues deposited in a joint account pending the resolution of the dispute. Due to the leasing pattern in the area, the joint account agreement also includes an area 2 miles wide on each side of the disputed strip. Therefore, two-thirds of the lands subject to this agreement are outside the disputed strip, and two-thirds of the funds in the joint account are not subject to dispute.

Several million dollars have accumulated in the joint account, dollars that might better be used to further the development of the respective tribal educational and industrial projects. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will act quickly on this legislation so that the matter may progress toward an early and final judicial resolution. The parties are anxious for the settlement of the matter, and the Congress should be equally anxious to provide the means whereby the dispute may be settled.

On behalf of Senators DOMINICK, ANDERSON, and myself, I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred, and that the bill lie on the desk for the remainder of the week so that other Senators who wish to join in sponsoring this bill may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 933) to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEDUCTION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR WATER ASSESSMENTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which would allow farmers to deduct as expense all amounts paid to irrigation ditch companies or similar entities for water assessments. This bill is prompted by the position taken by the Internal Revenue Service last year when its agents were auditing 1963 returns. I received letters from several of my constituents saying that the IRS had departed from its prior practice, and was disallowing portions of the water assessments.

The mutual ditch company is a legal entity which was first introduced in our Western States. It is largely unknown and little understood east of the Missouri River. It may take any one of several forms, but basically it is organized simply as a means of conveying irrigation water from the point of diversion on a stream to the final user, the farmer who irrigates his land. The company or association will hold naked legal title to the diversion works and canals. The shareholders of the association are entitled to water in proportion to their stockholdings, and the shares of stock in such companies have often been held in Colorado to be real property. The company may make assessments against the shares of stock, and unless those assessments are paid in full, the owner thereof is not entitled to receive water from the ditches of the company. Further, the assessments become a lien against the stock, and thus against the water rights represented thereby, and if the assessments continue unpaid, the stock may be sold by such association to enable it to recover the amount of such assessments.

Internal Revenue agents, from what I have been told, have not all treated these assessments in the same way, and there seems to be some question whether certain portions of the assessment should or should not be deductible. The great bulk of the assessments, however, are for operation and maintenance of the canal and reservoir systems. The bill which I introduce today, Mr. President, would clarify the situation and provide even-handed treatment to all farmers who must irrigate their lands. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will be able to adopt this measure in this Congress, perhaps as an amendment to a House-passed revenue measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table for 1 week to allow Senators to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 934) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer a deduction from gross income for water assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOOVER DAM POWERPLANT DEFICIENCIES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it has truly been said: "The mill cannot grind with the water that is past." The truth of this statement was apparent to delegations of the Upper Colorado River Basin States, and the Secretary of the Interior took heed of it on May 11, 1964, when he announced the closing of the gates at Glen Canyon Dam in Arizona, marking the termination of the misappropriation of Colorado River water belonging to the upper basin.

At that time, Lake Mead, behind Hoover Dam, was quite low, primarily as a result of allowing water far in excess of downstream entitlements to pass over the dam for power production purposes. To make the announcement more palatable to the lower basin, the Secretary also announced his intention to charge the upper basin fund with the cost of furnishing deficiency power to Hoover Dam power contractors; but the Secretary failed to indicate the source in law of this claimed authority to make such an arbitrary decision.

If the upper basin were withholding water beyond its legal entitlement, there might be some basis for the charge to the upper basin in equity, if not in law. But, during the past 10 years the upper basin has already delivered to the lower basin approximately 20 million acre-feet of water in excess of its legal obligation under the Colorado River Compact. What kind of justice would require the upper basin to pay for the privilege of keeping what lawfully belongs to it? The injustice of it is doubly apparent when one realizes that the water retained behind Glen Canyon Dam will turn its generators and produce revenues for the repayment of the Federal investment at Glen Canyon and will later be available downstream to turn the generators at Hoover Dam. Naturally, generators had to be installed at Glen Canyon Dam and a minimum power pool had to be established before we could commence producing power at two locations on the river with the same water, and it was the minimum power pool that the upper basin was fighting for. A delay in establishing this minimum power pool meant a delay in reaping the benefit of double beneficial use of the water. The bill I introduce today is designed to help relieve the upper basin of this unfair and oppressive burden. It will spread the cost between both the upper basin and the lower basin, and this is fair since Glen Canyon Dam spreads its benefits to both basins. In addition to receiving power generated at Glen Canyon Dam, the lower basin is greatly benefited by the better regulation of the river afforded by the dam.

The effect of this bill is to charge the Hoover Dam power deficiencies to the special fund established by the Boulder Canyon Project Act entitled "Colorado River Development Fund," into which $500,000 per year is transferred from the Colorado River dam fund. The Colorado River development fund is presently authorized to be used for the "investigation and construction of projects" in the Colorado River Basin, including both the upper basin and the lower basin. I believe that this approach is both reasonable and equitable to all concerned; and it is the hope of its sponsors that this bill will receive early and favorable consideration.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk for Senators ANDERSON, BENNETT, DOMINICK, MCGEE, MONTOYA, MOSS, and SIMPSON, and myself, and ask that it be appropriately referred. It gives me great pleasure to announce that the sponsors of this bill represent virtually the entire upper basin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 935) to authorize the appropriation of the receipts of the Colorado River Development Fund for the purpose of making allowances to the Hoover Dam powerplant for deficiencies in firm energy generation introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished senior colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish in Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

A similar bill passed the Senate in December of 1963, but was not acted upon by the House Interior Committee.

Happily I can report that support for this legislation has grown markedly both in Michigan and in the Nation as a whole. Citizens everywhere are every day more aware of the need to safeguard for the enjoyment of future generations the last remaining stretches of beautiful shoreline. Particularly is this a matter of urgency in those parts of the country—like the Middle West—which are near to huge concentrations of population. Increasing, too, is recognition that existing improved properties in areas of unique beauty are protected from changes which diminish the beauty of the setting when the area is established as a national lakeshore.

The bill which we offer today differs in only two minor respects from the one passed by the Senate 13 months ago. The changes are:

One. Elimination of a 420-acre strip of shoreline west of the town of Empire. This stretch, 1¾ miles long was not included in our original proposal, and I believe this initial decision was a wise one. I hope the committee will be persuaded to omit this stretch.

Second. A precise description of the route of the scenic highway along the highlands to the east of the proposed lakeshore. This highway was authorized in the Senate-passed bill but the right-of-way was not clearly defined.

This proposal has the support of the major national conservation organizations, the Michigan conservation organizations, leaders from all sections of our State, and—if the ballot box is a barometer of such things—from the people of Michigan. I hope the Senate Interior Committee will be able to schedule it for early action, and that we can send it to the House early enough in the session to permit that body to consider it in the 89th Congress. If we are to save this magnificent area for future generations, it must be done now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 936) to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. MCNAMARA), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 936

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to stabilize and preserve for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use, and enjoyment of the public a significant portion of the diminishing shoreline of the United States and its related geographic and scientific features, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to take appropriate action, as herein provided, to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

(b) In preserving the lakeshore and stabilizing its development, substantial reliance shall be placed on cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments to apply sound principles of land use planning and zoning. In developing the lakeshore full recognition shall be given to protecting the private properties for the enjoyment of the owners.

SEC. 2. The area comprising that particular land and water described in section 12 of this Act and generally depicted in a map identified as NPS–101–SB which is on file in the office of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, is hereby designated for establishment as the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of ten members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the counties in which the lakeshore is situated, two members to represent each such county;

(2) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Michigan; and

(3) Two members to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the lakeshore and with respect to the provisions of sections 9, 12, 13 of this Act.

(f) Any member of the Commission appointed under this Act shall be exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (g) of this section.

(g) The exemption granted by subsection (f) of this section shall not extend—

(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment; or

(2) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of two years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

SEC. 5. In administering the lakeshore the Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction in accordance with the laws of Michigan. The Secretary, after consultation with the Michigan Department of Conservation, may designate zones and establish periods where and when no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment and issue regulations, consistent with this section, as he may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 6. (a) The administration, protection, and development of the lakeshore shall be exercised by the Secretary, subject to the provisions fo this Act and of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, relating to the areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service; except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) In the administration, protection, and development of the area, the Secretary shall prepare and implement a land and water use management plan, which shall include specific provision for—

(1) development of facilities to provide the benefits of public recreation;

(2) protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment; and

(3) such protection, management, and utilization of renewable natural resources as in the judgment of the Secretary is consistent with, and will further the purpose of, public recreation and protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment.

(c) In developing the lakeshore the Secretary shall provide public use areas in such places and manner as he determines will not diminish the value or enjoyment for the owner or occupant of any improved property located thereon.

Sec. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting any governmental jurisdiction in the State of Michigan from assessing taxes upon any interest in real estate retained under the provisions of section 10 of this Act to the owner of such interest.

Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the limitations, conditions, and restrictions imposed by this Act, to acquire the land, water, and other property, and improvements thereon, and any interests therein (including easements) comprising the area defined in section 12 of this Act by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or condemnation; except that such authority to acquire by condemnation shall be exercised only in the manner and to the extent specifically authorized in this Act.

(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property under this Act, the Secretary shall give immediate and careful consideration to any offer made by an individual owning property within the lakeshore to sell such property to the Secretary. In any case in which an individual owning property within the lakeshore submits evidence to the Secretary that the continued ownership by such individual of that property would result in hardship to him, the Secretary shall immediately consider such evidence and, if he determines on the basis of that evidence that a hardship would so result, he shall, within the one year following the submission of such evidence, subject to the availability of funds, purchase such property if offered for a price which does not exceed its fair market value.

(c) Any property or interests therein, owned by the State of Michigan, or any political subdivisions thereof, may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any property owned by the United States on the date of enactment of this Act located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(d) With respect to that property which the Secretary is authorized to acquire by condemnation under the terms of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate no condemnation proceedings until after he has made every reasonable effort to acquire such property by negotiation and purchase.

(e) In any case where the owner and the United States agree, the power of condemnation may, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, be used as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances.

(f) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area designated for inclusion and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. The Secretary shall report to the Congress on every exchange carried out under the authority of this Act within thirty days from its consummation, and each such report shall include a statement of the value of the properties involved and of any case in which equalization payments are made or received.

Sec. 9. (a) The Secretary shall, at the request of any township or county in or adjacent to the lakeshore affected by this Act, assist and consult with the appropriate officers and employees of such township or county in establishing zoning bylaws for the purpose of this Act. Such assistance may include payments to the county or township for technical aid.

(b) No property within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore shall be acquired by the Secretary by condemnation during the one-year period following the date of enactment of this Act. Thereafter the Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring by condemnation any improved property so long as the affected county or township has in force and applicable thereto a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section and the use of improved property is in compliance therewith. In the event that the affected county or township does not have in effect and applicable to any improved property a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw so approved, the Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring such property by condemnation, if the owner therof notifies the Secretary in writing of such owner's agreement to use his property in a manner consistent with the applicable standard set forth in subsection (d) of this section, and such prohibition against condemnation shall remain in effect for so long as such property is so used.

(c) If the Secretary determines that any such property referred to in subsection (b) of this section covered by any such bylaw is being used in a way which is not in substantial compliance with such bylaw, or that any such property referred to in subsection (b) with respect to which an agreement has been made is being used in a manner which is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, he shall so notify the owner of any such property in writing. Such notice shall contain a detailed statement as to why the Secretary believes that such use is not in substantial compliance with such zoning bylaw or why such use is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, as the case may be. Any such owner shall have sixty days following the receipt by him of that written notification within which to discontinue the use referred to in such notification. Discontinuance of such use within such sixty-day period shall have the effect of prohibiting the Secretary from acquiring such property by condemnation by reason of such use. In any case in which such use is not discontinued within such sixty-day period and condemnation proceedings are thereafter initiated by the Secretary, no condemnation shall be ordered in any such proceedings if the Secretary fails to demonstrate to the court by substantial evidence that such a use was not in substantial compliance with such bylaw or was not substantially consistent with such applicable standards.

(d) Any zoning bylaw or amendment thereto submitted to the Secretary for approval for the purposes of this Act shall be approved by him if such bylaw or amendment contains provisions which—

(1) contribute to the effect of prohibiting the commercial and industrial use (other than a use for a commercial purpose as authorized under section 13 of this Act) of all property within the boundaries of such area which is situated within the county or township adopting such bylaw or amendment;

(2) are consistent with the objectives and purposes of this Act so that, to the extent possible under Michigan law, the scenic and scientific values of the lakeshore area will be protected;

(3) are designed to preserve the lakeshore character of the area by appropriate restrictions upon the burning of cover, cutting of timber (except tracts managed for sustained yield), removal of sand or gravel, and dumping, storage, or piling of refuse and other unsightly objects or other uses which would detract from the natural or traditional lakeshore scene;

(4) provide that no construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement of any property, including improved property as defined in this Act, within the lakeshore area shall be permitted, if such construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement would afford less than a 50-foot setback from all streets measured at a right angle with the street line, and a 25-foot distance from the abutters' property lines. Any owner or zoning authority may request the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether a proposed move, alteration, construction, reconstruction, or enlargement of any such property would subject such property to acquisition by condemnation, and the Secretary, within sixty days of the receipt of such request, shall advise the owner or zoning authority in writing whether the intended use will subject the property to acquisition by condemnation; and

(5) have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and of exception made to the application of such bylaw or amendment.

(e) The approval of any bylaw or amendment pursuant to subsection (d) shall not be withdrawn or revoked by the Secretary for so long as such bylaw or amendment remains in effect as approved. Any such bylaw or amendment so approved shall not be retroactive in its application.

Sec. 10. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property situated within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain, for a term of not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner or owners, the right of use and occupancy of such property for any residential purpose which is not incompatible with the purposes of this Act or which does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the value on such date of the right retained by the owner. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any deed or other instrument used to transfer title to property, with respect to which a right of use and occupancy is retained under this section, shall provide that such property shall not be used for any purpose which is incompatible with purposes of this Act, or which impairs the usefulness and attractiveness of such area and if it should be so used, the Secretary shall have authority to terminate such right. In the event the Secretary exercises his power of termination under this subsection he shall pay to the owner of the right terminated an amount equal to the value of that portion of such right which remained unexpired on the date of such termination.

SEC. 11. As used in this Act, the term "improved property" means a detached, one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before December 31, 1964, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, such land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be at least three acres in area, or all of such lesser acreage as may be held in the same ownership as the dwelling, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters on Lake Michigan, together with so much of the land adjoining such any beach or waters, as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto. If the Secretary makes such exclusion, an appropriate buffer zone shall be provided between any residence and the public access or beach.

SEC. 12. The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore shall consist of the following described areas together with adjacent waters:

SOUTH MANITOU ISLAND

(a) All of an island in Lake Michigan officially designated as South Manitou Island lying in townships 30 and 31 north, range 15 west, and adjacent waters for one-quarter mile offshore.

GOOD HARBOR—SLEEPING BEAR BAY AREA

(b) Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at the northern line of section 6, township 29 north, range 12 west, and continuing east along said line to the east line of said section and thence south along the said east boundary to the south boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the north-south quarter section line of section 7, township 29 north, range 12 west,

thence south along said quarter section line to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence west along said quarter section line and east-west quarter section line of section 12, township 29 north, range 13 west to the north right-of-way of a public road following the north shore of Little Traverse Lake,

thence in a general westerly direction along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south of the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 22, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west along the north boundary of said section to the northwest corner of the section, thence south along the west boundary of said section to the east-west quarter-quarter line of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west to the west boundary of said section, thence north to the northeast corner of section 17, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence west to the northwest corner of section 18, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the southeast corner of section 24, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the south boundary of said section to the east right-of-way of county highway 675, thence continuing northwesterly along said right-of-way to the projected intersection of the west right-of-way of a north-south county road in the northwest quarter, southwest quarter of section 24,

thence southerly along the said right-of-way to the south line of section 24, thence west to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 23, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the north-south quarter section line of said section,

thence north to the south boundary of section 14, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence east along said south boundary to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southeast quarter of said section,

thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence west 660 feet, thence north to the north boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the shore of Lake Michigan,

thence offshore one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore, thence along said shore in a general easterly direction at a distance of one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore to a point one-quarter mile offshore perpendicular of the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

GLEN ARBOR AREA

Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at a point 1,491 feet due east of the west boundary of section 21, township 29 north, range 14 west and running south to the south boundary of said section, thence running east to north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northwest quarter section of section 27, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the west right-of-way of monument 22, thence south along said west right-of-way to the north line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the north line of section 34 to a point which is 400 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 1, section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south 200 feet, thence west 430 feet, thence south 805 feet,

thence west 485 feet more or less to the west line of Government lot 1, thence south on the west line of Government lot 1 to the southwest corner of Government lot 1, thence east 144 feet more or less to a point 661.49 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 2, section 55, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 131.9 feet, thence north 81 degrees 02 minutes west 335.0 feet, thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 100 feet, thence south 30 degrees 37 minutes west 149 feet, thence south 89 degrees 38 minutes west 225.0 feet,

thence south 18 degrees 13 minutes west 235 feet, thence north 71 degrees 30 minutes west 45 feet, thence south 18 degrees 30 minutes west 450 feet,

thence south 71 degrees 30 minutes east 400 feet, thence south to the south line of Government lot 2, thence east on the south line of Government lot 2 to a point 418.35 feet east of Glen Lake on the south line of Government lot 2,

thence south 15 degrees 43 minutes west 100 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 2 degrees 59 minutes west 1,100.12 feet, thence west 43.1 feet, thence south 200 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 775 feet, thence west 225 feet, thence south 434 feet to the south line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the south line of section 34 to the east line of section 4, thence south along said east line to the north right-of-way of Forest Glen Road,

thence northwesterly along the north right-of-way of said public road to the north line of section 32, thence west along the north line of section 32 to the shore of Glen Lake,

thence continuing northwesterly along the shore of Glen Lake from the intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the south line of section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, to a point of intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the east line of Government lot 2,

thence north along the east line of Government lot 2 to the south sixteenth latitudinal line, thence west along the south sixteenth latitudinal line to its intersection with the west line of Government lot 2, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south on the west line of Government lot 2 to the shore of Glen Lake,

thence westerly and southerly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 664.77 feet east and 1,308.75 feet north of the southwest corner of Government lot 1, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north 89 degrees 39 minutes west 236.33 feet to the east right-of-way of Michigan Highway 109,

thence southerly along the east right-of-way to a stake on the east right-of-way of monument 109 located north 345.5 feet and north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 1,190 feet from the northwest corner of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence from stake on east right-of-way of monument 109 north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 229.5 feet, thence south 18 degrees 03 minutes west 400.0 feet,

thence south 89 degrees 12 minutes west 1,242.0 feet to the west line of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south along the west lines of Government lots 1, 2, and 3, section 31, to the southwest corner of Government lot 3,

thence east on south line of Government lot 3 to the west right-of-way of monument 109, thence southeasterly along the west right-of-way to its intersection with the north line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east along the north line of section 5 to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 5,

thence by a straight line in a southeasterly direction to the intersection of the east line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, and the south right-of-way of a public road lying on the south line of Government lot 5,

thence east along south right-of-way of said public road to its intersection with Michigan Highway 22, thence east across monument 22 to the south right-of-way, thence northeasterly along monument 22 to a point 476.5 feet west and 1,519.0 feet north of the southeast corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4,

thence south 400 feet, thence east 476.5 feet, thence north on the east line of the southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 4, to a point of intersection with the south sixteenth latitudinal line,

thence east on the south sixteenth latitudinal line to a point on the west boundary of a cemetery which point is north 89 degrees west 222.75 feet from the intersection of the south sixteenth latitudinal line with the east line of section 4,

thence south to the southwest corner of said cemetery, thence south 89 degrees east 222.75 feet to the west line of section 4, thence continuing east on the same bearing 33 feet more or less to east right-of-way of a public highway,

thence north to a point 554.2 feet south and 33 feet east of the meander corner at the north end of the west line of section 3, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east 233.0 feet, thence north 374.14 feet to centerline of a public highway, thence south 69 degrees 55 minutes east 49.01 feet,

thence north 0 degree 47 minutes west 11.3 feet, thence east to north right-of-way of said public highway, thence southeasterly along north right-of-way of said highway to its intersection with the south right-of-way of a private road listed on the plot of McFarlane Woods numbered 2 as Beech Tree Road,

thence southeasterly along the south right-of-way of Beech Tree Road to the northeast corner of lot numbered 14 of McFarlane Woods numbered 2, thence north 37 degrees 24 minutes east to the shore of Glen Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 1,850 feet due east of the west line of section 11,

thence south to the east-west quarter section line of section 14, thence west to the shore of Lake Michigan and east-west quarter section line, section 13, township 28 north, range 15 west,

thence continuing due west to a point one-quarter mile offshore, thence northerly and following along the shore at a perpendicular distance of one-quarter mile offshore to a point perpendicular to the point of beginning,

thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

PLATTE BAY AREA

Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at a point 700 feet due north of the south corporate line of the village of Empire,

thence east to a point on the east said corporate line, 700 feet north of the southeast corner of said corporate line,

thence north to the north line of section 30, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter section of said section,

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said section, thence east to the east line of said section, thence south to the southeast corner of said section, thence west to the north-south quarter section line of section 31, thence south to the north line of section 18, township 27 north, range 14 west,

thence east to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 19,

thence west to a point 500 feet perpendicular to, in a general easterly direction, monument numbered 22 and continuing along 500 feet from monument numbered 22 in a general westerly direction to a point 1,500 feet west of the east line of section 31, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence north to the southerly right-of-way of monument numbered 22,

thence westerly along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 36, township 27 north, range 16 west, thence south to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence east to the shore of Long Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore to the east line of said section,

thence south to a point 1,000 feet south of the south line of said section, thence west to the west line of section 1, township 26 north, range 16 west, thence north to the shore of Lake Michigan, thence perpendicular to the shore one-quarter mile,

thence following along the shore at a perpendicular distance of one-quarter mile to a point one-quarter mile offshore and due west to the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

SCENIC PARKWAY

(d) (1) In order to facilitate visitor travel, provide scenic overlooks for public enjoyment and interpretation of the national lakeshore and related features, and in order to enhance recreational opportunities, the Secretary is authorized to construct and administer as a part of the national lakeshore scenic roads of parkway standards generally located in accordance with the location description in paragraph (2) and lying within the parkway zone designated on map numbered NPS–101–SB. Such scenic roads shall include necessary connections, bridges, and other structural utilities. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary may procure for this purpose land, or interest therein, by donation, purchase with appropriated or donated funds, or otherwise: *Provided*, That land and interests so procured shall not exceed one hundred and fifty acres per mile of scenic road, except that tracts may be procured in their entirety in order to avoid severances. Property so acquired in excess of the acreage limitation provided in this section may be exchanged by the Secretary for any land of approximately equal value authorized for acquisition by this Act.

(2) The scenic roads authorized in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be located in accordance with the following generally described route, in three segments:

GLEN LAKE TO EMPIRE BLUFF SEGMENT

From the national lakeshore in section 7, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence meandering southerly through section 18 and portions of sections 13 and 24, township 29 north, range 14 west, to the top of the morainal bluff overlooking Glen Lake and Sleeping Bear Bay,

thence continuing through sections 19, 30, 31 and 32, township 29 north, range 13 west, and crossing the Burdickville, Maple City Road in section 5, township 28 north, range 13 west, continuing past Bow Lake through sections 8, 7 and 18, with a spur into the Kettle region of section 17,

thence continuing westerly through township 28 north, range 14 west, including sections 13, 14, 15, and 22 with an entrance and contact station in section 23, crossing M72 into sections 26 and 27,

thence traversing the rim of an ancient glacial drainage channel through sections 28, 33, 32 and 31, township 28 north, range 14 west, and section 5, township 27 north, range 14 west, meeting the national lakeshore in section 36, township 28 north, range 14 west.

GLEN ARBOR SEGMENT

A shore segment connecting the Glen Haven portion of the national lakeshore with the Pyramid Point portion, traversing parts of sections 27 and 26, township 29 north, range 14 west.

PLATTE LAKE SEGMENT

A scenic drive overlooking the Platte Lakes and Crystal Lake Embayments, connecting the national lakeshore to U.S. 31 and traversing sections 12, 11, 10, 9, 4 and 5, township 26 north, range 15 west, and section 32, township 27 north, range 15 west; with an alternate spur through section 6, township 26 north, range 15 west.

Sec. 13. In any case, not otherwise provided for in this Act, the Secretary shall be prohibited from condemning any commercial property used for commercial purposes in existence on December 31, 1964, so long as the use thereof would further the purposes of this Act, and such use does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore. The following uses, among others, shall be considered to be uses compatible with the purposes of this Act: Commercial farms, orchards, motels, rental cottages, camps, craft and art studios, marinas, medical, legal, architectural, and other such professional offices, and tree farms.

Sec. 14. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same, a certificate indicating, with respect to any property which the Secretary has been prohibited from acquiring by condemnation in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority is prohibited and the reasons therefor.

Sec. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $4,750,000, as may be necessary for acquisition of properties under the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I introduce at this time on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Senators Burdick, Hartke, and Tydings, proposed legislation which would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to enforce the duty imposed on each carrier under that act to provide adequate service in connection with the transportation authorized by its certificate of public convenience and necessity.

Mr. President, this amendment is designed to assure the enforcement of adequate air service at airports across the Nation. Experience has shown that neither the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 nor the administrative policies of the Civil Aeronautics Board are presently adequate to provide the American public with the air service so vital to its needs.

As was the case in relation to railroad service earlier in our history, today proper air service is indispensable for the development of an American city and its metropolitan area.

The crucial significance of air service to the modern city was recognized as far back as 1935 in the report of the Federal Aviation Commission. Recommendation No. 4 in the Commission report said:

> Certificates of convenience and necessity should be issued under proper safeguards and specifications. Provisions should be made to specify a minimum quality of service and a frequency of schedule on airlines.

During the early years of the airline industry, the matter of adequacy of service generally took care of itself as a result of the competition between carriers seeking to obtain a foothold in desirable markets. Today, however, the record shows that certified competition has not and will not insure adequate service for all the markets in this country.

Present policies and practices of the Civil Aeronautics Board require that cities, metropolitan areas, or individual airports which consider the service of a certified airline to be inadequate have no recourse but to initiate an expensive and lengthy administrative procedure in the nature of an "adequacy of service case." The history of such cases is a dismal record of neglect of the public interest. The experiences of the city of Baltimore in seeking adequate service from certified airlines at Friendship Airport will demonstrate the problem.

In May 1956, the Greater Baltimore Committee filed an adequacy of service petition with the Civil Aeronautics Board. The case was not finally decided until November 1960, and improved service did not begin to be received until well along in 1961, 5 years after the Baltimore business community called the matter to the attention of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The inadequacy of these procedures to protect the public interest is apparent. During the time in which a case is in litigation, the supporting data on which the case rests may change entirely and any improvements which might result therefrom are likely to be too little and too late.

I am convinced that the impracticality of this method of adjudication of disputes between the public and a transportation industry which undergoes consistent and rapid change is the explanation for there having been only four adequacy-of-service cases resolved by the Board since its creation in 1938.

During 1963, the concerned, enterprising, and dedicated leadership of the Baltimore Airport Board initiated inquiries regarding service at airports across the country. The replies which they received from Ohio, New York, Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, North Carolina, Indiana, West Virginia, Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, and Rhode Island indicate the deep concern of airport operators in these States for improved service and improved enforcement of adequate service on the part of certified air carriers.

Mr. President, it is only fair to admit that the Civil Aeronautics Board has recognized its obligation in the rendering of certain opinions and the establishment of certain machinery. In the course of its opinion in the Baltimore case, the Board stated:

> The obligation of the Board to guarantee adequate service is made clear in section 404a of the act. The use of the word "minimum" in connection with adequacy under section 404 does not mean that the adequacy standard is a narrow or insignificant one, nor does it mean that only minimum service should be provided. It means only that the adequacy standard is the basic floor laid down by the act, and that service below that floor will be found by the Board to be insufficient. The fact that broader policy considerations apply in certification cases where the Board is concerned with promoting the maximum development of a market does not mean that the standards in an adequacy proceeding are not sufficiently broad to protect the community's right to reasonable service. While section 404 may not be a major vehicle for attaining maximum service benefits, it is, nonetheless, a substantial shield safeguarding the communities from poor service.

The Community Relations Bureau, created in March 1961, was to provide machinery for the informal resolution of adequacy of service and other problems between carriers and cities. This office has proved useful; however, its lack of power to issue binding orders, its limited personnel and facilities, have prevented it from dealing with the problem of adequate service on a broad scale.

Students of air transportation have recognized from the beginning that the problem of reconciling the needs of cities for adequate service with the needs of carriers for adequate profits is not a simple one. Nevertheless, the importance of this problem to American cities is so critical as to require more attention from the Congress.

Let me give you an example of the service rendered to Baltimore, the sixth largest city in the country.

Let me remind you that the public investment in this modern jet terminal is $24 million, 20 percent of which is Federal funds. Let me also remind you that the facility is uniquely located to serve not only Baltimore, but much of Washington and all of the populous Maryland suburbs.

Friendship Airport has no service at all to or from La Guardia, and an average of only eight daily flights to and eight from Newark. Even in the Newark service, there is an afternoon gap of 6½ hours between flights. On Saturday, there is no service to Newark between 8 o'clock in the morning and 7 o'clock in the evening. Baltimore has no nonstop daytime service to Detroit, and none to Augusta. We have service in only one direction to Charlottesville, Memphis, Mobile, and Jacksonville. We have only one flight daily to Minneapolis and Milwaukee, and it originates at 11 p.m. Between Baltimore and Cincinnati, there is considerable community of interest; yet the only flight from Friendship originates at 6:45 a.m. and makes five stops before arriving at 11:15 a.m.

This schedule of service becomes effective February 6 of this year. Our present actual schedule is even less adequate.

Let me cite another example of the CAB philosophy. In 1963, Allegheny Airlines applied for certification to institute frequent nonstop service between Friendship and Newark—the downtown airport for New York City. This service was badly needed. The CAB ruled against Allegheny, and declared it ineligible for Federal subsidy. Allegheny replied that it could operate profitably on the Friendship-Newark run without the subsidy, and would like certification to do so. The CAB then ruled against Allegheny on grounds that four trunklines were already certified to supply this service. The Baltimore Airport Board appealed to the CAB to grant the Allegheny certification since the presently certified trunklines were unwilling to supply adequate service. The CAB refused to certify Allegheny, and the case was closed.

Mr. President, I contend that a quasi-judicial Federal agency which has the power to grant valuable franchises should also be legally required to see that the holders of the franchises provide adequate service, and, if not, to grant franchises to someone who will provide service. I contend that the Federal Aviation Act must be amended to provide relief from the unilateral scheduling decisions made by airlines who service their own interests without due regard to the public's interest. I contend that previous legislation has emphasized the ability of an airline to serve, rather than its willingness to serve best as a criterion for certification. I contend that, after certification has been granted, the Civil Aeronautics Board makes no attempt to enforce adequate service, and that the economic interest of the carrier is frequently paramount in decisions which are made. I contend that the lengthy adequacy of service proceedings, which are the public's only present recourse, are impractical, and that a more expeditious method of controlling airline scheduling must be written into the Federal Aviation Act. I contend that the act under which the Civil Aeronautics Board functions should be amended to require the Board to analyze the service rendered by certified carriers at each location, and to initiate corrective action where necessary. This is similar to the powers possessed by many other regulatory agencies, and this is the purpose of the legislation which I am now proposing.

Let me summarize the provisions of the legislation I am presenting. Under these amendments to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the Civil Aeronautics Board would be required to maintain a continual surveillance over the adequacy of service provided by air carriers by establishing a set of guides and tests to determine minimum levels of airline service to be provided between each pair of cities in the United States receiving scheduled service from a certified carrier. These guide lines or tests for minimum levels of service would be developed from the periodic reports and indicators provided by the Department of Commerce for determining the potential air market between each such pair of cities.

I might suggest that in conjunction with the preparation of these indices, the Department of Commerce and such other agencies as might be appropriate, could render a great service to other carriers and to the public by preparing similar indices of the potential market for other means of commercial transportation.

The Board would be required, within a reasonable time after its periodic review and comparison, to issue a notice of deficiency to each airline providing air service between pairs of cities when the Board determines it to be less than that which is necessary to provide adequate service. If such airline fails to provide the adequate service within a reasonable time, the Board would then be required to institute immediate proceedings for the carrier to show cause why service should not be increased and the Board would be empowered to issue orders or take action, including the revocation of certification and its award to another carrier, necessary to insure the maintenance of adequate service. In such proceedings it will, of course, be the right of any interested party to submit evidence in its behalf.

In addition, the Board shall, upon its own order or upon the motion of any city or State, public agency, or public body, institute an investigation to determine whether the public interest requires the authorization of new, additional, or improved service between any two or more cities. Upon determination that the public interest requires it, the Board shall issue such certificate and take such other action as may be necessary to insure adequate and efficient air service.

The corrective action sought in this bill is long overdue. Provisions of the legislation are in line with the resolution adopted by the Airport Operators Council at its recent New York convention. The inquiries made of officials in other cities by officials in Baltimore and my own personal conversations with colleagues in the Senate assure me of broad support. With this in mind, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at the close of my remarks, and that the bill lie on the table until the close of business on Friday, February 12.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

The bill (S. 937) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to enforce the duty imposed on each carrier to provide adequate services in connection with the transportation authorized by its certificate of public convenience and necessity, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Brewster (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 937

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1482) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"SURVEILLANCE AND ENFORCEMENT OF ADEQUATE SERVICE

"(j)(1) In exercising and performing its duties with respect to maintaining adequate levels of air service for the public convenience and necessity, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 401(e)(4) or any other provisions of this Act, the Board shall maintain a continuing surveillance over the adequacy of service provided by air carriers pursuant to the requirements of section 404(a) of this Act by, from time to time, establishing standards and tests to determine minimum levels of air carrier service to be provided between each pair of cities in the United States receiving scheduled service from a certificated air carrier, taking into account the periodic reports available from other governmental departments, including those furnished by the Department of Commerce, of indicators susceptible for use in determining the potential air market between each such pair of cities in the United States. The Board shall use the standards and tests established by it to periodically, but not less than once each year, determine the adequacy of air service provided by the certificated airlines between each pair of cities in the United States certificated to receive scheduled airline service. The Board shall, within a reasonable time after its periodic review, issue a notice of deficiency in the form of an order to show cause to each air carrier providing service between pairs of cities where the Board determines it to be less than that which is necessary to provide adequate service.

"(2) Each air carrier receiving a notice of deficiency shall, within the time specified by the Civil Aeronautics Board, correct the deficiency cited, or notify the Board of its reasons for inability or refusal to conform. In the event the air carrier does not correct the deficiency cited, parties of interest shall have the right to reply and comment on the air carrier's reason for its inability or refusal to conform. The Board may thereafter revise or rescind its notice of deficiency, or it may hold a public hearing upon the issues raised by the original or revised notice of deficiency. The Board shall issue such orders and take such action (including the revocation of any certificate to engage in air transportation issued under this Act), as may be necessary to insure the maintenance of adequate air service to all points designated in any such certificate. In said proceedings it shall be the right of any person or body with a substantial interest to become a party to the proceedings and to submit evidence in favor of or against the adequacy of the level of air service.

"(3) Notwithstanding any provision of this section, the Board shall, upon its own order, or promptly upon motion of any State, city, or other public agency or public body, institute an investigation to determine whether the public interest requires the authorization of new, additional or improved service between any two or more cities, and upon determination that the public convenience and necessity requires authorization of new, additional, or improved service, shall, subject to the other provisions of this Act, issue such certificate or order and take such other action as may be necessary to insure adequate and efficient air service between such cities for the present and future needs of air commerce."

(b) that portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading "Sec. 1002. Complaints to and investigations by the Administrator and the Board." is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"(j) Surveillance and enforcement of adequate air service."

Sec. 2. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 3 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the collection and publication of statistics, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 104. Report relating to air transportation services."

The Secretary shall undertake and produce in the Bureau or by contract with a private organization, a periodically updated report, of the community-of-interest indicators between each city or area in the United States and each other city or area in the United States designated by the Civil Aeronautics Board on the certificates of public convenience and necessity of the United States scheduled air carriers. These periodic reports will be in such form and include such data as will assist the Civil Aeronautics Board, the communities, the air carriers, and others in determining the potential air transportation needs, including the character, frequency and times at which air service is needed, for each city or area designated by the Civil Aeronautics Board on the certificates of public convenience and necessity of the scheduled United States air carriers.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, and others interested in these reports, shall advise the Bureau, upon the Bureau's request or otherwise, from time to time, as to the nature of the facts, data, statistics, and information which will be pertinent and helpful for the above purpose.

Such report shall be revised periodically, quarterly if possible, but in no case less than annually, and shall within a reasonable time after the end of each period, be forwarded by the Secretary to the Civil Aeronautics Board for use as a guide in determining the adequacy of air service between each city or area in the United States, and each other city or area in the United States designated to receive air carrier service. Copies of said report shall be made available to the public through the Office of the Superintendent of Documents if the demand warrants it, and in any event it shall be available for public inspection at the office of the Bureau. Copies of the report, or any portion thereof shall be furnished to those who request it upon the payment of such reasonable charges as the Bureau may from time to time establish. Such copies shall be admissible as evidence to establish any of the facts or opinions contained therein, in Federal courts and before Federal administrative agencies, including the Civil Aeronautics Board. The information obtained from this report may be used by the Department of Commerce for information and guideline purposes for such other activities as it sees fit.

(b) The analysis of chapter 3 of title 13 of the United States Code, immediately preceding section 41, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"104. Reporting relating to air transportation services."

ASSURING RESOURCES FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, this Nation has now entered its fifth year of uninterrupted economic growth. We have had 49 months of unbroken advance in our economy. Gross national product has gone to more than $600 billion with unusual stability and absence of overall inflation.

There can be no question that the Employment Act of 1946, the work of the White House Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Economic Committee of Congress have played a major role in this unusual economic record.

Since the enactment of the Employment Act, the administrators of our Government have been aware of both the ability and the responsibility, through carefully planned and coordinated Federal economic policy, to keep the national economy operating at an adequate growth rate. Our adjustment from World War II has been a remarkable contrast to the adjustment after World War I.

We have been through one period in which administrators were reluctant to use Federal authority and did not initiate programs quickly to reverse recessionary forces, but corrective steps were taken before any deep depression occurred. We are in a period now in which coordinated Federal programs affecting economic growth have succeeded in lifting our growth rate from about 3 to 5 percent annually.

We still have a great deal to learn about economic policy. As a Senator from an agricultural State, I feel we have some unsolved farm problems, of serious dimensions. That is an area in which there is still vital work to be done.

We have, however, learned a great deal since 1946, and we have demonstrated that violent cyclical economic swings—booms and busts—are not inevitable or irreversible. The Employment Act of 1946, which declared the maintenance of a high employment economy a matter of Federal concern and responsibility, and established an administrative and a legislative agency to provide continuing national leadership in the economic field, has worked to the tremendous benefit of the Nation.

The many agencies which once initiated programs affecting the economy, without thought to their consistency with actions of other agencies, or their economic effects, now have guides and goals in the annual Economic Reports of the

Council of Economic Advisers which make coordinated action possible.

We now have a system of analysis and communication so when economic weaknesses appear, the President, Congress, and other administrators know quickly that steps to strengthen the economy are needed. Economic policies, programs and actions are no longer based on hunches, but on a continuing flow of information and interpretation of events and trends in economic affairs.

I send to the desk, Mr. President, for myself and 15 other Senators who have joined as cosponsors, a measure to be known as the Resources and Conservation Act. The nature of the bill is familiar to most Members, for a similar measure was first proposed in the 86th Congress by the late Senator James E. Murray, of Montana, legislative author of the Employment Act of 1946.

Senators joining me in authorship of the bill are Mr. Bible, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Church, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Young of North Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the desk the remainder of this week for additional signatures.

The bill establishes a White House Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers paralleling the Council of Economic Advisers. It establishes select committees in the Senate and the House, each composed of members of the four committees dealing with resources legislation, Interior, Public Works, Agriculture, and Commerce, which will meet at least once annually, early in each session of Congress, to consider an annual national resources report by the Council.

It would establish the same sort of centers of informed, continuing resources and conservation leadership in the executive branch and Congress we have successfully and beneficially set up in the economic field.

Abundant resources—biological, land, water, air, minerals, timber—are basic to a sustained, affluent economy. Yet our attention to resources problems has been quite sporadic in the past.

Just after the turn of the century, President Theodore Roosevelt tackled resource problems of that day very vigorously. They did not get the same sort of major attention again until the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt when the Soil Conservation Service, TVA, land use planning, the National Resources Planning Board, and other programs were initiated by the New Deal.

In the past 6 or 7 years, we have fortunately had considerable resource leadership from Members of Congress. Senator Murray led efforts to create a Missouri Valley Authority, parks, and seashores. Our distinguished majority leader, Senator Mansfield, first proposed the landmark study of water resources problems which the late Senator Robert S. Kerr conducted brilliantly and which the senior Senator from New Mexico, Senator Clinton P. Anderson, still works with determination to implement. Senator Anderson has not only provided leadership on water resources legislation, he was the father of our recently adopted recreation resources programs. The recreation bills were the result of a 6-year effort which started back in 1958 when the Senator successfully proposed an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. It culminated last year with our enactment of the land and water conservation fund bill and the wilderness preservation bill. Senator Anderson's name is identified also with a helium conservation program, the saline water conversion effort, study of weather modification, phreatophyte control, and other similar resource measures. It is a pleasant recollection of mine that I sponsored companion measures on wilderness and recreation in the House of Representatives. Senator Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, came to the Senate 2 years ago with a national reputation as a conservation-minded Governor. He is brilliantly forwarding that reputation as a Senator. The conservation interest and effective work of Senator Metcalf, both as a U.S. Representative and as a Senator, is well known.

We have a land policy review commission now getting underway which has been brought about through the leadership efforts of the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Congressman Wayne Aspinall, with whom I had the privilege of serving two terms in the House of Representatives. Also on the House side, Congressman John Blatnik provided early leadership in regard to pollution control.

We do not suffer from a lack of interest in resources and conservation problems. I have never known a group of men with a greater dedication to their responsibilities than the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the House and Senate with whom I have served. They are both extremely hardworking groups. But all are Senators and Congressmen with neither the uninterrupted time, the staff, nor the authority to make the necessary studies in depth and to develop the comprehensive and continuing understanding, information, and recommendations on resources policies and programs the Nation needs.

In their campaign for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency in 1960, Senators John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson endorsed Senator Murray's proposal for a Resources Council in the same pattern as the Council of Economic Advisers.

Senator Kennedy, in his major campaign speech on resources at Billings, Mont., made it his domestic point four. In outlining a 9-point resources program, he said:

> Fourth, we will establish a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers in the Office of the President * * *. We have had many short-term limited, piecemeal studies. We have not had enough of the long-range, continuing and comprehensive surveys, determining the needs of our country, the increase in our population, the available resources and how they can be fitted together to build a strong and vital country.
>
> We need a permanent inventory of where we stand now, and where we want to be tomorrow, in water, power, timber, recreation and other resources. We need a rational schedule of action, instead of a hit-or-miss development that depends upon annual political or budgetary pressures. We need a national as well as a local or regional view, planning, for example, how we might profitably link the power systems of the Columbia and the Missouri Rivers, and decide where public and cooperative power systems require steam as well as hydro plants. I believe the time is coming in the Missouri River Basin, for example, when power user groups will operate thermal generating plants, utilizing the lignite fields of the Dakotas, Montana, and Wyoming, to supplement the hydropower of the Missouri River dams.

Mr. Kennedy discussed and advanced the Council proposal in a half dozen other speeches in terms of the resource problems most familiar to those localities.

In the period following the 1960 election, and before he took office, the President-elect initiated broad studies of the functions of the Government he would soon direct. He was urged by political economists to cut back the number of White House offices and establishments and he determined to undertake it. He called on the National Academy of Sciences for a study and report on our natural resources situation. He assigned a study and report on resources research to the Office of Science and Technology.

When the bill I have now reintroduced was brought to hearing, the Kennedy administration asked that action on it be delayed until the science agencies had reported and the administration had a clearer picture of natural needs in regard to resources. This request was respected and the bill has gone over to this time.

The reports which President Kennedy requested have been before us for several months. The National Academy of Sciences made a series of reports on different classes of resources in 1962. The Office of Science and Technology reported in May 1963.

The Office of Science and Technology gave us recommendations for research which should be undertaken on biological resources, water, land, air, and minerals. It also recommended research on the economics of resources—the role of resources in economic growth, their impact on our social and economic institutions, the efficacy of the methods and techniques with which we are approaching resource problems, the soundness of present resources policies and programs, the prospects for growth in demand on resources due both to our own population growth and international developments, prospective cost trends, and significance of various technological developments.

It outlined a whole series of important research undertakings on which there should be followup, but I doubt if there is a single Member of this body—including myself—who knows what has become of all those recommendations. I know of no progress report. I am aware that we have authorized some additional water resources research under the Anderson Research Act of 1964, and that a number of research budgets have been increased. Staff members advise me, after a brief check, that a few of the many recommendations have been partially implemented in the budgets but that 2 years after the recommendations were made it is still pretty much a hit-and-miss business, depending on whether some interested Member of Congress or official has picked up an isolated recommendation and pressed for action on it. The OST report, like so many commission reports, appears destined to fill shelf space in the libraries unless machinery is established to assure followup on it and other major studies in the resources field which have been made, filed, and forgotten in the past.

The National Academy of Sciences, in its report on renewable resources, put its finger on our needs in proposition VII—its final finding—which read:

> In view of the principles set forth in the preceding six propositions, it is evident that optimization of natural resources for human use and welfare cannot be achieved by fragmentary and sporadic attention given to isolated parts of the problem, but that the issues involved must be made the subject of a permanent, systematic process of investigation, recording and evaluation, carried on continuously in reference to the total perspective. It would appear mandatory, therefore, to entrust an independent organization with the task.

This finding, Mr. President, was the very essence of the case for a continuing Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers.

We are not going to achieve the best use of our resources by fragmentary and sporadic attention to isolated parts of the resources problem. We are fortunate that administrators and Members of Congress, in the absence of a permanent, systematic approach, have taken the leadership on some aspects. But as our population burgeons, and the pressure on our natural resources grows, we cannot and must not trust to resource crises forcing belated attention to some aspect of resource conservation and development, or to the chance of some individual interested in one or two aspects of resources problems making an appearance to stimulate action in time to avert shortages, waste, or permanent loss.

I am convinced that if President John F. Kennedy had survived to study and act upon the recommendations he got back from the two scientific agencies in regard to resources, he would have taken the initiative in urging the enactment of the resources and conservation bill. I am convinced that when the matter comes to President Lyndon Johnson's attention, he will favor moving ahead on the proposal.

We are reintroducing the bill today, Mr. President, in the conviction that there is now general agreement on the need and even urgency of creating the "permanent, continuing" center of resource leadership Senator Murray and his colleagues, Senator McGEE, Senator Engle, many others of us in the Congress, and the scientists have pointed out.

The 88th Congress is being called a variety of names. The President said when he signed the land and water conservation fund bill and the wilderness bill last fall, that if it were not famed for the tax cut, the nuclear test ban, education legislation, antipoverty measures, and the civil rights law, the 88th might be called "the Conservation Congress."

It did enact landmark conservation legislation. It passed the acts authorizing the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and a land and water conservation fund. It authorized the establishment of several new national recreation areas and Canyonlands National Park. It passed a water resources research bill. We stepped up pollution control and abatement activity. We cleared the way for high voltage transmission to link the States on the west coast. Compared to other Congresses, there is no question that the 88th was resource and conservation minded, and accomplished much more than most. It is entitled to the credit and praise it has received.

But, it can also be asked if the 88th Congress did enough. We were still dealing with resource problems in a fragmentary way. There were a number of urgent tasks which the 88th Congress left undone.

In spite of the urgency of the water supply problems in four southwestern river basins, and the Upper Missouri Basin, Congress did nothing on a bill to speed research in weather modification. The Select Committee on Water Resources recommended the development of plans by 1970 for optimum development of all river basins in the Nation. It recommended aid to States to speed their water planning. It called for a biennial assessment of water supply and needs by region so all areas would be kept aware of their situation.

The water planning bill was not passed, although we have been aware of need for such plans since the National Conservation Conference in 1908. We hope that it will pass early in this Congress.

No steps have been taken in Congress or the executive branch to provide the biennial assessment of water supply and demand by regions, a continuing, systematic oversight of that problem which some regions should be following as closely as the weather reports, because of its urgency.

The 88th Congress did nothing of significance in the mineral resources field, although there is great need for relief for some of our key mineral industries, and even greater need for expanded research into methods of exploring for mineral deposits and handling lower grade ores.

The Congress did little to speed up the programs for the national forests, or to hasten replanting of private forest lands, although that is a most critical resource area.

Chandler and Morse, authors of a study of our resource situation sponsored by Resources for the Future, found that timber products are the one major commodity for which we have to pay more, in terms of real costs, than we did back in Malthus' time. They find that it takes less input—less materials and human effort—to produce a unit of agricultural or mineral commodities than it did a century ago, when we had rich new lands and the richest ore deposits.

Timber products alone require more input now than then. We have frequent reports on the possibility of increasing timber production, reforesting idle lands, improving existing forest management and ending losses to insects, disease, and fires. But we do not follow up because we are not regularly advised where we stand. Most of us read a pamphlet on "The Program for the National Forests" 3 or 4 years ago and have dismissed the matter from our minds for a decade or until someone becomes alarmed again, because we are not effectively made aware each year that the program for the national forests is not being adequately implemented to meet future needs.

I have been advised, Mr. President, that the President's Task Force on Natural Resources and Conservation—one of the score of task forces he had studying Federal problems last fall—suggested a need for a White House center of leadership on resources.

It must, in my opinion, be a White House agency. There is such a multiplicity of bureaus and offices working on parts of our resource and conservation problem that there is no single point in Government, except the executive office, where it is possible to have an overall view. Senator ANDERSON found, in his study of water and water research problems, that at least 27 different Federal agencies deal with aspects of that one resource alone. The National Academy of Science, in its proposition VII, called for an agency apart—an independent agency.

It is the judgment of the sponsors of the Resources and Conservation Act that leaders of the principle legislative committees in the House and in the Senate which deal with resources, and there are at least four of them—on each side—Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, and Public Works—that can profitably meet together as a Select Committee on Resources and Conservation in each House once a year to go over an annual report on the subject and agree on areas of responsibility for legislative action in the various fields.

This proposal has aroused widespread public interest and support.

My own initiative in the matter is a response to discussions with at least a score of major groups in labor, agriculture, various conservation fields, and civic groups such as the League of Women Voters.

I hope and trust, Mr. President, that the measure will be enacted at an early date.

One of the great needs for better understanding of our resources and resource development opportunities is illustrated in the regional development problem which is before us right now.

Several regions of the United States have grown and withered as a result of the depletion, or original improper use, of resources.

Kentucky is suffering as a result of the decline of its coal industry.

The northern Great Lakes area is suffering from depletion of forests and high grade mineral deposits.

In the upper Great Plains—the area of my own immediate concern—we lag in economic growth partly because of a national misjudgment of the proper type of agricultural development in the area at the time of its original settlement. Homestead laws required the cultivation of lands which should not have been plowed. The great droughts and dust storms of the thirties followed, and a vast readjustment in land use—not yet completed—has had to be made.

There are alternate resource opportunities in each of these areas, and in other depressed areas. We would be much further along toward the solution of their economic problems today, and have a better basis for legislative action on depressed areas—if a Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers had been created a half dozen years ago and could advise us of national resource needs and the potentialities for resource development in each of these regions. We fortunately are aware, due to a recent survey, of pressing recreation needs.

In my opinion, the prompt establishment of the Council now could in a matter of months bring us guidance on resource needs and regional potentialities which could add tremendously to the permanent good which can be achieved by the economic opportunity program, and by any regional agencies we finally authorize.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 938) to declare a national policy on conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGovern (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LOWERING OF VOTING AGE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which seeks to extend the right to vote to citizens who have attained the age of 18.

The arguments which favor such legislation are well defined, but I believe they are more applicable today than ever before in the life of our Nation.

It seems to me that we are calling upon our young people to assimilate all the challenges of a society which grows increasingly complex.

We seek to institute programs which will encourage our young people to take a greater role in our national life.

There definitely is a trend toward young people in government and I submit that if the precious right to vote is extended to those who have reached the age of 18, we will be backing up our faith, hope, and confidence in youth in the most tangible possible form; indeed, in a manner which will encourage our youth toward a fuller participation in every aspect of American life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote in presidential elections, introduced by Mr. Cannon, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COUNCIL FOR EXPANDED TRADE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a high-level Council for Expanded Trade, composed of leading private citizens from the business, labor, and academic communities, to advise Congress and the President of the extent to which, and the methods by which, trade in nonstrategic goods and services between the United States and countries within the Communist bloc can profitably be expanded in furtherance of the national interest.

The proposal embodied in this resolution presents a natural and logical step in the evolution of our policies toward trade with the bloc countries. "History is again on the march in Eastern Europe," President Johnson has told us, "and on the march toward increased freedom. These people—and some of their rulers—long for deeper and steadier and more natural relations with the West. We understand this longing, and we intend to respond to it in every way open to us."

The President set forth our national policy in bold and challenging terms:

> We will welcome evidence of genuine willingness on the part of Eastern European governments to cooperate with the U.S. Government in joint endeavors. We will reject no such overtures out of hand. We will judge them in terms of the true interests of our own people and the people of these countries. We wish to build new bridges to Eastern Europe—bridges of ideas, education, culture, trade, technical cooperation, and mutual understanding for world peace and prosperity.

This policy reflects the growth of a broad national consensus that vigorous—if prudent—trade with those Communist states, which neither threaten us nor make war on our allies, serves our greater national interest. It is a consensus which is embraced, not only by traditional free traders, but by such advocates of the conservative viewpoint as the Wall Street Journal and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. As William S. White has said:

> Trade is the best weapon of the true conservative, and the alternative to the ultimate weapon nobody wants to use, the weapon of war.

Of 125 leading American businessmen polled by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last summer, no fewer than 105 spoke out in favor of expanded U.S. trade with Eastern Europe.

Then, late last fall, American business leaders representing 63 major manufacturing corporations met in Moscow with Soviet trading officials in extensive exchanges of views on trade potential. Upon their return to the United States, they reported their conclusions to the President. They, too, pressed for the broadening of commercial channels between East and West.

In the past, business leaders and Government officials have each tended to let the other take the lead in urging innovations in our trade policies toward the bloc countries. As a result, businessmen in general remain confused and uncertain of the guidelines of national trade policy, while the Government is unable to grasp the commercial realities involved in the pursuit of expanded trade with the East. What should be a great national debate is too often obscured by myth and misconception. Before we will be able to establish a rational exchange of goods and services with the bloc countries, we must establish a rational machinery for the exchange of ideas, experience, and fact between our own business and Government.

Thus President Johnson warmly welcomed the opportunity to exchange views with the businessmen returned from Moscow. The Council on Expanded Trade, which I propose, is designed to insure that such exchanges continue on a permanent, comprehensive, and orderly basis.

The Council would reach out into the private sector to enlist the services of "citizens of outstanding qualifications" from "business, agriculture, labor, the academic community, and nonprofit organizations concerned with matters of world trade." Directed to conduct continuing studies "with a view to determining the extent to which and the methods by which trade between the United States and countries within the Communist bloc can be expanded in furtherance of the national interest," the Council would be expected to pursue many of the practical commercial issues and unanswered questions in East-U.S. trade.

Once we have set out upon a course of expanded trade with the East, how do we go about it? Are U.S. firms reluctant to engage in East-West trade? If so, why? Can the Council recommend ways to encourage U.S. businessmen to engage in active pursuit of eastern markets?

What can we sell the Hungarians? What can we buy from the Rumanians? Do Russian innovations in electronic medical technology have any potential market in this country?

What can we learn from the experience of the West Europeans in trading with the East? Have they developed improved operational techniques which we can profitably accept or adopt?

Can our Commerce Department-sponsored export expansion activities fruitfully be expanded to Eastern Europe? Is there a potential return for trade fairs, trade missions, the assignment of commercial attachés to the capitals of Eastern Europe?

Would it be possible to achieve a larger volume of trade in goods and services without the need for long-term credit?

How do private firms learn to deal with state trading agencies? How are the divergent commercial practices and procedures prevalent in bloc countries to be harmonized with standard practices prevailing in the United States? The Council might explore the proposal to establish a national clearinghouse to inform and assist firms interested in entering the Eastern European markets.

Perhaps, as many businessmen have suggested, we need to consider the establishment of a quasi-governmental trade association to negotiate general terms and conditions with the state trading agencies, including such critical items as arbitration, patent and license protection, terms of payment and guarantees.

Expanded trade, no matter who our trading partner, serves our economic self-interest. More than that, expansion of trade with the Communist bloc serves our strategic self-interest in building a bridge, not only of goods, but of ideas to the peoples of Eastern Europe. I believe that the Council for Expanded Trade would be the keystone of such a bridge and that we shall soon begin to see how relatively independent a satellite nation can become when all roads and all bridges no longer lead to and from Moscow.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) to develop proposals for the expansion of trade by the establishment of a high-level Advisory Council, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. J. Res. 36

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a council to be known as the Council for Expanded Trade (hereinafter referred to as the "Council").

(b) The Council shall be composed of fifteen members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Persons appointed to the Council shall be private citizens of outstanding qualifications, including persons whose experience has been closely identified with business, agriculture, labor, the academic community, and nonprofit organizations concerned with matters of world trade.

(c) The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman. A majority of the members of the Council in office shall constitute a quorum, but the Council may function notwithstanding vacancies.

Sec. 2. (a) The Council shall conduct continuing studies with a view to determining the extent to which and the methods by which trade in nonstrategic goods and services between the United States and countries within the Communist bloc can be expanded in furtherance of the national interest.

(b) The Council shall report its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress annually, and at such other times as it deems advisable.

Sec. 3. (a) The Council may, in carrying out this joint resolution, sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, administer such oaths, procure such printing and binding, and make such expenditures as it deems advisable. Any member of the Council may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Council.

(b) The Council shall have the power to appoint an executive director and such other personnel as it deems advisable, and to fix the compensation of such personnel in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Council may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(c) The Council is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Federal Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this joint resolution; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Council, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

Sec. 4. Members of the Council shall receive $75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Council, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STUDY OF LOCAL AIRLINE SERVICES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of Senators Nelson, McCarthy, Mondale, Hart, McIntyre, McGovern, Long of Missouri, Boggs, Aiken, Cooper, Morton, and Hartke I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution authorizing a thorough review by the Committee on Commerce of the national needs for local airline service. The resolution expresses the sense of the Senate that pending the outcome of the review air service shall be maintained to all points now served.

This resolution grows out of complaints from cities, States, and national organizations, such as the Local Airline Service Action Committee, that local airline service is inadequate. Furthermore, cases before the Civil Aeronautics Board threaten the discontinuance of service to 100 localities of some 540 now served.

The concept of a truly national local air transportation system appears endangered by the possibility that service will be discontinued at almost one-fifth of the 540 air service points.

This threat of curtailed service is based on two policies now apparently guiding the Civil Aeronautics Board.

One is the so-called use-it-or-lose-it policy, whereby a community can be cut off from local airline service if it has less than five airplane passengers daily.

More than 80 of the communities facing loss of service are victims of this policy. Many other cities are uncomfortably close to this limit and may soon find themselves in the same situation. Almost 60 cities enplane only between 5 and 7 passengers a day.

The communities losing service under this policy have hopes of generating greater use of airline service and ask merely for the chance to do so.

Another is the "regional airport" policy adopted jointly by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency, whereby efforts are being made to consolidate airline service at airports which serve two or more cities each. In some cases, under this policy, cities now served by nearby fields would be as far as 50 miles from the proposed regional airports.

There is a real danger that this policy will decrease airline use even further. A study of the experience of a "feeder" airline in my State, conducted by the Wisconsin attorney general's office, shows that airline use declines as the ground distance to the airport increases. The study showed that as the distance reached 30 miles, use declined to 35 percent and at 50 miles it fell to 20 percent.

These 100 communities, and the Federal Government itself, have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to provide adequate airport facilities with the implied promise, both from the airlines and the Federal Government, that they would receive adequate airline service.

In my State recently, the Federal Aviation Agency joined with a community to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to construct an airport facility for use by a "feeder" airline, only to find that the Civil Aeronautics Board later authorized the "feeder" line to discontinue service.

How often is this happening elsewhere? The Congress should know. When two arms of the Federal Government are working at such obvious cross-purposes and creating such an extravagant waste, the need for review is apparent.

The expenditures made by local communities in these cases were made not as a matter of civic pride, but in recognition of the fact that cities with good transport facilities are at a great advantage in gaining and holding business and industries. Those without it are at a great disadvantage.

Many of the cities involved have lived on farm income and are dependent on air transportation to develop new industries. Some of these cities are in depressed areas where farming is no longer profitable, or where timber or mineral resources are now depleted, and are seeking to attract industry to bolster their economies. The discontinuance of air service may deal these aspirations a crushing blow and accelerate the economic decline of these communities.

The hearings before the Civil Aeronautics Board on the service cuts are replete with just such testimony. The Board itself is split on the matter and often decided such cases by a 3 to 2 vote.

The Federal Aviation Act was adopted to promote "an air tranportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States."

I believe that the sense of Congress has been that smaller and medium-sized cities require for their economic development air service to major trade centers.

This is why Congress has authorized the local airline system for which 13 local airline companies are paid $65 to $70 million a year in Federal subsidies.

Because this is a subsidized program and the outlay of Federal funds is substantial, a Senate study is in order to determine if the taxpayer's dollars are being used as efficiently as possible within the framework of the goals of the program.

In view of this, and because the Civil Aeronautics Board itself is split on the question, I think a review by the Commerce Committee would be appropriate. This is especially true since the Federal Aviation Agency and local communities have apparently spent huge sums on airport facilities one year only to find the Civil Aeronautics Board directing discontinuance of service the next. This is a transparent waste of millions of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be allowed to be on the desk through Friday, February 5, for additional sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. Res. 69

Whereas the Federal Aviation Act recognizes that air transport is essential to economic progress, and hundreds of communities, with or without aid under the Federal Airport Act, have financed airports to keep their place in a growing nation; and

Whereas complaints as to lack of adequate airline service have been sent to Congress; and

Whereas cases before the Civil Aeronautics Board threaten the discontinuance of airline service at more than 100 points and there is narrow division within the Board between a policy of restriction and one of expanding service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce shall make a thorough review of the needs of airline service, to set a progressive national policy and recommend any necessary legislation; and

That it is the sense of the Senate that, pending the outcome of such review, airline service be maintained to all points now served, on a frequency not less than at present.

AMENDMENT OF CLEAN AIR ACT—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 13)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 306) to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling and emission of pollutants from gasoline-powered or diesel-powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF EXPIRATION DATE OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 14)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 512) to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 15)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 596) to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT, TO PROVIDE FOR A PROGRAM OF GRANTS FOR ADEQUATE MEDICAL LIBRARY SERVICES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 16)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 597) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO SUPPLEMENTAL AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 2, after line 3 after the amount, insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That not more than $220,000 of the funds appropriated for 'Salaries and Expenses, Research, Agricultural Research Service' in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1965 (78 Stat. 862), shall be available until expended, without regard to any limitations included in that Act, for alterations necessary in connection with the installation of temperature and humidity control equipment for the Metabolism and Radiation Laboratory, Fargo, North Dakota."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment (No. 17), intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.J. Res. 234) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 2, after line 3, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under Public Law 88–573, approved September 2, 1964, shall be used to formulate or administer a program to eliminate agricultural research stations or lines of research until after the Congress has considered and acted upon such plans for the elimination of research in its regular consideration of the research appropriation estimates for fiscal 1966."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment (No. 18), intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, do the votes on the notices which have just been sent up by the order of the Committee on Appropriations require a two-thirds vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They do require a two-thirds vote.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR TO S. 296

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added to S. 296, a bill which I introduced, seeking to bring about the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF SENATE BILL 400

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 400) to authorize assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act for certain additional areas which has sustained, or are about to sustain, sudden and severe economic hardship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and resolution:

Authority of January 19, 1965:

S. 600. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education: Senators Bartlett, Brewster, Douglas, Fong, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Kennedy of New York, Long of Missouri, McCarthy, McGovern, Mondale, Moss, Muskie, Neuberger, Proxmire, Ribicoff, and Williams of New Jersey.

S. 610. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of the Chief Justice of the United States and of Associate Justices of the Supreme Court: Senators Church, Douglas, and Hart.

Authority of January 26, 1965:

S. Res. 62. Resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of material from speeches in the United States by Mr. Churchill: Senators Byrd of Virginia, Fannin, Kuchel, Long of Missouri, and Prouty.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Karsten of Missouri, Mr. Hays of Ohio, and Mr. Cunningham of Nebraska as members of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87–364, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Gallagher of New Jersey, and Mr. Frelinghuysen of New Jersey as members of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 16 United States Code 715a, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Karsten of Missouri, and Mr. Conte of Massachusetts as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 16 United States Code 513, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Colmer of Mississippi, and Mr. Saylor of Pennsylvania as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88–606, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Aspinall, of Colorado, Mr. O'Brien, of New York, Mr. White of Idaho, Mr. Saylor, of Pennsylvania, Mr. Burton, of Utah, and Mr. Morton, of Maryland, as members of the Public Land Law Review Commission, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87–586, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Matthews, of Florida, and Mr. Cramer, of Florida, as members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2(b), Public Law 88–271, the Speaker had appointed Mr. O'Brien, of New York, and Mr. Morton, of Maryland, as members of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88–630, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Morris, of New Mexico, Mr. Rivers of Alaska, Mr. Berry, of South Dakota, and Mr. Skubitz, of Kansas, as members of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Carey of New York, and Mr. Nelsen of Minnesota as members of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Nix of Pennsylvania, Mr. McDowell of Delaware, Mr. Wright of Texas, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Cameron of California, Mr. Slack of West Virginia, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Derwinski of Illinois, Mr. Springer of Illinois, Mr. Morse of Massachusetts, Mr. Harvey of Michigan, and Mr. Bell of California as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Mexico from February 11 to 18, 1965, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Celler of New York, Mr. Feighan of Ohio, Mr. Chelf of Kentucky, Mr. Poff of Virginia, and Mr. Moore of West Virginia as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 85–874, as amended, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Wright of Texas, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, and Mrs. Reid of Illinois as members ex officio of the board of trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title 6, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Mills of Arkansas, Mr. King of California, Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin, Mr. Mahon of Texas, Mr. Thomas of Texas, and Mr. Bow of Ohio as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures, on the part of the House.

TRIBUTE TO SUMNER SEWALL, FORMER GOVERNOR OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, one of Maine's most illustrious sons has passed away—Sumner Sewall—who was a good friend of mine. He was a statesman of many accomplishments, having served two terms as Governor of Maine and having served in both houses of the Maine State Legislature.

He was a military man of great distinction as a World War I "ace" and as a World War II military governor in occupied Germany. He was a business leader, especially in the establishment of commercial airlines.

But I think what I shall always remember most about Sumner Sewall was the manner in which he conducted himself in the 1948 Republican senatorial primary. He waged one of the cleanest, fairest and most ethical campaigns I have every experienced. He never stooped to smearing or to personal attacks. He was never negative—always positive. He was never unkind—always considerate and pleasant.

The beloved ones that he has left behind have much of which to be very proud. For he gave of himself to others—and for his kindly life this has been a better world.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials and press reports on the Honorable Sumner Sewall be incorporated in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials and press reports were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Jan. 27, 1965]

Ex-Governor Sewall's Funeral To Be Held on Thursday

Bath.—Maine mourned Tuesday its World War II Governor—Sumner Sewall, a flying ace of World War I and a pioneer in developing commercial aviation in the United States.

In Augusta, where he sat as chief executive from 1941 to 1945, the House and Senate extolled their alumnus—he served in both branches—as one of the most "colorful, vigorous, friendly and effective" leaders the State ever had.

Sewall died unexpectedly of heart disease in his Bath home Monday night. He was 67.

His funeral will be at 3 p.m. Thursday in Christ Episcopal Church in Bath.

HELPED FOUND PAA

Gov. John H. Reed said Sewall's vigorous leadership long will be remembered.

"As a wartime Governor," Reed said, "Mr. Sewall was called upon to discharge a heavy burden of responsibility, which he did in an outstanding manner * * *."

As a pilot in the famed 95th Pursuit Squadron in the first world conflict, Sewall was credited with downing seven German planes and observation balloons.

He and Juan Trippe, who later founded the Pan American Airways system, organized Colonial Air Transport, the first Boston-New York airline. Sewall, as its traffic manager, sold the Nation's first commercial passenger ticket.

TWO TERMS AS GOVERNOR

Later he became a director of United Airlines and still later president of American Overseas Airlines.

After his two terms as Governor, he served a year as U.S. military governor of the German state of Wuerttemberg-Baden, then made an unsuccessful try, in 1948, for Republican nomination to the U.S. Senate.

Since then he had devoted himself to business affairs, primarily the presidency of the Bath National Bank.

Sewall leaves his widow, Elena; four children, Nicholas of Bath, David, who is traveling in Europe, Mrs. William Mackey of Grosse Pointe, Mich., and Mrs. Robert Charles of Washington, D.C., and two sisters, Mrs. John K. Jayne of New Canaan, Conn., and Mrs. Fred Hector of Fargo, N. Dak.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Jan. 29, 1965]

Sumner Sewall, Governor and Air Pioneer, Gave Much to His State

Sumner Sewall, whose death this week the State mourns, was as genuinely a part of Maine as its lakes and mountains and the sturdy ships his family built and sailed to all parts of the world.

When only 18 and still in Harvard, he left to join a corps of U.S. ambulance drivers on the western front of World War I. When this country came in, the young Sewall turned to flying, and became a foremost American ace, winning numerous decorations.

Once the fighting was over he joined Juan Trippe, another aviation pioneer who later organized Pan American Airways, to establish Colonial Air Lines and fly the first regular airmail service between Boston and New York.

But Maine remembers him best as its wartime Republican Governor—World War II, that is—a post he filled with vigor and honor in the 1941–45 period. Earlier he had been elected from his native city of Bath to both the Maine House and Senate. After the war he accepted an appointment to be military governor of the State of Wuerttemberg in defeated Germany, and in 1948 made his final and this time unsuccessful bid for public office.

In whatever field he chose, his record did him honor; his liking for people, coupled with a temperament that was rarely anything but good natured and progressive, made him innumerable friends. With them, we lament the loss of a good man who was good for Maine.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, Jan. 28, 1965]

Death Ends a Distinguished Career

Sumner Sewall of the famed Bath shipbuilding family served his Nation and State well.

In World War I, he went overseas with a college ambulance unit when he was 19 years old. Upon U.S. entry into the war, he became an American aviator and an ace. He downed nine enemy planes and observation balloons and won decorations from the Governments of France and Belgium as well as the United States. He later became a pioneer in the development of commercial aviation.

Maine citizens remember him best as their Governor during World War II. He worked long hours at the statehouse and kept his staff busy. He was given extensive emergency powers but never abused them and constantly reminded his associates that the powers were given only to help the war effort. He served two terms, 1941–45, but rejected urgings to run for a third term although his reelection seemed assured.

Failing to win nomination for a U.S. Senate seat in 1948, Sewall busied himself with banking and other affairs in private life and remained active until stricken Monday with a fatal heart attack at the age of 67.

His was an active career made notable by distinguished public service. The tributes accorded him were well deserved.

EARTHQUAKE PREDICTION: A POSSIBILITY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, man and his science have a very long way to go before an adequate earthquake warning system is devised.

This does not mean, however, that interesting and important work is not now being undertaken. The Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense is now building a most promising, interesting and complex installation centering on Miles City, Mont., the large aperture seismic array (LASA).

This installation has developed from our Government's intensive efforts to improve its capabilities in detecting and identifying underground nuclear explosions. These explosions are detected by means of seismographic measurements with equipment similar to that used in the detection of earthquakes. In essence, LASA will be a superlarge seismograph taking measurements from what is in effect a sounding board several hundred miles in diameter. According to the Defense Department, this sounding board—"aperture array"—acting as a directional antenna will perhaps, with the use of modern computers, make possible a type of warning system for tsunami waves caused by the earthquake. The array will be completed by June 1965, and the data from it should be available by 1966.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from Director R. L. Sproull of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY,
Washington D.C., January 25, 1965.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: It was a pleasure to talk with you recently about possible ARPA projects in your State. As I mentioned then, one of our projects is perhaps the most promising new scientific facility in many years for the study of earthquakes. It is the large aperture seismic array (LASA) that ARPA is building in Montana, with the Air Force Technical Applications Center and Lincoln Laboratory as agents and technical helpers.

The prime purpose of this array is an experiment in the detection and identification of underground nuclear explosions from great distances. "Identification" means the distinguishing of a signal produced by a nuclear explosion from the common, background, "noise" signals that are always coming from small earthquakes all over the world. This primary purpose is in keeping with ARPA's project VELA, the research and development for the detection and identification of nuclear explosions.

However, this facility will also be a significant new instrument for the study of earthquakes. It would be rash indeed to predict just what its contribution will be to the study of earthquakes, but it is easy and safe to predict that it will make an important contribution.

Last year ARPA put together data from its seismological research observatories and from linear arrays established by the United Kingdom's Atomic Energy Authority and concluded that a major improvement could be made. Our basic conclusion was that a very large aperture array, covering several hundred miles by several hundred miles, may possibly improve underground nuclear test detection capabilities by a sizable factor. It is by no means obvious that just a "more and bigger" array will do this; the conclusion is based on a rather sophisticated study of the properties of the signal and the properties of the noise ("coherence lengths").

The experimental array now being built in Montana is described schematically in enclosure No. 1; most of this illustration has to do with an individual piece ("subarray cluster"), but at the left of this chart is a diagram on a very much smaller scale of the extent of the array. Enclosure No. 2 locates the array on the map of Montana. Enclosure No. 3 gives a schematic of some of the data processing. This array will act analogously to a very large directional antenna, such as used in radar. The data processing equipment will permit "pointing" the array at various regions of the earth, and for example, concentrating its attention on a single suspicious event or on an earthquake, rejecting noise from other areas of the world. Ultimately, the data will be processed in real time (not just stored on tape and aanlyzed at leisure), and therefore it may be possible to study earthquake activity in selected areas of the globe in great detail continuously. For example, concentrations on low level earthquake activity in selected regions near the seashore could conceivably lead to early information that an earthquake had occurred in a region where tsunamis have been known to be generated. Such information could, if the development is successful, be available in time to provide assistance to a warning system. The elapsed time between the event and its actual location might be sufficiently short to permit identification of possible areas of tsunami damage in time to evacuate the population. I should repeat, however, that so far this is all speculation, and that we are looking forward anxiously to the data from this new device to tell us just what its capabilities are.

Incidentally, ARPA supports some research work at the University of Alaska, and the professor of seismology there is, I believe, well aware of the LASA project.

The construction and installation of this large array is expected to be completed in June 1965. Estimates of its performance are expected by the fall of this year, and evaluation using all data channels will be completed (we hope) by January 1966.

Sincerely,

R. L. SPROULL,
Director.

FOR THE FISHERMEN

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I was extremely pleased to learn that on Monday, January 25, the Department of the Interior conducted the first hearing on an application for a subsidy under Public Law 88–498, the "U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act." This act, passed by the last Congress, will be of great value in the vital, much needed revitalization of our fishing fleet.

This act was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the committee responsible for the bill's passage, and cosponsored by myself. The late Senator from the State of California, Mr. Engle, and the distinguished Senators from the State of Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. SALTONSTALL] were also cosponsors. In fact, it is interesting to note that the first applicant for a subsidy is from the great fishing State of Massachusetts.

The first vessel to be constructed under this act will be owned by the Pat San-Marie, Inc., of New Bedford. The vessel will be steel hulled and approximately 30 feet longer than the present average boat length in the New Bedford fleet. Her range will be 2,800 miles, or more than twice that of existent boats in this fleet, and her newly developed gear will include larger winches, specially designed gallows frames, enclosed work spaces, and can readily be converted from the scallop fishery into the groundfish fishery. In addition, the vessel is designed with a stern ramp for easier handling of the trawling gear—an innovation that both the Russians and the Japanese have used to advantage for many years.

This vessel construction program was designed for the fishermen. The Congress has insisted that redtape be kept to a minimum. The preliminary application, used by the Secretary of the Interior to determine eligibility is not complicated. A qualified settlement broker can assist the vessel owner in its preparation, for the cost of perhaps $15. The preliminary plans for the vessel are usually drawn up without cost by a naval architect, and the total cost of the final specifications are included in the subsidy payment. The easy procedure should eliminate the necessity of protracted legal sessions, and should serve to increase the interest of the fishermen themselves in the improvement of fleet and fishing conditions.

As established by the Secretary of the Interior, an applicant for this subsidy must meet several requirements: The vessel itself must be suitable for use in the fishery for which it is designed; suitable for use by the United States for national defense; and suitable for the upgrading of the U.S. fishing fleet.

In addition, the vessel must be of advance design, which will enable it to operate in expanded areas; be equipped with newly developed gear, defined as the most modern gear available at the time of construction; and must not operate in a fishery where the operation would cause economic hardship to efficient vessel operators presently in that fishery. It is for this last reason that a hearing is to be scheduled prior to the granting of a subsidy to insure that no unfair advantage is created. As far as the applicant is concerned, he must possess the ability, experience, and resources necessary to maintain and operate the proposed vessel in an efficient manner. Further, the applicant is restricted to employing only citizens of the United States or aliens legally living here.

This act provides for a fishing vessel construction differential subsidy which amends the act of June 12, 1960—Public Law 86-516. The act increases the maximum percent of subsidy from 33⅓ to 50, increases the maximum amount of annual Federal funds available from $2½ to $10 million, and extends the program to June 30, 1972, as well as providing certain technical amendments.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to pay the difference between the cost of construction in domestic and foreign shipyards provided that this difference is less than 50 percent of the vessel's initial cost. The determination of the foreign cost is to be made by the Maritime Administrator.

We are all aware that in the shipyards of certain foreign nations, the cost of building fishing vessels is 40 to 50 percent lower than in American yards, yet our laws prevent American fishermen from purchasing these cheaper vessels for use in domestic fisheries. Not only must our fishermen purchase more expensive vessels, they must also compete on the market with imports of fishery products produced at much lower cost. The Fishing Fleet Improvement Act will at least remove the inequity caused by the high cost of American-made boats.

I applaud the wisdom of the 88th Congress in passing this act, and I look to the future for further development of the Nation's fisheries.

THE 119TH ANNIVERSARY OF CITY OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on this day, February 1, 1965, Milwaukee, Wis., officially celebrates her 119th anniversary as a city. It is one of the most significant birthdays in the long and splendid history of that community, for today Milwaukee becomes the first major American city to adopt a community renewal plan, perhaps the boldest new approach toward achieving planned, long-range development of cities through establishing a lasting partnership between local and Federal Government.

Milwaukee Mayor Henry W. Maier signs into law today a document which may very well set a pattern for future development of American cities. This plan provides for a comprehensive, long-range, fiscally sound method of preventing both residential and nonresidential blight; of redeveloping areas in which conservation is not feasible; of revitalizing Milwaukee's economically important downtown; of efficiently and effectively utilizing all Milwaukee's community resources and of increasing the city's tax base while improving the overall physical quality of the community.

I have known Mayor Maier for many years. He was a colleague of mine in State government when I was Governor of Wisconsin. He has long been recognized as a keen student of urban affairs—both in Milwaukee and nationally, as his election as president of the National League of Cities will attest to.

He took office as mayor in 1960 with a concept for the total development of his community which has become known as the Milwaukee idea.

This concept called for a comprehensive program for dealing with urban problems in the three interrelated areas of physical blight, economic obsolescence and human waste.

In the 5 years since he took office, Mayor Maier has done much to make the Milwaukee idea into an ideal. He established a pioneer economic development unit in his office which has made great advances in strengthening the business and industrial climate in his community. He established a social development commission which has made Milwaukee a leader in implementing the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

And today his city takes a giant stride in making the Milwaukee idea a precedent for development for other cities to follow—today he completes the cycle by officially adopting for his city the blueprint for long-range development which is the community renewal program.

On this occasion, Mr. President, I wish to commend Milwaukee for the progress she has made in providing a mechanism for solving the pressing problems of growth and change which beset that city, in common with other great cities of the Nation.

Mayor Maier has expressed his views on a strategy of total development for his city in an article. In view of the progress evidenced by Milwaukee today, I believe that excerpts from this article are very significant today and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

MAYOR'S PLAN FOR CITY PROGRESS

(The need for overall, step by step development of Milwaukee on a broad physical, economic, and social basis is stated by Mayor Henry Maier in the following article which he wrote for the Milwaukee Journal.)

Milwaukee's renaissance is well underway, but to bring it into full bloom Milwaukee must support an all-out plan of progress and improvement—a strategy of total development.

WHAT ABOUT FUTURE?

Now, while the spirit of renaissance is on the rise in the city, is a good time to think in terms of the design of the broad programs (in contrast with a specific project) that will not only serve the present generation but also present the pattern for a dynamic city in generations to come. What is the need for broad programs?

Why not let things go on as they have in the past? We have an enviable reputation for good housekeeping in government; we have streets so clean by contrast with other large cities that visitors commend us; we have a citizenry noted for its integrity. People say that this is a fine community in which to bring up children.

So why rock the boat when the passengers and the crew feel that the good ship Milwaukee is pursuing a steady course?

The best place to look for the answer is on the ship's bridge. Here signals have been arriving that other large urban ships of similar age are not in good shape. There is frantic activity on them because they are in more trouble than Milwaukee.

COMPLEX ORGANISM

Warning signals from our own ship indicate that some of the machinery is not functioning as well as it could, that some parts are in need of replacement, that some of the crew are not getting along as well as they might, that some of the navigators disagree about the course that has been plotted.

Now if Milwaukee were as simply organized as a real ship we could take her into port and get her overhauled. Instead, we are speaking of a complex organism—metropolitan Milwaukee.

Some see a big city as an organization for service to produce roads, sewers, street lights, snow removal, refuse disposal and the like.

Some who have fled it see it as a place of drabness and noise, but as a place of income. But some see it as home, and one they like in its variety.

ETHNIC ORIGINS DIFFER

It is a galaxy of people of different ethnic origins, and organizations—churches, labor unions, businesses, schools, welfare societies, manufacturing companies and others.

And when you are in the middle of all this it is somewhat like being in the middle of the forest: Unless you climb the tallest tree you can't take a look at the whole of it. Even then you need a powerful set of binoculars to see the necessary detail and a microscope to see invisible forces at work.

For invisible to the naked public eye is a disease in the public body that causes lassitude, immobility and inability to focus attention. Unless this disease is conquered, decay will set in, and every organ of the metropolitan area will be affected. Fortunately, unlike many other central cities, Milwaukee has experienced only the first symptoms.

NEED PRIORITIES

The enlightened planner says that the remedy is a vague thing called "comprehensive planning." And the political scientist talks about forms of government. A disgusted citizen says, "Those guys at city hall ought to get together."

Each of these answers may be involved in the cure, but none recognizes the real cause of the ailment.

The truth is this: This illness that could destroy the central city is caused by deficiencies in the system of making decisions. The system has failed in solving the main problem—the problem of establishing priorities for coordinated action on the broad economic, social and physical fronts.

The question comes right down to this: What should we do to add to the sureness of our decisions, to bring about the understanding that eliminates delay, and to condition our citizens and our decisionmakers to rational processes in government?

EMPHASIZES POINTS

My answer to this is that our strategy for development must emphasize:

A step-by-step approach to change that will reduce fear of change.

A formal process that will identify problems, assemble facts concerning them, differentiate between facts and assumptions in planning, formulate alternatives and calculate consequences.

Coordination of individual and group efforts.

Our strategy must make the foes of progress contend with logic. It must provide a better basis for resolving conflict. It must confront special interest groups with surer public policy in terms of priorities that serve broad public purposes.

Milwaukee's development program is made necessary by changes that inevitably overtake a city. Neighborhoods seemingly change overnight; or perhaps it is simply that people wake up one morning and suddenly become conscious of the accumulated change. Old industries become obsolete, the city must compete for new industries to replace them. Traffic is no longer a problem of a single street but of complicated patterns of urban highways with the attendant problems of city parking.

PROBLEMS OF GROWTH

And a development program for Milwaukee must consider the problems of growth as well as change. Few other older cities have Milwaukee's growth potential. Large acreages remain that can be developed on an orderly basis if our strategy for development includes a land bank reserved for future economic development, the proper development of our industrially zoned vacant land and the future use of the redevelopment tool for land clearance.

With the challenges of both change and growth before it, Milwaukee faces its decisions on development problems. How shall we proceed?

First, decisions in government move from level to level, or from branch to branch. To be accepted they must be understood, and they must not stimulate too large a fear of change. As the decisions move they must embrace acceptable steps resembling evolution. Revolutionary proposals simply cause explosions without results. This may be a sad revelation to the impatient, but it is a basic truth. So a step-by-step approach to change must be used.

LAID GROUNDWORK

An example of this process was seen in the creation of the department of city development, the first major reorganization in city government in decades. It was on the face of it accomplished in record time. But much consent was negotiated before it was finally a legal entity. And when the idea for the department was presented to the common council, it was not an all encompassing reorganization that called for the abolishment and the recreation of all existing apparatus in the field. It was presented as the longest acceptable step that could be taken without stimulating so much opposition that it would have been delayed interminably or killed. It laid the groundwork for the next steps.

Second, decisionmaking involves a choice in terms of how we use our resources. Today in our complex urban society when the choices are complex the old process of choice by intuition will not serve. A formalized process is needed. Problem areas must be identified, facts assembled, assumptions and facts disengaged (an amazingly difficult feat for some people whose credentials would indicate that they could do this with ease), assumptions laid out, alternatives selected and consequences calculated. This process enables the decision to stand well in the face of attack. It considers the fact that we must base our policy decisions on careful analysis.

ANSWER DIFFERS

What organization can best coordinate the many individual and group efforts, gather the facts, set the goals and priorities, and supply the creative inventiveness that is necessary for future decision? The answer differs according to whether the problem is physical, economic, or social in nature.

The department of city development was organized to attack our city's physical problems as a first step in the strategy. Organizing the division of economic development in the mayor's office is the first organizational attack on our economic problems. The newly organized commission for social development, recognizing that an organization including various governmental and private agencies is needed here, is a first step to attack our social problems on a broad front.

Let us take the community renewal program as a sphere of decisionmaking within the organizational framework of the department of city development. This is a gigantic effort to lay down the strategy for the future physical improvement, renewal, and development of Milwaukee's physical plant—yet no program is more misunderstood or less understood. Above all, it is an effort to lay down priorities for action in terms of a realistic total perspective. It is the basis for the step-by-step decisions of the future. It is planning for a program of action—action based upon calculated decisions, based upon alternative use of resources and the practicalities of development within our resources.

MUST DEVELOP APPROACH

The commission for social development must develop an approach that enables it to set priorities in terms of developing our human resources.

It may be that the areas laid down by the community renewal program will be used by the commission for social development to construct social profiles for the areas including such things as unemployment rates, spending habits, public assistance statistics, crime incidence, and so on.

Thus, the community renewal program may well provide the bridge between programs of physical and social development. Simultaneously, a pattern of economic development will be nearing completion. Thus, a pattern of total development begins to emerge that automatically begins to integrate itself.

The division of economic development has the job of formulating specific programs and recommending municipal policies which will advance Milwaukee toward the overall goal of economic development.

To succeed, the division must look to the universities which in cooperation with civic and labor groups must produce an economic base analysis which will show the strengths and weaknesses of our local economy, reveal the interrelationships of our basic industries so that future programs can be aimed at those industries which have a potential in our city, provide a basis for a realistic decision for city capital investment designed to strengthen our economic base and give us a general insight into where our economy is likely to go.

NEED FINANCIAL PLAN

Still another decision must be made after the previous operations—economic, social, and physical—are fully planned and programed. This pertains to a long-term financial plan.

There must be injected into the decisionmaking processes an increasing awareness of the effect of the State and Federal Government upon the financial resources of the local government. Our local resources are seriously affected by the manner in which the State government taxes and distributes these taxes.

These organizations and programs—physical, economic, social, and financial—will involve the total community: Public bodies, private agencies, universities, social agencies, all citizens.

This plan for progress, this Milwaukee idea, will be criticized at first for moving slowly. In reality, it is the only shortcut to total development.

By using this plan for progress, Milwaukee will have in readiness the means to meet the challenges of the future.

FRANK HEWLETT—REPORTER

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, almost every day for the last 14 years my staff and I have heard the Salt Lake Tribune's Frank Hewlett ask "Got any news for me today?"

Of course, Washington, serving as ex-officio capital of the world, has thousands of newspaper reporters listed in its directories. However, few have the background and the experiences of Frank Hewlett, who has covered everything from World War II in the Pacific to the smallest of reclamation projects in the West.

Sandor S. Klein, editor of the Boise Statesman, has written an excellent column on Mr. Hewlett, and has related some of those war experiences. Because of his modesty, few in the Capital know of them. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this well-earned tribute be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman, Jan. 17, 1965]

REPORTER'S NOTEBOOK

(By Sandor S. Klein)

One of my good friends in Washington is a reporter named Frank Hewlett. He is correspondent for several western newspapers. If you see a blur and flying coattails, you can pretty well bet it's Hewlett because he's always in a hurry.

Under ordinary circumstances, Hewlett is a pretty gentle fellow. But he can scrap, if he must, to get the news.

He was a correspondent for the United Press International in Manila when the Japanese attacked in World War II. With the Japanese threatening to cut off Manila, Hewlett said his farewells to his wife and in a borrowed car raced to beat the Japanese to the last road open to the Bataan Peninsula. He just made it, too, the last American correspondent out of Manila.

During the next 3½ months he lived with the heroic last-ditch defenders on Bataan and Corregidor. Joe Alex Morris, who was United Press foreign editor at the time, later recounted Hewlett's experiences in a book about the UP called "Deadline Every Minute."

During his stay with the isolated troops, Hewlett filed stories day after day about the heroic but doomed Americans. But he complained to his colleagues that he was getting no guidance from the UP's New York headquarters on coverage. The fact was that none of New York's messages had got through to him but one. It was a message from the accounting department asking:

"What shall we do with your paycheck?"

This irked Hewlett no end and he finally sent this reply, intended to be sarcastic:

"Hell, why don't you buy Liberty Bonds?"

As the end approached at Corregidor, Hewlett learned that a badly damaged trainer plane was being patched up. Under orders from the military command, Hewlett was ordered to leave on the plane and to carry out a sackful of Army intelligence records. The plane managed to escape Japanese gunfire on the takeoff but when it landed on the Philippine Island of Panay it collapsed gently after touching down. It looked for a while as though he might be trapped there but fortunately an American bombing plane from Mindanao was forced to make a refueling stop at Panay and Hewlett hitched a ride south. There he got another ride to Australia.

Hewlett remained with Gen. Douglas MacArthur's forces for the 3 years or so it took him to fight his way back into Manila. So, when on February 4, 1945, Hewlett heard that the 1st Cavalary was about to enter the city with a rescue column of 16 tanks and jeeps and trucks, he joined it. He had a personal reason. His wife, whom he thought at first would have diplomatic immunity because she was employed by the American High Commissioner to the Philippines, was in the notorious Santo Tomas internment camp in Manila.

As a tank broke through the prison fence, Hewlett's jeep was right behind it. A Japanese soldier fired at him from close range but fortunately missed. While fighting continued around the camp, Hewlett and several others made their way into the old auditorium.

Hewlett had a chance to greet Robert Crabb, one of his UP colleagues who had been interned by the Japanese, and Mrs. Franz Weissblatt, wife of another UP correspondent who had been captured on Bataan. But Hewlett could not find his wife. Desperately he searched out someone he had previously known in Manila and he was told to try the hospital building.

When there was a lull in the firing, Hewlett streaked across to the hospital. He started up a dimly lit stairway. He noticed a thin figure of a girl, who apparently weighed no more than 80 pounds, trying to make her way down the stairs. Hewlett stared. Then he took the remaining stairs in a few strides and his arms enfolded her. Hewlett and his wife, Virginia, were reunited again after 3 years.

I saw them when they returned to the United States. It was at the San Francisco organizational meeting of the United Nations. Mrs. Hewlett, though she had received medical attention and rest at a military hospital, was still thin. But her face was aglow. So was Hewlett's.

And I couldn't help but think of the line by Milton:

"They also serve who stand and wait."

GOLD OUTFLOW SHOWS LACK OF JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION DISCIPLINE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, because of the emotional impact that our gold reserve can have, I hope that those who testify, beginning tomorrow, at the hearing by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will avoid intemperate statements of panic and crisis. Already we have heard more emotional remarks and impassioned speeches than were necessary. Although such speeches make good headline material for newspapers, they do not assist with the problem at hand.

NO CRISIS

We must let it be known to all that we are not legislating on the gold reserve in an atmosphere of crisis. There is no reason for alarm. We do not need to be unduly concerned about what has been referred to as the international money ring. We do not need to spread distrust of our currency by announcing that it can not now be redeemed. That has been the case for the last 30 years. We do not need to frighten individuals with threats of poverty and unemployment as results of Federal Reserve action. We do not need to antagonize foreign countries whose cooperation is necessary if our present international monetary stability is to be maintained.

We do need, and we welcome, responsible statements of fact and philosophy; and I hope that all who testify on the bill will limit themselves to statements of that type.

ADMINISTRATION BILL NEEDED

The administration's request for action on the gold reserve currently being held behind our Federal Reserve notes and deposit liabilities is a timely one. A brief review of our monetary statistics over the postwar period gives a clear picture of the present situation and its causes. In 1949, our monetary stock of gold reached a high of nearly $25 billion. Since that time, our gold supply has decreased continually, with the exception of 3 years, 1952, 1956, and 1957. The outflow in the 15-year period has been about $10 billion. Now we have a total of just over $15 billion.

The gold outflow has not been entirely undesirable. During the years after the war, our European neighbors had a dollar shortage; and since they desperately needed assistance in rebuilding their economies from the rubble of the war, our deficit balance and resulting outflow of gold served a useful purpose. The international monetary system of the free world was strengthened; the European nations and Japan were assisted in the task of rebuilding. The shortage of dollars, however, was gradually overcome; and since 1958, according to the Joint Economic Committee, our deficit in the balance of payments has been a problem.

TRADE BALANCE IN OUR FAVOR

Interestingly, this problem has not been the result of importing more than we export in goods and services. The United States has exported more goods and services than it has imported, each year. The problem, interestingly, has arisen from our overwillingness to bear the burdens of the world. Earnings from the export surplus and other credit items have not been large enough to offset our defense expenditures, our economic assistance, and our capital investments in foreign countries.

As our payments continued to exceed our receipts, dollar balances began to build up in foreign countries. A new term, "Eurodollars" was coined, because of the importance of the U.S. dollars as a reserve currency and as a medium of exchange in Europe. These dollars represented a significant proportion of the total reserves of most of the free countries of the world.

Many countries have been, and apparently still are, content to have their reserves in U.S. dollars, because our dollars have been convertible at any time for gold, at a price of $35 an ounce. So long as this commitment exists and so long as there is no fear that it will not continue in the future, U.S. dollars literally are as "good as gold." In addition, dollar balances provide income to the holder, through interest payments, rather than being sterile, as gold might be.

PLEDGE STABLE PRICE OF GOLD

The United States has made plain the assurance that it is committed to holding the price of gold at $35 an ounce, and that dollars will be exchanged for gold at that price, if requested by foreign central bankers. We must stand by that commitment for the present and for the foreseeable future. If, for any reason, foreign monetary authorities thought the dollar was about to be devalued in terms of gold, of course they would seek to exchange dollars for gold before the devaluation. This we cannot afford; and thus it is imperative that we have sufficient gold to meet the requests made.

It is my opinion that recent conversions of dollars for gold have perhaps been overemphasized. It has been claimed that the $150 million purchase by France during January may be part of an effort to embarrass the United States. It could also be an effort to exert the national image of that country, and to break free somewhat from the influence of dollars as a large part of that nation's reserve, and thus to increase the prestige of France's own money. It should be remembered, however, that during 1964, French conversions of dollars to gold amounted to about $100 million a quarter. Therefore, the recent conversion need not be the basis for rash action or the foundation for unwarranted rumor. Rather, it should be considered as part of a continuing effort to maintain a certain proportion of the French monetary reserves in gold.

Spain, too, has quietly been converting its dollars into gold. A reported $40 million exchange was carried out in December; and a similar amount may have been exchanged during the past month. Further conversions may be expected until Spain's gold stocks are up to 50 to 75 percent of her total foreign exchange reserves, which are relatively small.

Whatever the reason for these conversions, they do cause an outflow of gold. It is presently estimated that the gold outflow in 1965 will be between $500 million and $1 billion. Some are predicting an even greater outflow.

ECONOMY EXPANSION

In addition to the gold outflow as a demand for our gold, our currency will, with a normal expansion, require additional backing. It is likely that an expansion of Federal Reserve notes and deposit liabilities would, in the absence of any such legislation, require an additional $400 to $500 million in gold.

The proposed new subscription to the International Monetary Fund will require about another $351 million.

Combining these, we come up with a possible total of about $1.75 billion in gold needed during 1965.

Latest Treasury statistics indicate that we have about $1.5 billion in what might be called free gold. This is gold that we possess above the 25-percent legal requirement behind Federal Reserve notes and deposit liabilities. Theoretically, this means that we only have $1.5 billion with which to meet foreign and domestic demands; and the unsophisticated could construe this to mean that our ability to redeem dollars for gold is limited to that amount. Foreign central bankers, however, are not unsophisticated; and they realize that the Federal Reserve Act makes provisions for emergencies, in a section giving the Federal Reserve authorities the power to suspend the 25-percent requirement for temporary—though possibly indefinite—periods, if necessary. They also are aware that in order to maintain the standing of the U.S. dollar, we must be committed to dollar conversion to the last ounce of gold.

GOLD BACKING FOR CURRENCY REMAINS

I mention this provision allowing conversion without any congressional or presidential action only to illustrate that we are not considering the removal of the gold backing from our currency out of necessity or weakness. Nations are not clamoring for our gold reserves. Our commitments could be met without any legislative action. It is desirable, however, that we do take legislative action to assure all who might be concerned that we do intend to keep the dollar strong.

Several proposals have been introduced. Many more, based on minor technical differences, could also be introduced. However, the three major alternatives are:

First. To eliminate all gold backing from both our Federal Reserve notes and our deposit liabilities. This proposal would completely eliminate any tie of our domestic currency to gold.

Second. To eliminate all the backing from the deposit liabilities of Federal Reserve banks, but to continue full 25-percent backing of Federal Reserve notes in circulation.

Third. To decrease the percentage of gold backing behind both Federal Reserve notes and our deposit liabilities from the present 25 percent to a lower percentage.

My research and analysis indicate that the second of these proposals is to be preferred. It would make available about $5 billion in gold with which to meet demands by foreign banks and to back the expected normal increase in our Federal Reserve notes as our economy expands. The Treasury proposal meets the need equally as well as do the other proposals, and at the same time it should cause the least concern which could develop into a crisis situation.

It has been suggested by some that the gold backing of our currency does not perform any useful function. This point of view is based on the claim that we have a managed money supply, that it is not limited by the gold; and that U.S. citizens cannot exchange U.S. currency for gold, and therefore it is useless to keep the backing.

It is true that we have a managed currency. The gold backing does not determine the quantity of money in circulation, nor does it act as a first line defense against inflation.

INDEPENDENT FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

The responsibility and authority to maintain a stable currency and an appropriate money supply have been delegated by Congress to the Federal Reserve System. Congress has taken this action because money management requires daily action and analysis which Congress is not in a position to perform. The Federal Reserve is an independent agency of the Federal Government, and, as such, is completely responsible to Congress. The independence of the system does not mean that it is not responsive to the overall goals and policy of the administration. It does mean that the action of the Board is not directly dictated by the administration, and thus it is one step removed from political pressure. The fact that the Federal Reserve is independent is the genius of the whole system. It precludes administrative politically inspired tinkering. Election-time politics has little to do with monetary action, and thus confidence can be placed in responsible monetary authorities. It may be true that there have been some errors in judgment that appear through hindsight; but there is every reason to trust the action of the Reserve Board so long as it remains independent of the administrative branch of the Federal Government.

It is interesting to realize that the chief sponsors of legislation to completely repeal the gold-cover requirement and thus release the money supply from any tie with gold are, for the most part, the same individuals who have attempted to destroy confidence in the independent Federal Reserve System. They are the same individuals who desire that Board members be, in effect, completely subject to political pressure. What a transfer of power that would provide for the Federal Government.

As a matter of fact, it is not desirable to end the independence of the Federal Reserve System. Neither is there a need at this time to completely remove all gold from our domestic system. Contrary to some allegations, the gold reserve does perform necessary and important functions. These hearings are a good example of one such valuable function. The fact that arbitrary gold-backing levels have been set has made it necessary to propose the action now being considered. This brings clearly to the attention of Congress and the American people the fact that we are losing gold, and that this is a result of our monetary and fiscal policies which can be altered to overcome the continual outflow. If this were the only value in the backing, I would consider it to be justifiable. Second, whether based on valid monetary theory or not, some individuals feel more confidence in our monetary system if it is backed by, or in some way is tied to, something with intrinsic value.

Many would like to go back to a full gold standard and make it possible to convert our currency into gold. Certainly that is not feasible with the present world supply of gold; and, thus, it cannot be considered a possible alternative. It is possible, however, to have some gold backing; and though our currency is not convertible by United States citizens, nor has it been since 1933, the gold backing does lend some confidence. Furthermore, a legal requirement that there be a gold reserve does provide ultimate limits on the inflationary potential in our currency.

The Treasury proposal will make it necessary again to bring this matter before the public in a few short years, if during the interim the basic causes of our gold outflow have not been solved.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION FAILS

Although I concur in the request of the Treasury, I wish it to be clear that I cannot concur in the monetary and fiscal policies that have made this action necessary.

During the last 4 years, the administration has developed several measures postponing the inevitable necessity of balancing international spending and income receipts. These measures have in some respects been ingenius and not altogether undesirable; but they have only been delaying tactics, and have not removed the source of the imbalance. Regardless of the hopes expressed by administration authorities and the assurances given that the imbalance would exist for only a few months, the months have turned into years, and it appears that during the fourth quarter of last year the deficit may have been at the astronomical rate of about $5 billion a year.

TEMPORARY EXPEDIENT

It should be stressed that the action now contemplated is also only a temporary expedient. The administration proposal will make about $5 billion in gold available to meet foreign and domestic demands without affecting the discipline of balancing our international expenses and receipts. This does not require that our fiscal policies be changed in order to avert additional deficit spending. It does nothing to change the inflationary forces present in our economy, which, if they break through the surface, could make our goods and services less competitive in a world market, and thus could increase our deficit balance.

This measure will only buy time during which the administration may, if it is willing to do so, take action which will strike at the real problems.

FISCAL AND MONETARY DISCIPLINE NEEDED

There is no doubt in my mind that there is a direct connection between fiscal and monetary discipline and the gold drain. There is no doubt that it is the result of overspending in the public sector, rather than the inability of the private sector to perform its responsibilities. On this basis, I think it is not a good long-range policy, as a possible solution, to penalize the private sector with direct controls on its activity.

I will support a measure to make gold available, because I feel that it is desirable that we not tie the hands of the administration. We must give it another chance to prove its dedication to fiscal responsibility both at home and abroad, despite the failures of the past. I shall do this only in the hope that appropriate action will be supported. We must do something positive; but we cannot afford to stifle the private sector, which even now is not only providing through taxes, much of the money for public spending, but also is providing in our international balance of trade a surplus to help in offsetting much of the Federal spending.

PLAN OF ACTION

The following is a list of positive steps that could be taken:

First. Exports should be encouraged, through Federal policies.

Second. Reduction of both tariff and nontariff barriers to the sale of U.S. goods should be encouraged.

Third. If other nations do not reduce their restrictions, it may be necessary to impose balancing or equalizing restrictions or quotas on imports.

Fourth. Wage increases must remain within the increase in productivity.

Fifth. Profit potential in the United States must be made equally as attractive as it is in other countries, so that capital will remain in this country.

Sixth. Other countries, particularly those that are developed and now showing a surplus in their international accounts must accept a greater part of the free world defense burden.

Seventh. Measures should be taken to encourage foreign investment in U.S. securities.

Eighth. Foreign-aid programs need overhaul and reduction.

Ninth. The price level of American goods and services must remain constant, so as to retain or increase the competitiveness of American products in the world markets.

Tenth. Tourist travel in the United States, by both U.S. citizens and foreigners, should be encouraged.

Only with appropriate action in these areas will our gold outflow problem be solved; and only if the administration takes that action will it be able to avoid the necessity of coming to Congress and the American people again, in a relatively short time, to admit its failure to manage our international business with prudence, by asking for final elimination of all gold behind our currency.

THE EISENHOWER TRIBUTE TO WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, most of us, I am sure, were impressed by the inspiring remarks of General Eisenhower in tribute to Winston Churchill, made over the facilities of the British Broadcasting Co. during the dramatic ceremonies the past weekend. I ask unanimous consent that his historic statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TEXT OF EISENHOWER'S TRIBUTE ON TV

Upon the mighty Thames, a great avenue of history, move at this moment to their final resting place the mortal remains of Sir Winston Churchill. He was a great maker of history, but his work done, the record closed, we can almost hear him, with the poet (Tennyson) say:

"Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me,
Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark.
And may there be no sadness of farewell
When I embark."

As I, like all other freemen, pause to pay a personal tribute to the giant who now passes from among us, I have no charter to speak for my countrymen—only for myself. But, if in memory, we journey back two decades to the time when America and Britain stood shoulder to shoulder in global conflict against tyranny, then I can presume—with propriety, I think—to act as spokesman for the millions of Americans who served with me and with their British comrades during those 3 years of war on this sector of the earth.

HE WAS BRITAIN

To those men Winston Church was Britain—he was the embodiment of British defiance to threat, her courage in adversity, her calmness in danger, her moderation in success. Among the allies his name was spoken with respect, admiration, and affection. Although they loved to chuckle at his foibles, they knew he was a stanch friend. They felt his inspirational leadership. They counted him a fighter in their ranks.

The loyalty that the fighting forces of many nations here serving gave to him during the war was no less strong, nor less freely given, than he had, in such full measure, from his own countrymen.

An American, I was one of those allies. During those dramatic months I was privileged to meet, to talk, to plan, and to work with him for common goals.

Out of that association an abiding—and to me precious—friendship was forged; it withstood the trials and friction inescapable among men of strong convictions, living in the atmosphere of war.

FRIENDSHIP GREW

The war ended, our friendship flowered in the later and more subtle tests imposed by international politics. Then, each of us, holding high official posts in his own nation, strove together so to concert the strength of our two peoples that liberty might be preserved among men and the security of the free world wholly sustained.

Through a career during which personal victories alternated with defeats, glittering praise with bitter criticism, intense public activity with periods of semiretirement, Winston Churchill lived out his 4 score and 10 years.

With no thought of the length of the time he might be permitted on earth, he was concerned only with the quality of the service he could render to his nation and to humanity. Though he had no fear of death, he coveted always the opportunity to continue that service.

At this moment, as our hearts stand at attention, we say our affectionate, though sad, goodby to the leader to whom the entire body of freemen owes so much.

CHAMPION OF FREEDOM

In the coming years, many in countless words will strive to interpret the motives, describe the accomplishments and extoll the virtues of Winston Churchill—soldier, statesman, and citizen that two great countries were proud to claim as their own. Among all the things so written or spoken, there will ring out through all the centuries one incontestable refain:

He was a champion of freedom.

May God grant that we—and the generations who will remember him—heed the lessons he taught us; in his deeds; in his words; in his life.

May we carry on his work until no nation lies in captivity; no man is denied opportunity for fulfillment.

And now to you, Sir Winston—my old friend—farewell.

THE MUSIC MAN FROM NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I call attention to the 500th performance of Lawrence Welk and his "Champagne Music Show" on the ABC television network on Saturday, January 23, 1965.

The Lawrence Welk Band is the first in television history to be signed for a full-hour program on a week-to-week basis. Its leader, a native of North Dakota, once expressed his feelings by saying, "You have to always be happy and play what the people want." Because of this attitude, this band continues to provide one of our most wholesome and popular television programs.

Lawrence Welk was born on March 11, 1903, in the south central community of Strasburg, south of North Dakota's capital city of Bismarck. He was one of eight children born to the German family of Ludwig Welk.

As was the case with so many of the farm children of that day, young Lawrence had to leave school at an early age, to work in the fields. But although his other education may have stopped, Lawrence's father taught him to play the accordion; and by the time he was 13, he was invited to play at weddings and other community affairs, and sometimes took in as much as $150 when he passed the hat at these gatherings.

At the age of 17, Lawrence's father gave him a $400 accordion; and soon he was playing with several small bands in the area.

Although hampered by his lack of education, inability to read a note of music, and German accent, young Welk rose fast; and it was not long before he had his own six-piece band, known as the "Hotsy Totsy Boys."

He enlarged his band, and was soon playing in top ballrooms in several major eastern cities. When, at Pittsburgh's William Penn Hotel, in 1938, he received several fan letters calling his music "sparkly and bubbly," he began to call it "Champagne Music"; and that theme has stayed with him to this day.

The band's first engagement at the Aragon Ballroom, in Ocean Park, Calif., in 1946, marked the beginning of Welk's success on the west coast.

In 1951, the manager of the Aragon Ballroom offered the band a 4-week contract to perform over KTLA, a local Los Angeles station. The show was so popular that it stayed on; and 4 years later it was among the top 10 of all programs in southern California.

In 1955, the "Lawrence Welk Show" joined the ABC television network; and soon "Champagne Music," with its unique ability to make people just sit back and be happy, was flowing into the living rooms of millions of weekly viewers.

Mr. President, as one musical writer once said, there is indeed "a touch of America in this genial, wholesome maestro's lilting, danceable music."

His story is one of dedication to the highest ideals of showmanship; and his popularity is ample proof that good taste and sound judgment are still part of the American community.

I salute this son of North Dakota, and ask unanimous consent that a character sketch of Mr. Welk, from Celebrity Register, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWRENCE WELK

The Welk vintage of "champagne" music has made him one of the richest maestros in the ballroom music business and one of the most popular. His gaiety and smiling friendliness have won over countless women, men, and children, who dig the smooth, simple sounds that bubble like froth out of the television set for 2 hours each week (an unprecedented time span for a musical program). Welk has said that his music may not be "sophisticated, or new, or clever, or smart." (Variety has called him a genius in schmaltz), but he wants it that way so that everyone can understand. "You have also to show a little friendliness, let's say it that way, and you do the things you know you can do." To promote this sense of contentment and well-being he pays his band members some of the highest salaries around and gives them pep talks when spirits are sagging.

Born into a farming family in North Dakota, March 11, 1903, young Lawrence restrained his musical ambitions until he was 21 because his family feared he would learn "worldly ways." But once out, he toured with his Lawrence Welk Novelty Orchestra which featured a Hawaiian guitar player as well as Lawrence himself on the accordion (the one he owns today cost $5,000). Later, he formed the Hotsy Totsy Orchestra and broadcast from his home State to farm audiences. About 1934, to sponsor a show, Welk promoted a Honolulu fruit chewing gum. Shipped in from San Francisco it was sold in his own wrappers until Wrigley wrote him that it wasn't such a good idea since both their names began with a "W." Lawrence dropped the chicle line but has had few troubles with sponsors since. Married in 1930 to a former nurse, Fern Renner (children: Shirley, Donna, Lawrence, Jr.), he lives quietly in California.

His high standing with Coral Records is due to his perennially big selling albums with such titles as "Bubble in Wine" and "Sparkling Strings." "Basically I'm a musician," he has said and has given strict orders to his producer and arranger to "watch the lyrics. When children are listening, I don't want to give them a smutty thought." For this wholesomeness Welk was voted in 1956 as the father of the year and as the man with the best musical show of the year by the National Ballroom Operators of America. His television shows, "Lawrence Welk's Top Tunes and New Talent" and "The Lawrence Welk Show," have prime time on ABC's television channel. Over his 25 years in show business, there has been little change in his musical formula: muted horns and strings pouring out simple arrangements with a light foot-tapping beat. Welk is content with that. "As long as I stay with my own audience," he once told his wife, "I'm a winner."

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the strong nationwide support for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore is well shown by the fact that 33 Senators now sponsor Senate bill 360, to establish the lakeshore, which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] introduced on January 8, and which the Senate passed last year.

The widespread support of the bill is also indicated by the favorable comment, in newspapers throughout the country, by editors and conservation writers and editors. The able conservation editor for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, Edward J. Meeman, recently wrote a very encouraging personal call for the rescue of the Dunes in the proposed National Lakeshore Park. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Meeman's editorial, as published in the Cincinnati Post and Times Star of January 23, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVING INDIANA'S DUNES—PARK BILL SET FOR PASSAGE IN 1965

(By Edward J. Meeman)

The 88th Congress earned the name of "the conservation Congress" because of its achievements in the historic Wilderness Preservation Act, the land and water conservation fund, the Fire Island National Seashore, the Ozark National Rivers, and other measures.

It also left to its successor, the 89th Congress, a rich heritage of legislation in process.

High on this list is the bill to create the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore which has just been reintroduced by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman of the Interior Committee, and cosponsored by Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana, and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. DOUGLAS has championed the measure because the dunes lie just east of Chicago where live millions of his summer-sweltering constituents who like to escape to this stretch of Lake Michigan beach, overlooked by ancient heaps of wind-blown sand anchored by rare vegetation.

The bill is in the exact form in which it passed the Senate in the last session. It has been endorsed by President Johnson, as a similar bill had been endorsed by President Kennedy. It is backed by the national conservation organizations. It will pass if the industrial and real estate interests which oppose it recognize that this administration bill is the final compromise, that so many thousands of acres have already been eliminated from the project that future compromise is out of the question. It will, if conservationists recognize that this is the best that we can do.

The bill sets aside forever as a permanent possession of the American people about 11,300 acres of land. This includes the 2,182 acres of the existing Indiana Dunes State Park, which will remain separately managed. The State park will become part of the national lakeshore only when the State of Indiana is willing to give it up. The proposed national park has a shoreline of 10.8 miles.

More generous terms than are usually provided to existing residents of a natural area about to be taken over, are in this bill. Senator DOUGLAS states them as follows:

"Owners of an improved property, which is within the lakeshore boundaries, defined as a detached, one-family dwelling construction which was begun before October 21, 1963, may forever retain their home in ownership and use, together with land on which it is located, or they may lease it, sell it or will it to their heirs. They may also sell it to the Government under a lease agreement for a period up to 25 years."

Not long ago I walked this beautiful shore and looked up with awe at these irreplaceable dunes. May they always be there for future generations to enjoy. This is the hour to assure that destruction of these dunes shall be halted, and this invaluable treasure in the heart of the Nation shall be forever inviolate.

GENERAL LEMAY—"MR. AIR FORCE"

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, today one of America's foremost airmen and one of its foremost generals steps down. I speak, of course, of Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, who is retiring this afternoon.

General LeMay—who has been "Mr. Air Force" for so long—is perhaps the most feared American in the eyes of the Soviet Union and Red China.

He was asked to keep America safe through the cold war; and he did his job well.

Murray Moler, of the Ogden Standard Examiner, one of Utah's leading newspapers, has penned an excellent tribute to General LeMay which deserves wide distribution. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD this appropriate editorial comment, which was published in the Standard Examiner on January 24, 1965. The editorial is entitled "U.S. Air Force Won't Seem the Same After Gen. Curtis LeMay Retires."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. AIR FORCE WON'T SEEM THE SAME AFTER GEN. CURTIS LEMAY RETIRES

February 1 is an historic date in the history of the U.S. Air Force.

On February 1, 1930, a 23-year-old Ohioan named Curtis Emerson LeMay received a commission in the Army Air Corps as a second lieutenant. He'd just received his wings at Kelly Field in Texas.

On February 1, 1965, this same Curtis LeMay—long a four-star general—retires from the Air Force which he has headed as Chief of Staff since July 1, 1961.

These 35 years span one of the most turbulent periods in the history of the world.

The growth of U.S. military aviation has been a major factor—in war and in peace—during these last two generations.

And "Curt" LeMay, to his thousands of admirers, has personified the Air Force—its development from a fledgling service to maturity as the top deterrent arm in the American arsenal.

Younger officers in the Air Force refer to General LeMay as simply "The Chief."

Veterans in the military aviation—and many of the correspondents who've also come to know and admire this husky, cigar-chewing man—fondly call him "The Bomber."

He earned this nickname by his long fight for superiority of the American bombing force and his constant insistence, even as long-range missiles were introduced, that the manned aircraft retain a significant role.

The Air Force just won't seem the same without General LeMay up there on top.

His successor as Chief of Staff, Gen. John P. McConnell, is an able, experienced flier, commander, and administrator.

But General McConnell doesn't have the color, the flair, that General LeMay has. No one else in the Air Force does, for that matter.

Stories about General LeMay can—and have—fill a book.

We've known him since World War II days, when, after helping direct the B-17 raids on Germany, he came out to the Pacific Theater of Operations to direct the B-29 attacks on Japan.

When Japan surrendered, we were with the 20th Air Force commander when he surveyed the damage done by his fire bombers on the key cities of Japan.

It was a sober General LeMay who looked over the ruins and read the lists of the civilian casualties.

He wasn't a killer by nature and his sorrow at the suffering showed it.

But, as he expressed his feelings, it was obvious to accompanying newsmen that he believed that the heavy bombardments from the air had actually reduced casualties—both Japanese and American—because they forced the enemy to its knees without the blood bath of an actual invasion.

We saw General LeMay again during the Bikini atomic bomb tests of 1946. He was reflective then, too, as he calculated the changes that would be made in the world's fighting machines with perfection of nuclear weapons.

That's when he pushed construction of the six-engined B-36 superheavy bomber—a plane that could fly long distances and carry tremendous loads of atomic weapons. The B-36 never dropped a bomb in anger—but, with General LeMay directing its deployment, it played a major role in keeping the peace.

After organizing air operations for the Berlin air lift, General LeMay really came into his element when he was ordered to set up the Strategic Air Command, whose headquarters he placed in the heart of America near Omaha.

From "the cave," SAC's underground operations control center dug into the banks of the Missouri River, Curt LeMay ranged far and wide.

He helped select SAC's motto—"Peace Is Our Profession"—to show that the bomber forces were there to keep U.S. strength so mighty that no enemy dare attack us.

He was a "nut"—and we use this in a favorable sense—about security.

"The Bomber" instilled in his officers and men a constant fear that subversive elements would infiltrate a SAC base—or put a destructive grenade aboard key aircraft.

He made spot checks, day and night, on patrols assigned to guard parked aircraft.

He ordered that everything brought aboard a plane be closely checked.

In March 1956 we were aboard a SAC B-29 weather plane on a 19-hour flight from Eilsen Air Force Base, near Fairbanks, up over the North Pole country.

Well along on the course over the Arctic Sea, a major who was serving as aircraft commander reached under his seat for his lunch box.

As he opened the lid, his face blanched.

Instead of the expected ham sandwich, there was a red-painted beer can. On its side was inscribed "The Bomb."

It wasn't a bomb, of course. But it could have been.

When we returned to base, that major had some explaining to do to get off the hook for not following all security regulations that General LeMay had ordered.

He was also a "ham" radio operator. When at SAC headquarters he and his deputy commander, Lt. Gen. Francis V. (Butch) Griswold, also a radio hobbyist, worked out a system of communications second to none in the world.

They placed aboard B-52's, B-47's and KC-135 tankers gear called "single sideband" radio. Its clarity was tremendous. So was its range.

Its objective was to guarantee that all weapons-carrying aircraft, including those on "aerial alert," were in close touch with SAC headquarters at Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha. It was part of the "positive control" program to preclude "war by accident."

In the fall of 1957, General LeMay was at the controls of a KC-135 that flew nonstop, without refueling, for 6,322 miles in 13 hours and 2 minutes from Westover Air Force Base, Mass., to Buenos Aires, Argentina.

During the flight, we talked with the general as he was over the jungles of Brazil. We'd called from the UPI desk in Omaha over the single sideband system.

General LeMay's voice came back over the miles loud and clear. You could, despite the distance, feel his pride of accomplishment.

That was his long suit—pride. He had it all the way.

He was equally proud of the missiles, when they came into cervice. But he always insisted that it would take a flexible "mixed" force of manned planes and unmanned rockets to keep America safe.

And keep America safe is what Gen. Curtis LeMay, who retires early next week, has helped accomplish so well for so many years.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of S. 3, and as a member of the Senate committee which will be requested, over a period, to appropriate not to exceed $1,092,400,000 for implementation of its provisions, I have made a section-by-section analysis of the act as it passed the Senate earlier today. Feeling that such an analysis may be informative and useful, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM IN EXPLANATION OF THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of the act is to assist the States in the Appalachian region in meeting their special problems, to promote their economic development, and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward attacking problems common to Appalachia. Public investments made under the act shall be concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest. The States will be responsible for recommending local and State projects, within their borders, which will receive assistance under the act.

TITLE I—THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Membership and voting

Under section 101, an Appalachian Regional Commission is established. It shall be composed of one Federal member, referred to as the "Federal Cochairman," and one member from each participating State in the Appalachian region. Each State member may be the Governor, or his designee, or such other person as may be provided by the law of the State represented. The State members of the Commission shall elect a cochairman of the Commission from among their number.

Decisions by the Commission shall require the affirmative vote of the Federal Cochairman and of a majority of the State members. Each State member shall have an alternate, appointed by the Governor or as otherwise provided by his State's law. The alternate shall vote in the event of the absence, death, disability, or resignation of the primary representative. Each State member and his alternate shall be compensated by the State represented, but the Federal Cochairman shall be compensated by the Federal Government.

Functions of the Commission

Under Section 102, the Commission shall, among other things:

1. Develop comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State and local planning in the region.
2. Conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including an inventory and analysis, of the resources of Appalachia, and cooperate with Federal, State and local agencies in sponsoring demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth.
3. Review and, where appropriate to increase the effectiveness thereof, recommend modifications or additions to Federal, State and local public and private programs.
4. Work with State and local agencies in formulating and recommending, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and in developing appropriate model legislation.
5. Encourage the formation of local development districts.
6. Encourage private investment in industrial, commercial and recreational projects.
7. Serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Appalachian programs.
8. Establish and utilize citizens advisory councils and conferences provide a forum for public consideration of problems and proposed solutions thereto of the region.
9. Advise the Secretary of Commerce on applications for grants for administrative expenses to local development districts.

Recommendations

Under section 103, the Commission may make recommendations to the President and to the State Governors and appropriate local officials regarding the expenditure of funds by Federal, State, and local agencies throughout Appalachia in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, education, training, health and welfare, and other fields related to the purposes of the act; the Commission may also make recommendations to the President and State Governors and appropriate local officials with respect to such additional Federal, State, and local legislation or administrative actions as the Commission deems necessary to further the purposes of the act.

Liaison between Federal Government and the Commission

Section 104 provides for the effective and continuing liaison between the Federal Government and the Commission, and a coordinated review within the Federal Government of the plans and recommendations submitted by the Commission pursuant to sections 102 and 103.

Administrative expenses of the Commission

Section 105(a) provides that the administrative expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the Federal Government for the period ending on June 30 of the second full Federal fiscal year following the date of enactment of the act. Thereafter such expenses shall be paid equally by the Federal Government and the States in the region. No assistance may be furnished to any State delinquent in payment of its share of such expenses.

Section 105(b) authorizes not to exceed $2,200,000 to defray the administrative expenses of the Commission as provided in this section.

Administrative powers of the Commission

Section 106 provides the Commission with the standard powers of administration in order to conduct its business, fulfill its functions and achieve its objectives under the act. The Commission is authorized, among other things, to accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal or mixed, tangible or intangible. The Commission is also authorized to enter into such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation. The Commission is also authorized to maintain a temporary office in the District of Columbia and establish a permanent office at such a central and appropriate location as it may select and field offices at such other places as it may deem appropriate.

Information

Section 107 authorizes the Commission, in order to obtain information needed to carry out its duties, to hold hearings, sit and act, at such times and places, take such testimony and receive such evidence as it may deem advisable. The Commission is also authorized to secure such pertinent information as may be available from appropriate Federal, State and local agencies.

Personal financial interests

Section 108 provides that no State member and no officer or employee of the Commission shall participate personally in any proceeding, application or other particular matter in which he, his spouse, minor child, partner, or organization in which he is serving as an officer, director, trustee, etc., has a financial interest except when such interest is fully disclosed and the Commission expressly determines that the provision may be waived. Violators are to be punished by fine and/or imprisonment, and the Commission is given discretion to void and rescind any contract or other transaction in relation to which the violation occurred.

TITLE II. SPECIAL APPALACHIAN PROGRAMS

Part A—New programs

Appalachian Development Highway System

Section 201(a) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to assist in the construction of an Appalachian development highway system to serve the Appalachian region. The system is not to exceed a total of 2,350 miles in length. Additionally, not to exceed 1,000 miles shall be local access roads that will serve specific recreational, residential, commercial, industrial or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program. The system, in conjunction with the Interstate System and other Federal-aid highways in the region, will open areas with development potential where commerce and communication have been inhibited by lack of adequate access. The provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to Federal-aid primary highways, shall also apply to the Appalachian development highway system and the local access roads, unless the Secretary of Commerce affirmatively waives such provisions as being inconsistent with this act.

These highways will not be constructed with the particular objective in mind of easing traffic congestion. Rather, they will be built as instruments of economic development. They will do so by opening up areas to development which have not heretofore been developed because of their remoteness and isolation. They will provide the means to insure that the industrial, recreational, and tourism potential is realized.

The funds for this program shall be provided from the general fund rather than from the highway trust fund.

Section 201(b) provides that the Appalachian Regional Commission shall submit to the Secretary of Commerce its recommendations with respect to (1) the general corridor location and termini of the development highways; (2) the designation of local access roads to be constructed; (3) priorities for construction of local access roads and of the major segments of the development highways; and (4) other criteria for the program authorized by this section. Before any State member of the Commission participates in or votes on such recommendations, he shall have obtained the recommendations of the State highway department of the State which he represents.

Section 201(c) gives the Secretary of Commerce authority to approve in whole or in part such recommendations or to require modifications or revisions thereof. The Secretary may not, however, approve any recommendation for construction which would require the expenditure of Federal funds (other than funds available under title 23 of the United States Code) in excess of the appropriation authorization in subsection 201(g). On its completion, each development highway not already on the Federal-aid primary system shall be added to that system and must be maintained by the State.

Section 201(d) allows the States to give special preference, in the construction of highways and roads authorized under this section, to the use of mineral resource materials indigenous to the Appalachian region.

Section 201(e) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, for the purposes of research and development in the use of coal and coal products in highway construction and maintenance, to require each participating State, to the maximum extent possible, to use coal derivatives in the construction of not to exceed 10 percent of the roads authorized under this act.

Section 201(f) provides that Federal assistance to any construction project under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the costs of such project, unless the Secretary of Commerce determines, pursuant to the recommendation of the Appalachian Regional Commission, that assistance in excess of 50 percent is required in furtherance of the purposes of this act. In no event, however, shall such Federal assistance exceed 70 percent of the costs of such project.

Section 201(g) authorizes an appropriation of $840 million to implement this section.

Demonstration Health Facilities

Section 202(a) authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for the construction, equipment, and operation of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers, and other facilities necessary to health. Grants shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated under this act and shall not be taken into account in the computation of State allotments made pursuant to any other provision of law.

Construction grants shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Hill-Burton Act, as amended, and the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963.

Section 202(b) provides that no grant for construction (including initial equipment) shall exceed 80 percent of the cost of the project. Moreover, not to exceed $41 million of the funds authorized in section 401 shall be available for construction grants under this section.

Section 202(c) provides that grants under this section for operation, including equipment other than initial equipment, of a project may be made up to 100 percent of the costs thereof for the 2-year period beginning on the first day such project becomes operational as a health facility. For the next 3 years of operations such grants shall not exceed 50 percent of the operational costs. No operational grants shall be made after 5 years following the commencement of operations. Not to exceed $28 million of the funds authorized in section 401 shall be available for operating grants.

The committee report defines the operating cost as the cost of operation of such facilities after deduction of any contributions by States, local governments, private organizations or individuals, and after deducting appropriate charges made for services rendered to individuals at such facilities.

Operational grants shall be available only for those hospitals which are constructed under sections 202 (a) and (b). They will not be available to hospitals already in existence or to those that will be constructed under other public or private programs.

Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control

Section 203(a) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to provide for the control and prevention of erosion and to promote conservation and development of soil and water resources in Appalachia, to enter into agreements up to 10 years with landowners and operators providing for land stabilization, erosion, and sediment control; and reclamation through changes in land use, establishment of conservation measures and practices.

Section 203(b) requires the landowner or operator to furnish to the Secretary a conservation and development plan enumerating the land uses and conservation measures mutually agreed upon between the parties.

Section 203(c) requires that such plan be incorporated in an agreement under which the landowner or operator shall promise to implement the planned land uses and conservation measures.

Section 203(d) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, in return for such agreement by the landowner or operator, to furnish such financial and other assistance to the landowner or operator as appropriate and in the public interest for implementing the measures agreed upon. Such grants shall not exceed 80 percent of the cost of implementing the measures, and such cost sharing is limited to 50 acres occupied by such owner or operator.

Section 203(e) permits termination of the agreement by the Secretary if he determines that such termination would be in the public interest. Modification of agreements is also permitted under this section.

Section 203(f) permits the Secretary of Agriculture to provide in any such agreement for preservation, for a period not to exceed twice the duration of the period covered by the agreement, of the cropland, crop acreage and allotment history applicable to land covered by the agreement for the purpose of any Federal program under which such history is used as a basis for crop production allotments, etc.

Section 203(g) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue such rules and regulations as are necessary to implement this section.

Section 203(h) provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, in carrying out the provisions of this section, shall utilize the services of the Soil Conservation Service and State and local committees.

Section 203(i), for the implementation of this section, provides an expenditure of not to exceed $17 million of the funds authorized under Section 401.

Timber Development Organizations

Section 204(a). In order that small individual timber stands may, through good timber management, more fully benefit the Appalachian region, this subsection authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide technical assistance in the organization and operation, under State law, of private timber development organizations having as their objective the carrying out of timber development programs to improve timber productivity and quality, and increase returns to landowners through establishment of private, nonprofit corporations, which on a self-supporting basis may provide (i) continuity of management, good cutting practices and marketing services; (ii) physical consolidation of small holdings or administrative consolidation for efficient management under long-term agreement; (iii) management of forest lands donated to the timber development organizations for demonstrating good forest management, on a profitable and taxpaying basis; and (iv) establishment of a permanent fund for perpetuation of the work of the corporations, to be composed of donations, real or personal, for educational purposes.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide not more than one-half of the initial capital requirements of such timber development organizations through loans under the applicable provisions of the 1961 Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act, but such loans shall not be used for the construction or acquisition of facilities for manufacturing, processing, or marketing forest products, or for physical consolidation of small timber holdings authorized by this subsection.

Section 204(b) provides that not to exceed $5 million of the funds authorized in Section 401 shall be available to carry out this section.

Mining Area Restoration

Section 205(a)(1) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make financial contributions to States in Appalachia to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines. This, in effect, extends the scope of the act of July 15, 1955, regarding the sealing and filling of voids in abandoned coal mines, from the anthracite region of Pennsylvania to the entire Appalachian region.

The Secretary is also authorized to make financial contributions to States to reclaim and rehabilitate existing strip and surface mining areas.

Section 205(a)(2) authorizes the Secretary to plan and execute projects for extinguishing underground and outcrop mine fires in the region. The $500,000 limit on annual expenditures for control of fires as contained in the act of August 31, 1954, is removed insofar as fires in inactive coal mines in Appalachia are concerned.

Section 205(a)(3) authorizes the Secretary to expand and accelerate fish and wildlife restoration projects in the region under the provisions of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act of 1937 and the 1950 Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act.

Section 205(b) provides that for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 the Federal share of mining area restoration projects carried out under subsection (a) and conducted on lands not federally owned shall not exceed 75 percent of the total cost thereof.

Section 205(c) provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and with the Appalachian Regional Commission, make a survey and study of strip and surface mining operations and their effects in the United States. The study will consider, among other things, the nature and extent of surface and strip mining operations and the conditions resulting therefrom; the effectiveness of State and local control over strip mining activity and requirements for appropriate State legislation to provide for proper reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mined areas; the public benefits which may result from reclamation and appropriate development of strip and surface mined areas; the appropriate cost-sharing roles of Federal and State governments and private interests in, and the objectives and total overall costs of a program for, accomplishing the reclamation and rehabilitation of existing strip and surface mining areas in the United States. The Secretary of the Interior shall then submit to the President recommendations for a long-range comprehensive program for reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mining areas in the United States. The President shall submit these recommendations, together with his own, to the Congress not later than July 1, 1967.

Section 205(d) provides that not to exceed $36.5 million of the funds authorized in section 401 shall be available to carry out this section.

No moneys may be expended for the purposes of reclaiming, improving, grading, seeding, or reforestation of strip mined areas, except on lands owned by Federal, State, or local governmental bodies, until authorized by law after completion of the study and report to the President as provided in subsection (c).

Water Resource Survey

Section 206(a) authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Army to prepare a comprehensive plan for developing and efficiently utilizing the water and related resources of the Appalachian region. Special attention shall be given to the need for an increase in the production of economic goods and services within the region as a means of expanding economic opportunities. The plan shall constitute an integral component of the regional economic development program authorized by this act.

Section 206(b) provides that the plan may recommend measures for the control of floods, the regulation of rivers to provide better water supply for industrial and municipal development, the generation of hydroelectric power, prevention of water pollution, development of the recreational potentials of the region, and such other measures as may be necessary to achieve the objectives of this section.

Section 206(c) provides that the Secretary of the Army, acting through the U.S. Army Engineers, shall consult with the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Power Commission, and the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare, to insure that the plan prepared shall constitute a harmonious component of the regional program.

Section 206(d) provides that the plan shall be submitted to the Appalachian Regional Commission, after which the Commission shall submit the plan to the President with a statement of its views. The President shall then submit the prepared plan to the Congress with his recommendations not later than December 31, 1968.

Section 206(e) authorizes the Secretary of the Army to enter into contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, etc., with any departments, agencies or instrumentalities of the United States or with any State, political subdivision, agency or instrumentality thereof or with any person, firm, association, or corporation in the preparation of the plan authorized by this section. Moreover, the Federal agencies referred to in subsection (c) are authorized to assist the Secretary of the Army in preparing the plan.

Section 206(f) provides that the plan shall be coordinated with all Federal comprehensive river basin plans heretofore or hereafter developed for river systems draining the Appalachian region.

Section 206(g) provides an expenditure of not to exceed $5 million of the funds authorized in section 401.

Part B. Supplementations and modifications of existing programs

Vocational Education Facilities

Section 211 (a) authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for construction of school facilities needed for vocational education in areas of Appalachia where such education is not now adequately available. The grants will be made in accordance with provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, but without regard to any provision therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings, or to State allotments.

Section 211 (b) provides for an expenditure not to exceed $16 million of funds authorized in section 401 for construction of such school facilities.

Sewage Treatment Works

Section 212 (a) authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for the construction of sewage treatment works in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, but without regard to appropriation authorization ceilings or allotments therein among the States of Appalachia.

Section 212 (b) provides an expenditure not to exceed $6 million of the funds authorized in section 401 for construction of such sewage treatment works.

Amendments to Housing Act of 1954

Section 213 makes the Appalachian Regional Commission an eligible agency to receive comprehensive planning grants under the Housing Act of 1954.

Supplements to Federal Grant-in-Aid Programs

Section 214(a) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to specific recommendations of the Appalachian Regional Commission approved by him and after consultation with appropriate Federal officials, to allocate funds to the heads of Federal agencies responsible for the administration of existing Federal grant-in-aid programs. Such funds shall be used only for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to projects under such programs above the fixed maximum portion of the cost otherwise authorized by the applicable law. This will enable the States and local communities of the region to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs for which they are eligible but for which they have been unable heretofore to supply the required matching share.

Section 214(b) applies an 80 percent ceiling to the Federal share of the total cost of projects under subsection (a).

Section 214(c) defines the term "Federal Grant-in-Aid Programs" as used in this section. It has reference to Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by this act for the construction or equipment of facilities. It includes all other Federal grant-in-aid programs in existence on the effective date of this act for the acquisition of land and the construction or equipment of facilities including, but not limited to, programs authorized by the Library Services Act, the Federal Airport Act, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The term shall not include, however, any program related to highway or road construction, nor would it include any program except a grant-in-aid program. Federal loan programs are to be excluded.

Section 214(d) provides, for implementation of this section, an expenditure of $90 million of the funds authorized in section 401.

Part C—General provisions

Maintenance of Effort

Section 221 provides that no State or political subdivision thereof shall be eligible to receive benefits under this act unless the aggregate expenditures of State funds for the benefit of the area affected, exclusive of Federal funds—and not including a State's expenditure for participation in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways—are maintained at a level at least equal to the average level of such expenditures for the last 2 full fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this act. However, the Commission shall recommend to the President or the President's designee a lesser requirement when a substantial population decrease in the area affected would not justify a State expenditure equal to the average heretofore alluded to or when a State's average level of expenditure, within an individual program, has been disproportionate to the present need for the affected area.

Consent of States

Section 222 provides that no State shall be required to engage in or accept any program under the act without its consent.

Program Implementation

Section 223 provides that no program or project authorized under any section of title II shall be implemented until the Commission has consulted with and obtained the recommendations of the appropriate State official involved and until plans with regard to such program or project have been recommended by the Commission and approved or modified by the President or such Federal officer as the President may designate.

Program Development Criteria

Section 224(a) provides criteria to be followed by the Appalachian Regional Commission in developing recommendations for programs and projects under the act. Among these are (1) the relationship of the project to overall regional development and the inclusion of its location in an area having a significant potential for growth; (2) the relative per capita income and the unemployment rates in the area served; (3) the relative financial resources available to the State or political subdivisions or instrumentalities which seek to undertake the project; (4) the importance of the project as compared with other projects in competition for the same funds; (5) the prospects that the project will improve, on a continuing rather than on a temporary basis, the opportunities for employment, the average level of income, or the economic and social development of the area served.

Section 224(b) precludes any assistance from being given to the relocation of establishments from one area to another, or to finance the cost of facilities for generation or production, transmission or distribution of electric energy or gas (natural, manufactured, or mixed). No assistance may be given to finance the cost of industrial plants, commercial facilities, machinery, working capital, or other industrial facilities or to enable plant subcontractors to undertake work theretofore performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors.

TITLE III.—ADMINISTRATION

Local development districts—certification

Section 301 defines the term "local development district" as an entity certified to the Appalachian Regional Commission either by the Governor of the State or States in which such entity is located or by the State officer designated, as having a charter or authority that includes the economic development of counties or parts of counties or other political subdivisions within the region. No entity shall be certified as a local development district unless it is (1) a nonprofit incorporated body organized or chartered under State law; (2) a nonprofit State or local government agency or instrumentality; (3) a nonprofit agency or instrumentality created by interstate compact; or (4) a nonprofit association or combination of such bodies, agencies, and instrumentalities.

Grants for administrative expenses of local development districts and for research and demonstration projects

Section 302(a) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make grants, either directly or through arrangements with the Commission, for administrative expenses to local development districts, the amount of any such grant not to exceed 75 percent of the administrative expenses in any one fiscal year. No such grants shall be made for a period in excess of 3 years beginning on the date the initial grant is made to such development district. Local contributions for administrative expenses may be in cash or in kind, including but not limited to space, equipment and services. The Secretary is also authorized, either directly or through arrangements with appropriate public or private organizations (including the Commission), to provide funds for investigation, research, studies, and demonstration projects, but not for construction purposes, which will further the purposes of the act.

Section 302(b). Recipients of Federal assistance under this section shall maintain accurate and complete records of activities financed with Federal funds and report thereon to the Secretary, such records to be available for audit respecting such grants by the Secretary of Commerce and the Comptroller General.

Section 302(c) provides an expenditure not to exceed $5.5 million of the funds authorized in section 401 for implementation of this section.

No part of any appropriated funds may be expended involving scientific or technological research or development activities unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions effective to insure that all information, copyrights, patents, etc., resulting from that activity will be made freely available to the general public.

Project approval

Section 303 provides that an application for a grant or for any other assistance under this act shall be made only by a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a local development district. It is required that the application be made through the State member of the Commission representing such applicant and that such State member shall evaluate the application for approval. The Commission can approve only those applications which are first approved by such State member.

Annual report

Section 304 requires that not later than 6 months after the close of each fiscal year, the Commission shall submit to the Governor of each State in the region and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on the activities carried out under this act during such year.

TITLE IV—APPROPRIATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Authorization of appropriations

Section 401 authorizes not to exceed $252,400,000 to be appropriated for the period ending June 30, 1967, to be available until expended. This amount is in addition to the appropriations authorized in section 201 for the Appalachian development highway system.

Applicable labor standards

Section 402 provides that wage rates in connection with activities under this act shall be no less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended.

Definition of Appalachian region

Section 403 delineates the area embraced in the term "Appalachian Region." Of the 12 States included in Appalachia, West Virginia is the one State in which all counties are eligible for assistance under the act.

Severability

Section 404 contains the usual severability clause.

Termination

Section 405 provides that the act shall cease to be in effect on July 1, 1971.

THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON NAZI WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, several Senators, including myself, have previously called to the attention of the Senate the situation which now obtains in Germany with respect to the prosecution of Nazi war criminals.

The German criminal code contains a 20-year statute of limitations on murder, which has been interpreted by the West German Government to bar the initiation of prosecutions for Nazi crimes after May 8, 1965—20 years after the end of the Hitler regime. The Federal Republic Government claims that even though the period of limitations is scheduled to run its course on that date, prosecutions of Nazi criminals will not cease, but that many cases now being prepared for trial will be heard over the next few years.

The German Government also has declared that it has initiated extensive investigations of all other known Nazi war criminals. It is a feature of German law that a period of limitation may be interrupted, thereby automatically starting the period to run again for another 20 years, by official initiation of an investigation. This will make it possible for the German Government to prosecute every Nazi criminal known to it on May 8, 1965. For this purpose it appealed, on November 20, 1964, to "all governments, organizations, and individual persons, both in Germany and abroad," to make available all documents in their possession relating to the offenses of Nazi criminals still unknown to the Federal Republic.

Despite the efforts of the Federal Republic, however, a number of war criminals may escape justice unless some way is found to avoid the application of the statute of limitations to their crimes on May 8. As an example of how this might occur, the East German Government has refused to give the Federal Republic free access to files in its possession which may contain information concerning war crimes. There is some fear that East Germany may be withholding information for release after May 8, when Nazi criminals known to it, but not to the Federal Republic, would be able to walk the streets of Germany freely, unafraid of official retribution for their acts. The propaganda value of such a situation for East Germany and other Communist countries is obvious: West Germany would then be held up to the world as "fundamentally unrepentant and, thus, a continuing danger to mankind." Phony as this would be under the circumstances, it would still be effective propaganda.

Recognizing these implications of the statute-of-limitations issue, the West German Bundestag, on December 9, 1964, called on the Federal Government to report to the Bundestag by March 1, 1965, whether in all identifiable cases the statute has been interrupted, and further, to report whether the Government is prepared, if necessary, to discuss with the Bundestag the question of extending the statute.

Mr. President, it is apparent from the facts I have just related that the West German Government and Bundestag will soon be making a historic decision—a decision which concerns all humanity. That decision may foreclose prosecution of the last remnants of the most infamous and brutal band of killers in modern history; or it may again demonstrate to all the determination of the German Federal Republic to insure that no one who committed mass murder—genocide—will go free to mock the world.

The power to choose is West Germany's alone. But no man can be indifferent to the choice. The resolution I am now introducing, on behalf of myself and of the Senator from Connecticut, calls upon the President to request the West German Government "to take whatever action it deems necessary in providing for an extension of the statute of limitations affecting Nazi war criminals so that there will exist no possibility that any war criminals will escape justice through the operation of that statute."

I send the concurrent resolution to the desk for the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] and myself, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

I also ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the desk for 1 week from today, for the addition of cosponsors, and that the text of the resolution may be printed, together with the text of my remarks, at this point in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 16

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

Whereas the West German Bundestag is currently considering whether to extend a 20-year period of limitation on the institution of criminal actions, otherwise barred by statute after May 1965, against Nazi war criminals charged with genocide or murder; and

Whereas under the law of the German Federal Republic such statute of limitations may be tolled by the institution of a judicially sanctioned investigation of any person suspected of a crime; and

Whereas as a result of the efforts of the Government of the German Federal Republic prosecutions or investigations of presently known war criminals have been instituted to the end that these felons will not escape justice; and

Whereas despite such efforts there is the distinct chance that some war criminals will escape justice through the operation of the statute of limitations and this is a question for the world and for morality; and

Whereas the chance that some war criminals will escape is enhanced by the possibility that certain files pertaining to their wartime activities are being withheld by the East German Government (Communist) for propaganda advantage in the event prosecution is no longer possible under the laws of the German Federal Republic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should request the Government of the German Federal Republic to take whatever action it deems necessary in providing for an extension of the statute of limitations affecting Nazi war criminals so that there will exist no possibility that any war criminal will escape justice through the operation of that statute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in all our history there has never been a more immoral act than the Nazi genocide. Murder has no statute of limitations, and it should have none under the German law.

We must make clear where we stand on this dreadful issue; there can be no silence. I hope very much that the West German Government and Bundestag will hear the call made here, and will pay attention to how deeply we feel about it. I hope too that the President of the United States, upon the adoption of such a resolution as the one I have introduced, or sooner—and I hope very much sooner—will exercise the great influence of his Office to see that there shall not be what would constitute one of the gravest miscarriages of justice in the history of man: The escape of any Nazi war criminal because of the operation of the statute of limitations.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and other Senators who would urge the West German Republic to act before May 8, 1965, in order that those individuals responsible for vicious war crimes under Hitler can be brought before the bar of justice.

At common law, Mr. President, which forms the basis of this Nation's criminal laws, there is no statute of limitations for murder. Justice demands that this principle be applied to the mass murders of millions of Europeans during World War II. Those responsible—from the top to the bottom—should be brought to justice and should not be given a ticket to freedom.

I am encouraged that our own Government is aiding the West Germans in the apprehension of war criminals. In a note sent by the Department of State to the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany the United States assured the German nation that "the Government of the United States of America will continue to assist the Federal Republic in every appropriate way in its search for evidence of Nazi crimes and criminals." I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the note be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the note was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Note Sent by the Department of State to the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany Concerning Collection of Evidence on Nazi Murders

On January 8, 1965, the Department of State transmitted the following note to the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in response to the Embassy's request, as part of a worldwide appeal, for assistance in collecting evidence concerning murders, perpetrated during the Hitler regime which are not yet known to the Government of the Federal Republic:

The Department of State acknowledges the receipt of the note from the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany dated December 22, 1964, requesting, as part of a worldwide appeal, the assistance of the Government of the United States in collecting evidence concerning Nazi murders not yet known in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The two principal repositories of German documents which might be of value to the Federal Republic are the Berlin Document Center and the National Archives and Records Service of Alexandria, Va. The archives of the Library of Congress also contain some German documents.

The Federal Republic has of course for a number of years frequently consulted the Berlin Document Center, and the center continues to give all possible assistance to appropriate German authorities. German investigators have also in the past searched the documents at the Library of Congress and may, if they wish, again investigate these files.

The Government of the United States has returned to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany over 80 percent of the German documents originally stored in the National Archives at Alexandria. In 1960, officials designated by the German Federal Government searched these Archives for material which could be of use in the prosecution of Nazi war criminals. In order to be certain, however, that no useful document which might still be in the Archives has been overlooked, the Government of the United States invites the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany again to search the German documents still remaining in the National Archives at Alexandria. Upon notification by the German Government of its desire to send competent and qualified authorities to visit the Archives, the Department of State will be pleased to make appropriate arrangements with the National Archives.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is aware that the Government of the United States of America has long had a deep interest in the efforts of the Federal Republic to find, prosecute, and convict Nazi criminals not yet brought to justice. The Federal Republic is also undoubtedly aware of the concern of many American citizens that the scheduled expiration in May 1965 of the 20-year period under the German statute of limitations for murder might permit presently unknown Nazi criminals to escape prosecution. In light of these considerations, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is assured that the Government of the United States of America will continue to assist the Federal Republic in every appropriate way in its search for evidence of Nazi crimes and criminals.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr.

Scott] with respect to the resolution introduced earlier today by Senator Ribicoff and me regarding the extension of the statute of limitations affecting the Nazi war criminals.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Scott

I urge the Senate to support the resolution introduced by Senators Javits and Ribicoff which requests the President to ask the Government of the German Federal Republic to extend its statute of limitations affecting Nazi war criminals.

As you know, on May 8, 1965, the 20-year statute of limitations runs out under West German law on the murders and genocide perpetrated before and during World War II.

I join with many people throughout the free world who shudder at the thought of any Nazi criminal coming out of hiding and being free of persecution because of such a circumstance.

But under West German law there are important exceptions to this situation. I am informed that a statutory limitation can be interrupted by an action on the part of a West German judge. In other words, if a judge makes a notation on the papers of a suspect that, "the investigation is to be continued," the statutory limit is set aside and the case stays open for another 20 years.

The West German Government is to be commended for its recent worldwide appeal for information on all Nazi crimes so that every possible suspect could be so designated.

However, as German Ambassador to the United States Heinrich Knappstein pointed out recently, it is entirely possible that some people with such information, such as those behind the Iron Curtain, might intentionally withhold data which they alone possess. That would allow the statute of limitations to run on some Nazi criminals. And Ambassador Knappstein added, "This possibility should also be blocked." Such a view is shared by many people throughout the free world.

Therefore, I commend the West German Government for what it has done up until now to prosecute Nazi criminals and for its actions to keep open the statute of limitations on specific suspects of which it is aware.

But I join the many others who have spoken from the floor of this Senate to urge that the German Government take whatever further action is necessary prior to May 8, 1965, to be certain that not one criminal, however carefully he is hidden, can possibly escape prosecution.

EXCISE TAXES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] and the distinguished minority whip [Mr. Kuchel] pointed with pride to the efforts of the distinguished minority leader last spring to reduce excise taxes amounting to some $550 million and said that the proposal of the President was merely copying Republican policy.

I think it should be noted that last spring the administration had cut taxes by approximately $11½ billion through reductions in personal income tax and in the corporate profit tax and that it was reluctant to take up a decrease in excise taxes on top of those reductions in the income tax. But since my good friends from the other side of the aisle have introduced the historical record of their efforts to reduce excise taxes, I think it would be appropriate if I introduced into the Record my previous efforts in 1958 to reduce excise taxes. On June 20, 1958, I proposed an amendment to the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1958 proposing wide reductions in excise taxes which would have amounted to approximately $1,350 million. We were then in a recession, and a reduction in excise taxes was very appropriate.

I ask unanimous consent that a description of this amendment be inserted in the Record, with the voting record of the two parties in the matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Voting Record

(Vote No. 117, Congressional Record, volume 104, part 9, page 11866)

Congress: 85th, 2d session.
File reference: Finance, commerce, industry.
Subject: H.R. 12695. Tax Rate Extension Act of 1958 (Douglas amendment).

DIGEST OF VOTE

H.R. 12695, an act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, and to repeal the taxes on transportation of property.

Vote on Douglas amendment to reduce or repeal the following excise taxes: (Estimated revenue loss, $1,347 million).

1. Retailer's excises: Repeals the 10-percent excise tax on jewelry selling at retail for $25 or less; the first $100 of the retail selling price of watches and clocks, toilet preparations, luggage, handbags, and wallets.

2. Manufacturer's excises: Repeals the 10-percent excise tax on air conditioners, light bulbs, radios, TV sets, phonographs, musical instruments, sporting goods (except fishing equipment), business machines, mechanical lighters, pencils, fountain and ballpoint pens, cameras, and film; repeals the 5-percent excise tax on household-type refrigeration equipment, electrical-gas-oil appliances, household-type projectors; repeals the 2 cents per 1,000 but not more than 10-percent excise tax on plain matches and the 5½ cents per 1,000 on fancy matches.

3. Facilities and services: Repeals the various rates of excise taxes on admissions of all kinds, including musicians; reduces from 10 percent to 5 percent excise taxes on telephone and telegraph leased wires; repeals the 10-percent excise tax on local telephone service; and reduces from 8 percent to 4 percent the excise tax on wire and equipment service.

RESULT OF VOTE: AMENDMENT REJECTED

Yeas (20): Democrats, 18, or 49 percent; Republicans, 2, or 5 percent.

Nays (55): Democrats, 19, or 51 percent; Republicans, 36, or 95 percent.

Not voting (21)—Democrats (12): Absent, 6; announced against, 4; paired for, 1; paired against, 1. Republicans (9): Absent, 2; announced against, 3; paired for, 2; paired against, 2.

Yeas (20)—Democrats (18): Carroll, Douglas, Fulbright, Hennings, Hill, Humphrey, Johnston of South Carolina, Kennedy, Long, Magnuson, Mansfield, McNamara, Morse, Murray, Pastore, Proxmire, Sparkman, Symington. Republicans (2): Langer, Malone.

Nays (55)—Democrats (19): Anderson, Bible, Byrd, Chavez, Church, Eastland, Ervin, Frear, Green, Holland, Jordan, Kerr, Lausche, Monroney, Neuberger, Robertson, Stennis, Talmadge, Thurmond. Republicans (36): Aiken, Allott, Barrett, Beall, Bennett, Bridges, Bush, Butler, Carlson, Case of New Jersey, Case of South Dakota, Cooper, Cotton, Curtis, Dirksen, Dworshak, Flanders, Hickenlooper, Hoblitzell, Hruska, Ives, Javits, Kuchel, Morton, Mundt, Potter, Revercomb, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Smith of Maine, Smith of New Jersey, Thye, Watkins, Wiley, Williams, Young.

Not voting (21)—Democrats (12): Clark, announced against; Ellender, announced against; Gore, absent; Hayden, absent; Jackson, paired for; Johnson of Texas, absent; Kefauver, announced against; McClellan, paired against; O'Mahoney, absent; Russell, announced against; Smathers, absent; Yarborough, absent. Republicans (9): Bricker, paired against; Capehart, paired for; Goldwater, paired for; Jenner, absent; Knowland, paired against; Martin of Iowa, announced against; Martin of Pennsylvania, announced against; Payne, announced against; Purtell, absent.

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON

A Presidential recommendation? H.R. 12695—Yes.

Administration's position: Against amendment.

Administration's position—Supported: Democrats, 19, or 51 percent; Republicans, 36, or 95 percent. Opposed: Democrats, 18, or 49 percent; Republicans, 2, or 5 percent.

Party cohesion: Democrats, 51 percent; Republicans, 95 percent.

Measure of party support on issue as voted on—For (20): Democrats, 18, or 90 percent; Republicans, 2, or 10 percent. Against (55): Democrats, 19, or 35 percent; Republicans, 36, or 65 percent.

Senator Douglas, in urging adoption of the amendment, stated: "It will be seen that most of these excises are durable goods excises. We all know that the present recession has been largely in the durable goods industry. This industry has been in trouble for some time. It has been in trouble for many months preceding the beginning of the recession last August * * * there is every reason why the manufacturers' excise—a wartime excise—should be repealed at this time, when our purpose should be to stimulate sales, and thereby employment and production in this industry."

Opponents' concern was in the loss of revenue at a time of increased Government spending.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, an analysis will show that there were 20 votes cast in favor of the reduction in excise taxes and 55 against. Of the 20 votes cast in favor of the reduction, 18 were Democrats; namely, Senators Carroll, Douglas, Fulbright, Hennings, Hill, Humphrey, Johnston of South Carolina, Kennedy, Long, Magnuson, Mansfield, McNamara, Morse, Murray, Pastore, Proxmire, Sparkman, and Symington.

I regret that there were only two Republicans who voted in favor; namely, Senators Langer and Malone.

In other words, approximately 50 percent of the Democrats who voted, voted for the reduction, but only 5 percent of the Republicans voted to reduce the excise tax, and 95 percent of the Republicans voted against the reduction.

Among the Republicans who voted against the reduction I find the name of the distinguished minority leader, my colleague [Mr. Dirksen], the distinguished minority whip [Mr. Kuchel], the chairman of the Republican policy committee [Mr. Hickenlooper], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], who occupies a very leading position in the Republican hierarchy.

So perhaps it was the movement of the progressive Democrats which I had the honor to propound which stimulated the

Republicans last spring, and which may have laid the basis for the action of the administration this winter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The junior Senator from Louisiana is pleased to note that his name was among those who voted for the Douglas amendment to reduce excise taxes by $1.3 billion. The Senator from Louisiana did not feel he could vote for the Dirksen amendment when it was offered some time ago because he feared it could be the beginning of an avalanche of reductions in addition to what had been planned. This Senator from Louisiana was in charge of a bill which provided for a $11.5 billion tax reduction, which the second year would amount to a reduction of $14 billion.

So the Senator from Louisiana is somewhat in the position of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]. He has voted for and against reduction of excise taxes. But, so far as I can recall, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] has been consistent, whether it was a Democrat who managed the bill or a Republican who did. He has voted to reduce excise taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not sure I have had a record of perfect consistency, but I have had one of relative consistency.

At any rate, there were only two Republicans who in 1958 voted with those who started the movement to reduce excise taxes, and this fact should be added to the historical record which the two distinguished leaders on the other side of the aisle placed in the Record.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has been one of my teachers and leaders in the matter of excise taxes in recent years. In 1947, however, the Senator from Oregon introduced a bill that would have eliminated most of the excise taxes and reduced the others recommended by the Committee for Economic Development in its great report of 1947.

The Senator from Oregon, year after year, has offered amendments, or revised amendments, containing proposals of the Committee for Economic Development, because I think the Committee for Economic Development was unanswerably right in 1947, and I think it has been unanswerably right since.

I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], great economist that he is, has been unanswerably right every time he has taken the floor and given his expert knowledge of the tax problems of the country on all phases of taxation, but particularly on the matter of excise taxes. I congratulate him for that record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oregon. Apparently I followed in the footsteps of the Senator from Oregon in this matter, as in so many other matters. But the record is clear that it was the progressive and liberal forces in the Senate that have led the move for reduction of excise taxes, and this fact should be noted and recorded. We are very grateful to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] for following in our footsteps. We are pleased that it has become administration policy. I have noted a general lag of 7 years between the time when the senior Senator from Illinois proposes measures and the time they are adopted. This is a cultural and political lag which I hope to reduce in the future.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct when he says it was the liberal forces, for I urge that we keep faith with the pledges made at the time the excise taxes were imposed in the first place. In many of my speeches on excise taxes over the years, I have cited the position taken by Senator after Senator and Representative after Representative that these excise taxes were imposed as a war measure. They made an unequivocal pledge that when the war was over, they would be removed. They received votes on the basis of that promise. I believe when a politician makes a promise, he ought to live up to it, or if he does not, he ought to admit that he is reneging on a pledge.

Congress has not kept faith with the commitments it made at the time excise taxes were imposed. They were imposed, as shown by the speeches made at the time, including those of both leaders of both Houses of Congress—as the Congressional Record will show—to discourage civilian production; and rightly so. We were saying that we were trying to win a war, and any unnecessary civilian production interfered with the prosecution of the war. In fact, a reading of those speeches will lead one to reach no other conclusion than that it was that which was given major emphasis.

The second reason advanced was that they were easy to collect, simple to impose and would raise a great deal of money quickly. They were imposed as a war measure for quick revenue and they were justified in that kind of imposition. There has been no justification for Congress to "renege" on the promise it made to the American people year after year since the war ended. The penetrating report of the Committee for Economic Development in 1947, stands unanswerable. I have listened to the debate in the Senate, and I have not heard one Senator come anywhere near presenting a rationalization which would justify a verdict in favor of continuing excise taxes.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUTER RAILROADS URGED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a lead editorial in the New York Daily News. The Daily News usually has a fairly conservative view on questions of subsidies.

It points today to the high necessity in the public interest of the Federal Government backing commuter roads, like the New York, New Haven, and Hartford.

This excellent editorial advises that this is a much wiser line of action than spending what is proposed to be spent at a future date on the experimental high-speed rail systems.

I hope that we can effectively and prudently afford to do both. But I think it is very interesting that this editorial should feel that this is a case which so richly deserves governmental financial backing, as I have urged together with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], my colleague from New York [Mr. Kennedy], and other Senators and Representatives so that the commuter lines can continue to operate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in this morning's New York Daily News, entitled "One Track; One Road," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One Track; One Road

The financial troubles of the New Haven and Long Island railroads have been making a lot of headlines recently, but these are not the only local lines whose commuter operations are sick, sick, sick.

A few days ago, Erie Lackawanna Chairman William White issued a worried and worrisome warning that his road soon may have to ask the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit the dropping of all Erie commuter service in northern New Jersey.

This road carries about 35,000 commuters every business day. The service is operated at a loss of more than $8 million a year. The State of New Jersey meets a $2.2 million worth of this loss while the railroad pays the State about $4.3 million in property taxes.

White says that "if the service is deemed essential, it can no longer be considered a private business; it is a public service that must be paid for by someone other than bondholders and shareowners of the railroad."

Would it be an injustice to taxpayers who don't use the railroad to allow States served by the local commuter railroads to set up a costly commission or authority which would take over operation of all commuter lines?

The Erie Lackawanna makes this meaty comment:

"Ironically, the millions of dollars being spent every year to build more and more highways only means more and more congestion in the already crowded metropolitan areas. Highway construction puts the emphasis on moving vehicles, not people. Conversely, one railroad track can move as many people as can autos on 10 to 20 lanes of highways. Why let this great asset go to waste? The commissioner of the New Jersey Highway Department has pointed out that assumption of the Erie Lackawanna's annual suburban service deficit would cost less than constructing 1 mile of superhighway."

On the strength of that statement, if taxpayers should be called on to subsidize a lot of commuter service until a big regional transit authority could get such service on a paying or break-even basis, the taxpayers would be getting their money's worth in more ways than one—less highway construction needed, less city traffic and parking congestion, etc.

But for the short haul in attacking the metropolitan area's commuter troubles, why doesn't the Johnson administration postpone those dreamy experiments with 200-mile-per hour Washington-to-Boston trains, and just make a wise distribution of a lot of that money among the New York and Boston metropolitan area commuter railroads?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination of Mr. W. J. Driver, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination to the Veterans' Administration will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, I have had some things to say in the past weeks about the announced closing of the Miles City Veterans Hospital. In my judgment—and I have spoken it repeatedly as a Senator from Montana—the closure is ill-advised, as well may be other closings which were announced at the same time. It is ill-advised because of the geography of the situation in the northern plains region. It is ill-advised because of the very adequate patient-load which the Miles City hospital has consistently carried. It is ill-advised because of the favorable cost-per-patient record of that hospital. It is ill-advised because of the great extra burden of travel which it places on both patient and family in the essentially rural and sparsely settled region which the hospital serves. It is ill-advised because the Miles City hospital is not only not obsolete but, on the contrary, is capable of useful expansion at least to twice its present size as a modern veterans' facility. It is ill-advised because the closing of Miles City will weaken a basic legal principle in veterans' legislation—that veterans are entitled to hospitalization at a location reasonably proximate to their place of domicile. It is ill-advised because veterans have been obtaining at Miles City first-class general medical service which, for more than a decade, has been entirely satisfactory to patients.

Those are the reasons, Mr. President, which have prompted me to speak out repeatedly on this situation. Those are the reasons which are involved in my vehement objections to the action which has been announced; and, together with my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF], I intend to continue to press them.

As for Mr. Driver, from all reports he is an able and conscientious man who has had long experience and dedication in veterans' affairs, which makes the closure at Miles City even more difficult to fathom. I can only assume—and I am inclined to believe and have so stated—that the responsibility for these closures is to be laid at the doorstep of the Bureau of the Budget with its false economy drive in the Veterans' Administration, which in this instance has been pushed at the expense of the fully earned and legally authorized rights of veterans to first-class, considerate, proximate, and humane treatment.

Because Mr. Driver is an able and conscientious public servant, I would expect that he will have the determination to resist the erosion of these earned and legal rights of veterans against those who may have yielded their human perspectives to the computers in the name of economy. I would hope, too, that as an able and conscientious public servant that he will be prepared to stand against an ill-advised economy and to dedicate himself to the redress of grievances which stem from it, especially when, as in the case of Miles City, the ill-advice is so transparent. It is with that expectation and hope and without reservation that I shall vote for the confirmation of his nomination. I urge all Senators to do so.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, shortly I shall move to postpone until March 1, 1965, consideration of the nomination of Mr. W. J. Driver by the President of the United States to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

I ask for the yeas and nays on that vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will have to make the motion first, before he can ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move to postpone until March 1, 1965, consideration of the nomination of W. J. Driver by the President of the United States for the office of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request for the yeas and nays is in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, there is more than an executive nomination at stake here today.

There should be under consideration as well the far-reaching and unwarranted closing of 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliaries and either a closing or a reduction in personnel at 17 regional offices, including the one at White River Junction, Vt., which were announced by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on January 13, 1965.

It is becoming more and more apparent that the White House and the Bureau of the Budget, not Mr. Driver, are the ones truly responsible for this coming and harmful curtailment of service to veterans. Yet, in the face of this fact, I think it is appropriate to say that ratification of Mr. Driver's nomination could very easily be considered as a ratification of the policies he so recently announced.

When it comes to executive nominations, Mr. President, the Constitution speaks of the power of the Senate to give its "advice" as well as its "consent."

Is the advice provision in the Constitution pure sham or do we indeed have just cause for giving counsel to the administration of which the Acting Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is a spokesman?

True it may be that Mr. Driver is a qualified man. True it may be that the decision to eviscerate the Veterans' Administration was not his.

But true it is also that if Mr. Driver is confirmed now the Senate will be saying to the veterans of this country:

> We are afraid to protest. We tremble at the thought of exercising the power of advice which the Constitution intended. In a word, we break faith with you.

How curious it is, Mr. President, that in the name of economy the administration recommends that we oppose aiding those who fought for this country in order to aid dictators abroad who now work against it.

How ironic it is that the veteran in Alaska must by reason of the proposed order travel a thousand miles to get hospital care and the veteran in Vermont some 250 or 300 miles to obtain aid on his claim.

And why are these inconveniences supposed to be necessary? When we ask, "economy," is the answer we receive.

Justice and health care can be made so inaccessible that there is neither justice nor care. The consequences of it all is that a man with a valid claim abandons it and the man who is ill wearies of the endeavor to get attention, grows worse and sometimes dies.

I say to my colleagues with complete sincerity that the Senate is not yet ready to act on the nomination of W. J. Driver as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

I say that the Senate has a right to know whether the curtailment of these Veterans' Administration activities will deteriorate or improve service to veterans of armed conflict.

The Senate also has the duty to find out whether the Federal Government should continue its practice of taking from rural States facilities that are much in need in order to crowd them into cities already overburdened with housing and transportation problems.

This is not yet a Senate of sheep, Mr. President. It still retains the power to advise as well as consent, to counsel as well as ratify.

If through unwisdom or folly we are forced to act now before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare completes its investigation of the proposed closing of veterans' installations, then the Senate has lost its best opportunity to speak out for the men who served with distinction in time of war.

I propose now that we avoid such a senseless loss.

I had intended, Mr. President, to propose to the Senate, without prejudice to the nominee, that action on his nomination be delayed until such time as the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reaches a determination, expressed in a written report, as to whether the proposed installation closings will increase or improve service to honorably discharged veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

I was advised, however, by the Parliamentarian that to be in order a postponement motion must specify a day certain.

Mr. President, that is the reason why I have offered the proposal. The purpose is to allow the Veterans Subcommittee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to complete their investigation.

I hope very much that the motion will be approved.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont, for the wisdom of his action today, and for his lucid explanation of his motion to postpone.

It is always a difficult matter to pass on an individual, particularly when, from all accounts, that individual is of the very highest type, and one whose character, integrity, capacity, and ability are not likely to be challenged by us.

It is also true that we must recognize that any man entrusted with the responsibility of leadership and control over a great bureau or division of our Government must of necessity, to a degree at least, follow the wishes of the administration and play on the team, in backing up the policies of the President.

When I say "President," I must say that I mean the President. The Bureau of the Budget is only a euphemistic way of referring to the President's policy. Therefore, perhaps we should not expect Mr. Driver to stand out against the fixed and considered policy of the administration that he does and presumably will later continue to represent. But, when we are dealing with the veterans of this country, and especially veterans who are disabled and have qualified for care and for hospitalization, we are dealing with a subject that transcends party. It transcends executive policies.

The head of the Veterans' Administration, I submit, should feel a deeper and more profound sense of duty to the service-connected disabled veterans and the aged veterans in this country than to any administration or to any policy.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont that we should wait. In the first place, if we were to vote on this confirmation today, I would be compelled to vote no. And, if we are compelled to vote on the nomination today, I shall vote no without any personal reflection upon the nominee. I shall do so because we cannot afford to place the hallmark of our approval upon the nominee, until we see how he stands up on these vital questions and the appropriate committees of Congress have had opportunity to report.

Therefore, if we can wait until the actions of that department emerge, and the lines are laid down more clearly, we may perhaps be able to exercise our constitutional duty more intelligently because of the knowledge we shall then have. We shall perhaps be able to act more fairly to Mr. Driver, to the veterans, and to the people of the country.

I think it would be a sad mistake to vote today, when that vote would stand for something that very few of us wish to stand for.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for offering this motion. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I certainly agree with him completely.

I think it should be pointed out that this motion is in no way intended to cast a reflection upon Mr. Driver as an individual, or upon his ability as an administrator.

It does seem, as the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire has pointed out so ably, that if we approve his nomination at this time, we are, in fact, saying that we approve the action which has been proposed by the Veterans' Administration.

I am sure this is not something which is in the interest of veterans. Every veterans' organization in the country, so far as I know, is militantly opposed to this action. The purpose of my motion is merely to give the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, more particularly the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, an opportunity to consider all the evidence and make a report to the Senate.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I am grateful to the Senator from Vermont for offering this proposal to postpone consideration of the nomination. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire. If the vote is forced today, and the vote on confirmation comes up this afternoon, I shall be constrained to vote against confirmation.

On January 22, when the hearings began in the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, I was prepared to vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I was prepared to vote for it in spite of the fact that, as my colleague [Mr. MANSFIELD] has pointed out, he had advised the ill-conceived proposal to close the veterans hospital. I was prepared to vote for confirmation in spite of the fact that he had written to Senators who came from States where hospitals or domiciliary facilities to be closed were located.

There were developments in those hearings that I shall go into, if I am forced to vote, that raise questions that are unanswered. There are several volumes of testimony which resulted from the hearings of the subcommittee that should be printed and made available to every Member of the Senate. Many questions were asked that were not answered, but material was to be supplied for the record.

Many inconclusive statements were made by Mr. Driver and especially by Dr. McNinch. I participated in those hearings.

So I believe we should delay action on the confirmation of the nomination. We should not permit the closing of hospitals. We should not permit the new policies by Mr. Driver and Dr. McNinch as the policies of the Veterans' Administration to be endorsed. We should not endorse this new program of depriving veterans in isolated and remote areas of hospitals and other facilities adjacent to their communities. We should not adopt the idea that we should move those facilities closer to the large populations and major facilities and close hospitals in other areas.

If forced to vote on the nomination this afternoon, I hope I shall be able to say more.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for giving me this opportunity to go into the matter and for giving Mr. Driver an opportunity to explain his position, so it will not cause any reflection on Mr. Driver. Perhaps if the vote came later, I would be able to vote for confirmation.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to the Senator from Montana. During the committee hearings he interrogated at great length members of the Veterans' Administration. Quite frankly, he could not be satisfied with the answers given to him and other members of the committee who were present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me. I compliment him on his most appropriate motion to delay the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs at this time. There are many angles to this so-called cutback, and the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has taken the time of its members and staff and of the witnesses to go into the subject so that we may have a full understanding of what is taking place. That would be done without prejudice to Mr. Driver. I cannot understand why the nomination should be pressed at this time until the committee makes its recommendations.

There are many other reasons, of course, why the confirmation should be delayed at least until March 1, or until the committee has an opportunity to report. Obviously, every day is bringing forth further information as to the aspects of the so-called cutback and economy effort against the veterans of this country, their widows, and their orphans.

In my own State of Delaware this past weekend, I attended a meeting of about 150 veterans, including the Governor of the State of Delaware, the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Jenkins, and members of the State legislature. They were all concerned by the so-called cutback or economy move against veterans, which places additional costs on veterans across the country, including veterans who cannot afford these costs.

In the State of Delaware, the legislature unanimously adopted a resolution last Friday against the cutback as it affects our State. The Governor has signed it. As I understand, this resolution is to be forwarded not only to the President of the United States and Mr. Driver, but to both Houses of Congress.

It seems to me, without further extending my remarks, that the motion to delay, without prejudice, a vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver, whom I recognize as a very able public servant of the country, and who is held in the highest regard—would be in his best interest. It would be in his interest to delay action on the confirmation until the committee has an opportunity to report to Congress on the issue we are considering today.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to my distinguished colleague. He made a powerful presentation when he appeared before the committee. He has pointed out the harms which would accrue to the veterans in the States if this proposal were carried through.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I commend the Senator on the motion he has made. I appreciate the fine work he has done in behalf of the veterans in committee and in the Senate.

Mr. Driver called at my office early in January and advised me that he was the nominee to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. We had a very pleasant visit. I could see no reason why I should not support him. I so advised him. It was not disclosed to me that the order was about to be issued. The order was issued in a matter of hours that veterans hospitals were to be closed.

Mr. President, we have no assurance that there is any economy in this move. Abraham Lincoln once put this conundrum. He said:

> If I call a calf's tail a leg, how many legs does it have? The reply was, "Five." Lincoln said, "No. Calling his tail a leg does not make it so."

Getting up and asserting that this is an economy movement does not make it so. We have a sizable program in operation for building new veterans hospitals. We have a sizable program for enlarging hospitals. The taxpayers of the United States are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to build hospitals of various kinds. Hospitals that have existed for some time carry the advantage of a lower per capita cost than the new ones.

(At this point Mr. TYDINGS took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if we are to give an individual veteran adequate care, it will require personnel, regardless of where the hospital is located.

If there is a surplus of veterans hospitals, why this program of enlargement? That does not prove that any economy is involved.

Furthermore, it has been stated by the Veterans' Administration that the need for hospital beds for veterans of World War II will increase each year for the next 15 years. The peak will be reached in 1980. That is not my statement. That is a statement made by the Veterans' Administration.

Why close hospitals at a time when the need is going up?

I do not believe that Mr. Driver should be confirmed until we find out what weight he will give to the findings of the committees now considering this situation.

The Senate is entitled to cooperation from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. It is a two-way street. Soon after the announcement came, the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives started to hold hearings. They began to gather information. They began to study the issue.

Did the Veterans' Administration hold everything in abeyance while Congress was looking into the subject?

Not at all. They are taking those steps in defiance of the act of Congress. Patients are being refused admission because of plans to close hospitals. Patients are being advised that they will have to move because of the plan to close hospitals.

The debt this Nation owes our veterans is so great that the least that can be done is to hold everything in abeyance until all the facts are in. The idea of going ahead and refusing patients and making plans for transferring them, is not only an act in defiance of the Congress, but also lacking in due regard for the needs of the veteran.

If their ground is so well taken, if they have such great proof that these hospitals are not needed, if they have indisputable proof that there is economy involved, why all the hurry?

Why not let the Senate committee and the House committee look into the facts? If, when the facts are all in, they prove their point, why do they wish to hurry?

The only plausible answer is that they do not wish the facts presented. They do not wish Congress to take time to study the matter before they proceed with the steps they have set in motion.

I shall not only support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], but also, I dare express the hope that perhaps this issue could be held in abeyance and not forced to a vote today.

I can see it no other way than an endorsement of what the Veterans' Administration is attempting to do. It is attempting to close hospitals while the matter is being studied by Congress. It is attempting to close hospitals on claims of economy that it has not established. It is attempting to close hospitals while it is opening and enlarging other hospitals.

It does not make sense.

I hope that we shall not be forced into the uncomfortable situation of having to vote against the nomination at this time.

If I am forced to do so, I shall oppose the nomination.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator from Nebraska has made a valuable contribution. I am indeed grateful to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to ask one question.

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My analysis of the problem is that there are two issues. One is the right of Mr. Driver to be approved. Two is the propriety and justice of what is contemplated with respect to the closing of certain hospitals.

How does the Senator from Vermont tie in these seemingly two separate issues into one, indicating that in order to properly solve the second question of the right to close the hospitals, we should delay approval or disapproval of Mr. Driver?

Mr. PROUTY. My answer to the Senator is this: Mr. Driver issued the order, I believe on January 13—I am not certain of the date—but it seems to me that if we approve his nomination at the present time, in effect we shall be saying that we approve the closing of these installations. A great many Senators feel that they are very much opposed to the closing of these installations at the present time, until proper examination has been made and justification has been given for such closings.

Thus far, we have not received that information. I am sure that anyone who attended the hearings when the representatives of the Veterans' Adminstration were present, would agree that their answers were far from conclusive. In many instances, they did not have the answers.

I have the highest respect for Mr. Driver as an individual. I hope, at some time in the future, that I can vote for confirmation of his nomination. I believe that he is a good administrator and has done a great job through the years for the Veterans' Administration, but I strongly feel that if we confirm his nomination now, we shall be saying to the veterans in our States that we approve of the orders sent out from the Veterans' Administration by Mr. Driver.

I am sure that the veterans in the 50 States are almost unanimous in opposition to the proposed closing of these hospitals, at least until the facts are made known more clearly than they are known at the present time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What answer can we give to those who might charge us with using the power of nonapproval of an appointment as a coercion upon him to adopt a judgment which he believes to be wrong and inconsistent with what should be done?

Mr. PROUTY. All we are trying to do, in this instance, is to give the committee an opportunity to ascertain the facts. We are delaying it. As I suggested earlier, I have the highest respect for Mr. Driver, but he has not made a strong case, in my judgment—and I believe in the judgment of those who attended the hearings—in support of his position.

Perhaps Mr. Driver is not the one at fault. Perhaps higher authority has suggested that he take this action; but, irrespective of that, I believe that in justice to the veterans we represent in the States throughout the country, we have no alternative other than to take this position at the present time.

I wish it could be avoided but, unfortunately, the nomination was called up.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In replying to the communications which I have been receiving in opposition to the closing of the hospitals, I have stated that I will do nothing to impede the proper treatment which the Federal Government should give its veterans. I have further stated that inquiries are being made by the appropriate committees of the Senate and House to pass on the merits of what is being done, and that I would await the findings of those committees. I should like to get the judgment of the committees. I shall make no findings of my own until I have heard all that the committees have to say. I am of the belief that probably to get this matter on an even keel, without force being applied one way or another, it ought to be held in abeyance until the committees make their reports.

Mr. PROUTY. That was my original point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to say, in response to what the Senator from Ohio has said, that I have made, and will continue to make findings on my own, because I know the situation at Miles City. I think it is outrageous.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which has looked into this matter, and am its ranking minority member. I have heard a good deal of the testimony—not all of it, but a good deal of it—and I would like to answer the statement of the Senator from Ohio, because I believe he has asked some very pertinent questions.

Mr. President, nothing will happen to Mr. Driver. He will probably eventually be confirmed as VA Administrator. I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination when it comes before the Senate. He is a fine public servant with a long record of service. We all understand that.

Mr. President, we all know that this is a decision which was made, not by him—and probably would not have been made by him even if he had been on the job for a year—because he came to the job on December 29 and the decision was announced on January 13th. It was undoubtedly significantly influenced by the Bureau of the Budget and by others in the administration.

Mr. Driver may have been a party to the consultation, but this was not his decision.

If that is the case, why should we postpone consideration of his nomination? In the first place, it does not change his position at all, because he is the Administrator, and will continue to be throughout this session of Congress. He has been testifying before us as Administrator, and he would perform his duties even if his nomination went over until the 1st of March.

I am not concerned about the fact that the world will take this as Senator MANSFIELD's agreement, even if he votes against the decision that the facility ought to be closed. I have never heard him express himself more strongly on any issue since I first came to the Senate.

What can we do in the circumstances? People say we have a great deal of power. If the decision to close these facilities is not modified, and an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration is pressed upon, we cannot, under the rule, move to add to that appropriation. All we can do is move to cut it, which we will not do under the circumstances, of course. We will find that our courses of action are somewhat limited no matter what the committee finally decides is the most prudent course. The best alternative we can adopt, I believe, is to adopt a resolution expressing our disagreement with the decision.

The President might make up his mind about this and say, "I am sorry that you have adopted this resolution." That is all we could do.

Our only opportunity is to postpone consideration of the nomination. This is not a terrible thing. After all, we are not living in a vacuum. Everyone will understand that this is the only opportunity the Senate has to protest against these arbitrary closings, whether the closing takes place in my State, in the State of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], or in other States. No matter where it takes place, the feeling is very deep against it.

We have heard the testimony in committee. The proponents of this action have not made out a case in their favor. Those who propose to close these facilities, which are important to our veterans must bear the burden of proof that these facilities should be closed. The Veterans' Administration and the Administrator, himself, must bear the burden of proof.

I cite, for example, the standard which was announced by the Administrator in connection with these closings. For example, he has said that the closings have been made because they will contribute to the maximum amount of operational economy and efficiency in maintenance. As shown by the cross-examination of the witnesses by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], in which I participated and in which others also participated—I refer to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and other Senators—it appeared clear that the facility at Sunmount, N.Y., was in good operating condition, and maintained high operating efficiency, and there was no reason for closing it.

The effect of the closing of the Bath, N.Y., hospital on medical services in that area is a cause of deep concern to me. The Bath hospital is located in south-central New York State and serves a seven-county area which includes 33,000 veterans. The ratio of hospital bed to population in this area is 8 to 3 as compared with the national average of 2 to 7. This hospital has been operating, moreover, at a 90-to-990 capacity for the past 5 years.

With respect to its economic impact, the closing of the Veterans' Administration Center in Bath would leave some 2,200 people in and around a community of 6,166 people without income support. The area would be losing a payroll of approximately $3 million to $3,500,000 per year, an extremely serious blow. The village of Bath has a population as specialized in the case of the aged and infirmed as Detroit has for the manufacture of automobiles. The loss of these funds to an area as dependent as the village of Bath is, would be a major calamity.

The Bath hospital is staffed with many certified specialists in fields such as pathology, surgery, urology, gastrointestinal, cardiology, radiology, and physical medicine. This hospital has more board specialists than any hospital within a surrounding area of approximately 90 miles. Bath has the only domiciliary in the area and serves approximately 9 million veterans in a 10-State area. The hospital has trainee programs with surrounding colleges—a nursing program with Keuka College, and affiliations with Cortland State University, the University of Rochester, the University of Syracuse, and the University of Buffalo. It has consultants who visit the hospital from Strong Memorial in Rochester, and Sayre Hospital, Sayre, Pa.

With respect to the Veterans Hospital at Sunmount, N.Y., this important medical facility provides medical services for 70,055 veterans in the area. The payroll there involves $3,075,000 which represents 45 percent of the income from wages in this community. In addition, the Veterans' Administration has spent over $2.5 million on this hospital in the last 10 years to improve its physical capabilities. In addition, over $70,000 was spent just to make the ceilings fireproof. This type of expenditure is not made on an obsolete and unnecessary facility.

The Castle Point VA Hospital closing will result in a drastic loss of medical services, movement of 250 patients, the loss of 340 jobs and $2,400,000 annual payroll to the community.

VA Administrator Driver stated to me in his letter of notice on the closings that they would contribute to "maximum operational efficiency and economy" and "maintenance of high standards of service." I question whether the record of hearings of the Veterans Subcommittee bears this out. I hope that the subcommittee will recommend that the VA reconsider its proposed closings and that in this event Administrator Driver would abide by that recommendation.

We ought to make it very clear that Mr. Driver is a fine gentleman; his nomination is expected to be confirmed; but that this is the only opportunity we have in the Senate to deal with these closings, considering the ways of the Senate. This is our first full opportunity to express our displeasure with this decision.

The Senator from Vermont has shown us a mild way to do it. After all, this proposal involves a deferral for only 30 days. It would not affect Mr. Driver, or his future, or his job. However, it would show the temper of the Senate. I shall vote to support the motion, and I hope the Senate will do likewise.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise to support the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. I commend him for submitting his motion to the Senate.

Speaking along the lines mentioned by the Senator from New York, this morning I was in receipt of a letter from the Director of the Department of Veterans' Affairs of the State of Nebraska, Mr. Leo J. Beck, Sr. He had received a letter addressed to him by Mr. Driver only a few days before he wrote his letter of January 29.

In Mr. Driver's letter concerning th Lincoln Veterans' Hospital to Mr. Beck this language is used:

> The current capacity of this hospital is 280 beds, 30 of which are out of use because of the limited demand for care in the area. There are also 40 beds out of use for the same reason at our nearby hospital in Omaha.

What is the truth about this situation? According to the information available to Mr. Beck, the following is what actually has happened. He states in his letter to Mr. Driver:

> The truth is that there have only been 250 beds in the Lincoln facility for the past 10 years and that the 30 beds you mentioned (Ward 1) has been used as office space for the psychiatric, social services, and dietetric schools. Also, in Omaha the 40 beds you mentioned are not in use for lack of money from the Bureau of the Budget.

I suppose that the lack of funds can be taken care of by a very generous appropriation through the Appropriations Committee. That has been done before.

Mr. Beck continues:

> We have sent men to Omaha this past year and they have been put on a 10-day waiting list. Outpatient care is being neglected here in Lincoln, mental patients are being sent home or to Knoxville.

Knoxville is more than 150 miles from Lincoln, Nebr.

It seems to me that it would be wise to follow the course suggested by the Senator from Vermont. He is not asking for any prejudice against the nomination of Mr. Driver. By voting for the Senator's motion we have the only way open to us to express our dissatisfaction with the policy adopted by Mr. Driver. He has freely stated this policy is the creature of the Bureau of the Budget and is recommended by and has the support of higher authority. The higher authority in this case can only mean the occupant of the White House. That is where the responsibility resides.

I believe it should be recorded in an official way that we are not taking this matter lightly and that we would like a report from the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee before we are called upon to confirm the nomination of Mr. Driver.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has brought out an important point in connection with the letter from which he has read. He emphasized one point. Is my understanding correct that Mr. Driver in his communication about the Lincoln, Nebr., hospital used a figure of the number of available beds or places for beds that was 10 years old?

Mr. HRUSKA. He did so; that was the language of Mr. Beck. The space for 30 beds has not been used in the past 10 years for beds because it has been used for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. And those other purposes are for services to veterans.

Mr. HRUSKA. Exactly.

Mr. CURTIS. I am fully aware that the order which we have been discussing is not the personal order of Mr. Driver, and that others have imposed it upon him. But still we are asked to make Mr. Driver the Administrator. We are asked to advise and consent to his nomination as head of the Veterans' Administration. If the head of the Veterans' Administration has no power and authority, the country should know it and the Congress should rewrite the organic law and see that this great agency, which operates hospitals, carries on insurance programs, adjusts claims, administers a compensation program, and so on, is accorded the services of an Administrator who can operate the agency.

I commend the Senator from Nebraska for his remarks on this subject. The very fact that the Veterans' Administration makes such a statement, going back to a 10-year-old figure on the size of a hospital, indicates the great need for the study, the inquiry and the gathering of facts now being carried on by the committees of the two Houses of Congress.

I believe that not only should the confirmation of the nomination wait, but also that the Veterans' Administration should have the courtesy and the sense of cooperation to hold in abeyance all steps toward closing these hospitals while the studies are going on.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution and his remarks. One further point, it cannot be contended that the Lincoln Veterans' Administration hospital is obsolete and unfit for the purpose at hand, because only 3½ short years ago an almost $1 million modernization program was completed there. That point ought to be placed in the Record, and I state it for that purpose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter from Mr. Leo J. Beck, Sr., director of the Department of Veterans' Affairs for the State of Nebraska, to William J. Driver as Director of the Veterans' Administration, dated January 29, printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 29, 1965.

Re Lincoln Veterans Hospital.

William J. Driver,
Director, U.S. Veterans' Administration, Veterans' Administration Central Office, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Driver: Thank you for your letter of January 26 and I believe that you are sincere in your reasons for including the Lincoln Veterans Hospital in the list of those to be closed.

It is quite apparent, however, that you have been and are still incorrectly informed as to the true situation.

You mention and I quote, "The current capacity of this hospital is 280 beds, 30 of which are out of use because of the limited demand for care in the area. There are also 40 beds out of use for the same reason at our nearby hospital in Omaha." The truth is, that there have only been 250 beds in the Lincoln facility for the past 10 years and that the 30 beds you mention (ward 1) has been used as office space for the psychiatric, social services, and dietetic schools. Also, in Omaha, the 40 beds you mention are not in use for lack of money from the Bureau of the Budget.

We have sent men to Omaha this past week and they have been put on a 10-day waiting list. Outpatient care is being neglected here in Lincoln, mental patients are being sent home or to Knoxville.

Grand Island is not properly staffed medically and the Lincoln and Omaha doctors will not go there. Your statement of better services to veterans cannot hold water. It is true that Grand Island is a newer building but cannot compare, even in a small degree, to the abilities and staffing of the Lincoln Hospital.

Some of your employees are being offered the high salary of $1.25 per hour in other hospitals so it is quite clear that you are taking good care of them. But my main concern is the veterans of Nebraska who you are definitely rejecting at a time when they are aging, finding it difficult to travel, and who, in many cases, will die before they can get into a hospital. These deaths, Mr. Driver, can definitely be laid at your door.

I am not so much concerned as to the economic impact on Lincoln since I am sure we are competent here to handle this, but with the greatest veteran hospital demand still to be reached, why not send someone to Lincoln who will find out the true situation. The word economy is certainly a false nomenclature for the hospital closing.

Cordially,

Leo J. Beck, Sr.,
Director, Department of Veterans' Affairs, State of Nebraska.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Through the courtesy of the Senator from Vermont, I had the opportunity to say a few words on the pending question. I had not intended to seek recognition in my own right, but I am impelled to do so because of the points made and the general tenor of the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

Incidentally, I have served with the senior Senator from New York for many years in the House and in the Senate. There is no Member of this body whose ability, skill, knowledge of the law, and capacity to analyze issues and questions I admire more. I have seen him when he was fighting for the State of New York. When he fought for the State of New York, he never once proclaimed the complete impotency of the U.S. Senate. He has not suggested on those occasions that there was nothing we could do about the situation except to register a general protest so the world would know that we did not like what was going on. My admiration for the Senator from New York has been unbounded, because when the interests of the people of New York were affected he has invariably found that there was something he could do about it. But this afternoon he was in another mood. He was in a "cast-oil-on-the-water" mood. I could not let pass unnoticed—although what I say is not antagonistic to the Senator's position and certainly not to him—the rather smooth and suave way in which he said, "Now, it is not a question of letting the world know that we protest. There is nothing we can really do about it. We cannot stop an appropriation."

He suggests that this proposal is a gentle little way, which everyone recognizes, of waiting 30 days so that people will know that we are unhappy and are not pleased.

Mr. President, I for one do not want anyone to go away with the idea, nor do I wish the public to read the proceedings in the Record and have the conception that in delaying confirmation of the nomination we, today, are merely going through the motions of mild protest. In the first place, it is not an insignificant act for the Senate to hold up the confirmation of the nomination of a man against whom not one word has been spoken on the floor of the Senate. Something very real must be involved, because the Senate does not act to hold up the confirmation of the nomination of a worthy public servant—and I have every reason to believe that the nominee is a worthy public servant—for 30 days, for 20 days, for 10 days, or for 1 day, unless Senators really feel that something vital is involved.

As far as I am concerned, I wish it distinctly understood that I do not agree to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Driver after 30 days. I wish to wait and see how he lines up. I wish to wait and satisfy myself as to whether his first allegiance and loyalty is to a political administration or whether his first allegiance and loyalty is to the veterans who need care in veterans' hospitals.

I wish to comment for a moment on the suggestion that there is nothing that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate can do, and that we cannot stop appropriations. We can stop them. We can increase them. We can earmark them. However, what has troubled some of us is not the fact that notice has been served that veterans' facilities will be closed. It is the fact that the closing of facilities has seemed to us very plainly to be aimed at and to militate against the sparsely populated rural sections of the country. With the load of veterans care increasing—and it is estimated that it will continue to increase until 1980—there is grave doubt as to whether any facility should be closed. But if they are closed, let all sections be treated alike. Yet, the program as outlined seems to be directed only toward the rural sections of the country, such as that represented by the distinguished Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. METCALF], who have spoken out so well, and toward the section represented by us in rural New England.

Mr. President, in all friendliness, I shall be glad to lay one wager with my good friend from New York. If word had gone out that there would be a sweeping closing of veterans care facilities in the State of New York, we would not be talking about a gentle protest or an idle gesture.

I cannot refrain from saying that it is highly appropriate that we should be discussing this problem today, because this afternoon by a significant vote the Senate followed a course laid down in the 88th Congress and in the 87th Congress. With the best motives and the best intentions in the world, the Congress has been following a course of procedure that makes Federal favoritism—and I repeat the term, "Federal favoritism"—inevitable.

The area redevelopment legislation inaugurated by Congress some years ago has all the earmarks of a beautiful, altruistic, idealistic project, whereby the Federal Government will use its vast influence and resources to help those who are underprivileged and in distressed areas of the country. But some of us voted against that bill, and we were held up to scorn as being coldblooded, cynical, and out of date.

The reason why we voted against it was that no matter how many provisions were written into it against pirating, so-called—against using the Federal Government's influence to lure industry from one State into another State, in the belief that that should not be done—the fact remains that no matter who administers that legislation, no matter whether it is a Democratic administration or a Republican administration, no matter how sincere is the desire to be fair and just, Uncle Sam cannot be expected to decide as between the rights and needs of his 50 children without falling into error. I do not refer to Federal rescue work in an area that is devastated or where some great calamity takes place. I refer to the proposition that the Federal Government in Washington will put its finger on one region this year, and another region next year, and say, "We are going to pour money in for you, and that will be all right; but the rest of you will have to wait. Next year we will take care of you; the following year we will take care of someone else." It is a long, long road; and King Solomon, in all his wisdom, could never administer that kind of Federal Government, with that kind of theory, and do it in fairness and with justice to all.

We are speaking within a very few minutes after the debate has been finished and the vote taken on Appalachia, which is the region to be favored today. Someone said there would be six more regions to follow, and I guarantee that my region will be the sixth. Anyway, Appalachia is the region that has been favored today. Immediately following the passage of that bill, we have begun the consideration of veterans' business.

It is not that facilities are being closed. Some of us have been crying for years for Government economy. If just and fair economies were being put into effect, we would be arrant hypocrites if we stood up and protested. That is the reason why I have not been shouting too loudly about the regional offices and administrative offices of veterans' facilities. Even there, however, there has been injustice, as I pointed out forcibly in my statement to the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

But I can see the handwriting on the wall. I can name some of the hospitals that will be closed next. They are hospitals in the more remote regions of the country. That is why this is a very real issue.

I, for one, wish to give due notice that this is not an idle gesture. This is not a 30-day moratorium to allow everybody to fall into line. I do not intend to sit on the Committee on Appropriations and be walked on by anybody who decides that my region, my sparsely populated State, and, above all, the veterans of that locality can be made to suffer because, presumably, there are fewer votes to protest such action. I do not intend to let that happen; and we are not powerless.

I have had such views rammed down my throat in this body for 10 long years. I believed them the first 2 years. I almost believed them for the first 5 years. Why? When we were voting on a foreign aid bill that was loaded to the gunwales with every kind of extravagance for countries that should not have been aided, people said to us, "Oh, no; you cannot vote against that bill on final passage. You must not."

"Why?"

"Because you will be cutting off the vital aid which we all agree must go to certain nations for the safety of this country."

I swallowed that reasoning and voted for foreign aid bills 5 years longer than I ought to have done. It never once occurred to me that that kind of argument sounded good but was not practical. If we had defeated a foreign aid bill 5 years ago, another one would have been before us within the next 3 weeks, reduced to proper size, merely because Congress would have stood up for once and said, "No." It would not have meant that the program concerning which we had said "No" was ended forever and that we would have been charged with its execution. The money bag and the purse strings are the only controls left in the legislative branch of our Government. We should not hesitate to use them.

All we need to do if we see injustice and favoritism, whether it be toward my State or the State of some other Senator, if we see the Federal Government getting beyond its proper sphere and picking and choosing—I almost said "bribing," but I would not use that word—among different sections of the land, is to stand up someday and refuse to report an appropriation bill until its provisions have been changed.

We need not think that the administration would allow the veterans hospitals of the country to be closed. Oh, no. We do not have to swallow that kind of talk. That is why I took exception, first, to the idea that the 30-day moratorium would be a nice little gesture on the part of the Senate to make the people back home feel good. It would not. It would be a highly significant act. It would involve a grave responsibility, to start with.

Second, it is a mistake to say that during those 30 days, no matter what reports came from committees, and if in the wisdom of the Veterans' Administration and the Federal administration veterans facilities in small States and in sparsely populated areas closed their doors and our veterans made to suffer, there was nothing that the Senate and its Committee on Appropriations could do about it. I say there is. I should like to see the Senate stand up on its hind legs someday and let the world know, when we are talking about giving notice to the world, that there is something else besides the executive branch of the Government and the Supreme Court. The legislative branch has become eroded to the point that Senators themselves say, "We have to take it. We can wait, but the ax is going to fall, so we might as well accept it."

That was what I wished to say. I do not say it in criticism of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, characterization is, I think, always a difficult thing when one man rises to try to define what is in the heart of another man in the way of characterizing his determination or his views as to how constant he wishes to be in that determination.

There are 100 strong-minded, strong-willed Senators in this Chamber. I yield to no one in my fidelity to my convictions. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire yields to no one in his fidelity to his convictions.

I shall express mine for myself. I do not agree with the description of them by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I say that with all respect and with a very deep and warm feeling toward him.

The argument was very potent and very effective. But, be that as it may, and I shall yield in a moment, the fact is that I said that by voting to defer the confirmation of the nomination of a worthy public servant—these are the words of the Senator from New Hampshire—we start the process of seeing what the things are that we can do to reverse the VA closing order. This is one of them.

I am not closing the door to what we can do in the future, to what the Committee on Appropriations can do—upon which committee the Senator from New

Hampshire so ably serves—or to what anyone else can do.

I shall join fully in every honorable effort toward that end with just as much conviction and just as much determination as the Senator from New Hampshire.

I am not engaging in an exercise to lay this question over for 30 days with a slap on the wrist for the administration, and the expectation that everything will be all right hereafter.

But, I shall not sacrifice, and I never have sacrificed any man like Mr. Driver in this Chamber in terms of his being a worthy public servant, which is the situation as it stands now. That is why I said what I did.

I shall vote "aye" on the pending motion. But, it is only fair to him, a man who has served 20 years in the Veterans' Administration, that I make clear that what I do is not directed against him.

We have complete interest in common in this matter. I join with my colleague from New Hampshire in every conceivable thing which any of us can do, he or I, or both of us together, in effecting the determination of the Senate, once expressed, that it disapproves thoroughly of this pennywise, pound-foolish, penny-pinching policy of VA hospital closings.

I know what men endure. It burned into my soul during my service in World War II.

I feel this very deeply. I admire and deeply respect the Senator from New Hampshire. But, I felt it important to state that my determination is just as unflagging as his, to see that what I consider to be a very serious wrong is corrected.

I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

I have reviewed in my mind what was said. I do not think that one word was said in criticism of the Senator from New York. What I said was in disagreement with his presentation.

We can disagree on issues and disagree on facts. We can disagree on alleged facts without being personal.

If I was personal in the slightest degree, I am indeed sorry. I hold the Senator in the very highest regard. I was not speaking in anger. I merely wished to make clear that I felt that perhaps inadvertently he had conveyed the idea that this afternoon's debate was a gesture. I wanted to nail that to the mast. I do not consider it to be a gesture.

I am sure that if anything were to happen to Mr. Driver, I would regret it as much as anyone. But, if we are put to the test, if we are to see something happen to Mr. Driver, rather than see something happen to thousands of veterans in this country, I would vote in favor of the thousands of veterans.

If I said anything that is offensive to the Senator from New York, I certainly withdraw it. I would not want to do that.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is very kind. Apparently some of my statement did not convey what I had intended to convey to the Senator.

I am glad that with his customary frankness, he has enabled both of us to make that very clear.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I regret very much that I must rise today and speak on the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

I hope that the motion of the Senator from Vermont is adopted so that I shall not have to analyze the hearing record, so that I shall not have to say some of the things about Mr. Driver as a result of his appearance before the committee that might be derogatory of his character.

I am not in accord with the statement that he is a fine man who has been abused because of the budget. His appearance before the committee indicates that he approves of the abandonment of congressional authority. He wants to move away from policies adopted by his predecessors in the Veterans' Administration. I want to give Mr. Driver the opportunity to put his defense in the Record. I want to have the Members of this body advised, so that all 100 Senators will have an opportunity to read the Record, especially to read the testimony he presents and to read his rebuttal when it comes.

Therefore, I think that the motion of the Senator from Vermont should be adopted. But, if it is not adopted, I say here and now that I am going to talk about some of my reasons for not voting on the present record for him to be the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I withhold that. But I want to have an opportunity to take the floor in the event that this motion fails, so that I can point out some of the points that were brought out in the hearings.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, while the nomination of the future Administrator of the Veterans' Administration is under discussion, I think it is altogether appropriate to point out that the impact which the proposed closings of VA facilities will have will be not only on the veterans of the various States involved but also on the States themselves.

In New Hampshire, the cutback in services at both the regional office in Manchester and the office in White River Junction will mean that many veterans, some of them in poor financial condition as well as poor physical condition, will have to travel up to 250 miles to go to Boston to find out whether they will or will not be eligible for assistance. I see no reason why New Hampshire veterans should thus be discriminated against in favor of those living in States which will have their own facilities.

The State of New Hampshire has taken official notice of this proposal. The House of Representatives of the New Hampshire General Court has, by resolution, protested the plans of the Veterans' Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the clerk of the house containing the resolution be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, inasmuch as my duties as a Senator from New Hampshire require that any attempt to thus discriminate against my State be thoroughly opposed, I intend to support the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty].

Exhibit 1

State of New Hampshire,
House of Representatives,
Concord, January 27, 1965.

Hon. Thomas J. McIntyre,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McIntyre: On Wednesday, January 20, the members of the house of representatives passed the following resolutions offered by Messrs. Coutermarsh of Lebanon and Vachon of Manchester:

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has ordered a cutback in the regional offices of veterans' affairs at both Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt.; and

"Whereas this action might cause a cutback in veterans services and the loss of employment at these facilities; and

"Whereas although the Federal Government has justified the cutback of the offices on the grounds that it would reflect economy without affecting the services to veterans: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the members of the House of Representatives of the 1965 session of the General Court of New Hampshire, strongly protest this cutback in the offices at Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt., because of the result in poorer services to veterans and hardship to people employed at these facilities; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the Veterans' Administration and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

Sincerely yours,

Francis W. Tolman,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] to postpone consideration of the nomination until March 1, 1965. The yeas and nays have been ordered——

CLOSURE OF WHITE CITY, OREG., DOMICILIARY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the recent announcement of the Veterans' Administration to close certain hospitals, domiciles, and regional offices has been of great concern to me, particularly with respect to the domiciliary in White City, Oreg. The Camp White facility was established early in 1949 as a domicile for veterans of World War I and II. The conversion of this former military base to a veterans' domiciliary was of particular interest to me because it was my bill, S. 1035, of the 80th Congress, to provide for the acquisition of the Camp White facilities for use as a veterans' domiciliary, that became Public Law 577 of the 80th Congress.

It is a very interesting case from the standpoint of legislative history. Here is a domiciliary that was established by statute. I am concerned about the fact that the Veterans' Administration takes upon itself the power of repeal of a statute. That is what this action amounts to. It raises some very interesting legal questions as to whether or not that power in fact vests in the Veterans' Administration.

I was very pleased when Senator Yarborough promptly scheduled hearings in the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs on the closure of these Veterans' Administration facilities. I certainly want to thank and extend my appreciation for my colleague's action on this important matter and his continued interest in the welfare of our veterans who have sacrificed so much on behalf of our country.

Due to a long-standing engagement which required my presence in Oregon, I did not appear personally to testify before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs regarding the proposed closure of the White City domiciliary. However, I requested Chairman YARBOROUGH to include, in the hearing record, my comments and several questions which I posed to the principal witness appearing on behalf of the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration responded to the questions I posed regarding the relocation of the 1,000 veterans at the White City domiciliary, the assimilation of these veterans into other domiciliary facilities, the alleged savings to the Government resulting from the closure of four domiciliaries, including Camp White, and the additional cost to the Government for transportation and care of these veterans at other Veterans' Administration facilities.

However, what concerns me most, Mr. President, is the Veterans' Administration's contention that there is a progressive decrease in the need for domiciliary care. It supplied a table on domiciliary facilities and the demand for the use of these facilities. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this table be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

7a. The need for domiciliary care as requested in average yearly waiting lists on a national basis is as follows:

Fiscal year	Average yearly waiting list	Workload as manifested by ADML
1959	872	16,374
1960	567	16,339
1961	567	16,237
1962	398	15,760
1963	393	15,589
1964	619	15,229

Domiciliary facilities and demand, Nov. 30, 1964

Domiciliary location	Available beds	Operating beds	Waiting list	Workload ADML fiscal year 1964
Bath, N.Y	830	830	9	747
Bay Pines, Fla	400	400	33	371
Biloxi, Miss	818	818	20	720
Bonham, Tex	327	327	141	324
Clinton, Iowa	565	565	23	574
Dayton, Ohio	1,600	1,600	34	1,535
Dublin, Ga	483	483	-------	462
Hot Springs, S. Dak	548	548	4	499
Kecoughtan, Va	1,250	1,203	-------	1,099
Los Angeles, Calif	2,550	2,550	-------	2,419
Martinsburg, W. Va	500	500	69	479
Mountain Home, Tenn.	1,771	1,771	2	1,604
Temple, Tex	392	392	55	381
Thomasville, Ga	800	800	-------	772
Wadsworth, Kans	1,000	1,000	-------	927
Whipple, Ariz	159	159	161	160
White City, Oreg	1,025	1,025	113	955
Wood, Wis	1,661	1,275	-------	1,201
Total	16,679	16,246	664	15,229

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is very difficult for me to believe that there is a decline in the need for domiciliary care in view of the figures supplied in this table. I wish to point out to my colleagues that the average yearly waiting list of veterans in need of care in domiciliaries across the Nation has increased from 393 in fiscal 1963 to 619 in fiscal 1964. These figures do not show a decrease in the need for domiciliary care. The average daily member load shows a slight decrease from 15,589 in fiscal 1963 to 15,229 in fiscal 1964. These figures do not appear to me to show a substantial enough decrease to warrant the closure of these domiciliary facilities.

The Veterans' Administration has also advised me that the 1,000 veterans at the White City domiciliary will be transferred to the domiciliaries at Los Angeles, Calif.; Whipple, Ariz.; Temple and Bonham, Tex.; and Hot Springs, S. Dak. However, upon the basis of the table provided by the Veterans' Administration, only the domiciliaries at Los Angeles, Calif., and Hot Springs, S. Dak., are in a position, with current beds available, to absorb the veterans from White City. But it would be impossible for these two facilities to absorb the 1,000 veterans.

According to the information provided by the Veterans' Administration, no expansion of facilities, in the way of construction, will be required to assimilate these veterans; however, the number of existing beds will be expanded to assimilate these veterans. If this is the case, do these other domiciliaries have the space available to make room for the additional beds and other facilities which will be required to take care of these veterans?

According to the figures provided in the budget for fiscal 1966, the Veterans' Administration intends to decrease the number of operating beds for use in domiciliaries for fiscal 1966 from 16,440 to 14,053. It is expected that the average daily member load will decrease from 15,241 to 13,993. Now the figures provided me in the table do not indicate that such a substantial decrease is going to occur in the need for domiciliary care by our veterans. Just how does the Veterans' Administration plan to assimilate the veterans from the closed domiciliaries with such an estimated decrease in beds? There are approximately 3,000 veterans who will be left without a domicile if the VA continues with its proposed action to close the domiciliaries. It is possible that some of these veterans will request discharge; however, I do not believe that the number who take this course of action will warrant such a decrease in the number of operating beds.

Are we going to make living conditions so unbearable that our veterans will be forced out without the means and ability to care for themselves? This appears to be what is happening in this instance. This is certainly a sad commentary on the carrying out of our obligations to our veterans.

During the war the hospital facilities were there. The structures are still there, and with equipment an excellent hospital could be provided.

Let me, in this digression, answer the alibi that the Veterans' Administration tries to put out—that they do not have the medical personnel with which to staff such a hospital. They argued that some years ago, and the result was that the Jackson County Medical Society of Jackson County, Oreg., met that one head on and worked out a cooperative program to which they offered their services to the Veterans' Administration to provide medical assistance.

Mr. President, we are dealing with some pretty precious human values. We are dealing with veterans who have been in these domiciliaries for some time. We are dealing with veterans most of whom come from this region of the country. It is very easy for a bureaucrat here in Washington in the Veterans' Administration to decide, "We are going to ship them wherever we want to ship them." To many of these men this has become home. These men are not bedridden. They are ambulatory. These men move from the domiciliary into the community. They have a great many friendships in the community. There are a great many associations in the community. They should not be treated as prisoners, to be moved from penitentiary to penitentiary as though they were closing a prison. These domiciliaries have become the homes of the present inhabitants, which carries with it a great many subjective values, as well as many human values. I stand aghast at what I consider to be the lack of appreciation on the part of the Veterans' Administration in regard to human values. I stand aghast that in this instance such a high value is being placed upon the dollar sign as against the human values involved in what I consider should be generous and kindly treatment on the part of the Government of the United States toward the men who fought for this Republic in time of war.

Mr. President, I wish the Senate—before it takes action on what I consider to be unsound economy on the part of the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration—could have an opportunity to commingle with the veterans themselves. I would like to see Senators get on an airplane and visit each one of these domiciliaries and give the veterans an opportunity to talk with them. Apparently, unless we can bring the politicians to the problems in this country, there is little hope of action in the Senate which will protect the kind of values I am talking about.

I have heard no evidence, I have read no argument presented by the Veterans' Administration, or by the Bureau of the Budget, or through them by the White House, to justify what I consider to be the inhumane action that really is behind the so-called economy drive on the homes called domiciliaries of the veterans of this country.

I know the kind of argument that will be used against those of us who speak as I am speaking this afternoon, that we are politicians caught in a squeeze involving our State or local districts which will take Federal funds out of those districts, so we cry to high heaven in protest.

That kind of ad hominem argument has never deterred me from making the plea for human values that I am making this afternoon. For I am pleading for the veterans in every domiciliary in this country who will be victimized by what

I consider to be unconscionable conduct on the part of the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration, and apparently approved by the President of the United States.

From the outset of the establishment of Camp White as a domiciliary, I urged the Veterans' Administration to include hospital facilities at Camp White. Despite the demonstrated need for a hospital at this installation, the Veterans' Administration remained adamant in its opposition to the hospital through Democratic and Republican administrations. I am more convinced than ever that it was a mistake not to include hospital facilities at Camp White. Instead of seeking closure action at present, the Veterans' Administration should be working to the best of its ability to construct a new hospital for the use of these veterans at Camp White.

It is obvious to me, Mr. President, that the Veterans' Administration is engaged in a squeeze play which will make life so difficult for these veterans that they will seek any place other than a veterans' domiciliary to wait out their retirement years. The end result will be that they will be compelled, against their wishes, to seek largess from friends and relatives. This is a cruel hoax to perpetrate on veterans who have served their country so well. This is a fine reward for loyal service to the Nation.

I hope that veterans' organization after veterans' organization will take stock of one of the early actions of the administration in regard to doing what I consider to be an unconscionable injustice to the veterans of America.

To add insult to injury, the Veterans' Administration is taking its domiciliary closure action under the guise of economy. If an increase in the burdens of the veterans can be called economy, I wish to dissociate myself from that kind of false economy, because it is purchased at the cost of the health and comfort of our veterans.

Any dollar that is saved at the cost of creating unhappiness and suffering and the disjointure of the lives of our veterans is shockingly false economy and will go down in the history of Congress and this administration to its everlasting discredit, if it is not stopped.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement that I made to the Yarborough Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1965.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your courtesy in scheduling prompt hearings on the proposed closure of certain Veterans' Administration facilities, including the Camp White, Oreg., domiciliary, is greatly appreciated, not only by me but by the people of Oregon and particularly those residing in Oregon's Fourth Congressional District.

I am thoroughly familiar with the purposes for which the Camp White facility was established early in 1949 as a domiciliary for veterans of World War I and II. I have firsthand knowledge concerning this project because I was instrumental in obtaining the use of this former military base as a veterans domiciliary. In fact, it was my bill, S. 1035, of the 80th Congress, to provide for the acquisition of the Camp White facilities for use as a veterans domiciliary, that became Public Law 577 of the 80th Congress. For many years thereafter, I sought to bring about the establishment of a veterans hospital in connection with the domiciliary. I was convinced then, as I am convinced now, that it was a great mistake for the Veterans' Administration to continue its adamant opposition to the inclusion of urgently needed hospital facilities at Camp White. The requirements for the hospital are great and the location is ideal.

Rumors of the proposed closure of the Camp White domiciliary came to my attention considerably in advance of the official notice of the closure, but I regarded these rumors as being without any substance because the thought of closing the domiciliary seemed to me to be utterly absurd.

Camp White is located in the vicinity of Medford, Oreg., in an area that is blessed with almost ideal weather conditions the year around. I can state without hesitation that no geographic location in the entire United States is better suited as the site of a domiciliary for veterans of the higher age brackets than this particular installation. Approximately 1,000 veterans live at the domiciliary and many have lived there for almost 15 years. There is every indication that the domiciliary is well managed, is comfortable, and has been accepted as a completely satisfactory home for the vast majority of the veterans living there. Undoubtedly, the veterans were as shocked and dismayed as I was when the news came that their domiciliary home would be closed down and that they would be transferred to distant domiciliaries with far different surroundings and climates. We all know that older people become deeply rooted, so to speak, at the place they call home, and it is difficult for most of us to imagine the distress caused by complete separation of these older men from the place they have known as home for so many years.

The Veterans' Administration is very matter-of-fact in indicating that this phasing out of the domiciliary is being taken for economy reasons. Administrator Driver's letter refers to the fact that the nationwide action being taken by the Veterans' Administration closures of facilities will effect "a savings to taxpayers in administrative or overhead costs amounting to $23,500,000 in fiscal year 1966." My only observation on this is that the savings is a mere pittance when compared to the vast amounts we throw away by way of wasteful expenditures under our foreign aid program each year. Our veterans, who are not only human beings, but who have served their country well, deserve far better consideration than to be made the victims of a program of alleged Federal savings which is microscopic in comparison to our foreign aid program. For once we should begin to think of our own folks at home when expenditures of Federal funds are involved.

I am not at all sure that Federal savings would be involved by the closure of Camp White and I am convinced that the closure would not be in the best interests of the veterans. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate your presenting to the principal witness appearing at tomorrow's hearing on behalf of the Veterans' Administration the following questions:

1. To what new locations will the 1,000 veterans at White City be transferred? (The nearest domiciliary facilities in the West, I am told, are located at Los Angeles, Calif., and Whipple, Ariz. There is not one other veterans domiciliary in the Pacific Northwest and most are located in the South. I am deeply concerned over the fact that these veterans will be transferred to facilities which are not close to the homes of their friends and relatives, and that members of their families will not be able to visit them readily. These visits are oftentimes an important part of their rehabilitation and care.)

2. Will other domiciliaries be able to assimilate the 1,000 veterans at White City and the additional 2,000 of other domiciliaries, which are also being closed?

3. Will the domiciliaries to which the White City veterans are scheduled to be transferred be able to assimilate these veterans without expansion of facilities? If expansion is required, what will be the cost of such expansion and the increased annual cost of operation?

4. How much will the closure of White City save the Federal Government?

5. How much will the closure of the total of four domiciliaries save the Federal Government?

6. What will be the additional cost to the Government by way of transportation and care for approximately 3,000 veterans at other VA domiciliaries?

7. Has the need for domiciliary care decreased and will it continue to decrease in the next 25 years? (I would like to have specific figures in this connection, including the number of beds available, the number of beds now in use, and the number of veterans on the waiting list at various domiciliaries if any.)

The report of the Veterans' Administration suggests that the domiciliary program was established initially to care for veterans who could not sustain themselves in the communities. The VA adds that the social security program, together with increased veterans' benefits, is providing more and more veterans with assurance of freedom from financial want. This does not impress me as being entirely logical because it overlooks the fact that costs of living and private nursing home costs have increased vastly in recent year. It is my hope that the subcommittee will explore this aspect of the case in depth with the officials of the Veterans' Administration participating in tomorrow's hearing.

The Veterans' Administration contends also that domiciliary care must be integrated with hospitals. However, in the case of Camp White, the VA fought vigorously my efforts and those of other Members of the Oregon congressional delegation to establish hospital facilities in connection with the Camp White domiciliary. Thus, the argument concerning the lack of a hospital appears to be a self-serving declaration created by the VA for its own benefit in this case. It is my firm opinion, and I would appreciate your so advising the VA, that we should now be considering the installation of hospital facilities at Camp White rather than talking about closing the domiciliary.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should reiterate that the climate in the area of Medford, Oreg., at which Camp White is situated is very mild and healthful and is conducive to the general well-being of these veterans. There is no domiciliary located in a more ideal area from the standpoint of health and climate factors. This domiciliary has had enthusiastic support and fine cooperation from the local people. This has been of immeasurable benefit to the veterans. The welfare of the veterans should bear far greater weight than the meager savings which are proposed for the Federal Treasury through the closure of Camp White.

Your consideration of my views in opposition to the closure of the Camp White domiciliary will be greatly appreciated; it is my hope that the subcommittee will agree that the closure is unwise and express in strong terms to the Veterans' Administration the desire of the subcommittee that this domiciliary should continue to serve in the years ahead the best interests of our veterans.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall vote for the Prouty motion because I believe that we need further time to go into the facts in regard to this nomination, and into the policies of the Veterans' Administration.

I am told, "all this nominee is doing is carrying out orders."

That is some basis for asking approval of a nomination, that the nominee is carrying out orders.

Now is the time to take a look at the orders. Now is the time to make clear to the administration that if it is appointing a man to carry out these orders, it is better that he not be appointed. We had better take the position of looking at the orders and the policies. I believe that a month is a short time, indeed, to ask for the postponement of action on this nomination until the appropriate committees of Congress can take a long, hard look at what I believe to be an unfortunate veterans policy announced by the administration through the Veterans' Administration, apparently with complete approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the White House.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I join Senators who have spoken so forcefully in behalf of the motion now pending before the Senate.

I must confess that when the motion to postpone was first made by the Senator from Vermont, I had some question as to whether that was the proper way to approach this subject. However, considering everything, I have decided that I shall vote for the motion to postpone, and I urge all other Senators to do so.

Perhaps this is a little ancient history now, and not all of it, if any, is attributable to Mr. Driver; but I have been less than satisfied with the presentations made by the Veterans' Administration to the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations during the last 2 years. In fact, it is my feeling—and I would be prepared to document it—that the former Administrator of the Veterans' Administration purposely deceived and misled both Senators from Colorado with respect to certain actions he took within that State. I do not believe that this necessarily can be attributed to Mr. Driver, and I do not do so.

But we are all in a very critical situation. The Veterans' Administration hospital at Grand Junction, Colo., is about to be closed. It was built in 1949, only 15 years ago, at a cost to the Government of $17 million. The personnel employed at that hospital, in a town of 20,000 population, is 168. That means that 168 families in that small town will be uprooted and thrown into movement that is unjustified by the economics of the situation and unjustified by the humanitarianism that we owe to veterans.

What will this mean to the people of western Colorado and the veterans of Colorado? I speak primarily with respect to the veterans. It means that when the facility at Grand Junction is closed—if it is closed—no facility will be available to veterans in Colorado, that great mountainous area between Salt Lake City and Denver, and between Cheyenne, Wyo., and Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Mr. President, I think we must ask ourselves why these veterans facilities were scattered around the country in the first place.

They were not put around the country in any logrolling deal. And they were not put around the country as a pork barrel. They were placed in various portions of the country so that we could adequately take care of the veterans in a region which was reasonably accessible to their homes, their families, and their friends.

Applying this reason to the State of Colorado alone—and I speak about the Grand Junction facility only because it is the only one that I know about personally—this means that some persons in Colorado would have to drive 350 or 400 miles, either to Denver or to Salt Lake City, to visit veterans who are in that hospital.

When one considers that in some months of the year in Colorado one must drive over 12,000-foot passes which are covered with ice and snow—and even on the best occasions it is a 7- to a 9-hour drive—it is an unconscionable burden upon the veterans, their families, and friends which they should not be required to bear.

It has been stated that the Grand Junction facility is an expensive facility. The figures that have been given to me by the Veterans' Administration are that it costs approximately $34 a day at that facility, and that some facilities cost as little as $28.

Mr. President, they will not save $34. They will not save $28. If they move these veterans from Grand Junction to Cheyenne, to Albuquerque, to Denver, or to Salt Lake City, they still have to be maintained. They still have to be taken care of. I, for one, am not going to abandon my obligation and sense of duty which I feel to these veterans wholly aside from the office which I hold.

Mr. President, I realize that deferring this decision does not hit at the main question. It does not hit it squarely. It is the only effective means of objection that we have available to us today. I do not question Mr. Driver's ability, honesty, or integrity. I do not do this as a personal thing against him. This was a move of the Bureau of the Budget. That means that it was a Presidential move.

And as I stated before, I do not intend to deprive our veterans in order to finance a part of the Great Society and some of the social concepts that the present occupant of the White House seems to entertain.

I hope that other Senators will join us in deferring this nomination. This would let them know that we in the Senate are serious about maintaining our position that these hospitals should not be closed to our veterans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], to postpone action on the nomination of W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, until a certain date.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BENNETT (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator for Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 12 Ex.]

YEAS—23

Aiken
Allott
Boggs
Cannon
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Fannin
Fong
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McIntyre
Metcalf
Morse
Mundt
Murphy

Prouty
Saltonstall
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—58

Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—19

Bennett
Dodd
Dominick
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Jackson
Johnston
Kuchel
McCarthy
Moss
Muskie
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Talmadge
Yarborough

So Mr. PROUTY's motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of William J. Driver to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I served notice during the debate on the previous motion that I should like to discuss the nomination in greater detail.

On January 22, when hearings started in the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I was convinced that I was going to vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. METCALF. I was convinced——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order. The Senator from Montana is entitled to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. METCALF. I was convinced, in spite of the fact that on January 13 Mr. Driver sent various Senators a letter announcing the closure of several veterans' installations. I read the letter. I did not feel that he was justified in the conclusions that he reached. I did not feel that the statements that he made were correct. But I believed that he probably made them in all honesty. That he had been forced to make them, as has been suggested here, by the Bureau of the Budget.

But after 2 days of hearings before the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], I am convinced that this man has not been frank with the Congress. He has told us half truths. He has insinuated things that cannot be justified. He is personally embarking upon a policy that is contrary to the traditions of the Veterans' Administration and contrary to the policies adopted by his predecessors.

A good deal of the debate has turned on economy. The letter of January 13 stated that if those 11 hospitals were closed, $23.5 million would be saved. After considerable interrogation Mr. Driver admitted that this policy he had embarked upon would not save money, but instead it would cost more money. Not a dollar would be saved. The appropriation for next year would be increased. The reason why he wanted to close the 11 hospitals was that back in 1958 or 1959 a ceiling of 125,000 hospital beds had been established by Presidential directive, and he needed the beds in the 11 closed hospitals so he could build hospitals in some other places.

On further interrogation we learn that the Veterans' Administration has adopted a policy of building hospitals of 400 or 500 beds in, near, or adjacent to medical education facilities. So that means that while today a hospital of 196 beds at Miles City, Mont., and a hospital at Grand Junction, Colo., will be closed, tomorrow the Veterans' Administration will close some of the other 100-, 150-, and 200-bed hospitals in remote or isolated areas.

So we said, "What do you mean by 'remote and isolated areas'?"

Then Dr. McNinch, Mr. Driver's deputy, testified. He testified from a prepared statement. He said that marginal hospitals had to go, that we had to have better quality of medical care and better quality of medical attention, and that the quality that the veterans were entitled to have could not be reached and could not be realized at hospitals having 100 or 200 beds.

I have a letter from a doctor in Miles City who says:

> There is not a VA hospital in the United States that is better than the Miles City hospital. The cases that require more specialty training have immediately been referred to Minneapolis or Denver for treatment. If their argument about medical care is true, then every doctor in Montana should leave and go to the city. I personally challenge any medical board of inquiry to attest in court, if necessary, to anything that even suggests that the quality of medical care in this hospital is anything but of the highest standard.

Nevertheless, the Veterans' Administration is committed to a policy of locating hospitals in metropolitan areas adjacent to medical centers. I asked Mr. Driver:

> Can you point to a new hospital that is proposed to be built next year that is located in some other area?

He cited an example of Tampa, Fla. He said that the Tampa hospital would not be located near a medical school. Subsequently, I learned that a medical school is proposed to be built at Tampa, Fla. I am glad there will be a hospital at Tampa. It is needed there. A shift in population has occurred, and because of an increase in the number of retired veterans, a hospital is needed there.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Last year, I obtained the exact figures on this situation in Florida from the State veterans' service office. Also, the figures were verified by the Veterans' Administration. At that time, more than 1,000 veterans in Florida suffering from mental ailments were being hospitalized outside Florida, some of them as many as 1,000 or 1,200 miles from their homes. This indicates something of the nature of the extreme need in our State, about which the Senator from Montana likewise knows.

Mr. METCALF. I concur completely with the need for a new veterans installation in Florida. I concur in the need for increased hospitalization in many other retirement areas.

President Johnson said to the newly elected Senators and Representatives, "Think in terms of 1980 and 2000 instead of in terms of 1933." Still, when our veterans are growing older, we continue to think in terms of the veto of the bonus bill and the running of the bonus army out of Washington in 1933.

Mr. Driver's letter to various Senators—I am reading from the one which my senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] placed in the RECORD—consistently pointed out that so far as regional officers were concerned, higher quality service was needed. Then during the testimony, he insisted that he had said throughout the entire letter that they would use new criteria and that they had planned to eliminate marginal hospitals in remote and isolated areas, because those hospitals were unable to provide quality service.

If the Veterans' Administration cannot provide service to 82 or 85 percent of the veterans who need merely general hospitalization in or near their homes, it is time we examined into some of our other hospitalization programs. It is time we looked into the Hill-Burton Act, the purpose of which is to encourage the development of hospitals in remote and isolated areas.

The Veterans' Administration says it intends to close the Miles City, Mont., hospital and the hospital at Grand Junction, Colo., because the quality of medical service rendered in them is not adequate for the veterans.

Where is it proposed to send the veterans? They would be moved to adjacent remote and isolated hospitals, where they would receive the same quality of medical service as they now get at Grand Junction, Colo., or Miles City, Mont. They would be moved to Minot, S. Dak., to Bismarck, N. Dak., and to other areas where the quality of service is no better and no different; to hospitals which have none of the specialized diagnostic services that are said to exist in Minneapolis, Denver, Salt Lake City, and Spokane.

So if this program of closure continues, as the first two closures indicate it will, there will be an area of the United States that stretches from Minneapolis to Spokane and from the Canadian border to Denver and Salt Lake City that will not have a single veterans hospital.

I say to Senators from States having hospitals with 200 or 300 beds:

"Send not to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for your States. It tolls for the veterans hospitals in your States."

The Veterans' Administration admits that with the approval of Mr. Driver it has embarked on a program of eliminating so-called marginal hospitals in remote and isolated areas.

The second item that was brought out, by coincidence, is that the Veterans' Administration plans to begin using the health services of the military branches and the Public Health Service. It proposes to have those services take care of veterans. That program has been opposed by the military authorities and the Public Health Service and also by veterans organizations in America since the inception of the veterans hospital program. These programs were not pushed upon Mr. Driver. He defended them. His deputy defended them. He told them that this was the way he intended to administer the Veterans' Administration. He has defied Congress to do anything about it. He insisted that he should have an opportunity to submit answers to the questions that many Senators propounded during the course of the hearing. He said, with respect to questions that were left unanswered, that answers would be supplied for the record. The Senate should have an opportunity to read the record of hearings that were conducted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and his committee. The Senate should not confirm the nomination of Mr. Driver, who on the record to date has been less than frank, less than forthright, and less than truthful to Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

It is very difficult for me, as my record in the Senate shows, to vote against the confirmation of a Presidential appointee. In 1945, it will be recalled by some of the oldsters here, I presented a 5-hour dissertation as the result of a long research study that I conducted into every confirmation fight in the history of the Senate. I laid out the four historic criteria that have been followed by the Senate in every confirmation fight.

I shall vote against this nomination tomorrow. In my judgment, the nominee does not meet the criterion of competency. The testimony that he gave before the subcommittee demonstrates that over and over again.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] used language that I think indicated that one of the conclusions that he reached was a question as to whether this man was dealing with the Senate in an openhanded way, or whether he was engaged in a misrepresentation that occurs when one does not tell all the facts.

The feeling the Senator from Montana had, as I understood him, was that he did not believe he got the full story from the witness.

I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Oregon raised that question. During the debate on the previous motion, the Senator from Oregon himself was talking about economy. He mentioned that this was false economy and that we should look at the humanitarian grounds, which demonstrates that Mr. Driver sold the idea to the Senators that this is an economy move. But Mr. Driver had to admit that there was not any economy involved at all. He had to admit that all he wanted was to have some additional hospital beds and hospital rooms, so that he could go forward with his construction program.

That was not frank. That was not forthright. That was a half-truth in an effort to deceive the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I completely agree with the Senator from Montana. Whenever I must come to a conclusion that a nominee is not engaging in a full-faith presentation of facts, he simply falls short of the competency that qualifies him for the job.

Mr. President, in my judgment, this man is not sufficiently competent to be placed in the position of trust that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs occupies.

Mr. President, I have stated that tomorrow I would vote against the nomination, on the ground that the nominee, in my judgment, does not meet the criterion of competence.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has made my case, although I shall enlarge upon it.

We cannot take the record of the testimony of this nominee before the Yarborough Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs and reach any other conclusion but that he was a witness who did not act in good faith in his testimony. He concealed. Therefore, I lost confidence in his intellectual honesty. I shall never vote for a nominee in whose intellectual honesty I do not have confidence, because such a nominee does not meet the criterion of competence.

Mr. President, some comments were made in discussion this afternoon by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], as to what we will be doing to individual veterans in moving them about the country as though they were pawns. In my earlier remarks, I stated that we should take the example of the Camp White domiciliary, because most of those men come from that part of the country.

Do we wish to put a dollar sign on the human values involved in the kind of transfer of those men into a strange environment at their advanced age? These are veterans of wars to whom we are all greatly obligated morally.

Does it mean nothing?

Does it mean nothing to the Bureau of the Budget or to this nominee—or, apparently, to the White House?

Does it mean nothing to pull these men out of an environment to which they have learned to adjust, an environment that provides them the only happiness they know in their last years, and thrust them into a new environment in Florida, Arizona, or in XYZ State?

I happen to believe that we cannot put a dollar sign on an action of that kind. Even though they have been able to substantiate economy—and the Senator from Montana has pointed out that the nominee failed completely, under examination, to uphold the claim of the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration on economy—even if one could show some dollar economy, we cannot erase the human hardship that this action will cause.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the nominee because I do not believe that he has demonstrated the competency which justifies his confirmation.

There is another phase of this situation I wish briefly to mention. It is interesting to hear the rationalizations advanced by some Senators and to read the news stories in the press in support of the nominee, that he is a bureaucrat who has climbed the ladder within the Veterans' Administration, that he was a deputy, and that this is desirable because it is promotion within the bureaucracy.

I am one who would have the Senate never forget that is dangerous administrative policy. Watch out for an administrative policy in connection with the various administrative agencies, in which we are going to fill top posts with bureaucrats from below.

I have been in the executive branch of the Government and I wish to tell the Senate that the cheap politics that reigns in many a bureau in this country puts major political party politics to shame.

It is not in the interest of efficient administration of administrative agencies to adopt the policy of giving the head position to a man who has previously served in lower positions. For the head position happens to be a policymaking position that calls for independent review.

As an old teacher of administrative law, let me point out to the Senate that we must watch out for bureaucratic inbreeding, that the nominee's career is an example of bureaucratic inbreeding.

Under our system of government checks, in promoting the efficiency of government, it is highly desirable to bring in independent minds that were never on the payroll of the agency to administer, review, and survey the policies of the administration.

Let me warn the Senate what this policy will result in if we do not stop it: It will result in the entrenched evils of bureaucracy spreading even wider.

I spoke about this danger briefly 1 or 2 years ago, when a nomination was before the Senate for one of our quasi-judicial tribunals, where one of the deputies to fill the commission post was picked. I warned at that time that it was going to result in bureaucratic inbreeding; and in that case, it has. In my opinion, that particular commissioner has been a complete "flop" from the standpoint of the public interest.

What we need is an independent check from the country. We need an independent check, not to promote someone within the bureau who has played bureaucratic politics for some years and secured for himself a position where he thinks he is qualified to be made the head man. In the Veterans' Administration we should put in charge a person who has not held a position in the Veterans' Administration before, but who we know is highly competent, able, and qualified to come into that agency and make an independent review of the policies which have been developed in past years under the previous Administrator. If they are good policies, he will sustain them. If they are bad policies, he will change them.

The difficulty in this kind of bureaucratic inbreeding that the Senate will sanction, if it confirms this nomination, is that we will have more of the same.

What we need in order to carry out our system of government checks is to check bureaucracy by seeing to it that an independent mind is placed in the top position to review the policies—in this instance, of the Veterans' Administration—and to weed out the policies that the former Administrator has been carrying on that may prove to be wanting. The odds are in favor of the fact that this bureaucrat will just give us more of the same, and will not give us the independent check for which I am pleading.

I close by saying that I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination because I do not believe the nominee meets the test of competence, because I do not have faith in his intellectual honesty, and because I think his promotion within the bureaucracy to the head position in the agency is not in keeping with the desirable carrying out of our system of checks, and therefore is not in the public interest.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO VOTE ON NOMINATION OF MR. W. J. DRIVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a vote on the nomination of Mr. Driver at 1 p.m. tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, that the Senate proceed to vote at 1 p.m., Tuesday, February 2, 1965, on the nomination of W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in executive session, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 2, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 1 (legislative day of January 29), 1965:

Commerce Department

Andrew F. Brimmer, of Pennsylvania to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Office of Emergency Planning

Buford Ellington, of Tennessee, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Diplomatic Service

William H. Brubeck, of California, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

John Hay, of Connecticut.
Joseph J. Montllor, of New Jersey.
Charles P. Nolan, of Massachusetts.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Richard W. Aherne, of Pennsylvania.
George E. Brown, of Texas.
Miss Ann P. Campbell, of Connecticut.
David Meredith Evans, of Pennsylvania.
John H. Fincher, of Illinois.
Miss Susan M. Klingaman, of New York.
Miss Claretta L. Krueger, of Illinois.
Alfred L. Padula, Jr., of New York.
Thomas R. Shaver, of Illinois.
Erwin W. von den Steinen, of California.
Stephen B. Watkins, of Connecticut.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

Miss Janet M. Ansorge, of Wisconsin.
John P. Banning, Jr., of New York.
William A. Bell, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Lynn Darrell Bender, of California.
Richard W. Bogosian, of Massachusetts.
William J. Boudreau, of Massachusetts.
James R. Bullington, of Tennessee.
Walter M. Cadette, of New York.
Miss Ellen Rose Delate, of New Jersey.
Guy Feliz Erb, of California.
Harrell Kennan Fuller, of New Mexico.
Arthur M. Giese, of Mississippi.
Marvin Groeneweg, of Iowa.
Miss Jean Marianne Haeske, of Washington.
Richard J. Harrington, of California.
David Bruce Jackson, of California.
Vernard A. Lanphier, of Utah.
Warren A. Lavorel, of California.
David E. Long, of Florida.
Peter J. Lydon, of Massachusetts.
Lewis R. Macfarlane, of Washington.
James B. MacRae, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
George R. Martens, of New York.
Michael A. G. Michaud, of California.
Charles T. Owens, of California.
Vernon D. Penner, Jr., of New York.
Miss Charlotte W. Peters, of Indiana.
Joseph A. Presel, of Rhode Island.
Jonathan B. Rickert, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph L. Romanelli, of New York.
Leonard G. Shurtleff, of Massachusetts.
Thomas W. Simons, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Rufus Grant Smith, of New Jersey.
James H. Taylor, of California.
Michael Acton Taylor, of Indiana.
Patrick N. Theros, of the District of Columbia.
John N. Thomas, of California.
Miss Susan L. Travis, of Pennsylvania.
James W. Wheatley, of Tennessee.
James C. Whitlock, Jr., of North Carolina.
Leonard F. Willems, of Wyoming.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Samuel B. Bartlett, of Massachusetts.
Don E. Bean, of Tennessee.
Robert J. Blais, of Maryland.
Marion V. Creekmore, Jr., of Tennessee.
William H. Gussman, of New York.
Edwin Ho, of Hawaii.
Leon M. Johnson, Jr., of Colorado.
D. Lowell Jones, of Mississippi.
Norman C. LaBrie, of Massachusetts.
James W. Lamont, of Maryland.
Mark Lore, of New Jersey.
Donald K. Parsons, of California.
Hal W. Pattison, of New Jersey.
Harry W. Quillian, of Virginia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

G. Gardiner Brown, of Ohio.
Miss Cornelia Anne Bryant, of South Carolina.
Gordon J. DuGan, of the District of Columbia.
Walter J. Kearns, of Montana.
Thomas E. Macklin, Jr., of California.
Miss Elizabeth F. O'Brien, of the District of Columbia.
James E. Thyden, of California.
Miss Judy Anne Uhle, of Illinois.
Anthony H. Wallace, of New York.
Miss Carol A. Westenhoefer, of Michigan.
Paul R. Wisgerhof, of Colorado.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Stephen F. Creane, of Virginia.
Robert F. Grealy, of Massachusetts.
James D. Keegan, of the District of Columbia.
Harry Keith, of Maryland.
John J. Reagan, of Florida.
Jaroslav J. Verner, of Minnesota.

Miss Carol Ann Lucas, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Grover C. Chappell, of Illinois.
John R. Friar, of Maryland.
Henry D. Hecksher, of Virginia.
Edward S. Juchniewicz, of New Jersey.
Myron M. Kline, of Minnesota.
John C. Murray, of New Hampshire.
Michael C. Sednaoui, of Colorado.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Helen F. Foose, of California.
Miss Margaret M. Herrick, of Minnesota.

In the Air Force

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code:

In the grade of general

Lt. Gen. William H. Blanchard, 1455A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

In the grade of Lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. James V. Edmundson, 1863A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert J. Friedman, 1397A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William K. Martin, 1697A, Regular Air Force.

Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, 1530A (major general, Regular Air Force), to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, under the provisions of section 711, title 10 of the United States Code.

Army of the United States

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert Rigby Glass, O19765, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., O20331, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, O20690, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roland Bennett Anderson, O21108, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Andrew Enemark, O20879, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Allen Beall, Jr., O19907, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Jarvis Tolson III, O20826, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Clare Dunn, O20245, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clarence Carl Haug, O19736, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Alexander Osmanski, O19745, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Allen Thomas Stanwix-Hay, O51759, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Melville Brown Coburn, O19973, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kelsie Loomis Reaves, O20777, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Jay Hayes III, O20134, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Arthur Goshorn, O31465, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Charles Fremont Tillson III, O21196, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Stuart O'Malley, Jr., O20682, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Edward Schlanser, O19886, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Otto Turnage, Jr., O20360, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald Vivian Bennett, O23001, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Arthur McKee, O31867, U.S. Army.

Col. William Herbert Price, Jr., O21903, U.S. Army.

Col. Lloyd Hilary Gomes, O21353, U.S. Army.

Col. Omer Sigmund Dews, O40079, U.S. Army.

Col. Samuel McClure Goodwin, O23177, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Emmett Ekman, O21190, U.S. Army.

Col. Wilson Maxwell Hawkins, O22737, U.S. Army.

Col. Michael Jesse Reichel, O40087, U.S. Army.

Col. James Lawton Collins, Jr., O21788, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Charles Forbes, O24511, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles McNeal Mount, Jr., O21849, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Riis Ploger, O21760, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Martin Gettys, O44181, U.S. Army.

Col. Edward Harleston DeSaussure, Jr., O23790, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Dickson Miller, O21270, U.S. Army.

Col. Clarence Clinton Harvey, Jr., O21076, U.S. Army.

Col. John Scarborough Hughes, O34271, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Eugene Kelsey, O21061, U.S. Army.

Col. Michael Paulick, O23060, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Marion Seignious II, O47226, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Philip Seneff, Jr., O23738, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thurston Tyler Paul, Jr., O32243, U.S. Army.

Col. John Frederick Freund, O23334, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Roland Merrill Gleszer, O23278, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas Henderson Scott, Jr., O23030, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Russell Deane, Jr., O24835, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jerry Spears Addington, O23041, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Alfred Bailey, O21083, U.S. Army.

Col. David Stuart Parker, O22907, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Samuel William Koster, O24873, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Walter MacRae Vann, O21812, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Alvin Ethelbert Cowan, O24171, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jack Emerson Babcock, O21413, U.S. Army.

Col. Donald Harry Cowles, O35735, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Campbell Cassibry, O23058, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin Fahey Black, O23012, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Andrew Peach Rollins, Jr., O24237, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Meszar, O23211, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

In the Navy

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Charles T. Booth II, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

In the Marine Corps Reserve

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert B. Bell.

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles T. Hagan, Jr.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the life and character of Sir Winston Churchill has been the subject of countless sincere and eloquent encomiums in recent days, and I would not presume to undertake an inclusive eulogy. I cannot let his passing, and the impressive funeral ceremonies, retreat into history, however, without a brief and heartfelt comment.

Sir Winston Churchill was the best of everything British. He was a man who could bring to the modern world the finest traditions of the past. Yet for all his achievements that would make him a legend in his lifetime, we saw in him, particularly, the greatness of human spirit. In many ways, he captured the spirit of Kipling's "If," and shining through a brillant career we cannot help but see the greatness of an individual that would be translated into magnificent accomplishments in the realm of public service.

Sir Winston Churchill was the embodiment of the British spirit. He represented the greatness of the British past and British traditions. Yet for all of his achievements in the field of politics, in military affairs, in art and letters, he shall be marked by the indomitable spirit in a man whose pole star for greatness was courage. This was a personal courage that would be translated into the courage of a nation, an empire, and a cause. It was physical, and it was moral. One cannot look at him without a sure conviction that here was a man who, without hesitation or fear, would undertake any task, perform any duty, make any sacrifice which he might demand of others.

His stature will grow in history, and the posterity which owes him so much will study again and again the character of this man who not only inspired the free world by the leadership of his country in Britain's darkest hour but who had the vision, the courage, and the foresight after the end of World War II to direct the world's attention to the tyranny of communism and the aggressive aims of the Soviet Union. It could well be that the greatest debt the free world shall owe to this man who towered above others in our tumultuous 20th century shall be found centered in his leadership in the postwar years to prevent the enslavement of mankind by the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Flags Again Flying in Front of Union Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, several of our colleagues, including GEORGE FALLON, SAMUEL FRIEDEL, CLARENCE LONG, and I, commute daily from our homes in Baltimore. Leaving Union Station for the House Office Building, we never failed to be thrilled by the sight of the flags flying in Columbus Circle Plaza, with the dome of the Capitol in the background.

Then one day we noticed that the flags and the poles were gone. A week or more passed and they had not been put back in place and we inquired about them. We were informed that after more than 50 years there, their condition was such that they had to be taken down. After expressing concern at their removal, action was taken.

The chill January wind reddened the faces of the group assembled on the Columbus Circle Plaza at the base of the flagpoles in front of one of Washington's landmarks—Union Station. They were gathered to officially observe the restoration of the three poles which had been removed because they had deteriorated beyond the point of repair, after standing proudly in their original positions for better than half a century.

Since the three flagpoles are on Government property, their restoration was under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Regional Director T. Sutton Jett inaugurated the action which culminated in flags once again being raised to fly in front of Union Station, as they had for so many years before.

When it was announced in July 1964 that new poles would be erected to replace those which had been removed, many persons, in many walks of life, evidenced great interest because of their feeling that these three poles had added greatly to the beauty and impressiveness of the plaza. Work on the project was started early in August and carried on to completion during the next 5 months.

In brief ceremonies on Friday, January 15, 1965, those who had shared such a great interest in seeing the poles restored, stood silently while an honor guard from the Military District of Washington solemnly raised the flags to the strains of the national anthem played by members of the Metropolitan Police Band.

In addition to Mr. Jett there were Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; Congressman GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland; Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, District of Columbia Commissioner; Mr. C. R. Van Horn and Mr. B. J. Viviano, of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and Pennsylvania Railroad, respectively; Mr. C. W. Shaw, Jr., manager of the Washington Terminal Co., which operates Union Station, and his immediate predecessor, Mr. A. W. Johnston, now regional manager, eastern region, B. & O. Railroad; Col. George Webb and Mr. Whitney Irons, representing the District of Columbia Society of the Order of Founders and Patriots of America; members of the Metropolitan Police Department; and a number of railroad and Union Station representatives. It was my privilege also to be present.

Not only these, but travelers and passers-by, who stood under the Union Station portico once again enjoyed an unsurpassed view of the Capitol dome beyond the gleaming white poles from which flew the flags of the United States of America and the District of Columbia.

They said it was the cold north wind that reddened faces and hands of those who stood in quiet reverence. But none said it was the wind, only the wind, that caused eyes to fill and glisten as the glorious colors rose toward the gray and wintry sky. Not a word was spoken, nor was there any need.

Wool Act Extension Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill calling for permanent extension of the National Wool Act of 1954. The National Wool Growers Association, at its 100th anniversary convention, held in Phoenix last month, adopted the following resolution:

> The National Wool Act throughout its existence has been a program that has proven a step toward establishing our industry on a sound basis. It provides additional income for growers and at the same time leaves wool in a position to compete freely in the open market. We urge early extension of the act by the Congress. In view of the long-term requirements of sheep and wool production, such extension should be for as long a period as feasible but in no event for less than 5 years.

The National Wool Act is unusual in that since its inception it has worked to the satisfaction of the entire wool industry, from producer through manufacturer. All major organizations in the industry have supported its extension each time it has been up for renewal.

The wool producers would now, after 10 years of experience with the act, like to have it made permanent. In any event, they feel that they are entitled to an extension of sufficient duration to encourage producers to expand their flocks. The average life of a breeding ewe is 7 years and an extension for at least that period of time would provide producers with the economic stability necessary to persuade them that increased investment in their operations is a prudent business move.

My bill calls for a permanent extension. Recognizing that the Congress can modify any statute at any time, I share the feeling of the wool growers that a permanent law would be of most benefit to them. If this is not possible of attainment, I feel strongly that an extension of 7 or at least 5 years would provide the sheep industry with the minimum necessary stability.

I therefore am happy to sponsor this measure in behalf of one of our important agricultural industries, and I am hopeful the Committee on Agriculture will give this measure early and favorable consideration.

Tragic Sacrifices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the ratio of workers deciding to retire before reaching 65 years of age has increased each year since the opportunity to do so first became available to women in 1956. The percentage of women choosing reduced retirement benefits each year has risen from 12 percent in 1956 to 66 percent in 1964.

The opportunity for early retirement became available to men in 1961. Thirty percent of those retiring accepted lower benefits that year, 47 percent in 1962, 48 percent in 1963, and 49 percent in 1964.

The Advisory Council on Social Security points out in its recent report that reduced benefits represent great sacrifices for many who accept them. On the whole recipients of reduced benefits get $78 in monthly payments compared to $103 paid full beneficiaries. In many cases this cut is more than the retiree can afford to give up if he is to avoid accepting welfare aid.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the reduced benefits represent actuarial determinations of what can be paid per month for more months without exceeding the total expected payments to a worker who waits until 65.

But the end result seems unfortunate to me. It demonstrates the great desire of many people to retire earlier than 65, certainly. But I wonder to what extent it demonstrates compulsion as well. How many workers electing reduced retirements feel they cannot go on, that their employers will not let them, that automation has taken their jobs, that their health cannot stand it, and so forth?

The Advisory Council on Social Security has called for an inquiry into this aspect of early retirement and the sacrifices the present law compels. I hope the Social Security Administration makes the inquiry promptly and makes the information readily available. In the face of the demonstrably great desire and need of Americans to retire before 65, I feel that a system which penalizes so many persons so severely cannot claim to be operating satisfactorily. Changes will have to come.

The following is a press release on this subject which I issued:

TRAGIC SACRIFICES

WASHINGTON.—Has 65 become too old to retire?

Is the strain of earning a living getting to be too great for men reaching their early sixties?

Almost half the men who retired last year took cuts in their social security benefits in order to quit before they reached 65, Representative John D. Dingell, Democrat, of Michigan's 16th District, said today.

These cuts went too deep, many fear.

The average early retiree gets only $75 in benefits for each $103 paid someone in similar circumstances who works until he is 65 years old.

The Advisory Council on Social Security warns that lower benefits now being accepted in many cases won't keep them off welfare in future years.

"These are tragic penalties," Representative Dingell, said. "A basic aim of social security always has been to pay benefits which would keep retirees off welfare."

To give early retirees a better break the Council urges Congress to modify the method of computing each individual's benefit "base." But this won't help all, the Council warns.

"I was one of the original advocates of permitting men to retire at the age of 62," Representative Dingell said. "This change became law only 4 years ago, in 1961.

"Acceptance was immediate; 30 percent the first year, 47 percent the second year. Of the 2,500,000 men who went on social security benefit rolls during the first 3 years of this program, more than 1 million retired early in spite of the sacrifices the present law demands.

"The prompt change reflects almost universal feeling that any man who has worked steadily ought to be able to quit at about age 60 if he wants to.

"The United States is certainly rich enough to afford this.

"But the sacrifice many are making is tragic. The pressures on some men to retire must be very great.

"Some early retirees are being displaced by automation, I suppose; some doubtless feel they can't meet competition from younger men; and I expect some are being forced to retire by their employers. I have heard of cases in which employers have made up benefit losses, but these have been exceptions.

"Many men retire early to save their health.

"I think the first thing we must do is to find out more of the reasons behind early retirement, and how great these sacrifices really are. Social security benefits for man and wife replace 71 percent of a $150 a month income, only 52 percent of a $350 a month income, and just 31 percent of a $600 a month income. Is this fair? Or necessary?

"We need to know how many retirees are getting out voluntarily, how many feel forced to quit, how many of these men actually have worked only occasionally in recent years. Desire for earlier retirement is too great for Congress to ignore.

"The proportion of women accepting reduced benefits in order to retire early is even greater than men, 64 percent. Their reasons vary. Some are retiring from jobs, some accepting dependents' allowances, some are widows, etc. Nearly all men retiring on reduced benefits are former workers."

Death of Dr. Virgil M. Hancher, Former President of the University of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I read this morning in the Washington Post of the death of Dr. Virgil M. Hancher, who was for 24 years president of the University of Iowa at Iowa City. Dr. Hancher was widely known as an educator, and he contributed much to the State of Iowa during the time he served as president of the University of Iowa. In addition to his long and successful career as an educator, he served his country well several years ago as an alternate delegate to the United Nations.

His death yesterday in New Delhi, India, where he was acting as an educational consultant for the Ford Foundation, comes as a shock to me, as I am sure it does to the many persons who are familiar with Dr. Hancher's contributions to higher education in Iowa and throughout the rest of the Nation.

I would like to extend my sincere condolences to Dr. Hancher's daughter and son-in-law, Dr. and Mrs. Richard Hockmuth of Marshalltown, Iowa. I am sure those who have known and worked with Dr. Hancher join with me in expressing sympathy and regret upon his death.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Rev. Harry W. Campbell, pastor, Epworth Memorial Methodist Church, South Bend, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, gather within Thy care all these who serve our land. Increase our wisdom by gifts of Thy truth; make steadfast our courage by revealing to us Thine own purposes; make real our best hopes for our Nation by quickening within us a sense of destiny; and enable us to walk proudly in our tasks by showing us that we are enlisted in a noble cause. Keep us hardheaded, but capable of being softhearted. In the blessed name of Jesus we pray. Amen.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 1, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 71)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on the District of Columbia home rule, which has been read in the House. Without objection, the message will be printed in the Record, and, without being read, it will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The restoration of home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia must no longer be delayed.

Our Federal, State, and local governments rest on the principle of democratic representation—the people elect those who govern them. We cherish the credo declared by our forefathers: No taxation without representation. We know full well that men and women give the most of themselves when they are permitted to attack problems which directly affect them.

Yet the citizens of the District of Columbia, at the very seat of the Government created by our Constitution, have no vote in the government of their city. They are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship while denied one of its basic rights. No major capital in the free world is in a comparable condition of disenfranchisement.

The denial of home rule to the District creates serious practical difficulties. The District is the ninth largest city in the United States—more populous than 11 of the States. Its government must handle the same problems which press with increasing urgency on the legislative, executive, and judicial arms of city governments throughout the Nation, and it must perform as well many of the functions of State and county governments. Under the present system these duties fall upon busy Members of the Senate and the House who—in addition to their congressional responsibilities—must serve as State representatives, county supervisors, and city councilmen for Washington.

Self-government for the District would not be an innovation. It is a return to the views of the Founding Fathers and to the practice of the early days of the Nation. James Madison wrote in the Federalist that the inhabitants of the Nation's Capital "will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them."

Such a municipal legislature was established in 1802 under President Jefferson. It was strengthened in 1812 under President Madison, and in 1820, under President Monroe, it was enlarged to include an elected mayor.

Had it not been for the tragedy of the Civil War, local government would have continued. In 1871 the people of the District, deep in the problems of the Reconstruction period and urgently needing a program of public works, acquiesced in a change to a territorial form of government under which they lost the right to elect their Chief Executive. The program of public works was badly executed and the territorial government was soon in virtual bankruptcy. In 1874 Congress withdrew the voting franchise entirely and substituted a commission form of government. The intent was to make the change temporary—a receivership which would be replaced by self-government as soon as the fiscal affairs of the city were on a sound basis. But this receivership has now lingered on for 90 years.

There is a fundamental Federal interest in the National Capital. The Constitution wisely delegates to the Congress supreme legislative power over "the seat of the Government of the United States." The Congress can, however, delegate to a municipal legislature all the powers necessary for local self-government, and at the same time preserve fully its ultimate power and the interests of the Federal Government.

The District of Columbia Charter Act which I am transmitting to the Congress today will relieve the Congress, to the maximum practical extent, of detailed legislative direction of District affairs while retaining essential control in the Congress. The bill—

(1) Creates a representative local government for the District;

(2) Provides a link between the Congress and the local government in the form of an elected Delegate to the House of Representatives; and

(3) Preserves intact the powers of the Congress and the President by—

(a) an express provision that the Congress is in no way deprived of its power to legislate for the District, and may repeal or modify any act of the local council;

(b) a provision for an absolute veto by the President of any act of the local council; and

(c) provisions for supervision of the fiscal affairs of the District by the General Accounting Office.

Home rule for the District has been unfinished business for far too long a time. Presidents of both parties—Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—have urged it. Measures to provide it were passed by the Senate in the 81st, 82d, 84th, and 86th Congresses.

The people of the District are ready and eager to join fully in the democratic process. In the presidential election of 1964, more than 90 percent of the registered voters went to the polls.

I urge the Congress to approve at the earliest possible date the legislation which will grant them the fundamental American right of self-government.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *February 2, 1965.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 88-354, the Speaker had appointed Mrs. Sullivan, of Missouri, Mr. Purcell, of Texas, Mr. Rosenthal, of New York, Mr. Cunningham, of Nebraska, and Mrs. May, of Washington as members of the National Commission on Food Marketing, on the part of the House.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 3 minutes on statements made during the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request by Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Regulation of Archeological Exploration in the Canal Zone

A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to regulate archeological exploration in the Canal Zone (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amortization of Certain Assets of the Panama Canal Company

A letter from the President, Panama Canal Company, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the amortization of fixed assets of the Panama Canal Company that are classified as nondepreciable (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Appropriations for Procurement of Vessels and Aircraft for the Coast Guard

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from excessive dental services to hospital patients at general hospitals, Veterans' Administration, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary transportation costs incurred because available Government-owned containers were not used for the movement of household goods, Department of Defense, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 1 of the Legislature of the State of Idaho

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas an adequate transportation system is necessary in the proper harvest and use of our natural resources; and

"Whereas the lack of an adequate transportation system is the greatest deterrent to the full use of our natural resources in the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas under the present rate of road construction, it will take 100 years to complete an adequate forest highway transportation system: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact legislation requiring all Government agencies involved to make sufficient funds available to expedite completion of an adequate transportation system on the main roads of national forests and public domain; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"PETE J. CENARRUSA,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"JACK M. MURPHY,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"ROBERT K. REMAKLUS,
"*Chief Clerk of the House "of Representatives.*"

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; ordered to lie on the table:

"RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO DRAFT APPROPRIATE RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCES IN MEMORY OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

"Whereas it was with great sorrow that the people of the United States learned of the death of Sir Winston Churchill; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States granted him a most unusual honor in 1963 when he was made an honorary U.S. citizen which citizenship was conferred upon him in absentia by President Kennedy in April of that year; and

"Whereas the memory of this great statesman should be perpetuated in the hearts and minds of the people of the free world and particularly of the United States where he was held in such high regard and esteem: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States draft appropriate resolutions of condolences in memory of Sir Winston Churchill; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, January 27, 1965.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the New Hampshire Department of Disabled American Veterans, signed by William J. McDonough, commander, remonstrating against the curtailment of veterans' services; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 76) to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 76

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;
(2) foreign commerce generally;
(3) maritime matters;
(4) interoceanic canals;
(5) transportation policy;
(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;
(8) Federal power matters;
(9) civil aeronautics;
(10) fisheries and wildlife;
(11) marine sciences; and
(12) Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $442,700, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of December 1964. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report and statement are as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, DECEMBER 1964 AND NOVEMBER 1964, AND PAY, NOVEMBER 1964 AND OCTOBER 1964

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(Table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for December 1964 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total[1] [2]	2,485,771	2,493,837	−8,066	$1,381,362	$1,447,263	−$65,901
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,466,349	1,470,353	−4,004	811,953	848,708	−36,755
Department of Defense	1,019,422	1,023,484	−4,062	569,409	598,555	−29,146
Inside the United States	2,325,845	2,333,505	−7,660			
Outside the United States	159,926	160,332	−406			
Industrial employment	542,218	544,549	−2,331			
Foreign nationals	133,283	135,079	−1,796	26,607	24,980	+1,627

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] December figure includes 25,071 temporary employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) of the Department of Commerce engaged in taking the 1964 Census of Agriculture, as compared with 25,086 in November.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1964, and comparison with November 1964, and pay for November 1964, and comparison with October 1964*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	December	November	Increase	Decrease	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	98,171	100,520		2,349	$55,348	[1] $60,265		$4,717
Commerce [2]	56,151	56,358		207	24,942	23,022	$1,920	
Health, Education, and Welfare	83,451	83,407	44		46,766	48,648		1,882
Interior	61,713	62,722		1,009	38,901	40,230		1,329
Justice	32,439	32,649		210	22,985	23,991		1,006
Labor	9,048	9,177		129	6,275	7,534		1,259
Post Office	[3] 598,234	597,561	673		301,849	319,620		17,771
State [4] [5]	41,332	41,306	26		24,180	24,576		396
Treasury	85,525	85,914		389	55,121	57,149		2,028
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	328	337		9	252	283		31
Bureau of the Budget	493	496		3	495	525		30
Council of Economic Advisers	46	47		1	44	46		2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	76	75	1		66	47	19	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	24	24			30	29	1	
National Security Council	41	39	2		40	40		
Office of Economic Opportunity	391	280	111		155	26	129	
Office of Emergency Planning	360	347	13		330	347		17
Office of Science and Technology	57	53	4		43	48		5
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	29	27	2		30	37		7
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy	1	4		3	5	7		2
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	21	12	9		8	9		1
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	10	10			9	9		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	25	24	1		24	22	2	
American Battle Monuments Commission	415	416		1	83	83		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,217	7,229		12	5,999	6,360		361
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	635	634	1		460	467		7
Civil Aeronautics Board	827	829		2	712	780		68
Civil Service Commission	3,762	3,791		29	2,510	2,693		183
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	5	6		1	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	93	92	1		60	63		3
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	3		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	295	300		5	232	240		8
Farm Credit Administration	230	230			189	191		2
Federal Aviation Agency	44,858	44,941		83	35,500	35,853		353
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	5		
Federal Communications Commission	1,529	1,536		7	1,149	1,223		74
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,387	1,391		4	947	997		50
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,248	1,250		2	924	981		57
Federal Maritime Commission	238	240		2	201	210		9
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	415	418		3	402	425		23
Federal Power Commission	1,110	1,114		4	874	909		35
Federal Radiation Council	5	5			5	5		
Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska					3	3		
Federal Trade Commission	1,150	1,156		6	919	951		32
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	200	217		17	122	125		3
General Accounting Office	4,211	4,266		55	3,081	3,250		169
General Services Administration	34,821	34,637	184		18,123	18,468		345
Government Printing Office	7,408	7,443		35	4,300	4,550		250
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,714	13,781		67	9,257	9,682		425
Indian Claims Commission	20	[1] 19	1		23	26		3
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,383	2,388		5	1,814	1,896		82
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,117	32,982	135		27,581	28,844		1,263
National Capital Housing Authority	434	438		4	211	219		8
National Capital Planning Commission	51	55		4	42	45		3
National Capital Transportation Agency	34	35		1	35	37		2
National Commission on Food Marketing	7	8		1	3		3	
National Council on the Arts	1	1			1		1	
National Gallery of Art	314	320		6	151	152		1
National Labor Relations Board	2,136	2,103	33		1,623	1,696		73
National Mediation Board	127	133		6	144	140	4	
National Science Foundation	999	1,106		107	775	787		12
Panama Canal	15,085	15,016	69		6,037	6,020	17	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	59	56	3		40	45		5
Railroad Retirement Board	1,769	1,777		8	1,107	1,168		61
Renegotiation Board	191	195		4	188	197		9
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	158	157	1		112	109	3	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,390	1,383	7		1,054	1,095		41
Selective Service System	7,197	7,128	69		2,449	2,656		207
Small Business Administration	3,518	3,489	29		2,463	2,564		101
Smithsonian Institution	1,695	1,695			926	953		27
Soldier's Home	1,098	1,107		9	426	395	31	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26			29	29		
Tariff Commission	280	280			225	235		10
Tax Court of the United States	151	153		2	148	155		7
Temporary Alaska Claims Commission	3	3			1		1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,500	16,959		459	10,555	11,588		1,033
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	163	157	6		145	187		42
U.S. Information Agency	11,802	11,848		46	5,491	6,208		717
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	12	12			8	4	4	
Veterans' Administration	171,560	171,678		118	83,858	86,105		2,247
Virgin Islands Corporation	315	320		5	119	115	4	
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1			(6)	(6)		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,466,349	1,470,353	1,425	5,429	811,953	848,708	2,139	38,894
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			4,004				36,755	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,084	2,076	8		1,516	2,086		570
Department of the Army	361,695	364,870		3,175	198,044	212,099		14,055
Department of the Navy	326,659	327,331		672	187,477	195,539		8,062
Department of the Air Force	291,207	291,484		277	160,983	166,900		5,917
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,896	1,892	4		1,010	1,052		42
Defense Communications Agency	939	940		1	684	758		74
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,146	2,150		4	1,605	1,660		55
Defense Supply Agency	32,258	32,203	55		17,778	18,134		356
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40			39	40		1
Interdepartmental activities	9	9			5	5		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1964, and comparison with November 1964, and pay for November 1964, and comparison with October 1964*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	December	November	Increase	Decrease	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense—Continued								
International military activities	55	46		1	$36	$39		$3
Armed Forces information and education activities	434	433	1		232	243		11
Total, Department of Defense	1,019,422	1,023,484	68	4,130	569,409	598,555		29,416
Net decrease, Department of Defense			4,062				$29,146	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [7] [8]	2,485,771	2,493,837	1,493	9,559	1,381,362	1,447,263	2,139	68,040
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			8,066				65,901	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] December figure includes 25,071 temporary employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) engaged in taking the 1964 Census of Agriculture, as compared with 25,086 in November, and their pay.

[3] Exclusive of 138,125 temporary Christmas employees.

[4] December figure includes 15,513 employees of the Agency for International Development, as compared with 15,375 in November, and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The December figure includes 4,215 of these trust fund employees and the November figure includes 4,028.

[5] December figure includes 1,138 employees of the Peace Corps, as compared with 1,132 in November, and their pay.

[6] Less than $500.

[7] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National ecurity Agency.

8

[8] Includes employment in the Job Corps by Federal agencies under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), as follows:

Agency	December	November	Change
Agriculture Department	92		+92
Interior Department	71	10	+61
Total	163	10	+153

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1964, and comparison with November 1964*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	96,925	99,277		2,352
Commerce	55,148	55,352		204
Health, Education, and Welfare	82,781	82,740	41	
Interior	61,072	62,087		1,015
Justice	32,082	32,291		209
Labor	8,969	9,069		100
Post Office	596,621	595,974	647	
State [1] [2]	10,882	10,919		37
Treasury	84,850	85,238		388
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	328	337		9
Bureau of the Budget	493	496		3
Council of Economic Advisers	46	47		1
Executive Mansion and Grounds	76	75	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	24	24		
National Security Council	41	39	2	
Office of Economic Opportunity	391	280	111	
Office of Emergency Planning	360	347	13	
Office of Science and Technology	57	53	4	
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	29	27	2	
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy	1	4		3
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	21	12	9	
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	10	10		
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	25	24	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,183	7,195		12
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	635	634	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	827	829		2
Civil Service Commission	3,760	3,789		29
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	5	6		1
Commission on Civil Rights	93	92	1	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	295	300		5
Farm Credit Administration	230	230		
Federal Aviation Agency	43,734	43,818		84
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,525	1,533		8
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,385	1,389		4
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,248	1,250		2
Federal Maritime Commission	238	240		2
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	415	418		3
Federal Power Commission	1,110	1,114		4
Federal Radiation Council	5	5		
Federal Trade Commission	1,150	1,156		6
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	189	192		3
General Accounting Office	4,154	4,209		55
General Services Administration	34,793	34,609	184	
Government Printing Office	7,408	7,443		35
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,499	13,568		69
Indian Claims Commission	20	[3] 19	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,383	2,388		5
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,101	32,966	135	
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Capital Housing Authority	434	438		4
National Capital Planning Commission	51	55		4
National Capital Transportation Agency	34	35		1
National Commission on Food Marketing	7	8		1
National Council on the Arts	1	1		
National Gallery of Art	314	320		6
National Labor Relations Board	2,103	2,070	33	
National Mediation Board	127	133		6
National Science Foundation	994	1,101		107
Panama Canal	165	160	5	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	59	56	3	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,769	1,777		8
Renegotiation Board	191	195		4
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	158	157	1	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,390	1,383	7	
Selective Service System	7,045	6,975	70	
Small Business Administration	3,461	3,430	31	
Smithsonian Institution	1,674	1.674		
Soldiers' Home	1,098	1,107		9
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26		
Tariff Commission	280	280		
Tax Court of the United States	151	153		2
Temporary Alaska Claims Commission	3	3		
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,497	16,956		459
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	163	157	6	
U.S. Information Agency	3,468	3,487		19
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	10	9	1	
Veterans' Administration	170,585	170,693		108
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,402,897	1,406,975	1,310	5,388
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			4,078	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,035	2,028	7	
Department of the Army	314,326	316,998		2,672
Department of the Navy	303,412	304,146		734
Department of the Air Force	265,468	265,706		238
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,896	1,892	4	
Defense Communications Agency	891	892		1
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,146	2,150		4
Defense Supply Agency	32,258	32,203	55	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40		
Interdepartmental activities	9	9		
International military activities	33	33		
Armed Forces information and education activities	434	433	1	
Total, Department of Defense	922,948	926,530	67	3,649
Net decrease, Department of Defense			3,582	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,325,845	2,333,505	1,377	9,037
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			7,660	

---

[1] December figure includes 2,989 employees of the Agency for International Development, as compared with 2,971 in November.

[2] December figure includes 734 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 733 in November.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

Table III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1964, and comparison with November 1964*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,246	1,243	3	
Commerce	1,003	1,006		3
Health, Education, and Welfare	670	667	3	
Interior	641	635	6	
Justice	357	358		1
Labor	79	108		29
Post Office	1,613	1,587	26	
State [1] [2]	30,450	30,387	63	
Treasury	675	676		1
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	408	409		1
Atomic Energy Commission	34	34		
Civil Service Commission	2	2		
Federal Aviation Agency	1,124	1,123	1	
Federal Communications Commission	4	3	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	11	25		14
General Accounting Office	57	57		
General Services Administration	28	28		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	215	213	2	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16	16		
National Labor Relations Board	33	33		
National Science Foundation	5	5		
Panama Canal	14,920	14,856	64	
Selective Service System	152	153		1
Small Business Administration	57	59		2
Independent agencies—Continued				
Smithsonian Institution	21	21		
Tennessee Valley Authority	3	3		
U.S. Information Agency	8,334	8,361		27
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	2	3		1
Veterans' Administration	975	985		10
Virgin Islands Corporation	315	320		5
Total excluding Department of Defense	63,452	63,378	169	95
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			74	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	49	48	1	
Department of the Army	47,369	47,872		503
Department of the Navy	23,247	23,185	62	
Department of the Air Force	25,739	25,778		39
Defense Communications Agency	48	48		
International military activities	22	23		1
Total, Department of Defense	96,474	96,954	63	543
Net decrease, Department of Defense			480	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	159,926	160,332	232	638
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			406	

[1] December figure includes 12,524 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,404 in November. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The December figure includes 4,215 of these trust fund employees and the November figure includes 4,028.

[2] December figure includes 404 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 399 in November.

Table IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1964, and comparison with November 1964*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,593	3,649		56
Commerce	5,614	5,640		26
Interior	9,515	9,600		85
Post Office	263	264		1
Treasury	5,359	5,395		36
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	252	255		3
Federal Aviation Agency	2,565	2,565		
General Services Administration	2,154	2,483		329
Government Printing Office	7,408	7,443		35
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,117	32,982	135	
Panama Canal	7,227	7,248		21
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	156	156		
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,402	13,843		441
Virgin Islands Corporation	315	320		5
Total, excluding Department of Defense	90,940	91,843	135	1,038
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			903	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 134,074	[2] 135,217		1,143
Outside the United States	[1] 4,299	[2] 4,345		46
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	183,955	184,090		135
Outside the United States	1,269	1,279		10
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	125,284	125,366		82
Outside the United States	840	832	8	
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,557	1,577		20
Total, Department of Defense	451,278	452,706	8	1,436
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,428	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	542,218	544,549	143	2,474
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			2,331	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

Table V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of December 1964, and comparison with November 1964*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	December	November	December	November	December	November	December	November
Crete	81	82					81	82
England	2,566	2,538	107	104	91	91	2,368	2,343
France	15,166	16,075	11,847	12,729	9	8	3,310	3,338
Germany	66,839	67,423	56,154	56,731	70	70	10,615	10,622
Greece	314	308			38	36	276	272
Japan	41,890	42,233	14,325	14,484	12,412	12,427	15,153	15,322
Korea	5,450	5,441	5,450	5,441				
Morocco	557	561			557	561		
Netherlands	53	50					53	50
Trinidad	367	368			367	368		
Total	133,283	135,079	87,883	89,489	13,544	13,561	31,856	32,029

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of December totaling 2,485,771. This was a net decrease of 8,066 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of November. The December total includes 25,071 employees of Commerce Department engaged in taking the 1964 Census of Agriculture.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1965, which began July 1, 1964, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,492,061	10,479	
August	2,495,606	3,545	
September	2,461,376		34,230
October	2,470,330	8,954	
November	2,493,837	23,507	
December	2,485,771		8,066

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of December was 1,466,349, a decrease of 4,004 as compared with the November total of 1,470,353. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,019,422, a decrease of 4,062 as compared with 1,023,484 in November.

Civilian agencies reporting larger decreases were Agriculture Department with 2,349 and Interior Department with 1,009. The largest increase was reported by Post Office Department with 673.

In the Department of Defense the larger decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 3,175 and the Department of the Navy with 672.

Total employment inside the United States in December was 2,325,845, a decrease of 7,666 as compared with November. Total employment outside the United States in December was 159,926, a decrease of 406 as compared with November. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in December totaled 542,218, a decrease of 2,331.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,485,771 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 133,283 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during December who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in November was 135,079. A breakdown of this employment for December follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Crete	81	--------	--------	81
England	2, 566	107	91	2, 368
France	15, 166	11, 847	9	3, 310
Germany	66, 839	56, 154	70	10, 615
Greece	314	--------	38	276
Japan	41, 890	14, 325	12, 412	15, 153
Korea	5, 450	5, 450	--------	--------
Morocco	557	--------	557	--------
Netherlands	53	--------	--------	53
Trinidad	367	--------	367	--------
Total	133, 283	87, 883	13, 544	31, 856

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Venezuela; and

Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ecuador.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

John D. Crowley, to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy, as an assistant professor, with the grade of lieutenant commander;

Thomas H. Rutledge, and sundry other officers, to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard;

Otto E. Graham, Jr., and sundry other officers for promotion on the teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy; and

Ellis P. Ward (retired), to be recalled to active duty for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Coast Guard. Since these names have previously appeared in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Walter R. Goldhammer, and sundry other officers, to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard; and

Douglas D. Vosler, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Coast Guard.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Carlson, and Mr. Allott):

S. 939. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young of North Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 940. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 941. A bill for the relief of Marija Pust;

S. 942. A bill for the relief of Evpraksija A. Paunovic; and

S. 943. A bill for the relief of Frantisek Vohryzka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Pell, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Smathers, and Mr. Saltonstall):

S. 944. A bill to provide for expanded research in the oceans and the Great Lakes, to establish a National Oceanographic Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. Gruening):

S. 945. A bill creating a joint commission of the United States and the State of Alaska to make administrative determinations of navigability of inland nontidal waters in the State of Alaska for State selections; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bartlett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 946. A bill to make certain expenditures made by the city of New Brunswick, N.J., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 947. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the last abovementioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Javits, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Scott, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Hart, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Case, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Pastore, and Mr. Morse):

S. 948. A bill to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, and Mr. Ribicoff) (by request):

S. 949. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Hruska):

S. 950. A bill to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 951. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to survey the recreation and conservation needs in the Wasatch Front area of the Cache, Wasatch, and Uinta National Forests in Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bennett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 952. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State upon certain prescribed conditions to deliver to an officer or employee of the United States any decoration, order, medal, present, or other thing conferred or presented to such officer by a foreign government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 953. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yuen Zang Chang;

S. 954. A bill for the relief of Ailsa MacIntyre; and

S. 955. A bill for the relief of Hanna Ibrahim Hanna Abv Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio (by request):

S. 956. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to extend construction authority for facilities at Guam and the Virgin Islands of the United States (76 Stat. 87; 19 U.S.C. 68); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HART:

S. 957. A bill for the relief of Dr. Emiliana San Diego Anselmo; and

S. 958. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Petrovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 959. A bill authorizing construction of a dam and reservoir on Mill Creek in Grand County, Utah, in the interest of flood control, recreation, fish and wildlife, and the development of municipal and irrigation water supplies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Douglas):

S. 960. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Bayh, and Mr. Fong):

S. 961. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of American Indians from being infringed upon by Indian tribes exercising powers of self-government; and

S. 962. A bill to protect the constitutional rights and to authorize the appeal of a criminal action from an Indian court to a U.S. district court for trial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Fong, and Mr. Hruska):

S. 963. A bill authorizing the Attorney General to receive, investigate, and act on complaints filed by Indians alleging that they have been deprived of their constitutional rights;

S. 964. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of certain citizens and directing the Secretary of the Interior to recommend to the Congress a model code governing the administration of justice by courts of Indian offenses on Indian reservations;

S. 965. A bill providing that the United States shall have jurisdiction concurrent with that of the States over certain offenses committed by non-Indians against non-Indians in Indian country;

S. 966. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of certain individuals;

S. 967. A bill relating to offenses committed within Indian country; and

S. 968. A bill relating to the employment by certain Indians of legal counsel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH:

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to permit membership in one house of a State legislature composed of more than one house to be apportioned with the approval of the electorate upon a system other than that of equal representation; and

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to permit membership in one house of a State legislature composed of more than one house to be apportioned with the approval of the electorate upon a system other than that of equal representation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as National Arbor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN, (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Fong, Mr. Johnston, and Mr. Hruska):

S.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to prepare and revise certain materials related to Indians in order that their constitutional rights might be fully protected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF CONGRESS AGAINST THE PERSECUTION OF PERSONS BY SOVIET RUSSIA BECAUSE OF THEIR RELIGION

Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself and Senators Allott, Bartlett, Bayh, Bennett, Boggs, Brewster, Burdick, Byrd of Virginia, Byrd of West Virginia, Cannon, Case, Clark, Cooper, Dodd, Dominick, Douglas, Fannin, Fong, Gruening, Hart, Hartke, Holland, Hruska, Inouye, Jackson, Javits, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Kennedy of New York, Kuchel, Lausche, Long of Missouri, Magnuson, McCarthy, McClellan, McGee, McGovern, McIntyre, McNamara, Metcalf, Miller, Mondale, Monroney, Montoya, Morse, Morton, Moss, Mundt, Murphy, Nelson, Neuberger, Pastore, Pearson, Pell, Proxmire, Randolph, Saltonstall, Scott, Simpson, Smathers, Smith, Symington, Thurmond, Tower, Tydings, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, and Young of Ohio) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Ribicoff, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 76) to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Magnuson, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV RELATING TO JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 77

Resolved, That paragraph (f) of section 1 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the Senate Committee on Commerce) is amended by—

(1) inserting after subparagraph 8 a new subparagraph as follows:

"9. Scientific research and surveys in the marine environment.";

(2) redesignating subparagraphs 9 through 18 as subparagraphs 10 through 19, respectively; and

(3) amending the subparagraph redesignated above as subparagraph 15 to read as follows:

"15. Measures relating to weather and climate, including the Weather Bureau.".

STUDY OF BANKING SYSTEM BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 78) to authorize a study by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the banking system, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study of existing practices with respect to the chartering of national banks, existing credit and other operating policies of such banks, and the circumstances under which recent bank failures have occurred with a view to determining what if any measures are needed to strengthen our national banking system. Such study shall include, but shall not be limited to, an inquiry into the following matters:

(1) Whether Federal requirements applicable to the chartering of new banks need tightening in the public interest and in order to prevent destructive competition among financial institutions;

(2) The extent to which there has been a progressive decline in the percentage of liquid assets held by national banks contrary to sound banking practices;

(3) Whether Federal requirements with respect to the capitalization of national banks are adequate;

(4) The extent to which sound credit policies have been relaxed by national banks in order to meet competitive pressures or otherwise;

(5) Whether any national banks are using affiliates or other devices as a means of speculation; and

(6) The extent to which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has access to all pertinent data necessary to the effective discharge of its functions.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, through January 31, 1966, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

A NEW WHEAT PRICE-SUPPORT PROPOSAL

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators MUNDT, CARLSON, and ALLOTT, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a new wheat price-support proposal. The companion bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota.

Mr. President, new and better price-support legislation, which will assure farmers a better income is sorely needed. Wheat farmers are in financial trouble in spite of better than average crops. The situation will become even more serious unless we provide a price-support program that will insure a better income. With sharply increasing costs of farm operations year after year, wheat farmers cannot remain solvent with present wheat income.

The bill we are proposing would increase the income of wheat farmers with little or no additional cost to the Federal Government. Under this proposal minimum mandatory supports would be at 50 percent of parity or the average of the world price for the past 3 years, whichever is the higher. This would increase the support level 5 to 10 cents a bushel over the program in effect for 1965.

Farmers would be paid 100 percent of parity through wheat certificates on that portion of their wheat which is consumed in the United States. It would increase the domestic wheat certificate payments from the present 75 cents a bushel to approximately $1.22 a bushel.

Under this bill the Secretary of Agriculture could elect to make all of the wheat certificate payments through the Commodity Credit Corporation, through sales of certificates to processors, or a combination of the two.

Another major difference between the provisions of this bill and the present wheat program is that this would require the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate farmers for the mandatory 10-percent reduction in acreage. The payment would be 50 percent of the basic noncertificate support rate times the normal yield.

It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments for acreage diverted beyond the mandatory 10 percent.

The program would be completely voluntary with no marketing penalties for farmers who elect to stay outside the program and overseed their allotment. Farmers who overseeded their allotment could still receive certificate payments if the excess production were stored under bond.

Under this bill there would be no costly export subsidies as has been the case for many years.

The most important feature of the bill is that it would be much more simple and understandable to farmers and nonfarmers alike than the present program.

This will increase wheat income to farmers considerably but even this does not go as far as it should in raising farm income. However, in view of the apparent attitude of the Johnson administration, it is probably the best we can hope to obtain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks, an explanation of the bill and an example of how the program would work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation and example will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 939) to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program, introduced by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The explanation and example are as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This bill provides for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program. It would—

1. Repeal existing provisions for marketing quotas;

2. Make permanent the provision for a minimum national acreage allotment of 49,500,000 acres;

3. Provide full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption, and not less than the higher of (i) the farm price equivalent of the previous 3-year average world market price, or (ii) 50 percent of parity for all other wheat;

4. Repeal provisions for acreage penalties for overplanting to equal 1 million acres;

5. Require the special acreage reserve for old wheat farms to equal 1 million acres;

6. Permit producers of excess wheat to store their excess and qualify for marketing certificates and price support;

7. Permit certificates to be issued for wheat held over from a prior crop where the current crop is underplanted;

8. Permit the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates, in which case all certificates would be redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation;

9. Repeal the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat; and

10. Extend the wheat diversion payment program permanently with a mandatory payment rate equal to 50 percent of the noncertificate support price multiplied by the normal production of the acreage diverted.

Under the bill acreage allotments would be proclaimed every year. The amount of the national acreage allotment would be the larger of 49,500,000 acres, or the acreage needed to meet the production objective, which could not be less than 1 billion bushels. It would be apportioned among States, counties, and farms as provided by existing law, except that no loss of history would result from the overplanting or underplanting of allotments. Marketing certificates would be utilized as under existing law, except that they would be restricted to the portion of the crop needed for domestic food consumption, and the support level for all certificate wheat would be full parity, instead of 65 to 90 percent of parity for domestic certificate wheat and 0 to 90 percent of parity for export certificate wheat. The remainder of the crop would be supported at the level now provided for noncertificate wheat, and certificates would not be required for export wheat. The President would determine, in accordance with the objectives of the act, whether processors would be required to obtain certificates for wheat processed for domestic consumption, or whether the wheat for domestic consumption should move at the noncertificate price, with the certificate issued to producers being redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill would be applicable to the 1966 and subsequent crops.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

REPEAL OF MARKETING QUOTA AUTHORITY—EXTENSION OF 49.5-MILLION-ACRE MINIMUM ALLOTMENT

Section 1 repeals the existing provisions for wheat marketing quotas, and continues in effect the minimum national acreage allotment of 49.5 million acres.

Subsection (a) provides that, instead of proclaiming marketing quotas when the supply would otherwise be excessive, the Secretary shall determine a production objective each year and proclaim a national acreage allotment designed to achieve it. The formula for determining the production objective would be the same as the present formula for determining the amount of the marketing quota, and the national acreage allotment would be the same as under existing law, except that, in additional to the 1 billion bushel minimum provided by existing law, this subsection would continue the 49.5-million-acre minimum which existing law makes applicable to 1965 only. The national acreage allotment would be apportioned to States, counties, and farms as provided by existing law, except that section 2 of the bill would prevent any history loss by reason of underplanting or overplanting in the same manner that the Agricultural Act of 1964 prevented such loss in 1965, and section 3 of the bill would provide a fixed acreage of 1 million acres for the special acreage reserve for old wheat farms created by the 1964 act. Acreage allotments could be increased as under existing law, but the existing provision for termination is deleted.

Subsection (b) repeals Public Law 74, 77th Congress, which deals with wheat marketing penalties; and amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 by striking out section 336 which deals with the marketing quota referendum, section 338 which deals with transfers of farm marketing quotas, and provisions in various other sections which have no meaning in the absence of marketing quotas. Paragraphs (8) and (9) of Public Law 74, which deal, respectively, with rice marketing penalties and support for the 1941 through 1946 crops are obsolete, and their repeal merely strikes out ineffective provisions. Rice marketing penalty rates are now established by section 356 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Subsection (c) makes changes in headings in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 required by the deletion of quota provisions.

ACREAGE PENALTY REPEAL

Section 2 makes permanent those provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1964 which prevented any loss of State, county, or farm acreage history in 1965 as a result of overplanting or underplanting allotments.

Subsection (a) prevents such loss of history in the case of the State allotment. The proviso to be amended by subsection (a) was added by section 202(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (b) prevents such loss of history in the case of the county allotment. The proviso to be amended by subsection (b) was added by section 202(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (c) prevents such loss of history at the farm level in the same manner as was provided for 1965 by section 202(3) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (d) complements subsections (a) and (b) by making changes in section

334(g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 necessary to assure that States and counties do not lose history as a result of the overplanting of farm allotments.

MILLION-ACRE SPECIAL ACREAGE RESERVE

Section 3 provides that the special acreage reserve for old wheat farms created by section 202(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1964 shall be 1 million acres. At present the reserve may be set at any figure up to 1 million acres that the Secretary determines desirable.

FULL PARITY FOR WHEAT FOR DOMESTIC FOOD CONSUMPTION

Section 4 provides price support at full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption, and puts a floor under the support level for other wheat equal to the higher of (i) the farm price equivalent of the previous 3-year average world market price, or (ii) 50 percent of parity.

Subsection (a) repeals the existing provisions for support of domestic certificate wheat at 65 to 90 percent of parity and export certificate wheat at 0 and 90 percent of parity; and provides instead for a single support level for all certificate wheat at full parity. Subsection (a) puts a floor under the support level for noncertificate wheat equal to the higher of (i) the farm price equivalent of the previous 3-year average world market price, or (ii) 50 percent of parity. Subsection (a) also repeals those provisions of the price-support law which are related to the marketing quota provisions repealed by section 1 of the bill. In addition subsection (a) preserves the eligibility for wheat price support of producers who exceed their allotments, but store their excess wheat as permitted under section 5(b) of the bill.

Subsection (b) limits the quantity of marketing certificates issued to producers to the quantity of wheat estimated to be needed for domestic food consumption (instead of including such portion of the estimated exports as may be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture as is now provided). Section 202(10) of the Agricultural Act of 1964 provided for the 1964 and 1965 crops for an adjustment in the computation of the national allocation percentage which was designed to result in issuance to the farmers who complied with the program of certificates to cover the entire wheat marketing allocation. Subsection (b) of the bill would make this provision permanent.

Subsection (c) strikes out the last sentence of section 379c(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which was added by the Agricultural Act of 1964 and provides for two kinds of certificates, domestic and export. By striking this sentence, subsection (b) provides for only one type of certificate. (The other reference in section 379c(a) to two types of certificates is deleted by an amendment made by section 5(a) of the bill.)

Subsection (d) amends the provision of section 379c(c) fixing the face values for domestic and export certificates to provide for fixing a face value for a single type of certificate.

CERTIFICATES FOR PRIOR CROP WHEAT IF CURRENT CROP UNDERPLANTED—STORAGE OF EXCESS WHEAT

Section 5(a) would permit marketing certificates to be issued in the full normal amount when the producer reduces his acreage in order to market uncertificated wheat on hand stored under bond from prior crops. The farm wheat marketing allocation is the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment multiplied by the national allocation percentage. Under existing law marketing certificates are to be issued for the farm wheat marketing allocation, but not more than the normal yield of the planted acreage, plus the amount of wheat stored from a previous crop under section 379c(b) or to avoid penalty which is released because of underplanting the allotment. Since the bill repeals marketing quotas, there no longer would be any wheat stored to avoid penalty. The bill would permit certificates to be issued for any uncertificated wheat stored from a previous crop to make up the amount of the farm wheat marketing allocation.

Subsection (b) of section 5 extends to 1966 and subsequent years the provisions enacted for the 1965 crop by section 202(13) of the Agricultural Act of 1964, which permit a producer who exceeds his allotment by not more than 50 percent to store his excess wheat and remain eligible for marketing certificates. Producers who store their excess in accordance with this provision also maintain eligibility for wheat price support under the provisions of section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Subsection (b) in extending this provision would strike from it provisions relating to storage to avoid marketing penalties, which would have no meaning after repeal by the bill of provisions for marketing quotas.

AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND REQUIREMENT FOR PURCHASE OF CERTIFICATES BY PROCESSORS—CERTIFICATES NOT REQUIRED ON EXPORTS

Section 6 would authorize the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates to cover the amount of wheat processed by them for domestic food consumption. This section also repeals the requirement that exporters acquire marketing certificates for wheat exported by them, since it is the purpose of the bill that the noncertificate wheat move freely into export. The President might suspend the requirement that processors acquire certificates either in whole or in part. If he determined, for instance, that the regulation of commerce would be better served by requiring the processors to acquire certificates for a part of the wheat processed by them, he could so provide. The suspension might be for an entire marketing year or a shorter or longer period, as determined by the President.

REPEAL OF MONETARY PENALTIES FOR PRODUCTION ON DIVERTED ACRES

Section 7 repeals the provision for monetary penalties for producing corps on acreage required to be diverted from wheat. Producers would continue, however, to be subject to loss of eligibility for wheat price support and marketing certificates, if they produced crops on such acreage. The Agricultural Act of 1964 made similar provision with respect to the 1964 and 1965 crops.

EXTENSION OF WHEAT ACREAGE DIVERSION PAYMENT PROGRAM

Section 8 extends the wheat acreage diversion payment program permanently and provides for a mandatory payment rate equal to 50 percent of the noncertificate support price times the normal production of the acreage diverted from wheat. The existing provision, which terminates with the 1965 crop, is discretionary on the part of the Secretary; and the amount of the payment, within the specified maximum, is also discretionary. Beginning with the 1966 crop, the Secretary would be required to formulate and carry out a program providing payments on acreage diverted from wheat by reason of the reduction of the national acreage allotment below 55 million acres, and the payment rate would be fixed by law at 50 percent of the noncertificate support rate multiplied by the normal production of the acreage diverted. The Secretary could permit diversion of up to an additional 20 percent of the farm acreage allotment at the same payment rate.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 9 would make the bill effective with the 1966 crop. If allotments were established for the 1966 crop before passage of the bill, they would be effective without further action.

IMPACT OF THE DOMESTIC PARITY WHEAT PROGRAM SPONSORED BY SENATORS YOUNG OF NORTH DAKOTA, MUNDT, CARLSON, ALLOTT, AS COMPARED TO THE PRESENT WHEAT PROGRAM ON A SAMPLE FARM

This farm under the 55-million-acre national allotment had a wheat acreage allotment of 108 acres. The 96 acres used in this sample is the acreage this farm would have after the mandatory 11.1-percent reduction required under the present law has been taken.

A 25-bushel-per-acre normal yield is used in this sample.

	Present program (1965)	Bill sponsored by Senator Young of North Dakota and other Senators
Wheat acres	96	96
Diverted acres	12	12
Wheat produced (bushels)	2,400	2,400
Wheat income:		
Basic support	$3,000.00	$3,120.00
Domestic certificates	810.00	1,220.00
Export	252.00	0
Total wheat income	4,062.00	4,340.00
Acreage diversion payments	0	195.00
Total income	4,062.00	4,535.00
Blend price per bushel	1.69	1.88

If cash wheat prices averaged 10 cents per bushel above support levels as has been the case in major wheat producing areas in the United States during the current marketing year, the blended price received by farmers under the Young, Mundt, Carlson, Allott proposal would be approximately $2 per bushel.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the American farmer is not receiving his fair share of the national income and this Congress must take steps to remedy that situation, or otherwise the farmer will not be the only one to suffer if he is forced into a depressed condition.

I am pleased to cosponsor a bill introduced by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], which, if approved by the Congress, would substantially increase the income of the wheat farmer.

This is an improved version of the bill that Senator YOUNG introduced last year and which I cosponsored. It can be definitely stated that had this bill been approved instead of the existing law approved by Congress last session, the income of the wheat producers of this Nation would have been substantially increased.

Present farm parity is rated at 75 percent. This is the lowest parity income that the farmer has received since the 1930's. The average parity during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration was 84½ percent. Certainly there can be no justification for this low parity ratio for agriculture today.

The American farmer asks only that he receive his fair share of the national income and this he is entitled to.

American farmers and ranchers—together with those who deal with them—are the most efficient producers in the world. They have developed a facility to put research findings and technological improvements into practice on a sound basis. Their chief problem is markets and an opportunity to adjust their productive enterprise to the ever-changing market opportunities.

Today, and for the foreseeable future, our American family farm will be able to feed our people at home and make available increasing amounts of food and fiber for trade and aid and economic development around the world.

One would think, based on ability to produce, that our farmer would have little anxiety for the future, but what are the facts?

The hard facts are that farm income has declined and farm expenses continue to mount. Net farm income was at its height in 1947 when it reached $17.3 billion. By 1960 it had climbed back to almost $12 billion. In 1962 it increased to $13.2 billion—in 1963 it was $13 billion or a decrease of 2 percent and for the first 6 months of 1964 it was running at a rate of 3 percent below the first 6 months of 1963.

In 1960 farm production expenses amounted to $26.2 billion and in 1963 amounted to $29.2 billion.

In 1960 the farmers' share of the total national income was 3 percent and by the first half of 1964 this had declined a full one-sixth to 2½ percent.

This substantial loss in farm income affects not only the farmer himself, but can and will have a vital effect on our national economy.

One of the greatest needs in agriculture today is unity as to goals and how to achieve them. Agriculture must once again speak with one voice. Then the representatives from the farming States will be able to act with greater effect.

I shall assist the Senator from North Dakota in any way I can to secure approval of the legislation he has proposed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am happy to join with my colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, Senator Young, and others in sponsoring a voluntary wheat domestic parity program which is designed to increase the income of the wheat producers of America and assist them in their struggle to achieve full parity of income for their overall farming operations and thus bring to this segment of our great American system a share of the prosperity being enjoyed by our city cousins.

The bill which has been introduced here today is designed to provide cooperators with full parity of income for that portion of their wheat production which is used for domestic consumption. It also provides for a minimum support for that portion of his crop production which finds its way into export. The legislation does away with the cumbersome certificate program for export wheat, and, in my opinion, allows more flexibility in the export trade market.

Further, in order to supplement the income of wheat farmers, the legislation makes it mandatory that on the diverted acres of the cooperators a payment will be made to the farmer based on a formula of 50 percent of noncertificate support price multiplied by the normal production of the acreage diverted. This would immediately place more income in the pocket of the wheat farmer since under present law the Secretary, while he may make payments, decided not to do so for the 1965 program.

Mr. President, according to the January 15 Department of Agriculture release entitled "Agriculture Prices," I note that parity ratio has declined another point and now stands at 74 percent of parity. The report points out that the main cause for the decline is the index of prices paid by farmers rose four points in the past month which places the farm economy in an even more untenable position than now exists.

It is time, Mr. President, that Congress take effective action to reverse the trend which has taken place over the past 4 years as a continual reduction of the farmer's parity. Congress in all of its wisdom has been considering and approving legislation to reinforce the economy of various segments of our country and I cannot urge too strongly that Congress immediately enact legislation to implement the economy of our great agriculture industry. It has been pointed out many times that a sound and stable agriculture economy is essential if we are to maintain prosperity through all America. Those engaged in agriculture are both producers and consumers. Farmers must be assured of parity of income so that they can purchase as consumers the products processed by those living in urban areas and engaged in our great industrial production. If the income of the farmer is depressed he cannot buy the automobiles, the TV sets, the farm machinery, the new household furniture, and many other items essential to 20th century living. If he does not enter the buyers market in this way it of course affects the income of those working in factories since their jobs depend on consumer purchasing power.

Mr. President, for many years the economic status of our farmers has been measured in terms of parity—which in farm language means that when a farmer receives full parity he enjoys the same purchasing power of his city cousins. That is justice. Today at 74 percent of parity our farmers are living on three-fourths the purchasing power of their city friends. It is time that we in Congress who legislate almost daily to improve the economic status of some segment of society give serious thought to needed legislation to provide the opportunity to the farmers of America to receive the full parity of income about which we have all spoken on so many occasions but have failed miserably in delivering. I therefore hope that the Senate Agriculture Committee will schedule hearings on this legislation and report to the Senate forthwith a bill which will bring into being a farm program designed to provide opportunity for our farmers to achieve the parity of income they so earnestly desire. It is axiomatic that when farmers prosper we increase the prosperity of other areas of our economy and open up employment opportunities all over the country. So let us start in the present session of a new Congress with a new determination to attack the problems of certain depressed areas by increasing the income of our rural population so that they can participate in the prosperity the Federal Government is trying to promote for all Americans.

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to increase social security benefits so as cover the cost-of-living increase of recent years. My bill is essentially the same as the measure passed by this Senate last year, and I hope it will receive prompt and careful consideration.

I have not included in the bill the controversial medical care proposals which prevented its passage last year. I hope those proposals will receive the separate consideration they need and deserve. In the meantime, I do not believe we can delay further in granting to social security beneficiaries the cost-of-living increase they so desperately need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a brief listing of the major features of my bill, and I ask that the bill be held at the desk through next Monday in case other Senators wish to cosponsor it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred. Without objection, the list will be printed in the Record, and the request of the Senator from Texas that the bill be held at the desk for cosponsors is granted.

The bill (S. 940) to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Tower, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The list ordered to be printed in the Record is as follows:

Features of Tower Social Security Cost-of-Living Increase Bill

1. Grants a $7 across-the-board benefit increase for primary beneficiaries and proportionate increases for other beneficiaries with a family maximum range of $70.50 to $312 per month depending upon the amount of covered earnings.

2. Physicians are not covered.

3. Tips are not included as wages.

4. Firemen and policemen with existing State or local retirement plans are not covered by this bill.

5. Proportionately increases those railroad retirement benefits which are tied to social security rates.

6. Increases the earning exemption by $300 to a $1,500 maximum and provides a $1 reduction in benefits for each $2 of earnings on the next $1,500 (nor next $500).

7. Liberalizes disability insurance definition of blindness.

8. Liberalizes the definition of "dependent child."

9. Exempts certain religious groups which make provision for their members otherwise.

10. Increases matching aid for the needy aged, blind and disabled and increases earning exemptions for old-age assistance programs.

11. Revises social security financing to set a $5,600 wage base and revises rates over a

5-year period to a maximum of 5.2 percent on employees and employers and to 7.8 percent on self-employed persons.

NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PROGRAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill to provide for expanded research in the oceans and Great Lakes, to establish a National Oceanographic Council, and for other purposes.

Unanimous consent is requested that the bill may lie on the table through February 9 to afford an opportunity for those of my distinguished colleagues who may wish to do so to be cosponsors, joining with those who are presently cosponsoring the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill introduced today has two major legislative objectives.

One is to set forth a policy and purpose for our national oceanographic program.

The other is to provide high level guidance and coordination of Government activities under this program.

A declared policy and purpose is necessary to provide a proper legislative base for the national program.

No such base presently exists.

Such a base was established in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 for our space program, in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 for our nuclear program, and in many other congressional enactments authorizing or inaugurating, advancing, or coordinating, programs of national significance.

A legislative base and a stated policy and purpose are equally important to the wise development and efficient administration of our national oceanographic program.

All of the above-named programs are vital to our welfare and security.

All involve scientific and technological undertakings of magnitude which demand cooperation, coordination, guidance, and evaluation at the highest Government level.

The oceanographic program lacks such coordination, guidance, and direction.

The bill introduced today proposes to remedy these omissions.

Enactment of the bill will provide the national oceanographic program a legislative base similar to that of our atomic energy and space programs.

The Nation's space program, its atomic energy program, and its oceanographic program are complementary to each other.

The nuclear submarine and the Polaris missile present a concrete example.

Knowledge of ocean depths and the forces within them, of capsuled and controlled atomic energy, and of the upper reaches of the atmosphere are vital to our Polaris program, and equally vital to our defense against missile-carrying submarines of other nations.

"The submarine armed with long-range missiles is probably the most potent weapon system threatening our security today," the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Oceanography has stated.

Mr. President, a secure America requires that we be strong in space, strong in the applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and the national defense, and strong on, in, and under the oceans.

Neglect of any of these three demands weakens a major bastion of national security, and the weakening of one bastion imposes additional defense burdens on the others.

Equally evident is the fact that scientific advancement in one arena encouraged by a sound national program should keep pace with expansion in the others to the extent our national security and welfare requires.

To this objective Congress can, and I am confident will, contribute.

Peaceful and defensive uses of atmosphere and space, as we all know, have increased tremendously in the past 8 years.

These increases in large measure are the fruit of the declaration of policy and purpose in the Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, introduced by then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, now President of the United States, and the late Senator Styles Bridges.

Peaceful uses of nuclear energy in industry, in medical fields, in research, and in many other areas have multiplied almost incredibly since the Atomic Energy Act was placed on our statute books.

This proliferation of benefits reflects the declarations of policy and purpose with which Congress, in its wisdom, headed that historic act.

Mr. President, the bill I have introduced today would, for the first time, state the objectives and goals of Congress in the development of a strong and efficient oceanographic and Great Lakes scientific program.

The declaration of policy and purpose in this measure is similar to that relating to the aeronautics and space program in the Aeronautics and Space Act, although applicable not to space but to the waters which bound us on the east, south, and west, and to those of the seas and the Great Lakes to our north.

The declaration is similar also to the declaration of policy and the statement of purpose in the Atomic Energy Act.

It is similar because the policies declared in those two acts and the pending bill are national policies; the purposes are national purposes, and these national policies and purposes express the determination of the Congress to strengthen our security, economy, and welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the declaration of policy and purpose embodied in the bill I have introduced today be printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the declaration and policy will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 944) to provide for expanded research in the oceans and the Great Lakes, to establish a National Oceanographic Council, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The declaration of policy and purpose presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

Section 201. The oceanographic and marine activities of the United States should be conducted so as to contribute to the following objectives:

1. The expansion of human knowledge of phenomena in and related to the oceans, the marine environment, and the Great Lakes, their boundaries and contents.
2. The preservation of the role of the United States as a leader in oceanographic and marine science and technology.
3. The enhancement of the general welfare and security of the United States.
4. The advancement of education and training in marine science and technology.
5. The development and improvement of the capabilities, performance, and efficiency of vehicles, equipment, and instruments for use in exploration, research, surveys, the recovery of resources, and the transmission of energy in the marine environment.
6. The coordination of activities of the various agencies concerned with the marine sciences, and the collection, storing and distribution of significant data acquired as a result of these activities.
7. The establishment of long-range studies of the potential benefits to the U.S. economy, security, health and welfare to be gained from, the opportunities for, and the problems involved in utilization of scientific marine and Great Lakes research and surveys.
8. The effective utilization of the scientific and engineering resources of the United States, with close cooperation among all interested agencies of the United States, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, facilities and equipment, or waste.
9. The making available to agencies directly concerned or affected by oceanographic or Great Lakes phenomena of knowledge obtained through U.S. scientific marine research and surveys which is of value or significance to the agency.
10. The cooperation by the United States with other nations and groups of nations in oceanographic and marine research and surveys when such cooperation is in the national interest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, when I began my remarks I stated that the bill introduced today has two major legislative objectives.

The first of these objectives, a declaration by the Congress of policy and purposes of our oceanographic program, I have detailed to the Senate for its consideration.

The second objective, necessary to implement the first, is to provide high level guidance to and coordination of our oceanographic program. There must be such guidance and coordination to effectuate our declared policy and purpose.

To achieve these requirements the bill would establish a National Oceanographic Council which would have certain key responsibilities and functions.

These responsibilities in the oceanographic field would be similar to those of the National Aeronautics and Space Council in the space program, and to those of the National Security Council in its vital area.

We have a National Security Council because several departments and agencies have separate and distinctive missions and programs which relate to our security, and coordination of these programs, domestic, foreign, and military, is essential. To this end the Council advises the President.

Similarly, a number of departments and agencies have separate missions in the aeronautics and space program.

When Chairman Johnson of the Special Committee on Space and Aeronautics reported the National Aeronautics and Space Act to the Senate in the 86th Congress, he noted in the report that at least 12 departments or agencies of Government were engaged or had a direct interest in aeronautical and space activities, and added:

> Any differences arising among the agencies must be settled at a governmental level higher than that occupied by any of these operating agencies.

And so we find in title I of the Aeronautics and Space Act a declaration of policy and purposes of the act, and we find title II carrying the heading: "Coordination of Aeronautical and Space Activities" with the subheading "National Aeronautics and Space Council."

The Council, it will be noted, takes precedence over the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, or other groups with responsibilities in the program.

Mr. President, it is equally obvious, in my opinion, that there is a pressing need for a National Oceanographic Council, a Council established and functioning at the highest Government level.

Six departments and 22 agencies, offices, and bureaus, of which five are independent agencies, are engaged or have a direct interest in the seas, their motions, their boundaries, and their contents.

These departments and agencies have separate and, almost without exception, historic missions. Some of these missions are vital to our national security. Many are important to our commerce and national economy. Several enhance our health and safety. Recreation values of the marine environment are receiving increasing Government and pubic attention. Each of the many missions is distinctive.

This means, in effect, that there are numerous and widely dispersed Government oceanographic programs, and that these programs vary in aims, techniques, disciplines, capabilities, requirements, and in present and potential value. All have been conceived to meet a need or to contribute to the strength and welfare of our country and our people.

Coordination of these programs and activities at a higher Government level than that of the operating agencies is as important to the development of an efficient, comprehensive, national oceanographic program as the Congress determined it to be to our national space effort.

Coordination is imperative if we are to have a truly national program, a balanced oceanographic program, and a program in which expansion of the various activities will progress to the degree merited by our national interests and objectives.

The National Oceanographic Council which the bill introduced today proposes be established, would assist and advise the President in coordinating these activities.

The Oceanographic Council would perform functions and offer services in the fields of oceanography and marine science identical to those performed by the National Aeronautics and Space Council in the space program.

The latter advises and assists the President, as he may request, in:

Designation of responsibility for direction of the major space and aeronautical activities.

Providing for effective cooperation between agencies engaged in these activities.

Development of a comprehensive program to be conducted by departments and agencies in the aeronautics and space field.

Resolving differences arising among departments and agencies with respect to aeronautical and space activities.

Reviewing and evaluating all significant aeronautical and space activities, including the policies, plans, programs, and accomplishments of departments and agencies of the United States taking part in the program.

In addition to the above, Mr. President, the Space Council participates in the pertinent overall budget analyses prior to their formal presentation to the President and transmission to the Congress, and advises as to duplications, speed of performance on projects, advanced planning, and areas of needed cooperation.

The National Oceanographic Council would duplicate these activities in the field of marine science and technology.

The Space Council, upon request of Members of the Congress and the staffs of congressional committees, supplies them with competent and objective information about the program under its surveillance.

The proposed National Oceanographic Council would provide a similar service to Members of the Congress and staffs of congressional committees who are concerned about our progress in the marine sciences and technology.

Mr. President, I submit that Members of Congress and the staffs of congressional committees have a real need for far more information on the numerous Government research, survey, and technological activities in progress or projected on, in, and under the seas around us and the inland ocean comprising the Great Lakes.

A National Oceanographic Council would supply this information.

A central source of oceanographic and marine information would have great value to the Senate Committee on Commerce which has legislative and oversight jurisdiction extending to agencies in three departments, agencies that in support of separate missions are actively engaged in ocean and Great Lakes research.

Such a source would be equally valuable other standing committees of the Congress that have maritime-related responsibilities contributing to the Nation's security, economy, and welfare.

Information provided by a National Oceanographic Council would assist materially the Appropriations Committees of the Congress in considering needs of the overall marine science program and in weighing the funding requests of the numerous departments and agencies participating in that program.

Far more important than the advantages a National Oceanographic Council will bring to the Congress, however, are the benefits that will accrue through a coordinated national program to industry, to commerce, to science, to education, to the health and prosperity of our people, and to the defense of our homes and liberties from attack or blockade by missile-bearing enemy submarines.

"Knowledge of the oceans is more than a matter of curiosity. Our very survival may hinge on it," the late President John F. Kennedy stated in a letter to Vice President Johnson in a letter dated March 29, 1961.

And 1 month to a day before his assassination, President Kennedy, addressing the 100th anniversary observance of the National Academy of Sciences, declared:

> Our goal is to investigate the world ocean, its boundaries, its properties, its processes. To a surprising extent, the sea has remained a mystery. Ten thousand fleets sweep over it in vain. We know less of the oceans at our feet, where we came from, than we do of the sky above our heads. It is time to change this, to use to the full our powerful new instruments of oceanic exploration, to drive back the frontiers of the unknown in the waters which encircle our globe. I can imagine no field among all those which are so exciting today than this great effort which our country and others will carry on in years to come.

Mr. President, we still know less about the oceans at our feet than we do about the sky above our heads, and we will continue to know less until we have a national oceanographic program coordinated at the highest Government level.

Oceanography must be put on an administrative parity with our space program. That is what enactment of this measure will do.

Writing in the December 1964 issue of Navy, the magazine of sea power, Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll, oceanographer of the Navy and commander, U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office makes this point:

> Our experiences in the exploration of outer space have shown us that it is easier and cheaper to stay in the lead than regain the initiative once we have lost it. Ocean-space research and the accumulation of new knowledge in the vast reaches of the oceans must be a matter of the highest priority for the Nation.

Elsewhere in the article, Admiral Knoll notes:

> The sea has traditionally been an avenue for commerce, a source of food, and an arena for war. It still is. We are working now to utilize the seas, including the ocean depths, to an even greater advantage, both in the areas of national defense and the general public welfare. It is not too much to say that our preeminence as a world leader, even our very survival, depends upon the success of this effort.

And Admiral Knoll appropriately concludes:

> A comprehensive and imaginative oceanographic program should be a cardinal peacetime mission.

Mr. President, the Congress can support, assist, and expedite that mission.

Congress can do so by enacting the proposed National Oceanographic Act of 1965, expressing national policy and purpose in expanding our marine science and technological programs, and establishing effective coordination of these programs through a National Oceanographic Council.

Similar legislation in the aeronautics and space field, as I have previously indicated, has achieved the purpose for which it is enacted. In that important mission congressional policy and purpose is being carried out; the program is well coordinated.

It may be pertinent to recall that the need for an intensified national space program and for a greatly expanded oceanographic program became manifest at about the same time, or 7 years ago.

Awareness of the need was aroused by Soviet activities and achievements during the International Geophysical Year.

Sputnik I spotlighted Soviet advances in the development of space vehicles, while a veritable flotilla of large, new Russian oceanographic research vessels, well manned and well equipped with scientific instruments shocked us into awareness of our own feeble fleet of small, aged, inadequate, and obsolete oceanographic vessels.

Committees of the Senate which were headed by Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, and of which I had the honor to be a member, and similar committees of the House of Representatives, cooperated in charting legislation designed to overcome Soviet Russia's lead in space.

Through this legislation that objective has been achieved. Our space program is proceeding more rapidly than that of Russia and our conquest of space continues.

It is noteworthy that the space legislation enacted contained both a declaration of policy and purpose and established a National Aeronautics and Space Council to advise and assist the President in coordinating the gigantic effort.

What has been the legislative pattern with reference to oceanography:

During the 86th Congress, the entire membership of the Committee on Commerce, of which I am chairman, sponsored a Senate resolution calling for immediate expansion of our oceanographic program as recommended by the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences.

Unanimous approval was given to this resolution by the Senate.

In that Congress and in the following Congress bipartisan bills to authorize a long-range oceanography program based on recommendations of the Committee on Oceanography passed the Senate but did not become law.

Although both of these bills included a declaration of policy, they did not provide for coordination of the numerous agency programs at the highest level through a National Oceanographic Council, an omission which may have had a bearing on the fate of the bills, and a defect which the measure I have introduced today would correct.

In the absence of any legislative base for a comprehensive national oceanographic program, the Committee on Commerce then took legislative steps to strengthen the marine science programs of agencies coming directly under its jurisdiction.

Statutory limitations were taken off the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Coast Guard to permit them to conduct oceanwide scientific research, utilizing appropriate vessels of their fleets. Accomplishments in oceanographic research by both of these agencies have been notable.

Legislation also was enacted expanding scientific research by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee meanwhile cleared and the Congress passed legislation enabling the Geological Survey to explore and study the ocean bottoms, authority which it had not possessed before.

Funding requests of the numerous departments and agencies participating in the oceanographic program have been considered by subcommittees of the two Appropriations Committees and by the parent committees and in large measure approved.

These committees, however, in my opinion, have had inadequate information concerning the overall oceanographic program or its important segments on which to base their best judgment. Information also has been lacking of the relationship of activities of one agency and another, of other agencies, of the progress or lack of progress being made by certain agencies in the program, of special problems or needs affecting this progress, of priorities given or withheld relating to specific missions and the reasons for the granting or withholding of these priorities, and of administrative or scientific evaluation of agency efficiency and achievement or of deficiencies and their causes.

In the absence of such knowledge Congress cannot be certain how well our national oceanographic program is progressing, or how well the program is progressing vis-a-vis that of Soviet Russia.

Congress does know that new U.S. oceanographic ships have been and are being constructed, that a number of new laboratory facilities have been built and others enlarged, and that the enrollment of young men and women in marine science courses in our schools and colleges has increased.

Definitely we are making progress, but are we making progress systematically and rapidly enough?

The United States is still surpassed by Soviet Russia in number and size of scientific ships being used in both physical oceanography and marine biology, and in the number of ships of opportunity being used for ocean research.

The Soviet Institute of Fisheries, for example, is utilizing more than 60 ships for research, among them a converted submarine. The top Russian fisheries research vessel displaces 4,000 tons and a twin ship is nearing completion.

Soviet scientific vessels are operating in all oceans and along our Atlantic, gulf, Pacific, and Alaskan coasts.

Capt. T. K. Treadwell, Jr., U.S. Navy, reporting on a recent visit to the U.S.S.R. with five other American oceanographers, states that evidently the number of Soviet personnel engaged in marine sciences is larger than the United States has available, that Russia is producing substantially more trained oceanographers, and that instrumentation, much of it imported, is adequate although with few innovations.

Russian shore facilities are crowded and run down, with poor lighting, heating, and ancient support equipment, "surely the worst part of their program," according to Captain Treadwell, who also considered the specialized research programs "generally disappointing."

Captain Treadwell doubted from his observations that person for person Soviet marine scientists are "the equivalent" of those of the United States, but he added:

> At the present moment it would seem that Russia is getting as much for their money as we are in the form of practical applications.

Soviet oceanography, as is that of the United States, is widely dispersed in many agencies.

> It does not appear—

The captain states—

> that their coordination is any more effective than ours, and most likely less.

Mr. President, effective coordination of our oceanographic program can be achieved, and achieved at the highest level in a democratic manner by establishing a National Oceanographic Council.

American business, American industry and finance, American transportation and communications has long led the world in coordination of vast and complex programs and operations, and through such coordination has achieved supremacy over other economic and social systems.

The U.S. Government has efficiently coordinated such immense programs as atomic energy and space development.

In Government high level councils perform the same coordinating function as do boards of directors of large corporations and financial institutions.

The National Oceanographic Council proposed in the bill I have introduced today will have a major role in meeting and surpassing Russia's challenge of science and technology on the high seas.

It will have a major role in reversing one of the strangest anomalies of these times, noted in a recent issue of Vectors, a publication of the Hughes Aircraft Co.

Writing in this issue, D. R. Heebner commented:

> It is almost amazing that the United States, one of the world's leading maritime nations, puts a tiny fraction of its scientific effort (only some 2,000 scientific workers) into a study of the medium from which it derives its principal strength—while another virtually landlocked nation puts substantially greater effort in this area.

The Council proposed in the measure I have introduced would be composed of the Vice President as Chairman, the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Directors of the Office of Science and Technology and the

National Science Foundation, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

All of these officials head departments or agencies which perform, direct, finance or oversee scientific oceanographic research and survey programs, many of them vital to the national security, and others important to the Nation's economy and welfare or to our international relations.

A similar bill introduced last year, too late for congressional action, provided for a council of nine members, omitting, through inadvertence, the inclusion of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution as members.

This omission was immediately noted by the scientific community, reasons for their inclusion on the Council were advanced by many eminent oceanographers, and the inadvertence has been corrected.

Among those writing to me in the matter were Dr. M. B. Schaefer, Chairman of the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences. His letter states in part:

> The marine sciences, by their very nature, being concerned with the world ocean and its resources, inevitably involve a very large component of international affairs, which are the responsibility, at least in part, of the Department of State. More pragmatically, funds are provided through the Department of State for the support of numerous organizations concerned with the sea and its resources, as well as with bilateral arrangements between the United States and other countries.
>
> Several of the international fisheries commissions engaged in ocean research are supported through the State Department. Substantial appropriations are made to specialized agencies of the United Nations for work in this field, including: Fisheries Division of the Food and Agriculture Organization, the Special Fund, the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, the Office of Oceanography of UNESCO, the World Meteorological Organization, and others.

The Secretary of State will be a member of the National Oceanographic Council under provisions of the new bill.

Elsewhere in this letter, Dr. Schaefer states:

> I personally believe that this proposal to establish a National Oceanographic Council offers a most excellent means of providing the needed high level coordination of the planning and execution of the U.S. national oceanographic program.

The National Oceanographic Council, as proposed in the bill introduced today, would include also the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

Under both the previous Secretary, Dr. Leonard Carmichael, and the present Secretary, Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, the Smithsonian has greatly expanded its oceanographic activities, particularly in connection with the collection and classification of marine biological and geological specimens.

The Smithsonian, in its oceanographic program, also is working with the National Institutes of Health in studies of cancer in minute and primitive marine organisms on the theory that these studies may offer clues to causes and possible checks to the development of cancer cells in higher forms of life.

Operation of its own scientific ship for marine biological research is contemplated by the Smithsonian in the near future, and a marine field station will be operated near the Isthmus of Panama, specializing in species and organisms in the tropical seas.

As an active, operating oceanographic agency, the Smithsonian Institution clearly should be represented on the National Oceanographic Council, and such representation is provided in the bill.

Mr. President, this is a large Council, but not as large as that of Great Britain, where the council of 32 members has functioned with signal success since it was established in 1950. The British National Oceanographic Council has an executive committee of 11 members. Canada to our north has a national council of 9 members.

Mr. President, the National Council would have certain designated functions, and such other functions as the President may prescribe. I ask unanimous consent that those functions specified in the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The proposed U.S. Council would advise and assist the President, as requested, on performance of functions in the field of oceanography and the marine sciences. These functions, as designated in the bill, would include:

First. A survey of all significant oceanographic and marine science activities of U.S. departments and agencies, and the policies, plans, programs, and accomplishments of these agencies in this field.

Second. Development of a comprehensive oceanographic and marine science program which will include exploration, exploitation, and conservation of marine resources, oceanographic engineering, studies of air-sea interaction, transmission of energy, and communications.

Third. Placement of responsibility for direction of these major marine science activities.

Fourth. Providing for effective cooperation among departments and agencies in the national program.

Fifth. Resolving differences between agencies with respect to oceanographic activities.

Sixth. Reviewing annually policies, plans, programs, priorities, and activities under national oceanographic program.

Provision also is made in the bill for a staff similar to the staffs which assist the National Aeronautics and Space Council and the National Security Council.

Mr. President, this is one of the key provisions of the bill.

The staff would be headed by a civilian executive secretary appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and would include experts, not to exceed seven in marine science, engineering, and administration.

These experts could be selected from industry, from oceanographic institutions, or from government; top men in their professions.

They would be completely independent of any department or agency; free to exercise their own best judgment in their fields.

The staff would give full time to its functions and responsibilities, as does the similar staff of the Aeronautics and Space Council, and its members, not connected with or supported by any operating agency or enterprise, could and would be completely objective.

The Council would operate on a modest budget which would not exceed the authorization in the bill, $550,000.

With the policy and purpose stated in the bill and with a National Oceanographic Council to implement that policy and purpose our oceanographic program will move ahead, constructively, efficiently, and economically.

It will carry out the promise envisioned by the late President John F. Kennedy in March 1961, when he stated:

> Knoweldge and understanding of the oceans promise to assume greater and greater importance in the future. This is not a 1-year program—or even a 10-year program. It is the first step in a continuing effort to acquire and apply the information about a part of our world that will ultimately determine conditions of life in the rest of the world.
>
> The opportunities are there. A vigorous program will capture these opportunities.

Mr. President, the opportunities are there, waiting to be realized.

Last month the National Academy of Sciences issued a report titled "Economic Benefits From Oceanographic Research."

This report estimates that a continuing national investment in oceanography of approximately $165 million a year—$24 million more than the amount requested in the fiscal 1966 budget—will produce within the next 10 to 15 years annual new production amounting to $2,745 million.

Annual savings from the expanded program are estimated at $2,970 million or slightly under $3 billion.

Economic benefits are envisioned and values estimated in increased fisheries production, exploitation of minerals from the ocean bottoms and the Continental Shelf, lower seaborne shipping costs, long-range weather forecasting resulting from oceanographic studies of the air-sea interchange, eradication or control of near-shore pollution, marine recreation, and reduction of certain peacetime naval losses and costs while greatly augmenting our security.

Mr. President, time has permitted me to only touch on this report, which is extensive and detailed. I commend it to my colleagues.

"The opportunities are there," as President Kennedy stated, waiting to be captured by a sustained and vigorous oceanographic program.

The bill introduced today will assure this program.

NAVIGABLE WATERS OF ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, in behalf of my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and myself, a bill to create a joint commission of the United States and the State of Alaska to make administrative determinations of navigability of inland nontidal waters in the State of Alaska for State selections.

Let me be quick to point out, Mr. President, this Commission is not what it appears at first blush. It is not a newly created, independent body but rather a kind of working agreement between the Secretary of the Interior, who has initial responsibility for determining navigability in connection with public lands, and the Director of Natural Resources for Alaska, who has prime responsibility under State law for the land selection program provided for in the Statehood Act. Under this working agreement the Department of Interior would cooperate with the State in making joint administrative determinations, for the purposes of State selections only, of the navigability of inland nontidal waters within Alaska.

Mr. President, the need for making such determinations arises primarily from the fact that section (1) of the Statehood Act, 72 Stat. 339 (1958), provided that the navigable waters of Alaska became property of the State immediately. Another provision of the act granted to the State 103,350,000 acres of land to be selected over a 25-year period. The navigable waters should not be charged against the State's selection quota, and thus navigability must be determined as the selection proceeds.

In the area of mineral resources development, navigability determinations will eliminate the need for acquisition of both Federal and State leases for the same lands. Moreover, the Federal Government and the State can fix, each in its respective sphere, the rights acquired under mineral leases granted by them.

The scope of the bill is limited to determinations of navigability with respect to State selections to avoid conflict with the functions of the Coast Guard, the Corps of Engineers, and the Federal Power Commission. This is appropriate as none of these organizations will be represented.

Members of the Commission will be appointed respectively by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Natural Resources. The appointees will come from the ranks of officers and employees of the Interior Department and the Alaska Department of Natural Resources. Not less than two nor more than five members will be appointed each by the Secretary and the Commissioner. The Commission will be known as the Navigable Waters Commission.

It should be noted that the Commissioner would be able to appoint a member of the Alaska Department of Law as one of the State's representatives; this provision was included as the department of natural resources does not employ attorneys. The State needs representation of legal counsel as the Interior Department most assuredly will place attorneys on the Commission.

The Commission will be guided in its determinations by statutory provisions, common law, and judicial authorities on the subject of navigability of waters. Commission determinations will be binding, insofar as State selections are concerned, upon all departments, agencies, and employees of both the State and Federal Government, and upon all persons deriving title from either or both governments subsequent to enactment of the bill. Judicial review of any determination is guaranteed under the bill by either government or any affected party by the filing of a petition in the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska within 1 year of publication of the challenged determination in the Federal Register.

The first Chairman of the Commission shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, and subsequent Chairmen shall be chosen alternately from the ranks of State and Federal appointees by majority vote of the members of the Commission. The meetings shall be held in Alaska at the call of the Chairman and desired determinations shall be presented either jointly or separately by the two governments. The Commission will make its determinations by majority vote after hearing testimony from representatives of the Departments of the Interior and Natural Resources, expert witnesses hired by the Commission, and persons who may establish to the satisfaction of the majority of the Commission sufficient interest in the proceedings.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that the salaries and expenses of Commission members and investigative expenses incurred will be borne by the respective governments and that joint expenses shall be borne equally by the two governments.

Mr. President, I have been working with officials of the Interior Department and officials of the State of Alaska since mid-1963 on the language of the bill I introduce today. Although the Bureau of the Budget has not reviewed the bill, the Interior Department has approved it subject to such review. Hon. William Egan, Governor of Alaska, has advised me of the State's concurrence in the bill's provisions, and the importance of the navigability issue to development of the State.

My colleague and I are hopeful this measure can be the subject of early committee hearings and Senate action in view of its importance to both our State's development and the efficient administration of Federal and State lands in Alaska by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Natural Resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 945) creating a Joint Commission of the United States and the State of Alaska to make administrative determinations of navigability of inland nontidal waters in the State of Alaska for State selections, introduced by Mr. Bartlett (for himself and Mr. Gruening), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 945

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the policy of the United States to cooperate with the State of Alaska in making a joint administrative determination, for purposes of State selections only, of the navigability of inland nontidal waters within the State of Alaska.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall designate, for such terms as he deems proper, not less than two and not more than five officers or employees of the Department of the Interior to comprise, together with a similar number of officers or employees of the Department of Natural Resources of the State of Alaska designated by the commissioner of that department, a Joint Commission of the United States and the State of Alaska for the determination of the navigability of inland nontidal waters within the State of Alaska, to be known as the Navigable Waters Commission.

(b) The Commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources of the State of Alaska may designate an officer or employee of the Department of Law of the State of Alaska as a member of the Navigable Waters Commission in lieu of the designation of an officer or employee from the Department of Natural Resources of the State of Alaska.

Sec. 3. The Navigable Waters Commission shall meet at a suitable place in the State of Alaska at the call of the Chairman. The Chairman for the first meeting of the Commission shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior. During the course of each meeting, the Commission shall elect a Chairman for the next meeting, and the chairmanship shall alternate between members from the Department of the Interior and members from the State of Alaska. Salaries and expenses of Federal and State members shall be borne by their respective governments. Joint expenses of the Commission shall be borne equally by the two governments.

Sec. 4. At each meeting the Department of the Interior of the United States and the Department of Natural Resources of the State of Alaska shall, either jointly or separately, propose to the Navigable Waters Commission, a determination of the navigability or nonnavigability of particular waters, or of all waters contained in particular areas described with reference to the public land survey wherever possible, situated in whole or in part within the State of Alaska. The members of the Commission shall not take part in the making of such proposals by their respective departments. The Commission shall hear from (1) representatives of the two departments, (2) any expert witnesses hired by the Commission, and (3) any person who first establishes to the satisfaction of one-half of the membership of the Commission a sufficient interest in the proceedings, evidence bearing on the question of navigability. As soon as practicable, the Commission shall make a determination of the navigability or nonnavigability of the inland nontidal waters so proposed. No determination of navigability or nonnavigability shall be made with respect to particular waters or areas containing waters unless concurred in by a majority of the members of the Navigable Waters Commission. The expenses of the Department of the Interior and of the Department of Natural Resources incurred in investigating and proposing the navigability or nonnavigability of waters shall be borne by the respective governments.

Sec. 5. In making its determinations the Navigable Waters Commission shall be guided by statutory, common law, and judicial authorities on the subject of navigability of waters.

Sec. 6. Determinations of the Navigable Waters Commission shall be binding, insofar as State selection rights of the State of Alaska are concerned, upon all departments, agencies, officers, and employees of both the United States and the State of Alaska, and upon all persons deriving title from either or both governments subsequent to the effective date of this Act: *Provided,* That the United States, the State of Alaska, or any other affected party may obtain judicial review of any determination by filing a petition for that purpose in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska within one year after the publication of such determination in the Federal Register. Such judicial review shall be on the basis of the record.

SOIL MAPS AND SUBURBS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I reintroduce for appropriate reference a bill to strengthen and improve the program of the Soil Conservation Service.

This bill has as its major objective the aid to planning of new suburban growth on what is now rural farmland.

My own State clearly demonstrates the urgent need for such action. New Jersey in 1970 will have increased its population by 25 percent to about 7.6 million. In the midst of this population explosion brought on by growing urbanization, the trend to suburban development will increase very rapidly. At this moment, however, our knowledge of soils data, septic systems, and general land capabilities cannot hope to keep pace with these changes unless our conservation services are expanded and improved.

In the past, Congress has not overlooked this need. Many years ago it created the Soil Conservation Service within the Department of Agriculture to answer the national demand for reliable soil data. This agency has done excellent pioneer work in this important field, but it is hampered by limited resources, and the necessity of directing most of its efforts toward agricultural problems.

Under these adverse conditions the Soil Conservation Service has nevertheless succeeded in drawing up soil maps of over 20 percent of the acreage in the continental United States and has thereby provided farmers with vital information about the nature and value of their land.

The assistance which the farmer has received must now be given to the suburban dweller if he is going to be able to plan safely and confidently for his own future. Thousands of new homes will spring up in all parts of the Nation during the next few years, and community leaders must be equipped to deal with the numerous problems of sanitation and waste disposal which this will present.

Their difficulties can be eased, and the well-being of millions of our future homeowners will be protected if we take steps now to find out more about the land on which we live.

New Jersey must rely now on eight soil scientists to accomplish work in 15 years which could be done in 5 with the help of a few more such specialists.

This bill would enable the mobilization of additional needed manpower and would clear up the present confusion in the laws under which the Soil Conservation Service is now directed to act.

Considering the magnitude of this task and the comparatively slight cost of putting existing machinery in motion, I urge the Senate to give this bill prompt and favorable consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 947) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on September 24, 1964, I submitted an amendment to the Export Control Act of 1949 (S. 3220) which would once and for all give American businessmen the protection they so urgently need to withstand the Arab boycott of firms dealing with Israel. I wish to reintroduce that bill today and to reclarify some of the conditions which dictate its passage.

The Arab States insist that they are still at war with Israel. Sometimes they act as though they are indeed still at war—for instance, in their costly schemes to stop Israel's water development with no ostensible advantage to themselves. Sometimes they act as though the war is over, as in the unperturbed entrance of Jordanians into Israel during the Pope's visit to that country. However, despite inconsistencies in actual policy, the Arabs always say that they are at war with Israel. They say it in the United Nations, at length, every year; they say it in their own newspapers and on every public occasion. What is more, they seem to expect the rest of the world to respect their belligerency.

This continuing hostility has caused difficult policy problems for the United States. We have strongly supported Israel's economic and political development since her creation.

As a nation we have sympathized with Israel's efforts to build democracy from the ashes of totalitarianism, in an area of the world where democracy has rarely succeeded. We have likewise looked favorably on any and all efforts of Arab leaders to improve the lot of their people. Our aid has poured into the Near East. Whether or not they think so, we have tried to help the Arabs to help themselves.

But our goodwill is often negated, because the Arabs maintain that it is impossible to remain friendly to both sides. They maintain that any American support for Israel's democracy is an American blow against the Arab world. In private, Arab leaders may acknowledge the opposite; in public, however, they shout the old axiom, "The friend of my enemy is my enemy" and the Arab masses believe them.

The Arab boycott of American firms dealing with Israel is one product of this public attitude; it has been officially neglected for too long; it is beginning to damage the domestic morale and worldwide dignity of the American business community; we have been remiss in letting it go this far; we must stop it now.

Briefly, the boycott operates in this manner. The central boycott office in Damascus, an arm of the Arab League, writes to the American businessman, threatening him with boycott in 13 Arab States unless he answers an enclosed questionnaire about his dealings with Israel. And he had better answer it to the satisfaction of the Arab boycott office.

If I may, Mr. President, I would like to read the list of questions which the boycott office has the effrontery to ask. I ask unanimous consent that this insulting questionnaire be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the questionnaire was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARAB BOYCOTT QUESTIONS

1. Do you now or did you ever have branch factories in Israel? In case you did in the past, or do now, please define the relationship of such branch with your company.
2. Do you now or did you ever have assembly plants in Israel?
3. Do you now or did you ever have in Israel general agencies head offices for your Middle Eastern operations?
4. Have you ever granted the right of using your patents, trademarks, copyrights, etc., to Israeli persons or firms?
5. Have you ever owned shares or any other interest in Israeli firms or businesses?
6. Have you ever rendered consultative services or technical assistance to an Israeli firm or business?
7. Do you now or did you ever represent any Israeli firm or other business in your country or elsewhere? In case you did in the past, or do now, please furnish us with the names and addresses of such Israeli firms or businesses.
8. Do you have a branch of yours in Israel? In case you have, please define the relationship of such branch with your firm.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, is it tolerable for an American businessman to be threatened with loss of his operations in the Arab world unless he ceases dealing with a country friendly to the United States? Is it tolerable for that businessman to be blackmailed into answering utterly private questions about his connections with Israel, and his plans for the future?

No one here today is arguing the ability of Arab governments to impose restrictions of trade upon Arab businessmen who might otherwise do business with Israel. But when the Arab world succeeds in imposing such restrictions on American firms, something is wrong. And when the U.S. Government can do nothing more to assist these firms than to say it does not condone the boycott, something is rotten.

Business International reported that as of January 1964, 164 American firms were on the blacklist. Fifty-three of them have been on since 1959 or before; 31 made it in 1961 and 1962; 33 made it by November 1963. In one case, a particularly vulnerable firm supplying parts for products distributed in the Arab world was made to leave its Israel operation through a secondary boycott—the Arabs put pressure on the customers and the customers, in self-defense, put pressure on the supplier. Thus blackmail breeds more subtle blackmail; the businessman without protection from his own country's laws, is placed in a position where both his dignity and his principles can be all too easily compromised.

It has been the policy of this Nation to protect its citizens wherever they are in danger. We protect them when they are held hostage to war in the Congo; we protect them when their holdings abroad are nationalized by making our aid contingent upon adequate compensation for expropriation.

Why should we make an exception for the Arab war against Israel? Every time a friendly nation wishes to make war on another friendly nation, shall we permit our business community to be caught in the path of the attack while our Government remains neutral?

Now that boycott office in Damascus is an Arab League office; its threats receive lipservice from sovereign Arab States, but Arab governments can and do differ with its policies. The sophisticated businessman might know full well that it takes more than a recommendation from the Arab League to make good a threat or a promise. But the individual businessman cannot know, except by costly and extensive investigation, whether the sovereign Arab States will accept or disregard Damascus directives; he is on unsafe ground; his decision whether or not to defy the boycott is a nerve-racking one.

One businessman may receive letters from several different boycott offices, because individual states maintain their own. In addition he may receive a covering letter from the Arab firm with which he plans to do business. An American company is more likely to be intimidated by this welter of documents than to understand that it implies chaos among Arab authorities. He has no defense against the intimidation; his Government has provided him with no defense. Is it any wonder that, although he knows the Arabs have no right to blackmail him in this way, he may permit himself to be blackmailed?

Now it is a fact that many American firms are defying the boycott. This fact testifies to the strong belief of our business community in freedom of trade and to that community's determination to stand up to an irritating and continuous barrage. These firms have learned to live with the boycott; they have found ways to circumvent it; they have learned not to advertise the fact that they do business with both sides, out of practical respect for Arab sensitivities; they have learned to hide the fact that a boycott office which publicly threatens them privately agrees to leave them alone. Israel has learned to live with the boycott too. She has developed a thriving merchant marine as much because of as in spite of the boycott. She has found new markets where the logical markets were denied to her.

I am aware that the most powerful American firms have been able to live with boycott pressure. My point is that they should not have to.

I am asking Congress to amend the Export Control Act, under which the Commerce Department can now regulate exports in order to further the foreign policy of the United States. I want it unequivocally stated by Congress that it is in fact our foreign policy to oppose and condemn any trade boycott directed against foreign countries with which the United States maintains friendly relations.

In addition to officially declaring our opposition to such trade restraints barring commerce with friendly nations, the provisions of my bill will specifically outlaw the giving of information which could be used to further such boycotts or the signing of actual boycott agreements.

Under the protections of this legislation, any American businesman can then, with impunity, flatly refuse to divulge any information about his commercial investments or dealings with any of our foreign friends, and he can refuse to sign agreements not to trade or deal with those countries.

Several European governments have already taken positive steps to protect their citizens from the boycott. The International Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution last November counseling chambers of commerce never to certify negative certificates of origin. Let us sound the final note on this growing volume of protest by adopting the legislation I propose. There are some principles which this Nation, as leader of the free world, cannot afford to neglect. And one of those principles is the principle of free trade—trade free from intimidation, trade free from fear, trade free from obstruction by a war which we oppose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table through the close of business on the 9th of February for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 948) to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. HART, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I join as cosponsor of the bill at this time? I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the most unreasonable acts that the Arab States are permitted to do is to try to intimidate American and other firms from dealing with Israel. It is perfectly ridiculous, but it is very dangerous and serious to world trade and business. I welcome the opportunity to join with the Senator from New Jersey.

PROPOSED STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, I send to the desk for appropriate reference the proposed State Technical Services Act of 1965, together with a letter of transmittal from Secretary Hodges and a statement of purpose and need.

Science and technology today have assumed an importance in our lives that was undreamed of in years past. They are vitally involved in assuring an adequate national defense. They are responsible for the present high levels of physical health enjoyed by so many of our citizens. They are at the heart of our efforts to explore and make use of outer space. They hold the key to unlimited sources of energy for the future. They have produced a miracle of abundance in American agriculture.

But there is one area in which science and technology are sometimes taken for granted, although it is a field that is as important as any of the others I have mentioned. I am referring to the dynamic growth of our industrial economy. A prosperous economy is absolutely dependent upon science and technology, and particularly upon our ability to apply the results of new knowledge to practical purposes. All of our efforts in space, in defense, in atomic energy, in public health, are ultimately based on the ability of the private sector of the economy to produce sufficient tax revenues to support these important national programs.

Fortunately, we have not neglected public support for science and technology. We are truly a scientific and technological giant among nations. The amount of new knowledge coming forth from our research and development laboratories accumulates at an ever-increasing rate. This new knowledge, however, does not automatically find its way into use everywhere it is needed, or everywhere it could be exploited.

Highly trained people are necessary to bridge the gap between what has been discovered in a laboratory and what can be used on a production line. Special mechanisms and institutions are needed to translate the results of science into the language of applied technology. The ability to do this must exist in all parts of the country if the results of science and technology are to bear productive fruit in all sections of the country.

To aid in stimulating and expanding the effectiveness of this vital process throughout the Nation, this new legislation has been proposed by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Federal agency responsible for fostering the steady growth of the American economy.

The State Technical Services Act is designed to permit the Federal Government to join with State governments, universities, and local communities in putting scientific and technical information, in a useful form, into the hands of private industry in all of the States. If successful, it would lead to increased employment through development of new business, improved processes and products, and new services that flow from the exploitation of technology. Finally, it would help make the products of American manufacturers more competitive in the rapidly expanding world markets.

These objectives would be accomplished by a program of technical services specifically designed to meet the needs of local business and industry. The technical services would be provided mainly through educational institutions with engineering or business administration programs.

In outlining his plans for the Great Society, President Johnson said that the solution to the problems facing the Nation rest neither on massive programs in Washington nor the strained resources of local authorities. What are necessary are new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism between the National Capitol and the leaders in local communities.

The Commerce Committee will, of course, want to make certain that the proposed State Technical Services Act embodies the most effective design to achieve its goals. Nevertheless, those goals are fully consistent with the principles which underlie the Great Society and they merit the thoughtful consideration and earnest support of the Congress.

I ask that the text of the bill and the letter of transmittal and the statement of purpose and need may be printed at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter of transmittal, and statement of purpose will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 949) to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 949

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

That Congress finds that wider diffusion and more effective application of science and technology in industry are essential to the growth of the economy, to higher levels of employment and to the competitive position of United States products in world markets. The Congress also finds that the benefits of federally financed research, as well as other research, must be placed more effectively in the hands of American business and enterprise. The Congress further finds that the several States through cooperation with universities, communities, and industries can contribute significantly to these purposes by providing technical services designed to encourage a more effective application of science and technology to both new and established industries. The Congress, therefore, declares that the purpose of this Act is to provide a national program of incentives and support for the several States individually and in cooperation with each other in their establishing and maintaining State and regional technical service programs designed to achieve these ends.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) "Technical services" means activities or programs designed to enable businesses and industries to acquire and use scientific and engineering information more effectively through such means as—

(1) analyzing problems of regions and industries to determine new opportunities for applying technology;

(2) preparing and disseminating technical reports, abstracts, computer tapes, microfilm, reviews, and similar scientific or engineering information, including the establishment of State or regional technical information centers for this purpose;

(3) providing a reference service to identify sources of engineering and other scientific expertise;

(4) sponsoring industrial workshops, seminars, training programs, extension courses, demonstrations, and field visits designed to encourage the more effective application of scientific and engineering information.

(b) "Designated institution" means the institution or agency in each participating State, which has been designated as administrator of the program for such State under section 3 of this Act.

(c) "Qualified institution" means (1) an institution of higher learning with a program leading to degrees in engineering or business administration which is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association to be listed by the United States Commissioner of Education, or such an institution which is listed separately after evaluation by the United States Commissioner of Education pursuant to this subsection; or (2) a State agency or a private, nonprofit institution which meets criteria of competence established by the Secretary of Commerce and published in the Federal Register. For the purpose of this Act, the United States Commissioner of Education shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of engineering or business education or training offered. When the Commissioner determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such programs, he shall publish a list of institutions he finds qualified after prior evaluation by an advisory committee, composed of persons he determines to be specially qualified to evaluate the training provided under such programs.

(d) "Participating institution" means each qualified institution in a State, which participates in the administration or execution of the State technical services program as provided by this Act.

(e) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce or the official to whom the Secretary has delegated all or part of the authority in this Act.

(f) "State" means one of the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

PLANS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. Any State which wishes to receive Federal payments under this Act in support of its existing or planned technical services program shall designate, under appropriate State laws and regulations, an institution or agency to administer and coordinate that program and to prepare and submit plans and programs to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under this Act. If the institution or agency designated by each State is not a State university or land grant college entitled to benefits under the Act approved July 2, 1862, or the Act of August 30, 1890, and acts amendatory and supplementary thereto (7 U.S.C. 301–329), the Governor or other competent State authority shall furnish the Secretary a written statement of his reasons for designating such other institution or agency.

SEC. 4. The designated institution shall prepare and submit to the Secretary in accordance with such regulations as he may publish—

(a) At the beginning of each five-year period, a five-year plan which may be revised annually and which shall: (1) outline the technological and economic conditions of the State taking into account its region, its industry and its industrial potential and identify the major regional and industrial problems; (2) identify the general approaches and methods to be used in the solution of these problems and outline the means for measuring the impact of such assistance on the State or regional economy; and (3) explain the methods to be used in administering and coordinating the program.

(b) An annual technical services program which shall: (1) identify specific methods, which may include contracts, for accomplishing particular goals and outline the likely impact of these methods in terms of the five-year plan; (2) contain a detailed budget, together with procedures for adequate fiscal control, fund accounting, and auditing, to assure proper disbursement for funds paid to the State under this Act; and (3) indicate the specific responsibilities assigned to each participating institution in the State.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall not accept a five-year plan for review and approval under this Act unless the Governor of the State or his designee determines and certifies that the plan is consistent with State policies and objectives; and the Secretary shall not accept an annual technical services program for review and approval under this Act unless the designated institution has, as certified thereto by the Governor or his designee—

(a) invited all qualified institutions in the State to submit proposals for providing technical services under the Act;

(b) coordinated its programs with other States and with other publicly supported activities within the State, as appropriate;

(c) established adequate rules to insure that no officer or employee of the State, the designated institution or any participating institution, shall receive compensation for technical services for which funds are provided under this Act from sources other than his employer and shall not otherwise maintain any private interest in conflict with his public responsibility;

(d) determined that matching funds will be available from State or non-Federal sources;

(e) determined that such technical services program does not provide a service performed as practicably by private technical services, professional consultants or private institutions;

(f) planned no services specially related to a particular firm or company except insofar as the services are of general concern to the community, State, or region;

(g) provided for making public all reports prepared in the course of furnishing technical services supported under this Act or for making them available at cost to any person on request.

APPROVAL BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall review each five-year plan and each annual program submitted by the designated institution under section 4, or by the regional or interstate institution under section 7, and shall approve only those which (1) bear the certification required by the Governor or his designee under section 5; (2) comply with regulations and meet criteria that the Secretary shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register; and (3) otherwise accomplish the purposes of this Act.

REGIONAL OR INTERSTATE PROGRAMS

SEC. 7. Two or more States may cooperate in administering and coordinating their plans and programs supported under this Act, in which event all or part of the sums authorized and payable under section 11 to all of the cooperating States may be paid to the institutions or persons authorized to receive them under the terms of the agreement between the cooperating States. When the cooperative agreement designates a regional or interstate institution to act on behalf of all of the cooperating States, it shall submit to the Secretary for review and approval under section 6 a regional or interstate five-year plan and annual regional or interstate technical services program which, as nearly as practicable, shall meet the requirements of section 4 and section 5.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 11, the Secretary is authorized to increase by 10 per centum the amount which he approves for any regional or interstate technical services program submitted under section 7. Such additional amount may be paid without requiring matching funds from State or non-Federal sources.

SEC. 9. The consent of the Congress is given to any two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance in establishing regional or interstate institutions under section 7 for accomplishing the purposes of this Act.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 10. Each designated institution and each regional or interstate institution shall establish an advisory council for technical services, the members of which shall represent broad community interests and shall be qualified to evaluate programs submitted under section 4. The advisory council shall review each annual program, evaluate its relation to the purposes of this Act, and report its findings to the designated institution and the governor or his designee. Each report of the advisory council shall be available to the Secretary on request.

ADMINISTRATION AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be needed to carry out the purposes set forth in this section.

(a) From these amounts, the Secretary is authorized to make an annual payment to each designated institution, regional or interstate institution, or person authorized to receive payments in support of each approved technical services program. Maximum amounts which may be paid to the States under this subsection shall be fixed in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register from time to time, considering (1) population according to the last decennial census; (2) industrial and economic development and productive efficiency; and (3) technical resources.

(b) The Secretary may reserve an amount equal to not more than 20 percent of the total amount appropriated each year under this section and is authorized to make payments to any designated or participating institution for technical services programs which he determines have special merit or to any qualified institution for additional programs which he determines are necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, under criteria and regulations that he shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register.

(c) An amount equal to not more than 5 percent of the total amount appropriated each year under this section shall be available to the Secretary for the direct expenses of administering this Act.

(d) No amount paid under subsection (a) shall exceed one-half of the cost of the approved annual technical services program of the State, and for each dollar paid under subsections (a) and (b) there shall be available for expenditure on each approved program at least one dollar from State or non-Federal sources: *Provided*, That the Secretary may pay an amount not to exceed $25,000 a year for each of the first three fiscal years to each designated institution to assist in the preparation of the first five-year plan and the initial annual technical services programs, without regard to any requirement of this section.

(e) At the end of each fiscal year, all remaining amounts which are appropriated for payments to the States under subsection (a) and which have not been obligated for payments to the States at that time, shall be available to the Secretary for payments under subsection (b), until expended.

SEC. 12. The Secretary is authorized and directed to aid the States and regions in carrying out their technical services programs by providing reference services which a State or region may use to obtain scientific, technical and engineering information from sources outside the State or region, for the purposes of this Act. There is authorized to be appropriated each fiscal year such amount as may be necessary to provide the services authorized in this section.

SEC. 13. The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria and procedures and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the administration of this Act.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 14. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods of instructions, or administration of any educational institution.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to affect the functions or responsibilities under law of any other department or agency of the United States.

EVALUATION

SEC. 15. Within five years from the date of the approval of this Act, and prior to the end of each five-year period thereafter, the Secretary shall appoint a public committee, none of the members of which shall have been directly concerned with the preparation of plans, administration of programs or participation in programs under this Act. The committee shall evaluate the significance and impact of the program under this Act and make recommendations concerning the program. A report shall be transmitted to the Secretary within sixty days after the end of each five-year period.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 16. Each designated institution or regional or interstate institution shall make an annual report to the Secretary on or before the first day of September of each year on the work accomplished under the technical services program and the status of current services, together with a detailed statement of the amounts received under any of the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of their disbursement.

TERMINATION

SEC. 17. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any institution receiving funds under this Act finds that—

(a) The institution is not complying substantially with the provisions of this Act, with the regulations promulgated by the Secretary or with the approved annual technical services program; or

(b) Any funds paid to the institution under the provisions of this Act have been lost, misapplied, or otherwise diverted from the purposes for which they were paid or furnished—

the Secretary shall notify such institution that no further payments will be made under the provisions of this Act until he is satisfied that there is substantial compliance or the diversion has been corrected or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until such institution repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended.

SEC. 18. Upon notice by the Secretary to any institution that no further payments will be made pending substantial compliance correction or repayment under Section 17, any funds which may have been paid to such institution under this Act and which are not expended by the institution on the date of such notice, shall be repaid to the Secretary and be deposited to the account of the appropriations from which they originally were paid.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 19. This Act may be cited as the State Technical Services Act of 1965.

The letter and statement of purpose presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1965.

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The President's Economic Report of last year stated:

"The Federal Government should join with private business and our universities in speeding the development and spread of new technology. I have directed the Department of Commerce to explore new ways to accomplish this."

During the past year the Commerce Department in accordance with the President's directive, has completed an intensive study of the relationship between technology and national economic growth. We have had discussions with scientists, industrialists, economists, engineers, educators, and officials of State and local governments, as well as with representatives of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

As a nation, we have not been giving sufficient emphasis to effective industrial use of the results of science and technology, particularly in our civilian economy at a time when military expenditures are leveling off. We have vast and increasing resources of technology in the United States. Yet too frequently the knowledge which science and engineering produces is not being applied on the production line and in the plants by those companies and industries that need it most.

As a result I now submit to the Congress a proposal to establish a cooperative program between the States and the Federal Government, to place the findings of science and technology in the hands of American business and enterprise. Its purpose is to speed industrial and economic growth through scientific knowledge. To accomplish this purpose, there is attached a draft bill called the "State Technical Services Act of 1965," with a statement of purpose and need.

Under the proposed legislation the Federal Government would join with universities, State and local governments and industry in supporting programs to make science and engineering information more readily available to industry. The bill would establish procedures under which State plans and programs would be formulated and put into effect with local initiative and responsibility. To qualify for Federal grants, the States would designate institutions responsible for administering and coordinating programs within the States. Regional centers could be established where two or more States wish to join in a cooperative program. Each designated State institution or regional center would submit plans and programs which, after approval by the Secretary, would receive Federal funds under regulations which would be published.

The cost to the Federal Government for this proposed program would be between $5 and $10 million for the first year, and the cost when the program is fully operative would be modest. The Federal expenditures combined with State and other local funds would, in my opinion, return benefits to the country manifold.

The proposed legislation would not only help to increase the strength of those areas which are now economically weak but would stimulate an increase in technical manpower and add to our economic strength by raising the level of technology in industry throughout the country.

Our efforts to improve education and to combat widespread unemployment and poverty critically emphasize the need for a healthy industrial economy. Sustained, healthy growth in established companies and industries and continued development of new companies and new industries will mean greater ability to achieve these other national goals.

While this proposal would be modest in terms of its dollar cost to the Federal Government, I think it can result in a very significant and basic contribution to the economic strength of our Nation.

I strongly recommend that Congress give prompt consideration to this proposal, which is in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED, PROPOSED STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

This proposed legislation is in response to President Johnson's direction to the Department of Commerce to explore new ways to speed the development and dissemination of new technology. In his Economic Report of January 1964, the President stated:

"The Federal Government provides major support for the research and development which underlie our striking technological advances. In the past, much of our research and development has been connected with national defense. Now, as military outlays level off we face a challenge to apply the Nation's growing scientific and engineering resources to new socially profitable uses—an opportunity to accelerate the technological progress of our civilian industries.

"The Federal Government should join with private business and our universities in speeding the development and spread of new technology. I have directed the Department of Commerce to explore new ways to accomplish this."

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed State Technical Services Act of 1965 would enable the Federal Government to make grants to States in support of programs to achieve more effective commercial use of the findings of science and technology. This would be done through technical services programs, planned locally, designed specifically to place these findings into the hands of local businesses and enterprises.

To qualify for Federal matching funds, a State would designate an institution or agency responsible for preparing and administering technical services programs within the State. A regional institution could be designated where two or more States wish to join in a cooperative program (10 percent more Federal support would be available for regional institutions). State and regional programs would be formulated and put into effect with local or regional initiative and responsibility. All qualified institutions in the State could participate.

NEED FOR THE PROGRAM

A close examination of the modern American economy reveals a number of recurring themes—all of them related in some degree to the importance of having effective mechanisms for introducing the results of science and technology into commercial use. For example:

The competition we face in both domestic and world markets is increasingly based on a high level of technology, not solely on lower labor costs.

The most successful competitors, whether at an international level, industrywide, or among individual companies, are those who have learned to use new technology effectively.

The cost of new technology, in the form of technical manpower and equipment, has been rapidly rising.

Opportunities to participate in benefits of technology have not been equally available in the various regions of the United States.

Substantial expenditures for specialized research and development in support of national defense and space missions have not met the full range of industrial needs for technology.

The vast increase in the Nation's total research and development effort have not eradicated long-term unemployment and economic decline in many parts of the country.

Technology cannot be effectively diffused merely by giving information to a potential user. There must be means for active interchange between those using and those furnishing information.

There are many factors involved in complete solutions to the broad problems outlined above. Common to all of them, however, is the need for institutions and mechanisms at the local level, specifically designed to bridge the gap between the most advanced technology, wherever it exists, and the industrial practices of the local region.

OBJECTIVES

Through this program and with the cooperation of universities, communities, and industries, three objectives will be served: (1) strengthening the Nation's economy by upgrading industries through the utilization of advanced technology, thereby generally expanding the industrial base; (2) increasing employment by facilitating industrial use of technology and the manufacturing of new products which result; and (3) enhancing the competitive position of U.S. products in world markets.

The proposal is based on the premise of strong local support and local initiative. The proposal is designed to stimulate local economic programs, utilizing local specialists and applying local resources with Federal matching support and encouragement. Distinct contributions to the economic vitality of our Nation will be made by those who are closest to the problems which the program is designed to meet.

HOW THE PROGRAM WOULD OPERATE

A State wishing to participate in the program would designate an institution (generally a State university or land-grant college) to administer and coordinate the State's technical services program.

The designated institution would prepare a 5-year plan, outlining the technological and economic situation in the State, the major regional and industrial problems, and the means to be used in assisting in their solution.

The designated institution would also prepare an annual technical services program, covering the objectives for the first year, the budget, and the responsibilities assigned to each qualified institution participating in the program. Up to $25,000 per year for each of the first 3 years may be paid to the designated institution to assist in preparing the first 5-year plan and the initial annual programs.

An advisory council would be established by the designated institution to evaluate and report on the 5-year plan and the annual technical service program.

The 5-year plan and the annual program would be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce. Federal matching funds would be made available to the designated institution to support those programs found by the Secretary to meet legal requirements and to further the purposes of the act. The maximum annual payment in support of any State program will be limited by a formula to be established by the Secretary, taking into consideration three criteria: (1) population according to the last census; (2) industrial and economic development and productive efficiency; and (3) technical resources. Supplementary matching grants, totaling up to 20 percent of the amount appropriated each year, may also be made to support programs which the Secretary determines have special merit. These provisions are designed to assure that the program's benefits will be widely diffused throughout the Nation while at the same time reserving sufficient discretion to the Secretary to assure that funds are granted only in support of adequately developed programs which will in fact advance the purposes of the act.

The formula to be established by the Secretary will be based on objective considerations such as the proportion of working population gainfully employed, the ratio of assets of individual establishments to employees, urban population, industrial population, numbers of scientists and engineers, and the physical research facilities used for industrial purposes. The formula will be weighted to provide funds to States and regions where industrial development has lagged behind its potential and where technical resources are weak. The population criteria will be applied in a manner which will permit even the smallest States to participate in a meaningful program.

New plans are required at 5-year intervals, although they are to be revised if necessary. Annual technical services programs must be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce each year in order to qualify for annual matching funds. In administering the program and approving plans, the Secretary would consult with other agencies of the Federal Government as appropriate. An annual report is required at the conclusion of each year.

Once in operation, there is a wide variety of technical services which might be offered by the various institutions participating in the program within a particular State. For example, a technology diffusion program oriented to the needs and problems of a specific industry dominant in one State or region might offer workshops, seminars, and demonstrations in order to bring existing technology to local entrepreneurs for use in plants within the region. A technology dissemination and referral center could offer two types of services: (1) technical reports, abstracts, bibliographies, reviews, microfilm, computer tapes, and the like; and (2) referral to sources of scientific and engineering expertise in the fields of interest to the local industry. Such a center would be in continuous interaction with local business and industry, so that its services will be pertinent to the local economy. These examples by no means exhaust the list of possible technical services that might be offered in any State program. The range of services can be as wide as the range of industrial and technological interests in this country, and, within the bounds of the act, is only limited by the imagination and initiative of the persons who develop the State program.

COST

The cost to the Federal Government of the proposed program is expected to be in the range of $5 to $10 million for the first year and such amounts as may be necessary for effective future programs which the States justify to the Secretary of Commerce.

All funds made available to States for technical services, except regional incentives, would be matched at least equally by non-Federal funds. Direct Federal expenditures would be limited to expenditures for administration, to be held to less than 5 percent of the cost of the program, and for reference services to aid the States and regions in collecting and processing technical information for dissemination to industry under the act.

These funds will be an investment in promoting the economic growth and widespread industrial development of the entire Nation.

THE PROFESSIONAL SPORTS BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators DIRKSEN, DODD, and HRUSKA, I am introducing a bill to clarify the status under the antitrust laws of the professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey.

For many years there has been an inconsistency in the application of antitrust law to these professional team sports. In 1922, the Supreme Court held baseball was not in interstate commerce and therefore was exempt from the antitrust laws. This decision was reaffirmed in 1953.

Baseball, then, has enjoyed this exemption while the other sports often were relegated to the limbo of uncertainty as to exactly where they stood under the antitrust laws.

This inconsistency has bothered many—not only members of the sports world, but Members of Congress and the Supreme Court itself.

In 1957, the Court—in deciding the applicability of the antitrust laws to professional football—stated it was limiting the exemption solely to professional baseball as granted by the previous decision. However, it said that if the decision appeared "unrealistic, inconsistent, or illogical, it is sufficient to answer, aside from the distinctions between the businesses, that were we considering the question of baseball for the first time upon a clean slate we would have no doubts. No other business claiming the coverage of those cases has such an adjudication. We, therefore, conclude that the orderly way to eliminate error or discrimination, if any there be, is by legislation and not by court decision."

The Court passed the ball to Congress to correct any discriminations between the sports.

Mr. President, since 1958 Congress has been attempting to wipe the slate clean on this question and to spell out legislation which would leave no uncertainties. Hearings have been held during four sessions of Congress by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

Certainly, I think it is fair to say that the general feeling in the Congress is that the professional team sports should be treated equally. That is what we are attempting to do with this bill. With its enactment, all four team sports would be put squarely under the antitrust laws. Exemptions would be granted in four areas necessary for the teams' sports operation and in which they are unique from other businesses.

We are of the opinion that the bill if passed would remove the threatening clouds and permit the team sports to operate in the manner which would most benefit the public and the growth of the sports.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the professional sports bill lie on the desk for 48 hours so others who wish to cosponsor may have the opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 950) to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and others Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WASATCH FRONT SURVEY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a survey of recreation and conservation needs in the national forests along the Wasatch front area in Utah. The survey would include the area beginning in the mountains north of Brigham City and north of Logan, and extending through the Cache National Forest, the Wasatch National Forest, and the Uinta National Forest to Nephi. Its purpose is to recommend a balanced recreation and conservation program in this heavily populated area of Utah.

NEEDED—INCREASED RECREATION FACILITIES

The survey would determine the potential in the three national forests for increasing facilities for recreation uses of all types, including camping, picnicking, hunting, fishing, hiking, and various other types of outdoor recreation. It would include a study of the need for trailways and recreation ways where the topography is suitable for their construction. Additional roads will open the area to greater public use and enjoyment of the forests.

The high mountain ranges of the Wasatch Front contain some of the most scenic country in the United States, and the area abounds in recreation opportunities. Picnicking, camping, hiking, riding, boating, sightseeing, hunting, and fishing are particularly popular. The abundance and variety of flora and fauna and interestingly exposed geologic features make attractive study materials for amateur as well as professional scientists, artists, and photographers. The broad snowfields of the area, with their varied slopes, are a skier's paradise. Alta and Brighton, two of the best winter sports areas in the United States, were among the first topnotch Alpine ski areas, and just last winter another great ski resort area was opened at Park City. Others include Snow Basin near Ogden, Beaver Mountain near Logan, Timphaven near Provo, Solitude near Brighton, and other smaller but equally important resorts nearby.

Recreation use and public interest in the national forest recreation resources along the Wasatch front are skyrocketing. The Wasatch National Forest, which is geographically situated in the heart of the population center, near Salt Lake City, Ogden, and Provo, is third among the national forests in the entire United States in visitor use, while the Cache National Forest ranks among the first dozen, and it is reasonable to expect that the trend along the entire Wasatch front will be upward in recreation uses and demands of all kinds. But, with the great popularity of the area, recreation facilities are already overtaxed and inadequate to meet the demands on them, and the Forest Service under its present program is unable to meet the increasing needs fully.

The visitor use figures for 1964 have just been compiled by the Forest Service. Estimated recreational visits in 1964 in the Wasatch National Forest were 3,093,000; in the Utah portion of the Cache National Forest, 2,378,000; and in the Uinta National Forest, 1,766,000. Recreational visits to the Wasatch National Forest alone exceeded visits to all of Utah's 2 national parks, 8 national monuments, and 2 national recreation areas combined, which for the same period totaled 2,134,400 visitors. Recreational visits to the Cache National Forest, likewise, exceeded the number of those visiting Utah's magnificent parks and monuments. The location of these great national forests near the metropolitan area of Utah makes them easily accessible for urban and suburban residents seeking evening and weekend recreational opportunities. Likewise, large numbers of out-of-State travelers enjoy this popular area.

SCENIC RECREATION WAYS

Much of the area is accessible by good roads, but much, too, remains in an undeveloped state. The intermountain region of the Forest Service, headquartered at Ogden, Utah, early this month submitted to the Utah State Highway Department a list and information on 13 recreation and scenic roads it recommends for construction, 5 of which are along the Wasatch front. The Forest Service notes the great recreation possibilities and scenic values which would be opened to the public by providing adequate roads. My bill specifically provides that these roads be included in the survey it would authorize.

The recreation and scenic routes recommended by the Forest Service are:

Wasatch Front Skyline Recreation Way, Wasatch National Forest, begins at Mill Creek Canyon, climbs to crest of Wasatch Front, descends into American Fork Canyon and joins present highway near Timpanogos National Monument. Total length is estimated at 25 miles.

Willard Mountain Scenic Drive Recreation Way, Cache National Forest, Willard Mountain to North Ogden Canyon; length, 25 miles.

Alpine Scenic Loop Recreation Way, Uinta National Forest, begins at U.S. 189 in Provo Canyon and runs north, then west to traverse American Fork Canyon to junction of Utah Highway 80 and 146; length, 20 miles.

Monte Cristo-Logan Canyon Recreation Way, Cache National Forest, a scenic route near Wasatch Divide, connecting U.S. 89 on north end of Logan Canyon and State Highway 39 in Monte Cristo Township; length, 45 miles.

Mount Logan Scenic Drive Recreation Way, Cache National Forest, a loop drive between Logan Canyon and Providence, Utah; length, 30 miles.

CONSERVATION NEEDS

In developing recreation facilities we must not overlook conservation needs, and my bill provides that in the conduct of the survey consideration shall be given to watershed protection and conservation. Watershed values are extremely high, for these mountain areas, with peaks from 7,000 to 13,500 feet in elevation, receive moisture mostly as snow and store it for later delivery to the valleys below. The watersheds must be protected at all cost, and for this reason my bill provides that in the conduct of the survey consideration shall be given to recreation use plans and watershed management policies which will tend to reduce fire hazards, minimize water pollution, and protect the watersheds. Well-managed watersheds provide pleasant recreation, inspiring scenery, good forage, plentiful game, abundant timber, and continuous usable supplies of water.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 951) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to survey the recreation and conservation needs in the Wasatch Front area of the Cache, Wasatch, and Uinta National Forests in Utah, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948, TO PROVIDE COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN ADDITIONAL LOSSES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] I introduce a bill to include under the War Claims Act of 1948 and thus provide some measure of justice to two classes of claimants who have not yet received any measure of recognition for the personal and property losses they suffered during World War II.

The first group consists of refugees from nazism and other tyrannies who became citizens of the United States after they had suffered their losses. It is very unwise of us to deny these unfortunate people a measure of justice on the ground that they were not U.S. citizens when their property was seized. They were caught in an international holocaust, and were driven off their lands and despoiled of their property by the most brutal tyranny the world has known.

The second group consists of persons who are now U.S. citizens and who were, during the Second World War, servicemen of the United States or her allies who were held as prisoners of war, or United States or allied nationals imprisoned by the enemy in violation of international standards. Both are most deserving classes of cases.

This bill in part represents a longstanding struggle by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself to recognize the victims who suffered worst under the Nazis, who came here when they lost their property and when they had not yet been naturalized. Under the law it is only those who were naturalized when they lost property who get any protection when we negotiate claims settlements with foreign countries or impound their property. This is one of the most unfair provisions on our law books. We should try to eliminate that unfairness. I hope that action will not be delayed on this still unfinished war claims legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 960) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROTECT RIGHTS OF INDIANS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, nine legislative proposals designed to safeguard the constitutional rights of our Nation's Indian citizens. These are the same bills and the joint resolution that I introduced at the close of the 88th Congress. At the present time, Senators JOHNSTON, BAYH, FONG, and HRUSKA, have joined me in cosponsoring some or all of these measures, as will be indicated on the particular bills when they are printed.

The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, since 1961, has conducted an extensive investigation into the constitutional rights of the American Indian, the first such study ever undertaken by Congress.

Complaints received by the subcommittee alleging that Indians were being deprived of their rights by Federal, State, and tribal governments, prompted the subcommittee's preliminary research into the legal status of Indian citizens.

This initial investigation included a survey of a broad cross section of those knowledgeable in Indian affairs—including tribal leaders, such as tribal councilmen, tribal governors, tribal council members, and other tribal spokesmen; judges of tribal courts and the courts of Indian offenses; attorneys representing Indian tribes; area directors and superintendents of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; private and church groups interested in Indian affairs; historians and anthropologists; U.S. attorneys, State attorneys general, and prosecuting attorneys; local law-enforcement officials; and other Federal and State officials concerned with Indian matters.

Hearings began in Washington in August 1961, and were concluded in March 1963. Field hearings and staff conferences were conducted in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, and North and South Dakota. These hearings and staff conferences were held in areas where the subcommittee could receive the views of the largest number of tribes. Representatives of 85 tribes appeared before the subcommittee. Further documentation, and clarification of local problems, resulted from correspondence with numerous individual Indians, and from staff research and investigation.

In introducing these proposals, I wish to note that these bills should not be considered as final solutions to the many serious constitutional problems confronting the American Indian. Rather, it is anticipated that the language in some of these proposals may be revised and concepts clarified as the Senate deliberates these matters. The substance of these bills, however, is exceedingly important if we are to provide to our Indian citizens the rights and protections conferred upon other American citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the legislative proposals and pertinent accompanying memorandums be printed at this point in the RECORD and unanimous consent for the bills to lay on the table for 2 weeks for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills and joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, together with the memorandums accompanying them, and, the bills and joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

The bills and joint resolution, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. FONG):

S. 961. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of American Indians from being infringed upon by Indian tribes exercising powers of self-government:

S. 961

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any Indian tribe in exercising its powers of local self-government shall be subject to the same limitations and restraints as those which are imposed on the Government of the United States by the United States Constitution.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 961 is as follows:

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF INDIAN CITIZENS FROM BEING INFRINGED UPON BY AN INDIAN TRIBE EXERCISING ITS POWERS OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

When the subcommittee began its investigation of the constitutional rights of the American Indian, Chairman ERVIN wrote to the U.S. Attorney General requesting his views on the constitutional rights of American Indians. Attorney General Kennedy replied as follows:

"All the constitutional guarantees apply to the American Indians in their relations with the Federal Government, or its branches, and the State governments to the same extent that they apply to other American citizens. It is not entirely clear to what extent the constitutional restrictions applicable to the Federal Government, or its branches, and to the State governments are applicable to tribal governments, but the decided cases indicate that there are large areas in which such restrictions are not applicable."

As indicated by the summary report's section on "Indian Tribes and the Constitution," tribal constitutions do not provide the Indian with protection against action by a tribal government that would be unconstitutional if undertaken by the Federal, State, or local governments. Various judicial opinions support this view.

In view of these facts, the subcommittee recommends the enactment of legislation to safeguard an Indian's constitutional rights which are subject to infringement by Indian tribal governments.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This measure assures that Indian tribes shall be subject to the same constitutional limitations and restraints that are imposed on the Federal, State, and local governments by the Constitution of the United States.

S. 962. A bill to protect the constitutional rights and to authorize the appeal of a criminal action from an Indian court to a U.S. district court for trial:

S. 962

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in any criminal action hereafter commenced in an Indian court against any individual wherein an individual is convicted by the court and deprived of a constitutional right, he shall have a right of appeal to the United States district court for the district and division embracing the place wherein such individual was prosecuted.

(b) Upon the filing of the notice of appeal with the clerk of the United States district court, the appeal shall be placed on the trial docket for trial de novo in the United States district court, which trial de novo shall take place in the same manner and under the same rules that would apply if the criminal action had been initially commenced in the United States district court: *Provided, however,* That if the appeal is unsuccessful the accused may be taxed not only with the court costs of the trial in the district court, but also with any court costs taxed in the Indian court.

(c) The trial de novo shall be by a judge and a jury. But a waiver of jury trial shall be permitted in accordance with the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure applicable to trials of criminal cases in the district courts.

(d) In any case, appeal by the accused from an Indian court to a United States district court wherein the accused has not been served with proceedings or wherein the process has not been perfected prior to appeal, or in which the process server proves to be defective, such proceedings or service may be completed or new process issued in the same manner as in criminal actions originally instituted in such district court.

(e) Where the criminal action being appealed concerns a criminal offense which corresponds to offenses punishable under the United States Criminal Code, the elements of proof of the offense shall correspond to those utilized in the trial of the corresponding offense recognized by the Criminal Code; with respect to offenses which do not correspond to offenses punished under the United States Criminal Code, the elements of the offense charged shall be defined and established in the same manner in which elements of a defense are defined and established in the prosecution of offenses punishable under title 18, United States Code, section 13.

(f) An accused convicted by a United States district court in an action appealed to that court under this Act, shall be subject to the same maximum punishment that could lawfully be imposed by the Indian court, provided that with respect to offenses corresponding to offenses punishable under the United States Criminal Code, including title 18, United States Code, section 13, the maximum punishment imposable shall in no instance be greater than would be permissible for the corresponding offense punishable under the provisions of the Criminal Code.

(g) In an action appealed to the district court, the court shall have the authority to order that the sentences be executed in the same manner and in the same place of confinement that would be applicable if the sentence had been imposed by the Indian court and had not been appealed. In the event that a fine is imposed, such fine, if paid, shall be paid in to the clerk of the district court for transmittal to the appropriate officers of the Indian court.

(h) Rules governing the procedure for the perfection and time of appeals under this Act shall be prescribed by the district court.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, the term "Indian court" means any Indian tribal court and any court of Indian offenses.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 962 is as follows:

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING APPEAL OF A CRIMINAL CONVICTION OF A TRIBAL COURT TO A U.S. DISTRICT COURT WHERE THE ACCUSED HAS BEEN DEPRIVED OF A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT

The Indian tribal court system is comprised of 53 tribal courts, 12 courts of Indian offenses, and about 19 traditional courts. Apart from appellate procedures within these three court systems, there exists no right to appeal criminal convictions of tribal courts to either State or Federal courts.

Since the Indian court system does not fall within the strictures of due process guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, but nevertheless renders judicial decisions affecting the lives and liberty of countless thousands of Indians, it is appropriate to provide persons deprived of a constitutional right in a criminal proceeding before a tribal court the right to appeal to a U.S. court. Such an appeal would not only protect the rights of those convicted by tribal courts, but would also improve the quality of justice rendered by tribal courts.

In view of these facts, it is recommended that the Congress provide Indians deprived of a constitutional right in a criminal proceeding by a tribal court the right to appeal to a district court of the United States.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE APPEAL OF CERTAIN CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS TO A U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Section 1 provides a person deprived of a constitutional right in a criminal proceeding before an Indian court the right to appeal to the U.S. district court for the district in which the original criminal action took place. The party appealing is entitled to a trial de novo by a judge and jury under the rules applicable to a criminal action initially commenced in the district court, including the right of the accused under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to waive the right to jury trial.

An accused convicted by a district court shall be subject to the same punishment that could have been imposed by the Indian court. In the event that the offense appealed corresponds to an offense punishable under the U.S. Criminal Code, the punishment imposed cannot exceed that authorized under the provisions of the code.

The district court has authority to order that sentences and place of confinement be executed in the same manner as though the punishment had been imposed by the Indian court and not appealed.

Rules governing the procedure for the perfection of appeals under this act shall be prescribed by the district court.

Section 2 defines the term "Indian court" to mean any Indian tribal court and any court of Indian offenses.

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 963. A bill authorizing the Attorney General to receive, investigate, and act on complaints filed by Indians alleging that they have been deprived of their constitutional rights:

S. 963

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to receive and investigate any written complaint filed with him by any Indian or by any person or agency acting in behalf of any Indian alleging that such Indian has been deprived of a right conferred upon citizens of the United States by the laws and Constitution of the United States. If, on the basis of such investigation, he determines that such Indian has been deprived of any such constitutional right, the Attorney General shall bring such criminal or other action as he deems appropriate to vindicate and secure such right to such Indian.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General shall, on or before March 1 of each year, file a written report with the Congress and the Secretary of the Interior containing the number of complaints received by the Attorney General under this Act during the preceding calendar year, and the action taken by him on each such complaint.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 963 is as follows:

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO SAFEGUARD THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

The subcommittee has received complaints concerning the deprivation of constitutional rights with respect to illegal detention of reservation Indians by State and tribal officials; arbitrary decisionmaking by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; denial of various State welfare services to Indians living off the reservations; discrimination by government officials in health services; mistreatment and brutality against Indians by State and tribal law enforcement officers; and job discrimination by Federal and State agencies and private businesses.

In view of these facts, it is recommended that Congress authorize the Attorney General to investigate any complaints filed by Indians alleging that they have been deprived of their constitutional rights.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF BILL

This measure authorizes the Attorney General to investigate complaints alleging that an Indian has been deprived of any rights conferred upon citizens by the Constitution of the United States or the laws thereof; and, on the basis of the investgiation, to bring an appropriate civil or criminal action to vindicate and secure such right.

The Attorney General is further directed to file a written report with the Congress and the Secretary of Interior by March 1 of each calendar year showing the number of complaints filed and the action taken thereon.

S. 964. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of certain citizens and directing the Secretary of the Interior to recommend to the Congress a model code governing the administration of justice by courts of Indian offenses on Indian reservations:

S. 964

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to recommend to the Congress, on or before July 1, 1965, a model code to govern the administration of justice by courts of Indian offenses on Indian reservations. Such code shall include provisions which will (1) assure that any individual being tried for an offense by a court of Indian offenses shall have the same rights, privileges, and immunities under the United States Constitution as would be guaranteed any citizen of the

United States being tried in a Federal Court for any similar offense, (2) assure that any individual being tried for an offense by a court of Indian offenses will be advised and made aware of his rights under the United States Constitution, and under any tribal constitution applicable to such individual, (3) establish proper qualifications for the office of judge of the court of Indian offenses, and (4) provide for the establishing of educational classes for the training of judges of courts of Indian offenses. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult with the Indians, Indian tribes, and interested agencies of the United States.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 964 is as follows:

Background and Need for Legislation Authorizing Model Penal Code for Indian Reservations

In the early thirties, Secretary Harold Ickes established a committee to review the status of law and order on Indian reservations. This committee recommended the present code of offenses which is operative in the Courts of Indian Offenses and which serves as a pattern for the codes of the tribal courts.

Title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 11, deals with law and order on Indian reservations. Sections 11.2CA–11.37CA sets out the jurisdiction of the Court of Indian Offenses, the number, duty, qualifications and procedures for the appointment of the judges, defines the method for setting up the appellate proceedings, rules concerning jury trials and the selection of jurors, use of professional attorneys, appointment and duties of clerks of court, recordkeeping, issuance of warrants, detention procedure, and bail procedures, and so forth.

Sections 11.38–11.87NH sets out the crimes and punishment under the Code of Indian Tribal Offenses. Approximately 58 criminal offenses are within the jurisdiction of the Courts of Indian Offenses, and sentences range from 5 days to a maximum of 6 months.

Testimony before the subcommittee indicates that the Code of Indian Tribal Offenses is outmoded, impractical, and fails to provide for an adequate administration of justice on Indian reservation.

Under the existing code, preemptory challenges in selecting a jury are limited to three. Subpenaed witnesses testifying are paid 50 cents a day; voluntary witnesses shall be paid by the party calling them, if the court so directs, their actual traveling and living expenses incurred. Questions before the court regarding the meaning of laws, treaties, or regulations are frequently referred to the superintendent for his opinion even though he is not a lawyer and lacks legal training. Although many tribes never have appointed an appellate court, the code provides the method whereby this could be done.

1. In view of the Federal guardianship responsibility over Indian lands and the extension of this responsibility over many phases of Indian life, the subcommittee feels that the Secretary of Interior should be authorized and directed to develop a model code for justice on Indian reservations.

2. Attention also should be given to the training of qualified judges for the Indian courts. Qualifications for such judges should be defined and training classes begun for these judges in order that the best possible justice can be given to Indian citizens who live on a reservation.

S. 965. A bill providing that the United States shall have jurisdiction concurrent with that of the States over certain offenses committed by non-Indians against non-Indians in Indian country:

S. 965

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1152 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The United States shall have jurisdiction concurrent with that of the States with respect to the punishment of offenses made applicable to Indian country by this section committed by non-Indians against non-Indians."

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 965 is as follows:

Background and Need for Legislation Conferring to the Federal Government Jurisdiction Over Offenses Committed by Non-Indians Against Non-Indians in Indian Country

During the subcommittee's investigation of the constitutional rights of the American Indian, various tribal leaders have indicated that there is difficulty in getting various States to exercise jurisdiction over crimes between non-Indians in Indian country. Failure of the States to exercise jurisdiction over non-Indian offenses perpetrated on Indian country, not only fails to protect the non-Indian victim, but also undermines the efforts of Indian tribes to promote and preserve law and order in their communities.

In view of these facts, the subcommittee recommended that the Federal Government be provided with concurrent jurisdiction over offenses committed by non-Indians against non-Indians in Indian country.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This measure provides that section 1152 of title 18 of the United States Code gives the United States concurrent jurisdiction with that of the States with respect to offenses of non-Indians against non-Indians in Indian country.

S. 966. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of certain individuals:

S. 966

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the consent of the United States is hereby given to any State not having jurisdiction over criminal offenses committed by or against Indians in the areas of Indian country situated within such State to assume, with the consent of the tribe occupying the particular Indian country which would be affected by such assumption, jurisdiction over such offenses to the same extent that such State has jurisdiction over offenses committed elsewhere within the State, and the criminal laws of such State shall have the same force and effect within such Indian country as they have elsewhere within that State. The provisions of sections 1152 and 1153 of title 18 of the United States Code shall not be applicable within any areas of Indian country with respect to which jurisdiction has been ceded by the United States pursuant to this section.

(b) Nothing in this section shall authorize the alienation, encumbrance, or taxation of any real or personal property, including water rights, belonging to any Indian or any Indian tribe, band, or community that is held in trust by the United States or is subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States; or shall authorize regulation of the use of such property in a manner inconsistent with any Federal treaty, agreement, or statute or with any regulation made pursuant thereto; or shall deprive any Indian or any Indian tribe, band, or community of any right, privilege, or immunity afforded under Federal treaty, agreement, or statute with respect to hunting, trapping, or fishing or the control, licensing, or regulation thereof.

Sec. 2. (a) The consent of the United States is hereby given to any State not having jurisdiction over civil causes of action between Indians or to which Indians are parties which arise in the areas of Indian country situated within such State to assume, with the consent of the tribe occupying the particular Indian country which would be affected by such assumption, jurisdiction over such civil causes of action to the same extent that such State has jurisdiction over other civil causes of action, and those civil laws of such State that are of general application to private persons or private property shall have the same force and effect within such Indian country as they have elsewhere within that State.

(b) Nothing in this section shall authorize the alienation, encumbrance, or taxation of any real or personal property, including water rights, belonging to any Indian or any Indian tribe, band, or community that is held in trust by the United States or is subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States; or shall authorize regulation of the use of such property in a manner inconsistent with any Federal treaty, agreement, or statute, or with any regulation made pursuant thereto; or shall confer jurisdiction upon the State to adjudicate, in probate proceedings or otherwise, the ownership or right to possession of such property or any interest therein.

(c) Any tribal ordinance or custom heretofore or hereafter adopted by an Indian tribe, band, or community in the exercise of any authority which it may possess shall, if not inconsistent with any applicable civil law of the State, be given full force and effect in the determination of civil causes of action pursuant to this section.

Sec. 3. (a) The United States is authorized to accept a retrocession by any State of any criminal or civil jurisdiction, or both, acquired by such State pursuant to the provisions of section 1162 of title 18 of the United States Code, section 1360 of title 28 of the United States Code, or section 7 of the Act of August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 588), as it was in effect prior to its repeal by subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Section 7 of the Act of August 15, 1963 (67 Stat. 588), is hereby repealed, but such repeal shall not affect any cession of jurisdiction made pursuant to such section prior to its repeal.

Sec. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of any enabling act for the admission of a State, the consent of the United States is hereby given to the people of any State to amend, where necessary, their State constitution or existing statutes, as the case may be, to remove any legal impediment to the assumption of civil or criminal jurisdiction in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The provisions of this Act shall not become effective with respect to such assumption of jurisdiction by any such State until the people thereof have appropriately amended their State constitution or statutes, as the case may be.

Sec. 5. (a) No action or proceeding pending before any court or agency of the United States immediately prior to any cession of jurisdiction by the United State pursuant to this Act shall abate by reason of that cession. For the purposes of any such action or proceeding, such cession shall take effect on the day following the date of final determination of such action or proceeding.

(b) No cession made by the United States under this Act shall deprive any court of the United States of jurisdiction to hear, determine, render judgment, or impose sentence in any criminal action instituted against any person for any offense committed before the effective date of such cession, if the offense charged in such action was cognizable under any law of the United States at the time of the commission of such offense. For the purposes of any such criminal action, such cession shall take effect on the day following the date of final determination of such action.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 966 is as follows:

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE THE PROCESS OF CEDING TO STATES CIVIL AND CRIMINAL JURISDICTION OVER INDIAN COUNTRY

During subcommittee hearings and investigations it was indicated that Public Law 280, which conferred to certain States civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indian country, had resulted in a breakdown in the administration of justice to a degree that Indian citizens were being denied due process and equal protection of the law.

Some of the problems indicated are:

1. Many States claim that because Public Law 280 conferred total jurisdiction over Indian reservations, subsidies from the Federal Government are needed if States are to adequately enforce law on the reservation;
2. Some States indicated a piecemeal cession of jurisdiction over Indian country would be more feasible;
3. Many Indian groups have urged the repeal of Public Law 280 on the grounds that it authorizes the unilateral application of State law to all tribes without their consent and regardless of their needs and special circumstances; and
4. Many tribes claimed that tribal laws were unnecessarily preempted by Public Law 280 and, as a consequence, they could not govern their tribal communities effectively.

In view of these facts, it is recommended that Congress repeal Public Law 280 and develop a legislative proposal that will permit a more feasible and equitable method of providing to States civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indian country.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF BILL TO CEDE TO STATES JURISDICTION IN CRIMINAL AND CIVIL MATTERS

Section 1 authorizes a State to assume criminal jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian country in the State, and to punish an offender in accordance with State law. Before a State can assume criminal jurisdiction, consent of the tribe(s) on Indian country in the State is required.

This section prohibits the alienation, encumbrance, or taxation of real or personal property, including water rights, of any Indian or tribe held in trust by the United States; the regulation of such property in a manner inconsistent with any Federal treaty, agreement, or law, and the deprivation of hunting, fishing, or trapping rights afforded any Indian or tribe under Federal treaty, agreement, or statute.

Section 2 authorizes a State to assume civil jurisdiction over causes of action between Indians, or to which Indians are party, which arise in Indian country in the State and to apply State law to such causes of action. Before a State can assume civil jurisdiction, consent of the tribe(s) on Indian country in the State is required.

This section prohibits the alienation, encumbrance, or taxation of real or personal property, including water rights, of any Indian or tribe held in trust by the United States; the regulation of such property in a manner inconsistent with any Federal treaty, agreement, or statute; and the adjudication by a State, in probate proceedings, the ownership or right to possession of such property.

Tribal ordinances or customs adopted by an Indian tribe consistent with applicable civil State law shall be utilized in the determination of civil causes of action.

Section 3 authorizes States, that have acquired civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indian country, to relinquish such jurisdiction to the United States.

This section repeals Public Law 280, which grants civil and criminal jurisdiction to States, but will not affect any cession of jurisdiction to a State prior to its date of repeal.

Section 4 provides that enabling legislation related to the admission of a State to the Union will not bar any State from removing any legal impediment to the assumption of civil or criminal jurisdiction as authorized under this act.

Section 5 provides that legal proceedings before any court or agency of the United States immediately prior to a cession of jurisdiction to a State under this act would not abate, and that such cession take effect on the day following final determination of such legal proceeding.

Cession by the United States under this act shall not deprive a U.S. court of jurisdiction over any offense cognizable under the laws of the United States conmmitted before the effective date of the cession. In such cases, cession shall take effect on the day following the date of final determination of the proceeding.

S. 967. A bill relating to offenses committed within Indian country:

S. 967

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1153 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended (1) by inserting immediately after "robbery," the following: "aggravated assault,", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"As used in this section, the offense of aggravated assault shall be defined as any type, category, or degree of assault recognized under the laws of the State in which the offense was committed, and which is, under the laws of such State, punishable by imprisonment for a period in excess of six months. Such offense shall be punished in accordance with the laws of the State in which such offense was committed."

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 967 is as follows:

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE "SEVEN MAJOR CRIMES" ACT RELATING TO OFFENSES COMMITTED WITHIN INDIAN COUNTRY

As a result of an early Supreme Court case, *Ex parte Crow Dog*, 109 U.S. 556 (1883), which held that State courts lacked jurisdiction over offenses committed in Indian country, Congress enacted the "Seven Major Crimes" Act in 1885. This law presently provides Federal courts with jurisdiction over the crimes of murder, manslaughter, rape, incest, assault with intent to kill, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson, burglary, robbery, embezzlement, and larceny committed by an Indian against another Indian or other person.

Those crimes not prosecuted in Federal courts fall within the jurisdiction of Indian tribal courts, which by Federal law, cannot impose more than a 6-month sentence.

In view of these facts, it is recommended that Congress amend the "Seven Major Crimes" Act so that serious felonies committed within Indian country could be prosecuted in Federal courts and be subject to appropriate punishment.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF BILL TO AMEND "SEVEN MAJOR CRIMES" ACT

This measure amends the "Seven Major Crimes" Act (1153 U.S.C. 18) to include the offense of "aggravated assault." This offense is defined as so as to include any type or degree of assault which is recognized under the law of the State in which the offense is committed and is punishable by imprisonment in excess of 6 months. Such an offense shall be punished in accordance with the laws of the State in which the offense was committed.

S. 968. A bill relating to the employment by certain Indians of legal counsel:

S. 968

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, if any application made by any Indian, Indian tribe, Indian council, or any band or group of Indians under any law requiring the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioner of Indian Affairs of contracts or agreements relating to the employment of legal counsel (including the choice of counsel and the fixing of fees) by any such Indians, tribe, council, band, or group is neither granted nor denied within ninety days following the making of such application, such approval shall be deemed to have been granted.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 968 is as follows:

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO EXPEDITE APPROVAL OF CONTRACTS BETWEEN INDIAN TRIBES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS

As a result of his guardianship powers, the Secretary of Interior has been provided authority to approve contracts between Indian tribes and their attorneys. Despite efforts of the Department of the Interior in 1960 and 1962 to expedite approvals of tribal attorney contracts, testimony before the subcommittee indicates that administrative delay in approving such contracts is a continuing problem. Frequently these delays extend for over a year and consequently impose severe hardships upon tribes in need of counsel and constitute a denial of due process of law guaranteed every citizen by the Constitution of the United States.

In view of these facts, it is recommended that Congress establish a definite time limit during which the Secretary of Interior must act on a proposed tribal attorney contract.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF BILL TO EXPEDITE APPROVAL OF TRIBAL ATTORNEY CONTRACTS

This measure provides for the approval of applications related to the employment of legal counsel made by Indian tribes, and other Indian groups, to the Secretary of Interior or Commissioner of Indian Affairs if the application is neither approved nor denied within 90 days from the date of filing.

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, Mr. JOHNSTON, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to prepare and revise certain materials related to Indians in order that their constitutional rights might be fully protected:

S.J. RES. 40

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order that the constitutional rights of Indians might be fully protected, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to—

(a) have the document entitled "Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties" (Senate Document Numbered 319, volumes 1 and 2, Fifty-eighth Congress) revised and extended to include all treaties, laws, Executive orders, regulations, and other matters relating to Indian affairs in force on July 1, 1964, and to have such revised document printed at the Government Printing Office; and

(b) have prepared an accurate compilation of all of the official opinions, published and unpublished, of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior relating to Indian affairs rendered by the Solicitor prior to July 1, 1964, and to have such compilation printed as a Government publication at the Government Printing Office.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, with respect to the preparation but not including printing, such sum as may be necessary.

The memorandum accompanying Senate Joint Resolution 40 is as follows:

BACKGROUND OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO PREPARE A REVISED EDITION OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 319

The subcommittee staff in 1961 began its preliminary research regarding the current legal status of Indian citizens under the U.S. Constitution. This undertaking involved an examination of the legislative, judicial, and administrative interpretations available on this subject.

The volumes entitled, "Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties" (S. Doc. No. 319, 58th Cong.) proved to be an invaluable research tool despite the fact that the last volume was published in 1938. Recognizing the pressing need for a current compilation of these documents, the chairman of the Indian law committee of the Federal Bar Association recently called for an updating of these volumes.

Equally important in appraising the legal status of Indians are the opinions of the Solicitor of the Department of Interior which have the force and effect of law. As part I of the hearings clearly indicates, however, many of the opinions of the Solicitor have not been published and made available to those interested in Indian affairs.

In view of these facts, the subcommittee recommends that the Congress authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to—

1. Prepare an accurate compilation of all the Solicitor's opinions relating to Indian affairs; and

2. Prepare a revised edition of the documents entitled "Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties."

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Section 1 authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to (a) revise and extend Senate Document No. 319, 58th Congress, to include all treaties, laws, Executive orders, regulations, and other pertinent matters relating to Indian affairs in force on July 1, 1964, and (b) to prepare an accurate compilation of all the Solicitor's opinions relating to Indian affairs.

Section 2 authorizes to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the preparation, but not the printing, of such a compilation.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, last year, in six extraordinary decisions, the Supreme Court declared that the Constitution required that both houses of State legislatures be apportioned on the basis of population. A scant 3 months later, the Senate was asked, in effect, to suspend the Constitution by postponing the implementation of the Court's decisions for up to 2 years. Last September 10, speaking of this proposal by Senator DIRKSEN, I said:

> It is no answer to say that the rider will suspend the right to equal representation for a period of only 2 years. If we can cross this threshold, what is then to prevent us from extending the suspension for another 2 years, or for 5, or indefinitely. If this were to come to pass, the independence of our judiciary to give force and effect to the Constitution will be thoroughly undermined, and the checks and balances upon which our system of government has long rested, will be placed in the gravest jeopardy.

The Senate rejected the "Dirksen rider," refusing, by a vote of 63 to 30, to invoke cloture. A week later, in a series of votes, the Senate refused to endorse amendments to reverse the whole effect of all six court decisions. But is the matter to end there?

I should hope not. At the same time that I spoke in opposition to the "Dirksen rider" last year, I expressed the hope that the Supreme Court decisions could be modified by a constitutional amendment. I said:

> I, myself, would prefer to leave the question of legislative apportionment to the people of each State, provided that the people themselves, in each case, are furnished with the opportunity to ratify their system by majority vote through a popular referendum. This would place the decision directly in the hands of the people, where sovereignty properly resides. I would support a constitutional amendment designed to accomplish this objective.

Today, Mr. President, I wish to propose such an amendment. It is one which acknowledges the sovereignty residing in the people of the States, while at the same time recognizing the right of every citizen to "equal protection of the law" under the 14th amendment.

The particular language of this proposed amendment is suggested by the professors of the School of Law at the University of Idaho, who have been working on it since last September, at my request. Dean Philip Peterson, assisted most closely by Professors Brockelbank, Bell, Berman, and Walenta of the law faculty, and Dr. Foy of the English faculty, worked intently and expertly on the amendment. I am grateful to them; and extend to them my sincere thanks for a public service well performed.

The significant portion of the amendment reads as follows:

> Any State having a legislature composed of more than one house may depart from the principle of equal representation in one house by adopting another reasonable system of representation with the approval of a majority of the electorate, provided review be permitted periodically.

Mr. President, I send this amendment to the desk and ask that it be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to permit membership in one house of a State legislature composed of more than one house to be apportioned with the approval of the electorate upon a system other than that of equal representation introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have also received a joint memorial which was recently passed by the Idaho State Legislature. It takes the form of an application, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution. The amendment which the Idaho Legislature endorses is very similar in objective to the one I have just introduced. Accordingly, I now send this proposed amendment to the desk, asking that it also be appropriately referred, and that the pertinent part be published at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the pertinent portion will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to permit membership in one house of a State legislature composed of more than one house to be apportioned with the approval of the electorate upon a system other than that of equal representation, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The pertinent portion of the joint resolution presented by Mr. CHURCH is as follows:

> ARTICLE —
>
> SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which has a bicameral legislature from apportioning the numbers of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.
>
> SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.
>
> SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it will be noted that the amendment which the law faculty has prepared differs slightly from that proposed by the Idaho Legislature. The faculty version provides for popular review "periodically," while that of the legislature requires only one ratification by referendum without any continuing recourse to the people.

I have misgivings about the "one shot" approach. I think the right to popular review over a matter so fundamental should be left open. Populations will continue to shift, and so may voter opinion.

Nevertheless, I think that both the amendment endorsed by the Idaho State Legislature and that prepared by the faculty of the Idaho Law School, deserve the most careful consideration of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Both uphold the basic principle that the people of each State should be entitled to their sovereign right to determine the composition of their own legislature. I also believe strongly in the validity of this principle. And I shall work for the enactment of an amendment designed to accomplish this objective.

Mr. President, in connection with the amendment drafted by the faculty of the Idaho Law School, I call the Senate's attention to the fact that Dean Peterson and his associates have prepared a supporting paper, in which they first refer to the historic Supreme Court decisions giving rise to the proposed amendment, and then explain the reasons for the wording they have chosen, giving appropriate citations of authority. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent supporting paper be published at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the supporting paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND

In a series of historic decisions, the Supreme Court on June 15, 1964, announced a rule of practical equality in legislative representation. *Reynolds* v. *Simms*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1362; *WMCA, Inc.* v. *Lomenzo*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1418; *Maryland Committee for Fair Representation* v. *Tawes*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1442; *Davis* v. *Mann*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1453; *Roman* v. *Sincock*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1462; *Lucas* v. *44th Gen. Assembly of the State of Colorado*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1472. These decisions elaborated upon and extended earlier decisions in which the Court had held that a complaint alleging "invidious discrimination in voting patterns" stated a claim for relief, *Baker* v. *Carr*, 82 Sup. Ct. 691, and held that the "equal protection clause" of the 14th amendment and the concept of "we the people" prohibits preferred voter classes and enjoins the use of a "one-man, one-vote" system in voting for candidates in a statewide election, *Gray* v. *Sanders*, 83 Sup. Ct. 801 (1963). In a related case the Court, construing article 1, of section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, and its requirement that representatives be chosen "by the people" has held that a "one-man, one-vote" rule is required in congressional elections. *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 84 Sup. Ct. 526 (1964).

The apportionment cases rest their weight upon the "equal protection clause" of the 14th amendment. Though mathematical exactness is not required, the equal-population principle becomes a well nigh exclusive criteria for apportionment:

"Neither history alone, nor economic or other sorts of group interests, are permissible factors in attempting to justify disparities from population-based representation. Considerations of area alone provide an insufficient justification for deviations from the equal population principle * * * if, even as a result of a clearly rational State policy of according some representation to political subdivisions, population is submerged as the controlling consideration in the apportionment of seats in a particular legislative body, then the right of all of the State's citizens * * * would be unconstitutionally impaired" (84 Sup. Ct. 1362, 1390–1392).

The Court rejected the Federal analogy and disregarded the expressed opinion of the people of the State of Colorado who had, by a 2-to-1 margin approved an apportionment scheme based on area representation and at the same time rejected a scheme based entirely upon population. *Lucas* v. *44th Gen. Assembly, State of Colorado, supra*. In substance, any deviation from the one-man, one-vote pattern will be viewed scrupulously with an apparent presumption against its constitutionality.

EXPLANATION

The words "any State" introduce departure from the restrictions of the equal protection clause announced in the apportionment cases. These words do not include territories, trust territories, or other areas under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The 15th and 19th amendments separate the "United States" and "any State"; the 21st amendment, to reach beyond States, uses broadly inclusive language, "State, territory, or possession of the United States"; the 23d amendment was necessary to extend representation in presidential elections to the District of Columbia. Case law supports the conclusion of exclusion. *Metropolitan Railroad Co.* v. *District of Columbia*, 10 Sup. Ct. 19 (1889); *Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association* v. *Dailey*, 75 Fed. Supp. 832 (1948). If extension to nonstates is intended, the introductory words should be "any State, territory or possession of the United States."

The limitation to "any State having a legislature composed of more than one house" is designed to insure that any unicameral legislature will continue to be apportioned according to the one-man, one-vote principle. Constitutional principles announced in those cases and other sections of the Constitution would constitute a necessary limitation upon the power of the States.

The term "principle of equal representation" is designed to express the rule of "one-man, one-vote" with its limited qualifications. The term has been construed to require representation on a basis as near to equality of population as possible. *Donovan* v. *Suffolk County Apportionment Commissioners*, 113 N.E. 740 (1916); *Raglan* v. *Anderson*, 100 S.W. 865 (1907).

Limiting application of effect to "one house" insures that nonpopulation representation will be permissible in only one of the bodies; therefore permitting, among other plans, the so-called "Federal analogy" rejected by the Court in its decisions. At the present time this would permit the existence of one house in the legislature of all but one of our States, Nebraska, based upon nonpopulation factors. The intent is to limit the exception contained in this amendment to a single house.

Adoption of "another reasonable system" is designed to enunciate clearly a permissible departure from the system of equal population representation and at the same time insure that legislative action will follow nonarbitrary grounds and avoid the possibility of nonrational allocation of representation. The use of the word "reasonable" leaves to the courts the problem of determining legitimacy of State action within the range of this amendment and does not impose inflexible, blind rules upon determination of standards. The word, if this amendment were adopted, would have light shed upon it by the dissenting opinions of Justices Stewart and Clark in the apportionment cases. *WMCA, Inc.* v. *Lomenzo*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1418, 1429–1442. In this opinion, these Justices take the position that the Court should have followed the traditional rule in equal protection cases, which relied upon a reasonable basis or classification to establish legitimacy. In a clear enunciation of this doctrine, Justice Stewart states:

"Moving from the general to the specific, I think that the equal protection clause demands but two basic attributes of any plan of State legislative apportionment. First, it demands that, in the light of the States own characteristics and needs, the plan must be a rational one. Secondly, it demands that the plan must be such as not to permit the systematic frustration of the will of a majority of the electorate of the State. I think it is apparent that any plan of legislative apportionment which could be shown to reflect no policy, but simply arbitrary and capricious action or inaction, and that any plan which could be shown systematically to prevent ultimate effective majority rule, would be invalid under accepted equal protection clause standards. But, beyond this, I think there is nothing in the Federal Constitution to prevent a State from choosing any electoral legislative structure it thinks best suited to the interests, temper, and customs of its people" (84 Sup. Ct. 1418, 1434).

Though this amendment would limit reasoning embellishing the word "reasonable" to one house, the fact that majority wishes are respected by the last two clauses of the amendment and the word "reasonable" as used here should lead a court to this opinion for aid in construction of the word "reasonable".

It is intended to require that deviation be permitted only in the event it occurs as a result of a majority of the electors of the State voting in its favor. This is achieved by making departure dependent upon action by submitting the proposal to the electorate for majority approval. Electorate is defined as:

"The whole body of persons entitled to vote in an election, or any distinct class or division of them." Webster's New International Dictionary (1960) 825. "The whole body of electors." The Oxford Universal Dictionary (1955) 591.

The term "majority" means more than half. This is designed to insure that before any departure from the principle of "one-man, one-vote" is permitted, majority vote of the people affected by the apportionment occurs.

The provision is designed to insure that an easy method of reapproval of the system be provided.

CONDEMNATION OF THE SOVIET PERSECUTION OF JEWS AND ALL OTHER PERSONS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for myself and 67 other Senators I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Soviet persecution of Jews and all other persons be condemned.

The concurrent resolution is similar to the one adopted by the Senate last year by a 60-to-1 vote as an amendment to the foreign aid bill. Unfortunately the amendment was stricken from the bill in conference. In its place the conferees substituted language condemning the "persecution of any persons because of their religion."

This is the compromise language I refused to accept on the floor of the Senate. The Senate sustained the original resolution by a 60-to-1 vote. Now I say Congress as a whole—the House and Senate acting together—should face this problem squarely and take a firm stand. I say Congress should condemn the intolerable conditions the Jewish people are enduring in the Soviet Union.

We must keep in mind that persecution of the Jews in the Soviet Union goes beyond simple religious persecution. In the Soviet Union the free exercise of religion in any meaningful sense has been denied to everyone. All religions exist precariously, to say the least, in an officially antireligious atmosphere. But in a variety of fundamental ways, Judaism is subject to unique discrimination.

Recent disclosures of continued persecution of persons of the Jewish faith in the Soviet Union make it clear beyond question that such activities are conducted with premeditated design as part of Soviet policy to discount obvious failures in that nation's social and economic structure. Religious persecution anywhere is bad enough, but when a nation uses it as an instrument of national policy it becomes reprehensible and should be condemned as such.

The main components of the Soviet policy against Jews are as follows:

First. The deprivation of cultural rights: Though the 3 million Soviet Jews are officially recognized as a nationality, they are the only nationality deprived of the basic cultural rights accorded to all the others—their own newspapers, for example, publishing houses, books, language, or theater.

Second. The deprivation of religious rights: Unlike all other religious denominations in the Soviet Union, Jewish congregations are not permitted to maintain nationwide federations or other central organizations. No Hebrew Bible has been published since 1917; there is an extreme shortage of prayer books and indispensable religious articles. Synagogues have been forcibly closed down in many cities and towns; the one rabbinical seminary in the country is permitted no more than three or four students.

Third. The anti-Jewish propaganda campaign: This policy is conducted within the charged atmosphere of a virulent press and propaganda campaign against Judaism. In this campaign, Jews are represented in traditional anti-Semitic stereotypes. Judaism as a religion is vilified.

Fourth. The scapegoating of Jews: Jews have been used as scapegoats for the economic ills that plague the country. Of the 195 people sentenced to death for such crimes, at least half, and possibly more, have been Jews.

Fifth. Discrimination in education and employment: The proportion of Jews in higher education, science, and the professions has been declining from 13.5 percent in 1935 to 3.1 percent today. Jews have virtually disappeared from the diplomatic service, and know that they cannot aspire to leading positions in economic, industrial, technical, and engineering work.

Sixth. Refusal of the right to emigrate: Jews who wish to leave the Soviet Union to be reunited with their families are forbidden to do so.

Taken together this adds up to a policy of reducing the Jews to second-class citizenship in the U.S.S.R., of breaking their spirit and crushing their pride. It aims to shatter, pulverize and gradually eliminate Jewish historical consciousness and Jewish identity. It goes beyond the usual form of religious persecution and becomes instead a spiritual strangulation—the deprivation of a people's natural right to know their past and to participate in their present. For without a past and a present, the future is precarious indeed.

Mr. President, Soviet Jews surely have the right to walk in dignity—no less than their fellow citizens of other nationalities and faiths. They are deprived of this right—and the United States, the leader of the free world, has the obligation to protest in the name of human decency. This can be done through enactment by the House and Senate of the resolution I introduce today. I am joined in presenting this resolution by Senators Allott, Bartlett, Bayh, Bennett, Boggs, Brewster, Burdick, Byrd of Virginia, Byrd of West Virginia, Cannon, Case, Clark, Cooper, Dodd, Dominick, Douglas, Fannin, Fong, Gruening, Hart, Hartke, Holland, Hruska, Inouye, Jackson, Javits, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Kennedy of New York, Kuchel, Lausche, Long of Missouri, Magnuson, McCarthy, McClellan, McGee, McGovern, McIntyre, McNamara, Metcalf, Miller, Mondale, Monroney, Montoya, Morse, Morton, Moss, Murphy, Nelson, Neuberger, Pastore, Pearson, Pell, Proxmire, Randolph, Saltonstall, Scott, Simpson, Smathers, Smith, Symington, Thurmond, Tower, Tydings, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, and Young of Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed the text of the concurrent resolution at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the resolution will be printed in the Record.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion, submitted by Mr. Ribicoff (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 17

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

Whereas the Congress of the United States deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world; and

Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens by singling them out for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses, by confiscating synagogues, by closing Jewish cemeteries, by arresting rabbis and lay religious leaders, by curtailing religious observances, by discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education, by imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and by other acts that oppress Jews in the free exercise of their faith; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has a clear opportunity to match the words of its constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific actions so that the world may know whether there is a genuine hope for a new day of better understanding among all people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] has submitted a sense-of-Congress resolution protesting the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union. One single line we must never forget. We learned in Hitler's time that silence will not help the Soviet Jews. Only if the world cries out will the Jews be helped.

The continuing charges of anti-Jewish activities in the Soviet Union should be investigated by the appropriate commissions of the United Nations, the organization established to protect the human rights of people the world over. The U.N. Subcommission for the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities should have the opportunity to examine first hand charges of anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R.

The suggestion was first made in Geneva last month by Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee. It is a good one, for anti-Jewish activities by Government action and policy in the U.S.S.R. have been going on for a long time, contrary to the laws of man, the U.N. Charter, and international morality.

We should explore all possibilities of beaming the spotlight of public disclosure on such acts wherever they occur. Individuals, groups, and, yes, governments in all areas of the free world must continue to give voice to their indignation over anti-Jewish activities. The Hitler madness is all too recent—so is the Stalin "doctor's plot"—not to warn us to speak out in time.

There are about 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union, and they constitute the second largest Jewish community in the world. They are recognized as a nationality, but they are not given the same rights accorded other recognized nationalities in the U.S.S.R. They are denied any form of community organization and are isolated from other Jewish communities throughout the world. But in spite of more than 40 years of persecution and near-persecution, government pressures, and restrictions designed to discourage religious identification, almost 2½ millions in the U.S.S.R. in the 1959 census declared themselves to be Jews.

In spite of Soviet claims of religious freedom and denials of the existence of anti-Semitism because it is a violation of Soviet law, there is ample and grim evidence that the Soviet Government is singling Jews out as a group for discriminatory restrictions and extreme punishment. Jews and the Jewish religion suffer greater limitations and prohibitions at the hands of the Kremlin than any other religious groups in the Soviet Union.

Synagogue buildings and seminaries have been padlocked, Jewish cemeteries have been arbitrarily shut down, and ritual supplies—including matzoth—needed for religious worship cannot be obtained. No Hebrew Bibles or calendars are printed, and prayer books are irreplaceable. Means for training rabbis and community workers are inadequate or nonexistent, and unlike other religous groups Jews are not permitted to establish national organizations. Jewish cultural life has been stifled, and the once flourishing Yiddish language literature in books, theater, periodicals, and newspapers has virtually been wiped out.

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union is very sensitive to charges of anti-Semitism and prides itself on the law which makes it a criminal offense. But when 89 out of 163 persons sentenced to death for alleged "black marketing'" or economic crimes, are publicly identified as Jews and held up for ridicule, contempt and caricature in the official Soviet press; and when a blatantly anti-Semitic book containing caricatures on the Nazi pattern is published under the title "Judaism Without Embellishment" by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, authored by one, Kichko, and thousands of copies are officially distributed, then it is time to expose the false Soviet claim that there is no anti-Semitism under communism and to denounce the hypocrisy behind the Kremlin's denials of anti-Jewish actions. The crude hatemongering of the Kichko book was even too much for the Communist parties in France, Italy, and the United States to swallow, and they protested, and the intensity of protest from all parts of the world finally persuaded Soviet authorities to suppress the book.

From time to time Soviet leaders have insisted that Soviet treatment of religious minorities is an internal matter and that protests constitute interference in the Soviet Union's domestic affairs. But similar disclaimers by Russia and other nations in earlier periods in our history did not deter the United States from protesting the persecution of Jews or other minority groups.

Since 1840 the United States, while recognizing the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another state, has, nevertheless, protested the persecution of oppressed minorities by foreign governments and has justified these protests in the name of moral duty toward humanity. This policy has remained valid to this day.

This is not the time for silence on the part of American Jewry. Each great wave of indignation will serve to ultimately alleviate, and will help to prevent aggravation of the plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union. Each protest, whether by individuals, by organizations, or by the free nations of the world acting independently or through the United Nations, will serve to make the Kremlin realize how sterile and harmful to its own prestige is its anti-Jewish policy.

I am delighted that many Senators have felt as deeply as I and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] have, and hope they will join in this action. This time I hope this resolution will not go down the drain as a part of the foreign aid bill.

I appeal to the majority leader and to the minority leader—though I do not ask for any assurance at this time—to make this proposal a separate basis of action on the part of the Senate, because last year's action indicates that unless this is done, it will not receive overwhelming support by Members of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 19)

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to House Joint Resolution 234, the joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and I ask that the amendment be printed.

This amendment would restore language placed in the resolution by the other body which curtails export of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic. I intend to call this amendment up for Senate consideration at the appropriate time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

> In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraphs 2 and 4 rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.J. Res. 234) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:
>
> Pages 3, on line 7, after the word "Act" insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment (No. 20), intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON) submitted the following notice in writing:

> In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraphs 2 and 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.J. Res. 234) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:
>
> On page 3, at end of line 20, insert the following new section:
>
> "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION
>
> "No funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans' Administration shall be utilized for the purpose of implementing any order or directive of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the closing or relocating of any hospital or facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration or with respect to the withdrawing, transferring, or reducing of services heretofore made available to veterans."

Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON) also submitted an amendment, No. 21, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. MILLER submitted the following notice in writing:

> In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraphs 2 and 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.J. Res. 234) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Amend the committee amendment as follows:
>
> On page 3: Strike lines 13 and 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "'or are necessary to carry out any other agreement with the United Arab Republic which has been approved by the Congress.'"

Mr. MILLER also submitted an amendment (No. 22), intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF SENATE BILL 899

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced Senate bill 899, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of America. The name of Senator BOGGS, of Delaware, was inadvertently omitted as a cosponsor and I ask unanimous consent that his name be added on the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION TO GRANT CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES WHO HAVE ATTAINED THE AGE OF 18 THE RIGHT TO VOTE IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res.

35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote in presidential elections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORT OF TEXAS RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW—RESOLUTION OF SAN ANTONIO MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on January 19 the board of directors of the San Antonio Manufacturers Association unanimously passed a resolution setting forth in no uncertain terms their support of the Texas State right-to-work law and expressing strong opposition to any national moves to invalidate that law which Texans freely adopted by majority vote.

I am in complete agreement with the views of the board, and I ask that their resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD so that other Senators may consider the depth of Texas conviction on this issue.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY SAN ANTONIO MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION PERTAINING TO OFFICIAL ASSOCIATION POLICY REGARDING LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS TOWARD THE REPEAL OF THE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

Whereas President Lyndon Baines Johnson, in his state of the Union message, on January 4, 1965, called on Congress to enact legislation for the repeal of section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act; and

Whereas it is most evident that any legislative action repealing said section 14-B would be the Government's denial to the American worker his freedom of choice and freedom of action; and

Whereas section 14-B does not in any manner injure nor destroy the rights of union workers or unions themselves; but, guarantees the rights to organize and the rights to belong as union members to the individual; and

Whereas section 14-B upholds and protects a great basic American freedom to the extent that freedom of individual action and personal conviction is recognized as being a valuable citizen right, in that this section 14-B reads:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law," and

Whereas we note with pride on one hand that antidiscrimination is now the law of the land; and, then, on the other hand, find that a great discrimination is asked as a law of the land against American labor in the repeal of the right to work law; and

Whereas the officers, board of directors, and the general membership of the San Antonio Manufacturers Association hold high the belief that the repeal of section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act, would be the destructive element of democracy for States rights; and, most of all, the rights of the individual; and

Whereas we strongly believe and hold the conviction that a serious matter of this nature deserves the entire American citizenry's rights to voice their decisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on January 19, 1965, the board of directors of the San Antonio Manufacturers Association, in official board meeting held in San Antonio, the above date, unanimously adopts this resolution of policy which reflects and clearly states opposition and objections in unanimous voice to any legislative programs calling for the repeal of section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act.

LESTER J. FERGUSON,
President, San Antonio Manufacturers Association.
BILL E. HENDERSON,
Executive Secretary, San Antonio Manufacturers Association.

THE JOHNSON BEGINNING

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Walter Lippmann writes with his usual brilliance in this morning's edition of the Washington Post. His column, entitled "The Johnson Beginning," is worthy of the highest praise. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOHNSON BEGINNING

(By Walter Lippmann)

Seen from the sidelines, it has been particularly impressive to note how the beginning of the Johnson administration has been marked by a change of emphasis and direction. For the first time in the 25 years since the start of the Second World War, the main attention of the President is not fixed upon the dangers abroad but on the problems and the prospects at home.

It will be a great mistake, I am sure, to read this as meaning that the country is withdrawing into isolation, having lost interest in the world abroad. What has happened is that there is for the time being a conjuncture of events abroad which makes it safe and prudent for the country to abate its anxiety and to pay attention to its own affairs. For these affairs have been sacrificed and grievously neglected for a quarter of a century.

The President's budget and his messages compose, it seems to me, a brilliantly contrived and integrated program for initiating those progressive reforms which are at once necessary and practicable. Read as a whole, the collection of messages shows the President to be a bold innovator, who is likely to succeed because he is deeply in touch with the great central mass of American sentiment and opinion. We have rarely, if ever, seen at the beginning of a new administration such a coherent program, such insight and resourcefulness. The President has grasped the nettle of race relations, of the church and state controversy, of business confidence and the welfare state, with a sure and skillful hand.

There is an international context for the explicit Johnson program. Though the President did not talk about it because it is not ripe to be talked about from his office, the State of the world today permits and justifies the preoccupation with American domestic affairs. I do not, of course, presume to know or to say how the President—if he were given to generalization and speculation, which he isn't—would describe the state of world affairs which is implied in his policies and program. But the state of the world can be described somewhat as follows:

The postwar period which has lasted for 20 years has kept us all preoccupied with the unfinished business of the World War. It has not been possible to make a settlement of that war, either in Europe where Germany and the Continent are partitioned, or in Eastern Asia where Korea, China, and Indochina are partitioned and Japan is separated from the Ryukyus. This postwar period is now ending. The period we have entered upon is already plainly visible in Europe and, quite dimly, it is just beginning to appear in East Asia. This post-postwar period will see a general movement toward that settlement of the Second World War.

The hard core of the settlement will be the inevitable return to normal after the convulsions which the World War produced. Thus, in Europe, the collapse of Hitler's Nazi empire brought the Russians to the Elbe River in the middle of Europe. The Soviet tide will have to recede. In fact, it has quite visibly already begun to recede. In East Asia, the collapse of the Japanese empire brought the United States to the Asian mainland and to some of the islands off its shores. This is an extension of our political power beyond its normal and natural limits, and like the Russians in Europe, the American tide will have to recede.

It is as abnormal for the United States to be in Seoul, in Okinawa, in Quemoy and Matsu and Formosa, in Saigon and Hue as it is abnormal for the Russians to be in Berlin, Warsaw, Prague, Budapest, Bucharest, and Sofia. The settlement of the World War, which must come someday, is certain to mean correction of the great displacements of power—of the Russian power into the heart of Europe and of American power onto the mainland of Asia.

The historical reality cannot be understood in terms of battles which are won or lost. The whole historical process is more like a geological phenomenon, like the subsiding of the earth and the return of the waters after a great upheaval. It is a callow kind of jingoism to talk of victory for us and defeat for the Soviet Union as it accommodates itself to the growing intercourse between the two halves of Europe. And it is panic-mongering to flagellate ourselves into paroxysms of anguish and shame at the prospect of negotiating settlements which end our entanglements in East Asia.

The role of the United States in the world today is to use its power, its resources, its brains, and its experience to see that this inevitable readjustment in Europe and Asia comes to pass decently and honorably. The time has come to stop imagining ourselves to be the "leader" of Europe. The time has come to stop beating our heads against stone walls under the illusion that we have been appointed policeman to the human race.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL TRAINING AN AID TO WORLD PEACE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of the agencies of Government which has attracted my attention and admiration for many years is the present International Agricultural Development Service—the agency which used to be the Foreign Agricultural Service—and its foreign agricultural training activities.

One of the great concepts which our Nation has adopted is that we can help to ease international tensions by easing economic distress, reducing illiteracy, and providing means for nations to help themselves. We are doing this through an exchange of knowledge in many areas, but we are doing especially well through the programs developed by foreign agricultural training.

Robert Ulrich in his book, "Education and the Idea of Mankind," said:

> Good education * * * is not only a process of information. It is also an endeavor to help a person respect honest differences of

opinion and discover his capacity for continuous growth through enriching experiences.

I believe that is precisely the type of education and training which is done by this agency of Government.

For the past 3 years, I have consulted with Cannon Hearne and others who share the responsibility for outlining these training programs. I have come to admire them for their dedication. Through their good offices, we have cooperated in bringing two great international training seminars to the campus of South Dakota State University at Brookings, S. Dak. In 1962 we had an international seminar on soil and water, which was an outstanding success. This summer, we expect to hold another such seminar covering the role of extension work and rural youth programs. We anticipate that it will also be a resounding success.

The foreign agricultural training division has just issued its annual report. As I glanced through it, I was inspired by the information it contained, as well as the challenges it presented for itself. I think the work of the agency is well set out in the following statement:

A PROGRAM FOR A BETTER FUTURE

Benefits of this international sharing of U.S. agricultural technology will be reaped for many years to come. This is a constructive and humanitarian effort in building a better world for all men which is in keeping with U.S. foreign policy and the American tradition. In many countries, this educational program is the foundation for hopes of adequate food and better nutrition in the near future. And, because agriculture is the number one industry in most developing nations, this assistance is vital to their economic growth and fuller participation in world trade.

Believing that others may be interested in the work and success of this agency, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record selected excerpts of its annual report.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The United States, for over 20 years, has helped developing nations of the free world improve their agriculture and rural life. This has been done through (1) technical assistance—sending U.S. technicians to advise on steps for development—and (2) training—bringing to this country specialists in agriculture to study our agricultural methods firsthand.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's part in this program is coordinated by the International Agricultural Development Service. IADS, established as a USDA agency in August of 1963, works with the other agencies of the Department in sending abroad USDA specialists to serve in the developing countries. This work is conducted for the Agency for International Development in much the same way as many U.S. universities are helping AID establish new universities in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. In 1964, teams of USDA technicians provided technical assistance in El Salvador, Ecuador, Bolivia, Colombia, Tunisia, and Algeria.

Training is coordinated by the foreign training division, a division of IADS. The foreign training division helps plan, schedule, supervise and evaluate programs for agriculturists sent to this country for training. It maintains close relationships with universities, associations, and agricultural businesses that can train individuals with needs for specialized skills and knowledge.

Cooperatively, the Department of Agriculture is working with the entire U.S. agricultural community—universities, organizations, businesses, farmers—to provide the best technical assistance and training possible.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL TRAINING, 1964

In the past year, 3,541 individuals from other countries arrived in the United States for training in agriculture. Another 1,009 remained in this country to continue agricultural training they had started the year before. These individuals are professional agricultural specialists from other countries, who have come to the United States to learn new skills and knowledge which will enable them to improve agricultural production and rural living at home.

Training for these people was planned and directed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Some training actually was conducted by the Department's various agencies. But most of it was provided by land-grant universities, farm organizations, agricultural businesses and other cooperating groups. The training often took unusual turns—from college classes in bee culture in Georgia for a man from Jordan to practice in making educational motion pictures in California for a man from Sudan—training for a specific individual's technical needs so that he might perform a job in his country more effectively on his return.

The participant

The individual agriculturist, when he arrives in this country under sponsorship of AID or an international organization, is called a participant. This term is used because he participates in the educational program which has been planned for him. The Department and cooperating institutions have made available to him training opportunities. But success or failure of the program depends on him, on his participation.

The term "participant" is used also because these individuals already are professionals. Thus they are neither students nor trainees. For the most part, they have had considerable academic training and numerous years of experience in their fields of specialization. They are among the most talented agriculturists in their country. On them rests their country's hopes for progress and development in the future.

Participants are picked for training in the United States with care and consideration. In almost every case, they are selected cooperatively by their own governments and a U.S. technician, usually an AID adviser, working in their country. The American technician, in fact, normally has worked directly with them and thus knows their specific training needs, their capabilities, and the part they are likely to play in the future development of their country. Participants therefore, come with certain training needs in mind which, if filled, will make them more effective in their jobs when they return. This U.S. training also helps them understand guidance offered by the American technician with whom they are working. Others benefit from their training, too, for in most cases participants help train their countrymen who are not able to come to the United States.

Participants come as individuals and in groups. They come at various times of the year and for different periods. Virtually all come for practical experience and know-how. A few attend college courses.

Most training in 1964 was either practical, or academic, or a combination. For a practical training program, the participant came to the United States for a period of a few weeks up to 7 or 8 months. More than likely he came as a member of a group. He may have spent some time in a university, but for practical rather than for primarily academic training. He probably traveled to three or four different locations around the country to observe and take part in practical operations related to his interests.

The participant coming for an academic program probably arrived in the fall to begin the college semester with most American students. He attended at least two semesters of class and possibly more. He may have earned a degree but his main objective was to attend a university to study agriculture or home economics.

The combination program enabled the participant to enroll in a university also but for only part of a school year and only for specialized courses. The remainder of his time in the United States was devoted to practical, on-the-job type training which related to his university course work. His program, normally 8 to 12 months, also may have included attendance in a workshop or summer school.

In the past year (fiscal year 1964), almost half of all agricultural participants arriving in the United States came for 10 months or more of technical training. Most of them also enrolled in some academic program. Africa sent the largest number of participants for the longer durations. Short-term programs of 3 months or less accounted for 24 percent with almost the same percentage for programs of 4 to 6 months in length. Almost half of the participants from Africa came for 10 months of training or more. Conversely, almost half of the participants from Latin America came for less than 3 months.

SUPPORT OF THE IMMIGRATION BILL—S. 500

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have joined the list of cosponsors of the immigration bill introduced on January 7 by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], with more optimism than ever before.

For years, there have been introduced bills which would somewhat liberalize the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act; but they have never made any progress. Hence, we have had to work out stopgap legislation to correct certain glaring deficiencies. One reason for this is that the weaknesses of the present law have not been dramatically brought to the attention of the American people. Immigration is a field in which change is genuinely feared by a great many people. But change, as it is written into Senate bill 500, is not at all alarming, once it is understood. The discussion of the issue during the recent campaign, President Kennedy's posthumous book, "A Nation of Immigrants," and President Johnson's fine immigration message have all contributed to a new awareness of the need for revision of the immigrant quota system.

We have set an annual quota of approximately 158,000 immigrants. For many years it has been American policy, written into the law, to discriminate against Asians and southern Europeans who wish to come to the United States to live, by allotting to them unreasonably small portions of this quota. But our law has abundant restrictions applying to all immigrants, to insure that their health, moral standards, and financial security are above reproach. We could, therefore, allocate the quota by criteria other than nationality, without weakening in any way our protection against unwelcome persons. We do not want people to come here from any country if they will go on relief or if they might endanger our national security. However, every year thousands of people who meet all our requirements, and who would be desirable additions to our society, because of the skills they possess or because their presence would reunite divided families, are denied permission to come here, due to their nationality.

Over two-thirds of our total annual quota is allotted to only three national groups: those from Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany. These quotas are never exhausted, and the large surpluses are not used. Last year more than one-half of Great Britain's quota of 65,361 was unused, and more than one-third of Ireland's quota of 17,756 was unused. Other countries with very small quotas, such as Greece and Italy, have lengthy waiting lists of eligible people. The fact that such discrimination is written into the law, in a country which basically believes in equal justice under the law for all men, raises severe doubts about our sincerity.

In his testimony before the House Immigration Subcommittee, last summer, Secretary Rusk stated that in 1 year more than a dozen foreign ministers spoke to him personally about the prejudice inherent in our immigration law. I hope the well-meaning people who support the present law as a guardian of the national character will take heed of the problem which it poses for our representatives abroad, who must reconcile the national origins system with our claims of equality for all.

In short, we can approximately keep our annual total quota of immigrants, but we can make sure that it is more fairly distributed among all eligible individuals. Under the Hart bill, the national origins system will gradually be abolished and the total annual quotas will be pooled for distribution by a more equitable formula, based on skill and close relations in this country. But careful precautions are written into the bill, in order to prevent any reverse discrimination against our good friends and allies in Europe.

The change that is proposed is not one of appreciably increasing the quantity of authorized immigration, but, rather, is one of changing the methods and principles by which it will be regulated. We shall not have coming to our shores significantly more aliens than those who now come. The total yearly quota will be increased by only 7,000—from 158,000 to 165,000. We shall reduce the need for private bills, 197 of which were passed by the 88th Congress; and we shall reduce the need for stopgap legislation.

Since 1957, Congress has responded to the need for revision of the McCarran Act by passing five laws which have admitted certain refugees and skilled persons. Under these laws, 141,598 eligible persons have entered the country outside of the quota, since 1957. These have been good laws, born of urgent necessity. But it ought not be necessary for Congress to legislate in each emergency. Senate bill 500 would reserve a percentage of the quota for such contingencies. This is a more foresighted and efficient approach than the stopgap legislation, since it would keep the number of entering aliens within the annual quota.

My colleagues on the Judiciary Committee cope each year with an enormous volume of private and public immigration proposed legislation. They are acutely aware of the problems of immigration and of its great historical significance in this country. I hope they will give Senate bill 500 the benefit of their knowledgeable scrutiny and will find it sound.

As a supplement to my remarks, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a pertinent editorial from the January 15 issue of the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Untangling Immigration

In his immigration message President Johnson oversimplifies somewhat, but basically seems to propose a rational course.

The immigration problem arises because more foreign nationals want to come than the United States can reasonably admit. The current system of choosing among applicants by alloting national quotas is not, contrary to inferences by the President and others, simply a manifestation of xenophobia with no basis in logic. To a certain extent, it is true that immigrants will assimilate better if they come from a culture similar to our own.

That is hardly the only relevant criterion, however, and the quota system undeniably leads to a number of anomalies. It turns away qualified applicants from some countries while quotas from others go unused. It can refuse a highly trained and skilled Asian while admitting an unskilled European, which makes it understandably hard to convince the Asian our motives are untouched by prejudice. The imperfections of the system have fostered recurring avalanches of private congressional bills allowing specific individuals to enter the United States.

A sensible alternative seems to be to put the emphasis on skills and relationships with U.S. citizens, as the President proposes. The change would correct many of the present inequities and set up a more logical criterion for picking the applicants most likely to make the largest contributions to our society.

It may be unfortunate that the proposals would reduce preferences for some countries with close ties to the United States. This effect would be mitigated by a host of temporary measures in the proposals, and more permanently by the fact that the specified skills and relationships would be found more often in those countries.

The President's recommendations apparently would not, despite the claims of some opponents, open our shores to hordes of new immigrants. The plan would increase the total quota from some 158,000 to 165,000 a year, hardly a huge number for a country of this size. There would be small increases from insuring that the total quota is fully used, and from shifting a few categories of applicants to nonquota status. There also might be a partially offsetting reduction in immigration under private bills.

While essentially the same legislative aims have been sought by four Presidents, they have received scant attention from Congress. Perhaps the lawmakers have good reason for their reluctance, but they have not made such reasons known.

In the absence of more telling objections than those usually advanced the President's suggestions seem intelligent steps toward straightening out a needlessly jumbled corner of national policy and foreign relations.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ADDRESS BY SENATOR ANDERSON

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President there is a very distinguished group of gentlemen in Washington who call themselves the Three and a Half Club. The club consists of some 40 Senators and Representatives who were formerly members of the fourth estate and have now dropped back to the third.

One of the most distinguished members of the Three and a Half Club is our colleague from New Mexico, Senator Clinton P. Anderson. He recently addressed the 1965 winter convention of the New Mexico Press Association. In his address, he made a very strong and moving plea for new legislation on freedom of information.

I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Government Secrecy

(Remarks of Senator Clinton P. Anderson before the 1965 winter convention of the New Mexico Press Association, Las Cruces, N. Mex., January 23, 1965)

To my great regret, I find that my tasks in Washington require that I live like the wornout saying: "Here today and gone tomorrow." I appreciate your kindness in rescheduling my appearance so I can catch a noon plane to Washington. That fact so circumscribes my time that I trust I will not talk beyond the limit of your endurance.

My excuse, of course, is that once the inauguration activities end, the work of legislating begins—and high on the list of priorities is the King-Anderson bill to extend hospital care to the aged through social security. I didn't realize how costly hospital care had become until a cattleman checked into an Albuquerque hospital for the removal of his gall bladder. He was allowed out of his bed to walk the length of a corridor the second day, but by the fifth day he was fuming and fretting to be allowed to check out and go home. His doctor explained to him the need for 3 more days of hospital care, but the cattleman replied: "Look, doc, it's costing me about a cow a day to stay here—and I've got a mighty small herd."

It's because I want to save that cattleman and his friends a few cows that I must hurry back to Washington to press for the early passage of King-Anderson.

Having first been a working newspaperman—probably long before most of you were and possibly before some of you were born—and then having been in public life for some three decades and thereby subject, on occasion, to the arrows of the press, I early experienced the joy of the bowman and subsequently the discomfort of the target.

As a former working newspaperman and as "a working Senator"—a phrase which received some circulation last fall—I am a member of a Washington club whose size indicates the power of the press in Congress. It is the Three and a Half Club, and some 40 Senators and Representatives are members. All of us have left the fourth estate and moved to the third estate, hence the name "Three and a Half."

With these credentials I feel I can speak frankly about at least one problem of mutual concern to the press and the public official.

While the press may be divided politically and a dozen different editorial positions could be mustered easily on any current issue, there is one subject on which the press is unanimously agreed: that is, opposition to Government secrecy—the kind of secrecy that shields from public view what the public legitimately and properly has a right to know. If I understand the position of the press, you do not want entry to what is rightly kept under cover to protect national security. But you do want access—without protracted delay and bureaucratic entanglement—to the kind of information essential to performing your responsibility fully and intelligently.

When I became Secretary of Agriculture 20 years ago, the United States was suffering its first real problems of food shortage at home. Abroad, we were faced with the task of feeding the largest share of the hundreds of millions of hungry and starving people. To do that, we took heavy supplies of food from this country. It caused some protests and outcries. So, in my first major public speech as Secretary, I discussed this massive problem and added these words: "I think it no part of the duty of a public servant to protect the people from the truth."

That is a fundamental principle of my political life, and I have used these words over and over. The Government may not always be able to tell the whole truth, but it should tell nothing but the truth.

Early in 1962, the New York Times asked me to do for its Sunday magazine, an article on secrecy. I wrote:

"While the handful of leaders who must determine the Nation's course and their advisers are men of good faith and ability, the critical questions of war and peace cannot be left to the experts, free of scrutiny by citizens and Congress. The citizen cannot abdicate his responsibility."

And I would add that the Government likewise cannot shirk its responsibility to keep the citizenry informed.

By opening up the channels of information, I do not mean the deliberate leak of information to a favorite reporter or a "trained journalistic seal" whose built-in bias makes him all but a spokesman for a particular agency or special interest. Slivers of slanted information are no substitute for frankness. The press should not lend itself to this practice, but I can understand an editor's problem when the leak from "a highly informed source" comes across his desk as copy. The editor in Washington, or elsewhere, where the "leak" may have originated, might ask his reporter for more substantiation. But those of you who depend so heavily on the wire services have to assume that the story coming over the teleprinter has substance.

Atomic energy development is one major area of Government activity which immediately conjures up in the public mind an aura of secrecy. Indeed, there is much that remains highly classified about our nuclear weapons program—and no reasonable person quarrels with that. But there are areas involving nuclear policy which should be out in the open. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and as its chairman for two terms, I battled against the AEC when it needlessly stamped information "secret" or "restricted."

We worked diligently on the Joint Committee to give to the people knowledge and understanding of radioactive fallout. The public clearly and positively had a right to know about the possibility of health and genetic effects of fallout. We successfully developed a public record on this subject, which is of tremendous and universal importance.

The persistency with which the Joint Committee contested unjustifiable classification produced positive results and a more open policy on information. I will return to that subject a little later.

The Joint Committee's interest, of course, was limited to atomic energy. But Congress has had an interest in Government policies on information for many years. Recommendations by the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization generated the introduction in Congress of freedom of information legislation, starting in the early fifties.

Among the principal champions of liberalizing Government information policies was the late Senator Thomas Hennings, of Missouri. His successor, Senator Ed Long, took up the challenge. Senator Long, in introducing his bill, recalled the words of James Madison, chairman of the committee which drafted the first amendment providing for freedom of the press. Madison said:

"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prolog to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both."

Although the principle laid down by Madison has been endorsed by public men since the birth of the Nation, a policy of disclosure is nowhere stated in law. The provision on public information of the Administrative Procedure Act has been interpreted by officials as a reason to withhold information rather than to give the public access to it.

Many witnesses before Senator Long's subcommittee testified that such phrases in the Administrative Procedure Act as "requiring secrecy in the public interest," "required for good cause to be held confidential," and "properly and directly concerned" actually became more useful as guidelines for wrongfully barring the public than for letting the people know.

The Long bill seeks to do away with vague phrases in order to set forth a clear philosophy of Government information, and to provide a court procedure by which the public and the press may obtain information which properly should be available to them. There is no remedy under existing law—and there should be—for the citizen seeking information if it is denied.

This is what the Long bill would do:

1. It sets up workable standards for what records should and should not be open to public inspection. In particular, it avoids the use of such vague phrases as "good cause found" and replaces them with specific and limited types of information that may be withheld.

2. It eliminates the test of who shall have the right to different information. For the great majority of different records, the public as a whole has a right to know what its Government is doing. There is, of course, a certain right to privacy and a need for confidentiality in some aspects of Government operations and these are protected as specifically as possible; but outside these limited areas, all citizens have a right to know.

3. It gives to any aggrieved citizen a remedy in court.

After a long history marked by continued support from the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the American Newspaper Publishers Association, Sigma Delta Chi, and other intimately involved organizations—and many members of the working press—the Long bill passed the Senate last July. It went over to the House of Representatives for committee action. But the session ended without hearings on the House side. Thus, the battle is on but the campaign is a long way from over. Although aided by the fact that the Senate has once passed the measure, it will have to again thread its way through the legislative process.

This attitude of concern about information policies is remarkable contrast from that which prevailed in another age.

The New York Tribune reporters once were barred from the Press Gallery of the House of Representatives because of a story in which one of them described the gustatory habits of an Ohio Congressman. The Congressman, it seemed, carried his bologna and crackers to the floor and lunched behind the Speaker's desk. The reporter went on to say that the Congressman wiped his hands on his bald head and picked his teeth with his jackknife.

I keep a box of licorice candy in my Senate desk, and a few months ago the United Press International carried a story about Senators who were raiding my private stock. I am not going to reveal the "reliable source" who leaked this story to the press. But we did not try to remove the United Press International reporter from the gallery. We offered him some licorice. And he took it.

Enactment of a Federal freedom of information statute would be a concrete manifestation of congressional adherence to the principle rooted in the first amendment.

Perhaps of even more fundamental importance than the proposed information statute was the decision last March of the U.S. Supreme Court in the New York Times case. The case grew out of a libel suit filed against the Times by a public official in Alabama who charged that an ad in the newspaper had libeled him. The ad, as you may recall, was a civil rights protest. The Alabama trial court awarded the official $500,000 damages; the Supreme Court overturned that decision and the press hailed the High Court action as a great landmark decision.

Writing for the majority, Justice Burton declared: "We consider this case against the background of a profound national commitment to the principle that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust and wide open, and that it may well include vehement, caustic, and sometimes unpleasantly sharp attacks on government and public officials."

The Justice continued that a public official is prohibited by the court's interpretation of the Constitution "from recovering damages for a defamatory falsehood relating to his official conduct unles he proves that the statement was made with actual malice—that is, with knowledge that it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false or not."

The Supreme Court did not find that condition to exist in the instance of the ad in the New York Times, and thus extended to the farthest latitude ever the classic American right of the governed to criticize those who govern.

This nullified the requirement in many States that the defendant in such cases must prove the truth of his statements; if he cannot, malice is presumed. Such requirement, said the Court, may act as a brake on would-be critics because of doubt that they could prove in court the truth of their statements or fear of the potential cost of such proof.

Justices Black, Douglas, and Goldberg would have gone even further than their brothers, by holding that the immunity of the press in criticizing the way public officials do their duty is absolute—even if maliciously false, as I read the opinion.

Consistent with his undiluted defense of press freedom, Thomas Jefferson—victim of unparalleled vituperation from the press—declared toward the end of his second term: "I have lent myself willingly as the subject of a great experiment, which was to prove that an administration conducting itself with integrity and common understanding cannot be battered down even by the falsehoods of a licentious press, and consequently still less by the press as restrained within the legal and wholesome limits of truth."

Having held relatively responsible public offices for some three decades, I bear my share of wounds inflicted by the pens of the press. Some were superficial and of no concern; some were deeper. But none was fatal—and all have healed. Still, I am in accord with Jefferson's liberal and sympathetic view that the press should be untrammeled, despite the sometimes unpleasant consequences of that freedom.

The American press enjoys a unique status in our society, protected by a tradition of freedom that predates the birth of the Republic. This freedom is sanctioned by the Constitution and defined by an impressive body of judicial decisions.

The press performs the absolutely essential role of being a well of information. But what end is served if the well is poisoned? Freedom carries with it the burden of responsibility. A free press must be a responsible press. In the heat of an election campaign, the press should be extremely careful about the political advertising it accepts and the level of its political reporting and commentary. For the most part, New Mexico's newspapers maintained a high level of responsibility in these areas last fall. The few instances of failure to do so, I would hope, would never be repeated.

If the press is to exercise responsibility today it must shed from the lexicon of so many editorial pages the wornout words of the past. "Socialistic"—as applied to the Federal Government—is one.

Is the power industry "socialized" when 76 percent of the generating capacity and 79 percent of the customers are served by privately owned companies? Is a social security-based program of health insurance for the aged "socialized medicine" or, in truth, an essential partner to private health insurance plans? Is the administration overrun by creeping socialism spending us into ruin; or, in reality, is State and local government debt climbing—almost unnoticed—four times as fast as the Federal budget, 60 percent of which goes for national defense and space exploration?

Speaking at Yale in 1962, President Kennedy defined the erosive nature of such rusty slogans when he said: "For the great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie—deliberate, contrived, and dishonest—but the myth—persistent, persuasive, and unrealistic. Too often we hold fast to the cliches of our forebears. We subject all facts to a prefabricated set of interpretations. We enjoy the comfort of opinion without the discomfort of thought."

As a longtime member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and as one who for many years has been closely associated with top secret projects of our Government, I have found it necessary from time to time to be critical of our Government secrecy practices. While I have repeatedly pointed out that the condition of the world in which we find ourselves unquestionably justifies certain secrecy practices, I have found it necessary on several occasions during the past 5 or 6 years to criticize abuses of the secrecy system in atomic energy and other areas.

As early as 1959, for example, I was of the opinion—and other members of the Joint Committee agreed—that extreme classification was retarding scientific progress. We were also disturbed by the fact that the public was not being adequately informed as to the facts on fallout. The Joint Committee took the initiative and held public hearings on the nature of radioactive fallout and its effects on man. Some strange ideas were advanced, some wild ideas were aired, but on the whole, I believe the results were on the plus side.

Some of the present atomic energy security practices within the Defense Department are questionable, particularly in comparison with those of the Atomic Energy Commission. Shortly after World War II, when we had very, very few nuclear weapons, our nuclear stockpile figures constituted one of the most sensitive areas of information. Very few persons were permitted to have access to this information. Today, despite the fact that we have publicly acknowledged that we have tens of thousands of such weapons, the Defense Department security practices continue to classify not only stockpile but also fission material production among the most sensitive information in the Government. It is put in the same category as war plans and codes. On the other hand, within the Defense Department, design information of our current and future planned nuclear weapons is not considered as critical despite the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission, which has responsibility for designing and developing these weapons, considers it of the highest sensitivity.

Within the last year a former Army enlisted man was convicted of selling atomic bomb secrets to the Soviet Union. Under the Department of Defense security system this man, an electronics technician at nearby Fort Bliss, was permitted access to classified nuclear weapon design information without having been subject to a background investigation. The Subcommittee on Security of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am chairman, ascertained that the military was sending individuals through service schools to be taught the intricacies of our most modern weapons. These men had access to highly classified design information although they had been cleared only by a check of records in such agencies as the FBI and CIA. The results of this check many times did not come through until after the man had completed the course.

Although there has been some improvement in the Defense Department's security procedures applicable to the nuclear weapon design information, it is still not comparable to that of the high standards of the AEC which, by law, it should be. For a number of years I and other members of the Joint Committee have called attention to the anomaly within the Defense Department whereby our production and stockpile figures today still are considered in the highest category of sensitive information and our advanced weapons design information is not.

While I have been a strong advocate of protecting real secrets—information which if disclosed would adversely affect our national defense—I do not believe security classification should be used, to go back to my old speech, "to protect the people from the truth." Too often I have seen evidence that security classification is used as a cover to prevent embarrassing information coming to light. In the last 2 years, for example, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, under the capable chairmanship of Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, made a very thorough and detailed investigation on the loss of the submarine U.S.S. *Thresher*. On January 10, 1965, the committee made public the unclassified portions of its hearings and investigation covering the year 1963–64. Every effort was made by us to assure that no real classified information would be released.

Staff members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy attended all the meetings of the Court of Inquiry at which secret testimony on the loss of the *Thresher* was taken behind closed doors. At the conclusion of the court of inquiry the 12-volume record of the court—one of the most extensive such inquiries in naval history—was made available to the Joint Committee. The committee then held detailed hearings in executive session at which the Secretary of the Navy and other top officials of the Navy Department testified. During the year and a half that the Joint Committee studied and investigated this unfortunate tragedy there was no leak of classified information from the Joint Committee. However, as Senator PASTORE stated in his foreword to the committee report: "* * * it has been the long-established policy of the Joint Committee that it has a responsibility to make public as much information as possible consistent with the national defense security requirements of the United States."

Although the Department of the Navy finally did cooperate with the committee and reviewed the committee record to designate what portions of the record could be made public, there was some reluctance at first. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Security I had to write several strong letters to the Secretary of the Navy and threaten to initiate unilateral action by the committee before the Navy was willing to assist in identifying the real classified information. In several letters in 1963 and 1964, I pointed out, "* * * my conviction that security classification should not be used to protect the people from the truth or keep embarrassing information from the public."

The Navy did not immediately see its way clear to comply. On August 29, 1963, Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth, wrote to me, and I shall read one paragraph:

"In my opinion," said Secretary Korth, "it would be a poor time indeed, to release piecemeal the facts and assumption documented by your hearings. Such action could materially downgrade our offensive-defensive submarine weapons systems both in the public mind and in the minds of our officers and men that man them. This would certainly lead to many comments and speculations. Such public knowledge would undoubtedly aid our enemies in their intelligence assessments and possibly in their own undersea program."

I wrote to Paul Nitze, Mr. Korth's successor as Secretary of the Navy, on March 16, 1964: "In my view, the Navy's refusal to identify specific areas of the *Thresher* transcript which are classified is based, in part, on a desire to withhold information which rightly belongs in the public domain. There can be no satisfactory justification for this attitude."

Those are hard words but they brought forth a better response than the earlier, kinder requests.

One of the factors cited by the Navy in not wanting to publish nonclassified but embarrassing facts was the possible adverse effects it would have on the morale of the men in the Navy and the Navy's efforts to get qualified naval officers to volunteer for nuclear submarine duty. In my opinion this was nonsense. The true facts were known by naval personnel.

Congressman ANDERSON, duly elected Representative from Tennessee, is the former Navy captain who commanded the *Nautilus* on its trip under the ice to the North Pole. Just the other day, after the hearings on the *Thresher* were published by the Joint Committee, Representative ANDERSON said that difficulty with fittings and connections in piping—a possible reason for the tragedy of the *Thresher*—was a problem when he was on the *Nautilus* years ago; that the men in the nuclear Navy knew about the problem of piping. If the men knew, why not let the public know?

In my humble opinion it is a tribute to the courage and dedication to duty of our many young naval officers and enlisted men that despite the deficiencies known to them that they continued to volunteer for such duty. The reenlistment rate in the nuclear submarine program was greater than in any other area of the Navy.

If there had been a whitewash or if the Joint Committee had not shown sufficient interest, then possibly the morale of our submarine personnel might have been hurt.

That note of tribute to the morale of our Armed Forces seems like a good place to close.

David Rockefeller, head of the Chase Manhattan Bank, has been in Washington and there has been speculation that he may be under consideration for a Treasury appointment. So I give you a story on him for your morgue.

Last autumn he went on a seaside vacation with business friends. He paddled his small boat into a lagoon and there it overturned. Mr. Rockefeller was thrown free without a thing to support him, so he floated on his back awaiting help. The head of the host company raced to the shore and shouted, "Oh, Mr. Rockefeller, can you float alone?" "Surely," the banker replied, "but this is a hell of a time to talk business."

Government secrecy is a part of my business in space and atomic energy. This may be a poor time to talk about it, but I hope you may study the Long bill and the practices of our Government, and help me to swim for shore.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I may assure you and my other colleagues that you shall soon have an opportunity to pass upon freedom-of-information legislation. As you will recall, the Senate unanimously passed a very strong bill, S. 1666, last year. Unfortunately, the bill got caught up in the legislative crush in the House of Representatives at the end of the last session. Our delay in reintroducing the bill this year is due to efforts to assure that we get a bill which will not only receive the favorable attention of the Senate, but also of the House of Representatives. I am hopeful that such a bill will be ready for introduction in a few days and that it will have wide sponsorship in the Senate.

PROBLEMS THE FARMERS FACE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, in recent months, I have received a number of letters from constituents in Missouri, farmers of substance, who have diligently complied with available Federal programs and have followed the practices recommended by the Department of Agriculture, the local ASC offices, and the University of Missouri Extension Service, but who still find themselves in an economic pinch. One of these letters, received from a lady in northeastern Missouri, impressed me as making a particularly impressive presentation of the problems facing farmers in the Midwest and throughout the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that portions of the letter from Mrs. Lewis DeHart, of Mexico, Audrain County, Mo., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LONG: There has been published recently in our county a summary of farm records from a group of farmers who live in Audrain County. This analysis was done by the University of Missouri through their tax planning and guide service and is based on the 1963 calendar year. We feel that you will be interested in the facts revealed.

This summary shows up very vividly what a number of people know is happening and has been happening to the farmer's economic condition.

The average farm and family earnings was $6,147. This figure includes $478 for the value of home-produced food. The average capital managed on these farms was $161,000. The analysis showed an average percent of return for this capital to be a minus 0.3 percent. The $6,147 farm and family earnings was all that was received as a return for capital and the farm family's labor. The most simple arithmetic would show us that this capital would have produced a greater return just invested in Government bonds. Hired labor, of which there was some, was deducted as expense, of course, but the average man-years of labor per farm was 1.6 man-years. This includes time involved with both management and labor. In every operation whose records were analyzed there was a negative return for labor.

In this analysis, the average size of the farm was 500 acres. The operations or production units are typical of Audrain County including beef cattle, hogs, and grain. Our land is good Midwest land, and probably better than average.

It is the general opinion that the farmers whose records were analyzed were above average in quality and experience and followed management practices of the best known. Our own university's best recommended practices have been put to use on these farms so the cause could not be accepted as poor management in these cases.

The point we would like to make is that this economic actuality exists and it is unhealthy for the Nation as well as the farmers as a group. The situation is common over all of Missouri, we are told, and with wheat being marketed at 55 to 60 cents per bushel less than in 1963 and cattle and hog prices down, any analysis of the 1964 records will likely show a worsening of those shown for 1963.

The Department of Agriculture, in our thinking, is in great need of attention. We hope you can get this point to our great President, Mr. Johnson, before it is too late. Or perhaps you could at least contact his advisers. The Agriculture Department's conservation programs are of the finest, and we as a nation, as well as the farmers, have and will reap untold benefits from this phase of its activities. But its commodity management and marketing programs have resulted in the farmer hanging on such a very narrow margin of profit possibilities that if it were a thread, we would say it is already broken.

Something must happen, and soon, to strengthen the price the farmer receives for his products at the marketplace. He has paid the increases as they have occurred on all items he purchases, yet is receiving lower prices for what he sells than he was 20 years ago. He is marketing a better quality product than at anytime in American history.

We realize the stock and trite answer that supply and demand is the answer. We are of the very firm opinion that the law of supply and demand has not worked and will not work for agriculture unless its academic meaning is reversed—that is, the farmer supply his product and demand a price. If he doesn't totally lose his self respect first, he just might do this.

We cannot study too far into many industries and find that the simple law of supply and demand has been totally responsible for their success and economic stability. There have been Government contracts, defense contracts, and many things too numerous to mention to bolster industries. It has all been good, and we favor continuing, but in the history of our lifetime we have seen nothing except World War II, that succeeded in adequately bolstering the net income of farmers. We cannot stomach the thought of this type of bolstering, and only mention it because it happened.

The present net income level of farmers certainly does not leave anything to spend for advertising to increase the demand for his product, but it, no doubt, would appear to be a solution. However, under present prices received on marketed products only the advertising agencies and the processors would benefit.

By way of summing up, we should like to ask that you give some thought to this concrete published report, and try to direct any work that may be done in reaching a solution toward increasing the price paid farmers for his product at the marketplace. Also try to get people of responsible abilities in positions where reports of food in storage and food needed are published. The published reports sometimes lead many people to feel that we actually have a great surplus and this unquestionably is not the case.

Processors would not suffer and any justifiable increase in the price of food in the grocery store would have to be fractional.

If any further details of this particular record study would be of value to you, please let us know and we shall try to get them for you. We repeatedly hear the same story from those who analyze their own records.

Very respectfully yours,

MRS. LEWIS DEHART.

ANTITRUST POLICY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has been conducting some hearings on economic concentration. They are long and involved, and from all that appears, they will be much longer and more involved before they are completed. Indeed, as we wend our way down the labyrinthian paths of the statistical testimony repleat with lengthy fine print footnotes covering assumptions, additions, exclusions, modifications, refinements, and the all-too-important reservations and interpretations our need for some clear guideposts becomes increasingly apparent. And so it was with considerable pleasure and gratitude that I noted the remarks of the senior Senator from Nebraska to the antitrust law section of the New York State Bar Association on January 27, 1965. He has had a laboring oar in the work of this subcommittee and he has with diligence extracted from the welter of statistics the essential facts and set them out in his address as guideposts for all the world to see. I commend to all those who wish to be guided out of the labyrinth this fine address, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FORECAST OF ANTITRUST POLICY REGARDING ECONOMIC CONCENTRATION

(Extracts from the remarks of Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska, to the New York State Bar Association, antitrust law section, January 27, 1965)

The hearings on economic concentration, which we are told will last for at least 2 years, are now in progress. Following the investigation of the general subject of concentration, the plan is to direct our attention to specific industries.

When this is done and we are more fully informed on this subject, the subcommittee will be in a better position to take any necessary legislative action.

That, in a general way, would describe the long-range program. It is certainly the main purpose of our present activity.

A number of persons having a deep interest in these hearings would like to have legislative changes made—changes which would have far-reaching effects. We know this to be so from bills introduced by Members of Congress, books written on the subject, political speeches which have been made, papers like those delivered tonight, and testimony given in hearings.

Let us be realistic. The mere holding of these hearings will stimulate efforts toward further Government action in the field of business management. Our economic structure will be described in them as being concentrated in the hands of a diminishing number of powerful corporations.

Every statistical device available in this highly technical field will be employed to convince the public that economic concentration is not only present, but growing at such a rate and to such an extent as to constitute a national menace.

Testimony has already been heard—with more certain to follow—that size, profits, sales, growth—in fact what we ordinarily call success—are to be equated with monopoly, ruthless dealings with competitors and exploitation of consumers.

For witnesses with such views, the solution is obvious. They call for an even larger scope and degree of governmental control over business than that which currently exists. We know it is already quite substantial.

With such a frame of mind it is easy to cast suspicion on our economic system. It takes no great skill to create an atmosphere of doubt and distrust about its basic operation. It is easy to weaken the public confidence in the soundness of the private enterprise system.

It is easy, but it is not necessarily in the public interest.

We who oppose such a course are not committed to the philosophy of Adam Smith or blind followers of laissez faire. True, this is the usual charge. But that charge just won't stick.

The simple fact is that those who question an increasing governmental role in business are keenly aware of the necessity for laws governing business action and conduct. We recognize as clearly as anyone the need, not only for proper laws, but for their vigorous enforcement.

We must have standards of fair conduct and proper marketing of merchandise. There must be rules insuring equitable treatment of competitors and consumers. Statutes providing these requirements are neither lacking nor inadequate. Of course, from time to time they also need amendment, revision and reconsideration.

But I must strongly suggest that these laws should not be replaced by a new order which thrusts Federal authority, not to mention Federal agents, directly into the board of directors' room, the manager's office or the routine operation of the plant.

Of great pertinence and interest on this point is the announcement earlier this month by U.S.S.R. authorities that they had approved for their economy a switch from rigid, centralized Marxist planning to Western-style profit guidelines for factories. This Liberman system by which factories would produce only what retail stores could sell, first came into being about 2 years ago. Khrushchev within the past year had given effect to this profit and free market system on a trial basis in 1964. Vast improvement resulted. When Khrushchev disappeared from the political scene there was speculation as to whether his favoring Libermanism was at least partly to blame because it was capitalistic and collided with orthodox Marxism. On the contrary, the new Soviet leadership moved quickly to make the Liberman system an extensive element of its domestic policy.

Thus we witness transformation of a government central planning system into the direction of the free market system. Retail managers, rather than the government planning bureau are authorized to place orders directly to factories. Factory managers get authority to set production based on retail store orders and to determine the size and wages of the work force needed to fill them at a profit.

The new system is being applied to 400 consumer goods factories; some 76 textile mills; 20 leather factories, some heavy industries, including a coal mine. This conversion to the new form of planning was hailed as profitable for industry and the population.

Citation of this instance is made for the sole purpose of demonstrating that the trend in Russia is now in favor of our direction, the direction of the free marketplace, and the direction of compliance with the laws of economics rather than government control in order that better progress can be made.

As our hearings have barely started, it is far too early to state any final propositions. There has already developed enough of a pattern to serve as a basis for some forecasts. It is with a little hesitation that I venture into this field and I advise you that it is done only upon your express invitation.

STATISTICIANS' FIELD DAY

Investigating an abstract concept like economic concentration entails a real danger that we will simply be lost in a field of artificial mathematical constructions. It is all too easy to lose touch with the real things in our world. Such inquiries tend toward a meaningless numbers game. We can expect from the more partisan participants greater emphasis on sensationalism than on fact.

An example will make the point, taken from our hearings so far on overall concentration. Several statisticians have already appeared, each with his own set of figures, some of which are in violent disagreement with those presented by others. To no one's surprise, the figures used by each reflected his own philosophical views.

In 1962, the subcommittee published computations prepared by the Census Bureau showing that in 1954, and again in 1958, the 100 greatest manufacturing corporations accounted for 30 percent of all manufacturing, measured in terms of what the Census Bureau calls value added by manufacture. The figure, again, was 30 percent.

Our first witness, however, presented the spectacular figure of 58 percent for the year 1962. Using a table entitled "One-hundred Largest Manufacturing Companies by Asset Size, 1962," the witness prepared and submitted a chart entitled "Increase in Manufacturing Concentration, Measured by Assets, 1929–62."

The chart purported to show that the 100 largest corporations had 40 percent of the total assets of all manufacturing corporations in 1929—and 49 percent in 1962. By calculating in terms of "net capital assets," he was able to develop the figures of 44 percent for 1929 and 58 percent for 1962.

Of course, at the end of his table there appeared some 16 lengthy, fine-print footnotes covering assumptions, additions, exclusions, modifications, refinements, reservations and more than a few interpretations. Nowhere was there any effort made to relate assets to the term "value added by manufacture." He started out with apples and gave the result in oranges.

This offered no deterent, however. The witness succeeded in reporting a 58 percent "concentration." He then observed: "These estimates * * * suggest that there has been a very considerable increase in concentration in manufacturing as a whole in the last 33 years."

A more accurate observation would have been that the assets of manufacturing concerns have increased substantially over what they were 33 years ago. The necessity to use inferences and estimates would have been obviated by simply employing the method used by the Bureau of Census; namely, "value added by manufacture."

For the purposes of making his case this much can be said: the witness was able to cite a figure of 58 percent for concentration instead of a much more prosaic one.

Another witness did even better. He used an admittedly new basis for showing concentration. He took net profits of the 100 largest corporations and came up with a higher figure for concentration than he was able to compute on an assets base.

On the other hand, a third witness reached a result opposite from the previous two. Using Internal Revenue Service statistics in corporate returns for total assets covering the period of 1931 through 1960, he testified:

"One result can under no circumstances be gotten out of these data, and that is the notion of any long term increase in overall concentration. * * * I do not see any possible escape from the conclusion that overall concentration in the largest manufacturing firms has remained quite stable over a period of 30 years from 1931 to 1960."

Which of the two opposing conclusions will prevail, on the one hand, a spectacular increase or, on the other, a stability over that three-decade period, remains to be seen.

Overall concentration, however, is of small moment and of little relation to the subject at hand, because it has nothing at all to do with competition within a particular industry, or the market behavior for a particular product.

For purposes of antitrust analysis, we should be concerned with particular markets and particular products. Thus, measures of industry concentration are relevant, but computations of overall concentration are misleading.

WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF CONCENTRATION IN AN INDUSTRY AND THE DEGREE OF COMPETITION IN THE MARKET?

Before entering into a discussion of the trends in industry concentration, a caveat is in order. There has never been shown to be any direct relationship between a high level of concentration and a lack of competition. There seems to be a widely held notion that there is such a relationship, or ought to be one, but this only acknowledges how firmly rooted is our conventional wisdom. Each time an effort is made to substantiate the claim, so many exceptions must be built in that it is hardly worth using even as a preliminary assumption.

The notion that high concentration automatically means the destruction of competition seems to be the unspoken assumption behind these hearings. It has been popular for some time. Half a century ago, my fellow Nebraskan, William Jennings Bryan argued that when a single corporation commanded over 50 percent of the market for the products of an industry, that constituted excessive concentration and could destroy competition. Significantly, he referred to the percentage controlled by a single giant firm, not by a big three, four, or five.

Some of the recent critics of American industry have proposed more stringent mathematical formulas. A recent book, "Antitrust Policy," by Kaysen and Turner, suggests, for example, that when eight firms account for more than one-third of an industry, that represents excessive concentration. By such reasoning, steps should be taken to break down that concentration, regardless of whether any objectionable conduct has occurred. In other words, the mathematical formula would govern, and not the activities of the firms in question.

A few years ago, in the 87th Congress, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Congressman CELLER, introduced two bills which embodied that principle, except that his percentages were not so strict.

One of these bills included a definition of "dominant economic power." Dominant economic power was presumed to exist if four or fewer companies accounted for 50 percent or more of total assets or capacity, or gross sales in any single fiscal or calendar year. When such dominant economic power occurred in any line of commerce, a basis was thereby laid for action looking toward divestiture or dissolution provided certain other elements were found to exist.

When proposals like these are made, my mind turns to some of the infinite variety of situations that have occurred in the business history of our country. I wonder what damage might have been done to America's extraordinary industrial growth during our own lifetimes had any such rigid mathematical molds been imposed.

Let me give you one example: In 1921 one automobile company sold 62 percent of all the cars purchased in this country. That was an extremely high concentration ratio—62 percent of the market controlled by a single company. Incidentally, the same company continued to supply over 50 percent of the market for a number of years in succession.

If the mathematical formulas against excessive concentration had been applied, that firm would have been subjected to dissolution or divestiture. What an extraordinary policy. The organizing genius of Henry Ford gave this country a whole new vision of the possibilities of mass production through the use of the assembly line and similar methods. Then, as it turned out, in due course the consumer was attracted to other products and Ford lost its leadership in this industry.

So, let us beware of the idea that a high concentration ratio necessarily tells us anything directly about the degree of competition. At best, this relationship is generally very vague. The statistics themselves are imprecise and at times quite misleading.

THE DIRECTION OF INDUSTRY CONCENTRATION

Notwithstanding the popular notion, there is persuasive evidence to show that industry concentration has not been increasing. If anything, there may have been on the average a gradual tendency for it to decline.

It should be reemphasized that this is a very difficult subject about which to make categorical statements. There are a great many different manufacturing industries, over 400 by the Government system of classification. In some of these, the level of concentration has increased, while in others it has declined. In saying that the trend of concentration, on the average, is downward, what is meant is that it is decreasing in more industries than the number of those in which it is increasing. This is true particularly in the larger and the more highly concentrated industries.

That is rather startling in view of the widespread notion that markets are falling more and more into the hands of a few large firms.

Yet expert after expert has testified that the trend, if anything, was downward. For example, Dr. Lee Preston, of the University of California at Berkeley, who has just completed an elaborate study of the changing size structure of the largest American firms, acknowledged that a majority of the more highly concentrated industries were experiencing declines in concentration.

Dr. M. A. Adelman, of MIT, who may be the outstanding authority in the country on this subject and who has served as consultant to the Census Bureau, presented data which pointed generally in the same direction. Dr. J. Fred Weston, professor of business economics at UCLA, pointed out how the degree of concentration had greatly declined in a number of the industries which formerly were quite concentrated. As a matter of fact, not a single witness claimed that the trend of industry concentration was upward.

I cannot refrain from quoting on this point the rather wry words of Dr. Adelman, to whom I referred a moment ago:

"I know that it is the official truth, particularly in the Supreme Court today, that concentration was increasing before World War II, during World War II, and after World War II, right down at least to the passage of the amending Clayton Act in 1950. They can now either take it from Mueller, who thinks concentration was actually decreasing from about 1935 to about 1950, or from me, who would say merely that it was at least not increasing. Either way, it is worth reflecting on a law professor's opinion that while Congress may have been all wrong in thinking in 1950 that concentration was increasing, still we cannot set this opinion aside merely because some statisticians have shown it to be false."

FREE MARKET FORCES TEND TO ERODE AWAY HIGH DEGREES OF CONCENTRATION

If industry concentration is not increasing, what does this mean?

This leads me into my next proposition. There are, within the American system of free competition, market forces of unsuspected power which tend to erode away the positions of the leading firms in an industry.

This is an interesting insight. It is not what we have been led to expect by critics of the American system. These critics have told us that, when there is a high ratio of concentration, almost total powers center in the leading firms. Such firms, whether efficient or not, wield enormous power over the market and enjoy an almost unlimited variety of potential competitive advantages, which their smaller rivals could not match. We heard this again and again.

If this were true, it would be expected that the leading firms in an industry would be able to maintain and improve their positions. The large companies would grow larger, both relatively and absolutely. They would necessarily squeeze out the smaller ones. An industry which once fell under concentrated control would necessarily remain so.

Under such circumstances, it is hard to see how the concentration of power in a highly concentrated industry could ever be broken up, except by Government action. That is the picture that has been painted by those who profess to see the danger from undue concentration of American industry.

Now we discover that these centers of concentration in many cases tend to break themselves up, primarily from the action of free market forces.

It may be worth while to mention some examples.

According to computations made by the Census Bureau, the four largest companies in the meat packing industry accounted for 41 percent of the activity in this industry in 1947, but by 1958 the share of the Big Four had dropped to 34 percent. In the petroleum refining industry the four largest companies accounted for 37 percent of shipments in 1947, but only 32 percent in 1958.

In the manufacture of aircraft engines, the four largest shipped 72 percent of the total output of the industry in 1947, but by 1958 could hold only 56 percent of the total market.

In the cigarette industry the four largest controlled 90 percent of the market in 1947, but only 79 percent in 1958.

Evidently there were powerful forces at work to reduce the extent of concentration in many industries.

This trend was particularly noticeable for those industries in which a high percentage of concentration had been observed in the past. A special analysis was made of those particular industries which appeared to have been most highly concentrated in 1947. In a majority of those cases, it was found that the concentration ratio—that is, the percentage or ratio controlled by the four largest firms—had declined by 1958, and in many cases had declined quite sharply.

For the shortening and cooking oil industry, it declined from 59 to 49 percent; for tobacco stemming and redrying, from 88 to 73; for synthetic rubber, from 80 to 60; for rubber footwear, from 81 to 65; for electrometallurgical products, from 88 to 73; for copper rolling and drawing, from 60 to 48; for aluminum rolling and drawing, from 94 to 78; for electronic tubes, from 73 to 53.

It is true that the trend was upward in some industries, but not many. On the whole, the downward trend was quite distinct.

IN MOST CASES THE BIG FOUR CANNOT EVEN MAINTAIN THEIR POSITION OF LEADERSHIP

In many cases, in fact—the Big Four in an industry is just as powerful as it ever was, according to the statistics—but it is a different Big Four in most cases.

What is the significance of that? Let me return to something I said a moment ago. Considering the supposedly vast powers of the leading firms in the various industries, it might have been thought that these leaders would use their powers at least to maintain their positions of dominance. In other words, it might have been expected that the four largest companies in an industry would still be leading the pack a few years later.

The facts are exactly the reverse. Moreover in 80 percent of the industries tabulated by the Census Bureau for the subcommittee, there was at least one change among the top four companies during the short span between 1947 and 1958. This is impressive evidence of the strength of the competitive forces in American industry during this postwar period.

MERGERS ARE NOT A MAJOR FACTOR

One final proposition. In 1950, as you know, Congress passed an antimerger statute. At that time and since, we have needed, but not had, full data on the importance of mergers as a part of the process of industrial growth and change.

From the amount of attention that has been paid to mergers as a part of our public policy, one would have supposed that they were of central importance in the economic growth process. However, during the hearings we learned that between 1950 and 1962, which is thought of as a period of high merger activity, mergers accounted directly for only 15.7 precent of the growth of the 200 largest corporations. Evidently 84 percent of the growth of these largest corporations came from internal factors.

SUMMARY

What have the hearings developed thus far? Unquestionably, the last word is not yet in, but the information received to date permits us to develop some points of interest. First, is this central fact that industry concentration has not been increasing, but has been declining. This may jar popular notions and disrupt accepted dogmas about the tremendous market power that can be wielded by well-entrenched corporations at the top.

Competitive forces in our system have a tremendous vitality. Under the impact of these competitive forces, the high concentration ratios in certain industries have sharply declined. Corporations thought to hold unassailable positions of leadership in their industries have lost ground to newcomers. Concentrated power supposedly held by a small group of three or four companies has been broken up. All this has happened through the interaction of competitive market forces.

If this conclusion is supported by the further information that the subcommittee develops, it suggests a number of ideas which I shall not attempt to elaborate at this time. I leave the subject with these questions: if the concentrated power of well-entrenched firms is dissipated by market forces, why do we focus so much of our antitrust enforcement activity against it? Is it really a danger after all? Or might we not be wiser to emphasize the traditional test of antitrust violation, that is, conduct, rather than market structure?

One last word. Let me say that I believe in the American economic system. While it is operated by mortals and therefore is imperfect, I have more confidence in the unpersonal, nonpolitical, diffused judgment of the American market mechanism than I do in an economy controlled from Washington.

WHITE CITY, OREG., VA DOMICILIARY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration domiciliary at White City, Oreg., unlike some other VA facilities which have been ordered closed at the end of the fiscal year, was specifically authorized by Congress. Public Law 80-577 directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs "to operate and maintain a facility for domiciliary care for veterans" at Camp White, Medford, Oreg.

With the specific congressional authorization and direction, which was signed into law June 3, 1948, by President Truman, does the Veterans' Administration have the authority to close the White City domiciliary?

This idea was presented in an editorial, written by Eric Allen, which was published in the Medford Mail Tribune. I ask that this editorial, entitled "Still Hope for Domiciliary," be printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of Jan. 25, 1965]

STILL HOPE FOR DOMICILIARY

Some real muscle is developing in the effort to prevent the closure of Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries throughout the Nation. Such powerful Senators as MIKE MANSFIELD, Democratic majority leader, and EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican minority leader, have both spoken out strongly against it.

So have other Senators from States which would be affected, as well as others who view the move as false economy and an undue hardship on veterans needing care.

The VA has thus far stuck to its guns, but there is some hope that it can be persuaded—or forced—to rescind the action.

In the case of White City, there is an additional weapon.

It will be recalled that White City (then Camp White) was a wartime training center. When it was torn down, the brick hospital structure was left standing, and a campaign was begun to find a use for it.

After a long struggle, Congress passed Public Law 80-577 on June 3, 1948. Part of it said the VA was: "* * * authorized and directed to acquire from the War Assets Administration the tract of land with improvements thereon formerly used for hospital purposes at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., and known as Camp White Hospital, and to operate and maintain thereon a facility for domiciliary care for veterans."

That directive has never been rescinded nor modified, and the law is still in effect, according to authoritative opinion.

A later codification of veterans laws permitted the VA to "consolidate, eliminate, or redistribute the functions" under its control, "except to the extent inconsistent with law."

Thus it would appear that the closure order, as it pertains to White City, is in conflict with Public Law 80-577, and that the VA is legally powerless to follow through with the order unless it receives congressional approval to do so.

If this interpretation is correct (and it is believed to be by Harris Ellsworth, of Roseburg, Congressman from this district when the law was passed), the VA will have to reconsider its action.

The Veterans' Administration did not want Camp White, and established it only at the specific direction of Congress. It is logical to assume that it would have closed it long ago if it felt empowered to do so. Now, under the guise of "unsuitability and economy," and because it is "outmoded," it is attempting to violate that directive.

As pointed out earlier, White City operates at considerably less cost per patient than most VA hospitals. Rather than closing it, many people believe it would be good economy to expand it to care for those veterans who are on the waiting list, or those who could be transferred here for convalescence from VA hospitals.

The effort to keep White City in operation may not succeed, but it is far from a lost cause.

E.A.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am concerned with human needs and values; so I am pleased that the appropriate congressional committees are carefully looking into the proposed closure of White City Domiciliary and the other proposed closures. The Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee has had a number of days of hearings; but there has not yet been presented any evidence that there will be a financial saving by means of the closure of the White City Domiciliary. These veterans must be cared for; and the cost of domiciliary care at far-distant points is comparable to that at White City. The domiciliary, with an authorized 1,025 beds, is operating at almost full capacity; and the VA has not encountered staffing problems. The brick buildings at the domiciliary have a continued useful life. It would cost thousands of dollars to move these veterans to domiciliaries at far-distant points.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the strong resolution dealing with the proposed closure. On January 22 it was adopted unanimously by the Jackson County court.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION, COUNTY COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON FOR JACKSON COUNTY

The public announcement by the Veterans' Administration, that the veterans' domiciliary center at Camp White is to be closed and phased out within a 6-month period, is of deep concern to the people of Jackson County; and

Whereas the Jackson County court desires to express the court's unanimous decision in objection to this decision by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas it is the court's understanding that the Camp White domiciliary center was established by congressional act; and

Whereas the Camp White domiciliary center is now serving the veterans' needs in the Pacific Northwest, and is the only such center in the State of Oregon; and

Whereas this domiciliary center, by utilizing the surplus facilities remaining after the military no longer required them, is now serving a much needed purpose; and

Whereas the needs, health, and welfare of our veterans are of prime importance. With a waiting list now on file for admittance to the domiciliary, greater needs can be anticipated for the future; and

Whereas it appears to the county court than no economy can be effected by this closure if the transfer of both resident veterans and employees to other locations, as has been stated, is followed; and

Whereas Jackson County has had, and desires to have in the future, the cooperative understanding and use of facilities at the Camp White domiciliary center for civil defense hospital emergency needs;

Now, therefore, the Jackson County court desires, by this resolution, to express objection to the closing of the Camp White domiciliary center, and requests a thorough intervention by Oregon's congressional Representatives and Senators by a formal hearing before the proper Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Dated this 22d day of January 1965.

EARL M. MILLER,
County Judge.
DONALD E. FABER,
County Commissioner.
RODNEY SEATING,
County Commissioner.

GREAT SOCIETY—NOT FOR VETERANS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, our concern for the closing of veterans' facilities has been put forward in the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee and in the Senate. Concern for these closings is even more in evidence in the areas affected, such as Nebraska.

On January 22 of this year, John A. Jenkins, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, delivered an address at a Department of Nebraska VFW meeting at Fremont, Nebr., which is in the area affected by the Lincoln closing.

While Mr. Jenkins pointed to some of the specific facts relating to the Lincoln hospital, he also provided an illuminating discussion of the course being followed by the Veterans' Administration. He very forcefully put the responsibility for this action on the Bureau of the Budget, where it rightfully belongs.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the President's Great Society is not for veterans.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Jenkins' remarks be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT SOCIETY IS NOT FOR VETERANS

(By John A. Jenkins, commander in chief, VFW of the United States)

I want to discuss the most recent vicious and wholly unwarranted attack on veterans in the never-ending effort of the social planners and the Budget Bureau dreamers to dismember the Veterans' Administration and eliminate all veterans benefits, especially hospital treatment, except for some consideration for service-connected disabilities. The announcement of the proposed closing of 17 VA regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliary facilities, will, if effected, be a victory for those who contend that veterans should receive no consideration based on service to our country in times of national peril.

The necessity of occasional limited changes in the field structure of the VA is recognized. In my opinion, however, the announced closings were neither motivated or justified by the reasons given by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

It is obvious that Bureau of the Budget officials and some VA officials are convinced that the types of services rendered to veterans and their dependents by regional offices can be accomplished equally well by correspondence. This is a calloused attitude doubtless born of the minds of bureaucrats who believe that form letters, computers, and other mechanical devices comprise all of the elements of efficient administration. This concept wholly disregards the human factors. You know, as I do, the importance of person-to-person contacts related to claims for VA administered benefits. Outstanding department service officers frequently advise veterans to personally appear before VA rating boards, or to meet with appropriate VA regional office officials, to state in their own words the reasons for their belief in the merits of their respective claims. Travel distances for these purposes are already far too great in many areas of the country and should not be increased by adding hundreds of miles by closing regional offices.

Since the 19th century, VA domiciliary facilities have provided very acceptable care for eligible veterans. The total capacity of the domiciliary system has been gradually reduced in recent years. Apparently the primary specific reason for the decision to close the four separate domiciliaries at Bath, N.Y.; Clinton, Iowa; White City, Oreg.; and Thomasville, Ga., is the fact that they are not adjacent to or associated with VA hospitals. The VA explanation stated that these separate domiciliary facilities "did not fit in the overall plan" which, interpreted, means simply that they are not operated in connection with VA hospitals. A VFW request for a copy of such plan caused quite a stir amongst the briefers. The fact is there is no such plan in written form and they had to admit it. It is nothing more than someone's personal professional whim. Some State veterans homes which do not have hospitals in the fullest sense provide not only home-type care similar to VA domiciliaries but provide excellent intensive nursing care despite the lack of complete hospital facilities. The same can be done by the VA in domiciliary facilities with modernization at some locations. Although the domiciliary members of the facilities proposed to be closed will be transferred, if they so desire, it is obvious that these closings will result in a permanent reduction of 3,000 domiciliary beds.

Most distressing is the decision to close 11 VA hospitals with operating beds totaling more than 2,900 and approximately 2,200 patients. VA briefers cited as reasons for selection of these facilities to be closed, the need for extensive modernization, staffing problems, excessive operating costs, and low or decreasing patient demand. With tongue in cheek they stated that the beds closed would be placed elsewhere in areas of greater need. The fact is that the VA does not have facilities ready at appropriate locations to absorb all of the beds to be closed. There will, therefore, be a reduction of approximately 1,000 and perhaps more in the number of operating beds next year. The gradual reduction of the total number of VA operating beds in recent years to approximately 118,000 makes a numerical joke out of the 125,000-bed limitation the VFW strongly supported.

The statement by the VA that because of medical advances more patients can be cared for in any given number of beds offers little solace in view of the estimate of the VA itself that nearly three times the number of beds now available will be necessary for care of veterans in VA facilities in 1986 if present rules of eligibility are maintained. Increased retirement benefits and other factors may reduce this demand moderately but certainly not to the extent of justifying any reduction in the present total number of VA hospital beds.

The VA spokesman cited substantial differences between the average daily patient load and the number of operating beds at facilities to be closed. The average daily patient load is nothing more than an arbitrary budget figure and in many instances does not reflect the true need in a particular area. Neither do VA hospital waiting lists. Officials of many VA hospitals are reluctant to maintain waiting lists. Unless an applicant can be admitted immediately, or within a very short time, they prefer to suggest that the veteran obtain care elsewhere rather than place him on a waiting list.

Patients from the areas served by the hospitals to be closed will hereafter be treated in distant hospitals. This will minimize visits of relatives and friends, and other community contacts, even though the VA has strongly emphasized the therapeutic value of visits to patients, especially by close relatives.

The fact that some of the facilities to be closed are not in very good physical condition should not be a compelling factor. The modernization program of approximately $100 million per year was designed for the very purpose of modernizing facilities or even complete replacement thereof where justification for continued operation exists. This has been done in the past and should be done in the reasonable future at some of the facilities selected for closing. It is inconceivable, for instance, that there is no continued need for domiciliary care in the area served by the Bath, N.Y., domiciliary which now cares for over 800 veterans. This is the only domiciliary in a 13-State area.

I was particularly surprised to learn that the Lincoln hospital was included in the list to be closed. Considerable money has been spent at this facility. Certainly there should be little or no staffing problem. The nearly 250 patients now being treated in the Lincoln hospital certainly indicate the need for its continuance. The fact that this is approximately 50 less than the number of authorized operating beds does not disprove need but is only the production of budget arithmetic. In attempting to justify the Lincoln decision the VA reported a November 30, 1964, average patient load budget figure of 177 even though 194 patients were actually in the hospital that same date.

The need for Federal funds to finance many expanding and new programs generally identified as the Great Society is evident. Apparently the choice has been made and rather than increase the total national budget to well over $100 billion much of it will be obtained through so-called economies. Even the request for funds for foreign aid is somewhat less although if approved more than $3 billion will be thrown around the world to governments of nations with no assurance that such funds will be of benefit to their individual citizens, and no reason to believe that democracy and freedom, as we know them, will be gained or maintained for the people of these nations as a result of our financial generosity.

The approximate $23 million estimated to be saved as the result of the VA proposed closings in the next fiscal year is a paltry sum compared to the tax dollars diverted to foreign aid. It is little to ask that economies in our domestic programs not be accomplished at the expense of veterans in need of VA services or hospital treatment. Curtailment of treatment facilities certainly is contrary to the stated purposes of the Great Society. Apparently veterans are to be barred from its bounty.

The wartime veterans of this Nation offered their lives to their country in four major wars and numerous campaigns. They are entitled to recognition of that service by maintenance of a reasonable and adequate program of benefits and VA facilities, including hospitals, domiciliaries and nursing care units. The Veterans of Foreign Wars asks no more but will tolerate no less. I do not want on my conscience, as I am sure neither do you, the burden of knowledge that doubtless many veterans will die prematurely if the present VA hospital system with reasonable facilities is not maintained.

I therefore have devoted much of my time during the last 2 weeks to mustering all of the resources of our organization in the hope and belief that we can succeed in our efforts to obtain revocation of this dastardly decision. While others have done so, we must not break faith with those who served this Nation in perilous times. I have conveyed our vigorous but reasoned objections to the President of the United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to all Members of the House and Senate of the Congress of the United States. I have requested the appropriate congressional committees to conduct hearings to officially and publicly identify the originators of this decision, and to determine and evaluate the reasons therefor. I urge all of you in the Department of Nebraska to contact your Senators and Congressmen, and to transmit your objections to any others whom you believe might be influential in assisting us in this fight for the welfare of our comrades and all veterans everywhere.

In closing, please indulge me long enough to recite a poem, "The Unknown Soldier," in honor and memory of those who gave their all that we might be free. This poem was composed by an unknown author during those trying days after the pensions had been taken from our needy veterans and their families. I think it most appropriate in view of the announced closing of VA facilities.

"THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

"There's a graveyard near the White House,
where the Unknown Soldier lies,
And the flowers there are sprinkled, by the
tears from mothers' eyes.
I stood there not so long ago, with flowers
for the brave,
When suddenly I heard a voice, it sprang
out from the grave.
I am the Unknown Soldier, the spirit voice
began, and
Have a few questions I must ask, man to
man.
Are my buddies taken care of, was their
victory complete,
Or is the big reward you promised, selling
pencils on the street?
Did we really win that victory we struggled
to achieve,
And do you still respect that Croix de
Guerre, above that empty sleeve?
And that babe who said, hello central, give
me no-man's land,
Can you replace her daddy with a military
band?
Does a Gold Star in the window now mean
anything at all?
I wonder how my old girl feels when she
hears a bugle call.
I wonder if the profiteers have satisfied
their greed?
I wonder if a soldier's mother ever is in
need?
Yes, I am the Unknown Soldier, maybe I
died in vain,
But if I were alive and my country called,
I'd do it all over again."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of executive business. The pending business is the nomination of Mr. W. J. Driver to be the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not speak at great length in opposition to the nomination, for other Senators are present who wish to speak concerning it. I do wish to invite attention to the statement made yesterday by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], which appears at page 1772 of the RECORD and which bears on the point to which I raised my opposition with respect to this nominee; that is, his lack of competency. In my judgment, his lack of competency is based upon what I consider to be his untrustworthiness in the representations he has made to Members of this body concerning the program of the Veterans' Administration, including the closing of veterans' hospitals and domiciliary homes in this country.

The junior Senator from Montana said:

> But after 2 days of hearings before the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], I am convinced that this man has not been frank with the Congress. He has told us half truths. He has insinuated things that cannot be justified. He is personally embarking upon a policy that is contrary to the traditions of the Veterans' Administration and contrary to the policies adopted by his predecessors.
>
> A good deal of the debate has turned on economy. The letter of January 13 stated that if those 11 hospitals were closed, $23.5 million would be saved. After considerable interrogation Mr. Driver admitted that this policy he had embarked upon would not save money, but instead it would cost more money. Not a dollar would be saved. The appropriation for next year would be increased. The reason why he wanted to close the 11 hospitals was that back in 1958 or 1959 a ceiling of 125,000 hospital beds had been established by Presidential directive, and he needed the beds in the 11 closed hospitals so he could build hospitals in some other places.
>
> On further interrogation we learn that the Veterans' Administration has adopted a policy of building hospitals of 400 or 500 beds in, near, or adjacent to medical education facilities. So that means that while today a hospital of 196 beds at Miles City, Mont., and a hospital at Grand Junction, Colo., will be closed, tomorrow, the Veterans' Administration will close some of the other 100-, 150-, and 200-bed hospitals in remote or isolated areas.

Later in his statement, the junior Senator from Montana said:

> The Veterans' Administration says it intends to close the Miles City, Mont., hospital and the hospital at Grand Junction, Colo., because the quality of medical service rendered in them is not adequate for the veterans.
>
> Where is it proposed to send the veterans? They would be moved to adjacent remote and isolated hospitals, where they would receive the same quality of medical service as they now get at Grand Junction, Colo., or Miles City, Mont. They would be moved to Minot, S. Dak., to Bismarck, N. Dak., and to other areas where the quality of service is no better and no different; to hospitals which have none of the specialized diagnostic services that are said to exist in Minneapolis, Denver, Salt Lake City, and Spokane.
>
> So if this program of closure continues, as the first two closures indicate it will, there will be an area of the United States that stretches from Minneapolis to Spokane and from the Canadian border to Denver and Salt Lake City that will not have a single veterans hospital.

The junior Senator from Montana continued in his speech to point out what he described as an attitude on the part of the nominee of being less than frank. There are various ways to misrepresent facts. One is by concealment; another is by not telling Senators the whole story. I respectfully submit that that is exactly what this nominee did before the Yarborough subcommittee.

It is a great disappointment to me that the Senate did not see fit yesterday in fairness to the nominee, to postpone final action on the nomination until we could have examined into the entire program of veterans hospitals that is being initiated under the nominee, obviously by direction of the administration. Nevertheless, we are today passing upon the man who will be the Administrator of the program.

The program should be most carefully scrutinized and analyzed. That ought to be done before the fact, not after the fact.

As the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said to me in a personal conversation a few moments ago, we ought to have the Committee on Finance look into the facts concerning this program. On the basis of the representations the nominee has made to date, I cannot support his nomination. He should have been given an opportunity to clarify his position and to tell the full story before a legislative committee that has the authority to approve or disapprove the policies of the Veterans' Administration.

The last point I wish to make is that the Senate should consider some other individuals besides the nominee. The Senate should consider the patients in the veterans hospitals and domiciliary homes. What are we doing with respect to domiciliary homes? We are rooting up old men—veterans—who have made great contributions to the security of the Republic. The domiciliary homes are their homes. Listen to the pleas from them that I have been receiving during the past several days. The Veterans' Administration proposes to place them in entirely new environments.

I spoke yesterday about the domiciliary home at Medford, Oreg. I said then that that domiciliary home was established by Congress, by statute. It is the only domiciliary home in the Nation that was established by a special, specific statute to create a veterans home in Medford, Oreg. The community of Medford has taken those veterans into its arms. The veterans are ambulatory; they move from the home to downtown Medford, and they move into homes in the area. They are a part of the community. They are very happy there.

Some years ago the Jackson County Medical Association was perfectly willing to cooperate with the Veterans' Administration in providing medical services for those veterans, because one of the arguments made by the Veterans' Administration has been that it does not have a hospital there. The Veterans' Administration was notified of the offer, but would not cooperate. The hospital at old Camp White was closed. It was an adequate facility for a hospital, but the Veterans' Administration closed it, with the thought that it would fly the urgent cases to Portland and other places, and take the others by ambulance.

In my judgment, the human values are such that a dollar sign cannot be placed on them. Let me say to the Bureau of the Budget, "You cannot economize on human obligations to the veterans. They ought to be left in that home, where they are happy and contented, where their adjustments are good, rather than be rooted out and taken elsewhere."

I speak not only of my State; I speak about the policy that is involved in the reorganization program of the Veterans' Administration. In my judgment, it will never stand up against a thorough study by legislative committees of Congress.

I shall not vote today to confirm the nomination of Mr. Driver to be Director of the Veterans' Administration because, in my judgment, he has not been frank and honest with the Senate.

I pointed out yesterday—and shall cover it with a broad brush stroke this morning—that there is another matter of public policy covered in this nomination. That involves the tendency that is developing in Congress to support bureaucratic inbreeding. The taking of men from the staff and promoting them to the top positions in an administrative body ought to be constantly subject to direct check by the people.

I have spoken about this before over the years. I happen to believe that in carrying out our systems of checks, it is important in administrative bodies, including quasi-judicial bodies such as our commissions and administrative agencies such as the Veterans' Administration, to bring in a man with an able mind, but an independent mind, one who has never been associated directly with the administration or agency that is to be administered, in order to provide that kind of check from the grassroots of America.

Watch out for the bureaucratic inbreeding that has come to characterize too many of our promotions to administrative positions at the head of commissions and agencies such as the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the nomination. I do not believe that the nominee meets the test of competency. No one can be competent when he deals with the Senate of the United States as Mr. Driver has dealt with us in the statements that he has made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it is my opinion that holding up the nomination of Mr. William J. Driver as Administrator of Veterans Affairs would have underlined our determination to explore every facet of the decision to cut back on veterans' facilities.

Approval of his nomination before submission of a report from the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare could be interpreted, it seems to me, as a weakening of the effort to determine the facts about the cutback. I feel strongly that this position should not be weakened.

Since a majority vote has now put aside further delay in considering the nomination, however, I think it is only right to point out that information which has come to light over the past 2 weeks makes it appear that the cutback order is not chiefly Mr. Driver's responsibility. Instead it is evident to me that it is more the responsibility of the Bureau of the Budget and the administration. Consequently I do not see any point in making Mr. Driver the scapegoat in this situation, and I will vote in favor of his nomination.

I was impressed with Mr. Driver personally when I met him and recognize that he has had a long and distinguished career in the agency he has been named to direct. From all reports he is an able, conscientious public servant and I wish him well in his very important assignment.

At the same time I want to emphasize that I will continue every possible effort to fight any reduction of service to Delaware veterans and their families. My best information from persons in Delaware who work daily on veterans affairs is that the proposed closing of the Wilmington regional office would bring about such a decline in service to the 56,000 Delaware veterans and their families. Until and unless I am convinced otherwise, I will use every means at my command to see that this cutback does not take place.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there have been some indications that people do not want anyone to be made a scapegoat in this matter. I am of the opinion that various citizens are being made scapegoats.

There was indication that the matter would be referred to at some length. I regret to see this matter coming to a vote this afternoon. I was in hopes that we might have a chance to study the matter so that we would be able to discuss it better. I think it would be desirable to postpone this confirmation for a while.

A hearing was held on January 13. At that time, the question arose as to the possibility of closing some of these hospitals. Mr. Driver was asked by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] whether specific determinations had been made. Mr. Driver said they had. Senator DIRKSEN asked whether they had been released.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said that people have not always been frank with the Senate. Mr. Driver replied to Senator DIRKSEN as follows:

> There is a story in this morning's paper which I understand stems from information distributed from some member that lists essentially the plan. An official announcement because of this is being made this afternoon.

After Mr. Driver's nomination had been considered, then this action was taken. I think that is a poor way to treat the Senate.

The members of the New Mexico delegation wanted to have a session in which to discuss one of the hospitals that it was proposed to close. We sent Mr. Driver what we regard as a respectful letter on January 13, and I ask unanimous consent that this letter to Mr. Driver may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1965.

Mr. W. J. DRIVER,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DRIVER: This is to acknowledge your letter of January 13, advising us that it is the intention of the Veterans' Administration to close the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex.

We certainly understand that the Veterans' Administration, at all times, must be looking toward improvement of the management of its programs and must also make every endeavor to furnish the best possible service to veterans at the lowest possible cost. We believe your policy of reviewing the various facilities and programs is sound. However, certain points should be made regarding your decision on Fort Bayard.

While the hospital at Fort Bayard is generally known as a tuberculosis hospital, our understanding is that this hospital is also equipped to provide medical and surgical services. The equipment for this purpose was installed in the hospital not too many years ago. Therefore, it should not be obsolete.

It is our information that increasing numbers of the veteran population are moving into the warmer and drier areas of the Nation. The veteran population of the Southwest is constantly increasing, and no doubt will continue to increase. (As an indication of this, the Bureau of the Census reported that in the period 1950–60, New Mexico had the fourth largest percentage gain in persons age 65 and over of any of the States.)

Fort Bayard serves southwestern New Mexico and parts of Arizona and Texas. We therefore ask that careful consideration be given to continuing the medical services at Fort Bayard, at least until additional facilities are provided in the Southwest area to take care of the increased veteran population. In connection with this, we would like to be advised concerning the amount of capital expenditures made on the hospital during the last 5 years.

Your office, no doubt, is aware that the veteran population increase in the Southwest is creating a heavy demand for facilities providing psychiatric treatment to veterans. Such a facility is particularly needed in our State.

Older veterans often seek a climate more favorable to arthritic and respiratory diseases. It is impossible to get older veterans, who need domiciliary care, into facilities now providing this care in the Southwest. We urgently need such a facility, and it is our judgment that Fort Bayard offers an excellent already-established site and buildings for a domiciliary facility.

We hope you will give full consideration to these points and give us an opportunity to discuss the matter with you before final action is taken.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
U.S. Senator.
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
U.S. Senator.
THOMAS G. MORRIS,
Member of Congress.
E. S. JOHNNY WALKER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Mr. Driver came to the meeting and very courteously discussed this matter with the members of the New Mexico delegation. I regret that we did not have a stenographer present to take down every word he said. I know that the members of the New Mexico delegation thought he was very frank. We were told, and thought it was correct, that there would be an opportunity to discuss the situation before the final order came through.

Fort Bayard has been in existence a long time. This was not suddenly established. It was used by the Public Health Service and other agencies for a long time.

There is a cemetery located at Fort Bayard in which some 1,500 servicemen of the United States are buried. Yet, the charges for maintaining that cemetery are not made against the Quartermaster Corps, but are made against the hospital. This accounting procedure made the costs very high. I submit that the care of a cemetery is not a proper cost to be made against a hospital. If it is done in that manner, it is certainly a different practice than has been in effect heretofore. That is a cost that should not be charged as per-patient-day costs.

We tried to find out about some of these things. We went to Mr. Driver. Mr. Driver said he would be very glad to discuss the matter and talk with our New Mexico delegation before final action was taken.

But within 24 hours, people were being told what to do about the hospital—to close down the hospital. There was no discussion of this with our delegation. A man was flown there from Denver. The program was undertaken very rapidly indeed.

We thought it would be well to have a group of men work on this problem. Congressman MORRIS of New Mexico appointed a group to form a physicians panel to evaluate the hospital facilities at Fort Bayard.

We had been told that the situation was not as good there as in other parts of the country, such as in Arizona. It is significant that on the other side of the State line, in the State of Arizona, there were three hospitals. They were not being closed. We wondered if their facilities were better than ours. We found that the costs were about the same in Arizona as they were in New Mexico. We could not understand why the charge of $32 a day was regarded as high in New Mexico, and a similar charge in Arizona was not too high. We tried to find out why. The panel of doctors was appointed in an effort to reach some decision.

There was a discussion with the head doctor at Fort Bayard, Dr. Womack, and the others checked on conditions in the Arizona and New Mexico hospitals, to discover whether the hospitals were in good condition.

I have brought along pictures to show the modernization that exists there. The medical facilities are very modern. These improvements were made within the past few years. The Fort Bayard hospital is more up to date than some of the hospitals that are being kept open.

We were hopeful that we could obtain a great deal of information on this matter. Dr. Womack discussed the situation with various people, to learn why some of the hospitals should not be kept open. He was frank. But I believe he spoke a little too frankly. On February 1, he received a telegram telling him to go to Washington on February 3.

I can imagine what will happen to him. He may find out what a pistol whipping means. It is too bad. He did not do anything but respond to an inquiry by Members of the Congress. But it is wrong to do that. Apparently, they should not give out any information.

That is why I wish the nomination could be held up. I would like to have further information so that we may know what is going on in that area before it is too late.

The New Mexico congressional delegation issued a press release after visiting with Mr. Driver. The text was agreed upon by every member of the delegation, the junior Senator from New Mexico, the two Congressmen, Representatives MORRIS and WALKER, and myself. It indicated that Mr. Driver had made certain promises to us. I think Mr. Driver would say that we cannot produce any evidence of it. But we could find four people who would testify as to what was said on that occasion. He does not agree with me. He has had people tag each piece of equipment to show where it is to go. He has officially decided that no more patients are to be admitted.

Mr. Driver had some time to discuss the matter. The delegation from New Mexico felt pretty bad about what happened. I ask unanimous consent that the press release dated January 21, and a statement that the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] and I made under date of January 28, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the press release and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE FROM THE OFFICES OF SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW MEXICO; SENATOR JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW MEXICO; CONGRESSMAN THOMAS G. MORRIS, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW MEXICO; CONGRESSMAN E. S. JOHNNY WALKER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW MEXICO

Members of the New Mexico congressional delegation met this afternoon with high officials of the Veterans' Administration and obtained assurance that the Fort Bayard VA Hospital would not be closed or patients or staff members transferred until further discussions can take place.

Veterans Administrator, William J. Driver, gave this assurance after an hour and 15 minute meeting in Senator ANDERSON's office attended by Senator ANDERSON, Senator MONTOYA, Congressman MORRIS, Congressman WALKER, Mr. Driver, A. H. Monk, Deputy Administrator, and Dr. M. J. Musser, Chief of Medicine and Surgery.

The congressional delegation strongly protested the fact that it appeared that Fort Bayard, despite excellent medical facilities and staff, would be shut down and that the veterans now served by the hospital would have to travel extremely long distances to other VA facilities. Dr. Musser told the lawmakers that the VA plans to open an additional 35 beds at the VA Hospital in Albuquerque. Senator MONTOYA, however, pointed out that it is 300 miles from Silver City to Albuquerque, which could impose a hardship on veterans, even though the Government pays their travel expenses. Mr. Driver said that he is limited by executive order to providing 125,000 hospital beds.

The VA plans to construct a number of large new hospitals, including one in Texas and that older facilities must be shut down in order to stay within the 125,000-bed limit. The delegation, however, pointed out that it might be possible to increase appropriations for the VA and thereby increase the existing limit. They said it was unwise to close down Fort Bayard in the light of modernization and the equipment expenditures which have taken place in recent years. "It simply does not make economic sense to close down serviceable facilities in an area of great need in order to build new hospitals elsewhere."

STATEMENT BY SENATORS CLINTON P. ANDERSON AND JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, DEMOCRATS, OF NEW MEXICO, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS IN SUPPORT OF THE CONTINUED OPERATION OF THE VETERANS' HOSPITAL AT FORT BAYARD, N. MEX., JANUARY 28, 1965

Mr. Chairman, thank you for granting us the privilege of appearing before you today to express our feelings about the recent decision by the Veterans' Administration to close several veterans' hospitals throughout the country.

We are fully aware of the necessity to practice fiscal responsibility by eliminating all unnecessary expenditures from the Federal budget. However, we firmly believe that the decision to close 11 veterans' hospitals and 4 domiciliaries was not in the best interests of our Nation nor was it economically sound.

We have recognized the justification for limited changes in the structure of the Veterans' Administration from time to time. The decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to close hospital beds in areas of greatly reduced need and to reestablish such beds in areas of increasing need are justifiable. These decisions were made only after a careful study proved that these changes would be in the best interest of those individuals who fought so gallantly for our country.

The proposal by the Veterans' Administrator to close the VA hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., appears to be the result of computer analysis. We do not know where the Veterans' Administration obtains its information, but we feel that too much stress is placed on computer results and not enough stress is placed on human needs.

One of the reasons given for closing these hospitals is that the Veterans' Administration desires to have its facilities located in large urban communities near medical schools and teaching hospitals. We agree with this philosophy as it applies to heavily populated areas in the Eastern and Midwestern sections of our country. However, the criteria set forth for these sections should not be imposed recklessly in the sparsely settled West—particularly, not upon New Mexico where our veteran population is increasing by leaps and bounds.

The New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas counties which the Fort Bayard hospital services has a total veteran population of over 100,000. This hospital is only 150 miles from El Paso, Tex., and about 33 percent of the patients come from that community. We would also point out that many veterans residing in eastern Arizona also receive treatment at this facility.

The Veterans' Administration proposes to transfer the majority of the patients at Fort Bayard to the veterans' hospital in Albuquerque, N. Mex. This hospital already has a waiting list of 102 and the veterans' hospitals in Phoenix and Tucson, Amarillo, and Whipple Center have a staggering waiting list which, at the present time, make it extremely difficult to secure hospitalization for those in need. Under these conditions, how could we possibly hope to accommodate in Albuquerque the 170-patient load at Fort Bayard?

If Fort Bayard is closed, Silver City veterans will have to travel 287 miles to the veterans' hospital in Albuquerque. This is 56 miles farther than the distance between Washington, D.C., and New York City. The veterans' hospital in Tucson is 203 miles from Silver City and 197 miles from Deming. If El Paso veterans have to go to Albuquerque for treatment, they must travel 272 miles. The closest hospital in Texas for El Paso veterans is at Big Spring, 341 miles away.

The facts do not bear out the charge by the Veterans' Administration that Fort Bayard is obsolete and difficult to staff with competent and trained personnel. Over the past 5 years, $430,440 has been expended on modernization and equipment for this facility and, today, it is a modern, up-to-date hospital.

Fort Bayard is fully staffed with a total of 259 personnel and an annual net payroll of approximately $1,825,974. The medical, professional, nursing, administrative and other personnel are extremely competent and are doing an excellent job. The day before the announcement to close the facility, Dr. F. C. Lepperd, M.D., joined the staff. Dr. Lepperd's qualifications are well known to those in the area since he served as staff physician at Fort Bayard in 1959 and 1960. There obviously is no problem in maintaining a competent, well-trained staff.

It has been said that the per patient cost at Fort Bayard is far above the national average. We would like to point out that the per patient cost in fiscal year 1963 was $29.68—well in line with the national average. This includes the cost of maintenance of the 1,500- to 2,000-grave cemetery at Fort Bayard, the burden of which will still be borne by the Federal Government, despite the closing of the hospital facility.

We submit factual evidence in support of the foregoing and request that it be made a part of these hearings.

We would also like to bring to the attention of the committee that the rate of population growth in this section of the country is far above the national average and second only to California and New York. Fort Bayard has one of the healthiest climates in the world and the terrain is magnificent—all assets conducive to both physical and mental health.

Over 1,000 disabled veterans with serious respiratory and asthmatic conditions have moved from the eastern part of the country into the area surrounding Fort Bayard. They have established their homes there and many are operating small businesses. To be forced to move to an area close to a veterans hospital would disrupt the entire community and force many of these veterans into bankruptcy.

We would also like to bring to your attention the fact that this has been declared a labor surplus area by the Department of Labor and the closing of this hospital would have a most serious effect upon the economy. We realize this is not justification for retaining this facility, but we do think it is a factor that should be given serious consideration.

We strongly protest the closing of the Fort Bayard Hospital in view of our increasing veteran population and the growing demands which will be made upon this excellent, modernized facility.

When the countless number of young men from New Mexico participated in the Bataan death march, they were not asked if they resided in a rural or urban area. Are we now to forget these 1,500 heroes of a never-to-be-forgotten atrocity? They, along with other deserving veterans of this area, are not to be denied their rightful claim to proper medical attention.

During discussions last week with Mr. W. J. Driver, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, he indicated that the VA is confronted with a ceiling of 125,000 beds and that the opening of new hospitals under construction necessitates the closing of certain existing facilities.

Since the establishment of this ceiling was an administrative decision, I would urge adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 which we introduced together with Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF, to raise this ceiling to 130,000-bed limit. Adoption of this legislation would be a permanent solution in providing adequate hospital facilities for the care of our Nation's countless veterans.

We strongly urge that this committee recommend that no veterans hospitals be closed until the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 can be thoroughly studied and acted upon by the Congress.

Thank you.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I shall not harangue the Senate. I feel bad about it. I like to feel that when I talk to a Government official and he makes a clear statement, I can depend on it. I know now that I cannot do so from here on out, in the case of the Veterans' Administration. I think it is very bad.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to discuss the nomination, I should like to speak for about 3 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his statement for a moment?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it must be conceded that the veterans organizations of the country have a tremendous stake in the efficiency and confidence of the Veterans' Administration. One of the great pledges they made to the veterans, who by millions are diffused over the country was that they would carry on their work with the Veterans' Administration, and that they would also come before Congress from time to time to obtain, if possible, legislation for veterans.

The veteran, his orphan, and his widow are the first concern of these organizations. This is a notable aspect of the American Legion.

I was a district commander of the American Legion many years ago. Among other things I tried to energize the work of the service officers in the various offices in the legislative district. So I do pay attention to and have some regard for what the organization says in matters of this kind.

This morning I received a telegram over the signature of the national commander of the American Legion, which reads as follows:

> The American Legion is unalterably opposed to the Veterans' Administration order closing certain of its installations. We are convinced that this move has been dictated by the Bureau of the Budget in pursuit of its unwarranted and unfair design of bringing about dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration and destruction of the veterans benefit programs. On the other hand, the American Legion believes that appointment and confirmation of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs is the responsibility of the President and Senate of the United States. We have traditionally taken no position on political appointments but do not oppose the confirmation of William J. Driver. We believe him to be competent and qualified and that his confirmation should be considered separate and apart from the decision of the administration to close certain installations.
>
> DONALD E. JOHNSON,
> *National Commander,*
> *The American Legion.*

I have a proper regard for the significance of this telegram. I think if I were in any other mood, this telegram would be influential in dominating my vote, but I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Driver.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I feel the same way. I see no inconsistency in fighting with all the vigor that one can summon against these closings of important veterans facilities which are most unwise and unjust, and at the same time not penalizing a public servant who is obviously worthy of the office and is bound by the administration's decision, which undoubtedly was influenced by the Bureau of the Budget. To punish this nominee or to have the fight we have made appear as a personal struggle against this man would not be conducive to the best interests of the Veterans' Administration. It is highly significant that the minority leader has taken this position. I am pleased that we are taking a parallel position, which strikes people like myself as reasonable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I take that position notwithstanding that I could join with the majority leader in going before the Yarborough subcommittee to ask for a study of the matter. I feel there has not been enough consultation, for one thing, and that the program had not been properly worked out. I am confident that if the Veterans' Administration would declare surpluses in areas where other veterans facilities were available they could still sit down on a consultative basis and do a much better job.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator will not discontinue his struggle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a matter of procedure, I cannot agree to any extraneous matters coming into this debate until Senators have finished discussing the nomination and every Senator who wishes to address himself to it has done so.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was among the group of Senators who voted yesterday for the Prouty amendment, because I thought it was well to clear the atmosphere against what I consider to be the senseless and cruel-hearted decision to close certain veterans installations, and get that behind us before voting on the merits of Mr. Driver's nomination. The two issues should not be confused.

Speaking of one change and the closing of one facility in the State with which I am most familiar, that at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., I see no economy whatsoever to be derived. What little saving it is proposed to show would result in additional costs being foisted on veterans and the veterans organizations, and would not result in any reduction in the cost to the taxpayers or the veterans whom the Veterans' Administration is supposed to serve.

Further, I do not believe that Mr. Driver is the author or the architect of these proposed closures. I have met with veterans' leaders of South Dakota with respect to the proposed changes in Sioux Falls and Fargo, N. Dak. We have presented our evidence. We have made our case. We have received from Mr. Driver a promise that he would send representatives to Sioux Falls and Fargo to consult with the people there with respect to the changes proposed at these facilities, to determine whether they might be changed or altered or rescinded.

It is difficult for me to vote to make a whipping boy of someone who, so far as I have been able to find, is not responsible for any of the developments which are proving to be detrimental to the veterans of America.

I said to Mr. Driver, when we had concluded our argument, that I thought he had made the best argument he could make for a very bad case. He did not seem to have any enthusiasm for doing it.

I know it is expecting to much of a man, in his first weeks in a high office like that, to run counter to the desires and wishes of the administration which appointed him. I am perfectly convinced that this decision originated in the President's Bureau of the Budget, and that it received the approval of the White House, so Mr. Driver was almost bound to support it or resign, even before his confirmation was submitted to the Senate.

If this were the only way Congress could make itself felt in conjunction with these bad decisions, I would now supplement my vote of yesterday to defer the decision until the atmosphere had been cleared by voting against the confirmation of Mr. Driver; but it seems to me that, in so doing, I would be voting against the wrong target for the wrong cause.

This is not the only recourse which Congress has. It has an opportunity in legislation through the House Veterans' Affairs Commitee to make its voice felt and its decision heard or it can do so through the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

Yesterday, the full Committee on Appropriations expressed its disapproval of an unrelated but somewhat similar step toward so-called economy in closing certain experimental stations by mandating the Department of Agriculture, and blocking its funds so that those closures cannot be made until Congress has had a full opportunity, in the regular appropriation bills, to consider all the ramifications and all the reasons pro and con.

That is the appropriate way to make our continued resistance felt against senseless, unjustifiable, and cruel-hearted closures, through the regular legislative procedures of Congress.

I believe that Mr. Driver is a conscientious, able, and competent individual, well trained to his service in prior years in the Veterans' Administration. I believe that personally he has the interests of the veterans at heart, and that it would be grossly unfair to condemn him for something over which, at this time, he has no control.

I intend to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver, and in so doing make clear that I propose to continue the fight in the Appropriations Committee, through legislation, and at every other level where it is possible to modify or to eliminate these closures, which I believe to be unjust and unfair and which I am convinced Mr. Driver, in his own good time, will be helpful in trying to rectify through proper steps and legislative procedures.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield at that point?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand the Senator—and I am asking this question for the record—that on the basis of a certain directive issued, I assume, by the Department of Agriculture, the Appropriations Committee, in effect, put on a stop order. Was a certain date fixed, at which these activities would cease?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. They were to cease about April 1. The stop order has been put on until such time as the regular money bills for the Department of Agriculture come before our committee, so that we can have an opportunity to consider them and to hear witnesses.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, I take it, one of the avenues open to those of us who feel very keenly on this subject—and none feels more keenly than I do about what has happened to the Miles City facility—is that even though a directive has been issued ordering the closing of the Miles City facility by June 30, it is still within the purview and authority of the Committee on Appropriations to take appropriate action to prevent that order from going into effect?

Mr. MUNDT. The distinguished majority leader is an able and valued member of our Senate Committee on Appropriations. It is my opinion—and I hope that is his—that we could follow a course somewhat along the same line. Fortunately, from the standpoint of the agricultural experiment stations, we have a convenient vehicle on which to carry our amendment, because it was an agricultural appropriation supplemental bill.

So far as I know, we do not have a supplemental bill in this area; but it occurs to me and what I have in mind is that we could take this matter up de novo in our own right, because, after all, the Veterans' Administration—as do all other departments of Government—must come to the Appropriations Committee for funds to enable it to function.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, we cannot withhold funds from the Veterans' Administration for the care of veterans, but I have discussed this matter informally with the distinguished chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriations Committee, under which comes the Veterans' Administration affairs—and I am referring to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]—asking that that committee take this matter up. While I intend to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver, I do not intend to stop any and all efforts I can make to keep the Miles City facility functioning. I believe that what has been done to the Miles City facility is disgraceful and is not founded on fact. All the facts are against closing, because it has a competent medical staff, and it serves an area larger than all the New England States combined.

Yesterday the Senate passed a bill giving aid to Appalachia, an area of 165,000 square miles. The State of Montana alone is 148,000 square miles in area. So that is a factor. We have had a full patient load since this directive was issued. There was one vacancy in the Miles City hospital the day the directive was issued, and that same night there were two, because one veteran died.

What about people from the western Dakotas? They come from the State of South Dakota, which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in part represents, and from northern Wyoming. Where are they going? Are they going 500 or 600 miles away? What about their families, and the therapeutic value their visits furnish in the recovery of patients?

What about the obligations of Congress by law and statute toward these veterans? Do we wish all veterans to go to the big cities? Are we trying to create rural slums and, at the same time, urban blighted areas? That is what will happen. This policy is a disgrace.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Montana makes a good point in inviting attention to the geographical conditions which exist in the great Middle West, or the upper Midwest, or however we wish to designate the areas of Wyoming, the Dakotas, and Montana. Distances are great in those areas. When we impose upon the veteran and his family the need to go great distances with poor transportation facilities for either the hospitalization or for his claims problems we are foisting every burden on the veteran, or on the veterans' service organizations, for costs which rightly should be paid by the Federal Government.

Let me explain to my good friend the Senator from Montana, what I have in mind as a device which could be used in the Committee on Appropriations. I have given a great deal of thought and consideration to this device. We could use precisely the same formula used in connection with the agricultural supplemental bill, even though we do not have a supplemental bill before us, because I see no reason in the world why the Committee on Appropriations or the Congress should not be able to adopt a resolution prohibiting the use of any of the funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans' Administration for the purposes of closing, moving, or changing veterans facilities in conformity with this order. Those changes cost money. They have to pay the expenses of the employees being moved. We can mandate the funds and block them. I believe that this is a much more appropriate way for the Congress to work its will than to throw a knife into the back of Mr. Driver, who, I am confident, is not responsible for originating these particular examples of misjudgment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. When I appeared before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, I pointed out that not a dime would be saved in the so-called $23.5 million saving, which the Veterans' Affairs Administrator has stated would be the case. On the basis of 126 employees in the Miles City veterans hospital—and, I am not being provincial—despite the fact that the Veterans' Administration stated that all the displaced people would be taken care of, it admitted that only 33 would be taken care of. It is not going to save any money. This is the most expensive program which it is undertaking, because it is building new hospitals today. The Miles City facility is practically a new hospital. The Veterans' Administration has authorizations for almost $100 million to build new facilities over the next 5 years. I do not know what it is doing. I cannot understand it. The program is unjust and uncalled for. It is making the veterans in my area second-class citizens.

Mr. MUNDT. Not only is it proposed to continue the people in their employment, but they must be reimbursed for their moving expenses if they are shifted from Miles City or Fargo or Sioux City to a metropolitan area.

In addition, when we shift families supported by Veterans' Administration employees from Miles City or Sioux Falls or Fargo to a metropolitan area, where living costs are substantially higher, it will be necessary to start upgrading the civil service classifications of those employees, to keep them happy, and to pay them higher salaries so that they can live with their families on the same standard of living on which they previously lived.

Therefore, instead of a saving, there will be a loss, in the final analysis, since such higher salaries would eventually eat up these supposed economies.

I submit that Congress has a right to specify, through its Appropriations Committees, supported by Congress, that not a dime appropriated to the Veterans' Administration shall be used to effectuate these closings. The closings cost money. In that way, we can make our feelings effective, instead of striking at the nomination of a man who was not connected with this program from its inception, who was not in charge at the takeoff, but who is present now at the crash landing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief, and then yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. I wish to reply, first, to the telegram from the National Commander of the American Legion which was read by the minority leader. The Commander of the American Legion does not have the responsibility of voting on the nomination. The Commander of the American Legion was not present at the hearings to hear the testimony of Mr. Driver. He did not reach the conclusion that those of us reached who testified against him have reached; namely, that he was not frank with the Senate. He was not intellectually honest. His intellectual dishonesty took the form of making some misrepresentations of fact, as brought out by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. The Senator from New Mexico, in his statement, has also pointed out that he has reservations in regard to this man's intellectual honesty and reliability, and his truthfulness.

That is the issue. Whether we talk about a scapegoat or a whipping boy, the responsibility is the Senate's in passing upon the competency of the nominee.

Any nominee who comes before the Senate and engages in the kind of evasion and duplicity in his testimony that Mr. Driver engaged in will not get my vote.

I also say to the Commander of the American Legion that it would be interesting to hear how the rank and file members of the American Legion, who are affected by this program, feel about this nominee.

The attempt is made to sidestep his connection with the program; but he testified for the program. It is said, "What choice did he have? After all, this is the administration's program."

Is that not the test of a man? Is that not the test of a man who is to be appointed to an administrative position? If he thinks a program is wrong, intellectual honesty calls upon him to say so. When direct questions were put to him, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] put them to him, he engaged in evasion and lack of frankness, as the Senator said.

We also have an obligation today to give him a chance to cleanse himself. He could have done that if we had postponed consideration of the nomination and if a legislative committee could have studied this program. We could still do so. We can do it by laying the nomination on the table for the time being and taking it up after we have finished consideration of the legislative program.

Before the debate is ended, I shall move to lay the nomination on the table for the time being.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I cannot find myself in accord with the very able and lucid statement made by my friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I shall be compelled to vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver, if I am compelled to vote today.

What is the situation? Yesterday 23 Senators—in addition to that, 2 other Senators by live pairs and a third Senator by stating his position—a total of 26 Senators asked the Senate—to do what? They asked the Senate to give them 30 days to satisfy themselves before they are compelled to vote on the confirmation of Mr. Driver's nomination. The majority in the Senate denied us that consideration. I refuse to vote for confirmation under duress.

I am not prepared to pass on whether Mr. Driver was guilty of incorrect behavior or lack of frankness in his testimony before the committee. I was not present. I have had an opportunity only briefly to glance at the testimony.

Therefore, in voting against the confirmation, I am not voting against Mr. Driver personally. I am voting against the confirmation because it is the only course left open to those of us who feel so deeply about an issue that is fast coming over the horizon, which affects thousands of veterans in this country.

I must know how strongly Mr. Driver really feels about closing veterans hospitals in the less populated sections. I shall not vote for his confirmation until I do know.

My vote carries no reflection on Mr. Driver's character and integrity.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to vote to confirm the nomination of William J. Driver as Veterans' Administrator. Mr. Driver is a career employee of the Veterans' Administration, where he compiled an enviable record. But I hope the State of New York, where he was born and educated, can claim some credit for him.

Mr. Driver served with high distinction in World War II, receiving the Bronze Star, the Legion of Merit, the Order of the British Empire, and the French Croix de Guerre. He joined the Veterans' Administration in 1946, and began his progress upward through the ranks—progress which was interrupted by recall to service during the Korean war.

During the last 2 weeks, I and many other Senators have questioned Mr. Driver closely on the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the United States. In light of the facts now known to me, I do not intend to modify my opposition to these closings. However, this does not alter my respect for Mr. Driver. He conducted himself capably at the hearings, and I was impressed by his honesty and candor. I was also impressed by his willingness to cooperate with Senators, and I think he will be as helpful as he can, as we continue to press for a reexamination of the hospital closings. He is a man who is obviously and deeply concerned with the welfare of our Nation's veterans.

I congratulate Mr. Driver on his nomination. I will vote for his confirmation.

CONSOLIDATION OF SIOUX FALLS VETERANS FACILITIES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, we are being called upon to vote on the confirmation of Mr. William Driver as the new Veterans' Administration head. Because of the proposed consolidation and transfer of a number of VA personnel from Sioux Falls to St. Paul many of the veterans in my State are asking me to vote against Mr. Driver's confirmation.

As I have previously stated on the Senate floor and before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, I am strongly opposed to this transfer of personnel. I think it not only jeopardizes veterans services, but aggravates another serious problem. I refer to the mistaken policy of concentrating Government agencies in heavily congested metropolitan areas. Not only does this further aggravate the population pressures of urban areas, but it deprives sparsely populated States such as South Dakota of a helpful economic stimulus. If economy calls for the consolidation of existing VA offices, it would seem to make more sense if cities such as Sioux Falls received the benefit of additional personnel rather than larger cities such as St. Paul.

Frankly, I sympathize with the objections being raised by veterans in my State to the confirmation of Mr. Driver, and yet, I know that Mr. Driver is simply executing policy that has been set at a higher level. Even if we were to reject his confirmation the policy guidelines would still be the same, and so would the problems with which we are now faced. I think, therefore, it does not serve a useful purpose to hold Mr. Driver responsible for what appears to be top administration policy. But let me make it perfectly clear that the veterans installations in my State are urgently needed and I will fight with all my strength any move to close any of them.

I do want the RECORD to show the feeling expressed to me on this issue. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the names and addresses of persons sending me telegrams in opposition to this confirmation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.,
January 29, 1965.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand confirmation of Driver as VA Administrator is to be voted on morning of January 30, 1965. Urge your negative vote and every blocking action available to your office.

ORVILLE DEVANEY,
State Commander, Disabled American Veterans.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.,
January 29, 1965.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand Driver's confirmation as Administrator veterans' affairs to be voted on January 30, 1965. Urge negative vote.

RAY ASMUSSEN.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
EARL FARLEY.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
OLE TWITE.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
LAWRENCE RICK.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
TOM NORDQUIST.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Russell Venard.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Chuck Carlson.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Jack Adams.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Irving Frick.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Ervin Jenson.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Carl Lauxman.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Ike Underwood.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Nels Thompson.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Stan Fillingsness.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
James Stoner.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Charles Bruehler.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Gordon Pedersen.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Richard Jensen.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Leonard Uecker.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Donald Johnson.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Martin Weber.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Bob Lillems.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Vernon L. Hustrulid.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Roy Hurd.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Willard Jensen.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Ray Messler.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Palmer Hustrulid.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Warren Wickstrom.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Tillman Kittelson.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Wayne Hustrulid.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Alex Singer.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Roy Bovill.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
R. L. Eirschele.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
George R. Clay.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Merle Twedt.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Norm Nygaard.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
James Haug.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Wesley F. Arends.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Marlin Klostergaard.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Harry Peterson.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Ed Fitzgerald.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
William Muller.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Clinton Klostergaard.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
L. L. Lawrensen.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Leland Klastergaard.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Clayton Fedderson.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Clifford Jonnes.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
William Lawrensen.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Earl Williams.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Mike Bak.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Burdette Peterson.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Clinton Klostergaard.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Elmer Duerst.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Jim Kennedy.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Paul Dubrall.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,
January 30, 1965.
Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to vote against approval of William Driver as VA Administrator.

Sincerely,
Franz Ryger.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 38, which would express the sense of the Senate that the proposed reductions and closings of VA facilities be canceled.

Yesterday I voted for the motion by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] to postpone action on the nomination now before the Senate.

I have taken these actions because I believe that the proposals of the Veterans' Administration are incredibly careless of the welfare of many of our Nation's veterans.

Nevertheless, I intend to vote for the confirmation of William Driver as Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. I have a high regard for his ability, and I am hopeful that he may be persuaded to see the error of these decisions which have been forced upon him by circumstances beyond his control.

Now that the Senate has rejected the motion which would have postponed action on the nomination, I believe that the best interests of our veterans will be served by speedy confirmation of this appointment, so that the VA may have a permanent and not an Acting Administrator.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, despite the involvement of Mr. W. J. Driver in the arbitrary decision resulting in plans to close various veterans hospitals and terminate the regional VA office in Cheyenne, Wyo., I will not oppose his nomination as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. It is recognized that Mr. Driver is simply an unfortunately placed cog in the mechanism of the Federal leviathan that recognizes the preeminence of executive power. He is forced at a most unpropitious time to be the amplifier through which the President's voice is broadcast on an extremely unpopular decision.

Accordingly, I will vote in favor of the Driver nomination in the hope that his recent experience in regard to the veterans hospitals will in some means induce him to act as independently as possible while holding office at the pleasure of the Great Society.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock has arrived. Under the order previously entered, the question now before the Senate is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs?

On this vote the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Oregon correct in understanding, upon advice from the Parliamentarian, that a motion to table the question of the confirmation of the nomination to a time certain would be out of order under the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senate is proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement, to vote at an hour certain on the nomination and such a motion would not be in order at the present time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to set aside the unanimous-consent agreement for a time certain in order to consider a motion to lay the question on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Oregon that a unanimous-consent request is always in order, except under a few circumstances prohibited by the rules.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would be willing to propose a unanimous-consent request that the Senator from Oregon be permitted to make his motion to table right now, but I would have to oppose that part of the motion which would postpone the vote until a time certain.

Mr. MORSE. That is the only time I am asking for—merely time enough to make the motion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may be allowed to make his motion to table and that a vote be taken on that motion immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like the attention of the Senator from Oregon. If, for example, a motion to table the motion to confirm the nomination should carry, that vote would end the matter for the time being.

Mr. MORSE. For the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the nomination would then be dead. Under the rules of the Senate, a tabling motion of the type proposed would constitute a final decision of the Senate on the question of the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If a motion to table should fail, immediately thereafter a vote would be taken on the confirmation of the nomination. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. The Chair has ruled that a vote to lay the confirmation of the nomination on the table would kill the nomination. If the question is on the table, can it not be taken from the table by motion at some future time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any proposition that has been tabled is in effect killed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the majority leader give me his attention for a moment?

It is not the intention or the desire of the Senator from Oregon to kill the nomination. But I believe that the debate has brought out the point of view of some Senators that was not understood yesterday when the motion to postpone for 30 days was voted down. There is power in the argument of the Senator from New Hampshire that 26 Members of this body asked the Senate for further time to consider the nomination in relationship to the testimony of the nominee on Veterans' Administration hospital policy. It is difficult for me to believe that the Senate, at the close of the present debate, would wish to continue to deny to such a substantial number of Senators further time to consider the nomination. I am not married to any 30-day postponement figure. But I believe that a period of time ought to be allowed before a vote is taken on the question of the confirmation of the nomination, from the standpoint of the nominee himself if from no other standpoint.

I should like to have the two leaders and other Senators consider whether or not they would give consent to a unanimous-consent agreement to be propounded by the Senator from Oregon that action on the nomination be delayed for 10 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the Senate is now operating under a reservation by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to object to the request of the Senator from Montana. Under that reservation the Senator from Illinois has the floor. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to be heard on his reservation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I withdraw it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will proceed——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say for the benefit of the majority leader that he has obtained from the senior Senator from Oregon the last unanimous-consent agreement in this session of the Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may reply?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator was aware of the fact that I was prepared—in fact I made the request—to permit the Senator from Oregon to make his motion to table the pending business. Then, as I understood, the Senator said that that was all he wanted. Later on he came forward with a 10-day extension proposal.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate that very much, but the present action has convinced me that unanimous-consent agreements defeat the public interest. I shall oppose them.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to associate myself with what the Senator from Oregon has said. Yesterday many of us understood that discussion of the nomination would proceed today. If we had known that a unanimous-consent request would be proposed, we would have been present. There was a time when there would always be a quorum call when a controversial subject like the present one was brought up. If that same principle had applied to the present issue, and there had been a quorum call, no unanimous-consent request would have been successful.

It is too bad that the principle of unanimous consent comes into jeopardy because we must confirm the nomination today.

The nomination of Mr. Driver came to the Senate Committee on Finance the morning of the day that Mr. Driver made his announcement. They did not dare postpone the hearing. Then he made his announcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senate that unless there is a unanimous-consent agreement to delay the vote further, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before I state the parliamentary inquiry, I wish to say that procedurally what the Senator from New Mexico has said is absolutely correct, and the leadership is at fault. That must be my responsibility.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was not trying to criticize the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand. In extenuation, before I propound my parliamentary inquiry, I wish to state that I, to the best of my ability, went around to Senators to find out if it would be acceptable to them to operate on the basis on which we have proceeded. I thought I had received unanimous approval. I did not see the Senator from New Mexico. It was not my understanding that, when the Senate defeated the motion of the Senator from Vermont, the issue would go over to today. But it did. It has worked out that way. I am sorry for the whole thing, but that is the way it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of William J. Driver to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 7, as follows:

[No. 13 Ex.]

YEAS—75

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Miller
Mondale
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—7

Anderson
Cotton
Curtis
Metcalf
Montoya
Morse
Prouty

NOT VOTING—18

Dodd
Dominick
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Jackson
Johnston
McCarthy
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Pearson
Russell
Scott
Talmadge
Yarborough

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senate has confirmed Mr. William J. Driver to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, in a telegram to me, describes Mr. Driver as "a career official eminently qualified to this post," and the VFW telegram from the national commander in chief, John A. Jenkins, concludes, "and it will be deeply appreciated by the 1,300,000 members of the VFW if you will vote confirmation when presented today."

The American Legion in a telegram to the Senate majority leader describes Mr. Driver as "competent and qualified and that his confirmation should be considered separate and apart from the decision of the Administration to close certain installations."

Mr. President, in light of these telegrams and representations made to me by these major national veterans' organizations I voted in support of Senate confirmation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington, D.C.,
February 2, 1965.

Senator Maurine B. Neuberger,
Washington, D.C.:

VFW vehemently opposed to closing of VA facilities ordered by White House and Bureau of the Budget. Most unfortunate that these closings announced shortly after appointment of William J. Driver as Veterans' Administrator who has responsibility of carrying out administration policy to reduce services for veterans. Driver is a career official eminently qualified to fill this post and it will be deeply appreciated by the 1,300,000 members of the VFW if you will vote for his confirmation when presented today.

John A. Jenkins,
Commander in Chief.

Washington, D.C.,
February 1, 1965.

Senator Maurine B. Neuberger,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Disabled American Veterans support William Driver for Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, appreciate your vote for confirmation.

William G. Dwyer,
"National Commander Disabled American Veterans.

Washington, D.C.,
February 2, 1965.

Senator Maurine B. Neuberger,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

AMVETS (the American Veterans of World War II and Korea) strongly urges your favorable consideration and affirmative vote with respect to the pending confirmation of William J. Driver as the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

Lincoln S. Tamraz,
National Commander.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 52, S. 701, the International Coffee Agreement legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 701) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "effect", to insert "or until the Congress by concurrent resolution determines that an unwarranted increase in the price of coffee has occurred,"; on page 3, after line 5, to strike out:

Sec. 4. It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should continue to adhere to the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, only so long as that agreement does not operate to produce unwarranted increases in the price of coffee in the United States. In the event that it is determined by the

President or by a joint resolution of the Congress that an unwarranted increase in the price of coffee has occurred and is attributable to the application or operation of the agreement, it is the further sense of the Congress that the President should forthwith apply to the International Coffee Council and the Executive Board for such corrective action as may be necessary to remedy the situation. If, following a reasonable period, not to exceed seventy-five days, after such application, the President finds that the Council has failed to make such adjustment of quotas or to take such other corrective action as is necessary to remedy the situation, he shall report his findings to the Congress with such recommendations as he may consider appropriate.

At the beginning of line 24, to change the section number from "5" to "4"; in line 25, after the word "this", to strike out "Act, other than the powers and duties conferred on him by section 4," and insert "Act"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "6" to "5"; at the beginning of line 17, to change the section number from "7" to "6"; and on page 5, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number of "8" to "7"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "International Coffee Agreement Act of 1965".

Sec. 2. On and after the entry into force of the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, and for such period prior to October 1, 1968, as the agreement remains in effect, or until the Congress by concurrent resolution determines that an unwarranted increase in the price of coffee has occurred, the President is authorized, in order to carry out the provisions of that ageement—

(1) to regulate the entry of coffee for consumption, or withdrawal of coffee from warehouses for consumption, including (A) the limitation of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, of coffee imported from countries which are not members of the International Coffee Organization, and (B) the prohibition of entry of any shipment from any member of the International Coffee Organization of coffee which is not accompanied by a certificate of origin or a certificate of reexport, issued by a qualified agency in such form as required under the agreement;

(2) to require that every export or reexport of coffee from the United States shall be accompanied by a certificate of origin or a certificate of reexport, issued by a qualified agency of the United States designated by him, in such form as required under the agreement;

(3) to require the keeping of such records, statistics, and other information, and the rendering of such reports, relating to the importation, distribution, prices, and consumption of coffee as he may from time to time prescribe; and

(4) to take such other action, and issue and enforce such rules and regulations, as he may consider necessary or appropriate in order to implement the obligations of the United States under the agreement.

Sec. 3. As used in section 2 of this Act, "coffee" means coffee as defined in article 2 of the International Coffee Agreement, 1962.

Sec. 4. The President may exercise any powers and duties conferred on him by this Act through such agency or officer as he shall direct. The powers and duties conferred by this Act shall be exercised in the manner the President considers appropriate to protect the interests of United States consumers.

Sec. 5. The President shall submit to the Congress an annual report on the International Coffee Agreement, 1962. Such report shall contain full information on the operation of such agreement, including full information with respect to the general level of prices of coffee. The report shall also include a summary of the actions the United States and the International Coffee Organization have taken to protect the interests of United States consumers. Such annual report shall be submitted not later than January 15 of each year. The first such report shall be submitted not later than January 15, 1966.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including the necessary expenses and contributions of the United States in connection with the administration of the International Coffee Agreement, 1962. The amount of the contributions of the United States to administer the agreement for any period shall not exceed 20 per centum of the total contributions assessed for such period to administer the agreement.

Sec. 7. The joint resolution of April 11, 1941, entitled "Joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes" (19 U.S.C. 1355 and 1356) is repealed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the majority leader suggested that I make a brief statement before returning to the hearings on the education bill. I am glad to oblige the majority leader.

I consider it a duty to make this brief statement in support of the coffee agreement in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs.

The coffee agreement is vital to our relationships with our Latin American neighbors. We can pour money into Latin America in the Alliance for Peace program; and we are doing it by the millions. I shall continue to support some economic aid to Latin America, but much more limited military aid to Latin America.

We would be wasting the American taxpayers' dollars in large measure if we were to turn down the coffee agreement which is so vital to the economic position of a number of Latin American countries. It is argued that it may result in an increase in the cost of coffee to the American housewife. That is disputable.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to support a coffee agreement on the assumption, although I do not think it would be borne out by the facts, that there might be a slight increase in the cost of coffee. We cannot have this as a one-way street in our economic relations with Latin America. The fact is that we export to Latin America about what we import.

Surely we cannot deny that over, say a 10-year period, our own prices of our exports have not risen. It seems to me that the argument that we should turn down a coffee agreement because it might raise the cost of coffee a very small amount per pound is a pretty false sense of economy on our part.

The lowering of the price of coffee per pound in Latin America is a loss to Latin America that is far in excess of the millions of dollars that we pour into Latin America by way of aid.

I make the further point that we have engaged in various interparliamentary conferences with Latin American countries in recent years. A group of us, the majority leader and the Senator from Alabama heading our delegation, will leave for Mexico in the next few days for our annual parliamentary conference with the members of the Mexican Parliament.

We have never had a single parliamentary conference with them, or with other parliamentary groups in Latin America, without the problem of their so-called one commodity, or two or three commodities in the way of so-called raw materials or natural products being exported to the United States, being a great bone of contention in those discussions.

There is a feeling throughout Latin America that we take advantage of them in connection with coffee and other so-called one-commodity areas of Latin America. If we want to really strengthen our relationships with Latin America, if we want to really carry out our profession that we are trying to do something about increasing economic opportunity and freedom in Latin America, we should not be parsimonious in connection with coffee. I do not want anyone to take it for granted that the coffee agreement is certain to increase the price of coffee.

It will be found that our State Department advisers advise to the contrary. On the other hand, I want it understood that the senior Senator from Oregon is not going to let that argument be the basis for advocacy of opposition to the coffee agreement.

I think it is a good agreement which represents a progressive step forward in our foreign relations with Latin America. In the best interests of our country, we ought to approve the agreement.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY MR. MAGNUSON ON THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have a long-time standing engagement to appear on a panel of the Advertising Council of America. It is a very important engagement. I am hopeful that I shall be through before the Senate votes on the coffee agreement, but if I am not through, and should I not be present to cast my vote, I want the Record to show that I would vote "yea."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Senate passage of the bill to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement is vitally important to the success of our policies toward Latin America.

I say that because it is very clear from past experience that a sharp decline in the price of one commodity can wipe out in one afternoon our combined efforts to raise standards of living in Latin America through private and public investment. It is estimated, for example, that each decline of 1 cent per pound in the price of coffee means a loss of $70 million in the foreign exchange earnings of the 35 principal producing countries in Latin America and elsewhere. Such price declines have happened often in the past. The price of coffee has fallen about 42 percent within the last 5 or 6 years.

No amount of production can make up for that. The increasingly adverse terms of trade of primary producing countries are continually vitiating all the aid we can give them. Therefore, the effort to stabilize their terms of trade is a remarkably fine contribution, both to international economic development and to the demands of the newly developing areas for economic stability. Indeed, these countries demand nothing less of us, and they have a right to demand nothing less.

This agreement is so great a contribution to international stability and international peace and to the anti-Communist struggle, that we must wonder why it is opposed. I have read with the greatest of interest the views of my colleagues in the Senate. I am sympathetic with their views. The proposal is opposed on the ground that to give price guarantees and to governmentally limit production is an ineffective solution to this problem; in fact, commodity agreements seem to work in reverse to the real purpose for which they are designed. The best evidence, it is claimed, is our domestic farm program.

Imperfect as this machinery is, it is nonetheless an effort in the international field to do what urgently must be done to deter erosion for the present, so that the forces of recovery, development, and diversification of the economies of these countries may be given a chance to get started.

If we want to give developing countries an opportunity to get off the ground, in terms of development, we shall have to provide them with some kind of stop-loss situation—because the stabilization of the value of a basic commodity like coffee, in quite a few of those countries, is absolutely the determinant of whether the economy will be improving or will involve them in the gravest kind of difficulties.

We must provide primary producing countries such relief in promoting trade as not to beggar them or to deprive them of the necessary political stability, so far as economics has a determining effect on their political stability. At one and the same time we should not allow the situation to become so embedded as to preclude any hope of industrialization or diversification or the ability to make a better future in their own development. The problem of commodity stabilization, as I see it, becomes one of mitigating random and cyclical fluctuations in the price of coffee—or any other primary commodity—without interfering with whatever long-term trend would be established by free market forces. Increased stability in export proceeds of developing primary producing countries could make a valuable contribution to their ability to make long-range development plans.

I do not wish it to be said that I am not interested in consumers. But it is one thing to be for consumers, and another thing to satisfy the needs of consumers by taking it out of the backs of producers, who are less well off, on the whole, than many of our consumers.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 8 (S. Res. 70), and certain other measures on the calendar in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the following resolutions were acted upon, as indicated:

BESSIE V. BOSE

The resolution (S. Res. 70) to pay a gratuity to Bessie V. Bose was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Bessie V. Bose, widow of Louis Bose, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LULU M. McDANIEL

The resolution (S. Res. 71) to pay a gratuity to Lulu M. McDaniel was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Lulu M. McDaniel, widow of Samuel L. McDaniel, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELEANOR C. JENKINS

The resolution (S. Res. 72) to pay a gratuity to Eleanor C. Jenkins was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eleanor C. Jenkins, widow of John F. Jenkins, Junior, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

The resolution (S. Res. 73) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Jordan of North Carolina; and Mr. Scott, of Pennsylvania.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Jordan of North Carolina; Mr. Pell, of Rhode Island; Mr. Clark, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Cooper, of Kentucky; and Mr. Scott, of Pennsylvania.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL

The resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for use during the 89th Congress was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-ninth Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that one thousand six hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining four hundred and fifty copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 38 (S. Con. Res. 9), and following measures on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The following measures were considered and acted upon as indicated:

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PRAYERS OFFERED IN THE SENATE BY PETER MARSHALL

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall in the Senate during the 80th and 81st Congresses was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 86, Eighty-first Congress, first session, being the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, doctor of divinity, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, 1947–1949; of which ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

AUTHORITY TO PRINT AS SENATE DOCUMENT HISTORY OF THE PIMA INDIANS AND SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION PROJECT

The resolution (S. Res. 22) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a history of the Pima Indians and the San Carlos irrigation project was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a history of the Pima Indians and the San Carlos irrigation project.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF CENSUSES OF TERRITORY OF NEW MEXICO AND TERRITORY OF ARIZONA

The resolution (S. Res. 23) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of certain censuses of the Territory of New Mexico and Territory of Arizona was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document excerpts from the decennial census of 1860 for Arizona County in the Territory of New Mexico, excerpts from the decennial Federal census of 1870 for the Territory of Arizona, together with excerpts from the Special Territorial Census of 1864 taken in Arizona under the authority of the Act of September 9, 1850 (9 Stat. 448).

AUTHORITY TO PRINT AS SENATE DOCUMENT COMPILATION ENTITLED "MINERAL POTENTIAL OF EASTERN MONTANA—A BASIS FOR FUTURE GROWTH"

The resolution (S. Res. 29) authorizing the printing of the compilation entitled "Mineral Potential of Eastern Montana—A Basis for Future Growth" as a Senate document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document the compilation entitled "Mineral Potential of Eastern Montana—A Basis for Future Growth", prepared by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, United States Department of the Interior, at the request of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed one thousand and three hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORITY TO PRINT AS SENATE DOCUMENT A REPORT ON STATUS OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

The resolution (S. Res. 33) to print as a Senate document a report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document the Eighth Annual Report on the Status of the Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects, prepared by the Department of the Interior, and an introductory statement by Senator ANDERSON, and that five hundred extra copies be printed for the use of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, those are all the items on the calendar.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 701) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the pending bill provides the authority necessary for the Senate to execute its responsibilities under the International Coffee Agreement.

The Senate ratified this agreement on May 21, 1963, by a vote of 69 to 20. The instrument of ratification was deposited on December 27, 1963, and since that time we have been a member of the International Coffee Organization. However, we are not able to act like a member should act. We can do that only upon enactment of this enabling bill.

Let me outline the authorizing features of the bill, and then I shall describe the safeguards for the American coffee consumer which we have written into this bill to insure that the coffee agreement does not become a price-fixing forum. Basically, we have three responsibilities under the agreement and this bill enables us to perform them.

First. It would enable the President to prohibit importation of coffee from other member nations unless accompanied by a certificate of origin, or by a certificate of reexport.

Second. It would permit the President to limit, but not prohibit, importation of coffee from producing countries that are not members of the Coffee Organization.

Third. It would authorize the President to require the maintenance of statistics, records, and other data he considers necessary to implement the obligations of the United States under the agreement.

The purpose of the bill is simple. Consuming nations—and this country consumes nearly as much coffee as all the rest of the world combined—will help producing nations maintain stable prices for coffee by assuring that the amount of coffee available for export does not exceed the amount desired for consumption.

Here is how the coffee agreement works. Estimates are made at the beginning of each year of the quantity of coffee which will be consumed during the year. On the basis of these estimates, the consuming nations on one side, and the producing nations on the other, jointly work out a coffee quota for the year.

Once the annual quota is fixed, the producing nations agree not to export more than their share of the total and to attach a certificate of origin to each bag exported.

Consuming nations agree not to allow coffee to be imported from producing nations unless there is a certificate of origin attached, and also to keep records of the quantity and origin of coffee imported. These statistics will enable producing nations to learn whether any of them are cheating on their agreements.

In effect, we help them enforce their own promises.

The United States has assurances, both in the coffee agreement itself and in this enabling bill, that its consumers are not to be victimized by price fixing under the agreement.

For instance, we have 400 of the 1,000 votes of the consuming nations. This gives us a virtual veto power over the fixing of annual quotas, since quotas and all other important decisions must be reached by two-thirds votes of each side. If the annual quota is not fixed, then there is no limitation whatsoever on the quantity of coffee which can be shipped by producing countries. Thus, the producers have a strong incentive to assure that a quota can be set which is agreeable to the consuming nations. I serve notice, here and now, on our representatives to the Coffee Organization that we expect them to drive a hard bargain in fixing the annual quota.

In this bill, we also have incorporated an important safeguard. We have provided, by committee amendment, that the enabling authority in this bill is to be conditioned upon the maintenance of reasonable price levels. Although the general date in the bill provides that the powers granted by it are to apply until October 1, 1968, we have added an exception to terminate the authority at an earlier date if—and I am quoting from the bill:

> Congress by concurrent resolution determines that an unwarranted increase in the price of coffee has occurred.

That is the amendment which was offered by the distinguished minority leader the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I felt that it was a very wise amendment, and I was happy to support it.

This is a real protection for our consumer. With it in the bill, we need not fear the coffee organization will unduly restrict quotas to boost prices.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that last summer the Senate approved a coffee program-implementing bill nearly identical with S. 701. We approved it by the substantial margin of 58 to 27. Unfortunately, the House was not able to complete its consideration of a Senate amendment before the 88th Congress adjourned and so we must approve this legislation anew in this Congress.

S. 701 is an important piece of the administration's program. It will improve our relations in Latin America and strengthen the Alliance for Progress. I urge that it be adopted.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 701. This bill will enable the United States to fully perform its responsibilities under the International Coffee Agreement.

Senators will recall that the coffee agreement itself was submitted to the Senate more than 2 years ago—in October 1962. We consented to its ratification on May 21, 1963, by a vote of 69 to 20.

Last summer the Senate took up the necessary implementing legislation and passed it on July 31 by the substantial margin of 58 to 27. Although the House conferees agreed to the Senate version of last year's bill, Congress adjourned before the House concluded its work on the bill.

The bill we have before us today is substantially identical to the bill we passed last year. It is my opinion that we should act on it promptly—the United States cannot carry out its functions under the agreement until we do.

One of the important features which had a lot to do with the strong vote cast for last year's implementing bill has been substantially retained. In fact, it is fair to state it has been improved on. I refer to the so-called Dirksen amendment which provided Congress with a mechanism for getting us out of the agreement if coffee prices became unreasonable. We looked upon that amendment as a safeguard for our coffee consumers—as an answer to charges that the coffee agreement meant higher prices.

In S. 701, the pending bill, we have kept this protection for the coffee consumers, but we have eliminated the cumbersome procedures required by last year's bill. Under the new version of the Dirksen amendment, whenever Congress finds by a concurrent resolution that there has been an unwarranted increase in the price of coffee, then the authority provided by this bill is automatically terminated. Without this authority we could not enforce the agreement, and I believe it is fair to state that if the United States does not enforce the agreement, it will all fail.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has ably described the provisions of S. 701 and the safeguards for our consumers, both in the bill and in the agreement itself. I want to add that the ultimate protection for our consumers is the unrestricted right we have under article 68 to withdraw completely from the agreement, when we feel it is resulting in increased prices of coffee.

Let me indicate why this bill is important. Coffee dominates the economy of Latin America. It accounts for about 25 percent of the export earnings of 14 Latin American countries, and in 6 of these—including Colombia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Guatemala—it accounts for more than half of their earnings. In Africa, coffee accounts for 30–50 percent of the earnings of seven producing countries. What happens in the world coffee market affects them profoundly.

We all know that the coffee market is a wildly fluctuating market with prices as low as 7 cents a pound in 1938 and as high as 93 cents a pound in 1954. It has a long history of boom and bust. These gyrations in coffee prices make orderly growth and development impossible. When prices are too high, there is inflation and overplanting in producing countries. When prices tumble, so too do their government revenues, exchange receipts, private investment, and the general level of economic activity in those countries. Trade with the United States is curtailed and increased aid is needed to bail out the producing countries.

The philosophy of the coffee agreement and of S. 701 is trade, not aid. The stated purpose of the agreement is the stabilization of coffee prices, that is, the moderation of the wide swings which have occurred in the past and the promotion of increased coffee consumption.

I emphasize "stabilization of prices." Last year we had a great deal of debate that the agreement would cause coffee prices to rise and that that was the objective of the agreement. I am not in favor of increasing coffee prices, and I do not believe any other Member of this body is. And I would not have voted either for the ratification of the agreement or for the enabling legislation if I had felt that prices would go up because of the agreement.

Unfortunately, coffee prices did begin to rise while we were considering last year's bill, but I believe it is now clear beyond dispute that it was not the agreement which caused it. Rather it was panicky buying of coffee roasters in fear of an impending shortage following a severe frost in Brazil. They unwisely bid prices up without thought that this was just the kind of situation the coffee agreement could and would deal with.

The coffee agreement did deal with that crisis. It acted to increase quotas to provide the market with coffee from stocks in warehouses inside the producing countries. When it was all over, the feared shortages never materialized and the sharp price rises which might have occurred in the absence of the coffee agreement were avoided.

That the coffee trade bought more coffee than it needed to meet consumer demand is well documented in the charts of the committee report indicating the very sharp increase in coffee inventories in this country, which began when the Brazilian crop failure was announced. This artificial and additional demand obviously sent prices up.

I think that now with this experience under the coffee agreement, we can expect less panicky buying in the future, because the trade will have more confidence in the ability of the agreement to get coffee out of stocks and onto the market when it is needed. I note that the coffee industry now favors enactment of this bill.

I join the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and a majority of the members of the Finance Committee in urging passage of S. 701.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not yet been ordered.

Mr. MORTON. I suggest that the Senate have the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it is rather difficult for me to oppose my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana, and my distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], on the implementation of the coffee agreement.

I believe my position is well known in the Senate and in the committee. I have consistently opposed agreements, not necessarily the International Coffee Agreement, although that is pending before the Senate now, but all agreements that enter into global price fixing. It is for that reason that I take the floor this afternoon.

We are today asked to approve implementing legislation for the International Coffee Agreement which the Senate approved and ratified on May 21, 1963. On December 27, 1963, the United States deposited its instrument of ratification and became a full member of the International Coffee Organization.

The implementation of the coffee agreement has been before one or both Houses of Congress since its ratification.

I appreciate fully the position of the administration and the State Department in their request for implementation of the International Coffee Agreement from a political standpoint.

Mr. President, I am not insensitive to the situation that develops, not only in Latin America, but in Africa and other countries, when it comes to a price support program which greatly increases the price of a commodity which an underdeveloped country or any other country produces.

On the other hand, we have been participating as a full member of the International Coffee Organization since ratification of the agreement in December 1963. We have paid our share of the costs of the International Coffee Organization; we have participated in setting quotas; and, in my opinion, have carried on as a full member of the Organization.

I have consistently opposed the enactment of the International Coffee Agreement and today oppose its implementation.

I am opposed to any attempt to set apart agricultural trade and divide international agricultural markets through the use of international commodity agreements.

Second, I do not believe our Government should enter into these agreements which require a certain amount of Government intervention, both in the production and trade of the commodity in question.

Today I have expressed my concern and views in regard to Senate bill 701. They are made a part of the report and headed "Minority Views on S. 701." These views are signed by other members of the committee. I believe that the report on the part of the majority and the minority is excellent. It contains a very excellent statement of the situation.

The charts which are included in this report clearly reveal that the price of coffee has gone up nearly 15 cents a pound in the 13-month period which has elapsed since December 1963, when we became a party to the agreement. At that time the price of coffee was barely 70 cents a pound in the retail stores of our country.

But after we joined the coffee cartel, coffee prices immediately began an upward spiral bringing coffee prices today up to nearly 85 cents per pound. This is higher than coffee prices have been since 1958 and inevitably enactment of this bill will be followed by new pressures to force prices up still higher.

The record of hearings before the committee is clear on this point and even the most ardent proponents of the coffee cartel do not deny it. For every 1-cent rise in the price of coffee the American consumer must pay an additional $32½ million a year for the coffee he drinks. And in the 13 months that we have been party to the agreement there has been a 15-cent rise in the price of coffee. At this rate the coffee agreement is already taking from our consumers more than $487 million a year.

In effect, the coffee agreement operates to levy an excise tax on American coffee consumers for the purpose of paying subsidies to already wealthy coffeegrowers, processors, and speculators; and it does this indirectly, without the formality of a taxing act. Based upon experience since the agreement became effective, the increase in coffee prices represents an excise tax equivalent to about 20 percent. And it is no secret that this bears most heavily on our low-income earners.

In addition to the views expressed in the minority report, I think the record is crystal clear that the International Coffee Organization expects to hold down world trade in coffee to the 47 million bags that were used in world trade in 1962, without any regard to the 3.3 percent population growth rate factor.

It is simple economics that any cartel that is allowed to restrict supply below demand will cause a rise in prices as users scramble for the short supplies.

In August 1963, the International Coffee Council established a national quota for the 1963-64 coffee year of 45,732,622 bags. This was done despite the fact that there was a demand for 48 million bags or more.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a list of quota actions by the International Coffee Council.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Quota Actions by the International Coffee Council

August 1963: Annual quota for 1963–64 coffee year established at 45,732,622 bags.

November 1963: Proposal to increase annual quota by 2.25 percent defeated by narrow margin of 25 votes.

February 1964: Annual quota increased by 5 percent to 48,120,044 bags.

May 1964: Adjustments in quotas of 2 countries increases total annual quota by 355,000 bags.

June 1964: Redistribution of shortfalls—reflecting inability of some countries to deliver their quota—raises total annual quotas to 48,773,273 bags. Total increase since initial quota set in August 1963 is 3,040,651 bags.

August 1964: At the August meeting of the Council, annual quotas for the year October 1, 1964–September 30, 1965, were set initially at 47.5 million bags with provision for increases of 500,000 bags on January 8, 1965, and prior to April 30, 1965, depending on the needs and condition of the market.

December 1964: At its December 10–16 meeting, the Executive Board recommended to the Council that the 500,000-bag increase suggested for January 8, 1965, not be made. Present quotas are therefore 47.5 million bags.

Source: Department of State.

Mr. CARLSON. I mention in that list the changes that took place in November 1963; February 1964; May 1964; June 1964; August 1964; and December 1964. It is interesting to note that in their December 10-16 meeting in London the executive board recommended to the Council that the 500,000-bag increase suggested for January 8, 1965, not be made. Present quotas are therefore 47.5 million bags.

The record of the quota actions by the International Coffee Council is such that the coffee consumers of the Nation and the world can expect but one thing from the operations of this agency—coffee quotas held at a figure that will increase the price of coffee to the consumer.

The idea that international commodity problems can be solved through controls on exports and imports has been given serious consideration for four decades.

Such proposals have been particularly appealing to leaders in underdeveloped countries, because of the promise of stabilization of prices, export earnings, and an improvement in the terms of trade—primary products versus finished goods.

Formal agreements have been implemented for sugar, wheat, tin, coffee, and cotton textiles, with varying provisions, but all have failed to attain their primary objectives for the following reasons:

First. Did not include a sufficient proportion of producing and trading countries.

Second. Export quotas negotiated on a prestige basis—not economic.

Third. Did not include provisions for production control and harmonization of agricultural policies.

Fourth. Governments were not strong enough to fulfill commitments when conditions required.

Fifth. Lack of understanding of importance of international cooperation.

Sixth. Interference of nonparticipating countries.

Seventh. Not sufficiently flexible to adjust to rapidly changing world conditions.

U.S. Government policy with respect to international commodity agreements has varied through the years from outright opposition to full endorsement.

First. The United States participated in the sugar agreement in 1937 and all subsequent extensions because the requirements with respect to commitments were only to carry out the U.S. Sugar Act in a nondiscriminatory manner and because of the prestige of belonging to an international sugar club.

Second. The United States participated in the wheat agreement in 1949 and subsequent extensions with the vain hope that it would slow the expansion of production of wheat in importing countries and thereby maintain an assured outlet for a certain portion of our own production. Also, it was believed that there is some prestige value in belonging. Actually foreign wheat production has continued to expand, and the United States has not been able to control production at home. As a consequence, the United States has resorted to Public Law 480 disposals and export subsidies as a temporary remedy. The wheat agreement has been relegated to mostly an international recordkeeping agency and forum for wheat discussions.

Third. With respect to tin, the United States has consistently refused to participate, largely because it was an exporter agreement with a buffer stock provision. Also, it was developed at a time when the U.S. policy was strongly in opposition to international commodity agreements.

Fourth. In the case of coffee, an agreement was first developed by Latin American exporters but gradually included some of the more important African producers. This agreement failed because the members would not or could not meet their commitments with respect to export controls. Also, many of the individual export quotas were based upon prestige rather than historical performance. In 1962 the United States, under a radical change in policy, participated in the development of a new agreement which included a large proportion of both exporting and importing countries. The agreement is now awaiting ratification of governments, but there is serious doubt that its provisions will be adhered to by the exporting countries.

Fifth. The U.S. Government found itself in a difficult political situation with respect to the imports of cotton textiles and its longstanding cotton program. In 1961 a 1-year cotton textile agreement was negotiated and in 1962 a longer term arrangement was agreed. Textile producers are supposed to control their shipments to certain markets including the United States, but the controls have been ineffective. As a consequence, the United States has had to implement import controls which have not been totally acceptable to exporters.

In 1961 the U.S. Government changed its policy to favor international commodity agreements, and there is now serious consideration being given to resolving all agricultural trade problems through this mechanism. Cotton textiles and coffee were the first, and studies are progressing with respect to grains, fats and oils, cocoa, and so forth. International study groups have been active as follows:

First. FAO Consultative Subcommittee on the Economic Aspects of Rice.

Second. FAO Cocoa Study Group.

Third. FAO Group on Citrus Fruits.

Fourth. FAO Group on Coconuts and Products.

Fifth. The International Rubber Study Group.

Sixth. The International Wool Study Group.

Seventh. The International Agreement on Olive Oil.

Eighth. The International Cotton Advisory Committee.

In a speech at the meeting of Agricultural Ministers at Paris in November 1962, Secretary Freeman said after making a strong plea for liberalized trade and access to the Common Market:

> The principal objective of commodity arrangements, as we see it, would be to develop measures for maintaining trade in those

commodities which do not lend themselves to regulation by fixed bound tariffs. Within this context, exporters would expect to obtain meaningful assurances of access to traditional markets. The elements which we believe should be considered in such agreements include international prices, producer prices, supply management including supply control, import quotas, export shares, stocking, and contributions in the form of food aid to less developed countries. Obligations with respect to any of these elements included in the agreement should apply equally to importing countries as well as to exporting countries. If it is not possible to agree on fixing producer prices in importing countries, then specific assurances as to the maintenance of established levels of imports would be required.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the need to include in any commodity arrangement effective measures of supply management. The productive capabilities of our agricultural industries simply exceed possible outlets for the foreseeable future. "We are fully aware of the difficulties that would be encountered in negotiating agreements that include elements which I have just indicated. It is for this reason that the list of commodities for which commodity arrangements are considered should be limited. This problem needs to be studied carefully.

This is a pressing problem at the present time. It will continue to be so as a result of the meetings of the 70 or more underdeveloped countries in Geneva last January until September, at which time there was a general discussion over the fact that these are underdeveloped countries, and other countries should pay above-world-prices for commodities produced in those countries.

For that reason I oppose the implementation of the proposed coffee agreement today, and hope that there may be a yea-and-nay vote on it.

If there is not a sufficient number of Senators present to order the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views on Senate bill 701 be printed as a part of the remarks which I made earlier on the coffee agreement.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS ON S. 701

The views here expressed are written out of consideration for the coffee consumers of our Nation. We are convinced that the International Coffee Agreement, which would be implemented by this bill, serves us no purpose but to increase the price our consumers must pay for the coffee they buy.

Indeed, the agreement already is having that effect. The charts which are included in this report clearly reveal that the price of coffee has gone up nearly 15 cents a pound in the 13-month period which has elapsed since December 1963, when we became a party to the agreement. At that time the price of coffee was barely 70 cents a pound in the retail stores of our country.

But after we joined the coffee cartel, coffee prices immediately began an upward spiral bringing coffee prices today up to nearly 85 cents per pound. This is higher than coffee prices have been since 1958, and inevitably enactment of this bill will be followed by new pressures to force prices up still higher.

Now, what does this mean to coffee consumers? The record of hearings before the committee is clear on this point and even the most ardent proponents of the coffee cartel do not deny it. For every 1-cent rise in the price of coffee the American consumer must pay an additional $32½ million a year for the coffee he drinks. And in the 13 months that we have been party to the agreement there has been a 15-cent rise in the price of coffee. At this rate the coffee agreement is already taking from our consumers more than $487 million a year.

In effect, the coffee agreement operates to levy an excise tax on American coffee consumers for the purpose of paying subsidies to already wealthy coffeegrowers, processors, and speculators; and it does this indirectly, without the formality of a taxing act. Based upon experience since the agreement became effective, the increase in coffee prices represents an excise tax equivalent to about 20 percent. And it is no secret that this bears most heavily on our low-income earners.

(It will be recalled that in the days of the New Deal an act to tax processors of agricultural products to subsidize producers was declared unconstitutional by our Supreme Court. We are unable to discern any real difference between what was done then and what is being done under the International Coffee Agreement.)

The increase in coffee prices following our membership in the coffee agreement is not mere happenstance. Quite the contrary—price increase is one of the stated objectives of the agreement. Thus, article 1 of the agreement states that one of its objectives is "to assist in increasing the purchasing power of coffee-exporting countries," and article 27 requires that the agreement be operated in such a manner that the real income of producing nations be "progressively increased." Unfortunately, nowhere in the agreement do we find any suggestion that coffee prices should ever level off.

There are additional reasons for our not favoring this legislation. The coffee agreement is not an isolated instance of an agricultural product which is in need of price stability. We fear the precedent that is being set today inevitably will be relied upon by the State Department, and others, to justify future agreements which serve to redistribute the wealth of the world by requiring American consumers to pay more for foreign products than they may be worth. We are concerned that the American consumer may thus soon find himself supporting the world price for an endless procession of these products from tropical countries.

The demands of the developing nations of the world, most of which are located in the tropical climates, were voiced in no uncertain terms at last year's United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Among other concessions, they demanded strong international agreements to support prices and to guarantee markets for their agricultural commodities.

Repeatedly we have been told that by bringing producing nations and consuming nations together in a single forum we will be able to influence the quantity of coffee to be made available for consumption, and that this is a benefit for consumers. We question how effective our influence might be. Although the United States consumes one-half of the coffee used in the entire world, when it comes to changing quotas to affect some reduction in price, we have only one-fifth of the votes. More importantly, we must persuade two-thirds of the producing nations to absorb the financial loss involved if prices should be reduced.

Our first effort to increase quotas under the coffee agreement was a dismal failure. Our next effort, which occurred after Congress threatened not to approve the implementing legislation (rather than as a result of persuasion), did result in increased coffee quotas, but the increase was not sufficient to halt the upward thrust of retail coffee prices.

We call attention to the fact that a 500,000-bag increase in the quota for 1965, which was scheduled to occur on January 8, failed to go into effect, and now we are under substantial pressure by exporting countries to reduce the 1965 quota by about 2 million bags. The Council has not yet acted to reduce the quotas, possibly because of the pending vote in the Senate on this very bill.

As we have already emphasized in these views, we must expect coffee prices to move upward to still higher levels if the threat of congressional disapproval of this implementing legislation is removed.

Even now, representatives of important coffee-producing nations of the world are banding together to devise means of keeping coffee off the markets to force prices on up. If these nations are successful then the coffee agreement is nothing more than an instrument to set prices at levels agreeable to the producing nations. If the prices resulting from quota action of the Council are unsatisfactory to the producers, then they merely refrain from exporting the coffee agreed to in the Council. This, of course, immediately affects prices and places American consumers still more at the mercy of foreign coffee producers.

Finally, much is said to us of the role the economic law of supply and demand will continue to play in assuring reasonable prices under the agreement. Actually, the coffee agreement repeals the law of supply and demand. That law cannot operate where supply is artifically limited. Only where supply is free to respond to demand change (and vice versa) does the law function properly.

Where supply of coffee is restricted by quotas but demand remains constant, or increases, those who are to have the coffee must bid higher prices than others are willing or able to pay for it. It is this philosophy of restriction of supply upon which the international coffee cartel is founded.

We can succinctly summarize our opposition to S. 701.

We object to the effect the coffee cartel has had on coffee prices.

We fear the precedent of having American consumers support world prices for foreign agricultural commodities.

We bemoan our poor bargaining posture under the procedures of the coffee agreement.

We deplore the repeal of the law of supply and demand.

For these reasons, we are convinced that the best interests of our people would be served if S. 701 were not agreed to.

FRANK CARLSON.
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.
HARRY F. BYRD.
WALLACE F. BENNETT.
CARL T. CURTIS.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the proposed coffee legislation was before the Senate in the 88th Congress. At that time I did not believe that there was sufficient control with respect to quotas, and therefore I offered some language in committee, which was adopted, which I thought would be effective in making certain that if prices went up, there would at least be a way to obtain larger quotas, because supply is the only answer to an increase in coffee prices.

On consultation with the Department of Justice it appears that there was a feeling that the language as adopted might be construed as something of an invasion of the right of the President under the treaty power. I am quite frank to admit that I could see partial validity, at least, to the point that was made. That language was deleted when the new bill came before the Senate in the 89th Congress.

At that time I offered language which appears in section 2, on page 1, inasmuch as within the legislative language a limitation of October 1, 1968, had been set for the exercise of the Presidential powers.

It must be quite clear, by implication, that other limitations might be written into it also. Accordingly, the language that appears on page 1 would give to the Congress the authority, if it so desires, to adopt a concurrent resolution whenever there is an unwarranted price increase which would have the effect of stimulating an increased quota in order to head off a possible price increase.

The whole subject of quotas, after all, is the nub of the matter. There have been too many rumors in various parts of the world—Africa, Latin America, and here—as to what the ultimate objective of the coffee producers was. It would appear, of course, that they are going to work at the matter until they obtain a substantial increase in price. By rule of thumb, we understand that a 1-cent increase in the price of coffee would put a burden of $32.5 million upon the American people. If the boast that was made that there would be no stopping until at least a 10-cent increase had been obtained should become a fact, the burden would amount to over $300 million, which would be added to what has already happened since 1962, when the coffee treaty was signed.

I believe that there must be a little more protection than that which appeared in the bill. Congress is free at any time, on ascertaining that coffee prices have increased to the point where we should take cognizance of the fact, to enact a concurrent resolution and, in so doing, bring it to the attention of the President. After that, there ought to be some kind of action to ameliorate the condition.

I do not essentially quarrel with the fact that coffee producers cannot be asked to produce coffee at a loss. No one expects that, of course. On the other hand, we do not expect a gouge, either.

So, in my judgment, between the authority that the President has and the authority that the consumer countries have by virtue of the way that the voting panels are organized, plus the additional language, a fairly good safeguard is constituted. For that reason, I propose to support the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in asking for the yeas and nays on the coffee agreement bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

BANK FAILURES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, considerable discussion has taken place in the newspapers and over the air within the last several days about the closing of a $41 million national bank in San Francisco. I have before me a newspaper clipping of Saturday, January 30, which states that the U.S. Government, through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, has begun sending out $10,000 checks, reflecting the guarantee that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation made against losses that might be suffered by depositors. The article further states that the payoffs to depositors are being conducted by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which was appointed receiver of the bank after Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon declared the bank insolvent.

Approximately 2 weeks have passed since the bank was closed. As of this time, there is no clear indication of what the cost of the collapse of the institution was.

We might look upon this closing as an isolated incident. We might say that we should approach it only from the standpoint of the possible mismanagement of the San Francisco national bank. I put the question to the Senate: When a $41 million bank closes, in the face of the responsibility of the Comptroller of the Currency to know what is going on in our banking institutions, and in the face of the guarantee that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation issues on bank deposits, can we afford to allow this closing to be treated as an isolated instance? Or, in the interest of the safety of depositors in all other banking institutions, has the time come to make a general study of what is happening with respect to credits, the competition to find borrowers, and the competition to find depositors by increasing the rates of interest paid depositors?

In my experience as a public official, as a consequence of deep grief and pain when I was Governor, I learned to know that when a red signal appears—a menacing sign—one should not go by it without stopping and looking to see what the ramifications indicated by the red signal might be.

I stated a moment ago that to my deep grief and pain as Governor I went by a red signal on one occasion, thinking it unimportant. Subsequently, I learned that it foreboded trouble of so grave a character that I resolved never again to go by a red signal without checking carefully to ascertain what had happened.

Before the closing of the bank in San Francisco, I had been concerned about the problem. I had been concerned about it because I had the misfortune, back in 1932, while I was a judge, to become a director of a bank about a year before its doors were closed. My name was used to procure depositors. Then came that fateful day in March 1933, when it was declared necessary to shut the doors of every bank in the country. Later, when the bank with which I was connected was examined, and we tried to ascertain what Government bonds we had and what cash we had to pay our depositors, it was found that the liquid assets were practically negligible.

Following an incident about 3 months ago, I inquired about the liquidity of a certain bank. The disclosure was that in 1954 that particular institution had Government bonds and cash in an amount equal to about 67 percent of its total assets. I wish to repeat that: In 1954, its assets were 67 percent in the form of cash and Government bonds; 33 percent were in the form of mortgages and notes. Ten years later, the same institution has 67 percent of its assets in mortgages, notes, and buildings, and 33 percent in cash and Government bonds.

Following this disclosure, I made calls to one of the agencies of the Government that is pertinently connected with the problem. I expressed to the representative of the Government my apprehension of this complete reversal in the character of the holdings of assets. I made the statement: "Several months ago, Mr. William McChesney Martin, speaking in Florida before the American Bankers Association, issued a warning to the bankers:

" 'Be careful about your investments. You are growing reckless,' he said in substance."

He said: "Be certain that you keep yourself in a state of liquidity that will enable you to meet whatever problems might arise."

I told this particular individual, high in Government responsibility, what Mr. McChesney Martin had said. His answer was, "I do not agree with him." I might as well identify the name of the second man. The second man was a principal assistant to Mr. Saxon, the Comptroller of the Currency.

Thus, on the one hand, we had McChesney Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank, Board of Governors, warning about the need of caution in the operation of the banks, and on the other hand, the Comptroller of the Currency saying that he did not agree with what Mr. McChesney Martin had said about looseness developing in the management of national banks.

I laid the thing aside. I felt that there was no reason for me to become excited, although intuitively I had a feeling that the bankers—who in this period of abundance when all financial institutions are making money—had forgotten all of the lessons that were learned out of the calamity of 1933.

When I learned of the closing of the San Francisco national bank, a contact was made with Mr. Joseph W. Barr. He is the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. He and his principal assistant came to my office last Wednesday, January 27.

When I spoke to Mr. Barr on the telephone before he came to my office, I said to him, "I am getting concerned, especially in view of this $41 million bank closing its doors, and about the great reversal in the last 10 years of the holdings of the banks in cash and Government bonds on the one hand, and mortgage notes, other securities, and real property on the other."

Mr. Barr brought a tabulation to my office. I shall discuss this tabulation in a moment. It shows the holdings and assets in all of the banks covered by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from 1954 to 1964. The tabulation shows that in 1954, all of the banks in the United States covered by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which includes both National and State banks, but not building and loan associations, had in their portfolio 52.8 percent in cash and Government bonds. That sum of 52.8 percent, held in 1954, has fallen to 32 percent in 1964. Thus, in 1964, all of the banks in the country have 32 percent of their assets in what we call liquid form, and 68 percent in the other category.

From 1954 down to this date, there has been a complete reversal in the character of assets held by the banks. From liquidity, in my opinion, if they have not already passed into a state of illiquidity, they are pretty close to it.

Since I received the paper from Mr. Barr, he sent me another document. It came in the mail today. This document shows how the assets in our banks were held in 1932. The banks were closed in March 1933. This document shows the status of the portfolio of all the banks in 1932.

The record shows that in 1932, 25 percent of the assets was in cash and Government funds, and 75 percent was in mortgages, notes, real estate, and other securities.

Today, 32 percent of their assets is in notes and Government bonds. The percentage is going down all the time.

Mr. President, a book entitled "Money, Credit, and Banks" was published in 1938. The author of that book, Mr. Westerfield, made a complete study of the bank failures of 1932.

This is what Mr. Westerfield said:

> One flimsy excuse or explanation offered by the bankers and readily swallowed by their victimized customers and shareholders is that the banks failed because of the severe depression in agricultural States or because of the marked contraction of values of securities or real estate. It is an intolerable situation that banks should fail and communities be wrecked every time business conditions change. If banks cannot anticipate such changes and adjust their portfolios so as to meet and not be wrecked by them, there is something basically wrong with the system that allows such bankers to operate banks, or that prevents them from operating soundly, or both.
>
> Our banks should be a stabilizing force, a source of succor in financial storm. It is a sorry fact that the failure rate of banks has recently exceeded the failure rate of commercial and industrial institutions, and that while these rates are increasing with every major business depression, the disparity is becoming wider. The rates as calculated by Dun's show that prior to 1921 the bank failure rate ruled lower than the commercial failure rate, whereas after 1921 the reverse was true; that while the prewar (1892–1913) commercial failure rate was almost identical with the postwar (1921–30) rate, the bank failure rate jumped threefold. The bank failure rate leapt forward even faster, both absolutely and relatively, between 1930 and 1933. Quite obviously, our banks have been dragging down rather than supporting our commercial institutions, and this propensity has been increasing.

Mr. Westerfield went on further to say:

> Every village wanted not one bank only but two or more which would compete in service to the community. The response to this demand was facilitated by the ease of starting a bank: Charters could be got freely under the general corporation or bank law; the State pushed the establishment of State banks and the Federal Government the national banks; and if the Comptroller of the Currency tightened terms of admission, the State banking department yielded readily, especially when politicians applied; the extent to which the public convenience, necessity, or advantage would be served was given slight attention. The capitalization required was low and it was possible for the subscriber to borrow more of it, if necessary, on the security of the subscribed shares themselves. It was not thought that a banker needed much brains, training, or experience. As a consequence of these conditions, banks multiplied to 30,033 in 1920, or 1 bank for every 3,500 people in the United States as a whole or for every 725 people in North Dakota, the region of greatest density.
>
> The results of this excessive multiplication of banks are legion and profound. Dividing the country's capital among too many banks reduces the average capital per bank to a figure that inadequately protects creditors. Starting banks as speculations on too thin capital, often mostly borrowed, sacrifices the conservatism and stability necessary to sound credit. The total deposits of the community are divided among so many banks that it becomes quite impossible for all of the banks to earn a livelihood. Competition runs keen and forces the banks to pay too high rates for deposits and to supply expensive free services. Out of a spirit of megalomania or ostentation a competition in bank buildings develops, loading the bank with high overhead and sinking undue proportions of its assets in fixed form earning little revenue. Every bank must be fully staffed, but the low earnings and small scale and easy entrance into the business usually mean that the official staff is mediocre in capacity. In order to make ends meet the bank is forced to ask high discount rates, and regions like Dakota or Oklahoma, despite their unwarrantable number of competing banks, pay crippling rates of 8 or 10 percent universally. If the bank operates at a loss, it is the worst possible type of competitor and drags the others to its plane. The small bank places untoward proportions of its assets in local loans and mortgages and securities, first, because it can get higher rates on these than on paper and securities from the metropolitan market, second, because borrowers shop around and place their account at the most accommodating bank and deposits are the sine qua non of banking, and third, because it feels a heavy social pressure to serve the local community, that is, to loan freely to local applicants and not let the money leave the community. The portfolios of loans and investments thus lack diversification as to area, industry, and type, and the fortune of the bank is hung on the one crop or industry of the town. In the newer, rapidly growing sections the banker feels an irresistible urge to speculate, not only with his own private money but with that of his bank, for he is sanguine of the possibilities of his town becoming a second Chicago; he lends funds on real estate projects of high speculative character, or on oil, coal, or other schemes for opening up the resources and developing the area; this urge is fanned and supported by local businessmen and visionary promoters (who generally want funds) until he feels a sense of duty exceeding the obligation felt toward depositors. The banker and applicant are too intimate, and loans, as a consequence, are granted on the basis of sentimentalities rather than coldblooded credit analysis.

Mr. Westerfield further said:

> Many of the leading banks established security affiliates to handle investment operations which the banks felt were unfit for themselves to undertake directly. In the latter years of the decade, affiliates of other types were erected and closely tied under the aegis of the bank, such as investment trusts, financing companies, foreign and international banking houses, land banks, speculative pools, holding companies, and realty companies. The Bank of the United States in New York City, which failed in 1931, had over 60 such affiliates, with most involved connections. The bank was likely to be loaded with affiliates, its assets purloined to benefit a subsidiary, its officers and directors biased in their judgments by adverse interests in affiliates, and its credit wrecked by publicity of sharp deals or by known support of weak securities in which the outfit was interested, and its business became too heavily involved in investment-bank affairs. The fact that most of these affiliates were not banks exempted them from supervision by the Comptroller of the Currency or State banking department and made them a handy means of doing things foreign to good banking.
>
> In addition to the adverse reaction of chronic agricultural depression in the 1920's and of general business depression in 1920–21 and 1930–33, the values of securities were driven down by the efforts of banks to meet runs and by the efforts of bank receivers to salvage what they could for needy depositors. The conversion of securities into cash for these purposes flooded the markets. A vicious circle developed, for the decline in values created apprehensions in the depositor's mind as to the safety of the bank and his demand forced further liquidation of securities. In order to avoid loss the banker sacrificed his best securities first, for they had declined least in value, with the result that the decline became general and that the losses were accelerated as the depression and failures proceeded. Sooner or later the banks with the weakest portfolios were sure to succumb.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD tables showing the changes in the portfolios, as carried, 1954 and 1964.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All insured banks, percentages of total assets

	June 30—	
	1964	1954
Cash and balances with banks	14.7	20.0
U.S. Government obligations	17.3	32.8
Subtotal	32.0	52.8
Loans and discounts	54.2	37.1
Other securities	11.2	8.7
Other	2.6	1.4
Total	100.0	100.0

Assets of all banks in the United States (States and other areas), June 30, 1932

	Amount	Distribution
	Billions	*Percent*
Cash and balances with banks	$7.4	12.9
U.S. Government obligations	6.9	12.1
Subtotal	14.3	25.0
Loans and discounts	28.1	49.0
Other securities	11.5	20.1
Other	3.4	5.9
Total	57.3	100.0

Source: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Division of Research and Statistics, Jan. 28, 1965.

All insured banks, June 30, 1964

[Amounts in billions]

Total assets	$366.1
Cash and balances with banks	53.8
U.S. Government obligations	63.3
Loans and discounts, net	198.5
Bank premises, furniture, fixtures, real estate	4.9
Other securities	41.1
Miscellaneous assets	4.5

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now I come to the main purpose of my making this talk today.

I send to the desk a resolution which resolves that the Committee on Banking and Currency or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized under section 13(4)(a) and 13(6) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, to make a study of the banking situation as it prevails with respect particularly to the adequacy of the inspections that are being made by the Comptroller of the Currency and by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

I want to relate to another matter in suport of what I am proposing. I asked Mr. Barr, the head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation how it was that he did not know of the weak condition of the bank in San Francisco. I said, "Mr. Barr, you are the head of the insuror. Why did you not know this $41 million institution was on wobbly legs?" His answer was that we should ask Mr. Saxon to see the financial reports on the different banks, the deposits of which his Corporation insures. Mr. Saxon said, "I will not let you see my examinations unless you pay me $100 for a transcript of the report."

I think Senators had better shake their heads a little on that proposition. The head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation told the Comptroller, "You can see the reports of the different banks, the deposits of which are insured." Mr. Saxon's answer was, "I will not let you see them unless you pay me $100 for each report I submit."

So we have a situation where the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, with its obligations covering 14,000 banks, has no knowledge of what is going on within those banks.

The resolution I have submitted calls upon the Banking and Currency Committee to make a study to determine whether Federal requirements applicable to the chartering of new banks need tightening or not.

Second. The extent to which there has been progressive decline in the percentage of liquid assets held by national banks contrary to sound banking practices.

Third. Whether Federal requirements with respect to capitalization of national banks is adequate.

Fourth. The extent to which sound credit policies have been relaxed by national banks in order to meet competitive pressures or practices.

Fifth. Whether any national banks are using affiliates or other devices as a means of speculation.

Sixth. The extent to which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has access to all pertinent data necessary to the effective discharge of its functions.

If all is well, it will be a good message to the depositors in our banking institutions, and to the banking officials. If there are weaknesses in the structure or in the law on the practices which are being followed, we can tighten them before calamity occurs.

I send the resolution to the desk. I ask that it be printed and placed in the RECORD. My hopes are we will awaken to the gravity of the situation which I have discussed today. I hesitated discussing it, but I finally became convinced that it is better to talk about it now than to grieve later that I had not talked about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 78) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study of existing practices with respect to the chartering of national banks, existing credit and other operating policies of such banks, and the circumstances under which recent bank failures have occurred with a view to determining what if any measures are needed to strengthen our national banking system. Such study shall include, but shall not be limited to, an inquiry into the following matters:

(1) Whether Federal requirements applicable to the chartering of new banks need tightening in the public interest and in order to prevent destructive competition among financial institutions;

(2) The extent to which there has been a progressive decline in the percentage of liquid assets held by national banks contrary to sound banking practices;

(3) Whether Federal requirements with respect to the capitalization of national banks are adequate;

(4) The extent to which sound credit policies have been relaxed by national banks in order to meet competitive pressures or otherwise;

(5) Whether any national banks are using affiliates or other devices as a means of speculation; and

(6) The extent to which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has access to all pertinent data necessary to the effective discharge of its functions.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, through January 31, 1966, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 701) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1963, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I understand that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the pending legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORTON. Has the third reading been had?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, before suggesting the absence of a quorum, I should like to have the attachés notify Members of the Senate that this quorum call is prior to a vote on the passage of the pending legislation.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I read from Report No. 53, dealing with the International Coffee Agreement, on page 2, the second paragraph:

> Coffee is the single most important agricultural commodity in the trade of most of the developing countries, particularly in Latin America. Coffee exports account for more than 50 percent of all exports in six Latin American countries and an average of 25 percent in all the 14 Latin American exporting nations. Seven new African countries receive from 30 to 50 percent of their foreign exchange earnings from coffee. About 20 million persons in the world depend on coffee for their livelihood; more than 60 percent of them are in Latin America. The overwhelming majority are small farmers cultivating less than 5 acres of land. In a very real sense, therefore, coffee is the lifeblood of the developing nations of the world.

Mr. President, it is with much regret that I find I am unable—again—to vote for the bill to implement the International Coffee Agreement of 1963.

Last July, when this matter was first before us, I detailed at some length the reasons for my opposition both to the original agreement, which I voted against, and to the implementing legislation.

Basically, I was opposed to this program because it would, in effect, become a regressive tax, falling most heavily upon low- and middle-income families. Further, I expressed grave doubts at the wisdom of our country's becoming the enforcing arm of a worldwide cartel, whose purpose was to put a floor, or minimum price, under coffee—without the protection of a maximum price, or ceiling.

The proposed legislation now before the Senate has been changed in some slight respects, but not enough to overcome my basic objections. Further, the duration of the implementing legislation has been extended from October

1965 to October 1968, to cover the entire life of the International Coffee Agreement.

I am aware of the fact that the procedure by which this implementing legislation could be terminated has been simplified over the cumbersome method proposed last year. Under this bill, the Congress—by concurrent resolution of both Houses—could terminate the implementing legislation by declaring that there had been an unwarranted increase in the price of coffee—without having to prove that the agreement was responsible for the increase.

But I realize, also, as a practical matter, that the price increase would have to be very steep—and amount to several cents per pound—before such action would be taken.

When we consider that a 1-cent increase in the retail price of coffee costs the American consumer $32.5 million a year—consumers would be penalized hundreds of millions of dollars before remedial action was taken.

And so, because the International Coffee Agreement, in my mind, constitutes an international price-fixing cartel—and because it establishes a dangerous precedent that will almost certainly result in extending this principle to such other commodities as tea, cocoa, soybeans, and other products—I will reluctantly vote against the pending bill.

I support the Alliance for Progress and aid to the developing countries but not at the expense of the coffee consumers of the United States.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as I am for full participation by the United States in the International Coffee Agreement, I am in favor of S. 701.

I supported the ratification of the International Coffee Agreement of 1962 because I believed that it would bring some stability to the very disorderly world coffee market, strengthen the Alliance for Progress, and also benefit our own consumers by stopping extreme prices. World coffee prices fluctuate widely. They were as low as 7 cents a pound for green coffee in 1938, over 90 cents in 1954, and 34 cents in 1962 and 1963.

In 1963, I testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in favor of the agreement as I believed that the agreement would benefit producing and consuming coffee countries and also my State. Hawaii is the only coffee State in the Union. Its coffee industry is absolutely dependent on world market prices, so that as world coffee prices go, so goes the price of Hawaii's Kona coffee.

Without the agreement, I am afraid that the price of coffee will continue to be erratic and may force many of our farmers out of business. The advent of the agreement offers considerable promise for our local coffee industry. While stabilizing the price of coffee may not have the effect of expanding our coffee industry, at least it will prevent it from declining.

It will also give us an opportunity to make needed improvements in our industry, which will again put it on a sound economic basis.

In the 1964 session in this Chamber, I supported the enactment of H.R. 8864, which was designed to implement the International Coffee Agreement of 1962, on the assurances of the Secretary of State that its goal was to stabilize at a level no lower than the general level of coffee prices in 1962, and with the firm belief that its amendment as proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] had adequate safeguards to protect the American consumers. The Senate did pass this implementing bill, but the Congress adjourned before the House completed action on the final compromise legislation.

Last week, before the Senate Finance Committee, I again supported S. 701, the pending bill to implement U.S. participation in the International Coffee Agreement of 1962, stating similar reasons.

There is no question that in stabilizing the price of coffee we must also protect our consumers against unreasonable price rises. Unreasonably high prices are not only bad for the consumers of America and my State, but also bad for the coffee producers as well, for in the long run unreasonably high prices will result in a coffee consumption decrease.

I am convinced that both the agreement and S. 701 contain adequate safeguards to protect the consumer against price gouging, and these safeguards will be used if need be, because clearly this is the sense of the Senate. The Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, before the Senate Finance Committee January 27, on S. 701 to implement the International Coffee Agreement, stated:

> The legislation now makes clear, in both sections 5 and 6, that protection of U.S. consumer interests should be a primary consideration in our participation in the agreement.

Moreover, there is no hampering of our coffee trade. Under the agreement, we can import as much coffee as we like. There are no import quotas. Our main obligations, as spelled out in the implementing bill, are to require certificates of origin on coffee entering the United States and to limit imports from nonmembers if this should be necessary to prevent them from glutting the market while members are exercising restraint.

The United States was instrumental in the steps leading to the creation of the International Coffee Agreement under the United Nations in the summer of 1962. To stabilize coffee prices and promote more orderly marketings, the International Coffee Study Group was first formed in June 1958. In 1961–62, it began to study the possibility of negotiations for a long-term coffee agreement embracing both producers and consumers.

Yet today, among the 18 importing countries which have joined the agreement, the United States is the only one which has failed to undertake its obligations under the terms of the treaty. Why? This may be attributed to an unexpected rise in price. Around October 1, 1963, prices for Brazil's Santos coffee began an upward movement. By March, 1964, New York spot prices for Santos 4 averaged nearly 50 cents per pound green. In August 1963, wholesale prices for Santos 4 on the New York market were averaging 32.7 cents per pound—the lowest level since 1949.

Higher coffee prices began to reach the consumer around the first part of 1964. Retail prices for roasted coffee in 1-pound cans, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, rose from an average of 69.7 cents in October 1963 to 71.7 cents in January 1964, and to 78.9 cents in March. By April, the average retail price had risen to 81.1 cents. By August, it was 84.4 cents. In December 1964 the price was 84.8 cents. American housewives became concerned about the prices. Many Senators had suspicion and fear about the coffee agreement. Some blamed the agreement for the unexpected rise in price, becoming dubious about the wisdom of passing the implementation legislation.

A proper perspective of the world coffee price situation should be understood.

Brazil is still by far the world's leading producer and exporter of coffee, even though its share of world output has declined from 65 percent during the late 1920's to an average of 46 percent for the 5 years ending 1963-64. World coffee prices tend to respond dramatically to unexpected developments in Brazil's coffee situation.

The agreement did not cause the increase in coffee retail prices. It was frost in Brazil in August 1963, coupled with the worst drought of the century in that country. This combination of natural calamities to Brazilian coffee was so severe that the world coffee traders rushed to stock up coffee in the market. By the end of 1963, inventories reached an all-time high in the United States. This bidding for future coffee crops pushed the price of coffee up; and, as it happens with other commodities, the price of future crops eventually was reflected in the retail price.

To check this rise in retail price, the International Coffee Council voted to increase export quotas by adding 2,500,000 more bags on the market in February 1964. Larger export quotas would mean greater supplies. This responsible action in fact helped to bring some stability to coffee prices. Brazilian coffee—Santos 4—which rose to a monthly average of 49.85 cents per pound green in March 1964, dropped to 48.60 cents in April. By December 1964, the monthly average was 45.18 cents per pound green.

By contrast, in 1954 when there was a frost in Brazil, green coffee prices zoomed from 58 cents to over 90 cents per pound. There was no coffee agreement then to assume responsible behavior by the producing countries.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the average price the American housewives paid for coffee over the past 15 years is 86.6 cents a pound can roasted. The average for U.S. retail, 1-pound can for 1963 was 69.4 cents, and for 1964, 81.8 cents. These prices are well under the 15-year average. So is today's price of 79 cents to 80 cents a pound. Supermarkets in the Washington area at the present time are retailing the leading top-quality coffee at 79 cents for a 1-pound can.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in 1951, an American factory worker with three children received an average take-home pay of $60.18. In 1963, when the worker's wife was paying 17.4 cents less per pound of coffee than in 1951, the worker's average take-home pay had risen to $87.30 a week.

To clear any misconception, the agreement is not an international cartel. Webster defines cartel as:

> An association of private business organizations bound by contract to cooperate in regulating production and marketing of products, thus tending to restrict world markets and fix prices.

The International Coffee Agreement is a treaty in which the producing countries and the consuming countries came together to discuss, deliberate, debate openly the issues pertaining to coffee production and marketing. In the United States, there is complete understanding and cooperation between the Departments of State and Agriculture on the one side, and private industry on the other, concerning the purpose and implementation of the agreement. It is a fine example of joint undertaking of Government and industry working at its best on a foreign commodity.

I cannot emphasize more the economic importance of coffee in the two-way trade between the United States and our friends in Latin America.

In Latin America, coffee is king. It accounts for more than 50 percent of export earnings for 6 Latin countries and 25 percent on the average for the 14 Latin coffee countries. A 1-cent change in green coffee prices means about $50 million to Latin America and more than $65 million to producing countries as a whole. Coffee prices affect exchange earnings, government tax receipts, private investment, and the level of economic activity generally. Gyrating prices make orderly growth and development impossible. When earnings decline, these countries curtail their purchases in the U.S. market.

To Latin America, what we do to help them stabilize the coffee market is of the first importance. They wish to have steady earnings that grow as consumption grows. They wish to earn their way in trade and not depend so heavily on aid. The coffee agreement is a cardinal element of the Alliance for Progress, as first proposed by President Kennedy and as reaffirmed by President Johnson. Failure to pass this implementing legislation would be a most damaging blow to our relations with the developing countries and to the Alliance for Progress program in particular.

Let us give the International Coffee Agreement an opportunity to operate, an opportunity to be effective. Let us provide the authority so that the United States can carry out its obligations under the agreement of 1962. This agreement is only effective for the period up to October 1, 1968, or until Congress, by concurrent resolution, determines that an unwarranted increase in the price of coffee has occurred. These provisions are certainly sufficient to safeguard the American consumer from being gouged with high prices on their coffee.

I therefore urge all Senators to give the agreement an opportunity to work by passing S. 701.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the International Coffee Agreement of 1963 was ratified by the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate which was given on May 21, 1963. Yet the Nation is in the ambiguous circumstance of having already filed the instrument of ratification—December 27, 1963—but without having passed the enabling legislation which would give meaning to our participation. As Senators will recall, the enabling bill died in conference after having passed the Senate by a vote of 58 to 27—July 31, 1964. Nevertheless, the seal of the United States is on the Coffee Treaty and, in all good faith, it is now necessary for the Congress to try once again to pass the enabling legislation to allow the United States to meet its obligation as a full participant in the agreement.

Argument was heard during debate on the floor of the Senate that implementation of the coffee agreement would raise the price of coffee to the American consumer. The evidence shows, however, that during the first year the agreement was in operation the price of coffee remained stable. Opposition to the agreement has noted that the price of coffee rose during the second year of the agreement. But all the evidence points to the cause of the price rise as stemming from the great fires in Paraná and the drought in Sao Paulo, which destroyed approximately two-thirds of the Brazilian coffee crop. Moreover, surpluses which existed at that time from previous years had no effect on the American market which strongly prefers coffee made from Brazil greens, or fresh beans. Even at that, the average price of coffee during 1964 was somewhat less than the average price of the previous 15 years during which time no coffee agreement was in effect. Prices now are lower than that average.

I quote from an article written by Virginia Prewett, published in yesterday's Washington Daily News, as follows:

> Opposition to the coffee legislation arises from vague congressional fears that it will somehow victimize the American housewife by pushing up coffee prices.
>
> These fears crystallized last year when the loss of two-thirds of Brazil's normal crop did raise coffee prices.
>
> Proof that the short Brazilian crop was responsible for the rise is found in the fact that a more normal supply has brought coffee prices to the housewife down from 1964's high average of 84.5 cents a pound a few months ago to 79 cents or 80 cents a pound now.

Mr. President, so long as the price of coffee remains seriously unstable, and so long as the price of American exports to Latin America increases, our Latin American partners will remain at a trading disadvantage and economic development will be curtailed. Until this enabling legislation is passed, the danger of severe economic instability will continue to plague Latin America and curtail the effect of U.S. assistance under the Alliance for Progress.

Reference to many of these and other compelling factors which make passage of the enabling legislation so essential was made in an outstanding and cogent article written by Virginia Prewett, and published in the Washington Daily News of February 1, 1965, from which I quoted a moment ago. It is an exceptionally well-informed and pointed treatment of the problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COFFEE TRADE ESSENTIAL TO ALLIANCE

(By Virginia Prewett)

Congress must fish or cut bait soon on legislation that will implement the world coffee pact.

Congress has approved the pact but balked at creating U.S. machinery to enforce it by monitoring the movement of coffee into the American market.

Seventeen of the twenty Latin American Republics export coffee. It has life-and-death importance in the economies of Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador, and Haiti, well over half of all Latin Americans.

Opposition to the coffee legislation arises from vague congressional fears that it will somehow victimize the American housewife by pushing up coffee prices.

These fears crystallized last year when the loss of two-thirds of Brazil's normal crop did raise coffee prices.

Proof that the short Brazilian crop was responsible for the rise is found in the fact that a more normal supply has brought coffee prices to the housewife down from 1964's high average of 84.5 cents a pound a few months ago to 79 or 80 cents a pound now.

Latin Americans ask if the United States can expect to continue to buy their coffee at depressed prices while U.S. family earnings and the cost of U.S. exports to Latin America are rising.

These are the facts and figures:

Bureau of Labor Statistics says the average price the U.S. housewife paid for coffee over the past 15 years is 86 cents a pound. The 1963 price of 69.4 cents a pound, taken as normal by the foes of pending coffee legislation, was actually the lowest in 14 years.

Even the 1964 high caused by loss of two-thirds of the Brazilian crop was still only 84.9 cents a pound, well under the 15-year average. So is today's price of 79 to 80 cents a pound, which the coffee producers want stabilized.

In 1951, an American factory worker with three children received an average take-home pay of $60.18 a week. In 1963, when the worker's wife was paying 17.4 cents less per pound of coffee than in 1951, the worker's average take-home pay had risen to $87.30 a week.

Another example reveals the heart of the Latin American arguments for coffee price stabilization: In 1958, it took 2,800 bags of Santos 4 coffee, the most usual Brazilian export, to buy 1 diesel locomotive from the United States. In July 1963 it took 3,377 bags.

U.S. exports have gone up 40 percent, while coffee prices have sagged.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate, S. 701, is entitled, "A bill to carry out the obligation of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes."

That is a long-winded title but not particularly helpful in explaining the real purpose of this bill. I can think of a better title. In my opinion, the bill should be called "A bill to raise the price of coffee." That is the sum and substance of this legislation.

The means of attaining this objective are not direct. They are indirect and roundabout. Ostensibly, all we are asked to do is to grant certain authority to the executive branch in the regulation of coffee imports. However, these regulations would be simply for the purpose of raising the price of coffee.

The basic principle of the International Coffee Agreement can be described in simple terms. Essentially, it is an arrangement to control the price of coffee throughout the world, by limiting the quantities that will be permitted to be sold. Under this agreement, the countries that produce the coffee and ship it abroad accept quotas on their exports; that is, limits on the quantity of coffee that each may ship and sell to other countries—but, of course, by doing so, these exporting countries receive higher prices and, thus, more money for less coffee.

It is the well-known old principle of pushing up the price by restricting the supply on the market.

If such a thing were done domestically, we would call it a monopoly or trust or restraint of trade and vigorously prosecute those involved under the antitrust law. In this case, governments have lent the sanction of law and thus the color of respectability to it.

Now, what is involved? Who will pay the cost of this scheme? The consuming countries, of course. And although there are other countries which import coffee, the United States is the most seriously affected by far. Actually, this country each year consumes more than half of all the coffee exported throughout the world. We import over 3 billion pounds of coffee a year. We drink 450 million cups a day. That is equal to 2½ cups per day for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

The excellent minority report pointed out that for every 1-cent rise in the price of coffee, the American consumer must pay an additional $32½ million a year for the coffee he drinks. In the 13 months that we have been party to the agreement, there has been a $0.15 rise in the price of coffee. At this rate, the coffee agreement is already taking from our consumers more than $487 million a year.

Mr. President, is it not a strange thing that this administration which continually tells us of its interest in the consumer is willing to impose this extra cost on the American housewife? In his Economic Report issued a few days ago, President Johnson specifically pointed out his sympathy for the problems of the consumer. He said:

> Informed consumer choice among increasingly varied and complex products requires frank, honest information concerning quantity, quality, and prices. Truth in packaging will help to protect consumers against product misrepresentation. Truth in lending will help consumers more easily to compare the costs of alternative credit sources.

Now we are asked to pass this bill to tax the American housewife $0.15 on every pound of coffee she buys. If consumers are to be protected against product misrepresentation through what has been called the truth-in-packaging bill, it is suggested that we should also require every can of coffee in the grocery store to carry this announcement in large print, "The price of this coffee has been increased $0.15 a pound by President Johnson's International Coffee Agreement."

Defenders of the treaty do not like to speak of increasing the price of coffee, of course. They like to refer to the agreement as "stabilizing" the price of coffee. That is their favorite word, "stabilize."

Unfortunately, the term of the agreement with coffee producing nations and the testimony at the hearing do not support that argument. Article 27, paragraph (1), of the agreement states, in part:

> The members * * * agree on the desirability of operating the agreement in a manner such that the real income derived from the export of coffee could be progressively increased so as to make it consonant with their needs for foreign exchange to support their programs for social and economic progress.

Then, in paragraph (2) of article 27, the agreement states:

> The members agree on the necessity of assuring that the general level of coffee prices does not decline below the general level of such prices in 1962.

In other words, the agreement sets a floor, but not a ceiling on coffee prices. There is a bland statement of platitudes in article 1 of the agreement, which refers to "equitable prices," but nowhere in the treaty is there any definition of that term, and there are no provisions to carry out that objective.

Our experience under the agreement has already shown us what to expect. On May 21, 1963, the Senate gave its advice and consent to the treaty. Our instrument of ratification of the treaty was deposited in December of 1963. Immediately, the price of coffee started to climb. Making comparison on the basis of the wholesale price of Santos 4's, the most commonly quoted type of Brazilian coffee, for the full year 1963, the average price was 34.11 cents per pound. The price of coffee had advanced just slightly during the last months of 1963 and averaged 37.45 cents per pound in December.

But, after the U.S. ratification of the treaty was made formal, in January the price averaged 44.83 cents, a gain of a full 20 percent in a single month. Then in February and March it went up some more, reaching a high of about 51 cents at one time in March. It has now receded slightly, but not very much.

The retail price of coffee had to go up correspondingly, of course. All during 1963, the average retail price of coffee in 1-pound cans, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, stayed a shade under $0.70. In 1964, it advanced rapidly, and for the past 6 months has been approximately $0.85.

Supposedly, there were built-in safeguards to protect the consuming countries from this kind of price gouging. Supposedly, our representation in the International Coffee Council, which has its headquarters in London, would permit us to stop prices from skyrocketing. The majority report of the Finance Committee states:

> The interests of the United States are protected by the fact that it will hold a minimum of 400 votes out of the total of 1,000 consumer votes in the International Coffee Council, the governing body of the agreement, and will also be a member of the executive board. Since practically all important decisions, such as the adoption of the budget, establishment of the quotas, or the production control program, require a two-thirds vote of the consumers and producers voting separately, the United States holds sufficient votes to prevent actions which might be considered adverse to our policy interests, to our business community, or to the American consumer.

Despite these assurances, we have found that our voting strength will not protect us. At this point, it is worth quoting from the minority views on the bill, as follows:

> Although the United States consumes one-half of the coffee used in the entire world, when it comes to changing quotas to effect some reduction in price, we have only one-fifth of the votes. More importantly, we must persuade two-thirds of the producing nations to absorb the financial loss involved if prices should be reduced.
>
> Our first effort to increase quotas under the coffee agreement was a dismal failure. Our next effort, which occurred after Congress threatened not to approve the implementing legislation (rather than as a result of persuasion), did result in increased coffee quotas, but the increase was not sufficient to halt the upward thrust of retail coffee prices.
>
> We call attention to the fact that a 500,000-bag increase in the quota for 1965, which was scheduled to occur on January 8, failed to go into effect, and now we are under substantial pressure by exporting countries to reduce the 1965 quota by about 2 million bags. The Council has not yet acted to reduce the quotas, possibly because of the pending vote in the Senate on this very bill.
>
> As we have already emphasized in these views, we must expect coffee prices to move upward to still higher levels if the threat of congressional disapproval of this implementing legislation is removed.

What does this particular bill do? It does two major things. It provides that we may require certificates as to country of origin for all coffee imported here. Second, it provides that we may limit, reduce, or stop altogether any imports of coffee from countries which have not adhered to the International Coffee Agreement.

The purpose of these two powers is to enable us to help to enforce its control over the world coffee market by the International Coffee Organization. They have no other purpose. When quotas had been set, we would help to enforce the quotas—whether we agreed with them or not—by rejecting coffee imports from any country that might secede from the International Coffee Organization, or from any individual producer in a member country who might try to ship us coffee without securing an export license or certificate from his own government. In effect, the United States would become an enforcing arm of a world coffee cartel, devoted to raising the price of coffee and keeping it high.

And since we are by far the largest importing country, we would be the chief enforcing arm of the cartel. That is what this bill provides.

When the agreement itself was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for consideration, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] said very candidly:

> It seems to me that to make an argument that this agreement is in the interest of the consumers is something less than frank. It is really in the interests of our national foreign policy, isn't it? * * * It is in the interest of our foreign policy like our foreign aid bill.

Mr. President, in May 1963, when the International Coffee Agreement was before us, I opposed it. At that time, it seemed to me that this agreement created grave dangers for the American consumer. Everything that has happened since then has borne out my misgivings. Even without enactment of this bill, we have seen how the agreement can be used to push the price of coffee up.

The United States should not participate in any such price boosting scheme at our own expense. Programs of foreign aid should be dealt with as part of the authorization and appropriation by Congress—and not slipped in in this roundabout way through boosting the price of coffee at the expense of the American housewife. This legislation should be defeated.

CORRECTION OF MINORITY VIEWS IN COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there is a misprint in the minority views on Senate bill 701, in the committee report.

In the third paragraph, under the heading "Minority Views on Senate 701," the sentence as printed reads:

> This is higher than coffee prices have been since 1945, and inevitably enactment of this bill will be followed by new pressures to force prices up still higher.

Mr. President, the figure "1945" printed in the report should read "1958."

I ask unanimous consent that this correction may be made, and sincerely regret the error which occurred in the printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the correction will be made accordingly.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 14 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Harris
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

NAYS—23

Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Douglas
Hart
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
McIntyre
McNamara
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Neuberger
Pearson
Proxmire
Robertson
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Dodd
Dominick
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Jackson
Johnston
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Randolph
Russell
Scott
Simpson
Talmadge
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So the bill (S. 701) was passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 51, House Joint Resolution 234.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the Senate will not begin debate on the pending bill today. It is my understanding that there are Senators who have remarks and speeches to make. At the conclusion of that part of our business, the Senate will adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the majority leader give us his best estimate as to the time when the Senate might proceed to vote on the pending measure?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have no estimate. I do not know.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the majority leader believe that a vote on the joint resolution may be reached tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would doubt it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator from California that no agreement will be reached to vote tomorrow or at any other time.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business of the session is completed this afternoon, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN POLICY AND PASSING GENERATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last Saturday night in Philadelphia, the former

Ambassador to India, John Kenneth Galbraith, made a brilliant speech before a large and enthusiastic crowd at the annual Pennsylvania Roosevelt Day dinner of the Americans for Democratic Action. He spoke on the subject of "Foreign Policy and the Passing Generation."

The speech follows generally an excellent article which Ambassador Galbraith has written for the February issue of the Atlantic Monthly, which I commend to all Senators.

In his speech, Ambassador Galbraith pointed out the difficulty which we in our country have, especially in the State Department, with what he refers to as the three generations of opinion which have arisen since the beginning of World War II. He points out that we are dealing with the age-old question of the generation. This is now the third of our foreign policy declarations since World War II. He says that each generation has had a formula appropriate to its time, but it has clung to its formula after circumstances have made it obsolete.

The Ambassador then points out with cogent reasoning that immediately following World War II, we were caught up in a dream of world order and hope for a peaceful and durable rapport with the Soviet Union.

We were disappointed in that regard when Joseph Stalin broke all of the commitments he had made in a series of meetings, first with President Roosevelt, and later with President Truman.

Reacting from that great disappointment, as we so often do, we came on with the second generation of thinkers with respect to foreign policy, the men of the days of President Truman. It was then thought it was necessary to organize the world against the monolithic power of communism. Everything else had to be subordinated to that end. It was believed that conflict would be an ultimate reality. As the Ambassador has pointed out:

> But the world is a cruel place in more ways than one. For the last several years the foundations of the cold war mystique have been crumbling.

Now we have a third generation who are of the view—and I share this view—that we should be devoting more of our efforts toward reaching a satisfactory detente with Russia rather than attempting to crush an implacable enemy dedicated to what some of our friends like to call godless communism.

The Ambassador points out that our foreign policy is having trouble in the light of the overlap within the State Department of individuals of all three generations. As he states, our foreign policy today speaks with a certain dissonance because there are many who are clinging rather righteously to the generations of the past.

I believe the article will be of real interest to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who are interested in attempting to bring some sense into our foreign policy and to make it accord with present reality instead of the conditions of the past.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Ambassador Galbraith's address may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY AND PASSING GENERATIONS

(Speech by John Kenneth Galbraith at the southeastern Pennsylvania Roosevelt Day dinner of the Americans for Democratic Action, Philadelphia, Pa., January 30, 1965)

Senator CLARK, my ADA friends, ladies, and gentlemen, one of the rewarding things of being out of public office is that one need make no speeches except by choice. Freedom of choice is further assured by the absence of compensation, a very reasonable precaution. So you can be sure I am genuinely glad to be here with so many old friends. And I am glad to have a chance to talk about the current state of our foreign policy.

I propose to be guided at the outset this evening by an article on this same subject in the current Atlantic Monthly. This is not entirely accidental. The article, which I personally recommend, is by a distinguished authority in the field of foreign affairs. I am sure you will agree with me that plagiarism, if kept within bounds, can be both instructive and, like imitation, a sincere form of flattery.

In this article I note that since the election last autumn we have seen, once again, the striking difference in the public attitudes toward domestic as compared with foreign policy. In domestic matters, following the election, we took for granted there would be a new thrust forward on education, the urban crisis, the deprived, medical care for the aged, the increasing squalor of our surroundings, and other matters awaiting attention.

And there can be no doubt that the President's own intentions extend to foreign policy. His instincts are clearly in the tradition of progressive innovation that marked the administrations of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman and, for 3 short years, that of John F. Kennedy. But here also is the contrast. On domestic matters liberals invariably want and support and expect action. They do not praise continuity in our past approach to Negro voting, the social squalor of the Appalachian plateau or the unemployment of young people. But in foreign policy the mood is less urgent. Here both the liberal and the official instinct is to accept present policies. This is true whether they are right, wrong, or potentially disastrous. We seek continuity in our relations with Canada and Mexico and Switzerland which work well. Equally, we accept continuity in policies toward southeast Asia, China, the arms race, which are not working at all or which are certain to be a source of further deep trouble. We accept the view, not unknown among my old friends in the State Department, that improvement is the sort of annoying thing that restless outsiders and liberal Senators are always proposing. They are both a great nuisance.

In domestic policy we also know that controversy is the price of change. We don't expect to get medical care for the aged without arousing the mighty wrath of the American Medical Association. No one imagined that the civil rights bill would win applause from that new tetrarch of the modern party of the abolitionists, the Republican Senator from South Carolina. There was no surge of national enthusiasm for those statesmen who preferred their personal peace to battling Barry Goldwater. But with foreign policy again there is a difference. Where, China, the world's newest nuclear power is involved, we expect those in charge to be fearful about arousing the ghosts of the China lobby or the communicants of the John Birch Society. We know that no man can afford to be thought soft on communism, Castro or the Panama Canal; and we don't expect liberals to go out on a limb—like WAYNE MORSE. It is true, I must admit, that we no longer pay much attention to Richard Nixon. Still at home a liberal is a man with a predisposition to change. In foreign policy he uses his liberal reputation to bless whatever the State Department has always done.

There is no reason why our foreign policy should be the natural stronghold of conservatism or liberal contentment. And in foreign policy as well as in domestic policy, there cannot be progress without controversy. There is now great need for bringing our foreign policy abreast of the times and, even more, for bringing it abreast of what, accordingly, we end up doing.

II

I also venture to think the American people are in a mood for change.

I had the usual firsthand experience with public opinion, of the part-time politician, during the campaign last autumn. People, I am persuaded, had very little trouble deciding against Mr. Goldwater; indeed, they didn't seem to need a great deal of help from orators like myself. But we shouldn't take comfort from this excessively easy choice. They also, I am persuaded, want improved performance on our side. They are willing to live with danger. But they would like serious efforts to mitigate it. They expect disorder, tension, and conflict in the world. But they want imaginative efforts to reduce them. They know how stubborn are the problems of the poor countries and how great the danger of explosive population growth. They want to be assured, not that our efforts are cheap, but that they are effective. Most of all, people are tired of the litany of our foreign policy—with the endless calls for vigilance, the pious assertions of virtue, the continuing assurances that we are tough minded, hardheaded and will never allow our better instincts to prevail. If Americans ever return to isolation it will be because where foreign policy is concerned, they have been bored to death.

III

What is wrong?

At the heart of the problem is the age-old question of the generations. We are now in the third of our foreign policy generations since World War II. Each generation has had a formula that was appropriate to its time. Each generation has clung to its formula after circumstances made it obsolete. There is nothing remarkable about this. Since time immemorial men have found it easier to avow that the world is unchanged than to face the really ghastly task of changing their minds.

During and immediately following World War II, we were caught by the dream of world order and the hope for a peaceful and durable rapport with the Soviet Union. It was a useful formula for a world menaced by Hitler and defended by a grand alliance. Those who now, with the aid of hindsight, urge that F.D.R. should have taken out after Stalin with a gun never explain what the Nazis would have been doing meantime.

However, Stalin did not prove the amicable, avuncular and cooperative old man of the wartime myth. There was, as the cognoscenti say, his forward policy in eastern Europe, Berlin, Korea and against the liberties of his own people. Interests diverged on other matters. Faith in the World War II formula was shattered. So were a certain number of liberal reputations—those of men who adhered too long to the formula for that time. Their fate is a warning to all who, intellectually speaking, now overstay their time.

The liberals of World War II were replaced by the men of the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan and the cold war mystique. They defined our new task. This was to organize the world against the monolithic power of communism. All else must be subordinated to this end. Conflict is the ultimate reality. We must promote alliances and position troops, trade or not trade, aid or not aid in accordance with the needs of this struggle. If the Soviets wanted something, it was a fair assumption that they shouldn't have it. The universities spawned the new breed of the belligerent professor. His specialty was war games, high strategy economic warfare, and calculation of acceptable levels of casualties in the event of nuclear war. Liberals, with the fate of Henry Wallace firmly before them, lost no opportunity for showing that they were just as hard-boiled as any conservative or any reactionary or even Mr. John Foster Dulles. The only difference was their greater intelligence.

But the world is a cruel place in more ways than one. For the last several years the foundations of the cold war mystique have been crumbling. This is the nub of our present problem and the clue to many of the riddles of our present foreign policy. For, as usual, we have some who accept change. But we also have some who, in the age-old tradition, find it easier to deny there has been change. So we have the foreign policy of those who accept the realities of our time. And we also have the foreign policy of those who are clinging, sometimes rather righteously, to the recent past. It creates a certain dissonance.

IV

What has changed?

The first thing that changed was the leadership of the Soviet Union. And in its wake came the profound reaction to Stalin's policies in the Soviet Union. The cold war mystique required a determined antagonist like Stalin and not an ambiguous one like Khrushchev. For a long while the keepers of the mystique argued, not without success, that there was no change. But now it is clear that different men did come in.

Then came the break in the solidarity of the Communist bloc—not only the clash between Moscow and Peiping but also the westward leaning particularism first of Yugoslavia and then of Rumania. The mystique required that communism be monolithic and united in its hostility to capitalism. It was highly inconvenient, to say the least, that the two main centers should fall out and some of the lesser ones look to the class enemy. Some rugged traditionalists still speak of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Then there has been the evident liberalization in the Communist world, not alone among eccentrics such as the Yugoslavs and Poles but also in Hungary and even in the Soviet Union. It is highly imperfect liberty. But the mystique required that communism be the relentless and all-powerful enemy of all liberty. Evidently it was not so powerful or there was some unsuspected power in the human spirit.

Then, and most important, it has gradually become evident that the peace of the world depends, of all things, on a tacit understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union. This understanding is the fruit not of clarity, soft-heartedness, or goodness of soul; it is the product of an elementary interest in self-preservation. Its elements are also reasonably clear.

Responsible leadership in both countries accepts the logic of the atom. Despite strong efforts by rightwing Republicans and the more penetrating of the belligerent philosophers, nuclear annihilation has remained unpopular with the average American voter. The same unheroic tendencies evidently exist in Russia. As a result leaders on both sides are careful not to confront each other in Berlin, the rest of Europe, the Middle East, or Cuba in such fashion so that the other has no alternative but to fight. That would be to destroy both countries. We also both keep up the threshold of the employment of nuclear weapons; they are not things to be employed casually against people or trees in Vietnam or Belgrade. We both resist the proliferation of these weapons. We are both conscious of the dangers of nuclear accident. We both support the United Nations, not as a final solution of the world's problems but as a shock absorber and alternative to what, otherwise, would be a bilateral monopoly of world affairs by the two great powers. We also, as a matter of formal agreement, refrain from poisoning the common atmosphere.

These are formidable points of agreement. They are also very serviceable. In their absence, the peace would not last a month.

Three times in the last 15 months we have had dramatic proof of how profoundly both countries are attached to this undertaking. The first reaction of the Soviets to the death of President Kennedy and the nomination of Senator Goldwater was fear that the understanding might be jeopardized. (The possibility of Senator Goldwater's election was compulsively on the mind of everyone, large and small, when I visited there last summer. The Marxist doctrine that the two great bourgeois parties of the United States were indistinguishable had taken a terrible beating.) We were similarly alarmed by the removal of Chairman Khrushchev. Was this a reversion to Stalinism? Even the theatrically hardboiled were to be seen looking for reassurances. The men of the cold war mystique had warned us constantly about what an evil trickster Khrushchev was while he was in office. The old gentleman must have been truly surprised at his rating in our polls once he became emeritus.

V

This is the problem. Our foreign policy has not fallen between two stools. But it is suspended between two generations. The changes that have occurred in these last years are recognized by those in charge. President Johnson, like President Kennedy before him, is a man of the third generation. (In keeping with this neither his acceptance speech last autumn, his state of the Union message, or his inaugural address had the usual incantation telling of the death struggle in which we find ourselves with the Soviets but promising their eventual, though peaceful overthrow.) But much of the litany and many of the lesser details of our foreign policy remain in the hands of the second generation. The litany is important and not the least to its authors. Like the voice of the muezzin in the minaret it is the constant assurance of eternal verities, that nothing has changed. It is also an affirmation of faith. The first generation affirmed righteously that we could get along with Stalin if only we would. With equal righteousness the second generation warns of the perdition that awaits all who do not hew to the line and resist negotiation.

The litany is the implacable conflict of the second generation. The reality is the practical accommodation of the third. It is not an altogether happy or safe combination. One problem is that simple men tend to be guided by the litany. One such was Senator Goldwater. We found him very alarming. Yet his talk of a sanguinary attack on communism with guns, defoliants and a new generation of manned bombers was much more consistent with the hundreds of official speeches warning of vile Russian intentions and calling for ceaseless vigilance than President Johnson's speeches about peace.

In fact we had an election with no real defense of the course of action on which the peace depends. If we avow one course of action and follow another, we should not be surprised if someone turns up asking us to do what we say. We were lucky that the demand came from a politician of such studied inadequacy as Barry Goldwater. Sometime we might mislead someone good.

There are other dangers in our present perch between the generations. There is always a chance that someone, military or civilian, might take the litany of conflict to be his personal responsibility and start shooting. Thus it enhances the risk of accidental conflict, which the reality of our policy seeks, above all, to avoid.

The litany of the second generation also continues to govern lesser policy. Not for years have our trade restrictions done any real damage to the Soviets or the satellites. At the cost of a little delay or expense, our allies or the neutrals filled the orders. And it is no longer quite clear why we should seek to inflict damage. But economic warfare and economic sanctions once had a great standing in the mystique of conflict. So they are still imposed—principally to our detriment. The same is true, rather more implausibly of restrictions on travel. In the mystique it is very important that we do not have visits by Americans which might seem to bestow blessing on the foe. And so with culture—the mystique requires that we weigh rather carefully the good done by Gershwin against the bad done by the Bolshoi. For the second generation, the U.N. was regarded, very largely, as a theater of verbal conflict with the Russians. The U.N. bureau in the State Department remains strongly under this management. For many months last fall it issued regular rescripts to the world telling that the Soviets (and French) would be expelled from the organization if they did not pay their assessments in accordance with article 14 of the charter. Our legal position was strong—although the actions in question also served our interest. All who dislike the United Nations and would like to see us pay for none of it were well pleased. But, as the day of reckoning approached, the third generation reality—which was that we and the Soviets both agree on remaining in the U.N.—came into view. We did not want them to go. The press turned a little sour. Also it doubtless occurred to some people that a President just returned to office on a platform of peace and prosperity might be reluctant to begin by presiding over the dissolution of the United Nations. So, ever since, we have been looking for promising avenues of retreat. For the moment we have agreed that there will be no voting at all and the Soviets will stay. Eventually, one supposes, a more satisfactory compromise will be found. One hopes it will not be damaging to the U.N.—although damage has been done and we have already revealed the confusion of our thought.

Here we see the nature of the third generation policy. It is not a policy of weakness or retreat. On the contrary, it avoids taking positions that can only lead to retreat. It does not assume charity, sweetness, and light. But it is a policy that recognizes that we have common interests with the Soviets which we and they both recognize and on which we negotiate. We also recognize that the Communist world is not static and that its problems and divisions are real. We adjust our policy to this.

This, in fact, is the modern policy of strength. A frozen policy cannot exploit opportunity; it is frozen in all directions. The greatest success of the Kennedy years was the test ban agreement. No one should be surprised that it was negotiated by Averell Harriman. Over a long career he has shown a singular capacity to remain abreast of the times. He is a lesson to all his fellow ADA members.

VI

The problem of generations is pervasive. A year ago when rioting broke out in Panama, we immediately declared it was the work of Communists and that the Panama Canal Treaty was sacrosanct. This was a classic second-generation response; the Communists are the source of all wickedness in the world. One must always stand firm.

In a more mature view the Communists were forgotten. We have agreed to negotiate. The second-generation reaction had again forced us to take a position from which there would only be retreat.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was in some respects the monument to the second generation. It originated in the cohesive force of the fear of Russia. American economic as well as military prominence made is easy for us to assert, and necessary for others to accept, our leadership.

Now much of the cohesive influence of fear is gone. And European economies are exceedingly strong. In some respects the second generation succeeded too well. It put itself out of business. But again we find men clinging to the old formula. A strong NATO is not a means to an end but an end. Its enterprises must be pushed, American muscle must be exerted, even though it pushes the French right out. Or such was the more zealous second-generation policy until President Johnson defused the MLF issue. Once again in refusing to recognize change the second-generation men ended up in weakness and retreat.

The military alliances which Mr. Dulles sponsored or negotiated in the Middle East and southeast Asia were in some ways the purest example of second-generation strategy. They were also the least useful or wise of its actions. From the beginning these treaties caused friction with the countries which were not members; now they are becoming increasingly unpopular in the countries which adhere to them. Pakistan has recently had an election on the issue of which candidate was least allied with us. It has been moving into a working alliance with the Chinese. We are in some trouble in the Philippines. If we hold on to these arrangements as though they are immortal, we will again have trouble. If we recognize that they are a product (and not a wise one) of their time, we have a chance for friendly reexamination while it is still between friends and we will remain friends. Again this is the course of strength not weakness.

Our avowed policy toward the poor countries is based broadly on the notion that economic assistance and technical support will bring a takeoff toward economic self-support. The second generation was deeply impressed by the success of the Marshall plan. Year after year, ever since, they have been hoping for a similarly magical response to money. We now know it will not happen in some places it will not be possible to prevent further deterioration. And in India, Pakistan, Egypt and a number of other countries we can no longer escape to terrible reality of the population explosion. We are stuck with a very long-term task with added imponderables of human biology, religion and tradition. Our only course is to abandon the facile promises and face the facts. Otherwise, having promised too much too soon, we will have more disillusionment and more disappointment and we won't be doing the things that need to be done. Again we will have a stronger policy if we face the modern reality.

VII

Finally, there is China. Two years ago I was the man on the ground when the dispute between China and India broke into open war. The policies which we concerted with the Indians and the British passed through my hands. I had some part in forming them. We combined firm support to the Indians with a clear understanding that we did not wish to see either country committed to a costly war in those distant hills. (There were, as you can imagine, numerous second-generation suggestions that we seek to commit a new ally to a new front in the cold war.) The policy worked; the fighting ended. At the point of their main attack in the northeast frontier agency, the Chinese returned to their previous lines. I cite all this not to serve my own vanity, which is adequate, but to urge my credentials. I am in no need whatever of sermons from those who say we must stand firm, must never underestimate the Chinese menace.

But second generation policy is to be firmly immobile on China. We must not admit of the existence of another Communist power. We must deny them the prestige of the U.N. Policy consists in devising sufficiently ingenious slogans to explain why nothing would be done—the first move is theirs; they cannot shoot their way into the United Nations; recognition and admission to the U.N. are no reward for bad behavior; they should stop whatever they are doing in Africa; membership in the U.N. is no guarantee of good behavior, although it is not clear that anyone ever suggested it was.

Here, I venture to think, we must soon have a third-generation effort at negotiation. The integrity of Taiwan is an obvious condition. The permanent seat in the Security Council for Taipei is not. Neither Taiwan nor China has a better right to this seat than, say, India. The proper course is to seek a reorganization of the Council. Without postponing other steps, we should certainly make a prompt effort on travel and trade. Among other advantages this would mean that we would no longer be impelled to invest diplomatic effort in largely futile efforts petitioning to our friends in Europe and Asia to refrain from trading with, or lending money to, or sometimes even speaking to the Chinese.

It is, of course, possible that the Chinese do not wish to come into the world. But if we make an effort now there is at least a chance that a decade hence China, with her nuclear arms, will be somewhat responsive to world opinion and hence will become a more responsible member of the world community. Acceptance of the test ban and control of delivery systems will at least become possible. If no steps are taken—if we do not take the initiative and if we reject all Chinese proposals as propaganda—then we can be sure that things will be no better and very likely much worse. This is not a policy of strength but a policy of negation.

VIII

I repeat, the third-generation policy has become the one of strength. It is the policy that accepts reality—and avoids positions which are the prelude to failure. We will not be defiled or defeated or destroyed if we do business with governments very different from our own. And certainly we won't be hurt by bringing the defense of our policy abreast of the course we actually follow.

POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Senators will recall that several years ago, under the sponsorship of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], a provision was inserted in the foreign aid bill to authorize the tendering of technical assistance to countries aided by the foreign aid bill in their search to find ways and means of limiting their population growth, a population growth which was then and is now proceeding at so high a rate that the per capita income in many of those countries is not increasing at all, even though the gross national product is increasing as a result of the efforts of the citizens of those countries, aided and abetted by our aid program.

Subsequently, on several occasions, the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I addressed the Senate and made many speeches throughout the country on the necessity for striking the cloak of secrecy from discussions of the population problem, which is acute in our country, as it is acute overseas.

I was delighted to read that in his state of the Union message President Johnson said:

> I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion of world population and the growing scarcity of resources.

I am happy to note that both former President Truman and former President Eisenhower have sprung to the defense of President Johnson and have enlisted themselves as honorary sponsors of Planned Parenthood-World Population, a civic organization which is working to bring to countries abroad the techniques and benefits which can result from voluntary plans of family limitation which are consistent with the religious beliefs of all.

President Eisenhower recently said:

> The population explosion has become one of the critical world problems of our time. It threatens to smother the economic progress of many nations and endangers the free world struggle for peace and security. Greatly expanded public and private efforts must be undertaken to contain this human explosion.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz recently said:

> There is strong indication that a disproportionate number of the unemployed come from large families. Responsible, informed parenthood is relevant in any consideration of a responsible, informed position regarding manpower supply and demand.

Mr. President, the crisis is not merely a threat; it is a fact. We are on a collision course of rampant population growth. Spokesmen of all faiths are deeply worried. I quote a statement by the distinguished Jesuit priest, Father John Thomas, who recently said:

> No sizable modern nation could long make reasonable provision for its population increase if its people were to make use of their full reproductive capacity.

Richard Cardinal Cushing, whom Senators will remember as having given the eloquent invocation at the inauguration of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, applauded his fellow Catholic churchman, Dr. John Rock, for calling to task "those who are unwilling to face the implications of the population explosion."

The tide of human numbers will rise by 160,000 today—more than 60 million this year. World population will double by the end of the century, if present birth rates continue. At this pace, as John Gunther has observed:

> In many nations there can be no advance at all, for the simple reason that the great expanding mass of people, human mouths, will eat progress away.

Even while the crisis deepens, the climate for dealing with it—the weather of understanding and tolerance—improves. National leaders speak out. All faiths agree on the principles of family planing, and are working together to resolve their differences about the means. A new Gallup poll shows that 78 percent of U.S. Catholics now believe "birth control information should be available to anyone who wants it."

Each year more nations want help in curbing population growth. Each day more parents want to limit family size. Our war on poverty, through local initiative in a growing list of places, is incorporating birth control assistance. Here and abroad, Planned Parenthood is spreading the message of birth control to scores of millions. The number of U.S. families served by Planned Parenthood has doubled in the last 5 years.

Private agencies and private doctors cannot do the whole job. As John D. Rockefeller III has emphasized:

> Population problems are so great, so important, so ramified, and often so immediate, that only Government, supported and inspired by private initiative, can attack them on the scale required.

There are a number of ways by which individuals can aid in this vitally important matter of national security: First, by standing up to be counted in support of governmental as well as private efforts to limit world population growth through voluntary fertility control. Second, by urging all public health and welfare agencies to provide birth control help to those who want it. Third, by urging expansion of research with Government funds to perfect a variety of simple fertility control methods acceptable to all faiths. Fourth, by urging our Government to assist other nations, on their request, with birth control knowledge and supplies.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I are conferring with civic leaders who are vitally interested in advancing this program at home and abroad. Within the next month or 6 weeks, we expect to have legislation to suggest to the Senate in this regard, legislation which I sincerely hope will receive favor when it is introduced.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I commend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for calling to the attention of the Senate and the people of the country the great problem which we all face.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has rendered an important service to the people of our country, not only this year but in years past, by inviting the attention of citizens to the problem of the population explosion of the world and of this country, as well.

With the possible exception of world peace and perhaps the control of nuclear power, I do not believe there is anything more pressing, as it affects the continuation of an effective Christian civilization, than the control of population explosion.

The sooner we face up to the facts, the sooner we use all the means we have in the local, State, and Federal Governments to assist in solving the problem, the sooner we will have some reasonable chance to combat it.

Again, I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for his efforts in years past and the effort he is now making. He has one more soldier in the ranks to fight with him.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the junior Senator from Maryland from the bottom of my heart for his courage in speaking out on this subject. I welcome him to the small but growing number of Senators who are determined not to allow this vitally important problem to be swept under the rug in the deliberations of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1965

The Senate resumed consideration of House Joint Resolution 234, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I am giving notice in writing on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself, that it is our intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing an amendment to House Joint Resolution 234, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, which will come before the Senate tomorrow or later this week.

The amendment is short. It reads as follows:

> On page 3, at end of line 20, insert the following section:
>
> "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION
>
> "No funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans' Administration shall be utilized for the purpose of implementing any order or directive of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the closing or relocating of any hospital or facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration or with respect to the withdrawing, transferring, or reducing of services heretofore made available to veterans."

Mr. President, I do this in line with the colloquy which I had with the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and others during the debate on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver. I pointed out at that time that I was voting for Mr. Driver because I did not believe in shooting down the wrong target for the wrong cause. I pointed out that there was a better, more effective, and more immediate avenue available to Congress, if it were really desired to stop this unwise, cruel, and heartless disregard of the interests of the veterans by summarily closing, without hearings, and without consideration or consultation with Congress, a number of veterans' hospitals and relocating other veterans' facilities.

My amendment, if agreed to by the Congress, would mean that we would block any such action, we would stop any such action until such time as the next annual appropriation bill would come before Congress. At that time, hearings could be held. If there is a case for economy to be made, it can be made in orderly and open congressional hearings, recorded and reported to the people. At that time, Congress could act affirmatively or negatively, as it desires.

I call this to the attention of the Senate and the country now. I understand that this legislation may come up tomorrow. It requires 24 hours' notice, which I hereby give.

I urge its serious and favorable consideration by all Senators, not only those who happen to live in States affected by this closing order, but also as a matter of commanding respect for Congress so that it will be consulted, and the wishes of Congress considered before such summary Executive action is again undertaken.

I think if we permit an Administrator and an administration to get by in this fashion, circumventing the desires of Congress and shortchanging the interests of the veterans, this is only the beginning of a long trail of melancholy maneuvers to the detriment of the American veterans.

I hope that this amendment will be agreed to overwhelmingly tomorrow. It will give the Senate an opportunity to consider in an orderly way and at a proper time this whole question of providing alleged and unproven economy in the transfer of veterans' facilities before appropriate facilities are available in an orderly way and at the proper time. I hope all Senators will be on hand tomorrow to vote for the Mundt-Anderson amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLER. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is House Joint Resolution 234, providing supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture for 1965.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I note from the print of House Joint Resolution 234 which I have that a committee amendment has been proposed. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are several committee amendments.

Mr. MILLER. The print that I have, which is shown as Roman numeral No. II, has what appears to be only one amendment. On page 3, from line 4 through the word "Act" on line 7, is deleted. And there is a proposed addition in italic representing, I believe, the committee amendment. It goes from line 7 down through line 14. Do I correctly understand the Chair to say that there are other amendments than this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Page 2, line 3, continuing through line 18.

Mr. MILLER. Then I request that the Chair direct his attention to the amendment to which I have referred on page 3. My question is whether the Chair is of the opinion that this amendment to which I have referred violates paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state whether he is referring to the amendment in lines 4 to 7, or the amendment in lines 7 to 14?

Mr. MILLER. What I refer to is what appears to be the proposed committee amendment, which constitutes the committee language, starting on line 7 and running through the end of line 14, all appearing in italics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will refrain from rendering an advisory opinion at this time, but will be ready to rule if a point of order is raised.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, that being the position of the Chair, I respectfully raise the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order against a committee amendment at this time is not in order. No committee amendment has yet been reported by the clerk for Senate action.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I do not want to prejudice the situation as far as the majority leader is concerned.

I would like to obtain an opinion from the Chair. If the language to which I have referred does not contravene paragraph (4) of rule XVI, then, would an amendment to this amendment of the committee automatically be held not to contravene paragraph 4 of article XVI?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter that the Senator has referred to on page 3 of the joint resolution is open to amendment when it is before the Senate. But, this matter has not yet been called up or presented to the Senate for action.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator understands that. However, what the Senator is trying to determine is whether or not an amendment which he intends to offer to the amendment proposed by the committee, which is not yet before the Senate, would fall within the same ruling as the committee amendment itself with respect to paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

In other words, if the committee amendment satisfies the requirement that it is not legislation on an appropriation bill, would an amendment to the committee amendment automatically be cleansed of any violation of the rule, also?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would depend upon the nature of the amendment offered. It would have to comply with rule XVI.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Chair advise that the mere fact that the committee amendment might be held by the Chair not to violate paragraph 4 of rule XVI does not carry with it an automatic ruling that an amendment to that amendment automatically is cleansed of the violation of the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the answer to the question would depend entirely on the language of the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Then, only for the purpose of protecting my rights, and in view of the fact that I do not wish to press it to the point of making a point of order at this time, I must also say that, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, an amendment, with the understanding that if the point of order is made and the Chair rules that the committee amendment is not in violation of said rule, it would not be necessary for me to serve such notice, because my amendment would not fall within the prohibition of the rule.

My amendment would strike lines 13 and 14 on page 3 of the joint resolution which states:

> And if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest.

My language would replace that language with the following:

> Or are necessary to carry out any other agreement with the United Arab Republic which has been approved by the Congress.

I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed.

I want to make clear that the purpose of my amendment is to leave——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to file a notice to suspend the rules?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa does file notice, as previously stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Notice is filed.

Mr. MILLER. The purpose is to require approval by the Congress of any future agreement with the United Arab Republic. It is not necessary to say that there will be no approval, but to leave it to the Congress to make that determination.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, in accordance with the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 2, 1965:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Donald W. Hoagland, of Colorado, to be Assistant Administrator for Development Finance and Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development.

POSTMASTERS

ALASKA

Lester Suvlu, Barrow, Alaska, in place of J. F. Connery, resigned.

ARIZONA

Lawrence A. Lippert, Florence, Ariz., in place of L. M. Morrell, retired.

ARKANSAS

Dee R. Robbins, Norman, Ark., in place of N. W. Smith, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Patrick F. Chevreaux, Elverta, Calif., in place of V. A. Schultz, resigned.

Gerald J. Stephens, Stirling City, Calif., in place of H. J. Martin, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Wilfred O. Racicot, Dayville, Conn., in place of W. A. Rollinson, retired.

GEORGIA

Jack B. Smith, East Point, Ga., in place of Scott Walters, Sr., retired.

ILLINOIS

Stanley H. Cowan, Dundee, Ill., in place of F. H. Popp, Jr., retired.

John B. Reis, Fairbury, Ill., in place of F. M. Masterson, retired.

Robert T. Elgin, Fairmount, Ill., in place of R. M. Hart, retired.

Robert D. Yordy, Flanagan, Ill., in place of M. D. O'Brien, retired.

Maurine C. Brown, Gardner, Ill., in place of L. C. Robinson, retired.

William L. Parker, Genoa, Ill., in place of J. R. Sester, removed.

Harold L. Morrison, Hoopeston, Ill., in place of John Petry, retired.

William F. Knobbs, La Harpe, Ill., in place of R. J. Bowen, transferred.

Glenard E. Miller, Willow Hill, Ill., in place of S. L. Keeler, retired.

INDIANA

Harold L. Shepard, La Porte, Ind., in place of R. W. Leets, retired.

Rex L. Tobias, Warren, Ind., in place of B. P. Smith, deceased.

KANSAS

Raleigh J. May, Haven, Kans., in place of W. M. Stoffer, transferred.

Charles H. Sellers, Mulvane, Kans., in place of G. E. Smysor, retired.

Myron L. Van Gundy, Reading, Kans., in place of W. R. Jones, retired.

KENTUCKY

David S. Miranda, Ashland, Ky., in place of H. D. Shanklin, retired.

Newell M. Hargett, Maysville, Ky., in place of N. M. Hargett, removed.

MARYLAND

G. Mitchell Boulden, Elkton, Md., in place of J. M. Terrell, retired.

Hilda B. Free, New Market, Md., in place of F. W. Brashear, retired.

Evelyn F. Lednum, Tilghman, Md., in place of B. V. Sinclair, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Martin H. Walsh, Gardner, Mass., in place O. R. Anderholm, retired.

MICHIGAN

Robert L. Hunsberger, Bloomingdale, Mich., in place of Cecil Plum, retired.

George E. Smith, Sand Lake, Mich., in place of I. L. Groner, removed.

Gerald A. Farnan, Shepherd, Mich., in place of K. W. Walker, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Hjalmar Hulin, Aitkin, Minn., in place of R. V. Peterson, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Mahala A. Ferriss, Bentonia, Miss., in place of M. H. Martin, transferred.

Maude U. Atkinson, Vance, Miss., in place of F. W. Blaine, retired.

MISSOURI

Arthur J. Fiene, Alma, Mo., in place of F. T. McClure, deceased.

Gerald E. Wilson, Blythedale, Mo., in place of C. M. VanHoozer, retired.

Edward C. Grimes, Gallatin, Mo., in place of J. W. Dickey, Jr., declined.

Robert W. Burford, Leeton, Mo., in place of F. E. Fewel, retired.

V. Wayne Shroyer, Mercer, Mo., in place of W. A. Girdner, retired.

William J. Blanton, Norwood, Mo., in place of J. H. Richardson, retired.

J. Walter Jones, Sweet Springs, Mo., in place of C. R. Muller, resigned.

George T. Lipscomb, Wellsville, Mo., in place of W. C. Brandenburg, removed.

MONTANA

Adele M. Coughlin, Helmville, Mont., in place of W. C. Coughlin, retired.

Jean F. Pedersen, Lolo, Mont., in place of L. M. Hughes, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Robert D. Nealon, Wolbach, Nebr., in place of H. E. Berney, retired.

NEVADA

Ronald F. Gandolfo, Austin, Nev., in place of B. J. Nurmi, resigned.

Vivian A. Cranmer, Pahrump, Nev., in place of F. L. Turner, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Jeanne L. Tamplin, Hewitt, N.J., in place of M. F. Sando, retired.

Leon J. Madden, Millington, N.J., in place of Charles Mertz, deceased.

Clarence P. Kinsley, Pemberton, N.J., in place of B. M. Lippincott, retired.

Warren T. Moulton, Rahway, N.J., in place of M. F. Gettings, deceased.

John Kane, Jr., South Plainfield, N.J., in place of J. B. Geary, Jr., retired.

Leonard F. Errico, Stockton, N.J., in place of W. J. Ledger, retired.

NEW YORK

Harry H. Emmons, Interlaken, N.Y., in place of J. V. Kellogg, retired.

Philip J. Dittmeier, Manorville, N.Y., in place of T. J. Jamer, transferred.

Barbara A. Alkinburgh, Nelliston, N.Y., in place of J. W. Van Alstine, retired.

Francis P. Secor, Otego, N.Y., in place of R. A. Southard, declined.

Louis P. Kriss, West Islip, N.Y. Office established September 15, 1958.

NORTH DAKOTA

Thelma A. Hovet, Buxton, N. Dak., in place of M. A. Ellingrud, transferred.

OHIO

Harold W. Kinney, Richmond, Ohio, in place of E. L. Clare, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Ruth M. Phillips, Gore, Okla., in place of E. E. Johnston, retired.

Beatrice H. Jones, Porter, Okla., in place of Evah Kirksey, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ernest E. Roberts, Bechtelsville, Pa., in place of W. S. Scheiry, retired.

Paul B. Vandevander, Bellwood, Pa., in place of R. M. Dysart, retired.

Harry P. Snyder, Columbia, Pa., in place of H. P. Shreiner, retired.

Phares C. Cramer, Conestoga, Pa., in place of E. C. Smith, retired.

Arthur E. Smith, Crooked Creek, Pa., in place of J. A. Brown, transferred.

Abram B. Lauver, Dalmatia, Pa., in place of P. L. Tressler, retired.

Raymond G. Mathews, Doylestown, Pa., in place of F. A. F. Fonash, retired.

Margery B. Lehman, Duke Center, Pa., in place of C. F. Semelsberger, deceased.

Richard D. Hetrick, Easton, Pa., in place of H. C. Schultz, retired.

Charles C. Kerlin, Falls, Pa., in place of C. H. Freas, resigned.

Walter E. Lucas, Fleming, Pa., in place of F. E. Zahniser, retired.

Adeline M. Waters, Gifford, Pa., in place of Elizabeth Shelley, deceased.

Ruth L. Funk, Glenwillard, Pa., in place of G. W. Golden, retired.

Harvey A. Baddorf, Halifax, Pa., in place of R. R. Kinsinger, retired.

Walter G. Woolbaugh, Hallstead, Pa., in place of F. E. Chamberlin, retired.

Hazel I. Suain, Hazel Hurst, Pa., in place of M. J. Suain, retired.

James J. Kelly, Herminie, Pa., in place of Katherine Diamon, retired.

Charles L. Gilmore, Lahaska, Pa., in place of E. M. Davis, retired.

William E. Nolan, Lake Ariel, Pa., in place of E. A. Deming, retired.

Warren B. Stapleton, Lewisburg, Pa., in place of G. L. Johnson, retired.

Edward B. Henning, Mehoopany, Pa., in place of D. R. Sheehan, retired.

William F. Farrell, Middleport, Pa., in place of Alexander Bubel, retired.

Alice H. Bustin, Milan, Pa., in place of A. G. Flood, retired.

Althea M. Best, Neffs, Pa., in place of L. C. Best, retired.

Raymond E. Hausman, New Tripoli, Pa., in place of F. D. Weiss, retired.

James T. Rorke, Northumberland, Pa., in place of Charles Gubin, retired.

Norma A. Stoudt, Palm, Pa., in place of S. R. Stauffer, transferred.

Irving E. Rath, Pillow, Pa., in place of C. M. Koppenhaver, resigned.

Robert L. Clink, Snow Shoe, Pa., in place of J. W. Sullivan, deceased.

Walter H. Hoffman, Strasburg, Pa., in place of C. W. Johnston, retired.

Everett A. Holmes, Thompson, Pa., in place of P. W. Walker, retired.

Walter P. Quintin, Thornton, Pa., in place of Lawson Stinson, resigned.

William J. Shields, Tidioute, Pa., in place of L. B. Atkin, retired.

William M. Pickens, Tionesta, Pa., in place of Neil Kunselman, retired.

Charles W. Plunkett, Turtlepoint, Pa., in place of G. L. Carlson, retired.

Florence E. Miller, Utica, Pa., in place of H. C. Brandt, retired.

George P. Kraft, Washington Boro, Pa., in place of C. B. Strickler, resigned.

Carlton I. Olsen, Youngsville, Pa., in place of W. H. Jones, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Jennie M. Swartz, Baltic, S. Dak., in place of C. R. Dregseth, retired.

Leonard H. Nelson, Miller, S. Dak., in place of W. A. Hall, retired.

TENNESSEE

Avos B. Halsell, Moss, Tenn., in place of F. H. Osgatharp, deceased.

TEXAS

Annie M. Whittley, Barksdale, Tex., in place of Lillie Perkins, retired.

Robert L. Baldridge, Jr., Clifton, Tex., in placeof A. L. Bronstad, retired.

Cloyce W. Floyd, Dawson, Tex., in place of C. D. Barry, retired.

Austin Skinner, Ferris, Tex., in place of A. T. McCarson, transferred.

James W. McMillan, Kingsville, Tex., in place of P. D. Cauley, Sr., retired.

Ramon G. Amaya, San Diego, Tex., in place of Trinidad Solis, removed.

Oleta B. Coleman, Splendora, Tex., in place of P. W. Davis, retired.

O. C. Sewell, Jr., Sulphur Springs, Tex., in place of Byron Williams, retired.

UTAH

G. Vernal Seamons, Hyde Park, Utah, in place of Vernon Perkes, deceased.

Myrtle H. Davis, Mexican Hat, Utah. Office established March 9, 1957.

VERMONT

James D. O'Brien, Shelburne, Vt., in place of E. T. Sevee, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

George A. Fahey, Wheeling, W. Va., in place of J. J. Mathison, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 2, 1965:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Galatians 6: 10: *As we have therefore opportunity let us do good unto all men.*

Most merciful and gracious God, Thou art daily making us the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence and never withholding from us anything that is needful for our blessedness.

Thou art our companion, walking with us when we are lonely; our counselor, guiding us in times of perplexity and confusion; our refuge and strength when the winds are contrary and we encounter trials and tribulations.

Grant that as we are continually receiving so much from Thee may we never be penurious and selfish.

Inspire us with the urge to give ourselves to others and share with them our many blessings.

Make us eager to bear the burdens of the weak; extending the hand of helpfulness to the fallen.

May we speak the words of encouragement to the bruised and brokenhearted who find the struggle of life so very difficult.

Constrain us always to manifest the Master's spirit of consideration and compassion.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3. An act to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region.

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FOOD MARKETING

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 88–354, the Chair appoints as members of the National Commission on Food Marketing the following members on the part of the House: Mrs. SULLIVAN, of Missouri; Mr. PURCELL, of Texas; Mr. ROSENTHAL, of New York; Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska; and Mrs. MAY, of Washington.

TIPS SHOULD BE COUNTED FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to correct a longstanding injustice in our social security system. My bill will allow those who receive tips and gratuities to consider such compensation as income for social security purposes. I introduced a similar bill in the 87th and the 88th Congresses.

Under present law tips and gratuities must be reported as income for income tax purposes, and the recipient of this compensation is required to pay income tax. But he cannot pay into the social security system. In other words, this money is considered as income for the purpose of income tax but not deemed income for the purpose of social security. As a result of this anomaly, millions of wage earners are denied the benefits of social security to which they are rightfully entitled. By excluding tips and gratuities, the amount of the average monthly wage for millions of Americans is reduced—and this is the figure which determines the amount of the monthly benefit. The amount of tips and gratuities received by employees who regularly receive them is estimated at more than $1 billion a year. Under the present law this $1 billion of earned income cannot be counted as income for social security purposes.

The social security system is vital to those who are excluded by this inequity. Because of low wages during their working years they are most likely not to have accumulated savings upon which to retire. Yet they are either not covered at all or, because the major portion of their income cannot be counted for a social security purposes, receive minimum benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this social injustice should have been corrected long ago. We cannot create the Great Society without providing our senior citizens with income sufficient to maintain their dignity.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday I was absent on rollcall No. 7. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

THE HIGH COST OF LENIENCY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have all been very disturbed over the crime situation, and not just juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the Members of the House a poem which I received on yesterday:

THE HIGH COST OF LENIENCY

It is plain to be seen, by those willing to look
That our modern society favors—the crook.
Of a juvenile criminal, someone will say:
"The kid was deficient in vitamin A."

If someone's too lazy to work for a living
His hard-working neighbors are told: "Be forgiving."
If mobs "out of hand" commit riot and rascality
Some one will insist: "T'was policeman's brutality."

And when, in a drunken rage, someone will kill,
Excuse is soon offered: "The poor chap was ill."
Assaulters leave victims in horrible shape
But we are assured, " 'Twas a slight case of rape."

The foulest of crimes and the worst of abuses
All seem to be coupled with ample excuses.
Are we getting so callous we are not discrimal
And see how such attitudes foster the criminal?

Will some clever "expert" with mental agility
Rob every known felon of responsibility?
We're giving the criminals cause to rejoice
Because they're unpunished for criminal choice.

And criminal acts too well planned and malignant
Since public inertia persists; not indignant
Disgust and prompt punishment. Stupidly lenient
The yield to temptation to crime is convenient.

Whenever no murmur of protest is heard
It seems that the criminal has "the last word"
And the faith of our fathers—a child's right to pray—
Our God-given right is denied in our day.

No wonder the powers of evil rejoice
When one is not condemned by his criminal choice
And our country's known enemy subtle and sly
Is awake and aware while we sit idly by.

If we will not awaken, it may not be long
Till the toxin of danger will change to a gong.
It's all too apparent, to those who will look
That society favors the Godless—the crook.

—FLORENCE M. STELLWAGEN.

FRANK ELEAZER, CHIEF OF THE UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL HOUSE STAFF

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a longtime friend of the House of Representatives received a signal honor last Thursday. Mr. Frank Eleazer, chief of the United Press International House staff, was high man in a contest for three seats on the standing committee of correspondents, the committee which administers the Congressional Press Galleries.

I am sure all Members join me in congratulating Frank Eleazer at this time.

Mr. Eleazer has covered the House for 17 years and has been head of the UPI House staff since 1954. A native of Nashville, Tenn., a graduate of Emory University, and the holder of a master's degree in journalism from Columbia University, he has worked on newspapers in Macon, Ga., and Richmond, Va., before joining the United Press in Atlanta, Ga., in 1943.

The House is fortunate to have correspondents of Frank Eleazer's caliber assigned to report upon our labors. He is known by all Members as a friend, yet an impartial reporter. He has our deep respect, because he is true to his profession.

Mr. Speaker, I also congratulate Mr. Milton R. Berliner, of the Washington Daily News, and Mr. Benjamin R. Cole, of the Indianapolis Star, who along with Mr. Eleazer have been elected to the standing committee of correspondents.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to reiterate and second the statement made by our distinguished majority leader on behalf of our friend who has acted so effectively, so ably, and so objectively. I congratulate Frank, his family, and his friends. He is a real credit to the House and to the press. His example is one that might be followed by objective reporters everywhere.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman. I join with him in the comments he has just made regarding Mr. Frank Eleazer, head of the UP staff here in the House since 1954. He has truly been a reporter who understands the workings of the House, and who is loyal to the House. I should therefore like to join the distinguished majority leader in paying tribute to him today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I emphasize and reiterate what the distinguished majority leader has just said, and which has been echoed by others. Frank Eleazer's record as a reporter is outstanding. We on our side have enjoyed working with him in the past and I am sure that that excellent relationship will continue in the future.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. I, too, would like to extend my congratulations to Frank Eleazer, not only because he is the expert newspaper man he is, but I think all of us in the House will appreciate he is also an excellent campaigner.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in tribute and congratulations to Mr. Frank Eleazer, of United Press International, who has just been elected to a seat on the standing committee of correspondents.

Mr. Eleazer is a native of my own home town, Nashville, Tenn., and we are proud to note his achievements here in Washington and the honor bestowed upon him by his colleagues. He is a longtime friend of the House of Representatives, having covered this body for some 17 years. He is a gentleman highly respected for his objective and penetrating reporting of the affairs of this body and a man who demands and receives the highest respect.

My congratulations also to Mr. Milton R. Berliner and Mr. Benjamin R. Cole who have also been elected to the standing committee of correspondents.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in the Congress in recognizing the high honor that has been paid Frank Eleazer by his colleagues of the press. Frank has directed the coverage of the House of Representatives for United Press-International since 1954. He was elected last week to a seat on the standing committee of correspondents, which oversees the operation of the congressional press galleries. While, as a new Member of this body, I have had to follow his excellent coverage of the House as an observer rather than a participant, I can point with pride to the fact that he cut some of his journalistic teeth in my Congressional District on the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch. Frank joined the Times-Dispatch before Pearl Harbor and left some time thereafter to serve his country. He did not return to Richmond after the war but we are all proud of the fine work he has done here in bringing to the country the activities of the House with the spirit of a man who loves his work and the fairness and integrity of a man who knows his job.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] and all others desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record regarding Mr. Frank Eleazer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. SMITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I advise the House that this is the birthday of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], chairman of the Committee on Rules, certainly one of the outstanding Members in all the history of the House. I am sure I join all Members in wishing the judge a very happy birthday and many more of them.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 71)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The restoration of home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia must no longer be delayed.

Our Federal, State, and local governments rest on the principle of democratic representation—the people elect those who govern them. We cherish the credo declared by our forefathers: No taxation without representation. We know full well that men and women give the most of themselves when they are permitted to attack problems which directly affect them.

Yet the citizens of the District of Columbia, at the very seat of the Government created by our Constitution, have no vote in the government of their city. They are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship while denied one of its basic rights. No major capital in the free world is in a comparable condition of disenfranchisement.

The denial of home rule to the District creates serious practical difficulties. The District is the ninth largest city in the United States—more populous than 11 of the States. Its government must handle the same problems which press with increasing urgency on the legislative, executive, and judicial arms of city governments throughout the Nation, and it must perform as well many of the functions of State and county governments. Under the present system these duties fall upon busy Members of the Senate and the House who—in addition to their congressional responsibilities—must serve as State representatives, county supervisors, and city councilmen for Washington.

Self-government for the District would not be an innovation. It is a return to the views of the Founding Fathers and to the practice of the early days of the Nation. James Madison wrote in the Federalist that the inhabitants of the Nation's Capital "will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them."

Such a municipal legislature was established in 1802 under President Jefferson. It was strengthened in 1812 under President Madison, and in 1820, under President Monroe, it was enlarged to include an elected mayor.

Had it not been for the tragedy of the Civil War, local government would have continued. In 1871 the people of the District, deep in the problems of the Reconstruction period and urgently needing a program of public works, acquiesced in a change to a territorial form of government under which they lost the right to elect their chief executive. The program of public works was badly executed and the territorial government was soon in virtual bankruptcy. In 1874 Congress withdrew the voting franchise entirely and substituted a commission form of government. The intent was to make the change temporary—a receivership which would be replaced by self-government as soon as the fiscal affairs of the city were on a sound basis. But this "receivership" has now lingered on for 90 years.

There is a fundamental Federal interest in the National Capital. The Constitution wisely delegates to the Congress supreme legislative power over the seat of the Government of the United States. The Congress can, however, delegate to a municipal legislature all the powers necessary for local self-government, and at the same time preserve fully its ultimate power and the interests of the Federal Government.

The District of Columbia Charter Act, which I am transmitting to the Congress today, will relieve the Congress, to the maximum practical extent, of detailed legislative direction of District affairs while retaining essential control in the Congress. The bill—

(1) Creates a representative local government for the District;

(2) Provides a link between the Congress and the local government in the form of an elected Delegate to the House of Representatives; and

(3) Preserves intact the powers of the Congress and the President by—

(a) An express provision that the Congress is in no way deprived of its power to legislate for the District, and may repeal or modify any act of the local council;

(b) A provision for an absolute veto by the President of any act of the local council; and

(c) Provisions for supervision of the fiscal affairs of the District by the General Accounting Office.

Home rule for the District has been unfinished business for far too long a time. Presidents of both parties—Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—have urged it. Measures to provide it were passed by the Senate in the 81st, 82d, 84th, and 86th Congresses.

The people of the District are ready and eager to join fully in the democratic process. In the presidential election of 1964, more than 90 percent of the registered voters went to the polls.

I urge the Congress to approve at the earliest possible date the legislation which will grant them the fundamental American right of self-government.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *February 2, 1965.*

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH INTO SPINAL CORD INJURIES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 203) to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 203

A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 216(a)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For each fiscal year in the period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending June 30, 1971, the Administrator shall set aside not less than $100,000 of such appropriated funds for the conduct of research into spinal cord injuries and diseases, and other disabilities that lead to paralysis of the lower extremities."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that funds appropriated for research in the Veterans' Administration shall have set aside in each fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1965, and ending June 30, 1971, a total of not less than $100,000 for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases and other diseases that lead to paralysis of the lower extremities.

This bill would accomplish this simple purpose stated in the paragraph above and would not cause any additional appropriation.

Section 216(a)(1) of title 38 specifically directs the Administrator to conduct research in the field of prosthetic appliances, prosthesis, and similar devices. The present research program in the Veterans' Administration directly related to spinal cord research alone approaches twice the amount set forth in this bill. Enactment of this bill will serve to focus attention on the needs of this particular group and will in no way, in the opinion of the committee, interfere with the research program of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 203. This bill will authorize $100,000 of the funds appropriated for research in the field of prosthetic appliances, orthopedic appliances and similar devices to be specifically earmarked for the conduct of research into spinal cord injuries and diseases and other disabilities leading to paralysis of the lower extremities. The bill provides that this authority shall exist for a period of 6 years. The Veterans' Administration indicates that its present research expenditures in this area are now considerably in excess of $100,000 a year. Enactment of the bill will, therefore, not result in the expenditure of additional funds. Instead, it will make mandatory the expenditures of a specific amount for this worthy purpose. Enactment of this bill will serve to focus attention on the specialized needs of paralyzed veterans. I urge its approval.

REPEAL OF "MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS" SECTION OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 214) to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 214

A bill to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The table of chapters immediately before chapters 1 and 31 of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out

"43. Mustering-Out Payments..........2101".

(c) Subsection (c) of section 12 of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate into one Act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration", approved September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-857), is repealed.

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect as of July 1, 1965.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, strike out all of line 3.

On page 2, line 4, insert the following:

"(d) The amendments and repeals made by this section shall take effect as of July 1, 1966.

"SEC. 2. Section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following new sentence after the first sentence thereof:

" 'Notwithstanding the first sentence of this section or section 71a of title 31, a member of the Armed Forces entitled to mustering-out payment who was discharged or relieved from active service as an officer of an armed force under honorable conditions before July 16, 1952, for the purpose of appointment as a warrant officer or commissioned officer in a regular component of an armed force, shall, if application is made before January 31, 1966, be paid mustering-out payment by the Secretary concerned beginning within one month after application has been received and approved.' "

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to repeal effective July 1, 1966, as obsolete chapter 43, title 38, United States Code, entitled "Mustering-Out Payments."

A Presidential proclamation, effective January 31, 1955, ended the right of any individual for mustering-out payments for service after that date.

Mustering-out payments in varying amounts ranging from $100 to $300 have been paid to World War II and Korean conflict veterans, pay grade O-3 or below; that is, a captain in the Army, Air Force, or Marines, a lieutenant senior grade in the Navy or Coast Guard. These payments were made on the basis of assistance to aid the veteran in returning to civilian life.

No additional appropriation will be required as a result of the passage of this legislation.

Similar bills passed the House in the 87th and 88th Congresses but failed to win approval in the other body.

The suggestion of the Department of Defense has been incorporated in the bill and would extend the time for filing for this benefit for approximately 200 beneficiaries to January 31, 1966.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 214, will repeal the obsolete mustering-out pay provisions of existing law effective July 1, 1966. Mustering-out pay was authorized by the Korean GI bill for active service in the Armed Forces between June 27, 1950, and January 31, 1955, for all ranks up to and including captain.

Like other readjustment programs established by the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, mustering-out payments were intended to aid persons who served during the Korean conflict in the transition to civil life. Consistent with this purpose, it was designated to be a temporary program.

Inasmuch as the program has long since served its purpose, H.R. 214 will repeal the authority to make mustering-out payments. I urge its passage.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 228) to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 228

A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) if the veteran, as the result of service-connected disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, or has suffered complete organic aphonia with constant inability to communicate by speech, or deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction, the rate of compensation therefor shall be $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) through (j) or subsection (s) of this section but in no event to exceed $340 per month; and in the event the veteran has suffered one or more of the disabilities heretofore specified in this subsection, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subsections (l) through (n) of this section, the rate of compensation shall be increased by $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $525 per month;".

SEC. 2. Any increased compensation authorized by the amendment made by the first section of this Act shall be effective as of the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, strike out "of a" and insert "one or more".

On page 1, line 7, strike out "organ" and insert "organs".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, existing law authorizes basic rates of compensation which are paid according to degree of disability. For example, in wartime cases basic rates range from $20 for a 10-percent disability to $250 monthly for total disability. In addition, certain statutory awards are authorized for specific disabilities. Among such awards is the payment of an allowance of $47 per month—in wartime cases—in addition to the basic rate applicable, where the veteran has lost the use of a hand, a foot, both buttocks, an eye, a creative organ, complete organic aphonia, or deafness of both ears. However, unless the veteran has a combination of disabilities for which a specific award of $340—or higher but not exceeding $525—is payable, he may receive only one additional allowance of $47 for the mentioned specific losses even though he may have more than one such loss.

This bill would authorize the payment of the additional allowance for each such loss, in addition to the basic rate of compensation.

The VA estimates that about 500 veterans would benefit from the bill's enactment at a cost of about $278,000 for each of the first 5 years.

An identical purpose bill was reported by the committee in the 83d Congress and in the 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, and 88th Congresses passed the House but failed of passage in the Senate.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 228 would authorize the Veterans' Administration to pay a statutory award for each service-connected loss, or loss of use, of a limb.

Under existing law the Veterans' Administration is authorized to pay statutory awards in varying amounts for different combinations of anatomical loss or loss of use of extremities, creative organs, buttocks, or eyes. Because of the language of the statute, a group of approximately 500 veterans who have suffered two of these disabilities are paid a statutory award for only one.

For example, the veteran who suffers the loss of an eye or an arm or a leg is entitled to a $47 monthly award. If he has lost both an arm and leg he is entitled to a statutory award which, in effect, compensates him for each such loss. If he suffered the loss of all three, an arm, a leg and an eye, he would receive a greater statutory award compensating him for this combination of disabilities. If he had the peculiar misfortune to suffer the loss of an eye in combination with an arm or a leg the statutory award would only compensate him for one of these conditions. To further illustrate this disparity in the law, take the case of three veterans, one having lost an eye, one having lost a leg, and the third having lost an eye and a leg. All three of these veterans would be entitled to the same statutory award of $47 monthly because of the language contained in the statute. There are approximately 500 veterans affected. The Veterans' Administration has estimated that this disparity in the law can be corrected at an annual cost of $278,000 for the first 5 years. I believe the bill has merit and urge its passage.

INTRODUCTION OF SILVER COINAGE BILL

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago I pointed out to Members of the House the need for legislation to immediately change the coinage of the United States. At that time I promised that I would introduce a bill to resolve the threat to our coins, which stems from the fact that their silver content is so high and silver supply so low it will soon be economical to melt them down. After intensive study of the various methods of solving this problem, I have today introduced a bill, which, I believe, will provide the country with an acceptable coinage system, and will allow for the smoothest possible transition to the new system. If this legislation is adopted, the United States will have coins of intrinsic value, no expensive changes will be required in the automatic vending machines and future recurrence of the present problem will be eliminated. In short, we will have coins which we can use, be proud of, and have adequate supplies with which to conduct the business of the country.

The key to the solution, which I propose is the reduction in the silver content of our coins. It specifies that the Secretary of the Treasury may reduce the number of grains in the dollar to 120—there now being 371—and a proportionate reduction in the silver content of the subsidiary coins. The amount of silver content is reduced enough to insure an adequate supply for the foreseeable future and is still high enough to allow the sophisticated rejection devices of our vending machines to function. The new coins will look, sound, and perform like our present coins.

By definition, the reduction of the silver content of the coins will raise the monetary value of silver. The consequent increase in monetary value will free approximately two-thirds of the silver now obligated to the backing of silver certificates. Under my bill, the freed silver may be sold to bona fide domestic users at $1.29 per ounce, the current world market price of the metal. The reason for this provision is twofold: to prevent the market price of silver rising to the point that it would become profitable to melt down our present coins, and to give our domestic users sufficient supplies of silver at an economic price through the transition period.

There are no requirements in the legislation which I propose that any particular alloy or method of minting be employed by the U.S. Government. Complete discretion is given to the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the weight, composition, and methods of manufacture of silver coins. Only the minimum standard of silver content is established for the foregoing reasons.

The Treasury Department is now studying the silver coinage crisis. It was to have reported to the Congress yesterday, but it may be 2 months before we have the results of its research. I have tried to work with that Department in these past months, and it is my hope that its recommendations will coincide with mine. At this point, however, it is impossible to say what it will propose as a solution. I believe my proposal answers the questions the Treasury is studying and it is my hope that the Congress will act upon it promptly.

A TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSWOMAN MINK

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1965, my distinguished colleague from Hawaii, Mrs. PATSY MINK, addressed the Washington chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League on the subject "A Greater Society Through Equality." In great eloquence Congresswoman MINK imparted to those present a statement of individual purpose worthy of espousal by all Americans.

It was with a sense of pride one experiences in seeing a teammate excel in performance, that I listened to her that night. So other Members of this House may share that feeling as a colleague I include her speech in whole in the RECORD at this point:

A GREATER SOCIETY THROUGH EQUALITY

(An address by Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK before the Japanese American Citizens League, Washington, D.C., chapter, January 30, 1965)

I am deeply honored by this invitation to speak at your installation dinner. I am happy to have this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the officers who have served so faithfully over the past year, and to convey my best wishes to those whom you have selected to guide you over the year to come. I am especially delighted to be your guest tonight, particularly since it included an invitation to my daughter, Gwendy, to join you here upon your inauguration of a junior chapter of your organization. To all of you young people, I would wish to express my special greetings and it is really in particular to you that I would wish to address my remarks tonight for it is really in regard for you that the high purposes of this organization are directed.

Your chairman has asked me to address myself tonight to the subject of "A Greater Society Through Equality," and to add a few comments on the "Sansei Coming of Age." The 35 years history which this organization has built toward responsible citizenship is the envy of like groups across this Nation. This growth has been torrid at times, and the goals must have seemed insurmountable to many. But your leaders have etched for all of us a record which we all can indeed be proud of. We have made giant strides in our assimilation into the total life and community of this Nation. We have achieved high posts in the business world, in the sciences, in the arts and music, in literature, and in government.

The era of displacement and social seclusion are past, and what is past is prolog. In our own struggles for social and legal equality and justice, we must be cognizant of our other fellow Americans who yet must achieve their rightful places in this Great Society. Those rights which our forebears set forth as inalienable, are still alien to many of our fellow Americans. So long as this is so, we must join in this fight for full equality for all, lest the past for us be repeated again in the lives of our children.

We are in an era of great social changes. The President has challenged this Nation with many programs. Many have direct and deep meaning to all of us as a group. We are about to have a monumental change in our immigration laws, which stands up as the final repudiation of the separation of peoples within this Nation by national origins. Let us join in this repudiation and begin to build a union as one people in this great Nation. None of us will deny that the national quota system presently forming the basis of our immigration program was nothing more than an insidious form of prejudice and bias and as the President stated "totally incompatible with our basic American tradition." The basic philosophy enunciated by the President in his proposal to the Congress should be of deep import and significant to all of us. As we remove the legal recognition of national origins as a legitimate criteria of national policy, we are clearly setting forth the fundamental doctrine of equality of mankind as a whole. It is for us to herald as well as to exemplify this egalitarian way of life. That this amendment will become law I have no serious doubt; that this philosophy will become the working tenet of the peoples of this Nation will be our burden, our responsibility, and our opportunity.

We must rededicate ourselves to this new pursuit. We must find our places in this great movement to give it every possible support and encouragement. We must demonstrate the incompatibility of national origins as a criteria of communal living in America.

Our circumstances have saddled us with preoccupation with ourselves. Social and economic pressures have made us self-oriented. As a group we have molded an image of conservatism and conformity, largely predicated upon our all-encompassing desire for acceptance into the mainstream of America.

Now a new generation of Americans is coming of age. I am confident that they know and appreciate their place in this society and that they will assume greater responsibility in the affairs of our country. That they will participate in the discourse involving basic moral and philosophic questions, I have no doubt. With your guidance and counsel, I know that they will lead the fight for greater equality and justice for all Americans within this country.

Make no mistake though, that my definition of compatibility does not include a renunciation of all our cultural traditions, customs, and mores. Rather I am deeply aware of how easily these great values can be lost to us and our children, if we do not consciously and actively work to keep them alive. The influence of my own parents and my grandparents has contributed greatly to my overall attitude and philosophy of life. This all-important influence of our cultural heritage and values must be preserved and our children given every benefit which we have derived from it.

Of all the measures our President has propounded for us, that which promises the most toward the accomplishment of this Great Society, is his recommendation in the area of education. While it is only a beginning, it places the resources of this country finally and firmly committed to a broad program of support for the improvement of the educational opportunity of so many of our children who are trying to learn under severe handicaps without special help or attention.

Most of us have seen to it that our children have received the best educational opportunity our communities could afford. We have been able to send our children on to higher educational pursuits. We have committed our personal lives and resources to help our children fulfill their intellectual capacities so that all that awaits them in the horizon of the future is their initiative and perseverance to carry them forward to their full measure of success and happiness.

We are being asked to translate our personal goals for our children into national goals for all the children of America who have been thus far deprived of the full educational opportunity that is so necessary for the building of these lives into productive human resources for this country. The President said in his message on education that—

"Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant."

And he was merely putting into words a basic fact—that unless those of us who are fortunate, see that others have the same opportunities, we must inevitably retrogress among the community of nations—and our retrogression must inevitably pull down with it the efforts of those who hope and work for a united world of peace and security.

Consider that one out of every three persons now in the fifth grade will drop out of high school before finishing. Almost a million young people a year will be doomed to a life of poverty and ignorance unless we reverse this trend.

Consider that more than 100,000 of our brightest high school graduates each year are unable to go to college because they lack the finances.

Consider that the taxpayers of the Nation—and we proudly number ourselves among them—spend about $450 a year to keep a child in a public school. But we spend $1,800 to keep a youngster in a detention home, $2,500 a year to provide relief for a family poverty stricken for lack of education, and $3,500 a year to incarcerate a criminal in a State prison.

Consider that, faced with the need for 400,000 new classrooms in the next 5 years, we already handicap our schools with almost half a million classrooms that are more than 30 years old.

And, finally, consider that, if our economic prosperity is to continue, it must be at the price of training more and more people to handle the complex techniques of our modern age, and of retraining those who inevitably will be displaced by automation and mechanization.

All this adds up to a unique challenge in which we may serve. We have for years believed that education has offered us the best route to equality and social justice. And we have proven this to be true for ourselves.

Let us help in this fight to give every child in America at least a chance at happiness and success instead of a life of drudgery, poverty, and despair.

Let us be in the forefront of the battle to improve our educational facilities so that all Americans may benefit.

Let us go out and work. Let us join other civic groups and give to them freely the time and effort they require.

Let us campaign, and talk, and drive—not among ourselves only but among the community at large.

Let us face the conviction that our education and our success are but the stepping stone from which others, less privileged than we, can reach upward to equal opportunity and justice.

Let it never be said that we do not care about what happens to others; that we rest content with our own achievements; that our preoccupation with ourselves sets us apart in any way from the problems of America.

Let us take a leading role in seeing that all Americans, of whatever background, have the education they need to live and work in comfort and dignity; that no child need be penalized because his father is poor or because his home is broken; that no breadwinner must sit idly at home for lack of training or skill.

And, from that effort, let us launch ourselves into the endeavors that a truly great society demands of its beneficiaries.

As I have said earlier, we are in the midst of a massive liberal movement in this country. Democracy is not a static thing. It is an ever-changing concept, that requires the best thought and most energetic efforts of all its people.

Democracy demands a citizenry willing to debate its issues, to form a consensus that benefits all, then to work toward its fulfillment.

The Civil Rights Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, the education measures passed by the last Congress, and the new measures now recommended by the President are all landmarks in this Nation's struggle for excellence and humanism.

It is our sacred duty as Americans to take part in this struggle. We owe it to our country with as much urgency as we owe military service or obedience to its laws.

We have much to offer. We have education and time and willing hearts. We have the firsthand knowledge of how the opening of the fountains of education to us all have given us a life of happiness and security.

This, then, is our great opportunity. We can take the theme, "A Greater Society Through Equality," and make it a rallying cry for our determination to help all the underprivileged of this Nation gain their rightful places in their communities.

We can show the world once again that Americanism is a humane and sensitive way of life—that Americans of all backgrounds are not only willing and determined to fulfill their duties and responsibilities but outspoken in their drive to perfect our society for all.

We, each of us, and I particularly, have benefited greatly from membership in collective entities, whether it be this organization, or the local PTA, or a labor union, or in a government body; but let us also realize that collective membership in no wise was ever intended to supplant the individual responsibility each of us has to express our own ideas, to communicate, to evaluate, and to render personal decisions on matters of collective importance.

All the measures that we are working for, whether they be in education, or job opportunity, are designed to elevate the individual in his own evaluation of himself. It is the recognition of the dignity of each individual's mind and being, that is at the heart of all our efforts to render him able to fulfill his capacities whatever they might be, great or small.

I do not believe that men can all be equal; some will be more talented than others; some will have greater skills than others; but while recognizing the innate differences with which we are endowed, we must work for the development of our institutions in America which will give each and every person the opportunity to achieve to the maximum of his individual capacities. Equality of opportunity in education is what I seek; equality in job opportunity is what I seek; for if the opportunity can be equal, then the vast differences of human mind and will, will generate for us that Great Society where the individual is contributing the most to his own happines and to the ultimate good of this Nation. May these high goals of our President become our own personal goals.

I thank you for your kindness and for being such a good audience to my brief thoughts.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE PRESENT WHEAT LAW

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with Senators Milton Young, of North Dakota; Karl Mundt, of South Dakota; Frank Carlson, of Kansas, and Gordon Allott, of Colorado, in introducing legislation to amend the present wheat law.

This is, of course, extremely important to North Dakota, which derives more of its income from the sale of wheat than any other State in the Nation. But it is equally important to all Americans, since agriculture is in a tough financial situation today. And agriculture is a business whose overall activity amounts to close to $50 billion a year.

Too many of our city friends fail to realize the great stake they have in the prosperity of the American farmer. Three out of ten persons employed in private industry look to the farm for their income, and illness in this segment of our economy can be a contagious thing indeed.

Our bill provides for the American farmer to get full parity, an American price, for that wheat he produces for other Americans, and this is only fair and reasonable since after all his costs of production are American costs and he is one of the best customers of American industry.

Because half of our wheat must be exported and increased exports of lifegiving food could well be the greatest benefit to our foreign policy, the amount of wheat going into export would be priced competitively and its value would be established in the marketplace. This would help our Nation more aggressively regain export markets we so sorely need.

Our bill is a much less complicated bill than the present bill. It removes some of the discretionary powers of the Secretary of Agriculture which have been so confusing to the American farmer.

I am including in my remarks a short explanation of the bill, as well as a more detailed point-by-point explanation for the interest of my colleagues.

Explanation of Bill

This bill provides for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program. It would—

1. Repeal existing provisions for marketing quotas;
2. Make permanent the provision for a minimum national acreage allotment of 49,500,000 acres;
3. Provide full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption, and not less than the higher of (1) the farm price equivalent of the previous 3-year average world market price, or (2) 50 percent of parity, for all other wheat;
4. Repeal provisions for acreage penalties for overplanting or underplanting allotments;
5. Require the special acreage reserve for old wheat farms to equal 1 million acres;
6. Permit producers of excess wheat to store their excess and qualify for marketing certificates and price support;
7. Permit certificates to be issued for wheat held over from a prior crop where the current crop is underplanted;
8. Permit the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates, in which case all certificates would be redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation;
9. Repeal the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat;
10. Extend the wheat diversion payment program permanently with a mandatory payment rate equal to 50 percent of the noncertificate support price multiplied by the normal production of the acreage diverted.

Under the bill acreage allotments would be proclaimed every year. The amount of the national acreage allotment would be the larger of 49,500,000 acres, or the acreage needed to meet the production objective, which could not be less than 1 billion bushels. It would be apportioned among States, counties, and farms as provided by existing law, except that no loss of history would result from the overplanting or underplanting of allotments. Marketing certificates would be utilized as under existing law, except that they would be restricted to the portion of the crop needed for domestic food consumption, and the support level for all certificate wheat would be full parity, instead of 65 to 90 percent of parity for domestic certificate wheat and zero to 90 percent of parity for export certificate wheat. The remainder of the crop would be supported at the level now provided for noncertificate wheat, and certificates would not be required for export wheat. The President would determine, in accordance with the objectives of the act, whether processors would be required to obtain certificates for wheat processed for domestic consumption, or whether the wheat for domestic consumption should move at the noncertificate price, with the certificate issued to producers being redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill would be applicable to the 1966 and subsequent crops.

Section-by-Section Explanation

REPEAL OF MARKETING QUOTA AUTHORITY—EXTENSION OF 49.5-MILLION-ACRE MINIMUM ALLOTMENT

Section 1 repeals the existing provisions for wheat marketing quotas, and continues in effect the minimum national acreage allotment of 49.5 million acres.

Subsection (a) provides that, instead of proclaiming marketing quotas when the supply would otherwise be excessive, the Secretary shall determine a production objective each year and proclaim a national acreage allotment designed to achieve it. The formula for determining the production objective would be the same as the present formula for determining the amount of the marketing quota, and the national acreage allotment would be the same as under existing law, except that, in addition to the 1 billion bushel minimum provided by existing law, this subsection would continue the 49.5-million-acre minimum which existing law makes applicable to 1965 only. The national acreage allotment would be apportioned to States, counties, and farms as provided by existing law, except that section 2 of the bill would prevent any history loss by reason of underplanting or overplanting in the same manner that the Agricultural Act of 1964 prevented such loss in 1965, and section 3 of the bill would provide a fixed acreage of 1 million acres for the special acreage reserve for old wheat farms created by the 1964 act. Acreage allotments could be increased as under existing law, but the existing provision for termination is deleted.

Subsection (b) repeals Public Law 74, 77th Congress, which deals with wheat marketing penalties; and amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 by striking out section 336 which deals with the marketing quota referendum, section 338 which deals with transfers of farm marketing quotas, and provisions in various other sections which have no meaning in the absence of marketing quotas. Paragraphs (8) and (9) of Public Law 74, which deal, respectively, with rice marketing penalties and support for the 1941 through 1946 crops are obsolete, and their repeal merely strikes out ineffective provisions. Rice marketing penalty rates are now established by section 356 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Subsection (c) makes changes in headings in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 required by the deletion of quota provisions.

ACREAGE PENALTY REPEAL

Section 2 makes permanent those provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1964 which prevented any loss of State, county, or farm acreage history in 1965 as a result of overplanting or underplanting allotments.

Subsection (a) prevents such loss of history in the case of the State allotment. The proviso to be amended by subsection (a) was added by section 202(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (b) prevents such loss of history in the case of the county allotment. The proviso to be amended by subsection (b) was added by section 202(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (c) prevents such loss of history at the farm level in the same manner as was provided for 1965 by section 202(3) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (d) complements subsections (a) and (b) by making changes in section 334(g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 necessary to assure that States and counties do not lose history as a result of the overplanting of farm allotments.

MILLION ACRE SPECIAL ACREAGE RESERVE

Section 3 provides that the special acreage reserve for old wheat farms created by section 202(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1964 shall be 1 million acres. At present the reserve may be set at any figure up to 1 million acres that the Secretary determines desirable.

FULL PARITY FOR WHEAT FOR DOMESTIC FOOD CONSUMPTION

Section 4 provides price support at full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption, and puts a floor under the support level for other wheat equal to the higher of (1) the farm price equivalent of the previous 3-year average world market price or (2) 50 percent of parity.

Subsection (a) repeals the existing provisions for support of domestic certificate wheat at 65 to 90 percent of parity and export certificate wheat at 0 to 90 percent of parity; and provides instead for a single support level for all certificate wheat at full parity. Subsection (a) puts a floor under the support level for noncertificate wheat equal to the higher of (1) the farm price equivalent of the previous 3-year average world market price or (2) 50 percent of parity. Subsection (a) also repeals those provisions of the price support law which are related to the marketing quota provisions repealed by section 1 of the bill. In addition subsection (a) preserves the eligibility for wheat price support of producers who exceed their allotments, but store their excess wheat as permitted under section 5 of the bill.

Subsection (b) limits the quantity of marketing certificates issued to producers to the quantity of wheat estimated to be needed for domestic food consumption (instead of including such portion of the estimated exports as may be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture as is now provided). Section 202(10) of the Agricultural Act of 1964 provided for the 1964 and 1965 crops for an adjustment in the computation of the national allocation percentage which was designed to result in issuance to the farmers who complied with the program of certificates to cover the entire wheat marketing allocation. Subsection (b) of the bill would make this provision permanent.

Subsection (c) strikes out the last sentence of section 379c(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which was added by the Agricultural Act of 1964 and provides for two kinds of certificates, domestic and export. By striking this sentence, subsection (b) provides for only one type of certificate. (The other reference in section 379c(a) to two types of certificates is deleted by an amendment made by section 5(a) of the bill.)

Subsection (d) amends the provision of section 379c(c) fixing the face values for domestic and export certificates to provide for fixing a face value for a single type of certificate.

CERTIFICATES FOR PRIOR CROP WHEAT IF CURRENT CROP UNDERPLANTED—STORAGE OF EXCESS WHEAT

Section 5(a) would permit marketing certificates to be issued in the full normal amount when the producer reduces his acreage in order to market uncertificated wheat on hand stored in bond from prior crops. The farm wheat marketing allocation is the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment multiplied by the national allocation percentage. Under existing law marketing certificates are to be issued for the farm wheat marketing allocation, but not more than the normal yield of the planted acreage, plus the amount of wheat stored from a previous crop under section 379cb, or to avoid penalty which is released because of underplanting the allotment. Since the bill repeals marketing quotas, there no longer would be any wheat stored to avoid penalty. The bill would permit certificates to be issued for any uncertificated wheat stored from a previous crop to make up the amount of the farm wheat marketing allocation.

Subsection (b) of section 5 extends to 1966 and subsequent years the provisions enacted for the 1965 crop by section 202(13) of the Agricultural Act of 1964, which permit a producer who exceeds his allotment by not more than 50 percent to store his excess wheat and remain eligible for marketing certificates. Producers who store their excess in accordance with this provision also maintain eligibility for wheat price support under the provisions of section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Subsection (b) in extending this provision would strike from it provisions relating to storage to avoid marketing penalties, which would have no meaning after repeal by the bill of provisions for marketing quotas.

AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND REQUIREMENT FOR PURCHASE OF CERTIFICATES BY PROCESSORS—CERTIFICATES NOT REQUIRED ON EXPORTS

Section 6 would authorize the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates to cover the amount of wheat processed by them for domestic food consumption. This section also repeals the requirement that exporters acquire marketing certificates for wheat exported by them, since it is the purpose of the bill that the noncertificate wheat move freely into export. The President might suspend the requirement that processors acquire certificates either in whole or in part. If he determined, for instance, that the regulation of commerce would be better served by requiring the processors to acquire certificates for a part of the wheat processed by them, he could so provide. The suspension might be for an entire marketing year or a shorter or longer period, as determined by the President.

REPEAL OF MONETARY PENALTIES FOR PRODUCTION ON DIVERTED ACRES

Section 7 repeals the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat. Producers would continue, however, to be subject to loss of eligibility for wheat price support and marketing certificates, if they produced crops on such acreage. The Agricultural Act of 1964 made similar provision with respect to the 1964 and 1965 crops.

EXTENSION OF WHEAT ACREAGE DIVERSION PAYMENT PROGRAM

Section 8 extends the wheat acreage diversion payment program permanently and provides for a mandatory payment rate equal to 50 percent of the noncertificate support price times the normal production of the acreage diverted from wheat. The existing provision, which terminates with the 1965 crop, is discretionary on the part of the Secretary; and the amount of the payment, within the specified maximum, is also discretionary. Beginning with the 1966 crop the Secretary would be required to formulate and carry out a program providing payments on acreage diverted from wheat by reason of the reduction of the national acreage allotment below 55 million acres, and the payment rate would be fixed by law at 50 percent of the noncertificate support rate multiplied by the normal production of the acreage diverted. The Secretary could permit diversion of up to an additional 20 percent of the farm acreage allotment at the same payment rate.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 9 would make the bill effective with the 1966 crop. If allotments were established for the 1966 crop before passage of the bill, they would be effective without further action.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which makes important improvements in our social security system.

I believe the 7-percent increase proposed by my bill is justified at this time in recognition of the increased cost of living and other changes in the economy that have taken place since the last general increase enacted in 1958. This increase in benefits should permit the beneficiaries of the program to enjoy minimum standards of health and comfort.

The bill would also provide benefits for dependents in school up to the age of 22 instead of the present cutoff age of 18. This provision should give to children who have suffered a loss of parental support the opportunity to complete their education.

Another important amendment would allow widows to retire at age 60, rather than at 62 as in existing law, provided they decide to accept an actuarially reduced benefit to take account of the longer period over which they will be paid.

Even with the passage of the proposed 7-percent increase in benefits, many elderly persons who are able to perform useful work to supplement their social security payments will be precluded from dong so under the present $1,200 limitation on outside earned income. Therefore, I have included a provision which raises the amount of outside earnings a social security recipient can receive without penalty to $3,000.

Finally, in fairness to those persons 70 years or older who were unable to acquire the necessary quarters of coverage, my bill would liberalize the eligibility requirements so that they could qualify for minimum benefits.

I am hopeful that early and favorable action will be taken to make these reasonable adjustments in the social security program.

NEEDED HOSPITALS FOR OUR NATION'S VETERANS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has acted hastily and, in my opinion, unwisely in closing 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals and 4 domiciliaries. This action will eliminate approximately 6,000 beds and force many more veterans with serious medical conditions to travel long distances and undergo unnecessary separations from their loved ones.

I have introduced today a resolution expressing the sense of the House against the closing of these hospitals at least until the House Veterans' Affairs Committee holds hearings to determine whether these closings are necessary and in the best interest of the Nation.

The hospitals should not be closed solely as the result of administrative action. Congressmen and the various veterans' organizations should have the opportunity to voice their concern and present pertinent facts that argue against this action. Our veterans who gave up so much in the service of our country deserve a fair hearing.

Statistics show that the veterans' population is growing older. With advancing age medical problems increase and the need for hospital care and services grows. Is the Veterans' Administration wise to insist on these closings when it is estimated that we will need more hospitals in the future? I think not. It smacks of penny wisdom and pound foolishness by the Veterans' Administration to close these hospitals; at the same time funds are requested to build new hospitals.

And, new hospitals are needed. This is indeed part of the argument for retaining those hospitals now in existence. If the Bath, N.Y., VA hospital is closed, there will be an even greater need for a new hospital in Rochester, N.Y. Rochester is a city which fulfills all the VA qualifications for a new hospital site. It is a world-famous medical center, with a large veteran population which the VA hospitals in the surrounding area are unable to serve. Last year more than 700 veterans from Rochester were transported to VA hospitals in other parts of the State for emergency medical attention. This is unfortunate. Anyone who has had to travel long distances when in need of prompt medical attention knows how terrible such trips can be. We owe our veterans' population decent hospitals, at a reasonable and safe distance from their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this nonpartisan resolution. Whatever the final outcome of the hearings, it is imperative that those who question these closings—and they are many—be given a chance to state their cases. The closing of 11 VA hospitals will have serious effects, both on communities and on many veterans. It is not a step to be taken hastily and without proper congressional consultation.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, there have been quite a diversity of events concerning the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the country.

I noticed in the Washington Post this morning an article which states:

> NEW VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL TO OPEN MAY 1
>
> The new Washington veterans' hospital will replace the old Mount Alto hospital to consolidate its outpatient treatment, and is expected to open May 1.

The article goes on to say that this hospital cost $17.3 million.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members of the House that I approve of good medical care being given to the veterans of the Washington metropolitan area.

I also believe that the veterans in the rural areas of western New Mexico and western Texas, as well as southeastern Arizona, are entitled to equal treatment.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that I have appointed an independent medical board of doctors in New Mexico, chaired by the dean of the University of New Mexico Medical School, to make an independent evaluation of the medical facilities at Fort Baird, N. Mex. They are there today. But a strange thing occurred yesterday. They have apparently been asked to delay their visit. I hope that the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee will give an early hearing to those of us who wish to testify before his committee on the proposed closing of these VA hospitals in the United States.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from New Mexico, I would like the House to know that as soon as possible the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will hold complete and thorough hearings. The veterans' organizations are on notice to get ready. We have contacted all members of the House and many have indicated a desire to be heard. There will be no one here during the 9th to the 14th period. I would expect by the 17th or 18th our committee will be ready to hold hearings.

Mr. MORRIS. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman's concern about this matter. I also feel that he is a great, a fine Congressman, and his statement, I hope, will prove to be true.

PROF. ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Alexander Meiklejohn was a friend and constituent, although it was not my privilege to know him until the autumn of his rich and creative life when he first moved to Berkeley.

Ordinary men in their eighties would have settled down quietly and made the most of retirement in a great university community. But Professor Meiklejohn was no ordinary man.

It was not at all an unusual sight for Berkeleyans to see Alex with his beloved wife Helen tramping the hills surrounding Greenwood Common. These near daily walks were soon considered commonplace. To the utter astonishment of his younger and middle-aged, poorly conditioned, friends, he played a lively set of tennis.

Most important, his writing and his speaking in the cause of justice and human freedom continued until the very end.

It was a high honor to know Professor Meiklejohn as a neighbor and a friend. I shall always cherish the memory of his wise counsel. The values he taught will always be remembered and revered.

On January 15, at a special memorial service in Washington, D.C., several former students and dear friends of this great man paid him tribute. Under permission granted, I include the statements of these noted men—Associate

Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Black; Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Wilbur Cohen; former U.S. Ambassador to NATO, W. Randolph Burgess; author and journalist, Alan Barth; associate secretary of the American Association of University Professors, Louis Joughin; president of Amherst College, Calvin H. Plimpton; member of the faculty of St. John's College, Jacob Klein; and former member of the faculty, the Experimental College of the University of Wisconsin, D. S. Otis—in the Record as a further and fitting remembrance of an outstanding American.

Remarks by Mr. Justice Black, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should say at once that I am not here to make a formal speech but to pay my tribute along with yours to a great man and his works. You can understand, I am sure, how much I appreciated the invitation to be with you when I tell you that so far as I can recall this is the first time I have ever left one of our regular weekly conferences to go to some other meeting in the 27½ years I have been a member of the Supreme Court. I could not resist your invitation, however. This is not because I was fortunate enough, like many of you here, to have been a student of Dr. Meiklejohn. I was not that fortunate. It was not even because I was privileged to have enjoyed a long and intimate association and friendship with him, for this was not my privilege. In fact, I saw and talked with him comparatively few times during the years I learned to respect and admire him so much. I do remember and have the fondest recollections of one memorable evening with him in my home when you who were his students would expect, he led me to discuss with him not so much our agreements as our disagreements. Not knowing his teaching methods I endeavored first to emphasize our agreements with one another. I found out very quickly, however, that he preferred first to discuss our disagreements, and it was not long before I discovered why he had this preference. In discussing and analyzing our differences, it soon developed that they were not very many and that in truth we cherished the same basic beliefs in reference to one subject which long had been a near and dear one to both of us throughout the years. This subject was the meaning of a few words in the first amendment which are: "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

Several books containing writings and lectures by Dr. Meiklejohn were sent out to my home day before yesterday when I returned from several weeks spent in Florida. Once again I discovered that the great ideals of liberty that I find in the first amendment were also cherished by him. While he and I did not see eye to eye as to the exact scope of the absolute terms used in that amendment, we did fully agree that a country dedicated to freedom as ours is, must leave political thoughts, expressions, and discussions open to the people if it hopes to maintain that freedom. Dr. Meiklejohn and I joined in another belief—and I cannot say much more in my 3 minutes. Neither he nor I opposed full freedom to fully discuss both sides of any public question, no matter how unpopular one side may be. We agreed that where a belief can be argued against, there likewise must be freedom to argue for it.

I am here today to express my appreciation, my admiration, and indeed my affection for a man who fought so valiantly—so gently in language but so firmly in conviction for his belief that if this country is to remain free, the minds, the tongues, and the pens of people must not be shackled.

I was impressed in reading one of the biographical sketches of Dr. Meiklejohn that wherever he went from his youth on, his challenge of the orthodox and the conventional frequently brought about heated arguments and passionate criticism of his ideas. Always he met these criticisms with calm reasoning and steadfast loyalty to principles of freedom in which he believed. His books, his writings, his discussions have done much through the years to bring about a better understanding of him and of his ideals. His work and his words have inspired countless people to love their country more and have done much to abate the fears of some that it is dangerous to preserve and to protect freedoms of speech and press guaranteed by the first amendment.

Dr. Meiklejohn, I think, agreed with the idea that I certainly have, that those who love this country should not be afraid of what people may hear or of what they may say about public affairs. Fear is bad enough in any field but in none is it more dangerous than in the area of freedom of expression.

Dr. Meiklejohn left us at an advanced age but his memory and his works live on to comfort and inspire us. His epitaph could well be that which the historian, Diogenes Laertius, composed for an ancient and aged philosopher, Polemo:

"We have buried Polemo, laid here by that fatal scourge of wasted strength. Yet not Polemo, but merely his body, which on his way to the stars he left to moulder in the ground."

Remarks by Hon. Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

We were 400 students, and we were young. We were the sons of Wisconsin farmers, of New York businessmen, of Middle West tradesmen and city teachers. We were 400 free Americans, and we were young.

It was a time of testing then. Not only for us, but for our teachers, our university, and also for democracy. We had come to learn, to be tested. There was much to learn and much to be done. The air was sharp with excitement. The times were hard. And we were free and we were young and we were still untested.

He was our teacher, our adviser. And he asked of every one of us each Monday and then again and again "What do you know of freedom?" And we began to see, in truth, that we knew nothing.

He was our teacher, and we came to him in our raw youth. We were 400 free men, boys, and eager youth come to learn the meaning of freedom.

What is freedom's form, its shape and size? Its color and taste and feel and smell? Is it cold and hard and strong, like steel? Does it course in swift flashes, like a mountain rill, or meander through time as an ancient river? What is freedom? How is it created and how is it contained? What are its uses? What is its power? And what have we to do with freedom? Where do we fit in?

So our search began—and still continues.

He was our teacher, and he led us in our search for the meaning of freedom, for the meaning of democracy, for the meaning of life.

He led us to his teachers—to Epictetus and Henry Adams, to Socrates and Plato, to Lincoln Steffens, Thucydides and James Stephens. He led us to a deep well, filled with the nectar of human wisdom and experience. He bade us drink, and we drank. We were young and very brash and thirsty for knowledge, and at his bidding we drank the heady draft of knowledge, and we began to know the anguish of learning as we tasted its sweet rewards.

He was our teacher, a kindly man, a gentle man, fragile and persistent, with the rugged Scot will to be free, and for all mankind to be free. He was our teacher, and we loved him then as we love him now.

He brought us to an understanding of what we were and what we might be; of what our country was, and visions of what it might become. He bade us read Pericles whose words became engraved on our memory: "Wealth to us is not mere material for vainglory but an opportunity for achievement; and poverty we think it no disgrace to acknowledge but a real degradation to make no effort to overcome." He gave us insight into the human purpose and understanding of the human order.

We learned from him and from his teachers, from the accumulated wisdom of the ages of man.

We learned the litany of freedom—the guarantee of civil liberties laid down in our Bill of Rights.

We learned the meaning of freedom—and its responsibilities.

We learned the uses of freedom—and its limitations.

We learned the price of freedom—what each of us had to pay. And in this way we found our first freedom, each in his own measure, and each according to his own will.

We were 400 young Americans searching for a meaning to our lives. He taught us with questions, always fearless questions. What is order? What is life? From our search, our questioning, we gained a sense of being, and of always becoming. And we came to know a joyous truth—that the search in fact was freedom. That it was an act of life.

And we learned other things about the act of living. We learned, as he had learned from the stoic Epictetus, "To make the best of what is in our power, and take the rest as it naturally happens." And we learned that in the nature of things there is both joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain, exertion and repose.

We learned that freedom has its tyranny, that good has its evil, and that life has its death. We learned these and many other things.

Now this great life has closed, and we mourn its close. But it has not ended.

The teacher will question his students no more. But he is not silent.

His questions will continue to echo. He will continue to prod us into an awareness of ourselves, our country, and our world.

On behalf of his students, we ask, "What, then, is immortality?"

He would argue the question's total irrelevance today, for it is not within our power to know the ultimate answer.

His obligation was to the living, and to those yet unborn, to the future generations of young and free Americans, who must need to know the meaning of freedom and to know where they fit in.

And we are left to pay his debt—to "ever encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found."

Remarks by W. Randolph Burgess, Fellow, Brown University, Former U.S. Ambassador to NATO

My experience covers a little different period of Alexander Meiklejohn's life than most of those here, for I was a student of his at Brown when he was dean and a young man. It was 55 years ago that I took part in one of the most extraordinary classes I have ever known. It was a group about as large as the number present on this occasion today. Such a class according to the educational pundits is too large for active student participation. But this was not, for Professor Meiklejohn somehow stimulated our interest so that every member of the class became a vigorous participant.

The subject of the course was "Logic." But it was not largely engaged with the syllogisms of formal logic. It was rather a vigorous debate on "What Is Truth," and the members of the class were so aroused as to practically tear at each others' throats to find a solution.

The class was divided up and I was picked with a few others to propound and defend the thesis of the Sophists, which we did with utmost vigor. Before we finished, our position was torn to shreds by the class. In the process we learned to think, hard and sharply. This was Alexander Meiklejohn's great contribution to our generation, that he compelled people really to think.

This was true not only in the classroom but also with his activities as dean, when for example he met around the table with representatives of the fraternities and they had to justify their manner of life.

One day I was in the outer office of the college president and gave tongue to the trite observation that everybody had in the back of his mind some idea of God. Alexander Meiklejohn, who had come into the room, whirled on me and said sharply, though smiling as always, "But how do you know that? And can you really call the crude idea of the savage God?" Thus he carved away the props of loose, but pleasant, notions and compelled one to think.

Two years ago, when I spent a semester at the University of California, I found him again in Berkeley with his wife, Helen, daughter of another of my other great teachers of philosophy, Walter Goodenow Everett. Again I felt the joy of contact with his active mind. As others have testified today, there was not always agreement, but always stimulation to vigorous thought.

From my experience abroad with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I have returned with the clear impression that this country is better able to face its great new responsibilities and do its part in world affairs because Alexander Meiklejohn taught so many people to think clearly, incisively, and persistently.

REMARKS BY ALAN BARTH, AUTHOR AND JOURNALIST

There is an element of presumption in my talking about Alec Meiklejohn on this occasion. The truth is that I never met him, socially at least, until he was 85 years old, although in a real sense I had known him for the whole of my adult life.

I was privileged to have a part in that wonderful birthday party given for him 6 or 8 years ago at St. John's College in Annapolis. And then, some time later, I lived for a year in Berkeley just around the corner from Alec and Helen and came to know them intimately and affectionately.

It was for me, as you can readily imagine, an exciting and enriching friendship. The seemingly great gulf created by the differences between us in age and eminence and learning disappeared at once. He embraced me as an adversary and a peer. This was what made him so great a teacher, I suppose. He not only challenged students; he sought challenge from them. He fostered maturity in them by treating them as mature. He elicited responsibility from them by dealing with them as responsible.

I never knew a man who relished argument so much. He loved discussion for its own sake, for the intellectual exercise it entailed, much as he loved tennis for its physical exertion. He valued it even more, however, as a tool for the attainment of truth. He cultivated controversy because he believed that out of the conflict of opinion comes the best assurance of unity and of wisdom in the determination of public affairs.

This was, of course, why he was so stalwart a champion of free speech. He believed unreservedly in the utility of freedom. "Freedom," he put it, "is always expedient."

I do not mean to represent Alec as a simple man. His mind was complex—supple as well as strong. Yet there was an extraordinary simplicity in him—a simplicity that grew out of an inner integrity.

I think I have never known a man in whom conviction and conduct were so harmoniously married. What he believed, he acted on. And he was almost wholly free from that kind of self-protecting caution which so commonly passes for prudence.

He was a fierce fighter—but a joyous rather than a rancorous one. There was hardly an intellectual controversy of importance in his time in which he was not an ardent and ebullient participant. Nevertheless, for all his passion, he was a man of the most exceptional sweetness and gentleness and gaiety.

All of us who knew and loved him must feel sadness at his going from us. But we can feel joy as well in the recollection of a life so richly lived, so graced by love, so meaningful and so fulfilled.

Helen, who was closest to him and who loved him most, wrote to me about his death. He was sitting up in a chair after only a day or two of illness, with her on one side of him, his doctor on the other, talking about the troubles on the campus of the University of California—talking, this is really to say, about the twin centers of interest in his life, students and freedom. Suddenly—with no cry, no suffering, no fear—he drew a deep breath and was gone.

What more could we have asked for him? As for us, I think that we shall keep his friendship as long as we live—or as long, at least, as we continue to care about the enduring values he cherished and sustained.

REMARKS BY LOUIS JOUGHIN, ASSOCIATE SECRETARY OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Fifty years ago, when Alexander Meiklejohn was 42 years old, Arthur O. Lovejoy, John Dewey, E. R. A. Seligman and other distinguished scholars were busy founding the American Association of University Professors. Alec, amusingly, could not join the association because he was then in his third year of service as a college president—surely a collateral activity for a man who could never be less than totally a teacher.

But the AAUP and Alec had no trouble in finding out each other. The seminal thinking of the philosopher, over five decades, undoubtedly influenced strongly those association leaders who have been mainly concerned with problems of freedom, and the relationship between authority and the individual. Many in the AAUP have exchanged letters and words with Alec on countless general questions and numerous specific situations.

The relationship between the man and the organization was fittingly and handsomely confirmed by the creation, in 1957, of the Alexander Meiklejohn Award. Alumni and from faculty members of the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin, many of whom are here today, established a fund which would enable the association to honor outstanding contributions to academic freedom by a college or university administrator or trustee, or by a governing board as a group. Between 1958 and 1964 the Meiklejohn Award has been given to five administrators and two trustees, and governing boards as a group have twice shared in the honor. The citations have been for defense of the right of students to hear speakers of their own choice, for defense of professors who have challenged racial discrimination on and off the campus, and for defense of the general right of teachers to have the same freedom as other citizens.

The administrators and trustees cited have been proud to receive the award. The name of Alexander Meiklejohn has gained added significance by being joined to noted acts of principle and courage. The endowers of the fund and the association have been justified in their linking of a profession charged with the advancement of learning to a man of magnanimous spirit.

I must add a word of personal respects. I first met Alec in 1948, which is really not so long ago. Common interests brought us together with increasing closeness, and to my delighted bewilderment I found myself the object of his affection. No sentimentality, not Alec. But subtle understanding, stimulation, wit, kindness, vivacity, and all else that he could give to make another man feel strong and cheerful. Alec did me worlds of good, and has made me want to be good for other men. I suspect that this is the magic which our teacher and our friend worked in many of us.

REMARKS BY CALVIN H. PLIMPTON, PRESIDENT, AMHERST COLLEGE

Alexander Meiklejohn was the eighth president of Amherst College and served from 1912–23. While he regarded Amherst as a very difficult and a very sensitive part of his life, it is only proper to recognize the truly tremendous contributions he made there.

Perhaps it is singularly appropriate for me as the 13th president to be speaking about this, particularly since my father George was chairman of the board of trustees during Meiklejohn's presidency, and my brother Francis was in college and spoke for the students in behalf of "Prexy."

I first met Dr. Meiklejohn early in 1960. I had just accepted the presidency of Amherst but was still in the practice of medicine. The telephone rang and it was Dr. Meiklejohn consulting me on a medical problem. We arranged the technical problem, and I indicated I wanted to meet him. He invited me to his hotel and after looking at each other somewhat suspiciously, we began to talk.

He said, "Dr. Plimpton."

I said, "Call me Calvin."

He said, "Alright, Dr. Plimpton, call me Alex."

I said, "Alright Dr. Meiklejohn."

He said, "I am so glad that you are going to Amherst. When you get there you may hear some things about my term as president."

I said, "Yes, Dr. Meiklejohn."

He said, "Furthermore, you may hear some things about me and your father."

I said, "Yes, Dr. Meiklejohn."

"Well," he said. "Just remember one thing, Calvin, no matter what you hear, your father was always extraordinarily kind and fair to me."

With that we froze together and never thawed apart.

So it is with the deep humility of one who is trying to follow in his footsteps that I reflect with great admiration on his achievements at Amherst. He was truly incredible—running the gamut from beating a varsity tennis player named John Jay McCloy, to attracting one of the outstanding faculties of the day. For example, it was Meiklejohn who really discovered Robert Frost and brought him to Amherst in 1916. He attracted Stark Young, Walter Stuart, Hamilton, and a host of others.

He was one of the most moving and eloquent speakers. No one listened to him without being inspired and stimulated. He loved a debate, and loved an argument, and he loved a fight.

In an interview in 1923, he said several key phrases. "Mr. Erskine has just said, 'Keep the best of the past, be sure of that,' and I say 'Yes, and the best of the past is change. For change is life. Life that does not change is dead.' " "I differ from most of you on most of the issues of life and I am going to keep it up."

"The point is that I am a minority man. I am always wanting change. On most of the great issues, I am usually against the greatest number."

Yes, he was controversial and he was lively. Too lively in fact for Robert Frost who occasionally spoke affectionately of dialectics as "Meiklejaundice." But on balance there is no question that he was one of America's great teachers.

I suspect that nothing pleases a teacher more than to know his words go marching on. I can think of no better tribute. Let me conclude by reading Alexander Meiklejohn's letter of welcome to the class of 1919:

"A WELCOME

"(By Alexander Meiklejohn)

"Members of the class of 1919, we welcome you to Amherst.

"When a man chooses to go to college he declares that he wants to be different, that he is not satisfied to be what he is.

"If any one of you is satisfied with himself, he had better go back and keep still for fear something may happen to disturb his perfection.

"If those who stay are rightly dissatisfied with themselves, they will satisfy us."

These words are as true today as they were then. We can give thanks for Alex Meiklejohn who made us want to change, want to be different, to seek dissatisfaction, and finally want to improve.

REMARKS BY JACOB KLEIN, MEMBER OF THE FACULTY, ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE

St. John's owes a great and unredeemable debt to Alexander Meiklejohn. In the years 1924–27, that is, long before the new program was instituted at the college, Dean Walter Agard, who had been Meiklejohn's pupil at Amherst, would invite him to lecture at St. John's. Later Scott Buchanan, who had also studied at Amherst and, as Dean of St. John's College, had been one of the initiators of the program now in force, found in Alexander Meiklejohn a stern but benevolent critic of the college's ways. From 1940 to 1948, Meiklejohn used to come to St. John's almost every year on "inspection" tours, as it were. He delivered formal lectures, attended classes and seminars, talked to students and faculty. He also served on the college's board of visitors and governors from 1943 to 1947.

None of us, engaged in teaching and learning at St. John's, will ever forget Meiklejohn's upright stature, his gentleness, his indomitable and uncompromising spirit, his seriousness and his intellectual vigor. He often disagreed with us, but this very disagreement was a fruitful one. He challenged our goals and sometimes our methods. He thus compelled us to clarify our assumptions and to view our tasks in a better perspective. Faithful in deed to his own words, he taught us how to become better men. For throughout all his life he proclaimed the inseparability of word and deed, of thought and action. Unyielding on principles, he hated any rigidity that might tend to limit the freedom of thought and action of any individual.

In a speech delivered at St. John's College in 1957, at a meeting called to mark the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the University of Wisconsin's Experimental College and the 85th anniversary of Meiklejohn's birth, he spoke of the combat which, during the 60 years of his teaching, had been waged in the American college. He described this combat in terms of a medieval mystery play in which God and the Devil contend for the possession of the souls of men. To quote him directly: "The Devil, one of whose favorite devices is that of raising for men the standard of living, thereby succeeds in lowering the standard of human intelligence." We should take these words to heart, especially today.

One of my most cherished memories is a lecture he gave at St. John's in 1947, I believe. He spoke of human excellence as the goal to be pursued through education, as the high ideal one should never lose sight of. This ideal was embodied in Meiklejohn himself. He commanded respect. One could not help admiring him. Above all, one could not help loving him. His friendship was a precious gift, to deserve it—a high reward. Nothing could match the purity of his heart. His memory cannot and will not fade.

REMARKS BY D. S. OTIS, FORMER MEMBER OF THE FACULTY, THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

I speak for all of us teachers who were associated with Alexander Meiklejohn in the experimental college—when I say we know how privileged we were. We were daily immersed in the vigorous intellectual excitement of that undertaking, which has so greatly influenced the course of higher education in America ever since.

This excitement was native to the college which Mr. Meiklejohn conceived. Free inquiry into men's thoughts and deeds in ancient Athens and modern America replaced the traditional curriculum of discrete courses of study. Group discussions of students and faculty replaced formal lectures. And Mr. Meiklejohn furnished the essential stimulus to this lively enterprise. His brilliance illumined every problem which the college faced—in teaching, in administration and in personal relationships. He approached every problem in terms of principle, in terms of clarifying issues—never in terms of expediency. To him, this was the approach all intelligent people should make and this was essential to true education.

This man of ideas and principle was also a man of quick and gentle wit and the most personal of friends. He often said, in his writing and speeches, that men are friends and brothers. This conviction underlay his dealings with individuals. Members of the college community felt the warmth and genuineness of his interest in them as persons.

The impact of Alexander Meiklejohn upon those who worked with him was immense. He stimulated their intellectual powers to the utmost and he gave purpose and direction to their thought. To him, man was an ethical being—with moral commitments which he must understand and fulfill. His heroes were Plato, Epictetus, and Immanuel Kant, whom he dearly loved to read to his students and friends.

He never preached but Alexander Meiklejohn imparted this moral imperative to those about him. He was capable of high indignation but it was directed at ideas and actions and it was tempered by his sensitive understanding of human frailties. It is my guess that many of us have long thought and shall continue to think—in coping with involved personal problems or public issues—what would Alexander Meiklejohn's approach to the situation be? That is one of the ways in which he will remain with us through the rest of our lives.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY INVESTIGATION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, with commendable effectiveness and deep understanding, our highly competent Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, determined that the cheating incidents which have recently been uncovered at the Air Force Academy call for more than an investigation of the specific incidents. Therefore, he has established a special advisory committee composed of distinguished citizens, headed by former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, retired Gen. Thomas D. White, who will review the entire Air Force Academy program, to see if they can determine any underlying causes of the problem. Members of the committee are Dean Hardy Dillard, professor of law at the University of Virginia; Dr. Robert L. Stearns, former president of the University of Colorado; Mr. Charles B. Thornton, president of Litton Industries; and Lt. Gen. J. J. Nazzaro, vice commander of the Strategic Air Command.

Secretary Zuckert will keep the Committee on Armed Services fully informed on this matter and he has told me that he will personally review the record of each individual who is involved. Because he is taking personal action on the individual cases as part of his statutory responsibility, he has instructed General White's committee to take a wide long-range look.

Although the greatest number of cadets were not involved in breaches of the honor code, I am pleased with the positive action of the Air Force and know that Secretary Zuckert will continue to keep us informed.

HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, during the past month or so, there has been considerable comment in the press and other news media about the fact that, on December 10 of last year, the Committee on Un-American Activities recommended that three witnesses who had appeared before it be cited for contempt of Congress.

Based on what I have seen and heard of this comment, I would say that all of the facts in the case have not been presented to the public and there is considerable confusion and misunderstanding about the matter. It is my hope that in these remarks I can set the record straight and eliminate such misunderstanding and confusion as may exist about the committee action.

In February 1964 the Committee on Un-American Activities authorized an investigation by a subcommittee into a matter clearly within its jurisdiction. It involved the administration of an important statute by the executive branch.

The subject matter of the inquiry was such that the committee preliminarily decided the witnesses should be heard in executive session. In accordance with its rules, however, it left the final determination of this point to the subcommittee.

I think every Member knows that there is nothing unusual about executive hearings, which are required by the rules of the House in some circumstances and are discretionary in others. Executive sessions have been held in certain cases by most committees of the House, particularly when it has been determined that the national interest required it or that the testimony received could well involve matters of national security.

The subcommittee's determination on the question of executive hearings coincided with that of the full committee. Accordingly, commencing in March 1964, it received the testimony of a number of witnesses in executive sessions. Nine such sessions were held. No one objected or complained and nothing concerning the hearings was "leaked" at any time. As a matter of fact, except for the committee members, certain staff personnel necessarily involved, and the witnesses who had previously appeared, no one even knew the hearings were being held.

At this point the subcommittee subpenaed the three witnesses in question to testify in executive session, just as the previous witnesses had. The subcommittee called them because it had—and still has—reason to believe they could give information on certain of the matters under inquiry.

Within a few days after the subpenas were served upon two of the witnesses, both of them women, the committee began receiving phone calls about the matter. They came from the offices of Members of this House, from newspaper reporters, editorial writers, and private parties. The callers wanted to know why the women had been subpenaed, what the purpose of the hearing was, why it was executive rather than public, and so forth.

I regret to say that, in some instances, callers who said they were employees of Members refused to give their names and, after being informed by the staff that committee rules forbade comment on the matter, continued to press for information and made it clear that they were opposed to the committee action.

The committee has a rule which provides:

> No member of the committee or staff shall make public the name of any witness subpenaed before the committee or subcommittee prior to the date of his appearance.

I have issued strict orders with respect to enforcement of this rule, and it has never been violated since I have been chairman of the committee.

About a week before they were to appear before the committee, the two women who had been subpenaed issued a press release on the matter.

On the day they were supposed to testify, they appeared at the hearing room with a support delegation of about 30 people. Twenty or so baskets and bouquets of flowers had been delivered to the committee office for them earlier in the morning. As a result of their earlier press release, television and radio news media had set up their equipment in the hall outside the hearing room. The subpenaed witnesses made statements for the news media both before and after they were called into the hearing room.

They asserted that merely to be subpenaed by the committee was damaging to them and that they could, therefore, "protect" themselves only by being heard in public with the press present. This request for an open hearing—soon made a demand—was made to the subcommittee in its executive session by all three witnesses and by counsel representing two of them—one witness did not desire to have counsel present.

The witnesses and their counsel were fully heard by the subcommittee over a period of several hours, and after most careful consideration, and after consultation with the office of the Parliamentarian, the subcommittee determined that because of the nature of the hearing and the posible impact of the witnesses' testimony on the inquiry as a whole, particularly at that point in it, the questions to be asked the witnesses and the answers which they might give had to be in executive session in the national interest and because they might "tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate" other persons—to quote the words of rule 26(m) of the House, binding on all its committees.

All three witnesses refused to testify, one even refusing to be sworn or to affirm to tell the truth. Had they acted in this manner in any court, the judge could immediately have held them in contempt. A congressional committee, however, does not have the power to hold anyone in contempt, to try, or to sentence.

Therefore, in the interest of maintaining and preserving the dignity of the House and fulfilling the duties and obligations we have under the rules of the House, which was not then in session, the full committee, exercising its best judgment, unanimously recommended to the Speaker that the matter be referred to the U.S. attorney for appropriate action. In the performance of his duty under the applicable United States Code provision, the Speaker—as has often been done before—cited these witnesses to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. The latter presented the matter to a grand jury as required by statute, and the grand jury returned indictments. Under the law, the offense is a misdemeanor.

These three persons will be accorded due process of law and will be tried. Whether they are found guilty or not guilty is a matter which is left up to regular judicial proceedings over which we have no control. Full appellate procedures will, of course, be available to them if they are convicted in the trial court.

I have no control over what has been said, is being said, or might be said in the future about this matter, but I think it might be well for me to add these observations for the benefit of the vast majority of the American people who are always interested in getting the facts before forming a final judgment, who do not want to go overboard in either direction, in regard to any issue.

In the past, the same people who are now criticizing the subcommittee for holding an executive session in this instance, have taken us to task even more severely for holding open hearings. Their argument then was that we were publicity seekers; that we held open hearings to expose people for the sake of exposure, to humiliate them, and to bring them to public scorn. They claimed then that our hearings should have been executive.

Today, they are conveniently closing their eyes to the fact that the committee maintained complete and absolute secrecy about the subpenaing of the three witnesses, while the witnesses deliberately made the matter public. They have been the publicity seekers. The committee's critics are failing to point out that in this instance—as in others before—it was the witnesses who not only leaked the fact of their being summoned, but also took steps to focus national attention on the matter.

In the future, it will not surprise me at all to see these same critics shift from one position to the other on this question, depending on whether we hold open or executive hearings. Of one thing I am sure: No matter what we do, we will never be able to please them. We can never be right in the eyes of these people. They will always find some excuse to criticize everything the committee does and to call for its abolition.

By the same token, however, I can assure you the committee will continue to hold both executive and public hearings. In determining which type any particular hearing will be, it will exercise its own best judgment after giving full consideration to the national interest and relevant House and committee rules.

The Committee on Un-American Activities was created by this House. It is mandated by the House to carry out certain duties, following procedures spelled out in the rules of the House and consonant with decisions of the courts on matters affecting committee operations.

As chairman of the committee, I take this occasion to inform the House and the American people that, as in the past, the committee will continue to do what the House, speaking for the people, has told us to do. We will not be deterred by carping critics, no matter who they are and no matter how much and on what issues they may agitate.

We on the committee are answerable for all our actions, ultimately, to the House, to the courts, and to the people. We welcome this responsibility. We are confident that, as in the past, our actions will be approved and upheld by them.

POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join with my colleagues in support of a bill to award posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor to our late beloved President John F. Kennedy.

President Kennedy was a man dedicated to the cause of freedom. His life stands as a monument to his willingness to place the welfare of his Nation as a leader of men during World War II; his creativity while a patient in the hospital; his forthrightness as a legislator and his willingness to assume the tremendous demands of leadership as President of the United States have endeared him to all of us.

If any man has served his Nation above and beyond the call of duty it has been John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I concur with my fellow Members of the House of Representatives in urging the granting of this honor to him.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HALL, for 5 days (February 22 through February 27), on account of official business—Armed Services—Hospital Construction Subcomittee (Fort Brook Medical Field Service School, Texas).

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ROUSH, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, February 4, 1965.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MONAGAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3. An act to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

479. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs" (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

480. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Council for the period January 1 to June 30, 1964 (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

481. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to measurement of farms"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

482. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the 1964 report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

483. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on accumulation and retention of excess missile spare parts due to inadequate supply management practices of the U.S. Army, Europe, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

484. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on activities outside the national domain carried on by the Geological Survey during the period July 1 to December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 87–626; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

485. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on measures being taken to control the emission of air pollutants from Federal facilities, pursuant to section 7(b) of Public Law 88–206; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

486. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens together with a list of the persons involved and the reasons for ordering suspension, pursuant to 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

487. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens together with a list of the persons involved and the reasons for ordering suspension, pursuant to 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

488. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard"; to the Committe on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

489. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report on the estimated amount of the losses or costs (or percentage of costs) incurred by the postal service in the performance of public services for fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 87–793; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 13. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of small business; with amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 19. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 44. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to conduct an investigation and study of the organization, management, operation, and administration of departments and agencies of the government of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 84. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy and the oversea operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy; with amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 68. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct investigations and studies; with amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 89. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct studies and investigations; with amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 104. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 4140. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4142. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount allowed as a child-care deduction, and to eliminate the income ceiling on eligibility for such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 4144. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 7-percent benefit increase, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widows's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to liberalize the retirement test, and to provide minimum benefits for all individuals not otherwise entitled at age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4145. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4146. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the number of years which may be dropped out in computing the benefit of an individual who is forced by a Federal agency to retire at age 60 or earlier; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4147. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to claim a personal exemption for his spouse, where such spouse is a student being supported by the taxpayer, regardless of such spouse's gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4148. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4149. A bill to terminate the retailers excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4150. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4151. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for certain expenses incurred by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at a college or university, to the extent that such expenses exceed the personal exemption or exemptions to which he is entitled for the individual or individuals involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4152. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 4153. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961 (Public Law 87-383), so as to permit the use within Canada of certain funds appropriated pursuant to such act for the conservation of migratory waterfowl; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 4154. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4155. A bill to prohibit trade with Communist nations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4156. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4157. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4158. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4159. A bill to establish a national policy and program with respect to wild predatory mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4160. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for self-employed physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 4161. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to eliminate the provisions requiring termination of annuities of surviving widows or widowers upon remarriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4162. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4163. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to extend to employees retired on account of disability prior to October 1, 1956, the minimum annuity base established for those retired after that date; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4164. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4165. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4166. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retierment Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4167. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4168. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4169. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow under retirement age may continue to receive mother's insurance benefits (but at a reduced rate) even though none of the children of her deceased husband are any longer entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 4170. A bill to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4172. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 4173. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4174. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on household type hot water heaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 4176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for a taxpayer with one or more children in college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4177 A bill to provide fellowships for graduate study leading to a master's degree for elementary and secondary schoolteachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4178. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 4179. A bill to create a joint commission of the United States and the State of Alaska to make administrative determinations of navigability of inland nontidal waters in the State of Alaska for State selections; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4180. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4181. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to proceedings against certain witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4182. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to specifically provide for the guarantee of loans made to veterans to purchase dwellings in multifamily structures which are owned cooperatively or are condominiums; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4183. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment may be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 4184. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the silver content of certain coins of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 4185. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 4186. A bill to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 268. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 103 of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H. Res. 170. Resolution to authorize a review of the needs for airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 171. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the extension of further foreign aid to the United Arab Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Res. 172. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the proposed closing of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Res. 173. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H. Res. 174. Resolution authorizing a review of national policy for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4187. A bill for the relief of Dr. Violetta P. Samoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4188. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juliana R. Usison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4189. A bill for the relief of Marcia Patricia Connell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4190. A bill for the relief of Tony Law, also known as Kam Mon Law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4191. A bill for the relief of Michael Willatt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4192. A bill for the relief of Yee Chow Choi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 4193. A bill for the relief of Nikola Kojich and Nevenka Kojich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4194. A bill for the relief of Angelica Anagnostopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4195. A bill for the relief of Mariuccia Italia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4196. A bill for the relief of Henry Mansoor Abdel Sayed, also known as Henri Mansoor, and Roxani Mansoor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4197. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Horacio De Brito Viegas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 4198. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yehudith Tenenhaus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4199. A bill for the relief of Marjorie and George Denich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4200. A bill for the relief of Bedri Gurbuzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4201. A bill for the relief of Bernard M. dos Remedios, and his son, Titus dos Remedios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4202. A bill for the relief of Irene Sankey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 4203. A bill for the relief of Alton G. Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4204. A bill for the relief of Christos Papayianis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 4205. A bill for the relief of Simon Der Simonian, his wife, Hossannah Der Simonian, and their children, Knel Sebouh Der Simonian, Rebecca Der Simonian, Haroutune Der Simonian, and Nishan Der Simonian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 4206. A bill for the relief of Morice E. Ovadia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4207. A bill for the relief of Phillip Mazzella, his wife, Anna Buono Mazzella, and their minor children, Michele Mazzella and Libera Maria Mazzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 4208. A bill for the relief of Lida Pira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4209. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Geraci, his wife, Antonietta Geraci, and their four minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 4210. A bill for the relief of Ki-soon Park and his wife, Ryo-bong Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4211. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Finocchiaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Nadeshda Heidelberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Filemon C. Yao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 4214. A bill for the relief of Carmencita Montalvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Miss Valentini Pastris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4216. A bill for the relief of Joao Manuel Borges Soares Da Mota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4217. A bill for the relief of Octavio Francisco Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4218. A bill for the relief of Gaetano La Bella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4219. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Fischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 4220. A bill for the relief of Maria Urso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4221. A bill for the relief of Andrzej Gitter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4222. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bennici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 4223. A bill for the relief of Dr. Andres Parras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Groundhog Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today is a very important day in this Nation which will deserve the attention of this Congress. It is Groundhog Day—and as is his custom the groundhog emerged this morning from his burrow on Gobbler's Knob at Punxsutawney, Pa., at sunrise.

I have been informed that he saw his shadow and after a while again disappeared into his comfortable den to await the arrival of spring. This ominous retreat by Mr. Groundhog is, as you all know, an infallible forecast of 6 more weeks of winter.

As Mr. Groundhog reappeared today for the first time since he entered his burrow to sleep away the winter months, he could not help but notice the many changes that have occurred.

For instance, we have inaugurated a new President of the United States amid pomp and ceremony, and for the first time in 14 months, this Nation has a Vice President. The new Congress is in session and is busy at work on many new programs.

The new President has announced plans for a new way of life which he calls the "Great Society." This new era is of great interest to the Punxsutawney groundhog because he is very proud of his lineage. He is the one and only pure groundhog in the world, and the only one that can claim the distinction of being an infallible weather prophet.

Of course there are imposters and those who challenge his supremacy but in every challenge of his pedigree, the Punxsutawney groundhog has emerged the winner. So this aristocrat of groundhogs will eagerly await the arrival of spring so that he can participate in this glorious age that the new "Great Society" will usher in.

The Punxsutawney groundhog has brought fame and renown not only to himself, but also to his native home—the Borough of Punxsutawney.

No place in the world on this Groundhog Day will receive the attention and acclaim as will this borough. Radio commentators, television reporters, newspaper accounts and many other news media all over the world will proclaim this day and applaud Punxsutawney.

Besides being the friendly habitat of Mr. Groundhog, Punxsutawney is a community of wonderful people, beautiful homes, thriving industry, educational opportunities, and countless other advantages.

The people of Punxsutawney welcome all Members of Congress and citizens everywhere to visit this remarkable and pleasant city.

I am pleased to say that Punxsutawney is located in the 23d Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which district I am proud to represent in the Congress.

Protect Our Pin Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I testified before the U.S. Tariff Commission on a matter of extreme importance to the economy of the State of Connecticut and to the Fifth Congressional District, which I represent. I refer to the Tariff Commission's investigation on safety pins under section 351(d)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act.

Briefly, by way of explanation, the import duty on safety pins was increased from 22½ to 35 percent ad valorem, effective December 31, 1957. Despite this increase in tariff, domestic production and sales have declined and imports have continued to increase. I have asked the Tariff Commission to recommend to the President that if an upward adjustment is not appropriate at this time, the President should be urged to leave in effect the proclamation effective December 31, 1957, increasing the duty on safety pins to 35 percent ad valorem.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the statement which I made today at the hearing of the Tariff Commission.

At the request of the Governor of the State of Connecticut, Hon. John N. Dempsey, I have also submitted to the Tariff Commission a letter from the Governor, which included with my statement, urges that the duty on safety pins be maintained at its current rate.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION AT 10 A.M., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1965

Re investigation on safety pins under section 351(d)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Tariff Commission, I appear here today on a mission of vital importance to family members and industries who depend for their livelihood and profit upon the safety pin industry in the United States which, for the most part, is centered in the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut. The payrolls received and taxes paid by this industry are real factors in the economy of our State.

This is a subject in which I am sure that members of the Tariff Commission are well versed, for safety pins have been the subject of "escape clause" investigations in every year but one since 1957. It was in January 1957 that serious injury to the domestic safety pin industry by increased imports was established and the Tariff Commission recommended an increase in the duty from 22½ to 35 percent ad valorem as necessary to remedy such injury. The President agreed with the Commission's findings of injury and increased the duty as recommended, effective December 31, 1957.

This is an industry which for the last century has given considerable employment to the people of my congressional district, although I am sure you are aware from your studies that despite the 35-percent duty imposed since 1957, domestic production and sales have declined and imports have continued to increase. Between 1959 and 1963, imports have supplied an average of 31 percent of the U.S. safety pin market. From 1959 to 1961, the number of man-hours annually worked in our safety pin industry have declined by 239,000 to an average of 380,000, a decline of approximately 38 percent. Some of our largest domestic plants are located in the Waterbury labor area which, according to the U.S. Department of Labor's "Area Trends in Employment and Unemployment" for December 1964, was classified in group "D," an area of substantial (6 to 8.9 percent) unemployment.

We have already lost some of this industry to another part of the country, not because of lack of skilled labor but because of the competition created by lower wage scales. Of even greater importance is the increasing threat of economic penetration from abroad through these low-wage products.

As you know, the problem of this industry is not an isolated one. The effects of our current trade policy have been felt in the bicycle industry, the table silver industry, the rubber footwear industry, the clock industry, and the brass industry generally—all vital industries in my section of Connecticut.

To continue relaxing the restrictions on imports at a time when an international financial condition is increasingly weaker would not appear to be a statesmanlike policy.

Parenthetically, I might say that even though compensation for injury is no substitute for business, even this is denied under the current language and interpretation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Gov. John Dempsey, of Connecticut, has requested that I read into the record his statement in which he strongly urges that your report to the President include a recommendation that the duty on safety pins be maintained at its current rate and, with your permission, I will do so at this point.

JANUARY 15, 1965.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I strongly urge that your report to the President include a recommendation that the duty on safety pins be maintained at its current rate.

I make this appeal for a number of reasons.

Connecticut may well be termed the "home of the domestic safety pin industry" since most of the plants manufacturing this item are situated in this State.

Further, the industry is concentrated almost wholly in the Naugatuck Valley where currently there is a problem of unemployment. Two of our safety pin producing plants are in the city of Waterbury where, the Connecticut State Labor Department reports, the unemployment rate for the month of December 1964, was 5.1 percent, 1 percent higher than the average for the State.

Should any of our safety pin producers transfer their operations outside of Connecticut to areas of lower labor cost, as they may do if their competitive position is further weakened by low-priced imported pins, the unemployment problem would of course be aggravated.

I am aware of the importance of making every effort to remove unnecessary trade barriers. I feel, however, that such efforts are not advantageous if they penalize our working people by depriving them of jobs.

Therefore, on behalf of the many Connecticut people whose livelihood depends on the safety pin industry, I hope very much that the duty on this product will be maintained at the rate which went into effect on December 31, 1957.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY, *Governor.*

My office has been deluged with correspondence from the worried employees of Connecticut's safety pin plants, and I have received appeals for help from officials of the Risdon Manufacturing Co., Naugatuck, Conn., the Oakville division of the Scovill Manufacturing Co. in Waterbury, and the Star Pin Co. in Shelton.

Legal representatives of the industry are prepared, I am sure, to present statistics in detail to show the sales, production, and employment declines that have resulted from increasing foreign imports despite the 35-percent duty effective since 1957. They will prove that the increase to 35 percent ad valorem in the rate of duty was inadequate to remedy the sales injury found in 1957 to have been caused by imports. They are also prepared to show that the injury has persisted despite the increase in duty and that further injury will result unless additional protection is afforded.

I feel that any lowering of the existing duty will pose a very serious threat to the survival of the Connecticut safety pin industry and to the economic well-being of several communities and the employment of many thousands of people. The Waterbury-Oakville, Naugatuck-Shelton, communities which stand to suffer the most are important segments of the economy of the Fifth Congressional District. I urge you, as I shall urge the President, to give these people the benefit of job security through the continuance of what at best is inadequate tariff protection.

This Commission, in its wisdom, saw fit to establish the 35-percent tariff in 1957 on the basis of its findings that the share of the U.S. market supply by imports increased from an average of 5 percent during the 5-year period 1946–50 to 21.3 percent during the 5-year period immediately preceding the 1957 finding. Clearly, there should be no reduction of the tariff at this point, since it has been shown that during the period 1959–63 imports have supplied an average of 31 percent of the U.S. market.

Domestic sales of safety pins in the United States had declined from an average of 13.1 million gross during the 5-year period 1946–50 to only 10.8 million gross during the 5-year period immediately preceding the 1957 finding. This was a decline of 2.3 million gross, or nearly 18 percent.

Now we find that during the last 5-year period 1959–63, domestic sales of the same 4 producers have declined to 8.4 million gross annually, a further decline of 2.4 million gross or 22 percent, which was a greater decline than was used as a basis for the finding of injury in 1957.

Let me read you a paragraph taken from a letter addressed to me by a salesman for one of the affected companies:

"This action is not only vital to our company and its obligations to the many thousands of family members involved, but also to the very existence of our industry. I have been with the company for 15 years and have sold our product (safety pins) against those of imported origins. The much lower cost to our customers, due to the lower wage and living standards in those countries of import origin, has reacted disastrously to our sales. I have seen the volume in my sales territories over the past 10 years decrease anywhere from 40 to 60 percent of that to which we worked prior to the influx of imports."

On the merits of these arguments, in support of the welfare of Connecticut workers and the well-being of Connecticut industry, and on the basis of your own knowledge, which comes from a succession of thoroughgoing studies of this industry, I respectfully urge that the Tariff Commission recommend to the President that the rate of duty on imports of safety pins not be reduced, and if an upward adjustment is not appropriate at this time, the President should be urged to leave in effect the proclamation effective December 31, 1957, increasing the duty to 35 percent ad valorem.

Congressional Responsibility for the Common Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 1, 1965, during the organizational meeting of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, in his first remarks as new chairman of that committee, outlined his views as to the responsibility of the Congress in carrying out the congressional mandate that the Congress shall provide for the common defense of the United States. In my opinion, I think it is one of the most monumental statements made in 25 years I have had the privilege of serving on congressional committees connected with our armed services.

Mr. Rivers' remarks referred to the integrity of the Congress of the United States, and its responsibility as far as the military structure of this country is concerned.

There are those, for good or other reasons, who do not believe in the necessity of a Congress. There are those who twist words and circumvent the intent of this Congress, continually flout the words of the law in our faces and take the law unto themselves, denying—by their actions—the hearthstone of our Nation, that it is a country of law and not of men. They take unto themselves a power which they do not have by law.

I do not blame them. I blame the Congress, I blame us, for not exercising our responsibility and not performing our duty to see that we protect our rights.

But if this continues, this Nation is gone. The tyranny of the majority is just as vicious as the tyranny of the individual.

In the months to come, I am sure this committee will have the opportunity under the leadership of L. Mendel Rivers, to prove to this Nation that we will discharge our responsibility as written in the Constitution, and that this committee and the Congress are not creatures of an agency or a department but that the department is our creature and it is ours to direct and guide.

I think the statement made by Mr. Rivers should serve as a warning to those people who persist and insist that they do not need Congress. They must come to Congress and they must get the Congress approval before any action can be carried into operation.

The words stated by the new chairman of the Armed Services Committee are just as solemn as the words that were said and discussed in Independence Hall in Philadelphia before the Declaration of Independence was written and proclaimed to the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the Congressional Record the remarks made by the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers at the organizational meeting of the committee, and I commend them to each of my colleagues:

The Chairman. Members of the committee, for many years, like many of you, I have listened to one of the great statesmen of our era, the Honorable Carl Vinson, address the members as he presided over this committee at the opening of each new Congress.

Today, fate and fortune transfers this privileged responsibility to me.

I am not sitting here as a successor to Carl Vinson. No one will really ever succeed him. But I shall do my best to fill his footsteps, and with your help some day I hope to achieve some portion of the success he had attained as the chairman of this great committee.

I would like to congratulate each of you on your reelection, or your election, and especially do I congratulate those who have been elected to membership on this committee.

This begins the 19th year in which the Committee on Armed Services has been in existence.

Prior to 1947, there were two committees dealing with defense matters—the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee. The Armed Services Committee was formed as a result of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and met for the first time in January of 1947.

We have more new members on this committee in this Congress than at any prior time in the history of the committee. So I trust the older members will bear with me while I discuss some of the responsibilities and procedures of the committee.

This committee has jurisdiction over the common defense generally, and particularly the size and composition of the Armed Forces; pay, promotion, retirement and other benefits and privileges of the Armed Forces; strategic and critical materials for the common defense; scientific research and development in support of the armed services; all forts, arsenals, military reservations, navy yards, ammunition depots; air bases, missile sites, the fantastic complex of military communication networks; the procurement of military aircraft, naval vessels, and missiles; the organization of the Department of Defense; the Selective Service System; and even the conservation, development and use of naval petroleum shale and oil reserves.

This is a heavy responsibility, gentlemen, but it is one we have never ever failed to meet.

While there is always hope that we will attain a world of genuine peace, nevertheless I think we are all agreed that the only way we can guarantee peace is to be prepared for war.

Now there is one overriding duty imposed upon the Congress, and part of it in turn imposed upon this committee, and that is the power vested in the Congress to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States and in particular the power, and thus the responsibility to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to make all laws which shall be necessary for carrying into execution the powers that I have just mentioned.

I don't plan to overlook that part of the Constitution.

Now there is a duty imposed upon the Congress, and no one has this responsibility but the Congress of the United States.

As far as I am concerned, this committee will be operated on behalf of the House of Representatives in accordance with that constitutional mandate.

We will always be happy to receive the views and recommendations of the executive branch of the Government, but we will not hesitate to initiate our own legislation, express our own views, and write our own laws.

To do this, the House has provided a membership of 37 members—25 representing the majority, and 12 representing the minority. In addition, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico is assigned to this committee.

It is now my great privilege to introduce the new members of the committee: Alton Lennon, North Carolina; William J. Randall, Missouri; G. Elliott Hagan, Georgia; Charles H. Wilson, California; Robert L. Leggett, California; Donald J. Irwin, Connecticut; Jed Johnson, Jr., Oklahoma; Frank E. Evans, Colorado; Rodney M. Love, Ohio; Floyd V. Hicks, Washington; Hervey G. Machen, Maryland; Speedy O. Long, Louisiana; E. S. Johnny Walker, New Mexico; Santiago Polanco-Abreu, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

I welcome each of you and again congratulate you upon your election to this committee.

I am not going to sit in Mr. Vinson's seat and not do some of the things he did.

I know you have been told by others that this is a hard working committee. To give you an idea of the workload of the committee, let me tell you what the committee did in the last Congress:

The full committee met 127 times; the legislative subcommittee met 104 times; other subcommittees met 135 times, for a total of 366 meetings.

The committee reported 80 bills and resolutions to the House; 79 passed the House. Of these, 2 became private laws; 57 became public laws; and 2 concurrent resolutions were approved; 18 House-passed bills were not acted upon by the other body. And, of course, this is par for the course.

In addition, 265 acquisitions and disposal projects were referred to the Real Estate Subcommittee for consideration. 250 were approved; 2 disapproved, and 4 are pending.

We produced 69 printed hearings and special reports—containing in excess of 10,600 pages.

I hope each member will keep in mind the importance of attendance at the full committee meetings, and his subcommittee meetings. The rules of the House require that we keep records of the business transacted by the committee, and this includes attendance records. The attendance record—mark this—of each member at committee and subcommittee meetings is public information and is available to anyone upon request.

Today, of course, is an organization meeting. Tomorrow we will begin our posture and procurement hearings. We will proceed this year, as we have in the past, with a posture briefing which will be conducted in connection with the bill that authorizes the procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and research and development within the Department of Defense.

We refer to that as 412.

Last year's bill contained an authorization for $16,914,000,000; to give you an idea of the magnitude of this undertaking, almost $17 billion.

Now, during these hearings we will go into many facets of our defense posture. Among other things, we will ascertain the status of the Vinson-Trammell Act.

And I intend to determine the position of the Department of Defense with respect to the 65–35 language affecting ship repairs and conversions which is now contained in the Defense Appropriation Act, for the last 2 or 3 years, I think.

Now, as members of this committee, you will receive and hear a great deal of highly classified information. Whenever we are to hear witnesses presenting classified information, we will go into executive session.

It will be our policy to hold as many of our hearings in open session as is humanly possible, always keeping in mind the nature of the information we receive during these hearings.

Before we go into the business of formally organizing the committee, I would like to stress one very significant point. While there are 25 members of the majority and 12 members of the minority, this is a nonpartisan committee in every sense of the word.

We all have one goal in mind—the maintenance of our national security.

For the 18 years that I have been a member of this committee, I have been impressed with the outstanding cooperation that has always existed between the majority and minority, regardless of the party in power. I know that Mr. ARENDS, as ranking minority member for several Congresses, cooperated fully with Mr. Vinson in every respect. And I am quite confident that Mr. BATES, as the new ranking minority member, will continue the complete cooperation that we have enjoyed in the past.

We are not Republicans or Democrats on this committee—we are Members of Congress working here as a team to attain a common goal—the security and safety of the Nation.

I hope that this spirit of nonpartisanship will always continue to prevail because there is no room for politics in national defense matters.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Harry W. Campbell, Epworth Memorial Methodist Church, South Bend, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, Thou knowest our need for the gifts which make public service bearable. Give Thy servants wisdom, courage, and far vision so that hard tasks may be done, and the pursuit of liberty and justice seem worth the chase. Keep us in good humor, so that the tensions of our time may not break us. Keep us in balance on the fine edge of duty, so that we will not neglect those who love us most, or differ among ourselves on issues without substance. Aid us to take the time, now and then, to look up and be excited by the land, the flag, and the dream which broods over us all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 701. An act to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall in the Senate during the 80th and 81st Congresses.

DR. EARTHA WHITE WINNING ON NEW PROJECT AT 88

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have recently been notified by the Florida Development Commission's Hospital Construction Department that the Mercy Hospital and Nursing Home, Inc., of Jacksonville, Fla., a nonprofit group, has had its application for Hill-Burton matching funds approved.

In Florida we are proud of our hospital and nursing home program, which has been helped greatly by Hill-Burton aid, administered by the Florida Development Commission.

There is no program, however, that has been approved in the State of Florida, or perhaps anywhere, which exceeds the kind of wonderful spirit and background with which the Mercy Hospital and Nursing Home is endowed.

The founder of the Mercy Hospital and Nursing Home is Dr. Eartha M. M. White, who recently celebrated her 88th birthday. Dr. White has long been a leader in Jacksonville, and is currently president of the Clara White Mission, Inc., named after her mother.

It is remarkable that Dr. White is beginning a new program of such magnitude and importance to her hometown. She is energetic and enthusiastic about this project, which will mean so much to Jacksonville. While others of her age are retired or inactive, Dr. White is working night and day to help make a better society. I doubt if there is another person in the whole country like Eartha White, my friend, and I want to take this opportunity to honor her with this tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, if it were not so tragic, the story of the closing of the veterans' hospitals throughout the United States unfolds like a great comic opera. For years I have heard the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, tell about funny money in the Federal Reserve System. Now I have become acquainted with funny bookkeeping within the Veterans' Administration.

When the announcement was made of the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., one of the reasons given as justification was the high cost of patient care per day. However, upon checking the bookkeeping at the VA, I find included in the cost of patient care per day the maintenance and operation of a 1,500-grave cemetery which is located on the hospital property. Fort Bayard was originally a frontier outpost and the cemetery has been located there for about 100 years. I doubt that there is any medicare that can be devised to help these American citizens who are already in the Fort Bayard Cemetery nor do I believe this is a proper charge to be levied against the cost per patient at Fort Bayard Hospital.

Now, I cannot help but wonder how many other funny bookkeeping systems will be uncovered when hearings are held by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] on the closing of these hospitals.

FEDERAL RESERVE ACTION ON DISCOUNT RATES

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recent newspaper reports indicate that Federal Reserve officials are currently recommending a tightening of credit presumably through the use of the customary tool of increased discount rates. This would result in higher bank interest rates at a time when lending institutions are overwhelmed with cash accumulations.

Why should the Federal Reserve be used to prop up interest charges when free market conditions would tend to develop into reduced interest charges to the American consumer.

The manipulation of the interest rate is the least effective device in the balance-of-payments problem. It could have devastating effect upon small business which does not have the capacity to generate adequate internal financing. It would add an interest surcharge on consumer goods which could upset stable prices in the United States, which are even more vital to our internal economy than the pressing problems of gold outflow.

Perhaps it is time to review our tax laws which provide lush tax advantages in foreign investments of American capital.

POLLUTION OF THE WATERS OF LAKE ERIE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, for two centuries the waters of Lake Erie have supplied the lifeblood for the stream of commerce that has built Buffalo into a great world port.

But, sad to say, much of this bright, sparkling water would—if bottled today—have to be labeled with the skull and crossbones, for detergents, pesticides, sewage, and industrial wastes have polluted our beautiful waters. And if this massive pollution continues unchecked, it could mean death to people, shipping, industry, and recreation.

Since this is such a grave problem in the district I represent, I sought and was assigned to a seat on the Public Works Committee. And today I joined my distinguished Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], in introducing legislation to attack the pollution which today menaces not only Lake Erie but most of America's streams, rivers, and lakes.

I should now like to bring my colleagues' attention to an illuminating speech on this subject by the Assistant Interior Secretary Briggs:

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FRANK P. BRIGGS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AT A MEETING OF THE OHIO COMMERCIAL FISHERMAN'S ASSOCIATION IN VERMILION, OHIO, ON SATURDAY, JUNE 20, 1964

Having been a midwestern newspaperman longer than I care to admit, I have always had a kind feeling toward the Great Lakes, especially for beautiful Lake Erie traditionally the most productive of the five. It has supplied the millions of citizens along its shores—fish for angling, fish for commercial operations, and fish for the public food supply.

It has offered vast stretches of public beaches, and has provided attractive waters for boating and recreation.

Your cities and industries have grown and prospered because of its ready supply of water. Few lakes have been used as Lake Erie.

But, have we used this lake wisely?

Are we proud to pass on to the next generation this same lake from which this area as well as this Nation has benefited so greatly?

The regretful answer to these questions must be a shameful "no." Conditions in Lake Erie today are deplorable—almost desperate. They are rapidly growing worse and I can see no immediate reversal of trend.

Let us review briefly what has happened and what is happening to the waters of Lake Erie and then turn to the present and projected consequences.

Man's activities along Lake Erie and its tributaries are hastening the time scale and pushing Lake Erie into a premature senility. All lakes age naturally, but here we are packing into a short decade aging that would take nature centuries to consummate.

Fertility in modest measure is useful but we are making Lake Erie fertile so fast that conditions are rapidly approaching devastation.

This is not a matter of surmise of casual observation—it is a matter of scientific record.

The greatest changes in the populations of fish and fish food organisms have occurred during the past 10 to 15 years. These changes have taken place during the period of greatly increased use of detergents and pesticides. Consequently, increased fertility may not be the only factor involved in changes in the lake, and the effects of detergents and pesticides must be considered.

I am no chemist—and neither, I think, are most of you—but I would like to lay down a few basic facts.

We have good chemical records that go back to the turn of the century. Let me give a few examples: From 1900 to 1960, the concentration of calcium in Lake Erie water has increased 24 percent, sodium and potassium 69 percent, sulfates 85 percent, and chlorides 230 percent. The rise of chlorides is especially significant for it is a sound indicator of pollution by domestic sewage.

Domestic sewage also is clearly indicated as the principal source of enrichment and pollution of Lake Erie that we can document, since no work has yet been done on pesticides, detergents and other toxic substances. The process has long been underway, but it has increased by leaps and bounds with the rapid growth of human population and now it is reaching critical levels.

I shall not belabor you with detailed figures, but let me give one or two examples. The sewage and industrial waste together from the Detroit metropolitan area contribute over a million pounds per day of suspended solids to the Detroit River—and that is in addition to vast amounts of dissolved solids.

Add to this load the sewage from the almost uninterrupted urban and suburban area which extends from Toledo eastward through Cleveland and Erie to Buffalo and the total suspended solids introduced to the lake each day, probably, is in excess of 2 million pounds.

Other industrial wastes such as petroleum derivatives, strong acids, or heavy metals are directly toxic to aquatic life. Others may simply enrich or make undue demands on the supply of oxygen in the water.

The effects on lake temperatures of the almost 3 billion gallons of water used per year for cooling condensers in power-generating plants are largely unknown; additional thermal pollution is sure to come from the new atomic power plant below the mouth of the Detroit River.

Agriculture, too, has made its contribution of toxic substances such as pesticides. In addition, drainage from heavily fertilized lands adds significantly to the nutrients in the lake.

Again, Erie's four major tributaries alone carry 2.6 million tons of silt into the lake annually.

The impact of these substances man has added to Lake Erie has been devastating.

Some of the effects we cannot actually see.

As we ride across the surface of the lake few of us realize that the mayflies, once a principal fish food, have largely disappeared to be replaced by sludge worms and midge larvae. How many of you realize that vast areas of bottom water each year become utterly devoid of the dissolved oxygen that is so essential to life?

We may not be aware of these changes, but the fishes are.

In the fish we do have a clear and distressing measure of our handiwork.

In 1953, just 10 years ago, Lake Erie yielded almost 28 million pounds of fish—good fish, excellent fish.

Last year, this same lake yielded about 18 million pounds of fish.

While the change in total pounds may seem significant, the facts are more dramatic when we realize that the present-day catch is not the previous high-priced preferred fish but is predominantly described as "trash" fish.

What has happened to the cisco which once dominated commercial catches? It is now a zoological rarity.

What about the gourmet item among Great Lakes fishes, the whitefish? Also gone.

The sauger—gone.

The blue pike—gone.

The walleye is at a tiny fraction of its former abundance.

Look most any direction today and you can see other evidences of pollution—signs on beaches that read, "Closed; Unsafe for Bathing"—and quite a few suspect that many beaches not yet closed fall short of good minimum standards of safety.

What of the small-boat operator? He must see that his children do not drink the polluted water and, in many areas, the refreshing dip overside is a fading memory.

Lake Erie still supplies good drinking water for its bordering communities though the water intakes are pushed farther and farther from shore.

Technologists at city waterplants do a superb job of straining out the sewage and killing of bacteria. Yet, even they have their problems with viruses. Evidence grows that epidemics of such ailments as hepatitis have originated from such treated water supplies.

Water intakes may have to be pushed even farther from these major sources of pollution. We may see a shadow of the future at Detroit which is now pushing a pipeline some 60 miles to a safer source of water in southern Lake Huron. Accounts say this is costing the city a neat $98 million—a rather stiff price to pay for man's thoughtless pollution of beautiful Lake Erie.

I must say in honesty that the outlook immediately ahead is not too bright for those interested in Lake Erie for angling, commercial fishing, boating, and swimming unless positive action is taken to redeem the lake from the debris under which we are burying it.

Both anglers and commercial fishermen will have to do for a while with what is now available.

Commercial operators in particular will need to improve methods of catching, handling, processing, and marketing—in short, learn to squeeze out a better margin from a pound of fish.

The high priced species now so scarce are not likely soon to be plentiful for more than short periods in the foreseeable future.

Boatmen cannot hope for improved water, and swimmers can anticipate the further closing of beaches. City water departments may face growing difficulties.

We are now confronted with this problem.

We cannot tolerate having Lake Erie, already badly polluted, deteriorate to a veritable cesspool.

At the same time, we know that we have a vigorous, expanding culture. We shall have more industry, more intensive agriculture, and more people.

We cannot reduce sewage by a return to the backyard privy and the garbage hole; we cannot reforest all our farmlands; we cannot dismantle our factories and powerplants. Yet, we must reduce pollution of the lake if it is to continue to be useful.

Is this problem without solution? No.

Will it be complex and difficult and require long-term research and development? Yes.

Will the solution be costly? Yes, but the reward will be great.

I cannot tell you how the problem will be solved, but solved it must be and solved it will be.

I have every confidence that a culture that has produced the scientific breakthroughs and the fabulous technical developments of recent decades can handle our Lake Erie problem.

First, we must realize that it is not a problem of the sport or commercial fishermen, of yachtsmen, of swimmers, of waterplant technologists, of owners of industrial plants, of public health officials but rather is a problem of the entire Lake Erie community—no exceptions.

The future of this region depends upon—requires—demands a solution.

If we delay our start longer, we may be in the position of a young prizefighter I once knew. He had been taking a beating for eight rounds. When he came back to his corner his second cautioned, "As it stands now, you gotta knock that guy out to get a draw."

Now is not the time for mutual recrimination or conservative procrastination. We must lend our joint support to immediate action. The more we delay, the greater will be everyone's injury. I believe, and I am sincere in the belief, that what man has polluted—man can reclaim.

I believe that Lake Erie can, and that Lake Erie will, be returned to a clean, sparkling lake where flora and fauna will abide in goodly numbers and man will be able to enjoy a generous portion of the fishing rewards of yesterday.

But we can't do that by mere wishful thinking.

We must act, and we must act now, to stop this infernal pollution.

We must find new dumping grounds for our wastes and we must find them now.

We must realize that clean water is as necessary to life as is clean air and clean food, and we must realize that now.

WASHINGTON CONFERENCE OF DIRECT MAIL ADVERTISING ASSOCIATION

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was a great pleasure for me to attend yesterday the breakfast of the Washington conference of the Direct Mail Advertising Association at the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

The Postmaster General, the Honorable John A. Gronouski, was the principal speaker, and I should like to commend to my colleagues the Postmaster General's fine address.

Mr. Gronouski explained certain features of the Post Office Department's continuing program to provide for more efficient handling of bulk second- and third-class mail. Pointing out the great and growing burden placed on local post offices by the necessity of sorting vast amounts of bulk material, Mr. Gronouski said that his responsibility to provide the best possible service at the lowest possible cost has prompted the decision to initiate a program of mandatory presorting by ZIP code for bulk second- and third-class mailers.

The full text of Mr. Gronouski's address follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL

We are living in a time of change.

And change is demanding and often painful. Old customs and habits are wiped away. Familiar surroundings disappear. Comfortable routines are disrupted. Accepted theories are demolished overnight.

But each change offers an opportunity as well as a challenge. If we are wise and bold and imaginative, we can bend it to our advantage.

If not—if we resist it and cling to past ways, because it is easier to do so—the tide of events will surely overwhelm us. The formidable dinosaur disappeared from the face of the earth because it could not adapt itself to a changing environment. And, if we in this age have the advantages of intelligence and choice that the dinosaur lacked, we do not have the benefit of a million years to make up our minds. The crush of events is upon us, and the opportunity is gone almost before we know it is there.

Consider the revolution that has taken place in the area of customer relations in 20 short years. Two decades ago, the motto of American retailers was "Service with a smile," and the public demanded that service as a matter of course. We were waited on by clerks behind every counter—and the merchandise we bought was delivered to our door. Today, the motto is "Serve yourself," and we have seen just the beginning. Now, people select their own food in supermarkets, flock to self-service department and drugstores, park their own cars, and operate their own elevators. There are even indications they may soon be pumping their own gas. They get their own coffee and soft drinks out of vending machines, write out their own trip insurance and rent their own trucks.

The days of the carriage trade are over. The age of self-service is upon us.

But there are advantages of self-service, as well as demands. The customer is asked to do part of the work, but he saves money in the process. The pre-packaged cut of meat is cheaper than the one the butcher has to specially prepare.

Perhaps the best example of the benefits that accrue from self-service has been provided by the telephone company. In past years, when you wanted to call long distance, you asked the operator to dial it for you. Today, you dial it yourself. And the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. was recently able to announce a rate reduction for long-distance calls.

All this is in recognition of the fact that today's labor is too dear a commodity to waste on actions that the customer can do himself. That is one of the basic economic truths of our time, and the businessman who ignores it does so at his own peril.

Today, the revolution of self-service has caught up with the Post Office Department, and the decision is mine whether to ignore it or to accept it as a welcome opportunity. Either way, the decision must be made—and it must be made now.

Since I last spoke to you, a year ago, our mail volume has soared by 2 billion pieces. Our annual rate of 72 billion pieces is half as much as the rest of the world's combined volume. Since 1940, it has increased by 166 percent.

This is what we call the "mail explosion." And the main contributing factor to this mail explosion has been the sharp rise in business mail, which accounts for 80 percent of today's volume. Last year, our volume of second-class mail was 8½ billion pieces. And third class amounted to another 18½ billion pieces. Together, they totaled a record 27 billion pieces—39 percent of our overall volume.

And yet, despite this fantastic growth, we are using the same system of sorting and handling the mail as we did 25 years ago. It is cumbersome and slow. It is also prohibitively expensive. In 1932, a 3-cent stamp paid for nearly 2 minutes of a postal employee's time. Today's 5-cent stamp covers less than a minute of his time.

If we continue along this road, if we continue to ignore the economic facts of life, if we close our eyes to the advantages of modern technology—in other words, if we keep adding thousands of new employees each year to handle the swelling mail volume, I can guarantee you what the results will be:

First, our service would deteriorate because no matter how many employees we have, we would be unable to keep the mail from logjamming in our major metropolitan areas.

And second, our rates would go up, and up, and up.

In other words, you, the American mailer, would be paying more and enjoying it less.

I cannot allow this to happen. If I did, you would be the first to say I had failed in my public trust—and you would be right. My responsibility is to provide the best possible postal service at the lowest possible cost, and I intend to fulfill that responsibility.

And so I have come here today to spell out to you the only practical solution to our present-day postal problems: modernization of our 1926 second- and third-class presorting regulations to conform to the ZIP code program.

It might be noted that this represents the first significant change in those regulations in nearly 40 years, and it is long overdue.

First, let me say that the program I am about to outline for you is not one which has been hastily thought out. In reaching our final conclusions, we were guided as much by your problems as we were our own; as much by the economic realities in the industry as by the economic pressures on the postal service. I might mention that the questionnaires sent out and compiled by your association and others provided us with an invaluable yardstick in this regard. We were hopeful, for example, that we could have the entire industry completely ZIP coded and presorting within 6 months—or within a year at the outside. This would have represented a tremendous savings to us at a time when even the smallest savings are vital. But after studying the reactions of your members, we decided it just didn't give bulk mailers enough time. We also considered a proposal to make an extra charge for un-ZIP coded bulk mail after next January 1, but again, we listened to you and decided against it.

We believe, then, that the program we have come up with is a modest one, representing the fairest possible compromise between the pressures on you and the pressures on us.

The regulations will go into effect in two steps.

Starting July 1 of this year, we are going to require second- and third-class bulk mailers—meaning those who enjoy a rate differential—to presort by sectional centers some of the mail they are now massing at State distribution points. By "some of the mail" I mean those bundles which would make up a third of a sack per sectional center but which would not constitute enough for a direct shipment to individual cities. The remainder you will send in a State sack as before. This also will have no effect on shipments now going directly to cities and carrier stations.

I think you will agree with me that this is a modest requirement. It is something you can do now to help relieve part of our mail congestion. And although it is modest, it will mean a considerable savings to us.

Actually, it affects only a few hundred or so of our 275,000 second- and third-class bulk mailers—and it requires very little of them.

At the present time, third-class mailers are required to make up their mail in bundles if there are 10 or more pieces going to the same city. For second-class mailers the bundle requirement is six or more pieces to the same city.

Under present regulations, when there are enough of these bundles to any one city to fill a third of a sack, the mailers send it direct. The rest they put in State sacks for a single distribution point. What we are now attempting to do is alleviate the congestion at these State distribution points by diverting some of these bundles to our 566 sectional centers.

The only new requirement this will place on bulk mailers is to know what sectional center serves each city and town he is mailing to, to mark the proper sectional center on the top of each bundle, and then, if there are enough bundles to a given sectional center, to sack them separately and send them direct.

In most cases, there will be at least one piece of mail for each bundle which is already ZIP coded. All the mailer has to do is put the sectional center number on top to identify the bundle and put the bundle in the corresponding sack. If there is no ZIP coded mail in a bundle, the mailer will have to look up the number—but only the first time if he makes up some tags for future use.

That is the preliminary step in our new regulations. It is modest, but it is important to us.

The second step will require all bulk second- and third-class mail to be completely ZIP coded by January 1, 1967—that's 23 months from now—and presorted by all five numbers. Any un-ZIP coded mail after that time will be subject to the single piece rate. Here is how the program will work:

You will continue to bundle your mail as before—on the basis of 10 pieces or more for third-class and six or more for second-class—but you will be required to make up bundles for delivery units, post offices, and sectional centers.

If you have enough mail with the same five ZIP code numbers to fill a third of a sack, you will presort it and send it direct to the carrier station.

Of the remainder, you will presort, sack, and send direct that mail which makes up a third of a sack to the same city post office.

Of the mail still remaining, you will presort that which makes up a bundle or third of a sack to a sectional center.

All the rest you will presort and bundle by sectional center, but send it in a State sack.

This is the very heart of our ZIP code program. In my opinion, it is the most far-reaching single postal innovation of the 20th century. Since we are now drafting legislation to require presorting by all large volume mailers, including first class, we will be in a good position to handle any volume of business mail this Nation can generate—and handle it speedily, efficiently, and economically. Under ZIP code, we will be moving well over 50 percent of the Nation's mail without even unbagging it until it reaches its destination area.

This, then, is our blueprint for the future. The decisions have been made. We are now asking for your cooperation and your support.

I would be foolish to believe that these decisions will be unanimously popular. Some large volume mailers are not going to find them to their liking. But I must say in all candor that they would like the alternative even less. And make no mistake about it, the alternative is a sizable rate increase now—and a succession of such increases in the years to come. I look upon mandatory presorting by ZIP code as a stitch in time; inconvenient for a short time, perhaps, but an inconvenience which will save mailers countless millions of dollars in the long run.

I think if you look at it from this point of view, you will agree with me that it is the only realistic course we can take.

I know, too, there are those of you who would prefer a rate increase over a mandatory presorting program, thinking it would be cheaper in the long run. But again, I ask you to remember that without ZIP code, we are not talking about one increase, but a whole series of them to keep up with our rising costs.

As you probably know, I have established an advisory panel, made up of distinguished members of the American business and labor communities, to conduct a thorough study of this whole rate question and to assist me in making my recommendations to President Johnson. Certainly, I would not want to prejudice the conclusions of that panel by making any premature recommendations on my own. But I think you should understand that the more efficiencies we develop with your cooperation, the more modest the increase will be—should there be one at all.

In the meantime, we in the Post Office Department are doing our share to save money whenever and wherever possible.

We are now preparing legislation which would permit us to lease automobiles for our 31,000 rural letter carriers in lieu of the present method of paying them 12 cents a mile. Studies show that we can save between $25 and $30 million annually under this program alone.

We are also looking into the possibility of direct post office construction of our large post offices—a program which we believe will result in a cost savings of hundreds of millions of dollars over the years.

We are forging ahead with our vertical improved mail program in high-rise office buildings. VIM, as this program is called, employs a sophisticated system of vertical conveyors to deliver office building mail and it is to our carrier costs what presorting is to our sorting costs.

And finally, we are carrying forward our mechanization in those post offices where such a program can really be effective; in other words, where the mail volume justifies it. One of the most important developments in this area is the development of an optical scanner which is capable of "reading" ZIP codes on envelopes and then sorting those envelopes at the rate of 35,000 an hour. This machine will represent a tremendous breakthrough in our efforts to process mail that has not been presorted, and I am happy to say that we plan to install the first one in a major post office within a year.

So this is not a one-way street. We are asking for your coopertaion to hold down our costs, but we are making a gigantic effort ourselves.

But I want to make it clear to you that we are talking about more than saving you money when we ask you to presort by ZIP code. We are talking about improved service, as well. As I said earlier, my responsibility is to provide not only mail service at the lowest possible cost, but the best possible mail service as well. And there is no question but that presorting will speed your mail by allowing it to bypass terminal stops and go direct to its destination area.

And even then we will not be satisfied. I want to tell you that as long as I am Postmaster General, I will spare no effort to give you the kind of service you want and deserve.

Just yesterday, I met with our volume mailer committee to seek new ways of providing that service. This is a continuing voluntary committee made up of leaders from the mailing industry—including a representative of your own association—which meets with the technical people and executives of the Post Office Department to discuss problems of mutual interest. It is strictly a working committee, the success of which will depend on the freedom of its members to speak frankly and openly.

The existence of this committee goes back to the statement I made at the beginning of my speech. The age of self-service is upon us. If we approach tomorrow with a sense of unity and cooperation, there are no problems which we cannot solve.

There is no other way to do it.

MEDAL OF HONOR FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, 72 of my colleagues recently joined with me in introducing a bill which would permit awarding the Congressional Medal of Honor to our late President and Commander in Chief, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

These proposals would recognize John Kennedy not only for his peerless leadership as head of the Nation's Armed Forces, but also for his heroic courage as a pioneer of freedom, his gallant and unselfish devotion to the service of his country, and his everlasting contribution to the cause of world peace.

The life of John Kennedy is certainly symbolized by the Navy Medal of Honor which carries the figure of Minerva—the Union—and the words "wise in the industries of peace and in the arts of war."

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on the Judiciary will take note of the support which this proposal has already received and give it prompt and favorable consideration so that it may move quickly to the floor.

I suspect that across the country there will be a smattering of people—a very small minority if my mail to date is a reflection—who may not be pleased with swift action on this proposal. Yes, I regret that there may be some who will not agree that our fallen leader deserves the Medal of Honor, who will argue against it on narrow partisan or sectional grounds.

I predict that the dissidents will continue to be small in number, a prediction based not only upon my mail but on the fact that the bill's sponsors include Republicans as well as Democrats, liberals as well as conservatives, northerners as well as southerners, easterners as well as westerners. They are men and women of the Union who have put political and sectional quarrels aside, who have recognized without fear or favor that John Fitzgerald Kennedy was not the President of one party or of one region, but of the entire Nation.

The relatively few dissidents in the land, of course, will not openly admit that their objections are based on petty motives. They undoubtedly will claim that John Kennedy did not possess the qualities demanded by the Medal of Honor.

They will probably argue that he lacked courage—conveniently forgetting his great courage both as a lieutenant in the Pacific war of two decades ago and as Commander in Chief during the Cuban missile crisis of only 2 years ago.

The dissidents may also allege that John Kennedy contributed nothing to world peace—again conveniently forgetting his success in obtaining the limited nuclear test ban treaty, heralded around the globe as a first step forward in man's quest of a world without war.

To those who would forget the record of John Fitzgerald Kennedy I quote in part a resolution adopted by numerous chapters of the Disabled American Veterans, an organization of former fighting men who have spilled their blood on the field of battle:

> Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy served the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war with exceptional honor, distinction, and heroism, all beyond the call of duty; and
>
> Whereas he continued to devote his life to the service of his country as a Member of the House of Representatives, and as a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts; and
>
> Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy became President of the United States, and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the Nation; and
>
> Whereas in November 1963 President John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave his life in the service of our country; and
>
> Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy personified all of the qualities called for in the awarding of this Nation's highest military decoration and honor: Be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States (is urged) to seriously consider the posthumous awarding of the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who gave the full measure of devotion to his country in the never ceasing battle for the freedom and equality of all men everywhere.

The dissidents may have forgotten John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Mr. Speaker, but we can all be grateful that the Disabled American Veterans do not have short memories.

I suspect, too, that when the dissidents discover the futility of challenging the courage and patriotism of John Kennedy they will fall back to a false front of nitpicking.

They will likely argue that our late President was not in the Army or Navy when he gave his life on that dark November day. But again the dissidents forget. They forget that according to the Constitution he was the "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

And they may argue that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not die in direct combat with the enemy. But they forget. They forget that as Commander in Chief he could never escape—not even for a moment—from the front line of combat. His was the ultimate responsibility on all battlefields, hot and cold, at home and abroad, on which we are committed around the globe.

To our everlasting sorrow John Kennedy's last battlefield was a street in Dallas. The fact that he wore no military uniform did not remove him from the gunsight of a nonuniformed advocate of Communism.

Mr. Speaker, I also suspect that when those who would deny John Kennedy his Nation's highest military honor find their argumentative barricades have crumbled before them, they will retreat to the trenches of what they mistakenly believe is "law and precedent."

I submit, however, that they have failed to learn either the law or precedent. The statute authorizing the Navy Medal of Honor for men who distinguish themselves by "gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty involving actual combat with the enemy" also states that the medal may be awarded for those who show similar gallantry "in the line of their profession."

This latter provision has not lain dormant. On several occasions Congress has chosen to confer the award on those who have, in the line of their profession, gone into combat against fear and the unknown.

Thus it was that Congress awarded the Medal of Honor to Charles Lindbergh for his courageous trans-Atlantic flight, to Richard Byrd for his daring exploration of the polar regions, to Billy Mitchell for his broad foresight in the field of aerial combat, and to Adolphus Greely for his life of splendid public service which began as an Army private and ended as a major general.

It would seem that law and precedent have routed the dissidents from the shelter of the trenches.

Mr. Speaker, I would also make one other point at this time. Among the purposes of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society—and I hasten to emphasize that the society does not participate in politics nor does it lend its support for the purpose of obtaining special legislative considerations—is "to inspire and stimulate our youth to become worthy citizens of our country" and "to foster and perpetuate Americanism."

Who more than John Kennedy has met this criteria in this generation?

Who among us—young and old, rich and poor—still does not hear his crisp voice sparking the cold January air 4 years ago:

> Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service are found around the globe.
>
> Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are; but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in, and year out, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.
>
> In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.
>
> And so my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country.
>
> With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have joined in this legislative effort to award the Medal of Honor now ask the Congress to join with history as the final judge of John F. Kennedy's deeds.

PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENT REMARKS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN TRIBUTE TO SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, Monday I introduced a House concurrent resolution which calls for the printing as a House document remarks by Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate in the Congress of the United States, which constitute tributes to the late Sir Winston Churchill.

These remarks would be printed and bound as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, 10 copies of such document for use by each Member of the House of Representatives and 15 copies for use by each Member of the Senate.

This House document would become a tangible symbol of the gratitude of the American people for the life of Winston Churchill and the contributions which he made during that life of fourscore years and ten. It will also be a reminder to us that more than that of any single person, his courage, his faith, and his indomitable will provided the leadership which led the United States, Great Britain, and our Allies to victory in World War II.

As the outstanding Briton of this century, as an honorary citizen of the United States, and as an outstanding leader of the free world, Winston Churchill merits this last tribute which we, the Congress, can bestow upon him.

I hope that this resolution will be favorably considered by the House of Representatives.

VOTE ON AID TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a newspaper release of the Republican congressional campaign committee, which is one of the lowest, most reprehensible, most contemptible acts of any individual or group in my knowledge. The release is headed, "GOP Criticizes Rogers for Vote To Help Nasser." The release quotes Bob Wilson of California, as stating that I voted against the best interests of the United States and on behalf of a Middle East dictator. This statement and conclusion I brand as a deliberate lie, and I would include in that category anyone of the Republican congressional campaign committee who was associated with this action or knew about it. In my opinion the only thing lower or more contemptible than the act itself would be the people responsible for it. It was, without doubt, the most irresponsible, unconscionable, and fraudulent act that I have witnessed in my experience since I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States of America.

The smear campaign that is being carried on by this Republican congressional campaign committee under the chairmanship of Bob Wilson is nothing more than a cheap, sordid attempt to misinform and mislead the public by distortions of fact, misstatements, half-truths, and outright lies. I serve notice here and now that if this group is to continue this nefarious and infamous practice I shall expect to meet it head-on with the truth and to expose its vileness on the floor of this House. I would hope that the members of the Republican congressional campaign committee, including Bob Wilson, its chairman, would exhibit at least some semblance of honesty, decency, and gentility by ceasing and desisting from this sorry practice that so resembles the Communist propaganda methods. However, if it is war they want, and they intend to continue their attempts at character assassination and to try to drag the names of Members of this Congress into the dirt, then I here and now serve notice on them that it is war they will have.

The truth about the vote on House Joint Resolution 234 is quite simple. It was a resolution making supplemental appropriation for fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture. A Republican amendment was offered to the resolution which had all the earmarks of the rawest kind of political demagoguery, and in my opinion was designed for the sole purpose of trying to embarrass the President of the United States in the eyes of foreign nations, both friendly and hostile. The amendment had nothing to do with foreign aid but was confined to the question of sale of surplus farm commodities to the United Arab Republic for local currency. The foreign policy of this Nation is vested in the President of the United States under the Constitution. The sale of surplus farm commodities, on which this Government is paying storage, has been provided for under Public Law 480. This authority has been used as a weapon in foreign policy to get hold of local currencies without this country needing to use up any of its gold reserves for that purpose. The availability of local currencies to our Government is most important in dealing with all foreign nations. If we can obtain these currencies without spending gold, our position is strengthened and the drain on our gold reserves reduced.

The entire political situation in the Near East is highly explosive and must be dealt with on a day-to-day basis by the President of the United States. Not only the security of this Nation is involved, but also millions and millions of dollars of U.S. private capital investments. The Communists have long sought to gain control of the vast oil reserves under the control of the Arab countries. Nothing would please Nasser better than to be afforded a propaganda weapon which he could use to solidify the entire Arab world against the United States and subsequently justify himself in expropriating properties belonging to private investors of this country, turning these over to our Communist enemies, closing the Suez Canal and helping the Communists to gain additional power on the continent of Africa. This is also a weapon that could be used and no doubt would be, against the country of Israel and the Jews all over the world.

In my opinion the amendment that was offered was designed, not only for the purpose of embarrassing the President of the United States in the eyes of all foreign countries, but would take away from him a weapon that has been most effective in our conduct of foreign affairs and hand this weapon and more with it over to an untrustworthy, irresponsible, and despicable dictator in the Mideast. The vote on the amendment to House Joint Resolution 234 called for a choice between the President of the United States and Abdel Gamal Nasser, a Mideast dictator. Anytime this choice is offered me my vote will be cast for the President of the United States and this country, and let the chips fall where they may.

If my Republican friends want to demagog I would not deny them that right. However, I would hope in the future that they do not demagog with the security of this country or the private interests of U.S. citizens abroad.

CHRYSLER CORP. EXPANSION AT NEW CASTLE, IND.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to announce that I have received word by telephone today that the Chrysler Corp. has announced an expansion of 40 percent in their facilities at New Castle, Ind., a city located within the congressional district which it is my honor to represent and which is my home city.

Mr. Speaker, this is an area, interestingly enough, that has been classified as a depressed area in the past. It was so classified because a few years ago the Chrysler Corp. put through a revamping of their production processes, commonly called automation.

Mr. Speaker, this increased prosperity and expansion of the Chrysler Corp. facilities is evidence of the fact that these painful processes are usually self-healing.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the very extensive programs that Chrysler now has in operation and the increased prosperity to which we can look ahead in our area as the result of private enterprise, the Chrysler Corp. is certainly to be congratulated on its fine record and efforts.

This follows closely on the announced program of expansion by Ingersoll Steel, a subsidiary of Borg-Warner. It, too, comes as a result of highly capable leadership and a favorable climate.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FIRE AND CASUALTY ACT

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of providing to the citizens of the District of Columbia and the many visitors to our Nation's Capital a vitally needed increased measure of protection against the all too many irresponsible motorists who infest our highways, I have today introduced a bill which greatly tightens up the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act in such a manner as to keep the dangerous, the reckless, and the financially irresponsible driver off our highways.

This bill, which in many ways parallels the proven and very successful law of my own State of Illinois would amend present District of Columbia law so as to:

First. Reduce from $100 to $50 the property damage necessary before an accident report is required, following which the uninsured driver would be required to post a minimum of $500 security, such security to be kept on deposit for a minimum of 2 years and failure to deposit would entail suspension of license for at least 2 years or until claims are satisfied;

Second. Add a provision requiring proof of financial responsibility on the part of the owner of the auto involved in an accident as well as the operator, and maintain proof for 5 years;

Third. Provide for the suspension of both the license and registration of both the owner and operator of an uninsured vehicle involved in an accident or in a serious traffic violation if the requirements of the law are not met;

Fourth. Impose a $25 fee for reinstatement of a suspended license; and

Fifth. Provide for the impoundment of an uninsured motorist's vehicle involved in an accident if the financial and security requirements cannot be met.

My decision to sponsor this approach to highway safety is dictated largely by the spiraling number of auto accidents here in our Nation's Capital which involve an increasing number of uninsured or financially irresponsible drivers. In too many cases involving an uninsured driver, the other motorist, property owner, or injured pedestrian is left holding the bag, unable to obtain restitution because many of the uninsured drivers simply are unable to pay. It follows, therefore, that our highways must be made untenable to the inept, reckless, and the financially irresponsible driver.

The District of Columbia authorities have revealed that approximately one-fourth of all the District of Columbia registered autos lack liability or property damage insurance and are involved in approximately one-fifth of all District of Columbia accidents.

My approach to highway safety takes a tack different from those States that require compulsory insurance. Compulsory insurance in the States requiring it has in many cases resulted in a sorry mess, accomplishing just the opposite of what was intended.

It is a matter of record that compulsory insurance tends to make the insured driver overconfident and apt to take more chances resulting in higher accident and injury rates; it leads to extreme and unwarranted claims and litigation; it leads to much higher individual premiums and administrative costs and it tends to lead many drivers to purchase only the absolute minimum amount of insurance required by law.

A second bill which I have introduced today complements the aforementioned Safety Responsibility Act amendments by amending the District of Columbia Fire and Casualty Act to provide that all auto insurance policies written in the District of Columbia include a provision for protection against uninsured motorists but only if the insured elects to carry such coverage—it would be purely optional.

I will seek hearings on these two important bills for the earliest possible date.

EXCISE TAX REPEAL

Mrs. **BOLTON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **BOLTON**. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to repeal the Federal excise tax on luggage, handbags, cosmetics, jewelry, and furs. These taxes were levied in 1941 and at that time had a twofold purpose: First, to raise revenue to aid the war effort; second, to discourage the purchase of such items so that the materials involved might be devoted to war purposes.

Almost 20 years have passed since the end of World War II and yet these taxes are still with us. For the consumers, it is a direct burden on their purchasing power. For the retailers, it constitutes an administrative burden since forms must be filed, records must be kept, and remittances made to the Treasury Department.

In view of this I, for one, was quite delighted that the President in his state of the Union message said:

> More money will be left in the hands of the consumers by a substantial cut in excise taxes.

The Republican minority made this very point last year, but without success.

It is my hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will consider favorably the matter and that we will have a chance to vote for it on the House floor in the near future.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 175

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Government Operations: Edward J. Gurney, of Florida.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: James T. Broyhill, of North Carolina.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICIAL OBJECTORS

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, first of all I desire to advise the House that the official objectors on the Democratic side in this Congress will be as follows:

Consent Calendar: Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado, chairman; Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts; and John J. McFall, California.

Private Calendar: Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts, chairman; Robert B. Duncan, Oregon; and John W. Davis, Georgia.

BIRTHDAY OF THE HONORABLE JAMES W. TRIMBLE, ARKANSAS

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, may I further advise the House that this is the birthday of a very prominent and beloved Member, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Trimble].

Every person who has served with Mr. Trimble knows that there is no more able, conscientious or effective Member of this House. Every person who has known Mr. Trimble, intimately or casually, has come to appreciate his fine qualities and to hold him in the deepest affection as well.

As the Speaker stated so appropriately this morning, Jim Trimble is one of God's noblemen. All of us, I am sure, wish Jim a happy birthday, and many more happy birthdays in the years to come.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 4355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Teague of Texas; Mr. Natcher, of Kentucky; Mr. Lipscomb, of California; Mr. Pirnie, of New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 9355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Rogers of Colorado; Mr. Flynt, of Georgia; Mr. Laird, of Wisconsin; Mr. Talcott, of California.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of title 14, United States Code, section 194(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. St. Onge, of Connecticut; Mr. Wyatt, of Oregon.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of title 46, United States Code, section 1126c, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Carey, of New York; Mr. Mailliard, of California.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RECORDING STUDIO

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of section 105(c), Public Law 624, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the House Recording Studio the following Members of the House: Mr. O'Brien, of New York; Mr. Steed, of Oklahoma; Mr. Devine, of Ohio.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of section 10(a), Public Law 474, 81st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Haley, of Florida; Mr. Morris, of New Mexico; Mr. Berry, of South Dakota.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of section 6, Public Law 754, 81st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Federal Records Council the following members on the part of the House: Mr. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, Mr. GROVER, of New York.

NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM ADVISORY BOARD

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a), Public Law 87-758, the Chair appoints as members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board the following members on the part of the House: Mr. KIRWAN, of Ohio; Mr. EDWARDS, of Alabama.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 6968(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; Mr. FRIEDEL, of Maryland; Mr. MINSHALL, of Ohio; Mr. KING, of New York.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having transferred this year from subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has special jurisdiction over immigration legislation, it would be inappropriate for me to serve on the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy to which I was reappointed on February 1, 1965.

In accordance with custom, I hereby respectfully submit my resignation from the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

Sincerely,

RICHARD H. POFF.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

APPALACHIAN PROGRAM NEEDS CAREFUL LOOK

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in the rush to approve the multibillion-dollar Appalachian regional development program, few voices are being raised to caution "stop, look, and listen." Big business, big labor, and I would guess the majority of the big press of the country are either loud with praise or silent on this legislation. Temperate and reasoned voices are difficult to find.

Therefore, it was with a happy sense of discovery that I read the editorial on the subject printed in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, which appears following these remarks. The editorial was published before the vote in the other body. In one sentence, it stated:

> Political pressures, therefore, are sure to call for vastly expanded amounts of Federal assistance.

This foresight was confirmed within hours when the other body adopted by voice vote an amendment expanding the potential scope of the program to 13 counties of New York State omitted from the original comprehension of this huge program. Other proposals to broaden the program to include wide regions at least equally deserving as the 13 counties in New York, were turned back, in the other body, although we may expect that they will come forth with their credentials in this House before we are done with the bill.

So political pressures are already much at work, diluting whatever clear streams of altruism that may have been flowing through the original bill.

The Wall Street Journal is to be complimented on this editorial and I urge all Members to read it.

THE GREATEST GROWTH CENTER

It has long been clear that the Government's approach to redevelopment of "depressed" areas has itself been in need of some redevelopment. But it is by no means clear that the changes under consideration will eliminate the program's more depressing aspects.

One mildly heartening development, noted in last week's Presidential Economic Report, is an indication of a certain disillusionment with the notion that just about any area can be revived if you inject enough Federal dollars into it. Up to now that old pork barrel theory has seemed to underlie most of Washington's redevelopment efforts.

In the short run, of course, the idea may often appear to work out. But the operations of the Area Redevelopment Administration have abundantly shown that merely feeding in Federal cash cannot restore health to an area lacking the manpower, material and natural resources on which a genuine revival might be built.

From now on, promises a Federal planner, quoted by Mr. Janssen in this newspaper recently, the Government will not be looking merely for the "neediest cases" but for those that "show the most potential for growth." That certainly sounds more sensible, and yet it provides no guarantee that aid will not continue to be based more on politics than on economics.

The politicking, in fact, may be expanded. Instead of concentrating on counties and similar smaller areas, the Government now proposes to make over whole regions, much as it is trying to uplift the 11-State "Appalachia" region in the East. So sweeping are the plans that, as some officials see it, a program for upper New England might even move across the border to encompass Canada's maritime provinces.

Washington officials insist it's not their intent to remodel these huge regions on their own. They will rely largely on plans drawn up by State officials within the regions—though they add that the States must submit "rational plans." It's too early to tell whether the States definition of "rational" will always conform with Washington's.

Some questions of definition could arise when it comes to designating the "growth centers" which are to get the bulk of Federal aid. Practically every community considers itself a growth center and local pride isn't likely to be diminished by the prospect that such a designation will bring a Federal reward. If the community is important politically to the party in power in the State, is it probable that the State's officials will choose to pass it by?

What is much more likely is already indicated by the outlook in Appalachia. Though Federal officials expect to wind up with only about 50 growth centers in the area's 359 counties, they're talking of labeling a lot of the left-out localities secondary centers and scheduling them for somewhat smaller Federal help.

Political pressures, therefore, are sure to call for vastly expanded amounts of Federal assistance. Meanwhile, there is no assurance that the regional approach will be able to surmount the practical problems faced by the ARA or even to avoid all of its blunders.

To take one problem, the ARA has found that manpower and materials often must be imported from prosperous areas for projects in distressed communities, which certainly limits the local benefit of such activities. The ARA furthermore has sometimes helped set up companies to compete with existing firms which already were having trouble finding enough business to stay afloat. In short, the new approach may possess all of the practical and political pitfalls of the old.

Since a dynamic economy will always encompass areas that are declining and others that are on the rise, it stands to reason that few of those having strong potential for growth will long be overlooked by private business—or lack help from State and local governments. Many States and localities are, in fact, far along on such self-help, and they might do even more if Washington had not preempted so many of their tax sources.

Nonetheless, the administration apparently is convinced that no growth centers can properly grow without a lot of heavy-handed help from the Government. It's just that sort of thinking that has made Washington the greatest growth center of them all.

FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA—LEARNING TO DO, DOING TO LEARN

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure last week to meet with Joseph Perrigo, a constituent of mine who has recently been selected as one of our four national vice presidents of the Future Farmers of America. He was in Washington for the meeting of the student board of officers of the Future Farmers of America.

This young man has taken a year's leave from his studies at the University of New Hampshire to serve this organization and its excellent program.

Joe is a well-qualified leader and spokesman for the Future Farmers, and a credit both to them and to his State, having served as vice president of the New Hampshire Future Farmers while in high school and as president of the body during his freshman year in college. With five other officers he will spend the next 6 weeks on a speaking tour of the eastern half of the country, talking to men of business and industry, after which he will spend the remainder of the year training Future Farmers throughout the North Atlantic region for leadership positions.

LEADERSHIP, COOPERATION AND CITIZENSHIP

The program of the Future Farmers aims at developing agricultural leadership, cooperation and citizenship. They encourage and help their members to develop their own individual farm programs, such as Joe has done at his family's 10,000 hen poultry farm in Weare, N.H. They encourage the members also to take an active interest in improving their farm homes and surroundings and to participate in activities that benefit agriculture and rural life. And for the development of the individual young man, they stress scholarship, thrift, and confidence in himself and his work. In New Hampshire, where most of our farms are relatively small family operations, the emphasis is on building and improving the facilities so that the family farm can retain its place in competition with the giant business-farmers. The Future Farmers also stress the place of the farm in the community and the responsibility of each individual to work in a spirit of cooperation in improving that community.

"DO-IT-YOURSELF" SPIRIT

The Future Farmers of America, although sponsored by the vocational education division of the Office of Education, is financed by the fundraising efforts of its members and by a foundation composed of businesses, industry and farm organizations. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this spirit of independence in itself is highly laudable and characteristic of the manner in which the group operates: local chapters support their activities by running concessions at sports events, selling magazine subscriptions and by raising and selling farm products.

The activities of the Future Farmers of America are carried on in conjunction with the classroom work in high school vocational agriculture classes. This learn-by-doing concept, along with the bookwork, keeps a good balance between the two necessities: learning techniques and methods on the spot and the kind of learning that will prepare them for living and thriving in a modern agricultural environment.

As Joe Perrigo pointed out in our talk, the farmer today must wear all the hats he used to—those of mechanic, veterinarian, biologist, retailer, administrator and accountant, but must add a few more. Today he must also be an especially adept businessman, advertiser, marketing expert, conservationist and chemist. Above all he must be imaginative, resourceful, and able to do for himself.

PUBLIC SPEAKING, RULES OF ORDER STRESSED

Development of aggressive rural leadership is an important goal. In order to prepare men for the positions of responsibility they will someday hold in their communities, all meetings are carried on with careful attention to the rules of parliamentary procedure. Public speaking contests are sponsored and the leadership of the program is left to the boys themselves, under careful adult guidance. Cooperation with other groups and assumption of responsibility are learned as they take part in community service projects. Here again they learn by doing.

The creed of the Future Farmers of America sums up a lot of important thoughts and beliefs, and its application transcends even the wide boundaries of agriculture:

THE FFA CREED

I believe in the future of farming, with a faith born not of words but of deeds—achievements won by the present and past generations of farmers; in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy have come up to us from the struggles of former years.

I believe that to live and work on a good farm is pleasant as well as challenging; for I know the joys and discomforts of farm life and hold an inborn fondness for those associations which, even in hours of discouragement, I cannot deny.

I believe in leadership from ourselves and respect from others. I believe in my own ability to work efficiently and think clearly, with such knowledge and skill as I can secure, and in the ability of organized farmers to serve our own and the public interest in marketing the product of our toil. I believe we can safeguard those rights against practices and policies that are unfair.

I believe in less dependence on begging and more power in bargaining; in the life abundant and enough honest wealth to help make it so—for others as well as myself; in less need for charity and more of it when needed; in being happy myself and playing square with those whose happiness depends upon me.

I believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and community which will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture and rural life are basic to our American heritage and essential to our economy. Young men like Joe Perrigo and the men who work with the Future Farmers as advisers are making an invaluable contribution to our Nation's future and the way of life we cherish. The laudable goals to which these young men dedicate their efforts is best expressed in their own motto: "Learning to do, doing to learn; earning to live, living to serve."

CITY OF MANCHESTER, N.H., FORMALLY PROTESTS VA CUTBACKS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to offer for the RECORD a resolution adopted January 19 by the Honorable Board of Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Manchester, N.H., in which the city formally registers its protest against the arbitrary cutback ordered by the Veterans' Administration for its regional office in Manchester. The resolution speaks for itself. It represents another in the growing list of protests rising all over the country against the VA's abrupt decision. It provides an additional reason why Congress should investigate the entire decision promptly and why the VA decision should be delayed until a congressional investigation is completed. I have introduced legislation calling for such a delay and hope it will be considered in the near future.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE CLOSING OF THE REGIONAL VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OFFICE LOCATED IN THE CITY OF MANCHESTER, N.H.

Whereas the U.S. Government has ordered the discontinuance of the regional veterans' Administration office located in this city, effective June 30, 1965; and

Whereas this agency was first established in this city in the year 1920 under the title of U.S. Veterans Bureau, while in the year 1924 the title was changed to the regional Veterans' Administration office, and since that date it has faithfully and conscientiously administered to the needs of 87,000 veterans and their families located in the State of New Hampshire, besides providing for the needs of 133 patients hospitalized at the veterans hospital in this city, also to 200 patients hospitalized at the New Hampshire State Hospital, and further assisting veterans in securing more than $2 million under the GI veterans home mortgage loan program; and

Whereas all veterans organizations and their members located in the State of New Hampshire, besides numerous nonveterans, are conscientiously and vigorously protesting the closing of the regional Veterans' Administration office in Manchester, as proposed, feeling that it will create untold hardship and great inconvenience to the American war veterans and their families who reside in the State of New Hampshire: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the board of mayor and aldermen concur wholeheartedly with the protests being registered by the veterans residing in Manchester, also those veterans residing in the State of New Hampshire, as it will create hardship and inconvenience to all veterans in New Hampshire, besides affecting the economy of this city, as 55 employees, residents of this city and now employed in this administration, will be removed from the total yearly earnings of citizens of this city; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all members of the New Hampshire delegation in Washington, D.C., accompanied by a copy of a communication as received by this board from the Disabled American Veterans, Department of New Hampshire, Inc., and to urge them to do all possible to have the order closing the regional office of the Veterans' Administration, located in this city, reconsidered and rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution shall take effect upon its passage.

Roland S. Vallee,
Mayor.

Attest.

M. J. Benson,
City Clerk.

CLEVELAND BILL WOULD DELAY VA CLOSINGS PENDING CONGRESSIONAL STUDY

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution calling upon the President to order a delay in the proposed closings and cutbacks in the operations of the Veterans' Administration until Congress has completed its investigation.

This resolution merely asks the President to delay the changes until Congress has thoroughly investigated the matter. The VA decision, which includes plans to reduce the regional offices at Manchester and White River Junction and transfer their main functions to Boston, was taken without any prior consultation with Congress. While there is no legal requirement that this be done, it would have been prudent because Congress must approve all appropriations for the VA and is deeply concerned that needed services to veterans are not curtailed.

So far, none of the information provided by the VA is clear as to the savings these moves would make. Overall savings of $23,500,000 are claimed, but I have been unable to obtain precise figures for Manchester and White River. The nationwide total is minute when contrasted with the $100 billion Federal budget. The total is also small when measured against the VA's announced spending plans—some $113 million for new hospitals in the next few years. Economy, then, does not seem to be the main reason.

The VA claims, but so far has not demonstrated, that these moves would increase its efficiency. The question remains whether these purported gains in efficiency will not be offset by reduced personal service and increased centralization of the VA. Such a result would be a serious mistake.

The increasing trend to concentrate Government services in large cities, remote from the people they are intended to serve, should be resisted except for the most compelling reasons. Modern communications are so swift that it is hard to see how merely concentrating large numbers of employees in a few big-city administrative centers, achieves any real savings. For one thing, the cost of office space is higher in the cities.

The VA's plans for Manchester and White River Junction reveal no savings or improvements in efficiency to justify the disruptions involved both for the employees and for the veterans they serve.

I shall raise these points before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and urge the committee to demand complete answers.

INCREASES DUE TO WHEAT-COTTON PROPOSALS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the cotton program enacted in 1964 was heralded as one which would bring down prices to consumers, and those supporting the wheat certificate program which was paired with the cotton proposal denied that it would result in increased prices for consumers for flour and flour products.

It therefore came as a shock to read the official publication of the U.S. Department of Agriculture entitled "Agricultural Prices" dated January 29, 1965. The prices being paid by consumers—including farmers of course—has jumped in the past year for such items as flour, bread, cotton work shirts, sport shirts and union suits.

Here are the comparative prices as reported by USDA as of December 15, 1963 and 1964:

Item:		
25-pound bag of flour	$2.18	$2.27
1-pound loaf of white bread	.206	.21
Cotton work shirt	2.33	2.37
Long-sleeved sport shirt	3.38	3.41
Heavy cotton union suit	3.07	3.14

BILL TO REPEAL COMMUNICATIONS TAX

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there is every indication that there will be repeal of many of the excise taxes imposed during World War II as emergency methods of raising revenue. The Byrnes motion would have accomplished this last summer, of course, had not the majority party defeated it in a party-line rollcall vote of 185 to 207 on June 17.

It is good to know that the administration has come around to our party's point of view on this issue and now endorses repeal of these taxes. Twenty years is a long emergency for temporary taxing purposes. We welcome the leadership's promise that in this Congress it will agree to elimination of retail excise taxes on jewelry, luggage, handbags, cosmetics, perfumes, and furs.

A number of House Members, however, on both sides of the aisle, also agree that another World War II "temporary, emergency" excise tax should be included with the so-called luxury items. This is the communications excise tax, which every household feels acutely when the time arrives each month to pay telephone and telegraph charges.

The telephone is the only household utility subject to excise taxation, and, while the tax brings in $1 billion annually in revenue, this could be more than compensated for by the exercise of wise economies in Government spending.

Therefore, I am joining a dozen other Members of the House in introducing a bill to repeal the communications tax, in the hope that this legislation will be adopted as an amendment to the general excise tax legislation by the Ways and Means Committee.

A LETTER OF CONSCIENCE

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Martin] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as a Christian and an American I am opposed to persecution of any human beings. As human beings we will have our differences of political views; we will practice different faiths; we will differ in our choices of vocations, friendships and associations. In all of these differences, however, we should be able to practice tolerance in allowing the other person his full freedom of conscience.

In my military service I visited the concentration camps of the Nazis. Prior to coming to Congress I traveled to Russia and saw firsthand the Communist persecution of those of Jewish faith. I abhor persecution in any form and believe the great need in our Nation and in the world is to recognize persecution and eliminate it wherever and whenever possible.

Today I received a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Jack Drew, secretary of the Hugo H. Hecht Lodge No. 734 of the B'nai B'rith, which I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House. Mr. Drew aptly titles his letter a "Letter of Conscience." I include it here as a part of these remarks.

The Honorable James D. Martin,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Martin: This communication can best be categorized as a "Letter of Conscience." As Americans of Jewish faith, we are profoundly disturbed by authorative reports of discriminatory and repressive treatment of our Jewish brethren in the Soviet Union. To our best knowledge, the reports incorporate in part the following anti-Semitic actions, now in full force, which are being taken by the Soviet Union against Soviet Jewry.

1. The suppression of the full measure of equality to the Jews in the Soviet Union, to which they are entitled under the Soviet Constitution.

2. The denial of unrestricted worship and religious instruction for young and old of the Jewish faith.

3. The denial of formal and cultural bonds with Jewish communities abroad, including official exchange visits and religious pilgrimages to the Holy Land.

4. The denial of the right to reopen Jewish cultural institutions and being permitted the full experience of Jewish cultural life.

5. The promulgation of anti-Semitic actions by Soviet Russian authorities; making Jews the scapegoat in the governmental campaign against economic crimes in the Soviet Union.

As American citizens of the Judeo-Christian heritage, the essential dignity and equality of all men is an elementary religious and moral principle. We further affirm that this principle is not only incorporated into the American way of life, but its application is universal in scope, as far as justice and brotherhood are concerned.

Accordingly, it is our contention that so long as this principle is violated anywhere in modern civilization, we cannot in good conscience remain silent. We, therefore, join with other Americans of all faiths and races in solemnly appealing to the good offices of our legislators and leaders of government in Washington to help alleviate the repressive conditions in Soviet Jewry.

Surely the impact of world opinion and the searching spotlight of public exposure can eventuate a change in the present posture of the Soviet Union toward the millions of Jewish Soviet citizens, whose only guilt is that they are faithful to the religion of their fathers.

We would be grateful for any salutary recourse obtained through your good offices in Congress toward furthering aid and succor to these victims of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

Respectfully yours,

JACK DREW,
Secretary, Hugh H. Hecht Lodge No. 734.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution to permit individual States of our Union to apportion the membership of one house of their legislatures on factors other than population.

I have long been hesitant to introduce legislation that would interfere with decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, but on occasion it seems imperative that we do so. On June 14, 1964, the Supreme Court decided that the sovereign States of the Union do not have the authority or the right to apportion one house of their legislatures on the basis of factors other than population alone. Not only do I believe that the decision was wrong, but I believe the sensitive balance between State and Federal powers will be irreparably damaged if the Constitution is not amended to reverse this decision.

The controversy revolves around the Court's interpretation of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution. History reveals that from its inception, the 14th amendment was never intended to prevent a State from choosing any legislative structure it believed best suited to its needs. In fact, during the debate on the amendment in the House, it was concisely stated that the amendment "takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it." The policy of apportioning one body of a State legislature on factors other than population long preceded the enactment of the 14th amendment. And when the people of the States agreed to form a Union, it was agreed that the political rights of the States should be preserved under the Federal Constitution.

There are now 50 States in our Union, each with separate characteristics, a wide range of local considerations within each involving unique history, geography, topography, climate, distribution of population, political heritage, and individual citizen's economic, political and social interests. I would agree with the Supreme Court that legislators represent people, not trees or acres. But we must also realize that people are not mere numbers and must be considered for their needs.

The majority certainly must have effective rule, and they do. But the minority, too, is entitled to effective representation lest important segments of our people be completely subjected to the will of a temporary majority. To abandon this concept would be to convert the oldest constitutional government in the world to something potentially dangerous to individual liberty.

For these reasons, I have introduced a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States so that States may apportion one house of their legislature on the basis of factors other than population.

THE CRIME OF PRESIDENTIAL ASSASSINATION

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would make it a Federal crime to attack or assassinate the President or Vice President, or anyone in line for the Presidency, including the President-elect and Vice-President-elect.

It was certainly shocking to learn 14 months ago that there was no Federal statute that made it a crime to assassinate the President. Over a year has passed since that tragic day in Dallas when a stunned and mourning Nation watched local authorities, whether rightly or wrongly, handle a case that was obviously one for Federal jurisdiction. It was astounding to learn that the FBI had to wait until local authorities invited them into the case.

Attacks upon a number of lesser Federal officials are covered by the United States Code, but not the men with which the American people have entrusted their future. This bill would eliminate any repetition of those unbelievable circumstances of November 1963.

This bill follows the recommendations of the Warren Commission to make it a Federal crime to attack or assassinate the President, the Vice President, any other officer next in line of succession to the President, the President-elect, and the Vice-President-elect. I sincerely urge the Congress to approve this proposal at the earliest possible moment.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE FRANK J. BECKER

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the close of the 88th Congress, I have wanted to take the floor and state my regret that my good friend Frank J. Becker will no longer serve beside me—and guide me—in the 89th Congress.

He was in many ways a man of contradictions—humble and proud, hardheaded, and soft-hearted, unyielding and yet warm.

Frank liked to give; and he gave to me and his fellow man a friendship, love, and dedication that is seldom to be seen and experienced on this earth.

Frank was a man among men; but a conscious child of God. It was fitting that he should choose to retire from Congress and work in the months after his decision with the same intense devotion which marked his career during the last 12 years.

If a Representative is to be worth anything he must be honest, independent, and fiercely determined to do what is right. Frank was worth his salt.

When he retired, the Congress lost its last "angry Congressman." His most ardent opponents will miss him. The Congress is something less without him.

His last act as a Congressman was typically a letter to his constituents. It reveals the man we all knew and something of the man we could only guess at.

I wish to spread it in the RECORD for posterity, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(From your Congressman Frank J. Becker, Fifth District New York, December 16, 1964)

DEAR FRIEND: As we approach the end of another year, I'm writing you from Washington as I wind up my affairs and say finis to my congressional career.

This task is filled with memories and a touch of nostalgia. While my decision not to seek reelection was announced last January, the full impact of closing my career is just setting in.

I cannot pick up a file, walk down a House corridor or look out across the Capitol from my office, without the events of the past 12 years rushing back at me.

I can still remember my first introduction to Washington as if it were yesterday. It was President Eisenhower's first inauguration with all of the pomp and ceremony that is official Washington on such occasions.

This first official visit was marked by the assignment of my congressional office, the office I was to occupy for the next 12 years.

I think the thing that impressed me most about this first experience in Washington was the fact that only in America could a man of my humble origin be elected to the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Yet, here I was, one of 531 men, serving in the Legislature of the greatest Nation in the world. Subsequent decisions I was to participate in would not only touch the lives of 180 million Americans but, in reality, would affect the lives of over 2 billion people; since what is done in America must ultimately have an influence on the lives of all the world's people.

What a responsibility, what a privilege, what a challenge, and I am no less impressed today as I prepare to retire as I was then at the very beginning of my tenure in office.

From these early days onward, march a series of incomparable experiences that no newsletter could adequately reveal.

On one occasion it meant crouching in a trench in the Nevada desert witnessing the awesome spectacle of a mighty atom bomb explosion. On another occasion it meant hurtling through space crashing the sound barrier in a F-104B jet fighter. On still another occasion it meant landing on an aircraft carrier in the middle of the Mediterranean Sea.

But my most unforgettable moment was the day the House of Representatives was interrupted by the staccato sound of gunfire, and my colleagues and I found ourselves the target of a group of fanatical Puerto Rican nationalists attempting to impress Congress how badly they wanted independence.

Yet, all of my memories were neither exciting nor happy. First, there was the ever-present specter of death, which continued to take the lives of one and then another Member of the Congress, many of them young men and dear friends.

Then came the great tragedy, and I found myself standing in the Capitol rotunda paying my last respects, along with a grieving nation, to our late President, John F. Kennedy.

Nevertheless, these were just moments out of 12 exciting, productive years in Washington.

From the beginning, it seems I was destined to fight my great battles over the spiritual rather than the material issues facing our Nation.

First, I introduced a resolution calling on the President of the United States to instruct our United Nations delegation to request that the General Assembly open each session with a prayer. Otherwise, I felt it would be futile to struggle for peace in an atmosphere which deliberately excluded God.

Unfortunately, this sincere gesture was blocked by our own American State Department. It was their contention that this action would offend Soviet Russia and her satellites. But then what sincere effort for peace has not offended the Communist world? Since that time, I have watched that noble, but illusive goal of peace, slip further and further from our grasp.

Next, was my long and frustrating fight to have the American flag follow our American servicemen in foreign lands.

This struggle involved my campaign against article 7 of the Status of Forces Agreement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This arrangement permitted foreign nations to prosecute American military men in their own courts. My position was that, since these were American servicemen, they were entitled to be tried in American military courts-martial where they understand the language, where the ideal of justice that "all men are innocent until proven guilty" prevails, and where hostile foreign citizenry cannot influence the outcome of the trial.

Here, once again, I crossed swords with our State Department. State argued that this abridgement of rights was necessary in order to placate the very nations that many of these same American servicemen had fought to liberate. While article 7 still stands, I did succeed in convincing our Government to make a vigorous effort to have foreign nations turn over American military personnel charged with a crime to the jurisdiction of the American military. Thus, today, the majority of all these cases are being tried in our military courts.

From these early battles to the still unfinished task of returning the right to pray to our public schools (of which you have read so much) there were many bills and many votes to contribute to a better and stronger America. Many of these votes were cast to save the taxpayers from the undue burden of spending in areas best served by the individual or the local and State government.

In making final judgment on the thousands of bills that came before me in my 12 years in Congress, I used three basic rules: Is it constitutional, is it good for my country, and can we afford it. If they passed this test, the bills received my support. If, however, they failed in any of these rules, they received my dissent.

Well, you might ask what does the box score show? How did you fare on the many crucial battles you fought on Capitol Hill? I must confess that I never kept a won and lost tally but then that really is not as important as honestly and sincerely believing you were right, and then fighting with all your might to make your point of view prevail. This I always tried to do.

Now, as I close this newsletter, I have one more journey to make and that will start with the long walk down through the subway that leads from this New House Office Building to the Capitol. There I plan to pay one last visit to the floor of the House of Representatives. It will be empty then. But for me, and, I guess, for any man who has served there, it will be filled with the voices of the men with whom he has served, as well as the voices of men reaching back to the very first Congress in 1789.

Then there will be, for me, that final rapping of the gavel and the Speaker of the House saying, "This Congress and the congressional career of the gentleman from New York stand adjourned, sine die."

And so with this last goodbye go my sincerest thanks, to you my constituents for affording me the privilege of serving you in the Congress, and to the thousands of you who worked so diligently every 2 years in my reelection campaigns. And finally, I wish to express my special thanks to the members of my Washington and Lynbrook staff for their devotion to duty and loyalty to me.

So again to you my heartfelt thanks, and now this newsletter too, stands adjourned "sine die".

With my very best wishes for you in the years ahead, I remain.

Sincerely yours,

Frank J. Becker.

THE REVEREND EDWARD J. COLES

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it seems fitting to note, at this hour, the passing of a beloved citizen of Lake County and of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois—the Reverend Edward J. Coles, pastor of the First Baptist Church in North Chicago for the past 29 years.

Reverend Coles is identified by all as the father of Nat King Cole, the gifted and distinguished singer and entertainer who, himself, is combating illness at this time.

Reverend Coles has attained prominence in Illinois and in the Nation in his own right. Born in Montgomery, Ala., he came to Illinois in 1922 and after his religious studies and earlier ministry he became pastor of the First Baptist Church in North Chicago in 1935.

As a citizen and spiritual leader Reverend Coles' life has epitomized the best which humankind has attained. As a friend, husband and father he was beloved and respected.

When family, friends and spiritual and public leaders gather to pay their final respects to Rev. Edward J. Coles, they will be honoring a man of faith and humility, a man of warmth and loyalty, a man of great heart and great spirit, a man whose love flowed from the Father and who was and is beloved by all.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many others in this Chamber join me in this tribute to Rev. Edward J. Coles. In the name of the House of Representatives, and in my own behalf, I extend this expression of respect and sympathy to his belowed widow, Corabell, and to his children and other members of the family.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 26, 1965, when the House voted on House Joint Resolution 234, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965 for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, it was necessary for me to be absent from the city. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to recommit which would bar the use of any funds to finance the exportation of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended. On January 11 and 12, 1965, 2 weeks before this vote was taken, I discussed this matter and my position on it as is shown in the Congressional Record.

THE HONORABLE JIMMY QUILLEN, OF TENNESSEE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a distinct pleasure and honor to rise today to commend my colleague and fellow 88th Club Member, the Honorable

JIMMY QUILLEN, of Tennessee, on his superior vote-getting ability, in a year when, regrettably, our party suffered great losses throughout the country. In the First District of Tennessee, which JIMMY represents in this Congress, he polled more than 72 percent of the total vote cast. At any time, this would be an outstanding achievement. This is a direct tribute to the type of service which JIMMY QUILLEN instituted during his first term in the House of Representatives, his dedication to duty and his desire to do more than necessary—to "go the extra mile" in determining the problems and interests of his constituency, and to address himself to those problems and interests in a direct, forthright, and resolute manner.

It is an encouraging fact and a credit to JIMMY QUILLEN'S constituency that they have recognized and returned so overwhelmingly this outstanding public servant to the Congress of the United States. I look forward to serving with JIMMY for many years to come.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in offering congratulations and our appreciation for the fine record and vote-getting ability of Representative JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN, of the First District of Tennessee.

He was the top Republican vote getter in the Nation on November 3, 1964, having received a total of 72 percent plus of the votes cast in his election.

It is fitting that we honor him in recognition of this outstanding accomplishment, of which we are all justifiably proud.

JIMMY QUILLEN won the nomination in a hard fought, five-man primary battle in 1962, then went on to win the 1962 general election by a small margin; his percentage of the votes cast was less than 55 percent.

As a freshman Member, JIMMY QUILLEN worked closely with his constituents. He inaugurated a refreshing program of "open door" meetings throughout the 14 counties in his district. More than 10,000 people took advantage of the opportunity to meet and talk with their Congressman during these sessions. Representative QUILLEN held these meetings at the county courthouses on Saturdays, visiting with a wide range of people in all walks of life.

Representative QUILLEN made many trips between Washington and Tennessee's First District. Incidentally, these trips were at his own expense. Contrary to popular belief, Members of Congress pay their own way on trips home, except for three round trips each session. His "open door" policy extended to his Washington office and perhaps none of our Members worked harder to solve the many problems that arise between the citizens and their Government—problems which the Congressman attempts to solve as a liaison between the agencies and the people.

Some 5,000 persons turned out for an appreciation dinner on May 15, 1964, a preview of the overwhelming endorsement of the people of his district were to give him at the polls in November.

As House minority leader, I share with my colleagues our pride in the fine record compiled by a fellow Republican Member of Congress, and congratulate the fine people of his district for their wise judgment in continuing JIMMY QUILLEN'S service to the Nation and to their district.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to extend my personal congratulations to our colleague, JIMMY QUILLEN, presently serving his second term in this great body as spokesman for the people of the First District of Tennessee. We congratulate him not solely on his reelection but upon his overwhelming majority—more than 72 percent of the total vote cast.

He has come to be known on our side of the aisle as the Nation's top votegetter. The significance of his majority lies not so much in the fact that it was 72 percent, but in the fact that 2 years previous it was less than 55 percent.

This does not merely mean that JIM conducted an effective campaign in his district of 14 counties. The type of campaign he conducted does not alone, by any means, account for his huge majority. The increase of 17 percentage points as a majority realized in 1964 over that in the 1962 election is due to the high quality of representation he gave his people during the 2-year period.

I take this occasion not alone to congratulate JIM QUILLEN. I congratulate the people of the First District of Tennessee. They recognized in him what we all know from what he has done and said in the Congress: a man firm on principles in which he believes, courageous in his convictions, and determined in his desire to serve his district and our country.

The assignment of this stalwart Republican from Tennessee to the vitally important Rules Committee emphasizes his worth to our party cause and the Congress.

And we hope our colleague will remain a Member of this House for many years to come.

Mr LAIRD. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the Republican conference.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois and all my colleagues in congratulating the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for his outstanding achievement in the 1964 general elections.

As the top votegetter of all Republicans in the congressional elections, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] lays claim to an enviable distinction. His 72-percent majority is a tribute to his own votegetting ability and should serve as an inspiration to all who are in politics or who would enter the political arena.

Mr. Speaker, in a year when my party's fortunes were not on the ascendancy, it is particularly gratifying to take note of the singular achievement of the gentleman from Tennessee. I wish to personally and publicly offer to him my congratulations and best wishes for continued success in the years ahead.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, the colleague of our friend Congressman QUILLEN.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride and pleasure in joining with my fellow colleagues to pay a special tribute to JAMES H. QUILLEN.

A great writer once said:

> Serve and thou shalt be served. If you love and serve men, you cannot, by any hiding, escape the remuneration.

The meaning of these words best explains why Congressman QUILLEN stands above the rest here today, receiving this deserved recognition.

I have known Representative QUILLEN for the past 15 years. I have never had the pleasure of meeting a finer gentleman nor a more dedicated and devoted public servant.

When elected to the 88th Congress, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] engaged in a very hard-fought campaign—winning the nomination by only a small majority. During the following 2 years, with enthusiastic determination, Congressman QUILLEN traveled around his district promoting republicanism—seeking recruits and encouraging unity for the cause to which we are all dedicated. The results of this endeavor are self-evident.

Representative QUILLEN, in attempting to provide representation by and for the people of his district, actively solicited the counsel and advice of his constituents—providing them an opportunity of participating in governmental affairs. Much of his success can be attributed to his earnest desire to serve the people in a manner they respect.

This special recognition which we are bestowing upon our colleague for achieving the distinction of being the top Republican votegetter, is not only a tribute to him, but to every citizen of the First Congressional District of Tennessee. In their efforts to elect a dedicated, devoted, and experienced public servant, they have sent to Congress a man whom we have all come to admire and respect—a colleague most deserving of this honor.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. REID].

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in the House this afternoon in honoring a fellow member of our 88th Republican Club, the gentleman from Tennessee, JAMES H. QUILLEN.

Many of you here today will recall that our 88th Club last year designated JIMMY as our "Congressman of the Week." We did not so honor him merely because we liked his ready smile, his pleasant personality, or his gentlemanly ways. When a group of colleagues select a "Congressman of the Week," they are in effect choosing a "Congressman's Congressman." This means that he must be outstanding.

Jimmy Quillen is outstanding. Just take a look at his plurality in the last general election on November 3. Seventy-two percent of his good constituents from the First District of Tennessee voted for him, making him the top Republican votegetter of the year. The people of his district have long been accustomed to the able representation of Jimmy's predecessor, the late Congressman Carroll Reece, who is still fondly remembered and admired by many in this chamber. So Jimmy had big shoes to fill and high standards to meet. His reelection was a resounding vote of approval.

I know I speak for all of you here when I congratulate Jimmy on his fine record and his many accomplishments in the Congress. His district may well be proud of him. And I am sure you also join with me in wishing him the best for the future.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Carter].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I arise to honor my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Quillen] who happens to be my neighbor from over the mountain. I know him to be honest, honorable, humble, and intelligent. The greatness of his victory was attained in the face of a Democratic tornado. He faced on the political arena every form of man or beast the well-financed opposition party could furnish and never lowered his arm. We freshmen would do well to call him chief and sit at his feet as did Saul of Tarsus at the feet of Gamaliel the tentmaker, humbly gleaning his words of political wisdom.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Jimmy Quillen. It was my privilege during the period of his first campaign to visit him and make an address in his community. At that time I was impressed with his potentials as a future Congressman. What he has delivered here has been wholly up to my expectations. As it has turned out, indeed, he has been a very worthy successor of Carroll Reece, who so ably and in such a distinguished fashion represented his district for many years. I trust he will not only enjoy many years of success in the Congress, but I wish for him and his lovely wife many years of happiness.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Broyhill].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine pleasure that I join today in honoring a close friend and an esteemed colleague. Congressman Jimmy Quillen of the First District of Tennessee represents an area of the beautiful Appalachian region which borders upon North Carolina's Ninth District which I have the privilege to represent here. Our two districts share many of the same problems. The fine people of this scenic area also share the strength, independence, and personal resources that are so notable among those who love and have developed mountain regions.

I am happy to say that the work and dedication to principle of Jimmy Quillen are well known in North Carolina. Certainly, that respect for our neighboring Congressman is well earned. Those of us who know him and the work he is performing for those he represents and for the country hold a special regard for him. We are especially proud that the people of the First District have returned him to Congress by such an overwhelming vote. It is a special tribute to Jimmy Quillen that he has received 72 percent of the votes cast in his election contest in 1964.

This tremendous vote of confidence is no accident. It represents a recognition of the tireless efforts Jimmy Quillen has expended in the service of his district. There can be no doubt that this dedicated "mountain man" has performed his great responsibilities superbly, never forgetting the people and problems of his area at the same time he pursues the highest principles in his service to the Nation.

To me, the ideals of public service include a sincere and deeply held desire to work in behalf of the best interests of the people, rather than for personal advancement or narrow partisan advantage. This motivation, combined with high intelligence and unswerving integrity, are essential for those who seek and hold high public office. In Jimmy Quillen, we see these attributes strikingly combined.

All of us here today join in expressing our affection and good wishes to Jimmy and his lovely wife, Cecile. We know that as the years pass, the First District of Tennessee will have cause for great pride in the record of service which their fine Congressman will render as their spokesman on the national scene.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Burton].

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that each of us in this body today has known what it is to bask in the beautiful sunlight of an election victory. It is something to salute a gentleman for that kind of an accomplishment; but I think that the greatest single tribute that has been paid to the gentleman from Tennessee is the recognition that has been given to him by his colleagues in this House. I was pleased and honored to be nominated by the gentleman who now has the floor, the gentleman from Illinois, to represent the Republican Members elected to the 88th Congress on the executive committee of the committee on committees as one of its 12 members. That committee has the responsibility of recommending committee assignments to the Speaker. It was my privilege to place in nomination the name of James Quillen as a member of the Committee on Rules. The executive committee is pledged to secrecy on its deliberations and actions, but I think I would not be violating my trust to say to the Members of this body that the name of James Quillen as a member of the Committee on Rules was received with universal approbation.

There were a great many voices raised at that time in support of his great ability, in support of his character, in support of his worthiness to serve on what is perhaps the most distinguished committee in the House.

So I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, and honored to join my colleagues in saluting Jimmie Quillen. I look forward to his service on that committee and in this body to be one of distinction for a good many years.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to participate in this tribute to my colleague, James H. "Jimmy" Quillen, Member of Congress from the First District of Tennessee.

From my personal observation of Congressman Quillen and his work, it is not too difficult for me to understand why his district supported him so overwhelmingly in the last general election. It was with respectful admiration that I noted that Jimmy Quillen received the highest percentage of Republican votes of any Republican Member elected to the 89th Congress.

The enthusiasm with which Congressman James H. Quillen entered upon his congressional duties, the willingness with which he undertook to extend his knowledge of our great Federal Government and the details of the issues which confront the Nation today are among the reasons for the national recognition which has come to him for his service in the House.

I congratulate Congressman Quillen on these merited honors and extend my good wishes to his family and the fortunate residents of the First District of Tennessee whom he so ably represents.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentelman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleagues in paying honor to Jimmy Quillen, of Tennessee, on this occasion. I feel the greatest honor any of us can be paid is to have the confidence of the people that one represents.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the events of the past year have demonstrated that the constituents of our colleague Jimmy Quillen have that sort of confidence in him. I have known Jimmy since I have been a Member of Congress and I have been very impressed with his legislative ability, his dedication to his constituents and colleagues, and his significant contributions to Tennessee's First Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, JIMMY QUILLEN has not only represented his district with great honor and great ability but he has also contributed greatly to the betterment of our Nation.

So, I take a great deal of pleasure and honor in participating on this occasion in paying tribute to one of our colleagues who certainly deserves it.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in this tribute to an outstanding Member of this great body. Many words of praise have and will be said about the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN, for his service to the Congress and his representation for all of the people of the First District of Tennessee. To me, the people of the First District of Tennessee have said it all—forcefully, dramatically, and ever so rightly—in returning JIM to Congress as the leading Republican votegetter among all our party's candidates for Congress. He engineered his own landslide, capturing over 72 percent of the congressional vote. That is a real testimonial—far exceeding any words of praise.

As one who served with JIM QUILLEN on the House Committee on Public Works, I have had the opportunity to admire and respect his fine contributions to our Nation and his district. It was, and still is, apparent he came to serve and to work. And, he came prepared. Prior to running for Congress in 1962, he served 8 years as a Republican member of the Tennessee House of Representatives and served as minority leader for two terms.

In a relatively short time in Congress, JIM QUILLEN has made his mark, and it is obvious that he is going to serve here for a good number of years. For this, everyone can be thankful. My sincere congratulations to the top votegetter, and many, many more of the same in the years ahead.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the many friends of the gentleman from Tennessee, JAMES H. QUILLEN, in calling attention to the contribution he has made since coming to the Congress in 1962. JIMMY has made his mark on the legislative history of the 88th Congress. The election statistics attest to his effectiveness as a campaigner. We who have worked with him here in the House are happy that the people of the First District of Tennessee, whom he has served with distinction, also recognize his outstanding ability. The proof of this is the resounding majority with which they returned him.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the special order commending the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN, for his achievement in being the "outstanding votegetter" of the Republican Party for the entire United States in the 1964 general election.

While this is indeed complimentary to JIMMY QUILLEN, as an individual, we should further recognize the wise decision and independent thinking of the people of his congressional district in the great State of Tennessee.

This is important because it shows sound leadership in a State and a region of the country that has been traditionally dedicated to the principles of the party of Jefferson, and has provided the people of his congressional district an opportunity to express themselves at the polls on behalf of these same principles, even though they are associated now with the party of Lincoln.

It would appear that JIMMY QUILLEN has in effect become a catalyst around which many people can rally in support of their deep-seeded philosophical convictions. Throughout this great Nation we hear from many outstanding people formerly associated with the Democratic Party, who find it increasingly difficult to remain with the party of Jefferson because of the tendency of the Democratic leadership to move away from the proven principles and concepts of government initiated by Thomas Jefferson. There are many of us who feel there is little or no difference between the teachings of Jefferson and Lincoln.

It would appear that the high vote of confidence given JIMMY QUILLEN is an indication of a trend among the people of Tennessee and other Southern States. I would expect this trend toward a stronger two-party system in the South to expand to the benefit of this Nation and potentially to the entire free world. His record is symbolic of the trend of people who are desirous of retaining the concept attributed to Thomas Jefferson: "That government which governs least, governs best." These same people are now seeking comfort that can only be provided in the Republican Party where more dynamic leadership in the State and local units of government is advocated as opposed to an overbearing, dominating central government.

We congratulate JIMMY QUILLEN for his great victory. We are proud to have him carry the Republican banner. We recognize him as a leader in the political transition of the great States of the South. Inwardly I am sure he is applauding this great transition. Outwardly the nations of the free world are depending upon expansion of this trend.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join my fellow Republicans in paying tribute to the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN—an outstanding votegetter and an outstanding Congressman. JIMMY led all Republican congressional candidates for 1964 with a plurality of over 72 percent. This magnificent showing was by no means an accident. Since he was first elected to Congress in 1962, JIMMY has set an outstanding example of leadership and service to his district and his country—a fact recognized not only by his constituents in the First Congressional District of Tennessee, but also by his Republican colleagues, who named him "Congressman of the Week" in 1964.

Congressman QUILLEN distinguished himself during his first term in the House by amending the administration's Federal Aid Highway Act, in selection for membership on the Republican House committee on committees, and in membership on the Public Works Committee and Subcommittee on Roads, Rivers, and Harbors. His highly successful open door policy serves as a model of distinguished service to constituents.

I am sure that Jimmy's excellent record, plus this thoughtful attention to his district were the factors that led to his magnificent plurality. May all of us strive to emulate his example.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join my colleagues today in congratulating our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN, for being the top votegetter among all Republican candidates for Congress throughout the United States in the 1964 general election.

Receiving over 72 percent of the vote is an outstanding accomplishment and a tribute to the record JIMMY QUILLEN has built during his first 2 years in this body.

As the ranking Republican on the Public Works Committee on which he served, I feel particularly well qualified to speak of the devotion JIM has to his job and the ability he possesses in carrying it out. In fact, it was his perspicacity as a member of the Roads Subcommittee which led to his introduction of a successful amendment to the Federal Highway Act to guarantee that future sections of the Interstate Highway System shall be constructed to adequately accommodate traffic for at least 20 years from the time of construction.

In fact, so significant was this amendment, that his colleagues in the 88th Club recognized him as "Congressman of the Week" last fall. He was also presented with a well-deserved citation in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the Roads Subcommittee.

I might add that as the ranking minority member of the full Public Works Committee this session, I will continue to seek JIMMY QUILLEN's sound advice on highway matters although he no longer serves on this committee.

The Congress of the United States is fortunate in having the services of JIMMY QUILLEN as are the people of the First District of Tennessee who can look with pride and satisfaction to their Representative in the Congress.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in this tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN. Congressman QUILLEN has distinguished himself as an able, sincere, and hardworking Member of the House of Representatives.

I recall his constructive contributions to the Federal-Aid Highway Act during the 88th Congress. Like many of us, he has a record of service in the legislature of his State upon which he built a foundation for his service in Congress. When the highway legislation was before us a year ago, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], drew upon his State experience with the highway legislative committee in Tennessee, and he successfully sponsored an amendment to guarantee that our Interstate Highway System will not be obsolete 20 years from the time of construction.

He takes his responsibilities to his constituency seriously, and he obviously has won the respect and confidence of the people of the First District of Tennessee. Congressman QUILLEN has formed a partnership with the citizens of his district. He has openly sought their opinions through questionnaires. He has made it his business to know their problems by a program of visitation into each of the counties in his district.

JIMMY QUILLEN has set an outstanding example of the meaning of representative government. He is a credit to his district, his State, and our Nation.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN, received a tremendous vote of confidence from his constituents in the First District of Tennessee in November. Defeating his opponent in 1962 with less than 55 percent of the vote cast, in 1964, he swamped his opponent with more than 72 percent of the total vote.

His vote-getting ability can be traced directly to his concern for all the people in his district. During the 88th Congress, JIMMY visited each county on a regularly scheduled basis, personally interviewing over 10,000 constituents during his 14-county tour. Eastern Tennesseans are fortunate in having a man represent them who cares about their problems and who is desirous of finding ways to work out solutions.

I am pleased to add my applause to my friend JIMMY QUILLEN as he is saluted by his colleagues as Congressman of the Week.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN, has earned a reputation for effective leadership through a very essential ingredient—hard work.

His ability to get things done was recognized long ago in the Tennessee Legislature, and in 1962 the citizens of the First Congressional District wisely sent this able legislator to Congress.

Through his dedicated service to the people he represents, JIMMY is becoming known as Mr. Republican, a cherished title bestowed upon his predecessor, the late B. Carroll Reece who served here in the House of Representatives for 35 years.

That he is deserving of the title, Mr. Republican, there can be no doubt. Last November 3 the people of his district showed their faith in JIMMY and their recognition of his ability. They sent him back to Washington as their Representative by the largest vote margin among all Republican candidates for Congress this year—72 percent, a truly amazing victory.

To my hard working colleague, I say congratulations on a job well done.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in pointing out to the House the outstanding home district acceptance of our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN.

Members of Congress, regardless of which side of the aisle they sit on, know what an outstanding Member JIM QUILLEN is, but it is also interesting to note that his qualities for hard work, straight thinking, and sincerity of purpose that have gained him so many friends in the House are undoubtedly the same qualities that resulted in his having received the highest percentage of votes of any Republican candidate for Congress this year.

Being a Congressman, while a public service, is a personal thing, a very personal relationship between the people of your district, whose votes you are actually casting, and yourself. And the finest tribute that can be accorded a Member is that those folks back home personally think he is doing a fine job.

There is no better way of demonstrating this than to come up with a fine, solid vote such as JIMMY received. It certainly testifies to the fact that the qualities that are uniquely JIMMY'S are appreciated in his home district in Tennessee.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and pleased to join my colleagues in a much deserved tribute to a good friend, a distinguished legislator, and a great American, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN.

In 2 short years, Congressman QUILLEN has demonstrated a knowledge and grasp of the problems of government and the legislative process which has made him the envy of his peers and has brought him unprecedented recognition by the leadership in his committee assignments.

The people of his district, and indeed, the State of Tennessee, can be proud; that they are blessed with a Representative who makes democracy a reality; and for the good of the country, I pray he will have many, many years of service in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I know that I join all of my Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives when I commend the gentleman from Tennessee Congressman JAMES H. QUILLEN for his performance in the 1964 general election. It is with great pleasure that I take advantage of the opportunity provided by special order to honor Congressman QUILLEN for his performance as the top votegetter in the election. His was a performance that should serve as a goal for all Republicans.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege to join today in the many well-deserved tributes being paid to the gentleman from the First District of Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN.

When JIMMY QUILLEN was elected in 1962 to the U.S. House of Representatives he stepped into a vacancy created by the death of Tennessee's longtime great Republican leader, Representative Carrol Reece and the retirement from the House of his equally respected widow, Mrs. Louise Reece. The Reece fame for service is widely recognized and made big shoes for JIMMY QUILLEN to fill. But I am happy to say he measures well against such exacting standards.

During those first 2 years in Congress, JIMMY QUILLEN was not content to sit in Washington with but casual contact with his beloved First District. Instead, he conducted a regular series of "open doors" where our colleague personally talked over problems with his constituents and permitted the citizens to participate in their government. Carrying this concept further, he mailed out a successful questionnaire seeking the views of his constituents on major legislation.

As evidence of his interest in the affairs of his State, JIMMY QUILLEN was elected in 1954 to the Tennessee House of Representatives and served in that capacity for 8 years. His colleagues there chose him their minority leader and he was twice nominated for the speakership of the State house.

As evidence of his personal popularity, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents in his district reelected JIMMY QUILLEN in 1964 to a second term in the House by over 72 percent of the vote, making him the top Republican votegetter in all of Congress.

As evidence of his abilities in the House of Representatives he has now been selected to serve on the important Rules Committee. Assigning a sophomore Representative to this influential group is without recent precedent and is further testimonial of the legislative talents and energy of the gentleman from the First District.

I know that JIMMY'S charming wife, Cecile, has been a constant inspiration to him.

As a Congressman, I am honored to sit with JIMMY QUILLEN in the House.

As an elected official, I am delighted JIMMY QUILLEN is a Republican.

As a Tennessean, I am fortunate to call him neighbor.

And as a man, I am proud to list JIMMY QUILLEN as a close friend.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, Tennessee may well be proud of its Representative in the U.S. Congress from the First District. JIMMY QUILLEN has demonstrated outstanding capabilities as a legislator and I join in properly saluting him today—this very special day designated by his colleagues to publicly acknowledge JIMMY'S accomplishments.

We who have served with him in Congress applaud JIMMY'S initiative and drive, his quick grasp and thorough analysis of major legislative measures, as well as his great devotion to country.

Recognition of JIMMY'S activities came early in his first year as a freshman Congressman when he was named Congressman of the Week for his outstanding contribution in the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee. This signal recognition was accorded by his colleagues of the 88th Club, where I have served with JIMMY for the past 2 years. The competition for such designation is keen and his selection was a true indication of leadership and respect.

An assignment to the much sought after and vital House Committee on Committees followed, further indication of the trust placed in JIMMY by his colleagues, as an assignment of this kind is rarely given to a freshman Congressman.

JIMMY'S activities on the homefront are in the true tradition of the U.S. Constitution. Not only does he keep his constituents well informed on the happenings in Washington through regular news releases; but he also seeks their views on the major issues through legislative questionnaires. It is obvious that JIMMY'S interest in his constituents is paramount. He believes this to be the only efficient and effective way to represent them. They are indeed well represented.

It is obvious also that JIMMY is loved and respected, and this is the greatest tribute any man in public life may hope to achieve. The mandate of the electorate is clear as JIMMY has been recognized as the top GOP votegetter in the Nation, having polled a greater percentage of votes than any other congressional candidate. This is truly a great tribute to a great man.

We salute you JIMMY, wishing you continuing success, and commend the residents of the First Congressional District of Tennessee on their enthusiastic selection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join today in this tribute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN. In the relatively short time he has been with us, he has made himself one of the most valuable Members of this body, and he has a bright future ahead in the Congress. The remarkable vote he received in the election is evidence that the people of his district recognize his abilities and achievments. I congratulate JIMMY QUILLEN, and I congratulate the people of his district for the kind of representation and leadership he is giving to them and to the Nation.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time extend my congratulations to one of our Republican Members who I believe has done an outstanding job, and who won the overwhelming endorsement of the people of his district during the past election.

Tennessee's First District Congressman, JAMES H. QUILLEN, better known to all of us and most people in his district as JIMMY was the top votegetter of our Republican Party throughout the country last fall. He received 72 percent of the vote in his district, which is a testimony to his good work as a freshman Congressman during the 88th Congress. It also shows mighty good judgment on the part of the constituents of the First District.

JIMMY QUILLEN has certainly earned the acclaim of his district. As a freshman Congressman he established a unique record. Few freshmen ever amend a major bill, yet Representative QUILLEN spotted a flaw in the Nation's highway legislation, introduced and saw through to passage a corrective amendment which will protect the standards of our Interstate Highway System for 20 years after the date of construction.

He guided through Congress two measures which benefited the Andrew Johnson Memorial at Greeneville, Tenn. Three pieces of law in a freshman session is an unusual record. It is a tribute to both JIMMY QUILLEN's sagacity and tenacity. His attendance record was outstanding, and indicated clearly that JIMMY was on the job, doing the legislative chores his constituents sent him to Washington to perform.

I am certain that all my Republican colleagues join me in congratulating JIMMY QUILLEN on his measure of appreciation by the folks back home, and I know that those on the other side of the aisle have come to respect him as a dedicated and able legislator.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to join the distinguished Members of the Republican 88th Club in honoring our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN. His achievement as the top votegetter among all Republican candidates for Congress in the 1964 general election is indeed a tribute to him and to the entire party.

Certainly it is a tribute to the good taste and discrimination of the people of Tennessee's First District that they returned JIMMY QUILLEN to Congress with an overwhelming majority. Doubtless they are well aware of his untiring efforts in their behalf.

I greatly enjoy my association with JIMMY in the House of Representatives. He is a most able and diligent Member of this Congress. I hope he will continue to serve in Congress for many years to come.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to pay my respects to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN]. We have served on the Public Works Committee together and I know firsthand how conscientious and hard working he is. The people of his district are to be congratulated in sending him back to Congress. I salute the gentleman on his tremendous victory at the polls and look forward to many more years of working with him in Congress.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor and a privilege to participate in this recognition of the election achievement of the honorable gentleman from the First District of the State of Tennessee, Congressman JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN.

Achieving a majority of votes, as we Republicans have come to find out, is a difficult and trying task. Nonetheless, the gentleman from Tennessee has persevered. He has in fact succeeded in achieving a tremendous vote plurality in 1964 which no other Republican Member of this House has equaled. We must attribute Congressman QUILLEN's amazing election success to the wisdom of his constituents, to the diligence of his campaign, and to the quality of his service. It would be well for many of us to thoroughly examine Congressman QUILLEN's techniques in the hope of gleaning some insight into his outstanding achievement.

I hail the gentleman from Tennessee, and I look forward to his improving his performance in 1966—if possible.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and service of Representative QUILLEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION TO DELAY PLANS TO CONSOLIDATE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REGIONAL OFFICES AND TO CLOSE 15 VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution calling on the President to delay announced plans to consolidate 17 Veterans' Administration regional offices and close 15 Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliary homes until the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is given an opportunity to look into this matter.

I believe enough questions have been raised with respect to the closing order that we are entitled to a full explanation and justification of this plan. In my opinion it has not been proved that the stated objectives of economy and better service to veterans will be met by this proposal.

I have been notified by the Veterans' Administration that the Cincinnati regional office will be consolidated with the Cleveland office. It is my understanding that this will mean a loss of 280 jobs in the Cincinnati area and that these employees will be offered employment in the Cleveland office. Apparently, then, there will be no savings as far as salaries are concerned.

But, more important, I am concerned about the welfare of our veterans and their families. I am not convinced that their best interests will be served by this move or by the other proposals made in the recent VA order. Their interests should be of paramount importance, and I sincerely believe that in the Cincinnati case especially their best interests would be served by the office remaining in Cincinnati.

THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate passed the International Coffee Agreement bill by an overwhelming vote of 56 to 23. This bill, S. 701, is the implementing legislation for the International Coffee Agreement. The agreement was ratified by the Senate in 1963 and since that time we have been a member of the International Coffee Organization. The purpose of the implementing bill is to permit the United

States to carry out its responsibilities as a member.

In acting swiftly, in the first few weeks of the new Congress, the Senate has done much to correct the impression that was left at the close of the 88th Congress when the work of passing the implementing legislation was left undone. To say that the image of Uncle Sam, reaching across the borders of Latin America in order to help the peoples of those Latin American countries help themselves, faded somewhat when we failed to complete our commitment to the stabilization of the coffee industry, is putting it mildly. On January 12, 1965, the Ambassador of Costa Rica, Gonzalo J. Facio, touched on this subject in a speech he delivered at Yankton College in South Dakota. He said:

> The failure of the House of Representatives to pass the enabling legislation during the past session was received with bewilderment—and in some cases bitter criticism—of the United States by the Latin American press. This negative action also caused much embarrassment to the U.S. delegation to the Third Meeting of Ministers of Economy of the Americas, held in Lima, Peru, last December.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about pan-American friendship and inter-American friendship for many years. We now have an opportunity to demonstrate the meaning and significance of our friendship, as well as our good sense.

The purpose of the Coffee Agreement is to stabilize the wildly fluctuating coffee industry, and ultimately to help stabilize the economies and the governments who depend on this commodity. These ends serve our own interests. For the chronic instability of so large and so important an area as the one encompassed by the countries which depend upon coffee exports can, if left unchecked, eventually shake all of the Western Hemisphere, if not the world.

In Africa seven underdeveloped nations obtain from 30 to 50 percent of their foreign exchange earnings from coffee. Six Latin American countries depend on coffee for more than 50 percent of their export receipts, and the 14 Latin coffee-exporting countries receive an average of 25 percent of their export receipts from this commodity. In Latin America alone, more than 12 million people depend on coffee for their livelihood.

It is no answer to the vicious cycle of feast and famine which these countries endure with depressing regularity to hide behind the foreign aid program. Jose Figueres, the former President of Costa Rica, said:

> Continuation of the cycle of low prices for commodities and bigger doses of foreign aid is like giving an anemic man a blood transfusion in one arm and draining it out of the other.

The people of Latin America need trade more than aid, in my judgment. But the avenues of commerce, in a just world, must be two-way streets. Nations need to sell as well as buy, particularly underdeveloped ones. The International Coffee Agreement will, when properly implemented, enable the coffee-producing nations of Latin America to sell their product and go about the business of diversifying their economies.

AN ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSEL OR AMERICAN OMBUDSMAN WOULD HELP CONGRESSMEN HELP THEIR CONSTITUENTS WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF TRADITIONAL CONGRESSIONAL - CONSTITUENT RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced legislation, H.R. 4273, to create an Administrative Counsel of the Congress to help Congressmen help their constituents who have problems with the Federal Government.

I am pleased to say that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is introducing an identical bill in the other body today.

The chief purpose of this bill is to give Congressmen and their staffs more time to work on legislation and our great national problems by lifting some of the burden of dealing with the problems of individuals. Yet establishment of an Administrative Counsel of the Congress would not disrupt the existing congressional-constituent relationship.

I have called the Administrative Counsel an American ombudsman because it is an adaptation to our constitutional system and political traditions of the institution of ombudsman first established in Sweden in 1809. The ombudsman has proved so valuable in protecting the rights of citizens against bureaucratic abuses and errors that it has spread to Finland, Denmark, Norway, and New Zealand. A bill similar to H.R. 4273 is pending in the Utah State Legislature.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSEL WOULD INVESTIGATE AND HELP SOLVE CITIZEN'S PROBLEMS REFERRED TO HIM BY CONGRESSMEN

The bill provides that the Administrative Counsel would help Congressmen help their constituents in many of the cases which are the traditional subjects of constituents' appeals to Members—delayed social security payments, misconstrued veterans' laws, mistreatment in the Armed Forces, claims of discrimination in Government contracts, and the like.

Constituents would continue to write their Congressmen about these matters as they do now. The Member might choose to refer the constituent's problem to the Administrative Counsel. The Counsel would have a small staff of experts and specialists in the various aspects of administration which cause the most problems. These experts could look into the complaint on the basis of information supplied by the constituent or, at the Counsel's discretion, undertake their own investigation. The Counsel would have the investigatory power of a congressional committee and would be able to examine papers and records of the administrative office concerned, or question its employees.

The Counsel would transmit his findings and recommendations to the Congressman who referred the matter to him. In the vast majority of the cases, where individuals are being injured by administrative error or delay, by excessively strict interpretations of law, or by unreasonable administrative regulations, the Counsel's investigation and recommendation would probably be sufficient to obtain remedial action. However, if the administrative agency persisted in undesirable practices or policies despite the Counsel's recommendation, the Counsel could recommend appropriate legislative action in reports to both Houses of Congress. The Counsel is required to make an annual report. He may make special reports. These reports can be expected to receive widespread publicity and to summon the force of public opinion against the administrative abuses exposed in them.

In the countries with an ombudsman, it has been found that the ombudsman's right to publicize combined with his power to recommend action to parliament have made administrators strongly inclined to heed his recommendations.

In virtually all cases, the Congressman would reply to his constituent, as he does now, describing the resolution of the citizen's problem. Thus the beginning and the end of the case would remain firmly in the Member's hands. The Counsel would play his unobtrusive, yet effective, role in the middle of the case where the real time-consuming work is.

The role of the Counsel would become obvious only in the relatively few cases which became specific parts of the Counsel's reports. These, however, would undoubtedly be cases in which an individual Member would have been unsuccessful in objecting to maladministration. If the Counsel's publicity could bring a remedy both the citizen and the Congressman would be better off.

Of course, Congressmen would not have to refer cases to the Counsel. They could continue to handle them themselves. Members are also not required to use the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress or the legislative counsels of the two Houses. But, in fact, heavy use is made of these aids.

It would be of great importance to have an outstanding person as Administrative Counsel. The Nordic and New Zealand ombudsmen have been topflight people, including supreme court justices who resigned to become ombudsman. The bill provides that the Counsel be appointed "without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness" by the Speaker of the House and President pro tempore of the Senate. While the 2-year constitutional life of the House requires a reappointment at 2-year intervals, it is anticipated that the Counsel would be repeatedly reappointed. He would be paid the same salary as Members of Congress.

The Administrative Counsel would not encroach on the jurisdiction of the Comptroller General concerning the legality of governmental expenditures. Nor would he have any jurisdiction with respect to the President, Members of Congress and their employees, judges, officers of the District government, or certain other Federal employees.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSEL WOULD ALLOW MEMBERS TO BE BETTER LEGISLATORS, PROMOTE EFFICIENCY, HELP CITIZENS, AND IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION

As governments throughout the Western democracies have expanded their efforts to promote public welfare, the impact of the actions of the bureaucracy on individual citizens has increased continually. Programs such as social security, public housing, veterans' benefits, and so on, are full of possibilities for individual injustice if there are not readily accessible avenues for correcting administrative abuse or error.

In the United States, a citizen with a problem with the Federal administration is likely to write to his Congressman about it. He may also have an administrative appeal or a judicial remedy, but these may be costly, complex, or unknown to him.

The role Congressmen have assumed as the citizen's advocates against the bureaucracy is important and valuable in our system of government. It has helped to prevent injustices and to promote good administration. But the job of handling constituents' cases has become so burdensome that it is interfering with the primary job of Congressmen as legislators. The national problems we face today demand more time for thought and study and debate, yet the growing burden of casework allows us less.

The Administrative Counsel is not a cure-all. But it does promise additional time for members and their staffs to spend on legislation and national policy.

There are three other significant advantages of establishment of an Administrative Counsel.

First, the Administrative Counsel could do a better job of protecting the interests of constituents. The Members of this body particularly do not have staffs large enough to have a staff expert in each field of bureaucratic activity. The "jacks of all trades" in congressional offices often find themselves somewhat at the mercy of more knowledgeable administrators. The experts on the staff of the Administrative Counsel would be able to protect citizens' interests faster and better.

Second, handling casework on a centralized basis instead of in 535 separate offices would be more efficient and less costly.

Third, the Administrative Counsel would have a unique vantage point to spot causes and sources of citizens' difficulties with the Federal bureaucracy. With complaints spread out among 535 Representatives and Senators, improper procedures, inefficiency, or consistently rude and lazy officials may go undetected. Congressmen may be able to prevent injustices to the citizens who appeal to them, but the basic cause of the citizens' problems may go uncorrected while many individuals who do not appeal to their Congressmen suffer injustice. In recommending reforms to eliminate the causes of citizens' problems with the bureaucracy, the Counsel would constitute a second force for better administration, in addition to the permanent Administrative Conference of the United States created by Congress last year.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 4273

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Administrative Counsel Act".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the increasing complexity of the Federal Government has created difficulties on the part of private citizens in dealing with the Government, that there is a clear need for the Congress to be informed of the nature of such difficulties, particularly those of a recurrent nature, in order that remedial legislative action may be taken, and that, under existing procedures, such information is only sporadically available and frequently is inadequately developed or fails entirely to reach the appropriate legislative committees. The Congress further finds that the necessary and proper efforts of its individual Members to deal with these problems have increasingly become so burdensome as to constitute a serious impediment to the discharge of their other legislative duties.

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be an officer of the Senate and House of Representatives who shall be known as the Administrative Counsel of the Congress and shall perform such duties as are prescribed by this Act. He shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform the duties of his office, for a term which shall expire upon the commencement of the Congress succeeding the Congress during which he was appointed, except that he may continue to act during such succeeding Congress until he has been reappointed or his successor has been appointed. He shall receive the same salary as Members of Congress.

(b) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Administrative Counsel may appoint such assistants, clerks, and other personnel as may be necessary to carry on the work of his office.

SEC. 4. Upon the request of any Member of either House of Congress, the Administrative Counsel shall review the case of any person who alleges that he believes that he has been subjected to any improper penalty, or that he has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States, or that the determination or award of any such right or benefit has been, is being, or will be unreasonably delayed, as a result of any action or failure to act on the part of any officer or employee of the United States other than those exempted under section 6 of this Act. The Administrative Counsel may, in his discretion, confine his review of the case to the material submitted to him with the request for review, or may make such further investigation as he may deem appropriate. Upon the completion of his review, he shall report his conclusions and recommendations, if any, to the Member or committee by whom the claim was referred.

SEC. 5. All officers and employees of the United States, except those exempted pursuant to section 6, shall furnish to the Administrative Counsel such information regarding their activities within the scope of their official duties or employment as he may require of them, and the Administrative Counsel, or any of his assistants, when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, records, files, or other documents, and the right to consult directly any officers or employees of the United States without securing the permission of their superiors.

SEC. 6. (a) This Act shall apply to all officers and employees of the United States except the following:

(1) The President;

(2) Members, officers, and employees of the Senate, the House of Representatives, or any committee or joint committee thereof;

(3) Judges, clerks, commissioners, referees in bankruptcy, and other officers (other than attorneys as such) and employees of any court of the United States, regardless of whether such court is legislative or constitutional;

(4) Officers and employees of the District of Columbia or any other local governmental unit not under the supervision or control of some other department or agency of the United States; and

(5) Any other officer or employee of the United States whose activities are of such a nature that, in the discretion of the Administrative Counsel, the application of this Act thereto would be contrary to the public interest.

(b) For the purposes of this Act, the term "officers and employees of the United States" includes officers and employees of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States.

SEC. 7. (a) The Administrative Counsel shall make an annual report to the Congress. Such report shall summarize his activities, shall include reviews of those individual cases which, in his judgment, should be brought to the attention of the Congress, and shall set forth such recommendations for legislation or further investigation as he may deem appropriate.

(b) The Administrative Counsel may, in his discretion, make an interim report on any occasion when he deems such action appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) Any report of the Administrative Counsel pursuant to this section shall be printed as a public document.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who love New York City have been saddened in recent years by the continuing decline of what we believed to be the greatest city in the world.

A team of New York Herald Tribune investigators has put together a series of articles on the crisis situation which has developed in New York. This series has covered the whole gamut of urban problems faced by America's largest urban center. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the first of that series which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 25, 1965:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—REASONS FOR OUTRAGE AND REASONS TO ACT

(NEW YORK is the world's financial and cultural center, the Nation's tastemaker, and the home of the power elite, but to many of its 8 million citizens, it is no longer the greatest place in which to live. Discontent has always been a distinctive quality of the New Yorker—restlessly unwilling to accept the status quo—and in the past this discontent has been channeled into the tremendous creative civic energy which has given the city its dynamic character. But in the complex years since the end of World

War II the creative channels have clogged up. The city's simple problems require complex answers. And the complex problems seem to have no solutions at all. With reasonable outlets denied, the citizen's discontent has turned inward: to bewilderment, frustration, rage, and finally fear or indifference. A special Herald Tribune team—headed by Barry Gottehrer and including Barrett McGurn, Marshall Peck, and Claude Lewis—has spent the last half year investigating the deeply disturbing characteristics of a city in crisis, and, in this series of articles, presents its findings.)

POVERTY

It is a city in which poverty is everywhere and the gulf between the rich and poor grows greater and more insurmountable every day. To Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and aged whites, who know the killing effects ghetto life and isolation have on the mind as well as the body, the much-publicized war against poverty so far is just another political slogan with, according to Negro leader Bayard Rustin, the force of a cap pistol. Nearly one-fifth of the city's people now live in poverty conditions—families earning less than $3,000 a year and individuals earning less than $2,000 a year—many in cramped, inadequately heated, unsanitary, rat-infested apartments.

YOUTH

It is a city in which more than 70,000 youths now roam the streets, out of school, out of work or underemployed, untrained and uncaring. Because of its limited staff and its inability to keep trained personnel, the youth board, set up as the official city agency to deal with youth problems in 1947, has made very little headway despite a $45 million outlay. And HARYOU-Act and Mobilization for youth, the new groups which offered so much hope for the future, already have become bogged down amid political, ideological, and financial controversy.

TRAFFIC

It is a city in which the daily traffic jams grow worse and worse and the hope for any improvement grows less and less. To many New Yorkers, particularly those forced to drive the Long Island expressways, the jokes about the massive traffic jams (in one, everybody leaves his car, the city pours cement over the deserted autos, and New York has solved its traffic problem) no longer are amusing. Despite the billions of dollars spent on highway construction, New York's roads and parking facilities are totally inadequate to accommodate the 1.5 million cars registered here and the 600,000 others that enter the midtown area each weekday.

MIDDLE CLASS

It is a city in which 800,000 middle-class whites, traditionally the heart of a metropolis and its economy, have fled to the suburbs since 1950 to be replaced by 800,000 Negroes and Puerto Ricans who, for the most part, are unskilled or semiskilled. And though the mayor and city officials decry this exodus, they have done little to keep the middle-class whites from leaving. "This is a white man's city," says Miriam Robinson, a Negro nurse. Yet not many white middle-class New Yorkers would agree.

HOSPITALS

It is a city in which the hospitals are supposed to be the best in the world, but most patients and many doctors know better. Officials say that there are some 3,000 more beds than are being used daily, but it is not at all unusual for people being forced to wait hours and even days to get into a city hospital. An 84-year-old woman, rushed by ambulance to a hospital after suffering a stroke recently, had to wait 8 hours and be transferred to three different hospitals before a bed could be found for her. "Maybe there are additional beds in the private rooms and semiprivates, but we need all the ward space we can get," said one of the admitting doctors at Roosevelt Hospital. "There should be an up-to-the-minute listing in each hospital telling exactly where the vacant beds are, but there isn't any." This doctor had to phone seven hospitals before he found a bed for the aged woman at Metropolitan Hospital. While he telephoned, the woman waited alone and unattended in one of the emergency examining rooms. Yet even more critical than the problems of beds and services is the problem of health insurance. Despite a 33-percent increase in rates this summer and a 124-percent boost over the last 5 years, Blue Cross health insurance, the basic financial resource of the city's hospital service, is on the verge of setting its prices beyond the range of the people who need it most.

COMMUTERS

It is a city in which the commuter railroads that are needed to bring more than 200,000 people into midtown Manhattan 5 days a week are now closer to financial oblivion than they have ever been before. Commuter fares have skyrocketed on the New Haven, New York Central, and Long Island lines in the past few years, but losses continue. And, unless increased Federal aid and control are provided in the immediate future, the railroads may be forced to shut down commuter service completely. For the other New Yorkers, who travel by subway and bus into midtown Manhattan, getting to and from work each day has become a true survival of the fittest.

HOUSING

It is a city in which a public-housing program has been set up to cure at least one of the problems of poverty, but, because of limited funds, unlimited red tape, and little direction from the top, it seems to have created almost as many problems as it has solved. There are currently 520,000 people living in public housing, but there are more than 660,000 others now waiting to get in. At the rate that public housing has been constructed over the last 2 years (12,000 units or apartments since 1962), it would take someone more than 10 years to gain admittance to a public-housing project if he applied today.

URBAN RENEWAL

It is a city in which more than $2.19 billion has been committed to urban-renewal projects since 1950 in an attempt to wipe out slums and provide decent low- and middle-income housing, but one in which the slums continue to spread, the ghettos remain, and there is still a critical shortage of low- and middle-income housing. To many New Yorkers, urban renewal has come to mean Negro or human removal, the shifting of a minority group from one slum to another.

WELFARE

It is a city in which half a million people, more than the number living in the States of Alaska, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, or Wyoming, are now receiving welfare with no solution in sight. "There is not a single thing we can do to keep this figure from increasing," says one welfare department worker. "For every case we close, another three or four are added to the rolls."

BUSINESS

It is a city in which the problems of automation and urbanization, which threaten the future of cities all over the world, are multiplied a thousand times. In the past 5 years, hundreds of businesses, both large and small, have deserted the city—and there appears to be no way and little effort on the part of city officials to halt this drain. Despite a temporary commercial building boom brought on by a change in the zoning code and by the World's Fair, construction is now on the decline with the trade unions currently reporting more than 15 percent unemployment. What makes this problem even more critical is that it is precisely the employers of the unskilled and the semiskilled who are deserting the city in frightening numbers. More than 80,000 manufacturing jobs alone have been lost in the city over the past 5 years. "Taxes, labor costs, insurance, and the city government's attitude have made Manhattan a nightmare for small businessmen," says one disgruntled dress manufacturer. "This is becoming a city with white-collar jobs and blue-collar people."

FINANCES

It is a city in which the financial needs grows increasingly critical every day and the sources of possible revenue increasingly difficult to find. The gigantic $3.355 billion expense budget—only the Federal Government's is larger—has more than doubled under Mayor Wagner, creating the latest in a series of worsening financial crises for the city government. It has now reached the point where 14 percent of each year's expense budget—nearly $1.3 million a day—must go to pay debt service, and a $350 million deficit has been predicted for 1966. The worsening problem: Where are the new taxes—the money to bridge the gap between the city's increasing expenses and limited sources of revenue—going to come from? The increased sales tax, boosted from 3 to 4 percent in 1963–64, has been a dismal failure, failing to approach predicted revenues. And the off-track betting proposal, even if it is approved by the Democratic-controlled State legislature this year, cannot be expected to provide substantial—or even adequate—revenue. The mayor's solution (and one he applies to almost every major city problem): allocating $1 million of city money, setting up a special commission to study the problem, and convincing several important bankers and businessmen to lend their names (if not their undivided attention) to it. "It's all a game," says one of the mayor's aids. "We know we have fiscal problems and we know what we have to do—raise existing taxes or put in some new ones. But, most of all, we know that we must get more Federal and State help. But by setting up these commissions, the mayor gets the bankers and business leaders, many of them Republicans, involved. If they should ever come up with something new, then all the better. If they don't—and they rarely do—it's their failure, not the mayor's. And then, who says that he has to do anything with their proposals."

BUREAUCRACY

It is a city in which a giant bureaucracy flourishes, growing more unmanageable every day. The first charter revision in 26 years was approved in 1961, but the government and the people continue to struggle along seemingly unable to cut through the red tape, the politics, the duplication of time, money and departments, the inferior personnel, and the needlessly increasing costs that both separate and strangle them. "The basic problem in New York is that the government long ago ceased to be a government of and for the people it governs," says Jane Jacobs, author of "Death and Life of Great American Cities" and, labeled by her critics, the "Barbara Frietchie of the Slums." "The people of this city are being utterly disregarded. Our government doesn't listen to the people. It has become too insulated and too smug to care about their problems." One planning commission specialist has come up with a novel suggestion that is guaranteed never to see the light of day under the present city administration. "This city needs a lot of things but I'd like to use an IBM machine to figure out some chain of command for how to go about getting something done in this city," he says. "Then you'd know exactly where the power was and exactly where to go to get something accomplished."

HARLEM

It is a city in which an already troubled Negro population learned last summer that city hall could be made to listen—if not made to act. As a result of last summer's rioting and the fear that it might have become worse, Harlem now has a Negro police captain—and hopes that other concessions (perhaps a civilian police review board) are no longer out of the question. The responsible people of Harlem may have had nothing to do with the rioting but these people and the civil rights leaders, who found themselves totally unable to control or direct the demonstrations, have not failed to grasp the significance of it. "Time is running out for this city," says CCNY's Prof. Kenneth Clark. "The people of Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant are tired of promises and nothing else from city hall."

SCHOOLS

It is a city in which a gigantic school system is torn by overcrowding and substandard teaching, particularly in slum areas, becoming a political football for the mayor, the board of education, civil rights groups, and racists. Though the city has built more schools and classrooms under the present administration than it had in all of the previous administrations, the vocational schools have been allowed to become woefully outdated (more students drop out than graduate) and almost nothing has been done to prepare for an elementary school population in the Bronx and Manhattan that is now more than 65 percent Negro and Puerto Rican. "You don't worry about teaching these kids here," says one longtime Harlem teacher, who happens to be white. "You just keep them from killing each other and from killing you." With this attitude, it is not at all surprising that 24 percent of the youths who took the selective service exam, which approximates a 13-year-old equivalency test, in New York last year failed. The argument, favored by city officials, that the school dropout rate was greater 25 years ago than it is today overlooks one basic point. Twenty-five years ago youngsters dropped out of school to go to work or go into the Armed Forces. Today, with the seriously declining number of unskilled and semiskilled jobs, youngsters are dropping out of school not to go to work but to become members of the increasing number of the untrained and the unemployed.

POLITICS

It is a city in which the strike of nearly 7,000 welfare department workers and dozens of other city problems grow more critical every day, yet Mayor Wagner seems to spend most of his time wheeling and dealing for political control of a State legislature more than 160 miles away.

MAYORALTY

It is a city in which the major delights in expressing optimism, yet creates pessimism by his unwillingness to act boldly. Today, Robert F. Wagner is unquestionably one of the most popular mayors in the city's history but, even to his friends, he seems to be a man almost totally incapable or unwilling to make forceful or meaningful decisions. "I like the mayor—everybody likes the mayor," says one prominent New York educator, who voted for Mayor Wagner in each of his three campaigns for the city's top position. "He's always available and he's always pleasant. But when you leave his office or Gracie Mansion, it suddenly dawns on you that he hasn't really said a damn thing. These are extremely troubled times and the problems of this city are not going to solve themselves or disappear. We need a mayor who doesn't care about his image and his political popularity. We need a mayor who cares about the city and has the ability to cope with its problems."

COURTS

It is a city in which the court backlog has become so bad that 18 Brooklyn trial judges currently face 38,000 civil cases with more than 29,000 listed on jury calendars. The backlog is now so excessive that it takes 4 years to get many cases before a jury. The caliber of the city's judges and the manner in which they are chosen (picked by politicians and elected, frequently in face of opposition by the bar association) have both been severely criticized, and reforms have been suggested, but nothing has changed. "There are often rumors, difficult to substantiate, but persistent enough to cause concern, that there is a going price for a judgeship," wrote Herbert Brownell, former U.S. Attorney General and president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. "One year's, salary is the reported figure in New York City. No honorable lawyer wants a judgeship at a price."

POWER ELITE

It is a city in which big businessmen complain about civic apathy and the way the city is run, but rarely do more than talk and lend their names to civic organizations and city commissions. When they do become actively involved (and this does not include lending their names to one of the mayor's countless commissions), as in the struggle for midtown parking garages, the trade center, and the Wall Street redevelopment, it has generally been an involvement born as much out of self-interest as it has been out of a love for the city. They prefer instead to complain that, even if New York could organize a supercitizens' council (as has been done so successfully in San Francisco and Philadelphia), it could accomplish little without the cooperation, if not the leadership, of the man in Gracie Mansion. "There has to be a coordination of civic effort, but there has been none here," says David Yunich, president of Macy's, New York, who favors the creation of a supercitizens' council. "A city where there is real desire for solutions can come up with a grassroots movement. A start must be made. But I think the mayor must first take the initiative." There are few businessmen or politicians who believe that Mayor Wagner ever will. "Another civic group?" says the mayor. "What for? If there's one thing the city does have, it's enough civic groups."

STUDIES

It is a city in which the foundations, the universities, thousands of civic groups, and the city government itself spend countless millions of dollars each year on studies relating to New York City (not infrequently studying the same thing) and then do little more than file the reports for posterity. It is only rarely that the civic groups get together on a single project—and this seems to be the way the mayor would like to keep it. By keeping the civic and business groups divided, interested for the most part in winning improvements for their own particular project or area, the mayor remains the single unifying force in the city.

POLICE

It is a city in which the police force has added more than 7,000 men in the past decade and is called "the best and most honest in the world" by Mayor Wagner. Yet the narcotics rate in New York has skyrocketed (half of the narcotics addicts in the United States now live in New York) and gambling, the numbers and prostitution continue to flourish. "One of the big problems with Negro kids is that they just don't have any respect for the law," says one white policeman. This is not difficult to understand. In Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant, corruption and the law do not always appear to be in conflict. In one after-hours place in Harlem, reefers are sold and smoked openly. In another, prostitutes, some as young as 13, solicit openly and argue over price at the bar. "We don't worry about being raided," says Jimmy the bartender and bouncer, taking a bet on a number. "Some of our best customers are cops—white cops."

PRESS

It is a city in which the press alternates between praising and panning the mayor but, with few exceptions, limited by space and finances, offers little sustained, constructive criticism. One exception was a lengthy indictment in the magazine Nation, which documented a series of major city scandals. The article was thorough and hard-hitting and brought about immediate concern and momentary indignation when it appeared in late 1959. But, in the long run without the support of the city's other papers and magazines, it accomplished little. The same administration sits in city hall, seemingly more secure than ever before, and, if the corruption and scandal are no longer as extensive or as obvious, the problems of the city are a great deal worse.

POLITICIANS

It is a city in which the Republican Party assails the mayor and complains about the "inefficient and corrupt" administration, but, so far, has offered no leader and no program of its own. "OK, so they don't agree with the way I run the city," says the mayor, "But what do they offer in my place? In the years I've been mayor, the Republicans have never even really had a platform. They don't even come to the budget hearings any more. I wish they did. I'm willing to listen to anybody." Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, a young Republican mentioned increasingly as a candidate for mayor, does not dispute the mayor's charge. He suggests the creation of a "shadow cabinet," modeled after the British body, made up of experts in the party out of office and serving as a watchdog over the party in power. "I think that under Mayor Wagner New York has lost its will power, its great energy, and its great leadership," says the Congressman. "You hear a lot of people say that the city is too big to be governed by one man. I don't agree with that at all. It's just a cliche.

"But to run this city properly and get it going again, the mayor has to be very tough. He's got to ask for the moon and he's got to convince the people to make sacrifices. It will take a man who loves the city and a man who loves its people. If we don't get going again soon, New York will become a second-class city."

Barbara Ward, the noted British economist, is even more pessimistic. "If children were run down in the streets, something would be done," she said, during a speech last fall. "All over the world things are becoming intolerable, but we are tolerating them. Unless someone comes up with some jolly good solutions, the problems facing cities may become more lethal than the bomb."

AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: Today, I would like to introduce a resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day.

Such a bill was introduced during the last session of Congress but no action was taken. I am hopeful that the 89th Congress will be the one to honor the original inhabitants of this Nation.

The importance of this bill is realized when we glance back through the great history of our Republic and observe the contributions made by the Indian people to our heritage and to our present day culture. We can see a proud people, the first citizens of our land who have endured many hardships and many trials and have emerged as a responsible and patriotic section of our population.

The influence of the Indian is deeply engrained in our Nation. We must act to place the national and even the world spotlight on the Indian and thus, show our pride toward them. In this way, we can promote better understanding toward the American Indian. We can also help to advance the economic and social welfare of our Indian community.

CLOSING OF VA HOSPITALS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has ordered the closing of 11 hospitals, the consolidation of 17 regional offices, and the phasing out of 4 domiciliaries. I have asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delay any action until Congress can make a thorough study and investigation to make certain such closings will not curtail hospital or other care to any veteran. I do not want to see any action taken which would prove detrimental to our Nation's veterans.

I am particularly concerned about our State of New York, where we have 10 percent of the Nation's veterans. We have 2¼ million veterans and their dependents. The plan would affect my State as follows: the two VA hospitals at Castle Point and Sunmount would be closed; the VA hospital and domiciliary at Bath would be closed; the regional offices at Syracuse and Buffalo would be consolidated; and the functions of Brooklyn and Manhattan regional offices would be consolidated under one manager.

I am concerned that the closing of these facilities and the consolidation of others might impose a hardship on those who can least afford it—that it would result in hardship not only to the veterans themselves if they are moved to another distant locality, but also to their relatives who, in many instances, would find it impossible to visit these veterans in distant locations. The closing of these facilities would, no doubt, also result in additional financial burdens to public welfare agencies in New York because many of the patients or inmates will return to the area they formerly lived in rather than be moved to distant locations.

The elimination of the two hospitals and the domiciliary center in my State seem to me to be diametrical to the policy to establish additional nursing type beds. The attendant drop in employment and resulting economic effect on the communities where these installations are located would not be in keeping with the aims of our antipoverty program.

I realize the VA must periodically analyze and study their facilities in order to operate as efficiently and economically as possible. Certain changes are necessary from time to time to keep pace with science and medical research, which is certainly in the interest of our veterans. However, in recent years the VA has built additional hospitals, and we continue to build or improve or enlarge others. We should study all VA-proposed expansion programs and determine how much expansion might become necessary if these facilities are closed.

I am hopeful that Congress will enact a medical care program. It follows that such a program would bring an expanded and prolonged use of existing hospital facilities. Would this not mean that our local hospitals would have to accommodate larger numbers of patients? The result might be that veterans hospitals and domiciliaries, if closed, would only have to be reopened, at greater expense in the long run than keeping them open now and administering the necessary repairs and modernizations.

Various veterans' organizations and groups in my State have expressed opposition to the curtailment program and have stated that "in the face of the ever-growing need for medical care and hospitalization for many of the Nation's veterans, the elimination of 11 marginal hospitals will create considerable distress and hardship, particularly to veterans who will have to travel long distances for treatment and services."

Laws enacted by Congress establish the responsibility on the Federal Government to provide all required care to veterans disabled from military service. We owe it to them to provide the best possible hospitalization and care, and whenever possible, in facilities convenient to them and their families. Our veterans of World War I are advanced in age and our veterans of World War II are middle aged or beyond. This makes it appear to me that in years ahead the need for additional facilities will be greater.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the closing of these facilities held in abeyance until Congress has the opportunity to review and appraise the possible impact on the welfare of our veterans.

LITERACY TESTS AS QUALIFICATION FOR VOTING

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit literacy tests as a qualification for voting in State elections as well as Federal elections for citizens who have not been adjudged incompetent and who have completed the sixth grade.

Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited the discriminatory use of literacy tests in Federal elections and required that they be in writing and created a rebuttable presumption that an individual who had completed the sixth grade possessed sufficient literacy to vote in Federal elections.

My bill would specifically prohibit the use of literacy tests in State as well as Federal elections for those who have completed the sixth grade and who have not been adjudged incompetent.

Mr. Speaker, voter registration and the fact that many of our citizens have been denied this privilege, should be of immediate concern to all of us in this body. The right to register and vote is fundamental to democratic government and the Federal Government is responsible for the protection of that right. The purpose of my bill is to prevent an otherwise qualified citizen from losing his right to register and vote solely because of unreasonable literacy requirements.

It is a well-known fact that unreasonable literacy tests have been and are still being used unjustly to deny citizens the right to vote. How are we to safeguard and protect our people against the deliberate use of technicalities to deny them the right to vote because of race or color? I believe the most effective way is to establish an objective standard by which an individual's literacy may be judged, as I have proposed in my bill. This would eliminate the intrusion of bias and prejudice; it requires the determination of fact, rather than a judgment or an interpretation.

Mr. Speaker, education is a reliable gage of literacy, but we should have a fair and just standard. My bill would specifically establish the minimum line at the completion of "the sixth grade in school accredited by any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

The community language in Puerto Rico is Spanish, but the capacity to understand and to communicate develops as well through one language as another, and English is taught in the schools in Puerto Rico beginning with the first grade. Therefore, pupils who have gone through the sixth grade have considerable command of English, sufficient to understand and write it well.

No one will quarrel with the contentions that voters should have certain basic equipment in order to vote intelligently. Certainly, the electorate should be aware of the issues. Literacy is a reasonable requirement to assure minimum understanding. I believe the demarcation point of "the sixth grade" proposed in my bill is reasonable.

I feel that the completion of a sixth-grade education is ample demonstration of literacy. We must not deny any citizen who is demonstrably literate the right to register and vote in any election. To prevent such injustice, I urge early approval of my bill.

THE RETIREMENT OF ED REARDON

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, when the 89th Congress convened at the beginning of the year, a familiar face was missing from the House Press Gallery. For my good friend, Ed Reardon, had retired.

Ed Reardon served for many years with distinction as the Washington correspondent of the Herald-News, a daily newspaper which is published in Passaic, N.J., in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

Ed Reardon has served in the highest tradition of journalism. He has been painstakingly accurate, and he has never engaged in sensationalism or half-truths. As an individual, he is unfailingly kind and decent. While serving his newspaper in Washington, he came to be widely known and respected by many in the Nation's Capital and in the Halls of Congress. We will miss him, but we hope that Ed will be busy in retirement, enjoying all the good things life has to offer.

MORE SUPPORT FOR SHORTER CAMPAIGNS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, as a stanch advocate of legislation to shorten presidential campaigns and as a sponsor of H.R. 96 and House Joint Resolution 16 which I have filed for this purpose, I was gratified to read a report of the speech made by Mr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. at the annual meeting of the Institute of Life Insurance in New York on December 8, 1964.

Mr. Stanton made several timely and important suggestions in keeping with the improvement of our election practices to bring them into line with the demands and realities of modern life and to take full advantage of the tremendous present day advances in electronic communications.

Mr. Speaker, the expression "too long, too expensive, too arduous" which I have often used in my arguments in favor of my proposal to limit presidential campaigns to 60 days was used effectively by Mr. Stanton in his comments concerning the 1964 campaign. With permission to extend my remarks and in further support of my proposals to limit Presidential campaigns to 60 days, I include herewith a portion of Mr. Stanton's December 8, 1964 speech:

Too Long, Too Expensive, Too Arduous

If the electorate was bored and disgusted, there is evidence that the candidates were exhausted and perhaps even remorseful. After the campaign was over, the Democratic Vice Presidential candidate said, "What we really find ourselves doing with these long, extended campaigns of 2 to 3 months is replaying old material. And it loses a quality of its spontaneity and its freshness, and therefore I think that you [the candidate] tend to become tired; the public becomes a little tired." His opponent, the Republican Vice Presidential candidate, agreed that the campaign was "too long, too expensive, too arduous, and too boring for the public."

The depressed level of the campaign of 1964 was reflected in the turnout on Election Day. Only 61.3 percent of eligible voters went to the polls, as compared to an alltime high of 64 percent 4 years ago, in 1960. And while the 1960 vote represented an increase of more than 11 percent in the number of voters casting their ballots over that of 1956, the 1964 vote amounted to an increase of only 1.5 percent over that of 1960, despite a 6 percent rise in the number of eligible voters. (Of the 1.5 percent increase in ballots cast, one-fifth was accounted for by the District of Columbia which was enfranchized for the first time since 1800.)

This could have come as no surprise to anyone who followed the uninspired and uninspiring use of communications in the 1964 campaign. Compared to the peak audience of 75 million that witnessed the Presidential debates of 1960, the peak audience of any political broadcast in 1964—the night before the election—was only 16 million. And the rate at which television audiences watched the other paid, set-piece political programs of 1964, compared to the average audience of 71 million for all four debates in 1960, is no less persuasive evidence that something is tragically wrong with the role that today's communications are permitted to play in American political life.

ALTERED CONTEXT OF POLITICAL LIFE

It takes no mystical insight to see where the trouble lies to a great extent. The fact of the matter is that, instead of using the great communications advances of our time, the political forces in this country have been resisting them—commanding them, like latter-day Joshuas commanding the sun, to stand still while the politicians do business at the old stand in the old way. And the citizen is expected to carry out electoral duties paced and dictated by the rapid complexities of the 20th century in accordance with the slow simplicities of the 19th. There is an ugly and dangerous anachronism in the facts of our scientific and political life. The Vice-President-elect put this bluntly enough after the election when he said, "we are going to have to catch up politically with the developments in science."

But we are not going to bring our political processes into line with the scientific realities of our time unless we face some elementary truths. Primary among these is the need for a clearheaded, realistically coordinated, and bona fide effort on the part of our political leaders and our political representatives to accept the fact that electronic communications have profoundly altered the context of political life today—and altered it to the good. And we need to adapt our old political processes to this new reality. We need this done now—when, since there is no campaign either current or immediately impending, there is no question of advancing or impeding the interest of any one party or of any one candidate.

PRISONERS OF AN UNWORKABLE RELIC

So far as the public interest goes, the people of this country are the prisoners of a discredited and unworkable legal relic of a generation ago: Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, which requires equal time to be given by broadcasting stations to all candidates of all political parties, major or minor, for an office—and there were 12 parties with candidates for the Presidency in 1964—if time is given to the candidates of any party for that office. It was the suspension of this legislation by joint congressional resolution for the 1960 Presidential and Vice Presidential campaign that made possible the Kennedy-Nixon debates and other types of broadcasts involving the candidates. It was the failure to suspend or repeal the section that, for all practical purposes, made similar confrontations between the major Presidential candidates in 1964 impossible.

Despite the almost unanimous editorial voice of American newspapers, despite the repeated requests of broadcasters, despite the demonstrably and widely acclaimed success of the 1960 suspension, there has been no resolute, conclusive legislative action getting rid, for once and for all, of the obstructive equal-time restrictions.

They will not be gotten rid of unless—and until—the electorate of this country speaks with such a loud and unmistakable demand that neither political stalling nor parliamentary juggling can silence or contradict it. For it is section 315 that keeps our political methods a century behind our communications.

SENSELESSLY PROLONGED CAMPAIGN

Once this log jam is broken, the way will be clear to taking a new look at the decrepit political practices that, having long outlived their point and their usefulness, hamper rather than advance the sensitive and difficult business of self-government.

Not the least of these outdated usages is the senselessly prolonged campaign between the conventions and the election. A hundred years ago, 3 months and more were necessary for the candidates to travel around the more than 3 million square miles of this country in order to be seen and heard by the voters. Even then, only a microscopic percent of the electorate ever saw any of the candidates or even heard them. Day after day of repetitious speeches, mile after mile of tedious travel, rally after carefully staged rally—after weeks of all this, the electorate was an emotional bundle of impressions far more often than an informed judge of qualifications. And yet 12 years have gone by since this outmoded and outworn ritual, with its unnecessary expense of time and constantly increasing expense of money, has been made obsolete by advances in electronic communications.

As long ago as January 1953, William S. Paley, chairman of CBS, put the case very clearly: "I would like to present for the earnest consideration of the two major political parties," Mr. Paley said, "the proposal that the national conventions should start around September 1. Allowing 3 weeks for the completion of the nominating process, this would leave approximately 6 to 7 weeks for the two candidates to present their cases to the people. The effective use of television and other media of communication, combined with the basic minimum traveling demands required by political necessity, would, in my judgment, enable the candidates to register a deep and pervasive impact on the electorate during this 7-week period." The experience of the 1960 presidential campaign suggests that, with the unfettered use of television, the campaign could be even shorter—perhaps no longer than a month.

PRICE FOR THE DELAY MOUNTS

The reform is now long overdue. Every year the price for the delay mounts—not only in huge campaign costs, but also in terms of the suspension of normal legislative and executive functioning, uncertainty among other nations as to our future policies, and the bitterness at home that becomes inevitable as charges and countercharges stretch out interminably.

No constitutional and no statutory barrier stands in the way of the realistic and forward step suggested by Mr. Paley 12 years ago. Given the repeal of section 315, to rid electronic communications of the equal-time straitjacket, all that is required—beyond a clear look at the facts—is action by the two major party's national committees, which have been fixing the dates of nominating conventions for over a hundred years. During that span of time presidential campaigns have varied in length from 25 to 10 weeks.

THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT DESIGNED TO RETRAIN UNEMPLOYED WORKERS IN AREAS OF SERIOUS UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 was designed to establish programs to retrain unemployed workers in areas of serious unemployment.

The requirement that the State and local government match these funds, while theoretically sound, all but nullifies this act in areas where it is most needed. These economically depressed areas are not only losing population but property values are dropping rapidly and in many cases large corporations, which paid a substantial portion of the taxes in the area, are disappearing either by a voluntary secession of operations or through bankruptcy.

The tax base loss from such economic developments is quite serious, and it is further decreased by the fact that a substantial number of the wage earners who, were they employed, would maintain normal income and property values for the business firms in the area, now contribute nothing to the economic health of the area.

If we are to make this program effective in areas where it is most needed, we must remove the requirement for State matching funds. The amendment to the act, which I have introduced today makes it possible to maintain a sound, well-rounded, manpower training act in those economically depressed areas which most need such a program.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, FEBRUARY 16

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, all of us need to be reminded that February 16 marks the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. We need to be reminded of this anniversary because it marks the day when a valiant people succeeded in proclaiming their independence after centuries of subjugation and of rule by external authorities.

All the liberty-loving people of the world rejoiced on that day in February 1918 because of this significant democratic victory. The free peoples of the world observed with appreciation and admiration the rapid strides which this small and new Lithuanian Republic made in its form of government and in the social, economic, and cultural fields.

Unfortunately, it was for only a brief span of a score of years that this progressive young nation could enjoy its achievements and its independence. All too soon, its self-determination and its sovereignty were lost and its people made vassals of a bigger and more powerful nation.

Although successfully fighting Russian maneuvers and attempts to engulf it for 3 years, Lithuania was illegally incorporated into the Soviet Union as its 14th republic.

Since this event, the plight of the people of Lithuania has been and is today tragic. Almost overnight the progress made and the institutions developed under the banner of equality and freedom were wiped out.

The Soviet Union stands before these people and their relatives who have fled to freedom elsewhere as a tyrant and a bullying oppressor. The United States and other freedom-loving nations have never recognized the legality of this Soviet steal. I trust that we never yield to any persuasions to recognize the infamous act of the U.S.S.R. in swallowing up a proud and free nation which gave such promise as did Lithuania.

Today as never before we need to continue to maintain our guard to prevent similar illegal Communist moves being enforced against other nations of the world. This Lithuanian Independence Day anniversary should make us more determined to combat Communists and communism in all its evil intentions. This day should remind us not only of those great men and women again living under foreign domination in Lithuania but it should remind us of that fine segment of American citizens—the Lithuanian-born Americans and the Americans born of Lithuanian parents. We join them in celebrating this independence day and we congratulate them on the great and constant contribution which they continue to make to our country. On this anniversary we renew our pledge to do our utmost to hasten the day when once more Lithuania can truly celebrate its independence day.

HORTON AMENDMENT FOR PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY AND SUCCESSION

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1963, the late Senator Estes Kefauver opened an inquiry into presidential inability pleading for statesmanship. He said:

> We are very fortunate that this country now has a young, vigorous, and obviously healthy President. This will allow us to explore these problems in detail without any implication that the present holder of the office is not in good health.
>
> The essence of statesmanship is to act in advance to eliminate situations of potential danger. * * *

Before the year was out, both the Senator from Tennessee and the "young, vigorous, and obviously healthy President" to whom he had referred were dead. The lessons implicit in this ironic twist of circumstances are too apparent to require extended elaboration. No one, regardless of station, has anything more than a day-to-day lease on life. We are in all respects tenants at will or sufferance.

Despite universal awareness of this grim imperative and notwithstanding the classic examples of Presidents Garfield and Wilson, the Congress has comported itself as if the facts were otherwise. Under the impact of each succession or tragedy involving our Nation's highest officers, we have marched up the hill of legislative action firm in our resolve to find a solution. As the emergency subsided, we have marched down again bearing only unfulfilled promises.

In Dallas, as on seven previous occasions, a Vice President became President as a result of the incumbent's death. Although there was some little discussion about what he succeeded to—the office or the powers and duties—President Johnson took an oath to become President.

But what happens when a President is incapacitated for some reason and is unable to perform his duties? Can the Vice President act in his place? Who determines whether the President is incapable of acting? Who decides when he has recovered?

The Constitution's vagueness in these particulars has occasioned perplexity and discomfiture for more than a century. The circumstances surrounding the death of President Kennedy have taught us that we can no longer afford the uncertainty that presently exists.

I have today introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing a solution to the problems of presidential inability and succession. Under the terms of my proposal, the inability of the President may be established by a declaration in writing of the President. Similarly, it would provide that the ability of the President to resume his powers and duties also shall be established by his declaration in writing. To insure that the President may regain his powers and duties as soon as he is able to discharge them after relinquishing them himself to the Vice President, I have included language providing that the President may resume his duties and powers immediately upon declaring his inability at an end.

In the event that the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet or such other body as Congress shall provide do not concur in the decision of the President, the matter would be resolved by the veto of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress. Should the House and Senate fail to act promptly, the President would automatically resume his powers and duties 10 days after declaring the termination of his inability.

In the event the President fails or is unable to declare himself incapacitated, it may be established by the Vice President with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet or by such other body as the Congress may provide.

In order to still the recurrent controversy that accompanies each succession, the proposal would provide that in the event of death, resignation, or removal of the President, the Vice President shall succeed to the office for the unexpired term.

Because of the transformation of the Vice-Presidency from an office of obscurity to one of growing influence and national prominence, it is important that it be filled at all times. Under my proposal, when a vacancy occurs in the vice-presidential office, the President would be authorized to nominate a person who, upon confirmation by a majority of the Congress, would become Vice President for the unexpired term.

Mr. Speaker, divine providence has given us a renewed opportunity for statesmanship. To miss the opportunity again could amount to a mortal omission.

HORTON BILL FOR PROTECTION OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the important recommendations made to Congress by the Warren Commission was that legislation be enacted making it a Federal crime to attack or assassinate the President, the Vice President, any officer next in the line of succession to the Presidency, and President-elect, or the Vice-President-elect. Similar provisions are needed to protect members of the President's Cabinet and Members of Congress as well.

Bills for this purpose, including my proposal of November 27, 1963, were submitted in the Second Session of the 88th Congress, but action was not taken. One of them passed in both the House and Senate as long ago as 1902, but failed of enactment by disagreement in conference between the House and Senate. Such a bill should be enacted now.

The Senate sponsor of the bill introduced in 1902, Senator George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts, spoke as follows on the reason for making such homicidal attacks punishable under Federal law:

> What this bill means to punish is the crime of interruption of the Government of the United States and the destruction of its security by striking down the life of the person who is actually in the exercise of the executive power, or of such persons as have been constitutionally and lawfully provided to succeed thereto in case of a vacancy. It is important for this country that the interruption shall not take place for an hour.

Congress long ago made it a Federal offense to attack or murder various categories of Federal employees, including Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, customs agents, and postal inspectors. By this bill the full resources of the Federal Government would be brought into action in case of any future attack upon the President or those in the line of succession to him, just as they now may be brought to bear if those lesser officials I have named are subjected to murderous violence.

The Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate properly waited for the recommendations of the Warren Commission in this matter. The recommendation has now been made unequivocally. The case for making physical attack upon the President and those in the line of succession a Federal crime is so clear that there is no occasion for delay. Even if there had been no tragedy at Dallas and no failures on the part of State authorities in the custody of the alleged assassin, it would still be eminently desirable to extend the added protection of a Federal statute around the President and all those who would succeed him in the event of his death or disability.

If this bill is enacted, it will mean that Federal law-enforcement officers must investigate such crimes against our highest officials. The Warren Commission report has noted that, as it is now, such Federal agencies as the FBI participate in investigations of the heinous crime of presidential assassination "only upon the sufferance of the local authorities." Moreover, the Commission has pointed out that the enactment of this bill would "insure that any suspects who are arrested will be Federal prisoners, subject to Federal protection from vigilante justice and other threats."

We have a duty to the memory of the late President to enact this bill. We have a duty to the administration of criminal justice by our Federal Government to enact this bill. We have a duty to the preservation of our constitutional system of government to enact this bill.

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation—recommended by the President—which will again amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

You and the Members of this House will recall, I am sure, that when I asked your support for the original Manpower Development and Training Act program, in February 1962, I stated that "this is the first of many steps we must take if we hope to eventually eliminate our unemployment problem."

In December of 1963 I requested the support of the Members for amendments to this act as the first year's experience in administering the program had revealed the need for providing basic academic education—along with occupational training—if we hoped to reach the hard-core unemployed. Other changes were made at that time also, and all were directed toward eliminating roadblocks discovered in our attempt to retrain the unemployed. These were some of the "additional steps" I had said we would probably have to take.

Today I am introducing additional amendments which we have found to be necessary if we hope to enjoy full employment in this Nation.

The Manpower Development and Training Act has proved that it can get our unemployed workers back into the active labor market. The records show that between 70 and 80 percent of all those retrained under this program are gainfully employed. Not only have these people been made active participants in our economy but, above all, they have regained their self-respect, for they were all eager to return to the ranks of the taxpayers rather than remain on the public relief rolls.

Only last week the city of Pittsburgh—a part of which is in my congressional district—reported that retraining courses for jobless workers are saving the taxpayers of the city $35,000 a month in relief payments. I am sure that similar conditions exist in the districts of many other Members.

The continuation of this program is certainly necessary and, I am happy to say, it has gained the support of all segments of our Nation—industry, labor, education, government, and even the average citizens who belong to no specific group or organization.

Because of its noncontroversial nature, I anticipate early passage of this legislation.

The need for its uninterrupted continuation is mandatory and, for this reason, the Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, has scheduled public hearings on these amendments starting tomorrow, February 4. The Secretary of Labor, the Honorable Willard W. Wirtz, will be our opening witness; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, will testify on February 5; with Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, the legislative director for the AFL-CIO, scheduled to testify on February 10.

Additional hearings will be scheduled, and it is my hope that in the very near future, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will be reported to the House for final passage.

With the unanimous consent of the House, I am appending to my remarks a brief explanation of the amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act proposed by the administration:

OUTLINE OF PROVISIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

1. Termination date: Removes the June 30, 1966, termination date of the title II provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

2. Job development programs: Directs the Secretary to stimulate and assist job development programs to fill service needs which are not being met because of a lack of trained workers or other reasons affecting employment.

3. Experimental and demonstration programs: Expands the Secretary's research authority under title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act so that he may undertake experimentation and demonstration projects, and make grants to or contract with appropriate organizations for such purposes.

4. Labor mobility demonstration projects: Extends authority to conduct such projects for 2 more years, increases appropriations for such projects from $4 million to $5 million a year, removes the language which restricts the type of relocation expenses covered by the section to transportation costs and grants to 50 percent of such costs, adds provisions dealing with loans, and makes the provisions a part of title I, repealing section 208 accordingly.

5. Trainee bonding demonstration projects: Further amends title I to provide for demonstration projects to assist in the placement of trainees who have difficulty in securing bonds required for employment. Not more than $200,000 for fiscal year 1966 and $300,000 for fiscal year 1967 is authorized for such projects.

6. Training allowances:

(a) Extends period of training allowance support from 1 to 2 years.

(b) Changes eligibility requirements to permit single persons without dependents to receive training allowance.

(c) Increases training allowances by $5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of six.

7. Revision of limitation on number of youths who may receive training allowances: The act presently provides that not more than 25 percent of those receiving training allowances may be under the age of 22. This provision is amended to enable the Secretary of Labor to make such adjustments as administrative necessity may require.

8. Transportation allowances: Permits the payment of transportation allowances for daily commuting between the residence and the place of training.

9. Outside work for on-the-job trainees: Permits on-the-job trainees to engage in up to 20 hours of outside work without a reduction in their training allowance.

10. Matching funds: Matching for training allowances and HEW training programs may be combined and is put on a 90–10 basis. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind.

11. Appropriations:

(a) The present monetary limitations in section 304 of the Manpower Act on authorizations authorized for each title are replaced by an open-end authorization for the whole act.

(b) Makes it clear that costs of training allowances as well as institutional costs approved in any fiscal year may be paid out of funds appropriated for that fiscal year. Also permits the non-Federal contribution to be based on the matching requirement in existence at the time the training program is approved. (Thus, training programs approved before June 30, 1965, will not require matching by the States, even though payments to States are made after that date.)

12. Area Redevelopment Act: Authorizes special funds under the Manpower Act for training programs in areas designated as redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment Act to be carried out by the Secretaries of Labor and HEW pursuant to the MDTA, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce and with full Federal financing. The need for the separate training provisions now in the Area Redevelopment Act is thus eliminated and the training requirements in all areas can be conformed to the maximum extent practicable.

13. Miscellaneous: Technical changes are made in the method of computing the average weekly unemployment compensation payment in the States, upon which weekly training allowances are based.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), for 20 minutes, on February 4.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), for 30 minutes, on February 3.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 5 minutes, on Thursday, February 4, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FLYNT.

Mr. CARTER (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. TALCOTT.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COOLEY.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 701. An act to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall in the Senate during the 80th and 81st Congresses; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 4, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

490. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on supply support deficiencies contributing to high deadline rate of air defense equipment at an oversea location, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

491. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate maintenance and supply support of aviation units of the Eighth U.S. Army, Korea, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

492. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate maintenance and supply support of aircraft of the Seventh U.S. Army, Europe, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

493. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year 1964, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 858 (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

494. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to make uniform for all commodities, for which a marketing quota program is in effect, provisions for reducing farm acreage and producer allotments for falsely identifying, failing to account for disposition, filing a false acreage report, and for harvesting two crops of the same commodity produced on the same acreage in a calendar year; and to provide in the case of peanuts and tobacco for credit for penalties paid on marketings against penalties incurred for false identification or failure to account; to the Committee on Agriculture.

495. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a copy of the 14th Annual Report of Selective Service for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 10(g) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

496. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

497. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on weaknesses involving primarily the disposition of surplus nonfat dry milk, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

498. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on increased costs due to failure to obtain competition in procurement of electronic parts on qualified products lists at the Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio, Defense Supply Agency, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

499. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs resulting from the use of statewide personnel in civilian positions at naval installations on Guam, Mariana Islands, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

500. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide cost-of-living allowances for judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska or Hawaii"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

501. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in their behalf, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

502. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting a copy of the 48th Annual Report of the U.S. Tariff Commission for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 3818. A bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONAGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of Special Study Mission to Europe 1964 (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 4224. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4225. A bill to correct inequities in the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act and in other laws governing civil service retirement benefits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 4226. A bill to repeal retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4227. A bill to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 4228. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 4229. A bill to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery below but as near the Wolf Creek Dam, on the Cumberland River, near Jamestown, Ky., as is feasible and practicable; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 4230. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4231. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4232. A bill to authorize the President to recognize the Union Army of the Centennial, Inc., as a nonprofit organization consisting of reactivated military units that were active during the American Civil War 1861–65 and loyal to the Union. This organization being established to commemorate the American Civil War and designed to observe this period and afterwards with appropriate ceremonies and activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4233. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4234. A bill to repeal the Federal excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage and handbags, general telephone service, general admissions, transportation of persons by air, and safe deposit boxes, effective for periods after March 31, 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4235. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 4236. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, in computing annual income for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain pensions, certain payments received on account of disability shall be excluded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4237. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the central west coast area of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4238. A bill to amend section 612(e) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of outpatient medical services to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4239. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,500 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4240. A bill to amend section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of the compensation of chaplains employed by the Veterans' Administration shall be considered as a rental allowance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4241. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 4242. A bill to establish a Commission on Congressional Reorganization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FALLON (by request):

H.R. 4243. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to extend construction authority for facilities at Guam and the Virgin Islands of the United States (76 Stat. 87; 19 U.S.C. 68); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4244. A bill to provide that cigarettes sold in interstate and foreign commerce shall be packaged and marked so as to bear a warning that they may be dangerous to health and to show the nicotine and tar content of the cigarettes in each package; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4245. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954 as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4246 A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Senior Citizens within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help senior citizens; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4247. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4248. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4249. A bill to prohibit literacy tests with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 4250. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to authorize urban planning grants for areas affected by Federal treaties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4251. A bill to provide that any civilian agency which contemplates moving or closing any of its installations shall notify the Members of Congress concerned and shall afford an opportunity for public hearings with respect to such contemplated action; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 4252. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Herbert Hoover National Monument in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4253. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 4254. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4255. A bill to amend the Unemployment Tax Act so as to exempt from coverage thereunder service performed in the employ of certain tax-exempt agricultural or horticultural organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4256. A bill to amend section 883 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to exemption from taxation of earnings of ships under foreign flag; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4257. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4258. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States, members of the President's Cabinet, and Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4259. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the taxable year of a partnership with respect to a deceased partner shall close as of the date of his death unless the successor in interest of such deceased partner elects not to have such year close; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit corporations to qualify as real estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 4261. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4262. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4263. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 4264. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 4265. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises (now exempt) engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing of clothing or fabrics which compete substantially in the same metropolitan area with similar enterprises not exempt and to lessen unfair competition; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 4266. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4267. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make the robbery of a cooperative bank which is a member of the Federal home loan bank, a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4268. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4269. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the silver content of certain coins of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4270. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to remove therefrom the requirements for State matching funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4271. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 4272. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4273. A bill to provide for an Administrative Counsel of the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 4274. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life of the Honorable Sam Rayburn and to assist in the support of the Sam Rayburn Library; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 4275. A bill to continue the Commission on Civil Rights on a permanent basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4276. A bill to provide for declaratory judgment procedures in cases involving refusal of witnesses to testify or produce papers before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4277. A bill to punish the killing, attempted killing, or assaulting of the President of the United States and other high officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4278. A bill to amend section 2(2) of the National Labor Relations Act to provide that the definition of "employer" therein shall include certain corporations or associations operating a hospital; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4279. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to provide relocation payments for persons displaced from their places of residence or business as a result of construction financed thereunder; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4280. A bill to amend part B of title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide relocation payments for persons displaced from their places of residence or business as a result of construction thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4281. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 4282. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for an individual member of a recognized religious sect who is conscientiously opposed to acceptance of benefits because of his adherence to the established tenets or teachings of such sect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4283. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain forms of nickel be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 4284. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia to provide for the financial protection of certain persons suffering injury as a result of the operation of a motor vehicle by uninsured motorists; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4285. A bill to strengthen the Motor Vehicle Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4286. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent duplication of benefits based on disability in cases where the disabled individual receives workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4287. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 4288. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for certain additional hospital employees in California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 4289. A bill to permit Federal savings and loan associations to make loans for the acquisition of major household durable goods and furnishings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4290. A bill to permit Federal savings and loans associations to make loans for vocational education to the same extent as they are permitted to make such loans for academic education; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 4291. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4292. A bill to provide for the protection, preservation, and maintenance of the historic buildings and area of the Washington Navy Yard in the Nation's Capital, and the development of the area for the exhibition of historic ships and weapons, for the benefit of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 4293. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4294. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRALEY:

H.R. 4295. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 4296. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 4297. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4298. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 4299. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 4300. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 4301. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 4302. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4303. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4304. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.J. Res. 269. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the apportionment of districts from which members of subordinate State units of government are to be elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.J. Res. 270. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any States to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.J. Res. 271. Joint resolution to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers excise tax on cosmetics and purses and handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.J. Res. 272. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 273. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to apportionment of the membership of State legislatures and of subordinate governing units of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 274. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.J. Res. 275. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 276. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution authorizing the First Cavalry Division Association to erect a monument in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 166. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and other Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a study of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Con. Res. 169. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H. Res. 176. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discontinuance of air service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H. Res. 177. Resolution to urge the President of the United States to cancel all action in connection with the closing of veterans hospitals awaiting study by the subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 178. Resolution to urge the President of the United States to cancel all action in connection with the closing of veterans hospitals awaiting study by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H. Res. 179. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H. Res. 180. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H. Res. 181. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 182. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Res. 183. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 184. Resolution condemning persecution of national and religious minorities in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 185. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. Res. 186. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study the operation of hospital facilities by the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H. Res. 187. Resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 188. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to direct the Secretary of Commerce to include a portion of U.S. Highway 95 in the Federal-aid highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 4305. A bill for the relief of Lee Kam Jon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 4306. A bill for the relief of Maja Thomsen Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4307. A bill for the relief of Mimi Abadi, Zaki Ezra Abadi, Ezra Abadi, Rachel Abadi, Meyer Abadi, Rosette Abadi, Hayem Abadi, Albert Abadi, and Eliahu Abadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4308. A bill for the relief of Oi-Ling Ma, Kwok-Wai Ma, Yui-Chiu Ma, Sai-Mi Ma, and Sai-Wan Ma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4309. A bill for the relief of Tong Yung Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4310. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew B. Kasprzyk and Genevieve Kasprzyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO (by request):

H.R. 4311. A bill for the relief of Teresina Fara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.R. 4312. A bill for the relief of Dr. Amin A. Faris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4313. A bill for the relief of Emilie Antoine Stergiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4314. A bill for the relief of Elaine Minerva Hylton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4315. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Lawrence Nestor against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4316. A bill for the relief of Hisae Otsu Coleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4317. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Rappa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4318. A bill for the relief of Vinton Walker Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4319. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey certain lands in Saline County, Ark., to the Dierks Forests, Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 4320. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Mistica Adornetti and Sister Elena Brogno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4321. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Boscarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By. Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 4322. A bill for the relief of Harry Nicolas Vakalopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4323. A bill for the relief of Gorgonio B. Policar, Jr., M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4324. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 4325. A bill to authorize the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to rent certain property in the District of Columbia for certain office purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 4326. A bill for the relief of Borivoj Divcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4327. A bill for the relief of Brenda Patricia Fawkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 4328. A bill for the relief of Lawerence C. Fincher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4329. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabel Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4330. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Spataro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 4331. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of the Algonac Manufacturing Co. and John A. Maxwell against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 4332. A bill for the relief of the Students' Association of the University of Texas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4333. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late William F. Valters a commission as second lieutenant, Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4334. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ofra Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4335. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isabelo Remedio Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4336. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hotica Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4337. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Pichon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4338. A bill to authorize the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to rent certain property in the District of Columbia for certain office purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4339. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Kirousi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 4340. A bill for the relief of Virginia Clemente Coelho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4341. A bill for the relief of Primo Meconi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4342. A bill for the relief of Guido Aquilini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4343. A bill for the relief of Farida Hanna Hazbon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4344. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kodungallore Janaki Warner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Dr. James P. Wesberry, pastor, the Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Once again, our Heavenly Father, we are grateful for the privilege of being in our Nation's Capitol, with its giant dome of architectural beauty, its crowning statue of freedom, and this sacred Chamber where a just and adequate edifice of law is built upon the heritage of our fathers.

We come humbly to unite our prayer, with those of multiplied millions of our fellow citizens, on behalf of each Member of the U.S. Senate, the Vice President, the Chaplain, the clerks, and all others who share and bear with them the heaviest governmental responsibility on earth.

Grant, we beseech Thee, most gracious God, unto these, Thy servants, in whose hands rest the welfare and virtue of the people to make or mar, divine wisdom, that their decisions may be righteous; divine guidance, that no ill will shall befall them or us; divine sympathy, that they may serve the best interests of all the people; and the counsel of Thy Holy Spirit, that they may know themselves to be Thy ministers.

Give Thou strength and health and Thy special providential care to the President of the United States.

Fill each of our hearts, we pray, with the love of God and the daring of Thy kingdom in the perennial and holy warfare for the freedom, justice, and rights of people everywhere. Renew our vision, O God, of the possible future of our country, and set our hearts on fire with new determination to do Thy will and to speed the coming of Thy kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 2, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases; and

H.R. 214. An act to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 214. An act to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read routine nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to make an announcement, that pursuant to Public Law 86–420, the Chair appoints the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to be a member of the fifth meeting of the Mexico-United States interparliamentary group in lieu of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] who is excused.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to make uniform for all commodities, for which a marketing quota program is in effect, provisions for reducing farm acreage and producer allotments for falsely identifying, failing to account for disposition, filing a false acreage report, and for harvesting two crops of the same commodity produced on the same acreage in a calendar year; and to provide in the case of peanuts and tobacco for credit for penalties paid on marketings against penalties incurred for false identification or failure to account (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Increased Federal Government Participation in Meeting Costs of Maintaining the Nation's Capital City

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Section 374 of Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to measurement of farms (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that an appropriation to the White House Office for salaries and expenses, for the fiscal year 1965, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Reports of District of Columbia Armory Board

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of that Board on the District of Columbia National Guard Armory and the District of Columbia Stadium, including financial statements, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Audit Report on Farm Credit Administration

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farm Credit Administration, fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on supply support deficiencies contributing to high deadline rate of air defense equipment at an oversea location, Department of the Army (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on inadequate maintenance and supply support of aviation units of the 8th U.S. Army, Korea, Department of the Army (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on accumulation and retention of excess missile spare parts due to inadequate supply management practices of the U.S. Army, Europe, Department of the Army, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on weaknesses involving primarily the disposition of surplus nonfat dry milk, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on increased costs due to failure to obtain competition in procurement of electronic parts on qualified products lists at the Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio, Defense Supply Agency, Department of Defense, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on inadequate maintenance and supply support of aircraft of the 7th U.S. Army, Europe, Department of the Army (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from the use of stateside personnel in civilian positions at naval installations on Guam, Marianas Islands, Department of the Navy, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Certain Activities of Geological Survey

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on activities exercised through the Geological Survey to areas outside the national domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

General Revision of the Copyright Law, Title 17 of the United States Code

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and for reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COST-OF-LIVING ALLOWANCES FOR CERTAIN JUDICIAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide cost-of-living allowances for judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska or Hawaii (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF LOSSES OR COSTS INCURRED BY THE POSTAL SERVICE

A letter from the Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the estimated amount of the losses or costs (or percentage of costs) incurred by the postal service in the performance of public services, during the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 1965; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON MEASURES BEING TAKEN TO CONTROL THE EMISSION OF AIR POLLUTANTS FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on measures being taken to control the emission of air pollutants from Federal facilities, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL IN THE BRIGHTON DISTRICT OF BOSTON

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Massachusetts House of Representatives that the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in the Brighton district of Boston will be closed; and

"Whereas more than 60,000 outpatients, many of whom are fishermen engaged in New England's oldest industry, are treated annually in this facility; and

"Whereas if the Rutland Heights Hospital of the Veterans' Administration is closed, the load on remaining U.S. hospitals for inpatient service will be increased: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in the Brighton district of Boston; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States rescind the order providing for the closing of said hospital; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, January 20, 1965.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by District 50, United Mine Workers of America, State of Michigan, relating to medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by District 50, United Mine Workers of America, State of Michigan, relating to the war on poverty; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JORDAN of Idaho:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the act of Congress of June 29, 1956, entitled 'the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956,' (70 Stat. 374), and subsequent revisions thereto, have provided for a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways of not to exceed 41,000 miles of such highway system; and

"Whereas since the enactment of the aforesaid Federal Aid Highway Acts, the construction of the Interstate Highway System is nearing the halfway point in its completion; and

"Whereas the 50 States, in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, are now in the process of preparing a comprehensive study and analysis of overall highway needs, and the financing thereof, after completion in 1972 of the Interstate Highway System; and

"Whereas the aforementioned study will include an evaluation of all Federal aid highway programs, including the possibility of extending the mileage of the Interstate Highway System; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 is presently on the Federal aid primary highway system in the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 is the only north-south route between north Idaho and southwest Idaho and serves an area with a population of 300,000 people, which is 45 percent of the total population of the State of Idaho and would also serve the inland empire area of eastern Washington, including the Spokane, Wash., metropolitan area; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 is one of the most important arterial highways in the State of Idaho; presently the only all-weather, all-year route between north Idaho and south Idaho; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway 95 provides the only north-south connection in Idaho between Interstate Highway No. 90 and Interstate Highway No. 80 North; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 if improved to expressway or interstate highway standards would provide a highway facility having high standards of service and access control and lying approximately midway between Interstate Highway No. 5 to the west and Interstate Highway No. 15 to the east of the currently designated Interstate Highway System; and

"Whereas an improved U.S. Highway No. 95 would provide an excellent highway service tie with transcontinental routes in Canada and with the Alcan Highway to the State of Alaska; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 offers excellent opportunity for extension to the south and west from the Idaho-Oregon State line through Oregon and Nevada to a connection with Interstate No. 80 in the vicinity of Winnemucca, Nev., and this in turn, would provide a most important service connection from California to Idaho and Canada; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 serves the following population centers in Idaho; Bonners Ferry, Sandpoint, Coeur d'Alene, Moscow, Lewiston-Clarkston, Grangeville, Council, Cambridge, Payette-Ontario-Weiser, and Boise-Nampa-Caldwell; in addition to servicing Calgary and Edmonton, Canada; Winnemucca, Reno and Carson City, Nev.; and Sacramento, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, Calif., through connecting interstate highways, as well as numerous historical, recreational, and scenic areas together with the agriculture, mining, and lumbering industries; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 would also serve the important water transportation terminal planned for development at the Port of Lewiston: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge that when priority selection is made for the next most important highways in the United States, after the present Interstate Highway System is completed, that the Congress of the United States of America direct the Secretary of Commerce to include U.S. Highway No. 95 from the Idaho-Oregon State line in the south to the Idaho-Canadian border in the north in the mileage of expressway or interstate highway extensions as may be determined for Federal aid highway programs upon completion of the presently designated Interstate Highway System; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the 18th day of January 1965.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the 20th day of January 1965.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"DRYDEN M. HILER,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas an adequate transportation system is necessary in the proper harvest and use of our natural resources; and

"Whereas the lack of an adequate transportation system is the greatest deterrent to the full use of our natural resources in the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas under the present rate of road construction, it will take 100 years to complete an adequate forest highway transportation system: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America, to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact legislation requiring all Government agencies involved to make sufficient funds available to expedite completion of an adequate transportation system on the main roads of national forests and public domain; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT RUTLAND

"Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has proposed that the medical-surgical facilities of the Veterans' Administration located at Rutland be closed on June 30, 1965; and

"Whereas the closing of these facilities appears to be contrary to the philosophy of rendering maximum benefits to the veterans of the country whose timeless efforts and unselfish sacrifices should always be remembered: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to instruct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to rescind his directive ordering the closing of the veterans' facilities at Rutland; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Surgeon General of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate, January 27, 1965.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. RES. 76. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies (Rept. No. 54).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. RES. 63. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel (Rept. No. 55).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S. 969. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to give 6 months' advance public notice of the planned closing or relocation of any veterans' facility, and to provide for at least one veterans' service center in each State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. BOGGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

S. 970. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to expand and improve services under the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, to provide special funds for training professional personnel for providing health services for crippled children, to provide for a program of medical assistance for children and other persons whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical care and services, to enable States to implement and follow up their planning and other activities leading to comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. RIBICOFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 971. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elena B. Guira; and

S. 972. A bill for the relief of Manuel S. Pablo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 973. A bill to prohibit the use of mail covers to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Missouri, when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. PELL):

S. 974. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 975. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 976. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 977. A bill to provide for the adoption of a perpetual calendar; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. FONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 978. A bill for the relief of Ethel Hudson Morrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 979. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John J. Bailey of Orlando, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 980. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 981. A bill for the relief of Steven Ho, Tsou Chang Mao Ho, and their children, Samuel and Anita; and

S. 982. A bill for the relief of Maj. Robert G. Smith, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 983. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL:

S. 984. A bill to provide for an Administrative Counsel of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. PELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CLOSING OF VETERANS HOSPITALS

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 79); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, Whereas on January 13, 1965, the Acting Administrator of the Veterans' Administration announced the proposed closing of 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliaries and 17 regional offices operated by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas said announcement was made without notice or consultation with Representatives in Congress or Senators or with the appropriate committees of the Congress having jurisdiction over veterans affairs; and

Whereas the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has, since said announcement, begun hearings and studies concerning the need for said hospitals and other facilities and the advisability for said closings; and

Whereas the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has announced its intention to have similar studies and hearings; and

Whereas notwithstanding the interest of these committees of Congress and the hearings and studies already underway, the Veterans' Administration has proceeded to refuse admission to worthy veterans to said hospitals covered by the closure order, and has proceeded to move toward transfer of patients elsewhere, and to take other steps toward closing hospitals to the detriment of veterans needing hospitalization: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that none of the hospitals or other Veterans' Administration facilities mentioned in the order of January 13, 1965, be closed without the approval of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate and the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, and that until those committees have completed their studies and hearings the Veterans' Administration and all of its officers and employees cease and desist from refusing admission of patients or transferring patients or taking steps leading to the closing of said facilities until final action has been taken by the committees.

VETERANS' SERVICE CENTERS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Delaware may proceed.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], I introduce, for appropriate reference, amendments to title 38 of the United States Code, dealing with veterans' benefits.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 969) to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to give 6 months' advance public notice of the planned closing or relocation of any veterans' facility, and to provide for at least one veterans' service center in each State, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Boggs (for himself and Mr. Metcalf), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced would do two things: First, it would call for the location in each State of at least one veterans' service center, a VA field office which would serve as the center for administration in that State of VA programs to its veterans. Second, the bill I have proposed would require that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs give 6 months' notice before closing or materially reducing the services available at any VA hospital, domiciliary or outpatient dispensary.

I have hesitated to take this step, because I am reluctant to impose any restrictions on an agency of the executive branch, but I think that recent experience bears out my thinking that these two small changes in the law are called for.

The first of these proposals, the one relating to veterans' service centers, will not result in a very great change in the administration of our many excellent programs for veterans; but it will, I think, guarantee our former servicemen a measure of sensitive, close-to-home handling of their affairs.

As some Senators are all too painfully aware, the recent move by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to consolidate a number of regional offices will, if it is allowed to proceed, have the effect of removing far from the homes of many of our veterans all but the slightest office contact with the VA. This sort of consolidation may, as the Administrator claims, result in a saving—at least on the books—but my investigation into the matter has convinced me that any savings thus effected will be more than offset by inconvenience and added expense to the veterans served by the so-called remote offices.

Now, the measure which I have proposed would not require that there be a VA office in every hamlet, however sparsely populated or far from a regional center. It would require only that every veteran be able to transact his affairs with the VA within his own State. There is now, in every State and in the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, at least one VA office, either a regional office or VA center. The recent unfortunate cutback decision will leave eight States without such an office. All that this measure would require is that there be at least one such office sufficiently staffed and equipped so that it could handle the affairs of the veterans in the State, rather than having to send to Philadelphia, or Boston, or Los Angeles or Washington for a man's file, for instance, before the office could even begin to consider his case.

This is not simply a matter of State pride—although I for one have noticed with some alarm the increasing tendency of Federal agencies to disregard the States as entities in making up regions for administrative purposes. There is a very compelling practical reason for administration of VA programs at the State level. It is not generally recognized, or fully appreciated, but an astounding amount of the burden of keeping our veterans apprised of their rights and obligations under law is borne by the service organizations such as the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to name only three of these helpful groups. These veterans organizations have assumed and carried out a tremendous responsibility in the vital task of maintaining a working relationship between the veteran and his Government. All of these fine organizations are organized and function on a State-by-State basis. The American Legion, for example, is made up of 58 departments, 1 for each State and the District of Columbia, and 7 outside the country.

It is obvious that if each of these State veterans service units can maintain a working contact with a corresponding State-level VA service center, that will help tremendously in providing service to the State's veterans. And it is equally clear that removal of State contact, or reduction of it to a point where it is substantially lost, would mean a very real breakdown in effective administration of the programs designed to aid those men who have served this Nation so well. Let us look for efficiency and economy in Government by all means, but let us by no means be unduly conscious of cost, when dealing with those who did not count the cost in serving their country. And let us be sure we are talking about real savings, and not merely transferred expense.

The second change in present law which the bill would bring about is quite a simple one, and one to which I should think there could be little objection. Under this change, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs would be required to publish, in the Federal Register, notice of his intention to close any VA medical facility at least 6 months before acting on his proposal to close it; and, if requested, he would have to hold hearings in the congressional district in which the affected facility was located.

There is a human side to every administrative problem. And the 6 months' notice provision which is called for in this bill will allow that human side to make itself known.

The issue in any case of a proposed closing is whether the needs of the area's veterans will be met after the change. A hearing of interested veterans will shed a great deal of light on that issue. The criteria of efficiency and economy remain essential, but no less essential is the reason for the Veterans' Administration itself; namely, service to veterans and their families.

This provision for notice of intention to close any veterans medical facility would prevent any sudden announcement of a decision to take such action before the Congress and others had an opportunity to explore the matter thoroughly. Our recent experience underlines the need to have some prior notification, in my opinion.

To conclude, I simply say that while these two changes are far from earthshaking so far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned, in my opinion they will, if written into the law, provide some very real and needed safeguards for those whom that law, and the agency which administers it, are intended to serve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 969

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 230(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "The Administrator shall establish in each State not less than one veterans' service center, which shall be the center in such State for the administration of programs and services provided by law for veterans and their dependents and beneficiaries; and the Administrator may establish such regional offices and such other field offices within the United States, its territories, Commonwealths, and possessions as he deems necessary. As used in this subsection the term 'State' means the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia."

Sec. 2. Section 5001 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and (2) by inserting after subsection (e) a new subsection (f) as follows:

"(f) No hospital, domiciliary, or outpatient facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be closed or relocated, nor shall the services provided at any such hospital, domiciliary, or outpatient facility be materially expanded or reduced, unless notice of such proposed action has been published in the Federal Register at least one hundred and eighty days prior to the date any action in furtherance of such proposed closing, relocation, expansion or reduction is taken, and opportunity has been afforded, if requested, for a hearing in the congressional district wherein such facility is located on such proposed action by any interested veteran or group of veterans."

CHILD HEALTH AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference the Child Health and Medical Assistance Act of 1965.

The bill amends the Social Security Act to expand and improve services under the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs; to provide special funds for training professional personnel for providing health services for crippled children; to provide for a program of medical assistance for children and other persons whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical care and services, and to enable States to implement and follow up their planning and other activities leading to comprehensive action to combat mental retardation.

This is a bill broad in scope, designed to carry out many of the major health proposals suggested to the Congress by the President in his message of last month. It is identical to the measure introduced last week in the other body by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. President, medical and research technology has advanced the art and science of medicine further in the past 25 years than in all of the previous medical advances in the history of mankind. Already the surgeon's knife enters where it never could before. Entire organs are removed and transplanted; segments of blood vessels replaced. The body temperature is lowered—cooled—while the heart surgeon explores the vital pump. Drugs have conquered once deadly bacterial enemies, others relax the grip of hypertension and even mental disorders. Hormones ease the pain of arthritis and other chronic ailments. Vaccines shield the body against certain viruses. Cancer researchers explore the exciting possibility that a virus may cause that dread disease—and logically, that there may then be a vaccine to protect us from it. Less spectacular but no less important, simple procedures have been devised to detect hidden diseases before outward signs appear, while they can still be treated and still be cured.

We are thrilled and encouraged by these developments but let us never lose sight of the essential question: How vigorously can we put our carefully built scientific capability to the service of those who need it? How swiftly and equitably can we deliver these services to the society of the sixties, the seventies, and the eighties? While we congratulate ourselves on success in sophisticated open-heart surgery successes, let us not forget the child in the slum, who right now is falling victim to a disease for which we long ago discovered preventive vaccines.

Let us not forget especially the health needs of the 15 million children of families who live in poverty.

As President Johnson stated in his message on the Nation's health:

> Our first concern must be to assure that the advance of medical knowledge leaves none behind.

And as the President further stated:

> We must not allow the modern miracles of medicine to mesmerize us. The work most needed to advance the Nation's health will not be done for us by miracles. We must undertake that work ourselves through practical, prudent, and patient programs.

The bill I am introducing today will provide for just such practical, prudent, and patient programs. It builds upon our sizable body of experience with health measures in the fields of maternal and child health services, of crippled children's services and services to the mentally retarded, of school health services, and of health services available through our public assistance programs including medical assistance for the aged.

This bill is designed to help meet many of the urgent health needs pointed out in the President's message. Its provisions for increased authorizations will help the States to extend their maternal and child health services, crippled children's services, and programs to combat mental retardation. Included in these programs are provisions for grants to aid in the training of professional personnel, such as physicians, psychologists, nurses, dentists, and social workers, for work with crippled children, particularly those who are mentally retarded and those with multiple handicaps. We now have severe shortages of professional personnel in these fields.

The bill provides for a 5-year program of special project grants to help the States provide comprehensive health care and services for children of school age and for preschool children, particularly in areas with concentrations of low-income families. Such projects would provide screening, diagnosis, preventive services, treatment, correction of defects, and aftercare for children in low-income families. These measures are of crucial importance because our children represent the future of our Nation, and they must have good health while they are young in order to be able to prepare themselves for full adult participation in our society and to be able to help our Nation meet the challenges of the future.

In addition, the bill provides for greatly needed improvements in the health care available under our public assistance programs. By applying to all of the federally aided public assistance categories the experience we have gained in the program of medical assistance for the aged, we will take a major step toward providing for improvements in the health of children and other needy persons. This bill would establish a program of medical assistance under a new title XVIII of the Social Security Act and would include, under the federally aided public assistance programs administered by the States, a program of medical assistance for all persons now receiving public assistance in the categories of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to families with dependent children.

In addition, it would permit States to include, as is presently done under the program of medical assistance for the aged, medical assistance for needy persons who are able to provide their own maintenance but whose income and resources are not sufficient to meet their medical costs.

The bill would also assure for our needy senior citizens that the federally aided, State-administered programs of medical assistance for the aged would make provision for paying, in the case of eligible individuals, any deductible imposed with respect to individuals under the program established by the Hospital Insurance Act of 1965.

Mr. President, the provisions of the bill will help the States achieve greatly needed advances in making adequate medical care available to children in low-income families and other needy persons and will thereby assure not only a better state of health for these needy families and individuals, but a better state of health for our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a summary of the provisions of the bill prepared by Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 5 days in order that Senators who wish to cosponsor it may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 970) to amend the Social Security Act to expand and improve services under the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, to provide special funds for training professional personnel for providing health services for crippled children, to provide for a program of medical assistance for children and other persons whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical care and services, to enable States to implement and follow up their planning and other activities leading to comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The summary to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE CHILD HEALTH AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE ACT FOR 1965

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

TITLE I—AMENDMENT OF CHILD HEALTH PROGRAMS UNDER TITLE V OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The bill would increase the amounts authorized for maternal and child health services by $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and by additional sums to be determined by the Congress in succeeding fiscal years. Such increases would assist the States to move toward the goal of extending maternal and child health services with a view to making such services reasonably available to children in all parts of the State by July 1, 1975.

Extension of the maternal and child health program to additional parts of the State will provide preventive health services for more mothers and children and contribute to further reduction of infant and maternal mortality through greater availablity of services.

The bill would increase the amount authorized for crippled children's services by $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and by additional sums to be determined by the Congress in succeeding fiscal years. Such increases would assist the States to move toward the goal of extending crippled children's services with a view to making such services reasonably available to children in all parts of the State by July 1, 1975.

Extension of services for crippled children to areas of a State not now served will increase the number of children helped by the program, and make services more accessible in all parts of a State. The increased funds will also help States to extend their programs to urban areas and further broaden their definitions of "crippling" until all State programs would serve children with any kind of handicapping condition or long-term illness.

The bill would increase the amount authorized by the Social Security Act for crippled children's services by such amounts as appropriated by the Congress for fiscal year 1967 and for ensuing fiscal years, such funds to be used for the training of personnel.

Grants would be made to institutions of higher learning for training professional personnel such as physicians, psychologists, nurses, dentists, and social workers for work with crippled children, particularly mentally retarded children, and those with multiple handicaps. Training of such scarce personnel, especially in clinics and university centers, now provided to a limited extent from funds available through the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, would be greatly accelerated.

The program would help to reduce the severe shortage of professional personnel to serve mentally retarded children and children with multiple handicaps.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to carry out a 5-year program of special project grants to provide comprehensive health care and services for children of school age, or for preschool children, particularly in areas with concentrations of low-income families. Projects would provide screening, diagnosis, preventive services, treatment, correction of defects and aftercare for children in low-income families.

An appropriation of $15 million would be authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and necessary amounts for the next 4 fiscal years.

The grants would be available to the State health agency or with its consent to the health agency of any political subdivision of the State, to the State agency administering or supervising the crippled children's program, to schools of medicine, and to teaching hospitals affiliated with schools of medicine.

A full report on the program, including evaluation and recommendations, would be made to the Congress prior to July 1, 1969.

This program would enable State or local health agencies, crippled children's agencies, and medical schools and teaching hospitals to provide comprehensive health care to children in need of such care in areas where low-income families are concentrated and to improve the amount and quality of care available to children of low-income families by the organization of the necessary services to provide care. It would reduce the numbers of children of preschool and school age who are hampered by remediable handicaps and provide necessary medical care for children of low-income families who would otherwise not receive care.

Project applications must show how services will be coordinated with State health, education, and welfare departments.

TITLE II—MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

In order to provide a more effective program of medical care for children and other needy persons, the bill would establish a program of medical assistance under a new title XVIII of the Social Security Act. This single and separate medical assistance program would provide an emphasis now lacking under the separate medical care provisions of the present law as well as extend coverage to include additional children and others in need of help in meeting the cost of medical care.

The proposed title would replace medical assistance for the aged and the provisions for direct payments to suppliers of medical care and services under old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to families with dependent children, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and the consolidated program for the aged, blind, and disabled. The program would be administered by the States (and by the same State agency that administers old-age assistance) and would include all persons now receiving assistance for basic maintenance under the public assistance titles enumerated above. In addition, States may include, as presently done under medical assistance for the aged, persons who are able to provide their maintenance, but whose income and resources are not sufficient to meet their medical care costs. Services offered the former group may be no less in amount or scope than for the latter group. If the medically needy are to be included, comparable eligibility provisions would apply so that all persons similarly situated among the aged, blind, dependent children, and the disabled would be included in the program. No age requirement may be imposed that would exclude any person under 21, or over 65 years. A flexible income test taking medical expenses into account would be used.

The Federal share of medical assistance expenditures under the new program would vary in relation to a State's per capita income with no maximum on the amount of such expenditures in which there would be sharing. The bill also provides that no less than one-half of the non-Federal share shall be met through State rather than local funds and after July 1, 1970, all the non-Federal share would be from State funds. In order to receive any additional Federal funds as a result of expenditures under the program, the States would need to continue their expenditures at their present rate. For a specified period, no State would, however, receive less in Federal funds than under current provisions of law. The bill provides that a State plan will not be approved if the operation of the proposed State program would result in a reduction of assistance under the basic maintenance assistance programs.

In order to continue to receive Federal funds under the new title, the State would need to show progress toward a goal of comprehensive care and services to substantially all needy individuals under its program.

The new title would prohibit the imposition of durational residence requirements. No liens would be imposed against the property of a receipient during his lifetime for assistance correctly paid. Also, no recovery can be made of any medical assistance correctly paid except from the estate of a person over the age of 65 at the time he received medical assistance, and then only after the death of surviving spouse and minor children. Only income which is actually available may be considered in determining need and any resources of the individual must be reasonably evaluated. States may not take into account the financial responsibility of any individual for anyone who is not a spouse or child under the age of 21.

As a minimum, the medical services which must be offered under the plan are to include inpatient hospital services, outpatient hospital services, other laboratory and X-ray services, skilled nursing home services, and physician's services whether furnished in the office, the patient's home, a hospital, or a skilled nursing home. Other items of medical service are enumerated and are optional with the States. Provision would be made for a State authority or authorities to establish, maintain, and improve standards for public and private institutions if the State plan provides for services to be available therein. Included would be standards applicable to arrangements between facilities and institutions that provide care or services.

The States would need to have professional medical personnel to participate in the administration of the program, and the cost of such personnel, whether on the State or local staff, would be shared in by the Federal Government at a rate higher than for normal administrative costs. States may also provide social services with the Federal share of the cost at the same higher rate. The State agency administering the program would need to work out cooperative arrangements with health and vocational rehabilitation agencies looking toward effective coordination of available services. In developing its plan for medical services under the title, States would need to show that in their plans eligibility for care and services will be determined in a manner consistent with simplicity of administration and the best interests of the recipient. The State in determining eligibility and the medical assistance to be provided, would need to make provision for paying, in the case of eligible individuals, any deductible imposed with respect to individuals under the program established by the Hospital Insurance Act of 1965.

If the State plan includes provision for making medical assistance available to persons in mental or tuberculosis hospitals, the State would need to show that appropriate steps are being taken to provide, for such persons, the medical and related services they need, and the States are working toward a comprehensive mental health program in the State. The availability of Federal funds for the cost of medical assistance paid in behalf of such persons is contingent upon a corresponding increase in total expenditures in the State for mental health services.

Under existing law direct payments to suppliers of medical care, i.e., physicians, hospitals, nursing homes, druggist, etc., may be considered as assistance under all of the federally aided programs. In the case of medical assistance for the aged, a single formula applies and all payments under the program are by vendor payment. In old-age assistance there are special provisions for matching vendor payments up to an average of $15 per month and any excess above this average may be matched as regular assistance within the limitations that exist. In the programs of aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to families with dependent children there is no special matching provision for vendor payments but such payments may be counted along with all other payments in determining Federal participation.

Even among these three programs the basic formula is different for aid to families with dependent children than for aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. In the combined adult programs under title XVI the arrangement is essentially the same as that for old-age assistance. Under the medical assistance for the aged program there is no limitation on the amount of expenditures that is matchable while under each of the other programs there is a limitation imposed by an average maximum. Thus, there are wide variations in the extent to which Federal participation is available depending on the individual program, amount of assistance provided in a particular State, and other factors.

The bill would enable the States to establish a program of medical assistance that would afford a uniform basis of Federal participation in expenditures for medical care without regard to any of these other factors. It would assure that some medical care is made available to needy children as well as to adults receiving public assistance and should minimize differences in the services available to them. The bill would also afford a basis for dealing with medically indigent children and adults who would be eligible for federally aided assistance if their needs were sufficiently great. In this respect, it would follow the precedent established by the medical assistance for the aged program.

Since medical assistance would be provided under the program without regard to whether the individuals were or were not receiving money payments, problems of transfer from one program to another would be avoided. Thus there would be no basis for such transfers as have taken place between the OAA and MAA programs. The separate medical care program would provide a solid basis for needed medical assistance to all needy and medically needy people within the scope of the federally aided categories and would result in substantial administrative and program simplification.

TITLE III—IMPLEMENTATION OF MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENT OF TITLE XVII OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

This title would authorize grants totalling $2,750,000 for each of fiscal years—the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. The grants would be available during the year for which the appropriation is authorized and during the succeeding fiscal year. They are for the purpose of assisting States to implement and followup on plans and other steps to combat mental retardation authorized under section 1701 of the Social Security Act.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF MAIL COVERS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, some 2 years ago, there was brought to my attention a method of surveillance practiced by the Post Office Department known as a "mail cover." This technique involves the systematic recording of all mail received by a person or firm as well as the recording of all information obtainable from the mail without opening it.

Under postal regulations, any postmaster in the country is authorized to place a mail watch on a person or firm at the request of any law enforcement official. The regulations authorize such mail covers only for the purpose of locating fugitives from justice. But apparently the postmaster is required to take without question the law enforcement officer's assertion as to purpose. The thought that every policeman, constable, and deputy sheriff in the country has the authority to learn what mail any person is receiving causes me grave concern. But this regulation is only the beginning. Under another regulation, postal inspectors may order mail covers. Evidence which I have collected over the past 2 years indicates that watches will be instituted through the Postal Inspection Service at the request of any Federal agency and practically for any reason.

The Postal Inspection Service claims that agency requests for covers are honored only if they are to be placed on the mail of persons apt to receive communication from a fugitive from justice or on the mail of persons known to have committed or strongly suspected of having committed a serious criminal violation. However, this claim is not substantiated by the information received from other agencies. The Internal Revenue Service last summer told me that the Post Office Department has instituted mail covers at its request as part of employee and tax practitioner integrity investigations. Such investigations are certainly a long way from criminal matters.

My inquiries into the use of mail covers has convinced me of one thing despite protestations of the Post Office Department to the contrary. There is wide open use of this surveillance technique with absolutely no effort at control. During the past 2 years, I have called on the Department on several occasions to discontinue the use of mail covers or at least to establish some system of control. On each occasion, I have been assured they are used sparingly and only where necessary. The evidence does not support this contention.

As a result, I introduced in the last Congress a bill to prohibit mail covers. Since the situation has not improved, I am again introducing a bill for this purpose. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the use of mail covers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 973) to prohibit the use of mail covers, introduced by Mr. Long of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.

This bill, I hope, will become law. In that event, it will be called the Manpower Act of 1965. I assume that, as in former years, it will be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment of that committee will hold hearings on this bill on February 9 and 10.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record. I further ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section description of the bill may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 974) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Clark (for himself and Mr. Pell), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Act of 1965".

Sec. 2. (a) Section 102(5) of the Manpower Development and Training Act, as amended (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), is amended by adding a comma after the word "arrange" and inserting "through grants or contracts," immediately following the comma.

(b) Section 102 of the Act is further amended by adding new paragraphs (6) and (7) at the end thereof to read as follows:

"(6) establish a program of experimental, developmental, demonstration, and pilot projects, through grants or contracts, with public or private nonprofit agencies, for the purpose of improving techniques and demonstrating the effectiveness of specialized methods in meeting the manpower, employment, and training problems of worker groups such as the long-term unemployed, disadvantaged youth, displaced older workers, the handicapped, members of minority groups, and other similar groups. In carrying out this subsection the Secretary of Labor shall, where appropriate, consult with the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Where programs under this section require institutional training, appropriate arrangements for such training shall be agreed to by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He shall also seek the advice of consultants with respect to the standards governing the adequacy and design of proposals, the ability of applicants, and the priority of projects in meeting the objectives of the Act;

"(7) stimulate and assist, in cooperation with interested agencies both public and private, job development programs, through on-the-job training and other suitable methods, that will serve to expand employment by the filling of those service and related needs which are not now being met because of lack of trained workers or other reasons affecting employment or opportunities for employment."

Sec. 3. Sections 103 and 104 are renumbered 105 and 106 and new sections 103 and 104 are added to read as follows:

"LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"Sec. 103. (a) During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out, in a limited number of geographical areas, pilot projects designed to assess or demonstrate the effectiveness in reducing unemployment of programs to increase the mobility of unemployed workers by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such projects the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed.

"(b) Loans or grants provided under this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, with loans subject to the following limitations:

"(1) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

"(2) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

"(3) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

"(4) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (A) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (B) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purposes; and

"(5) the loan is repayable within not more than ten years.

"(c) Of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this Act, not more than $5,000,000 may be used for the purposes of this section.

"TRAINEE BONDING DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"Sec. 104. During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary shall develop and carry out experimental and demonstration projects to assist in the placement of persons seeking employment through a public employment office who have successfully completed or participated in a federally assisted or financed training, counseling, work training, or work experience program and who, after appropriate counseling, have been found by the Secretary to be qualified and suitable for the employment in question, but to whom employment is or may be denied for reasons other than ability to perform, including difficulty in securing bonds for indemnifying their employers against loss from the infidelity, dishonesty, or default of such persons. In carrying out these projects the Secretary may make payments to or contracts with employers or institutions authorized to indemnify employers against such losses. Of the funds appropriated for fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, not more than $200,000 and $300,000, respectively, may be used for the purpose of carrying out this section."

Sec. 4. Section 202(i) of the Act is amended by striking the words "and such persons shall be eligible for training allowances for not to exceed an additional twenty weeks.", and by changing the comma after the word "Act" to a period.

Sec. 5. (a) Section 203(a) of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Amend the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding one hundred and four weeks, and the basic amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed $10 more than the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available: *Provided,* That the basic amount of such payments may be increased by $5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of four additional dependents: *Provided further,* That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of his total allowance, including payments for dependents, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.";

(2) Amend the second paragraph thereof to read as follows: "With respect to any week for which a person receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the total training allowance, including payments for dependents, provided for by the preceding paragraph, a supplemental training allowance may be paid to a person eligible for a training allowance under this Act. The supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the training allowance provided by the preceding paragraph.";

(3) Insert the words "under the training program" after "compensated hours per week" in the third paragraph of such subsection;

(4) In lieu of the fourth paragraph of such subsection insert the following:

"The training allowance of a person engaged in training under sections 204 or 231 shall not be reduced on account of employment (other than employment under an on-the-job training program under section 204) which does not exceed twenty hours per week, but shall be reduced in an amount equal to his full earnings for hours worked in excess of twenty hours per week."

(b) Section 203(b) of the Act is amended by inserting a comma after the word "transportation" where it first occurs, striking out the language after that word and before the word *"Provided"* and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "and when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of the trainee's regular place of residence, subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of the trainee:".

(c) Section 203(c) of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Strike the words "not less than" and insert "at least" in lieu thereof;

(2) Insert a colon after the words "gainful employment", strike everything in the first sentence after the words "gainful employment", and insert the following in lieu thereof: *"Provided,* That they are not members of a family or a household in which the head of the family or the head of the household as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is employed.";

(3) Amend the last sentence to read as follows: "The number of youths under the age of twenty-two who are receiving training allowances shall, except for such adjustments as may be necessary for effective management of programs under this section, not exceed 25 per centum of all persons receiving such allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation)."

(d) Section 203(d) is amended to read as follows:

"For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter, Federal payments for training allowance under this section, or as reimbursement for unemployment compensation under subsection (h), shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 241."

(e) Section 203(h)(2) of the Act is amended by striking everything in the first sentence after the term "1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "and for 90 per centum of the amount of such benefits paid thereafter."

Sec. 6. Section 208 is repealed.

Sec. 7. Section 231 of the Act is amended by striking the third sentence and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, Federal payments under this Part shall be 100 per centum of the cost of carrying out the agreement, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter, Federal payments under this Part shall be made in accordance with the provisions of section 241."

Sec. 8. Title II of the Act is amended by adding part C to the end thereof to read as follows:

"PART C—FEDERAL PAYMENTS FOR TRAINING AND TRAINING ALLOWANCES

"Sec. 241. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter, Federal payments for training allowances and for reimbursements for unemployment compensation under section 203 and for training programs under section 231 shall be limited to 90 per centum of the total of all such costs. Expenditures from non-Federal sources may be made in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services."

Sec. 9. Title II of the Act is amended by adding part D to the end thereof to read as follows:

"PART D—REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"Sec. 251. (a) Notwithstanding any limitation in the other provisions of this Act, the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, in accordance with their respective responsibilities under parts A and B of this title, are authorized to provide a supplementary program of training and training allowances, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, for unemployed and underemployed persons residing in areas designated as redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment Act. Such program shall, insofar as practicable, be carried out by the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare in accordance with the provisions otherwise applicable to programs under this Act and with their respective functions under those provisions, except that—

(1) the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall determine the needs and the eligibility of persons for training under this section;

(2) the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, each with respect to his functions under this section, prescribe jointly with the Secretary of Commerce such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section; and

(3) no funds available under this section shall be generally allocated to any State pursuant to any agreement entered into under this Act, nor shall any State or local matching funds be generally required, nor shall any apportionment of funds be made among the several States, except as the Secretary of Labor or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the case may be, jointly with the Secretary of Commerce, may deem appropriate, giving adequate consideration to the relative needs of the eligible areas.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out this section.

"(c) The expiration or termination of any other part of this Act shall not terminate the authority conferred by this section unless an Act of Congress explicitly so provides."

Sec. 10. Section 302 of the Act is amended by striking the word "and" following "the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act," inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and inserting "and the Vocational Education Act of 1963," following "the Vocational Education Act of 1946."

Sec. 11. Section 304 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. For the purpose of carrying out this Act there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter such amounts as may be necessary."

Sec. 12. The following subsection is added to section 305 of the Act to read as follows:

"(e) The costs of all training programs approved in any fiscal year, including the total cost of training allowances for such programs, may be paid from funds appropriated for such purposes for that fiscal year; and the amount of the Federal payment shall be computed on the basis of the per centum requirement in effect at the time such programs are approved: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, may be expended for training programs approved under this Act prior to July 1, 1965, and expenditures for such purposes shall be subject to the matching requirements in effect at the time such programs were approved."

Sec. 13. Sections 309(a) and 309(b) are both amended by striking "Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to April 1, 1964, April 1, 1965, and April 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof: "Prior to April 1 in each year."

Sec. 14. Title III is amended by repealing section 310.

The section-by-section description presented by Mr. Clark is as follows:

Outline of Provisions of Department of Labor Manpower Act of 1965

1. Termination date: Removes the June 30, 1966 termination date of the title II provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

2. Job development programs: Directs the Secretary to stimulate and assist job development programs to fill service needs which are not being met because of a lack of trained workers or other reasons affecting employment.

3. Experimental and demonstration programs: Expands the Secretary's research authority under title I of the MDTA so that he may undertake experimentation and

demonstration projects, and make grants to or contract with appropriate organizations for such purposes.

4. Labor mobility demonstration projects: Extends authority to conduct such projects for 2 more years, increases appropriations for such projects from $4 million to $5 million a year, removes the language which restricts the type of relocation expenses covered by the section to transportation costs and grants to 50 percent of such costs, adds provisions dealing with loans, and makes the provisions a part of title I, repealing section 208 accordingly.

5. Trainee bonding demonstration projects: Further amends title I to provide for demonstration projects to assist in the placement of trainees who have difficulty in securing bonds required for employment. Not more than $200,000 for fiscal 1966 and $300,000 for fiscal 1967 is authorized for such projects.

6. Training allowances: (a) Extends period of training allowance support from 1 to 2 years; (b) Changes eligibility requirements to permit single persons without dependents to receive training allowance; (c) Increases training allowances by $5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of six.

7. Revision of limitation on number of youths who may receive training allowances: The act presently provides that not more than 25 percent of those receiving training allowances may be under the age of 22. This provision is amended to enable the Secretary of Labor to make such adjustments as administrative necessity may require.

8. Transportation allowances: Permits the payment of transportation allowances for daily commuting between the residence and the place of training.

9. Outside work for on-the-job trainees: Permits on-the-job trainees to engage in up to 20 hours of outside work without a reduction in their training allowance.

10. Matching funds: Matching for training allowances and HEW training programs may be combined and is put on a 90–10 basis. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind.

11. Appropriations: (a) The present monetary limitations in section 304 of the Manpower Act on authorizations authorized for each title are replaced by an open-end authorization for the whole act; (b) makes it clear that costs of training allowances as well as institutional costs approved in any fiscal year may be paid out of funds appropriated for that fiscal year. Also permits the non-Federal contribution to be based on the matching requirement in existence at the time the training program is approved. (Thus, training programs approved before June 30, 1965, will not require matching by the States, even though payments to States are made after that date.)

12. Area Redevelopment Act: Authorizes special funds under the Manpower Act for training programs in areas designated as redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment Act to be carried out by the Secretaries of Labor and HEW pursuant to the Manpower Development and Training Act, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce and with full Federal financing. The need for the separate training provisions now in the Area Redevelopment Act is thus eliminated and the training requirements in all areas can be conformed to the maximum extent practicable.

13. Miscellaneous: Technical changes are made in the method of computing the average weekly unemployment compensation payment in the States, upon which weekly training allowances are based.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill broadens the Manpower Development and Training Act by making the act permanent.

It directs the Secretary of Labor to embark on a news program to train unemployed workers for jobs in the expanding service sector of the economy.

It increases funds for research in new training techniques for the unemployed and those displaced by automation.

It increases from $4 to $5 million the amount available for helping working families to move to where new jobs are located.

The bill increases both the duration and the amount of the retraining allowances and eliminates the limitations on the number of young people who can be retrained under the act.

Most important, the bill recognizes the great financial strains upon the various State treasuries and recommends that the Federal Government fund 90 percent of the cost of the program on a permanent basis, in lieu of the original 50–50 cost-sharing plan originally envisioned when the Manpower Development and Training Act was first passed in 1962.

ADOPTION OF A PERPETUAL CALENDAR

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the adoption of a perpetual calendar, effective January 1, 1967.

This calendar was devised by a fellow Hawaiian, Dr. Willard E. Edwards, in 1919. Dr. Edwards makes a convincing case for the adoption of the perpetual calendar. I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Dr. Edwards entitled, "A Systematic Calendar Recommended," be printed in the Record together with the perpetual calendar.

I also ask unanimous consent that an article written by Sylvia Porter, a noted financial and business columnist, entitled, "Revised Calendar Proposed in Bill," and which appears in today's Washington Star be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the articles and calendar will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 977) to provide for the adoption of a perpetual calendar, introduced by Mr. Fong, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The articles and calendar presented by Mr. Fong are as follows:

A Systematic Calendar Recommended

(By Willard E. Edwards)

A calendar is defined as a system of determining the beginning, length, and divisions of a year. And the word "system" implies a regular, orderly, or logical way of doing something. However, our present calendar is neither systematic nor logical. It has two serious faults; it lacks fixity, and its divisions are unequal.

It is not logical to have irregular and unequal lengths of months, quarters, and half years. Nor is it necessary to have each year begin and end on a different day of the week.

To print just one size of all calendar months, a printer requires 28 plates. He needs seven for starting 28-day months on each day of the week; seven each for 29-, 30-, and 31-day months. To print just one size of our complete calendar years, he needs 14 plates. Seven are required for starting a 365-day year on each day of the week; and seven more for a 366-day year.

February now has 4 Sundays plus 24 workdays, not counting holidays. January and March can have 27 workdays plus 4 Sundays. When compared with February, these 2 months can have three-twenty-fourths or 12½ percent more workdays.

This is very costly in all comparison, statistical, and accounting work. Many workmen paid by the hour earn considerably less in February. But they may have the same monthly rent and other fixed monthly bills to pay. Employers paying employees a fixed monthly salary get less work from them in February. This short month is thus unfair, impractical, and costly, almost any way you look at it.

Some sources say February used to have 29 days but had one day removed and added to a 30-day August to make August a "lucky-number" month. The 6th month of the Roman year, Sextilis, was renamed August in honor of Augustus Caesar. At that time, Romans thought months with an odd number of days were lucky, and that months with an even number of days were unlucky.

February was then at the end of the year and mattered least. The other months of the Roman calendar originally had alternate months of 31 and 30 days, beginning with March.

The first 3 months of our calendar year now have 90 days, the second quarter has 91, and the third and fourth have 92 each. The first half year therefore has 181 days, and the second half 184. This is far from being systematic, logical, or practical.

Since each year starts and ends on a different day of the week, no 2 years are now alike in succession. Our present calendar is simply an awkward arrangement and an expensive heritage from the past. There is little to be gained by cherishing or defending it, and no progress is ever made without change. We have but one clock in international use. Isn't it time we changed to one fixed international standard civil calendar? The clock and the calendar simply record the passing of time, and it would be of great economic and social advantage to have them both as international civil standards.

Regularity and fixity are demanded in all of our other international standards. Why then should we not have fixity and regularity in the calendar? Time is a measurement of the earth's rotation on its axis and of its revolution around the sun. The laws of nature determine the length of our solar year. At noon on January 1, 1965, it was 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, and 45:66 seconds in length. When reduced to a decimal, this period becomes 365.242195 days.

However, the calendar year, when averaged over a period of 400 years, is 365.242500 days in length. Our calendar is thus slow by the small difference of 0.000305 day, or an average of about 26 seconds each year. It will take 3,280 years for the calendar to get behind the solar year by one whole day, providing the annual difference remains constant.

Our calendar was considered corrected in 1582 by Pope Gregory when 10 days were dropped and a new leap-year rule was formulated. Adding 3280 to 1582 we get 4862, and the year 4860 can be counted as a 365-day year instead of a leap year. The calendar will then be corrected for another 32 centuries, and this should be accurate enough for most of us.

There is thus no fault with the length of our calendar year; astronomy does not enter into present calendar revision problems in any way. The great expense and inconvenience in using our present calendar lies entirely in its lack of fixity and in its unequal divisions. When learning of these two faults of our calendar in 1919, I was challenged to devise a better one. "The perpetual calendar" is the result.

By dividing 365 by 4, we get 91¼ days in each 3-month period. By setting aside the quarter day, 91 days may be divided into 30-, 30-, and 31-day months. This allows 13 full weeks in each quarter. Since this would give us a calendar year of only 364 days, or 52 weeks, we must account for 1 day more.

It is most logical to choose New Year's Day and have it become a day apart. It is already an international holiday and can be used like the day we gain when crossing the 180th meridian eastward. We then have an "extra day" as a calendar correction, often called meridian day. It is also called a second Sunday, or any other day of the week, depending on what day the dateline is crossed in an easterly direction. Such an extra day at the dateline has been readily accepted ever since 1884.

In the perpetual calendar, this first day of each year may also be called January 0 for accounting or statistical purposes. Zero is the first cardinal numeral, a perfectly good number, 1 less than 1. In mathematics, it is a real number. It should be shown preceding the figure 1 on our telephone dials and in our dictionaries.

The prime meridian of longitude through Greenwich is "the zero meridian," and the first hour of the day is "the zero hour." We don't say it is 1 o'clock, or 0100, until 1 hour past midnight, the beginning of the second hour of each day.

In the perpetual calendar, the second day of each new year becomes Monday, January 1, a working day. But we will always have a 3-day New Year's weekend. The first day of the year, the New Year's Day holiday, follows a Saturday and Sunday, December 30 and 31. Each quarter and each week starts on a Monday. Saturday and Sunday then become the weekend on the calendar as well as in fact. They are often shown this way on European calendars.

In leap years, a second "day apart" follows June 31 and precedes July 1. It is called leap-year day, a holiday and the first day of the second half year. These 2 days apart may be abbreviated as NYD and LYD. Unless they are used, any other proposed change in the calendar becomes impractical.

By the use of these yeardays or days apart, the calendar becomes fixed and perpetual, and that is their only purpose. With equal quarterly divisions, only three plates are then required to print the months. And only one plate is then required to print the whole year. People born on the annual day apart can say "I was born on New Year's day." Those born in leap years on the 184th yearday can say "I was born on leap-year day."

No one will lose a birthday in the perpetual calendar, but many will gain one. Those born on February 29 in the present calendar can observe that same date every year in the new calendar. To find your birthday in the perpetual calendar, simply count the days in the present calendar from January 1 to your birthdate. Then count the same number of yeardays in the new calendar, starting with "New Year's day." The birthdate yearday will always be in the same month, with a difference of no more than 1 or 2 days.

Easter is suggested on April 14 to conform with the original date and a provisional bill enacted by the British Parliament in 1928. Good Friday will then never fall on a Friday the 13th, there being no such date in the perpetual calendar. Easter Monday, as a holiday on April 15, could always be the third day of a 3-day weekend.

Christmas would also fall always on a Monday, making Christmas Sunday a more meaningful day. And New Year's eve, on Sunday, December 31, would not interfere with regular church services.

There is much to commend the adoption of the perpetual calendar. It has been officially endorsed by the Legislatures of the States of Hawaii and Massachusetts. It is the only calendar proposal which has received any official U.S. endorsement. It has been endorsed by thousands as the simplest, most practical, and most logical plan for a new fixed equal-quarter international standard civil calendar. Its use in the business, banking, industrial, and insurance worlds will save thousands of hours now spent in needless annual bookkeeping, accounting, and tax figuring. A bill is before the U.S. Congress asking for adoption of the perpetual calendar beginning with 1967.

To remember its arrangement, the following rhyme is offered:

"With a day apart, the year's begun,
  Followed by thirty, thirty, thirty-one.
Months always start a certain way,
  On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.
Each quarter and each year the same,
  Is the perpetual calendar's aim."

On October 25, 1963, the Vatican Ecumenical Council voted 2,057 to 4 not to oppose adoption of a perpetual calendar. It also voted 2,058 to 9 in favor of a fixed Easter. In the perpetual calendar, Easter can be easily fixed, and on the original historic date at that. The perpetual calendar is an efficient, logical, timesaving, and scientific plan, entirely suitable for this day and age, and for the years to come.

Revised perpetual calendar

New Year's Day (occurs between December 31 and January 1 each year)

JANUARY

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

FEBRUARY

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

MARCH

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

APRIL

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

MAY

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

JUNE

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Leap-year Day (occurs between June 31 and July 1 in leap years)

JULY

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

AUGUST

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

SEPTEMBER

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

OCTOBER

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

NOVEMBER

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

DECEMBER

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

REVISED CALENDAR PROPOSED IN BILL

(By Sylvia Porter)

Imagine a calendar in which:

This month had 30 days instead of 28 and leap year fell not in February but between the last day of June and the 1st of July.

Your birthday and all holidays fell on the same day of the week each year and each year began on a Monday.

Friday the 13th was abolished, the calendar year had only 364 days and you always could look forward to a 3-day holiday weekend at Christmas and New Year's.

A bill on a calendar with all these radical changes—starting in 1967 or 1968—is due to be introduced in the Senate this week by Hawaii's Republican Senator HIRAM FONG. Designed to correct the many gross irregularities and confusions in today's calendar, it has strong support in business, government, and international circles.

Of course, the "perpetual calendar" is not going to become law this year or in the foreseeable future; habits of centuries are formidable obstacles.

Nevertheless, the Commerce Department backs the calendar—on condition that other leading nations also would go along. The changes have been endorsed by two State governments, many large companies and chambers of commerce, college presidents and chiefs of major foreign governments. And when you ponder what we've been putting up with for 2,000 years, you well may conclude that the calendar proposal makes a lot of sense.

For instance, for centuries February has been a short month because of the superstitions of two Roman emperors. Julius and Augustus Caesar renamed July and August after themselves—from the original Quintilis and Sextilis. Julius declared July a 31-day month because the Romans considered even-numbered months unlucky. Augustus simply took a day from February to make August another "lucky" 31-day month.

As a result of such unscientific juggling with the calendar, we are wasting hundreds of thousands of working hours and countless millions of dollars each year in needless figuring and accounting. For the precision-minded statistician, there actually is no such thing as a "comparable period last year."

In addition, today's calendar imposes tangible financial burdens on workers and employers. As another illustration, this February has only 24 working days (including Saturdays) while March has 27—12.5 percent more than February. Millions of workers who are paid by the hour thus earn much less in February, yet have the same monthly bills to pay. If they pay workers by the month, employers will get far less work for their pay in February 1965, than in any other month this year.

With the days redistributed in an equal pattern, each calendar quarter would have an even sequence of 30-, 30- and 31-day months—and by reducing the calendar year by 1 day, each quarter would have exactly 91 days.

The "extra day" would be New Year's Day, not shown on the calendar. This day would fall between the last day of December and January 1 and would be called January zero. It would become an international holiday—as would leap year's day, another "extra day" every 4 years.

The "elimination" of New Year's Day and leap year's day would move forward everybody's birthday by 1 or 2 days and everybody's birthday would fall on the same day of the week each year. If you were born on February 29, you would also be able to celebrate your birthday each year instead of each 4 years.

If the changes sound crazy, it is because we have been living by a "crazy" calendar for so many centuries. There really is little "to be gained by defending our present calendar," as Senator Fong says. "It is just an awkward and expensive heritage from the past."

QUALIFICATIONS OF PERSONS APPOINTED TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The proposed bill provides that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Supreme Court unless at the time of the appointment he shall have had at least 5 years of judicial experience as a judge of the district court of the United States, the U.S. Court of Appeals, or a judge of any State court of general jurisdiction, or as an appellate State judge having jurisdiction over courts of general jurisdiction.

Mr. President, the Constitution has little to say with respect to the qualifications of members to be appointed to the Supreme Court. It refers to Justices of the Court in only two instances. Section 2 of article II states that Justices shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Section 1 of article III provides that Justices shall hold their offices during good behavior and "Shall at stated times, receive for their services, a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office."

The members of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 were determined, above all things, to establish a government of laws and not of men. To accomplish this objective they inserted in that document the doctrine of separation of governmental powers.

They utilized this doctrine in a twofold way. First, they delegated to the Federal Government the powers necessary to enable it to discharge its limited functions as a central government. They then left to each State the power to regulate its own internal affairs. It was this use of the doctrine of separation of powers which prompted Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase to make these memorable remarks in his opinion, in *Texas* v. *White*, 74 U.S. 700 (1868):

> Not only, therefore, can there be no loss of separate and independent autonomy to the States through their union under the Constitution, but it may be not unreasonably said that the preservation of the States, and the maintenance of their governments, are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government. The Constitution, in all its provision, looks to an indissoluble Union, composed of indestructible States.

In their other utilization of this doctrine, the members of the Convention of 1787 vested the power to make laws in the Congress, the power to execute laws in the President, and the power to interpret laws in the Supreme Court of the United States and such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time establish. Moreover, they declared in essence that the legislative, the executive, and the judicial powers of the Federal Government should forever remain separate and distinct from each other. Each is sovereign within its own sphere. One cannot encroach upon the other.

Some of the members of the Convention of 1787 expressed fear that the Supreme Court, having no rules by which to govern or to limit the execution of its judicial power, would usurp the powers vested in the other two branches of the Federal system and thereby destroy the concept of separation of powers upon which the entire system was expected to endure.

Alexander Hamilton rejected these arguments. He argued that the men selected to sit on the Supreme Court of the United States would "be chosen with a view to those qualifications which fit men for the stations of judges," and that they would give "that inflexible and uniform adherence" to legal rules "which we perceive to be indispensable in the courts of justice."

By these remarks, Hamilton assured the several States that men selected to sit upon the Supreme Court of the United States would be able and willing to subject themselves to the restraint inherent in the judicial process. History has led some eminent legal scholars to question the accuracy of Hamilton's prediction.

The late Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson, for example, said of the Supreme Court:

> Rightly or wrongly, the belief is widely held by the practicing profession that this Court no longer respects impersonal rules of law but is guided in these matters by personal impressions which from time to time may be shared by a majority of Justices. There is no doubt that if there were a super-Supreme Court a substantial proportion of our reversals of State courts would also be reversed. We are not final because we are infallible, but we are infallible only because we are final. (*Brown* v. *Allen*, 344, U.S. 433, 535, 540 (1953).)

In 1958, the conference of chief justices of State courts, appointed 10 of its members to study the impact of Supreme Court decisions on Federal-State relationships. While recognizing that the "ultimate judicial power" of the country must abide in the U.S. Supreme Court, this special committee said, however, and I quote:

> We do not believe that this goes so far as to impose upon us an obligation of silence when we find ourselves unable to agree with pronouncements of the Supreme Court (even though we are bound by them), or when we see trends in decisions of that Court which we think will lead to unfortunate results.

The principal recommendation of this eminent committee was that the Justices should exercise more fully the concept of "judicial restraint."

I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of August 29, 1958, commenting upon the findings of this committee be inserted in the Record at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Supreme Court: A Critical Look by State Justices

(Note.—The U.S. Supreme Court needs more "judicial self-restraint," in the opinion of the chief justices of 10 States.

(The justices had been appointed to a special committee by the conference of chief justices to study recent decisions.)

The U.S. Supreme Court is taken to task by a committee of State chief justices for going too far and too fast in expanding Federal power. The chief justices urge Justices on the highest Federal court to use a bit more "judicial restraint."

That's the main conclusion submitted last week to the Conference of Chief Justices by a special committee appointed last year to look into decisions affecting Federal-State relationships.

The committee headed by Chief Judge Frederick W. Brune, of the Maryland Court of Appeals, included top judges from seven Northern States and three Southern States. The Northern States represented were New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Oregon, and Massachusetts, besides Maryland. The Southern States were Texas, Georgia, and South Carolina.

The report, at the outset, recognizes that "by almost universal common consent" the ultimate judicial power of the country rests with the U.S. Supreme Court. It goes on to say: "Any other allocation of such power would seem to lead to complete chaos." The report adds: "It is a part of our obligation to seek to uphold respect for law." But then this comment is made:

"We do not believe that this goes so far as to impose upon us an obligation of silence when we find ourselves unable to agree with pronouncements of the Supreme Court (even though we are bound by them), or when we see trends in decisions of that Court which we think will lead to unfortunate results."

WHEN LAWS CONFLICT

The report deals mainly with decisions involving the supremacy of Federal laws over State laws, and with decisions rendered under the 14th amendment. However, recent decisions on racial segregation, which were rendered under the 14th amendment, are not mentioned.

In the field of labor relations, the justices noted that the theory of supremacy, "coupled with only partial express regulation by Congress, has produced a state of considerable confusion." Decisions are cited that prevented a State from acting to bar strikes in public utilities and that seemed to give Federal courts exclusive jurisdiction in suits between employers and unions. The report also notes that, in two decisions last year, the Supreme Court upheld the right of an employee to sue a labor union in a State court. In labor regulation, the report suggests that Congress might clear up the confusion.

The justices also note that, under the supremacy doctrine, the Supreme Court has "practically eliminated" any antisubversive laws by States.

When it comes to cases under the 14th amendment, the State justices take particular exception to decisions which limited the authority of States to make their own rules for the admission of lawyers to the bar. Their report quotes with approval a dissent by Justice John M. Harlan that "this case involves an area of Federal-State relations—the right of States to establish and administer standards for admission to their bars—into which this Court should be especially reluctant and slow to enter."

The justices direct their sharpest criticism at Supreme Court decisions relating to State enforcement of criminal laws. They object to a decision that freed a confessed murderer because he pleaded guilty without having a lawyer; decisions that require States to provide free transcripts of trials so that convicted felons can appeal; and a decision that struck down a city ordinance aimed at supervising ex-convicts.

At one point, the report observes: "Appellate courts generally will give great weight to the findings of fact by trial courts which had the opportunity to see and hear the witnesses, and they are reluctant to disturb such findings. The Supreme Court at times seems to read the records in criminal cases with a somewhat different point of view."

The justices appear especially disturbed at the decisions governing appeals from criminal convictions under State laws. There is a possibility, the committee fears, that State appellate courts may bog down under the weight of appeals from criminal convictions. "The danger of an almost complete breakdown in the work of State appellate courts under the flood of appeals which may be loosed * * * is not a reassuring prospect," the committee said.

The committee, however, acquits the Supreme Court of invading some State powers. The justices note that, in Federal trials of suits between citizens of different States, the laws of States rather than of the Federal Government are to prevail. Supreme Court decisions also have upheld suits in State courts against corporations from other States. And on taxes, the report observes that: "On the whole, the Supreme Court seems perhaps to have taken a more liberal view in recent years toward the validity of State taxation than it formerly took."

COURT-MADE LAW

Overall, however, the committee finds a Supreme Court majority often too eager to make policy decisions and to assume legislative power. In questioning this trend, the report notes that Supreme Court Justices themselves frequently disagree. Hence the suggestion for "judicial self-restraint."

Besides Judge Brune, the chief justices who signed the report are: Albert Conway of New York, John R. Dethmers of Michigan, William H. Duckworth of Georgia, John E. Hickman of Texas, John E. Martin of Wisconsin, William C. Perry of Oregon, Taylor H. Stukes of South Carolina and Raymond S. Wilkins of Massachusetts, plus Associate Justice Martin A. Nelson of Minnesota, who signed the report for the chief justice of his State.

Immense and Dominant Power

(Following is the text of conclusions reached by the Committee on Federal-State Relationships as Affected by Judicial Decisions, in a report submitted to the Conference of Chief Justices in Pasadena, Calif., August 20, 1958)

This long review, though far from exhaustive, shows some of the uncertainties as to the distribution of power which are probably inevitable in a Federal system of government. It also shows, on the whole, a continuing and, we think, an accelerating trend toward increasing power of the National Government and correspondingly contracted power of the State governments.

Much of this is doubtless due to the fact that many matters which were once mainly of local concern are now parts of larger matters which are of national concern. Much of this stems from the doctrine of a strong Central Government and of the plenitude of national power within broad limits of what may be necessary and proper in the exercise of the granted powers of the National Government which was expounded and established by Chief Justice Marshall and his colleagues, though some of the modern extensions may and do seem to us to go to extremes. Much, however, comes from the extent of the control over the action of the States which the Supreme Court exercises under its views of the 14th amendment.

We believe that strong State and local governments are essential to the effective functioning of the American system of Federal government; that they should not be sacrificed needlessly to leveling, and sometimes deadening, uniformity; and that, in the interest of active citizen participation in self-government—the foundation of our democracy—they should be sustained and strengthened.

As long as this country continues to be a developing country and as long as the conditions under which we live continue to change, there will always be problems of the allocation of power depending upon whether certain matters should be regarded as primarily of national concern or as primarily of local concern. These adjustments can hardly be effected without some friction. How much friction will develop depends in part upon the wisdom of those empowered to alter the boundaries and in part upon the speed with which such changes are effected. Of course, the question of speed really involves the exercise of judgment and the use of wisdom, so that the two things are really the same in substance.

We are now concerned specifically with the effect of judicial decisions upon the relations between the Federal Government and the State governments. Here we think that the overall tendency of decisions of the Supreme Court over the last 25 years or more has been to press the extension of Federal power and to press it rapidly.

There have been, of course, and still are very considerable differences within the Court on these matters, and there has been quite recently a growing recognition of the fact that our Government is still a Federal Government and that the historic line which experience seems to justify between matters primarily of national concern and matters primarily of local concern should not be hastily or lightly obliterated. A number of Justices have repeatedly demonstrated their awareness of problems of federalism and their recognition that federalism is still a living part of our system of government.

The extent to which the Supreme Court assumes the function of policymaker is also of concern to us in the conduct of our judicial business. We realize that, in the course of American history, the Supreme Court has frequently—one might, indeed, say customarily—exercised policymaking powers going far beyond those involved, say, in making a selection between competing rules of law.

We believe that, in the fields with which we are concerned and as to which we feel entitled to speak, the Supreme Court too often has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint. We feel this is particularly the case in both of the great fields we have discussed—namely, the extent and extension of the Federal power, and the supervision of State action by the Supreme Court by virtue of the 14th amendment. In the light of the immense power of the Supreme Court and its practical nonreviewability in most instances no more important obligation rests upon it, in our view, than that of careful moderation in the exercise of its policymaking role.

We are not alone in our view that the Court, in many cases arising under the 14th amendment, has assumed what seem to us primarily legislative powers. See Judge Learned Hand on the Bill of Rights. We do not believe that either the framers of the original Constitution or the possibly somewhat less gifted draftsmen of the 14th amendment ever contemplated that the Supreme Court would, or should, have the almost unlimited policymaking powers which it now exercises.

It is strange, indeed, to reflect that, under a Constitution which provides for a system of checks and balances and of distribution of power between National and State Governments, one branch of one government—the Supreme Court—should attain the immense and, in many respects, dominant power which it now wields.

When we read the Lincoln Mills case in connection with the regulation of labor relations, we find language which reads to us very much as if the Supreme Court found in a somewhat obscurely worded section of the Labor-Management Relations Act a grant by Congress to the Federal courts of a power closely approximating legislative power. Perhaps no more is meant by the term "to fashion a body of Federal law" than to interpret and apply a statute whose meaning is rather vague, but the possible implications of this phrase may be considerably broader.

We believe that the great principle of distribution of powers among the various branches of government and between levels of government has vitality today and is the crucial base of our democracy.

We further believe that, in construing and applying the Constitution and laws made in pursuance thereof, this principle of the division of power based upon whether a matter is primarily of national or of local concern should not be lost sight of or ignored, especially in fields which bear upon the meaning of a constitutional or statutory provision, or the validity of State action presented for review. For, with due allowance for the changed conditions under which it may or must operate, the principle is as worthy of our consideration today as it was of the consideration of the great men who met in 1787 to establish our Nation as a nation.

It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast. We find first that, in constitutional cases, unanimous decisions are comparative rarities and that multiple opinions, concurring or dissenting, are common occurrences.

DIVERGENT VIEWS OF JUSTICES

We find next that divisions in result on a 5-to-4 basis are quite frequent. We find further that, on some occasions, a majority of the Court cannot be mustered in support of any one opinion and that the result of a given case may come from the divergent views of individual Justices who happen to unite on one outcome or the other of the case before the Court.

We further find that the Court does not accord finality to its own determinations of constitutional questions or, for that matter, of others. We concede that a slavish adherence to stare decisis [standing by previous decisions] could at times have unfortunate consequences; but it seems strange that, under a constitutional doctrine which requires all others to recognize the Supreme Court's rulings on constitutional questions as binding adjudications of the meaning and application of the Constitution, the Court itself has so frequently overturned its own decisions thereon, after the lapse of periods varying from 1 year to 75, or even 95 years. See the tables appended to Mr. Justice Douglas' address on "Stare Decisis," 49 Columbia Law Review 735, 756–758.

The Constitution expressly sets up its own procedures for amendment, slow or cumbersome though they may be. If reasonable certainty and stability do not attach to a written constitution, is it a constitution or is it a sham?

GRAVE CONCERN OVER SOME RULINGS

These frequent differences and occasional overrulings of prior decisions in constitutional cases cause us grave concern as to whether individual views as to what is wise or desirable do not unconsciously override a more dispassionate consideration of what is or is not constitutionally warranted. We believe that the latter is the correct approach, and we have no doubt that every member of the Supreme Court intends to adhere to that approach, and believes that he does so. But to err is human, and even the Supreme Court is not divine.

It is our earnest hope, which we respectfully express, that that great Court exercise

> **to the full its power of judicial self-restraint** by adhering firmly to its tremendous, strictly judicial powers and by eschewing, so far as possible, the exercise of essentially legislative powers when it is called upon to decide questions involving the validity of State action, whether it deems such action wise or unwise. The value of our system of federalism, and of local self-government in local matters which it embodies, should be kept firmly in mind, as we believe it was by those who framed our Constitution.
>
> At times the Supreme Court manifests, or seems to manifest, an impatience with the slow workings of our Federal system. That impatience may extend to an unwillingness to wait for Congress to make clear its intention to exercise the powers conferred upon it under the Constitution, or the extent to which it undertakes to exercise them, and it may extend to the slow processes of amending the Constitution which that instrument provides.
>
> The words of Elihu Root on the opposite side of the problem, asserted at a time when demands were current for recall of judges and judicial decisions, bear repeating: "If the people of our country yield to impatience which would destroy the system that alone makes effective these great impersonal rules and preserves our constitutional government, rather than endure the temporary inconvenience of pursuing regulated methods of changing the law, we shall not be reforming. We shall not be making progress, but shall be exhibiting that lack of self-control which enables great bodies of men to abide the slow process of orderly government rather than to break down the barriers of order when they are struck by the impulse of the moment." Quoted in 31 Boston University Law Review 43.
>
> We believe that what Mr. Root said is sound doctrine to be followed toward the Constitution, the Supreme Court and its interpretation of the Constitution. Surely, it is no less incumbent upon the Supreme Court, on its part, to be equally restrained and to be as sure as is humanly possible that it is adhering to the fundamentals of the Constitution with regard to the distribution of powers and the separation of powers, and with regard to the limitations of judical power which are implicit in such separation and distribution, and that it is not merely giving effect to what it may deem desirable.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, more recently, Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of the Harvard University Law School said in his annual report of 1964 that there is a "widespread and strong" feeling among lawyers that judges "cannot be relied upon to be judicious and wise." Dean Griswold said that he and the lawyers who complained to him recognize that there are many judges of outstanding character and ability. He said, however, that the "departures from that high standard are encountered frequently enough to make this a fundamental concern to the legal profession and also to all citizens."

Mr. President, there is a growing consensus in the legal profession that the quality of our judiciary could be improved if we begin by requiring that all future appointees to the Supreme Court have prior judicial experience.

The late great Justice Benjamin Cardozo once gave a series of lectures on this subject at Yale University. His lectures subsequently appeared in a book entitled, "The Nature of the Judicial Process." The entire book is a plea for judicial experience as a prerequisite for anyone appointed to the Supreme Court.

Justice Cardozo, in studying the process of judging, said:

> What is it that I do when I decide a case? To what sources of information do I appeal for guidance? In what proportion do I permit them to contribute to the result? In what proportion ought they to contribute? If a precedent is applicable, when do I refuse to follow it? If no precedent is applicable, how do I reach the rule that will make a precedent for the future? If I am seeking logical consistency, the symmetry of the legal structure, how far shall I seek it? At what point shall the quest be halted by some discrepant custom, by some consideration of the social welfare, by my own or the common standards of justice and morals?

This is a picture of a great legal mind in action. It is a picture of the thinking of one of the greatest judges this country has produced. It is also an implicit plea for judicial experience before any man is appointed to the Nation's highest court.

No one would consider being operated on by a man not trained as a doctor. No one would consider being represented in court by a man who was not an able and competent lawyer, skilled in the art of his profession.

An equally strong case can be made against forcing the American public to be judged, in the highest judicial tribunal in the land, by men who lack the basic ingredient of "experience" in the task to which many have been so prematurely assigned.

Yet it is unfortunately true that many men have been selected to sit upon the Supreme Court with no prior judicial experience whatsoever. In fact, some had never even engaged in the practice of law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, a compilation by the Library of Congress entitled "Prior Judicial Experience of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices from 1789 to 1963."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this table shows that of the 14 Chief Justices who have served since our country's founding, 8 had no prior judicial experience. It shows, furthermore, that of the 84 Justices who have served on the highest Court, 29 were appointed without prior judicial experience.

Even today, there are six men who sit upon the Supreme Court of the United States who had, prior to their appointment, no judicial experience whatsoever, with the exception of one who served 1 year as a police judge 27 years prior to his appointment on the Court.

Nevertheless, learning to think judicially is a skill which should have been mastered before a man becomes a Supreme Court Justice. It is a skill which equips a man with the discipline necessary to discard personal notions and to decide the issues upon the basis of the Constitution, the statutes, and legal precedent.

One of the most eminently qualified judges in the entire country, my distinguished colleague Senator ERVIN, had this to say about the importance of legal precedent:

> Practicing lawyers and judges of courts of general jurisdiction perform their functions in the workaday world where men and women live, move and have their being. To them, law is destitute of social value unless it has sufficient stability to afford reliable rules to govern the conduct of people, and unless it can be found with reasonable certainty in established legal precedents.

Mr. President, I offer the proposed legislation not to impugn the Supreme Court, nor to in any way question—or bring into question any person now sitting on the Supreme Court. My purpose is to strengthen our constitutional system by strengthening the Court in the future. As a lawyer I know from academic training and considerable experience that a strong and highly respected U.S. Supreme Court is indispensable to our system of government. I want to see the Court strengthened. I want to see its members and its decisions respected by lawyers, by jurists, and by the American people.

I know of no more sound nor, at the same time, more considered step toward restoring that confidence than by requiring that the men whose function it is to dispense "equal justice under the law" be men of experience in the arduous task of the judicial process.

I therefore urge that the Senate take prompt and favorable action on the proposed measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 980) establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXHIBIT 1

Prior judicial experience of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices from 1789 to 1963

	Supreme Court service	Judicial service prior to appointment
CHIEF JUSTICES		
John Jay	1790-96	Chief justice, New York Supreme Court, 1776-79.
John Rutledge	1795 (4 months)	Chief justice, Supreme Court, South Carolina, 1791-95.
CHIEF JUSTICES—continued		
Oliver Ellsworth	1796-1800	Judge, Governor's Council, Connecticut (Supreme Court of Errors), Colonial, 1780-85. Judge, superior court, Connecticut 1785-89.

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

Prior judicial experience of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices from 1789 to 1963—Continued

	Supreme Court service	Judicial service prior to appointment
CHIEF JUSTICES—continued		
John Marshall	1801–35	None found.
Roger Brooke Taney	1836–64	Do.
Salmon Portland Chase	1864–73	Do.
Morrison Remick Waite	1874–88	Do.
Melville Weston Fuller	1888–1910	Do.
Edward Douglas White	1910–21	Justice, Louisiana Supreme Court, 1879–80.
William Howard Taft	1921–30	Judge, Supreme Court, Ohio, 1887–93. Judge, Federal Circuit Court, 6th Circuit, 1892–1900.
Charles Evans Hughes	1930–41	None found.
Harlan Fiske Stone	1941–46	Do.
Frederick Moore Vinson	1946–53	Associate Justice, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, 1938–43.
Earl Warren	1953 to present	None found.
ASSOCIATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES		
John Rutledge	1790–91	Chief Justice, Supreme Court, South Carolina, 1791–95.
William Cushing	1790–1810	Probate judge, Lincoln County, Maine (Colonial), 1760–72. Judge, Superior Court, Massachusetts. (Colonial) 1772–75. Judge, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1775–77. Chief Justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1777–89.
James Wilson	1789–98	None found.
John Blair	1789–96	General Court, Virginia (Colonial), 1778–80. Judge, High Court of Chancery, Virginia (Colonial), 1780. Judge, Virginia 1st Court of Appeals, 1780–89.
James Irodell	1790–99	Superior Court judge, North Carolina (Colonial), 1777–78.
Thomas Johnson	1792–93	Chief judge, General Court, Maryland (Colonial), 1790–91.
William Paterson	1793–1806	None found.
Samuel Chase	1796–1811	Chief judge, Criminal Court, Baltimore, Md. (Colonial), 1788. Chief judge, General Court, Maryland, 1791.
Bushrod Washington	1799–1829	None found.
Alfred Moore	1800–1804	Judge, superior court, North Carolina, 1798–99.
William Johnson	1804–34	Judge, Court of Common Pleas, 1798–1804.
Henry Brockholst Livingston.	1807–23	Judge, Supreme Court, New York, 1802–6.
Thomas Todd	1807–26	Judge, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1801–6. Chief justice, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1806–7.
Gabriel Duvall	1811–35	None found.
Joseph Story	1811–45	Do.
Smith Thompson	1823–43	Associate justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1802–14. Chief justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1814–19.
Robert Trimble	1826–28	Judge, Court of Appeals, Kentucky 1807–9. Federal district judge, ship, Kentucky, 1817–26.
John McLean	1830–61	Judge, Supreme Court, Ohio, 1816 22.
Henry Baldwin	1830–44	None found.
James Moore Wayne	1835–67	Judge, superior court, Georgia, 1824–29.
Philip Pendleton Barbour	1836–41	Judge, General Court, Virginia, 1825–27. Judge, U.S. District Court, Eastern, Virginia, 1830–36.
John Catron	1837–65	Judge, Supreme Court of Errors and Appeals (then Court of Last Resort), Tennessee, 1824–31.
John McKinley	1837–52	None found.
Peter Vivian Daniel	1842–60	Judge, U.S. District Court, Virginia, 1836–41.
Samuel Nelson	1845–72	Judge, 6th Circuit, New York, 1823–31. Associate justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1831–45.
Levi Woodbury	1845–51	Judge, New Hampshire superior court, 1817–23 (6 years).
Robert Cooper Crier	1846–70	Presiding judge, District Court, Allegheny County, Pa., 1833–46.
Benjamin Robbins Curtis	1851–57	None found.
John Archibald Campbell	1853–61	Do.
Nathan Clifford	1858–81	Do.
Noah Haynes Swayne	1862–81	Do.
Samuel Freeman Miller	1862–90	Justice of the peace, Barbourville, Ky., date unknown.
David Davis	1862–77	Judge, 8th judiciary district, Illinois, 1848–62.
Stephen Johnson Field	1863–97	Justice, Supreme Court, California, 1857–63.
William Strong	1870–80	Judge, Supreme Court, Pennsylvania, 1857–68.
Joseph P. Bradley	1870–92	None found.
Ward Hunt	1873–82	New York Court of Appeals, 1865–73;
ASSOCIATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES—con.		
John Marshall Harlan	1877–1911	Judge, county court, Franklin County, Ky., 1858–59.
William Burnham Woods	1880–87	Judge, U.S. Circuit Court, 5th Circuit, 1869–8 .
Stanley Matthews	1881–89	Judge, court of common pleas, Hamilton County, Ohio, 1851–(?). Judge, superior court, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1863–65.
Horace Gray	1881–1902	Justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1864–81.
Samuel Blatchford	1882–93	District judge, New York, Southern District, 1867–73. Circuit judge, 2d Judicial District, 1873–82.
Lucius Quintas C. Lamar	1888–93	None found.
David Josiah Brewer	1889–1910	Commissioner, Federal Circuit Court, District of Kansas, 1861–62. Judge, probate and criminal courts, Leavenworth County, Kans., 1862–65. Judge 1st Judicial District, Kansas, 1865–69. Supreme Court, Kansas, 1870–84. Federal Circuit Court, 8th District, 1884–89.
Henry Billings Brown	1891–1906	Circuit judge, Wayne County Mich., 1868 to (unknown). U.S. judge, eastern district, Michigan, 1875–90.
George Shiras, Jr.	1892–1903	None found.
Howell Edmunds Jackson	1893–95	Circuit Court, 6th Circuit, 1886–91. Presiding judge, Circuit Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit, 1891–93.
Edward Douglas White	1894–1910	Justice, Louisiana Supreme Court, 1879–80.
Rufus Wheeler Peckham	1896–1909	Justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1883–86. Court of Appeals, New York, 1886–96.
Joseph McKenna	1898–1925	Judge, Circuit Court, 9th Circuit, 1892–97.
Oliver Wendell Holmes	1902–32	Associate judge, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachussetts, 1883–89. Chief justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachussetts, 1889–1902.
Rufus William Day	1903–22	Judge, court of common pleas, 1886–89. U.S. Court of Appeals, 6th circuit, 1899–1903.
William Henry Moody	1906–10	None found.
Horace Harmon Lurton	1910–14	Justice, Supreme Court, Tennessee, 1886–93. Judge, U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, 6th circuit, 1893–1909.
Charles Evans Hughes	1910–16	None found.
Willis Van Devanter	1910–37	Chief justice, Supreme Court, Wyoming, 1889–90. U.S. circuit judge, 8th circuit, 1903–10.
Joseph Rucker Lamar	1911–16	Associate justice, Supreme Court, Georgia, 1906–08.
Mahlon Pitney	1912–22	Associate justice, New Jersey Supreme Court, 1901–08.
James Clark McReynolds	1914–41	None found.
Louis Dembitz Brandeis	1916–39	Do.
John Hessin Clarke	1916–22	U.S. district judge, northern district of Ohio, 1914–16.
George Sutherland	1922–38	None found.
Pierce Butler	1923–39	Do.
Edward Terry Sanford	1923–30	Judge, U.S. District Court, Middle and Eastern District, Tennessee, 1908–23.
Harlan Fiske Stone	1925–41	None found.
Owen Josephus Roberts	1930–45	Do.
Benjamin Nathan Cardozo	1932–38	Judge, Supreme Court, New York, 1914. Associate judge, Court of Appeals, New York, 1914–32.
Hugo Lafayette Black	1937 to present	Police judge, Birmingham, Ala., 1910–11.
Stanley Forman Reed	1938–57	None found.
Felix Frankfurter	1939–62	Do.
William Orville Douglas	1939 to present	Do.
Frank Murphy	1940–49	Judge, recorders court, Detroit, Mich., 1923–30.
James Francis Byrnes	1941–42	None found.
Robert Houghwout Jackson	1941–54	Do.
Wiley Blount Rutledge	1943–49	U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia. 1939–43.
Harold Hitz Burton	1945–58	None found.
Thomas Campbell Clark	1949 to present	Do.
Sherman Minton	1949–56	Circuit Court of Appeals, 7th Circuit, 1941–49.
John Marshall Harlan	1955 to present	U.S. Court of Appeals, 2d Circuit, 1954–55.
William J. Brennan, Jr.	1956 to present	Superior court judge, New Jersey, 1949–50. Appellate division judge, 1950–52. Justice, Supreme Court, New Jersey, 1952–56.
Charles E. Whittaker	1957–62	U.S. District Court. Western District of Missouri, 1954–56; Court of Appeals. 8th Circuit, 1956–57.
Potter Stewart	1959 to present	Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit, 1954–58.
Byron R. White	1962 to present	None found.
Arthur J. Goldberg	do	Do.

DISCONTINUANCE OF POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to discontinue the Postal Savings System.

POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM OUTMODED

The Postal Savings System was established by act of Congress on June 25, 1910. When enacted in the first decade of this century, the Postal Savings System was designed to attract the savings of small depositors who lacked confidence in the private banking system and to provide savings deposits facilities in communities where no banks existed. With the growth in recent years of the private banking system, credit unions, and the savings and loan associations, there are few communities in the United States without ready access to banking services. In those few isolated places which do not have banking services, the "bank by mail" system has met the need. The formation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has also provided the necessary guarantees and security of deposits on savings in commercial banks which were not available when the Postal Savings System was established.

DECLINE STEADY SINCE 1947

From its establishment in 1910 up until 1947, the Postal Savings System experienced a continued growth in deposits. The System grew from 12,000 depositors with desposits totaling $677,000 in 1911, to a high of 4.2 million depositors with deposits totaling $3.4 billion in 1947. Since 1947, however, the System's activities have been on the decline. Annual deposits have decreased consistently every year from 1947, and withdrawals have exceeded deposits annually since 1948. By the close of fiscal year 1964, the number of depositors had shrunk to 1,076,225 and the principal to the credit of these depositors to $415,965,295.

It is easy to understand the rapid decline in the Postal Savings System. First, the convenience of commercial banking facilities. Second, the insured protection which deposits under $10,000 now carry in banks and savings and loan companies. Third, postal savings deposits by law provides for the payment of interest on deposits at a rate of only 2 percent per annum. While the first two reasons are very important, the third factor is probably most controlling. Any knowledgable investor is not going to leave his money on deposit at 2 percent interest in postal savings, when commercial banks and savings institutions will pay him from 4 to 4½ on money deposited in savings accounts. In fact, if all of the money on deposit last year in postal savings had been reinvested by depositors in commercial banks, the depositors would have received an additional $8,290,779 in interest.

THOUSANDS OF INACTIVE ACCOUNTS

Many of the postal savings accounts have been inactive for years which indictates a lack of information or ignorance on the part of depositors or their families in the existence of these accounts. In fact, as of June 30, 1964, there were 155,718 unclaimed accounts, which had been inactive for 20 years or more.

By liquidating the Postal Savings System we would be getting the Federal Government out of a commercial type business operation which is no longer needed or justified. We would also perform a service to the depositors, by forcing the transfer of these funds to other investments where they could earn the higher going rate of interest which, in most instances, is more than double the 2 percent rate paid on postal savings deposits. The abolishment of the System would also result in a savings of manpower and operating expenses in the Post Office Department, which is already overburdened with other nonpostal duties such as selling duck stamps, issuance of savings bonds, and registration of aliens.

ABOLISHMENT RECOMMENDED BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

The Hoover Commission recommended the abolishment of the Postal Savings System many years ago. The Comptroller General as early as 1952 recommended that Congress take the necessary action to liquidate this system. When I became a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the 82d Congress, I introduced my first such bill S. 3312 to discontinue the Postal Savings System. In the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses I again introduced similar bills. Time and events have certainly proved that there is no justifiable reason for continuing this outmoded system. Therefore, I urge my colleagues in the 89th Congress to take immediate action to repeal the Postal Savings Act.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed at the end of my remarks, a table which shows a summary by fiscal year of postal savings business since the establishment of the system.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 983) to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The table presented by Mr. BENNETT is, as follows:

Summary of postal-savings business since the establishment of the system, by fiscal years

Fiscal year [1]	In operation			Deposits	Withdrawals	Balance to credit of depositors [2]	Increase or decrease (−)		Number of depositors [3]	Average principal per depositor	Balance on deposit in banks	Excess of income before operating expenses	Operating expenses [4]	Net income or loss (−)
	Offices	Branches and stations	Total depositories				Amount	Percent						
1911	400		400	$778,129	$100,984	$677,145			11,918	$57	$571,671	$3,168	$20,282	−$17,114
1912	9,907	263	10,170	30,732,357	11,172,418	20,237,084	$19,559,939	2,888.6	243,801	83	18,586,042	233,266	359,572	−126,306
1913	12,158	662	12,820	41,701,383	28,119,597	33,818,870	13,581,786	67.1	331,006	102	31,512,337	312,840	431,035	−118,195
1914	9,639	708	10,347	47,815,249	38,189,848	43,444,271	9,625,401	28.5	388,511	112	40,919,673	416,483	336,604	79,879
1915	8,832	714	9,546	70,314,858	48,074,421	65,684,708	22,240,437	51.2	525,414	125	60,086,319	675,950	332,768	343,182
1916	7,701	720	8,421	76,775,868	56,440,691	86,019,885	20,335,177	31.0	602,937	143	80,775,586	660,185	347,988	312,197
1917	6,423	738	7,161	132,112,217	86,177,406	131,954,696	45,934,811	53.4	674,728	196	126,840,820	1,308,341	469,786	838,555
1918	5,926	730	6,656	116,893,259	100,376,456	148,471,499	16,516,803	12.5	612,188	242	140,658,608	1,243,483	411,710	831,773
1919	5,715	724	6,439	136,690,122	117,838,361	167,323,260	18,851,761	12.7	565,509	296	135,942,981	1,814,490	405,988	1,408,502
1920	5,583	731	6,314	139,208,954	149,255,892	157,276,322	−10,046,938	−6.0	508,508	309	126,426,019	2,165,509	461,250	1,704,259
1921	5,554	746	6,300	133,574,840	138,461,259	152,389,903	−4,886,419	−3.1	466,109	327	48,668,108	3,291,187	779,660	2,511,527
1922	6,020	754	6,774	96,507,746	111,161,210	137,736,439	−14,653,464	−9.6	420,242	328	44,160,417	3,924,745	755,109	3,169,636
1923	6,047	755	6,802	88,008,160	94,073,299	131,671,300	−6,065,139	−4.4	417,902	315	61,844,062	5,478,741	751,394	4,727,347
1924	5,995	763	6,758	94,932,846	93,790,011	132,814,135	1,142,835	.9	412,584	322	96,369,774	7,272,563	777,036	6,495,527
1925	5,896	759	6,655	89,707,991	90,348,915	132,173,211	−640,924	−.5	402,325	328	97,898,486	2,075,387	815,365	1,260,022
1926	5,853	770	6,623	90,751,051	88,745,704	134,178,558	2,005,347	1.5	399,305	336	101,175,541	1,437,814	892,828	544,986
1927	5,896	776	6,672	103,606,868	90,426,172	147,359,254	13,180,696	9.8	411,394	358	114,597,400	1,533,904	930,374	603,530
1928	5,897	786	6,683	96,386,499	91,602,404	152,143,349	4,784,095	3.2	412,250	369	118,714,519	1,569,950	951,348	618,602
1929	5 976	794	6,770	112,446,412	110,945,232	153,644,529	1,501,180	1.0	416,584	369	127,639,413	2,876,795	1,110,102	1,766,693
1930	5,998	797	6,795	159,959,071	138,331,914	175,271,686	21,627,157	14.1	466,401	376	148,255,213	1,562,107	1,426,244	135,863
1931	6,665	794	7,459	366,900,908	195,755,724	347,416,870	172,145,184	98.2	770,859	451	306,119,698	2,239,153	1,898,262	340,891
1932	6,743	806	7,549	860,195,852	422,792,099	784,820,623	437,403,753	125.9	1,545,190	508	681,726,891	4,255,327	3,231,425	1,023,902
1933	7,071	817	7,888	1,166,326,647	763,961,062	1,187,186,208	402,365,585	51.3	2,342,133	507	976,377,147	6,558,753	4,440,629	2,118,124
1934	7,247	812	8,059	966,650,799	955,916,819	1,197,920,188	10,733,980	.9	2,562,082	468	694,575,369	8,102,625	4,116,790	3,985,835
1935	7,301	810	8,111	944,959,559	938,016,807	1,204,862,940	6,942,752	.6	2,598,391	464	384,510,210	11,828,955	4,494,512	7,334,443
1936	7,299	804	8,103	933,071,216	906,261,000	1,231,673,156	26,810,216	2.2	2,705,152	455	203,010,277	9,508,164	4,594,494	4,913,670
1937	7,266	802	8,068	972,743,476	936,742,892	1,267,673,740	36,000,584	2.9	2,791,371	454	136,094,899	9,938,040	4,767,075	5,170,965
1938	7,245	805	8,050	929,480,177	945,354,737	1,251,799,180	−15,874,560	−1.3	2,741,569	457	114,654,887	11,133,169	4,719,599	6,413,570
1939	7,162	802	7,964	897,339,074	886,846,425	1,262,291,829	10,492,649	.8	2,767,417	456	68,266,768	13,033,715	4,688,347	8,345,368
1940	7,172	808	7,980	923,266,363	892,149,457	1,293,408,735	31,116,906	2.5	2,816,408	459	43,131,865	10,817,131	4,802,895	6,014,236
1941	7,203	835	8,038	923,660,091	912,915,552	1,304,153,274	10,744,539	.8	2,882,886	452	29,969,506	9,246,565	5,004,417	4,242,148
1942	7,211	852	8,063	895,079,877	883,709,846	1,315,523,305	11,370,031	.9	2,812,806	468	23,918,756	9,451,495	5,119,656	4,331,839
1943	7,199	861	8,060	1,033,549,955	771,547,650	1,577,525,610	262,002,305	19.9	3,064,054	515	11,875,204	15,888,515	5,324,068	10,564,447
1944	7,183	874	8,057	1,363,027,587	906,416,690	2,034,136,507	456,610,897	28.9	3,493,079	582	8,685,412	18,126,143	5,406,937	12,719,206
1945	7,162	888	8,050	1,739,340,729	1,113,902,275	2,659,574,961	625,438,454	30.7	3,921,937	678	7,904,432	20,791,630	6,369,274	14,422,356
1946	7,187	902	8,089	2,127,037,514	1,666,956,179	3,119,656,296	460,081,335	17.3	4,135,565	754	5,279,425	14,934,883	8,530,337	6,404,546

See footnotes at end of table.

Summary of postal-savings business since the establishment of the system, by fiscal years—Continued

Fiscal year [1]	In operation			Deposits	Withdrawals	Balance to credit of depositors [2]	Increase or decrease (−)		Number of depositors [3]	Average principal per depositor	Balance on deposit in banks	Excess of income before operating expenses	Operating expenses [4]	Net income or loss (−)
	Offices	Branches and stations	Total depositories				Amount	Percent						
1947	7,225	916	8,141	2,163,618,842	1,890,501,677	3,392,773,461	273,117,165	8.8	4,196,517	808	5,561,323	34,870,656	9,076,920	25,793,736
1948	7,234	949	8,183	2,055,651,215	2,069,294,693	3,379,129,983	−13,643,478	−.4	4,111,373	822	6,472,055	27,381,460	8,339,027	19,042,433
1949	7,213	982	8,195	1,947,237,723	2,048,965,436	3,277,402,270	−101,727,713	−3.0	3,964,509	827	6,680,390	11,710,576	9,297,594	2,412,982
1950	7,215	1,020	8,235	1,827,912,752	2,007,998,573	3,097,316,449	−180,085,821	−5.5	3,779,784	819	9,507,181	8,130,584	8,457,033	−326,449
1951	7,208	1,039	8,247	1,603,326,721	1,912,444,160	2,788,199,010	−309,117,439	−10.0	3,529,527	790	22,508,797	14,317,639	7,981,997	6,335,642
1952	7,200	1,061	8,261	1,460,414,712	1,631,049,586	2,617,564,136	−170,634,874	−6.1	3,339,378	784	33,378,638	16,190,595	9,473,026	6,717,569
1953	7,181	1,066	8,247	1,342,674,724	1,502,690,672	2,457,548,188	−160,015,948	−6.1	3,162,176	77	33,046,504	15,468,475	8,588,482	6,879,993
1954	6,816	1,056	7,872	1,197,325,333	1,403,454,284	2,251,419,237	−206,128,951	−8.4	2,934,795	767	30,664,075	15,210,666	7,828,865	7,381,801
1955	6,708	1,042	7,750	1,140,503,005	1,383,925,784	2,007,996,458	−243,422,779	−10.8	2,711,110	741	30,831,056	18,392,739	7,842,080	10,550,659
1956	6,623	999	7,622	606,100,315	848,626,927	1,765,469,846	−242,526,612	−12.1	2,482,026	711	29,650,979	12,973,376	6,447,914	6,525,462
1957	6,483	886	7,369	353,628,378	656,829,920	1,462,268,304	−303,201,542	−17.2	2,200,508	665	27,214,262	12,530,732	5,167,746	7,362,986
1958	6,037	834	6,871	241,239,105	489,899,563	1,213,607,846	−248,660,458	−17.0	1,925,852	630	24,339,541	10,110,805	4,876,580	5,234,225
1959	5,537	787	6,324	192,886,980	363,042,165	1,043,452,661	−170,155,185	−14.0	1,740,052	600	21,760,490	8,083,855	4,180,294	3,903,561
1960	5,189	734	5,923	145,081,905	350,474,905	838,059,661	−205,393,000	−19.7	1,550,930	540	19,137,686	7,009,716	3,974,420	3,035,296
1961	4,848	636	5,484	114,884,340	251,248,335	701,695,666	−136,363,995	−16.3	1,397,538	502	17,846,397	5,492,107	3,823,721	1,668,386
1962	4,601	604	5,205	93,674,620	212,303,325	583,066,961	−118,628,705	−16.9	1,271,858	458	18,620,747	4,444,526	3,458,287	986,239
1963	3,696	554	4,250	76,441,625	174,752,436	484,756,150	−98,310,811	−16.9	1,164,634	416	17,394,771	3,801,458	3,314,352	487,106
1964	2,993	473	3,466	63,154,600	131,945,455	415,965,295	−68,790,855	−14.2	1,076,225	387	17,372,425	3,157,989	3,103,545	54,444
Total												444,989,125	205,507,043	239,482,082

[1] Figures based on fiscal year which ended June 30 of each year except June 28, 1957, June 27, 1958, June 26, 1959, June 24, 1960, June 23, 1961, June 22, 1962, June 21, 1963, and June 19, 1964, except last 4 columns which are based on fiscal year ended June 30.

[2] Balance to credit of depositors includes item shown on balance sheet as unclaimed.

[3] Includes depositors whose accounts are reflected on balance sheet as unclaimed.

[4] Expense of the Post Office Department incident to the operation of the system.

Source: "Report of Operations of the Postal Savings System, 1964," letter from Postmaster General dated Jan. 4, 1965.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSEL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create in Congress an Office of Administrative Counsel, staffed with experts. This proposed legislation is the outgrowth of the standout efforts of Representative Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin, to have the Scandinavian "Ombudsman" concept adopted in this country.

I introduce this companion bill for several substantial reasons. First, it would relieve Members of Congress of some of the inordinate burden they are compelled to carry in acting on behalf of their constituents, in connection with problems these people have with the Federal Government. Second, an Administrative Counsel's office would employ persons who would be experts in every field of Government, something no Member of Congress can hope to duplicate on his own staff.

Much has been said of the action of Members of Congress in contacting various Federal agencies and departments on behalf of their constituents. It has been suggested that all such contacts be made a matter of record and be available to public scrutiny. I endorse this proposal and hope it will be adopted. But, if this legislation was adopted, there would be less of a need in this regard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 984) to provide for an Administrative Counsel of the Congress, introduced by Mr. Pell, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF S. 256

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 256) to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, at the next printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 22, 1965, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

S. 646. A bill to implement further the constitutional right to bail by authorizing in appropriate cases the release on a personal recognizance of persons otherwise eligible for bail: Senators Bartlett, Burdick, Dirksen, Dodd, Inouye, Metcalf, Scott, and Tydings.

S. 647. A bill to assure that convicted persons will receive credit toward service of their sentences for time spent in custody for lack of bail: Senators Bartlett, Burdick, Dirksen, Dodd, Inouye, Metcalf, Scott, and Tydings.

S. 648. A bill to further implement the constitutional right to bail by permitting persons admitted to bail to make a cash deposit with the court in lieu of providing securities or other collateral security: Senators Bartlett, Burdick, Dirksen, Dodd, Inouye, Metcalf, Scott, and Tydings.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce that a hearing will be held on the nomination of John Doar, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice.

The hearing will begin on Thursday, February 25, 1965, at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to appear and testify or submit a statement pertaining to this nomination should send the request or prepared statement to the subcommittee no later than 1 week prior to the hearing date.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that yesterday the Senate received the nomination of Donald W. Hoagland, of Colorado, to be Assistant Administratrator for Development Finance and Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

THE DANGEROUS ONES—HELP FOR CHILDREN WITH TWISTED MINDS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, early last month I introduced S. 488, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to assist States and communities to establish programs for the identification, care, and treatment of children who are in danger of becoming emotionally disturbed. The current issue of Harper's magazine carries an article I have written about the proposed legislation and the urgent need for it. There has been a great deal of interest in this article, entitled "The Dangerous Ones: Help for Children With Twisted Minds." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE DANGEROUS ONES: HELP FOR CHILDREN WITH TWISTED MINDS

(By Senator Abraham Ribicoff [1])

He has suffered serious personality damage but if he can receive help quickly this might be repaired to some extent. So wrote a social worker who interviewed 13-year-old Lee Harvey Oswald in 1953.

---

[1] As Governor of Connecticut; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and now a U.S. Senator, Abraham Ribicoff has been able to translate into action new ideas in the field of mental health and mental retardation.

"Oswald never received that help," the Warren Commission tersely reported in 1964.

Oswald is dead and so is the beloved President he murdered. But there are—according to expert estimates—close to a half-million American children as desperately sick as young Oswald was, who, like him, are not getting the help they need today. Nor will their plight be eased greatly by the $150 million Congress appropriated last year for the construction of new community mental-health centers. Indeed, the Joint Commission on Mental Health and Illness—whose studies laid the groundwork for that legislation—lacked the funds even to study the problem of emotionally disturbed children.

Yet this is a problem of peculiar urgency—as a matter both of humanity and of public safety. Week after week, our newspapers report senseless killings, rapes, and acts of sadism. For those who read beyond the headlines there emerges a repetitive chronicle of neglect and inaction by a society that turned its back on deeply troubled children until it was too late to save them or to protect the community.

Such, for example, was the story of Anthony, a 17-year-old New York boy who confessed last September that he had raped and strangled several elderly women. Anthony had an IQ of 62 and was always a strange and violent child. When he was 13 his mother took him to Bellevue Hospital. The doctors there sent him to a State school for mental defectives where he became one of 4,100 patients in the care of 20 psychiatrists. Two years later he was released and told to report to another sadly understaffed institution—a mental-health clinic in the Bronx. They discharged him last April, and in June he was arrested for rape. The judge, who knew nothing of his past psychiatric record, released him on $500 bond. Three months later he was in a Brooklyn police station confessing to a horrendous catalog of sex crimes.

"You wonder who let him go," Lt. Harold Norton, one of the interrogating officers, said afterward to reporter Jimmy Breslin. "His background alone—arson, raping a 5-year-old child—that should have been enough to hold him. Talk to the boy for a couple of hours and you'd know he never should be on the streets. The psychiatrists—they get busy, too many patients, no room in the hospital."

Too few psychiatrists, too many patients—this is a familiar refrain as one studies the records of potentially dangerous children who later turn up in criminal court. And there is still another recurring theme: no one is in charge. The troubled child seems to drift haphazardly, with little if any communication among courts, mental-health clinics, social workers, with no one responsible for getting at the root of the trouble and following through and treatment.

Consider, for instance, Michael who was born to a 15-year-old mother who had a record of sexual delinquency. Michael was admitted to his first institution—a county hospital—when he was 6 months old because of malnutrition and neglect. For the next 3 years he was shunted from foster homes to his mother, to a great-aunt, and then back to his mother and a new stepfather. By the age of 9 he was a very disturbed child, and social agencies made plans to have him placed in an adoptive home. But they were never carried out.

In the next 3 years Michael lived in nine different foster homes, became sick with rheumatic fever and then ileitis, and finally was placed in a children's home where he stayed for 3 troubled years. In his teens, a record of crime begins, and he comes before the juvenile court because of his dangerous cruelty to younger children. He is accepted by a home for boys and, 6 months later, runs away. Shortly afterward he is picked up for stealing, confesses that he had attacked and almost killed a small boy, and is sent off to a school for delinquents.

There an examining psychiatrist finds in Michael "a spine-chilling coolness as he describes his misadventures and I feel he is quite capable of a repeat performance. The boy seems to be guarding against forming a relationship with anyone. * * * The origin of this, of course, seems to lie in the disturbed relationship with his mother."

But Michael is paroled after 6 months to one of his stepfathers; within a few months he kills a woman customer in a holdup attempt. Now he is under life sentence in the State penitentiary.

Such cases could be multiplied by the thousands out of court records. None probably illustrates the problem more vividly than that of Lee Oswald. And we can find some clues to what should be done if we reexamine his now familiar story. Here are the salient facts which are, I think, worth restating and pondering:

An unhappy, bitter child in a badly deranged home, Oswald found it almost impossible to establish the most elemental give-and-take with other people. Sometimes his inner anguish poured out, and gave foreboding signs. This was especially true during his brief stay in New York—a city with many helping agencies. Taunted while he was at junior high school, the 13-year-old preferred to sit in the apartment he shared with his mother and watch television. His persistent truancy finally brought him to Youth House—an institution in which children are kept for psychiatric observation or for detention pending court appearance or commitment to a child-caring or custodial institution like a training school.

Here he stayed for a month in 1953 and was examined by experts. The diagnosis: "Personality pattern disturbance with schizoid features and passive-aggressive tendencies." At 13, Lee Oswald was found to be a child of more than average intelligence, detached and withdrawn, with serious environmental problems. The experts recommended that Oswald be placed on probation on condition that he attend a child-guidance clinic. They also suggested psychotherapy for his mother. But this probation plan did not work out.

"Few social agencies even in New York were equipped to provide the kind of intensive treatment that he needed," the Warren Commission observes, "and when one of the city's clinics did find room to handle him, for some reason the record does not show, advantage was never taken of the chance afforded to Oswald."

WHO'S IN CHARGE?

How many other potential Oswalds fail to take advantage of the chance afforded? Recent studies conducted by the National Institute of Mental Health suggest an appalling answer. Of 60 children studied in the District of Columbia, 58 had persistent emotional problems which were first noted when they were in preschool, kindergarten, or first grade. Nationwide, 208,000 children under 18 years of age were seen in psychiatric outpatient clinics in 1959; of these 86,000 were under 9 years of age. This is the picture we get from reporting clinics alone. Yet, two-thirds of the children diagnosed as needing help left the clinics before treatment was started, and less than half of their parents went to the guidance clinics to which they were referred. Only about one-third of those who went to the clinic returned for help after the first contact.

So the statistics accumulate and the tragedies mount. What is needed, it seems to me, is an all-out effort to make sure that potentially dangerous youngsters are identified early, effectively brought into treatment, and continuously treated as long as necessary to assure decent lives for themselves and safety for society.

Professional people have indeed told us this time and time again in recent years. Last year, for example, a conference of all the leading child psychiatrists in the country, held by the American Academy of Child Psychiatry and the American Psychiatric Association, urged that a national survey be conducted under the leadership of representatives of the entire spectrum of child-care professions in the field of mental illness and health "looking to the formulation of a national program to combat childhood mental illness and to secure the wherewithal to carry out such a plan."

TO MAKE SOMEONE RESPONSIBLE

I have offered a bill in the U.S. Senate to take the first step in this direction. Briefly, this bill would set up a program of Federal grants, administered by the Government agency most concerned—the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These grants would make it possible for qualified local agencies—be they social agencies or universities—to develop community therapeutic centers for emotionally disturbed children, or children in danger of becoming disturbed. Up to 75 percent of the cost would be borne by the Federal Government.

These centers, cooperating with the schools and courts, would offer a variety of services to children, all aimed at giving them accessible, comprehensive, and continuing care. A child might come to a center via a school, or a court, or a social agency, or a parent, or even a concerned neighbor. It would then be up to the center to use all the means at its disposal to make sure that the child does not slip haphazardly through its fingers into the never-never land of neglect and remorse. The child would not be referred from one office to another—guided only by a slip of paper bearing the address of an agency in a distant part of the city. The center would provide one-stop service, with a counselor taking responsibility for the case, even though different therapists would be involved at different times. With grant funds, the center itself could treat the child, or counsel his parents, or refer him to a foster family or a residential treatment center, as it saw best. But it would retain responsibility for that child, for making a comprehensive plan for him and seeing that it is carried out.

My bill is designed to help communities find and treat children with severe emotional problems. It is, of course, only the beginning of an attack on this problem. The cost in Federal funds will be $1 million for the first year, $3 million in 1966 and 1967, and $5 million annually thereafter. These are modest sums compared not only to the need, but to amounts appropriated for other major health and welfare problems. But they will permit us to make a start in some communities toward providing the full range of services to children who desperately need them. Once the projects have proved their worth, and as we train adequate professionals to staff them, I predict that they will—like similar good beginnings—gradually multiply.

At the outset, the bill would set up an expert panel of advisers to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to make recommendations and advise him on a nationwide plan to provide preventive, diagnostic treatment and protective services for children who are, or are in danger of becoming, emotionally disturbed. This would be done from the standpoint of the best interests of the child, the parents, and the community.

I know many people are tired of panels and reports and proliferating committees and studies. And there are those, too, who doubt that we can do much to cure the ills of the mind and emotions. Certainly it is true that psychiatry is still an infant discipline. And although Freudian jargon has filtered down into country-club conversation, we still have much to learn about the workings of the human mind. But certain things we do know—for instance, that the signs of emotional instability manifest themselves when children are very young and that cure is more likely if treatment is begun at an early age and is carried through without interruption.

Though we do not often read about them in the papers, many children can be—and have been—helped. To cite just two examples, there was Paul who first came to the attention of a social agency at 6. Now at 19, after many years of continuous treatment, he is a self-supporting university student. In the case of James, tuberculosis proved to be his salvation, because his physical ills put him under the wing of doctors, who observed and treated his emotional ills also.

In contrast, the tragedies of Anthony and Michael which I have cited earlier, and the grim record of Lee Oswald, are not stories of treatment failures but of society's failure to treat those who needed it. Today, out of an estimated half-million emotionally disturbed children, only 10,000 are known to be getting any sort of treatment. In other words, we are letting 98 percent of this group slip through our fingers, condemning them to lives of futility and anguish, and society to nameless perils. The risk is, I submit, one we cannot afford to take. No one can guarantee that they can all be helped or cured. But so far, we have scarcely even begun to try.

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL GRONOUSKI BEFORE OKLAHOMA PRESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], to have printed in the Record the text of the address delivered by Postmaster General John A. Gronouski before the Oklahoma Press Association at Oklahoma City on January 29, 1965.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General, Before the Oklahoma Press Association, Oklahoma City, Okla., January 29, 1965

I am happy to be here with you today. I take great pleasure in the opportunity to speak to this distinguished group of newspaper editors and publishers. And I am honored that your invitation should have come through two men I have long admired: Senator Mike Monroney and Congressman Carl Albert.

My respect for Senator Monroney and Congressman Albert is so great that I could easily devote the entire time I have allotted to me this morning in a tribute to them.

As you know, Mike Monroney is chairman of our Postal Operations Subcommittee and he's one of the acknowledged experts in the United States on the postal service. As such, he's a pretty tough taskmaster on all of us in the Department. He keeps a sharp eye on us. But he's a fair taskmaster, too, and I'm proud to call him my friend and trusted adviser.

Of course, anything I could say about Carl Albert was expressed far better by his own colleagues in selecting him as their majority leader. And having selected him, they can tell you that there is no harder worker in Washington today—or a more brilliant one.

It was my honor to share the platform with him at a senior citizens rally in Atlantic City last summer with a group of other government officials, and I must say that I had reservations about ever doing it again. The fact is, he upstaged us all. But here I am again—not a glutton for punishment, but a victim of his persuasiveness. The fact of the matter is, it's an honor to be upstaged by Carl Albert.

I read an item in Editor & Publisher the other day which reported that one of your newspaper engravers here in Oklahoma City—Raymond Frazier by name—has collected enough postage stamps to start a small post office of his own.

I hope he thinks it over before doing anything drastic.

In the first place, I don't think the public is quite ready for a whole new set of ZIP code numbers.

And then, too, I'm not at all sure he knows what he'd be letting himself in for. "Postmaster General" is a nice sounding title, but there are a lot of headaches that go with it. In fact, I've been putting in a 15-hour day ever since I took the job, more than a year ago, and I'm just beginning to identify some of the problems. You know, the President talks about the Great Society as "a place where leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect * * * and a place where man can renew contact with nature," but at the rate he's been working us, I'm beginning to get the idea that the Great Society doesn't include the Cabinet. Secretary Udall may have a chance to renew contact with nature once in a while, but you can bet he's spending more of his time renewing contact with the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

So my advice to our friend is to stay with engraving. It's a quieter life all the way around. In addition to that, he's a lot better off on that side of the newspaper than the other side. As Postmaster General, I often find myself looking right into the editorial barrel, so to speak, and it gets a bit nerve-racking. It's a lot safer on the firing end.

The most recent editorial fad seems to be writing open letters to the Postmaster General, wondering aloud why he can't run the Post Office Department like a business and show a profit for a change.

Of course, under law, we're prohibited from making a profit, but we do try to operate under sound business procedures. I was beginning to convince some people of this, too, until the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. came along last month and announced rate reductions on long distance calls. I don't know whether it was deliberate or not, but they made the announcement the same day I hinted at the possibility of increases in second- and third-class postal rates.

The open letters really had fun with that one. In fact, they're still coming in.

"Why is it, Mr. Postmaster General," they ask with undisguised sarcasm, "that private enterprise can reduce rates while the Government is preparing to raise them?" Of course, there's seldom an attempt at understanding the differences between the two operations—such as the fact that the telephone company installed phones in remote areas only when it became economically feasible to do so, while we established rural routes whether they made money or not, simply because we're a public service organization. Or that it's easier to transport a voice than a letter. Or that it's still a whole lot cheaper to send a 3-ounce letter from coast to coast for a nickel than it is to make a 3-minute call for a dollar. These things are not considered because it's automatically assumed that if the Government operates a service, it's bound to be inefficient. Grey-flannel-suit socialism is the way one columnist referred to the postal service.

The whole thing bewilders me at times. A businessman would have to pay a private message delivery service $3.25 to pick up a letter and deliver it 3 miles away in the city of Washington, while we will charge him 8 cents to fly it across a continent.

And so we have different requirements and different problems, and we should recognize them.

But that does not mean that we should become bemused by them. There are certain areas of similarity that we would ignore at our own peril. When we can learn from private enterprise, we intend to do so.

Actually our rate structure is based in large part on our present method of operation. If we can modernize that operation, we can modernize the rate structure as well. Last week, I appointed an advisory panel of distinguished business, economic, and labor leaders from all over the Nation to study this whole question and to assist me in my recommendations to the President. This is part of President Johnson's policy of consulting with outstanding experts in private industry in formulating and carrying out Government programs and services.

Frankly, I cannot say at this time what their recommendations will be. But I can say that whatever the decision is, it will be based on the soundest advice available in this Nation.

Basically, our challenge is this:

Our mail volume, now running at an annual rate of 72 billion pieces a year, is increasing at an explosive rate. No one is complaining about it, because it is part and parcel of our national prosperity. Nevertheless, it has increased by about 166 percent since 1940 and continues to increase at the rate of 2 billion pieces a year.

The trick, of course, is to find a better way of sorting the mail so we can keep it moving—and that is just what we are doing. through ZIP code. And the most important aspect of ZIP code is the one which deals with our large-volume mailers.

Many people do not realize it, but 75 percent of our total mail volume is business mail. We spend a lot of our time and effort keeping up with it. One program which we have recently initiated in this regard is called VIM—vertical improved mail—which speeds the delivery of business mail in highrise office buildings. Replacing the time-consuming operation of walking from office to office, from floor to floor to deliver the mail, we can now handle the entire operation from a single mailroom in the basement by the use of a vertical conveyor system. This means that every tenant gets his mail as soon as it is sorted, and continues to get it throughout the day.

But the most significant breakthrough has come at the sending end of our operation. We now have discovered a way to keep a large proportion of our business mail out of the post office entirely until it reaches its destination area—to send it directly to one of our 566 new sectional centers without once unbagging or sorting it. And that is the real key to ZIP code. When we do that, we have gone a long way toward meeting the challenge of growth in the postal service.

How do we propose to do it? By asking large-volume mailers to use their automatic data processing equipment to sequence their address lists by ZIP code numbers and then presort their mail before they give it to us.

This is a lot to ask of a mailer, but I assure you it is not a one-way street. In the long run, his cooperation will save him money by helping us hold down rates, and will assure his mail much speedier delivery.

This program of presorting is more than just desirable, however; it is vital.

And so, with this in mind, I am, by administrative action, planning to require all large volume second- and third-class mailers to presort.

Further, I plan to ask Congress for legislation to require the same of large volume first-class mailers. We are now far enough along on our ZIP code program for this to have an immediate effect on our overall postal operation—and frankly, I do not see any other way out.

I am not so naive, however, to think that we will escape criticism entirely.

But I do not believe we are asking anything unreasonable of our mailers. In fact, a major reason A.T. & T. has been able to save money—and pass that savings along to the public—is that each year they are asking their customers to do more and more of their work for them. Long-distance dialing is a case in point. Several years ago, when you wanted to call long distance, you asked the operator to place it for you. Today, you dial it yourself.

That's exactly the type of cooperation we are now asking of our customers—and we believe the results will be just as meaningful.

The other vital area of cooperation, of course, lies with the average mailer's use of ZIP code. Obviously, the program will not reach its full potential if people fail to address by ZIP code—or fail to include ZIP code in their return address.

To help speed this program along, I announced, earlier this week, a new program to imprint ZIP codes right on the postmarks of the more than 30,000 post offices that individually serve one ZIP code area. They will carry the ZIP code number in the lower portion of the familiar circular postmark. This, I believe, will speed the use of ZIP code by years and will be a tremendous boon to the volume mailer in ZIP coding his lists.

As you probably know, we have been working for some time on an optical scanner which will be able to "read" ZIP code numerals on envelopes and sort the mail. We have now made the big breakthrough in this area. In about a year, we expect to begin installing these sophisticated new machines in large post offices throughout the United States. When you realize that each machine will be able to "read" and sort at the rate of 35,000 letters an hour, you begin to understand why I call this the icing on the ZIP code cake.

Presorting by ZIP code is, of course, the major postal achievement of our era—and because of it, we would still need ZIP code if we never had an optical scanner. But the scanners, themselves, will help us move the mountains of individual mail that will continue to pour into our large post offices, will speed delivery and will keep our workforce at a manageable size—which, in turn, will allow us to hold rates down to a reasonable level.

This is not a pie-in-the-sky dream. This is a goal that can be reached in a few short years.

It's not going to be easy, but we intend to strive for it—and we intend to succeed.

Thank you.

JOHN CARVER SPEAKS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on Monday of last week it was my pleasure and privilege to be at San Francisco when John A. Carver, Jr., recently elevated to the position of Under Secretary of the Interior, after having served so admirably as Assistant Secretary during the last 4 years, spoke at the annual convention of the National Canners Association. His was an excellent speech. It has a message of interest to all Americans; and therefore I consider myself particularly fortunate in gaining for Under Secretary Carver's remarks an even wider audience than the one present at San Francisco. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF JOHN A. CARVER, JR., UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE GENERAL SESSION OF THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION IN SAN FRANCISCO, ON JANUARY 25, 1965

I have, as your chairman has announced, recently moved from what I have often called the dry-land part of the Department of the Interior, into a much more varied assignment as the chief lieutenant of the Cabinet officer responsible for the entire Department.

Naturally, I haven't been unaware that there was in the Department a Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, or a U.S. Geological Survey. But as I have grappled with the problems of Indian and territorial administration, with public land administration, and with parks and recreation and a railroad in Alaska, I have not been as fully aware as I might have been of relationships and comparisons which are capable of being made when these other programs are related to the conservation movement generally.

So I hope you will forgive me as I try to adjust my thinking to include the harvesting of the products of the ocean with the harvest of crops on the lands in the context of conservation consciousness.

I think it particularly appropriate to start with this particular group—you as canners see quite clearly that the food from the sea, particularly the coastal sea, and the food from the land must be produced with a consciousness of conservation principles, if supplies are to be maintained, and if we are to meet the demands of a population which will double in a period of time shorter than the age of most of us here.

Today I want to take a few minutes to talk about the American conservation movement in this transitional period.

In my dryland phase, I came to know Wesley Powell, John Muir, Gifford Pinchot, and Harold Ickes as the intellectual giants of the conservation movement. I am sure that when the history is written about efforts to achieve conservation of resources of the sea, heading the list will be found a man who shares the platform with me today, the Honorable E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, Senator from Alaska. He has devoted his life to this and continues to lead the effort.

In my dryland phase, my laundry list of the resources which are essential to the continued growth and prosperity of our modern society emphasized petroleum and coal, metalliferous minerals and timber, potable water and animal forage. Now I must add many products of the sea. Citing known supplies, rates of use and needed reserves, to a large extent, misses the point of the national resource picture. The critical resources of one generation tend to be outrun by technology, so that the following generation faces a whole new pattern of resource issues.

I can make the point by citing only two examples, and the history of each are well known, making it unnecessary to give details. One is the uranium boom and the other is the present vastly expanded demand for silver after a long period of decline.

I do not choose to consume our valuable time with either historical review or statistical evaluation of our present resource situation. I would rather talk about the methods of public policy formulation. I think you might find it profitable to examine for a few minutes into the ways that resource conservation issues are posed in this complicated decade.

For this purpose, let me state a fairly simple thesis—one that may seem grossly oversimplified until you have pondered it awhile. I am persuaded that national conservation emphasis, now and for the future, must be concentrated on certain basic, fundamental subjects: land to live on and potable water for survival. Whether development and wise use of the seas and their resources should be included is the new idea I'm adjusting to.

Our land economists point out that the process of urbanization alone—for housing, commercial, and industrial development—is consuming the countryside of this Nation at the rate of 1 million acres per year. This has obvious implications for the long-range future—the prospect of simply running out of living space. But we needn't look that far ahead to see its impact. There is already ample evidence that real estate values—raw land values—have increased more than any other commodity since the end of World War II.

The literature of our youth used the expansive words—"boundless," "inexhaustible," "endless," "numberless," "unlimited"—to describe our prairies, forests, flight of birds, runs of salmon, herds of buffalo. The land which was beyond the blue ridge was the jumpoff for the land beyond the Cumberland Gap, up the Missouri, beyond the Rockies, and finally the arid desert itself.

It is only recently that we have come to the realization that the supply was finite.

Science and technology only stretch the limits of resources from the land necessary to man's existence. Chemical fertilizers multiply our food and fiber potentials. Energy can be captured from the fundamental atom, and soon from the sun itself. Technology cannot make the earth itself bigger. The supply of land is a closed vessel.

The adjacent seas, I now see, offer great possibilities for expansion of our activities. We are rapidly becoming vitally interested in the world ocean—all seas. Instead of thinking only or first of our defense interest in the sea, our vision must include the great opportunities for increasing commerce, for producing fresh water, for utilizing energy from the sea, or for utilizing the resources within the sea of minerals and food.

Our science and technology are progressing to a point where we can look forward to farming the shallow expanses of the seas, producing more shellfish and inshore varieties of valuable species of market fish.

These developing uses of adjacent seas, coupled with the multiple-use concept of the land, offer possibilities for expansion of our conservation horizons.

It is gratifying that conservation, as an attitude or pattern of thinking, has become an umbrella spacious enough for all—those who enjoy our lands and parks in a recreation sense, as well as those who derive their sustenance from it, whether from the timber, the forage, the minerals, or the resources of the sea.

But although multiple use and a consciousness of conservation, represent sound public policy and good sense, as concepts they do not eliminate the necessity for making hard choices. As competition for land use increases, the feasibility of multiple uses is reduced. The hard choices become more and more frequent—and more and more difficult.

When we turn from the national land base to the question of fresh water, the situation is not much different. The fastest growing areas of the United States are to be found on either side of the lower Colorado River—south central Arizona and southern California. Neither of these areas is self-sufficient in water resources. Both have looked to the Colorado as the key to their growth for nearly 60 years. For 30 years, they resorted to both litigation and legislation to assure adequate water for agriculture and for municipal uses.

Through the whole history of the Boulder Canyon legislation and judicial consideration of the issues in *Arizona* v. *California*, it was taken as fact that the lower Colorado would furnish 7.5 million acre-feet of water to the Southwest annually. Now we are reasonably certain that this is not so. After almost three generations of controversy, finally resolved by the Supreme Court in 1963, we face the unpleasant prospect of having to allocate a net shortage. Unless, that is, our conservation statesmanship is bold enough and imaginative enough to save water now being wasted and augment supplies from other sources.

These, you say, are relatively simple decisions to make. It takes only application of basic economic and engineering principles to determine whether and how much we can afford to do. True, except that this view ignores the simple fact that the very issues at stake will undoubtedly constitute one of the principal political battlegrounds of our generation and the next. And the resulting contest will be heavily colored by the slogans and epithets of past conservation crusades.

Even experienced and sophisticated veterans of public resource management react in a conditioned way to verbal stimuli which are a part of our political tradition. Take the word "exploit" in reference to economic development needs. This is ordinarily a bad word in the conservation lexicon—not for any etymological or philological reason, for words are neutral. But this one exudes the colorful symbolism of our political environment. "Exploit" means "spoil"; "conserve" means "save." In this context, one doesn't even need to write down the moral propositions that create the differences. Generations of holy crusade have produced the glandular reaction—"exploiter," evil; "conservationist," virtuous.

This Pavlovian reference illustrates how deeply conservation issues have cut into national thinking.

Some will say: "Isn't this good? Shouldn't people react righteously without having to ponder? Let's not equivocate with evil." This begs the question, for it assumes that the labels and catch phrases, the campaign slogans, have been correctly assigned; that there is some divine guidance, some intuitive gift, that permits ready identification of an infidel or heathen cause. For the purist, there are no gradations of virtue—no compromises between ideal and reality.

Recently, an experienced and seemingly sophisticated government servant said to me, "Why doesn't the Department create a special board for the sole purpose of identifying the public interest?"

A good question. Yet in the 4 years I've been in the Department, I can't recall anyone of the innumerable controversies where each side of the issue wasn't framed plausibly in terms of the public interest. I've known no decision made by Secretary Udall which hasn't been made in the public interest. Yet the controversies have been deep and vigorous, and many have reverberated in the halls of Congress or the columns of the press long after they were made. In all of them both sides of the controversy are stated in terms of the public interest, and in most of them both sides are in the public interest, in greater or lesser degree. But choices have to be made and the job of making choices cannot be delegated by the Secretary to a board.

Conservation issues are public issues. Success in the task of conservation requires mastery of the workings of politics, both internal and external. I have found that the word "external" includes, in a special way, international politics. Conservation presents elemental conflicts of values.

If the politics of conservation are to be worthy, if it is to be recognized that resource managers must communicate to the public and to the legislatures a sense of ethical urgency rooted in a felt philosophy, then history must be studied, our society comprehended, our governmental system mastered.

It helps to recognize that these are the current manifestations of a long tradition. Resource issues have been political issues since the earliest days of the Republic. Jefferson and Hamilton's ideological struggle had as one of its ingredients the policies which should govern in settling western lands. In the last decade, Al Sarena held center stage while the pressure for more open space, better recreation facilities, more and purer water piled up. This accumulation is our political inheritance, the unfinished agenda of our generation.

The techniques of achieving political goals for conservation were never more effectively exhibited than they were at the hands of the first Roosevelt and his chief lieutenant, Gifford Pinchot. Roosevelt made his name synonymous with conservation, as he met both the interests and their legislative spokesmen headon.

By a pen's stroke, he set aside public lands for forest purposes while enrolled enactments of Congress prohibiting such executive action sat out the constitutional waiting period on his desk. Forestry, reclamation and wildlife protection became main functions of the Federal Government under his tutelage.

Teddy Roosevelt took the conservation movement out of the polite conversation of drawing rooms and off the platforms of the lecture circuit. An ideal, clothed with Victorian respectability, became an objective of public policy—of government activity. Conservation was made an object of political contest—where it has been ever since, not only at the Federal level but in the States as well.

Theodore Roosevelt's task in establishing the conservation deal ran across the grain of traditional thinking. He had to first establish waste as something close to immoral—and then worked on the public conscience to see that it reacted accordingly. The substantive issues of his day were, however, relatively uncomplicated. Techniques of forest protection were direct, elementary, and easily comprehended; power generation and transmission had potential for the future, but comparatively little current relevance; demands upon land and water resources were confined to single uses, uncomplicated by competing needs incompatible with each other.

Now our population has almost doubled and its mobility multiplied fivefold or tenfold.

Hetch Hetchy was the ancestor of today's truism: That one man's conservation ideal can be another's desecration, that recriminations among allies under stress can draw as much blood as contests between ideological enemies.

Any number of parallel situations may be cited to demonstrate the increasing conflict between and among interests within the conservation family in its broad expanse. The Steamboat Springs project, dear to the hearts of the reclamation branch of the family, foundered upon the unavoidable consequence of flooding a part of Dinosaur National Monument. The filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir is already underway, but the bitterness over failure to protect Rainbow Bridge against water intrusion will not be easily forgotten. Issues such as these find their outlet in the exercise of highly developed techniques of political pressure.

The issues upon which the conservation community finds itself divided will increase as demands for scarce land increases. The political dimension of conservation has expanded in ever-widening circles as our society and our technology have become increasingly complex. The simple "for" or "against" issue of 1900 now assumes overtones of the bureaucratic contest for policy supremacy. "Multiple use" becomes a slogan to block the preservation of critically needed recreation values, freedom to locate mineral claims argues against inclusion of a public domain tract in either a forest or a park. Parks supporters are accused of "locking up" resources because they regard public hunting incompatible with park objectives. The pluralism of modern life makes extremely complicated the simple faith which motivated Thoreau, Muir, Powell, and the other prophets of the good life.

I have spent perhaps more time than I should on the general nature of modern conservation issues and the environmental context in which they must be decided. But I think it is more important that these concepts be understood than that we compile a catalog of specific problems and the programs designed to meet them.

Yet I do not wish to leave any impression that the problems are insurmountable—or that they are not being attacked most vigorously. Neither is the case.

The 88th Congress has justly deserved the title of "Conservation Congress." In its short 2-year span, more basic conservation laws were passed than in any comparable period—even the Roosevelt years were less productive. In 1964 alone the following expressions of national policy were enacted into law:

A Land and Water Conservation Act sets aside certain Federal revenues for a program of land acquisition and assistance to the States in meeting our burgeoning outdoor recreation demands.

A Public Land Law Review Commission was created to study and recommend a comprehensive overhaul of the laws and policies governing the management and disposal of the public domain.

The Wilderness Act established a system of primitive areas to be preserved for future enjoyment and study, but with appropriate recognition of the need to develop certain resources, principally minerals, within such areas.

Fourteen new units were added to the national park system, including Fire Island National Seashore and Canyonlands National Park.

Appropriations were made to start construction on a giant intertie of power systems in the Far West, designed to balance the power resources, public and private of a region spreading from Canada to the lower Colorado.

A Water Resources Research Act provides authority for an expanded and coordinated program of water research, with emphasis on Federal-State cooperation and use of land-grant college facilities.

"New starts" were authorized for Federal reclamation projects in Utah, Idaho, Colorado, Wyoming, and Washington State.

And last, but not least, for those of you engaged in the fishing industry, several very important pieces of legislation were passed which strengthened the research programs of the individual States and give promise of upgrading at long last the domestic commercial fishing fleet.

Now all of you are experienced enough in the ways of government to know that this kind of legislative production did not spring into being, full-blown, in the course of 1 year. Most of it is the culmination of long deliberation and hard bargaining going back over a 2-, 4-, or 8-year period. It represents, however, a high-water mark in executive-legislative cooperation, because Federal land and water policies are uniquely within the congressional prerogative.

If, as I predict, these conservation questions are to be central public issues in this and the next decades, then we can profitably spend our time considering how public issues are resolved in this country.

The ultimate arbiter is the consensus of the people, but this consensus is acceptable to those adversely affected only as the interested groups like your association and others are satisfied that the processes or resolution of disputes are fair and equitable and in accordance with our constitutional system.

So we must keep in mind that it is to the Congress, as our representative form of government, that land managers—resource managers—must look for the articulation of the rules. This is the philosophy behind the Public Land Law Review Commission. Only rules derived in legal fashion will be fully honored as decisions inevitably become harder and harder.

Perhaps your interest—perhaps you in the business world who are seemingly remote from some of these issues will see that your role is central, too. Perhaps those of you whose crop is from the sea might see these issues as still a decade or two away. But history as I read it does illuminate. I hope you will agree.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON INITIATES PHOTOGRAPHIC HISTORY OF THE 1960'S

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, last summer I visited the photograph collection in the Library of Congress to review pictures taken thoughout the country during the New Deal period. I was amazed at the number of excellent photographs on file, and the history of our country that was captured so dramatically by brilliant photographers of this period. Miss Dorothea Lange played a key role in the photographic record of the 1930's, and she has continued to press for greater public recognition of the need to maintain a photographic history of our times.

I have considered introducing legislation providing for a photographic history of the 1960's.

On January 13, President Johnson issued a memorandum to his department and agency heads asking that they submit to him each month three photographs which they feel most powerfully portray American life in their area of responsibility. From this group the President will select one photo each month to be designated "The President's Choice."

I wish to commend the President for initiating this most valuable effort. With a minimum of expense, we shall have a visual history of the United States which will be of immeasurable benefit to generations to come.

I ask unanimous consent that a White House press release dated January 13, 1965, describing the President's directive be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 13, 1965.

President Johnson today announced a White House program of photography.

In a memorandum to the heads of departments and agencies, he stated: "The history of our times and the efforts of this administration to meet the challenges of today are graphically expressed in photographs now being made. Photography can show with peculiar power that government is personal, that we are concerned with human beings, not statistics."

The President asked the heads of departments and agencies to submit by the 20th of January, and on the first of each month thereafter, the three photographs taken in their division of the Government which most powerfully portray the problems of America and the efforts to meet them. These photographs will be screened by a group of outstanding photographers consisting of Ansel Adams, Walker Evans, W. Eugene Smith, and John Szarkowski; with Mr. Szarkowski, director of photography of the Museum of Modern Art in New York City, serving as executive director of the group.

From the photographs recommended by this group, the President will select one each month and it will be released as "The President's Choice." It is the President's hope that in time these photographs will be placed in exhibitions and gathered in a book which will capture the spirit of our times.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered

THE VOTING CRISIS IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, to the dismay of the whole country the racial crisis in Selma, Ala., is daily becoming more serious, with hundreds of arrests Monday and hundreds more yesterday. What is most shocking about it is that it is a crisis over Selma's Negro citizens' right to vote, a right which all Americans, Southerners as well as Northerners, seem to agree is fundamental and inalienable, whatever their feelings on other subjects. This is probably why Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., chose Selma as the site of a major voter registration drive last month. Up to that time it was one of the most intransigent holdouts from the general pattern of compliance in the South with the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Since the voter registration drive in Selma began, the statistics demonstrate the extent to which the pattern is one of seemingly flagrant disregard for the law and for the most basic right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. Close to 2,000 Negroes have sought to register to vote in Selma since the opening of the drive. In January, 280 were arrested while waiting at the courthouse; on Monday, 264 more were arrested along with some 600 students who demonstrated in sympathy with those waiting to register; and yesterday some 500 more were arrested, including 120 adults. With all this, 36 have had their applications processed in 1 week, 57 the week following that, and Monday another 70. Not a single Negro has been actually registered to vote yet, since none of the processed applications have been acted upon. The usual period before notification in Selma is about 6 weeks. When the whole laborious effort has been completed, it may only result in increasing the number of rejected applications—rejections based upon Alabaica's difficult and arbitrary literacy test for voting.

Added to all this frustration, and arising from it, is the danger of physical violence which hangs like a pall over the long line of registrants in Selma. It has exploded on several occasions already in the past few weeks, and it could again if something is not done soon to remedy the situation.

Dr. King has outlined the hurdles faced by Negroes in Selma who want to do no more than exercise the right to vote: A city ordinance against parading without a license is used to discourage applicants from coming to the courthouse in groups, when a Negro in Selma cannot be expected, after decades of intimidation, to try to do so in any other way; the county sheriff James Clark, is apparently dedicated to making the process of registering as dangerous for Negroes as possible; the registration officials are seemingly engaged in a slowdown, since despite a court order requiring 100 applicants to be processed each day, Monday's total of 70 was the highest to date actually to be processed; finally, even if these hurdles could be cleared, there remains Alabama's literacy test. Selma's pattern of resistance is clear enough now. In one Alabama county, where a Federal referee has finally been appointed under the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, the only result has been an increased rate of flunking the literacy test.

All these facts are before the Federal courts in a half dozen pending lawsuits, four of them brought by the Justice Department. The arrests Monday and yesterday and the summary contempt penalties meted out Monday against some of the picketers should be added to the suits still pending before the three-judge Federal district court, and I have asked the Justice Department to go into this question. I have every reason to believe that the Department is alert to the events in Selma and will move rapidly to obtain relief under the law where it can be obtained.

However, there are apparently limits to the effectiveness of the Federal law to protect voting rights, and the Selma situation should also be watched closely to see whether additional law is now necessary. For, this crisis again underscores the need for legislative proposals to resolve this kind of seeming paralysis in the voting system of a State. It may well show that Federal legislation is required authorizing the appointment of Federal registrars who would themselves be empowered to register citizens to vote.

The crucial point here is that this dangerous confrontation is avoidable. The people of Selma have every reason to implement now what all America knows: that the right to vote is the very heart of the democratic system and will not be denied on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin. To endeavor to do otherwise is to play King Canute with the sea and jeopardizes domestic tranquillity and security. I deeply believe the people of Selma can find the way if they determine in their minds to do so.

My main reason for making this statement on the floor of the Senate is that I do not believe that situations in the country as serious as this one, which is widely discussed and commented upon, should be merely swept under the rug and not noted in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record an editorial entitled "On Winning the Right To Vote," from last night's New York Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On Winning the Right To Vote

The arrest of Martin Luther King and 700 Selma Negroes should serve to highlight the single most dramatic statistic about the voter registration drive in Selma. Despite all the long hours of waiting, of demonstrations and jailings, not a single Negro is known to have succeeded in registering.

Those Negroes who, by patient persistence, have managed to get into the office of the board of registrars were confronted with questions such as: "If no national candidate for Vice President receives a majority of the electoral vote, how is a Vice President chosen? In such cases how many votes must a person receive to become Vice President?"[1]

How many New Yorkers would qualify to vote if they were obliged to answer such questions?

There is only one way to cut through the massive barriers of force, procedure, and subterfuge erected to keep the Negro from voting. That is to enact legislation in Congress establishing a system of Federal voting registrars.

Such a law would authorize a Federal registrar to move into a community like Selma, set up shop in the local post office and begin to register the disenfranchised Negro voters.

The right to vote will remain a slogan, not a reality, in too many places until such a law is enacted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I feel, with other members of the bipartisan group which traditionally sponsors civil rights legislation, that this crisis may very well show that we still have not gotten abreast of the situation, and that the only way to accomplish the purpose is to give power to Federal registrars to register voters to finally break the iniquitous system that, somehow or other, keeps people from exercising one, single, unquestionably cherished American right—the right to vote.

POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday I had occasion to speak on the floor of the Senate about the enormous growth of public sentiment in support of voluntary measures of population control, both inside, and outside the United States.

This morning's Wall Street Journal carries on its front page a most enlightening article, entitled "Birth-Control Push: Federal, Local Agencies Begin To Move Deeper Into Controversial Field—Cities, Counties Open Over 680 Clinics—United States Is Making Poverty Funds Available—Raising a Storm in Milwaukee."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Birth-Control Push: Federal, Local Agencies Begin To Move Deeper Into Controversial Field—Cities, Counties Open Over 680 Clinics—United States Is Making Poverty Funds Available—Raising a Storm in Milwaukee

(By Richard D. James)

Chicago.—State and local governments are rapidly invading an area they once regarded as strictly off limits and loaded with political dynamite—birth control.

This week the Baltimore City Health Department began operating five birth-control clinics, providing both advice and contraceptives, with $10,000 in city funds allocated to carry the program through 1965. It's estimated the program will serve about 3,600 women this year.

Last year the California Board of Public Health began urging county health departments to set up public birth-control programs. As a result, a dozen counties opened such clinics in 1964, and another dozen are expected to open them in the next 6 months, says Dr. Leslie Corsa of the State health department.

These two efforts are typical of hundreds scattered across the country. It's estimated that cities and counties in 21 States now are running more than 680 public birth-control clinics, up from 470 clinics in only 11 States a year ago. The number of mothers receiving help through these facilities jumped sharply to 175,000 last year from 75,000 in 1963 and about 50,000 in 1960, says the Planned Parenthood-World Population Council.

FEDERAL EFFORT GROWS

Moving into the field, too, though at a more cautious pace, is the Federal Government. As part of the antipoverty war, it is offering to pick up the tab for birth control for the first time. Already one project has been approved, and applications from three other cities are pending. Corpus Christi, Tex., last month was granted $8,500 in Federal funds to run birth-control clinics for married women in poverty-stricken areas inhabited by Negro and Spanish-speaking citizens.

The growing role of governments in birth control generally represents a major change in policy. Though the dissemination of birth-control information and devices has not been legally barred in most communities, the usual custom in government medical programs has been either to ignore the matter completely or to refer patients to private birth-control clinics. As a practical matter, contraceptive aid was available in the main only to women who could afford the services of a private physician. It generally was denied to women whose poverty and high reproductive rate made them the most likely candidates for birth-control assistance.

The present effort by public agencies is aimed mostly at promoting birth control among welfare recipients and low-income families. By spending tax money to run clinics, buy and distribute contraceptives, and supply information and counsel on family planning for these people, public health and welfare workers hope to save much greater sums now going to provide expensive medical care for expectant mothers and to support unwanted children who wind up on relief rolls.

A FACTOR IN WELFARE RISE?

Public health and welfare authorities contend the lack of access to modern, effective child-spacing methods is an important reason why more than half of the 7,800,000 persons on relief in this country are mothers and their dependent children. The lack of birth-control information, it's argued, also helps explain why this aid to dependent children (ADC) relief group has soared to more than 4 million persons from 2.2 million in 1955. Total ADC payments now run over $1.5 billion a year, compared with $639 million in 1955.

Partly because authorities see it as a way to reduce this huge burden, tax-supported family planning is bound to continue growing, perhaps even more rapidly than to date. "There is a lot of interest that hasn't yet been put into action, so I'm sure this will be a burgeoning affair," forecasts Dr. Johan W. Eliot, assistant professor of maternal and child health at the University of Michigan.

Another reason Dr. Eliot and others see increased activity ahead is what a high U.S. Public Health official in Washington calls a change in attitude on a very broad base toward recognizing that family planning is a problem.

A PRESIDENTIAL STEP

Evidence of such a change cropped up just a few weeks ago when President Johnson in his state of the Union message warned of the seriousness of the population explosion and said the Federal Government had a responsibility to do something about it. This is the furthest any President has ever gone in publicly throwing Federal support behind family planning. Some have interpreted the President's comment as foreshadowing further steps by the Government into the birth-control field.

The moves, if they come, are certain to be slow and deliberate in hopes that major opposition from the Nation's 45 million Catholics could thus be avoided. The Catholic Church condemns the use of artificial birth-control methods, including pills, as immoral. The only legitimate natural means, in the view of the church, is the rhythm technique, which requires periodic continence.

Even here, however, signs of a changing attitude on family planning are to be found. A commission of Catholic bishops and cardinals is studying the church's birth-control stand and will report its recommendations to the full session of the Vatican Council II when it resumes in Rome this September.

The growth of public birth-control programs has been particularly vigorous of late. Besides the new programs in Baltimore, California, and elsewhere, activity is climbing sharply in seven southern States which have long-standing policies encouraging counties to operate public birth-control clinics.

Alabama, for one, has sponsored a birth-control program at public expense for the past 20 years, and 63 of the State's 67 counties operate clinics. However, their major growth has come in just the past 4 years. During this period the number of mothers receiving family-planning assistance "has at least doubled to 10,000 a year," says Dr. Harold H. Klingler of the State health department.

Florida, which has favored publicly financed birth control for 15 years, spent $25,000 last year to supply contraceptives to county projects, compared with an outlay of only $1,000 in 1961, reports Dr. David L. Crane, a State health official. The number of Florida counties operating clinics now totals 61, compared with only 13 in 1962.

There's plenty of evidence to show that the number and size of family planning programs operated by public agencies will continue to expand. At a February 17 meeting of the Chicago Board of Health, Dr. Eric Oldberg, board president, will introduce a resolution which, if adopted, will pave the way for the city to run birth-control clinics for the first time. Dr. Oldberg is optimistic that the program will be approved and that Mayor Richard Daley will support it. If so, Dr. Oldberg expects to have the clinics operating in the city's 34-maternal-child health centers in second quarter of this year.

---

[1] By 51 votes in the Senate.

Several State legislatures are weighing requests for funds to expand new birth-control programs. Oregon lawmakers are debating a request for $135,000 by the State welfare department for the 2 years beginning July 1 so it can buy contraceptives for up to 4,000 welfare recipients. The State's first county birth-control clinic opened in November, and several others are expected to open soon, says Dr. Carl Ashley of the State health department.

TENNESSEE EFFORT EXPANDS

Tennessee Gov. Frank G. Clement has asked his State's legislature to vote added funds to finance a State health department program calling for outlays of up to $35,000 in the coming 2 years for drugs and supplies for county family-planning clinics. The number of county programs in the State has increased to 19 from just 1 a year ago, and 5 more will begin shortly, says Dr. R. H. Hutcheson, State health commissioner.

Perhaps more important because of the national precedent involved, President Johnson has asked Congress to appropriate $85,000 for the Washington, D.C., Public Health Department's birth-control program, more than double the $25,000 Congress allotted to get the program going last April.

One reason public officials are encouraged to seek more birth-control money is the generally widespread support shown so far for the Government projects. "The support has been spectacular," says Detroit Health Commissioner Dr. John J. Hanlon in discussing the city's month-old birth-control program. "We have a Catholic mayor, and I discussed the program with him and he publicly took a stand in favor of it."

Before Dr. Page Seekford, county medical director in Charleston, W. Va., started a birth-control clinic last July—the first in the State—he sent questionnaires to the local politicians and the medical society. "The response was in favor of going ahead, and we got editorial support from both local newspapers too," he says.

ILLINOIS FUROR SUBSIDES

In other areas, once fierce opposition is now crumbling. It appears, for instance, that an Illinois legislative birth-control commission will recommend next month an extension of the State's birth-control program to all of the 52,000 woman, wed or unwed, on the State's welfare rolls who request help. In 1963 Catholic criticism and controversy over the morality of aiding the unwed forced Gov. Otto Kerner to limit the program to 12,000 married women on relief.

"Personally, I still dislike the idea of giving contraceptives to unmarried women," says State Senator Morgan Finley, who led the anti-birth-control fight in the last legislative session and who heads the commission. "But after the hearings I find it actually boils down to the lesser of two evils—giving birth-control information to the unwed or face the continuing explosion of ADC rolls."

But in at least one instance, a proposed birth-control program has not been warmly received. A Milwaukee request for $45,000 in Federal antipoverty money to run five birth-control clinics has evoked a storm of protest and created doubts as to whether the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity will approve the request. The agency has indicated that local agreement on a program would be needed before a project would be approved.

The Milwaukee Common Council, the city's governing body, is objecting to the plan. So is a group of citizens called the Civic Awareness Committee, which is distributing a statement urging opposition on medical grounds, and so is another citizens' group which is circulating petitions requesting Gov. Warren P. Knowles, who has the final word, to veto the plan. Catholic Archbishop William E. Cousins of the Milwaukee archdiocese, whose orginal statement was widely interpreted as favoring the plan, has amended that stand lately and now questions whether there is either local consensus or need for the program.

The expansion of public birth-control programs has provided a major new market for drug companies selling contraceptives. It's estimated that the industry this year will sell $4 million worth of oral contraceptives, measured at retail prices, to Government birth-control programs, up from only $1.8 million last year. "This year the public programs will be the fastest growing segment of the whole oral contraceptive market," says William L. Searle, marketing vice president of G. D. Searle, which manufactures the contraceptive Enovid.

Though it's too early to tell definitely, there are indications that public birth-control programs do effectively lower birth rates among low-income families and thereby reduce relief spending. A State-run clinic near Nashville, Tenn., figures it has prevented at least 130 pregnancies among the 200 women served since the clinic opened 15 months ago. "We've had only 8 pregnancies, and the normal rate in this group would have been 140 to 160," says Dr. Hutcheson, State health commissioner.

Mr. CLARK. I hope very much, as a result of the breakthrough which has occurred in the field of population control since the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], and I began to speak in the Senate with reference to this problem, we shall be able to take necessary action both at home and abroad to bring to every citizen of the world information necessary to enable parents to regulate the size of their families in accordance with their own choice; and thus make progress in preventing economic distress which is already occurring, and which is sure to increase as time goes on, resulting from the fact that hundreds of thousands—indeed, millions—of unwanted children are being born every year because their parents do not have the type of information to enable them to engage in the type of family planning they would like to engage in.

LAW-ENFORCEMENT WIRETAPPING

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently the Christian Century published articles by two law school professors advancing arguments for and against law-enforcement wiretapping.

Being opposed to law-enforcement wiretapping, I found the article by Prof. Herman Schwartz most impressive. Professor Schwartz was a member of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee staff before he joined the faculty of the law school at the State University of New York at Buffalo.

Professor Schwartz points out with clarity the grave dangers of law-enforcement wiretapping. I believe all who read the article will find it interesting and enlightening.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reflections in Opposition

(By Herman Schwartz, associate professor of law at the State University of New York at Buffalo)

Wiretapping seems to raise one of the sharpest conflicts between individual liberty and effective law enforcement; specifically, how can one fight organized crime without unnecessarily invading the citizen's privacy? Put this way, the problem seems resolvable only by a compromise or "balanced" solution such as that currently being supported by a few articulate prosecutors, a solution which would permit a limited amount of wiretapping, restricted to the investigation of a few major crimes and closely supervised and controlled by the courts in all but national security cases. Such a narrowly restricted invasion of privacy seems a small price to pay for smashing organized crime, especially since, as is often noted, we are dealing only with the privacy of criminals.

Unfortunately, this reasonable compromise is no compromise at all. Physical and other inherent factors virtually preclude any meaningful limitations; as a matter of fact, the invasion of privacy is far greater than at first appears. The same factors preclude effective supervision by the courts; indeed, experience has shown that many courts do not even try to exercise any control. Moreover, there are indications that the so-called dilemma is more apparent than real, and that wiretapping may not be quite as indispensable as is often claimed.

I

The bedrock assumption on which the case for court-authorized wiretapping rests is that the invasion of privacy by means of a wiretap is no different in quality or degree from that produced by a conventional search. Since judicial supervision is considered effective protection for the latter, why treat wiretapping differently? This assumption is completely unwarranted, for a tap represents an immeasurably greater intrusion into the privacy of not one but many people.

Moreover, unlike the conventional search, wiretapping is inherently unlimitable. The invasion of a home under a search warrant must and can be narrowly limited to a specific place armed or occupied by a specific person, and to specified items therein. A policeman is not authorized to enter any suspicious area simply in the hope of finding something that may turn out to be useful. Limitation and specificity are essential to a valid search under a warrant, and there is no inherent reason why these restrictions cannot be observed and enforced. A wiretap, however, cannot possibly be kept within such bounds. Whereas a conventional search is limited to a specified place and item, a wiretap catches not only all the telephone conversations of the suspect at the place where he is calling or is called, but also of many other persons and conversations.

As to the suspect, all of his calls are overheard, no matter how intimate, irrelevant or even legally or constitutionally privileged they may be. Thus, in the Coplon case in 1950, the Government tapped conversations between the defendant and her attorney during the trial, thereby violating her constitutional right to counsel. And a Queens County, N.Y., district attorney has wiretapped in abortion cases, thereby eavesdropping on the statutorily privileged physician-patient conversations.

A wiretap's intrusion does not stop with the suspect and any other persons using his phone. It also catches all persons who are called by the suspect and by others using the tapped phone as well as all those who call any of these people on that phone, regardless of the total irrelevance of any of these conversations to a valid police purpose. It has been reported that in the course of tapping a single telephone a police agent recorded conversations involving at the other end the Julliard School of Music, the Brooklyn Law School, Consolidated Radio Artists, Western Union, the Mercantile National Bank, several restaurants, a drug store, a real estate company, many lawyers, a stationary store, a dry cleaner, numerous bars, a garage, the Prudential Insurance Co., a health club, the Medical Bureau To Aid Spanish Democracy, dentists, brokers, engineers, and a New York police station.

Wiretapping's broad sweep is most apparent where public telephones are tapped. Of 3,588 telephones tapped by New York City police 1953–54, for example, 1,617—almost half—were public telephones. It is inevitable that in these cases only an infinitesimal number of the intercepted calls were made by the suspect or by anyone remotely connected with him. The same holds true for taps on the phones of hotel switchboards, law firms and large corporations. All such taps invade the privacy of thousands of people—and once the tap is in, nothing can be done to curb its operation. The inherently dragnet nature of any tap thus precludes any meaningful limitation.

Because of the inherently unlimited scope of electronic eavesdropping, a court cannot control wiretapping in the way it controls more traditional searches. Its power is also weakened because of the fact that the tap must necessarily remain secret and because of certain other realities of practical jurisprudence.

The traditional search and seizure for tangible items cannot be kept hidden, whereas almost all wiretaps are likely to remain secret. As New York District Attorney Frank S. Hogan has pointed out, most taps are installed not to obtain material for use in court, where they might be subject to challenge, but solely as leads to other evidence. The defendant must find out and prove whether any of the evidence introduced against him is in fact derived from wiretapping. According to a Yale Law Journal study some years ago, Federal judges have been very reluctant to permit such an inquiry, and the rule excluding wiretap evidence from Federal courts has proved an illusory safeguard. There is no reason to think that defendants have been more successful in tracing wiretap evidence in State courts.

The small probability of a challenge to the propriety of a wiretap order invariably makes for lax judicial scrutiny of the application, especially where judges are overworked or otherwise unable to make a close study of papers. Some judges are, of course, more prosecution-minded than others, and practicing lawyers know that careful judge shopping is one of the most important and widely practiced skills of any successful law practice. This may be one reason why New York district attorneys assert that although they have occasionally been required to modify their supporting papers, they have never been denied a wiretap order.

Nor does experience with a court order system provide any basis for faith. For several years such systems have been in effect in New York and a few other States. An extensive 2-year study concluded that "the experience of the statutes throughout the country providing for judicial supervision has been very bad. Law enforcement officers have had no difficulty obtaining a court order when they wanted it. Judges who are "tough" are just bypassed. In addition, police officers have shown complete impatience with the court order system and more often have engaged in wiretapping without a court order than with a court order."

II

But what of organized crime? Surely the urgent need for wiretapping as an investigative technique overrides the unavoidable danger to individual liberty. After all, when criminals can avail themselves of the most modern devices, how can one restrict the police to horse-and-buggy methods?

Such an argument has first-blush appeal but little more. In the first place, many law enforcement officials do not agree that wiretapping is indispensable. Among such officials are the present and former attorneys general of California, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Delaware, and New Mexico, as well as district attorneys from Philadelphia and from Cook County, Ill. In a recent congressional survey only 13 out of 45 State attorneys general called for wiretapping authority; most expressed no opinion and 6 were flatly opposed.

On the Federal level enthusiasm for wiretapping is relatively new. Although FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover now appears converted to the ranks of its champions, at various times in the past he has called it archaic, inefficient, and "a handicap to the development of sound investigational techniques." And in March 1961, early in his term, former Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy in an interview published in Look expressed a strong aversion to wiretapping.

State legislative committees in California and New Jersey have concluded, after hearings and study, that the value of wiretapping is far outweighed by the dangers to privacy. Several State judges with years of experience have come to the same conclusion; for example, New York State Justice Samuel Hofstadter has declared that his record of wiretapping results "showed some arrests and fewer convictions and then rarely, if ever, for a heinous offense."

There is much evidence that Federal law enforcement is quite effective without wiretapping. The Attorney General's report for the past few years show great success in the fight against organized crime, narcotics, and gambling, even without this power. Indeed, wiretapping is rarely mentioned in any Federal statements on law enforcement except in testimony in support of wiretapping authority.

Even in internal security matters it has never been shown that wiretapping is necessary or even useful. As Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., told the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1962: "We can be sure that if this wiretapping which has been going on since 1939 had produced effective results, they would have been presented to the public in support of this request for further wiretapping authority."

An even weaker case is made for State wiretapping. Although many of the arguments for its use are couched in States rights terms (each State should be able to protect itself against crime), the inextricably interstate nature of a telephone system precludes such insularity. If the State of Illinois attempts to safeguard the privacy of her residents by banning wiretapping, her efforts will be frustrated by New York's lesser concern for the privacy of her residents. Each time a conversation takes place between Chicago and New York, regardless of who initiates it, what its purpose is, or how intimate and confidential its nature, that conversation will be subject to eavesdropping by New York police.

The primary justification for local wiretapping authority is again the need to fight gambling and organized crime, especially traffic in narcotics. There is no evidence, however, that where it has been used wiretapping has been particularly effective in combating those evils. New York has permitted its officers to tap for years, yet there is no evidence that it has coped with illegal gambling any better than has Philadelphia or Chicago, where all wiretapping is forbidden. Indeed, it is generally acknowledged that the difficulty in fighting gambling and organized vice—the other area where wiretapping is widely resorted to—is not that the investigative techniques are inadequate; it is, rather, that the public is indifferent and that the police have a tendency to be lax, inept, and not infrequently corrupt.

Hardly a year goes by without some startling revelations of police tieups with gamblers. The most recent revelations concern the New York police, where corruption in connection with gambling may well have gone very high indeed and may have involved a telephone company employee. There were similar revelations in 1950, and there have been others in numerous other cities since then. Before risking our privacy to hands so readily tempted, must we not insist that law enforcement authorities make better use of such weapons as they already have?

This is not to say that wiretapping is not useful. But it is to say that a case for indispensability has not been made—and in a free society one does not give the police drastic powers unless a need is conclusively shown.

III

So far most of the discussion has focused on telephone communication. This, however, is only a small part of the problem. Wiretapping in itself is but one of many investigative techniques made possible by the electronic revolution. We now have detectaphones which when placed next to a wall pick up all the conversations in the adjacent room; spike microphones that can be put in contact with a pipe and so turn an entire heating or plumbing system into one vast microphone to pick up all conversations throughout a house, from bedroom to basement; parabolic microphones which require no contact whatsoever in order to pick up conversations hundreds of feet away.

Recent history has demonstrated that legitimation of wiretapping leads to acceptance of such other devices as well. The New York, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Nevada statutes, originally limited to wiretapping, now permit eavesdropping by all methods. In 1961 Senator Kenneth Keating, of New York, introduced a bill to permit States to legalize not only wiretapping but all types of electronic eavesdropping.

So far law enforcement officals have not been too reluctant to use these devices. Among decisions of the past 10 years permitting its use were a California case where police installed a listening device in a suspects' bedroom; a New York case in which a jail-visiting room was "bugged" and conversations between a prisoner and his lawyer were overheard; and a District of Columbia case where a hotel room was similarly "bugged." There are of course many other instances which did not reach the courts, for the reasons earlier set forth.

Our society has much more sympathy for the policeman trying to catch criminals than for the individual trying to maintain an enclave of privacy. Wiretapping and other forms of electronic eavesdropping would constrict this enclave almost to the vanishing point. As Senator PHILIP HART said in 1962: "Let's be sure that we don't make a move which ultimately will produce a people that never knew what privacy was [that] isn't aware that they have lost anything."

ROA LISTS 30 REASONS AGAINST LIQUIDATING RESERVES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Secretary McNamara's decision to eliminate the Army Reserve raises serious questions about our national defense posture which must be thoroughly explored by Congress. Any proposal as far reaching as this one cannot be accepted by Congress without thorough investigation and establishment of the facts.

Many of the arguments which can be raised against the Secretary's decision are contained in an article appearing at page 12, in the February 1965 issue of the Reserve Officers Association magazine, the Officer. The charges made by the ROA are weighty indeed, and merit Congress' close attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Thirty Reasons (There Are More) Give Basis for Grassroots Revolt Against Plan," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTY REASONS (THERE ARE MORE) GIVE BASIS FOR GRASSROOTS REVOLT AGAINST PLAN

ROA has sparked a grassroots drive to defeat the McNamara plan to destroy the Reserves with a brief citing 30 principal arguments.

The paper went to ROA leaders throughout the Nation, who were supplied the ammunition for developing local understanding of the issues raised about national security.

For the benefit of all readers of the Officer, this ROA staff paper is presented herewith in full:

1. The proposal will weaken the United States militarily, reducing the mobilization base by 21 divisions and discarding 150,000 trained, able-bodied reservists.

2. The plan, based on a directed decision, was conceived in secret, studied furtively in a limited circle which knows little about the Reserve components, and was adopted without the advice or knowledge of the Army's responsible professional military staff, the Army Committee on Reserve Policy, or the Congress of the United States and its committees.

3. The plan was presented after the fact to the Reserve Forces Policy Board, established by law as "principal policy adviser to the Secretary of Defense" on Reserve matters, and was rejected by this Board.

4. Only the Congress of the United States can make major changes in the statutory structure and policy of the military. Yet this decision was made before the national election and the decision was announced after the election and while Congress was not in session.

5. Historically, it has been proved that control and command of all military forces committed to the defense of the Nation must rest with the armed services. To propose the fragmentation of this authority among the 52 National Guard jurisdictions will result in organizational chaos, deterioration of combat readiness, and the erosion of every purpose of these men and weapons.

6. This so-called realinement places the responsibility for military training upon the Governors of the several States. Organization of the National Guard does not place authority where responsibility rests. None of the States and territorial Governors has any direct responsibility for national security; none is answerable to the National Government. Can anyone honestly believe that the Governors of the States, through their political appointees, can do a better job of training military forces than the professionals of the Regular Forces?

7. The State militia, as now constituted, provides ample force for the Governors to deal with disasters and riots in their States; to add to the size of these forces at the present time defies logic. What possible justification is there for State Governors to command units equipped with high-powered atomic cannons, high-performance and long-range aircraft, and the heavy armor with which our modern divisions are equipped?

TWO RESERVE ELEMENTS REQUIRED

8. There is historic and practical legal basis for two separate elements in the Reserve Forces. Congress established the National Guard with two functions, State and Federal, but the State function—action on strikes, insurrections, and emergencies—is primary; its Federal function secondary. Reserves have the exclusive function of augmenting the Regular Forces in emergencies. A Federal Reserve supported, trained, and controlled by the service concerned is vital to national survival.

9. Reserve units are inherently more flexible and responsive than Guard units. Transfer of units and transfer of individuals, weapons, and equipment between units in different States presents no problem in the Reserve. Nor do activations and inactivations among Reserve units as requirements change. All of these actions run into almost insurmountable obstacles in the National Guard.

10. There is a great problem in connection with the obligated Reservists who comprise 50 percent of the strength of many Reserve units, if their units are transferred to the State guard. Since a State oath or enlistment is required, this would provide an excellent opportunity for all of them to abrogate their obligation and escape service. Even though they might be required to train with the guard unit, they will not belong to the unit and cannot be called up by the Governor for State functions. The unit, in reality, would be at half-strength.

11. The decision does not take into account the personnel composition of the component involved. The facts are that the Reserve is manned with a hard core of active-duty-experienced noncommissioned officers and ROTC-trained company officers. On the other hand, the National Guard is predominantly manned with superficially trained enlisted personnel, with no previous active-duty military experience, who cannot possibly be effective without extensive post-mobilization training.

12. Any decision to transfer all units to the National Guard reduces the entire Reserve to a stagnant pool. This means that highly trained active-duty-experienced officers and men will be denied continuing training, but will be subject to callup in a mobilization emergency and condemned to slaughter in early combat. Such a system turns the clock back 40 years, actually destroys the military services' most valuable backup asset and reverts to a system inferior even to that of pre-World War II.

13. The 1961 callup provided an eloquent example. Three divisions were called up; one Reserve division and two National Guard divisions. The Reserve division mobilized quickly, relieved a Regular Army division for combat availability and performed quietly and competently with high morale during the entire period.

The National Guard divisions were not self-sufficient and had to be reinforced by Army Reserve "fillers" who had not been drilling. They had been left dormant in a pool. This element of the Army Reserve was integrated into the National Guard divisions under the leadership of the National Guard officers. They found conditions so intolerable as to cause them to reach a point of near rebellion; some actually picketed while on active duty.

The Secretary of Defense's proposal will destroy the element of the Army Reserve that performed so well and turn the entire Army Reserve into a dormant pool of the type found to be so unready.

LAW REQUIRES RESERVE TRAINING

14. The law of the land says:

"Whenever units or members of the Reserve components are ordered to active duty (other than for training) during a period of partial mobilization, the Secretary concerned shall continue to maintain mobilization forces by planning and budgeting for the continued organization and training of the Reserve components not mobilized, and make the fullest practicable use of the Federal facilities vacated by mobilized units, consistent with approved joint mobilization plans" (title 10, United States Code, sec. 276(a)).

15. The Reserves themselves were not granted their "day in court" on this matter, although leaders of the National Guard actually helped to draft the decision and to join in the campaign to "sell it" to the public.

16. The Reserve components represent a prudent and wise investment by the American taxpayers, with hundreds of thousands of officers and men organized in a modern system, carefully worked out under laws enacted on the basis of long experience. This system of laws keeps modern the Reserves of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with qualifications the same as for the active services. The operation of these laws—not dicta from the Pentagon—is the basis of our system of national security.

17. Service in the Reserve forces is a requirement for national defense, not some sort of picnic. The philosophy cited as the basis for this decision to abolish the Reserves is fallacious, and reflects a failure to recognize what Congress found to be true subsequent to World War II and Korea, that men and women must be persuaded that their services in the citizen-reservist forces are needed, and are appreciated by the Nation's leadership. Denunciation of their records does great harm to the cause of national defense.

18. During World War II, the victorious U.S. Army was composed of: 95 percent citizen-soldiers, 2 percent Regular Army, and 3 percent National Guard. This is our future reliance. The experienced elements must not be discarded.

19. The late President Kennedy warned the people of this Nation (as has every other enlightened leader in modern times) that free and open debate on all issues is essential to maintenance of freedom in this free republic. Dissent in the Pentagon already has ended. This must not be extended throughout the citizenry.

20. While it is obvious that, if the Pentagon spends the $150 million to be saved on Reserve personnel to equip the National Guard, the claim that the taxpayers will save $150 million annually is not true. On the other hand, if the Defense Department's aim is to save money—it can lop off three Active Army divisions and put a billion dollars on the Reserves, or it can save $50 billion by simply disbanding.

21. How do you "increase the combat readiness of our Ready Reserve Forces" by eliminating the 150,000 trained men and 21 divisions? The Secretary of Defense himself testified to the Nation's specific need for them earlier this year, and very recently the Chief of the Army Reserve components claimed they represent minimal needs.

"WHAT'S THE HURRY?"

22. The rarely seen haste to put this decision into effect in itself should suggest caution. Careful investigation should be made of the entire Reserve structure to avoid adoption of this hasty and radical decision which has only one goal, destruction of the Army Reserve.

23. The American people have a right to know what political considerations entered into this decision.

24. If another general war should occur, we all know who would be ordered into uniform first. To repeat an ageless slogan, "The Reserves ask only the right to be ready."

25. This decision not only reflects unjustifiably upon the Reserves, it sets aside the

basic philosophy of this Nation that every citizen has a responsibility for national defense, and must be encouraged in every way to make this commitment.

26. This proposed abolishment of the Army Reserve has been interpreted in many places as the first step toward complete elimination of our Armed Forces Reserve. Throughout all history civilizations which have abandoned the citizenship responsibility for defense and depended solely on professional forces (mercenaries) completely divorced from the mainstream of society, have been destroyed by their enemies.

27. President Lyndon B. Johnson stated in a letter dated October 24, 1964, addressed to all members of the Army Reserve:

"Defense of our great Nation is every American's business. We rely heavily on the Army Reserve as a significant part of our country's defense team. * * *

"I am confident that the Nation can rely upon the Army Reserve today and in the future as it has so often in the past." (From the Army Reserve magazine.)

(The decision to abolish the Reserve was forwarded to the Army Secretary on October 6.)

28. Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance said recently:

"Under the concept of flexible response, the Nation's Reserve components assume a degree of importance unsurpassed at any time in our history * * *. It is opposite from the truth to say that America's Reserve components have lost their usefulness in this era of nuclear deterrence." (Address to ROA Fort Monroe chapter, July 1964.)

PERSHING'S WARNING

29. General of the Armies John J. Pershing, before the 1st ROA convention in 1922 said:

"Of special importance is a stimulus in the organization of Reserve units throughout the Nation. Before the war, there was no conception of such a society. But the war brought home to us in a striking manner the advisability of * * * precaution. The experience has awakened the country so that a resolve has gone forth embodied in the law of 1920 (National Defense Act of 1920 setting up an organized Reserve) that never again shall our untrained boys be compelled to serve their country on the battlefield under leadership of new officers with practically no conception of their duties and responsibilities."

30. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, stated:

"During the buildup of the Cuba crisis, the argument was frequently heard throughout the Pentagon that we should call up the Reserves, so that they would have time to really get themselves ready. I expressed the opinion that the Air Reserve Forces were ready, and that they should not be called until they were actually needed. On the night of Saturday, October 27, 1962, the order went out from the Pentagon at 2100 hours to selected Air Force Reserve units. At 0900 hours the next morning, these units were reported 93 percent manned, with an optimum in-commission rate on aircraft at 75 percent. At the 30-hour mark, the Secretary of Defense declared them 'operational and deployable.'

"At a press conference in December (1962) Defense Secretary McNamara called it a 'fantastic prformance.' This is the standard of performance that has been built into the Air Force Reserve * * *." (In special article, the Officer, September 1964.)

STATE OF THE STATE ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DEMPSEY OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on February 2, Connecticut's great Governor, John N. Dempsey, gave his state of the State address before the Connecticut General Assembly.

Governor Dempsey presented a very forward looking program to meet the needs of the people of the State of Connecticut. This address will serve as a good model for constructive State legislation for all our States, and I commend it to my colleagues for their careful consideration.

I am sure that the program outlined by Governor Dempsey will have the support of the general assembly and the people of the State of Connecticut.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF GOVERNOR DEMPSEY'S STATE OF THE STATE ADDRESS

We begin today a new chapter in the record of a general assembly destined to serve a longer term than any other in the history of Connecticut.

This general assembly—the last to be elected under a system which our highest court has said must be changed—has the valuable asset of experience.

It knows how to resolve differences. And this, of course, is the first lesson that must be learned by any legislative body with divided political control.

I am convinced that the people of our State view their government as a creative instrument in shaping the scope and quality of today's Connecticut and the Connecticut of tomorrow.

The people want a government which:

Is keenly aware of its human obligations.

Accepts reasonably and responsibly its economic stewardship.

Constantly seeks improvements in its own structure and operations.

Welcomes all challenges of today as an opportunity for fulfillment of the promise of tomorrow.

Assuring such a government calls for a wide and unlimited view of the mandate now resting upon us.

That mandate is to do all that we can to give our children and their children the kind of Connecticut we want them to have as we enter the 21st century.

Because Connecticut is so good a place to live, its population is growing faster than that of most States.

By the year 2000 there will be twice as many people living in Connecticut as there are today.

The problems that arise when a family doubles in size—the need for more living space, for more income, for more services—are multiplied many times when the population of a State increases so dramatically.

These problems are of crucial significance in shaping any program of governmental action.

I propose, therefore, to outline steps we can take now to assure a Connecticut of tomorrow in which:

Every natural resource is conserved.

Every material resource is developed.

Every human resource is fostered and encouraged to reach its fullest potential.

Education is the key to this effort.

Our goal is to provide every Connecticut child and young person with the fullest and finest education to the limit of his capabilities.

To that end, we must increase the support of public education in our towns and cities.

And, in so doing, we must pay special attention to areas of special need.

Every child whose environment leaves him unprepared to profit from formal education represents a waste of priceless human resources.

We must make it possible for these children to bridge the educational gap they face through no fault of their own.

State assistance must be provided for preschool, remedial education, and guidance programs designed to give every child in our public schools full and equal access to the benefits of a first-rate education.

There is also an imperative need to accelerate the pace of growth we have maintained for the past several years in our institutions of higher learning.

The executive budget will, therefore, make renewed provision for 700 additional students each year at the university and its branches and 300 additional students at the technical institutes.

At our State colleges, provision will be made for 800 additional students—300 more than the annual increase that has prevailed for the past several years.

Furthermore, I recommend the establishment of a new postsecondary program, confined to academic subjects, to be conducted at the State colleges during afternoon and evening hours when these valuable facilities should be better utilized.

This new program will provide for the enrollment of 1,400 students the first year, and an increase to 1,800 the second year.

Two years ago this general assembly approved my recommendations to establish a State scholarship program and a commission on higher education.

I urge your continuing support of the vitally needed work of the scholarship commission in helping deserving Connecticut young people attend college in this State. You will also, I am sure, give long and serious consideration to the forthcoming report of the commission on higher education.

Technical education both at the secondary and postsecondary levels is vitally important. I propose accelerated expansion of our vocational and technical education programs in both scope and quality.

I strongly recommend the establishment of a center for education and research in the field of metallurgy and materials science at our great State university.

Adoption of my budget recommendations for this center will insure a significant advance in the creative partnership between industry and our State university for the development of new skills, new products and new jobs for our people.

Educational opportunities for all of our people are incomplete without good library service.

I commend to your thoughtful consideration the proposals of the special committee on libraries which I appointed in December of 1963 in accordance with the intent of this general assembly.

Education enriching the mind and spirit must include a broad range of cultural opportunities. The report of the State commission on the arts points the way toward fuller enjoyment of our cultural resources.

We must remember, too, that the finest educational facilities fail of their purpose unless staffed by good teachers. The teacher is the one absolutely essential element in any educational program.

Therefore, let us make sure that we do everything possible to prepare teachers and to compensate them adequately for the heavy responsibilities they carry.

Our concern for education reflects our great concern for our richest resource—our young people.

We must assure continuing expansion of opportunities for youth outside the field of formal education.

In full partnership with the Federal Government, we should take maximum advantage of the provisions of the national economic opportunity program. In this way we will help idle youth return to education, do useful work, acquire valuable occupational skills, and develop excellence of performance in every possible field.

In creating these broader opportunities, you will have the benefit of the recommendations of the Commission on Youth Services which you established in 1963.

Wisdom and foresight dictate that we must also plan and act for the fullest conservation and development of our human resources in the broad field of health and humane services.

The physically and mentally ill, the disabled, the handicapped, the blind, the deaf, the mentally retarded, the helpless and the needy are, even as we, children of Almighty God. The kind of Connecticut we have created, and which we want to maintain and improve, will not permit them to suffer neglect.

What greater reward can we know than the light which our help brings to the eyes of a crippled child?

Will we measure these deeds in the terms of cold budget figures?

Or will we acknowledge that the enrichment which they bring to our lives far outweighs their cost?

We must increase and expand facilities for the care and treatment of the chronically ill and the mentally ill.

Services of the highest caliber for the blind, the deaf, and the physically disabled must be provided.

Connecticut's deep concern for the mentally retarded has found expression in a nationally acclaimed program of care, treatment, and research which has made this State an acknowledged leader in this all-important humane endeavor.

We are aware that few afflictions bring more distress to more people than the heartbreak of mental retardation. That is why Connecticut's already excellent program must not only be continued but expanded.

The guidance of the State committee on mental retardation planning will be of great assistance in this effort.

We must prepare for the staffing and operation of the regional center under construction in New Haven and the center soon to be under construction in Newington and for the planned growth of the newly opened center in Putnam.

To meet a demonstrated need in Fairfield County, I am recommending that a care and treatment center be established in conjunction with the Kennedy Center in Bridgeport.

Mental illness, another national health problem of the first magnitude, also has long been of deep concern to Connecticut.

Connecticut's position of leadership in this field will be maintained. The new mental health center in New Haven, a joint venture uniting the resources of the Yale University School of Medicine, Grace-New Haven Hospital, and the State of Connecticut, will open next year. It will provide our people with the newest and finest combined facilities for teaching, research, and treatment.

Our continuing emphasis on community based mental health care calls for the establishment of a community mental health center and branch hospital in Fairfield County.

Pioneer programs meriting your continuing support are the mental health service corps and summer camping project which serve as models for the Nation.

The growing menace of narcotics addiction requires the expansion of research and treatment facilities at the Blue Hills Clinic.

We are fortunate in all these endeavors to have the assistance of the dedicated citizens serving on the State advisory council on mental health planning.

One of the greatest programs that the State of Connecticut has ever undertaken is housing for the elderly.

Men and women retiring after a lifetime of useful work have earned the right to live in decency and dignity.

It is our duty, therefore, to go forward with the housing program that brings new hope and security to our older men and women.

To increase the range of other opportunities for older people, the commission on services for elderly persons needs additional resources. The report of the committee to study tax burdens of elderly citizens will also merit your thoughtful consideration.

Another report bearing on our social and humane obligations comes to you from the commission to study the welfare laws.

The welfare department is required by law to furnish the basic needs of food, clothing, shelter, and medical care to those who cannot provide for themselves.

It has the further responsibility of helping the dependent to become self-supporting.

The commission's report gives detailed consideration to these responsibilities.

Connecticut must be a State where every citizen has full access to all the rights of citizenship.

I therefore urge this general assembly to reconsider measures giving the civil rights commission power to secure compliance with laws forbidding discrimination in housing.

The commission must have the authority to obtain injunctions against the sale or rental of housing units where discrimination is charged, until a court of law has ruled on the charge. The full intent of the fair housing legislation you already have adopted cannot be carried out until the commission has this enforcement resource.

I will recommend in the budget that we substantially reinforce the staff and field capability of the civil rights commission and its top level executive direction. In particular, we should make full-time legal assistance directly available to this commission.

Two years ago, I made three major proposals for highway safety. Two were enacted—the absolute maximum speed limit and the chemical test law.

Nothing was done about the problems that arise, on the highway and elsewhere, when young people consume liquor. Those problems have not diminished.

I ask you, therefore, to help in their solution by adopting the bill that will make illegal the possession of liquor by persons under 21 years of age.

Connecticut will continue its fight for recognition by the State of New York of the perils to which its liquor laws expose teenagers.

One of the most important aspects of highway safety is the training of our young drivers. My budget will substantially increase assistance to the driver education program.

Again I call attention to the urgent need for a department of correction.

Our adult correctional institutions must be coordinated so that they can operate more efficiently and economically and be truly effective as an instrument of rehabilitation.

I stand ready to work with the legislative leaders of both parties in eliminating any obstacles to prompt enactment of this long needed reform.

We must assure for the Connecticut of tomorrow the preservation of those blessings of nature which have so enriched the quality of Connecticut life in the past.

To this general assembly which adopted it originally, I know that I can confidently recommend a continuation of the open spaces conservation and development program.

A closely allied problem, and one that presents major difficulties in a densely populated industrial State, is eliminating pollution in our streams, rivers, and coastal waters.

We must step up the cooperative effort to assure clean, pure water for the health, recreation, and prosperity of our people. The increasing menace of air pollution also requires our intensified concern.

A prime objective of the research advisory committee will be accelerated investigation of pollution control methods.

A safe, modern, and effective transportation system is indispensable to the convenience of our people and the health of our economy.

The highway construction program which I will recommend will provide for completion of Connecticut's share of the basic interstate system and for substantial expansion in the interior road network.

Our economy cannot, however, continue to grow and prosper unless it is assured a sound and efficient rail transportation service.

And the convenience of our citizens also requires that this service be maintained. I have long stressed the obvious fact that Connecticut action alone cannot insure the survival and the prosperity of all services of the New Haven Railroad.

But in the area of passenger transportation, we have recognized a State obligation to act, and this recognition must be extended.

An important step in this direction is the joint Connecticut-New York program, announced last month, to provide both new equipment and new cash income for essential commuter operations.

Additional legislative action is required to assure Connecticut's full participation in this program.

Our program to replace urban blight with healthy urban growth has brought dramatic changes to the skylines of our cities. I recommend continued State participation in the urban renewal program.

Our population increase is matched, of course, by an increase in the need for jobs.

The Connecticut Development Commission and the Industrial Building Commission are performing outstanding service in this area. We must give them the vigorous support they need to meet the added demands of an expanding economy.

An advanced program of scientific and industrial research is the key to Connecticut's future as an important center of space age technology.

I recommend that the research advisory committee, established by executive action in 1961, now be made a permanent agency of the State government.

Our State, which 4 years ago set an example for the Nation with its job retraining program, now has a greater opportunity than ever before to develop the occupational skills of its people.

Our continuing emphasis on the creation of new job opportunities must take into account labor legislation. The effects of automation and changing patterns of defense production must be studied and anticipated.

Connecticut will take maximum advantage of the programs established under the Federal Economic Opportunity Act.

Another partnership effort with the Federal Government which will yield far-reaching benefits is the interregional planning program.

In the years of growth which we are certain to experience, the success of this program will mean the difference between orderly, planned development * * * or haphazard, disorderly growth.

Connecticut's leadership in this task is demonstrated by the fact that our grant from the Federal Government for interregional planning is the largest received by any of the 50 States.

I have outlined for you some of the challenges confronting our State government. The quality of our response depends on the skill and dedication of the men and women who do the State's work.

I will, therefore, recommend an upgrading in the rewards of State service.

I make this recommendation in recognition of the devotion and talents of the thousands of men and women who have given Connecticut the finest State government in the Nation.

We must protect our State employees and the public whom they serve by the adoption of a code of ethics. The recommendations of the legislative council, based on the report of the special committee which I appointed, should provide valuable guidance in this endeavor.

This general assembly also has an unprecedented opportunity to provide a prompt, fair and effective solution to the troubling question of the use of the party lever on our voting machines.

Many who share my opposition to the mandatory party lever have resisted efforts to make its use optional because of their sincere conviction that this would be a first step toward its complete abolition.

These sincere doubts can be overcome by adopting now a bill making the use of the party lever optional, but containing the further proviso that the bill will become effective only upon adoption of a constitutional revision giving the optional lever permanent constitutional status.

Important proposals for improvement in our judicial system will be brought to your attention by the reports of the judicial council and of the special commission which you established to study the judicial systems of other States.

The recommendations I have presented represent a program wholly consistent with continued prudent fiscal management.

The fiscal aspects of this program will be presented in detail to you in the budget message.

I have served in this Chamber; I have participated in the legislative process in Connecticut for a long time, and I know that we will be united in our basic purpose—to serve the State we love and of which we are so proud.

Your effort and sacrifice will be amply rewarded if, because of what you do here, one of our children earns a hard-won diploma, a crippled child walks again, a despondent and idle worker regains a job, learning a simple skill brings a smile of happiness to the face of a mentally retarded youngster.

I feel sure that John F. Kennedy, the President so tragically taken from us, had these rewards in mind when, in accepting the leadership of our country 4 years ago, he spoke these words:

"With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

THE IMPORTANCE TO CONNECTICUT OF THE PROPOSED STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] introduced a significant bill—S. 949—to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science in the hands of American industry.

I am pleased to join him as a cosponsor of this bill, which is important to the continued growth of our Nation's economy and the growth of the economies of every State, including my own State of Connecticut.

Science and technology have historically been the main source of Connecticut's economic development and affluence. The inventive genius of men of the caliber of Eli Whitney, Seth Thomas, and Linus Yale provided the early impetus for our transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy, during the early 19th century. Science and technology, as the modern catalyst for economic expansion, have led to the development of many of Connecticut's leading industrial and business enterprises.

But we cannot rest upon past accomplishments. If Connecticut is to continue to capitalize upon the dynamic opportunities offered by modern science and technology, we must push forward toward four major economic goals:

To promote Connecticut's economic growth;

To improve Connecticut's competitive position in national and international trade;

To encourage regional economic growth so that Connecticut can achieve its share of the benefits of an expanding economy; and

To achieve and maintain a high level of employment throughout the State.

Mr. President, the need for action is greater now than ever before. For, paradoxically, in the process of developing our present economic gains, problems have been created that could restrict our future economic growth. Connecticut, like many other States with an industrial and urban economy, is confronted with problems of mass transit, air and water pollution, effective use of land and natural resources, and a host of other problems associated with urban growth and automation. To combat these problems, we must undertake programs which assure the development and spread of new technology. The proposed State Technical Services Act provides a weapon for the battle. It would permit Connecticut, in conjunction with its universities and local industries, to join with the Federal Government in bringing the latest technology, wherever it exists, into the production lines and plants of Connecticut industry.

The proposed act would enable Connecticut to receive Federal grants, on a matching basis, in support of programs to make better commercial use of the latest findings of science and technology. The programs, planned and carried out by the State, would place these important findings in the hands of business and industry at the local level. The technical services provided would include: Identifying new opportunities to apply technology to the advancement of specific areas and industries; preparing and disseminating scientific or engineering information; and facilitating its use by business and commerce.

Connecticut is already making significant strides in this general area. Governor Dempsey presented a proposal to the Connecticut General Assembly yesterday to establish a permanent State research advisory commission. Also, the Governor has requested authority to establish an institute of materials science and engineering at the University of Connecticut, to assist in the dissemination of materials and metallurgical technology to the industry of the State. The Federal support which the State Technical Services Act would give, would greatly strengthen and accelerate the efforts already underway.

Through this joint Federal-State program, we will respond to the President's challenge to apply the Nation's growing scientific and engineering resources to new socially profitable uses.

CONSUMERS SEEK LIFTING OF CONTROLS ON RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a matter of great importance to my State and to other States on the eastern seaboard; namely, the residual fuel oil import problem. My colleagues and I have over the years protested the continuation of controls over the importation of this vital fuel which is so costly for our schools, hospitals, powerplants, and apartment dwellers.

In this connection I call attention to an advertisement which appeared in today's Washington Post calling this vitally important problem to the attention of the President. This appeal is timely, for two reasons: First, the announced intention of the Department of the Interior to hold hearings on this problem early next month; and second, because a task force under the direction of Secretary McNamara is looking at this problem from the point of view of its impact on Appalachia.

I sincerely hope that the President will give this appeal the fullest consideration and let us have his decision before the start of the next fuel oil import year—April 1, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement that appeared in this morning's Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[An advertisement in the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your state of the Union message you declared all-out war on waste in Government, and with justifiable pride, cited your administration's past accomplishments. We enlist in your war, Mr. President, which we know you will pursue with your customary determination.

You can take action right now, Mr. President, to move ahead in this war by eliminating at least $80 million of waste annually—waste to our Federal Government; waste to our State governments; waste to our entire national economy.

You can do this by removing senseless and needless controls on residual fuel oil imposed in 1959.

These controls, which restrict a free and certain supply of a vital raw material, produced in this country in insufficient quantity to supply our own domestic needs, have created shortages and have artificially inflated fuel prices.

Residual controls, Mr. President, are unnecessary, in fact they are harmful to our Nation's well being because:

They have deprived 50 million east coast consumers of the economic benefits of free and open competition.

They have impaired our international relations, particularly with our good friends of Latin America in a life or death struggle with Castro's communism, and are in direct contradiction to the principles of the Alliance for Progress.

They have impeded economic development in areas such as New England, New York, and Florida, whose people ask only the opportunity to help themselves to move ahead in the march toward the Great Society.

They have added millions of dollars each year to the Federal budget by forcing the Defense Department and other Federal agencies to pay premium prices for fuel supplies.

You can act now to remove these controls, Mr. President, with the certain knowledge that you will:

Act in the interest of our national security. The Director of the OEP, acting on Cabinet recommendation, found residual controls were not necessary for national security and there should be a meaningful relaxation.

Restore competition among all fuels without injuring any domestic industry—the petroleum industry is constantly seeking to reduce domestic residual production. Other domestic fuels, particularly those supplying the energy market where the growth potential is tremendous, do not need this subsidy.

Improve U.S. trade relations throughout the world.

Stop the annual waste of millions of consumer dollars by ending premium fuel prices.

We are in sympathy with your plans and desires to eliminate poverty and to cure regional economic distress whether it be in Appalachia or elsewhere. One important factor to help alleviate economic distress along the east coast would be to eliminate this unnecessary economic burden. Let us have our vital fuel supplies with the benefits of free and open competition.

We join with you, Mr. President, in the belief that there is no place in our society for waste and inefficiency. Eliminate this needless program now and all Americans will benefit.

SPONSORS

The New England Governors' Conference.
Massachusetts Association of Nonprofit Schools and Colleges.
Associated Industries of Maine.
Florida Electric Cooperatives Association.
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority.
St. Croix Paper (a subsidiary of Georgia-Pacific Corp.)
St. Joe Paper Co., Port St. Joe, Fla.
Lee County Electric Cooperative, Inc.
Mecaw Industries, Portland, Maine.
City of Cambridge, Mass. John H. Cochrane, purchasing agent.
Town of Arlington, Mass. Edward C. Monahan, town manager.
Town of Danvers, Mass. Robert E. Curtis, town manager.
Gardner A. Caverly, Executive Vice President, the New England Council.
Committee for a National Trade Policy.
American Public Power Association, Alexander Radin, general manager.
Gas and Electric Department, Holyoke, Mass. Francis King, manager.
Florida State Chamber of Commerce.
Utility Board of City of Key West, Fla., M. E. Rosam, II, manager.
City of Ocala, Fla.
Central Maine Power Co.
Keyes Fibre Co., Waterville, Maine.
Brown Co., Berlin, N.H.
St. Regis Paper Co.
Florida Power Corp.
Orlando Utilities Commission.
The Great Northern Paper Co.
City of Quincy, Mass., Thomas V. Morrissey, purchasing agent.
City of Bangor, Maine, V. E. Kane, purchasing agent.
State of New Hampshire, Richard N. Peale, division of purchase and property.
Ashland Paper Mills, Inc., Ashland, N.H.
APW Products Co., Hinsdale, N.H.
Monadnock Paper Mills, Inc., Bennington, N.H.
Oil Users Association.
Greater Boston Hospital Council, Inc.
Florida Municipal Utilities Association.
City of Bartow, Fla.
Penobscot Co., Boston, Mass.
Tileston & Hollingsworth Co., Boston, Mass.
City Electric & Water Utilities Department, Jacksonville, Fla., by its city commission.
Stauffer Chemical Co.
Spaulding Fibre Co., North Rochester, N.H.
Byron Weston Co., Dalton, Mass.
Town of Brookline, Mass., Henry Saumsiegle, purchasing agent.
Town of Westwood, Mass., Richard J. Hart, purchasing agent.
City of Newton, Mass., Harold T. Pillsbury, purchasing agent.
State of Vermont, Richard C. Raymond, purchasing director.
Crompton & Knowles Corp., Worcester, Mass.
The Foxboro Co., Foxboro, Mass.
S. D. Warren Co.
Florida Power & Light Co.

(Entire cost of this advertisement borne by oil consumers.)

FEDERAL POWER PRODUCTION—ADDRESS BY CLYDE T. ELLIS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, for many years the production of electric power at generation plants owned by the Federal Government has provided vast benefits to the people of America. Combined with the distribution of the electricity to the ultimate users, through consumer-owned systems such as cooperatives, power districts, and municipal systems, Federal power has served as a yardstick against which the service provided by the investor-owned utility monopoly could be measured.

In areas where Federal power is produced, not only do the members and customers of the consumer-owned systems enjoy low electric rates, but the customers of the utility companies benefit, as well. In the strong light of comparison, the companies have been forced to keep their rates in line with those of the public and cooperative systems; and, by doing so, their sales of electricity have increased tremendously, and their profits have grown correspondingly.

This electric-power yardstick has, therefore, served the country and the people well. It has been of inestimable value, and it needs to be continued as a national policy.

However, Mr. President, many of us who try to protect the interests of the American consumer are becoming concerned over a trend that is taking place. With the Nation's use of power doubling about every 10 years, and with a slowdown in recent years in the construction of new Federal power generation plants, the effect of the yardstick is diminishing. If the trend is not halted, the usefulness of the yardstick in the years ahead could become so limited that its benefits could almost disappear.

No one is more aware of this grave danger than Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. In an address which he delivered before more than 8,700 members of NRECA, at its 23d annual meeting, in Miami Beach, last week, Mr. Ellis analyzed the problem in considerable depth, and proposed some solutions. I earnestly commend to the Congress the text of Mr. Ellis' address; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN TODAY ALREADY WALKS TOMORROW

(Address by Clyde T. Ellis)

We come together this week for the 23d time in a great national meeting which is part review and part revival; part reunion and part renewal; and, according to some, perhaps, part riddle and part religion.

And, as you may have discovered, the people of Miami Beach may remember this meeting as part rural and part revenue.

For my part, I'm glad we're meeting in this beautiful setting, in a shoreline city built on what could hardly have been called even an island of shifting sand where nothing was before. This is a great State with an important rural electrification program. Florida is a sort of cross section of the rest of the Nation, and most of the problems and challenges that confront any of you can be found somewhere in this State.

We all have plenty of problems and challenges—the problems of today, and the challenges of tomorrow. In many respects the most trying and difficult years for our program will be those just ahead. We must deal with problems and opportunities that are vastly complex and for which there are no easy answers. Many of them are already with us. You'll hear them discussed and debated in the next few days as our program participants speak to the theme of the meeting: "Rural Electrification, Today and Tomorrow."

I'm reminded of these great lines from Coleridge:

"Often do the spirits of great events stride on before the events, and in today already walks tomorrow."

We would be making a foolish mistake if we did not try to read our future course in the signs that are everywhere around us today. We must seek out and take advantage of our opportunities, and we must deal with our problems. Some of them are of such magnitude that if we try to ignore them they can engulf us and sweep us into the backwash of history. This has happened to other worthwhile programs which bloomed in their first hour of need but withered in the march of time.

This might already have been the fate of our program if you had considered electricity as an end in itself, rather than a means to an end. You did not allow your organizations to stop and stagnate when the first lights were turned on. Instead, you have had a vision of the dynamic role the rural electric systems must play in building a thriving, prosperous rural America. As the leading corporate organizations in the rural areas, you have recognized your responsibilities to your communities, the Nation and the world.

These things and more have elevated you and your program to new heights of public esteem and respect.

Through your accomplishments you have spread your influence across the whole spectrum of our economic and political life—from the kitchen of the sharecropper to the offices of the mighty.

We've come a long way over these years, and we still have a long way to go. But we approach our problems and opportunities today from a position of strength.

We must use this strength wisely yet boldly. This morning, I want to suggest steps that we of the staff believe must be taken in several areas. The time for action is now, for, "In today already walks tomorrow."

RURAL ELECTRIC PROGRAM NEEDS ARE MANY

Our major problems continue to center around (I) financing, particularly for the generation and transmission program, which is under constant attack; (II) territorial protection; (III) Federal Power Commission jurisdiction; (IV) low-cost wholesale power supply, including the modernization of the electric power yardstick through new projects, interconnections and pooling; (V) our concern about the people in the rural areas generally; and (VI) our concern about our political role in achieving all of these objectives.

I. OUR FINANCING PROBLEM

We had hoped to have the results of our study of possible private sources of financing, which you authorized last year at Dallas, available at this meeting. The scope and complexity of the study, together with the early date of this year's meeting, made this impossible. This independent study, now in progress by a New York investment banking firm, will be completed in the next few months. We plan to have it completed in time for its consideration by the NRECA board this summer and your consideration of it during the regional meetings this fall. Meanwhile, after the summer board meeting we will probably present parts of it to committees of the Congress.

We know there is tremendous pressure within the administration and in the Congress to raise the interest rate, cut back on the amount of loan funds authorized, and to stop all loans for the generation and transmission of power.

We understand that at least one high official in this administration—not the President—is urging that tight new restrictions be placed on generation and transmission loans, and even that the REA loan program be abandoned—to be replaced by some scheme of guaranteed private loans.

Let me remind anyone with such ideas that the winner of last fall's election was not Barry Goldwater—and that the man who did win ran on a pledge of strong support for the rural electrification program.

We are watching these developments closely, and we are strong believers in the old admonition that "by their deeds ye shall know them."

Some who are genuine and proven friends of this program feel that we should take the initiative now and recommend changes in the loan program to Congress. They argue that as a result of the elections last fall we have a friendly administration and a more favorable Congress. Their reasoning is that, if changes must come eventually, it is better to make them while our friends are in control.

There is logic in this approach, but the plain fact is that nobody can be sure at this point just what kinds of changes might safely be made without jeopardizing the program.

In the light of all these developments your national board voted yesterday to broaden our study to now include REA and/or other Government sources of capital.

During the summer we will have an opportunity to thoroughly analyze our own study and any concrete recommendations the administration may have. This fall we can discuss the alternatives and our recommendations with you at the regionals. You will then be in position to make an informed decision at our annual meeting in Las Vegas early next year.

This administration will still be in office next year, and so will this Congress. I believe we can persuade Congress not to take any drastic action this year. My suggestion is that for the time being you retain your policy of support for the present REA loan program.

Need for loan fund account and revolving fund now

The one exception for this year is that we badly need to establish a true revolving fund for REA loans. Under such a plan your repayments on your loans would go into a special account and be available for relending. You have supported this concept in the past. The administration will probably recommend again this year that Congress establish an REA loan fund account under which our Government would change its bookkeeping to show that our loans are investments and not Government operating expense. This is good, but it does not go far enough. We need a true revolving fund under which your loan repayments could be held in a special fund for relending.

Need for adequate REA loan funds this year

We will have our usual difficult problem this year of securing adequate REA loan funds without restrictions on their use. Our annual need for loan funds increases as our use of power continues to double every 6 or 7 years.

We must seek, also, to ease the crippling restrictions that recent Appropriations Committee reports have placed on the Administrator's ability to make loans. Every year lately power companies—but not all of them—fight us in the appropriations committees in greater numbers and with greater force. Their prime objective is to destroy the feature of our program which they dislike the most—our right to generate our own power and transmit it to our own load centers. If they can knock out our G–T program, they can accomplish two things: first, destroy the only alternative of hundreds of our systems which are buying power from them, thus rendering these cooperatives completely dependent on the companies for power supply on the companies' terms; and second, eliminate the growing importance of the yardstick factor which our G–T's provide in the industry. I'll have more to say about yardsticks in a moment.

II. NEED FOR TERRITORIAL PROTECTION

Since our systems are all incorporated under our respective State statutes, and depend upon State statutes for their right to operate in given areas, territorial protection is a State problem. It is key, nevertheless, to the elimination of other major power company campaigns against us.

Our only real protection in the long run is law, State law. If you will achieve territorial protection in your State, and this year may be our last best year to try, you will go a long way toward stopping the other attacks upon us as well.

Let us make clear to both the power companies and the legislatures that we have no quarrel with the power comapnies—but only they with us—that they have nothing we want, that we want peace with them as to territory and all other matters.

You in several States have achieved your fair play legislation after hard fights. Others of you are achieving it by negotiations and then both you and the power companies going to the legislatures together and getting the laws passed. I urge all of you who have not achieved it to try—now.

III. NEED FOR GETTING FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION OFF OUR BACKS

Our major national legislative effort this year must be dircted toward a satisfactory solution of the Federal Power Commission encroachment problem. The consumers and owners of rural electric systems are one and the same and they don't need the FPC to protect them from themselves.

The results of this senseless self-assertion of jurisdiciton over us by FPC would be enormous additional expense for the rural electrics—it already is to some—in complying with or resisting all the red tape requirements and endless delay in obtaining REA loans—and since Commission decisions can be appealed to and through the courts, power companies would thus achieve their long-sought desire to haul us into court for endless litigation over all REA loans they would not like. They know we cannot survive such long wars of attrition.

Over the years the Federal Power Commission has demonstrated that it has much more than it can do in discharging the responsibilities it already possesses. The FPC needs to devote more time to its job of regulating the monopolies under its jurisdiction, and less to empire building.

In line with the policy you have established, we shall spare no effort in this session of Congress to pass a bill specifically exempting rural electric cooperatives from FPC jurisdiction. And I think we will win. FPC reminds me of a story of a friend of mine who said his doctor treated him for 6 months for yellow jaundice before he found out he was Chinese. And he said he almost cured him, too.

The matter of getting our wholesale power contracts with the companies exempted, too, must await your further study and policy formulation.

IV. NEED TO IMPROVE OUR WHOLESALE SUPPLY

Any business that cannot purchase its wholesale supply in a competitive market or produce its own is in trouble. We are in trouble. And with our wholesale requirements doubling about every 7 years we are in double trouble. Let me speak first about the need for modernizing the electric power yardstick.

Need for modernizing the electric power yardstick

I want to compliment the Federal Power Commission upon its National Power Survey released last month. This is in many respects an admirable piece of work. Although it has serious limitations, it is nevertheless an impressive research document that should serve as a basis for achieving the technical revolution that it suggests in the electric power industry.

Significant technical breakthroughs in our industry have already been achieved, in large part through the experimentation of Federal agencies, notably TVA and Bonneville and their consumer-owned distributors and by the giant facilities of the huge European and Russian power pools. Once the breakthroughs are put to general use in the years just ahead, great benefits will flow from them.

But a major question is: Who will benefit, the consumer or the commercial power companies or both? The FPC speaks of savings in terms of price, implying that the consumer's power bill will be less.

If the past is any guide to the future, most commercial companies will not pass these benefits on to the rural electric co-ops which they serve and to their other customers, unless forced to do so. The record is clear that regulation, either by Federal or State commissions, will not get the job done. We've had regulation for decades, and this is not preventing power companies from overcharging customers, including us, of hundreds of millions of dollars a year.[1]

There has never been but one really effective influence on the commercial companies, and that has been the electric power yardstick. The electric power yardstick, as you know, is created by the combination of the Federal wholesale power and the consumer-owned, nonprofit power distributors, including our co-ops and power districts which buy that power and distribute it—and, in some areas, by the power generated by our own generation and transmission co-ops and the distribution co-ops. It takes the nonprofit generation and the nonprofit distribution to create a measure (or yardstick) of the costs of generation, transmission, and distribution.

---

[1] A report on overcharges of 106 major electric utilities, NRECA, 1965.

While there is no direct competition in the retail sale of electricity (except when the companies invade our territory), the mere fact that the Federal Government and the rural electric G–T's[2] can and do generate and sell some power at wholesale (none at retail), and that some people do join with their neighbors and serve themselves with electricity on a nonprofit, yardstick basis, is a healthy influence upon what is basically a monopolistic industry. The one thing that strikes fear in the heart of a monopoly is the prospect of competition—even competition by yardstick example, as in this case.

This concept of the value of an electric power yardstick, by which both the consumers and public officials can measure the real cost of service, has long been a matter of national policy. TVA could not be a yardstick, standing alone, but the combinatin of TVA and the electric co-ops and municipal systems to which it sells its power is a yardstick. The same is true of the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers projects through their sales to these nonprofit groups. And the same is true of our G–T's and their member distribution systems.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, like Teddy Roosevelt before him, often spoke of the necessity of this electric power measuring stick, or yardstick. The 20th Century Fund has said that while F.D.R. did not propose the elimination of the commercial companies, he advocated sufficient public operation to provide a yardstick for measuring the cost of electric service.[3] This is an opinion I believe most reasonable people still share.

Value of the yardstick

There is just no question about the benefits of the electric power measuring stick, or yardstick, to the consumers, including those served by the commercial companies. Companies serving areas near such major Federal projects as TVA and Bonneville tend to set lower rates to both their retail and wholesale customers, including us, and the farther away from such projects a company is, the higher its rates. The companies' rates around the periphery of TVA are lower than the average. The companies of New England have long and successfully opposed any Federal development which would generate power. Take the example of two comparable cities served by two power companies. The consumer in the city of Boston, Mass., far removed from the yardstick influence, pays $9.91 for 250 kilowatt-hours; but the consumer in the city of Portland, Oreg., where the influence of the Bonneville Power Administration is strong, pays only $5.35 for 250 kilowatt-hours—a little more than half as much. And some companies in New England charge our co-ops there two and three times as much as do companies near the TVA and Bonneville areas. There are almost as many examples, one way or the other, as there are companies.

High rates are more important than many people realize. Most consumers do not understand that the power costs they pay are many times the amount of their monthly power bills—that there is a factor for power costs in everything they eat, drink, and wear—in everything they buy.

There is also no question about our Nation's policy concerning some Federal generation and sale of wholesale power. This policy has been reaffirmed time and again in legislation dating back to 1906. At least in the yardstick sense, the Federal Government is and has been in the wholesale electric power business to a limited degree for over half a century, not to the extent of dominating the industry, but just enough to exert a healthy and effective influence on behalf of the consumer.

But as the Nation's use of power continues to double about every 10 years, this yardstick is shrinking rapidly, relatively, and in any effective sense could almost disappear in the years ahead. In the past decade there has been a rapid decline in the construction of new Federal generating plants. Between 1956 and 1962 the Federal Government's percentage of total installed generating capacity in the Nation fell from 15.2 percent to 12.7 percent.

We believe there is a direct relationship between the decline in this percentage of Federal generation and power company rate increases or failures to decrease rates and in the growth of power company overcharges. We have long believed that in order to be effective nationally the Federal wholesale part of the yardstick should approach 20 percent, and never be lower than 15 percent, of total installed capacity.

It is essential, too, for our own security and to help strengthen the yardstick, that we increase our own generating capacity as the total industry grows. The FPC survey notes that our cooperatives as a group generate a smaller percentage of the power they sell than any other major segment of the industry. We generate only 18 percent of our own needs, and less than 1 percent of the industry total though we serve about one-tenth of the population.

But even if our own generation were sharply increased, say to 25 percent of our own requirements, this still would be only a drop in the bucket. The major responsibility for maintaining an effective yardstick must be carried by the Government.

If the Government is going to achieve and maintain at least a 15-percent level, then by 1980 the Federal projects must have a generating capability of 79 million kilowatts. At present they have a capability of about 26 million kilowatts. This means that if the yardstick is to be preserved, some additional 53 million kilowatts of Federal capacity must be added in the next 15 years. In this same period the commercial companies will be adding many times this amount.

In other words the yardstick must be modernized as to generating capacity and as to major transmission line pooling, not to give the Government a major share of the industry, but just to hold its own in the total picture in the public interest.

Need for new power sources and some new policy

But where and how should this additional 53 million kilowatts of Federal capacity be achieved? The country is running out of the better hydroelectric sites. The FPC survey indicates the limit of total hydro additions by 1980 at about 40 million kilowatts, and predicts that only half of this potential will be developed by Federal agencies. So let's be optimistic and assume that all the projects needed to add 20 million kilowatts to the Federal hydro systems will be approved and built. This will still leave a deficit of about 33 million kilowatts if the 15-percent minimal yardstick is to be maintained.

This means that in one way or another the Government will have to utilize steam generation on a much greater scale than in the past.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is the only Federal agency now authorized to construct steamplants. By 1980, TVA will need to add about 20 million kilowatts of steam generation. Subtracting this from the 33 million needed means the Federal Government must develop on the order of 13 million kilowatts of steam capacity outside the TVA area.

Even if this must be done within the framework of the traditional Federal policy that the development and sale of electric power should be related to other purposes, such as the reclamation of arid lands or multiple-purpose river development, still it can be done.

There are many human needs in our modern society that an extension of this related-purpose concept could help us meet. Let me mention three of them:

First, the desalinization of water: It would be inexcusably wasteful if the huge desalinization plants of the future were not designed to produce electric power as a related purpose. The generation of electricity requires high-pressure, high-temperature steam which, when exhausted after use, still contains appropriate heat for water distillation. This is true regardless of whether coal or gas or atomic heat is used to produce the steam. Under classical reclamation theory, the revenue from the sale of the power could also be used in part to subsidize the cost of producing the fresh water and delivering it to the places of need. Your policy in this area needs to be updated.

Second, there is every justification for the large-scale generation of steam power in the coal fields of the poverty-stricken Appalachian area. Or to say it another way, can our Federal Government longer tolerate the economic, social, and political joke of trying to treat only the symptoms of poverty in the 11-State Appalachian region when the real disease, or at least a major one, is the lack of development for the region's own benefits of its greatest natural asset: the Nation's prime storehouse of low-cost coal?

Both TVA and commercial companies have proved that the larger the generation and transmission facilities, the lower the cost of generation and transmission per kilowatt-hour of power. The national power survey forecasts single units of from 1,500 to 2,000 megawatts by 1980. This presupposes large-scale pooling as in TVA. The Appalachian area should be the center of low-cost, coal-fired electric power generation for almost the entire eastern United States. Our studies indicate that giant publicly financed plants in Appalachia could deliver wholesale electricity almost anywhere in the eastern half of the country at lower cost than power is now being generated in those areas, except the Tennessee Valley.

But there is more. These low-cost calculations include the payment into some kind of an "Appalachian development fund" of one-half mill per kilowatt-hour sold. This fund would be used for the overall economic development of the region. Considering the projected power demand in eastern United States by 1980, it is conceivable that under such a plan $5.7 billion could be poured into this overall area development fund, from this one-half mill, during this 15-year period, and that 184,000 new coal mining jobs could be created.

And this would be but the beginning of benefits. The benefits of low-cost power would be a tremendous stimulant to the total economy of the entire region, even of the Nation. The Appalachia problem cannot be solved without converting its vast storehouse of fossil fuel energy into low-cost energy for its own and the country's use through minemouth million kilowatt, or more, generators and farflung power pooling in the public interest.

Leadership for such a program, and its administration, could be provided by an Appalachian Federal Resource Development Corporation with self-financing authority, and with the power generated being sold to all types of distributors: commercial, cooperative, and municipal.

---

[2] Generation and transmission cooperatives composed of and owned by the distribution co-ops they serve.

[3] "Electric Power and Government Policy," a survey of the relations between the Government and the electric power industry, the 20th Century Fund, 1948.

I hope you will develop a solid policy in this direction at this meeting.

A third area of possibility for the needed Federal steam generation in the future lies in the Bureau of Reclamation program. Since the generation and sale of hydroelectric power now are used as a means of subsidizing reclamation, why shouldn't steam-power revenues be used in the same manner? Certainly the result would improve the efficiency of the Government's wholesale power system since the hydropower could then be put to its most valuable use, as peaking power.

Our Government came close to getting into the dual purpose steam generation business at Hanford, Wash. The President recommended and the Senate passed such a bill in 1961, but the House killed it. You took a strong position for, and fought for, this Hanford atomic steam project but, except by implication, you have no stated position generally on supplemental steam generation. And TVA's steam generators are not supplemental. I hope you will have a position on Federal steam generation outside of TVA before this meeting ends.

Need for pooling and interconnections

As important as it is for the Federal Government to continue to own an effective portion of total power generation, this in itself will not modernize the yardstick. The FPC National Power Survey reaffirms and supports our longstanding position that throughout the United States there must be intelligent pooling and interconnection of the Nation's power resources. The potential benefits—to the electric industry and to the consumer—of national power pooling on a giant scale are almost beyond comprehension.

Several company spokesmen have also expressed specific opposition to the FPC survey recommendation that high voltage interconnections should be built between the different areas of the country, yet this is a key concept in the entire national plan.

The FPC survey estimates that time zone diversity alone between east and west, thus shifting the peaks, would be worth 6 million kilowatts of installed capacity by 1980—and that this could be increased to 12 or 13 million kilowatts by reserve savings, seasonal peak load diversity and coordination between hydroelectric plants.

These are fantastic potential benefits, valued by FPC at $2 billion by 1980 in terms of generating investment saved.

The survey concludes that overall efficiencies, including pooling, would make possible a 27-percent decrease in the price of electricity throughout the United States by 1980. This saving would amount to $11 billion per year. Properly applied, it could help all Americans to live better, could help all business, and could help U.S. industries compete in both the domestic and world markets.

There are strong indications that most power companies will resist polling and interconnections on a national scale—except where they do them themselves. In the weeks before the FPC survey was to be released, combinations of power companies in several areas of the country, knowing it was coming, hurriedly announced plans for their own regional pooling, while still publicly belittling general pooling. The newspaper stories carried the companies' claims of great benefits and savings for their plans, but in none that I saw did they support pooling of all power in an area and in none was any saving cited as an objective either for their consumer customers or for us, their wholesale customers. Several of the companies in the proposed pools also made it clear that they were going to operate very exclusive clubs and did not want the rural electrics and other nonprofit distributors to participate.

This is stone age thinking that has no place in our modern economy. The great promise of power pooling will never be realized if it is founded on narrow self-interest, age-old prejudices and on monopoly charge-the-customer-all-he-can-bear practices. The public interest requires not only national power pooling but that our systems participate, and we intend to see that you are given the opportunity to participate.

New EHV interconnections needed

Without taking a position on the ownership of the lines, the FPC survey recommends several extra high voltage, east-west interconnections. It is significant that in all cases the suggested lines either begin or terminate at major Federal power systems, or at terminals of transmission facilities which are under contract to Federal agencies.

We do not have to look very far into the future to see that if the yardstick provided by the Federal wholesale power program and the nonprofit producers and distributors is to avoid extinction, the parts that compose it must grow as the total power industry grows.

To preserve and modernize the yardstick, I urge that in addition to maintaining at least the 15-percent ratio of Federal generation, serious consideration be given immediately to the authorization and construction of the following elements of a Federal transmission system:

1. An extra high voltage, common carrier, Federal tieline between the Federal facilities of the Columbia Basin and the Missouri Basin. This line would utilize time zone diversity and coordinate two major adjacent Federal hydroelectric wholesale systems.

2. A similar major line between the Missouri Basin System and the Federal Southwestern Power Administration. This line would carry a portion of the 3-million-kilowatt seasonal diversity forecast by FPC as existing by 1980 between the Northwest and the SPA area.

3. Extra-high-voltage, Federal, common carrier lines to link SPA with TVA and TVA with the Federal Southeastern Power Administration facilities, and with the southern terminal of a Passamaquoddy-St. John Federal transmission system in the Boston area. This network would carry part of the load needed to realize the benefits of a 3.3-million-kilowatt diversity the FPC forecasts between the Northeast and SPA areas by 1980. These lines would interconnect the proposed giant steamplants in Appalachia with the other major Federal projects. They would extend the Federal part of the yardstick into the high-power cost areas of the Eastern States, including Florida and New England.

Most of these Federal systems or projects are already built, from the Columbia to the Savannah, from the Colorado to the now promised Passamaquoddy-St. Johns. They must all be tied together—and very soon—and tied with the Canadian pools and beyond to the Alaskan projects, including Rampart Dam on the Yukon.

These recommendations require no basic adjustments in national power policy. They are merely an extension and modernization of the policy which developed in this country over the years. If everything I have called for this morning were in full operation in 1980, the proportion of Federal participation in the total power picture still would be no greater than it was in 1956.

So we aren't discussing revolutionary ratios; we're discussing the preservation of the small competitive factor provided by the participation of the nonprofit segments of the power industry.

Our direct self-interest is clear. We now purchase 37 percent of our wholesale power supply from Federal agencies and 38 percent from the commercial companies. The modernized yardstick would produce efficiencies which would increase—and thus maintain the ratio of—our supply of Federal power and decrease the rates per kilowatt-hour we pay the companies. Full participation in the pools by our generation and transmission cooperatives would result in great savings for them and would prevent many of our relatively small plants from becoming obsolete.

Modernization of the yardstick including national power pooling is going to be achieved. And I think you are going to lead that fight in the public interest, and win it, just as you have led and won many other fights, including the west coast intertie battle last summer.

V. NEEDS OF RURAL AREAS IN THE GREAT SOCIETY

Another area of the consumer interest in which you have long played a major role, and which I believe must be of even greater concern to you in the future, is the broad area of human need. Probably because our own program deals so intimately with people, you have long supported progressive efforts to increase the opportunities of people to lead fuller and more rewarding lives. While you have focused your efforts on the needs of rural people, the results of your work benefit the entire Nation.

The recognition of these efforts by the President, by Members of Congress, by the press and others, benefits you tremendously in the raising of our program's prestige. It has given all of us a more responsible position in the minds of many of this country's most influential people. Many who have no particular interest in our bread-and-butter rural electrification issues respect and support us because of the broader, humanitarian aspects of our program. This is an attitude that has taken on new importance in recent years, and in my opinion, our participation in the various community development programs, and our willingness to share our experience with our fellow rural peoples of other nations on a nonprofit basis, plus our TNT (tell the nation the truth) about what we are doing have been chiefly responsible.

As you know so well, new Federal programs are now being developed to help the less fortunate people in both our rural and urban areas. These programs, their benefits are a part of what President Johnson calls the Great Society. Some think little of this vision the President has for our Nation, and some think it is too idealistic to ever be accomplished. I am convinced most of it is going to be accomplished and we can either keep hands off and probably see most of the benefits flow to the cities, or we can increase our efforts and help shape it to make all of rural America bloom again.

Let us not forget that this country never had a more idealistic undertaking than the rural electrification program. The cynics and scoffers and prophets of doom and men of little faith once had a field day with the idea that all rural people could, or should, have electricity. Now they are in full bay at the heels of the antipoverty program and the other elements of the Great Society.

Let me tell you something: I have a feeling that Lyndon Johnson just may be able to do it. I'd like to help him, and I think most of you would, too. Whatever we can do to help, we'll be repaying in small measure the great debt we owe all the people of this country for their help and support of our own program. If everyone in America were blind to everything except his own narrow self-interest, the country would be in sad shape, and, among other things, most of rural America would be in darkness tonight.

And let me tell our great President something, too, and the Congress: Your Great Society is not going to work efficiently, in my opinion, unless and until the Federal Government, which in recent years has been abdicating its necessary role in the power field, reasserts itself in the consumer and public interest to bring all the known efficiencies of giant electric power into being with the built-in controls and influences of a modernized yardstick.

We will continue to help you, Mr. President, with rural areas development—we have already done much—and we will help you with your war on poverty—and this for us will be in its finest sense "bread cast upon the waters," but please, Mr. President, in these areas you must help us to help you.

VI. NEED FOR MORE POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY

Finally this morning, I want to compliment and congratulate all of you on the magnificent job you did in saving your program at the polls in the elections last fall.

Certainly the spirit of that great event strode on before the event, and it lingers long after the event.

I don't have to detail for you now the stake this program had in the presidential election, what all of us did, or what the results were. You know that on the basis of the record, the election of Senator Goldwater would have meant the end of the rural electrification program we have known. You know that we all mobilized as never before in our history in grim determination that this would not happen. And you know that largely as a result of these efforts President Johnson piled up the largest rural vote of all time.

While you were about it, you also decided to do something about a number of Congressmen with long and clear records against us, and to do more in support of many Congressmen and Senators who had long supported us. Partly as a result is a Congress that as a whole seems more favorable to us than any in the past decade.

In a political sense, you came of age last fall. You developed a political maturity that you never had before, and it carries with it both responsibilities and opportunities. Whether we like it or not, our entire political posture has changed, and we can never go backward.

The men we helped elect cannot be abandoned. If they are to fight for us, we must support them. Another day, in another year, they will have to run again. We hope they will run on their support of our programs. Where will you—all of us—be on that day?

Because our program was established by public action and exists by public consent and support, it has always been in politics, though not partisan politics. There have always been in both parties those who supported us and those who opposed us, and whom, in varying degrees, we either supported or opposed.

The difference now is that we have learned to be effective in politics, and we must be even more effective in the future—even to the point of seeing to it that the candidates nominated by both parties be friendly toward us.

We know how to mobilize our own program—and we must learn how to work effectively with others whose overall best interests coincide with ours.

We are strong in rural areas where others are weak. They are strong in mushrooming urban areas where we are weak. Surely simple commonsense dictates that we seek each other out, find whatever areas of agreement we can, and then work together. Our electric consumers information committee, through which two dozen organizations work together in the power area—cooperative, power groups, trade unions, farm organizations—is proof positive that this can be done.

I strongly urge that in every State you take the initiative now to find the groups with whom you can work effectively, and form your alliances.

During these next few days you are going to be hearing a lot more about the future. I know you'll do some hard thinking and participate in the discussions. The program needs your ideas and your help.

Through your accomplishments in several areas, you are now in a strong position to deal with the future more on your own terms. You have the strength and know-how to make your own program secure, to help shape the future of the whole power industry, and to help make the world a better place for all of us.

IN CONCLUSION

Yes, Coleridge wrote, "In today already walks tomorrow"; and I hope that on this day all of us can have the vision to see the needs of tomorrow, the wisdom to find the solutions to those needs, and the courage to do whatever must be done.

Vision, wisdom, courage—these are hallmarks of the great; and this is a program touched with greatness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, Calendar No. 51, House Joint Resolution 234, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have some brief preliminary remarks to make on the pending joint resolution, however, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] also has some brief remarks; and since he must leave soon for another important appointment, I waive making my opening remarks at this time in order that he may be heard.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida.

As we consider supplemental funds for the Department of Agriculture to carry out of its price-support commitments, we do so in the light of the disturbing fact that the farm parity index as of mid-January declined to 74 percent, down from 75 percent since 1939.

If we look more closely into the reasons for this decline in the parity index, we discover it is not due to a reduction in farm prices—which in fact increased 1 percent between mid-December and mid-January. Rather it is due to the steady, almost relentless, increase in prices paid by farmers, which are up 1¼ percent in January compared with December.

This is the continuation of a long-term upward trend in farm costs. In 1947, farm costs were $17 billion, less than 50 percent of gross farm income of $34.4 billion.

Since 1947, gross farm income has been increasing steadily. But farm production costs have been going up much faster. In 1964, gross farm income was $42 billion, but farm costs had increased to $29 billion—70 percent of gross farm income.

Thus, between 1947 and 1964, production costs have increased from less than 50 percent of gross income in 1947 to 70 percent of gross income in 1965.

This is the well-known cost-price squeeze in agriculture. The crucial factor adversely affecting farmers is not so much prices or gross incomes. The crucial factor is costs. January figures indicate that the situation is not improving—but is getting more critical. Costs are still going up.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing gross farm income, production expenses, net farm income, the ratio of costs to gross income and the parity ratio for each of the years 1947 to 1964, inclusive.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year	Gross income	Production expenses	Net income	Ratio, expenses to gross	Parity ratio
	Billions of dollars			Percent	
1947	34.4	17.0	17.3	49.4	115
1948	34.9	18.9	16.0	54.1	110
1949	31.8	18.0	13.8	56.6	100
1950	32.5	19.3	13.2	59.4	101
1951	37.3	22.2	15.2	59.5	107
1952	37.0	22.6	14.4	61.1	100
1953	35.3	21.4	13.9	60.6	92
1954	33.9	21.7	12.2	64.0	89
1955	33.3	21.9	11.5	65.7	84
1956	34.6	22.6	12.0	65.3	83
1957	34.4	23.4	11.0	68.0	82
1958	37.9	25.3	12.6	66.8	85
1959	37.5	26.2	11.3	69.9	81
1960	37.9	26.2	11.7	69.1	80
1961	39.6	27.0	12.6	68.1	80
1962	41.0	28.3	12.6	69.0	79
1963	41.7	29.2	12.5	70.0	78
1964	42.0	29.4	12.6	70.0	75

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I do not know of any reason to suppose that it is necessary for farm costs to go up every year. There is no immutable law of nature that dictates this upward trend. Farm costs are manmade. The reasons that farm costs go up, at least many of them, are clear.

Whenever wage rates go up faster than productivity, the result is inevitable. Higher prices and costs.

The past five Presidents of the United States have been compelled to call on labor unions to be moderate in their wage demands. But it is unrealistic to suppose that labor union leaders can accept this counsel. Their responsibility is to their members, and their members expect them to get at least as much as other labor leaders. No, this is our responsibility—to so arrange the economic climate that labor unions can effectively represent and promote the interests of their members, but without excessive and inflationary wage increases.

Wage rates are also pushed up by other factors. Wage rates are pushed up by Government. Whenever we increase the minimum wage level, or extend minimum wage legislation to new groups, this pushes up not only the wage levels of those directly affected, but also the whole wage structure.

The maintenance of proper differentials between different categories of skills is in fact an essential public objective, since we must maintain proper incentives for people to increase their skills. Much evidence is available to indicate that when wage levels are pushed up at the bottom, the push extends to the whole wage pattern.

An increase in required overtime payments, or a reduction in the workweek would have the same inflationary effect on the cost-price situation.

We are also inclined to forget that the benefits bestowed on people by law for more generous retirement programs or benefits, or improved unemployment insurance benefits, do not come free. The cost of such benefits is not paid by Government or by employers. The costs are reflected primarily in prices.

Since farmers purchase not only the same items used for consumption as do other segments of the population, but also expend 70 percent of their gross income for production items, they are particularly affected by rising prices.

One of the most recent examples of Government action to increase farm costs has been the requirements imposed by the Secretary of Labor which must be met by farmers who wish to establish eligibility to employ farmworkers from Mexico, the British West Indies, Canada or other foreign origins.

Farmers who wish to establish such eligibility must offer continuously, whenever they are recruiting domestic workers, to enter into a written contract with each such domestic worker, under the terms of which the farmer promises to pay transportation, housing and occupational insurance for such workers, without charge to such workers—plus a wage fixed by the Secretary of Labor on an hourly basis, which must be paid to workers on a price rate basis no matter how little they produce.

The required hourly minimum wage which must be paid varies by State from $1.15 in Texas to $1.40 in California. This represents an increase of from 20 cents to 55 cents per hour. In addition to this minimum wage, farmers are required to provide without charge to the worker, transportation, both local and long distance, housing and occupational insurance.

I do not recall that the Congress has ever enacted legislation providing for a minimum wage for farmworkers. Yet the Secretary of Labor appears to have established by executive decree what the Congress has refused to provide by statutory enactment.

It can, of course, be argued that what the Secretary of Labor has required is not a minimum wage, because no penalty is imposed on those who do not pay the prescribed amounts. The only sanction is that the farmer is not eligible to employ foreign workers. But those farmers in those areas who grow high-labor-requirement crops commonly have no alternative. The practical effect of the Secretary's ruling is exactly the same as though imposed by statute.

Fortunately, producers of some crops have made great strides during the past 2 or 3 years toward mechanizing their operations. Such reduction in numbers of workers employed have been made in anticipation that the Labor Department and the Congress were taking actions to tighten the farm labor supply situation.

But many producers of many other crops have not been fortunate in having comparable new technology available to them.

In the case of many high-labor-requirement crops, the increased wage requirement will be farreaching.

For example, I doubt that U.S. producers of such crops as pickles and strawberries can compete with the growing pickle and strawberry industries of Mexico when they have to pay more for 1 hour of work than Mexican employers pay for a day. The production of such crops as lettuce and tomatoes, will certainly be expanded in Mexico and the Caribbean area.

We must, of course, enact the pending measure. We have no alternative but to provide funds for commitments that have been made, no matter how ill-advised they may have been. That is not the point I would make. The point I would make is that the Congress, and the executive branch, too, should recognize that there are many factors, and factors within our control, which bear on the economic status of farmers. We are often inclined to overlook these factors. Many legislative enactments that do not appear to be directly related to the interest of farmers have a greater impact on the economic position of farmers than farm program legislation.

As Congress progresses with its work in the year ahead, we will deal with a number of measures which, whatever else may be said for such measures, do involve cost increases for farmers. This is one of the possible adverse consequences that should not be lost sight of in the exercise of our legislative responsibility.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida once more for giving me the opportunity to make these remarks at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the pending joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234), as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations, recommends supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture amounting to $1,600 million.

The committee considered supplemental estimates proposed in House Document No. 59 totaling $1,742,209,000. The $1.6 billion recommended is $142,209,000 under the supplemental estimates, and is the same amount as approved by the House.

I wish to make a further statement in regard to some of the items carried in the joint resolution.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET LOSSES TO THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The joint resolution provides an additional appropriation of $1.1 billion to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for unreimbursed net losses sustained during fiscal 1963, and $100 million of unreimbursed loss sustained in fiscal 1962.

I wish I could advise the Senate that the reductions in the supplemental estimates totaling $142 million were a saving, but such is not the case. All of these reductions in the estimates will have to be reconsidered in some future appropriation bill. That is due in part to the fact that we are dealing with appropriations that are required under law to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation by appropriation for realized losses, already sustained in prior years, in the conduct of mandatory price support programs. We are also dealing with appropriations to meet the costs and expenses under Public Law 480.

Both the Congress and the executive branch have failed to act responsibly in making the necessary appropriations as required under various laws.

PROVISIONS AUTHORIZING REIMBURSEMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a summary furnished to the committee by the Department of Agriculture citing the various provisions of law authorizing or requiring appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for costs or losses sustained in carrying out various authorized programs.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS FOR REIMBURSEMENT TO CCC FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES AND RESTORATION OF CCC CAPITAL IMPAIRMENT (PRIOR TO JULY 1, 1960) AND FOR REIMBURSING CCC FOR PROGRAMS FINANCED FROM CAPITAL FUNDS

I. PROVISIONS OF LAW AUTHORIZING OR REQUIRING APPROPRIATIONS

Restoration of CCC capital impairment

Act of March 8, 1938 (15 U.S.C. 713a-1), provided for annual appraisal of assets and liabilities of the CCC by the Secretary of the Treasury and further provided: "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually * * * an amount equal to any capital impairment found to exist by virtue of an appraisal as provided herein."

This act, as amended by Public Law 312, approved March 20, 1954, carried the Williams amendments which provided for future restorations of capital impairment on the basis of realized losses and also that: "Such capital impairment shall be restored with appropriated funds as provided herein rather than through the cancellation of notes."

(NOTE.—Superseded by Public Law 87–155 authorizing appropriations to reimburse CCC for net realized losses sustained after June 30, 1960 (next under).)

Reimbursement to CCC for net realized losses

Public Law 87–155 (75 Stat. 391), August 17, 1961: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, * * * an amount sufficient to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for its net realized loss incurred during such fiscal year, as reflected in the accounts and shown in its report of its financial condition as of the close of such fiscal year. Reimbursement of net realized loss shall be with appropriated funds * * * rather than through the cancellation of notes."

The act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 783), increased CCC's borrowing authority from $12 billion to $14.5 billion.

Special milk

Public Law 86–446, April 29, 1960, amending Public Law 85–478 (7 U.S.C. 1446 note): "There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, separate from any other appropriation of funds for Commodity Credit Corporation, such amounts as may be deemed to be necessary to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for amounts advanced by it."

(NOTE.—The Agricultural Act of 1961, Public Law 87–128, title IV, authorized appropriations for fiscal years 1963 through 1967. Under this authority the 1963 appropriation was made to the Agricultural Marketing Service.)

Sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies and commodities disposed of for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples, titles I and II of Public Law 480

Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—Public Law 480, title I (7 U.S.C. 1703(a)), July 10, 1954: "For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation * * * for commodities disposed of and costs incurred under titles I and II of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums," etc.

Long-term supply contracts, title IV of Public Law 480

Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, Public Law 480, title IV, as amended by Public Law 86–341 (7 U.S.C. 1736), September 21, 1959: "In carrying out this title, the provisions of sections * * * 103(a) * * * shall be applicable to the extent not inconsistent with this title."

Public Law 480, title I (7 U.S.C. 1703(a)), July 10, 1954 (sec. 103a): "For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation * * * for commodities disposed of and costs incurred under titles I and II of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums."

(NOTE.—Activity under this program started in December 1961.)

International Wheat Agreement

Public Law 421 (7 U.S.C. 1641), October 27, 1949, as amended: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation of its estimated or actual net costs."

Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile

Agricultural Act of 1956, Public Law 540, title II (70 Stat. 200 7 U.S.C. 1856), May 28, 1956: "In order to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for materials transferred to the supplemental stockpile there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts equal to the value of any such materials so transferred. The value of any such materials for the purpose of this subsection, shall be the lower of the domestic market price or the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of such transfer, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture."

National Wool Act

Agricultural Act of 1954, Public Law 690, title VII, National Wool Act (7 U.S.C. 1784), August 28, 1954: "For the purpose of reimbursing the Commodity Credit Corporation for any expenditures made by it in connection with payments to producers under this title, there is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, an amount equal to the total of expenditures made by the Corporation during the preceding fiscal year and to any amounts expended in prior fiscal years not previously reimbursed: *Provided, however,* That such amounts appropriated for any fiscal year shall not exceed 70 per centum of the gross receipts from duties collected during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of such fiscal year on all articles subject to duty under schedule 11 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended."

Grain for migratory waterfowl feed

Public Law 654 (7 U.S.C. 445), July 3, 1956: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its investment in the grain transferred."

(NOTE.—This appropriation item is now included under the Department of the Interior.)

Surplus grain for game birds

Public Law 87–152 (75 Stat. 389), August 17, 1961: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its investment in grain transferred."

(NOTE.—Appropriations to cover costs of grain transferred to States will be requested in a later budget. Appropriations to cover costs of grain transferred to the Department of the Interior will be requested by that Department.)

Cotton classing and tobacco grading

The 1952 Agricultural Appropriation Act (7 U.S.C. 414a), August 31, 1951: "Hereafter there may be transferred to appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof such sums from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be necessary * * * such transfers to be reimbursed from subsequent appropriations therefor."

(NOTE.—This appropriation item is now included under Agricultural Marketing Service.)

Soil Bank Act

Agricultural Act of 1956, Public Law 540 (7 U.S.C. 1808(a)), May 28, 1956: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, including such amounts as may be required to make payments to the Corporation for its actual costs incurred under this section."

(NOTE.—Program completed. Direct appropriations made beginning in fiscal year 1958.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that corrective action should be promptly undertaken by the executive department to request the Congress to appropriate the amounts necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for all outstanding prior year losses, as well as to estimate carefully the costs of Public Law 480, the International Wheat Agreement, and any other related items for which mandatory appropriations are requested. In recent years, both the executive and the legislative branches have sought to make funds available only as needed to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to finance all authorized programs.

The committee believes that this pending supplemental would not be required if both branches had acted more responsibly in recent years in regard to the appropriations needed for this general purpose.

EXCERPTS FROM COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. President, in view of the importance of the pending joint resolution and the need to emphasize that the Commodity Credit Corporation appropriations should be considered on a more current basis, I request unanimous consent that portions of the committee report, accompanying the resolution, and dealing with the various appropriation items, including the language amendments dealing with Public Law 480, be included in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the request of the Senator from Florida is that only the report be included in the RECORD, and that it does not involve acceptance of any recommendation in the report or any amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. I merely wish to have it placed in the RECORD in order to show those portions of the committee report which show the fiscal situation of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the failure to meet it in accordance with the law, and the amendments which we are recommending. I am not asking for action on the resolution at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT

The committee recommends an appropriation of $1,100 million to complete the restoration of unreimbursed losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal 1962 of $100 million, and to provide an additional $1 billion of reimbursement appropriation for unreimbursed losses sustained in fiscal 1963. The total net realized losses sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the conduct of mandatory price support and related farm programs for fiscal 1963 amounted to $2,654,853,000 and of this amount $1,574 million was appropriated to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in the regular Agricultural Appropriation Act for 1965. That amount, together with the $1 billion recommended in this resolution, restores all of the capital impairment for fiscal 1963, except for $80,853,000.

The need for this supplemental appropriation of $1,100 million results in part from the failure of the executive branch to request full restoration of net realized losses pursuant to Public Law 85–155, approved August 17, 1961, which authorizes appropriations to reimburse for such realized net losses as reflected on the accounts of the Corporation, as shown in its financial statement at the close of each fiscal year. In addition, the Congress has not always provided the full amount of partial restoration estimates submitted by the Department; and this procedure of attempting to provide sufficient funds on an estimated basis to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to discharge all its mandatory operations has led to the need for this supplemental appropriation in the middle of fiscal year 1965. The committee strongly urges the Department to amend the budget for fiscal 1966 to request the full losses sustained in fiscal year 1964, and expects that in future budgets, the full amount of all unreimbursed losses for prior fiscal years, as finally determined, will be requested, including the $1,057 million of unreimbursed losses sustained in fiscal 1961 as a result of revaluation of the inventory.

The committee has included in the resolution under this appropriation head two provisions dealing with agricultural research. The first proviso will preclude the Department of Agriculture from proceeding to eliminate certain lines of research and to close out research stations which were listed in the announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture in his press release of last December 31. The committee believes that no formal action to close out the research announced by the Secretary should be taken until the committees of both Houses of Congress have acted upon these proposals to eliminate research in conjunction with the consideration of the regular agricultural appropriation bill for 1966. The second provision would authorize the use of available funds to provide for the installation of urgently needed temperature and humidity control equipment for the metabolism and radiation laboratory recently constructed at Fargo, N. Dak. The provision increases the limitation in the regular Agricultural Appropriation Act for renovation and alteration of research facilities and does not provide any additional appropriation since funds already made available will be used to carry out this urgently needed alteration in connection with the new facility.

PUBLIC LAW 480

The committee has considered the supplemental estimates transmitted in House Document No. 59 for Public Law 480, and recommends an additional appropriation of $250 million, for sales of commodities for foreign currencies authorized by title I of Public Law 480. This is a reduction of $23 million under the amount of the supplemental estimate and is the same amount as approved by the House. The Department did not request restoration of the House reduction. The supplemental appropriation recommended, together with $1,612 million appropriated in the regular appropriation act, will make a total of $1,862 million available in fiscal 1965 for financing expenses and costs incurred in the sale of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies.

A supplemental appropriation of $233,400,000 was proposed for financing the expenses under title IV, which authorizes long-term supply contracts for the sale of commodities. The House reduced the supplemental estimate to $200 million, a reduction of $33,400,000, and no restoration of the budget estimate was requested by the Department. The committee concurs in the amount approved by the House, which together with the $35 million already appropriated, makes a total available in fiscal 1965 of $235 million.

The supplemental appropriation is recommended to provide for increased expenses in the current year and to enable the Department to move in the direction of placing this program on a pay-as-you-go basis, and thereby further relieve the obligations against the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation for conduct of its mandatory farm program operations. Future appropriation requests for expenses of this program will be estimated on a more current basis, and as repayments of outstanding contracts are received, they will be applied against the yearly costs, and future appropriation estimates will be based upon gross annual program costs less the receipts from repayments under outstanding contracts.

As the resolution passed the House, it carried a limitation in regard to the export of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic. The committee recommends that the provision inserted in the House be stricken from the resolution. The text of the language stricken reads as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act".

In lieu of the language stricken, the committee recommends the inclusion in the resolution of the following provision:

": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest".

It is further the policy of Congress that most careful consideration should be given by the responsible agencies of our Government concerning the continued provision of assistance under this act to countries that are, directly or indirectly, hostile to the United States or that are providing assistance to groups or countries that are acting against the best interests of the United States.

In exercising said provisions of assistance, the Congress emphasizes that said assistance is contributed by the people of the United States of America out of taxes paid by them; it is not reasonable to expect them to want to renew said assistance to countries which permit the property of the United States of America to be destroyed and whose leaders make statements derogatory to our country.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

The committee recommends an additional appropriation for expenses of the International Wheat Agreement in the amount of $50 million. This amount, together with the sum of $31,838,000 carried in the regular Agricultural Appropriation Act, makes the total available during this fiscal year of $81,838,000. The amount recommended is $4,956,000 under the supplemental estimate and is the same amount as carried in the House bill. The additional appropriation is necessary to meet the expenses resulting from increased volume in wheat support payments for 1965 and to cover additional unrecovered expenses for 1964 program costs.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to continue briefly.

COMMENTS ON ELIMINATION OF RESEARCH

The committee adopted the provision inserted in the bill dealing with the closing out of research activities because it believes that due to the long-term nature of research activities and due to the outstanding contribution that agricultural research in particular has made to the efficiency of American agriculture, that the committee should be furnished with specific details affecting the proposed elimination of research. The committee has an opportunity to consider and pass upon the funds required for the establishment of research facilities and lines of research annually when it considers the appropriation requests for this purpose. The committee believes that more detailed information should be furnished to it and considered by it, and in my opinion, whenever and wherever research is no longer making a sound contribution in light of overall research expenditures and other expenditures, it should be phased out, or eliminated.

In other words, I completely approve the general philosophy of the Secretary, that items found to be no longer needed should be discontinued. However, I believe the responsibility is not wholly a matter for the Secretary to determine, as to what items are not now serving a useful purpose in research.

The announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture, as issued in a press release, is not in conformity with the usual approach to decreases in research activity. I expect to ask the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish more specific details in regard to the lines of research and locations of research which he proposes to eliminate. In his press release of December 31, 1964, he merely announced some general criteria which were used by the Department in arriving at the decision to eliminate research activities.

I believe the committee should be advised more fully in regard to how these criteria are specifically applied to stations to be closed and lines of research to be discontinued in accordance with the announcement made by the Secretary. In addition, the committee should be promptly advised as to the original purpose for the establishment of these lines of research and research stations; the accomplishments of such research activity if any; the problems which need further investigation; a summary description of current investigations and their objectives; the economic importance of the research investigations by activities or by commodity; whether the research is directed to and results in research findings of regional or local significance; and in cases of local significance, whether the State or States involved plan to continue their research activity. Finally, any other additional pertinent data, such as the economic importance of the affected commodity, should be promptly assembled and furnished to the committee.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I would suggest that upon receipt of such data from the Department, the subcommittee be furnished with copies and give early consideration to the additional justification material supplied by the Department, and then advise the Secretary of Agriculture as promptly as possible in regard to stations and lines of research in which the committee would concur in the proposed action by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Speaking only for myself, I do not want the Secretary of Agriculture to regard the action taken today, if it be taken, as a deterrent or to discourage him from making proposals for economy in reducing the cost of administration of any agricultural activity. I am sure that a number of these research activities which are proposed to be discontinued have possibly fulfilled their original objective and may warrant closing.

Since the Congress originally supported their establishment and has approved the funds for their operation over the years, it should have an opportunity to review any proposed action by the Department to close them out—and should have the opportunity to make this review prior to actual elimination of the project or activity. The normal procedure should be followed as is the case in connection with the budgetary proposal in this year's budget for fiscal 1966 to eliminate beginning next July 1 the Federal share of financing in connection with the cooperative eradication program to control the fire ant.

I commend the Secretary in that case, for following the normal and sound approach, although I may not agree with him in his recommendation. I wish that he had followed the same type of approach in connection with the large group of closings of research activities which he has suggested on his own judgment.

Another amendment is proposed by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking member of the subcommittee which is headed by me. It is an important amendment, requested by the Department of Agriculture. An explanation of the justification for it has been given by the Department of Agriculture in a written statement. Acting for the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, I ask unanimous consent that the explanation of the Department of Agriculture be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION SUBMITTED FOR THE COMMITTEE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ON BUILDING LIMITATION

This amendment would authorize the use of available funds to provide for urgently needed temperature and humidity control at the U.S. Metabolism and Radiation Research Laboratory, Fargo, N. Dak.

The new Laboratory at Fargo is a major link in research to develop ways to control insects effectively without hazard to man, animals, and plants from residues. Research at the Fargo Laboratory includes basic studies on the metabolism of agricultural chemicals in insects, plants, and livestock, and the development of sterility techniques for the control of insects.

In designing the Fargo Laboratory, it was recognized that critical control of temperature and humidity would be required in the radiological and quarantine wings. However, based primarily on the geographic location of the Laboratory, the Department and the project architect were of the opinion that a mechanical ventilating system would be satisfactory in maintaining desired summer temperatures in the remainder of the Laboratory facility.

Operation of the installation during the past summer months has definitely proven that the mechanical ventilating system, as designed and installed, will not provide the required critical control of temperature and humidity in the remainder of the Laboratory.

Plant and animal life respond directly to changes in temperature and humidity in research, and if an experiment is to be consistent these changes must be controllable throughout the entire year. Fluctuations in temperature and humidity influence the speed and rate of absorption of test insecticides into the insect and also influence the rate of metabolism of the insecticides within the insect. A similar problem exists in studies on the relative effect of various herbicides on plants or pesticides in animals. Therefore, in order for this facility to meet the requirements of the research, it will be necessary to convert the existing mechanical ventilating systems to a system properly designed to effectively control temperatures and humidity.

It is estimated that the cost of providing the required additional facilities will be $220,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the amendment relates to the use of funds already appropriated in an amount exceeding $200,000, to furnish humidity and temperature control facilities for the research facility at Fargo, N. Dak., which proved during the hot days of last summer to be unable to perform to advantage some of its functions due to the absence of those facilities at the station.

SALES AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. President, the pending joint resolution provides urgently needed funds for the conduct of mandatory agricultural programs. As passed in the other body, the resolution carried a provision that none of the appropriation under the head of "Public Law 480" shall be used to finance during the balance of the fiscal year the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such act.

In placing that provision in the resolution, the other body expressed by its action the sentiments of most Americans and many Members of Congress. Personally, I am sympathetic to the objective sought by the House. Following action by the House, the committee, on request of the Secretary of State, delayed further consideration of the resolution until such time as officials of the Department of State could be scheduled to present the views of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, had asked to be heard personally before the committee, but due to the delay incidental to his attendance at the Churchill funeral and his subsequent illness, our committee did not meet until February 1, when it heard Mr. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, speaking for himself and the Secretary of State.

Following a complete hearing before the full committee, the committee met later on February 1 and considered whether it should eliminate the provision inserted in the House or to amend it.

After thorough consideration, the committee voted to adopt the amendment which appears on page 3 of the resolution, and which has already been placed in the RECORD for the information of Senators.

It will be noted that the committee struck out the language inserted in the House and in lieu of it inserted the same language that had been stricken and added the words "except when such exports are necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest". The amendment reported by the committee thus provides that any action under title I of Public Law 480 be limited to the fulfillment of the existing agreement between our country and Egypt, and that such action be taken only if the President first finds it is in the national interest to do so.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask a question in relation to the language which the Senator has read. Is it possible that the appropriation which is now being considered might carry over into a period following the fiscal year 1965?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not if the wording of the committee amendment is adopted. It is the purpose of the committee that funds be available only until the completion of the present fiscal year and only for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the existing contract, which has existed for nearly 3 years. Only then would the President determine whether the carrying out of that contract, or the partial carrying out of it, would be in the national interest of the United States.

Mr. MILLER. I understand the latter point, but I am wondering about the significance of putting into the amendment the language "during the fiscal year 1965" to which the Senator has just referred.

Mr. HOLLAND. The joint resolution is a supplemental appropriation measure. Therefore it should properly relate only to expenditures to be made in the fiscal year 1965. Our committee was very anxious to limit the wording placed in the joint resolution by the House amendment in two additional ways. The House limited it to no expenditures under title I. We limited it further to no expenditures under title I unless they were in fulfillment of that contract and unless they were made in the fiscal year 1965. So we think we have further limited it except for the possibility of partial or total expenditure of that balance, which the record shows is about $37 million. Only in the event that the President determines that it is in the national interest shall that expenditure be made.

Mr. MILLER. That was the point which the Senator from Iowa was trying to bring out. I have seen two different interpretations of that language appearing in the press. One interpretation was that the language "and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest" relates only to the carrying out of the agreement entered into October 8, 1962. That is one interpretation.

The other interpretation is that it not only covers that agreement, but also covers any further agreement from which these funds might flow, either during the balance of the fiscal year 1965 or after the end of the fiscal year 1965.

Mr. HOLLAND. I can say for the Senator's information that I believe it was the understanding of the whole committee—and the committee was not a unit in reporting the amendment—that we were limiting it entirely to the carrying out of the existing agreement within its allotted time period. The agreement expires June 30, 1965. Therefore, we made this appropriation entirely a supplemental appropriation, and provided for the carrying out of it only in case the President made the determination that it was in the interest of this Nation to carry it out within that time and to the degree, of up to $37 million—if he should find it was to the interest of the United States.

Mr. MILLER. So that with respect to lines 13 and 14, which read:

> And if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest—

That really means, within the intention of the committee, the same as saying—

> and if the President determines that the financing of such exports under such agreement entered into October 8, 1962, is in the national interest.

That is implied.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is implied and, I believe, stated by the wording of the committee amendment, that we are discussing only the balance due upon an existing contract that we do not want to see welched upon, and only in the amount still due upon that contract, which is $37 million. That would be the maximum which could be spent; it could only be spent up to June 30 of this year, and only then in the event such a finding should be made by the President as is stated in the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry that I did not have the opportunity personally to discuss the subject with the Senator from Oregon but I understand that he and other Senators very much desire to proceed quickly to the third committee amendment, which is the amendment that deals with Public Law 480, the contract with Egypt, and the expenditure of any Federal funds in fulfillment of that contract. For that reason I am not going to make the customary request for the adoption of all amendments, but I hope that if the Senate feels it appropriate to do so it will, adopt the two preceding committee amendments. If there is any objection to them, at least the Senator from Florida has not heard it. The Senate could adopt the amendment relating to the closing of research stations, and the explanation of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. I have already placed in the RECORD an explanation of the second amendment, which was furnished by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will be in accord with the adoption of these two amendments at this time en bloc.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for his usual courtesy and cooperation. I know of no objections to the first two amendments. I suggest that the Senate adopt the first two amendments en bloc, which would leave the third amendment for debate, and then we can get on with the business. I think that there will be a relatively short debate on the subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would be very happy if that course were followed. There is one additional comment I should like to make. If the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] wishes to speak briefly on his amendment, I would desire to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President the record has been made by the insertions into the RECORD made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. So we have no further need to discuss the amendment, unless some questions are raised.

Mr. McGOVERN. The President, I am strongly in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], which would postpone the closing of agricultural research stations such as the one at Newell, S. Dak. These facilities are urgently needed to strengthen our agricultural economy. The Newell station should certainly not be closed. If it needs modification and improvement, those changes should be made.

I hope that the Senate will approve the committee amendment so that we can carefully consider the future role of our agricultural research stations.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the supplemental appropriations bill we are today considering has gained importance with last Monday's action by the Senate Appropriations Committee in amending it to preclude the use of Public Law 88-573 funds in the elimination of agricultural research stations.

I am gratified that Senators of the Appropriations Committee voted without dissent to attach to House Joint Resolution 234 the language:

> None of the funds appropriated under Public Law 88-573, approved September 2, 1964, shall be used to formulate or administer a program to eliminate agricultural research stations or lines of research until after the Congress has considered and acted upon such plans for the elimination of research in its regular consideration of the research appropriations estimates for fiscal 1966.

For this reason, if no other, I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 234.

I am firmly convinced, Mr. President, that the Secretary of Agriculture in his decision of last December 31 to close horticultural research stations in a number of States, including Wyoming, acted arbitrarily and without statutory authority. I take this opportunity to publicly thank and applaud the Appropriations Committee Senators for their attention to this question by bringing to this floor language providing that this order will not be carried out "until after the Congress has considered and acted upon such plans for the elimination of research" in the course of debate on the agricultural appropriations bill.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the text of a letter I prepared January 29 and mailed February 1 to Senators of the Appropriations Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> U.S. SENATE,
> COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
> INSULAR AFFAIRS,
> *February 1, 1965.*
>
> On December 31 last, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that for reasons of economy he had ordered the closing of a number of agricultural research stations, including the one at Cheyenne, Wyo. The Secretary stated that he hoped to effect savings of $8 million and an extensive reduction in USDA personnel, both of which objectives I wholeheartedly applaud. However, a study of the Cheyenne-based research station, as well as a study of the prerogatives under law enjoyed by the Secretary, leaves me firmly convinced that Mr. Freeman, in seeking to close the research station, has acted outside the context of the law and with total reliance upon the naked power of the Presidency.
>
> The station is the only one of its kind in the Great Plains area conducting research on shrubs, trees, windbreaks, and ornamental horticultural products and vegetable crops.
>
> I am writing, therefore, to ask your help in maintaining this research station and to offer a brief explanation of my reasons for believing the station should not be closed.
>
> The Cheyenne station was created March 19, 1928, by Public Law 178 of the 70th Congress. This law provides in part that: "The Secretary of Agriculture be and he is thereby authorized and directed to cause * * * an experiment station of the Department of Agriculture to be established at or near Cheyenne, Wyo."
>
> The act further provides: "It is hereby authorized to be appropriated each fiscal year necessary appropriations to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry on the experiments contemplated by this act."
>
> Public Law 178-70 is codified (7 U.S.C. 387, 387-A) and is not amended. The Secretary is not empowered under Public Law 178-70 or under any general or unique powers given him by the Conrgess to close the Cheyenne station.
>
> In a document on this question prepared at my request by the Library of Congress, the conclusion is reached that: "Since the Secretary does not appear to have been accorded any express statutory authority to close any one of these (agricultural research) stations on the ground of obsolescence or for any other specific purpose * * * [this] would appear to represent another attempted exercise by the President of a power to impound appropriated funds and thereby prevent their disbursement."
>
> The Library of Congress report further states (in quoting 7 U.S.C. 361a to 361e, 387-390k) that Congress "has made it abundantly clear that these research stations were designed as permanent installations the continued operation of which was to be suspended for any appreciable duration only by warrant of statutory authority."
>
> The importance of the agricultural research station to Wyoming is evidenced by press dispatches from my State's capital city, as well as by letters from scores of individuals and organizations all of whom, like myself, applaud true economy in government but cannot see justification in the closing of this important research facility.
>
> It should be pointed out here that the research station is responsible for the most part in developing shelter-belt trees and shrubs over an area which includes about 150,000 square miles in sections of Wyoming, South Dakota, Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas. The station is credited with developing the first strawberry plant hardy enough to survive the rugged Western and Great Plains

weather, and it is currently testing new potato crosses from the Greeley, Colo., area.

It is impossible to estimate the savings to ranchers and farmers realized as a direct result of this station's 38 years of operation, but it has certainly been many times more than the facility's modest $206,000 annual budget.

In an editorial from the January 4 Cheyenne, Wyo., State Tribune, the Secretary's economy argument is directly challenged. Says the newspaper: "We challenge the fact that any saving will be achieved at all * * * it merely produces the total disappearance of a function that has existed for nearly four decades in this region, working for the betterment of plant production." Copies of the Tribune editorial and a Wyoming Agriculture Department news release are enclosed with this letter.

Another point I should raise is that this dilemma facing the people of the Rocky Mountain West is not analogous to similar action by the Secretary of Defense, who does have the statutory authority to close certain facilities under his Department. Such specific authority has not been granted the Secretary of Agriculture by the Congress.

As I said at the outset, Senator, I need your help. It is my belief, based upon careful research, that the horticultural plant breeding station at Cheyenne is irreplaceable within the context of its expenditures. The information gleaned from research at this facility is of vital importance to farmers and ranchers throughout the West, and I am convinced further that the station does not constitute a financial liability but that it is, in fact, a most worthwhile and economical facility. Unless the Congress acts, however, it will be closed some time between April 1 and June 30 of this calendar year.

I ask that you use your influence and position on the Senate Committee on Appropriations in an effort to restore funds for this project when the appropriate legislation comes before your committee.

If the 89th Congress appropriates funds to provide for the facility at its present level of operation, I believe the station can be perpetuated despite the Secretary's wish that it be closed.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss this with you, and I thank you for your attention to this lengthy correspondence.

Sincerely yours,
MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have also written Secretary Freeman directing his attention to the points of law propounded in my letter to Senators. I have yet to receive the Secretary's reply.

Mr. President, the agricultural research station at Cheyenne is the only one of its kind in the Great Plains area conducting research on shrubs, vegetable crops, and windbreaks—areas of research vitally important to farmers and ranchers courageous enough to stake their future on the fickleness of nature in the Great Plains and Rocky Mountain area. This station was established by an act of Congress—the 70th Congress—on March 19, 1928.

I am unalterably opposed to this station's termination through Executive fiat or bureaucratic caprice. If the language of the Senate Appropriations Committee amendment to House Joint Resolution 234 is adopted, this station will have a new lease on life, and the Congress will have ample opportunity to perpetuate or terminate that which it created more than a quarter century ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the first two committee amendments may be considered en bloc. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the figures "$1,100,000,000", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following provisos:

Provided, That none of the funds appropriated under Public Law 88–573, approved September 2, 1964, shall be used to formulate or administer a program to eliminate agricultural research stations or lines of research until after the Congress has considered and acted upon such plans for the elimination of research in its regular consideration of the research appropriation estimates for fiscal 1966: *Provided further*, That not more than $220,000 of the funds appropriated for "Salaries and Expenses, Research, Agricultural Research Service" in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1965 (78 Stat. 862), shall be available until expended, without regard to any limitations included in that Act, for alterations necessary in connection with the installation of temperature and humidity control equipment for the Metabolism and Radiation Laboratory, Fargo, North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, it is proposed to strike the language——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the legislative clerk read both of the preceding amendments together.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. They were considered en bloc.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The third committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 3, after the figures "$200,000,000", it is proposed to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act" and insert ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest".

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I understand, the amendment just read is the one about which the Senator from Oregon had some questions, and perhaps other Senators have similar questions. I ask, therefore, for the immediate consideration of that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, after line 3.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the parliamentary situation is perfectly clear; but I want to leave no room for doubt about it. So I shall raise a parliamentary inquiry or two, and then suggest the absence of a quorum. The call need not be for a full quorum. However, I promised certain Senators that when this particular amendment was reached, I would see to it that there was a quorum call.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. As I understand, the amendment now pending is the amendment to the appropriation bill that proposes to modify the action taken by the House in regard to the so-called Nasser issue, involving the shipment of Public Law 480 food to Egypt.

It seems to me that we are indebted to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for bringing this amendment to us in the most simple form, a form that calls for either the acceptance or the rejection of the Senate committee's amendment.

Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that if the Senate should reject the amendment offered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, that would then leave the bill in the same form in which it came to the Senate from the House; namely, that it would contain the House action which seeks to deny the administration the authority to ship some $37 million more of Public Law 480 food to Egypt?

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair understands the inquiry of the Senator from Oregon, if the amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations were rejected, the situation would be that the language that came to the Senate committee from the House would remain in the text of the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Chair means on this one point, does he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; the so-called third amendment in the joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I commend the Senator from Florida for handling the problem procedurally in the way he has. It provides the Senate with a clear-cut issue to vote up or down. I should not think the debate need be long. I shall make a short speech if I am recognized after the quorum call.

Unless the Senator from Florida wishes to make some comment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is perfectly acceptable to me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the majority leader has suggested that I might wish to protect my right to the floor, if I can obtain unanimous consent to proceed with my speech immediately after the quorum; so with that understanding I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest that the quorum be live and that Senators be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

[No. 15 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Arkansas, [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed with my statement, with many Senators present in the Chamber, I believe I should state the parliamentary situation. With the cooperation and unfailing courtesy of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], we are in a situation in which the pending amendment is the Appropriations Committee's amendment dealing with the issue of whether or not $37 million worth of Public Law 480 food should go to Nasser if the President, in his discretion, should decide it is in our national interest to send it to Nasser.

That is the way it ought to be done. We ought to vote it up or down. The issue before us now is whether to support the committee amendment, which would permit the food to go to Nasser if the President should decide it is in the national interest, or follow the House position of not sending it to Nasser.

The senior Senator from Oregon takes the position that the Senate should take the position taken by the House, for reasons that I shall set forth, I may say for the relief of all Senators, in a relatively brief manuscript.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator clear up one question? Apparently there are contracts covering certain amounts of food aid which are not covered in the $37 million, and the $37 million is an uncommitted fund. I ask the Senator whether or not it is clear that the House language deals only with the $37 million and does not affect any agreement, though there may have been no deliveries under it yet, which relates to specific items of food.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As briefly as I can, I shall explain the situation. This contract, soon to be 3 years old, expires June 30, 1965, and approximately $37 million of commodities, distributed between three of the commodities covered by the agreement, have not yet been committed in any way to Egypt for delivery.

There is an additional amount, which I think has caused the question by the Senator from New York, of some $30 million, which was asked for by Egypt, and, with respect to which commitment was given. About half of it has been actually contracted for by distributing firms in this Nation, since the distributions are handled that way.

It is my understanding that this amendment not only does not cover that half which is being handled, and some of it may be on the water; it does not cover the other substantially $15 million worth, because that has been completely committed to Egypt and it is presently being farmed out to the various distribution agencies and businesses of this Nation, and through similar businesses in Egypt. No contention has been made—in our committee, at least, or otherwise; and I do not make any such contention—that any part of the $30 million is involved in this issue.

It is my belief, from all the evidence presented and from every statement I have been able to obtain, that the only thing involved is whether or not the $37 million shall be left in the joint resolution, and to allow the President to determine in his discretion, that it is in the national interest to deliver any part of that $37 million commitment.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Florida that that is my understanding.

Mr. JAVITS. Am I to understand that in the Senator's effort to persuade the Senate to accept the House language, which would have the net effect of rejecting the Senate committee amendment, the Senator makes no contention that the House language would inhibit action as to any other commitment, but only as to the $37 million? Of course, that strips of validity the argument that we are going back on a contract or contracts which may be in channels of distribution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record from page 89 of the printed hearings the list furnished by the Department of Agriculture showing the commodities still undelivered, amounting to $36,972,000, broken down into four different groups. The largest is for wheat and there is a smaller amount for vegetable oils. There is a small amount for NFD milk, and a small amount for tobacco.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Funds remaining available for new PA's (Jan. 28, 1965)

Commodity:	*Millions*
Wheat	$22.432
Corn	-------
Vegetable oils	5.59
Tallow	-------
NFD milk	0.1
Poultry	-------
Tobacco	8.85
Dry beans	-------
Butter-butter oil-ghee	-------
Cheese	-------
Beef	-------
Total	36.972

Mr. HOLLAND. I make the statement again for the Record. I understand that my learned friends from New York and Oregon agree that this is what is involved in the language of the House, and therefore in the amendment of the Senate committee.

Mr. JAVITS. The important thing that we are seeking to do is to show our disapproval of Nasser's policy. It should not be complicated with any other questions of contracts, or food which people expect—and have the right to expect—or anything else. It is a straightforward issue: how to show how thoroughly we disapprove.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because I believe that continuity of presentation is important to an understanding of my position in connection with this amendment, I shall not yield until I finish my brief speech, and then I shall be happy to yield for any questions Senators may wish to ask.

Mr. President, the committee amendment to the House amendment on food sales to the United Arab Republic should be rejected. It simply restores the sale of food to that country through June 30, 1965, and nullifies the House amendment.

The committee amendment states that funds appropriated may be used to carry out exports to the United Arab Republic under the sales agreement entered into in October of 1962 if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest.

Since the administration has been continuing sales under that agreement, we know that it has already made the determination mentioned. We also know that despite what Under Secretary Ball has told the Appropriations Committee, that the President is not necessarily going to carry it out, our Ambassador in Cairo has been working hard to assure Nasser and his officials that the administration is doing everything it can to carry it out.

The New York Times of February 2 carries the story. It says:

> But Mr. Ball made clear that it was by no means certain the President would so decide. "I'm not saying the President is necessarily going to carry it out," he said.

Two columns over is its special report from Cairo, dated February 1. It says in part:

> Ambassador Battle met with President Nasser tonight to outline the administration's effort to continue American food shipments to Egypt, and to discuss the future of the aid program.

Later in the same story:

> In the last few days Mr. Battle is understood to have given high Egyptian officials reassurances of the administration's intention to continue aid to the United Arab Republic.

Experience has taught me that what the U.S. State Department tells foreign governments is far more reliable than what it tells the American Congress.

I would even go so far as to say that the Department would tell Congress almost anything to get past this potential legal limitation on food sales to Egypt. It, too, has learned by experience that Congress is too timid to exercise its own powers in these matters. It knows that we are, indeed, the sapless branch because we are afraid to exercise our constitutional powers where they have an effect upon international issues or problems. So we delegate one more congressional function to the executive branch, and thereby bleed a little more of the sap from our veins.

We hear from the administration that it needs flexibility, although it never flexes but only bends before any demands made upon it by a foreign government.

We hear it said that "the stakes are high in the Middle East," which is the euphemism for American oil interests. We hear that if the United States does not meet Nasser's price the Russians would be glad to, because it would give them additional influence upon our oil interests.

In fact, I understand that the Under Secretary of State never even so much as whispered the word "oil" during his testimony before the Appropriations Committee. However, the American people can be sure that oil is always uppermost in the minds of the top officials of the State Department when they are trying to sell a program to the Congress in getting along with the dictators of the Middle East and, for that matter, dictators in other parts of the world, such as Sukarno in Indonesia.

Although it may be said that Egypt does not have oil, the fact is that Nasser is the chief political leader of the Arab world, and his political power in the Arab world stands as a constant threat to American oil interests. Any time he wants to make trouble for us, he can use his political power in the Arab world to start a diplomatic squeeze play on oil.

It needs to be pointed out to the American people that American foreign policy in many parts of the world oozes with oil. Prick that foreign policy in many places, and oil diplomacy oozes out.

What does the oil-oriented State Department suggest to the Congress in response to Dictator Nasser's vicious anti-American campaign after a USIS library of thousands of volumes is sacked and burned and the building destroyed, after uncontrolled mobs are allowed to destroy American property and deface American symbols, after Nasser makes not one but several speeches insulting the United States and in effect, uses an Arab figure of speech which in American vernacular means, "Go jump in the lake"?

The oil-oriented State Department oozes forth with the proposal that we must try to get along with Nasser by sending him $37 million more of Public Law 480 food that belongs to the taxpayers of the United States.

In Indonesia, another dictator, Sukarno, does not tell the United States to go jump in the lake, he actually tells us to take our aid and go to hell.

What does the oil-oriented State Department do in response? It engineers the White House into continuing the full delivery of foreign aid to Sukarno in spite of the fact that Congress, in the last session, notified the White House by an amendment to the foreign aid bill that it was opposed to sending more foreign aid to Indonesia. It is true that the so-called Presidential escape clause was attached by the Congress to the restriction on aid to Indonesia. This escape clause permitted the President to send aid to Sukarno if he, the President, found and reported to the Congress that, in his opinion, it was vital to the interests of the United States to continue the aid.

Congress cannot justify giving any such unchecked power to the President of the United States. Under our system of checks and balances, Congress has the legislative authority to determine what countries shall get aid, in what amount, and under what conditions. It should not delegate that authority to the President. We are dealing here not with any inherent power of the President. We are dealing with the statutory power of Congress. Foreign aid rests upon the statutory power of Congress exercising its legislative power over the expenditure of hard-earned taxpayers' dollars, which constitutes no interference with any right of the President.

Any time the President believes that it would be in the vital interest of the United States to supply foreign aid to any dictator who is threatening to drive American interests out of his country, and who insultingly tells the United States to take its aid and go to hell, he can either appear before the Congress or send a message to the Congress requesting legislative action by way of passing a special bill granting such aid. Of course, we all know that if Congress would stop abdicating its legislative power in the field of foreign aid by delegating it to the President and started requiring the President to get specific legislative approval covering such shocking fact situations as exist in Indonesia, the President would never be able to get the legislation passed. He would not be able to get it passed, because American public opinion would rise up in opposition to it. Then Congress would recognize the force of that public opinion.

The behind-the-scenes maneuvering of the State Department which it has been doing in connection with Nasser and Sukarno is a good example of what I mean when I say that the American people are having concealed from them time and time again the background facts and motivating causes that are producing the many unsound recommendations of the State Department to the White House in the field of foreign policy.

I am satisfied that one of the major reasons for our State Department's appeasement policies toward Sukarno is spelled out in a three-letter word—oil. Most Americans do not know that there is a billion to a billion and a quarter dollars worth of American oil investments in Indonesia, in addition to which other governments, such as the British and the Dutch have extensive investments in Indonesia. The most reliable information I have been able to find is that oil production in Indonesia amounts to at least 444,000 barrels a day. Esso has a refinery in Indonesia with a run of 65,000 a day. The Shell Refinery has a run of 85,000 barrels. Pan-American Oil Co. entered Indonesia in 1963. The Union Oil Co. has engaged in talking negotiations at least with the Indonesian Government. Caltex Pacific Oil Co., California & Texas Oil Cos., Standard Oil of New Jersey, Shell Indonesia owned by British and Dutch interests are the major oil companies operating in Indonesia. The oil export from Indonesia is estimated to be a minimum of $250 million a year. All these oil companies have had a great deal of trouble with Sukarno, because from time to time, he has threatened to nationalize them and take them over.

American oil companies are rushing as fast as they can to build a huge refinery in South Vietnam. That will not be the last one, if we continue our policy in South Vietnam. I am one Senator who will not sacrifice American boys for oil anywhere. The American people will not be either when they get the facts.

In 1963, Sukarno went to Tokyo, and representatives of the American Government carried on long negotiations with him, resulting in a so-called oil contract agreement.

I am discussing the Indonesian situation, long with the Egyptian situation, because we are dealing with two tyrants of the same stripe, and we are dealing with two tyrants who are following the same tactics. Thus far they have been able to have their way with our State Department, which in my judgment, is following a shameful program of appeasement of dictators in many facets of American foreign policy.

How long this will last in Indonesia, is, of course, up to Sukarno. With his cuddling up to the Chinese Communist leaders, as evidenced by the recent trade and economic and military aid agreement, announced as a result of the negotiations with the Chinese leader and Sukarno's foreign minister, Subandrio, in Peiping, I am willing to make judicial notice that it is only a matter of time before the oil-oriented diplomacy of the State Department in Indonesia will be in more trouble.

In a very real sense, the economic aid that our Government has been supplying Sukarno to the expense of the American taxpayers constitutes a form of economic subsidy to American and foreign oil interests in Indonesia. To put it more bluntly, it is protection money; it is payoff money; it is bribe money.

When are we going to learn that these international crooks, such as Nasser and Sukarno, will not stay bought? We only stultify our own country by engaging in such corrupt oil-oriented diplomacy. Sooner or later, Communist-oriented Sukarno is going to throw us out of Indonesia anyway.

The American taxpayers are entitled to have our Government stop throwing away their money in such places as Egypt and Indonesia. The American people are also entitled to have their Congress exercise its checking power upon the executive branch of Government by refusing to pass foreign aid legislation in such form as permits the State Department and the Pentagon Building and the White House to implement with American taxpayers' dollars such unsound foreign aid programs as the State Department and the White House propose to continue to implement in Egypt and Indonesia.

I ask unanimous consent that certain articles on this subject be inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate places squarely before the Senate both an opportunity and a duty to stop the State Department and the White House from continuing an unsound aid program in Egypt. Nasser, by his anti-American course of action, has abrogated any claim on his part to a continuation of American foreign aid. That is an elementary tenet of contract law. The U.S. Government owes it to the American taxpayers to stop sending to Nasser $37 million worth of Public Law 480 food which is what we would be sending if the Senate Appropriations Committee action should stand. In my judgment, if the State Department has its way, that is what we will be sending. Not only that, but if the Senate folds in regard to this item of foreign aid, I am satisfied, judging from past experience with the State Department, that we will have in the not too distant future some more oil-oriented foreign policy proposals made to us for a continuation of another round of economic aid to Nasser.

The coating of oil slick should be removed from the cloak of American foreign policy, and the issue raised by this amendment offers the Senate an opportunity to back up the House in the foreign aid drycleaning job it started. I would have the Senate take a further look at Nasser's policies as an aggressor and a dangerous threat to peace in the world.

Nasser invades Yemen at a very high human and financial cost; he aids the Congo rebels and we offset it by raising our own aid to Tshombe; he maintains a costly military establishment reinforced by a nuclear and missile research program; he enables Egyptian students to attack and burn the property of the U.S. Government. But still and all, so long as he does not move against our oil interests there are those who still believe he is deserving of the largess of the American taxpayers.

Humanitarian aid? No, Mr. President, we are not talking about humanitarian aid under Public Law 480. That is not involved here. The House amendment did not in any way touch the food the President may give away under title II to meet the food needs of people stricken by famine or other natural disaster.

Nor did the House language stop the sale of food under Public Law 480 for hard currency. That involves some contracts, to which the Senator from New York has referred. We can still sell it to Nasser for hard currency. He would not want much under those conditions. Only soft currency sales are affected by the House amendment. This is another concealment of cause and effect from the American people with respect to foreign aid and foreign policy.

People talk about sales for soft currency. They say to the American people that the soft currency piles up. To a large extent it is no sale at all, because only a small part of the soft currency ever benefits the American people. Under international arrangements, we cannot even spend that soft currency unless we obtain the consent of the country in which the currency is stored. We have great stacks of it around the world, and we are not able to spend it, because before we can spend it we must obtain the consent of the country involved, and it must first make a finding that its use will not cause any monetary or economic problem within that country.

That is why Senators have not found me enthusiastic about so-called soft sales. It is much better to make loans and to have them paid back in the course of time in hard money at interest rates which cover the cost of the use of the money for the protection of the American taxpayer, thus giving us a very interesting check, which results in a remarkably practical assurance that they will not be asking for loans except for projects that are feasible, for projects that will pay out, for projects that are economically sound, culturally desirable, and will help raise the standard of living of the people. That is what we are interested in.

Mr. President, we shall win this great contest between totalitarianism—the most vicious form of which is communism—on the one hand, and freedom on the other. We must follow a foreign policy that will bring the benefits of economic freedom to the masses of the people in the countries which we seek to help.

I shall continue to do everything I can to help support programs that will help the people of Egypt and the people of any Arab State. We shall not help them if we turn the control over to their dictators, for their dictators have demonstrated time and time again that it is not people that constitute their primary concern. That is why we must try to devise loan programs invested in given projects that will give definite benefits to the people in order to raise their standard of living.

So, Mr. President, I say that there is no humanitarian aid involved in the subject matter of the amendment.

It is only the soft currency sales that are affected by the House amendment. It is only the soft currency sales that permit Nasser to import American foodstuffs, sell them within the United Arab Republic, and use the proceeds for the purposes of government specified in the agreement. American food on those terms permits the United Arab Republic to finance its foreign aggressions and intrigues out of income it would otherwise have to spend to feed its people.

What we are in fact doing to a remarkable degree in regard to the sale of food to Nasser is helping Nasser to invade Yemen. We are helping Nasser to carry on his support of the rebels in the Congo. We are helping Nasser to build up a foreign policy pattern in the Middle East that jeopardizes the best interests of the United States. It may not jeopardize the present immediate best interests of the oil companies. But, Mr. President, it does not advance the cause of human freedom around the world; it sets it back. We must follow through on these sales. We must analyze what the benefit of this food is to Nasser as a dictator in carrying out a foreign policy that shocks the free world, a foreign policy of aggression, a foreign policy that, if we do not stop it, will fan the flames of a great war in that part of the world.

Mr. President, we cannot put our stamp of approval upon Nasser's foreign policy. We cannot escape the hard, cold, financial fact that we are helping him financially by this program; and when we help him financially, we in fact indirectly help finance his shocking foreign policy program.

I tell Members of Congress that once this bill is enacted without the House amendment in it, the State Department will furnish the remainder of the $30 million under the existing agreement, the $37 million more that Nasser was expecting to receive under the agreement, and it will negotiate a new agreement to replace the one that expires on June 30 of this year.

Senators can talk all they like about what promises were made about "consultation" with Congress or a committee of the Congress. But no committee can speak for the Congress. In order to avoid floor action in the two Houses of the Congress, one of the gimmicks of the State Department in recent years, by way of retreat—and they do not even like to make this retreat—is to try to offer to the Congress some arrangement whereby they will "consult" with some committee. Committees are not the Congress. If we are to carry out our responsibilities under the checking system of the Constitution, we must insist that those questions be determined by both Houses of the Congress. The "gimmick" of a consultation with the committee, in my judgment, is nothing but an evasive, digressive strategy.

The only consultation that will take place will be that which informs us as to why a certain thing was done. That is the conception of "consultation" that is practiced with Congress on the administration of foreign policy legislation.

We have put ourselves in this position by accepting time after time, year after year, the same excuses and arguments for "executive flexibility." Our constituents know, of course, that the Constitution gives to Congress the powers that are being exercised under this bill. It does not give them to the executive branch. Every insult, every intrigue against American friends in Africa and the Middle East which Nasser undertakes with American subsidy is the fault and the responsibility, in the last analysis, of the Congress, not the President, because we authorized it and we allow it to continue, unless we start stopping it here this afternoon. By continuing aid under these circumstances, we invite others to imitate and improve upon Nasser's blackmail technique of getting aid from the United States.

We cannot really evade this responsibility by turning the decision over to the executive branch to make. I think most of our constituents have already seen through that.

The committee amendment means that Nasser's United Arab Republic is to continue receiving American food, and I believe it should be rejected.

Mr. President, as I said at the beginning, the parliamentary situation gives us a clear choice—the choice of voting again to delegate to the President more power that belongs under the Constitution of the United States to the Congress, or to exercise our legislative responsibility for foreign aid. If extraordinary circumstances develop during the life of administering a foreign aid program, and the President would like to do something with a program which the Congress has not legislatively authorized him to do, let him send up a message. Let him, in keeping with our system of checks and balances and in keeping with that great program of a three-branch system of government, coordinated and coequal, carry out his function as President. He can respect that system by saying to Congress, "I send you this message and request legislative action to carry out the following suggestions. I think X country, in spite of a course of action that it has followed, ought to receive Y dollars of aid."

Then let us debate that aid proposal. Then we shall be carrying out our system of three coordinate and coequal branches of the government. That is not what the committee amendment says. The committee amendment says, "Let the President decide it for us."

I close by saying that this amendment by the committee is really another proposal to surrender more legislative power to the executive branch of Government.

This proposal is to enlarge the power of the President. I respectfully submit, because I am a supporter of the President—and I yield to no one in my support of the President—that I have a duty and a trust to disagree with him when I am satisfied that he proposes something that is not in the public interest. The President's attempt to obtain this enlarged delegation of power this afternoon is not in the interest of the people of this country, and the President should be stopped in his attempt to obtain such authority.

I close by urging the Senate to reject the amendment of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which has become known in this debate as amendment No. 3. By rejecting it, the bill will be left with the House language in it; and when the House language is left in it, Nasser will not get the $37 million worth of food. But he will get something else. He will get an answer from an America that is finally awakened to the responsibility of making clear to tyrants such as Nasser, Sukarno, and the others that we cannot be blackmailed and will not continue a program which, if we continue it, will be interpreted by many as a foreign aid program based upon the false notion that we can buy tyrants and that they will stay bought.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1965]

SENATE UNIT EASES BAN ON CAIRO FOOD: APPROPRIATIONS PANEL HEEDS WHITE HOUSE PLEA FOR FREE HAND IN AFRICA

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, February 1.—The Senate Appropriations Committee voted today to let President Johnson complete a surplus food sales agreement with the United Arab Republic if he finds it in the national interest.

Last Tuesday the House of Representatives, by a vote of 204 to 177, declared that no part of the $1.6 billion supplemental appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation could be used to finance food exports to the United Arab Republic.

The House action would have meant that $37 million worth of commodities—all that remains of $431.8 million worth that the United States agreed 3 years ago to sell to the United Arab Republic for local currency—would not have been delivered.

[In Cairo, President Gamal Abdel Nasser conferred with Ambassador Lucius D. Battle in their first meeting this year. West Germany's Ambassador to Cairo was called home to report on the worsening relations between Cairo and Bonn.]

Today the Senate Appropriations Committee, by a vote of 17 to 6, agreed to retain the House ban, but then added the following language: "Except when such exports are necessary to carry out the sales agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest." Thus did the committee accede to the administration argument that Congress should not limit the President's constitutional responsibility in foreign affairs, while registering at the same time its disapproval of continued aid to President Nasser as long as he persisted in anti-American acts and speeches.

The administration was not only agreeable to the action of the Senate committee but also welcomed it. A nose count had indicated that the Senate might well go along with the House unless the President himself took responsibility for carrying out the remainder of the agreement.

In fact, the committee did exactly what Under Secretary of State George W. Ball requested it to do during testimony this morning.

Mr. Ball said that relations between Washington and Cairo in recent weeks "have been anything but satisfactory." He candidly admitted that it was impossible to say "whether it will be possible to bring about the kind of understanding between the United States and the United Arab Republic that can contribute to peace and stability in the Near East and in Africa."

EFFORT NEEDED

If relations are to be improved, he went on, "it will take a substantial effort by the United Arab Republic and not merely by the United States."

The State Department is not advocating "a policy of weakness," Mr. Ball said. He said U.S. relations with the United Arab Republic involved a "highly moving situation," and it was necessary to proceed "with coolness and great caution."

"All I'm saying is that the President should have power to complete it (the agreement) if he decides it is to the advantage of the United States," Mr. Ball said.

But Mr. Ball made clear that it was by no means certain the President would so decide.

"I'm not saying the President is necessarily going to carry it out," he said.

Meanwhile, it was learned that the President was considering sending letters to Senators MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana and EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the Democratic and Republican leaders, which would set forth the administration's policy toward Egypt.

URGED BY SENATORS

Several Senators have urged the President either to send such letters or to make a White House statement of policy in order to reassure some Members and give others a defensible explanation to their constituents for not supporting the House action.

Nevertheless, some officials said today that the President was resisting either a statement or a letter to the Senate leadership.

In a brief floor speech today, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, said he wanted to give the President a free hand in foreign policy. But he said that unless there was some assurance that the United Arab Republic "will not torpedo U.S. foreign policy, then I think we have no alternative but to go along with the House."

State Department officials emphasized today that the administration was as angry as Congress over the supplying of arms to the Congolese rebels by the United Arab Republic, the burning of the U.S. Information Library in Cairo and President Nasser's telling the United States to take its aid and "jump in the Mediterranean."

Mr. Ball assured the committee today that the administration would consult Congress before undertaking new aid agreements with the United Arab Republic.

For its part the committee added two paragraphs to its report on the bill that were a warning both to the administration and President Nasser. It said:

"It is further the policy of Congress that most careful consideration should be given by the responsible agencies of our Government concerning the continued provision of assistance under this act to countries that are, directly or indirectly, hostile to the United States, or that are providing assistance to groups or to countries that are acting against the best interests of the United States.

"In exercising said provisions of assistance, the Congress emphasized that said assistance is contributed by the people of the United States of America out of taxes paid by them; and it is not conducive for them to want to continue said assistance to countries which permit the property of the United States of America to be destroyed and whose leaders make statements derogatory of our country."

NASSER MEETS WITH ENVOY

CAIRO, February 1.—Ambassador Battle met with President Nasser tonight to outline the administration's efforts to continue American food shipments to Egypt, and to discuss the future of the aid program.

Qualified sources said Mr. Battle also talked with the Egyptian President about the

Congo situation where previously Washington's and Cairo's policies have clashed.

It was their first meeting since December 19 and since President Nasser had publicly accused the Ambassador of arrogance and rudeness toward Egypt in a pre-Christmas speech.

TENSION RELAXES

Despite the congressional battle over Egyptian aid, the atmosphere of American-Egyptian relations has relaxed considerably here. Constant Egyptian speculation that Ambassador Battle would be replaced has ceased and a number of high Egyptian officials have privately complimented the Ambassador.

Although neither side would go into specifics of the discussion today, diplomatic sources disclosed that recently the United States has been sounding out a number of African governments on the possibilities of working out a compromise government in the Congo with Moise Tshombe removed from the scene.

It was presumed that this was touched upon tonight.

On the aid question Mr. Battle took with him late reports of the administration's campaign to beat off House restrictions on surplus food shipments in return for local currency.

In the last few days Mr. Battle is understood to have given high Egyptian officials assurances of the administration's intention to continue aid to the United Arab Republic.

[From the New York Times, May 21, 1963]

Oil Firms Bow to Indonesian Contract Terms

(By Ronald Stead)

Djakarta, Indonesia.—Three major foreign oil companies in Indonesia have just agreed to the Government's new conditions to turn over to it 60 percent of their proceeds from oil extraction.

The companies involved are Standard Vacuum of California, American Caltex, and British-Dutch-owned Shell.

This is the shape of things to come for all foreign companies allowed to work Indonesia's rich oil resources. One company, Pan-American Oil of Chicago, is already implementing the first such new-style accord.

SURVEY COMPLETED

It recently completed an aerial magnetometer survey over 13,000 square miles of Sumatra. Pan-American's next development is a seismograph study which will pinpoint oil location so that rigs for drilling can be brought in early next year.

Pan-American Oil paid a nonrefundable bonus of $5 million to the Indonesian Government in order to become contractor to the state-owned oil company named "Pertamin," and it has undertaken to pay another $5 million bonus after oil production has reached exploitable quantities.

THE 30-YEAR PACT

The area available to Pan-American is 25,000 square kilometers in central Sumatra adjacent to the Caltex workings.

The agreement to share the crude oil value in the ratio of 60-to-40 percent is valid for 30 years, the first 10 being utilized for exploration and the remaining 20 for exploitation.

An authoritative official of the company who furnished this correspondent these details says that about 500 Indonesians are employed so far and there has been no labor trouble worth mentioning.

Indonesia's Communists, who dominate the labor unions, object to the new system for foreign participation in the country's oil potential and urge nationalization.

MAJOR REVENUE SOURCE

Indonesia supplies only 2 percent of the world's oil but this contributes 40 percent to Indonesia's total income from exports.

Under the new plan which the Government is imposing, foreigners become contractors not lessees. In other words, Indonesia's mineral rights are not going to be leased to non-Indonesians any more. Contractors furnish all the technical and financial outlay.

The three big companies—Stanvac, Caltex, and Shell—that have been installed in Indonesia many years do not look favorably on the terms they were told they must accept by June 15 if they desired to continue production in this country.

Under an Indonesian law passed 3 years ago, all previous concession rights were abolished. But the companies were allowed to continue working under the old plan until a new agreement was reached.

CONCESSIONS ENDED

Talks have been in progress more than 2 years, with the companies holding out for something better than 40- to 60-percent division of the financial yield from crude oil production.

The regulation containing the June 15 ultimatum became effective April 26.

TIME LIMIT IMPOSED

It said that the foreign companies had been given enough time to accommodate themselves to Indonesia's new oil policy and had failed to carry out the requirements of a Presidential decree issued in 1962. The resultant situation required imposition of a time limit, the order declared—hence the deadline.

Had any company decided to terminate operations in Indonesia, it would have been given 5 months in which to do so—under conditions to be announced.

Indonesia's take-it-or-leave-it attitude concerning oil emphasizes President Sukarno's goal of independence at any price.

So far as the national economy is concerned, the price now is higher than ever before—with the foreign exchange reserve exhausted, inflation chronic, and few permanent results discernible from the 8-year development plan which the President (recently installed in that office for life) has ordered be put into execution without fail.

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1963]

Western Oil Men Reach an Accord With Indonesians: United States and British Concerns Becoming Contractors in Nationalization Step—Long Deadlock Broken—Crisis Between Washington and Djakarta Averted and Both Seem Satisfied

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

Tokyo, June 1.—Indonesia and three Western petroleum companies signed an agreement today that will put the country's oil industry under a combination of private foreign enterprise and gradual, compensated nationalization.

The agreement, reached after urgent political intervention by the U.S. Government, broke a long deadlock between the companies and Indonesia and averted a crisis in relations between Washington and Djakarta.

All parties seemed satisfied by the results of the days and nights of hard bargaining in Tokyo, where President Sukarno is vacationing.

Indonesia was able to stick to its principle that oil belonged to the nation. Mr. Sukarno was also able to keep the foreign oil companies operating in his country. Their knowledge and market channels are vital to Indonesia.

President Kennedy sent Lt. Gov. Wilson Wyatt, of Kentucky, to Tokyo as his personal representative in the negotiations. Assisting Mr. Wyatt were Abram Chayes, State Department legal adviser, and Walter James Levy, an oil specialist who is acting as consultant to the State Department.

THE COMPANIES INVOLVED

The oil companies are Caltex Pacific Oil Co., owned by Standard Oil Co., California, and Texaco, Inc.; Stanvac Indonesia, owned by Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), and Shell Indonesia, owned by British interests.

As a result of the negotiations here, the oil companies' status has shifted from owners to contractors. But they remain in control and management of the $250 million a year export production for at least 20 years.

Also they won acceptable selling terms for that part of the industry—refining and internal distribution and marketing—that they had agreed long before would be taken over by the Indonesians.

Western oil specialists here said that "pragmatically" the foreign companies had lost little and gained much. They said the chief gains were the prospect of orderly operations in Indonesia and the long-range possibility that the companies and the Government would benefit enough to want to renew the contract after 20 years.

Washington, which had been so worried about a breakdown in the talks that it dispatched Mr. Wyatt and his experts, avoided a showdown. That might have meant an end to U.S. aid to Indonesia and a greater Indonesian drift to the Communists.

The agreement was signed by President Sukarno's aids and officials of the companies. It ended a dispute that had been going on for more than 2 years.

The oil companies had believed they were being forced to work under conditions, and under threats, that made long-term operations impossible. Washington was afraid that an Indonesian move toward nationalization without the companies' agreement might be interpreted by Congress as an act of expropriation barring Indonesia from U.S. aid.

The agreement runs along these lines:

The oil companies will continue to produce and export crude oil for 20 years, after which the contract will be renegotiated. The companies, by paying a bonus, will also get the rights to explore and exploit new oil deposits.

During the 20 years the companies will give the Government 60 percent of the profits. That is the rate they have been paying for the last 2 years, ever since a 50–50 arrangement ended.

Within 5 years the Indonesian Government can take over facilities for domestic distribution of oil products. U.S. sources said the companies had agreed some time ago that these facilities would be nationalized.

During the Tokyo talks the negotiators agreed on terms for the takeover: An agreed price, payment in hard currency within 5 years and interest on the unpaid balance. The amount to be paid was not disclosed.

The refining facilities of the companies may be taken over in 10 to 15 years. If Indonesia waits the full 15 years, the agreed rate of depreciation will mean she will pay almost nothing for the refining facilities.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1963]

Politics Complicates Operations of Petroleum Companies in Asia

(By Richard Rutter)

Petroleum companies have had more than their share of trouble in southeast Asia. If anything, the situation may deteriorate further.

In the Eastern Hemisphere, as a whole, oil business continued to expand and international companies were able to post a gain in earnings while other segments of the industry had harder going. But the bulk of the gains came from operations in the oil-rich Middle East rather than from Asia.

In three southeastern Asian countries in particular—Indonesia, Burma, and Ceylon—operating conditions ranged from difficult to almost impossible and the cessation of all activity in those nations now looms as a definite possibility.

Indonesia is a case in point, with its trend toward increased state regulation and nationalization of industry.

More than 500 enterprises are now run by the Government, 300 of them Dutch companies taken over in 1957. The Western-owned oil companies, however, worked out a "hands off" agreement with the Sukarno government. Caltex, Stanvac, and Shell were allowed to restore war-damaged facilities, import equipment, and export products free of foreign exchange controls and other restrictions.

CONCERNS DO WELL

Constituting a sort of oasis of free enterprise in a largely state-run economy, the oil industry has done well. Output has risen so that shipments now account for almost 40 percent of the nation's total export earnings.

But more recently the Indonesian Government has "gotten tough" with the oil companies and has insisted on altered working arrangements. The three foreign operators have agreed to higher royalty payments and a long-term timetable has been set up under which they will eventually turn over to the Government all their facilities—without compensation.

These companies have a combined investment in Indonesia of almost $1 billion, and understandably, they have balked at investing more capital in further expansion instead of using retained earnings. As a result, the Government now threatens nationalization in the near future.

At that, the companies in Indonesia have so far escaped the fate of the Western operators that have been in Ceylon for the last 40 years or more. Last summer Ceylon, through the Government-owned Ceylon Petroleum Corp., expropriated about 20 percent of the operating facilities of three foreign companies—Caltex, Esso Standard Eastern, Inc., and British Shell. Taken over were gasoline filling stations, storage depots, kerosene outlets, and bunkering facilities.

Caltex valued its seized properties at about $1,500,000 and Esso put its at $2,500,000. At the same time, the state oil company began to import Soviet petroleum products through a barter agreement and to market them through the expropriated facilities. Ceylon has no known petroleum deposits of its own.

UNITED STATES RETALIATES

The Government promised compensation for the appropriated properties, but so far none has been forthcoming. As a result, the U.S. Government early this year suspended various forms of assistance to the island country, totaling about $15 million.

In retaliation, the Ceylon authorities have imposed a ceiling price on imported crude oil and stipulated that no foreign exchange will be released for the import of oil above that price. That quotation, incidentally, is what the state-owned company is paying for Soviet crude oil, or 20 percent less than the Persian Gulf price that the Western companies adhere to.

Ceylon has also indicated that if the private oil companies do not import oil at the cutrate price, their remaining facilities will be taken over.

In Burma a military junta took over last year and promptly stated an official goal of "nationalization of such vital means of production as agriculture, industry, distribution, transportation, communications, and external trade."

The already scheduled nationalization of the British-owned Burma Oil Co. was pressed. Negotiations are now proceeding to acquire the British shares in that company and related trading companies. The Government has announced that all commerce and industry will be completely nationalized though new private enterprises may be established in exceptional circumstances.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I share the concern of the Senator from Oregon relative to the history and responsibility of Congress in the field of foreign affairs. I might disagree with some of the Senator's contentions about the involvement of the oil industry in this matter. Whether it is or is not involved is quite beside the question.

The question is, How long are we going to let petty dictators tweak Uncle Sam's nose with impunity and pluck off his beard and blow it in his face? The time has come for the United States to assert to those who thumb their noses at us while receiving handouts from us, while they try to increase their prestige in the world, that we have a responsibility in the field of foreign relations, one that we are too often prone to abdicate to the executive branch.

I fervently hope that we will reassert that responsibility today. I hope we will not retreat from the correct position taken by the House of Representatives. I fervently hope that the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I speak with mixed feelings concerning the action the Senate is now considering. I jotted down some thoughts as I listened to the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] on this troublesome question. I say "with mixed feelings" because I have long been a student in this body of the Senator from Oregon in particular, in regard to the complicated, complex questions that trouble me at this moment.

The principal reason of my obtaining the floor is to take issue with some of the questions that have been submitted until now and to suggest that perhaps there are other priorities that might well prevail in our judgment on this question.

I think it well to remember that this is a Department of Agriculture appropriations supplemental measure; that it was designed only for fulfilling obligations already on record. It is not a projection of a new program or a new position of policy. In my opinion there should have been no consideration of a compromise of the House action. It seems to me, in the interest of being forthright on this question, that the language should have been stricken completely from the record. It is my understanding that no hearings were held on it by the House. It popped up on the floor of the House. It did not receive the deliberation that we ordinarily accord to this kind of proposal. But that is water over the dam.

We are considering this afternoon a compromise proposal that the committee has carefully considered for very good reasons. I hasten to add that I think the most unfortunate thing this body could do would be to try to shape American foreign policy from a sense of anger against some dictator like Mr. Nasser or Mr. Sukarno. We have no business shaping the foreign policy of the United States merely because someone has pulled our beard in a spirit of aggravation. In the role we are called upon by history to fill at this time we must be bigger than that; we must be more firm than that; we must be more farseeing than that. If every 10-cent dictator who came along could get us off the track and deliberately incite us by remarks that were intemperate, it would be difficult indeed to live up to the responsibilities placed upon our shoulders.

It seems to me that Senators should remember, as we search our souls for a decision on this question today, that this is not a question of satisfying our own ego concerning Mr. Nasser. He gets under my hide, as do Sukarno and other dictators on the international scene. But the fact that he irritates me should not be the source of the foreign policy of our country. Foreign policy should be laid out on the basis of its principles, concepts, goals, targets, and priorities, not on a basis of personal venom or of "revenge" because we are out of patience at the moment.

I would be the last to carry any brief for Mr. Nasser or Mr. Sukarno, or any of their ilk. I only say that the world is round; that Nasser is not in a political vacuum; that the world is not going to revolve around an axis between Washington and Cairo. What happens in Eastern Europe, Latin America, or Africa affects us all. Our responsibility is to a world that is round, not a world that is shrunken to the axis of Cairo and Washington, in the midst of which we are sitting today. For those reasons, it seems to me we ought to think twice before we act precipitately on a matter such as this.

If I may speculate for a moment, I believe much can be said to the effect that Israel will be in a slightly better position if we have more to do in Cairo than if we break off with Cairo. For whatever our connections there are worth, some restraints can be imposed, some cautions can be invoked, that our absence from Egypt or our breaking away from there would not permit. Even from the standpoint of our interest in the neighbors of Egypt, there is some obligation, it seems to me, on our part to keep them within our sights.

So the question is not merely, How do we get even with Nasser? How do we tell him off? How do we get the message through to him? The whole world will not rise or fall because of something dictated by Nasser. I question the real substance of a nation's foreign policy if that policy is to reflect, at the whim of Congress, every bit of intemperance or outspokenness on the part of dictators. In our country, our task is not and cannot be to punish, bad as Nasser may be, bad as Sukarno may be. What kind of national purpose would that be? What kind of national policy would that project? Our task, if I may respectfully suggest it, is that of being as good and strong and wise as the times demand.

If I may draw a parallel, what would have happened to the image of British life in the two or three centuries when they took on the chores of trying to balance the delicate political powers of the world, if whenever someone on the sidelines tweaked the nose or pulled the tail the British had digressed from their long-range purpose of trying to preserve the balance of the world?

The world would have been in a shambles many a time as the result of losing sight of the high road along which they alone were in a position to maintain a course toward a slightly better world in their time.

As Members of the Senate—and we are all very jealous of the prerogatives and responsibilities of the Senate—we ought to be ready to face up to the facts of our time as to where the responsibility rests.

I never want to forfeit the responsibility of the Senate in a projection of foreign policy. We live now, though, in a world of dictators for a large part, not in a world of democracies as such. What we do with this $37 million, or do not do with it will not make one iota of difference to the chances of democracy in Egypt.

This is a matter that concerns another of these disturbances, should this issue not be followed through by this body, that can well ruffle the only troubled waters in the Middle East, at a time when there are still higher priorities, in a way that would not bring any attendant consequences of advantage to us, as I see it.

There is only one place where the buck cannot be passed any longer. I think well of a remark made by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] this week in my presence. The Senator reminded us all that we can sound off here, as we should, and air this issue in the open. We can be wrong, as we sometimes are. And the consequences of our making a mistake are not always earthshaking, fortunately.

We have a second chance. We can make a second guess and indulge in a second try in an effort to find the right answer. But, when this decision is arrived at by the President, he must be right the first time. He has no second chance.

It behooves us under the circumstances at this moment to abide by the compromise language that the Committee on Appropriations has drafted. That action would leave it to the discretion of the President to assert his judgment in a small way on a matter that has accumulated from the past. It is not a policy that is being written here today. It has no business being written here today. It merely concerns language that was tacked on an agricultural supplemental measure in a short period of time. Therefore, we ought to leave the President of the country the latitude of judgment in the national interest in this particular instance as he sees it.

I am sure that by June, July, or midsummer, the question of what we shall do with the Public Law 480 program, what will happen to some of our foreign aid programs, and what our real policy direction ought to be will be before us again. That is the time for us to have a great debate along these lines. That is when we can exert collectively the kind of influence on or guidelines of wisdom that the times require.

In conclusion, I am always sobered in these moments by recalling a conversation that I once had the privilege of having with the senior Senator from Tennessee when he and I were in New Delhi. It was a rather philosophical session with Prime Minister Nehru. We were talking about the relative injustice of the criticism that is heaped upon the United States by other countries and the double standard that is applied to measure whether a country is doing the right thing or the wrong thing.

We always catch a lot of the "flak," but we are not in the position of trying to lead the world in order to be patted on the head, nor perhaps even to be thanked. We must stick to this business, because if we do not, and if we are not willing to take this "flak," we forfeit the leadership to those to whom we do not care to entrust the world.

As we mused on that occasion over the criticisms we received in those days from Indians—and today from Nasser, Sukarno, and others—Mr. Nehru made a very astute observation. He said:

> You know, the injustice of all this must be obvious to all of you. We understand the effect it has in your own political arena. But what would happen to me, Nehru, in India if I were to make a mistake? I may be defeated in the next election. My party may be thrown out. My party may suffer as a consequence. And that is about all. But, you Americans are like Atlas, with the world on your shoulders. If you make a mistake, stumble, and fall, the world falls with you. That, in some measure is one of the reasons for the anxious criticisms that are occasionally levied at you. We know that you make the difference, that what you do makes the difference.

It seems to me that we should do all within our capabilities to live up to the responsibilities, the frightening, costly, and yet exciting possibility that the history of our times has placed upon us.

In doing so, we had better have an opportunity to meet those obligations and those responsibilities in a way that will stand the test of history, and will enable us, as we stand before the bar of history, to hold our heads high in the knowledge that we did what we thought the times required.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reply briefly to the Senator from Wyoming.

I disagree with every major premise of the speech. I shall try to recollect the major points made by the Senator from Wyoming and give my point of view on each.

The Senator from Wyoming speaks of our taking a precipitate action of intemperance in the Senate today. But that is an old debating technique, seeking to color the opposition with a name rather than facing up to the facts of the issue.

There is nothing precipitate about what is proposed here. The issue as to what we should do is a matter of foreign policy in respect to aiding dictators around the world who follow courses of action that are not in the best interests of the United States.

The issue has been before the Senate year after year for many years. It has been before the Committee on Foreign Relations time and time again. We have taken some actions in regard to it. Let me name a few. We took some action, as I said in my earlier speech today, in respect to Indonesia last year. We included a presidential escape clause in that one. The fact is, however, that Sukarno has not lost a dollar of aid. The fact is that the administration has proceeded, following the inadequate congressional action of last year, to continue to give Sukarno aid.

We had a long debate 2 years ago on the aggressor amendment. The Senate took a petition on that issue. I do not know of a foreign policy issue that has been more openly debated than the issue raised by the committee amendment this afternoon—How far should Congress go in delegating its legislative powers?

Yet the Senator from Wyoming calls this precipitate action. This has been an issue that has been before Congress and the people of this country for quite some time. There is growing public support that Congress should exercise its authority.

It is suggested by the Senator from Wyoming that we who support the House language and oppose the Senate amendment are somehow, in some way, engaged in intemperate action. That is pure nonsense. Is it intemperate to say we must take a look at our foreign policy with regard to Nasser and decide what the relationship of that foreign policy is to the best interests of the United States? Is it intemperate to place a congregational check upon our aid program in Egypt because it goes to a man who has knowingly been an aggressor against Yemen? That has been a matter of great protest in the Congress and in the country for many months. If we continue to supply Nasser the kind of aid that is proposed to be supplied to him in the Senate amendment to the joint resolution, his aggressor potentialities will be strengthened.

Those of us who disagree with the Senator from Wyoming and the majority of the Senate Appropriations Committee agree that we have had a thorough debate on the merits of the issue and the time has come to take action this afternoon.

Let me mention one of the actions we have taken by way of exercising checks by the Congress by way of legislation. In 1955 we adopted the Lehman-Morse sense-of-Congress resolution with regard to policies in the Middle East. At that time one policy which we protested relates to Norway, which was quickly rectified by Norway. We made clear in that action that the State Department should understand that the Senate looks askance at grants-to-aid countries that engage in the kind of shocking and deplorable action we were protesting.

In 1959 we made the Lehman-Morse resolution of 1955 an amendment to the foreign aid bill. It became the Javits-Morse amendment to the foreign aid bill. It was an amendment stating the policy of the Congress. Of course, that statement of policy is in line with the House language.

"Precipitate," says the Senator from Wyoming. "Intemperate," says the Senator from Wyoming. The fact is that this is another link in the chain forged in recent years by the Senate, seeking to exercise its responsibilities and act to check such powers as these.

The Senator from Wyoming says it will be a deplorable thing if Congress makes a mistake; that the President should not be put in a position where he can be checked by the Congress, because he cannot afford to make a mistake; that he must not be put in a position where he can make mistakes.

Mr. President, this President and previous Presidents have been making mistakes in foreign aid. They have been making mistakes in foreign aid because Congress has not imposed the type of restriction that we are arguing this afternoon should be imposed, and which it is not only our constitutional right to impose, but our clear duty.

I strongly oppose delegating the kind of discretionary power to the President that the Senator from Wyoming would leave him. We cannot afford to continue the kind of mistakes Presidents have been making in the field of foreign policy, because we have been delegating this kind of discretion to the President, rather than passing on the merits and sending it to the President, who can return it with a veto message, which is his checking power.

The argument of the Senator from Wyoming really adds up to a proposal to give more and more power to the President, to abdicate more and more of our constitutional duty to determine standards so far as foreign aid and agricultural legislation are concerned.

This issue does not involve a question of inherent Presidential power. It is a question of power to be exercised by the President only to the limit he is permitted to exercise it under a statute passed by the Congress.

For some years, some of us have been bringing this issue to the floor of the Senate time and time again, and have been urging that standards and limitations be placed upon that delegation of power to the President of the United States.

The Senator of Wyoming raises what I respectfully submit is an entirely irrelevant question about what position the British lion would have been in in history, if, every time its tail was tweaked or there was any opposition, it had followed the course of action to which the Senator from Wyoming referred.

I know that the British lion bled nearly to death trying to placate and manipulate and maintain its own version of peace and empire all over the globe.

That argument has nothing to do with the issue before us, but let me say that the world would be in a better position today, and freedom would not be suffering as much today, if the British lion had stopped its growling decades ago and had begun establishing freedom in British territories around the world. That issue is irrelevant to this debate, but if it is to be dragged in, let me point out there is no basis for setting up Great Britain as a model for the United States to follow in policies involving millions of people who are not free.

The Senator from Wyoming says we shall have a chance next June, or whenever a foreign aid bill is brought up, to have a great debate. I am accustomed to that argument—"Not now, but some other time." That is the argument made—"Do not face up to your responsibilities now, but some other time."

The legislative framework that has delivered this issue to the floor of the Senate happens to be that of an appropriation measure. It is within the authority of the Congress to face up to the issue in an appropriation measure. But let me say most respectfully that if the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses bring it in, there is no merit in the argument of the Senator from Wyoming that we should not face up to it now, but face up to it next June, because he does not like the legislative format that brings the issue to the Senate.

It happens to be within the rules of the Senate to bring it in in this way. I am interested in the issue, and I am interested in the merits of the issue. We have before us this afternoon the merits of the issue as to whether or not we are going to countenance giving this arbitrary power to the President in an area where, in my judgment, it is not in the interest of the United States to extend aid.

We have the legislative authority to follow the course of action which the House has followed. This raises the simple and basic question: Is that policy of the House sounder foreign policy for this Republic to follow than the foreign policy proposed by a majority of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate?

My answer is decidedly "yes."

It is decidedly in the best interests of the foreign policy of this country to stop aiding a man who is aiding the rebels in the Congo ever so little or ever so much.

We do not know where the Congo issue will lead, but the Congo issue can take on awful and frightening proportions. There is no doubt that Nasser is a conduit to the rebels in the Congo. Nasser provides a training center for the rebels in the Congo. Nasser provides a corridor for Communist forces by various devices, some by subterfuge and some with not so much subterfuge, to aid what is going on in the Congo.

Neither the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] nor any other Senator can stand up in the Chamber this afternoon and show that it is in the interests of the United States to have Nasser—or the head of any other country—giving aid to the rebels.

Is it in the interests of the foreign policy of the United States to give countenance, support, and aid to a dictator that has been carrying on an aggressive policy which he has been carrying on in Yemen? Of course it is not.

Mr. President, we did not draw the issue. Nasser did. If the Senate adopts the House language, it is not my position that it will be taking action this afternoon out of pique, out of intemperance, or out of any motivation to discipline Nasser. It is my position that if we are to protect the best foreign policy interests of the American people, we should stop subsidizing Nasser. That is the issue.

I do not care what language is used by those who wish to rationalize the insistence of the State Department that it should be allowed to do what it wishes to do in the Middle East concerning Nasser. The fact remains that it has already demonstrated what it wishes to do, and what it has been doing—under the kind of policy which the House seeks to prevent—which has not been in the best interest of the United States.

What should we do? Fold our arms? Surrender? Admit we are making a mistake, and that if we keep on making the mistake we will not be checked but go ahead and continue making it?

The Senate has a duty to the American people to exercise whatever legislative authority it has to change a foreign policy which, I believe, is not in the interests of our country.

It is interesting that some Senators have come to me and told me they are going to vote for the Senate language, but, they say, "We believe it is a mistake to continue the policy, but we do not like to be placed in the position of seeming to vote against what we believe the President wishes in foreign policy."

Let me say respectfully to those Senators that it is their duty to vote for the House language, if they actually believe that the President is following a foreign policy which is not in the best interests of the country.

I rest my case on that major premise. We cannot analyze the foreign policy of Nasser and find any basis for arguing that his foreign policy is in the interest of the people of the United States.

The authority over American aid to a foreign government lies with the Congress, not with the President. The only powers he can legally exercise in connection with sending food or money or military aid abroad is what we give him. But he is only our agent, and we continue to be responsible for the results.

Senators represent the people of the United States. Every Senator who believes that Nasser's policy is not in the best interests of the people of the United States, in my judgment, has a clear duty to vote for the House language and against the language of the Senate committee. In my judgment, the Senate has to vote to stop a foreign policy that is being practiced by the President and the Secretary of State—and, yes, by the Pentagon—which, if it is continued, will cause serious crises in this country.

I believe that the way to stop a war is to stop it before it begins. I believe that we should make it perfectly clear to the dictators of this world—and make it clear to them now—that we are not going to give them aid in any way, shape, or manner which can strengthen their warmaking plans, their aggressive plans, the plans which some of them have publicly announced, that they intend to attack certain countries whenever they consider themselves strong enough to do so.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I do not intend to prolong the debate. I regret that I did not take the opportunity to prepare a written text which could have been used as a basic reference.

Let me say for the record that the real point in this discussion is that the Senate has before it a supplemental agricultural appropriation measure; that this is a policy already laid down; that this is an extension of a policy of trying to fill the gap with $37 million already authorized and contracted for; that we are not considering the extension of a policy; and that we are not opening up the consideration of a new policy.

Therefore, in that context, we must weigh the consequences of this move now in regard to what it means in its gains and in its risks to our basic foreign policy decisions.

I submit, with all due respect, that this matter of $37 million, while it is bound to offer some psychological advantage on the other side, will have no real message which it can convey in meaningful ways to moderate, restrain, hold back, or in any other way strengthen our hand with Nasser. That problem must be dealt with at some other time and on some other basis in terms of a policy projection.

As the Senator from Oregon seems to imply, if we are really out to have no truck with any dictator, let me say that we shall not have anything left in the way of any international relationships, with the exception of a small part of Western Europe and one or two scattered republics here and there.

We are dealing with a dictator, and we must be realistic about it.

Are we going on a great crusade, beginning with Nasser and Sukarno, and make little Americas and little democrats out of these people?

We shall be better off in the long run, if that were possible, but we are dealing with the world as it is, not with a dream that might be.

The same thing obtains in regard to Nasser. He is hardly a proper object on which to focus American foreign policy. For long after Nasser has gone, the people of Egypt will be there. The political vacuum in the Middle East will be there. The great tensions will still prevail.

If we really wish to bring down Nasser—which I gather from the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] should be basically our long-range policy, to get rid of him because he is a rascal—then we should impose a blockade on Egypt right now.

We should cut off all economic intercourse with the United Arab Republic and really put the squeeze on Nasser. Most people, I am sure, fully appreciate the fact that this is not a rational approach in the times in which we live.

Therefore, let us get down to brass tacks. To cut off this $37 million, which has been already laid out, already projected, already authorized, and already contracted for, will do nothing except increase tensions and increase strain—and heaven knows, there are enough tension and strain areas—does not offer us the alternative of clearing it up, or strengthening our hand, if we take this retaliatory action.

In my judgment, the issue is as simple as that.

For that reason, I again urge Senators to consider the consequences of this action with the almost nonexistent, beneficial gain which might be realized from this small sum of money applied in this way.

I conclude by reminding my colleagues that I oppose Mr. Nasser in principle and in substance in every way I know how. But there is one thing that takes precedence over my personal bitter opposition to Nasser, and that is that we try to strive to keep a strong position in all the areas of the world, at the same time without jeopardizing the tensions in certain areas with a proposal which would not offer us the prospect of a great gain; and that prospect of a great gain is not present in the particular decision now pending.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall reply briefly to the rejoinder by saying that most of it is based upon an attempt on the part of the Senator from Wyoming to put words in my mouth.

The Senator from Oregon has not taken the position this afternoon that we should have no communion with dictators. The blanket suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming, that I am proposing this afternoon that we have no dealings with totalitarian government, is not based on any fact in connection with anything that I have said. I referred to dictators who plan and carry out aggressions against their neighbors.

Certain courses of conduct have been followed by Nasser which I have set forth in support of my major premise. We must ask ourselves this question: Is his conduct in the interest of the public policy interests of the people of the United States?

Let me quickly review them again, because I say to my friend from Wyoming that the issue was raised by the appropriation measure, quite appropriately, and that we now must review the question of whether we wish to continue aid to a man who in my judgment has abrogated all right to further aid by the course of conduct he has taken against the United States, and a course of conduct that he has taken elsewhere in the world that is in the worst interest of the United States—Yemen and the Congo and, in fact, his whole attitude in the Middle East.

What has he done? We know that he has permitted in his country the anti-American action that we have protested. We know that he has summarized his position, as far as his caring as to what we think about it, in the language that I used in my earlier remarks which, in the American vernacular, is that we can take our aid and go jump in the lake. We are being asked to aid a man who has pointed out very clearly that we can count on him not to agree with us in diplomatic channels, but to oppose us and to do what he wants to do, and that we can like it or else. That is what has developed since there has developed the lack of funds to supply him with more goods under soft currency sales to the tune of $37 million.

Of course, Congress has the right—and I happen to believe the duty also—to review that action on the part of this individual. My speech goes to this individual and to his conduct. I say, on the basis of his anti-American record, on the basis of his conduct, which threatens our interest in that part of the world, which may very well create a situation in the Congo that might embroil us, as well as a good many other nations, that we cannot justify giving him further aid.

I talked about Sukarno as the second horrible example that I believe confronts us. The President of the United States has made a serious mistake every time he has sent further aid to Sukarno after the action taken by Congress last year. He did it under the law. He did it in the exercise of Presidential escape clause. But on the merits he has been aiding a man whom he should not aid, because he is a man who has shown his disrespect and his evaluation of American aid by making the statement, which he has reiterated, that we can take our aid and go to hell.

If we in Congress proceed to pass legislative controls and restrictions in the administration of foreign policy that meets the challenge raised by such foreign policies as are being practiced by Nasser and Sukarno, are we precipitate, are we intemperate, are we affecting the decision of whether we will aid anyone?

The Senator from Oregon has made perfectly clear in vote after vote that he is willing to grant aid to people that we can count on to keep their word, that we can count on not to be aggressors, and to people who, although their ideology may be different from ours, demonstrate that they are not warmakers. We are dealing with a man who in my judgment is a serious threat to the peace in the Middle East.

Senators will remember that a few years ago Congress added to the foreign aid bill the provision terminating aid to any country that seized the property of American investors without due compensation.

It is remarkable to recall that there was no Presidential escape clause in it. Yet we heard no outcry about tying the President's hands, or denying him flexibility. It has proved to be one of the most useful and successful provisions in the aid program.

We tried to follow the same pattern in the aggressor amendment. But that provision requires a Presidential finding and hence it has proved inoperative.

I believe we should adopt the House language in the interest of protecting the best interests of the American people and deny Nasser the $37 million in aid.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I sincerely regret that the Senate Appropriations Committee has changed the wording of the Agricultural Supplemental Appropriations Act and has thereby weakened the prohibition against Public Law 480 agricultural commodities being sent to the United Arab Republic. The House of Representatives wrote into this act a very strict prohibition against the use of any funds appropriated by this act to finance the export of food to the United Arab Republic. It is my belief that the wording as it has been changed by the Senate committee has no meaning in fact. The President could now prevent the use of these funds for exports to Nasser if he determines that it is necessary. Obviously the administration has determined that furnishing Nasser with this food, is, somehow, in the interest of the United States.

Mr. President, I feel kindly toward the Egyptian people, and I believe that if they were given full information a majority of them would stand with the United States in the defense of freedom. However, President Nasser has been treating the United States in a most highhanded manner which cannot go unnoticed by the Congress and by the American people. Nasser, in conjunction with the Red Chinese and others, has been sending military supplies to the Congolese rebels. He joined in bitter protests against the United States-Belgian rescue of white hostages from the Congo. On November 26, 1964, the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library in Cairo was sacked and burned by a mob that the Government of the United Arab Republic was either unable or unwilling to control. On December 19, 1964, the Russian-built planes of Nasser's air force shot down an unarmed commercial plane belonging to the Mecom Oil Co. of Texas. On December 23, 1964, in a long speech in Port Said, Nasser added insult to injury by telling the U.S. Ambassador the Egyptian equivalent of "go jump in the lake."

It is apparent to any observer, Mr. President, that our furnishing of food to Nasser enables him to divert his attention from the production of this basic commodity to the building up of a vast arms industry. I wonder how long the American people will be content to have their Government stand idly by in the face of such insults and aggressive actions and continue to subsidize the man who is responsible.

Under the terms of the 1963 Foreign Assistance Act, the President was directed by Congress to withhold all foreign economic aid, as well as food-for-peace aid, from any nation committing aggressive actions against any other country receiving our aid. Nasser has publicly admitted supplying arms and munitions to the Congolese rebels whose avowed intention is to overthrow the Central Government of the Congo. The U.S. Government recognizes and supports the Central Congolese Government. I believe that this constitutes a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of this provision of the 1963 Foreign Assistance Act. Obviously it is time for Congress to take firm action; and the provision adopted by the House of Representatives represents a good step in the right direction.

Mr. **EASTLAND** obtained the floor.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **EASTLAND**. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois with the understanding that I do not prejudice my rights to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I suppose that I could probably indulge in remarks not unlike those that have been offered on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. But at the risk of being slightly partisan, it seems to me that some of the "bread" cast upon the waters 5 years ago is beginning to come back. There run in my mind many statements and principles that were uttered in 1960 about the prestige and the preeminence of the United States of America. My own party was certainly scolded in no uncertain terms for allegedly having permitted our prestige and preeminence to sink to an all-time low.

Late one night this week I found time to go back and reread a few of those speeches. Then I began to think about the prestige and the preeminence that are manifested and reflected by the incident that has somehow triggered the proposal that is before the Senate today.

It is rather interesting to go back and read the language uttered at that time, and then find myself in the position of supporting the committee and the administration in this matter. And that, of course, I intend to do, because I believe it is the right thing to do.

But if one were to read the record on the subject of our prestige at the present moment, a gentleman by the name of Castro—and I must assume that he is a gentleman—although he is still 90 miles away, is still there, and he still carries on his nefarious schemes in Latin America to subvert, if he can, freedom and free government. That certainly does not comport with the restoration of prestige that was promised in most eloquent terms by the administration then in power.

I think of Sukarno. I remember him best when he appeared before a joint meeting of the House and Senate. I know what my feelings were at the time, because some of his language was ornamented to the point where it was very testy to Members attending the joint meeting.

So, as I see him now, and the attitude that he expresses toward this country, whose largess he has experienced in abundant measure, I wonder where this prestige is that we supposedly lost and which was then to be restored by those who succeeded him.

I think of a gentleman by the name of Ben Bella, who called upon the Chief Executive, and evidently, from all that I could learn, secured a pledge of assistance and then promptly left our country to go to Havana. When he had stayed his leave in Havana, he went to Moscow. It was quite evident that after he got a pledge of assistance from us, he did not share our feelings at all so far as the liberty of people and their freedom from tyranny are concerned.

Then I think of Mr. Nasser, who has ignored our admonitions with respect to his troops that are still in Yemen, and who admittedly, of course, has sent weapons to the Congo, which has been such an uneasy scene for such a long time. And parenthetically, Mr. President, the record evidently does not show the exact circumstances under which Mr. Nasser made the statement that has caused so much fulmination in the newspapers and elsewhere. A hint has come to me that our own Ambassador was quite firm with him in discussing Public Law 480 aid, and because of the firmness of our Ambassador in stating what we would and would not do, probably that statement was regarded as some provocation for the statement that was ultimately made.

I do not know. I picked up a little here and a little there. But the record itself is not clear on that point. It may have been adduced in the form of off-the-record testimony. But how can we pass judgment unless we know whether or not there was provocation at the time the statement was made?

Any lawyer knows full well that those things that excite the spirit and suddenly find articulation in some vengeful act register with a judge and with a jury when the time comes for a judgment of those situations.

But no one has undertaken to tell under exactly what circumstances the statement was made. I am not inclined to believe that the little smatterings of information that have come to my attention may very well have been correct.

We get up our bile a good deal about what is going on in Vietnam. I assume they are going to throw at us—and I assume on occasion that we will pay our respect to their leaders, and perhaps it will not be very complimentary. But it certainly does not add to the conduct of foreign policy of this country, and it is not the road to settlement, to understanding, and to ultimate peace.

I do not want to be embroiled 12,000 miles from here in Asia and then be embroiled in another place in the Middle East. My friend the Senator from Oregon has talked about being embroiled. The easy way to become embroiled is to take a good strong bludgeon—and it can be a verbal bludgeon—and strike a leader in some far off country over the head, when we do not know all the circumstances that might have provoked the expression that found currency in every newspaper and on every television and radio station in our land. That is a pretty thin basis upon which to render judgment and to indulge in name calling, no matter how polite, in what we are pleased to refer to as the world's greatest deliberative free body.

We had better mind our language a little. We had a situation in Mozambique, when our own diplomatic representative, at the end of a bayonet, was hustled down to the dock and told to get out. It looked like capricious treatment of our representative. But after a while, it was swallowed up by the waters of time, and we have not heard much about it.

We had a similar experience closer at hand when our flag was taken down in the Republic of Panama, and when the snipers were shooting into the Canal Zone. What a weird admixture of feeling that engendered everywhere in the country. But after a while, it subsided before any real damage was done.

It is true that our libraries have been burned, our flag has been hauled down, and our teachers, so far as I know, have been run out of a university in Ghana. Of course, we have protested, although we have given the leader of that country an abundant measure of our resources in machinery and food and money in order to let him carry on and undertake to industrialize his country, if he can.

In many areas of the world, it appears that respect for us has vanished. I am not so naive as to believe that some far-off country will love us particularly and lavish affection on us for what we may do for it. I concluded long ago that probably the only thing we can get is respect; and that respect we will gain through strength. But we must be very sure that we are on good ground; that our facts are straight; and that we either know or do not know whether there was an element of provocation that can so easily call forth an equivalent expression, and use that as a basis for an interdiction by Congress in a piece of legislation that will have its repercussions in the chancelleries of the world, particularly in the United Arab Republic and in the Middle East.

This could be something of a pattern. Who shall say? But arbitrary, capricious, and precipitate action will not further the cause of the United States as the leader of the free world. That leadership has been thrust upon us, and we could not avoid that responsibility, even if we wanted to do so.

So how do we carry on in the pursuit of the idealism we have flaunted to the world? Do we do it by striking back? No. There is some Christian virtue in the old biblical admonition to turn the other cheek.

Also, in the admonition that has come rolling down the corridor of time: "Let not the sun set upon your anger."

Nobody could sit in this Chamber this afternoon and hear some of the utterances that have been made without knowing that there was some bile and some anger behind them. One does not negotiate in a spirit of anger and ever expect the negotiations to be durable and to solve the problems of this country. How easy it would be for the leaders in all parts of the world, on the basis of what we might contrive here this afternoon, if we failed to support the committee, to conclude that Congress had taken out of the hands of the Chief Executive the responsibility for conducting the foreign policy of the country. Congress is not adequate to it unless it has all the facts, unless it knows as much about the situation as the President does—and the President has the facilities for obtaining the last word upon the subject. The Central Intelligence Agency might have investigated it, or the State Department or another instrumentality of the executive branch might have done so.

Who shall say what the feeling was like? I cannot say because, frankly, I do not know. On that tenuous basis, I shall not let it be manifested to the world that I am taking away from the President his responsibility in the conduct of the foreign policy of the country.

There is still another factor. Who shall say whether whole or partial restitution has been made? I understand that restitution has been made, certainly in part. I received two reports. One was that a palace was turned over to us in lieu of the library that was burned. The other report was that a thousand books have been made available. So evidently there was a spirit of restitution that quickly asserted itself. It is a consideration that must be kept in mind.

It was said here this afternoon that there are oil interests abroad, and that we are trying, somehow, to crucify American foreign policy upon the altar of oozing oil. Is not oil a legitimate interest in the world? How is one to get into the oil business unless he knows where oil is? When I was a boy, we organized a group around the corner in the little town where I lived, and someone suggested that we raid an apple orchard. Then, of course, the discussion began. "Whose orchard?" Usually I won, because I said I wanted to go to an orchard where apples were on the trees; otherwise there would be no fun.

So one goes where the oil is. The economy of this country is driven forward dynamically every second by this energy-creating fuel. What would we do without it?

So our people rightly go forward into the earth to explore and to find oil, and to enrich us and enrich other countries at the same time. Is there something illegal or illegitimate about the touch of oil when our enterprisers and explorers should go forward into the Middle East or into Indonesia, where there are extensive and productive oil interests? What is wrong with that, so long as the business is legitimate? Those people, as corporate citizens and as individual citizens, are entitled also to the consideration of their country when they go abroad for exploratory purposes to enrich mankind and to help to carry our civilization forward.

Is there something wrong with that? If the day ever comes when we must apologize for our people who go abroad to exploit, but who leave some of the profit there for the enrichment of other people, then we might as well tell them to come back home and say to them, "The protection of the flag is no longer with you." I do not want to put it on that thin ground. I want to see the whole subject in proper perspective, including the possibility that some provocative words might have coaxed forth the sentiment so suddenly uttered about getting a gulp of sea water, which supposedly has its equivalent in the idiom of our world. I merely want to get back and put things together.

I have to scold our friends a little, because they have charged us with letting our prestige go to the very bottom, under a great President—Eisenhower.

All these incidents arise. So, I must ask in all humility where to use that prestige and where to use that influence.

It has not been restored. But I shall be the good Samaritan type. He went all the way. We jump off in that great story before we get to the full meat of it.

The good Samaritan went down this road. Who was this victim? He was dumped off to one side. The robbers had taken his valuables, his clothes. The Levite came on one side and left him there. The priest came on the other side and left him there. Then the Good Samaritan did what? He bound up his wounds after putting oil on them. He put him on his beast. He took him to the inn down the road. He went in with him. Then what did he do?

He did not call it quits there. He went up to the man at the desk, where one signs his name on the hotel register. He said, "I picked my friend out of the ditch. He is hurt. He needs ministration. He needs succor. Look after him and wait until I get out my wallet. I will give you a little money now, and then I will come back this way and pay you the rest of what will be owed, while you take care of him."

That is the real nub of the story—to go the second mile, to go all the way.

I shall not be deflected by bile. I know what it is. My desk is as littered with correspondence as that of any other Senator, and perhaps more so. As to what we ought to do, should we clench our fist, set our teeth tight, and talk through our teeth in language that even Nasser can understand? That is the spirit in which we somehow restated the policy of our country. Ought we to sit down in sweetness and light in the hope that that is the way to get peace—peace with a baseball bat? No. We had better leave this matter where it is, with the President of the United States.

We had better accept the committee's language. It does not always satisfy me entirely. I tried to write alternative language for the committee. But I shall ride along with what the committee has done, and what the committee has written in the report. That is what I was interested in. The report states that we want to put them on notice that it is not the Senate of the United States that is sending this aid; it is not the House of Representatives. It is the taxpaying people of this country who are supplying that aid, and their patience could wear thin. But let us not let it wear thin in a single afternoon of discussion in this hallowed Chamber, saying "this is what the American people have mandated us to do, to cut you off, talk tough and let you know who we are in the scheme of things."

That is a great diplomatic manifestation, is it not? Not in my book. While I am not entirely satisfied with it, I urge the Senate to go along with the committee and to make no precipitate blunder that can cause us trouble in one end of the earth when we already have enough trouble 12,000 miles from here, in Vietnam. More than 53,000 young Americans have either been in or out of Vietnam since we have been engaged, and $1.5 million of our money is expended there every 24 hours.

We are talking here about an amount of $37 million. That is big in my book. If one comes from a country town, that is not hay. Put those values beside each other, the $1.5 million a day in Vietnam compared with $36 million or $37 million. Let us be pretty careful in dealing with that amount in order to make it plain to a man who said an unkind thing and so expressed his ingratitude, his lack of appreciation. He will be punished, and the sense of the punitive has been uttered on this floor. Let us not do it. There is too much fever in the world.

I do not want to see my country get into difficulty that may at long last cost us some sweat and anguish before we are through.

I say to the committee that I hope the Senate will sustain the position that the committee has presented to us.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me briefly.

I express my very deep appreciation to the distinguished minority leader. I expected nothing else from him but a nonpartisan patriotic, American, constitutional position such as the one that he has taken. I say that speaking for our entire committee.

That was the kind of position that was taken there. That was the kind of position that brought out the amendment of the committee, and the excellent wording in the report to which the Senator has referred. Using that, the committee, as a whole, voted for this amendment 17 to 6. Two of the six voted in the negative thinking that we ought not to say anything in derogation of the President's view. So, really one might say that the vote was 19 to 4. It was animated somewhat by the same principles of devotion and dedication which the Senator has shown so clearly.

The position that we shall be in if the committee report is not adopted has been stated for the RECORD. In the first place, this is not a question of our power. Of course, we can undo what we have done before, even though we leave some fine people high and dry, and leave the policy of our country in the air, which I hope we shall not do.

Notwithstanding what we have done in the past, notwithstanding that we have delegated power to certain fine officials to enter into a contract under Public Law 480—which I helped to draft, on another committee than Appropriations—notwithstanding the fact that that contract is there, and there is not any doubt about it, it is now proposed that we put it off before its terminal date, and without leaving it to the officials to whom we have entrusted the negotiation of that contract and its administration. It is proposed that we pull the rug out from under the officials and leave the world with the feeling that we do not propose to stand behind the officials whom we have confirmed and the law which we have enacted and entrusted to them to administer.

It is not a question of power. It is a question of wisdom. I remind the Senator that the Senate confirmed the nomination of the Secretary of State without a dissenting word. The warmest expressions of confidence in the Secretary of State which came from the Senate at that time came from the lips of my beloved friend, the senior Senator from Oregon. There was not a dissenting voice in the Senate. There was not a dissenting voice to be heard when we confirmed the nomination of Mr. Ball as Under Secretary. There was not a dissenting voice to be heard when we confirmed the nomination of Mr. Battle as Ambassador.

The people of the United States spoke rather clearly last November when they spoke of their confidence in the President of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield at this time. I have only 10 minutes. Then I shall be glad to let the Senator speak on his own time.

We heard Mr. Rusk. We heard Mr. Ball. We read the words of the Ambassador. We know what transpired. If Senators care to read various parts of the record, they will find, on pages 95, 96, and 104, excerpts from what the Ambassador did when he terminated the discussion of any renewal or extension of this contract under Public Law 480 because of the rude treatment—which is the least one could say of it—which we had received. He was willing to stand up in foreign capitals and say, "As long as this is the climate you create, we will not negotiate for an extension of these benefits to you."

At the same time, he knew, and it was stated to us in the hearings, that with respect to 25 percent of their requirements in certain foods and up to 50 percent of their requirements in certain other foods, we have been helping to feed the poor people of Egypt. It is proposed to take this authority away from the power of the Ambassador, the Secretary of State, and the President, to use that which they describe as their "ace in the hole" in the negotiations, not merely with Egypt, but all through the world, in places I am not at liberty to mention for the record. This shows the influence they were able to exercise, due to our representatives there, in keeping down tragedies in other places I am not free to mention. The information is in the record, and any Senator who wishes to read it can do so, but I am not free to mention it on the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I had declined to yield to the Senator from Oregon. If I yield to the Senator from North Dakota, I shall have to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is it not true that when we consider the regular agricultural appropriation bill which will be before us in July, probably, we can again go into the matter of foreclosing or stopping any assistance to Egypt? That bill will deal with funds for surplus foods for various nations such as Egypt. In the meantime, the President will be given time to work out some satisfactory understanding with Egypt.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. And let me say on the floor of the Senate, where it cannot be denied by any Senator, that Senators who were against foreign aid in any form, in an overwhelming and bipartisan expression of their feeling of what we should do, voted for this program. They felt that we should not tear up our contract, violate it, or do anything that would pull the rug out from under our duly selected officials whose nominations the Senate had confirmed. It was not a part of sound judgment to tolerate such conduct—and I will not use an adjective I might like to—in a situation of this kind. It was felt that this matter should be left to those with full knowledge of the facts.

As the Senator from North Dakota has stated, we will consider the entire question when we have before us the annual foreign assistance bill, in 6 weeks or 2 months, when these questions can be gone into with greater care and detail.

The Senator from Florida has felt as keenly as anyone has on this matter. He has not failed to stand up against the President in matters such as the sale of wheat to Russia, which the Senator from Florida thought was wrong. There was a difference of opinion. But in the present instance—and I might say I have not heard from the President—there is involved only a matter of giving decent support to the President, the Secretary of State, and our Ambassador in Egypt.

I could not give my consent to pulling the rug out from under the feet of those good people just because we had the power to cut the heart out of this contract 5 months before it was to expire, when the contract was perfectly legal and made under a provision of law which we ourselves had enacted, and under which we gave those officials power to negotiate the contract.

I yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Florida is quite correct when he says I voted for the confirmation of the nomination of the Secretary of State and others. I am only saddened because they did not live up to my expectations. They have been following a course of action in regard to foreign aid which, in my judgment, is not in the interest of the American people. This is an example.

My good friend from North Dakota talks about our taking this matter up later. We have an opportunity now to act on it. We are about to set a precedent. I know how this body works. Once a precedent is set, there will be a hard time getting away from that precedent later.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

COMMUNIST FORCES BEHIND NEGRO REVOLUTION IN THIS COUNTRY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Communist forces both inside and outside the United States are pressing for a Negro revolution in this country.

This Communist position is not unique. Support for the cause of Negro revolution is coming also from non-Communist organizations and individuals both inside and outside the United States.

From inside the United States, aid and incitement for the Negro revolution is not coming entirely from Communist and pro-Communist sources, it is being provided also by others, including both persons and organizations which are demonstrably not Communist, and which may not even know that they are serving the purposes of world communism and helping toward the achievement of a Communist objective.

For example, Communist support for and participation in the so-called Freedom Party and its activities is both direct and diffused. Communist infiltration of the so-called Freedom Party can be traced clearly and demonstrated readily.

But support for the so-called Freedom Party has come also from groups and individuals that are not Communist, and from others in which the Communist influence, if it exists, is not clearly evident or easily exposed.

The State of Mississippi has been subjected to an invasion which the Communists regard as only the opening maneuver in the coming Negro revolution.

In discussing the background and origins of this project for the invasion of Mississippi, and those who have participated, I have found it is hardly possible to avoid referring to persons or organizations in these different categories I have just mentioned.

I propose to call attention to some of the evidence respecting Communist infiltration of the so-called Freedom Party, the degree of Communist control or guidance of its activities, and the nature, sources, and channels of Communist support being provided.

Mr. President, I recognize that there will be a tendency on the part of some to discount what I say here today because of my origin. It will be charged that I am attempting to smear the civil rights movement by associating it in the public mind with communism. There will be cries of "guilt by association," but for the sake of the young men and women from different parts of this country who have come into Mississippi to associate with the individuals I am talking about today, and with others of this stripe, I ask that they give me as fair a hearing as they would want for themselves. I challenge these young people to check up on what I say, to get the facts for themselves, and then to decide for themselves whether they wish to be associated with people of this kind, whether they wish to lend themselves to an effort which is serving the objectives of the Communist conspiracy, which is helping to foment disorder and racial strife and which already has destroyed the gains of many years in the field of racial relations in this country.

(At this point Mr. FANNIN took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. EASTLAND. For an understanding of how the State of Mississippi is being made a battleground by forces from outside the State, one fact which needs to be made very clear is this: the so-called Freedom Democratic Party—now often called the Freedom Party since it was commanded by court injunction not to use the word "Democratic" or claim to be a "Democratic Party"—this organization, by whatever name, is in no way representative of the State of Mississippi.

On the contrary, the so-called Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party was sponsored by nonresidents of the State of Mississippi, organized by nonresidents of the State of Mississippi, and chiefly developed by nonresidents of the State of Mississippi. Its principal support and impetus come today from outside the State of Mississippi. It gets most of its financing from outside the State of Mississippi. This is a carpetbag outfit if there ever was one.

The so-called State convention of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party was attended by only some 400 representatives and these 400 came from only 40 of the 82 counties of Mississippi. More than half the counties of the State had no representation at all in this rump meeting.

The idea of a Freedom Democratic Party popped up after a planned meeting, scheduled to be held in Jackson, Miss., in early May of last year for the purpose of arranging participation, by stooges of out-State groups, in precinct meetings of the regular Democratic Party of Mississippi on June 16, 1964, turned out to be a complete fizzle. That meeting was arranged under the directions of David Dennis, Mississippi Director of CORE. When only 55 persons showed up at the meeting, representing only 4 Mississippi counties, it was decided to try to develop a new party. Dummy conventions were held in precincts in 40 counties, and then county conventions were held on August 1 and the statewide convention of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party came along on August 6.

This group never has been, at any time, free of control by nonresidents of the State of Mississippi. A circular distributed in Mississippi, and even outside the State, showing support for the so-called Mississippi Freedom Party by the Council of Federated Organizations—COFO—gives the same address for both the Freedom Party and the Mississippi State headquarters of the COFO, at 1017 Lynch Street, Jackson, Miss.

On January 11, 1965, the New York Times published an article, on page 26, referring to 21 lawyers who were, according to Mr. Peter Kihss of the Times, "pledged to go to Mississippi to take depositions in efforts to oust Mississippi's 5 present Members from the U.S. House of Representatives."

At least some of the New York and New Jersey lawyers planning to go to Mississippi talked to the press at a private session set up by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party according to the New York Times story.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of this New York Times story, to which I have referred, and which I now send forward, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-ONE LAWYERS BEGIN MISSISSIPPI DRIVE—GROUP WILL SEEK DEPOSITIONS TO OUST CONGRESSMEN

(By Peter Kihss)

Twenty-one lawyers pledged here yesterday to go to Mississippi starting this week to take depositions in efforts to oust Mississippi's five present Members from the U.S. House of Representatives.

"We go down with hearts open and eyes closed," jested George Nims Raybin, assistant counsel to the city's rent and rehabilitation administration, when questions were raised over whether any of the legal volunteers might have qualms about personal safety.

One silver-haired volunteer was Ephraim Cross, professor emeritus of romance languages at City College, who started teaching there in 1911 and who preferred not to reveal how much older he might be than pretty women might think.

Professor Cross said he had been a member of the New York bar for many years and had decided to invoke his legal training for this deposition caravan—after having hired lawyers in similar cases of his own in the past.

A 40-DAY DEADLINE

Snow swirled outside the Broadway Congregational Church, 211 West 56th Street, where the fifth-floor private session had been set up by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. The Mississippi group is acting under a law permitting contestants to take depositions against newly elected Members during the first 40 days of a new session of Congress.

Morton Stavis, a Newark lawyer who is national coordinator of the caravan, told the group that Mississippi was readmitted to representation in Congress in 1870 after the Civil War on a compact that its State constitution would never be changed to deprive any citizens of the right to vote if they were entitled to vote under its 1869 constitution.

The only qualifications then set were that the voters be male citizens at least 21 years old, who had lived 6 months in the State and 1 month in a county. But in 1890, he asserted, Mississippi repudiated this compact with a new constitution requiring voters to be able to give "a reasonable interpretation" of any section.

The current challenges, served December 4 on the four Democratic Representatives and one Republican elected last November, charge that Negroes have been "systematically excluded" from voting in Mississippi.

STATEWIDE EFFORT

William M. Kustler and Arthur M. Kinov, who with Benjamin E. Smith, of New Orleans, are general attorneys for the Freedom Democratic Party, said the effort would seek subpenas for depositions throughout Mississippi's 22 counties.

Among those to be served are Gov. Paul B. Johnson, Jr., Attorney General Joe T. Patterson, and Secretary of State Heber Ladner, as members of the State board of education. The procedure under title 2, chapter 7, of the United States Code, provides for subpenas that may be issued by officials living within each congressional district ranging from judges and mayors down to public notaries.

Among the volunteers here, Ernst Rosenberger, of 80 William Street, who is 33 years old, said he was born in Germany and had to leave there as a Jew when he was 4 years old. "I've been down this road," he said.

Alan H. Levine, of 61 Broadway, is 26 years old but his blond appearance make people think he's just about entering college. He spent 2 months in the South last summer as a volunteer lawyer on voter registration projects after he decided he wanted to help in "a practical meaningful way" more than paying dues to civil rights groups.

Barney Rosenstein, of 500 Fifth Avenue, has been a lawyer particularly in housing cases, for some 30 years. He explained his motive by saying:

"We who have good fortune because we're in New York ought to be willing to share some of it."

More lawyers will be sought in another New York briefing to be held next Saturday, Mr. Stavis said. Ten were briefed in Detroit last Saturday. Other briefings are scheduled for next Saturday in Chicago and either in San Francisco or Los Angeles.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, spokesmen for the Freedom Democratic Party called a news conference in New York City last December 6 to announce that the party would challenge the seating of all five Members of Mississippi's delegation to the House of Representatives, according to the New York Times of December 5, 1964.

The Times story said that "spokesmen" for the Freedom Democratic Party stated that "a legal peace corps" of more than 100 lawyers would go to Mississippi to gather evidence in the case.

The Times story said William M. Kunstler, of New York, whom the Congress described as "counsel for the predominantly Negro party" had explained the legal grounds for the challenge. This same story said:

> The Freedom Democratic Party was founded in Jackson, Miss., last April 24, by a coalition of civil rights groups in an attempt to organize prointegration forces loyal to the National Democratic Party and its candidates.

I mention that paragaph because it indicates the Times recognizes the conspiratorial nature and non-Mississippi emphasis of the organization.

Whether anyone besides William Kunstler appeared at the New York press conference as a spokesman for the so-called Freedom Democratic Party was not stated by the Times story from which I have quoted.

That news story, nearly 2 months ago, did not name any of the lawyers who would be in the legal task force from the New York area joining the invasion of Mississippi. But now we are beginning to learn who they are.

A news story which moved on the Associated Press wire from New York and was published in the Washington Post & Times Herald on January 12, 1965, set forth that a group of 21 lawyers planned efforts in Mississippi to seek the ouster of that State's five Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Stating this had been announced at a press conference in New York, the AP story went on to say this group of lawyers is headed by one Morton Stavis who calls himself the national coordinator of deposition caravan. Morton told the Associated Press his group would seek depositions from citizens of Mississippi in an effort to prove that Mississippi has violated the conditions under which it was readmitted to representation in Congress in 1870.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this Associated Press news story, and also the text of a story from the Worker of January 17, 1965, which I now send forward, may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 12, 1965]

SLAYING OF TWO NEGROES

A group of 21 lawyers yesterday planned efforts in Mississippi to help seek the ouster of that State's five Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. The move was announced at a New York news conference.

They said they would go there to take depositions, starting this week, claiming that Negroes have been systematically excluded from voting in elections there.

The project is called deposition caravan.

Morton Stavis, a Newark, N.J., lawyer who is national coordinator of the caravan, said the ouster effort was based on the contention that Mississippi had repudiated a pact for its representation.

Mississippi was readmitted to representation in Congress in 1870 after the Civil War, he said, on a compact that its State constitution would not be changed to deprive any citizen of the right to vote.

The only qualifications then set were that voters be male citizens who had lived 6 months in the State and 1 month in a county, he said. However, in 1890, he added, the State repudiated this compact with a new constitution requiring voters to be able to give a reasonable interpretation of any section.

Plans were to seek depositions chiefly from Negro citizens but also from a number of State officials.

[From the Worker, Jan. 17, 1965]

THIRTY-ONE LAWYERS TO GET PROOF OF MISSISSIPPI VOTE CURBS

(By T. R. Bassett)

Thirty-one lawyers, 21 in New York City and 10 in New Orleans, last week signed up with depositions caravan and volunteered to go to Mississippi to assist the interracial Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party in its campaign to unseat that State's 5 Congressmen.

The lawyers held legal seminars and a briefing session over the weekend. They are expected in Mississippi January 20, and are to be joined by other volunteers to be recruited at meetings scheduled for January 16 in California.

They will take depositions to present to the Elections Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee to back the charge that Negroes are systematically excluded from the franchise in Mississippi.

Under title 2, United States Code, section 201, such depositions can be taken within 40 days of a new session of Congress. In New York, William M. Kunstler, attorney for the Freedom Party, said subpenas will be served throughout Mississippi's 82 counties.

Most witnesses to back the charges are expected to be Negroes, but State officials will also be subpenaed, including Gov. Paul B. Johnson, Attorney General Joe Patterson and Secretary of State Heber Ladner, as well as officials of the State subsidized Mississippi Sovereignty Commission it was learned.

At the New York briefing session at the Broadway Congregational Church, Morton Stavis, national coordinator of the caravan, pointed out that Mississippi was warned by the Congress when readmitted to the Union in 1870 that she would lose her representation in that body in case of wholesale denial of the vote to Negro citizens.

Community, civic and labor groups and individuals are urged to press for Congress action after the evidence is presented.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this man Stavis, who is heading up this caravan of New York area lawyers invading Mississippi, was born Moses Isaac Stavisky on May 26, 1915, in New York, N.Y. He changed his name legally to Morton Stavis in 1939. Stavis resides at 203 Ketes Street, Elizabeth, N.J., and maintains a law office at 744 Broad Street, Newark, N.J.

Morton Stavis' public record goes back a long way. For instance, the Communist Daily Worker of September 4, 1940, at page 3, named Stavis as one of 63 lawyers then meeting at the Emergency Peace Mobilization in Chicago who joined in a telegram to the House Military Affairs Committee opposing the Burke-Wadsworth military peacetime conscription bill as unconstitutional and un-American. The Emergency Peace Mobilization has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

This same Stavis was a member of the Communist Party in 1945 and 1946 in New York and New Jersey. Presumably he stayed in the party after 1946, because in 1950 he was a member of the Communist Party unit in Union County, N.J. In 1952, he was considered within party circles as a lawyer who was a real leader and a good speaker, and was considered a member of the Lawyers Club of the New Jersey Communist Party.

Stavis has served as counsel for Communist Party members in court and at hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He had been active in the affairs of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee from 1955 through 1964, during which time he has been a member of that organization's national council.

In 1950, Morton Stavis was attorney for two men charged with distributing pro-Communist literature at the General Motors plant in Linden, N.J. These men refused, on advice of counsel, to state whether they were members of the Communist Party. Morton Stavis, as counsel for these two men, objected to the question about Communist Party membership on the ground that the question involved the political beliefs of his clients. The case was reported in the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., the issue of August 9, 1950.

Morton Stavis was defense attorney for Mrs. Sylvia Neff, who was convicted in May 1952, for swearing falsely to a Federal grand jury that she had no Communist connections. She was found guilty on three separate perjury counts. Federal Judge Madden of Camden, N.J., who tried this case, charged Stavis with "throwing sand and legal gravel in the eyes of the jury" and was seeking to "cast a shadow of doubt to create confusion." Speaking directly to Stavis, Judge Madden declared:

> I have never had my patience tried so much before. You tried me so thoroughly that I had to go to a doctor so I could stay on the bench to conclude the trial. Both you and your client have no idea what it means when you take an oath such as you took when you became a member of the bar. You followed the obvious line of the Communist Party to such an extent that it was open and obvious to the jury what your methods were.

Judge Madden's charge was reported in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of May 29, 1952.

Morton Stavis was attorney for James B. McLeish, president of district 4 of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, when McLeish on December 22, 1952, refused to state to a Federal grand jury whether he had been a member of the Communist Party, USA, and was cited for contempt of court as a result. The circumstances were fully reported in the Newark Star Ledger of December 23, 1952. The United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America had been expelled from the CIO in May of 1950 because of Communist domination of the UE.

From 1954 through 1962 Morton Stavis has been listed as a member of the executive board of the National Lawyers Guild.

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and the National Lawyers Guild have been cited as Communist fronts by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Stavis and his wife both invoked the fifth amendment before the House Committee on February 28, 1956, in refusing to answer all questions put to them regarding past or present Communist Party membership.

In May of 1956 a witness named William A. Wallace testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which was then engaged in investigating the unauthorized use of the U.S. passports. In the course of his examination under oath, Mr. Wallace testified:

> Morty Stavis directed me to Forer. When I came to Washington I came to Forer and discussed my whole case with Joe Forer, and he told me that in order to keep myself off the limb that we would arrange that if he touched me once on the knee—we were sitting like this—if he touched me once on the knee that I could go ahead and answer the questions; if he touched me twice on the knee then that I should use the fifth amendment or call for consultation.

The Morty Stavis mentioned in that testimony, and the Morton Stavis referred to in the other incident I have recounted here, is the same Morton Stavis who announced in New York that he was head of a group of lawyers who were going to move into Mississippi to aid the so-called Freedom Party in its effort to unseat duly-elected Representatives of the State of Mississippi in the Congress of the United States.

What this means, Mr. President, is that it is an attempt by the Communist Party to influence the Congress of the United States.

The New York Times article of January 11, 1965, by Peter Kihss, which I have just offered for the RECORD, mentioned one Ephraim Cross as among the group of lawyers planning to go to Mississippi, to participate in the Freedom Party's drive to oust Mississippi's delegation to the House of Representatives. The article described this man as a "silver-haired volunteer" and as "professor emeritus of romance languages at City College."

This is the same Ephraim Cross who put himself on record in favor of abolishing the House Committee on Un-American Activities; who was a member of the New York Council to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities; who was a member of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Ephraim Cross was a member of the National Lawyers Guild, and, I believe, still a member of that organization. He was a sponsor of the National Assembly for Democratic Rights. He was a signer of a petition for executive clemency for Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson, both identified Communists.

This is the same professor Ephraim Cross who, in the spring of 1953, addressed a conference of some 100 delegates who had met in Philadelphia to map out "an intensive drive to win clemency for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg," the convicted atom spies. A story about this conference and Professor Cross' association with it was carried in the Daily Worker of March 3, 1953, on page 4. This same Ephraim Cross also had been one of the signers, in 1953, of a statement defending the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, which is one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.

According to the Daily Worker of October 1, 1953, Prof. Ephraim Cross was one of 99 so-called notables who sponsored a call for repeal of the McCarran-Walter Act.

According to the Worker of December 18, 1962, Ephraim Cross had at that time just attacked the House Un-American Activities Committee for its investigation of Communist penetration of certain so-called peace groups.

On January 16 of this year the Peoples World, the Communist newspaper for the Pacific coast, carried a story naming three San Francisco lawyers who had announced that they were going to Mississippi on behalf of the Freedom Party. The attorneys named were Terry A. Francois, George Moscone, and Ed Stern.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of the news story to which I have referred, and which I now send forward, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may yield to me for a brief statement by way of a preface to my question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, my colleague and I have discussed these facts. I know the major points in his speech. I have heard part of it, and I am familiar with all of it through him.

First, I wish to highly commend him for bringing out these well-documented facts. I know my colleague knows what he is talking about and I commend him for bringing this matter up not only for the benefit of the Senate but also for the benefit of the American people.

I believe the people of the Nation will have a growing concern and interest, as they learn more and more about the activities of this group, particularly of those with Communist connections, who are members of the party or are affiliated with it in some way.

This morning, as over the past several weeks, I gained special information about the activities of the Communists in Vietnam, on the other side of the world, where we have sent many thousands of our armed services personnel. Many of our servicemen have been killed trying to stem the tide of this very influence that the Senator from Mississippi is describing in such detail is going on in one of the States of the United States on the racial question. The same type activity is also going on in other States.

During the latter part of 1964, while in Mississippi, I went into several of the communities in which activities of freedom schools—the schools operated by COFO—were being operated. I went to police officers and mayors and other citizens whom I personally knew and I talked to them about the modus operandi of the workers and how the operation was conducted. Without exception I found the same general pattern. These groups came into various counties in Mississippi last spring or early summer. Included within the groups were some very fine clean-living young people of intelligence, high purpose, and good but perhaps misguided intentions. Along with them came a kind of middle group. Then there was another group of beatniks and below that group was very low-class common trash.

They were cunning, vigorous, and persistent.

Without exception and within a short time the better group I have described would recognize the kind of associates they had and they would move on to some other place where the condition was not so rank. The better ones left after a few days or certainly within a few weeks. But the agitators, the common crowd and the crumbs, would stay there. They were the ones who would make the trouble.

Did not my colleague find a similar pattern of operation?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The crowd that remained was the group of trained and paid agitators. Included in the group were some of those which the Senator is now describing as Communist affiliated. They were the ones who flouted all the customs and traditions of a social order to which people had been accustomed and had lived under for almost two centuries.

The white boys and white girls would live in Negro homes. They would sit in the courthouse square on park benches, and they would love and hug and go down the streets holding hands. I am speaking of the white girls and white boys in the groups that came in.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know of several instances in which members of the group were syphilitic and the Public Health Service had to take charge.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I heard of that, too. The mores, customs, and traditions that the people there were taught in their youth were flouted daily in the faces of both races.

Those activities naturally provoked our people. They provoked the ladies, the men, the youth, and everyone else, over and over again. The fact that those activities were deliberate and planned is clear as crystal and beyond doubt.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know of an instance in my hometown in which a Negro woman cut her husband up because of his attention to one of those white girls.

I shall say that those people did not realize that they were part and parcel of the Communist conspiracy. Those activities were directed by the Communist conspiracy in an attempt to take over the State of Mississippi by the Communist Party. That is all it can mean. Its leadership is Communist. They are trying to influence the House of Representatives against five duly elected Members of that body. It is a Communist plan to influence the Congress of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. The pattern of operation is certainly the same.

I found that the more understanding and better type of colored people neither liked nor appreciated that conduct on the part of the white and colored people who came in there. They shied away from those who came. They stayed away from them and used their influence to keep them from making any headway.

Did the Senator find that pattern of conduct in his area?

Mr. EASTLAND. From my observation—and my area was right in the center of it—40 of the agitators reported in the area at one time. I would say that 95 percent of the Negroes in the area spurned any association with them and condemned their coming. They condemned everything that the groups stood for.

Mr. STENNIS. I found the same pattern of operations in the area in which I live. What we have discussed has been confirmed by the police and other responsible people in the community. They saw those incidents as they happened.

Is it not true, too, that all of the conduct which we have discussed has a tendency to array race against race, even though members of a race did not take any part in the activity, and neighbor against neighbor? When the agitation came and split the races, did it not cause understanding to be spread further and further apart? Is that not true in these instances in which the groups were able to remain and carry on an aggressive campaign over and over and week after week? Was that not the effect of the activity?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, that was the effect of it. But I know that members of the groups would go to town after town and try to obtain quarters in a Negro home, and there was not a Negro home in the town that would let the members of the groups remain there.

Mr. STENNIS. I was referring to the places in which they did stay or in which they were permitted to remain.

Mr. EASTLAND. What my colleague has said is exactly correct.

Mr. STENNIS. In many places they were not able to make any headway at all. They were spurned by the colored people, and everyone else. Then they would get out, and they would not be seen any more in those areas.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know of town after town in which that happened.

Mr. STENNIS. In areas in which those people were able to stay, their activities would disrupt the business life, the social, and the spiritual life of both races and generally disrupt the peace and harmony of the people. Is that not what the Senator found?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Now, after all this has occurred, to that the most active participants and some of the most effective of the leaders are either Communists themselves or have a documented Communist connection, makes the pill even more bitter to swallow. It becomes an insult on top of an insult, and it should be a subject of the gravest concern to every Senator, every Representative, the administration, and the people of the United States. The people should know those things are being carried on in various places under the guise—the damnable claim—that "it is something we are going to do to help the races."

Mr. EASTLAND. I have referred to Stavis, who is down in Mississippi now taking depositions. He is a Communist, and it is a Communist attempt to influence Congress. It is a Communist attempt to deprive five legally elected representatives of their seats in the House of Representatives.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly agree with my colleague. The Members of this body do not realize the extent to which this activity is being carried on in order to try to scrape up some kind of proof that might possibly be used to unseat the Members of the House of Representatives elected from our State.

Mr. EASTLAND. My colleague knows that they come back with lurid stories such as that of a citizen of my town named Fannie Lou Hamer. I saw the story in the Washington Post. She made a speech here a few days ago and said that 6 out of 10 Negro women who were taken to the Sunflower City Hospital were sterilized.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a joke and a lie on its face because, to begin with, there is no hospital in Sunflower City. There is no hospital within miles of Sunflower City. Yet absolute lies, that are put out for propaganda purposes, are printed in the newspapers and hurled at the people of Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Do not the facts disclosed by the Senator fully underscore and bring out the correctness of the repeated warnings that have been made by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, about the efforts of the Communist Party to infiltrate any part or element it can in regard to the racial struggle? I should like to quote something that Mr. Hoover recently said, as late as January 1965, as set forth in an FBI release:

> The Communist Party is making every effort to increase its influence in the racial struggle and continues to promote the false impression that it is a legitimate political party.

Those are not idle words; they do not come from an idle source, a questionable source, or a biased source.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator says is absolutely correct. That statement comes from a man who has thoroughly infiltrated the Communist Party and knows whereof he speaks.

This is an attempt by the Communist Party to use the responsible news media for propaganda purposes in order to take over one of the 50 States of the Union.

Mr. STENNIS. As we stand here and discuss the subject, it is natural that we shall be charged with some bias, partisanship, or prejudice on the subject. But I have another quotation from Mr. Hoover. I shall read it and let the Senator or anyone else who hears it decide whether it does not bear out what we are saying. Mr. Hoover, in December 1964, speaking in New York City before the Society of Pennsylvania Women, said:

> Nowhere have the devious tactics of the Communist Party been more forcefully demonstrated than in the party's efforts to drive a wide breach of racial misunderstanding in this country to capitalize upon areas of dissension and unrest.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct. It applies absolutely to conditions in Mississippi today.

Mr. STENNIS. It fits exactly like a hand in a glove. One more thing about the effect of these activities: Does not the Senator believe that in an area where large numbers of white and colored people live together, and who have been living together peacefully, that if this activity continues for any appreciable time, it will tear down business, tear down the economy, and disrupt the spiritual life as well as the social life of the areas in which it is operating? That there will no longer be a normal economy; there will no longer be a market in which to buy automobiles, farm machinery, or anything else? That Mississippi will no longer be a place to produce agricultural or any other products? That the economy of the area will be destroyed wherever such activity takes place?

Mr. EASTLAND. It will hurt both races and will hurt our national economy.

Mr. STENNIS. Of course it will, and not only in our State, but in any other State where conditions like these exist.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not believe that any Member of the Senate or anyone else has any sympathy with this activity. I do not believe they approve it. Still, much more pressure will have to be put on the very people whom the Senator is describing in his speech, if their activity is to be stopped and if they are to be prevented from traveling under the guise of political freedom or of improving racial relations or the social structure of our country. If they are left to freely pursue that course, they will leave the country in shambles.

Mr. EASTLAND. It means that Congress will have to take action to curb the Communist Party. After all, this is a Communist conspiracy. Why should the Communist Party be permitted to take over a State of the Union? That is the plan.

Mr. STENNIS. The Nation is in serious trouble in Vietnam. Day by day, we are expecting things to become more serious there. It is a part of the Communist conspiracy to move in on soft spots wherever they occur in the world and cause as much trouble as they can under whatever guise fits their purpose, even to the extent of guerilla warfare and similar tactics.

Such activities are occurring not only in other countries; they are beginning to take place rapidly in our home States. This is a challenge to the Government; it is a challenge to the best thought and the best spiritual relations we can possibly bring about in the whole Nation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is not the big challenge to control the Communist Party at home?

Mr. STENNIS. Of course it is. It is a challenge to do something effective about the Communist Party. Instead, the Communists are being encouraged in many ways to continue their activities, and large sums of money are being sent in to finance them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator believe that the connotation of race—that it is necessary to get people wrought up—is merely the pretext for the Communist Party to march in, and is not that what is happening in Mississippi?

Mr. STENNIS. Instead of the situation becoming better, it will probably become worse than it was last year, unless something effective is done to control it.

I thank the Senator for yielding. I commend him for his statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. I appreciate the statement of my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. President, the San Francisco Examiner of Janurary 19, 1965, published an article reciting that several attorneys from the San Francisco area were proceeding, in separate groups of five or more, to the First Congressional District of Mississippi to "perfect the challenge to the Mississippi congressional delegation." The Examiner article indicated that Representative PHILLIP BURTON, a freshman Member of Congress from San Francisco, had written a letter to the Attorney General asking that U.S. marshals and FBI agents protect this group of lawyers while it was in Mississippi.

One group of five California lawyers, which reportedly left for Mississippi on January 19, was alleged to include Alvin H. Goldstein, a former special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, and Benjamin Dreyfus, a former member of the professional section of the Communist Party USA, in San Francisco. Dreyfus was a member of the Communist Party at least until 1945 and national president of the National Lawyers Guild, 1962–64. The other three members of this group of five lawyers reportedly headed for Mississippi as a part of the Freedom Party invasion were reported as Edward Stern—presumably the same person as the Ed Stern mentioned in the People's World article on January 16; Jack Berman; and Harry Lohstroh.

Who are some of these lawyers coming into the State of Mississippi to make more trouble? I cannot give complete answers, but I can furnish some facts.

Edward Stern is a member of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers Guild.

Jack Berman was born in 1922 and admitted to practice in 1946, after graduation from the University of California with an LL.B. degree. He has an office on Market Street in San Francisco. In 1960 he was counsel of record for some of those who had participated in riots at the city hall in San Francisco. According to the 1961 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at page 112, he was a sponsor of the Los Angeles Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born. That organization was an affiliate of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, which has been cited by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive and Communist.

Benjamin Ballinger Dreyfus was born in 1910, admitted to practice in 1938, after getting his LL.B. from Stanford University. He is a native of San Francisco, has his law office there, and lives in Mill Valley, Calif. He was identified on June 19, 1957, by Dr. Jack Beverly Patten, in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as a former member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Patten testified under oath, and identified Dreyfus as a fellow member of the professional section of the Communist Party in San Francisco in the early 1940's.

Dreyfus himself testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on June 21, 1956, and invoked the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution in refusing to answer questions regarding Communist Party membership. He admitted membership in the National Lawyers Guild and the holding of official posts in that organization.

Dreyfus is a former president of the National Lawyers Guild. He was elected a member of the National Executive Board of the National Lawyers Guild at its 1956 convention.

Benjamin Dreyfus was a sponsor of the California Statewide Legislative Conference held in February of 1947 in Sacramento. This conference was cited as subversive in the 1947 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at pages 240–242. Benjamin Dreyfus turned up the next year as a member of the expanded executive board of the California Legislative Conference, according to a report in the Daily People's World of September 13, 1948. The California Legislative Conference was cited as subversive by the fifth report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities for 1949, at pages 436 and 437.

The Daily People's World of October 24, 1949, in an article captioned "Five Thousand Dollars for Defense Fight Against Medina Edict Started at CRC Dinner," reported that Benjamin Dreyfus, referred to as secretary of the National Lawyers Guild, had been toastmaster at a testimonial banquet sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress and held at 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco.

According to a news story in the Santa Rosa Press Democrat of October 30, 1950, Benjamin Dreyfus spoke on October 29, 1950, at a meeting sponsored by the California Legislative Conference, and held at the Labor Temple at Santa Rosa. This is the same California Legislative Conference that I mentioned earlier as having been cited as subversive by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

The 1955 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at page 329, listed Benjamin Dreyfus as a speaker on October 5, 1953, at a meeting of the Los Angeles Committee To Get Justice for the Rosenbergs, convicted atom spies.

Benjamin Dreyfus was counsel for William Schneiderman, identified Communist leader, in 1956, according to a report appearing in the Daily Worker of September 11, 1956, at page 3.

Benjamin Dreyfus, listed as "president of the National Lawyers Guild in Los Angeles," was scheduled to speak on November 11, 1960 at a meeting of the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms at St. Nicholas Greek Church in Los Angeles. The Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms was cited as subversive by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in its 1963 report, at page 13.

In February 1961, Benjamin Dreyfus signed a petition for executive clemency for Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson, whose appeal after conviction had been denied by the U.S. Supreme Court. In June of 1961, Benjamin Dreyfus was a sponsor of an East Bay community forum in honor of Bertram Edises, an identified Communist.

The 1961 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at page 117, lists Benjamin Dreyfus as a member of the Southern California Executive Committee of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee has been cited as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Benjamin Dreyfus has signed several petitions for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. One instance of this was reported in a circular accompanying a letter dated March 27, 1963 and signed by Clarence E. Pickett, appealing for support for a campaign to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities. Another more recent instance, was reported in the Worker of December 8, 1964.

Terry A. Francois was born in 1921, admitted to practice in 1950 after graduation from Stanford University. He has an office in uptown San Francisco. The 1961 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at page 110, listed Terry A. Francois as president of the San Francisco chapter of the NAACP.

All I know about George Moscone, at the moment, beyond his inclusion in the group of San Francisco lawyers announced as working for the Freedom Party, is that he was referred to in an article in the October 26, 1963, issue of the People's World, Pacific coast organ of the Communist Party USA, as a candidate for supervisor, San Francisco, having labor endorsement.

According to an article in the Reporter magazine for August 13, 1964, the groundwork for the so-called Freedom Party was "accomplished in a series of conferences that included Aaron Henry and two other Negro leaders, Robert Moses, field secretary of SNCC, and David Dennis, field secretary of the Congress for Racial Equality." Moses, who, the article declares, "appears to be the key figure in all civil rights undertakings in Mississippi" was described as "program director for COFO."

Robert Parris Moses is a 27-year-old New York Negro—last known address 17 West 139th Street—who has been extremely active in Mississippi and other States in encouraging Negroes to register and vote. He is affiliated with the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee in New York. He has been the initiator of numerous complaints of alleged civil rights violations, and in many instances his charges have not been substantiated.

For instance, Moses was tried in police court in McComb, Miss., on October 31, 1961, on charges of disturbing the peace. At the time, Moses had been conducting voter registration schools in the McComb area. But he was not arrested for that. His arrest was the result of his participation in a mass demonstration to protest the action of local officials in not allowing sit-in demonstrators to reenter a Negro school. On October 31, 1961, he was found guilty on the charge of disturbing the peace and sentenced to a fine of $200, with 4 months imprisonment in the county jail. He filed notice of appeal and was released on $1,000 bond.

On May 21, 1962, Moses was tried before a county court jury, was again found guilty, and was sentenced to 6 months in jail and a payment of a $500 fine. He again filed notice of appeal and was released on $1,000 bond.

In 1962, Moses appealed as a conscientious objector from the decision of his local draft board with respect to his classification. At that time Moses was working for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. His claim did not appear based on specific religious beliefs, or adherence to the tenets of any particular church creed, but was supported mainly by his allegation that he did not believe in violence and killing. It was reported that Moses had expressed a desire to be arrested in connection with his alleged civil rights activities so that he would not be taken into military service. However, the U.S. Attorney General closed the file on this case without taking action against Moses.

In January 1963, Moses and others filed suit against the Attorney General of the United States and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation seeking to compel them to take action against local authorities and other individuals alleged to have violated or to be violating the rights of Moses and others. U.S. District Judge Youngdahl, in the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia, indicated disbelief that he had authority to take the action Moses' suit requested, and the suit was dismissed in July 1963.

Let me name some of the other well-known nonresidents of the State of Mississippi who have been publicly identified with the organization of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party, and tell something about them.

One of these individuals is George William Crockett, Jr., a Negro, long active in the Detroit chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, and who has been on its advisory board. Crockett was designated as cochairman of a committee of lawyers who would spend a period of 12 weeks in Mississippi, after the Guild in 1964 inaugurated a lawyers peace call program involving the recruiting of attorneys to devote their time for defense of individuals involved in Mississippi civil rights cases.

George William Crockett, Jr., is a partner in the law firm of Goodman, Crockett, Robb, & Philo, of Detroit, Mich. He has defended Communists in various Smith Act cases. For instance, he represented the chairman of the Michigan Communist Party in the New York Smith Act trial. In that famous trial of first-string Communists in 1949 before Judge Medina, Crockett so comported himself that at the end of the trial Judge Medina held him in contempt of court and sentenced him to 4 months' imprisonment on each of nine specific contempt charges. Crockett sought relief from a higher court, but the U.S. Supreme Court denied his petition for certiorari, and Crockett and other attorneys similarly sentenced in the same proceeding served their sentences in 1952.

In 1962 Crockett went to Mexico, where he associated with individuals known as among the more active members of the American Communist group there. In 1964 Crockett was registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as an agent of the Cuban Communist Government of Fidel Castro.

A man who has been particularly active in voter registration matters in Mississippi, and who is known as a supporter of the so-called Freedom Party, is James Foreman, spelled F-o-r-e-m-a-n, also known as Forman, without the e, who has been active in connection with racial demonstrations in other portions of the South, also. This man Foreman has been involved in various civil rights investigations either as subject or alleged victim. In 1936 he was alleged to have represented himself improperly as a member of the Domestic Peace Corps in Mississippi, but was not prosecuted because there was no evidence that those to whom he misrepresented himself were in fact misled into believing that he was a Government employee. This matter arose through Foreman's activities as a member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

On August 28, 1961, the Memphis Press Scimitar referred to Foreman as having claimed to be the president of the National Freedom Council. This was in connection with a story about Foreman's involvement in the incident at Monroe, La., wherein a man and woman were held hostage in the home of Robert Williams, Monroe Negro integration leader, during racial demonstrations on August 27, 1961. According to the Memphis Commercial Appeal, which also referred to Forman as president of the National Freedom Council, Forman claimed he had been clubbed during the incident at Monroe. It should be made clear that Forman was not a party to the kidnapping by Williams, but defended Williams thereafter.

Foreman was arrested at Albany, Ga., in 1961, in connection with activities testing the use of intrastate trains. At that time newspapers referred to him as heading a subcommittee of the Congress of Racial Equality—CORE.

Like many of the backers of the so-called Freedom Party, Foreman has had various affiliations in connection with the fomentation of racial discord and strife and the organization of racial demonstrations, all under the banner of civil rights.

Another backer of the so-called Freedom Party is Jesse Williard Gray. Gray is a Negro, born in the South, in Louisiana, not in Mississippi; and he has been a resident of the New York area for many years and rose to notoriety and power among racial agitators in that area. He is presently a resident of New York City, and director of the so-called Harlem Community Council on Housing. Gray has been a major agitator in organizing tenants in the Harlem area since late 1958. Gray's various interlocking interests call to mind the essay on Communist aims and tactics written in 1928 by Joseph Pogany, a representative of the Communist International, using the name of "John Pepper," and titled "Platform of the Workers—Communist—Party of America." In this essay, "John Pepper" wrote that "one of the biggest tasks" of the party was "to extend its activities to the solid South," and in explaining tactics to be used in this effort, pointed out that "the Negro Miner's Relief Committee and the Harlem Tenants League are examples of united front organizations which may be set up as a means of drawing the Negro masses into the struggle." Incidentally, it may be worth noting that this essay on Communist tactics, written 37 years ago, declared that "Communists must not forget for a moment that the struggle—of the Communist Party—for the national liberation of the Negroes includes the relentless struggle against the Negro bourgeoisie and the struggle against the influence of the petit-bourgeoisie over the Negro proletariat." That translates into plain English as warning that in order to exploit the Negro race in this country the Communists would deliberately seek to defeat and supplant old-line Negro leaders and discredit or destroy Negroes who had gained influence in their community by attaining a measure of education or material success, or both. That still is Communist policy and practice today, as numbers of those who have been real leaders of the Negro race down through the years, until recent date, have been learning to their sorrow.

Now, let us get back to the subject of backers of the Freedom Party.

Jesse Williard Gray openly admitted Communist Party membership in the 1950's. He was a Communist Party organizer from 1950 to 1958. In November 1958 he was relieved by the party of his duties as regional director of the Harlem section of the Communist Party, but apparently did not resign from the party.

This is the same Jesse Gray to whom I referred to in an earlier address, who was very active in the recent riots in Harlem, and who has been well known for some time by the New York City Police Department as a troublemaker.

There is no direct evidence available to show present membership by Jesse Gray in the Communist Party, but he has recently obtained contributions for the party, including a contribution of $2,500 or more from the trust fund of a married daughter of Samuel Rubin of New York City, always a generous contributor to the Communist Party, and who for many years was president of Faberge, Inc., engaged in the perfume business.

Last July the New York Journal-American carried an article reporting that Malcolm X, who had formerly been a member of the so-called nation of Islam, had announced the formation of the organization for Afro-American Unity—OAAU. This organization was described as a group dedicated to "fomenting a black revolution in this country by any means necessary, including arming Negroes." The article stated that Malcolm X, in an interview, had indicated that he and other militant Negro groups had established a brain trust which was engaged in mapping out a program for the OAAU. Jesse Gray was named by Malcolm X as one of the members of this brain trust.

Another operator in behalf of the Freedom Party is Bayard Rustin, quondam close associate of Martin Luther King.

When the Freedom Party moved on Atlantic City at convention time last year, Bayard Rustin was announced as having been placed in charge of arranging for demonstrations.

I referred to Bayard Rustin on an earlier occasion in more detail than I shall attempt today. He served some 28 months during World War II as a conscientious objector. In January of 1953, he was convicted in Pasadena, Calif., for sex perversion and lewdness. In 1956, he attended the Young Communist League meeting in New York as an observer. In 1958, he went to Soviet Russia and there participated in Communist propaganda shows. More recently, he was concerned with organizing Martin Luther King's march on Washington, D.C., which the Communist newspaper, the Worker, called a Communist project.

(At this point, Mr. KENNEDY of New York took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, another supporter of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party and its program is one Jack Minnis, former research director of the Southern Regional Council's voter education project. In 1964 Minnis was reported as doing research on southern politics and economics in association with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Minnis gave a lecture at the State University of New York in Buffalo, N.Y., in February of 1964, and the February 28, 1964, edition of Spectrum, the weekly student newspaper at that university, published an article about the lecture. This article indicated that Minnis had stressed what he called the complete absence of Federal authority in Mississippi, and had further claimed that he had personally seen FBI agents "remain dormant" while Negroes were harassed and prevented from registering to vote. The article indicated Minnis had also asserted that all Federal authority was locally influenced.

From this, it is obvious that Minnis either has a complete lack of understanding and knowledge concerning the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the matters he mentioned in his lecture, or else he was deliberately misrepresenting the situation.

According to the student newspaper article, Minnis testified in Federal court in the case of the United States against Joni Rabinowitz to the effect that racial prejudice of southern juries placed the defendant in the case in serious jeopardy of a miscarriage of justice. Joni Rabinowitz, a student at Antioch College in Ohio, was field secretary of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and had been indicted for perjury by a Macon, Ga., Federal grand jury in connection with civil rights activities. The student news story to which I have referred pointed out that her father was or had been an attorney for Fidel Castro. The fact is that Joni Rabinowitz is the daughter of Victor Rabinowitz, of the New York law firm of Rabinowitz & Boudin, registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as agents for Fidel Castro and associated in that connection with Benjamin E. Smith, of New Orleans, counsel for the Freedom Party.

After the assassination of President Kennedy, Jack Minnis and one Staughton Lynd prepared a long article entitled "Seeds of Doubt," recounting alleged discrepancies in reports respecting the assassination and claiming that the Dallas Police Department and the FBI should "account for their own activities" in connection with the matter. Questions raised in this article were not new, having been previously raised by the press, and were shown to have been based on erroneous information or speculation.

The Worker of December 20, 1964, on its front page, hailed "a massive organizational effort" to get New York City Congressmen to support "the Mississippi Democratic Freedom Party's challenge of the Mississippi congressional delegation."

The article went on to describe an all-day conference of representatives of some 45 organizations associated with the Metropolitan Conference of Civil Rights Action, and said the conference was largely devoted to discussing ways and means of mobilizing New Yorkers in this fight.

The Worker article identified as chairman of the Metropolitan Conference one Rev. Edler G. Hawkins, also referred to as this year's moderator of the United Presbyterian Church.

Edler G. Hawkins was a candidate for the New York State Assembly on the American Labor Party ticket in 1948, participated in a conference of the American Labor Party in March of 1949, and was a member of the State executive committee of the American Labor Party in April of 1949.

According to a report on the Communist peace offensive, made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Edler G. Hawkins was a member of the American Sponsoring Committee of the World Congress for Peace, which met in Paris in April of 1949. This was one of the long series of Communist-inspired and manipulated peace meetings intended to produce, and which did produce, propaganda useful to the Communist conspiracy on a worldwide scale.

In 1943, Edler G. Hawkins was a sponsor of the Citizens' Emergency Conference for Interracial Unity. A statement sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, opposing renewal of the Dies Committee, was signed by Edler G. Hawkins in 1943.

In August of 1945, a booklet issued by the Committee for Equal Justice for Mrs. Recy Taylor, which was an auxiliary of the International Labor Defense, listed Edler G. Hawkins as a sponsor.

The 1946 fall term calendar of the Tremont Annex of the Jefferson School of Social Science, in Bronx, N.Y., listed Edler G. Hawkins as a sponsor.

On page 28 of a review by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of the 1949 Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, Edler G. Hawkins is listed as affiliated with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Edler G. Hawkins was a sponsor of the Waldorf Conference of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions in March 1949, according to one of the conference's own leaflets.

In April of 1947, Edler G. Hawkins was publicly announced as one of the signers of a statement called "The Negro Leaders' Defense of the Communist Party."

Mr. President, the Worker of December 8, 1964, identified William Kunstler and Arthur Kinoy, of New York, and Benjamin E. Smith, of New Orleans, as "legal counsel for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party."

The Peter Kihes article in the New York Times of January 11, 1965, which I have offered for the RECORD, stated that:

> William M. Kustler and Arthur M. Kinor, who with Benjamin E. Smith of New Orleans are general attorneys for the Freedom Democratic Party, said the effort would seek subpenas for depositions throughout Mississippi's 22 counties.

The name "William M. Kustler" is an obvious typographical error. The individual referred to is William M. Kunstler.

This is the same William Kunstler of whom Representative WILLIAM M. TUCK, of Virginia, said, in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives on February 1, 1964:

> This Kunstler has been doing all he could to impede the processes of justice in Danville, Va., but impeding justice is not new for him. He has taken a lead in the movement for the pardon and the release of the notorious conspirator and enemy of America, Norton Sobell, who is currently serving a 30-year prison sentence for conspiracy to commit espionage in 1951 in connection with the Rosenberg case. This same Kunstler was sponsor of the rally to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, held in New York City on April 21, 1961. Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson were among the contemptible speakers at this rally. Both of them were then about to begin serving sentences in prison for contempt of the Congress of the United States, extending from their refusal to answer whether or not they were or had been members of the Communist Party.
>
> Another speaker at the meeting was Pete Seeger, who had just been sentenced to a

> year in prison for the same reason. This same Kunstler, who, posing as a respectable professor of law, plagued the people of the city of Danville, has been shown to be one of the signers of a petition which urged Presidential clemency for Carl Braden. I have evidence also that in March 1962, after having failed in his efforts to secure a pardon for Braden, he attended a reception in New York in honor of this convicted scoundrel.
>
> Kunstler was one of the 25 of the signers of the endorsement of Justice Black's dissent from the 5 to 4 Supreme Court decision of June 5, 1961, requiring the Communist Party to register with the Government of the United States. These signatures were sponsored by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.
>
> From that background one is led to suspect that Kunstler, who along with Carl Braden, Carl Braden's wife, and others of their ilk, was prominent in the strife which occurred in Danville, is less interested in the plight of the Negro race than he is in the Communists and their causes, and that he is more interested in creating a stage for civil disobedience which will further the cause of lawlessness in this country.

Representative Tuck was eloquent, but he did not claim to discuss the entire record of this man Kunstler, nor did he do so. Neither do I make such a claim; but I can add a few more facts to what Representative Tuck said.

Kunstler was trial counsel for Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

William Kunstler was special counsel for CORE. He was special counsel for the NAACP. He was special counsel for the ACLU. He was counsel for the Southern Conference Educational Fund. With Henry Winston, an identified spokesman for the Communist Party, he was a speaker for the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, according to a report of the National Guardian of May 30, 1964, at page 4.

The Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties was a Communist front, and the purpose of the rally at which Kunstler spoke was to whip up sentiment and action against the Internal Security Act.

With identified Communists Frank Wilkinson and Harvey O'Connor, and leftwing attorney Mark Lane, Kunstler was a scheduled speaker in October 1962, at a rally to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This rally was held at Manhattan Center in New York City. The Mark Lane who spoke with Kunstler at that rally is the same Lane who later became notorious as a leading exponent of the theory that Lee Harvey Oswald was framed for the assassination of President Kennedy and did not actually commit the crime.

Preceding the New York Times story of January 11, but following the Worker story of December 8, 1964, the Washington Post of January 5, 1965, named Arthur Kinoy as attorney for the Freedom Party. This was in connection with reporting that Kinoy had addressed a meeting of this organization at Lincoln Memorial Congregational Temple on January 14, 1965.

Arthur Kinoy is a lawyer, a member of the firm of Kunstler & Kunstler at 511 Fifth Avenue, New York City. He is 44 years old, having been born in the Bronx, N.Y., in September of 1920.

In his student days at Harvard, Arthur Kinoy was a member of the national executive committee of the American Student Union, an organization cited as Communist by five different investigating committees. In 1945, he was registered as a member of the American Labor Party.

Later, Kinoy was a representative of the International Workers Order. He was attorney for the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers Union of America, a Communist-controlled union. He has been connected with various other front groups.

During the investigation by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of Communist infiltration among American citizens employed by the United Nations, Mr. Kinoy appeared as counsel for one Alfred J. Van Tassel who claimed his fifth amendment privilege in refusing to testify about his Communist Party affiliations.

Arthur Kinoy took an active part in the defense of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, who were executed on June 19, 1953, after conviction of atomic espionage. Kinoy made two last-minute efforts to save the Rosenbergs from execution. A motion brought by Mr. Kinoy for Emanuel Bloch on June 18 was referred to Judge Kaufman by Judge Ryan; and the following day, a motion for a stay of execution pending determination of the motion brought by Mr. Kinoy the previous day was referred to Judge Kaufman by Judge Dimmock. This motion was denied, and another motion to stay the execution pending appeal of the decision was likewise denied.

Arthur Kinoy was honored by the New York Committee for Protection of Foreign Born at a banquet advertised as salute to attorneys. The New York Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is an affiliate of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

In the New York Times of October 3, 1946, at page 21, Arthur Kinoy is listed, together with Frank J. Donner and Marshall Perlin, as attorney for Steve Nelson before the U.S. Supreme Court. Steve Nelson was a notorious American Communist who was also an international Communist leader.

In 1958, Arthur Kinoy was associated with the law firm of Donner, Kinoy & Perlin, a firm which received payments from various Communist groups in the 1950's including the Committee for Justice for Morton Sobell and the Labor Youth League.

According to testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in April 1959, which has been publicly printed and made public, Arthur Kinoy was at that time listed by Harry Sacher as a member of the law firm of Harry Sacher, Frank Donner, Marshall Perlin, & Milton Friedman, with offices at 342 Madison Avenue, New York City. Both Harry Sacher and Frank Donner have been frequently listed as defending Communist cases.

Kinoy has been associated with the National Lawyers Guild for a long time. He was national vice president of that organization in 1954. Ten years later, he was still active in the work of the National Lawyers Guild. He recently served as vice president at the National Lawyers Guild Convention in Detroit. The June 13, 1964, issue of the Michigan Chronicle, a weekly Detroit newspaper in the Negro community, reported Kinoy as having participated in a conference sponsored by the National Lawyers Guild Committee for Legal Assistance in the South, the purpose of the conference being to brief attorneys on legal problems confronting civil rights demonstrators in Mississippi. The news story to which I have referred indicated that those who attended the conference volunteered to go to Mississippi to defend any demonstrators who might encounter legal difficulties.

Along with Kinoy and Kunstler, Benjamin E. Smith was named as one of the three who guide the legal affairs of the Freedom Party. Whether or not because of his position as legal counsel, this Benjamin Smith is indeed a very strong supporter of the Mississippi Freedom Party and its objectives. He was at one time, and may still be, one of two men in charge of the activities of a special task force sent into Mississippi by the National Lawyers Guild to aid in registration of Negroes to vote.

Benjamin E. Smith is a member of the firm of Smith & Waltzer in New Orleans, La.

Smith is a member of the National Lawyers Guild and has served on its executive board. He is a politically minded man, and was active in leftwing politics before he could vote. In 1948, at the age of 21, he was named a presidential elector on the Henry Wallace ticket.

Benjamin Smith had an early association—more than 10 years ago—with Hunter Pitts Odell, then a Communist Party district organizer, who subsequently, and much more recently, became an assistant to Martin Luther King.

In October 1954, Benjamin E. Smith was one of 175 signers of a letter to President Eisenhower urging him to grant amnesty to "political prisoners convicted under the Smith Act."

In 1956, in sworn testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee at a hearing in New Orleans, La., Smith denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party.

In the spring of 1958, Benjamin E. Smith was appointed assistant district attorney of the parish of New Orleans. This came about in an interesting way. The newly elected district attorney was one Richard A. Dowling, who had been identified in the July 1938 issue of Equal Justice as an attorney for the International Labor Defense in New Orleans, who had been a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association in 1942, and who was listed in 1938 as a member of the Lawyers' Committee on American Relations With Spain. District Attorney Dowling appointed one J. David McNeil as his executive assistant. Mr. McNeil had been a member of the International Labor Defense and had been identified with the National Lawyers' Guild and with the

Southern Council, Southern Conference for Human Welfare. At the same time that he appointed Mr. McNeil as his executive assistant, Dowling named Benjamin E. Smith as assistant district attorney.

Benjamin E. Smith went to Cuba near the end of December 1960, and stayed about 2 weeks, reportedly as a guest of the National Lawyers' College of Cuba, to attend events commemorating the second anniversary of the Cuban revolution. Smith reportedly has claimed that Fidel Castro has done a great deal to help the Cuban people and that the American press has given a distorted picture of the Castro regime.

In October of 1961 or prior thereto, Smith was employed by the Republic of Cuba; and in 1964 both Benjamin E. Smith and his partner, Bruce C. Waltzer, were registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as agents of the Republic of Cuba.

Smith was elected a vice president of the National Lawyers Guild at its national convention in Detroit, Mich., in February of last year.

Prior to last October, A. Phillip Randolph of the Negro-American Labor Council, who was a prime mover behind the so-called march on Washington, called for a state of the race meeting of leading Negroes from throughout the country to be held in Washington, D.C., in October 1964. This meeting later was postponed until after the national elections, and was scheduled for December 11 to 13, 1964, at Howard University. Still later the meeting was again postponed, and rescheduled somewhat indefinitely to be held during January 1965 in New York City. In an announcement with regard to this meeting, reported in the Washington Evening Star of November 9, 1964, at page C-20, Walter E. Fauntroy, pastor of the New Bethel Baptist Church in the District of Columbia and director of the Washington office of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said the purpose of the meeting "will be to discuss what future activities will encase the civil rights organizations and what new directions the movement will take."

While there has been no overt evidence that the Communist Party has had anything to do with the planning of this gathering, the party has been greatly interested in taking advantage of it. Claude Lightfoot, chairman of the Communist Party's National Negro Commission, instructed a number of party members to attend the state of the race gathering. The party's obvious purpose in having its people from various parts of the country attend this meeting was to make possible its hope of controlling or at least influencing actions taken.

It was interesting to note that on January 30 of this year, a meeting called by A. Phillip Randolph was held at the office of the National Council of Churches at 425 Riverside Drive, New York City. This was announced as a meeting of the Negro-American Labor Council. Whether this is all that came of Randolph's call for a state of the race meeting, or whether that meeting is still to come, I do not know.

Mr. President, the efforts multiply, and intensify. The fronts proliferate, and interlock. Bad men are enlisted, venal men are bought, stupid men are duped; some good men are misled, some honest men are fooled, even some very brainy men are led astray by their own logic, for a man is like a computer in this: feed in the wrong facts, or not enough facts, and the right answer will not come out.

So, Mr. President, the cast of characters swells and alters, some put on new disguises, some play new parts, but the theme of the play is no different. The tactics change, but the objective remains the same. And all the while, the pressure mounts.

The whole worldwide effort of the Communist conspiracy and its apparatus, its fellow travelers, its hirelings, its dupes, and its unwitting helpers, to achieve a black revolution in this country, stands oriented to focus on a State which is particularly vulnerable because it has a million blacks and a million whites. The focus is Mississippi, the State where I was born, the State to which I owe allegiance.

As late as 1955, the FBI could not report a single Communist in Mississippi. Undoubtedly it could report a good many now. Few of them are local products. Some of them may be recent converts by Communist missionary activities. Most of them will be found to have been imported into Mississippi from the North.

Only last year FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told the House Appropriations Subcommittee, in executive session, that Negroes in the United States "today constitute the largest and most important racial target of the Communist Party." The Communists, Mr. Hoover said, magnify and dramatize racial tensions. They use such campaigns, Mr. Hoover explained, as steppingstones to extend Communist influence among Negroes.

> We do know—

Mr. Hoover told the committee—

> that Communist influence does exist in the Negro movement and it is this influence which is vitally important. It can be the means through which large masses are caused to lose perspective on the issues involved and, without realizing it, succumb to the party's propaganda lures.

Last July Communist leader Gus Hall made a speech at the Riverside Plaza Hotel in New York City in which he declared that "Mississippi is now the critical testing ground for all the democratic victories won by our people," and asserted that Mississippi "has now become a front line in the struggle against the rising danger of fascism in America." Remember, when Gus Hall says "democratic victories" he means victories for communism; when he talks about "fascism" he means anticommunism.

When Gus Hall declared last year that the Communist Party "lives and grows, it is again attracting the best, the young fighters from the trade unions, from the civil rights front, the best of the fighters for peace and democracy"; he was saying, in Aesopian language, that the Communists are gaining power, prestige, and desirable new recruits through exploitation of racial strife. When Gus Hall called Mississippi "the critical testing ground for all the democratic victories won by our people" and "a front line in the struggle against the rising danger of fascism in America," he was saying that if the Communists can win a clear victory in Mississippi, under the so-called civil rights banner, ultimate Communist control of the entire country will be brought much closer; but if they lose, all the Communist gains in the past 16 years will stand in danger of being wiped out.

Last August James E. Jackson, Negro boss of the Communist Worker, wrote in the World Marxist Review that Negroes "have become the new American proletariat."

> The presence of so large a proportion of Negroes in the American working class, so especially motivated to militancy, can be likened to the addition of manganese to iron ore—

Jackson wrote—

> When the two elements are fused in the furnace of class struggle, the metal of the American working class acquires * * * a quality vastly superior to either of its components—the quality of pure steel.

Translated from Communist jargon into plain English that means the Communist Party, U.S.A., has high hopes of using Negro discontent as a basis for fomenting both industrial and civil strife, and concurrently promoting Communist political causes.

Communist plans and hopes for a Negro revolution in the United States go back a long way. They were on paper as early as 1928. And in the winter of 1953, the National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., issued a statement saying:

> The next period ahead will witness momentous struggles of the Negroes. Given the vanguard leadership of the Communist Party, we may be confident that the Negro liberation movement will ally itself more fully with the camp of decent democracy.

In plain English, that meant that more than 10 years ago the Communist leadership in this country had confidence in their ability to fan the fires of racial hatred, to use and pervert the racial and individual aspirations of Negroes and Negro groups, to manipulate Negro and racial organizations so as to bring them into the Communist camp.

This is the issue, Mr. President. It is an issue which vitally affects all the people of this Nation. I pray they may come to understand it, and to translate their new understanding into action in time to help the people of the South to beat back this attack, in time to halt this invasion of Mississippi, in time to end Communist-directed perversion of political processes in this country, before the Communists can derive from the rising strife the full potentialities which it holds of benefits for them and for their plans to take over our country. Whether all the people come to this understanding in time, the people of the South understand now. The people of Mississippi understand. They know what they face; they know what they are fighting for—not only to protect their own way of life and their own freedoms, but to turn back the concentrated and focused power of the world Communist conspiracy and all its helpers, witting or unwitting, on what the Communists themselves have termed a critical testing ground. The people of Mississippi did not ask for this critical struggle. They did not want it or seek it. But they will not shirk it; they will not run from it; they will not compromise with the enemy. They have asked for the understanding and the help of their fellow countrymen. But they will stand their ground alone if they must. They will not give up. There is too much at stake.

Mr. President, there is no compromise with death.

Exhibit 1

[From the People's World, Jan. 16, 1965]

San Francisco Lawyers Plan Trip to Mississippi

San Francisco.—Three well-known local attorneys have announced plans to go to Mississippi on behalf of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP) as part of a national effort to collect evidence on denial of Negro voting rights in that State.

Attorneys Terry A. Francois, George Moscone, and Ed Stern plan to join other lawyers from across the Nation as part of the MFDP challenge to the seating of Mississippi's five Congressmen. Both Francois and Moscone are members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

The challenge is separate from Representative William F. Ryan's fairness resolution, defeated at the time Congress opened. The new challenge is provided under title 2, sections 201–226 of the United States Code.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. McCulloch, of Ohio, as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 6968(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. Flood, of Pennsylvania, Mr. Friedel, of Maryland, Mr. Minshall, of Ohio, and Mr. King of New York as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 4355(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. Teague of Texas, Mr. Natcher, of Kentucky, Mr. Lipscomb, of California, and Mr. Pirnie, of New York as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 9355(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. Rogers of Colorado, Mr. Flynt, of Georgia, Mr. Laird, of Wisconsin, and Mr. Talcott, of California as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 14 United States Code 194(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. St. Onge, of Connecticut; and Mr. Wyatt, of Oregon as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 46 United States Code 1126c, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Carey, of New York, and Mr. Mailliard, of California, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a), Public Law 87–758, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Kirwan of Ohio, and Mr. Edwards of Alabama as members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 6, Public Law 754, 81st Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Staggers, of West Virginia, and Mr. Grover, of New York, as members of the Federal Records Council, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(a), Public Law 474, 81st Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Haley, of Florida; Mr. Morris, of New Mexico; and Mr. Berry, of South Dakota, as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 105(c), Public Law 624, 84th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. O'Brien of New York, Mr. Steed of Oklahoma, and Mr. Devine of Ohio as members of the Committee on the House Recording Studio.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I withhold my request for a moment so that I may explain what I am doing. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum only so that Senators may know that we are resuming the debate on the pending motion on the committee amendment to the joint resolution which is before the Senate.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heard with the greatest interest the debate with respect to the provision inserted by the House, to which an amendment has been proposed by the Senate committee and I have listened with the greatest respect to the contentions of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and to the contentions of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], exactly opposite to each other in their implication.

It seems to me that the issue is not what the Senator described; and it is for that reason that I have taken the floor in an effort to clarify it.

It seems to me that the issue is not one of anger at Mr. Nasser, however justified that would be, nor is it one of untying the hands of the President of the United States, a position with which I thoroughly agree. Indeed I voted against the prohibiton of aid to Indonesia. I believe I was one of approximately 20 Senators who voted against the proposed prohibition in order to keep the hands of the President free.

The issue is whether or not an honest and spontaneous expression of indignation by the American people should be permitted to continue to sound out across the world, or whether it should be stillborn, stopped in the Senate. I think that is the issue, and none other.

There is no issue of oil politics, in my judgment. Our oil people have every right and every reason to explore for oil and produce and sell oil throughout the world. Nor do I think that it is a question involving Israel particularly. There are two schools of opinion on that score. Some believe that the American presence in the United Arab Republic is generally a good thing as part of our endeavor to keep some sanity in the dreadful and continuing intransigence of the Arab States with respect to Isreal. Others believe it is time to declare to the Arab States that the world will no longer stand for such irresponsibility.

But I do not believe that is really and directly involved in this particular issue. What is involved is whether the honest indignation of the American people, as expressed in the House of Representatives, is to be sustained and, therefore, allowed to express itself here, or not.

In order to understand clearly that that is the issue, and the only issue, it is also necessary to understand what has happened with respect to the fulfillment of any existing contracts or commitments to Mr. Nasser or, indeed, any likelihood of giving him any aid in the future. As to this, the record is clear. We have been very generous with Mr. Nasser. As recently as 1964—and I am reading from page 93 of the hearings—we sold or gave to Egypt $143.1 million in agricultural commodities under Public Law 480. We also gave Egypt an AID loan of $1.4 million, making the total aid to the United Arab Republic $144.5 million in 1964.

Since the beginning of Public Law 480, we have sold to Egypt, for local currency, the astounding aggregate of $705,800,000 worth of farm commodities. Mr. Ball sums up the total answer by saying:

> Through 1964, the total value of Public Law 480 sales was about $825 million.

Mr. President, it seems to me that with that kind of record there can be no argument about any nation being short or sharp with any leader like President Nasser. Also, I point out that this very contract itself, of which $37 million is left for completion, originally called for $394,800,000 worth of commodities. The overwhelming bulk of the original contract has now been completed.

One other point, which is very important: We have heard arguments about pulling the rug out from under a contract made by the authorities of the United States with the United Arab Republic. When one cancels a contract or cancels any part of it, based upon the terms of the contract, he is not pulling the rug out from under anybody. The terms of this contract are found on page 81 of the hearings.

Those terms are as follows, in paragraph 5 of the contract itself:

> The financing, sale, and delivery of commodities under this agreement may be terminated by either Government if that Government determines that because of changed conditions the continuation of such financing, sale, or delivery is unnecessary or undesirable.

In addition, there has not even been a commitment under this contract, as it is generally and euphemistically called, because the contract itself provides that the amounts which are to be delivered under it are to be determined on the basis of an annual review made by the Government prior to the beginning of each fiscal year; and it has already been testified that the $37 million affected by this amendment does not come within the purview of that kind of agreement.

Finally, there is discussion about whether we are going to offend Mr. Nasser by doing what we are talking about in this amendment. If Mr. Nasser wants to be offended, he has plenty of reason to be offended other than by this amendment. If Senators will refer to page 100 of the hearings, they will find that Mr. Ball testified to the following effect:

> Senator **Ellender**. You are now telling the committee, then, that our only obligation to Nasser is contained in the particular agreement under discussion and that no promises have been made to renew or extend more aid to Nasser after the termination of this agreement.
>
> Secretary **Ball**. That is right, sir.

I take the word of Under Secretary Ball for this; I am not questioning his good faith, and I am not charging any double dealing on the part of the State Department of the United States.

In addition, Mr. Ball made it very clear in his testimony, which appears on the same page, that we intended no further agreements with the United Arab Republic. As I say, if Nasser wants to be insulted, he has plenty of basis for it right in the record. This will not compound or worsen or better the situation we are talking about here. Mr. Ball said:

> Let me say with respect to this that whether there would be any further agreements with regard to Public Law 480 assistance is a matter which would have to be fully reviewed with this committee and with the Congress when we come up for appropriations for the following fiscal year. Certainly, there will be nothing more in this fiscal year, and that question is one which will be fully reviewed with you in the light of the circumstances at that time. So there is nothing intended now.

In short, anyone looking for a reason to be offended can be very much offended by the fact, which is now public testimony, that we shall do no further business with Nasser under Public Law 480 unless Congress says we should.

Why is this cry of indignation which has been made in the House of Representatives so important, and why, in my judgment, should it be sustained? The reason is this: A time comes in the life of any person and in the life of a nation when wrenched out of it by a succession of events which become intolerable is that amazing human emotion of indignation. Somehow or other, indignation often has a way of reaching people in a way that nothing else has. We have been tried sorely by many nations. I agree with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. **Dirksen**] about that. We have been tried sorely by Indonesia and by many other countries. I shall not specify them, because to do so might be invidious. But when events occur in succession, one upon the other, like hammer blows, to make people feel that they have come to the point where they will take them no more, then an expression of indignation can be most effective in this world. It is for that reason that I shall vote against the committee amendment.

To those who would say that we must work along, we must play along, with Mr. Nasser; that it is very important to our position in the Arab world; and that we do not want to antagonize him, I say that that was what we said in 1956, when we caused the forces of the United Kingdom, of France, and of Israel to be pulled out of Sinai, and the result was that Mr. Nasser talked softly until they were pulled out, but then talked very harshly to the world.

We have had a succession of incidents with Nasser in which exactly the same thing has taken place.

First, we have been talked to kindly and graciously, to gain our confidence and dispose us favorably toward the United Arab Republic; then the very confidence we have vested has been abused. This has not happened once; it has happened time and time again. Now it is compounded by the fact that, I think it is fair to say, the hopes and efforts of anti-American activity and propaganda in the whole of Africa, very much tantamount to what is being preached in Communist China, is centered in the United Arab Republic.

We do not know—only the Lord knows—what is being prepared in the way of rockets and missiles there, with the help of ex-Nazi scientists who are employed there. We do not know exactly what Nasser is fomenting in the Congo and in other areas of Africa. We know he brags that he has armed the Congolese rebels, who have been guilty of some of the most barbarous acts that have ever taken place in the civilized world.

We know he has urged the Government of Libya to throw us out of the Libyan bases, and has urged the government of any other African country where he has any influence to be anti-American in its policy and to throw out the United States.

Mr. President, this was not a calculated exercise of foreign policy discretion on the part of the House of Representatives. It was an honest cry of indignation. An honest cry of indignation was well deserved in the case of President Nasser.

I doubt that any adult person believes that we will win with blandishments or with $37 million in additional commodity aid to President Nasser. He is following a very hard, considered policy on his own. But Egypt is not a country that is distant from us in terms of orientation. It is a country within the compass of the free world. This cry of indignation from the House of Representatives, if sustained in the Senate, may do what nothing else has yet done: it may reach into Egypt and make the people of Egypt feel how very deeply we are offended by what has occurred in their country with respect to us.

I think our action will have, if anything, an influence to tone down Mr. Nasser if we sustain the House, rather than reject the action of the House.

I deeply believe that the President should have freedom of action and that his hands should not be tied. For over a week I have urged the President to give us some declaration of policy which would at least show the displeasure of the United States with President Nasser.

If we should sustain the committee, we would be giving a clean bill of health to the whole operation. We would not even be protesting. We would not even be expressing displeasure. We would be scurrying around in the back rooms and telling Mr. Nasser, "Do not worry about this. The President of the United States will get the Senate to reverse the House." This pandering is equivalent to saying, "They have no backbone. You can use them any way you want. You can play one against the other. They will always come back for more punishment."

Is it not true that the only way in which we can indicate our displeasure is by a protest, and the most vigorous kind of protest, by the President of the United States? The President could have protested the day before yesterday, or the day before that, or the day before that. I would have been delighted to vote the other way if the President had taken that kind of action. But the President leaves us helpless if, acting under the advice of the State Department, he does not do it. We cannot even express our displeasure unless we express our sentiment against the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, has the President of the United States given the Senator from New York any good reason for not sustaining the House amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. Not at all. I must say this with the deepest of humility and respect—I have asked directly, and other Members have asked the President directly. I am sure that, under the advice of the State Department, the President acted in the greatest of good faith.

Nonetheless, we are entitled to believe that if he does not express our displeasure with Mr. Nasser under the terrible provocation that we have already suffered, then we must, or somebody must. It cannot be permitted to go by unchallenged.

Consider the vote in the House of Representatives. One hundred twenty-eight Republicans, every single Republican, voted "aye." Thirty-one Democrats from the southern part of the United States and 45 Democrats from the northern part of the United States voted "aye." This vote was leaderless. The majority leadership in the House was not looking for this vote. It was an honest exclamation of displeasure over Mr. Nasser. Certainly, $37 million is not going to make or break Mr. Nasser. It will not make or break us. In my judgment, it will not result in rupturing the diplomatic relations between us unless Mr. Nasser wants to rupture the diplomatic relations. If he does, he has plenty of reason for doing so, as a result of the testimony of Mr. Ball and the testimony of others.

One thing that our action would do would be to tell Mr. Nasser and the people of Egypt, "At long last, we are deeply displeased with what you are doing."

We can take the one method which is open to us to let them know in unmistakable terms that they are not to tempt the United States any farther than they already have.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I make this statement to the Senator from New York, whose opinion I respect. I sat as a member of this committee. I heard the Secretary of State testify in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I heard Mr. Ball and others testify in the Appropriations Committee.

The point that appeals to me the most in the whole problem which faces us in connection with their appropriation measure is that the President, and the Department of State under the President, have responsibility for initiating foreign policy and for carrying out that policy with respect to other countries.

If Congress flatfootedly refuses to permit the President to exercise the initiative he thinks he ought to exercise, we have taken all opportunities to negotiate away from the President and from the Department of State.

I invite the attention of the Senator from New York to two paragraphs on page 3 of the committee report. This was considered by the committee with very great care.

I shall read the two paragraphs, because I would like to have them in the RECORD. They read as follows:

> It is further the policy of Congress that most careful consideration should be given by the responsible agencies of our Government concerning the continued provision of assistance under this act to countries that are, directly or indirectly, hostile to the United States or that are providing assistance to groups or countries that are acting against the best interests of the United States.
>
> In exercising said provisions of assistance, the Congress emphasizes that said assistance is contributed by the people of the United States of America out of taxes paid by them; it is not reasonable to expect them to want to renew said assistance to countries which permit the property of the United States of America to be destroyed and whose leaders make statements derogatory to our country.

That is a statement that the committee unanimously agreed to in adopting the recommendations of the committee. That is in the joint resolution. We feel that it is the initiative of the President of the United States. We expressed our opinion. We still gave him the initiative that he should have. But we made it perfectly clear that we did not like what was going on.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have given precatory notice to the State Department in the committee report. Suppose that the State Department does not act upon it? Do we make another request, and another request, and another request? At what time do we exercise our power if our requests are not honored? I point out to the Senator that we have been making this same kind of request for years and incorporating it in foreign aid bill after foreign aid bill. There have been recitals that the country involved should respect the peace and other people, respect transit through the Suez Canal, and respect the property of the United States.

Mr. Nasser has treated such recitals like pieces of paper. And so has the State Department.

Nonetheless, I would not have initiated this proposal. I doubt if I would have voted for the measure if it had come up as an original measure in the Senate. I voted against the Indonesia measure, as I stated earlier.

This action seems to be so spontaneous, and would represent so little in the way of substantive breach, or break, or stoppage, that it would not be like showing all of our authority.

One does not get a decision when these precatory recitals are not honored; and they have not been honored, to my personal knowledge, for 10 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when the security of our country is involved, and we have an equal responsibility with the President to maintain that security, certainly we should act. But, when the security of our country is not directly involved, I believe that we have to leave the initiative of the foreign policy of our country in the hands of the President, the State Department, and the Chief Executive's special advisers.

In this instance, I did not believe, and I do not think our committee believed, that the security of the United States was involved, but rather that diplomatic relations with other nations of the world—which we cannot discuss in detail here in the Senate—are involved. If we take the initiative away from the President and from the State Department we may be interfering with other sections of the world with which we are concerned. It is very important that we leave the initiative to the administration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my point is, if I may finish on this note, that sometimes an honest cry of indignation cuts through all the niceties, unties the hands of the bureaucracies, and expresses the heart of the people. This voice having sounded, it should not be stilled. That is exactly how I feel about it. I do not feel that this is a precedent for me, or anyone else. Tomorrow I can vote the other way. But the voice of honest indignation has been sounded; and it should not be silenced in the Senate. It is long overdue.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the committee amendment at the desk which I ask to have stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to obtain the floor in my own right, if I may.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, so would I.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is an unusual way to bring up an amendment—by having a Senator yield.

Mr. MILLER. I am willing to yield. I would like to have my amendment put before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand the rules of the Senate. I have no right to yield for the purpose of a Senator's making an original speech, except by unanimous consent, whether that unanimous consent is asked for or not. If the Senator from Iowa desires to make a unanimous-consent request, I will yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will not object.

Mr. MILLER. I do not want to have unanimous consent. I would like to yield to the majority leader. But I want to make it clear that I would like to have my amendment put before the Senate. I have been here all afternoon. I want to get my amendment up as rapidly as possible.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand that no Senator has any objection to having the amendment to the amendment submitted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no unanimous-consent request pending.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Iowa for the purpose of presenting his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I must say that this is a highly unusual way to conduct the business of the Senate. The Senate has rules. Senators know of my interest in orderly procedure. This is no way for the Senate to conduct its business. Unanimous consent should not have been given. The majority leader should be given the right to the floor, and the Senate should proceed in an orderly manner.

I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Chair had made the announcement that the unanimous-consent request was agreed to, and on that basis the Senator from Iowa is recognized. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

AMENDMENT NO. 22

Mr. MILLER. I call up my amendment (No. 22) to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3 is proposed to strike out lines 13 and 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or are necessary to carry out any other agreement with the United Arab Republic which has been approved by the Congress."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in view of my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] earlier this afternoon, which has clarified the situation, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified to read as follows:

> Strike lines 13 and 14 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and are approved by the Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment will be so modified.

Mr. President, my amendment being before the Senate, I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I shall be brief. I have listened with interest all afternoon to the debate on the amendment which was reported overwhelmingly by the Appropriations Committee. I can sympathize with much of what has been said. I am quite certain that every Member in this Chamber, on either side of the aisle, could make that same statement.

In executive session I asked Under Secretary of State, Mr. Ball, some questions that I would just as soon have asked in open session had I been able to leave the Senate floor that morning.

I pointed out to him that there were certain matters in the field of foreign policy vis-a-vis the United Arab Republic which I thought were open to question; for example, our recognition of the so-called republican regime in the Yemen, which brought about the dispatch of 30,000 to 40,000 Egyptian troops into that unhappy little country.

I pointed out also that we were aware of the fact that certain statements had been made pertaining to the Red Sea by the President of the United Arab Republic; one of our libraries had been burned; not so many weeks ago, Egypt, among other countries, dispatched arms, material, and munitions, by way of the Sudan, into the Congo.

I pointed out also that, so far as I was concerned, our Government did the right thing in carrying out the Belgian-American paratroop drop into Stanleyville and beyond. I think it had to be done. I approved of it. But I certainly did not approve of Egypt and other countries sending arms to the Congo to assist in the overthrow of the constituted government and making an already tense situation more difficult so far as the Congolese and Africans are concerned. It is known that Nasser has designs on large parts of Africa, as do other African leaders.

I call attention to the fact that some days ago the joint leadership from both Houses were called to the White House, for a meeting and discussion of the foreign situation with the President of the United States. Many personal opinions were expressed. The President made one statement to which I wish to refer, and this can be corroborated, because there were present the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the dean of the Republicans in this body, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and others at the White House. The President has feelings, too, but the President has a responsibility which transcends all of our responsibilities because of the particular position which he holds. He said at that meeting that "I have to ask myself one question in the final analysis, and that question is, 'What is in our national interest?' "

I asked Mr. Ball the other day if what he was saying represented the feelings and the thinking and the attitude of not only his immediate superior, Mr. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, but of the President of the United States; and, if it did, whether it fitted in with what is in our national interest. He said, "I would not be down here if it were not on that basis"—or words to that effect.

So perhaps the Senator from New York has not received direct word from the President of the United States, but certainly, from the statement made by the Secretary of State and Under Secretary of State, who speak for the President, I think we have received word concerning the President's attitude in this matter, how he sums up this particular situation, and what he thinks should be done for the next 5 months—and that is all this supplemental appropriation covers. The committee amendment gives the President the flexibility to decide whether or not the remaining $37 million, the last part of the contract formulated in 1962, is or is not to be carried into effect.

So I would hope that the vote would be in favor of the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which considered this supplemental appropriation, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who has such a well-deserved reputation for soundness and patriotism, and that the Senate would support him on this occasion.

Remember that in the report issued by the committee, certain strong statements were made which were read to this body by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. PELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, when it comes to the exercise of the weapons of tactical diplomacy, many of us believed that the executive branch of our Government should be permitted the maximum flexibility. It is for this reason that I intend to join those supporting the committee's language in granting the administration's wish to retain freedom of decision as to whether or not to continue extending 480 wheat to Egypt. I would add, however, that I am disappointed at the very few times the administration has exerted negatively in the past its much vaunted weapons of tactical diplomacy.

Specifically, only in Indonesia in 1964, the Dominican Republic in 1963, Peru in 1962, and Egypt in 1956 do we see actions taken in the past decade by our various administrations using Public Law 480 wheat as a means of expressing our disapproval of actions taken by foreign governments. It will be seen that while there are these four instances of such action, these are far too few, considering the provocations that we have suffered during this 10-year period, the times we have been insulted, kicked around and spat upon by various foreign nations.

This compilation of the past 10 years may not be complete, but it is as complete as I have been able to ascertain.

I believe that the administration should be encouraged to use more frequently the weapons of tactical diplomacy at hand, such as the withholding of Public Law 480 wheat, the clamping down of aid, the holding up of consular invoices, or the withdrawal of various amenities that foreign nations have come to take for granted.

In this case, what I, for one, should like to see is what I understand the administration will do; that is, that the administration itself will exert a tight rein on Public Law 480 wheat being sent to Egypt and will do so only on a very short-term basis indeed.

I believe, too, that we should leave our administration this flexibility. In spite of recent difficulties, there still are areas of common interest that Egypt shares with the United States. We should not, for our part, force Egypt to the bottom of the well. For this reason, I favor preserving the widest possible flexibility for those entrusted with the tactical exercise of responsibility for our foreign policy, but I urge the administration to exercise its backbone and use more steel in its withholding of Public Law 480 wheat as a weapon of tactical diplomacy in the future.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for nearly 10 years I have been voicing apprehension with respect to the political maneuvering of President Nasser, along with his obvious disagreement with the policies of the United States, which he recently reemphasized in sharp language.

I would hope that it would be possible for us to terminate any assistance to him, especially as we now know of his extensive activities in promoting the cause of the rebels in the Congo.

There are certain reasons for not voting now for a cutoff of food shipments to Egypt, however, even though no American would approve the calculated laxness which allowed a student mob to burn a library, nor should anyone withhold his contempt for Nasser's previously referred to language when he talked about American assistance.

Despite these occurrences, the Senate now has to consider what is in the national interest. In that connection, I note that the food shipments which are now underway are part of a signed agreement; and that there is nothing in this agreement which calls for its suspension on account of episodes and language like that of recent weeks, however offensive they may be. Should we not ask ourselves if this is the time for the United States to put itself in the position of breaking its word, by breaking this contract.

As chairman of the Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, I believe it fair to say that our relations in the Middle East are becoming increasingly complex. It is clear that 1965 may well be a year of danger, danger arising from tension over the Congo, tension over Jordan waters, tension both within and among the Arab States.

In recent years, American Presidents have conducted our delicate relations with these countries in an effort to defend the interests of the United States—and, incidentally, to assist in the maintenance of the security of our friends in the State of Israel.

There is no substitute, in such a situation as this, for the discretion and authority of the President, acting under the Constitution, to carry out his responsibility for the conduct of our foreign relations.

Therefore, I believe that the Congress, if the President so decides, should approve his having the right to make the shipments under this existing contract.

We of this body know this President. We know that he will decide to continue such shipments only on the basis of what is best for the country.

I would honestly hope, however, that this is the last aid the President requests for this leader of a totalitarian state who continues to talk and act against the best interests of the United States, and continues to promote unrest in his part, and other parts, of the world.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the hour is late. Senators are anxious to vote and go home or to their many engagements. I shall detain the Senate for less than 5 minutes.

To lapse into the vernacular, Nasser, the dictator of Egypt, is a "pain in the neck," which none will deny.

His activities are utterly without excuse. He has committed grave affronts to the United States. I am just as disappointed with the Egyptian dictator as any one of the "small band of angry men" across the aisle. I am concerned over his activities in stirring up revolution in Yemen. I am deeply disappointed at the way he fuels the arms race by using German scientists to develop a rocket-striking force aimed against Israel. I have no sympathy with the trouble he has stirred up in the Congo by aiding Chinese-backed rebels. I am concerned over his rude, anti-American statements, and the fact that he stood idly by while the USIA library was being burned.

Nevertheless, I shall support the committee amendment because I believe that the President should have the power to send aid to Nasser, if he takes a more responsible "tack," and that the President should not be without power to influence Nasser to end the menace in the Middle East and his quite unjustifiable intervention in the Congo. The result would ge greater insecurity for Israel, and a greater danger in sparking and touching off world war III.

Because the hour is late, I shall curtail my remarks and expect to speak more extensively on this subject tomorrow.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I rise to support the committee amendment.

In view of the opinions which I have expressed on the floor of the Senate in the past, I know that this statement will come as a great surprise to many Senators listening to me.

I realize the feelings that influence not only a great many Members of this body, but also the feelings which prevailed in the other House when it attached to the joint resolution the language which it did, before it was sent to the Senate.

First of all, I recall that for many years I have advocated a firmer and tougher line in all our foreign relations. This has been a consistent act, not only through committee work, but also in my votes in the Senate.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who spoke so very well this afternoon, can testify—as other Senators can—to the fact that in the past year I have supported most of his amendments which I thought would add a tougher and more realistic position to our foreign policy.

In the year before last six of us on this side of the aisle took the floor, over a series of weeks, and offered a series of proposals with respect to what could be done in the Cuban situation. Except for one brief reply from the senior Senator from Oregon, we were met by cold silence from Senators, from the State Department, and from the President himself.

We have offered many amendments for the purpose of taking a firmer and tougher line with our allies.

I believe we must ask ourselves, What is the primary and first purpose of the foreign policy of the United States? I was asked this question by members of the Peace Corps, and I gave them this answer, and received snickering laughter in reply. I said that the primary purpose of the United States is to preserve the peace and freedom of the people in this country—not the peace and freedom of anyone else, but the peace and freedom of the people of this country.

I believe that the freedom of other people throughout the world contributes to that peace, but the primary order is the preservation of our safety and our own peace and our own freedom.

The minority leader spoke at some length this afternoon on this subject, and made a very brilliant speech. I agree with his conclusion, but I do not agree with his reasons. I am through, personally, with presenting the other cheek to anyone regardless of who he is. There is no use going through the list of provocations which Nasser has incited, which Sukarno has incited, which Castro has incited, which other people have incited, and which we continue to ignore.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming also said that we should not speak from pique. I do not speak from pique this afternoon. Only last week I made a very strong statement against any aid to Nasser and the United Arab Republic in any manner, shape, or form.

Something has occurred which has changed my mind. I wish to read two or three significant sentences from the hearings. I read from page 96, from the testimony of Under Secretary Ball:

> Secretary Ball. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an opportunity to amplify this to the committee, but I really feel that this is the kind of testimony which probably should be heard in executive session.

Again, at page 99 of the hearings, I read:

> Secretary Ball. I would like to discuss this in executive session. We are quite flexible in our approach to this problem. What we want to do is to save the President's ability to deal with a critical situation.

The Secretary repeated that same statement in two or three other places, I believe, in the hearings. This is the key to the reason why the Senator from Colorado has changed his general opinion about this subject and supports the President today. What was said in the executive session, off the record, we are not able to repeat here. I cannot tell my constituents. I cannot tell the reasons. I do say that they were hard facts. These facts caused the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, to appear before the committees of Congress, and caused Under Secretary Ball to appear for Secretary Rusk, in his illness, just 2 days ago before the Appropriations Committee, and to make the appeal that he made to Senators there. I am sure that many Senators felt in their hearts an indignation and a feeling of outrage, as I felt; and many Senators voted for the amendment which the committee has reported.

When do we face up to our responsibility? Let me answer a part of the question which the Senator from Oregon posed. I say that we face up to our responsibility when we consider things in a long-term range, in an atmosphere of study and calm. I cannot go along with my friend from New York [Mr. Javits] in his argument that a cry of indignation will be effective throughout the world. A cry of indignation is like a boy stepping on a thorn. It is instinctive and involuntary, and reflects about the same high mental philosophy.

What we want and what we need in the Senate and in Congress in general is a calm, judicial determination of how we wish to influence the foreign policy of this country through legislation. Every one of us will have an opportunity to do that when the foreign aid bill comes before us later in the session. We shall have another opportunity to do that when the appropriation bill on foreign aid comes before us. Therefore, in this year, every Senator will have an opportunity, at least twice, to consider this matter calmly, with a judicial aspect, and then vote in a way which will best reflect his ideas and concept of the foreign policy of the United States.

I told the committee the other day, when it was considering this subject, that, as I felt now, even though I vote for and support the committee amendment, I have no intention of voting for any aid to the Arab Republic later in this year unless the action today, if it should occur, produces an amelioration of the situation in the Near East.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for the very forceful and sound statement he is making with reference to the testimony before the Appropriations Committee. I heard it before the Foreign Relations Committee, too. I heard the sound reasons that were given. We are not now free to disclose those points. I believe the Senator is making a wonderful summary of the situation in which we now find ourselves. For that reason I voted as I did in favor of the amendment in the committee and shall vote for it on the floor. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I always value his judgment in all these matters.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I wish to commend the Senator from Colorado on his excellent persuasive statement. I, too, deeply resent Mr. Nasser's statement about the United States. I believe his position and mine were about the same before we had the hearings on this subject before the Appropriations Committee. Had I been a Member of the House, with the information most Members of the House had, and the only choice open to me between what they voted for and nothing at all, I would have voted with the majority for their amendment. However, I believe that the pending amendment offers an alternative that most Members of the House who voted for the House amendment could accept.

As the Senator from Colorado has said, we shall have another chance to review this matter and to write foreign policy of the United States on an appropriations bill, if we must, and in connection with the foreign aid authorization bill and the agricultural appropriation bill, when we will be appropriating further funds for the food-for-peace program.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. He is entirely correct. We shall have an opportunity to do that.

I wish to conclude my remarks very shortly. However, I wish to make my position clear for my constituents and for the Senate.

Having constantly proposed a harder and more realistic line in international affairs, it is indeed a change of climate to be voting as I shall, particularly in view of the way we have been attacked by Nasser and the things he is doing, which it would serve no purpose to repeat now.

As we now stand, I would agree with the Senator from Oregon in all that he has said about the vacillation, the weakness, and the deviation of the State Department. They have caused all of us worry. The concern of the Senator from Oregon is mine, too. When we authorize the money requested, regardless of what we insert in the joint resolution, the State Department will continue blithely down the same primrose path that it has pursued too often in the past.

Yet I have changed my basic position in relation to the one amendment proposed. When the Under Secretary of State comes to that committee and in executive session says to the committee, "This is in the national interest"—and I refer specifically to the statement of the distinguished majority leader a few moments ago when he stated that Mr. Ball was asked if this was the position of the President and he told him in substance, "Yes"—I would not be in this room if the President did not so regard it.

As an American, knowing the volatile situation in the Near East and knowing that it is at the boiling point and that it can boil over any time; knowing what the situation is in Africa; knowing the significance of Egypt to the situation in the Congo; knowing the significance of Egypt to the relationships of Yemen and other places in the Near East, I could not avoid supporting the President in the present instance. As I look at it today, if I did not support the President in the present instance, in effect, I would have to say, in my own mind, "I do not believe Ball and I would not believe Dean Rusk if he were here, either, and if the President were here, I would not believe him, either."

But, Mr. President, I cannot say that. I cannot say that, because the President is the shaper and the implementer of our foreign policy. When those men come to us and in an executive session tell us facts which justify their position that it is in the national interest, and that if the President finds it in the national interest, we might utilize this, then in all conscience I must, in this instance, support the President. I can see no other course if I am to keep faith with the oath of my office.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Colorado is making a very sound and sensible statement. I find myself virtually in the same position in which he finds himself. I for one would like to congratulate the Members of the House who voted in the manner in which they did with the information that they then had, so that this subject could be brought over to us for more serious consideration.

We have now had several meetings in executive session. We have been provided with reasons which are rather persuasive, but which cannot be discussed publicly.

The thing that impels me to vote to sustain the committee position, as I did in the committee, is the fact that this proposal is now our only opportunity to improve our relationships with Nasser to get him to improve his activities vis-a-vis the Congo and some of his neighbors in that area. It is an opportunity we should not fumble by rapid actions or by apologetic bargaining. By tough bargaining we can improve the relationships. By accepting the action of the House and summarily cutting off the aid, it is true we would reprimand Nasser. But we would also close the door on any opportunity for negotiation or improvements. I would like to keep open any opportunity that we have for progress in this troubled and explosive area of the world.

After the conference adopts the proposed language, I intend in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to interrogate Mr. Rusk, Mr. Ball, or whoever shows up in due course. I shall ask, "What did you do about that $20 million? What would you do about the remaining amount of money which is available—$37 million, I believe, in toto? What kind of deal did you drive? What kind of bargain did you make? What beneficial results have you won for America?"

If they come to us and say that they fell on their faces and received no concessions, but they still made available these grains, it will be exceedingly difficult for them again to induce the Congress to go along with what seems to me a reasonable proposal in the present troublesome instance.

This is not the end of the ball game. This issue will be coming up time and time again. The House will pass similar reservations. If it does not, I am sure the Senate will, if in fact we continue to give aid to people who repudiate us, reject us, insult us, and undermine us. The proposal is a good laboratory for us. How good are our bargainers in the State Department? What will they do now that they have been given this opportunity? Will they come through and insist upon some concessions from Nasser or will they deny Nasser any further aid? Or—worst of all—will they continue the aid and win no concessions from Nasser?

It is not a very expensive venture insofar as our international expenditures are concerned. It is a rather easy way to find out in the laboratory of life whether or not the State Department and the President follow through with the assurances that they have made to us.

I shall vote to give them the opportunity, and I devoutly hope that they will be successful.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. His observations are very timely and helpful. My position is exactly the same as his. Had I been voting at the time the House did with the information that they had, I would have voted the way they did. If I had had to vote before Secretary Ball appeared before the committee the other day in executive session, I would have voted again with the House position. But, as I have explained, I cannot in conscience and as I see my own duty—and I do not cast any reflection upon the position or the views that any other Senator has—after listening to that, and after listening to those representations, I can do nothing else but support the committee amendment, for which I voted in committee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote to sustain the committee amendment. I have one chief reason for doing so. The question is, whether in this first test in the first full term of President Johnson, the Congress shall deny him the authority to negotiate and to exert all the authority of the President with respect to the sensitive situation in Egypt. I believe that he should have that opportunity. Therefore, I shall vote for the committee amendment.

Nevertheless, I doubt very much that our action today will settle very much. We have voted upon similar situations in past years. I am afraid that when the foreign aid bill comes to the floor of the Senate this year, we will be voting again upon aid to Egypt, Indonesia, and similar situations. I believe a much deeper question is involved. We are in this sorry situation today, because succeeding administrations, and the Congress of the United States have failed to establish any consistent aid policies, and we have lost control of the foreign aid program.

I have no simple remedy. Our concept of foreign aid has changed. At its beginning, foreign aid was designed to help countries establish industrial and agricultural strength which would in time, raise the living standards of their peoples. We know that much of our foreign aid has been wasted, and that it has not contributed greatly to solid economic development. We know also, as in this situation, our aid is provided to countries which devote their needed resources to aggressive purposes. Our basic purpose is to help independent countries remain free and sovereign, that they may contribute to freedom and security, including that of the United States. But our aid has been turned against our basic interests by some countries.

I do not believe, as some have testified, that it is in the best interests of our country to continue to make it possible for countries to offend our basic purposes, by providing aid to them.

This afternoon, it has been said that when we work upon the foreign aid bill, we shall be able to evolve a new program, or correct the mistakes of the present program. I doubt it very much. I think it likely that we will be voting again whether to give aid to Egypt or Indonesia, and upon the same issues before us today. But I hope very much that we shall maintain today the authority of the President. I have come to believe that the only way we can recapture control of our own foreign aid program, or the chief way, is by the initiative and action of the Executive. The President, as he starts on a new term, has now a better opportunity to correct our foreign aid program and make it effective, than he will ever have. Countries over the world are looking toward him. They wonder what his policies will be. He has unusual authority and power to correct the foreign aid program, and I believe that he will do so. I would hope that our programs would be reviewed and assessed in every country, as I have urged for years, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said for years, and as the Congress voted 2 years ago on my amendment to the foreign aid bill.

I would hope that the President would establish policies that would be applicable to every country; that our economic aid would not be continued unless used effectively; and that we should not give economic aid to countries which used it to supplement their resources for aggression.

I propose a way to reestablish consistent policies, and recapture control of our foreign aid. I would like for the President to announce, with the approval of the Congress, that for the year 1965, or any part of it, that the United States does not intend to make available any economic aid to any country except for humanitarian reasons, until he had reviewed and assessed our program and until policies were laid down applicable to all countries.

I have written the President and suggested that he do this.

The reasons why I think it would be an effective plan are as follows: It would give the executive an opportunity, in consultation with Members of Congress and committees charged with the responsibility, to develop a program and policies which would carry out the purposes we want carried out, beneficial to the countries we help, and to the United States, and fair to our taxpayers.

Also, if it were to deny aid to all countries for a time, it could not be said that we were punishing or favoring a specific country.

Third, if aid were discontinued for a time, countries wanting aid would have to come to us, openly and fairly, on the terms of our policies.

Today, after having received aid for years, if it is suggested to some countries that it should be made more effective, they answer by saying, "You are putting strings on our aid." If we suggest to Mr. Nasser "You should stop certain actions; otherwise we cannot give you aid," he replies, "you are interfering with the policies of our country."

Some others give the impression that if we do not give them aid, they will go to Russia. I would say, "Go to Russia." In effect, the program has become their aid program, not ours, used by them for their purposes.

I have voted for foreign aid since I have been a Member of the Senate; but since I had the opportunity to observe its application in one country—India—when I was there as Ambassador for more than a year, I knew that the program ought to be strengthened and its defects corrected.

In all those years, I have urged that certain steps be taken to make the aid program more effective. I have not been wholly successful. Today we have come to a climax, to the point where we know that something must be done. The most important thing to understand is that we have lost control of the foreign aid program—the program of the United States.

I shall vote to give the President this authority, which I think he deserves; but I hope with all my heart that he will use this time to review and reassess the entire program and place it in its original concept. I believe he should discontinue the program for a time—for a year, if necessary—to develop the proper policies consistent with the interests and good purposes of the United States—that it may again become an effective foreign aid program of the United States and its people, and that it will be genuinely helpful to recipients. It is the program of the United States, and not of other countries, and it must not be the program of countries which turn our aid against the interests of the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield briefly?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed with the distinguished minority leader the schedule for the remainder of the evening. The minority leader is momentarily absent from the Chamber, but I feel that I should make an announcement, and I do so with his approval and, I believe, with the approval of most Senators now in the Chamber.

The Senate will be in session for some time yet this evening. I hope it can dispose of this amendment shortly, one way or the other, and then take up the Mundt proposal and, if possible, come to a final vote on the joint resolution itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I assume that the distinguished leader, in referring to "this amendment," meant both the Miller amendment and the United Arab Republic amendment, to which it is addressed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I give deep faith to the arguments that have been made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and other Senators, urging that we accept the proposal made by the Committee on Appropriations.

For the past several years, I have been hoping that better treatment of our country would come from those who have been the recipients of our generosity.

I have subscribed to the policy of turning the right cheek after I have been smitten upon the left. I have done so with a great deal of contentment within my own conscience. But, as time passes, I have concluded that this submission to attacks by those whom we have helped has not contributed to our character or our security. Suffering abuses has not helped our image among the nations of the world.

When we have allowed our enemies and our friends to expropriate property without protest, we have witnessed an advance of expropriation by other countries. When we have continued to give aid to those who have spat upon our flag, burned our embassies, torn down our libraries, attacked us with the epithet we were an imperialistic nation, and sought to create disturbances in countries where we were attempting to bring tranquillity, we found that instead of our position growing better, it grew worse.

I do not want to approach the issue of Nasser on any basis except what I believe is in the best interest of our country. And, approaching it from that standpoint, I know that when Nasser went into Yemen, he followed a course that was inimical to the security of our Nation. I know that when he granted that his nation should be the vehicle and the corridor for creating disturbances in the Congo, he was not helping the security of the United States. I know that when, at the Belgrade conference of the nonalined neutral nations of the world, word was received by those in attendance—which included Nasser—that Red Russia had broken its agreement about the nonuse of nuclear tests, no word of protest came from Nasser, or any of the other so-called neutral nations in attendance.

The principal objective of our course should be the establishment of an image of the character of our country. We cannot be exhibited around the world as being spineless and absolutely devoid of what the ordinary individual would claim to be character. By the use of the word "character," I mean that we should say, "We shall give you help with respect to your need for food. We will not oppose you in your efforts to develop your nation in conformity with what you think is right. We will tolerate your attacks and your abuses up to a certain point. But, when that point has been reached, our character demands that we discontinue the sufferance of the attacks which you have made upon us."

The senior Senator from Oregon spoke today about a forfeiture or an abdication of the powers of Congress, as contained in the language which states that if the President determines that it is in the interest of the country, he may grant this aid. I subscribe to what he said. But, I point out that that principle should not be applied only to Nasser. It should be applied to the Communist countries of the world. It is not being applied to them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall yield in a moment.

I hope I shall not be boring to my associates, but there has developed a new philosophy in the foreign relations of our country.

I want my colleagues to listen to what I say. We shall be hearing more and more of the theory that there is no Communist country in the world. I repeat that. We shall be hearing more and more from persons in high, responsible positions that there is no Communist country in the world. That will be said to us in spite of the fact that we have statutes on the books which identify certain countries as Communist countries.

I want to adopt a uniform principle that will apply to Nasser and to the Communist countries, concerning this dispensation and exculpation of abuses which they have perpetrated upon us, through the President saying, "It is in the interest of our country to grant aid." If we are to do that, let the program be uniform.

I yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio is laboring under the misapprehension that it is the belief of the senior Senator from Oregon that the principle he argued for today in respect to uniform application should not be applied, let me disabuse him of that impression.

Let me say also that when we aid Nasser, we are aiding communism. Let us not deceive ourselves about that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have not yet stated what my position on the bill is.

I shall vote against the committee recommendation. I shall do so because I believe the time has come when we must establish the image among the people of the world that our flag shall not be torn down, that our property shall not be burned, that we shall not suffer under the claim that we are an imperialistic nation which wants to exploit the people of the world, that we shall not allow our enemies to be aided and our good purposes to be ignored.

The past 15 years have demonstrated that that policy does not work. We are growing weaker and weaker everywhere around the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about my amendment. What we have been talking about for the past 2 hours is what is in the national interest.

The committee amendment provides:

> That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the sales agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest.

The action of the House of Representatives makes it very clear that a majority of the Members of the House, in a bipartisan vote, do not believe that it is in the national interest at all; and they do not want anybody else to decide that question, either, except the Congress of the United States.

That is a pretty severe position to take, but it is warranted by what has taken place. First of all, I would be shocked if any Member of the Senate would say that it is in the national interest, as of now, to go forward with $37 million more of foreign aid to the United Arab Republic. It is about time for us to show some self-respect as a nation. The intemperate language that has been used by the leader of the United Arab Republic, the anti-U.S. propaganda which has been delivered over various means of communication in the Middle East controlled by the government, and the burning of our library are only a few of the instances which have impinged upon the respect of the United States.

Our security is involved, and I say this with all respect to my friend from Massachusetts, because the confidence of other nations of the world is involved, or their respect, not only for the strength of the United States, but for the willingness of the United States to use its strength.

I do not need to point out that we are reading all too frequently statements made by Communist leaders, particularly Mao Tse-tung, to the effect that the United States is a paper tiger. Smaller nations, particularly to the south of us, are very perceptive. Many of them are worried about whether or not we are indeed a paper tiger. If we are not willing to stand up against a situation which exists in the Middle East with respect to our foreign aid, then how, they will wonder, can we possibly stand up to situations which are much worse, including the one in South Vietnam.

There is more involved than merely the self-respect and security of the United States. The United Nations is very much involved. We say, as a matter of national policy and national interest, that we are for the United Nations and that we support the United Nations. Yet we are giving aid to a country which has gone contrary to United Nations policies through its aggression in Yemen, through its support of the rebels in the Congo, and through its persistent delinquency in the payment of dues and assessments to the United Nations.

As of December 31, 1964, the United Arab Republic was delinquent to the extent of $374,322 in dues and assessments to the United Nations.

This, Mr. President, after $700 million of foreign aid from the United States, which, as the Senator from New York has pointed out, has been what we have contributed since our foreign aid program began.

It is about time for us to face up to the fact that, in determining the national interest, the Congress has a responsibility. It is not for us to slough off that responsibility to the executive branch of the Government. There are certain areas where the executive branch probably has more of a responsibility in determining the national interest than does the Congress. This should be done on a partnership basis, if at all possible.

During the past few years, Congress has gone far more than half way in allowing the executive branch to determine what is and what is not in the national interest. I do not believe we should have gone as far as we have gone. The people of the United States look to their representatives in the Congress to declare what is and what is not in the national interest, especially when our self-respect and national security are involved.

I point out that we are not involved in reneging on any agreement. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], made an excellent statement on this point. I should like to amplify to some extent what he had to say about it.

On page 89 of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations on the supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, 1965, it is indicated that there are $37 million in purchase authorizations which have not been issued.

On page 81 of that same document there is set forth the agreement itself. The very first paragraph of the agreement reads that subject to the issuance by the Government of the United States of purchase authorizations, certain things will be done. Since these purchase authorizations have not yet been issued, they are subject to issuance, and the contracts are based upon their issuance. If they are not issued, there is no contract, or at least the contract is terminated in line with the very terms of the contract.

Also on page 89 of the same hearings, it is indicated that some $30 million more is involved, namely, purchase authorizations of $30 million which have been issued.

The committee amendment is not clear on this point. I understand that the State Department thinks the $30 million for which purchase authorizations have already been issued would not be affected by the committee amendment, and that only the $37 million for which purchase authorizations have not been issued would be affected.

I am willing to abide by that interpretation. So what we are really talking about is $37 million, for which clearly no purchase authorizations have been issued, which would be within the express terms of the contract.

A further item should be brought to the attention of the Senate in connection with the alleged "reneging" of our agreement.

On page 88 of the hearings, in a letter to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Department of Agriculture set forth a memorandum regarding the current status of the agreement with the United Arab Republic. On page 89 it is stated:

> All purchase authorizations which have been issued are by their terms expressly made subject to the provision of the regulations under which they are issued. These regulations reserve the right "at any time" and "for any reason or cause whatsoever" to revoke any purchase authorization and terminate deliveries thereunder.

I suggest that the argument of anyone who would impute to the Senate a reneging of an agreement or the embarrassment of our officials who may have negotiated this agreement is not well placed at all.

It is said, also, that the committee amendment represents the only chance for any leverage or bargaining power with the United Arab Republic. I submit my amendment gives us another chance, because my amendment does this. It states, in effect:

Go ahead and negotiate with the United Arab Republic, but let it be clearly understood that the negotiations are subject to final aproval by Congress. We have not slammed the door shut, as is now the case with the action taken by the House. There is still a card left in the deck, so to speak, for negotiating and bargaining purposes. But, when and if a negotiation takes place with the $37 million, then Congress will take a look at it and will have to approve it.

We shall have 2, 3, or possibly 4 months to see how things go, with respect to the attitudes and actions of the United Arab Republic. It would be hoped that 2 or 3 months from now, if an agreement is negotiated regarding the $37 million, Congress could wholeheartedly support the agreement; because, in the meantime, the United Arab Republic will have shown itself to be a good, upright citizen—in fact, a free nation, and a good member of the United Nations. But, if it has not, then Congress, naturally, would not be expected to approve the agreement.

One final argument. On several occasions I have heard mentioned the importance of comity between the two Houses. This is a perfect time to preserve comity between the two Houses. The 204 Members of the House of Representatives who voted for the House amendment did not do so lightly. They did not do so on the spur of the moment. Those Members of the House have seen what has happened. They have done their homework. It will be difficult, I believe, for any of them to change their minds on the subject. If the Senate comes along and destroys that amendment completely, I believe that the comity between the two Houses will be threatened.

My amendment offers a middle way. It still keeps a string on the $37 million. I would be hopeful that the House would go along with that amendment, but I would be pessimistic that the House would acquiesce in the amendment by the Appropriations Committee if that prevails.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield. I understand that my friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] wishes to respond, and I am happy to yield to him at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have had little to say today, although I have been assigned by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to handle the bill.

This particular amendment, which we have been arguing about for more than 6 hours, relates to only 2 percent of the total amount of the joint resolution. The joint resolution relates to the important and vital functioning of the Department of Agriculture in three fields—which I am not going to discuss at this time because everyone should know about them; but they relate to the very bones and sinews of the agricultural program of the Nation.

Therefore, I have had little to say, after 6 hours or more of debate spent on the subject, and after we approved the amount which is involved—and it is a big amount, $1,600 million—after we adopted the other two amendments and got down to the discussion of this little amendment which relates to Egypt.

With all due respect and much affection for the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], let me say that I believe that his amendment would leave us in a very unfortunate position. It would make it look as though the Senate thought that the Constitution permitted Congress to have the last word on a matter such as foreign policy. The Congress does not have that authority under the Constitution. That is a policy so well settled, and a philosophy so well fixed, that there is no way in the world for the Senate to change it.

I am sure that this amendment was drawn rather impulsively on the floor of the Senate. I so regard it.

The amendment as drawn retains the wording of the House provision, and then adds these words, which were in the committee amendments—

> Except when such exports are necessary to carry out the sales agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended.

Then it completes the amendment with these words offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]—

> And are approved by the Congress.

This means that he would provide, if his amendment were adopted, that regardless of negotiations, regardless of the Constitution and the laws under it, Congress would undertake the responsibility of asserting the last word in the matter of international policy and administration.

I rarely move to lay a motion on the table and am not going to do so in this instance if it is possible to obtain an immediate vote. I know that Senators wish to go home. I would hope that Senators will permit a vote to be taken on this particular amendment. If that can be done, I shall be glad not to make a motion to lay on the table.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to respond briefly to my friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and emphasize that the amendment was not impulsively drawn.

The substance of the amendment was discussed with the Secretary of State when he was in the Senate committee last week. I regret that his illness apparently prevented following up on his assurance that he would have to look into it.

Second, with respect to the constitutional argument, I believe that if the Senator would push his argument to its logical conclusion, we might say that Congress is not even permitted to act on the appropriations bill. I believe that Congress has that permission. I believe that Congress has the last word with respect to foreign relations insofar as Public Law 480 is concerned, and insofar as the appropriations thereunder are concerned. Congress itself enacted Public Law 480. If Congress can extend authority under Public Law 480, it can also withdraw authority in whole or in part. That is all my amendment does. It would withdraw authority with respect to only a very small but a very important part.

Therefore, I hope that this debate will not go off into a constitutional argument. I respect my very dear friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] but I do not believe that his argument would stand up, if he would carry it to its logical conclusion.

In any event, I do not wish to delay the Senate any longer. I hope that we may vote on the amendment.

NEED TO PRESERVE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY POWER IN EGYPT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I support the language that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has approved to give the President discretion in carrying out the agreement to sell surplus agricultural commodities to Egypt.

Mr. President, I am concerned, as I know all the American people are concerned, over the recent actions of Egypt's President Nasser. The shipping of arms to the Congo to inflame a murderous civil war, as well as such prior activities as shipping weapons to Cyprus and maintaining a military force in Yemen, are clearly not in the interests of the United States, or of peace, in the critical areas of the Middle East and Africa. Nevertheless, I believe that we must be realistic about this matter. Is it conceivable to anyone that the cutting off of $37 million of foodstuffs sales is going to cause a shift in Nasser's attitudes? Can we seriously expect that by cutting off these sales for the next 6 months we would convince Nasser to reverse his policies in these areas, throw his arms around the American Ambassador and promise never to threaten American interests again?

Mr. President, these very questions are ridiculous, for it must be quite clear that the actions we take today will not have any constructive effect on Nasser's policies. On the contrary, if it has any effect at all, it will tempt Nasser to undertake still more destructive policies which in the long run will help neither the United States nor the United Arab Republic. It is hardly becoming for a great power like the United States to act from sheer spite, without any hope of accomplishing what we seek to accomplish, and with a real danger of deliberately worsening relations with an important foreign country merely out of anger or intemperance.

Mr. President, an article written by John S. Badeau, former American Ambassador to Egypt, in the latest issue of Foreign Affairs puts the whole question of American-Egyptian relations in a rational perspective. There is, indeed, a "crisis of confidence" between the United States and Egypt. There are real differences in the policies of both countries, yet by and large both the United States and President Nasser's government have a number of common interests and both have far more to gain than to lose by maintaining moderately good relations. Ambassador Badeau points out very cogently that from the Egyptian point of view American policy in the Middle East has been inconsistent. In his words:

> American foreign policy toward Egypt has been so erratic largely because Americans—like Egyptians—react rather than act. They do not recognize that it is possible for two countries to oppose each other on specific issues while maintaining a continuing and mutually profitable relation. It is too often an "all or nothing" policy. Either American wheat buys Egyptian compliance to an American viewpoint, or there will be no American wheat. This assumes that the object of American aid is to "bring Egypt to heel," and that when this fails the only alternative is pressure totally to stop the aid program. This seldom works, and particularly it does not work with President Nasser. If the United States desires to protect such national interests as involve the United Arab Republic, it must be prepared steadily and quietly to pursue a policy that does not fluctuate like the stock market with every political crisis. American policy must be aimed at maintaining a relationship with Egypt, not on seeking pretexts to sever it.

Mr. President, we must keep our eyes open and our wits about us in dealing with President Nasser. The aid we are supplying him is not tanks and machineguns but wheat, dairy products, and beef. These are not implements of war, but products designed to help the people of Egypt to achieve a higher standard of living. These products are shipped under title I of Public Law 480 which enables the Government of Egypt to sell these goods for Egyptian currency which then remains under the control of the United States. President Nasser cannot take this money and go out and buy weapons with it. It has been implied that, indirectly, some of these funds have been misused to support Nasser's military ventures in Yemen. Responsible Government agencies deny these charges, but if there is still concern in the minds of Members of Congress that U.S. aid to Nasser may have gone astray or been misused in any way, then the proper course is to authorize an investigation and audit, perhaps by the General Accounting Office. Certainly, if any other agency of Government were accused of misuse of funds, our reaction would not be to abolish that particular agency of Government or program but to investigate the situation and determine what actually has happened. I do not believe that the charges of a single defector who may have ulterior motives of his own should be the basis for abruptly terminating a commitment of this nature without any effort to get further facts.

Finally, Mr. President, we must not forget what happened in 1955, when Secretary of State Dulles abruptly canceled U.S. promises to help with the Aswan Dam project. That was done as a strong expression of disapproval of Nasser's policies. It was a clear effort to tie foreign aid assistance to acquiescence with the broad political policies of another government. The results were not at all what we had sought and, in fact, created grave problems in the Middle East for many years thereafter. It is, of course, one of the common lessons of history that men do not learn from history, but surely that example less than a decade ago should be fresh enough in our minds and should discourage any desire on anyone's part for a repetition.

Mr. President, in short, there is nothing to be gained by an action taken from spite, carried out with great fanfare, and designed not seriously to weaken President Nasser but merely to antagonize him. There is nothing to be gained in the eyes of the rest of the world by depriving the people of Egypt, and the children of Egypt of foodstuffs which we have virtually promised to make available to them. One does not starve a nation into friendship. I strongly believe that the President must have the discretion provided by the language approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee in order to conduct any kind of rational and meaningful relations with President Nasser. We would be cutting off our nose to spite our face, as the saying goes, to deny Egypt surplus U.S. food. We would not be enhancing the security of Israel by this act, or encouraging Nasser to cooperate more closely with the United States. We would only be aggravating an already dangerous climate of distrust and antagonism in the Middle East.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I believe that it would be an extremely dangerous precedent to establish the requirement that Congress must approve Public Law 480 food-for-peace agreements. Congress is not and should not be an administrative body. It does not have the staff or the facilities to investigate and act on executive agreements. The amendment offered by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] appears to be clear and straightforward. In actual fact, it is a back-door approach, overturning the constitutional responsibilities of the executive branch of the Government and placing Congress in a position where it does not belong and where it cannot act properly and responsibly. If the Senator feels that such a far-reaching change is necessary, then his proposal should be introduced in the form of a straightforward amendment to Public Law 480 on which hearings can be held, officials connected with the program can be heard, and a thoughtful investigation made. The increasing tendency toward what I call back-door legislation—to alter the nature or operation of a program by an amendment offered at the last minute on the floor of the House or Senate without going through the front door of committee hearings and study—is, in my judgment, unwise. It bypasses competent committees and does not permit careful responsible legislating. I am deeply opposed to the amendment offered and urge that it be defeated.

Mr. President, I strongly urge that no changes be made in the language which the committee recommends.

I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Badeau's article to which I referred earlier be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States of America and United Arab Republic: A Crisis in Confidence

(By John S. Badeau)

During recent congressional debates on aid legislation many harsh things were said about the United Arab Republic and its President. One Senator stated that "Col. Abdel Nasser * * * has been responsible more than any other single individual for keeping the political cauldron boiling in the arid, strifetorn Middle East * * * pouring oil on whatever brush fires break out." President Nasser has been equally sharp and critical. Early in 1964 he publicly described American foreign policy toward the Arab world as "not based on justice but on the support and consolidation of the base of aggression, Israel, and we cannot, under any circumstances, accept it."

To be sure, much of this may be dismissed as political talk for the public ear. Nasser, no less than American Senators, has a constituency which periodically must be stirred up and marshaled for support. There is thus little new in the current skirmishing between Arab and American spokesmen—but those who follow United States-United Arab Republic relations closely feel there ought to be. For this increased tempo in verbal attacks comes during a period of notable improvement in relations, when both the United States and the United Arab Republic, as a matter of basic policy have been trying to get along with each other.

For both parties the change began in the aftermath of the Suez affair. By its prompt support of the United Nations and its refusal to back the Israel-Anglo-French invasion, the United States gave practical proof of its impartiality in Middle East quarrels which threatened the peace of the area and the world. This was followed by a quiet mending of relations in the closing days of the Eisenhower administration. Economic aid to Egypt was cautiously reinstituted and a franker exchange of views took place. President Kennedy supported and expanded this policy, identifying the Middle East as an area vital to American interests. He sought to develop relations with Egypt around points of mutual interest, while recognizing that the United States had, and would continue to have, sharp differences with Nasser.

In making this approach, the United States paid particular attention to economic assistance. Whatever else the revolution in Egypt stands for, it is the most vigorous attack on the perennial problems of poverty, disease, ignorance and privilege ever seen in the ancient valley of the Nile. With a burgeoning population (doubled since 1936), severe limitation of arable land (3½ percent of the country's total area), and limited foreign exchange earnings (chiefly the cotton crop, Suez Canal tolls and tourism), it is obvious that the United Arab Republic cannot forge ahead with desperately needed modernization and social advance without substantial foreign assistance.

Here was a point of mutual concern on which closer American-Egyptian relations could be built. On its part, the United Arab Republic needed to develop a healthy and progressive society without being captured in the process by the Soviet bloc. But a socially stable and progressive Egypt was also in the interests of the United States, one of whose basic Middle East policies is to contribute wherever possible to tranquillity through social progress in this vital region. Political and economic chaos in the Valley of the Nile would have repercussions in the surrounding area. Both in its own right, and as a major influence in the Arab world, the sound economic progress of Egypt is a desirable American objective. American economic assistance, chiefly through the Public Law 480 food program, was therefore increased.

Egypt's response to this approach opened a new era in United States of America-United Arab Republic relations. A cultural agreement was signed in 1962. In 1963, after 11 years of negotiation, Egypt entered into an investment guarantee agreement with the United States, aimed at stimulating and protecting American business interests. On several occasions, notably at the Economic Conference in Cairo in the summer of 1962, the United Arab Republic played a moderating role in containing African and Asian extremists. Nasser opposed the Soviet resumption of nuclear testing and shifted his policy away from supporting Gizenga in the Congo. While maintaining diplomatic relations with Cuba, the United Arab Republic displayed little enthusiasm for Castro and took a reasonably sympathetic attitude toward President Kennedy's showdown with Khrushchev. And for the first time in some years, the controlled press in Egypt gave a fairly objective, often sympathetic, account of American actions.

Against this background of cooperation, the shrill crescendo of bitter accusation between American and Egyptian leaders strikes an ominous discord. A popular Egyptian proverb says, "One day it's honey—the next onions." After the good diet of the past 3 years, are American-Egyptian relations in for a ration of onions? Under the present administration, the United States made its most determined effort to protect its interests in the Near East through a reasonable rapprochement with the United Arab Republic. Are all such efforts bound to be fleeting? What is it that interrupts them just when everything seems to be going well?

The answer is not to be found so much in specific policies of the two countries as in the atmosphere within which these take place. At the end of the First World War, an American observer reported that "Before all else (the nations of the Near East) need renewed confidence in each other and in us, and in our honest purposes of good." That is as true today as it was 40 years ago. The day of honey in Arab-American relations so easily changes into a day of onions because there is a mutual distrust of each other's honest purposes of good. Actions in themselves relatively minor become objects of deep suspicion because they are seen as cloaks for imperialism, neo-colonialism, pan-Arabism, or the personal ambitions of some Arab ruler. The crisis is often a crisis of confidence, generating a fog of suspicion which chokes good relations and makes it difficult to negotiate a lasting solution to differences.

It is a crisis in confidence which currently threatens American relations with the United Arab Republic. Although the mutuality of interests continues, the United States is wondering whether in the light of recent events it can trust the United Arab Republic to follow a reasonably consistent course of cooperation—or will it undercut vital American interests in the Arab world at its own whim? And can the United Arab Republic trust the United States to pursue its present course with continuity—or will the erratic winds of changing administrations and election pressures continually blow American foreign policy off course? It is doubt about these fundamentals of the American-Egyptian relationship which has created a crisis between the two nations.

One reason for such doubts is the very success of recent policy. Each party now finds itself playing an important role in the national interests of the other, a role in which the capacity to hurt is large. American food makes a massive contribution to the well-being of Egypt and is a resource on which the United Arab Republic national budget is currently based. While the country could get along without it (as the aftermath of Suez shows), the withdrawal of our food sales would create a serious economic problem. Moreover, the attitude of the United States influences both government and private credit resources in Western countries upon which the United Arab Republic now depends for its badly needed foreign currency assistance. Thus the United Arab Republic is nervous about anything which might suggest a sudden shift in American policy and scrutinizes carefully and suspiciously every American statement, fearing the worst.

But the United States also is nervous about Egypt. The United Arab Republic and its President are the single most powerful force in the Arab world. With the largest and most modernly equipped Arab army, the most powerful and sophisticated propaganda system and wide appeal among the Arab masses, President Nasser has a potential which cannot be neglected by any nation having interests in the Near East. He has the power to harm American interests to a considerable degree, as the response to his call for liquidating the American airbase in Libya shows. It is not simply a matter of power and ambition; Nasser typifies the socially revolutionary and politically self-determining forces which are at work in most countries of the Near East. If these forces, under the spell of Nasser's leadership, are aroused against American interests in Libya, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, they can cause much trouble, even if they might not in the end totally destroy the U.S. position.

But this mutual fear is more than a current mood, bred by recent experience. There are, in fact, good reasons for the United States and Egypt to suspect each other—reasons which have a long history. Each Nation has a bill of particulars against the other, drawn from the experiences of the last decade. It is this which forms the reservoir of suspicion from which a crisis of confidence is so easily drawn.

On Egypt's part, the first count against the United States is the unpredictibility of its policy. American-Egyptian relations since the revolution in 1952 amply illustrate this. In the opening stages of the new regime, America was closely and hopefully identified with it, believing that a change in social and political conditions was long overdue in the Valley of the Nile. This led to a "honeymoon" policy, when sympathy and identity of interests seemed high.

In 1955 this cordial relation abruptly changed, due to Egyptian arms purchases from the Soviets. Failing to secure military equipment from the West on acceptable terms, Nasser turned to the Soviet bloc. The American reaction was a reversal of policy, which now set itself to contain and separate Egypt from its Arab neighbors. This was the policy of "isolation"—a long cry from the "honeymoon" which preceded it.

This policy failed. The United States was unable to isolate Egypt, the Israel-Anglo-French invasion of Egypt brought Nasser to the summit of his influence in the area, and it became clear that some new approach was needed. In the aftermath of Suez, America therefore shifted to a line that was "cautious but correct," gradually reinstituting aid and seeking at least minimal normal relations.

Under President Kennedy, this was reinforced and expanded to become a policy of "selective cooperation" built on mutual interests. In no sense was this a return to the "honeymoon," with uncritical support of all United Arab Republic policies. Rather it was based upon a sense of mutual needs and a willingness to concentrate on these instead of on the many disputes which had soured past relations.

Thus in less than a decade the United States has followed four different policies toward Egypt. While each is defensible in terms of the conditions which produced it, the effect on the Egyptian is to create the impression that American actions are unpredictable, not built upon clear principles—indeed, not even built upon a consistent view of America's own interests. It is this penchant for change in the American course which makes the Egyptian reserved and suspicious of us, especially during a period when relations are good.

A second cause of Egyptian suspicion is the rapid rise of American power, particularly in and near the Middle East. Prior to the Second World War, the American presence in the Arab world consisted chiefly of missionaries, educators, archeologists, and a limited number of businesses, petroleum being the largest. The United States was a threat to no one; it had no bases, no troops, no fleets, and it displayed none of the panoply of power Arabs expected from a great nation.

This changed after the war. Beginning with President Truman's commitment to the defense of Turkey and Greece in 1947, the United States played an increasing role in the area. Military bases in Morocco, Libya, Turkey and Arabia, the powerful 6th Fleet always just across the horizon, support for the military establishments of Iran, Turkey and Greece, the landing of Marines in Lebanon—these were disturbing proofs to the Arab that the United States had become a military presence which could interfere with actions of the Arab States whenever it chose. What Great Britain once was, the United States has now become—the policeman of the world. Therefore the spectre of American might in the Middle East always lurks just offstage and Egyptians are convinced that at some unexpected point it will step from the wings to play the dominant role in their affairs.

This fear is fed by a third suspicion—that the United States is too often in league with the forces of "imperialism and neocolonialism." What the Egyptians mean by this is not (despite the paragraph above) that America will deliberately seek to create a Middle East empire. It is that we are damned by our association with the British and the "reactionary" Arab regimes. As to Britain, many Arabs believe that the present remnants of its historic position in the Middle East are supported by the United States. While at the time of the Suez invasion in 1956 the United States joined in condemning (and thus terminating) the Anglo-French invasion, within a few days we froze Egyptian assets in America, refused to sell food and drugs to Egypt, and ended the CARE program. Obviously, it is argued, America was prepared to support Britain as far as it dared.

This identification with "imperialism" is given more substance by our interests in and association with Arab regimes which the Egyptian considers "reactionary." By this he means the monarchies of the area and their governments which he claims do not represent popular consent or the interests of the people. The Egyptian argument is that these regimes are based upon an economic and political elite who keep power against the best interests of the common masses by cooperating with the foreign power having a stake in the country. He believes that the very character of the regimes in Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Libya (to name the current lot) drive them into subservience to Western, therefore American, power. This is the "neocolonialism" against which the nonalined world so frequently agitates as a threat to its untrammeled independence.

These three causes for distrust are brought to a focus in the problem that most continuously and deeply besets our relations with the Arab world—the question of Israel. There are many aspects of this tangled affair, but as regards American foreign policy the heart of the matter is that the Egyptian (and most of his fellow Arabs) believes that Israel exercises a veto power on American policy toward the Arab world. Whatever understanding of the realities of Arab life there may be in American circles, and however logically American interests can be served by at least an even-handed policy toward the Arabs, the Egyptian is convinced that when the cards are down Israel and its supporters can force the United States to make their interests paramount. Thus the Egyptian believes that no balanced American policy toward the Arab world can be permanent. Sooner or later it will run counter to Israeli interests, and when that happens, the U.S. Government is powerless to hold to its course.

So runs the Egyptian indictment. But Americans have equally deep suspicions of the United Arab Republic. Most basic is the conviction that Egypt and its President are compulsive meddlers in the affairs of their neighbors. Both openly and secretly they stir up strife, support dissident movements and seek the overthrow of regimes of which they disapprove. Even Egyptians recognize this and express themselves in one of Cairo's many jokes about the regime. According to the story, when President Nasser went to Algeria last spring, he took with him a number of movie films, one of his favorite forms of relaxation. Among these was "Mutiny on the *Bounty*." After seeing the picture, the President sent a cable to the Foreign Office saying, "Contact the mutineers on the *Bounty* immediately. Tell them we support their cause and any attack on them will be considered an attack on the United Arab Republic."

During the past 2 years there have been five instances of United Arab Republic meddling which particularly disturbed Americans. The first was Egypt's support for the coup d'etat which overthrew the Imam of Yemen. What began as modest help to Republican forces against the Royalists ended with full-scale military occupation of the country. Egypt eventually had nearly 40,000 troops in the Yemen. A second instance was the dispatch of United Arab Republic arms and technicians in support of Algeria in its border dispute with Morocco—and this at a time when Cuba was also getting into the act.

The third incident was the supply of small arms to the Government of Cyprus during the current civil war on that unfortunate island. While any government has the legal right to sell arms to another government, it seemed that Greek Cypriots had ample quantities of weapons on hand, both for their regular and irregular forces. What reason had the United Arab Republic to contribute to an already overabundant supply except the desire to fan the fires of conflict between Greek and Turkish Cypriots? And why did Nasser welcome Makarios so warmly to Cairo this summer, unless the United Arab Republic is more interested in perpetuating than in calming the Cyprus disorders?

The fourth instance is perhaps the most serious. In February 1964, President Nasser, in a public speech heard throughout the Arab world, called for the ending of British and American base rights in Libya. The response was an immediate public furor in Libya which came dangerously near to ending in the abdication of the king. Once again Egypt was interfering in the affairs of its neighbors, and in a form directly challenging an American interest.

Finally, there is the current Egyptian campaign against the South Arabian Federation and its British sponsors. Here is an area remote from the United Arab Republic, without visible impact on Egyptian security interests. Whether the Egyptian offensive is a diversionary ploy in the Yemen affair or a more general stirring up of trouble for trouble's sake, it only confirms American opinion that the United Arab Republic is always minding someone else's business.

This continuous "keeping the pot boiling" by Egypt causes serious problems for the United States. Not only does it have a number of specific interests in the countries involved, but its policy has been to promote tranquillity among Middle Eastern states. We believe that disputes, small in themselves, run the risk of inviting outside interference and so spreading into a major conflict. We do not want to see our friends in Arab countries threatened by Egyptian meddling and we do not intend to have world peace shattered by small-nation disputes.

The second set of American complaints against the United Arab Republic is related to the first. Egypt's ability to involve itself in affairs throughout the area is based in part on its military and propaganda strength, and this deflects money from urgently needed economic development. While not massive as modern armies go (about 150,000 men for a population of 28 million), Egyptian forces are the biggest and best equipped in the Arab world. Their weapons and aircraft are by far the most sophisticated. Egyptian secret activities abroad in the form of subsidies, weapon supply, and agents are large and continuous. These efforts are supported and extended by propaganda including subsidies to newspapers, writers, conferences, foreign students studying in the United Arab Republic, and an extensive multilingual radio program.

All this is expensive. It may be argued that all nations incur such expenses; they are accepted in our chaotic modern world as a necessary part of "national security" which costs us all so much. But the point for Egypt is that it cannot afford the role of a dominant or dominating power in the area and at the same time win its internal fight against ignorance, poverty and backwardness. Remarkable improvements have been made in Egyptian life under Nasser's regime, but it is still touch and go as to whether the Egyptian economy can permanently bear the burden. Why does the United Arab Republic insist on incurring a high bill for activities abroad when at least some of this money is so desperately needed at home?

A third general cause for American suspicion toward Egypt is the continuing concentration of political power in personal hands. This is what the American means when he speaks of "dictatorship"—not so much a theory of government (as fascism or nazism) as a practical situation which the fate of society and individuals is determined by one man or a small group of men upon whom the citizenry has no form of restraint.

It was to be expected that in the early days of the revolution, Colonel Nasser and his associates should become the de facto center of power in the country. But if a revolution is to be anything more than a coup d'etat, it must eventually broaden its base, diffuse its power and build a rule of law. None of these things appears to have happened yet in Egypt. Laws are promulgated by Presidential decree, there is no provision for a loyal opposition, and expressions of criticism of government policies are only possible within the very narrow limits set by the Government itself. The press is firmly controlled. At times private citizens are under sharp surveillance (as during the 1962 French spy trials) and guilt by association plays a large role.

All this does not add up to a police state in the full pattern so familiar in Communist countries. But it does have a profound effect on society, generating an atmosphere of unpredictability and curtailed liberty. Insofar as the American sees world issues as involving the principles of freedom and responsibility, he is suspicious of the character of the Egyptian regime and the direction it has thus far been traveling.

This suspicion is related to another American question about the United Arab Republic, namely its relation to the Communist world. The more extreme statements that Nasser is at least a crypto-Communist and that Egypt is in fact, if not in desire, a Communist satellite can be dismissed as uninformed and wishful thinking. But whatever its intentions, the United Arab Republic, as Americans see it, has put itself dangerously in fee to the Soviet system. The Egyptian Army is equipped from top to toe with Soviet weapons. This makes the nation entirely dependent upon Soviet good will for military spare parts and replacements. In fact, the Soviet monopoly on the Egyptian regime's chief instrument of power—its military establishment—gives the Russians an absolute veto on certain Egyptian policies if they care to use it. Whatever the United Arab Republic's dedication to independence may be, its freedom of action in relation to the Soviets is more sharply limited than it is in relation to the free world.

Added to this is the belief that Soviet and United Arab Republic policies in the Middle East too often coincide. A major Soviet objective has been to dispossess the Western powers of influence in the area, thus opening the way for Soviet action. The United Arab Republic would appear to serve this through its attack on the British position, foreign bases (which are all Western) and nonrevolutionary Arab States with which the West has close relations. Thus, while Egypt does not intend to be a Soviet satellite, its own activities sometimes aid and abet Soviet interests and cause problems for the United States.

Finally, there is Israel. Depending on the knowledge and emotional commitment of the American, his attitude ranges from seeing in Nasser the dragon who will devour Israel as soon as he is strong enough, to the more sober recognition that the United Arab Republic's continued hostility to Israel is the keystone of the Arab attitude which refuses to consider even a remote possibility of peace discussions. This concerns many Americans who are in no sense Israeli protagonists. Insofar as the Arab-Israeli dispute is a constant source of tension and conflict, its lack of solution is a constant threat to tranquility, progress, and stability in the Middle East. Many Americans want it settled, not because they favor Israel or the Arabs, but because they are thoroughly weary of alarms and excursions which periodically set the world's teeth on edge. If the United Arab Republic would exercise its leadership in the Arab world for a gradual rapprochement with Israel, everyone would breathe easier.

Accusation and counteraccusation—how much of it is strictly true? Only a detailed study of each issue would answer this, and then it would be seen that there is confusion as to facts and highly questionable judgments in the interpretation of them. But one thing is clear, when all the mythology has been extracted from the mutual causes for suspicion, a hard core of fact remains. Egypt has sound reasons for mistrusting the United States, and the United States cannot help but mistrust it in return. The crisis in confidence is real, not artificial, and it is the chief factor which must be taken into account by both countries if they desire to continue reasonably cordial relations to their mutual benefit.

Can confidence be restored? Given the causes for suspicion recounted above, it may be argued that this is impossible; the gulf is too wide and has been deepened over too many years to be bridged now. This is certainly true for the immediate future. Both parties need to understand and admit that the restoration of confidence is a slow business and that no sudden change in foreign policies will bring it about immediately. For one thing, national as well as personal characteristics are hard to change. Egypt is a revolutionary society and nothing the United States can do will alter that fact. All the problems of dealing with its ebullient and frequently embarrassing activities will continue and must be recognized as part of the given situation. On its part, the United States will not change its character as a leader of the free world with interests that frequently run counter to Egyptian desires. No matter what Egypt thinks or does, America will not place its own and its partners' security in jeopardy by turning a blind eye on any Egyptian activity which causes tumult in the Near East or appears to strengthen the Soviet position.

This is to say that both countries will get along better only if each is more realistic about its capabilities of easily and quickly influencing the other's course of action. Americans are prone to think that they can play God in Near Eastern (and other) affairs, shoring up or bringing down regimes, or by threats and economic pressure forcing the United Arab Republic Government to take actions which it judges to be against its basic national interests. And Egyptians equally exaggerate their limited ability to put pressure on the United States through propaganda, appeals to revolutionary groups in other countries, or agitation against American positions such as Wheelus airbase and the petroleum interests at the head of the Persian Gulf. Each country can damage the other, but neither can force a basic change in policy unless it is prepared to resort to overt action—and in this the United States is in the stronger position.

If this fact is accepted, it means that differences and clashes of interest between the United States and Egypt will continue for some time. The problem is not to wipe these out (which is impossible) but to curtail and contain their power to threaten a reasonable relationship between the two countries. For this both sides must be prepared to take some positive steps. For the Egyptians, there must be a greater appreciation that the public image they create in the American mind largely determines what it is possible for the U.S. Government to do. The United States is a democracy, which Egyptians do not fully understand. Neither the Secretary of State nor the President can sustain a policy toward Egypt (even when it is in the best interests of the United States) without some Egyptian help in creating a climate of favorable public opinion. When this climate is unfavorable, it is not because (as alleged by Egyptians) the American press is controlled by pro-Israel interests or American Senators who are captives of the Jewish vote. It is because of what the Egyptians themselves do. They can now do several things which will help their position.

One is to display more dedication to carrying out their word. Failure to make even token troop withdrawals under the Yemen disengagement agreement has seriously shaken American faith in President Nasser's bona fides. Actions taken against foreign companies in Egypt despite earlier agreements and promises have the same effect. In general, Egypt must work to correct the impression of undependability which its actions have generated.

Egypt can also affect the American attitude by emphasizing accomplishments rather than propaganda as its implement of influence in the Arab world. The sound development of the Valley of the Nile economy with resulting success in raising living standards will do much more to win Egypt a good reputation in the Middle East and abroad than strident and vicious radio broadcasts. The real measure of the Egyptian revolution's place in history will not be the extent to which it can outdo other Arabs in invective, but the degree to which it can stand upon its actual accomplishments of a better society. The Egyptian image as a responsible Arab world power has been badly damaged by its unceasing and raucous broadcasts.

Again the American attitude will be affected by the efficiency with which the Egyptian social and economic plans are carried forward. Great changes for good have taken place in Egypt, but great wastage of human and economic resources has also taken place in the process. American economic assistance has been large; but it is difficult to make the case for its continuance unless the Egyptian developmental process is tightened and foreign adventures curtailed in the interest of internal development. Economic conditions in Egypt are not as bad as many foreign observers would like to believe, but they are considerably worse than the Egyptian official admits. If the American is to be induced to continue helping in the remaking of the Egyptian system, he must be given more confidence in the process.

Then there is the difficult matter of Israel, which creates a continuing and most exacerbating strain in United Arab Republic-United States relations. Americans cannot expect Egypt to change its basic attitudes on this, any more than France can expect the United States to change its attitude toward Red China. But there are several things Egypt can do to ease the situation and thus create confidence in America, particularly in non-Zionist circles. One is to let its actions speak rather than its words. The Egyptian policy toward Israel over the past few years has, in fact, been encouragingly moderate. Nasser's public eschewal of aggressive military action as an answer to the current Israeli utilization of Jordan waters is a case in point. The trouble is that Presidential speeches often outrun Presidential policies. The Israel dispute is unnecessarily dragged in on every occasion and vague verbal attacks on Israel are taken at their face value in Congress and by the American public.

Even more important would be some steps by the United Arab Republic toward alleviating the arms race with Israel. It is the American conviction that this can be done without imperiling the basic security of the United Arab Republic. Acceptance of international safeguards in the development of atomic power and some willingness to consider means by which the arms level can be frozen at its present position would create a very favorable world reaction. Even if Israel did not respond, or respond fully, Egyptian leadership in this would go far to encourage the great mass of Americans both in and out of government who want only to see peace in the Middle East.

But the task of creating confidence is not Egypt's alone; the United States must also be prepared to make some changes. The first is a greater consistency of approach. American foreign policy toward Egypt has been so erratic largely because Americans—like Egyptians—react rather than act. They do not recognize that it is possible for two countries to oppose each other on specific issues while maintaining a continuing and mutually profitable relation. It is too often an "all or nothing" policy. Either American wheat buys Egyptian compliance to an American viewpoint, or there will be no American wheat. This assumes that the object of American aid is to "bring Egypt to heel," and that when this fails the only alternative is pressure totally to stop the aid program. This seldom works, and particularly it does not work with President Nasser. If the United States desires to protect such national interests as involve the United Arab Republic, it must be prepared steadily and quietly to pursue a policy that does not fluctuate like the stockmarket with every political crisis. American policy must be aimed at maintaining a relationship with Egypt, not on seeking pretexts to sever it.

This means that the United States must be more clear sighted in defining for itself and the United Arab Republic what its vital interests are. There is a confusion in the American mind—even among policymakers—between American interests and what Americans consider desirable. The latter is as broad as the moral values of the particular observer and includes a free press, the parliamentary system, private enterprise—or even the whole gamut of the American political system. Desirable as these may be to the American, they are not per se American interest, involving the essentials of national security. It is these latter which are the central concern of foreign policy and the American approach to the United Arab Republic must be made consistent with them.

It is as difficult for the United States to decrease suspicions generated by its policy toward Israel as it is for the United Arab Republic in the same situation. But the attempt must be made if American interests in the Arab world are not to suffer needlessly. The United States—like the United Arab Republic—has certain commitments in the Arab-Israeli situation from which it will not retreat. These include recognition of Israel as a sovereign and continuing member of the international community of nations and support for and collaboration with the United Nations in dealing with questions arising from the Arab-Israeli dispute.

Arabs need to understand and respect these commitments, as Americans must do. It needs to be made clear both in Congress and in sections of the general public that the

American commitment to Israel is limited. Our commitments are not based on the assumption that in every and all circumstances we will come to Israel's aid. Nor is Israel (or any other Middle East state) the chosen instrument of the United States in its policy toward the area. The basic consideration must always be what serves American interests in the Middle East. And this must be so regardless of its effect in helping or hurting either Israel or the United Arab Republic.

This principle is understood in policymaking circles in Washington and, in general, action accords with it. The difficulty lies in the sensitive domestic political situation. Often it is felt that Israel and her protagonists must be placated by public statements, even though these do not herald a shift in American policy. It is too much to expect that all politicians will resist the temptation to drag Israel into their election campaigns as a vote-catching device, but at least responsible Government spokesmen can take more care as to the place and content of their speeches. It was unfortunate that President Johnson's first policy statement on the Middle East was made before an organization identified with Israel, just as it would have been equally unfortunate if it had been made to a pro-Arab group. It would also help if American policy decisions involving Israel could be kept out of election campaigns, thus underscoring their character as considered moves based upon American national interest and not merely election gestures.

Difficult tasks are evidently involved for both parties. Many will say, "Why bother to attempt them, when the differences between the two countries are so continuous and exasperating?" The answer is that both Egypt and the United States need each other; their realistic national interests demand reasonably cooperative relations. This is why, despite the strains and vagaries of policy during the past decade, there has never been an irrevocable rupture. In each period of bad relations, as the point of no return approached, both parties paused, took a new tack and tried to repair the breach. In the aftermath of the Soviet arms deal the United States did not succeed in isolating Egypt and possibly bringing about its downfall; and Egypt, despite strenuous efforts during the same period, did not permanently hurt American interests in the Arab world. Both found their capabilities more limited than they thought and their mutual interests more powerful than they had admitted. They therefore gradually returned to a policy of fostering better relations.

It is these mutual interests which form the basis of an enduring relation between the two countries. Despite suspicions, clashes, and differences in policy, the United States and the United Arab Republic have concerns in common on which a reasonable cooperation can be built. Egypt wants to develop in independence, without becoming either a Western or a Soviet satellite. Similarly the United States, now increasingly recognizing the inevitability (and often the utility) of the nonalined position of many nations, is concerned to see Egypt independent. Egypt wants a better and more stable social system, with a rise in living standards for the masses of the Nile Valley. Here again American and Egyptian interests coincide; a stable Egypt is very much desired by the United States, for a major catastrophe there would have repercussions throughout the entire Arab world. To improve its economic situation, Egypt needs continuing ties with the West; even if the Soviet connection were to be increased vastly, the Soviet bloc cannot do what needs to be done for the Egyptian economy. And all of Egypt's foreign cultural, intellectual, and technical traditions are of the Western World. With them the Egyptian feels at home. To make this Western connection secure in both its economic and cultural aspects, Egypt needs good relations with the United States.

So long as the United States has vital interests in Arab lands and the United Arab Republic has a role of influence and leadership, the two countries cannot escape doing business with each other. The question is whether they can be sufficiently mature, clear sighted, and patient to work out gradually a consistent and mutually profitable relationship.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise to explain my vote on House Joint Resolution 234, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture.

A supplemental appropriation bill is normally a routine measure, requiring no explanation. This particular resolution would appropriate funds to carry out the food-for-peace program under Public Law 480. I support the program of providing developing countries with our surplus farm commodities and would, under normal circumstances, vote in favor of this measure without a second thought.

I have serious second thoughts about this particular measure, however, because one of the countries which would receive assistance under the funds to be appropriated is the United Arab Republic.

If this were a simple question of whether to continue aid to the United Arab Republic, I would vote to end such aid. It is time that this Government, in no uncertain terms, told other nations of this world that we will no longer give assistance to governments which are bent on aggression.

The United Arab Republic has repeatedly threatened to annihilate Israel. It is now engaged in threats aimed at the United States. How can such a country be considered peaceful?

The American people want peace—in the Middle East and throughout the world. But there is no peace in the Middle East and, indeed, there will not be because of the blustering warlike threats of Nasser and his Arab League associates who, fortified in the main with Soviet weaponry, have arrogantly proclaimed to the world that when they feel ready they will annihilate Israel. If Israel is annihilated, who will be next?

Despite serious misgivings, Mr. President, I intend to vote in favor of the pending resolution.

The resolution embodies a substantial compromise between the action of the House of Representatives and the wishes of the President. The House voted to eliminate any further shipments of surplus commodities to the United Arab Republic. The President desired a free hand.

The compromise we have before us would allow funds to be used to finance shipments to the United Arab Republic only if the President found it to be in the national interest, and only under the agreement of October 8, 1962, between the United States and the United Arab Republic. That agreement terminates on June 30, 1965, so we are only authorizing further shipments for less than 5 months.

More important is the question at issue of the powers of the President of the United States. The power of the Executive to carry on the foreign policy of the country was of such import that our Founding Fathers clearly provided for it in the Constitution. At stake here is the flexibility and viability of the office of the President of the United States, the very essence of the execution of the foreign policy of our country.

I have, along with my colleagues, been assured that a complete review of our aid to the United Arab Republic is being undertaken within the State Department. I have full confidence that the Secretary of State, who pleaded so eloquently before the Members of this body for the continuation of aid to complete the 3-year agreement, will determine, after the utmost scrutiny, whether the exportation of these agricultural commodities is in the national interest.

Mr. President, it is with these reassurances, and in the light of the devastating nature of the alternative, that I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the issue today is not whether we approve of Mr. Nasser and the reprehensible acts that have occurred, but whether congressional action cutting off food-for-peace aid to Egypt advances our basic objective to preserve peace in the Middle East and protects the security and freedom of Israel.

President Johnson believes that our policy of pursuing these goals could be furthered by not tieing the administration's hands in this matter at this time. He has requested support from the Senate on this, his first foreign-policy test of the session. I believe that he deserves that support.

Furthermore, I have been impressed by the fact that members of the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee have changed their opinion after receiving classified information about what can be accomplished by supporting President Johnson on this issue.

Therefore, I shall vote today to support the President—not to express my feelings toward Mr. Nasser—and I do so firmly believing it to be in the interest of the United States and in the interest of furthering our objective of preserving peace in the Middle East and preventing aggression against Israel.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, my position on the question of food-for-peace aid to the United Arab Republic has nothing to do with my approval or disapproval of the acts of that government, but stems instead from my strong belief that maintaining the President's discretion on the matter is the path best calculated to keep the peace in the Middle East and to assure the independence and territorial integrity of Israel.

The recent actions of Mr. Nasser in relation to this country have been insulting, and in relation to problems in Yemen, Aden, and the Congo have partaken of the kind of aggressive interference in the internal affairs of other nations that is inconsistent with fundamental American principles. Nevertheless, I feel just as strongly that President Johnson is right in asking that the administration's hands not be tied in this matter, and I am confident that leaving him free to act will further our primary purpose of preventing hostilities in the Middle East and protecting Israeli freedom.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is an agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], as modified, to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent because of Illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Seantor from Pennsylavnia [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 7, nays 75, as follows:

[No. 16 Leg.]

YEAS—7

Dodd
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Miller
Pearson
Prouty
Simpson

NAYS—75

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Bennett
Byrd, W. Va.
Curtis
Fulbright
Gruening
Hartke
Johnston
Kuchel
McCarthy
Metcalf
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Talmadge

So Mr. MILLER's amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have always supported the idea of a foreign aid program. I hope to be able in good conscience to continue my support so long as it serves our national interest and the interests of freedom in the world. Furthermore, I recognize the necessity of preserving executive flexibility in administering a program that involves such important problems of foreign policy and national security in a world of rapidly changing events.

Nevertheless, the increasing evidence of inefficiency, bad planning, contradictory policies, and plain bureaucratic blundering in administration of the aid program causes me to make my protest here and now. Our failure to effectively and properly use our aid program to expand private business sales abroad purely because of lack of policy, coordination, and planning urgently demands correction now—not next year.

I hope to see a substantial change in this program, a reconciliation of conflicting policies and programs, and a shakeup in the agencies administering it.

My only opportunity to effectively express my dissatisfaction is to cast a negative vote when an issue is before us. I am hopeful that an increasing expression of criticism of the program by its supporters will compel a substantial reevaluation of the program as well as a reorganization and streamlining of the agencies and methods of administering it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, after line 3, to strike out:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act:.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Parliamentary inquiries are not in order.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 17 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Eastland
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Mondale
Mundt
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—38

Aiken
Anderson
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cotton
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Harris
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
McIntyre
Miller
Montoya
Morse
Murphy
Nelson
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Simpson
Smith
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—18

Bennett
Curtis
Fulbright
Gruening
Hartke
Johnston
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
Metcalf
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Talmadge

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 21 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, at the end of line 20, insert the following new section:

"VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"No funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans' Administration shall be utilized for the purpose of implementing any order or directive of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the closing or relocating of any hospital or facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration or with respect to the withdrawing, transferring, or reducing of services heretofore made available to veterans."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I think I can briefly explain the amendment. It is not complicated; it is exactly on four squares with what we have already done today by approving committee action on behalf of agricultural experiment stations. My amendment has almost the identical language as that offered by the committee in relation to the proposed closure of a group of agriculture experiment stations primarily designed to cure diseases of cattle, hogs, poultry, swine, and rabbits.

If it is so important that such action on the matter of the research stations be deferred until Congress has had a chance to examine into it and I emphatically agree that it is, we have the same language in this amendment to provide for the same careful consideration for veterans. The amendment is offered on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself. I want to repeat that what we propose to do for the veterans is what has been done today with respect to agriculture experiment stations. The experiment station action was adopted unanimously by our Senate Committee on Appropriations following a motion made by Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, and seconded by the senior Senator of South Dakota. It was a wise and proper action and we should now take similar action to protect our veterans hospitals and service facilities.

The Mundt-Anderson amendment would do two things. It would delay the closing orders from being implemented until at least the next regular appropriation bill comes before us. It would provide us with an appropriate forum, namely, the Committee on Appropriations, to hold hearings, to call witnesses, to examine the facts, and to determine what, if any, economies actually can be effectuated, should the administration renew its closure proposals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join the Senator from South Dakota in his brief explanation. This is one way to cope with a problem on which no consultation was had with Senators from the respective States or the Representatives from the respective districts. I sincerely hope the Senate will vote in the affirmative on the proposal offered by the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Montana. This situation evolved out of a colloquy which the senior Senator from Montana and I had in the Chamber yesterday, when we were trying to divorce this issue from the question of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, under the practice of the Committee on Appropriations, prescribed by resolution adopted in 1931 and continued in force since that time, it becomes my duty to raise the point of order that this amendment, which relates to no matter in the joint resolution, but instead refers to appropriations heretofore made in other bills, is legislation and is, therefore, not subject to being considered on the joint resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota, of course, concedes the point of order. I said earlier that we were writing legislation in the joint resolution with respect to livestock. We are likewise proposing similar action in connection with our veterans' hospitals and service facilities. I filed a motion yesterday, recognizing that a point of order might be raised, so we can set aside the rules of the Senate and take this salutary action on the Mundt-Anderson proposal.

Mr. President, I ask that there be a vote on the proposed legislation, notwithstanding the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not yet ruled on the point of order.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall await the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair now sustains the point of order.

Mr. MUNDT. I appeal from the ruling, and therefore I call for a vote. I have no desire to detain the Senate. If there could be a standing vote, to determine whether two-thirds of the Senate favor overruling the decision of the Chair, that would be satisfactory. Otherwise I can ask for a rollcall as I mean to be sure we have an opportunity to vote on this amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to have a standing vote. I invite attention to the fact that this proposal is not like the previously adopted amendment. That amendment was approved by the committee. This amendment was not submitted to nor considered by our committee. The other amendment was directed by the committee to be brought up, with instructions to file the appropriate notices given to the chairman. That is all I shall say about it. I shall not address myself to the merits of the amendment except to say that there is little similarity between it and the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MUNDT. No, it is not necessary. I have filed notice to suspend the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rule for the purpose of having the Senate consider the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, we need not detain the Senate much longer, because the same sentiment that prevailed earlier on a question that required a two-thirds majority will prevail now, I am sure, on our proposed rider which now requires only a simple majority.

The country has about 22 million veterans at the present time. The closing order involves some important national policies concerning the veterans of America.

As the majority leader has pointed out, congressional committees certainly have a right to consider what is proposed. All I ask is that Congress be heard and the closure proposals delayed until such time as that has been done and we have before us the regular appropriation bill pertaining to the Veterans' Administration.

So far as I am concerned, I now ask for a vote on the amendment, unless other Senators desire to discuss the proposal.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there has been much discussion of the subject on the floor of the Senate about what we could do about the closings. The Senator from South Dakota has shown us exactly what we should do. It is an honor to support his amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the Mundt-Anderson amendment might well be termed the antipoverty and antihardship amendment, for it will have the effect of alleviating both these two evils.

Only hours ago the Senate approved the Appalachia bill which is designed to deal with some of the problems of the Nation's poor. The Appalachia measure has been surrounded by an aura of publicity calculated to show the compassion of the Administration for the underprivileged. It would serve us well to ascertain whether that compassion is fact or fiction.

Compassion is not a one-time thing that disintegrates and vanishes when the propaganda bugles have finished blaring. Rather it is a quality of sympathy and understanding that pervades and permeates every action of any consequence.

I leave it to the Senate, then, and ask, Does the administration have compassion when it initiates a plan which will for the first time in recent history deprive eight States of VA regional offices which serve disabled and in many cases impoverished veterans?

Does the administration show concern for the poor when, for a show of false economy, it takes out of a small community such as White River Junction, Vt., a payroll approximating $300,000 dollars a year and gives the displaced employees only the vague guarantee that somewhere in the United States there may be a job for them—admittedly far removed from home, admittedly at reduced levels with all the hardships that such changes would entail.

And what about the members of the families of displaced VA employees? Many of these people have jobs in private industry to supplement their husband's or father's income. Will they, too, get jobs when the VA employee is forced to move to a location not of his own choice?

I think Senators know the answer as well as I do.

What kind of games are we playing with Federal employees? Have they now become instruments that we can shift about at will in order to add to our list of depressed areas?

If you do not think that the proposed closing of 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries operated by the Veterans' Administration is going to cause great unemployment and hardships, then you are not willing to look at facts as they really are.

This, then, is the effect of the black thirteenth—the January 13th order of the Acting Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

In vaudeville days, Al Jolson used to say "You ain't seen nothing yet." These words have a rather ominous ring today.

James F. O'Neil, former commander of the American Legion, said only a few days ago in Rutland, Vt., that what we are now witnessing is only the beginning, and I think he meant the beginning of the end of effective service to veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Many of our older veterans have arteriosclerosis with chronic brain syndromes. Now they can go only a few miles away to White River Junction to put in an appearance in connection with their claims. These severely disabled veterans are met by Vermonters who take them to the proper offices and help to guide them around.

Under the "black 13th" order, these veterans with varying degrees of brain damage will have to go 250 miles to Boston. And who is going to meet them there, assuming that they are able to withstand the ardors of the journey?

Mr. President, how is any Vermont veteran, particularly an ailing one or an older one, going to be able to get down to Boston? There is no rail service from Vermont to the capital of Massachusetts. Air service is impossible a good share of the year because of weather and limited schedules, and from some communities in Vermont there is no direct bus service at all.

What a Great Society this Federal Government of ours is conjuring up for them.

The American Legion representative at White River Junction has reported to me that many Vermont veterans come into the regional office without funds for the return trip home. The Legion, he says, often tries to furnish the small sums needed to return these impoverished veterans to their home communities and this is true also of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans.

But, he asks, would not the cost be prohibitive if a trip from Boston were involved? The Legion simply does not have the funds to handle the problem.

Hundreds of older veterans with heart conditions and the like, are sometimes able, with difficulty, to withstand a 30-, 40-, or even 100-mile trip to White River Junction. In the "black 13th" order of the Veterans' Administration Administrator, there is no provision made for these veterans who will soon have to make long wearisome trips, often unattended, to Boston.

I cannot speak with authority about the problems of veterans in other States, but I do know what is going to happen in Vermont if the "black 13th" order goes through.

Let us suppose that a Vermont veteran is seeking to appeal a case in which he is asking for a small increase in pension. Let us assume, also, that his appeal is justified and that the Boston office awards him the small increase. Would not the monetary value of the increase be more than eaten up for a whole year because of the cost of the veteran's hotel room in Boston, his transportation, meals, taxi fares, and so forth? And let it not go unnoticed that in many cases the veteran will have to pay someone to accompany him because he is not well enough to make the trip alone.

When I first received word of the bad news of the black 13th, it was alleged by the VA that the closing of the regional office at White River Junction would not create any real problems because 98 percent of the workload is handled by mail. This was a very impressive statement but I found that it did not bear scrutiny. It turns out that the Veterans' Administration is not really talking about what percentage of the problems is handled by mail, but, rather what percentage of total communications is handled by mail and the VA lumps into this figure, according to the manager of the regional office at White River Junction, all mail received by that office whether it be administrative in nature, mail for patients at the hospital, mail dealing with supply problems, and so forth.

Let me give Senators an idea of how misleading this actually is. There are now on the books at the VA office in White River about 9,700 approved awards of disability or death benefits. Many of these awards have been made over a period of years and involved no new administrative work during the last year. Yet, despite this fact there were, during the last fiscal year, nearly 5,000 instances when veterans contacted the regional office at White River in person or by means other than mail.

Moreover, the central office of the Veterans' Administration in Washington informed me that veterans appeared in person only 20 or 30 times a year to make a formal or informal appearance before the adjudication board in White River. My office checked with Manager Flussi at White River and he told a member of my staff that there were between 200 and 300 personal appearances.

I am always willing to allow for a slight administrative error, but when an agency gives me statistics which are 1,000 percent or 1,500 percent wrong, then I think that the agency is trying to justify its actions without regard to ethics or equity.

At the present time when a veteran goes to White River Junction, Vt., if he has a clear-cut case which merits award, his American Legion representative can pull the case file immediately, set up a meeting before the adjudication board and the case is quickly handled. Once the regional office is removed from White River, the Legion, if it has power of attorney, will have to send to Boston for the case folder and the veteran will have to make several trips of considerable distance to get his claim settled.

Administrator Driver sent up to my office a Mr. Stratton, who is deputy benefits director. Stratton, when interrogated about the Administration's claims of economy resulting from the White River-Boston merger, informed us that there are about 12,000 square feet of office housing space at White River Junction and that if the merger goes through only about 4,000 square feet of space would be needed by the VA.

Later, when the VA was made to appear ridiculous, then and only then, its spokesman began to allege that much of the vacant space would ultimately be utilized.

I ask the Senate: Is it economy to abandon space in a low cost of living area such as White River Junction, Vt., in order to procure space in a high cost of living area such as Boston?

Mr. President, the VA cannot deny that only 7 or 8 years ago it spent several hundred thousands of dollars to construct an administration building in White River, and now it wishes to abandon a high percentage of the space in that building in order to bring about a move to Boston.

If this be a new version of administration economy, then Heaven save us when it becomes extravagant.

Seventeen regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries have been placed under the VA hatchet and one wonders whether it is really true in Jolson's words that we "ain't seen nothing yet."

It used to be a guiding principle that those who served their country in time of need would be served by that country in time of their own need. That principle is now being given the heave-ho treatment.

With those who left their limbs and lives and hopes and dreams in the remote battlegrounds of the earth, we should never break faith.

To those who abandoned their jobs, their education, their security, in order that our liberties might remain safe, we have a solemn duty.

It is not a duty to close hospital doors, but rather to open them. It is not a duty to delay the handling of their just claims, but to expedite them. It is not a duty to injure, but instead to promote their welfare.

That is a duty I as one Senator mean to fulfill to the best of my ability.

Only a few short days ago I was told by a representative of the Veterans' Administration that no hospital can function well unless it gets to the 400 or 500 bed level.

Did he really mean to suggest that the hundreds of hospitals throughout this country with small bed capacities are performing useless services? Let him peddle this ridiculous theory to the thousands of citizens whose lives have been spared and who can walk and talk again because of the treatment they received at the small hospitals he so blatantly ridicules.

If gigantic hospitals are the one and the only type of installation worthwhile, why then did the present administration fail to say this when the Hill-Burton program was under consideration?

I will tell Senators why. It did not say so because it knew that it would be laughed down by every small community in this country. And it is saying so now only because it is desperate to find some justification for a drastic program of curtailment of service to veterans that was conceived in ignorance, born of misinformation, and which, with good fortune, will die because of the wisdom of Congress.

I urge the Senate to support the amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 13, 1965, the date when I was notified of the Veterans' Administration's decision to close 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and several regional offices, the machinery to phase out these facilities had already been set in motion. Of course, I had heard rumors to that effect, but I do not believe that a Senator should base his actions on rumor. Yet, in the hearings which have just been held before my Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, we were informed by Veterans' Administration officials that they felt it only fair to formally notify us of this action on January 13, because rumors were spreading.

This poses an interesting question, Mr. President: Just when would we have been notified, if rumors had not prompted the Veterans' Administration to tell us as late as January 13 of its action? We were not consulted beforehand; neither were veterans organizations consulted. Are the Senators of the United States, given the trust to see that the laws and mandates of Congress are followed, now relegated to a position of hearing by rumor about a star chamber decision which we witness only when we finally see our Veterans' Administration hospitals being phased out of existence?

Mr. President, in light of the importance of medical care for the veterans of this Nation, a decision which could adversely affect them should not be arrived at lightly. Because of this, our Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee has just completed hearings during which at least 30 of my fellow Senators voiced suspicions about the wisdom of this decision. I understand that the House committee is planning to conduct similar hearings. Since our action on this matter was forced to be "after the fact," due to lack of notification and consultation, it will take time before we can reach conclusions on these closings.

Yet, the secrecy and rapidity of this transition has raised such a cloak of suspicion about the Veterans' Administration decision that something must be decided now, or else we shall again be considering such matters "after the fact." In light of this situation, Mr. President, I think it in the interests of the veterans and the general public that this action be held in abeyance until conclusions can be reached. If it is a sound program, it can justify itself at any time; if it is not sound, then much will be lost by having it completed before effective objections can be raised. For this reason, I am supporting the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment to prevent the Veterans' Administration from utilizing its present appropriation for the purpose of closing veterans' hospitals. The veterans of this country deserve the service which the veterans' hospitals provide them, and I am convinced that the VA's action in announcing the closings is inconsistent with that need. My examination of the facts concerning Sunmount, Bath, and Castle Point hospitals in New York has convinced me that these hospitals should remain open. The facts show that they are not obsolete, that they are not difficult to staff, and, most important, that they serve a definite need. The brief chance which I had to question the officials of the VA in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs demonstrated the need for the kind of full and free inquiry which the present amendment will give us time to undertake.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to stand in support of Senator MUNDT's amendment as it pertains to the Veterans' Administration facilities. It is my sincere belief that the whole story regarding the closing of Veterans' Administration facilities over the United States and particularly in my State of Wyoming has not been heard.

I want to emphasize my distress concerning the manner in which this matter was handled. A matter of this importance should warrant previous consultation with Members of Congress, the service organizations, and the veteran himself. I believe only shortsighted consideration of possible immediate savings dictated the orders to close. The many other conditions of service to veterans and short- and long-range additional costs to other State and Federal agencies were ignored.

The statement announcing the action taken to close the Veterans' Administration facilities mentions economy as one of the prime reasons for the proposed move. It is stated there will be a net savings of some $23,500,000 through this action. The relatively insignificant so-called savings of $23,500,000 in the fiscal year 1966 at the expense of the many services in so many widely separated places will make no real contribution to the President's social program which is projected in billions of dollars annually.

I am particularly concerned because of the effect of the proposed action on the veterans of my State of Wyoming. The contemplated action of the Veterans' Administration would move the major function of the Cheyenne veterans regional office to Denver, Colo. I am informed that of the 34 present employees, approximately 20 will be involved in the move. The case load being handled by the Cheyenne Veterans Center has increased and not decreased. Therefore, it is inconceivable to me how less than half a staff could handle the work being done by a full staff. It cannot be done and give the service the veterans and their dependents so justly deserve and were promised.

During the hearings before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it was stated by officials of the Veterans' Administration that additional funds will be requested for new and additional facilities. I oppose the shifting and not the sifting of Government appropriated funds.

In his budget message submitted to the Congress, President Johnson states:

> Our major emphasis in veterans programs should be concentrated on meeting fully our obligation to those who were disabled in the defense of the country and to their dependents and survivors.

I say "Amen" to this statement. However, since contrary action is contemplated by the Administration, in the words of one of the greatest statesmen of the 20th century, the late Sir Winston Churchill, I strongly urge the Members of this Senate, "to prevent them from putting the folly they speak of into action."

I fully support the amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] on their amendment which would postpone action on the closing of Veterans' Administration facilities until Congress has had an opportunity to review the subject. The veterans and their representatives have a right to a full and careful hearing on this important matter. I hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment in the interest of my fellow veterans.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to express my strong support of the Senator from South Dakota's amendment to restrain the unwise closing of Veterans' Administration facilities. In New York, the effective hospitals at Sunmount, Bath, and Castle Point have been performing essential medical services for the veterans in the surrounding communities. Closing of these facilities, as well as consolidation of operational regional offices of the Veterans' Administration located in major cities in my State will impose an unjustified hardship on the veterans in New York. The hard facts forming the basis for this decision and others have not been developed. I believe it is absolutely necessary that the burden of proof for the closing of these important medical facilities and the resulting reduction in services be squarely met by the proponent, namely the Veterans' Administration. Until this full justification in the name of economy is set forth on the record and properly reviewed, these unwise closings should not be carried out.

The alleged savings set forth in the record of hearings by the Finance Committee on the nomination of Mr. Driver and on the subject of the closings by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee have not been explained in sufficient detail, and we should not accept these closings without receiving a further explanation of the reasons. I sent a telegram to VA Administrator Driver on the day he announced the closing of these facilities, asking for a justification for the plan to close them by June 30 of this year. I have still not seen a full and detailed justification. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me that many Senators would be convenienced by having a voice vote this late in the evening instead of a yea-and-nay vote. Many Senators desire to leave soon.

I should like to have the assurance and understanding, however, that the conferees will consider such a voice vote as important a mandate to sustain the amendment if it is adopted by a strong voice vote as if it were actually adopted by a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope that Senators have noted how much business has been transacted today without the use of a unanimous-consent agreement. If there had been a unanimous-consent agreement, the talk in the cloakroom is to the effect that the Senate would have voted on the measure some time tomorrow afternoon.

I shall continue to object to unanimous-consent requests.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with further reference to the legislation we have just acted upon, as my colleagues know, New York State is the second largest producer of class I fluid milk in the country. I am, therefore, very much concerned over the reduction in funds in the administration's budget for the vital special milk program, funds for which are included in this bill. The 1966 budget request for this program is $100 million, while the fiscal year 1965 appropriation was $103 million. Senator HOLLAND, the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], along with many other interested Senators, have worked to insure that sufficient funds have been provided each year for this essential program. I want to assure the distinguished Senator from Florida and my colleague from Wisconsin that I shall continue to work just as hard as in the past to insure that necessary funds for the special milk program are included in this year's Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The record of committee hearings on House Joint Resolution 234 reveals that the fiscal year 1965 estimate of realized losses for the special milk program is $305 million. I would like to make it clear that any reduction in funds for this program would not only impose a penalty on low-income families, but might also end up in losses for the Government if purchases of surplus milk were necessary at 75 percent of parity.

I hope that the Appropriations Committee will do all possible to insure that sufficient funds for the special milk program are provided in the fiscal year 1966 agricultural appropriation bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I should like to query the majority leader as to the order of business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, there will be minor items considered tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening, it stand in adournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. It is then our intention to go over from tomorrow until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today I reintroduce legislation which has come to be labeled the truth-in-packaging bill. I do this on behalf of myself and Senators BARTLETT, DOUGLAS, LONG of Missouri, MCNAMARA, METCALF, MONDALE, MUSKIE, and NEUBERGER, and ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

It seems superfluous to take time now to argue the pros and cons of this bill. These are stated eloquently in six volumes of hearings held on the general topic. And this is the third time the bill has been introduced so its intent and provisions are no strangers to my colleagues.

Since the first hearings on packaging and labeling practices were held by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in 1961, many changes have taken place in our supermarkets which some would credit as benefits brought about by the very existence of congressional interest. The changes are praiseworthy. But to those who would cite these improvements as evidence of the lack of need for enactment of the bill, I would cite in reply these facts:

First. Consumers who must fight the battle of the budget weekly in the supermarket are not convinced that the few improvements have come anywhere near correcting all the practices the bill is aimed at. Witness to this are the hundreds of letters I have received in recent weeks from every State in the Union—from economists, marketing professors, and from the lady known as the smartest shopper in the world, the American housewife.

Second. President Johnson still believes the bill is necessary—as witness his economic report to the Congress of last week. He said:

> Informed consumer choice among increasingly varied and complex products requires frank, honest information concerning quantity, quality, and prices.

He added:

> Truth in packaging will help to protect consumers against product misrepresentation.

Third. The Council of Economic Advisers also sees a need for the bill. The Council said:

> All too often * * * consumers are not completely informed about products available and sometimes products are misrepresented, whether by accident or intent. Most of the responsibility for providing consumer information rests with private producers and retailers. But where the consumer is not able to obtain honest information, the Government has a role to fulfill.

The Council continued:

> Abuses have become acute in the packaging of products sold in retail establishments. In today's marketing system, the package has become the silent salesman. The truth-in-packaging bill would assure consumers of simple, direct, visible, and accurate information as to the nature of the product and the quantity in the package.

Fourth. One of the major concerns of the Congress these days is how to help those Americans who are suffering along on extremely low annual incomes. One expert estimates that the average family could utilize this bill to save approximately $250 yearly. That, I point out, would add more to the average worker's budget than a 10-cent-an-hour raise.

Mr. President, one more point should be mentioned in regard to this bill. One of the areas of concern about the bill as previously drafted was that it was proposed as an amendment to the Clayton Act. Some objected to this. These objections have been considered and this session we introduce the bill as a new law.

A few other minor changes have been made in the bill reacting to arguments against the previous bill which seemed to have substance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table for 1 week in order to give additional Senators who wish to cosponsor the opportunity to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not think it is necessary to ask unanimous consent under the circumstances. But, I wish to be heard on the matter of reference of this bill to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill has been before the Committee on the Judiciary. We have heard more than 80 witnesses over a period of 2 or more years. I shall probably address myself to the order of reference on tomorrow.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the bill, in view of this comment, will lie over, in any event, for 1 day. Is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a request that the bill lie on the desk until tomorrow?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the bill has been introduced with the request that it be appropriately referred and that it be held at the desk for 1 week in order that additional cosponsors may join.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let the RECORD show my reservation of objection. I have no objection to its lying on the table for a week. But I do have objection to its reference. I wish to address myself to that question later.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, under the rule, the bill would lie over for 1 day before reference. But, is it correct that the additional request that it be held for 1 week at the table does not affect the reference to committee?

I ask that in view of the usual language, which I note in connection with bills. When request has been made that they lie over for more than 1 day, reference is made to the fact that the bill nonetheless remains at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, of course if objection is heard, the bill could not be received today. It would have to lie over.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the presentation of the bill today. The distinguished Senator from Michigan has uttered some advance information on this matter. Therefore, I would have no objection. But, I do not want the reference to be made to the Committee on Commerce until I have been heard.

With that understanding, I would have no objection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be kept at the desk for a day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and for clarity only, are we to understand that the question of reference will recur tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the reference would be held over until tomorrow, and the question could then be raised.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mrs. NEUBERGER), introduced a bill (S. 985) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes, which, by unanimous consent, was ordered to lie on the table.

The following additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 986. A bill for the relief of Stevan Akocs, his wife, Rozalija Akocs, and their children, Carlos Akocs and Jorge Akocs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 987. A bill to reduce the excise tax on club dues and fees from 20 to 10 percent; to the Committee on Finance.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, February 4, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3, 1965:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3305:

To be colonel, Medical Service Corps

Frick, Edward H., O31160.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be major

Brown, Richard M., O61086.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Adams, Charles L., O95417.
Adams, Charles W., O97075.
Adams, William E., O96559.
Affourtit, Rene J., O92870.
Allison, William C., O92873.
Amick, Robert L., Jr., O92874.
Anderson, Bobby L., O95421.
Anderson, Jerome F., O95422.
Armstrong, Marvin C., Jr., O92883.
Arrington, Robert D., O96306.
Askins, William M., O96562.
Banks, Gary G., O96310.
Barber, Don W., O92895.
Bartlett, Harvey S., 2d, O96312.
Beadle, Norman L., O95119.
Beauchamp, Ramar K., O95434.
Beeman, Richard C., O99575.
Belanich, Joseph F., Jr., O92917.
Biggs, Danny J., O92935.
Bitler, William D., O92945.
Boggs, Carl A., Jr., O96323.
Bohls, Robert J., O95445.
Bond, Richard R., O88324.
Borneman, Edward L., O99795.
Bowers, George W., O92971.
Brewer, Charles R., O92983.
Brown, Billy C., O99799.
Brown, Keith I., O92996.
Brown, Reginald J., O93590.
Brown, Robert W., O95454.
Brownlee, Romie L., O95455.
Bruce, Gene D., O93007.
Bruington, Ray D., O95457.
Brumfield, Wetzel D., O93009.
Bunton, Terry, R., O93016.
Burke, Larry K., O95461.
Burlingame, John C., O95462.

Burtner, James R., O95464.
Butts, Samuel J., O96336.
Byrne, William F., O93055.
Campbell, David B., O93122.
Cappadona, Louis A., Jr., O94515.
Carter, James E., Jr., O95472.
Christopher, George L., O91173.
Coleman, Alan B., O93156.
Collins, Michael D., O95478.
Colson, David A., O93161.
Cone, Edward E., Jr., O93162.
Conner, Dan A., O93628.
Cook, Ronal B., O91335.
Cooper, Nelson J., O99495.
Corder, Joseph W., Jr., O97294.
Cote, Thomas G., O95483.
Counts, Ronald W., O99806.
Couture, John F., O93183.
Coy, Dale E., O93185.
Crane, James P., O95487.
Crockett, James R., O96352.
Crow, Stuart J., O99632.
Crowe, Charles E., O96354.
Davis, David L., O96758.
Davis, Joseph S., 2d, O95495.
Davis, Motier DuQ., Jr., O96359.
Dempster, Robert J., Jr., O96361.
DeWalt, Robert M., O95500.
Dill, Paul H., O99818.
Dinger, Timothy S., OF100258.
Dodson, Billie R., O93251.
Dondlinger, Jerome C., O99819.
Dorsey, James J., O96755.
Dunnington, Joseph C., O93277.
Durenberger, George M., Jr., O95510.
Dye, Preston C., O99829.
Eddy, Thomas F., O99831.
Eian, John N., O91718.
Elliott, David R., O99834.
Emge, William P., O96372.
Erway, Douglas K., O93301.
Eveleth, Robert G., O93687.
Farris, James L., O93320.
Ficalora, Paul B., O93338.
Firestone, Terry J., O93340.
Fisher, Donald J., OF100267.
Fleming, Roger S., O99644.
Frater, Arthur W., OF100269.
Freeman, Malcolm A., O99844.
Garner, John E., Jr., O96381.
Gerhardt, William F., O96384.
Gerst, Jackson C., Jr., O96385.
Gorman, Thomas, O97772.
Goulet, Donald J., OF101815.
Grindell, Chelsey V., O99854.
Gudat, Frank F., O95544.
Guinn, Jack L., O93468.
Guinn, William A., O95545.
Hagenhoff, Stanley R., OF100377.
Hahn, Wade E., O93472.
Haigler, Thomas E., Jr., O96392.
Halbritter, Frederick P., O94811.
Hale, William R., O93479.
Hall, Dennis C., O95548.
Hall, Thomas F., Jr., O93489.
Hamina, Robert K., O95549.
Hannan, William T., Jr., O92384.
Hansen, David G., O99857.
Harrison, David A., O99860.
Harrison, Phillip T., O93527.
Hartman, Benjamin C., Jr., O96395.
Hatch, George S., O94035.
Havlu, Don R., O99328.
Hawley, Gary D., O91734.
Heer, Bernard C., Jr., O94050.
Heinschel, Robert F., O94062.
Hendrix, Paul V., O94077.
Henry, Noah W., 3d, O94093.
Henson, Charles W., O95556.
Hicks, Billy W., O94125.
Highfill, Gary W., O94129.
Hilger, Charles N., O95559.
Hinds, Paul T., O94137.
Hines, Charles A., O94153.
Hintz, Norman C., O95560.
Hitti, John L., Jr., O99872.
Hobbs, Gary L., O94164.
Holcomb, Cecil B., Jr., O96409.
Holland, James R., O94178.
Hood, Brian C., O93202.
Horowicz, Richard E., OF100286.
Howard, John W., O94181.
Howard, Robert P., O94692.
Hurst, Curtis C., O95566.
Huser, Herbert C., O94185.
James, Arthur M., O95571.
Jarock, Norman F., O99885.
Jemison, Paul O., O96415.
Johnson, Charlton G., Jr., O89369.
Johnson, Thomas G., O91813.
Joiner, Robert E., 3d, O95579.
Jones, Donald H., O94908.
Jones, Malcolm W., OF100295.
Kallay, Michael T., OF100492.
Kingman, Dan C., Jr., O95583.
Kirby, Rance A., OF100523.
Kish, Joseph P., O99264.
Kitchings, Phillip, Jr., O96425.
Kobaly, George, Jr., O96426.
Koelsch, Raymond E., O95590.
Konopka, Thomas, O95591.
Kopcsak, George C., O95348.
Krebs, Joseph G., O99897.
Kuster, Bernard A., Jr., O95595.
Landrum, Benson F., O94363.
Larkins, John G., O95598.
Larson, Kermit E., Jr., O94369.
LaRue, Lowell G., O91996.
Lasecki, Ronald P., O94371.
Lee, Robert C., OF100307.
Leffler, Samuel A., O95600.
Leonard, William E., O93268.
Leonhardt, Thomas C., O94540.
Lewis, Bobby J., O95601.
Livingston, John J., OF100678.
Long, William H., O99682.
Lopez-Alonso, Juan R., O94212.
Luallin, John S., OF100202.
Lundy, James I., O94628.
Lunsford, Mirt S., Jr., O99683.
Lybrand, Charles W., O95608.
Mabry, David L., O95611.
Mackintosh, Eric I., OF100311.
Maher, Patrick J., O92670.
Maier, Nelson H., Jr., O94686.
Maksimowski, Richard J., O92672.
Markiewicz, Joseph, O92014.
Martin, Robert F., O99913.
Mason, Keith L., O94776.
Mason, Ralph A., Jr., OF100313.
Mason, Tommy R., O94789.
Mathern, Vernon J., O96439.
Matteson, Stephen C., O99914.
Matthews, Daryl B., O96440.
Maurer, George H., O94809.
Mayer, John H., OF100314.
Mayoras, Donald E., O94810.
McCoy, Ronald L., O96444.
McDowell, Thomas D., O96447.
McFarland, Lewis G., O94825.
McFerron, Darrel A., O94829.
McGregor, William L., Jr., O95622.
Meyer, Richard A., O97679.
Meyer, Robert W., O95628.
Miles, Donald F., O95630.
Miller, Robert L., O94821.
Mitchell, David G., O92720.
Moore, Calvin B., O95635.
Mottl, Richard J., OF100320.
Myer, Allan A., O99934.
Napier, Joseph S., O92071.
Napierkowski, Raymond J., O95644.
Neal, Clarke L., O99698.
Neisess, James A., O91237.
Newman, Harold M., O96460.
Newman, Ralph E., O95128.
Newman, William F., O95129.
Nolan, Donny R., O95645.
Oberholzer, John A., O95135.
Olive, Sergei V., O93871.
Olson, Raymond S., OF100324.
Oswald, Robert W., O95142.
Oualline, Charles E., O95143.
Owens, John V., O99701.
Paul, Leroy W., O96607.
Pendergrass, Larry L., O99376.
Perrin, William H., OF100330.
Pierce, Edward D., O96474.
Pierce, Robert V., OF100994.
Pippin, James D., O96477.
Portmann, Joslyn V., O95163.
Powell, Paul E., O95166.
Price, Carl N., OF100333.
Pryor, Robert W., O99960.
Queen, Charles E., O95169.
Quinlan, John L., 3d, O95663.
Raines, Austin M., O95171.
Randt, Richard C., O99962.
Ray, David E., O99364.
Redner, Paul C., O99964.
Reed, James L., O95177.
Remling, Arthur A., 2d, O95183.
Renigar, Frederick H., O95185.
Richardson, Hugh B., O95187.
Richardson, Johnny L., O97423.
Richardson, Joseph L., O98418.
Riggs, Harold E., O95189.
Riley, James E., O97855.
Ringham, Lee O., O95671.
Rippee, Eldon T., O95190.
Robertson, Robert S., O97965.
Ryan, William E., O94980.
Salerno, Jerry A., O95200.
Sanko, William J., O95678.
Saville, Duane E., O95679.
Sawyer, Frederick H., O95681.
Scharrett, William J., O99985.
Schmidbauer, James P., O95682.
Schmitz, James W., O95683.
Scruggs, James T., Jr., O99987.
Sebastian, Elmer G., O95685.
Shepard, John D., O96620.
Sheridan, John T., O95215.
Short, Alonzo E., Jr., O95689.
Silvey, Bedford J., O95218.
Sims, Thomas L., O95221.
Smith, Randolph L., O96506.
Smith, Richard F., O93508.
Smith, Robert P., OF100005.
Smith, Samuel W., O95225.
Sneed, Thomas A., O95226.
Snellings, David D., Jr., O95696.
Spaulding, William J., Sr., OF100006.
Spetz, Steven N., O95700.
Staehler, Joseph C., OF100007.
Statum, Herman C., O96510.
Stizza, John B., O95708.
Summers, Clark H., Jr., O96514.
Swendson, Joe A., O95715.
Sworts, Ned, O95716.
Sylvester, Carroll E., O95718.
Tate, Raymond A., O95242.
Tatum, Benjamin R., O95719.
Taylor, Carl S., O95720.
Taylor, Robert E., O96516.
Thomas, Billy M., O96517.
Thornton, Jack R., O96520.
Tippins, Gerald M., OF100018.
Tobin, Jacob G. W., O96527.
Toccafondi, Primo V., O95726.
Torres, Peter B., O95728.
Tucker, Charles G., O96529.
Turner, Harvey E., O95254.
Upchurch, Gilbert, O95730.
Vannes, Clayton L., O95260.
Varner, Thomas A., O95113.
Vaughan, Bernard W., Jr., O99752.
Velez, Agustin E., O94257.
Veselka, Reynold, O95263
Vivas, Ernest E., O96531.
Volta, Donald H., O99114.
von Hoene, John P. A., O95732.
Vozka, David, O95266.
Vucichevich, Ivan J., O95733.
Wagner, William J., Jr., O95267.
Walker, Charles R., OF100030.
Walters, Floyd J., Jr., O96535.
Walton, Elmer D., Jr., O95271.
Walton, Jamie W., OF100032.
Ward, John E., O95273.
Warren, Howard L., O95738.
Wassom, Herbert M., OF100035
Watkins, Leo F., Jr., O95740.
Watson, Neal C., OF100036.
Weber, James J., O95742.
Weber, Neal J., O95743.
Whitaker, Chester J., O95286.
Whitley, James R., Jr., OF101866.
Whittington, William R., O96546.
Wilbur, Paul A., O95289.
Wiley, Jerry D., O96547.
Wilkerson, Roger C., O96548.
Williams, Dock H., O95291.

Willis, Deral E., O95292.
Wilson, Lee B., O95749.
Wilson, Lester R., O96551.
Woods, James B., 3d, O96554.
Word, Larry E., O95303.
Wright, James A., O95754.
Wuench, Robert L., O96556.
Wulf, Bruce L., OF100049.
Yardas, Douglas A., O95306.
Zelez, Gordon N., O95308.
Zwicker, Gary L., O95311.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bell, George T., O96314.
Browning, Charles W., O96710.
Burch, Vernon R., O96952.
Candelaria, John J., O95467.
Curtis, James H., O93212.
Eppler, Larz D., O95513.
Fulghum, Joe R., Jr., O93412.
Gary, Dennis T., O93386.
Gerukos, John, O93402.
Gordon, Thomas J., O93442.
Grundstein, Amram S., O95330.
Hays, Walter R., O97128.
Holzer, Donald B., O92414.
Hunt, Dan W., O96987.
Johnson, Michael L., O95342.
Ketelsen, Keith D., O92441.
Lobingier, John H., O99907.
Lynch, Jeffrey G., O96436.
Mayer, Henry A., Jr., O97158.
McAllister, Hugh A., Jr., O92061.
McNeill, Douglas W., O97161.
Phillips, Robert E., Jr., O93269.
Ramirez, Oscar, Jr., O95172.
Roby, William W., Jr., O95674.
Rose, Robert D., O96494.
Rose, Walter E., O95675.
Rosenbleeth, Milton H., O96332.
Rowlette, Lemuel A., O95197.
Schiefer, Bernard A., OF100347.
Schorzman, Mark H., O99390.
Silverstein, Herman R., O97206.
Simpkins, Charles M., O95219.
Soberg, David A., O97039.
Tedrow, Thomas N., O95721.
Thompson, Jerry L., O95246.
Timberlake, John S., 3d, O97364.
Tolman, Joseph B., O96524.
Troy, Milton W., 2d, O96528.
Truscott, James J., O95252.
Williams, Charles M., O95746.
Wright, Robert E., OF101870.
Zimmerly, James G., O96557.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Cusick, Judith M., N3156.
Kisella, Mary A., N3100.
Whitman, Jacqueline K., N3150.

To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Webb, Annie J., M10200.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

White, Charles E. (SigC), O77773.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Carlson, Carl E. (CE), O89800.

To be first lieutenant

Sheridan, Richard M. (MSC), O94722.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Brannon, Buford W., O1080177.
Chancey, Clarence W., Jr., O964250.
Furrer, Robert C., O1338584.
Hyatt, Howard L., O1935862.
Riseborough, Charles M., O1922525.
Sapenter, Reginald J., O2206185.

To be captains

Adler, James M., O5301725.
Beames, Clare F., III, O1893275.
Blackwell, Cedric L., Jr., O5301830.
Bland, William L., O5302547.
Borum, Louis M., O4009763.
Bryant, Donald R., O5202213.
Bubon, John J., O4061442.
Burns, Billie R., O1890091.
Bussiere, Richard T., O5301587.
Cason, James P., O4047130.
Cataldo, Fulvio J., O2266988.
Champagne, Richard A., O4071209.
Daschle, Charles L., O4026377.
DeVilbiss, Donald R., O4010668.
Duke, Lynwood R., O4023902.
Everett, Robert W., O4012077.
Fargason, Leroy H., Jr., O4059160.
Ferguson, James C., O5502663.
Gieseke, Donald E., O4058299.
Graham, Harry C., O4074483.
Guglielmo, Eugene M., O5200886.
Hansen, James M., O4010412.
Holleran, Raymond F., O4034313.
Honma, Douglas T., O1932465.
Killette, James L., O4074402.
Klingman, Harold E., Jr., O4025562.
Lawrence, Ernest, O1936238.
Lenschau, Justus M. M., Jr., O5700210.
Lewis, Joseph W., III, O4084673.
Lindberg, Charles F., O1889049.
Lockwood, Bill G., O4006622.
Lowe, James W., O5301533.
Lyerly, Virgil T., O4083564.
Mantooth, John W., O1939728.
McCartt, James M., O4031086.
Melbye, John, O4031159.
Merritt, Ronald H., O4026628.
Miller, William D., Jr., O4009713.
Moye, Harold W., O4012178.
Mulvey, Francis P., O4009715.
Oden, Foster L., O4011949.
Parnell, Roy L., O4063814.
Paulk, Charles D., O5405183.
Platt, Richard L., O1880201.
Seldon, Felix L., O5502802.
Skulborstad, Glenn R., O2277200.
Smiley, Robert D., O4021071.
Smits, Robert G., O5503407.
Sorbet, John W., O1935401.
Sutherland, James C., O4032526.
Thomas, Stephen L., O4041884.
Turner, Clyde A., III, O5303252.
Vannoy, Claude E., O5405045.
Varoz, Roman, Jr., O4074340.
Viney, James L., O5301926.
Wakefield, Jack E., O1925579.
Winter, Robert G., O4085056.
Zieringer, Mathew P., O4074574.

To be first lieutenants

Abernethy, Robert J., Jr., O5008414.
Andrews, Anthony J., O5002967.
Archer, John R., O5314281.
Baker, Ronald L., Jr., O5514566.
Banks, William J., O5308543.
Becque, Peter A., O5510507.
Beebe, Merrell S., O5310215.
Bent, Robert E., O5405693.
Boyer, Albert J., O5211035.
Brauer, Paul F., O5009861.
Brown, Jerry L., O5512296.
Burns, Clifford H., O5213813.
Bushdiecker, William A., O5511874.
Butts, Don E., O5313770.
Candia, Ruben A., O5307315.
Carr, James A., O5307443.
Chapman, Jimmy R., O5410751.
Christensen, Don T., O2289329.
Copenhaver, Warren L., O5215460.
Corbett, John E., O5009952.
Cours, John D., O5411025.
Covington, Everett S., O5211640.
Cypher, Ronald P., O5208722.
DiCaprio, Anthony, O5211782.
Dobrzelecki, Eugene J., Jr., O5311434.
Downer, George R., O5211894.
Duckloe, John H., O5208148.
Dunaway, Fred C., O5405780.
Fish, Robert W., O5315084.
Ford, Randall L., O5313395.
Fowler, Calvin M., O5010161.
Gaffney, Richard L., O5307213.
Geisler, Burl O., O5705886.
Gentle, Gary S., O5308370.
Glenn, John T., O5310148.
Gooden, William J., O5215505.
Henderlong, James F., O5515142.
Hewett, James D., O5311169.
Higgins, John M., O5006674.
Hill, Howard D., O5515339.
Holder, Charles J., O5410867.
Holly, Frank D., Jr., O5212404.
Huff, Harold L., Jr., O5310036.
Johnson, Preston, O5409917.
Kam, David A., O5313382.
Lee, Philip L., O5409177.
Lewis, Ronald D., O5207636.
Lillvik, Carl V., O5313673.
Love, William H., O5210179.
Magee, David W., O5310097.
McGaw, Hugh R. L., O5409434.
Martins, Joaquim D., O5211073.
Maylie, John C., Jr., O5705320.
McCartin, John M., O5204834.
McGourty, Francis C., O5405802.
Mergner, George F., O5200089.
Moore, Edward M., Jr., O5310504.
Morgan, Lowell E., O5307505.
Murray, Hershell B., O5410480.
Murtha, Daniel F., O5705112.
Nicholson, Thomas L., O5307962.
Norris, Robert R., O5311495.
Osborn, Larry N., O5208466.
Perkins, Stuart L., O5310927.
Reinhard, Ransford A., O2293806.
Rittman, Charles J., O5512857.
Rizzo, Charles, O5310668.
Ruszkiewicz, John J., O2298329.
Rutledge, Gerald E., O5700983.
Schrauth, Michael R., O5005922.
Scott, Richard M., O5307140.
Shank, Edward L., O5513440.
Sheridan, Richard I., O5215021.
Sowle, Peter H., O5510551.
Stiles, Charles E., O5875187.
Stuessi, Dennis A., O5512516.
Suzuki, Daniel I., O5705492.
Swart, Oura L., O5508935.
Sylvia, William H., Jr., O5208124.
Theofanous, Angelo G., O5209187.
Turner, John M., Jr., O5213639.
Vaughan, Walter A., Jr., O5313117.
Voigt, Volkert T., O5008622.
Ward, William B., O5007798.
Watson, Vaden K., O5309966.
Wearden, Glen E., O5411780.
Wendler, Dale L., O5309963.
Wertz, Robert B., O5503567.
Weyand, John W., Jr., O5215171.
Whitley, Donwell D., Jr., O5405703.
Wilson, James E., O5211747.
Wooton, Windel E., O5210361.
Yazinski, Edward C., O5215332.

To be second lieutenants

Anderson, Edwin P., O5517192.
Bergeron, Paul R., O5012083.
Briggs, Donald T., O5406043.
Brooks, Joseph H., O5314331.
Burdett, John C., O5219625.
Bushong, James T., O5412098.
Carlton, Charles A., Jr., O5218841.
Caruso, Joseph G., O5320275.
Cebula, Joseph A., O5406205.
Craddock, Ollie C., Jr., O5406048.
Crews, Norman A., O5319638.
Donelan, James J., O5012050.
Donoghue, Glen M., O5515864.
Ernest, Marion D., O5406089.
Flebotte, Paul R., O5318172.
Frierson, Donald M., O5313177.
Haines, Charles O., O5208483.
Hammock, Millard E., O5317238.
Hoherz, Melvin A., O5530733.
Hovey, Roy A., O5517936.
Howerton, William R., O5413565.
Kampf, Michael E., O5316394.
Kennedy, John L., O5709183.

Lippincott, William R., Jr., O5014176.
Livingston, David R., O2308527.
Mahalik, Paul D., O5219047.
McCold, Frederick E., O5219048.
McCullough, Joe G., O5317445.
Michles, Earl R., O5413211.
Moore, Julius B., Jr., O5406064.
Morrison, Carlos S., O5216296.
Pennywell, Johnson E., O5413785.
Pilgrim, Mark T., O5014365.
Plymale, Charles F., O5217094.
Powell, Horace W., O5317253.
Prather, Thomas L., Jr., O5218456.
Putman, Gerald H., O5413542.
Ruppenthal, Harry L., O5517476.
Samples, Watson L., O5320075.
Showalter, James V., O2308574.
Stack, Lawrence R., O5531005.
Stock, Lawrence W., O5516102.
Sydes, Thomas A., O5406119.
Tysdal, Thomas P., O2309017.
Vejar, Ray J., O5707070.
Wilkins, Harold H., O5216325.
Williamson, Clyde T., Jr., O5313157.
Wittbrodt, Thomas A., O5517471.
Wood, Smythe J., O5211691.
Woulfe, Robert J., O5413078.
Wurm, Charles M., O5015930.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and branches specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

To be major, Medical Corps

Salcedo, Jose R.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Bluemle, Madeline L., N901686.
Garbett, Jean A., N902242.

To be captains, Chaplain

Bell, Arthur F., O4070659.
Bell, Berdon M., Jr., O4063186.
Stevens, Ernest L., Jr., O2200941.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Combs, Frank F., O5518980.
Johnson, Billy, O5518093.
Mayotte, Richard V., O5518827.
Solo, James A., O5315699.
Takala, John A., O5518891.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Daniels, David C., O5217720.
Ferry, Darwin J., Jr., O2300697.
Fortini, Glenn E., O5706091.
Gemma, Frank E., O5219355.
Hutton, John E., Jr., O2313027.
Koebele, Eberhard, O5706107.
Macdonald, Joseph C., O2311575.
McKendell, Lawrence V., O5707189.
Moore, William L., Jr., O5312921.
Pierce, Joseph A., Jr., O5315697.
Thomas, Ernest M., Jr., O5707262.
Yhap, Edgar O. G., O5004937.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

May, Ralph J., Jr., O2298689.
McBride, Victor G., O2296294.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Kelly, John B., O2288592.
Massey, Robert A., O4074720.
Retzlaff, Donald H., O4060195.

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

Capacio, Marguerite L., L1010749.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Borg, Naldean J., N5501975.
Hiers, Frances A., N2298683.
Soper, Linda A., N5411329.
Vuyk, June J., N5411286.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Hansen, James E., O2300188.
Johnson, Paul E., O2308998.
Martin, Richard K., O5217751.
Piskura, Joseph H., O5208196.
Woehr, David J., O2309561.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Almquist, Tod F., O2313927.
Baker, James E., O2313527.
Carabin, Dan L., O5414782.
Chandler, Norbet F., O2311523.
Malinoski, Joseph C., O2311224.
Phalen, James R., O2311791.
Rice, Leonard E., Jr., O5205634.
Von Kiparski, Hans, O2315039.
White, Charles A., Jr., O5215881.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Brazinsky, John H., O2316913.
Wagner, Kenneth J., O5507244.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Dolbier, James A., O2298921.
Lamke, Charles L., O5509725.
Lillard, Joseph K., O5215041.
Oberhofer, Thomas R., O5507201.
Rasmusson, James A., O2298337.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Seedle, Clyde D., O2312599.
Sims, James E., O2309551.

To be second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Webster, Norma J., N2314333.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Baggett, John A., O2314493.
Gmelich, James R., O5512319.
Hardgrave, Newt L., O5414517.
Harrington, Jack O., Jr., O5413591.
Kishimoto, Richard A., O2307664.
Picone, Gaspare P., O2311812.
Walker, Jimmy, O5413827.
Williams, David G., O2311693.
Yamanouchi, Kenneth K., O5708006.

To be second lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Bransford, Ann H., L5322581.
Hery, Te-Ata R., L2314103.
Zimmerman, Mary Lou, L2313744.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Adams, William D., O5226394
Baines, Tyrone R.
Boehle, Daniel F.
Burlingham, Robert G.
Curtin, Thomas V.
Deger, Robert J. Jr.
Ferguson, Scott K.
Jones, Joseph B.
Jordan, Charles F.
Kennedy, George T.
Kramer, Kenyon K.
Lemieux, Edward C.
Lichte, Jack R., Jr.
Lynch, Edward F.
Markle, Brian C.
Matheney, Dennis S.
Medaugh, Robert A.
Millea, Daniel J.
Murphy, William D.
Parker, Thomas A.
Pommett, Francis A., Jr.
Saramanidis, Steven
Schnabolk, Howard J.
Scott, James A.
Sorensen, Wayne B.
Stees, Jack L.
Wear, Flavil L.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Adamowski, Paul L.
Adams, James B.
Adsit, Stanley L.
Aebischer, Louis J., Jr.
Aitken, John D., II
Alexander, Edward G.
Allcorn, William A.
Allen, John W., Jr.
Almes, Edward W.
Anderson, David L.
Anderson, Larry L.
Anderson, Robert B.
Arensdorf, David W.
Arey, Chester M.
Arico, Eugene
Armstrong, Grant W.
Arterberry, John D.
Arthur, Robert K.
Ayres, Larry F.
Bailey, Kenneth D.
Baldwin, Eldon C.
Banister, Alan H.
Barie, John P.
Barlow, Gregory P.
Baron, Anthony S.
Barrington, Donald.
Bartosik, Harry J., Jr.
Baseler, Robert W.
Baxter, Richard P.
Behne, James R.
Bellia, Matthew
Belt, Richard L., II
Benton, Norman W.
Berman, Barry A.
Berry, Robert H.
Bezek, Robert J.
Black, Elbert C., III
Blodgett, David S.
Blood, George H.
Boese, Frederick G.
Bondurant, William C.
Bouchard, Raymond E., Jr.
Bourne, Charles A., Jr.
Bowers, Norman L.
Braccia, Joseph C.
Braithwaite, Raymond G.
Braswell, Donald C.
Briganti, Francis L.
Brinkley, Barry A.
Briscoe, Charles H.
Brockstedt, Martin J.
Brooke, Ronald M.
Brown, Barry M.
Brown, Charles W., Jr.
Brown, Stephen W.
Brueckmann, Jan C.
Bryant, Michael W.
Buckley, John R.
Bunton, David D.
Buono, Michael J.
Burchett, Kenneth E.
Burke, Charles F.
Burres, Stephen W., Jr.
Burton, Gail O.
Bush, Joseph E.
Butler, James E.
Butner, Henry C.
Byerly, Paul J.
Byrne, Patrick C.
Caggiano, Anthony F.
Callarman, William G.
Campbell, Charles O.
Capps, Freddie L., Jr.
Carpenter, Bernard R.
Carpenter, Joseph E., Jr.
Carr, Freeman A., O5019523
Carr, Michael T.
Cashman, Richard M.
Chapman, Thaddius
Cheatham, Calvin W., Jr.
Childs, Richard E., Jr.
Chiles, Wayne D.
Clark, Alton A.
Cole, Carlos E.
Cole, Michael W.
Collins, Patrick W.
Cook, Jack C., Jr.
Cook, Theodcre L.
Coppolino, Ronald V.
Corson, Fred W., II
Cox, Calhoun W., Jr.
Cox, Robert S.
Cozens, George D., Jr.
Crittenden, John B.
Crittendon, William S., Jr.
Cross, Belford E., Jr.
Cummings, Donald L.
Czarniecki, John J.
Dacey, Bertrand J.
Daley, Victor N.
Dalton, William C.
Darnell, Robert T.
Davidson, Henry A.
Davis, Richard H.
Deakin, Craig E.
Deist, Robert P.
Dent, Charles A.
Dent, Norman M.
Devney, Alan E.
Di Matteo, Joseph R.
Diperno, Donald V.
Dobson, Ronald W.
Donsbach, William J.
D'Orso, Joseph V.
Dortch, William R.
Duck, Theodore A.
Duffy, Patrick M.
Dumont, Wayne R.
Eames, Jeremiah F.
Earle, Oliver P., III
Echols, Eugene W., Jr.
Emerson, William K.
Evans, Frederick H.
Evans, James L.
Evans, Russell S., Jr.
Evans, Walter L.
Everett, William W.
Ewing, Peter C.
Falke, William P.
Farrell, John B.
Faulkner, Donald S.
Faulkner, William L.
Feret, John M. E.
Fielden, Larry E.
Finn, Russell N.
Fitt, Charles B.
Flagg, Lewis N.
Flesch, Joseph E.
Fletcher, Roland G.
Ford, Robert L.
Fordiani, Daniel C., O5224228
Francis, Jerry D.
Frazier, Claude W.
Friedman, Daniel J., Jr.
Fuller, John D.
Fulton, George R.
Gagne, Herbert F., Jr.
Galebach, William D.
Gallagher, William A.
Gardner, Robert H.
Gibbons, Richard F.
Gibson, Donald A.
Glass, Maurice J., Jr.
Goodbary, Robert A.
Goodhart, Raymond R.
Goodloe, Albert T., II
Goolsby, James D.
Gordon, Clark G.
Gorka, Paul
Graham, Joe D.
Grant, John H.
Green, Gary L.
Griffard, Bernard F.
Griffin, Karl R.
Griffin, Peter J.
Grigalunas, Thomas A.
Gruggel, Carl A., III
Gunter, Terry A.
Habersberger, Albert J.
Haddad, Alan H.
Hagen, John F.
Haley, Richard L.
Hall, Conrad M.
Hammar, Peter L.
Hammond, Joseph P.
Hanf, Richard J.
Hansen, John R.
Happe, Robert W.
Harmeyer, George H.
Harold, Robert S.
Harry, Robert E.
Hartford, Thomas F.
Harvey, Frederick W.
Hastings, Hugh W.
Hawes, Thomas J.
Hawkins, Arthur G.
Heaston, William P.
Heelan, Richard A.
Hendrix, James E.
Hergen, James G.
Heslin, John G.
Hiett, Ronald S.
Hill, John J.
Hillquist, David K.
Hoffman, Kenneth C.
Hogler, James L.
Holbrook, William A.
Holder, James R.
Holford, Jack D.
Hollenbeck, Douglas B.
Hollister, Dennis J.
Hopgood, Daniel K.
Hopkins, William C.
Horn, James A., Jr.

Hough, Charles P.
Hubble, James A.
Hugus, David K.
Hupp, Dennis J.
Hurley, William J.
Hunt, Norman J., Jr.
Huse, James G., Jr.
Hyland, Thomas W.
Ingate, Jerome T.
Jablonsky, Edmund A., Jr.
Jackson, William H.
Jacubec, George P., Jr.
Jandreau, James L.
Jatnieks, Girts U.
Jaunitis, Juris
Jeffrey, David C.
Jeffries, Lewis I.
Jempson, James R.
Jester, John N., Jr.
Jobert, William A.
Johnson, Ernest L., III
Johnson, James R.
Johnson, Jay F.
Johnson, Kenneth E.
Johnson, Lehman H., III
Johnson, Wesley L.
Johnston, William V., III
Jones, Donald E.
Jones, James K.
Jones, Mills G.
Jordan, John M., Jr.
Jordan, Kenneth R.
Josey, Grover A., Jr.
Judd, John R.
Kahn, David S.
Karp, Andrew T.
Katin, Jon D.
Kellock, James A., Jr.
Kelly, John H.
Kelly, Kenneth F.
Kelsey, James H. P.
Kelsey, Ronald G.
Kennedy, George M., III
Kenney, Robert A.
Kidd, Franklin F., III
Kiernan, Thomas G.
Kimak, Michael D.
Kimbrough, Robert W.
King, Felix D., Jr.
Kline, Edward M.
Knight, Reid M.
Knirk, Ernest P.
Kobes, Eugene H.
Koga, Marvin R.
Kohoskie, Stephen E.
Krajniak, Charles A.
Krane, Ralph J.
Kruszewski, Joseph A.
Kulicki, John M.
Kuntzman, John C.
Laidman, David G., O5226741
Lake, William A., Jr.
Lane, Michael H.
Lanning, Forest D.
Larrabee, Willis F., O5224240
Laurence, Benedict E.
Laux, James H.
Law, Robert M.
Lawrence, Gordon C.
Lawson, Roger W.
Laycock, Richard J.
Leake, Sanford E., Jr.
Leatherwood, James M.
Lee, Robert E.
Lenderman, William, III
Linderman, Dean
Linley, John C., Jr.
Linnemeier, William D.
Lippay, Andrew P.
Little, Robert D., O5226131
Loeper, Charles P.
Logan, Thomas M.
Loomis, Robert L.
Lorenz, Albert
Love, Earl R.
Ludwig, William J.
Lund, Donald A.
Lyman, David A.
Lynch, James Q.
Lyttle, David A.
MacHarrie, William R.
Mack, Robert J.
Maiden, Douglas W.
Malaney, Dempsey L.
Malcolm, Jerry D.
Malone, James E.
Mandulak, John P.
Marksity, Ronald E.
Marold, George A.
Marshall, Grayson W., Jr.
Martin, John E.
Martin, Kenneth J.
Mattson, Bruce F.
Matthews, Stephen K.
Mayton, Joseph H., Jr.
McCarthy, Verlin L.
McColl, Winston F.
McConnell, Brian C.
McConnell, James T., O5323662
McCracken, Robert A.
McCumber, Irwin H.
McDonough, Edwin J.
McElroy, John J.
McGill, Howard L., Jr.
McGreevy, Michael E.
McMullan, Joseph C.
McShea, George M.
Melgard, Stephen C.
Merrill, Aubrey R., Jr.
Merritt, Frederick M., II
Metts, Isaac S., Jr.
Michel, William L.
Miller, James L.
Miller, Nathan N., Jr.
Miller, Ronald A.
Miner, Edward L.
Mitchell, Brent N.
Moberly, Kenton D.
Molin, Alton A.
Monahan, William J., O5534287
Montgomery, Joel E.
Montgomery, Paul D., O5323822
Montopoli, Jerome P.
Moore, Easley L., Jr.
Mooza, George R.
Moren, Jan W.
Moroney, John F., III
Mosakewicz, Felix J.
Mullaney, Walter E.
Muller, Bernhard J., Jr.
Murphy, Michael A.
Murphy, Richard F., III
Nartowitz, Edward S.
Nelson, Gary E.
Nelson, Jack E.
Newman, Robert F., Jr.
Newman, Robert L.
Neyer, John A.
Nicholls, Roger G., Jr.
Nichols, Joseph W.
Niedermeier, Bart W.
Nizolek, Martin C.
Norman, Forrest A., Jr.
Norris, Ethan R.
Norton, Gary J.
Obenchain, Ronald L.
Oberbeck, Keith M.
O'Connell, Edward W.
O'Connell, John J., Jr.
Orgain, Albert M., IV
Orr, Wallace C.
Ossorio, Peter M.
Ostlund, Donald T.
Otto, Thomas W., Jr.
Paju, Enno
Palmer, Robert R.
Pearson, David M.
Peary, Timothy H.
Pecce, Jan L.
Perryman, Gary M.
Pevenstein, Jack E.
Phelps, Dean A.
Pickup, Dana R., Jr.
Piper, John D.
Plaza, Richard J.
Popely, Paul E.
Potter, James V.
Poucher, James A.
Powers, Barry E.
Prehar, Bohdan, O5534439
Priestley, Robert R.
Quekemeyer, Henry B., Jr.
Radin, David A.
Rafter, David J.
Rampmeier, William A.
Rau, James J.
Rawlerson, Franklin S.
Ray, Larry H.
Rayback, James M.
Raymond, Daniel A., Jr.
Reagan, John E.
Rebold, Peter M.
Rector, David W.
Reinecke, Paul S., III
Rennie, David A.
Rhode, LeRoy E.
Riccabona, Steven V.
Rice, Richard A.
Rice, Robert R., III
Ricketts, Ormonde B.
Riddell, John M.
Riley, Richard E.
Ringer, Gordon J., Jr.
Risi, Anthony P., Jr.
Rivers, Robert D.
Roark, Thomas E.
Robertson, Alan R.
Roerty, Gerard J.
Rogan, Dennis W.
Rogers, John B.
Rosenheim, Harry T., III
Rossetti, Nicholas J., Jr.
Rubin, George F.
Rueger, Carlisle F., II
Ruth, Robert C.
Ryan, William F., Jr.
Rzepecki, Franklin J.
St. Germain, Henry J.
Sager, Wayne K.
Saliny, Dennis E.
Saponaro, Peter P.
Schafer, William L., Jr.
Schallenberger, Morris G.
Schauss, Charles T.
Schmelzer, Henry L.
Schnur, Dess E.
Scott, James L., Jr.
Scott, Robert H.
Scott, Wilmore S., Jr.
Sexton, Timothy J.
Shaw, Hubert S., Jr.
Sherman, Dennis D.
Sherman, Frank W.
Sherman, William A., Jr.
Shtogren, Thomas A.
Siegel, Charles L., Jr.
Simonds, Donald T.
Skidmore, David F.
Slaughter, Frank L., Jr.
Smith, Alan D.
Smith, Daniel A.
Smith, Michael J.
Smoluk, John J., III
Snyder, Robert A.
Southworth, Robert M.
Souza, Howell H., Jr., O5800475
Sparaco, Donald L.
Spiegel, Dennis J.
Spillane, Joseph A.
Spina, Charles
Sprague, Robert F.
Stadler, Richard J.
Stalker, Jesse R., Jr.
Stamillo, Michael E.
Starbuck, Todd R.
Stenger, James D.
Steuber, Thomas P.
Stewart, Samuel B., II
Stills, John D.
Strovas, Louis, Jr.
Stull, Michael D.
Sullivan, Raymond C.
Sullivan, Thomas H., Jr.
Sunshine, Michael D.
Surles, Thomas B.
Sutherland, Jack L.
Suydam, Martin J., Jr.
Tabar, Roger G.
Tabb Robert D.
Tamber, Stephen I.
Tarowsky, Edward G.
Taylor, Louis N.
Tedrick, William D.
Teigen, William K.
Tepper, Elliott I.
Thesing, John H., III
Thomas, David F.
Thomson, James L. H., III
Thornhill, Frank W., Jr.
Thornton Robert J.
Tiedje, Charles P., Jr.
Tilghman, Philip B.
Timmons, Richard F.
Troutman, Howard T.
Tuohig, Paul J.
Turnbow, Woody W.
Valentine, Dennis W.
Vasquez, Leopoldo R., Jr.
Vaughan, Thomas E.
Vernier, Roger A.
Viele, Frederick O., II
Voto, Fredric A.
Wagda, Joseph A., Jr.
Walker, Joseph, Jr.
Walker, Paul D.
Walker, Rex I.
Walsh, Gerard P.
Ward, Nathaniel P.
Watts, Phillip M.
Webb, Rockwell C.
Weigand, Donald A.
Wells, Owen W.
Westover, Dennis W.
Whaley, Robert E.
Wheeler, Thomas H.
Whirl, Robert G.
Whitaker, McKenzie.
White, Larry D.
White, Randolph C.
Whitesell, Thomas C.
Whitfield, Steven K.
Whittaker, Tom S.
Wilkerson, John R.
Wilkinson, Robert A., Jr.
Williams, Don E.
Williams, Hugh A.
Williams, Samuel I.
Wilmeth, James L., III
Winch, Jack J., Jr.
Wolfe, Ira M.
Wood, Marcus G.
Wright, Donald L.
Wright, Robert W. G.
Yaghoobian, Charles, Jr.
Yeary, John T.
Zak, William E.
Ziegler, John H.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

Wymberley Coerr, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named person to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy as an assistant professor with the grade indicated:

To be lieutenant commander

John D. Crowley

The following officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade indicated:

To be lieutenant commander

Thomas H. Rutledge

To be lieutenants

Roger V. Millett
Timothy J. Howard
Paul Resnick
Robert W. Davis
Fred M. Lane
Walter N. Warschun

The following officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade indicated:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Marcus J. Wallace
William H. Tydings
James F. Hunt
Branson E. Epler
Stephen L. Richmond

The following officer of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be captain

Otto E. Graham, Jr.

The following officers of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be commanders

John D. Crowley
Carl W. Selin

The following officer of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be lieutenant commander

Ronald A. Wells

The following retired officer recalled to active duty for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be lieutenant commander

Ellis P. Ward

The nominations beginning Walter R. Goldhammer to be lieutenant commander, and ending Albert E. Kaufmann, Jr., to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26, 1965; and

The nominations beginning Douglas D. Vosler to be captain, and ending Thomas E. Brown to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26, 1965.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tribute to Dr. James Mercer Tribble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago Dr. James Mercer Tribble came to Senoia, Ga., established his office, and began the practice of medicine.

On February 1, 1965, friends, family, and patients filled a large auditorium to honor him and to express appreciation and gratitude for his years of service.

Dr. Tribble knew that something was taking place, but he did not know what it was. He was surprised almost to the point of being overwhelmed when cousins, sisters, brothers, children, and grandchildren arrived to play their roles in a "This Is Your Life" type of program.

The entire community participated in the planning of this tribute to Dr. Tribble. Many of the community leaders, especially younger men and women, worked tirelessly to plan and present this program. It was my honor, privilege, and pleasure to be present and to actively participate in his community's expression of appreciation.

His services as a dedicated physician, citizen, soldier, and community leader are in accordance with the highest of American tradition. It is with pleasure that I include as a portion of my remarks a letter which I read and which was presented to Dr. Tribble on this occasion:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1965.

Dr. JAMES M. TRIBBLE,
Senoia, Ga.

MY DEAR DR. TRIBBLE: Last December I participated in the planning of this tribute to you on the 50th anniversary of the commencement of the practice of your profession in Senoia, Coweta County, Ga. I was asked to make the presentation of this expression of appreciation to you, and I have looked forward to being here with you tonight.

Circumstances beyond my control nearly prevented me from being here. Immediately after the conclusion of this meeting I must return to Washington so that early tomorrow morning I can be present at an important meeting with the Committee on Appropriations.

During the 50 years since you first came to Senoia, in February 1915, you have been a good physician, a good citizen, a good community leader, and a good friend. You have treated the sick; you have comforted the afflicted; and you have eased suffering and cured illness. You have responded at all hours of the day and night. You have called upon those who needed your help. You have used your God-given talents and you have acquired skill and science in behalf of your neighbors and your fellow man.

As a citizen and community leader you have given freely of your time and your material goods to make your community a better place in which to live. Senoia and Coweta County are each truly a better place because of your life and the many contributions which you have made.

For many years you served as mayor of Senoia. As the head of the city government of the city in which you have lived and served for 50 years, you have assumed and fulfilled your full measure of civic responsibility.

As a soldier and officer in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army, you served your country in the cause of freedom in two world wars. In World War I you served from 1917 to 1919. At the termination of your active duty status in World War II, you continued as a Reserve officer during the years in between. When the American forces were mobilized at the beginning of World War II, you volunteered and returned to active Army service as a Colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army. In this capacity and as a field hospital commander, you served in such a manner as to reflect credit upon the highest traditions of the U.S. Armed Forces.

For all of these things, Dr. Tribble, we express our sincere appreciation and our heartfelt gratitude. Most of all, however, we are thankful for having been a part of this community with you and for the privilege of calling you our friend.

Good physician, good citizen, good community leader, good soldier, good friend; James Mercer Tribble, doctor of medicine, citizen of Senoia, Ga., United States of America.

As one of the many privileged to know you, my friend, I am grateful for the privilege and honor of participating in this 50th anniversary program which honors you.

With warmest personal regards and every good wish, believe me,

Sincerely your friend,
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
U.S. Representative in Congress,
Sixth District of Georgia.

Laborsaving Device

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to refer to the cover page of the Idaho Farmer of January 21, 1965.

The caption under a splendid picture of a new machine tells what ingenuity can do in meeting the challenges of high costs and labor shortages facing farmers in producing and harvesting their crops.

In the production of beans, which is one of the most profitable crops grown in southeastern Idaho and is of the finest variety, the tedious task of polesetting and trellising is a time-consuming, laborious job for bean growers.

I congratulate Harvey H. Rasmussen of Preston, Idaho, who invented and constructed this machine which removes much of the tedious hand labor in polesetting jobs. In Franklin County where Mr. Rasmussen grows beans, he uses the new machine on his own crops and does custom work with it for several bean-growing neighbors.

The machine is mounted on a tractor, and it sets two rows of poles properly spaced. At the same time, it strings the bottom cord, the horizontal wires, and the diagonal strings. Five men can now do the work which formerly required upward of 9 or 10.

Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include herewith my statement made this morning before the House Rules Committee on legislation sponsored by a number of other Members of Congress and myself, to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

I have been and continue to be a strong advocate of congressional reform to modernize the procedures and processes of the Congress, and I am hopeful that the majority of my colleagues will see fit to support this legislation.

My testimony follows:

The creation of a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization should occupy the highest priority on the agenda of the 89th Congress. During the past several years, more and more voices have urged the Congress to take a vigorous and exacting look at its machinery and procedures. A wide segment of the public, scholars, and members of Congress feel the efficiency and internal democracy of the legislative branch are undermined by such factors as: a maldistribution of power, through seniority, innumerable duplications of hearings before committees, reduced congressional influence in the formulation of legislation, and inadequate powers for the central leadership. Whatever specific measures are in order, it has been clear to most that a fully comprehensive and systematic review of the Congress by the Congress has long been overdue. It is nothing less than that purpose to which we should commit ourselves by creating a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization.

Such a committee, of course, is not without precedent. The procedures, machinery and organization under which today's Congress operates are largely deprived from the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The groundwork to this bill, in turn, was laid by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, known as the LaFollette-Monroney Committee. Twenty years have passed and the complexity of political problems and legislative operations has increased enormously. It is time again for the Congress to put itself under careful scrutiny.

At the onset of this session, the House approved a series of significant reforms designed to provide more equitable rules under which legislation can be introduced and debated. These steps were long needed and welcome. But we cannot be content with patchwork. No institution can persevere if it is not prepared to examine its basic purposes and goals. To meet such a need, a Joint Committee on Congressional Organization must be prepared to ask fundamental questions. Is the duty of Congress primarily to initiate legislation? To process the needs of individual constituents? To oversee the administration of the laws? Are all these functions still compatible or must the Congress decide to make some final choice of priorities?

An increasing number of proposals from outside the Congress as well as from within now merit careful consideration. For this reason, a joint committee must be empowered to call upon outside experts and members of the other branches of Government whose counsel the Congress respects. The joint committee must equally be free to examine the rules, procedures, practices and precedents of both the House and the Senate. We cannot fail to meet these prerequisites if justice is to be done to the complexity of the issue of congressional reorganization.

Many are rightly impatient for swift reform. But we cannot afford to be impatient if impatience does not allow us to ask all the questions, again and again, with deliberation and reflection.

I strongly support the establishment of a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization. I urge the House and Senate to be satisfied with nothing less than an examination of purposes as well as procedures and of ends as well as means.

Let's Reserve Judgments Regarding Air Force Academy Honor Code Violations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, regrettably the Air Force Academy has been racked by an episode of cheating. An investigation is being, and should be, carried out with dispatch. The rights of each cadet must be, and are being, scrupulously protected, yet the incident must be thoroughly and professionally probed.

There are literally dozens of reporters and photographers awaiting outside the Academy grounds to expose and spectacularize the events in minute detail. Unbelievably there are many who seem to revel in demeaning the cadets, individually and collectively, possibly out of pure jealousy or a sense of personal or moral inferiority.

The Air Force Academy cadet code is exceptionally high and honorable. "We will not lie, cheat, or steal—nor tolerate among us those who do." Reflect on this. Not only does it require the cadet to be moral, but it equally requires him to reject evil. Both requirements are absolutely necessary. A society or group which tolerates lying, cheating, or stealing is doomed. Think how much better our society would be if only more groups, organizations, and nations would adopt and adhere to such a code.

Would there be the Bobby Baker scandal if another segment of our society had lived by the honor code of our Air cadets? How can standards be enhanced—even maintained—by tolerating breaches of our laws or code of ethics?

This incident may be a personal and family tragedy for a few young men who failed to measure up. They should not despair. They have lives to live and marks to make. This lesson may serve them well.

The cadets who remain, the overwhelming majority, have learned much by sharing the embarrassment. But they can be proud of an institution and service which has been strengthened by their splendid adherence to an exemplary code of personal conduct.

Those who decry and demean the Air Academy Honor Code would better serve the Academy, youth, and our country, by trying, instead, to live by it. They would have more empathy for those who failed, and more appreciation of those who have measured up.

The Military Academy and Air Force Academy have similar codes of conduct. Cadets of other academies, and students of many other quality universities, are not obliged to "not tolerate" moral, ethical, and legal violations. The obligation to "not tolerate" honor code violations does not require "tattling," "squealing," or "ratting." Parenthetically, those who customarily use these latter terms, too often have no, or a low, moral code themselves. It actually would be sufficient and proper compliance for a cadet who had been proffered illicit examination answers to say directly to the profferor, "This is a violation of our code of honor, I suggest that you report it." Many an honorable cadet has reported his own violation—thereby not placing any unfair onus upon his fellow cadets to tolerate his violation.

Some may not appreciate such a demanding code, but let us not deny its essential benefits to those to whom it can mean life or death. Let not false rumors or unfounded gossip build up any pressure to change or mollify this superb code of personal conduct.

A code which is self-enforcing is quite superior to a code which requires an extramural Gestapo or policing unit. Neither society, nor any part of society, should be required to rely upon an extramural investigating and enforcing agency. The military services should not be peculiar, but certainly they cannot tolerate the underworld philosophy that "any conduct is permissible unless you get caught by an outsider." The citizen who has the courage and the dedication to make a citizen's arrest is a better citizen than one who stands by unconcerned as crimes are committed, saying "crime is none of my business—only the police should enforce our laws."

If an honor code relieves the violator from being discovered or reported by a fellow citizen or fellow cadet, there are many in every society who would take every advantage of such immunity. If an honor code relieves the innocent victim or witness from any obligation to report the violator, there would likewise be some in every society who would then operate criminally with impunity.

I am confident that the investigation will disclose that the cadets who have resigned did so after an overt honor code infraction. Even if this is not true in every single instance, our immediate sympathy should not be permitted to discredit or discard an honorable code of conduct.

We should commend the Academy for employing a high code and be gratified by the great majority of cadets who are willing to live by it—to their everlasting credit and to the everlasting benefit of our still-moral-Nation and military services.

We should be careful to not discredit or discard something just because it is good or difficult.

Every thorough study of undergraduate honor codes will disclose that there is considerably less cheating at our Military and Air Force Academies than at other academies and universities.

Effective control of student cheating can best be achieved through a demanding honor code enforced by the students. Almost all will comply. The others should seek another university or place in society with a code of conduct more to their standards. A high code of honor, strictly and fairly enforced by peers, contributes as much as anything else to the central and overriding purpose for maintaining and attending a service academy.

Rather than modify or weaken the U.S. Air Force Academy Honor Code, it might be better to institute and enforce a similar code at other academies and universities.

Should we not devote our thoughts to preserving and perfecting the honor code and our efforts to striving to measure up to it?

Tobacco: Billions in Taxes—The Integrity of a Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about the costs of farm programs, but very few people realize that since our mammoth effort to establish a parity position for our farm families began back in 1933, the Federal Government actually has collected in taxes from just one crop—tobacco—more than twice the dollars spent on all farm price-support programs, for all crops, through the price stabilization agency, the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Federal and State excise collections on tobacco in these last 32 years have amounted to $52 billion—$39.5 billion by the Federal Government and $12.5 billion by State governments.

The Federal levies on tobacco and tobacco products have produced more revenue than the combined costs of farm price-support programs, amounting to $15 billion, and the food-for-peace program, costing $12.5 billion.

The Federal and State excise collections amount to more than $3 billion a year. In contrast, the tobacco program, which maintains decent prices for the people who produce tobacco, has cost only about $39 million during the entire life of the program.

Incidentally, the tobacco farmer receives only about 3 cents for the tobacco in a package of cigarettes which sells at retail for an average of 28 to 30 cents.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt the Members of this body generally are aware that we now have some very serious problems in the operation of the tobacco program. These problems have developed through vastly increased per acre yields of tobacco, through our failure to develop large new export outlets, and because of the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, on smoking and health.

My purpose today is to impress upon my colleagues the importance of protecting the integrity of the tobacco program and of improving this program. To this end, I have written to the President suggesting that of the many billions of dollars collected through tobacco excises, the Federal Government plowback 1 cent of the 8-cent-a-pack levy upon cigarettes, in programs to continue America's supremacy of foreign tobacco markets, to maintain the stability and prosperity of tobacco producers and the industry generally, and to undertake research in the field of smoking and health.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the facts set forth in this letter to the President, and the suggestions embraced therein, are of interest to Members of this body; therefore, I am inserting this letter in the RECORD.

The text follows:

JANUARY 6, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I commend your recommendation, presented in the state of the Union message, that family purchasing power be strengthened by a substantial cut in Federal excise taxes. Such an adjustment should contribute in a very sound and solid way to a growing economy and a strong nation.

You did not set forth, in your message, what precise excises you want reduced; but the press on December 27, 1964, reported that you would ask the Congress to repeal or cut all these levies except those upon tobacco products, alcoholic beverages and highway use.

The tobacco tax is one of the oldest levies in our revenue system. Perhaps no tax is felt by a greater number of our citizens, from the tobacco producer, through workers in manufacturing plants, on to the user of tobacco products. Therefore, I respectfully submit a suggestion with respect to this tax, embraced in the context of these facts:

1. Since 1933, when the tobacco program and other farm programs first were inaugurated, Federal and State Governments have collected $52,019 million in excise taxes upon tobacco and tobacco products—the Federal Government $39,431 million and State governments $12,588 million.

2. The $39 billion from Federal tobacco collections alone during this 32-year period are substantially more than twice the grand total of $15,026 million expended by the Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation on all farm price support programs for all crops since these programs were inaugurated. The Federal tobacco levies have yielded more money than the combined costs of all these farm price support programs and the food-for-peace program through which this country has invested $12,486 million to lessen hunger among friendly peoples around the world.

3. While $52 billion has been collected in tobacco excises by Federal and State Governments, the cost of the tobacco program, which has protected the income of tobacco farmers since 1933, has been only $38 million.

4. Meanwhile, during these 32 years, our tobacco and tobacco product exports—without any export subsidy—have amounted to $10 billion, contributing substantially to our Nation's balance of payments with other countries. In this connection it might be well to mention that during the first 100 years of our history as a nation, it was the export of tobacco and cotton that maintained America's financial integrity before the world.

5. Tobacco is an $8 billion industry in the United States. Hundreds of thousands of farm families in 21 States are engaged in the growing of tobacco. There are some 550 plants, employing approximately 100,000 workers in 30 States, engaged in the manufacture of tobacco products. Approximately 1,500,000 businesses with many hundreds of thousands of workers are in the tobacco trade.

6. The $3 billion-plus now collected annually by Federal and State Governments from tobacco levies amounts to more than twice the income farmers actually receive each year for all the tobacco they produce. The total of these excises is 10 times the profits, after taxes, of all cigarette and other tobacco manufacturers.

7. During the Korean conflict, the Federal excise on cigarettes was increased from $3.50 to $4 per 1,000 cigarettes—or from 7 to 8 cents per pack. Under the revenue law approved October 20, 1951, the cigarette levy was to have reverted to $3.50 at the termination of the Korean hostilities; but the reversion to the prewar rate has been postponed year after year. Under the law, unless there is further legislation, the cigarette excise will drop back to $3.50 per 1,000 on July 1, 1965.

8. In recent years, great increases have been attained in the per-acre yield of tobacco on our farms so that, despite severe restrictions upon acreage devoted to this crop, surpluses have accumulated and now endanger the operations of the tobacco price stabilization program. This program has been the most successful of all farm programs in protecting and improving, at the least cost, the incomes and standard of living of those farm families engaged in the production of a crop. Coincident with the increasing per-acre yields of tobacco in the United States, other areas of the world have developed and expanded tobacco culture, and now are competing in world markets which have been dominated by our tobacco since colonial times. The quality of our tobacco is superior to any produced anywhere else in the world, and is preferred in world markets, but price competition has become intense. The severity of this competition can be measured by the fact that in 1963 the average export price of Flue-cured (cigarette type) tobacco was: United States 82.1 cents, Canada 71.7 cents, Rhodesia-Nyasaland 63.3 cents, and India 36.1 cents. The world price competition has been much more severe in 1964, but average export prices for this year are not yet available. Our tobacco has been able to hold markets where superior quality is required, but the price cutting by other exporting areas now is being severely felt.

9. The soundness of our tobacco economy, its ability to yield revenues to our Federal and State governments, its contribution to the Nation's balance of payments, the continuation of the tobacco program that has meant so much to the many thousands of farm families producing tobacco, all rest in a substantial way upon the holding and expansion of our foreign markets for tobacco. The export of tobacco is a proper concern of our Government in the interest of our Nation.

10. New problems for tobacco developed early this year in the report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General on "Smoking and Health."

Now, therefore, in the light of the foregoing, I respectfully petition your serious and careful consideration of a recommendation which I have arrived at after the most searching deliberation.

If it is your judgment that the excise on cigarettes not be reduced from $4 to $3.50 per 1,000, as now is scheduled to occur on July 1, 1965, then let us by appropriate legislation assign an amount of money equal to the proceeds from the 50 cents difference between the $3.50 and $4 levy for these specific purposes:

a. To enable and promote the export and marketing of American tobacco around the world;

b. To bear all costs of the tobacco price stabilization program;

c. To finance research and inquiry into smoking and health.

This proposal in effect would assign 1 cent of the 8 cents a pack levy on cigarettes—or about $250 million annually—to the above specified purposes.

Mr. President, since Federal and State governments are collecting annually on tobacco products three times as much money as our farmers actually receive each year for their total tobacco crop, this proposition of plowing back a portion of the Federal excise collections makes sense to me.

It will make the tobacco price stabilization program self-sustaining, as the sugar program now is self-sustaining through a special sugar levy.

It will make certain that American tobacco will remain supreme in the tobacco markets of the world, thereby guaranteeing the continued effectiveness of our tobacco price stabilization program and decent incomes for those many thousands of Americans who produce tobacco.

It will assure proper and effective concern for the health of all Americans who use tobacco.

Moreover, it is my conviction that in going this route our Federal and State governments in the long run will derive even greater revenues from tobacco, and tobacco's contribution to America's critical balance of payments with other nations will be greatly enlarged.

With high esteem and warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

Health Insurance for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri, recently gave an excellent analysis of the comprehensive medical care bill which many of us are sponsoring in the House of Representatives. He discussed the bill in his regular report from Washington and I should like to insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

His remarks follow:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN DURWARD G. HALL

The House Ways and Means Committee has begun executive hearings on the various proposals that have been introduced in the Congress dealing with medical care for persons over 65 years of age.

The bill advocated by the Johnson administration, known as the King-Anderson bill, H.R. 1, would impose an additional social security tax on employers and employees and would provide a specified number of hospital days in each benefit period for certain persons over age 65. The King-Anderson bill has no provision for doctor bills, drugs, and care outside the hospital.

A recent Gallup poll revealed that 77 percent of the American people have a mistaken concept of the benefits that would be offered under this bill, which has inaccurately been labeled "medicare." Actually, it would be more appropriate to label it "hospicare," since "medicare" implies total health coverage.

It has always been my belief that legislation to met the problem, which admittedly exists, should follow three basic principles.

1. It should be focused on those who need help.

2. It should be voluntary, rather than compulsory in nature.

3. It should be administered as close as possible to the people in the respective States.

With those guidelines in mind, I've introduced legislation in the House of Representatives, which I believe will provide a much more satisfactory solution to the problem than the King-Anderson bill.

Basically, my bill would authorize Federal grants to the States on a matching basis to help persons 65 years of age and older pay costs of comprehensive health insurance. The private insurance industry, both the "Blues" and commercial carriers, would administer the program.

For individuals with incomes below the limit set by each State, the Government, using matching Federal and State funds out of general revenue, would pay the entire cost of the premiums. For individuals with incomes between the minimum and maximum, the Government would pay a part of the cost on a sliding scale according to income. Individuals with income above the maximum would pay the entire cost, but they would have the benefits of an income tax deduction for such payments, as well as statewide bargaining for noncancellable health care policies.

An important aspect of my bill is that it would dispense with the so-called means test which the present Kerr-Mills bill now requires to be conducted by each county welfare department. Instead, each individual would simply certify his income to the responsible State agency at least once a year.

The Hall bill would provide comprehensive medical, surgical, and hospital benefits. Benefits would include, not only payment of hospital and nursing home charges, but also payment of medical, surgical, drug, and other costs. Furthermore, there is no limit to the duration of coverage, thus providing protection against catastrophic illness.

The King-Anderson bill, on the other hand, limits inpatient hospital care to 60 days per benefit period. It omits entirely surgical care, physicians care in the home or office, drugs and medicine outside the hospital, and most nursing home care and private nursing duty.

In essence, the choice between the bill which I have introduced, and the King-Anderson bill, is a choice between a bill which would pay all medical costs—hospital, surgical, and drugs—for persons who need help, and a bill which would pay only one aspect of those costs—hospital care—and then only for a limited period of time, for all persons, regardless of need.

I'm happy to report that several members of both parties are sponsoring legislation similar to the bill I've submitted, and I'm confident that this approach will receive detailed attention in the hearings now underway in the Ways and Means Committee.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, as in reverence we hallow Thy name, so may we hallow our own, as we keep our honor bright, our hearts pure, our ideals untarnished, and our devotion to the Nation's welfare high and true.

To all the heinous forms of brutal hatred which devastate our earth, which could be so fair, we would close our eyes for this dedicated moment and still our souls in the calm assurance that at the heart of the universe, goodness reigns.

In that faith, send us forth, without fear or favor, to do the right as Thou dost give us to see the right, firm in our conviction that these clouds are lies and that the blue sky is the truth.

At last may grateful generations who will inherit a kindlier earth count us among the architects of the final parliament of peace and plenty in which every kindred and every tongue shall find its rightful place.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 3, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

RURAL AMERICA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 73)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on rural America. Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The bounty of the earth is the foundation of our economy.

Progress in every aspect of our Nation's life depends upon the abundant harvest of our farms.

Because 7 percent of our work force can produce our food and fiber, the vast majority of Americans can work at other tasks that make our democracy strong and prosperous.

Because our people eat better at less cost than any other people in all the world's history, we can spend our earnings for the many other things which make life rewarding.

Because we have the means to conquer hunger, we can wage an unconditional war on poverty—and win it.

The farm people of this Nation have made and are continuing to make a lasting contribution to our national prosperity. As a matter of simple justice they should share equitably in this prosperity. They deserve a place of dignity and opportunity.

Farmers want new and expanding markets for their efficient production. Farmers want freedom to grow and prosper, freedom to operate competitively and profitably in our present economic system.

As a Nation we are increasingly recognizing that food and agricultural policies affect our entire economy. Sound agricultural policy must give full consideration not only to the role of the producer, but also of the processor, the distributor, the exporter, and the ultimate consumer. This is one major reason for a national investment in agricultural programs.

Farm policy is not something separate. It is part of an overall effort to serve our national interest, at home and around the world.

WHAT WE WANT TO DO

These are the objectives which should guide us:

1. An abundance of food and fiber at reasonable and stable prices for the people of the United States.

2. Effective use of our agricultural resources to promote the interests of the United States and world peace through trade and aid.

3. A workable balance between supply and demand at lower costs to the Government.

4. Opportunity for the efficient family farmer to earn parity of income from farming operations.

5. Parity of opportunity for all rural people, including new opportunity for small farmers.

The gains which we have made in the past 4 years—in raising farm income, in reducing surplus stocks, in promoting new economic opportunity in rural areas—point the direction we should continue to follow.

THE RURAL SCENE

Rural America is the scene of one of the greatest productive triumphs in the history of man. Yet, despite its service to the Nation, rural America is also the scene of wasted human talent, where there are too many people without jobs and too many with only part-time jobs.

Opportunity in rural America will require wise farm programs to support and stabilize the incomes of commercial family farmers. It will require solutions to the problems of small farmers and those who live in the towns and villages of rural America.

Only one of four rural families now lives on a farm. Only 1 out of 10 boys now growing up on farms can expect to earn a good living as a full-time farmer. Most young people in rural areas must go elsewhere to find their opportunities.

I am determined that the farmers who have been efficient and successful in agriculture shall be fairly rewarded for their success. And I am equally determined that the rural community which has sustained the growth of agriculture shall have the chance to broaden its economic base and the range of opportunity which it can offer the children of its families.

To the White House in recent months have come hundreds and thousands of letters from men and women who live in rural America. Their words are eloquent testimony to the changes which are occurring there and to the uncertainty which those changes are causing.

Thirty years ago, over 7 million American families lived on the farm. Today, 3½ million families feed a population that has grown by 50 percent. Enough food is left over to fight hunger among free people all around the globe.

Thirty years ago, a good farm in the Midwest operated with a capital investment of $18,000. Today, nearly $100,000 is needed. In the Southeast, capital requirements rose from $4,500 to $30,000.

Farmers with inadequate resources make up one segment of rural America's great unsolved problem of underemployment. Another is made up of families who have left the farm but have not yet found a place in the nonagricultural sector of the economy. A third consists of families displaced by the decline in the rural-based extractive industries—mining and lumbering.

The rural unemployed and underemployed are largely out of sight. Most of them are hidden in the remote valleys of Appalachia and the Ozarks, on the unpaved side roads of the South, in the once-rich timberlands of the North, on Indian reservations, and in the worn-out mining communities of the West.

The results of opportunity's decline in rural America are reflected in harsh facts:

Lack of a decent life is almost twice as prevalent in rural America as it is in urban America. Only 30 percent of our families live in rural areas, but they include 46 percent of those American families with incomes under $3,000.

Rural America has almost three times the proportion of substandard houses found in urban areas. A fourth of all farm homes and a fifth of rural nonfarm homes are without running water. Over 14,000 rural communities of more than 100 population lack central water supplies.

Rural people lag almost 2 years behind urban residents in educational attainment. They often suffer from a lower quality of education. Per pupil expenditures for elementary and secondary education in rural school districts are substantially below expenditures in urban districts.

Rural communities lag in health facilities. Rural children receive one-third less medical attention than urban children. Their mortality rate is far higher.

These deficiencies feed on one another. They leave too few resources to support education, health, and other public services essential to development of the talent, skills, and earning power of the people.

PARITY OF OPPORTUNITY FOR RURAL AMERICA

These facts require a national policy for rural America with parity of opportunity as its goal.

There has been a steady migration from our countryside. In the 1950's more than half of America's rural counties suffered a population loss. But farmers who are handicapped by poor health, age, or lack of skill in any occupation outside of farming and who leave their home communities for want of opportunity often create new problems—for themselves, for the communities they leave, and for the cities which receive them.

When people move away from rural areas, the area suffers. Migration leaves vacant stores, abandoned churches, empty schoolrooms, declining tax bases, and a declining ability to support a minimum level of public service.

This is what we need to have parity of opportunity for rural Americans:

National economic prosperity to increase their employment opportunities;

Full access to education, training, and health services to expand their earning power, and

Economic development of smaller and medium-sized communities to insure a healthy economic base for rural America.

When the rural citizen, his community, business and government cooperate, the chances for a better rural life increase. Local leadership and initiative are necessary if rural development is to keep pace with the needs of the people. But government can and should provide information as well as the technical and financial assistance which will speed progress.

Many measures enacted by the Congress in recent years are assisting rural communities in building new opportunities for their citizens. Others I have recommended this year aim at these same objectives.

The Area Redevelopment Act has helped scores of small- and medium-sized communities through loans to new industrial enterprises and loans and grants for needed public facilities. I will soon make recommendations that will urge this act be improved and made permanent.

Under the Economic Opportunity Act, communities will be carrying out programs to provide new opportunity for low-income rural families.

The Department of Agriculture has a wide range of programs to assist in rural economic development—loans for telephone systems, for recreation enterprises, for development of forest resources, for community water systems, and for rural housing. The small watershed and resources conservation and development programs add to business activity in rural areas.

The development of new job opportunities in rural areas has been considerably aided in the past by a strong program of rural electrification. The ability of rural areas to attract and support industrial activities—one of the fundamental solutions to the basic problem of our farm population—rests in very large part upon the availability of electric power. We must and will continue our efforts to enable those areas that do not presently possess an adequate power supply to meet their growing demands and insure that the benefits of industrial diversification are available in rural areas.

Many other activities of the Government are assisting businessmen and farmers to revive dying economies and raise the level of public services in rural areas. These include aid for community facilities, employment services, health and education programs, small business loans, job training, and development of outdoor recreation.

Yet gaps remain between the levels of living in rural America and those of urban America: in income, in education, in housing, in health and sanitation facilities. Parity of opportunity remains a distant hope for many. It is a challenge we must meet head on.

REACHING OUT TO RURAL AREAS

In my earlier messages to the Congress, particularly those on education and health, I have proposed measures to assist those areas of our country and those families most in need, both urban and rural.

It is not easy to equitably distribute Federal assistance to a scattered rural population. Rural communities often lack the specialized organizations found in major cities which keep informed of development programs and initiate action to make use of them. Special measures must be taken both by the States, and by Federal agencies to reach rural people, particularly in remote areas.

Since it is clear that an administrative office for each Federal agency or program cannot and should not be established in every county, a method must be developed to extend the reach of those Federal agencies and programs which should, but do not now, effectively serve rural areas.

Accordingly, I have asked:

1. Each department and agency administering a program which can benefit rural people to assure that its benefits are distributed equitably between urban and rural areas.

2. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget to review carefully with the head of each department or agency involved, the administrative obstacles which may stand in the way of such equitable distribution. They should propose administrative or legislative steps which can be taken to assure that equity is attained to assure full participation by rural areas.

3. The Secretary of Agriculture to put the facilities of his field offices at the disposal of all Federal agencies to assist them in making their programs effective

in rural areas. The Secretary is creating within the Department of Agriculture a Rural Community Development Service, which will have no operating programs of its own but will devote its energies to assisting other agencies in extending their services. I have requested funds in the 1966 budget to finance this service and to strengthen the capacity of the Cooperative Federal-State Extension Service to assist rural communities in forming strong and active development organizations. In the meantime, I recommend that the Congress:

1. Enact legislation to equalize the availability of home mortgage credit in rural areas. This can be done by supplementing the mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration with a rural mortgage insurance program to be administered by the Department of Agriculture. The Department has administered a direct housing loan program since 1949. But an insurance program will enable the Government to assist effectively a far greater volume of homebuilding with a minimum of budget costs. The Federal Housing Administration has initiated action to extend the effectiveness of its insurance programs in areas where private lenders do not now fully utilize its service.

2. Increase the annual limit upon the Department of Agriculture's existing loan insurance program, which insures not only farm ownership loans but loans for community water systems and recreation development.

We have the opportunity now to provide the means by which people in rural towns and on inadequate farms can join the march toward a better life. We must seize this opportunity.

PARITY OF INCOME FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The commodity programs which were initiated 30 years ago in the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt have helped to create a commercially successful agriculture. I propose that these commodity programs be continued and improved.

Over the past 4 years our commodity programs have raised and sustained net farm income at an annual level nearly $1 billion above 1960. Few activities so dramatically indicate the value to farmers of good programs well administered. Yet the consumer is the major beneficiary of farm progress. While retail food prices have risen in recent years, the prices of what the farmer sells have actually declined 15 percent since 1947–49.

Our agricultural abundance has also made possible the food stamp, school lunch, surplus food distribution, and special milk programs. These projects are essential to our needy people and to our schoolchildren.

The skill of our family farmers is not an accident. It is the product of a century of public policy aimed at improvement of our agriculture.

Research and education, credit and conservation, and price stabilization have all served us well. They have benefited all Americans, though they were designed as programs for farmers.

Progress is never free of problems. Agricultural progress has made price and income support programs increasingly necessary and increasingly difficult.

The basic need for farm programs arises from the farmer's economic isolation and his enormous capacity to produce. We have today at least 50 million acres more cropland than is required to produce all of the food and fiber that we can consume plus all we can export. Without programs to guide production, new crop surpluses would be inevitable. Even relatively small surplus can depress prices below cost of production levels.

Independent studies by university economists are unanimous in their basic conclusion: the removal of price and income supports would have a catastrophic effect upon farm income.

For three decades we have had programs which, by one means or another, have sought to achieve a balance between supply and demand. Born in the emergency of the 1930's, they have countered the income-depressing potential of the revolution in agricultural production.

Our farm programs must always be adapted to the requirements of the future. Today they should be focused more precisely on the opportunity for parity of income for America's family farmers and lower Government costs. But we must recognize that farm programs will be necessary as long as advance in agricultural technology continues to outpace the growth of population at home and markets abroad.

We need to change much of our thinking on farm policy. Just as we do in other segments of our economy, we need to separate the social problems of rural America from the economic problems of commercial agriculture. We need to be concerned about both, but the answers to each may be different.

Our programs should—

Provide efficient family farmers an opportunity to earn parity of income;

Assist those small farmers who have little chance to enlarge their operations but whose age, physical handicap, or lack of education, prevent their shifting to other employment;

Assist those farm families who seek to enlarge their productive resources in order to obtain a decent living and have the opportunity and capacity to do so.

We must also continue to tie domestic farm policies to our international trade objectives by pricing our products for export at competitive world levels and by relating our production to the longer term demands of world markets.

Our objective must be for the farmer to get improved income out of the marketplace, with less cost to the Government.

To do this, I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture to so utilize the Commodity Credit Corporation as to make the free market system work more effectively for the farmer. We must encourage the private segment of our economy to carry its own inventories, bought from farmers, rather than depending on the Government as a source of supply. We must urge the private sector to perform as many services as possible now performed by Government agencies.

PRICE SUPPORT AND PRODUCTION ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

I recommend to the Congress that the programs now in effect for our major commodities be continued and improved.

These programs can continue to serve our objectives of increased freedom of operation, a steady improvement of incomes, a greater reliance on market forces, and lower Government costs.

Building on present programs, I recommend the following legislation:

WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN

Voluntary feed grain and wheat programs should be extended. Specific recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress which will permit the operation of these programs to be simplified and make it possible for additional crops—particularly soybeans—to be grown as needed on acreage diverted from grains.

Authority should be continued for the Secretary of Agriculture to set price support levels and to adjust other program features as conditions may require.

COTTON

The cotton program of 1964 should also be extended and improved. It is essential that cotton be competitive with other fibers and in world markets. At the same time we must adopt measures to reduce the cost of this program and the level of stocks. Specific amendments to current legislation will be suggested to accomplish these objectives.

TOBACCO

The tobacco program must also be reappraised this year. Yield increases, higher Government costs, deterioration in quality and loss of foreign markets have weakened what has been a highly successful program.

Legislation is needed to authorize production and marketing limits on an acreage-poundage basis. Consideration should also be given to revisions in our programs which will make American tobacco more competitive in world markets.

RICE

Consideration should be given to amending the price support program for rice to support market prices at competitive world levels, and to provide additional supports for producer incomes from the proceeds of marketing certificates.

WOOL

The Wool Act which expires early next year is operating successfully to help stabilize wool production and bolster producer income. I recommend that it be extended with minor amendments which will be transmitted to the Congress.

LIVESTOCK

The sale of meat animals amounts to nearly one-third of all farm income. The stability of this vital phase of our farm economy is based on the continued stability in our feed supply.

We will continue to cooperate with livestock farmers and ranchers so as to maintain a fair price in the marketplace. We will help them to build markets here and abroad, and to preserve fair competition in the marketing of livestock and livestock products, and continue our present measures which will prevent an undue increase in imports.

OTHER COMMODITIES

Continuing study is being given to programs and needs for other agricultural commodities and appropriate changes and recommendations will be made as circumstances may require.

TRANSFER OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

I recommend that acreage allotments and bases under the several production adjustment programs be made transferable by lease or sale to family farmers in the same State.

This will permit some small farmers to expand their acreage. Others who no longer wish to farm can add to their incomes by leasing or selling their allotments.

LONG-RANGE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

The annual acreage diversion and acreage allotment programs now in effect should be supplemented by a long-term cropland adjustment program.

I recommend to the Congress a program which will reduce the cost of our production adjustment efforts, assist landowners in turning their land to nonagricultural uses such as recreation and to forestry, and assist small farmers who want to do other work while remaining in their communities. The proportion of land which could be covered by this program in any area should be limited to protect our communities.

Agriculture's excess production capacity is a long run problem. A long-term land use program can achieve a large part of the needed adjustment more effectively and with greater benefits than annual diversion programs.

This program will reduce the annual cost of other programs by more than its own cost. It will provide enduring benefits not realized under present programs.

The purposes of the cropland adjustment program will be served if much of the land is permanently removed from production. Every reason exists, therefore, for applying a contribution from this program to the cost of public purchases of cropland for recreation, for enhancement of natural beauty, for prevention of air and water pollution, or for open space purposes.

I recommend that the authorized legislation permit funds appropriated for cropland adjustment to be used to augment moneys raised by States and local governments and those which are provided by the Federal Government through the Land and Water Conservation Fund and other programs for public land acquisition.

RESERVE STOCKS

It is time to consider our requirements for agricultural commodities in a reserve for national security, for emergency relief purposes, and for domestic economic stabilization.

The President should be authorized to determine the levels of commodity stocks required and to take actions to insulate these stocks from the market so that they might be preserved for time of emergencies.

The costs incurred in maintaining that part of our commodity stocks designated as reserves should be separated from the cost of farm price and income support programs. The Commodity Credit Corporation would continue to manage the stocks in conjunction with price-support operations.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE

The welfare of American agriculture is closely linked to foreign trade. Our 1968 goal of $6 billion farm product exports was reached in 1964. American farmers last year accounted for one-fourth of U.S. merchandise exports.

These exports have strengthened farm prices, brought additional business income, reduced our surpluses and storage costs, and have helped our international balance of payments. Abroad, they have contributed to political stability and economic progress.

We are not content with the gains we have made in world markets. We expect to make additional gains by improving the means by which we can be competitive in price, in quality, in service to our customers. We will merchandise our products actively, but with full regard to rules of commercial conduct between friendly nations.

In the trade negotiations underway in Geneva, we shall make every effort to achieve liberalization in agricultural as well as industrial products.

WORLD PROGRESS AND PEACE

The food-for-peace program is good international policy and it is sound economic policy. Food is a powerful weapon for peace. People who are hungry are weak allies for freedom. Men with empty stomachs do not reason together.

We broadened the food-for-peace program last year and are continuing to study ways to broaden it further. Food shipments under this program help to expand it by building food habits which increase the demand for U.S. products. As the economies of recipient countries are strengthened through American aid, we are able to shift from outright grants of food to concessional sales for foreign currencies and later to sales for dollars.

Foreign currencies accruing from the sales of commodities under the food-for-peace program have also provided funds for a worldwide market development program, which has played a significant role in bringing about the dramatic increases in commercial farm exports.

This same program has also strengthened growing economies, contributed to rising standards of living, promoted international stability, and literally saved lives in many less developed countries. Our agricultural resources are thus making a significant contribution to the prospects for peace in the world.

These contributions must continue. They will be increasingly directed toward assisting agricultural development in less developed, densely populated countries, thus fostering overall economic growth, higher living standards, and better nutrition. The disturbing downward trends in food output per person in both Asia and Latin America in recent years must be reversed. And these trends can be arrested and reversed only by a massive mobilization of resources in both the food-deficit countries and the advanced countries of the industrial West.

As I pointed out in my message on foreign aid, we must use both our agricultural abundance and our technical skills in agriculture to assist the developing nations to stand on their own feet. Under our assistance programs we will make full use of the agricultural know-how in the Department of Agriculture and in the land-grant colleges and State universities. We will enlist the support and cooperation of private agencies and enterprises of all kinds.

To make this food aid most effective, we plan to gear our food-for-peace programs more specifically to the needs of recipient countries and their economic development programs. We may need more flexibility to assure proper nutritional balance in these programs, particularly as they relate to child feeding.

I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture and others concerned to study and recommend changes in agricultural policy that may be needed to accomplish these goals.

COMMISSION ON U.S. FOOD AND FIBER POLICY

All Americans have shared in the fruits of an efficient agriculture. All Americans share also the problems we face in the farm economy and in rural America in the years ahead.

Accordingly, to assist in adapting our farm programs to the needs of tomorrow, and in making rural America a full partner in our national economic progress, I intend to conduct a fundamental examination of the entire agriculture policy of the United States. I will reorganize the National Agricultural Advisory Commission—which has made an invaluable contribution in years past—into a new Commission on Food and Fiber. It will be broadly representative of rural communities, consumers, producers, industry, government, and the public. I expect it to make a detailed study of our food and fiber policies and to bring additional viewpoints to bear on the place of rural America.

There are other parts of our agriculture which merit the support of Congress and the attention of all Americans. Conservation of agricultural land is making a contribution to the beauty and the development of our Nation. It can help even more as we attack pollution of our streams and the defacement of our landscape. Research and education must continue to speed our progress in agriculture, to insure the protection of consumers, and to make full opportunity more than a distant hope.

We must win the battle for a better diet. At the same time we must increase the demand for farm products. If the income of all low-income families were brought up to the $3,000 annual level, per capita consumption of all food would rise by 2 percent. Meat consumption among these low-income families would rise by 15 to 20 percent; poultry by 10 to 15 percent; milk products by about 7 percent, and fresh fruits and vegetables by 15 to 20 percent.

The Congress has repeatedly enacted legislation to encourage farmers to improve their economic position through cooperatives. This encouragement and assistance will be carried out, in terms of both the letter and the spirit of the law.

The task of achieving a life of quality and dignity in rural as well as in urban America is one that will engage our minds and hearts and our energies for a lifetime.

We begin with the conviction that this is a goal which is right. We go forward with the knowledge that the unparalleled harvest of today's rural America has been achieved because our ancestors said this too was a reasonable goal.

The path we follow may be long. But I am as certain of eventual success as was President Abraham Lincoln when he founded the Department of Agriculture a century ago and thus started us on the path to abundance.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 4, 1965.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 228) to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 228) to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 3 minutes on statements made during the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Upon request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Upon request by Mr. SPARKMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

A concurrent resolution applying to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That this legislature respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Be it further resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the house January 27, 1965.

CLYDE HILL,
Speaker of the House.
L. D. HAZEN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of: In the Navy, one admiral and one vice admiral, to be placed on the Navy retired list in those grades; one captain to be rear admiral in the Naval Reserve; one rear admiral and one vice admiral for promotion to the grades of vice admiral and admiral, respectively; Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, to be Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery; in the Army, one brigadier general, to be major general in the Army National Guard; one lieutenant general, for promotion to general, and one lieutenant general for assignment to the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations; and one major general to lieutenant general in the Army. I ask that these names be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Adm. James S. Russell, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral, when retired;

Vice Adm. John S. Thach, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving;

Charles N. Paxton, Naval Reserve, for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

Brig. Gen. Francis Stevens Greenlief, Army National Guard of the United States, for promotion to major general as a Reserve officer of the Army;

Vice Adm. William A. Schoech, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired;

Rear Adm. Ignatius J. Galantin, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving;

Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Navy;

Lt. Gen. Robert William Porter, Jr., Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations; and

Maj. Gen. Edgar Collins Doleman, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 432 promotions and appointments in the Regular Army in the grades of colonel and below; 1,553 temporary promotions and permanent promotions in the Marine Corps, in the grades of major and below; and 628 regular appointments in the Air Force, in the grade of major and below. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

John W. Goar, and sundry other officers, for temporary promotion in the Marine Corps;

Frank J. Cox, Jr., and sundry other officers, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Robert M. Dean, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Victor E. Delnore, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Henry H. Mauz, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list;

Johnnie L. Runnels (CmlC), and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army;

Lyle D. Gisi, distinguished military student, for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States; and

William S. Bedford, Jr., and sundry other distinguished military students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 988. A bill for the relief of Suhn Cha Ha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 989. A bill to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Robertson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 990. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit child's insurance benefits to continue after age 18 in the case of certain children who are full-time students after attaining such age; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gore when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 991. A bill to improve the public assistance provisions of titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act, relating to aged individuals, and for other purposes; and

S. 992. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, through grants for construction of recreational activity centers, and through grants to stimulate employment opportunities; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 993. A bill for the relief of Dr. Oscar Valdes Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the first two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 994. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGee when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. Hart, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Hill, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 995. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF (for himself, Mr. Montoya, and Mr. Moss):

S. 996. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education or metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. Hill):

S. 997. A bill to authorize improvement of Perdido Pass Channel, Ala., in the interest of navigation and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 998. A bill to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 999. A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands, and for other purposes; and

S. 1000. A bill to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1001. A bill for the relief of Louis Sirota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1002. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the furnishing of additional information by tax-exempt labor organizations and to require the disclosure of such information to the members of such organizations and to the public; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1003. A bill to provide for the inclusion in the charter or bylaws of labor organizations of provisions requiring officers of such organizations to respond to certain questions concerning their qualifications asked in proceedings before tribunals empowered to elicit testimony; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1004. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1005. A bill to establish a procedure for the publication of patent applications; and

S. 1006. A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. Muskie, and Mr. Bennett):

S. 1007. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Ottilia Bruegmann James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Simpson):

S. 1009. A bill to amend section 37 of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, relating to disposition only as provided in such act of deposits of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, and gas in lands valuable for such minerals, except as to valid claims pursuant to laws under which initiated and existing at the date of the passage of such act, which claims may be perfected under such laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Allott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1010. A bill to repeal section 315 of the Communications Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of May in each year as Senior Citizens Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution proclaiming the corn tassel as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROTECTION OF TRADE AND COMMERCE AGAINST UNREASONABLE RESTRAINTS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to make subject to our antitrust laws strikes that unreasonably restrain trade or commerce among the States, or with foreign nations, in commodities or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health or safety, or any substantial segment thereof.

This is the same bill that I introduced in 1950, primarily to protect industry and the Nation at large from the efforts of John L. Lewis at that time to force coal operation to pay what was then the highest wage in industry by creating an artificial scarcity of coal by limiting production to 3 days each week. That bill was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee which conducted hearings but took no further action.

Today the foreign trade of this Nation and a substantial segment of domestic commerce is suffering from the effects of a longshoremen's strike, which is now in its fourth week.

A Government official, Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson, has estimated this current strike is costing the national economy about $67 million a day.

Although it involves 75,000 longshore jobs primarily, Mr. Johnson estimates that it is also affecting 12,000 seafaring jobs and 15,000 workers in allied industries.

Although my bill is not confined to the transportation industry, it is being introduced at this time because the current dock strike demonstrates once again how a work stoppage in any part of the complex transportation setup of this country adversely affects large numbers of workers not directly concerned in the dispute.

It is especially harmful to railroad workers, who haul to the port cities a large percentage of this country's vast foreign trade.

In such situations my bill would enable the Government to go into court and let a judge decide whether the strike is an unreasonable restraint on commerce.

The Taft-Hartley law provides for 80-day injunctions in such strikes, to serve as a cooling-off period in labor-management negotiations. But if no settlement is reached within that time, the Government has no further recourse except appeals to the parties.

Only 2 years ago the east coast ports were tied up by a dock strike, as they are today.

Mr. President, the various channels of transportation are so closely related that a work stoppage by any one segment affects them all, and when a transportation strike continues for weeks, it affects the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Although no separate figures are available to show how many of these allied workers are railroadmen, the dock strike has affected the earnings of some Virginia railroad workers.

Rear Adm. D. H. Clark, U.S. Navy, retired, now executive director of the Virginia State Ports Authority, estimates that the Hampton Roads ports are losing about $230,000 a day, or more than $5 million since the start of the dock strike nearly a month ago.

Despite the fact that coal can be loaded by machinery on ships that arrive empty at the Hampton Roads ports, ships which arrive with other cargoes and intend to take out coal, are tied up because the incoming cargo cannot be unloaded.

As a result, coal shipments from the Norfolk area for January were 657,000 tons less than in January 1964, and more than a million tons down from December 1964, probably due to the strike.

This is bound to have some effect on the railroads of Virginia and their workers who haul coal to the ports.

The Norfolk & Western Railway Co. estimates it has lost about $1 million as a result of the strike.

Shipments other than coal from the Hampton Roads area are down by 626,000 tons for the period from the start of the strike to February 2, below the figures for the first quarter of 1964. These figures on how the strike has affected Virginia ports are believed to be on the conservative side.

The Association of American Railroads estimates that 16,000 cars per week are being lost or deferred in the export trade, and possibly another 9,000 cars per week of imports. This figure on imports is a rough estimate but if it is approximately correct, the total is 25,000 cars a week. Allowing for an average of 40 tons per car, this would be 1 million tons per week.

The current dock strike is still dragging on, at heavy cost to the Nation, mainly because negotiators in a few port cities have not been able to agree on manpower management problems, as distinguished from straight wage-and-hour issues.

Philadelphia is one of the remaining stumbling blocks. In that city longshoremen crews have always consisted of 20 men. The shippers want to go down to 17, as in New York, but the negotiators are stymied over the question of a guaranteed annual wage.

Each port seems to have different manpower problems, and until they are all ironed out, apparently there will be no return to work in the entire east and gulf coast area.

In New York the dock crews were handling perishables for some days after an agreement was reached in that city, but there were reports in Government circles today that the handling of perishables has stopped again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of my bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 989) to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1 of the Act of July 2, 1890, entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies", as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 1), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "*Provided further,* That when a labor organization or the members thereof have unreasonably restrained trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, in articles, commodities, or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety, or any substantial segment thereof, such conduct shall not be made lawful, and the jurisdiction of any court of the United States to issue an injunction against any such conduct shall not be restricted or removed, by the Act of October 15, 1914, entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes' as amended, or the Act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An Act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes'."

(b) Section 3 of the Act of July 2, 1890, entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies", as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 1), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "*Provided,* That when a labor organization or the members thereof have unreasonably restrained trade or commerce between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory or Territories and any State or States or the District of Columbia, or with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State or States or foreign nations, in articles, commodities, or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety, or any substantial segment thereof, such conduct shall not be made lawful, and the jurisdiction of any court of the United States to issue an injunction against any such conduct shall not be restricted or removed, by the Act of October 15, 1914, entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes', as amended, or the Act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An Act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes'."

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which I send to the desk and ask for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 990) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit child's insurance benefits to continue after age 18 in the case of certain children who are full-time students after attaining such age, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, last year the Finance Committee of the Senate approved a number of important and badly needed improvements in our social security system. The Senate, it will be recalled, added another important change, the so-called medicare provision.

Because of a lack of agreement in conference, all these improvements in concept and coverage of the social security system were lost. A great deal of publicity has been given medicare. This is as it should be, and I am confident the Congress will, this year, pass a good medicare provision. I continue my active and vigorous support for this measure.

But considerably less publicity has been given to some of the other Senate-approved amendments of last year. Some of these are just as important and just as badly needed, from the viewpoint of those directly affected, as medicare.

One of the amendments I was particularly disappointed over losing last year was one which would have continued the payment of insurance benefits to children up to age 22 so long as those children remained in school.

As a former teacher and county superintendent, I feel more strongly than many, perhaps, the need for more educational opportunities for our young people. I have consistently supported measures to strengthen our educational system, and to encourage young people to get as much formal schooling as they could absorb with profit to themselves and to society.

The bill I have just introduced, and which I shall offer in the Finance Committee as an amendment to whatever social security bill the House may pass, would provide for the payment of a child's insurance benefits until that child reached his or her 23d birthday, provided that child remained in school. I have extended the age 1 year beyond the age limit set last year by the Senate.

It seems to me that no child should be shortchanged on his schooling merely because of the death or disability of the father. Sending a child to school, even to a public or State-supported institution, is expensive; and, although numerous scholarships are available, they do not by any means cover all costs, in most cases.

This measure will benefit the persons directly affected—all the members of the family. It will also benefit the whole society. For the whole society suffers whenever one of its members fails for any reason—lack of education or otherwise—to live up to that individual's full potential.

I have added 1 year to the term covered in last year's amendment. There are good reasons for this. In the first place, many children do not finish high school by their 18th birthday, and will not, therefore, finish college by their 22d birthday. Second, it is now increasingly important in many fields to go beyond the bachelor's degree to at least the level of the master. Third, some children do not mature sufficiently early to take advantage of their educational opportunities. Some may change institutions or types of curriculum, and, therefore, need more time to settle down to meaningful study.

The cost of this improvement in social security coverage is not great. Benefit payments under last year's amendment were estimated to amount to $175 million for the first year, and would have been spread among some 275,000 children.

Mr. President, I hope the Finance Committee will very soon be at work on a House-passed social security bill. I hope we can make many of the changes in social security which our times dictate and demand. I shall press for the adoption of the bill I have just introduced with the same vigor I have always employed and shall continue to employ in pushing for the enactment of a program of hospital and nursing home insurance under social security.

SENIOR CITIZENS PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Senior Citizens Public Welfare Amendments of 1965." This bill is identical to S. 1358, a bill which I introduced in the last Congress jointly with Congressman WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. It has as its purpose a number of important improvements in provisions in titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act, which deal with our Federal-State programs of old-age assistance.

Section 2 of the bill would require States to provide medical protection for old-age assistance recipients which would be at least equal to that provided those in the medical assistance for the aged program established by the Kerr-Mills Act.

Section 3 would eliminate the 42-day limitation for medical care in a general hospital for a person suffering from mental illness or tuberculosis.

Section 4 would provide that as a condition for receiving Federal grants for old-age assistance, a State's plan must establish and maintain standards of health and safety for housing rented to recipients of this program.

Section 5 would gradually reduce the maximum period of residence which States require for eligibility under old-age assistance programs to 1 year by 1972.

Section 6 would provide that protective payments under old-age assistance may be made to a third party in behalf of the needy recipient comparable to provisions adopted in 1962 for dependent children.

Of the 18 million persons aged 65 and over in this country today, about 1 in 8, or 2.2 million receive old-age assistance payments.

These payments are made on the basis of individual need and these 2.2 million aged are accordingly the neediest among our senior citizens.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE AGED

Four and one-half years ago, the Congress enacted a new program of medical assistance for the aged, generally referred to as the Kerr-Mills Act. This program is now in operation in 39 States and 4 other American jurisdictions. In 7 States—California, Connecticut, Idaho, Iowa, Michigan, New Jersey, and South Carolina—medical assistance under the new program is more generous in amount, scope, or duration than the assistance that is available for medical care of the very neediest old-age assistance recipients. It seems poor policy for us to provide less in the way of medical care to persons on old-age assistance, who require help with their day-to-day living expenses, than we provide to the recipients of medical assistance for the aged, who have enough resources to meet their regular expenses other than their medical bills.

To cure this defect, section 2 of the proposed legislation would require that by July 1, 1967, States have provisions for at least the same scope of medical assistance to the persons eligible to receive old-age assistance as they provide to the persons who received only medical assistance for the aged. The effective date—2 years hence—would give the States that may be in this situation time to work out any existing differences.

AID FOR THE TUBERCULAR AND MENTALLY ILL

Another provision of the bill is directed toward aged persons who are mentally ill or who have tuberculosis. In 1960, recognizing the trend toward more care of mentally ill persons in general hospitals where needed treatment could sometimes be effected in a relatively short time in the individual's home community, the Congress provided that in both old-age assistance and in the new program of medical assistance for the aged, the Federal Government would participate for up to 42 days in public assistance payments for medical care of recipients who are mentally ill or have tuberculosis in general hospitals.

Two problems have arisen regarding this 1960 provision. One is that the 42-day period is a short one in relation to certain individuals.

The second is that the administrative burden of keeping track of individuals to determine exactly when the 42d day ends and the 43d day begins is unduly time consuming and has deterred States from taking advantage of this provision. The Congress can at very small cost eliminate the 42-day time limitation on such care in general hospitals. This would be done by section 3 of the proposed legislation. Since no State is required to take any legislative action under this provision, it would become effective July 1, 1965, as an additional resource to State public welfare programs. The provision would be applicable to medical assistance for the aged as well as old-age assistance. This section would amend the old-age assistance provisions by deleting, as of July 1, 1965, the existing limitation which precludes Federal participation in cash payments to individuals who are tubercular or mentally ill in general hospitals.

Since the Senate last September added as an amendment to the social security bill a provision similar in principle to this section, the Senate has already approved the policy which it represents. As the social security bill expired in conference, it is necessary to offer this provision again in bill form.

BETTER HOUSING FOR THE AGED

The studies and hearings of our Special Committee on Aging have shown that many aged persons are especially subject to various types of exploitation. One aspect of this problem is that many old-age assistance recipients live in housing that does not meet even the barest minimum of health and safety.

Studies have shown that the needy aged frequently must pay exorbitant rentals for grossly substandard quarters. Census data indicate that among households headed by a person age 65 or older who live in rental housing, nearly 40 percent are in quarters that are classified as substandard.

Rental costs represent a major segment of our payments of old-age assistance despite the fact that a large proportion of our aged own their own homes, including many of the needy aged who receive old-age assistance.

Clearly the time has come when States and localities must come to grips with this basic problem. The bill does not propose to tell States how to set standards or who in the State government should administer those standards.

The bill would simply require that by July 1, 1968, the States establish or designate some agency to establish and maintain standards of health and safety for the quarters which recipients of old-age assistance rent. This would give the States very broad latitude in providing realistic protection for aged renters and sufficient time in which to get their provisions into operation.

LIBERALIZING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

It is estimated that one person in five in the United States moves each year. Substantial numbers move across State lines. Aged persons almost certainly do not move as often as younger workers. However, many aged persons may need to change their State residence in order to be near relatives who can offer care and companionship.

At present a State may impose a residence requirement for old-age assistance as long as 5 years out of the preceding 9. Today there are 19 States that impose this maximum requirement permitted under the Federal law. They are: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, and Washington. The Governors' conference several years ago recommended that this be reduced to 1 year. The proposed legislation would reduce the present 5-year limitation to 3 years, beginning in 1970, and to 1 year immediately preceding application, beginning in 1972. This timespan would permit States to make any necessary adjustments. With the continued decline in the old-age assistance caseload, the cost of this humanitarian step would be minimal.

PROTECTIVE PAYMENTS FOR THE AGED

As I indicated earlier, there are among our aged on old-age assistance a substantial number of persons who are very old and feeble. These persons, while not mentally ill, are often forgetful. Some tend to lose things, some are subject to exploitation by unscrupulous persons. Some of these individuals live with children or relatives. Others live in nursing homes or institutions. By and large, they do not need formal legal guardianship. However, they do frequently need help in managing money.

Under existing law, we can make money payments to a recipient or his legal guardian. We can make payments directly to doctors, hospitals, or other suppliers of medical care, but we cannot make payments to a third person to help a feeble senior citizen.

Section 6 of the bill would make provision, with appropriate safeguards, for protective payments made to a third person in behalf of an old-age assistance recipient.

In 1962, the Congress enacted a provision for protective-payments-in-aid to families with dependent children. While the need among the aged arises for somewhat different reasons, I am convinced that this provision will serve a highly useful and humane purpose.

The Senate has also placed its stamp of approval upon this proposal, since it last year added it as an amendment to the social security bill which expired in conference.

Throughout the bill corresponding changes have been made in title XVI of the Social Security Act. This title permits a State to elect to have a combined program for the aged, blind, and disabled so that aged persons under the combined program would receive the advantages of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, the cost of the amendments which I have proposed here is negligible. I consider that this bill would make possible a number of modest, positive noncontroversial steps which would improve the situation of some of our neediest senior citizens. I believe that it is worthy of prompt consideration and early enactment by the Congress. I intend to offer the provisions of this bill as an amendment to any social security bill which may receive major consideration in the Senate this year. I hope that in this or some other way, these proposals may become law by the end of the session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 991) to improve the public assistance provisions of titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act, relating to aged individuals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL WOOL ACT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the National Wool Act.

This legislation is unique, in that it is one farm program which has met with the approval and worked to the satisfaction of all major segments of the wool industry, from producer through manufacturer.

The National Wool Act had its inception in 1954. It was established in lieu of a tariff increase on raw wool recommended by the Tariff Commission. This recommendation as made to the administration following an investigation under section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act. The administration took the position that, in order to protect our relations with friendly nations shipping wool to this country, an increase in the tariff should not be made. The Wool Act was worked out from aministration recommendations at that time as a means of maintaining a domestic sheep industry without increasing tariff duties on imports.

Mr. President, the act permits wool to seek its price level on the open market. Whenever the national average price received by producers falls below a level established by the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage domestic wool production, payments are made to producers at a percentage rate to bring the national average price up to the incentive level. Under this formula, a grower is encouraged to produce quality wool and get the best market price possible. The more he obtains in the marketplace through quality production, the greater his incentive payment.

The program is financed on the basis of 70 percent of the receipts from duty collections on imports of wool and wool manufactures, and thus does not take directly from the Treasury and the taxpayer.

The bill would extend the operations of the act through December 31, 1972. There are two basic reasons why the bill is being introduced for a 7-year extension.

In the first place, 7 years is the average life of a breeding ewe. If the act is extended for that length of time, a farmer or rancher could go into a sheep enterprise knowing that he would have economic stability through at least one cycle of sheep production. Sheep raising is a long-term enterprise and is not like crop production where we can plant seed and obtain a crop the same year. A 7-year extension would make the program practical and effective.

In the second place, the National Wool Act is now going into its 11th year of operation and has proved to be one of our sound and successful agriculture programs. I therefore feel that an extension for at least 7 years, or for one cycle of sheep production, is now in order.

Another commendable feature of the act is the "self-help" provision, whereby producers have authorized a deduction from their payments to finance a program of advertising and sales promotion of their products, lamb and wool. In this way, they increase returns in the marketplace and thereby lessen the needs for payments under this program.

It is important that the act be extended as early as possible in this first session of the Congress. The present 1965 marketing year is the last under the current legislative authority. Extension of the program is needed by early summer so that the Secretary of Agriculture, as prescribed in the act, can announce the program for the ensuing year sufficiently in advance so as to permit producers to plan the size of their breeding flocks for the next year's operation and obtain the necessary financing from their lending institutions.

Mr. President, I am happy to introduce a bill to extend a popular and successful farm program. I ask that the bill lie on the table through February 11 and I invite all of my colleagues to join as cosponsors, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire that the bill lie on the desk?

Mr. McGEE. In view of the recent colloquy, I ask that there be followed whatever the proper procedure may be under the circumstances, so long as the bill is available for cosponsorship by as many Senators as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will take care of the matter.

The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wyoming.

The bill (S. 994) to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, introduced by Mr. McGEE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in Section 703 of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 910; 72 Stat. 994; 75 Stat. 306), the second sentence is amended to read as follows: "Such price support shall be limited to wool and mohair marketed during the period beginning April 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1972."

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I commend the President on his agricultural message, which he has just sent to Congress. In his message, in taking a realistic approach to the problems that confront American agriculture today, he makes the recommendation that the Wool Act be extended. The President recognizes in this situation, of course, the high success of the program until now. He likewise emphasizes the importance of maintaining stability in the price structure of the livestock industry. This, too, has plagued us for a long time. I commend him on the emphasis and the priority he gives to these items. I add my voice to those who have applauded him for his views on the farm question.

SENIOR CITIZENS' COMMUNITY PLANNING AND SERVICES ACT OF 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "The Senior Citizens Community Planning and Services Act of 1965." The bill would amend the Social Security Act by establishing a new title XVIII to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States.

I introduced in the last Congress a bill identical in substance, S. 1357, jointly with Congressman WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

This proposal was introduced to carry out some of the recommendations in President Kennedy's message to Congress on February 21, 1963 on "Elderly Citizens of Our Nation."

Last year, hearings were held on it by a Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Aging. The chairman of that subcommittee was and is the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. Testimony presented at those hearings support the conclusion that the proposed authorizations would do much for our Nation's elderly at relatively little cost. The Special Committee on Aging later issued reports endorsing the proposed authorizations in this bill.

PART A—GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING, SERVICES, AND TRAINING

The new title XVIII which would be added to the Social Security Act by this bill is divided into five parts. Part A would authorize formula grants to each State based on the ratio of the State's population aged 65 or older to the national population of that age. These moneys would be used by the State to strengthen its program and agencies for the aging and to work with communities to strengthen theirs. Funds would be available for community planning and coordination of programs, establishment, expansion, and demonstrations of programs and services, and the training of necessary personnel.

A comprehensive State plan would be drawn up; a single State agency would administer or supervise the program.

The States are deeply concerned with the needs of their older citizens. Many have moved to action with increasing urgency. There are active agencies on aging in 39 States and in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. But only 30 of these 39 active State agencies have a State appropriation, and only 32 of these active State agencies have a paid executive director or secretary.

Funds proposed under this part of title XVIII would permit States to encourage planning and coordinating committees in cities and counties to determine the needs of their older citizens and to stimulate public and voluntary agencies to develop communitywide programs of health, social services, employment, recreation, education, and housing to meet them.

Pilot projects could be developed and existing programs improved in such areas as preretirement education, the teaching of creative skills, development of social and recreational programs, provision of meal centers and home-delivered meals, establishment of homemaker services, development of sales outlets for senior craftsmen, and such safety measures as establishment of special telephone service to maintain contact with older people living alone.

Grants could be made by the States from their allotments to agencies and organizations such as adult education and training centers and university extension services.

These Federal funds would make it possible for the States to obtain and maintain up-to-date information on the numbers and general needs of their older citizens, to analyze existing programs and available services to plan improvements, new approaches, and techniques. In particular they would make possible better coordination of services and provision of guidance and consultation to communities.

I ask unanimous consent that a table of State allotments indicating the Federal sum each State can expect to receive under part A in the peak years of the program be inserted in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated allotments to the States under part A of the Senior Citizens Community Planning and Services Act of 1965:

	Maximum annual allotment
Alabama	$215, 965. 63
Alaska	126, 860. 00
Arizona	156, 445. 63
Arkansas	192, 715. 63
California	604, 356. 87
Colorado	180, 102. 50
Connecticut	209, 513. 75
Delaware	137, 438. 75
District of Columbia	149, 063. 75
Florida	317, 684. 37
Georgia	226, 253. 75
Hawaii	135, 171. 87
Idaho	145, 285. 63
Illinois	464, 624. 37
Indiana	280, 193. 75
Iowa	239, 157. 50
Kansas	208, 700. 00
Kentucky	226, 835. 00
Louisiana	209, 165. 00
Maine	162, 141. 87
Maryland	203, 933. 75
Massachusetts	324, 136. 25
Michigan	347, 328. 13
Minnesota	248, 457. 50
Mississippi	191, 204. 37
Missouri	300, 363. 13
Montana	147, 785. 00
Nebraska	$182, 195. 00
Nevada	131, 335. 63
New Hampshire	148, 598. 75
New Jersey	320, 241. 87
New Mexico	142, 844. 37
New York	712, 818. 13
North Carolina	233, 751. 87
North Dakota	145, 401. 87
Ohio	437, 538. 13
Oklahoma	211, 664. 37
Oregon	188, 995. 63
Pennsylvania	518, 099. 37
Rhode Island	156, 213. 13
South Carolina	177, 486. 87
South Dakota	149, 935. 63
Tennessee	232, 589. 37
Texas	384, 644. 37
Utah	145, 866. 87
Vermont	140, 228. 75
Virginia	225, 672. 50
Washington	222, 185. 00
West Virginia	185, 101. 25
Wisconsin	265, 313. 75
Wyoming	134, 009. 38
Puerto Rico	167, 547. 50
Virgin Islands	63, 255. 63
Guam	62, 906. 88
American Samoa	62, 674. 38
Total	12, 500, 000. 00

PART B—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, part B would authorize funds for research and development project grants to public and nonprofit agencies, voluntary organizations, institutions, and individuals to develop or demonstrate new approaches, techniques, and methods, which hold promise of substantially contributing to worthwhile and meaningful life for older persons.

Research is needed in many areas. There are great gaps in our knowledge about the elderly. Many current approaches and programs need to be evaluated and improved. Current patterns and conditions of living of older persons need to be studied to determine what factors are beneficial and what detrimental.

We know little of the social-psychological processes of aging.

We know little of the preferences and patterns of older people as consumers.

We know little of the most satisfactory design and method of providing services in housing projects for older people.

We know little of the extent and kinds of activity in which older people are interested and of which they are capable.

Demonstration projects would, in the main, be pilot projects of national scope and significance, which could serve or be adapted to varying local conditions.

They could, for example, include experiments in total community organization designed to keep older people informed of all services available to them.

They could be experiments in activity, education, and recreational programs and concerted social services within or adjacent to senior housing projects designed to determine which are most effective in maintaining independence, mental health, community participation, and good family relationships among older people.

They could be projects to develop teaching and training tools, study units, and materials, for use by educational institutions and the professions.

PART C—TRAINING PROJECTS

Part C would authorize funds for grants to or contracts with public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions for the specialized training of persons employed in or preparing for employment in the field of aging.

There is a serious shortage of professionally and technically trained personnel to work with older persons. Institutions of higher education have only begun to work toward fulfilling this need. Colleges, universities, and professional schools need teachers with knowledge of aging, and almost every profession and technical occupation involved in serving older people is acutely short of persons trained to work with them. There is a particular and immediate need for persons broadly trained in aging to work in State and community planning of programs for the aged.

Several witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee to which I previously referred testified that the shortage of trained personnel is indeed a serious handicap in establishing and carrying out community programs for the aging. One witness who works in programs for the elderly in Boston testified that even if additional financial support were given his programs, it is doubtful because of the difficulty of finding trained personnel that such funds could be effectively used.

The proposed legislation would provide funds for internships and fellowships, for establishment of courses, institutes of gerontology, and development of new training materials and curriculums.

PART D—CONSTRUCTION OF MULTIPURPOSE ACTIVITY CENTERS

Part D of the new title would provide grants for construction, remodeling, or equipping multipurpose activity centers for the elderly.

These unique centers are essentially community centers especially designed for older people. Comparatively new to the American scene, they are generally regarded as the most important facility that has come into existence in connection with community efforts to meet the needs of their older people.

They serve both the elderly and the community.

They provide opportunity for older people to continue as active participants in community life, to build retirement lives based on the pursuit of interests, skills, and recreation.

Studies have shown that participation in the activities of senior recreation centers improves both the mental and physical health of senior citizens. For example, a study of 300 members of the Sirovich and Hodson Centers, conducted by the New York City Welfare Department, resulted in a finding that after 6 months of membership in the center there was an 87.9-percent decline in attendance at medical clinics. There was an additional finding that there was only one admission to a mental hospital during the first 7 years of the Hodson Center's operation, while it was estimated that there would otherwise have been between 40 and 60.

Another indication of the benefits of such activities to the health of senior citizens was the experience of Ben Grossman, executive director of Drexel Home of the Aged in Chicago. He found a substantial reduction in sick call reports when activity programs were started in Drexel Home.

Therefore, apart from the humanitarian reasons for stimulating the construction of senior activity centers throughout the Nation, it makes good fiscal sense to use this comparatively modest authorization to decrease the financial load upon Government programs for the mental and physical health of senior citizens.

PART E—SPECIAL PROJECTS TO STIMULATE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Part E of the new title would authorize grants to stimulate employment opportunities for the elderly, primarily through projects to demonstrate their employability.

It is one of the anomalies of our day that while more people reach their 65th birthday than ever before, the percentage of older persons in gainful employment has declined steadily. To the extent that this is a result of voluntary retirement, it is good. No one would deny retirement to the worker who seeks it after many years of toil.

But there is evidence that for many of our older citizens, retirement is forced and unwelcome. They are able to work. They wish to work, yet opportunity is denied them, largely because of age. As President Kennedy said, rules of employment that are based upon the calendar rather than upon ability are not good rules. No economy can reach its maximum productivity by wasting its human resources. This is both personal tragedy and a national loss.

Prevailing attitudes, casting doubt upon the capability of senior citizens to continue working beyond arbitrary retirement age, are major barriers to their employment. Yet, as the Presidential message points out, studies of the Department of Labor show large numbers of older workers exceeding the average performance of younger workers, and doing so with steadiness, loyalty, and dependability.

In order to demonstrate this employment capability of older citizens, part E of title XVIII under the administration of the Secretary of Labor, would make grants available to public and nonprofit agencies to provide employment to older persons in public or community undertakings or services that would not otherwise be possible.

PART F—GENERAL—ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND ADMINISTRATION

To strengthen the effectiveness and administration of all grant programs in the act, part F of the new title would establish, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, an Advisory Committee on Aging, made up of 15 distinguished citizens, men and women of demonstrated experience and interest in special problems of the aging. They would advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on matters of general policy concerned with the program. Each member would hold office for a term of 3 years; none could be otherwise in the employ of the United States.

In addition, part F would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, in administering their respective functions under the act, to draw upon the services and facilities of "any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit private agency or institution" that can be of assistance in strengthening the program.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in carrying out the purposes of the title could give consultative services and technical assistance to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions. He could provide short-term training and technical instruction. He could also conduct research and demonstrations, and could collect, prepare, publish, and disseminate special educational and information materials to assist the purposes of the act, including reports of projects for which funds are provided under the act.

SUMMARY

I have, of necessity, greatly condensed my description of this far-ranging piece of legislation. It is, I feel, of equal importance to any in our entire program for the elderly.

The assistance to be provided under this proposed legislation will not duplicate services now possible under other grant programs; indeed it will make possible the more effective use of these grants.

The very act of developing a comprehensive community plan, of drawing together and evaluating existing services, will enable communities to discover where gaps exist, where unnecessary duplications lie, and to determine precisely where a health grant is most needed, a sound social service program should be strengthened, or an adult education program or senior housing development is justified.

Program operations and services made possible by enactment of the measure would not infringe upon the prerogatives of State or local health, welfare, recreation, education, or housing agencies, but would assist and work with and through existing authorities wherever possible.

The expenditures authorized by this bill are minor—minor in relation to the total annual budget, minor in relation to our other expenditures for the work of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and minor in relation to the benefits which would accrue to our society. As a matter of fact, I believe it would be more accurate to regard the funds required for this program as an investment rather than as an expenditure. It would be an investment in enriched living for those among us who are already elderly and an investment in brighter futures for those of us who hope to live long enough to be elderly some day. It would be an investment in helping America's elderly to make themselves even more of an asset to the Nation than they now are.

I intend to offer the provisions of this bill as an amendment to any social security bill which may receive major consideration in the Senate this year. I hope that in this or some other way, these proposals may become law by the end of the session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 992) to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, through grants for construction of recreational activity centers, and through grants to stimulate employment opportunities; introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PRIVATE ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act.

This bill is an amended version of S. 1935 of the 88th Congress, which I introduced on July 24, 1963. The changes that have been made in S. 1935 are the result of consultations with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly [Mr. HART], following the extensive and thorough hearings on the bill by that subcommittee last year. I am especially proud to announce that the Senator from Michigan is cosponsoring this bill with me, and that the cosponsors also include the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act prohibits three kinds of misconduct in the field of pricing. In the language of the act, these are:

> 1. To be a party to, or assist in, any transaction of sale, or contract to sell, which discriminates to [the seller's or purchaser's] knowledge against competitors of the purchaser, in that, any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge is granted to the purchaser over and above any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge available at the time of such transaction to said competitor in respect of a sale of goods of like grade, quality, and quantity;
>
> 2. To sell, or contract to sell, goods in any part of the United States at prices lower than those exacted by said person elsewhere in the United States for the purpose of destroying competition, or eliminating a competitor * * *; or
>
> 3. To sell, or contract to sell, goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor.

Violators, upon conviction, are subject to $5,000 fine, a year's imprisonment, or both. Prohibitions quite similar to the first two of these three occur also in section 1 of the Robinson-Patman Act. That section is made, in terms, amendatory of section 2 of the Clayton Act. The Clayton Act, by definition contained in its own section 1, is one of the antitrust laws. Other sections of the Clayton Act empower private citizens who have been injured, or the Government, to bring civil actions for treble damages and injunctive relief against violators of the antitrust laws. Before 1958, it had been widely assumed that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act was a part of the antitrust laws. While several lower courts doubted or denied the right of private suitors to base damage actions on violation of section 3, enough others did grant relief thereunder to cause the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, in its 1955 report—page 200—to note that private plaintiffs had emerged as the principal enforcers of this section.

On January 20, 1958, the Supreme Court, in two companion cases decided by a 5-to-4 majority, ruled that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act was not a part of the antitrust laws, and, as a result, that private action for treble damages and injunctive relief would not lie for violation of the unreasonably low pricing ban contained only in that section—a criminal statute—and not paralleled in section 2 of the Clayton Act. Three days later, for myself and a number of cosponsors, I introduced S. 3079, 85th Congress, a bill to make section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the antitrust laws. Shortly afterward the Senate Small Business Committee held public hearings on the general topic of private antitrust enforcement. An ensuing report—Senate Report No. 1855, 85th Congress, 2d session, 1958—prepared by subcommittees headed by then Senator HUMPHREY and Senator LONG of Louisiana, won endorsement of the full committee, without a dissenting vote. The first recommendation was for enactment of S. 3079; but the Senate Judiciary Committee, to which it was referred, took no action on the bill, and it accordingly died upon expiration of the 85th Congress.

Over subsequent years, counterparts and variations of S. 3079 were introduced and reintroduced by me and by many other Senators and Representatives. But, until the 88th Congress, neither the House nor the Senate Judiciary Committee ever took action or scheduled hearings on any of the bills. Last year, for the first time, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee held 4 days of thorough public hearings on two of the bills, direct "descendants" of S. 3079. One was S. 1815, 88th Congress, introduced by Senator HUMPHREY. The other was S. 1935, which I introduced for myself and Senators BARTLETT, BIBLE, HILL, HUMPHREY, Kefauver, LONG of Louisiana, MORSE, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, and YARBOROUGH. These two bills differed in statutory technical approach only. Identical in substance, each had the same purpose as my original 85th Congress bill: to make section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act an "antitrust law," for purposes of private and governmental civil enforcement.

At the hearings, favorable testimony was received from the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Commerce; also from the National Farmers Union, the National Federation of Independent Business, the National Association of Retail Druggists, the National Independent Dairies Association, the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, the National Association of Retail Grocers, and the National Candy Wholesalers Association, among others. I recall that the then attorney general of Minnesota, the Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE, now a Member of this body, sent in a favorable statement.

House counterparts of my bill were introduced by Representatives WRIGHT PATMAN and JOHN D. DINGELL, and the latter sent in a statement to the Senate subcommittee favoring S. 1935.

Of course, there was also opposition testimony. One objection that was noted was that the first two prohibitions contained in section 3 are redundant, because the same offenses can be reached under section 2 of the Clayton Act. In the bill that I am introducing today, upon the recommendation of my distinguished cosponsor, the Senator from Michigan, we have gone at least part way toward meeting this objection by striking the first prohibition and transferring to the Clayton Act only the remaining two.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I earnestly hope that it may be possible during the 89th Congress to make available to the Nation's small businessmen the benefits that would accrue from civil enforcement of the prohibitions against geographical price discrimination and unreasonably low pricing now found in section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act.

It is my expectation that the forthcoming 15th annual report of the Senate Small Business Committee will contain a renewed endorsement of this proposed legislation, along with a more detailed and annotated version of the information contained in this statement.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I am introducing today, followed by the text of the statement I made to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee at the hearings on the prior version of the bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 995) to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, introduced by Mr.

Sparkman (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1936 (49 Stat. 1528; 15 U.S.C. 13a) is repealed.

Sec. 2. (a) The Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (38 Stat. 730 et seq.; 15 U.S.C. 12 et seq.), commonly known as the Clayton Act, is amended by inserting therein, immediately after section 3 thereof, the following new section:

"Sec. 3A. It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, to sell, or contract to sell, goods in any part of the United States at prices lower than those exacted by said person elsewhere in the United States for the purpose of destroying competition, or eliminating a competitor in such part of the United States; or to sell, or contract to sell, goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor.

"Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

(b) Sections 11 and 16 of that Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. 21, 26), are amended by striking out the words "sections 2, 3, 7, and 8" wherever they appear therein, and inserting in lieu thereof in each instance the words "sections 2, 3, 3A, 7, and 8".

Sec. 3. Nothing herein contained shall affect any pending prosecutions, or judgments or orders of any court issued and in effect or pending on appeal, based on section 3 of the Act of June 19, 1936, prior to the effective date of the repeal thereof by section 1 of this Act.

The statement presented by Mr. **Sparkman** is as follows:

Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on S. 1815 and S. 1935, 88th Congress, 1st Session, February 19, 1964

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN OF ALABAMA IN SUPPORT OF S. 1935

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate very much your invitation to appear in support of S. 1935, a bill I introduced last July 24 for myself and ten cosponsors: Senators **Bartlett**, **Bible**, **Hill**, **Humphrey**, Kefauver, **Long** of Louisiana, **Morse**, **Neuberger**, **Randolph**, and **Yarborough**. I was particularly proud on that day to be able to announce the name of the late, dedicated chairman of this subcommittee, Estes Kefauver, as a cosponsor.

S. 1935 is a "descendant" of a bill I introduced on January 23, 1958. That bill was S. 3079, 85th Congress. It, too, had a number of distinguished cosponsors,[1] and was also sponsored, in a concurrent House counterpart, H.R. 10243, by Chairman **Wright Patman** of the House Small Business Committee.

The purposes of both bills before this subcommittee today, S. 1815 and S. 1935, as well as of the several predecessor bills in earlier Congresses,[2] are identical. Their common objective is to cure a deficiency in the antitrust laws of the United States that was brought to light by the Supreme Court over 6 years ago, and just 3 days before my first bill on this subject was introduced. On January 20, 1958, the Supreme Court, by a 5-to-4 decision, handed down its opinions in the companion cases of *Nashville Milk Co.* v. *Carnation Company*[3] and *Safeway Stores, Inc.* v. *Vance*.[4] These decisions held that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act[5] was not a part of the antitrust laws, within the scope of sections 4 and 16 of the Clayton Act.[6] Consequently, the Court held, private actions for treble damages and injunctive relief will not lie for infractions of section 3 of Robinson-Patman. (For the convenience of the subcommittee, I have appended to my statement copies of the headnote summaries of these cases, and of another important and relevant case that I shall mention later.)

Enactment of either of the bills you are considering today would cure this situation by making violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act most clearly and unequivocally the subject of injunctive relief in civil suits brought by the Government or by private parties, of cease and desist orders of the Federal Trade Commission, and also cause for treble-damage awards in private civil antitrust actions.

I would say that the action this subcommittee takes on these bills may well hinge on consideration of these three questions:

1. Do we want to perpetuate and enlarge the 74-year-old policy of the Congress to authorize and encourage enforcement of the antitrust laws by private parties?
2. Do we want to make the provisions of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act the specific subject of such private civil actions?
3. Assuming that we answer the first two questions "yes," which of the two bills before the subcommittee is the more effective instrument for accomplishing the purpose?

I shall speak briefly to each of these questions.

I. Private antitrust enforcement a valid policy, a vital force

The Supreme Court's decisions in the Nashville and Safeway cases were deeply troubling to many members of the Senate Small Business Committee, and to me as chairman of that committee.

True, there was much logical force and impressive documentation in Mr. Justice Harlan's opinion for the Court's thin majority, that Congress did not intend section 3 of Robinson-Patman to be a part of the "antitrust laws."[7]

On the other hand, in addition to the dissent's equally impressive counterdocumentation, these words from the dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Douglas compelled consideration:

"In resolving all ambiguities against the grant of vitality to section 3, we forget that the treble-damage technique for law enforcement was designed as an effective, if not the most effective, method of deterring violators of the act.

"As the Court notes, it appears that the Department of Justice has never enforced the criminal provisions of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. Because of the Court's holding that section 3 is not available in civil actions to private parties, the statute has in effect been repealed. It is apparent that the opponents of the Robinson-Patman Act have eventually managed to achieve in this Court what they could not do in Congress."[8]

Nevertheless, the Court had decided—no matter by what majority—what Congress intended in 1936. The issue to me, and to others, then became whether Congress still intended, in 1958, that section 3 of Robinson-Patman be confined to criminal applications only. A larger question raised was the vitality of private antitrust enforcement generally, in the wake of the Nashville and Safeway decisions. To help shed light on these questions, perhaps resolve them, I introduced S. 3079, 85th Congress, just 3 days after the decisions, and, not long afterwards, with Senator **Humphrey**, made plans for public hearings on the general topic of private antitrust enforcement. Those hearings[9] were held on March 3 and 4, 1958, by our Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices, chaired by Senator **Humphrey**. The ensuing report[10] was prepared by that subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Monopoly, of which Senator **Long** of Louisiana was then, and still is, chairman. The report won the endorsement of the full Small Business Committee, without a dissenting vote. A quotation from that report is relevant and may be helpful here:

From page 2: "Although rooted in the common law,[11] the right to sue for treble-damage redress of business injuries resulting from trade restraints and other monopolistic practices first found statutory expression in section 7 of the Sherman Act[12] [now repealed and superseded by comparable substantive provisions of section 4 of the Clayton Act.[13]]

"In thus wedding Federal antitrust policy with private compensatory law, the Members of the 51st Congress believed that they had created an effective device for keeping competition hard but clean. By allowing injured parties to recover costs of suit, plus three times the amount of the damage done, Congress hoped to give businessmen a strong incentive to become, in effect, a legion of antitrust enforcement vigilantes. The procedures established reflected a logical uniting of self-interest with public policy."

Three years before Nashville and Safeway, the Supreme Court recognized "the public interest in vigilant enforcement of the antitrust laws through the instrumentality of private treble-damage action * * *."[14] The Court has also stated:

"Congress has, by legislative fiat, determined that such prohibited activities are injurious to the public and has provided sanctions allowing private enforcement of the antitrust laws by an aggrieved party."[15]

---

[1] Senators **Hill**, **Humphrey**, **Morse**, **Proxmire**, Thye, **Javits**, **Neuberger**, O'Mahoney, **Yarborough** and **Long**.

[2] E.g., S. 3079 and H.R. 10243, 85th Cong.; S. 725, 86th Cong.; H.R. 125, 87th Cong. See also H.R. 913 and H.R. 8833, 88th Cong.

[3] 355 U.S. 373.

[4] 355 U.S. 389.

[5] June 19, 1936, c. 592, section 3, 49 Stat. 1528; 15 U.S.C. 13a.

[6] Oct. 15, 1914, c. 323, sections 4, 16, 38 Stat. 731, 737; 15 U.S.C. 15, 26.

[7] 355 U.S. 376–382. Rowe, Price Discrimination Under the Robinson-Patman Act, 470 (1962), the next-to-latest of three recent major treatises on the act, agrees: "The majority interpretation accords with the predominant congressional consensus of 1936."

[8] 355 U.S. 387–388.

[9] Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee on the "Extent to Which Private Enforcement of the Antitrust Laws Offers a Practical Form of Protection to Small-Business Victims of Predatory Pricing Practices and Other Antitrust Wrongdoing," 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958).

[10] Senate Small Business Committee, "The Role of Private Antitrust Enforcement in Protecting Small Business," 1958, S. Rept. No. 1855, 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958).

[11] IV William Blackstone's "Commentaries on the Laws of England" (4th ed.), ch. 12 (1769). (Footnote 7 in original.)

[12] 26 Stat. 210; cf. 15 U.S.C. 15 [1952]. (Footnote 8 in original. 26 Stat. 210 [1890] was repealed by 69 Stat. 283 [1955], effective Jan. 7, 1956.)

[13] Oct. 15, 1914, ch. 323, sec. 4, 38 Stat. 731; 15 U.S.C. 15.

[14] *Lawlor, et al., t/a Independent Poster Exchange* v. *National Screen Service Corp. et al.*, 349 U.S. 322, 329 (1955).

It is interesting that, at the Senate Small Business Committee's hearings on private antitrust enforcement in 1958, both the then Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Victor R. Hansen, a Republican, and a man who was to become one of his Democratic successors, Lee Loevinger, then a private antitrust practitioner, spoke out strongly in favor of private enforcement of the antitrust laws as a potent arm of public policy. Their comments were noted in a speech made almost 4 years later, on January 18, 1962, by Federal Trade Commissioner Everette MacIntyre before a joint meeting of the antitrust sections of the Chicago and the Illinois State Bar Associations. It is to that speech by Commissioner MacIntyre that I am indebted for the following statistical observations, which both drew upon and updated figures in our 1958 hearings:

"The legislative intent to enlist the private individual in enforcement of the antitrust laws was largely unrealized until after World War II. As of 1940 in a half century of private litigation, only 175 cases of this nature had been filed and of these only 13 resulted in judgment. The number of private suits in the period, according to one comment, assumed a comparatively futile insignificance taking into consideration the large number of businessmen and the extent of corporate consolidation by certain of their number.

"The private antitrust litigant, however, assumed importance after World War II; reported recoveries from 1945 to 1951 amounted to one and a half times the number in the entire previous period.

"The statistics of the administrative office of the U.S. courts for antitrust cases filed since 1941 graphically document this point. The first significant increase in the number of private actions filed took place in 1949 when the 162 suits filed registered an increase of 131.4 percent over the 70 private suits filed in 1942. Thereafter, in the period 1950 through 1961, there is a steady upward trend in private antitrust litigation, disregarding fluctuations in certain years. For example, the 378 private suits filed in 1961 showed an increase of 133.3 percent over treble damage litigation filed in 1949 and an increase of 440 percent over corresponding litigation in 1942.

"The growing importance of private litigation is made even more obvious by comparing the number of private suits filed for various periods in the 20-year interval between 1942 and 1961. The years 1942 through 1948 involving a period of 7 years saw 397 private actions filed; in the next 7-year period, 1949–55, 1,373 such actions were filed, while in the last 6 years, 1956–61, private litigants initiated 1,541 antitrust suits.

"Another comparison further drives home the indispensable role that the private suit has played in the antitrust field in recent years. In the 20-year period 1942–61, the U.S. Department of Justice filed 986 criminal and civil suits; in the last 5 years of the period, private parties initiated 1,314 actions. Private actions in the 5-year period exceeded by 328, therefore, the total number of Government suits filed for the entire 20-year interval."

At the conclusion of its 1958 report, the Senate Small Business Committee observed:

"Notwithstanding the past failure of private antitrust enforcement activity, your committee is convinced that the statutory authority for such suits is sound in principle and can be made workable in practice."[16]

Figures such as those cited by Commissioner MacIntyre make me feel surer than ever that our observation was well taken. I trust that this subcommittee will agree that Congress should perpetuate and strengthen the policy of private antitrust enforcement, in general.

II. Statutory "reversal" of Nashville and Safeway is in the public interest

Section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act prohibits three specific types of commercial misconduct. It forbids "any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce":

1. To be a party to, or assist in, any transaction of sale, or contract to sell, which discriminates to his knowledge against competitors of the purchaser, in that, any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge is granted to the purchaser over and above any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge available at the time of such transaction to said competitor in respect of a sale of goods of like grade, quality, and quantity;

2. To sell, or contract to sell, goods in any part of the United States at prices lower than those exacted by said person elsewhere in the United States for the purpose of destroying competition, or eliminating a competitor; or,

3. To sell, or contract to sell, goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor.

In the Nashville case, the plaintiff had sued under only one, the third, of these three prohibitions. The Court held that the dismissal of his complaint had been proper, because the unreasonably low prices ban of Robinson-Patman section 3 is not paralleled in section 1 of the act, which, of course, was made very specifically an amendment of section 2 of the Clayton Act. In the Safeway case, plaintiff had claimed violations of two of the three provisions, the ones numbered 1 and 3 in the foregoing breakdown. The Court held that the private action would not lie for injuries allegedly caused by unreasonably low prices of the defendant but that treble damages could be recovered for injuries allegedly caused by unlawful price discrimination, since that count, if proved, would amount to a violation of amended section 2 of the Clayton Act (sec. 1 of Robinson-Patman), as well as section 3.

Similarly the Supreme Court relied on both sections 2(a) of amended Clayton (sec. 1 of Robinson-Patman) and section 2 of Robinson-Patman to interdict a rather clear and brutal example of geographical local price-cutting in the 1954 case of *Moore* v. *Mead's Fine Bread Co.*;[17] but in that case, as Justice Douglas points out in his dissent in Nashville and Safeway, the particular question whether section 3 was or was not made part of the antitrust laws by Congress, "was neither briefed nor considered."[18] The 1960 case of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Anheuser-Busch, Inc.*,[19] however, provides reassurance that the Supreme Court will find 2(a) alone a sufficient legal peg on which to hang prevention of area price discrimination. The holding of that case, you will recall, was that the respondent could not charge a local product price for its premium product in one area, while charging a premium price elsewhere.

It seems fair to say, therefore, that it is only for the third of the three prohibitions of Robinson-Patman section 3—the ban on "unreasonably low prices"—there is a continuing need for Congress formally to instate this section as a part of the antitrust laws. I suggest that this is reason enough.

Frederick M. Rowe, in his 1962 treatise, "Price Discrimination Under the Robinson-Patman Act," is generally critical of the act and (at p. 474) specifically recommends repeal of section 3. Yet Mr. Rowe acknowledges (p. 465) that "the earmarks" of the "unreasonably low pricing" proscription have been "judicially detailed in the F. & A. Ice Cream case."[20] He seems to me, by implication, also to concede (at p. 466) that the 10th circuit has shaped a sensible test for determining when even sharp price cuts are not "unreasonably low."[21] Perhaps most important, he notes (p. 469, at footnote 99) that in a number of cases—following the Supreme Court's "inadvertent" but favorable dictum on section 3 in the 1947 Bruce's Juices case[22] and preceding the death blow to civil enforcement struck in Nashville[23] in 1958—the lower courts had awarded damages under the "unreasonably low pricing" clause with some frequency. Enough so, in fact, for the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws (also hostile to sec. 3) to observe, in its 1955 final report (at p. 200) that private plaintiffs "emerged as the principal enforcers of its difficult prohibitions, rushing in where the Government perhaps fears to tread." Finally, Mr. Rowe's fear (pp. 470–472) that the "unreasonably low pricing" terminology of section 3 may be unconstitutionally vague, for a criminal statute, has now been resolved, in the statute's favor, by the Supreme Court: *United States* v. *National Dairy Products Corp., et al.*, 372 U.S. 29 (1963). A headnote summary of this case is appended. It seems to me to follow rather obviously that if the statute is sufficiently clear for criminal prosecution, it will serve for civil litigation purposes.

The difficulty I have with Mr. Rowe's and also with the Attorney General's National Committee report's dismissal of section 3 with a demand for its total repeal is that their position is too "ivory tower." They simply do not encounter, as I do, the small businessmen who are being buffeted and destroyed by these things termed "unreasonably low prices" which have as their purpose "elimination of a competitor." Rowe would relegate this one statutory ban on "unreasonably low pricing" to the junkheap, without, as far as I know, proposing anything in its stead save utilization of section 2 of the Sherman Act. But the two sections are not identical in their coverage. I doubt very much that every situation that could be found, under Robinson-Patman section 3, to be an unlawful sale of goods "at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor" could with equal ease and certitude be found to be a Sherman section 2 "attempt to monopolize." That language of section 3 must, therefore, be retained and made more useful by engrafting it onto the Clayton Act.

III. S. 1935 offers a "neater" technical approach to the goal

My original bill to incorporate section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act into the antitrust laws won the support of the Justice Department in the Eisenhower administration, in principle; but certain technical deficiencies were noted in that 85th Congress bill. It is my understanding that the Justice Department in the present administration also approves of the general principle that section 3 should be made an "antitrust law" by express legislation.

---

[15] *Radovich* v. *National Football League, et al.*, 352 U.S. 445, 453 (1957).

[16] Small Business Committee report, op. cit. supra, note 10, at p. 12.

[17] 348 U.S. 115.

[18] 355 U.S. 383.

[19] 363 U.S. 536.

[20] *F. & A. Ice Cream Co.* v. *Arden Farms Co.*, 98 F. Supp. 180, 189–190, (S.D., Cal 1951).

[21] *Ben Hur Coal Co.* v. *Wells*, 242 F. 2d 481, 486 (10th Cir. 1957).

[22] *Bruce's Juices, Inc.* v. *American Can Co.*, 330 U.S. 743, 750 (1947).

[23] *Nashville Milk Co.* v. *Carnation Co.*, 355 U.S. 373 (1958).

The method employed by S. 1815 is to incorporate reference to section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act into every section of the Clayton Act that sets up a private or governmental civil action for violation of "the antitrust laws" or "this act" (the Clayton Act). The method employed by S. 1935 is to repeal section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act and reenact it as section 3A of the Clayton Act. Since the Clayton Act is an antitrust law, by express statutory definition in its own section 1 (15 U.S.C. 12), this device will entitle all of those having an interest in, or who are damaged by, violation of the section to all of the civil remedies available for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, notably to private treble-damage actions and suits for injunctive relief.

The reason for the new approach taken by this bill—that is, repealing section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act and immediately reenacting it as a section of the Clayton Act—is perhaps best explained by quoting a paragraph from the comments of the Department of Justice on my original bill, S. 3079 of the 85th Congress. Then Deputy Attorney General Leonard E. Walsh, in a report to the Senate Judiciary Committee, wrote, in part, as follows:

"It is noted that in its present form the bill does not make section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act in terms a specific amendment to the Clayton Act, and thereby leaves undefined the words 'person' and 'commerce' used in that section. Absent definitions such as those in section 1 of the Clayton Act, for example, it might be held that 'persons' includes only natural persons, not organizations, a result which Congress obviously did not intend. Moreover, unless section 3 is made clearly amendatory to the Clayton Act, the Government may be unable to use injunctive proceedings under section 15 of that act (15 U.S.C. 25) against section 3 violations, for the injunction proceedings are limited to those directed to restraining 'violations of this act,' the Clayton Act. It would appear that these defects could be remedied by amendment of the legislation to state expressly that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is made an amendment of the Clayton Act."

The letter from Deputy Attorney General Walsh concludes:

"Subject to the above suggested amendment, the Department of Justice favors the enactment of the measure. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report."

I do not think it makes a great deal of difference whether you employ the method of S. 1815 or of S. 1935; but, as a further indication that the latter may have a slight technical edge, I would point out that the sponsor of S. 1815, Senator HUMPHREY, later offered to cosponsor S. 1935, and Congressman PATMAN has introduced a House counterpart of S. 1935, H.R. 8833.

I think it will make a difference if you elect to report neither of these bills, nor any other bill to do the same thing. I have spoken for the most part today in lawyer's language, in technical and logical terms. As chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, however, I cannot help, at times, viewing these problem areas in human, emotional terms as well. Perhaps nothing better sums up the need for enactment of one of the bills, on those terms, than the title of one of the two celebrated 1958 Supreme Court cases the bills are designed to overturn. Usually the second of the two companion cases is referred to by a short-form title, *Safeway Stores* v. *Vance*. The full title reads like this: *Safeway Stores, Incorporated, petitioner* v. *Harry V. Vance, trustee in bankruptcy for Frank Melvin Thompson, bankrupt.*

APPENDIX TO STATEMENT OF SENATOR SPARKMAN

Headnote summaries from West's Supreme Court Reporter to the three principal cases

1. *Nashville Milk Co., petitioner* v. *Carnation Company*, 355 U.S. 373 (1958).

Action for treble damages and injunctive relief under Clayton Act for injuries allegedly suffered by plaintiff by reason of defendant's sales at unreasonably low prices in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. The District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Western Division, dismissed the complaint, and plaintiff appealed. The Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, 238 F. 2d 86, affirmed. On certiorari granted, the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Harlan, held that Congress had not, by amendment, made section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act (which is one of the "antitrust laws" whose violation can lead to private causes of action); and held that, therefore, although price discriminations are both criminally punishable (under section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act) and subject to civil redress (under section 2 of the Clayton Act), selling "at unreasonably low prices" is subject only to criminal penalties provided in section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, and a private cause of action for practices forbidden only by that section will not lie.

Affirmed.

The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Douglas, Mr. Justice Black, and Mr. Justice Brennan dissented.

2. *Safeway Stores, Incorporated, petitioner* v. *Harry V. Vance, trustee in bankruptcy for Frank Melvin Thompson, bankrupt*, 355 U.S. 389 (1958).

Private action for treble damages for injuries allegedly caused by sales "at unreasonably low prices" and by "unlawful price discrimination." The District Court for the District of New Mexico, 137 F. Supp. 841, granted defendant's motion to dismiss, and plaintiff appealed. The Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, 239 F. 2d 144, reversed. On certiorari granted, the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Harlan, held that private action for treble damages would not lie for injuries allegedly caused by sales "at unreasonably low prices" but held that treble damages could be recovered for injuries allegedly caused by "unlawful price discrimination."

Judgment of court of appeals vacated and case remanded with directions.

The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Douglas, Mr. Justice Black and Mr. Justice Brennan dissented.

3. *United States, appellant* v. *National Dairy Products Corp., et al.*, 372 U.S. 29 (1963).

Defendants were charged with violating the provision in the Robinson-Patman Act making it a crime to sell goods at unreasonably low prices for purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor. The U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri granted defendants' motion for dismissal on the ground that the statute was unconstitutionally vague and indefinite. The Government took a direct appeal. The Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Clark, held that the provision sufficiently defines the prohibited conduct and is not unconstitutionally vague and indefinite as applied to sales made below cost with such purpose.

Reversed and remanded.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain at the desk through February 11, 1965, so that other Senators who desire to do so may add their names as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SYSTEM OF HEALTH AND SAFETY RULES AND REGULATIONS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries—excluding coal and lignite mines; and for other purposes.

This is a comprehensive mine safety bill. It relates to all mining accidents and all mining operations, including open pit operations.

The bill is based in part on provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, bills introduced in previous Congresses to establish a permanent Federal health and safety program for metallic and nonmetallic mines, and from the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Safety Act—Public Law 85-742.

The principal differences in approach between the bill and the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act are that the former provides for broad enforcement powers, rather than specifically limited enforcement authority as in the Coal Mine Safety Act, and that it does not exclude smaller mines or have a "grandfather clause" permitting the continued use of unsafe equipment in use at the time of passage of the act.

Principal provisions of the bill would:

First. Direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the U.S. Bureau of Mines, to promulgate and enforce a health and safety code for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries.

Second. Grant right of entry for inspection purposes.

Third. Require submission of accident and occupational disease reports as may be prescribed.

Fourth. Empower the Secretary of the Interior to order withdrawal of all persons from an unsafe place except for the purpose of making it safe.

Fifth. Provide criminal penalties for obstruction or failure to comply with orders.

Sixth. Create advisory committee with equal representation of labor and management.

Seventh. Define metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries to include all types of mines and mining operations other than coal and lignite mines, and specified related processing operations, including milling, smelting, and refining, and other enumerated operations performed by the mine operator at or adjacent to the mine site or at places located in relation to the mine site with regard to economic factors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 996) to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. METCALF (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF TERM DURING WHICH SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR IS AUTHORIZED TO MAKE FISHERIES LOANS UNDER THE FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT OF 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 998) to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes.

We request that this proposal be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

Section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended (16 U.S.C. 742c) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make loans for the purposes of financing and refinancing the operations of commercial fishing vessels and the maintenance, repair, and replacement of such vessels and their gear. It also is intended to be used for research into the basic problems of the fisheries. The authority to make these loans is limited to situations where there is evidence that the applicant was otherwise unable to obtain financial assistance on reasonable terms. The objective of the program is to provide financial assistance to the commercial fishing industry for the purposes of upgrading or modernizing our fishing vessels and gear and thereby contributing to more efficient and profitable commercial fishing operations.

In order to carry out this program, a fisheries loan fund was established as a revolving fund. The fund initially had an authorization of $10 million, but this was increased in 1958 to $20 million. A total of $13 million has actually been appropriated to the fund. The fund, however, will expire on June 30, 1965, unless extended by this proposal.

The program was initiated because long-term credit was generally not available to fishing vessel operators. The relative success of the program has encouraged a few banks to reenter the field of fishing vessel financing in the case of vessel owners having exceptionally good credit rating. Bank financing on reasonable terms, however, is still not available to many fishermen because of the hazardous nature of the fishery.

These lending institutions are generally not familiar with the problems of the industry and are unwilling to take the risks involved in long-term financing of fishing vessels and equipment.

This program has filled this credit gap. It has enabled our fishermen to obtain this needed financing and to continue operating their vessels. We strongly believe it should be extended. U.S. fishermen are in constant competition with foreign fishermen for fish at fishing grounds where traditionally American vessels have, until recently, almost exclusively operated, and for markets in the United States. Imports constitute an increasing percentage of the total supply of fish marketed in this country. This dual impact on our fisheries has increased the need for reasonable long-term financing for fishing vessels and gear. Under the circumstances, we believe that our domestic fishing fleet should be given this assistance where possible in meeting such competition. The extension of this worthwhile program, as provided in the enclosed proposal, will continue to help many fishing vessels stay in operation.

As of July 31, 1964, the fisheries loan fund has provided needed financing for the replacement of 142 fishing vessels, the conversion of 25 vessels to purse seiners, the rebuilding and repairing of 202 vessels, the reequipping of 209 vessels, and the purchase of 152 new engines. In addition, 280 vessel mortgages and lienable debts on 255 vessels were refinanced. Many of these loans were multipurpose loans. During the period, beginning after the date of enactment of this act through July 31, 1964, a total of $15,774,000 had been loaned for these various purposes and $8,530,000 had been repaid. The interest collected during this period amounted to $1,766,000.

While the principal purpose of this proposal is to extend the fisheries loan fund program to June 30, 1975, the proposal also contains other technical changes in section 4 of the 1956 act which are designed to make the program conform to the guidelines adopted by the President on Federal credit programs.

The first of these changes removes the present minimum annual interest rate established by section 4 of the 1956 act and substitutes a formula for establishing the interest rate. This formula provides that the annual interest rate on each loan shall be a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average cost of all outstanding interest-bearing public debt obligations of comparable maturity. The formula also provides that the rate may include an additional charge to cover administrative costs and prospective losses whenever the Secretary of the Interior determines that such an additional charge or portion thereof is consistent with the program objectives.

The second technical change provides for the annual payment into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury from the fisheries loan fund of the interest on total loans outstanding at the end of the fiscal year at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average cost of all outstanding interest-bearing Treasury obligations of comparable maturity. We believe that this would result in a rate of about 4 percent.

Currently, the interest rate charged under the fisheries loan program is 5 percent. This rate has been sufficient for the past 3 fiscal years to cover all of the program's administrative costs of about 4 percent and annual losses incurred on individual loans. It is our intention to continue this charge. This will be sufficient to cover the payment into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury and all future losses. It will not, however, cover administrative costs. Inasmuch as these administrative costs are now paid from the revolving fund, the principal of the fund will gradually be depleted and future appropriations to restore the principal may be needed.

As required by the act of July 25, 1956 (5 U.S.C. 642a), the enclosed statement has been prepared concerning the estimated additional man-years of civilian employment and expenditures for the first 5 years of the program to which this proposal relates.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK P. BRIGGS,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Estimated additional man-years of civilian employment and expenditures for the 1st 5 years of proposed new or expanded programs

	19CY[1]	19CY+1	19CY+2	19CY+3	19CY+4
Estimated additional man-years of civilian employment:					
Executive direction	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Administrative services and support:					
Legal	----------	----------	1	1	1
Clerical	----------	----------	----------	1	1
Total, administrative services and support	----------	----------	1	2	2
Substantive (program):					
Loan examiners	----------	3	3	3	3
Fishery specialist	----------	----------	1	2	3
Clerical	----------	----------	1	2	3
Total, substantive	----------	3	5	7	9
Total, estimated man-years of civilian employment	----------	3	6	9	11
Estimated additional expenditures:					
Personal service	----------	$30,000	$55,000	$80,000	$100,000
All other	$1,600,000	1,600,000	1,632,000	1,632,000	1,632,000
Total, estimated additional expenditures	1,600,000	1,630,000	1,687,000	1,712,000	1,732,000

[1] Current year refers to fiscal year 1966 as bill would take effect July 1, 1965, if passed.

WITHDRAWAL, RESERVATION, OR RESTRICTION OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill at the request of the Department of Defense to amend the act of February 28, 1858, relating to withdrawal, reservation or restriction of public lands, and for other purposes. The act of February 28, 1958—Public Law 85-337; 72 Stat. 27—provides that public land areas exceeding 5,000 acres may not be withdrawn, reserved or restricted for defense purposes except by act of Congress. The proposed legislation would substitute a new procedure for restriction of those areas within the Outer Continental Shelf.

So that all interested persons may be informed of this proposal to amend the military withdrawal act, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the accompanying letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 999) to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Jackson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of February 28, 1958 (Public Law 85–337, 72 Stat. 27), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) No public land, water, or land and water area shall, except by Act of Congress, hereafter be (1) withdrawn from settlement, location, sale, or entry for the use of the Department of Defense for defense purposes; or (2) reserved for such use, if such withdrawal or reservation would result in the withdrawal, reservation or restriction of more than five thousand acres in the aggregate for any one defense project or facility of the Department of Defense since February 28, 1958, or since the last previous Act of Congress which withdrew or reserved public land, water, or land and water area for that project or facility, whichever is later.

"(b) No area shall be restricted for defense purposes from the operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (Public Law 83–212, 67 Stat. 462) if such restriction would result in the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of a greater acreage than that described in section 2(a) unless the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives shall have been notified in advance of such restrictions by the Secretary of the Interior. No area exceeding the acreage described in section 2(a) shall be restricted for purposes of bombing, missile launching, weapons training, weapons research or other activities which may make the areas unsafe for nonmilitary use except by Act of Congress."

The letter presented by Mr. Jackson is as follows:

General Counsel of the
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1965.

Hon. Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hayden: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands, and for other purposes. This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to its submission to the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would amend the act of February 28, 1958 (Public Law 85–337, 72 Stat. 27), which now provides that public land areas exceeding 5,000 acres may not be withdrawn, reserved, or restricted for defense purposes except by act of Congress, so as to substitute a new procedure for the restriction of areas within the Outer Continental Shelf.

Since 1958, when Public Law 337 was enacted, the military importance and the military uses of the Outer Continental Shelf have vastly increased. Accordingly, although in 1958 the Department of Defense did not object to having restrictions of shelf areas subject to the same requirement for enabling legislation that was being made applicable to the fast lands of the United States, subsequent developments have indicated that in many cases where shelf areas are required for military purposes, compliance with the present statutory requirement, and the time-consuming procedures it entails, could seriously impair defense capabilities. For this reason, the Department of Defense has proposed the legislation enclosed herewith, which would, with respect to the most urgently needed shelf areas, replace the existing requirement for an act of Congress with a procedure under which the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs would be notified in advance of any proposed restriction. The present requirement regarding shelf areas would have been similarly relaxed under section 102(4)(D) of H.R. 776, 87th Congress (Committee print No. 23, dated August 10, 1962), a provision which took full cognizance of the different situation prevailing on the shelf, but the amendment failed of enactment. The present proposal is, in fact, more restrictive than the one included in H.R. 776, since it would continue to make applicable the requirement for enabling legislation to shelf areas which are to be used for bombing, missile launching, or other activities which might make the areas unsafe for nonmilitary use.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of the proposed legislation will not increase the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely,

L. Niederlehner,
Acting General Counsel.

TRANSFER OF TITLE OF CERTAIN MOVABLE PROPERTY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill I am introducing at the request of the Department of the Interior to amend the Movable Property Act so as to permit transfer of title to municipalities and other agencies which assume operation and maintenance and responsibility for certain water projects.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Department's letter transmitting the draft of the proposed legislation, together with the text of the bill, appear in the body of the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1000) to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions, introduced by Mr. Jackson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of July 29, 1954 (68 Stat. 580), as amended by the Act of August 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 940), is further amended to read as follows:

"Section 1. That whenever an irrigation district, municipality, or water users' organization assumes operation and maintenance of works constructed to furnish or distribute a water supply pursuant to a contract entered into with the United States in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) (43 U.S.C. 371 note), the Secretary of the Interior may transfer to said district, municipality, or organization title to movable property which has been purchased with funds advanced by the district, municipality, or organization or which, in the case of property purchased with appropriated funds, is necessary to the operation and maintenance of such works and the value of which is to be repaid under a contract with the district, municipality, or organization. In order to encourage the assumption by irrigation districts, municipalities, and water users' organizations of the operation and maintenance of works constructed to furnish or distribute a water supply, the Secretary is authorized to use appropriated funds available for the project involved to acquire movable property for transfer under the terms and conditions hereinbefore provided, at the time operation and maintenance is assumed."

The letter presented by Mr. Jackson is as follows:

Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of bill to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions.

We request that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The title to Movable Property Act (act of July 29, 1954 (68 Stat. 580)), as amended by the act of August 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 940), provides that the Secretary of the Interior may transfer title to movable property to an irrigation district or water users' organization when such district or organization assumes operation and maintenance of irrigation works pursuant to a contract entered into with the United States in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws. The Secretary is authorized to transfer title to movable property which has been purchased with funds advanced by the district or water users' organization as well as property purchased with appropriated funds, the value of which is to be repaid under a contract with the district or organization. The act also includes authorization for the Secretary to use appropriated funds available for the project involved to acquire movable property for transfer to the district or organization at the time it assumes the operation and maintenance responsibility.

The proposed amendment would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer title to movable property to municipalities which assume operation and maintenance responsibilities for project works serving municipal and industrial functions under the same conditions and on the same terms as title may be transferred to an irrigation district or water users' organization which assumes operation and maintenance responsibilities for project works serving an irrigation function.

It is important to successful administration of the Federal reclamation program that all aspects of reclamation law be accommodated to the changing aspect of the reclamation program itself. With the shift in reclamation activity from concentration on development exclusively for irrigation purposes to modern multipurpose projects in which municipal and industrial water supply, hydroelectric power, fish and wildlife conservation and development, and recreation purposes are served along with irrigation, has come the need to review and, if appropriate, revise elements of reclamation law that are not completely in tune with the times. One such element is the title to Movable Property Act of 1954, as amended. This act is designed to encourage water users' organizations and irrigation districts to assume operation and maintenance of works constructed to furnish or distribute a water supply, to facilitate the efficient discharge of that important responsibility once assumed. This is accomplished through authorization extended to the Secretary of the Interior to transfer title to movable property which is necessary or useful in the operation and maintenance function to the agency that takes it over. The act has served its purpose well, and the Department is gratified with the responsibility demonstrated by many water users' organizations in undertaking the operation and maintenance of project works serving them.

The title to Movable Property Act is, however, limited in application to irrigation districts and water users' organizations. A review of recently authorized reclamation projects demonstrates that supply of water to municipalities for municipal and industrial use has become a significant purpose of reclamation projects. The reasons for transferring operation and maintenance responsibility of irrigation works to irrigation districts exist to an equal degree in support of a policy of encouraging and facilitating the transfer of operation and maintenance of works serving municipal and industrial water to the municipalities that they serve.

The proposed bill to amend the title to Movable Property Act that is submitted herewith would accomplish that objective by placing municipalities on the same footing as irrigation districts and water users' organizations insofar as authority is reposed in the Secretary of the Interior to transfer title to movable property to them in connection with the assumption of the operation and maintenance of works constructed to furnish or distribute a water supply.

Under the proposed legislation, the same conditions would apply to the transfer of title to movable property to municipalities as currently apply to irrigation districts and water users' organizations, i.e., the property must be purchased with advanced funds or, in the case of property purchased with appropriated funds, it must be necessary to the operation and maintenance of project works, and the value thereof must be repaid under a contract.

It is not anticipated that enactment of the proposed amendment will result in any additional expense to the Federal Government.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH HOLUM,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, so as to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes. It is being introduced at the request of the Acting Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1965.

According to the Acting Administrator, the primary purpose of the bill is to make the modern code of procurement procedures contained in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 directly applicable by statute to executive agencies of the Government not now so covered.

The bill also proposes certain less significant improvements in procurement. It would exclude the procurement of personal services from the operation of title III, which is essentially a property management code of procedures. It would make certain limitations of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949—concerning fees of cost-type contracts, contingent fees, examination of records, et cetera—applicable to contracts negotiated by executive agencies under any law, not only those under title III.

An identical bill (S. 1232) was introduced in the 88th Congress, which was reported and passed by the Senate but failed to be acted upon in the House.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Acting Administrator of General Services, dated January 15, 1965, which sets forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1004) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1965.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed for consideration a draft bill "To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes."

Section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 includes the provision that the Administrator of General Services shall prescribe for executive agencies policies and methods of procurement and supply of personal property and nonpersonal services. Section 205(c) of that act provides that he shall prescribe regulations he deems necessary to effectuate his functions under the act, and that the head of each executive agency shall issue orders and directives necessary to carry out such regulations.

The primary purpose of this legislative proposal is to make the procurement procedures specified in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 directly applicable to executive agencies. Presently the use of all title III procedures is permissive with most executive agencies under a general delegation of authority to such agencies made by the Administrator of General Services on March 26, 1962 (27 F.R. 3017).

Procedures corresponding to those of title III already apply to procurement by the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (10 U.S.C. 2303(a)). Accordingly, section 1 of the draft bill recognizes this existing authority as well as other authority of agencies to procure without regard to all or part of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as provided, for example, in section 602(d) of that act.

Title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act represents a modernized code of procedures for procurement by the Government of property and nonpersonal services. It concerns such matters as advertising, negotiation, small business, antitrust laws, covenant against contingent fees, cost-plus and incentive-type contracting, examination of contractors' books and records, and advance payments. Chapter 137 of title 10 of the United States Code (derived from the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947) provides a similar version of this code for the Armed Forces and NASA. For agencies which do not use title III procedures pursuant to the delegation of authority made by the Administrator of General Services, or which do not come within chapter 137 of title 10 of the code, the only general legislative procurement-procedure directive is section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5). Section 3709 merely requires formal advertising for procurement for the Government, except in certain specified cases. It is narrow and limited in application, and silent as to other important facets of procurement procedure, such as those provided in title III and chapter 137.

Section 302(a) of title III, as originally enacted in 1949, contained a rather circumscribed authorization to the Administrator of General Services to make delegations of title III authority to other executive agencies. This authorization was subject to a narrow construction, and under it but few delegations were made, which were, for the most part, of limited nature. However, Public Law 85-800, approved August 28, 1958, amended section 302(a) by liberalizing the authority of the Administrator to permit the use of title III by executive agencies, in order to promote uniformity and simplification in their procurement procedures. Accordingly, the Administrator on March 10, 1959 (F.R. Mar. 17, 1959, 24 F.R. 1921; reissued Mar. 26, 1962, 27 F.R. 3017, Mar. 30, 1962), issued a delegation of authority to executive agencies to use title III. This delegation of authority does not require executive agencies to use the procurement procedures under title III but leaves this use permissive. On the same date he established the Federal Procurement Regulations System (24 F.R. 1933), which is now codified in subtitle A of title 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

A section-by-section analysis of the draft bill is attached hereto. For the reasons enumerated in this letter and in the attachment, GSA recommends early enactment of the proposed bill. Enactment of this proposed legislation would not affect the budgetary requirements of the General Services Administration or of any other agency.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.,
Acting Administrator.

ATTACHMENT

The first section of the enclosed bill extends title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377, 393; 41 U.S.C. 251ff) directly to all executive agencies, except the agencies and activities specified in title 10, United States Code, section 2303(a), and is, therefore, the logical extension of this law to complement what has already been achieved in systematizing Government procurement. It would thus provide a common legislative foundation for uniform procurement practices by agencies under regulations prescribed by the Administrator. Until such controlling regulations are issued by the Administrator on any given aspect, agencies would apply the statutory powers in accordance with their own proper interpretation.

In addition, the section makes clear that the limited exemptions specified in section 602(d) of the 1949 act, or in any other law, are not eliminated by this section, but provides that Revised Statutes sections 3709 and 3710, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5 and 8), shall remain applicable to such exempt procurements in the absence of authority to procure without advertising or without regard to said section 3709. Thus, an agency which properly exempts itself from all or any part of the act will not thereby obtain the right to negotiate contracts as distinguished from having to formally advertise although it may do so to the extent that it has negotiating authority under other law.

Section 2(a) of the draft bill deletes from paragraph (4) of section 302(c) of the act the reference to "personal" services and would limit the negotiation authorization of the paragraph to the procurement of "nonpersonal" services. As more fully explained in connection with section 6 of the draft bill, this amendment would bring the paragraph in line with the policy of Congress in assigning property management responsibilities to the Administrator of General Services.

Section 2(b) of the bill would add "section 304 shall apply to such purchases and contracts" to paragraph (15) of section 302(c). The effect of this addition would be to make the restrictions of section 304, which are applicable to contracts negotiated under paragraphs (1)-(14) of section 302(c) similarly applicable to contracts negotiated under paragraph (15). The restrictions in section 304 pertain to limitations on the use of cost-type contracts, inclusion of a covenant against contingent fees, inclusion of an examination of records clause, etc. The amendment, therefore, would provide uniformity in the requirements applicable to negotiated contracts.

Section 3 of the draft bill would interpolate in section 307(a) of the act a reference to section 205(d) of the act. This is a technical amendment applying only to the Administrator of General Services. It is intended to make clear that his authority to delegate under title III does not include the authorization to delegate authority to issue policy regulations applicable to executive agencies. Accordingly, the "implementing regulations" of section 302(a) mentioned in section 1 of the draft bill, for example, can be issued only by the Administrator.

By section 4 of the bill, which is purely technical, the second sentence of section 307(b) of the act would be deleted. Presently, this sentence provides that the power of the Administrator to make the delegations and determinations specified in section 302(a) shall be delegable only to the Deputy Administrator or to the chief official of any principal organizational unit of the General Services Administration. Deletion of this provision is appropriate because the proposed amendment of section 302(a), contained in section 1 of the draft bill, eliminates the reference to delegation now contained in the text of section 302(a).

Section 5 of the bill, amending section 310 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, is likewise technical. It is ancillary to section 1 of the draft bill amending section 302(a).

The proposed amendment of section 310 provides that neither sections 3709 and 3710 nor section 3735 of the Revised Statutes shall apply to the procurement of property or nonpersonal services made by any executive agency pursuant to title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. Revised Statutes sections 3709 and 3710 are the General Statutes (dating from 1861 and 1868, respectively) requiring formal advertising for procurement of supplies and services for the Government, except in specified cases. Revised Statutes section 3735, dating from 1868, prohibits executive departments from making contracts for stationery or other supplies for a longer term than 1 year. Sections 3709 and 3735 are already, under the present text of section 310(a), made inapplicable to procurement by GSA and, within the scope of authority delegated by the Administrator, to any other executive agency. Similar provisions apply to the armed services, the Coast Guard, and NASA (10 USC 2314). The broadened application of title III, in particular, section 303, to executive agencies makes continued applicability of section 3710 superfluous.

The amendment would delete reference to two other statutory provisions now stated by section 310(a) to be inapplicable to procurement under title III; namely, sections 65 Stat. 705, October 31, 1951). Under the Stat. 1109, as amended (41 USC 6 and 6a), which set forth certain exemptions from Revised Statutes section 3709. Said section 1 has been repealed (sec. 1 (98)-(105), 65 Stat. 705, Oct. 31, 1951). Under the terms of the amendments proposed by the bill, reference to section 2 is no longer necessary.

By virtue of section 310 as proposed for amendment in this bill, exemptions from the requirements of revised statutes, section 3709 (and 3710), heretofore given to agencies which are not exempt from the provisions of title III, whether or not these statutory authorizations expressly refer to section 3709 (and 3710), are preserved by constituting these as exceptions from the advertising requirments of sections 302(c) (and 303) of the act pursuant to section 302(c)(15), as proposed for amendment in section 2(b) of this bill.

Under this amendment, however, contracts negotiated under such exemptions are subject to the restrictions of section 304 of the act, made applicable by the proposed amendment to section 302(c)(15) unless exemption from section 304 is available and asserted pursuant to section 602(d) of this act or other law. The application of section 304, however, is considered primarily technical since agencies have generally observed most of the limitations contained therein either as a matter of policy or under GSA or agency regulations.

Section 6 of the bill would amend title III by inserting nonpersonal before services throughout the title. Section 1 of the bill already purposes such a change in section 302(a) of the act, section 2(a) in section 302(c)(4), and section 6 in section 310. The effect of these changes would be to conform the authority of the Administrator to the policy stated by Congress in section 2 of the act (to provide a system for the procurement and supply of personal property and nonpersonal services) and to the responsibility vested in the Administrator by section 201(a) of the act (to prescribe policies and methods of procurement and supply of personal property and nonpersonal services).

With respect to services, it seems clear that the efficiency and economy sought to be accomplished through the regulatory activity of the Administrator can better be found in the field of nonpersonal services, more akin to property management, than in the field of personal services procurement. In connection with section 2(a) of the bill, it should be noted that section 3709 of the revised statutes (item 4) will be available to executive agencies for procuring personal services by negotiated methods. The first sentence of section 304(b) of the act is explicitly not affected by section 7 of the bill in order to preserve for personal services contracts the 6-percent maximum fee limitation applicable to contracts for architectural and engineering services.

Section 7 of the draft bill would amend section 602(d) of the act to include references to the Postmaster General's present authority with respect to the leasing and acquisition of real property and the Secretary of the Interior's authority with respect to procurement for program operations under the Bonneville power project. The bill thus recognizes and confirms the special and exceptional procurement authority over these matters which has hitherto been conferred by law (16 U.S.C. 832(a)(f); 39 U.S.C. 2102, 2103(a)(2), 2114). It is understood that administrative and housekeeping items are excluded from the term program operations and that, to the extent that these procurement programs would not be impaired by compliance with the Administrator's regulations, such regulations will be observed, as heretofore contemplated by the Congress and the President (H. Rept. 670, 81st Cong., 1st Sess., 28; Presidential directive of July 1, 1949, 14 F.R. 3699).

PUBLICATION OF CERTAIN PATENT APPLICATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the publication of certain patent applications. A major purpose of this bill is to relieve the Patent Office of some of the burden involved in the examination of patent applications. The enactment of this legislation would result in more efficient use of Government personnel and contribute to a modest reduction in the sizable backlog of pending patent applications. This bill would also facilitate the more rapid dissemination of scientific information and provide a less-expensive and quicker alternative form of protection for those who currently secure patents mainly for defensive purposes.

During the second session of the 88th Congress, I introduced a somewhat similar bill on this same subject which was drafted by a Committee of the American Patent Law Association. The bill which I am introducing today incorporates several suggestions which were made to improve this measure. While I believe that there is merit in the approach reflected in this bill, I am not committed to any particular procedure concerning the publication of patent applications. I introduce this bill to provide a basis for further discussion and I, accordingly, invite interested individuals and groups to communicate their views to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1005) to establish a procedure for the publication of patent applications, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF THE COPYRIGHT LAW

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I introduce, by request of the Librarian of Congress, a bill to provide for a general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code. This bill has been drafted by the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress.

During the second session of the 88th Congress, I introduced a predecessor bill, S. 3008. The bill which I am introducing today reflects some modifications of the earlier draft.

It is the hope of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights to conduct hearings on this legislation in due course. Interested parties are requested to submit comments to the subcommittee, room 349-A, Old Senate Office Building.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1006) for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to permit Federal agencies to restore to the States certain jurisdictional authority now vested in the United States which may be better administered by the States, and to establish as the policy of the Congress that with respect to future land acquisitions, the Federal Government shall receive only that measure of legislative jurisdiction which is necessary to the proper performance of its functions.

With the exception of a minor technical amendment, this bill is virtually identical to proposed legislation developed by the Committee on Government Operations, in cooperation with the Department of Justice, and originally introduced in the 84th Congress to implement the recommendations of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States. Throughout its development, it has been carefully coordinated with the Council of State Governments, the Governors' Conference, the National Association of Attorneys General, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, individual Governors and State attorneys general, and other Federal agencies having an interest in it. All of these groups, agencies, and individuals have supported its objectives and urged its enactment.

Identical measures have been considered by the Committee on Government Operations in several Congresses, and hearings on an identical bill were held by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of that committee in the 88th Congress, during which all of the basic issues involved were thoroughly examined.

Virtually identical measures have had the support of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, and the present administration, through its Acting Attorney General has urged its prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Acting Attorney General, addressed to the Vice President of the United States, setting forth the background and justification for this legislation, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1007) to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1965.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I transmit herewith for your consideration and appropriate reference a legislative proposal "To provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes."

At the present time, the Federal Government has exclusive legislative jurisdiction over about one million people who reside on more than 5,000 individual areas of land located throughout the United States. This means that for these people the governmental functions and authority which under our Federal-State system normally are lodged in the States are lodged with the Federal Government. For most purposes each such area is not considered a part of the State in which it is located, and the persons residing on it are not considered residents of the State. Although subject to State taxation, the residents of these areas are often denied the use of public schools, State and local police and fire protection, access to State and local courts in matters involving marriage, divorce, adoption, and descent and distribution of decedents' property, and other rights and services normally available to State residents.

This legislation will authorize the heads of Federal agencies having jurisdiction, custody or control of such land areas to relinquish to the States, with their consent, any measure of legislative jurisdiction as in their judgment may be desirable from the standpoint of the residents and consistent with the proper performance of the functions of the Federal Government. The measure also declares it to be the policy of the Congress that with respect to future land acquisitions the Federal Government shall receive only that measure of legislative jurisdiction which is necessary for the proper performance of its functions.

Proposals similar to this have been introduced in the past several Congresses with the support of the Council of State Governments, the Governors' Conference, the Association of State Attorneys General, many individual State Governors and attorneys general, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, all interested Federal agencies, and other knowledgeable groups and individuals. In the 88th Congress, S. 815 was the subject of extensive hearings before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate. It is hoped that these hearings will serve to expedite action on the legislation in the present Congress. A companion bill, H.R. 4433, was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations, but received no congressional consideration.

In my judgment, this legislation will be of inestimable benefit to the many persons who reside on land as to which the Federal Government would divest itself of exclusive legislative jurisdiction, and will in no way be detrimental to any individual or group. It will also resolve vexing Federal-State problems which result from the retention of such jurisdiction by the Federal Government. For these reasons I urge its prompt, favorable consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Acting Attorney General.

TITLE CLOUD ON UNPATENTED OIL SHALE MINING CLAIMS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last year I introduced S. 2809 which I considered an opening wedge in bringing the matter of the numerous unpatented oil shale mining claims to the attention of all who may be interested. When introducing it I considered it merely a point of departure, as indeed it was. Last year's bill evoked many suggestions and much constructive comment. I am extremely gratified that without exception every comment or criticism I have received upon that bill has been of a very constructive nature.

Differences of opinion are bound to arise in such matters, and this legislative proposal is not immune to such an eventuality, but with the past display of good will and the spirit of cooperation that has pervaded this whole matter I consider the chances of continued constructive cooperation to be excellent.

Taking into account the many suggested improvements I have received, I have redrafted the bill in an effort to incorporate these improvements while retaining the original intent of the bill. It is this redraft that I introduce today, on behalf of Senators DOMINICK, BENNETT, SIMPSON, and myself.

Senators know that I have long favored the development of an oil shale industry in this country not only because of the many economic benefits to be derived, but also because a viable oil shale industry is now of particular importance to our defense posture in light of the very fluid status of the political alinement of the countries upon which we depend for most of our oil imports. The many reports summarizing this country's energy requirements and domestic supply have adequately demonstrated the urgent necessity of developing new and alternative sources of energy to meet our ever-expanding needs. In my opinion, oil shale presents the most apparent available alternate source. In the national interest, Congress has an affirmative duty to remove barriers and impediments to an early development of a vigorous and commercial oil shale industry. That is the purpose and intent of the bill I introduce today—to help create that favorable climate necessary for the development of an oil shale industry.

Last year I announced from the floor of the Senate the signing of an agreement between the United States and the Colorado School of Mines. The Bureau of Mines facility at Anvil Points, Colo., was leased to the research foundation of the Colorado School of Mines for the purpose of continuing research in the development of an economically and commercially feasible method of extracting oil from oil shale. As Senators know, the Bureau of Mines had done considerable pioneering work in retorting processes, and more particularly has made some startling developments in oil shale mining techniques.

Two pioneering companies engaged the Colorado School of Mines Research Foundation to conduct a defined research program extending over 3 years and costing $5 million. These two companies—Socony Mobil and Humble Oil Co.—took up the challenge to develop the technical know-how. Since that time, four other forward-looking companies have joined in this research venture on an equal footing. Research to develop a commercially and economically feasible process is now in progress. However, the Department of the Interior, in its Union Oil Co. decision last year, has burdened the patentability of placer oil shale claims with the past or present existence of an economically or commercially feasible method of extracting shale oil from oil shale. To permit the continuance of such a burden would not only be unrealistic, but would also be unreasonable. Accordingly, the bill provides that the Secretary will not deny patents on that basis.

Among the many things that yet need to be done to create the favorable climate necessary for the development of a commercial oil shale industry is the removal of the cloud to the Government's title to oil shale lands. But in accomplishing this, the Congress is obligated to act in a fair and equitable manner, and must protect the rights of all citizens.

> Citizens similarly situated are entitled to equal treatment by their Government.

This must be the guiding principle in our legislative endeavors.

The purpose of the legislation I am introducing today is to correct what I consider gross inequities resulting from the confusion that developed with the enactment of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920. Under its terms oil shale lands were removed from disposition under the mining laws. However, in section 37 of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act, recognition of the existence of oil shale claims was made, and it provided for the continued application of the mining laws to such claims. Despite this, the Department of the Interior instituted actions to cancel many of these oil shale placer claims during 1929 and 1930. Some were challenged by the Department on a basis of abandonment, and the rest were challenged on a basis of failure to perform annual assessment work. The reason for the distinction between the charges affecting different claims was never clear, if indeed there was a reason. However, in the 1935 Supreme Court decision of *Ickes* v. *Virginia-Colorado Development Corporation*, 295 U.S. 639, the Department's theory that oil shale claims could be canceled where assessment work was delinquent and had not been resumed was struck down as being "beyond the authority conferred by law." Considerable reliance was placed upon this decision by both the Department and the claimants until 1958. I am informed that between 1935 and 1958 at least 124 oil shale placer claims which had been previously declared null and void by the Secretary were patented. However, since 1958 the Department has rejected patent applications based upon its 1930 holdings that such claims were null and void, and the departmental decision last year in the Union Oil case has the effect of overruling the 1935 Supreme Court decision. Senators know that our concept of "separation of powers" is abrogated whenever an executive department ignores or overrules the judicial pronouncements of the courts or the legislative pronouncements of Congress.

I can appreciate the great difficulty of the problem the Department of the Interior is attempting to resolve in determining which of the oil shale-bearing lands of the public domain are subject to disposition under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act and which lands are still subject to the mining laws. The interests of justice and the discharge of our affirmative duty to create a favorable climate for the development of an oil shale industry require legislative assistance in the resolution of the title problems of these unpatented mining claims.

At the request of the Secretary, many interested parties submitted suggested leasing policies. Gov. John Love, of Colorado, with the able advice and assistance of his Oil Shale Development Advisory Committee, submitted to the Secretary an excellent proposal, in my opinion. However, in establishing such a leasing policy the Secretary must necessarily define the lands to which this policy will be applicable. So long as the title to these lands is unsettled, such definition will not be possible. It is, therefore, not only in the interests of justice but also in the interests of responsible management by the Department of the Interior that an effective legislative tool be granted to the Department to finally resolve this knotty title problem.

It is in that spirit that the bill is introduced. I believe that if the bill becomes law and is administered in the spirit in which it is offered it will materially aid in the judicious, equitable, and expeditious clarification of the status of these unpatented mining claims, and thereby remove a major impediment to the early development of an oil shale industry, which is important to the economic well-being of this country as well as being vital to our defense posture.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1009) to amend section 37 of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, relating to disposition only as provided in such act of deposits of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, and gas in lands valuable for such minerals, except as to valid claims pursuant to laws under which initiated and existing at the date of the passage of such act, which claims may be perfected under such laws, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF EQUAL-TIME PROVISIONS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, when our great communications industry was born, the future of radio and television could not have been imagined as we now find it. In the last 15 years, for instance, the number of American television homes has increased from 700,000 to 52 million.

Television today attracts more than $2 billion in advertising.

Yet, we continue to treat this industry and its older companion, radio, as a stepchild, an ignorant stepchild too foolish and immature to make its own decisions on public interest.

Since radio and television operate on a limited spectrum of airwaves, we have always had—and, indeed, always will have—governmental control over licensing. It is the only way of allocating with any equity the use of this limited air space. It is the only way our relationships with broadcasting rights of other countries can be handled.

Thus, we adopted the only real criterion for licensing—public interest. And we embodied our concepts of continuing public interest in the Communications Act of 1934. Basically, there is no quarrel with either the intent or operation of this act and the regulations based upon it.

There is, however, one portion which has bred more trouble and difficulty in this generation than any other. It is section 315—the so-called equal-time provision.

That the section does not do the job for which it was intended has long been recognized by the Congress. We have amended that obnoxious section in an attempt to partially free the industry to report legitimate news events. I am proud of my part in this liberalization, which was but a step in the proper direction.

Likewise, we suspended the effects of section 315 on the Presidential contest of 1960, a move that led to the Kennedy-Nixon debates. A move for a similar lifting of the provisions failed last year.

I have stated before, and I state again now, a law that has to be changed often or suspended periodically is an unjust and unworkable law. Its interpretation by the Federal Communications Commission has not always been consistent and, sometimes, I fear, has been based on some loose interpretation of our intent in our effort to insure fairness.

The whole question of fairness among candidates, between parties and in regard to issues is now being settled haphazardly by the Commission in an attempt to administer an unworkable law. I shall not burden the Senate now with chapter and verse of various rulings, but shall now only refresh Senators with the diverse opinions of equal time restrictions that occurred in the last campaign vis-a-vis the President and his role as both Chief Executive and candidate.

The operation of section 315, at best, is predicated on the mistaken notion that a Government agency is better able to judge news and public affairs, is better able to judge and insure fairness than anyone else.

To impose similar restrictions on journalism other than electronics journalism would bring down the wrath of public opinion—and would, most likely, be struck down by the Supreme Court if not by an aroused public. Our Nation has rejected from its earliest days governmental control over the press. It properly should recognize now the coming of age of radio and television journalism as a new kind of press and should free this journalism from its shackles.

It may be argued that the very size and influence of radio and television today require that a careful eye be kept on the use of its size and influence. This is precisely the same argument used through the decades to control the printed word.

We have come to recognize in America that the danger to freedom does not lie in use or misuse of the power of the press by the press itself, but rather from regulation.

I am introducing now a bill to repeal section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 because I believe the section is now working contrary to its original purpose.

I hope that full consideration will be given my bill and that, in the process, we shall be able to evolve clear and concise intent of Congress that the FCC is not expected or ordered to pass judgment on how public affairs are covered by radio and television.

It seems to me that the power of the Commission to review public service and interest when licensees seek renewal is ample guarantee that the general interest and welfare will be protected if this power is used judiciously.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1010) to repeal section 315 of the Communications Act, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SENIOR CITIZENS' MONTH

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce,, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim May of each year as "Senior Citizens' Month." In 1963, President Kennedy issued such a proclamation for May 1963, and last year our present President issued one for last May. These official proclamations made it possible during May of those years to direct the public's attention to the problems, needs, and opportunities of senior citizens in ways which might not otherwise have been available.

In issuing his 1964 proclamation, the President made the following points:

First, the numerical growth of Americans aged 65 and over is accelerating as the miracles of modern medicine increase life expectancy.

Second, since not everyone is blessed with the gift of long life, those who are so endowed should occupy a place of special honor among us.

Third, our country, although more blessed with abundance than any other, cannot afford to be wasteful of its resources if it is to achieve its fullest potential.

Fourth, the Federal Government is deeply and constantly concerned with the well-being of all its citizens.

Fifth, this Nation can and should offer leadership and assistance to the States, municipalities, and voluntary organizations in their efforts to extend special recognition to and make continuing maximum use of the skills of our senior citizens.

While it is true that the President may issue such proclamations each year hereafter without congressional action on this proposal, he is entitled to the congressional support which favorable action on the resolution would afford him for his past proclamation of Senior Citizens' Month and any which he may issue in the future. In addition, approval by Congress of this resolution would make permanent the annual celebration of May as Senior Citizens' Month.

Passage of this resolution will require no expenditure of Federal funds. However, it will benefit America's elderly by directing the attention of American officials and public to the problems, needs, and opportunities of Americans in this age group. This in turn will help us to build a better life for our Nation's elderly. I sincerely trust that prompt and favorable action will be taken on this proposed resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41) to authorize the President to proclaim the month of May in each year as "Senior Citizens Month," introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE CORN TASSEL AS THE NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, our Nation has been without a national floral emblem since its birth. After 189 years, Congress should, in my judgment, now proceed to fill this void. I hope Congress will not only act on the matter during this session but also will enact the joint resolution I am introducing today. The joint resolution would proclaim the corn tassel to be the national floral emblem. By July 4, 1776, corn had already saved the Pilgrims from starvation, corn had kept George Washington and his army alive during the American Revolution, and corn had provided the major source of food during the long, cold winters of the Thirteen Original Colonies.

A variety of other proposals for the national floral emblem are being advanced, and doubtless, others will appear before Congress finally resolves the matter. All of us should marvel at the beauties of nature rather than denounce them. So, without attempting to cast aspersions on any of these other proposals, I place before Congress a standard against which we should measure candidates for our national floral emblem.

The history of the United States begins with the Pilgrims setting foot on American soil at Plymouth Rock. No roses were presented to the Pilgrims at this time, no marigolds were placed in their hands, and no shasta daisies greeted their first steps in the New World. What was the Pilgrims' first gift from the American Indians? Corn. Thus, corn became engrained in the very first stage of the United States, and it has remained so engrained through every day of our Nation's history. Its role has not been diminished by periods of affluence or depression, by times of peace or war. While the horse has been replaced by the automobile, the cider press by the cocktail shaker, and the smoke signal by the telephone, the corn tassel has continued to symbolize American crops growing ripe for harvest.

Other nations have adopted floral emblems. Some of these nations are older than ours, others are younger. England, Iran, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Honduras, and Luxembourg have designated the rose. Liberia lives unofficially under the banner of the white frangipani. Australia has the golden wattle, and Brazil, the blossom of ipecac, which I understand has a root that contains alkaloids emetine used in the treatment of amoebic dysentery.

Mr. President, the United States stands emptyhanded in the hall of national floral emblems. We should have one which will be based in her history, symbolic of the wealth and bounty of our life, and which should inspire our present and future generations to continue the traditions and progress of our democratic way of life.

Mr. President, I could not let this opportunity go by without paying tribute to the woman who has championed the corn tassel and made thousands of Americans realize how much corn means to us. I refer to Miss Margo Cairns, who lives in the Methodist Building, across the street from the Capitol, and who years ago began reminding people by letters, visits, telephone calls, and speeches that all of us owed so much to corn, and that we should adopt the corn tassel as our national floral emblem.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators McCarthy and Long of Missouri, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to designate the corn tassel as our national floral emblem. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the Record and lie on the desk for 10 days for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will be printed in the Record and will lie at the desk for 10 days in accordance with the request of the Senator from Illinois.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 42) proclaiming the corn tassel as the national floral emblem of the United States, introduced by Mr. Douglas, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that no person except a natural born citizen shall be eligible to the Office of President of the United States; and

Whereas a floral emblem of the United States should likewise be natural born in America; and

Whereas the corn tassel, botanically the floral element of the corn plant, was presented as a native crop to our first settlers and best symbolizes the United States—its history, traditions, health, wealth, energy, progress, and well-being: Now, therefore, be it, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Resolved, That the corn tassel is hereby designated as the national floral emblem of the United States, and the President is requested to declare such fact by proclamation.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 915) to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of that act, the name of the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] may be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of January 26, 1965:

S. 689. A bill to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government: Senators Ervin, Jordan of Idaho, and Saltonstall.

Authority of January 28, 1965:

S. 811. A bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging": Senators Fong, Inouye, McGee, Mondale, and Sparkman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON OCEAN FREIGHT RATES AND ON BARRIERS TO U.S. BEEF EXPORTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I announce that the Senate Small Business Committee will hold public hearings on February 24 and 25, to explore ocean freight rate differentials and other factors which may be barriers to the exportation of U.S. beef and beef products.

Preliminary investigation by the committee has revealed that countries of the European Common Market, with their rising incomes, are experiencing a large and growing deficit in beef and meat products. The shortfall has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture at between 50,000 and 200,000 tons per year. At current prices this could amount to an annual market of between $45 and $170 million which is open to the American beef industry.

Since nearly all of the cattlemen, about 70 percent of the meatpackers, and a majority of the processors in the country are small businesses, U.S. entry into a market of this magnitude could be of great benefit to small business. Of coruse, these would be a further benefit to our economy to the extent that such exports are carried aboard American-flag ships.

We have found that the United States was in 12th place among world meat exporters in 1963, behind Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, France, and Uruguay. This appears to the committee to be rather a minor league position for this country in view of its resources, ingenuity, and traditional trading prowess.

This posture is an even greater surprise in view of the continuing pressures upon our balance of payments and the apparent potential among expanding world populations for the sale of high-quality, healthful American beef products.

The committee's curiosity was aroused as to why virtually no American beef was exported to the European Continent during the years between the end of World War II and 1964. It has been suggested that a differential in ocean freight rates might account for the situation, since rates to Europe from certain South American countries are apparently only one-half what they are from the United States—which is actually a shorter distance. We have been informed that, if overall transportation costs could be equalized, the price differential in Europe between U.S. beef and South American beef would be cut by 50 percent, which would certainly assist the American beef industry in its efforts to be competitive. The committee plans to identify and examine carefully the relationships between these rate differentials and our position in the beef trade.

As our inquiry progresses, other unanswered questions, have been arising: What facilities exist for assessing the potential of oversea markets, including Europe, for U.S. beef and livestock products? What are the components of cost in marketing American beef products in Europe and elsewhere in the world? What fraction of these costs is accounted for by transportation and how are these costs to be analyzed? What vessels are available to transport beef products in their various forms? How does the merchant marine set their ocean freight rates, and do our regulatory agencies have adequate power to deal with them in terms of our national interest?

What are the roles of the various industry associations and government agencies in promoting beef exports, and is there sufficient coordination among them?

It will be the committee's purpose to bring together the interested parties in a cooperative atmosphere, in order that we can seek answers to these questions, and in order that all concerned can contribute to a breakthrough in beef exports. The committee is planning to hear first from Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. Thereafter, other Government officials and representatives of both the beef and shipping industries will testify.

It is apparent to the committee as we get underway that the effort to broaden our commercial beef market will require a concerted effort of this nature. A good deal of patience and hard work will be necessary on the part of all concerned. But the rewards seem to be worth the difficulty, and in this spirit I would emphasize that our committee desires to elicit the interest, advice, and cooperation of all persons and organizations in the country who desire to further exports of beef and beef products. Such persons and groups are urged to make themselves known to the committee, and to join us in this endeavor.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF NICHOLAS deB. KATZENBACH TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL, AND RAMSEY CLARK, OF TEXAS, TO BE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Monday, February 8, 1965, beginning at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Attorney General.

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Deputy Attorney General.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

Mr. EASTLAND. Notice is hereby given that the immigration hearings scheduled to open on Monday, February 8, 1965, are postponed until Wednesday, February 10, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF THE PESO AS HARD CURRENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have frequently discussed on the floor of the Senate the exceptional pace of economic development in Mexico, our closest neighbor to the south. My attention has been drawn to another notable milestone in this progress. I speak of the formal acceptance, by the International Monetary Fund, of the Mexican peso among the so-called hard currencies of the world. The peso now takes its place alongside the dollar, the franc, the deutsche mark, and pound sterling and certain others as a currency "acceptable without limitation in international operations." I might point out that such recognition attests to the increasing economic stability of Mexico and speaks highly for the responsibility and effectiveness of the Mexican efforts in economic development. Mexico is an outstanding example in Latin America—indeed in this hemisphere and the world—of what can be done by a nation, sincere and determined in its effort to build a modern, viable and equitable economy.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief notice to this effect, which appeared in the Washington Post of February 3, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> PESO QUALIFIED BY WORLD FUND
>
> MEXICO CITY, February 2.—The peso has been recognized as "hard" currency for the first time in Mexican history, the treasury ministry announced today.
>
> The announcement said the International Monetary Fund has qualified the peso as "acceptable without limitation in international operations because of its solid parity to exchange."

COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED FARM PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, since I never hesitate to criticize where criticism is due, I feel that I should also give credit where credit is due.

Today, I want to refer to the agricultural message of President Johnson just received.

This is an excellent message.

It sets forth clearly the importance of agriculture to American consumers, to our domestic economy, and to our international relations.

The President points out accurately the present status of agriculture and the changing problems of the farmer, with particular reference to the capital required to operate an up-to-date farm.

He points out in connection with agriculture some of the obstacles that confront the rural resident and what might be done to overcome these obstacles.

No one can criticize the laudable objectives which the President sets forth.

It is true that he does not expound details in connection with his recommendations.

It would probably be unwise for him to attempt to do that in this message since details will emerge after hearings of the Agriculture Committees in the two Houses of Congress progress.

In one or two instances, the President's message is a bit inconsistent with the budget message, but I am sure that such inconsistencies will be reconciled by the Congress.

The President naturally praises the present agricultural programs and recommends their continuance.

It is noticeable, however, that while he recommends continuance of the programs, he also recommends improvement.

I realize that anyone looking for opportunity to criticize can probably find statements in this message that lend themselves to such purposes.

I personally feel that the situation of agriculture and rural America today is such that it calls for full cooperation and criticism only when such criticism may produce constructive results.

The President states:

> The removal of price and income supports would have a catastrophic effect upon farm income.

I agree thoroughly with this statement and I also agree that present programs can doubtless be improved upon.

The President is on solid ground when he recommends continuance of voluntary feed grain and wheat programs.

It is doubtful if this Congress would agree to compulsory programs anyway.

The President recommends adequate reserves of farm commodities which would be insulated from the market.

I agree completely that, as a nation, we should maintain adequate reserves of food and fiber.

We will have a problem, however, in insulating such reserves so that they will not have a depressing effect upon market prices.

His statement in reference to the food-for-peace program is sound, particularly when he refers to "making rural America a full partner in our national economic progress."

This must be done if America is to progress and develop to the degree indicated by our probable needs.

Since most of our temporary agricultural programs are expiring, the Congress will have its work cut out for it to revise and strengthen the programs applicable to agriculture and the rural areas of this Nation.

The President's message provides a good launching pad from which to start.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I thought that the President's message on agriculture was one of the strongest farm messages and one of the best farm messages ever received by the Congress. I had that belief even before I heard the Senator from Vermont. But I am now all the more certain that the message on agriculture is a good one. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], is not only the ranking member of his party on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but also his is one of the most respected voices on agriculture in the Nation today, and has been over a good many years.

Mr. President, the President's farm message, received by Congress today, is good news for the farmers of America. It is a firm pledge that our Government will seek to work with farmers in securing higher agricultural income, expanded markets, and a better life for rural America.

It very wisely places parity of income for the farmer on a high priority basis.

The President has also called for the establishment of a national food reserve sufficient to meet our domestic and foreign commitments that can be considered a national security reserve rather than a farm program cost.

The President's message inspires us all with its emphasis on America's food-for-peace program. In a world of hunger and distress, how thankful we should be that we are blessed with an agricultural abundance. As the President has said, we need to use that abundance to feed the hungry both at home and abroad, and we need to share the skills of our farmers in helping the developing countries to produce more effectively in their own right.

Food for peace has relieved hunger and suffering among many millions of people in the less developed countries of the world. It has not only met food needs in these countries of rising expectations but also has contributed materially toward their economic development. In many ways American food has fostered peace and international stability.

Food for peace has also been good for us. It has enabled us to make highly constructive use of our agricultural productivity. It results in exports of $1.6 billion annually, an outlet which adds to farm income and benefits hundreds of thousands of Americans working in the processing, handling, transportation, and other services in the business community needed to export farm products. Our food-for-peace shipments under Public Law 480 have been effective in turning potential markets into actual commercial markets and thus is a substantial factor in U.S. agricultural exports for dollars of $4.5 billion annually.

I commend the commitment of the administration to expand the food-for-peace program and to study ways and means of gearing it to meet more effectively the food and nutritional needs of emerging countries and to utilize food aid to develop indigenous agricultural resources in these countries. I am confident we will find better ways to coordinate the food-for-peace program and our agricultural technical assistance program so as to speed the day when the developing countries are better able to help themselves. This will promote peace and prosperity among all of us.

Food aid over the past 10 years has totaled more than 100 million tons of exports including 3 billion bushels of wheat, 100 million bags of rice, 6 billion pounds of vegetable oil, and large quantities of feed grains, dairy products, cotton, tobacco, and other farm products.

Mr. President, this message is not only good news for farmers; it is good news for the Nation as a whole, because it balances the interests of farmers with those of consumers and taxpayers. This is one of the most balanced and most thoughtfully constructed Presidential farm messages ever sent to Congress.

As the principal author of the voluntary wheat bill now on the statute books, I am pleased that the President has called in his message for that program not only to be continued but to be strengthened and improved. I now have pending before the Senate legislation designed to raise the income features of the voluntary wheat plan. I think it is in line with the guidelines of the President's farm message.

I am grateful, too, that the feed grain programs and other commodity price support programs now on the books will be strengthened and improved if the President's message is heeded by the Congress.

Mr. President, rural America is in serious difficulty today. Farmers still receive only half the per capita income of the national average. We can't say that our farmers are inefficient when they fail to make a living with a farm parity level at 75 percent of a fair price. No businessman can survive at 75 percent of a fair price. Neither can farmers.

This is a serious problem for the Nation, not for farmers alone. As economist Leon Keyserling reminded us in his letter to the Washington Post of this week, one-half of the Nation's unemployment stems from the exodus of farm people from the land. The loss of farmers from the land, as the President has said, means boarded up storefronts, dark churches, and depleted schools.

Thank God for a President and a Vice President who have grown up in rural America, and who now point the way toward a better life for our farm citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement by Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, in which he has commended the President's message.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Herschel D. Newsom, Master, National Grange, on the President's Farm Message, February 4, 1965

The Grange is pleased with the President's message and the legislative recommendations it contains.

His clear recognition of the dual problems of low farm income and low nonfarm purchasing power in rural America is a basic understanding which is necessary for the proper solution of these problems.

The Grange welcomes the President's endorsement of existing commodity programs. We will vigorously support legislative efforts to extend and modify this legislation to maintain and improve farm income, reduce Government holdings, and prevent or reduce further accumulation of these commodities in Government hands.

We have made great progress in the last 2 years in establishing a direction toward these objectives in wheat, cotton, and feed-grain programs. To the extent we may be successful in our continued efforts to improve farm income through reliance on the primary American domestic market, and thus able to eliminate or reduce the direct price-support programs, the Grange will be prepared at a later date to support lower appropriations.

We will continue to support the present levels until substantial progress is made in this direction.

President Johnson's proposal to establish minimum national food reserves is in accordance with longstanding Grange policy, and we heartily endorse it.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION NEEDS OF TOMORROW

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the recent annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Miami was especially significant because it focused attention on the future needs of our farm families and the growth of the rural cooperatives which serve them.

In an address to the NRECA audience, Norman Clapp, the distinguished Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, correctly stated that the Great Society must include all Americans. No great society can be achieved without good farms as well as great cities, without fair income for our farmers as well as for businessmen on Main Street. The rural electric cooperative movement has contributed beyond measure to the improvement of rural America. As Mr. Clapp has said in his superb address, that movement has an even greater and more exciting role to play in the years ahead.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Clapp's highly significant address be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Is Our Program Adequate To Meet the Needs of Tomorrow?

(Remarks of Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, before the 23d annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Miami Beach, Fla., January 26, 1965)

I am pleased to be with you again at your great national annual meeting. It is always an inspiration. To even the casual observer, the sheer size of this meeting is impressive in representing as it does the extent and magnitude of rural electrification in America. However, even more impressive to those who know the character of your deliberations is the serious purpose they always demonstrate. Eight thousand strong here today, you represent the interests of over 5 million consumers served by nearly 1,000 rural electric systems. Although the cooperatives you serve and represent are private enterprise, you are engaged in a great public service to rural America. You have accomplished great things in the past, and the Nation looks to you to accomplish even greater things in the future.

The rural electrification program developed by your joint efforts with your Federal Government through the Rural Electrification Administration passes its 30th anniversary this year. In those 30 years it can be given major credit for unlocking the door to rural America's true potential—both for better living and greater economic development and opportunity.

But as the theme of your conference indicates, you are concerned here today not with yesterday but tomorrow. You are undertaking today the consideration of decisions necessary to prepare for the problems of tomorrow. It is in this spirit that I come to speak to you this afternoon.

As we attempt to look into the future and anticipate what it may require of us in this program of rural electrification, we must face a fundamental question. Is the rural electrification program as we know it today going to be adequate to the needs of tomorrow?

Will it be adequate to match the purposes of the Great Society?

Will it be able to meet the needs of a rapidly growing America?

Will it be able to keep rural America in step with the march of technology in the electric industry?

President Johnson has spoken eloquently of the Great Society which he sees in America's future destiny. It will be a society of liberty and justice. It will be a society free of want and full of opportunity. It will be a society, however, not merely of material goals but of spiritual and cultural values.

Above all, it will be a society of all America and for all Americans. It must include rural America. It must be a society of good farms as well as great cities. The foundations on Main Street must be as sound as those of Wall Street. Quality of life and opportunity for progress must be as widely attainable on the farms and in our rural communities as they are in urban communities, for there can be no truly great society if rural America is left behind.

Achievement of the purposes of the Great Society will require a very real parity of opportunity for rural people, for people making their living on the farm, for people in need of off-the-farm rural employment, and for those who have been caught in the hopeless cycle of persistent poverty. It is a cruel but inescapable fact that while only one-third of all Americans live in the country today, half of the Nation's poverty is in the rural areas.

We cannot boast of urban prosperity while there is rural depression; we cannot be confident of our Nation's economic strength while there is weakness in the rural sector.

The attainment of the goals which the President has set for us will require the best efforts of all patriotic Americans, but it poses particularly stern challenges for leaders in rural areas. For as we know, from the days of privation for the early pioneers to the present day, rural people have labored under special handicaps. Always there has been the handicap of isolation—insolation from one another, from centers of information and culture, from centers of trade and opportunity, and from sources of capital for growth and advancement.

As our modern industrial civilization has developed, bringing with it great increases in material wealth to our society as a whole and making possible higher living standards and greater comforts and conveniences, these rural handicaps have never been more dramatically demonstrated than in the struggle to bring the blessings of electricity to rural people and their communities.

Today the initial phase of the task of rural electrification, that of reaching rural people with the physical facilities of service, is being successfully accomplished. Thanks in large measure to the efforts of you people here, electricity is available now in all parts of rural America to help us get started in building the Great Society. But there still remains before us the continuing challenge of making electric service—and telephone service as well—available under conditions of parity.

In examining the roles to be played by rural electric cooperatives in bringing about the Great Society in America, there is, it seems to me, no challenge so urgent, so demanding, as this need to achieve parity of rural rates and service with urban rates and service.

Too many rural sectors in the United States have been held back from the fast pace of economic development in this country by the high cost of such essential services as electric power or the lack of availability of modern telephone service. If rural America is to participate fully in our future economic growth, if rural people are to share in full measure in the kind of abundant society envisioned by our President, it is imperative that these utility services be provided to rural people under terms and conditions comparable to those available to people living in our towns and cities. For parity electric service, and parity telephone service as well, are not only essential to the achievement of better living standards in rural areas, but they are also essential tools for commercial and industrial development. They are basic to the development of equal economic opportunity in rural America.

The critical importance of electric power to economic growth and the close relationship between economic growth and the need for expanded electric facilities require us to take a long hard look at the capital resources which may be available for the expansion of rural electric facilities in the years ahead.

We know that the capital requirements of REA-financed systems will increase enormously in the years ahead. The best estimates available to us indicate that between now and the end of 1980, all of the electric systems of America—cooperative, commercial and public—will require more than $140 billion of new capital for expanded plant facilities to meet the growing demand for service. The capital requirements in the year 1980 alone for the American electric industry may reach the high figure of $13.7 billion.

And what will be the rural share of this tremendous capital demand? We estimate that REA borrower systems may need as much as $8.1 billion in new capital between now and the end of 1980, and that the requirements during the year 1980 may reach the figure of $675 million.

This capital will be needed for a number of rural system purposes. First, it will be needed to provide facilities for new consumers, presently being added to REA borrower lines at the net rate of about 125,000 per year. Capital also will be needed to provide the additional facilities needed for system improvements and to provide increased capacity to carry the expanding loads of present consumers. During the last decade, the average use of electricity among rural residential consumers—including both farm and nonfarm population, has risen from 223 kilowatt-hours per month to 425 kilowatt-hours per month.

Additional future capital also will be needed to cover the higher costs of plant replacements, resulting not only from the general increase in price levels, but also because of the higher unit cost of making replacements at various locations in a system's area, as compared with the unit cost of initial, down-the-road construction. The installed cost of the replacement unit, particularly with respect to the poles, towers, and fixtures which make up nearly 35 percent of distribution plant investment, is likely to be several times the installed cost of the pole being removed from service.

And beyond this, there will be the capital needed for new and expanded generation and transmission facilities.

Over the past history of the REA program, the annual increments of new capital made available to the rural systems through REA have averaged $208.5 million. The low year was fiscal year 1943 when only $10 million was authorized by the Federal Government for electric loans. The high year was fiscal year 1950 when the Congress authorized a total electric program of $500 million. The authorization for the present fiscal year is $365 million, including a $90 million reserve authorization. These figures, while impressive and important, nevertheless fall short of the $600 to $700 million level which future needs may well require.

When we look to tomorrow's needs and try to appraise the adequacy of today's capital financing available to rural electrification, we face more than the problem of total dollars required. We face, too, the problem of historical restrictions on the use of present REA financing.

The basic 2-percent financing now authorized under section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act is strictly limited to the financing of facilities "for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service." Under this authority, the Administrator of REA has been able to finance not only facilities for the initial and sole service of persons who fit this description, but also subsequent facilities for expanded service to such defined beneficiaries of the act and even facilities which do in fact provide some incidental service or benefit to others. All this has been essential to an effective and feasible program and the development of rural system efficiencies, as the pooling of facilities among power systems has become more and more a requirement of sound utility operation.

But even with the eminently reasonable and fully legal interpretation of this authority which has made these adjustments possible, REA practice has been confined to certain limits which are now running head on into the need for still greater flexibility if rural systems are to achieve the major economies offered by the industry's advancing technology.

Most dramatic of these economies is the economy of large thermal generating units, backed by the new capabilities of extra-high-voltage transmission.

It was less than 7 years ago that REA made its first loan for a 100,000-kilowatt, single-unit generating plant. It was as recently as last October that REA made the first loan to finance a 300,000-kilowatt single-unit plant, the largest we have financed to date. Yet we know that as industry standards go today, these are not exceptionally large units, and it takes no prophet to foresee that by 1980, 1-million-kilowatt plants will be commonplace in the United States. The industry already is considering the savings available from mammoth steamplants burning fossil fuels with capacities of 1.5 million or 2 million kilowatts. Also by 1980, it is anticipated that large nuclear plants will account for an important share—some predict 13 percent—of the Nation's installed generating capacity of about 525 million kilowatts.

Before World War II, the largest transmission line in use in this country was a 287-kilovolt line from Boulder Dam. It was about 20 years before any higher voltage lines were built. Then in the early 1950's both a power company and a Federal agency built the first 345-kilovolt lines. With the development of those first extra-high-voltage lines, many in the industry began to experiment with EHV, and both manufacturers and utilities undertook tests of materials, lines, and stations on lines up to 750 kilovolts.

Today these exhaustive tests have proved the practicality of 500-kilovolt transmission, not just on a line or two, but throughout a whole operating system. Two commercial companies already have built 500-kilovolt systems and TVA has one under construction, which will connect its system with the Southwest Power Pool.

But this is only the beginning of the EHV story. One commercial utility already is projecting the use of 700-kilovolt lines as a backbone for a 345-kilovolt system, and 1,000-kilovolt lines are being discussed by industry people as a possibility by 1975 or 1980.

As a result of this march of technology, the American electric industry is talking about the construction of extra-high-voltage transmission systems which will interconnect all the electric suppliers of the Nation. Now interconnection is nothing new to rural electric cooperatives. Today virtually all REA-financed plants are interconnected in some way with other facilities. From the initial provision of emergency interconnection for standby purposes and exchange of economy energy, substantially all of your systems have achieved in some degree joint use of facilities through parallel operation involving interconnected transmission systems.

But the tide of technology is sweeping your systems into a new phase, a phase which will require far greater emphasis on pooling of resources, not only among cooperatives but with other utility systems, both public and private. We are going to have to look beyond local patterns to regional and even interregional power supply patterns.

The kind of large-scale interconnection and pooling being envisioned by the electric industry today would produce enormous benefits for rural electric cooperatives and their consumers. It would permit construction of larger and more economic generating units, and transmission of bulk power from generating sources to major load centers.

It would make possible savings in fuel transportation costs in mass shipments of energy, such as our borrowers will experience in the lignite fields of North Dakota.

It would allow the location of large steamplants in the less heavily populated areas to alleviate air pollution problems in the large urban centers, a benefit with important implications for your rural systems.

It would reduce the reserve requirements of individual systems and provide further savings by permitting seasonal exchange of capacity between areas with opposing summer and winter peaks. And, among a number of other benefits, it would allow more efficient use of hydroelectric plants for peaking purposes.

But while the benefits of low-cost power through interconnection and pooling and large-scale generation are clear to the industry obeserver, it is not so clear how, under the present terms of the Rural Electrification Act, the rural electric systems can share in these benefits. We know that a rural electric cooperative cannot hope to compete with a 1-million-kilowatt unit with its own 22,000-kilowatt unit, but it is just as true that to justify construction of a 1-million-kilowatt plant with 2 percent REA financing and the restrictions it entails may be beyond the present capabilities of REA borrower systems.

Under present restrictions it took 76 cooperatives in 6 States, with the special good fortune to have available a 4,000-mile transmission system of the Federal Government, to put together sufficient load requirements to justify the 200-megawatt generating plant now under construction by Basin Electric Power Cooperative.

The 615-megawatt generating plant proposed by Buckeye Electric Cooperative in Ohio could not be financed by REA under present policy limitations, which require that capacity be absorbed by beneficiaries of the Rural Electrification Act within 10 years. The Buckeye plant would not be fully utilized for service to its own members for approximately 17 years, according to present load projections. Yet the economies of generating units of this size are great, and there is a ready market for the power until such time as it is needed for Buckeye's members.

The same kind of problem must be faced in EHV transmission and large interconnections and regional power pools. Under the present REA financing pattern, it is much more difficult for electric cooperatives to borrow REA funds to enter into such arrangements with other suppliers than it is to use REA funds for systems which borrowers operate entirely by themselves.

We have reached a point in the development of electric technology and of the rural electrification program when the restrictions which the act places upon the basic 2 percent financing makes it difficult for rural systems to move apace with the industry. REA borrowers today require capital that is available under fewer restrictions to permit them greater flexibility in making power supply arrangements. This increased flexibility is absolutely essential to the future strength and development of REA-financed systems and to the achievement of parity of rates and services for rural people with city people.

So, as we look ahead today toward the needs of tomorrow, these are the problems we face.

The present basic REA financing at 2 percent interest has been and still is an essential equalizer to bring parity of electric service within the reach of most rural communities served by REA-financed systems.

This basic program must be preserved and continued to the full extent it is needed to accomplish area coverage, provide rural parity rates and service, and develop proper system reserves to assure sound business operation and offer the rural people served reasonable assurance of stable and reliable service for the future.

But this alone will not be enough. There will be need for capital above and beyond these basic requirements. And the question we face is how can it be secured in adequate amounts and under terms fitted to the needs of future operations.

Your association a year ago undertook a study to determine if rural electric systems would be able to meet these needs for additional financing from the private money market. You are to be commended both for your foresight and for your insistence on getting the facts before making any judgment. This study is still in progress.

At the same time I told you that we in REA proposed to study the possibility of developing a new type of intermediate REA financing to supplement the present basic 2-percent financing. Such intermediate financing would, on the one hand, be freed from some of the restrictions placed upon the present basic REA financing and, on the other hand, return a rate of interest which would be fully compensatory to the Federal Government for the cost of its money.

Such intermediate financing would supplement, not replace, the basic 2-percent financing, where the basic financing is needed to accomplish the basic objectives of rural service.

As I pointed out a year ago, if this intermediate financing is made fully compensatory to the Federal Government by means of a higher interest rate, the Federal Government could in turn more easily make such loans available in the greater volume necessary to meet the needs of the future. It could afford also to make such financing available on a less restrictive basis.

While we all await the results of your study on the availability of private financing to meet your future needs before forming any final judgment, I am confident any realistic appraisal of the prospects at this point must be deeply concerned with at least two major obstacles to the attraction of private capital.

One is the substantially lower owner equity in most rural systems than is customary in the commercial electric utility industry.

The other is the lack of territorial protection for rural systems in most States.

Until these two deficiencies can be corrected, the prospects for any substantial financing from the private money market would appear very limited at best.

As a practical matter the intermediate financing such as we have been studying in REA may prove to be a very necessary bridge between the present basic REA financing and your ultimate access to the private money market on favorable terms.

It is with this in mind that I have suggested it would be advisable for you of NRECA as well as us in REA to study the possibility of supplemental public sources of financing for rural electrification. And we welcome the decision of your board of directors announced yesterday to expand your present study to cover this field of potential financing. Let us not forget it is you as well as we who face the necessity of decision on the future course of this program.

Together we must move to meet the needs of a growing America. To you falls the challenge of leadership in rural America. With you will rest a great responsibility for its ultimate place in the Great Society. The challenge is great, and the time for action not long. To be ready for tomorrow, we must begin today.

THE PRESIDENT RECOGNIZES CONSUMER NEEDS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am happy that the President in his farm message to Congress has given top priority to the objective of an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable and stable prices for the people of the United States.

This surely is of the utmost importance to all 191 million people of America who are the consumers of the food and fiber produced by some 6 million workers on 3½ million farms.

By stabilizing agricultural production and farm prices, this administration also has been stabilizing the prices paid by consumers in the retail stores across this Nation.

Today the American consumer has available the cleanest, most wholesome, most varied and abundant food supply of all time. On the average, U.S. consumers spend less than 19 percent of their income after taxes for food. This compares with 30 percent in England and France, and with 50 percent in Russia.

As the President noted in his message, the consumer is the major beneficiary of farm programs because of the abundance of food and fiber the farmer is producing at stable prices.

Our agricultural abundance, as the President pointed out, has also made possible the food stamp, school lunch, surplus food distribution, and special milk programs so essential and so beneficial to our needy people and to our schoolchildren.

The President is to be commended for the careful attention that is being paid to meeting the consumer needs of our Nation in the farm program he has outlined to Congress.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have been pleased to hear the comments on the President's farm program. I second the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota in his remarks regarding the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I am always pleased to hear the comments of the Senator from Vermont on agricultural matters, because there is no finer expert or greater authority on agriculture matters than he. I was pleased to hear him open this discussion on the President's message.

While I have not had occasion to study the message in full detail, it impresses me as a fine and strong message. In it, the President has faced up in a sincere and realistic manner to the problems and potentials of rural America. He has exploded a myth that has endured far too long—the myth that, like all men, all farms are created equal. They are not. Opportunities for earning good livings are not the same on every farm. Our acceptance of that fact will enable us to put more muscle and more heart into legislation and programs for rural America.

The message recognizes that rural America's unemployment and underemployment are not wholly related to farms, by pointing out that changes in mining and lumbering industries have also cut into traditional earning opportunities in rural sections of the country.

I am particularly pleased with the President's determination to make the services and benefits of the entire package of new economic opportunity, education, and health legislation as fully available to rural people as to those in our cities. Oftentimes, I have seen programs enacted that gave only scant notice to the needs of rural America. I have pointed that out many times in connection with housing programs. It was always easy to get a program through for people who lived in urban areas; but when we tried to obtain a program for people who lived on the farms, a program that those people could handle, our efforts became most difficult. Even today, we do not give the emphasis to the needs of housing in the rural parts of our country that we give to the needs in urban areas. That is true of so many programs.

I particularly wish to emphasize the part of the President's message in which he points out the need to have rural areas share these programs with urban areas.

The President has accepted for the administration, and has given to Congress, some vital challenges. He has, in this message, offered to Congress and the people well-considered guidance. I anticipate purposeful response to the challenges, and utilization of the guidance.

I know that careful consideration of the message will be given by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, one of our most able committees. The same thing will happen in the House. I know that careful consideration will be given to the President's agricultural proposals by both Houses of Congress. I feel that the chances for the passage of a truly good agricultural bill by Congress are good.

THE PRESIDENT REITERATES SUPPORT OF THE GATT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, stressing the important role which an expansion of agricultural exports can have in improving the income of American farmers, the President's farm message restates and emphasizes the need for a successful Kennedy round of negotiation under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. These negotiations, which are now in progress in Geneva can, if concluded successfully, mean substantial increases in our exports of feed grains, tobacco, soybeans, certain fruit and livestock products, wheat and other important commodities. Our farmers may reasonably expect an increase of several hundred million dollars in annual export sales if the trade liberalization we are striving to obtain is achieved. Such trade liberalization also is a major avenue of achieving sound economic growth among nations generally as each will profit from expanded trade through broader markets and more economical supplies.

The President also underscored the importance of accomplishing liberalized terms of trade for both farm and industrial products and not just industrial products alone as some of the nations at Geneva would prefer to do.

These views of the President reiterate those of the Congress as expressed in enacting the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 authorizing U.S. participation in the negotiations now in progress. The enunciation of this policy by the President will strengthen our position in the current negotiations and augurs well for the further realization of this important component in our international policy.

At one time, a few years ago, I was a delegate representing the Senate as an observer to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Therefore, I know with what diligence and care negotiations are pursued, and how difficult it is to achieve the goals which we, or any other particular nation, desire.

Nevertheless, by persistence and by placing high principles in the forefront, I believe we can achieve these goals.

FEDERAL POWER AND THE KEATING PROVISO

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Keating proviso in all our Public Works Appropriations Acts since the fiscal year 1952 has resulted in millions of dollars of excessive charges for wheeling Federal power. This requirement completely disregards the economics of transmission costs. Although the Keating proviso was again incorporated in the 1965 Public Works Appropriations Act, the Senate Appropriations Committee stated in its report that no wheeling contracts should be made by the Interior Department "which call for wheeling charges greater than Federal costs for such service, or which do not provide to the Department wheeling capacity in the lines to meet its full requirements." This statement was a partial recognition of the need for economic comparison of wheeling charges as against the costs of direct service. This rigid statutory restriction should no longer prevent the search for the lowest possible electric power costs for the consumer. The Keating proviso should be eliminated.

On February 2, 1965, the Honorable JOHN E. MOSS, Member of the House of Representatives from the Third District of California, spoke to this point before a panel of the American Public Power Association, meeting in Washington, D.C.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his statement be printed in the RECORD; and I commend the statement to the attention of Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPEAL OF THE KEATING PROVISO

(Excerpts from remarks of Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Third District, California, at panel discussion of American Public Power Association, in Washington, D.C., on February 2, 1965)

The Keating proviso in the Public Works Appropriation Acts has resulted in millions of dollars of excessive charges for wheeling Federal power. These excessive charges have been borne not only by the Federal Government but also by the consumers of publicly generated power.

The Keating proviso was first adopted during the Korean war emergency in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1952 (65 Stat. 248, 255). Since that time it has appeared in every Bureau of Reclamation appropriation for construction and rehabilitation and is now in the Public Works Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1965. (Public Law 88–511, 78 Stat. 682, 686.)

The language of the Keating proviso is as follows: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer."

Those who proposed the proviso contended that it would avoid duplication of transmission facilities in order to achieve savings of Federal funds and critical materials needed for the defense effort in the Korean war emergency. The principal proponent of the proviso, former Congressman (and later Senator) Keating, of New York, repeatedly stated that it would prevent the Bureau of Reclamation from constructing transmission lines only where the wheeling service provided by existing utility lines was adequate and at a reasonable rate.

Unfortunately, the language of the proviso is framed in terms of "areas covered by power wheeling service contracts." Once the Bureau has entered a wheeling contract, the entire area covered by the contract is subjected to the prohibition of the Keating proviso, without regard to whether the wheeling service is adequate, or whether the wheeling costs are reasonable, or whether they exceed the costs of direct transmission service.

The Keating proviso is a politically motivated requirement which disregarded the economics of transmission costs. Its absurd rigidities were exemplified when it obstructed the Bureau's proposal to construct a line from Keswick to Toyon to provide electric service to the Shasta Dam Area Public Utilities District in California. Another example of its harmful effect was the recent decision by the Comptroller General holding that the Keating proviso precludes the Bureau's effort to provide a substation needed to transmit Government power to the city of Hillsboro, N. Dak. In all of these cases, the negative role of the proviso operated without regard to the excessive costs or the inadequacies of the wheeling contract covering the area.

The hearings in 1960 by the Special Power and Land Subcommittee concerning sale and transmission of electric power from the Bureau of Reclamation project in California thoroughly demonstrated the extent of these excessive costs on both the Federal Government and its preference customers.

For example, in the case of one of the Bureau's preference customers, the Shasta Dam Area PUD, the engineering data presented at the hearings demonstrated, on the basis of a mere 8,000-kilowatt load, that if Government power were delivered to the PUD by direct service instead of by wheeling, the Federal Government would save almost $3 million in wheeling charges, and the PUD would save almost $6 million in wheeling charges, beyond the total cost of a federally constructed line during its useful life. In the case of another preference customer, the city of Redding, Calif., on the basis of its 1960 load alone, the direct transmission of power instead of by wheeling would save the city $5 million, and would save the Bureau of

Reclamation even more than $5 million, in 30 years.

In the case of the city of Roseville, on the basis of a 15,000-kilowatt load, the Government's savings would amount to almost $10 million, and the city's savings would amount to almost $11½ million, over a 50-year period, if CVP power were delivered to the city directly, instead of by wheeling over private power lines.

In the case of larger loads, the cost differences could be much greater. For example, the hearings demonstrated that by constructing a direct service line of about 8 miles the Sacramento Municipal Utility District enabled the Bureau of Reclamation to achieve savings, over the payout period of the Central Valley project (i.e., to July 1, 2013), amounting to the staggering sum of $205,401,520.30.

Although the Congress has, from time to time, specifically authorized the Bureau to construct transmission lines notwithstanding the existence of the Keating proviso, the proviso has nevertheless exerted a totally negative influence, not only on the Federal power program, but also on the ability of both public agencies and preference customers to obtain lower costs for transmission of federally generated power. The Keating proviso establishes a legislative tone looking toward rejection of necessary transmission facilities. It has undoubtedly caused the Bureau of Reclamation in many cases to refrain from proposing construction of needed and more economical transmission facilities.

For these reasons, the House Committee on Government Operations concluded (in H. Rept. No. 2221, 86th Cong.) that the proviso "has resulted, in many cases, in substantially increasing, rather than decreasing the costs of power transmission, both to the Government and to the preference customers." The committee pointed out that the proviso has undercut the bargaining power of Government agencies, "has gravely impaired the Government's ability to achieve the lowest possible costs for the transmission of federally generated power," and has substantially deterred the Government "from taking into account the comparative costs of wheeling versus direct transmission service in determining whether to recommend Federal construction of transmission facilities."

The committee's report put the issue in a nutshell when it stated: "Much economy could be achieved by eliminating that proviso, or by amending it so as to prohibit the Bureau from expending appropriated funds to construct power transmission facilities only where the Bureau shows that the cost of adequate wheeling would be less than the cost of amortizing and operating a federally constructed transmission facility over the life of such facility."

The power companies have continuously lobbied for retention of the Keating proviso and its language of area coverage. They have consistently opposed any modification which would permit a comparison of the wheeling costs in relation to the costs of amortizing and operating a direct transmission facility over its useful life.

Although the Keating proviso was again incorporated in the 1965 Public Works Appropriation Act (Public Law 88-511, 78 Stat. 682, 686), it is heartening to note that when the Senate Appropriations Committee reported the appropriation bill, it stated that no wheeling contracts should be made by the Interior Department "which call for wheeling charges greater than Federal costs for such service, or which do not provide to the department wheeling capacity in the lines to meet its full requirements." (S. Rept. No. 1326, 88th Cong., p. 37.)

This statement by the Senate Appropriations Committee is a partial recognition of the need for economic comparison of wheeling charges as against the costs of direct service. The Congress showed a similar recognition of this need when Congress, in authorizing the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project (act of June 30, 1960, 74 Stat. 156, Public Law 86-488), included a provision for an economic comparison of direct service facilities and wheeling charges under a firm 50-year contract.

I want to emphasize, however, that such economic comparison must take into account the cost of the wheeling charges not only to the Federal Government but also those imposed on the preference customer. Many wheeling contracts provide for wheeling charges which are paid in part by the Government and in part by the customer. A comparison of direct service costs and wheeling charges to the Government alone would be totally unrealistic since it would not prevent imposition of unnecessary charges on the consuming public.

The recent National Power Survey by the Federal Power Commission highlighting the importance of adequate transmission facilities and the potentialities for reduced electric power rates has made the repeal of the Keating proviso more urgent than ever. We should not permit this arbitrary and rigid statutory restriction to prevent the search for, and attainment of, the lowest possible costs of electric power for the Nation's consumers. The time has come to mount a full attack on that proviso.

A FOUNDATION FOR STRENGTHENED FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the message on agriculture which President Johnson sent to Congress today is a message from a President who reveals his understanding of agriculture, his knowledge of rural America, and his willingness to set forth ideas and programs which will lead to a brighter future for those Americans who live outside our large cities.

I was particularly concerned with that section of the message dealing with programs for the important agricultural commodities of wheat and feed grains as well as cotton, tobacco, wool, and others.

Congress must deal with the programs relating to these important farm products this year and the President has given us his views and his guidance and his proposals for our consideration.

In addition, he has provided to the farmers of the country who grow these products the chance to build on the current successes of agriculture, toward a strengthened farm economy.

There has been uncertainty in the minds of many farmers as to whether some of these programs may be continued and what the administration will propose if they are to be continued. The President has recommended continuation of the farm programs along their lines, suggesting that some changes may be needed to strengthen them and to keep their costs at a minimum. This would provide for the farmers a continuation in their thinking and planning and, as all of us who know agriculture know, this is most important.

The future can be bright in rural America.

ROBERT T. KIRKWOOD, ARKANSAS TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, Mr. Bob Kirkwood, head of the science department of the Pine Bluff, Ark., High School, was recently selected as Arkansas Teacher of the Year of 1965. I join his multitude of friends and admirers in extending to him warmest congratulations and very best wishes. This is a fine and well-deserved honor for one of Arkansas' many able and dedicated teachers who have given unstintingly of his time and energies to the education of the youth of our State. His career should serve as an inspiration to the thousands of other loyal and competent teachers who staff the public schools of Arkansas and the other States of the Nation.

Mr. Kirkwood graduated in 1947 from the University of Missouri with a B.A. in Zoology. He taught for a time in Humphrey, Ark.; later, he was principal of Altheimer, Ark., High School; and, in 1960, he became head of the science department of Pine Bluff High School. He earned his master of science degree in education, and his master of arts degree in zoology from the University of Arkansas.

In honoring Mr. Kirkwood, we also honor the many, many dedicated teachers who do the indispensable job of educating our youth. We must have an educated citizenry if we are to cope with the complex problems and to meet the responsibilities of our time. We are dependent upon the teaching profession for the task of building such an educated citizenry.

Again, I extend my congratulations to Bob Kirkwood, and I also give him my thanks for his service to the fine young people of Arkansas in their pursuit of an education.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Kirkwood's statement on the "Philosophy of Teaching" printed in the RECORD. All of us would profit, I think, from reading and pondering his statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILOSOPHY OF TEACHING

(By Robert T. Kirkwood)

My task is to lead each student to confront his universe and to equip him to enjoy and to benefit from the confrontation. I must first convince the student that the encounter is desirable, that the attainment of knowledge adds to life a dimension that cannot be gained in any other way. I must also convince the student that he may safely risk himself to the encounter. Learning may change his self, but the change will always be constructive, will always lead to the development of a larger self.

Before I can lead another individual to examine the universe in which he lives, I must engage actively in the same examination. I must continue to study all facets of life, not just the one subject matter area that I teach. If I am to convince students that involvement in life is a rewarding experience, I must listen to more music, read more books, examine more art, study more natural history, and seek to know more people.

As I encourage students to grow by learning I must be extremely careful that I do nothing to diminish anyone in his own eyes. Although a student may understand all mysteries and may have all knowledge, if he does not care for himself, he is nothing.

Finally, I must be sure that each student learns that the acquisition of knowledge carries with it responsibilities. Because learning is a social activity, the one who learns has social responsibilities. Each must make what contribution he can for the benefit of all.

A MESSAGE FOR ALL AMERICANS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the President's message on agriculture is a purposeful and challenging explanation of where we are and where we should go with our food and agriculture policies and programs.

It merits the attention of every American, whether he lives in the heart of a city, in a country town, or on a farm.

I am impressed by its recognition that food and agriculture policies affect the entire economy, and its emphasis on the interrelationship of agricultural policies to other aspects of the Nation's economy and to foreign policy.

The President's clear-cut identification and definition of the economic and social problems of rural America will be most helpful to Congress in constructing remedial legislation, and in making any necessary improvements in existing laws related to food and agriculture and to rural community development.

It is a realistic message. It does not attempt to minimize either the volume or the variety of the tasks which lie ahead in bringing rural America into full Great Society membership and partnership. Yet the message is laced with confidence in the people, and the future, of rural America.

I am confident that we in the Congress will have ideas of our own, which, I trust, can, together with those expressed by the President, be worked out to produce the best program for America and for rural America. But I am glad to say that I believe the program as expressed in the President's message is a solid launching pad of opportunity for study by all and for constructive action by the people and the Government.

A MESSAGE FOR EVERYONE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I hope every farm family in the Nation reads President Johnson's message on agriculture.

It contains one of the finest tributes ever paid to the producers of the Nation's food and fiber, and demonstrates deep appreciation for their contributions to the total well-being of our society.

I hope every consumer in the Nation reads it, too, for a better understanding of how much our farmers contribute to his health and economic security.

It is an honest appraisal of today's agriculture and the rural American scene.

The message lays out guidelines which, if followed, will strengthen the economic and social foundations of farms and rural communities.

It leaves no doubt about the President's determination to provide rural America with every opportunity to achieve full-citizenship in the Great Society.

It is a thoughtful message, informative, marked with challenge, and well seasoned with inspiration and confidence.

I look forward to assisting with implementation of the President's proposals.

Mr. President, may I say also that I am very glad that this reassurance can be given to people of agriculture. There have been rumors around Washington, unfounded, with respect to what the plans and programs of this administration were in this field.

No one in America understands the problems of the American farmers better than the present incumbent in the chair, the Vice President of the United States. Our President is also a farmer.

In behalf of many people, and especially the farmers of Missouri, I want to thank him, and the President, for their deep concern with the problems of our farmers.

CONSUMERS SHARE IN THE EARTH'S BOUNTY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in President Johnson's message on agriculture to the Congress, he gave top recognition to an undisputable fact—that the bounty of the earth is the foundation of our economy.

As the President pointed out, progress in every aspect of our Nation's life depends upon the abundant harvest of our farms.

And he stated as our No. 1 objective—an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable and stable prices for the people of the United States. I think all of us would subscribe to and support this program.

Surely, the consumers of America—all 191 million of us—reap the benefits of our farm commodity programs, not just the 6 million people who produce our food and fiber on 3.5 million farms.

Without these commodity programs we would not have stabilized agricultural production and stabilized prices. But with the commodity programs we do have an abundance of the earth's bounty at stable prices. We pay less than 19 percent of our take-home pay for food, which makes us the best fed people at the lowest relative cost of any people in the world.

The English and the French, for instance, have to spend about 30 percent of their disposable income for food, and the Russians about 50 percent.

Because our people eat better at less cost than any other people in the world's history, we can spend our earnings for the many other things that make life more rewarding, as the President pointed out.

In addition to this, we share our abundance with the needy and hungry people at home and abroad through our food stamp and food distribution programs in this country and our food-for-peace program in the far corners of the earth. And we are able to provide our children with lunches and special milk at school.

But as the President said, we must continue to speed our progress in agriculture, to insure the protection of consumers and make full opportunity for all our people more than a distant hope.

His message eloquently describes the path we should seek to follow in the days ahead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was impressed by the President's message on agriculture, particularly with respect to the expansion of markets.

Pointing out that the welfare of American agriculture is closely linked to foreign markets, the President stressed the need for further increases in our agricultural exports and outlined steps to achieve this policy. Our market development program, already playing a significant role in stimulating exports to a number of countries, will be broadened where there are opportunities to expand our commercial farm exports. In order to enable U.S. exporters to compete more effectively, the President has directed the Secretary of Commerce to study possibilities for liberalizing export regulations for all agricultural products except those in short supply. The President also stressed the need for domestic commodity programs that would further improve our competitive position in world markets from the standpoints of price, quality, and service.

American agriculture already has taken giant strides in export expansion. Last year such exports exceeded $6 billion and accounted for a fourth of all U.S. merchandise exports. With renewed emphasis, however, further progress can be expedited to the benefit of our farmers through larger markets, our Government program through lower costs, our international balances through larger exchange earnings, and the American public generally through the higher rate of growth and international stability that accompany increases in international trade and commercial ties.

The problem of exports and imports and balance of trade is one of the most important matters confronting the Nation's economy today.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING—REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yesterday the Senator from Michigan introduced his bill on packaging and labeling. He discussed it very briefly last night. As I understand, that bill now lies on the desk, at his request. There is a little controversy about the reference of the bill.

May I ask whether the bill has actually been referred to any committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill has not as yet been referred to committee. The request was made yesterday that the bill lie on the table. That has been done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would like to propound a unanimous-consent request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce and thereafter, and that when the Commerce Committee has completed its work on the bill, it be referred back to the Judiciary Committee.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan whether he would have objection to that request.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I understand fully the concern the distinguished minority leader has with respect to this bill. Clearly, as the bill has been introduced, the jurisdiction is that of the Committee on Commerce. I would hope, knowing the distinguished chairman of that committee, we would have an opportunity for hearing and action. As the sponsor of the bill, I would be hopeful that action would be favorable and that we would be presented with a bill.

I think I would be unwilling to agree that, in the event of favorable action by the Committee on Commerce, the bill, as of the action taken up to this morning, thereafter would be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It may well be that the bill, if it is reported by the Committee on Commerce with certain changes and conditions by the committee, should go to the Committee on the Judiciary, but I would dislike at this time to presume to have any idea that that would happen to the bill when it came from the Committee on Commerce, if it did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the record, there is a substantial reason for the request I make. First, this bill was originally introduced in the 87th Congress. At that time I am not sure there was any desire for action, but at least the desire was to obtain information with respect to its contents. It was reintroduced in the 88th Congress. There were many hearings. I believe we heard 88 witnesses and compiled as much as 2,000 pages of testimony—all this while the bill was in the hands of the Commerce Committee, and rightly so, because when it was first introduced it was as an amendment to the Clayton Act, and very clearly the Judiciary Committee had jurisdiction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 3 minutes of the Senator from Illinois have expired. Does the Senator wish to have additional time in order to dispose of this matter?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The bill has been introduced as an independent bill, and not particularly or by reference as relating to the Clayton Act. I believe I could not quarrel with its reference to the Committee on Commerce, but I believe it could be referred to both the Commerce Committee and the Judiciary Committee, because of the length of time we spent on the bill and the mass of expert testimony from business and industry. Since it deals with labeling and packaging from every aspect, on the basis of the work that has been done and the amount of time we have devoted to it, it very properly should come back to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HART. One of the greatest uproars concerning the bill the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has described with reference to the testimony before the Judiciary Committee was that it was thought improper to have it go before the Judiciary Committee in the first place and that it was a completely inappropriate amendment to the Clayton Act. This criticism, along with several others that has been given us, has been reflected by modification. Unless the Committee on Commerce changes it, the bill has no relation to the antitrust laws at all, but, as was true of the Fur Labeling Act and others over the history of the evoluton of these matters, it is properly referable to the Committee on Commerce.

It is conceivable that that committee, in its analysis of the bill and in its determinations, would report a bill which should go to one or more of the antitrust laws. In that case, clearly it should go back to the Judiciary Committee. Absent that, it would be inappropriate at this juncture to direct that this bill, even now, or at a time certain in the future, should go to another committee than the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Technically I could concede the point the Senator from Michigan makes, except there is no question that the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee could also claim jurisdiction to hold hearings on the packaging and labeling bill, because the bill deals with standardization and so-called nonprice competition which are factors that have been considered by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the FTC as reasons for looking into certain antitrust law violation cases.

And I cite the fact that the bill is exactly the bill that was before the Judiciary Committee. There may have been some minor modifications, other than the fact that it does not tie into the Clayton Act. Other than that, it is the same subject matter to which the Judiciary Committee has devoted so much time. I make my suggestion in good conscience and good grace that it should go back to the Judiciary Committee.

First, I inquire whether the Senator from Michigan would object to a unanimous consent request to that effect.

Mr. HART. Namely, that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, following study and action by the Committee on Commerce?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HART. For the reasons I have indicated, and reluctantly, I would not agree to action today which would have the effect of referring the bill at some future day to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Michigan whether reference of the bill can be deferred until the Parliamentarian takes a further look at it to see what ties it has to the general body of our antitrust statutes.

Mr. HART. I would have no objection to that. I believe that none of us wants a reference to be made under pressure of time. I believe that the Parliamentarian should be certain in his own mind that the proposed reference is appropriate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As of yesterday, the request made by unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table takes it off and away from the jurisdiction of the Chair to make appropriate referral. The unanimous-consent request was for 1 day, as the Chair recalls, and at the end of that day, if no other disposition is made of it it comes back in the hands of the Chair for his disposition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That means today?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it could be deferred until next week, before there is a reference to committee, there would be a little more opportunity to discuss it. Then, if possible, at the appropriate time I would wish to make a motion with respect to reference of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Illinois is suggesting it remain on the table, which will require unanimous consent and would have to be official.

Mr. HART. I wonder whether it would accommodate the desires of the Senator from Illinois, and also the convenience of the Senate—and I now so request—that the bill lie on the table for 5 days for the purpose, among others, of permitting cosponsorship. This would have the additional advantage of permitting the Parliamentarian to carefully analyze the bill and fix a time certain, at which time the Senator from Illiniois and others might wish to make a specific motion with respect to reference. I would reserve the right myself to make such a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So that the Senator may understand, there is a difference between a bill being held at the desk and lying on the table. If the Senator is asking unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table, it means it will not be available for purposes of reference. If the bill is merely being held at the desk, for additional cosponsors, it is referred, but merely held up for printing so as to get the names of the additional cosponsors on the bill when it is printed.

Mr. HART. I believe that the Senator from Illinois and I are agreed on that, at least. We have no desire precipitately to require a reference. The Senator has indicated his strong feelings on that point, and so have I.

What we seek to do is to permit Senators concerned with the bill to know when, next week, a decision may be anticipated, which can be assured, I take it, by asking that the bill lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HART. Lying on the table would also permit additional cosponsors during that period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When a bill is lying on the table, and such a request has been made it is available for additional cosponsorship within the time in question. The Chair will, then, after the period the bill has been ordered to lie on the table has expired, make appropriate reference thereof, unless in the meantime the Senate has made some other disposition of the matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can the motion to take up a discussion for purposes of reference be made during the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. After the transaction of morning business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair inquires once again, Does the Senator from Michigan wish to have the bill to lie on the table, or does he wish disposition?

Mr. HART. No, I am perfectly willing, because of the concern voiced by the Senator from Illinois, that opportunity be given—as I have indicated to the Parliamentarian, and to the Senator from Illinois and others—fully to study the proposal and the appropriate reference.

What the Senator from Illinois and I are now attempting to determine is what date the Senate is likely to be in session, in order that I may request that the bill lie on the table until that date.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a moment while he is conferring with the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HART. I am glad to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] for 3 minutes, provided that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. HART subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois and I have had an opportunity to look at this matter further. It appears that because of the uncertainty of the schedule next week, the soundest way to dispose of the matter of reference of the truth-in-packaging bill is to make a request, which I now make, that the bill lie on the table until February 18, which is 2 weeks from today, and that during that period of time cosponsors may be added. On the 18th of February we shall ask unanimous consent that the matter become the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted.

EARTHQUAKE RESEARCH IS NEEDED—IT SHOULD PROVE A VALUABLE INVESTMENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the seismograph, first invented in the 1880's by John Milne, of England, is of inestimable value to man as it registers the shocks and motions of earthquakes.

Early this morning, at 12:10 a.m. eastern standard time, while most residents of the eastern United States were sleeping, the faithful seismograph registered a series of three severe tremors in the vicinity of Amchitka Island. Amchitka is one of the Aleutian Islands chain. It is 1,420 miles from Alaska's largest city, Anchorage. The quakes near the island registered an intensity of 7.5 to 8 on the Richter scale.

Armed with this information, and aware that the earthquakes could create devastating tidal waves in the Pacific Basin Rim area which includes the Pacific coast, Alaska, Hawaii, and the islands of the far Pacific, including Japan, inhabitants of the areas were warned that tidal waves could be expected. Residents left the low coastal areas and moved to higher ground. The time of the Amchitka Island tremors was 6:10 p.m., February 3, Bering time. Several hours later, waves 10 inches higher than usual were recorded along the shores of the Hawaiian Islands. The waves hitting the shoreline of the Japanese Islands were reported to be two inches higher than normal. According to news wire reports, no noticeable increases were registered along the Pacific coast.

We may be thankful that the tidal waves were minimal. More important, we thank the scientists who are perfecting the machinery which enables us to know more about the earthquakes and their after effects.

An informative article written by Lawrence Lessing, entitled "Solving the Riddle of the Shuddering Earth" is published in the February 1965 issue of Fortune.

Author Lessing reminds us that the Good Friday earthquake which struck south-central Alaska March 27, 1964, was the biggest ever recorded on this continent. It registered between 8.4 and 8.6 on the Richter scale, and for nearly 5 minutes shook an area of nearly 500,000 square miles.

Mr. Lessing graphically describes this earthquake's enormity:

> In the main shock area, centered about 75 miles east of Anchorage, a 400-mile-long subterranean rock formation extending down the coastline and out to the southern tip of Kodiak Island was rent asunder. On one side of this enormous fracture, the land—including part of a mountain range—dropped as much as 8 to 10 feet; on the other side, the coast—and one offshore island—rose as much as 30 to 50 feet. Later measurements showed that the fracture had permanently displaced the earth's crust as far west as Hawaii.

That Good Friday earthquake was responsible for the deaths of more than 100 persons. It caused damage exceeding $350 million. It appears to have triggered an intensive and extensive effort on the part of man to learn what causes earthquakes.

Mr. Lessing suggests:

> Evidence is growing that the Alaskan quake marks a real turning point. While the reverberations from aftershocks still continue and rebuilding goes on apace, a long-range scientific effort is at last getting underway to solve the riddle of what causes earthquakes.

We would be wise to encourage every effort to learn more about the causes of earthquakes and, more important, to learn how they may be predicted.

Damage to this Nation inflicted by earthquakes of the past 50 years is difficult to assess. Author Lessing suggests that the monetary damage, as of now, exceeds $1 billion in earthquake damage.

Danger from earthquakes is not confined to the Western United States alone. Lessing writes that—

> The Utah-Montana-Wyoming triangle has been active recently. A century and a half ago three big quakes in quick succession struck New Madrid, Mo.; and in 1886 Charleston, S.C., was devastated. The mid-Mississippi Valley, the southern coast, the St. Lawrence River Valley, and even the New England area around Boston are all seismic regions that have been active in the past. The fact that an area has been quiet for a long time is no reason to believe that it will not be struck tomorrow, with catastrophic results even to such a seemingly impervious city as New York.

We know that the March 27, 1964, earthquake is the subject of the most intensive study ever made of an earthquake. It should be.

What are the clues which appear prior to an earthquake which could give inhabitants of the area a warning in advance of the actual tremor? Mr. Lessing reminds us that an oil-prospecting magnetometer registered a curious shift on field just prior to Alaska's Good Friday quake. Cattlemen on Kodiak Island have told me that they observed the cattle standing silent and facing the direction of the quake before it occurred. Some people believe that animals have such a prophetic sense.

So let us move ahead and learn all we can.

Author Lessing discusses what he calls closing in on earthquakes. He says:

> While this broad inquiry into fundamentals goes forward, without which earthquakes would never be fully understood, geophysicists are also bent upon a closer, more practical study of individual earthquakes themselves. Much remains to be learned about the character and pattern of their activity, with an eye to prediction. Volcanologists have reached a good rate of success in predicting eruptions by studying specific volcanoes over long periods. And for a decade the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey has operated a tsunami warning system out of Honolulu; by checking special tide gages dotted around the mid-Pacific, it is able to predict the arrival time on shorelines of the giant, 500-mile-per-hour sea waves generated by oceanic earthquakes. Coast and Geodetic is now extending the system to Alaska, and is also seeking a way to predict by computer analysis not only arrival times but also wave heights. The earthquake problem is much more difficult, but it too may yield to an organized effort.

Earlier this session, the Senate approved S. 408, a worthy bill introduced by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], which I cosponsored. The bill authorizes a study of methods to help provide financial assistance to victims of disasters, and directs that a study on earthquake insurance be reported to the President for submission to the Congress no later than 3 years following enactment. This amendment was perfected by my able colleague, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. The bill is now in the House of Representatives which I hope will act soon on this proposed legislation, for whenever man has the opportunity to help prevent unnecessary loss of life he should move with all possible speed in that direction.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lessing's article from Fortune be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLVING THE RIDDLE OF THE SHUDDERING EARTH

(By Lawrence Lessing)

(NOTE.—Undersea exploration, nuclear testing, and observation of the orbits of space satellites—all are adding new clues to the causes of earthquakes. The new knowledge may provide ways to warn against these disasters and to minimize their damage.)

The earthquake that struck Alaska's southern coast on the evening of Good Friday, March 27, 1964, was of a magnitude to erase complacency about this horrendous phenomenon. It was the biggest ever recorded on this continent. On a seismic scale of magnitudes from 1 to 10, it registered

8.4 to 8.6. In actual energy released, it far outdid the great San Francisco quake of 1906. For 1½ to 4 minutes, as if under the blows of a mighty battering ram, the earth shook over a land area of nearly 500,000 square miles. In places as distant as Illinois, New Jersey, and Florida, water-well levels precipitously dropped 2 to 10 feet. In the main shock area, centered about 75 miles east of Anchorage, a 400-mile-long subterranean rock formation extending down the coastline and out to the southern tip of Kodiak Island was rent asunder. On one side of this enormous fracture, the land—including part of a mountain range—dropped as much as 8 to 10 feet; on the other side, the coast—and one offshore island—rose as much as 30 to 50 feet. Later measurements showed that the fracture had permanently displaced the earth's crust as far west as Hawaii.

In the main shock area, huge avalanches, landslides, crevasses, and mud spouts knocked out all utilities, roads, transportation, and communication. A giant, 30-foot seismic sea wave or tsunami, generated by the main shock, and many shorter-range but taller waves, generated by submarine landslides, dashed upon the coast, wiping out Alaska's fishing and canning industry, and spreading havoc as far south as California. Small coastal towns, such as Chenega and Valdez, all but disappeared; Seward lost its entire waterfront; and Anchorage sustained the greatest amount of total damage to schools, offices, and homes. There, two small boys playing in their yard suddenly disappeared down a yawning crevasse. In one night of primordial terror some 115 lives were lost and over $350 million in damage was sustained.

For centuries men have accepted these catastrophes fatalistically. Indeed, the human race has a heroic capacity for picking itself up and forgetting such disasters almost before the last tremors fade. But evidence is growing that the Alaskan quake marks a real turning point. While the reverberations from aftershocks still continue and rebuilding goes on apace, a long-range scientific effort is at last getting underway to solve the riddle of what causes earthquakes. The hope is that this study will make it possible to develop a warning system against big quakes, whose surprise factor is the worst menace to human life, and to prescribe protective measures against their most damaging effects.

The Alaska quake was the most observed earthquake in history. By Easter Sunday of that tragic weekend the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey had flown in five special portable seismographs from its laboratory at Albuquerque, N. Mex., to get a full record of aftershocks. It also installed 15 strong-motion seismographs, the first in Alaska, to study the vibrations of buildings under shock; this would aid in repairs and in future building design. Finally, Coast and Geodetic swiftly began sea and aerial surveys to remap the deranged harbors, coastline, and terrain. Japan, an old hand at earthquakes, flew in experts and equipment to help round up data. The U.S. Geological Survey rushed in teams to assess substrata changes, rezone areas for reconstruction, and begin compiling a complete record of the quake's geologic and hydrologic effects.

Coordinating all this activity is the President's science advisory office, aided by a big committee of the National Academy of Sciences. A special panel of experts appointed by Donald F. Hornig, the President's chief science adviser, is realistically weighing the prospects of finding a method to predict big earthquakes. Recommendations for a broad national and international program are expected early this year.

IT COULD HAPPEN EVEN IN NEW YORK

The effort is long overdue, for earthquakes are by no means uncommon occurrences in the United States. Forty-eight major convulsions have been registered so far in this century in Alaska and the Aleutian Island arc, the Nation's most active earthquake area. A close second, with fewer big quakes but many smaller ones, is the west coast region. But these are by no means the only danger zones. The Utah-Montana-Wyoming triangle has been active recently. A century and a half ago three big quakes in quick succession struck New Madrid, Mo.; and in 1886 Charleston, S.C., was devastated. The mid-Mississippi Valley, the southern coast, the St. Lawrence River Valley, and even the New England area around Boston are all seismic regions that have been active in the past. The fact that an area has been quiet for a long time is no reason to believe that it will not be struck tomorrow, with catastrophic results even to such a seemingly impervious city as New York. In the last 50 years alone the United States has sustained at least $1 billion in earthquake damage, and the cost is bound to rise as urban areas spread and grow more complex. The Alaskan earthquake simply precipitated a rising belief that the time has come to do something about the problem.

Only a few years ago any suggestion that earthquakes could be predicted would have drawn snorts of quackery from the profession, for the gaps and uncertainties in knowledge were so great that forecasting was out of the question. The uncertainties are still very big. But hopes have been raised by the great advance and confluence of the earth sciences, from geology and geophysics to oceanography, armed with important new information from nuclear bomb testing and space. The basic earth sciences have been in vigorous upheaval for a decade or more, and this ferment augurs well for finding a solution, because the problem of earthquakes reaches down deep into the origin, structure, and dynamic behavior of the earth itself.

Interestingly enough, most of what knowledge there is of the interior of the earth comes from the seismographic study of earthquakes. Other instruments measuring the earth's gravity, magnetic field, and heat flow have contributed much valuable supporting data and in the future may add even more. But the most useful of all tools is the seismograph, invented only late in the last century by the Englishman John Milne, while he was sojourning in quake-ridden Japan. The seismograph is essentially a pendulum or delicately balanced weight, suspended in a rigid frame on bedrock, which transmits and records electrically the relative wave motions of the earth under shock. Long, intricate analysis of these seismic waves, their directions, velocities, travel times, refractions, and reflections through the layers of the earth, enabled seismologists to build up a gross picture of the earth's interior.

WITH A FIRE IN ITS BELLY

This is the now famous three-layered model of the earth: a very thin crust, covering an enormously thick, solid mantle, enwrapping a molten, liquid core. Subsequent refinements of technique have identified seven distinct layers or shells within the earth, but these are essentially divisions of the major three. Below the crust, only a few miles deep, stretches the mantle, some 1,800 miles thick to the boundary of the core. The precise upper limits of the mantle were discovered in 1909 by the Croation seismologist, Andrija Mohorovicic, who noted that seismic waves suddenly jumped in velocity only a few miles below the surface of the earth, indicating a sharp change in the nature of the materials. This transition region is the now famous Mohorovicic discontinuity or Moho. By comparing the velocity rate of shock waves through the mantle with the rate through known materials in the laboratory, seismologists were able to infer that the mantle is composed of something resembling a dark, dense, basaltic rock known as olivine.

Below the mantle, some 2,160 miles down to the center of the earth, is the core, generally believed to be of a heavy iron-nickel composition, though recent opinion is veering toward the idea that it is simply a continuation of the mantle material in a different state of matter at these greater depths. Early seismologists inferred that the whole core was liquid because they discovered that a certain component of seismic waves called shear waves, which cannot pass through liquids, did not pass through the core. But it is now believed that the inner core is solid, and only the outer core is a molten liquid. That at least part of the core is molten is inferred from the probable temperature-pressure level at these depths. Readings in deep mines and boreholes show that the internal heat of the earth rises sharply with depth, reaching an estimated 2,500° F. only 50 miles down. Only the increasing weight and pressure of matter, which raise the melting point of materials, keeps the mantle from being molten. In the core the heat outstrips the pressures, causing the material to melt. The tremendous heat entrapped in the core is generally thought to have come from the compressive forces exerted in the early formation of the earth and from radioactivity in its substance, originally about 15 times more intense than it is now. Thus the core is still glowing at temperature estimated at somewhere between 3,600° and 18,000° F., under pressures of nearly 45 million pounds per square inch.

The earth, therefore, is a dynamic structure that has evolved over many millions of years—just over 4½ billion years, according to the precise timeclock of radioactive elements in its substance—and it is evolving still, with a fire in its belly. Geologists have read the history of its constant change in rocks and rills. Mountains rise, are ground down, and continue to rise elsewhere. Continents emerge in places where once there were seas.

But the most spectacular and abrupt of all changes occur when the earth shakes. For geophysicists it is not enough to know that an earthquake occurs when a fracture or fault in the earth's crust gives way through internal strain or some deep collapse below, causing a shear movement or subsidence in the crust. These are just local effects. Earthquakes are intimately related to such larger, slower movements as the formation of continents and the building of mountains, and to the deep forces within the earth that cause these changes. Before they can begin to explain and eventually to predict earthquakes, geophysicists need to know the general pattern of those forces.

NEW CRACKS IN THE EARTH'S ARMOR

In the last decade or so, advances in instruments and techniques have enabled seismologists and other explorers to throw a few shafts of light into some of these deep places. Much of the advance has been in the sheer organization of instruments on a scale new to geophysics. In the International Geophysical Year, 1957–58, leading nations collaborated on a vast physical audit of the earth. As part of this, Columbia University's Lamont Geological Observatory installed the first skeleton network of standard seismographic instruments ever to operate on a global basis. Following up on the IGY work, the international upper mantle project set the United States, Canada, West Europe, and Russia to building up standard networks of their own and drilling a series of deep boreholes, the most ambitious of which is the U.S. Project Mohole (see Fortune, May 1963). Its object is to drill down to the Mohorovicic discontinuity through the ocean floor and to bring back a sample of the mantle itself, which has never been conclusively examined before. Finally, to handle the vast amount of data flowing in, the ubiquitous computer has been integrated into the whole system to speed up and extend analysis a hundredfold, even to the point of directly controlling, recording, and analyzing seismograms.

Meanwhile, the instruments themselves were undergoing great extension and refinement. Leading the advance was a new class of long-period seismographs, conceived mainly by Hugo Benioff, of California Institute of Technology. These are able to detect and sort out long earthquake waves undulating around the world through the surface of the crust and upper mantle, thus giving scientists a clearer picture of this region. They also are able to sort out, for the first time, the free oscillations of the earth, its natural vibrations under rotation.

From seismography in oil exploration, where explosive charges are used to simulate seismic events, came sophisticated, portable electronic instruments. And along with them came methods of arraying instruments over the earth to refine reception, and methods of sounding the ocean bottom and sedimentary layers, pioneered by Lamont Observatory's noted director, Maurice Ewing.

From Project Vela, the Defense Department's big effort to develop reliable means of detecting underground nuclear explosions, came still further refinements. Indeed, techniques have been so improved that seismologists are now able to locate and discriminate between small earthquakes and underground explosions to an extent unheard of a few years ago, bringing within reach an inspection system capable of operating entirely outside an antagonistic country. And this focus on "small events" turned seismologists' attention to the study of small earthquakes, heretofore largely ignored.

Out of all this came some notable discoveries. The analysis of long surface waves, for instance, showed that the crustal layers below the oceans differ considerably in depth, density, and composition from those below the continents. Underlying the oceans is a heavy, basaltic type of rock only 3 to 4 miles deep; under the continents is a lighter rock, mainly granite, some 20 to 25 miles thick, with the roots of mountains extending even deeper than that into the mantle, like partly submerged icebergs in the sea. This means that the Mohorovicic discontinuity, instead of being a symmetrical boundary under the crust, rises close to the surface under oceans and dips down deep under continents, setting up pressures and strains on the rims of continental blocks—precisely where most of the great earthquakes occur. At the same time, long-wave studies have also confirmed the suspected existence of a "soft" layer in the upper mantle, some 35 to 155 miles down. Wave velocities drop in this area, indicating that the rock is in a plastic state or even molten in places, owing to some temperature-pressure imbalance. These additional irregularities may further account for earthquakes as well as for volcanoes.

DEEPER THAN THE GRAND CANYON

Perhaps the most provocative geophysical discovery of the decade is a mighty interconnected chain of submerged mountain ridges and valleys now known to stretch for some 40,000 miles under the oceans of the world. Hints and fragments of this globe-girdling chain were glimpsed for nearly a century. But its full dimensions were not grasped until the late fifties, when the Lamont Observatory research ship *Vema* and other IGY voyagers seismically sounded its main branches through the mid-Atlantic, Indian, southern and mid-Pacific oceans, and on up the great east Pacific rise, curling along the American west coast to Alaska.

These underwater mountains are quite unlike those found in the upper world. They rise in great, sharp, rugged scarps of basalt, some nearly as tall as the Himalayas. Down their centers run deep, long valleys or rifts, many deeper than the Grand Canyon, extending for hundreds of miles. Heat flowing up from the rifts registers higher than almost anywhere else on earth. Along their length, relatively small, shallow earthquakes and volcanic activity occur in profusion. From their bottoms, oceanographers have dredged up basalt boulders, indicating a continual upwelling of soft or molten matter, perhaps from the mantle itself. This causes the rising scarps and rifts to spread apart at a small measurable rate. Analysis of the boulders shows they crystallized out of molten matter no more than 10 million years ago. indicating that the rifts are a comparatively young feature of the earth. All together, the rifts form a huge tension crack in the earth's crust, running in an almost continuous line nearly twice around the earth.

In a few places in the world the rifts actually emerge on dry land, where they can be observed as steadily widening fissures or crevasses, which until recently defied explanation. One of these strange formations, the famed "rift valleys" of east Africa, is now seen to be a landward extension of an Indian Ocean ridge. Another, a northerly continuation of the mid-Atlantic ridge, runs jaggedly across a great central graben or depression in Iceland. Measurements over the years show that this crevasse is steadily widening at a rate of a fraction of an inch a year and pushing up matter to build up the ridges on both sides.

IS THE EARTH EXPANDING OR CONTRACTING?

All these discoveries raise fundamental questions about the evolution and behavior of the earth. To begin with, a comprehensive theory is needed that will account not only for the familiar continents, ocean basins, mountains, and earthquakes, but for all the new phenomena as well. In an effort to find an all-embracing explanation, theories old and new have been brought to a boil.

Perhaps the oldest theory is that the earth has been contracting ever since it began cooling down from its early molten state. As speculation goes, this shrinking caused the hardened crust to shrivel like the skin of a dried prune as it adjusted to new dimensions, thus raising continents and mountains and causing earthquakes. Old-school geologists still cling to this theory, but it has been badly weakened in recent years. For one thing, the theory assumes that the earth was formed, as was once widely believed, out of a molten blob torn from the sun. But modern cosmologists find strong evidence that the earth, like other planets, was formed by the cold accretion of dust and gases whirling in a primordial disk around the sun. Only gradually, over a period of about a billion years, did it heat up to the molten state through compression and radioactivity. The amount of contraction that could have occurred in cooling off since then is not sufficient to account for the earth's mountain heights and ocean depths. Moreover, it is highly doubtful whether the interior of the earth has yet lost much of its original heat, because its huge mass is a slow conductor and radioactivity is constantly adding heat.

A newer theory is that the earth is actually expanding. This was first suggested about a quarter of a century ago, on purely cosmic grounds, by the great British theoretical physicist, P. A. M. Dirac. He reasoned that in an expanding universe, in which all bodies are seen to be rushing away from one another at a measurable rate, the force of gravity in any given body must be gradually diminishing with age. Even a slight decrease in the earth's gravity, unmeasurable as yet by any ordinary means, could cause its matter to expand by as much as 1,100 miles in circumference in 3.25 billion years. The expansion theory, long dormant, suddenly gained support from the discovery of the mid-ocean ridges and rifts. For this global system covers a surface area about equal to that of the calculated expansion, and the rifts might well be the expansion joints where matter from the swelling interior of the earth is oozing out to form new crust.

A third major theory of the earth, which may or may not include expansion, is the theory of continental drift. First conceived about 50 years ago, mainly by a German geologist named Alfred Wegener, it has acquired many adherents as a result of recent discoveries. Noting the curious jigsaw fit of continental profiles, particularly between the Americas and Europe-Africa, and the curious similarity of fossil remains in widely separated continents, Wegener suggested that once there was only one mammoth continent that later was split up. Since then the continents have been slowly drifting apart, floating like great, buoyant, granitic rafts on the heavy, sluggish basalt beneath.

THE DRIFTING CONTINENTS

For years this idea was largely dismissed as fantasy, since there was no evidence anywhere in the seemingly solid mantle of any heat currents or other flow mechanisms to give the continents such mobility. But lately new information has been piling up to support the idea of drift. One bit of evidence comes from an exotic branch of geophysics known as paleomagnetism—the study of magnetic lines of force in ancient rocks. It was discovered that the lines of force frozen into continental rocks at the time of their crystallization are all askew with reference to the present position of the North and South Poles. Continents must once have been oriented to the poles very differently. And the recent discovery of a "soft" layer in the upper mantle supplied a plausible medium upon which the continents might be drifting.

But the strongest evidence was again provided by the discovery of the midocean system of ridges and rifts, which fitted into the theory of continental drift in either of two ways. If the earth is expanding, as the midocean rifts seemed to indicate, then this expansion is what caused the original splitting up of the continents and their apparent drifting apart, like patterns on the surface of an expanding balloon. On the other hand, if the earth is not expanding, as some still maintain, then the rifts could support the theory of drift in another way. They could well be the vents through which huge, internal heat currents or convection cells—circular, rolling currents like those seen in boiling liquids—reached the earth's surface, pushing up mantle material, forcing a plastic flow of light materials to the underside of continents, causing the continents to drift, and compressing them horizontally to form the wrinkled folds of mountains and set off earthquakes.

What precise mechanism could thus cause the heavy, enormously thick, and solid materials of the earth to flow? Egon Orowan, a solid-state physicist at MIT, has recently investigated the matter, using polycrystalline alumina to simulate the materials in the upper mantle and crust. He concludes that convection heat currents in the crystalline mantle could induce a type of slow plastic movement known as hot creep—a sliding of crystals on one another—which, as strains accumulate in the rock structure, could cause creep fractures, wrinkling, and earthquakes. By various calculations he concludes that the United States and the whole western Atlantic are creeping or drifting westward into the Pacific at a rate of about 1 centimeter per year.

There are still many objections to these upsetting new theories. The drift hypothesis, for instance, would require that a huge section of the earth's crust between rift valleys be moving inexorably in one direction, tending to open the rift on one side of a continent and to close the rift on another side. Actually, however, the rifts appear to be opening on all sides of every continent. And, the expansion theory has been challenged by two

U.S. Geological Survey physicists, who performed a modern version of the amazingly accurate measurement of the radius of the earth made by Eratosthenes about 250 B.C. and found that the radius has not varied by more than a few miles in the last 200 million years.

Meanwhile, a fourth theory has come to the fore. It holds that the earth is neither expanding nor contracting but is essentially stable and solid all the way down to its core. This theory centers around the teachings of Britain's great old master geophysicist, Sir Harold Jeffreys, who maintains that the earth is much too solid, rigid, and strong to allow such mass movements in its crust and convection currents in its mantle as continental drift would imply. In this view, continents were formed in the molten stage by upward segregation of lighter materials, like slag rising to the top of a molten ingot of steel, and they remain frozen and embedded in the now solid mantle. Indeed, according to a famous computation by Lord Kelvin, the mantle has about double the rigidity of steel. Hence, except for some local fluidities, the earth is not plastic but essentially elastic, like steel.

This concept of the earth was startlingly confirmed in 1960 from a totally unexpected quarter—space. Observations of the irregular orbits of space satellites, which reflected a highly variable gravitational pull from the earth over large areas, led to two important though still controversial discoveries. One was that the earth is slightly pear-shaped, bulging more below the Equator than above. Small as this irregularity is, it causes the earth to depart so far from being a perfect oblate spheroid that it apparently exceeds the calculated strength of its own materials. The second discovery was that there are extensive irregularities in gravity over the earth, like great shallow hills and bowls. Eight major gravity anomalies have been located, the two greatest being a deep depression or "bowl" off the tip of India and a great "hill" or rise in the New Guinea area. The gravity "hills," being areas of great strain in the earth's mass, appear to coincide with the greatest earthquake zones.

To sustain such gross irregularities in shape and mass without breaking apart, the earth must be exceedingly rigid and strong. The strains generated by these anomalies, according to space geodesists, must go down to the very core of the earth. They are so great that, to account for them, some have refurbished the theory, first suggested by George Darwin, that a great catastrophe once tore a huge mass out of what is now the Pacific Ocean to form the Moon and perhaps Mars. A more plausible hypothesis, suggested by Gordon J. F. MacDonald of the University of California at Los Angeles, is that the deep strains are caused by a 10-million-year lag in the adjustment of the earth's shape to its declining rate of rotation. This lag stores vast tension or energy in the earth, like a coiled spring, accounting for all the shifts in its crust, including earthquakes.

In this clash of theories, science progresses. And when the din is at its highest, the greatest advances may be expected, often through a melding of conflicting viewpoints. For instance, Walter M. Elsasser, of Princeton University, now suggests that all changes or movements in the earth of any significance are confined to a thin surface layer only 200 to 250 miles deep, which would leave the bulk of the earth relatively stable, strong, and solid, while allowing some form of drift or mobility in the upper layer. In any event, most geophysicists believe that it will be only a matter of a few years before many of the key issues are decided.

CLOSING IN ON EARTHQUAKES

While this broad inquiry into fundamentals goes forward, without which earthquakes would never be fully understood, geophysicists are also bent upon a closer, more practical study of individual earthquakes themselves. Much remains to be learned about the character and pattern of their activity, with an eye to prediction. Volcanologists have reached a good rate of success in predicting eruptions by studying specific volcanoes over long periods. And for a decade the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey has operated a tsunami warning system out of Honolulu; by checking special tide gages dotted around the mid-Pacific, it is able to predict the arrival time on shorelines of the giant, 500-mile-per-hour sea waves generated by oceanic earthquakes. Coast and Geodetic is now extending the system to Alaska, and is also seeking a way to predict by computer analysis not only arrival times but also wave heights. The earthquake problem is much more difficult, but it too may yield to an organized effort.

A number of hopeful lines of research open out. One is the study of the foreshocks and aftershocks of big earthquakes to see whether they reveal a warning pattern. For years the Japanese and others have tried this without much success, but a few broad hints have emerged. For one, the Japanese found that big quakes generally followed a counterclockwise course around the rim of the Pacific. More recently, accurate location of earthquakes in depth has revealed a fairly regular pattern of quakes moving up and down major faults. Today, more comprehensive computer analysis of small earthquakes is available from a worldwide network of 125 seismographic stations operated by U.S. Coast and Geodetic, and the hope is that more significant patterns will emerge.

A still more promising line of research, untried on any big scale as yet, is the burying of strain, tilt, and displacement gages broadside over a major earthquake area. Observations of the buildup of strain or tilt in underlying rock formations may reveal a warning pattern as strain reaches the breaking point and an earthquake occurs. Dr. Frank Press, chairman of the special national advisory panel on earthquake prediction and director of California Institute of Technology's seismological laboratory, has a $250,000 grant from the National Science Foundation to try such an instrumented experiment in the great San Andreas Fault area around San Francisco. The San Andreas Fault is a huge, steadily moving fracture slanting down the State from a point 130 miles north of San Francisco nearly to the Mexican border. Measurements show that one side of the fault is moving in relation to the other at a rate of about 2 inches a year. When the strain reaches a critical point, another big quake will occur. The area may be almost due for one.

Other clues are worth pursuing. An oil-prospecting magnetometer registered a curious shift in field just prior to Alaska's Good Friday quake, hinting that magnetic fields may have some relation to earthquakes. Something might be learned from the study of microseisms or tiny earth tremors, which are little understood though they show up in all seismograms. The great difficulty in such lines of investigation is to distinguish anything significant against the background of constant minor shiverings or rumblings in the earth, including the hundreds of major to minor earthquakes occurring somewhere in the world every day. Obviously it will take long and patient observation to begin to see a pattern upon which to base predictions.

BUILDING TO WITHSTAND THEM

Pending the discovery of a method of forecasting earthquakes, however, many practical measures can be taken to lessen the damage from them. The first is the careful zoning of active earthquake areas, based on geological foundation studies, and the enforcement of codes prescribing what may be built and where. One of the most damaged districts in Anchorage was a new residential area, where landslides and sharing action turned most of the homes into matchwood. Only 5 years before a U.S. Geological Survey report warned that the soil in that region was unreliable. Most of Alaska's towns are built on similarly unconsolidated silty or clayey coastal soils, dangerously subject to slides. Only strong shoring, drainage, and soil conditioning can reduce the risks on such shaky ground.

Similar dangerous ground conditions exist elsewhere, around Boston, in the Puget Sound area, and all up and down the California coast. One smart residential district just below San Francisco's Telegraph Hill has been built on filled land that is liable to slide away in any major quake, and other developments are mushrooming on shoreline landfills, bulldozed hillsides, and other questionable areas, posing a danger for the future. Real estate developers have resisted clear earthquake zoning so strenuously in the past that to date no detailed U.S. zoning map is available.

Much also remains to be done about the building of earthquake-proof structures, beyond providing the lateral bracing and reinforced walls prescribed in most quake areas. Even in California, where the strictest building code has been in effect only since 1933, the law has grown lax and inadequate under the pressures of a burgeoning population and real estate development. Last year, however, Los Angeles passed a new city ordinance requiring all major new buildings to install strong-motion seismographs, patterned on a new U.S. Coast and Geodetic instrument, to study the motion of the buildings under tremors and to gather data for improving future design. Through such studies, and the mounting effort to understand and predict earthquakes, this old earthly affliction may yet lose some of its horrors.

PROBLEMS FACING MISSISSIPPI—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MISSISSIPPI ECONOMIC COUNCIL

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have just been handed a copy of the resolution passed yesterday by the board of directors of the Mississippi Economic Council, which is the equivalent of a State chamber of commerce. The membership of this board is composed of a large number of business and professional men from all over the State and certainly represents the thinking of the great majority of the business and professional leaders of the State. This resolution represents the firm and strong stand of the membership of this organization for law and order.

It is certainly not an imaginary problem the people in our State are facing. It is a very real one. These business and professional leaders are not willing merely to stand and wait, nor are they willing merely to stand by the wayside and criticize. They are willing to take their stand out front and in a constructive way for obedience to law which, after all, is the foundation of true liberty.

Mr. President, I commend these leaders for both their purposes and their action. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the resolution passed by them yesterday be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, MISSISSIPPI ECONOMIC COUNCIL, JACKSON, MISS., FEBRUARY 3, 1965

As concerned Mississippians aware of the monumental problems facing our State, we advance with pride the fact that Mississippi is not an island unto itself but is an integral and responsible part of the United States.

We recognize that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has been enacted by the Congress as law. It cannot be ignored and should not be unlawfully defied. Resistance to the law should be through established procedures in the American tradition of resort to enlightened public opinion, the ballot boxes, and the courts. We should adjust ourselves to the impact of this legislation, regardless of personal feelings and convictions, and limit our resistance to the stated methods.

For the purpose of furthering justice, harmony, and continued development in Mississippi, we respectfully urge the following:

1. Order and respect for the law must be maintained. Lawless activities in the State by individuals and organizations cannot be tolerated. The penalty for law violations should be fairly and equitably applied to all law violators.

2. Communications must be maintained between the races within the State.

3. Registration and voting laws should be fairly and impartially administered for all.

4. Support for public education must be maintained and strengthened.

Mississippians have the capacity and courage to face the problems of this State and to create conditions favorable to their solution. We call upon all Mississippians to take positive action toward these ends.

AID TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I regret that because of circumstances beyond my control I was unable to reach the floor until late yesterday afternoon and then only minutes before the final vote on whether we should prohibit Public Law 480 shipments to the United Arab Republic or leave the matter to the discretion of the Executive.

I voted against the amendment to leave the decision to Executive discretion, because I believe such a formula nullifies or seriously undercuts congressional responsibility in this area. It makes no sense for Congress to pass on the details of our foreign aid program and appropriate funds for it if we give the executive branch of the Government the right to override the intent of Congress whenever in its opinion the national interest demands it.

If there are those who believe Congress should be deprived of responsibility in this area and that the executive branch should be given plenipotentiary powers, let them say so.

For my own part, I believe this responsibility properly belongs to Congress. I point out that while the Constitution—as those on the other side of this issue so often remind us—gives the President authority in the field of foreign relations, in recent years the foreign aid programs have come to be an important part of foreign policy and foreign relations, and the Congress has the constitutional authority to appropriate the money for them. Therefore, I believe from a constitutional standpoint that Congress should not, and cannot, waive its authority and responsibility in this area.

In saying this I wish to make it clear that I do not favor eliminating Public Law 480 assistance to the Egyptian people. Neither do I favor giving aid to Nasser with no strings attached, as we have done up to now.

Had I not been out of the country when the matter first came up, I would have proposed a compromise resolution reducing Public Law 480 sales to Egypt by one-third or one-fourth of the average figure for the past 4 years. My proposal would also have held out the promise of a restoration of this cut if the Government of the United Arab Republic desists from further aggressive and subversive action in the coming year. And it would have warned of further cuts if, despite American friendship and assistance, Nasser continues to engage in aggressive and subversive activities directly against other countries in the area.

Although the amendment has now been voted on in the Senate, I think it may serve some purpose to present this compromise proposal, even at this late date, because it may serve as a meeting ground for the Senate and House conferees. I intend to bring it to their attention right away.

I think it no exaggeration to state that Nasser could not have survived the past decade without the massive shipments of American food that have gone to the United Arab Republic. But because we have given this assistance without conditions of any kind, it has only served to encourage Nasser to persist in his aggressive activities against Yemen and the Congo, in subversive activities against the Governments of Jordan, Syria, Iraq, and Libya, and especially in the preparation of aggression against Israel.

Our aid was intended to benefit the Egyptian people. But the potential good that might have been accomplished by our aid program has in large measure been vitiated by Nasser's topheavy investments in his military establishment and by his adventures abroad. It has, for example, been estimated that the cost of Nasser's war in Yemen, to which he has now committed 50,000 United Arab Republic troops, has over the past 2 years been roughly equivalent to the cost of the entire American aid program.

Nasser has also sunk vast sums of money into his missile program, in which he has, regrettably, been able to employ the technical assistance of German scientists. We have thus far been able to do nothing to discourage this program, even though it is common knowledge that it is directed in the first instance against the State of Israel.

This posture toward Israel has been his most consistent foreign policy outrage, one which stands out above and beyond his other adventures. Nasser's massive armament program has compelled Israel to step up its own military expenditures in self-defense. And so the Middle East is caught up in a vicious arms spiral.

Somehow the nations of the Middle East must extricate themselves from this spiral if a major war is to be averted. But thus far Nasser has consistently rejected all attempts to normalize relations with the State of Israel, to solve the Arab refugee problem on a cooperative basis, and to put an end to the arms race which threatens his own people just as much as it does the people of Israel and of the surrounding Arab States.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to commend the senior Senator from Connecticut highly for his constructive proposal. Regrettably, the Senate yesterday reversed the action of the House which sought to prevent the continued sale of Public Law 480 food and fiber to the United Arab Republic. The action of the House clearly expressed the will of the vast majority of the people of the United States judging both from my mail and from the editorial comment appearing throughout the country.

I sincerely hope that the action of the Senate will not, with respect to this provision, mean, as it has meant so often in the past, that the conference will delete the provision entirely. The close vote in the Senate and the large vote in the House for its much stronger and more meaningful provision will, I hope, give heart to the House conferees to hold firm and insist on the House provision.

This is not a new matter. The question of our continued economic assistance to the United Arab Republic while it continued its anti-U.S. aggressive policies has been before both Houses many times in the past. I, myself, as well as many of my colleagues, have often spoken out strongly against the continuation of these policies.

In October 1963, I proposed an amendment, on behalf of myself and many of my colleagues, to the Foreign Assistance Act to prohibit further economic assistance to nations found by the President to be committing or preparing to commit aggression against other nations receiving U.S. assistance. That amendment was adopted and is now the law of the land.

But there has been no action to withhold further aid to the United Arab Republic which, on the record, was committing aggression, has continued to commit aggression and prepared to commit further aggression, and gives every indication that it will continue on its headlong course of thwarting U.S. peaceful policies wherever it can.

Consider the record since that antiaggressor amendment was adopted. Nasser had aided rebellion on the island of Cyprus, despite the United Nations efforts to bring calm to that beleaguered island. Nasser has continued to act as a conduit for supplying Communist arms to the rebels in the Congo—rebels who had savagely massacred unarmed civilians regardless of color. Nasser has denounced the United States for undertaking to rescue those civilians from barbaric slaughter. Nasser's Communist-supplied jets have shot down an unarmed U.S. civilian plane, which could be clearly identified as such. Nasser has continued to wage a brutal war of aggression in Yemen in a revolution he inspired. Nasser had his police stand idly by while the mob destroyed the John F. Kennedy library. Nasser, with a high official of the Soviet Union at his side, has denounced the United States and told us we could jump in the sea with cur AID.

And still we continue to give him the wherewithal to continue his aggressions.

I welcome the efforts of the senior Senator from Connecticut in this continued fight against a policy of aiding those who seek in every way the efforts of the United States to bring peace to the troubled areas of the world.

The senior Senator from Connecticut has made a very constructive proposal that the aid be cut one-half. That should be considered as a happy compromise between the action of the House in eliminating it completely and the action of the Senate in cutting back to that outworn and useless formula that it be left to the discretion of the President. Since 1963 we have had as the law an antiaggressor amendment which has been an absolute nullity, because somewhere down the line, not the President, but some employee in the State Department decides what is the will of the President.

I hope that the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut will be seriously considered, if the House conferees do not stand firm in insisting on the retention of the House-approved language.

Mr. DODD. I am very grateful to the Senator from Alaska for his support. I also hope that he agrees with me on the constitutional question involved. I tried to make the point that we exercise a clear constitutional responsibility in appropriating millions of taxpayers' dollars for foreign aid. It is clear to me that under the Constitution only the Congress can do that and that Congress cannot waive its constitutional duty. It is nonsense to say, "Yes, we have the responsibility, but we waive it."

Because it is illegal and unconstitutional to do so.

To give aid without conditions of any kind puts us in a position that strongly resembles appeasement. It would be difficult to point to any recent actions of Prime Minister Nasser which might justify this policy. On the other hand, there has been a whole series of actions by the United Arab Republic Government, culminating in its open intervention on behalf of the pro-Communist rebels in the Congo, which suggests that our policy is achieving precisely the contrary of what we had hoped for.

We do not want the Egyptian people to suffer because of the delinquencies of their government. I believe that the compromise which I propose would have the advantage of assuring the Egyptian people that we regard them as friends and that it is our desire to help them, within certain limits, despite the attitude of their government.

On the other hand, we must face up to the fact that our Public Law 480 assistance to Egypt can be an instrument of the greatest importance in inhibiting the aggressive and subversive tendencies of the United Arab Republic Government and in assuring the peace of the area. Nasser can perhaps obtain industrial equipment from other sources if he does not obtain it from us. But there is no other source from which he can obtain the food to feed his army and to prevent starvation among his people.

I think that only good can come from letting Nasser know that Congress is tired of providing aid to a government that engages in open aggression and subversion against other countries of the Middle East and of Central Africa, which inspires mob attacks on American Embassy installations, and which consistently sides with our enemies in world affairs.

Only good can come from putting Nasser on notice that our patience is drawing to an end, that we shall continue to offer him the hand of friendship, but that there will have to be some reciprocal action on his part if he is to continue receiving from the United States the assistance which is essential to the survival of his regime.

TAX HANDLING OF THE DU PONT DIVESTITURE OF GENERAL MOTORS STOCK

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, public confidence in our Government in all its aspects is essential to the proper functioning of our democracy. In no area is this more important than in the field of taxation, and more particularly in income taxation, for voluntary compliance plays a large part in this system of collecting vast revenues from our citizens.

From time to time I have spoken out about what I considered defects in our tax laws. My colleagues have, perhaps, become accustomed to this.

But I have now uncovered an administrative situation within the Treasury Department which I regard as highly improper.

Following the enactment of the Du Pont bill in 1962, the Internal Revenue Service issued certain rulings by which the divestiture of General Motors stock by both Du Pont and Christiana Corp. would be governed.

This divestiture proceeded according to plan, with everyone abiding by the rulings, until December 1964. By that time General Motors stock had increased in price on the exchange to a point at which even the modest tax imposed by the terms of the "relief" bill the Congress approved was beginning to pinch some large stockholders.

Christiana, a Du Pont family-owned corporation set up merely to hold Du Pont stock, had some 8.4 million shares of General Motors stock which it had either to sell or to pass on to its stockholders.

Rather than come back to the Congress or even to the Senate Committee on Finance for a review of the question, the Treasury Department altered its rulings so as to allow a reduction in taxes in enormous amounts—many millions of dollars, I believe.

The chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], at my request, asked the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to come up and discuss the subject with the committee in executive session today. Secretary Dillon came, but for reasons which he regarded as satisfactory, he was unprepared to discuss the issue in text and detail.

Mr. President, I have studied the text of the rulings and the change in the rulings which occurred on December 15, 1964. I have also studied as much of the record as I have been able to obtain. But I am under injunction to keep those documents in confidence. Yet this is public business and it involves many millions of dollars of tax favoritism. Therefore I feel I have no choice, in conscience and duty, but to request the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to call an open public hearing on this question and to explore the entire transaction thoroughly and in public.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The junior Senator from Louisiana was not privileged to attend the entire meeting of the Senate Finance Committee this morning, although he did have the opportunity to be present during a part of the proceedings.

In my judgment, the Secretary of the Treasury was on sound ground in taking the position that he as Secretary would not be a court of appeals as to rulings of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

It is the published position of the Secretary of the Treasury that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has the responsibility to make tax rulings, and that he should not present his proposed rulings to the Secretary of the Treasury, except as to policy matters which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue believes he should clear with the Secretary.

It is my understanding that this new Du Pont problem really has nothing to do with the so-called Du Pont bill which Congress passed a couple of years ago, but that, rather, this is a problem that would have existed whether an act of Congress had or had not been passed.

It is further my limited understanding of this situation that what is involved is that the Government, in the beginning, insisted upon a stipulation, but that upon further consideration, after consulting lawyers for the other side, the Government eventually became persuaded that it could not sustain its position. Having become persuaded that it could not sustain its position, the Government eventually yielded on it. It may very well be that the Senator from Tennessee can demonstrate that there was something improper in the conduct of the Government lawyers; but in the judgment of this Senator, the Government lawyers are fine people, some of the best men in Government, and are entitled to a presumption that they are acting in the public interest until it is shown otherwise.

If the same lawyers had decided against a taxpayer, the taxpayer would, of course, have had his remedy before the Tax Court and the court of appeals. He would even have had an opportunity to appeal the decision to the Supreme Court of the United States.

When a Government lawyer makes a decision that would tend to favor or concede a point to those who represent a private taxpayer in his litigation or his disputes with the Government, the Government, of course, would not be the party to appeal, and the taxpayer would not be expected to appeal the decision. But if any Member of Congress thought that a ruling was incorrect, means are available to him to obtain all the facts he wants in order to make his case that the Government lawyer failed to make the proper efforts to sustain the Government's position. It would be appropriate, in the view of this Senator, that the person to defend that position should be the Government lawyer who made the decision, not a private businessman serving as Secretary of Treasury, who might not be a lawyer, who did not make the decision, and who did not feel that it was his responsibility to make the decision or to inquire into it.

So under those circumstances, this Senator would feel that the usual procedure would be the correct one to follow. The lawyers who made the decision—the General Counsel and the man who was the Commissioner or the Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue at the time the ruling was made—are available to us. They were present today, and they will be available from now on, as long as we want them to be available, to discuss these matters.

In my opinion, unless and until our committee concludes that something has been done that was not correct or not proper, we should not invite the executives of major corporations before our committee, particularly in open hearings; and we should not invite the Secretary of the Treasury to open hearings unless and until we have found some irregularity.

So far as I am concerned, I shall certainly assure the Senator of my utmost cooperation in obtaining any information that the Senator wants with regard to this particular tax decision and to have it made available to him, to enable him to make his judgment as to whether he believed the action of the Government was correct or incorrect.

As I recall, it was 2 years ago that the Senator from Tennessee felt that perhaps there had been some impropriety with regard to the stock option plan of the Chrysler Corp. I believe he obtained all the information he needed to make his case on the floor of the Senate in that regard. To some extent, he was successful, because Congress later modified the provisions of the stock option law. But I believe the facts showed that there was no improper conduct in that case, just as I would suspect—the evidence will speak for itself, and I should be happy to make it available to the Senator, so far as I can obtain it—that when we have all the facts before us, we shall most likely find that no impropriety is involved in the matter as to which the Senator is interested.

In any event, I believe the Secretary of the Treasury will be found to be correct in not determining what the decision should be in regard to this case, because the Commissioner of Internal Revenue should be expected to make the decision and defend it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the able junior Senator from Louisiana. I do not wish at this time to discuss the merits or demerits of the ruling. Suffice it to say that I have read it. I have read the change in the ruling. I have not proposed that the committee summon corporation officials before it in public session. I think it is rather strange for the junior Senator from Louisiana to say that there is something improper about a committee of the Senate examining a public issue in public session by the interrogation of the Secretary of the Treasury. What is wrong? It seems to me that this is orderly and proper procedure.

I intend to obtain the facts. I should like to obtain them in a public session of the Committee on Finance. At this point, that is all that I am asking. I am asking that there be a hearing or a public session upon this matter. At a later date I shall discuss the issue and the amount of millions of dollars involved. I am saying at the moment that this is a subject in which the public interest is involved. The public interest has been prejudiced. I demand a public hearing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in the judgment of this Senator, a taxpayer's tax liability is his own private business unless and until it is established and determined that that taxpayer is guilty of some sort of misconduct. Up until that point, he is entitled to the protection that the law gives him for the privacy of his own business and his own affairs.

If a Senator or any other taxpayer is guilty of improper conduct, or if he has violated a law, or if any Government official has aided or abetted that person in violation of the law, then, of course, the entire matter is subject to being laid before the public.

But one who would like to lay that taxpayer's affairs before the public and make his case should first undertake to establish that there has been some impropriety, some improper conduct. Only upon that basis, should he then ask that that person's affairs be made public. But I submit that any information a Senator wants on this subject should be——

Mr. GORE. Do not go too far.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes—should be obtained by procedures that we have used time and again, year in and year out, procedures of which the Senator from Tennessee has availed himself in the past.

The impression that this Senator gained was that the purpose in requesting this hearing was that the Senator does not want to debate the subject with the lawyers. He wants to debate the matter with a man who did not issue the ruling. It is not shown that that man has done anything improper.

If we are going to make the Secretary of the Treasury, a businessman, debate the tax law with a lawyer, then the first thing we should do is to send the Secretary of the Treasury to a law school so that he can be a lawyer. Perhaps we should send him to a university for a postgraduate degree so that he will be a tax lawyer.

The people who made the decision are available. As far as I know, they have not withheld one bit of information. As far as I am able to determine, they did not do anything wrong.

The Senator may convince me otherwise. But, I do not think the Senator has a situation that would justify any difference in procedure. The Secretary of the Treasury adheres to his position. He adheres to what he stated to us when he testified on the confirmation of his nomination, that it would not be the policy of the Secretary of the Treasury to take an interest in rulings by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in individual cases. He is on record that he should not take any such position. A memorandum was circulated in the Department to make it amply clear to those who had responsibility with regard to the rulings that they would assume their responsibility and do their job, and that he was not to be a court of appeals from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful for the contribution of the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana. I have not requested his assistance in this matter, although it is certainly appreciated.

The request that I have addressed is to the chairman of the Committee on Finance, Senator BYRD of Virginia, who, in discussing the Du Pont bill before the Senate, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 1, page 180, speaking in part, said:

> It is not the intention of the bill to give relief for a passthrough.`

I should like to read in part a statement which former President Kennedy made when he signed the bill:

> It should be clearly understood that neither the Congress nor I have approved a divestiture which would permit the stock of General Motors to pass through Christiana to the stockholders of Christiana.

Mr. President, I have a considerable portion of the record before me. But, I am under injunction to keep it in confidence.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article published in the Wall Street Journal on January 5, 1965, entitled "Christiana Plans $801 Million Swap of Its GM Stock."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRISTIANA PLANS $801 MILLION SWAP OF ITS GM STOCK: HOLDERS WOULD GET 8.4 MILLION GM SHARES AT RATIO OF 3¼ OF GM FOR 1 OF CHRISTIANA—COURT ORDERED DIVESTITURE

PHILADELPHIA.—Christiana Securities Co. announced plans to offer its shareholders 8.4

million shares of General Motors Corp. common stock in exchange for Christiana common in order to comply with a court-ordered divestiture of its GM holdings.

The exchange ratio would be 3¼ shares of GM common for each share of Christiana. Christiana said the market value of the GM shares to be exchanged for each Christiana share was approximately equivalent to the net asset value of a Christiana share, based on the closing price for GM shares on December 31.

GM shares, traded on the New York Stock Exchange, closed yesterday at $95.375, placing the value of the GM stock involved at about $801 million. Yesterday's bid price for Christiana, traded over the counter, was $287.

The offer is restricted to Christiana stockholders of record January 4 and is subject to approval by Christiana stockholders at a special meeting January 28.

Christiana said it has arranged with GM for the auto company to file a registration statement covering the GM shares involved. The registration is expected to be effective January 15 and the exchange offer will expire February 8. Christiana said a preliminary prospectus on the offer will be mailed to stockholders "within the next few days."

The company said that any shares not disposed of through the offer will be distributed on a pro rata basis to Christiana shareholders or sold to satisfy taxes prior to May 1. It noted that it intends to sell about 500,000 GM shares prior to May 1 to raise funds for taxes.

Christiana Securities is a holding company and a major Du Pont Co. stockholder. Under a 1962 court order requiring Du Pont to divest itself of 63 million GM common shares, certain Du Pont stockholders, including Christiana, were also ordered to divest themselves of any GM shares received from Du Pont through its divestiture plan. Du Pont was given until February 28 this year to complete its divestiture and Christiana was given until May 1. Du Pont completed its divestiture of GM stock yesterday with a third and final distribution of 23 million GM shares.

At the effective date of the original Du Pont divestment order, Christiana held 535,500 shares of GM stock. It has since received 18,247,283 GM shares in 3 distributions from Du Pont.

In November 1962, and again last January, Christiana distributed 4,416,210 GM shares to its stockholders. It has also sold 1,050,000 GM shares.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I again renew my request for a public hearing, with public officials appearing, with regard to a ruling that has been issued which provides vast benefits to the stockholders of a publicly held corporation which has been the subject of long litigation in the courts, and legislative enactment.

There has been much publicity over this, but there have been too many private dealings already.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana subsequently said: Mr. President, I wanted to make it very clear, regardless of the position taken by the Senator from Tennessee with regard to Du Pont and General Motors, that the Secretary is following a long-established policy in declining to make a ruling or influence the decision of a specific tax case one way or the other. I have before me a transcript of the hearings on the nomination of the Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon. I read from page 6:

> I have also considered my position in the event that corporations in which I have an interest should be involved in tax cases.
>
> Again I am advised that cases involving the liability of specific companies do not normally come to the attention of the Secretary. In any event, I shall instruct the appropriate persons in the Treasury not to bring cases involving such corporations to my attention.
>
> I have given a power of attorney to certain individuals to represent me in all matters involving my own personal tax returns, which power shall be irrevocable while I am Secretary of the Treasury.

In other words, what the Secretary was saying was that he did not want to be consulted on anything involving the tax liability of any company in which he had an interest; but he also stated what the policy of the Treasury had been through the years—that the Secretary of the Treasury was not to make tax rulings or be consulted about any individual cases.

I read further from the same page of the hearings:

> The Chairman. I would like to also make clear the independence of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. He is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.
>
> Mr. Dillon. That is my understanding.
>
> The Chairman. To what extent would you be able to influence or control any actions of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in regard to refunds of taxes or anything else?
>
> Mr. Dillon. I have been informed that, as a matter of practice, these individual items are handled by the Commissioner and do not come to the Secretary of the Treasury.
>
> However, to make certain I do intend, if I am confirmed, to issue clear instructions, which I would like to discuss with the General Counsel, to make certain that no such questions that might have anything to do with any company in which I had any interest, direct or indirect, are brought to my attention. They would be left with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.
>
> The Chairman. In fact, while it is not strictly an independent agency, it is my understanding that throughout the years the Secretary of the Treasury has not attempted to influence in any way the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in regard to taxes, refunds of taxes, or anything else. Is that your understanding?
>
> Mr. Dillon. That has been my understanding; yes, sir.

I have in my hand the memorandum to which the Secretary referred and which was circulated in the Department. It is dated February 21, 1961. It states——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent to have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The memorandum reads:

> February 21, 1961.
>
> Memorandum to: The Under Secretary, the Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, the assistant secretaries, the General Counsel Director, executive secretariat, heads of bureaus.
>
> In accordance with what I am advised has been the general practice of my predecessors, and to assure an orderly administration of the business of the Department, I desire that you not refer to me cases involving the tax liability of particular taxpayers or other matters requiring determinations affecting particular individuals or corporations. Accordingly, I request that, in the normal course, you dispose of all such matters within your respective offices. In the event you feel that a matter raises questions of policy of such importance as to require determination at a higher level, please in the first instance consult with the Under Secretary, or in his absence, the General Counsel.
>
> When and if references and inquiries concerning the tax liability of particular taxpayers are brought to the Secretary's office from outside the Department for my attention or for the attention of members of my staff, including the Under Secretary and General Counsel, they should be referred promptly and without comment directly to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for handling in accordance with the established practices and procedures within the Internal Revenue Service.
>
> Douglas Dillon.

I find nothing whatever wrong with that position. It seems to me that the Secretary of the Treasury, who has vast economic responsibilities and interests, was entirely proper in conducting himself in this fashion and stating that he should not be called upon to make a determination as to whether the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may have made a mistake one way or the other in making a decision under the law in pursuance of his responsibilities.

As I stated before, any taxpayer may be subject to investigation by the Internal Revenue Bureau, the Senate Finance Committee, or the Ways and Means Committee of the House; but his affairs should not be laid before the public merely because one person may have claimed that, in his opinion, the Government had not collected as much in taxes as he feels might conceivably be owed. If the committee determined that a particular taxpayer had received favoritism, it would be appropriate for us to have a hearing.

Should we take a different position, it would permit any individual Senator, or any number of Senators, unlimited possibilities for keeping the committee, and the Senate, in session year after year, with much publicity about matters that are properly the private business of taxpayers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICA COMES LAST WITH THEM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the recent election last November was an overwhelming repudiation of rightwing extremism.

Our Nation wants moderation and the continuance of our traditional two-party system of government. However, despite the growing disdain of all thinking Americans, these rabble rousers of the lunatic rightwing continue their vicious crusades. If anything, their activities have increased in intensity in recent months, and they cannot always be dismissed as mere cranks.

It is my conviction that the John Birch Society, so called, with its secret cells and false propaganda, is the most dangerous organization in America. If the Communist leaders had hired helpers in their announced task of burying us, of creating disunity, distrust, and undermining our institutions from within, they could not have chosen a better vehicle than the Birchites or Birch saps, or sons of Birches, as the distinguished minority whip [Mr. Kuchel] terms them, and their fellow-traveling radical crackbrain followers. Among these is a particularly scurrilous group termed "The Minutemen."

The wild men who lead this band of psychotics realize that they will never achieve power through democratic means. Therefore, they have turned to force. The Minutemen, a lunatic fringe, rightwing extremist group, have issued a call for volunteers to join a secret underground army of terrorists and saboteurs.

Membership is secret, but has been variously estimated at between a few thousand and a hundred thousand. The current campaign, according to the New York Times, is for an army of a million, operating in guerrilla bands of a dozen or so each. Directly after the election, this organization's newsletter "On Target," stated:

> The hope of millions of Americans that the Communist tide could be stopped with ballots instead of bullets has been turned into dust.

It is a ridiculous statement. Recruits are asked to indicate whether they want to join a "combat team" or do "medical, intelligence, or espionage work."

These stupid Fascist-minded, misguided, ignorant Americans imitate language and methods of the Nazis in Germany, the Fascists in Italy, and Communists everywhere.

Will they never learn? We in America have sufficient concern in finding a course of action to meet the encroachments and challenges of international communism and Soviet and Red Chinese imperialism. We do not need the Minutemen, so called, to complicate matters.

Their leaders overlook entirely the threat of Communist aggression from Soviet Russia and Red China. Instead, these sandlot witch hunters malign their neighbors, berate the clergy, and talk about Communists on the faculties of our colleges and universities. The demagogs of the lunatic fringe extreme right sell their followers the diagnosis that internal communism is the disease that causes all ills and then prescribe local vigilante action as the cure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Too many may laugh or shrug these rabble rousers off as mere mischief makers or annoyances. We cannot disregard them for their purposes are at odds with our Nation's freedom. In my judgment, officials of the Department of Justice should take action against the Minutemen, so called. Whether this organization has many, or few, lunatic rightwingers as members, the facts are any organization which proposes to secure for its members automatic weapons including submachineguns, tripod-mounted machineguns, flamethrowers, aerial bombs, mortars and other instruments of war should be denounced and eliminated.

We must destroy these enemies of democracy, not with bullets, as they would use against us, but with facts, constant exposure, and relentless publicity. America is last with them. They are truly America-lasters. If the ignorance that breeds these antidemocratic groups is dispelled, they will soon go the way of the know-nothings, the Coughlinites, the America-firsters, the German-American Bund and other lunatic organizations in our past history.

MAJOR NEED FOR EXPANDING WATER POLLUTION CONTROL EFFORT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on January 28 the Senate passed S. 4, legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This bill, managed by Senator Muskie, the able chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Water Pollution of the Senate Public Works Committee, provided grants for research and development, increased grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, and authorized the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing pollution.

At that time, I introduced an amendment to S. 4 to eliminate features of the existing Water Pollution Control Act which discriminate against heavily populated areas. This amendment was intended to:

First. Eliminate the existing limitation of $600,000 for a single project or $2.4 million for a joint project involving several communities on grants for construction of waste treatment facilities, and also authorize an across-the-board Federal contribution of 30 percent of the cost of constructing these facilities.

Second. Eliminate the existing requirement that half of all construction grant funds be used for municipalities of 125,000 people or less.

Third. Establish a more meaningful standard for the allocation of funds for construction of sewage treatment facilities in urban areas of need.

The State of New York is embarking on a new $1.7 billion water pollution program with $513 million to be expended through 1970 for construction of needed sewage treatment facilities. To permit States making substantial efforts in this important field to accelerate their work, I believe the Federal Government should assume a full 30-percent share, and the other provisions of the present law which discriminate against heavily populated urban areas should be altered.

During debate on the amendment the distinguished manager of the bill assured the Senate that hearings would be held on the questions raised by this amendment and the adequacy of the existing grant program and in view of the tremendous water pollution control needs of heavily populated areas.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point an editorial from today's New York Times on this subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cleaning Up the Waters

> The antipollution bill recently passed by the Senate is barely sufficient to enable the Nation to hold its own in the struggle for pure water.
>
> The upward spiraling of population is exceeding the capacity of old sanitary facilities as fast as Government builds new ones. Industrial expansion in our booming economy creates an ever-growing demand for fresh water and also adds new sources of pollution.
>
> The bill, offered by Senator Edmund S. Muskie and 32 cosponsors, does gives the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare additional authority to define and enforce standards of water quality in interstate streams. It also authorizes an additional appropriation for research into methods of combating the discharge of sewage from combined storm and sanitary sewers, one of the biggest problems in this field.
>
> Although these measures are important and will be particularly helpful to many small communities, the bill does little to help the biggest cities which have the biggest problems. For example, the measure raises the limit on the Federal contribution to the building of a sewage treatment plant from $600,000 to $1 million. But a single pollution control project in a metropolis can easily run upward of $50 million, or half the sum the Federal Government now allocates each year for the entire Nation.
>
> There is no prospect in this bill that the Federal Government will provide anything remotely approaching the $513 million Governor Rockefeller anticipates for his $1,709 million program to clean up the rivers in this State over the next 6 years. Nor does the bill recognize that there will probably have to be Federal construction grants for new sewer systems, which are more expensive than sewage treatment plants and just as badly needed.
>
> Senator Muskie readily conceded all of this in an exchange on the Senate floor with Senator Javits. It is encouraging to have Mr. Muskie's assurance that the passage of this bill does not mean that the Public Works Committee has finished its efforts against water pollution in this Congress. More hearings, more legislation, and more money are needed if the Nation is to win the battle for clean water.

THE PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President's farm message today places meaningful emphasis on the development of rural America, its concern with the development of rural facilities and resources and the need for substantially increasing efforts to insure adequate income for our rural citizens is a most important one.

I am very pleased that the President's farm message calls for the establishment of a National Agricultural Advisory Commission on Food Policy which I had proposed in legislative form as early as October 1962, and in every Congress since the 87th including this one, as Senate Joint Resolution 20. A basic review of our food policy including the goals of our existing agricultural programs and the effectiveness of their operation has long been badly needed. I also support the President's emphasis upon the role of the free market in the farm economy, and the need for developing new markets.

I am disappointed that the President's message does not place sufficient emphasis on expanded authority for drought relief which New York farmers sought so earnestly this year. I also regret that the President did not set forth any administration position on dairy legislation. The farmers of New York State are interested in learning the administration's views on this vital matter. I also look forward to seeing the details of the President's legislative proposals on feed grains, wheat, cotton, tobacco, wool, and other important commodities.

DIRECTORY OF HAWAII'S SCIENTIFIC RESOURCES

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, Hawaii, long famous as a vacationland, is reaching for another goal. It is seeking to become a world center for science and technology. It is already making vigorous strides toward this long-range objective, under both public and private auspices. We are diligently developing the necessary foundation so we can exploit the unique geographic and climatic advantages we already enjoy.

I wish to call the attention of all who are interested in Hawaii's intensive pursuit of scientific growth, to a timely publication entitled "Directory of Hawaii's Scientific Resources." The directory was prepared and published by the Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development for initial distribution at the Governors' Conference on Science and Technology, which was held in Hawaii last week. The conference brought together about 200 participants for a 5-day session devoted to such diverse and exciting subjects as oceanography, space communications, and astrogeophysics. More than a score of nationally outstanding scientists, like Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee, addressed the conference.

The "Directory of Hawaii's Scientific Resources" presents an impressive summary of the number and variety of research and development organizations in Hawaii and the strength of technical and scientific educational facilities. It reflects the vigorous efforts of a young State to achieve eminence in the world scientific community. It looks optimistically to a future built on the University of Hawaii's rapid progress in specially selected scientific areas; the State's encouragement of both private and public research activities, and cooperative efforts of key community leaders.

The directory notes that there are 1,352 scientists and professional persons engaged in research in Hawaii, covering many scientific disciplines. The State has 23 research and development and allied firms, employing 167 professional persons; 18 companies with scientific capabilities employing 369 professionals; 10 computer science and related management service firms employing 90 professionals; 9 testing laboratories with 21 professional; 54 governmental research agencies with 574 professionals and 16 private research agencies with 131 professionals.

There are also 198 private companies, research agencies, professional associations, schools, and colleges in science. There are 18 libraries with scientific collections or other collections of particular value to scientists. They have cataloged 350,960 scientific volumes.

All of these agencies, firms, and educational institutions concerned with scientific research and development activities are listed in the directory with pertinent data about each.

I call the attention of my colleagues and others to this directory so that they may become familiar with Hawaii's growing scientific resources and capabilities.

CLOSING OF VETERANS HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in this morning's mail I received a photocopy of a letter received by a Nebraska veteran from an official at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Omaha. This letter advised the veteran he has been found eligible for hospital treatment, then added:

> However, since a bed is not available for your admission at this time, your name has been placed on our waiting list.

Mr. President, this veteran lives in a community quite close to Lincoln, where the VA proposes to close its hospital. Normally, he would have made application for admission to the Lincoln hospital. I am informed that his is the first application from his county filed with the Omaha hospital since the Lincoln VA stopped taking applications. And he was turned down.

The letter from the Omaha hospital tells the veteran that if his condition should change to the extent that emergency treatment is necessary, his physician should notify "the nearest Veterans' Administration hospital immediately."

Mr. President, Nebraska's third VA hospital is located at Grand Island—and that is even farther away from his home than Omaha. I do not know what the Grand Island situation is today, Mr. President, but on the day the VA closure order was issued that hospital had 31 vacant beds. On that same date, the Omaha hospital had 30 beds available, for a total of 61 in the two places. On that day also, there were 212 patients being treated at Lincoln. The other two hospitals could have accommodated 61 of them if the Lincoln hospital had been closed on that date. But what would have happened to the other 151 hospitalized veterans?

I was advised this week that the Omaha hospital had a waiting list numbering 71.

Mr. President, I am gratified that the Senate yesterday imposed the prohibition on the use of previously appropriated funds to carry out the VA closure order. I hope the other body will accept this prohibition.

I am hopeful also that this body will approve a resolution I introduced earlier in the week which would require approval of the Senate Labor and Public Works Committee and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee before the VA can close any of these facilities. I believe we in Congress should be given the opportunity to take a look at these things and have a chance to know what is being contemplated before such actions are taken, not after they are accomplished facts.

The text of the letter to the Nebraska veteran, withholding the names of the writer and the recipient, is as follows:

> Your application has been reviewed and you have been found eligible for hospital treatment. However, since a bed is not available for your admission at this time, your name has been placed on our waiting list. You will be notified as soon as a bed is available, at which time you will be furnished instructions for reporting. Upon your arrival, our physicians will examine you and if hospitalization is needed, you will be admitted.
>
> In the meantime, should the condition change to the extent that emergency hospital treatment is believed necessary, please have your physician notify the nearest Veterans' Administration hospital immediately so that appropriate action may be taken. If your physician is not available, direct contact should be made with the admitting physician at the nearest Veterans' Administration hospital.
>
> Should the condition improve to the extent that hospital treatment is no longer desired, please notify us so that your name may be removed from the waiting list.
>
> Do not come to the hospital unless instructed to do so, since it may not be possible to admit you.

Mr. President, a few days ago I received another letter relating to the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Lincoln, this one from a lady in that city. It speaks for itself, and I submit it without comment. It reads:

> I'm writing about the closing of the veterans hospital here. I have a veteran of World War I that I look after. Twice a month I take him to the veterans hospital for treatment. Three times in the last 3 years he has had a heart attack and I have called an ambulance and he has recovered. He lives alone (has no relatives and no one to look after him but me) in a small one-room apartment where he eats and sleeps and shares a bath with at least a dozen other people.
>
> What will I do when the hospital is gone? He can't go to Omaha on the bus because he wouldn't know how. I can't take him because I'm afraid to drive in Omaha traffic. What will I do next time he has a heart attack?
>
> Three days' foreign aid to Vietnam will keep our hospital going 1 full year. Can't you do something for us?

STUDENT REPORTS INTERVIEW ON HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am pleased to ask unanimous consent for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the close of these remarks, of an article appearing in the Beacon, the student publication of Woodrow Wilson High School, here in Washington, under date of January 29.

The article has particular significance to me, because it is the work of Cheryl Broide, daughter of my administrative assistant, Mace Broide. Based on a personal interview, Miss Broide's article, in its description of the Hartke college student assistance bill, is worthy of many a more mature journalist. Perhaps there is a factor of inheritance, since her father is a former newspaperman and a graduate of the Indiana University School of Journalism.

Now that higher education is receiving attention from a House subcommittee, and with the anticipation of early hearings before the Senate Education Subcommittee, I believe it is appropriate to call attention to this article for its content, which accurately reports my views as expressed to Miss Broide.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR'S BILL TO AID COLLEGE BOUND

(By Cheryl Broide)

"The emphasis in my education bill will be placed on the student, rather than his parents," stated Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana. "For example, the student himself will be able to borrow money from the bank."

Two weeks ago, the Senator introduced the Hartke education bill on the floor of the Senate. This bill is a three-part program which would allow anyone who is academically qualified to receive a college education.

Any student, no matter how wealthy, is guaranteed a loan on which he pays 4-percent interest and the Federal Government pays 2 percent. The student may spend up to 5 years in school and is allowed 10 years from the day of graduation to repay the loan.

For students who can get higher education no other way, the bill includes grants and scholarships. "The granting of scholarships will depend mainly on the student's potential and will be given to B and C students as well as those with A averages," the Senator said.

When students apply to colleges or universities, they also ask and apply for the scholarship or loan they need. Hopefully, the bill will be in effect by fall of 1965.

The Senator commented on past education programs that Congress has worked on or has passed. "Last year, money was appropriated for new dormitories, teacher-training programs, new school buildings, loans for gifted students, and Federal aid to schools."

None of these programs, however, guarantees a loan or applies to average-grade students. Almost every year, someone introduces the tax percentage bill. This bill calls for a percentage tax cut for any parent with children in college.

"In the first place," Senator HARTKE explained, "this bill would help parents, not students, and it is not the parents that are going to school. Secondly, one has to earn money to pay taxes. Some people do not earn enough to pay taxes and therefore would not be helped.

"Also, the amount of money taken off is not enough to help a student appreciably. A bill of this type would give most help to wealthy colleges or wealthier people and cost the Government twice as much as my program. It is a special tax cut for a certain group of people."

Now entering his second term, Senator HARTKE has seven children, two of whom are at State universities. He himself attended Indiana University and graduated from Evansville College in Evansville, Ind.

The Senator's father, brother, sister, and wife were all schoolteachers and, as he says, "I don't think that everyone should go to a college or university, but I do think that a lack of money should never hold back a young person who wants more education after he receives his high school diploma."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE CONTINUING UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, not even the question of what to do about South Vietnam has as many differences of opinion in this town as has the problem of what courses of action should be taken to correct our continuing unfavorable international balance of payments.

One thing is certain, however. We now known that something can, should, and must be done.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a moment?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have already yielded to the Senator from New York, but am glad to yield again.

Mr. JAVITS. I testified yesterday before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which in the course of colloquy came forth with an interesting idea which I should like to propose to the Senator, because he may just wish to comment on it. That is the thought that if we moved promptly into the international area to try to correct the world situation which results from the fact that our imbalance in international payments is what is sustaining the credit and trade of the world today—without which the world could not carry on its business—we could carry the present rate of this imbalance for a period of a few years, rather than to engage in the dislocations which in almost every case are more serious than the difficulties of carrying the imbalance—dislocations which we would put into effect if we take the measures now under discussion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have great respect for the opinions of the Senator from New York on this subject. Some of the points I will recommend in this brief speech, I am sure the Senator will agree with. Other points we can discuss at his convenience.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in a talk about this growing problem made on the Senate floor November 18, 1963, the first of five made on that subject, I presented my reasons for believing that this country, in the economic field, was allowing itself "to drift into a situation where we are gradually losing freedom of action in our internal and external economic policies."

More recent events demonstrate that that prediction was well founded.

A year ago last November I said also:

> If the situation is allowed to continue we could fall under the influence and policy dictation of other countries, because from a creditor nation a few years ago, we are fast becoming a debtor nation; and our creditors, mostly in Western Europe, could be acquiring the influence, if not the power, of dictation over us in the field of economic policy.

In the 6 fiscal years between 1959 and 1964, the total cumulative deficit amounted to some $18.7 billion. Our gold reserve is now down from $24.7 billion in 1950 to some $15.2 billion as of now.

Recently it was announced that these reserves are now lower than they have ever been for over 25 years.

Because of growing apprehension about the size of U.S. balance-of-payments deficits, especially in 1962 and early 1963, this Government initiated a number of programs, plus some legislation in order to try to combat this problem. We increased the effort to tie aid to domestic sources, made special effort to persuade foreigners to travel to the United States, made reduction in duty-free allowance for returning tourists, started an export drive, and established an interest equalization tax.

Let us note that our overall deficit declined from $3.6 billion in 1962 to $3.3 billion in 1963; and then to a seasonably adjusted annual rate of $2 billion during the first three quarters of 1964.

But while our gold supply during the first 9 months of 1964 held steady, and while we found ingenious ways of financing our deficit, our international position worsened.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table entitled "U.S. Gold, Foreign Exchange, Nonmarketable Bonds Outstanding and Short-Term Banking Liabilities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. gold, foreign exchange, nonmarketable bonds outstanding and short-term banking liabilities

[In millions of dollars]

	December 1963	September 1964 (P)
Gold:		
Total	15, 596. 0	15, 643. 0
Treasury	15, 513. 0	15, 463. 0
Foreign currency	212. 0	227. 0
Total gold stock and foreign currency holdings	15, 808. 0	15, 870. 0
U.S. Treasury nonmarketable notes and bonds issued to official institutions of foreign countries:		
Payable in foreign currencies	730. 0	1, 005. 0
Payable in dollars	163. 0	354. 0
Banking liabilities to foreigners:		
Short-term	25, 937. 6	27, 368. 6
In dollars:		
Official institutions	12, 436. 9	12, 316. 3
Foreign banks	5, 683. 5	6, 621. 6
Other foreigners	3, 046. 2	3, 233. 0
International and regional	4, 637. 1	5, 065. 9
In foreign currencies	134. 6	131. 7

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, actions of the United Kingdom to reduce her deficit by a 15-percent import surcharge, also by raising the bank rate, do not work in our favor. This situation, plus rising bank lending abroad in the face of interest equalization tax on foreign securities, plus rising Canadian borrowing in the United States, all contributed to what is generally thought to be a substantially worse fourth quarter in 1964. This would mean the deficit for the full year could be in the vicinity of $2.5 billion, which would also mean that the actual deficit in the fourth quarter alone could be $1 billion or more.

Despite the devices used thus far to protect our gold and to avoid policy decisions to solve the deficit, at some point in the future, in the face of a continuing deficit, foreigners will be unwilling to add further to their holdings of dollars or U.S. Government bonds.

The best one can say of the recent French action is that it was a warning to get our house in order.

A warning—heard elsewhere—for as reported on January 26 in the Washington Post, Spain began to convert its dollar reserves to gold—$40 million in December—with further conversions anticipated until gold stocks reach 50 percent or 75 percent of its total foreign exchange reserves.

While our attention on the urgency of this problem is renewed, it does nothing to solve it.

What possible paths to solution are there?

Some people seem to feel that we need merely to further expand our exports; and while some aspects of our export potential do appear bright, there seems little prospect of Europe substantially increasing her imports from us without offsetting exports; in fact, in some ways Europe seems bent on even more protectionist policies where the United States is concerned.

Japan, Canada, and the United Kingdom all have precarious balance-of-payments positions of their own, and can offer little in net additional imports from the United States.

The underdeveloped world cannot increase its imports materially without more aid, a combination which would have no net impact on our balance-of-payments deficit.

Any ability to increase foreign travel in the United States could have only limited impact on our deficit.

Stimulating more direct investment by foreign firms in the United States might have an adverse impact in the long run, and in any case would require phenomenal growth, as the 1963 total was only $17 million.

U.S. tourists abroad spend very large sums. In 1963, our citizens spent over $2 billion abroad, and paid an additional $625 million in fares to foreign carriers. Serious consideration should be given to action in this field.

The Government could exercise controls over private capital flows, by extending the interest equalization tax beyond the end of 1965 and applying presidential discretion to include bank loans of 1 year and more; also, by seeking legislation to control direct foreign investment by U.S. business firms.

Application of IET to bank loans in its present form, however, might be of questionable value, for it might lead to the expanded use of credits for less than 1 year, with indefinite renewals, just as application of interest equalization tax to foreign securities had led to the sharp increase of bank loans.

Extension of interest equalization tax to include Canada could result in a substantial net contribution.

Is it desirable to limit or control direct foreign investment by U.S. firms? Would such limitation contribute positively to our balance-of-payments position? The matter needs careful study, and bears inquiry.

It would seem reasonable to expect U.S. business firms to slow down or halt earnings repatriation if further capital outflows were halted. That this action would be serious can be seen by a comparison between 1963 repatriations—$3,059 million—and direct foreign investment outflows—$1,888 million.

Some Europeans, notably the French, would welcome control over U.S. direct foreign investments abroad, and have suggested this as a solution to our deficit. Other aspects of this are discussed in an article entitled "France Ponders U.S. Restraint."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the Record, which was published in the Washington Post on January 12, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

France Ponders U.S. Restraint—Seeks Curb on Foreign Power

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Paris.—The French Government is quietly pondering a new strategy to restrain another phase of American power: the big, rich, technologically savvy American corporation.

Just how Paris will proceed is far from clear, even to Paris. This is because the American corporation, whether selling to France or operating a subsidiary here, brings some well-recognized benefits to the local economy.

But the problem of the American giant is occupying more and more official attention here. General de Gaulle underscored it in his yearend speech when he warned the nation against becoming "colonized by foreign investments, inventions, and capacities."

French businessmen have been fretting for several years over American competition. It is only in recent years that the historically protectionist French industrialist has learned that he could live and prosper with the competition of Common Market firms.

But there is a fear frequently voiced in business circles that the tariff cuts of the Kennedy round will expose French industry to devastating competition from American firms.

INCREASING DISMAY

In the same way, executives here look with increasing dismay at the home-grown competition from local subsidiaries of American firms.

At the drop of an investment dollar, French businessmen trot out masses of statistics to demonstrate the gigantism of the United States. The Patronat Francais, a big business organization with power and sophistication unmatched by the American National Association of Manufacturers, put together a classic study a few months ago.

Among other things, it cited these facts: Some 49 American firms enjoy annual sales of more than $1 billion but nobody is in this class in France; the United States is spending 25 times as much on research and development as France and nearly 7 times as much per person; some 700 of the thousand largest American firms already have subsidiaries in France.

The Patronat's president, Georges Villiers, warned that American firms have the "investment resources, intensity of technical research, the command of means to prepare for the future" that "strengthens their ability to compete."

In fact, the American penetration of the French economy is more striking for its growth than its breadth. Since 1950, direct investment in plants, machinery and other tangible assets has increased more than sixfold. But the total investment at the end of 1963 was still only one and a quarter billion dollars. And this was only about one-third of the total foreign investment here.

HIGHLY VISIBLE

However, this outlay by Americans and other foreigners is highly visible. It tends to be concentrated in relatively few industries. Foreigners control about 90 percent of France's synthetic rubber, 80 percent of ball bearings, 70 percent of farm equipment manufacturing, 60 percent of elevators and 50 percent of her electric light bulbs.

Moreover, foreign investment sometimes rubs some of the rawest political nerves. When Ralston-Purina opened a big chicken slaughtering plant near Rennes last fall, police guards were called out to restrain local demonstrators. The plant promised farmers a steady income at guaranteed prices. But the individualistic French peasants didn't relish being converted into dependent processors of chicken feed.

This little chicken war illustrates one reason why Paris is reluctant to move precipitously against foreign investment. Despite the pressure of the farmers, the Government recognizes that one of the chief restraints on the French economy is an inefficient system of distribution. Ralston-Purina's plant may threaten peasant independence; it also serves as a powerful competitive spur to other slaughterers and reduces food distribution costs.

Something like this happened again last summer when General Electric bid for France's one computer company, Machines Bull. The Government turned itself inside out for a plan to keep Bull out of GE's hands. At last, Paris gave up on all but Bull's military work. The French company simply had to have the American firm's technical know-how and capital resources to survive.

The Government could block any direct investment. A foreign firm seeking to buy up a French company or set up in business for itself must get approval of the Finance Ministry. The only loophole now existing is the stock market. An American firm can buy shares of a French concern on the Bourse, without official approval. The Finance Ministry proposed new legislation a few weeks ago to close this loophole. It was rejected by the National Assembly, but a version is likely to be submitted this spring.

However, the Government is usually unwilling to invoke its power for still another reason. A foreign firm blocked here can set up across the Rhine in Germany or anywhere else in the Common Market and sell inside France. Trade barriers within the Common Market are coming down rapidly and will disappear completely by 1970 at the latest.

CAN'T GO IT ALONE

Paris knows it can't go it alone. So the French have been sounding out their Common Market partners for more than a year on a unified policy toward foreign investment. Until recently, Paris was rebuffed. The Dutch and Belgians, with a long history of hospitality to international firms, continue to turn a deaf ear to the French suggestions. The Italians are hostile, too.

But there is a new element in the picture. For the first time, the Germans are showing some interest in the problem. There is nothing like an agreed upon strategy. But at least Bonn has been privately agreeing to talk about the question.

A hint of this came a few months ago when the two big German auto firms, Volkswagen and Daimler-Benz, agreed to set up a common subsidiary. This joint venture, it was made clear, was inspired by the competition of General Motors' powerful German subsidiary Opel.

Meanwhile, the French Government has taken on its own a sideswipe at American investment. Paris has been stepping up the rate at which it sells dollars for gold. In part, this move is an effort to remind Washington that it would not have to give up gold if American corporations kept their dollars at home.

For the longer run, the French business community, with some government support, has its own patented solution. The Patronat's answer to the American giant is the creation of homegrown giants for the entire Common Market. The Patronat has been urging more mergers and agreements to reach across the national boundaries inside the European Economic Community as well as more concentration within national industries.

The French Government, with its nationalistic ardor, is probably exaggerating the threat to its sovereignty posed by American investment. But even critics concede that some real problems can be below the chauvinism.

Can a nation enjoy the full fruits of technological advance if it must depend on outsiders for all the products of the new industrial frontier? The recent disclosure that Washington had blocked IBM from selling France an advanced computer points this up.

How can a nation like France, which relies on a kind of nondirected or indicative planning, move effectively if important industrial sectors are controlled abroad? What happens to plans for investment and employment if key decisions are not made at home but overseas?

Even foreign policy is affected. France wants to trade with Communist China; the United States does not. Can Washington pressure Chrysler so that its French affiliate, Simca, refuses to sell to Peiping?

Indeed, the problem can be turned around. The foreign subsidiaries of American corporations could countermand policies and programs established in Washington. For example, international corporations can and do play hob with currency reserves, either by shifting liquid funds from center or by untimely investments abroad.

The French are now looking at the problem from their own, somewhat narrow angle. But they are fumbling for an answer to a concern that may some day involve all governments, restraining corporations that escape any one nation's sovereignty by operating on a global scale.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the suggestion has also been made that there should be an expansion of international liquidity with some form of gold guarantee for surplus countries accumulating dollars. This is really a method of institutionalizing our deficit so that we may continue to borrow from Europe and lend to underdeveloped countries, with the added assurance that our dollars can be exchanged for IMF credits with a gold guarantee.

The advantage of this to the Europeans is obvious—the risks to them are less if they lend to us—accumulate dollars—and have us lend to the underdeveloped countries. Some of the benefits of our assistance to developing nations will flow to Europe to the extent assistance dollars are spent there.

In short, that action would be a means for allowing us to continue our deficit, not a method for correcting it.

In past weeks, there has been considerable discussion about reducing or eliminating the tie between gold and Federal Reserve notes and deposits at Federal Reserve Banks.

As pointed out on January 26, in remarks on this subject by the able and experienced senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the question is becoming academic. Unless we take action, absent measures that could be invoked by Federal Reserve authorities in an emergency, shortly there will be no free gold left to honor our international commitments—our current free margin today is only $1.5 billion.

But we should not permit action in this regard—whether it be removal of the gold requirements for either Federal Reserve notes or deposits or both or a percentage of each, to thrust the problem of our balance-of-payments deficit into the background, to be ignored until a true crisis of confidence in the dollar occurs.

Where then shall we begin, for begin we must, though the discipline be painful wherever applied. At this juncture, we cannot await a neat solution that may lie potentially in a new international monetary system.

It would be fruitful to frame our foreign assistance programs within a concept of what we can afford, based upon our expected balance-of-payments position over the coming fiscal period.

Domestically, while we do run deficits in most years, we at least frame our Government expenditures in part based upon Government revenues.

In addition, it should be remembered that our domestic debt to our own citizens, and much of it long term, is far different from our international debt. The latter is owed to foreigners, is of value only in terms of its ability to command confidence—this based on its gold backing—and most of it is short term.

Coupled with this situation is the need for a review of some of our military assistance programs.

While it is apparently true that some 80 percent of our aid dollars are spent in the United States, the remaining 20 percent of a total package of some $3.5 or $3.6 billion involves an outflow of some $700 million. What assistance is given should be on a loan basis in kind—we would supply needed goods, and dollars on a stringent basis, for specific projects important to economic development. This would avoid insofar as possible any negative impact of aid given and prevent unrealistic leakages of dollar claims to Europe.

Especially because of the recent relatively constricted actions being taken with respect to many of our agricultural programs, we should make extraordinary and specific provisions for food and fiber to substitute for dollars in our aid program.

Too often the dollars do not end up where they were intended, these people to whom we want to render assistance need food, and it is vital to our own economy for us to dispose of these agriculture surpluses.

West European countries hold many billions of dollars of our current liabilities. They are held primarily by the countries of the Common Market. More of those countries, following France's lead, could increase their demands for gold in payment of current claims against the United States.

In November 1963, I made the following observation on the Senate floor:

> This is to some extent a Damoclean sword over the U.S. Government. I believe it explains some of the lack of success we have had in such fields as trade negotiations and agricultural policy, as experienced in our dealings with the Common Market. The bargaining power in the economic field has at least partially shifted from the United States in favor of Western Europe.
>
> If such a result had been obtained in the field of U.S. military capability, most everyone in this body would be agitated. But in the economic field, it seems to me we may have allowed our power of independent action to be subjected to external pressures without an accurate analysis and confrontation of the causes so that immediate remedial action may be taken.
>
> If it is true, as some assume, that continuance of the cold war in a period of peaceful coexistence means the erosion of U.S. economic power, and the subjugation of our sovereignity and freedom of action to foreign influences, then we must be careful that our own policies are not responsible for bringing about the attrition of U.S. economic independence.

Some 450 days later we have further justification for that thinking. General de Gaulle recently succeeded in reducing German wheat prices some 11 percent, at the same time increasing French wheat prices 8 percent. This action can only react to the serious disadvantage of American farmers. Along with other decisions, it would appear to be a major step in reducing, if not actually eliminating the best cash farm market U.S. agriculture has had outside of this country.

Over 60 percent of our national debt represents what the United States has spent, advanced, or lent, or given away since World War II; and as late as 19 years after that war, our expenditures for foreign aid and military presence abroad are running some $8.5 billion, annually through, first, mutual security legislation; second, Public Law 480; and third, military expenditures.

These huge figures do not include contingent liabilities created by various insurance and guarantee programs such as those underwritten by, fourth, the Import-Export Bank and, fifth, the AID agency in the field of exports, private investment, and housing. Nor do they include contingent liabilities authorized as callable subscriptions to the capital of international financial institutions, such as, sixth, the Inter-American Development Bank and, seventh, the International Development Association.

In this connection, the correspondence between Secretary Dillon and Senator MORSE with respect to the latest tapping of the American money market, pages 927 and 928 of the RECORD of January 19, make interesting reading. We also note the latest request for an increase in the resources of the Inter-American Development Bank introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT with reservations, pages 1464–1465 of the RECORD of January 28.

Foreign assistance programs, aimed at both our military preparedness and at economic, social, and political development abroad, are desirable programs. We all know, however, that they depend upon our economic strength, without which, as the recent French decision to step up gold purchases may well indicate, we may begin to lose flexibility and independence of action.

Immediately after the Second World War, with our great financial reserves, with most of the rest of the world impoverished or exhausted from war, and with the dollar shortage in world trade, we could afford huge aid programs, and these programs were crucial to international economic recovery. Today, we have neither the reserves nor the private account surplus to afford an economic assistance program of the present magnitude.

Actually, this country has been financing its foreign assistance operations and military expenses abroad by currently borrowing money from foreign governments and institutions abroad.

In addition, radical steps could and should be taken to reduce our offshore military expenses. For over 20 years now the United States has supported at least five divisions in West Germany. Today nearly 1 million Americans live in Europe, a paramount reason for the continuation of our unfavorable balance.

Recently there have been interesting and effective speeches which have emphasized that although in foreign policy, moral and ideological considerations are desirable, from the standpoint of a nation's future, there are no true substitutes for the reality of self interest.

Continuous reappraisal of our foreign assistance and offshore military expense programs is important. But they alone cannot form the totality of effort necessary to meet and overcome these dangerous deficits.

Desirable bank loans abroad, emanating from the private sector of our economy, also require scrutiny in the klieg light of our international balance sheet.

Recently we have been reading of the great inroads scientists and engineers have been making on both the thinking and the action of politicians and diplomats.

As we recogize changes in these other fields, however, there would appear little recognition of the importance, the desirability, of change in certain aspects of our economic policy.

In this field, despite the steady attrition of our economic strength resulting from 15 years of unfavorable balance of payments, we continue to show little overall interest; and therefore fail to supply adequate remedial action.

How ironic it would be if, after building the strongest military force in world history, with its base a superior scientific and technological platform, and with our spiritual convictions held high, we foundered as a nation because of the failure of our policies in the economic field—as represented by banking and business and world trade.

In the days before Korea, when the United States was trying to get its military house in order, there was a line used, "The biggest fool of all is the fool who fools himself." From a fiscal and monetary standpoint today, as with the military picture of yesterday, it would be well to remember that observation.

In summary, therefore, in order to make a more determined effort to correct these unfavorable balances, I believe we should:

First. Substitute more in the way of goods, especially the food and fibers of agriculture, for dollars in our aid program, at the same time implementing policies designed to create more trade and less aid.

Second. Substitute additional taxes on the order of the interest equalization tax, including recognition of the heavy unfavorable balance created by tourism and capital outflows.

Third. Recognize in more practical fashion the recent changes in weaponry and the world balance of power through major changes in our offshore military expenditures.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri on his analysis of our gold situation, and what I think is a very objective attempt to deal with some of the problems that have created it. As with all such complicated subjects, we would disagree, of course, as to some points of emphasis. I feel that we need as one of the first bases of cure for the outflow of gold problem a more stringent discipline of ourselves with respect to our own affairs. I do not believe that we can continue to operate with deficits, particularly such deficits as those under which we have been operating, and expect to cure the deficit of gold problem no matter what else we do. Nevertheless, though we may differ on emphasis and in different parts of the statement, I think that the Senator's study of the subject and his speech upon it has been a great contribution, and it is something that I wish and hope that Congress would devote itself to for an objective, and, if it can be, a nonpolitical study, because what he has said is entirely true. We may have the strongest and best armies in the world. We may have the best missile system. We may be able to destroy Russia and China together two or three times over. However, it would be ironical if we lost the advantage of all of that because we permitted our economic system to break down.

I think the Senator has contributed a great deal to the discussion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished senior Senator from Colorado, one of the ablest Members of this body and an authority in this field.

I feel we should do our best to correct any deficits. However, I am not as worried about our internal debts, because as the Senator knows we do not have double entry bookkeeping in the Government of this country. Therefore, items such as the great Interstate Highway System, our dams, our flood control projects, our Military Establishment itself, are all recognized as net liabilities, part of the national debt. Of course, that is not true with respect to our international debts.

Again I come back to the figures which worried me over a year ago, when I started talking on this subject, and which now worry me even more, based upon more recent developments.

In 1949, as the able Senator knows, we had $24.5 billion worth of gold bullion in this country, and owed $5 billion to foreigners, primarily the foreign central banks.

Today our gold has dropped to $15.2 billion, and our current liabilities redeemable in gold amount to some $29 billion. These liabilities are held primarily by the foreign central banks.

In addition, some $13 billion of that amount is monetized or "nonfree" gold, assigned as reserve on the basis of our 25-percent gold guarantee of our currency.

To sum up, we have, as mentioned, around $1.5 billion in gold to redeem approximately $29 billion of current liabilities held abroad and which we have promised to redeem in gold.

I know there are many answers, and reasons why, in all probability, there will not be at this time a gold run against the U.S. Treasury. But I am becoming increasingly apprehensive and am in complete agreement with the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] that now is the time to take more practical steps to get our monetary house in order. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I know that he shares my concern. We are getting away from the old Mark Twain adage that "everybody talks about the weather, but nobody does anything about it." This is something that we can do.

APPORTIONMENT IN THE STATES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, during the course of last year there was a decision of the Supreme Court which affected the apportionment of all legislative bodies in our State legislatures throughout the country. Many people who were unaware of the impact that apportionment would have on them are now becoming aware that it will have a deep impact upon the complete political life of every State in the Union.

I have in my hand three resolutions from the Grange in Colorado touching on this subject and supporting a proposed constitutional amendment to provide that the States may, by vote, establish one house of their legislature on some basis other than strict population.

I ask unanimous consent that these very thoughtful and helpful resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in the year 1962 the citizens of the State of Colorado passed by a majority vote amendment No. 7, known as the Federal plan, to the Colorado State constitution as the method of apportioning our State legislative bodies; and

Whereas the LaPlata Pomona Grange No. 10 of the County of LaPlata, State of Colorado, together with other grangers in the area and throughout the State supported the Federal plan of apportionment and worked for its passage; and

Whereas a minority group in the State of Colorado challenged the constitutionality of amendment No. 7 to the constitution of the State of Colorado which set up guidelines of apportioning the States legislative bodies; appealed it to the Supreme Court of the United States who set aside amendment No. 7 and directed that both legislative bodies of the State be reapportioned on a population basis as nearly as possible: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved by LaPlata Pomona Grange No. 10, LaPlata County, Colo., That legislation be introduced in this session of the 89th Congress of the United States of America permitting the sovereign States of this great Union to apportion their legislative bodies according to the wishes of the citizens of the respective States and thus return the Government to the people.

Resolution Committee, LaPlata Pomona Grange No. 10,
Robert Barr.
Walter W. Jefferies.
Bryan Woods.

Deer Trail, Colo.,
January 14, 1965.

Senator Gordon Allott,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We, the members of Deer Trail Grange No. 412, feel the Supreme Court overstepped their authority in declaring our plan for reapportioning the legislature illegal.

We hope the National Congress will pass an amendment to the Constitution making it legal for a State, with bicameral legislature, to elect one house on other than a population basis. We hope you will give this some consideration.

Yours truly,
Deer Trail Grange No. 412,
Myrtle Hayward, *Secretary*
Mrs. C. J. Hayward.

Whereas in the year 1962 the people of the State of Colorado passed by a majority vote what was termed the Federal plan of apportioning our State's legislative bodies; and

Whereas the Animas Valley Grange No. 194, Durango, Colo., together with other granges in the area and throughout the State, supported the Federal plan of apportionment and worked for its passage; and

Whereas a minority group in the State of Colorado saw fit to challenge the constitutionality of the amendment to the constitution of the State of Colorado; which set up the guidelines of apportioning Colorado's legislative bodies; appealed it to the Supreme Court of the United States of America, who set aside the aforementioned amendment to the constitution of the State of Colorado and caused the two legislative bodies of the State to be reapportioned on a population basis as nearly as possible: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved by the Animas Valley Grange No. 194, Durango, Colo., That legislation be introduced in this session of the 89th Congress of the United States of America which will permit the sovereign States of this great Union to apportion their legislative bodies by similar methods as our Federal governmental bodies and thereby give the Government back to the people.

Signed,
Robert Barr,
Master of Animas Valley Grange.
Jennie Gray,
Secretary of Animas Valley Grange.
Walter W. Jefferies,
Chairman of the Legislative Committee.

LAGGING REPAYMENT OF STUDENT LOANS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, as one of the authors of the National Defense Education Act, I was very interested in what we hoped to accomplish by the National Defense Education Act. This morning's issue of the Wall Street Journal contains an article entitled "Student Loan Program Troubled Increasingly by Lagging Repayment." I commend the article to all Senators who are interested in education—and they all are; every Member of this body is interested in the subject—because some of the elements stated in the article must give everyone great pause.

For example, the article states:

> Boston College officials say that about 40 percent of the National Defense Education Act borrowers who should be paying up their loans aren't doing so.

The gist of the article is that those loans which are handled through colleges are going by the board so far as collections are concerned. Many students leave college, the college loses contact with them, for they do not know the addresses of the students, and the students themselves who have borrowed seem to feel that, "Well, this is Government money. It really does not matter whether we pay it back."

I believe that the overall percentage, as nearly as it could be ascertained, is that some 16.6 percent of the borrowers whose loans have become due have defaulted in the payment of such loans. That would be compared, for example, with the experience of commercial banks, where there is an average defalcation of about 1.7 percent.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred may be printed in the Record. I hope that when the education bill comes before the Senate, that particular aspect of it will be given very serious consideration by Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Student Loan Program Troubled Increasingly by Lagging Repayment—Delinquent Borrowers Elude Colleges' Collection Efforts—U.S. Provides Bulk of Funds

(By Fred L. Zimmerman)

A Federal program aimed at helping needy college students is causing a major headache for schools and for Uncle Sam.

The program, part of the 7-year-old National Defense Education Act, provides for deserving students to borrow up to $1,000 a year, with a $5,000 maximum. The Federal Government contributes 90 percent of the loan money and the college 10 percent.

The law specifies that the students are to repay the money, plus 3 percent interest, in 10 annual installments, beginning 1 year after graduation. But a lot of graduates are neglecting to send payments to their colleges, which are responsible for collecting the debts, though losses ultimately will be borne largely by the United States. And it's these delinquent alumni who are currently paining educators and Federal officials.

The experience of Boston College is indicative of what's happening at many of the 1,600 colleges and universities participating in the student aid program. At last count, the Catholic institution was trying to track down 228 of its alumni who are in hock to the school and the United States for about $28,000. Boston College officials say about 40 percent of the National Defense Education Act borrowers who should be paying off their loans aren't doing so; of this group, two-thirds have been delinquent for over 2 years.

SURVEY OF DELINQUENCIES

No one knows how many recipients of National Defense Education Act loans are delinquent for the Nation as a whole. But a study made last fall by the Office of Education, which administers the program, showed $2 million in loans were in default at 1,000 schools surveyed. This represented 16.6 percent of the borrowers whose loans had become due. By way of comparison, the delinquency rate on installment loans from commercial banks averages 1.7 percent.

Moreover, schools report the number of National Defense Education Act delinquencies is increasing sharply as more loans made in the early days of the program become payable. "This collection problem is getting out of hand," laments Wallace B. Smith, student affairs director at Henry Ford Community College, Dearborn, Mich.

Perplexed college business offices, which have little experience in bill collecting, attribute much of the problem to their inability to keep track of borrowers once they have graduated. "On three-fourths of our delinquencies we just don't know where to send the bill," says Daniel Breslin, comptroller of Boston College. In many cases, too, borrowers find themselves financially pressed because of family and business obligations upon leaving college.

"But one of the biggest things we're having to fight is the attitude on the part of the borrower that anything from the Government is a handout and that if he simply dilly-dallies around long enough we'll forget about his obligation," declares Howard Kreitzer, an Office of Education representative in Dallas who works with southwestern schools in administering the National Defense Education Act program.

AN EXPANDING PROGRAM

The loan plan was voted by Congress shortly after Russia launched its first sputnik. The stated purpose was to spur the study of science, mathematics, engineering and foreign languages, but most schools will lend National Defense Education Act money to needy students in any field of study. The program has grown from an appropriation of $30.8 million in loan funds in fiscal 1959 to $163.3 million in the current fiscal year. By 1968 loan funds are expected to amount to $195 million annually. President Johnson aims to extend the program through 1971, when it would reach a high of $275 million in Federal outlays.

From past experience in collecting the loans, many colleges foresee a dreary future. Blame for the high loan delinquency rate is tossed about freely. Many colleges contend the Office of Education should take more of a hand in collecting the loans; as it is, the full responsibility and costs for collecting rest on the participating schools. Last November the Comptroller General's office criticized the Office of Education for being "slow in taking effective action to assist institutions in installing good collection procedures." But Office of Education people contend that the way the act is written they can't take a more active part in collecting the loans.

Office of Education personnel say they're surprised by the laxness with which many colleges handle the program. One agency official says that at a large eastern school several students got their loan checks, dropped out of school and took Florida vacations with the money.

At one major southwestern university, the associate dean of students is responsible for approving loan applications, but collections are left up to women clerks. "Collections aren't in my department," says the official, who concedes he has no idea of the delinquency rate for borrowers whose loans have matured.

A number of schools are trying to curb the delinquency rate by tightening collection procedures. Twenty midwestern colleges have turned their National Defense Education Act collection tasks over to American Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, and several colleges in other parts of the country are thinking of taking similar steps. The University of New Mexico at Albuquerque may hire a collection agency to handle its delinquent accounts because "we'd hate to have to sue our own alumni," says Fred Reagan, assistant dean of men. Other schools are seeking collection advice from finance companies.

Some schools also are introducing stricter procedures for handling loan applications. "No longer can a student come in and just say he needs $200," says an official of one college. "He's really put through the wringer." Besides asking applicants for references from acquaintances, many schools also are obtaining names of college roommates and names and addresses of relatives for possible use in locating borrowers after graduation should they fail to pay up.

Although delinquency rates on National Defense Education Act loans far outstrip those on installment loans from banks, persons familiar with the program explain that the student loans are entirely different in character. Ellis P. Waller, who directs the National Defense Education Act collection center at American National Bank & Trust in Chicago, notes that "the student gets the loan only if he'd have difficulty in repaying it; he's got to be needy."

The Office of Education is sensitive about questioning on loan delinquencies. It stresses that because some borrowers are repaying their loans faster than is required, total repayments under the student aid program are running about 7.5 percent ahead of schedule. As for the graduates failing to make payments on time, one Office of Education official says the agency prefers not to describe these borrowers as "delinquent" because that makes it "sound like a moral problem, and we don't consider it that. We prefer the term 'past due accounts' or 'arrearages.' "

Whatever terminology is used to describe the problem, Congress may look into the whole National Defense Education Act program in the current session, says Representative EDITH GREEN, an Oregon Democrat who heads the Education Subcommittee of the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE GREAT NEW SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, during the past 6 years the Senate Small Business Committee has become increasingly involved in the effect on small business of the great new scientific and technological changes. We can even refer to these changes as a scientific and technological revolution. No company or industry is immune to the spreading effects of this revolution, which is largely dependent on the stimulus which research—both Government and private—has given to the general economy and particularly to the general levels of capital investment.

As research has grown, its influence on profitability has also grown to the point where it now either determines or at least strongly influences, profit performance of many areas of industry. The new element in our society is the growing recognition that new products and new processes are the key to a company's growth, an industry's growth, a nation's growth—and these are dependent on the continuous development of innovations to keep the economic system expanding.

It should not surprise us to find that there is a good correlation between the percentage of sales devoted to research and development and profits as a percentage of net worth. In other words, the higher the percentage of gross receipts spent on research, the higher the rate of return on net worth. About 70 percent of actual scientific and technological research and development in our Nation is paid for by the public through its Government. In addition, this amount covers proportionally more of the most advanced fields.

A considerable amount of this research and development work has potential commercial applications, and most company officials are well aware that many of today's important industries and products are outgrowths of Government-funded research.

Some obvious examples from World War II research are antibiotics, the jeep, radar, jet engines, precooked frozen meals, aerosol bombs, new power-steering and suspension systems, and miniature electronic components. The present electronic computer industry is the direct product of Army sponsored research resulting from a military need during the early years of World War II.

The contribution of publicly financed research and development to our society is still continuing. Already a reality are machines that read and record numbers and letters up to a hundred times faster than a human which will cut the cost of putting great masses of information into high-speed computers. A relatively small firm in Cambridge, Mass., for example, built a machine for the Air Force that reads Russian technical journals into an IBM translating computer.

Reading machines as computer input devices are only one example of how the Government is stimulating the technology of high-speed data processing. According to one source, these machines could generate a billion-dollar business in the not-too-distant future. In addition, the Department of Defense is pushing other "peripheral" computer equipment and the central unit, the computer itself.

Because of the great opportunities opening up in these new areas, I have instructed the staff of the Senate Small Business Committee to study this problem and to attempt to identify ways in which small business can participate in the benefits of this new technology.

Byproducts of our space programs include the development of biomedical instrumentation for better diagnosis and patient care, new materials, advanced electronic devices, communications, and the most advanced types of transportation. The development of space batteries has contributed to better hearing aids and lifesaving equipment.

The benefits flowing to the company performing Government research are incalculable. These include not only profit on the research contract, but also other advantages of value less easily appraised but probably of greater significance. Some of these other advantages are: First, the acquisition of a favorable position in competing for future research or procurement contracts; second, the accumulation of advanced knowledge of commercial applications of newly developed products and processes; third, the acquisition and maintenance of a competent staff of scientific personnel; and, fourth, the securing of a general body of technical information not widely shared.

During fiscal 1965, the Federal Government will obligate an estimated $15.44 billion for the support of scientific research and development. This means that 15 cents out of every dollar to be spent by the Government in the coming fiscal year will go for this activity.

Unfortunately, small business will get only a tiny fraction of this sum. If this situation continues, the inevitable result will be that small business will be confined to the traditional, slower growing activities like the distributive trades as well as merely the fringe areas of the new dynamic industries. A knowledge of only simple arithmetic is needed to see that small business will decline in importance in our society if it is excluded from the most profitable and fastest growing segments of our economy.

Mr. President, the Senate Small Business Committee plans to concern itself with these developments in our economy. Technological advances need not necessarily bode ill for small business. It is our hope that they, in fact, will contribute to the strength and vitality of the small business segment of our economy.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, reading the President's message to Congress regarding agriculture, I am struck by its thoughtfulness and constructive suggestions. However, I am moved to be facetious by one paragraph, which might be a prolog, wherein he states:

> Because our people eat better at less cost than any other people in all the world's history, we can spend our earnings for the many other things which make life rewarding.

This argument has been used by one of our country's leading food processors as an argument against consumer legislation—namely, because our food costs so little, people are using money wisely at the grocery store. However, we know that not every segment of the population is doing as well as it could. I hope this particular food processor will not pick that line of the message out of context to try to show that the President is against consumer legislation.

Perhaps the President's message on agriculture can best be described as "We may not be able to keep them down on the farm once they have seen 'Paree,' but maybe we can keep them in the rural community." That seems to be the gist of the message—we are not eager to take them off the farms and put them in our rural areas, but we must provide something for them to do.

However, a steady migration from the countryside has been a fact of 20th century life. The reason for this population shift has not been merely that inefficient farmers could not make the economic grade. Thousands of prosperous farm families and small town merchants have seen their sons and daughters leave for the great urban areas of our Nation because the opportunities for economic advancement are there, and the cities are the centers of cultural and recreational amenities.

It is a fact of life that the young people of this age do not want to stay on the farm.

But opportunity in America ought not to be based on an accident of geography. The President's message is an attempt to coordinate many existing resources, from the local to the Federal, and to revitalize our rural communities so that they might also share in the Great Society.

I wholeheartedly support that part of the message which declares a parity of opportunity for rural America. The President states that these gaps remain between the levels of living in rural America and those in urban America—gaps in income, in education, in housing, in health, and sanitation facilities.

What is there left in life? Those are the things that concern us all, and that we most need.

We need an increase in national economic prosperity to increase employment opportunities; full access to education, training, and health services to expand their earning power; and economic development of smaller and medium-sized communities to insure a healthy economic base for rural America is called for.

To specify one thing particularly in the message, I comment on the challenge which the President has issued, to get improved prices at the marketplace at less cost to the Government. This is one statement we all like, because we are all interested in the question of less cost to the Government. But the challenge is to utilize the Commodity Credit Corporation so as to make the free market system work more effectively for the farmer and to encourage the private segment of our economy to carry its own inventories, bought from farmers, rather than depend on the Government as a source of supply.

The last time I checked, the cost of storing our surplus commodities was running at more than $1 million a day.

I hope the private sector of our economy will stop criticizing the farm program, accept the challenge, and see if it can help reduce the excessive cost to all Americans, and thus help ourselves and our Government.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. MONDAY NEXT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to query the distinguished majority leader as to what he contemplates as the legislative program for the remainder of the week and for the following week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, responding to the question raised by my distinguished friend the minority leader, first, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be a morning hour when the Senate convenes on Monday next.

The next order of business will be to consider the 35 items on the calendar at this time, all reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, and all having to do with funds for committees to function for the remainder of the year.

It is my hope that each committee chairman and subcommittee chairman involved will be in the Chamber Monday, because they can then anticipate, and they should be prepared for, the assault, in a sense, on many of these resolutions by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. So I hope they will be present, because the Senator from Louisiana will be here. In their own interest, they had better be ready.

On Tuesday, February 9, and this has been discussed with the distinguished minority leader and with other interested Senators—it is anticipated that the stockpile bill, reported from the Symington subcommittee, and approved unanimously, I believe, today by the Armed Services Committee, will be laid before the Senate and made the pending business and debated.

There will be other bills reported next week from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and other committees. Those bills will be considered as soon as they reach the calendar.

Then, on the 11th, the Lincoln Day recess—not vacation—begins and ends on the 16th.

When anyone refers to these "vacations" it must be remembered that they take into account the Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays involved.

So it is anticipated that the Presidential inability constitutional amendment, reported unanimously by the Subcommittee on the Judiciary under the chairmanship of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and I understand the full committee, today, will be the pending business on the day the Senate resumes on Wednesday, February 17.

Following that, it is anticipated and hoped that the Senate will be able to take up the gold cover bill, as soon as hearings shall have been concluded. It should be ready for action at that time.

That is all the information I have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m., Monday, February 8, 1965.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Monday, February 8, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4, 1965:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONERS

The following-named persons to be Interstate Commerce Commissioners for terms of 7 years expiring December 31, 1971:

Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia (reappointment).

John W. Bush, of Ohio (reappointment).

U.S. ATTORNEY

Richard L. McVeigh, of Alaska, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Alaska for the term of 4 years vice Warren C. Colver, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted this verse from Isaiah 26:3: *Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on Thee.*

Let us pray:

O Thou who art the inspiration of every noble ideal and principle, may we daily profess and proclaim our faith in the sovereignty of Thy divine will. Grant that we may not fail to enter the sacred retreat of prayer and there bring our many needs to Thy listening ear and understanding heart.

May a sense of Thy greatness and goodness transcend and supplant those feelings of anxiety and uncertainty which so frequently dissipate our strength and destroy our peace of mind.

Show us how our beloved country may be used by Thee in lifting and leading struggling humanity out of the lowlands of fear into the lofty heights of freedom.

Inspire us to pray more fervently and labor more zealously for peace on earth and good will among men.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon,

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and appoints Mr. Holland, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hill, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Mundt to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86–420, appointed Mr. Dodd to be a member of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Mexico on February 11–18, 1965, vice Mr. Inouye, excused.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–417, the Chair appoints as members of the James Madison Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Smith, of Virginia; Mr. Slack, of West Virginia; Mr. Moore, of West Virginia; Mr. Glenn Andrews, of Alabama.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, United States Code, section 2251, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES B. McCLINTOCK

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the passing of the Honorable Charles B. McClintock, a Member of the House for the 16th District of Ohio in the 71st and 72d Congresses, in Canton, February 1.

Judge McClintock was a most distinguished citizen, honored and respected by all during over 40 years of service to county, State, and Nation as prosecutor, Member of Congress, and jurist. His career was an inspiration to me and his friendship was greatly prized.

I ask leave to extend at this point in the Record the obituary of Judge McClintock which appeared on page 1 of the Canton Repository, and I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the passing of our late distinguished colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The news article referred to follows:

C. B. McClintock

Death has ended the long public career of Charles B. McClintock, lawyer, county prosecutor, Congressman, and appellate judge.

He died at age 80, Monday afternoon, at the McKinley Nursing Home where he had been a patient for some time, moving there from his home at 1023 14th Street NW.

Shortly after the death of his wife, the former Ruth M. Grant of Wilmot, his health began to fail and he resigned his seat on the Fifth District Court of Appeals bench where he had served 16 years.

The name C. B. McClintock, as he became known professionally, received national attention in 1926 and 1927 when he prosecuted five men indicted in the murder conspiracy that brought the assassination of Don R. Mellett, publisher of the Canton Daily News.

He had been elected county prosecutor in 1922 and was reelected in 1924. At the conclusion of that term he was appointed by the county's common pleas judges as a special prosecutor to complete the Mellett murder trials.

In 1928 he was elected to the first of two terms as Congressman from the 16th District, which then included Stark, Tuscarawas, Wayne, and Holmes Counties. His election shifted the district from the Democratic to the Republican column.

He returned to law practice in March 1933 and ran for judge of the 15-county Fifth District Court of Appeals in 1946. To win election over the Democratic nominee, Arthur Limbach, he defeated the veteran Clyde C. Sherick, of Ashland, in the Republican primary.

Judge McClintock was reelected in 1952 by a record margin of 123,000 votes and again in 1958. On March 1, 1963, with 2 years of his third term remaining, he decided to retire and sent his resignation to Gov. James A. Rhodes.

Judge McClintock was born May 25, 1884, on a farm in Wayne County, a son of the late J. W. and Emma (Huguelet) McClintock. When he was 5 the family moved to Beach City where he attended grade schools and Beach City High School.

After his graduation from high school, the young man taught school for 5 years and attended spring and summer terms at Mount Union and Wooster colleges. One of his pupils was the late Benjamin Fairless, who became president of United States Steel Corp.

He enrolled at Western Reserve University Law School, taught night classes at Central High School in Cleveland while he was studying law and received his law degree in 1910.

He came to Canton and began practice in association with Canton's famed lawyer, Luther Day.

The jurist's first public office was as assistant county prosecutor in charge of civil work for 4 years and he entered the race for prosecutor in 1922, when he was elected to his first term.

It was at a time when prohibition brought a nasty era of bootlegging and other crime to Stark County as well as many other portions of the Nation.

Shortly after he became prosecutor, the ugly specter of bribery charges rocked Canton's city administration. Prosecutor McClintock sent three defendants to the penitentiary on bribery charges and in the spring of 1924, Gov. Vic Donahey removed C. C. Curtis from office as Canton's mayor in one of the few instances of such gubernatorial action in Ohio's history.

As prosecutor, his record was enviable. In 4 years his office disposed of more than 700 criminal cases. His trials brought only four acquittals.

In a statement at the end of 1957, when he announced his candidacy for a third term on the court of appeals bench, Judge McClintock pointed out that more than 96 percent of his opinions which had gone up to the Ohio Supreme Court had been upheld.

Judge McClintock's death takes the last of the Mellett murder prosecution officials from the scene. One of his assistant prosecutors, Henry W. Harter, Jr., who later became a common pleas judge, died more than a dozen years ago. His other assistant, James M. Aungst, passed away last year.

The Mellett trials brought scores of newsmen to Canton from major cities and the press associations.

Several months after the young publisher was shot to death as he put his car in his garage, Prosecutor McClintock had elicited a confession from one man and he accepted a guilty plea to a lesser charge with a short prison term as compensation for having turned State's evidence.

Three of the five indicted were convicted of murder charges and sentenced to Ohio Penitentiary. A fifth defendant was found guilty at a first trial, won a court of appeals reversal and was acquitted at a second trial on a change of venue to Columbiana County.

Judge McClintock was a member of First Methodist Church; Canton Lodge No. 60, F. & A. M., and Ohio State and Stark County Bar Associations.

He is survived by a sister, Mrs. Alexander Stevens of Winter Park, Fla.

Funeral services will be conducted Thursday at 10 a.m. at Schneeberger Funeral Home at 1137 Market Avenue North. Rev. Kenneth Bowser will officiate. Burial will be in Greenlawn Cemetery at Wilmot.

Calling hours at the funeral home will be Wednesday from 7 to 9 p.m.

Judge McClintock's favorite charity was the Stark County Humane Society.

WNEW RADIO PETITIONS CONGRESS TO RELEASE THE USIA FILM "JOHN F. KENNEDY: YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of the 89th Congress I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 47 to permit American citizens in the United States to see the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

I believe that every American should have the opportunity to see this film which has already meant so much to people around the world. This splendid documentary captures the spirit of the Kennedy years and gives a special sense of the potential of the best of our Nation.

I hope that Congress will act soon to make this film available for distribution.

Mr. Speaker, WNEW radio in New York has taken the leadership in advocating that all Americans be given an opportunity to see the film. WNEW did a half hour documentary program in its "Sunday News Closeup" series on December 6, 1964. Entitled "The Film You Cannot See," this excellent program featured interviews by Jerry Graham, director of WNEW News, and Rudy Ruderman, assistant director for public affairs, with film critics Bosley Crowther, of the New York Times, and Judith Crist, of the New York Herald Tribune, who had been so moved by the USIA film that they agreed that it should be made available to the American public. Carl Rowan, the Director of USIA, was also interviewed. Senator Jacob Javits and I were also privileged to participate.

At the conclusion of the program WNEW announced it would petition Congress to release the film and invited the listening audience to respond. Immediately after the program was broadcast, WNEW was deluged with telephone congratulations and pledges of support.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record excerpts from a letter describing the reaction which was written to me by Jerry Graham, director, WNEW news, and Rudy Ruderman, assistant director for public affairs:

Excerpts From Letter

Immediately after the program was broadcast, WNEW was swamped with telephone congratulations, and pledges of support for the petition to Congress we announced that we were preparing. And there was much praise for your announced intention to introduce a sense-of-Congress resolution at the opening of the new session.

The audience response was massive; we are still receiving letters of support for the petition, nearly 1 month after the broadcast. We have tabulated some 900 names thus far. On the air, we asked only that listeners who shared our view that the "Years of Lightning" film be released within the United States, send us their names on a postcard or write their Congressman. But a substantial number also added comments, and this letter to you will include some typical ones. We also are enclosing a transcript of the December 6 program.

The postcards and letters came predominantly, of course, from the primary WNEW listening area: New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. But many also came from other New England States; and we received a request from as far as California for a copy of the tape, from a gentleman who had heard about it from a friend here in the East.

Upon hearing the tape, the gentleman from Los Angeles wrote to us again, saying in part:

"It was one of the best planned programs of its kind. We especially appreciated the superb quality, its narration, music, and editing. It carried its message with dramatic impact."

From a couple in Dover-Foxcroft, Maine:

"We certainly want our names added to the petition (to have Congress release for domestic showing) the wonderful film about our beloved President Kennedy and what our country stands for. It is this kind of information that should be rubbed off on American citizens * * * so they may realize and appreciate and stand up for this wonderful United States of America. Your radio presentation of the sound track was most touching and impressive."

From Palisades Park, N.J.:

"Excellent program; please add our names to your petition list to get the John F. Kennedy USIA film shown in the United States."

A lady executive of a West Side Manhattan fashion house wrote on her firm's letterhead:

"Your program is to be commended as a public service * * * we enclose the following list of names and addresses of New Yorkers who sign this petition to their representatives in Congress to make known their sentiment on the subject."

The list contained some 46 names; that letter, and all the other's, are on file in our studios, and, of course, can be made available if the Congress so desires.

A gentleman who works for an East Side Manhattan film company wrote that he wanted to add his voice to the "many others asking you to take whatever action possible to insure that the film be released in the United States. Your efforts for this worthwhile film to be seen by the people of the United States will be most appreciated and most useful for everyone."

A letter from a listener in Westchester County:

"By all means let the citizens who paid for it, see it."

A woman in Hollis, New York, said:

"We so very much would like to see the film on our dear, late President Kennedy. He played a vital part in each of our lives. It is unfair to deny us the right to see this great work of art."

From Long Island City, a request from a lady:

"The Congress should make an exception in this particular case, so that everyone can view this fine documentary that they may better understand the basic aims of our Nation."

A second-grade schoolteacher in Brooklyn reminded us:

"Care must be taken (not to set a precedent) that government funds may be used for partisan motives; but care must also be taken that partisan motives do not support rigid resistance to a growing demand from the American people (to see) a film that provides a review of the deepest meanings and implications of an event in history still fresh in our experience * * * this documentary was apparently prepared with taste and artistry. Its availability particularly to schoolchildren is necessary."

A woman from Manhattan's East Side said the film should be shown in movie theaters throughout this country, and added:

"It is unbelievable that it could be considered a propaganda piece for the present administration; we have a right to see it."

A housewife in Bellaire, Long Island, sent us a letter signed by 15 of her friends from other Long Island communities, and from Manhattan, Bronx, and Queens as well. Her letter read in part:

"Wholeheartedly in support of this film being shown in the United States. I do hope WNEW and others can urge Congress to pass a special law allowing the USIA to distribute it to American theaters."

A lady in Forest Hills wrote that she agreed the people of the United States should be given an opportunity to view the film. "This movie should be shown in the United States as well as abroad. Let me congratulate WNEW on taking the initiative in this so very worthwhile effort, along with Congressman William F. Ryan."

These comments were repeated over and over, and there was not one single nay-sayer among the 900.

After the program, "The Film You Cannot See," was broadcast, a WNEW reporter contacted your colleague from across town, and across the aisle, Representative John Lindsay. He said, in an interview we broadcast later that evening, that he, too, agrees the USIA film should be shown in this country. The American people, he said, should be able to judge the merits for themselves, of material that is prepared primarily for overseas consumption.

In conclusion, Mr. Ryan, we reaffirm our dedication to the proposition that this film is a "must-see" for all Americans, and we respectfully request that you, as the representative of great numbers of our listening audience, accept and act on this petition.

Cordially,

Jerry Graham,
Director, WNEW News.
/s/ Rudy Ruderman
Rudy Ruderman,
Assistant Director for Public Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily commend WNEW for its initiative in bringing this important question to public attention. Jerry Graham and Rudy Ruderman have performed a most constructive public service in producing the program "The Film You Cannot See." I urge all my colleagues to act favorably on the petition which WNEW radio has laid before the Congress.

CONDEMNING SOVIET PERSECUTION

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I join with several of my colleagues in the House and Senate in again introducing a resolution condemning Soviet persecution of her citizens of the Jewish faith. It is known that religion is not looked upon favorably by the Soviet Union. It is also known that those of the Jewish religion have a particularly difficult time in practicing their religion. The power of the Soviet state consistently has been used to prevent the free exercise of the Jewish religion; synagogues and seminaries have been closed; religious publications suppressed; the baking and distribution of matzohs during Passover prevented; numerous "economic crimes" have been charged against Jews; and various other state-encouraged deprivations have occurred. I do not have to go into greater detail concerning this religious persecution, as the facts have become well known.

On December 19, 1963, in a speech on the floor of the House I delivered a detailed account of the situation in the Soviet Union. At that time I submitted facts which showed that restrictions on Jewish worship were far greater than on other minority religions.

If the experience of the last 30 years teaches anything, it teaches that we cannot be silent in the face of anti-Semitism. As the Representatives of the people, we have a special obligation to express the conscience of America on this important issue. The resolution I have introduced today states:

> That it is the sense of the House that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Let us pass it before Passover, which falls on April 16 of this year. On February 3, the Rabbinical Council of America representing 900 rabbis in the United States and Canada appealed to the new Soviet leaders to permit the baking of matzohs. If this resolution is adopted by April 16, it would aid in this appeal and further the cause of religious freedom.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. RUMSFELD. I congratulate the gentleman on his statement and the resolution he has introduced. I introduced earlier this week a similar resolution which I had also introduced in the 88th Congress, but which was not acted upon. I join with the gentleman urging support of these resolutions.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman for his support in this great cause.

EMPLOYEE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, none of the legislative issues confronting the 89th Congress is likely to stir more controversy or generate more heat than the proposal to repeal section 14(b)—that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which leaves with the several States the authority to outlaw compulsory union shop agreements.

What promises to be a debate of major proportions is already raging in and out of Congress, ignited by President Johnson's reference to 14(b) in his recent state of the Union address. As this debate proceeds toward an historic climax, it is my purpose today to focus attention upon certain fundamental legal and civil rights which are inextricably involved in any thoughtful consideration of legislation to sanction compulsory unionism—legal and civil rights which, in this context, the modern-day "pseudoliberal" seems eager to ignore or brush aside.

It is my firm conviction that repeal of 14(b) must be conditioned upon the enactment of certain fundamental safeguards for the workers who are, or would be, compelled to join and make payments to a union in order to hold their jobs. If such safeguards are included, along with meaningful provision for effective enforcement, I am prepared to support, and to advocate, the repeal of section 14(b).

I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 4350, which would accomplish these purposes. It is entitled the "Employee Civil Rights Act of 1965."

It is a bill which ought to rally the enthusiastic support of true liberals in both parties.

My bill would strike the existing provisions of 14(b), and would extend the privilege of negotiating union shop agreements to labor organizations in all of the 50 States. However, my bill would not take away State power to check union abuses in this area without substituting Federal power to protect the basic legal and civil rights of individual workers who would be affected.

Briefly, under my bill it would be unlawful for a union which makes an agreement requiring membership as a condition of employment—

First, to discriminate on account of race, color or creed;

Second, to use the dues collected for political purposes or for any other purpose not related to the union's statutory function as collective bargaining agent; or

Third, to fine or penalize a member for exercising any legal or civil right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Of course, the enumeration of such basic individual rights would be meaningless without provision for effective enforcement. Under my bill, a union which violates any of these fundamental employee rights could not enforce a contract provision which imposes union membership as a condition of employment. Those who suffer damages as the result of a violation could file a civil suit in Federal district court, or they could file an unfair labor practice charge with the National Labor Relations Board, in order to obtain appropriate relief.

As my bill indicates, I join the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in the call for an end to discrimination in union membership and union apprenticeship programs. And I share his recently expressed concern that 14(b) should not be repealed unless "assurances" are provided that unions which enforce compulsory membership requirements will not discriminate.

Of course, I assume that the chairman is also contemplating "assurances" in the nature of accompanying legislative safeguards with effective enforcement provisions. Surely, responsible legislators could accept nothing less.

While impressive strides have been made toward political equality in recent years, this progress has not been altogether comforting for the American who cannot get a job because of his color. To be sure, the "Equal Employment Opportunity" title of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, despite its limitations, can be a useful instrument in the eventual attainment of its stated goal. However, the way provided by title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which requires discrimination charges to be filed first with a State agency, must look like a long and almost hopeless road to Negroes in a number of States.

It is unfortunate, but true, that discrimination by labor unions is often a more serious problem for the Negro than discrimination by employers. This is particularly true so far as apprenticeship and training programs are concerned. Where compulsory union membership is not a requirement, Negroes can often find it easier to obtain a job, or an opportunity for training.

Obviously, if Congress, without providing effective safeguards, should repeal 14(b) and thereby sanction compulsory unionism in the 19 States which have so-called "right-to-work" laws, the Congress, by its action, would actually reduce the economic opportunities for Negroes and increase the difficulties they face.

Surely, a Congress that is truly concerned about poverty and the economic plight of the Negro, will not deliberately extend compulsory unionism into the very States, in some cases, where discrimination problems are the most serious—unless individual workers are effectively protected against discrimination.

My deep concern for another fundamental civil right is appropriately reflected in the safeguards of this bill. Individual citizens—including those compelled to join a union—are entitled to political freedom. Moreover, they are entitled to meaningful assurance that union dues paid under such circumstances will not be used for purposes foreign to a union's function as collective-bargaining agent.

Those who advocate compulsory unionism and oppose State right-to-work laws frequently advance the "free rider" argument. Within limits, this argument has merit; it goes like this: Under the law, when a union is selected by the majority of employees in a bargaining unit, that union is required by law to represent, not just those employees who voluntarily join the union, but all employees in the unit. Since the union must represent all employees, and since all employees theoretically benefit from the union's services as bargaining agent, it is only fair that all employees should be required to pay dues. Employees who do not pay dues are referred to as "free riders."

This argument has considerable appeal in the case of a union which uses its dues only for those purposes for which it is required by statute to represent all of the employees. However, it is very important to note that section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act provides that a labor organization selected by a majority of employees "shall be the exclusive representative of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment."

Obviously, the "free rider" argument rings hollow when it is sounded by spokesmen who vigorously oppose any effective legislation to prevent the use of union dues for political or other purposes not related to a union's statutory function as bargaining agent.

As for me, I agree with Mr. Justice Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, when he stated:

> The collection of dues for paying the costs of collective bargaining of which a member is a beneficiary is one thing. If, however, dues are used, or assessments are made, to promote or oppose birth control, to repeal or increase the taxes on cosmetics, to promote or oppose the admission of Red China into the United Nations, and the like, then the group compels an individual to support with his money causes beyond what gave rise to the need for group action.

And Mr. Justice Douglas went on to say:

> I think the same must be said when union dues or assessments are used to elect a Governor, a Congressman, a Senator, or a President. It may be said that the election of a Franklin D. Roosevelt rather than a Calvin Coolidge might be the best possible way to serve the cause of collective bargaining. But even such a selective use of union funds for political purposes subordinates the individual's first amendment rights to the views of the majority. I do not see how that can be done, even though the objector retains his rights to campaign, to speak, to vote as he chooses. For when union funds are used

for that purpose, the individual is required to finance political projects against which he may be in rebellion. (*International Machinists v. Street*, 376 U.S. 740.)

It is worthy of note that other forced associations are not altogether uncommon or alien to our American way of life. For example, in many States an attorney is compelled to join and pay dues to a bar association in order to practice his profession.

However, I am confident that few Members of Congress—and surely no liberals—would oppose a proposition to preclude the bar association, where membership is compulsory from, first, discriminating against Negroes or, second, using its dues for purposes not related to its professional function or, third, penalizing members for exercising constitutional or other legal rights.

Finally, the safeguards in my bill reflect a serious concern about the ability of a union member to exercise the constitutional and legal rights available to other American citizens.

Unfortunately, there seems to be a noticeable trend on the part of the NLRB and some courts to downgrade and subordinate the legal and constitutional rights of individuals when they become union members subject to union discipline. It is disturbing when any union member is relegated to the status of a second-class citizen. However, this is an alarming and intolerable situation as it affects those who are compelled to be union members in order to work.

Union members have been penalized by union officials for speaking out on political issues in opposition to union policy.

Union members have been fined for not engaging in concerted activities of a union even though section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act specifically confers upon every employee "the right to refrain from any and all such activities."

According to the strange rationale recently applied by the NLRB, such rights are protected when exercised by an employee—but not when exercised by an employee who is a union member.

Under recent Board decisions, a union member who is fined for violating union policy is not necessarily left with an option to pay the fine or drop out of the union. He can be compelled to pay the fine, even if it means garnishment of his wages or attachment of his property.

Surely, if compulsory unionism is to be sanctioned by the Federal Government throughout the 50 States, the right of dissent without reprisal must be guaranteed. The words of Justice Douglas speak eloquently to this point:

> If an association is compelled, the individual should not be forced to surrender any matters of conscience, belief, or expression. He should be allowed to enter the group with his own flag flying, whether it be religious, political, or philosophical; nothing that the group does should deprive him of the privilege of preserving and expressing his agreement, disagreement, or dissent, whether it coincides with the view of the group, or conflicts with it in minor or major ways, and he should not be required to finance the promotion of causes with which he disagrees.

I believe my bill is fair and reasonable. It recognizes merit in the arguments for union security, but it does not sacrifice basic individual rights which are at least of equal importance.

It may be that extreme partisans in the ranks of management and labor will not applaud this bill. However, I am confident that the vast majority of thoughtful Americans in and out of Congress will not abandon or ignore the sound principles which it represents.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS SITUATION IN ALABAMA

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the potentially explosive situation in Selma and other communities in my home State of Alabama is a cause for growing national concern.

There are many conflicting reports regarding the true state of affairs in these Alabama communities, but of this much we are certain: further exacerbation of existing tensions in these areas might well result in a complete breakdown of law and order and consequent violence and bloodshed.

As an Alabamian, I am, of course, deeply concerned with the welfare of my State and its citizens. As a Member of Congress, I believe some measure of responsibility to avert such a tragedy devolves upon the Congress in this case.

Those who last year supported the Civil Rights Act of 1964 did so in the belief—as one advocate of that legislation phrased it—that passage of the bill would "elevate the civil rights movement from the streets to the court."

Unfortunately and irresponsibly, leaders of the civil rights movement have otherwise interpreted the meaning of enactment of the civil rights bill. In Selma, in Marion, and in other communities of Alabama, these irresponsible leaders have, in effect, taken their movement from the courts into the streets, defying normal processes of justice, law, and order.

What are the true facts regarding the events now transpiring in Alabama? The people of the United States want to know and are entitled to know. And the people of Alabama not only willingly, but eagerly, await an honest, impartial investigation of these events.

In this regard, on Tuesday I received a telegram from Mr. Roswell Falkenberry, publisher of the Selma Times-Journal, a leading citizen of that community. Mr. Falkenberry said:

> SELMA, ALA.
>
> Hon. ARMISTEAD SELDEN,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> In view of continued provocation of local Negro citizens by professional agitators, despite conscientious efforts of a responsible white community to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, this newspaper respectfully requests that you urge the immediate appointment of a joint congressional commission to investigate the actual conditions existing in Selma at this time. We urge that an unbiased, responsible group representing both the House and the Senate be dispatched to this city immediately as factfinders to observe the situation in which the city of Selma is being thwarted in an attempt to observe all existing local, State, and Federal statutes.
>
> We believe that the Congress should determine for themselves the true facts without regard to race traditions or propaganda. You must agree that firsthand, on-the-scene knowledge of tragic conditions in any community is equally as important to the national welfare as any of the various surveys which have been conducted by the Congress on problems unrelated to civil rights. Certainly, massive attempts to provoke disunity in any area within the boundaries of the United States demands as much consideration as that in most instances where commissions have been authorized to make investigations in foreign nations.
>
> We do not ask for help, nor do we request intervention. We simply ask that the true facts concerning the racial difficulties now existing in our city be ascertained by the Congress and that these truths be made known on the floors of both the Senate and the House of Representatives.
>
> ROSWELL FALKENBERRY,
> *Publisher of the Selma Times-Journal.*

Mr. Falkenberry's proposal is both fair and reasonable. Coming as it does from a leader of the Selma community and one of the most prominent newspaper publishers in the State of Alabama, it bears out the fact that the people of my State will welcome any fair, impartial congressional inquiry aimed at uncovering the truth regarding the recent events in Selma and other communities.

In response to Mr. Falkenberry's suggestion, and in cooperation with my colleague, the Honorable GEORGE W. ANDREWS, I therefore have taken this proposal up with the chairmen of both the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, requesting that a joint congressional group, composed of members of these committees, be appointed to go to Alabama to investigate the situation there and report back to the Congress. Yesterday, at the invitation of the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Congressman GEORGE W. ANDREWS and I appeared before the Senate committee and conveyed to them Mr. Falkenberry's request.

These committees have the authority and the responsibility to conduct such an investigation in the national interest, and I am today introducing a resolution directed toward this end.

Certainly any congressional investigation of the existing situation in Alabama should be conducted in a responsible and balanced manner—one which will serve to calm rather than aggravate community tensions in the area.

This resolution is aimed at a responsible and balanced congressional response to the need for a legislative investigation of the situation in Alabama. It would certainly obviate the need for other Members of Congress, whose investigatory role in this matter could only be described as self-appointed, to travel to Alabama. The role of any congressional investigative body in Alabama should be to uncover the facts and report back to the Congress. Let me caution that no helpful purpose can be served by self-appointed congressional groups

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

traveling to the scene of action and thereby aggravating existing tensions in an already volatile community situation.

As Mr. Falkenberry has said, the people of Selma and Alabama "do not ask for help, nor do we request intervention. We simply ask that the true facts concerning the racial difficulties now existing in our city be ascertained by the Congress and that these truths be made known on the floors of both the Senate and the House of Representatives."

THE CIVIL RIGHTS SITUATION IN ALABAMA

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, an explosive situation exists in my State, which has been on the front page of almost every newspaper of America for a period of the past 3 weeks.

When the civil rights bill was enacted last year, the thought was that finally with the consensus of the Congress the matter of civil rights would be taken off the streets and into the courts, but for 3 weeks in the city of Selma there have been constant demonstrations and street operations going on which have consumed a great amount of the press and have been brought to the attention of all of you.

Several days ago a newspaper editor from Selma telegraphed the President and Members of both the House and the Senate and said that he would like an impartial investigation of what was going on in the city of Selma to report the facts correctly to the people of America.

At the time I had no particular desire that this matter, which was being handled skillfully locally with restraint and in good order and within the law, with a sincere desire to abide by the law, be brought before this body, which, in my opinion, has no jurisdiction over the things which have been going on in Selma.

This morning I noticed in the newspaper that a congressional delegation was planning on visiting the city of Selma to investigate matters down there and presumably report to this body or to the press or to whomever they intended to report. I immediately made moves to go into my State myself.

This is an unofficial body of Congressmen consisting of Mr. Don Edwards, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Powell, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Vivian, Mr. Reuss, and Mr. Ryan.

I was called an hour ago and was invited to participate in this visit in order that it be an unbiased group. I would like to warn against this unofficial visit into my State at a time when our people and the situation in my State is at such a tremendously high emotional pitch. I fear that an unofficial visit will be regarded by the people of my State as just another collection of professional agitators. They have evidence that there are already too many of these in Selma now.

I would recommend that if the Congress thinks it is necessary to have an official body visit my State and bring back the facts as to what has been going on down there during the past 3 or 4 weeks, then such a body should be constituted officially and be properly appointed. I urge that my colleagues abandon this attempt of going into my State without the proper authority and, yet, carrying with them congressional status, which would tend to cloak with authority their findings which I do not believe will be reported without bias.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Stratton). The time of the gentleman has expired.

SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I rise to speak in connection with the same problem that my colleagues, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Glenn Andrews] have so ably brought to your attention. I concur in their remarks and heartily support their position.

Mr. Speaker, these are serious times in our country. We southerners are asking that the leaders of this Nation come to the forefront and join with us in seeking rule by law and justice. I urge those who fought so hard to get the civil rights law enacted, now allow this law to operate. It is not being given a chance to operate in Selma because the city is being subjected to mob rule and law enforcement officials are being pilloried by a subversion of the facts and news stories colored to create a false account.

It is true that many of us opposed the passage of the civil rights bill. The bill is now the law of the land and we recognize that fact. The people of Selma and the people of Marion, Ala., are conscientiously endeavoring to abide by the law. I grant that there are difficulties. In Selma you have a people nurtured in traditions as old as the city itself; people who have resisted change and find the new law a bitter pill to swallow. But with determination, in the tradition of good American citizens, they are determined to try to do what is right. They are conscientiously endeavoring to abide by the law.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are those in Selma who have no respect for the law. Martin Luther King has told his followers repeatedly that they need not obey laws with which they disagree. He has called upon them to show their contempt for the law and for those legally charged with enforcement of the law. I do not believe that there can be one set of laws in America for all the people and another code of laws for Martin Luther King.

I ask all who are in high positions of leadership, including the President, to come forth on this occasion and to lend their voices to an appeal to reason. I ask that we in Congress, and the President, support the people of Alabama in seeing to it that law and order prevail. If there are any who have influence with Martin Luther King, ask him to leave Alabama and bring with him all of his agitators who are stirring up racial tensions and hatreds.

Let us act now before greater tragedy occurs or before the spirit of the people of Selma and other small towns in Alabama lies crushed and bleeding beneath the iron heel of mob violence. Let the law work its course. Or are those who spoke so highly of the civil rights bill afraid to give it opportunity?

This is a call, Mr. Speaker, to all good Americans to rise to the challenge we face, take up the burden of the task before us to bring peace to our country so that justice and law will prevail. There is no other way to guarantee justice for all the people under the Constitution and it is imperative that each of us and those in high places take immediate action or bear the responsibility for the death of freedom for the people of Selma. If we take their freedom, freedom may be lost to all of us, including the people Martin Luther King professes to want to help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the motion of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden], and also to comment on the remarks of the gentlemen from Alabama, Congressman Glenn Andrews and Congressman Martin.

Mr. Speaker, the people in my State are law-abiding citizens. We believe in this country and in its institutions and in its laws. It is our purpose to live in harmony and peace with one another. It is very difficult for the people of a city, say, like Huntsville, Ala., to comply with the 1964 Civil Rights Act even though the city of Huntsville has only 15 percent population of Negro people. But compliance is a much more difficult thing when you demand of the people of Selma, with its high percentage of Negro citizens, that they virtually turn upside down the entire power structure of their community and make radical changes in many of their institutions.

I have come to know the people of this city through years of experience, and I know them to be fine Americans and fine people. It is a city that has responsible leadership. There are those in the positions of responsibility at this hour who are manfully striving to keep the peace and to maintain law and order.

Their efforts are being thwarted and frustrated by the actions of those who have come in from outside the city to organize demonstrations and to attempt to create a situation in which large numbers of people are demonstrating in violation of local law, and a situation of great danger is being created.

We have had experience with this before, in my own city, when the people of Birmingham voted for a change in their city government, when they voted in a mayor and a city council, a part of the platform of which was to work toward the solution of certain racial problems. Because the election was held before their term of office had expired, the existing city commission challenged the leadership of this new mayor and council, and there was a legal court battle going on to determine who were in fact the rightful leaders of this city. It was at this point that Dr. King chose to come into our city to make demands of the city leadership—to make demands which no one could legally answer—and to organize demonstrations which went on for many days thereafter.

Gentlemen, I do not believe this is the kind of action we need to solve our problems, nor will it contribute to the solution of those problems to have a self-appointed investigating committee of Members of this House, not working under the Judiciary Committee or in any other way authorized to conduct a congressional investigation, to go to Selma at this time.

I urge and implore my colleagues to refrain from injecting themselves into a situation which is critical, which could be dangerous, and in which they can serve no constructive purpose. Let instead an official investigation be made, by a proper committee of the Congress, as requested by the people of Selma, themselves.

May I reaffirm my faith in the people of Selma, Ala., of both races, and my conviction that they will, in time, work out their own problems. They will work out their problems in peace and harmony and in line with the law of our land. They will do so, if their efforts are not continually thwarted by those from outside who cannot do other than complicate the situation.

SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Glenn Andrews, Mr. Martin of Alabama, Mr. Buchanan, and myself immediately follow in the Record remarks previously made by Mr. Selden.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that my first remarks on this floor should be directed toward the problem of civil disobedience in my home State.

I have come to this body, as have my four colleagues from Alabama, mindful that we would probably be characterized as "those five new Republicans from Alabama who were elected only because they are racists and who have come up here with only one thought in mind, and that is to harass our colleagues and impose upon them our feelings on the so-called civil rights issue."

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth.

We are concerned with the disregard for civil authority now being exercised in Selma. Alabama is our home. The very lives of our friends and neighbors stand in danger at this very moment. However, let me affirm first, here and now, that I am not a southern Republican, I am a Republican from the South. I am not interested only in Alabama or only in the race issue; because that is only one facet of the challenge which nourished our interest in becoming Members of this distinguished body.

I feel, however, that a grave injustice has been done here and a grave wrong has been perpetrated upon the people of my State and the people of my neighboring district, in Selma and Marion.

There are facts which should be brought out. Facts which the people of this country should be aware.

First, though it is not known generally, it is true that 2 weeks ago letters were printed in the State of Alabama and the address on the letters was plainly marked "county jail." They were very obviously printed by Dr. Martin Luther King to be mailed out from the county jail in Selma. They were dated 2 days ago, the very day he insisted on being arrested. He has refused bond. He took this action as an essential part of his newest drama, "Peaceful Luther Comes to Selma." This was necessary because his letters now being mailed in my State, printed 2 weeks ago, were already prepared to go out and he had to be in jail to have them valid and to have the dramatic appeal befitting his great hunger for publicity and sympathy.

Secondly, although it is not generally known, it is true that the FBI has asked Dr. King to remove himself from the premises, to remove himself from this inflammatory and volatile situation. They have asked him to please get out and to let law and order prevail. This he has refused to do.

It is not generally known, but the same Nazi that affronted this House the day we were sworn in and who came bursting through these doors, which we all witnessed, was later seen on the streets of Selma. He is not from Alabama, but he is a member of one of many groups of full-time paid agitators, either volunteer or professional. There are many professional leftwing radicals and full-time cardcarrying Communists in our State right now trying to initiate and aggravate dissension among the good people of Selma.

Mr. Speaker, any rump session, or ad hoc committee, or self-appointed committee from this body which seeks to go to Selma and lend the dignity of the Congress of the United States to any such biased or partisan groups is no different from this Nazi who chose to intervene in the affairs of the people of Selma. The only purpose and the only conceivable result that can come from this adventure is to foment more trouble and more strife so that they can get more publicity when, in effect, they do not want law and order and do not want the law to take its own course. They simply seek to create discord rather than harmony between the American people. This body should go on record as condemning any such trip—now or in the future.

No self-appointed, self-serving group from this august body has any more moral or legal right in injecting themselves in this situation than the eight Congressmen from Alabama would have in going to Harlem to investigate the moral degeneration in the gentleman from New York's district.

Nor do I recall any such great concern of this group in going to Rochester or Brooklyn in New York State where violence and disorder destroyed lives and public and private damage was estimated to be many, many millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to speak against something that might present a precedent which after reflection all my colleagues could well regret.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Stratton). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

LET LEGISLATORS KNOW

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Mellus newspapers on January 27, 1965, merits the attention of this Congress. The publisher, William S. Mellus, has effectively explained to the readers of his chain of newspapers, circulated in the downriver suburbs of Detroit, the tremendous impact that citizens may wield by letting their Congressmen and State legislators know of their opinions.

To encourage his readers to send their viewpoints to their legislators, Mr. Mellus has published the names and addresses of the U.S. Senators from Michigan, and of the Congressmen, State senators, and State representatives whose districts are in his newspapers' circulation area.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Mellus newspapers are performing a valued public service worthy of emulation by newspapers throughout the Nation. In view of its brevity, I have asked unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the Record following my remarks:

Let Legislators Know

In order that our democracy may operate in a manner to fulfill the lofty principle so eloquently stated by Abraham Lincoln in his oft-quoted "of the people, by the people and for the people," it is necessary that those in

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

charge of our Government know what the people want.

The best way for the leaders to find out is for the citizens to tell them. Since personal contact with Senators and Representatives on the State and National level is impossible for all but a very few, the most effective way to get this information to the legislators who represent us is by writing letters.

An individual may ask himself, "What is the use of my writing? I'm just one person and who will pay attention to me?"

It is true that the beliefs and wants of one person may seem insignificant, and his influence may appear to be scarcely noticeable in a nation of nearly 200 million citizens. However, these individual ideas and desires are the fibers that make up the woof and warp of our national consciousness.

Like the tiny threads that are intertwined and woven to produce a rope of great strength, the thought of millions of individual citizens combine to establish patterns of thinking which determine the direction and extent of our national progress.

Unexpressed, the ideas have no effective meaning or strength. Made known in sufficient volume, they become forces which no political leader can long ignore. Our Nation was founded upon the fundamental truth that "in union there is strength." This is as true and as vital now as it was in our earliest days.

On many occasions, the Mellus newspapers have expressed views editorially upon matters of public interest. We often have urged that our readers write to Michigan's State senators and representatives in Lansing and their counterparts in Washington, expressing support of or opposition to important measures. We have made it a practice to list the names and addresses of the legislators or other public officials to whom letters should be directed.

The recent redistricting of Michigan's legislative and congressional districts resulted in changes of long-familiar boundaries. As an aftermath, many citizens are uncertain as to the districts in which they now reside, and as to the names of their State and National legislators.

To overcome this confusion and to enable our readers to readily communicate with their Senators and Representatives both in Lansing and in the National Capital, the Mellus newspapers today inaugurate a special service.

We might describe it humorously as "an aid to people who want to get something off their chests." At any rate, in a special feature elsewhere on this page will be found a complete list of the State senatorial and representative districts and the congressional districts in the communities within our circulation area.

Also listed are the names of each State senator, State representative, U.S. Senator, and Congressman who represents any part or all of this area. This feature will be kept in type and will be published in our newspapers from time to time as space permits. We urge our readers to clip the directory and file it for handy reference.

We also recommend that they write frequently to their legislative representatives, expressing their views on subjects of interest and importance.

And we further request that our readers mail us copies of their letters for our "Letters to the Editor" columns so that we may let others share their ideas.

Let us all do our best to make this truly a government of and by the people, as well as for the people.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, the single, overriding issue in foreign affairs, has been the worldwide struggle against communism. The United States has poured over $100 billion into its foreign aid programs in this fight. We have fought a major war, the Korean conflict, which we failed to win. We settled for a truce. We are now engaged in another war, in faraway southeast Asia, which we are losing badly.

This desperate struggle has forced the United States to maintain a costly defense establishment, on which we spend some $50 billion a year.

The high cost of foreign aid and maintaining large numbers of troops abroad, has resulted in a steady outflow of gold. Our gold stocks are now so dangerously low that the administration is about to ask the Congress to pass legislation to withdraw the support of gold from our own currency, in order to meet our international obligations.

Despite these tremendous efforts on our part, we are not winning the struggle against communism. In Asia, communism has made tremendous advances, and may well be on the brink of engulfing this whole region.

In Africa, there is daily evidence of growing Communist influence among the new nations there. Communist agitators are appearing all over the continent, and well planned, amply financed Communist activity is ever expanding.

In Latin America, Communist Cuba has become the strongest military power in the hemisphere, outside of the United States, and from this unhappy island a steady flow of Communist terrorists spew out to the rest of the Latin nations, whose mission it is to try to convert and subvert the rest of Latin America to the godless, freedomless society that is communism.

It is plainly evident that if this Nation is to win this struggle against communism, that we must change our tactics and learn and practice new techniques.

I am today introducing a bill, which I firmly believe, is a long step in the right direction of a new approach in meeting communism on far more favorable terms and give us hope of eventually winning against it.

This is the Freedom Academy bill. I hasten to point out that this idea is not mine, but was conceived by Mr. Alan Grant, of Orlando, Fla., some years ago, who has spent a very considerable portion of his life and his energies and his money in seeking a meaningful solution to this struggle with communism.

The Freedom Academy idea is so simple, and to me so plainly sound, that it is hard to see why the Congress does not adopt it forthwith.

This bill would establish a school for the special training of people who would fight this Nation's battles against communism in the cold war spheres.

We have three splendid service academies to train our young men to lead our Armed Forces. We spend large sums to send them to graduate schools for further training.

Since the struggle with communism is largely a cold war, and not a shooting war, why do we not train our people for this kind of conflict also? Our cold war soldiers need to know and understand the Communist philosophy of government and its dedication to world conquest. Especially must they know the methods by which the Communists seek to conquer. They need to know the language and customs of scores of foreign nations where the cold war is being fought, so that Americans can go to these foreign nations and convince their citizens of the friendship of America, and the danger of communism. They need training in as many variety of ways to meet and successfully defeat communism as the mind of freemen can conceive.

We have been like amateurs against professionals in this conflict. The Communists train their people intensively in special schools for work abroad. We do not give our people similar training. Obviously, we are at a disadvantage.

This Nation has all the resources it needs to successfully stem the tide against communism. There are young people in abundance who would welcome the opportunity to meet this challenge. We can put together a superb faculty, equipped with the necessary tools for teaching. All we need to do is to pass the necessary legislation, this Freedom Academy bill, to get this vital project underway.

Now I do not contend that communism will fold its tent and quietly steal away with the founding of a Freedom Academy. I do say that we will have at our disposal another sorely needed weapon to use in this struggle, a means of training highly skilled people who will be far more adequately prepared to lead our Nation and freemen everywhere in this life and death worldwide struggle with Russian and Chinese communism.

Let us delay no longer. Let us pass this legislation.

THE DEATH OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the passing of a man who stands without question as the outstanding world figure of this century.

Sir Winston Churchill played such a vital role in the history of his nation and of the world that his impact will be felt and his name remembered so long as man inhabits this earth.

Sir Winston was a man of such widely varied talents that no one word can be used to describe him. He was a statesman, soldier, writer, orator, lecturer, painter, historian, and humanitarian. He was the very symbol of the British Empire at its best—tough, cocky, stubborn, confident, humorous, and capable.

To us who were privileged to share the stage of world events with Sir Winston, his memory will remain as an enduring monument to the principles in which he believed and for which he fought. Before any other world leader, he recognized and warned of the evils and dangers of Nazi Germany. Two decades ago he foresaw the coming struggle against world communism.

Throughout his long life he was an implacable foe of tyranny in any form, and fought with determination to protect and expand the advances that mankind had made toward freedom and dignity.

The English nation owes him a debt of gratitude that cannot be measured. In the darkest days of World War II, when it seemed that no power on earth could stop the Nazi juggernaut, Sir Winston stood with inflexible courage and confidence. With his incomparable mastery of the English language, he bolstered the sagging hearts of the English people, and gave them new confidence that their empire would continue. When he stated, simply and calmly, "We shall never surrender," Englishmen and free people everywhere took heart. They suddenly knew, somehow, that this man was right; that Britain would not surrender and that the cause of freedom would prevail.

The United States, and the world, share this debt of gratitude to Sir Winston. Without his valiant leadership and courage, who knows what course the war might have taken? Who can tell what course history would have followed had not the inspired English rallied behind Churchill to halt the tide of Nazi victory in time for the United States to join in the battle?

It is indeed fitting, Mr. Speaker, that Sir Winston Churchill was made an honorary citizen of our country. For we can now share with the British Commonwealth the feeling that we have lost one of our own.

During the grim and bleak days when the Royal Air Force singlehandedly stood off Germany's attempt to bomb England into submission, Winston Churchill uttered a phrase which has become a byword of the English language:

> Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to borrow this statement today, and rephrase it to remind the people of the United States that never in the course of human history have so many owed so much to one man.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 8]

Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Betts
Bingham
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Cabell
Cederberg
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Corman
Craley
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Fraser
Gray
Grover
Gubser
Harsha
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
King, Calif.
Landrum
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McCulloch
Macdonald
Martin, Mass.
Miller
Moorhead
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Powell
Pucinski
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Ronan
Roosevelt
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Skubitz
Staggers
Sullivan
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Watkins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wydler
Yates

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 353 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FARM POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 73)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The bounty of the earth is the foundation of our economy.

Progress in every aspect of our Nation's life depends upon the abundant harvest of our farms.

Because 7 percent of our work force can produce our food and fiber, the vast majority of Americans can work at other tasks that make our democracy strong and prosperous.

Because our people eat better at less cost than any other people in all the world's history, we can spend our earnings for the many other things which make life rewarding.

Because we have the means to conquer hunger, we can wage an unconditional war on poverty—and win it.

The farm people of this Nation have made and are continuing to make a lasting contribution to our national prosperity. As a matter of simple justice they should share equitably in this prosperity. They deserve a place of dignity and opportunity.

Farmers want new and expanding markets for their efficient production. Farmers want freedom to grow and prosper, freedom to operate competitively and profitably in our present economic system.

As a nation we are increasingly recognizing that food and agricultural policies affect our entire economy. Sound agricultural policy must give full consideration not only to the role of the producer, but also of the processor, the distributor, the exporter, and the ultimate consumer. This is one major reason for a national investment in agricultural programs.

Farm policy is not something separate. It is part of an overall effort to serve our national interest, at home and around the world.

WHAT WE WANT TO DO

These are the objectives which should guide us:

1. An abundance of food and fiber at reasonable and stable prices for the people of the United States.
2. Effective use of our agricultural resources to promote the interest of the United States and world peace through trade and aid.
3. A workable balance between supply and demand at lower costs to the Government.
4. Opportunity for the efficient family farmer to earn parity of income from farming operations.
5. Parity of opportunity for all rural people, including new opportunity for small farmers.

The gains which we have made in the past 4 years—in raising farm income, in reducing surplus stocks, in promoting new economic opportunity in rural areas—point the direction we should continue to follow.

THE RURAL SCENE

Rural America is the scene of one of the greatest productive triumphs in the history of man. Yet, despite its service to the Nation, rural America is also the scene of wasted human talent, where there are too many people without jobs and too many with only part-time jobs.

Opportunity in rural America will require wise farm programs to support and stabilize the incomes of commercial family farmers. It will require solutions to the problems of small farmers and those who live in the towns and villages of rural America.

Only one of four rural families now lives on a farm. Only 1 out of 10 boys now growing up on farms can expect to earn a good living as a full-time farmer. Most young people in rural areas must go elsewhere to find their opportunities.

I am determined that the farmers who have been efficient and successful in agriculture shall be fairly rewarded for their success. And I am equally determined that the rural community which has sustained the growth of agriculture shall have the chance to broaden its economic base and the range of opportunity which it can offer the children of its families.

To the White House in recent months have come hundreds and thousands of letters from men and women who live in rural America. Their words are eloquent testimony to the changes which are occurring there and to the uncertainty which those changes are causing.

Thirty years ago, over 7 million American families lived on the farm. Today, 3½ million families feed a population that has grown by 50 percent. Enough food is left over to fight hunger among free people all around the globe.

Thirty years ago, a good farm in the Midwest operated with a capital investment of $18,000. Today, nearly $100,000 is needed. In the Southeast, capital requirements rose from $4,500 to $30,000.

Farmers with inadequate resources make up one segment of rural America's great unsolved problem of underemployment. Another is made up of families who have left the farm but have not yet found a place in the nonagricultural

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

sector of the economy. A third consists of families displaced by the decline in the rural-based extractive industries—mining and lumbering.

The rural unemployed and underemployed are largely out of sight. Most of them are hidden in the remote valleys of Appalachia and the Ozarks, on the unpaved side roads of the South, in the once-rich timberlands of the North, on Indian reservations, and in the worn-out mining communities of the West.

The results of opportunity's decline in rural America are reflected in harsh facts:

Lack of a decent life is almost twice as prevalent in rural America as it is in urban America. Only 30 percent of our families live in rural areas, but they include 46 percent of those American families with incomes under $3,000.

Rural America has almost three times the proportion of substandard houses found in urban areas. A fourth of all farm homes and a fifth of rural nonfarm homes are without running water. Over 14,000 rural communities of more than 100 population lack central water supplies.

Rural people lag almost 2 years behind urban residents in educational attainment. They often suffer from a lower quality of education. Per pupil expenditures for elementary and secondary education in rural school districts are substantially below expenditures in urban districts.

Rural communities lag in health facilities. Rural children receive one-third less medical attention than urban children. Their mortality rate is far higher.

These deficiencies feed on one another. They leave too few resources to support eduction, health, and other public services essential to development of the talent, skills, and earning power of the people.

PARITY OF OPPORTUNITY FOR RURAL AMERICA

These facts require a national policy for rural America with parity of opportunity as its goal.

There has been a steady migration from our countryside. In the 1950's more than half of America's rural counties suffered a population loss. But farmers who are handicapped by poor health, age, or lack of skill in any occupation outside of farming and who leave their home communities for want of opportunity often create new problems—for themselves, for the communities they leave, and for the cities which receive them.

When people move away from rural areas, the area suffers. Migration leaves vacant stores, abandoned churches, empty schoolrooms, declining tax bases, and a declining ability to support a minimum level of public service.

This is what we need to have parity of opportunity for rural Americans:

National economic prosperity to increase their employment opportunities;

Full access to education, training, and health services to expand their earning power; and

Economic development of smaller and medium-sized communities to insure a healthy economic base for rural America.

When the rural citizen, his community, business, and government cooperates, the chances for a better rural life increase. Local leadership and initiative are necessary if rural development is to keep pace with the needs of the people. But Government can and should provide information as well as the technical and financial assistance which will speed progress.

Many measures enacted by the Congress in recent years are assisting rural communities in building new opportunities for their citizens. Others I have recommended this year aim at these same objectives.

The Area Redevelopment Act has helped scores of small- and medium-sized communities through loans to new industrial enterprises and loans and grants for needed public facilities. I will soon make recommendations that will urge this act be improved and made permanent.

Under the Economic Opportunity Act, communities will be carrying out programs to provide new opportunity for low-income rural families.

The Department of Agriculture has a wide range of programs to assist in rural economic development—loans for telephone systems, for recreation enterprises, for development of forest resources, for community water systems, and for rural housing. The small watershed and resources conservation and development programs add to business activity in rural areas.

The development of new job opportunities in rural areas has been considerably aided in the past by a strong program of rural electrification. The ability of rural areas to attract and support industrial activities—one of the fundamental solutions to the basic problem of our farm population—rests in very large part upon the availability of electric power. We must and will continue our efforts to enable those areas that do not presently possess an adequate power supply to meet their growing demands and insure that the benefits of industrial diversification are available in rural areas.

Many other activities of the Government are assisting businessmen and farmers to revive dying economies and raise the level of public services in rural areas. These include aid for community facilities, employment services, health and education programs, small business loans, job training, and development of outdoor recreation.

Yet gaps remain between the levels of living in rural America and those of urban America; in income, in education, in housing, in health, and sanitation facilities. Parity of opportunity remains a distant hope for many. It is a challenge we must meet head on.

REACHING OUT TO RURAL AREAS

In my earlier messages to the Congress, particularly those on education and health, I have proposed measures to assist those areas of our country and those families most in need, both urban and rural.

It is not easy to equitably distribute Federal assistance to a scattered rural population. Rural communities often lack the specialized organizations found in major cities which keep informed of development programs and initiate action to make use of them. Special measures must be taken both by the States, and by Federal agencies to reach rural people, particularly in remote areas.

Since it is clear that an administrative office for each Federal agency or program cannot and should not be established in every county, a method must be developed to extend the reach of those Federal agencies and programs which should, but do not now, effectively serve rural areas.

Accordingly, I have asked:

1. Each department and agency administering a program which can benefit rural people to assure that its benefits are distributed equitably between urban and rural areas.

2. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget to review carefully with the head of each department or agency involved, the administrative obstacles which may stand in the way of such equitable distribution. They should propose administrative or legislative steps which can be taken to assure that equity is attained to assure full participation by rural areas.

3. The Secretary of Agriculture to put the facilities of his field offices at the disposal of all Federal agencies to assist them in making their programs effective in rural areas. The Secretary is creating within the Department of Agriculture a Rural Community Development Service, which will have no operating programs of its own but will devote its energies to assisting other agencies in extending their services. I have requested funds in the 1966 budget to finance this service and to strengthen the capacity of the Cooperative Federal-State Extension Service to assist rural communities in forming strong and active development organizations. In the meantime, I recommend that the Congress—

1. Enact legislation to equalize the availability of home mortgage credit in rural areas. This can be done by supplementing the mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration with a rural mortgage insurance program to be administered by the Department of Agriculture. The Department has administered a direct housing loan program since 1949. But an insurance program will enable the Government to assist effectively a far greater volume of home building with a minimum of budget costs. The Federal Housing Administration has initiated action to extend the effectiveness of its insurance programs in areas where private lenders do not now fully utilize its services.

2. Increase the annual limit upon the Department of Agriculture's existing loan insurance program, which insures not only farm ownership loans but loans for community water systems and recreation development.

We have the opportunity now to provide the means by which people in rural towns and on inadequate farms can join the march toward a better life. We must seize this opportunity.

PARITY OF INCOME FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The commodity programs which were initiated 30 years ago in the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt have helped to create a commercially successful agriculture. I propose that these commodity programs be continued and improved.

Over the past 4 years our commodity programs have raised and sustained net farm income at an annual level nearly $1 billion above 1960. Few activities so dramatically indicate the value to farmers of good programs well administered. Yet the consumer is the major beneficiary of farm progress. While retail food prices have risen in recent years, the prices of what the farmer sells have actually declined 15 percent since 1947–49.

Our agricultural abundance has also made possible the food stamp, school lunch, surplus food distribution, and special milk programs. These projects are essential to our needy people and to our schoolchildren.

The skill of our family farmers is not an accident. It is the product of a century of public policy aimed at improvement of our agriculture.

Research and education, credit and conservation, and price stabilization have all served us well. They have benefited all Americans, though they were designed as programs for farmers.

Progress is never free of problems. Agricultural progress has made price and income support programs increasingly necessary and increasingly difficult.

The basic need for farm programs arises from the farmer's economic isolation and his enormous capacity to produce. We have today at least 50 million acres more cropland than is required to produce all of the food and fiber that we can consume plus all we can export. Without programs to guide production, new crop surpluses would be inevitable. Even relatively small surplus can depress prices below cost of production levels.

Independent studies by university economists are unanimous in their basic conclusion: the removal of price and income supports would have a catastrophic effect upon farm income.

For three decades we have had programs which, by one means or another, have sought to achieve a balance between supply and demand. Born in the emergency of the 1930's, they have countered the income-depressing potential of the revolution in agricultural production.

Our farm programs must always be adapted to the requirements of the future. Today they should be focused more precisely on the opportunity for parity of income for America's family farmers and lower Government costs. But we must recognize that farm programs will be necessary as long as advance in agricultural technology continues to outpace the growth of population at home and markets abroad.

We need to change much of our thinking on farm policy. Just as we do in other segments of our economy, we need to separate the social problems of rural America from the economic problems of commercial agriculture. We need to be concerned about both, but the answers to each may be different.

Our programs should—

Provide efficient family farmers an opportunity to earn parity of income;

Assist those small farmers who have little chance to enlarge their operations but whose age, physical handicap, or lack of education prevent their shifting to other employment;

Assist those farm families who seek to enlarge their productive resources in order to obtain a decent living and have the opportunity and capacity to do so.

We must also continue to tie domestic farm policies to our international trade objectives by pricing our products for export at competitive world levels and by relating our production to the longer term demands of world markets.

Our objective must be for the farmer to get improved income out of the marketplace, with less cost to the Government.

To do this, I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture to so utilize the Commodity Credit Corporation as to make the free market system work more effectively for the farmer. We must encourage the private segment of our economy to carry its own inventories, bought from farmers, rather than depending on the Government as a source of supply. We must urge the private sector to perform as many services as possible now performed by Government agencies.

PRICE SUPPORT AND PRODUCTION ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

I recommend to the Congress that the programs now in effect for our major commodities be continued and improved.

These programs can continue to serve our objectives of increased freedom of operation, a steady improvement of incomes, a greater reliance on market forces, and lower Government costs.

Building on present programs, I recommend the following legislation:

WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN

Voluntary feed grain and wheat programs should be extended. Specific recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress which will permit the operation of these programs to be simplified and make it possible for additional crops—particularly soybeans—to be grown as needed on acreage diverted from grains.

Authority should be continued for the Secretary of Agriculture to set price-support levels and to adjust other program features as conditions may require.

COTTON

The cotton program of 1964 should also be extended and improved. It is essential that cotton be competitive with other fibers and in world markets. At the same time we must adopt measures to reduce the cost of this program and the level of stocks. Specific amendments to current legislation will be suggested to accomplish these objectives.

TOBACCO

The tobacco program must also be reappraised this year. Yield increases, higher Government costs, deterioration in quality, and loss of foreign markets have weakened what has been a highly successful program.

Legislation is needed to authorize production and marketing limits on an acreage-poundage basis. Consideration should also be given to revisions in our programs which will make American tobacco more competitive in world markets.

RICE

Consideration should be given to amending the price-support program for rice to support market prices at competitive world levels, and to provide additional supports for producer incomes from the proceeds of marketing certificates.

WOOL

The Wool Act which expires early next year is operating successfully to help stabilize wool production and bolster producer income. I recommend that it be extended with minor amendments which will be transmitted to the Congress.

LIVESTOCK

The sale of meat animals amounts to nearly one-third of all farm income. The stability of this vital phase of our farm economy is based on the continued stability in our feed supply.

We will continue to cooperate with livestock farmers and ranchers so as to maintain a fair price in the marketplace. We will help them to build markets here and abroad, and to preserve fair competition in the marketing of livestock and livestock products, and continue our present measures which will prevent an undue increase in imports.

OTHER COMMODITIES

Continuing study is being given to programs and needs for other agricultural commodities and appropriate changes and recommendations will be made as circumstances may require.

TRANSFER OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

I recommend that acreage allotments and bases under the several production adjustment programs be made transferable by lease or sale to family farmers in the same State.

This will permit some small farmers to expand their acreage. Others who no longer wish to farm can add to their incomes by leasing or selling their allotments.

LONG-RANGE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

The annual acreage diversion and acreage allotment programs now in effect should be supplemented by a long-term cropland adjustment program.

I recommend to the Congress a program which will reduce the cost of our production adjustment efforts, assist landowners in turning their land to nonagricultural uses such as recreation and to forestry, and assist small farmers who want to do other work while remaining in their communities. The proportion of land which could be covered by this program in any area should be limited to protect our communities.

Agriculture's excess production capacity is a longrun problem. A long-term land use program can achieve a large part of the needed adjustment more effectively and with greater benefits than annual diversion programs.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This program will reduce the annual cost of other programs by more than its own cost. It will provide enduring benefits not realized under present programs.

The purposes of the cropland adjustment program will be served if much of the land is permanently removed from production. Every reason exists, therefore, for applying a contribution from this program to the cost of public purchases of cropland for recreation, for enhancement of natural beauty, for prevention of air and water pollution, or for open space purposes.

I recommend that the authorizing legislation permit funds appropriated for cropland adjustment to be used to augment moneys raised by States and local governments and those which are provided by the Federal Government through the land and water conservation fund and other programs for public land acquisition.

RESERVE STOCKS

It is time to consider our requirements for agricultural commodities in a reserve for national security, for emergency relief purposes, and for domestic economic stabilization.

The President should be authorized to determine the levels of commodity stocks required and to take actions to insulate these stocks from the market so that they might be preserved for time of emergencies.

The costs incurred in maintaining that part of our commodity stocks designated as reserves should be separated from the cost of farm price and income support programs. The Commodity Credit Corporation would continue to manage the stocks in conjunction with price support operations.

AGRICULTURE TRADE

The welfare of American agriculture is closely linked to foreign trade. Our 1968 goal of $6 billion farm product exports was reached in 1964. American farmers last year accounted for one-fourth of U.S. merchandise exports.

These exports have strengthened farm prices, brought additional business income, reduced our surpluses and storage costs, and have helped our international balance of payments. Abroad, they have contributed to political stability and economic progress.

We are not content with the gains we have made in world markets. We expect to make additional gains by improving the means by which we can be competitive in price, in quality, in service to our customers. We will merchandise our products actively, but with full regard to rules of commercial conduct between friendly nations.

In the trade negotiations underway in Geneva, we shall make every effort to achieve liberalization in agricultural as well as industrial products.

WORLD PROGRESS AND PEACE

The food-for peace program is good international policy and it is sound economic policy. Food is a powerful weapon for peace. People who are hungry are weak allies of freedom. Men with empty stomachs do not reason together.

We broadened the food-for-peace program last year and are continuing to study ways to broaden it further. Food shipments under this program help to expand it by building food habits which increase the demand for U.S. products. As the economies of recipient countries are strengthened through American aid, we are able to shift from outright grants of food to concessional sales for foreign currencies and later to sales for dollars.

Foreign currencies accruing from the sales of commodities under the food-for-peace program have also provided funds for a worldwide market development program, which has played a significant role in bringing about the dramatic increases in commercial farm exports.

This same program has also strengthened growing economies, contributed to rising standards of living, promoted international stability, and literally saved lives in many less developed countries. Our agricultural resources are thus making a significant contribution to the prospects for peace in the world.

These contributions must continue. They will be increasingly directed toward assisting agricultural development in less developed, densely populated countries, thus fostering overall economic growth, higher living standards and better nutrition. The disturbing downward trends in food output per person in both Asia and Latin America in recent years must be reversed. And these trends can be arrested and reversed only by a massive mobilization of resources in both the food-deficit countries and the advanced countries of the industrial West.

As I pointed out in my message on foreign aid, we must use both our agricultural abundance and our technical skills in agriculture to assist the developing nations to stand on their own feet. Under our assistance programs we will make full use of the agricultural know-how in the Department of Agriculture and in the land-grant colleges and State universities. We will enlist the support and cooperation of private agencies and enterprises of all kinds.

To make this food aid most effective, we plan to gear our food-for-peace programs more specifically to the needs of recipient countries and their economic development programs. We may need more flexibility to assure proper nutritional balance in these programs, particularly as they relate to child feeding.

I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture and others concerned to study and recommend changes in agricultural policy that may be needed to accomplish these goals.

COMMISSION ON U.S. FOOD AND FIBER POLICY

All Americans have shared in the fruits of an efficient agriculture. All Americans share also the problems we face in the farm economy and in rural America in the years ahead.

Accordingly, to assist in adapting our farm programs to the needs of tomorrow, and in making rural America a full partner in our national economic progress, I intend to conduct a fundamental examination of the entire agriculture policy of the United States. I will reorganize the National Agricultural Advisory Commission—which has made an invaluable contribution in years past—into a new Commission on Food and Fiber. It will be broadly representative of rural communities, consumers, producers, industry, Government, and the public. I expect it to make a detailed study of our food and fiber policies and to bring additional viewpoints to bear on the place of rural America.

There are other parts of our agriculture which merit the support of Congress and the attention of all Americans. Conservation of agricultural land is making a contribution to the beauty and the development of our Nation. It can help even more as we attack pollution of our streams and the defacement of our landscape. Research and education must continue to speed our progress in agriculture, to insure the protection of consumers, and to make full opportunity more than a distant hope.

We must win the battle for a better diet. At the same time we must increase the demand for farm products. If the income of all low-income families were brought up to the $3,000 annual level, per capita consumption of all food would rise by 2 percent. Meat consumption among these low-income families would rise by 15 to 20 percent; poultry by 10 to 15 percent; milk products by about 7 percent and fresh fruits and vegetables by 15 to 20 percent.

The Congress has repeatedly enacted legislation to encourage farmers to improve their economic position through cooperatives. This encouragement and assistance will be carried out, in terms of both the letter and the spirit of the law.

The task of achieving a life of quality and dignity in rural as well as in urban America is one that will engage our minds and hearts and our energies for a lifetime.

We begin with the conviction that this is a goal which is right. We go forward with the knowledge that the unparalleled harvest of today's rural America has been achieved because our ancestors said this, too, was a reasonable goal.

The path we follow may be long. But I am as certain of eventual success as was President Abraham Lincoln when he founded the Department of Agriculture a century ago and thus started us on the path to abundance.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 4, 1965.*

THE PRESIDENT'S AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a great message from the President of the United States, setting five goals and objectives of this administration, with which I concur. I doubt if there is any area of disagreement as to the objectives, though as is usually the case, there might be some difference of opinion as to the procedure which should be followed in attaining these goals.

Frankly, I was apprehensive as to the recommendations that the President might make in his farm message, especially in view of statements made recently by the Director of the Budget. In the light of my interpretation of what the President has said and the assurance he has given, indicating his desire to extend to the rural population the "parity of opportunity" enjoyed by other segments of our society, I am encouraged to believe that the recommendations for legislation which will come from the Secretary of Agriculture, will reflect this recognition of the "farm problem" and the President's desire to secure for the farmer "an improved income out of the marketplace, with less cost to the Government."

Representing that area which grows all of the cotton that is produced in the State of Missouri, I am naturally interested in the future of this crop, along with the other commodities produced in the 10th District of Missouri. I am pleased that the President recognizes the importance of cotton and has recommended that along with other basic crops, "the cotton program of 1964 should also be extended and improved," and I could not agree more with his conclusion that, "it is essential that cotton be competitive with other fibers and in world markets." It has been disappointing to all of us that surpluses have increased during this past season, due in no small measure to our inability to meet the goals which had been set in export sales, and it is my hope that the specific amendments to current legislation which will be suggested, will include a more aggressive and a more effective policy to insure increased export sales. Specifically, it would appear that this could be possible through the adoption of a policy, implemented by legislation, to include "fiber" in any "food for peace" program, making it a "food and fiber for peace" program. Further, by insisting on the substitution of both food and fiber, for dollars, insofar as practicable and possible, and certainly to use every precautionary measure to insure that none of the dollars contributed or advanced in any aid program, be used by any recipient country in the purchase of agricultural commodities, which the United States has in abundance, from any other nation.

As this Representative has pointed out on many occasions in the past, in some of our various assistance programs, where this Nation has contributed hard-earned taxpayers' dollars, these same dollars have been used in the purchase of agricultural commodities from other nations, particularly wheat, when the United States had such commodities in great abundance. These commodities could have been given in lieu of dollars.

This Representative views with some alarm and apprehension the recommendation that acreage allotments be made transferable by lease or sale to family farmers in the same State, since this would permit the transfer or sale of allotments from low yield or marginal operation areas to areas of heavy yields, thereby increasing surpluses. By limiting such transfer or sales within the same county, would still permit small farmers to expand their acreage. It might be well also to consider outright sale of acreage allotments to the Government, thereby compensating the small, marginal operator over a period of years, but permitting the allotment so acquired to be held in a special reserve. This would serve to reduce production, at the same time benefiting the small farmer during a period of readjustment. There is the same basic reason for prohibiting the transfer of acreage allotments from outside the county, or production area, that there is for prohibiting the transfer of acreage allotments across State lines.

President Johnson is to be applauded for pointing out in this message and emphasizing the oft-overlooked fact that all Americans have benefited from the wide variety of programs, directly chargeable to the agricultural appropriation, while the consumer has been the major beneficiary of farm progress. It has been estimated, and I believe correctly, that not less than two-thirds of the agriculture budget is spent on programs which benefit persons other than those directly engaged in the production of our food and fiber. I am referring, of course, to the food stamp program, school lunch, surplus food distribution, meat and poultry inspection, food for peace and other foreign aid programs, subsidized sales to the Armed Forces at home and abroad, and so forth. While some 30 years ago, many were disturbed by the prediction that our expanding population would in the foreseeable future tax the agriculture production of the United States and that by the end of the century this Nation would be unable to produce the food necessary to feed its own people, we now find ourselves in the position so dramatically described by our President when he said, "We have today at least 50 million acres more cropland than is required to produce all of the food and fiber that we can consume plus all we can export."

No one can charge the American farmer with inefficiency. He has been the victim of his own resourcefulness, his initiative, his hard work, and his capacity to implement the advanced technology through which production records continue to be shattered year after year. Again, as the President stated, "The skill of our family farmers is not an accident. It is the product of a century of public policy aimed at improvement of our agriculture." The American farmer has earned the esteem and respect of his fellow countrymen, and we cannot forsake him at this crucial period in our history.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, numerous Americans have expressed concern in recent weeks and months about what was rumored to be the President's agricultural policy. Today the President has spoken and, as those of us who know the President's deep concern for rural America expected, there was no reason to fear his views or his program.

Repeatedly during the campaign of last year, our great President told us of his concern for rural America. He promised that one of the main goals of his administration would be to work for elimination of rural poverty and the adoption of farm programs which would enable the farmer to receive his fair share of our Nation's economic abundance.

Now, in his message to the Congress today, our President has set forth the policy to carry out his goals. It deserves, and will receive, careful study by the Congress. But a first appraisal of the President's statements and recommendations is most encouraging to me.

In speaking of commodity programs, which have helped to create the world's finest agricultural system, the President said, "I propose that these programs be continued and improved." This statement is repeated again later in his message. For those who have expressed fear in recent days, these words should be a source of encouragement.

The President has proposed the extension of the wheat program. I applaud him for this because the wheat program has brought increased income to our wheat farmers. It has reduced further our surpluses of wheat and it has held prices stable for our consumers. It has been popular in the wheat-growing areas of the country. I know because I have heard from the people in these areas and they want to see these programs continued.

The President has not set forth all details of the program in its continuation and he has thereby given us in the Congress a chance to work with the administration in trying to strengthen this program and to improve it as we continue it for future years.

I command the President for his outstanding message and I know that agriculture, rural America, and the Nation as a whole will benefit from his proposals and recommendations.

The policy set forth in this message indeed justifies the faith and confidence in President Johnson which rural America expressed last November 3. With the President's support, we can now proceed to tackle the complex and significant legislative problems which face us in the field of agriculture.

Equally as important, however, is the President's expressed concern for the future well-being of all rural Americans. His message today outlines the needs of these citizens. While they represent an ever-decreasing minority in this country, our citizens in rural areas are vital to both our economic and cultural well-being.

I am sure that my colleagues who represent primarily urban areas will study this message closely, and that they will approach with an open mind the needs of rural America, just as those Representatives from rural areas have always been sympathetic to the needs of their neighbors in the cities, and will continue to be.

I come from a district which is essentially rural. I find in this message so

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

much that will be of benefit to my constituents but when my constituents benefit, all citizens in the country benefit because the strength of rural America is vital to the strength of all our people and food is one of our basic necessities.

This is a time for all Americans to pull together for the needs of all other Americans. Our President's programs have this as their primary goal. His compassion and desire to serve humanity should be the guide for each of us.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President has stated that the National Agricultural Advisory Commission has made an invaluable contribution over past years, and he has called for broadening the duties of this Commission under a broader membership and a more significant name—Commission on U.S. Food and Fiber Policy. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the outstanding men who have served on the National Agricultural Advisory Commission for their wonderful performance during the years since the National Agricultural Advisory Commission was formed. This Commission was organized under a Republican administration and continued under Democratic administrations. From the start, it has been a bipartisan Commission. Its principal criteria for membership was outstanding ability and close association with farm problems of this country. Because of its bipartisan nature and because of the outstanding men who have served on the Commission, it continued to give invaluable advice for more than 10 years.

This Commission has done more than give oral advice. It has written penetrating reports on some of our toughest agricultural problems. The recommendations of these reports have gone far in helping us to develop sound agricultural programs. However, we now need advice not only on farm programs but upon the various aspects of our society which are linked to farm programs—some in a direct manner and some in a not so direct manner. The President is most perceptive in recommending a broadening of the membership and responsibilities of this Commission.

I am sure that the spirit which has prevailed in this Commission during its entire history will continue and it will continue to consist of men of outstanding ability who are chosen because of their intimate knowledge of the problems we are likely to face.

I commend the President for continuing and expanding this valuable advisory group.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the President's recognition of the valuable work of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission and his request for an expansion of its responsibilities are indeed welcomed. All of us are acquainted with the outstanding work of this group of men as shown in their reports, some of which are: "The Family Farm in American Agriculture," "Food and Fiber Reserves for National Security," and "Farm Policy in the Years Ahead." Despite this valuable work, the President recognizes that even broader problems face those who will be concerned with agriculture in the future. These include the problems of nonfarm rural communities, the problems of industry dependent upon agriculture—some as consumers of farm products and some as producers of farm equipment and supplies—the problems of ultimate consumers who are fed by our marvelously efficient agricultural plant; and, of course, the interests of the public, which includes all of us.

With a broadened charter, the Commission on Food and Fiber Policy will become even more of a blue-ribbon Commission than the National Agricultural Advisory Commission was in the past. I hope that many of the members of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission who have done such outstanding work in the past will continue to serve on the new Commission and I hope that those who will be appointed will complement the abilities of those who are reappointed. The advice of this new Commission should go far toward helping us on our knotty farm problems and toward helping us solve the problems of the nonfarm segment of our rural communities. The importance of this Commission cannot be overestimated.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the President's message on agriculture and I believe that he has indicated that once again his interest in agriculture, his knowledge of agriculture, and his understanding of the problems that those who live in rural America today are faced with.

I was particularly interested to read and study his proposals for the various commodity programs.

First, I was pleased to see his recommendation that we continue the commodity programs which are currently in existence. Although I realize that these programs are not perfect, nor do they do all that each of us desire, they have proved valuable to agriculture during the last 4 years. The net income of the farmers is up, our surpluses, generally, are down, and our consumers have a stable supply of food at the lowest cost to them in history.

I was happy to see the President's recommendation to continue the cotton program which we passed last year. The cotton industry of this country, from grower to processor, was in a difficult state previous to the passage of the program last year.

Now the grower can plan on a reasonable and stable income; those in the cotton trade can make their plans based on a program that can be understood; and those who process cotton in the mills can offer competition to foreign producers.

Cotton was on its back last year. Cotton is now rising to its knees under this program to take its place again as an important and stable industry in this country. The President's recommendation to extend and improve the program is an important contribution to strengthening the cotton industry. I congratulate him on this proposal in the agricultural message.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the President has requested authority to accumulate reserve stocks of agricultural commodities. These reserves should not be considered as reserves exclusively for national defense. They are reserves to meet civilian emergencies, such as flood, fire, or more massive disasters like the Alaskan earthquake and they are reserves to prevent inflation in the event of weather disasters or other natural disasters.

Our wonderfully efficient agricultural plant has provided us with stocks of many commodities which can be used to start this wonderful reserve. Furthermore, this start can be accomplished without the outlay of any money to acquire such insurance. We have the stocks of wheat; we have the stocks of feed grains; and we have the stocks of cotton which would be needed to meet any conceivable reserve needs. We have some stocks of other commodities, but in the nature of farming, larger accumulations of many of these commodities will occur sooner or later. When this happens, we can fill our remaining reserve needs.

We only have to look at the famine-ridden countries of the world to realize the value of the reserves produced by our Nation's farmers. All of us have read in the paper about food riots in India. Adequate stocks of grain would have prevented such a disaster. All of us recall the horror of the Alaskan earthquake last year. We have no worries about starvation here even with such a monstrous disaster because of our agricultural production. The recommendation of the President is welcomed as a deliberate policy to insure ourselves against disasters caused by a shortage of farm products.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the President's farm message shows great understanding of the many complex problems of rural America. Rural America, as the President pointed out, is home to 30 percent of our Nation's population. The first sentence of the message is challenging enough to stir the interest of everyone. It reads:

> The bounty of the earth is the foundation of our economy.

For 30 percent of our citizens, it is this knowledge that causes them to be concerned with the level of farm income. The full text of the message graphically portrays to that portion of our society that does not live on our farms and in our small towns that their lives are greatly affected by the conditions and capacities of rural America. I am sure a greater appreciation will result of the scope and magnitude of the problems we must deal with.

The President expressed clearly his desire to lead in presenting programs for congressional action. It is now the duty of the Congress to aid in seeking the specific actions necessary to improve farm income and enhance life in rural America. The message ended the concern of recent weeks that those who have no real understanding of agriculture's problems would find expression. Though there are many areas that need expanding and some that need to be included by congressional action, I am especially pleased that the President has recommended reserves of farm commodities for national security and emergency relief purposes. The accumulation of such reserves would insure against the effects of disaster. They are not reserves to be used in normal times.

I recall clearly the great shortage of grains which developed at the end of World War II. The United States was the world's breadbasket, and without our large stocks of grains, many people of the world would have died of starvation. Our large stocks have caused many problems, but in times of disaster they are a wonderful asset.

More recently, I recall a plea from India to the United States for additional grain to feed her teeming millions. Because our production of food grains was so efficient and because we had large stocks of such grains, we were able to step in and bridge the gap between India's needs and her grain output.

Domestic disaster also calls for the use of reserve stocks. Many of us can remember the floods of the mighty Mississippi or the Alaskan earthquake. Who knows where food and fiber reserves will be needed next?

We should not put ourselves in the position of being short of agricultural commodities to meet emergency needs. I commend the President for his courage in requesting authority to hold reserves in order to fight disaster.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREIGG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message reaffirms his faith in rural America. In so doing, he has reaffirmed his faith in the future of all America.

Of utmost importance is the President's recommendation that the voluntary feed-grains program must be continued. In addition to this program, a careful evaluation of all programs affecting our agricultural economy is in evidence in the message. As we recognize the complexities of our agricultural economy, I applaud the President's intention, to conduct a fundamental examination of the entire agricultural policy of the United States.

The future of our free society depends, to a large degree, on the stewardship of the soil. As I analyze this measure, it is far more than just a farm message—it is a national message.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message to the Congress on agriculture embodies the greatest and the most promising breakthrough for rural America in modern times.

The President's message is very encouraging for the entire feed-grains economy. His message not only embodies recommendations for the improvement of the feed-grains program, but for improvement of the related cattle and sheep industries as well. This message is directly designed to encourage and strengthen the family farm. I consider the inclusion of the national defense food reserve program a vital addition to our existing agricultural policies.

This message assures that the full weight of the leadership of President Johnson will be exercised in the behalf of those of us in the Congress who are seeking sound agricultural legislation. All in the Middle West owe President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY a debt of gratitude for their efforts in insuring that the needs of the feed-grains economy will be met.

The President's message puts to rest the widely circulated notion that this administration would be a party to a program that would drive more agricultural producers from the land. I particularly applaud the President's recommendation that the feed-grains program be continued and strengthened, his request for creation of a national food reserve, and his emphasis on export trade and the food-for-peace program. The recommendation of a Commission on Food and Fiber is not only fitting recognition of the great service that agriculture has provided all Americans, but is a recognition of the fact that our whole national economy is dependent upon a strong agricultural sector. Finally, it is most encouraging that the President's message included the recommendation of a concerted effort to combat water pollution to preserve for future generations our abundant and beautiful natural resources.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of one of the most farm oriented districts in the United States, I feel impelled to comment on the farm message of President Johnson.

This is in my judgment the best farm program advanced in several years. I was particularly pleased to see the concern for the small farmer expressed by the administration. Contrary to many rumors that were abroad about the plan of the administration to turn its back on the problems of agriculture, I feel the administration has placed before the American people the role of agriculture in its true perspective when it recognized that, "Progress in every aspect of our Nation's life depends upon the abundant harvest of our farms."

The request of the President for a strengthened parity program heartens all of us who have been working for an increased share of the national income for the farmer.

This program has, in my judgment, put to rest the charge that the administration wants to eliminate all but 1 million farmers. From what has been presented here, it is quite evident there is no desire nor plan to force persons off the farm by economic attrition. Rather there is a deep concern that those who have served as stewards of the soil for so long, be given a helping hand when necessity requires it.

I am particularly pleased with the proposals concerning the voluntary feed grain program and the provisions made on beef imports. I feel confident it is a program that the new Democratic Congressmen from the Midwest can support.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BANDSTRA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I am very pleased with President Johnson's message on agriculture and rural development, which was delivered to the Congress Thursday. It offers a realistic approach to drafting agricultural legislation that will serve the interests of all America, both urban and rural.

The President's message clearly demonstrates that he understands the difficult problems confronting rural America. It demonstrates that he is firmly committed to the task of solving them. I sincerely hope the President receives the support of all the Congress in that task.

I want to specifically emphasize two important points the President made in his message:

First, that poverty is a rural, as well as an urban problem.

> The rural unemployed and underemployed are largely out of sight—

The President said. But they are there, nevertheless, and I hope the Congress will enact the sort of legislation proposed by the President that will make the war on poverty a truly effective force in rural America.

Second, that the farm commodity programs are valuable and should be—in the President's words—"continued and improved." Some critics have suggested that these programs are too expensive. But the only valid test of any Government program is not whether it costs money but whether it accomplishes the purposes for which it is intended.

Last September, for example, the Library of Congress reported that for each $100 of net Commodity Credit Corporation expenditure on price support and acreage diversion programs in 1961, 1962, and 1963, farm income was increased $236. And if there had been no price supports during those 3 years, the report added, it would have resulted in an annual loss in farm income of some $6 billion, as well as annual losses of several billion dollars in farm real estate values.

As a Representative from Iowa, a State where both the rural and urban economy is heavily dependent on corn production, I was particularly happy to read this portion of the President's message:

> Voluntary feed grain and wheat programs should be extended. Specific recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress which will permit the operation of these programs to be simplified and make it possible for additional crops—particularly soybeans—to be grown as needed on acreage diverted from grains.
>
> Authority should be continued for the Secretary of Agriculture to set price support levels and to adjust other program features as conditions may require.

The feed grains program has been a success. It is essential for Iowa, and for the other States that have benefited from its operation, that the feed grains program be continued. But there is always room for improvement, and I endorse the President's recommendation.

Allowing farmers to raise soybeans on some of the land diverted from feed grain production should add flexibility to the program, reduce the overall cost to the Government, and increase farm income for those participating in the program.

Moreover, by increasing soybean production, the change should bolster America's farm export position. There is now a heavy demand abroad for soybeans and it is estimated that the United States will need at least 200 million bushels for export this year, if it is to maintain its competitive position in the world market. And, as the President pointed out in his message yesterday, the welfare of American agriculture is linked closely to foreign trade.

The Congress still has before it the job of enacting specific legislation in specific areas of agriculture. That will not be an easy task. But the general philosophy of the President's message is a most encouraging point from which to begin.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on agriculture outlined a program which is broad in purview, yet sensitive to the needs of the individual farmer and the specific problems of rural America. The message puts in proper perspective the invaluable role of agriculture in the national economy and should serve to repudiate any suggestion that this administration is only interested in a fraction of American farm families. It represents instead a rededication to our goals of preserving the family farm and expanding opportunities throughout our rural areas.

I am particularly gratified that any doubts about renewing the successful feed grains program were resolved with the President's recommendation that it be extended and improved. Since its inception this valuable program has contributed substantially both to farm income and the reduction in surplus production of these commodities.

The President has properly emphasized the correlative nature and the mutual interdependency of agricultural policy and our trade and foreign policy objectives. We must pledge ourselves to continued efforts to develop world markets for our agricultural abundance, and to the wise use of that abundance through the food-for-peace program as an effective step toward our goals of economic security and political stability throughout the world.

While enacting programs to assist economic development in rural areas, we have too often overlooked the necessity of providing for their implementation and initiation in the vitally affected areas. I, therefore, am extremely pleased with the President's request that the Secretary of Agriculture create a Rural Community Development Service to aid other Government agencies in making their services more readily available in rural areas. I have previously discussed this problem with the Secretary and officials in the Department of Agriculture with a view toward the establishment of an office to consult with representatives of rural areas and coordinate Government programs so as to better assist them in realizing the full benefits of existing programs to revitalize and preserve small towns. I hope that we may assist in any appropriate manner the valuable functions of this proposed office.

I also wish to offer my support for the President's proposal for creating reserve stocks of agricultural commodities. This will insure an adequate reserve of vital agricultural commodities to satisfy national security and emergency needs while at the same time properly separating the cost of this critical program from that of farm price and income support programs.

The message clearly indicates that it is the policy of this administration to insure freedom of choice and opportunity for rural Americans and not an impersonal and insensitive program of economic attrition and disaster to drive people from the land. As a communication of challenge, and yet of hope, it establishes an appropriate basis for congressional review of our agricultural policy.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CALLAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the message on agriculture by the President will give confidence not only to farmers but to the whole agricultural community.

One of the most significant paragraphs in the message is the one which reads:

> Farm policy is not something separate. It is a part of an overall effort to serve our national interest at home and around the world.

If the Congress will attack the problems of agriculture with this philosophy, then farm legislation can be written which will be indeed in the best interest of not only the American farmer but every segment of the national economy.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's longstanding concern for rural America is reflected in his message on agriculture. I feel certain, moreover, that the President requested and received invaluable counsel from another friend of agriculture, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Those of us from rural areas are reassured by the message, which places in perspective the vital role of agriculture in the national economy. As a Representative of North Dakota, I am particularly pleased by the emphasis on continuing and improving the wheat and feed grain programs.

I realize, of course, that the message necessarily sets forth general concepts and that exhaustive work remains in filling in the details, but the message provides a good framework with which to begin.

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, no problem is born big. It reaches the acute, dangerous state because we are unaware of its evolution or choose to ignore it. Neither reason can be justified by men of responsibility.

The recognition of the problem is necessarily the first barrier to be broken down. In many instances it is the major barrier.

What I am discussing today was officially recognized and described in broad outline little more than 3 months ago. At that particular time there was a more immediate problem facing our constituents and the Members of this Chamber. This overshadowed the significance and importance of the report made by the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

In the report it was pointed out 15 percent of the total Federal budget is directed toward the Government's research and development needs. An expenditure of this size cannot help but have a marked influence upon the course of events. It has a direct influence on the expansion of the body of knowledge and the development of new products. It has a major effect on the ebb and flow of scientific and technical manpower between sections of the country. It is playing an increasingly important role in the economy of the various sections of the Nation. These influences will not wane in this century—nor are they likely to in the next century.

The increase in knowledge, the development of new products, more efficient and economical processes are to be desired and sought after. But all of this is not taking place without some undesired and widespread side effects.

One of these side effects has been described by Dr. Elvis Stahr as a "brain drain." Dr. Stahr, a former Secretary of the Army and now president of Indiana University, is not talking about a surgical technique. He is pointing to the migration of vitally important manpower between different sections of the Nation. The prognosis for the areas suffering this "brain drain" is not critical at this time. The deterioration to such a point can take many years. But to ignore treating the symptoms now can only aggravate the condition and speed up the decline.

The Middle West is a major producer of scientific and engineering talent. During the decade of the fifties the major universities in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin produced about one-third of all the doctorate degrees in the biological sciences and engineering. The same institutions awarded roughly one-fourth of all the doctorate degrees in the physical sciences and mathematics. But despite these numbers this reservoir of talent—of intellect—is being drained away by those sections of the country which have benefited most by the sudden expansion of Government research and development funds. This expansion of funds has ballooned from less than 1 percent of the Federal budget 20 years ago to 15 percent today.

The expansion of knowledge stimulates industrial growth. The demand for more scientists and engineers with advanced degrees pyramids. This is in turn translated into greater demands for expansion of graduate study facilities and a corresponding increase in graduate school faculties.

Here we find the universities caught in a pressure squeeze. It becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the proper ratio between teacher and graduate student enrollment. There is the vital need for the maintenance and expansion of research programs. The potential faculty member faces a choice between the university and industry. He can have a combination of both offered in those sections of the Nation blessed with a heavy concentration of research and development fund allocations.

The Middle West has not been standing still. Indiana University, for example, is now spending almost six times as much money in its research programs as it did just 10 years ago. The other great universities of this area can point to similar tremendous increases in research. But still the competition for their homegrown talent continues at a furious pace as the concentration of Government research and development funds in other areas is increased.

My remarks up to now have been concerned with the effect of ratio of research and development fund allocations upon the educational field. I now want to discuss briefly another side effect which could assume tremendous proportions in the decades ahead. This is the effect of such activity on the basic economies of various sections of the country.

A recent report issued by the Department of Commerce describes a similar geographical pattern. In this case it is concerned with changes in the relative shares of personal income that each region of the Nation receives.

This analysis reveals a significant geographical redistribution of income over the postwar years. The southern and western regions have increased their share of the national total of personal income by 15 percent while the northeastern and central sections have recorded a decline of the same amount.

Three growth components were considered in this analysis. The first is the overall growth of our national economy. If all regional characteristics had remained the same there would have, naturally, been no redistribution recorded. Two other factors provide the key for the change. One is the factor of industry mix and the other is the regional shifts within individual industries.

In the industry-mix factor each industry's national growth rate is measured against the national all-industry growth rate. This provides the composition of rapid and slow growth industries within a particular area.

The regional shift factor measures the rate of growth of a particular industry in a particular area against the industry's national growth rate. The declines in the share of participation income received in New England, the Mideast, and the Great Lakes region have taken place because four-fifths of their industries suffered reductions in their share of corresponding industry national totals.

I think it can be considered significant that those sections of the Nation which have shown increases in income are the same areas which have received the major share of Government research and development funds.

I do not maintain the geographic distribution of such funds is the only—or even the major reason—for rapid growth in one area. Nor do I imply a smaller share of such funds is the major reason for a slowing down in the rate of growth in another area.

But I do maintain it is having an effect and it is a subject which requires the most serious consideration and study.

I believe it is imperative we attain a better adjustment between the immediate goals of research and development and the long term goal of establishing a broadened national competence in research and development. I am convinced such a move will go far toward correcting the imbalance which is developing between regions.

We are facing a fundamental problem which can create weak links in the chain of our national economy. It is not yet a big problem. It can become one. The time to begin corrective action is now. It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to expand on this subject in the immediate future with specific recommendations.

FSLA LOANS FOR HOUSEHOLD GOODS AND FURNISHINGS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced H.R. 4289 to authorize Federal savings and loan associations to make loans for major household durable goods and furnishings.

These items of property physically constitute a home as much as the outside structure of shelter. Since the lending institutions have already determined such vital information as the borrowers credit and repayment record, they are readily equipped to extend further credit for home furnishings.

The enactment of this legislation should result in lower interest charges for this type of lending for the benefit of the homeowner and the consumer.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT WITH REFERENCE TO AID TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the majority of my colleagues for voting to cut off any further aid to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480.

Circumstances compelled me to be in Arizona on January 26, 1965, when this

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

vital matter came before the House for consideration. Had I been here, however, I would have voted to end this self-defeating, degrading policy of aiding a cynical and dangerous foreign power.

President Nasser has at last been made to clearly understand that he cannot continue to slap the face of America with one hand and at the same time accept its bounty with the other.

Perhaps the other body will not concur in the action taken by the House. Yet, even so, the world now knows that the patience of Americans is wearing thin. There is much we will endure in the cause of peace, but all too many nations have confused tolerance with weakness. We are setting the record straight.

VA CLOSURES ARE NOT IRREVOCABLE

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the other body was successful in placing a rider on the supplemental agricultural appropriations bill prohibiting expenditure of funds to implement recent directives by the Veterans' Administration closing 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals and 4 domiciliaries in all parts of the United States. Within a short time House conferees will have to decide whether to agree with or recede from this particular amendment to the bill.

Assent to the rider sponsored by the Senators from South Dakota and New Mexico is not the only way this House can express dissatisfaction with decisions announced on that black 13th of January 1965. But it is one of the most effective ways to do so under the circumstances at hand. The rider is not only timely, but it serves as a sharp reprimand to the Veterans' Administration for the highhanded manner in which they made and announced their hurried decision.

The other body has presented those of us in the House who are concerned about the closing of 32 VA facilities a rare opportunity to make it crystal clear to the new Administrator and his associates the feelings of the House on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, my present remarks are not directed solely to those Members whose districts are affected by the proposed closing of facilities. Of course those Members who have suffered a loss of a VA facility should emphasize the importance of this amendment to the conferees. But every other Member of the House who believes that there should not be a reduction or impairment of adequate services to our veteran population should also be interested in sustaining the action of the other body.

I respectfully urge the House conferees to accept and agree to the rider, notwithstanding any points of order that will undoubtedly be evoked. Further implementation of the VA's highly questionable decision should be brought to a grinding halt—or as they say in some parts of the country, to a "sliding whoa"—until both Houses of Congress have conducted complete and thorough investigations of the whole affair.

The capable and distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has promised such an investigation. Adoption of the rider attached by the other body will insure that hearings do not become polite tea parties which take up a lot of time in fruitless discussion. Let us not be party to any thinking that the decision is irrevocable.

LONG-RANGE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President's statement in his farm message that "farmers want freedom to grow and prosper, freedom to operate competitively and profitably in our present economic system," but I doubt that he could convince many American farmers that they have that kind of freedom today under his wheat, feed grains, cotton, and tobacco programs.

Our farmers could, however, have the freedom that the President says he wants for them by enacting the farm bill I am introducing today.

I have long advocated the adoption of a long-range cropland adjustment program, and I am pleased to learn that the President is now supporting such an approach to our farm problems. Such a program is included in my bill, and I shall do all that I can to see that such a plan is adopted. However, the President fails to recommend corrective legislation necessary to return the freedom to the farmers producing crops that he says they should have. My bill does this. I would, for example, eliminate all marketing quotas and allotment programs for wheat and feed grains and give the farmer the freedom to plant on his own land what he wants without fear of penalty. A floor—rather than a ceiling—of the average world market price during the preceding 3 years would be available to all wheat producers and our feed grains would have a floor of not less than 90 percent of the average price received by farmers during the last 3 years. The sale of CCC stocks at less than 125 percent of the prevailing support levels plus reasonable carrying charges would be prohibited. A program patterned after these guidelines would give our farmers the freedom they want and the freedom the President has referred to in his message.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. Yes. I will be very pleased to yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman on his statement and speak in support of the legislation he has introduced. To me it is a very potent measure which is now before the Committee on Agriculture. It is apparent from the President's statement that he has expressed an interest at least in a part of this proposal, and I join the gentleman in hoping that he will adopt the entire proposal.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I need not point out to the Members of the House that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], is a member of our Committee on Agriculture and is one of its most respected members. I welcome his support of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SLOWDOWN IN THE PENTAGON

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in the January issue of Foreign Affairs, there is an outstanding article by the well-known author on military affairs, Hanson Baldwin. Very appropriately entitled "Slowdown in the Pentagon," the article clearly and concisely reviews the current state of our defenses and the decisions that led to our present condition. Even more important, it reveals the thinking of those principally charged with the responsibility of those decisions. It quickly becomes apparent that the thinking and dictates of Congress have been largely ignored.

Those of us who sit on the committees responsible for national security have begun our hearings to review new budgets and proposals. I urge all of my colleagues who are concerned directly or indirectly with national security to read the very fine analysis by Hanson Baldwin. Accordingly, I insert the article, "Slowdown in the Pentagon," by Hanson Baldwin, in the RECORD at this point:

SLOWDOWN IN THE PENTAGON

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

In 1947, the "bible" of the Nation's military contractors—Armed Forces Procurement Regulations—was a slim volume about 100 to 125 pages long. Today, the AFPR, which governs in minute detail all those who do business with the Pentagon, has expanded to four huge volumes totaling something like 1,200 pages, with new ones added daily.

Five to seven years ago, according to a careful statistical average compiled by one major defense contractor, it required 4 to 5 months to execute a contract from the time an acceptable price quotation was received in the Pentagon to the time the contractor received the final document. Today, the same contractor estimates that an average of 9 to 12 months is needed for the same process; a very few may be completed in 30 days; some may require 23 months.

Parkinson's law of bureaucracy—the less there is to do the more people it takes to do it, and the simpler the problem the longer the time required for the solution—appears to be operating in Washington, particularly in defense contracting. There are many reasons for this state of affairs.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, the apostle of cost-effectiveness these past 4 years, must share the blame for many of them as well as the credit for some improved management procedures. But the lengthening delays in the development and production of new weapons started long before he took office, and no one man, no one cause, is responsible.

A rough rule of thumb used to hold that it required about 7 years (in the United States) from the gleam in the eye of the designer to the finished operational product. This time span, which has been compared unfavorably with the lead time required for the development and production of new weapons in Russia, has been steadily lengthening, and there is no sign at the moment that the process is being checked.

Even more important, there appears to have been in the first half of the 1960's a definite reduction, as compared to the 1950–60 period, in the evolution and production of new weapons. The Republicans protest too much when they allege that the Pentagon, under Mr. McNamara, has not produced a single new weapons system. But it is at least true that virtually all the major—and most of the minor—weapons systems in operation or in development today (Polaris, Minuteman; B-70, TFX, or F-111; AR-15 rifle, etc.) were already in production, development or in preliminary design and specification form back in the 1950's. The Pentagon in recent years has certainly instituted some much-needed management reforms, effected some economies and added considerably to our ready strategic strength and our conventional war and general support forces. But it has probably canceled more development contracts (the nuclear-powered aircraft Dynasoar; the mobile medium-range ballistic missile Skybolt, etc.) than it has initiated new ones.

Two principal and telling criticisms have been leveled at the Pentagon's present policies, trends and procedures by scientists who can be in no way accused of political parochialism.

Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the Corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, cautioned recently against an attitude that is too prevalent in and outside of the Pentagon—a belief that the technological revolution is over. No one in the Pentagon has ever explicitly stated such a belief, but the attitude of skeptical show-me-ism widely held there acts as a very definite brake upon the excited enthusiasm which should energize new research projects. Mr. McNamara's "whiz kids," complete with slide rules and computers, brushed aside the factor of professional judgment or scientific hunch when they took office and their emphasis upon "perfection on paper" and the cost part of the cost-effectiveness formula has definitely slowed the pace of military development.

Behind this attitude in the Pentagon is an even broader trend. Part of it is a belief expressed by many scientists—notably by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner and Dr. Herbert F. York in a recent issue of Scientific American—that disarmament, or arms limitation, is the only way to political salvation, and that therefore continued technological military development worsens the situation. This somewhat simplistic viewpoint has had an increasing public and political appeal and indeed has its adherents in the Defense Department. And even so hardheaded a man as Representative MELVIN PRICE, chairman of the Research and Development Subcommittees of the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, recently warned that "we are entering a leveling-off period, a plateau, in the total dimensions" of the Government's research program. This feeling of disillusionment on the part of scientists, and of fear of economic limitations on future breakthroughs in weapons research, comes at a time when the military technological revolution is far from finished.

Despite our present great strength, Dr. Killian has said, we cannot "rest on our oars," thinking the race is won. "We may be only at the beginning of unexampled scientific and engineering achievement," he notes, and the "high confidence" and sheer size of the present research and development effort may "obscure weaknesses still present in our program and lead us once again into complacency."

The second major criticism leveled at present weapons development policies comes from James T. Ramey, Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Dr. Edward C. Welsh, acting chairman of the National Aeronautics Space Council. Mr. Ramey in a recent speech urged the Government to rid itself of what he called the requirements merry-go-round. He pointed out that every new project had to be justified on the basis of military requirements, and that many promising developments—particularly in space—could never be pushed, or even demonstrated, if development had to wait for the establishment of requirements. Invention has never followed this path; the machinegun and the tank would still reremain blueprint dreams if their development had awaited the specifications of clear-cut military requirements. One cannot state a requirement for an inventor's hopes. As Dr. Welsh has pointed out, "If we had required a clear-cut prior mission, we would probably have developed no airplanes, no spacecraft, or, in fact, no wheel."

Other causes for the delays in development and production of new weapons have their roots in the past, well prior to the present administration, and the responsibility extends far beyond the Pentagon. A $50 billion annual defense budget attracts the eager interests of many government agencies.

The sprawling bureaucracy of big government; the control of major military or paramilitary projects by agencies over which the Defense Department has no direct authority, including the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of the Budget; congressional legislation and executive regulation—social, political and economic; the tremendous size and complexity of the Armed Forces; overcentralization and overregulation in the Pentagon; too much service rivalry and not enough service competition—all these and other factors have become builtin roadblocks in defense development and contracting.

Big government itself is undeniably one of the roadblocks to speedy performance. Everybody must get in on the act, particularly if a new development project involves sizable sums of money or promises numerous jobs, or involves systems or components which must be provided by foreign governments or by other agencies of government.

Development of nuclear weapons and nuclear engines is the responsibility of the AEC, yet the only users are the military, and they develop the devices which carry warheads and the vehicles which use the propulsion systems. Over the years, an effective system of liaison by interchange of officers, by committees and other means has made the AEC quickly responsive to military needs, but the mere process of two-headed control slows and complicates the system.

LASV (low altitude supersonic vehicle) provides an enlightening case history of how many heads produce many purposes, and no final results. LASV was once hailed as a highly promising project. The AEC was to develop a nuclear-powered ramjet engine and the Pentagon would use the engine to power a pilotless atmospheric missile, capable of indefinite flight (perhaps 10 times around the world) at 3 times the speed of sound. The weapon was envisaged as a possible future successor to, or supplement for, ballistic missiles in case the Russians should develop—as they now appear to be doing—an antiballistic missile. In this instance the AEC, after overcoming many technical difficulties in its part of the job, was on the verge of outstanding success and was ready to flight-test the engine, when Mr. McNamara, reversing prior judgments—and as Dr. Edward Teller put it, for "the sake of an economy that amounts to less than 1 percent of the Air Force budget"—canceled the project after a prior investment of nearly $200 million. Dr. Teller was caustic: "I believe this is the biggest mistake we have made since the years following World War II when we failed to develop the ICBM.

Whether Dr. Teller is correct or not in his assessment of the importance of such a weapon, the fate of LASV is illustrative both of prevalent negativistic Pentagon philosophy about new weapons systems and of the difficulties of developing new systems under hydra-headed controls.

The creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has provided another type of problem. NASA stemmed from the same kind of political philosophy that nurtured the AEC. Atom bombs were too powerful to allow the generals to play with them; ergo, a civilian agency must control nuclear power—and it must be channeled away from nasty military purposes. The same scientific-political pressure groups that advocated this concept helped (with President Eisenhower's approval) to establish NASA, again on the theory that space efforts must be controlled by civilians and that space must not be used for military purposes. The pragmatic absurdities of this point of view are now self-evident; nuclear power so far has been more important in the military weapons and military propulsion field than in any other way, and the most important applications of space technology have been military—reconnaissance satellites, weather satellites, missile-warning and navigational satellites.

But in the case of NASA, the problem has been compounded. For while the AEC is essentially a research and production agency, NASA is an operating agency as well. From a small highly efficient aeronautical research agency, it has now expanded into a gargantuan multibillion-dollar empire, with tentacles all over the country, managing the biggest program on which the United States has ever embarked—to place a man on the moon.

In its early years, NASA was sluggishly if at all responsive to military needs, and the Pentagon itself was inhibited from any effective space developments (though, curiously, the only effective space boosters available were military ballistic missiles). Gradually the liaison, due to Dr. Welsh and others, has been greatly improved. Numerous military officers, active and retired, now hold some of the most important positions in NASA, and in addition the Armed Forces have furnished most of the astronauts and by far the most important part of the facilities and services used by the agency. The two-headed control still offers difficulties, but today the main stumbling blocks to the rapid development of military space projects are Secretary McNamara and his Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Dr. Harold Brown, who in his new political role in the Pentagon has become a remarkably unadventurous scientist.

Often the President's Scientific Adviser, whose contacts with Pentagon and other Government scientists cut squarely across organizational lines, has also acted as a roadblock to new developments. He exercises tremendous power without either specific responsibility or specific authority; therefore, his intervention often not only delays but confuses. The Adviser's great power stems largely from his White House status; unfortunately around him has grown up a small but important office manned by men more impressive as bureaucrats than as scientists, who represent, in effect, another echelon of delay. The old bogey of "no military requirements" has been invoked again and again by the Defense Department, with tacit support of scientists outside the Department, to stifle projects aborning particularly in the military space field.

The Central Intelligence Agency is another organization which has gradually usurped some of what were once primarily military functions. Two factors—the creation of the Agency and its tremendous increase in power, and the creation by Mr. McNamara of a Defense Intelligence Agency outside and above the service chain of command, and directly responsive to him—have greatly reduced the importance of the now emasculated service intelligence agencies—G–2, A–2, and the Office of Naval Intelligence. The service chiefs no longer sit as members of the U.S. Intelligence Board, the governing policymaking organ of the defense community. In operations as well as in procurement the results is still another proliferation of agencies and committees. The fiasco of the Bay of Pigs—a military operation run principally by the CIA instead of by the Pentagon—is one example of the kind of problems this expansion of the executive department can produce. And until recently the CIA—not the Army—was operating the Army's own special forces counterinsurgency troops in South Vietnam.

The new centralized organization of intelligence can also affect weapons procurement, for military requirements must be measured in part against Soviet capabilities; if the centralized control of intelligence reduces those capabilities, obviously force levels and weapons requirements are altered. This is not an imaginary problem. For instance, the strength and speed of mobilization of the Soviet Army has been sharply reduced, in the Pentagon's intelligence estimates, during the McNamara administration.

The Bureau of the Budget with its pervasive influence over the source of all power—the dollar—has now developed military "experts" who literally can doom a weapons system or foster its growth. Even Congress' watchdog—the Comptroller General—has become his own "expert" on tactics and military supply.

Thus the "advice"—and the actual control—exercised on military projects by executive agencies outside the Pentagon is sweeping but almost completely negative. They delay and they criticize and they inhibit; they do not expedite.

Congressional legislation and executive regulation complicate, restrict and delay research and procurement contracts. The contractor must comply with hundreds of laws or executive orders. Accounting procedures, minimum wages, civil rights, veterans' preferences, subcontracting, profit limitations and so on and so forth, all are roadblocks to speed. The Armed Forces procurement regulations reflects in its bulk, size and complexity how social, political and economic considerations, as well as those that are military and technical, influence the awards of contracts.[1]

Economic considerations—the need, for instance, to funnel defense contracts into depressed areas—and political pressure—the need to win an election or placate a pressure group—play their part in consideration and delay in contracts. Normally, as the TFX investigation brought out, no major defense contract is awarded without Presidential approval, and the Democratic (or as the case may be, the Republican) National Committee representatives always have their opportunity to urge contractual rewards to the party faithful. The F–111 (TFX) contract went to the General Dynamics Fort Worth plant, although the services in three separate evaluations preferred the Boeing proposal. Many in Washington believe this was the result of political pressure.

All of these practices—all of this redtape—"jest growed" as part of big Government and a big defense budget.

II

But the major causes of recent delays are to be found in the Pentagon itself, and they stem from the overcentralized organization established by Mr. McNamara and the attempts made to achieve perfection on paper before any steel is bent.

Centralization—"unification," the public calls it—has been steadily increasing, particularly since the passage of the 1958 modifications to the National Security Act. But Mr. McNamara has used the power every Secretary of Defense has always had to a far greater extent than any predecessor. There is no doubt that he has run the show. Any major contract must be approved by him; even relatively minor modifications must pass the gauntlet of his numerous assistants.

The checkreins Secretary McNamara has used were, without doubt, needed to halt the proliferation of unneeded weapons systems and the expenditure of billions on projects that turned out to be "duds" or duplications of others.

It is an axiom of sound military research practices that in the early stages two or more parallel lines of development should be followed leading to the same end—a weapons system of given characteristics. In case an unexpected engineering problem of insuperable difficulty is encountered in one developmental effort, the second may offer an alternative. But to avoid unnecessary duplication and expense once the teething troubles are over one of the two lines should be abandoned and full efforts concentrated on the more hopeful one. In the pre-McNamara era this decision was often left until too late. This was the case, for instance, when the Air Force developed the Thor intermediate-range ballistic missile and the Army developed Jupiter. Because of service rivalries and pressures, both missiles were developed to final "hardware" stage and both were produced in small but expensive quantities, although one virtually duplicated the other and either could have done the job of both. Mr. McNamara, therefore, had some justification for his show-me attitude and for the elaborate system he has established of evaluating and analyzing all new projects. But he or "the system" has overcompensated. The cost part of the cost-effectiveness formula has been emphasized and underscored at the expense of speedy development and new ideas. Never in the history of competition have so many been able to say no, so few to say yes.[2]

In the past, technological development and research and procurement contracting were largely decentralized; the individual services were responsible to a major degree for their own weapons development. Service competition, in the happiest sense, produced the air-cooled aircraft engine (sponsored by the Navy) and the liquid-cooled engine (sponsored by the then Army Air Corps) with which the United States fought and won World War II in the air. One without the other would have been incomplete; service competition produced both.

When a new aircraft was required, the service needing it determined the characteristics wanted to perform the specialized missions contemplated. Competitive contracts were then let for a small number of planes, and actual flight competitions between competing companies were held, with the big payoff production contract going to the contractor who built the best plane, as actually determined in the air.

The services formerly had, within overall policy and budget limitations, a considerable degree of autonomy, and weapons development and procurement were largely decentralized. What can be done when redtape is cut, authority and responsibility are coupled, and organization is decentralized to the working levels is shown by the production of the Polaris missile and the A–11 aircraft. The highly successful and extremely complex Polaris was pushed to completion as an operational weapon in about 3½ years, well ahead of schedule. One man, Vice Adm. W. F. Raborn, was given authority and responsibility to cut across organizational lines, and he was fully backed by the Navy and the Department of Defense. There was then no such centralization in the Pentagon as exists now. The A–11, successor to the famed U–2 high flying reconnaissance plane, was a secret project, amply funded by the CIA and by the Air Force. With ample funds, full authority and responsibility, and a high degree of autonomy, Lockheed Aircraft was twice able to produce—in the U–2 and its successor—world-beating aircraft in an abbreviated time span. Similarly, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, who wore two hats—one Navy, one AEC—and whose authority therefore spanned the bifurcated organizational structure, was able to produce what was essentially a new weapons system with minimum delay. The key to these and other successful development and production efforts is the coupling of authority and responsibility at working levels.

Today the entire picture has changed violently. Under the law, separate service departments must be maintained and the services cannot be directly merged; Mr. McNamara has merged them indirectly, as John C. Ries points out in his new book.[3] A fourth service—the Office of the Secretary of Defense—has been built up as an all-powerful apex. It is far more than a policymaking and coordinating agency, as it was originally intended to be under the National Security Act of 1947; it administers, operates, contracts, develops, procures, and commands. Superagencies, superimposed over the service departments, are answerable only to the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Former service functions have been assumed by the Defense Supply Agency, which procures items common to the services; by the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency (communications, intelligence, and security; codes and ciphers, etc.), the Defense Communications Agency (common and long-lines communications) and the Defense Atomic Support Agency. These have added new superechelons to the Pentagon bureaucracy.

---

[1] AFPR regulations require the proposals of the contractor to be reviewed before submission by engineering, pricing, auditing, data, legal, civil rights, subcontracting and many other experts, and in turn various Pentagon and Government agencies must review the proposals for compliance. Even so, AFPR regulations are sometimes vaguely worded. A Congressional investigating subcommittee recently requested the Department of Defense to alter those regulations dealing with employee health and recreation expenses. The wording of some of the regulations permitted the charge-off of losses for operating factory cafeterias, and contractors could also charge cocktail parties to the taxpayer if they were billed as "employee welfare."

[2] Management experts and contractors have pointed out that the exercise of centralized control by the Department of Defense over the services requires information and reports from the services. The self-generating and self-defeating nature of the workload imposed becomes apparent. The tighter and more centralized the control, the more reports that are required. The more authority taken away from the working level, the more paperwork that is required from those at the working level to back up their diminished authority.

[3] "The Management of Defense." Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins University Press, 1964.

Mr. McNamara came into office intending—he let it be known—to streamline top echelon Defense Department management. There were some 15 Presidential appointees of the rank of Assistant Secretary of Defense or higher in January 1961 when he took office; there are 16 today. There were 11 Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense 2 years ago; there are about 30 today.

The Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was originaly limited by law by Congress to 100 officers, then increased to 400, a specific limit intended to prevent the development of a super-General Staff; it now numbers the full 400, plus another 1,170 military and civilian personnel. The additional personnel are labeled members of the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a euphemism which permits evasion of the legal restriction (with both executive department and Congress winking at the extralegality). This staff, rich with rank, now has three lieutenant generals or vice admirals assigned to head its more important sections or divisions, and its director—a three-star general—may be given four stars if current suggestions are carried out.

As one would expect with a gigantic staff which tends to generate its own paperwork, the workload of the Joint Chiefs of Staff steadily increases—from 887 papers or reports requiring some action by the JCS in 1958 to about double that number today. Something like a de facto hierarchical general staff now exists, with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs as a kind of overall Chief of Staff; and it busies itself with the ridiculous and the petty as well as the crucial and important. (The Joint Chiefs, for instance, determine the details of the administration and curriculum of the National War College and other joint service schools and have even solemnly considered such important matters as the advisability of establishing an all-service soccer team which might compete with European all stars, and the numbers of cooks, and which services should furnish them, for a U.S. headquarters in Europe.) Representative Charles S. Gubser, of California, has estimated that there are now a total of some 34,000 employees responsible to the Office of the Secretary of Defense (exclusive of separate service departments in Washington). Statistics like these indicate the revolutionary changes that have occurred within the Pentagon in the past 15, particularly in the past 4, years. As Mr. Ries puts it, the dogma of centralization has triumphed.

Many beside Mr. Ries worry about the capability of the present defense organization to withstand the strain of real war or protracted crises. There have been some disturbing signs of faltering and confusion during the Berlin crisis, the Cuban missile crisis, and one of the Gulf of Tonkin incidents.

The present Secretary of Defense has a computer mind, capable of absorbing and recording immense quantities of detailed data. He also has ferocious energy. The combination of these two qualities has enabled him, so far, to deal with what Mr. Ries calls the minutiæ that floods upward in a centralized organization. But even Mr. McNamara has several times given evidence of strain, and after Mr. McNamara, who? To decentralize the Department so that the Secretary could have time, opportunity, and assistance to cope with major decisions would require a decrease rather than an increase in the staff of the Secretary, something that no democratic bureaucracy seems capable of accomplishing.

The centralized organization of the Pentagon and the accompanying growth of a bureaucracy—particularly in the upper echelons—explain in part the delays in development and procurement of new weapons systems. In effect, responsibility and authority have been separated in the Pentagon. Vice Admiral Rickover gave several instances of delays caused by bureaucracy in testimony to a Senate committee in 1958. Purchase of nuclear cores was delayed for 6 months "just because one staff person with no responsibility but with authority had on his own decided" against the purchase. In March 1964, he testified before a House Appropriations Subcommittee on the question of nuclear power for a new aircraft carrier. The carrier itself was already approved by both Congress and the Defense Department. The Navy and most Congressmen felt that such a major new investment should be as modern as possible, and that it should be powered with nuclear reactors rather than with oil, even though the initial cost would be considerably greater. But the subject was studied to death. Admiral Rickover testified: "The Department of Defense itself caused much of the delay. They considered the Navy's request to change it to a nuclear carrier for a year. The Department of Defense kept on asking for more information, more studies, more analyses. New studies and analyses are underway now on nuclear propulsion for the next carrier and other surface ships. These studies never end, and we don't build ships."

The services still have the legal responsibility for development and procurement but not the authority to implement their responsibility. Similarly the responsibility for planning and execution has been separated. The Joint Chiefs no longer legally command anything; in the procurement field the services must often execute or carry out procurement plans they have not formulated (i.e. the TFX).

In an admirable attempt to promote some much-needed long-range planning in the Armed Forces and to control costs, Mr. McNamara instituted what is called the 5-year force structure and financial management program, often dubbed "the book." "The book" tries to chart and elaborate all major details of service force structures (including sizes, types) and weapons systems required, being procured or developed, for the next 5 years. Any significant change in "the book," including research expenditures, requires consideration by hundreds of people, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary himself, and an elaborate process of justification, review, and approval all along the line from lowest to highest echelons. Contracting, budgeting, progress on weapons systems—and even lawn cutting—are programed and controlled in detail from various echelons of the Secretary's office, with streams of reports required. The services have complained that there is an inherent, built-in inflexibility and rigidity in this system.

In addition to the Secretary of Defense and his deputy and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the 1,570 supporting staff, all of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense have become, not de jure, but de facto, line operators as well as staff assistants. By virtue of authority delegated by the Secretary, they can and do cut across service lines and intervene at the lowest echelons. Two offices, in particular, have a major influence in weapons development and procurement; unfortunately they are to often delaying factors rather than expediters.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Controller) has completely changed its character under the McNamara regime. Charles J. Hitch, the incumbent, has, with the Secretary's approval, applied the methods he developed as an economic theorist at the Rand Corp. to military strategic programing. The cost effectiveness of various weapons systems is analyzed on paper by his office, and he and his associates have a powerful voice in determining what kind of weapon will do to what service. Dr. Brown, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, does another analytical job, supposedly from the technical and engineering feasibility point of view. His analyses are particularly important in the research and development stages.

Any projected weapons system has to run the gauntlet between the Charybdis of Mr. Hitch and the Scylla of Dr. Brown; but many other high and low echelon perils confront it also. The McNamara administration has established "for all large endeavors" (and for some that are not so large) what it calls a Project Definition Phase (PDP in Pentagon jargon). In Secretary McNamara's words, "before full-scale development is initiated, the specific operational requirements and the cost effectiveness of the system must be confirmed, and goals, milestones, and time schedules must be established. * * * All the aspects of a development are tied together into a single plan which defines, for Government and industry alike, what is wanted, how it is to be designed and built, how it will be used, what it will cost, and what systems and techniques will be used to manage the program. * * *"

The PDP represents the Pentagon's search for "perfection on paper" before any operation begins. There is no doubt that it is an attractive theoretical management tool, but here is also not much doubt that it has delayed development and procurement of new weapons systems, and whether or not the end result in the form of "finished hardware" is actually any better or less expensive, it is still too soon to tell.[4] The TFX (F-111) aircraft for the Air Force and Navy has been programed and evaluated, analyzed, and costed in detail on paper in the "PDP"; it is still in the development stage and may not be operational for years to come.[5] This plane, which can vary the sweep of its wings (their angle to the fuselage) in flight, was forced into a preconceived and theoretical mold in the PD phase. Mr. McNamara insisted, against service objections, that Navy needs and Air Force needs could be satisfied by a single all-purpose plane, which could be flown from land fields and carrier decks on several entirely different types of missions. The attempt to achieve this—in theory and in blueprint form—required many months before designs acceptable to both services were evolved. The development contract was finally awarded to Convair and the first of the developmental TFX planes is nearing completion. The Navy fears the finished version may be too heavy for carrier decks.

---

[4] Stanley Bernstein, of the Raytheon Co., in a paper "The Impact of Project Definition on Aerospace System Management," delivered at the first annual meeting of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (June 29–July 2, 1964), used the mobile medium-range ballistic missile as a case history. He pointed out that contractors were expected to meet some 20 different requirements in a final PDP report, "one may consider the several contractors who participated in the MMRBM effort," he said. "Even prior to Department of Defense program authorization in January 1962, companies like Hughes, Thiokol, Martin, and many others had been engaged in significant engineering efforts. When program definition was authorized, originally as a 4-month effort, nine prime companies and many subcontractors and suppliers geared for maximum effort. The 4 months stretched to almost 1 year. Motivation has to be maintained. The present status of MMRBM is clouded. [Since this paper, MMRBM has been virtually killed.] Yet the participants must retain a level of interest in order to be ready to proceed if the program should become active. The maintenance of this motivation is a major management challenge. The requirement for stated performance incentive goals will, inevitably, lead to more conservative design and engineering during the program definition phase. * * * PD contracts should not be used as a means of postponing difficult government decisions or to decide what kind of military capability is required."

[5] The practice of "superstudy" is extending beyond the Pentagon. The SST, or supersonic commercial transport, is now called the super-studied transport. Najeeb E. Halaby, head of the Federal Aviation Agency, recently said that "whether or not it ever flies, it will easily be the most analyzed project in the Government's history." If so, this is quite a record.

The finest fighter in the world today, the Navy's McDonnell F-4B Phantom II, which the Air Force is now buying in quantity in a slightly modified version, was the product of flight competition back in the fifties when the PDP in its present rigid form was unheard of, and centralization in the Pentagon had not reached today's extreme. The McDonnell and Chance-Vought aircraft companies, in response to a Navy need for a supersonic fighter of certain given specifications, were each awarded developmental contracts for a small number of planes. The results were then actually flight-tested in competition. McDonnell won, but the Chance-Vought product was also good and was procured in more limited quantities for specialized reconnaissance and other missions for the fleet.

Many believe that this type of flight and interservice competition produces the best dividends. One service evolves the plane or engine and (after actual competition between several bidders) contracts for and procures the one best suited to its own specialized needs. That one may well be adapted—after it is operational—to the needs of another service.[6] Each gets the type it wants, and a better plane or weapon than if it had been forced, on paper, into a common mold. For there frequently are incompatible requirements between service weapons systems, and the attempt to provide "commonality" in the interest of reducing costs may well increase cost and reduce combat effectiveness.

It is true, of course, that major weapons development projects have become far more complex and costly than they were 10 to 20 years ago. In theory, the attempt of the Department of Defense to define a project and to refine it on paper before the steel is bent has a great deal of attractiveness. Many authorities who are loud in condemning the delays of the PDP system do not believe it is economically feasible—at least in all cases—to return to the old era of actual competitive service tests. Others, however, think that competitive testing of several different models, while more expensive initially, may actually save money eventually, chiefly because it may result in a better product. Eugene E. Wilson, retired naval officer and retired vice chairman of United Aircraft Corp., wrote in the September-October 1964 issue of Shipmate, the magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association, that "the current practice of awarding production (and development) contracts to a single supplier, on the basis of contract guarantees unsubstantiated by competitive prototype performance * * * will not protect a hapless purchaser (the Government) willing to risk his all on computation." The fundamental difficulty with PDP is that it has been invoked as an answer to all development and production problems, that it is interpreted too rigidly, and that there has been far too much dependence in the Department of Defense on what is essentially a management tool at the expense of judgment and enginering and scientific intuition.

It is only fair to add that recently the complaints of the services and of industry have resulted in a recognition in the Defense Department of some of these faults. A new and standardized procedure for rating, evaluating and selecting the winning contractors in a screening competition has been under preparation for 2 years and is now being presented—possibly for final approval—to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. For any large projects (exceeding $100 million in production costs) authority will still remain at the highest levels; for smaller projects authority may be delegated to lower echelons. The procedure may—but probably will not—lessen the timelag; certainly it will not change the recent emphasis on "perfection on paper."

In the program definition phase of weapons development three high hurdles, in addition to countless evaluation procedures, cause many projects to stumble and fail.

One is the eruption of interservice rivalry instead of—in the best sense—interservice competition. A proposal for a new weapon or aircraft by one service is now picked to pieces and studied on paper by all services before even a minor development contract is approved. Now that their former degree of autonomy is restricted and actual development competition discouraged, the services know that the PD phase offers a now-or-never chance. Each service may produce a different concept or a different set of desired performance figures; a long hassle ensues to try to put them all into one weapons system. This occurred, notably, in the case of the TFX; it is happening now with the new Coin (counter-insurgency) aircraft which the Marines want to develop. The result is delay, sometimes a compromise as to performance.

A second factor causing delay and difficulties is the attempt by the Secretary's numerous assistants to eliminate what they call goldplating, or unnecessarily high performance figures or standards. The attempt is laudable, but it is sometimes carried to extremes, and it has been difficult, as Adm. George W. Anderson, former Chief of Naval Operations, pointed out, for men in uniform to adjust to the idea that a 10-mile-an-hour speed differential between our own aircraft and enemy planes may not—in the eyes of the Department of Defense—be important. To a pilot, that 10 miles an hour, even though costly in terms of dollars, may be the difference between life and death.

It is in the PD phase, too, that the old bogey of "no operational or military requirement" becomes a major obstacle to weapons development. It is invoked at both high and low levels. Mr. McNamara has been rigid—though with some signs of a slight relaxation recently—about the statement of specific needs before development can start. The "operational requirement," as an experienced naval officer puts it, "is another of the paper obstacles which are intended to insure proper planning but which, when operated by people who have no real knowledge of the problems involved, frustrate progress."

In the military exploitation of a new medium, like space, it is completely impossible to define, in the terms required by the PDP evaluations, the need for, or the performance characteristics of, a new vehicle. How can even a prescient scientist predict what usefulness a manned orbiting laboratory will have? Yet the invocation of "no specific operational requirement" has delayed Air Force development of this highly important new project for at least 2 to 3 years.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD's Military Operations Subcommittee of the House recently gave its view of what's wrong with the Pentagon. After a thorough study of Mr. McNamara's protracted efforts to merge military and commercial satellite systems, the subcommittee reported that 2 years had been wasted. It said: "We still detect uncertainty and overeconomizing in the Defense Department approach * * * there has been overmanagement and underperformance * * * too many layers of supervision, the lack of clear-cut responsibility * * * and sluggish channels of * * * communication."

Senator JOHN STENNIS, in common with many others, has decried the tendency to be negative, to object, to try to refine requirements in too much detail, to evaluate and study too much. Some weapons systems, he has said, "have literally been studied to death." He cites the B-70 (which dates back in inception to 1954) as a prime example of what happens to a weapons system development "when it is subjected to repeated stops and starts and when there is not a strong, orderly and continuous program to bring it to completion." This bomber, designed for long-range, high-altitude flights at three times the speed of sound, has encountered many technical difficulties and is well behind even a revised schedule. This was made certain by off-again-on-again programs in the Pentagon and by the multilayered, centralized organization there.

Before a final contract for a project is signed and actual development starts, an average of at least 50 signatures or approvals is required—sometimes as many as 100 to 200. Some individuals, required by legal or administrative reasons to sign twice, have had to be briefed twice; by the time the second signature was needed they had forgotten what the contract was about.

It is true that centralization in the development and procurement field, epitomized by the 5-year force structure and the program definition phase, was in part the outgrowth of inadequate management by the services of some research and development contracts. It was also the result of the failure of past Secretaries of Defense to exercise the power they have always had by eliminating—not service competition—but duplicatory and unnecessary service rivalry. But the cure has proved worse than the disease.

Healthy service competition can be encouraged and unhealthy service rivalry can be discouraged by—

1. Abandonment of attempts—keyed primarily to costs, not effectiveness—to force service weapons systems into "all-purpose" molds. "Commonality" develops naturally from actual technological accomplishments, not from "PDP's" or paper plans.

2. Return, insofar as possible, to competition in hardware rather than competition on paper. The end product is almost certain to be better, and ultimately may cost less.

3. Sponsorship, within a service, or by two or more services, of competitive research and development projects, all having a common goal, but each following different technological paths to that goal.

4. Definite selection by the Defense Department at the earliest possible stage of the best project; cancellation of the others.

The key lessons for tomorrow are two. Responsibility and authority must be coupled at working levels in the management of research and development and production contracts. And there must be a much higher degree of job stability and continuity in management than the rotational policies of the services have made possible in the past.[7]

---

[6] There are countless instances of this kind of adaptation. In addition to the liquid- and air-cooled engines and the F-4B, the Air Force, for instance, uses the Navy-developed Sidewinder and Bullpup missiles.

III

Mr. Ries, whose studious book on defense organization cannot be accused of service or political partisanship, quotes Ernest Dale as writing in the American Economic Review for May 1961: "The greatest single bane of management today is its growing absolutism, its refusal to discuss or listen to different opinions." Mr. Ries declares that "fantastic though it may seem, defense reformers have succeeded in turning the calendar back 60 years."

Whether one agrees with this strong statement or not, there can be no basic disagreement with the testimony given to the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1949 by Ferdinand Eberstadt, one of the most perceptive students of defense organization. He said: "From shattered illusions that mere passage of a unification act would produce a military utopia, there has sprung an equally illusory belief that present shortcomings will immediately disappear if only more and more authority is conferred on the Secretary of Defense, and more and more people added to his staff. * * * I suggest that great care be exercised lest the Office of Secretary of Defense, instead of being a small and efficient unit which determines the policies of the Military Establishment and controls and directs the departments, feeding on its own growth, becomes a separate empire."

Today the separate empire exists. Parkinson's law must be reversed if the Pentagon is to stop "feeding on its own growth" and if ideas, weapons development and imaginative policies are to be encouraged.

TEXTILE MILL MARGINS BIGGEST IN 19 YEARS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the supplemental appropriation last week for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, I charged that textile mills have not kept their end of the bargain under which they were to drop consumer prices to reflect the advantage they gain from multimillion-dollar payments they receive in the new cotton subsidy program.

Since then I have had communications from the industry both supporting and challenging my charge.

The very proper and valid question still remains: Have the textile mills, which have already received over $300 million in taxpayer-financed payments under this new program, kept faith by dropping their prices?

Today I received statistical information supplied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture which, frankly, is shocking and suggests that the textile mills have not kept faith. The information is published in Cotton Situation, CS-216, issued for release February 1.

The purpose of the cotton legislation was to make cotton more competitive so farmers could have expanding markets. Because the domestic price has been kept artificially high, in recent years the U.S. cotton industry has been losing out to manmade fibers and to cotton textile imports.

The Cotton Situation bulletin reports that cotton textile imports have trended upward in the months since the new cotton program began. Meanwhile, cotton textile exports have remained below the same months in 1963.

Exporters of U.S. textiles, so the official report states, "are finding it more difficult to sell in foreign markets because of first, rising prices for domestically produced goods, resulting in part from inventory demand; and second, the elimination of equalization payments under the cotton products export program."

The same bulletin reports "cloth prices slightly higher." It continues:

> Prices paid by mills for cotton used in the 20 constructions have trended upward in recent months but not as fast as have cloth prices. As a result, mill margins have continued to widen.

The bulletin's statistics indicate further that U.S. exports of both raw and textile cotton are down.

What has happened? The statistical table published on page 17, identified as table 14, in Cotton Situation suggests the answer:

TABLE 14.—*Fabric value, cotton price and mill margin, per pound, United States, by months, August 1960 to date*

[In cents]

Month	Fabric value (20 constructions) [1]					Cotton price [2]					Mill margin [3]				
	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
August	62.86	58.78	61.12	60.60	61.00	32.52	34.84	35.89	35.33	27.64	30.34	23.94	25.23	25.27	33.36
September	61.90	59.78	60.93	60.99	61.02	32.25	35.16	35.23	35.19	26.82	29.65	24.62	25.70	25.80	34.20
October	60.64	60.32	60.71	61.34	61.25	32.05	35.35	35.08	35.11	26.80	28.59	24.97	25.63	26.23	34.45
November	59.98	60.45	60.68	62.00	61.48	31.99	35.46	35.10	35.27	26.98	27.99	24.99	25.58	26.73	34.50
December	58.61	60.54	60.67	62.29	62.27	32.00	35.58	35.30	35.37	27.30	26.61	24.96	25.37	26.92	34.97
January	58.06	60.63	60.55	62.34	--------	32.01	35.78	34.45	35.47	--------	26.05	24.85	25.10	26.87	--------
February	57.78	60.76	60.47	62.40	--------	32.41	35.82	35.66	35.55	--------	25.37	24.94	24.81	26.85	--------
March	57.64	61.07	60.49	62.45	--------	33.32	35.98	35.95	35.58	--------	24.32	25.09	24.54	26.87	--------
April	57.46	61.23	60.26	62.00	--------	33.46	35.85	36.08	35.63	--------	24.00	25.38	24.18	26.37	--------
May	57.54	61.19	60.00	61.62	--------	33.86	36.13	36.16	35.67	--------	23.68	25.06	23.84	25.95	--------
June	57.60	61.24	60.11	60.87	--------	34.09	36.34	35.86	35.76	--------	23.51	24.90	24.25	25.11	--------
July	57.88	61.29	60.28	60.95	--------	34.45	36.19	35.57	35.60	--------	23.43	25.10	24.71	25.35	--------
Crop-year average [4]	59.00	60.61	60.52	61.65	--------	32.87	35.71	35.61	35.46	--------	26.13	24.90	24.91	26.19	--------

[1] The estimated value of cloth obtainable from a pound of cotton with adjustments for salable waste.

[2] Monthly average prices for 4 territory growths, even running lots, prompt shipments, delivered at group 201 (group B) mill points including landing costs and brokerage. Prices are for the average quality of cotton used in each kind of cloth. Beginning August 1964, prices are for cotton after equalization payments of 6.5 cents per pound have been made.

[3] Difference between cloth prices and cotton prices.

[4] Starts Aug. 1 of the year indicated.

Source: Cotton Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

You will note that fabric value has held fairly steady throughout a 4½-year period. As of December 1964, it was 62.27 cents per pound, about the same as a year ago—62.29.

However, the price of cotton to the mills dropped sharply during that same 1-year period, declining from 35.37 cents a pound, to 27.30 cents—a decline of more than 8 cents a pound. The mill margin—the gross profit per pound—therefore jumped from 26.92 cents to 34.97 cents—an increase of more than 8 cents.

Curiously, the increase in mill margin from the month before the new mill-subsidy program became effective—July, 25.35 cents—to the month after it became effective—August, 33.36 cents—is 8.01 cents, almost exactly the amount of reduction in the price of cotton.

Meanwhile, fabric prices started a new upward climb, instead of going down.

From this, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the multimillion payments to the mills went into net profit rather than into lower prices on finished products.

After receiving the bulletin from USDA I checked with the Department and learned that since the new subsidy program began, the cost of cotton to the mills has dropped to the lowest point since the Korean war period 19 years ago. Likewise, mill margins are at the very highest point since the Korean war.

---

[7] As Representative MELVIN PRICE notes, one reason, for example, that the Army (nuclear) reactor program (a program for developing a small portable nuclear reactor which could provide power in remote areas) has fallen flat on its face is that the Army kept transferring out the managers of the program. There were six different managers in 5 years.

What of the plight of the cotton farmer? Is he better off as the result of this program? Far from it. The farmers who produce over 70 percent of the cotton are worse off, incomewise. Even the small producer, who has received a special direct payment under the program is only slightly better off incomewise. When the plight of cotton is measured from the standpoint of world and domestic markets for U.S. cotton, all cotton farmers are worse off.

Where are the champions of the cotton farmer?

This program certainly has not helped the farmer. It has not helped the consumer. Definitely it has helped the profit situation of the textile mills.

To sum up, after more than $300 million in handouts to textile mills, consumer prices are up, U.S. exports of raw cotton and textiles are down, and mills are showing the biggest margins in 19 years.

AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PROVIDE THAT CONTRIBUTIONS TO FOREIGN CHARITIES BE DEDUCTIBLE FROM GROSS INCOME

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 170(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a charitable contribution made to a foreign charity by a U.S. taxpayer to be deductible for income tax purposes.

The nondeductibility of such contributions was brought to my attention by a constituent and his wife who during the past several years have made contributions to Protestant religious groups in Japan. The constituent's father established a mission in Japan in 1895 and this mission today is known as the "Church of Christ in Japan." A college classmate of his wife built a settlement house in Japan and both of these worthwhile organizations have received financial and moral support over the years from these two Americans. These Americans are quite interested in the progress and work of these Japanese organizations and have generated a great deal of good will and friendship for our people. Deductions of gifts to these two religious charities and similar organizations have been disallowed by the Internal Revenue Service for the reason that under the present law they do not qualify for such treatment.

Section 170(c) of the 1954 code provides in part that for the purposes of this section, the term "charitable contributions" means a contribution or gift to or for the use of:

> 2. A corporation, trust, or community chest, fund, or foundation—
>
> (A) created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof, or under the law of the United States, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States.

After I looked into this matter I wrote Mortimer M. Caplin, then Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and he replied stating that the legislative background of section 170(c)(2) of the 1954 code indicates the intent of Congress that only contributions made to "domestic" charities be deductible. He said this restriction which was first enacted into the law as section 23(c) of the Revenue Act of 1938 limits the deduction for contributions to those made to or for the use of a domestic charity. In his letter he quoted from the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on section 23(o) of the Revenue Act of 1938, H.R. 1860, 75th Congress, 3d session—1938—pages 19 and 20, as follows, to wit:

> Under the 1936 act, the deductions of charitable contributions by corporations is limited to contributions made to domestic institutions (sec. 23(q)). The bill provides that the deduction allowed to taxpayers other than corporations be also restricted to contributions made to domestic institutions. The exemption from taxation of money or property devoted to charitable and other purposes is based upon the theory that the Government is compensated for the loss of revenue by its relief from financial burden which would otherwise have to be met by appropriations from public funds, and by the benefits resulting from the promotion of the general welfare. The United States derives no such benefit from gifts to foreign institutions and the proposed limitation is consistent with the above theory. If the recipient, however, is a domestic organization, the fact that some portion of its funds is used in other countries for charitable and other purposes (such as missionary and educational purposes) will not affect the deductibility of the gift.
>
> The policy reasons cited for limiting the deduction to domestic organizations might have had some validity in 1938, but it sounds almost strange in 1963, particularly when we think in terms of our mutual security programs, the purposes of point 4, Peace Corps, student exchanges, and so forth. It seems to me that the time has come for the Ways and Means Committee to again consider these basic policy reasons established back in 1938 to determine whether or not they are still valid or whether or not some changes should be made to more accurately reflect our present policies and attitudes.

When I introduced this bill during the last session, I received a report from Mr. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, giving me the Treasury's views on this bill. I include that report in the Record at this point:

Treasury Department,
Washingon, D.C., December 23, 1963.

Hon. Wilbur D. Mills,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in reply to your request for the views and recommendations of this Department on H.R. 8367 (88th Cong., 1st sess.), entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that contributions and gifts to foreign charities shall be deductible from gross income."

The bill, if enacted, would make two changes in the present provisions dealing with income tax deductions for gifts to foreign charities. The first change would be to eliminate the present requirement contained in the last sentence of section 170(c)(2) of the Code which requires that contributions made by corporations to a "trust, chest, fund, or foundation" shall be deductible only if "the contribution is to be used within the United States or any of its possessions;" the so-called domestic use requirement. The second change would eliminate the present language contained in section 170(c)(2)(A) which requires that all deductible contributions must be made to a charitable organization "created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof, or under the law of the United States, any State or Territory, the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States;" the so-called domestic organization requirement.

ELIMINATION OF THE DOMESTIC USE REQUIREMENT

As noted above, a corporation, under present law, may only deduct a contribution to unincorporated donees if the gift is to be used exclusively within the United States or any of its possessions. However, since the code does not specifically require gifts by a corporation to a charitable corporation to be used exclusively within the United States or any of its possessions, the Service has taken the position that a gift by a corporation to a domestically organized charitable corporation is not subject to the domestic use requirement. Because of the presence of a domestic organization through which the Internal Revenue Service can monitor the activities of the donee organization so as to determine whether such activities are in accord with the congressional grant of an income tax deduction to the donor, the absence of a domestic use requirement with respect to gifts made by noncorporate donors has not lead to any serious abuses or administrative problems. Therefore, we would have no objection to treating charitable contributions made by corporate donors in a manner similar to that presently accorded in the case of contributions by noncorporate donors. Accordingly, this Department would have no objection to the removal of the last sentence of section 170(c)(2) (the domestic use requirement).

ELIMINATION OF THE DOMESTIC ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENT

The second change which would be made by the bill would be to broaden the provisions allowing deductions for charitable contributions so as to permit the deduction of gifts made by both corporate and noncorporate donors without regard to whether the donee institution is a domestic or a foreign charity. Such was the scope of the law with respect to charitable contributions made by noncorporate donors prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1938. The expressed intent of the present restriction upon income tax deductions for charitable contributions to domestic charities, which was enacted in that year with respect to gifts made by noncorporate donors, was to insure that the United States would obtain an offsetting benefit for the revenue loss resulting from the deductibility of such contributions. At that time the Ways and Means Committee took the position that the United States derives no benefit from gifts to foreign institutions and that, therefore, only contributions to domestic organizations should be deductible under the income tax law. Thus, the report of the Ways and Means Committee states that: "Under the 1936 act the deduction of charitable contributions by corporations is limited to contributions made to domestic institutions. The bill provides that the deduction allowed to taxpayers other than corporations be also restricted to contributions made to domestic institutions. The exemption from taxation of money or property devoted to charitable and other purposes is based upon the theory that the Government is compensated for the loss of revenue by its relief from financial burdens which would otherwise have to be met by appropriations from public funds, and by the benefits resulting from the promotion of the general welfare. The United States derived no such benefit from gifts from foreign institutions, and the proposed limitation is consistent with the above theory. If the recipient, however, is a domestic organization the fact that some portion of its funds is used in other countries for charitable and other purposes (such as missionaries and educational purposes) will not effect the deductibility of the gift."

Irrespective of the validity at the present time of the reasoning which led Congress to limit the deduction to contributions made to domestic organizations in 1936 and 1938, the Treasury Department believes that the limitation should now be maintained for strong administrative reasons. We feel that the elimination of the domestic organization requirement, which would allow tax deductible gifts to be made directly to foreign charitable organizations without providing a domestic entity through which the Internal Revenue Service could insure that the provision of the income tax law allowing deductions for charitable organizations are followed, would prevent the effective supervision over charitable funds expended abroad. Such lack of an effective policing power to insure that the funds were in fact expended for religious, charitable, etc., purposes, that no part of the net earnings of the foreign entity inure to the benefit of any individual and that no substantial part of the recipient organization activities consisted of carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation would lead to widespread abuses in this area. Such action might, in effect, place foreign philanthropic activities, which could not be adequately policed, in a preferred position as compared with domestic activities.

In addition, the ability to make contributions directly to foreign organizations might permit payments with respect to which an income tax deduction has been granted to be used by Communist organizations and thus would circumvent the purpose of section 11 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 996; 50 U.S.C. 790) which denies an income tax deduction for contributions to domestic Communist-action or Communist-infiltrated organizations.

For the above reasons, this Department is opposed to the provisions of lines 6 through 9, inclusive, of H.R. 8367 which would, in effect, remove the domestic organization requirement.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, in reading through this report it appears that Secretary Surrey's primary objection for permitting deductions for charitable contributions to foreign charities is the difficulty of administer the program. I think Mr. Surrey is correct and I think he has put his finger on what appears to be the most difficult problem. It seems to me that we can put the burden of qualification upon the foreign country. It would certainly be in that country's best interest to see that its domestic charities qualify for private foreign aid. Why not by regulation determine what criteria must be satisfied before foreign charity can qualify and then have the foreign government process the applications of their domestic charities. This data could be submitted to the local embassy for checking in the doubtful cases and the foreign charity would be obliged to recertify its qualifications each year or from time to time as the Commissioner feels appropriate.

It is certainly possible that some of these contributions will be diverted to other than charitable purposes, but this probably happens in our own country; and if it does, then the recipient should be disqualified. If we err, it should be on the side of the open door as opposed to the closed door. If our original premise is valid then we should be thinking in terms of ways to implement it rather than limit it.

Another collateral aspect of this problem involves the tax exemption status of foreign charities. The Commissioner has outlined the procedures for establishing this tax exempt status of foreign charities by various separate tax treaties. In fact, all organizations which enjoy a tax-exempt status must qualify under the Internal Revenue regulations and such organizations have been listed by the U.S. Treasury Department in IRS Publication No. 78. It does not seem to me to be an insuperable task to establish guide lines consistent with the policy behind the deduction.

There are a good many of us in Congress who believe that the people-to-people approach is extremely important if we are to achieve better understanding and closer friendships between our people and the peoples abroad. It is my feeling that such relationships should be encouraged rather than discouraged. We have written a great many tax incentives into our Internal Revenue Code to encourage the development of certain policies. This could well be an area where the Congress should take a long look to determine whether or not this impediment to contributions to foreign charities should be changed or eliminated. It may be time to replace the impediment by a policy of equality with other charitable gifts. I hope that my colleagues will give some thought to this suggestion and give the members of the Ways and Means Committee the benefit of their thinking on this matter.

TO EQUALIZE THE WITHHOLDING TREATMENT ON INVESTMENT INCOME EARNED WITHIN THE UNITED STATES BY NONRESIDENT ALIENS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend section 1441(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize the withholding tax treatment of investment income of nonresident aliens earned from deposits in Federal- and State-chartered savings and loan associations on the one hand, and commercial banks and stock-owned savings and loan companies on the other.

Under existing law all investment income earned in the United States by nonresident aliens is subject to a withholding tax at a rate of 30 percent. The only exception to this withholding treatment is "interest on deposits with persons carrying on the banking business." Commercial banks are thus exempted. A revenue ruling in 1958—Revenue Ruling 58-34—has held that stock-owned savings and loan companies are also exempt. A 1954 revenue ruling has held that "savings accounts in Federal savings and loan associations are not deposits with persons carrying on the banking business"—Revenue Ruling 54-624, C.B. 1954-2, 16. State-chartered mutual savings and loan associations have not been exempted because their depositors are deemed to have received dividends on the operation of the association, and can exercise control over the operation of the association in the same manner as a holder of common stock in a corporation.

These interpretations have led to a competitive inequality in the banking business and make it more attractive for foreign investors to bank their money in commercial banks and stock-owned savings and loan associations. Currently the laws of 32 States provide for the chartering of only mutual savings and loan associations. Sixteen States have operating stock-owned savings and loan associations, and two States have authorized the chartering of this latter type but no charters have been issued. Thus, the Internal Revenue Code has forced an inequality in banking competition on the institutions of 32 of our States. Our tax laws should be aimed at creating competitive equality within a given industry rather than at destroying it. Indeed, this disparity in the market for foreign deposit funds, by reducing competition, is undoubtedly driving some foreign investors to deposit their money in other countries where greater competition has forced interest rates paid to depositors higher. This reduces, somewhat, the amount of capital that our banking system can pump into the economy and slows our economic growth. Further, the diminished flow of savings funds into the country has contributed to our balance-of-payments deficit. Therefore, I have introduced a measure today that will restore equal competitive conditions in the banking community, and will in the long run attract more deposits into our banking system.

TO EQUALIZE TAX TREATMENT OF CO-OPS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to equalize the tax status of cooperative corporations with that of other incorporated businesses. The different Federal tax treatment of these two forms of doing business has created an artificial competitive advantage for one over the other. Although there is some economic and social justification for giving preferential tax treatment to the small farm marketing or purchasing co-op which remains, by its small size truly a cooperative organization; there seems to be no justification for the preferential treatment to the mammoth cooperatives that have sprung up largely as the result of the preferential tax treatment they receive. This bill will also produce additional revenue for the Federal Government which would reduce somewhat the fiscal burden of all other taxpayers.

While the Congress recently partially reduced the preferential tax treatment of co-ops, under the present law, a cooperative still can escape taxation of the business income earned by distributing 20 percent of net earnings in cash to its patrons. Thus the cooperatives avoid most of the tax that is paid by other business corporations at rates up to 48 percent of their earnings. The cooperatives' patrons, however, are required to report as individual income 100 percent of their share in the cooperatives' earnings even though they may receive less than enough in cash to pay their tax obligation thus incurred.

As matters now stand, hardly anyone is satisfied with these provisions of the 1962 Revenue Act, which purport to tax cooperative income either to the cooperative or to its patrons. The patrons can complain that it is unjustifiable to require them to pay tax in excess of the cash they receive as part of their patronage dividends, the Treasury is deprived of the opportunity to collect the tax at the source, and businessmen are disappointed because they believe that cooperative income should be taxed in the same way as the income of any other corporation in order that there will be competitive fairness.

Cooperative leaders claim that there should be a single tax on income, and that it should be at either the cooperative level or the patron level. I agree with this in principle, provided it is equally applicable to the earnings and dividends of all corporate businesses. This would be the single tax on corporation earnings that many of us would like to see displace the present double taxation of such earnings when they are distributed. But I believe we recognize, as realists, that the elimination of this double taxation is not at present at all likely. As long as the double taxation of corporate earnings continues for the sake of fairness in competition, it should be equally applicable to the earnings of all corporate business, cooperative corporations and ordinary corporations which compete with each other.

My bill provides for the taxation of cooperative corporations and their owner-patrons in the same way as ordinary corporations and their owners are taxed. However, it would exempt from the income tax—just as the original exemption of cooperatives, many years ago, was intended to do—those small groups of farmers who may join together to assist each other in the sale of the individual farmer's products and the purchase of supplies that the individual farmer needs. Where such cooperative activity is this type of business operation, and the individual farmer has dominion over his own transactions, it would not be subject to the income tax.

If the earnings of cooperatives were subject to tax at both the cooperative level and the patron level, as proposed, patronage dividends, like the dividends of ordinary corporations, would be excluded from the income of the recipients up to $100—or $200 in the case of a joint return. This is already permitted under the present law. As comparatively few members of cooperatives receive more than $100 a year of patronage dividends, there still would be, to a large extent, a single tax on the cooperatives' earnings, but it would apply where the impact of the tax should fall, directly to the cooperatives themselves.

The original intent of Congress to exempt from the income tax small groups of farmers that act for themselves has been so magnified and extended that it has become a tax "loophole" of major proportions, causing a revenue loss to the Government of millions of dollars each years. This constitutes a subsidy to the cooperative form of doing business at the expense of all other taxpayers, and gives this form an unwarranted competitive advantage over other forms of doing business.

The tax preference that this bill would remedy, if continued, endangers continuation of the free competitive enterprise as we know it. After all there is little distinction between the operation of a cooperative organization with hundreds and even thousands of "patrons" and a corporation with hundreds and even thousands of stockholders. Both organizations are essentially run by management and the patrons and stockholders actually have little to say about the running of the organization, particularly if it is prospering and growing. The only difference is that the patrons of a cooperative vote and elect management on the basis of a per capita voting system regardless of the number of patron shares they own while the stockholders of a corporation vote by the number of shares they own. Once either of these organizations have grown to substantial size with many owners, diffuse and unorganized as they are, management runs the show and perpetuates itself. There seems to be no economic or social justification in preferring this one form of doing business, the cooperative, over the corporation.

THERE ARE TWO SIDES TO THE SELMA STORY

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, to read the stories in the newspapers and to listen to the TV and radio commentators one would gather that there is only one side to the story of what is happening in Selma, Ala. I assure you this is not true. Either by design or through ignorance of the situation, many of the facts about Selma and the current troubles there are not being told to the public.

In order to help set the record straight and, at least, to give the people of the United States the other side of the story, I would like to include as a part of these remarks an editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser written by an able editor, Don F. Wasson.

I ask only that my colleagues take time to read Mr. Wasson's article and weigh it against the stories as being reported from Selma.

Mr. Speaker, is there any Member of this body, or any right-thinking American citizen who will say that a return to law and order is not justified? That is all we of the South are asking. Is this an unreasonable request? Please, let us have all the facts about Selma. Let us be given the truth and then, as Americans, as men of good will, as a people grounded in a deep religious heritage, certainly we can find a solution to the problems we face.

Mr. Wasson's article follows:

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, Jan. 31, 1965]

CITY WRONGED: SELMA INSCRIBES NOTE OF REASON IN HISTORY TEXT

(By Don F. Wasson)

History is an image projected upon a screen through the telescope of time, which merges people, places, and events so that the reader gets the entire picture at one time.

Fifty, 100 or 200 years from now, the events, places and people of today will be but a paragraph in the history books and for all the toil, sweat, and tears expended by the generations of our time on earth, a paragraph is about all they will rate.

In the super colossal, wide screen, livid color drama now being acted out by today's cast of characters and called civil rights the name of one place called Selma might never appear in the finished product. It might well end on the cutting room floor, because the production will be long enough as it is.

But it would seem that if historians of the future were looking for a focal point upon which to base their postmortem conclusion as to who was right and who was wrong, what exactly did happen and what did not, then Selma, Ala., can offer a case study in the entire problem of the United States versus the people.

A DETERMINATION TO OBEY LAW

In Selma, you have a people who, nurtured on traditions as old as Selma itself, have resisted change with all their hearts and souls. They are a people who are conservative in their thoughts and actions and the forcible disruption of their traditions by an all-powerful government has been a bitter pill to swallow.

But with determination, after last year's turmoil and strife, people in Selma had come to the conclusion that they would obey the law as best they could.

Mayor Joe Smitherman and Chief of Police Wilson Baker are the men who must lead the people through this difficult transition. As Baker told a civic club meeting recently:

"This administration feels that it has a responsibility to lead Selma in dignity through the maze of legal transition resulting from the passage of the Civil Rights Act."

AN UNREASONABLE ATTITUDE

It appeared that the transition was going peacefully until early in January when Martin Luther King, spokesman for a large segment of the Negro population, decided, in all his infinite wisdom, that Selma needed to be prodded into more rapid action in racial matters. So King, the prophet from Oslo, came into Selma and agitated the multitude. Full of ideas on how to get Negroes to register to vote, he marched them upon the courthouse and here is where the unreasonable attitude of the racial agitators comes into sharp focus.

The Dallas County Board of Registrars had requested, and had received approval of the State, to register voters for 10 additional days in January. Normally the board meets twice a month, on the first and third Mondays, to accept voter applications. Records show that it can handle from 25 to 35 voter applicants at 1 day's session.

But Martin Luther King sends 150 or more down to the courthouse to register and they come back again, and again.

IN 6 DAYS, 35 APPEARED

Now any resident of Dallas County had ample reason to know that the voter registration time had been extended, but on the first 6 days the board was in session, only 35 prospective voters showed up. Of these, 20 were Negroes. These 20 Negroes received the applications without fuss, and, as far as can be determined, were registered.

So, with 4 days left, Martin Luther King herds his flock down to the courthouse. It seems that anyone with sense enough to pass the voter requirements would know that a three-man board couldn't register that many people in 4 days, even if they were all qualified.

Some of Martin Luther's flock, once inside the registrar's office, indicated that they didn't really want to be there. There also appeared several Negroes who could neither read nor write.

REGISTERING, OR AGITATING?

So it would appear that King and his cohorts in CORE, SNICK, and other racial groups weren't really so interested in registering Negroes as voters as they were in agitating.

It seems from here that historians who write of our day and time are going to be lenient of the good people of Selma, and other southern cities who tried to do right but that they will be pretty rough on King and his cohorts whose goals always appear to be self-aggrandizement and agitation—keeping their reputations alive—as it were.

Selma's mention in the history books might well read: "In one city in Alabama, Selma, in Dallas County, the white people tried to meet the demands of the times as dictated by the Federal courts with reasonableness, but it was not allowed by the racial agitators."

THE INVADING HORDE

And in passing, we might also condemn a large segment of the national press, those publications who feed on sensationalism and half-truths, for sending into Selma a horde of semiliterate newsmen who, without feeling for the hard-working and God-fearing people, send back stories which distort the facts or, worse, disregard the facts completely.

You can read in countless publications how the great and noble King was punched in the face in Selma, Ala., without ever reading that the man who punched the Negro leader was not a Selman. Was not, in fact, a native Alabamian.

You can read how a law officer subdued a Negro woman who was standing in the voter line without ever knowing that she shouted obscenities at him beforehand. You can read how a law officer insisted that the Negroes use a certain door to enter the courthouse without ever seeing an explanation that a crowd of this size would completely block the main entrance and put a stop to normal business conducted in other courthouse offices.

BEATNIKS, UNLIMITED

Many of these so-called newsmen turn up at every scene of racial unrest. A good many of them seem to have been swept from the expresso houses and their knowledge of the history and traditions of the South is totally nonexistent. Yet they come down dressed in unpressed clothes and superior attitudes and sniff around for trouble. They see King get hit and this is all they need. The wires to New York and other centers of culture are kept hot with their unmitigated trash, their half-truths and fabrications.

We have warred with the northern and liberal press before and we shall again. But the indictment of history shall weigh far more heavily upon the heads of these publishers than it shall upon the good people of Selma.

These good people are to be commended for their forbearance under circumstances no outsider can ever fully appreciate. And we say to them, "Hold fast to reason, for it surely shall prevail in the light of history."

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE PLAN

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 and over on a uniform basis throughout the United States. The cost of the program will be shared by the individual participants and the Federal Government. The program will be entirely voluntary.

I am happy to state that joining me today in the introduction of identical bills are Hon. JAMES B. UTT, of California; Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS, of Ohio; Hon. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania; Hon. HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois; Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin; Hon. BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota; Hon. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, of Alabama.

The plan will more adequately meet the medical needs of the aged than the administration's medicare proposal. It will be more equitable. It will not endanger the soundness of the social security system. It will be voluntary instead of compulsory.

The administration plan is generally limited to hospital and nursing home expenses. This plan will cover both hospital and nursing home care and surgical and medical expenses. It is both comprehensive in scope and comprehensive in effect. It will cover up to $40,000 of expenses.

The administration plan is compulsory. This plan is voluntary and every citizen over 65, without a means test, will be eligible for coverage under it.

The administration plan is inequitable. It requires wage earners to pay a regressive payroll tax chargeable to the lowest levels of income to provide medical benefits for others—a tax misleadingly justified on the basis that workers are prepaying for their own care. This plan will mainly be financed from two sources—the beneficiaries themselves based upon their ability to pay, and by the Federal Government through general revenues derived from taxes collected on the same principle. In addition, provision will be made for the States to share in financing full participation for the medically indigent.

The administration plan endangers the adequacy of retirement, death, and disability benefits under the social security system by pushing the regressive payroll tax to the limits of acceptability. The insurance concept of this plan, its method of financing, and its administration are completely independent of the social security system. Social security benefits are used merely as a test of ability to pay the individual contribution. The social security system's only involvement is the assignment of a specified percentage of an individual's social security benefits to a health insurance fund administered by the Secretary of the Treasury.

In summary, the administration's medicare proposal is unsound and dangerous. Its enactment would start us down a path from which there is no returning—the path toward regimented and deteriorating medical care. We propose a solution which we believe is typically American—comprehensive, fair, voluntary, and oriented to individual freedom and initiative. This is the way to meet the urgent needs of our elder citizens in the financing of medical care.

In brief outline, the plan would work as follows:

All persons aged 65 or over would be eligible, on a uniform basis, for insurance protection equivalent to the Government-wide indemnity benefit plan. Their participation would be voluntary; there would be no means test. Enrollment would be during an initial enrollment period, followed by periodic enrollment periods.

For those under social security—or railroad retirement—enrollment would be exercised by an assignment of a premium contribution to be taken out of, or checked off, the individual's current social security benefit. Those not under social security would execute an application accompanying it with their initial premium contribution. State agencies would be granted an option to purchase the insurance for their old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged recipients at a group rate.

Premium contributions by individuals would be based upon the cash benefits which they would either receive, or be entitled to receive, upon reaching age 65. The premium would be 10 percent of the minimum social security benefit and 5 percent of the balance. Those receiving the lowest social security benefits would pay the least. The average premium contribution on the basis of today's benefit levels would be $6 per month per person. Persons not under social security would pay a premium equivalent to the maximum contribution of an individual under social security. The remainder of the cost of the insurance would be paid by the Federal Government out of general revenues.

Benefits would be paid out of a national health insurance fund. The fund would receive as deposits the contributions of individuals, contributions from the social security system and Railroad Retirement Board on behalf of individuals covered under those systems, State contributions for OAA and MAA recipients, and annual appropriations from the Federal Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury would administer the fund. The insurance program would be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which would be charged with general administration, recordkeeping, and so forth, but would not process the claims or bills of hospitals, physicians, and the like. The Surgeon General would contract with private agencies—Blue Cross-Blue Shield, for example—which would process and pay the claims of those furnishing services and would then be reimbursed from the national health insurance fund.

DESCRIPTION OF COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH INSURANCE BILL

SUMMARY OF BENEFITS

The program will provide for comprehensive health insurance equivalent to the medical services available to Government employees under the high option of the Governmentwide indemnity plan, modified in order to meet the special needs of the aged.

The benefits under the program will greatly exceed the benefits provided for in the King-Anderson bill (H.R. 1). The program provides for full coverage of the first $1,000 of hospital—or nursing home—room and board plus 80 percent of any balance. This is the equivalent to 50 days in the hospital or 100 days of a qualified nursing home without a deductible.

In addition, the program provides for 80 percent of all other hospital, surgical, and medical expenses, after a deductible of $50, of which only $25 will apply to other hospital charges. This includes professional services of doctors, such as surgery, consultations, and home, office, and hospital calls, professional services of registered nurses, diagnostic services, rental of medical equipment, ambulance service, and prescribed drugs and medicines.

The program covers the catastrophic illness, with up to $40,000 in benefits. No longer will the life savings of an elderly person be wiped out because of a major illness.

The program will pay the actual charges for the service, subject to the reasonable and customary test used by private insurers.

Except for the liberalization of the coverage of hospital room and board to include nursing homes, the program is in all respects identical to the high option of the governmentwide indemnity plan offered to Federal employees. This means that an individual can undergo major surgery and have paid in full the first $1,000 of hospital room and board plus 80 percent of all other hospital and medical expense incident to that operation after a deductible of not more than $50. In addition, the program will cover 80 percent of all posthospital medical expense after the deductible of $50 has been exceeded by prior expense, including the $25 deductible applicable to the hospital charges.

METHOD OF FINANCING

The program would be financed by a graduated premium contribution by the individual participants based on ability to pay, supplemented by an annual appropriation from the general revenues.

By including a contribution or premium charge, the cost of the program is shared by those who receive the benefits and by the Government.

Unlike the King-Anderson bill, the program does not rely upon a regressive payroll tax for financing. The program thus avoids the dangerous fiction inherent in the King-Anderson bill that, through the use of a payroll tax, today's workers and their employers are prepaying the cost of health protection for their later years. The fact is that the regressive payroll tax will be financing the cost of medicare for those currently over 65. Under our program, the Government's share of this cost will be paid from the general funds of the Government.

ELIGIBILITY FOR COVERAGE

All persons upon attaining age 65 will be eligible for coverage on a voluntary basis. Following enactment of the program, there will be a 6-month enrollment period during which all persons 65 years of age and over will be eligible to elect to participate. Thereafter, there will be periodic enrollment periods. All persons upon reaching age 65 will have 7 months within which to elect to participate.

Under the King-Anderson bill, all persons aged 65 and over—except Federal employees—are automatically covered regardless of their wishes in the matter. This results in the inclusion of persons opposed to such coverage, for example, the Amish, Christian Scientists, as well as those already covered by group insurance programs.

The voluntary concept avoids excess coverage. Since there is a cost to the insured, those who already have adequate programs paid for by their former employers or through associations and the like, may decide not to participate in the Government-sponsored program. The automotive workers, the chemical workers, and other large industrial groups, have fully paid comprehensive health plans for retired workers. To the extent that these do not participate, the cost to the Government is reduced.

MANNER OF ELECTION

For those under social security—or railroad retirement—the election will be exercised by authorizing a "check-off" or assignment of the prescribed premium contribution out of the individual's current monthly social security benefit. An election by those not under social security—or railroad retirement—will be evidenced by execution of an application for participation in the program and the payment of premium contributions.

BASIS FOR PREMIUM CONTRIBUTIONS

The premium contributions by the participants are graduated according to ability to pay as evidenced by their old-age insurance benefit. The premium is an amount equal to 10 percent of the minimum cash benefit of a primary beneficiary—currently $40 per month—plus 5 percent of the additional cash benefit payable to the primary beneficiary and his spouse—if over age 65. This will result in an average premium contribution of $6 per month per person.

If an individual otherwise entitled to receive cash benefits under social security is ineligible for such benefits—or such benefits are reduced—on account of the earnings test, this will not affect the individual's contribution. The amount of the individual's contribution will be paid by the Social Security Administrator to the insurance program irrespective of earnings. To this extent, there is an automatic liberalization of the earnings test.

At the existing level of social security cash benefits, the premium contributions required for select benefit levels would be as follows:

Monthly benefit of aged family unit and monthly health contribution

$40 (single worker)	$4.00
$60 [1]	5.00
$75	5.75
$105	7.25
$150	9.50
$190 [2]	11.50

[1] Present monthly minimum of $40 for worker and $20 for wife.

[2] Present monthly maximum of $127 for worker and $63 for wife.

Railroad retirement contributions would be based upon the same formula as the social security contributions, up to the maximum payable by social security participants.

For a couple receiving the maximum social security benefit—currently $190—the cost of the insurance will be $11.50 per month. A couple receiving the minimum social security benefit—currently $60—will be able to buy the same health insurance at a cost of $5 per month. The amount of the Government subsidy thus varies with the economic status of the individual, as measured by social security benefits.

At the conference on the social security amendments bill of 1964, it was virtually agreed that OASI cash benefits should be increased by 7 percent with a minimum increase of $5 per month. We can assume that an increase will be enacted this year at least equal in amount. This will provide the OASI beneficiaries with additional funds required to participate in the insurance program.

Persons who are not under social security may participate by a premium contribution equal in amount to the maximum contribution of those eligible under social security. Where payment of the premium would represent an undue hardship, such as in the case of a person under old-age assistance, the individual could be included under the group buy-in option extended to the States.

The insurance concept is completely independent of the social security system. Social security benefits are used merely as a test of ability to pay in determining the amount of the individual contribution. The assignment of a predetermined percentage of these benefits to the health insurance fund is the only relationship of the program to the OASDI system.

PARTICIPATION BY STATE AGENCIES—GROUP BUY-IN OPTION

State agencies will have the option to purchase the plan benefits for their old-age assistance—OAA—and medical assistance for the aged—MAA—recipients at a group rate equivalent to the weighted average rate applicable to the social security beneficiaries, which is presently about $6 per month.

The program preserves fully the role of the States in providing for those who are in need. The State agency will have considerable flexibility in meeting the requirements of these groups. If the individual is a social security beneficiary, presumably the State would require the individual to elect the benefits through the assignment of social security benefits and increase the individual's old-age assistance cash allowance to make up the difference. Other recipients of State aid could be blanketed in at the group rate.

Thus, while the individual contributions will vary, all persons over 65 will be eligible for the identical comprehensive protection. No distinction is made between the person covered on an individual basis, the recipient of OAA or the recipient of MAA.

ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM

There will be established a national health insurance fund. The fund will be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury. Premium contributions of the individual participants will be deposited directly to the credit of the fund. An appropriation will be made annually to provide for the additional amount required by the fund in order to finance benefits for the ensuing benefit period.

The general administration of the insurance program will be entrusted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That Department will be charged with the responsibility of making known the program to those presently over age 65; notifying those reaching age 65 in the future of their rights to participate; maintaining records; preparing actuarial studies; and presenting the appropriation requests for the program to the committees of the Congress, and so forth.

The Office of the Surgeon General will be charged with the administration of the benefit provisions of the program. The Surgeon General will utilize established health insurance organizations to process the claims—bills—of the hospitals, physicians, and other organizations rendering the service. Payment for health service will be processed in the same manner as a charge presently covered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield or a private insurer. The hospital, physician, and the like will send their bills to the accredited health organization designated to process claims. After the customary verification, such organization will pay the charge. The paying organization will then be reimbursed by the Treasury for the charges paid together with an agreed upon fee or handling charge.

Examples showing comparable benefits under King-Anderson bill (H.R. 1) and under this program

CASE A—HOSPITAL

	Amount
Hospital room and board	$441
Hospital ancillary charges	353
Surgeon and anesthetist	260
Other physicians	200
Private duty nurse	85
Out-of-hospital drugs	75
Other expense	15
Total medical expense	1,429
Recovery under King-Anderson bill	−754
Cost to insured under King-Anderson bill	675
Additional recovery under this program	−438
Cost to insured under this program	237

CASE B—NONHOSPITAL

Surgery	10
Nonhospital physician visits	120
Nonhospital nurse visits	8
Prescribed drugs	94
Other nonhospital care	18
Total medical expense	250
Recovery under King-Anderson bill	0
Cost to insured under King-Anderson bill	250
Additional recovery under this program	−160
Cost to insured under this program	90

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 8 AND BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the majority leader, if he would kindy advise us as to the legislative program for the following week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. There is no further legislative business this week. The program for the week of February 8 is as follows: Monday, a request to send to conference House Resolution 234, supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

Monday is District day. There are 11 bills as follows:

H.R. 1064, authorizing canine corps for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1065, exempting majority and minority rooms from sales tax;

H.R. 1066, retirement salaries of certain retired judges;

H.R. 647, appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust;

H.R. 66, discharge of parolees from supervision;

H.R. 1699, to permit national board examinations for podiatrists;

H.R. 1700, providing for voluntary admissions to District of Columbia Training School;

H.R. 1007, exemptions from attachment of wages of nonresidents;

H.R. 947, requiring reports to police of motor vehicle collisions;

H.R. 948, amending District of Columbia Code with respect to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage; and

H.R. 3314, requiring premarital examinations.

For Tuesday and Wednesday: H.R. 3818, repealing certain legislation relating to reserves against deposits in Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes.

For Thursday and the balance of the week there is no legislative business scheduled.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that any further program will be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE KATHERINE ST. GEORGE

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, during the 88th Congress, it was my pleasure to serve on the U.S. delegation to Interparliamentary Union Conferences in Lucerne, Copenhagen, and here in Washington. I was impressed time and time again by the interest and dedication and leadership of our chairman, the Honorable Katherine St. George, of New York.

Mrs. St. George gave of herself and her time unstintingly to make the participation of the United States effective and meaningful. We are all in her debt.

I think it was fitting that Mrs. St. George was elected an honorary member of the U.S. group and as secretary. I am delighted that we will have the benefit of her enthusiasm and wisdom during the 89th Congress and in the future.

A 4-YEAR TERM

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Lowell, Mass., Sun has made an interesting and thoughtful contribution to the growing dialog on congressional organization and procedure. In its January 30 edition, an editorial "A 4-Year Term," explored the possibility of a longer term for Members of the House of Representatives.

Most importantly, the editorial stressed the need for a "lively debate" on the structure and functions of Congress. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and insert it in the body of the RECORD following my remarks:

A 4-YEAR TERM

For a long time Members of the U.S. House of Representatives have grumbled that because of their 2-year terms, they have to start running for reelection practically as soon as they are sworn in each term.

Political scientists have been in general agreement that 2 years is too short a term for any elective office. But, like doing something about the weather, this has been all talk and no action.

There are some historic arguments advanced by the few persons who declare their support of the present system. One is that 2-year elections "keep the House close to the people." In those days when sessions of Congress ran only 3 or 4 months and Representatives spent most of their time at home, maybe there was some validity to this.

Now, however, with 8- to 10-month sessions, most House Members maintain offices in their districts, keep in contact by telephone, and jet back home every 2 or 3 weeks. They keep in close touch with their constituencies, still, but with the addition of primaries and general elections every 2 years, they don't have much time on Capitol Hill to carry out the constituents' wishes.

There is some debate as to the desirability of entirely doing away with mid-term elections. Proponents of this idea contend that a President shouldn't be shackled by the loss of strength the "ins" usually suffer in these nonpresidential year elections. The reverse of that argument is that public sentiment may change sharply in 2 years, and that these elections provide a check on the administration.

One compromise proposal has been advanced in the past calling for half the House Members to be elected every 2 years, for 4-year terms.

Whether this ferment results in a constitutional change or not, it's healthy to have the discussion.

Certainly Congress is covered with the barnacles of tradition. A lively debate upon its structure and functions might at least result in a few such innovations as electric voting machines, trimming much of the dreary, useless verbiage from the Appendix to the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and reducing abuse of the franking privilege.

THE CHEATING SCANDALS AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern and regret of all Americans about the recent cheating scandals at the Air Force Academy. I have a unique concern as one of the two Members of this Congress who is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. The Air Force Academy honor system is patterned after the honor system at West Point.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to explain in some depth some of the features of this honor system. The press has not been able, in short reports, to do this, and I am glad to have the opportunity to do this today.

The honor system at West Point is not just an honor system. It is a way of life. It involves everything that a cadet may do or think during his 4 years at West Point and during his life thereafter. It does involve, yes, cheating, but many other things. It does not just mean that a professor is free to leave the room during an examination. It means much more. It means that a cadet's word is trusted in everything he does. A cadet can explain any action of his. No one is requested to corroborate his reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of one occasion when I was a cadet at West Point when due to a blizzard, many cadets were late coming back from leave because so many of the planes and trains were not running. In no case did the academy check the word of a cadet or check to see if the trains were running, although this could have involved very severe penalties.

Mr. Speaker, when a cadet appears before a general board for a very serious infraction of the rules there are no witnesses. The cadet's word is taken as his bond. When a cadet leaves his room the room may be inspected. He may mark a card in the room saying merely that he is on an authorized visit and his word is always accepted.

I would like to say further that the cadet honor code is administered by the cadets and not by the military officers.

When a cadet comes to West Point, he is not expected to know all of the rules of the honor code, but during the period of many months as a new cadet while at the U.S. Military Academy and, of course, while as a plebe at the U.S. Air Force Academy, this honor code, and how it affects the individual cadet, is explained by other cadets. He learns the rules, he understands the rules, and he is expected to abide by the rules.

I would like to say further that the Academies are different from other schools in this country because these are not merely universities. These are academies training leaders for our Military Establishments. We are speaking of men who will lead other fine young men of our country in combat, men who must be trusted and whose word must be trusted, certainly without qualification or question.

Mr. Speaker, one of the rules of the academy honor system is that quibbling will not be allowed. Quibbling is defined as any statement which on the surface is true but which gives a false impression. This is a violation of the honor code, just the same as outright lying. This is brought out by many military experiences and one in particular that I remember.

In World War II there was a colonel who was asked a question. The question was, "Are you moving?" Everyone knew what this question meant. The question meant "Are you crossing the line of departure?" The colonel answered "yes." His troops were moving but they were not crossing the line of departure. This was quibbling. This quibbling endangered the lives of a great many men.

Mr. Speaker, when we speak of the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy, we are speaking of training leaders whose word must be trusted, because it will soon become a life and death matter in the event of leading men in combat.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak particularly about one aspect of this scandal which has been emphasized so much by the press. This is the aspect of informing on others or of turning other people in.

I am informed that none have resigned to date who were involved only in reporting on others. But let me speak of reporting on others. The Air Force Academy Code is very simple. It says, "We will not lie, cheat or steal nor tolerate among us those who do."

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that cadets are not asked to turn in people who violate rules. If a cadet sees a fellow cadet who is late to formation or sees any violation of any rule, he is not expected to turn this man in. He is only expected to ask the man to turn himself in or to turn the man in to other cadets for investigation, in cases where this man is found to be lying, cheating, or stealing. Such a man is unfit to be an officer in this country's military force.

Mr. Speaker, while this is harsh and while it is not normal in our Nation's universities today, we are not speaking of a normal university situation. We are speaking of a military situation at the Military Academy, at the Air Force Academy, and at the Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, the alternative to this would be intolerable. We cannot train military leaders who will accept or live with anything less than complete truth and honesty.

The honor code could not be continued without this kind of a rule.

I would like to say further that these cadets, though I have great sympathy for them, knew the rules. The rules were well understood. They were given months of intensive sessions by fellow cadets, and if they did not like the rules they had the opportunity to resign.

I applaud the blue ribbon committee that has been appointed. I think an investigation of a scandal of this kind is necessary, and I am sure that the distinguished gentlemen on this committee will investigate fully. I hope that each cadet and the family of each cadet will be treated with great sympathy and understanding. Yet it is my urgent plea that the honor system of the service academies will not be attacked but, rather, that the system will be preserved and perfected. This, Mr. Speaker, is my request.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for his very fine statement on the most unfortunate situation at the Air Force Academy. Certainly the gentleman's knowledge as a graduate of West Point and as one who has maintained a continuing interest in our service academies has enabled him to shed light on this very difficult problem. The gentleman's thoughtful remarks today should do a great deal toward increasing public understanding of the regrettable problems at the Academy. I congratulate my very able colleague for the significant contribution he has made.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia for clarifying what I think is an extremely difficult and unusual case. Perhaps inadvertently the American press has given some people the impression that the honor system must be at fault in this regard. I congratulate the gentleman, and I join him in his wish to clarify this point. Certainly the honor system has been more than worthwhile in the preservation of our system of values in the military academies.

I urge my colleagues to join in this effort. We must make clear that the honor system itself is not subject to criticism.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, if there is any party line that is stronger than that observed in this House it is that observed between those who went to the Military Academy and those who went to the Naval Academy. I congratulate the gentleman on his remarks. I do this as a graduate of the Naval Academy, and as a graduate of the University of Virginia. I applaud the committee that has been named to investigate the tragic scandal within the Air Force Academy. I am particularly confident something good will come of it, because it has on it Dean Hardy Dillard of the Law School of the University of Virginia.

I would add my voice and say that no matter what comes of this we need the honor system in the name of national security.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

There are three Naval Academy graduates in the Congress. The graduates of the Naval Academy share with the graduates of the Military Academy their concern at this particular time.

FEIGHAN EXPOSES MYTHICAL QUOTA SYSTEM—THREAT OF NONQUOTA IMMIGRATION DEMANDS CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to address the 36th annual conference of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies. That organization has established a meritorious record over many years in fighting for those ideals which have made our country great. The pursuit of patriotism imposes heavy responsibilities and very often brings small reward for the effort made. But this is not new. It is to the credit of all those associated with this organization that they do not seek acclaim for their efforts because their reward comes from the knowledge that they are doing what they believe to be right and necessary in any given circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, by leave granted, I insert in the RECORD the address I delivered today.

ADDRESS BY MR. FEIGHAN

Reasonable people will agree that our immigration laws are the most complex on the statute books. The complexities of the law have led to a great deal of public confusion and misunderstandings about our immigration policy—both as to theory and as to actual practice.

My remarks today will be directed to some of the realities of our immigration policy. I have singled out the major issues which should guide the current public discussion on our Nation's immigration policy. If a consensus can be found on these major issues, we stand an excellent chance of revising our immigration laws in a manner which will accord with our requirements as a nation, both domestically and internationally, at this advanced stage of our national development.

The first issue to be examined is the national origins quota system, authorized by Congress in its present form in 1924. That system assigned an annual quota to all countries outside the Western Hemisphere, based upon a mathematical proportion of people from each of those countries residing in the United States according to the 1920 census. The quota fixed for each country was expected to serve as a ceiling on immigration from each country. No quotas were fixed for independent nations within the Western Hemisphere which were thereby favored with unrestricted immigration to the United States.

The motives behind this system of an annual quota for some countries and unrestricted immigration from others are now open to sharp criticism and lost in an emotional upheaval. But the span of 40 years since this system was instituted permits some valid conclusions. It is now clear that the far-reaching political and economic upsets in Europe in the wake of World War I, when the geography of old empires was dissolved, posed the imminent problem of immigrant arrivals from those troubled lands on a scale which could threaten the stability of our Nation at a perilous point in history. Uninformed hindsight can easily reject this conclusion of history, but justice to those who were then responsible for the destiny of our Nation requires that we weigh that conclusion against the time and tide of human events in which it was made. Further, the harsh disappointments which followed in the wake of that war with respect to a lasting peace based upon freedom for all nations and people—our war objectives—led to disillusionment and a retreat into hemispheric isolation.

Let us not forget in terms of time, that the great expanses of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans then provided us and the other nations of our Hemisphere with a high degree of national security and regional peace which has been washed away by the relentless scientific and technological progress of the past 25 years. The New York Times, in an editorial of March 1, 1924, advanced arguments in support of the quota system based upon our right to decide who shall or shall not enter, what was best for our Nation's interest as a whole rather than the special interests of any particular groups and cautioned: "The great test is assimilability." The world of our times is a far cry from the early 1920's when the quota and nonquota concepts were laid down as basic policy for our immigration program. The New York Times, like most metropolitan newspapers, has since reversed its position of 1924.

What does the record of performance over the past 10 years, as distinguished from theory, tell us about the national origins quota system? Has it worked out in practice as the theory intended? Let us look at the official record.

Take the countries of Europe as a starter. Here are some startling comparisons:

Portugal has an annual quota ceiling of 438 fixed by law. Yet the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Portugal has run 2,736 per year during the past 10 years. There is a difference between the theoretical ceiling of 438 per year and the actual of 2,736 immigrant admissions each year.

Greece has an annual quota ceiling of 308 fixed by law. But the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Greece has run 2,666 per year for the past 10 years. There is a considerable difference between the theory of 308 and the actual of 2,666 per year immigrant admissions.

Italy has an annual quota ceiling of 5,666 fixed by law. Yet the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Italy has run 15,685 per year for the past 10 years. There is a noticeable difference between the theory of 5,666 and the actual of 15,685 immigrant visas per year.

Spain has an annual quota ceiling of 250 fixed by law. But the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Spain has run 1,264 per year for the past 10 years. The difference between the theoretical ceiling of 250 and the actual of 1,264 immigrant admissions per year is evident.

This essentially is the pattern of immigration from Europe for the past 10 years, with the exception of the once free nations behind the Russian Iron Curtain where freedom of movement is restricted and normal immigration is impossible. To summarize, of the 35 quota countries of Europe, 22 exceeded the ceiling set by the national origins quota system during the past 10 years.

Let us turn to Asia. What does the record of performance over the past 10 years tell us, as distinguished from the theory of the national origins quota system. Here are some outstanding examples.

Japan has an annual quota ceiling of 185 fixed by law. But the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Japan has run 4,887 per year for the past 10 years.

China has an annual quota ceiling of 100 fixed by law. Yet the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of China has run 2,103 per year for the past 10 years. In addition, another quota concept of "Chinese persons" has been created with an annual quota of 105. Here again the record shows a total of 5,526 immigrant visas were issued to persons in this category during the past 10 years. Over and above these totals are the Chinese refugees, from Hong Kong, who are "paroled" into the United States under a Presidential determination and who are not charged to any quota system.

Indonesia has an annual quota ceiling of 100 fixed by law. Nevertheless there have been issued to residents of Indonesia an average of 1,657 immigrant visas each year for the past 10 years.

Philippines has an annual quota ceiling of 100 fixed by law. Here we find that the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of the Philippines has been 2,281 per year for the past 10 years.

Korea also has an annual quota ceiling of 100, fixed by law. But the record reveals an average of 1,250 immigrant visas have been issued each year for the past 10 years to natives of Korea.

To summarize, there are 34 quota countries or areas of Asia and 15 of these exceeded the theoretical ceiling set by law over the past 10 years. This record of practice provides ample evidence that the national origins quota system has not worked out as originally intended.

On a worldwide basis there are 119 quota countries or areas established by the national origins system. Of this number 46 exceeded the theoretical ceiling set by law during the past 10 years.

For the source of this wide disparity between the ceiling of immigrant admissions set by the national origins system and the actual numbers of immigrant visas issued we must look to the nonquota provisions of the law. Changing times and the pressure of meeting practical human problems in the post World War II era have resulted in a long series of amendments to the basic law authorizing nonquota status for certain classes of aliens outside the Western Hemisphere. It is these new, nonquota classes which reduce the national origins quota system to a myth.

I referred earlier to the system of unrestricted immigration from the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere as the historical companion of the national origins quota system. In the 1920's immigration from the countries of the Western Hemisphere was low and mobility of movement within the hemisphere was limited. But that condition has changed. Over the past 10 years an average of 110,435 nonquota immigrant visas were issued to natives of this hemisphere each year. That figure would be much higher were it not for the requirement that applicants for admission must provide proof against the likelihood of becoming a public charge.

The full scope of nonquota immigration to the United States on a global basis can be measured by the trend over the past 10 years. During that period 1,774,367 nonquota immigrant visas were issued as against 948,334 quota visas. This means approximately a 2-to-1 ratio over quota immigration.

The January 1950 issue of the Monthly Review published by the Immigration and Naturalization Service reporting on nonquota trends pointed out, "In the quarter of a century of immigration since the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, nonquota immigration nearly equaled quota immigration." Hence, within 15 years nonquota immigration has doubled quota immigration.

It is reasonable to conclude, based upon this examination of the record, that the national origins quota system is little more than a theory in terms of regulating immigration to the United States. If that system was intended to restrict immigration to the United States it has failed equally. It is futile to support myths, and corruptive of our national purposes to hold tightly to theories, which have little practical application.

The national origins quota system must be replaced by a new system—a selective immigration system which establishes qualitative and quantitative controls. That is the real task confronting Congress today.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his immigration message to Congress on January 13, 1965, stated: "The principal reform called for is the elimination of the national origins quota system." Later, in that message, he emphasized, "The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from, but what are his personal qualities." From these guidelines principles, upon which a new policy of immigrant admissions is to be based, a number of logical and practical questions arise.

First and foremost is the question whether people who are natives of the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere are to be considered superior to, and therefore preferable to, people born in Europe or elsewhere in the world. That is precisely what retention of the nonquota status for natives of countries of the Western Hemisphere, under provisions of the basic 1924 law would clearly imply. If we eliminate the theoretical quota system for countries outside the Western Hemisphere, which system has been labeled with being racial and prejudicial, how can we continue to justify the nonquota status for natives of independent countries in the Western Hemisphere?

The question then arises, What system shall replace the quota-nonquota concepts in the law? I favor a complete disengagement from the misleading term of quota. A numerical limit to immigrant admissions per annum on a worldwide basis is now required. The annual limit should be based upon a realistic assessment of the number of immigrants we can absorb. Our experience with immigrant admissions over the past 10 years should provide a reliable basis on which to make the assessment. The modest annual increase of 7,000 called for by President Johnson should present no real problem.

The current hassle over the national origins system has misled most people to believe that the quota of 158,361 is the maximum number of immigrants to be admitted each year. The facts are that quota immigration has been averaging 95,000 per year and nonquota immigration has been averaging 178,000 per year. That makes a grand total of approximately 273,000 rather than the misleading figure of 158,361.

It has been said that the administration bill would increase by less than 7,000 the present authorized quota. That is true. However, since an average of 63,000 of those authorized quota numbers have not been used each year and the administration bill requires that they all be used under a new system, that would mean an actual annual increase of 70,000 quota immigrants each year. Other provisions of the administration bill would result in a further increase in nonquota immigration and parole admissions. There is some doubt about the exact numbers involved. Mr. Abba Schwartz, Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, in the course of testimony taken on August 3, 1964, admitted the overall admissions would increase to a minimum of 400,000. See page 533, part II, Immigration Hearings of 1964. This would mean an increase of more than 100,000 per year over the annual average of the past 10 years. Mr. Schwartz was one of the principal architects of the administration bill and he should know something about the numbers involved.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in his testimony of last year on the international implications of our immigration policy, stated that foreign ministers complain to him about the discriminatory nature of the national origins quota system which creates problems in terms of relations with the United States. Secretary Rusk made it clear the problem was not numbers of immigrants we admit, since we have the most generous immigration program in the world, but the manner in which immigrants outside the Western Hemisphere are judged on the basis of their national origin.

Similarly former Attorney General ROBERT KENNEDY testified that he was more concerned about the method of allocating quota numbers based upon national origin than he was concerned with numbers of immigrants we admit each year. Given a choice, he hoped we would not have to reduce general immigration, but held the most important thing was to remove the penalty in the law which relates to national origin.

In light of the testimony by members of the Cabinet and the latest admonition from the President, underscoring the principal reform called for is elimination of the national origins quota system, it is fair to ask why we must at the same time increase our general immigration admissions by more than 25 percent per year? The answer to that question was not found during the 1964 congressional hearings.

The justification for this large increase if there is any must be established during the hearings which will open in the House on February 16. We will also seek clarification of the practical effect resulting from the changes made in the first administration bill, particularly the added definition of a refugee in the context of the unusual geographical definition of the Middle East to include all of north Africa. The new parole authority requested is certain to increase further the actual number of immigrant admissions each year, even though this method escapes both the quota and nonquota controls in the proposed administration bill. Further, we will need to know whether the new administration bill sent to Congress will result in an additional increase of 50,000 so-called quota immigrants beyond the 400,000 estimate, during the first year of proposed operations. If authorized but unused quota numbers from the previous year are recaptured for use in the first year of proposed operations under the new law, this added increase would be certain. The language of the proposed bill is unclear on this point and will need to be clarified.

The next major issue on which practical insight is an imperative is the problem of distributing immigrant visas on an equitable basis. Here the administration proposal calls for a seven-member immigration board, engaging four Members of Congress in the business of the executive department, with purely advisory functions on how the quota immigrant visas are to be distributed. The drafters of the bill appear to have overlooked the constitutional principle of separate but equal divisions of the Federal Government and how maintaining the balance of powers is dependent upon maintaining the separate status for each of the three branches of Government. If our Constitution provided for a parliamentary system like that of Great Britain, under which the principal officers of the Government must be Members of the House of Commons, then the mixed member immigration board called for would make sense. But our Constitution does not permit the parliamentary system which governs Great Britain.

From a practical point of view, the unique Presidential authority over immigrant admissions called for by the administration bill could hardly be exercised by the President in the detailed manner necessary to satisfy all the facets of the problem. He is altogether too preoccupied with more important obligations. This authority would, therefore, be passed on to appointed officers of the Government, most likely the faceless bureaucracy—over whom the Congress and the people have little or no control. Anyone with experience in seeking a redress of grievances from the typical Government bureaucrat can not help but shudder at the prospect of what could happen if control of immigrant admissions was passed to them. The citizen right of petition is anchored most firmly in the Congress and our experiences over the past 20 years indicates immigration has been a matter of frequent petition for a redress of grievances. This trend is unlikely to change under the best of circumstances and Congress must retain the responsibilities involved.

We must find a new system which avoids conflict over authority and which rests upon the governing directives of clear-cut law.

One method to that end is to establish new criteria of preferences and to assign each preference a percentage ceiling of the maximum visas authorized by law for use on a worldwide basis. Limits would need to be fixed on the number of visas that could be issued annually to natives of any one country in order to guarantee fair and equal treatment to all countries.

Now, as to the preferences which would govern visa issuances within the maximum number set by law, I would urge the following preferences in this order of importance:

1. Uniting families of U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens. Families should include those relatives covered by the present law.

The highest values of our free society are the integrity of the family and the sanctity of the home. The strength and stability of our Nation flows from a firm adherence to these values. Families, split and divided by peculiarities of law rather than free choice, are at variance with our longstanding tradition. Our first obligation should be to correct this inequity of law and to prevent its recurrence.

2. Skills, talents, and special training of applicants for an immigration visa for which there is a demonstrated need in the United States. The method now used for establishing our national needs in this regard is both inadequate and uncertain. The fault for this condition does not rest with the Secretary of Labor. Secretary Wirtz testified during the 1964 hearings that his Department had made efforts to secure authority and funds to undertake and maintain a national survey of such needs but without success. A preliminary study of the problem is now underway, however, and the results may be helpful in establishing new guidelines in law.

President Johnson proposed a new class of workers with lesser skills in his recent immigration message. The meaning and scope of this new class of preferred workers will require examination in the forthcoming hearings in the House.

The present law with respect to skilled workers requires that they be needed urgently in the United States. On this point the administration bill substitutes the requirement of "especially advantageous to" the United States. What this change of language means in terms of qualitative and quantitative application also requires clarification.

3. Haven for victims of religious and political persecution and national catastrophies. These classes of aliens have by long tradition been the beneficiaries of our humanitarian concern for the oppressed and most unfortunate. For this preference a ceiling should be set and eligibility requirements governed by a statutory definition of refugee-escapee.

The administration bill as I indicated earlier recommends a different method. It requests authority to use the parole provisions of law for refugees, with no numerical limitation set as to the number of immigrants in this category to be admitted annually.

In closing I raise several questions which are basic to the principles which I have advanced for a new, selective immigration program.

If the national origins quota system is so discriminatory and offensive to our national heritage—why must we take 5 years to abolish it? Why not abolish it forthwith.

Since the national origins quota system is in fact a myth, as I have demonstrated, why should we fear to abandon a myth which has caused dissension at home and embarrassment abroad?

Let us turn our undivided attention to the real task of finding a national consensus on a selective immigration program which meets the needs of our Nation as they in fact exist today.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, once again Congress is being asked to approve large outlays for assorted Federal aid to education projects. While it is virtually impossible to estimate the total amount of cash already being expended for school-connected projects, it is reckoned that some $8.5 billion is being expended by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies for this purpose.

Yet even this vast sum is not enough for the administration, which at latest report hopes to bring pre-kindergarten tots into the Government's chautauqua tent for exposure to the teachings and tales of erudite bureaucratic marms and masters. Rather than promise the taxpayer that he will be allowed to keep a geater share of his earnings so that he can use it to improve educational opportunities for his own children and his community, the administration would keep more and more tax revenue in order that it can dole out our funds as it sees fit to "Donald Duck" nurseries through college campuses.

The Washington Post of Sunday, January 24, described activities for 4- and 5-year-olds in one school sponsored under a grant by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity. The class has been set up for 2 hours on Saturday mornings. Here is one paragraph from the Post:

> They danced in a circle (developing social capacity), sang and played a clapping game (acquiring a sense of music and rhythm), played with a set of large plastic keys (learning the colors), visited a make-believe grocery store and examined artificial fruit (sharpening imagination and the sense of touch), marched in military fashion to the washroom, and later met Cuddles, a brown guinea pig.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how my colleagues take to this sort of activity underwritten by the American taxpayer, but I personally find it entirely repugnant and a matter that should be investigated by the appropriate committee of Congress. By whose authority does the Federal Government provide Treasury funds to teach tiny youngsters social capacity and a sense of music and rhythm? Parents who want to teach colors to their children can get a good start by having them compare the black and red figures in the national budgets of the past few years, and they can take their youngsters to supermarkets to examine the fresh fruit whose cost is completely out of proportion due largely to the inflation caused by just such ridiculous programs as this dilly sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Marching in military fashion to the washroom is no doubt meant to prepare individuals for goosestepping to the cleaners when they become taxpayers. While it is no longer possible to go to market to see a fat guinea pig, the children can learn at least a trifle more about animals at the local zoo, which is maintained by the Federal Government at great cost and is open to all without an admission fee.

This prekindergarten demonstration should serve as a warning against permitting the Federal Government's getting its dancing slipper into the door of our primary and high schools. In the early grades children may be able to further their artistry by combining the development of social capacity and music and rhythm into a single operation with simultaneous dancing and clapping to the tune of supercalifragilisticexpialidocious. Thus there will be no danger of their becoming wallflowers by the time they are ready for the Government-sponsored junior cotillion and senior prom.

Now we are all prepared for the college campus, where large plastic Phi Beta Kappa keys of various colors will await the better students with outstanding social capacity and superb sense of music and rhythm. Some time ago I received a letter protesting Federal aid to education from a member of a school board in Pennsylvania's 22d Congressional District. He wrote:

> Do not be stampeded into passing legislation which will gradually develop into an octopus which will have its tentacles into every hamlet in the United States of America. Government power corrupts and destroys the intrinsic worth of our citizens regardless of the good intentions which created it.

Observing that free scholarships will not necessarily "make scientists," he stated:

> If an individual wants to become a scientist, and is willing to pay the price, there are all the necessary opportunities in our educational system. This is just another political plum which the professional politicians and Government bureaucrats will keep dangling before the eyes of a gullible electorate.

Perhaps it is time that Congress allow itself a spoonful of this homely philosophy. Through Treasury dollars already made available in the past few years for educational purposes, the Federal Government wields its professional ruler over many of the Nation's institutions of higher learning. To extend its largesse and gratuities into areas it now envisions will enable bureaucrats to hold the rod over a predominant number of the country's total school enrollment.

Certainly there are, at least for the time being, ample scholarships available for those who wish to become scientists or to pursue whatever career they choose. Under the National Defense Education Act a student may borrow up to $1,000 a year for each of 4 or 5 years. He pays no interest until a year after he graduates and then pays only 3 percent. He has a 10-year period to repay, and payments are far less than on a new car. In addition, there are almost countless scholarships available through private industry, foundations, State grants, individual grants, and through numerous Federal departments and offices.

While no one qualified for college work should be deprived of the opportunity to attend an institution of higher learning if he has the interest, the ambition, and the determination, we should never forget the truism, "free scholarships do not necessarily make scientists."

Last week—January 27—was an important anniversary. It was on that date in 1880 that Thomas Edison was granted a patent for an electric incandescent lamp. Edison got no free scholarships. At 12 he was a railroad newsboy and after 15 earned his living as a telegraph operator in various cities, always studying and experimenting in his spare time. In succeeding years his inventions included—in addition to those dealing with the generation and distribution of electric light, heat, and power—stock tickers, automatic telegraph systems, the electric pen—which developed into the mimeograph—the phonograph, a machine for office dictation, and a camera for taking motion pictures.

Whether the remarkable Thomas Edison could have contributed more to mankind had he received a full education is a question open to debate, but the fact that he was not spoon-fed through his early youth by a paternalistic government certainly did nothing to discourage his driving ambition and irrepressible imagination. Energy of this nature can very well be destroyed if the task of going to college is reduced to the point where a qualified student need only apply for a Federal grant to assure a comfortable life on campus. There is also a tendency to restrict parental initiative and responsibility in the matter of a child's education through patronizing and overgenerous government proffers. At this point in the Record I should like to insert a news story, originating in the U.S. Office of Education, published in the Connellsville, Pa., Courier of April 10, 1963:

Lack of Encouragement Keeps Many Boys, Girls From Entering Colleges

> Why is it that many bright boys and girls do not go to college? Is it because they lack the funds—or, as a recent study suggests, is it because they lack the incentive?
>
> According to U.S. Office of Education studies, two-thirds of the country's high school graduates do not go to college, although many are obviously capable of college work, having been in the upper half of their graduating classes. While it is true that some of them miss out on a higher education because they cannot afford it, the studies suggest that, more often, young people do not go to college because they have not been encouraged to do so.
>
> For instance, the attitude of parents on the subject of college has a direct connection with a youngster's decision. Children of college graduates are most apt to be brought up with the idea that they, too, will go to college. But the survey does show that the child who is really hungry for college has a good chance of getting there, even though his parents may not be college-trained. The overriding factor is usually the encouragement of his parents. On the other hand, a negative attitude toward college—or even one of indifference—will have a negative effect on the youngster.
>
> Then, too, as many parents know, teenagers' opinions can be heavily influenced by what their friends and schoolmates think about college. If the teenager happens to "travel" with a college-minded crowd, chances are he will also want to attend.
>
> The very community in which the family lives can also affect a youngster's attitude toward school. For instance, young people who live near a college are more likely to attend than those who live some distance away. But this is not to say that families must move to the vicinity of a university to get young people interested in higher education. Parents can use their influence, wherever they live, to achieve the same end.
>
> Perhaps some parents are reluctant to encourage the idea of a college because of the cost involved. The U.S. Office of Education reports that the national average expense for 1 recent academic year is $1,550. Parents provide about $950 of this amount, on the average. The balance comes from student earnings, scholarships and other sources, such as gifts.
>
> But the young man or woman determined to enter college without a scholarship or financial aid from his family still has other avenues open to him. He can look into municipal or State colleges where fees are low; he can supplement tuition fees with a part-time job; or he may be able to obtain a student loan from a college, bank, or the Government. Substantial amounts of money have been provided for loans to college students by the Federal Government under title II of the National Defense Act of 1958. And some banks, in recent years, have established the practice of making available to promising students low-interest loans.
>
> Actually, reports the Institute of Life Insurance, many families begin planning for their children's education in advance, particularly through systematic savings. According to a Ford Foundation study, life insurance most often figures in these plans. For example, a father buys an additional life insurance policy, earmarking the benefits for college expenses if he were to die before his youngster reaches college. If the father lives, as he probably will, the policy is valuable in other ways. He may use the cash value to help see his child through school, or he may prefer to keep the policy and borrow on it if he finds that he cannot manage comfortably out of current family income.
>
> Incidentally, parents appear to be more willing to assist their sons than their daughters through school. This is reflected in the ratio of 13 boys for every 10 girls in college. Girls who have been through college have no doubt about the value of a college education. Not long ago, a large group of women, recent college graduates, were asked what they thought about higher education. Although many had become full-time homemakers, the group as a whole said they would follow the same course if they had to do it all over. They did not feel they had been "overeducated," and, for that matter, the majority were working in jobs which required the kind of knowledge and skills learned in college. Their education, as many women know, is also valuable when a college graduate becomes a wife and mother.

Mr. Speaker, while these considerations are vital factors in the Federal-aid-to-education issue, the additional matter of Government waste and Government control haunts every home as well as every institution of learning in the United States. Each expenditure undertaken in Washington adds to, or precludes reduction of, the national debt, that ruthless manipulator largely responsible for the deflated value of today's dollar. While it is true that some of our communities are incapable of meeting necessary school expenses, there is hardly a place in the entire country whose financial status is on as low a level as that of the Federal Government, with a debt now far in excess of $300 billion.

Federal aid envisioned by the administration has the added nefarious disadvantage of dissuading local effort toward improving school systems and providing more remunerative teachers' salaries. It furthermore penalizes the many States and communities which have already built new schoolhouses and raised faculty pay.

Even more repelling to understanding Americans is the portent of Federal control over our school systems whether it be at the kindergarten stage, in grade or high school, or in college—or at all levels. Delivering direction of these responsibilities to Washington would surrender to the bureaucracy the prescribing of curriculums and subject matter as well as complete supervision of faculty members.

One noted educator, Dr. Benjamin Fine, has said that the increasing number of research grants—from such agencies as the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Mental Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the U.S. Office of Education—"tumble upon the colleges in high confusion."

Each of the agencies makes its own rules and regulations and has its own standards in dealing with the colleges. Research may be contracted by one agency, supported by a grant from another, and paid for under a variety of arrangements. Dr. Fine noted also that some men are hired by colleges not because they can teach, but because they can bring a Federal research grant with them. Men are even brought in to become deans and administrators because of these grants. Dr. Fine might also have mentioned that entirely too many teachers and scientists are gravitating into administrative positions in the Federal Government because of salaries and pension plans with which local schools and universities cannot compete. This imbalance lowers the number of instructors available for actual teaching assignments and establishes unrealistic income levels for teachers-become-politicians.

Arthur Krock, New York Times columnist, has written:

> It is a matter of record that the nationalized public school systems in other countries have been successfully employed by the dominant political party to influence the thinking of pupils through teachers who look to the capital for promotion and pay.

Mr. Krock was referring to Russia and Nazi Germany, but they are not the only examples of the evils that come through centralized control of a nation's educational process. The threat to private as well as public schools has been explained editorially in the Steubenville, Ohio, Register, official publication of that diocese:

DANGERS OF FEDERAL AID

(By Msgr. Joseph P. Kiefer)

At the turn of the century in France, the cause of Catholic education seemed doomed to extinction. Powerful forces of secularism, spurred on by rationalistic and Masonic influences, succeeded in securing legislation intended to destroy Catholic schools.

At that time, an avowed foe of the Catholic Church, Rene Viviani, speaking in the Chamber of Deputies, uttered this prediction: "We have put out lights in heaven which will never be lighted again."

The lights which Viviani and his accomplices thought had been forever extinguished in France have slowly been relit. The new French law granting aid to some 10,000 Catholic schools has provided the torch.

Under the present legislation, state payments for teachers' salaries are provided when teachers of private schools fulfill the same requirements as those in the public schools. Furthermore, local governments may pay operating expenses of such private schools.

There is a hitch to this generosity on the part of the Government. State officials reserve the right to veto the appointments of teachers and exercise limited control over the curriculum and the administration of school finances. On the secondary level, more aid to Catholic schools is provided, but, at the same time, more state control is exerted.

France joins the majority of nations in Western Europe which grant state aid for religious schools. In this respect, the United States is far behind its allies.

At the same time, we must be made aware of the dangers inherent in any Federal aid to parochial schools. France is a striking example. We must proceed with extreme caution, asking ourselves: Are we willing to risk our autonomy, our privilege of retaining religion as a vital part of our Catholic school curriculum in return for Federal assistance which may lighten our financial burden?

This, in our opinion, is a serious consideration that should be debated before we go all out in shouting for unqualified Federal aid to our Catholic schools.

Mr. Speaker, the sensible, the simple way to make more funds available for all schools—public or private, primary, high school, or college—is through legislation which I introduced on January 4, 1965, to allow a taxpayer increased personal exemptions for his children while they are attending school. The amount is graduated from the grade and high school to the college levels, but I am not wedded to the amounts of deductions provided in H.R. 1160. The size of the deductions may be amended without objection from me once the theory is thoroughly discussed in committee hearings and on the floors of the House and Senate. What is important is that Congress undertake as soon as possible to study closely this bill before the Federal Government encroaches further onto the rights of States and communities through extension of its gift, grant, endowment, and other sugar-coated educational plans that inflate inflation and thereby make school construction far more costly while robbing teachers and retired teachers of purchasing power.

RUTLAND HEIGHTS VA HOSPITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Rutland Heights in my district is one of the most shocking, indefensible measures ever undertaken by the Federal Government in the long history of the veterans rehabilitation program.

The ill-advised order closing this outstanding facility, which for 40 years has hospitalized, treated, and in many instances cured, literally thousands of disabled veterans, came like a bolt from the blue. It came without proper notice to the patients and their dear ones, the many capable faithful employees, and without proper notice or warning to the several committees of this Congress legally charged with responsibility for the care and treatment of our beloved veterans, the most cherished wards of the Government.

Upon receiving word about the Rutland Heights closing, I registered my strong protest with the President. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the text of my telegram to the President, urging retention of Rutland Heights:

JANUARY 13, 1965.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

I was greatly shocked today to learn of the proposed closing of the Rutland Heights VA hospital in my district. This facility is the only veterans hospital in central Massachusetts. If it is closed it will require the veterans in my district and several other adjoining districts to be taken comparatively long distances to other VA hospitals for urgent or necessary care and treatment. Since this facility is considered by our people here in Massachusetts to be a permanent institution for the hospitalization and care of many of our veterans, its closing will be widely and bitterly protested I am sure, not only by veterans but by the general public of every race, class, and creed. I would greatly appreciate it if you would request a very careful review of this matter to permit an evaluation of all the factors that favor the continued operation of this great facility. It would be most unfortunate if we were to make our veterans the innocent victims of so-called economy which would appear to be very doubtful. I would especially appreciate your advice and assistance in this matter so that extended inquiry can be made to ascertain the wisdom and validity of this proposed closing.

Thanks and regards.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Mr. Speaker, when the closing order came on January 13, there were 396 patients in the Rutland Heights Veterans' Administration hospital and an additional 250 discharged patients still receiving careful, outpatient followup.

The announcement came at a time when the hospital was preparing to implement the new 120-bed nursing home care unit previously authorized by the Veterans' Administration to be established at Rutland Heights.

Adequate quarters had already been selected to house this new nursing home care unit in the fine, solid building built in 1946—a well-constructed, well-laid-out, modern building that had been for some time past housing 149 patients in one and two bedrooms.

These 120 nursing home care beds were the New England regional allotment of the 4,000 nursing home care beds for veterans recently funded by the Congress.

The medical staff at the hospital had been engaged for several months in reducing the patient load in order to convert these fine accommodations into an up-to-date, completely modern, well-equipped and well-staffed, nursing home care unit.

Mr. Speaker, with the closing of Rutland Heights, the Veterans' Administration is sacrificing 120 nursing home care beds, specifically set up for the chronically ill veteran patient under legislation passed in the last Congress.

These are the beds which the Veterans' Administration was setting up for the special needs of the whole northeast area and particularly the veterans from New England. And what do we find as a sorry substitute for the phased-out Rutland beds? Mr. Speaker, I was astounded to learn that out of the first 1,000 nursing home care beds the Veterans' Administration has already allocated, there is not one single bed in New England. In fact, the Veterans' Administration hospital at Buffalo with an allocation of 36 beds is the nearest Veterans' Administration facility thus far with nursing home care beds. Apparently it is expected to be able to carry on the load that was originally intended for Rutland Heights.

It is clearly evident that the computers spilling out statistics about veteran populations and hospital operating costs were not geared to the computers allocating nursing home care beds to meet the needs of the more than 3½ million veterans in the New England States and New York. In fact, Massachusetts alone with its 700,000 veterans would sorely tax the most inadequate 36-bed allocation for Buffalo.

Prior to the Veterans' Administration order calling for the closing of Rutland Heights, I had some correspondence with the former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, John S. Gleason, Jr. His December 31 letter touches upon our Massachusetts situation and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1964.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PHIL: Thank you for writing to me concerning the need for facilities to care for chronically ill veterans in the State of Massachusetts. Providing for such care is a recognized problem, and the Veterans' Administration now provides treatment for a wide range of chronic conditions in existing facilities.

The Veterans' Administration furnishes hospital care for non-service-connected conditions within the limits of existing facilities. As you know, most of our hospitals serve veterans in more than one State. However, the most recent census shows that there are approximately 1,600 Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical beds for an estimated 674,000 veteran population residing within the State of Massachusetts. This provides about 2.4 beds per 1,000 veterans which compares favorably with a nationwide average of about 2.7 beds per 1,000 veteran population. In addition to beds located within the State, our nearby hospitals in adjoining States also provide care and treatment to a substantial number of Massachusetts veterans.

I can tell you that there are plans, although tentative at the present time, to place general medical and surgical beds in Veterans' Administration psychiatric hospitals in Massachusetts. This would mean an increase in bed capacity for patients in this category.

It is true that it has taken considerable time to initiate the nursing home care bed program. However, I am pleased to tell you that the first 1,000 beds have been allocated to Veterans' Administration hospitals in areas where there is demand and facilities can be provided. Studies are underway to provide data that will permit the most equitable distribution of the remaining 3,000 beds.

I am sure you realize that there are many factors to be considered in implementing this program such as workload, local operating conditions, and the availability of appropriate space. However, you may be assured that every possible consideration will be given to the needs of Massachusetts veterans in our planning.

This program is being developed as rapidly as possible. Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, several reasons have been given by the Veterans' Administration in support of the plans to close the Rutland Heights hospital, and all of them are specious, unjustifiable, and untenable.

It is not true, as alleged, that Rutland Heights is obsolescent. The contrary is true. It is solidly constructed, especially well laid out, well equipped, highly suitable, accessible, and well located in an extremely beautiful section of Massachusetts.

The claim that is it too costly to modernize is another gross misstatement, because it is in such good solid condition that it does not need extensive modernization, but merely requires relatively routine changes to accommodate the facilities to the new VA nursing home care bed program and perhaps addition of some new equipment and limited renovation of quarters.

The assertion that the hospital has any special difficulty recruiting professional staff and insuring quality medical care is absolutely inaccurate. Ample, capable staffs always have been, and are currently, available.

The best medical care in the world is within easy striking distance of this hospital, and the present medical, nursing, administrative staff and employees are highly experienced, highly competent, and rank at the very top in ability, diligence, and fitness.

Moreover, the hospital is located within short driving distance of the great medical center complex of the city of Boston, which embraces several outstanding medical schools, talented staffs, numerous highest ranking hospitals, and medical doctors and specialists who are reputed to be the greatest in the world.

All of these facilities and highly skilled doctors are readily available at all times, as the need may demand. In those rare instances when highly specialized medical attention is needed, it is possible for the doctors to travel from Worcester or Boston to Rutland, or to transport emergency patients from Rutland to Worcester or Boston, if the occasion should demand it, in a very short time.

The Government has spent large sums improving and modernizing this fine facility so that the medical attention and services are of the very best quality and the comfort, safety, and welfare of the patients is at all times served and guaranteed.

The physical surroundings, the condition of the facilities, the equipment, the medical nursing staff, the attendants, the administrative group, the employees, and everything about the Rutland Heights hospital clearly indicate that it is a special and general hospital of highest rank.

As I have pointed out, it would be deemed unnecessary to modernize extensively this superb hospital in order to provide new equipment, techniques, and suitable space. For this reason, the cost to the Government would be less than one-tenth of the funds being spent to modernize a large Veterans' Administration hospital in another State.

The geographical position of Rutland, apparently deemed "remote" by the Veterans' Administration, is in the center of our comparatively small State of Massachusetts which contains a population of over 5½ million people, 12 miles from the busy, forward-looking city of Worcester, with a population of 180,000 people and in the heart of Worcester County, which has a population of 500,000 people.

This facility is, if anything, ideally situated and in surroundings of unsurpassed beauty where high altitude, grassy knolls, flowing terrain, and lovely wooded areas combine to lend a scenic quality that can hardly be rivaled at another spot.

By way of contrast, the Veterans' Administration is retaining some hospitals located in places far removed from centers where specialized medical doctors and up-to-date hospitals are not available and where the nearby population is less than one-tenth that of Rutland.

In Worcester County alone there are 75,000 veterans. In Massachusetts there are about 700,000 veterans of whom 75,000 are over 65 years of age. In other New England States, most of which are within driving distance to Rutland, there are an additional 698,000 veterans, of whom 71,000 are over 65 years of age. These include a large segment of veteran population whose members are in advanced years. These aging veterans require more medical care, and often in many cases, are suffering from chronic illnesses that demand continuous expert care.

Rutland Heights Hospital takes care of many patients suffering from chronic conditions, 68 percent of its patient load is over 50 years of age, and represent generally age groups that require more extensive medical care and treatment. In fact, with veterans getting older, day by day and year by year, the need for hospital facilities grows more rather than less.

The sad and shameful fact, Mr. Speaker, is that our aged veterans have become the forgotten men of our generation. All too often, these comrades are simply allowed to vegetate in old men's homes and other institutions despite the gigantic strides made in the treatment of the aged in recent years.

The President and the Veterans' Administration should right the callous and heartless wrong they are about to perpetrate against our aged veterans in the name of economy. New England veterans have always been discriminated against by the lack of domiciliary services in our section of the country. It has been the practice of the Veterans' Administration to meet New England's domiciliary needs through the domiciliary center at Bath, N.Y., now also the victim of the task force economy ax.

This discrimination becomes even more unjust with the closing of Bath this June. Veterans in the whole northeast area will now have to go as far away as Martinsburg, W. Va., Dayton, Ohio, and Kecoughtan, Va., near Norfolk, for domiciliary care.

I have received and continue to receive daily hundreds of letters in protest against the closing of the Rutland Heights VA Hospital. These protests are well justified because there is no question about the need for these facilities to meet the hospitalization needs of the veterans of our section of the country.

Rutland Heights, which was originally established as a specialized hospital for tubercular patients, assumed a new and important function in the VA hospital system as a general medical and surgical hospital as medical progress helped to reduce the need for tubercular beds. As a result, Rutland Heights, in its new role, was able to absorb the growing overflow of patients who would otherwise have to wait to get into the already overcrowded West Roxbury and Jamaica Plain VA Hospitals.

That the work of Rutland Heights in the VA hospital program is necessary and vital is well evidenced by its average daily patient load over the 11-year period, 1954 to 1964, and I include the patient load chart at this point in the RECORD:

	TB	Surgical	Medical	Total
1954	566	None	None	566
1955	548	0	2	550
1956	512	0	34	546
1957	448	0	72	520
1958	413	0	104	517
1959	358	0	115	473
1960	323	0	127	450
1961	242	0	214	456
1962	227	0	216	443
1963	200	36	167	403
1964	147	37	207	391

During fiscal year 1964, Rutland Heights had an average daily patient load of 391 and an 81-percent bed occupancy rate. While many of these patients were from the central Massachusetts area where the hospital is located, a growing percentage of patients came from the Greater Boston area and throughout New England.

If Rutland Heights is closed finally by next June, it is those veterans from the metropolitan area of Boston who will be particularly penalized by having to wait even longer periods for needed hospitalization. Through some slide rule legerdemain, the VA statisticians have decided they can continue to meet the hospital needs of the area by closing Rutland and transferring the patients to the already overcrowded West Roxbury and Jamaica Plain VA hospitals which were unable to accept them in the first place.

Despite their arguments of shifting veteran populations and high operating costs, VA officials have been unable to furnish me with a satisfactory explanation on how they anticipate filling the bed requirements which have been and are being met by the facilities at Rutland Heights. They readily admit that Rutland Heights is carrying on an important function by taking care of the overflow of patients waiting to get into Jamaica Plain and West Roxbury. If and when Rutland Heights is closed, VA officials anticipate transferring the tubercular patients to West Haven, Conn., and the general medical and surgical patients to Jamaica Plain and West Roxbury.

It is obvious that veterans from the Greater Boston area now waiting to get into these two Boston hospitals will be deprived of beds which necessarily must be set aside for the patients from Rutland Heights. In addition, the bed problem at both Boston hospitals will become even more acute as the flow of patients previously channeled to Rutland Heights comes to an end.

The Veterans' Administration knows and I know and my colleagues in the House know who will be the innocent victims of the unsound economy which is being claimed as justifying the closing of Rutland Heights. It will be those gallant men and women to whom a grateful nation made solemn pledges of aid and assistance when they came home from the wars. Not only will our veterans suffer, but their families and dependents will have to endure lengthy waiting periods until hospital care can be provided for the veteran in need and then long trips from their homes to visit their dear ones.

This is truly shocking ingratitude from the richest nation in the world. It is an intolerable situation which the American people will never condone.

Mr. Speaker, last August I had a very striking and vivid example of the wave of picayune economy which has swept over the Veterans' Administration. Upon the receipt of complaints over the quality and quantity of the food being served at the Rutland Heights VA hospital, I wrote the VA officials at Rutland and also Administrator Gleason, seeking clarification of these reports and urging immediate corrective action. That action was promptly taken and I was so advised.

Following is the exchange of correspondence I had on this problem, which I include in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1964.
Mr. ALAN W. CHADWICK,
Manager, Veterans' Administration Hospital,
Rutland Heights, Mass.

DEAR MR. CHADWICK: Today I received some very serious complaints about the food at your hospital from the spokesman of some of the patients there who has stated that the food is becoming less and less satisfactory both in quality and quantity and that arrangements have been made to go into effect this coming week, to cut down the amount of food across the board for patients at the hospital.

These complaints had no reference to patients on special diets.

I would appreciate it very much if you would look into the matter and let me know just what the situation is, whether curtailments in the quality and quantity of the food are being made and if so whether this action is being done under your instructions or in compliance with instructions from higher authorities.

I appreciate, of course, that there are sometimes unfounded complaints of this kind but in this instance, the source from which I received current complaints are persons well known to me and they are responsible individuals of character and veracity.

Hoping you are getting along well and with thanks, warm regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1964.
Mr. ALAN W. CHADWICK,
Hospital Director,
Veterans' Administration Hospital,
Rutland Heights, Mass.

DEAR MR. CHADWICK: Thank you for your letter outlining your new ration patterns at the Rutland Heights Hospital.

I may state that it is the first time in many years that I have had complaints about food in veterans hospitals.

I think it is ridiculous beyond expression to limit the patients at your hospital to one egg for breakfast unless it is done under the specific orders of a doctor. Congress provides plenty of money for the veterans hospitals and services to our veterans, and we intend that they shall be well cared for and well fed at all times, and I don't think that we will permit them to be treated like guinea pigs and denied proper food. I think there are few people in this country indeed who are willing to practice economy in veterans hospitals at the expense of our disabled and sick veterans.

Of course, I also appreciate that you may be merely complying with directives, and for that reason I am taking the matter up at a higher level.

With warm regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1964.
Hon. JOHN S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator of Veterans Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I am greatly disturbed about complaints of inadequate food that I have received at the Rutland Heights VA hospital in my district, and thought I should forward you the enclosed letter that I received from Alan W. Chadwick, director at that hospital.

I have been informed by some patients who are very good friends of mine that the food at the hospital has been cut down in quantity and that veterans can get only one egg for breakfast, reduced meat portions, etc., and on the whole, according to my reports, they seem to feel that the food is inadequate and unsatisfactory.

Since we have never had any trouble in recent times at Rutland or in other Massachusetts VA hospitals, I wish you would advise me whether the practices now being carried out at Rutland as explained by Mr. Chadwick are nationwide or just at Rutland or certain other hospitals or what the situation is.

Obviously, this is a very serious situation. Please advise me.

Hoping you are getting along well, and with thanks, warm regards, and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Rutland Heights, Mass.,
September 11, 1964.
Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Clinton, Mass.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: Thank you for your letter of September 1, 1964.

The expression of your feelings on food served to the patients at this hospital was most welcome.

Upon receipt of your letter of August 21, 1964, we immediately initiated necessary action to correct any and all deficiencies with respect to the quantity and quality of food served. We are happy to state that there appears to be complete satisfaction on the part of all patients. We well realize that psychologically food is an important part of everyone's well-being.

Your interest in bringing to our attention matters such as this is sincerely appreciated and most helpful.

Sincerely,

DAVID W. MILLER,
Acting Hospital Director.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE
OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1964.
Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PHIL: This is in further reply to your letter concerning complaints you received about the food situation at the Veterans' Administration hospital, Rutland Heights, Mass.

Our Rutland Heights hospital was 1 of 28 Veterans' Administration hospitals designated to participate as a test station in a study of single ration allowance for menu planning and cost control. Two plans were placed in effect. This hospital participated in one plan for the period January 1 through June 30, 1964, without significant problems. Since July 1 the second plan has been in effect. This plan generated patient dissatisfaction.

The hospital brought this matter to the attention of our dietetic service and requested permission to revert to the former plan. Since patient satisfaction is of primary concern to us, the hospital's request has been granted and funds have been provided to support the former ration plan. We believe this action will resolve the complaint received from the patients.

Thank you for bringing this matter to our attention.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Massachusetts delegation in Congress is united against the closing of Rutland Heights and it is most difficult to understand the Veterans' Administration rationalization of this proposal.

That the hospital is not needed is refuted by the VA's own statistics showing an average patient load of nearly 400 patients daily during all of 1964.

That the hospital is outdated is refuted by VA expenditures of over $4 million to make it in better condition than newer VA hospitals.

That the VA has not found it difficult to recruit a staff is evidenced by the some 500 capable, faithful, and dedicated employees making up the medical staff and hospital personnel.

Another reported deficiency is that Rutland Heights is not associated with a medical school. What is obvious, as I have already pointed out, is that Rutland Heights can draw upon the outstanding medical specialists at nearby Worcester and Boston. In addition, it is located in the center of New England in the heart of Massachusetts with its relatively small area and large population.

If the Veterans' Administration plans on using the association and proximity of its hospitals to medical schools as guiding criteria, it might be well for my colleagues in the House to take a close look at the VA medical facilities in their States before they, too, become the targets of the VA computers and statisticians.

The Veterans' Administration estimates it will save $23.5 million in administrative or overhead costs by closing the 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries affected by the January 13 closing order. These alleged savings at the expense of the welfare of the veteran and his loved ones are indefensible other than to those officials who feel that veterans should receive no special consideration or what little consideration the general public welfare assistance programs can accord them.

Since the closing of the splendid Rutland Heights facility is unjustified, since it is urgently needed to provide our beloved veterans with the care and treatment the American people and the Congress insist that they have, I urge every vigorous action to retain this fine hospital at Rutland Heights and all other veteran hospitals that are needed to insure the best treatment and care for those whose heroism, valor, and sacrifice saved this Nation and the free world. I respectfully urge this action upon our great President and my esteemed colleagues of the Congress.

NOW OR NEVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of our having put off consideration until Monday next of the supplemental appropriation for Commodity Credit Corporation, which was to have gone to conference today, I should like to take this time to inform the Members of the action I was prepared to take today and will take on Monday next.

You will recall when the bill was considered in the House I offered a motion to recommit with instructions, "that no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such act," and this motion was adopted by a vote of 204 to 177.

The measure went over to the other body and yesterday the bill was passed by a voice vote with four amendments:

The first amendment restricts the use of funds to eliminate agricultural research stations until Congress has considered and acted thereon.

The second amendment would take $220,000 of funds previously appropriated and permit their use for the installation of temperature and humidity control equipment for the Metabolism and Radiation Laboratory at Fargo, N. Dak.

The third amendment which passed 44 to 38 is the one which, for all practical purposes, nullifies the amendment adopted by this House on my motion to recommit. The Senate did, as a matter of fact, retain the language of my amendment, word for word, but added to it the following:

> Except when such exports are necessary to carry out the sales agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest.

The fourth amendment would prevent the proposed closing of VA hospitals or other facilities.

To make sure that we have another separate rollcall vote on the amendment adopted by this House and possibly on one or more of the other three amendments adopted by the Senate, I am going to offer a motion to instruct the conferees.

The mechanics of this action will be as follows: the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, will move to send the bill to conference. I shall not object at this point, and as a matter of fact, under one of the new rules we adopted as this session got underway, it would take a majority vote of the House to sustain an objection. When we have agreed to send the bill to conference, and just prior to the Speaker's appointment of the conferees on the part of the House, I shall offer my motion.

Normally, there would not be any really important business to take up next Monday, and conceivably many Members could be out of town. This will, of course, be a crucial vote, and I would hope that we would still have the strong bipartisan support that was so prevalent when we adopted my amendment in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to devote the balance of my remarks to amendment No. 3.

The issue before the House is very clear—if you want to bar the use of U.S. surplus food to bolster the economy and the war machine of President Nassar for use against our allies in Africa, then you should vote to instruct the conferees.

If you do not care whether Nasser uses our food to feed his 47,000 troops, destroying freedom in Yemen, or whether our surplus food frees other money for him to pay for arms to help the Congolese rebels slaughter our missionaries, then vote against my motion to instruct the conferees.

As pointed out in Arthur Krock's column in the New York Times of February 2, Nasser plans to use the currency generated by the sale of surplus food to free other money to pay for arms to be used to destroy the present pro-U.S. Congo Government and to arm Communists in Cyprus. In his article Mr. Krock writes:

> Of the payments in local currency made by Egypt to the U.S. Government for shipment of surplus foodstuffs, 85 percent is in effect returned as a gift. What the Egyptian Government does with this gift in current circumstances was precisely stated in a Cairo dispatch to this newspaper under date of January 2: "It will help free money that President Nasser can spend on arms shipments to the Congo, to Cyprus, to Algeria, or south Arabia, to oppose the United States and its allies."

Mr. Krock goes on to say:

> This is the situation which impelled the House of Representatives last week by a vote of 204 to 177 to stop further execution of the 1962 agreement between the two Governments for surplus food deliveries to the total worth of about $431.8 million.
>
> The worth of the undelivered remainder for which the necessary contractual steps have not been taken, is $37 million. but there is a concluded contract for another $30 million worth that has not yet been shipped.

Well, now, these figures Mr. Krock cites are substantially correct. I pointed out in my remarks when we were considering the bill on the House floor that the $431.8 million was the "export" value figure, and that actually taking into account the net realized losses suffered by the Commodity Credit Corporation, it was carried on the books of that corporation as a transaction amounting to $583.8 million.

Now the situation has not changed since we had the vote in the House. Nasser certainly has not changed, nor is there any "hard intelligence" that he will. Our policy of selling these surplus farm commodities to Nasser has not changed, and there is no indication from the President or his advisers that it will change.

In fact on the very day the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee eased the ban on foods to Cairo, Nasser's Egyptian Government agreed to represent Communist China in Burundi, after that government closed the Peiping Embassy and invited its officials to leave because of subversive activities.

This "sign of our times" shows the link that Communist China has established with Nasser in Africa and how closely they are working together.

If administration officials would only look at their intelligence reports, they would learn that Nasser is delivering to the Congolese rebels some of the latest model Soviet-made weapons—including some that are even better than those in the U.S. Army's table of organization.

One such weapon, I understand, is a recoilless repeating bazooka, which startled intelligence experts of both the military and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we do not want to be a partner with Nasser and the Soviet Union in putting these arms in the hands of the Congolese rebels who are bent on destroying all of our missionaries of whatever faith, in the Congo.

It is Nasser who is denying food to his own people by helping the Soviet Union wage their "wars of destruction" throughout Africa.

Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1965, Acting Secretary of State George W. Ball, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee as follows:

> We ask, therefore, that the Congress not limit the President's freedom of action in the conduct of our relations with this key country during the weeks ahead.

Mr. Speaker, title VII, United States Code, section 1721 states:

> In order to enable the President to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the peoples of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the President out of its stocks such surplus agricultural commodities (as defined in section 1706 of this title) as he may request, for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements of such nation, and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, that under the law, the President may use his contingency fund if he feels the good faith and honor of this country has been affected by House action on House Joint Resolution 234.

In summary, then, Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind Members of the House that my amendment was limited to title I sales under Public Law 480. It does not affect title II, III, and IV, and under these titles the President, in my opinion, still has plenty of room to maneuver if he sees fit, for under title II the President has the authority to donate surplus agricultural commodities to nations to meet emergencies; under title III, the President has the authority to assist international welfare agencies, international feeding programs, and to participate in barter transactions; under title IV, the President has the authority to sell surplus agricultural commodities to nations for dollars.

Now, to those who would argue that the Congress has no right to act as we did in this area, I would remind them that Public Law 480 was a creation of the Congress, and so we have every right to amend provisions, oversee, and evaluate its operation, or repeal it, for that matter.

I do hope the House will stick by its guns and stand by its original position, by voting in support of my motion to instruct the conferees when this matter comes up for consideration next Monday.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S STATEMENT ON AMENDMENT RELATING TO SALE OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC UNDER TITLE I OF PUBLIC LAW 480

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a statement of President Johnson at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's statement at his press conference on the amendment relating to sales of surplus commodities to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480 is as follows:

> Last week the House adopted a proposal that would, if enacted, preclude the United States from carrying out our present 3-year agreement, ending this June, to sell surplus commodities to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480. Yesterday, the Senate passed a modified version of this proposal, which would permit the completion of details of the agreement if I, as the President, determine this to be in our national interest.
>
> It is of the greatest importance that the flexibility provided to me by the Senate action be sustained by the Congress. Our relations with the United Arab Republic present difficult problems in a highly sensitive area of the world; the area where tensions are high. The basic purpose of our policy in this area has been, and will continue to be, the protection of our vital interests. To do this it is essential that I have freedom of action.
>
> It is obvious that an improvement in relations between our two countries will require efforts on both sides. It is impossible to predict whether such an improvement would be achieved. But if there is to be any chance of success at all, it can only be if I have adequate flexibility to deal with this complex and volatile situation.

RACIAL TROUBLE IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to answer anything that has been said to those of us who have voluntarily taken upon ourselves the opportunity to travel and assist a State of this Union. I have personally been invited by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and by Dr. King and by citizens of Selma to observe what is going on in that State. It is not my intent to test any law, and it is not my intent even to stay in one of the hotels of that State. It is my intent to stay in a Negro home when I go to Selma, Ala., and to return to Washington with great dispatch. I do not consider my trip to Alabama or to any other State of the Union as being for the purpose of agitating or engaging in any type of activity which would prompt anyone to be placed in danger. It is my intent to go as an observer. I certainly will avail myself of the opportunity to seek information on both sides. I would hope that the public officials of that State would meet with us and try to work out with us some understanding of what is happening in that State. A few days ago I saw a picture in the newspaper. I do not know whether it is authentic or not, but this was a picture of a woman, and it happened to be a Negro woman, who was lying on the ground. Three sheriffs were on top of her and a police stick was upraised and used on this woman while she was on the ground. This does not, to me, as an American citizen, portray the image of a good State nor, certainly, of law-abiding individuals engaged in the proper enforcement of the law. If this happened in my city, I quite assure you that there would certainly be a great uproar. I am not judging this and I am not saying that this woman was right or wrong and I am not saying that the law officials were right or wrong. However, it certainly indicates to me that there may be something wrong, for which reason other Americans at least should attempt to observe the situation so that they will have some knowledge of what is going on there. As I have indicated, others will be going with me. I am certainly not the chairman of this group. I did not organize it. I am simply one who has seen fit to join it. I certainly hope that the expressions that have been made today on both sides will be helpful in bringing about some type of understanding of what has happened in our American society.

To me brotherhood is not so wild a dream as it is to those who propose postponing it pretend. Personally I believe we can bring about brotherhood even in the Southern States. I was born in a southern State myself before my family migrated to Los Angeles. So I think I can speak as a southerner. I think I know something of the feelings of southerners. I know of the great emotions that have been aroused as a result of some of these happenings. I know that this Congress has passed three laws to secure the voting rights of the citizens of every State of this Union. I do know and feel that some of these laws are not being upheld. Whether the law should be strengthened is something which is certainly worthy of some attention. If I shall have observed something in Alabama that might make me a better Congressman or put me in a better position to recommend something to strengthen brotherhood in our country then I think certainly a great mission will have been accomplished.

I doubt seriously that this will be a world-shaking event. I do feel that neither I nor anyone else will be placed in jeopardy for making this trip. And I should certainly hope that the State of Alabama will profit as much as my own State from my trip to Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that I am going at my own expense. As has been indicated I voluntarily designated myself to go to this State. There has been no impression given that this is an official committee of this House or that we are speaking for any other Member of this House. We are going merely as observers. I hope that my colleagues from Alabama will join us on this mission, will meet with us and join with us in a spirit of cooperation, as that has been expressed, so that we may bring back something more constructive.

As I have said, this is a simple trip of an American citizen to an American State of this Union and as such it seems to me it should be supported by all of us and not condemned by any of us.

THE FARM MESSAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the President's message should set at rest the very proper concern which has disturbed so many of our people since the Director of the Budget wrote his much quoted article which many people interpreted to indicate a desire to force some 2½ million farm families out of their homes.

The President is a practical man and he has repudiated any such proposal.

He realizes that even though some of those now living on the farm will not be able to make a reasonable livelihood farming that it is much better for these people to stay where they are than it is to move them into the big cities.

The President's message clearly outlines the problems of our rural people and suggests a continuation of our present voluntary price support and production adjustment programs. I think this is a wise and a sound approach. As a Member of Congress I shall try to help the President keep these programs in operation.

I would emphasize, as did the President, that every impartial study has shown that the removal of price and income supports would have a catastrophic effect on farm income and farm income is too vital to our entire economy to be dealt with lightly. I am happy that the President has again indicated his deep concern for the welfare of those who provide the food and fiber for America.

THE SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have a strong belief that the situation and the circumstances in Selma, Ala., are of such importance as to merit consideration by the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress. The appropriate authority in this House for such an inquiry into these facts and circumstances I believe is the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. I have therefore today requested the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER of New York, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, to select from the membership of that committee a number of its members to visit Selma, Ala., for the express purpose of determining for themselves what the actual facts are. This committee of the House has direct jurisdiction over the legislative matters involved herein. I believe we should immediately determine the actual facts as they are found to exist in Selma, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary will act promptly and accede to my request that members of that committee be dispatched in a quasi-official mission to Selma, Ala., so that this House may have before it a complete recital of the facts and circumstances as they actually exist.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to point out, as I did earlier today, that responsible citizens of Selma have asked that a duly appointed and impartial congressional group come down and ascertain the correct facts. Day before yesterday both the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE ANDREWS] and I talked with Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee and made that request. We also appeared yesterday before the Senate Judiciary Committee with the same request. We felt that any investigative group that goes to Alabama should be composed of members of the Judiciary Committees of both the House and the Senate. Although no action has been taken as yet on our request, I am introducing today a joint resolution the purpose of which is to set up a joint committee in the event either Judiciary Committee chairman feels he presently does not have the authority to make these appointments.

Mr. Speaker, while I question the advisability, I certainly do not question the right of any Member of this body or any citizen of the United States to visit Selma. It should be made perfectly clear, however, that any self-appointed group from the Congress that goes to Selma does not in any way represent an investigative committee of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MOORE. I took note of the meetings that were announced by the gentleman from Alabama and one of his colleagues. I believe as a supporter of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 it is entirely appropriate for me as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary to request that that committee which has the legislative jurisdiction in this area should move to obtain the facts and circumstances that exist there. I have, therefore, asked Chairman CELLER as a member of the committee, to follow through and designate Members to officially go down and take a look at the situation.

Mr. SELDEN. I want to say to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] that I welcome his support.

THE FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS PROGRAM

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, everyone concerned with the manner in which the foreign oil imports program affects the domestic industry and national security will want to read the incisive statement of Mr. M. D. Abel, president of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association, made in response to a recent report of the Department of the Interior.

The Government reports that the oil industry is enjoying prosperity. But the prosperity of the huge international companies should not be confused with the relative depression for domestic independents, who do not benefit from the foreign oil import program. The Government, in fact, concedes that the small independent producer is in trouble, and that there is a problem of inadequate exploration. Many authorities see a direct link between the present foreign oil import quotas and the deteriorating conditions in the domestic oil industry. It is to this problem that Mr. M. D. Abel addressed his remarks.

With unanimous consent I am inserting the statement of M. D. Abel, president of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association:

AN APPRAISAL OF THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES

Hard-pressed domestic independent oil producers can only regard the Kelly-Lattu report as a pitifully inadequate and grossly misleading "appraisal" of the petroleum industry in this Nation.

If the forthcoming Interior Department hearings concerning the oil imports program are to be approached in this context, there seems little hope that present officials will prove any more willing now than in the past to face up to the real issue of a fast-growing imbalance in this industry. The question was not whether "the oil industry" is enjoying prosperity, or whether adequate resources are available to meet foreseeable consumer needs. Rather the need was for information as to extent of and cause for a relative depression for domestic independents during peak prosperity for international companies. We have here a case of poverty amid plenty, pure and simple, or what Gov. John Connally has called "our own Appalachia" in the prosperous oil industry. However correct may be the assertion that Interior had available inadequate statistics for a comprehensive look at independents, it could overlook only with great difficulty the mountains of evidence that present governmental policies are failing to come to grips with the problem, and that the oil imports program in particular is not even approaching declared objectives.

Particularly distressing is the virtual rejection of the national security concept which underlies the oil imports program. Entirely beside the point is the Interior declaration that national security extends "far beyond the limited objective of assuring a supply to meet our own needs during a national emergency," and that national security embraces the security of both the United States and its free world allies, and both domestic and foreign sources of petroleum. The section relating to the import control program is largely given over to emphasis upon the objective of maintaining prosperous and happy foreign oil sources. International considerations are due attention, of course, but this report would seem to subordinate all other considerations to the preservation of available supplies from other countries.

It's one thing to say, as does the report, that "the United States needs the oil resources of the Middle East," and there is for the security of NATO nations "an equally compelling need for continuing production in other major producing areas." However, it is another thing entirely to infer that U.S. security commitments in the Eastern Hemisphere require importation of Mideast oil into this country. In fact, such movement tends to weaken security objectives of both this Nation and her allies.

The security clause in the Trade Act prescribes criteria relating to the objective of a healthy home industry. If Interior officials do not like this limited concept, and wish to insist upon a one-world resource viewpoint, then they should lobby for a change in the law. In the meantime, there should be adherence to the law as Congress wrote it and, we believe, as Congress intended to write it.

We submit that Congress had good reason to concern itself with U.S. relative self-sufficiency of this No. 1 munition of war. Only an adequate supply available from home sources can assure us the bargaining power to obtain oil resources from other nations on terms which are both economically reasonable and relatively secure. Any one of our major import sources could be cut off in short order, as was the case no later than 1957 when the Suez Canal was closed and the Middle East supply denied us and our free world allies. The day America loses her relative self-sufficiency in oil, foreign oil will cease to be cheap in any sense. Congress recognized this, whether or not Interior officials wish to do so today.

The report concedes that the small independent producer is in trouble, and that there is a problem of inadequate exploration. But it appears not to recognize the direct link between these two occurrences.

It notes the need for developing new reserves without increasing output, but purports to see this as primarily a problem for State conservation reform. Overdevelopment of the 1950's is called the most important reason exploration is not keeping pace with expanded requirements, when, in fact, virtually all increased domestic demand since has been supplied from imports and offshore leases, and it is these less secure sources which account for our surpluses today.

It infers that the loss of ground by independents to the major companies is a natural result corresponding to shifts in crude production from older to newer areas, noting that major companies rather than independents drill the deeper and better prospects. It thereby ignores that Federal policy favoring more prolific offshore production, largely on Federal lands, accounts for a substantial part of the surplus. The problem is not so much that independents haven't shared in deeper offshore development as it is the fact that surplus output from this major-company-dominated source has denied independents the economic incentive to drill anywhere, including the shallow prospects which are available to them.

A basic problem raised by the report is the combination of "excess" productive capacity (some 700,000 barrels per day over total demand) and insufficient exploration to cover tomorrow's needs. In detailing the many assumed causes for this situation, very great care was taken to rule out even the possibility that an inadequate imports program underlies the problem.

It would seem obvious that imports—which along with offshore production has accounted for virtually all demand increases during the life of the mandatory program—must be required to mark time until domestic production assumes a better balanced share of the total U.S. liquids hydrocarbon market. Only then will domestic independents be in financial condition to restore lagging exploration activities.

It speaks of a "well-defined trend" toward fewer and fewer smaller companies, acknowledges the shrinkage of their share of total production, and then forecasts a continuation of this trend. Recent developments, it says, may signal only "the onset of a long-term trend toward fewer and larger independents." Sellouts and mergers are pictured as a logical result of the fact that "at any point in time, a given producer may determine that his financial interests are better served by sale of oil in place rather than by continuing to produce." It thereby interprets as a normal and healthy trend toward efficiency what is in fact an alarming trend toward monopoly concentration in this great industry.

Interior's report curiously poses problems without penetrating beyond superficial causes, and then tends to dismiss need for solutions. A case in point is the product imbalance situation which has led to serious products price erosion in recent years. Noting that uneconomic domestic residual fuel output is on the wane, the report indicates satisfaction over refiners' resultant opportunity to cut down domestic crude needs and at the same time utilize new processes to increase output of other products. At the same time it recognizes that "other products" are in oversupply already. Yet the practice of dumping gasoline on the market, with resulting price wars, is simply criticized as illogical without relation to import policy. Ignored is the obvious: if imports are to be relied upon increasingly to meet demand for residual fuel, then other product imports and imported crude must be correspondingly reduced to avoid excess supplies on the domestic market. As a matter of fact, the report carefully eliminates residual fuel oil and its portion of total demand from virtually all charts, tables, and discussions relating to the supply-demand problem.

It is unfortunate indeed that, as we approach the hearings on the oil imports program, Interior would find occasion to gloss over industry conditions in such sweeping generalities as the following: "The industry as a whole is growing, it is in excellent financial shape, and it is demonstrating daily its ability to live in today's competitive world."

The facts are that Federal policy is failing to provide an adequate foundation for a healthy domestic oil industry so essential to our national economy and security. Both with respect to Interior's implementation of the oil import control objectives, and its handling of Federal offshore lands, the Federal Government is seriously weakening the capacity of domestic producers to fulfill their obligation to this Nation.

We hope that the hearing will provide no stacked cards for setting and reevaluating Federal policy.

In general, this report clearly necessitates a new approach on our part. The facts of our distress, and of inadequate domestic exploration, have been recognized beyond dispute. But Interior officials responsible for this report not only misapply these basic facts, in such a way as to minimize considerations of a more adequate import program, but also serve up a number of inconsistencies in the process.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE SOVIET UNION FOR PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution condemning the Soviet Union for persecution of the Jews.

I have asked representatives from both political parties and from all sections of the country to join me in condemning Russia for singling out Jews for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses, confiscating synagogues, closing Jewish cemeteries, arresting rabbis, and lay religious leaders, and curtailing religious observances.

My resolution also protests the Russian practice of discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education, imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and through other acts oppressing Jews in the free exercise of their faith.

An identical resolution has been offered in the Senate by Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff, of Connecticut, and 67 cosponsors. I have asked House Members to introduce resolutions identical to mine so that the House and Senate resolutions would be uniform and so that by a showing of significant support the Foreign Affairs Committee will be encouraged to take early action.

I am delighted to announce, Mr. Speaker, that I have been joined by many Members of this body, who have indicated to me that they share my concern and views. I wish to thank each of my colleagues for their supporting resolutions. Further, I call to the attention of the House that these resolutions have been introduced simultaneously, indicating a unanimity of concern.

PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join more than 80 of our colleagues in sponsoring a concurrent resolution condemning Soviet anti-Semitism and the singling out of Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith for extreme punishment for alleged economic crimes.

On January 4, 1965, I introduced House Resolution 50 expressing the same sentiments on the part of the House alone. The concurrent resolution in the other body to the one the House receives today states the unanimity of opinion on this matter on the part of the resolution's adherents in both the Houses of the Congress.

As I stated last year, when I introduced an identical House resolution, it is clear that the Soviet Government and the Communist Party have fostered and encouraged religious persecution in the Soviet Union. In the case of its Jewish citizens, the Soviet Government has singled them out in reporting arrests and executions for alleged economic crimes; it has confiscated synagogues, closed Jewish cemeteries, arrested Rabbis, curtailed religious observances and Jewish cultural activities.

It is my hope, and I know the hope of those others of our colleagues joining in the sponsorship of this resolution today, that the Soviet Government, in the name of decency and humanity, will cease its persecution of Soviet Jews and permit the free exercise of religion by all of its citizens.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART II

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues part II of the New York Herald Tribune series on "New York City in Crisis."

The following installment concerns the tragic failure of urban renewal in New York City and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 26, 1965:

New York City in Crisis—Urban Renewal Hope: Plagued by Indecision—Aroused and Indignant

("We're fighting all over the world to preserve democracy and then we find ourselves kicked in the teeth in our own city," said one caller to the Herald Tribune. He was among scores of citizens responding yesterday to the first article of "New York City in Crisis," and among millions of New Yorkers who feel that the greatest city in the world may no longer be the greatest place in which to live. The Herald Tribune is presenting this special investigative series on the deeply disturbing characteristics of a city in crisis with the aim of ending the bewilderment, frustration, rage, fear, and indifference that have become hallmarks of city life. It welcomes any public reaction and hopes that out of these articles can come some positive direction to reopen the channels of civic creativity: Whether in terms of individual response, a banding together of citizens, or a change in the pattern of municipal responsibility.)

(By Barry Gottehrer and Marshall Peck)

To New York and dozens of other cities, fighting a seemingly endless, sometimes futile war against spreading slums, urban renewal has become the chief—and essential—weapon for progress. But in New York—and elsewhere to varying degrees—it is frequently a peculiar sort of progress, one that destroys slums out of necessity but one that also often destroys small businesses and uproots lower income families out of ignorance, incompetence and indecision.

Despite the city's extravagant claims, the 15-year-old slum-clearance program in New York has consistently failed to live up to its original purpose—"the realization as soon as feasible of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

The slum-clearance program officially came into being in 1949 with the passage of the title I section of the Federal Housing Act. Under the legislation, the Federal Government agreed to pay cities for slum clearance and redeveloping by putting up two-thirds (the other third to be paid in full by the city or split between the city and the State) of the cost of buying up and clearing slum areas. The cleared land was then to be turned over to builders and developers at a considerably lower price than they would have had to pay if they had cleared the land themselves.

WHEN IT BEGAN

The term "urban renewal" was brought into use in 1954 when the Federal Housing Act was extended to provide Federal assistance on a similar basis for conservation, rehabilitation and comprehensive planning and redevelopment.

Since 1949, the U.S. Government has approved more than $4 billion worth of urban renewal contributions nationally, with more than $263 million allocated for New York City. Out of this, after 15 years, the city now has 41 federally aided projects totaling 63,074 apartment units in varying stages of planning or construction.

Through last month, however, only 3 of these 41 projects and only 24,052 of these 63,074 apartments were listed as completed by the housing and redevelopment board. In a city in which the slums and ghettos continue to spread and where there is a desperate need for more public and middle-income housing, 15 years of urban-renewal work and money have not made notably impressive headway.

The failure of the city's urban renewal program—coupled with a severe shortage of public housing (New York voters rejected 2 amendments last November that would have provided 2,500 additional public-housing units)—has made the housing problem one of the most critical facing the city.

Some 1.25 million New Yorkers live in substandard housing today and more than 600,000 need to and can't get into public housing.

The white, middle class continues to desert the city (more than 800,000 have left since 1950) because the apartments in Manhattan are, for the most part, too small or too expensive.

And the city's Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the principal victims of urban renewal, continue to be pushed from one slum to another.

One of the most outspoken and articulate critics of haphazardly administered and poorly planned urban renewal is Representative John V. Lindsay, whose 17th Congressional District includes the Bellevue South area. To the Republican Congressman, urban renewal is necessary for progress. But he seems to feel that in New York City urban renewal has unfortunately been allowed to become a necessary evil instead of a necessary good in many instances.

"The purpose of the Housing Act of 1949 is not served when we indiscriminately erase whole communities from the map," says Mr. Lindsay. "We must stop destroying neighborhoods in the name of urban renewal. We must stop ruining businesses, scattering the families we should keep and creating greater pressure on deteriorating housing—all in the name of urban renewal. Past programs have been urban removal rather than urban renewal."

PAYING THE PRICE

To a great extent, New York City today is paying for the capricious manner in which the urban renewal program was run through the years. Under the direction of master builder Robert Moses and his committee on slum clearance, the urban renewal or title I program—as it was originally called—was the subject of criticism and the object of controversy almost from the beginning.

Unlike other cities, which would relocate the residents and then clear the land before turning the sites over to private developers, New York insisted upon turning over the sites with the buildings still standing and the tenants still paying rent. This was done because Mr. Moses said it was the only way he could get firm commitments from developers. And what Mr. Moses wanted, Mr. Moses got.

It was precisely this policy, which allowed developers to delay relocation and clearance almost indefinitely while collecting rents from their slum tenants, that led to the start of the program's troubles. By mid-1956, with 10 projects approved but all running far behind schedule, hints of scandal and criticism of the way many slum residents were being treated were commonplace. But the biggest explosion—centering around the Manhattantown project, a six-block area between Amsterdam Avenue and Central Park West and 97th and 100th Streets—was yet to come.

The plan, calling for the construction of 17 apartment houses with 2,720 units, was approved by the board of estimate in September of 1951 and scheduled for completion by August of 1956. Manhattantown, Inc.—a group of developers headed by a builder named Jack Ferman and Samuel Caspert, who previously had been appointed a city marshal by Mayor William O'Dwyer—obtained the six-block area, which the city had condemned for $16.3 million, for $3.1 million, putting up only $1 million in cash.

THE MANHATTANTOWN STORY

But it wasn't until the fall of 1954 when the U.S. Senate Banking and Currency Committee held a 1-day hearing in New York that the story began to leak out.

Mr. Caspert disclosed how he had set up a separate firm headed by his son-in-law which bought all the refrigerators and gas ranges in the Manhattantown tenements for $33,000.

The son-in-law then rented the exact same refrigerators and ranges back to Manhattantown which, in less than a year, paid him $115,326. Though the Senate committee reported that $649,215 had been siphoned out of the Manhattantown project by similar methods in its first 18 months of operation, no official action was taken by either Mayor Wagner or Mr. Moses.

When charges of irregularities continued and the project's scheduled completion day came in August of 1956 without a single building having even been started, Mr. Moses blamed the Federal officials for taking too much time in underwriting a loan for the developers. Yet even when the loans were approved the Manhattantown developers did not pick them up. The situation became so bad in the Manhattantown tenements that one tenant complained she had no hot water for 3 months and no water at all for 1 month.

By mid-1957, the dimensions of the problem no longer could be evaded or denied. Though developers were collecting millions of dollars in rent from slum tenements throughout the city, some of them had not even bothered to pay their taxes or interest to the city. Of the $1 million owed the city, Manhattantown owed more than $414,000.

THE MAYOR'S VIEW

Finally, on June 11, 1957, the slum clearance committee recommended that the city start foreclosure action to repossess the Manhattantown site. Nearly 6 years after the project had first been approved, Manhattantown had not paid its taxes (which now totaled $620,000), had not cleared its land, had not started construction of its first apartment, and had not even picked up its Federal commitments.

At a city hall press conference, Mayor Wagner, who had steadfastly supported the slum clearance committee and its chairman and would continue to do so, was asked why he had done nothing but deny all charges involving Manhattantown in the past.

"We were misled," said the mayor.

"You mean to say you were conned for 5 years?" asked one reporter, who had been a persistent critics of the Manhattantown setup.

"Well, if you want to put it that way—yes," he said. "I guess you could say we were conned for 5 years."

Ultimately, under a new sponsor (Webb and Knapp, later replaced by Alcoa Residences, Inc.) and under a new name (Park West Village), the Manhattantown project became a reality. Today, 2,525 units are occupied (at rents between $28 and $55 a room) and another 140 are underway.

Manhattantown, however, wasn't the only urban renewal project tainted with scandal and dotted with irregularities. In others, it also became obvious that urban renewal might not always work for the benefit of the slum residents, but it certainly didn't harm the developers.

At one point, the program was being run so haphazardly that a Federal Housing Administrator in Washington reportedly decided to do something about it. According to the story, the Administrator sent word to the slum clearance committee in New York that further funds would be withheld until the city cleaned up its program, eliminated the scandal, and started providing better housing and relocation for the people pushed out.

Within a week, the Administrator reportedly received a call from a superior. The message was supposed to have been loud and clear: "Leave Bob Moses and New York alone."

The Administrator is said to have taken the advice and Mr. Moses, whose own honesty and integrity have never been questioned, continued to administer New York's urban renewal program in the way he saw fit.

(The Tribune repeatedly has attempted to interview Mr. Moses about his role in the city's urban renewal program and its history, but has been told that Mr. Moses would under no condition speak to anyone from this newspaper about anything.)

Finally in 1960, the housing and redevelopment board was established to take over the duties of the slum clearance committee and six other municipal programs. Unfortunately in New York, unlike several other cities (Boston, for one), the urban renewal program and the city's planning unit, both of which overlap in many areas, were not brought under a single administration.

A PLANNING DECISION

It is still up to the city planning commission, which has received $3.7 million from the Federal Government under a new urban renewal arm called the community renewal program, to hold preliminary hearings and designate specific areas for urban renewal.

It is then up to the HRB to request additional funds from the Federal Government for further study of these designated areas and, perhaps someday, for ultimate condemnation and clearance. Theoretically the HRB cannot initiate an urban renewal project and the planning commission cannot complete one.

Caught up in this massive bureaucracy and this needless duplication of time, money, and effort, hundreds, of thousands of New Yorkers must wait—unable to move because there is no place to move to and unable to repair their homes or businesses because banks are extremely reluctant to extend credit to someone whose business or home might be torn down in the next few years.

What then is the difference between the city's urban renewal program 5 years ago and today? Essentially, the difference seems to be that the people running the program now have their hearts in the right place. There are still occasional whispers of scandal, but they are infrequent and unsubstantiated.

Under Chairman Milton Mollen, who last week was named to coordinate all of the city's housing programs, the HRB picked up the cry of other cities in following the leadership of New Haven Mayor Richard Lee and his emphasis on human renewal. Mr. Mollen tactfully avoids criticizing the old slum clearance committee ("I'd rather not talk about the past," he says), but believes that the entire emphasis of the program has changed for the better—"from simply clearing slums to a concern for the problems they symptomize."

"I think urban renewal is the hope of many areas of the city," he says. "Without it, there's uncertainty. As it is, there's inaction on one hand. In certain areas, such as Bedford-Stuyvesant, private enterprise won't go in. On the other hand, in other areas, private real estate interests are moving in. They only disrupt the neighborhood and they provide no relocation for the people."

In New York now, the department of relocation, which was set up in November of 1962, has taken the job of urban-renewal relocating away from the builders. And the city itself—and not the builders—remains in control of the apartments and stores, collecting the rents until everyone is relocated and the site is cleared. Then—and only then—is the land turned over to the developers.

These are decided improvements—steps in the right direction—but the administration of the program and its accomplishments remain far from impressive.

One need look no further than Lincoln Center for a vivid example of the city's urban-renewal program at its very best and, yet at the same time, still not satisfying everyone.

At its best, the Lincoln Center project cleared away a seriously blighted area and provided the city with a cultural core—including a new theater, a new philharmonic hall, and an opera house—that any city in the world would be proud to possess.

Yet even here—where the beauty and worth of the cultural center so clearly demonstrate a step forward from the slum it replaced—there has been criticism—and, to a degree, the criticism is valid.

CAUSE FOR CRITICISM

In the place of the low rent, admittedly slum housing, a string of expensive apartment houses has been built—far out of the price range of the people these buildings have dispossessed. This is the continuing failure of urban renewal—this aimless traffic and removal of lower income people from one slum to another—and it is one that New York officials have been unable to solve.

HRB officials are quick to point out that the Lincoln Center apartment houses are integrated, but they usually fail to mention that they are integrated by upper middle class Negroes and not by Negroes and Puerto Ricans who had been driven from the area by the bulldozers. These houses, where 90 percent of the 4,271 apartments rent for $61 a room, have at best token integration and the project, despite HRB denials, is a prime example of what civil rights leaders call "Negro removal."

"It's unfortunate that someone has to be hurt and suffer but you have got to think of the greater need and the greater good," says one city official. "And, for a city the size of New York, the greater need is the elimination of slums."

Few people—even those uprooted by urban renewal—would dispute this. Everybody knows slums are bad and everybody knows slums must go. But what troubles these people and the many, many others is the lack of leadership from city hall, the indecision and the bureaucracy of the planning and urban renewal units, the corruption, the politics, the inhumanity, and the irrationality that have plagued this city's clearance program throughout the years of its existence.

DESPERATION OR DECISION?

It makes little sense to clear one slum merely to start another one somewhere else. New housing is desperately needed, but, unfortunately, those who are the most desperate have, for the most part, been the last to get it.

Anyone can tell you that Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant both need immediate and far-sweeping urban renewal programs and low and lower middle income housing, but, because of the magnitude of the problem and the uncertainty of where to house the people while the areas are being rebuilt, the city chooses to look and rebuild elsewhere.

"I'm absolutely committed to making New York a slumless city, a city in which every family, regardless of race, color, or creed, will live in a decent home, at a price it can afford to pay, in a good neighborhood with soundly planned community facilities," wrote Mayor Wagner in a series of syndicated articles last summer.

The mayor obviously meant every word he wrote, but, to those people forced to move out of Bellevue South, Lincoln Center, and dozens of other renewal areas and those people unable to move out of Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant and the city's other slums, the mayor's inaction speaks louder than his words. No matter what name you call it—be it human renewal or human removal—the city's housing problems are extreme and in desperate need of remedial action.

ANNOUNCEMENT TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCERNING REPRINTING OF STATEMENTS MADE ON THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that reprints will be made of statements of Members of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. The reprinting has been requested by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., 302 West 13th Street, New York, N.Y.

If there are any Members who do not wish to have their statements reprinted, they should so advise the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Clerk, Mr. Raymond F. Noyes, room H-112, the Capitol Building.

Otherwise, statements and remarks made in connection with this year's Ukrainian Independence Day will be reprinted in pamphlet form.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON, IN HIS BUDGET MESSAGE, RECOGNIZES REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN'S MONUMENTAL WORK IN EXPOSING ABUSES OF TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant passages of the President's budget message to the Congress of January 25, is worthy of noting verbatim:

> I will also present recommendations to correct certain abuses in the tax-exempt privileges enjoyed by private foundations.

In that brief statement, the President recognized one of the great achievements of his fellow Texan, the gentleman from Texas, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of a subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, which has been studying the impact of tax-exempt foundations on the Nation's economy. My good colleague is mainly responsible for the magnificent work done by the House Small Business Committee in bringing to light the costly abuses of numerous tax-exempt foundations.

One measure of the Small Business Committee's accomplishments is the fact that the Internal Revenue Service has recovered large amounts of taxes resulting from the material published by the committee. Of recent date, the Internal Revenue Service filed a tax lien for $22 million in back taxes, interests, and penalties against one of the 546 foundations which have been under study by the subcommittee. In another case the Internal Revenue Service was able to get $642,000 in taxes based on the business activities of a foundation which was under study by the subcommittee. And there is probably still more to come.

By his remarks in his budget message, the President shows that he understands what Mr. PATMAN has been talking about and clearly recognizes the problems tax-free foundations spawn. One of the great problems that has been ever presented in Mr. PATMAN's work is the recognition of foundation-controlled enterprises competing in the marketplace with taxpaying businessmen. As a working member of the Small Business Committee, I know firsthand that this has concerned us no end. It is clearly recognized, along with other pertinent subject matter, in a splendid editorial in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times of January 24, called "Disguised Menace," which I enter for the RECORD.

A second editorial, which appeared December 6, 1964, in the Dallas, Tex., Times Herald, by A. C. Greene, editor of the editorial page, entitled "Representative PATMAN Digs at the Foundations," is also entered for the RECORD.

These two editorials get at the heart of the entire problem, which President Johnson sees so clearly and wishes to correct. For the President to thus recognize the great work of WRIGHT PATMAN is but another achievement by another great Texan, the President's colleague and mine, WRIGHT PATMAN.

The articles follow:

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Jan. 24, 1965]

DISGUISED MENACE

In 1962 Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, produced his monumental study of tax-exempt foundations. In 1963 and 1964 further investigations were undertaken and reports published.

The realm of tax-free foundations, as revealed by PATMAN's studies, is one characterized by almost complete lack of official information, by mushrooming growth both in number and wealth of foundations, and by, in PATMAN's words, "laxness and irresponsibility" on the part of the Internal Revenue Service. This is not a good combination.

PATMAN also found violations of both law and Treasury regulations in many foundations. He noted a rapidly increasing concentration of economic power in foundations which, in his view, was "far more dangerous than anything that has happened in the past in the way of concentration of economic power.

"Foundation-controlled enterprises possess," he added, "the money and competitive advantages to eliminate the small businessman." Perhaps more important is the erosion of the tax base that supports the Federal Government. Every dollar which escapes taxation by flowing into a tax-free foundation, no mater how laudable the purpose of that foundation may be, puts an added burden on other taxpayers of the Nation.

PATMAN found numerous abuses. He found donors who, through loans or exchanges, obtained a return of the assets they had donated. He found them lending to themselves and their friends out of foundation funds. He found them using foundations to help their own positions in proxy fights. He found donors using a foundation to keep voting control of a corporation in the family after the death of the principal stockholder.

PATMAN made several recommendations for reforms. Among them were these:

1. That the life of foundations should be limited to 25 years instead of permitting them to exist in perpetuity.

2. Tax-exempt foundations should be prohibited from engaging in business, directly or indirectly.

3. Commercial money-lending and borrowing by foundations should be banned.

4. Foundations should not be permitted to own more than 3 percent of the stock of any corporation.

5. No contributor should be allowed a deduction for payments to a foundation that he controls until the foundation actually uses the money for charity.

6. There should be an agency to regulate tax-exempt foundations, requiring full disclosure of foundation assets and expenditures and a national registry of all foundations.

In the 2 years that have elapsed since PATMAN made his first report nothing has happened, except that a bad problem has gotten worse. The whole field needs closer supervision. Both Congress and the Treasury should take action on the Patman report and his recommendations.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times-Herald, Dec. 6, 1964]

REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN DIGS AT THE FOUNDATIONS

(By A. C. Greene)

One of the constant problems of a democratic system lies in keeping a balance between good laws and an unjust usage of them. Right now there is approaching a period of adjustment for the tax-exempt foundation. The idea of a charitable, educational, religious, or scientific foundation being given tax-exempt status on the basis of its aims and public good is acceptable. The problem comes when these virtuous uses are turned to private or nonbeneficial ends.

Leading the legislative battle for stricter foundation control is Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana, and in 36 years of House service he has proven himself to be the bulldog of Congress.

The Congressional Quarterly says PATMAN made a detailed study of 546 privately controlled foundations from among the 45,124 the Internal Revenue Service says exists. (PATMAN estimates there actually are 100,000 foundations in the United States.)

THE UNREASONABLE ACCUMULATION

His general findings as reported by Congressional Quarterly, were:

1. The IRS has been lax and irresponsible in supervising foundations.

2. Foundations had unreasonable accumulations of income.

3. Foundations widely disregarded Treasury regulations, despite penalties provided by law.

4. There was increasing concentration of economic power in foundations which PATMAN felt "was far more dangerous than anything that has happened in the way of concentration of economic power."

5. Foundation-controlled enterprises had the money and competitive advantages to eliminate the small businessman.

Therefore PATMAN has urged an immediate moratorium on the granting of new tax exemptions to foundations and has recommended that the life of a foundation be limited to 25 years and that foundations be prohibited from engaging in business, directly or indirectly; commercial moneylending and borrowing; exercising control over any corporations; speculating or trading in securities; soliciting or accepting contributions from suppliers or users of foundation goods or services, and self-dealing practices between a contributor and the foundations he controls.

Actually, the use of a foundation to distribute money for public purposes or to support public programs is stimulating to responsible use of wealth and relieves a great many areas of governmental spending. But some foundations seem to accumulate money faster than they spend it, some foundations have elaborate lists of officers who draw more than justifiable salaries, are housed in quarters far above the keeping of their ostensible purposes. Not to mention the foundations which are benevolent in name only and are set up as an attempt to gain tax shelter for some private ax-grinding purpose.

"CHARITABLE" IS A "FORMALITY"

PATMAN says it's too easy to get tax exemption for a foundation today. The process has become, he says, "a mere formality. An organization becomes 'charitable' merely by describing itself as such."

The ideal foundation is one which receives contributions from private sources and these funds are then administered by a control which is separate and public. Most of the famous foundations have come to this—the original founders having no control over operations once the foundation has been set into specific motion.

Representative PATMAN's drive has recently drawn two foundations under close scrutiny which have particular Dallas interest: the Life Line Foundation, operated by H. L. Hunt, and Christian Echoes National Ministry, which is operated by Billy James Hargis, of Tulsa, founder and director of the Christian Crusade.

The Internal Revenue Service district directors in Baltimore in 1962 and 1963 recommended revoking Life Line's tax-exempt status, and about 3 weeks ago the Tulsa directors recommended the same for the Hargis organization, both recommendations on the grounds that the foundations engaged in political propaganda instead of education.

PATMAN's particular concern is the problem of "unreasonable accumulation." He found that while approximately 50 percent of income in operating and administrative expenses, some 40 percent (of $7 billion, in this case) was left unspent. He foresees a day, under this process, when foundations could control private wealth and investment.

The Treasury Department feels the next Congress will pass measures to alleviate problems in at least three areas: self-dealing between contributor and the foundation he controls, foundations in business and the "unreasonable accumulations."

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon says his Department does not intend interfering with operations of the great foundations which are reputable and doing such an excellent job. On the contrary the hope is to strengthen the legitimate foundations by eliminating those which are trying to ride on their backs by doing things which they shouldn't do. PATMAN is taking the personal role of seeing that it happens.

THE NATION HAS NOW ENJOYED 49 MONTHS OF UNBROKEN ECONOMIC ADVANCE

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has now enjoyed 49 months of unbroken economic advance. Predictions pertinent to our national future are all forecasts of continued growth. All sectors of American life are counting on a continuing and even substantial growth in our economy as a whole.

To support this necessary growth we assume that there will be enough natural resources to go around and fill the needs of our country and people. As of today, I feel this may well be a very ill-founded assumption. We have no sound reasons for believing that our country's soil, water, timber, grassland, wildlife, and other natural resource needs will be adequately met. As a nation and as a government, in the executive or the legislative branch, we are not pursuing a sufficient and deliberate course to meet them. I believe as our late great President Kennedy said: "Let us begin." We are making some beginnings: H.R. 1111, the pending water resources planning measure introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], is part of this beginning and I wish to congratulate him and his colleagues for their efforts in water resources planning and coordination. But Mr. Speaker, we must also move forward on other fronts to find mutually acceptable solutions to problems fully grown. Time is running out—action may not be postponed any longer. By the year 2000 we will need 900 billion gallons of water a day. No one knows now where we will get this water, how it will be divided up, or what it will cost. Beyond the year 2000 none of our forecasters even dare look—yet surely our future extends beyond that date.

Equally hard problems are at hand in connection with our soils, timber, ranges, recreation space, water storage sites, wildlife, and other renewable and nonrenewable natural resources.

It may be argued, and unfortunately frequently is the case, that ultimate decisions on national resource problems are budgetary decisions. Witness the 1966 budget presented to us. On the one hand we go forward with pollution control, natural beauty, saline water developments, and other tremendously important phases of the total problem. Yet on the other hand water development projects are curtailed, agricultural research is centralized to a degree perhaps nonresponsive to the regional soil and water needs of people, the basic agricultural stabilization and conservation practice program is cut in half and while we seek more recreational resources from the land and water conservation fund we cut to the bone the operating and development budgets for our public lands, national parks and wildlife refuges—even hear of administrative proposals to dispose of some of these public resources because their operation is too costly.

Obviously there is little if any evidence that resource budgeting is related in any deliberate or scientific way to national needs. Instead, appropriation requests for natural resource programs are based clearly on only past budget history or departmental ceilings rather than on any overall national appraisal of resource requirements.

The several resource programs of the Federal Government are now distressingly uncoordinated in their operations. Each program is administered independently of others. The many interagency and interdepartmental committees which give lipservice to cooperative and coordinated resource development are highly ineffective in resolving the basic conflicts and issues which face our Nation in the field of natural resources. The Nation can no longer afford the Medusa-like committee approach as a substitute to the unified national leadership so urgently required by the Nation.

The basic nature of the resource problems before us demand continuing, intelligent national planning and programing not handicapped by entrenched bureaucratic rivalries. A source of effective positive leadership is required for the overall continuation of national resource efforts to the Nation's oncoming needs. To provide this vital leadership and programing the bill, which I have the pleasure of introducing today—and which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Mr. MCGOVERN, has introduced in the other body, establishes a White House Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers paralleling the Council of Economic Advisers. It establishes select committees in the Senate and the House each composed of members of the four committees dealing with resources legislation, Interior, Public Works, Agriculture, and Commerce, which will meet at least once annually, early in each session of Congress, to consider an annual national resources report by the Council.

It would establish the same sort of centers of informed, continuing resources and conservation leadership in the executive branch and Congress that we have successfully and beneficially set up in the economic field.

Mr. Speaker, I urge we begin at last to deal with our resource problems in an intelligent and coordinated manner and in a manner in which both the executive and legislative branches may make their full contributions to a better, more prosperous America for tomorrow.

DISTINGUISHED MEMBER OF BUSINESS COMMUNITY ALINES HIMSELF WITH GENERAL, BROAD GOALS OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is no longer headline news when a distinguished member of the business community alines himself with the general, broad goals of the Great Society President Johnson has set down for his administration.

During the campaign last November, a sizable delegation of businessmen and industrialists joined with leaders of organized labor, farmers, and members of the professions in rejecting the reactionary philosophies of arch conservatism. They did so with vision and with courage.

I was particularly delighted this past week to receive the full text of remarks made by Stewart S. Cort, president of the Bethlehem Steel Corp. before the Metropolitan Baltimore Chamber of Commerce on January 18.

Mr. Cort is among the most distinguished spokesmen in American industry today. He has brought to his duties with Bethlehem Steel Corp. not only a superb sense of business economics but, far more important, I think, an awareness of the public responsibility a growing and prospering business enterprise must have.

In his address to the Baltimore chamber, Mr. Cort has set down a remarkable and highly commendable set of guidelines for America's giant corporations. It is a blueprint with which most informed and enlightened businessmen can heartily agree. I think most other members of the community will find it encouraging, also.

We may disagree on some of the specifics set forth in Mr. Cort's "Pattern for Progress." But no one can possibly discount the good faith and the enormous sense of civic duty which went into making them.

I commend Mr. Cort's excellent address to those of my colleagues who look upon the future of our great Nation as a challenge, not to Government alone, but to all interests in our society and to all individuals.

I ask that the text be included as part of the RECORD at this point.

A PATTERN FOR PROGRESS

(An address by Stewart S. Cort, president, Bethlehem Steel Corp.)

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and thank you, Mr. Wehr, not only for your gracious introduction, but for accurately naming my employer.

Up until just a few days ago I might have been described as working for Bethlehem Steel Co., which was for many years the principal operating subsidiary of Bethlehem Steel Corp., although I held identical titles in both the company and the corporation. At yearend, the company was merged into the corporation, and I have only 1 official employer, plus 250,000 stockholders. There were many reasons for the merger. Our lawyers agreed that they are good ones and, when you consider what you have to pay for legal eagles these days, you can't afford to ignore their advice—besides, they didn't recommend a cut in my pay.

Another good thing about this merger is that it could be accomplished without bringing down the wrath of the Department of Justice on our heads. There are very few mergers about which this can safely be said these days. In fact, there are very few business decisions of any kind which are not influenced to some degree by Government activities. Because of this basic fact of present-day life, our country's progress now requires more than ever before that business and Government understand the other's role and act on the basis of that understanding. This gets me—not entirely by accident—to the subject of my talk.

As businessmen, you and I know that the motivating force behind real economic progress is free enterprise. Commerce and industry, functioning in a congenial community atmosphere, have indeed contributed mightily toward making Greater Baltimore a truly greater Baltimore.

As a former resident, I am impressed—as any visitor to this city must be—by Charles Center. It is the crown jewel of your midcity rejuvenation—and what a gem it will be.

Likewise, there is evidence all around us of the success of your efforts to attract new industry to this area—in which Bethlehem people have gladly shared. This has brought many benefits to your community and its citizens.

Finally, there is the example of our own Sparrows Point plant, an industrial establishment that has sprung from humble roots. It was founded in 1887 by men who saw opportunity in serving the material needs of a growing nation. They were farsighted men—as were those who formed a small iron company in Bethlehem, Pa., in the mid-1800's. Both enterprises prospered, grew, and combined forces in 1916. As a part of Bethlehem Steel, Sparrows Point accomplished what it never could have done on its own—it has become the greatest steel plant in the free world.

In a year's time, Bethlehem provides a payroll of close to $240 million in the Baltimore area, pays about $14 million in local taxes, and purchases millions of dollars in goods and services from local firms. I recite these facts simply to emphasize the tremendous benefits resulting from what I look upon as a pattern for progress—private enterprise working within a healthy climate provided by realistic and forward-looking government—in this case, local government.

But just as weather patterns take form and gather strength at some distance from the places where they ultimately determine the climate, so the climate for business is to a large degree formed, not in the local community, but on the banks of the Potomac—on occasions an extremely high-pressure area.

Let's take a look at the Washington weather map today.

We see a Federal establishment of colossal proportions and armed with formidable powers. If big government is a necessity in our day and age—and I must regretfully admit that it seems to be—it is a costly one. Today, all levels of government—local, State, and Federal—account for more than 30 percent of all expenditures for goods and services compared with only 8 percent as little as 35 years ago. And today the Federal Government accounts for more than 50 percent of that total in contrast to 15 percent in 1929.

We all know where those dollars come from. The burden of taxation was once described in these vigorous words: "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors. If those taxes are excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and in hordes of hungry people tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain. Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay. They pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy, or in unemployment throughout the land." There is much truth in those words uttered in Pittsburgh in 1932, by a presidential candidate. His name was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Whatever the historical reasons and whatever the cost, we are in an environment of tremendous Government activity. It may be what is demanded by the times we live in, and there is little likelihood of any substantial reduction in the role of Government in the foreseeable future.

Now, how does the Washington weather map look to me? What kind of a climate can we expect it to provide for our pattern for progress?

The recent tax cut and the more realistic treatment of depreciation by the Treasury are good signs. Government seems to have a clearer idea than it did at times in the past of the role of free enterprise in achieving a growing, stable, and prosperous economy.

We have seen, and I think most of us approve, the appointment of able and responsible businessmen to Federal offices, including Cabinet level. We are conscious of an increased willingness, if not even eagerness, on the part of various Federal agencies to sit down with business and industry and discuss mutual problems in the office instead of the courtroom.

A careful reading of the weather map shows some clouds, of course. There are plenty of people in Washington who seem to think that all important decisions must be made there. There are far too many who seem to believe that Government spending is more potent than private when it comes to stimulating the economy. And there is a marked tendency in some Government quarters to use the shotgun approach in dealing with complex problems. But the general tone is encouraging.

For our part, I believe businessmen should accept these promising indications at face value and do their best to enhance them.

I can assure you that my own company is going to do its best to work in harmony with Government for a healthy, prosperous economy. President Johnson has proposed for business a sixfold obligation: to market high-quality products and to develop new and improved products; to strive always to reduce costs; to sell vigorously in the domestic market and, when possible, abroad; to provide job security and incentives to our employees; to invest to the limit of our ability in sound expansion; and, to manage so as to encourage economic stability.

I believe you will agree with me that these objectives are quite consistent with our own ideas as to the primary functions of private enterprise.

But I think that sound and forward-looking business management requires even more than the President has proposed. Private business must develop a keener awareness of the impact of its policies and actions on the public. We must be less inclined to stand on our private rights and more inclined to accept public responsibility. If we do not voluntarily accept broader responsibility, we can expect that what we fail to do will be undertaken by the Government, on terms we probably would not like—and we get the bill anyway. Affirmative thinking and affirmative action are needed.

Second, we must do a far more effective job of instilling a better understanding and a wider acceptance of the concept and benefits of private enterprise. The importance of business profits remains too little appreciated—and too little understood—by the general public. Profits are so basic to the remarkable growth of our economy that most people have gotten in the habit of taking them for granted and have forgotten how essential they are.

We businessmen are the logical spokesmen for the free enterprise system, and yet much of what we say is really a case of talking to ourselves. If we would be effective disciples of the free enterprise system, let us preach the gospel not to the faithful, but to the unbelievers, or to those whose faith is weak.

Preaching the gospel in this case does not mean making speeches about abstractions. People in government are like people everywhere else. They are convinced more by performance than by oratory, and they are most likely to be convinced when the performance relates to problems with which they are directly concerned. It is not enough to keep reminding people that our unparalleled standard of living is the product of the enterprise system. What we have to do at every opportunity is to demonstrate that business can make important contributions to the solution of today's great problems and many of the nagging smaller ones too—if Government and business coordinate their activities. It is not generally recognized that certain kinds of civilian problems which greatly concern the Government cannot be solved at all without the active participation of business. Let me give you an illustration:

One of our most stubborn national problems is the chronic deficit in our balance of international payments. The origins of the problem are extremely complex and its solution requires action on many fronts. In every instance, however, the action requires coordination between business and Government. Take the matter of increasing exports. We can export only those products which are competitive in world markets in terms of quality, delivered prices, and customer service. Maintenance of quality is primarily the job of the manufacturer, and depends increasingly on his being able to develop better technology and take advantage of it. That, in turn, is affected by Government tax policies and, to some extent, labor policies. Delivered prices of exported goods are influenced not only by production and transportation costs but also—and importantly—by internal tax policies and the tariff and tax policies of the country representing an oversea market. Customer service is affected by Government export credit and maritime policies.

The import side of international trade obviously plays a large part in our balance of payments. Now it should be plain to all that in the long run a nation cannot export without importing and, ideally, its total exports to all other countries of the world should equal its total imports. But to have that sort of ideal balance, all nations must be trading under the same rules. They are not today. As a result, some of our important industries, including steel, are being hurt by cutrate imports against which a private defense is impossible. Both the establishment of uniform international trading rules and the prevention of damage to domestic industries are the responsibility of Government. The Government cannot, however, carry out that responsibility without the advice and experience of businessmen who have an intimate knowledge of the realities of trade.

I could go on into other actions which might help solve the balance-of-payments problem—the possibility of reducing foreign aid expenditures through increased private investment, the encouragement of oversea investments as long-term income producers, the attraction of foreign tourists to the United States and many others. But I think I have said enough to make clear that we must have real and close cooperation between business and Government if the problem is to be solved without adversely changing our economic institutions.

International trade is only one of a number of national problem areas in which only the joint efforts of business and Government can provide satisfactory answers. The alleviation of poverty is another. So is the social adjustment to technological change. We as businessmen must participate in the search for solutions unless we are willing to take the awful responsibility for having acquiesced in the destruction of what George Champion of the Chase Manhattan Bank recently called our "free opportunity system."

What, exactly, does this cooperation involve on our part?

First, we must identify the problems which we as businessmen are particularly qualified to work on. Some of these are obvious and some are not.

Second, we must understand what those problems consist of and what contribution we can make to their solution. This requires real study. Fortunately, we can get help from business associations, other private agencies and government bodies which are interested in particular problems. The point is not to sit back and wait until something has happened before we start finding out what the problems are.

Third, we must try to visualize the kinds of solutions which would be in the public interest and determine how they would affect our own longrun interest. This requires understanding the Government viewpoint which may be quite different from that of the business community.

Fourth, we must develop in concrete terms what we think are appropriate solutions, specifying the part business must play in them.

Finally, we must sell those solutions to the appropriate people in Government and to their constituents. Representatives in Government want to have our views and the facts upon which they are based.

This must seem like a very large order to men who wonder how they can handle their normal daily business responsibilities within 24 hours. Obviously, all of you cannot work on all the problems facing the United States, the State of Maryland, and the city of Baltimore. But each of us can be more actively interested in what associations like this one are doing. We can have more frequent and less casual contacts with our acquaintances in government at all levels. And we can all say, "Yes," more often when we are asked to help study one of the problems with which Government and business are wrestling. We might even go farther and volunteer to help.

The stake is worth the effort. It is simply the survival of the economic institutions to which we are all committed and on which the prospertly and safety of our society depend.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. We must keep constant surveillance of our operations and practices so that they will be adequate to properly represent 190 million Americans, in this complex, changing world. We should not be satisfied with outdated operations, but should constantly seek ways to improve our procedures. Traditions should be revered and kept where they do the job, but old ways should be discarded when new methods get the job done quicker and better.

I believe a joint committee to study our operations and practices is a reasoned and moderate approach. I am pleased to join with Senator MONRONEY, a cosponsor of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and with many other distinguished colleagues, in introducing legislation to create a joint committee. It would be composed of 12 Members—6 from the House and 6 from the Senate.

I have given a great deal of thought to suggested reforms which would be proper for the joint committee to consider, and I know that many Members are ready to testify on ways to improve the Congress. I strongly urge approval of legislation to create a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, in my mind the veterans of this country deserve the service which the regional offices and veterans' hospitals provide them, and I am convinced that the VA's action in announcing the closings is inconsistent with that need. We pour billions of dollars out to foreign aid, but we cannot spend $25 million on our veterans, who offered their life in time of national emergency.

I would appreciate if you would reprint attached letter, which is but one among hundreds that I have received on this subject, from Melvin L. Jacobsen, commissioner for veterans affairs in my State of Nevada. I believe you will find his remarks self-explanatory.

COMMISSIONER FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Reno, Nev., January 27, 1965.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALTER: The more I think of Mr. Driver's decision to move the Reno regional office to Los Angeles the more I'm concerned because of the lack of service to the veterans in this area. As you know I am definitely against this move and I would like to tell you a few things that may not come to your attention concerning this move.

With the regional office in Reno, and it being the only regional office in the State of Nevada, this office is most important to the veteran who applies for his benefits from welfare, social security, Federal jobs and other benefits that he is interested in, especially pension and compensation. We work and coordinate claims with social security, also welfare, and this is very important because in so many cases when the veteran finds that he needs help he needs it immediately. With the regional office here, and with our cooperation with the Federal, State, and county agencies, it is only a matter of a couple of days and everyone concerned knows the particular case and in 15 to 30 days the veteran is receiving his benefit from Federal, State, or county agencies. With the regional office in Los Angeles the veteran will not get the service because we have to request the information necessary from Los Angeles and as you know in any large office it has to go thru the proper channels and this takes time. In other words the veteran that needs help immediately will have to wait months before he gets his service. I can go into more detail if needed and also specify cases where it was necessary to request information from other stations. There are times when we have to go outside regular channels to get the necessary information and even then it is sometimes weeks and months to get the information. The disabled veteran with the service-connected disability, in my opinion, is the one that will suffer the most from this move.

Again I implore you to do anything in your power to stop this move of the Reno regional office to Los Angeles.

Sincerely yours,
MELVIN L. JACOBSEN,
Commissioner.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT WILLIAM McKINLEY

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, Members of the House took note of the birthday anniversary of one of our former Presidents, President William McKinley. It was only natural that a part of the program of the Ohio Society of Washington, D.C., for its January monthly meeting would also include some reference to this great Ohioan and dedicated public servant.

The task was admirably performed by Dr. Edward J. Wagner, administrative assistant to the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable JOHN GILLIGAN, of the First District. These brief comments, in my humble judgment, are quite in order for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend them to the reading of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF DR. EDWARD J. WAGNER

Tonight we observe the 122d anniversary of the birth of William McKinley—a great Ohioan, a great American and a great and dedicated public servant.

William McKinley's was a success story that could, even then, happen only in America. The son of an iron founder, William

McKinley advanced rapidly in life, from citizen-soldier in the Civil War to prosecuting attorney, to Member of Congress, to Governor of his State, and on to the Presidency itself. I think that it is significant that only three Presidents were elected to consecutive terms of office in the 64-year period between 1836 and 1900. One was Abraham Lincoln, one was U. S. Grant, another distinguished Ohioan, and the third was William McKinley.

History has not passed final judgment on his Presidency, but I think that it is significant that he had and held the confidence and goodwill of his fellow men during the historic period that has become known as the "McKinley era."

Though truly a man of compassion, William McKinley was shot down and fatally wounded in the fifth year of his Presidency. A contemporary account of the assassination, published in Janary 1902, read in part:

"The terrible shock of the assassination of President McKinley by Leon F. Czolgosz at Buffalo, N.Y., on September 6, 1901, imparted to the entire civilized world a mingled feeling of horror, vindictiveness, and revenge, which was exceeded only by the profound sense of sorrow and depression which took possession of the people."

All of us here just recently experienced the terrible shock of the loss of another great and good man. So we can well imagine how the people reacted to the murder of William McKinley.

But he, himself, had no thought of revenge or vindictiveness. McKinley died as he had lived—with firm reliance in the Almighty. Approaching death, his last words were, "It is God's way. His will, not ours, be done."

That his final thoughts were of God is not surprising. William McKinley firmly believed in the divinity of Christ and recognized Christianity as the mightiest factor in world civilization. The spirit of William McKinley, the goodness of this man, will live on as long as the dignity of man prevails. I might say in closing that William McKinley belongs to all Americans, regardless of political affiliation.

SHORTEN THE CAMPAIGN—A 1953 MESSAGE

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting evidence of support for an abbreviated presidential election campaign. The legislation which I have filed for this purpose has been the subject of favorable editorials and other encouraging comment throughout the country.

My interest in this endeavor to spare our Nation and our candidates the rigors and the expense of long and boring campaigns has been well known to my colleagues since I first came to Congress. However, I have recently had called to my attention an address by Mr. William S. Paley, chairman, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., which he delivered before the Poor Richard Club of Philadelphia on January 17, 1953.

This is further illustration that we have been far too long discussing this needed change by failing to take the essential action. I hope that we will resolve ourselves to act during the present session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I include here the following statement which is an excerpt from Mr. Paley's 1953 speech:

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM S. PALEY

SHORTEN THE CAMPAIGN

It seems to me that one of the central and major contributions which television can make to our political life is to shorten the campaigning process by a considerable length of time. In this connection, I would like to present for the earnest consideration of the two major political parties the proposal that the national conventions should start around September 1. Allowing 3 weeks for the completion of the nominating process, this would leave approximately 6 to 7 weeks for the two candidates to present their cases to the people. The effective use of television and other media of communication, combined with the basic minimum traveling demands required by political necessity, would, in my judgment, enable the candidates to register a deep and pervasive impact on the electorate during this 7-week period.

The advantages that would accrue from this shortening the campaign seem to me to be inescapable. For one thing, it would substantially reduce the physical and mental strain upon the candidates by eliminating a large portion of the traveling and speaking which they must now subject themselves to. Even if it did nothing more than this, it would appear justified when you consider the initial strain on an individual who has suddenly been designated a nominee for the highest office in the land, with the grave responsibilities ahead which such office entails. It could even be said that it does serious injury to the national interest to impose the prolonged pressures of a protracted campaign upon an individual who is to be charged with the leadership of the Nation.

The public would share equally in the benefits accruing from a shorter campaign. Political campaigns divide families and friends. Initially keyed up by the excitement of the conventions, most citizens live in a heightened state of emotion during the campaign. Nerves lie close to the surface, and differing political sympathies flare up in frequent argument. Under present conditions, this atmosphere of controlled hostility is maintained for a period of 4 months. It is damaging to the spirit, not to mention the body politic.

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN REPERCUSSIONS

But an even greater benefit of a shorter campaign period would be its salutary influence on the administrative process. As things now stand this process appears to come close to a complete halt during the hiatus between the end of the conventions and election day. It would seem as if Government suddenly suspended operation while awaiting the outcome of the election. Policies are postponed, actions delayed. The legislative and executive branches of Government virtually cease to function. The consequences of this stoppage extend far beyond our national boundaries. They affect world policy. During this period the governments of foreign nations live in a state of uneasiness and frustration. Because of the controlling position of the United States in world affairs they are uncertain as to what the future holds for their own fortunes. Many of them, unfamiliar with the traditional behavior of Americans during a presidential campaign, look upon our political emotionalism as a sign of disunity. Throughout the world our enemies rejoice and our friends grow nervous at our political quarreling, and although neither reaction has any basis in reality, the campaign period manages to create ferment and instability abroad.

Finally, a shortened campaign would inevitably result in lower campaign costs and expenditures by the national and State committees of the leading parties.

The argument that under the present arrangement the campaigns do not get underway in any event until after Labor Day does not seem to me to hold up under examination. It is invalid on several counts. During the recent campaign each of the two major candidates made six major speeches between August 5 and September 4.

But even if it were true that no major campaigning is undertaken prior to September 1, it is still questionable whether this would be a good thing, as far as the electorate is concerned. The speed of modern communications and the political sophistication of the American voter make the popular demand for immediate communication imperative. At the close of the two national conventions, the electorate is waiting expectantly for the candidates to communicate their views and positions. To delay the communication is only to produce anticlimax and uncertainty.

TIMING OF CONVENTIONS

There is no law that demands that the national conventions be held in June or July. In the colonial period, what passed for nominating conventions, but in reality were small private meetings of Government leaders, were held sporadically and irrelevantly at different times during the year preceding the election. There was no rhyme or reason behind their dates. The first actual presidential nominating convention composed of 112 delegates chosen from among the legislators of 13 States was held in Baltimore by the Anti-Masonic Party 14 months prior to the election of 1832. With the growth of political parties and the development of party organization, and the consequent need for mobilizing the various political forces throughout the country the habit developed of holding the national conventions in late spring following the adjournment of Congress. It was not until 1856 that the conventions began to be held with consistent regularity in June. The national committees met in December of the year preceding the election, at which time they fixed the date and place of their conventions. This practice has been followed ever since. It was thought necessary to allow for 3 or 4 months of campaigning after the convention in order to give the candidates an opportunity to make themselves known to the electorate.

But those were the days before airplanes and broadcasting. Today a campaign period of 4 months seems clearly obsolete.

OVERRIDING ADVANTAGES

In conclusion, therefore, I would again urge the serious consideration of the proposal that our national conventions be pushed forward to early September in view of the substantial advantages such a step would provide in shortening the campaign and thereby materially reducing the intensive pressures on both the presidential candidates and the general public as well as shortening the hiatus in government and curtailing the mounting costs of political campaigning.

The latest count at yearend reveals that there are approximately 21 million American homes equipped with television receivers and 117 television stations on the air. It will be difficult to name a sizable community in the country which will not be accessible to the sight and sound of the nominees of 1956.

The infinite ways in which television is modernizing our lives and extending our horizons—in education, in entertainment, in economics—become more manifest each day.

It seems to me inevitable that this modernizing effect should carry over into our political institutions. Moreover, this occasion and this city seem both a fitting time and place to introduce the possibilities of such modernization. For it was in this city, after all, that the greatest documents of modern political life were introduced—documents which swept in an air of freedom such as man had never breathed before.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SAYLOR, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. PHILBIN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MICHEL, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OTTINGER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEED.

Mr. SWEENEY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 8, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

503. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the utilization of ships provided to a nation under the military assistance program, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

504. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 19, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Ponce de Leon Inlet, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 16, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

505. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 13, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted March 17, 1960, and May 10, 1962, and a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 10, 1962. It is also in partial response to the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 75); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

506. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 7, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim survey of Oceanside Harbor, Oceanside (Camp Pendleton), Calif., authorized by Public Law 14, 79th Congress, approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

507. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a copy of the Third Annual (1964) Report of the Office of Civil Defense, pursuant to section 5 of the Executive Order 10952 of July 20, 1961, and section 406 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

508. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "a bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

509. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend and clarify the laws relating to advertising in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

510. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 11–1902, District of Columbia Code, relating to the duties of the coroner of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

511. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the appropriation of payments to support fire protection and fire prevention services for District of Columbia institutions located outside the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

512. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the loan authorization for the construction of District of Columbia highways and to increase the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel tax"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

513. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'an act to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain employments in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved May 17, 1928, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

514. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 3 of the act approved April 23, 1892, as amended, to authorize the deposit of public space excavation permit fees to the credit of such District of Columbia fund or trust fund account as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia determine"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

515. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 203(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the filing of schedules of charges by connecting carriers"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

516. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of drafts of legislation covering several bills as an outcome of legislative recommendations in the Commission's 78th annual report; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

517. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Tucker Act, section 1346 (a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, to increase from $10,000 to $50,000, the limitation on the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in suits against the United States for breach of contract or for compensation"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

518. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of years of Federal judicial service for judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

519. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

520. Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to further amend section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949" (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 66. A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced; without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 647. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties; without amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 947. A bill to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved; without amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1064. A bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1065. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to provide an exemption from the tax imposed by such act for certain operations of the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1066. A bill to amend section 11–1701 of the District of Columbia Code to increase the retirement salaries of certain retired judges; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1699. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiarty in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1700. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 948. A bill to amend part II of the District of Columbia Code relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1007. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 3314. A bill to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 4345. A bill to amend the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 to extend the period during which section 1306 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as enacted by such act), was effective; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4346. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4347. A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4348. A bill to debar evidence obtained through electronic eavesdropping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 4349. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 4350. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; and to amend such act to strengthen and protect fundamental legal and civil rights of individual workers required to join a union as a condition of employment; to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, or creed where employment is conditioned upon union membership or payment of moneys to a union; to prevent the use for political purposes of union dues and moneys paid by workers subject to compulsory union membership agreements; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4351. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 4352. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 4353. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 4354. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4355. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 4356. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 4357. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 4358. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4359. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 4360. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4361. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4362. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4363. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 4364. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 4365. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 4366. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4367. A bill to amend section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to measurement of farms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that contributions and gifts to foreign charities shall be deductible from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4369. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the withholding of tax on nonresident aliens with respect to income derived from investments in mutual savings and loan associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4370. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, by equalizing taxation with a special exemption for farm marketing and purchasing agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4371. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4372. A bill to specify the number of hospital beds that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs must maintain and operate at the veterans' hospital, East Orange, N.J.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4373. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 4374. A bill to amend section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 and section 231 of the National Housing Act to improve and render more effective the Federal direct loan and mortgage insurance programs providing assistance to housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 4375. A bill to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Army of certain lands in the Fort Gibson Reservoir, in Oklahoma, subject to flowage easements and other reservations; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 4376. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4377. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit premium compensation of firefighting employees to be considered as basic salary for the purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 4378. A bill to establish a third U.S. mint to be located in Will or Du Page County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4379. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide free insurance protection for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4380. A bill to amend section 336 of title 38, United States Code, to provide wartime rates of disability compensation for veterans disabled from injury or disease incurred or aggravated by oversea service; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4381. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to transport stolen sheep or goats in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 4382. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 4383. A bill to make permanent the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4384. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 4385. A bill to amend section 304(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide that certain expenses shall not be allowable costs under certain contracts and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4386. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 28 of the United States Code to toll the running of the statute of limitations against tort claims of persons under legal disability or beyond the seas at the time their claims accrue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on household-type hot water heaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4388. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 4389. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4390. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 4391. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4392. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 4393. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4394. A bill to amend section 4481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the truck use tax where the taxpayer, during the taxable period, disposes of a truck and acquires another truck; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4395. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4396. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 63 and to women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4397. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 4398. A bill to bring certain holders of star route and other contracts for the carrying of mail within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4399. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 7-percent benefit increase, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to liberalize the retirement test, and to provide minimum benefits for all individuals not otherwise entitled at age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4400. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 4401. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4402. A bill to authorize construction of flood control projects on the Housatonic, Still, and Naugatuck Rivers at Danbury and Derby, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 4403. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4404. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Kiwanis International; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 4405. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4406. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4407. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4408. A bill to assist in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4409. A bill to assist in the construction and operation of senior citizens centers and programs of education, recruiting, and training for community service, counseling, and other activities in keeping with the needs of older citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4410. A bill to establish a Community Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4411. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances or a joint committee or joint board empowered to interpret provisions of collective bargaining agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4412. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 4413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4414. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 4415. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4416. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4417. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fossil Butte National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4418. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4419. A bill to establish the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4420. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4421. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 4422. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to contempt citations in the case of witnesses before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4423. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in years 1966 and 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 4424. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the limitation on the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits, and to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4425. A bill to further secure the right to vote, free from discrimination on account of race or color, through the establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4426. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4427. A bill to further secure the right to vote, free from discrimination on account of race or color, through the establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 4428. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 to grant to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals jurisdiction to review decisions of the District of Columbia Tax Court; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 4429. A bill to provide for reimbursement to the State of Wyoming for improvements made on certain lands in Sweetwater County, Wyo., if and when such lands revert to the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4430. A bill to declare a national policy on conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 4431. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the United States shall pay the hospital expenses of certain veterans hospitalized under certain circumstances in non-Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 278. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State with the approval of its electorate to consider factors in addition to population in the apportionment of one house of its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution to authorize the President to declare a day of prayer and dedication in memory of American missionaries slain in the Congo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 285. Joint resolution to enable the District of Columbia government to aid the arts in ways similar to those in which the arts are aided financially by other cities of the United States by providing funds for special concerts for children and others, by aiding in the establishment of a permanent children's theater, and by providing for competitions to discover and encourage young Americans in the pursuit of excellence, and to acquaint them with the best of our national cultural heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.J. Res. 286. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to conduct an impartial investigation of the recent events in Selma, Ala.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to conduct an impartial investigation of the recent events in Selma, Ala.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Con. Res. 170. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from illegal Soviet occupation; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. Con. Res. 172. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film prepared by the U.S. Information Agency entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POOL:

H. Con. Res. 173. Concurrent resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 6 of each year as German-American Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 174. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Con. Res. 175. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H. Con. Res. 177. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. Con. Res. 178. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H. Con. Res. 182. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H. Con. Res. 183. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 185. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H. Con. Res. 195. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H. Con. Res. 196. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREIGG:

H. Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KREBS:

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H. Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. Con. Res. 207. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H. Con. Res. 209. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Con. Res. 210. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 211. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H. Con. Res. 212. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Con. Res. 213. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 214. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 215. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 216. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 219. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 223. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H. Con. Res. 224. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 225. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 226. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Con. Res. 227. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Con. Res. 229. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. Con. Res. 233. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TENZER:

H. Con. Res. 234. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H. Con. Res. 235. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H. Con. Res. 239. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 242. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Con. Res. 248. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H. Con. Res. 249. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DYAL:

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUOT:

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. Con. Res. 259. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. Res. 189. Resolution providing for a review of the needs for local airline service by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 190. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discontinuance of air service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 191. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to amending title IV of the Social Security Act to permit mothers and older children in families in the aid to dependent children program to become employed to supplement their income without the reduction of ADC benefits because of earnings from such employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Memorial of the State of Montana relative to the closing of the Veterans' Administration facility at Miles City, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4432. A bill for the relief of Despina Kouloumoundras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 4433. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fe O. Isla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4434. A bill for the relief of Natalia Lores Cachero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4435. A bill for the relief of Lee Shee Hung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4436. A bill for the relief of Stavros Constantin Thomaidis and his wife, Helena Stavros Thomaidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4437. A bill for the relief of Bryan George Simpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4438. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anisse Nichan Vizoyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4439. A bill for the relief of Guiseppina Bilotta Ruberto and son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angeliki Kandilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4441. A bill for the relief of Halina J. Adamska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 4442. A bill for the relief of Remegio Fedelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 4443. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Beas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4444. A bill for the relief of Enzo Bertolotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4445. A bill for the relief of Epifania F. Gamoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4446. A bill for the relief of Claudette Marie Dahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4447. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4448. A bill for the relief of Lampros Nicolaides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4449. A bill for the relief of Mihran Mihranyan and his wife, Hayguhi Mihranyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 4450. A bill for the relief of Miss Marion James; to the Committee on the Judiciary

H.R. 4451. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Livitsanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.R. 4452. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos Anastasiadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 4453. A bill for the relief of Matteo Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 4454. A bill for the relief of Herman Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4455. A bill for the relief of Miltiades Troumpoucis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 4456. A bill for the relief of Nelie C. Marzan Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 4457. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Miller and Mildred M. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4458. A bill for the relief of Michael Fahim Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4459. A bill for the relief of Giorgina Raniolo Infantino and her children, Georgio Infantino, Angelo Infantino, and Giovani Infantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 4460. A bill for the relief of Georgia Manoles (formerly known as Georgia Demetrakopoulou); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4461. A bill for the relief of Dr. Violeta Poblacion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 4462. A bill for the relief of Giacomo D'Andrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4463. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kostera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 4464. A bill for the relief of Michael Hadjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas, and Paniote Hadjichristofas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

87. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting the proper authorities to give full consideration to the Mexican Isthmus of Tehuantepec as the site for a new interoceanic canal between the Atlantic and the Pacific; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Legislation Needed for Interstate Highway Extension Into Southwest Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to extend the Interstate Highway System into southwest Florida. The route would be along the same lines as U.S. 41, passing through Tampa and on to Bradenton, Punta Gorda, Fort Myers, Naples, Miami, and Homestead. This new superhighway would not only link cities in the rapidly growing gulf coast of Florida, but would serve the vital interests of Homestead Air Force Base and the various U.S. Naval and Coast Guard operations in the Florida Keys.

Recall the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, when large numbers of military equipment and personnel were moved into south Florida on short notice. This situation pointed up the need for providing military authorities with a high-speed access into an area of critical importance to the Nation's defense.

Yet military needs are not the only basis for extending the Interstate Highway System into southwest Florida. A good example for such an extension may be seen in Lee and Collier Counties as they are typical of the phenomenal population expansion which has taken place in our State. Lee County's population increased 25 percent in the past 4 years, and Collier County increased over 43 percent in the same period. As all indications forecast continued expansion in the future wise planning dictates that adequate roads such as an interstate extension be constructed now.

Finally, the 14 million tourists who visit Florida each year are citizens of virtually every State in the Union, and many of them use interstate superhighways outside Florida to reach their destinations. As more than 82 percent of Florida's tourists travel by automobile, the extension of an interstate route into the lower gulf coast would not only serve the economy of the surrounding area but the demands of millions of Americans who tour our State as well.

For these reasons I urge prompt action on legislation designating a new interstate highway route into southwest Florida. Since first introducing such legislation in 1959, I have worked to see an interstate highway become a reality in this area. Our State has changed greatly since then, and the need for a new superhighway has become even more pressing. Proper planning and foresight demand this highway improvement now.

Eulogy to Michael A. McGrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIC

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the passing to his heavenly reward on January 31, of Michael A. McGrath, one of Ohio's most beloved and outstanding citizens.

Michael McGrath's passing will be lamented throughout the entire Irish-American community.

Michael McGrath, who, in his lifetime, was an outstanding lawyer and specialist in the insurance field, was also the past national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

Michael McGrath was an Irish-American of great warmth and intelligence, and one who was extremely proud of his Gaelic heritage. His life was dedicated to the principles of the Ancient Order of Hibernians; namely, friendship, unity, and Christian charity; and Michael McGrath lived these traditions on a day-to-day basis every day of his life.

In addition to his service with the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Michael McGrath also served as member and officer of the Clan Nae Gael, the Irish good-fellowship society and the United Irish Society of Cleveland.

He was a former administrative assistant for the late U.S. Representative Charles A. Mooney, of Ohio's 20th Congressional District, and most active through the years in the affairs of the Democratic Party of Cuyahoga County.

Mr. Speaker, with the passing of men such as Michael McGrath, so, too, passes an era in which the Irish of this land had to fight for recognition without the benefit of laws that exist today against discrimination. Michael McGrath was in the forefront of that struggle for national recognition of his rights. He was a credit to his nation, to his church, and to his family and always steadfast in his defense of America's historical heritage of liberty and freedom.

On the occasion of his passing, our hearts go out in sympathy to his daughter, Janice Hurd, his two grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren, as well as his sister, Mrs. Katherine Paes, of Concord, Calif.

Postmaster General Gronouski Addresses Oklahoma Press Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski visited Oklahoma last week for an address before the annual midwinter convention of the State press association at Oklahoma City.

His remarks on the operation of the Post Office Department and its future are significant and constructive, and I herewith enter the text of his speech:

> I am happy to be here with you today. I take great pleasure in the opportunity to speak to this distinguished group of newspaper editors and publishers. And I am honored that your invitation should have come through two men I have long admired: Senator MIKE MONRONEY and Congressman CARL ALBERT.
>
> My respect for Senator MONRONEY and Congressman ALBERT is so great that I could easily devote the entire time I have allotted to me this morning in a tribute to them.
>
> As you know, MIKE MONRONEY is chairman of our Postal Operations Subcommittee, and he's one of the acknowledged experts in the United States on the postal service. As such, he's a pretty tough taskmaster on all of us

in the Department. He keeps a sharp eye on us. But he's a fair taskmaster, too, and I'm proud to call him my friend and trusted adviser.

Of course, anything I could say about CARL ALBERT was expressed far better by his own colleagues in selecting him as their majority leader. And having selected him, they can tell you that there is no harder worker in Washington today, or a more brilliant one.

It was my honor to share the platform with him at a senior citizens' rally in Atlantic City last summer with a group of other Government officials, and I must say that I had reservations about ever doing it again. The fact is, he upstaged us all. But here I am again, not a glutton for punishment but a victim of his persuasiveness. The fact of the matter is, it's an honor to be upstaged by CARL ALBERT.

I read an item in Editor & Publisher the other day which reported that one of your newspaper engravers here in Oklahoma City, Raymond Frazier by name, has collected enough postage stamps to start a small post office of his own.

I hope he thinks it over before doing anything drastic.

In the first place, I don't think the public is quite ready for a whole new set of ZIP code numbers.

And then, too, I'm not at all sure he knows what he'd be letting himself in for. "Postmaster General" is a nice sounding title, but there are a lot of headaches that go with it. In fact, I've been putting in a 15-hour day ever since I took the job, more than a year ago, and I'm just beginning to identify some of the problems. You know, the President talks about the Great Society as a place where leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect * * * and a place where man can renew contact with nature, but at the rate he's been working us, I'm beginning to get the idea that the Great Society doesn't include the Cabinet. Secretary Udall may have a chance to renew contact with nature once in a while, but you can bet he's spending more of his time renewing contact with the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

So my advice to our friend is to stay with engraving. It's a quieter life all the way around. In addition to that, he's a lot better off on that side of the newspaper than the other side. As Postmaster General, I often find myself looking right into the editorial barrel, so to speak, and it gets a bit nerve racking. It's a lot safer on the firing end.

The most recent editorial fad seems to be writing open letters to the Postmaster General, wondering aloud why he can't run the Post Office Department like a business and show a profit for a change.

Of course, under law, we're prohibited from making a profit, but we do try to operate under sound business procedures. I was beginning to convince some people of this, too, until the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. came along last month and announced rate reductions on long-distance calls. I don't know whether it was deliberate or not, but they made the announcement the same day I hinted at the possibility of increases in second- and third-class postal rates.

The open letters really had fun with that one. In fact, they're still coming in.

"Why is it, Mr. Postmaster General," they ask with undisguised sarcasm, "that private enterprise can reduce rates while the Government is preparing to raise them?" Of course, there's seldom an attempt at understanding the differences between the two operations—such as the fact that the telephone company installed phones in remote areas only when it became economically feasible to do so, while we established rural routes whether they made money or not, simply because we're a public service organization. Or that it's easier to transport a voice than a letter. Or that it's still a whole lot cheaper to send a 3-ounce letter from coast to coast for a nickel than it is to make a 3-minute call for a dollar. These things are not considered because it's automatically assumed that, if the Government operates a service, it's bound to be inefficient. "Gray flannel suit socialism" is the way one columnist referred to the postal service.

The whole thing bewilders me at times. A businessman would have to pay a private message delivery service $3.25 to pick up a letter and deliver it 3 miles away in the city of Washington, while we will charge him 8 cents to fly it across a continent.

And so we have different requirements and different problems, and we should recognize them.

But that does not mean that we should become bemused by them. There are certain areas of similarity that we would ignore at our own peril. When we can learn from private enterprise, we intend to do so.

Actually, our rate structure is based in large part on our present method of operation. If we can modernize that operation, we can modernize the rate structure as well. Last week, I appointed an advisory panel of distinguished business, economic, and labor leaders from all over the Nation to study this whole question and to assist me in my recommendations to the President. This is part of President Johnson's policy of consulting with outstanding experts in private industry in formulating and carrying out Government programs and services.

Frankly, I cannot say at this time what their recommendations will be. But I can say that whatever the decision is, it will be based on the soundest advice available in this Nation.

Basically, our challenge is this:

Our mail volume, now running at an annual rate of 72 billion pieces a year, is increasing at an explosive rate. No one is complaining about it, because it is part and parcel of our national prosperity. Nevertheless, it has increased by about 166 percent since 1940 and continues to increase at the rate of 2 billion pieces a year.

The trick, of course, is to find a better way of sorting the mail so we can keep it moving—and that is just what we are doing, through ZIP code. And the most important aspect of ZIP code is the one which deals with our large-volume mailers.

Many people do not realize it, but 75 percent of our total mail volume is business mail. We spend a lot of our time and effort keeping up with it. One program which we have recently initiated in this regard is called VIM—vertical improved mail—which speeds the delivery of business mail in high-rise office buildings. Replacing the time-consuming operation of walking from office to office, from floor to floor to deliver the mail, we can now handle the entire operation from a single mail room in the basement by the use of a vertical conveyor system. This means that every tenant gets his mail as soon as it is sorted, and continues to get it throughout the day.

But the most significant breakthrough has come at the sending end of our operation. We now have discovered a way to keep a large proportion of our business mail out of the post office entirely until it reaches its destination area—to send it directly to one of our 566 new sectional centers without once unbagging or sorting it. And that is the real key to ZIP code. When we do that, we have gone a long way toward meeting the challenge of growth in the postal service.

How do we propose to do it? By asking large-volume mailers to use their automatic data processing equipment to sequence their address lists by ZIP code numbers and then presort their mail before they give it to us.

This is a lot to ask of a mailer, but I assure you it is not a one-way street. In the long run, his cooperation will save him money by helping us hold down rates, and will assure his mail much speedier delivery.

This program of presorting is more than just desirable, however; it is vital.

And so, with this in mind, I am, by administrative action, planning to require all large-volume second- and third-class mailers to presort.

Further, I plan to ask Congress for legislation to require the same of large-volume first-class mailers. We are now far enough along on our ZIP code program for this to have an immediate effect on our overall postal operation—and frankly, I do not see any other way out.

I am not so naive, however, to think that we will escape criticism entirely.

But I do not believe we are asking anything unreasonable of our mailers. In fact, a major reason A.T. & T. has been able to save money—and pass that savings along to the public—is that each year they are asking their customers to do more and more of their work for them. Long distance dialing is a case in point. Several years ago, when you wanted to call long distance, you asked the operator to place it for you. Today, you dial it yourself.

That's exactly the type of cooperation we are now asking of our customers—and we believe the results will be just as meaningful.

The other vital area of cooperation, of course, lies with the average mailer's use of ZIP code. Obviously, the program will not reach its full potential if people fail to address by ZIP code—or fail to include ZIP code in their return address.

To help speed this program along, I announced, earlier this week, a new program to imprint ZIP codes right on the postmarks of the more than 30,000 post offices that individually serve one ZIP code area. They will carry the ZIP code number in the lower portion of the familiar circular postmark. This, I believe, will speed the use of ZIP code by years and will be a tremendous boon to the volume-mailer in ZIP coding his lists.

As you probably know, we have been working for some time on an optical scanner which will be able to "read" ZIP code numerals on envelopes and sort the mail. We have now made the big breakthrough in this area. In about a year, we expect to begin installing these sophisticated new machines in large post offices throughout the United States. When you realize that each machine will be able to "read" and sort at the rate of 35,000 letters an hour, you begin to understand why I call this the icing on the ZIP code cake.

Presorting by ZIP code is, of course, the major postal achievement of our era—and because of it, we would still need ZIP code if we never had an optical scanner. But the scanners, themselves, will help us move the mountains of individual mail that will continue to pour into our large post offices, will speed delivery and will keep our workforce at a manageable size—which, in turn, will allow us to hold rates down to a reasonable level.

This is not a pie-in-the-sky dream. This is a goal that can be reached in a few short years.

It's not going to be easy, but we intend to strive for it—and we intend to succeed.

Thank you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted this verse from Ephesians 6: 10: *Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might.*

Let us pray:

O Thou who wert the God of the Founding Fathers, and in whom they trusted, we rejoice that Thou hast been the God of all their succeeding generations.

May our own life with its manifold problems and perplexities, and its heavy responsibilities, daily become richer and stronger in the realization of Thy sustaining power and peace.

Help us to cultivate those capacities of insight and understanding which will enable us to see our tasks in their right perspective.

Grant that we may be inspired by that conquering faith which will encourage us to meet every moral issue without compromise or complaint.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 4, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to announce the assignments to the objector committees on our side of the aisle.

On the Consent Calendar the objectors will be the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON].

On the Private Calendar there will be the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCEWEN].

THE CLOSING OF THE VA HOSPITAL AT GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to state that I am wholeheartedly in favor of the provisions that were placed in this bill by the Senate. I am wholeheartedly behind the amendments to the 1965 agriculture appropriations supplemental bill, which would prohibit the closing of certain Veterans' Administration facilities and agriculture research stations.

The closing of the VA hospital at Grand Junction, Colo., presents a problem peculiar to the West. To those veterans and their families on the western slope of the Rockies it would mean a great hardship to travel hundreds of miles to the nearest VA hospital. It will not save money; it will only cheapen services. Do we not owe a great debt to these disabled veterans in bringing the best possible hospital facilities at the greatest possible convenience? The gentleman from Colorado, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, in whose district this Grand Junction hospital is located, has given his full support to retaining this hospital and I wish to associate myself with him.

While the Cheyenne Horticultural Field Station at Cheyenne, Wyo., is not in Colorado, it is a regional station serving my constituents. If the Cheyenne Horticultural Field Station is closed as planned there will be no institution left in the whole Great Plains-Rocky Mountain region doing any significant research on those plants needed for President Johnson's "green legacy for tomorrow." Certainly no other part of the United States has greater need for horticultural reseach, because ours is the last great area of the country to be settled and because our conditions are so different from those of the older East, Midwest, and Far West that their horticultural plants and practices cannot be employed here.

I feel that it would be a great blunder to discontinue the research now underway at Cheyenne.

AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, while we were adjourned Friday last, there occurred in the life of one of my fellow Illinoisans one of those milestones we each and every one note with the passing of the calendar years. This gentleman from Illinois has seen 65 years come and go, and he has not stood idly by while these birthdays came and went. As we know from the events of recent days, he worked Friday last on the occasion of his 65th birthday, as indeed he has for many birthdays in the past, and we hope, as he shall for many in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this statesman—for statesman, he is—has, in fact, been one of those active participants in history without which our lives would be less meaningful and our history less purposeful.

It is appropriate, therefore, that we say not only "happy birthday" to Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, but also express appreciation for his years and decades of unselfish public service to his fellow countrymen, not to mention his fellow citizens of the world. He comes, Mr. Speaker, from a State whose motto is "State Sovereignty, National Union." As one of the outstanding Governors of Illinois, he was always faithful and true to this admonition. As a candidate for the highest civil office in our land, he demonstrated in his speeches and writings a profound understanding of the deep philosophical roots of our democratic system and an acute awareness of the practical operations of its diverse parts. I might add a personal note that his speeches and writings first sparked my own interest in public service.

During the presidential campaigns and throughout his subsequent service in the realm of international affairs, Mr. Stevenson has added a new dimension to the Illinois State motto—that of an active commitment to the cause of a free world at peace. His fellow citizens in Illinois are proud of his devotion and tireless work in behalf of a better America in a world at peace.

Adlai E. Stevenson is the fourth out of five generations to serve the people of his State and of the Nation. Even now, his eldest son and namesake, Adlai E. Stevenson III, is embarked upon a new role as a member of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois. He is following the example of his illustrious father, and a more outstanding example he and others would be hard put to find.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to speak publicly, on this my first statement in the House, of the unselfish concern for and outstanding participation in public and world service by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois during the greater part of his 65 years among us.

He, more than many of us, has always been aware that all of us have to be concerned about the future because we are going to spend the rest of our lives there. As he enters his 66th year, he continues to look ahead to and work for a better future for all.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO HALT U.S. ALLIES SHIPPING TO CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to curb the traffic of U.S. Allies shipping to Cuba.

Not only have our allies been sending their ships to Castro's island, but ships from Britain, Greece, Lebanon, Norway, and the Netherlands have been supplying communist North Vietnam.

As a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have long been concerned with the situation whereby U.S. articles are transported aboard vessels sailing under flags participating in trade with communist countries. There is considerable support for putting a stop to this situation, and it may be found not only here in the Congress but in the shipping industry and the American public as well.

So outrageous is this practice that even foreign corners echo discontent over ships from nations friendly to the West carrying goods to Communist governments. Just Saturday the Venezuelan longshoremen saw their proposal for a labor boycott of Cuban trading vessels adopted by a committee of the Inter-American Regional Labor Organization meeting in Mexico City. American delegates from the AFL–CIO urged even stronger steps.

Unfortunately a large portion of this shipping is carried on under the British flag. According to information which I have received, some British ships may even sail direct from Red China to Cuba and North Vietnam.

The world has just witnessed the passing of a great British statesman, Sir Winston Churchill. Although it was Churchill who first warned of the dangers of world communism, the England he governed now aids the Reds. The British merchant marine, once under Churchill when he served as First Lord of the Admiralty, now serves the Communists by transporting their profitable cargos.

Recall Churchill's pleas for the United States to aid Britain in the early days of World War II. By contrast, today's U.S. requests for an end to British shipping to Communist Cuba have thus far gone unnoticed.

In 1941, when Britain was enlisting U.S. help, Churchill said:

> The action of the United States will be dictated not by the methodical calculations of profit and loss, but by moral sentiment.

The Congress must act now to incite the moral sentiments of Britain and other allies whose ships aid communism. Enactment of the legislation I have introduced today will serve that purpose.

PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE IGNORES CALIFORNIA'S CRITICAL NEED

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, California, the Nation's leading agricultural State, and the critical need of its farmers for workers, were totally ignored by the President in his farm message to Congress.

When the law permitting Mexican farm workers to enter this country was allowed to expire, at the instigation of the administration, California farmers were immediately confronted with a shortage of harvest laborers. To make matters worse, the Secretary of Labor then issued an order setting discriminatory wage rates that place California farmers at a serious competitive disadvantage. Rates in other States have been fixed at substantially lower figures. California agriculture today is in the most critical stage of its history, yet it is being totally ignored by the President.

All the emphasis of the message was placed on help for the growers of subsidized crops, such as wheat and feed grain, cotton, tobacco, rice, and wool. Most of our California crops are without subsidy, although we grow 43 percent of the Nation's vegetables and 42 percent of the fruit and nuts—all of which are not subsidized. The President suggests nothing to assure that this produce, vital to the entire country, will be harvested.

Agriculture is California's leading industry, by dollar volume of production. It would seem to me that any threat to its health ought to be a matter of special concern to the President. However, we do not seem to have any friends in this administration, since we are being overlooked by the President and harassed by the Secretary of Labor.

HORTON RESOLUTION CONDEMNS SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a concurrent resolution to condemn the Soviet Union for its persecution of Jewish citizens.

The wave of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union is wicked evidence of the godless nature of communism and should be exposed before the world.

Soviet efforts to crush the spirit of Russian Jews are sickening to Americans. We deeply believe in freedom of religion for all people.

Our national and natural opposition to any infringement of religious freedom summons us to denounce the Communists' campaign which is bent on destruction of traditional Jewish values and institutions.

We have abundant evidence that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens. It is singling them out for extreme punishment of alleged economic offenses, synagogues are being confiscated, Jewish cemeteries are being closed, rabbis and lay leaders are being arrested, religious activities are being curtailed, educational and cultural opportunities are being denied Russian Jews, and restrictions are being imposed that prevent the reuniting of Jewish families.

The powers of the Soviet state are being ruthlessly and inhumanly directed against Jewish citizens. Jews suffer persecution in Russian universities, in Russian publications, and in Russian courtrooms.

This shocking condition demonstrates the base treachery of communism and should be so noted before the world, especially in the face of Soviet claims of equality.

The U.S. Congress has before it the opportunity to endorse and encourage the protests of millions of our fellow citizens. Let us, then, affirm their appeal to Soviet authorities that in the name of decency and humanity religious freedom be restored to the Jews of Russia.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 79)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The wonder of nature is the treasure of America.

What we have in woods and forest, valley and stream, in the gorges and the mountains and the hills, we must not destroy. The precious legacy of preservation of beauty will be our gift to posterity.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said a long time ago that—

> In the woods is perpetual youth. Within these plantations of God a decorum and sanctity reign, a perennial festival is dressed, and the guest sees not how he should tire of them in a thousand years. In the woods we return to reason and faith.

Emerson would have been cheered and comforted by the establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System. On September 3, 1964, when I signed that law it brought into being the preservation for our time and for all time to come 9 million acres of this vast continent in their original and unchanging beauty and wonder.

The new law designated 54 national forest areas—9.1 million acres—as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, with special provisions for certain restricted commercial uses for a limited period. Included were all the wilderness, wild, and canoe areas previously established by the Department of Agriculture.

Thirty-four national forest primitive areas—5.5 million acres—will be reviewed over a 10-year period for possible addition to the system. Also to be reviewed are all roadless areas of 5,000 acres or more in the national park system, as well as all such areas and roadless islands, regardless of size, in the national wildlife refuges and game ranges. None of the areas to be reviewed may be added to the system except as provided for by subsequent acts of Congress.

Only in our country have such positive measures been taken to preserve the wilderness adequately for its scenic and spiritual wealth. In the new conservation of this century, our concern is with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not only man's material welfare but the dignity of man himself.

The Congress can justly be proud of the contribution of foresight and prudent planning expressed by this measure to perpetuate our rare and rich natural heritage. Generations of Americans to come will enjoy a finer and more meaningful life because of these actions taken in these times.

It is now my privilege to send to the Congress today a report which, in accordance with the terms of the act last year, details the beginnings of our progress on a long road of "reason and faith."

I am confident that it is a road worth the travel and a journey we shall be proud to have pioneered.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1965.*

NATURAL BEAUTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 78)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

For centuries Americans have drawn strength and inspiration from the beauty of our country. It would be a neglectful generation indeed, indifferent alike to the judgment of history and the command of principle, which failed to preserve and extend such a heritage for its descendants.

Yet the storm of modern change is threatening to blight and diminish in a few decades what has been cherished and protected for generations.

A growing population is swallowing up areas of natural beauty with its demands for living space, and is placing increased demand on our overburdened areas of recreation and pleasure.

The increasing tempo of urbanization and growth is already depriving many Americans of the right to live in decent surroundings. More of our people are crowding into cities and being cut off from nature. Cities themselves reach out into the countryside, destroying streams and trees and meadows as they go. A modern highway may wipe out the equivalent of a 50-acre park with every mile. And people move out from the city to get closer to nature only to find that nature has moved farther from them.

The modern technology, which has added much to our lives can also have a darker side. Its uncontrolled waste products are menacing the world we live in, our enjoyment and our health. The air we breathe, our water, our soil, and wildlife, are being blighted by the poisons and chemicals which are the byproducts of technology and industry. The skeletons of discarded cars litter the countryside. The same society which receives the rewards of technology, must, as a cooperating whole, take responsibility for control.

To deal with these new problems will require a new conservation. We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities. Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare but the dignity of man's spirit.

In this conservation the protection and enhancement of man's opportunity to be in contact with beauty must play a major role.

This means that beauty must not be just a holiday treat, but a part of our daily life. It means not just easy physical access, but equal social access for rich and poor, Negro and white, city dweller and farmer.

Beauty is not an easy thing to measure. It does not show up in the gross national product, in a weekly paycheck, or in profit-and-loss statements. But these things are not ends in themselves. They are a road to satisfaction and pleasure and the good life. Beauty makes its own direct contribution to these final ends. Therefore it is one of the most important components of our true national income, not to be left out simply because statisticians cannot calculate its worth.

And some things we do know. Association with beauty can enlarge man's imagination and revive his spirit. Ugliness can demean the people who live among it. What a citizen sees every day is his America. If it is attractive it adds to the quality of his life. If it is ugly it can degrade his existence.

Beauty has other immediate values. It adds to safety whether removing direct dangers to health or making highways less monotonous and dangerous. We also know that those who live in blighted and squalid conditions are more susceptible to anxieties and mental disease.

Ugliness is costly. It can be expensive to clean a soot-smeared building, or to build new areas of recreation when the old landscape could have been preserved far more cheaply.

Certainly no one would hazard a national definition of beauty. But we do know that nature is nearly always beautiful. We do, for the most part, know what is ugly. And we can introduce, into all our planning, our programs, our building, and our growth, a conscious and active concern for the values of beauty. If we do this then we can be successful in preserving a beautiful America.

There is much the Federal Government can do, through a range of specific programs, and as a force for public education. But a beautiful America will require the effort of government at every level, of business, and of private groups. Above all it will require the concern and action of individual citizens, alert to danger, determined to improve the quality of their surroundings, resisting blight, demanding and building beauty for themselves and their children.

I am hopeful that we can summon such a national effort. For we have not chosen to have an ugly America. We have been careless, and often neglectful. But now that the danger is clear and the hour is late this people can place themselves in the path of a tide of blight which is often irreversible and always destructive.

The Congress and the executive branch have each produced conservation giants in the past. During the 88th Congress it was legislative executive teamwork that brought progress. It is this same kind of partnership that will insure our continued progress.

In that spirit as a beginning and stimulus I make the following proposals:

THE CITIES

Thomas Jefferson wrote that communities "should be planned with an eye to the effect made upon the human spirit by being continually surrounded with a maximum of beauty."

We have often sadly neglected this advice in the modern American city. Yet this is where most of our people live. It is where the character of our young is formed. It is where American civilization will be increasingly concentrated in years to come.

Such a challenge will not be met with a few more parks or playgrounds. It requires attention to the architecture of building, the structure of our roads, preservation of historical buildings and monuments, careful planning of new suburbs. A concern for the enhancement of beauty must infuse every aspect of the growth and development of metropolitan areas. It must be a principal responsibility of local government, supported by active and concerned citizens.

Federal assistance can be a valuable stimulus and help to such local efforts.

I have recommended a community extension program which will bring the resources of the university to focus on problems of the community just as they have long been concerned with our rural areas. Among other things, this program will help provide training and technical assistance to aid in making our communities more attractive and vital. In addition, under the Housing Act of 1964, grants will be made to States for training of local governmental employees needed for community development. I am recommending a 1965 supplemental appropriation to implement this program.

We now have two programs which can be of special help in creating areas of recreation and beauty for our metropolitan area population: the open space land program, and the land and water conservation fund.

I have already proposed full funding of the land and water conservation fund, and directed the Secretary of the Interior to give priority attention to serving the needs of our growing urban population.

The primary purpose of the open space program has been to help acquire and assure open spaces in urban areas. I propose a series of new matching grants for improving the natural beauty of urban open space.

The open space program should be adequately financed, and broadened by permitting grants to be made to help city governments acquire and clear areas to create small parks, squares, pedestrian malls, and playgrounds.

In addition I will request authority in this program for a matching program to cities for landscaping, installation of outdoor lights and benches, creating attractive cityscapes along roads and in business areas, and for other beautification purposes.

Our city parks have not, in many cases, realized their full potential as sources of pleasure and play. I recommend on a matching basis a series of Federal demonstration projects in city parks to use the best thought and action to show how the appearance of these parks can better serve the people of our towns and metropolitan areas.

All of these programs should be operated on the same matching formula to avoid unnecessary competition among programs and increase the possibility of cooperative effort. I will propose such a standard formula.

In a future message on the cities I will recommend other changes in our housing programs designed to strengthen the sense of community of which natural beauty is an important component.

In almost every part of the country, citizens are rallying to save landmarks of beauty and history. The Government must also do its share to assist these local efforts which have an important national purpose. We will encourage and support the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, chartered by Congress in 1949. I shall propose legislation to authorize supplementary grants to help local authorities acquire, develop, and manage private properties for such purposes.

The Registry of National Historic Landmarks is a fine Federal program with virtually no Federal cost. I commend its work and the new wave of interest it has evoked in historical preservation.

THE COUNTRYSIDE

Our present system of parks, seashores, and recreation areas—monuments to the dedication and labor of farsighted men—do not meet the needs of a growing population.

The full funding of the land and water conservation fund will be an important step in making this a parks-for-America decade. I propose to use this fund to acquire lands needed to establish—

Assateague Island National Seashore, Md. and Va.;

Tocks Island National Recreation Area, N.J. and Pa.;

Cape Lookout National Seashore, N.C.;

Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich.:

Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.;

Oregon Dunes National Seashore, Oreg.;

Great Basin National Park, Nev.;

Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Tex.;

Spruce Knob, Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, W. Va.;

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Mont. and Wyo.;

Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area, Utah and Wyo.; and

Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, Calif.

In addition, I have requested the Secretary of the Interior, working with interested groups, to conduct a study on the desirability of establishing a Redwood National Park in California.

I will also recommend that we add prime outdoor recreation areas to our national forest system, particularly in the populous East; and proceed on schedule with studies required to define and enlarge the Wilderness System established by the 88th Congress. We will also continue progress on our refuge system for migratory waterfowl.

Faulty strip- and surface-mining practices have left ugly scars which mar the beauty of the landscape in many of our States. I urge your strong support of the nationwide strip- and surface-mining study provided by the Appalachian regional legislation, which will furnish the factual basis for a fair and reasonable approach to the correction of these past errors.

I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture to work with State and local organizations in developing a cooperative program for improving the beauty of the privately owned rural lands which comprise three-fourths of the Nation's area. Much can be done within existing Department of Agriculture programs without adding to cost.

The 28 million acres of land presently held and used by our armed services is an important part of our public estate. Many thousands of these acres will soon become surplus to military needs. Much of this land has great potential for outdoor recreation, wildlife, and conservation uses consistent with military requirements. This potential must be realized through the fullest application of multiple-use principles. To this end I have directed the Secretaries of Defense and Interior to conduct a conservation inventory of all surplus lands.

HIGHWAYS

More than any country ours is an automobile society. For most Americans the automobile is a principal instrument of transportation, work, daily activity, recreation, and pleasure. By making our roads highways to the enjoyment of nature and beauty we can greatly enrich the life of nearly all our people in city and countryside alike.

Our task is twofold. First, to insure that roads themselves are not destructive of nature and natural beauty. Second, to make our roads ways to recreation and pleasure.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to take a series of steps designed to meet this objective. This includes requiring landscaping on all Federal interstate primary and urban highways, encouraging the construction of rest and recreation areas along highways, and the preservation of natural beauty adjacent to highway rights-of-way.

Our present highway law permits the use of up to 3 percent of all Federal-aid funds to be used without matching for the preservation of natural beauty. This authority has not been used for the purpose intended by Congress. I will take steps, including recommended legislation if necessary, to make sure these funds are, in fact, used to enhance beauty along our highway system. This will dedicate substantial resources to this purpose.

I will also recommend that a portion of the funds now used for secondary roads be set aside in order to provide access to areas of rest and recreation and scenic beauty along our Nation's roads, and for rerouting or construction of highways for scenic or parkway purposes.

The Recreation Advisory Council is now completing a study of the role which scenic roads and parkways should play in meeting our highway and recreation needs. After receiving the report, I will make appropriate recommendations.

The authority for the existing program of outdoor advertising control expires on June 30, 1965, and its provisions have not been effective in achieving the desired goal. Accordingly, I will recommend legislation to insure effective control of billboards along our highways.

In addition, we need urgently to work toward the elimination or screening of unsightly, beauty-destroying junkyards and auto graveyards along our highways. To this end, I will also recommend necessary legislation to achieve effective control, including Federal assistance in appropriate cases where necessary.

I hope that, at all levels of government, our planners and builders will remember that highway beautification is more than a matter of planting trees or setting aside scenic areas. The roads themselves must reflect, in location and design, increased respect for the natural and social integrity and unity of the landscape and communities through which they pass.

RIVERS

Those who first settled this continent found much to marvel at. Nothing was a greater source of wonder and amazement than the power and majesty of American rivers. They occupy a central place in myth and legent, folklore and literature.

They were our first highways, and some remain among the most important. We have had to control their ravages, harness their power, and use their water to help make whole regions prosper.

Yet even this seemingly indestructible natural resource is in danger.

Through our pollution control programs we can do much to restore our rivers. We will continue to conserve the water and power for tomorrow's needs with well-planned reservoirs and power dams. But the time has also come to identify and preserve free flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers before growth and development make the beauty of the unspoiled waterway a memory.

To this end I will shortly send to the Congress a bill to establish a National Wild Rivers System.

THE POTOMAC

The river rich in history and memory which flows by our Nation's Capital should serve as a model of scenic and recreation values for the entire country. To meet this objective I am asking the Secretary of the Interior to review the Potomac River Basin development plan now under review by the Chief of Army Engineers, and to work with the affected States and local governments, the District of Columbia and interested Federal agencies to prepare a program for my consideration.

A program must be devised which will—

(a) Clean up the river and keep it clean, so it can be used for boating, swimming, and fishing.

(b) Protect its natural beauties by the acquisition of scenic easements, zoning or other measures.

(c) Provide adequate recreational facilities, and

(d) Complete the presently authorized George Washington Memorial Parkway on both banks.

I hope action here will stimulate and inspire similar efforts by States and local governments on other urban rivers and waterfronts, such as the Hudson in New York. They are potentially the greatest single source of pleasure for those who live in most of our metropolitan areas.

TRAILS

The forgotten outdoorsmen of today are those who like to walk, hike, ride horseback, or bicycle. For them we must have trails as well as highways. Nor should motor vehicles be permitted to tyrannize the more leisurely human traffic.

Old and young alike can participate. Our doctors recommend and encourage such activity for fitness and fun.

I am requesting, therefore, that the Secretary of the Interior work with his colleagues in the Federal Government and with State and local leaders and recommend to me a cooperative program to encourage a national system of trails, building up the more than 100,000 miles of trails in our national forests and parks.

There are many new and exciting trail projects underway across the land. In Arizona, a county has arranged for miles of irrigation canal banks to be used by riders and hikers. In Illinois, an abandoned railroad right-of-way is being developed as a prairie path. In Mexico utility rights-of-way are used as public trails.

As with so much of our quest for beauty and quality, each community has opportunities for action. We can and should have an abundance of trails for walking, cycling, and horseback riding, in and close to our cities. In the back country we need to copy the great Appalachian Trail in all parts of America, and to make full use of rights-of-way and other public paths.

POLLUTION

One aspect of the advance of civilization is the evolution of responsibility for disposal of waste. Over many generations society gradually developed techniques for this purpose. State and local governments, landlords, and private citizens have been held responsible for insuring that sewage and garbage did not menace health or contaminate the environment.

In the last few decades entire new categories of waste have come to plague and menace the American scene. These are the technological wastes—the byproducts of growth, industry, agriculture, and science. We cannot wait for slow evolution over generations to deal with them.

Pollution is growing at a rapid rate. Some pollutants are known to be harmful to health, while the effect of others is uncertain and unknown. In some cases we can control pollution with a larger effort. For other forms of pollution we still do not have effective means of control.

Pollution destroys beauty and menaces health. It cuts down on efficiency, reduces property values, and raises taxes.

The longer we wait to act, the greater the dangers and the larger the problem.

Large-scale pollution of air and waterways is no respecter of political boundaries, and its effects extend far beyond those who cause it.

Air pollution is no longer confined to isolated places. This generation has altered the composition of the atmosphere on a global scale through radioactive materials and a steady increase in carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels. Entire regional airsheds, cropplant environments, and river basins are heavy with noxious materials. Motor vehicles and homeheating plants, municipal dumps, and factories continually hurl pollutants into the air we breathe. Each day almost 50,000 tons of unpleasant, and sometimes poisonous, sulfur dioxide are added to the atmosphere, and our automobiles produce almost 300,000 tons of other pollutants.

In Donora, Pa., in 1948, and New York City in 1953 serious illness and some deaths were produced by sharp increases in air pollution. In New Orleans, epidemic outbreaks of asthmatic attacks are associated with air pollutants. Three-fourths of the 8 million people in the Los Angeles area are annoyed by severe eye irritation much of the year. And our health authorities are increasingly concerned with the damaging effects of the continual breathing of polluted air by all our people in every city in the country.

In addition to its health effects, air pollution creates filth and gloom and depreciates property values of entire neighborhoods. The White House itself is being dirtied with soot from polluted air.

Every major river system is now polluted. Waterways that were once sources of pleasure and beauty and recreation are forbidden to human contact and objectionable to sight and smell. Furthermore, this pollution is costly, requiring expensive treatment for drinking water and inhibiting the operation and growth of industry.

In spite of the efforts and many accomplishments of the past, water pollution is spreading. And new kinds of problems are being added to the old:

Waterborne viruses, particularly hepatitis, are replacing typhoid fever as a significant health hazard;

Mass deaths of fish have occurred in rivers overburdened with wastes;

Some of our rivers contain chemicals which, in concentrated form, produce abnormalities in animals;

Last summer 2,600 square miles of Lake Erie—over a quarter of the entire lake—were almost without oxygen and unable to support life because of algae and plant growths, fed by pollution from cities and farms.

In many older cities storm drains and sanitary sewers are interconnected. As a result, mixtures of storm water and sanitary waste overflow during rains and discharge directly into streams, bypassing treatment works and causing heavy pollution.

In addition to our air and water we must, each and every day, dispose of a half billion pounds of solid waste. These wastes—from discarded cans to discarded automobiles—litter our country, harbor vermin, and menace our health. Inefficient and improper methods of disposal increase pollution of our air and streams.

Almost all these wastes and pollutions are the result of activities carried on for the benefit of man. A prime national goal must be an environment that is pleasing to the senses and healthy to live in.

Our Government is already doing much in this field. We have made significant progress. But more must be done.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY

I am directing the heads of all agencies to improve measures to abate pollution caused by direct agency operation, contracts, and cooperative agreements. Federal procurement practices must make sure that the Government equipment uses the most effective techniques for controlling pollution. The Administrator of General Services has already taken steps to assure that motor vehicles purchased by the Federal Government meet minimum standards of exhaust quality.

CLEAN WATER

Enforcement authority must be strengthened to provide positive controls over the discharge of pollutants into our interstate or navigable waters. I recommend enactment of legislation to—

Provide, through the setting of effective water quality standards, combined with a swift and effective enforcement procedure, a national program to prevent water pollution at its source rather than attempting to cure pollution after it occurs;

Increase project grant ceilings and provide additional incentives for multimunicipal projects under the waste treatment facilities construction program;

Increase the ceilings for grants to State water pollution control programs;

Provide a new research and demonstration construction program leading to the solution of problems caused by the mixing of storm water runoff and sanitary wastes.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will undertake an intensive program to clean up the Nation's most polluted rivers. With the cooperation of States and cities—using the tools of regulations, grants, and incentives—we can bring the most serious problems of river pollution under control. We cannot afford to do less.

We will work with Canada to develop a pollution-control program for the Great Lakes and other border waters.

Through an expanded program carried on by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Interior, we will continue to seek effective and economical methods for controlling pollution from acid mine drainage.

To improve the quality of our waters will require the fullest cooperation of our State and local governments. Working together, we can and will preserve and increase one of our most valuable national resources—clean water.

CLEAN AIR

The enactment of the Clean Air Act in December of 1963 represented a long step forward in our ability to understand and control the difficult problems of air pollution. The 1966 budget request of $24 million is almost double the amount spent on air-pollution programs in the year prior to its enactment.

In addition, the Clean Air Act should be improved to permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to investigate potential air-pollution problems before pollution happens, rather than having to wait until the damage occurs, as is now the case, and to make recommendations leading to the prevention of such pollution.

One of the principal unchecked sources of air pollution is the automobile. I intend to institute discussions with industry officials and other interested groups leading to an effective elimination or substantial reduction of pollution from liquid-fueled motor vehicles.

SOLID WASTES

Continuing technological progress and improvement in methods of manufacture, packaging, and marketing of consumer products has resulted in an ever mounting increase of discarded material. We need to seek better solutions to the disposal of these wastes. I recommend legislation to—

Assist the States in developing comprehensive programs for some forms of solid waste disposal;

Provide for research and demonstration projects leading to more effective methods for disposing of or salvaging solid wastes;

Launch a concentrated attack on the accumulation of junk cars by increasing research in the Department of the Interior leading to use of metal from scrap cars where promising leads already exist.

PESTICIDES

Pesticides may affect living organizations wherever they occur.

In order that we may better understand the effects of those compounds, I have included increased funds in the budget for use by the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare to increase their research efforts on pesticides so they can give special attention to the flow of pesticides through the environment; study the means by which pesticides break down and disappear in nature; and to keep a constant check on the level of pesticides in our water, air, soil, and food supply.

I am recommending additional funds for the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce contamination from toxic chemicals through intensified research, regulatory control, and educational programs.

The Secretary of Agriculture will soon submit legislation to tighten control over the manufacture and use of agricultural chemicals, including licensing and factory inspection of manufacturers, clearly placing the burden of proof of safety on the proponent of the chemical rather than on the Government.

RESEARCH RESOURCES

Our needs for new knowledge and increasing application of existing knowledge demand a greater supply of trained manpower and research resources.

A National Center for Environmental Health Sciences is being planned as a focal point for health research in this field. In addition, the 1966 budget includes funds for the establishment of university institutes to conduct research and training in environmental pollution problems.

Legislation recommended in my message on health has been introduced to increase Federal support for specialized research facilities of a national or regional character. This proposal, aimed at health research needs generally, would assist in the solution of environmental health problems and I urge its passage.

We need legislation to provide to the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior authority for grants for research in environmental pollution control in their areas of responsibility. I have asked the Secretary of Interior to submit legislation to eliminate the ceiling on pesticide research.

OTHER EFFORTS

In addition to these needed actions, other proposals are undergoing active study.

I have directed the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, with the appropriate departments, to study the use of economic incentives as a technique to stimulate pollution prevention and abatement, and to recommend actions or legislation, if needed.

I have instructed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology to explore the adequacy of the present organization of pollution control and research activities.

I have also asked the Director of the Office of Science and Technology and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to recommend the best way in which the Federal Government may direct efforts toward advancing our scientific understanding of natural plant and animal communities and their interaction with man and his activities.

The actions and proposals recommended in this message will take us a long way toward immediate reversal of the increase of pollutants in our environment. They will also give us time until new basic knowledge and trained manpower provide opportunities for more dramatic gains in the future.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

I intend to call a White House Conference on Natural Beauty to meet in mid-May of this year. Its chairman will be Mr. Laurance Rockefeller.

It is my hope that this Conference will produce new ideas and approaches for enhancing the beauty of America. Its scope will not be restricted to Federal action. It will look for ways to help and encourage State and local governments, institutions and private citizens, in their own efforts. It can serve as a focal point for the large campaign of public education which is needed to alert Americans to the danger to their natural heritage and to the need for action.

In addition to other subjects which this Conference will consider, I recommend the following subjects for discussion in depth:

Automobile junkyards. I am convinced that analysis of the technology and economics can help produce a creative solution to this vexing problem. The Bureau of Mines of the Interior Department can contribute technical advice to the conference, as can the scrap industry and the steel industry.

Underground installation of utility transmission lines. Further research is badly needed to enable us to cope with this problem.

The greatest single force that shapes the American landscape is private economic development. Our taxation policies should not penalize or discourage conservation and the preservation of beauty.

Ways in which the Federal Government can, through information and technical assistance, help communities and States in their own programs of natural beauty.

The possibilities of a national tree planting program carried on by government at every level, and private groups and citizens.

CONCLUSION

In my 33 years of public life I have seen the American system move to conserve the natural and human resources of our land.

TVA transformed an entire region that was "depressed." The rural electrification cooperatives brought electricity to lighten the burdens of rural America. We have seen the forests replanted by the CCC's, and watched Gifford Pinchot's sustained yield concept take hold on forest lands.

It is true that we have often been careless with our natural bounty. At times we have paid a heavy price for this neglect. But once our people were aroused to the danger, we have acted to preserve our resources for the enrichment of our country and the enjoyment of future generations.

The beauty of our land is a natural resource. Its preservation is linked to the inner prosperity of the human spirit.

The tradition of our past is equal to today's threat to that beauty. Our land will be attractive tomorrow only if we organize for action and rebuild and reclaim the beauty we inherited. Our stewardship will be judged by the foresight with which we carry out these programs. We must rescue our cities and countryside from blight with the same purpose and vigor with which, in other areas, we moved to save the forests and the soil.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1965.*

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON PRESERVING THE BEAUTY OF THE LAND

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the President has called for a national effort to preserve the beauty of this land. He has put before us a program which ranges from the wilderness to the city and from the seas to the sky. He has called the Nation's attention to some distressing facts about what we are doing to deface America.

Several years ago I was privileged to serve on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Our concern, on that Commission, was the whole outdoor environment, our heritage of natural beauty, and man's relationship to that environment. I am encouraged and deeply gratified by the great awakening to certain facts which were brought out so clearly to those of us who served on that Commission. We are a prosperous, growing nation but that very growth is threatening the beauty of the land. We have made tremendous technological advances which have contributed to our wealth and power—but have, at the same time, contributed to an ugly America. But this need not be so. The President has performed a great service to all of us by calling the Nation's attention to these facts; and by proposing programs to reverse the trend toward ugliness.

As an easterner, I am particularly pleased with the concern about revitalizing our cities. One of the facts brought out so clearly by ORRRC was that most of the people are in the East while the great majority of open lands is in the West. The President's message recognizes the importance of bringing beauty and breathing space to our cities where most of us live. The President has presented a program which requires a national effort. He has not called for huge new Federal programs to do the whole job. He has called for action by the States and cities, by businessmen and private citizens. I am sure the Nation will respond.

CONSERVATION NEED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Americans will be heartened for years to come by the splendid message the President sent to the Congress today.

The President described our problems with moving eloquence. He reminded us of our carelessness and neglect. He alerted us to the necessity of improving the quality of our surroundings if we are to attain the beautiful America envisioned.

He has given us a blueprint for creative conservation which will help our cities cope with blight and ugliness; create more parks and recreation areas; and give full meaning to man's relationship to his total environment.

The President's proposals for conservation are dynamic and far reaching. Americans will understand these proposals and adopt them as a means of achieving an America that will turn the tide of blight into a citadel of beauty.

The sooner we move to achieve the President's program, the faster America will become a better nation in which to live.

WILD RIVERS AND RIVER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, much of America's development has occurred along her rivers and streams. We have dammed them, disposed of wastes in them, rechanneled and bridged them, and denuded their watersheds.

Luckily, changes wrought by man have not reached all our rich heritage of fresh water. In his message on natural beauty, President Johnson has made constructive proposals for preserving some of the Nation's remaining unspoiled rivers.

In a program which fires the imagination, the President would establish a national system of wild rivers. Selected rivers and "slim threads of nature" on both shores would be preserved for the generations ahead. They would remain places to fish, boat, and swim in nature's splendor.

At the same time, the President proposes that cleanup programs be continued. Flood control, navigation, and irrigation will advance. The President has shown great foresight by anticipating the needs of future Americans for something more than utilitarian products from our streams.

This Nation's economic stature will benefit by a national system of wild rivers. When the time comes, I hope you will give the wild rivers proposal your support.

The President also has acknowledged a tremendous national responsibility of long standing—the cleanup of the Potomac River. Its condition now is a disgrace which must be alleviated. It seems to me that we all should unify to make this great Capital City stream a model of restoration and development as an example for the Nation.

The program ahead is a big one, but it can be accomplished—and must.

BILLBOARDS AND JUNKYARDS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, drive a hundred miles along the highways of any State in the Union today and two elements of the President's message on natural beauty will come home to you.

Lining both sides of county, State, and Federal roads are thousands of commercial messages. Advertising is forced upon your attention whether or not you have any interest in the products extolled.

Particularly on a leisurely drive to enjoy the countryside does the extent of the problem come home forcefully. Billboard after billboard screens from the motorist—you and me—the scenic beauty along our highway system.

And if it is not billboards which jar our esthetic pleasure, it is rusting hulks of wrecked and outdated automobiles littering our hillsides.

President Johnson has hit at the heart of the two problems—billboards and junkyards. The past has been marked by much individual dissatisfaction with our roadsides. There have been occasions of heated campaigns against these blights on scenic America. The truth is, however, that no effective program to alleviate these problems has been made. Strong Federal action is needed. Every new highway constructed with Federal funds should be freed of these two blights. We should support all reasonable proposals to accomplish these goals.

CLEAN WATERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's call for full attention to the consideration of natural beauty in our environment immediately brings us the realization that in this area we have woefully neglected our duties and responsibilities. His recommendation for legislation which would restore to us the clean, inviting waters which our forefathers knew offers us at once a challenge and an opportunity, to which I believe this Congress will respond readily.

The measures the President has proposed seem adequate to the job at hand. His proposal that we develop a national program to prevent, rather than cure, water pollution constitutes a perceptive and imaginative approach to the problem. The proposed system of setting water quality standards and requiring permits for waste disposal in our waterways requires careful consideration by appropriate bodies of the Congress, but I have no doubt that it will find favor.

The legislation which the President recommended to increase grant ceilings for pollution control projects and to provide additional incentives for multimunicipal projects under the waste treatment facilities construction program will help resolve some of the most difficult problems confronting the cities of the United States today.

The same obviously is true of his proposal to increase ceilings for grants needed to assist States in their water pollution control programs. The research, demonstration, and construction programs he seeks should certainly lead toward resolving some of the problems caused by undersirable mixing of water runoff and sanitary wastes.

We await with interest full development of details of the intensive program which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is instructed to undertake in cleaning up the Nation's most polluted rivers. We find no difficulty in agreeing with the President that we can bring this problem under control with cooperation of the States and cities through use of the tools of regulation, grants, and other incentives.

The portion of the program which the President outlined looking toward cooperative work with Canada in developing an effective pollution control program for the Great Lakes and other border waters will find welcome support from our neighbors to the north as well as in the States.

The last point he mentioned in his discussion of legislation needed to keep our waters clean, the search for effective and economical methods for controlling pollution from acid mine drainage through expanded programs in both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and in the Department of the Interior, holds promise which all of us hope can be fully realized.

The President's own words sounded the keynote for the clean water program. He said:

> Working together we can and will preserve our most valuable resource—clean water.

An America alert to the needs of living in harmony with its environment can do no less.

POLLUTION BY SOLID WASTES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Johnson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on natural beauty contained appeal after ringing appeal which struck responsive chords in all of us. His proposals for air and water pollution control seem at once imaginative and realistic.

The same can be said for his proposals in another area, one which does not normally come to mind when we talk about pollution control and the need to clean up our environment. I refer to the problem of disposal of our solid wastes.

As the President so ably pointed out, we sustain an ever-mounting increase of discarded material. This is product in part of our continuing technological progress and improvement in methods of manufacture, packaging, and marketing of consumer products.

The recommendation for legislation to help resolve the problem of our solid wastes merits careful attention and prompt action from this Congress. The emphasis he places on programs which will assist the States in developing comprehensive solid waste disposal programs seems well assigned.

The President's suggestion of research and demonstration projects which will lead to more effective methods for disposing of or salvaging solid wastes certainly deserves a fair trial.

His promise of increasing research in the Department of the Interior looking toward industrial or other commercial utilization of metal from scrap cars evidences his willingness to explore all possible avenues which could rid us of unsightly automobile bodies and other metal remnants.

A nation with our resources, our greatness, can solve its problems, banish its wastes, improve its landscape. I feel that the President has found a responsive Congress for his message. I feel that we will respond positively to the charter which he has laid out for us.

URBAN NEED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the President's natural beauty message will be cited for years to come as one of the most thrilling conservation landmarks in the Nation's history.

If we follow the recommendations of the President, we will be a stronger, happier, and safer country.

The problems he so ably outlined have become more pressing each year.

The programs of action he recommended, constitute dynamic, creative conservation. What he asks is a beautiful America—a nation with sufficient foresight and perseverance to blot out the ugliness that pervades our cities, to remove the junkyards that dot our landscape, and to adopt a whole new concept relating man to his total environment.

America is ready for the President's action programs.

I wish to join in urging early consideration and adoption of the President's recommendations. We must move quickly to acquire more parks and recreation areas, restore our cities, beautify our countryside, remove the poisons from the air we breathe, and otherwise act to improve the quality of everyday life of all Americans.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in praise of the message the House of Representatives has on this day received from the President of the United States. Conservation of our natural resources, including those resources which are so desperately needed in order to give the people of this Nation an opportunity to return to the natural surroundings in which our forefathers lived, are extremely vital as this Nation faces an ever-growing demand for land. Sometimes it seems as if the expanding population and the accompanying demand for homes, businesses, stores, and highways threaten to put all the lands of our country under concrete and macadam.

In the words of the President:

> A growing population is swallowing up areas of natural beauty with its demands for living space, and is placing increased demand on our overburdened areas of recreation and pleasure.

The Second Congressional District encompasses about a third of the State of California, or a total of some 53,000 square miles of land area. Even in this vast area, which includes some of the Nation's scenic beauty spots, we are feeling the pressure of the ever-growing demand for land.

The call for recreation facilities continues to increase in the 19 counties of the Second District at a never-ending pace. Therefore, I am pleased that President Johnson, in his message has called upon the Congress to implement fully the farsighted legislative program enacted by the 88th Congress in the land and water conservation fund. This is needed to develop and protect the outdoor recreational resources available so that future generations will always have a place to enjoy nature as created by our Maker.

I feel pleased that one of the specific projects mentioned by the President is the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, located in northern California. This area will encompass the lands around four major reservoirs constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. They are: Shasta Lake, Lewiston Reservoir, Whiskeytown Reservoir, and the Clair Engle Lake, named in honor of our former colleague who served for many years as a Member of the House of Representatives from the Second Congressional District, and who during that time was noted for his leadership in the field of conservation while serving as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the provisions of H.R. 797, a bill which would establish this recreation area.

Furthermore, I would like to call upon the Congress to develop the prime recreation areas of our vast national forest system. I might note that this month, the Forest Service is observing its 60th anniversary. I can attest to the importance of recreation development by this agency because I have the 19 counties of the Second Congressional District in which is located some 12½ million acres of National Forest Service land. The programs for national forest development in the field of recreation are critical to the economies of the mountain areas which I represent.

Major emphasis was given by President Johnson to the question of controlling and eventually eliminating the pollution which is depriving this Nation of much of its water resources and is contaminating the air which we breathe in many areas.

That the President called for a massive attack upon pollution of all types is extremely gratifying.

As the President declared:

> Pollution destroys beauty and menaces health. It cuts down on efficiency, reduces property values, and raises taxes. The longer we wait to act, the greater the dangers and the larger the problem.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would call upon each and every one of my colleagues to study with care the message presented by the President today. There is a tremendous amount of work to be done in this field. We have an obligation to not only our generation to meet the needs of our times and to preserve for our use the scenic and other recreational areas of our Nation, but we have an even greater responsibility to the generations to come to insure that they, too, will have an opportunity to enjoy the great outdoors which many of us in the past have tended to take for granted. The President has summarized much of this work. I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in getting on with the job.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my congratulations to the President for his forward looking proposals to restore, enhance, and preserve the natural beauty of this Nation. Not only is this important in the years immediately to come, it is absolutely vital if future generations are to inherit America the Beautiful rather than a barren and ugly countryside. The President has shown a depth of concern in this matter that is most commendable.

Mr. Speaker, in campaigning nearly 50,000 miles in the Sixth District of Tennessee, I was constantly impressed that scenic beauty and the potential for great expansion in outdoor recreation facilities constitutes one of our prime assets. Just as one example among many, we have the Buffalo River, which is said to be one of the last remaining good canoe streams in the United States. I understand the Buffalo may come under consideration for inclusion in the national wild rivers system. I stand ready to assist the President and the Federal departments in pursuing this and other studies so that the best possible preservation of scenic beauty and recreation resources development can be brought to the Sixth District under the President's fine program.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express support for the President's announced intention of increasing this Nation's efforts at conservation and land and water resources. It is clear that we must preserve as much of the natural beauty of this country as possible.

I believe that my State has been a leader in this field and I know that it will continue to be. The beauty of Nebraska has been and is being preserved. In the near future, no city in my home State will be polluting the rivers and streams of this country.

But we must do more and it is clear that the President intends that we do. I would, however, point out that heroic efforts are already being made by numerous citizens of this country through ongoing programs of many years duration.

The farmers of this country have, for many years, with Federal participation, shared their own money and efforts for soil conservation practices which have meant that tons and tons of topsoil from our rich farmlands have been saved from clogging rivers and streams. We must not reduce our efforts in this field for to do so would be to plug one hole in the dike of conservation by unplugging another.

I hope that the "new conservation" proclaimed by our President means also to continue and strengthen our programs of watershed developments, terracing, and waterways.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the President's messages on conservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

A POEM BY CARDINAL CUSHING

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I am very happy to insert a sweet and refreshing philosophical poem entitled, "I'm Fine," written by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston. How well can this sweet and resigned philosophy expressed by Cardinal Cushing apply to every one of us.

A friend of mine recently wrote to me and he included in his letter the poem written by the cardinal. I am inserting it in the RECORD because I feel everyone who reads it will derive great pleasure and benefit from it.

I'M FINE

(By His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing)

I live out in Brighton, close to B.C.
And I'm just as healthy as I can be
I have arthritis in both my knees
And when I must speak, then I talk with a wheeze
My pulse is weak and my blood is quite thin
But I'm awfully well for the shape that I'm in.

I need arch supporters to strengthen my feet
My ankles are swollen; I'm white as a sheet
I toss in my bed without sleep every night
No wonder each morning I look like a sight
My memory is failing, my head's in a spin
But I'm awfully well for the shape that I'm in.

Diverticulitis is a word hard to spell
But it's a disease from which I'll never get well
Ulcers that keep me on a diet with maalox
Prevent me from resting in a funeral box
The length of my sermons brings yawns or a grin
But I'm awfully well for the shape that I'm in.

The moral is, friends, as this tale I unfold
That for you and for me who are fast growing old
It's better to say "I am fine" with a grin
Than to let people know of the shape that we're in.

H.R. 4466—RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—A PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPMENT OF ALL DEPRESSED AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES—PREFERABLE TO APPALACHIA REGIONAL APPROACH

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works of the House, having been devotedly interested in and concerned about the regional approach to poverty being proposed by the administration relating to Appalachia, and recognizing that this discriminates against the rest of the United States of America, and recognizing further that there are in excess of some 1,400 counties throughout America that were included as depressed areas under the area redevelopment program and the accelerated public works program and that those counties are being denied assistance of any kind; and, also being opposed to basic makework pork barrel public works approaches to these matters rather than long-range efforts to solve the difficulties and help the communities meet their unemployment demands and attain their economic potential, I have today introduced H.R. 4466 which is to provide for the economic development programs needed to assist in the development of all areas of the United States where depression exists and in order to encourage their realization of their full economic potential.

This is known as the Resources Development Act of 1965. I say to all of those Members who are concerned about the Appalachia approach, they being outside of this area, and secondly about setting up a Federal czar to dictate to the States and local counties, that they should take a close look at this legislation and I hope they will support it.

I have a 30-minute special order that I intend to use for a further discussion of this matter.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 15, United States Code, section 1024(a), as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Economic Committee the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Patman, of Texas; Mr. Bolling, of Missouri; Mr. Boggs, of Louisiana; Mr. Reuss, of Wisconsin; Mrs. Griffiths, of Michigan; Mr. Curtis, of Missouri; Mr. Widnall, of New Jersey; Mr. Ellsworth, of Kansas.

MEMBERS OF NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 523, 78th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Teague, of Texas; Mr. Sickles, of Maryland; Mr. Don H. Clausen, of California.

NEW JERSEY TERCENTENARY CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-683, the Chair appoints as members of the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Rodino, of New Jersey; Mr. Thompson, of New Jersey; Mr. Widnall, of New Jersey; Mrs. Dwyer, of New Jersey.

COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 192) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 192

Resolved, That the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, provided for by section 5 of Public Law 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, shall consist of two members of the Committee on House Administration, to be appointed by the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of Public Law 115, 78th Congress, and House Resolution 192, 89th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Chamberlain].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

Abernethy
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Baring
Battin
Bell
Blatnik
Brooks
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Cederberg
Clancy
Corbett
Devine
Dwyer
Erlenborn
Evins, Tenn.
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Gibbons
Grabowski
Hagan, Ga.
Hardy
Herlong
Holifield
King, Calif.
Laird
Landrum
Leggett
Love
Martin, Mass.
Miller
Morse
Murphy, N.Y.
Pelly
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Rivers, Alaska
Roush
Shipley
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Waggonner
Williams
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Michel moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 234 be instructed to insist upon disagreement to Senate amendment No. 3.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the argument of those in opposition to my amendment who say that this would "tie the President's hands" is completely without foundation. In my speech of February 4, I pointed out that the President can operate under title 7 of the United States Code, as well as under title II, III, and IV of Public Law 480.

The argument that the amendment adopted by the House of Representatives to House Joint Resolution 234, exceeds the powers of Congress because it limits the discretion of the President in conducting our foreign relations is wholly without substance. There is nothing whatever in the Constitution to support the notion that the President has the sole authority to determine this Government's foreign policy. To be sure, the Constitution makes the President the sole spokesman of this Government in dealing with other countries. He alone conducts negotiations with foreign governments. But that by no means gives him exclusive authority to determine what the foreign policy of this Nation shall be.

Article II, section 3, imposes on the President the duty to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." This applies to all laws Congress is empowered to pass; the Constitution makes no distinction between laws relating to internal affairs and those which affect our relations with the rest of the world.

The fact that several of the powers vested in Congress by article I, section 8, directly and explicitly affect foreign relations clearly shows that the framers of the Constitution had no thought of giving the President exclusive authority in this field. Under article I, section 8, it is Congress, not the President, which is empowered to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; and to define and punish felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations. It is Congress, not the President, which is authorized to regulate commerce with foreign nations. In the light of these provisions there is no warrant for suggesting that in exercising its powers under article I, sections 8 and 9, to control the Nation's purse strings, and under article IV, section 8, to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations concerning property belonging to the United States, Congress is subject to some unexpressed limitations with respect to matters which affect foreign policy. Far from having exclusive authority to determine how, when, and where public property and public funds shall be used in dealings with foreign countries, the President has no authority whatever to use one penny of public funds or to dispose of one item of public property for this purpose unless that authority is granted by act of Congress.

The notion that Congress is overreaching its authority by adopting this amendment is particularly farfetched in the light of the legislative history of the provision for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies. This provision had its genesis in an amendment added in 1953 to the Mutual Security Act of 1951, 67 Stat. 159. In that year each House added an amendment looking to the use of surplus agricultural commodities as a form of assistance to friendly nations, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 5, page 6910, and volume 99, part 6, page 7779. The provision finally adopted was drafted by the conference committee, House Report No. 770, 83d Congress. It was carried forward in 1954 as part of title I of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Without this provision, and appropriations made to implement it, the President would be powerless to sell or grant any agricultural commodities to any country on any terms whatsoever. How can it be argued that Congress is exceeding its authority when it stipulates that moneys provided under a program which originated with it, and which could not be used at all without its affirmative action, shall not be spent for purposes deemed inimical to the best interests of the United States?

Moreover, it should be emphasized that this amendment does not completely bar the furnishing of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic if the President sees fit to continue such aid in spite of the views expressed by Congress. This amendment restricts only the use of funds made available by House Joint Resolution 234. It applies only to the remaining 5 months of the fiscal year 1965. It does not prevent the furnishing of such aid, even in the next 5 months, by the use of other funds which may be available from other sources than the appropriation made by this joint resolution. It does not prevent the use of funds made available after the close of this fiscal year. By its terms, the amendment affects only transactions under title I of Public Law 480. The authority of the President under other provisions, such as his power under title II of Public Law 480 to make grants of surplus agricultural commodities to promote economic and community development in underdeveloped areas, remains unchanged.

This amendment makes clear the serious concerns of the Congress that the contemptuous attitude of the United Arab Republic to this Government, and its intent that moneys extracted from the pockets of American taxpayers should not be used to subsidize activities inimical to their interests and to the peace of the world. It will call a halt to the continued flow of surplus funds to the United Arab Republic as a matter of routine. But, since it affects only the expenditure of the moneys appropriated by this resolution, and is limited in time to the remaining months of this fiscal year, it does not unduly restrict the discretion of the President. It leaves ample opportunity for him to continue to supply aid to the United Arab Republic, if after full consideration, he considers it desirable to do so and takes personal responsibility for that action.

Mr. Speaker, as for the argument that this aid is going strictly for and directly into the mouths of starving Egyptian children, and therefore we should not cut off the flow of these commodities, let me quote from the Washington Post in their editorial of December 27, 1964, which said:

> It would be a great pity if this should happen, but it would be even worse if others should infer that the United States is so devoid of self-respect that it can be unfairly abused with utter impunity.

We all know this foregoing statement sums up the feelings of any reasonable man and the starving children bit is a phony argument. Anyone with an ounce of commonsense knows that the millions of dollars of surplus foods this country sends to Egypt operates—by freeing Egyptian funds and food—as an indirect subsidy in helping it to carry out its policy of international disruption. This is brought out in Nasser's own words, as I will cite later in the course of my remarks.

Another argument that was recently raised is that Nasser was provoked into villifying this country because of the actions of our Ambassador and therefore Nasser's actions are justified. Let us examine the events leading up to this so-called provocation. I now quote from the article "United States of America and United Arab Republic—A Crisis in Confidence," written by John S. Badeau, our former Ambassador to Egypt, appearing in the January 1965 issue of Foreign Affairs:

> During the past 2 years there have been five instances of United Arab Republic meddling which particularly disturbed Americans. The first was Egypt's support for the coup d'etat which overthrew the Imam of Yemen. What began as modest help to Republican forces against the Royalists ended with full-scale military occupation of the country. Egypt eventually had nearly 40,000 troops in the Yemen. A second instance was the dispatch of United Arab Republic arms and technicians in support of Algeria in its border dispute with Morocco—and this at a time when Cuba was also getting into the act.
>
> The third incident was the supply of small arms to the Government of Cyprus during the current civil war on that unfortunate island. While any government has the legal right to sell arms to another government, it seemed that Greek Cypriots had ample quantities of weapons on hand, both for their regular and irregular forces. What reason had the United Arab Republic to contribute to an already overabundant supply except the desire to fan the fires of conflict between Greek and Turkish Cypriots? And why did Nasser welcome Makarios so warmly to Cairo this summer, unless the United Arab Republic is more interested in perpetuating than in calming the Cyprus disorders?
>
> The fourth instance is perhaps the most serious. In February 1964, President Nasser, in a public speech heard throughout the Arab world, called for the ending of British and American base rights in Libya. The response was an immediate public furor in Libya which came dangerously near to ending in the abdication of the King. Once again Egypt was interfering in the affairs of its neighbors, and in a form directly challenging an American interest.
>
> Finally, there is the current Egyptian campaign against the South Arabian Federation and its British sponsors. Here is an area remote from the United Arab Republic, without visible impact on Egyptian security interests. Whether the Egyptian offensive is a diversionary ploy in the Yemen affair or a more general stirring up of trouble for trouble's sake, it only confirms American opinion that the United Arab Republic is always minding someone else's business.

Now let us examine Nasser's own words regarding the so-called provocation. The Library of Congress was kind enough to provide me with a copy of President Nasser's speech at Port Said on December 23, 1964, and from that I quote:

> I am saying this because the American Ambassador yesterday called on the Deputy Premier for supply and sat with him for a few minutes, looking glum and sulky. He was supposed to talk with him about the supply material we are obtaining from America in accordance with the products law. The Ambassador told the Deputy Premier that he cannot at present talk about this matter at all. Why? Because he does not like our conduct, that is, conduct here in Egypt.

President Nasser went on to say:

> He who speaks a single harsh word to us will have his tongue cut off.

Now was Nasser really provoked by a single harsh word of an Ambassador who looked glum and sulky.

Let us look further into his speech to see what he had to say about the real provocation: I quote:

> An aggression has taken place against the Congo. American and Belgian troops landed in Stanleyville. We have condemned this aggression. For what is the difference between the Anglo-French aggression against Port Said in 1956 and the American-Belgian aggression against Stanleyville in 1964? Both had arms, both landed by parachute, and both killed the natives of the country. We are opposed to aggression in whatever form it may be. We are for the freedom of peoples.
>
> Can we possibly recognize Tshombe as the representative of the Congolese people? Tshombe is a murderer. If America and Belgium had installed Tshombe as a Premier, he is then a Premier in the pay of America and Belgium, and we cannot under any circumstance recognize him as a Premier representing the Congolese people. It is not only us who did not recognize him. You remember when Tshombe came here during the nonalined conference? The nonalined states did not recognize him, and not a single state agreed to allow him to attend the conference as a representative of the Congolese people.
>
> Who then says that Tshombe represents the Congolese people? The Americans and the Belgians. We say that Tshombe is nothing but an agent of imperialism. Tshombe is an agent serving the interests of America and Belgium in the Congo. We will in no way allow this example to succeed in Africa. This example must fail in Africa, and the national forces there must succeed.
>
> We have helped the Congolese people. They (the West—ed.) said that we have helped the Congolese people, and I say, indeed, yes. We have helped the Congolese people. We have sent arms to the Congolese people, and we will still send them arms. We do not attempt in any way to deny or hide our (few words indistinct), because we do not recognize Tshombe. We do, however, recognize him as an agent of imperialism. We consider that the national rebels in the Congo require every support from the national forces and the honorable forces in the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, we see that our humanitarian operation in the Congo to save the lives of our missionaries who were being butchered like animals is tabbed as barbaric behavior. Now we have an appeal to help Egypt on humanitarian grounds.

Why did our action in the Congo to save our missionaries cause such a violent reaction resulting in the so-called provocation: The most recent issue of Intelligence Digest, February 1965, which just came across my desk has an excellent analysis of the offensive against the church in Africa. The article states:

OFFENSIVE AGAINST THE CHURCH IN AFRICA

The massacres in the Congo have set off a full-scale Russian diplomatic offensive in Africa against the Christian church in general and against missionaries in particular. The hysteria which events in the northeast Congo have caused in widespread parts of Africa has been turned to good advantage by clever maneuvering in Moscow.

For instance, proof has been found of a plot between Tshombe and the Vatican calling for the brutal killing of missionaries in the Stanleyville area by Tshombe's forces so that these murders can be blamed on the rebel forces.

The atrocities are therefore in no way denied; but the rebels are exonerated from all blame. The tragedy is, instead, held up as but yet another example of the bestial methods the church has used in Africa for the past 500 years, and Tshombe is shown as the willing tool of the "neocolonialists in clerical dress." Tshombe's recent audience with the Pope, during his visit to Rome, is exploited to the full.

A WELL-PREPARED CAMPAIGN

There is evidence that Russia's African experts in Moscow have prepared for some time for this campaign against the Christian church in Africa and that they have merely waited for the opportune moment to launch it. The Stanleyville massacre appears to have been deemed a useful opportunity.

The basis of the campaign is a well-documented exposure of the Christian church's history in Africa which has certainly taken careful research to produce. The aim is not to discredit religion as such, but to warn against the work and influence of all missionaries, every one of whom is said to be a western agent seeking to reenslave Africa.

A NEW AND BOLD PHASE

The "exposure" is to be made available, through Soviet Embassies and agents, to African nationalist leaders. It is not a mere propaganda attack. It is a new and bold phase in Russia's African strategy.

The exposure goes back into history, to the days when "the colonial plunder and violence had only just begun"—to the decree of Pope Alexander VI which divided the non-Christian world between Spain and Portugal. This decree is shown to have established "in the colonies a savage system of torture and punishment with which it terrorized the population." It laid the foundation for the monastic orders to engage in usury, slave trading, and smuggling.

Missionaries are shown to have been, throughout history, the merciless exploiters of the people in the seized territories, and at all times to have acted as forerunners of the secular colonialists. Today they are allegedly the agents of the "neocolonialists and imperialists who are seeking to crush the national liberation movement."

The colonial-imperialist system now places great hopes on the church and its missionaries. A whole "army" of missionaries is said to be busy with a fresh invasion of the African continent. "The colonialists are using this strong, well-trained, well-equipped army, whose numbers are constantly increasing, as an instrument of neocolonialism," Moscow claims authoritatively.

AMERICANS ACCUSED

"It is a characteristic fact that during the past decade, especially during the postwar period, American clerics and American monastic orders have been playing a more and more important part as missionaries, and missionary work itself is being more and more financed by U.S. monopolists.

"There is today a total of 35,000 American missionaries. They do not halt their intrigues and subversive activities for a single day. We would be justified in saying that there has not been a single more or less important event in the liberation movement in recent years in which the church leaders and missionaries acted nobly."

A TURNING POINT

Moscow further claims to have unearthed a secret report to the Vatican prepared in 1956 by a leading Belgian cleric, whose name is given as Jacques Meyer, in which he allegedly advised that in future missionaries "if they want to succeed in fighting the national liberation movement, they should hurry and change their costumes, adapt themselves to new conditions, maneuver and deceive, and teach their flocks more slyly." Thus, "the Vatican and the local reaction do their dirty work together."

BESTIAL HATE

Referring specifically to the Congo, the Vatican's army of 300 missionaries is said to have been sent in under the command of the monstrous Father Martin Adolf Bormann to practice against the freedom fighters the lessons he had been taught by his father, Hitler's lieutenant.

That apparently explains the "bestial hate" which the church has been spreading in the Congo. "Supposedly holy nuns" are accused of openly joining the mercenaries in their work of extermination, although they are more normally engaged in sabotage.

It is also claimed that fresh evidence now discloses that it was the church which had engineered the death of Patrice Lumumba. The reason for it was that the church had learned that Lumumba was working on a book to expose the criminal activities by missionaries in Africa over the years.

It has thus been found that while missionaries preach with the Bible in hand by day, they plot devilish schemes against Africa by night. Even the recent rioting and bloodshed in Khartoum was due to to the "provocative activities of foreign missionaries" who have been sowing discord and animosity with their inflamatory sermons.

The purpose of the whole campaign is summed up in the following words taken from the Moscow-prepared brief: "The nations that have cast off the chains of colonial slavery should remember that although the colonialists have gone, their underlings, the church and the missionaries, remain, continuing their disgusting efforts against freedom and progress."

A TURNING POINT

Our East European correspondent, who has been studying the Soviet drive in Africa from the Russian end, has sent the following comment: "There are clear indications that Moscow sees the recent events in the Congo as a turning point. The Stanleyville and other massacres have brought the missionaries into the limelight and have given the Russians the opportunity to set in motion a well-prepared plan to discredit the Christian church.

"The wish to break the influence of the church in Africa is not new, but hitherto there was caution because the reaction of the many thousands of African Christians could not be foreseen. The fact that the hesitation has now gone reflects the growing confidence among Russian leaders that they are making definite progress in Africa and need no longer consider moderate African opinion. The offensive against the church is but another sign of their altogether more bold approach to Africa in the past 2 months."

Donora, Pa.,
February 5, 1965.

Representative Robert H. Michel.

Dear Sir: In view of the fact that you have sponsored the anti-Nasser amendment, I am sending you a copy of the letter that I wrote to President Nasser and to their official newspaper.

Mr. Michel, it is very hard for me to understand the throwing away of our money to countries that are not friendly toward us—yet I cannot borrow a couple thousand of dollars to send my daughter through a State teacher's college. My daughter is a good girl, one who studies very hard, one who would like to become a good elementary schoolteacher, her college freshman year grades are all "A" and "B." I am not working very steady, have an older son in college, a mortgaged home. We are now a family of seven.

It is frightening when one considers all the injustice that is going on.

Mr. Michel, I have just begun to fight.

May our good God bless you and your loved ones.

Yours truly,

Andrew Warholic.

Donora, Pa.,
January 4, 1965.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Dear Sir: Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Andrew Warholic, age 48, happily married, blessed with a wonderful wife and four children. I work in a steelmill. I am a Byzantine Catholic and I am trying very hard to be a good one.

Mr. Nasser you stated that you are a people of dignity, I'm glad to hear that, and that's the way it should be. Now what makes you think that we Americans don't have any dignity?

Mr. Nasser, the economic aid that you have received from our wonderful country comes from part of my income tax. A tax that I gladly pay so that others less fortunate than I can benefit.

Now that you have received our aid, and you are now slapping me across my face, I don't like it one bit, and I'm going to tell you so.

I don't believe that our Ambassador, Mr. Lucius Battle, was trying to dictate United Arab Republic policies in exchange for aid.

If our aid was stopped because you have sent arms to the Congo, then I say it's about time that we are taking a stand. What right have you to help kill our priests, nuns, and missionaries in the Congo? These people were doing a wonderful job for the Congolese people and now you admit that you helped to kill them by sending arms.

Mr. Nasser, when this aid was given to your country, I did not want nor expect a thank you for it, but it hurts when you tell us to go and drink from the ocean, after, you receive our aid and the fact that you are asking for $35 million more of surplus food.

If the aid was stopped because of your indifference to the sacking of the U.S. Information Service Library in Cairo, then it's about time that we are taking a stand on that also.

If the aid was stopped because of your indifference to the shooting down of an unarmed airplane, then once again I say it's about time that we took a stand.

Mr. Nasser, the speech that you made in the presence of Mr. Alexander Shelepin, criticizing the United States wasn't right, and you know it. Why are you trying to blame us for your nation's economic crisis?

I wonder what Russia would do to you if they were giving you aid, and you in turn would be sending Communist China arms?

Yes, Mr. Nasser, we are a proud and sensitive people. We will not accept insults from anyone, not even you.

I have no quarrel with the people of your country, for I try to accept them, their customs, and their cultures. But I have been slapped by you—it hurts and I don't like it, and I as a freeman don't have to like it, especially a man that has tried to help your country.

At this time I cannot fully understand why you hate us so. Were you grandstanding for the benefit of the Russian, Mr. Shelepin? If so, then you were playing a very dangerous game. Just remember that in the past, "Those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside."

Mr. Nasser, our late beloved, President Kennedy expressed himself and the American people when he said, "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardships, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty. This much we pledge—and more."

"To those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best effort to help them to help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

"My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man."

To all Egyptian people, I sincerely hope and pray that the new year will be much better, and that our good God will bless you and your loved ones with very good health and happiness.

Yours truly,

ANDREW WARHOLIC.

[From the New York Journal-American, Dec. 30, 1964]

UNITED STATES TIRES OF ROLE AS WHIPPING BOY

(By Frank Conniff)

If there ever was a time when we needed Nasser's friendship—a doubtful proposition at best—that time is long gone. Ben Bella and the other minor league fuehrers also seem to be overlooking the fact that the United States no longer needs them in any capacity trussed to our security.

The consensus mentioned above may soon tolerate a situation which sees the two Communist giants wrestling one another for control of parts of the globe really not worth fighting over. Meanwhile the United States, rebuffed by the same people who should welcome our friendship, will rest snug and secure under the new conditions of a power balance achieved since the stabilizing of Europe and the development of sophisticated missile systems.

The point that Afro-Asian leaders, particularly those at the United Nations, should bear in mind is that this new trend in American thinking is sparked not by people unfriendly to their cause. Their nations need help, and we want to give it to them. But not at the expense of listening forever to pro-Communist proclamations and anti-American tirades. We're just like them in a way: We want to be respected, despite our wealth. And we will.

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 3, 1965]

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

The hostile actions and abuse from nations which the United States has befriended and defended have brought us to a turning point.

The view is essentially one that our Hearst newspapers have always advocated: that the enlightened self-interest of the United States be put ahead of all other considerations in international affairs.

There have been times when U.S. self-interest called for intervention in parts of the world. There have been times when our national self-interest called for aid to bolster allies and even countries which preferred to call themselves neutral.

We don't have to keep on giving aid to dictators like Nasser and Ben Bella and Sukarno who sneer at us. We have been trying to help their people, but these self-centered, bean-brained dictators have instead bitten our hand.

We don't have to compromise about the Soviet welshing on U.N. obligations.

It is, as above stated, a time to get tough—a time to speak.

A primary vital interest is one in which the security and well-being of a nation are involved. By this criterion we have been committed far beyond our primary vital interests and far beyond our military and political reach.

Finally we come to the almost frantic anti-American hysteria indulged in and encouraged by the Soviet Union in recent weeks. It is at least a novel form of the "coexistence" so smugly proclaimed by the Kremlin as its basic foreign policy.

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 4, 1965]

UNCLE SAM: IS HE FINALLY FED UP?

(By William S. White)

There is a fed-up feeling here at a whole series of actions of a grotesque unthink and newspeak. President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic finds his patience with us so exhausted that publicly he calls upon us to go to hell—though he uses an Egyptian variant of that expression—and to take our millions of dollars in aid with us.

Nasser has had a dreadfully hard time from us. For years we have been forcing crude American dollars upon him—many of which he has been spending for arms in the Soviet Union—although we have at least been sensitive enough never to demand that he alter his habitually anti-Western policy line.

One also can well understand how right he is to be displeased with us for other reasons. After all, we go around in the United Nations daring to suggest that he ought to quit sending in arms to Chinese Communist-backed rebels who are trying to destroy the free Government of the Congo.

One wishes, indeed, that President Johnson would take the occasion to say something to this effect: "We have read your statement as what we should do with our aid, Colonel Nasser. As of right now we are pleased to adopt your advice and bring our money home." The lesson might be salutary all around.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH OUR MIDDLE EAST POLICIES?

(By Walter Winchell)

Appeasement is a dirty word. In this case it is the only accurate description of our policies there. Dictator Nasser has exchanged a handshake for a backstab. Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once observed that a page of experience was worth 10 volumes of logic. The entire experience of appeasement is that it is as foolish as it is dangerous. The appeaser considers his policy as a gesture toward peace. The dictator accepts appeasement as a military victory.

[From the New York Journal-American, Dec. 30, 1964]

A "NO" FOR NASSER

Washington showed signs of getting tough about Egyptian President Nasser, the diatribing American-hater who holds his hand out for our aid the while he foams at the mouth against us.

Under a 3-year agreement, ending next June 30, we have been sending him $140 million in food annually. He has asked for a special additional $35 million supply. Washington has delayed decision until 1965. Under a new provision, the heavy shipping charges, heretofore borne by the United States, would then have to be paid by Nasser.

This prospect has enraged him. He is outraged at this departure from the spirit of gentle endurance that hitherto has induced Uncle Sam to help Nasser remain in the good graces of his hungry countrymen by providing him with vast cargoes of food.

The great mass of American public opinion will approve any firm stand by Washington that demonstrates its patience has ended and that its delayed decision is a first step in terminating the coddling of its malicious assailant.

We can't play it both ways, gentle and tough. We've tried the first. It hasn't worked. The alternative is a must.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 25, 1964]

AID TO EGYPT

In a speech bristling with insults to the United States, President Nasser of the United Arab Republic has declared that his country intends to go on sending arms to the Congolese rebels. The insults are less important than this blatant assertion of resolve to help equip forces of pillage, murder and dissension in their effort to overthrow the legal government of the Congo.

The Nasser declaration makes it impossible for the United States to escape a recognition that the millions of dollars in surplus food this country sends to Egypt operates—by freeing Egyptian funds—as an indirect subsidy in helping it carry out its policy of international disruption. The United States does not provide aid as a means of dictating the policies of foreign governments; but neither does it provide aid as a means of undermining world peace or enabling foreign adventurers to interfere in the affairs of their neighbors by military or other means.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 27, 1964]

AID AND EGYPT

Those who give may be blessed, but they cannot expect effusive gratitude—especially when a rich country gives to a poor one. Indeed, the very sense of dependence that foreign aid may encourage can cause leaders elsewhere to carry precariously perched chips on their shoulders. A nation no less than an indivdual is loath to suggest that its soul is for sale for a bowl of pottage.

Something of this psychology is evident in the present controversy with the United Arab Republic. President Nasser is seeking an emergency supplement to the $140-million-a-year food aid program. The request has coincided with a dispute over Egyptian aid to the Congolese rebels, the mob attack on a USIA library in Cairo, and a recent incident involving the shooting down of a privately owned U.S. plane.

Under new language added to Public Law 480, hard currency is required for shipping costs. This requirement has added to Mr. Nasser's irritation. In a speech marking an anniversary of the Suez debacle of 1956, the Egyptian President said that those who disapprove of his views, "can go drink sea water. If the Mediterranean is not enough for them, we can give them the Red Sea to drink too. We cannot sell our independence for 30, 40, or 50 million pounds."

Certainly the United States is not asking the United Arab Republic to sell its independence. This country has learned something since the time when Secretary Dulles precipitously canceled our support for the Aswan High Dam. In past years, by dint of patient effort and considerable restraint on both sides, relations have improved between Washington and Cairo. But the line Mr. Nasser is now taking puts those relations in jeopardy.

The donor no less than the recipient has pride in any foreign aid venture. It is quite true that the United States cannot expect agreement from the Egyptians on the many issues in which both countries have an interest. But this country can rightly expect to have its diplomatic missions respected in Cairo and to be spared blunt attacks that go beyond normal diplomatic usage in relations between states.

It would be a mistake, in our view, for the United States angrily to withdraw all help from Egypt because of the present dispute. But it would not be an error, if the same vehement attacks persist, for the United States to indicate quietly and without anger that the program can be terminated and thus spare Egypt suggestion that the food is being used as a bribe. It would be a great pity if this should happen, but it would be even worse if others should infer that the United States is so devoid of self-respect that it can be unfairly abused with utter impunity.

[From the Houston Post, Dec. 26, 1964]

TOUGHER FOREIGN AID POLICY?

However much the Soviet Union and Communist China may be at loggerheads, they are united in a massive, global propaganda effort to destroy the prestige and influence of the United States, and it seldom has been equaled in bitterness and virulence. The campaign is being pressed in the United Nations and on every other possible front.

The heart of this effort appears to be an attempt to smear the United States as a colonial power out to dominate the world. It is an old trick, of course, to try to convict your opponent of what you are trying to do yourself. The fact that the United States is not a colonial power and has no aspirations to be does not make the slightest difference.

The Communists have taken care of that by inventing a new term, "neocolonialism." Nobody seems to know exactly what the term means, but presumably it covers anything this country may do anywhere in defense of its own interests, to forestall the spread of Communism or to help other countries maintain their independence from Communist domination.

Some of the so-called unaligned nations which have been receiving American help are most vocal and active in this smear campaign. They have asked, begged for and received aid from the American taxpayers. They have even used blackmail in attempt to get more of it. Yet they turn right around and shout that this aid is part of a deep, neocolonialistic plot on the part of the United States, that it is attemping to make them economically subservient.

Their attitude seems to be that they are entitled to this aid as a matter of right simply because the United States is rich and powerful and they are backward, that it should be given them in unlimited quantities with no string attached. They feel no sense of gratitude whatsoever and take the position that none is due.

It would serve them right if all the abuse and vituperation they are now heaping upon the United States in cooperation with the Communist smear campaign returned to haunt them.

There is some indication that the Johnson administration is moving toward a tougher policy with respect to the dispensing of foreign aid. This helps explain the angry outburst of Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser against the United States. On the same day that he delivered his tirade against this country, Foreign Aid Director David Bell was saying in Austin, after a conference with President Johnson, that the foreign aid budget for the 1966 fiscal year may be even lower than this year's $3.5 billion.

The purpose of the foreign aid program is not to win friends or anybody's gratitude. It is intended to serve this country's own interests. Those interests include doing whatever is reasonably possible to combat the spread of Communist imperialism. Help is extended to other countries to help them remain free from this domination if they really want to be free. But the United States does have a right to demand that they make a satisfactory effort to help themselves and at least not bite the hand that is helping them. If they do bite it, it may be withdrawn.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 4, 1965]

SELLING OUR DIGNITY

Only 5 days after President Nasser of the United Arab Republic angrily denounced the United States and told us to go drink sea water—Egyptian slang for "go to hell"—the Department of Agriculture issued an authorization for shipment of $16,944,000 worth of wheat to the United Arab Republic under the food-for-peace program. Our Government will pay cash for the wheat in the open market, and Egypt will pay for it, not in dollars, but in Egyptian pounds, much of which will be spent there as part of our foreign aid.

Arrangements for the transaction had been made some time before Nasser bitterly accused our Ambassador, Lucius D. Battle, of trying to put economic pressure on Egypt. The Arab dictator had asked the United States for an additional $35 million worth of food this year because of a food shortage in Egypt. Since the food-for-peace program was enacted in 1954 as Public Law 480, the quantity of American surplus foodstuffs sent to the United Arab Republic has had a total market value of more than $720 million but has cost our Government more than $1.1 billion dollars, including ocean transportation.

What apparently irked Nasser was our Government's suggestion that if he is going to continue to spend money to send arms to the Congolese rebels, who have been massacring Americans and other white hostages, he might pay for our food in hard cash dollars. Up to now he has been paying for it in nonconvertible Egyptian currency, most of which has been returned to him as foreign aid loans and grants. He called Congolese Premier Moise Tshombe a murderer and an imperialist agent of the United States and Belgium, adding, "We shall send more arms to the Congo."

It may be recalled that only last month a Cairo mob burned the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library, and more recently an Egyptian Air Force jet shot down an unarmed private American oil company plane, killing the pilot and copilot. Yet our Government went ahead and authorized a virtual gift of $16 million worth of wheat. How long will it be before we hear that the additional $35 million worth of wheat Nasser asked for will be forthcoming?

During his harangue Nasser accused the United States of trying to get Egyptians to sell their dignity. He has more regard for Egyptian dignity than the State and Agriculture Departments have for ours when they continue to give aid to a two-bit dictator who has nothing but insults and abuse for us.

[From the Chicago Sun Times, Dec. 25, 1964]

WHY SUBSIDIZE OUR VILIFIERS?

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Denunciations of the United States and its foreign policy by Communist nations are to be expected as a matter of course. But denunciation of the United States and its foreign policy by nations which the United States has sought to aid indicates a need for a realistic appraisal of that policy; an adjustment, perhaps, to facts as they exist.

Petty tyrants, strutting about in the manner of cockerels on dunghills, denounce the United States and, in effect, tell us to pack up and get out. In their oratorical frenzies designed, in part, for local consumption they suggest they neither need nor want our aid, economic, military, or otherwise.

They parrot the Communist line which holds we are imperialists intent on exploiting the undeveloped nations; they turn their mobs loose to burn and destroy American embassies and information libraries. They have converted the United Nations Assembly into a propaganda device for assaults on the United States.

Gamel Abdel Nasser, the dictator of the United Arab Republic, who let a Cairo mob burn down a U.S. Information Service library, and followed that insult by letting his jet fighters shoot down an American oil company airplane, boasts he sent arms to Congolese rebels and says he will continue doing so.

He now says Egypt can get along without the $140 million in U.S. aid it receives.

Very well. If he can get along without it we shouldn't be giving it to him. He makes war on Yemen, he's constantly threatening war on Israel, and he's playing the Communist game by sending arms to the Congolese rebels. Take him at his word. He doesn't need American aid, so he says.

The notion advanced in the past by the State Department that we can, by subsidizing such charlatans, win them over to the side of the free world has been disproved time and time again. Consider Prince Norodom Sihanouk in Cambodia. Look at the record of Sukarno in Indonesia. Recall the days spent by the U.N.'s spokesmen of various undeveloped African nations in denouncing the United States and Belgium for rescuing their nationals, and those of other nations, from the savage Congolese rebels whom Nasser now boasts he has been and will continue to supply with arms.

There is a long list of similar happenings.

For some reason this aspect of U.S. foreign policy is no longer working the wonders it is supposed to perform. In far too many places it is producing the reverse effect.

Stop bolstering these nations with U.S. funds and they will flock into the Communist camp, so we are told. Maybe. In some instances that wouldn't be bad. The Soviet Union would have to support them as it now has to support Cuba.

U.S. aid has accomplished much good in some countries. It put Western Europe and Japan back on their economic feet. It has improved the lot of the people in others. But none of that offsets the fact it is an increasing mess in many others. Even in some nations in which it is not a mess the United States is getting the bad part of the bargain as a consequence of our own inept practices, especially propaganda ones.

And now, to top the absurdity of this situation comes Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, commander of the military forces of South Vietnam, and maker and unmaker of governments in that land.

The United States has spent in excess of $3 billion in South Vietnam in efforts to aid its government stamp out the Vietcong guerrillas who now dominate between one-half and two-thirds of the country. We are now spending more than $1,500,000 a day in this same effort. We have approximately 22,000 American soldiers there, soldiers who act as trainers of the South Vietnamese Army and as advisers to it.

Still, the Saigon government is no match for the guerrillas who are equipped and supplied by North Vietnam and Red China.

We are losing that war. But we cling to our policies and practices despite manifest shortcomings. And now Khanh tells us he'll go it alone if we don't stop meddling. He can't. South Vietnam would disappear behind the Iron Curtain overnight if we pulled out. The general knows that. He's running another bluff.

President Johnson, who inherited most of these messes from his predecessor, did little to straighten them out during the year following President John F. Kennedy's assassination. Perhaps now that he's about to enter the Presidency in his own right he'll put an end to the constant vilification to which this Nation is being subjected by the vipers which we have too long nourished without complaint.

What they need is a striking object lesson; a demonstration, for example, of what would happen in Egypt if the United States took Nasser at his word and cut off aid.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 4, 1965]

AID TURMOIL—RECIPIENTS GO BEYOND ABUSING UNITED STATES

(By William S. White)

International etiquette among foreigners generously aided by the United States has sunk to a point almost beneath sight. It is necessary to remind these splendid characters that one really need not hit his grandmother with a spade to establish that he is beyond doubt absolutely independent and positively awash with self-respect and all that.

Indeed among the new year's resolutions made by the U.S. Government is a resolution to this effect: Perhaps we shall not be unduly sensitive to those aid recipients who merely curse us in three languages. But we really are going to be provoked—and we are going hereafter to show it to the extent of actually withdrawing assistance if nothing else will work—at those regimes which go beyond abusing us to condoning acts of arson against our embassies and of personal violence against our people.

There is a fed-up feeling here at a whole series of actions of a grotesque unthink and newspeak. President Nasser of Egypt finds his patience with us so exhausted that publicly he calls upon us to go to hell—though he uses an Egyption variant of that expression—and to take our millions and millions of aid with us.

Colonel Nasser has had a dreadfully hard time from us. For years we have been forcing crude American dollars upon him—many of which he has been spending for arms in the Soviet Union—though we have at least been sensitive enough never to demand that he alter his habitually anti-Western policy line.

One also can well understand how right he is to be displeased with us for other reasons. After all, we go around in the United Nations daring to suggest that he ought to quit sending in arms to Chinese Communist-backed rebels who are trying to destroy the free government of the Congo.

Again, look at the intolerable American aggressions against which Malaysia has so courageously reacted. Here is an appalling situation in which old Uncle Sam has the crust to ask for interest on his loans. Such effrontery cannot go unpunished; the People's Action Front demands that American Peace Corps volunteers be expelled from the country to avenge Malaysia's honor.

Then there is Pakistan. A high official of the Pakistan Government publicly charges the United States with financing the campaign of Fatima Jinnah, the opponent of President Mohammed Ayub Khan. Not long ago this sort of violently offensive rhetoric would have been thought rude beyond any conceivable international usage. But this sort of thing has now regrettably become the more or less common coin of converse with the United States from among the weak and angry powers of the world.

One can to a degree understand if not condone it in the case of Pakistan.

* * * * *

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this is no time for divided counsel. A crisis impends in South Vietnam. We must present to the world a united front in support of our President. There should not be the slightest doubt that the Congress does sustain our President. A vote against the pending motion to instruct is a symbol of our respect for our President's judgment.

A wise diplomat many years ago said: "We have no permanent allies, we have no permanent enemies. We only have permanent interests."

That has been illustrated many times. Germany, our erstwhile foe, is now our NATO ally. Japan, guilty of treachery at Pearl Harbor, is now our friend. France, our brother for decades, is now ruled by General de Gaulle, who has soured on the United States and wants to elbow us off the sidewalks of Europe.

Parenthetically I offer the reason for his conduct:

Gratitude is a heavy burden
Our "interests" must be the lodestar of our policy
Friend today may be foe tomorrow. Foe now may some day become friend.

Our President knows well our basic interests. We can trust him.

Foreign policy, therefore, cannot be nailed down. Foreign policymakers should not be placed in any kind of mental straitjacket. Foreign policy must be governed by the wise discretion and the keen prescience that reside in the Executive.

The Executive and not the Congress is possessed of the daily dispatches from all over the world, the diplomatic pouch contents, the intelligence reports, the secret correspondence, direct communication with our ministers abroad—all of which are essential to the evaluation of foreign policy.

Beyond that, our foreign policy cannot refer to a single country only. Our foreign policy cannot be considered in a vacuum. It must be correlated with our attitude toward other nations. Thus the policy may become part of a global or hemispheric strategy. Congress cannot possibly evaluate such an elaborate process.

Does this mean that Congress must remain like dumb driven cattle, completely silent? Not at all. We can and should comment and criticize, but we should not seek to dominate or command. We properly, shall I say, admonished the Executive the other day in our reference to food to be sent or not to be sent to Egypt. We deprecated Nasser's nose-thumbing attitude. We registered some doubt as to whether U.S. aid to Nasser contributed to our peace and security.

The next move, I take it, is up to the President. If the President determines it is in the national interest to continue sending food to the United Arab Republic, it will be essential for the President to set forth in plain terms the reasons therefor. He must tell us why such aid will fortify instead of undermine the aims of our foreign policy. He must insist upon certain changes in the region of the Nile.

Every pharaoh has his Moses, and maybe Johnson will be a modern Moses in this regard.

There may be, particularly from the metropolitan area of New York, Members who are a little worried. Pressure groups have been after them over the weekend, and they may be a bit jittery. I hope they will not yield to that kind of pressure.

I would like to quote to them a statement made by President Lincoln after he was in the White House 6 months, concerning these pressure groups. He said:

> If I were to try to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference.

I hope, therefore, with a resounding vote we shall vote down this motion to instruct and that we shall finally vote for the conference report.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has indicated that we should not yield to pressure groups. He has not, however, indicated why he has changed his own position. I would not suppose it is due to pressure from the administration or elsewhere, but it is regrettable that we do not know why he should have changed his own mind.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have gone along, ever since I have been in the Congress, with the idea that the Executive should be given a reasonable degree of flexibility. However, in this case I see no excuse and no justification for changing my own vote. In other words, I personally do not believe in this case that we should allow the Executive discretion.

The gentleman from New York has indicated that the next move would be up to the President, if we should continue to grant him discretion with respect to this situation. What could the President do, if we should grant him discretion in this matter? Surely he is not contemplating a deal with Nasser? The gentleman from New York suggested that foreign policy cannot be nailed down. But cannot Congress even try to help nail it down? I would suggest that it is entirely appropriate and in this case essential, for the Congress to assert itself. Congress should indicate its position clearly and unequivocally, and do it by reiteration if necessary as it appears to be today. The House should make plain that we do not feel, under the present circumstances, that the United Arab Republic should get this food.

As the gentleman from Illinois has pointed out, this is a limited kind of prohibition, entirely within the discretion of the Congress, and an appropriate action by the Congress of the United States.

I would suggest it is entirely unfounded to suggest, because of the unhappy situation in Vietnam or elsewhere, that we owe any obligation of any kind, whether we are Republicans or Democrats, to form a united front in support of our beloved President. Beloved he may be, but in this case I myself do not feel that he is entitled to any discretion in this matter. I shall so vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct the House conferees to insist upon its amendment to the supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture.

This body, in a loud and clear bipartisan voice, expressed its will that the United Arab Republic should have no further aid under title I of Public Law 480. I strongly support that position, and urge that the House conferees be instructed to definitely reject the Senate position that discretion in this matter should remain with the President.

Under the Gruening-Javits amendment of 1963, and the Roosevelt amendment of 1964, the President was called upon to bar any aid to any country unless he could certify that it was not an aggressor against any nation with which we have diplomatic relations and was not using our funds for purposes inimical to our foreign policies.

May I make it absolutely clear that my action of today is not a contradiction or reversal of my amendment in 1964. It is insistence that that amendment be lived up to and proof that I meant exactly what I said then.

No Member of this body, nor indeed of the other, can doubt that the United Arab Republic is an aggressor against countries friendly to the United States. And none but the most naive can dispute that our furnishing of food to the United Arab Republic enables it to divert its own resources to the production of a vast arms industry and propaganda machinery with which it aids, abets, and foments tumult in the Near East and Africa. Surely this is inimical to our foreign policies.

The expression of Congress is clear. The words of the statute are clear. The purpose and actions of the United Arab Republic are clear.

On December 28, 1964, I wrote to the President urging the administration to take immediate action to terminate all further aid to the United Arab Republic. This was prompted by continuing anti-United States statements and actions made and condoned by President Nasser; and his continuing aggression and adventurism in the Near East and Africa.

I had hoped that the administration would act decisively—that it would terminate Public Law 480 shipments to the United Arab Republic; and that its failure to do so would not force the Congress to act.

But Congress must now act. This issue does not involve a question of inherent Presidential power. It is a question of power to be exercised by the President only to the extent he is authorized to exercise it under a statute passed by Congress.

The other body has abdicated its constitutional duty to determine standards so far as foreign aid and agricultural legislation are concerned. This body must not abdicate and our conferees must be so instructed.

This country's commitment to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480 is conditioned upon the basic principle expressed in the Gruening-Javits and Roosevelt amendments. Today this aid to the United Arab Republic helps President Nasser carry out a foreign policy that shocks the free world, a foreign policy of aggression, a foreign policy which, if we do not stop it, will fan the flames of a great war in that part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot escape the cold, hard fact that President Nasser has breached that underlying and all-important condition and basic principle of Public Law 480 aid. We cannot escape the clear conclusion that continued Public Law 480 aid to the United Arab Republic is illegal. We cannot escape the grave responsibility and necessity of barring any assistance under Public Law 480 to the United Arab Republic; for such aid indirectly helps President Nasser finance and wage his shocking foreign policy program.

I firmly believe that we can best protect our friends, and best serve our foreign policy interests by instructing the House conferees not to abandon or suffer any weakening of the House amendment.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The issue will be joined here today, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion and return our foreign aid program to sanity and balance.

On previous occasions we have refrained from explicit wording in order to give the President and his executive instrumentalities the final discretion in determining whether certain countries will receive American assistance.

But the intent of the House has always been manifested, despite its hesitancy before questions of executive prerogative. During the debate in the Senate, we heard the argument that with our earlier amendment, the House was voicing an impulsive, intemperate judgment. I cannot agree. This issue has been debated in this Chamber and before committee time and time again—for many years; we have a great bulk of testimony; whether or not this Nation should aid President Nasser was an issue long before the burning of the John F. Kennedy library, before the shooting down of a U.S. commercial plane; before the large-scale intervention in the Yemen, before Nasser's boasts of arming the Congolese rebels; and before his most recent ugly denunciations of the United States.

We possess all the facts that are necessary to form a judgment, to take this honorable and positive step and set this Nation's course straight. We should vote unhesitantly to affirm the House language.

On this supplemental appropriations bill we are talking about an additional extension of $37 million in food to the United Arab Republic. I think it should be clear that in debating this issue we are not concerned with the Government's humanitarian efforts which, as I understand it, are channeled by both title II and title III.

We do not seek to terminate arbitrarily a charitable endeavor to meet hunger and emergency. Title I concerns the sales feature, and Egyptian currency is what we receive in exchange, only it is meaningless to us.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it is poor policy to assist a foreign country which pursues a course flagrantly at variance with our own interests in the Middle East and the world at large. That is the nub of the question. This has nothing to do with patience or the lack of it.

Let me highlight but a few points. The Egyptians have over 40,000 troops engaged in the Yemen; they are building an awesome offensive military force, spending hundreds of millions of dollars made possible, if you will, by our economic assistance programs which allow Nasser to divert his own resources for such purposes. And Nasser is materially supporting rebel forces in the Congo, where the United States seeks to strengthen the legal Congo Government.

I find the situation dangerous and disillusioning. The foodstuffs we have supplied is permitting the Egyptian Government to divert its resources toward engagements wholly contrary to the goal of peace, stability, and economic growth with we seek in the Middle East. For South Vietnam, we warn the Communists to let their neighbors alone; but in the Middle East, we appease those forces of chaos and foreign involvement and allow them freedom of action.

The State Department says this policy allows us to keep our foot in the door. I say bunk. I cannot accept for 1 minute the utter illogic of this policy.

It is time our so-called diplomats stopped this sphinxlike attitude and pulled their heads out of the desert sands.

Obviously our giving of aid to Nasser—more than a billion dollars—has not had any effect on his acts or aims. In fact, he is more defiant; more dangerous than ever.

Let the Department say how and where they have been able to win friendly relations with this Castro of the Nile. His radio Cairo has continuously spewed vicious anti-American venom. He votes consistently with the Soviet bloc in the

U.N. He embraces the Red Chinese leadership and sings the praises of its regime. He subverts the governments of his fellow Arab States. He vows the complete destruction by force of friendly Israel. He leads a vicious boycott against American businesses. His attitude is more anti-United States than ever. His insults more repugnant.

Moreover, in perspective, the extension of aid to Nasser is undermining the legitimate rationale of our aid program. It is destroying the responsible and intelligent basis upon which we seek to aid the underdeveloped countries of the world.

More and more we are coming to realize that in response to our readiness to assist, recipients must take practical measures of self-help if our programs are to be really effective. Yet Egypt, because of its foreign entanglements, its international mischief which threatens the peace of the world, is not facing those stern domestic decisions which it is in her position to confront and which we should expect from her government.

Let me point out another thing. And this is important. The New York Times reported that our Ambassador had conferred with President Nasser on February 1 to outline the administration's continued aid plan. On the other hand—while our Ambassador was giving such assurance, Under Secretary Ball has testified that the President may not carry it through, whatever the Congress does. Perhaps Nasser is more aware of what our Government intends to do than we are; a Times reporter said:

> Experience tells me that what our diplomats tell foreign governments is reliable * * * and unfortunately often more so than what it tells the Congress.

For my part, I am sure of the position which we ought to take. That position must be in keeping with the validity of our foreign aid program, and it must complement our interests in the Middle East.

It is important now that we uphold a firm decision to halt the mockery of aiding the Egyptian Government under existing circumstances. I urge my colleagues to underline our previous action by supporting this motion, setting this country on a path of principle and enlightened judgment.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to yield at this time to several members of the subcommittee who heard this matter in the first instance.

I yield first to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for 4 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I was in Budapest, Hungary, along with members of the staff of the Appropriations Committee. We had been in Poland and satellite countries of Russia. Upon my return here, the then President, President Eisenhower, announced, I believe in a speech at Cleveland, Ohio, that we would not fight nor support England and France in their fight to hold the Suez Canal. As a result Nasser forced the English and the French out and took over the canal. Three or four days later Russia moved in on Hungary and slaughtered great numbers of the Hungarian people. Prior to that Russian troops were pulling out of Hungary somewhat as they had in Poland. Apparently, when we would not support our allies in fighting to hold the Suez Canal, the Russians believed we would do nothing to defend Hungary. At any rate after President Eisenhower's speech, the Russian troops reversed their withdrawal and moved back on Budapest. The slaughter followed.

I do not know what the reaction of this country would be if, tomorrow, Nasser were to close the Suez Canal to our use. Do you? I do not really know.

May I say some of the things I do know?

The resolution to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation was and is a "must" resolution.

We held hearings before the Committee on Appropriations was organized for that reason. I know this: There is an agreement that my friends on the left, my Republican friends, will get out by Wednesday night for Lincoln's birthday in order to make a series of speeches and what-have-you. I also know that if you do not restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation by Wednesday night, you will have hundreds of banks who today hold the discounted paper of the Commodity Credit Corporation, crying for the payment of the notes they hold, you are going to hear from them, and so is the economy of this country. Remember this Corporation is not just out of money, but is practically out of authority to borrow—and could be required to default on notes now outstanding. We do not have here a vote on the foreign policy of this Nation. Here we have an effort, in effect, to instruct conferees the second time on the same thing. The vote the other day was with respect to instructions to a degree. That has not been repealed or rescinded by this House. I know that this amendment or instruction does not cut off aid by grant or gift to Egypt, but it just says that you cannot sell them surplus commodities. The proponents have said that sections 2, 3, and 4 of Public Law 480 will let you give Nasser anything you want to under the terms of the act. This is a motion to instruct your conferees the second time on the same thing, and the first instruction was not effective when it was first written and it would not be effective now. I think perhaps some of you may know what we would do if Nasser were to close the Suez Canal tomorrow, but I do not. I know what we did when we closed the door on France and England. In effect we told them not to fight but let Nasser take over. We told them, "You have to, because we are not going to back you up." The Hungarian slaughter followed in a very few days after that.

I am saying to you that if we go into conference and our hands are tied a second time and if the Senate is adamant, then you are going to have banks all over this country crying because you tied this restriction on a piece of important legislation. I am asking you to read this motion and you will see that there is nothing to it insofar as effectiveness is concerned except that you could get us all crossed up and do great damage to our economy, with no resulting benefit.

I urge you to vote against this motion, let us go to conference and work this matter out effectively with full information before us.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to another member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. MICHEL. If that is his desire, yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Illinois will lose the floor when he yields for that purpose.

Mr. MICHEL. Then, I do not yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois declines to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. MICHEL. Would the gentleman like to take the floor in support of what he might have done without actually doing it? If so, I will be glad to yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes for debate.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, truly we have had some very pertinent debate as it relates to the question before us. There is, however, still one element with regard to the subject matter before us that has as yet had no discussion, for the other body in its wisdom also saw fit to attach amendment No. 4. Now, what does that deal with? It prevents the expenditure of money by the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of carrying out a directive recently issued by them, a directive which would result in the closing of some 11 veterans' hospitals and 17 service stations as well as veterans' homes.

I want to call this to the attention of the House because of the significance that it bears to thousands of veterans throughout the entire Nation. I know that many of you, just as I, have heard not only from the veterans in your district but from many outside of your district, as many Members have come to me and called it to my attention.

For that reason I would like to point out that the amendment adopted by the other body does bear some real significance. First of all, what a false move this is under the guise of economy. I am sure that while it was being considered in the other body ample consideration was given to all of its merits and its demerits. I am in no position to speak for the amendment in the sense of what it actually does in limiting service, except the one that serves my particular area. But I want to call attention to what it does in my area. And I am sure that the effect is much the same.

The closing of the service center there and limiting the conveniences and the services that it provides to veterans all through that district means that it will move these services several hundred miles farther away, if you will. All of you have had experience, as I have had, with emergency cases where transportation has been involved, and in which we have found that immediate attention was needed for those cases. The changes proposed by the VA means that they will now have to travel much farther, and it will be that much more inconvenient for them to get there, so that in many, many instances services will not be rendered. Think too, of the additional cost involved, as well as both health and life being endangered.

For that reason I think it is well, as we are considering all of the items that relate to the question before us, that we give ample consideration to this item, too.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I am going to mention one further matter. I know that we register a unanimous concern for veterans and their problems in this House. Remember that in this instance they are asking no favors. They are not asking for any additional consideration by Congress. All they are asking is the very minimum request of letting them have what they have already got. I ask you in all sincerity, is that too much on their part?

I think we ought to sustain their plea in this matter and see to it that this amendment is kept in as a part of this resolution. It is regretable that the parliamentary situation was such that my amendment could not be offered.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the United States has for too long allowed its policy in the Middle East to remain tied to the irresponsible actions of Gamal Abdel Nasser. In the mistaken belief that he represents the best hope for stability and progress in that important region of the world, we have provided the United Arab Republic under his leadership with hundreds of millions of dollars of aid. The Public Law 480 program for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities alone has provided Egypt with over $800 million in wheat, beef, and other foodstuffs.

In recent years and months, Nasser has become increasingly belligerent. Like all other petty tyrants, his actions grow bolder as the response from democratic countries becomes milder. Instead of concerning himself with the almost insurmountable domestic problems which Egypt faces, Nasser has taken it upon himself to actively interfere in the affairs of such varied nations as Yemen, the Congo, and even Iran. And, as if this were not enough, he has now insolently affronted the United States—informing us that he does not need nor particularly want our aid, and in effect telling us to go jump in the lake.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite obviously the feeling of the majority of the population of this country that we should not tolerate the insults and policies of Nasser any longer. Certainly we have given him sufficient warning that unless he stops his meddlesome interference in the affairs of others, we are not going to supply him with any more aid. Twice in the recent past we have passed amendments to other laws affecting our foreign aid procedures, both quite obviously directed to Nasser's Egypt. I think it is high time that we made it absolutely clear that the United States cannot and will not knuckle under to blackmail; that we are invoking the law of aggression.

The House amendment which we would like to see as law does not affect the ability of the President to supply emergency food for humanitarian reasons under other titles of Public Law 480. It also does not prohibit the sale of our agricultural commodities for hard currency. Similarly, we in the House are not trying to legislate for the next fiscal year, nor have we attempted to permanently tie the hands of the President with respect to the conduct of foreign policy. Our aim is a simple and just one: 3 years ago we signed an agreement to provide Egypt with over $390 million in surplus foodstuffs. We have delivered over $350 million under that agreement. There remain 5 months and some $37 million to go. We do not want to see the remainder delivered—and for a purpose: how else can we express the rage of the American public at the actions of a tyrant? How else can we express our own feelings of frustration at this tyrant's words and deeds?

Mr. Speaker, we are entitled under paragraph 5 of article I of the 1962 agreement to terminate it if, and I quote, "because of changed conditions the continuation of such financing, sale, or delivery is unnecessary or undesirable." Clearly, I think, conditions have changed, making further delivery very undesirable. We here in Congress should not permit ourselves to be convinced that all actions heretofore taken are necessary or valuable. If we feel that the President is perhaps receiving poor advice in the conduct of our foreign policy in the Middle East, it is not only our right but also our duty to express the will of the American people as to what actions or policies our Government will adopt. Let us not pursue a policy in the Middle East that may lead to a crisis similar to that now existing in the Far East.

In this instance, Mr. Speaker, our path of action is clear: we must act. We must demonstrate to the world that the United States is not the impotent power in the Middle East which some have made us out to be. We must demonstrate to the world that we will tolerate neither the language nor actions of such despots as Nasser. We can at the present time best do this by severing our soft currency sales under Public Law 480 aid to Egypt for the remainder of this fiscal year. Tying our foreign policy in the Middle East to Egypt has provided us with a paucity of results. No wonder the Congress has reacted in the fashion it has heretofore. It is time for a change. Let us instruct the committee to stand by the House position.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in support of the position I took on January 26 when the House by a vote of 204 to 177 placed a limitation on the supplemental appropriation bill to prevent the use of funds appropriated by the supplemental for the sale of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic. I said then that it was time for Congress to implement the policy declarations which we wrote into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 and Public Law 480 in 1964. The situation has not changed.

Nasser's belligerency is well known. I do not have to recite the record of his hostility toward Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, or of his interference in the Congo or of his activities in Yemen—to say nothing of his contemptuous attitude toward the United States. The fact is that the assistance which Nasser receives under our foreign aid programs enables him to spend his resources on the ever spiraling arms race in which he is engaged. As I have said before, the United States must not underwrite this arms buildup.

This is not a new issue for the House. It is clear from the legislative history of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 and the extension of Public Law 480 in 1964 that the "aggressor nation" clauses of those acts were directed at the United Arab Republic. However, the "aggressor nation" clauses have never been implemented. Therefore, if the policy which we formulated is to have meaning, we must act.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct the conferees with respect to the use of funds in this supplemental appropriation for the sale of surplus commodities under title I of Public Law 480 to the United Arab Republic.

I think that the principal issue in all of this has been lost sight of in the debate and in the press. The question is not one of Presidential discretion. The question is very simply as to whether we are going to assist a nation that has been actively and openly supporting aggressive military activities against another nation receiving our aid, in clear violation of the spirit of the Foreign Assistance Act as it now stands.

On December 23, speaking before the Arab Social Union in Port Said, President Nasser said:

> This is our policy. It is a clear, well-known policy. We make it clear and public. We do not hide and have never denied that we have sent arms to the Congo. We say that we have sent arms to the Congo and will still send arms to it.

I think it is about time that we make our policy just as clear and well known. The United States is not going to send assistance to aggressor nations. It is just that simple; it is essential if our stated belief in progress through order and stability is not to be a mockery.

In 1963 the House wrote section 620(i) into the Foreign Assistance Act. That section provides:

> No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act.

To my knowledge the command of the law has not been enforced by the President. The determination required of the President has not been made. It is not a difficult one. Nasser himself has made it very clear that aggressive military efforts are underway.

I do not believe the President's hands will be tied by the action proposed to be taken. This ban on sales of surplus commodities to the Nasser regime would apply only to title I. The ban will be in effect only until June 30. If the President, under section 620(i) can report to the Congress at that time that he has determined that the military efforts have ceased and that he has received satisfactory assurances that they will not be renewed, the ban can be lifted. Certainly there is no question of an infringement of Presidential discretion involved.

The reasons for the inclusion of section 620(i) in the Foreign Assistance Act are just as valid now as they were in 1963. Our report pointed out at that time that a nation which turns its resources and energies to the harassment of other nations reduces its own capacity for economic development and the betterment of life for its people. In addition, failure of the United States to prevent such activity will be only an indication that the United States tolerates, if not endorses, such aggressive activities.

I urge that the motion be supported.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the United States if the Suez Canal might be shut down, as mentioned by a previous speaker, I believe is appropriate in this discussion because it raises a fundamental question.

Must we keep on paying ransom, and that is what it would amount to, in order to keep the Suez Canal open? If Nasser will shut down the canal if we shut off the flow of handouts to his government, then I say the sooner we face the showdown the better.

The impending financial crisis of the Commodity Credit Corporation has a familiar ring. Every day the Commodity Credit Corporation is mentioned to this body, it seems to be a day of crisis. It was a crisis when the appropriation bill was presented to the House last week. It was a crisis the day when it was in the Senate. It is a crisis again today. I am sure the country is going to get by today's crisis, whether we act or not. I am sure the next time CCC is before this body, that too will be a day of crisis. I am just as sure that New York banks stand ready to discount the Commodity Credit Corporation paper—and thus relieve the new crisis—just as they have heretofore.

The motion to instruct, proposed by the gentleman from Illinois, will bring to our relations with Nasser a measure of the same proper posture we apparently are now taking toward North Vietnam. The attack on North Vietnam was long overdue, and in my book, this rebuke to Nasser is long overdue.

Finally, there is ample precedent for this kind of restrictive action. The initial act, establishing Public Law 480, prohibited sales to the Soviet Union and to all Communist bloc countries. The prohibition is still in effect. Last year the Congress saw fit to add Yugoslavia and Poland to the list of countries excluded from benefit under title I sales.

So there is indeed ample precedent for what I consider to be the very wise restriction proposed in the gentleman's motion.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the situation in which we find ourselves today is one of the most confusing and difficult in my experience in the House of Representatives. But let there be no mistake about my position and the position of others of the leadership on this side of the aisle. We are supporting the President of the United States in this critical hour on a matter of utmost importance to our country.

Our friends on the other side have chosen to take advantage of a political opportunity. Some will call their move a cheap political trick. In my opinion, this misses the point. The course they have chosen is not just a case of naked political opportunism. It is more than just a cheap political trick. It is a course which was chosen despite consequences for the security of the United States and it violates the cardinal principle of American partisan politics which is "Will it hurt my country?"

Only yesterday, my good and distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader, sat in an extraordinary session of the National Security Council. He was a guest of the President who wanted his counsel on a critical foreign policy decision. I hope that our good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, will not today support an amendment which would endanger our national security and add to the burdens of the President by creating trouble in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, to vote for this amendment is to say to the President, "Mr. President, we want you to have flexibility to deal with the Vietnamese problem. We know you are the only one who can order American boys into combat. We know you are the only man who can push the button in a thermonuclear war.

"We know that you are entrusted with making life-and-death foreign policy decisions. But, Mr. President, we don't trust you to protect our interests in the Middle East."

The President recently made the following statement:

> I judge it of the highest importance that the flexibility provided the President by the Senate version be sustained by the Congress and I hope the House of Representatives will accept the improvements made by the Senate committee and voted by the Senate because if we are to protect our vital interests in this part of the world where tensions are very high, then the President must have freedom of action to act in the best interest of all the people of this land.

Now the President did not just say that he hoped the House would support the more flexible language. He said he personally judged House support to be "of the highest importance." Those words, Mr. Speaker, are strong words. But, as for me, I shall never turn my back on any President—Democrat or Republican—when, in his opinion, the stakes are so high.

Mr. Speaker, this involves only the matter of supporting the President of the United States in the performance of his duties and responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs—not in his interest, not in the interest of the Democratic Party—but in the national interest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, within the last 24 hours the President has shown firmness and strength in guarding the national security of the United States. He has shown beyond a shadow of a doubt that he can and will act decisively to defend the national interest. He has acted decisively and firmly in Vietnam. He can be depended upon to act decisively and firmly in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to vote down this motion.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. As the gentleman knows, at a recent meeting of the steering committee of the House of Representatives on the Democratic side, we wholeheartedly subscribed to this doctrine.

I wish to say, as I see it, for what it may be worth, after my having been here for 20 years and after my having voted for the foreign policies of every President of the United States, irrespective of party, I am going to vote for President Johnson, because I believe that, today, this is a vote of confidence or no confidence in our Government at a critical hour in our country's history. I do not like Nasser or Sukarno any more than those of you who voted against the administration on January 26, but our estimation of these two "pirates" is not at stake here—the real test is simply whether we support our President at a time when trouble, doubt, suspicion, and fear embrace the world. We must uphold the President's hand—and now is the time to do it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the distinguished minority leader, I wish to say, in answer to the distinguished majority leader relative to his comments with respect to political trickery, that if such a charge were properly leveled, then it surely would apply to the 76 members of his own party who joined me the first time we had the vote in the House. Further than that, I could very well have engaged in some lowbrow political trickery. I could very well have coupled my motion with a little thing having to do with the closing of VA hospitals, and so forth, but we are not going to be guilty on this side of engaging in that kind of so-called political trickery. This is a straight out-and-out motion on our part, made in good faith in keeping with our own personal convictions.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish to say to the gentleman that I said, "some may call this political trickery."

Mr. MICHEL. The RECORD will speak for itself.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I say without hesitation or qualification that the motion, if it is approved—if it receives a majority of the votes—will help, not hinder, the President of the United States.

In response to the statement made by my good friend the majority leader, it is perfectly true that I attended a meeting with the President yesterday, and I attended one this morning with the President and other congressional leaders. At both meetings, I told the President personally that I fully endorsed the action which was taken by him; and, furthermore, I have told the public that I fully endorse the action taken by this Democratic administration in reference to Vietnam.

But what we decide to do in Vietnam, individually and collectively, has no relationship whatsoever to a vote on this motion involving a completely different area of the world.

In my judgment this motion, if approved—and it is in the same language we approved on January 26—will not tie the hands of the President of the United States.

We know that this is applicable only to title 1 of Public Law 480. The President may, under titles 2, 3, and 4, make donations for humanitarian reasons or otherwise, to the people of and to the nation of the United Arab Republic.

Under no circumstances is this motion against the people—the people, I emphasize—of the United Arab Republic. We, in our typically American humanitarian way, can proceed, through action by the President, to make surplus agricultural commodities from this country available to the people of the United Arab Republic.

Furthermore, under existing legislation the President does have the authority under the foreign aid program to help and assist the United Arab Republic and its people, if he believes that is in our best interests.

So let us lay aside once and for all the feeling that this motion in any way whatsoever will handicap the prosecution of a foreign policy by our President.

On January 26, we spent a good part of a day discussing the pros and cons of the amendment which was included in this appropriation bill.

Anyone who is objective, after reading the debate, cannot help but come to the conclusion that the actions of Mr. Nasser warranted the kind of action that the House of Representatives took on January 26. I see no change in conditions between January 26 and today, February 8. The conditions that prevailed then prevail today. I say to you that it will be a little difficult, perhaps, for some people to explain, if they voted for this amendment on January 26, how they can, less than 2 weeks later, make a decision to vote differently today. I wonder how any explanation could be made. Nothing has intervened in the time between January 26 and today to warrant a change of vote.

It seems to me that if you read this RECORD—and it has been repeated today by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]—these men have documented sound reasons why we should reiterate what we decided to do by a rather overwhelming majority on January 26.

Yes, the United Arab Republic is inviting itself actively in Yemen. The United Arab Republic is inviting itself actively in helping forces that are opposing the best interests of the United States in the Congo. And, we are all familiar with the sad and tragic day when the United Arab Republic did nothing to prevent the sacking of the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library in that nation.

I say to you again and most firmly that a vote for this amendment will help and not hinder the President and will be beneficial and not detrimental to the foreign policy of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as the relatively new and inexperienced chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I would very much regret to see the House, on the very first appropriation bill of the year, instruct the House conferees even before they have had an opportunity to go to conference and try to work out the differences. I say especially to the new Members that perhaps every 3, 4, or 5 years this unusual type of action is taken, but certainly it is a very rare thing. To send us over to the conference as second-class conferees, so to speak, would not be wise. The prestige of a group representing the House is to some extent involved. That would be true no matter what committee might be involved.

Now, if you had to say that, "this is the only chance I have to express my views on aid to Egypt and on the sale of surplus food to Egypt," that would be a different proposition. But I say to you that there will be another vote on this specific issue of sale of surplus foods to Egypt when the conference report comes back. There will be another vote.

My able and eloquent friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], said that nothing has intervened since the House voted on this matter on January 26, and that if you voted to recommit at that time then you should vote to instruct the House conferees now. This is wholly irrelevant to the point. It is not unheard of to vote against instructing conferees when one might very well agree with the views of those who wished to instruct.

But has anything intervened? Of course something has intervened. The other body has put in a different version of the so-called Nasser amendment; a version that was not before you when you voted on the original motion on January 26. Just a while ago, the House disagreed to the Senate amendments—all of them. So in a sense we have already been instructed to follow the position of the House. Insistence of the House version is therefore our first position when we go to conference. If the other body refuses, as I feel certain it is likely to do, then we will have to seek some settlement other than the House version.

The eloquent and able leader on the Republican side of the other body, Senator DIRKSEN, voted to repudiate the position taken by 100 percent of the Republican Members who voted in the House on the original so-called Nasser proposition on January 26. And he is no babe in the woods in the matter of foreign affairs. He took the position that the Senate version of the so-called Nasser amendment is preferable.

So I do not believe that you are going to say to your conferees, you should not say, "We will not give you a chance to confer, we will downgrade you to the position of second-class conferees." I am confident you will not do that.

Let me say further: How did we get into this situation? We got into it pretty much by reason of the firm policy of the President with respect to Mr. Nasser. We have cut our other aid to the United Arab Republic to virtually nothing in the last 18 months. The President has been tightening up in that respect. We had sold to the United Arab Republic about $432 million worth of our surplus foods and then Mr. Nasser indicated that he wanted a new agreement to begin on this coming July 1, at the end of the present agreement. We have actually delivered 92 percent under the old agreement. Now he has indicated that he wants to renew this agreement. And what did he get? He got a resounding no, as I understand it, until at least his actions and his attitudes with respect to our interests are changed. All our consultations on aid questions with the United Arab Republic are at a complete standstill.

Our attitude with respect to further sales of surplus food to the United Arab Republic beyond July 1 next apparently infuriated Mr. Nasser. And so he made some statement adverse to the United States. But what I am trying to say is that your Government now, with respect to Mr. Nasser and with respect to aid to Egypt, is following a firm policy. This pending amendment does not say that we cannot give them or grant them food. It only says that we cannot sell them surplus food—not even the last 8 percent or so that we agreed to as part of the October 1962 agreement.

I think we would all agree that our Government was right in indicating that a further agreement with Nasser to supply surplus food should not be made. I, for one, certainly feel that a tough policy with Nasser is desirable. I feel that unless Nasser changes his conduct we should not make any further commitments to supply him with anything.

My view is that unduly restrictive congressional action at this time in this delicate situation is not in the best interests of the United States. A continent is involved, the Arab world, the Suez Canal, and the oil-rich Middle East. The President has asked permission to have the full authority to negotiate and handle relations with Egypt in this delicate and explosive situation. It appears to me to be in the best interests of the United States to let the President try to handle the problem for a time. I am supporting the President in this position.

So I say to you that in my judgment you should vote not to instruct the conferees because, in the first place, it is a slap at the conferees; in the second place, it is not necessary in order to express your view because you will have an opportunity later; and in the third place, we ought to preserve our ability to meet whatever situations may arise in conference to the fullest extent possible.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has expired.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This Nation cannot afford to experiment politically with a dangerous and explosive situation. How can we say, "Mr. President, you cannot sell surplus food to Egypt for 5 months, even though we made a contract for sale in 1962, but if you want, you can give it to them."

Mr. Speaker, no one in this body condones the recent actions of Mr. Nasser. It is, however, dangerous and irresponsible for this body to force the President of the United States into a position of reducing his means of negotiation in foreign affairs.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reiterate my full support of the motion by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] to instruct the House conferees to stand firm by the House position to call a halt to the continuing flow of aid to the United Arab Republic under Public Law 480.

I supported this effort last year, and again this year I urged such action by the House. On a number of occasions during recent years and months I have spoken out on this matter and inserted pertinent material in the RECORD.

I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership in this important matter and trust the motion will pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, Americans cannot afford to play paltry politics with the President of the United States while we as a nation face so many threats of aggression throughout the world. Gamal Abdel Nasser rates among the vilest of dictators in modern times. Like many thoughful Americans, I resent his attack upon the honor and the integrity of the United States. But despite my resentment of his actions, I do not intend to weaken the constitutional authority of the President of the United States in a time of so many crises throughout the world. Nor do I have any intention of carelessly mixing a completely domestic issue into the delicate field of foreign affairs.

Therefore, I am proud that the House of Representatives supported the President today. And I am pleased that we have acted with promptness in continuing our vitally essential feed grains program.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it seems abundantly clear to me that the action taken by this body on January 26 needs to be remembered. We voted on a major policy matter as though it were of little consequence.

I am sure that most of the Members of this House are opposed to the policy, program, and manners of Mr. Nasser. But this does not give us any excuse to take this opposition out on President Johnson. If the President is to have responsibility for the foreign policy of this Nation, then we must not enact legislation that would hamstring him.

It is not considered responsible statesmanship to play politics with a matter so important to our Nation as the conduct of foreign affairs. I do not want to be guilty of tying the hands of the President of the United States in the matter of foreign policy, and it is reasonably certain that most of the Members of this body do not wish to do this sort of irresponsible thing.

Whether or not the President always makes the right decision is a matter of opinion, but I do not wish to make his task more burdensome by this kind of nuisance legislation. President Lyndon Johnson is to be commended for his farsighted attitude toward our natural treasures as revealed in his message to Congress on the subject of natural beauty.

It is becoming more and more important that the beauty of recreational areas be a part of all our daily lives and that these areas be dispersed over the land so that all will have easy access to them, irrespective of his or her point of residence.

With the continued stepup of stress and tensions in our modern business and social lives, our people need an increasing amount of recreation and relaxation available to them in order that they might maintain the high efficiency that modern procedures demand of them.

The sort of thing the President proposes is a true development of the natural resources that will contribute to the economic and social good of our Nation.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to aid to Egypt just as I am opposed to aid to Sukarno and his ilk. Those that would extend their hand to us for aid; then thumb their nose with this same hand do not deserve our assistance.

I would hope that the President shares this view and this be our policy in foreign affairs. But this motion burrows deeper than aid and restrains the President in the conduct of his duty to the American people.

I cannot permit this appeal to emotion to inhibit the freedom of action of our President and put into jeopardy our national security. I am, therefore, opposed to the motion.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, the U.S. House of Representatives, under its constitutional legislative responsibility, voted to cut off shipments of surplus foods under current contracts to the United Arab Republic. This action reflected a growing resentment toward the questionable practice of attempting to buy friends with foreign aid.

Only 5 days after President Nasser of the Arab Republic angrily denounced the United States, the Department of Agriculture issued an authorization for shipment of some $14 million worth of wheat to the United Arab Republic. Under this arrangement, the United States pays cash for the wheat in the open market, ships it to Egypt where Nasser pays for it—not in dollars—but in Egyptian pounds to be spent there as part of the foreign aid program. Total cost of aid to Nasser in the past 10 years has been $1.1 billion. What has this fantastic sum bought?

Last month a Cairo mob burned the U.S. Kennedy Memorial Library, an unarmed commercial plane was shot down, and Nasser continued to supply the Congolese rebels and to pursue a policy of aggression, while asking for additional aid.

Under the 1963 Foreign Assistance Act, the President was directed by Congress to withhold economic aid, as well as food-for-peace aid from any nation committing aggressive acts against another country receiving our aid. It is time for vigorous action and firmness in foreign policy by our Government. It is time to discontinue underwriting nations who show no respect for the United States. As President Johnson in his recent state of the Union message declared—"the community of nations requires mutual respect. We shall extend it—and we shall expect it."

My previous vote and my vote today to ban the current aid program to the United Arab Republic reflects my conviction that now is the time to act in the best interest of America.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is my position that the United Arab Republic should get no more aid from this country, but I also believe that the Congress is not the branch of Government which should make this diplomatic decision. Diplomatic maneuvers cannot be legislated and in his conduct of foreign affairs of this Nation the President should not have his hands tied by inflexible legislation.

In support of this position I ask unanimous consent to include an editorial from the Washington Star dated February 1, 1965, and an article by Drew Pearson in the Washington Post dated February 1, 1965, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 1, 1965]

THE HOUSE ON NASSER

President Nasser of the United Arab Republic has asked for the action that our House of Representatives, by a vote of 204 to 177, has taken against him. The action, if the Senate follows suit, will put an end to the sale of surplus American food sorely needed in Egypt.

The vote, of course, would not have occurred if Nasser himself had not invited it. He did so by delivering a speech, just a few weeks ago, in which he declared, in effect, that the United States would be well advised to jump in the lake with its aid. Like President Sukarno of Indonesia, he thus put himself on the list of irritating people nominated for oblivion on Capitol Hill. And this is the more true because of the way in which he has tolerated mob action against a USIS library in Cairo, and supported pro-Communist military intervention in the Congo.

We happen to agree that Nasser should get no more aid from this country. But—and it is a big but—we also agree with Secretary of State Rusk that Congress is not the branch of Government which should make this decision. The President should not have his hands tied in advance by the type of inflexible legislation that has just been enacted. He, not Congress, is responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs, and the granting or withholding of aid is an important element of our diplomacy.

The Senate, when it gets around to the matter, will be rendering good service if it reverses the House action. It can do this in a manner that does not absolve Nasser. What is important is that the State Department and the President be permitted the flexibility essential to diplomatic maneuver in a difficult world.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 1, 1965]

NEW FOOD-TO-EGYPT DEVELOPMENTS

(By Drew Pearson)

Some hectic backstage developments contributed to the administration's defeat on sending surplus American food to Egypt. Some of these are continuing, as the Senate prepares to vote on whether to override the House.

Development No. 1 was an erroneous newspaper column which stated that Myer Feldman, White House adviser on Middle East matters, "was blocked off from the administration's recent decision" regarding food for Egypt; that Feldman was "excluded from the White House decision"—by McGeorge Bundy—not to suspend food shipments to Nasser.

The real fact is that Feldman and Bundy are good friends, consult with each other frequently. Though Feldman didn't attend the reported meeting, he did concur in the decision.

SEES U.S. ROLE USEFUL

Actually, he went much further and, speaking January 10 before a meeting of United Jewish Appeal, told 1,000 Jewish leaders that it was in the best interests of the United States and Israel that food shipments be continued to Egypt.

Feldman argued that if we did not continue friendly relations with Egypt, Egypt would swing toward the Communist camp; also that peace between Israel and the Arab world depended upon a broker, which the United States could continue to be. He pointed to the useful role of the United States at the first Arab summit conference in persuading Arab leaders not to attack Israel over the diversion of water from the Sea of Galilee.

However, Congressmen who voted to curtail food shipments had read the erroneous column, did not know Feldman's real position.

FOOD CONTINUANCE URGED

Development No. 2 was a cable from U.S. Ambassador Walworth Barbour in Israel, who reported that Nahum Goldman, the American Jewish leader who is now president of the World Zionist Organization, had urged Ambassador Barbour strongly not to discontinue food to Egypt.

Development No. 3 was Nasser's explanation that the burning of the American library in Cairo was instigated by Chinese Communists who distributed oil-soaked rags to rioting students. Nasser is prepared to pay $500,000 for the rebuilding of the library.

Development No. 4 was Nasser's explanation that the American oil company plane shot down over Egypt had the exact configuration of an Israel fighter plane, furthermore was definitely over Egyptian territory. He reported that the plane was not shot down hurriedly, but failed to answer Egyptian challenges.

PEARSON IN EGYPT

When this writer was in Egypt and Israel last summer, I reported that Nasser was following a policy of undercutting the United States in many areas. He has persuaded the Libyan Government to cancel the lease on the giant U.S. air base at Wheelus. He tried to persuade Haile Selassie, unsuccessfully, to cancel our communications base at Kagnew in Ethiopia. He has maintained 40,000 Egyptian troops in the Yemen, aimed primarily at American oil companies in adjacent Saudi Arabia. Since then, he has been sending arms and men into the Congo to support the Congolese rebels.

In Israel, I talked to the top leaders of that Government, asked them pointblank about the American policy of sending food to Egypt. Their reply was interesting.

They said: "After all, this food is for people. It's not for the Egyptian Government. And we have no quarrel with hungry people."

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased when a few days ago, a majority of my colleagues in this distinguished body, by a vote of 204 to 177, attached a rider to an appropriation bill which had the effect of requesting the President of the United States to withhold any further aid to the United Arab Republic. Now, the Senate has refused to accept this amendment. If the amendment did nothing else, it put us on record as to the sentiments of the American people.

I strongly urge the House members of the joint conference on this amendment to stand firm in their efforts.

To me it is unthinkable that the American taxpayer should be asked to give 1 more cent to Dictator Nasser or to assist him in any manner. We have already stood by while our Nation has been subjected to the insults of this pro-Communist dictator. We have watched the uprisings in Africa kill thousands of innocent people, many of them American citizens and these uprisings were, in fact, financed in part by Nasser's sales of our surplus foods to buy guns and ammunition for Congolese rebels. Certainly the American people cannot be asked to contribute further to these infamies.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are a generous people. We have great sympathy for the unfortunate people of Egypt under this dictator's heel. But how much of this surplus food actually goes to these unfortunate people? From the amount of aid that Nasser is able to give the Communists in Cyprus and the tremendous burden of maintaining his forces on the Yemen border, it appears to be very little.

We know, too, of the suppression of news in the United Arab Republic. There is no doubt in my mind that whatever minute amount of our surplus food does trickle down to the unfortunate United Arab Republic citizen, he certainly does not know its source.

We have been told by the State Department that we will be blamed in the Far East and Middle East press for starving the people of Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, how can we be blamed for this if we have never been given credit for feeding them in the first place?

Mr. Speaker, I voice the sentiments of myself, my district, my State, and the people of the United States when I say we should unanimously approve the motion to instruct the conferees to reject the Senate amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my profound regret that the Democratic leadership, through a parliamentary maneuver, prevented the membership from voting on whether to instruct the conferees to keep the Veterans' Administration from using certain funds to close down a number of its facilities.

I firmly believe there would have been an overwhelming vote against President Johnson's plan to close these installations, a move I consider to be heartless and based on false economy.

One such installation—the Bath, N.Y., VA Center—is located in my congressional district.

Certainly such a major step as has been ordered by the President should not be carried out without full hearings in both the House and the Senate.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in conclusion that it is not unique for us to instruct conferees, in either body for that matter. One need only to look at the makeup of who the conferees may be and how they voted the first time around to know what will happen in compromising the position of the House. What I am trying to do is to take the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and others who will serve as conferees, off the hook by giving them a sound, resounding vote of the House again to back up our position.

I urge Members of the House to support the motion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as other speakers have previously noted nothing has occurred in the few days that have elapsed since the House of Representatives, by a 27-vote margin approved an amendment making it the sense of Members of the House that aid to Dictator Nasser be ended.

Why should Nasser be given one thin dime, either in cash or agricultural commodities, as long as he thumbs his nose at the United States and tells us to "go to hell"?

It will indeed be interesting to note how the Members of the House vote today on this issue. It will be especially interesting to note the results of President Johnson's arm-twisting tactics.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the question today is quite different than it was when the matter of agricultural commodities aid under the Public Law 480 program for Nasser was before the House last week.

Today under the Senate amendment the President is required to give aid only when he finds that it is in the national interest.

We face crises in several areas with respect to international involvements and dangers to our security. In such situations, I think the President must have some flexibility that will enable him to act as he deems best in the conduct of crucial foreign policy matters and believe the proviso contained in this measure to act for the national interest is a satisfactory, workable formula for the next 5 months or so when the House will have another opportunity to review and reevaluate this issue, as it should have from time to time.

I think these considerations should move the House to clarify and qualify its position and make very clear its intention to stand behind the President in matters affecting the national interest and security of the United States.

In this regard, I bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a memorandum recently furnished me by the State Department in answer to my request of early January for information concerning recent events in the United Arab Republic.

This is the statement from the Department of State:

> Recent incidents in the United Arab Republic have caused many Americans to question the sale of American commodities to the United Arab Republic for local currency under Public Law 480. These incidents include the burning down of the USIS library in Cairo, the shooting down of an American-owned plane over United Arab Republic territory, and remarks of December 27 made by President Nasser. The great bulk of our assistance to the United Arab Republic is in the form of Public Law 480 sales which meet about one-quarter of all the food grain requirements of its people. Termination of this program would not affect United Arab Republic capacity to carry on its military programs, but could well convince the United Arab Republic Government that the United States is not sincere in its professed desire to help improve the living standards of the Egyptian people. Arbitrary termination could result in rapid deterioration of our relations with all Arab States and in increased hostile pressures against Israel.
>
> The burning of our USIS library in Cairo was a senseless act of destruction which the great majority of Egyptians deplore. The mob attacking the Embassy consisted of African students, with few if any Egyptians participating. The Egyptian police responded to the Embassy's call for assistance but did not arrive in time or sufficient numbers to protect the Embassy compound. On the day after the attack, our Ambassador in Cairo delivered a note of protest to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The following day our Embassy received a note from the United Arab Republic Government expressing regret for the damage done and willingness to compensate for the losses sustained. A detailed reckoning of the damages is being made and when it is complete a bill will be presented to the United Arab Republic Government. Meanwhile the United Arab Republic Government has made temporary quarters available. In a meeting with our Ambassador on December 19, President Nasser offered a gift of 1,000 volumes and an encyclopedia for a new American library in Cairo.
>
> The shooting down of an American-owned plane over the United Arab Republic has been investigated by the U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency. A preliminary report by those investigators indicates that communications failures and the apparent failure of the pilot to follow certain prescribed procedures for overflying the United Arab Republic were involved in the incident. While recognizing that certain procedural errors may have occurred, the U.S. Government does not consider them sufficient justification for the United Arab Republic action of shooting the aircraft down. A protest was made to the United Arab Republic Government on December 24 which reserves the right, pending completion of all aspects of the investigation, to claim restitution for loss of life and property.
>
> The remarks of December 27 resulted from a misunderstanding of the motives of the food for peace program. We know that the United Arab Republic authorities fully recognize the importance of the Public Law 480 program to the economy of the country.
>
> Current consignments of commodities to the United Arab Republic are in accordance with U.S. commitments under a 3-year agreement signed in 1963. The Department now has under consideration a new request from the United Arab Republic for a supplementary agreement. The interested agencies of the U.S. Government, including the Department, have not reached a decision on this request.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the imposition of restrictions on our conference committee. This is not a politically wise position for a new Member from my district. However, both I and the distinguished Congressman whom I succeed, the Honorable August Johansen, were sent here to vote according to our own best judgment after the arguments had been properly heard. He did not, and I shall not, do otherwise.

We are about to decide whether we resolve today, before proper and thorough studies by this Congress, an issue which is in no way related to the urgency of the supplemental appropriation to the CCC. We vote on whether we abandon or continue a system of committee study which has assisted Congress to order thoughtfully its activities.

The advantages to be gained by yielding to our emotions are obvious. The responsibilities of this body lie elsewhere.

Let us properly hear the arguments on these two unrelated issues, soon but at another time, and decide them individually, and on their own merits.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 241, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—165

Abbitt
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baldwin
Bates
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Farbstein
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gilbert
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stratton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tupper
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Weltner
Whalley
Widnall
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Younger

NAYS—241

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holland
Howard
Hull

Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Powell
Price
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
St Germain
St. Onge
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Selden
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watts
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—27

Abernethy
Baring
Battin
Bell
Blatnik
Brooks
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Cederberg
Clancy
Corbett
Evins, Tenn.
Gibbons
Hagan, Ga.
Hardy
Herlong
Holifield
Laird
Landrum
Martin, Mass.
Murphy, N.Y.
Pelly
Pucinski
Shipley
Toll
Williams
Wilson, Bob

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mr. Pelly for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Gibbons for, with Mr. Brooks against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, THOMAS, WHITTEN, NATCHER, Bow, and MICHEL.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tomorrow to file a conference report on House Joint Resolution 234.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the resolution, House Joint Resolution 234, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the House to the fact that one of its most beloved and courageous Members left a sickbed this morning to come here in line of duty. I join all Members of the House in welcoming back to the floor our beloved and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. Speaker, this demonstration certainly testifies to the affection which the House has for the gentleman and the gentleman's conduct in coming back today demonstrates to the country the fidelity of Members of the House toward the duties of their office. We commend the gentleman and we appreciate and admire his great courage.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members have the privilege of inserting their remarks in the RECORD following the passage of each of the bills I shall call up today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CANINE CORPS

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 1064) to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting through the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, are authorized to acquire, train, and maintain as many dogs as may be necessary to be used in connection with law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 1064, is to authorize the expansion of the canine corps of the Metropolitan Police force.

The use of dogs in urban police work originated in Belgium more than 50 years ago, and has since spread to many other countries. Today, more than 40 police departments in the United States are utilizing dogs in patrol work, and the number is increasing very rapidly.

The canine corps was first established in the District of Columbia in December 1959, and on April 19, 1960, six dogs went on the streets of the city with their handlers. By the end of that year, the number had increased to 20 such teams, and today the corps consist of 84 dogs on the streets and 6 more in training, for a total strength of 90.

The effectiveness of the canine corps as an arm of the Metropolitan Police Department may be evaluated from the following statistics for the calendar year 1964. During this period, there were approximately 75 man-dog teams patrolling the streets of Washington, D.C.

	Arrest with use of dog	Arrest without use of dog	Total
Housebreaking	232	148	380
Robbery	103	40	143
Assault	67	82	149
Larceny	50	39	89
Homicide	1	1	2
Destroying private property	3	10	13
Rape	7	1	8
Unauthorized use auto	17	37	54
Drunk and disorderly	52	163	215
Total	532	521	1,053

Thus, more than half of all the arrests made in these categories during that entire year were accomplished with the use of trained dogs. In addition to their actual participation in these arrests, the dogs of the canine corps have proved invaluable on many other occasions by the deterrent effect of their mere presence at the scene of actual or potential trouble. The dogs' keen sense of smell enables them to locate fugitives hiding in buildings, junkyards, and other places where the policemen would otherwise have a most difficult and dangerous task in apprehending them.

Your committee is informed that for several reasons any program of expansion of the corps cannot be made to proceed too rapidly. First, the recruitment and selection of the dogs must be accomplished carefully and deliberately. Then the training itself takes 14 weeks, and the nature of the training work forbids too large groups. In this connection also, each dog is assigned to one particular man, and this patrolman and his dog must be trained together. Thus, any rapid acceleration in the training program would take too many patrolmen off their regular beats at one time, to the detriment of law enforcement in the city. In addition, each man-dog team in service must be brought back for 1 day of refresher training every 2 weeks. For these reasons, the Police Department estimates that not more than 25 new dogs be acquired, trained, and added to the corps each year.

Thus far, all the dogs in the canine corps have been donated, and thus have cost the Police Department nothing. However, if the contemplated program of expansion necessitates the purchase of any of the new dogs, it is estimated that they may cost as much as $250 each. An item of expense is involved in the fact that the policemen who handle these dogs must transport them daily in their own cars, and also must keep the dogs at their homes. This calls for fenced yards and extra cleaning. Also, most of the work of these policemen must be performed at night. For these reasons, these men are paid additional compensation in the amount of $580 per year, as grade 2 technicians.

The cost of adding 10 man-dog teams to the present canine corps is estimated to be $21,500. This includes the patrolman's extra compensation as a technician, and the food and veterinary care for the dogs, but not any cost of purchase.

For the present fiscal year, the appropriation to the canine corps is $95,388, which is sufficient to bring the corps to a strength of 100 man-dog teams. Enactment of H.R. 1064 would provide legislative authorization for this and any further expansion of this corps, which has proved such an invaluable asset to law enforcement in the District of Columbia, which future need may dictate.

This bill is identical to H.R. 1935 of the 88th Congress—House Report No. 76—which passed the House on March 11, 1963.

The following letter, written by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the last Congress, expresses their endorsement of this proposed legislation:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, February 25, 1963.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report H.R. 1935, 88th Congress, a bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia. The bill authorizes the acquisition of as many dogs as may be necessary for police use. The police force now has approximately 70 dogs, most of which are on active duty. Some are still in training.

The Commissioners recognize that the man-dog teams of the canine corps of the Police Department have compiled an excellent record of crime detection and prevention since they first appeared on the streets of the District of Columbia in 1960. The corps was originally established on an experimental basis with five man-dog teams. With the concurrence of the congressional appropriation subcommittees the corps was continued on this basis through the fiscal year 1961. Fifty man-dog teams were authorized for fiscal year 1962 and 75 for fiscal year 1963.

The Commissioners have recommended an increase of 25 dogs in the budget for fiscal year 1964.

Therefore, the Commissioners recommend the enactment of this legislation.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Yours very sincerely,
F. J. CLARK,
Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

INCREASING THE RETIREMENT SALARIES OF CERTAIN RETIRED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDGES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 1066) to amend section 11–1701 of the District of Columbia Code to increase the retirement salaries of certain retired judges, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill (H.R. 1066) is to bring the compensation of the retired judges of the court of appeals and the District of Columbia court of general sessions in line with the pay raises granted, as of July 1, 1964, by Congress to all the other judges of these courts.

It is the opinion of your committee that such legislation is necessary and appropriate in order that the same salary ratio between active and retired District of Columbia judges under present law may be retained.

The 16 judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, and the 3 judges of the District of Columbia court of appeals are all included in the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964—H.R. 11049, recently passed by the Congress. However, through inadvertence, no provision was included therein to cover the two retired judges—one in the court of appeals and one in the court of general sessions. Inasmuch as each of these judges has continued to perform active service in the two courts named, it is felt that in fairness and justice they should be entitled to a proportionate raise in their compensation.

By the reported bill, those judges who have heretofore retired will have their retirement salary computed under the same formula and at the new rate of compensation as will be the case with judges who may in the future retire under the Federal Employees Salary Act—Public Law 88–426. In other words, there will be, and in the opinion of your committee there should be, no difference in the status of presently retired judges and judges who may retire in the future, at least insofar as such retirement occurs under the existing law.

In addition, when retired judges are called upon to perform full-time judicial duties, under this bill they will receive active duty salary of the office in which they perform such duties.

BACKGROUND

The Consolidation Act—Public Law 512, 77th Congress, 2d session—approved April 1, 1942, provides, in section 11, for the retirement of judges after serving 20 years or more, with compensation in equal monthly installments in the sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge on the date of such retirement that the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the total of 30 years.

Paragraph (b) of the same section provides that any judge receiving retirement salary may be called upon by the chief judge of either court to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him for a period up to 90 days in any year. But there is no provision therein for full salary for active duty pay. Your committee believes that it has been firmly established by the Congress that Government employees, whether judicial, military, civilian, or other, should receive full pay when performing full active duty.

The fact of the matter is, as stated, that both the retired judges have continued to perform active service, and one of them has given full time on the bench for the last 15 months, due to court vacancies, sickness, and vacations, and of course neither has received the compensation of a full-time judge even though he has worked full time. The reported bill would obviate such injustice.

Except for the provision giving full salary for active duty, this bill is identical to H.R. 12198 of the 88th Congress, which passed the House on August 11, 1964—House Report No. 1726.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This applies only to two judges.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It is retroactive?

Mr. McMILLAN. To July 1, 1964, at the time the new Salary Act was passed.

Mr. GROSS. To July 1, last year?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, and it applies only to the retirement of these two members of the District of Columbia judiciary, who have been called back to active duty with full schedules.

Mr. GROSS. This means these two judges will get this pay increase and will also get an increase in retirement?

Mr. McMILLAN. If they have been on active duty since July 1, they get active duty pay only.

Mr. GROSS. If they have been on active duty since July 1?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. What is their compensation in retirement? Is it full pay?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, only 66 percent.

Mr. GROSS. According to the salary scale before July 1, 1964?

Mr. McMILLAN. It is according to the Salary Act we passed some time ago. I think it is about 66 percent. And the local judges do pay into their retirement system.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11-1701 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by adding at the end of subsection (c) the following new sentence, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) . . . A judge receiving retirement salary pursuant to this section shall be entitled, for any period for which he performs full-time judicial duties under this subsection, to receive the salary of the office in which he performs such duties, but there shall be deducted from such salary an amount equal to his retirement salary for such period.

"(d) A judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals or the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions who has retired prior to the effective date of section 306 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 shall receive an increase in the retirement salary to which he is otherwise entitled under this section in the same percentage as the increase in salaries provided in section 306(1)(2) and section 306(1)(3) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 for judges who are serving on the effective date of such section 306 on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions."

SEC. 2. The increases in compensation authorized by the amendments of this Act shall be retroactive to July 1, 1964.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House District Committee I call up the bill (H.R. 1065) to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to provide an exemption from the tax imposed by such Act for certain operations of the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 128 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2605) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(s) Sales of materials and services to a Member of Congress for use in the performance of his official duties (as determined by the Clerk of the House of Representatives) made in connection with the operation of the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives by the printing clerks."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the gross receipts from any sales of materials and services to a Member of Congress made in connection with the operation of the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives by the printing clerks prior to the effective date of the first section of this Act shall be exempt from the tax imposed by the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act.

SEC. 3. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to the sale of materials and services made on or after the first day of the first month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 128 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2605) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(s) Sales of materials and services to the printing clerks of the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives for use in the operation of such rooms, and sales of materials and services made by such clerks in connection with the operation of such rooms.'

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to the sale of materials and services made on or after January 1, 1961."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments to the committee amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER:

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT TO THE TITLE OF THE BILL H.R. 1065

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to provide exemptions for certain operations of the House of Representatives from the taxes imposed by that Act and the District of Columbia Use Tax Act."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "paragraph" and insert in lieu thereof "paragraphs".

Page 2, line 21, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 2, after line 21, insert the following:

"(t) Sales of food, beverages, and other goods made to any person for use in the operation of the majority and minority cloakrooms of the House of Representatives and sales of such food, beverages, and other goods made by such person in connection with the operation of such cloakrooms."

Page 2, strike out lines 22, 23, and 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph (s) of section 128 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, added by the first section of this Act, shall apply with respect to the sale of materials and services made on or after January 1, 1961.

"(b) Paragraph (t) of section 128 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, added by the first section of this Act, shall apply with respect to sales made on or after the first day of the first month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed these amendments with Members on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle, and as far as I am concerned I agree to the amendments.

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to provide an exemption for the operations of the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives from the taxes imposed by such act in the District of Columbia Use Tax Act."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

"A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to provide exemptions for certain operations of the House of Representatives from the taxes imposed by that Act, and the District of Columbia Use Tax Act."

The amendment to the committee amendment to the title was agreed to.

The title was amended.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 1065, as amended by your committee, is to exempt from the application of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act and the District of Columbia Use Tax Act the operations conducted by the printing clerks of the House of Representatives in the majority and minority rooms, which were established many years ago to perform printing services for Members of the House of Representatives.

The printing clerks of the House of Representatives are employees of the House and receive a nominal salary in the performance of their services. The House of Representatives provides to the majority and minority rooms heat, light, space, and some furniture, but the printing clerks must supply, on their own account and expense, the printing equipment necessary to produce printed materials. Accordingly, the printing clerks must charge for their services, whether or not paper and other materials are furnished for the production of the finished printed product.

For many years the operation of the majority and minority rooms of the House was exempt from any District of Columbia taxes. The exemption was predicated upon the provisions in the District of Columbia tax law which exempt Government functions from all taxes. About 18 months ago, the tax officials of the District of Columbia learned that the equipment used by the printing clerks of the House was privately owned. Based on that finding, the District of Columbia levied property taxes retroactively against the House printing clerks and those taxes have been paid. While taking this action, the District tax officials determined that printed materials produced for Members of the House of Representatives were subject to sales tax and that equipment being used might be subject to application of the District of Columbia use tax.

The printing clerks were notified of liability for back sales taxes and for sales taxes of future services performed by them for Members of the House of Representatives.

The effect of the ruling of District of Columbia tax officials regarding application of sales tax on materials produced by the House printing clerks is to impose a sales tax on any portion of the stationery account of each Member which is used to furnish paper or other materials to the printing clerks for the production of printed materials. Under the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, the full value of paper, other materials, and the services performed in printing, is subject to sales tax whether or not a sales tax was paid for paper and materials prior to placing such materials in the hands of a printer. Thus, even though a Member of the House furnishes paper and materials, such Member would be required to pay sales tax on the total cost of the paper, materials, and printing services.

It is the intent of this bill, and the language so provides, that all operations of the printing clerks performed in the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives be exempt retroactively from all sales taxes on materials or services and exempt from use taxes on all equipment in use or which may be purchased by the printing clerks to perform printing services for Members of the House of Representatives.

The bill does not reduce the tax revenues to the District of Columbia in any respect since no taxes have been collected from this source in the past.

This bill is identical to H.R. 12371 of the 88th Congress, which passed the House on September 4, 1964—House Report No. 1846.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], to call up some bills.

REPORTS TO THE POLICE OF MOTOR VEHICLE COLLISIONS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H.R. 947) to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (43 Stat. 1124; sec. 40–609(r), D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended (a) by adding at the end of the first paragraph the following: "In addition to the preceding requirements with respect to the action to be taken immediately in cases involving personal injury or substantial damage to property, every person who, in the District of Columbia, operates a motor vehicle which is involved in a collision, which has resulted in damage to the property of any one person in excess of $100 or in bodily injury to or in the death of any person, shall immediately make a written report thereof to the Chief of Police, on a form prescribed by him. Such written report shall be made without regard to the degree of personal injury resulting from such collision. In the event the operator of a motor vehicle involved in a collision is injured or otherwise disabled to such an extent as to render him incapable, in the opinion of his attending physician, of making any report of the collision as required by this subsection, such operator shall make such report within forty-eight hours after the date on which, in the opinion of his attending physician, he can reasonably be expected to have recovered from his injury or other disability to the extent of being able to prepare and submit the required report."; and (b) by striking "substantial" in the third paragraph.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Commissioners may be delegated by said Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 947, which is a Commissioners' bill, is to require that all collisions involving motor vehicles in the District of Columbia which result in property damage in excess of $100, or in personal injury of any degree, be reported immediately to the District of Columbia Chief of Police.

Under present law, motor vehicle collisions as described above must be reported within 5 days to the safety responsibility officer of the District of Columbia, who functions as a part of the Department of Motor Vehicles and whose primary responsibility is to determine the financial responsibility of the various parties to such accidents. However, only those collisions which result in personal injury are required to be reported to the Chief of Police. Although the Police Department is required to forward copies of all their accident reports to the safety responsibility officer, the latter does not send his reports to the Police Department.

Your committee is informed that during fiscal year 1964, while 37,691 motor vehicle collisions were reported to the safety responsibility officer, only 29,345 were reported to the Chief of Police. Thus, during this year 8,346 motor vehicle accidents involving property damage in excess of $100 were never reported to the police.

Two glaring weaknesses are inherent in this situation. First, whereas copies of all the Police Department's reports are sent to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering and Operations of the District of Columbia Highway Department, where they serve to reveal dangerous areas in the city's street system and thus guide the Highway Department in effecting corrective measures, the safety responsibility officer's reports are not adaptable for this purpose and hence are not sent to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering. Thus, the facts involved in 8,346 serious collisions were not made available to the Highway Department for this very valuable purpose during fiscal year 1964.

The second major point of weakness which H.R. 947 seeks to correct is the matter of the chronic offenders among the drivers involved in the 9,000 collisions per year of which the police are not apprised. When any driver becomes involved in accidents with sufficient frequency to cause suspicion as to his fitness to operate a motor vehicle, the safety responsibility officer reports the case to the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles, who orders a hearing to determine the person's fitness status, both physical and with respect to attitude. An adverse finding as a result of this hearing brings about a suspension or revocation of the offender's permit to drive. However, the safety responsibility officer and the Department of Motor Vehicles do not and cannot act in any way to initiate legal prosecution against any such offender, for this is a police function. It is obvious that a chronically negligent driver, utterly lacking in a normal sense of responsibility, may become involved in frequent motor vehicle collisions and thus become a real hazard to the public; and while suspension or revocation of the operator's permit may be effective in some such cases, certainly in many others nothing short of legal prosecution can provide the protection to which the public is entitled.

H.R. 947, therefore, is designed to bring about a degree of accident control and traffic safety which is not possible under the existing law.

This bill is identical to H.R. 1982 of the 88th Congress—House Report No. 78—which passed the House on March 11, 1963.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Since this bill deals with additional reports to the police of motor vehicle accidents, is the committee giving any consideration to compulsory insurance in the District of Columbia? I understand there are a substantial number of drivers in the District of Columbia who are not required to obtain and do not have liability insurance.

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the chairman of the full committee to reply to the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. During the 88th Congress we had several bills under consideration about the subject to which the gentleman refers, but for 8 months we have been waiting for the Commissioners' recommendations. We expect to act on this legislation during the present session of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from South Carolina. I would hope his committee would expedite such legislation. It is unthinkable that there would be so many uninsured drivers in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. I certainly agree with the gentleman. I have been in favor of this legislation ever since I have been chairman of this committee. During previous Congresses, the House has been successful in securing favorable consideration to proposals of this nature, but they never become law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUIRING PREMARITAL EXAMINATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 3314) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all applications for marriage licenses shall be open to inspection as public records. All such applications upon which licenses have not yet been issued shall be kept together in a separate file readily accessible to public examination.

Sec. 2. No application for a marriage license shall be accepted unless there shall be filed therewith a statement or statements, signed by a person in the District of Columbia certified by the Department of Public Health as duly qualified to administer and interpret such test, or by a physician licensed to practice medicine in the District of Columbia or in a State or territory of the United States, or by a commissioned medical officer in the military service, or Public Health Service of the United States, that the applicant has submitted to a standard laboratory blood test within thirty days prior to the filing of such application, and that, in the opinion of such physician, or medical officer, or certified person based upon the result of that test, the applicant is not infected with syphilis in a stage of that disease in which it can be transmitted to another person, but such statement shall not disclose the technical data upon which it is based. Any such statement shall include the name of the person or laboratory administering the test, the name of the test administered, the exact name of the applicant, and the date of the test.

Sec. 3. No marriage license shall be issued until twenty-four hours following the filing of the application.

Sec. 4. For good cause a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have the power to waive the provisions of either or both of the foregoing two sections and, upon his certificate that public policy or the physical condition of either of the parties requires the intended marriage to be celebrated without delay, a license may be issued without compliance with the provisions of the section so waived.

Sec. 5. Any applicant for a marriage license, physician, or representative of a laboratory who shall misrepresent his identity or any of the facts called for by the certificate form prescribed by this article; or any licensing officer who shall issue a marriage license without having received the certificate form or an order from the court, or who shall have reason to believe that any of the facts on the certificate form have been misrepresented, and shall nevertheless issue a marriage license; or any person who shall otherwise fail to comply with the provisions of this article shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and punishable accordingly.

Sec. 6. This Act shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law of those States which enact it.

Sec. 7. This Act may be cited as the Uniform Marriage License Application Act.

Sec. 8. All Acts or parts of Acts which are inconsistent with provisions of this Act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 9. This Act shall take effect upon the expiration of ninety days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill H.R. 3314, is to require laboratory tests of persons who are contemplating marriage, with a view to ascertaining whether they are affected with syphilis in a communicable stage. The bill provides that no license would be issued without certification by a physician or authorized designated person that the parties contemplating marriage are not infected with such disease, or if infected, that such disease is not in such stage to be transmitted to another person.

The bill is based upon the Uniform Marriage Application Act proposed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law in 1950. Forty-five States now require by statute some form of premarital examination or routine serological testing for syphilis as a condition precedent to the issuance of a marriage license. Nearby Virginia has such a requirement although Maryland does not.

Your committee has been disturbed by reports made of the high percentage of infectious syphilis cases reported in the District of Columbia.

From 1956 to 1963, the number of reported cases of infectious syphilis in the District of Columbia increased from 36 to 711. This was an increase from 4.3 cases per 100,000 population to 92.3 cases. In 1963, among cities of 200,000 population or over, Washington, D.C., was second only to Newark, N.J., and there were only 4 other cities with a rate of over 50 cases per 100,000 population. During the period from 1956 to 1963, the national rate also increased, but not nearly so dramatically from 4.1 cases per 100,000 population to 11.9 cases.

While some of the indicated increase in the District of Columbia may be the result of better case findings and better reporting, the indications are that the major part of the increase is an actual increase. This is confirmed by reports from 63 cities throughout the country, 28 of which have attributed the major part of their own increase to an actual increase in cases.

How many cases exist which are not reported is not estimated, but the above figures are so impressive as to confirm the necessity of the enactment of legislation such as proposed in this bill. The District of Columbia Commissioners in the past have favored such legislation and it is certainly the hope of those concerned therewith that these tests will materially contribute to education of the public and to the avoidance and treatment of this disease, thereby curtailing its spread as well as materially contributing to the prevention of genital syphilis in the District of Columbia.

The Department of Public Health in the District of Columbia estimates that the enactment of the bill would require between 19,000 and 20,000 serologic tests each year, approximately 75 percent of which would be performed by this Department, the other 25 percent estimated to be handled by private or hospital laboratories.

The extra services and supplies required by the Department of Public Health is estimated to cost less than $10,000 per year, a very small price to pay for attempting to remove this disgrace from the Nation's Capital.

This bill is identical to H.R. 11302 of the 88th Congress, which was approved by the House on September 29, 1964—House Report No. 1845.

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: Page 2, line 2, immediately after "medicine" insert "or osteopathy".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING LAW RELATING TO DIVORCE, LEGAL SEPARATION, AND ANNULMENT OF MARRIAGE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 948) to amend part II of the District of Columbia Code relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16–902 of the District of Columbia Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 16–902. Residence requirements

"No action for divorce shall be maintainable unless one of the parties to the marriage has been a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia for at least six months next preceding the commencement of the action. No action for annulment of a marriage performed outside the District of Columbia shall be maintainable unless one of the parties is a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of the commencement of the action. No action for the affirmance of any marriage shall be maintainable unless one of the parties is a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of the commencement of the action. The residence of the parties to an action for annulment of a marriage performed in the District of Columbia shall not be considered in determining whether such action shall be maintainable."

Sec. 2. Section 16–904 of the District of Columbia Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 16–904. Grounds for divorce, legal separation and annulment

"(a) A divorce from the bond of marriage or a legal separation from bed and board may be granted for adultery, actual or constructive desertion for one year, voluntary separation from bed and board for one year without cohabitation, or final conviction of a felony and sentence for not less than two years to a penal institution which is served in whole or in part. A legal separation from bed and board also may be granted for cruelty.

"(b) A judgment of legal separation from bed and board may be enlarged into a judgment of divorce from the bond of marriage upon application of the innocent party, a copy of which shall be duly served upon the adverse party, after the separation of the parties has been continuous for one year next before the making of the application.

"(c) Marriage contracts may be declared void in the following cases:

"First. Where such marriage was contracted while either of the parties thereto had a former wife or husband living, unless the former marriage had been lawfully dissolved.

"Second. Where such marriage was contracted during the lunacy of either party (unless there has been voluntary cohabitation after the discovery of the lunacy).

"Third. Where such marriage was procured by fraud or coercion.

"Fourth. Where either party was matrimonially incapacitated at the time of marriage and has continued so.

"Fifth. Where either of the parties had not arrived at the age of legal consent to the contract of marriage (unless there has been voluntary cohabitation after coming to legal age), but in such cases only at the suit of the party not capable of consenting."

SEC. 3. Section 16-916 of the District of Columbia Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 16-916. Maintenance of wife and minor children; maintenance of former wife; enforcement

"(a) Whenever any husband shall fail or refuse to maintain his wife, minor children, or both, although able to do so, or whenever any father shall fail or refuse to maintain his children by a marriage since dissolved, although able to do so, the court, upon proper application, may decree, pendente lite and permanently, that he shall pay reasonable sums periodically for the support of such wife and children, or such children, as the case may be, and the court may decree that he pay suit money, including counsel fees, pendente lite and permanently, to enable plaintiff to conduct the case.

"(b) Whenever a former husband has obtained a foreign ex parte divorce, the court thereafter, on application of the former wife and with personal service of process upon the former husband in the District of Columbia, may decree that he shall pay her reasonable sums periodically for her maintenance and for suit money, including counsel fees, pendente lite and permanently, to enable plaintiff to conduct the case.

"(c) The Court may enforce any decree entered under this section in the same manner as is provided in section 16-911 of the District of Columbia Code."

SEC. 4. Section 16-920 of the District of Columbia Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 16-920. Effective date of decree for annulment or absolute divorce

"A decree, annulling or dissolving a marriage, or granting an absolute divorce, shall not become effective until the time for noting an appeal shall have expired, and, if notice of appeal has been entered, such decree shall not become effective until the date of the final disposition of the appeal."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the laws of the District of Columbia, relating to divorce, separation, and annulment of marriage, have had essentially no changes in their substantive provisions since the last general revision of such law in 1935. During the years since that action by Congress, the laws in most other States have been changed substantially, and the District of Columbia today is not in harmony with the provisions of most other jurisdictions including the adjoining jurisdictions of Maryland and Virginia. H.R. 948 is recommended by your committee to bring the provisions of the District of Columbia laws into closer harmony with adjoining jurisdictions and into a more general conformity with the provisions of other States.

The bill, H.R. 948, as reported by your committee, would amend the District of Columbia Code to provide the following:

First. That where the cause for divorce occurs within or without the District, either party to the marriage may bring the divorce action if either party has been a resident of the District of Columbia for a period of 6 months next preceding the commencement of the action.

Existing law requires the petitioner to have been a bona fide resident of the District for a period of 1 year when the cause arose within the District, or a bona fide resident for 2 years when the cause arose outside of the District.

Second. An action for annulment of a marriage performed outside of the District of Columbia may be maintained if one of the parties to the action is a bona fide resident of the District at the time of the commencement of the action. In case of a marriage performed within the District of Columbia, either party may bring an action for annulment and the residence of the parties at the time the action is commenced shall not be a factor in determining whether the action shall be maintainable.

Present law requires that the petitioner must have been a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia for a period of 1 year, in order to maintain an action in annulment, regardless of whether the marriage was performed within or without the District of Columbia.

Third. An action to affirm the validity of a marriage, whether performed within or without the District of Columbia, may be maintained if either party is a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time the action is brought.

No residence requirement is stated in existing law relating to the affirmance of a marriage.

Fourth. An absolute divorce may be granted on the ground of actual or constructive desertion which has continued for a period of 1 year.

Present law provides for absolute divorce on the ground of desertion only after a period of 2 years.

Fifth. Voluntary separation without cohabitation is a ground for an absolute divorce after 1 year with no cohabitation.

Present law provides that a period of voluntary separation without cohabitation for a period of 5 years is a ground for an absolute divorce.

Sixth. An absolute divorce may be granted where there has been a conviction for a felony and a sentence of not less than 2 years in a penal institution has been imposed and where such sentence is served in whole or in part.

Existing law requires that the felony be one "involving moral turpitude."

Seventh. In addition to the foregoing grounds for an absolute divorce, a limited divorce may be granted on the ground of cruelty.

Eighth. A decree for a limited divorce may be enlarged into an absolute divorce on application by the innocent party after 1 year measured from the time the limited divorce was granted.

Existing law provides for the enlargement of a limited divorce to an absolute divorce on application by the innocent party after 2 years.

Ninth. Marriage contracts may be declared void if: First, either party had a lawful husband or wife by a previous undissolved marriage; second, lunacy of either party is discovered and there is no cohabitation following the discovery; third, the marriage was procured by fraud or coercion; fourth, either party is matrimonially incapacitated; fifth, either party lacked the age of consent and there was no cohabitation after attainment of legal age.

Present law is essentially the same except for the combined statement of grounds relating to lunacy and to fraud and coercion.

Tenth. Where a husband fails to maintain his wife, minor children, or both, or where a father fails to maintain his children by a previous marriage, the court, on proper application, may decree, pendente lite and permanently, the support of such wife and children or such children, and the court may decree suit money including counsel fees.

Where a former husband has obtained an ex parte divorce in a foreign jurisdiction, the court, on application of the former wife, after personal service and process upon the former husband in the District of Columbia, may decree the payment of reasonable sums periodically for her maintenance and suit money including counsel fees.

Existing law provides that whenever a husband fails to maintain his wife and minor children, the court, on application of the wife, pendente lite and permanently, may decree the payment of sums periodically, for the maintenance of herself and the minor children committed to her care by the court.

Eleventh. A decree for annulment or absolute divorce shall not become effective until the time for noting an appeal (10 days) shall have passed, or, in the event of an appeal, not until final disposition of the appeal.

Present law provides for a 6-month waiting period after a final decree before such decree becomes effective.

The provisions of H.R. 948 amending the District of Columbia divorce, legal separation, and annulment laws, as above set forth, will bring the District's law more into line with the laws of various State jurisdictions and more particularly with the laws of Maryland and Virginia. Under the provisions of the bill, where the cause for divorce occurs within or without the District, either party to the marriage may, as stated, bring the divorce action if either party has been a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia for a period of 6 months. This change would permit a nonresident to sue for divorce in the District of Columbia where the other spouse has resided in the District for a period of 6 months.

This would provide a remedy to the nonresident wife whose husband has deserted her and established residence in the District of Columbia. The deserted wife could come to the District and invoke the jurisdiction of the District's courts and obtain an adjudication of her right to divorce, property rights, and rights to support for herself and her children.

In the matter of residence requirements, the laws of Maryland and Virginia are similar to those proposed in H.R. 948. The Maryland statute merely requires that either the party plaintiff or the defendant be a resident of the State at the time of the application for a divorce or an annulment is made, unless the cause of action arose outside of the State, in which case the party plaintiff or defendant must have resided within the State for a period of 1 year. The Virginia statute requires that one of the parties shall have been a resident of the State for 1 year before commencement of the action.

The bill amends existing law with regard to the annulment of marriages. It would appear that public policy favors reasonably prompt dissolution of marriages where either party can justify an annulment. The bill facilitates the possibility of prompt action by permitting either party to bring an action to annul a marriage performed outside of the District if either party is a resident of the District of Columbia at the time the action is brought. In connection with marriages performed in the District, either party may bring an action for annulment and the question of residence shall not be a consideration in determining whether the action is maintainable.

H.R. 948 also amends the law of the District of Columbia relating to causes for divorce. The bill makes the following changes in the grounds for divorce:

First. The period of actual or constructive desertion as a ground for absolute divorce is reduced from 2 years to 1 year.

Second. The period of voluntary separation required as a ground for an absolute divorce is reduced from 5 years to 1 year.

Third. The words "involving moral turpitude" are eliminated from the description of a felony conviction as a ground for absolute divorce.

Fourth. The waiting period for enlarging a limited divorce into an absolute divorce is reduced from 2 years to 1 year from the date of separation of parties.

The reduction of the period of actual or constructive desertion from 2 years to 1 year would bring the District statute into line with that of the State of Virginia and 25 other States which have a similar 1-year requirement in their laws. In Maryland, the period for desertion is 18 months. The reduction of the period for voluntary separation without cohabitation from 5 years to 1 year would make the District statute more comparable to the requirement of the State of Maryland which is a period of 18 months. The State of Virginia requires 3 years. The reduction of the waiting period for enlarging a limited divorce into an absolute divorce brings the District of Columbia statute into line with the law of the State of Virginia, which likewise provides for such action after 1 year. Maryland has no statutory provision under which limited divorces may be granted.

The bill eliminates the presently required 6-month waiting period before a final decree of annulment or absolute divorce becomes effective. The law for the District of Columbia would thus parallel the similar provisions of, first, Virginia, where a final decree becomes effective on the determination of the issues, and, second, Maryland, where the final decree becomes effective immediately on determination that ground for divorce exists.

This bill is a refinement of similar legislation introduced and considered during the 86th and 87th Congresses, and is identical to H.R. 10777 of the 88th Congress—House Report No. 1541—as approved by the House on July 27, 1964.

The committee heard testimony from representatives of the District of Columbia bar, the District of Columbia Domestic Relations Committee of the Bar Association, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Your committee has been informed that the judges of the court of general sessions have no objection to the bill.

The enactment of the bill will not involve any additional expense to the government of the District of Columbia.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW TRUSTEES IN DEEDS OF TRUST

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] to call up a bill from his subcommittee.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 647

A bill to amend the Act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 522 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45–603), is amended by inserting immediately after "a new trustee" the following: "by agreement of the parties pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45–614(b)) or", and by striking out "or trustee" in the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", trustee, or new trustee".

(b) Section 534 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45–611), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing contained in this section shall prevent the appointment of a new trustee pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45–614(b)) and the execution of the trusts of said deed of trust by such new trustee."

(c) Section 537 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45–619), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing contained in this section shall prevent the appointment of a new trustee pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45–614(b)) and the execution of a deed of release by such new trustee."

(d) Section 538 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45–614), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before "In case of the refusal" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and notwithstanding any provision in a deed of trust to the contrary, whenever the grantors named in, and the persons secured by, the deed of trust (or their successors in interest) so desire, they may by written agreement executed and acknowledged in the same manner as an absolute deed substitute any trustee named in the deed of trust with a new trustee. No written instrument entered into pursuant to this subsection shall be effective as to any person not having actual notice thereof until a notice of the appointment of the new trustee signed, sealed, and acknowledged by the parties agreeing to the appointment of the new trustee shall be recorded among the land records in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds.

"(c) Notwithstanding any provision of a deed of trust to the contrary, the owner of the debt secured by such deed of trust may, by a written designation signed, sealed, and acknowledged by him, appoint substitute trustees, and such designation shall be effective from and after the tenth day following the filing of such designation in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and the service of a copy thereof upon the debtor in the manner provided for the service of a petition by section 534 of this subchapter, unless within such ten-day period the debtor shall file in said court an objection to the appointment of any such substitute trustee. In the event any such objection is filed in said court, further proceedings shall be in accordance with section 534 or 537 of this subchapter, or subsection (a) of this section, whichever is appropriate. The clerk of the court shall maintain a separate docket in which there shall be kept a record of designations of substitute trustees filed under this subsection."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to all deeds of trust, whether entered into before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 647, is to provide for the substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by means of a written instrument entered into by all the parties or their successors in interest, notwithstanding any provision of the deed of trust to the contrary.

The bill affects two situations whereby new trustees to a deed of trust can be appointed. One is where the parties to a trust agree in writing to the appointment. Provision is included that before any such instrument is effective, notice of the appointment of the new trustee, bearing the signatures under seal of the parties, and acknowledged by them, shall be recorded among the land records in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds. This affords notice to other parties not having actual notice of the designation of the new trustee.

The other situation covered by the bill is where the owner of the debt secured by a deed of trust may, unilaterally, acting on his own, and without the prior agreement of other parties to the deed of trust, appoint a new trustee by written designation signed, sealed, and acknowledged by said owner of the debt. However, in such case, such appointment of new trustee is effective only after the lapse of a 10-day period following the filing of such designation with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and service thereof on the debtor. If the debtor within the 10-day period files an objection to the appointment of such trustee, court proceedings would follow as are provided under the District of Columbia Code for appointment of a substituted trustee in the event of death of the designated trustee, under which proceedings the court may appoint a new trustee.

This bill is identical to H.R. 682 of the 88th Congress—House Report No. 74—which passed the House on March 11, 1963. Hence the letter from the Commissioners expresses approval of the present bill.

AUTHORIZE DISCHARGE OF PAROLEES FROM SUPERVISION PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION OF THEIR MAXIMUM TERM

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] to call up some bills from his subcommittee.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 66) to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 66

A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to establish a Board of Indeterminate Sentence and Parole for the District of Columbia and to determine its functions, and for other purposes", approved July 15, 1932, as amended (sec. 24–204, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 4." and by adding a new subsection at the end of section 4 to read as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Board of Parole may, subject to the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, promulgate rules and regulations under which the Board of Parole, in its discretion, may discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced."

Sec. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 66, which was requested by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is to authorize the Parole Board for the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision when the Board deems that the purpose for which the parole was granted has been accomplished.

The groundwork for this proposed legislation actually was started in 1956, when the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners appointed a Committee on Prisons, Probations, and Parole to supervise a study of the problem of overcrowding in the District's correctional institutions, and also the existing policies with respect to probation and parole. The report of this Committee, submitted in 1957, included a recommendation that the Parole Board be granted the authority which is incorporated in this bill.

The District of Columbia Board of Parole has advised the Commissioners that under its parole supervision there are presently many persons under sentences which would require that they be supervised for periods as long as 20 to 30 years, and in some cases even for the rest of their natural lives. Moreover, many such individuals have been out on parole for 10 or even 20 years, and have made very good adjustments to community life. In such cases, the Board of Parole is of the opinion that the purpose for which the sentences were originally imposed—namely, the rehabilitation of the individuals—has been accomplished and that to require such persons to continue under parole supervision would not serve any useful purpose. It is their opinion, in fact, that such continued supervision might well lead to a depressed mental attitude which in some cases might prove detrimental to a good adjustment previously attained. Moreover, it is felt that this possibility of early discharge from supervision may provide an incentive to prisoners facing long parole terms, to strive to make a good adjustment.

A member of the District of Columbia Parole Board has advised this committee that at present the Board has 107 persons who have been under parole supervision for 5 years or more, perhaps 10 percent of whom might be discharged from supervision under the provisions of this bill; and another 73 persons who have been on parole for 10 years or longer, some 40 percent of whom might be relieved from supervision by the Board. Thus, it seems probable that the parole supervision of some 40 to 50 present parolees might be terminated if this bill is enacted.

This committee understands that the authority which this bill would grant, to discharge such parolees from supervision prior to the termination of the original sentence, would be discretionary with the Board of Parole, and that a favorable recommendation by the parolee's supervisory parole officer will be a prerequisite to consideration of any such case by the Board.

Your committee is informed also that several States, including California, Connecticut, and Ohio, have enacted similar legislation, and that in 1958 the Congress granted this same discretionary authority to the U.S. Board of Parole in connection with Federal employees.

At a public hearing conducted on September 30, 1963, no opposition to this bill was expressed.

The current bill, H.R. 66, is identical to H.R. 4333 of the 88th Congress—House Report No. 838—as it passed the House on October 14, 1963.

AMENDING ACT WITH RESPECT TO EXEMPTIONS FROM ATTACHMENT FOR NONRESIDENTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 1007) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1007

A bill to amend the Act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1107 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 15–403), is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting immediately after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the wages (as defined in section 1104 A(f) of this Act) of any person not residing in the District of Columbia who does not earn the major portion of such wages in the District of Columbia shall, in any case arising out of a contract or transaction entered into outside of the District of Columbia, be exempt from attachment, levy, or seizure, by any process or proceeding of any court, judge, or officer of the District of Columbia in the same amount and to the same extent as is provided by the law of the State in which such person resides for persons residing therein. Whenever any claim is made for an exemption from attachment pursuant to this subsection, the burden shall be upon the plaintiff to prove that the contract or transaction involved in the case was entered into within the District of Columbia."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 1007, is to stop a practice which has developed in relation to the use of garnishment laws in a way which enables a creditor to do indirectly what he is not permitted to do directly in his own jurisdiction.

This practice involves the filing in the District of Columbia of an action for garnishment against an employer who also has a business in Maryland so as to secure payment by attachment of wages from an employee who is not a resident of the District. The object of such practice is to escape the limitations in States outside the District, regarding exemptions from garnishment in favor of employees. This bill is designed to assure that where an action in such a case is brought in the District of Columbia, the nonresident defendant involved will be entitled to the same exemptions as are provided by law in the State in which the said defendant may reside.

Maryland law, for example, provides for an exemption from attachment of wages and salaries in the amount of $100 for each pay period. In a month, or 4⅓ weeks, this exemption would aggregate $433. Your committee has been informed that some persons in the debt collection business have found that the District of Columbia garnishment law provides a lower exemption; namely, 90 percent of the first $200 per month of wages, 80 percent of the next $300 per month, and 50 percent of all above $500 per month. In the case of a worker earning a wage of $100 per week, or $433 per month, therefore, an employee's entire salary would be exempt from attachment in Maryland, but in the District of Columbia only $366.40 per month would be exempt, leaving $66.60 per month subject to garnishment.

Accordingly, your committee, in hearings, was advised that Baltimore creditors, with claims against employees living and working in Baltimore, have in several instances determined that the employers also have places of business in the District of Columbia and hence are subject to service of garnishment or attachment process in the District, and accordingly have brought their claims to Washington and filed suits here, laying an attachment against the wages of the employee debtor in the hands of the employer, thus escaping the exemption from attachment provided by Maryland laws.

This same procedure could conceivably be adopted by collection agencies from any State if the employer maintains a place of business in the District, so that he would be subject to the service of garnishment process here.

This committee is of the opinion that it was never intended that District of Columbia law should serve as a collection medium against employees who live elsewhere, work elsewhere, and may even never have been in the District of Columbia. This bill is intended to so amend the District of Columbia law as to terminate this practice by granting to nonresidents of the District the exemptions from garnishment and attachment of wages afforded by their local State laws.

This bill is identical to H.R. 7882 of the 88th Congress, which was amended to meet with suggestions made by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and which passed the House on October 14, 1963—H.R. 836.

AMENDING ACT REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF PODIATRY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 1699) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1699

A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia", approved May 23, 1918, as amended

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918 (40 Stat. 560), as amended (sec. 2–705, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended by designating the first paragraph as subsection (a), by redesignating the second and third paragraphs as subsections (b) and (c), respectively, and by adding at the end of the second paragraph, redesignated herein as subsection (b), the following: "The Board of Podiatry Examiners may, in its discretion, waive both the written and oral tests or either such test and accept in lieu thereof the satisfactory completion by an applicant of an examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners: *Provided,* That such applicant shall pass a practical examination given by the Board of Podiatry Examiners: *Provided further,* That in exercising its discretion to waive the written and oral tests or either such test the Board of Podiatry Examiners shall satisfy itself that the examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners was as comprehensive as that required in the District of Columbia. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Board of Podiatry Examiners may, in its discretion, require an applicant to satisfactorily complete an examination which supplements the examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners, or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners, may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 1699, which was requested by the District of Columbia Commissioners, is to provide the District of Columbia Board of Podiary Examiners with the discretionary authority to accept the written theoretical examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners to virtually all graduates of the recognized podiatry colleges, in lieu of the local board's own theoretical examinations for licensing of podiatrists in the District. However, a satisfactory performance on a practical demonstration test administered by the District of Columbia Board will continue to be required of all applicants for such license.

The National Board of Podiatry Examiners consists of 12 members, representing such nationally recognized professional organizations as the Federation of Podiatry Boards, the American Podiatry Association, and the American Association of Colleges of Podiatry. In addition, 13 groups of prominent educational testing specialists assist the national board in the development of its testing program, which is presently recognized and accepted in 19 States and by the Army and the Navy.

Your committee is advised that the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners favors the adoption of the national board theoretical examination as the standard for licensing of podiatrists in the District because this examination, by reason of its national scope and character, offers a uniform and consistent measure of academic professional qualification. Also, the resources available to the national board make possible a rapid processing of these tests, and the early reporting of the results to the applicants. Further, all expenses incident to the preparation and administration of these tests are sustained by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners.

We are advised that the examination given by the national board is at least as comprehensive and as difficult as that conducted by the District of Columbia Board. However, this bill charges the District of Columbia Board with the responsibility of satisfying itself that this continues to be the case; and the Board is empowered, in its discretion, to require any applicant to supplement his national board examination with whatever further theoretical test or tests the Board may deem advisable.

PRECEDENT

H.R. 6350, which was passed by the House on July 23, 1963, and which was approved on August 19, 1964—Public Law 88–460, extended an identical discretionary authority to the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners, enabling them to accept a national board examination in connection with the licensing of dental hygienists in the District of Columbia.

Your committee is of the opinion that this same authority should be granted with regard to the licensing of podiatrists in the District of Columbia, for the same reasons; namely, the elimination of a needless duplication of theoretical testing with a consequent saving of time and expense on the part of the District of Columbia Board, and also the alleviation of needless hardship on the part of applicants who may have been out of school for some years and yet can demonstrate professional competence by satisfactory performance on the practical demonstration test, which would still be required of all applicants.

At a public hearing conducted on February 28, 1964, no opposition was expressed to the passage of this legislation. This bill is identical to H.R. 9962 of the 88th Congress, which passed the House on March 9, 1964—House Report No. 1223.

The National Board of Podiatry Examiners is composed of 12 members, of whom 6 represent the Federation of Podiatry Boards, 3 represent the Council on Education of the American Podiatry Association, and 3 represent the American Association of Colleges of Podiatry. Assisting the national board in developing its examinations are 13 groups, each consisting of 3 or 4 members and including outstanding examiners or educators in various fields covered by the examinations. The national board examinations cover the following fields: anatomy, histology, embryology, bacteriology, biochemistry, chemistry, pathology, pharmacology, materia medica, physiology, dermatology, syphilology, jurisprudence, ethics, economics, orthopedics, footgear, podiatric medicine, physical medicine, therapeutics, podiatry-chiropody, hospital protocol, radiology, foot pathology, diagnosis, surgery, and anesthesia. The U.S. Army and the U.S. Navy accept the national board examination in considering applications for commissions in those services. The national board program is recognized by the following States: Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Carolina, West Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

The Commissioners recommend the amendment of the Podiatry Act so that the District Board of Podiatry Examiners may, in its discretion, waive both the written and oral tests or either such test of an applicant for license as a podiatrist who holds a certificate from the National Board of Podiatry Examiners, providing such person successfully passes the practical examination administered by the District Board of Podiatry Examiners.

It is expected that the examination conducted by the national board is to be at least as comprehensive as that conducted by the District Board. However, since this might not always be the case, the bill requires that the District Board, in exercising its discretion in waiving the written or oral test or both such tests, satisfy itself that the examination given the applicant by the national board was at least as comprehensive as that required in the District of Columbia.

The acceptance of the examination conducted by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners will benefit the District as well as the applicant. By reason of their national character, the national board examinations have a tendency to provide a uniform and consistent measure of the qualifications of persons seeking licensure. The composition of the examination tends to reflect the teaching of the theory of podiatry on a nationwide basis. The resources in personnel and equipment available to the national board make possible the rapid evaluation and dissemination of the results of the examinations. The expense of printing the examinations, furnishing materials, securing administrators and proctors, and payment of shipping charges and all other costs involved in the testing program are sustained by the national board.

VOLUNTARY ADMISSION OF MENTAL PATIENTS TO DISTRICT TRAINING SCHOOL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 1700) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if I understand this bill correctly: the commitment of a mental retardee to this training school is entirely voluntary on the part of the person committed; is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. That is the purpose of this bill—to permit and authorize the voluntary admission of mental patients to the District Training School. There is a prerequisite to such voluntary admission that there be a financial arrangement with the District of Columbia on behalf of the patient or the relatives of the patient when the patient is admitted if they are financially able to pay all or part of the expenses.

Mr. GROSS. But so far as the mentally retarded person is concerned, this is entirely and unqualifiedly a voluntary commitment to this institution.

Mr. DOWDY. So far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. DOWDY. Of course, they may be committed by a court.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but I am asking insofar as this bill is concerned.

Mr. DOWDY. Yes, that is correct.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1700

A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, as amended

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That an Act entitled "An Act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from, the District Training School, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1135), as amended (sec. 32–601 et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended as follows:

(1) Wherever the terms "District Training School", "Board of Public Welfare", "said board", "feeble-minded", and "inmate" occur in such Act approved March 3, 1925, they shall be stricken, and the terms "Forest Haven", "Department of Public Welfare", "said department", "mentally retarded", and "patient", respectively, inserted in lieu thereof.

(2) Section 2 is amended to read as follows: "The words 'mentally retarded persons' in this Act shall be construed to mean any person afflicted with mental defectiveness from birth or from an early age, so pronounced that he is incapable of managing himself and his affairs, and who requires supervision, control, and care for his own welfare, or for the welfare of others, or for the welfare of the community, and is not insane nor of unsound mind to such an extent as to require his commitment to a hospital for the mentally ill."

(3) The first sentence of section 14 is amended by inserting after "If the order for admission is as a public patient" the words "or if the patient is admitted under the provisions of section 30 of this Act".

(4) The first sentence of section 15 is amended by inserting after the words "If the order for admission is as a public patient" the words "or if the patient is admitted under the provisions of section 30 of this Act."

(5) By adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 30. (a) Subject to the provisions of this Act and in addition to the preceding sections, the Director of Public Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the Director) may admit to Forest Haven as a patient any adult who has been a resident of the District of Columbia for one year next preceding the date of application or any child under the age of twenty-one (1) who is certified by the Director of Public Health to be mentally retarded and in need of care at Forest Haven, and at least one of whose parents or legal guardian has been a resident of the said District for one year next preceding the date of application; (2) who, either by himself, his parents, his spouse, or his legal guardian makes written application for admission to Forest Haven; and (3) who does not express, either to the Director of Public Health or Public Welfare, his objection to being so admitted.

"(b) Any person admitted to Forest Haven pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be released therefrom not more than five days after receipt by the Superintendent of Forest Haven of a written request for release: *Provided,* That if within such five-day period a petition concerning such person, as provided by section 7, shall be filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, such person shall be detained until a final judgment is entered by the court upon said petition.

"(c) The Director may discharge any patient of Forest Haven admitted pursuant to authority contained in this section if the Director is satisfied that such discharge will not adversely affect the welfare or interests of the mentally retarded person, the community, or others.

"(d) (1) If the Director finds that any person with respect to whom an application for admission to Forest Haven has been made, as provided in this section, or any parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian of such person, is able to pay all or any part of the cost of maintenance and care of such person, the Director shall not admit such person unless a contract for payment, satisfactory to the Director, be executed by such person, parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian.

"(2) The Director is authorized to enter into any agreement he deems necessary with any applicant to become a patient in Forest Haven, or with his parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian, for payment to the District of Columbia of all or part of the cost of such maintenance and care. Upon default of payment provided by any contract entered into under this section, the Director is authorized to discharge any patient of Forest Haven and, in addition, he may utilize the procedures provided for in sections 14 and 15 of this Act to secure payment.

"(e) The Director, with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be performed by the Board of Commissioners or may be delegated by said Board in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out line 8, page 1, through line 5, page 2, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof:

"Wherever the terms 'the District Training School', 'Board of Public Welfare', 'said board', 'feeble-minded', 'inmate', 'inmates', and 'an inmate' occur in such Act approved March 3, 1925, they shall be stricken, and the terms 'Forest Haven', 'Department of Public Welfare', 'said Department', 'mentally retarded', 'patient', 'patients', and 'a patient', respectively, inserted in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill (H.R. 1700) requested by the District of Columbia Commissioners, is to accomplish the following:

First. To authorize voluntary admission of mental patients to the District Training School.

Second. To require that a prerequisite to such voluntary admissions be a financial arrangement with the District of Columbia on behalf of such patients when they or their relatives are financially able to pay for all or a part of the expenses involved.

Third. Delete certain archaic terminology in the present law and substitute modern terminology in its place.

The District Training School is an institution at Laurel, Md., operated by the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare for mentally retarded citizens of the District, where such persons are not only cared for but are given such education and training as their mental capacities will permit.

Under present law, admission to the District Training School can be accomplished only by court order, the issuance of which must be preceded by a petition to the court and a hearing. It is the opinion of this committee that families could well be spared the emotional ordeal involved in bringing their mentally retarded relatives before the court, and that the time of the court could more profitably be used for other purposes. In this connection, we are informed that these petitions are nearly always uncontested.

H.R. 1700 would provide, in addition to this present system of admission to the District Training School by court order, for voluntary admission in cases where the District of Columbia Director of Public Health determines that the applicant is eligible for admission, and where the patient expresses no objection to being admitted.

A patient voluntarily admitted would have the privilege of petitioning for his own release, and would be discharged 5 days after filing his petition with the superintendent of the training school, unless during this period the Director of Public Welfare petitions the district court to detain the patient for court hearing. In this event, the patient would be retained until the court has disposed of the case.

This bill provides further that where the term "District Training School" occurs in the present law, the more commonly used title "Forest Haven" shall be substituted. Similarly, the more humane term, "mentally retarded," would replace "feeble-minded," and the word "patient" would be inserted in lieu of "inmate." This committee feels that these changes in terminology would serve to a degree to spare the feelings of the families of these retarded persons and thus lighten the burden upon them.

At a public hearing conducted on July 26, 1963, the Administrator of the District of Columbia Children's Center, of which the District Training School is a part, testified that the Department uses a scale similar to the public assistance scale in determining what amount the families of patients admitted to the training school should be required to pay. Such payment is then stipulated in the court order authorizing the admission. However, changes in the families' financial circumstances frequently occur during the patient's period of residence at the training school, which may make them able to pay substantially more than was originally stipulated, or unable to pay as much. In either case, present law requires the Department of Public Welfare to go back into court for any change in the original agreement. The Department is very much in favor of the provision in H.R. 1700 which would authorize them to handle the financial arrangements with the families directly, as this would facilitate frequent review and adjustment of charges when altered circumstances indicate a need for such changes.

The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners requested this legislation, and approval has been expressed also by the Director of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health. No opposition to its enactment has been expressed.

This bill, H.R. 1700, is identical to H.R. 7440 of the 88th Congress, which passed the House on August 26, 1963—House Report No. 704.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of District of Columbia business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD A. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader what is the program for tomorrow and the remainder of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the question of the distinguished gentleman, tomorrow, as previously announced, H.R. 3818, to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities, will be called up; I should like to advise and admonish the House that consideration of this bill will be finished tomorrow. Upon completion of action on this bill, we may take up the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I have no further announcement at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Does the distinguished majority leader have any idea when the bill on Appalachia or any of the other bills will be programed? Will they be programed for the following week?

Mr. ALBERT. As soon as the bill which the gentleman has mentioned is ready we would like to program it for floor action. Whether that will be next week, I am not able to advise the gentleman at this time. I should like to withhold any further announcement until later in the week.

ACTION NEEDED TO CLOSE $189 MILLION SUGAR LOOPHOLE

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the President's farm message did not even mention sugar. Of most imediate importance it did not contain a recommendation for reestablishing sugar recapture fees during 1965 and 1966.

I think that Congress should now act quickly to correct that omission and I am introducing legislation today to achieve that objective.

In the last session when the administration and the Congress let the foreign quota provisions of the Sugar Act expire on December 31, 1964, a great injustice was done to the American taxpayer.

Unless remedial legislation is enacted the revenue loss to the U.S. Treasury could be at least $189 million.

Under the now expired provisions of the Sugar Act, a total of approximately $126 million could have been collected by the U.S. Treasury from foreign sugar producers in 1965. As things now stand there will be a $126 million windfall for foreign sugar interests this year with prospects for an equal bonanza next year.

Now that the law has expired, the Secretary has administratively extended country quotas for the first 6 months of 1965. That unfortunately means it is too late to collect the recapture fees during the first 6 months of 1965.

However, if we act quickly there is plenty of time to enact legislation to collect these fees beginning on June 30 and thus partially close a giant loophole in the sugar law. It will also recapture at least $63 million for the U.S. Treasury during the last 6 months of 1965 without costing U.S. consumers one red cent.

Under the Sugar Act our consumers pay the U.S. price for sugar. That price is currently 6.7 cents a pound. The world price for sugar is now about 2.2 cents a pound. Foreign nations having the privilege of selling in our market receive the U.S. price. Thus on a significant portion of foreign produced sugar they realize about 3 cents a pound more in the U.S. market, after deduction of transportation and tariff, than they do in the world market.

Under the 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act all or a portion of this difference between the United States and world market prices—known as the quota premium—was to be collected by the U.S. Treasury as a recapture fee. On part of the imported sugar there was a total recapture while on the rest the recapture fees were set under an escalated formula which worked to take a greater percentage of the quota premium each year. We must remember, of course, that about a million tons of Philippine sugar comes into the United States under a special treaty and is not subject to any recapture fees at all.

Frankly these recapture formulas did not work too well at first because the world price of sugar went above the U.S. price in 1963 and in part of 1964.

Now, however, the world price has returned to its normal level well below the U.S. price.

Therefore the recapture formula would work at the present time. Unfortunately however, the part of the Sugar Act which contains the authority for these recapture fees expired on December 31, 1964.

Let me repeat again the legislation which I am introducing does not affect the U.S. price of sugar one bit. Therefore U.S. consumers will not have to pay more.

It does not affect the total amount of sugar that can be imported into the United States in 1965 and 1966.

This bill does not give U.S. beet and cane producers a greater share of the U.S. market. Even though I feel our beet industry should be allowed to expand, this legislation does not deal with that separate problem.

My bill would do just one simple thing. It would partially close a giant loophole in the sugar program whereby foreign producers will receive at least a $126-million windfall in 1965 and a like amount next year.

It will not, unfortunately, close that loophole for the first 6 months of 1965, because the Secretary of Agriculture has already made allocations to foreign nations running through June 30, 1965.

My bill, however, should save taxpayers at least $189 million.

This legislation will, if enacted, collect at least $63 million in revenue during the balance of this calendar year and possibly another $126 million next year.

I certainly hope it will receive the prompt attention of the House.

I have attached a set of the calculations I used to make these estimates of revenue loss in the absence of corrective legislation.

CALCULATION OF $189 MILLION ESTIMATE OF LOSS OF REVENUE UNDER EXPIRATION OF FOREIGN QUOTA PROVISIONS OF SUGAR ACT

Assumption No. 1: That the quota premium for 1965 and 1966 will be at least 3 cents. The world price for sugar is now 2.2 cents per pound. The June 1965 future is 2.45 cents per pound.

The present New York price is 6.7 cents per pound. The June New York future is 6.71 cents per pound.

Present difference:	*Cents*
New York	6.7
Transportation and tariff	−1.0
Net price New York	5.7
World price	−2.2
Quota premium	3.5
June future difference:	
New York June future	6.71
Transportation and tariff	−1.00
Net price New York June future	5.71
World June future	−2.45
Quota premium in June	3.26

It is therefore assumed that the quota premium for 1965 and 1966 will be at least 3 cents.

Assumption No. 2: That U.S. consumption of sugar in 1965 and 1966 will be approximately 10 million tons annually. The U.S. consumption estimate has been set by the Secretary at 9.2 million tons for 1965. This is too low. It will be closer to 9.8 million tons, as was the case last year. The Secretary has already allocated to foreign nations their share of the U.S. market on a country by country basis for the first 6 months of 1965.

It is therefore assumed that domestic consumption will be about 10 million tons in 1965 and 1966.

Assumption No. 3: That approximately 40 percent of our sugar needs will be met by foreign production, and the remaining 60 percent will be produced by U.S. growers. Last year (in 1964) approximately 1½ million tons of sugar were global quota sugar reserved for Cuba and approximately 1½ million tons were country quota sugar and approximately 1 million tons came from the Philippines under treaty. The Sugar Act provides for about a 60–40 ratio between domestic and foreign sugar.

Therefore, it is assumed that in 1965 1½ million tons of global quota sugar would have been subject to a complete recapture of the quota premium and 1½ million tons of country quota sugar would have been subject to the 40-percent rate scheduled to go into effect under the projected escalated recapture formula.

Calculations:	
Global quota sugar (tons)	1,500,000
Per ton (based on 3-cent quota premium)	×$60
Total amount which could have been recaptured by U.S. Treasury in 1965 from global quota sugar	$90,000,000
Country quota sugar (approximately 1,000,000 tons of Philippine sugar not subject to recapture) (tons)	1,500,000
Per ton (based on 40 percent of quota premium formula)	×$24
Total amount which could have been recaptured by U.S. Treasury from country quota sugar in 1965	$36,000,000
Global quota	$90,000,000
Country quota	36,000,000
Total amount which could have been collected by Treasury in 1965	126,000,000
Minus ½—1st 6 months of 1965 not collectible because allocations have already been made	−63,000,000
Amount which can still be collected in 1965 if legislation enacted in time	63,000,000
Estimated amount which might be collected in 1966	126,000,000
Total amount of revenue loss in 1965 and 1966 possible if no remedial legislation is enacted	189,000,000

GEN. CURTIS LeMAY, CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, February 1, the President of the

United States presented Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, his third oak leaf cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal.

The occasion was on the day of the retirement of the man many of us have grown to know as "Mr. Air Force."

His farewell statement upon receiving that medal was reflective of his general attitude. With personal modesty, he attributed his success to the team of experts around him. Yet, at the same time, he accepted as a reality the fact that he himself had assembled "the best air staff that I have ever seen assembled and the best group of commanders in the field that can be possibly procured."

How typical are these remarks of General LeMay. Always straightforward, always candid, and yet always modest.

In the military field, there is little I can say that would add to his distinguished military record with which you are all so very familiar. In fact, many of us believe that our air assault success in World War II was largely the responsibility of the procedures and techniques that he developed. I am sure all of the free world recognizes its debt of gratitude to him.

But it is not his ability as a military strategist to which I want to direct my remarks. Rather, it is the role of the military man in his relations with his superiors in the Defense Department and the Congress of the United States.

To me, he has exemplified everything that America stands for: without being bellicose, he has been straightforward; without being disobedient, he has been informative; without fear of personal position, he has not been silenced when he thought his decision was in the best interest of the United States.

Always a strong advocate of the manned bomber, he has always stressed the importance of maintaining a balanced concept of bombers and missiles.

It has been my privilege for a number of years to hear General LeMay as he appeared before the Armed Services Committee to present the position of the Air Force in its annual authorization request. Never has he failed to impress me with his grasp of knowledge not only of the technical aspects of the Air Force, but also with the astuteness with which he appraised the global military situation. During these appearances, I cannot remember a question to which he failed to respond completely, openly, and responsively. Somehow, there was always a sense of refreshment when he appeared. Too often this is not the case.

Many honorary degrees, medals, accolades, and tributes have been given to Curtis LeMay. But I rather think that the greatest satisfaction Curtis LeMay has is to reflect on his own career with deserved pride in his many accomplishments.

I have great esteem and affection for Curtis LeMay, and I shall always consider it a privilege to call him my friend. I wish him and Mrs. LeMay well upon the occasion of their retirement.

I hope, for the sake of our Nation and the entire free world, that Curtis LeMay will continue to exercise a position of leadership.

PROTECTION OF SUPPLIERS ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a measure designed to afford some degree of protection to unpaid suppliers of labor and materials on construction, alteration, and repair contracts not exceeding $2,000 in value which have been let by the Government of the United States. Under the Miller Act passed by Congress on August 24, 1935, contractors under such contracts are not required to post either performance or payment bonds for the protection of the United States and suppliers. The supplier, therefore, is in a very weak position as the law does not give him a lien on Government property for his protection as he would normally have in the case of work done under a private contract.

The need for this legislation was brought to my attention under two contracts let by General Services Administration to Dennis & Burns, local area contractors, in November of 1963 for repair of a certain building at the Washington Navy Yard. The two contracts totaled $1,706.20. Most of the work actually done under the two contracts was performed by the Holt Bros. Construction Co., of Falls Church, Va., under a subcontract. Mr. Wayne Holt is the owner of the business.

Both contracts were completed on December 9, 1963, and Holt submitted a bill to Dennis & Burns for $893.65 for the performance of work done by subcontract under the two contracts. On December 13, 1963, only 4 days after the completion of the contracts, GSA paid Dennis & Burns the amount of $1,706.20, the amount called for under the contracts. Dennis & Burns filed bankruptcy proceedings a short time after receiving payment, to wit, on January 17, 1964, and were adjudicated as bankrupt during the same month. As a result, Holt's claim was wiped out entirely in bankruptcy proceedings as an unsecured claim.

Since the contracts were under $2,000, no protection was afforded Holt through a payment bond and since the Government was involved rather than a private person, no lien was available to him. The U.S. Government received his materials and labor, but Dennis & Burns received the money and considerably more than his bill of $893.65 even though Dennis & Burns performed a very small amount of work in addition to Holt's subcontract work.

Shortly after Dennis & Burns were declared bankrupt in January 1964, the General Accounting Office reports that Mr. Burns of the firm reentered the construction business in the name of Stephen L. Burns and later began trading as the Weyonoke Construction Co. He was awarded three contracts by the same governmental agency, to wit, General Services Administration, during February and March of 1964 for a total amount of $4,411. Mr. Dennis of the firm became associated with Advance Construction Co. During January, February, and March of 1964, the Advance Construction Co. was awarded five contracts by GSA, for the total amount of $6,368.

Thus, we have a case where two contractors default in payment to their subcontractors and suppliers on a Government contract, receive full payment from the GSA, and are later awarded additional contracts by the same governmental agency having knowledge of their prior irresponsibility. This would seem to be a very loose construction of the term "responsible bidder" indeed, particularly so when payment bonds are not required. I seriously question the propriety of such interpretation by the General Services Administration, however, I am not striking at this deficiency directly but rather propose to cure the matter by precluding such failure of payment on the part of prime contractors.

The bill I am introducing today would prevent the recurrence of such cases by requiring an affidavit of payment to suppliers on the part of contractors before payment is made to him, or in the event payment has not been made by withholding the amount of the claims of suppliers for direct payment to them unless the suppliers execute written consent for payment to the contractor. This would seem a reasonable requirement where the Government does not demand a payment bond or afford the supplier lien protection.

CLOSING OF DWIGHT, ILL., VETERANS HOSPITAL

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I herewith submit for the RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois in opposition to the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Dwight, Ill.

I feel the general assembly action is fully justified and I concur with the position it has taken.

The resolution follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7 OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Whereas the Senate of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring, takes notice of the mass protest meeting attended by more than 2,000 persons in Dwight, Ill., on January 24, 1965; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Illinois deplores the administrative decision on the part of the Veterans' Administration, as an economy measure to close the veterans hospital located in Dwight, Ill., which has admirably and ably served its community and the veterans in its 32 county service area; and the General Assembly of the State of Illinois is firmly dedicated to the belief that a decision of this magnitude ought to be a matter for congressional rather than administrative action; and

Whereas this institution serves a 32-county area and the removal of its patients to distant facilities will impose a hardship on the men who served their country so unselfishly and courageously in the past and their families, while the buildings of the Dwight Veterans Hospital are in excellent condition as evidenced by the fact that the main building was constructed in 1946 and the powerplant and other facilities were cited in 1964 by the College of Surgeons as an "excellent facility"; and

Whereas Dwight, Ill., is ideally situated for the 32 counties which it serves since it is located at the crossroads of Interstate Route 55 and Illinois Routes 47 and 17 beside being served by the G.M. & O. Railroad, Greyhound, and Continental Bus Lines providing regularly scheduled and frequent stops at this wholesome community; and

Whereas the hospital itself has a professional staff of the highest caliber and competence, a patient-to-employee ratio of 4 to 1 and has had a daily patient load that from 1958–64 has ranged from 189 to 192 patients whose cost per patient is less than other hospitals; and

Whereas the operating cost per day of the hospital at Dwight compares favorably with the national average cost for all of the 127 Veterans' Administration hospitals in this great land; and

Whereas the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois requests a rescission of the order curtailing admission of qualified patients to the institution at Dwight, Ill., and further requests that the decision to close the facility be deferred until the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the U.S. Congress have been able to hold hearings and a careful reevaluation of this decision can be made: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 74th General Assembly on the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That this body favors the retention of the Veterans' Administration Hospital located at Dwight, Ill., and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, Mr. W. J. Driver, Veterans' Affairs Administrator, Senate Minority Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from Illinois.

Adopted by the senate, January 27, 1965.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives, January 27, 1965.

JOHN P. TWOHY,
Speaker of House of Representatives.
CHAS. F. KERWIN,
Clerk of House of Representatives.

SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the House on a matter of deep concern to many of our citizens throughout the Nation.

The old age, survivors, and disability provisions of the Social Security Act provide a basic economic security system of which this country is justly proud. It has been refined and improved by numerous modifications over the nearly 30 years of its existence, so that it now provides a wide spectrum of benefits covering 9 out of every 10 workers in the United States and their dependents.

One noticeable shortcoming of the system, however, is its failure to provide adequate and realistic protection to over a million workers who derive a substantial portion of their income in the form of tips.

The problem of covering tips under the social security system has been before Congress for many years. The coverage of such income was proposed as far back as 1948 in the report of the Advisory Council on Social Security.

One of the early proponents of such a proposal was the late Senator Herbert Lehman, who offered it as an amendment to the social security amendments of 1956 when they were being debated on the Senate floor. Senator Lehman stated at that time:

> There are thousands of people in the United States who receive part of their wages in the form of tips—taxicab drivers, waiters and waitresses, barbers, bellhops, and others. These people are entitled to the same degree of social security coverage as the rest of our citizens. They should not be penalized simply because part of their earnings are not paid to them directly by their employer.
>
> These people are required to include moneys received in this way in their income tax returns. I can think of no reason why they should not be entitled to have these moneys counted for social security.

Senator Lehman's words are as true and compelling today as when he uttered them nearly a decade ago.

I am happy to note that the pending social security amendments, containing the administration's recommendations, include provisions to cover income from tips as wages under social security, as did the amendments which passed the House of Representatives last year but died in conference. I note also that the report of the Advisory Council on social security which was made this year also recommends the inclusion of tips under the social security system. As was pointed out in the Advisory Council's report:

> Tip income is estimated to represent, on the average, more than one-third of the work income of regularly tipped employees; in many cases, of course, tips represent a much larger part, or even all, of the employee's income. For example, a waiter in a large city may get only $35 a week in wages and may average another $55 a week in tips.
>
> Under present law, with only his wages counted toward benefits, the waiter who gets $35 a week in wages and $55 a week in tips would receive a monthly retirement benefit, beginning at age 65, of $74. If his tips were also covered, his benefit amount would be $125. Because their tips are not counted toward benefits, tipped employees are not adequately protected under the social security program. Moreover, since tipped workers pay income tax on earnings they get in the form of tips, it seems particularly unfair to them that these earnings are not counted for social security purposes. This situation should be corrected.

I agree that it is high time that this situation be corrected. The social security bill that will be enacted this year will make it even more imperative that tips should be counted under the system. For, the wage base increase provided in the bill would otherwise increase the discrepancy of treatment between tipped employees and all other workers who will have more of their income included under the program.

I am confident that when the social security amendments are approved this year, the longstanding inequity against tipped employees will be eliminated and that they will be granted full coverage of their income under the social security system.

H.R. 890, THE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, human discards, which we refer to as solid wastes, are as old as civilization. They are probably as old as the human race itself. From the piles of animal bones and half-burned sticks left by the caveman we can determine much of our early ancestors' way of life.

Throughout the Middle East the remains of ancient cities appear above the level plains as high plateaus. Archeologists tell us that the ground level of these ancient cities rose gradually, due to the custom of dumping trash and garbage in the streets and on the floors. When things got too thick underfoot, new mud floors and streets were laid.

American Indians simply carried their refuse out into the woods and left it. This method was imitated by our early farmers and settlers. Indian cliff dwellers threw their debris over the edge and over the centuries the accumulation rose up the sides of the cliffs.

As cities developed and grew, organized systems for collecting refuse and burning it were developed. We still have these systems but today we are producing wastes in such volume and using up open land so rapidly that the disposal systems are threatened with collapse.

The average American now produces 4 to 5 pounds of rubbish each day. Everything comes wrapped and packaged—even a pair of socks. Some of the prepared dinners contain a variety of cans, bottles, and boxes, all of which are thrown out when the meal is consumed. The problem of solid waste disposal is getting worse, and the challenge to all of us is becoming greater with every passing year.

President Johnson said last year:

> The skeletons of discarded cars, old junk cars, litter our countryside.

The President was expressing exasperation over a sight we have all seen.

Mr. John Warren Giles, a former professor of law, writing in "The Rotarian" last year, had this to add:

> If the scrap processing industry were to close its doors tomorrow, our cities would be faced with a solid waste disposal problem the like of which we never dreamed could hap-

> pen. The highways and byways would be choked—

He said—

> with old automobiles, refrigerators, stoves and everything else of solid or semisolid salvageable nature.

Speaking recently at a "Seminar on Regional and Municipal Environmental Planning," Dr. John S. Chapman of the University of Texas, with tongue in cheek, spoke of a vision he had—a vision in which New York City had become "just a dune, a mound of piled up jalopies, old tires, rotting banana peels, sucker sticks, and orange peels, all gently powdered over with fresh fallen snow. And the last few remaining men struggling through the whole thing to get to the ground level, which is the spiral on top of the Empire State Building."

> This is the sort of thing one can think of—

Dr. Chapman observed—

> if you expand the possibilities of waste enough, and consider our ability to produce waste.

Let me repeat that last thought: And consider our ability to produce waste.

Our population of 190 million Americans today is expected to reach 235 million by 1975. That is only 10 years away. The Public Health Service, in its report, "Solid Waste Handling in Metropolitan Areas," says that today total refuse production is over 150 million tons a year, or at a rate of 4½ pounds per person per day.

What are these wastes we are talking about? Are they merely the junked automobiles, refrigerators, and stoves Mr. Giles spoke of; the old tires, banana peels, and sucker sticks of Dr. Chapman? Yes, they are these and a seemingly endless variety of other substances, items and materials of an affluent society well on its way to becoming an effluent society.

They are household garbage, shopping center debris, the demolished remains of old buildings, the multitudinous odds and ends of new construction; they are dead animals, ashes, tree trunks, old furniture, and Christmas trees; they are anatomical and pathological wastes from hospitals, clinics, and medical centers; they are wastes of every imaginable kind from our industries; and they are mountains of manure, fruit skins, pits, stalks, and leaves from our vast agricultural enterprises.

They are, in other words, everything our prolific society does not want or cannot use.

The problem of disposing of the residues of living and doing is no longer simply solved by hauling them away and dumping them or burying them. As our population booms and spreads out into suburbia, and suburbia expands outward into exurbia, we rapidly use up the land we once used for waste disposal. Sanitary landfills sites are disappearing. Sites for open dumps are getting scarce. Burning is prohibited in many areas and incineration is only a partial solution.

Open dumps, moreover, breed rats, insects, and vermin. Burning open dumps create smoke, odor, and nuisance problems. Proper incineration is too expensive for many communities; hence, many community incinerators are inadequate to handle the growing local load. This leads to improper burning, which in turn creates pronounced air pollution problems. Backyard incineration is also a major contributor to air pollution in thousands of communities. Hauling to sea is expensive and the debris often washes up on the beaches, even when dumped 20 to 30 miles out. Improper burial of wastes in the ground causes contamination of surface water supplies and has been known to make a community water supply unpalatable, if not unpotable. It looks as though we cannot go up, down, or out with solid wastes without creating more problems.

The hauling, disposal, or salvage of solid wastes from industry and agriculture have always been recognized as a task for private industry. In contrast, however, the collection and disposal of domestic solid wastes are generally considered to be the responsibilities of municipal government. Yet many cities, especially the smaller ones, make no provision for collection of refuse, and the householder is expected to transport his solid wastes to an open dump designated by the county or operated privately. In other communities, no public provision is made for refuse collection but almost every resident contracts for private service.

The annual outlay by our communities for public collection and disposal services—over $1.5 billion—is exceeded only by community expenditures for schools and roads. In addition to this $1.5 billion outlay, it has been estimated that annual expenditures for private collection and disposal services are over $1.3 billion. In other words, we are spending about $3 billion a year to have our solid wastes hauled away and disposed of.

We are spending $3 billion a year for service, but what are we spending for research into the underlying problem? Total expenditures for research in the area of liquid wastes are about $10 million a year, according to Prof. J. E. McKee of the California Institute of Technology. This includes sponsorship by Federal, State, and local agencies, industrial associations, private industry, philanthropic foundations, and university and industrial research. In contrast, the total amount of research money spent for solid waste collection and disposal probably does not exceed $500,000 a year from Government and private sources. In other words, funds spent for research on liquid wastes each year are at least 20 times those spent on solid wastes.

The number of eminent engineers and scientists associated in any way with solid waste problems is pitifully small in relation to those engaged in waste-water disposal. To be sure, there are several competent engineers in the larger cities, particularly in California, who devote a great deal of their time to solid wastes but they are far outnumbered and outglamored by their colleagues in the waste-water field.

Consulting engineers are seldom engaged for investigations or design related to solid wastes and, indeed, Professor McKee notes, they do not tend to seek such work. To be sure, he says, the design of a large municipal incinerator calls for superior engineering competence and some engineers have specialized in such work. By and large, however, the gross fees paid to consulting engineers in the solid waste field are negligible compared with those in the water supply or waste-water areas. Finally, few professors of engineering have taken any interest in solid wastes compared with the scores of competent colleagues in the waste-water field.

Why has the solid waste field been so neglected?

First. There has been no strong pressure or demand for scientific evaluation of research, either from municipal administrations, the regulatory agencies, or the public at large. Too many people are willing to let sleeping dogs lie.

Second. There have been no epidemics attributable to improper handling or disposal of solid wastes. While there is ample reason to believe that the insanitary handling of solid wastes contributes to endemic disease, there have been no epidemics of respiratory disease or cholera, or the like, to dramatize the problem.

Third. Federal and State agencies have not provided the direction that this problem deserves.

Fourth. It is difficult to reduce the problem of solid wastes to clear-cut scientific or engineering investigations because the economic and political factors are so overpowering.

In an effort to call attention to this problem and to stimulate national interest, technologically speaking, the First National Conference on Solid Waste Research was held at the University of Chicago in December 1963. It was sponsored by the Environmental Sciences and Engineering Study Section of the Public Health Service, in cooperation with the American Public Works Association, and attracted top engineering talent from universities, private industry and government throughout the country.

The conferees were told that the country's present capacity for and methods of treating solid wastes leave quite a bit to be desired. They were told that the ideal solution would be to convert wastes into useful and marketable forms by processes which would be swift, inoffensive, silent, economical, and invisible. Short of this, they discussed possible methods of compacting bales of refuse for sanitary burial. They talked about techniques for incineration which would restrain fly ash and foul-smelling fumes, and reduce the volume of wastes by 90 percent.

The conferees were also told of several pilot plant models of waste processing equipment, including a million-dollar machine which pulverizes automobiles quickly and separates metals, rubber, glass, and fibers economically. A pilot plant in California was described which separates conventional mixed refuse and processes it into baled paper, charcoal briquets, bales of iron scrap, gaseous fuel, compost, and brick tile.

The conference members expressed considerable optimism over composting of solid wastes. Composting is the method of converting waste organic matter, through natural processes of decomposition, into a sanitary, nuisance-free, humuslike material.

Of course, composting is but one method of waste utilization. Some speakers held the view that there are sufficient potential resources in solid wastes to create—through conversion—industries not yet born. However, solid waste technology has not reached the point where the cost of disposal can be offset by profits from conversion and other uses, such as composting. More research and development must be conducted before we can hope to advance beyond this point.

Professor McKee, whom I have cited in these remarks, was one of the principal speakers at the National Conference on Solid Waste Research. Another speaker, a former Member of this House, was the Honorable John Lesinski, of Michigan.

On April 10 of last year, 4 months after the conference, Mr. Lesinski introduced H.R. 10807, the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1964. A month later, I introduced H.R. 11236, an identical bill. Since no action was taken on either bill before the 88th Congress adjourned, on January 4 of this year I introduced H.R. 890, the Solid Waste Disposal Act. The reference to composting is particularly timely in view of the fact that the Public Health Service and the Tennessee Valley Authority are preparing to embark on a joint solid waste project involving the study of composting on a municipal scale.

The purpose of H.R. 890 is fourfold, as follows:

First. To initiate and accelerate a national research program for improved and economical methods of solid waste collection, handling, and disposal.

Second. To provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments in the planning, development, and conduct of improved solid waste disposal programs.

Third. To provide financial assistance on a matching basis to assist in establishing demonstration projects for improved methods of solid waste handling and disposal.

Fourth. To provide for the training of professional and technical personnel. This bill is particularly designed to facilitate advanced types of processes or practices.

Because solid waste collection, treatment, and disposal are primarily public health activities, H.R. 890 places administration of its provisions under the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

H.R. 890 provides for Federal expenditures of $43½ million for a 4-year period beginning July 1, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note that the Public Health Service has recently increased its attention to this vital problem—through new research grants stimulated by the National Conference on Solid Waste Research, and through the joint PHS-TVA composting project. But the increase is yet on a far too limited scale. H.R. 890 must be enacted to give the Nation a firm foundation for a comprehensive research and development program in solid wastes. Many of the authorities and administrative provisions for such a program are lacking. H.R. 890 provides for them.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress can provide a national nucleus for action against air pollution, water pollution, and radiological health problems—as we have done—certainly we can do the same for a problem as significant in all respects. Let us not overlook the fact that solid waste disposal problems are parallel and related to our air pollution and water pollution problems, and that the industrial and agricultural waste load is of the same magnitude as the domestic waste load.

Mr. Speaker, before I close I would like to present some specific examples of the solid waste problem in various sections of the country. These should serve to underline the urgency of my remarks.

It has become apparent in recent years that all of the disposal sites under the jurisdiction of the city of Seattle would be filled within a few years and that no other suitable sites were available within the city. In each instance, the city's efforts to obtain disposal sites in King County have been rebuffed by local citizens who objected to establishment of a refuse disposal facility in their vicinity. It has been proposed to utilized a large tract of State land that is approximately 26 miles from the heart of Seattle.

In a 1963 report on refuse disposal needs, the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission declared:

> More than three-fourths of the remaining refuse disposal capacity in northeastern Illinois is found at open dumps. These dumps have created a widespread public aversion and resistance to all types of refuse disposal.

The Commission also reported:

> With 6.25 million persons living in the 6 counties of northeastern Illinois in 1960, 14 million cubic yards of domestic refuse were collected that year. On the basis of current population projections, it is estimated that 150 million cubic yards of refuse will have to be collected by 1970. Existing incinerator capacity could burn approximately one-third of this amount, leaving a balance of 105 million cubic yards of refuse that must be accommodated at disposal sites. This volume of refuse would cover an area of 50 square miles to a depth of 2 feet.

A 1963 study of waste disposal facilities used in Metropolitan Dade County, Fla., revealed that the "present dumping practices in the north and central area of Dade County are endangering both present and future water supplies." It was also pointed out that:

> If present methods of waste disposal are continued, an area of 20 square miles (equal to the present area of the city of Hialeah) will be covered with garbage, refuse, and trash to a depth of 10 feet by the year 2000.

Two-thirds of the 129 political subdivisions in Allegheny County, Pa., have adopted antidumping ordinances or have zoning ordinances which do not permit the construction and operation of disposal facilities within their territorial limits. Refuse disposal remains one of the major urban problems to be solved by the officialdom of that county.

In a 1963 refuse study prepared for the Connecticut Capital Regional Planning Agency, it was reported:

> Of the 10 largest municipalities, 4 will exhaust disposal land in 5 years or less. Within 2 years, or 1965, eight towns of all sizes will have exhausted their disposal land. By 1975, 18 towns will have exhausted their disposal land.

A recent study of the solid waste program for the island of Oahu, in Hawaii, revealed:

> Refuse disposal operations at all land sites (nine city and county areas) utilize the open burning dump methods, and present potential and existing public health problems; the two municipal incinerators are overloaded.

The Office for Local Government, State of New York, pointed out in a recent report on refuse collection and disposal that "population increases have resulted in refuse problems in communities where previously no service was provided and where there has been little or no recognition of municipal responsibility." Municipalities with established refuse collection and disposal services have found that as growth presses to a municipality's borders and vacant land is developed, adequate refuse disposal sites are at a premium.

WHAT IS TRUTH?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks, a letter from a constituent, Richard A. Frederick, and a copy of a news story from the January 13, 1965, issue of the Indiana, Pa., Evening Gazette upon which his comments and questions are based.

I place this material in the RECORD in hopes that someone among my colleagues may be able to supply a reasonable answer to the queries which Mr. Frederick has propounded. Or perhaps the U.S. Information Agency, whose battery of motion picture experts was responsible for the spectacular production which prompted the Gazette report, will be able to supply me with an acceptable reply to Mr. Frederick's realistic request for information.

For my part, a wholesale investigation of the entire USIA setup, from personnel to procedure to accomplishment, would be a valuable contribution to American progress in the field of international relations. Of just what value is the USIA, whose budget for fiscal 1966 is set at $173 million? How many persons are employed by this Agency, and what are salary levels? How much is involved in their expense accounts for sending teams of so-called experts around the world and for maintaining their persons and families in the manner that they have become accustomed since catching onto the payroll underwritten by Mr. Frederick and other American taxpayers? Finally, who are paid as consultants by the USIA, and what is their stipend?

Within the past several weeks I read a news story describing the destruction of 2 dozen or more automobiles belonging to the USIA by a bomb in Guatemala. I have several questions on that incident myself, and I shall appreciate answers from the USIA or from any other office or individual who has the figures, the integrity, and the courage to supply the answers.

How many USIA automobiles were actually involved in the incident?

How many automobiles does the USIA own, rent, or lease in Guatemala, a country whose area is approximately that of Kentucky, and whose population approximates 4 million? How many automobiles does USIA own, rent, lease, or otherwise utilize in toto on the world's streets and highways, including those in Washington, D.C.?

If at least 24 automobiles were destroyed or damaged by a single bombing incident in Guatemala, the chances are that there may be very many motor vehicles under the supervision of the USIA at large in that country, unless the explosion took place during a special auto conclave perhaps designed for the purpose of driving out communism at high speed. In any event, Mr. Frederick and the rest of the American people whose taxes pay the bills for these cars and their operation should have a right to know the answers to these questions.

Mr. Speaker, I shall submit a copy of this statement, with the correspondence and news story from Mr. Frederick, to the USIA on this date, and I shall be happy to ask the USIA answers be included in a future issue of the Record so that my colleagues as well as Mr. Frederick and his neighbors in the 22d Congressional District may be properly informed on this important subject.

The letter and news story follow:

Old Timers Progressive Club,
Rural Valley, Pa., January 15, 1965.

Congressman John P. Saylor,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Saylor: The theme of this letter might well be "What is truth." As a basis for my theme the enclosed AP article by Mr. Peter Arnett is a glaring example of what the U.S. Information Service wants to feed the American people and other nationals as an authentic report of a battle scene of the South Vietnam civil war. It is indeed a tragic day for America when USIS officials set the stage, the props, and actors to film a phony scene of battle action. I say to you, "Why is such a deceit practiced and permitted when in the background of this stage setting our men and boys are daily being shot down and our aircraft blasted from the sky?" To me this is a shameful example of hypocrisy to our boys, their parents, and the American people. To date no less than 250 of our men and boys have been sacrificed on the altar of a cold war, only to have the USIS in a slimy propaganda effort enlist the aid of our GI's and others in taking films of a phony battle action. As a father of three boys I wonder what the parents of these men and boys who died in action will think of this disgraceful and deceitful propaganda stunt. After this exposé by Mr. Arnett these films should not be released because in the first instance they are phony, and a disgrace to those men who sacrificed their lives for the administration's foreign policy and secondly, if shown to other nationals we will be held up to ridicule and the laughing stock of those nations. Is this an example of the administration's policy of propaganda and news management?

What is the truth about Air Force jets bombing Laos? Several days ago news broadcasters stated that the Peiping radio announced that two American bombers were shot down over Laos. This was denied by the administration. Several days later, lo and behold, the American people through news media were told that this has been going on for months. Why does the administration hide behind a cloth of secrecy? Important news affecting our Government, its policies, etc., in many instances is withheld and released for public consumption only after one hears it broadcast through some foreign news media. Why is such tragic news withheld from the American people? Is this another policy of the administration news management? Less than 3 years ago an official of the administration is alleged to have said, "that an administration has the right to lie." As a veteran I accept that theory in time of war. I go along with the idea that we have to withhold information during hostilities lest it give comfort to the enemy. But, and this to me is a big but, we are not at war, perhaps a cold phase of a war but at peace with all nations. Are we Americans so naive or in fear of the Asian situation that the administration believes in their policy of assuring us that all is sweetness and light, be patient and the Asian problem will solve itself? I do not think so. America's greatness was only achieved by the impatience of our forefathers. They met the issues that confronted them with a firm purpose, squarely and on the level. False images of battle actions, distortions, deceit, evasion, and failure to give the American people the truth can only result in loss of confidence in our Government. An uncertain, weak, or vacillating foreign policy by our administration or any government will eventually lead to its own destruction. Is our foreign policy predicated upon a guessing game or are we just nibbling at the fringes of events, spouting verbal fireworks of no consequence, except the ultimate consequence of getting deeper and deeper into the whirlpool of foreign entanglements?

What is the truth about Russia and the atomic bomb? Which one of the two, Brezhnev or Kosygin has the finger we heard so much about in the last election—the trigger finger. Yes, we do have a nuclear test ban treaty. To what avail. Our President a few days ago in one of his TV news media proclaimed in an off-the-cuff statement that we would welcome a visit of the B. & K. team to his ranch. I predict that if they come to the United States they will do so only for propaganda value, take two steps forward and one back which as usual leaves a gain of one step. In 50 some odd years, I have become familiar with the philosophy of Russian leadership beginning with Lenin and ending with Khrushchev. Not one ever deviated from the policy of their foreign relations program: Dedicated to world conquest and ideology of communism. The deposed Mr. Khrushchev stated: "We will bury you," also "no need to worry about America, first socialism and then communism." Khrushchev risked two steps forward in the Cuban missile crisis, took one step back and we now have a Communist Cuba 90 miles from our shore. Will President Johnson have any success with this B. & K. team. I doubt it. How can a nuclear test ban between nations be bona fide when Russia, one of the signers to the treaty has an outstanding regard of ignoring treaties, when it no longer suits its purpose.

What do I want from my government. The truth. Tell America where we are heading. Let the road be straight without detours. Let us rebuild our townhouse in America and our oversea house of foreign relations upon a foundation of truth. Let us say to the world—this is our policy. We shall meet emergencies and deal with them successfully as they arise and act decisively in moments of crisis.

I pray to the Almighty that a vigilant press and Congress will never permit an ambitious administration to manage the news. Otherwise, Lincoln's immortal words, "Government by the people" will quietly fade into the pages of history.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Frederick,
President.

[From the Indiana Evening Gazette, Jan. 13, 1965]

Combat Soldiers Say Faked Battles "for the Birds"—USIS Making Movie of Vietnam War

(Editor's Note.—An Associated Press correspondent drove south of Saigon today to check reports of a battle. This is what he found.)

(By Peter Arnett)

Tan Hiep, South Vietnam.—The overloaded bus stopped with a clumsy jerk as machineguns clattered somewhere in the roadside trees.

A score of passengers leaped into a watery ditch as the firing continued amid clouds of green, red, and blue smoke.

"Take it easy," said a young U.S. Army officer casually smoking a cigarette in a jeep parked at the roadside.

"That isn't war. I thought I was coming over here to advise soldiers. They may as well have sent me to Hollywood."

The U.S. Information Service was making a color movie on the Vietnamese war. A battle scene was being staged with a company of Vietnamese troops and spotter planes.

Other troops were on guard to keep the Communist Vietcong from getting into the act.

"Marvelous, isn't it?" said a USIS officer as a dozen colored smoke grenades provided a thick screen for Vietnamese troops attacking the absent enemy with blazing weapons.

"Don't talk when they use real bullets," the American film producer shouted. "You'll ruin the natural sound."

The U.S. officer at the roadside watched the Vietnamese troops taking the "enemy village."

"It's a pity they never get around to doing it as professional as that in real life," he said.

The attack scene is to be used in a 30-minute film for worldwide distribution to show how the Vietnamese war is going.

"We want to show the world how things really are here," the information officer said.

Three soldiers were blasting a rice paddy with automatic weapons.

"Get that dirt flying," the producer yelled.

"What we are looking for is realism," a USIS officer said. "Two days ago we staged a great defense of an outpost. We had the men defending like heroes and the women binding their wounds.

"We didn't show the 'attacking' Vietcong. In real life, you never get pictures of the Vietcong."

The film unit has been on the job 3 weeks and hopes to finish in another month. They have avoided the real war and such major engagements as Binh Ga.

"We don't want to show cruel things like bodies," said the USIS officer. "And we will avoid references to tanks, fighter aircraft and artillery. This is a people-to-people film to win support from the free world.

"We want more flags here. We can sell Vietnam by minimizing the brutality and emphasizing the personal aspects of the war."

"All this colored smoke and 'gung ho' bayonet charges is for the birds," said a U.S. captain who advises a Vietnamese battalion in the Mekong Delta.

"If they want pictures of the war, "They should come with me sometime. If they want to portray the war, they should try to do it at least like it really is."

"I only hope they don't end up ambushing themselves," said a veteran combat photographer.

RUTLAND HEIGHTS VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again join the ever-growing number of my colleagues who have here voiced their dismay and shock over the closing of veteran facilities throughout the country.

The reasons given so blithly is that the Government is thinking of saving some money. Let me say, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I have kept careful watch over Government spending and have frequently urged economy where economy was required. But I sincerely doubt if the saving which the Veterans' Administration claims will result from the closing of these facilities will, in the coming years, be a real saving. The savings anticipated may look good on paper, but they are, I wish to emphasis, only anticipatory.

I doubt also that when we sent our boys into World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, that we asked them to economize on their courage, or their valor, in order to save their own lives. We asked them to give their all with the tacit understanding that in future years the country they served so well would insure their well-being in their hour of need.

In January of this year I received a letter from Mr. Edward H. Story, Jr., president of the Employees' Association of the Rutland Heights Veterans' Administration Hospital in Massachusetts. I believe then that the feelings expressed in the letter reflected not only those of the employees of the hospital, but also a good number of residents of Massachusetts. My feelings in this matter were confirmed when I received a copy of a resolution of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, calling upon the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the veterans' facilities.

Mr. Speaker, under previous leave I insert in the Record both a copy of Mr. Story's letter and a copy of the resolution of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

Employees' Association,
Veteran's Administration Hospital,
Rutland Heights, Mass., January 25, 1965.
Hon. Silvio O. Conte,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Conte: In 1963 the Veterans' Administration hospital at Rutland Heights, Mass., celebrated its 40th anniversary with a week of diverse activities including outstanding lectures in the field of medicine, psychiatry, social work, physical fitness, and topped off its celebration with a band concert for the patients, and a family night. At that time, members of the staff, patients and their families, and members of veterans' organizations wondered if the 50th anniversary of Rutland would be better than the 40th, and wondered who would be around to attend it. Now we know the answer. Nobody will be there. No patients, no doctors, no nurses, no veterans' organizations, no band, no family—just nobody.

Why? Because less than 2 years later, the VA hospital at Rutland was ordered to close its doors by June 30, 1965, although on the day that the order came (January 13, 1965), there were 396 patients in the Rutland VA Hospital and the medical staff was following an additional 250 patients who had been discharged and were on a completion-of-bed-occupancy-care basis. (A private hospital would call this outpatient followup).

The announcement of the closing of Rutland came so suddenly and without any prior warning or knowledge that the patients, their families, the employees, and the community are still in a state of shock. (Now everybody needs medical treatment.)

Why had the radar system at Rutland failed to perceive this situation? Partly because the VA hospital at Rutland had been planning, anticipating, and had been instructed that a 105-to-120-bed nursing care unit (for veterans?) would be established at Rutland. Our D building had been selected and designated for the nursing care unit. This building was built in 1946, and it is not antiquated but is modern and has 3 floors capable of and accustomed to housing 149 patients in 1- and 2-bed rooms. This was in keeping with legislation passed by Congress to provide 4,000 nursing care beds to veterans. Also, the medical staff, for several months had been reducing the patient load in order to be able to convert the D building into a nursing care unit, and without inconvenience to patients and their families.

It has been charged and alleged that VA hospital, Rutland is: (1) obsolescent; (2) it would be too costly or prohibitive to modernize it; (3) there is a limited demand for hospitalization due to its remote location; (4) it is difficult to recruit professional staff and insure quality medical care; (5) other VA hospitals can expand the boundaries of their geographic area served.

If the first four reasons above are true, then Rutland VA hospital should have been closed 10 years ago, and a saving of $30 million would have been achieved.

Is Rutland obsolescent? Reconstruction and renovation of buildings housing patients has been consistently accomplished. A modern laundry, sprinkler system, new boiler room, new warehouses are all in excellent condition. Our physical plant has been improved and modernized in the last 5 years, and it is estimated that a half million dollars was spent on improvements, with the major focus and emphasis being on improved service, comfort, safety and welfare of patients.

We admit that we do not have air conditioning as some modern hospitals do, and we do not need it because of our ideal climate. One VA hospital, only 11 years old, has air conditioning in the wintertime that requires patients and nurses to wear overcoats and mittens. We realize that this was an architectural and engineering mistake, but the cost to renovate that new hospital is $4 million.

It has been said that it will cost $1 million to modernize VA hospital, Rutland. The VA hospital at Coral Gables, Fla., is presently being modernized at the cost of $10 million.

Rutland Heights is so obsolescent and antedeluvian; that a Boston newspaper described it as a "magnificent and beautiful hospital that the State of Massachusetts should take over." Its value is about $20 million.

Rutland is remote. It sits in the middle of a small State with over 5 million people. Rutland is 12 miles from Worcester with 180,000 people, and Worcester County has a total of 500,000 people. The VA hospital at Oteen, N.C., is 12 miles from Asheville which has a population of 60,000. (In Worcester County alone there are 74,000 veterans.)

In Massachusetts there are 695,000 veterans, of whom 75,000 are over 65 years of age. In the other New England States, there are an additional 698,000 veterans, of whom 71,000 are over 65 years of age. This group of 146,000 veterans in Massachusetts and New England represents and constitutes a segment of the veteran population who, because of age, require more medical care, and quite often require chronic care. The Rutland VA hospital has served chronic-care patients. Our last statistical summary on patients' ages revealed that 28 percent of our patients were 70 years or older, 22 percent were in the 60-to-69-age bracket, and 18 percent were in the 50-to-59-year-old bracket. The fact that 68 percent of our patients were over 50 years of age is not unusual, because these older age groups do require more extensive medical care and treatment. Incidence of disease increases steadily with advancing age, and a national health survey has even shown that health impairments are significantly higher in male aging veterans than in nonveterans.

Veterans are not getting younger. The average age of World War II veterans is 47. VA statistics show that half of the aging veteran population is located in nine States (California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Florida, and Pennsylvania), and that geographic mobility and residence changes decline in most areas with advancing age.

Who and what VA facilities are going to take care of aging veterans if the Veterans' Administration obliterates a hospital like Rutland which has been making a marked contribution to the care of chronic and geriatric cases? The possible solution of placing these veterans in private nursing homes is not the total answer or solution, because private nursing homes do not want, and will not accept, bedridden and wheelchair cases that require extensive nursing care. The private nursing home cannot afford to provide care to these patients.

Do private nursing homes have services such as physical therapy, occupation and recreational therapy, spiritual guidance of the chaplaincy service, library service, and volunteers for these aging veterans? In the majority of instances, the answer is, "No. No. Absolutely no."

The State of Massachusetts has provided care to Massachusetts veterans through the soldiers' hospitals and dormitories at Chelsea and Holyoke. However, at Chelsea it takes 9 months on their waiting list before a veterans can be admitted to their hospital section.

VA hospital, Rutland, was for many years a leader in the treatment of tuberculosis, and was the second largest tuberculosis hospital within the VA system. Patients from all the New England States, and even New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland were treated at Rutland. With the marked reduction in tuberculosis cases, Rutland has only 122 tuberculosis patients, including veterans from 3 other New England States. Tuberculosis is still a serious, deadly, communicable, and contagious disease, that initially requires hospital treatment until it is under control and stabilized. Rutland still provides expert care for the tuberculosis patient. Where will the tuberculosis patient go after Rutland closes? In the past, very few VA hospitals have wanted or were willing to treat the tuberculous patient. Will the tuberculous veteran be hospitalized in a VA hospital? You do know that tuberculosis will not be eradicated in our lifetime.

Rutland Veterans' Administration Hospital provides acute medical care and treatment for general medical patients. Because Rutland has a small waiting list of patients to be admitted for treatment, is this a reason for condemnation? When a veteran is sick, does Congress say he must wait for treatment? Long waiting periods for hospital treatment should be condemned rather than condoned. Do veterans legally entitled to treatment from the Veterans' Administration have to go to other hospitals in the community while waiting for a bed in a VA hospital?

Is the Veterans' Administration in Massachusetts meeting all the medical needs of its veterans who need hospitalization and medical treatment? What about the veterans who are alcoholics and who need hospital treatment and rehabilitation programs? Are their needs being met? Don't we need new and improved programs in general medical hospitals for these veterans? Not 10 to 20 beds in a token program, but 50 to 60 beds if the need is there. And the need is there for veterans in Massachusetts as well as other sections of the United States.

It has been alleged that Rutland VA hospital has difficulty in recruiting professional staff (in suburbia?). If this is true, Rutland VA hospital should have been closed 10 or 20 years ago, because the VA has proclaimed medical care second to none, and Rutland should not have been allowed to be an exception or a compromise hospital for the thousands of patients who were successfully treated here. However, the truth is and the facts are that Rutland has had, and still has, excellent medical, surgical, and nursing staff, as well as other paramedical disciplines. Rutland VA hospital at this moment has 20 physicians, including 4 surgeons, plus 2 dentists. We also have 35 physicians who are consultants and function in many specialties in the field of medicine. If the hospital is to be closed, it will be then that we will have difficulty recruiting, and not before.

Ten years ago, when Rutland averaged 600 patients, there was a total of 20 physicians, including the manager. The type of treatment has changed, and this patient population has decreased, but our present staff of 20 physicians is sufficient, and we are not having difficulty recruiting or finding excellent people in medical or paramedical services.

We have been talking about patients and veterans and their special needs. We should add that the majority of our employees have worked for the VA for over 20 years, and worked in this hospital when it was purely for treatment of tuberculosis. Each employee (and his family) did expose himself in his work to contracting this disease. Some employees did get tuberculosis, and others just incurred the risk. However, this kind of duty consisted of dedicated loyalty to the patients and to the Veterans' Administration, and the reward for this dedication should not be reduction in force or transfer to Alaska. Hawaii? Well, maybe.

The forward-looking programs of the Great Society, medicare, aid to education, the antipoverty bill, represent the feelings, desires and aspirations of all the people of our country. False economy in the guise of not just reducing but actually depriving veterans of good medical care to which the Congress has legally entitled them (and for good reasons) will make a mockery of the new programs that the President is envisioning. The veterans of this country do not want a government of slogans and promises, but they do want a government of action, of integrity and sincerity.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD H. STORY, Jr.,
President.

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE RUTLAND HEIGHTS HOSPITAL AND THE MANCHESTER FACILITIES OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Massachusetts House of Representatives that the medical-surgical facilities of the Veterans' Administration, located at Rutland Heights in the Commonwealth and Manchester, N.H., will be closed effective June 30 of the current year; and

Whereas the closing of these facilities is in direct conflict with the general philosophy behind veterans' benefits in the United States as it has evolved over a long period of years and will result in derogation of veterans' benefits; and

Whereas the removal of these hospitals will work a particular hardship on the veterans of the Commonwealth who have been so conveniently served at Rutland Heights and Manchester: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the veterans' facilities at Rutland Heights and Manchester; and be it further

Resolved, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States rescind the order providing for the closing of the medical-surgical facilities located at Rutland Heights and Manchester; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Surgeon General of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, adopted, January 14, 1965.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA—A 55TH ANNIVERSARY TRIBUTE FROM CONGRESSMAN CLEVELAND

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, centuries before the birth of Christ, Aristotle wrote, "All who have meditated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced that the fate of empires depends on the education of youth." This year, as the Boy Scouts of America carry out their American heritage program of training our youth in the traditions and virtues that have made our country great, they present to us a striking contrast with the forms of youth organization and training in countries not blessed with a representative form of government.

Dictators have not been slow to learn the usefulness of training the young for loyalty and service to their regimes. The regimentation of youth has been one of the first acts of modern dictators. In many countries of the world, but especially those behind the Iron Curtain, youth organization is a state monopoly and all youth groups are a branch of the ruling political party and of the government. Children are taught to spy on their parents and are rewarded and praised for turning them in to the authorities. The family is weakened, if not destroyed. Militant atheism is inculcated. Programs for young people are but a political tool of the dictator.

Thank God this is not true in America. The Boy Scouts of America are a fine example of what can be done by individual citizens and community institutions working together to preserve our American heritage and build a better America.

VOLUNTARY PROGRAM INSTILLS SELF-RELIANCE

No one has to become a Boy Scout, or a Boy Scout leader. No Government edict determines what the Scouts shall and shall not do. Boys belong because they want to belong. They belong because it is fun—and because they find in scouting a form of learning and of inspiration that they could not find elsewhere. When Congress chartered the Boy Scouts in 1910, it was in order that America might have a private organization of its citizens who would "teach boys to do things for themselves and others," instruct them in Scoutcraft, and instill in them the virtues of "patriotism, courage, and self-reliance." Scouts have an opportunity to have their individual accomplishments recognized through the advancement system culminating in the award of Eagle Scout. But they also learn to live as part of a community in their patrol and troop. They are trained to help others by "doing a good turn daily" and their knowledge of first aid and lifesaving, among other things, has saved countless lives over the years.

Scouting has also given boys a sense of self-reliance that is becoming increasingly rare in our mechanized world. These are youngsters who still know how to walk from place to place, and do not litter our highways when they do. These are youngsters who can take care of themselves when they are far from home, adventuring in the fields and forests of our beautiful Nation.

HONOR AND DUTY

Perhaps the finest thing scouting has given our youth is a deep sense of the honor and duty of an individual human being. The Scout oath and law gives boys a set of values that adds great meaning to their lives, supplementing for some the work of home and church, and providing for others what has been neglected in their lives. Scouting teaches boys to do things right, not because someone is holding a club over their heads, and not because they are afraid that a policeman might come around the corner, but simply for the sake of doing things right.

J. EDGAR HOOVER PRAISES SCOUTING

I can say no more than to agree with FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, when he said:

> Boy Scout training makes a deep and lasting impression. In the many FBI men who were Scouts when boys, I have seen the personal qualities which scouting develops—self-reliance, dependability, and an unselfish devotion to duty. * * * America needs men with such qualities now, and she will always need them in all walks of life and in all occupations.

Some people are hypnotized by the false doctrine that an all-powerful central government can, by the mere passage of a law or the launching of a program, solve the deeply complex and troublesome problems of the day.

FREEDOM IS SOURCE OF STRENGTH

This we know is not true. The strength of our Nation and our American heritage is based on free individuals working at the local level with the energy that is generated by the precepts of the Scout oath. The strength of our Nation and our American heritage has come from people who believed with the Scouts that it is right and good to be trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and above all reverent.

What a much better world it would be, if every person asked himself at the end of each day, as each Scout asks himself at the end of his evening campfire, in those wonderful words of Scout vespers:

> Silently each Scout should ask
> Have I done my daily task?
> Have I kept my honor bright?
> Can I guiltless sleep tonight?
> Have I done and have I dared
> Everything to be prepared?

APPALACHIA ALTERNATIVE: A REPUBLICAN PLAN FOR ALL THE NATION

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, with other Republican members of the Public Works Committee, I am today introducing the Resources Development Act of 1965—a program for all the Nation—as opposed to the restricted, special-interest Appalachian program, which the administration sponsors.

Unlike the President's plan, this bill would help areas throughout the country that are in need. The administration bill is limited to 360 counties in an 11-State region and some 70 of these counties are above the prosperity levels used as criteria for Federal aid under the area redevelopment program and the accelerated public works program. The administration bill leaves out of consideration other areas of the country that are equally in need. There are, for instance, areas of New Hampshire in sore need of better roads, sewage plants, hospitals, vocational training schools, and the other community facilities provided for by the administration program for Appalachia.

APPALACHIA VIOLATES NATIONAL HIGHWAY CONCEPT

To fully understand my objections to the administration's Appalachian proposal, it must be noted that 85 percent of the program is for highway construction. Over the years, our National Highway System has been developed so that all the States in the Union, on a time-tested formula, have shared in a fair manner Federal funds for highway construction made available to States on a matching basis.

Now, for the first time, 11 States, among them the largest and wealthiest in the Nation, are being singled out to receive $840 million of special funds for development highways and access roads. Having in mind that other areas of the Nation have a real and pressing need for such highway funds, the essential unfairness of Appalachia becomes apparent.

RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

This legislation would authorize the Federal Government, over an initial 2-year period, to assist and advise problem areas wherever they are located on a national basis, and a fair basis. For construction of development roads, $800 million would be allocated during the 2-year period; for health facilities, $82 million; for timber development, mining area restoration, and water resources surveys, $58 million; for sewage treatment plants, $12 million; for research and expenses connected with local development districts, $11 million; and for vocational educational facilities, $32 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very large plan but it is an orderly one and above all, it is fair to all. It can be continued and extended as deemed necessary after the initial 2 years of experience. Those of us who are sponsors of this legislation fully recognize the pressing needs of the depressed areas along the Appalachian chain and, under our bill they can, over the course of the program, benefit much as they would under the administration bill.

STATES RETAIN REASONABLE CONTROL

There is an additional advantage the Republican alternative carries over the administration's bill. That is found in the manner in which this program would be administered. The States themselves retain control and make the decisions under the Republican plan. The administration's bill, however, establishes a special Commission composed of the 11 Governors or their representatives and a Federal representative, designated by the act as cochairman and with an absolute veto over the Governors. That is, if the Governors all should agree on an operation under the program but the Federal Commissioner said "No, there would be no such operation."

We believe this concept is wrong. It is a major encroachment on the rights of the States, which are, after all, the agencies closest and most responsive and most knowledgeable about the needs of their citizens. This Commission concept is a bad precedent. It places too great a responsibility upon the Federal representative and subjects him to pressures of time—and politics—too great for sound administration.

The role of the Federal Government, as we envision it and as the Republican Party has always envisioned it, is to be of help; to respond to legitimate calls for assistance but within a Federal system. The Commission concept as proposed by the administration would permit the Federal Government, which is to say a handful of remote officials or even a single official to impose a design from above.

HOW "STARVED" IS THE PUBLIC SECTOR?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, not long ago it was fashionable to assert that the private sector in American life was bloated with affluence while the public sector, providing such services as education, defense, and health care, was "starved." One of the leading proponents of the thesis was the Harvard economist John Kenneth Galbraith. His book, "The Affluent Society," has had an important impact on both public officials as well as the average citizen. Judging by some of the proposals coming from the White House the administration itself apparently believes that the public sector in American life is "starving" and in need of nourishment.

A new study by economists of the highly respected National Industrial Conference Board sets out to measure the influence of Government in business. This study is designed "to provide information on the extent to which Government is now directly engaged in areas of economic activity previously considered to be in the realm of taxpaying private enterprise." It points out that "the growing involvement of Government in business-type activity is steadily obliterating the historic, traditional borderlines between the public and the private sectors."

As the foreword to the study asserts, "publicly financed enterprises impinge upon activities for which private funds had earlier provided the required capital and related resources, they not only tend to restrict further risk-taking enterprise in these fields but they also lead to the erosion of the tax base, thereby placing an even heavier burden upon the remaining private ventures."

In light of the widely held position that the public sector is "starved," some of the facts in the National Industrial Conference Board study are astounding. Members of Congress, as well as the press and administration officials, will be interested to know not only the extent of the Government's present involvement in business-type activities, but also the rapid rate at which that involvement has grown over the years. This is indicated by the following facts:

First. Total assets of the Federal Government were valued at $315 billion in mid-1963. This represented an increase of $53 billion, or 20 percent, from 1958. National defense accounted for more than three-fifths of the total.

Second. Fully a third of the 2.3 billion acres of land in the United States is owned by the Central Government. Another 5 percent is held by State and local units. In 1900, public buildings comprised 5.8 percent—4.5 percent State and local; 1.3 percent Federal—of the value of all structures. By 1958 this had grown to 21 percent—16.7 percent State and local; 4.3 percent Federal.

Third. In 1963 all governmental units took off the marketplace goods and services valued at about $128.9 billion, or fully 23 percent of gross national product. As late as 1929 the figure was $9.2 billion, or about 9 percent of gross national product.

Fourth. Direct employment by government totaled 12 million in 1962. Thus, one in every six employed persons, including those in military service, was on government payroll. Better than half were employed by State and local governments, nearly a third by Federal defense and related programs, and almost an eighth in Federal nondefense programs. Indirect government employment derives from the receipts of the private sector from Government purchases. When the direct and indirect impacts are added, they total 18.5 million jobs, or more than one-quarter of all employment.

Fifth. Federal budget expenditures on agriculture and agricultural resources rose from $1.2 billion in 1939 to $7 billion in 1963. The farm program has grown steadily more costly despite a significant decline in farm population. While the number of farms has declined from 6.1 million in 1940 to 3.7 million in 1959, a decline of two-fifths, the number of employees in the Federal Department of Agriculture increased by nearly one-fifth. And while national income almost doubled between 1950 and 1963, income originating in agriculture has remained unchanged, despite billions of dollars of support activity.

Sixth. As late as 1930 only 6 percent of all the power-generating capacity was Government owned and that largely by municipalities. In 1960 Government-owned generating capacity represented 23 percent of all U.S. power capacity. Federally owned projects now account for almost 60 percent of all Government-owned power.

Seventh. Between 1946 and 1963 the cumulative value of new construction put in place reached $753.5 billion. Of this, $205.9 billion were public expenditures for highways, public structures, and related purposes. Private building almost quadrupled during that period, but public building increased at double the private rate. Government buildings and structures accounted for 22 percent of all new public and private construction in 1946–52, 28 percent in the investment boom of 1953–57, and 30 percent during 1958–63.

Eighth. Commissaries and PX's aggregate sales totaled $2.3 billion in 1962, so that these outlets combined ranked fourth among the Nation's leading retailers. If sales abroad are excluded, they ranked seventh.

Ninth. By 1963 public medical expenditures totaled about $8 billion. They were 15 times greater than in 1929 and accounted for almost one-fourth of all such medical care outlays.

Tenth. The $109.8 billion in Federal loans and guaranteed or insured loans outstanding represents a tenfold increase since 1945.

Eleventh. Total national expenditures for R. & D. increased by nearly $10 billion, or 186 percent, between 1954 and 1962. Federal expenditures for these purposes rose by $7 billion, or 252 percent, so that they accounted for nearly two-thirds of all research outlays.

COMMENTS ON THE MOVE TO ABOLISH THE HUAC

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on August 4, 1964, I received a letter from an organization called the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. I assume that this letter was sent to most, if not all, Members of the Congress. Accompanying this letter was a tentative draft of a petition.

On August 20 I referred this letter to the House Un-American Activities Committee requesting its comments. Francis J. McNamara, director of the House committee, replied promptly, stating that the House Un-American Activities Committee had not received a copy of the tentative draft of the petition but if I would be good enough to forward a copy the committee would be happy to provide me "with some of the facts and thoughts the committee would present in reply to it." On September 11, I sent a copy to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

On December 15, 1964, I received a comprehensive reply from Mr. McNamara.

I think it is very important to develop a dialog on the subject of the adequacy of the House Un-American Activities Committee and to eliminate the battle of press releases and self-serving statements to the public which has been going on for many years. To further this objective I am placing in the Congressional Record the reply I received from the director of the House Un-American Activities Committee along with a copy of a letter I have written to the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I was hopeful that the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee would make a response as I requested in my letter. It apparently has not chosen to do so. If it does, I will place it in the Record.

I think it would be helpful if the House Administration Committee would hold public hearings at the time the budget of the House Un-American Activities Committee is under consideration and invite the critics of the House Un-American Activities Committee to be heard in full. If the critics have a case that can be made, let us have it presented under circumstances which permit cross-examination of the witnesses who level the charges and testimony in rebuttal to be presented by those who disagree with them. I am a little bit tired of what seem to be their hit-and-run tactics.

The Congress of the United States is the proper forum in which to present the pros and cons of controversial positions of a political nature. The Congress constantly fulfills this function through public hearings by its standing committees. Utilizing the Congress in this fashion is the best way to resolve matters where grave differences of opinion exist on subjects of a political nature, such as this one. This also will tend to lessen the public confusion which is bound to arise around any public question when controversial statements not subject to cross-examination and rebuttal testimony are widely publicized. The public confusion will be greatly lessened if the news media will diligently report to the people the full dialog which goes on in committee hearings, that is, opening statements, cross-examination, redirect examination and rebuttal witnesses with their cross-examination and redirect examination.

To those interested in pursuing this matter further, I call attention to some material previously appearing in the Congressional Record. In 1963 I proposed that a separate committee be established to assume jurisdiction over contempt cases which might arise out of the hearings of the various House committees—Congressional Record, volume 109, part 1, pages 1020–1021; volume 109, part 9, page 12126. I exchanged correspondence with Congressman James Roosevelt and the American Civil Liberties Union on this proposal, originally in 1961, urging their support of the proposal for handling contempt citations. I had some lengthy correspondence with Rev. Stanley I. Stuber in respect to the House Un-American Activities Committee and in particular to the alleged violation of the House Un-American Activities Committee in permitting materials in its files derogatory to an individual to be publicized—Congressional Record, volume 108, part 3, page 3779; volume 108, part 13, pages 18279–18282; volume 108, part 14, pages 19503–19505; volume 109, part 4, pages 4627–4629; volume 109, part 6, pages 7258–7259.

I am again introducing the proposal to establish a separate committee to handle all contempt citations arising out of hearings before congressional committees—H.R. 2795—and the remarks concerning this bill appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1, 1965, at page 1634.

The following is the reply of the House Un-American Activities Committee and Director Francis McNamara's letter and my letter to the Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

AUGUST 4, 1964.

Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: We enclose herewith the tentative draft of a petition relating to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is our intention to circulate the petition, after revision, for signature among recognized authorities in the constitutional law field. We have two objectives in mind. One is that it may be possible in this way to secure agreement, among leading individuals and organizations opposing the committee, on a single concrete program of action in advance of the convening of the new Congress next January. The other is that publication of the petition and signatures this fall may result in increased public support for the objectives of such a program.

Before circulating the petition for signature we would like to obtain the reaction of certain key individuals and groups who feel the same concern about the committee as we do. For that purpose we are sending the petition to you in its present draft form. We would very much appreciate it if you would send any comments or suggestions you may care to make to Alexander Meiklejohn, 1525 LaLoma Avenue, Berkeley, Calif.

Sincerely.

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN.
THOMAS I. EMERSON.

PETITION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (DRAFT, JULY 29, 1964)

We, the undersigned, for the reason set forth below, respectfully petition the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The sole power conferred on the committee is to investigate "un-American propaganda activities" and "subversive and un-American propaganda" in the United States. Its jurisdiction is thus limited to inquiring into ideas, opinions, speech, and other forms of expression. Within this area, however, its powers are undefined, for no precise meaning has been, or can be, given to such vague terms as "un-American" or "subversive." We believe that the existence of a legislative committee with such authority is irreconcilable with a system of free expression in this country. There can be no doubt that the power of a legislative committee to summon witnesses, to interrogate them in public, to subject them to public exposure, and otherwise to mobilize the great force of governmental authority against the object of its investigation, constitutes an awesome exercise of official power. When such power is directed exclusively against the rights of Americans to free and open expression, or association for such purposes, it cannot be justified under any concept of democracy.

In its actual operation the Committee on Un-American Activities has wrought much harm. It has taken as its main function, as indeed is inevitable from its grant of power, the exposure and extermination of ideas, opinions, and organizations which it conceives to be un-American. Its methods have often been unfair. It has attempted to create in the legislative branch a permanent institution, consisting of staff, files, informants, and similar machinery, designed to serve as a bureaucratic big brother to censor the opinions and associations of American citizens. The result of these activities has been to curtail the discussion of controversial issues and to hinder the development of new ideas and new approaches to the troublesome questions which face us in a rapidly changing world.

The Committee on Un-American Activities serves no useful purpose. So far as the operations of the House of Representatives are concerned, the committee considers only a handful of bills each year, and all these fall within the jurisdiction of some other committee. So far as the committee attempts to serve the function of safeguarding internal security, it is quite unnecessary. We have adequate laws, regulations, personnel, and machinery for that purpose. There are serious problems confronting us, but the human and natural resources in this country are surely adequate to the task. What is needed is an opportunity to permit our democratic institutions to function as they are meant to do, with new and unorthodox ideas welcomed but subject to full and free discussion. The maintenance of a legislative committee to restrict this process betrays an ultimate lack of faith in a democratic society.

Believing that there is no place in our system for such a committee, we urge the House of Representatives to abolish the committee by repeal of paragraph 18 of rule XI.

We do not suggest the abandonment of all legislative machinery for investigation of matters pertaining to legislation necessary for assuring internal security, or to administration of existing laws. We believe that adequate authority for these purposes is already vested in other House committees, particularly the Committee on the Judiciary. Under subsection c of paragraph 12 of rule XI, the Judiciary Committee now has jurisdiction over "Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting." Under this provision, and a similar one in the Senate Rules, the Judiciary Committees have traditionally dealt with matters of internal security. In the event Members of the House feel that the authority of the Judiciary Committee should be clarified, however, this can readily be accomplished by amendment. In order to avoid perpetuation of the problems noted previously, such an amendment should make clear that the Judiciary Committee has power to investigate overt actions but not propaganda or other forms of expression, or association for those ends. We believe this objective could be achieved by amending subsection c to read: "Bankruptcy and counterfeiting; mutiny, espionage, sabotage, insurrection and other overt actions relating to internal security."

There remains the question of disposing of the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities. These files are extensive, containing miscellaneous and often inaccurate data about millions of Americans. It may be assumed that, insofar as this material pertains to violation of law, it has been made available to the appropriate prosecuting authorities. The remainder is not of a character which should be maintained in a legislative file or furnished to the public. Self-respecting citizens of a democratic country cannot allow their representatives in government to keep dossiers on their beliefs, ideas, political views, or associations. Such an enterprise is destructive of the sovereign rights of the individual and a perversion of the governmental process. We recommend that the files be transferred to the Archives, not to be open for official or public inspection for 50 years, or destroyed.

We therefore petition the House of Representatives (1) to repeal paragraph 18 of rule XI, thereby abolishing the Committee on Un-American Activities; (2) to transfer its files to the Archives, under condition they be not open for official or public inspection for 50 years, or to destroy them; and (3) if the House believes that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Judiciary requires clarification, to amend paragraph 12 of rule XI to give that committee power to investigate overt actions relating to internal security, but not matters of speech, opinion, or other forms of expression.

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN.
THOMAS I. EMERSON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, August 31, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Thank you very much for forwarding to me a copy of the letter, dated August 4, which you received from the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I gather from the context of your letter that you are interested in learning what the committee would reply to the charges which are apparently contained in the draft petition now being circulated for signatures by the above-named organization.

From the contents of this organization's letter, I gather that a copy of the petition was enclosed with it for your consideration. Inasmuch as the committee has not yet received a copy of this petition and since, probably inadvertently, a copy of the one you received was not enclosed with your letter to the committee, I am not in a position to comment on it.

If you will be good enough to forward us a copy of the petition for study, I will be most happy to provide you with some of the facts and thoughts the committee would present in reply to it.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. MCNAMARA,
Director.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, December 15, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Enclosed, in response to your request, are replies to the various allegations concerning the Committee on Un-American Activities contained in the petition drafted by Alexander Meiklejohn and Thomas I. Emerson and circulated by the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

These draft replies do not contain all that could be said on each subject they cover, but they will be sufficient, I hope, to give you some idea of the reply the committee would make to the various allegations in the petition.

With appreciation for your thoughtfulness in forwarding us a copy of the petition when it was in draft form, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. MCNAMARA,
Director.

ALLEGATIONS IN PETITION TO ABOLISH HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

1. It has power to investigate only subversive and un-American propaganda and propaganda activities, and is thus limited to inquiring into ideas, opinions, speech and other forms of expression.
2. Its powers in this area are undefined, because no precise meaning has ever been given or can be given to such vague terms as "un-American" or "subversive."
3. The committee has taken as its main function the exposure and extermination of ideas, opinions, and organization which it conceives to be un-American.
4. Its methods have often been unfair.
5. It attempts to censor the opinions and associations of American citizens.
6. Its activities have resulted in the curtailment of the discussion of controversial issues and hindered the development of new ideas and approaches to troublesome questions.

7. It serves no useful purposes, considering only a handful of bills each year. All the bills it handles are within the jurisdiction of other committees.

8. The committee is unnecesary. The country has all the laws, regulations, etc., needed to safeguard its internal security.

9. Its functions would be better transferred to the Judiciary Committee, whose authority should be amended to give it jurisdiction over "bankruptcy and counterfeiting; mutiny, espionage, sabotage, insurrection and other overt actions relating to internal security," but not to include propaganda or other forms of expression or association for those ends.

10. The committee's files, which often contain inaccurate data about millions of Americans, should be destroyed or transferred to the Archives and not to be open for either official or public inspection for 50 years.

It has power to investigate only subversive and un-American propaganda activities, and is thus limited to inquiring into ideas, opinions, speech and other forms of expression.

REPLY

This claim is false. Propaganda does not exist in a vacuum; it is not self-generating. It is created and disseminated by individuals, groups and organizations. The creation and dissemination of propaganda is a complicated process, involving various kinds of activity, particularly when carried out in behalf of a conspiracy.

While ideas, opinions, speech and other forms of expression are, generally speaking, protected activities, they are not always so. They are most definitely not protected by the first amendment when carried out in behalf of a conspiracy such as communism. As Justice Jackson said in *Dennis* v. *U.S.* (41 U.S. 494):

"The Constitution does not make conspiracy a civil right."

The U.S. Supreme Court, in a recent (1959) decision defining the power of the Committee on Un-American Activities stated:

"In pursuance of its legislative concerns in the domain of national security the House has clothed the Un-American Activities Committee with pervasive authority to investigate Communist activities in this country."

In the same decision, it also stated:

"From the beginning, without interruption to the present time, and with the undoubted knowledge and approval of the House, the committee has devoted a major part of its energies to the investigation of Communist activities.

"In light of this long and illuminating history it can hardly be seriously argued that the investigation of Communist activities generally, and the attendant use of compulsory process, was beyond the purview of the committee's intended authority under rule XI." (*Barenblatt* v. *U.S.A.*, 345 U.S. 930).

Several years earlier, writing for the majority in the *Watkins* case (354 U.S. 178), Chief Justice Warren stated in referring to the committee's enabling resolution:

"At one time, perhaps, the resolution might have been read narrowly to confine the committee to the subject of propaganda. The events that have transpired in the 15 years before the interrogation of petitioner [in 1954] makes such a construction impossible at this date."

Thus, the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has also explicitly held that the committee's jurisdiction clearly extends beyond the field of propaganda.

This allegation against the committee implies that matters embraced by the first amendment—particularly speech and all other forms of expression—are absolutely protected against inquiry by the Congress and, therefore, also by the committee. Relative to this implication, Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the majority in the Internal Security Act case, wrote on June 5, 1961:

"Where the mask of anonymity which an organization's members wear serves the double purpose of protecting them from popular prejudice and of enabling them to cover over a foreign-directed conspiracy, infiltrate into other groups, and enlist the support of persons who would not, if the truth were revealed, lend their support, it would be a distortion of the first amendment to hold that it prohibits Congress from removing the mask."

Writing for the minority (excepting Justice Black) in the same case, Justice Douglas pointed out:

"The Bill of Rights was designed to give fullest play to the exchange and dissemination of ideas that touch the politics, culture, and other aspects of our life. When an organization is used by a foreign power to make advances here, questions of security are raised beyond the ken of disputation and debate between the people resident here. Espionage, business activities, formation of cells for subversion, as well as the exercise of first amendment rights, are then used to pry open our society and make intrusion of a foreign power easy. These machinations of a foreign power add additional elements to free speech just as marching up and down adds something to picketing that goes beyond free speech."

Its powers in this area [of ideas, opinions, and expression] are undefined, because no precise meaning has ever been given or can be given to such vague terms as "un-American" or "subversive."

REPLY

Precise meanings have been given to the terms "subversive" and "un-American." These terms are not vague.

A definition of "subversive" can be found in any dictionary. The definition given will be as precise and definite as that given many other words in our language which are used daily to convey precise thoughts or ideas.

The term "un-American" is no more vague than the term "un-Christian," a term which conveys a precise meaning not only to and among clergymen but all familiar with Christian precepts.

Moreover, over the years, the courts of this country have defined and refined through their decisions the meaning of the term "un-American" as it is used in the mandate of this committee, giving it not only a generally but even a legally precise definition. [See excerpts from the Supreme Court decision in the *Barenblatt* case quoted in reply to previous allegation.]

The House itself and the courts, of course, have the final say on the question of what is and is not un-American. It is their decisions on the subject which have guided, and which will continue to guide, the committee in its operations. It is significant, however, in discussing this point, to note that one of the most highly respected social science research organizations in the country has drawn definite conclusions as to what is un-American activity.

In 1945, the committee asked the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C., to undertake a study of this subject. It took this step not because it felt the institution had a right to determine what the committee could or could not investigate, but because it believed that a responsible research institution of this kind could probably produce some guidelines that would be helpful in determining the type of investigations it should undertake. (It should be kept in mind that law relative to the committee's mandate, as expressed in court decisions, was practically nonexistent at that time.)

In response to the committee's request, the Brookings Institution made an analysis of what was "un-American," based on study and analysis of the rules of the House defining the duties of the committee, the U.S. Constitution, and the oath required by law of all foreign-born persons who petition for U.S. citizenship. The institution's conclusions were published, in April 1945, in a pamphlet entitled, "Suggested Standards for Determining Un-American Activities."

While it is true that there is same vagueness in terms such as "un-American" and the "principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," this is no more fatal to the clarity of the committee's mandate than terms such as "pursuit of happiness" and "the general welfare" are to the clarity of the Declaration of Independence—or "due process" is to the U.S. Bill of Rights.

Many fundamental documents, laws, etc., are written in more or less general terms because that is the only way they can be given validity for more than the moment. Our Founding Fathers might have had considerable difficulty in 1795 in attempting to define precisely what they meant by "pursuit of happiness" and "due process." Undoubtedly, the definition they would have given in those days would differ from that given by constitutional authorities and the courts today. Yet, it is the very generality of these terms which makes the Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights valid for more than the very era in which they were proclaimed.

Presuming that the Committee on Un-American Activities should continue in existence for another 50 years, changes in customs, laws, and the overall culture of this country will probably effect some changes in what is termed "un-American" just as they will effect additional changes (as the last 100 years of our history has) in terms such as "due process." Thus, it can be said that the generality of the terms used in the committee's enabling resolution are a strength rather than a weakness, desirable rather than unfortunate or deplorable.

The committee has taken as its main function the exposure and extermination of ideas, opinions and organizations which it conceives to be un-American.

REPLY

For many years, the committee has concentrated almost exclusively on the operations of the Communist Party, its fronts, and members. The implication that it is only the committee that feels that the Communist Party is un-American is completely unfounded. Numerous Communist Party leaders have been convicted in our courts for conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of this Government by force and violence. Inasmuch as one party official has also been convicted under the membership clause of the Smith Act and his conviction has been upheld by the Supreme Court, it can be stated that the Supreme Court has ruled, in effect, that the Communist Party is un-American, i.e., dedicated to the destruction of our form of government.

The Congress itself, in enacting various laws, has found the Communist Party to be un-American, although it has not used that term in describing it—classifying it, instead, as totalitarian, subservient to the world Communist movement, to a foreign ideology, etc.

It is also, of course, the finding of hundreds of scholars of all nations that the nature of the Communist movement is such that the U.S. Communist Party is clearly un-American, that is, fundamentally antagonistic toward the principles enunciated in various documents on which the U.S. form of government is founded.

The claim that the committee has taken as its main function "the exposure and extermination of [un-American] ideas, opinions and organizations" is also unfounded. As clearly indicated by the transcripts of numerous committee hearings, the committee has taken as its main function the development of facts about Communist Party operations and the activities of Communist fronts and party members for the purpose of enabling it, and the Congress as a whole, to judge the worth of various bills submitted, the effectiveness of existing security laws, and the need for additional legislation or for amendments to existing laws within its jurisdiction.

It is generally considered that the Internal Security Act of 1950 is the most important piece of legislation reported by the committee in recent years and enacted by the Congress. This law is regarded as the country's major antisubversive law today. It is the law to which the Department of Justice is devoting most of its attention in its efforts to deal with the Communist problem.

An analysis of the provisions of this act completely refutes the claim that the committee considers it its main function to exterminate the Communist Party. Actually, this law is designed primarily to make the Communist Party open and above board in its operations, to strip it of the mask of concealment and deceit under which it has operated since its formation in this country. If the party were to comply with the provisions of the act by registering its members, making annual financial reports to the Attorney General, identifying its and its fronts' publications and other literature—and also their radio and television programs—as what they are, the party would be completely free to carry on all the activities it has been carrying on in this country for many years, exclusive only of those which are contrary to other laws.

As far as the claim that the committee desires to exterminate ideas and opinions is concerned, it can be restated that, over and over again, when known or identified Communists have testified before the committee and expressed their ideas or opinions on certain matters, the committee members have informed them that the committee is not concerned with their ideas, opinions, and beliefs, but rather with their acts. The hearing records of the committee demonstrate conclusively that the main thrust of the committee's operations for many years has been in the area of Communist actions, rather than ideas or opinions.

Its methods have often been unfair.

REPLY

Contrary to the above claim, the Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives of the American Bar Association, after its members had made a study of the committee's hearings, reached the following conclusion:

"The congressional committees investigating communism, and in particular the House Un-American Activities Committee, have been attacked on the ground that they have engaged in smear campaigns and have invaded the constitutional rights of persons investigated. Your committee is impressed with the fairness with which hearings before that committee have been conducted during the period of time indicated by our study of the published testimony. We are satisfied that the witnesses called to testify before the committee are being treated fairly and properly in all respects and we also feel satisfied that each witness is accorded full protection so far as his constitutional or other legal rights are involved; moreover, the confidential communications between attorneys and clients have been fully respected.

"It is the view of your committee that current attacks on the House Un-American Activities Committee are unjustified. Whether deliberate or misguided, such unwarranted attacks result in reducing the effectiveness of that committee's great service to the American people."

The Committee on Un-American Activities has actually been a pacesetter in establishing fair rules of congressional procedure and in observing them. It was the first committee of the House to publish its rules of procedure in booklet form. Ths was done in 1953, after the committee had been following these rules for some years. Every witness subpenaed to testify before the committee is provided with a copy of these rules, so that he and his attorney will have full opportunity to insist upon the observance of procedures and the rights of witnesses spelled out in them.

In addition, the committee has created a subcommittee to consider proposed amendments to its rules. This subcommittee, headed by the late Congressman Clyde Doyle of California, invited every Member of the House to submit to it any proposals they had for amendment of the committee's rules. The extremely small number of suggestions submitted to this subcommittee prior to the last revision of the committee's rules in 1961, is a tribute to the thoroughness and fairness with which the committee, over the years, has developed rules and procedures fully consonant with constitutional and other rights.

It should be borne in mind, too, that the courts of this country in numerous contempt cases have had an opportunity to review the committee's rules of procedure. In no instance have they found them unconstitutional or violative of witness rights.

It attempts to censor the opinions and associations of American citizens.

REPLY

The wording of the above charge is an example of the manner in which semantics are used throughout this petition in an effort to discredit the committee.

The answer to charge No. 3 refutes the claim that the committee attempts to censor the opinions of American citizens.

As far as the claim that it also attempts to censor their associations is concerned, two points are made:

1. There are various kinds of associations—those of a purely social or innocent nature and those involving conspiratorial activities and/or evil designs. A study of the committee's hearings reveals that it has attempted to impugn the Americanism of anyone on the basis of purely social relations with Communists or anyone else.

2. As concerns the conspiratorial associations (activities) of individuals, the fact is that the committee has attempted to develop as much information as possible on such activities for legislative purposes and for the information of the Congress and the people. This is quite different from attempting to censor such associations.

The late Justice Robert Jackson, in his concurring opinion in the case of *Communications Association* v. *Douds*, pointed out:

"There has recently entered the dialectic of politics a cliche used to condemn application of the conspiracy principle to Communists. 'Guilt by association' is an epithet frequently used and little explained, except that it is generally accompanied by another slogan, 'guilt is personal.' Of course it is; but personal guilt may be incurred by joining a conspiracy. That act of association makes one responsible for the acts of others committed in pursuance of the association. It is wholly a question of the sufficiency of evidence of association to imply conspiracy."

Its activities have resulted in the curtailment of the discussion of controversial issues and hindered the development of new ideas and approaches to troublesome questions.

REPLY

No facts are given to substantiate the above allegation and it can, therefore, be answered only in a general way.

There can be little question about the fact that during the 26 years of the committee's existence, the discussion of controversial issues and the development of new ideas and approaches to troublesome questions has increased tremendously. For the most part, the existence of the committee has had no effect, one way or the other, on this development. It has been due primarily to better and more widespread education, the improvement of new coverage of local, national and international affairs, the development of radio and television, and various other factors bearing on the dissemination of information.

Insofar as the existence of the committee has influenced this development—and it undoubtedly has in a minor degree—it can be stated that the committee has promoted, rather than curtailed, the discussion of some of the most controversial issues of our time.

There can be no question but that the 500 volumes of information on the subjects of communism, fascism, and nazism which the committee has published have provided a wealth of background information for Members of Congress, the press, clergymen, educators, students, public officials, and the public at large, assisting them in understanding and debating these issues, the troublesome questions associated with them, and in developing new ideas and approaches to the solution of them.

Many nationally and internationally known authors and authorities on communism, in books on the subject, have quoted from or referred to committee material both in the informative phase of their treatment of communism and also in drawing conclusions as to what steps may be taken to meet its challenge.

It serves no useful purpose, considering only a handful of bills each year. All the bills it handles are within the jurisdiction of other committees.

REPLY

The value of a committee is not judged by the number of bills it handles each year. For a variety of reasons, many bills concerning certain areas of activity will be introduced in each Congress while, as regards other areas, relatively few bills will be introduced. It is the importance of the bills to national security and overall welfare of the Nation, rather than the number of them, that is important.

Regardless of the number of bills the committee considers each year, the bills it does handle are of extreme importance to the Nation. This is so because they involve not only the means of protecting our security, but also, in nearly all instances, grave constitutional issues.

Despite the fact that it functions in an extremely difficult area, both from the constitutional and investigative viewpoints, the committee has compiled an impressive legislative record. Approximately 45 laws enacted by the Congress in the last 25 years have been based on the committee's recommendations. The committee's studies and investigations have also, at times, led it to the conclusion that a certain problem can best be corrected by a policy directive rather than by legislation. Approximately 15 of the committee's recommendations in this area have been adopted by the executive branch of the Government.

It is also a fact that the more than 500 volumes of hearings, reports and consultations published by the committee in its 26 years of existence serve as a continuing fund of source material for the Congress in considering legislation, some of which is referred to other committees and which touches on the question of national security.

For detailed data on the committee's legislative record, see two independent studies made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congres, entitled "Legislative Recommendations by House Committee on Un-American Activities" and published in 1958 and 1960.

The statement that all bills handled by the Committee on Un-American Activities are within the jurisdiction of other committees is obviously false. If they were within the jurisdiction of other committees, they would be referred to those other committees. This charge could be true only if one accepts the premise that there is within the House complete disregard for its committees and matters concerning their jurisdiction.

The committee is unnecessary. The country has all the laws, regulations, etc., needed to safeguard its internal security.

REPLY

The legislative recommendations made by this committee in its recent annual reports refute the above claim that the country has all the laws, regulations, etc., needed to safeguard its internal security. The claim is also refuted by the fact that in each Congress many Members of both the House and Senate introduce bills related to internal security. Some of these bills are based on the independent study and belief of those who introduce them; some on the reports of congressional committees; some on the statements and requests of officials of the executive branch of the Government.

Generally speaking, no country ever reaches the stage where it has all the laws and regulations needed in any area. New developments create new needs, render ineffective outdated laws, etc.

On July 1, 1960, the special Committee on Communist Strategy, Tactics and Objectives of the American Bar Association made the following statement:

"The record of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security is one of the accomplishments and achievements despite the fact they have been the targets of inspired propaganda attacks designed to curb their effectiveness. Continuation of these committeees is essential to the enactment of sound security legislation."

Its functions would be better transferred to the Judiciary Committee, whose authority should be amended to give it jurisdiction over "bankruptcy and counterfeiting; mutiny, espionage, sabotage, insurrection, and other overt actions relating to internal security," but not to include propaganda or other forms of expression or association for those ends.

REPLY

This proposal was rejected in the most important reorganization of the Congress to take place in this century. In 1945, the House found itself with 48 standing committees—too many for its effective operation. It determined that a reorganization was in order. The advice and testimony of Members of the House and Senate and of constitutional authorities was received. The Reorganization Act of 1946 was the outcome. Through this act, the House reduced its standing committees to 19. Most significant, although the Committee on Un-American Activities had then been a standing committee for only a little over a year, it was one of the 19 retained. Twenty-nine other standing committees were eliminated.

This action, it should be noted, was taken prior to the period generally recognized as the beginning of the cold war. Many people in the United States, in and out of Government, were not as aware then as they are today of the nature and aims of both world communism and the U.S. Communist Party and of the concomitant need for study, investigation, and legislation related to them.

As far as the present time is concerned, it is significant that just 2 years ago, in organizing the 88th Congress, the House Rules Committee considered and rejected the idea of transfering the function of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Judiciary Committee.

On the purely theoretical level, it would make no difference whether the committee of the House charged with investigating Communist and other subversive activities were a standing committee, or a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee or of some other committee. It would make no difference, either, whether it were known as the "Committee on Un-American Activities" or by some other name.

From a practical viewpoint, however, there are various reasons why the committee's function should not be transferred to the Judiciary Committee.

1. The Judiciary Committee, as is well known to all who are informed on the subject, is probably the most overworked committee in the House. It has an extremely difficult time carrying out its presently assigned duties. In view of this fact, it would be not only unwise, but also unfair, to further burden the Judiciary Committee with jurisdiction in the very important field of subversive activities. The probable result of doing so would be that vital investigative and legislative activity in this field would suffer, as would work in the other areas in which the committee has jurisdiction.

2. Should the House decide to transfer the function of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Judiciary Committee, it would have to take either one of two steps in spelling out the Judiciary Committee's power in this area:

(a) transfer to it the precise mandate of the Committee on Un-American Activities as contained in Public Law 601, part 2, rule XI; or

(b) draft a new rule spelling out the committee's jurisdiction.

Should it adopt the first procedure, the transfer of jurisdiction would be meaningless. The Judiciary Committee would then be empowered to do precisely what the Committee on Un-American Activities has been doing for 26 years and, it must be presumed, would do as its mandate directed.

If the second procedure should be adopted, it would lead to the creation of serious difficulties for the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee charged with investigating subversion activities. As previously indicated, the present mandate of the Committee on Un-American Activities has been defined, clarified, and redefined by both the Federal Legislature and judiciary. There is a gloss of House activity and judicial interpretation giving it clear meaning. In this respect, it has not only clarity, but strength and unquestioned validity.

A completely new mandate in this area would be immediately open to questioning before the courts. It is more than likely that many years would pass before a sufficient number of decisions relative to the mandate would have been handed down giving it clarity and preciseness. Thus, for a considerable period of time, the members of the subcommittee would be operating in a gray area. They could not be sure of precisely what they could and could not do—which actions on their part would be upheld by the courts and which ones rejected. The obvious and unquestioned result of this would be impairment of the investigative-legislative function of the House in the very important area of national security.

For the above reasons, it would seem that anyone truly desirous of having subversive activities investigated and our laws in the area improved, would fight any effort to transfer the Committee on Un-American Activities function to the Judiciary Committee.

It must also be emphasized that impairment of the Nation's security would surely result if, as suggested, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities was transferred to the Judiciary Committee and that committee was then denied the authority to investigate propaganda activities.

Lenin said: "A word is a deed." Propaganda is an essential element in fomenting revolutions, recruiting spies, destroying faith in the established government, and in other activities essential to the success of the Communist design to take over the world.

As the courts have repeatedly held, there is no requirement under the U.S. Constitution for this country to wait for an overt act to take place, directed at its overthrow, before it has a right to take steps to preserve itself and thus the rights and freedoms of all its citizens. Preparations for revolution, propaganda and other, are the legitimate concern of the Congress, and it has been the judgment of the House for 26 years that the House should vigorously demonstrate this concern. To fail to do so now would be to invite destruction by the most skilled revolution-fomenting force the world has ever known.

The committee's files, which often contain inaccurate data about millions of Americans should be destroyed or transferred to the Archives and not to be opened for either official or public inspection for 50 years.

REPLY

The commitee's files fall into two categories—public source material and investigative. The committee's investigative files are accessible only to the committee's investigators and other key staff personnel. No information in them is made available to the public. They provide leads for committee investigations, but no allegations of any kind contained in these files are ever made public until they have been verified, and then only in hearings of the committee where persons concerned have the opportunity to deny, qualify or refute them.

The committee's public files, collected over a period of 26 years, are one of this country's most comprehensive sources of information on Communist and other subversive activities. They are composed completely of public source material—the hearings and reports of committees and commissions on the Federal, State and local levels; extensive collections of Communist newspapers and other periodicals; letterheads and literature of Communist organizations; court decisions; news accounts from numerous newspapers and similar material.

The petition's statement that these files "often contain inaccurate data about millions of Americans" is false.

President Truman, in Executive Order No. 9835 of 1947, instituting the loyalty program, directed that the committee's files be checked in the Government's investigation on on the backgrounds of all applicants for Federal employment.

This directive would certainly not have been issued if the President and/or other responsible officials of the executive branch—who are in a position to know the facts—possessed evidence that the files contained inaccurate data.

Although President Truman's order has been supplanted by President Eisenhower's Order No. 10450 of 1953, the executive branch has continued the policy instituted by President Truman. Each year, thousands of visits are made to committee offices by representatives of the Civil Service Commission, FBI, intelligence branches of our armed services, and other agencies for assistance in their all-important job of protecting the security of this Nation. In 1962, representatives of these agencies made over 2,000 visits to the committee's offices for this purpose, and, in 1963, representatives of 25 different Federal agencies made almost 2,000 visits for the same purpose. Eighty percent of these visits covered a full working day.

The committee's public files also serve as the main source of information on Communist and other un-American activities for the Congress. In 1962, the committee received over 3,800 requests for information from Members of Congress. In response to these requests, the names of 7,500 individuals and 3,900 organizations and publications were checked, and 3,747 reports prepared. In 1963, the committee handled aproximately 200 requests per month from Members of Congress. Approximately the same number of reports were prepared in answer to these inquiries as had been prepared in 1962.

To destroy the committee files or to transfer them to the Archives where they would be held secret for 50 years would be to deprive both the executive and legislative branches of our Government of one of their most valuable sources of information on subversive movements and activities in this country. Such a step could not be taken without serious injury to the national security. The Communist Party, however, would obviously be overjoyed if this were done.

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1965.

National Committee to Abolish the House
Un-American Activities Committee,
Post Office Box 74757,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Gentlemen: I received your letter of August 4, 1964, in which you enclosed the tentative draft of a petition relating to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I forwarded a copy of your letter and the enclosed petition to the House Committee on Un-American Activities for its comments.

I am enclosing for your consideration a copy of the rather extensive reply I received from Mr. Francis J. McNamara, Director of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I would appreciate receiving the comments of your committee on this reply.

I believe the final draft of the petition of your committee followed essentially the form of the tentative draft, although I do not have a copy of your final draft. If this is so the comments of Mr. McNamara's reply to me remain pertinent.

In order that your committee may prepare the kind of a reply to my letter which I seek, I should state that up to date I have been unimpressed with both the substance of the charges your committee has made against the House Un-American Activities Committee and the techniques your committee has employed in widely disseminating these charges without accompanying them with substantiation and before making a direct confrontation of the House Un-American Activities Committee with these charges so that your committee has the benefit of the response of those accused.

I intend to place the material I have received up to the present in the Congressional Record. I would be happy to place any response your committee wishes to make in this matter in the Congressional Record as well.

In this way perhaps we can develop a national dialog on this very important subject and avoid the battle of self-serving press releases (on both sides of the question) which up to date seems to have been the techniques employed. The use of these techniques in lieu of developing a dialog creates public confusion rather than promotes public understanding and so hampers intelligent decisionmaking.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Curtis.

ECONOMY IN CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to repeal section 100 of title 2 of the United States Code providing a storage trunk to each of the Members of the Congress annually. The Congress has presently been cast in a poor light with regard to its own spending, and this seems an area where we could cut back expenditures without jeopardizing the functions of the Congress or seriously inconveniencing any of the Members.

The carpenter in the House Office Building indicates that there are no charges for crating and packaging various items that may from time to time need to be stored. This seems a much more effective and economical way to deal with our storage needs than to have a provision to provide a large, and often unneeded and unwanted trunk to each of the Members annually. This is a small area of waste in the ancillary functionings of the Congress which we should move promptly to eliminate.

GARNISHMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' SALARIES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the curious byproducts of the concept of national sovereignty is that employees of the Federal Government are shielded from some of the normal processes which creditors may use to reach the assets of defaulting debtors. In particular, the garnishment, execution, and trustee processes which might be used against the wages or salary of one hired by a private business are not available in pursuing a Federal employee; for the Federal Government has not consented to be made a part of such legal action and without consent it cannot be subjected to it.

On the surface it would seem that this is a problem of peculiar interest to the consumer credit industry, and especially to the creditmen of the District of Columbia and surrounding areas. Certainly it does interest them, and I have had a number of offers of assistance, in the form of stacks of worthless judgments against Federal employees, from the credit companies in the Capital region.

But this idea should not find acceptance only with the credit industry. It will operate as well to the benefit of the Federal employee who pays his bills, the various governmental agencies and even to the defaulting employee.

Knowledge of the difficulty which faces creditors in getting satisfaction from recalcitrant Federal employees leads them, in self-defense, to make credit rules tighter for all Federal employees. The honest Federal worker who would not avoid his obligations is placed in the same light, for purposes of extending credit, as his less desirable coworker. In short, he pays the penalty for the man who would not pay his bills.

For the agencies the advantage lies in the lessened administrative burden which they must carry. Executive opposition to this proposal has, in the past, been based on the idea that allowing the normal legal processes for the protection of creditors' interests would complicate the workings of the agencies. Yet, at present, mail to the agencies on the subject of unmet obligations is voluminous. Correspondence, personal interviews with the employees involved and, as a last resort, dismissal proceedings all result from the failure of there being an established procedure for the collection of these obligations. Even more important, however, in the lessening of the administrative burden on governmental agencies through the adoption of this proposal would be the self-restraint which the existence of these proceedings would impose on those Federal employees who now use their reflected immunity to scorn payment of their debts. Knowledge that their obligations may be enforced against them will be an effective deterrent to such activities.

Finally, the enactment of this proposal will be of benefit to the defaulting employees themselves. Presently such acts on the part of a Federal employee are met by only one sanction, dismissal from Federal service. Unable to enforce payment, the agency can only use dismissal to curb a continuing offender. In the short run the debtor may have a couple of more dollars in his pocket by avoiding his debts; in the long run he stands a good chance to lose his job.

For all concerned, this proposal would be beneficial and I hope that action on it will be possible in this Congress.

JEFFERSON LOAN CO.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced for the consideration of the Subcommittee on Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary a private bill for the relief of the Jefferson Loan Co., and its corporate successor, the Jefferson Mortgage Co.

This corporation incurred tax liability and paid taxes in the business years ending January 31, 1947, and January 31, 1948, on the amounts reported in profits by certain of the corporation officers. In reality, there were no profits in those years and the profits reported were so reported as part of a plan by the officers involved to accomplish a fraud.

The corporation in question has since thrown out the faithless officers and now seek to have refunded to them the amount of the tax overpayments. Attempts to seek a remedy in the courts have pointed to the necessity of seeking relief through the Congress. The action taken to date in this regard has had the effect of visiting the wrongs of former officers on the present organization. The result of this is, as a matter of policy to reduce the incentive on the part of shareholders and other honest employees to throw out dishonest management. These people should not be punished for their salutory action, but should rather be encouraged to keep a close eye on management.

As a matter of fact this is just one more example among many which points to the need to review our general law which relates to the tax and other treatment of the corporate entity when alert stockholders remove management guilty of criminal action and replace it with law-abiding people.

PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Robison] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced legislation in the form of two House joint resolutions providing for a constitutional amendment and the establishment of a permanent commission relating to the subject of presidential inability and succession.

The language of the Constitution is vague as to who is to determine that presidential inability exists, what constitutes inability, and who determines when the inability no longer exists. One of the resolutions I have today introduced would amend the Constitution and remove this element of doubt by giving the Congress these powers. The language of this amendment has been approved and recommended by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association.

The other resolution I have introduced provides for the establishment of a Commission on Presidential Disability composed of 10 members from both the executive and legislative branches of the Government, including minority party representatives, whose duty it would be to decide the President's ability to discharge his duties in a questionable situation. It would also provide for the President to declare his own disability and to declare an end to any such self-imposed disability.

The shortcoming of our Constitution in this regard has been of concern to me for several Congresses, and as time goes on and as the events of recent history have so forcibly impressed upon us, the need for such reform becomes more apparent and immediate. I am gratified that there seems to be a favorable climate for consideration by this Congress, and that the administration has at last seen fit to offer its support for this much-needed reform.

The President's recent hospitalization, while not for a serious ailment, has once again aroused the interest and concern of the general public for some action to remedy the existing situation. This interest has been bolstered by the backing of the President himself as evidenced in his message to this Congress on January 28. As he rightly pointed out in that message, the time to act is now. We can ill afford to delay any longer. While I am sure that it is the fervent hope of us all that the provisions of these reforms may never be put to test, we must realize our duty to provide for such an eventuality. We know only too well that the need for such machinery can, and in all probability will again, present itself, without warning and in but a moment's time.

There are very encouraging signs in the other body that indicate forthcoming action on the presidential inability and succession problem based on the recent Presidential message, and we are, of course, all aware of the vote in the Senate in the waning days of the 88th Congress which passed such an amendment. I have some fault to find with the provisions of that amendment, but the important thing is that action be taken and soon. I would hope that the House and its appropriate committees will take an immediate and active interest in this extremely important subject so that when another emergency or cloudy situation arises in the Presidency, no one in the Congress can be blamed for not having done his utmost to insure that the constitutional void is filled.

REPEAL OF ADMISSIONS TAXES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision as to which excise taxes to eliminate still remains in doubt, although we have the administration's assurance that cuts are forthcoming.

It is to be hoped that wartime-imposed taxes on entertainment will be among those to be erased. The entertainment world is in a state of economic distress and a repeal of taxes in this area would spur new employment among those in the industry.

We all have seen the empty theaters and clubs in our major cities, many of them out of business and boarded up. Presently almost one-fourth of all our larger theaters are in jeopardy of being closed, turning as many as 10,000 employees on the street in search of work.

The situation in cabarets is even more serious, since they also are victims of the expense account regulations. A repeal of excise taxes on nightclub admissions could create as many as 30,000 new full-time jobs, according to estimates.

We cannot afford to regard the entertainment business as frivolous; it is an important segment of American life, both to those who depend on it for their livelihoods and for those of modest means who turn for relaxation to the motion pictures, the legitimate stage, and the cabarets.

I am today introducing legislation to repeal these admissions taxes in the hope that the administration will encourage such repeal in its anticipated excise tax reduction recommendations.

EAGLE SCOUT, CURTIS FRYE, 1 OF 12 CHOSEN

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure and good fortune, along with many other Members of the Congress, to take part in the Boy Scout birthday breakfast held at the Statler Hilton Hotel, an event which helped to launch the 55th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America.

We were greatly impressed by the 12 young men representing the 12 Boy Scout regions across the Nation, who are here to make a "report to the Nation." They will convey to the President and to other officials of Government and Congress information concerning some of the accomplishments of the Boy Scouts of America during 1964.

This occasion today was particularly thrilling for me, since 1 of those 12 boys lives in the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota, which I have the privilege to represent. He is Curtis Frye of Fergus Falls, a young man who has not only made an excellent mark in scouting, but is respected in his community as an outstanding young citizen. We are indeed proud that he was chosen to represent our region.

We in the seventh district are justifiably proud of the caliber of young men being developed through Scouting. Curtis Frye is the third of our young men to appear here in Washington since 1961 as 1 of 12 regional representatives reporting to the Nation.

Such outstanding young men as these have been coming to Washington during Boy Scout Week each year since 1948 to render this service. This year's representatives participated in the breakfast program representing the over 5½-million of their fellow Boy Scouts and Scouters. Each of the 12 report to the Nation Scouts has attained the rank of eagle and has distinguished himself in many other ways. During the breakfast the young men proudly introduced their Congressmen and Senators who were special guests of the Scouts on this occasion. Being introduced by our own representative, Curtis Frye, was indeed a great honor for me.

The 64th Congress issued a charter to the Boy Scouts of America on June 15, 1916, and next year we will observe the 50th anniversary of that charter, the first to any youth serving agency.

Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, U.S. Army, retired—served as master of ceremonies at the breakfast and the chief scout executive of the Boy Scouts of America, Mr. Joseph A. Brunton, Jr., told us of the activities connected with the observance of Boy Scout Week throughout the Nation this year. He expressed the appreciation of the movement to the Congress, the executive branch of our Government and to cooperating organizations throughout the country who worked with and helped the Boy Scout movement during the past year. It was announced that the membership of the scouting program at the end of 1964 was 5,585,000 with more than 140,000 scouting units serving boys in all sections and territories of the United States. Among the outstanding accomplishments last year were the sixth national jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa., in July which was attended by 52,124 boys and leaders; and the dedication of a memorial in the ellipse here in Washington last November, called the commemorative tribute which honors the volunteer leaders of Scouting during its first 50 years.

In connection with the jamboree special presentations were made to the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Educaticn, and Welfare for their support of this and previous jamborees. Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze accepted the award for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Gen. Harold Johnson, Chief of Staff of the Department of the Army, for the Department of Defense. Mr. Brunton announced that the next world jamboree will be held in the United States during 1967. It will be attended by representative groups of Scouts from more than 84 Scout associations around the world.

Mr. Brunton outlined a new and far reaching program entitled "Breakthrough for Youth" which will be launched this year and aimed at reaching and serving greatly increased numbers of boys throughout the country, especially in hard to reach urban and rural areas. He said:

> We are aware and concerned today that there are still tens of thousands of boys who have no unit within their reach, in spite of the annually, increasing membership of the Boy Scouts of America over the years. The Boy Scouts of America feels a keen awareness of its responsibilities to the Nation to see that these boys have the opportunity to belong and to develop ideals and physical well being which are conducive to good citizenship and character.

The Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa., was recognized by the Boy Scouts of America for successful completion of a special program in citizenship, entitled "Strengthen America's Heritage," and which was called the largest single exercise in citizenship training ever undertaken by a youth agency. Dr. Kennth D. Wells, president of the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, read 1 of the 36 winning essays for which the Freedoms Foundation presented its Nathan Hale Youth Patriotic Award. More than 35,000 Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts and Explorers submitted statements in this contest. It was reported that 1,361,938 individual boys actively shared in this program during the past year and that nearly 60,000 Scouting units across the country conducted activities aimed at "Strengthening America's Heritage," including nearly 40,000 special camp fires called American Heritage Camp Fires, the first of which was conducted at the national jamboree.

SOVIET TINDERBOX

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, too often the interpretation of the State Department of internal conditions in the Soviet Union is based on the false premise that the U.S.S.R. is a monolithic State ardently supported by all of its residents. The opposite is truly the case although the public is too rarely provided with news and commentary emphasizing the anti-Soviet spirit of individual national groups within the U.S.S.R. Therefore, I am especially interested in directing to the attention of the Members an article which appeared in the Saturday, February 6 New York Journal American by Columnist Guy Richards. I ask leave to place it in the Record at this point.

Soviet Tinderbox: Ukrainians Stirred Up by Slaying

(By Guy Richards)

The itch for freedom is a curiously variable force which has probably caused more wars, upsets and surprises than any other.

Its harvest of surprises is especially interesting. They're rooted to the cyclic nature of the itch.

Not all peoples have it in the same degree. Those who feel it most strongly in certain years of a certain decade may scarcely notice it 10 years later.

The docile aborigines of Australia have never felt it very strongly. Neither have the tribe-ridden Arabs. And the Polynesians of American Samoa were given a sample inoculation and thereafter made it clear they wanted no part of it.

Many a liberty-loving Frenchman, willing to murder anyone who challenged his right to denounce his own government leaders, wouldn't lift a finger to save the last vestiges of France's oversea empire from passing out of the family.

So the itch not only produces paradoxes. It produces hypocrisies which so aggravate it that it often becomes an epidemic strong enough to spark a revolution.

TROUBLE BREWING FOR THE RUSSIANS

Taxation without representation proved to be the final fuse for our Revolution and now the Soviet Union may be about to endure some of the wracking ordeals suffered, for somewhat different reasons, by the bumbling monarchy of George III.

Ingredients for an explosion are present and are fast building up. In the first place, in the field of nauseating hypocrisy, the U.S.S.R. is without a rival on the face of the earth.

Here is a nation holding a whole galaxy of captive states in the grip of its army and secret police, while at the same time pretending its heart bleeds for the "liberation" of oppressed peoples everywhere. What a mockery! Look at Hungary.

Red China—every bit as aggressive—has never tried to strain anyone's credulity about being interested in peaceful coexistence with the West.

Secondly, within the broad confines of Russia and her satellites, are millions of people who have always felt the itch for freedom intensely: Notably in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Ukrainian Union Republic and the Tartar Autonomous SSR. Of these, the ones most keenly feeling the impulse at the moment are reportedly the Baltic populations, the Ukrainians and the Tartars.

Thirdly a fuse has started to burn. It's a lulu and it's burning in the Ukraine, the great black earth belt north of the Black Sea which harbors a population of 43.5 million.

Those millions go a long way to feeding the rest of Russia, and ever since the 18th century days of Ivan Mazeppa, Hetman of the Ukraine, inspirer of the romantic movement enlivened by the great poet, Taras Shevchenko (who, in turn, inspired Lord Byron, Victor Hugo, Franz Liszt and even Alexander Pushkin), they've always done their best to kick free from the Russians.

The last time was during the German invasion of World War II. That almost succeeded.

What has relit the old Ukrainian fuse is the combination of a brutal political assassination, a book about it and the elevation in the Russian hierarchy of one of the men who masterminded it.

The assassination in Munich, Germany, in 1959, was that of Stephen Bandera, Ukrainian nationalist leader. He was murdered by a KBG-trained agent, Borgan N. Stashinsky, who used the relatively clueproof cyanide spray gun.

The book about it is "Political Assassination" by a West German, Hermann Raschhofer. (He writes that the murder caused the CIA to reinvestigate the death of 150 politicians who appeared to have died naturally.) It is being distributed in the United States by the Boniface Press, in Philadelphia, Pa.

PLOTTER BECOMES DEPUTY PREMIER

The man who helped plan the murder, and who has since risen from KGB boss to deputy premier of the U.S.S.R., is Aleksander N. Shelepin.

This trinity—a murder, a book, and a high promotion—is reportedly having an abrasive effect in Europe, and especially in the Ukraine. It has been translated in several languages. It spells out move by move how the murder of powerful insurgents has become a state policy of the U.S.S.R.; how the opposition (in this case West German intelligence) was deliberately framed to look like the guilty one; and how planners and perpetrators were rewarded.

Bandera was an Ukrainian hero. He was a white flame of the nationalist movement. The dossier of his cold-blooded extermination and of the projected quick followup murder of Yuroslav Stezko, head of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations headquartered in Munich, is gaining a prairie-fire readership among those anxious to find the real face of the Kremlin under the smiling facade.

The book makes instructive reading for citizens of the Congo, the United States, South Vietnam, Iran, and Burundi, to name a few, who have recently lost government leaders via the assassination route.

AN IMPACT FELT IN UNITED STATES

It's having an impact on the more than 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent who seem to know very well what it means when political assassination is as firmly entrenched as Russian policy as social security is as American policy.

The lesson is being rammed home, too, in their major English-language publications, the Ukrainian Bulletin, the Ukrainian Weekly and the Ukrainian Quarterly Review. The editor of all three, Walter Dushnyck, a veteran of the Army's World War II campaigns in the Pacific, told the Journal-American:

> "The Bandera assassination demonstrates the eternal Russian fear of the Ukrainians' loyalty to the Ukraine. As long as Ukrainian freedom fighters exist anywhere in the world, the Russian Communist bosses know they're insecure—and they are."

This timely and vivid description of the nationalistic seething within the Ukraine is reflected by the Baltic peoples, Armenians, Cossacks, and other groups held captive within the Soviet empire.

We must emphasize to our State Department that diplomatic, economic, and information pressure should be brought to bear upon the Soviet Union so that the colonial practices of that Government might be terminated. It is with a sense of frustration that I recognize the State Department's unwillingness to deal firmly with the Soviet threat. Therefore, articles such as this one by Mr. Richards serve a most helpful, timely role in providing the public with proper information from within the U.S.S.R.

EMPLOYEE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, last week, on February 4, I introduced a bill, H.R. 4350, proposing enactment of the Employee Civil Rights Act of 1965. My remarks explaining the purposes and provisions of the bill appear, beginning on page 2030, in the Record for that day.

Under permission granted, the text of H.R. 4350 is reprinted below:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Employee Civil Rights Act of 1965".

Sec. 102. Section 14 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking therefrom subsection (b) and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) (1) Nothing in any constitution or law of any State, or political subdivision thereof, shall preclude a labor organization from making an agreement with an employer covered by this Act requiring membership in such labor organization or the payment of moneys thereto as a condition of employment subject to the provisions of subsections 8(a) (3) and 8(f): *Provided,* That it shall be an unfair labor practice for any labor organization, which is a party to such an agreement, or its agents—

"(A) to deny, limit, or otherwise restrict membership in such labor organization, or any rights or privileges pertaining thereto, or participation in any apprenticeship or training program on account of race, color, religion, or national origin;

"(B) to use, directly or indirectly, any part of the dues, assessments, or other moneys collected from any individual covered by such an agreement for any political purpose whatsoever or for any other purpose not directly related to those purposes specified in section 9(a) for which a labor organization is authorized to act as the exclusive representative of all employees in a bargaining unit: *Provided,* That nothing in this subparagraph (B) shall preclude a labor organization, if otherwise authorized, from expending moneys for lobbying or other activities to promote enactment or defeat of legislation directly related to the purposes specified in section 9(a): *Provided further,* That nothing in this subparagraph (B) shall preclude a labor organization from establishing and administering a separate contributory fund for political purposes or for any other purpose if all contributions to such fund are collected separately and paid voluntarily by individuals; or

"(C) to fine, suspend, expel, or otherwise penalize, or threaten, any member for exercising, or attempting to exercise, any legal or civil right guaranteed to any person by this Act, or by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

"Provided further, That nothing in this paragraph (1) shall be construed to permit any activity or conduct which would otherwise be an unfair labor practice under section 8(b).

"(2) In the event a labor organization or its agents shall engage in any activity or conduct defined as an unfair labor practice in subsection (b)(1) of this section 14, the provisions of any agreement entered into by such labor organization, which require membership therein or payment thereto of any moneys as a condition of employment, shall be illegal and unenforcible.

"(3) It shall be unlawful for any labor organization or its agents to engage in any activity or conduct defined as an unfair labor practice in subsection (b)(1) of this section 14. If one or more persons shall suffer damages or injury by reason of any violation of this subsection (b)(3), he or they shall have the right for and in behalf of himself or themselves and others similarly situated to bring a civil action in a district court of the United States for such relief (including injunctions) as may be appropriate. Any such action against a labor organization shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the district where the alleged violation occurred or where the principal office of the labor organization is located."

Sec. 103. The National Labor Relations Act of 1947, as amended, is further amended as follows: (a) by adding after "8" in subsection 10(a), "or 14(b)"; and (b) by striking the comma after "8(b)(7)" where it first appears in subsection 10(1) and adding "or 14(b).".

Sec. 104. Section 705 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 is amended by striking out "(a)" after "Sec. 705." and by striking out subsection (b) thereof.

THE FFA FACES THE FUTURE

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is no coincidence that the week of February 20 to February 27 has been selected as Future Farmers of America Week. Traditionally, the Future Farmers choose the week of George Washington's birthday for the observance of their national week. True it is, that General Washington was a Revolutionary War hero. True it is, that as our first President he served his country well and with valor. But it is still more true that Washington's first love was farming. Thus, it is altogether fitting and proper that the Future Farmers of America honor him, not only as the Father of our Country, but as a pioneer leader in American agriculture. I have the feeling that George Washington would treasure this tribute.

The Future Farmers of America, composed of vocational agriculture students, was organized in November 1928 in Kansas City, Mo. Originally incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, it was granted a charter by the Congress of the United States in 1950. Today there are approximately 400,000 active members in 9,000 local high school chapters located in the farm sections of our country.

This means that there are some 400,000 young men diligently preparing themselves for one of the most rewarding careers offered. Some prefer the term "agribusiness" rather than agriculture, for no longer is agriculture just farming. It is more than farming and the FFA groups are learning, in their schools, in their county, and State meetings, and at their national conventions, new and practical ways to meet the challenge of new agricultural demands.

Farming today represents a triumph of technology over serfdom—of education over ignorance. We must give a large portion of credit to the vocational agricultural education in the public schools, with its accompanying organization, the Future Farmers of America. I am proud of the FFA groups in the Second District of Kentucky not only for their achievements but for their high ideals.

Thirty-seven years ago, the FHA adopted a creed. It began with these words: "I believe in the future of farming." They took this belief and made it into a tangible and worthwhile effort. Their faith was justified then, as it is now, for abundant agricultural production will always be the backbone of America's strength.

Thirty-seven years ago, the FFA adopted as their motto this inspiring message: "Learning to do; doing to learn; earning to live; living to serve." This, too, has been instilled into these fine students by their expert and watchful teachers. The aims and purposes of the Future Farmers typify the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, we are dependent upon these farm boys—these farmers of the future—and under the guidance of their leaders, they will meet the responsibility placed before them. These thousands of boys will become successful farmers, agricultural workers and scientists in the future, and provide the assurance that adequate food, a serious problem in most areas of the world, will never become a problem here.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK, SPEAKER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the spirit that is the inspiration and guide of our people in every good endeavor was impressively expressed at the annual Presidential prayer breakfast which was held at the Shoreham Hotel on Thursday, February 4, 1965.

Government and religious leaders, laymen, and members of all faiths took part in this annual prayer breakfast meeting which has become an increasingly important institution in the life of our Nation's Capital.

On this occasion there were remarks by the President of the United States and others, a message from Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, and an address by our leader, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the body of the RECORD the eloquent remarks of Speaker McCORMACK at this meeting, together with the printed program.

Speaker McCORMACK's remarks at the Presidential prayer breakfast follow:

> Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Senator CARLSON, reverend clergy, distinguished Members of both branches of the Congress, members of the President's Cabinet, and of the judiciary, distinguished Governors, and other State officials; gentlemen, the one area in which we can all be in agreement today is that the Presidential prayer breakfast comes clearly within the atmosphere of being a divine institution. For it is as Godly as prayer itself. Yet it occurs under this impressive hospitality. And because it brings us together under circumstances of good will and friendship and the breaking of bread, it creates an atmosphere for the better transaction now and in the months and years to come of the business of our country and the free world.
>
> For we are embarked on what may well be the greatest legislative and leadership adventure of the 20th century. Those of us present, and others, hold in our hands a destiny upon which history itself hangs in the balance. It is important that we should not only work together, legislate together, and commune together in an understanding manner, but it is equally important, recognizing in our own life and in the life of our country, that we should breakfast together and thus on every level of human activity get to know each other for the best results in the management of the affairs of mankind.
>
> It has been well said of the President of the United States that his political style is based upon the saying of Isaiah, the prophet, "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord." The greatest and most lasting achievements of men and nations are brought about in this way—not by force and the exercise of arbitrary power, not by pretense and indirection, but by friendly discussion and persuasion. The ecumenical spirit abroad today in this land, and all over the world, is, I fervently believe, a manifestation of the spirit of God. In this spirit, people of differing religious beliefs are meeting, filled with devotion to God and with good will toward one another, to discuss both the differences and the similarities of our religious beliefs and customs, and to join wholeheartedly in prayer—extending areas of agreement, and thereby reducing areas of misunderstanding.
>
> Whatever the differences of our faiths and traditions, we gain in moral strength and spiritual grace from meeting together, as we do today, in the love of God and in human fellowship, to pray for the good of the country, and for mankind.
>
> It is for these reasons that I like to think of the institution of the Presidential prayer breakfast as an institution of the highest moral order of human betterment. To those like President Johnson who are warm of heart and eager for achievement—whose leadership is dedicated to the unity of our country in the eyes of the world—this is much more than just a meeting at breakfast. It is the relaxed but sincere expression in the home atmosphere of a dedication to great tasks for the coming years. For we have the leadership in the President, we have the will, the understanding, and the independence in our legislators, judges, Governors, and other public officials, and we have, as we know, the approbation of a divine providence.

The Presidential prayer breakfast program follows:

> U.S. Army Chorus: "Sweet Hour of Prayer."
>
> Presiding: The Honorable FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senate.
>
> Invocation: Lt. Gen. M. H. Silverthorn, USMC (retired).
>
> Old Testament lesson: Psalm I.
>
> Greetings from the U.S. House of Representatives: The Honorable HORACE R. KORNEGAY, U.S. House of Representatives.
>
> New Testament lesson: St. Matthew 6:24–33.
>
> Greetings from the U.S. Senate: The Honorable B. EVERETT JORDAN, U.S. Senate.
>
> Vocal solo: Mr. Tony Fontane (Mr. Al Kohlmeier, accompanist).
>
> The Speaker of the House of Representatives.
>
> "Intercession for national leaders," Dr. Abraham Vereide.
>
> Message: Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.
>
> The President of the United States.
>
> Benediction: Dr. Richard C. Halverson.
>
> Closing song: "America."
>
> "Our Father's God to Thee
> Author of liberty,
> To Thee we sing.
> Long may our land be bright
> With freedom's holy light
> Protect us by Thy might,
> Great God, our King."

AGRICULTURAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 26, 1965, I stated my position on the supplemental agricultural appropriation bill and particularly the amendment thereto which would prevent the President from exercising his constitutional prerogatives for the conduct of foreign affairs by preventing him from using one part of these funds for the United Arab Republic. Because of the importance of this matter, I should like to reiterate my feelings against aid to the United Arab Republic at this time, but for Presidential discretion in the handling of our foreign affairs.

I voted today against instructing our conferees in a way which would hamstring the President in his conduct of foreign policy with respect to the United Arab Republic.

The proposed instructions provided that the conferees would have to maintain the House's original position that no funds for surplus food distribution under the supplemental agricultural appropriation bill shall go to the United Arab Republic.

This was not a vote by any means favoring the United Arab Republic or Mr. Nasser, but a vote for giving the President and Secretary of State the flexibility they need for the conduct of our foreign policy. The Constitution places this responsibility with the Executive and this is the only way foreign policy operations can be intelligently exercised.

Broad policy guidelines can be properly established by Congress, setting forth the basic principles upon which our foreign relations should be conducted, but Congress is not the body to decide that we should adopt this or that tactic here or there, stop assistance as a snub to such-and-such a leader, and so forth. Congress, in addition to lacking the constitutional authority for such conduct of foreign affairs, lacks the detailed knowledge of the complex situations in the many countries with which we deal, and lacks the diplomatic expertise to exercise the function of policy conduct intelligently. Once again, the framers of the Constitution demonstrate their farsighted wisdom.

Now, if I were the State Department and were charged with this decision, based on my present knowledge, I certainly would not be giving aid of any kind to Mr. Nasser. I deplore his entry into the Congo to aid the disruptive and savage rebels there. I deplore his expressed contempt for the United States and its assistance. I deplore his permitting wanton destruction of U.S. property without lifting a finger to protect our legitimate rights. I deplore his bellicose actions and attitudes toward Israel and the Jews, including our own Jewish people, of whom I am one.

Nasser's contemptible actions and attitudes, his destructive leadership of the Arab world, more than justify our refusing to give him any kind of aid or comfort. Indeed, we subject ourselves to criticism as being soft and softheaded for continuing aid to Nasser under these conditions, though this harsh assessment is far beyond that enunciated by the Government of Israel. The Israeli Ambassador to the United States stated his country's position as being for aid to the Arab people in a recent speech, stating:

> We in Israel are not an anti-Arab country, and we never will be. We recognize not just the existence of the Arab States, but the legitimacy of their existence. We are not against the development of the Arab States. We think it is right that they should seek to develop the status and the level of their peoples, just as we in Israel seek to develop and expand the horizons of opportunity for our own people. Thus, we never objected to their getting help for economic development. The real issue, however, lies elsewhere.

Still, I would not have Congress void the President's constitutional power and tie the President's hands under the ruse of its power over appropriations. Let the President decide and take the consequences if his decision is incorrect. The people of the United States have just elected him with an unparalleled vote of confidence. I have confidence that his decision would be right and just.

There may be factors in the administration's decision on such a matter as this that we as Congressmen or the public do not know and cannot be told. How do we know that this assistance is not vital in some arrangement the administration is negotiating with Nasser to get him to mend some of his horrendous actions and attitudes? How do we know that if this assistance is denied, Nasser does not have a commitment to receive it from the Communists or that denial would not drive Nasser more irrevocably into the Communist camp? How do we know that this assistance may not be playing a key role in preventing Nasser from taking some action still more detrimental to our interests than those he has already taken? These are the kinds of questions the Congress is not competent to answer—the kind of action with which our 435 nonexperts are simply not qualified to deal.

The action taken today by the House prevented destructive congressional interference in foreign policy conduct, depriving the President unconstitutionally of the power delegated to him, and which he must have to intelligently and ably conduct our foreign affairs.

CASTLE POINT VETERANS' HOSPITAL

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I visited the Castle Point Veterans' Hospital on Saturday morning, February 6, 1965, to get a personal insight into the advisability of closing that facility. I met with Dr. Vincent Powers, the director, and Dr. John Deegan, chief of staff.

I was greatly impressed by the facility. It is a beautifully kept and maintained institution with the most modern equipment in all departments, including a great deal of brand new equipment. It has a completely new modern kitchen, the latest in anesthetic equipment, and completely refurbished operating rooms.

The Castle Point Hospital has an esprit d'corps that is remarkable and has a decided effect on the caring of its patients. Many of these patients have been to other hospitals but swear by the Castle Point facility because of the quality of the care that is given there.

I looked over the hospital's figures and find that, contrary to the Administrator's generalizations that the hospitals that are being closed are inefficient, this is a highly efficient, economical operation. There has been no trouble getting or keeping excellent staff and the present staff includes many internationally renowned specialists. In addition, the hospital is also able to call on specialists from the New York City hospitals who live in the area.

Many of the patients at Castle Point are elderly people who need a good deal of individual attention to help them eat, read, and perform their daily functions. Castle Point is helped a great deal in handling these patients by a corps of about 200 volunteer workers that would be irreplaceable elsewhere.

This is the only VA general hospital serving a very large area of suburban and urban New York. There are no other VA general hospitals between it and the city. It has always had more patient applications than it could handle with the money allocated to it by the Veterans' Administration.

It seems absurd to be closing down an efficient operating facility of this nature at a time when the country is desperately short of hospital beds, and when the Veterans' Administration itself is asking for substantial moneys for the construction of new hospital facilities.

I strongly urge the administration to take a more careful look at its proposal to close down this and the other VA hospitals. If the other hospitals are as good as this one, it would appear that the administration has made a serious error.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join in efforts to prevent a closing down of this and the other facilities until a thorough investigation can be made.

In support of my own views on the efficient and warm operation of the Castle Point Hospital, I would like to include in the Record a report of the visit by Miss Ruth Von Metzsch, a reporter for the Danbury News-Times. Her reactions are very similar to mine and she describes them very vividly:

Castle Point VA Hospital Proves Efficient, Warm

(By Ruth von Metzsch)

Beacon.—We were curious to see why it was that the Veterans' Administration in Washington is closing down VA hospitals, including three in New York State.

They said that they were obsolete.

We wanted to see an obsolete hospital that is taking care of our veterans so we went to Beacon.

EXCELLENT VIEW

On a hilltop surrounded by a view excelling that of Putnam Community Hospital, is a VA hospital called Castle Point that serves an average of 240 veteran patients per day, 40 per year from Putnam County.

The sturdy walls of the 40-year-old structure radiate warmth and a feeling of safety that clashes with the cold modern and sterile equipment used throughout the building.

Castle Point Veterans' Hospital is one of the hospitals to be shut down by the VA. This means that the patients would have to be transferred to Albany, New York City, and other hospitals throughout the Nation because all are overfilled.

How would families of these veterans be able to visit their relatives?

The hospital and the equipment would probably stand idle and rot away while it could save many lives.

Many veterans need care but can't afford to go to a private hospital.

HOW ABOUT IT?

How about all the money that was spent on a new coal and oil burner, sewage disposal plant * * * one of the finest in operation of any hospital in the area, the up-to-date equipment * * * it is comparable to equipment at the brand-new Putnam Community Hospital, three research labs in use constantly * * * new laundry and bathroom facilities, the contracts with Westinghouse to furnish three new elevators next week * * * new utility equipment, new beds, new sheets, new paint, the equipment still stored that isn't even unpacked * * * where will it go or will it just stay there and get rusty?

LOVE THE PLACE

Of the 248 patients there yesterday we spoke to many and they said they loved the care they received from the doctors and the wonderful nurses.

We saw patients that couldn't move a muscle in their faces but the atmosphere and wonderful care they received left a smile in their eyes and you knew that everything possible medically was being done for them to get well again.

PROUD PATIENTS

We saw the proud smile of the patients who were learning to walk with their leg or legs made of wood, fitted and refitted by experts so that the body is not damaged or any discomforts suffered.

We saw the satisfied smiles on the faces of those that were learning while convalescing, getting a high-school diploma or learning new hobbies.

DREAMING OF SPRING

We saw the man who had just conquered walking with his wooden leg looking out of the door dreaming of spring or summer when the three-hole golf course would be green and he would get a crack at that little white ball and drop it in that hole * * * he just couldn't wait.

These are the patients who will be moved from a hospital so well suited to care for our sick veterans * * * many of whom would have died without the expert care they receive at Castle Point Hospital. There is a shortage of these hospitals and the waiting list is tremendous.

EMPLOYEES NUMBER 330

The 330 employees, many of whom have been there more than 10 years, would be relocated to other hospitals. The payroll totals $2 million per year.

There are some 80,000 veterans in the Mid-Hudson area it serves.

The hospital has many doctors who are internationally renowned including Dr. Bok Y. Lee, chief surgeon, who operated on the Duke of Windsor. He made a vein graft * * * that is he inserted a synthetic vein and connected it to a human vein. Dr. Lee will also have a major exhibit on hypertension of veins which causes heart failure at the annual American Medical Association Convention in New York City.

The hospital has the best and most elaborate physical medicine rehabilitation center in the area.

Some 220 volunteers are associated with the hospital which is almost a small city in itself with its own post office, powerplant, spacious grounds, buildings, residences for doctors and nurses, laundry and radio station.

As we left Castle Point we knew it was not obsolete nor isolated but rather a refuge of mercy and wonderful care for men who had served their country well.

> We believe the country could return that by not closing the doors to these men * * * because it would be hard to ever replace the spirit and warmth which is an integral part of this fine, efficient and wonderful hospital.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF A BILL TO ALLOW, FOR FEDERAL INCOME TAX PURPOSES, A DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN INTEREST COSTS INCURRED BY CERTAIN INVESTMENT DEALERS

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which provides that certain interest costs incurred by dealers in connection with the purchase of tax-exempt obligations will not be disallowed as a deduction for Federal income tax purposes. The bill is designed to correct an inequity that has prevailed in our tax laws far too long.

Under present law, section 265(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 disallows a deduction for interest on indebtedness incurred to purchase or carry Government obligations whose interest is tax exempt. It is quite rational to expect that ordinarily a taxpayer who borrows to purchase tax-exempt bonds should not be allowed a deduction for the interest paid on the loan and then also be exempt on the interest earned on the bond. However, rationality further demands that under certain conditions, modifications of this general principle must be provided. I will explain the justification for such a modification, as provided in my bill, in the case of the security dealer.

A significant part of the business of investment dealers is to underwrite municipal bonds, the interest on which is exempt from Federal income taxes. The dealer performs a service that is analogous to the function the retailer performs in marketing the goods of a manufacturer. The security dealer carries bonds—as inventory—the same as the retailer must maintain an inventory of goods. Furthermore, since much of today's business transactions require operating through the credit market, it is not uncommon for businesses to obtain funds from external sources to maintain their inventories. Similarly, the investment dealers must borrow funds in order to purchase and hold their bonds for sale.

If a security dealer pays a greater interest cost on the loan used to carry the tax-exempt bonds than he receives as a return on the bonds, he incurs a net interest cost. Yet this net cost is not recognized as a legitimate business cost for tax purposes. This is clearly inequitable. No one would doubt that an inequity would exist if a retailer were disallowed a deduction for part of an expense representing a legitimate interest cost of carrying his inventory. So why should it be equitable in one case and not in another? There is no sound reason for this. Thus, my bill asks for an allowable deduction for the interest cost on the loan to the extent it exceeds the interest earned on the bonds. It does not ask for any discriminatory favors. It asks only for fair treatment.

In past years, various dealers in the business of buying and selling municipal bonds have challenged the disallowance of a deduction when the interest costs exceeded the interest income from the bonds. One point that was made by the court in the case of Paul P. Prudden and others—2 B.T.A. 14—was that the statute on the disallowance is clear, and the duty of the court to follow the statute is clear. I agree that the courts had no choice except to follow the law. That is the very reason I appeal to the Congress to modify existing tax laws according to the provision of my bill. In recent years, the Congress has been keenly concerned about correcting inequities that have unfairly burdened certain sections of our business-taxpaying community. Although we have come a long way toward removing discriminations, we should not relax now. Therefore, my suggested correction of the inequity that I have described today should be adopted quickly. It would be another significant step in our march against inequitable tax laws.

An exception to the disallowance of an interest deduction provided in section 265(2) is granted banks by Revenue Ruling 61-222—1961, 2 C.B. 58. This ruling states that section 265(2) does not apply to interest paid on indebtedness represented by deposits in banks engaged in general banking business since such indebtedness is not considered to be indebtedness incurred or continued to purchase or carry obligations within the meaning of section 265.

Another somewhat related exception, which was provided in the Revenue Act of 1964, applies to certain nonbanking financial institutions that deal in "face amount certificates" and are subject to State banking laws. The face amount certificates are issued to investors who make periodic payments to the institution for a specified period of time as a means of investing their savings. The holders of the certificates are repaid the payments plus interest as specified in the certificate. The Revenue Act of 1964 provided that these financial institutions can deduct, under certain conditions, the interest on these certificates even though the payments received from the investors are partially reinvested by the institutions in tax-exempt bonds.

Thus, the tax laws have recognized in recent years that some exceptions to the strict rule of disallowance are justifiable. Now is the time for Congress to provide further recognition to this fact by enacting the long overdue modification provided in my bill. This will remove a serious inequity created by section 265(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and will strengthen our general tax structure by making it a fairer tax structure.

CIVILIAN AGENCIES SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO NOTIFY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN WHOSE DISTRICTS IT IS CONTEMPLATED THAT INSTALLATIONS SHALL BE CLOSED, AND TO AFFORD AN OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1965, I introduced H.R. 4251, to provide that any civilian agency which contemplates moving or closing any of its installations shall notify the Members of Congress concerned and shall afford an opportunity for public hearings with respect to such contemplated action. This is the same bill that I originally introduced during the 88th Congress on January 18, 1963.

It provides for reasonable notice of contemplated closings of civilian installations to each U.S. Senator and each Representative in Congress representing the district in which the installation is located. At the request of any Senator or Representative concerned, the head of the appropriate civilian agency would be required to hold a public hearing at a convenient location in the vicinity of the installation, before making the final decision with respect to the contemplated action.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new bill. As I have already indicated, I first introduced it more than 2 years ago during the 88th Congress. What prompted the introduction of this bill in early 1963 was a situation which all of my colleagues will easily recognize.

In 1962 the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, Najeeb Halaby, announced that the Air Route Traffic Control Center located in San Antonio, in my home district, would be shut down. This announcement came without prior warning or hearing of any kind. I was not notified of the contemplated action prior to the final decision. In view of the fact that the San Antonio Center had been custom built for the FAA at a heavy expense to the taxpayers only 4 years earlier, the decision to abandon it came, needless to say, as a shock to the 200 Federal employees working at the Center and their families, to the entire community, and to myself, their recently elected Representative in the Congress. Not only was the news that the brand-new Center was to be abandoned a shock, it was also a mystery. For the Center, in addition to being a new one, had an excellent record for performance and efficiency.

My appeals and the appeals of the civic leaders of San Antonio to the FAA Administrator, Najeeb Halaby, were met by a callous disregard for the facts, by insult and indifference, and by deceit. In fact, I believe that when the full story of this incident becomes known, as inevitably it must, Najeeb Halaby will be recorded as one of the most arrogant and dangerous public officials this Government has ever employed.

The initial justification for closing the San Antonio Center, offered only after I had made numerous requests for an explanation, was ridiculous on its face. After I challenged it with facts and figures, Halaby and his comptroller admitted some mistakes on their figures. But instead of reexamining his decision, he simply changed the justification by presenting new figures. These are as erroneous as the earlier set. I have made what I consider to be an irrefutable case for the San Antonio Center. Still Halaby clings to the original impulsive decision like a petulant child caught in an outright falsehood but refusing to confess the truth.

Last year I discussed this matter extensively with the Bureau of the Budget. On March 24, 1964, I presented a detailed brief, together with exhibits, to the Bureau of the Budget, demonstrating beyond any reasonable doubt the need for retaining the San Antonio Air Route Traffic Control Center. I was assured that the Bureau would review the case and its initial approval of the proposed abandonment of the center. To date I have received no report or other indication that the Bureau of the Budget has completed its review.

My colleagues, it can happen to you.

Mr. Speaker, I have given some of the background in this case to show what motivated the original introduction of H.R. 4251. As I said, it is not a new bill; neither is it a new idea.

The idea that permeates H.R. 4251 permeates this Nation and our democratic system. That idea is simply that the people of America govern themselves through their elected representatives. Elected officials are responsible for their actions to the people because they have to stand for reelection, and if the people do not like their representatives, they can kick them out of office. Appointed officials are not chosen by the people. They do not have to be reelected. Some of them do not feel responsible to the people. Some appointed officials are good, some are bad. The people have to endure the bad because they have no choice.

But the people should not have to endure and suffer through every bad decision made by appointed administrators, whether made in good faith or otherwise. The people look to their elected representatives for guidance and leadership on matters with which they are concerned. It violates every principle of our democracy for an appointed official to have the power to order an installation shut down without any prior notice to the elected representatives, and for the people, who pay for and maintain those installations, to have no recourse, no appeal, no right to a public hearing, no opportunity to present the facts or participate in the final decision. My bill is intended to correct this unfortunate and undemocratic situation.

Recent events have shown the need for the people to have the right to a public hearing on a contemplated shutdown of an installation in their community. So long as they do not have this right, entire communities will remain exposed to the whims and designs of appointed administrators, some of whom may be petty tyrants more interested in the advancement of their own careers than the advancement of the public welfare.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—ADDRESS BY CARLOS SANZ DE SANTAMARIA, CHAIRMAN OF CIAP

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Carlos Sanz de Santamaria is the Chairman of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress, called CIAP from its initials in Spanish. On February 4, 1965, he delivered an important address before the Workshop on Latin American Integration of the Pennsylvania and Philadelphia Bar Associations.

The address is important because it places the Alliance within a perspective too often lost in the furor of American politics. A year ago it became popular to criticize the Alliance on the grounds that it was moving too slow. But, first, as Mr. Sanz de Santamaria points out, when the Alliance was created by the American Republics in 1961 they committed themselves to undertake a 10-year program of development and reform during which time they would try to establish a base for much longer term progress. The socioeconomic problems of Latin America date back more than a hundred years. These problems cannot be solved in 2 years or even in 10 years. Still, the groundwork must be laid to construct a modern, progressive, prosperous Latin America. The Charter of the Alliance for Progress is that groundwork.

Second, there have been definite gains in the struggle for economic growth and social progress in our sister American Republics which have been won with the help of the Alliance. One of the most significant signs of development is the fact that in only 3 years the number of universities and centers of advanced study in Latin America has risen from 160 to 196 and their enrollments have increased from 519,000 to 680,000. Further evidence of the spirit with which the Latin American countries have embraced the Alliance can be seen from the total investment that these nations have made toward social and economic investment. This investment is between $23 and $24 billion.

But Carlos Sanz de Santamaria presents the arguments for the Alliance far more eloquently than I could, and I recommend his speech for every person interested in the problems and the progress of our hemisphere. With unanimous consent, I am inserting the entire speech at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF CARLOS SANZ DE SANTAMARIA

It is a privilege to address this distinguished gathering from the Pennsylvania and Philadelphia Bar Associations, and the chamber of commerce and the Banking Association of Philadelphia, a city so closely identified with man's struggle for liberty in the New World and one that is today a dynamic center of science, industry and art of our hemisphere.

It has been suggested that I talk about the Alliance for Progress and its executive arm, the recently formed Inter-American Committee on the Alliance, or CIAP as it is called from its initials in Spanish. Permit me to thank you all for your interest in this newest enterprise of freedom, an enterprise that seeks, through economic development and social progress, to give greater meaning to the political independence of the peoples of America.

You are all familiar with the basic history of the Republics of Ibero-America. Like the United States they acquired their political independence by overthrowing a colonial system; then, in a somewhat similar fashion, they entered into a new period of struggle to shape their national identities and boundaries and to strive for economic, as well as political, liberty. This struggle for economic liberty meant, essentially, achieving an authentic command of the utilization of their own resources and the right to participate in the normal interchange of the world market.

This difficult task of determining the boundaries that history had left to each of them, of forming nationalities and systems of government, according to the Western tradition that seeks the greatest dignity of the individual human being, took a century and more, and still not all the problems were solved. But in the process, and especially in the latter decades of the era, the notion of nationality underwent a change. Whereas, at the beginning of the period, the concept of nationality—or citizenship—meant primarily the individual's relationship and responsibility to a particular state, later the concept came to include the responsibility of the state toward the individual.

In any case, however, the state's concern for the individual would have had to grow because of the appearance on the national scene in every country of the poverty-stricken masses—the phenomenon of rapid demographic growth we are only now beginning to study with intensity—while at the same time economic development was hampered by a lack of savings and shortage of men skilled in the new technology that has enabled a nation like your own to steadily expand the production of wealth by the efficient exploitation of natural resources.

Another factor has lately had an impact on the attitude of governments toward their citizens. This is the rapid and widespread knowledge through the modern systems of communication: the jet-powered fleets of the airlines, television, radio. These have shown even the illiterates of our countries new kinds of life, new forms of social relationships, new forms of cooperation between countries.

This "social intervention," as we might call it, cannot be prevented by governments, except by the most extreme forms of censorship, and cannot therefore be ignored by countries that believe in human liberty.

One result of this development is that the closed, or limited, market has been losing its functional adaptability. People tend to enlarge, rather than restrict, their relationships; to look at nationality as toward a wider horizon; to think in regional or continental terms. And while this tendency creates tensions and threatens dislocations in old social and economic structures it also holds out the hope that a way can be found to seek political freedom, economic and social justice, and peace through community and cooperation on a global basis.

Today, even the industrial enterprises that once sought to defend themselves behind a shield of high tariffs have come more and more to recognize that protectionism alone is not enough to guarantee prosperity, that the complicated process of economic development, whether it be in the realm of agriculture or manufacturing, requires a cooperative effort within each nation by both private enterprise and government.

And most recently it has come to be recognized that this cooperative effort must serve all citizens of the Nation, regardless of race, religion, origin, or geographical location.

This cooperative effort proceeds, and perhaps is made imperative, by one of the fundamental factors of our times which is the factor of continuous and rapid change and which is found not only in economics but in all the aspects of human affairs. In every country and region of the world the tendencies in the spectrum of economic development reflect change—change in technology, in the distribution and acquisition of human skills, in the accumulation of capital, in the aspirations of consumers. In the highly industrialized countries the advance of technology and of the instruments for creating and distributing wealth have produced profound changes, greatly benefiting consumers, while in the developing countries the determination of masses of people to bring about changes in their lives—to become consumers—has brought inexorable pressures on governments and social structures.

The Alliance for Progress is, of course, a direct result of this present-day tendency of change. It is founded on the belief that the demands of the masses for a better life are fundamentally right, that the advances of technology—if widely enough applied—can make these demands attainable, and that the cooperative way can help to bring technology to bear in such a way that what is attainable in theory shall be attained in practice.

Economic growth and social progress, of course, cannot be brought about in the twinkling of an eye. There is no magic of economics that will enable an economy to grow as quickly as the magic of physics can destroy an economy in a nuclear explosion.

This should be evident to all. But somehow it is often forgotten. When the American Republics created the Alliance for Progress at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in August 1961, they committed themselves to undertake a 10-year program of development and reform. But they did not commit themselves to complete their economic and social development in that short time. They resolved to try in that 10-year period to establish a base for much longer term progress.

It was perhaps natural for people to expect too much too soon. Fortunately, in the past year, we have noticed the spread of a more realistic attitude. People are finally beginning to realize that a 10-year program should not be pronounced dead after the first or second year.

The Inter-American Committee on the Alliance—CIAP—which began its work less than a year ago, is at least partly responsible for this change in attitude. With your indulgence, I will explain why.

Remember that the Alliance was conceived as a 10-year program requiring an investment of not less than $100 billion. Of that amount, the Latin American signatories pledged themselves to provide not less than four-fifths, or $80 billion. The United States pledged Government resources to the amount of approximately $13 billion. The remainder, it was hoped, would come from international financing agencies, other governments, and private investors.

Clearly the program was based mainly on self-help. But the question naturally arose: How to coordinate such a vast and complex program?

Initially, the task was assigned to a panel of nine experts, chosen by the Inter-American Economic and Social Council with the advice of the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States, the President of the Inter-American Development Bank and the Executive Secretary of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America. Their chief function was to evaluate national development plans. But not all the participating governments had plans to evaluate, and not all were prepared to give full power in this respect to the panel, or the "nine wise men," as they came to be popularly called.

As a result, the United States soon found itself in the position of chief decision-maker, with the Latin American governments playing a passive role.

What was intended to be a multilateral, cooperative effort based mainly on self-help began almost immediately to run the risk of becoming just another U.S. aid program. It was the nine wise men who most quickly diagnosed this undesirable condition and proposed a remedy. The result was a study by two former Latin American presidents, Alberto Lleras Camargo, of Colombia, and Juscelino Kubitschek of Brazil. And it was on the basis of their recommendations—made in 1963—that CIAP was created by the Alliance governments.

The Committee, of which I had the honor to be elected the full-time Chairman, has eight members in all, including myself. The United States has one member, Walter Whitman Rostow, Chairman of your State Department's Policy Planning Council and a world-renowned figure in the field of economic development. All my other colleagues are Latin Americans and all of them have long backgrounds in economic affairs.

We held our first working session in Mexico City in July 1964. As a task of first priority we set for ourselves that of emphasizing to the member governments the self-help nature of the program. Borrowing inspiration from the OEEC, that played such an important role in making a success of the European recovery program, we established a procedure of country-by-country reviews. Adapting the procedure to Latin America's special needs, we brought into this procedure not only the governments themselves but the experts of the panel of nine, ECLA, representatives of financing agencies such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the U.S. Agency for International Development. We have also invited European governments to participate through the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Late in 1964, we completed our first cycle of reviews. They were inadequate in some respects. But they did give us a picture of the efforts of the individual governments and they did enable us to make an estimate of the availability of, and need for, external financing.

At the same time they demonstrated to the individual governments the benefits of having their development programs examined simultaneously by the experts from different agencies, and the financing agencies themselves had the benefit of being able simultaneously to view the country programs through each other's eyes, so to speak.

The evidence I can offer you that this procedure was effective was the reaction of the governments themselves. At the third annual review of the Alliance, held in Lima last December, the governments fully endorsed the country review process and called for an even more intensive scrutiny in the new round that we shall soon begin.

CIAP, I should emphasize, is not a financing agency itself. We have no funds from which to make loans or grants. We are, rather, coordinators and catalysts. We try, through our continuous review process, to spot problems before they become critical and to suggest solutions. We try to bring desirable programs and adequate financing together. We try to stimulate the process of reform: tax reform, agrarian reform, educational reform, labor reform, housing reform, administrative reform. We try to encourage innovations in regional development and integration. We try to encourage decisionmaking on the political level that will produce good result on the economic and social level.

One of our special concerns is integration.

The Alliance charter conceives of integration as a major instrument for change, that is, for reform and development. The charter calls for the elimination of tariffs and other barriers to trade within the region and the coordination of Latin American action to gain better treatment for the region's exports in the world's markets.

Trade, even more than aid, must be the concern of the Alliance nations. Rising trade can come only as a result of higher production and productivity, whereas aid—not always, but sometimes—may have to serve only as a temporary compensation.

The charter also proposes that the nations undertake projects of a regional character both within their borders and on a joint basis, including joint efforts in regional planning and in the integration, wherever feasible, of transportation, communications, and power systems.

At least three basic instruments for the promotion of integration were already in existence when the Alliance was created. Other participants will give you details. I will simply mention the main points.

The Latin American Free Trade Association was established in 1960 with the aim of reducing barriers to trade within Latin America as a whole. Just recently, in Bogotá, LAFTA adopted its first common schedule. It will eliminate tariffs on 25 percent of intra-LAFTA products in 1973. Equally significant was a decision to take steps toward other kinds of joint action.

The Central American integration movement springs from efforts going back to 1948. It now embraces not only trade but regional industrialization, currency convertibility, power, transportation, and communications. The Central American movement goes even further, reaching education, and there are developments affecting such subjects as labor affairs.

The Inter-American Development Bank, which began operations in October 1960, has among its responsibilities the promotion and financing of projects and programs of a regional and multinational character.

Greatly assisting the integration efforts have been the studies and the programs of technical assistance and training provided by the OAS and ECLA.

The progress that has already been made in integration in Latin America, particularly Central America, seems to me to symbolize the hopefulness we should all feel about the Alliance for Progress.

From the atmosphere of change that I referred to earlier, there has begun to emerge a hemispheric philosophy about integration and the whole concept of economic and social development.

First, whereas integration was seen initially as a process for increasing trade within the region, now it is seen as part of a whole process of economic and social development.

Second, economic development itself is seen as a process that is simultaneously political as well as economic.

Third, in the broadest sense, economic and social development must grow out of a planning process.

Fourth, planning, once considered primarily a technical process or a methodological alternative for forecasting in the economic and social fields, now emerges as a new instrument, a fundamental national resource, that is part of the function of government in a political, as well as an economic, sense. Properly used, that is, democratically used, the planning process becomes a way of reflecting in a development plan, as a document, the aspirations of the electorate. Thus, it must involve not only technicians in an agency of the executive branch of government, but the political leadership of the executive branch as a whole, and the legislative branch as well.

Fifth, it follows that the strengthening of Latin American trade must have the highest possible priority because, without it, external aid cannot be the catalytic agent of greater development and the complement to national self-help that it is supposed to be.

So that is the philosophy, the rationale, that has slowly and painfully taken shape since the signing of the Charter of Punta del Este. But we must keep reminding ourselves that economic development and integration are not ends in themselves, but means to an end. The end is human development and integration. The Alliance is for man, not man for the Alliance.

So at the core of our efforts is the investment in human resources, the spread of education. The Alliance charter commands the nations "to wipe out illiteracy; to extend, as quickly as possible, the benefits of primary education to all Latin Americans; and to provide broader facilities on a vast scale, for secondary, and technical training and higher education."

The efforts in the realms of human development are rather impressive in only 3 years the number of universities and centers of advanced study in Latin America has risen from 160 to 196 and their enrollments have increased from 519,000 to 680,000, or 30 percent.

Whereas a few years ago the national budgets of Latin America gave 8 or 10 percent to education, today the proportion is closer to 15 percent and in some countries even 20 percent and more.

Integration and reform; loans, grants, private investments; new homes, new schools, new hospitals, and health centers; powerplants, highways, factories—all these are multiplying with each passing day as tangible results of the Alliance. The U.S. Government is meeting its commitments. The Latin American nations are striving mightily to meet theirs. Already their total investment in economic and social development runs to the magnitude of $23 to $24 billion.

But I repeat, the physical accomplishments, the dollar figures on investment, are not ends in themselves. They are a means. The Alliance is not a goal but a highly flexible and many-faceted instrument for waging on a hemispheric basis the same kind of war on poverty that the people of the United States are now carrying on within their own borders.

We have the opportunity of extending on a hemispheric scale the search for the Great Society that President Johnson has called on his own people to pursue. We are fully aware, as he is, that the Great Society cannot and should not be patterned on "the ordered, changeless, and sterile battalion of the ants" but on "the excitement of becoming, always becoming, trying, probing, falling, resting, and trying again—but always trying and gaining."

And so little more than 3 years ago our governments, acting according to the desires of our peoples, accepted a challenge—a challenge that the technology of abundance offers us to wage peaceful and democratic revolution. We have made a beginning. We are called upon now to match courage with imagination, enthusiasm with determination to see the task through, whatever this requires in the way of change and adaptations in law, or commerce, or finance, or social structures.

THE DISGRACEFUL DENIAL OF VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to learn that President Lyndon B. Johnson will call upon the Congress for additional measures to safeguard voting rights throughout the Nation. Recent events in Selma, Ala., in which thousands of law-abiding Negro citizens were jailed merely because they wish to exercise their precious right to vote, indicate the clear and urgent need for immediate action.

I shall gladly support amendments to the Civil Rights Act strengthening its voting provisions or, if necessary, a constitutional amendment giving the Federal Government added jurisdiction in voter eligibility provisions.

It is unthinkable that in our democracy, any person or group of persons should be expected to pay taxes and sustain an obligation of military service, but be forbidden to have a meaningful expression as to who should hold public office. If taxation without representation was tyranny in 1776, it is no less tyranny today.

EXCISE TAXES ON COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to bring about the systematic reduction and eventual abolition of excise taxes on communications services.

I am in complete accord with the President's announced intention to reduce and eliminate discriminatory nuisance taxes which have been levied in times of emergency and allowed to stay on the books with little regard for their harmful effects on consumers and our national economy alike.

It would be clearly impossible to remove the 10-percent tax on telephone and telegraph services at once, of course. These taxes accounted for slightly less than $1 billion in revenue during fiscal 1964.

But I believe that the tax can, should, and must be gradually removed. Few examples of taxation in our country's history have been less justifiable or more harmful to the best interests of consumers and business.

We levied our first national excise tax on long distance telephone calls in 1932. The tax was extended and increased during World War II when such taxation served a dual purpose of producing revenue and reducing the load on our heavily burdened communications network.

Thirty-five years ago, the telephone was, perhaps, a "luxury." In most areas of our Nation, those were the days of the party line and the telephone's greatest use may have still been the transmittal of information once confined to the backyard fence.

Quite obviously, this is no longer true.

In today's highly technological society, the telephone is a necessity, both at home and in the office. A majority of our business is carried out by telephone and telegram. Time is a critical factor in the business world and there is no faster means of securing correct information than by using the telephone. In our own homes, the telephone can mean the difference between life and death. And, although I am told by colleagues who have teenage sons or daughters that the greater part of the time they seem unable to get a word in edgewise on their own telephones, phone service remains an absolute necessity in the average American household.

The bill I have introduced today would reduce the tax rate on general telephone service, toll telephone service, telegraph service, teletypewriter exchange and wire mileage from the present 10 to 8 percent in 1966. It would further reduce the tax by 2 percent each year until it has been completely removed in 1970. The tax on wire and equipment would be reduced in 1966 to a new figure of 6 percent and completely removed in 1969.

There are many arguments in favor of reducing this tax as quickly as possible. I believe removal of the tax will stimulate our economy further by putting telephone service within the reach of more consumers. This would necessitate greater telephone construction and this, in turn, would help to create new jobs.

Consumer savings on phone bills would pour new money into our economy, creating added purchasing power. We have already seen the dramatic value a tax cut can have in our effort to maintain and increase the level of prosperity our Nation enjoys.

In wartime there may have been justification for levying such a tax on communications service, regardless of how necessary it may have been to the individual or his business. Today, that justification simply does not exist.

We can reduce this tax without, in any way, reducing the long-range revenue production to our Federal Treasury. A lower tax will result in greater use of the service in some quarters and greater construction on the part of the utility companies involved. These two increases in activity should more than offset the decrease in tax rates and bring about the greatest possible all-around benefit to the consumer and the country.

No other utility service in the American home is taxed in this manner by the Federal Government.

It is time we recognized a simple truth the American businessman and the consumer he serves have known for a long time: The telephone is not a luxury and it should no longer be treated that way.

PRESIDENT'S AGRICULTURAL MESSAGE

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Ullman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, the President sent to the Congress his agricultural message. I strongly praise and endorse its contents. Many aspects of this fine message are worthy of expansion and comment. Today, however, I only wish to expand on the President's references to our national needs for improved and enhanced rural water supply developments.

The implementation of needs in this area can be accomplished by the rural water legislation which I introduce today.

Mr. Speaker, the President emphasized our needs for rural water supply developments in his message by stating:

> The results of opportunity's decline in rural America are reflected in harsh facts: rural America has almost three times the proportion of substandard houses found in urban areas. A fourth of all farm homes and a fifth of rural nonfarm homes are without running water. Over 14,000 rural communities of more than 100 population lack central water supplies.

If this situation was paralleled in any city in the country there would be a hue and cry from all sides for immediate action. Similarly, although the voices are small from thousands of rural communities throughout our land, the Congress must hear and must act in behalf of rural America.

In his inaugural address, President Johnson said:

> Ours is a time of change—rapid and fantastic change—shaking old values and uprooting old ways.

One of the most dramatic and serious changes in our society is and has been the massive outpouring of millions of people from rural America into our cities.

This dislocation of rural people has created two serious major problems:

First, it has depleted rural America of many of its young people with their vigor and strength, their potential abilities, their enterprise and ambition. It has eroded and weakened many rural communities with the subsequent loss of vital and necessary rural institutions.

Second, the migrating rural people by their very numbers have added to and compounded the problems of city congestion and unemployment. This has added astronomical costs to cities.

A study being made by Iowa State College indicates that the No. 1 reason rural people move to cities is the great disparity between the living conditions of rural areas and those of the city.

Personal reasons for moving often boil down to the hard choice of a bathroom or no bathroom, water from a faucet or an old well.

The bill I introduce today is only a first step for the enhancement of rural America. It is concerned only with clean water for rural areas—water for domestic use and the attraction of people and small businesses back to a rural environment. There are other steps before the Congress in the several pieces of legislation pending, pertinent to pollution abatement and sewage control. This of course is a companion problem in rural areas to that of water development. I am confident that wise thoughtful legislation will also be enacted in this area of need by this Congress.

The provisions of the legislation I introduce for stepped-up rural water development are briefly these: It establishes the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants for water systems in rural areas, when there is demonstrable need, plans are approved by the Secretary, it is impracticable to finance these systems by loans or to include these systems in small watershed programs. The bill further amends the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act by more specifically identifying water projects as eligible for loans under that authority and by raising the unpaid indebtedness limit of that act from $1 to $5 million. It broadens the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act by providing authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the proportionate share of a watershed project payable in direct Federal assistance to allocations for rural water supply, storage or distribution systems for domestic consumption or the development of small business or industry. The intent is to provide assistance equal to that now given for fish and wildlife or recreational developments. Nothing in this bill contravenes State authority in the field of water resources.

With the enactment of this legislation, I feel strongly that we may move to meet the President's urging for a "parity of opportunity for rural Americans."

GOLD—HOW IMPORTANT IS IT?

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, once again, I am taking the time to give expression to the thought that monetary and fiscal policy is not so intricate that only the expert economist understands it.

It is the duty of every American to know the simple basic principles.

If he understands them, he will be less inclined to react emotionally in times of crisis and will not panic at every downturn of either the stock market or of the economy generally.

It is high time we tried to understand the fundamental economics on which our very existence depends.

An excellent start is to make required reading the following article from the June 1961 issue of Reader's Digest:

What Is Profit?

(By Fred I. Kent)

(A schoolboy, disturbed by the current fashion of speaking disparagingly of the profit system which has formed the basis of the American way of life, wrote to his grandfather asking him to "explain just how there can be a profit which is not taken from the work of someone else." The grandfather, Fred I. Kent, LL.D., was president of the council of New York University and a former director of the Federal Reserve Board. Dr. Kent replied to his grandson's query as follows:)

My Dear Grandson: I will answer your question as simply as I can. Profit is the result of enterprise which builds for others as well as for the enterpriser. Let us consider the operation of this fact in a primitive community, say of 100 persons, who obtain only the mere necessities of living by working hard all day long.

Our primitive community, dwelling at the foot of a mountain, must have water. There is no water except at a spring near the top of the mountain: therefore, every day all the 100 persons climb to the top of the mountain. It takes them 1 hour to go up and back. They do this day in and day out, until at last one of them notices that the water from the spring runs down inside the mountain in the same direction that he goes when he comes down. He conceives the idea of digging a trough in the mountainside all the way down to the place where he has his habitation. He goes to work to build a trough. The other 99 people are not even curious about what he is doing.

Then one day this 100th man turns a small part of the water from the spring into his trough and it runs down the mountain into a basin he has fashioned at the bottom. Whereupon he says to the 99 others, who each spend an hour a day fetching their water, that if they will each give him the daily production of 10 minutes of their time, he will give them water from his basin. He will then receive 990 minutes of the time of the other men each day; this arrangement will make it unnecessary for him to work 16 hours a day in order to provide for his necessities. He is making a tremendous profit—but his enterprise has given each of the 99 other people 50 additional minutes each day.

The enterpriser, now having 16 hours a day at his disposal and being naturally curious, spends part of his time watching the water run down the mountain. He sees that it pushes along stones and pieces of wood. So he develops a water wheel; then he notices that it has power and, finally, after many hours of contemplation and work, he makes the water wheel run a mill to grind his corn.

This 100th man then realizes that he has sufficient power to grand corn for the other 99. He says to them, "I will allow you to grind your corn in my mill if you will give me one-tenth the time you save." They agree, and so the enterpriser now makes an additional profit.

He uses the time paid him by the 99 others to build a better house for himself, to increase his conveniences of living through new benches, openings in his house for light, and better protection from the cold. So it goes on, as this 100th man finds new ways to save the 99 the total expenditure for their time—one-tenth of which he asks of them in payment for his enterprising.

This 100th man's time finally becomes all his own to use as he sees fit. He does not have to work unless he chooses to. His food and shelter and clothing are provided by others. His mind, however, is ever working, and the other 99 are having more and more time to themselves because of his thinking and planning.

For instance, he notices that 1 of the 99 makes better shoes than the others. He arranges for this man to spend all his time making shoes, because he can be fed and clothed and sheltered from profits. The other 98 do not now have to make their own shoes. They are charged one-tenth the time they save. The 99th man is also able to work shorter hours because some of the time that is paid by each of the 98 is allowed to him by the 100th man.

As the days pass, another individual is seen by the 100th man to be making better clothes than any of the others, and it is arranged that his time shall be given entirely to his specialty. And so on.

Through the foresight of the 100th man, a division of labor is created that results in more and more of those in the community doing the things for which they are best fitted. Everyone has a greater amount of time at his disposal. Each becomes interested, except the dullest, in what others are doing and wonders how he can better his own position. The final result is that each person begins to find his proper place in an intelligent community.

But suppose that, when the 100th man had completed his trough down the mountain and said to the other 99, "If you will give me what it takes you 10 minutes to produce, I will let you get your water from my basin," they had turned on him and said, "We are 99 and you are only 1. We will take what water we want. You cannot prevent us and we will give you nothing." What would have happened then? The incentive of the most curious mind to build upon his enterprising thoughts would have been taken away. He would have seen that he could gain nothing by solving problems if he still had to use every waking hour to provide his living. There could have been no advancement in the community. Life would have continued to be drudgery to everyone, with opportunity to do no more than work all day long just for a bare living.

But we will say the 99 did not prevent the 100th man from going on with his thinking, and the community prospered. As the children grew up, it was realized that they should be taught the ways of life. There was now sufficient production so that it was possible to take others away from the work of providing for themselves, pay them, and set them to teaching the young.

Similarly, the beauties of nature became apparent. Men tried to fix scenery and animals in drawings—and art was born. From the sounds heard in nature's studio and in the voices of the people, music was developed. And it became possible for those who were proficient in drawing and music to spend all their time at their art, giving of their creations to others in return for a portion of the community's production.

As these developments continued, each member of the community, while giving something from his own accomplishments, became more and more dependent upon the efforts of others. And, unless envy and jealousy and unfair laws intervened to restrict honest enterprisers who benefited all, progress promised to be constant.

Need we say more to prove that there can be profit from enterprise without taking anything from others, that such enterprise adds to the ease of living for everyone?

These principles are as active in a great nation such as the United States as in our imaginary community. Laws that kill incentive and cripple the honest enterpriser hold back progress. True profit is not something to be feared, because it works to the benefit of all.

We must endeavor to build, instead of tearing down what others have built. We must be fair to other men, or the world cannot be fair to us.

Sincerely,

GRANDFATHER.

Mr. Speaker, there, briefly but succinctly, is a primer on economics. But that is only the beginning.

Let us proceed further from where grandfather stopped. These same primitive people grandfather talked about soon found that one of their number liked to gather shells. In other similar communities people found different kinds of metals which were pounded into various forms. One of these metals was copper, another silver, a third gold.

In all of these communities, quite independent of each other, the same problems arose.

When goods were not made fast enough to supply the demand, instead of 10 minutes of labor per item, 20 minutes were demanded. Throughout these remarks "minutes of labor" is intended to include capital and the products of both.

When the opposite occurred and the goods were made faster than they could be acquired, instead of 10 minutes of labor per item, 5 minutes were acceptable in exchange for it.

Call it what you will—it all added up to inflation and deflation. And for thousands of years, despite these invidious labels, the world has made progress, become more civilized—I did not say completely civilized—and has even become a better place in which to live, at least in the free areas of the world.

Also within each community, they found it was just too difficult to keep account of how many minutes one person owed another. It was difficult to stockpile minutes of labor. Even if they could, how could Mr. A, to whom was owed 100 minutes by Mr. B, transfer those minutes to Mr. C in exchange for Mr. C's products, assuming he could precisely measure the correct number of minutes to pay Mr. C. What happened if Mr. C could not use Mr. B's type of labor or if Mr. B could not get along with Mr. C or, if as permitted in a free enterprise system, Mr. B just would not work for Mr. C or would refuse at Mr. A's bidding to work 50 minutes for Mr. C and 50 for Mr. D?

That is when the shells, the copper, the silver, and the gold, came into the picture. Paper money came much later.

In one community minutes of labor were equated to shells; in another to a piece of copper, or a piece of silver or a piece of gold.

Soon, instead of trading minutes, they were trading shells, copper, silver, or gold. Few, if any, communities had all four. Within each community the medium of exchange, yes, the money, was not all four but one or more of them.

It was not until communities began to trade with one another that the shells, the copper, the silver, and the gold had to be matched against or exchanged for each other. Even then, however, the basic value was not the intrinsic value of the shell, the copper, the silver, or the gold, but the number of minutes of labor each represented.

I have, of course, been speaking of a primitive precapitalist society in which minutes of labor roughly determine value. In our modern capitalistic society, things are a little more complex. Even though the minutes of labor are the same, today values are quite different for two roadbuilding workers, one working with a shovel and the other with a giant bulldozer. Identical twins with the same number of minutes of labor, one working poor land and the other rich, establish very different values. A farmer using thousands of dollars worth of machinery and equipment can do all the preharvest labor on a wheat farm half the size of Manhattan Island—with no more minutes of labor than a less efficient farmer with only hand tools needs to eke out the barest existence from 3 or 4 acres of barren land. A lawyer's value is not determined alone by the minutes of labor—but by what he does with them. One lawyer may be paid $50 a week, and another one $5,000. The difference comes from richer education, more extensive knowledge, greater skill—even greater luck.

So in the modern world, to determine value we must add to minutes of labor a variety of factors which for simplicity we will call capital. The combination of the two determines basic values.

In modern society, the fourth step came about just as naturally. Who wanted to cart around a truck full of shells, or push a wheelbarrow of copper tokens, or carry a bag of silver or a pouch full of gold?

Imagine the squeals from the salaried man today calling for his $165 paycheck if, instead of that piece of paper—the check—or four pieces of currency—a $100, a $50, a $10, and a $5 bill, he were handed 5 ounces of gold. Therefore, ingenious man developed the system of issuing paper money instead of shells, copper, silver, and gold.

Paper money, just like the coins, was originally made and issued by men, not by governments. It deteriorates and becomes worthless when it loses its representation of minutes of labor and capital and instead represents merely the coins or bullion.

As the value of the metal changed or the metal was destroyed or stolen, the value of the paper money changed or was destroyed.

Bankers and banks came into being as warehousemen of the shells, copper, silver, and gold, issuing on paper promises to pay on demand the equivalent of what they received. These promises to pay became the currency and checks of today.

The reserves are the coins—or the bullion from which coins are made. As long as the banker reserves; that is, keeps on hand enough to meet the demands made against the outstanding promises to pay, the currency and checks are good—but good only for exchange to what was held in reserve or warehouse, to wit: the coins and bullion. But the coins and bullion are worthless unless they always represent a certain number of minutes of labor and capital. That necessarily means minutes of labor and capital that can be converted into useful, usable production or products.

It should now be too obvious to require further exposition that the problems of inflation and deflation remain the same throughout all of these stages and basically are neither encouraged nor discouraged by the medium of exchange.

That is not to say that the quantity of the mediums of exchange has no effect. Just as obviously, increasing or decreasing the quantity of the shells, the metals, or the paper must affect the price of goods and of labor and necessarily the loss of profit derived from the marketing.

It took civilized nations a long time to arrive finally at the determination that individuals cannot be trusted to fix the value of the mediums of exchange. Whether they be called entrepreneurs, monopolists, private bankers, or any other kind of bankers, the economic history of the world teaches us that even though the free enterprise system may permit any and everyone to gather, mine, or produce as much as he pleased of shells, copper, silver, gold, or paper, only responsible governments should determine which, if any or all, and to what extent and in what denominations they could be used as mediums of exchange.

Note that I say "responsible governments." Irresponsible governments or irresponsible action by responsible governments will throw us back to the economic chaos of the days when individuals "rigged" and "manipulated" the money markets.

That brings us to the point of understanding the need, no longer questioned but unanimously supported, for the existence of central banks, owned and controlled by government.

Our Central Bank, owned and controlled by the U.S. Government, is the Federal Reserve System. The head of the System is the Federal Reserve Board. The operating branches are the Federal Reserve banks in the 12 regional districts.

Let me repeat, what should nowhere be contradicted—the Federal Reserve banks, all of them, are owned lock, stock, and barrel by the U.S. Government.

Despite the issuance of paper, miscalled stock, to member banks of the System, those member banks do not own the Federal Reserve banks or any part thereof. Their misnamed stock cannot be sold, transferred, or hypothecated. It has no voting rights. It is merely a receipt for dollar deposits coupled with a promise of repayment when the member bank gets out of the System, either by withdrawal or liquidation.

Each member bank's right to vote to elect directors of a Federal Reserve bank is fixed by statute and exists quite independent of the issuance of the misnamed stock certificate and regardless of the amount of stock issued to it. Each bank has only one vote. There are other limitations of no consequence, however, to this discussion. Membership on the board of directors of a Federal Reserve bank should not be confused with membership on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Long before our own country learned the economic lessons of life as to governmental central bank operation, there was written into our Constitution the provision that only the Congress can coin money or issue currency. By the method of trial and error, we learned the grievous lesson that there can be no economic stability if this privilege is delegated to any but a Government agency.

Today coins may be produced only by the U.S. mints. Currency may be issued only by the U.S. Treasury or by the Federal Reserve banks. The weight and fineness of the coins are fixed by our Government. There is no variance but complete uniformity within each type of coin. Theoretically each is worth its weight in the particular metal of which it is made. The Government must retain the sole right to fix the price of the raw metal. If it did not, the value of each type of coin would change as the market price of the metal changed.

I again use the word "theoretically" because, and this will strike some people as incredible, the bullion value of our silver coins is by statute less than the monetary value and in our copper and nickel coinage there is no relationship between the denomination or monetary value of the coin and the value of the bullion or metal therein.

Try raising an objection next time you get a dime, a nickel, and a penny in change and you will be looked upon as psychotic.

No one ever dreams of raising any questions about it. Our Government coins these "shells," fixes their metallic content, names their denominational values, and everybody takes it for granted that they are worth as many "minutes of labor" as the market offers for them. Their monetary value does not change.

What the coin will buy, however, in a free competitive enterprise system, such as we try to make ours, will vary in accordance with what happens in the marketplace, uncontrolled by our Government, though regulated in certain phases.

So it is also with our currency. The Government issues it in various denominations. The cost of producing a $10,000 bill is no more than that of the $1 bill. It is legal tender for the denominated amount impressed on it not because of any intrinsic value but because that is the amount the U.S. Government promises to pay. The legal effect and validity of that promise is exactly the same, whether the currency is issued by the U.S. Treasury or by a Federal Reserve bank.

Every dollar, currency or coin, is worth 100 cents only because of the credit of the United States of America and the faith, the confidence, we and the rest of the world have in it. It is not worth 100 cents on the dollar because of the gold, silver, or copper our Government owns.

Take out of your pocket and look at a Federal Reserve note—say a $10 bill. It carries this engraved statement: "Redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank." But take it to the Treasury and ask for redemption in "lawful money." An astonished clerk will look at you, take your bill with one hand—and give you back an identical bill with the other. You are actually handling not a piece of paper—but a piece of the faith, credit, and confidence of the United States.

Silver certificates are literally backed by silver, dollar for dollar. But who can guarantee that the value of the silver will not change in the marketplace.

As a matter of fact, the silver in our silver dollar does not have a bullion value equal to a dollar. But here, too, whether you use the silver certificate or the silver dollar to make a purchase or pay a debt, the monetary value does not change.

The rest of our currency by law must be backed by a percentage of gold. But why not, like silver, require dollar for dollar. Again, in either event, whether dollar for dollar or 25 cents for each dollar, who can guarantee that the value of gold will not change in the marketplace?

From 1913 to 1945 the law required a reserve of 35 percent in gold certificates or lawful money against deposits and 40-percent gold certificates against Federal Reserve notes in circulation.

In 1945 that was all changed to require only 25 percent of gold certificates against the Federal Reserve notes.

But so far as currency and money are concerned today, no American can own gold or gold certificates in or out of our country.

So of what earthly use is a gold reserve to our domestic economy? It cannot add or detract from its stability. It cannot affect inflation or deflation.

Historically at one time the U.S. gold reserve laws had meaning. When the Nation operated under the gold standard, and individuals could own gold, actual boxes of physical gold were shipped in or out of the country, depending on prices offered for the gold in the various gold markets. This movement in turn affected bank reserves, the volume of currency, and the country's economic position. But for years we have not operated under the gold standard—and today our gold reserve laws are a meaningless economic fiction.

The physical movement of gold into and out of the United States now depends largely on decisions of monetary authorities as to whether they wish to hold gold under earmark in the United States or ship it from the United States to their own country. Under the old gold standard there were also shipments of gold by banks and brokers in response to movements of exchange rates to the so-called gold export or import points; and fundamentally, these movements resulted when there was a surplus or deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. Internationally, the United States continues to operate on the international gold bullion standard and the international aspects of the gold standard have not been fundamentally changed. The major change from the gold standard of the past is the elimination, since 1933, of the redeemability into gold of U.S. money for domestic holders of dollars. Before 1933 these domestic holders could legally demand gold for internal monetary use. Under this system, sometimes called the gold coin standard, there could be an internal drain on our gold reserves even though the balance-of-payments position might be in balance. Like the United States, most leading countries have abandoned the practice of redeeming their money domestically upon demand.

The gold reserve will not help or hurt our gold miners. As long as our Government will provide who may and who may not own gold and also fix its price, the lot of the gold miner will be no better or no worse.

We can, if we want to, continue to dig gold out of one hole in the ground and rebury it in another hole in the ground at Fort Knox.

Gold or no gold, each piece of paper, check, or currency and each coin, copper, nickel, or silver, will buy and pay for a certain number of minutes of labor and capital, nothing more, nothing less, even though the number of minutes may vary.

As of June 27, 1962, there were outstanding Federal Reserve bank obligations, exclusive of capital accounts, of $47.3 billion against which the Federal Reserve banks had a gold reserve of $16.2 billion. Under existing law, against that gold reserve, the Federal Reserve System could add to the total of currency and deposits about $17.5 billion for a total of 66.5 billion. In other words, the Federal Reserve notes—currency—could be increased from $27 billion to more than $44 billion. No one has suggested that that be done. I am certain that there is no intention to do so. Imagine what would happen to the value of that minute of labor and capital if we suddenly increased the quantity of currency in circulation by $17.5 billion.

This then is the case against requiring a gold reserve on the domestic scene and in favor of repealing the law requiring it.

To those who argue that history tells us that every country without a gold reserve has collapsed economically, I say they confuse gold with manipulation of the economy.

Our gold reserve is subject to the same manipulation as our economy. Irresponsible Government officials can manipulate either. Thus far in our country, in our generation, that has not been done. We must be alert to be sure it is not done. Gold, however, is not the brake on such conduct.

To repeal the law requiring a gold reserve has certain positive advantages. We would replace a legalistic myth with reality. We would be freed from juggling around reserve percentages to meet conditions which might arise. We would simplify the economy's financial structure. And in time of potential war with a power possessing vast gold deposits, we would strengthen our economy in the world, add greater flexibility and mobility, and increase our chances of survival and success for the United States.

But will this affect our balance of payments? Will we not cause a run on our gold by foreign claimants if we abolish our statutory requirement for a gold reserve? The answer is positively, unequivocally, and categorically "No."

Checkbook money calls for dollars, not gold.

U.S. currency is either Treasury certificates or Federal Reserve notes. Each calls for silver or for lawful money of the United States. None call for gold.

No individual, no corporation—American or foreign—can demand gold from us.

Foreign governments and foreign central banks; that is, government banks, do not have a right to demand settlement of their claims against the United States in gold. We can satisfy such claims either with gold or with the currency of that country making the claim. As a matter of national policy the Treasury sells gold for dollars to foreign governments and central banks for the settlement of international balances.

By repealing a sterile and useless domestic gold reserve requirement, we have available to meet foreign claims a gold stock of more than $16.4 billion.

The total amount, private and Government, of foreign claims is only $20 billion and only about half of it is foreign government. Our gold stock is almost double that amount. Total short-term liabilities to foreign countries reported by banks in the United States amounted to about $18.8 billion on April 30, 1962, of which $10.3 billion were official balances of governments and central banks. In addition, foreign countries held about $1.4 billion of U.S. Government bonds and notes for which we have no official-private breakdown. The total of these foreign dollar holdings was $20.2 billion. These figures do not include the $5.6 billion held by international institutions, which do not constitute potential claims on our gold.

In addition, we have a right to call on the International Fund for the use of $1.4 billion in currencies we could use in lieu of gold to meet foreign government claims. That much we can get, as of right. We can borrow almost as much more, if necessary, plus much larger sums by negotiated agreement. But how could we possibly need it, and for what?

Over and above the foreign claims referred to, Americans own investments in foreign countries in excess of $54 billion. All of them are earning profits for Americans. Some of the earnings and of the capital is repatriated—brought home to the United States—every year.

Those who argue that we must have a gold reserve to prevent printing excessive quantities of paper money, completely ignore the fact that it is the law, as made by Congress and approved by the President, and not the quantity of quality or fineness of gold, which determines how much and what kind of paper money should be issued in this country.

The quantity of money that is held in the form of currency and coin is determined primarily by the habits of the public and the need for pocket money. The quantity of money in the form of deposits in the banks results, on the one hand, from the operations of the Federal Reserve System and the commercial banks, under the laws affecting these institutions made by Congress and approved by the President. On the other hand, it is affected by the current requirements for bank loans by the community.

Only if our entire gold stock were needed to meet the 25-percent gold requirement could this requirement be said to impose a limit on the money supply. At the present time our gold reserve is substantially more than the minimum established by law.

Those who argue that we should go back on the gold standard and devalue the dollar, that is, increase the price of gold from $35 to $70 an ounce, or to any other figure, also tell you that that must not be done unilaterally by the United States, but we must do it in agreement with the major "hard" currency countries of the world, else we upset the world currencies.

If that is what we must do, why waste the time with such mathematical gymnastics? If we double the value of the ounce of gold and thereby cut the dollar in half, and do the same to the British pound sterling, and the German mark, and the French franc, and the Italian lira, what have we accomplished? But look at the windfall we create for the country that will not enter into so foolish an international agreement—"fiasco" would be a better word. Would the Swiss bankers join us in such a move? I doubt it.

Would the Russians? You can bet your last dollar they would not.

It is said that half of the world's gold is owned by the Russians. For every dollar we add to the price of gold, we add a dollar to the value of the Russian hoard.

Double the world price of gold, and the Russians get a windfall which will automatically put them in a tremendously powerful economic position worldwide.

Every last economist and financial writer who regularly tries to instill fear about our balance of payments, and tries to destroy confidence in the American dollar, and urges increasing the price of gold, also insists that our fractional reserve system is the best yet devised by man.

The fractional reserve system is that which permits the issuance of currency or checkbook money in multiples of the gold or other reserves on hand. The theory proved by experience is that not more than one-sixth to one-fourth of the gold on hand is ever demanded by the holders of claims against the gold.

As long as the free world keeps most of its gold in the United States of America, it is safe. Safe not only from misappropriation and embezzlement, but safe from capture by dictators of the left or of the right, and certainly safe from the Communists.

Everyone knows that the last place in the world the Communists can get to is the United States of America. They know, too, there is no safer place than here for their gold. They can trade with their claims on that gold while it is here. If the Communists steal those claims, the United States of America can refuse to honor them, holding the gold here for the true owners thereof. If the claims are redeemed and the gold taken home, and the gold captured by the Communists, it is gone forever.

Of course, the earmarking of gold for a foreign country or central bank takes it out of our gold reserves, whether the gold remains here or is shipped abroad. But such gold once so taken out of our gold reserve is effectively immobilized. It becomes a nonearning asset that eats into its own value by the cost of storage, insurance, and so forth. Their dollars, on the other hand, cost nothing to store, need no insurance, and can earn interest while waiting to be used.

The one thing the economists do not tell us, and yet the only basic truth, is—no economy, domestic, foreign, or international, depends on gold or on the medium of exchange, no matter what it is called.

Our economy, every sound economy, must depend upon the production of our farms and of our factories. The dollar protects itself when we protect our economy. We protect our economy when we keep our people employed in producing. Every producer is an earner; every earner is a consumer.

That is the one circle that cannot be called vicious. It is the unalterable, but happy circle that makes for peace and contentment.

It is axiomatic that a sound domestic economy cannot operate in an international vacuum. A domestic economy which is sound produces for resale on the international markets goods that may be sold abroad at competitive prices.

In that atmosphere, all the world knows that our dollar, whether check, currency, or gold, is exchangeable for full value in minutes of labor and capital, no more and no less.

FIRMNESS TOWARD NASSER IS THE RIGHT COURSE—LET'S NOT BACK DOWN NOW

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel] to instruct the conferees to insist on the original House amendment to this bill, denying assistance under this program for the balance of the fiscal year to Mr. Nasser's Egypt.

Last year, at the time the foreign aid authorization bill was before the House, I offered a similar amendment to it pointing out that events had already demonstrated that Nasser was following a course hostile to our interests and to the interests of peace and stability in the Near East. He was arming against Israel. He was pressuring the Libyans to drive us out of our key air base at Wheelus. He was sending arms into Cyprus to stir up the fighting there and further menace the stability of the NATO alliance. He was supporting military operations in Yemen and in the Congo, contrary to the interests of the United Nations. My amendment did not carry, but it did get substantial support.

Subsequently, a similar amendment was offered to the appropriations bill, and this one came closer to adoption. The other day in this new Congress the same amendment was offered again and of course I supported it, as did a substantial majority of this House, and it carried.

It carried, I believe, because not only had Mr. Nasser not stopped in the intervening months pushing the policies and actions which I had noted 6 months ago as being contrary to our interests, but he had, in fact, since then increased them and had even sneered at the whole concept of American assistance when we had indicated our displeasure with his conduct.

Mr. Speaker, it would certainly not be consistent for me, after having fought so hard for this principle both in this Congress and the last, to change my position now and oppose the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I could not in good conscience do so because I believe our country would be making a grave mistake in reversing the thoroughly healthy action taken the other day by the House of Representatives.

I have always supported the foreign aid program, even though it has not always been popular in the district which I have the honor to represent. But I have also believed very strongly that this assistance is wasted unless we make certain that the countries to which it is directed do follow certain policies or take certain actions in accord with our best interests, in other words that certain "strings" are tied to it. One of the very serious dangers in our foreign aid program, I believe, is that countries might get the impression that this assistance is available to them no matter what they do or what they may say.

We have been told, for example, that because of this continued aid we are a "moderating" influence on Mr. Nasser's conduct, and without this assistance we would have no more "handle" on him. This strikes me as very much a one-way kind of argument. We can turn the spigot on, apparently, but we can't turn it off. Such a view puts us into the intolerable position where any tinhorn dictator can blackmail us simply by threatening to undertake certain "immoderate" actions if we even threaten to discontinue our assistance to him.

There must come a time, Mr. Speaker, when those who would undermine the interests of the United States learn exactly what our intentions and determination really are. Otherwise, we should be following a road that would be, unfortunately, all too similar to the appeasement policy directed toward Adolf Hitler in the 1930's. I am sure that Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain also thought that his concessions to Hitler would have a "moderating" influence on the Nazi dictator and would give the British some kind of "handle" on Hitler. But we found out then that appeasement does not work and cannot work, and I think it is time for us to recall that lesson now.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday, President Johnson took bold and decisive action in Vietnam to make perfectly clear the intentions and determination of the United States in that area of the world. I thoroughly support him in this action. I believe the action of the House of Representatives in regard to the United Arab Republic is a similar healthy and decisive step which should certainly not be upset.

In fact the record indicates that the action of the House has already had a "moderating" effect of its own on Mr. Nasser and has prompted a reappraisal of his actions toward us. We have gotten these results by "getting tough" with Nasser just as we hope to get results by "getting tough" with North Vietnam. To reverse the action of the House now would not only jeopardize the good which our earlier action did, but would again create doubt and misunderstanding as to our real intentions and our determination.

Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the argument that by our actions we are taking food out of the mouths of hungry Egyptian children. The agricultural commodities proposed to be conveyed to Mr. Nasser will after all only be transformed into currency to finance his aggressive military operations elsewhere. And we are not in any case cutting off all aid to Nasser. Several other titles of the bill are still available for genuinely humanitarian aid. Nor are we cutting off all ties with Nasser. We are simply making clear that this Congress and this people recognize a limit beyond which those who seek and receive our assistance simply cannot go. We do not intend to be a "paper tiger" in the pocketbook any more than in our defense stance.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the contention that this position constitutes a repudiation of the President of the United States. True, the President has broad authority in the field of foreign relations. But the Congress also has authority in this same field, both under the Constitution and as an outgrowth of progressive developments over the years. In an age when foreign policy is increasingly being conducted through allocations of vast sums of money, those of us in Congress who have the ultimate say on money also have both a share and a responsibility in the conduct of our overall foreign policy. In this vital question of our policy toward Nasser, as in other matters, the ultimate actions of the U.S. Government must reflect not only the thinking of the executive branch but also of the elected representatives in the Congress as well. I cannot believe that it is proper for us in this House to default our heavy responsibilities in the conduct of our foreign policy and it is in that spirit that I support the pending motion.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following press account from the New York Times of January 30:

Cairo Restrains Criticism of United States—It Wants To Avert Cutoff of Aid Program by Congress—Reds Are Warned

(By Hedrick Smith)

Cairo, January 29.—President Gamal Abdel Nasser, who just a month ago was telling the United States to "jump in the lake" with its economic assistance, is following a policy of restraint now that the U.S. Congress is considering cutting off aid to the United Arab Republic.

Egyptian authorities, anxious to have the American aid program continued, are making a serious effort to avoid embarrassing the

Johnson administration by intemperate outbursts during the current aid battle on Capitol Hill.

President Nasser was reliably reported to have intervened to prevent the publication of two bitterly anti-American editorials in the Cairo newspaper Al Akhbar Wednesday, the day after the House of Representatives voted to suspend surplus food sales to Egypt.

In general, confident talk in press and official circles about doing without the $140 million a year American food shipments has given way, at least for the time being, to expressions of appreciation for the efforts of the State Department and the Johnson administration to save the aid program.

DISTINCTION IS DRAWN

The Cairo press, which has in the past delivered broadside attacks against the United States on issues far less important to Egypt than the American aid program, has been critical of Members of Congress on the aid question. However, it has drawn a sharp distinction between the House action and the viewpoint of the administration and, for the first time in recent months, has painted a clear picture of the administration's predicament and the range of views within the United States on the aid question and relations with the United Arab Republic.

Moreover, Cairo's most authoritative columnist delivered a thinly veiled warning today to Egypt's Communists on behalf of the regime not to overplay their hand in the present situation.

Some American officials took comfort from the editorial by Mohammed Hassanein Heikal, a confidant of President Nasser, because they had feared that Cairo was letting the Communists develop new influence unchecked.

In his weekly column in Al Ahram, Mr. Heikal warned the Communists against attempting to reform their party openly or secretly or trying to tamper with religion in Egypt. In either case, he said, they would be violating the National Charter and "hence the law has the right—and indeed the duty—to intervene and strike at them."

REDS IN INFLUENTIAL JOBS

About 600 Egyptian Communists were freed from jail last April and have made their way into influential jobs, especially in the press. There have been reports that the Central Committee of the Communist Party was secretly reformed last fall.

Qualified sources said Mr. Heikal's column—the first significant public criticism of the Communists in months—was intended to assure the West and warn the Soviet bloc that the Nasser regime was not about to espouse communism even if Western aid were cut back.

Since Egyptian-American relations reached a low point at Christmas after mobs attacked the U.S. Embassy compound and burned the U.S. Information Agency Library in Cairo in protest against the American role in the rescue of white hostages in the Congo, Mr. Heikal has played a personal role in trying to rebuild contacts with the United States. He has met repeatedly with Ambassador Lucius D. Battle.

Mr. Battle was reported to have given the Nasser regime assurances that the Johnson administration would do all it could to retain the economic aid program and prevent enactment of a ban on surplus food shipments to the United Arab Republic.

This morning Al Ahram attributed the House vote for the ban to "an alliance between elements favoring Israel and isolation and the [Republican] opposition in Congress."

FARM LABOR

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 78, adopted in 1951, resulted in employment of foreign nationals, Mexican, or otherwise. It expired on December 31, 1964. Congressmen from districts which rely on these laborers are acutely aware of this crucial problem and that such a basic element in our finely balanced economy cannot be disturbed without shattering consequences.

Wyoming's sugarbeet growers deserve commendation for efforts to cope with this problem on their own; however, we cannot wait until our beets are spoiling in the fields—a present problem of California date growers—to solve this problem.

We must know that present legislation, such as the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, Public Law 414, will be effective to provide temporary assistance of foreign nationals where growers cannot find enough American workers to perform these necessary seasonal labors.

A nonlegislative remedy to this problem is going to require full cooperation and good faith between the Department of Labor and the growers. This would be greatly aided if the Department of Labor would assume a neutral role on this matter rather than that of an advocate. A continued strict construction of the Public Law 414 could well lead to one of the blackest years in the history of American agriculture.

In support of my view I would like to read into the RECORD two letters typical of many I have received.

The first is from Mr. Fred G. Holmes, a vice president of the Great Western Sugar Co.; the second from a Wyoming beet grower:

THE GREAT WESTERN SUGAR CO.,
Denver, Colo., January 28, 1965.

Hon. TENO RONCALIO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RONCALIO: We and our growers are greatly concerned about the possibility that Mexican nationals will not be available for sugarbeet work this spring. We ask for your help and advice in solving this problem.

I believe that our future need for this type of worker can best be developed by a review of the actual number of workers employed and acres worked in 1964. Following is the detail of the acreage worked by types of workers in our Lovell-Wheatland areas:

Types of workers	Acreage worked	Number of workers	Average acres per worker
Growers' families	221		
Local labor	1,867	184	10.15
Youth groups	32	15	2.13
Drift-in workers [1]	110	8	93.75
Recruited workers	1,701	130	13.08
Mexican nationals	21,775	1,110	19.62
Total	25,706		

[1] Drift-in workers are those who are either recruited directly by their grower-employer or who travel to our areas without being contacted by our recruiters.

At first glance at the above figures it would appear that the loss of Mexican nationals would mean a shortage of 1,110 workers. However, to work with domestic workers the 21,775 acres worked by Mexican nationals would require the recruitment of 1,664 additional workers instead of 1,110 Mexican nationals. This is based upon the average performance of recruited domestic workers in 1964, and the assumptions (1) that the same numbers of local and drift-in workers would again be available and (2) that the additional workers needed could be recruited.

We do not believe it possible to recruit enough workers to fill the shortages that would result if Mexican nationals were not available. We have assisted our growers in recruiting fieldworkers for over 50 years. From 1948 until 1961 I was in charge of our labor department and I personally know that every effort was made to fill our shortages with domestic workers recruited from Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, and other Western States. In addition, the Colorado State Employment Service has also recruited workers for our Rocky Mountain area growers in the Southwestern States for many years; yet, our combined efforts could not fill the needs and each year from 1951 to date it has been necessary for us to contract Mexican nationals. It is also reasonable to assume that the demand for domestic agricultural workers for other areas in the United States, resulting from the loss of approximately 180,000 Mexican nationals, will reduce the number of workers that will be recruited for our areas in 1965.

It has always been extremely difficult to recruit domestic workers for sugarbeet work in Wyoming. We believe that this difficulty is mainly due to (1) the great distances workers must travel from their homes in the Southwest to Wyoming and return, and (2) the shortness of the working season because of the lack of work in other crops. In Colorado, for example, workers also have work in harvesting tomatoes, cucumbers, and potatoes, in addition to their beet work. But even in Colorado, we have been unable to recruit enough domestic labor to fill the needs.

As you know, the sugarbeet industry has made tremendous strides in the development of better seed, machines, and herbicides in an effort to reduce and, we hope, eventually eliminate the need for fieldworkers. As a result, we now need only one-half of the number of workers that were required 20 years ago. We feel confident that within a few years we will have herbicides that will eliminate weeds—and labor. Until that day arrives, we must face the fact that labor shortages will cause crop losses.

Our growers have accorded to domestic workers the principal benefits given Mexican nationals. The wage rates paid both types of workers have been as determined annually by the Secretary of Agriculture under the terms of the Sugar Act. The 9,119 Mexican nationals contracted to us in 1964 who worked in our 5-State area averaged $1.242 per hour worked. Although payrolls are not kept on domestic workers by our growers, we think it reasonable to assume that similarly qualified domestic workers earn equally as much inasmuch as they are paid at the same rate as Mexican nationals.

There has been no discrimination in housing and the free housing furnished both domestic workers and Mexican nationals has been inspected and has met the Department of Labor's minimum housing standards for nationals. The sugar industry is one of the few that have provided both occupational and nonoccupational insurance coverage for domestic workers. Robert Sakata, as a representative of the Mountain States Beet Growers Association of Colorado testified at the recent Department of Labor hearing in Dallas as to the benefits given. A copy of this statement is attached for your information.

You know that both my company and our growers are greatly concerned over the possibility that we might be denied Mexican nationals this spring. This concern was clearly shown when we were unable to settle the 1965 contract at our recent negotiations.

Very truly yours,

FRED G. HOLMES,
Vice President, Agricultural Administration.

POWELL, WYO.,
January 23, 1965.

Hon. TENO RONCALIO,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: When the Government lifted acreage restrictions on sugarbeets and in 1963 said there would be no acreage restrictions imposed at least through the 1965 or 1966 growing seasons due to an apparent shortage of sugar, many growers responded by investing heavily in new equipment to raise more acres to help offset this shortage. This was done in the hope that income from more acres harvested would repay the money borrowed in 3 or 4 years, if most all of the profits from the crop were used for that purpose.

When it became apparent that there was not such a shortage as the USDA thought, acreage restrictions on U.S. beet growers instead of foreign allotments were the answer. Most grower associations reluctantly went along with this. The growers felt they could tighten their belts a little and get by. Now, to top this off, Secretary of Labor Wirtz says there is plenty of unemployed labor in the United States waiting around to do such jobs as thinning beets.

You being a Representative from Wyoming beet-raising communities know it takes a particular kind of person to do the stoop labor of beet thinning. You and I know that very few of the labor force in the United States could do this kind of manual labor.

Chemical weed control and mechanical thinning equipment are making progress; however, they are still not effective enough to let us produce a profitable crop without additional hand labor. The Mexican nationals are excellent at this work, and the money they take home to Mexico greatly helps the economy of our neighbor. At the same time, if we can produce a profitable crop, we will be buying more machinery and supplies and helping keep the economy of this country rolling.

I strongly urge you to use your influence to help us beet growers with this problem. Thank you.

Sincerely,

DON FAXON.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overstate this problem or the present need for clarification and certainty in this area.

INTRODUCTION SPEECH FOR VOTING RIGHTS BILL OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of us here today stand together with the vast majority of the American people who believed that the Civil Rights Act of 1954 had finally guaranteed the right to vote to all of our citizens regardless of race or color. Unfortunately, this belief has been painfully shattered by recent events in Selma, Ala., and neighboring areas. The cold fact that sufficient authority does not exist in the laws of the United States to prevent discrimination at the ballot box must come as a shock to the Members of this body who labored so long and diligently last winter. Four days ago I was in Selma. I was immediately struck by the fact that the Dallas County Board of Registration and all other city and county officials stated time after time that they were obeying the Alabama laws pertaining to registration and voting and did not consider themselves guilty of any wrongdoing. They did not understand, nor could they explain why only 2 percent of the eligible Negroes were registered, while 70 percent of eligible whites had qualified to vote. A number of Selma residents, particularly white businessmen, told me that unless there were truly effective Federal legislation, it would be impossible for the Negro to attain his voting rights at any time in the near future.

I believe that we must enact a law as quickly as possible that will, without question, conclusively abolish voting discrimination. Our duty as Members of the Congress of the United States compels us to do no less. At this point, decisive action is required. We—as Members of Congress—must face the fact that existing legislation just is not working. The situation in Selma must jar us from our complacency concerning voting rights. Most of us believed that the passage of the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964 would end violence and demonstrations and move this type of controversy into the courts.

Why then are we faced with the spectacle of young children crowded into jails, men and women being beaten and subject to wholesale arrests, teachers losing their hard-won jobs and skilled craftsmen subject to all sorts of economic reprisals when they attempt to exercise their supposed inalienable right to vote?

There are several reasons. First, the 7-year history of judicial enforcement of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964 has shown a pronounced tendency on the part of the Federal courts in the South to proceed very, very slowly. Secondly, the voting referees procedure established by the 1960 act and somewhat strengthened by the 1964 act necessitates drawn out litigation that postpones final relief, and usually establishes in each suit only the rights of individuals or small groups. Third, the Federal judiciary in the South has shown an extreme reluctance to appoint any voting referees. In fact, the number of referees actually appointed is probably less than the number of the fingers on one hand—and this, despite the glaring abuses that exist in Dallas County and other counties throughout the South. And fourth, even if a referee should be appointed, he is obliged under the existing procedure to apply State laws which in many areas as in Alabama, are highly discriminatory and precisely designed to prevent Negroes from voting.

Dallas County, Ala., dramatically exemplifies the ineffectiveness of existing legislation. As early as 1961, soon after the passage of the 1960 Civil Rights Act, the Justice Department filed suit against the Board of Registrars of Dallas County. Four years and five more Federal suits later effective relief is yet to be forthcoming, and the first voting referee is yet to be appointed. The extraordinary concentration of the legal resources of the Justice Department has been to no avail. Last week a Federal district court issued its most recent order. That order tolerates a situation in which the board of registration is open only 2 days each month. It does order the board to process at least 100 applications each of those 2 days; but at that rate it would take close to 7 years merely to process the applications of the 15,000 qualified Negro citizens of Dallas County.

Viewing the clear and almost total failure of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964 to secure the right to vote without regard to race, and sensing the great and immediate need for remedial legislation, I am today introducing a bill which would establish a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission. The new Commission would consist of six members, three from each political party, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Commission would act upon receipt of complaints or upon its own motion regarding discriminatory registration or voting procedures. It would hold hearings and, if complaints were substantiated, it would act quickly and effectively to secure the right to vote.

One of the key provisions gives the Commission the power to appoint Federal registrars for all elections—State or local—who would be authorized to register qualified voters without complex literacy tests, poll taxes, or any other restrictive procedures.

Regretfully, in my limited time I can not explain this bill in detail. Under unanimous consent, I introduce into the RECORD, along with the text of the bill, an overall analysis of the bill. I would like to add that Profs. Mark deWolfe Howe, Paul Freund, and Louis Jaffe, of the Harvard Law School faculty, were asked for their views on the constitutionality of this proposed legislation. I also include Professor Howe's reply in the RECORD.

Let there be no mistake about what I am asking. I urgently request the distinguished Committee on the Judiciary to hold immediate hearings not only on this bill but also on the many other constructive proposals which have been introduced in the Congress by my esteemed colleagues.

Too long has the southern Negro borne unaided the intolerable burden of braving dangers and risking his life in his attempt to register to vote. The time has long since passed when the Congress should have provided him its effective assistance.

We must end the spectacle of elected white officials using the letter of their law to violate and undermine the spirit of the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United Sates.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a copy of the bill which I have introduced and an analysis of the same. I am also including a letter from Prof. Mark DeW. Howe, of the Harvard Law School:

H.R. 4509

A bill to further secure the right to vote, free from discrimination on account of race or color, through the establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965."

The Congress hereby finds: (1) that large numbers of citizens of the United States are denied the right to vote on account of their race or color; (2) that many State and local registration and election officials are responsible for such denials; (3) that such denials are sometimes accomplished through violence, threats of violence, economic reprisals, and other forms of intimidation; (4) that in many areas of the United States the literacy test, interpretation test and other such devices are frequently abused so as to deny qualified citizens the right to vote on account of race or color; (5) that the poll tax as a condition of suffrage is today almost exclusively used to deny the right to vote on account of race or color; and (6) that the delays incident to granting the right to vote to qualified citizens of the United States regardless of their race or color under existing legislation have been excessive and unreasonable.

Sec. 2. Definition.—"Election" means any election, including an election for Federal, State or local office; a primary election or any other voting process at which officials or candidates for public office are chosen; and any vote which decides a proposition or issue of public law.

Sec. 3. The right to vote in any election shall not be denied or abridged by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

Sec. 4. There is hereby established a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission which shall consist of six members appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the members shall be of the same political party. The President shall designate the Chairman of the Commission.

Sec. 5 The Commission, on application of any aggrieved person, or on its own motion, shall determine, after a hearing on the record, whether there exists a pattern or practice of denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of race or color in any State or political subdivision thereof.

Sec. 6. Whenever a determination is made by the Commission under section 4 that a pattern or practice of denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of race or color exists in an area, without further action by the Commission any applicant seeking to register to vote:

(a) shall, by completion of six grades of education in a public school or in a private accredited school, be deemed to have fulfilled all literacy, education, knowledge, or intelligence requirements, and

(b) shall be allowed to satisfy any registration or voting requirements at any time until thirty days before an election.

Sec. 7. Whenever the Commission makes a determination of a pattern or practice of denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of race or color under section 5, it is empowered to take appropriate action to correct such denials or abridgments. "Appropriate action" may include:

(a) Establishment of a system of officials to conduct and make return of elections in the area;

(b) Appointment of supervisors to oversee elections conducted by State or local officials. The Commission may confer upon the supervisors such powers as it deems necessary to guarantee the right to vote, including the powers of United States marshals to arrest and to bear firearms;

(c) Establishment of a system of Federal registrars empowered to register persons to vote in all elections. Such registrars may secure registration on a house-to-house basis.

(d) Requiring the use of such registration and voting application forms as are consistent with the policies of this Act and which incorporate the valid qualifications for registration and voting under State law. "Valid qualifications for registration and voting under State law" shall not include any requirement the purpose or effect of which the Commission finds is to further in any way the pattern or practice found pursuant to section 5.

(e) Establishment of a system of voter education and information centers designed to facilitate registration and voting;

(f) Preparation, publication, and distribution of materials;

(g) Establishment, suspension or modification of registration deadlines or periods, or of other such time limitations.

Sec. 8. If the Commission finds after a hearing on the record, that any official of any State or political subdivision thereof has refused, or has aided another such official in refusing, in any way to accept or count a ballot cast by a person registered pursuant to section 7 of this Act, the Commission shall assess a civil penalty of $300 for each separate ballot not counted upon both (a) the official, and (b) the State or political subdivision thereof of which he is an official. These civil penalties shall be collected by United States marshals.

Sec. 9. (a) It shall be a discriminatory election practice for any person to—

(1) commit in an official capacity any act which furthers the pattern or practice found pursuant to section 5;

(2) interfere with or impede the effectuation of any order or action of the Commission;

(3) violate any rule or regulation adopted by the Commission under section 15.

(b) Upon complaint of any aggrieved person or upon its own motion, the Commission shall determine, after a hearing on the merits, whether any person has committed a discriminatory election practice. Upon such determination the Commission may issue a cease and desist order or order such affirmative action as will effectuate the policies of this Act. Such cease and desist orders may apply to all future discriminatory election practices. The Commission may apply at any time to the Court of Appeals of the Circuit within which the discriminatory election practice occurred for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining orders.

(c) If the Commission finds that discriminatory election practices have resulted in a substantial denial of the right to vote on account of race or color in any election, the Commission may declare the election void, and may order and conduct a new election. This subsection shall not apply to elections for Presidential and Vice-Presidential Electors, United States Senators, and United States Representatives.

(d) The Commission may request such further assistance from the President as it deems necessary for enforcement of this Act.

Sec. 10. Appeals.—Any aggrieved person may appeal any determination, order, or action of the Commission pursuant to sections 5, 8, 9(b), or 9(c) within sixty days to the Court of Appeals for the Circuit in which the proceeding arose. Unless stayed by an order of the Court or a panel thereof, a determination, order, or action of the Commission pursuant to sections 5, 8, or 9(c) shall remain in full force and effect pending appeal. In any appeal under this section, or upon application by the Commission for enforcement of its order pursuant to section 9(b), the findings of the Commission as to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive.

Sec. 11. Testimony of Witnesses and Production of Documents.—The Commission shall have the power to compel at any designated place the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of papers and documents relevant to its powers and duties through the use of the subpena. Upon refusal to obey a subpena, the Commission may apply for its enforcement to the court of appeals of the circuit in which the inquiry is being held. The court shall forthwith order full compliance with the subpena and shall cite a refusal to do so as a contempt.

Sec. 12. This Act shall be liberally construed so as to secure and protect the right to vote.

Sec. 13. The Commission shall appoint an executive director and such officers and other personnel as performance of its duties requires.

Sec. 14. The Commissioners shall receive an annual salary of $25,000; the Executive Director, $22,500.

Sec. 15. The Commission shall have authority to make, amend, or rescind rules and regulations, procedural or substantive, for the enforcement of the provisions and policies of this Act.

Sec. 16. The Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to proceedings under this Act, provided that, whenever a single Commissioner has presided at a hearing, the Commission may, upon the basis of consultation with that Commissioner, decide the matter.

Sec. 17. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to repeal or supersede the provisions of title 42, United States Code, section 1971.

Discussion and Analysis of the Voting Rights Act of 1965

The heart of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is its establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission empowered to deal effectively with those communities, or larger political areas, in which pervasive voting discrimination exists. Three Federal civil rights statutes (1957, 1960, 1964) have cumulatively established elaborate judicial proceedings for enforcing, by private action or suit by the Attorney General, the right to vote, confirmed by the 15th amendment, without discrimination because of race or color. Throughout large segments of the South, however, these laws have not sufficed to insure more than a token of nondiscriminatory voting registration. This failure, while it stems in part from the overly cautious manner in which rights created were hedged and qualified, is attributable ultimately to the laws' primary reliance upon courts and court proceedings. This reliance has unhappily proved misplaced. Though a court may order action, it cannot itself act. It may order a registrar to examine Negroes with the same dispatch with which he examines whites; but accumulating direct and convincing proof of noncompliance is arduous when it is not impossible. The subtler modes of discrimination are as difficult for a court to detect as they are for it to remedy and eliminate. Sanctions which a court may impose for disobedience of the orders are not always persuasive.

The short of the matter is that the Justice Department must, and does, devote a century of man-hours in order to achieve results which are limited to localities and sparse even in their local impact. These propositions receive verification from the saddening story recounted this week in Selma, Ala. There, the three prime techniques for discrimination—opening the registration offices only a few times each month; processing only a minimum of applications during those days when the office is open; administering needlessly long and complex tests of literacy and intelligence—are shrewdly suited to evading the Federal mandate. A Federal court, moving into action late last week after a massive Justice Department effort, ordered only that, if adequate registration was not allowed by early summer, then some other action would be taken. It would be mistaken, moreover, to single out Selma for special blame, as if conditions there were uncharacteristically grave. For Selma is a microcosm of the Deep South, representative of hundreds of communities in which the Justice Department has filed no suit. It is only with awareness of this fact that the lessons of Selma became truly instructive.

For these reasons the Resnick bill calls for the establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission. To this Commission is entrusted first, the responsibility for determining, after hearings, those areas in which exist a "pattern or practice"—language drawn from the 1960 act—of voting discrimination. The area to which the finding of pattern or practice pertains may be as small as a village, as large as a State.

Once this determination is made, certain rights follow as a matter of course: A sixth-grade education conclusively satisfies (or is deemed to satisfy) all tests of knowledge or literacy; and application for registration must be allowed at reasonable times until a month before an election.

After making its finding of pattern or practice, the Commission is authorized to undertake large-scale administrative relief. The range and kind of these relief measures comprise the driving thrust of the Resnick bill, distinguishes it most dramatically from its predecessors, and literally promises the rapid and just enfranchisement of the Southern Negro. The Commission may: Organize a system of Federal registrars for the registration of Negroes; prohibit the use of registration qualifications which it finds contribute to the pattern or practice of discrimination; adjust the hours and times during which registration will be allowed; supervise and, if necessary, actually conduct the elections themselves.

Recourse to any one of these Federal remedies does not necessarily entail recourse to specific others. What happens if a Negro, registered pursuant to a Federal program, is subsequently rebuffed by the State on voting day—his ballot either not accepted or not tabulated? In such a case, the result is summary. The Commission must—not may—impose a civil penalty of $300 both upon the officer who actually refused the ballot and upon the city or political unit employing him.

What happens if persons interfere with remedial activity of the Commission? Or if an official refuses to honor the sixth grade literacy standard? Section 9(a) designates such behavior as a "discimlnatory election practice." After a hearing the Commission may order the offending party to cease and desist. If, moreover, discriminatory election practices are found to have substantially reduced the suffrage in a given election, the Commission may, at its discretion, declare the election void and conduct a new election.

Hearings are provided at the proper moments throughout the sequence of Commission proceedings: for a determination of pattern or practice; for assessment of the $300 fine; for trials of discriminatory election practices. The Administrative Procedure Act, representing Congress standing judgment on procedure, governs throughout with one minor exception.

Action of the Commission is subject to review upon three occasions. The original finding of "pattern or practice"—which triggers the various mechanisms of the bill—may be immediately appealed to the court of appeals. There, the scope of review is limited to whether the Commission's finding is supported by "substantial evidence." The Commission itself must go to the court of appeals for enforcement of its orders remedying discriminatory election practices. Those assessed the mandatory fines may appeal the findings of facts underlying the assessment. While action taken by the Commission to correct a pattern or practice is not immediately appealable, its legality may be challenged collaterally when the court examines the finding of a discriminatory election practice.

The Constitution supports this legislation at every step. The first section of the 15th amendment guarantees the right to vote in all elections free from discrimination because of race or color. The second section of that amendment reads as follows: "The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." Doubtlessly, this legislation is in some senses far reaching; but it reaches no further than it must in order finally to realize those great rights supposedly secured by constitutional amendment almost a century ago.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 titles the act as "The Voting Rights Act of 1965."

Section 1. This act applies uniformly to all elections, Federal or State. The 15th amendment, forbidding the discriminatory denial of voting rights "by the United States or by any State," applies with equal force to all elections. The 1957 and 1960 voting acts regulated State elections as well as Federal. Only with the 24th amendment and the 1964 act has there been imported into the law the notion that State elections may permissibly be more discriminatory than Federal. The notion is grounded neither in the Constitution nor in any rational conception of federalism. The 1965 act returns to the scope of the 15th amendment, and governs across the electoral board.

Section 3. The 24th amendment, ratified last year, prohibits the poll tax as a qualificaton for voting for Federal office. This section extends that prohibition to elections for State and local offices. Inasmuch as the poll tax is used today primarily in a manipulated manner to disenfranchise the Negro, Congress possesses adequate power under the 15th amendment to outlaw its use.

Section 4 establishes a six-member Commission, three members to be culled from each of the two parties, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Section 5. Commission action is confined to areas in which the Commission finds there exists a pattern or practice of voting discrimination. Such a finding is to be the outcome of a hearing under the Administrative Procedure Act (with a minor deviation). The Commission may hold such a hearing upon application of a private individual or upon its own initiative.

Section 6. Once the Commission has made its finding of pattern or practice, certain results follow automatically, while others are left to the discretion of the Commission. Section 6 spells out the automatic consequences. Under section 6(a), a sixth-grade education establishes a "conclusive presumption" of literacy. The rule applies not only to a "literacy" test, so-called, but also to that whole cluster of tests which determine mental aptitude, regardless of whether denominated a test of "literacy," "knowledge," or "constitutional interpretation."

The conclusive presumption of the Resnick bill goes a step beyond the 1964 act, which derived from a sixth-grade education only a presumption of literacy that could be rebutted by the use of literacy tests. Thus, an individual might be forced to go through lengthy court proceedings to establish his eligibility to vote. Literacy tests undoubtedly serve a legitimate function in many States of the Union. Yet they are also easy to abuse by the intentional application of stiffer standards to certain individuals. Confronted with such an abuse, each individual would be forced to commence expensive and lengthy litigation to vindicate his right to vote. This section acts only in areas where the Commission has found a pattern or practice of racial discrimination—that is, where the Commission finds after a hearing that election officials are acting deliberately to deny the right to vote on the basis of race. Thus, the use of literacy tests in areas where individuals are treated equally without regard to race is unaffected. Because of the general sufficiency of a sixth-grade education to make an individual both literate and familiar with the structure of government, and because of the notorious abuse of literacy and intelligence tests to deprive Negroes of the right to vote, Congress has the authority under the 15th amendment to establish this rule of law.

Section 6(b): Another frequent abuse of officials bent on depriving Negroes from exercising their suffrage is the manipulation of registration deadlines to frustrate legitimate attempts to register. Consequently, in any area in which the Commission finds a pattern or practice of official discrimination, an outer date of compliance with registration requirements is set at 30 days before the date of election. Thus, officials in such an area would be prohibited from closing registration books more than a month before an election or from refusing to accept any registrant who satisfied all qualifications anytime up to such a 30-day period.

Section 7. This is the lifeblood of the bill. Once the Commission has found the existence of a pattern or practice or denial of the right to vote under section 5, the Commission is authorized to adopt a broad range of programs to correct these abuses. Section 7 provides means to combat abuses both at the registration stage and at the voting stage. The first line of attack must necessarily be to facilitate the registration of qualified voters regardless of race. To accomplish this goal, the Commission can advance a three pronged attack. First, it can establish voter education and information centers to familiarize those wishing to vote with registration forms and qualifications; in short, to create a liaison between election officials and the electorate. Second, it can act to insure that registration procedures are administered fairly. For example, if the Commission finds existing application forms to be overly complex and burdensome, it can prescribe that more appropriate forms be used which will avoid intimidating and confusing those seeking to register. Similarly, the Commission can eliminate those qualifications that are found to contribute to the pattern of racial discrimination rather than to serve a legitimate function. Third, and most important, if the Commission finds that local registration officials refuse to perform their function of registering all qualified applicants, the Commission is authorized to establish a system of Federal registrars who can register persons to vote in all elections—municiipal, State, and Federal. To remove the last vestiges of intimidation and to facilitate the registration of all qualified voters, such Federal registrars would be permitted to follow a flexible procedure, such as registering voters on a house-to-house basis.

The second line of attack—after the registration process has been revitalized—is to insure that those registered to vote are not frustrated in their attempts to vote. Thus, the Commission can appoint supervisors to oversee the conduct of State and local elections. And, with serious abuses, the Commission could appoint Federal officials to conduct the election itself.

Section 8. Sections 8 and 9 provide the Commission with power to effectuate the orders or programs it has adopted under section 7 to eliminate the pattern or practice of racial discrimination. Section 8 deals with the case of an election official who refuses to honor in any way the ballot cast by an applicant registered pursuant to a program conducted by the Commission. Such an official would automatically be assessed a $300 penalty for each ballot he has failed to honor. Because the Commission will only undertake these registration programs in an area in which there exists a pattern of official racial discrimination, a responsibility for the acts of single election officials must be shared by the community at large. Thus, section 8 imposes a similar automatic penalty on the local unit of government.

Section 9. Broad powers of enforcement are conveyed under section 9 through the creation of a "discriminatory election practice." This section will enable the Commission to initiate proceedings against individuals who violate Commission orders or who interfere with Commission action and against officials who act in any way to further the pattern or practice of racial discrimination. Thus, while acting affirmatively under section 7 to secure individual rights, the Commission can also proceed against those election officials who continue to inhibit and frustrate the efforts of qualified voters to exercise their franchise.

The Commission must first find, after a hearing, that a discriminatory election practice has been committed. It then issues a cease and desist order proscribing the continuation of the offending conduct, and if appropriate, prohibiting the Commission of any future discriminatory election practice. If the violating conduct persists, the Commission must apply to the court of appeals for enforcement of its order. Once enforced, further violations would constitute a contempt of court, punishable by civil and criminal sanctions.

If the Commission finds that discriminatory election practices committed during an election have resulted in a "substantial denial of the right to vote," the Commission is empowered to invalidate the election and order or conduct a new election. In theory, an election so stained by unconstitutional discrimination is not a legal election; in practice, the votes that might otherwise have been cast might have altered the outcome. Election for Federal office is exempted from the coverage of this section so as to avoid any possible conflict with the constitutional grant of authority to the House of Congress to judge the validity of their own elections.

Section 10 outlines the pattern of judicial review. The original Commission finding of a pattern or practice of discrimination can be appealed immediately to the court of appeals. Pending appeal, however, and unless stayed, the finding remains in effect, so that section 6 provisions will be operative and section 6 remedies may be initiated. Citation for a discriminatory election practice under section 8 and imposition of the $300 penalty under section 8 are similarly appealable, and in this manner the legality of Commission action taken under section 7, which is not directly reviewable, can be challenged during such an appeal. The Commission's findings of fact shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. Thus, on appeal from a Commission finding under section 5 that a pattern or practice of discrimination exists, the court of appeals need only search the record for substantial evidence to support the Commission's conclusion.

Section 11 is meant to confer upon the Commission the customary power to secure testimony and issue subpenas.

Section 15 confers upon the Commission the authority to promulgate rules and regulations of procedure and substance. It will be remembered that section 9(a)3 makes violation of one of these rules or regulations a discriminatory election practice. The procedure for promulgation is governed by the Administrative Procedure Act by virtue of section 16.

Section 16 makes the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to all Commission proceedings. However, there is one important exception. If a single Commissioner presides at a hearing, the Commission may, after consultation with that Commissioner, issue its own decision on the matter. It is believed that this procedure, while in no way imperiling the essential safeguards of the Administrative Procedure Act, will expedite proceedings before the Commission, particularly in the case of pattern or practice findings under section 5.

Section 17: Section 1971 of title 42 of the United States Code, recently amended by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, is in certain respects parallel to the provisions of this bill. There is no intention to supplant that section.

Law School of Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass., February 6, 1965.
Hon. Joseph Y. Resnick,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Resnick: I understand that on Monday next you will introduce in the Congress a bill "To further secure the right to vote, free from discrimination on account of race or color, through the establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission." I have studied the draft of the bill with considerable care. It seems clear to me that its provisions are constitutional.

I might add that my colleagues, Profs. Paul A. Fruend and Louis L. Jaffe have also given close attention to the latest draft of the bill. They have authorized me to say that they too believe it to be constitutional.

Very sincerely yours,
Mark DeW. Howe,
Professor of Law.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate and thank my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] for the statement he has made and for the bill which he has introduced today. I journeyed last week to Selma, Ala., with Mr. Resnick and a bipartisan group of 15 Members of Congress to get firsthand information on the situation there regarding the right of Negro citizens to register to vote.

Selma lies within the Fourth Congressional District of Alabama and is represented by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Alabama Representative Glenn Andrews, of Anniston. Mr. Andrews had made arrangements so that our group was able to meet with him, other members of the Alabama congressional delegation, and local officials, all of whom treated us with the utmost courtesy.

I must regretfully state that no facts, developed during the visit to Alabama, give cause for hope that the voting provisions of the existing Federal civil rights statutes are adequate or that all qualified Negroes can look forward to being permitted to register and to vote in accordance with their constitutional rights.

Although many provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are being implemented, the most fundamental and precious right, the right to vote, is being denied in many counties in Alabama, Mississippi, and elsewhere. For example in Dallas County, Ala., the county seat of which is Selma, there are approximately 16,000 Negroes and 14,000 whites. Seventy percent of the eligible whites are registered as voters, approximately 9,800, while only 325 Negroes are duly registered. In adjoining Lowndes County which is 80 percent Negro there is not a single Negro registered voter. Nor are there any Negroes registered in Wilcox County, although they represent 78 percent of the total population. In the State of Mississippi in Amite County and Issaquena County less than 1 percent of Negroes of voting age are registered, although in each case more than half of the population is Negro.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee I am urging my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], to hold immediate hearings for the purpose of preparing a legislative proposal to provide an answer to correct this evil. It should be as easy for the Negro in the South to register and to vote as it is for his white brother.

I intend to introduce a bill in the next few days after study and consultation with interested colleagues and leaders of civil rights groups on the best means for attaining the goal of full enfranchisement. My bill will include a provision for Federal Registrars appointed by the President.

Again, I compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] for his taking this time today to report to the House regarding the visit to Selma and for the amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 introduced by him today.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. Edwards] and those of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick].

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] has made a statement on the floor which reflects credit on this House and a greater credit on the gentleman as the author.

I have been impressed with Congressman Resnick's determination that the constitutional rights spelled out in the basic document of our land are brought to all of its citizens. I should like to at this time express to the House my own personal commendation of the gentleman on this effort to achieve equality for all persons in our country.

Mr. RESNICK. I thank the gentleman.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE DISCRIMINATORY APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced the Resources Development Act of 1965 as a nationwide substitute for S. 3, the unacceptable and unfair proposal of the administration to extend massive economic assistance to the Appalachian region alone thus ignoring the economic problems of the rest of the Nation.

My bill, which reflects the views of many of the Republican Members of this body, avoids the discrimination and Federal dictation of the administration's proposal as passed by the Senate and as reported to the House Committee on Public Works by an ad hoc subcommittee last Friday. The President's proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act is objectionable for several reasons, and

I will comment briefly upon the three major objectionable features.

First. The administration's bill would provide Federal assistance for the economic development of only one region of the United States. It is, therefore, blatantly discriminatory to all other economically depressed areas throughout the Nation. There are other areas of the country with problems more acute than those found in the 11 State Appalachian region. It is highly unfair to single out one region for favored treatment. Even though the White House has apparently given its blessings to future proposals covering the Ozarks, Upper Great Lakes iron ore region, northern New England, and possibly other depressed areas, the selection of such additional portions of the country would merely extend the discriminatory precedent that will be established by the Appalachian bill, and could set State against State and region against region.

Second. The administration's proposal would provide for special Federal assistance to many prosperous counties in the Appalachian region. Even though the President's proposal is based upon the theory that the counties of 11 States making up the Appalachian region lag behind the rest of the Nation in economic growth and thereby need special Federal assistance, 70 of these counties do not meet the administration's own test of poverty, unemployment, and lack of economic development to qualify for programs under the Area Redevelopment Act or the Accelerated Public Works Act. In fact, two of these counties are the most prosperous in their respective States. It is obviously unfair to burden taxpayers in economically depressed areas in other parts of the Nation by requiring that they pay for special development programs for the Appalachian region alone, much of which region is prosperous.

Third. One of the most objectionable provisions of the administration's proposal is the establishment of a super governmental commission for the Appalachian region that would be superimposed over all other layers of government. The Appalachian Regional Commission is to be made up of 1 representative of each of the 11 States and 1 Federal representative whose vote would be able to override the votes of all 11 States, thus giving the Federal Government veto power over what a majority or all 11 of the States may propose. Since the Commission will develop plans and programs and establish priorities for the economic development of the region, and since no program or project under the bill can be implemented until plans therefore have been recommended by the Commission, the Federal member, whose affirmative vote is required for every decision made by the Commission, can dominate the actions of the Commission and assert his will with respect to every program and project.

My bill incorporates the acceptable programs of the administration's proposal, but avoids its objectionable features. Appropriately called the Resources Development Act of 1965, my alternative proposal would provide financial assistance for all economically depressed areas throughout the United States that are eligible areas within the meaning of the Public Works Acceleration Act. It is designed to assist only those areas in need of economic assistance and development, and not to funnel Federal dollars into prosperous areas. It would permit the States to coordinate their activities without Federal dictation from a new regional bureaucracy, and would avoid the Federal pork barrel approach that is inherent in the Appalachian bill.

The 80 percent of the money to be authorized by the administration's proposal is for the construction of a new development highway system and local access roads to open up areas in Appalachia with a development potential, where commerce and communication have been inhibited by inadequate access. My bill places similar emphasis upon highway construction, but it is applicable to all "eligible areas" throughout the Nation having need for development highways.

The other acceptable programs of the Appalachian bill which have been enlarged upon and incorporated in my proposal, with nationwide application, include the construction and equipment of health facilities and construction of vocational education facilities and sewage treatment works. In addition, my bill enlarges upon the programs contained in S. 3 for technical assistance and loans to timber development organizations and for the restoration of mining areas throughout the entire country, as well as a nationwide water resource study.

The Resources Development Act of 1965 does not contain any provisions, similar to that contained in the administration's proposal, for financial assistance for the operation of hospitals, which would be a form of socialized medicine, nor does it contain provisions similar to that in the Appalachian bill for land improvement, which would increase competition in the livestock industry, and the $90 million authorizations for increasing to 80 percent the Federal share of the cost of projects under all grant-in-aid programs for the construction or equipment of facilities has been eliminated. This latter provision is nothing more than a backdoor reenactment of the discredited and ineffectual Public Works Acceleration Act a pork barrel boondoggle for benefit of the 30 counties in Appalachia.

I am hopeful that this alternative nationwide measure will attract bipartisan support and will be adopted by the Congress as an alternative to the administration's discriminatory proposal for Appalachia alone. It is inconceivable to me that any Member of the Congress having economically depressed areas in his district or State could vote for such massive Federal aid to the Appalachian region at the expense of the taxpayers in depressed areas that he represents.

A section-by-section analysis of the Resources Development Act of 1965 follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Section 2. This section sets forth the congressional findings of a lag in the economic growth of various depressed areas of the United States and states that it is the purpose of the act to promote the economic development of these areas and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward providing the basic facilities essential to their economic growth and attacking their problems and meeting their needs on a coordinated and concerted basis.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAYS

Section 3. This section would make any "eligible area", within the meaning of the Accelerated Public Works Act, which has an economic development potential that can be promoted by highway access, and where commerce, communication, and realization of economic development potential have been inhibited by lack of adequate highway access, eligible for the designation and construction of economic development highways. This section would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to designate 10,000 miles of economic development highways throughout the United States to be constructed over a 6-year period (not to exceed 3,000 miles of which may be placed on the Federal-aid secondary system and the remainder on the Federal-aid primary system). The bill authorizes the appropriation of $400 million for each of the first 2 fiscal years, with the remaining amount of authorizations to be passed upon an estimate of cost to complete such highways, to be submitted to the Congress by January of 1967. The Federal share of the cost of individual projects is not to exceed 50 percent, unless the State cannot meet the matching requirements, in which case the Federal share cannot exceed 70 percent.

DEMONSTRATION HEALTH FACILITIES

Section 4. To demonstrate the value of adequate health facilities to the economic development of eligible areas, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for the construction and equipment of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers, and other facilities necessary to health of persons in any eligible area. The amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for this purpose is $82 million for the period ending June 30, 1967.

TIMBER DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Section 5. To enable any eligible area to more fully benefit from timber stands which is one of its prime assets, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide technical assistance in the organization and operation, under State law, of private nonprofit timber development organizations. These organizations will have as their objective the carrying out of programs to provide improved timber productivity through (a) continuity of management, cutting practices, and marketing; (b) physical or administrative consolidation of small holdings; (c) management of forest lands donated for demonstrations of good forest management; and (d) establishment through donations of a permanent fund to carry out the educational works of the organization. The Secretary is also authorized to provide not more than one-half of the initial capital requirements of these organizations, through loans under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. Not to exceed $10 million may be used for carrying out this section for the period ending June 30, 1967.

MINING AREA RESTORATION

Section 6. In this section, the Secretary of the Interior is given broadened authority to (a) seal and fill in abandoned coal mines, (b) execute projects for extinguishing underground and outcrop mine fires, and (c) expand and accelerate the restoration of fish and wildlife habitat destroyed by strip mine and stream pollution from mine drainage.

The section authorizes the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with appropriate Federal, State and local agencies, to carry out a comprehensive study for the purpose of reclaiming and rehabilitating strip and surface coal and other mining areas of the United States and to report to the Congress by July 1, 1967. The Federal share of mining area restoration projects is increased for this program to cover up to 75 percent of the total project costs; $43 million in Federal outlay for the period ending June 30, 1967, is authorized for this part of the program.

WATER RESOURCES STUDY

Section 7. This section authorizes a study of all authorized projects and all surveys authorized for projects for flood control, navigation, and beach erosion control, the construction of which will be economically beneficial to eligible areas to determine priorities of construction, and to determine the need for authorization of new projects. The Secretary of the Army would submit a report of the study to the Congress not later than June 30, 1967, together with his recommendations for priorities of the making of surveys and the construction of projects that will be economically beneficial to eligible areas. The sum of $5 million is authorized to carry on this work.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING ACT OF 1954

Section 8. This section provides 75 percent planning grants to States, local development districts, and other governmental agencies to carry out programs under the act. All funds for this section will come from the Housing and Home Finance Agency's budget.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FACILITIES

Section 9. A Federal supplement of $32 million for 2 fiscal years is authorized in addition to the construction funds provided by the Vocational Education Act because of the shortage of vocational school facilities in many eligible areas. Funds will be made available under the same terms as contained in that act.

SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

Section 10. In addition to the authorizations for appropriations made in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, $12 million in Federal funds is authorized by this section for the period ending June 30, 1967. These funds will be made available to eligible areas nationwide through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the terms contained in that act.

MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

Section 11. No State or political subdivision thereof may receive benefits under this bill if the total expenditures of State funds, exclusive of Federal expenditures, for the benefit of portions of the State which are designated as eligible areas falls below the average level of such expenditures for the last 2 full fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this act, exclusive of the State's share of interstate highway construction.

CONSENT OF STATES

Section 12. This section insures that no State will be required to engage in or accept any program without its consent. The consent of a State to a program for which assistance is provided under this act will be given by that State in the same manner in which the State consents to receive assistance under the basic statute authorizing that assistance.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND PROJECT APPROVAL

Section 13. This section provides that the Secretaries administering the several programs under the act must consult with the Governor of the State or officials designated by him, and obtain recommendations and approval of such State officials for each program, and approval of each project before Federal assistance is made available therefor. This section also provides that Federal assistance will not be made available for any project in an area unless such area is an "eligible area" on the date the Secretary gives final approval of such project for Federal assistance.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

Section 14. In order to clearly establish the intent of the Congress, specific criteria are set forth in this section which the States are to consider in making program and project recommendations. These criteria include: the relationship of the project to overall economic development, including its location in an area determined by the State to have the greatest potential for growth; the population and area that the project or class of project serves, including the unemployment rate and per capita income of the people of the area; the financial resources available to the State and political subdivision thereof which are undertaking the project; the importance of the project in relation to other projects seeking aid; the prospects that the project will make a long-range contribution to economic growth. There is also a specific requirement that the funds not be used to finance the cost of commercial facilities, industrial facilities, machinery, or working capital, or the generation, production, transmission, or distribution of gas or electricity.

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS—CERTIFICATION

Section 15. This section sets forth a definition of those local units to which assistance will be extended through the appropriate State governments. The State government will certify local development districts. Such local development districts shall be nonprofit organizations certified by their States as units having a charter or authority including the economic development of eligible areas.

GRANTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS AND FOR RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Section 16. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make grants either directly or through appropriate public or private organizations to provide funds for investigations, research, studies, and demonstration projects to further the purposes of this act. No funds can be provided for construction purposes under this section. The Secretary is also authorized to make grants for the administrative expenses of local development districts of up to 75 percent of their expenses attributable to the economic development of eligible areas. Such grants shall not be made to any one district for a period in excess of 3 years. Eleven million dollars is provided to carry out this section for the period ending June 30, 1967.

ANNUAL REPORT

Section 17. Each secretary of an executive department administering any program under this act shall prepare and submit to the Governor of each State and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on the activities carried out under this act during each year. This report is to be submitted not later than 6 months after the close of each fiscal year.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 18. In addition to authorizations for the economic development highway program, authorizes the appropriation of $195 million for the period ending June 30, 1967, for all other programs under the act.

APPLICABLE LABOR STANDARDS

Section 19. This section provides that the construction projects assisted by this act will be covered by standard Davis-Bacon (local prevailing wage) provisions.

DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE AREA

Section 20. This section provides that the term "eligible area" shall have the same meaning as given it in section 3(a) of the Public Works Acceleration Act.

SEVERABILITY

Section 21. This is the usual clause used to protect other sections of a bill in case one section is held to be invalid.

TERMINATION

Section 22. Provides that the act will cease to be in effect on July 1, 1971.

H.R. 4466

A bill to provide public works and economic development programs needed to assist in the development of areas of the United States which have not realized their full economic potential

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Resources Development Act of 1965".

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that some areas of the United States, which may be abundant in natural resources and rich in potential, lag behind the rest of the Nation in economic growth and that the people of such areas have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity. It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to assist these areas in meeting their special problems, to promote their economic development, and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward providing the basic facilities essential to their growth and attacking their common problems and meeting their common needs on a coordinated and concerted basis. The public investments made under this Act shall be concentrated in areas where there is the greatest potential for future growth, and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest. As these areas obtain the needed physical and transportation facilities and develop their human resources, the Congress expects that such areas will generate diversified industries, and that these areas will then be able to support themselves, through the workings of a strengthened free enterprise economy.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAYS

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to assist in the construction of economic development highways. Such highways, in conjunction with Federal-aid highways and other public highways and roads shall be designed to open up areas with an economic developmental potential where commerce and communication are inhibited by lack of adequate highway access. The provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to the Federal-aid primary systems and which are not inconsistent with this Act, shall apply to the economic development highways provided for in this section, except that the provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to the Federal-aid secondary system and which are not inconsistent with this Act shall apply to any economic development highways added to such system. Each development highway not already on the Federal-aid primary system shall be added to such system, except that not to exceed 3,000 miles of development highways may be added to the Federal-aid secondary system.

(b) As soon as feasible after enactment of this Act the State highway department of each State shall submit to the Secretary its recommendations with respect to (1) the general corridor location and termini of economic development highways, within the State, not exceeding a mileage equal to 5 per centum of the total mileage of highways then designated on the Federal-aid primary system within the State, and (2) priorities for construction of the major segments of such highways. Such recommendations shall be accompanied by a certificate of the Governor of the State that the recommendations have been developed after consultation with the State agencies concerned with conservation and development of natural resources, and public health and welfare.

(c) All economic development highways designated as such pursuant to this section shall serve eligible areas (1) which have an economic developmental potential that can be promoted by adequate highway access, and (2) where commerce, communication, and realization of economic development potential have been inhibited by lack of adequate highway access.

(d) The Secretary shall have authority to approve in whole or in part the recommendations of the State highway department or to require modifications or revisions thereof. As soon as feasible after enactment of this Act, but in any event not later than January 30, 1966, the Secretary shall designate economic development highway routes in each State having an eligible area meeting the criteria set forth in subsection (c) of this section, and not exceeding 10,000 miles in total length. Funds available for economic development highways shall be used to pay the Federal share of the cost of construction and improvement of such highways. The Federal share payable on account of any such highway project shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of construction, unless the Secretary determines that the State does not have the economic and financial capacity to supply its percentage of such costs and assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, but in no event shall the Federal share payable on account of any project exceed 70 per centum of the cost of construction.

(e) Sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure on the economic development highways shall be apportioned among the several States by the Secretary on or before January 1 next preceding the commencement of each fiscal year, except in the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, which sums shall be apportioned as soon as possible after enactment to this Act, in the following manner:

(1) For the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, June 30, 1967, and June 30, 1968—in the manner provided in section 104(b)(1) of title 23, United States Code, for the apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system.

(2) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and succeeding fiscal years, in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the economic development highways in each State, as determined and approved in the manner provided in this paragraph bears to the sum of the estimated cost of completing such highways in all of the States. As soon as the highway routes have been designated pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, the Secretary, in cooperation with the State highway departments, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of completing the economic development highways as then designated, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in accordance with rules and regulations adopted by him and applied uniformly to all of the States. The Secretary shall transmit such estimates to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1967. Upon approval of such estimate by the Congress, the Secretary shall use such approved estimate in making apportionment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and succeeding fiscal years, unless and until the Congress shall direct a different manner of apportionment.

(f) To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the sum of $400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

DEMONSTRATION HEALTH FACILITIES

SEC. 4. (a) In order to demonstrate the value of adequate health and medical facilities to the economic development of any eligible area, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for the construction and equipment of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers, and other facilities necessary to health of persons in any eligible area. Grants for such construction (including initial equipment) shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291–291z) and the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (77 Stat. 282), without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceiling or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law.

(b) No grant under this section for construction (including initial equipment) shall exceed 80 per centum of the cost of the project. Not to exceed $82,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 shall be available for construction grants under this section.

TIMBER DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) In order that any eligible area shall more fully benefit from the timber stands that are one of its prime assets, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to—

(1) provide technical assistance in the organization and operation, under State law, of private timber development organizations having as their objective the carrying out of timber development programs to improve timber productivity, and quality, and increase returns to landowners through establishment of private nonprofit corporations, which on a self-supporting basis, may provide (A) continuity of management, good cutting practices, and marketing services, (B) physical consolidation of small holdings or administrative consolidation for efficient management under long-term agreement, (C) management of forest lands, donated to the timber development organizations for demonstrating good forest management, on a profitable and taxpaying basis, and (D) establishment of a permanent fund for perpetuation of the work of the corporations to be composed of donations, real or personal, for educational purposes.

(2) provide not more than one-half of the initial capital requirements of such timber development organizations through loans under the applicable provisions of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1926 et seq.). Such loans shall not be used for the construction or acquisition of facilities for manufacturing, processing or marketing forest products. (b) Not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

MINING AREA RESTORATION

SEC. 6. (a) In order to further the economic development of any eligible area presently damaged by deleterious mining practices, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to—

(1) make financial contributions to the State in which such eligible area is located to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 15, 1955 (30 U.S.C. 571 et seq.), without regard to section 2(b) thereof (30 U.S.C. 572(b)) or to any provisions therein limiting assistance to anthracite coal formations, or to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Grants under this paragraph shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act.

(2) plan and execute projects for extinguishing underground and outcrop mine fires in any eligible area in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 31, 1954 (30 U.S.C. 551 et seq.), without regard to any provisions therein relating to annual appropriation authorization ceilings. Grants under this paragraph shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act.

(3) expand and accelerate fish and wildlife restoration projects in any eligible area in accordance with the provisions of the Act of September 2, 1937 (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), and the Act of August 9, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 777 et seq.), without regard to any provisions therein relating to apportionments among the States and to limitations on the availability of funds. The expenses of projects under this paragraph shall be paid solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the apportionments among the States pursuant to any other provisions of law.

(b) For the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of mining area restoration projects carried out under subsection (a) of this section and conducted on lands other than federally owned lands shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total cost thereof.

(c) The Congress hereby declares its intent to provide for a study of a comprehensive, long-range program for the purpose of reclaiming and rehabilitating strip and surface coal and other mining areas in the United States. To this general end, the Secretary of the Interior shall, in full cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other appropriate Federal, State, and local departments and agencies, make a survey and study of strip and surface mining operations and their effects in the United States. The Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the President his recommendations for a long-range comprehensive program for reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mining areas in the United States and for the policies under which the program should be conducted, and the President shall submit these to the Congress, together with his recommendations, not later than July 1, 1967. Such study and recommendations shall include, but not be limited to, a consideration of the following matters—

(1) the nature and extent of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and the conditions resulting therefrom;

(2) the ownership of the real property involved in strip and surface mining operations;

(3) the effectiveness of past action by States or local units of government to remedy the adverse effects of strip and surface mining operations by financial or regulatory measures, and requirements for appropriate State legislation, including adequate enforcement thereof, to provide for proper reclamation and rehabilitation of areas which may be strip and surface mined in the future;

(4) the public interest in and public benefits which may result from reclamation, rehabilitation, and appropriate development and use of areas subjected to strip and surface mining operations, including (A) economic development growth, (B) public recreation, (C) public health and safety,

(D) water pollution, stream sedimentation, erosion control, (E) highway programs, (F) fish and wildlife protection and restoration, (G) scenic values, and (H) forestry and agriculture;

(5) the appropriate roles of Federal, State, and private interests in the reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mining areas and the relative costs to be borne by each, including specific consideration of (A) the extent, if any, to which strip and surface mine operators are unable to bear the cost of remedial action within the limits imposed by the economics of such mining activity, and (B) the extent to which the prospective value of lands and other natural resources, after remedial work has been completed, would be inadequate to justify the landowners doing the remedial work at their expense; and

(6) the objectives and the total overall costs of a program for accomplishing the reclamation and rehabilitation of existing strip and surface mining areas in the United States, giving adequate consideration to (A) the economic benefits in relation to costs, (B) the prevention of future devastation of reclaimed and rehabilitated areas, (C) the avoidance of unwarranted financial gain to private owners of improved property, and (D) the types of aid required to accomplish such reclamation and rehabilitation.

(d) No moneys authorized by this Act shall be expended for the purposes of reclaiming, improving, grading, seeding, or reforestation of stripmined areas except on lands owned by Federal, State, or local bodies of government, until authorized by law after completion of the study and report to the President as provided in subsection (c) of this section.

(e) Not to exceed $43,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

WATER RESOURCE STUDY

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to make a study of all authorized projects, and all surveys authorized for projects, for flood control, navigation, and beach erosion control, the construction of which projects will be economically beneficial to any eligible area in the development and efficient utilization of water and related resources, particularly in regard to the need for an increase in the production of economic goods and services within the eligible area, as a means of expanding economic opportunities and thus enhancing the welfare of its people, and for the purpose of determining priorities of construction of such projects and the need for authorization of new surveys, new projects, or additional work, which will provide such benefits for eligible areas.

(b) The Secretary shall submit a report of the study to the Congress not later than June 30, 1967, together with his recommendations for priorities of the making of surveys and the construction of projects that will be economically beneficial to eligible areas.

(c) Not to exceed $5,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING ACT OF 1954

SEC. 8. (a) Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 461(a)) is amended by striking the word "and" at the end of paragraph (7), by substituting for the period at the end of paragraph (8) the phrase "; and", and by adding a new paragraph (9) to read as follows:

"(9) States, local development districts, and other State governmental agencies and instrumentalities authorized to administer or carry out programs or projects under the Resources Development Act of 1965."

(b) Section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 461(b)) is amended by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ", or to States, local development districts, and other State governmental agencies and instrumentalities in connection with planning for the economic development of eligible areas under the Resources Development Act of 1965".

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FACILITIES

SEC. 9. (a) In order to provide basic facilities to give the people of any eligible area the training and education they need to obtain employment, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for construction of the school facilities needed to provide vocational education for persons of any eligible area for whom such education is not now adequately available. Such grants shall be made in accordance with the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (77 Stat. 403), without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law.

(b) Not to exceed $32,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

SEC. 10. (a) In order to provide facilities to assist in the prevention of pollution of the waters in any eligible area and to protect the health and welfare of its citizens, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for the construction of sewage treatment works in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.), without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States pursuant to any other provision of law.

(b) Not to exceed $12,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

SEC. 11. No State and no political subdivision of such State shall be eligible to receive benefits under this Act unless the aggregate expenditures of State funds, exclusive of Federal funds, for the benefits of all eligible areas within the State are maintained at a level which does not fall below the average level of such expenditures for its last two full fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this Act. In computing the aggregate expenditures of State funds and the average level of expenditure for its last two fiscal years, a State's expenditures for participation in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways shall not be included.

CONSENT OF STATES

SEC. 12. Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State to engage in or accept any program under this Act without its consent.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND PROJECT APPROVAL

SEC. 13. (a) A program authorized under any section of this Act shall not be implemented until the Secretary administering such program has consulted with the appropriate official or officials concerned with such program as may be designated by the Governor or Governors of the State or States involved and has obtained the recommendations and approval of such official or officials with respect to such program. No project shall be approved for Federal assistance under this Act unless it is approved by such appropriate State official.

(b) No Federal assistance shall be given under this Act for any project for an area which is not an eligible area on the date such project is finally approved for assistance by the Secretary administering such assistance, except that if such area shall thereafter cease to be an eligible area, this subsection shall not prevent (1) the furnishing of Federal assistance for the completion of such project, or (2) the granting of additional Federal assistance to such area under this Act to complete the construction or equipment of any highway, hospital, health, educational, sewage treatment, or other facility, with respect to which such project has been approved.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

SEC. 14. (a) In developing recommendations on the programs and projects to be given assistance under this Act, and in establishing within those recommendations a priority ranking of the requests for Federal assistance, the States shall follow procedures that will insure consideration of the following factors:

(1) the relationship of the project or class of projects to overall regional development including its location in an area determined by the State to have the greatest potential for growth;

(2) the population and area to be served by the project or class of projects including the relative per capita income and the unemployment rates in the area;

(3) the relative financial resources available to the State or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof which seek to undertake the project;

(4) the importance of the project or class of projects in relation to other projects or classes of projects which may be in competition for the same funds;

(5) the prospects that the project for which assistance is sought will improve, on a continuing rather than a temporary basis, the opportunities for employment, the average level of income, or the economic and social development of the area served by the project.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall authorize any assistance under this Act to be used (1) in relocating establishments from one area to another; (2) to finance the cost of industrial plants, commercial facilities, machinery, or working capital; (3) to finance the cost of facilities for the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy; or (4) to finance the cost of facilities for the production, transmission, or distribution of gas (natural, manufactured, or mixed).

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS—CERTIFICATION

SEC. 15. For the purposes of this Act, a "local development district" shall be an entity certified to the Secretary of Commerce either by the Governor of the State or States in which such entity is located, or by the State officer designated by the appropriate State law to make such certification, as having a charter or authority that includes the economic development of any eligible area, or areas, or parts thereof. Such charter or authority may also include the economic development of areas outside of an eligible area. No entity shall be certified as a local development district for the purposes of this Act unless it is one of the following:

(1) a nonprofit incorporated body organized or chartered under the law of the State in which is it located;

(2) a nonprofit agency or instrumentality of a State or local government;

(3) a nonprofit agency or instrumentality created through an interstate compact; or

(4) a nonprofit association or combination of such bodies, agencies, and instrumentalities.

GRANTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS AND FOR RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Sec. 16. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized—

(1) to make grants for administrative expenses to local development districts. The amount of any such grant shall not exceed 75 per centum of such expenses attributable to the economic development of eligible areas in any one fiscal year. No grants for administrative expenses shall be made to a local development district for a period in excess of three years beginning on the date the initial grant is made to such development district. The local contributions for administrative expenses may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services; and

(2) either directly or through arrangements with appropriate public or private organizations, to provide funds for investigation, research, studies, and demonstration projects, but not for construction purposes, which will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) Not to exceed $11,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 16 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

ANNUAL REPORT

Sec. 17. Not later than six months after the close of each fiscal year, each Secretary of an executive department administering any program under this Act shall prepare and submit to the Governor of each State and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on the activities carried out under this Act during such year.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 18. In addition to the appropriations authorized in section 3 for the economic development highways, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the period ending June 30, 1967, to be available until expended, not to exceed $195,000,000 to carry out this Act.

APPLICABLE LABOR STANDARDS

Sec. 19. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction, alteration, or repair, including painting and decorating, of projects, buildings, and works which are financially assisted through the Federal funds authorized under this Act, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267, 5 U.S.C. 133–133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE AREA

Sec. 20. As used in this Act, the term "eligible area" shall have the same meaning as is given it in section 3(a) of the Public Works Acceleration Act (76 Stat. 541).

SEVERABILITY

Sec. 21. If any provision of this Act, or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

TERMINATION

Sec. 22. This Act shall cease to be in effect on July 1, 1971.

THE NEED FOR A U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the President must define our policy in Vietnam. It is still apparent that we have no clear policy except an aimless patchwork of scotch tape and bailing wire that becomes more confused every day. It should not be necessary, I suppose, to express our shock and dismay over the widening American bloodshed. But we need not be taken for fools in accepting without further explanation that this is permitted in the name of "stability." Stability of what? A series of cabals and cliques that defy stability and have no base of support in the country other than our own military backup? If there is any element of American political prestige in addition to the military it is declining very rapidly. Stabilize the area with what then? More mortars and guns that eventually are turned against us? Or with more inspection tours by four star generals thereby again leaving the impression that the full military might of the United States is committed, which is neither true nor desirable.

There will be, from now on, more strikes and counter strikes until the little remaining cover is totally stripped away and the involvement that is euphemistically known as military support becomes a naked U.S. war that has neither front lines nor back lines, nor beginning or ending, nor commitment by the very people we seek to defend.

I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we pick up and walk out of Vietnam tomorrow morning. Obviously such a petulant act, born out of anger and frustration, would at this point have giant repercussions in the chain of anti-Communist defense running the loop from India and Pakistan, to Malaysia and the Philippines to Australia, Formosa and Japan. The Oriental notion of "face" is not to be taken lightly. And even our friends who think we are fools agree that we have got ourselves sufficiently frozen in to be incapable of immediate extrication.

I do suggest, however, that heads of state display some willingness to communicate with each other—some energetic commonsense—in order to prevent this miserable war from unnecessarily enmeshing the entire globe in a conflict of arms. The initiative must come from the President of the United States, for no one else can or will take the lead.

This initiative, Mr. Speaker, should include a report to the Congress and the country, by the President, defining our policy in this area, its purpose and its proposal for a political solution, the means by which a halt—even temporary—to military operations can be achieved, and what measures interested nations should be prepared to undertake on a collective basis to guarantee the independence of the area.

VOTING RIGHTS BILL OF 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to change to an entirely different subject on domestic policy and speak for just a moment on the problem of voting rights in the United States and civil rights legislation in that regard. A group of Republican Members of the House have joined me this afternoon in introducing a comprehensive bill designed to fill in the gaps that have been demonstrated to exist in legislation that is now part of the United States Code and which relates to the responsibility that the Federal Government has in the area of voting rights.

Members will recall that it was during the Eisenhower administration that key legislation was developed, submitted to the Congress and passed, under which the right to vote is guaranteed, and that right is implemented.

In 1960 the Congress passed a Civil Rights Act affecting voting rights which established a procedure under which the Attorney General and the Department of Justice may apply to a U.S. court for a finding of a pattern or practice of voting denials in any area. The court then, under existing law, listens to the argument on both sides between the U.S. Government and local registrars of voting and makes a decision. All due process is met. In the event that the court should find that a pattern or practice of voting denial exists, the court is empowered under existing law to appoint referees, or himself to order registered persons denied registration by the local registrar. This was good and sound legislation. It was adjusted slightly in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 through voting provisions that had been suggested, I may say, by many of us on the minority side of the Judiciary Committee. It is demonstrated now, however, that in the United States it is still too difficult for qualified persons to gain the right to vote where they have not had it before. No one can deny the facts that have been stated and restated to the effect that there are too many areas in the United States where no Negro citizens are registered to vote at all.

I would like to add that this problem is one that is not confined necessarily to any one particular part of the country and it should not be regarded as a sectional issue. It is a U.S. issue and one that all U.S. Congressmen as U.S. Congressmen have the duty to pay some attention to.

This bill that is submitted today by several of us, including at least two Members on the minority side of the House Committee on the Judiciary, is a proposal which is sound, carefully worked out, feasible, practical, fair, reasonable, and which I think will work. What it does in effect is to give the executive branch of the U.S. Government the power to take the initiative in setting in motion the procedure for registering persons who allege that they have been denied the right to vote in any case where a Federal court is slow to act or negligent in the conduct of its responsibilities.

What the bill does in effect is, or will be, to force a court to take a position. Where a court finds that 50 or more qualified citizens in a voting district have been denied the right to vote, the Federal court must find a pattern or practice of discrimination. If it finds such pattern or practice, the court shall appoint one or more Federal registrars to register citizens similarly situated within the area who have been denied the right to vote. If the court fails to make the finding or fails to appoint registrars within 40 days, the President shall do so if he receives certified statements under oath from 50 qualified citizens in the area that they have been denied the right to vote.

Thereafter, the Federal registrars shall receive applications and register qualified citizens within the area. Any applicant who has a sixth-grade education shall be deemed to have complied with all literacy, education, knowledge, or intelligence requirements. Registrars shall also disregard poll tax requirements.

Federal registrars shall also have the duty of overseeing elections in the affected area. If local voting officials refuse to permit persons to vote who have been registered by the registrars, they may be held in contempt of court. And, if 50 or more such persons in an area are refused permission to vote, the court shall void the election.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this piece of legislation be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

An Act to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes

SECTION 1. Title 42, sections 1971(a)(2) and (c), United States Code, are amended by striking out the word "Federal" wherever it appears therein.

SEC. 2. Title 42, section 1971(f), United States Code, is deleted and the following subsections shall be renumbered accordingly.

SEC. 3. Title 42, section 1971(e), United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In any proceeding instituted pursuant to subsection (c) of this section in the event the court finds that any person has been deprived on account of race or color of any right or privilege secured by subsection (a) of this section, the court shall upon request of the Attorney General and after each party has been given notice and the opportunity to be heard make a finding forthwith whether such deprivation was or is pursuant to a pattern or practice. If the court finds that fifty or more persons of such race or color resident within the affected area are qualified to vote under State law and have been, within one year from the date the proceeding was commenced pursuant to subsection (c), (1) deprived of or denied under color of law the opportunity to register to vote within two days of making application thereof or otherwise qualified to vote, or (2) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law, it shall immediately make a finding that a pattern or practice of discrimination exists.

"Upon such a finding of a pattern or practice, the court shall appoint one or more Federal registrars from a panel of no less than ten persons so designated by the President of the United States. A Federal registrar shall be appointed by the court for one year and thereafter until the court subsequently finds that such pattern or practice has ceased.

"If the court, within forty days after the request of the Attorney General for a finding of a pattern or practice, fails to determine whether such pattern or practice exists, the President shall appoint Federal registrars in the same manner as the court is empowered to do, if the President received statements under oath from at least fifty persons within the affected area that they have been, because of their race or color, (1) deprived of or denied under color of law the opportunity to register to vote within two days of making application thereof or otherwise qualified to vote, or (2) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law.

"The panel of persons from which Federal registrars are to be chosen shall be existing Federal officers or employees who are qualified voters in the judicial district in which the proceeding has been instituted. Federal registrars, so appointed, shall subscribe to the oath of office required by section 16 of title 5, United States Code. Such registrars shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work as registrars shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from their usual place of residence, in accordance with the provisions of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended.

"Federal registrars shall, notwithstanding a registration deadline or other such time limitations as may be established under State or local law, receive applications to register to vote of any person who is resident within the affected area and is of the same race or color as those persons who were found to be deprived of the right to vote. Federal registrars shall, in determining whether an applicant is qualified to vote, apply State law, except that any applicant who has completed the six grades of education in a public school in, or a private school accelerated by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, shall have fulfilled all literacy, education, knowledge, or intelligence requirements. The Federal registrar shall disregard any poll tax as a prerequisite to vote.

"Applications to vote shall be received by a Federal Registrar upon any working day of the week up to thirty days prior to any election and he shall forthwith determine whether an applicant is qualified to vote. If a Federal Registrar determines that an applicant is qualified to vote, he shall issue to the applicant a certificate identifying the holder thereof as a person so qualified. The certificate of qualification to vote shall be effective within the longest period for which such applicant could have been registered or otherwise qualified to vote under State law, but no less than one year or until the court finds that a pattern or practice of discrimination has ceased, whichever is greater. Copies of the certificate shall also be submitted to the court, to the Attorney General or his designated representative, and to the appropriate election officers.

"Notwithstanding any inconsistent provision of State law or the action of any State officer or court, an applicant so declared qualified to vote shall be permitted to vote in any appropriate election. Federal Registrars shall, until the court finds that a pattern or practice of discrimination has ceased, oversee all elections conducted by State and local officials within the affected area, make tallies, and report to the court and the Attorney General or his designated representative, any persons, holding certificates of qualification to vote, who have been refused the right to vote. The refusal by any such officer with notice of such certificate of qualification to permit any person to vote shall constitute contempt of court where the court has made a finding of pattern or practice of discrimination. In addition, thereto, the court where it has made such finding, shall void any election, except an election for the office of President, Vice President, or presidential elector, where it finds that fifty or more persons, possessing certificates of qualification to vote, have been refused the right to vote in such election. If the court fails to void an election, as so required, the Attorney General shall seek the issuance of a writ of mandamus from the Supreme Court of the United States to require the court to take such action.

"Where the President, instead of the court, has found a pattern or practice of discrimination, and has appointed Federal Registrars, the President shall declare such election void under the same conditions that the court is empowered to do, and shall request the Attorney General to institute the necessary legal action to have such declaration of voidance enforced.

"When used in the subsection, the word 'vote' includes all action necessary to make a vote effective including but not limited to, registration or other action required by State law prerequisite to voting, casting a ballot, and having such ballot counted and included in the appropriate totals of votes cast with respect to candidates for public office and propositions for which votes are received in an election; the words 'affected area' shall mean any subdivision of the State in which the laws of the State relating to voting are or have been to any extent administered by a person found in the proceeding to have violated subsection (a) of this section; and the words 'qualified under State law' shall mean qualified according to the laws, customs, or usages of the State, and shall not, in any event, imply qualifications more stringent than those used by the persons found in the proceeding to have violated subsection (a) of this section in qualifying persons other than those of the race or color against which the pattern or practice of discrimination was found to exist.

"Unless stayed by an order of the Supreme Court, the action of the court or the Federal Registrars pursuant to subsection (e) shall remain in full force and effect pending appeal."

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provisions to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle to examine this proposal with care, and I ask that the majority members of the House Judiciary Committee controlling it as they do by a margin of 2 to 1 undertake an examination and have hearings on this subject without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

As one of the Members who made a private visit to Selma, Ala., on Friday, I appreciate his reference to the fact that every Member of this House, regardless of the geographical location of the district he represents, has an interest and a responsibility in the right of every American citizen to vote. I appreciate his reference to the legislation which has been introduced and which he and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid] and a number of other Members, including myself have cosponsored, which is intended to implement the suggestions made as long ago as 1957 by Attorney General Brownell in the Eisenhower administration.

At that time the suggestion for the appointment of Federal registrars was not adopted by the Congress, but certainly local communities have been on notice from that time that the Congress would consider the appointment of Federal registrars where there was some failure on the part of local officials to provide the necessary machinery whereby American citizens could be guaranteed the right to vote.

It has become necessary as a result of the passage of those 7 years to reconsider the Brownell proposal for the appointment of registrars, and this is the basic thrust of the bill which we have introduced in the House of Representatives today. I think it does deserve the consideration of all Members of the House. I hope we can give it an early hearing in the Committee on the Judiciary, and that we can add this further remedy for the solution of problems that are wracking the country.

This is not an effort to supersede State authority because the bill does not operate until State authority has failed to act. It is not a bill to impose a nationwide system of Federal voting registration because the bill clearly provides that the standards shall be those of the States, and the machinery shall operate upon the theory upon which the State itself would operate if it were acting in the discharge of its responsibilities.

It is a bill which simply carries out the responsibilities of the Federal Government in guaranteeing to all citizens equal rights before the law and particularly equal voting rights as is the responsibility of the Government under the Constitution of the United States.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding. I am happy to join in the cosponsoring of legislation to provide for Federal registrars with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay], with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias], with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse], and others.

As the gentleman from Maryland has already indicated, a bipartisan group of Members of the House made a recent, private visit, at their own expense, to Alabama. We were interested in seeing the facts at firsthand.

Our concern is not sectional; our concern is with the particular question and the broad principle of the right to register, and the right to vote for all Americans.

It was clear in Selma, Ala., and in Dallas County, and I am sure is clear in some other areas, that there are patterns and practices of voter discrimination. Approximate figures as reported by the New York Herald Tribune, Inc., indicate the following:

The figures tell the story

	White residents	Registered white voters	Negro residents	Registered Negro voters
Dallas County	23, 952	9, 463	32, 687	320
Lownes County	2, 987	2, 314	12, 438	0
Marengo County	10, 264	6, 280	16, 834	295
Perry County	5, 943	3, 006	11, 415	289
Wilcox County	4, 143	2, 974	14, 598	0
Total	47, 289	24, 037	87, 972	904

District Judge Daniel H. Thomas in Mobile, Ala., in his recent court order said:

> The court specifically finds the defendant has deprived Negroes of the right to vote and such deprivations have been pursuant to a pattern and practice.

Further, the court found that the three-member voter registration board has followed "an extremely slow registration process."

It was the judgment, I believe, of many members of the bipartisan group who visited Selma and met with local officials, with Dr. Martin Luther King, Rev. Ralph Abernathy, and others concerned that there is a clear need for new legislation to assure every citizen his or her inherent right to vote now.

I believe that this bill is addressed to a particular problem, that it is fair and equitable, and meets one of the imperatives of our day—the right to vote.

This bill amends the existing civil rights statutes of 1957, 1960, and 1964, by incorporating a number of major changes.

As in existing law, the Attorney General is authorized to require that the three-judge Federal court make a finding of a pattern or practice of discrimination in voting. But, where existing law gives the court considerable leeway in making this finding and taking action thereafter—such as in appointing referees—this new proposal sets up mandatory time periods and action to be taken.

For example, if the court finds that 50 or more citizens have been denied the right to vote, it must make a finding that a pattern or practice of discrimination exists. If it fails to do so within 40 days after the request is made, the President shall do so if he receives the statements of 50 persons under oath that they have been denied the right to vote.

And, as an aside, such denial will be found to exist if a person is unable within 2 days to have his registration application passed upon.

Once the Federal court finds that a pattern or practice exists, the court or the President shall appoint Federal registrars who shall be Federal officials or employees selected from a panel of such persons selected by the President.

The Federal registrars shall register citizens up to 30 days before an election regardless of any time requirements in State law. Registration shall be conducted every working day of the week when application for registration shall be immediately passed upon. In conducting registration procedures, Federal registrars shall disregard literacy, education, knowledge or intelligence requirements if the applicant has completed six grades of a public or an accredited private school. In addition, such Registrars shall disregard any poll tax as a voting prerequisite.

Federal registrars shall also oversee elections in the areas where they have been appointed. Tallies shall be made and they shall report to the court and to the Attorney General instances where persons have been prohibited from voting although possessing registration certificates issued by the registrars.

State officials who deny such persons the right to vote shall be held in contempt of court. In addition, if 50 or more persons in a voting district have been denied this right the court shall declare the election void unless it is an election for President. If the court refuses, the Attorney General may seek a mandamus from the Supreme Court to require the lower court to so void. And, where the President himself has had to appoint the registrars, he shall instruct the Attorney General to seek the necessary legal action to obtain the voidance.

Accordingly, I hope that the distinguished Committee on the Judiciary of the House will hold prompt hearings on legislation guaranteeing every citizen his or her inherent right to vote because the day has long since passed when any citizen of the United States should be denied the right to register or the right to vote where qualified. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] for his timely comments today and for his outstanding efforts in the field of civil and human rights. I wish, too, to commend the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] as well as another distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Reid] for their dedicated activities in the fight to win equal rights and opportunities for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be a cosponsor of this legislation which, as was pointed out here today, deserves the fullest consideration, evaluation and, I trust, approval of the Judiciary Committee and the Members of this Congress. It is a long overdue step forward in the legislative effort to fulfill constitutional guarantees.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I have joined in cosponsoring this legislation, and I congratulate the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Maryland, and the other gentleman from New York for their leadership in this area.

I am not convinced that this particular bill is going to be or necessarily should be the answer in this very difficult area of assuring all Americans the right to vote. I do, however, feel that it is obviously past time for some action here in the Congress to see that the systematic denial of the right to vote because of the color of one's skin, which has taken place and is continuing to take place in certain portions of this country, is corrected, with the assistance of the Congress and the Federal Government. I am hopeful that the appropriate committees of the Congress will hold prompt hearings on these recommendations and any other suggestions which may be offered and come to a reasonable conclusion at the earliest possible time.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is a national tragedy that we are faced once more on the floor of the House with the need to legislate on the question of voting rights. In 1957 and again in 1960 legislation was enacted to insure that every American would be entitled to participate in the selection of public officials. The Civil Rights Commission, in its first study, found shocking examples of denial of voting rights in the South. We all remember the case of a southern registrar who denied a Negro the right to vote because of an "error in spilling."

Again in 1964 we acted in this field. The Civil Rights Act, which I supported last year, made an effort to speed the process of voting rights litigation. It also required that the same standards be applied to all individuals seeking to register and vote and forbade the denial of the right to vote because of a minor mistake or omission. It sought to avoid abuse of literacy tests by requiring that they be in writing and that the tests be made available upon request. In addition, the courts were to presume that anyone who has completed the sixth grade is literate in voting rights suits.

Yet, despite this legislation, abuse is rampant. Although more Negroes voted in the South in the 1964 election than ever before, there are still many counties where only a very small percentage of the Negroes of voting age are registered to vote; and some counties where not one Negro is registered. This is a shocking commentary.

I had hoped that we could wait until we had an opportunity to see the Civil Rights Act in operation before we took up new legislation, but the events of recent weeks have made this impossible. We cannot rely on existing law. We cannot delay the elimination of this tragic deprivation of civil rights any longer.

I join today with several of my colleagues in introducing legislation that should put an end to racial discrimination in the application of voting laws once and for all.

The bill will put an end to dilatory tactics by the courts by providing for the appointment of Federal registrars by the President if the court does not act within 40 days of the Attorney General's request.

The Federal registrars will be empowered to issue certificates of qualification. If these certificates are not honored by the appropriate election officials, contempt of court proceedings can be instituted.

When 50 or more persons with certificates of qualification to vote are denied this right, then the election will be voided.

A sixth grade education in an accredited public or private school will be regarded as fulfillment of literacy, education, or intelligence requirements. Despite the commands of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, shocking and devious tactics have been employed to restrict the voting right.

In my judgment, this legislation is absolutely necessary to guarantee that every single American citizen who can qualify to vote can vote. We can do no less.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD RATIFY THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last year I spoke on the floor and attempted to rally the force of opinion behind the long-dormant Convention on Genocide. Now we have reached the year 1965, and with the passage of time, this country's delay is becoming steadily more reprehensible.

For Members unfamiliar with this treaty, let me say that its intent is to outlaw forever the mass persecution of persons because of race, national origin, or religion. Last March 3, I inserted the text of the treaty in the body of the RECORD, and I recommend its reading to all my colleagues.

I understand that 67 nations have already ratified the Genocide Convention, officially known as the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. We signed the agreement on December 11, 1948, when it was referred to the Senate for its approval. Since June of 1949, the treaty has been deposited with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which has not taken conclusive action.

And so for over 15 years we have had no judgment on the Genocide Convention.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 103 expressing the sense of this body that the United States should ratify this agreement. I hope my colleagues will join in pressing for passage of this measure.

It is inconceivable that a pact of this nature, so closely attuned to American principles of law and human justice, has not been approved by the Senate. For one thing, the United States has a stake in the steady growth of world law and the Genocide Convention also forms part of this desirable pattern.

As I have stated, some 67 nations have already ratified the agreement; it is already in operation and these countries stand in shock and consternation at our dismal delay.

When this treaty was considered by a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, many questions were raised concerning the reach and intent of the articles. The language generated a good deal of misunderstanding. In substance, there is no reason to fear the application of the agreement.

Some persons felt that in submitting to the regimen of this pact, the United States would be surrendering a portion of its sovereignty. Our legislature would be obligated to enact certain penalties for the punishment of the crime. Article VIII provides that contracting parties may refer cases to organs of the United Nations for review and argument.

The Genocide Convention, in fact, does not only outlaw the crime itself, but it provides for vehicles by which this illegality can be punished. We have articles of implementation and enforcement.

Certainly, in ratifying the agreement, we are undertaking a serious obligation. But it is right and reasonable that we do so. History has taught us that agreements often amount to nothing when they are not complemented by procedures for enforcements.

To oppose this treaty on the grounds of national sovereignty is invalid and hollow. This Nation has been entering into countless international undertakings, of great importance and duration, and I do not notice a diminishing of the freedom and authority to pursue foreign policy as we see fit.

Indeed, it is the purpose of a peaceful foreign policy to seek mutually beneficial agreements that further our interests and those of other powers. The objectives of the Genocide Convention are so immediately advantageous to us that I will never understand how our legislators in the other body have been deterred these many years.

When this treaty was originally drafted, the triumph and tragedy of the Second World War was still very much in everyone's mind. It was definitely felt that the agreement could help to insure that the tragic furor of Nazism would not trace its ugly path again.

And I do not really think that the Treaty is aimed beyond these cases of discriminate group persecution.

Opponents of the Genocide Convention have also claimed that it interferes with, or even supersedes, our domestic law. It emphatically does not. If members will read the terms of the treaty, I think they will find that acts of genocide enumerated in the convention indicate that this crime manifests itself in overt acts which are patently outlawed by our own internal codes.

And secondly, we know that international law is part of our law and dutifully enforcible in our courts. This has long been recognized. As a member of the world community this is a national obligation.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the opponents of this treaty speak from fear and ignorance. The United States has nothing to lose by this convention, and everything to gain. We must establish ourselves firmly as adherents to justice and human dignity.

I urge the House to consider and approve my resolution. And it is urgent that the Senate ratify the convention on Genocide to erase the stain of ambiguity and irresolution that has hurtfully characterized the official handling of this issue.

"HOW'RE YA GOIN' TO KEEP 'EM DOWN ON THE FARM?"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the question "How're ya goin' to keep 'em down on the farm?" called for music and laughter during World War I. Nearly 50 years later, the question is still pertinent but now calls for serious and sober reflection.

In the farm budget message recently reported in the New York Times, it was stated that farming alone could not be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than about 1 million of the 2½ million farm families even with continued Government assistance.

"Therefore," the message continued, "many low-income farm families will have to find other ways to make a living or other sources of income to supplement their modest farm earnings, if they are to share more fully in our national prosperity."

Friday, January 15, 1965, the New York Times carried an article from Paris on the farm policy of the French Government. In it, reference was made to the basic law of 1960—the charter of French farm policy—which sanctions the family-size farm as the basic unit of agriculture and says it must be encouraged. It states that the average French farm is a 37-acre holding. Difficulties in maintaining farm income and the family farm there are complicated by the fact that the 37 acres are not located in one plot, or even two or three, but consists of several parcels, brought together by centuries of marriages and inheritances.

Nonetheless, it is the policy of the French Government to maintain the family farm, and to provide a rise in annual farm income, 2 percent greater than that of the other sectors of its economy, so that their rural citizens may share in the boom their industries enjoy.

If the French family farm of 37 acres can be maintained as a basic cornerstone of French farm policy, to receive over the next 5 years an increase of farm income at an annual rate 2 percent in excess of that of other sectors of the French economy, why is it that nearly two-thirds of the American family farms must be considered suitable for liquidation?

I suggest that the average American family farm—depending on locale—consists not of 37 acres, but is nearer 137 or even 237 acres.

If the American family farm is to perish it will do so not because of any weakness inherent in the American economy. It can perish only if there is a weakness in our determination to continue this independent segment of our society.

It has been said that 50 million Frenchmen cannot be wrong. Let us resolve that 190 million Americans shall not be wrong on this issue.

Page 156 of the President's economic report submitted to this Congress in January of this year states that "the average rural community does not do as well as the typical urban community in providing education, health, and other necessary community services." I cannot say these statements are incorrect, but I do assert they are debatable, and I would debate them.

On the question of education I suppose this depends in great measure upon what one deems to be "education." Had Sam Clemens had the benefit of a study of this nature, he would have realized that by being born in Florida, Mo., and being raised in that rural Midwestern area, he had been so educationally deprived that even to buy a pencil and paper in an effort to write would be a misuse of funds.

Had Frederick Hazlitt Brennan been able to see Eolia, as it can be seen from Washington, or other great educational centers, he, too, would have known how uneducated he was, and we should still be without his writings as well as those of Mark Twain.

Had Dr. Andrew Still realized the inadequacies of his facilities when he began the practice of osteopathy in a log cabin, there are thousands, perhaps millions, of rural Americans who would have gone without the adequate care of a physician and indeed perhaps on occasion without any care from a physician. There might have been no osteopathy.

In short, there is education and there is education. And while rural America may be shown by chart and graph, statistic and form, to be failing in its educational responsibilities—"tain't necessarily so."

Next, what of the allegation as to health. It was not my impression that the major instances of silicosis, mental disorder, and venereal disease occurred in rural America.

The report asserts that inequality of opportunity has an even higher incidence in rural, than in urban areas. If by this you refer to opportunity to exercise leadership qualities, the question is open to dispute. There are apt to be the same number of people serving as class officers, the same number of participants on a basketball team, a football team, or in a class play, whether the school be of 50 students or 5,000.

Therefore, many students are afforded an opportunity to demonstrate their abilities and develop their qualities of leadership in rural units, while these opportunities are denied the countless capable youths in the larger educational factories. Not only this, but in the small school the same youth is apt to have an opportunity to serve in each of these capacities so that if he has leadership in any of these fields, it can be exercised and developed through use at an early age.

Our rural communities have many faults. But to learn what they are, let us ask the people who live there. We find it presumptuous for others to designate our faults for us. Our values and goals may not be the same. Such uniformity was not alway required.

Our America is one in which there is a place for individuality, as well as conformity. A place in which it is realized that efficiency and accuracy are not one and the same.

We possess an ingrained stubbornness and skepticism which is refueled from time to time when our more advanced and efficient counterparts produce an Edsel. There are even those of us who would consider the loss of the American family farm as great a disaster as the loss of Vietnam.

A MORE SENSIBLE SCHEDULE FOR NATIONAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS AND FOR PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, many people throughout the country felt that the campaign of 1964 was just too long and repetitive. The latter stages of the campaign, in many parts of the country, come in a period when the weather is really too cold for campaigning. The Presidential inauguration comes at a time when the weather is also likely to be bad in Washington, D.C.

Prof. Paul T. David, chairman of the Woodrow Wilson Department of Government and Foreign Affairs has come up with some useful suggestions for improving this situation. I intend to have drafted a constitutional amendment which I hope will furnish the basis for discussion and action on this vital issue.

INAUGURAL TIMING OFF

(By Paul T. David)

The President's trip to the hospital, whether or not it was the direct result of wear and tear suffered during inauguration week, reminds us of the hazards of holding these ceremonies in the middle of winter. We also again find ourselves with a new Congress, not yet fully organized but already buried in a series of legislative and budgetary proposals, with the end of the fiscal year on June 30 less than 5 months away.

All of this leads me to suggest again the schedule for the election, convening of Congress, and inauguration that I first suggested in a letter to the Washington Post published on June 28, 1961. The schedule I proposed was as follows:

Election of President and Congress, first Tuesday in October.

Convening of the new Congress, first Monday in November.

Inauguration of the President, first Friday after the first Monday in November.

Under this schedule, the national party conventions would probably be held in July, leaving August available to organize the campaigns and September in which to conduct them. Presidential messages on the state of the Union, economic report and budget would continue to be sent to Congress in January, and the fiscal year would continue to begin on July 1 and end on June 30. Congress would meet annually in November.

The proposed schedule would have the following advantages:

1. The new Congress would convene in time to count the electoral votes for President and take such action as may be necessary. It would then have about 2 months in which to complete its organization work before receiving the major messages in January. It could then take up the budget promptly, and would greatly improve its chances for completing action on all appropriation bills before June 30. In most years it would work actively on pending legislation during November and December. It should be able to adjourn in advance of the national party conventions in presidential election years, and by the middle of July in most years.

2. The period between election and inauguration would be shortened to approximately 5 weeks. This interval, whatsoever its length, is potentially one of great danger, and should therefore be as short as possible. But there must be time to count the election returns and make any necessary recounts; and the incoming President must have some period in which to organize his administration.

3. The length of the presidential election campaign would be shortened by a month and it would be concentrated in September—a good time for it—assuming that the parties would continue to hold their conventions in July or early August.

4. In the event of a change in administration, the major messages to Congress in January would all become the responsibility of the new administration—as they should be. It would have 2 months in which to prepare them, a period substantially longer than that implied in Senator MANSFIELD's proposal of 1961, under which the new President would take office December 1.

5. The weather on the first Friday after the first Monday in November may not be ideal, but at that time there is some reason to expect that the weather will be suitable for large-scale outdoor ceremonies, unlike January 20.

The congressional wives who are annoyed because Congress stays in session all summer have a point, but genuine reform needs to start with earlier features of the schedule.

The proposed new schedule would require a constitutional amendment to change existing provisions for the convening of Congress and inauguration. The Constitution does not require that the election be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, and the act of 1845 could be changed by Congress so far as Federal elections are concerned. Unfortunately, a number of State constitutions written since 1845 do contain provisions that fix the day on which general elections are to be held. A Federal amendment could override such provisions, but might need to unfreeze the situation for State elections as well as Federal in order to facilitate the entire set of changes.

I prepared a draft of a proposed constitutional amendment to accomplish these various objectives, and presented it before the late Senator Estes Kefauver's subcommittee on constitutional amendments, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on June 28, 1961, the same date my letter was published.

In this proposed amendment, among other things, State legislatures would have been authorized to adjust the dates of State elections without regard to existing provisions of State constitutions. Senator Kefauver was a little startled at the suggestion that this could be done through a Federal amendment, but on further thought agreed that this was possible; indeed, something very similar was the result of the amendment on woman's suffrage.

The necessary amendment might be relatively easy of adoption if it would be confined to the scheduling problem. The first Tuesday after the first Monday in November is not even a very good date for State elections, as many State legislators would realize if they thought about it. State governments also have their problems of transition when a new Governor is elected, and are just beginning to reconsider the rationality of their existing schedules, which generally are afflicted with a relationship to the timing of the fiscal year that is no happier than that of the Federal Government.

Hence, it would seem to me that this is a situation where there is a convergence of reasons for change that could easily lead to action if the possibilities are seriously considered.

This proposal is substantially the same as the one I made in 1961, but I think it is timely enough again to be repeated. Some action of this kind merits renewed consideration.

THE SECOND TREATY OF MOSCOW

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the winter edition of the Ukrainian Quarterly carried an article by the internationally renowned Georgetown University economics professor, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, on the subject of the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Convention. In view of the obvious desire of the present administration to pursue coexistence with the Soviet Union despite the activities of the Communists in Vietnam, the Congo, Cuba, and other world trouble spots, this article by Dr. Dobriansky is of extreme significance, and under leave granted, I include it in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

THE SECOND TREATY OF MOSCOW

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

At the close of 1964 the American people seemed to desire peace above all else. According to a reliable pollster, about 83 percent of the American public favored the partial test ban treaty with Russia, this despite the doubtless advances made by Moscow from its previous supermegatonic tests.[1] Approximately 81 percent felt that by keeping militarily strong we could avoid a global war; the prospect of being cornered into such a disastrous conflagration through continued cold war advances by the Red totalitarians was not considered. And some 63 percent, ignorant of or wishfully impervious to all past experience, advocated attempts at reaching agreements with the totalitarian regimes in the hope of realizing world peace, regardless of the enslavement of one-third of the human race. The consular convention with the U.S.S.R. is supposed to be an example of such agreements.

On June 1, 1964, the convention was signed in Moscow and 11 days later was submitted to the U.S. Senate for ratification. Unlike the test ban treaty, it represents the first bilateral agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. However, like the treaty of Moscow, which the test ban pact came to be known under Russian propaganda auspices, the convention was consummated in the chief imperiocolonialist capital of the world and has provided further propaganda fodder for Moscow. Russian propagandists have lost little time in offering this second piece of evidence as confirmation of Moscow's intentions to secure world peace. For, after all and on the record, both pacts originated in and bear the stamp of Moscow, the vanguard of world "peace." Indeed, we might as well call the convention the Second Treaty of Moscow. It's truly uncanny how low and how little our capacity is for propaganda advantage and value.

President Johnson was quick to hail this second treaty of Moscow. Before it was concluded, he said, "it is hoped that this treaty * * * will be a step forward in developing understanding between the two countries which is so important in continuing the struggle for peace."[2] The President has the illusory conception that the U.S.S.R. is not only a country such as ours but also a nation. He noted also at the time that the treaty would be "the first bilateral (two-nation) treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union."[3] A few days later, when it was concluded, Johnson called it "a significant step in our continuing efforts to increase contacts and understanding."[4] And on June 12 in his message to the Senate he approvingly declared, "I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the convention and protocol submitted herewith and give its advice and consent to their ratification."[5]

Apparently at that moment Johnson thought ratification by the Senate would be swift and smooth. In its glowing spirit of "peaceful coexistence," Moscow joined with the President in hailing the Treaty of Moscow II. Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko, for example, depicted the pact as "a positive step in the normalization and improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States."[6] And we shall see later, he had good reasons to view the treaty as "a positive step." Also, many editorial comments in the United States appeared to encourage the "early and favorable consideration" sought by the President. One large New York organ observed then, "The conclusion of a Soviet-American consular agreement marks an important step toward further normalization of relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R."[7] Another, in Washington, had this to say, "That the two countries took 30 years to come to the threshold of such a routine and normal agreement is sobering indeed."[8] From our standpoint, we haven't seemed to learn much about the Soviet Union these past 30 years, particularly the changes in relations between the non-Russian Republics and Moscow within the U.S.S.R. itself.

---

[1] Harris, Louis. "Public Favors Dealing With Reds on Peace," a nationwide syndicated article.

[2] The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., May 27, 1964.

[3] The Washington Post, Washington, D.C., May 28, 1964.

[4] The Washington Post, Washington, D.C., June 2, 1964.

[5] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 10, p. 13670.

[6] "U.S., Soviet Union Sign Accord on Establishing Consular Posts," Associated Press, Moscow, June 1, 1964.

[7] "The Consular Treaty," the New York Times, May 28, 1964.

[8] "Welcome Accord," the Washington Post, May 29, 1964.

BLACKOUT FOR THE CAMPAIGN

Despite all this high-powered approval of a most questionable treaty, fear suddenly seized its advocates. Serious doubt spread in the administration circles about the ease with which ratification could be obtained. The Republican leadership in Congress began to question the prudence and validity of the pact. Senator Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois, the minority leader, bluntly stated that the treaty would be "an unprecedented concession to the Soviet Union." He directed his criticism chiefly at the diplomatic immunity provided for consular officers who are supposed to be principally concerned with trade and consultative duties. With this provision, they would be immune from prosecution for crimes, including espionage. Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper, high-ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, complained sharply about the lack of advance consultation on the pact, which was now being submitted for the Senate's "advice and consent."

This first flurry of attack frightened the Democratic leadership into postponing hearings on the treaty until the next Congress in 1965. As one report had it, "in an election year, the administration would prefer not to engage in a full debate on the merits of its policies toward the Soviet Union."[9] This observation was amply confirmed when the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. W. Fulbright, let it be known that no hearings would be scheduled on the pact. The blackout action taken was not only in response to the initial Republican opposition but also to the heavy critical mail pouring into Congress from the Midwest and West, where two of the expected three Soviet consulates would be established. The National Captive Nations Committee also placed itself on record in opposition to the Convention as drawn.

One of the strange aspects of this background is this maneuver by the administration to prevent the American electorate from discussing this vitally important treaty during the presidential campaign. It would seem that in a democracy such as ours discussion on this and similar matters would be strongly encouraged rather than discouraged. Especially is this true during a presidential campaign, when issues should be thoroughly examined. In his acceptance speech the Republican candidate, Senator Barry M. Goldwater, alluded to the treaty but, unfortunately, failed to develop it into an issue in the course of the campaign.

Apparently the only effort made in this direction was by the Republican National Committee. In one of its pamphlets special mention was made of the "sponsorship of consular convention with Moscow, sealing the permanent captivity of a dozen non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. and opening up the United States to further Russian espionage, rackets, and propaganda (now before Foreign Relations Committee for ratification)."[10] A second, widely distributed pamphlet urged the "Rejection of the consular convention as it is now written because it will be America's stamp of approval on Moscow's Russian Empire, diminish Baltic independence which has been steadily maintained since the end of World War II. And in this country Russian consulates will act as spy centers and means of duress and propaganda among American ethnic groups."[11] An open discussion of these and related points would undoubtedly have contributed to a productive national forum, which in essence a presidential campaign should be.

ON THE EVE OF A HEARING

Following the administration's strategy, an examination of the Consular Convention is thus confined to the Senate and its Committee on Foreign Relations. Of course this doesn't mean that others won't take an interest in the subject, but by no means could it be the scope and depth that a campaign of issues would have occasioned. At this writing the treaty is being discussed in few circles, while preparations are being made for hearings by the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee. It will be interesting to observe how close and thorough the hearings and examination will be.

By all the evidence, the conceptions of the committee's chairman regarding the Soviet Union will be countered by several of the fundamental critcisms directed against the convention. In his unforgettable address last year no "Foreign Policy—Old Myths and New Realities," Senator Fulbright made the sound point that "If we are to disabuse ourselves of old myths and to act wisely and creatively upon the new realities of our time, we must think and talk about our problems with perfect freedom." Then he appropriately quoted Woodrow Wilson: "The greatest freedom of speech is the greatest safety because if a man is a fool, the best thing to do is to encourage him to advertise the fact by speaking." Evidently, the proponents of the Convention were unwilling to bank on this truth during the campaign.

For some time now the affable Senator from Arkansas has clung to the myth that some "200 million Russians inhabit the Soviet Union, let alone the earth."[12] In the address quoted above he strikes a further mythical note about the Soviet Union being "a normal state with normal and traditional interests."[13] That is, a state similar to ours in structure, composition, and "for certain purposes" behavior. These and related myths, long entertained by the Senator, are not in the order of judgment and opinion, but rather of basic knowledge and understanding.

However, the spirit of free debate in which the Senator drenched his remarks is readily accepted by every thinking American. Such debate should have been staged in the 1964 campaign. In fact, it is high time for another great debate in Congress and across the Nation on fundamental subjects like U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union and the need for a coherent American cold war strategy. A staged debate on these issues has been long overdue. There exists now a concrete and specific subject before the Senator's own committee that should prove to be a valid test of his expressed bent for open inquiry and perceptive examination. The issue of the Consular Convention has broad policy ramifications and can easily ignite the type of healthy discussion the Senator seems to encourage.

Fulbright himself views the treaty as a small step toward normalizing and regularizing relations with Russia. Nevertheless, we must think and talk about our problems with perfect freedom. It would be interesting to see whether the Senator himself is intellectually willing to shed some of his encrusted myths about the Soviet Union. On the surface, the subject of consular exchanges appears innocuous and procedural; beneath, it is fraught with profound implications for our moral and political position in the cold war.

ESSENTIALS OF THE PACT

The State department has, of course, been pressing for heavy Senate support of the treaty. It naturally would like to see its work, which was started with discussions about the treaty in 1959, when Khrushchev was here, and accelerated by actual negotiations beginning in September 1963, brought to a point of final culmination. On a reciprocal basis, the pact would lead first to the establishment of consulates in New York and Leningrad, and then gradually include other cities, very likely Chicago and San Francisco here, Odessa and Vladivostok there.

Supporters of the treaty keep stressing the rather outworn, self-legitimating argument that this would be another step toward the easing of tensions. Whether it squares with the demands of political realities and what it implies for the aspirations of millions of non-Russian captives in the U.S.S.R. are considerations of negligible worth. Another chief argument advanced is that the pact would furnish more protection for U.S. citizens traveling and residing in the U.S.S.R. The case of Prof. Frederick C. Barghoorn, who in 1963 was detained for a period of 13 days before American officials were notified, has been reportedly used as an example of "spy arrests" which, it is argued, a consular system may tend to curb. The fact is that a politically and historically more realistic alternative to the consular treaty would realize the same objective, without all the deficiencies and disadvantages of the latter.

The convention requires for ratification a two-thirds majority in the Senate and the President's signature before becoming law. Should it come to pass, the treaty as a law of the land would also conclude a history of deliberation that sporadically extends back to the early thirties. In a real sense, the treaty is a product of the rather naive thinking of the thirties which in many areas viewed the U.S.S.R. as "a great experiment." When the United States recognized the Soviet Union in 1933, the intention to enter into a consular convention was expressed by both sides. In the Tsarist Russian Empire there were eight U.S. consulates or consular agents. In the thirties, as now, American hope was expressed that through these diplomatic approaches, through trade and closer cultural visitations, the United States and the U.S.S.R. would help mold the peace of the world. The events of that time showed how palpably naive we were.

Although no formal convention was arrived at, both the United States and the U.S.S.R. opened up consulates immediately prior to and during World War II. We established one in Vladivostok in 1934, and in the same year Moscow set up consulates in New York and San Francisco. In 1937 it opened up a vice-consular office in Los Angeles. Following World War II, we requested and received permission in 1947 to open up a consulate in Leningrad, but never did. For, by 1948, Russian cold war activity against the United States assumed bolder proportions, and after the Oksana Kasenkina affair in New York, the U.S.S.R. broke off consular relations completely.

One would think that in the past 20 years our state of perceptive knowledge regarding the Soviet Union and its Russian center has improved measurably to warrant a more realistic and sophisticated approach in this area. The deceits of the period, the revelations of World War II on the Eastern front, the amendments to the Soviet Constitution, the indomitable force of non-Russian nationalism in the U.S.S.R., and events in the United Nations, all this and more should have at least made us a little more imaginative in this sphere of cold war diplomacy. This, however, doesn't appear to be the case. Instead, the unfounded preconceptions and myths of the thirties continue to mislead us in the sixties. Significantly, the consular pact rests on the very myths nurtured by Senator FULBRIGHT himself.

---

[9] "Johnson Seeks To Keep Red Pact Out of Politics," the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., June 28, 1964.

[10] Republican National Committee. "I Need Your Help." Washington, D.C., 1964, p. 4.

[11] Republican National Committee. "Republican Win Policy: Johnson No-Win Policy." Washington, D.C., 1964, p. 8.

[12] "Fulbright Asks Details of Goldwater's Views," Associated Press, July 25, 1962.

[13] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 5, p. 6228.

MORE NEGATIVE ESSENTIALS ABOUT THE PACT

Needless to say, there are many more counterarguments that have been raised in opposition to the consular pact. Some, with an eye for the entire spectrum of cold war conflict today, have rightly questioned the supposed change of circumstance from 1948. Behind the smokescreen of "peaceful coexistence" the cold war is far more intensive and obviously more extensive than it was then. From Moscow's viewpoint, the consular pact has as much cold war weight as any other treaty arrangement. It is easy to recite the details of what the convention will do, such as protecting citizens, performing notarial services, processing birth and marriage certificates, certifying wills, expediting travel documents, providing translation services, advising about local laws, and representing citizens, but these are only administrative aspects of an instrument that will be used for various cold war penetration of our environment. To view it differently is to view it blindly.

Concerning the protection feature, opponents have pointed to the meager numbers of Americans in the U.S.S.R., annually now about 17,000, and the few hundreds of Russians and non-Russians of the U.S.S.R. touring here, annually about 2,000, but only about 200 as individual tourists. These facts cause one to wonder whether this protection aspect isn't being overplayed. The argument is made that for the unusual concession of the immunity clause in article 19 of the convention and also in the specifics of the incorporated protocol, Moscow has conceded heavily on the subject of detention of nationals, which is provided for in article 12 of the treaty and also in the protocol. Moscow is supposed to have overridden its own criminal code by which a person can be held incommunicado during an investigation of as long as 9 months. Now, according to the treaty, U.S. authorities are to be notified of the arrest of Americans within 3 days and be given access to them within 4.

Why the privileges of early notice and access haven't been pressed for on a reciprocal basis within our present ambassadorial arrangement is still an unanswered question. Provision for such privileges in the consular treaty does not necessarily justify the treaty's ratification, particularly when its basic defects are understood. Such provision is logically not a necessary integral part of the treaty since it could be—indeed, should have been—obtained on the ambassadorial level, with the principle of reciprocity fully applied. Advocates of the treaty claim also that the U.S. Embassy in Moscow is inadequate to meet all the responsibilities of protection, representation, etc., and that therefore consulates are needed in this vast area. With a practical and more realistic alternative, as given below, all of these needs and requirements can be even more efficiently realized. In addition to not generating the deficiencies and disadvantages of the consular arrangement, the alternative would sidestep the problem created by the treaty where other states would demand on a most favored nation agreement basis the inclusion of a diplomatic immunity clause in their outstanding consular pacts. In connection with Red totalitarian states and their representatives here, the policing problems would be immense.

Another ground of objection is Moscow's multifaceted interest in having this pact. One facet is money and its present importance for a foreign currency-starved state. The treaty, in article 10, provides for the handling of estates to relatives in the U.S.S.R., but these wills have not been executed because of the lack of consular representation. The legacies have accumulated, and it is rumored that they aggregate into sizable sums.[14] Surely the amount of these legacies should be investigated to determine the pecuniary measure of Moscow's interest in the treaty. If there is any American interest from this angle, then mirages must have surrounded our negotiators.

The second facet of Moscow's interest is unquestionably greater opportunities for espionage, propaganda, and racket activities on our terrain. The spy factor was emphasized by Senator DIRKSEN who quoted both FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and former Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY as to the danger involved. Hoover has underscored the fact that "a topheavy percentage of Soviet bloc personnel assigned to this country actually have intelligence assignments," while KENNEDY has pointed out that "the Communist espionage in this country is much more active than it has ever been." If we have any confidence in the two highest internal security offices of our country, this factor of spy activity cannot be taken too lightly.

Propaganda and racket activities also loom large in Moscow's scheme of interest. Soviet consulates in strategic sectors of this country would undoubtedly concentrate on breaking down the anti-Communist force of several well organized ethnic groups. These groups would become prime targets of consular propaganda. Just as Rumanian-American groups and individuals, they would be victimized in a visa racket garnering perhaps millions of dollars annually for Moscow and its cold war uses. To what extent we are prepared to cope with these inevitable developments is also a major question we must resolve before ratifying the treaty.

However, in advancing some of these counterarguments aren't we implicitly admitting our inabilities to spy with equal or greater efficiency, to propagate ideas with perhaps more subtle dexterity, and to substantially withstand their onslaughts in our ethnic areas? If, in truth, we are that incapacitated, then these alone are sufficient reasons for not ratifying the treaty. On the other hand, if we recognize a two-way street proposition for most of these and are determined to traverse the street, then the adequacy of these arguments evaporates somewhat.

Yet, for the sake of argument, let's admit that a consular pact will contribute to a further easing of tensions, that it will signify our good intentions for more peaceful relations and understanding between peoples, that it will provide some protection for Americans in the U.S.S.R., and also that spying and propagandizing are two-way streets. Hypothetically, even admitting all this, the convention as it stands contradicts all of our official pronouncements on the self-determination and freedom of nations. As pointed out by this writer in a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, "Most important is the reason that under present circumstances consulates set up in the non-Russian Republics in the U.S.S.R. would constitute both a contradiction of our many official statements underscoring the self-determination right of the captive non-Russian nations and a virtual confirmation of the imperiocolonial nature of the Soviet Union."[15] It was further stated: "The assumptions underlying the proposed agreement are in striking discord with the political realities present in the U.S.S.R. and are scarcely in accord with both our moral and political objectives as concern colonialism and the independence of nations."

Based on truly reactionary and backward premises of thought, the convention serves to perpetuate the myth that the U.S.S.R. is "a normal state with normal and traditional interests" and in effect places a stamp of acceptance on the imperiocolonial character of the Soviet Union. Even the language of the text appears nonsensical in terms of both the Soviet Constitution and the political realities of the U.S.S.R. Beginning with article 2, paragraph 8, and running through the entire Convention, use is made of the terms "nationals" or "national," foolishly implying that, like an American national, there exists a "Soviet national," a citizen of a nonexistent Soviet nation. What has become of the Lithuanian nation, the Ukrainian, the Armenian, even the Russian, and their respective real-bodied nationals with this stroke of what one may rightly call juridical genocide?

This semantic comedy is extended in article 7, paragraph 6, wherein the language of the "Soviet national" is accepted as Russian, Sovietese not having yet emerged. This oblique and indirect American support of Moscow's linguacide program against the colonial non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. is really something for us to ponder. When in article 16 we witness a provision for a "national flag" and a "national coat-of-arms" to be hung over Soviet consulates here, we wonder first whether the U.S. negotiators know the difference between the concept of nation and that of state and second, whether they realize the depth of their conceptual and political contribution to Moscow's long-range genocidal plans. Article 23, dealing with taxation by the state, states, or local governments, suggests the myth of parallelism, that the U.S.S.R. is like the United States, made up of various states in a bond of federation and consisting of local governments. In short, the "state" of Latvia is equivalent to the State of Rhode Island.

It doesn't require much foresight to see this convention as an opening wedge for our eventual recognition of the forced incorporation of the Baltic countries in the U.S.S.R. The "problem" of the Baltic States, as some "realists" put it, can be disposed of in this manner. As Odessa in Ukraine is being bandied about for a prospective U.S. consulate, Latvian Riga or Estonian Tallinn will eventually crop up to receive our consular and diplomatic blessings on the eternal solidarity of Soviet Russia's internal empire. The reader should find most entertaining the State Department's wiggly and vacuous response to this essential criticism: "the convention does not deal with the question of opening consulates which will be the subject of separate negotiations."[16] Not only is the conceptual construction of the convention overlooked but also one's credulity is taxed to the point of believing that with the foundation laid by the convention our Department of State would religiously observe the Russian/non-Russian line of demarcation.

Finally, and worse still, as an additional step toward "peaceful coexistence," the Convention deprives us of a cold-war advantage with no parallel sacrifice by the Russians. In fact, as shown above, it plays beautifully into Soviet Russian hands. It also makes mockery of the President's own statements. Is there a rational alternative to this ill-advised Convention?

THE ALTERNATIVE OF AMBASSADORIAL EXCHANGES

In his April 3, 1964, statement on NATO, President Johnson stressed: "In particular we must be alive to the new spirit of diversity that's now abroad in Eastern Europe."

By all means, let's do so, starting with the multinational U.S.S.R. The consular pact runs counter to this statement, but the initial establishment of U.S. Embassies in Ukraine and Byelorussia would demonstrate how truly alive we are to the "spirit of diversity." Not only this, it would realize with greater effectiveness all the objectives cited for the consular pact without losing any advantage in principle or kind in the ever-present cold war. More, in contrast to the pact, it would furnish objective credence to the President's words: "If we are to live together in peace, we must come to know each other better." [17]

---

[14] "U.S. and Soviet Seen Nearer Consular Pact," the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1964.

[15] Communication, May 4, 1964.

[16] Department of State communication, May 14, 1964.

Once we cast aside the populational and constitutional myths mentioned earlier, we can begin to understand that scarcely half of the population in the U.S.S.R. is Russian and that Kiev, the national capital of Ukraine, is no political counterpart of Chicago; nor is Minsk, the Byelorussian capital, a substantive parallel to San Francisco.[18] In short, the United States is a single nation; the U.S.S.R. is not—it's a diversity of nations. Thus, logically, if we are wise and true to ourselves and also to the realities in the U.S.S.R., we should urge a consular pact for Russian cities, like Leningrad, in federated Russia (the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic) administratively linking the consulates with our Embassy in Russian Moscow. At the same time, in behalf of realistic contacts with diverse nations, we should also proffer direct and full diplomatic relations with Ukraine and Byelorussia, at least as a start.

This important subject of ambassadorial exchanges with the national governments of the non-Russian republics in the U.S.S.R. has an even more interesting background than the consular convention. If in this phase of "peaceful coexistence" the latter seems appropriate, the former is far more necessary. The United States Senate would do well to consider the two in combination; i.e., if some Senators can discard their myths.

In 1953 a special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee considered every aspect pertaining to the exchange of Ambassadors with Ukraine and Byelorussia.[19] Hearings on House Concurrent Resolution 58, which was sponsored by the late Congressman Lawrence H. Smith, of Wisconsin, brought out these salient facts: (1) Article 18a in the U.S.S.R. constitution stipulates that "Each Union Republic has the right to enter into direct relations with foreign states and to conclude agreements and exchange representatives with them"; (2) being charter members of the United Nations, Ukraine and Byelorussia are de facto recognized by us; [20] (3) despite a secretive and abortive attempt by the British Government in 1947 to make direct diplomatic contacts with these two nations, open negotiations are justified both by the demands of changing times and all the legal credentials involved; and (4) if we are earnest about understanding and maintaining peaceful relations with different nations and peoples, then we should make every effort toward the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

Every conceivable criticism of the resolution was treated, including those submitted by the State Department in opposition to the proposal.[21] The Department expressed itself twice; once in a statement, dated June 26, 1952, to Senator H. Alexander Smith, who took a keen interest in this, and later, on March 13, 1953, in a communication to the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Robert B. Chiperfield. Both statements are virtually alike.

In view of its present pressure for the consular pact, it is interesting to note some of the Department's arguments against ambassadorial exchanges. (1) It is "doubtful whether the American people would look with favor upon an increase in the number of Communist missions in the United States." (2) It "would require a large expenditure of money by the U.S. Government." These two major arguments might just as well be applied against the consular pact. Again, spying is a two-way street, and the multiple benefits to be derived from ambasssadorial exchanges would more than justify the money expended.

The Department also argued that U.S. embassies in Ukraine and Byelorussia would bolster the myth of their sovereignty and pave the way for further participation of these republics in international organizations. Surely U.S. diplomatic missions in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and the other captive countries are no evidence of their sovereignty. The second point is utterly specious when one surveys, for example, Ukraine's participation in the International Labor Organization, UNESCO, and many other bodies.

Many other possible criticisms, such as the effect of this action on our nonrecognition of Red China, the possibility of Moscow rejecting our offer, or the attitude of our allies, were so convincingly answered that the special subcommittee, headed by Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, unanimously favored the Smith resolution. Before the measure could be considered by the full Foreign Affairs Committee, the State Department intervened in July 1953, requesting that it be given time for its further study. The request was granted and, regrettably, a short time later the resolution's able sponsor passed away.

Actually, no serious study of this subject was undertaken. In 1956, Undersecretary of State Robert Murphy admitted this to the writer. Two years later, Assistant Secretary William B. Macomber confirmed this fact when, in response to an inquiry by Representative Leonard Farbstein, the new sponsor of the resolution, he stated that "the Department has no record of a study such as you described having been made subsequent to this time." [22] He enclosed a copy of the Department's 1953 statement to Mr. Chiperfield.

The need for a full examination of this issue is more pressing now than ever before. The basic criteria for diplomatic recognition, as set forth by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in an Overseas Press Club address in March 1954, are fully satisfied by the proposal for ambassadorial exchanges with Ukraine and Byelorussia. They entail (1) usefulness of diplomatic intercourse—informational, psychological, cultural, etc.; (2) absence of any moral approval of the governments involved; and (3) no intense hostility toward the United States. There is no problem in this score.

The real problem is the mythical notions that many harbor with respect to the U.S.S.R. They represent the case of old myths about old realities. The occasion for Senate judgment on this consular pact is also an occasion for judgment on ambassadorial exchanges. As the President not too long ago put it, "Our guard is up, but our hand is out." Question: Will the hand remain fractured by old myths?

Mr. Speaker, I direct the special attention of the Members of the House to the thought-provoking title of the article "The Second Treaty of Moscow." May I also urge the Members to most carefully ponder the points emphasized by Dr. Dobriansky. The clarity of the message and the logic of his position deserve the special consideration of the Members of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Stalbaum, for February 8, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia (at the request of Mr. Whitener), for Monday, February 8, 1965, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Hungate, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Diggs, for 60 minutes, on February 9; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bingham (at the request of Mr. Diggs), for 60 minutes, on February 9; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Conyers (at the request of Mr. Diggs), for 60 minutes, on February 9; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hawkins (at the request of Mr. Diggs), for 60 minutes, on February 9; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Resnick, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois, for 1 hour, on February 16.

Mr. Hechler, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Cramer, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Gurney), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Lindsay, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Saylor and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gurney) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Broomfield.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Huot) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pickle.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Satterfield.
Mr. Fascell.
Mr. Stubblefield.
Mr. Zablocki.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

---

[17] State of Union message, Jan. 4, 1965.

[18] See Dobriansky, Lev E. "Nations, Peoples, and Countries in the U.S.S.R.," U.S. GPO, Washington, D.C., 1964.

[19] "Favoring Extension of Diplomatic Relations With the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1953.

[20] "Review of the United Nations Charter," U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1955, pp. 1829–1851.

[21] Dobriansky, Lev E., "The Dilemma of the State Department on Diplomatic Relations," the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. X, spring 1954, pp. 159–166.

[22] Dobriansky, Lev E. "Revived Interest in U.S. Diplomatic Relations With Ukraine and Byelorussia," The Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. XVIII, autumn 1962, p. 231.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 9, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

521. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting proposed new obligational authority submitted as supplemental appropriations for various agencies and the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1965, and other proposals not increasing new obligational authority incurred under previously granted contract authorizations for transfer between certain appropriations (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

522. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the compilation of General Accounting Office findings and recommendations for improving Government operations relating for the most part to fiscal year 1964, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and other related laws (H. Doc. No. 81); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

523. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the financial statements of the Tennessee Valley Authority for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

524. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight instruction program for fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 2110(b) of Public Law 88–647; to the Committee on Armed Services.

525. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report on the number of officers above lieutenant commander, by rank and age groups, receiving average monthly flight pay authorized by law for the 6-month period ended January 1, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 301, approved February 18, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

526. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Forces), transmitting a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight instruction program for the period January 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 2110(b) of Public Law 88–647; to the Committee on Armed Services.

527. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report on the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard utilizing authorizations contained in section 701 of Public Law 88–390, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and authority delegated by the Secretary; to the Committee on Armed Services.

528. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering the progress made in liquidating the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation (transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957) for the quarter ended December 31, 1964, pursuant to 67 Stat. 230, as amended, and 22 F.R. 4633; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

529. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

530. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks and money orders"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

531. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the establishment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of a Board of Appeals and Review as an agency of the government of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

532. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the establishment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of a Council on Human Relations as an agency of the government of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

533. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting three reports, namely, (1) names, salaries, and duties of employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board, (2) cases heard and/or decided by the Board, and (3) the fiscal statement showing total obligations and expenditures for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 3(c) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

534. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on foreign excess property disposed of during calendar year 1964 by the Department, pursuant to section 404(d) of Public Law 81–152; to the Committee on Government Operations.

535. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on financial statements of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1964 and 1963, pursuant to section 17 of 60 Stat. 801; to the Committee on Government Operations.

536. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an annual report for 1964 on the progress and accomplishments of the anthracite mine water control and mine sealing and filling program, and a report on the joint State-Federal program, pursuant to Public law 87–818; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

537. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Department of Labor for year ended December 31, 1964, pertaining to administrative adjustment of claims of $2,500 or less, pursuant to title 28, section 2673, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

538. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States under law and pursuant to section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

539. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report on refugee operations for 6-month period ended December 31, 1964, pursuant to the act of July 14, 1960; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

540. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

541. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting an annual report for calendar year 1964 on positions in certain grades under the Classification Act, as amended, in the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Office of Economic Opportunity, pursuant to the act, and supplementing other reports forwarded January 27, 1965; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

542. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 1, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Apalachicola Bay, Fla., at 2 mile, requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted December 9, 1960, and August 15, 1961. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

543. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 45. A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank; with amendment (Rept. No. 27); to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 193. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 3818, a bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 4465. A bill to enact part III of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Decedents' Estate and Fiduciary Relations," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to decedents' estates and fiduciary relations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4466. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs needed to assist in the development of areas of the United States which have not realized their full economic potential; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4467. A bill to designate the lake formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia, as Lake Eufaula; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4468. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that section 265 of such code shall not apply with respect to certain interest paid by certain dealers in connection with the purchase of tax-exempt obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 4469. A bill to make permanent the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954 as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 4470. A bill to incorporate the American Academy of Actuaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4471. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the manufacturers excise tax on entertainment equipment to alleviate the economic burden on consumers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4472. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in the home; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4473. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4474. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 4475. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide Federal financial assistance for establishing and maintaining State programs of voluntary health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 4476. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs needed to assist in the development of areas of the United States which have not realized their full economic potential; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4477. A bill to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4478. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to remove certain inequities in the rates of payments to survivors; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 4479. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 with respect to the position descriptions and salary levels of mail handlers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4480. A bill to repeal the provisions of the act of March 3, 1901, relating to packing boxes for the use of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4481. A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4482. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4483. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to wife's insurance benefits or widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4484. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more liberal definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4485. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has enough quarters of coverage to be fully insured for old-age benefit purposes, regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 4486. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4487. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and the Clean Air Act, as amended, to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 4488. A bill to make the birthday of Abraham Lincoln a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4489. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to conduct a national referendum on the question of Federal lotteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 4490. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4491. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 4492. A bill for the relief of certain displaced nationals of the Netherlands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4493. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1966, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 4494. A bill to make permanent the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4495. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4496. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 4497. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1935, to require certain contractors with the United States to give an affidavit with respect to payment of subcontractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4498. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future natural disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 4499. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 4500. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 4501. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4502. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption of $1,000 for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 4503. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on storage batteries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 4504. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax, to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving picture theater, and to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to any live dramatic (including musical) performances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4505. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4506. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4507. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4508. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 4509. A bill to further secure the right to vote, free from discrimination on account of race or color, through the establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration and Elections Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4510. A bill to incorporate the Young Engineers and Scientists of America, for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4511. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4512. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on communications services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4513. A bill to amend section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 and section 231 of the National Housing Act to improve and render more effective the Federal direct loan and mortgage insurance programs providing assistance to housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4514. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 4515. A bill to provide for the designation of qualified interpreters to assist defendants who are unable because of deafness to understand proceedings in Federal criminal actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4516. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4517. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 4518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit employers to withhold for 1964 and 1965 income tax not withheld currently from the wages of their employees, and to treat the amounts so withheld as having been paid by such employees on the dates on which returns are filed for such years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 4519. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 4520. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4521. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4522. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 4523. A bill to amend the criminal laws of the United States to prohibit any person from crossing State lines for the purpose of violating the laws of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4524. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4525. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the continuation of authority to develop American flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4526. A bill to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1970; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4527. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4528. A bill to regulate archeological exploration in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4529. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize retirement without reduction in annuity of employees with 20 years of service involuntarily separated from the service by reason of the abolition or relocation of their employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 4530. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1940, relating to the administration of the Washington National Airport, to transfer to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency certain additional real property of the United States to facilitate the expansion of such airport for general aviation purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4531. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs needed to assist in the development of areas of the United States which have not realized their full economic potential; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4532. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4533. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 4534. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of eight additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4535. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility for pensions under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 4536. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4537. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1954, to establish a National Advisory Council on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4538. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (by request):

H.R. 4539. A bill to amend section 607(D) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 4540. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 4541. A bill to incorporate the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 4542. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make the transportation of stolen sheep or goats in interstate or foreign commerce a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 4543. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 4544. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4545. A bill providing grants-in-aid to assist the States to staff community mental health centers constructed under the Community Mental Health Centers Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 4546. A bill to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling and paying certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. aircraft at Wichita, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4547. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4548. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning, acquisition, construction, development, or improvement of rural water supply, storage and distribution systems, and to provide for cooperative Federal-local financing through appropriate loan and grant programs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4549. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 4550. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4551. A bill to provide for the implementaton of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4552. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 4553. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4554. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 4555. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 4556. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.J. Res. 288. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State with the approval of its electorate to consider factors in addition to population in the apportionment of one house of its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.J. Res. 289. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning on the Sunday starting the last full week in October, each year, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.J. Res. 290. Joint resolution to extend foreign quotas and recapture fee provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and thereby prevent a continuing loss of revenue to the U.S. Treasury; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.J. Res. 291. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.J. Res. 292. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the American Legion National Convention of 1966, to be held in Washington, D.C.; to authorize the granting of certain permits to the American Legion 1966 Convention Corp. of the District of Columbia on the occasion of such convention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to establish a permanent Commission on Presidential disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 294. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential inability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 295. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to restore to the States certain rights affected by recent Supreme Court decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 297. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of office of judges of the Supreme Court of the United States and inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 298. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall not participate in any civil action except as a party to such civil action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Con. Res. 260. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H. Con Res. 261. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SENNER:

H. Con. Res. 262. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Con. Res. 263. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Con. Res. 264. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOW:

H. Con. Res. 265. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Con. Res. 266. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 267. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H. Con. Res. 268. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Con. Res. 269. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Con. Res. 270. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H. Con. Res. 271. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Con. Res. 272. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. Con. Res. 273. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film prepared by the U.S. Information Agency entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. Con. Res. 274. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. Con. Res. 275. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 276. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 277. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Con. Res. 278. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 279. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis performing essential Navy and other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Res. 194. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the proposed closing of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H. Res. 195. Resolution amending the rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Res. 196. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the proposed closing of certain Veterans' Administration facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H. Res. 197. Resolution to urge the President of the United States to cancel all action in connection with the closing of certain veterans' facilities awaiting study by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H. Res. 198. Resolution authorizing a review of the national needs for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to taking such action as needed to revoke the directive of the Department of Defense ordering the closing the the Springfield Armory; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting legislation authorizing the minting of silver dollars; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Governor to proclaim the week of August 29, 1965, as Junior Legion Baseball Week; to the Committee on Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to authorizing the construction of a dam across the Savannah River, and Duke Power Co. to construct an electric generating plant on the Savannah River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to actions to prevent the closing of the Rutland Heights Hospital and the Manchester facilities of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to actions to prevent the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Rutland; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to actions to prevent the closing of the Lincoln Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to taking certain action regarding social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting minting and immediate availability of silver dollars; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4557. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vasilike Yakumithis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 4558. A bill for the relief of Regine Irene Calef, Marion Calef, and Monica Calef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4559. A bill for the relief of Raouf Seoud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4560. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Soldavini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 4561. A bill for the relief of Eagle & Phenix Manufacturing Division of Reeves Bros., Inc., of Columbus, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4562. A bill for the relief of the Jefferson Loan Co., Inc., and Jefferson Mortgage Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4563. A bill for the relief of Benedetta Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4564. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dora V. Silva Arminan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4565. A bill for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4566. A bill for the relief of Gerald Sichel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4567. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Rella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4568. A bill for the relief of Dr. Christopher G. Hadjigeorgio (also known as Hadjigeorge); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4569. A bill for the relief of Tsingos Panagiotes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 4570. A bill for the relief of Alexander Medovich, Olivera Medovich, Nikola Medovich, and Patrick Medovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4571. A bill for the relief of Ahlam Najia Shohet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4572. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sophocles E. Sakellariou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4573. A bill for the relief of Donald Ho-Yu Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 4574. A bill for the relief of Miss Shirley Kishna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4575. A bill for the relief of Ivy Roselle Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4576. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Josephine W. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4577. A bill for the relief of Samuel Lipsih; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 4578. A bill for the relief of Matitiau Meilich and Charlotte Meilich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4579. A bill for the relief of Panagiote Tzaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 4580. A bill for the relief of Holt Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4581. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rocio Eufrosina Papa Galvez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4582. A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia S. Silvani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 4583. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria A. Sponer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 4584. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Michalska Holoweckyj (formerly Mrs. Anna Zalewski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4585. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kaney Ebisuzaki and Emiko Kato Ebisuzaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4586. A bill for the relief of Raul Goncalves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4587. A bill for the relief of Tomas Pereira de Medeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4588. A bill for the relief of Edmundo Jacome Monteiro De Medeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4589. A bill for the relief of Maria Encarnacao Soares Resendes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4590. A bill for the relief of Gerardo L. Ciriello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4591. A bill for the relief of Ernesto de Melo Mercier de Miranda, Maria Raimunda Dias Miranda, and Zelia Maria De Cunha Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4592. A bill for the relief of Helana da Rosa Alves de Faria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4593. A bill for the relief of Antonio Florio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4594. A bill for the relief of Filippo Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4595. A bill for the relief of Dr. Stephen Matseoande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 4596. A bill for the relief of Myra Knowles Snelling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 4597. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Loza Bedoya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 4598. A bill for the relief of Luzia De Jesus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4599. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 4600. A bill for the relief of Stella Sellas (nee Christofilogiannis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4601. A bill for the relief of Trinidad Laceras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 4602. A bill for the relief of Capt. Donald W. Ottaway, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4603. A bill for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Harold Edward Henning, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4604. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Delfina Urbon DeCarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4605. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Andrena A. Whalen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

88. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Western Association of Nurserymen, urging that the Department of Labor rescind recent regulations governing employment of foreign workers for seasonal agricultural work, and further resolving that the regulation should be rescinded because it has the effect of setting a minimum wage for agriculture through regulation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

89. By Mr. PHILBIN: Petition of Ovila Case Post No. 905, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Gardner, Mass., against the closing of the Rutland Heights, Mass., Veterans' Administration Hospital and requesting hearings by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to explore and evaluate the reasons for closing this hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

90. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Russel L. Brown, Ketchikan, Alaska, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Congress making a study of the equipment of the Air National Guard of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

91. Also, petition of president, Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress for early enactment of a bill authorizing payment of pretreaty claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

92. Also, petition of the City Council, Cambridge, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favoring proposed Federal legislation requiring reduction of air pollution from automobile exhausts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

93. Also, petition of the mayor, Fort Gaines, Ga., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting Congress to name the lake created by the Walter F. George lock and dam, "Lake Winston Churchill"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

94. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting Congress to form a Joint Committee on U.S. Executive Branch Secrets; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

Monday, February 8, 1965

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf in the chair).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, DD., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in a world that lieth in darkness swept by fitful winds of hate and doubt and despair, we pause at this sheltered sanctuary of Thy grace, to make sure that the light within is brightly blazing.

In the goodness of human hearts, like fragrant lilies in murky swamps of evil, Thy holiness breathes upon us.

In truth, though crushed to earth for an hour, yet rising triumphant over the false, Thou dost put into our hands the keys for every prisonhouse of the spirit.

Make us, we beseech Thee, great enough for these days of titanic import changing the face of the earth. Cast down our pride—national, racial, personal. May all our kinships be with men of good will, anywhere and everywhere, who labor to bring sense and system to this disordered globe. Join our frail and fallible hands with those of the shining company of unconquered spirits who, in evil times, have stood their ground at crimson cost, preserving the heritage of man's best, and whose flaming faith makes their lives as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom.

We ask it in the ever blessed name of the One who is the Light of the World. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Harris, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 4, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 3 minutes on statements made during the morning hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Harris, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration; the Subcommittee on Education and the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Section 5 of Reorganization Act of 1949

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report of Office of Civil Defense

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Civil Defense, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Military Construction, Air National Guard

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction, Air National Guard (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Director of Selective Service

A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Proposed Legislation Relating to Interstate Commerce

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting drafts of proposed legislation, as follows:

A bill to amend sections 20a and 214 of the Interstate Commerce Act;

A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke, amend, or suspend water carrier certificates or permits under certain conditions;

A bill to repeal the Medals of Honor Act applicable to outstanding acts of heroism involving railroads and motor carriers;

A bill to amend section 1(22) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as expressly to include within the exemption provided therein, the construction, acquisition, operation, abandonment, and joint ownership or joint use of spur, industrial, team, switching or side tracks, and terminals incidental thereto, and for other purposes;

A bill to amend section 5(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the requirement for approval of pooling arrangements between motor common carriers of household goods, and for other purposes;

A bill to amend paragraph (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption provided for by such paragraph;

A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to utilize its employees more effectively and to improve administrative efficiency;

A bill to amend section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate certain valuation requirements, and for other purposes;

A bill to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control, and for other purposes;

A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to authorize exemption from the provisions of such part, of services, and transportation of such nature, character, or quantity as not substantially to affect or impair uniform motor carrier regulation;

A bill relating to the use of Interstate Commerce Commission records and testimony of Commission personnel in regard to accidents involving motor carriers and railroads; and

A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and certain supplementary and related acts with respect to the requirement of an oath for certain reports, applications, and complaints filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Section 203(a) of Communications Act of 1934

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 203(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the filing of schedules of charges by connecting carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Legislation Relating to District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of a Council on Human Relations as an agency of the government of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of a Board of Appeals and Review as an agency of the government of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain employments in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1928, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and clarify the laws relating to advertising in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of payments to support fire protection and fire prevention services for District of Columbia institutions located outside the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 11–1902, District of Columbia Code, relating to the duties of the coroner of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3 of the act of April 23, 1892, as amended, to authorize the deposit of public space excavation permit fees to the credit of such District of Columbia fund or trust fund account as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia determine (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of U.S. Tariff Commission

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Inadequate Consideration Given to Utilizing Reserve Fleet Ships in Lieu of Providing New Ships to Iran Under Military Assistance Program

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on inadequate consideration given to utilizing reserve fleet ships in lieu of providing new ships to Iran under the military assistance program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on Tennessee Valley Authority

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the financial statements, fiscal year 1964, Tennessee Valley Authority (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Examination of Financial Statements, National Capital Housing Authority

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal years 1964 and 1963, National Capital Housing Authority (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Proposed Legislation of Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Tucker Act, section 1346(a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, to increase from $10,000 to $50,000, the limitation on the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in suits against the United States for breach of contract or for compensation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of years of Federal judicial service for judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Positions in Grades GS–16, 17, and 18

A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, as of December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Governor to proclaim the week of August 29, 1965, as Junior Legion Baseball Week

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

"Whereas South Dakota is the birthplace of Junior Legion baseball; and

"Whereas this is the 40th anniversary of the birth of Junior Legion baseball; and

"Whereas the Little World Series, representing the Nation's best Junior Legion baseball teams, will be played in South Dakota in 1965; and

"Whereas Junior Legion baseball contributed directly to the physical, mental, and moral health of today's young men; and

"Whereas the Little World Series, the young men who will participate in the event, and all Junior Legion baseball players merit the recognition and attention of the people of the State of South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Governor proclaim the week of August 29, 1965, as Junior Legion Baseball Week; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of South Dakota to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Charles Droz,
"Speaker of the House.
"Walter J. Matson,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"——— ———,
"President of the Senate.
"Niels P. Jensen,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the act of Congress of June 29, 1956, entitled the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374), and subsequent revisions thereto, have provided for a national system of interstate and defense highways of not to exceed 41,000 miles of such highway system; and

"Whereas since the enactment of the aforesaid Federal Aid Highway Acts, the construction of the Interstate Highway System is nearing the halfway point in its completion; and

"Whereas the 50 States, in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads are now in the process of preparing a comprehensive study and analysis of overall highway needs, and the financing thereof, after completion in 1972 of the Interstate Highway System; and

"Whereas the aforementioned study will include an evaluation of all Federal-aid highway programs, including the possibility of extending the mileage of the Interstate Highway System; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 is presently on the Federal-aid primary highway system in the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 is the only north-south route between north Idaho and southwest Idaho and serves an area with a population of 300,000 people, which is 45 percent of the total population of the State of Idaho and would also serve the Inland Empire area of eastern Washington, including the Spokane, Wash., metropolitan area; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 is one of the most important arterial highways in the State of Idaho; presently the only all-weather, all-year route between north Idaho and south Idaho; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 provides the only north-south connection in Idaho between Interstate Highway No. 90 and Interstate Highway No. 80 North; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 if improved to expressway or interstate highway standards would provide a highway facility having high standards of service and access control and lying approximately midway between Interstate Highway No. 5 to the west and Interstate Highway No. 15 to the east of the currently designated Interstate Highway System; and

"Whereas an improved U.S. Highway No. 95 would provide an excellent highway service tie with transcontinental routes in Canada and with the Alcan Highway to the State of Alaska; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 offers excellent opportunity for extension to the south and west from the Idaho-Oregon State line through Oregon and Nevada to a connection with Interstate 80 in the vicinity of Winnemucca, Nev., and this in turn, would provide a most important service connection from California to Idaho and Canada; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 serves the following population centers in Idaho; Bonners Ferry, Sandpoint, Coeur d'Alene, Moscow, Lewiston-Clarkston, Grangeville, Council, Cambridge, Payette-Ontario-Weiser and Boise-Nampa-Caldwell; in addition to servicing Calgary and Edmonton, Canada; Winnemucca, Reno and Carson City, Nev.; and Sacramento, San Francismo, and Los Angeles, Calif., through connecting interstate highways, as well as numerous historical, recreational, and scenic areas together with the agriculture, mining and lumbering industries; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 would also serve the important water transportation terminal planned for development at the Port of Lewiston: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge that when priority selection is made for the next most important highways in the United States, after the present Interstate Highway System is completed, that the Congress of the United States of America direct the Secretary of Commerce to include U.S. Highway No. 95 from the Idaho-Oregon State line in the south to the Idaho-Canadian border in the north in the mileage of expressway or interstate highway extensions as may be determined for Federal-aid highway programs upon completion of the presently designated Interstate Highway System; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this Memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"This house joint memorial passed the house on the 18th day of January 1965.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 20th day of January 1965.

W. E. DREVLOW,
"*President of the Senate.*
"DRYDEN M. HILER,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A letter from the Washington representatives, American Public Welfare Association, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the publication of that association entitled "Federal Legislative Objectives for 1965"; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, while the proposed closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals is of immediate and overriding concern, and properly so, it is true also that consolidation of certain VA regional offices will work a substantial hardship on many of our veterans, and probably with no actual financial savings to the Government.

Last week, the New Hampshire Senate adopted a resolution, offered by Senator Dorothy Green, of Manchester, condemning these proposals and asserting that loss of the regional offices at Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt., will have a direct and adverse impact on New Hampshire veterans, in terms of inadequate service and inconvenience.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be inserted in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, RESOLUTIONS, ON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has ordered and proposed in the near future to centralize veterans' services in Boston and for the purposes thereof plans to cut back such services at Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt.; and

Whereas such two places have been the only offices within our area where the veterans in the State of New Hampshire have received such services; and

Whereas it has been the inevitable result of such a cutback and centralization that subsequently the area offices are phased out completely; and

Whereas if veterans in the State of New Hampshire are required to communicate or travel only to Boston to receive services, it would create a material hardship on them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the General Court of New Hampshire strongly protest and deplore this proposed action by the Veterans' Administration which can only result in poorer service and greater inconvenience to the veterans of this State; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the Veterans' Administration and to all of New Hampshire's Senators and Representatives in Congress.

DOROTHY GREEN,
Sponsor.
STEWART LAMPREY,
President of the Senate.
BENJAMIN F. GREER,
Clerk of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. SYMINGTON), from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 28. A bill to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 56).

REPORT ENTITLED "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION" (S. REPT. NO. 57)

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Immigration and Naturalization," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "REVISION AND CODIFICATION" (S. REPT. NO. 58)

Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Revision and Codification," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1011. A bill to give financial assistance to the States for educational purposes by authorizing annual appropriations to each State equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual income taxes collected therein; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1012. A bill for the relief of Dr. Otto F. Kernberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1013. A bill to clarify the components of, and to assist in the management of, the national debt and the tax structure; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1014. A bill to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1015. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission authority to prescribe regulations for the manufacture, import, sale, shipment, or use of devices which caused harmful interference to radio reception; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1016. A bill to establish a Commission on National Agricultural Policy; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. BOGGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1017. A bill to amend section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to measurement of farms; and

S. 1018. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to make uniform for all commodities, for which a marketing quota program is in effect, provisions for reducing farm acreage and producer allotments for falsely identifying, failing to account for disposition, filing a false acreage report, and for harvesting two crops of same commodity produced on the same acreage in a calendar year; and to provide in the case of peanuts and tobacco for credit for penalties paid on marketing against penalties incurred for false identification or failure to account; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1019. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1020. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sydney Philip Traub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1021. A bill to amend title 18, chapter 39, of the United States Code, entitled "Explosives and Combustibles"; and

S. 1022. A bill declaring the Grand (Neosho) River above the town of Fort Gibson, Muskogee County, Okla., to be not navigable water of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Monroney when he introduced the first two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Ervin, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 1023. A bill to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, by providing greater flexibility to States in the use of certain public health grants-in-aid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Muskie when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1024. A bill for the relief of Wong Way Man and Wong Yee Man;

S. 1025. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Lym, doing business as Lym Enginering Co.;

S. 1026. A bill for the relief of Yee Keo Toon;

S. 1027. A bill for the relief of Alma Z. Green;

S. 1028. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Roberta Fronteras de Aquino; and

S. 1029. A bill for the relief of Richard Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTYRE (for himself and Mr. Cotton):

S. 1030. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a survey of Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River in New Hampshire and Maine, in the interest of navigation and allied purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1031. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that adoption of a child shall not disqualify him from monthly insurance benefits to which he otherwise is, or upon application therefor would be, entitled, if such adoption is by the brother or sister of such child; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. McGee):

S. 1032. A bil to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1033. A bill to provide public works planning, coordination, and implementation of economic development programs needed to assist in the development of the Intermountain Region; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 1034. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make and insure loans to certain public bodies and nonprofit associations for the acquisition, construction, improvement or extension of waste disposal and fuel distribution systems and other community services and to make construction grants with respect to certain water systems and waste disposal systems serving rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Montoya when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1035. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCarthy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 1036. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Kanelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1037. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Montoya when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 1038. A bill to provide for the free entry of chipped colored glass windows for the use of St. Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev.; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cannon when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1039. A bill for the relief of Andreina Viselli; and

S. 1040. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Rafala Monarca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 1041. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1042. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Rotella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1043. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Dimitrios Kokkitis; and

S. 1044. A bill for the relief of Helen E. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1045. A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1046. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to authorize exemption from the provision of such part, of services, and transportation of such nature, character, or quantity as not substantially to affect or impair uniform motor carrier regulation; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1047. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 1048. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to make allotments under section 103 available under certain conditions for the payment of the Federal share for the construction of academic facilities for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1049. A bill to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. Sparkman):

S.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to conduct an impartial investigation of the recent events in Selma, Ala.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to permit any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population with the approval of a majority of its voters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

MEETING THE NEEDS OF EDUCATION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in words that have as much meaning today as when they were first penned, James A. Garfield, the 20th President of the United States, expressed his convictions on education this way:

> Next in importance to freedom and justice is popular education, without which neither freedom nor justice can be permanently maintained.

Garfield's words are an apt measure of the importance of education. They help to convey some idea of the task confronting us today when 1 out of every 4 Americans is going to school, the Nation's total school enrollment increases by more than 1½ million each year.

While education is a direct responsibility of the States and their political subdivisions, we have long since recognized that the Federal Government must properly and effectively assist the States in meeting these critical responsibilities.

In this spirit, I introduce a bill to give financial assistance to the States for educational purposes. The bill would provide each State with an annual amount equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual income taxes collected in the State.

This plan to return to each State, solely for educational purposes, a percentage of the Federal taxes collected in the State is simple and straightforward. There is nothing complicated about it.

It eliminates the need for complex formulas for allocating funds among the States. Each State would receive 1 percent of the Federal income taxes collected from individuals in the State.

It eliminates costly, inflexible restrictions on the use of the funds. Each State can determine for itself the purposes to which the funds can be applied, without Federal strings. Thus, they can be applied to construction, teachers' salaries, or whatever purpose may meet the needs of a particular locality.

It overcomes objections based on religion or race. Each State is free to use the funds in the same way it uses its own revenues.

It would not require an army, or even a bureau, of Federal employees to administer.

It would keep control of education with the voters, school boards, the parents, and teachers in each State, without any opening wedge or excuse for Federal control.

Of course, Mr. President, this is not a new proposal. I offered it in the 88th

Congress, and, in somewhat different form, in the 87th Congress. For many of the reasons I have cited, it has gained increasing support in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and I believe it merits renewed consideration this year.

The bill proposes a modest program. In fact it may be more modest than necessary or desirable. The use of 1 percent of the Federal individual income tax receipts would make about $480 million available for education. My own State of New Hampshire would receive an estimated $1,250,000 under the bill. Of course, this proposal can easily be modified to expand the amounts made available for education. Increasing the percentage of the income tax which would be returned to the States would be a simple matter.

In its simplicity and its flexibility, the legislation I am introducing today stands in marked contrast to the administration's program.

The administration's principal proposals for primary and secondary education are restricted to narrow categories. The funds are rigidly earmarked—and earmarked for purposes which may not come even close to meeting the real needs in many States. Instead of attacking the problems of education in a forthright, head-on fashion, they nibble at the fringes.

The President's most important request is for Federal grants to school districts based on the number of children whose family income is less than $2,000 a year. These funds "would be used essentially for improving the education of educationally deprived students, not for the general educational programs of the schools," we are told. Yet this restriction may prevent the use of these funds for the best, most effective educational purposes.

The President applies only one yardstick to educational needs, the number of low income families in a district, while as a matter of fact, there are many other factors to be considered. Even if we grant that the family income is a dominant factor, under my plan the aid goes to the State and in distributing the funds that aspect can, and undoubtedly will, be considered by the State and probably with greater accuracy than it could be by a distant government in Washington.

The administration's plan clearly favors the big cities where there often is a large industrial and commercial tax base which is available for support of education. It neglects the needs of the rural communities and also the suburban areas which too often must finance and pay for schools out of the revenues from a limited, wholly residential tax base.

It neglects the needs of the whole in order to concentrate on just one aspect of the problem.

And it may not be completely surprising to find that, under the administration's proposal, oil-rich Texas will get three times as much aid per pupil as New Hampshire.

Some other disquieting aspects of the President's proposals were explored in a recent editorial from the Concord, N.H., Monitor, which pointed out:

> The way the program works out it appears New Hampshire will be putting up about $4 million in Federal taxes to get back $2,400,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the January 23 issue of the Concord Monitor be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

In his other proposals, the President calls for aid to school libraries and new educational efforts for preschool children under the age of five. These may be desirable, useful programs, particularly for school districts not concerned about the levels of teachers' salaries or the need for new classrooms and laboratories. But for most, these programs are more likely to siphon off into side channels the funds that are most critically needed for basic educational needs.

Because I believe we must take the front-door approach in dealing with the problems of education, because I believe we must provide Federal assistance to enable local school districts to solve their own most serious problems, without telling them in advance just what those problems are and without telling them to solve problems that may not even exist, I shall press again this year for consideration of and action upon the legislation I am introducing.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Tydings in the chair). The bill will be referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1011) to give financial assistance to the States for educational purposes by authorizing annual appropriations to each State equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual income taxes collected therein, introduced by Mr. Cotton, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The editorial ordered to be printed in the Record is as follows:

> SUCCORED BY THE SUCKER STATES
>
> When one analyzes where the Great Society's additional educational aid of a billion and a half dollars will go the same old pattern emerges. The Northeast will be taxed the most to nourish the less self-sufficient States, especially those of the South.
>
> Twenty-two States will receive more than the national per capita average distribution of $6.06 under this program. These, then, are the States which the distribution formula arbitrarily establishes as needy beyond their own ability to meet their need.
>
> A frank Federal aid program would give to these States the difference between $6.06 and the per capita figure the formula for need shows, thus reducing total dollar aid to the actual redistribution of wealth figure. Then every State would know just where it stands and whether it is a giver or a getter.
>
> Such simple frankness is seldom the political way, however. So all States give, 22 less than they get back, and 28 more than they get back. Actually, the 22 recipient States get, in effect, $3.10 net per capita, which means the other 28 States give, in effect, $2.96 net per capita.
>
> But the 28 States might not vote for a program supported by the taxes of all 50 States, if only 22 States got anything back. Also, the 28 States would balk at the imposition of any Federal conditions on the way they run their schools. However, such is sleight-of-hand politics, if 28 States get back some part (but not all) of what they contribute in taxes, then they will accept increased centralized control over their school systems. (How silly can the States be?)
>
> We are not attempting to reason that the needy should not be aided by the more affluent. But we do think this won't be a Great Society until some of the false masks come off its leader's proposals for achievement.
>
> The actual Federal appropriation really required to provide the 22 needy States with the actual aid in the Johnson program is only a little more than half the $1.5 billion asked of the Congress.
>
> Needless to say, no New England State would get any aid if only enough to succor the needy were appropriated. New Hampshire would receive only $3.66, or $2.40 less per capita than the national average distribution. Massachusetts and Connecticut would be even heavier contributors to the needy States, getting only $3.24 and $3.30 back.
>
> Americans are given to loud protests because the foreign states to which we give dollar aid are seldom appreciative. We can hardly justify such protests in view of our domestic policies, in which a minority of the States manage to rig a raid upon their neighbors and make it appear that all 50 States are being treated charitably by the "Great White Father."
>
> Incidentally, Texas and Minnesota are among the 22 States which will benefit at the expense of the other 28 States.
>
> The way the program works out it appears New Hampshire will be putting up about $4 million in Federal taxes to get back $2,400,000.

MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL DEBT AND TAX STRUCTURE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am introducing again this year a bill to clarify the components of and to assist in the management of the national debt and tax structure. An identical bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Finance last year and passed the Senate on August 5, 1964. Regrettably the House Ways and Means Committee did not act on the measure prior to adjournment of the 88th Congress.

The Finance Committee report on the bill which I introduced in the 88th Congress, S. 2281, stated in part:

> The committee believes that it is desirable to make available in a single, concise report, pertinent information with respect to the current status of the contingent liabilities of the Federal Government, including its long-range obligations and commitments. Indeed, the committee recognizes a responsibility to make available in such a report—as clear and complete as possible, the overall financial condition of our Government. Such a report * * * will enable the Congress to have a better understanding of the current fiscal needs of the Federal Government.
>
> The report will fill a need which has been felt by the Congress for many years.

This bill would require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit annually to Congress a brief report setting forth the amounts of the contingent liabilities of the Federal Government. At the present time, a complete and easy to understand report on the sizable contingent liabilities of our Federal Government is not available. Today, neither Congress nor the American public can really find anywhere a complete report on the actual Federal debt.

The reporting of the statutory debt, estimated for fiscal year 1966 to rise to $322.5 billion, is covered in daily statements from the Treasury. Long-term lease obligations and real estate transactions are reported annually to the Senate Appropriations Committee, as are authorizations for so-called backdoor spending programs. In many other instances, however, contingent liabilities of various Government programs are either not reported at all, or are available only by agency or corporation, or are inadequately presented. Nowhere is this information published in one place or in a uniform way.

Some of the most important of these long-term liabilities and obligations are found in the various Government trust funds, such as the social security funds to which the administration now proposes to add a health care for the aged plan, Federal insurance and annuity programs, and indirect liabilities such as FHA and VA mortgage insurances. Other liabilities are found in the Defense Department retirement program, which is not funded. Current appropriations will be required to cover over $8 billion of commitments here in the next 5 years, for example. All of these programs, to be sure, have the resources of the Federal Government behind them. But these callable resources rest in the American taxpayer, and he should know what the total obligations of his Government amount to.

I believe that congressional action to require the reporting of this information is particularly timely. Congress is now being asked to pass on programs which envision the planning for and accomplishment of long-range national goals. The methods of financing these programs are varied. I believe it is important for us to start now to develop a clear understanding of where we are financially and where we may be in future years. The total financial liabilities of the Federal Government cannot be handled on a piecemeal basis any longer if we hope to manage our resources efficiently and effectively and develop sound programs to meet the country's needs. To do this, we must first and foremost be informed on the facts.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1013) to clarify the components of, and to assist in the management of, the national debt and the tax structure, introduced by Mr. Saltonstall, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT, RELATING TO DEVICES WHICH INTERFERE WITH RADIO RECEPTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission authority to prescribe regulations for the manufacture, import, sale, shipment, or use of devices which cause harmful interference to radio reception. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with an explationary statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanatory statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1015) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission authority to prescribe regulations for the manufacture, import, sale, shipment, or use of devices which cause harmful interference to radio reception, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and explanatory statement presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1965.

The Vice President,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vice President: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 89th Congress a proposal to amend the Communications Act by adding a new section pertaining to devices which interfere with radio reception.

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by the Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The attached proposal is identical to a Commission proposal submitted in the 2d session of the 88th Congress and introduced in the Senate as S. 2684.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Yours sincerely,

E. William Henry,
Chairman.

Explanation of Proposed Amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended (Proposed New Section 302), To Give the Federal Communications Commission Authority To Prescribe Regulations for the Manufacture, Import, Sale, and Shipment of Devices Which Cause Harmful Interference to Radio Reception

The Federal Communications Commission recommends that Congress enact legislation amending the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by adding a new section thereto, proposed section 302. Under this new section, the Commission would obtain authority to prescribe regulations for the manufacture, sale, shipment, and import of devices which cause harmful interference to radio communications and thus interfere with radio reception.

The chief purpose of this legislation is to give the Commission adequate authority to deal with increasingly acute interference problems arising from expanded usage of electrical and electronic devices which cause, or are capable of causing, harmful interference to radio reception. This would be accomplished by empowering the Commission to deal with the interference problem at its root source—the sale by some manufacturers of equipment and apparatus which do not comply with the Commission's rules. This new authority to require that equipment be properly designed to reduce radiation to specified and acceptable limits, and, where necessary, to specify operating frequencies before it is sold to the consumer, is not only necessary and in the public interest, but also, will provide a more reasonable basis for dealing with interference problems than is now possible under the present scheme of regulation provided for in the Communications Act.

Presently, the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, particularly section 301 thereof, prohibits the use of equipment or apparatus which causes interference to radio communications, while section 303(f) empowers the Commission to prescribe regulations "to prevent interference between stations." However, the Commission has no specific rulemaking authority under the act to require that before equipment or apparatus which radiates electromagnetic energy is put on the market, it must be properly designed to prevent harmful interference to radio reception. The defects of this scheme of regulation become more obvious with each passing year. Since the prohibition falls on the use of offending equipment, it means that the Commission, in trying to control interference, is confined in large measure to apprehending the users of equipment which interfere with radio communications, even though in most instances such users have purchased equipment on the assumption its operation would be legal without further suppression of spurious radiation. It also means that the Commission is reduced to an after-the-fact approach to preventing interference, for obviously, until the Commission has discovered interference (either through its Field Engineering Bureau or on the complaint of some user of radio equipment), there is no basis for proceeding against the offender.

Of course, when the Communications Act was adopted, interference problems were relatively small, both in number and complexity. But especially since World War II, with the explosively rapid growth experienced in the communications industry, there has been a corresponding increase both in the development of new uses for radio and in the number and type of devices capable of causing harmful interference. In many instances, those radiating devices lie outside the area conventionally associated with radio transmission and reception. They include such devices as electronic garage-door openers and certain electronic toys, which, because of poor design or for other reasons, radiate radio frequency energy beyond that needed for their functions. They also include other devices, such as high-powered electronic heaters, diathermy machines, welders, and radio and television receivers, which radiate energy, either purposely or incidental to carrying out their primary functions.

The cumulative effect of all this excessive radiation (or "spectrum pollution," as one writer has put it) is most apparent in large metropolitan areas. Especially in peak periods of operation of radiating devices, such areas are blanketed by a "radiation smog" which makes it increasingly difficult for any user of radio communications to obtain interference-free reception. To radio listeners and television viewers, this means the reception of distorted and garbled signals, or fluttering images, of a technical quality less than that possible when interference is under effective control. To those who use radio for industrial communications purposes, the cumulative effect of excessive radiation means increased disruption of communications services. In the really vital areas where radio is used for safety purposes, such as in air navigation control, this radiation problem becomes most acute. Here, it poses a genuine threat to safety of life. And finally to those users of radio whose operations must be conducted under conditions of relatively low background interference (such as the Commission's radio monitoring activities, the operation of military communications systems, or radio astronomy observations), high levels of excessive radiation constantly force such users to seek out new areas of low interference or to require that all devices used in a given area (such as a military post) be properly suppressed against radiation before use. Both of these latter-mentioned alternatives impose additional costs of operation on the Government itself.

In our view, the only lasting solution to these interference problems is to require that before a device capable of causing interference leaves the manufacturer, it be properly designed so as to limit its radiation to acceptable values. Under the present scheme of the Communications Act, compliance by manufacturers with our rules and regulations is on a purely voluntary basis. Of course, many manufacturers have voluntarily complied with our radiation requirements. But at the same time, many others have refused to do so, citing in justification of such refusal our lack of legal authority to control the manufacture of such devices under the present provisions of the Communications Act. Quite often, this refusal stems from the fact that compliance would require additional manufacturing costs.

Nevertheless, the effects of this refusal to comply with our radiation requirements are clear. In terms of fair competition between manufacturers, it penalizes the responsible manufacturer who wishes to hold down excessive radiation by placing him at a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis the marginal manufacturer who prefers to ignore our rules. In terms of the consumer, who generally is unaware that an inadequately suppressed device will cause interference and who purchases the device in good faith, it forces on him the cost of bringing his equipment into compliance. Obviously, it is unfair that the buying public should bear the brunt and embarrassment of our enforcement procedure, but under the present terms of the act, the Commission has no alternative.

Our proposed legislation has been drafted with a view to these problems, and in response to an earlier suggestion by the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee.

The proposal consists of three subsections. Basically, subsection 302(a) describes the radiating devices which would be subject to our authority as those "which in their operation are capable of emitting radio frequency energy by radiation, conduction or other means in sufficient degree to produce harmful interference to radio communications." In the case of such devices, the Commission would have authority to prescribe rules applicable to the manufacture, import, sale, shipment or use of such devices and would prescribe the permissible degree of emission of radio frequency energy of such devices. Subsection 302(b) prohibits the use, import, shipment, manufacture, sale or offering for sale of devices which fail to comply with radiation limits duly promulgated by the Commission under the authority of section 302. Subsection 302(c) sets out three exceptions. The proposed legislation would not apply to (a) carriers transporting interfering devices without trading in them, (b) the manufacture of devices which are intended solely for export, or (c) devices which are used by the U.S. Government or any agency thereof.

Several observations regarding this proposal are in order. Perhaps most important of these is that while this legislation may at first seem novel, the United States is perhaps the only major industrial nation in the world which does not approach the interference problem by prescribing permissible radiation limits at the manufacturing level. Over the years, there has been a progressive abandonment by other countries of the "user regulation" approach still followed under the Communications Act, in favor of controlling interference by requiring that radiation be held to acceptable limits before equipment is put in the hands of consumers.

This latter approach, which is reflected in our proposed legislation, has much to recommend it. It constitutes a direct approach to interference control, thus meeting the problem at its source by the application of preventive techniques. Further, it recognizes that from every viewpoint, the ideal time to prevent excessive radiation is before radiating equipment is sold. By so doing, it will bring substantial benefits to both the Government and the public.

From the standpoint of the Commission, rulemaking authority to prescribe permissible radiation limits at the time of manufacture will go far toward reducing the enforcement problems the Commission presently faces. It will avoid the piecemeal, "after the fact" approach the Commission must now follow in order to apprehend the users of equipment which causes harmful interference. Of course, this enforcement problem varies with the type of equipment involved. Where relatively few units of a large piece of equipment, such as multikilowatt industrial heaters, have been sold, tracing the owners of this equipment is not too difficult. But where a large number of radiating devices, such as garage door openers, toys, or improperly designed radio or television receivers, have been placed in the hands of the public, the enforcement problem becomes exceedingly difficult, if not indeed impossible. In the calendar year 1963, for example, in excess of 150,000 man-hours were devoted to tracing and eliminating interference of all types. This figure does not take into account the large number of interference problems which are never brought to the Commission's attention. Thus, granting the Commission authority to approve radiating equipment before it is sold would, by reducing our enforcement problem, permit more effective utilization of our manpower resources than is now possible.

A further benefit to the Government from a general reduction of levels of excessive radiation (the "radiation smog" over metropolitan areas earlier referred to) is that Government radio services whose operations must be conducted in areas of relatively low radiation limits would, to a great extent, be relieved of the need for relocating to escape high-radiation areas. The need for the Commission to relocate its monitoring installations as increasing urbanization brings about higher levels of radiation has already been mentioned. It is also our understanding that the interference problem has become so acute in areas of military installations that military purchase specifications for radiating devices now are written to require that such devices be suppressed or otherwise designed to prevent interference. Finally, from the Government's viewpoint, the Government, as well as the public, would be benefited by enactment of this legislation through the additional protection against interference which would be afforded to those services, such as air navigation control, where the safety of life depends on purity of reception.

The public would also benefit from this legislation because a reduction in the present levels of excessive radiation would permit reception of a better quality than is now possible. Here it might be noted that the public has become so accustomed to a degraded quality of service under present conditions that unless radio reception is seriously interfered with, the public will not complain. The public would also gain reassurance that, except perhaps under extraordinary circumstances, equipment it bought would not need further modification as a condition to its legal operation.

There remains to be considered the problem of additional costs to manufacturers which might be necessary under this legislation. We recognize, of course, that properly designed equipment costs more than improperly designed equipment. But, generally speaking, in most instances, the additional costs to manufacturers stemming from this legislation would be small. Even now, when the Commission orders a user to shield or otherwise adjust his equipment to prevent excessive radiation, this can be accomplished at relatively low cost. If this were done at the time of manufacture, costs could further be minimized by the economies possible under proper design and mass production techniques.

But, in any event, the consumer must now pay the cost of eliminating excessive radiation, as well as the cost of administrative proceedings brought against him. In light of this, we think it preferable that members of the public who buy devices that may radiate should have assurance that such devices are properly designed at the time of manufacture, rather than having purchasers discover noncompliance with our radiation requirements after the sale. By requiring that all manufacturers hold radiation down to acceptable limits, not only does the public gain this warranty that equipment purchased is fit for legal operation, but those manufacturers who now voluntarily comply with our radiation rules would be relieved of the competitive disadvantages they now operate under.

Several remaining aspects of our proposal deserve mention. First, it should be noted that this new section is not intended to supplant our authority under section 301, but rather, to supplement it. While the new section will go far to reducing levels of excessive radiation, there will be instances where properly designed equipment is improperly used, thus calling for application of section 301.

Further, implementation of our authority would necessarily be on a gradual basis. Before promulgating new standards, the Commission would give public notice of rulemaking proceedings, and any person or segment of the industry affected by a particular set of regulations would have ample opportunity in subsequent rulemaking proceedings to comment on the proposed regulations. Thus, the Commission would be in a position to assess the impact of its proposed regulations on those affected, and, where appropriate, could minimize the effect of new standards on the industry. In short, if the Commission obtains this legislation, it would proceed to implement it gradually, and only after a thorough study of all the problems involved.

Finally, there are the three exceptions to this proposed legislation contained in proposed subsection 302(c). The first exception is designed to exempt carriers which merely transport interfering devices without trading in them. The second exception relates to the manufacture, sale, etc., of devices which are intended solely for export. Even though a device might interfere with radio reception under the standards to be promulgated pursuant to this legislation, its use in some other country may still be lawful. By permitting the export of devices to such foreign countries, American manufacturers will not be placed under any competitive disadvantage. The final exception involves the use of electronic devices by agencies of the Government. Under section 305 of the Communications Act, the Commission does not have regulatory jurisdiction over stations owned and operated by the United States. This same theory is carried forward into the final exception of proposed subsection 302(c), in order to avoid any jurisdictional confusion which might arise under the new legislation. In many respects, the needs of the Government, in terms of procurement, the development of new electronic devices, security considerations, etc., are unique. Beyond this, the Government agencies are fully aware of the need for suppressing objectionable interference, and in many cases, the standards adopted by individual agencies are more stringent than those which the Commission would impose. In light of these considerations, it was considered desirable to except from the operation of this legislation devices used by the U.S. Government or its agencies, leaving it to the agencies to cooperate through the offices of the Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee to achieve acceptable levels of radiation.

In conclusion, the direct approach to control of interference inherent in our proposal is, we think, the most logical solution to the problems of excessive radiation, problems which become increasingly acute with the ever-expanding use of radio. What the Commission seeks here is a more rational scheme of regulation which will be possible by shifting the emphasis from the present cumbersome technique of "user regulation" to the preventive techniques of dealing with interference control at the source of the apparatus. The benefits to be derived from reducing spectrum pollution far outweigh any inconvenience to those manufacturers who now place inadequately designed devices on the market, on the assumption that if such devices cause harmful interference to radio reception, the buyer can undertake the necessary equipment modifications.

Adopted October 21, 1964.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Commission on National Agricultural Policy. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record following my remarks.

Mr. President, it is very gratifying to me that President Johnson has decided to "conduct a fundamental examination of the entire agriculture policy of the United States," as he says in his message to the Congress of February 4.

I agree heartily that such an examination is necessary. In fact, it is urgent. That is why, on November 12, 1963, I introduced a bill providing for a Commission on National Agricultural Policy.

This Commission was to be "composed of leaders from public and private life" and was to "study, investigate and evaluate the problems and trends of agriculture in the United States, with a view toward recommending an overall national policy for agriculture." The 88th Congress took no action on my proposal.

While I endorse the President's intention now to try and bring order and direction to the Nation's agricultural policy, I am in sharp disagreement with his procedure.

He says he intends to reorganize the National Agricultural Advisory Commission into a new Commission on Food and Fiber, and that this Commission would be "broadly representative of rural communities, consumers, producers, industry, Government, and the public."

While the President may hope that reorganization and a name change will give him the agency he needs, I would respectfully suggest that the problems and questions are too large and complex to be effectively considered in this fashion. The National Agricultural Advisory Commission operates within the scope of the Department of Agriculture, and has since it was established by Executive order in 1953. It is a bipartisan group appointed by the President. Its task has been to review policies and administration of farm programs within the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and to advise the Secretary of Agriculture. Last November this Commission, in a report entitled "Farm Policy in the Years Ahead," cited the need for a positive farm policy.

Even if such a Commission is reorganized and renamed, however, it is hardly likely that it could carry out its function without considerable dependence on and direction from the Department of Agriculture.

The country's need for a new look at agriculture's problems requires the most independent study possible, and the type of commission which I have already proposed would be much better suited to meet this need. It would draw on the Department of Agriculture's resources but would be able to stand far enough away from the Department to evaluate its present policies and recommended policies from a detached point of view. Under my plan, the Commission would be composed of 12 members:

Four appointed by the President, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life; four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives, and two from private life.

In order that this balance be maintained to the greatest extent possible, not more than six of the members would be from the same political party.

In addition, of course, the Commission would call on experts throughout the country. It would hold hearings. The Department of Agriculture would naturally contribute a great amount of the data and expert opinion, but the impact of agriculture is so broad that the Commission would also listen carefully to views of business, consumers, foreign affairs experts, and others.

In brief, I believe a commission set up as I have proposed would be in a better position than a reorganized Federal agency to conduct the broad study required to arrive at the best possible policy recommendations.

The Commission on National Agricultural Policy should look at agriculture in relation to: Foreign policy; the world's population problems; world trade, in particular the Common Market; new uses for agricultural products; greater return to farmers for their work; rural unemployment as a result of agricultural technological change; improvements in agricultural marketing; relation to other industries.

I mention these areas of inquiry to indicate how important the Commission's work would be, and because it is so important we can afford to have nothing less than the best possible Commission conducting the inquiry and making recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1016) to establish a Commission on National Agricultural Policy, introduced by Mr. Boggs, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDING AND PURPOSE

Section 1. The Congress finds that American agriculture, the Nation's basic industry, in many instances is being punished by its own success. Research and development in the field of agriculture plus hard work by American farmers have combined to make the United States the best fed nation on earth, but at the same time a nation with crop surpluses and other farm imbalances.

In attempting to solve our agricultural problems we have made great expenditures of tax dollars on a variety of programs and, consequently, put ourselves at an economic disadvantage in world trade with respect to many agricultural products. Because mechanization and automation are changing the farming industry every year, it is essential to the continued success of American agriculture and the welfare of the United States that this Nation develop and follow a sound and comprehensive policy for agriculture, a policy which defines the general scope of farming plans for the foreseeable future, and determines what the role of the Federal Government in farming should be. It is the purpose of this Act to provide for the establishment of a Commission, composed of leaders from public and private life, to study, investigate, and evaluate the problems and trends of agriculture in the United States, with a view toward recommending an overall national policy for agriculture, a policy which will help agriculture prosper for the good of both farmer and consumer, and for the good of the Nation as a whole in domestic and international commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 2. There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on National Agricultural Policy (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(d) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(e) Not more than six members shall be from the same political party.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. (a) The Commission shall make a comprehensive study and investigation of any and all matters relating to the agricultural industry of this country with a view to formulating recommendations for a general agricultural policy for the future which will best serve the interests of farmer, consumer, and Nation. In formulating any agricultural policy pursuant to this act, the Commission shall give special consideration to the following:

(1) How the Federal Government can best serve the interests of the Nation in the field of agriculture.

(2) How agricultural research may be more effectively utilized, particularly in regard to finding new and improved uses of agricultural products.

(3) How the United States can increase and expand its exports of agricultural products.

(4) How the problem of unemployed farmers and farmworkers can be solved in the wake of continued modernization and mechanization of farming.

(5) How agricultural education can be improved in light of the increasing complexity of farming.

(6) What services and functions of the Federal Government relating to agriculture, which are carried out under existing law, should be expanded, curtailed, modified, or eliminated.

(7) How agriculture is related, directly and indirectly, to the domestic economy, national defense, and international relations of the United States, and what adjustments might be made to improve these relationships.

(8) How the marketing of farm products can be improved to give a better return to the producer.

(9) How the Nation's land resources can be most effectively utilized in order to insure a continued abundance of food and fiber.

(b) The Commission shall, not later than June 30, 1965, submit to the President and to the Congress a final report setting forth the results of its study and investigation and its recommendations. The Commission may from time to time submit to the President such earlier reports as the President may request or as the Commission deems appropriate. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 5. (a) The Commission or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof may, for the purpose of carrying out its duties under this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or such member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality any information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

Sec. 6. (a) The members of the Commission who are Members of the Congress shall serve without additional compensation. The members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without additional compensation, but shall continue to receive the salary of their regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. All other members of the Commission shall receive $75 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) All members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES

Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 9. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the expiration of six months after the submittal of the final report provided for in section 4(b).

CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, since I do not believe I shall disadvantage any other Senators, that I may proceed for longer than the 3-minute limitation on statements during the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. Murphy], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes.

The simple fact is that the waters of the Colorado River will not be sufficient to care for the growing water needs of those States in both the upper and lower basins through which the river wends its way.

For a long time, there has been a regrettable dispute between the States of Arizona and California with respect to the waters of the Lower Colorado River Basin. That dispute has raged and has become violent in times gone by. I am glad to record that a few weeks ago a historic meeting was held in Washington. This meeting was called and presided over by the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, Secretary Udall, and was attended by the distinguished Governors of Arizona and California, by the two distinguished Senators from Arizona [Mr. Hayden and Mr. Fannin], and by me. I had the opportunity on that occasion to speak both for my California colleague [Mr. Murphy] and myself. The meeting was also attended by a number of staff personnel.

As we left the meeting, I believed that an understanding among those present had been agreed to, under which we could proceed with the building of the central Arizona project in Arizona, an urgently needed project for the people of my neighboring State. I believed also that agreement had been reached at that meeting that a guarantee would be given to the people of California to provide that from the waters available in the lower basin of the river, 4.4 million acre-feet would continue to flow to southern California until such time as the President of the United States should announce that supplemental water had been introduced into the main stream of the Colorado River in a dependable amount of 2,500,000 acre-feet per year.

The bill which I introduce today authorizes the construction of the central Arizona project. It provides for the type of protection of the people of the State from which I come in accordance with the comments I have just made and the understanding reached at the meeting mentioned above. Indeed, the protective section for my State is, in essence, the same as the protective section of the bill I introduced a month ago, on January 6.

The bill I introduce today, the product of able draftsmen representing the Department of the Interior and interested persons from both States, not only authorizes the construction of the central Arizona project and provides for the type of protection which I enunciated, but also, it directs the Secretary of the Interior to commence a study of the water needs of the entire Colorado River Basin and to recommend projects to introduce additional water into the system, and to place his first goal of supplemental water in the amount of 2,500,000 acre-feet a year. I observe that this is double the amount which was urged 2 years ago, when the Department of the Interior first presented an estimable concept of a basinwide development.

The bill would provide for additional waters by which we will continue to meet the burden of the Mexican treaty, and thus indicate to our neighbors, for whom we have a great affection and growing ties of friendship, that we intend to discharge our duty and give to Mexico not only the quantity of water which the Mexican-American treaty calls for, but also water that is usable.

The bill provides for recreation benefits, as did the bill I introduced a month ago. It provides specific protection with respect to the authorized construction of Bridge and Marble Canyon in such a fashion as to prevent the diversion of those waters in a way that might militate against recreation facilities.

The bill does not do what my bill of a month ago sought to do and that is that it does not authorize on a conditional basis the vast public works projects which must come along. These vast public works projects will in good time, I have no doubt, bring supplemental water supplies to the river in the lower basin where the Secretary finds they can be most feasibly transported. In such study and findings, the rights of the States of origin will be protected.

I think my bill offers a sound and satisfactory solution to both Arizona and California. It can set at rest a dispute that has done neither State any good. Our two States are intertwined economically. We are neighbors geographically. We must work together. This bill is an opportunity for us to work together in the public good in the development of that vast semi-arid West which acts as a magnet in drawing hundreds of thousands of people each year from other parts of the country.

I am glad to observe that on the first of February, the dean of the Senate, the able and great senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] sent to me a memorandum in writing, telling me that he would be prepared to accept reluctantly the type of legislation which I have just described, if that were the only means by which the central Arizona project would be built.

I suggest, without unduly embellishing the RECORD, that there is a risk of insufficient water. The bill which I introduce today would make our two States share that risk and so give them a vast incentive to work together in order to solve a problem for the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the memorandums from the distinguished dean of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], dated January 29 and February 1 be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the partial text of a memorandum from the law firm of Ely, Duncan & Bennett, dated February 5, 1965, which law firm represents a number of public agencies in California and participated in the drafting of this legislation, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum and partial text were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR KUCHEL

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
January 29, 1965.

Yesterday at a meeting of staff from my office, your office, the Department of the Interior, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and Governors Brown and Goddard, there was presented by the members of my staff a tentative proposal, the objective of which was twofold, to wit:

1. To assure the State of California the fullest measure of protection for uses from the Colorado River up to 4,400,000 acre-feet per annum, for such period in addition to the 25-year period proposed in S. 75, as would elapse during the construction of works neccessary to provide for the importation into the main stream of not less than 2,500,000 acre-feet per annum; and

2. To assure that both California and Arizona would have an incentive to secure the authorization of the necessary importation works at the earliest practicable time and in any event within not more than 15 years from the effective date of my bill.

The net effect of my tentative proposal coupled with the language of S. 75 is to provide to California a guarantee of 4.4 million acre-feet of consumptive use for 25 years with the further guarantee that if within 15 years an importation project has been authorized, the guarantee of 4.4 million acre-feet will be extended throughout the construction period of the importation project, even though such construction period exceeds 10 years. In the alternate, if no importation project is authorized within 15 years, California would then have a 10 year period in which to make provision for waters from another source or sources if, in fact, other waters are needed.

The alternative which was presented to our staff people yesterday is for Arizona to concede that her rights on the Colorado River are inferior to those of California by guaranteeing a perpetual protection of the use of 4.4 million acre-feet by California. Such a proposal would go far toward removing any incentive for California to secure the authorization of importation works which would jointly benefit both States.

To this alternative they could not accede nor can I.

The proposal which was presented by the members of my staff has subsequently been revised and a copy of that revision is attached. The attachment represents the final concession which I am prepared to make in order to achieve California and the Interior Department's support for the authorization of the Lower Colorado River Basin project. I can go no further.

CARL HAYDEN,
U.S. Senate.

TENTATIVE PROPOSAL

S. 75, page 10, line 23, delete the period, substitute a colon and insert the following: "*Provided, further*, That, if such project or projects, for the importation of water in aggregate annual quantities of not less than two million, five hundred thousand acre-feet are authorized by Act of Congress within not more than fifteen years from the effective date of this Act, then, until the President shall proclaim that such project or projects have been completed; are in operation; and are capable in his judgment of continuously delivering water in aggregate annual quantities of not less than two million, five hundred thousand acre-feet into the Colorado River system or at the water users' point or points of use from a source or sources outside the natural drainage area of the Colorado River system, article II(B)(3) of the decree of the United States Supreme Court in Arizona against California (376 U.S. 340), shall be so administered that in any year in which, as determined by the Secretary, there will be insufficient mainstream Colorado River water available for release to satisfy the annual consumptive use of seven million five hundred thousand acre-feet in Arizona, California, and Nevada, diversions for the purposes of the central Arizona unit shall be junior to the aggregate annual consumptive use, including the satisfaction of present perfected rights by users in the State of California, served under contracts with the United States by diversion works heretofore constructed and by Federal reservations in that State under decreed rights, of four million, four hundred thousand acre-feet of main-stream water."

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR KUCHEL

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 1, 1965.

On January 29, I advised you that I could not accept the amendment to S. 75, which you had proposed, even as modified at the staff meeting of January 28. I offered you a compromise amendment which you rejected.

I have since been informed that at the staff meeting in question Mr. Ely expressed confidence that substantially all of the Members of the House of Representatives from California would be prepared to introduce bills and to press for passage of legislation along the lines of the most recent draft submitted by Mr. Weinberg of the Department of the Interior to the group in attendance at the staff meeting. I assume that such bills would include the amendment which you have proposed as modified by Messrs. Ely and Weinberg at the staff meeting on January 28.

In order to avoid further delays in the enactment of legislation providing for water resources development in both of our States, I propose to press for passage by the Senate of S. 75 in substantially its present form. It is my hope that the Congressmen from California will follow the course which Mr. Ely has indicated they are prepared to take. I assure you that if a bill along those lines is passed by the House, I shall press for its prompt passage by the Senate notwithstanding that it contains the language of your proposed amendment as modified at the January 28 staff meeting by Messrs. Ely and Weinberg.

In other words, I am prepared—although reluctantly—to accept your proposal when the legislative process has reached the point where I can plainly see that my acceptance of it will result in the authorization of the central Arizona project. I shall do so because authorization of the central Arizona project and additional developments in California are of such vital importance that our presently differing views regarding the manner in which protection for California shall be spelled out must not be allowed to delay enactment of the necessary legislation.

It is my hope that both Houses can now proceed simultaneously to consider legislation authorizing a Lower Colorado River Basin project.

CARL HAYDEN.

MEMORANDUM TO MEMBERS OF THE CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

ELY, DUNCAN & BENNETT,
COUNSELLORS AT LAW,
WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 5, 1965.*

Re proposed bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes (draft of Feb. 2, 1965).

This draft results from an agreement reached at a meeting January 21, 1965, between the Secretary of the Interior, the Senators and Governors of Arizona and California, and several of their Congressmen.

The bill has been drafted by representatives of the Interior Department and of the two States. It is approved by the Colorado River Board of California, on which are represented the Metropolitan Water District, the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, San Diego County Water Authority, Imperial Irrigation District, Coachella Valley County Water District, and Palo Verde Irrigation District. I share the responsibility for this draft, believe it is a good bill, and am prepared to testify on behalf of it. On behalf of the Colorado River Board, I respectfully request that you introduce it and press for its passage.

These are its essentials:

1. Investigation of importation projects. Title II authorizes investigations to find sources and plan projects for importation of at least 2.5 million acre-feet into the main stream in the lower basin, but does not authorize their construction. No particular sources are named. The Secretary is to make his report within 3 years.

2. Protection of California's 4.4 million acre-feet in connection with authorization of the central Arizona project. Title III authorizes construction of the central Arizona project, but section 304 (p. 7) makes this subject to the protection for California that is proposed in the Kuchel bill, S. 294. Thus, if less than 7.5 million acre-feet is available, diversions for the central Arizona project

must be so limited as to assure 4.4 million acre-feet for California's existing projects (plus water, as well, for existing projects in Arizona and Nevada). This protection will only cease when works are completed which will permanently deliver at least 2.5 million acre-feet annually into the main stream, from sources which the President proclaims can supply this without adverse effect on the water supplies which are required in the States of origin, to satisfy their foreseeable needs. As importation of this quantity of 2.5 million (which offsets the 1.5 million acre-foot Mexican burden and 1 million acre-feet of evaporation losses) assures us, for all practical purposes, against any shortage in the 7.5 million. California is permanently protected against shortage in the 4.4 million, since the protection ends only when the need for it ends. This cutoff thus bears no resemblance to the 25-year cutoff of the protection of our 4.4 million which was proposed by Arizona last year, and which California water users rejected. That provision would have terminated the protection just when it is needed, if importation of water is delayed.

The imported water is to be made available at Colorado River costs, up to a total of 4.4 million acre-feet in California, 2.8 million in Arizona, 300,000 in Nevada.

If importations make more than 7.5 million acre-feet available, the excess is apportioned, as under the Supreme Court decree, one-half to California, one-half to Arizona and Nevada. This is important to the Metropolitan Water District. That district, being junior to 3.85 million acre-feet of California's agricultural priorities, would receive only 550,000 acre-feet if California should receive only 4.4 million. For the balance (662,000 acre-feet) of its total Colorado River contract supply (1.212 million), it must look to water available to California in excess of 4.4 million. The bill provides that this excess shall be charged for at actual cost, not at Colorado River prices.

Section 304(a), protecting the 4.4 million, is substantially the amendment drafted by Attorney General Mosk last year. Section 304(b), which continues this protection until 2.5 million annually is imported (the Kuchel formula), was drafted in collaboration with Attorney General Thomas Lynch, of California, and his staff.

3. Construction of Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams. Title III also authorizes construction of Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams and powerplants as cash registers to finance repayment of the cost of the whole project, including importation works, when authorized. The Bridge Canyon Dam will be a high dam, backing water about 13 miles into the Grand Canyon National Park. (The act of February 26, 1919, 40 Stat. 1175, authorizes this, if it is done in aid of a reclamation project.) But the bill requires the lake level to be held within a range of 10 feet in elevation, to the extent practicable. This will enable visitors by boat to see spectacular canyon scenery, now inaccessible, and avoid unsightly lowering of the lake. To avoid any implication that Marble Canyon Dam will be a diversion structure for the Kanab project (which this bill does not authorize), the bill prohibits diversion of water at Bridge or Marble Canyon Dams for use elsewhere. These provisions were asked by people primarily interested in scenic and recreation values. So also with provisions assuring protection of fish and wildlife along the river, including reservation of 84,000 acre-feet (outside California's share of water, however), for these purposes.

4. Protection of areas of origin. Important provisions for protection of areas and States of origin appear in titles II and III. Thus, in section 201(a)(2) the Secretary is directed, in planning works to import water, to "make provision for adequate and equitable protection of the interests of the States and areas of origin, including assistance from the development fund established by title IV of this act, to the end that water supplies may be available for use therein adequate to satisfy their ultimate requirements at prices to users not adversely affected by the exportation of water to the Colorado River system." Section 304(b), which terminates the protection of California's 4.4 million acre-feet when the President proclaims that works capable of delivering annually 2.5 million acre-feet into the river have been completed, stipulates that the proclamation must state "that such sources are adequate, in the President's judgment, to supply such quantities without adverse effect upon the satisfaction of the foreseeable water requirements of any State from which such water is imported into the Colorado River system."

5. Basin account. Title IV creates a basin account (development fund) into which will be paid revenues from Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, and also from Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams after those projects have paid out. Net revenues will be applied to repayment of the cost of the whole project, including the cost of the importation works, when later authorized.

6. Law of the river. Title V requires the Secretary to conform to the law of the river, and if he does not do so, grants consent to suit by any affected State in the Supreme Court, joining the United States as a party.

I recommend this measure.

Respectfully,

NORTHCUTT ELY,
Special Counsel,
Colorado River Board of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk until the close of business on February 17, in the hope, which I trust may not be vain, that my colleagues from Arizona may see fit to join my colleague from California and me in sponsoring the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 1019) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF DR. SYDNEY PHILIP TRAUB

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Dr. Sydney Philip Traub. Dr. Traub is a neuroradiologist with an outstanding reputation in his profession. He is married to an American citizen and is presently doing research for the University of Oklahoma Medical Center in Oklahoma City. Dr. Traub has spent considerable time in the United States having interned at the Jewish Hospital of St. Louis, Mo., and having done his residency in pathology at Mount Sinai Hospital and Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio. He also spent 3 years in Minneapolis, Minn., during his fellowship in radiology at the University of Minnesota.

He is performing invaluable research in radiology at the Oklahoma Medical Center, but due to a quirk in our State law his services may be ended unless he is permitted to obtain his American citizenship.

This bill would permit Dr. Traub to be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no additional period of residence would be required. Dr. Traub would make an excellent U.S. citizen and I am sure contribute greatly to the march of medicine in our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1020) for the relief of Dr. Sydney Philip Traub, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SAFETY REGULATIONS FOR INTERSTATE PIPELINES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to place pipelines under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the purpose of establishing safety regulations for interstate pipelines.

Safety in transportation, either of passengers or property, is uppermost in the mind of the public. The transportation industries subject to safety regulations realize that the public interest demands that such regulation be applied consistently, rather than applied to some forms of transportation and not to others.

The bill I am introducing will bring about more consistency in the regulation of safety of interstate carriers subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The proposed legislation would make oil pipelines subject to safety regulation by the Commission.

Prior to 1960 the ICC, under authority of the Transportation of Explosives Act of March 4, 1921, presumably had authority to establish safety regulations for oil pipelines. Several surveys were made by the ICC but no comprehensive code of safety regulations was deemed necessary.

This situation continued until the law pertaining to the transportation of explosives was amended in 1960 to modernize the act to encompass the movement of new commodities such as radioactive materials and etiologic agents. In the course of the enactment of this legislation oil pipelines were, inadvertently, I believe, from the research I have done on the subject, removed from the jurisdiction of the ICC with respect to safety regulations. This bill would restore the Commission's authority.

I should point out that the need for such legislation has been recommended by an interagency committee on dangerous cargoes that made a comprehensive study of the subject. The Interstate Commerce Commission favors restoration of the safety authority repealed in 1960, pointing out that "if the Commission is again vested with authority over all pipelines in the field of safety, the carriers will be protected against hazards which may arise by virtue of changes in the operations or traffic consist of oil pipelines."

Finally, I should add that the oil pipeline industry has asked that the Congress restore the Commission's safety jurisdiction in the field of oil pipeline safety. The bill I am presenting will accomplish that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1021) to amend title 18, chapter 39, of the United States Code, entitled "Explosives and Combustibles," introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

FLEXIBILITY TO STATES IN THE USE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC HEALTH GRANTS-IN-AID

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, for myself and Senators BARTLETT, ERVIN, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MOSS, MUNDT, PEARSON, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide greater flexibility to States in the use of certain public health grants-in-aid. I ask unanimous consent to have this bill lie on the table for 7 days so that other Senators may join in cosponsoring it.

The proposed legislation implements a recommendation of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The senior Senator from North Carolina, the senior Senator from South Dakota, and I have been members of the Commission since it was established.

In the last Congress I introduced similar legislation, S. 1051, but the bill I introduce today differs substantially from S. 1051. It does provide greater flexibility in the use of Federal grants for certain public health programs. But, unlike S. 1051, it does not seek to standardize Federal procedures for the allotment of grant funds.

The bill amends the Public Health Services Act. It permits States to transfer up to one-third of the Federal funds granted in any one of five health categories. These transfers must be to one or more of the other categories in this group of health programs. The categories involved are: general health assistance, cancer control, heart disease control, tuberculosis control, and venereal disease control. Other health grants are not affected for administrative reasons.

Mr. President, the sole purpose of the bill is to provide greater flexibility in State use of Federal grant funds. For many years now these funds have flowed to the States within the rigid confines of the categorical structure. At first, most of these public health programs were established to initiate or stimulate specific types of activity. Today, as a general rule, the major cost of these health activities is borne by the States. The Federal Government plays only a supporting role.

Further, the needs of the States vary considerably. Therefore, the States should have greater discretion in the use of the Federal funds. If the States can transfer up to one-third of the funds in these categories, State health officers will be able to meet unusual and frequently changing needs. With this flexibility, the overall purpose and integrity of the State health programs will be strengthened.

Many groups support this legislation: the Governors' Conference, the National Association of State Budget Officers, the National Association of Attorneys General, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the Executive Committee of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, and the National Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments. Each of these important national organizations has adopted a formal resolution urging adoption of this measure.

The enactment of this bill, Mr. President, would eliminate one of the obstacles to better Federal-State relations. I ask unanimous consent that its text be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The bill (S. 1023) to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, by providing greater flexibility to States in the use of certain public health grants-in-aid, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(n) To enable the Surgeon General to assist, through grants, States, counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the State, and public and nonprofit agencies, institutions and other organizations, in establishing and maintaining organized community programs of cancer control, including grants for demonstrations and the training of personnel, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for such purposes. The Surgeon General shall, in accordance with regulations, from time to time make allotments from sums appropriated under this subsection to the several States on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the financial need of the respective States, and (3) the extent of the cancer problem. Upon making such allotments, the Surgeon General shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts thereof.

"(o) Not more than one-third of the amounts allotted to any State pursuant to subsection (a), (b), (c), (e), or (n) of this section may, at the option of the State concerned, be transferred for use to carry out the purposes of any other of such subsections. Any amount so transferred to carry out the purposes of such subsection shall be deemed to constitute a part of the allotment made under such subsection, for purposes of subsection (h)."

CORRECTING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (h) of section 314 of such Act is amended by striking out "and (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(e), and (n), (including as a part of any such allotment amounts transferred pursuant to subsection (o) to carry out the purpose for which such allotment was made)".

(b) (1) Subsection (g) of section 314 of such Act is amended by inserting "or subsection (n)," after "or subsection (e)".

(2) Subsection (i) of such section 314 is amended by inserting "or subsection (n)," after "or subsection (e),".

(3) Subsection (1) of such section 314 is amended by striking out "or (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(e) or (n)".

PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS IN COAL MINES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce for myself, and Senators BARTLETT, BAYH, DOUGLAS, and MCGEE, a bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to prevent accidents in small coal mines.

When this act became law in 1952—Public Law 552, 82d Congress—it contained in section 201(b) a limiting provision that exempted mines employing regularly 14 and fewer persons underground from the mandatory prvoisions of that act.

From 1940 through 1964, 283 disaster-type accidents have occurred in the exempted underground coal mines and they resulted in the death of 101 persons and injury of 204 others. In eight of the explosions, all the men underground were killed. Bureau of Mines records show that imminent danger of explosion, fire, inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident was cited in reports on 23 percent of the exempted mines inspected during the last 5 months of 1964, and that less than 2 percent of these cited dangers were abated during the Federal inspection.

During the period 1952 through 1964, the number of exempted underground mines increased 24 percent whereas the number of mines covered by the mandatory provisions of title II decreased 56 percent. The number of employees in exempted underground mines increased from 26,451 in 1952 to 31,549 in 1962, whereas the number of employees in title II mines decreased from 264,711 to 72,238 in the same period.

In 1952, only 9 percent of the total underground coal mine employees were not protected by the mandatory provisions of title II of the act. By 1962, this figure had increased to 30 percent and is expected to be higher when the 1963 and 1964 data are available. Thus, the exemption of small mines had far less significance in 1952 than it has today.

The bill I am introducing today has been before us in previous Congresses. The need for its enactment has never been more clear than it is now. I hope final action can be taken this session.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be left on the desk for 5 legislative days for further cosponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 1032) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines, introduced by Mr. Moss (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] joins as a cosponsor and asks that his name be added to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERMOUNTAIN REGION DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to provide public works and economic development programs, and planning and coordination essential to the development of the intermountain region. For the purposes of this bill, the region would encompass the high plateau country surrounding the four corners area of the country where the States of Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico meet.

The bill would establish an Intermountain Development Authority to work out, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local planning agencies and groups, an overall, coordinated program for the development of the region. The program would include plans for water development, road construction, land use, and public works.

The problems of the people in the area are similar, although several States are involved. Economic growth has been slowed down by a shortage of water for municipal, agricultural, and industrial expansion, by depressed metal prices, by low standard roads and inadequate transportation generally, and by reductions in established industries because of changed requirements in the national economy. These factors have contributed to making it an area of uneven development, which has not permitted self-sustaining growth.

There are pockets of unemployment, and a lack of opportunity for new jobs. Lower incomes have produced a lower standard of living, and in some instances, poorer educational opportunities and facilities. Although there are exceptions, it is generally an area of high out-migration.

I feel it is time that we attacked the common problems of the area with a plan of action suited to them. The local people, the county governments, and the State governments are not prepared with an immediate plan for development. But an Intermountain States Development Authority, working with local, county, and State governments, can establish such plans, and achieve the coordination which will produce the results we are seeking.

One million dollars would be appropriated for the use of the Intermountain Development Authority, which would be composed of nine members, two from each State, and a chairman.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide public works planning, coordination and implementation of economic development programs needed to assist in the development of the intermountain region. I ask that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1033) to provide public works planning, coordination, and implementation of economic development programs needed to assist in the development of the intermountain region, introduced by Mr. Moss was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Intermountain Regional Development Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. A shortage of water for municipal, agricultural and industrial expansion, depressed metal prices, inadequate rail and highway transportation, and reductions in established industries because of changing requirements of the national economy have slowed down the economic growth of large areas of the Intermountain Region of the United States. Upgrading human and natural resources and their uses, road construction, and development of recreational potential of the region are prerequisites for vigorous and self-sustaining growth. Revitalization can best be assured through extensive cooperation between State, local, and Federal authorities in implementing development programs tailored to the natural and human resources of the region. Research by Federal, State, and private organizations has established the feasibility, the desirability, and the urgent need for regionwide development. It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to assist the region in meeting its special problems, to promote economic development, and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward making the adaptions and advances essential to growth on a coordinated and concerted basis. As the region obtains greater development of its local water resources and new water supplies are imported from water-surplus areas, as new technologies help basic industries to better compete with production both in this country and abroad, and as human resources are better marshalled to guide and operate its new activities, Congress expects that this region will then be able to participate more effectively in the national free enterprise economy.

TITLE I—THE INTERMOUNTAIN STATES DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Membership and Voting

SEC. 101. (a) The Intermountain States Development Authority (referred to as the "Authority") shall be composed of nine members, five appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: Four members appointed, one from each participating State, from among one or more nominees by the Governor of such State; four members appointed, one from each participating State; and one member, appointed at the discretion of the President, who shall serve as Chairman and executive officer of the Authority. No member of the Authority shall be the holder of a full-time public office in either State or Federal Government.

(b) Decisions by the Authority, unless delegated to the Chairman, shall require the affirmative vote of the Chairman and four other members.

(c) The Chairman shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. There shall be a Deputy Chairman appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the Authority, who shall serve as his alternate and who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for Grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and when not serving as an alternate for the Chairman shall perform such duties as are delegated to him by the Chairman. Other members of the Authority shall receive compensation at a rate of $75 per diem for each day on which they are engaged in the performance of duties of the Authority, and shall be reimbursed by the Authority for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

Functions of the Authority

SEC. 102. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Authority shall—

(1) develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs including those for water development, road construction, land use and public works, and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region;

(2) conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including where necessary, inventory and analysis of the resources of the region, and, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth;

(3) review and study, in cooperation with the agency involved, Federal, State, and local public and private programs and, where appropriate, recommend modifications or additions which will increase their effectiveness in the region and assist in their financing;

(4) formulate and recommend, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and work with State and local agencies in developing appropriate model legislation;

(5) support existing local development districts and encourage their formation where needed by providing technical assistance and participating in the financing of professional staff and administration;

(6) encourage private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects;

(7) serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Federal, State and local programs in the region;

(8) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and propose solutions and establish and utilize, as appropriate, citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences;

(9) designate such counties in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah as part of the intermountain region for the purposes of this Act as the Authority determines necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act; and

(10) formulate for the Congress a program of development projects with proposals for Federal participating in their funding.

Administrative powers of the Authority

SEC. 103. To carry out its duties under this Act, the Authority is authorized to—

(1) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its functions;

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Authority to carry out its functions, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949;

(3) request the head of any Federal department or agency (who is hereby so authorized) to detail to temporary duty with the Authority such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as the Authority may need for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status;

(4) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any

subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

(5) accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

(6) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation;

(7) establish a permanent office at such location as it may select and field offices at such other places as it may deem appropriate; and

(8) take such other actions and incur such other expenses as may be necessary or appropriate.

TITLE II—SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR INTERMOUNTAIN REGION

Natural resource development

SEC. 201. In order to promote the conservation and fuller utilization of the natural resources of the region, the Authority is authorized to contract with or make grants to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, any State or political subdivision, agency or instrumentality thereof, any public or private educational institution or any private research organization, to carry on basic and applied research in the development of such resources.

Water resources development

SEC. 202. (a) In order to assure effective conservation and utilization of water and related resources and to coordinate such water resource planning with comprehensive regional planning for the Intermountain Region, the Authority, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Soil Conservation Service, and the Secretary of the Army, through the Corps of Engineers, shall develop and prepare detailed plans on water and related resources in the region, which shall include recommendations for projects for reclamation, flood control, municipal water supply, generation of hydroelectric power, prevention of water pollution, enhancement of recreational opportunities, and the conservation and ultilization of land resources.

(b) The Authority is authorized to consult with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Federal Power Commission on such plans on water and related resources as the Authority determines is necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.

(c) The Authority shall coordinate such plans on water and related resources with United States study commissions, and any other relevant planning agencies which have prepared comprehensive river basin plans for river systems draining into the Intermountain Region.

Recreational development: Golden Circle Scenic Highway

SEC. 203. In order to develop and coordinate the recreational resources of the region, the Authority, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall prepare detailed plans for a highway to provide better access to the scenic, archeological, historical, Indian and recreational features of the region to be known as the Golden Circle Scenic Highway. For the purposes of this section the Authority shall consider, among others, the following attractions of the region: Grand Canyon National Park, Zion National Park, Bryce Canyon National Park, Mesa Verde National Park, Petrified Forest National Park, and Canyonlands National Park; Capitol Reef National Monument, Arches National Monument, Colorado National Monument, Canyon de Chelly National Monument, Natural Bridges National Monument, Pipe Springs National Monument, Sunset Crater National Monument, and Wupatki National Monument; Glen Canyon Dam and National Recreation Area; the Navajo, Hopi and Zuni Indian Reservations; and associated national forest, public lands, Indian reservations and State parks.

Local development districts: Certification, financial assistance

SEC. 204. (a) For the purpose of this Act, a "local development district" shall be an entity certified to the Authority either by the Governor of the State or States in which such entity is located, or by the State officer designated by the appropriate State law to make such certification, as having a charter or authority that includes the economic development of counties or parts of counties or other political subdivisions within the region. No entity shall be certified as a local development district for the purposes of this Act unless it is one of the following:

(1) A nonprofit incorporated body organized or chartered under the law of the State in which it is located;

(2) A nonprofit agency or instrumentality of a State or local government;

(3) A nonprofit agency or instrumentality created through an interstate compact; or

(4) A nonprofit association or combination of such bodies, agencies, and instrumentalities.

(b) The Authority is authorized to make grants to certified local development districts for the costs of technical staff and consultant assistance to such districts. The amount of any such grant shall not exceed 90 per centum of such costs in any one fiscal year. The Authority may delegate staff members to assist certified local development districts to prepare requests for grants under this section.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 301. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the period ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $1,000,000 to carry out this Act, and for fiscal years thereafter such amounts as the Congress shall hereafter authorize.

Annual report

SEC. 302. Not later than six months after the close of each fiscal year, the Authority shall prepare and submit to the Governor of each State in the region and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on the activities carried out under this Act during such year.

Consent of States

SEC. 303. Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State to engage in or accept any program under this Act without its consent.

Definition of intermountain region

SEC. 304. As used in this Act, the term "Intermountain Region" means that area of the United States commonly known as "Four Corners", consisting of the following counties (including any political subdivision located within such area):

In Utah—Sanpete, Sevier, Piute, Garfield, Kane, Carbon, Emery, Grand, Wayne, San Juan, Washington, Iron, Beavor, Millard, and Juab; and

Such other counties in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah as are designated by the Authority under section 102 of this Act.

Mrs. **NEUBERGER** subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1033, the intermountain regional development bill introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] may lie at the table until Wednesday, February 10, 1965, for additional sponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1961

Mr. **MONTOYA.** Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make and insure loans to certain public bodies and nonprofit associations for the acquisition, improvement or extension of waste disposal and fuel distribution systems and other community services and to make construction grants to certain water systems and waste disposal systems serving rural areas, and for other purposes.

In his inaugural address, President Johnson said:

> Ours is a time of change—rapid and fantastic change—shaking old values and uprooting old ways.

The President did not merely refer to changes wrought by science, by our increased knowledge, by the harnessing of the atom, or by our exploration into space. The President referred to all change—including the rapid and fantastic changes that are taking place in our social structure.

One of the most dramatic and serious changes in our society is and has been the massive outpouring of millions of people from rural America into our cities. In the last decade a million farm families—5 million people—have left their farms to go to urban areas. Every single rural county in the Nation lost population in the same decade, meaning that millions more from rural communities migrated to cities.

This dislocation of rural people has created two serious major problems:

First. It has depleted rural America of many of its young people with their vigor and strength, their potential abilities, their enterprise, and ambition. It has eroded and weakened many rural communities with the subsequent loss of vital and necessary rural institutions such as churches, civic organizations, social centers, independent professional, and business services, parks, and recreational facilities, and other community services.

Second. The millions of migrating rural people by their very numbers have added to and compounded the problems of congestion, slums, transportation, crime, education, and health of cities. Because most of the rural people moving to urban areas have been and are poorly educated and untrained and therefore unemployable, have swelled the unemployed ranks and overburdened the relief roles. All of this has added astronomical costs to cities.

Preliminary reports of a study being made by Iowa State College indicate that the No. 1 reason rural people move to cities is the great disparity between the living and social facilities of rural areas and those of the city.

In short, rural American communities are unattractive. Personal reasons for moving out boil down to the bald choice of a bathroom or no bathroom, water from a faucet or an old well; throwing slop and dishwater out the back door or down the sewer, a local doctor or no doctor, adequate recreation, and entertainment facilities or no community hall at all. The list is endless.

The bill I am introducing is no cure-all for the problems I have outlined, but it is an important first step.

There are some 30,000 rural areas that lack adequate water systems and many of these communities need grant assistance to start their development.

Further, community water systems without accompanying community sewer systems are really no solution. By all rules of logic and common sense both systems, in most cases, should be financed and installed at the same time. As central water systems become available, water use climbs dramatically. The disposal of used and soiled water becomes a major problem, a serious health hazard. Previously built cesspools and septic tanks are inadequate and the danger of pollution increases at an alarming rate.

According to the 1960 Census—the latest available: there were over 4 million farm and rural nonfarm homes without any kind of sewage disposal facilities; there were over 8.5 million farm and rural nonfarm homes with private cesspools or septic tanks—many grossly inadequate.

This gives you some idea of the magnitude of the problems. This bill is designed to help remedy this problem, with loans and grants to distressed, low-income communities.

Another objective of this bill is to help rural communities construct and develop other needed community facilities such as auditoriums, clinics, community halls and fire-protection centers.

The day is not long past when the country schoolhouse served not only as the community's education center but was its indispensable cultural, social and entertainment center as well. In the interest of better education and better school facilities there has been a rapid consolidation of rural school districts and an equally rapid disappearance of the small rural school.

In 1948, there were nearly 75,000 one-teacher schools—practically all of them in rural areas. Today there are less than 10,000 such schools left. School districts of all kinds—most of them in rural areas—have declined from 100,971 in 1948 to approximately 26,000 today.

This change was inevitable and probably for the best, but it has left thousands of rural communities without a social and entertainment center. It leaves a huge and unattractive gap in rural life.

This bill would assist a low-income rural community to close that gap and become a more attractive place to live.

Finally, there are many rural areas in this country that are adjacent to adequate sources of natural gas. Private utilities are not interested in extending service to most rural areas and no other financing is presently available to associations of farmers and rural residents for this purpose.

Use of this gas for homes, as fuel for irrigation pump motors and for local industry would greatly enhance living standards, increase property values and encourage economic growth.

This bill would, through loans, provide assistance to communities and associations to finance gas distribution systems to provide fuel at economical rates.

We are all agreed—from the President on down—that we must move steadily and courageously toward the goal of a Great Society. We are all agreed that the first step is to win the war against poverty.

Rural America, where only one-third of our people reside, has half of all the poor people in the country.

It does not make sense to move rural poor people to cities where they remain even poorer—economically and spiritually. It does not even make sense from a standpoint of cost.

It is cheaper, better, and more effective to lick poverty where it is.

The program I have outlined in this bill will have other economic advantages. Construction of water and sewer and gas fuel systems, the construction of community centers will provide immediate and substantial employment. It would pump new money into communities. The new community services will attract new enterprises, new industry which in turn will provide more jobs and more money into rural America.

Most of this program would be in the form of insured loans—to be repaid with interest. In the end, actual cost to Federal Government and to the taxpayer would be minimal. It would be a far different operation than trying to salvage the same people in the gigantic urban centers.

Farmers Home Administration is the proper agency to handle this program. It has the experience, the know-how and the expertise in similar programs where it has done an outstanding job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1034) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make and insure loans to certain public bodies and nonprofit associations for the acquisition, construction, improvement or extension of waste disposal and fuel distribution systems and other community services and to make construction grants with respect to certain water systems and waste disposal systems serving rural areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO EXTEND THE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD BENEFITS TO CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more.

This measure is the same as the bill I introduced in the 88th Congress and which I proposed as an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1964. During the course of the floor debate the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] offered an amendment to my proposal which, I regret, largely removed the substance of the measure. Senator LONG's amendment carried, but it did not survive the conference committee action.

It is my view that the original bill has great merit and that it takes into account the social change which has occurred in America. Great numbers of older single persons do, in fact, maintain a household of their own. The present law is unrealistic in that it gives no recognition for tax purposes of the expenses that single persons have in maintaining a household nor does it recognize the need of older single persons to have such a household.

Many single persons, by the time they are 35, have no family home in which to live even if they desired to do so. Others live too far away to have their residence with their parents and they must maintain a separate household if they are to continue their work. In general, those over 35 who are working and making an income have established a pattern of life which requires their maintenance of a household because of their place or position in society or simply for the sake of decency and convenience in living.

These single persons often contribute to the support of their parents or other dependents, although not all of them to the degree required to qualify as head of household under the present tax law. They pay the same social security taxes as married wage earners but do not receive the same benefits, for instance benefits for dependents. They contribute—and they are expected to contribute as single persons—to many socially useful causes in a greater degree than many married people. Their costs and expenses of maintaining a household deserve to be recognized in the tax law. We have accepted in the tax law that a husband and wife, both working and without dependents, can have the advantages of special tax consideration of split income. Why should not a single person who also maintains a household be given recognition for the particular expenses which have become a necessity for his or her way of life?

It is estimated that there are nearly 18 million single persons in the United States who are 35 years of age or over. Of these, 13 million are women. The problem is especially serious for the single woman. Her need for privacy and permanence is greater than that of single men.

The problems confronting widows and widowers are also serious. If they do not have dependents, they are placed in the status of single persons in the year following the death of the spouse, even though they may be struggling to maintain a home for themselves and to readjust their lives.

The present law permits some unmarried persons to claim "head of household" status if they meet certain conditions. These conditions include their having furnished over half the cost of maintaining as their home a household which was the principal place of abode of certain related persons and dependents. It also permits widows or widowers with dependent children and who meet other qualifications to file a joint return if their spouse died during either of the 2 preceding taxable years.

I ask unanimous consent that the instructions related to these categories, as listed in "Your Federal Income Tax Return, Form 1040, for 1964" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the instructions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Your Federal Income Tax Return, Form 1040, for 1964

MARRIED PERSONS—JOINT OR SEPARATE RETURNS

Advantages of a joint return: Generally it is advantageous for a married couple to file a joint return. There are benefits in figuring the tax on a joint return, which often result in a lower tax than would result from separate returns.

How to prepare a joint return: You must include all income, exemptions, and deductions of both husband and wife. In the return heading, list both names including middle initials (for example: "John F. and Mary L. Doe"). Both must sign the return.

A husband and wife may file a joint return even though one of them had no income. A joint return may not be filed if either husband or wife was a nonresident alien at any time during the taxable year.

When a joint return is filed, the couple assumes full legal responsibility for the entire tax, and if one fails to pay, the other must pay it.

How to prepare a separate return: Separate returns may be filed by husband and wife where each has income of his own. In such case each should report his or her own income, exemptions, and deductions in separate returns. Only the name of the filer should be entered in the name and address area of the return. Check the box "married filing separately," line 1c, page 1 of the return and give the first name and social security number of your husband or wife in the space provided. When filing separate returns, the husband and wife should each claim the allowable deductions paid with his or her own funds. (In community property States, deductions resulting from payments made out of funds belonging jointly to husband and wife may be divided half and half.) If one itemizes and claims actual deductions then both must do so. If one uses the 10 percent standard deduction (instead of the minimum standard deduction—line 11a(2), p. 1, form 1040), then the other may not use the minimum standard deduction.

A separate return may also be filed where only the husband or wife had income. Enter only the name of the one having income in the name and address area. Check the box "married filing separately," line 1c, page 1 of the return and do not enter your wife's (husband's) first name or social security number. To claim the exemption for your wife or husband check the boxes provided in line 2, page 1.

Changes in marital status: If you are married at the end of your taxable year, you are considered married for the entire year. If you are divorced or legally separated on or before the end of your taxable year, you are considered single for the entire year.

If your wife or husband died during the year, you are considered married for the entire year. Generally a joint return may be filed for the year provided you have not remarried before the end of the year. If an executor or administrator has been appointed, the return should be filed by both you and the executor or administrator. If no executor or administrator has been appointed, you may file the return. Indicate you are filing as a surviving husband or wife in the signature area of the return. If a refund is due, attach Form 1310: Statement of Claimant to Refund Due on Behalf of Deceased Taxpayer. You may also be entitled to the benefits of a joint return for the 2 years following the death of your husband or wife. See "Widows and Widowers," below.

SPECIAL COMPUTATIONS

Unmarried head of household: The law provides special tax rates for any individual who qualifies as a head of household. Only the following persons may qualify: (a) one who is unmarried (or legally separated) at the end of the taxable year, or (b) one who is married at the end of the year to an individual who was a nonresident alien at any time during the taxable year. In addition, you must have furnished over half of the cost of maintaining as your home a household which during the entire year, except for temporary absence, was occupied as the principal place of abode and as a member of such household by (1) any related person other than your unmarried child or stepchild (see list under "line 3," paragraph 5, on page 4 of these instructions) for whom you are entitled to a deduction for an exemption, unless the deduction arises from a multiple-support agreement, or (2) your unmarried child, grandchild, or stepchild, even though such child is not a dependent.

The home you maintain for your father and mother need not be your residence.

See head of household rates on page 10.

Widows and widowers: Under certain conditions a taxpayer whose husband (or wife) has died during either of her 2 preceding taxable years may compute her tax by including only her income, exemptions, and deductions, but otherwise computing the tax as if a joint return had been filed. However, the exemption for the decedent may be claimed only for the year of death.

The conditions are that the taxpayer (a) must not have remarried, (b) must maintain as her home a household which is the principal place of abode of her child or stepchild for whom she is entitled to a deduction for an exemption, and (c) must have been entitled to file a joint return with her husband (or wife) for the year of death.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the bill which I am introducing would permit for income tax purposes the inclusion of all unmarried persons age 35 or over, as well as widows and widowers, in the category of head of household.

Under the Revenue Act of 1964, a single taxpayer with taxable income of $6,000 will pay a tax of $1,130 on his 1965 income. A head of household with the same taxable income will pay $70 less.

A single taxpayer with taxable income of $8,000 will pay $1,630 while a head of household with the same taxable income will pay $130 less.

A single taxpayer with taxable income of $12,000 will pay $2,830. A head of household with equal taxable income will pay $290 less.

This bill is a step in the direction of equity. It will mean a justified tax adjustment but beyond this, it will provide in the law a recognition of the fact that single persons over 35 who are working and maintaining a household have an established way of life that imposes its own particular expenses and which deserves to be treated with respect and equity. The Congress should make adjustments in the personal income tax rates which were called for following the adoption of the split-income principle given to married persons.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 1 week so that Senators who wish to cosponsor the bill may have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 1035) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head-of-household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more, introduced by Mr. McCarthy, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE ADJUSTMENT OF INEQUITIES AND OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, we boast of the fact that our Nation is the strongest and most prosperous in the world today, but too often we forget to be thankful for the reasons this is so. One great contribution to the strength and prosperity of our Nation is the loyal service of devoted and capable civil employees—not only now but in the years gone by. We have generously recognized the contributions of our employees who are serving us today, but what have we done for those who have given us the last full measure of service and devotion, and are now on the retirement rolls?

According to figures recently published, the average salary paid under the Classification Act on June 30, 1964, was $7,239; at the same time the average postal salary was $5,889, the average wage board salary $5,530, and the average salary under other pay systems $6,618. Substantial salary increases approved after June 30, 1964, have increased the average Classification Act salary 4.3 percent to $7,550, and the average postal salary 5.6 percent to $6,218. As of June 30, 1964, there were 2,784 retired Federal employees in my home State of New Mexico, who received a total of $468,183 per month, or an average annual rate of $2,016 per year. There were also 822 survivors of former Federal employees who receive a total of $68,360 per month, representing an average annual annuity of $996. New Mexico ranks a little below the national average of $2,196 in annuities paid to retired Federal employees, but the survivors are at the average annual rate of $996. These people received no increase at all in their annuities last year.

This forgetfulness toward the retired Federal employees of our great Government has extended back for almost 10 years. In 1955, there was a general salary adjustment for classified and postal employees and a matching increase in the annuities of retired employees and their survivors. Since that time, salaries have been increased five times without any matching increase in annuities. There has been only one general increase in annuities during the past 10 years—an increase of 5 percent which became effective January 1, 1963.

During this 10-year period, the cost of living as reflected in the Consumer Price Index has risen from an average of 93.3 in 1955 to an average of 108.1 for 1964, an increase of more than 15 percent. Classified salaries were increased 10 percent in 1958, 7.7 percent in 1960, 5.5 percent in 1962, 4.1 percent on January 1, 1964, and 4.3 percent in July 1964, a cumulative increase of 34.8 percent. Postal salaries were increased 10.2 percent in 1958, 8.3 percent in 1960, 8.6 percent in 1962, 2.6 percent on January 1, 1964, and 5.6 percent in July, 1964, a cumulative increase of 40.4 percent. Salaries of employees were increased substantially more than double the increase in the cost of living, while annuities advanced about one-third the increase in the cost of living.

Although there is a cost-of-living adjustment provision in present laws to bring about an automatic increase in annuities to match an increase of 3 percent or more since 1962, this cannot be operative until April 1, 1966, and these forgotten annuitants need an adjustment to make up for the neglected annuity increases over the past 10 years.

My bill would help to correct this situation by providing an immediate annuity increase of 10 percent on each annuity up to $3,000 per year, and an increase of 5 percent on the portion of any annuity over $3,000. This would make up for the lack of increases to match the increase in the cost of living during the past 10 years, while still leaving the automatic increase provision to take care of current and future increases in the cost of living.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1037) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Montoya, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COLORED GLASS WINDOWS FOR ST. ANN'S CHURCH, LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the free entry of chipped colored glass windows for St. Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev.

Mr. President, this bill was introduced late in the second session of the last Congress, so there was insufficient time to complete action on it. I hope it can be passed expeditiously this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1038) to provide for the free entry of chipped colored glass windows for the use of St. Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev., introduced by Mr. Cannon, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create a new Department of Housing and Urban Development. The bill would consolidate the present Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, and the Federal National Mortgage Association in one Cabinet-level Department under a Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

I have introduced similar proposed legislation in each new Congress ever since I became a Member of the Senate, in 1957.

I point out that the President has called for the establishment of the new Department as a step toward rebuilding the Nation's cities and improving the quality of urban life.

This is not a bill for the big cities alone. It is addressed to the problems of our metropolitan areas, large and small. It is addressed to the problems of suburbia as much as it is addressed to the problems of the central cities. It gives our metropolitan areas equal voice in the Cabinet with our rural areas who have had a representative—the Secretary of Agriculture—in the Cabinet for more than a century. Soon, three-fourths of all Americans will live in our metropolitan areas. The problems of crowded urban and suburban living are among the most urgent in America today. Those problems must have Cabinet attention. They must be recognized at the highest levels of Government. This bill would afford them that recognition.

The bill adds no new programs to those already enacted. Its cost will be negligible. Its purpose will be orderly administration.

I hope that the 1st session of the 89th Congress will bring into effect this badly needed administrative reform which I, at least, have been urging on Congress for the last 8 years and many before me.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk until Friday, February 12, for the addition of cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1045) to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Clark, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF PART II OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I reintroduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act.

This amendment proposes to give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to decline jurisdiction over services or transportation which will not substantially impair, interfere, or affect interstate commerce.

Specifically it is aimed at redressing grievances which have been caused pigeon enthusiasts, who frequently must ship their birds thousands of miles in preparation for races back to the home roost.

Under the present rules pigeon racers are subjected to unnecessary difficulties and expenses which prevent them from pursuing this popular sport with a requisite amount of freedom. To transport these pigeons from one place to another, they are now forced to use specially licensed interstate carriers whose rates are prohibitively high. The end result is only inconvenience for the shipper and a good deal of feather-ruffling for the pigeon, which is a delicate animal requiring tender care.

In view of the fact that the shipment of homing pigeons can hardly be classified as "big business" requiring agency supervision, I feel this amendment is both just and sensible. It will enable the Interstate Commission to refuse to regulate the interstate shipment of these pigeons, and thereby in one short stroke eliminate this problem.

I therefore urge the Senate to act favorably and quickly on this proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1046) to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to authorize exemption from the provisions of such part, of services, and transportation of such nature, character, or quantity as not substantially to affect or impair uniform motor carrier regulation, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

A BILL TO REQUIRE ADEQUATE PATENT PROTECTION FOR AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, article I of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to "promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

To accomplish this purpose, Congress has established a comprehensive system for protecting the creative products of our scientists, inventors, and writers. Over the years, this system of complex legislation has been efficiently administered by the U.S. Patent Office, and countless individuals have thus received long-term benefits from their own imaginative work.

However, the basic principle of protection of patent rights is now being threatened by recent purchasing policies of the Department of Defense. Acting under a 1958 ruling promulgated by the Comptroller General that defense must buy all its supplies at the lowest possible price regardless of any possible patent infringement, Federal purchasing agencies have been buying many U.S. patented products from foreign sources which have manufactured these products with stolen patents and trade secrets.

It is clear that such purchasing policies will seriously injure those American firms and individuals which have already secured their legitimate patent rights from the U.S. Patent Office as well as greatly undermine confidence and respect in the existing system of patent protection. In short, one segment of the U.S. Government—the defense procurement agencies—are acting in clear violation of congressional policy.

I think that such actions must be stopped, and that Congress must take immediate action to halt these purchases of foreign goods.

It has been argued that these purchases are justified on the ground that the prices quoted by suppliers of the unlicensed foreign goods are substantially lower than those of American patent owners and their licensees. Such an argument ignores the basic elements of the American industrial picture.

Of course, foreign firms—for example, Italian drug firms—can manufacture goods more cheaply than their American counterparts for they pay wages that are one-fourth of the rates prevailing in the United States.

These foreign businesses are exploiting a readymade situation. They are not the companies which have to bear the heavy costs of equipping a modern research laboratory, of paying the salaries of topflight, highly trained scientists, of developing a market and building up demand for new and revolutionary products.

The facile cry of lower foreign prices ignores both the long-range and short-range consequences of such purchases. Initially, these purchases cannot avoid adversely affecting American workers, the reduction in sales volume of American products and the further patent violations which will be encouraged will result in immediate dollar losses to local firms and layoffs of American workers. To this must be added what the economists call the "multiplier effect"—as jobs are lost by our wage earners, personal income decreases, consumer purchases fall at an alarming rate, and other workers in affected sectors of the economy lose their positions as demand for consumer goods declines.

Naturally, the loss of American revenues will result in the further loss of tax revenues to Federal, State, and local governments. While losses of this type cannot be precisely estimated, it is clear that they will represent substantial cuts in the vitally needed revenues of all our governmental units.

From a long-range viewpoint, a further consequence of such procurement policies—and this will be especially noticeable in the drug and electronic industries—will be the discouragement of invaluable research and investigation. Needless to say, experimentation in vital products for defense industries and medical advancement is no dispensable luxury. These are necessities of life for us—for our continued existence as the best defended and protected Nation in the world and for our achievement of the Great Society's goals.

One of the most significant effects of this buying of foreign goods may well be its adverse effect on our overall balance of payments. With all the concern being expressed over the continuing outflow of gold from this country, surely we should be doubly dubious about wasting precious dollar purchases on foreign products which are merely capitalizing on American expertise and know-how.

Finally, let us be entirely candid and practical about the situation we are dealing with. We are not launching any know-nothing buy America campaign. The firms from which these agencies are buying their goods have neither developed the product, nor contributed the brains and imagination to creating the product, nor maintained aggressive marketing and advertising organizations which are vital for promoting the sales of new products. In short, our American firms have earned their patents: these foreign firms are merely skimming the cream off the top.

Unfortunately, the existing statutory scheme provides a most inadequate remedy for the U.S. patentholder who is being so unfairly dealt with. Section 1498 of title 28 of the United States Code merely allows an aggrieved party who believes that his patent has been infringed to sue the Federal Government in the Court of Claims for damages. In the case of an agency like the Defense Department, the firm could follow administrative procedures and negotiate for damages and reasonable royalty fees.

Clearly, both of these avenues are long, expensive, and very, very uncertain of success. Significantly, an aggrieved party cannot even obtain any degree of preliminary injunctive relief against a patent-infringing Government agency, no matter how strong a case it could make out in the courts. In effect, the Federal Government is enjoying what amounts to a preferred position with respect to its own violation of the very patents it has issued.

This situation is demonstrably unfair. It is denying to a substantial segment of the business community the guarantees and equal protection of our patent laws. These firms have acted in good-faith reliance on our patent laws and in the expectation that they will be adhered to and respected by everyone, and most obviously by everyone associated with the Federal Government itself.

To remedy this inequitable situation, the bill I am now introducing will clearly spell out prohibitions against the Secretary of Defense authorizing the use or manufacture of any product validly patented under U.S. laws, unless the Secretary of Defense makes a specific determination that such use or manufacture is required by the needs of national defense.

In this way, American firms will receive adequate protection from the unprincipled activities of unlicensed foreign businesses, and will be assured of continuing respect and strengthening of the U.S. patent system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this bill now be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1047) to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1047

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1498 of title 28, United States code, is amended by adding immediately after and underneath the last paragraph of such section the following new paragraph:

"Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the use or manufacture by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States, which has not previously been held invalid by an unappealed or unappealable judgment or decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, without license of the owner thereof, unless the Secretary of Defense, or his delegate, shall determine in the case of each such invention that the national security of the United States requires such use or manufacture."

AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, under title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, Public Law 88-204, which provides matching funds for the construction of college buildings, 22 percent of each State's total allotment is reserved for the exclusive use of public community colleges and public technical institutes.

My State of South Dakota is one of several States which does not have such institutions. While I thoroughly commend the desire to encourage development of technical training and community colleges, particularly in urban areas, the real need in South Dakota and, I suspect, other States, is not for more institutions of higher learning. In a State of some 700,000 people we already have 17 institutions of higher education. At present, there are only 2 towns of more than 5,000 population in South Dakota which are without a full 4-year institution of higher education. Neither has a population exceeding 15,000.

Clearly, the critical need in my State is to assure adequate support for the schools now in existence, not additional colleges. At its first closing date on October 15, 1964, the South Dakota Commission on Higher Education Facilities had received applications totaling $755,473. Because the State's allotment for 4-year schools was only $719,682, the commission was not able to provide the maximum Federal assistance to all of the eligible projects. A far greater excess of applications over available funds is anticipated for the second year.

The better method of development of technical training for South Dakota would be to introduce appropriate programs as a part of the curriculum of the existing 4-year schools. Forcing a State such as South Dakota, already so richly supplied with institutions of higher education, to build more institutions in order to obtain its Federal share, appears to be going in the wrong direction.

For these reasons, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, to make allotments under section 103 available under certain conditions for the payment of the Federal share for the construction of academic facilities for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutions.

This amendment, which incorporates a ratio of existing institutions to population, is narrowly drawn so as not to contradict or contravene the original intent of the act. It is based on the theory that sound development of higher education in the rural, more sparsely populated States would be better served by a limited provision for the reallocation of funds.

On another matter, Mr. President, I also will introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act to authorize administrative expenses for State plans for an additional fiscal year. It is my understanding that it was the intent of the original act to provide funds for administrative costs for the first 2 years of operation. Because appropriations followed passage of the original act by a year, funds will not be available after June 30 of this year. The amendment which I offer is designed to correct this situation. It will encourage further State support for administrative purposes and will further the intent of this excellent legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

S. 1048. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to make allotments under section 103 available under certain conditions for the payment of the Federal share for the construction of academic facilities for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1049. A bill to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed constitutional amendment to allow the voters of any State, in a one-man, one-vote referendum, to determine if one house of their State legislature should be apportioned on a basis other than population alone.

I have long believed that urban areas require fairer treatment in the apportionment of many State legislatures. It was this principle which the U.S. Supreme Court recognized in the 1962 Baker against Carr decision asserting jurisdiction in the Federal courts to test the fairness of State legislative apportionment under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, and also in the landmark decision last year, Reynolds against Sims, holding that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned upon a population basis, that is, on a one-man, one-vote basis.

While I believe that the Court was historically correct in its decision in Reynolds against Sims, I feel very strongly that most Americans are firmly convinced that the so-called Federal system is a wise one and should be applied equally to the Congress and to State legislatures.

My proposed constitutional amendment would permit the people of a State to determine in a one-man, one-vote, statewide referendum whether they wish to have one house of their State legislature apportioned on a basis other than population alone. Under the proposed amendment the second house would still have to remain apportioned strictly on population.

My proposal seeks to achieve the same goal as the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator DIRKSEN, the minority leader. But it differs from his in three respects. First, my proposal eliminates the first sentence of Senator DIRKSEN's proposed amendment. Although I am sure this was not Senator DIRKSEN's intention, this sentence might be construed to limit the Supreme Court's jurisdiction asserted under the Baker versus Carr decision. This was what the struggle in the Senate last session was all about, and I believe there should be no vestige of this issue in the effort to obtain a constitutional amendment authorizing the use of the so-called Federal system—that is, one house of a legislature based on population and the other on factors other than population.

Secondly, my amendment adds the phrase "in a statewide referendum" to make it absolutely clear that the people of the State in a one-man, one-vote referendum—not a State legislature or a constitutional convention—are to be given the sole power to authorize this departure from the strict population apportionment.

Thirdly, my amendment would provide that when the people vote for a departure from a strict population basis for one house, they also be given the opportunity to determine whether the new apportionment will be tested by the people in future referendums, at least every 10 years. The amendment therefore permits, but does not require, that the Federal analogy be ratified by the voters following every decennial census. If the people so chose, this would avoid the freezing of the Federal analogy into the legislative setup of a State and would let the people periodically redecide the issue.

I hope that action can soon be taken by both Houses of Congress on a constitutional amendment of the type I am introducing today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 44) to amend the Constitution of the United States to permit any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population with the approval of a majority of its voters, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). On behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to section 9355 of title X, United States Code, the Chair announces the appointment of the following Senators as members of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy: Senators YARBOROUGH, BREWSTER, and ALLOTT.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—CHANGE OF CONFEREE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] be excused from further service as a Senate conferee on House Joint Resolution 234, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and I request that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] be appointed as a conferee in lieu of the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, there is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, S. 348, a bill to encourage the preservation and development of a modern and efficient passenger rail transportation service in the northeastern seaboard area by granting the consent and approval of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York to negotiate and enter into a compact to create their own northeast rail authority, and by guaranteeing certain loans and other credit to such authority.

The Committee on Commerce has expressed an interest in this bill since it deals with the interstate rail transportation service.

However, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction to consider compacts generally, and particularly in pursuance to the requirement of the Constitution of the United States as contained in article I, clause 10.

In view of the interest of the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary has authorized that request be made that it be discharged from consideration of S. 348 at this time with the understanding that when the Committee on Commerce completes its hearings on the provisions of the bill, that the bill, S. 348, be again referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for the purpose of carrying out its jurisdiction in compliance with the provisions of article I, clause 10 of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of S. 348 at this time and that it be referred to the Committee of Commerce for the purpose of holding hearings and upon completion thereof S. 348 shall be again referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for the purposes previously mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 14, and that the Senate joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Public Works. I am told by my legislative assistant that the question has been cleared with the chairman of the two committees, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and that the course proposed is the proper course because the bill, which would establish a James Madison Memorial, has heretofore been referred to and considered by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The action proposed is perfectly satisfactory with our committee. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the junior Senators from Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey [Messrs. KENNEDY, NELSON, SCOTT, and WILLIAMS] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as cosponsors to S. 561, a bill to promote intergovernmental cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 560), the Federal Installations, Facilities, and Equipment Pollution Control Act, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have been requested to ask unanimous consent, and I therefore do ask unanimous consent, that the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be joined as a cosponsor of S. 899 and S. 900 at the next printing of those two bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 969) to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to give 6 months' advance public notice of the planned closing or relocation of any veterans' facility, and to provide for at least one veterans' service center in each State, and for other purposes, the names of Senators BIBLE, HICKENLOOPER, YOUNG of North Dakota, and ANDERSON, be listed as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 218) to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, which I introduced on January 6, 1965, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the names of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the name of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] as a cosponsor of S. 43, a bill for the relief of Cato Bros., Inc., the next time that bill is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILL TO PROVIDE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW BEFORE VA CLOSINGS AND TO REQUIRE STATE VA SERVICE CENTERS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] to add my name as a cosponsor to S. 969, his bill to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to give 6 months' advance public notice to the planned closing or relocation of any veterans' facility, and to provide at least one veterans' service center in each State.

The announced closing of service centers and VA hospitals and the announced consolidation of the VA center in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., motivates me to become personally associated with this legislation.

Heated denouncements of VA policy are not enough. The only real and permanent answer to this question lies in quick and effective legislation by the Congress. I have carefully weighed the problems involved and I feel that the Congress should direct its immediate attention to the growing curtailment of services to veterans. My State of South Dakota would benefit greatly by enactment of this bill since ours is one of eight States that will be without a complete VA service center if the proposed administration announcement is implemented. Passage of this bill would solve the immediate question of the facility in my State as long as the law is on the statute books. It would also prevent the closing of other VA facilities without congressional consideration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of January 26, 1965:

S. 745. A bill to further insure to military personnel certain due process protection by providing for military judges to be detailed to all general courts-martial, and for other purposes: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, LONG of Missouri, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 748. A bill to provide additional constitutional protection for members of the Armed Forces by establishing Courts of Military Review, and for other purposes: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, LONG of Missouri, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 750. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by insuring their right to be represented by qualified counsel in certain cases, and for other purposes: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, LONG of Missouri, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 751. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by increasing the period within which such personnel may petition for a new trial by court-martial, and for other purposes: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, LONG of Missouri, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 754. A bill to insure due process in the case of certain administrative actions involving military personnel: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 755. A bill to further insure the fair and independent review of court-martial cases by prohibiting any member of a board of review from rating the effectiveness of another member of a board of review, and for other purposes: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, LONG of Missouri, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 758. A bill to provide additional constitutional protection in certain cases to members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 760. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) so as to assure the constitutional rights of confrontation and compulsory process by providing for the mandatory appearance of witnesses and the production of evidence before certain boards and officers, and for other purposes: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, LONG of Missouri, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 761. A bill to provide for compliance with constitutional requirements in the trials of persons who are charged with having committed certain offenses while subject to trial by court-martial, who have not been tried for such offenses, and who are no longer subject to trial by court-martial: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 762. A bill to provide for compliance with constitutional requirements in the trials of persons who, while accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States, commit certain offenses against the United States: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Authority of January 28, 1965:

S. 812. A bill to provide for the use of public works and other economic programs in a coordinated effort to aid economically disadvantaged areas of the Nation: Senators AIKEN, BREWSTER, BURDICK, CHURCH, CLARK, DOUGLAS, HART, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MONDALE, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PELL, RIBICOFF, SYMINGTON, and TYDINGS.

S. 891. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes: Senator MURPHY.

Authority of February 1, 1965:

S. 899. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America: Senator HART.

S. 900. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America: Senator HART.

NOTICE OF HEARING RELATING TO INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and other interested persons that the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has scheduled hearings on S. 561, a bill dealing with intergovernmental cooperation. The hearings will be held on March 29, 30, 31, and April 1 in room 3302, New Senate Office Building, starting at 10 a.m.

Any Senator or other person wishing to testify at the hearing should notify the subcommittee, room 357, Senate Office Building, extension 4718, in order that he might be scheduled as a witness.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS RELATING TO EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold public hearings on East-West trade on February 24, 25, and 26, beginning at 10 a.m. each day in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building. These hearings will continue the committee's consideration of this important subject which began a year ago. Due to the pressure of other business the committee was unable to complete its previous hearings and did not have an opportunity to hear testimony from any nongovernmental witnesses. The hearings will also give committee members an opportunity to explore points raised by businessmen, bankers, and academic experts whose views were contained in a compilation published by the committee last November. Additionally, the committee will hear a number of distinguished businessmen, international bankers, and academic experts, and through this series of hearings will obtain valuable information that will be helpful to the Congress and the public in considering any future legislative or administrative action in this area. The committee would also welcome the views of interested individuals and organizations on the subject for the record.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. BOW, and Mr. MICHEL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–683, the Speaker had appointed Mr. RODINO, of New Jersey; Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey; Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey; and Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey, as members of the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of Public Law 115, 78th Congress, and House Resolution 192, 89th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan, as members of the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 15 United States Code 1024(a), as amended, the Speaker had appointed Mr. PATMAN, of Texas; Mr. BOLLING, of Missouri; Mr. BOGGS, of Louisiana; Mr. REUSS, of Wisconsin; Mrs. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan; Mr. CURTIS, of Missouri; Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey; and Mr. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas, as members of the Joint Economic Committee, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 523, 78th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas; Mr. SICKLES, of Maryland; and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, of California, as members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 42 United States Code 2251, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–417, the Speaker had appointed Mr. SMITH, of Virginia; Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia; Mr. MOORE, of West Virginia, and Mr. GLEN ANDREWS, of Alabama, as members of the James Madison Memorial Commission, on the part of the House.

LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this Congress will soon consider, and I hope approve, the measures recommended by the President to help make the benefits of advancing medical science available to all elderly citizens. Public and private pension plans are providing basic financial security to millions of retired people. Yet, even with good health and adequate income, the prospect of long years of retirement is frequently faced with apprehension.

To ease the transition from active working life to retirement, I would like to see more experimentation with systems of gradual retirement during the last few years and months of employment. It seems to me that our Federal Government should offer leadership in this direction, and I intend to urge the Civil Service Commission to consider what kinds of gradual retirement arrangements might be feasible for Federal employees.

Leisure time may be a mixed blessing to the person accustomed to active productive work, but many churches and community organizations are beginning to find ways to bring pleasure and satisfaction to the retirement years.

St. Luke's Methodist Church in Oklahoma is meeting the challenge through its excellent school of continuing education for senior adults. The school began as a 1-day-a-week program offering a wide variety of courses, ranging from creative writing and physical fitness to archeology and Bible history and understanding world problems. This year two Thursday courses have been added, golf instruction at the various clubs throughout the city, and conversational Spanish.

Evidence of the success of the St. Luke's program is the rapid rise in enrollment each semester, from 135 on opening day in 1963 to more than 500 by December of 1964. Less than 100 are members of St. Luke's, and retired couples have begun to come in from many of the surrounding towns. The combination of an attractive array of courses and activities and a reasonable fee, $2 a semester total, has inspired an enthusiastic response among retired people in the Oklahoma City area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a description of the St. Luke's program prepared by the Reverend Joseph T. Shackford, associate minister at St. Luke's and coordinator of the school.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SCHOOL OF CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR SENIOR ADULTS, ST. LUKE'S METHODIST CHURCH, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

(By the Reverend Joseph T. Shackford)

After many months of study and examination of the need for a senior adult school to provide creative, dynamic living for persons in retirement, St. Luke's decided in the spring of 1963 to launch such a school, meeting each Friday, to open on September 6, 1963. It was decided the school should be as comprehensive as possible and include as many areas of challenge and interest as could be built into a 1-day school.

Accordingly, classes were established at 10 a.m. in creative arts, investments, recreation, Bible, and group piano; at 11 a.m., additional creative arts, community service, recreation extension, modern Spanish and travel with a purpose. At 12 a luncheon would be served in the building with a guest artist providing entertainment. From 1 p.m. until 2, a town hall series, in which interesting speakers on interesting subjects, from the community and beyond, would be invited to speak, would be established.

An administrative committee was established under a Committee on Senior Adult Planning, of which Mrs. L. P. Oldham was chairman. The administrative committee was to be the Reverend Joseph T. Shackford, coordinator; Mrs. Lavorah Spradlin, director of curriculum; Mrs. Forrest P. Dowling, assistant director of curriculum; Mrs. V. J. Booth, dean; Mrs. Joseph T. Shackford, assistant dean. Throughout the summer, once the format was established, persons were sought throughout the city to provide resource positions of teaching courses and providing lectures and entertainment. Wide publicity was sought through television, radio, and the local press. Excellent coverage was given in these areas and particularly in the Oklahoman and the Oklahoma City Times.

On opening day, 135 persons enrolled. The enrollment increased through the first semester until 270 were enrolled. In the spring semester (1964) 233 persons enrolled. The fame of the school began to spread across the Nation and inquiries came from some 15 or 20 States, asking for information about the school. Inquiry came from the Office of Aging in April and the coordinator, Mr. Shackford, was able to confer with that Office in Washington in early May 1964.

School opened for the second year on September 11, 1964. Courses have now been expanded to six meeting each morning hour at 9, 10, and 11 in the morning. The luncheon, with over 200 persons remaining, and the guest artist series continued. Town hall, where some 175 persons remained and afternoon classes from 2 until 4 were held. These were the classes: Creative writing, public speaking, physical fitness, fall gardening, photography, oil painting, understanding investments, party foods and entertainment, group piano I, group piano II, Spanish I, Spanish II, archeology and Bible history, book reviews, understanding world problems, travel with a purpose, guest artists, town hall lectures, ceramics, china painting, bridge, sculpture; and on Thursdays, two courses were established: Golf instruction, at the various country clubs over the city, provided by the pros of those excellent country clubs, and a conversational Spanish course.

The administrative staff by now had expanded to over 20 persons. Enrollment opening day the second year was 325 persons. By December 4, 1964, enrollment had expanded to 504 persons. Of these, less than 100 were members of St. Luke's Methodist Church. The others came from the various groups and churches of the city and surrounding areas. Couples were coming in from Choctaw, Guthrie, Norman, and Crescent. The weekend of December 2, 3, and 4, 1964, the Office of Aging (HEW) sent Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough to make a thorough investigation and case study of the school, in order to represent it more widely across the Nation, and encourage other voluntary groups to attempt a similar program.

The school is done on the basis of a simple $2 charge per pupil, per semester, for total cost of involvement in the school. The luncheon costs 75 cents additional for those attending; and those buying oil painting materials, or materials of that sort, provide these materials at their own expense. St. Luke's provides staff direction, all utilities and space, custodial staff help, kitchen and dining halls, lecture halls, and the volunteer leadership to direct the school.

The underlying philosophy of the school is summed up in two significant statements, which early came to the attention of the coordinator, first attributed to Senator McNamara and given at the recent White House Conference on Aging, to the effect that, of all those since the dawn of history reaching 65 years of age, 25 percent are now alive upon the earth. This means that we are in a revolution, not just an acceleration, of aging in our society. The other statement, attributed to a geriatrics specialist, is to the effect that a person of 80 can learn as well as a child of 12. With more than 18 million senior adults now in our society and an estimated approximate 25 million anticipated by 1980, democratic society whose end product is supposed to be free personality, cannot escape its responsibility when it forces retirement upon its citizens, to provide them the opportunity to grow, to think, to create, to aspire, to develop.

Life expectancy, which once was composed of two phases, preparation and productivity, now has added a third phase as a normal expectation—senior citizenship. Society, whose end product is intended to be free personality, cannot retire its citizens without providing them the opportunity for effective living. Government has responded to its challenge by providing social security, housing, and medical benefits. It remains now for the churches, and other community groups concerned with persons, to provide the opportunity, such as St. Luke's has demonstrated will be used, to keep life challenging, dynamic, and meaningful.

We fervently hope and urge other groups across this Nation to pick up this program, improve it, expand it, enlarge it or reduce it if the community is too small to support such a program and to help organize community resources to provide our senior adults a chance for meaningful living which they need and deserve.

WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in recent days millions of people have paid tribute to Winston Churchill, one of the great men of our time. Yesterday, on its editorial page, the Washington Star published a thoughtful and moving statement by the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, about Mr. Churchill and what he meant to the free world. I should like to quote the last sentence of the article by Dr. Harris:

> There was a man sent from God whose name was Churchill, who, in a storm-swept world, stood securely on both feet.

I commend the article to Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Standing Securely on Both Feet

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

On this perplexed and baffled globe there is heard today one name above every name. In an oft-quoted poem it is recorded of the hero whose name was written in the angel's book of gold that because of the shining virtues of his goodness his name led all the rest. The name, Winston Churchill, written across the skies during these days of mourning, is that of a "Mr. Valiant for Truth" whose mother was an American and whose father was an Englishman. In the most crucial battle of the ages this one man's words were like armies with banners. With them he met the diabolical onslaught of the mightiest forces ever to be hurled against freedom, and justice, and human dignity. Now that the great captain of this epochal time has kept the faith and finished his course, sorrowful millions around the poorer earth gather at his bier in Britain's historic hall.

It is one of the most glorious entries in all history that when defiant battalions lifted their swords to stop the advance of the tyrant's mad charge, were beaten down by the perfidious foe and their captive nations desolated, this man who became a legend even while he lived, stood like a flint facing what seemed to be impossible odds and mobilizing the English language, with nothing but the wizardry of words potent as planes, broke through the frozen paralysis of a nation and stood it upon its feet while the few anonymous eagles of the air held back the threat to civilization.

Who can think of it as anything short of "providential" in the sense that God was working His purpose out. Winston Churchill became the living link uniting his mother's land with his in the grand alliance which at last made tyranny not only tremble, but ignominiously tumble. To be sure the horror of Pearl Harbor cemented the union which alone could say "They shall not pass." But that oneness of action was assured because the American President and this "pugnacious cherub" joined hands and hearts on a battleship at sea where was fashioned the Atlantic Charter.

How prophetic it seems in the long range fitness of things that, almost a generation before this revolutionary, tempestuous century comes to its close, that the sculptured form of Franklin D. Roosevelt stands in restored London, and that the statue erected in eternal gratitude to Winston Churchill will soon stand in the American Capital. When the announcement of the plan to erect this memorial on Massachusetts Avenue at the British Embassy was made in Spires under the caption, "Winston Comes To Stay," came to the hands of the great man to be thus honored—even though he was then in age and feebleness extreme—he sent a personal message to Bradshaw Mintner, president of the Washington English Speaking Union, expressing his appreciation of what the Washington Star had published. In the letter, signed with his trembling signature, he inscribes: "My warm thanks for the great honor you do me. It gives me the greatest pleasure that the statue should stand on both American and British soil and I feel that it will rest happily and securely on both feet." And, before many more months have passed it will rest securely, even as he stood, on both feet when all we hold nearest our hearts was threatened by sinister forces without pity or conscience.

And so because he accomplished so much for so many the world is listening to the recitation of his winged words. But, we are looking now not at his lips but at his steadfast feet when so many feet wavered. Thank the Master of all Good Workmen that Winston Churchill planted both feet on enduring truth when fearful men felt that the ground could not be securely held. He raised his right hand with the V sign of victory and kept his head when all around him (to quote his countryman, Kipling) were losing theirs and blaming it on him.

The conquering sign of his uplifted hand, the elixir of the words which fell from his eloquent lips, were made flesh because in every adverse situation he never turned his back but marched breast forward, and because he stood securely on both feet.

And so by his words and his hands, and his feet, he was

"True to all truth the world denies,
Not tongue-tied by its gilded lies,
Not always right in all men's eyes—
But faithful to the light within."

And so for millions in the years to come, as the cause of freedom goes on conquering and to conquer, the Churchill statue will stand as a sacred highway shrine. It will speak for all the years to be of one who in an age on ages telling heard the words of the prophet of long ago, "I sought a man among them who should build up the wall and stand in the breach before me that the land should not be destroyed." To that ancient challenge he cried, "Here am I, send me." And when the very ground trembled beneath men's feet as if all that seemed so firm was to be shattered, there was a man sent from God whose name was Churchill, who, in a storm-swept world stood securely on both feet.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN OUR FUTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I had the honor to address the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Miami Beach on January 25, on the subject "Resource Development in Our Future."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of that speech be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resource Development in Our Future

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, before 23d annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Fontainbleau Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla., January 25, 1965)

The theme of your meeting, "Rural Electrification, Today and Tomorrow" quite naturally brings us to a discussion of "Resource Development in Our Future," the subject of my remarks to you this afternoon. What our country does about resource development will have a profound effect on the kind of rural electrification program we will have in years to come. Wise resource development and a strong rural electrification program are both important to our Nation's future.

We must remember, you and I, that the comfortable and pleasant life we have partially attained is to a great degree an inheritance from generations gone before. Likewise, the welfare of those who dwell here in years to come will be strongly affected by our own performance. So, in a very real sense we have, for a short time, the responsibility of stewardship over the earth and its bounty, and an opportunity to influence for good the lives of millions of men and women yet unborn.

In the handling of natural resources, neither those who have gone before us, nor we ourselves, have been perfect. But, we are improving. We are learning to develop our resources, rather than to exploit them. Exploitation implies reckless and unjust use for personal gain, while development means to expand and to improve by the process of growth.

We used to exploit our timber resources by indiscriminate logging which left the forest land unfit for further use. This has given way to sustained yield programs which permit us to have the wood products we need today and at the same time preserve this great resource for future generations. Farming practiices which depleted the land have been replaced by soil conservation programs that insure rich harvests now and in the years ahead.

This is the kind of thinking we must perfect and put into practice in developing our resources in the future.

It is startling to realize that since the beginning of the First World War consumption of most fuels and other minerals has been greater than total world consumption for all the preceding centuries. With population increases compounding at an alarming rate, and living standards constantly on the rise, our stewardship over the wealth of the land, the sea, and the air faces a unique challenge quite unlike any which has gone before.

Supplies of minerals and petroleum are exhaustible. They cannot be replaced. Already we can see the end of higher grade deposits of some minerals which we have feverishly been consuming. But there are larger supplies in lower quality ores that remain untouched. With proper new, improved techniques of extraction and processing, we can help to avoid the inevitable day of reckoning despite accelerated consumption. And here is one of the places where the low cost of electric energy will be so important. It is the key to transforming many of these low-grade mineral deposits into useful raw materials.

Research will undoubtedly find synthetics or substitutes for some of these dwindling resources. Other mineral resources may have to be reserved, and their use restricted for the common good. I should think that in the future we will have to place more emphasis on the creation of electric energy from hydro, atomic, and solar plants so our supply of fossil fuels can be diverted to other uses.

We are, however, awakening to the need for conserving our exhaustible resources and making more efficient use of them. Improving our ability to conserve resources is one of the great challenges of what remains of the 20th century.

Although critical times may be ahead with respect to the supply of some of our vital resources, we can take considerable comfort in the fact that the earth's supply of water is available in unlimited quantities. At first, you may not agree with me if you are from one of the water shortage areas, or have lived through the bitter experience of drought. Nevertheless, the oceans are still full of water, and nature's cycle of picking it up from the oceans, dropping it off on the land to run back into the ocean again, is still operating—although sometimes erratically. So, for us it is a question of water management, rather than water shortage. And, as you know, it is a problem which is of as great concern to the urban East with its falling water tables as it is to the semi-arid West.

To illustrate what I mean I need only to remind you of what took place within the last month in my own State of California and neighboring States in the Northwest. Floods caused the loss of 40 or more lives and millions of dollars in property damage. Thousands of people were homeless and exposed to disease, suffering and misery—all because we were not prepared to manage our supply of water. This is the second time such a disaster has occurred in the last decade. But it is interesting to note that in some areas, where the rivers are controlled to a greater degree by dams, the loss of life and property damage was much less because the flood waters were held back in the storage reservoirs behind the dams. How many lives were saved and how much property damage was avoided because of this effective river control, no one knows. It should be obvious to us, however, that it does not take many experiences such as this to more than pay the cost of river control projects.

While the raging flood waters were taking lives, inflicting suffering and causing damage in the northern part of my State—and rushing on to the sea—my constituents in the south were urgently seeking more water for domestic, agricultural and industrial uses. So, in one section of our country, we have the paradox of both too little and too much water at the same time. This situation demands rectification. See the tragic irony of Arizona and California and their long and bitter dispute over a dwindling supply of Colorado River water; while in other parts of the country several dozen times their needs wastes away to the sea with each passing year.

The job of effective water control has only been started. What has been done has been accomplished in spite of the cries of "pork barrel" and "socialism" from those who oppose almost all expenditures of public funds for the common good. Full acceptance and adherence to the principle of multipurpose development of our waterways is one of the requirements of good stewardship. Sites suitable for the construction of dams on our rivers must be utilized to the fullest extent for all purposes—flood control and storage, irrigation, navigation, power development, wildlife conservation, and recreation. We will have to follow the advice of a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, who, back in 1908, said that: "Every waterway should be made to serve the people largely and in as many different ways as possible. Every stream should be used to its utmost."

Another paradox in our situation with regard to water supply is the fact that while we suffer for lack of water, our continent is surrounded by oceans. The familiar lines from the Ancient Mariner tell the story: "Water, water everywhere, but not a drop to drink." This sad condition, too, can be rectified, and the initial steps are being taken to do so. Desalinization of sea water and transporting it to land areas where water is scarce will be one of the major efforts in the development of resources in the future.

Here, again, electric energy will be involved. The National Power Survey points this out where it says: "Water supply is already a problem in the West, and as water supplies continue to dwindle in relation to expanding requirements, we must expect large electric power requirements for water treatment, desalinization, and the transportation of water between watersheds. Attaining an abundant low-cost energy base, is among the Nation's most important long-term concerns."

So, another of the challenges we face in future resource development is to manage our supply of water so that we obtain the maximum of benefits and eliminate its ability to destroy.

This is going to require a greater breadth of vision than we have been accustomed to seek in the past. We must, we shall, enlarge our concepts of what is possible, and revise our judgments with regard to costs. Here is an example of what I mean:

The Senate Committee on Public Works now has under study proposals for the development of a plan to collect surplus water in the Arctic, and, through a system of canals, tunnels, and rivers, to distribute it to water-scarce areas of Canada, the Western United States and northern Mexico. In addition, the project would provide a waterway from Vancouver, Britisn Columbia, on the Pacific, to Duluth, Minn., on Lake Superior. The channel would deliver water to the northern plains from Alberta to South Dakota, and increase the flow through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system. As the water descends through the proposed system of storage reservoirs and canals it would generate electric power to help meet our growing energy requirements and contribute toward investment and operating costs of the project.

Such a gigantic proposal almost defies the imagination. Its estimated cost in the neighborhood of $100 billion (equal to the entire U.S. budget for 1 year) makes it seem fantastic. Yet, this is no more unbelievable to us than were some of the accomplishments of the present generation when they were first envisioned. A few short years ago the idea of sending a man to the moon was merely a dream relegated to the comic pages, but accomplishment of this feat is now near at hand.

So, when it comes to developing our resources in the future, let us not be afraid to envision great and daring achievements, for in their attainment rests the future of mankind.

Electric energy will play a key role in all plans for developing resources in the future. For many projects power is the byproduct that pays the bill for the entire undertaking. In others, it is the energy of electricity that will transform raw resources into products which man can use.

Actually, electric energy is a resource in itself, but it has no physical form—it is something that happens: electrons flowing from one point to another. We have devised a variety of ways of causing this phenomenon to occur, and apparently man's ingenuity is the only limitation on the quantity of the flow to be generated and the uses to which it can be put. Aside from technical aspects, electricity has become a basic ingredient in our complex society, without which we would be almost helpless. Its importance, therefore, cannot be overemphasized.

Because both the availability and cost of electric energy will have such a profound effect on our future, one of our prime economic goals today should be to achieve the maximum efficiency from our energy resources. In this, too, we will need great vision and willingness to embark on gigantic enterprises for the public good. We have these qualities in this generation, and we proved it this past year by getting started with the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie system to bring together the electric generating and transmission systems of the Far West into one vast power pool. I am proud of the role which the California congressional delegation took in bringing this to fruition.

The successful completion of this intertie will mark a historic milestone in the full utilization of electrical energy by private and public bodies in our land. Such an approach may well deserve early consideration for still other areas of the United States.

However, if we are to develop to the fullest our resources in the future, we will need to continue to overcome some false attitudes still held by a few either because of ignorance or for selfish reasons. We must recognize the cooperative and useful role which all levels of government can and will play in this area. To develop fully our water resources, as every reclamation State in the West knows, requires the active assistance of the Federal Government. This does not mean the dominance of the Federal Government. In California, it would be impossible to develop fully our water resources without the closest cooperation between the Federal, State, and local government as well as the private sector of our economy. Despite great Federal reclamation and public works projects which have harnessed raging rivers to produce needed water and power and recreational opportunities, the people of California have initially bonded themselves in the amount of $1.75 billion for what will eventually be a $12 to $15 billion State water program. Local districts and municipalities have acted similarly.

An essential element in the development of water resources projects is, of course, the development of hydroelectric power. This is not merely because of its value, but also because the power produced at Federal projects is a paying partner for irrigation, municipal and industrial water supplies, flood control, navigation, and irrigation. Without it, the financing of many of these other purposes would be impossible. Furthermore, power facilities are a self-liquidating investment: all costs are returned to the Treasury and with interest.

Thus, let us recall that our natural resources belong to all the people and pledge ourselves to develop them for the good of all the people. The common good is the framework through which America must envision, plan, and carry out the great work of turning the bounty of nature into benefits for mankind if we are to be true to ourselves and our posterity.

We must also quit treating the financing of resource development as expenditures rather than investments. Of necessity, resource development of the scope we can see will be needed in the future, will be financed in great part through Government funds. But, too many of our people and all too many Members of Congress view appropriations for this purpose as expenditures for which there is no return. Nothing could be further from the truth. When we can get better acceptance of the idea that resource development is investment in the future, with monetary and humanitarian returns, that far exceed the original cost, a sizable stumbling block on the road to building a better America will be removed.

The floods which destroyed human life and property only last month showed that we cannot measure the value of a storage dam solely in terms of economic feasibility and dollar return. The uncontrolled Eel River, and other rivers in northern California and Oregon destroyed property valued at as much as a billion dollars. But more important, as I noted earlier, the flood resulted in a loss of life and in a loss of the homes and furnishings that many people had accumulated over a lifetime. Those costs can never appear in a government ledger. Where storage dams were in operation—as Folsom Dam above Sacramento—serious flooding was prevented. Thus, I would welcome your organization's valued support for the Auburn Dam—Folsom South Canal project, which will hopefully be acted upon by this Congress and whose multipurpose aspects will include important flood control benefits.

More positively, I believe that our future water resource policy should reflect, first, the need to conserve and use all of our available water supplies; second, to make each drop of water perform as many jobs as possible, and, third, to make sure that the American people generally obtain the benefits of Government investment in water projects.

This is the policy which we have tried to follow since early in the 20th century when Theodore Roosevelt pointed the way in conservation and controlled development of our natural resources.

I do not propose any basic change. I suggest only that economics will make it necessary for us to plan more carefully, to develop more imaginatively, to find new jobs for water to do. Meanwhile, there are many feasible and sound projects ready to go forward. I hope that Congress will waste no time in moving ahead with such developments in an orderly manner. Delay represents a daily waste of water and power, and America cannot afford such waste.

In looking ahead at the future of rural electrification, I see the greatest threat, ironically, in the huge success of the rural electrification program. In a few decades, the REA program has electrified our farms, brought about a revolution in the techniques of farming, invigorated rural industry, and—contrary to almost everyone's predictions—paid for itself.

This is a great record of achievement. Unfortunately, this very record has brought attacks from those who just a few years ago were predicting that rural electrification would not work. A going concern is a tempting morsel, and I see no evidence that the investor-owned utilities will lose interest in serving industry or even farmers in your service areas. In a sense, this is merely a manifestation of competitive enterprise which the consumer-owned utilities have maintained in the industry.

This competition stimulates all utilities to be on their toes, to give better service, and to conduct a more cost-conscious operation from the consumer's standpoint all along the line.

California has a long tradition of consumer ownership of electric utilities. In addition to several rural electric cooperatives, the State has the Nation's largest municipally owned electric utility—the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power—and municipal systems at other cities such as Sacramento, Santa Clara, Pasadena, Glendale, and elsewhere. This institutional competition—"yardstick" competition if you will—has been good for all of the utilities of the State. It has been particularly beneficial in savings for the ultimate consumer, but that "yardstick" must be vigorously maintained.

While I fully support your desire to have protection from unfair competition, as every facet of American industry deserves protection from unfair tactics, I believe that the greatest defense and the greatest strength of the rural electric cooperatives will lie in their member-owners. With an informed and alert membership, with efficient management, and with continued dedication to the interests of consumers, your part in the national power industry of the future will be secure. As you strive to better your own service in your own areas, strive also to think and work for the national interest.

Satisfactory achievement in resource development will not come about without controversy. Some will label any progress as "socialism," the shortsighted will say we cannot afford it, and the fearful will say it cannot be done. But, controversy need not be destructive. It can be just the opposite, by clearing the air and sifting out the facts so that the course ahead is made clear. We should welcome such controversy and the heightened public understanding which an intelligent discussion will bring to achieve these purposes.

When men of the future look back on the last half of the 20th century, let us hope they will be moved to say, "There was a generation which was a good steward of the earth and its bounty." If this can be said of us, we will not have struggled in vain.

TWO NECESSITIES: THE NEED FOR REASON AND THE NEED FOR LEADERSHIP

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I had the honor to be invited by the California Newspaper Publishers' Association to speak at its annual meeting in Sacramento, Calif., last Thursday.

The virus which has been going around the city struck me down in the middle of last week, thus I could not go. I am very glad, however, that my former administrative assistant, Mr. Merrell F. Small, read the partial text which I had prepared, and also spoke from notes which were furnished to him by my office on some of the issues which I considered to be of interest to the newspaper profession in my State.

I ask unanimous consent that the partial text of my comments be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Partial Text of Remarks by U.S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, Presented to the California Newspaper Publishers Association's Convention, El Dorado Hotel, Sacramento, Calif., February 4, 1965

We are confronted in Washington with a series of messages and recommendations from the President and from the concept of what he has called the Great Society. No one should cavil at the high goals which he has set forth for us. All of us hope for better life and learning for our youth, and for happier days for all our people, whose lifespan is lengthening through the marvels of medicine and science. All of us agree that poverty ought to be fought, and that disease and illiteracy are bad, and that our free society, and its system of free enterprise represent the best form of society which we intend to keep and to improve. There is a real question of the prodigious amount of money involved in all this, and at what rate, in all the many fields the President covered, we should seek to proceed toward their attainment. A rule of reason needs to be applied respecting levels of public expenditures, for fiscal integrity in our Federal Government must be attained.

I wish to point out that however good life is, or may be, in the United States, the globe is not ours alone. The vagaries of mankind, and the paths which other nations may follow, bear strongly and directly upon what kind of living may be our own lot.

The $50 billion we shall again appropriate for the next fiscal year for our military is not to promote the welfare of our country, but rather to help its preservation. We intend to maintain a military superiority to deter potential aggression against us, or, if necessary, to combat it.

The moneys our Government spends abroad are intended for our own security, and for advancing, if that is possible, toward a decent and just peace.

But, since evil and lust for power are not going suddenly to evaporate, the administration has a firm and continuing duty to exert itself in matters of defense and foreign policy, indeed, to lead, with vigor and courage, all the free nation-states against a growing number of potential pitfalls, many of which they themselves create, and most of the rest of which come from the trickery and treachery of international communism.

The other day, a prominent Paris newspaper suggested that President Johnson's illness was faked in order to avoid meetings with international leaders attending the funeral for Sir Winston Churchill in London. That is an ugly charge, and a false one, unworthy of a great newspaper. The President was ill and he should not have gone overseas. Its falsity can best be proved by the President and his administration exerting a leadership, in American foreign policy, through all the techniques of diplomacy and statesmanship, among all nations who, with us, aim to keep their freedom and integrity. The security of America, including such progress as we hope reasonably to make, rests on a foreign policy which successfully meets the flow of dangers as they emanate from international communism and elsewhere.

The fact is that this world of ours is full of trouble. There is considerable peril in almost every corner of the globe, and very little of it seems to be on the wane.

A war is being fought in the Indochinese Peninsula and it involves the United States. Under General Eisenhower, we responded to a call from the Government of South Vietnam for "advice and assistance" and it is generally conceded that, in the intervening years, that phrase has been rather liberally construed by our own Government. Religious, political, and personal differences among the South Vietnamese people have produced constant instability in their Government, which has changed hands so often as to raise serious doubts on their capacity to unite even in defense of their homeland. Unity of their own leaders in the formation of a government with some stability is an indispensable prerequisite to the protection and to the integrity of their homeland. The Vietcong, from the north, abetted by the infamous Marxist regime of Red China, yearn for the day when all of this Asian peninsula will fall to the Reds. If they would let their non-Communist neighbors live in peace, there would be very little trouble, and some kind of a peace could ensue in this beleaguered area. But Marxist communism does not work that way. Decades and generations—perhaps centuries—are of small moment in their strategic planning. Life, to them, is hardly an expensive commodity. And now, the announced visit of a Soviet delegation, led by its Premier, to North Vietnam adds new mystery and foreboding to the danger.

However much Americans may wish to debate the wisdom of our original response to a cry for help, the fact is we did respond and we are present—to "advise and assist"—and I can now see no honorable means for us abruptly to abandon the South Vietnamese peoples as some in the Congress and the country now demand. I see no useful purpose in now arguing whether we should have agreed, years ago, to assist South Vietnam. The fact is we did agree and we are there. The sanctity of America's word, of her response to a plea for help, raises a question of honor when some among us urge our Government to pull out. Friends who trust us must not be disillusioned, and our enemies and potential enemies must recognize that America does not run away from danger.

I like what Dean Acheson said in a recent speech at Amherst College. We have a duty "to preserve values outside the contour of our own skins, and at the expense of foregoing much that is desired and pleasant, including—it may be—our own fortunes and lives."

Of all the worries which plague us, I think one of the most grievous is that which we and some of our historic friends have themselves brought upon us. Churchill spoke about the need for close collaboration among the English-speaking countries. How true. And among our historic friends and allies in Western Europe, we, over here, have fondly hoped that, some day, they would become the United States of Europe. That day has not arrived. But we have had, in the Second World War, and in the subsequent years of uneasy peace, a Western alliance, a collective military interdependence of free democracies, agreeing that an attack against one of them would be treated as an attack against all of us. And since the North Atlantic Treaty Organization came into being, Red inroads in Europe have come to a halt.

Much progress has been achieved in the Atlantic Community. Yet, perhaps partly because of such progress, this achievement is now faced with great danger. Why should this be so? The Communist danger has not disappeared. That communism shows its greatest impact now in Asia and Africa, where Western unity is either nonexistent or much less in evidence than in Europe, ought to reawaken us to the very value of that unity. And it is also true that the rise of emerging nations confronts the entire Western World with common problems which we could resolve far better by a common effort. History seems to disclose that trouble flows most freely when the West is disunited.

What has happened to this great alliance? Why is it suddenly in such disarray?

Some fainthearted critics have told us that this alliance was forged in the days when America was supreme and Europe lay prostrate; but now, we are told, Europe wants to be on her own. Hence, they say this alliance is outdated. To many, this appears to make sense on first impact, but if we take the trouble to cut through the verbiage and look at facts, not fiction, a quite different picture emerges.

True, there is criticism here and there, and there are various suggestions for improvements. Obviously, changes should be made in an alliance created over 15 years ago. But it is equally true that neither in Great Britain, nor in Germany, nor in Italy, nor in the Benelux countries nor Scandinavia, is there a demand for fundamental change or renunciation of NATO. None of them desires the United States to be less active in the common defense of the West, or less of a participant in NATO, though they do desire a stronger voice in the common weal. We should be ready, indeed, active, to seek ways of achieving this.

Only one country appears to seek the dissolution of NATO and the withdrawal of America from Europe. That country is France. And even there, many of France's citizens and nearly all of the great newspapers are opposed to the policy of their government.

Last New Year's Eve, General de Gaulle addressed the people of France, and spoke of "rejecting all systems which, under the guise of 'supranational,' or of 'integration,' or else of 'Atlanticism' systems which would actually maintain us under the hegemony of which you know."

If these words mean what I am afraid they mean, then our long-time friends, the gallant French people, under de Gaulle's leadership, may not long remain in an integrated system of defense among the Atlantic nations.

France is an independent, sovereign country. If she were to choose to leave the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, we cannot stop her.

But we, too are an independent, sovereign Nation, and so are our allies. While we cannot stop France, France cannot stop us or those in the Western alliance who agree with us in our wish to make lasting arrangements for the common defense of like-minded members of the Atlantic area.

The situation cries out for leadership, and leadership will come from the United States, or it will not come at all. Should we look to the United Kingdom, whose government was elected with a razor-thin majority, and which is beset with many problems? Will leadership come from Germany, or from Italy? Surely, there can be no question. It is the Government of the United States which will supply the leadership, if any there be, or the disarray of NATO will give way to disintegration and demise.

VIETNAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on last Thursday I said:

A war is being fought in the Indochinese Peninsula and it involves the United States. Under General Eisenhower, we responded to a call from the Government of South Vietnam for "advice and assistance" and it is generally conceded that, in the intervening years, that phrase has been rather liberally construed by our own Government. Religious, political, and personal differences among the South Vietnamese people have produced constant instability in their government, which has changed hands so often as to raise serious doubts on their capacity to unite even in defense of their homeland. Unity of their own leaders in the formation of a government with some stability is an indispensable prerequisite to the protection and to the integrity of their homeland. The Vietcong, from the north, abetted by the infamous Marxist regime of Red China, yearn for the day when all of this Asian Peninsula will fall to the Reds. If they would let their non-Communist neighbors live in peace, there would be very little trouble, and some kind of a peace could ensue in this beleaguered area. But Marxist communism does not work that way. Decades and generations—perhaps centuries—are of small moment in their strategic planning. Life, to them, is hardly an expensive commodity.

And now, the announced visit of a Soviet delegation, led by its Premier, to North Vietnam adds new mystery and foreboding to the danger.

However much Americans may wish to debate the wisdom of our original response to a cry for help, the fact is we did respond and we are present—to "advise and assist"—and I can now see no honorable means for us abruptly to abandon the South Vietnamese people as some in the Congress and the country now demand. I see no useful purpose in now arguing whether we should have agreed, years ago, to assist South Vietnam. The fact is we did agree and we are there. The sanctity of America's word, of her response to a plea for help, raises a question of honor when some among us urge our Government to pull out. Friends who trust us must not be disillusioned, and our enemies and potential enemies must recognize that America does not run away from danger.

I like what Dean Acheson said in a recent speech at Amherst College. We have a duty "to preserve values outside the contour of our own skins, and at the expense of foregoing much that is desired and pleasant, including—it may be—our own fortunes and lives."

Yesterday at the request of the wire services, I made a statement reading as follows:

> There is yet time for communism to halt this frightful adventure. Whether anyone likes it or not, America is in South Vietnam as her request, to help her preserve her independence.

It is an independence grounded on the agreement in which the Soviet Union itself participated.

> And we are not going to be driven out nor run away. America's purpose is clear, and communism must not misunderstand us. Otherwise, the Reds in Asia—maybe elsewhere—could mistakingly ignite a fire to destroy far more than they bargained for. I completely approve our immediate response to the new, enlarged sneak attack of the Vietcong. Why the sneak attack was successful at all remains to be answered.

I must add, as a Senator who speaks as an American in this Chamber, and not as a political partisan, that the question of why the sneak attack was successful at all remains a problem to be answered by the appropriate committees of the Senate.

STOCKPILE INVESTIGATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will have before it S. 28, a bill to provide for the sale, eventually, of all surplus stockpiled materials, which had a cost price of about about $8½ billion.

The Subcommittee on National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves of the Senate Armed Services Committee started its stockpile investigation on February 23, 1962 for the purpose of recovering unconscionable profits from producers who contracted to sell strategic and critical materials to the Government.

In a press conference on June 1, 1962, the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves stated that as of that date his subcommittee had established that the taxpayers stand to lose $1 billion as a result of these stockpile operations. He further stated:

> We have also established the fact that much of this loss is because of maladministration or inefficiency in the handling of the program.

Although I am not aware of any report on the recovery of unconscionable profits, the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and the full committee have voted out a bill, S. 28, which cuts across the legislative jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Agricultural and Forestry Committee, and the Finance Committee.

The Banking and Currency Committee has legislative jurisdiction over the Defense Production Act inventory of materials, and this inventory has been subject to continuing review by the Joint Committee on Defense Production. S. 28 seeks to transfer all authority over the Defense Production Act inventory to the Subcommittee on National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves and to bypass the Banking and Currency Committee.

S. 28 proposes to transfer materials in the Defense Production Act inventory to a new materials reserve inventory if not required to meet current stockpile objectives. Also, materials hereafter acquired under the provisions of the Defense Production Act which are not needed to meet stockpile objectives of the national stockpile would be placed in the materials reserve inventory. The Banking and Currency Committee would be required to relinquish its authority over the Defense Production Act inventory to the Armed Services Committee.

Notes representing the acquisition costs of materials so transferred, together with unpaid interest thereon, would be canceled, and the borrowing authority under section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act would be correspondingly reduced. The waiver of interest and the cancellation of notes under the borrowing authority of title III of the Defense Production Act has been the subject of discussion in 1964, 1962, and earlier. Approval of such waivers and cancellation has been denied.

Materials in the Defense Production Act inventory may not be sold at less than the current domestic market price. In 1962 it was proposed to eliminate the word "domestic" from this provision of the Defense Production Act. However, the proposal was not adopted. S. 28 provides for the sale of materials in the materials reserve inventory at "fair market value" but provides that "fair market value" shall be construed to mean not less than the current domestic market price unless the President shall determine that such a construction is inconsistent with the purposes of the act.

There is no requirement in the Defense Production Act for any delay in selling materials acquired under that act. The timing of a sale is entirely within the discretion of the agencies administering the act. S. 28 would impose on sales from the new materials reserve inventory, and consequently on all materials in the Defense Production Act inventory, a requirement of at least 60 days' delay, and would subject them to veto by resolution of the Senate or the House.

In extending the Defense Production Act, the Banking and Currency Committee expressly recommended continuance of sections 302, 303, and 304 to continue available to the executive the means for quick and decisive action to meet a materials supply problem in a new emergency. If materials acquired for this purpose are made subject to the 60-day waiting period imposed by section 7 of S. 28, the purpose of the program would be frustrated.

The basic responsibility of the Armed Services Committee, as related to materials, is to determine what is needed in the stockpile for defense purposes. The Banking and Currency Committee has responsibility for economic measures, stabilization, and controls. Surplus supplies of materials which are to be offered for sale in the civilian economy should be under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee.

S. 28 appears to be similar to a proposed bill which originated in the General Services Administration and was circulated among Government agencies long before the subcommittee started its stockpiling hearings. This may explain why the policymaking functions of the Office of Emergency Planning are being transferred to the housekeeping agency of the Government, the General Services Administration. The Office of Emergency Planning, which has special skills and knowledge as to the needs of the military and of the civilian economy for defense and mobilization purposes, and the Department of Commerce, would be entirely bypassed.

As early as January 1955, the Joint Committee on Defense Production reviewed the procedures being followed in the administration of materials contracts and recommended that GSA review the records of individuals within GSA who failed to carry out assigned duties and to properly safeguard the interest of the Government. There is a case in court at the present time involving the expensing of capital equipment on a materials contract that the GSA auditors should have disallowed. Witnesses from the General Services Administration have been critical of policy decisions and actions of the Office of Emergency Planning, yet the General Services Administration failed to mention most of the actions complained of in the hearings in its reports to the Joint Committee on Defense Production. If there have been large losses which resulted from maladministration as reported, it would seem inappropriate to transfer the policymaking functions over materials to the agency which has had the responsibility for administering these contracts in past years.

DETAILS OF BILL

S. 28, introduced by Senator STUART SYMINGTON on January 6, 1965, contains the same language as the amended version of S. 2272 which was originally introduced on October 31, 1963. Senate Report No. 1025, to accompany amended bill S. 2272, was submitted on May 26, 1964.

S. 28 would consolidate the national stockpile, the Defense Production Act inventory, and the supplemental stockpile. There would be two remaining inventories: National stockpile; materials reserve inventory.

The jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee over materials in the Defense Production Act inventory would be transferred to the Armed Services Committee. The jurisdiction of the Agricultural and Forestry Committee over the supplemental stockpile would be transferred to the Armed Services Committee. Notes representing the acquisition costs of materials transferred from the Defense Production Act inventory and the unpaid interest would be canceled, and the borrowing authority reduced accordingly.

The President would determine the stockpile objective for each material. Materials required to meet stockpile objectives could be transferred from the national stockpile to the materials reserve inventory and sold at prices which appear to be much less definite than the price established in the Defense Production Act which provides for sales at not less than the current domestic market price.

Section 7(d) provides that sales shall be made with due regard for protecting first, the United States against avoidable loss; second, producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets; and third, the foreign relations of the United States. Materials could be sold by negotiation or competitive bid, and even sold to undesignated classes of potential purchasers. Although four classes of purchasers are set forth in the bill, sales are not limited to these particular classes.

Senator Symington advised the Banking and Currency Committee that the executive branch would decide, after consultation with the industry in question, what would be a fair price, and it would be sold at that price, unless one of the Houses of the Congress said it should not be sold at that price.

S. 28 has since been amended to provide for sales at fair market value, which means not less than the current domestic market price unless the President shall determine that such construction is inconsistent with the purposes of the act.

S. 28 provides for stockpiling strategic and critical materials required for the industrial and economic recovery of the United States following a nuclear attack. There is no specific reference to nuclear attack in the present law.

Although S. 28 would provide materials for an emergency following a nuclear attack, "strategic and critical materials" is given a more limited definition. The definition is phrased to specifically deny authority to stockpile manufactured forms of materials other than diamond dies and jewel bearings.

Although it is stated on page 11 of Senate Report No. 1025 that the return to the Government could be substantial if any substantial part of the excess is disposed of, there is some question as to the quantity of materials which could be sold under S. 28. It is interesting to note, parenthetically, that disposals have stepped up recently. During the last 6 months of calendar 1964, more than $200 million was sold or committed for, compared to about $167 million during the entire fiscal year 1964.

Since the bill provides for stockpiling for industrial and economic recovery following a nuclear attack as well as stockpiling for conventional war, it would seem that the excess quantity of materials could not be known until determinations are made covering requirements for nuclear war. Such determinations may require many years.

Section 7(b)(5) of S. 28 authorizes the use of materials in the materials reserve inventory for the payment of costs incident to upgrading materials in the national stockpile. In the past producers have asked the Appropriations Committee to provide for "payment in kind" rather than permit the use of one material to pay for the upgrading cost of other materials.

S. 28 would eliminate the exemption under section 106 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 that has applied to raw materials. The Renegotiation Act is under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee.

Section 5 of S. 28 provides that materials in the national stockpile may be released for use, sale, or other disposition for the purpose of solving economic dislocation. Stockpiling under the present law is carried out for common defense purposes. The report—No. 1025—contains inadequate information on the need to make use of the defense stockpile for solving economic dislocation.

Section 7(b)(11) provides that the President shall direct the Administrator of General Services to abandon, destroy, or donate to public bodies materials in the materials reserve inventory which have no commercial value or which do not have sufficient commercial value to justify further care and handling. The report—No. 1025—does not indicate the quantity and value of materials that are considered to have little or no commercial value. This language appears to be sufficiently broad to create a giveaway program in materials.

Under section 7(b)(9) the President shall direct the Administrator of General Services to require, whenever practicable, that departments and agencies use materials from the Materials Reserve inventory in lieu of procuring such material from private sources.

Section 7(d) of S. 28 seeks to prevent disposals to Communist-controlled nations. The Budget Bureau requested a change in language and the language in the bill was changed. The Bureau of the Budget was interested in making it clear that the Export Control Act is to govern.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a brief summary of the hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last year on a similar bill.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STOCKPILING—SUMMARY OF HEARING OF SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON JULY 24, 1964

Senator Symington introduced S. 28 on January 6, 1965, which is the same bill as the amended version of S. 2272. S. 28 was voted out of the Subcommittee on National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves on January 29, 1965. S. 28 was voted out of the full committee on February 4, 1965 with an amendment. The amendment provides that materials may be sold from the Materials Reserve inventory at "fair market value," and further provides that "fair market value" shall be construed to mean not less than the current domestic market price unless the President shall determine that such a construction is inconsistent with the purposes of the act.

S. 28 relates to the three inventories of strategic and critical materials which follows:

	As of June 30, 1964	
	Cost	Market
Defense Production Act inventory	$1,463,619,700	$867,384,100
National stockpile	5,677,325,600	5,688,262,400
Supplemental stockpile	1,358,189,400	1,213,312,100

S. 28 would continue the national stockpile, abolish the Defense Production Act inventory and the supplemental stockpile, and create a new materials reserve inventory. The two remaining inventories would be: national stockpile; materials reserve inventory.

The summary of the hearing before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on July 24, 1964, follows:

When the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee found that the proposed legislation would eliminate much of the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee, he wrote a letter to Senator Mansfield on July 17, 1964, and suggested the elimination of language in the bill which related to the Defense Production Act. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee stated that he hoped the bill (S. 2272) would not be brought up for action until he had had an opportunity to discuss with members of the Banking and Currency Committee whether or not they were willing for the Defense Production Act to be superseded.

The chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee further stated in part as follows:

"If new legislation be needed for purposes of disposing of surplus stockpile material, I would be glad to support it, but my surface impression is that the Banking and Currency Committee would not favor a bill which makes no material improvement in the method of disposal but merely confers complete jurisdiction over all inventories of materials upon the Armed Services Committee.

"For instance, subsection 7(a) of S. 2272 would abolish the defense production inventory. It also would abolish the supplemental stockpile established by subsection 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. The bill provides for the Armed Services Committee to exercise the general type of review of the Defense Production Act inventory as provided by the Defense Production Act. The same is true of the section relating to discovery and development of mineral resources and the development of substitutes for strategic and critical materials."

Reference was also made to the provision in the Defense Production Act which requires that materials be sold at not less than the current domestic market price as compared to the indefinite language in the bill. It was stated that the Senate had consistently refused to cancel the borrowing authority and to waive interest as provided in S. 2272. The chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee concluded the letter by stating that if members of the Banking and Currency Committee could have an opportunity to formulate their views, agreement might be reached on amendments that would make the bill more acceptable.

On July 20, 1964, the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee wrote a letter to Senator Stuart Symington and indicated he would have no objection to S. 2272 provided he would leave out provisions in the bill which virtually eliminate the Defense Production Act, which is under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee.

On July 24, 1964, Senator Stuart Symington appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

The purpose of the hearing is indicated in the statement of the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on page 5:

"The Chairman. The distinguished patron of the bill felt that his committee was unanimous, all of the agencies were unanimous, and he didn't want to change the bill.

"I called attention to the fact that if we passed this bill without change, we would still have under title I of the Defense Production Act priorities and allocations, under title III of the act we would have the matter of guaranteed V-loans and under title VII voluntary agreements, and so on. Some members of our committee wanted to go into the question of just what this bill did to our jurisdiction and just why we should yield our jurisdiction over the Defense Production Act inventory to the Armed Services Committee. And that is the purpose of this meeting."

The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee recalled that there had been a hearing in 1950 when Senator SYMINGTON was strongly advocating that the Defense Production Act be passed so we could have authority to buy materials at such prices as the procurement agency saw fit, and enter into long-term contracts. Senator SYMINGTON was then the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Senator ROBERTSON pointed out that in 1950 he thought the authority being requested was broad, that the administration could do a lot of things without proper congressional control, and that he was uneasy about giving blanket authority to pile up all sorts of materials under long-term contracts at such prices as the procurement agency saw fit to pay.

The first page of the hearing sets forth a statement that Senator SYMINGTON made on July 24, 1950, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee as head of the National Security Resources Board.

"Mr. SYMINGTON. I think Senator ROBERTSON's point was quite pertinent to this discussion. The question is whether in operating this act there is going to be integrity in the way it is handled. I think these questions are all technical questions and questions of integrity, as you put them up. I think at this stage it is much more advisable to risk possible details of maladministration and get the powers out and support the troops than it is to question the details."

In contrast to the above statement about risking possible details of maladministration, Senator ROBERTSON pointed out that in a press conference on June 1, 1962, after Senator SYMINGTON had stated that his subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee had established that the taxpayers stand to lose over a billion dollars, he said that his subcommittee had also established the fact that much of this loss is because of maladministration or inefficiency in the handling of these programs.

(NOTE.—Although Senator SYMINGTON's subcommittee appears to have discovered a billion dollar loss in 1962, the borrowing authority reports to the Congress estimated as early as 1954 that there would be losses of over $1 billion on Defense Production Act programs handled by GSA.)

Senator ROBERTSON pointed out that when he was chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production agreements had been worked out on aluminum imports that saved the Government about $90 million.

Senator ROBERTSON stated that the bill to merge all stockpiles and put the jurisdiction under the Armed Services Committee contains a provision which authorizes sales of surplus materials at less than the domestic market price set forth in the Defense Production Act. Senator ROBERTSON stated he was not sure just what the price would be, except that the selling agency is to use discretion so as to not hurt the market.

Senator ROBERTSON asked Senator SYMINGTON what the price would be for surplus metals sold under his bill (p. 19). Senator SYMINGTON stated: "Any sale, exchange, or other disposal made pursuant to this subsection shall be made with due regard for protecting (1) the United States against avoidable loss, (2) producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets."

Senator SYMINGTON stated that the executive branch would decide, after consulting with the industry in question, what would be a fair price, and it would be sold at that price, unless one of the Houses of the Congress said it should not be sold at that price.

Senator ROBERTSON asked about deleting any reference to the Defense Production Act and Senator SYMINGTON stated this would defeat the whole purpose of the bill (p. 19). He stated that the Defense Production Act stockpile has many flaws in it from the standpoint of proper disposal. Senator SYMINGTON stated that one purpose of the bill is to get more control over the supplemental stockpile.

Senator DOUGLAS inquired about the number of meetings of the Joint Committee on Defense Production during the past 5 years. Senator SPARKMAN stated that the work of the joint committee is of such a nature that it doesn't call for regular meetings (pp. 20 and 24). Letters relating to this subject were made a part of the record (pp. 26 and 27).

Although Senator SYMINGTON's bill would transfer the Defense Production Act inventory and the supplemental stockpile to two inventories under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, Senator SYMINGTON stated on page 28 that there is no desire on the part of the Armed Services Committee to take over anything.

There was some discussion regarding employees at present and under the proposed legislation. Senator SYMINGTON said that disposal is far more complicated under the national stockpile than under Defense Production Act and asked the question as to why it can be operated without a single member in the way of staff. However, Senator SYMINGTON did not make reference to the limited number of meetings his subcommittee held over a period of years.

Senator BENNETT stated that the Banking and Currency Committee has responsibility for the health of the Nation's economy, including prices, production, and stabilization of the economy (p. 31). He further stated as follows:

"Now I am glad that you would put all of the stockpiles together. I think that is sound. But I think if you want to look at the basic problem of fundamental jurisdiction, the responsibility of the Armed Services Committee is to determine what is needed in the stockpile for national defense purposes. And the fundamental responsibility of our committee should be with respect to the reserve stockpile, and we, and not you, should have the responsibility for handling the disposal, because that was certainly our responsibility, for example, with respect to synthetic rubber plants the Government operated during the war.

"I think we are also responsible for that part of the bill which affects the financial relations with the Treasury. The Treasury is our problem. So I would say that if this bill were amended to provide that the Banking and Currency Committee—and not the Armed Services Committee—would have the responsibility for disposal of materials not needed for defense, which is ours, as well as the opportunity to review and have the responsibility for the decision regarding the cancellation of notes to the Treasury, that that should resolve this disagreement.

"Now you may say 'Well, look, we have the biggest stockpile in defense.' I don't think that is vital, because you are taking stockpile that was under our responsibility away from us. Let's split the responsibility where it belongs. The Armed Services Committee is responsible to provide stockpiles needed for defense. And I think we are responsible to dispose of the material that is not needed for defense. And I think that would resolve the difficulty of jurisdiction.

"Now if that were done, I think we might have to have some hearings about the question of price and about the question of whether it is going to be done on a limited congressional veto basis, rather than a positive basis. I am sure it is obvious to the Senator from Missouri, as it probably is to the members of this committee, that the people who produce this material in the United States—production and stabilization is part of our problem—are very much disturbed by that language in the bill which would give the executive the power to dispose of this material below the domestic market price.

"Now I know the Senator from Missouri says it is hard to find a domestic price. I think it is much harder to find a world price, because you have got so many more factors involved in it.

"So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if we want to really preserve the jurisdiction of this committee, that we ask for those amendments and then we could support the bill. Because I really believe that the right of disposal which affects both production and stabilization is our jurisdiction; certainly the Armed Services Committee is not concerned fundamentally with the disposal of material. They are concerned with the defense of the United States."

Senator SPARKMAN stated that when we do have a period of emergency, and have to have controls of any kind, it is the Banking and Currency Committee that has jurisdiction over those controls. And it is because of the economic implications. He said that we are in a period now when we don't have those controls, and we find a surplus in the various stockpiles. Senator SPARKMAN stated that does not mean that the Banking and Currency Committee should lose interest or should lose jurisdiction regarding the economic considerations (p. 35).

Senator SYMINGTON stated that he was not asking for any jurisdiction, and that if the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee wants to discuss with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that he would like to take over the jurisdiction of disposals, he would be willing.

Senator PROXMIRE stated that he is very sympathetic with Senator SYMINGTON's bill, but further stated that the Banking and Currency Committee should zealously guard its jurisdiction, particularly in the area of production and stabilization. Senator PROXMIRE indicated that passage of the bill would help the budget and the economy. Senator PROXMIRE stated that he is in favor of the bill although he did not think the Banking and Currency Committee ought to cede any jurisdiction (p. 38).

Senator ROBERTSON stated that there may be a need for a stockpile for a nuclear war, but nobody has ever told us what kind of stockpile we need for a nuclear war.

Senator MUSKIE stated that he is sympathetic to Senator SYMINGTON's bill, that he thinks the approach is a commonsense one, and that he reserves some judgment in the details of the bill. He thinks the question of jurisdiction is a valid one to be explored by the chairmen of the two committees, but that the disposal of materials takes priority over jurisdiction.

POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I personally am pleased that the President of the United States and the Postmaster General, Mr. Gronouski, are reported to be in favor of asking Congress to abolish the old and badly worn Postal Savings System. I commend them for this action which I believe would be in the best interest of the people.

The Postal Savings System was established by an act of Congress in the early part of this century. It was designed to attract small depositors and to encourage thrift and to provide savings deposit facilities, especially in communities where banks did not exist. Today banking facilities are readily available in practically every community.

The Postal Savings System served its purpose. After its founding by the Congress in 1910, the System experienced a continued growth until about 1945 or 1946. Since 1947 the System's activities and deposits have been on a decline. Easy access to commercial banking facilities; federally insured protection for deposits; and the low rate of 2 percent paid on postal savings deposits have made the System obsolete. Today the System is time consuming, an expense to the Post Office Department; and pays the depositor a very inequitable rate of interest. The Post Office Department should get out of the banking business.

I was glad to support legislation that would have helped to remedy this situation in the 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses.

I believe it was in 1955, the Hoover Commission recommended the liquidation of the Postal Savings System. Also, it was recommended by the Postmaster General during President Eisenhower's administration. This legislation was needed at that time, but it did not pass. It is needed today and I shall be glad to give it my support.

I do this because I believe the operation of the Postal Savings System, which was expected to aid the Nation's economy by encouraging thrift and drawing additional money into circulation, has served well, but in the realm of modern facilities for saving it has become outmoded and should be discontinued.

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 13th Annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast was held last Thursday morning, and there were over 2,500 in attendance.

Among those attending were the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, members of the Diplomatic Corps, Governors of various States, and over half of the membership of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, as well as religious and lay leaders from over the Nation.

The growth of the prayer breakfast movement over the past 13 years has been remarkable. As a result of this breakfast, practically every Governor of the United States holds an annual prayer breakfast in his own State Capitol with the leaders of his State and literally hundreds of small regular groups are meeting to foster faith and freedom in this land and around the world.

There is a growing appreciation for the values gained when leaders meet in the spirit of prayer—recognizing that our ultimate hope and trust is in God.

One of our Nation's outstanding columnists, David Lawrence, wrote a very excellent article entitled, "Religion in Governmental Life," which appeared in the Washington Star last Saturday and other papers in the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Religion in Governmental Life

(By David Lawrence)

Church and state are supposed to be separate, and formally they are. But the 13th Annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast yesterday at the Shoreham Hotel here, attended by the President of the United States and prominent men from the other two branches of the Government, was an outstanding example of the role that religion plays in governmental life in the United States.

Just 4 years ago, at the Ninth Annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast, Lyndon Johnson, then Vice President, said:

"We need to remember that the separation of church and state must never mean the separation of religious values from the lives of our public servants."

In his address this week to the prayer breakfast—now as President—Johnson said:

"I find for myself, as I know men and women throughout this great Government of ours also find, a sustaining strength from the moments of prayer, whether we assemble together or whether we pray silently alone. What has become a tradition and practice in our times is actually one of the oldest public traditions of our national life."

All this may sound paradoxical in view of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, that have banned the use of prayers as a classroom exercise in the public schools. But the annual Presidential Prayer Breakfasts here have become inspiring manifestations of devotion to the concept of prayer, whether public or private.

Besides Johnson, there were in attendance Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Speaker John McCormack, Justice Tom C. Clark, of the Supreme Court of the United States, and some of the leaders of the Senate as well as the House of Representatives.

The brief speeches were particularly significant. One was made by Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Army Chief of Staff, who told of the value of prayer to him as he passed through dangerous moments in World War II and in the Korean war. He spoke of an occasion when he was a prisoner aboard a Japanese ship that was being bombarded by U.S. aircraft. He said:

"I bowed my head and prayed, and in the course of my prayer said, 'Lord, I am ready if you want me.' And I knew a great peace. * * *

"Fourteen years ago and two months, on a lonely road just southeast of Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea, a road that was deserted except for a small handful of American defenders, a lonely commander was deeply troubled by the threat to the men that he was charged with safeguarding. Could he do the job that was his to do and still give his men a fighting chance to survive? And out of the still of the night, as if from a great distance, came God's voice saying, 'Be strong, have no fear, I am with you.' And in the years that have since passed by, I continue to turn to God, both in my infrequent hours of accomplishment or achievement to thank Him, and in my more frequent hours of tribulation to seek His help. In short, I am here because I believe. I am sure that you are here because you believe."

Another impressive speech came from William C. Jones, a successful businessman from Los Angeles who has been host to the Presidential prayer breakfasts here for several years. He said:

"Prayer has played a significant part in my life, and I feel perfectly at home here. The reason I am sure that Jesus Christ changes a life is because He changed mine. In answer to a prayer 12 years ago, after being an alcoholic for 15 years, ruining my home, my friends, and everything, He put a new light into me, and I've experienced this miracle in my own life."

In attendance at the Presidential prayer breakfast this year were more than 70 presidents of national and international labor unions, more than 100 leaders in the field of industry and business, the chancellors and the presidents from a number of universities and colleges, and prominent men from the courts, from communications, and from every other phase of economic life. Senator Frank Carlson, Republican, of Kansas, who presided at the meeting, said:

"The growth of the prayer breakfast movement during these past 13 years has been remarkable. As a result of this breakfast, practically every Governor in the United States holds an annual Governor's prayer breakfast in his own State capital with the leaders of that State. And literally hundreds of smaller regular groups are meeting to foster faith and freedom in this land and around the world.

"New prayer groups which meet weekly are being organized among businessmen, civic officials, secretaries, clerks, housewives, college and university students.

"Now there's a growing appreciation for the values gained when leaders meet in the spirit of prayer, recognizing that our ultimate hope and trust is in our God."

So it can hardly be said that the use of prayer has been discouraged in American public life.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week the 14-nation Executive Board of the International Coffee Council met in London and voted that the annual export quotas for 1964–65 should be reduced.

This decision was reached 3 days after the U.S. Senate voted to implement the Coffee Agreement, and is further evidence that the International Coffee Council has but one program in mind and that is a continued increase in the price of coffee for our consumers.

At this meeting the exporting countries recommended an immediate 5-percent cut in the export quotas, which would reduce present world exports of 47.5 million bags by some 2.2 million. This would bring the world export of coffee down to 45.3 million bags, which is the lowest since 1962.

The consumer countries which are members of the International Coffee Council have for some time been urging an export quota of coffee of 50 million bags, while the exporters have been contending for an export quota of 45 million bags.

This reduced quota has not had the support of the United States, but in the final analysis, we only have 20 percent of the votes in establishing coffee quotas.

The coffee consumers of our Nation can continue to expect ever increasing prices for coffee.

I ask unanimous consent that the dispatch from London which appeared in the Washington Post last Saturday, February 6, be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 6, 1965]

COFFEE GROUP DECIDES ON EXPORT CUTS

LONDON, February 5.—The 14-nation Executive Board of the International Coffee Council decided in principle today that annual export quotas for 1964–65 should be reduced.

No agreement was reached on the amount of the reduction, however, and the Board, which ended a 5-day session this evening, announced it would meet again February 15–16 to decide this matter.

A statement issued at the close of the meeting said:

"In the light of a careful study of the market situation, and in particular of the recent instability in the prices for robusta coffees, the Board decided in principle that annual quotas for 1964–65 should be reduced.

"The exporting members offered to provide satisfactory guarantees that they would support a subsequent increase in the current annual quotas in the event of an unacceptable rise in prices."

The statement said that when the Board met again February 15 for 2 days, it would decide the following points:

The amount by which quotas should be reduced.

The distribution of such a reduction as between the current and remaining quarters of the coffee year.

The nature of the guarantees to be given by exporting members, and

The measures to be taken to insure that contracts already entered into could be fulfilled notwithstanding any quota reduction.

The Board had been discussing a request from the exporting countries for an immediate 5-percent cut in export quotas, which would reduce present world exports of 47.5 million bags by some 2.2 million.

The consumer countries, led by the United States, have opposed this but, it was understood, would be prepared to accept a smaller reduction. What this should be has been the main point of difference not only between exporters and consumers but among the consumers themselves.

THE STORY OF STORIES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, for many years during my younger days, it was my honor to be a member of the Fourth Estate. During much of this period I looked down from a gallery, as the distinguished members of the press do now.

I know the dreams of newspapermen, watching and listening to the discussions of this august body that we are proud to call the greatest deliberative body in the world—men like Warren Duffee, of the United Press International, Milt Kelly, of the Associated Press, Sam Shaffer, of Newsweek, Jack Bell, of the Associated Press, Don Irwin, of the Los Angeles Times, Marshall McNeil, of Scripps-Howard, E. W. Ned Kenworthy, of the New York Times, and Jerry O'Leary, formerly of the Washington Star, and whom we now see on the floor now and then.

They too have chased the elusive story of stories which I had hoped would break on the floor of this Senate so that I too could report it. But the story of stories which every newspaperman hopes for and expects to break occurred, not in Washington, where we might expect it, but in Laytonsville, Md., on Thursday afternoon. Unfortunately the Senate was not in session.

This is the kind of story that newspapermen dream of. Somehow or other the byline story did not get on the front page but hit on page 3.

Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request. I am afraid I shall be out of order. I would like to be advised if the acting majority leader would object to it. I would like to ask unanimous consent that the picture which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post on Friday, February 5, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I regret that I have to object to that request as being one that transgresses the rules.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was afraid there would be objection. Sometime we may be able to enliven this diurnal, but in the absence of such permission, we shall have to leave a white space where the picture would be and carry the caption and the cutlines under the picture. "The Firemen Couldn't Save the Firehouse," reads the caption, and below it there appears the following words as the cutlines:

"THE FIREMEN COULDN'T SAVE THE FIREHOUSE

"Firemen from neighboring communities make a futile attempt to extinguish the flames in the firehouse at Laytonsville, Md. The building caught fire yesterday morning but the warning siren wouldn't sound because the wiring had burned out. The electrically operated doors wouldn't open either, and so all the firefighting equipment was destroyed. Loss was estimated at $100,000."

Mr. President, anything after that brief, succinct, yet tragic description would be an anticlimax. This story proves that just outside Washington, D.C.—in fact in nearby Maryland—things can get loused up even worse than they can within the boundaries of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, since the picture cannot be printed, the story written by Helen Dewar be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 5, 1965]

LAYTONSVILLE FIREHOUSE IS DESTROYED BY BLAZE

(By Helen Dewar)

The tiny town of Laytonsville, Md., lost its firehouse yesterday. It went up—equipment and all—in about $100,000 worth of smoke.

For the dozens of volunteers who built the proud little fire company from scratch over the past decade, there was a tragic irony:

All the gadgets that helped them fight other people's fires only contributed to their own disaster.

The warning siren wouldn't sound because the electric current had been burned out. The electrically powered doors wouldn't open. And explosions from the trucks' fuel tanks fed the already raging blaze.

Nobody was in the small brick-covered frame firehouse, built 40 years ago as a lodge hall, when the fire broke out. By the time smoke was spotted about 11:45 a.m., the interior was an inferno. Soon flames were shooting 50 feet in the air.

First on the scene was Mike Windham, a former Laytonsville fire chief and an employee of the G. D. Armstrong fuel company's plant across Route 108 from the firehouse.

He tried to set off the siren, then tried to open the doors—all in vain.

Despite efforts of five neighboring fire companies to salvage something, five pieces of equipment—three pumpers, a tank wagon, and an ambulance—were destroyed.

Laytonsville Fire Chief Jonathan Barnsley had left the station about 10:30 a.m. to go to Baltimore. When he returned, his firehouse was no more.

Cause of the blaze was still undetermined last night. "I don't think there's enough left to tell 'em how it started," Windham said. Senior Montgomery County Fire Inspector Thomas Slater estimated damage at $100,000.

SIGNA, THE UNTALENTED ONE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the one-room schoolhouse has been as much a part of the American way of life as apple pie and hamburgers. However, in recent years the one-room school has been rapidly disappearing from the modern scene.

Just recently I learned that this was the subject of a new novel published for nationwide distribution. I was especially pleased that the author is a former student of mine at the University of Montana in Missoula. I was faculty adviser to the then Ethel Matson. Mrs. Ethel Matson Read now lives in California where she is teaching in the Reedley High School.

The setting for the novel is taken from the area around Saco, Mont., the early home of the Huntley family, whose best known member is Chet Huntley, NBC news commentator. I wish to take this opportunity to express my congratulations to Mrs. Reed and to wish her every success in her future literary efforts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the January 31 issue of the Fresno Bee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fresno (Calif.) Bee, Jan. 31, 1965]

REEDLEY TEACHER PUBLISHES NOVEL ON ONE-ROOM SCHOOL

(By Jean Rotan)

Reedley—"In my own way I am trying to pay tribute to the one-room schoolhouse that is fast disappearing from the modern scene."

Thus Mrs. Ethel Matson Read of Reedley summed up her reasons and feelings for her recently published book, "Signa, the Untalented One," published by Carlton Press which is making its appearance in bookstores all over the country.

Mrs. Read will be honored at an open house in Reedley at the Reedley Study and Civic clubhouse today from 2 to 5 p.m. The affair is sponsored by the Reedley Business and Professional Women's Club of which Mrs. Read is a past president. The public is invited to attend.

The setting for Mrs. Read's book is the plains of Montana and the story deals with a girl who is the misfit of an artistically talented Seattle family.

The girl, Signa, goes to Montana to teach in a one-room school hoping that, away from her family, she will find something of value within herself that she will be content to live with. The story revolves around Signa and the inhabitants of the small town where she teaches school.

The locale of the school used in the book is in reality the Huntley School in Saco, Mont., which has been restored and kept as a historic landmark by a committee headed by Mrs. Read's sister, Mrs. Cleve Glascock.

The school was named for Percy Huntley, father of the well known Chet Huntley, radio and television news commentator. Huntley and his brothers and sisters attended this school during their childhood.

Mrs. Read was born in Bagley, Mich., to an immigrant Norwegian father and an old line Yankee mother. Her father filed a homestead in North Dakota and moved his family there.

She received her higher education in Montana State University, where her faculty adviser was the now Senator Mike Mansfield.

"He talked me into majoring in history," she said, "and I've never regretted it." She also has a master of arts degree in history from the University of California and has done postgraduate work at the University of Washington, in Seattle.

She began her teaching career in the rural schools and then advanced to high school and junior college. She has taught for 13 years in the Reedley High School.

She first taught English and history and did some work with dramatics. Now she teaches business English and shorthand.

"There is a lot of satisfaction in teaching business courses. They are electives and the students have a different attitude about them. They seem to want the training they are getting and see the reason for it all.

"My hobby, more or less is writing. I attend Don Miller's creative writing course in Reedley College and thoroughly enjoy it. I love meeting other writers, and people with the same interests as mine."

Mrs. Read who has worked on her novel during summer vacations said the start of the book, Signa, was actually a short story she had written while attending the Montana University.

Vardis Fisher, her instructor at the time, told her that the short story was the start of a novel.

"He said you have left it wide open to go on and on." From there she wrote the first draft of her book and the short story became chapter 2. "It was just a bunch of episodes with no particular plot or anything to really draw it together."

While working for her masters degree in the University of California at Los Angeles she took private courses in plot construction.

Her instructor told her she would have to spice up her story, that people did not want to read about goody, goody characters. So she began rewriting and had to revise from 660 pages down to 350. "I really benefited by his criticism and learned a good deal about construction."

Mrs. Read has traveled extensively through the United States, Europe, Mexico, and Central America. She taught for a year at Balboa in the Panama Canal Zone and during World War II she worked as a legal secretary at Hickam Air Force base, Honolulu, Hawaii.

She has had some poetry published and short articles and is now working on a collection of short stories.

She is married to Edmund Read and has a daughter, Patricia McKitrick, who teaches business at Sierra Union High School, and one grandson, Michael.

RATCHET I

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, for some time it has been common knowledge that there is in the Bureau of the Budget an operation called "Ratchet I," a term used by employees there to describe a "tightening up" on investment and expenditure of tax dollars collected at the Federal level.

I prefer the definition having to do with printing, in Webster's unabridged dictionary, which, in part, is: "a device for turning the screws or clamps on."

"Ratchet I" has resulted in orders to close defense installations, veterans hospitals, and fish hatcheries, and to withdraw Federal funds from State-supported agricultural research programs, among others.

If my colleagues in the Senate think "Ratchet I" is tough, wait till they see "Ratchet II."

ANOTHER EGYPTIAN BLACKMAIL ATTEMPT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I read with considerable concern the report carried in this morning's newspapers that Egypt had decided to sever diplomatic relations with West Germany if the Bonn government continues to supply arms to Israel.

This new blackmail threat is particularly severe because it comes at a time when similar threats have apparently succeeded in cowing the U.S. Government.

From 1955 through the end of last year, the United States provided Egypt with economic aid totaling more than $1 billion—some $825 million of it in the form of surplus farm commodities.

Then, after Egypt, first, permitted the burning of a U.S. library in Cairo; second, sent thousands of Egyptian troops to fight in a civil war in neighboring Yemen; third, tried to deprive the United States of Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya; and forth, provided arms to the Congo rebels, the U.S. Government urged Egypt's dictator Nasser to stop such actions. He maintained that the United States was interfering with Egypt's internal policies—and he advised us to take our aid and "jump into the lake with it."

But, refusing to be deterred from supporting the Nasser government, the United States insists on continuing aid payments to Egypt.

Thus encouraged, Nasser moves on to a new area of the world and threatens West Germany.

Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate that many issues are at stake here. The executive branch of our Government is asking us to continue sending American goods and money to a dictator who is using that aid to operate very much against the interests of the United States. Now he is branching out, attempting to disrupt diplomatic dealings with other nations in the free world with whom we are allied.

I hope the Department of State is aware that, by its intractable policy on countries like Egypt, it is making it increasingly difficult for Members of the Senate, who are otherwise disposed to support the foreign aid program, to continue their support.

ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES FROM TOTALITARIAN OPPRESSION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on the evening of January 27 it was my great privilege to attend in New York a dinner organized under the auspices of the International Rescue Committee, an organization which has, for some four decades now, rendered assistance to refugees from totalitarian oppression in every part of the world.

The occasion was a doubly auspicious one, because the International Rescue Committee had selected President George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, as the recipient of its Freedom Award, in recognition of the outstanding services which the AFL–CIO and President Meany himself have rendered to the cause of freedom in recent decades.

It is a rare public function at which one can listen to a speech of historic significance. The IRC's dinner, in my opinion, was altogether unique, because it was marked by two truly outstanding speeches, one given by President George Meany in receiving the award, and the other one given by Mr. Leo Cherne, a longtime director of the IRC, in presenting the award to Mr. Meany.

Mr. Cherne's speech is an eloquent statement on the moral and political significance of the modern refugee problem; Mr. Meany's address is marked by his uncompromising commitment to human freedom in any approach to the conflicts and crucial problems of the world today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record at this point both the address of Mr. Leo Cherne in presenting the IRC's Freedom Award to Mr. George Meany and the response of Mr. Meany in accepting the award.

I hope that my colleagues will find the time to read these two notable statements, because they go far beyond the routine speeches that generally accompany the presentation of awards.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Leo Cherne, Address at Freedom Award Dinner for AFL–CIO President George Meany, New York Hilton Hotel, January 27, 1965

Our minds and purposes are often prisoners of the words we use. Think briefly of the words we have invented or used to identify those who have fled tyranny, those who, in the search for freedom, have torn all family ties, ripped out a lifetime's roots, painfully sought new beginnings among us. How do we know them? But these words redolent of despair and dislocation—refugee, immigrant, greenhorn, displaced person, escapee, parolee.

But I ask you tonight to think of the American pantheon inhabited by those who at a critical moment of their lives were parolees, greenhorns, wetbacks, ship jumpers, fugitives, escapees, immigrants. Think back to Albert Einstein, Neumann, Fermi, to an incredible trio of Hungarian refugee scientists, Szilard, Teller, and Wigner. Do you recall a hero's welcome for Emma Goldman, a red carpet for David Dubinsky or Sidney Hillman? Did the galleries clamor for the canvasses of the newly arrived Marc Chagall, or the bronzes of Jacques Lipchitz? And

Manuel Lleo Urrutia, who only months before had been President of the Cuban Government which had overthrown Batista—was he hailed, wined, dined on his arrival here.

Yet the vision and character of these and many more whose names are all but unknown is what we are gathered tonight to commemorate. We salute the courage involved in the personal struggle against tyranny, the lives risked in the endless fight against totalitarianism, the unbelievable resources of personal strength required to break with all that is known as home and start out anew in a foreign and not always friendly place. And we honor particularly those like George Meany who reached out to help these men and women in the days of their deepest distress.

Modern history has known nothing comparable to the opening of the sluice gates that began on Monday, January 30, 1933, when a man with the burning eyes of a fanatic took the oath of office as Chancellor of the German Reich.

First, there were the German victims of Hitler's brutal oppression. Then in 1936, Hitler began to devour Europe, course by course, as Winston Churchill described it, and a tragic stream of refugees spurted westward. The pattern was repeated over and over again until all of Europe was under the Nazi heel. Together with millions of French, Belgians, and Dutch who retreated before the advancing German armies, were tens of thousands of refugees from all of Europe's tyrannies—Russians and Germans, Poles and Italians, Hungarians and Spaniards.

France, which had been the last asylum for those who fled the oriental wrath of Stalin and the steel juggernaut of the Nazis became a giant mantrap for the most prominent anti-Nazi, anti-Fascist, and anti-Communist leaders of Europe. Some were on the Nazi hunting list; others were the quarry of the Italian Fascists, still others were the designated prey of Stalin's GPU. Hated impartially by Nazis, Fascists, and Communists alike were the spokesmen of the European democratic labor movement.

Among these, the leader of Austria's labor movement during the underground years of Nazi capture and its eminent historian, Joseph Buttinger, now our vice chairman, has been a central figure in IRC's work throughout these tragic 25 years. His counsel, cooperation, and assistance were invaluable during the most difficult period of IRC's existence, and we were proud that he consented to be IRC's first European director after the war. His wife, Muriel, preceded him to Europe after Paris was liberated and she was in charge of our French operation at a time when it was the most important oversea activity of the committee.

And as all these men and women found their last hope for life in Europe ended, two American groups began to move. At the initiative of the Jewish Labor Committee, a special program was set up by the American Federation of Labor under the leadership of William Green, David Dubinsky and Adolph Held. Simultaneously the International Rescue Committee compiled lists of writers, artists, scholars, philosophers, statesmen and professionals, who were on the Nazi death list. Within weeks representatives of the AFL and the Rescue Committee reached Marseille. A few months later, when the AFL representative, Dr. Frank Bohn, returned to the United States, the delegate of the Rescue Committee, Varian Fry, assumed the responsibility for rescuing those leaders of labor who had not yet escaped. During the following 13 months, he and his colleagues succeeded in assisting to freedom more than 2,000 prominent men and women who had been marked for slaughter by the Nazis.

The labor list, as prepared by the Jewish Labor Committee, contained the names of people who had gained renown as leaders of Europe's democratic forces. From Germany, among others, there were the former ministers, Rudolf Hilferding and Rudolf Breitscheid, and the ex-deputy, Paul Herz, who was to play a leading role in the recovery of free Berlin after the war. From Italy there were, among many others, the fiery chairman of the Italian social democrats, Giuseppe Modigliani, and a then unknown exile, Giuseppe Saragat, today President of Italy. Russia was represented by the Menshevik leaders, Rafael Abramovich and Teodor Dan, Victor Tchernoff, the president of the democratically elected Parliament of 1917, and the writers David Dallin, Boris Nikolaewsky and Solomon Schwarz. From Austria there were the venerable Friedrich Adler and Wilhelm Ellenbogen; from Belgium, Louis de Broukere, and from France, the ex-premier, Leon Blum. And there were the leaders of the heroic Jewish labor organizations of Poland, most prominently among them Arthur Bigelbaum who, 3 years later, was to give his life in protest against the world's uncomprehending reaction to the slaughter of a whole people. There were Paul Vignaux, the spokesman of the French Christian trade unions, Werner Thorman, the exiled leader of the German Christian trade unions, Bruno Buozzi, once the president of the Italian Federation of Labor—a whole galaxy of names, the likes of which had never before, collectively, been exposed to the same deadly danger. In this crucible the links between the American trade union movement and the International Rescue Committee were forged, and it is only fitting that today, in honoring George Meany, we recall this chapter of past and continuing comradeship in arms.

Not all the efforts to save the doomed were successful. Leon Blum was captured by the Gestapo in a Vichy France prison and taken to a German concentration camp. Rudolf Hilferding and Rudolf Breitscheid, who had been granted American "danger visas" and for whom arrangements had been made to leave France, were informed on January 30, 1941, that Vichy had cancelled their exit visas. What happened afterward was told by Mrs. Breitscheid in a memorandum which is still in our files:

"On Saturday evening, February 8, shortly after 11 o'clock, there was a loud knock on our door. Officials of the local police told us excitedly that we should immedately pack our bags, as my husband and Hilferding must get away at once in order to avoid a German commission which was looking for them. At the police station the chief of police said he knew nothing beyond the fact that an automobile was coming from Marseille to take us away. We were taken instead to a hotel in Vichy. There was no sign to identify it, but there is no doubt that it belonged to the police. At 11 o'clock Hilferding and my husband were taken away. I left them a couple of minutes before, because my husband insisted on it. They had taken Hilferding's poison away from him, but they had not found my husband's. He planned to take it only in the last extremity, but I was afraid the Germans would find it. From my hotel I watched the two autos drive away."

Both Hilferding and Breitscheid died at the hands of the Nazis.

But, fortunately there were the 2,000 who did escape to life and liberty. Recall that among those helped to freedom were: Wanda Landowska, Hans Habe, Lion Feuchtwanger, Marc Chagall, Hannah Arendt, Franz Werfel, Andre Masson, Max Ernst, and Jacques Lipchitz.

The help and support which the American labor movement first gave to the International Rescue Committee a quarter century ago has been unfailingly repeated throughout 25 years filled with crises, tragedy, heroism, butchery, and escape. There are no secret springs from which this understanding flowed. The labor leaders of that period like many still today were themselves the victims of the manifold tyrannies of the old world who fled with their dreams to help shape and perfect a better society in the new world. But if the significance of the faithfulness and vision represented by our guest of honor and of his many colleagues in the unions of America are to be fully comprehended, this is the occasion to better recall, to more completely understand those who risk their lives in the flight toward freedom.

In comfort of this room how can we even dimly sense what it is for 18 bedraggled human beings, including children in arms, to set out in an open boat in the stealth of night from the coast of Cuba across the treacherous Caribbean without charts, without adequate food or water, with no shelter from wind, sun, storm. Only recently one such open boat reefed on the bright sand, not of Florida, but of one of the islands of the Bahamas with one survivor and 17 dead. That episode earned an inch and a quarter of space in a great newspaper.

Can we here sense the combination of hopelessness and hope which drives the thousands monthly from the great Red prison of China to illegal sanctuary in Macao or Hong Kong. Can we for a moment imagine what it means to be within sight of that harbor of safety and to be apprehended by a patrol boat and sent back? Can we here comprehend how long is that interval of anguish and fear for those who in desperation cross the barbed-wire, trap-filled, no-man's land which divides East and West Berlin to vault the barbaric wall with machineguns at their backs? How long is the continuous night for those who dig a tunnel, 6 months in the making, with sound detectors operating overhead to sense the slighest movement of earth, shovel, or pick? Can we know what it means to break through finally in East Berlin only to face the sight of Communist police and guns patiently waiting? Do we know, even, that for every one of the tunnels which successfully provides escape for a handful, four tunnels fail?

It has been said so often during these years filled with the tragedy of flight that they vote with their feet. How tragically inadequate is that phrase. They vote with their lives. And many are lost and only a handful of those who, in relative terms can be called fortunate, arrive on their feet.

On June 17, 1953, a group of workers in Berlin taught a lesson which we in America have, I am afraid, all too quickly forgotten. Three years later, still another group of workers, that time in Poznan, revived the lesson, recalled it to our short memories. Then in that extraordinary year in October 1956, the students and workers of Budapest gave their lives to burn that lesson deep into human consciousness. And still the lesson fades, recalled only at random moments such as these.

I have long pondered why the lesson fails. First of all, I think it is because many among us do not want to remember. We desperately wish peace, and so we repeatedly find it. We are so unhappy with yesterday's miserable climate that each day we find new harbingers of a promised political spring. We are so busy binding the wounds left by the assaults upon us that we completely ignore the weakness of our adversary. Yet those weaknesses are considerable—because we are at peace, and they are at war.

The shattering and heroic events in Berlin, in Poznan, in Budapest, in Vietnam, and Hong Kong were both heartening and disturbing. They were heartening because they reaffirmed the knowledge that men who have once enjoyed freedom cannot long submit to its denial. But on another level these reminders are disturbing because they do indeed shatter the peace. They thrust upon our consciousness the knowledge that there is a restless prison to the East. An inhumane and bloodthirsty imperialism is at war with us and with all the decent, proud, and quiet things we deeply value.

I had the great privilege of accompanying the then President of the International Rescue Committee, Ambassador Angier Biddle Duke, on an IRC mission to carry tangible, humanitarian help to those who were voting with their lives in Hungary in 1956. We saw intimately and personally a revolution against tyranny. It is appropriate to recall this experience tonight, because it is also the story of the heroism of Marseilles, of Hong Kong, of Angola.

What is a revolution? It is a weary laborer who sits behind a machinegun for 6 days and nights without sleep or relief. It is the commandant of a battalion of freedom fighters who sits at a desk handing out small slips of paper with handwritten battle-station orders to an endless line of students and youngsters and workers. That officer was a young girl, now dead.

The revolution is the 11-year-old boy who was named hero of his unit. With the agility of the child and the courage of the seasoned revolutionary, he had four times scampered across the freezing cobblestones of Budapest and up the side of the firing Soviet tank to deposit a bottle of gasoline. He emerged each time unscatched. But a revolution is also the score of young female students who employed their agility to throw themselves, clasping Molotov cocktails, into the very path of an onrushing tank.

The revolution is terrible and terrifying. As you drive at night through shattered streets over glass and rubble, tangling your car in overhead electric cables lying everywhere in the streets in distorted shapes, you know with nauseating shock that under your wheels is something which was alive just yesterday.

The revolution is the harrowed and grateful expression on Cardinal Mindszenty's face as you present to him a gift of terramycin from the American people. It is the incredible sight of 30 strong, healthy men in worn workers' clothing, each carrying 1 loaf of bread from your car into the headquarters of the Social Democratic Party as though they carried the Hapsburg crown jewels.

A lawyer and a brass manufacturer stand for hours in the freezing cold, at first observing, then helping, and then inevitably becoming a part of the revolution. Less than 1,000 feet away a woman with a swollen belly runs alone toward the border and suddenly falls to the ground. It is no longer the cold that freezes you as you watch and wait. Five minutes pass, and then, shots are heard somewhere along the frontier. Still no movement. You can wait no longer. You grab a truck, a car, anything that moves, rush across the frontier to pick her up. She is still alive and, when she revives, you learn that she is 8½ months pregnant. All of her life is compressed into one simple instinct—that child must be born in freedom.

A commission returns to the United States to report. They writhe as they use the word "refugee." These are not bedraggled, pitiful, sorrowing, broken people. These are people with the demand for freedom burning within them and the will to risk all for its achievement.

It is not accident that the Berlin revolt of 1953 began with a parade of striking workers down Stalin Allee. It is not chance that among the first to flee Castro's Cuba were the leaders of the Cuban labor unions. Nor is it accident that most of those who fought for Hungarian freedom in 1956 were students or workers. Whatever the tyranny, whether Trujillo's Dominican Republic, or the Kremlin's Russia, whether Ulbricht's German prison or North Vietnam, tyranny and a free labor movement are as incompatible as the Bible and Mein Kampf. This year marks the 25th anniversary of one of the most tragic yet also most glorious chapters in the history of our time.

There are moments in this country as in all free societies when there is difference between management and labor, even painful dispute. In countries under the heel of fascism and communism this is intolerable. Here we regard it as an urgent and valued aspect of a free society. It is significant that distinguished leaders of American industry and commerce have joined here tonight to honor the outstanding labor leader of our time just as these businessmen and the leaders of labor have generously supported the International Rescue Committee throughout these years.

In honoring George Meany we honor both a man and a multitude. We honor him and his colleagues. We honor the tenacity and utter faithfulness of his opposition to tyranny of any kind and the clarity of his constant support of free society. We honor a man whose personal history is one of the great American sagas and whose personal courage is the hallmark of the American ideal. We of the International Rescue Committee are merely the spokesman for the silent many who owe much to the movement which he heads and the generosity he has so freely and consistently conveyed.

Mr. Meany, the regard in which you're held is here more evident than words of mine can describe. We of the IRC are merely the instrument to express that regard, to salute your vision and your faithfulness. Five years ago we had the privilege of conferring our award on Sir Winston Churchill. For sharing that man's vision, with regard and pride we salute you.

ADDRESS BY AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY TO THE FREEDOM AWARD DINNER OF THE INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE

I deeply appreciate the honor which you have bestowed on me this evening. I accept it not as a personal tribute to me but rather as a recognition of the contribution of the American trade union movement to the cause of human freedom and democracy.

For three decades the International Rescue Committee has worked tirelessly and effectively in that same cause. The Committee has endeavored to bolster the spirit and sustain the courage of the victims of tyranny to give them asylum and moral and material support, and to build their capacity as fighters for right and justice.

The great mass of refugees aided by the IRC were not human beings fleeing from natural disasters like floods or earthquakes; nor were they displaced by the force of embattled armies locked in combat. They were refugees from manmade calamities—from the terror of governments engaged in the ruthless extermination of the rights and freedom of their own people. That is the great tragedy of their lives and of our times. That is the tragedy that all men of reason, hope, and good will must join in averting wherever it threatens.

The American trade union movement has a long history of devotion to the cause of human freedom all over the world. Today, to a greater extent than ever before, we are active in that cause.

The representatives of American labor are at this moment lending their support to the advancement of workers' freedom in Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

To give you some idea of the scope of our involvement in this work, more than 24 percent of the income of the national AFL–CIO is spent outside the country—though we do not expect to ever be repaid or to collect any dues in these faraway places.

Why should American labor be interested in the conditions of workers in Bolivia, Nigeria, Pakistan or Ghana? For that matter, why were we active in rebuilding free trade unions in France, Germany, Japan and Italy in the crucial years immediately following World War II? The answer is really very simple—we are interested in the achievement and preservation of free societies on the practical theory that every instrument of oppression that exists anywhere in the world is a potential threat to the continued existence of democracy and freedom in this land of ours.

Let us imagine, for a moment, where we would stand here in America if the Soviet plan to extend communism to all of Latin America by way of Castro's Cuba were to be successful. To what extent would such a circumstance jeopardize our free way of life here in the United States?

We know from actual experience that trade unions cannot exist in any atmosphere except that of freedom.

Likewise we know from bitter experience in our lifetime that no dictatorship of any kind whether of the Hitler type or the Soviet type can exist without controlling the lives of the workers and their organizations.

President John F. Kennedy made this point very well when he said in addressing a trade union convention in West Berlin on June 26, 1963.

"I urge you, gentlemen, in meeting your responsibilities to those who belong to your unions, to also realize that your unions will not survive except in a world of freedom. I urge you to hold out, as we are trying to do in the United States in the AFL–CIO, a helping hand to those who seek to organize trade unions in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. This is how a free society remains free."

That is why we in the labor movement in America take the position that, in any approach to the complex and crucial problems of the world today—human freedom is basic and fundamental.

We want a world in peace, but we mean peace with freedom—not the peace of the slave labor camp or the surface tranquility of a people living in constant fear of a tyrannical government. We support the principle of international cooperation to ease world tensions, but we are convinced there can be no permanent cooperation or relaxation of tension between nations without that mutual trust and respect that can come only where all enjoy the dignity of freedom.

We are convinced beyond question that there is no long-range hope for world peace unless it is based on the elemental spirit of freedom that lies within the breast of all men.

While American labor uses its influence and material resources to defend and preserve free societies all over the world, our No. 1 concern is with the preservation of a free way of life here at home.

We make no apologies to anyone for our defense of the American system. Oh, yes, we are constantly portrayed by Communist propaganda as capitalist lackeys, or agents of Wall Street—but this does not concern us very much. We can prove beyond question that we have achieved more for the workers of America through free trade unions operating within the American economic system than have the organizations of labor in any other place on earth—no matter what label they operate under, be it Socialist, Communist, or any other.

Very frankly, we of the trade union movement like this system. We, of course, intend to continue our efforts to improve the standard of America's workers by improving the system. We do not propose to abandon it for a pipe dream or some ideological fantasy conjured up by those who do not understand the real needs and aspirations of a working people.

I believe that most American businessmen are coming to recognize the role of the trade union movement as a bulwark of our American system. I do not mean, of course, that we have no disagreements or conflicts. But I have observed over the years a growing appreciation, by thoughtful leaders of industry, of the vital part that strong and responsible trade unions play in our system and in the defense of our democratic free way of life.

An outstanding example of this is the American Institute for Free Labor Development which was established in Washington by the AFL–CIO to train young Latin American workers in the fundamentals of trade unionism as it is practiced in this country.

This is a joint venture. Many employers have joined with us in this undertaking and these employers are part and parcel of the American Institute for Free Labor Development and they provide equally with the labor movement the financial support that makes the Institute possible.

Similarly, it should by now be clear to businessmen as well as workers, to management as well as labor, to intellectuals and farmers no less than to our Government leaders in Moscow so fondly hope, not only the preservation of that system.

The idea that some can make progress or profits by doing business with those who would destroy all of us is just plain nonsense. If we lose the cold war, if totalitarian communism engulfs the entire world, as the leaders in Moscow so fondly hope, not only trade unions but business management, profits and all other aspects of our present system will be wiped out. No single group or element in our society will be spared.

In this light, I wonder why some of the leaders of American industry have been calling for the expansion of trade with and the extension of long-term credits to the Communist regimes. Surely, they know that no Communist Party in or out of power has dropped its basic aim to remold the entire world on the pattern of totalitarian dictatorship.

When then are some of our businessmen so eager for our Government to grant economic concessions to the Communist dictators? Why are they so disinterested in the requirement, beforehand, of steps that might warrant the resumption of normal trade relations, by reducing the world tension and eliminating the causes of the cold war? Why are they now indifferent to the proposition that concessions should be called for in return, such as an end to Communist aggression in South Vietnam, dismantling of the Berlin wall of shame, agreement to German national unification in freedom, and the acceptance of international inspection and supervision of disarmament? I wonder why these businessmen, in their eagerness for profits, have forgotten the disastrous experience of "business as usual" with the Nazi and Fascist dictatorship prior to World War II. Have they forgotten how the New York City Third Avenue elevated scrap iron sold for a profit to the Japanese war lords came back to the American people in the most cruel casualties at Guadalcanal? Surely they do not want the enemies of freedom to be so strengthened by American long-term credits and technical proficiency as to be encouraged to resort to new aggressions which might precipitate a nuclear conflagration.

One prominent industrialist recently urged the extension of trade with all countries as a solution to world problems. He said: "I think the place to start is in commerce and trade. It is the best, because you are not concerned with the economic, political, or religious views of those buying your product. The only thing that matters is profit and competitive advantage."

This man, who is not alone in his view, apparently believes that he can do business in an international vacuum. He would have us believe that the political differences between American democracy and the Russian and Chinese Communist dictatorships are similar to the political differences between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. Obviously, it is easy for one who believes that "the only thing that matters is profit and competitive advantage" in commerce with the Communists, to equate the differences between the great religious faiths with the differences between the ideology of communism and the ideals of democracy.

Why should American free enterprise seek to rescue its sworn enemies from the snare of their own economic fallacies? The Russian and Chinese Communists share a common basic aim—the destruction of democracy and the free enterprise system throughout the world. They only differ as to how they would bury us.

With help from American industry, the Soviet Communists might overcome some of their present serious economic difficulties. With such American help, they would find it less difficult to accelerate their production of more destructive nuclear weapons and at the same time ease the heavy burdens of armament on their disillusioned people.

But will such American business policies and practices help our country and promote freedom and world peace? Will it help strengthen democracy in its worldwide struggle with dictatorship? Or will such economic aid to the Kremlin only help the Societ dictatorship in its policy of arming for Communist world conquest.

Those who would risk weakening essential liberty to purchase a little temporary profit deserve neither liberty nor profit. President Lyndon Johnson reflected this conviction when he struck the following keynote in his message on foreign aid:

"We live in a turbulent world. But amid the conflict and confusion, the United States holds firm to its primary goal—a world of stability, freedom, and peace where independent nations can enjoy the benefits of modern knowledge. Here is our difference with the Communists—and our strength. They would use their skills to forge new chains of tyranny. We would use ours to free man from the bonds of the past."

Why provide the Communist rulers with skills to forge new chains of tyranny? I do not question the patriotism of these confused captains of American industry. But I would point out to them that the American business community has been doing quite well in garnering profits without strengthening the enemies of our democracy. Why endanger our entire free enterprise system by putting faith in the promises and pretensions of the Communist leaders? Why should we help them avoid the pitfalls and perils of their own false and despotic doctrines?

These shortsighted advocates of "business as usual" could learn much from the refugees aided, over the years, by the work of the International Rescue Committee. Among the artists and scholars, scientists, and simple workers, they would find men of business and industry who could tell them much about the economics of trade and commerce under tyranny.

They would find men of wealth whose property was taken from them; businessmen whose enterprises were seized; and merchants whose profits were forfeit.

When freedom was lost, all was lost. All came to the same level and were driven to the same last hope—escape to freedom, leaving all else behind. In the light of their experience, can anyone seriously propose that we should feed tyranny with one hand, while we welcome its refugees with the other? I am perhaps too simple to comprehend the virtue of such logic or the necessity for such duplicity. I believe in the cause of freedom; I cannot understand that we can advance that cause if we sell it out, for a bit of profit or a better balance of trade.

In the fight for freedom, our country and its leaders should always have a sense of the urgency of the world crisis. Let us always show a feeling for the people under the yoke of dictatorship. Let us never forget that the exiles and refugees of today are the symbols and spokesmen of a cause that is also our cause. In their hands, firmly clasped with ours, is the tomorrow of freedom.

Let us keep faith with them. Let us not lend aid and comfort to their oppressors. In the final analysis this is exactly what the International Rescue Committee stands for.

THE UNCERTAIN CRIMINAL LAW

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, most of us, and I mean elected and appointed officials as well as the general public, are familiar with the "landmark" court decisions, such as the ones on reapportionment, the reading of prayers in public schools, and the Gideon case upholding the right to counsel for indigent defendents.

But we are not really well versed on the day-to-day application of these decisions in courts throughout the country.

For this reason I was pleased when one of our most highly respected jurists, Judge Irving Kaufman of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, wrote an article on this subject for the January issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

Judge Kaufman's article is titled "The Uncertain Criminal Law" and his main point is that there is no finality in law and I would like to quote one of his summarizing paragraphs:

> It seems vital that the public maintain its interest in and awareness of our developing criminal law even after the headlines have died down and the landmark decisions have been rendered. For as I have attempted to explain, the issues which are sometimes thought simply to trail in the wake of the landmark cases may not be so lightly dismissed. Rarely arising as clearcut confrontations between good and evil, they call for a subtle and judicious balancing, for an often painstaking selection between competing goods or competing evils.

I ask unanimous consent to have this outstanding article printed in the RECORD so that my colleagues and others will have a chance to read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNCERTAIN CRIMINAL LAW: RIGHTS, WRONGS, AND DOUBTS

(By Judge Irving R. Kaufman)

(NOTE.—Irving R. Kaufman is a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which includes New York, Connecticut, and Vermont.)

With the wide growth of the mass media and the increasing tendency of the courts to concern themselves with questions touching at the very essence of our life as a free people, what once seemed the secret workings of the law have lost much of their aura of mystery for even the most casual reader of the daily newspaper. Whether dealing with racial segregation, legislative apportionment, prayers in the public schools, or the right of a defendant to counsel in a criminal prosecution, headlines informing the public of new, "landmark" decisions have become almost commonplace in recent years.

What is less generally known, however, is that these well-publicized landmark decisions are in a real sense merely guideposts pointing toward a virtually endless series of vexing legal questions. And while we like to think that the major cases settle matters once and for all, subsequent and less noted decisions can be far more troublesome. It is often more difficult to determine how far the court should travel along a road than to decide what road should be taken.

Illustrations of this difficulty exist in all areas of the law, and especially in those most familiar to the lay public. Many found it a relatively simple matter, for example, to agree that State-compelled racial segregation in the public schools was a denial of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment. A nation founded on the proposition that all men are created equal could hardly have decided that a man's skin should be the sole determinant of his educational or economic potential. But even after this principle was established, it was far more difficult to determine how desegregation should be accomplished, or the validity of de facto school segregation, perpetuated not by State governments more color bound than color blind, but by the practical if unfortunate realities of residential patterns.

Similarly, there was substantial editorial approval of the Supreme Court's initial decision that grossly inequitable legislative apportionment was a proper matter for judicial scrutiny. The traditional democratic ideal of majority rule, it was argued, could not be subverted by apportionment schemes which at times appeared to give the rural voter twice the electoral strength of his urban counterpart. But when this principle was extended to render unlawful the composition of virtually every State legislature in the Nation, the reaction to such an extension received as much attention as the original apportionment decision.

Through a long series of landmark decisions, we have recently witnessed an almost revolutionary development in the area of criminal law. The institutional imperatives of federalism, which had traditionally dictated deference to the States in our system of dual sovereignty, have become subordinated to the moral imperatives of the Constitution. Within the last several years, to select but a few examples, the States have been required to provide counsel to an accused financially unable to retain his own attorney; to exclude evidence seized in a manner violative of responsible police conduct; and to keep from the jury confessions obtained under circumstances which might cast doubt upon their voluntary character.

As in so many other areas, however, these landmark decisions resolved only comparatively clear-cut questions; far from concluding matters, they were merely the beginning and left much more difficult problems unsettled. And in this gray area of unresolved, less publicized issues, many new and competing considerations arise to assure the continued uncertainty and complexity that have long been occupational hazards of the art of judging. A few representative examples are in order.

THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL

The Supreme Court's declaration that counsel must be provided for indigent defendants in State criminal prosecutions came in the case of Clarence Earl Gideon, a semiliterate, 51-year-old electrician convicted of robbing a poolroom in a small Florida town. At first blush, Gideon's seemed the simplest and most mundane of prosecutions; he had been identified at trial as having been alone in the poolroom, without apparent explanation, at 5:30 on the morning of the robbery. No stranger to the world of criminal law—he had been convicted of four prior felonies. Gideon was compelled to conduct his own defense and was able to make scarcely a dent in what had seemed the ironclad case against him. But Gideon's case itself, as often happens in a judicial system dealing with flesh-and-blood personalities rather than abstract prinicples, strikingly illustrated the necessity for expert counsel in even the simplest criminal case.

When the Supreme Court reversed his conviction for lack of counsel, Gideon was retried for the same offense, but this time with the help of a trained attorney. On his second trial, Gideon's counsel was able not only to present an explanation for Gideon's conduct—he had occasionally been authorized to operate the poolroom—but also to point the finger of suspicion at the prosecution's star witness. The second time that Gideon's case went to the jury, accordingly, he was promptly acquitted. Gideon's guilt, which the first jury was able to find beyond a reasonable doubt when his case was presented without the aid of counsel, was, in the opinion of the second jury, to whom the defenses were developed by an experienced lawyer, not established.

The Gideon decision has been widely acclaimed and almost universally applauded. So urgently was reform needed that the attorneys general of no fewer than 22 States urged the Supreme Court to uphold Gideon's insistence that an attorney's aid at trial is a constitutional requisite. Many States had in fact tendered that aid by legislative enactment. But Gideon was merely the beginning. If I may borrow the title of Anthony Lewis' superb book, the precise dimensions of the area in which the blast of "Gideon's Trumpet" will be heard are yet to be determined and far more difficult to ascertain. There has been considerable speculation on three principal questions: what constitutes indigency? In what kinds of cases must counsel be appointed? And, certainly, the most perplexing, how soon must the appointment be made?

As the devotees of detective fiction well know, a trial is merely the final act of the law enforcement drama. Before it may take place, the investigative process must be employed; leads must be followed, clues pursued, suspects interrogated. Ultimately, an arrest must be made, and the accused formally charged or indicted. At which stage in these long and complex proceedings is the attorney's entrance required? Would the logic of Gideon enable the suspect, as well as the defendant, to claim a right to counsel? Will an attorney's guidance be required in the police station as well as in the courtroom?

These questions are not as hypothetical as might be imagined. Recently, the Supreme Court indicated that Gideon's call will carry far indeed. In a case, *Escobedo* v. *Illinois,* which received little of the popular attention devoted to Gideon, the Court declared that where the criminal "investigation is no longer a general inquiry into an unsolved crime but has begun to focus on a particular suspect, the suspect has been taken into police custody, the police carry out a process of interrogations that lends itself to eliciting incriminating statements, the suspect has requested and been denied an opportunity to consult with his lawyer, and the police have not effectively warned him of his absolute constitutional right to remain silent, the accused has been denied 'the assistance of counsel' in violation of the sixth amendment to the Constitution * * * and no statement elicited by the police during the interrogation may be used against him at a criminal trial."

In short, the Court seems to be telling us that the right to counsel might attach the moment the open-ended "investigating process" narrows to the "accusatory process"; after this point, statements of the defendant, even though voluntary, might not be admissible against him at trial if they were obtained after a request for counsel had been denied. This pronouncement, if we are construing it properly, may require substantial changes in law enforcement procedures, for our police place great importance on the answers elicited from the accused's lips; early access to a lawyer would send confessions to their remise, a matter of grave concern to our law enforcement agencies.

But Escobedo does not end matters, and will be the progenitor of more litigation. Some will undoubtedly argue that the decision should be strictly limited to the facts of the particular case—the accused's counsel was in the police station trying to talk to his client. Prof. James Vorenberg, of the Harvard Law School, in pointing out that "when we ask about [a] man's right to counsel we are not asking one question but a whole range of questions," suggested as series of categories: the suspect may have a lawyer and want to call him; he may not have a lawyer but may have funds to retain one if given the opportunity; or he may be indigent but would want legal advice if it were made available or he were told he was entitled to it. Professor Vorenberg suggests that the Supreme Court's reliance on Gideon in deciding Escobedo "almost seems to be designed to serve as a warning that the limitation on interrogation before consulting counsel may apply also to the indigent defendant with no lawyer." Moreover, no bright line separates the "investigatory" from the "accusatory" process; this is a gray area in which much is yet to be determined.

Are we moving in the direction of establishing a rule of law which requires that all police investigation and interrogation must always be conducted in the presence of the attorneys for the individual questioned? If so, this would be a radical departure from law enforcement procedures followed throughout the country. Law enforcement officials have told us that with criminal behavior on the increase and more difficult to control, any restraint on their right to interrogate would make crime detection and prevention virtually impossible. Is an adversary system, created for the formalistic world of the courtroom, suited or practicable in the far less formal arena of criminal investigation?

Recent statistics compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation reveal that in the first 6 months of 1964 the number of serious offenses known to the police in the United States increased by some 15 percent over a similar period in 1963. While the violence haunting the streets of our larger cities has often been reported, the wealthier, presumably safer suburban areas have shown even more disturbing figures. There crime has increased at a rate of 23 percent, with an 18 percent rise in the number of murders and a 34 percent increase in forcible rape cases. Against this alarming background, my brother on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, Chief Judge J. Edward Lumbard, warned that before we impose additional restrictions upon the police we should display great caution, "lest in the desire to protect individual rights, the larger and greater right of all the people to be secure in their persons and in their homes become secondary."

It has also been emphasized that the interests protected by a requirement of counsel before trial may be quite different from those safeguarded by the Gideon decision itself. One of the oldest of Anglo-Saxon beliefs is that the truth, in a controverted situation, will emerge when champions for each side bring to light those facts most helpful to their particular cause. This is the rock upon which our form of criminal trial rests.

If a defendant such as Gideon is denied counsel at trial, the main prop for this form of adversary litigation is immediately removed. Forced to shift for himself, deprived of the legal, forensic, and investigatory skills of his lawyer, the defendant will generally be no match for the prosecuting attorney; he will be unable adequately to present his version of the story to the forum in which he stands. As a result, the jury will receive not a well-rounded presentation of both sides, but merely half a picture of the vital events in question. The truth-finding purpose of the trial, its raison d'être, will have been intolerably impaired.

When it is urged that the right to counsel be extended to the suspect in the police station, however, quite different interests are involved. Here it is not primarily the truth-finding nature of the law enforcement process that is at stake. Since any confessions obtained as a result of the crowbar or subtler coercive devices will be unavailable to the prosecution at trial, the police will not wish to invite the spotlight of judicial scrutiny into methods which would establish that the suspect was browbeaten into making a false admission. The voluntary nature of a confession is always a matter for court inquiry at trial, and this fact, known to all police officers, serves as a deterrent to most law enforcement lawbreakers.

Of course, the interests of the suspect undergoing questioning are not of any lesser significance than those of a defendant at trial. Nor would I suggest that the right to legal assistance before the trial commences is not of the utmost importance. Central to our Bill of Rights is the privilege of one accused of crime to remain silent in the face of police interrogation. If an attorney is not present, the danger that even the innocent suspect will provide the police with incriminating information is undoubtedly increased. So long as we pride ourselves on protecting the innocent, these considerations cannot be ignored.

But it does seem significant that just as the interests of society differ, the interests of the suspect in the police station are not precisely those of the defendant at trial. While we may speak of both cases as involving the right to counsel, the problem of accommodating the rights of the individual to those of society may well be different. In the Gideon case, the issue pitted the defendant's interest in full disclosure and fair defense against no real corresponding value on the part of society. Certainly an ordered society would not wish to convict a defendant solely because he forfeited his case. When we move outside and beyond the courtroom, however, we must balance the individual's right to legal guidance at the only stage when it may be crucial to him against the public interest in efficient and effective crime-detecting and law-enforcement machinery. The Gideon case, in short, was but the first, and the easiest, step in the right-to-counsel area. What was once a one-sided question has become a difficult problem of balancing. The landmark decision was simply the prelude.

UNLAWFUL SEARCH AND SEIZURE

The fourth amendment to our Constitution, protecting the right of all Americans to be secure in their homes from unreasonable searches and seizures, was patterned upon the Englishman's right to absolute protection from official harassment. As William Pitt eloquently wrote: "the poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storm may enter; the rain may enter; but the King of England cannot enter—all his force dares not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

In the United States, the fourth amendment had for several years been construed as preventing State as well as Federal officials from arbitrarily entering American homes, but it was not until the spring of 1961 that the Supreme Court decided, in *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, that evidence unlawfully seized by State officers would be inadmissible in State criminal prosecutions. As in Gideon's case, the abstract question decided by the Court in Mapp was placed in sharp focus by the factual context in which it arose. From its examination of the trial record, the Court learned that seven Cleveland police officers, denied entrance to a private home when they failed to produce a search warrant, forcibly entered by prying a screen door off its hinges and by breaking the glass in the door. Once inside, they handcuffed Miss Mapp, and over her vigorous protests, proceeded to ransack her entire home, from a child's bedroom on the second floor to a trunk stored in the basement. In the course of this indiscriminate and wholly unauthorized search, the police discovered several allegedly obscene books and pictures, for the possession of which Miss Mapp was arrested, indicted, and convicted.

Obviously shocked and repelled by the brutal and oppressive tactics of the police, the Supreme Court promptly reversed her State court conviction. Evidence obtained in this arbitrary and oppressive manner, the Court declared, could not be admitted even in a State court. Rather than condone or encourage this sort of police conduct, the Court found it preferable to allow one defendant to escape punishment, even though it appeared she had in fact possessed the obscene literature.

Mapp v. *Ohio* unquestionably was a landmark decision. Not only was it widely publicized and discussed, but it climaxed one of the bitterest legal battles of recent years. Lawyers, judges, and scholars have long wrestled with the problem of whether State courts should be required to exclude evidence at trial because of the repugnant manner in which it was obtained. The debate has hardly been one sided; no less eminent a scholar than Justice Benjamin Cardozo persuasively argued that it made little sense to let a criminal go free simply because "the constable had blundered," and the Supreme Court itself, in an earlier decision involving State prosecutions, had seemed to agree. Indeed, counsel in the Supreme Court failed to raise the issue in Mapp that there had been an unconstitutional search and seizure, and that therefore the evidence seized should have been excluded at the trial. Instead, he confined himself merely to arguing that the literature was not obscene. By the time *Mapp* v. *Ohio* was decided, however, most observers had concluded that the "exclusionary rule" was a constitutional necessity. It was generally agreed that the fourth amendment's prohibition of unreasonable searches and seizures would offer scant protection of individual liberty until State law enforcement officials were told that the fruits of an unlawful search would be inadmissible at trial, and that any violation of this provision of the Constitution would be self-defeating.

But as we have seen in the right-to-counsel cases, this landmark decision, in which the Supreme Court reversed its own prior decision, was merely the beginning. Not all fourth amendment cases are characterized by the patently oppressive police conduct involved in Mapp. In many instances, the question whether given conduct actually constitutes a "search and seizure" will be far more subtle and perplexing. It is the genius of our Constitution that its terms have proved sufficiently flexible to retain vitality in situations undreamed of by the framers. Men familiar with the clipper ship and the pony express drafted language of a breadth and length that enables Federal regulation of supersonic jets and communication satellites. The 14th amendment, designed to break the shackles of actual human slavery, has facilitated the destruction of far subtler bonds of social and political serfdom.

In this very generality, however, inevitably lies uncertainty; the breadth which permits transforming 18th- and 19th-century prose into a 20th-century reality necessarily lacks absolute precision. Phrases such as "due process of law," "equal protection of the laws," and the "establishment of religion" can bear as many definitions as there are lawyers to define them. So it is also with "search and seizure."

Perhaps the most prominent of situations in which the meaning of search and seizure is heatedly disputed is that involving wiretapping. Despite repeated opportunities, wiretapping has not yet been held to constitute a search and seizure regulable by the fourth amendment. Yet the interception and divulgence of telephone communications, even by State and Federal law enforcement agencies, is prohibited by act of Congress. While this may seem like an exercise in legal technicalities or semantics, the distinction between illegality and unconstitutionality is not merely one of labels, but one which carries several important consequences. Thus, for example, the Supreme Court has in the exercise of its supervisory power over the Federal courts forbidden the introduction of wiretap evidence in Federal criminal prosecutions, but out of deference to our dual sovereign judicial systems—Federal and State—has left the States free to decide whether to admit or exclude such evidence in their own courtrooms. In addition, so long as wiretapping remains simply a statutory and not a constitutional violation, Congress is presumably free to amend or repeal the antiwiretapping statute, and thus empower Federal and State officials to utilize electronic eavesdropping devices to a far greater extent than is now possible.

To many people who consider the problem and weigh the competing interests, the use of wiretapping or bugging mechanisms seems every bit as pernicious as the less subtle, break-the-door-down sort of search symbolized by the Mapp case. Orwellian visions of a police state, in which an electronic big brother hears and sees all, seem too vivid a danger to be dismissed as mere fiction, and these specters are invoked to argue that wiretapping should stand on no surer constitutional footing than do other, more traditional forms of police misconduct.

On the other hand, many responsible law enforcement officials have insisted that the present wholesale restrictions on wiretapping are hopelessly antiquated, and needlessly restrict the ability of Government to combat organized crime operating in many States and threats to the national security. The fourth amendment should not be read, they argue, to prevent the use of modern methods to aid in the detection and prevention of 20th-century crime. Accordingly, legislation has been introduced in Congress to permit a limited and supervised degree of wiretapping in a carefully defined class of cases.

It is not my purpose to express any view in regard to the wisdom or constitutionality of such legislation. I merely wish to emphasize that landmark decisions are the beginning and not the end of litigation; the Mapp decision, forbidding the use of "unreasonably seized" evidence, furnishes little assistance when the meaning of fourth amendment language is called into question in less extreme cases. For the striking, and perhaps the crucial, aspect of the Mapp case was not the simple fact that an individual's right to privacy had been invaded; many such police invasions occur every day, and many will continue to be tolerated as "reasonable." It was, rather, the extent of that invasion which was determinative. Differences of degree, as well as of kind, are all-important when constitutional principles are at stake.

Thus, a suspect's right to privacy is undoubtedly invaded when the police maintain surveillance outside his home or place of business and take notes or even motion pictures of his visitors and their actions. But no one to my knowledge has ever suggested that this familiar tactic is impermissible as a fourth amendment "search." On a less innocuous plane, we know that the Government will occasionally place a "mail watch" on a suspect, and although the authorities do not open his mail, they will be able to identify the senders of all incoming letters. We are told that the mail watch can be invaluable as a means of verifying beliefs that a suspected lawbreaker is not, in fact, acting alone, but is rather part of a larger conspiracy. However distasteful it may appear under certain circumstances, are we prepared to say that the mail watch so differs from more traditional forms of police surveillance as to constitute the sort of search always condemned by the Constitution?

In short, it is clear that many forms of accepted police investigatory work involve, to a greater or lesser degree, an invasion of the individual's right to privacy. The crucial question is whether a particular means is so intolerable that it cannot be justified by any end, however desirable. But when we depart from the polar extreme of Mapp, the scale is not so easily tipped. The weights are more nearly in balance.

I should add at this point that the uncertainty over the proper meaning of search and seizure, typified by the wiretapping controversy, is hardly the only or even the most pressing problem which will remain long after the decision on the Mapp case. We must never forget that Pitt, at least if his words are applied to the fourth amendment, spoke in somewhat hyperbolic terms; the Constitution does not prohibit all searches and seizures, but merely those that are "unreasonable." And in deciding whether a given search or seizure satisfies the loose criterion of "reasonableness," we can hardly expect to be provided with all-purpose, ever-applicable standards. The infinite varieties of human experience, and the intricacies of criminal cases which possess no common characteristic other than their uniqueness, can scarcely be so easily pigeonholed.

Of course, even in this uncertain area, some things are clear. It has long been established, for example, that a search is proper, even if no warrant has been obtained, if the search is "incident to a lawful arrest." The police officer who apprehends a dangerous felon need not trust to luck that his prisoner is unarmed; he is fully justified in searching for a concealed weapon or evidence which might easily be destroyed. Yet this standard, in most cases, merely pushes the quest for "reasonableness" back one step. For the lawbooks reveal that, again in the absence of a warrant, an arrest is "lawful" only if there are "reasonable" grounds therefor.

Recently the State of New York enacted a statute which permits the police to conduct limited searches, even in the absence of an arrest. Known popularly as the stop-and-frisk law, the new statute enpowers a police officer to stop any person "abroad in a public place" who he "reasonably suspects is committing, has committed, or is about to commit" certain criminal violations, and to "demand of him his name, address, and an explanation of his actions." If the officer "reasonably suspects" that he is in danger of suffering serious injury, he is also authorized, under the law, to "frisk" the suspect for a dangerous weapon.

Despite the repeated appeal to a test of reasonableness required by the statutory language, it has already been argued that the new law is unconstitutional on its face, and that any search unauthorized by a warrant or unaccompanied by and prior to an arrest is "unreasonable" within the meaning of the fourth amendment. Many charge that the statute is an invitation to police harassment, and some have even likened it to the infamous requirement of a "permit" or "license" necessary before totalitarian regimes will allow specific classes of citizens to walk the streets.

When the issue of constitutionality is ultimately decided, when it is finally determined whether a "stop and frisk" is, indeed, a "reasonable" search, the balancing already familiar in wiretapping and right-to-counsel cases will take place. Mindful of the possible abuses, we will have to decide whether the inconvenience of occasional police questioning is too great a price to pay for the measure of additional safety on our streets or in our homes which the sponsors of the new statute tell us it will bring.

Some have argued that the new statute will provide the flexibility denied police under prior law and enable them to combat crime without unduly impinging upon the civil liberties of the individual. They urge that the "reasonable suspicion" which justifies detention and interrogation under the statute may prove a less rigorous standard than the "probable cause" customarily necessary for arrest. Harvard's Professor Vorenberg recently explained the sort of case in which the new statute might be used.

"In the early morning hours an officer sees a shabbily dressed man hustling out of an alley behind a store carrying an odd-looking satchel. Or he hears a scream and sees a man run out of a doorway. In a neighborhood where a burglary has been reported a man with his hat over his eyes turns and runs the other way when he sees a police car. What is the officer to do? Commonsense or an informed instinct tells him that there is a pretty good chance that if he could stop the man and ask him a few questions—perhaps frisk him—he would solve a crime. Yet it is doubtful that in any of these cases he has in either the technical or general use of the phrase 'probable cause' to make an arrest."

Professor Vorenberg urges that the new law be interpreted to require the officer promptly to release an uncooperative suspect, a view which would minimize the statute's infringement of the individual's rights. The courts will have to decide, on a case-by-case basis, whether the invasions of privacy permitted by the New York law are so acute as to outweigh the protection to society it is intended to provide.

NO FINALITY IN LAW

Whenever I am told that a landmark criminal case has settled matters once and for all, I am reminded of the gentleman of the 1850's who suggested that the Government close the Patent Office because "nothing was left to be invented." In law, just as in the arts and sciences, there can never be such absolute finality; problems will always exist, difficult distinctions will have to be drawn, subtle issues will always remain to be decided. Indeed, courts will change their minds and reverse themselves on issues long ago decided,

As a result, it seems vital that the public maintain its interest in and awareness of our developing criminal law even after the headlines have died down and the landmark decisions have been rendered. For as I have attempted to explain, the issues which are sometimes thought simply to trail in the wake of the landmark cases may not be so lightly dismissed. Rarely arising as clear-cut confrontations between good and evil, they call for a subtle and judicious balancing, for an often painstaking selection between competing goods or competing evils.

The very notoriety which attends the landmark case is often attributable, as in Gideon, to the one-sideness of the issue at stake; a case becomes a cause when stark injustice to the individual is accompanied by no corresponding social benefit. The problems remaining after this glaring inequity has been remedied, however, precisely because they are so much more subtle and perplexing, are those most deserving of the attention not only of the lawyer but of the public as well.

Those who seek easy or simplistic panaceas will be sadly disappointed. Just as police work cannot be equated to totalitarian oppression, devotion to constitutional principles is not equivalent to softness on crime. As a recent report pointedly noted, "the proudest traditions of common-law criminal procedure hamper efficiency to some extent—because we wish to protect the innocent as well as convict the guilty, and because we wish to treat all prisoners, innocent or guilty, in ways that fit in with the kind of society we want."

I should add one final note of caution: not all the difficult problems that arise in the area of criminal law are constitutional in nature. We should recognize that it is not the role of the courts to pass on the wisdom of legislation, as opposed to the power of the legislature to enact it. The Constitution has been interpreted as incorporating certain of the more indisputable indicia of civilized society, but legislatures can do, and will continue to do, at each session at least some things that some judges will consider unwise. If lack of wisdom were ground for nullification, we would need not only, in a political sense, a different society; we would also need, in a practical sense, wiser judges. The world being what it is, and the limitations of men—even those wielding gavels—being what they are, the public has an important responsibility, acting through its elected representatives, to share the burden in shaping the rules of criminal procedure by which our civilization will be judged.

JUNIOR LEGION BASEBALL WEEK

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, my State of South Dakota is the birthplace of American Legion baseball. For the last 40 years thousands of young boys have participated in this organized version of our national pastime.

It is only fitting that the 1965 Little World Series will be played in South Dakota. The South Dakota State Legislature now in session has passed a resolution directing the Governor to proclaim the week of August 29, 1965, as Junior Legion Baseball Week.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

Concurrent resolution requesting the Governor to proclaim the week of August 29, 1965, as Junior Legion Baseball Week

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

Whereas South Dakota is the birthplace of Junior Legion baseball; and

Whereas this is the 40th anniversary of the birth of Junior Legion baseball; and

Whereas the Little World Series, representing the Nation's best Junior Legion baseball teams, will be played in South Dakota in 1965; and

Whereas Junior Legion baseball contributed directly to the physical, mental, and moral health of today's young men; and

Whereas the Little World Series, the young men who will participate in the event, and all Junior Legion baseball players merit the recognition and attention of the people of the State of South Dakota: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Governor proclaim the week of August 29, 1965, as Junior Legion Baseball Week; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of South Dakota to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

CHARLES DROZ,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.
———, ———,
President of the Senate.
NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

HELP WANTED BY OUR AMBASSADORS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the New York Times magazine recently printed an article, by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], entitled "Help Wanted by Our Ambassadors," which analyzes the crucial role played by our ambassadors in the conduct of our foreign relations. The article is based on a number of the key findings of the Senate Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations, chaired by Senator JACKSON, and on which I had the privilege of serving.

I believe that my colleagues will be interested in the suggestions in the article for strengthening the hand of our American Ambassadors.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From New York Times magazine, Oct. 11, 1964]

HELP WANTED BY OUR AMBASSADORS

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman, Senate Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations)

President Johnson surprised the nation and the world by appointing Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor as Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam. By shifting him there from the chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, one of the most influential posts in Washington, the President dramatically underscored the importance of the ambassador's role in our conduct of foreign affairs.

In the past, the American people have been too little aware of the contributions of their ambassadors, and have paid too little attention to their problems. Although the press seldom mentions their names, they are our representatives at history's front lines; a false step could mean a costly reverse or even a crisis that threatened the peace. If American Ambassadors, therefore, are to spearhead and protect our interests in a dangerous world, it is clear that they must not only be men and women of high competence but they must also have the authority and the backing they need from Washington. Too often, that support and understanding are lacking.

The modern American Ambassador must possess unusual and varied abilities. Ideally, he should be a shrewed negotiator; an acute and sensitive observer and reporter; a man knowledgeable in history, economics, propaganda, and military affairs; a linguist; an outgoing and persuasive personality, and a forceful dynamic executive, coupling a love of country and dedication to its interests with a willingness to earn far less than a man of equal talents could earn at home—perhaps even a willingness to go into debt for the privilege of serving the Nation. With all these requirements, it is surprising how closely most ambassadors measure up to them.

Strong executive ability is particularly important if interagency conflicts and fragmentation of effort are not to dissipate our influence abroad. Yet even more vital is the capacity to understand the internal forces at work in other societies and to influence them where possible in directions consistent with our own policies.

The old argument about the respective merits of career and noncareer appointments has little relevance. Today and in the future, most ambassadors will come from the career service—the proportion is now about two out of three—but there will still be room for candidates with special qualifications brought in from outside—as witness General Taylor. There is no place, however, as Ambassador Samuel Berger, recent envoy to Korea, has said, for a "noncareer man who brings neither interest, nor aptitude, nor professional skills" to the job.

Over the years successful ambassadors have come from many different backgrounds and occupations. If any generalization is valid, it may be that a solid foundation in some specialty is an asset, for mastery of a particular field often seems to lend a person added depth and confidence. The Foreign Service has tried to give young officers opportunities to specialize, but on the whole too few have been allowed to spend enough time in one place or in one type of work or to take advanced studies. Today, qualifications in the social sciences, in economics or in military affairs are highly desirable.

Yet, when all is said and done, the important thing is that an ambassador be a cultivated man who, in the best sense, is wise in the ways of the world with the maturity of judgment that comes from varied experience, and with reserves of know-how and courage to call upon in a pinch.

Fundamentally, an ambassador is the President's personal agent. But his traditional role as a negotiator with foreign governments has been complicated by technology as well as the enormously widened range of foreign affairs. The jet plane and electronic communications may keep him in closer touch with Washington, but they also mean that many issues he would once have handled himself on the basis of general instructions are now dealt with by special emissaries from the State Department or in Washington itself in talks with visiting foreign officials. And even when negotiations are entrusted to our ambassadors the cabled instructions from home run hot and heavy.

The ambassador's perspective on many issues is necessarily that of a diplomatic mission in one country, while Washington tends to see almost everything as a multi-country problem. From the State Departments' point of view, an ambassadors' advice may seem—and be—limited and thus helpful. But if the ambassador often doesn't see the forest for his particular tree, Washington also often overlooks the fact that it is, after all, trees that makes the forest.

Another problem the modern ambassador is called upon to face is that of directing and coordinating his country team. At a major embassy, this may include not only State Department officials but units from the Agency for International Development (AID) and the U.S. Information Service; the service attachés (Army, Navy and Air Force); military assistance advisory groups (MAAG); the CIA; Treasury and Agriculture representatives; science attachés, and the Peace Corps. As if coordinating their efforts were not difficult enough in itself, the ambassador is denied any effective influence at present over the budgets, staff, assignments, and policies of many key members of his team. Not only do they look past him to their own Washington headquarters for money, personnel, and instructions but their loyalties naturally tend in the same direction.

While postwar Presidents have repeatedly expressed their desire to see ambassadors as the active leaders of their missions, too often Washington itself has undercut the leadership it asks them to provide. If they are to perform their vital job intelligently and well, our ambassadors must be able to count on much firmer support in the future.

First and foremost, they need a static-free policy line from Washington. An ambassador who has to guess at administration policy is an ambassador in trouble. Armed with a timely, coherent, approved policy line and the reasoning behind it, he is in a position to seize opportunities to advance our interests; without it, the best he can do is muddle through.

Ambassadors are also entitled to expect effective backstopping at headquarters. A constant complaint is that Washington is too slow in answering their communications. One of them has said: "Sometimes the only way we can get things done is to go to Washington and attend to them personally."

Delays are due partly to layering inside the State Department. An official acting on behalf of an ambassador and traveling the long road to the Secretary of State has to stop every few blocks for a bureaucratic red light. Another difficulty is the multiplicity of departments and agencies that get into the act. Much time and energy are consumed by what Robert A. Lovett, former Cabinet member, calls the merry-go-round of concurrences.

The obvious solution is to provide ambassadors with strong working counterparts in the State Department—Assistant Secretaries and desk officers—with authority to cut through red tape and get answers out to the field within hours if necessary.

The prestige of our ambassadors needs strengthening, too—in the eyes of the governments to which they are posted and for the sake of their relations with the rest of the administration at home (especially with agencies operating overseas).

A highly prized commodity, always in short supply, is good news, and Washington rarely has any to spare for ambassadors. Often called upon to deliver the bad, they would certainly profit if occasionally they had the pleasanter duty of announcing the good.

Washington could call ambassadors home more frequently—and more obviously—for consultations. This is another simple device for enhancing prestige, both with foreign governments and their own embassy staffs—especially if they are given the opportunity to talk, however briefly, with the President.

An ambassador should also be invited to comment on the budgets, programs, and key personnel assignments affecting all elements of his mission team. This would lend weight to the ambassador's opinion and thus increase his ability to guide the operations now only nominally under his control. In this connection, arrangements for an up-to-date communications system between the Department of State and our embassies should be completed as quickly as possible. Some agencies operating overseas can at present communicate with Washington more speedily than the ambassador. The Nation can ill afford the risks inherent in slow, unreliable, and sometimes insecure communications with its chiefs of mission.

But perhaps the quickest means of rebuilding prestige would be to restrain the Washington jet set. Our embassies, especially those in the most attractive countries, are plagued with "official emissaries" from the capital. A special negotiator may be justified when highly technical or highly sensitive issues are involved and where someone more closely associated with the President would have a special advantage, but the supply of emissaries today clearly exceeds the real need for their services. Indeed negotiations are often less skillfully handled, for the peripatetic emissary can scarcely be as sensitive to local questions of timing, custom, personality, and protocol as the man on the spot.

This asset of experience is constantly being thrown away in the reassignment of ambassadors. The average tour of duty is now less than 3 years, even though, as former Ambassador Livingston Merchant, now a Government consultant, has pointed out, "one usually has to be at a post at least a year before one has gotten one's bearings." Career Ambassador Ellis Briggs has said that "no single move * * * would pay greater dividends than leaving American envoys at their posts for sufficient time to capitalize on their knowledge and their experience." While no hard and fast rule should be established, it seems clear that tours of duty should at least run closer to 4 years.

If the ambassador's lot can be eased and his hand strengthened by practical reforms of this sort why, then, haven't they been introduced before? It should be said at once that Washington has at least recognized the problems—which is always a precondition to progress. In part, the difficulty may be traced to the fact that most foreign-policy executives in Washington have very heavy responsibilities and are apt to give administrative problems low priority. Some also take the position that the gains are likely to be small—especially in the relatively short period during which they expect to be in the seats of power.

Congress is also often at fault. Its concern for economy is sometimes unwisely carried to lengths that discourage necessary reforms. Adequate funds, for example, should be provided for ambassadorial maintenance allowances, so that no ambassador need draw on his private means to meet the legitimate expenses of his post.

Then there are the inherent difficulties of providing early and consistent policy guidance when the nature of Government action is often determined by an ad hoc, one-thing-at-a-time approach. Even when the main lines of policy are clear, operations must be adjusted day by day to changing circumstances.

Strong leadership at the center is, therefore, essential, but that is often hard to achieve. For one thing, under the American system of checks and balances, the executive branch and the Congress may differ about national policy, sometimes getting into a major controversy or a stalemate. And for another, within the executive branch itself the making of foreign policy has become interdepartmental. The plethora of interagency concurrences, meetings and coordinating committees exacts a heavy price in wasted time, unnecessary compromise, and general administrative sluggishness.

To get decisive, coordinated action in foreign affairs, a President needs expert help from his own staff and a strong Secretary of State—strong enough to achieve unity among the sprawling and brawling elements of policymaking mainly by the sheer force of his personality. As President Truman once said, even the power of the President is at bottom the power to persuade, and this observation applies with even greater force to a Secretary of State.

But, while the onus of strengthening our diplomatic representation abroad rests primarily on officials at home, we should not forget, as Ambassador Freeman Matthews put it, that "too often ambassadors have shown too much caution or timidity, usually those with lesser experience or unfamiliarity with the ways wheels mesh and grind in Washington." If an ambassador is really determined he can go far on his own account to boss his mission and give added punch to America's effort in foreign affairs. We need ambassadors who know how big their shoes are—and have the gumption and self-confidence to try to fill them.

TREATY ON PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, recently the Soviet Union detonated a large underground nuclear device which was detected by our monitors and others in the vicinity of northern Japan.

Our Government responded by requesting additional information. If past history is any criterion, we may be a long time waiting for an adequate response from the Soviets; but this situation does point out the problem of the many uses of atomic energy, and specifically, the peaceful uses. It occurs to me that this may be a fortuitous time to begin discussions of a revision of the treaty which would permit the peaceful uses of atomic energy to be exploited for the benefit of mankind. Only when this occurs shall we be able to turn away from the dreaded and destructive face of the atom, and partake more fully of its benefits.

Much testing in the field of peaceful uses is needed, and, indeed, had been underway at the time of the treaty. These were put aside—temporarily, I hope—in the interest of the overall objective of the test ban treaty. I believe it is now time to reopen the unresolved question.

A recent editorial in the Las Vegas Review Journal comments very intelligently on this problem. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Las Vegas (Nev.) Review-Journal Jan. 22, 1965]

The release into the atmosphere of radiation from an underground nuclear test in the Soviet Union this week would appear to be an ideal time for President Johnson to revise the international test ban treaty.

In the days preceding the atmospheric test ban agreement, the Review-Journal opposed it on the grounds that testing was necessary to national security and to maintain this Nation's lead in atomic weaponry. Those who had dire predictions for the human race from increased radiation levels have yet to prove any of their theories—and it has been a generation since the first atomic bomb was detonated in New Mexico.

But, we are not going to propose scrapping the test ban treaty because the Soviets have "leaked" a little radiation into the atmosphere. Only suggest that it be revised to eliminate a major stumbling block to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Monumental public works projects are prohibited under the treaty although they would release only insignificant amounts of radiation across international boundary lines. Some tremendous projects in the public interest must be shelved until the treaty is revised or cancelled altogether.

Most significant of these projects is the sea-level cut across the Isthmus of Panama. Already the present system of locks is too small for a number of the world's great ships. But officials of the Atomic Energy Commission estimate that a minimum of 5 years of testing would be necessary before the cutting of a canal by nuclear energy could be practical.

A hundred miles south of Las Vegas, studies are underway to determine the feasibility of cutting a trench through the Bristol Mountains to realine the Santa Fe Railway and U.S. Highway 66 to greatly speed up rail and highway traffic between southern California and points east.

There must be a score of other locales where nuclear energy could be put to use on a project which would be too expensive, or impractical for conventional explosives and machinery.

Unfortunately, none of these projects can ever be a reality under the present terms of the test ban treaty. The treaty, after all, was designed as a benefit to mankind. The peaceful uses of nuclear energy are also designed to benefit mankind. There must be some way the two can exist harmoniously.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CAN BE EFFICIENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, 9 months after the Alaska earthquake, tidal wave, and fire, it is possible to assess the extent of the truly extraordinary and effective assistance given to the people of Alaska. Alaskans have every reason to be grateful and proud: grateful for the help which was immediately forthcoming from Washington, D.C., the States, and the localities; proud of the courage and hard work with which Alaskans made full use of this assistance.

The January 22, 1965, issue of the Kansas City Times gives full recognition to the extent to which the Government can be effective and excellent when there is true need:

> But Alaska proved that, when the overwhelming consideration is people in terrible trouble, the rules can be stretched and shortcuts can be found to get the job done.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Kansas City Times be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Times, Jan. 22, 1965]

ALASKAN QUAKE SNAPPED REDTAPE, TOO

Disaster can bring out the best in people, both in the courage displayed by the victims and the outpouring of aid from their neighbors. So it was in the terrible Alaskan earthquake of last March when, in the words of one account, "Everybody turned hero." Now a Government summary of the Alaskan rebuilding effort reveals another encouraging fact: Under sufficient stress and need, bureaucratic redtape can be severed broadax style.

Federal administrative machinery was not yet fully operative in our 49th State when the earth rocked sickeningly last spring. But in the days and weeks that followed, 17 Federal agencies rushed in to assist the local recovery effort. Bypassing previous legislation restrictions, Congress promptly voted \$23½ million in Federal aid to restore essential public services. Other Federal grants backed a State mortgage forgiveness program on irreparably damaged property. The VA went along on home loans it had guaranteed.

The FHA, the REA, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency were empowered to adjust loan indebtedness of earthquake victims. The maturity period on Small Business Administration loans was boosted from 20 to 30 years. The Federal Government authorized heavy purchases of Alaskan State bonds to speed recovery.

Civil defense rushed in supplies. Water and sewer systems, power and communications were restored. The armed services pitched in. The Army Engineers—under quickly expanded authority—restored the ruined docks and harbor works vital to the State's fishing industry. Home and business reconstruction loans totaled $60 million; repair of $112 million in damages to highways, railroads, and airports was rushed.

On a hundred fronts the rehabilitation task moved ahead rapidly. Federal bureaucracy has frequently been castigated for its ponderous rate of movement, paper shuffling, and complex, multilevel organization. But Alaska proved that, when the overwhelming consideration is people in terrible trouble, the rules can be stretched and shortcuts can be found to get the job done.

THE 20 QUESTIONS QUESTIONED—IOU NO. 31

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I received one of the highest compliments ever paid me when my article on the loaded light bill—IOU No. 28, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 6, 1964—was declared by an employee of a public utility a masterpiece in the use of the half-truth, the innuendo, the implication, and the generality. The commercial utilities have specialized in this business over the years, and are themselves masters in half-truths and innuendoes. Certainly this employee is paying me the highest compliment he knows how to pay. However, I do not deal in half-truths and innuendoes as the private utilities do; and here is the straightforward answer.

An employee of an IOU—investor-owned utility—in Fort Wayne, Ind., has written me a five-page letter in which, using "a logical and factual approach," he attempts to answer the "most serious and damaging misstatements" which I made concerning abuses of the private power companies.

If his "answer" is accorded the treatment sometimes provided by the industry, somebody will pull the chain, and his letter will suddenly appear in reports to stockholders and employee publications around the country, and will be discussed by members of utility "speakers' bureaus." Editorials lauding his magnificent letter, written by editorial-writing services subsidized by the companies, will appear in various newspapers. Various tax-exempt "educational" organizations to which the IOU's contribute will also circulate the material in publications and speeches.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my speech entitled "IOU No. 28," the entire letter, and my comments on various sections of the letter.

There being no objection, the speech, letter, and excerpts and comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IOU No. 28—20 QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR LOADED LIGHT BILL

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a favorite propaganda technique of the IOU's—they call themselves investor-owned utilities—is the rigged quiz. Electrical consumers are asked questions and told answers which create an image of the local power company as home folks, overburdened by taxes and regulation but nevertheless struggling to meet the payroll, just as the corner grocer.

Anyone interested in an elaboration of this technique will find most interesting the articles, "A Farm Family Visit to a Powerhouse," and "Rigging Your Own Quiz Programs" which appeared in the June 8, 1961, and November 23, 1961, issues, respectively, of Public Utilities Fortnightly, an industry publication.

Mr. President, there is a great need for consumer understanding of utility operation. The electric light and power industry is the Nation's largest. Every month millions of American families each pay the local power company up to $5 more than it needs to provide electrical service, expand and make a reasonable profit. For many consumers, the $60-a-year overcharge cancels out the income tax reduction voted by Congress this year.

Companies use part of this monthly overcharge to finance a massive propaganda campaign, through their advertising and public relations programs and by contributions to a variety of organizations which want to shift more taxes from the rich to those less able to pay and which would abolish the United Nations. They also seek to weaken or destroy their nonprofit competitors—the rural electric, municipal and public utility district power suppliers. The IOU's do not like competition, which forces them to reduce rates.

Part of the overcharge is kept by the companies as extra profit. However, ordinary stockholders in power companies do not always benefit from the consumer overcharge. In fact, if you hold stock in an investor-owned power company, you may get taken twice—once when you pay your light bill and again when you get your dividend check. The equity of ordinary stockholders in some power companies is being diluted by creation of additional stock which is sold to company insiders for as little as one-fourth of the price charged ordinary stockholders.

In an attempt to provide better understanding of this issue, I have prepared 20 questions and answers which will, I hope, help offset the rigged quiz programs of the power companies and afford consumers a better understanding of their electricity bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD these 20 questions and answers.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"TWENTY QUESTIONS

"1. Who supplies the power?

"2. How do power suppliers differ?

"3. How do IOU's differ from other businesses?

"4. Don't power companies pay any taxes?

"5. Do the IOU's refund taxes when they collect too much?

"6. Must an IOU refund other overcharges?

"7. How are electric rates set?

"8. Are IOU profits increasing?

"9. Are IOU rates too high?

"10. Don't lower rates increase sales?

"11. Do IOU insiders get cutrate stock?

"12. What do options cost?

"13. Are option windfalls taxed?

"14. Aren't options more costly than salaries?

"15. Then who do IOU's use options?

"16. What will reduce my light bill?

"17. How do IOU's distribute propaganda?

"18. How do IOU's help ultraright groups?

"19. Do the companies publicize such gifts?

"20. Who pays for the propaganda?

"1. Who supplies the power?

"About three-fourths of the electricity in the United States is supplied by 220 companies. These are the large 'investor-owned utilities' (as they call themselves) or the IOU's (as I prefer to call them). Together these companies comprise the largest industry in the United States, with about 12 percent of all capital invested in business in the Nation.

"The rest of the power—less than 25 percent—is supplied by nonprofit systems, including municipals (city owned), rural electric cooperatives, and public utility districts.

"All power suppliers are alike in one sense. They are monopolies, being the sole supplier of power in a given area, with rare exceptions.

"2. How do power suppliers differ?

"The IOU's and rural electric cooperatives are privately owned; the other systems are publicly owned. The IOU's are controlled by principal stockholders, which are frequently holding companies, insurance companies,[1] banks or individuals who live far from the companies' service areas. The rural electrics are controlled by the consumers they serve. Each customer has one vote. Likewise the municipal and public utility district systems are locally controlled.

"Control of the IOU's is usually centralized. In fact, in some instances all voting at annual meetings—of millions of shares of stock—is by proxy. The primary interest of IOU investors is profit.

"In contrast, the primary interest of consumer-owned power suppliers is good service, at the lowest possible cost.

"3. How do IOU's differ from other businesses?

"Competitive, free enterprise businesses are subject to risks and losses. About 15,000 ordinary businesses fail each year. There has not been a failure in the giant electric light and power industry in more than a generation. This is because, as utilities, they are granted numerous special favors by government and practically guaranteed all expenses, including taxes, plus profit. In other words, they are essentially cost-plus contractors, assured costs, including taxes, plus profit.

"4. Do not power companies pay any taxes?

"No. Despite what many IOU's advertise, each company 'merely acts as tax collector for the Government.' Surprisingly, these are the words of a private power spokesman, Edwin Vennard, managing director of Edison Electric Institute, the IOU trade association. You, the customer, pay the taxes when you pay your light bill. They are included by the company as part of its expenses.

"If you don't pay those taxes which are included in your light bill, the company will cut off your lights.

"In their advertisements, some IOU's try to appear to be identical to other businesses. But the IOU's have a monopoly on an essential product, for which demand is unparalleled, along with the practical assurance of all expenses—including taxes—plus profit.

"How many other businesses are in that category?

"5. Do the IOU's refund taxes when they collect too much?

"Hardly ever. In fact many IOU's do not even pass on tax reductions to the consumer who buys electricity at a rate set high enough to pay the company's taxes and other expenses. Under the Revenue Act of 1964, for example, private power companies get two tax reductions—a 2-percent cut in 1964 and an additional 2-percent reduction in 1965. But according to a State-by-State survey by the New York Times in June of 1964, many companies do not plan to pass this tax reduction on to their customers and several State regulatory commissions have indicated they will make no effort to get the companies to do so.

"This is only the most recent example of the IOU's failure to pass tax reductions on to the customer. Since World War II the Federal Government has granted nine tax reductions to the IOU's. Many companies have simply pocketed the reduction. Since 1954 the IOU's have obtained more than a billion dollars in tax relief through accelerated amortization (fast writeoffs of property for tax purposes) and more than a half a billion dollars through liberalized depreciation. The investment tax credit provides them an annual tax savings of more than $50 million. The Revenue Act of 1964 will save the industry $50 million in 1964 and $100 million in 1965 and every year thereafter. In addition, power companies have distributed more than $741 million in tax-free dividends which, because of rapid depreciation, are considered a return of capital.

---

[1] Just one insurance company—Metropolitan Life—has more than twice as much invested in the electric power industry as the Federal Government has invested in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"Thus, in summary, many private power companies are really tax collectors who, when the Government cuts the tax rate, keep on collecting taxes from the consumer at the higher rate. But if taxes are raised, IOU's pass the increase on to the consumer. So the IOU's collect more tax dollars than they turn over to local, State, and Federal Governments.

"6. Must an IOU refund other overcharges?

"No. One of the principles of utility regulation is the 'water over the dam' rule. Under this principle, if revenues or expenses are incorrectly estimated, the party damaged does not get a refund. Another way of stating this principle would be the old phrase, 'let bygones be bygones.' The trouble with this rule, as far as the electric consumer is concerned, is that in rate cases most of the experts are on the side of the IOU's. Many regulatory commissions do not have sufficient staff to analyze critically the company's statements. And in most States electric consumers are unorganized.

"One of the cases I have used to illustrate how the 'water over the dam' principle hurts the consumer involves the Virginia Electric & Power Co. About 10 years ago it started sending out light bills every other month, instead of each month. During a rate case at that time the company was asked how much money it would save sending out only half as many bills. The company said there would be practically no savings. The State regulatory commission accepted this statement, and granted the company the rate increase it requested. Yet by 1962 the company was telling its shareholders that it was saving almost $2.5 million a year just by bimonthly billing. This saving was not passed on to the consumer. And as late as February 1964, a spokesman for the State regulatory commission said he didn't even know how much the company was saving by bimonthly billing.

"Recent studies of the companies' own reports show that 95 IOU's overcharged their consumers more than $2.2 billion in recent years. But past overcharges cannot be balanced off against future profits. The money is gone—water over the dam.

"So the IOU's are better off than the ordinary cost-plus contractor, who sometimes has to go before a renegotiation board which will require him to return excess profit.

"7. How are electric rates set?

"Officials elected by the electric consumers establish rates for rural electric cooperatives and municipals. But rates for IOU's, which serve four out of five Americans, are in most cases established by a State regulatory commission. Most commissions and utility consultants consider a 6-percent rate of return on investment to be reasonable. Thus if the company has $100 million invested in plant and equipment, rates will be set to provide the company a net operating income or profit of $6 million ($100 million times 6 percent) after expenses, including taxes, are deducted from revenue.

"A 6-percent rate of return on investment usually means a 9- or 10-percent return on common stock. This is because carrying charges on bonds and preferred stock, by which the average IOU raises well over half its capital, are well below 6 percent—about 4 or 4½ percent.

"Typical rate of return

"Revenue ($20 million) minus expenses ($14 million) (including taxes) equals net operating income ($6 million) divided by rate base ($100 million) (plant and equipment) equals rate of return, 6 percent. Because of lax regulation the rate of return for some companies has risen as high as 9 percent.

"8. Are IOU profits increasing?

"Yes. Standard & Poor's, a leading investment adviser and financial publisher, reported in 1963 that 'in the past few years, a number of electric utilities increased their earnings to the extent that rates of return on invested capital reached or exceeded those allowed by regulatory authorities.' Net income for electric utilities 'has advanced from 14.5 cents out of every revenue dollar in 1952 to 18 cents in 1962, a gain of almost 25 percent,' according to a 1963 report by Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, the largest investment stock brokerage house.

"Standard & Poor's predicted that 'the extraordinary growth of the electric power and light industry during recent years is but a foreshadowing of continued progress to come.'

"9. Are IOU rates too high?

"Yes. According to Standard & Poor's the net earnings of electric utilities increased $543 million from 1958 to 1962, yet during the same 4-year period the net effect of IOU rate changes was an increase, of $85 million.

"The net effect of rate changes is now a slight decrease, but these small cuts don't begin to give the customer his due. Technological changes have produced great savings. Although cost of electricity to the residential customer is less than two-thirds what it was during World War I, twice as many kilowatt hours of power can now be obtained from a ton of coal as was possible at the end of World War II. Power pooling is also providing spectacular savings. These intertied transmission systems will provide savings estimated at $3 billion, just from reduction of reserve capacity, by 1980.

"Forbes magazine reported in 1964 that the industry's 'net income is rising faster than net property and the industry's rate of return has moved up steadily.' But instead of sharing the increasing profits with the consumers, the solution to the rate of return 'problem,' according to Forbes. 'seems to lie in expanding the rate base.'

"10. Don't lower rates increase sales?

"Yes, they do. Furthermore, when IOU's reduce rates, they still do well financially. Most of the IOU's close to the Tennessee Valley Authority have reduced rates more, proportionately, than companies in other parts of the country. And their common stock earnings have increased more than twice as fast as the national average. In Oregon and Washington residential families use from two to four times as much electricity as persons in Montana, where the rates are about twice as high. Oregon and Washington have substantial Federal power development and consumer-owned power systems which provide yardsticks by which the public can compare profit and nonprofit power. There is not a single municipal power system or public utility district in Montana.

"11. Do IOU insiders get cutrate stock?

"Yes, many do. Power companies, which are assured expenses, including big salaries and retirement plans, plus profit, are different from competitive businesses, some of which argue that they have to offer restricted stock options to key executives to provide incentive. But during the complacent 1950's a number of power companies—by now at least 29—started issuing their key executives restricted stock options. One of the lucky IOU executives can now buy the stock at a price no more than or even slightly below what it was when the option was granted. The market value of many utility stocks has increased fivefold—in one case, fourteenfold—since 1950. This means that an IOU executive with a stock option may buy, for $100, the same amount of stock for which an ordinary stockholder must pay several hundred dollars. Some IOU insiders in Texas and Montana made several hundred thousand dollars apiece in windfall profits by using the restricted stock option.

In the case of the president of the Montana Power Co., who made $370,000 in windfall profit in one option transaction, the windfall has more than doubled to about $800,000 because of the increasing market value of the stock.

"12. What do options cost?

"It is impossible for a regulatory commission to estimate the future value of option stock. Therefore, profits from options are not included in the ratemaking process. Issuance of these options dilutes the equity of ordinary stockholders and indirectly reduces the company's capital, because stock sold on the market provides the company full market value, while option stock does not. Furthermore, availability of option stocks encourages company officials to forgo rate reductions and make ever greater profit, thus, increasing the market value of the stock, so their windfall profit will be even larger when they exercise their options.

"13. Are option windfalls taxed?

"Not always. If the company executive sells his stock, he will have to pay only capital gains, which is 25 percent or less. If he gives the stock to a tax-exempt organization he may be able to deduct the market value of the stock—not just the lower option price—from his gross income.

"But with smart advice from his tax lawyer, he may give the stock to his wife or children and avoid not only Federal income tax, capital gains tax and gift tax but also—with advice planning—estate tax as well.

"The average American may make less in his life than an IOU official makes in one option transaction, but the consumer might pay more taxes on his lifetime earnings than the IOU executive pays on this one windfall.

"14. Aren't options more costly than straight salary increases and bonuses?

"Absolutely. There is no question that stock options are far costlier than salary increases or bonuses because the latter are tax deductible. The cost of stock options, on the other hand, is not. For example, suppose a utility company president makes a $300,000 profit through the restricted stock option. The company is therefore out $300,000 in capital forgone. But if the president had received a $300,000 bonus, and if the State or Federal regulatory commission ruled that the $300,000 bonus was compensation for services rendered, the company would be out nothing. It could include the entire $300,000 in its operating expenses, which the company gets from its customers.

"15. Then why do IOU's use options?

"IOU expenses, including taxes, are simply passed on to the consumer. Perhaps more importantly, bonuses and salaries are sometimes publicized and options are usually hidden. Not even stockholders are told much about option benefits. Power companies sometimes send their own propaganda and reprints from the Reader's Digest along with the light bill. But have you ever seen a report from a power company on how its officials are benefiting—at the expense of the ordinary stockholder and consumer—from a restricted stock option plan?

"16. What will reduce my light bill?

"Regulatory commissions composed of strong members who do what they are supposed to do (regulate the utilities) and backed by an expert staff and an informed organization of electric consumers will help obtain savings for the ratepayer while still allowing the power companies to make a reasonable profit. However, the most effective method of rate reduction is to give the IOU's more competition, in the form of municipal power systems, rural electric cooperatives, public utility districts, and Federal power projects.

"These are 'yardstick' competitors because the operations and rates charged by private power companies can be measured against them.

"The IOU's attack these competitors as socialistic or worse, although all of them are much more democratic than IOU's. The monopoly IOU's have no real competition and they are afraid of even remote competition by comparison offered by yardstick competitors.

"For example: Georgia Power paid the city of Rome, Ga., $50,000 for its agreement 'not to establish a municipal electric system in competition with' Georgia Power.

"A rural electric cooperative in Montana was charged 9½ mills per kilowatt-hour by Montana Power Co. until Congress voted funds for a transmission line to serve the cooperative, whereupon the company promptly cut the rate to 5½ mills.

"Back in the thirties, the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York City fought off a rate reduction, then cut rates anyhow. Why? Because the then Mayor Fiorello La Guardia threatened to set up a municipal powerplant as a yardstick by which reasonable rates for the city could be determined.

"As former Federal Power Commissioner Howard Morgan said in 1963:

" 'Regulation must be supplemented by programs that in addition to their other roles would provide the yardsticks and competitive restraining forces necessary to assist the regulatory commissions in their efforts to hold the price of electric utility rates to just and reasonable levels. * * * Few utilities * * * can stand the glaring contrast between their own rates and those of the Federal and rural electrification programs. Wherever such a glaring contrast has existed, the utilities have found means of reducing costs and rates. They have had no other choice.'

"17. How do IOU's distribute propaganda?

"The companies enclose propaganda reprints in bills to consumers and reports to stockholders. They spend millions of dollars on advertising. The Federal Trade Commission reviews questionable ads of some industries but not the institutional ads of the IOU's, although one series of national ads by the companies, which associated the companies' competitors with communism, was termed 'particularly ugly' by the late President Kennedy. The IOU's 'plant' editorials with friendly editors. They circulate in most States films such as 'The Power Within,' which attacks rural electric cooperatives. The film is accompanied by a detailed manual instructing the person who shows the film how to get his audience to write Congressmen letters which 'appear spontaneous and not as though it were a planned concerted effort by any one interested group,' being careful not to 'betray the source of the letters to the recipient.'

"The Federal Power Commission has said that the cost of propaganda should not be charged to consumers. But the regulatory commission staffs—thanks to utility lobbying—do not have sufficient staff to check closely on many aspects of company operations.

"18. How do IOU's help ultraright groups?

"Many power companies contribute regularly to organizations which advocate abolition of the United Nations and the income tax, curtailment of IOU competition (rural electrics, municipal and Federal power programs) and denial of civil rights. These organizations include Manion Forum, America's Future, Harding College (and its national education program), the Southern States Industrial Council, the Committee for Constitutional Government, and the Foundation for Economic Education (which publishes the Freeman magazine). Many power company executives also serve as officials of these organizations, which widely distribute radio programs, pamphlets, editorials, and newsletters.

"19. Do the IOU's publicize such gifts?

"Not if they can help it. In reports to the Federal Power Commission, some companies lump several hundred thousand dollars as 'contributions' despite regulations which require some itemization. Sometimes these contributions are listed as part of the companies' operating expenses, chargeable to the consumer. Frequently a number of companies will make regular, fairly small contributions to various ultraright organizations. That way the contribution of each company doesn't seem too significant. But similar, regular contributions from many companies provide, in total, sizable retainers for the ultraright organizations.

"20. Who pays for the IOU propaganda, overcharges and options?

"In 1931 ERNEST GRUENING, then a newspaperman and now U.S. Senator from Alaska, wrote a book about power company propaganda, entitled 'The Public Pays.'

"The book was reissued in 1964 with an amended title, which still answers the question—'The Public Pays, and Still Pays.' "

JANUARY 15, 1965.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just finished reading report No. 20—"Loaded Light Bill"—published by the Electric Consumers Information Committee, and written by yourself. I am forced to admit that this is just about the slickest piece of literature I have ever read, and is a masterpiece in the use of the half-truth, the innuendo, the implication, the generality. By the clever and careful use of these means, you have told a tale designed to arouse the citizenry against unscrupulous giants whose aim is to bilke John Q. Public out of his eyeteeth. To those of us who know better, a piece of printed matter such as this is appalling and frustrating, mainly because persons in positions of responsibility are normally expected to assume a corresponding amount of it. If this publication were issued by a half-educated, illogical, egomaniac it would not be quite so hard to understand.

I have chosen to refute only a few of your most serious and damaging misstatements, taking care to use a logical and factual approach, rather than one based largely on half-truth and appealing to the emotions of the ill-informed layman.

The statements you have made, and my rebuttal of each follow:

Introduction: "Companies use part of this monthly overcharge to finance a massive propaganda campaign, through their advertising and public relations program and by contributions to a variety of organizations." May I remind you that all businesses of any size carry on extensive public relations and contributory programs, because the failure to do so inevitably leads to a lack of confidence in the company by its customers, regardless of whether it is an electric utility or automobile manufacturer. (The automobile manufacturer, of course, is not bothered by government competition.)

Question No. 2: "In fact, in some instances all voting at annual meetings—of millions of shares of stock—is by proxy. The primary interest of IOU investors is profit." You seem to be laboring under two serious misconceptions: (1) In large corporations, most of which are widely held, proxy voting is the rule, rather than the exception, and (2) can you name any investor in any business whose primary interest is not profit? If you believe that "profit" is a dirty word, then you should expect to take the consequences if anyone should label your views as socialistic. Don't forget, Mr. Senator, that your salary is paid from taxes on the profits of American businesses, including utilities.

Question No. 3: "Competitive free enterprise businesses are subject to risks and losses. There has not been a failure in the giant electric light and power industry in more than a generation." If you don't believe that our business is competitive, you ought to come and watch us for a couple of months sometime. We are in competition for the customer's dollar just as much as anyone else. You seem to forget that people can cook, heat water, heat their homes, cool their food, and do many other things with types of energy other than electricity. It is because we compete with other types of energy, that we can sell more energy at an ever lower cost per kilowatt-hour. And, if you think that no electricity utility ever gets into financial trouble, you are seriously mistaken. I assume that by "failure" you mean that the business ceases to exist. If so, how do local families and businesses get electric power? The answer is, of course, that when a company gets into trouble, a merger with, or sale of assets to an interconnected utility is consummated before a shutdown is necessary. This should be obvious to you.

Question No. 4: "Each company merely acts as tax collector for the Government." Of course, Mr. Vennard said this, because it is 100-percent true. Your lack of business knowledge, Mr. METCALF, is amazing. Where, in the final analysis, do you think that each and every business enterprise in the entire world gets the money which it pays out as taxes to its government? From its customers, that's where, and I can't visual you not realizing this. Any company's ability to pay taxes hinges on its ability to bring in revenue from its customers.

Question No. 5: "Since 1954 the IOU's have obtained more than a billion dollars in tax relief through accelerated amortization, and more than half a billion dollars through liberalized depreciation." When you call this legislation (secs. 167 and 168 of the 1954 Revenue Code) tax relief, it is plain to see that you don't even know what these two forms of fast write-offs are. They are not relief, but deferral of tax liabilities. In a practical sense, if a company, at the outset of these programs, had passed the temporary cash increase on to its customers, and the tax rate had increased (which could have happened), then the company would have had to recoup the cash passed on, plus an amount sufficient to cover the increased rate. But the most important point here is that the cash generated by these deferrals is reinvested in plant, thus decreasing the need for the company to go into the money market for capital funds, which in turn keeps the debt service on bonds, plus the income requirement on stock, at a minimum.

Question No. 6: "One of the principles of utility regulation is the 'water over the dam' rule. Under this principle, if revenues or expenses are incorrectly estimated, the party damaged does not get a refund." Here again, we find a half-truth. You forget to mention that the consumer is not always the party damaged. You neglect to mention that frequently, regulatory commissions either knowingly or innocently damage utility companies through a process known as "regulatory lag." Let's assume, for purposes of illustration, that the ABC Utility Co. has been allowed a rate of return of 6 percent. Let's also assume no ensuing tax cuts, etc. The company operates at 6 percent for a year or so, then, because of rising costs, etc., sees the rate slip to 5.7 percent, and head lower. By the time the company applies for rate relief, the commission goes through its slow, laborious proceedings and issues an order granting relief, much time has elapsed, during which the rate has been less than 6 percent. So, in a real sense, very few companies ever earn a full rate; and even if the rate goes a little above 6 percent for a while, it still can't average out to 6 percent in the long run. Again, if you have any knowledge of regulatory matters, this should be self-evident. By the way, if you have the impression that utilities are never required to make refunds, you are mistaken. However, I am sure that you are aware that they do.

Question No. 7: "A 6-percent rate of return on investment usually means a 9- or 10-percent return on common stock." I get the distinct impression here that you are again making an insinuation, this time that the common stockholder receives a 9- or 10-percent return on his investment. This, of course, is ridiculous. Only after many years of growth and successful operation, during which the dividend payout per share has increased, can a stockholder earn even 6 or 7 percent. In the first year or so after purchase, the utility stockholder who can get 3 or 4 percent is indeed fortunate. For example, I own a small number of shares in the company for which I work. I bought these shares 7 and 8 years ago. The value of the stock has increased considerably during this time but, computed on original investment, my rate of return today is 6.7 percent; and by industry standards, our stock is considered stable and healthy.

Questions No. 8 and 9 (general): Again you fail to show utility profits in their proper light. Naturally, revenues have increased tremendously. However, to achieve this kind of revenue increase, it is necessary to invest huge amounts of capital into the rate base, thus pushing the revenue requirement up. In other words, it is possible to increase revenues threefold, but realize a lower rate of return.

Question No. 10: "When IOU's reduce rates, they still do well financially." You cannot ignore the caution which must be exercised in doing this, and you must realize that, under existing tax, financing and other regulations, an investor owned utility cannot compete with TVA. Where their areas overlap or lie adjacent, IOU's must pare rates dangerously low, in order to keep businesses and industrial customers from deserting to TVA. (This happens anyway.)

Questions No. 11 to 15 (generally): It is a well-established fact that some utilities offer stock options to executives, but I invite you to compare stock option plans industry-wide with those in the automobile, chemical, heavy machinery, or any other large industry in this country. I'm sure that you will agree that the utility industry would look conservative indeed. I am sorry to read about the greedy Montana Power Co., president; but I respectfully submit that business, industry, and yes, even government, have people who will come up with a fast dollar if the opportunity presents itself. Again, I feel you are well aware of this situation.

Question No. 16: "However, the most effective method of rate reduction is to give the IOU's more competition, in the form of municipal power systems, rural electric cooperatives, public utility districts and Federal power projects." Before you tie up billions of taxpayers' dollars in duplicate power facilities, you need a better reason than to provide competition for investor-owned utilities. How far you can push the New York taxpayer to provide tax funds for cheap Montana electricity, I don't know. But I'm sure there's a limit. It's one thing for government to regulate, but quite another to compete; and it's the duty of government to serve, not to be served, although this may be difficult for a politician to comprehend. I agree with your statement that a good regulatory body with an expert staff is a basic ingredient in the ratemaking recipe.

Question 17 to 20 (general): Naturally, the investor-owned companies spend money on advertising and institutional promotion. They are rightly disturbed at the socialistic thinking of some of our so-called responsible leaders.

Let me ask you: If you owned a gasoline service station across the street from another one, which by special legislation was largely tax exempt, and could also borrow money at the local bank for half the interest cost to you, what would you do? I doubt if you would sit idly by and watch him steal a large number of your customers. Instead, you would attempt to convince the public that, (1) this was not fair, (2) that some of their tax dollars were helping keep him in business, and last but not least, (3) our free enterprise is being watered down by socialism.

I could make this letter three times as long with little or no effort, because you have provided such a fertile field. It is amazing, and at the same time disturbing to me and many other citizens of this country, that a few supposedly responsible people can be so loose and irresponsible with a business so large, vital, and for the most part completely devoted to the challenge of (1) providing the best electric service to its customers at the lowest possible cost, (2) earning for its investors a reasonable rate of return, and (3) maintaining a standard of compensation and environment so as to attract competent and conscientious employees, which in turn make possible the first two points.

In closing, I wish to state that, although I am employed by one of your "IOU's" and am a former employee of a State regulatory commission, I write this letter as an independent citizen and taxpayer. The views expressed herein are my own, and, fortunately, are shared by many others. I would very much appreciate a personal reply to this letter. If your convictions are strong enough, and your position is defensible, I'll get one.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I now proceed to read various parts of the letter, and to comment on them:

I have just finished reading Report No. 20—"Loaded Light Bill"—published by the Electric Consumers Information Commitee, and written by yourself. I am forced to admit that this is just about the slickest piece of literature I have ever read, and is a masterpiece in the use of the half-truth, the innuendo, the implication, the generality. By the clever and careful use of these means, you have told a tale designed to arouse the the citizenry against unscrupulous giants whose aim is to bilk John Q. Public out of his eye teeth. To those of us who know better, a piece of printed matter such as this is appalling and frustrating, mainly because persons in positions of responsibility are normally expected to assume a corresponding amount of it. If this publication were issued by a half-educated, illogical, egomaniac it would not be quite so hard to understand.

I have chosen to refute only a few of your most serious and damaging misstatements, taking care to use a logical and factual approach, rather than one based largely on half-truth and appealing to the emotions of the ill-informed layman.

The statements you have made, and my rebuttal of each, follow:

Introduction: "Companies use part of this monthly overcharge to finance a massive propaganda campaign, through their advertising and public relations program and by contributions to a variety of organizations." May I remind you that all businesses of any size carry on extensive public relations and contributory programs, because the failure to do so inevitably leads to a lack of confidence in the company by its customers, regardless of whether it is an electric utility or automobile manufacturer. (The automobile manufacturer, of course, is not bothered by Government competition.)

Mr. President, that part of the letter is a classic example of what the Memphis Commercial Appeal has called one of the great triumphs of the propaganda trade, the "plastic surgery which has made it possible for the dealer in electricity to pass as a member of the tribe of salesmen of shoes, real estate, and cottonseed." The shoe salesman or the automobile manufacturer or the IOU's can make all the contributions they want; but the IOU's are delightfully different.

The shoe salesman or the car manufacturer will have less profit after he makes his contributions. But the IOU's include some of their contributions—millions of dollars worth each year—as "operating expenses." Because utilities are assured rates which provide a good profit, plus enough revenue to take care of all expenses, these contributions do not cost the power company a cent. Each of us gives them this additional money when we pay our light bills. They give it to the charity of their choice, and they get the credit. They become great benefactors and philanthropists—with our money.

For example, in 1963 the company for which my correspondent works, Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., included as an operating expense $110,249 as "payments to development associations, educational funds, and so forth"; $65,051 for "other public relations expenses, including direct-mail handouts, displays, fairs, shows, exhibits, dedications, tours, plant and office openings, public-opinion surveys, movies, slides, films, speeches, civilian defense and so forth"; and $41,036 for "dues to chambers of commerce, business and homebuilder associations, industrial councils and so forth."

I now read the next part of the letter:

Question No. 2. "In fact, in some instances all voting at annual meetings—of millions of shares of stock—is by proxy. The primary interest of IOU investors is profit." You seem to be laboring under two serious misconceptions: (1) In large corporations, most of which are widely held, proxy voting is the rule, rather than the exception, and (2) can you name any investor in any business whose primary interest is not profit? If you believe that "profit" is a dirty word, then you should expect to take the consequences if anyone should label your views as socialistic. Don't forget, Mr. Senator, that your salary is paid from taxes on the profits of American businesses, including utilities.

Mr. President, in the above paragraph the writer relies on another standard device of the IOU's. Whenever they are criticized, they wrap the flag more securely about themselves, adjust their halo, and holler "Socialist."

It is essential that the public begin to understand that the largest industry in the United States, which is increasingly dominant in the educational and political life of the country, as well as in its financial life, is controlled by relatively few individuals. I know this is not the image the industry projects. Most of us have seen—and helped pay for—the advertisements which show the people who "own" our friendly power company—the little boy with jam on his face; "Margaret Lewis, the widow"—this from the industry's propaganda movie, "The

Power Within"; the neighbors; and so forth.

Company spokesmen would have us believe that IOU's are somehow subject to the desires of these little shareholders. Not long ago, the president of one large power company told how the antitrust settlement which he negotiated pleased the stockholders so much that they "commended the company management" for it at the last annual meeting. Mr. President, in the first place, the stockholders of the company did not even know that the issue was to be discussed at the annual meeting, for it was not on the proxy solicitation notice. Second, more than 98 percent of the votes cast at the meeting were cast by proxy. So management commended management, and construed that to mean stockholder approval.

Yet that particular IOU annual meeting was more "democratic" than most. In the case of 60 percent of the 224 major power companies which filed form 1 reports for 1963 with the Federal Power Commission, every vote at the 1963 annual meeting was cast by proxy or by the holding company or other company which owned the power company.

This includes the letterwriter's employer, Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., which is owned by the American Electric Power Co. In the case of most of the remaining companies, more than 99 percent of the votes—sometimes more than 99.99 percent—were cast by proxy.

I read further from the letter:

> Question No. 3: "Competitive free enterprise businesses are subject to risks and losses. There has not been a failure in the giant electric light and power industry in more than a generation." If you don't believe that our business is competitive, you ought to come and watch us for a couple of months sometime. We are in competition for the customer's dollar just as much as anyone else. You seem to forget that people can cook, heat water, heat their homes, cool their food, and do many other things with types of energy other than electricity. It is because we compete with other types of energy, that we can sell more energy at an ever lower cost per kilowatt-hour. And, if you think that no electricity utility ever gets into financial trouble, you are seriously mistaken. I assume that by "failure" you mean that the business ceases to exist. If so, how do local families and businesses get electric power? The answer is, of course, that when a company gets into trouble, a merger with, or sale of assets to an interconnected utility is consummated before a shutdown is necessary. This should be obvious to you.

Mr. President, I give the letter writer credit for trying to paint the IOU's as being competitive. The industry is trying hard to appear competitive. At last year's convention of the Edison Electric Institute, the industry trade association and public relations experts counseled the industry to eliminate the old monopoly and cost-plus labels—mainly by pointing up competition with gas and oil.

But the paint will not stick. It is extremely difficult for more than one-third of the companies to appear competitive, for the simple reason that they are combination companies which sell both electricity and gas; and combination companies cannot get excited about the beneficial effects of competition between electricity and gas. For example, not long ago Philadelphia Electric made public a report, from Commonwealth Services, in which it was stated that spinning off the company's gas properties in suburban Philadelphia would not be economically justified and would not be in the best interests of the customers, the employees, or the stockholders.

But here is the big point: Whatever competition there is in the electric industry—aside from that furnished by other power suppliers which, combined, are one-third the size of the IOU's—is in reality leading to increased monopoly. I shall document that point, using industry sources.

At Edison Electric Institute's 1963 convention, President Donald Cook, of American Electric Power Co., pointed out that the electric-power industry had taken over public and private lighting from gas half a century ago. He said the electric companies should never settle for less than 51 percent of a potential market. He said the industry should not be satisfied with less than the predominant position in every competitive market, and that the goal of predominance in heating is not only feasible, but also is highly probable. Later in 1963, Truslow Hyde, Jr., a partner in F. S. Smithers & Co., told the New York Society of Security Analysts that electric utilities would make further inroads in water heating and space heating.

A long-range trend of increasing market domination by the electric-power industry was forecast by the Federal Power Commission's Advisory Committee on Electric Power Requirements, the majority of whose members are officers of investor-owned utilities. This Committee reported the historic pattern of new, ever-increasing uses of electric energy. It noted rapid advances in power technology and the integration of electric systems, and expressed confidence that these developments will continue to improve the position of electricity in competition with other fuels.

One of these possibilities could carry the IOU's into a fabulous new area of growth and power, into competition with the gasoline industry. The feasible electric automobile may be just around the next bend in the road. Let me quote from page 41 of the FPC National Power Survey:

> Perhaps the best illustration of a potential development that could substantially alter future projections is an improved electric battery, which would open up a whole new vista of electric power growth. The potential of the market is large even if only a moderate segment of our vehicles were battery operated. The magnitude of the opportunity can be gaged from the fact that supplying the automotive needs in this country with electricity would roughly double the industry's present output. Battery-operated vehicles are common today for specialty uses such as golf carts and electric industrial trucks. Improvements in battery weight, life and costs—of a magnitude which does not seem at all unattainable—would make possible a tremendous multiplication of battery-operated appliances and vehicles. Because batteries can be recharged in offpeak hours they offer loads which are ideal for improving system load factors. They would thus provide an opportunity for solidly based attractive rates.

The February 2, 1965, issue of the Washington Post carried an article which tells of the increasing use of electric-powered vehicles for urban-suburban transportation. I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Howard Simons, and headlined "New Idea Would Put America In 'Go-Carts,'" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW IDEA WOULD PUT AMERICA IN "GO-CARTS"

(By Howard Simons)

General Electric is moving ahead to speed up the Great Society with a slow-motion vehicle—and the solution does away with air pollution.

Slow motion electric propulsion is GE's answer to the urban-suburban transportation dilemma.

What GE engineers are concocting is a battery-operated electric vehicle capable of carrying two adults, kids, groceries, and packages. Top speed would be 20 miles per hour. Range would be 30 to 40 miles. Cost would be less than $1,000.

Builders of a new airport at Oakland, Calif., are interested in GE's scheme. So, too, are developers of several planned communities throughout the United States, and city managers in Lisbon, Portugal. GE, itself, has just applied for a Government grant to develop its scheme.

AUTOLESS COMMUNITIES

"These vehicles," says Max L. Feldman, "would be used to furnish short-distance transportation to rapid rail transit lines, to reduce automotive traffic, to permit the design of autoless communities, and to provide acceptable transportation for senior citizens and teenagers." Feldman, prime mover of the electric "transporter," is a member of TEMPO, GE's "think factory" at Santa Barbara, Calif.

Feldman makes it clear that he is not "proposing an electric automobile to replace the gasoline automobile." In his view, it is impossible for a battery-operated electric vehicle to compete—economically with the high-speed, long-range automobile.

But in areas where the high-speed gasoline vehicle now crawls about, spewing noxious fumed acid, threatening life, a 20-mile-per-hour electric transporter can become a welcome substitute.

One such area is the new planned community. Instead of installing the maze of streets now required, explains Feldman, transporter paths would be provided. All automobiles and garages would be located at the outer perimeter of the community.

FOR AIRPORTS, FAIRGROUNDS

Another application would be the use of the transporters in systems—remotely and automatically controlled, getting their power from a central power source rather than the vehicle's own battery. Such systems, Feldman says, could be used "to transport people around historical sites, large jet airports (such as Oakland's planned new terminal), fairs and even tourist attractions, such as the Mall area in Washington, D.C."

Finally, Feldman would build urban and suburban "transportways"—overhead electric highways that could be enclosed and heated or air conditioned as required.

GE has already built and tested a model transporter. Moreover, recent advances in electronic controls and energy storage devices made the transporter even more attractive. An oil company, for example, has recently developed a power device that would allow a transporter to travel 100 miles. A recharge of the new device takes only 5 minutes.

> There is no reliable estimate of just how soon the electric transporter will find wide acceptance as a "second car."
>
> But the concept already is gathering momentum. The electric shopper-type vehicle is gaining popularity among senior citizens in Long Beach and Santa Barbara, and an East Coast utility is building electric transporters for experimental use in a summer resort area.
>
> Now, GE is proposing the electric transporter as an ideal car pool and shopping tool for the short-trip travel that amounts to about half of all automobile driving—the kind of driving Feldman suggests is bad for automobiles and the Great Society.

Mr. METCALF. However, Mr. President, there is more to the IOU's fantastic attempts to picture themselves harried by competitors, despite the facts. At the May 1959 convention of the Edison Electric Institute, the retiring EEI President, J. E. Corette, also president of the Montana Power Co., said:

> No industry is faced with more aggressive, more vicious, more difficult competition than the utility industry in the competition which it has from federally owned or financed power.

This, mind you, was said during the Eisenhower "no new starts" era.

More recently, an industry spokesman has urged IOU officials to take over municipal water systems, now that a distinguished Member of this body, some scientists, and Federal tax dollars have pioneered in the development of dual-purpose plants which simultaneously desalinize water and produce electricity. The editorial in the June 22, 1964, issue of Electrical World, the industry's principal trade publication, tells of the "new threat." I quote from the editorial:

> Key to the new threat lies not in the nuclear aspect but in water desalinization. The U.S. Office of Saline Water has reported considerable success with multistage flash evaporators for extracting potable water from sea water. Its publications also indicate that water cost is lowest when the evaporator is heated by steam first passed through turbine generators to produce electric power. Thus power generation becomes an adjunct to water desalinization.
>
> Delving a little deeper, we find assertions that water supply is almost universally a public venture financed at carrying charges as low as 4.7 percent. Finally, the cheapest desalinized water would be produced in a combination plant financed at similar carrying charges and selling its considerable byproduct power in competition with investor-owned electric utilities. Thus the stage is set for another onslaught on a new battle front.
>
> The treat is insidious. Official predictions of impending water shortages are too frightening for successful rebuttal.

So, what, Mr. President, is to be done? Now that Federal research has brought a new market within reach, the IOU's should take over. So says Electrical World:

> The alternative is for electric utilities to assume a responsible role in the supply of potable water.

The editorial then concludes with the industry pitch for propagandizing the public:

> Electric utilities in all susceptible areas must lose no time in facing this new attack. They must fight water with water and assertions with facts. Commencement platforms should not be overlooked; they can be an important channel in campaigns for getting all pertinent facts before all the people.

Earlier, I made reference to the major role played by a distinguished Member of this body in the development of the dual-purpose plants. Let me read from an excellent article, appearing in full on page A141 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 14, 1965, which was published in Agriculture and Livestock, by the Valley National Bank in Arizona:

> The dual purpose approach was originated not by an engineer or a scientist but by a politician—Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico. Several years ago, ANDERSON attended an Interior Committee meeting and heard about the steam temperature required for an effective desalinization plant. Shortly afterward, he went to a congressional Atomic Energy Committee meeting where reactors were being discussed—and learned that the steam, as it came off an electrical turbine, was about the same temperature as that used in the desalinization process.
>
> ANDERSON then wrote to Dr. R. P. Hammond, then at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and now at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, inquiring why it would not be possible to combine desalinization and the generation of relatively inexpensive electricity. Hammond, it developed, had been thinking along the same lines—and out of Senator ANDERSON's suggestion grew a 1962 report by Hammond concluding very large reactors could distill sea water economically. Direct result of his report was the appointment of the interagency task group to examine his conclusions. Its April 1964 report to the White House confirmed them in all important respects.

Mr. President, I cannot suppress the thought that, had the IOU's hired a few more engineers, instead of propagandists, a few years back, they might have been able to precede Senator ANDERSON and Dr. Hammond in reaching this beneficial conclusion.

Let me summarize, then, the situation among those oh-so-competitive IOU's: The combination companies—which furnish both gas and electricity—are hardly enthusiastic about the talk of competition between gas and electric companies. The electric industry took over the light business from the gas companies a long time ago, and will soon overshadow the gas companies in the heat business. Electricity may soon compete with gasoline as a power source for passenger vehicles. The electric companies are cranking up their propanganda machinery for taking over water systems. Of course, some of them already provide water, bottled gas, and, in some instances, telephone service.

I will bet Ma Bell is looking over her shoulder right now, wondering whether the nation's largest industry will decide, in the name of mother, God and country, to relieve her of the burden of providing communications.

I read more of the letter:

> Question No. 4: "Each company merely acts as tax collector for the Government." Of course, Mr. Vennard said this, because it is 100 percent true. Your lack of business knowledge, Mr. METCALF, is amazing. Where in the final analysis, do you think that each and every business enterprise in the entire world gets the money which it pays out as taxes to its Government? From its customers, that's where, and I can't visualize you not realizing this. Any company's ability to pay taxes hinges on its ability to bring in revenue from its customers.
>
> Question No. 5: "Since 1954 the IOU's have obtained more than a billion dollars in tax relief through accelerated amortization, and more than half a billion dollars through liberalized depreciation." When you call this legislation (sections 167 and 168 of the 1954 Revenue Code) tax relief, it is plain to see that you don't even know what these two forms of fast writeoffs are. They are not relief, but deferral of tax liabilities. In a practical sense, if a company, at the outset of these programs, had passed the temporary cash increase on to its customers, and the tax rate had increased (which could have happened), then the company would have had to recoup the cash passed on, plus an amount sufficient to cover the increased rate. But the most important point here is that the cash generated by these deferrals is reinvested in plant, thus decreasing the need for the company to go into the money market for capital funds, which in turn keeps the debt service on bonds, plus the income requirement on stock, at a minimum.

Mr. President, here, again, my IOU correspondent seeks to convey the erroneous impression that utilities are just like other businesses, in regard to tax matters. The November 1964 issue of Coronet magazine carried Vic Reinemer's and my article which explains how this is not so, and shows that the Government never receives, and the taxpayers never get back, hundreds of millions of dollars which are collected from customers, for taxes, by the IOU's.

I ask unanimous consent that the Coronet article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE YOU BEING OVERCHARGED ON YOUR ELECTRIC BILL?

(By Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, as told to Vic Reinemer)

Two years ago, I was amazed to receive a report from the Internal Revenue Service that nearly 300 employers in my State of Montana had not turned over to the Federal Government approximately $1 million in Federal taxes that they had deducted from employees' paychecks.

Most employers, of course, pass on employees' taxes promptly. But taxkeeping employers are found throughout the Nation. Their annual tax delinquency totals almost a quarter of a billion dollars. Negotiation and Federal liens bring in some of these delinquent taxes. But last year, despite increased enforcement, the Internal Revenue Service entered in the uncollectible column $57 million which employers had withheld from employee paychecks for Federal income, social security, railroad retirement, and unemployment taxes, but never turned over to Uncle Sam. The tax keepers are subject to indictments, fines, and jail sentences.

My congressional committee assignments have included the House Ways and Means Committee, which writes tax laws, and the Senate Committees on Public Works and Interior, which deal in part with electric power production and distribution. Concerned by the report on loss of taxes deducted from paychecks, I decided to find out whether the taxes included in electric bills are also being lost.

As I dug into this area, I found that the taxkeeping employers with their $57 million were really little fish. I learned that the

Government never receives—and the taxpayer never gets back—hundreds of millions of dollars which are collected from consumers, as tax benefits by a single industry. This industry—the Nation's largest—consists of the investor-owned electric light and power companies which furnish electricity for four out of five people.

As one of their spokesmen once admitted, the electric light and power industry "merely acts as tax collector for the Government." You, the customer, pay the taxes, just as you help pay the taxes for a grocer when you buy a loaf of bread.

But grocery stores and most other American businesses are vastly different from power companies, because the latter are government-sanctioned monopolies, which means that the State or Federal Governments will not permit another power company to set up business in competition with them in the area they serve. In return for this privileged sanctuary above the everyday fight for economic survival, the rates your local power company charges for electricity are usually subject to State or subject to Federal regulation.

These regulatory agencies permit power companies to set their rates at a level which will pay all of their operating expenses—including taxes—plus enough profit to afford the company a 9- or 10-percent return on the book value of its common stock. This is the American concept of regulated utilities: The government guarantees the utility a monopoly position free of competition, and in return the company subjects its rates to government regulation.

But this procedure has shortcomings. For example, when operating costs increase, the utility goes to the regulatory agency and gets a rate increase. But what happens when costs—including taxes—decline? Nine times since World War II Congress has reduced power company taxes, but seldom have the companies passed this tax cut on to the consumer by cutting rates. Instead, they go on collecting taxes from the consumer at the same old rate.

Under this year's tax act, for example, private power companies received two corporation tax reductions—a 2-percent cut in 1964 and an additional 2-percent cut next year. This will mean $50 million more income for the industry this year and $100 million in 1965 and each year thereafter. But according to a State-by-State survey by the New York Times last summer, many power companies do not plan to pass this reduction on to their customers.

Thus, millions of Americans will continue receiving electricity bills which include—although it isn't separately listed—a charge for taxes at the old, higher rate.

And what happens to these tax dollars that the companies collect? They go straight into the private power industry's profit pocket, which is already bulging. Net income for electric utilities "has advanced from 14.5 cents out of every revenue dollar in 1952 to 18 cents in 1962, a gain of almost 25 percent," according to the Nation's largest investment stock brokerage house.

But that is just half the story. Some of the consumers' tax dollars are then distributed to the company shareholders in dividends, part of which are often tax free.

During the past 10 years, about three-quarters of a billion dollars in tax-free dividends have been distributed by just 33 of the 220 big power companies. This tax windfall is permitted by another of the industry's nine recent Federal tax reductions, the "rapid depreciation" section of the 1954 tax law. This complicated provision permits companies to keep two sets of books—one for tax purposes and the other for the utility regulatory commissions. When income, in the "regulatory" book, exceeds income in the "tax" book, the difference can be paid to shareholders as a tax-free return of capital.

Let's pause a moment and consider what this kind of tax policy means. The 220 big power companies provide electricity for about 140 million Americans. These include millions of families whose income is less than $3,000 a year. They all help pay the taxes which the company collects. (If they don't pay, the company cuts off their electricity.) Then the company turns around and passes out these taxes, along with ordinary profits, to the stockholders. Most of the money goes to that 1.6 percent of the adult population which owns 80 percent of all stock. Taxes paid by the poor become the tax-free income of the wealthy.

Let's contrast the situation of the two groups of tax keepers, the employers, and the power companies.

First, employers who keep withholding taxes include owners of some of the 15,000 businesses which fail each year. Most of them are small businessmen. They plead hardship. Perhaps they thought if they could use that tax money for a while, they could keep the business going. Their employees would still have jobs. Later, the company would pass the employees' taxes on to the Treasury. These tax dollars, although they did not belong to the employers, would keep the business from failing.

Their argument certainly cannot be used by the power industry. Its only failures are electrical, not financial. The industry has not recorded a business failure in at least a generation, and breaks its own profit record every year. Financial publications call it the outstanding growth industry of the century.

Secondly, the electric light and power companies have a monopoly on an essential product, for which demand is constantly increasing—this along with the practical assurance from Government of all expenses, including taxes, plus profit. They are hardly what we think of when we talk about the American free enterprise system.

Third, the action of the tax-keeping employers is clearly illegal. That of the power companies is perfectly legal. In the first instance, it is illegal for the tax collector to keep Uncle Sam's money. But in the second instance, when Uncle Sam or a State or local government decide to give up their claim to taxes, which the taxpayer has already paid, by granting a tax cut, there is no law which says that the tax-collecting utility has to make a refund. In fact, Congress this year specifically forbade Federal regulatory commissions from requiring power companies under their jurisdiction to pass a substantial tax saving on to the consumer.

Retained taxes and other charges in the electricity bill also help key electric utility officials obtain windfall profits through another device, the restricted stock option. Although perfectly legal, the options are costly to consumers and to ordinary stockholders as well.

The cozy option gimmick, used by at least 29 power companies, works this way: A company committee gives selected top officials options to purchase a certain amount of stock at a future date, but at the price the stock was selling for on the day the option was granted. Because of the excess profits of electric utilities, the stock of many companies has increased several times in value during the past 10 years. So company officials who buy stock now, on options granted a few years ago, frequently pay only one-half, one-third, or as little as one-fourth the price which an ordinary stockholder is required to pay. This below-market stock is, of course, in addition to substantial salaries and handsome retirement benefits.

In one instance, the president of a western power company, whose salary is $75,000 a year, made a windfall profit of $370,000—more than the average American makes in a lifetime—in one option transaction.

The stock-option windfalls are almost as remunerative as the tax-free dividends. If the company executive sells his stock, he will have to pay only a capital gains tax at the rate of 25 percent or less. If he gives the stock to a tax-exempt charitable organization, he may be able to deduct the full market value of the stock, not the lower option price, from his gross income. With smart advice from his tax lawyer he may give the stock to his wife or children and avoid not only Federal income tax, capital gains tax, and gift tax, but also, with advance planning, estate tax as well. Thus, while the average American makes less in his lifetime than some power company officials make on stock options alone, he will probably pay more taxes on his lifetime earnings than the official pays on his windfall.

Why is the electric consumer required to subsidize power companies and their top officials?

Most power company rates are regulated by their State commissions which, in too many instances, are understaffed and headed by men more sympathetic to the industry they are supposed to regulate than to the consumer whose pocketbook they are supposed to protect.

The regulatory commission considers how much the company has invested, and how much revenue the company will need to pay all expenses, including taxes, and make a reasonable profit. (Most regulatory commissions and utility consultants consider a reasonable profit one that permits a 9- or 10-percent return on the book value of the company's common stock.) Rates are then set accordingly. But although a rate may be reduced to reflect a current tax cut or other savings, the companies are not required by law to refund past overcharges.

For example, when Congress reduced the corporation income tax this year, the major power company in my State declared that it was not going to pass this saving on to its customers. After public pressure for a rate reduction mounted, the State regulatory commission required the company to pass the tax cut on. Accordingly, rates were reduced by about $1¼ million a year.

However, the regulatory commission could not require the company to refund to the consumer excess taxes, or for that matter any other overcharges, which had accumulated in the company coffers. These past overcharges, according to a principle of utility regulation, are "water over the dam" and cannot be recovered. These overcharges add up to $5 per month, per residential customer. For many consumers, this $60 a year overcharge in the electricity bill cancels out the personal income tax reduction Congress gave them this year.

But the main reason why the power companies get away with such outrageous activity stems from the companies' advertising campaigns, which are amazingly successful and thoroughly misleading.

Although their own spokesmen admit that the companies don't pay, but only collect, taxes, and although the record in State after States shows that the companies neither pay nor refund all the taxes they collect, the companies tell us—in magazine and newspaper advertisements, in material mailed with our electricity bills and through organizations to which the companies regularly contribute—that the local power company is the biggest taxpayer in the neighborhood. And they sometimes use your lost taxes to pay for this propaganda.

I have on my desk newspaper advertisements which appeared during the past year in Montana and Colorado. One makes the claim that "Montana Power is the biggest taxpayer in Montana." The other one, by

Public Service Co. of Colorado, goes even further:

"When it comes to paying their share of taxes, the investor-owned utility industry takes a back seat to no one. In fact, the industry is the Nation's largest taxpayer. Public Service Co. is no different. As Colorado's largest taxpayer, we paid well over $25 million in taxes in 1963."

Then, having built its case upon a misleading statement, the company piously denounces its relatively small competitors in the power business with these words:

"At Public Service Co. we look upon paying our fair share of taxes as a part of our citizenship responsibility. We only wish that Government-subsidized power suppliers felt the same way and acted accordingly.

"PUBLIC SERVICE CO. OF COLORADO,
"An Investor-Owned Utility."

The power industry's criticism of nonprofit power companies and Government regulation is becoming more vicious and the campaign to bamboozle the taxpayer is increasing.

Two years ago, a series of national advertisements by certain power companies—that the late President John F. Kennedy termed "particularly ugly"—featured pictures of Communist guards and barbed wire over texts which criticized Government, rural electric cooperatives and municipal power systems. This year the industry has doubled its national advertising program, to $4 million. Additionally, individual power companies have increased their advertising more than other utilities have. Some power companies spend more than 75 cents per customer on advertising. In many States, the companies have succeeded in getting service clubs or other community organizations to show the industry's current propaganda film, "The Power Within," which is designed to get the audience to send Members of Congress spontaneous letters which attack nonprofit power suppliers.

Although the companies experience no difficulty in machine processing electricity bills—and my $2.80 quarterly dividend check—they find it hard to report to regulatory agencies how much they spend on propaganda. I asked a regulatory agency to require itemization of these expenditures and discovered that some of the propaganda expenditures are listed as "operating expenses." This means that you must pay for some of this propaganda, in addition to paying taxes which the company keeps, when you pay your bill.

That's why I think the industry's own name for itself—the investor-owned utilities—can be abbreviated. They are IOU's.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I read further from the letter:

> Question No. 6: "One of the principles of utility regulation is the 'water over the dam' rule. Under this principle, if revenues or expenses are incorrectly estimated, the party damaged does not get a refund." Here again, we find a half-truth. You forget to mention that the consumer is not always the party damaged. You neglect to mention that frequently, regulatory commissions either knowingly or innecently damage utility companies through a process known as "regulatory lag." Let's assume, for purposes of illustration, that the ABC Utility Company has been allowed a rate of return of 6 percent. Let's also assume no ensuing tax cuts, etc. The company operates at 6 percent for a year or so, then, because of rising costs, etc., sees the rate slip to 5.7 percent, and head lower. By the time the company applies for rate relief, the commission goes through its slow laborious proceedings and issues an order granting relief, much time has elapsed, during which the rate has been less than 6 percent. So, in a real sense, very few companies ever earn a full rate; and even if the rate goes a little above 6 percent for a while, it still can't average out to 6 percent in the long run. Again, if you have any knowledge of regulatory matters, this should be self evident. By the way, if you have the impression that utilities are never required to make refunds, you are mistaken. However, I am sure that you are aware that they do.

Mr. President, frankly I am surprised that my IOU correspondent brought up the rate-of-return matter. He assumes a decrease in a company's rate of return. Actually, the rates of return of many companies are increasing, so that they even exceed regulatory limits—an indication that the "lag" is on the part of regulators, the press, and the public. Let me quote some impeccable sources on this subject.

First, from Standard & Poor's Industry Survey on July 18, 1963:

> In the past few years, a number of electric utilities increased their earnings to the extent that rates of return on invested capital reached or exceed those allowed by regulatory authorities. There is nothing on the horizon to suggest any change in the impressive trend of revenues for electric utilities, even allowing for the possibility of periodic rate reductions.

The January 1 issue of Forbes magazine, under the headline, "Greater Efficiency Has Generated an Unexpected Problem for the Electric Power Companies—The Earnings of Many Are Bumping Against Their Rate Ceilings," states:

> Net income has been rising faster than net property, and the industry's rate of return has moved up steadily.

I read further from the letter:

> Question No. 7. "A 6-percent rate of return on investment usually means a 9- or 10-percent return on common stock." I get the distinct impression here that you are again making an insinuation, this time that the common stockholdler receives a 9- or 10-percent return on his investment. This, of course, is ridiculous. Only after many years of growth and successful operation, during which the dividend payout per share has increased, can a stockholder earn even 6 or 7 percent. In the first year or so after purchase, the utility stockholder who can get 3 or 4 percent is indeed fortunate. For example, I own a small number of shares in the company for which I work. I bought these shares 7 and 8 years ago. The value of the stock has increased considerably during this time, but computed on original investment, my rate of return today is 6.7 percent; and by industry standards, our stock is considered stable and healthy."

Mr. President, Lemont K. Richardson, in an article entitled "Misconceptions About Earnings Dilution in Electric Utility Analysis," which appeared in the September–October 1964 issue of Financial Analysts Journal, wrote:

> Utility companies have been earning anywhere from 7 to 13 percent on their common equity or net worth in recent years. Again, for convenience, let us assume a 10-percent return on common equity is fairly representative for the industry.

W. T. Hyde, Jr., in an article entitled "'Growth' in Utility Earnings," which appeared in Growth Trends of Public Utilities, 1963, published by F. S. Smithers & Co., listed as follows Moody's average 24 electric utility common stocks return on yearend book value:

	Percent
1962 [1]	10.75
1961	10.35
1960	10.32
1959	9.90
1958	9.79
1957	9.40
1956	9.70
1955	9.65
1954	9.14
1953	8.81
1952	8.42
1951	7.90
1950	8.84
1949	8.27
1948	7.86
1947	7.74

[1] Estimated.

I read further from the letter:

> Questions No. 8 and 9 (general): Again you fail to show utility profits in their proper light. Naturally, revenues have increased tremendously. However, to achieve this kind of revenue increase, it is necessary to invest huge amounts of capital into the rate base, thus pushing the revenue requirement up. In other words, it is possible to increase revenues threefold, but realize a lower rate of return.
>
> Question No. 10: "When IOU's reduce rates, they still do well financially." You cannot ignore the caution which must be exercised in doing this, and you must realize that, under existing tax, financing, and other regulations, an Investor Owned Utility cannot compete with TVA. Where their areas overlap or lie adjacent, IOU's must pare rates dangerously low, in order to keep businesses and industrial customers from deserting to TVA. (This happens anyway.)

Mr. President, my previous comments and authorities cited show that the rate of return is up, and that income has been rising faster than property. Therefore, question No. 8 and question No. 9 assume a generally nonexistent situation. As for his question No. 10, and the "dangerously low" rate of IOU's near the TVA, competition and consequent rate reduction and increase in sales has been wonderful for the investor-owned companies, as well as for the customers in the TVA area. The index of earnings for all class A and class B utilities since 1937–39 is up slightly less than 500 percent. But for the IOU's contiguous to the TVA, the index of earnings is up almost 1,200 percent from the 1937–39 average. Furthermore, during the past quarter of a century the common stock earnings of investor-owned utilities contiguous to the TVA have increased more than twice as fast as has the national average for the IOU's. TVA competition has forced the IOU's in the area to follow the basic economic rule that ordinary businessmen understand. Lower prices mean increased sales. Cheap and abundant power is good for the company which sells it, and for the customers, too.

I read further from the letter:

> Questions No. 11–15 (general): It is a well established fact that some utilities offer stock options to executives, but I invite you to compare stock option plans industrywide with those in the automobile, chemical, heavy machinery, or any other large industry in this country. I'm sure that you will agree that the utility industry would look conservative indeed. I am sorry to read about the greedy

Montana Power Co. president; but I respectfully submit that business, industry, and yes, even Government, have people who will come up with a fast dollar if the opportunity presents itself. Again, I feel you are well aware of this situation.

Mr. President, in a moment I shall ask permission to have printed in the RECORD my recent magazine article concerning the optioned elite among the IOU's. First, I point out, however, that my article tells the story of only a few of the option excesses indulged in by power company insiders. I would suggest to any interested newsmen or regulatory commissions that they would find especially interesting the option schemes of Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.; Ohio Edison; United Gas Improvement Co.; Kansas City Power & Light; Eastern Gas & Fuel, of which Boston Gas is a subsidiary; and others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my article entitled "Utility Stock Options—Executive 'Incentive' Versus Public Interest," which appeared in the September 28, 1964 issue of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTILITY STOCK OPTIONS—EXECUTIVE INCENTIVE V. PUBLIC INTEREST

(By Senator LEE METCALF)

On October 5, 1959, the president of a private utility company supplemented his $75,000-a-year salary in a one-day transaction which netted him $370,000—or more than the average American will make in his lifetime.

More important, however, are the facts that this 1-day windfall will come out of the pocket of the average American, and that the utility executive may pay less Federal income tax on it than the average American will pay on his much-lower lifetime earnings.

Illegal? Not a bit. The utility president's profit-and-tax advantage are part of a perfectly legitimate modern business incentive—the restricted stock option device—which is supposed to help highly competitive businesses attract and hold competent executives.

Under this deceptively simple scheme, a certain amount of stock is set aside forsale to company insiders (mostly top executives) at some later date when, it is hoped, the market value of the stock will have risen. When the time comes for the executive to exercise his option, he does not buy the stock at its current price, but at the price as of the day his option was granted. Thus he makes an automatic profit—and without risking a hair, since he has no obligation to buy the stock. If its value rises, he buys; if it doesn't, he doesn't.

There are those who contend that the stock option is perhaps a superfluous incentive for people making $75,000 a year, and I tend to agree with them. However, my concern here is not with the option in general but with its use in one of the most stable, least competitive, most profitable enterprises in America—the electric light and power industry.

In spite of the enormous sums they spend to advertise themselves as such, the privately owned companies that provide 75 percent of the Nation's electricity are not "just another business." There is a significant difference between an electric light and power company (or any private utility, for that matter) and an electronics, plastics, or space age company, or any nonutility businesses for that matter. The latter compete, more or less, with other firms in the same field and run the risk of being forced to close up shop if they fail to offer a desirable product at a competitive price.

The electric light and power companies—the Nation's largest industry, with about 12 percent of the capital invested in all American business—have little normal competition. As public service companies, they operate under Government franchises and enjoy the power of eminent domain and other special privileges. But most of all, they are monopolies in their communities, and, therefore, above the everyday fight for economic survival. Each year some 15,000 businesses go on the rocks; not a single private power company has failed in more than a generation.

Instead, the industry annually chalks up record profits—partly because of technological advances, but mainly because it is a monopoly selling a necessity for which demand is constantly increasing.

Since the industry is not competitive, and since the consumer is forced to foot the bill for the company operating costs and profit, the question should be asked whether the investor-owned utilities (as they like to call themselves) or IOU's (as I prefer to call them) should be allowed to use the restricted stock option.

Option plans are increasing in the utilities. They began spreading quietly through the industry during the complacent fifties, and at last count some 29 private electric companies had option plans for executives. Even had it wanted to—which it didn't during the Eisenhower administration—the Federal Power Commission could neither herald nor halt this invasion. FPC jurisdiction over security issues is severely limited to the few independent operating companies that are organized outside the States in which they operate, or that are organized and operating in States which lack a State agency authorized to police issuance of securities.

As a result, only one of the 29 plans was approved by the FPC. Of the remainder, 10 are part of holding-company option plans approved by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and 18 were presumably approved by State regulatory agencies which are even more susceptible to taming than Federal agencies and which, in some States, are little more than industry lap dogs. Only three State regulatory agencies (Maryland, Georgia, and New York) have taken stands against the stock option for public utilities.

On the Federal level, the SEC has considered three cases involving utility use of stock options and the FPC has considered two. Both agencies have consistently held that option plans for utilities are not prohibited by law. But although both are also specifically authorized to reject such plans on the ground that they are detrimental to the interests of stockholders and consumers, only the FPC has found any merit in this position.

The first option plan to come before the SEC was opposed by the SEC staff on this basis, among others. However, the Eisenhower-appointed commission rejected the staff position and the two subsequent plans were approved without hearings.

The precedent set by the Eisenhower Commission was also followed by the New Frontier Commission (four Kennedy appointees and one Eisenhower holdover) which approved the third holding-company plan.

Kennedy appointments did make a difference at the FPC, however, as was demonstrated in the Black Hills Power & Light Co. case early this summer. By a 3 to 2 vote, the present commission rejected the company's application to set up an option plan for top executives on the ground that the plan "is not compatible with the public interest." (One hopes this decision will encourage the SEC to reexamine its position when next it considers a utility application for stock options.)

The Black Hills decision reversed the position taken by the FPC under the Eisenhower administration, which, after it had shed even the pretense of regulating electric utilities, approved—with neither hearing nor dissent—the application of Montana Power Co. to issue options on 100,000 shares of stock.

That was in 1956, when the company was a New Jersey corporation operating in Montana. The authority for that issuance was to expire in June 1959, but on May 27, 1959, the cooperative Eisenhower commission authorized the company to issue 5,693,382 additional shares to cover a 3-for-1 split of all the firm's stock. Neither the company's application nor the commission's approval mentioned anything about stock under option or the June expiration date, so the 100,000 shares under option were also multiplied by 3.

In addition, the company boosted the total number of shares subject to option to 750,000, or 10 percent of its total common stock issuance—without official approval insofar as can now be determined. When the honeymoon ended with the advent of the Kennedy administration in 1961, the company escaped FPC jurisdiction over security issues by moving "home" to Montana.

The FPC now estimates that the 750,000 shares the company has under option will eventually cost $9 million in capital foregone—$9 million which will come out of the pockets of the ordinary stockholders and the company's customers.

It comes out of the ordinary stockholder's pocket because issuance of cutrate stock to company insiders dilutes the equity of ordinary stockholders and thereby reduces their earnings per share. And it comes out of the consumer's pocket because the capital loss resulting from the sale of stock at prices far under market value tends to discourage rate reductions and encourage rate increases.

But for the favored few, the stock option is a virtual guarantee of additional riches to pile atop their already fat incomes.

Let's return, for example, to the $75,000-a-year utility executive I cited earlier. His name is J. E. Corette, president of the Montana Power Co. Montana Power stock was selling for $23.75 per share on that October day in 1959 when he exercised his insider's option to purchase 30,000 shares. Mr. Corette, however, paid less than $11.50 per share (what the stock was selling for a few years earlier when his option was granted) or a total of $342,230 for stock worth $712,500 at the time he purchased it.

Nor is this all. Montana Power stock is now selling for about $38 per share; thus Mr. Corette paid $342,230 for stock now worth $1,140,000. And to top it off, another 35,000 shares has been set aside for him to purchase at similar bargain-basement prices later on.

Mr. Corette's case is neither isolated nor extreme. For example, G. L. MacGregor, president of Texas Utilities, who has an annual salary of $92,150, and who will receive more than $33,000 a year when he retires, has also realized a windfall profit of $350,000 under the stock-option gimmick as of this writing.

Other examples could be cited, but I single out Montana and Texas because the IOU's in these States are the top contenders for the light overcharge championship of the United States. The rates of return for major power companies in both States is about 9 percent—or 50 percent more than the 6-percent rate considered reasonable by most regulatory commissions and utility experts. Remember the Dixon-Yates controversy of 10 years ago? One of the main reasons for congressional concern at that time was the provision for a 9-percent rate of return for that utility combine.

The absence of risk is not the only advantage in this guaranteed profit scheme. Our tax laws contain special preferential provisions for such unearned riches. Thus, should he sell his stock bonanza, the option-rich executive would not have to pay the higher progressive rate which doctors, lawyers, and other high income Americans must pay. Instead, he would pay the much lower 25-percent or less capital-gains rate. Or he may give some of the stock to a tax-exempt organization, in which case he is allowed to deduct, not what he paid for it, but its higher current market value.

The IOU's have based their case for the stock option on two main pillars—that the option is needed to attract and hold competent executives, and that the device provides an incentive for better management, thereby benefiting the consumer as well as the company and its shareholders.

Neither argument made much impression on the FPC majority in the Black Hills case. The first pillar was toppled with the tart observation that it "can hardly be accepted since the record shows that without stock options the company has lost no employees with a salary in excess of $7,000 per year except by death or retirement." And in answer to the argument that options stimulate better management, the FPC commented that such plans permit "executive compensation which is often irrational, erratic, and unrelated to the performance of the executive," and that there is "no basis for concluding that such plans either lead to or have evolved from distinguished performance in the public interest."

As for benefiting the consumer, the industry is apparently referring to something other than the cost of electricity. For example, since 1956, when Montana Power Co. established a stock option plan "to stimulate better management," the cost of electricity for Montana homeowners and businesses has increased.

The same is true for the industry as a whole. During the 4-year period from 1958 through 1962, the net earnings of electric utilities increased by $543 million. Yet the net result of all rate changes during this same period was an increase of $85 million.

The industry's guideline to success, it would seem, is to pass all cost increases on to the consumer, but pocket all cost reductions. For example, as a result of technological advances, the industry can now produce twice as much electricity from a ton of coal as it could 20 years ago. You would never know it to look at your electric bill.

And nine times since World War II, Congress has granted the IOU's a tax reduction. Yet seldom have these savings been passed on to the consumer, whose light bill is set at a rate high enough to insure a profit after payment of all taxes and operating costs, including fat executive salaries, plush fringe benefits and, in some instances, well publicized charitable contributions and unpublicized country club memberships for executives.

The fact is that little evidence can be advanced to show that the stock option has provided any sort of incentive which benefits the consumer, but plenty can be offered to suggest that it provides an incentive to keep rates and profits so high that the market value of stock is almost certain to rise.

The FPC noted the conflict-of-interest danger in the Black Hills case with the comment that "the incentives under stock option plans * * * tend naturally to divert management from their responsibilities to the public and to focus their attention on maximizing prices and earnings in order to push stock quotations ever higher."

There are several other arguments against recourse to the stock options, not only by public utilities but by any business. For example, they fail to achieve their stated purpose insofar as the biggest option grants go to already established, fat-salaried senior executives such as Messrs. Corette and MacGregor.

Also, there is the surprising fact that stock options are far more costly to a corporation than straight salary bonuses because, unlike bonuses and salaries, option costs are not tax deductible. For example, if Montana Power Co. had given its president a $370,000 bonus instead of an option to buy 30,000 shares at half price, the company could have deducted 52 percent, or about $192,000, from its taxes.

Why then do the IOU's cling to the stock option? First of all, why worry about taxes when they are simply passed on to the consumer? Beyond that, high salaries and bonuses stick out like sore thumbs in front of stockholders and regulatory commissions. The costs of stock options are less apparent and therefore less embarrassing.

FPC noted in the Black Hills case that not only are the actual costs hidden from shareholders and consumers, but stock options distort the real cost of electric utility service because there is no practical way of including their cost in the rate formula.

Furthermore, the secrecy surrounding utility use of restricted stock options, the lack of adequate reporting on option windfalls by utility executives, and the shortage of staff in most regulatory agencies, both State and Federal, cripple any attempt to determine the precise use and consequences of restricted stock-option plans.

The staff shortage is especially significant in the Federal regulatory commission. For example, during the Eisenhower years the staff of the SEC ownership reports section was slashed from 14 to 7. This section reviews ownership reports of many companies, including the power utilities.

The staff has since been upped to 9, but because of the increased number of businesses the section now has twice as many ownership reports to review as when there were 14 on its staff. Yet this section is one of the few places where prospective investors, stockholders, and ratepayers can get some idea of the extent to which company insiders have utilized restricted stock options.

Similarly, the staff of the FPC is still suffering from its reduction to skeleton force during the 1950's and the Eisenhower deemphasis of electric utility regulation. Consider, for example, the comments of the present Chairman, Joseph C. Swidler, a Kennedy appointee:

"There is small wonder that knowledge of the FPC's rate jurisdiction has not been widespread. When I became a member of the Commission it took me some time to find the Commission's electric rate staff. It turned out that it was hidden away in the Bureau of Natural Gas."

Expansion of the FPC staff, to provide a degree of protection and information for investors and consumers, is now imperative in view of this year's Supreme Court decision in the Colton (California) case, which gives the FPC jurisdiction over wholesale power rates.

Fifty-year licenses for hydroelectric projects, granted to private power companies under the Water Power Act of 1920, will begin expiring in 1970, and Congress must have, well in advance, information to determine whether these licenses should be renewed.

The industry will do all it can to prevent appointment of consumer-oriented commissioners or additional staff at either agency. And the industry will continue to cry that it is the body and soul of competitive American free enterprise, and that all businesses pass taxes and operating costs on to the consumer. However, it must be repeated that competition limits what other businesses can pass on.

No one denies that the electric light and power industry faces competition of a sort. For example, it faces limited competition from the gas utilities (also monopolies, and in many instances incorporated in the same firm as the electric monopoly) which offer a product that is just as good as electricity for some purposes, such as cooking. But there is little danger that gas will replace electricity as the means of lighting the Nation's homes and streets or powering its industry.

Further, the few public-owned municipal power systems, the rural cooperatives, and the Federal power program also might be considered competitors in that they serve as yardsticks against which private power operations and rates can be measured.

But even such remote competition as this is obnoxious to the private-power industry. It has mounted a multi-million-dollar propaganda campaign—paid for in part by electric consumers—against these other suppliers of electric power, and it regularly contributes money and executive leadership to a host of rightwing organizations which attack public power—as well as the income tax, aid to education, civil rights, and the United Nations—as part of the Communist conspiracy.

Yet despite these quasi-competitors, the fact remains that the electric light and power industry is delightfully different as it perches on a luxurious tax shelter far above the battle for economic survival in which ordinary businesses engage.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I read further from the letter:

Question No. 16: "However, the most effective method of rate reduction is to give IOU's more competition, in the form of municipal power systems, rural electric cooperatives, public utility districts and Federal power projects." Before you tie up billions of taxpayers' dollars in duplicate power facilities, you need a better reason than to provide competition for investor-owned utilities. How far you can push the New York taxpayer to provide tax funds for cheap Montana electricity, I don't know. But I'm sure there's a limit. It's one thing for Government to regulate, but quite another to compete; and it's the duty of government to serve, not to be served, although this may be difficult for a politician to comprehend. I agree with your statement that a good regulatory body with an expert staff is a basic ingredient in the ratemaking recipe.

Mr. President, of course no one is proposing to tie up billions of tax dollars in duplicate power facilities. However, the same mail which brought the letter to which I here refer also brought me a letter from the city manager of Santa Clara, Calif., which shows that the refusal of IOU's to amend wheeling contracts, and in some instances even to negotiate, leads to demands for Federal transmission lines to serve customers with distribution systems which are at the mercy of an IOU. There have been similar instances recently in Idaho and in Georgia. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD correspondence which I have received from the Santa Clara city manager, D. R. von Raesfeld, who says that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. stated they "had no wish to negotiate any contract modifications with the city and would further refuse to wheel power to the city of Santa Clara."

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITY OF SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
January 12, 1965.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. LEE METCALF: The city of Santa Clara, which operates its own municipal electric system, appreciates your booklet on the loaded light bill.

The problems of obtaining fair and equitable treatment from the IOU's, specifically Pacific Gas & Electric Co., has recently been very graphically pointed out to the city of Santa Clara.

On July 27, 1964, the city of Santa Clara received an allocation of 75 megawatts of Central Valley power from the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior. Since that time, the city has been trying to implement this allocation by means of renegotiations of their existing contract with Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

On January 5, 1965, a meeting was held with representatives of this largest electric utility in the United States. At this meeting Pacific Gas & Electric Co. stated they had no wish to negotiate any contract modifications with the city and would further refuse to wheel power to the city of Santa Clara.

This attitude of Pacific Gas & Electric Co. prompted the city council to pass the enclosed official resolution and to also file letters of complaint with the Federal Power Commission and the California Public Utilities Commission. Copies of these documents are enclosed for your consideration and use.

The city of Santa Clara requests your immediate aid and action in every manner possible to enable the city of Santa Clara to modify its contract so that we may receive fair treatment from Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Very truly yours,

D. R. von Raesfeld,
City Manager, City of Santa Clara.

The City of Santa Clara, Calif.,
January 5, 1965.

California Public Utilities Commission,
San Francisco, Calif.

Honorable Commissioners: The city of Santa Clara, a municipal corporation of the State of California, whose principal office is situated at 1500 Warburton Avenue, Santa Clara, Calif., has directed me, as the city's mayor, to file this letter of complaint with you, against Pacific Gas & Electric Co., a California corporation whose principal office is located at 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

The city of Santa Clara, at the present time, purchases its entire requirements of electric power and energy from Pacific Gas & Electric Co., a California electric utility company, which operates in central and northern California. Santa Clara applies some of the power purchased to municipal uses, but resells the bulk of it to thousands of residential, commercial, and industrial customers.

On July 24, 1964, the city of Santa Clara received from the U.S. Government Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, an allocation of 75 megawatts of withdrawable Central Valley project power.

The electric service was to be furnished over the facilities of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., under the terms and conditions provided in contract No. 175r–2650 between the U.S. Government Department of the Interior and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

On August 7, 1964, a letter was sent to Mr. L. J. Brundige, division manager, San Jose division, Pacific Gas & Electric Co. This letter confirmed previous telephone conversations, and requested a meeting to reopen contract talks with Pacific Gas & Electric Co., and commence immediate discussions to determine a mutually acceptable means for terminating or modifying our existing power purchase contract with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The city requested at that time that the time schedule be such as to permit Santa Clara to start receiving Federal power wheeled over the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. facilities starting on or before January 1, 1965.

On August 10, 1964, a letter was written to Mr. Robert J. Pafford, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Department of Interior, Sacramento, Calif., requesting his office prepare a contract for the purchase of the 75 megawatts of Central Valley project power in accordance with the letter of allocation dated July 24, 1964, signed by Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior.

On August 21, 1964, the city of Santa Clara received a letter from Mr. C. Kadie, acting regional director of the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, confirming receipt of the letter of August 10, and advising the city of Santa Clara that they had requested transmission and wheeling service from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for the city of Santa Clara.

In his letter, Mr. Kadie stated that it was his understanding that Pacific Gas & Electric Co. planned to meet with the city of Santa Clara for further discussion of contractural arrangements.

It has been almost 5 months since the city has initially contacted Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and to date, no action on their part has been made to resolve our problem. In the interim, we have had numerous inquiries from our industrial community and citizens at large, requesting information regarding the present status of our negotiations with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Secondly, large amounts of money are involved and it is the feeling of all concerned that negotiations with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. be accelerated and concluded at an early date, so that we may take advantage of our 75 megawatts of power as allocated by the Department of Interior.

On January 5, 1965, a meeting was held with representatives of the city of Santa Clara and Pacific Gas & Electric Co. At this time Pacific Gas & Electric Co. stated that they have no wish to negotiate any contract revisions with the city of Santa Clara and further would refuse to wheel power to the city of Santa Clara. This answer was given despite the fact that Pacific Gas & Electric Co. representatives had offered and the city of Santa Clara accepted a proposal to seek a means of modification to the existing contract. In the meeting of January 5, 1965, the city of Santa Clara did offer a proposed revised contract to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

No consideration was given by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to the failure to reduce the resale schedule "R" due to the recent El Paso case decision or the availability of power from governmental sources, including the State of California.

The city of Santa Clara has been purchasing electrical energy from Pacific Gas & Electric Co. historically since 1913. The agreement now in effect was authorized and signed on October 26, 1955, and further supplemented on the 24th day of May 1960.

Section 7 of this supplemental agreement extends the original contract for a period of 5 years and terminates on August 27, 1967. Section 10 of the same agreement stipulates that it shall, at all times, be subject to such changes or modifications as the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California may, from time to time, direct in the exercise of its jurisdiction.

It is the position of the city that it owes to itself and the public users of power acquired from city, the benefits of the cheaper power presently available; that is, rapid and effective utilization of the 75 megawatt Federal allocation.

It is the position of the city that the Commission shoulders a similar responsibility and perhaps of greater magnitude where duties are commensurate with powers.

It is the position of the city that the Commission has the right, power, and duty to make adjustments to the contract under which the city now obtains power from Pacific Gas & Electric Co., as expressly provided under the terms of the contract.

It is therefore requested that the Commission initiate immediate action that will permit modification of the existing contract so that City and its customers may take full advantage of its rightful and lawful share of the allocation of Central Valley Power that has been granted by the Department of Interior at the earliest possible date.

Due to the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Southern California Edison, et al.* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 84S, CT, 644376, U.S. 205 (1964), the city of Santa Clara intends to also request an investigation of schedule R as it applies to the city of Santa Clara by the Federal Power Commission.

Attached is a copy of our letter being sent to the Federal Power Commission.

Very truly yours,

Lawrence L. Fargher,
Mayor, City of Santa Clara.
By D. R. von Raesfeld,
City, Manager, City of Santa Clara.

The City of Santa Clara, Calif.,
January 5, 1965.

Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Mr. Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman.)

Honorable Commissioners: The city of Santa Clara, a municipal corporation of the State of California, whose principal office is situated at 1500 Warburton Avenue, Santa Clara, Calif., has directed me, as its mayor, to file this complaint with you.

The city of Santa Clara, Calif., at the present time, purchases its entire requirements of electric power and energy from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., a California electric utility, which operates in central and northern California. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co., whose principal offices are situated at 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., sells power and energy to customers located there and to other utilities located within and outside the boundaries of the State of California. Santa Clara applies some of the power purchased to municipal uses, but resells the bulk of the electric power and energy to thousands of residential, commercial, and industrial customers within its incorporated limits.

The city of Santa Clara entered into a contract with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for the purchase of electric power and energy on October 26, 1955. This agreement was further supplemented on May 24, 1960. This contract terminates on August 27, 1967.

At the time of the original agreement and the supplemental agreement with Pacific Gas & Electric Co., their resale service, schedule R, dated September 30, 1954, and effective August 31, 1954, was in effect. The original agreement stipulates that schedule R was effective for the city of Santa Clara during the fourth and all subsequent years of the terms of the agreement.

By subsequent action schedule R was revised, the date filed was November 12, 1957, and became effective November 15, 1957, over the protests of the city of Santa Clara.

The city of Santa Clara was first billed under schedule R on October 1958.

The city of Santa Clara contends that the State of California Public Utilities Commission did not have the jurisdiction to revise schedule R in light of the recently decided case of the *Southern California Edison, et al.* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 84S, CT, 644376, U.S. 205 (1964).

It is our understanding that Pacific Gas & Electric Co. filed schedule R, effective November 15, 1957, with the Federal Power Commission on July 23, 1964, together with a copy of the city of Santa Clara contracts with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. We hereby protest this upward revision of schedule R as unjust and unreasonable, just as we previously protested to the California Public Utilities Commission and also the substitution of the 1957 schedule R as a part of our contract, rather than schedule R dated 1954.

Under the Federal Power Act of 1935, and specifically section 824d of (a), the rate to be charged for wholesale power of electric power must be just and reasonable, otherwise, it is unlawful.

This upward revision of schedule R has resulted in extra charges to date to the city of Santa Clara of $790,298.73.

Under the same Federal Power Act, section 824d, it is provided that there shall not be made or granted any power preference or advantages to any persons or subjects or to any undue prejudice or disadvantage to another, so as to maintain any unreasonable difference in rates, charges, services, or facilities. Within the last 2 years there have been rate decreases granted to users and industrialists of other communities who are served by the permanent facilities of Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

There has been no renovation of schedule R, the resale rate, despite the El Paso decision, even though a rate reduction was passed on to customers who purchased power from Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for purposes other than resale. This failure to reduce rates has further injured the city of Santa Clara and its citizens.

It is therefore apparent that an undue advantage has been given to users of electric power and energy situated within the territorial jurisdiction of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to the prejudice of all resale customers.

We therefore request that the Federal Power Commission instigate an immediate investigation of schedule R and decide on the legality and justness of the rate increase in November 1957 and the failure of Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to reduce this rate when, as a result of the El Paso decision, reduced generation costs were enjoyed by Pacific Gas & Electric Co. who then unjustly apportioned some of these cost reductions to privileged customers and excluded others. We also request the Federal Power Commission to utilize any powers within its jurisdiction to enable us to obtain an immediate modification of our existing contract which we consider unreasonable and unjust in light of recent decisions in the courts and the availability of lower cost power from Federal and State of California sources.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE L. FARGHER,
Mayor, City of Santa Clara.
By D. R. VON RAESFELD,
City Manager, City of Santa Clara.

RESOLUTION BY CITY COUNCIL OF CITY OF SANTA CLARA, CALIF.

Resolution finding that the public interest and necessity require the modification of a certain contract under which city acquires electric energy and power and authorizing and directing that matter be immediately placed before the appropriate public power and utility commissioners and officials

Whereas, the city of Santa Clara, a municipal corporation of the State of California, supplies power and electrical energy which it purchases to municipal uses, but resells the bulk of it to thousands of residential, commercial, and industrial consumers within the corporate limits of the city; and

Whereas, the city of Santa Clara, under the leadership, guidance, and with complete cooperation of its elected officials and others, has received from the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, an allocation of power from the Central Valley project, and city is now ready, able and willing to accept said power for itself and its public users that it serves; and

Whereas Pacific Gas & Electric Co., a California public utility company, declines to allow the city of Santa Clara and the public users of city supplied power the use of such power but insists that city and the users of city power continue to use Pacific Gas & Electric Co. supplied power until August 27, 1967, pursuant to a contract between Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and city of Santa Clara; and

Whereas Pacific Gas & Electric Co. not only refuses to allow modification of the contract to allow city of Santa Clara and its users of electric power to meet the public needs with Federal power, and also declines to modify the rates charged city and the users of city power; and

Whereas Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has decreased rates to other users and has declined to reduce rates to city, although the rates now charged includes a rate increase not reviewed and approved by the FPC; said increase was put into effect November 15, 1957; and

Whereas it is estimated that the saving to the city and the users of city power by using power under the Federal contract or other power at similar rates is no less than $1 million per year under what the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. presently charge the city so that the passage of time is depriving the city and the users of city power of a rate adjustment intended for their advantage so that immediate action is necessary to protect the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Santa Clara:

1. The city council hereby finds and determines that the public interest and necessity require the modification of the contract presently existing between the city of Santa Clara and Pacific Gas & Electric Co. whereby the city is charged for the power supplied by Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to itself and to its users.

2. The city council further finds and determines that immediate action by the public power and utility commissions is necessary in the modification of the power contract and for determination of rebates presently due and owing city for charges made pursuant to the schedule R rate increase.

3. The city council hereby further finds and determines that undue preferences and advantages had been given to other customers of Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to the prejudice and disadvantage to the city and its customers by their unwillingness to adjust the wholesale rates for electric power.

4. The mayor and city manager of the city of Santa Clara are hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to immediately transmit in the most effective manner letters, including the history of the complaint herein, to the respective public power and utility commissions. Said letter shall be transmitted to each of the honorable commissioners with appropriate number of copies and documentation so that there will be no need for further delay in an appropriate investigation by the commissions. Said letter shall request that immediate action be taken with regard to the herein mentioned contract and rates charged and chargeable by Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to city so as to correct the inequities of the matter and insure city and the public users of city power of the contract and/or rate adjustment and/or refund to which they are entitled by contract, law, and equity.

5. That copies of this resolution be sent to all public power and utility commissioners, officials of the Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, and all other appropriate officials.

Passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Santa Clara this 5th day of January 1965.

Attest:

A. S. BELICK,
City Clerk.

THE CITY OF SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
January 27, 1965.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HON. LEE METCALF: On January 19, 1965, city representatives had a meeting with representatives of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The meeting was arranged by and held in the office of Mr. William Bennett, commissioner of the California Public Utilities Commission. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. made no offer and gave us no encouragement that they would modify the present contract. In one instance they told us that there was a very small return to their company on schedule R, the resale power rate under which Santa Clara is now being billed. Secondly, they told us that there would be no advantage to Santa Clara to modify the contract if Pacific Gas & Electric profits resulting from their contract with Santa Clara were kept intact.

We understood this to mean that to modify the existing contract, Santa Clara would have to give the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. the differential in cost between the Bureau of Reclamation charges for Central Valley Power and the costs resulting from an application of Pacific Gas & Electric schedule R rate. In other words, Pacific Gas & Electric is holding to a payment of approximately $1 million a year to release or modify Santa Clara's contract, if it is to be considered at all, so that we might receive our allocation of available surplus Central Valley power.

The only progress that was attained at this meeting was that Pacific Gas & Electric would submit to Santa Clara a valuation study of costs of service to Santa Clara and would meet with us again on February 25, here in Santa Clara.

At this time Santa Clara holds no hope of reaching any reasonable settlement with Pacific Gas & Electric, although we will continue to try to work with them. Their attitude, plain and simple, is: Pacific Gas & Electric has a contract; Pacific Gas & Electric makes the million dollars if Santa Clara doesn't, and Pacific Gas & Electric is going to make it, regardless of Santa Clara or its citizens' wishes.

Very frankly, the general attorney for Pacific Gas & Electric is of the opinion that the California Public Utilities Commission does not have jurisdiction, and jurisdiction rests entirely with the Federal Power Commission. We intend, and are continuing to seek assistance from the two commissions, the Federal Power and the California Public Utilities Commissions, for we believe both to have jurisdiction in different areas. It appears that Pacific Gas & Electric intends to keep the question of jurisdiction involved and that, realistically, Santa Clara can spend the next 2½ years negotiating without any relief.

We in Santa Clara believe the attitude of Pacific Gas & Electric Co. lays bare their true intentions and our only recourse must be through friends like you and the political pressure you may exert to make Pacific Gas & Electric see their shortsighted attitude is not in the public interest. We are deeply concerned that this is an example of the treatment that can be expected by all public agencies when the private power companies control the intertie between the Pacific Northwest and Southwest resources.

Perhaps it is not too late to reconsider the decisions reached by Congress on the intertie, since the contracts are now only in the stage of being drawn and negotiated, according to information we have received.

We appreciate your help in the past and we certainly need your help at this time when we are faced with the situation that is now so apparent, where one party, Pacific

> Gas & Electric Co., refuses to any position except one of pure negation.
>
> Very truly yours,
> D. R. VON RAESFELD,
> *City Manager, City of Santa Clara.*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I now read the remainder of the letter:

> Question 17–20 (general): Naturally, the investor-owned companies spend money on advertising and institutional promotion. They are rightly disturbed at the socialistic thinking of some of our so-called responsible leaders.
>
> Let me ask you—if you owned a gasoline service station across the street from another one, which by special legislation was largely tax exempt, and could also borrow money at the local bank for half the interest cost to you, what would you do? I doubt if you would sit idly by and watch him steal a large number of your customers. Instead, you would attempt to convince the public that, (1) this was not fair, (2) that some of their tax dollars were helping keep him in business, and last but not least, (3) our free enterprise is being watered down by socialism.
>
> I could make this letter three times as long with little or no effort, because you have provided such a fertile field. It is amazing, and at the same time disturbing to me and many other citizens of this country, that a few supposedly responsible people can be so loose and irresponsible with a business so large, vital, and for the most part completely devoted to the challenge of (1) providing the best electric service to its customers at the lowest possible cost; (2) earning for its investors a reasonable rate of return; and (3) maintaining a standard of compensation and environment so as to attract competent and conscientious employees, which in turn make possible the first two points.
>
> In closing, I wish to state that, although I am employed by one of your IOU's and am a former employee of a State regulatory commission, I write this letter as an independent citizen and taxpayer. The views expressed herein are my own, and, fortunately, are shared by many others. I would very much appreciate a personal reply to this letter. If your convictions are strong enough, and your position is defensible, I'll get one.

Mr. President, it is a little-known fact that some 40 investor-owned utilities have obtained REA loans, to which my correspondent makes reference by speaking of the loans "at half the interest cost." One reason why more IOU's do not obtain REA loans is that there is pressure from the industry not to participate in the program. Another reason is economic: They cannot make as much money with 2-percent loans and by accepting the service obligations which rural electrics accept as they can by getting higher-cost money and by serving more populous areas.

Mr. President, the investor-owned utilities are doing much more than provide legitimate criticism through advertising. The senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] recently made a great speech about the right-wing groups which spread hate throughout the land, question the patriotism of elected officials and neighbors, advocate abolition of the United Nations and the income tax, and spread malicious material among schoolchildren and adults, as well.

It is time, I think, to go beyond these organizations, and to see who is putting up the money for these hate organizations. It is not generally known, but it is a documented fact that investor-owned electric utilities are contributing to many of these organizations, including Manion Forum, America's Future, the Committee for Constitutional Government, the National Education Program, and the Southern States Industrial Council. Some IOU's charge off these donations as operating expenses, to be paid by the customer.

It is time, I believe, for Congress to require that donations to such organizations be matters of public record.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE AIR FORCE, THE ARMY, AND THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Army, and the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, these nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—CHANGE OF CONFEREE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] be excused from further service as a Senate conferee on House Joint Resolution 234, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] be appointed to serve as a conferee in lieu of the Senator from Georgia.

This is being done at the request of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES AND OTHER COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 13, Senate Resolution 61, and that the succeeding resolutions be considered in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 61) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before proceeding to consider the many resolutions which are before the Senate, and which seek to obtain additional funds to operate the special committees. I should like to review for a moment what has taken in the past few years with respect to the increasing cost of operating Congress.

As I stated some time ago, I believe that the President of the United States is making every effort to curtail the expenses of government. Successful efforts have been made up to now in curtailing expenses of the Defense Department. The President has had the full cooperation of many other departments in curtailing the expenses of government. It is my judgment that in the Senate we should make every effort to lead the way in helping the President in his task.

It was my hope that we could set an example to other departments of government in our efforts to curtail expenses.

Last year we considered and passed a bill that increased the salaries of Senate employees as well as Senators and Representatives. I voted against the bill. I would cheerfully have voted for it if the bill had been limited to an increase in the salaries of those in the lower brackets, where an increase was really and truly necessary.

In the past 4, 5, or 6 years, whenever legislation has been presented to the Senate providing for an increase in the salaries of any particular group, other groups have been included in the bill. As a result, we have been confronted with bills wherein proposed raises in salary for many groups have not been in proportion. Situations have developed in which employees already receiving fairly good salaries—more or less adequate salaries—have received increases of as much as 25 percent. Those in the lower brackets whose salaries should have been raised more have received increases as low as 4 percent.

As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I discussed the subject of pay raises with other members of the committee, including the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I felt then, as I feel now, that it was not right for the Congress to pass a bill which would result in increasing the salaries of the staff members of the standing committees of the Senate by as much as $4,300 or $4,400. So I proceeded to use my judgment. I do not know how many other committee chairmen did what I did. I suppose my action was unpopular, but that is all right. I did what I thought was right. I cut back a proposed increase to all the employees on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to a sum which I thought was fair. The chairmen of the committees have quite a leeway in that they can permit the full amount of the increase to be given to all employees, an increase which would range from 4 percent to as much as 25 percent, if they see fit to do so. I do not know of too many committee chairmen who did not give the full amount.

I did the same thing in relation to increasing the salaries of members of my staff. I did not permit the increases to take place as they could have under the law. But I spent some time in trying to evaluate the amount of increase that should be allowed to members of my staff in the light of the increase in salaries not only of members of the legislative branch, but also members of the executive branch, and others, that had recently taken place.

For a long time we have followed a certain method of fixing the salaries of employees not only on the committees, but on the staffs of all Senators as well. Depending upon the population of a State, a certain amount of base salary is provided. A Senator may divide that base salary more or less as he sees fit, except for three or four limitations. He may arrange for the pay of one employee to be above the $5,100 base; he may arrange for the pay of one to be above the $6,540 base; he may arrange for the pay of one to be above the $8,040 base; he may arrange for the pay of one to be above the $8,460 base.

The gross salary of an employee in our office receiving the $5,100 base immediately becomes $13,462.23. The difference is made up from funds provided by the Congress. At this moment I am unable to understand—and I doubt if many other Senators can—how that system works. I have tried to find out. We can designate the base salary of a chief assistant at $8,880. If we do so, the gross salary then becomes $22,945.

That is a difference of almost $15,000 that is paid to the employee from the fund provided by the legislative branch. How the figure of $22,945 is reached, I do not know, but it is misleading. It puts a Senator and a Representative more or less in a bad way with his staff, when they examine the list that is published every 6 months by the Secretary of the Senate.

A list of all employees of all Senators is made, showing the gross pay of each employee. The gross pay does not represent the actual pay that comes from the allowance given to Senators out of their respective base pay. It would seem to me that this formula needs some revision, so that our constituents may know more about what is being done with their money.

I believe it would be acting in better grace if a Senator were placed in a position in which he did not have to do what his colleagues do. I have not yet seen a copy of the last pay raise list; therefore, I do not know how many Senators have given their assistants and the rest of their help the entire increase provided in the latest pay raise bill; but I would wager that many have done so.

I doubt whether the chairmen of the various committees have taken the trouble to examine into the provisions of the pay-raise bill, to see whether some kind of equitable payment could be made to the employees in proportion to the capability of the persons employed.

Not long ago Congress saw fit to construct a new Senate Office Building. As I recall, the arguments advanced then were to the effect that there were 12 Senators from large States who desperately needed more space. After holding the proposal at bay for at least 10 years, I was finally defeated. My alternate proposal was to use as much space as possible in the Old Senate Office Building, and then to proceed to construct an addition to the Capitol which would provide, for the Senate and the House, in excess of 100 additional offices. A further suggestion was that when the East Front of the Capitol was extended, provision should be made for a large restaurant where Senators and Representatives could obtain their meals each day, thereby resulting in a saving to the taxpayers—on the Senate side—of from $65,000 to $85,000 a year, which is the cost of operating the Senate dining room today. But I was not listened to. Believe it or not, Congress ended by not only building the New Senate Office Building, but also extending the East Front of the Capitol. I challenge any Senator to visit the Old Senate Office Building, or even the new one, and find some space. Every room is taken.

All of us remember that recently the Vice President was unable to find sufficient room in which to do his work. Why? Because all the space had been gobbled up by the many subcommittees that the Senate has been creating or expanding each year. When the Reorganization Act was placed on the statute books, each of the 15 standing committees was provided with 4 specialists and 6 clericals. A total of 150 employees were to be selected to operate the standing committees.

But not long after the Senate was reorganized under the act of 1946, we started to add special committees. The addition of special committees, besides the extra help that has been provided for each standing committee, has resulted in a situation in which, aside from the 150 employees that are hired to operate the 15 standing committees, the total number of employees on the committees is 389. I do not include the Committee on Appropriations, because it operates under an arrangement different from that of other standing committees.

Today we have 389 employees on the special committees, some extra employees on the regular committees, and 185 employees on the standing committees, including appropriations, for a total of 574 employees. This is in contrast to 259 employees when the Senate had, as I recall, 47 standing committees.

Mr. President, do we wonder why we do not have any more space here, when the Senate continues to create committees which never die? Some committees have been in existence for many years. I like to refer, and I shall when the time comes, to the child delinquency subcommittee. That subcommittee was formed 15 or 16 years ago as I recall. It was supposed to help in dealing with child delinquency. The job was to be done in the space of 2, 3, or 4 years, at an expenditure of about $225,000. But, as time went on, the subcommittee remained in existence and grew stronger and stronger. It seems that the longer the committee stays in existence, the more child delinquency there is. Nothing had been done toward solving the problem.

There are other committees that could be done away with. I am not very hopeful. I am frank to confess that I do not expect much assistance today from the Senate.

It entails a great deal of work to go through this procedure each year. I have been trying to curtail our expenses for the past 17 or 18 years, since reorganization. The work that I have done in this direction may have acted, I hope, as a deterrent to the creation of more committees, or to the increased size of existing committees. Sometimes, I am doubtful that I have been able to do even that, when we stop to consider that of the 16 standing committees, there are only 2 or 3 that have no special or extra committees.

The Agriculture Committee, as well as the Committee on Finance, works within the amount of money provided for in the original Reorganization Act, and that amounts to $168,432.89.

I may not be doing a good job on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I do not know. But, I know that I work hard at it. And ever since I became chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I have returned to the Treasury much of the funds that were made available to me for the purpose of operating the committee. I try to use the facilities that were set up by Congress in the Library of Congress under the Reorganization Act. We are spending much money in the Library of Congress.

There are a couple of hundred employees, more or less, whose duty it is to work with the committees and the staffs of Senators in obtaining information for their guidance.

As I shall point out in a moment, one of those committees uses the Library of Congress facilities extensively. But in obtaining the information from the Library of Congress, the committee employs a couple of editors, a couple of assistant editors, a couple of this, that, and the other. The committees always find ways and means with which to use up the moneys that are provided by the Senate. Much of the data that has been publicized by some of the committees is obtained from the Library of Congress through the reference service provided under the Reorganization Act.

If Senators who head the special committees were to examine into this field, they would find through the regular committees, and through their own staffs, which have worked in cooperation with the Library of Congress, that much of the data that is needed could be obtained from that source. But the extra special committees make those inquiries. The staffs of the respective Senators and the staffs of the regular committees could do it, rather than have the special committees sit from year to year, and, in many instances, do little or nothing.

I did not make a tabulation of all the Congresses. But I have before me a document which gives a summary of the committee authorizations for the special committees—not the standing committees, but merely the special committees that have been created and furnished funds to carry on the work of inquiring into various subjects.

Some subcommittees are necessary. A few of them have done a good deal of excellent work. I am not unmindful of the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary has been doing much of the work that was formerly done by the Committee on Claims before reorganization. The Committee on the Judiciary is now doing a great deal of work on immigration. That work was formerly done by a special committee. I was chairman of the Committee on Claims for some time when that committee was in operation, before reorganization. I am proud to say that every claim bill that was ever introduced in this body received attention by that committee. Our committee more or less cleared the deck, as it were, and it was not necessary for Senators to introduce the same measure every year because the previous Congress gave it no consideration.

As chairman of that committee, with seven or eight other Senators and one clerk, I handled all the claims that were filed in the Senate. That small committee accounted for more than 50 percent of all the bills enacted by the Congress each year.

Today my good friend from Mississippi makes a claim which is true. His committee now handles all these claims and, in addition thereto, immigration matters. If we add all the measures that go through the Judiciary Committee and come before the Senate, we find that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate handles in excess of 50 percent of the legislation introduced in the Senate. But in order to do so we have provided a special subcommittee, on which perhaps three or four lawyers serve, with quite a few clerical employees. The same holds true for the Immigration Subcommittee.

The subcommittees are well staffed. In addition, in order to facilitate action on this legislation, much information is obtained from the Justice Department. The cost in that area has increased considerably over what the cost was before the Reorganization Act.

I have before me a summary of the subcommittees that have been created under the Judiciary Committee.

There is the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, which started in the 86th Congress. During the two sessions of the 86th Congress the subcommittee started with $230,000. As time has gone on, there has been an increase in the amount spent, so that the percentage increase in the case of that subcommittee has been 30.4 percent.

Another one is the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. The information I have before me begins with the 84th Congress. I believe that subcommittee was created before then. That subcommittee started with $434,396 for the entire 84th Congress. During the 88th Congress we provided it with $1,008,750. For this Congress, the 89th Congress, we are being asked to supply $543,500. If the same amount is asked for next year, it will amount to $1,087,000, an increase from the 84th Congress of 150 percent.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments started with $50,000 for the 86th Congress, when the subcommittee was organized. We have now reached the point of $182,000, or an increase of 378 percent.

Bear in mind that the amounts provided for these subcommittees are in addition to the amount we provide for the regular committee.

In the 84th Congress the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights received $152,200. In the first session of the 89th Congress it will receive $195,000. If the subcommittee asks for the same amount next year, which it will—or perhaps more—it will total $390,000, or a percentage increase of 156.2 percent.

There is one subcommittee which has not increased its expenditures, and that is the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, which I think was one provided for my friend, the Senator from Illinois. Why that subcommittee is in existence I do not know, but it has spent $15,000. The subcommittee was created during the 87th Congress, and it has asked for no increase.

The Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery is headed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. This is one subcommittee in which the amount requested, percentagewise, has not increased. It shows a minus 4 percent, in the amount provided from the 86th Congress through the 88th Congress.

I come now to the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, the subcommittee I was speaking of a while ago. The amount asked for in the first session of the 89th Congress is $162,000. If the subcommittee asks the same amount next year, which I am sure it will, it will mean that from the 84th through the 89th Congress the cost of operating this subcommittee will have increased 60.4 percent.

The Subcommittee on Internal Security has asked for $431,000 for this session, or a total of $862,000 for the Congress if the subcommittee asks for the same amount next year. During the 84th Congress the subcommittee was allocated $540,976. The increase from the 84th through the 89th Congress has been 59.3 percent.

The Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, which was created about 16 or 18 years ago, and which was supposed to complete its work during one Congress, is still going strong. During the 84th Congress—I did not obtain the amounts before that Congress—that subcommittee spent $248,310. For the first session of this Congress, the 89th Congress, that subcommittee is asking for $220,000, or a total of $440,000, should the subcommittee ask for the same amount next year. The increase in expenditures in that subcommittee from the 84th to the 89th Congress, first session, has been 81.2 percent.

One subcommittee that has not increased its costs is the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries. I do not know why that subcommittee should be continued in existence from year to year.

(At this point, Mr. MUSKIE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year, I understand the subcommittee asked for $5,000 and spent $708; but it is still there, and we have provided $5,000 each session of Congress to operate that subcommittee. From the 84th Congress through the 89th Congress, the amount asked for has been minus 24.7 percent.

The Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, of the Committee on the Judiciary was organized prior to the 84th Congress but I have the record before me from the 84th Congress through the 1st session of the 89th Congress. In the 84th Congress, $158,234 was authorized. This year, the amount asked for is at the rate of $240,000—that is, $120,000 per session, which shows an increase from the 84th Congress of 57.9 percent. I do not understand why the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees is still on the statute books.

For the 84th Congress, it received $68,783. During the 89th Congress, 1st session, it is asking for $102,300, or an increase from the 84th Congress through the 89th Congress of 197.4 percent. Instead of going down, it seems that expenditures for this subcommittee are constantly going up, on the justification that they wish to look into the problem of Cuban refugees. There is already a special committee looking into that subject. We are providing all the funds in order to take care of Cuban refugees. Why a study by the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees is necessary, I do not know. I was disappointed to learn that whenever there were refugees in China, or refugees in Western Europe, good old Uncle Sam spent millions of dollars in order to assist refugees from Russia and countries behind the Iron Curtain.

When the Cuban refugee problem faced us, we tried to obtain assistance from other countries. We knocked on the door, but there was no answer. Our allies said in effect, "That is your baby; take care of it."

We have been taking care of it ever since, singlehandedly. It is costing a great amount of money. As I pointed out during the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, efforts were made to have some of the Cuban refugees taken by the nations of South America. To add insult to injury, those who promised to take some Cuban refugees stated: "You pay for it. You pay the expenses, and we will be glad to take care of them."

With respect to the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification, from the 86th Congress through the 1st session of the 89th, there has been an increase in expenses of 62 percent.

The Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy has been on and off for some time. I do not know why it should be maintained. But that committee's authorization, from the 84th Congress through the 89th Congress, increased 14.9 percent.

I have the total of the moneys allocated from the 84th Congress through the projected 89th Congress by the subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary. Bear in mind that the Committee on the Judiciary has, as all other committees have—the sum of $168,443.89. During the 89th Congress, if the amount being asked for now is asked for next year, the total amount that will have been spent by that committee alone, in addition to the amount I have just stated, would be $4,455,600, in order to pay the expenses of operating the various subcommittees of the standing committee.

I have a summarization of the authorizations and expenditures of other committees, showing the total amount authorized and the amount spent. In examining the figures, Senators will notice that the expended amount has been increasing from the 83d Congress, when $3,099,670 was actually spent, although $4,494,000 was authorized. It has been constantly increasing. During the 84th Congress it increased from over $3 million to $4,769,000 actually expended.

The 85th Congress expended $5,906,721 on special committees.

The 86th Congress spent $7,834,222.

The 87th Congress spent $7,524,000—just $300,000 less than the previous Congress.

The recently expired 88th Congress authorized $10,014,000 and spent $7,490,830.93.

During the 89th Congress, 1st session, by adding the amounts of these resolutions, it will be found that the authorized amount up to now is $5,443,500, including $380,000 for the Appropriations Committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the two summaries from which I have just read.

There being no objection, the summaries were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Judiciary subcommittees

JANUARY 1955 TO JANUARY 1965, OR FROM COMMITTEE BEGINNING

Subcommittee	Amount	Dollar increase	Percent increase
Administrative Practice and Procedure:			
84th Cong			
85th Cong			
86th Cong	$230,000.00		
87th Cong	230,000.00		
88th Cong	230,600.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	150,000.00 [1]300,000.00	70,000	30.4
Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation:			
84th Cong	434,396.05		
85th Cong	640,000.00		
86th Cong	875,000.00		
87th Cong	923,000.00		
88th Cong	1,008,750.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	543,500.00 [1]1,087,000.00	653,604	150.4
Constitutional amendments:			
84th Cong			
85th Cong			
86th Cong	50,000.00		
87th Cong	83,000.00		
88th Cong	109,423.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	91,000.00 [1]182,000.00	132,000	378.0
Constitutional rights:			
84th Cong	152,200.00		
85th Cong	215,000.00		
86th Cong	280,000.00		
87th Cong	282,000.00		
88th Cong	317,300.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	195,000.00 [1]390,000.00	237,800	156.2
Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations:			
84th Cong			
85th Cong			
86th Cong			
87th Cong	$15,000.00		
88th Cong	14,500.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	7,500.00 [1]15,000.00	0	0
Federal Judicial System:			
84th Cong			
85th Cong			
86th Cong	210,000.00		
87th Cong	190,000.00		
88th Cong	192,200.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	100,000.00 [1]200,000.00	−10,000	−4.7
Immigration and Naturalization:			
84th Cong	202,097.00		
85th Cong	180,000.00		
86th Cong	232,000.00		
87th Cong	260,000.00		
88th Cong	269,200.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	162,000.00 [1]324,000.00	122,093	60.4
Internal Security:			
84th Cong	540,976.00		
85th Cong	513,291.45		
86th Cong	478,000.00		
87th Cong	665,000.00		
88th Cong	693,880.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	431,000.00 [1]862,000.00	321,024	59.3
Juvenile Delinquency:			
84th Cong	248,310.00		
85th Cong	135,000.00		
86th Cong	300,000.00		
87th Cong	411,000.00		
88th Cong	384,300.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	220,000.00 [1]440,000.00	201,690	81.2
National Penitentiaries:			
84th Cong	13,292.00		
85th Cong	10,000.00		
86th Cong	10,000.00		
87th Cong	10,000.00		
88th Cong	10,000.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	5,000.00 [1]10,000.00	−3,292	−24.7
Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights:			
84th Cong	158,234.00		
85th Cong	215,000.00		
86th Cong	280,000.00		
87th Cong	255,000.00		
88th Cong	240,800.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	120,000.00 [1]120,000.00	91,766	57.9
Refugees and Escapees:			
84th Cong	68,783.00		
85th Cong	80,000.00		
86th Cong	62,500.00		
87th Cong	137,500.00		
88th Cong	168,500.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	102,300.00 [1]204,600.00	135,817	197.4
Revision and Codification:			
84th Cong			
85th Cong			
86th Cong	50,000.00		
87th Cong	52,000.00		
88th Cong	55,900.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	40,500.00 [1]81,000.00	31,000	62.0
Trading With the Enemy:			
84th Cong	104,410.00		
85th Cong	100,000.00		
86th Cong	155,000.00		
87th Cong	90,000.00		
88th Cong	110,800.00		
89th Cong., 1st sess	60,000.00 [1]120,000.00	15,590	14.9

---

[1] Projected for both sessions.

Standing committee authorized $168,432.89 by Reorganization Act of 1946

TOTAL AUTHORIZED JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEES

Congress	Amount	Dollar increase	Percent increase
84th	$2,032,834.00		
85th	2,188,291.45		
86th	3,192,500.00		
87th	3,613,500.00		
88th	3,754,653.00		
89th (projected)	4,455,600.00	2,422,766	119.1

NOTE.—Increase of 5 new subcommittees, total, now 14.

Summary of committee authorizations and expenditures for inquiries and investigations, 83d through 89th Cong. (1st sess.)

	Authorized	Expended
83d Cong. (1953–54):		
Inquiries and investigations	$4,125,181.63	$2.873,965.74
Routine	369 000.00	225.705.64
Total	4.494,181.63	3.099.670.38
84th Cong. (1955–56):		
Inquiries and investigations	6,578,859.94	4,530,074.67
Routine	315,000.00	239.523.35
Total	6,893,859.94	4,769,598.02
85th Cong. (1957–58):		
Inquiries and investigations	7,958,780.14	5,696,275.34
Routine	320,000.00	210,445.89
Total	8,278,780.14	5,906,721.23
86th Cong. (1959–60):		
Inquiries and investigations	10,458,231.37	7,619,895.65
Routine	300,000.00	214,326.52
Total	10,758,231.37	7,834,222.17
87th Cong. (1961–62):		
Inquiries and investigations	9,458,700.00	7,308,844.72
Routine	283,300.00	215,888.67
Total	9,742,000.00	7,524,733.39
88th Cong. (1963–64):		
Inquiries and investigations	9,734.433.00	7,287,835.58
Routine	280,000.00	202,995.35
Total	10,014,433.00	7,490,830.93
89th Cong. (1st sess.):		
Inquiries and investigations	5,443,500	

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table from which I was reading a moment ago, which indicated the total number of committee employees authorized by the Reorganization Act, aggregating 185 employees, and those under the various subcommittees that were authorized for standing committees, aggregating 389 persons, for a total of 574 employees.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number of committee employees as of June 30, 1964, in excess of those authorized under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946

	Number
Investigation of aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies	6
Study of banking and currency	6
Study of Federal housing	7
Study of U.S. foreign policy	9
Subcommittee on Investigations	24
Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of Government Operations	9
Interior Committee investigations	10
Study of administrative practice and procedure	14
Investigation of antitrust and monopoly laws	41
Study of constitutional rights	18
Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations	1
Study of Federal judicial system	6
Investigation of immigration and naturalization matters	10
Investigation of juvenile delinquency	27
Examination and review of Patent Office and statutes	9
Refugees and escapees	6
Trading With the Enemy Act	5
Additional professional staff members and clerical assistants for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare	17
Study of migatory labor	9
Investigations on post office and civil service	14
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service	1
Study of problems of small and independent business	14
Special Committee on Aging	16
Investigations by the Committee on Armed Services	11
Study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities	18
Study of certain aspects of national security and international operations	8
Constitutional amendments	4
Internal security	25
Study of matters pertaining to revision and codification of statutes of the United States	2
Additional staff and funds for the Committee on Public Works	4
Privileges and elections	8
Investigations by Commerce Committee	30
Total	389
Total number of committee employees authorized under Legislative Reorganization Act[1]	185
Total	574
Total committee staff employees in June 1944 prior to Reorganization Act	259

[1] Includes current staff (35) of Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is pending before the Senate a resolution to cover the expenses of the investigations being made by the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is chairman of that committee.

Last year a request was made for an appropriation of $88,500. This year the request is for $95,000. The number of employees as of June 30, 1964, was six. The number of employees requested is five. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct. The difference between the two amounts is accounted for by the item to which the Senator from Louisiana referred a moment ago; namely, the pay increases which were ordered by Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that much of the funds appropriated for the subcommittee are used on a reimbursable basis; Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. What the Senator said about using the Library of Congress services is very appropriate as applied to this particular committee. More than $30,000 of the $88,500 spent last year was spent on a reimbursable basis. About $20,000 with the Library of Congress and $12,420 with the Military Establishment, in this case the Army, for studies which relate to construction of facilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that the committee paid this sum to the Library of Congress?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, indeed; we could not obtain that service otherwise. This service has been provided through the special committee, and it was reimbursed in that way; not through the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the Senate has a special organization in the Library of Congress for that purpose. For example, in connection with agricultural matters, there is a specialist in the person of Dr. Wilcox, who handles all agricultural inquiries, and all the information that our committee desires is obtained without any cost. I am wondering if the Senator pays any special fees; and, if so, to whom he pays them. This is an entirely new matter to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. We pay it directly to the Library of Congress. In this particular instance it is to reimburse the Library for the services of Mrs. Eilene Galloway, who made special studies on certain types of space activities.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is she an employee of the committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. She is an employee of the Library of Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator pays her salary?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, but only for the time she spends on committee business.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator says he pays that money to the Library of Congress, he means he reimburses the Library for the salary of Mrs. Galloway; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I meant when I said that a good deal of hiring that was done by the Senator's subcommittee was done on a reimbursable basis.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. We thought that was the best way to do it. In the last session of the previous Congress the request of the subcommittee was for $200,000. When I became chairman 2 years ago, we cut the amount in half. That is what I had done in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I hope to do it a little each year. There is one study, however, which will cost some money. It is a study which has to do with a manned orbiting laboratory and the extended Apollo program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has now four specialists and 10 clerical employees. Does the Senator have any other employees other than those I have mentioned?

Mr. ANDERSON. There are nine employees on the regular committee, and five on the special committee, and they work very satisfactorily. When we get into a special situation, such as the conflict between the Air Force and NASA, on the utilization of the manned orbital laboratory, we must have people who are competent to make that kind of study.

I point out to the Senator that the budget which was sent to the President carried an item of $300 million for a manned orbital laboratory for the Defense Department. We had made a special study and had material ready on it, and we protested to the President and said that the amount seemed too high, in fact, extravagant. I do not wish to go into the details now, but we thought it was too high. The President had the Director of the Bureau of the Budget come to the Texas ranch. Along with the Director came the Secretary of the Department of Defense, Mr. McNamara. When they had finished considering that particular item, it was reduced by $150 million.

I am not trying to say that this is all a saving, but there is the possibility that that was the way to proceed. We did have the scientific background to support it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Sometimes it is advisable to have someone watch these expenditures. That is the situation on other committees.

As I said, some of the committees are essential and should be retained. I have never objected to that. I am glad to note that the Senator's committee has returned in the neighborhood of $40,000 of this appropriation each year.

Mr. ANDERSON. The expenditures can run high again. This study was something that the Air Force would not normally do; nor would NASA. We felt that a very good result was obtained.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator's committee look into the matter of trying to adjust the salaries in the committee, rather than giving the employees of the committee the full measure of the additional salaries provided by Congress?

Mr. ANDERSON. We did. There was one individual on the staff who had been underpaid, and we thought it was a satisfactory adjustment to give him the raise. With respect to others the chairman did not favor the full adjustment.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the Senator did not increase those salaries to the full amount authorized?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct. It was left subject to review by the staff director.

Mr. ELLENDER. That will be reflected in the report, of course. I have been trying to obtain such a report from the Secretary of the Senate. I understand that it will not be available until later. That will show the additional salaries that have been paid to the staff members as well as to all employees of the committees. I have been unable to go into that matter.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not wish to mislead the Senator. Nearly all the increases were granted, approved by the chairman. I believe that in only one of two cases they were not approved. One person, to whom I have referred, was the staff director. He had taken a substantial reduction in salary when he came to us. He was offered a higher salary in the space program, but he remained with the committee. When Congress made extra money available, I felt he was entitled to extra compensation. Since then he has been hired by another department at a still higher salary. Therefore, I feel that the salary we paid him was not out of line.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator's committee, however, has looked into the matter and has adjusted salaries in line with capability. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that what the Senator did?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 61) was agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 61

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $2,100 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $95,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 10) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee has reviewed and approved Senate Resolution 10. The Rules Committee has also reviewed and approved Senate Resolution 10. I believe it would be appropriate for the Senate to do the same.

Senate Resolution 10 would provide $106,000 for expenses of the Banking and Currency Committee to provide assistance in carrying out its many functions and duties—with the sole exception of housing, for which Senate Resolution 15 would provide additional funds.

I might add also that Senator BENNETT, the ranking Republican on the Banking and Currency Committee, is cosponsor of Senate Resolution 10.

This resolution provides for the Banking and Currency Committee to continue at the same scale of operations as was the case in 1964. The amount is bigger to reflect the salary increases enacted last year. But the resolution does not provide for any additional personnel, and the amounts proposed for travel, hearings, witness fees, stationery and supplies, communications, and the like are all identical with those set forth last year.

I believe it is unnecessary to go into any detail about the importance and variety of the work which the committee handles. It would be enough, I think, to point out that gold legislation, silver and coinage legislation, national banks, the Federal Reserve System, and the FDIC, as well as the Export-Import Bank and the Export Control Act, all fall under our committee's jurisdiction.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the chairman of the Rules Committee, which was printed in the Rules Committee report, explaining the need for the resolution, be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 27, 1965.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On Tuesday, January 26, 1965, the Committee on Banking and Currency agreed to report Senate Resolution 10, introduced on January 6 by myself and Senator BENNETT. The resolution was reported on January 26.

Senate Resolution 10 would authorize this commitee or any duly authorized subcommittee of this committee, under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to examine, investigate, and study matters pertaining to certain subjects, specified in the resolution, in accordance with the committee's jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. In order to do so, the committee is authorized to make expenditures, to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and to utilize reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of Government departments and agencies.

Section 3 of the resolution provides that the expenses of the committee under the resolution may not exceed $106,000, and may be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

For a number of years resolutions similar to this have been approved for this committee. We have introduced and reported this resolution because of our need to retain additional personnel as we have done for the past several years to supplement the permanent staff and to cover other expenses incident to our committee responsibilities.

The workload of the committee in dealing with legislative matters which occur year after year is extremely heavy. Experience has shown that we must anticipate during each session some special study or legislation making it necessary to employ additional staff and to incur additional expenses.

It is, of course, impossible at this time to predict with any degree of precision the legislative and investigative activities which the committee will undertake this year. However, there are areas within our jurisdiction which can be expected to call for greater attention than usual.

A problem of major importance faces the committee this year in connection with the administration proposal to revise the gold reserve requirements in the Federal Reserve Act. Hearings have already been scheduled on this bill, and it is anticipated that this legislation and related proposals—for example, bills pertaining to the balance-of-payments situation, may call for extensive consideration by the committee. In addition, it is expected that legislation relating to coinage, particularly silver coinage, will call for extensive consideration by the committee. Other matters likely to involve extensive work by the committee staff include the Export-Import Bank and the Export Control Act, including problems relating to export financing and East-West trade, and problems relating to the Defense Production Act inventory.

Of the $91,000 authorized for the year from February 1, 1964, through January 31, 1965, expenditures through December 31, 1964, amount to $65,663.29, leaving a balance of $25,336.71. After allowance is made for salaries and other expenses during January 1965, it is anticipated that the balance remaining at the close of January 31, 1965, will be approximately $17,000. In this connection it is appropriate to note that the committee was without the services of its chief economist for a substantial part of the year.

I enclose a copy of Senate Resolution 10. It is in the usual form prescribed, except that section 3, requiring that findings and recommendations be reported by the expiration date of the resolution, is omitted.

I enclose the completed standardized form showing expenses for a 12-month period totaling $106,000. The budget calls for the same number of employees as last year, six in all. The increase is almost entirely the result of the salary increase last year.

As was the case in 1964, the committee included no specific funds for travel abroad, and, if substantial expenditures for this purpose are necessary, the committee will request additional funds. However, it is entirely possible that travel abroad may be found desirable in connection with such questions as the balance of payments, central banking problems, foreign and domestic monetary policies, the Export-Import Bank, and export controls.

Sincerely yours,

A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice from the accompanying report that the text of the resolution has apparently been changed from the form in which the resolution has appeared in past years. A section requiring that findings and recommendations be reported by the expiration date of the resolution has been omitted. Why was that done?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Such language has never been included in a resolution pertaining to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Committee on Rules and Administration has not asked for it and we did not put it in.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood that such a section was omitted this year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have been informed that the language was not included in the last previous resolution of a similar nature.

Mr. ELLENDER. There must be some error somewhere.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Evidently, but it was not on our part.

Mr. ELLENDER. Language providing that findings and recommendations be reported by the expiration date is omitted.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We are speaking of funds for the regular standing committee. We are not speaking of a special committee. We are talking about the Committee on Banking and Currency, which reports in the form of legislation, not by way of a special report on an investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, no. This is a special committee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is a special staff, but it is the regular committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, Senator; but to operate the committee, the committee now receives $168,400, aside from the $106,000 which the Senator is requesting here and aside from the $133,000 the Senator has requested for the Subcommittee on Housing. The committee is well provided for.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is well provided for, but it would receive less than the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not use all of the $168,000 provided. I have returned to the Treasury approximately $50,000 to $60,000 of that amount each year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is commendable.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee of which the Senator is chairman would receive $168,000. The committee has seven employees. This year the Subcommittee on Housing would have eight employees. Studies for the Committee on Banking and Currency would require additional sums of over $200,000. The Senator would receive more for the two subcommittees of his committee than he receives for his regular staff.

I believe I recall that the Subcommittee tee on Small Business is looking into some banking aspects. The Committee on Government Operations is also. I wonder if my good friend the Senator from Virginia is familiar with the work that is being done by those two committees, and if he knows whether there might be some conflict in the work that is being done by the subcommittees.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If in the past the Select Committee on Small Business, which is of course not a legislative committee, or the Committee on Government Operations has ever gone into the banking field, I do not know anything about it. But in presenting requests for this year, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations pointed out that all Government functions come within the committee's investigative jurisdiction, and that it had received a number of complaints about irregularities in the operation of banks, the deposits of which were insured by the FDIC to the extent of $10,000 each, and that the committee felt it should look into some of those issues. But it has not done so in the past.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator from Virginia feel that if the Committee on Small Business or the Committee on Government Operations should look into issues that should come under the jurisdiction of his committee, it would infringe upon the work of his committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator feels that the Committee on Banking and Currency is fully competent to do the work mentioned by the Senator from Louisiana, but far be it from him to criticize the operations of any other committee. That is a question for the Congress. The chairman has not asked for help. He does not indicate a current need for help. But he will not criticize those who say, "We want to give you some help."

Mr. ELLENDER. If that is the way the Senator feels about it, I have no further questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 10) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $106,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING

The resolution (S. Res. 15) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, speaking for the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is the chairman of the subcommittee and has been for a number of years, the Government contingent liability in housing now exceeds $100 billion.

In my opinion the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has done a very fine job as chairman of the subcommittee, not only in supervising the FHA program, the veterans program, the FNMA mortgage program, but also everything connected with public housing and urban renewal.

The expense of that work has been kept reasonably low. It is the same this year as it was last year, with the exception of the increase resulting from the pay increase which the Congress voted.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] which he would have presented in person but for an unavoidable conflicting engagement, and a letter from him to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Senator from Alabama did not know that the resolution would be considered today.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN ON SENATE RESOLUTION 15

Senate Resolution 15 would authorize the sum of $133,000 to be expended by the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to continue its study, investigation, and preparation of legislation relating to all public and private housing matters. The funds requested in this resolution would continue the activity of the subcommittee at the same rate as has been carried on during the past several years although the amount requested this year is an increase over the amounts requested in previous years. The increase requested this year, of course, is necessary to offset the increase in salaries authorized by the Federal Employees' Salary Act of 1964.

Let me say that I think the Housing Subcommittee has done an excellent job of keeping the Senate informed on housing matters. During the period that the subcommittee has been in operation, the staff of the subcommittee has accumulated experience and knowledge which are utilized every day by Members of the Senate having interest in housing legislation, both existing and proposed, and in administrative problems affecting housing legislation which are brought to their attention.

The Federal Government's contingent liability in housing has grown to an amount which now well exceeds $100 billion. The cost of operating the subcommittee is infinitesimally small compared with the Government's involvement in the field of housing and surely this small investment to insure that the Senate's interest in housing matters is protected is well worth while.

I should like to call the Senate's attention to the fact that Senate Resolution 15 was cosponsored by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, Senator ROBERTSON, as well as by the ranking minority member of the committee, Senator BENNETT, and the ranking subcommittee member of the minority, Senator TOWER. I might also add that the resolution was reported, without objection, by the Banking and Currency Committee.

I, as well as other members of the Banking and Currency Committee, believe that the Housing Subcommittee plays an important role to the Senate and I hope the Senate will give favorable consideration to this resolution.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING,
January 27, 1965.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Senate Resolution 15, which I introduced and which was cosponsored by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, as well as the ranking minority member of the Housing Subcommittee, was favorably reported, without amendment, by the Banking and Currency Committee and has been referred to your committee for consideration.

This resolution requests authority for the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee, to expend funds in an amount not to exceed $133,000 during the period from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966. These funds will be used by the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency to continue its study and investigations of matters relating to public and private housing. Those functions are authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, pursuant to the committee's jurisdiction under rule XXVI(d)4 of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The subcommittee proposes to employ upon a temporary basis such assistants as it deems advisable in connection with the scope of activity to be carried out.

The funds requested in this resolution would continue subcommittee activities at the same rate as has been carried on during the past several years, although the amount requested is an increase this year over the amounts requested in previous years. The increase requested this year is necessary to offset the increase in salaries authorized by the Federal Employees' Salary Act of 1964.

The Federal Government's commitments and contingent liability in housing have grown to an amount which now exceeds $100 billion. The Housing Subcommittee is charged with studying, investigating, and preparing legislation in all Federal housing programs. The scope of subcommittee activities includes the Federal Housing Administration system of mortgage insurance, which has an outstanding mortgage insurance obligation of nearly $47 billion; a $4.7 billion authority for slum clearance and urban renewal which now covers some 1,709 projects in 797 communities; a low-rent housing program of more than 700,000 units completed or under construction; the secondary market, the special assistance, and the management and liquidation operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association, which have a combined portfolio of $2.6 billion; and several other specialized programs such as housing for the elderly, farm housing, nursing homes, home improvement loans, and the voluntary home mortgage credit program.

Thus, the funds requested by Senate Resolution 15 are negligible in relation to the Federal Government's commitments and contingent liability in housing, and it seems to me, at least, and to other members of the Banking and Currency Committee, very wise and appropriate for the Senate to expend the amount requested by the resolution to "watch over" the Federal Government's activity in this area.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of the Banking and Currency Committee report (S. Rept. No. 9) on Senate Resolution 15, which shows the committee's justification for continuing the Housing Subcommittee.

It is our sincere belief that the $133,000 authorization requested is completely justified by the size and complexity of our Federal housing programs and is, in fact, necessary if the Senate is to keep itself informed on these vital matters. We hope that your committee will give favorable consideration to Senate Resolution 15.

In accordance with your request, I am attaching an itemized 12-month budget indicating the manner in which the funds requested are proposed to be used.

Sincerely,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 15) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $133,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXAMINATION AND STUDY OF FOREIGN POLICIES

The resolution (S. Res. 28) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine and study the foreign policies of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the pending resolution, an excerpt from the report, and a letter sent to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The letter is dated January 22, 1965, and reads as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 28) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to make a study of U.S. foreign policy, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 28 would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $135,000 by the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, "to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate for the same purpose during the last three Congresses. Committee expenditures are shown through December 31, 1964:

Foreign relations

Congress and session	Authority	Date	Authorized	Expended [1]
U.S. FOREIGN POLICY				
86th			$685,000	$464,988.36
1st	S. Res. 31	Feb. 2, 1959	500,000	371,022.22
			500,000	371,022.22
2d	S. Res. 250.	Feb. 9, 1960	185,000	93,966.14
			185,000	93,966.14
87th			320,000	220,437.11
1st	S. Res. 41	Jan. 31, 1961	160,000	98,523.16
			160,000	98,523.16
2d	S. Res. 246.	Feb. 7, 1962	160,000	121,913.95
			160,000	121,913.95
88th			293,000	178,757.01
1st	S. Res. 25	Mar. 14, 1963	[2] 143,000	95,538.09
			143,000	95,538.09
2d	S. Res. 277.	Feb. 10, 1964	150,000	83,218.92
			150,000	83,218.92

[1] Through Dec. 31, 1964.

[2] 11-month basis.

The purposes of the study are stated fully by the Committee on Foreign Relations in its report to the Senate on Senate Resolution 28 (S. Rept. 4, 89th Cong., 1st sess.). Additional information on the contemplated inquiry is contained in a letter to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which letter is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
January 22, 1965.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There are enclosed copies of the resolution (S. Res. 28) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine and study the foreign policies of the United States, together with the committee's report (Rept. No. 4) thereon.

This resolution would authorize $135,000 to the committee to continue its studies of international events and foreign affairs as they may have bearing and influence on this Government's policies abroad. The amount sought is $15,000 less than was asked of the Senate for the same studies last year. A budget showing how the requested $135,000 is proposed to be spent is contained in the report.

I regard the resolution's purposes as contributing to the basic functions and activities of this committee and to its usefulness to the Senate. For such reasons I hope your committee will give Senate Resolution 28 favorable consideration and early report.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know whether or not, in addition to the nine employees of the committee that would be provided for in the resolution and the regular employees provided under the Reorganization Act, there are any other employees of the committee? I have a recollection that a special resolution providing for additional employees over and above the ones for which the present resolution would provide and the employees regularly employed under the Reorganization Act was adopted. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have been informed by the chief clerk of the committee that the number of employees additional to the report should be 13, and that in the 13 are included the 6 that would be covered by the Senator's question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean six additional employees?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The 6 would be included in the 13 additional to the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. On the regular standing committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Those are more or less permanent employees?

Mr. MANSFIELD. More or less permanent employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the Senate adopted a resolution that provided for appointments that would be permanent unless Congress passed a resolution to the contrary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 28) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $135,000 for the period ending January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDIES AS TO EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF THE OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The next resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 54) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the resolution authorizes the continuation of a provision of funds to cover expenditures of the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Last year the subcommittee had $450,000 allotted to it. This year it is returning approximately $75,000 of that amount.

This year the subcommittee is asking for $15,000 less than it received last year. In addition, we are absorbing the total amount of increased salaries, which amounts to $52,800. Thus we propose to operate the subcommittee this year for $67,800 less than we obtained last year.

We are attempting to economize. The subcommittee has an overall function to investigate economy and efficiency in the Government. We also have powers that have been enlarged to investigate any State crime and also to investigate labor-management relations.

I shall be glad to answer any questions the Senator from Louisiana may wish to ask. I wanted him to know that the funds we are seeking this year amount to a decrease of 15 percent in operating cost. I applaud the Senator from Louisiana in his attempt to effectuate economy. I am trying to practice what he advocates.

Mr. ELLENDER. I commend the Senator from Arkansas. I compliment him for having reduced the amount of his request.

A moment ago, I said to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that I understood that the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Arkansas would begin a study of federally insured banking institutions. Why is it necessary that the Senator's subcommittee go into that area?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Primarily because the subcommittee has jurisdiction and because allegations and complaints have been received that manipulations are occurring in that field that amount to fraud against the Government and against a Government fund operated by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The Committee on Banking and Currency would have jurisdiction to make such an investigation. But the purpose of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations is to maintain a staff that is equipped to examine into such activities whenever the occasion arises. It saves the creation of another special or select committee to do such work.

I do not know what the outcome of the investigation will be. Some time ago I directed the staff to make a preliminary investigation into alleged manipulations in the banking field in instances in which banks are being bought. Apparently, a majority of the stock or a large block of the stock is bought so that the purchasers can obtain control of a bank. Then they manipulate its affairs so as to acquire worthless securities, and the bank fails. Those who unload the securities are the ones who profit therefrom, and they are often the ones who bought the stock so that they could unload the securities.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would not such activities come within the province of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot answer that question. I know they come within the province of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was wondering whether there was any duplication of investigations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Frequently, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has deferred to other committees that had staffs with which to do the work. We are not seeking to do everything that might be done.

I remember an occasion when both the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Committee on Armed Services, of which the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is the chairman, and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations were preparing to investigate a matter. The Senator from Mississippi discussed the subject with me, and I immediately told him that if he wished to have his subcommittee proceed, we would try to avoid any duplication.

The purpose of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations is to be ready to make investigations. Many standing committees do not have sufficient staffs to make investigations when the need arises. That was the purpose of creating the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and providing it with a staff. We are trying to perform that function.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will it be necessary for the subcommittee to obtain the services of specially qualified investigators in order to take on the new work in the banking field?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have sought no special services. We are using our regular staff today. Sometimes in our work we borrow or have assigned to us some help from the General Accounting Office, but we reimburse the General Accounting Office for that assistance. As yet, we have not asked for any additional help to conduct the banking investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator said a moment ago that it was to the advantage of the subcommittee to keep a staff busy in order to examine into these matters, he was not speaking of additional staff members, but of his own staff as presently constituted?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not hiring additional staff. Actually, we have reduced our staff. We are operating as economically as we can. I have shown my good faith.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a letter dated January 26, 1965, which I sent to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], in support of the resolution for funds for this year.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
January 26, 1965.

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This letter is an amplification of Senate Resolution 54, 89th Congress, 1st session, which was introduced in the Senate on January 26, 1965. Senate Resolution 54 contains the request for authority and for the funds essential to the operation of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Government Operations Committee for the period from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966. Prior to the introduction of this resolution to the Senate, it was considered and approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Senate Resolution 54 is practically identical with Senate Resolution 278 of the 2d session of the 88th Congress under which this subcommittee has been operating during the year.

Similar to resolutions of earlier years, Senate Resolution 278 authorized and directed the subcommittee to investigate and report in three major areas (a) efficiency and economy in Government, (b) improper activities in the labor or management field, and (c) organized crime. I believe this authorization and direction under which we have been operating in the past will be adequate for the program we contemplate for the coming year. Our projected activity for the year includes subjects we believe to be important to each of these three major areas of interest.

I am attaching to this letter a budget which the committee has approved and which it proposes for the effective operation of the subcommittee. We believe that $435,000 will be required to sustain the activities of this subcommittee for the coming year. Of course, it is possible that unforeseen developments may require additional expenditures and in that event we would have to ask the indulgence of your committee and seek additional funds.

It has been the practice of our subcommittee to function with the strictest economy possible consistent with effective operation. We are pleased to report to you that we have been able to effect a savings of approximately $70,000 of the last year's appropriation and, of course, this money will be returned to the operating funds of the Senate. You will note that we are asking for $15,000 less than we had available for the year just completed; however, considering the $52,800 extra expenses brought about by legislation increasing salaries, our anticipated operating level is under last year's appropriation by $67,800, a figure which is consonant with the amount of $70,000 which we are returning this year. I assure you we shall in the future, as we have in the past, practice every economy possible.

ORGANIZED CRIME

During the past year, the subcommittee pursued its inquiry into the field of organized crime, particularly the traffic in narcotics and the associated problems of treatment and rehabilitation. Crime imposes a dreadful levy on our society in depravity, corruption and losses of billions of dollars each year. Our hearings into this subject followed from the more general testimony provided the previous year by Joseph Valachi.

Valachi provided the subcommittee with authoritative confirmation for the first time that there is in existence an underworld government composed of professional criminals who owe their first loyalties to the organization which is known by various names, Cosa Nostra, Mafia, the Black Hand, etc. Valachi's testimony was not accepted without extensive verification by police officers, both Federal and local.

In the hearings this past year the subcommittee took extensive testimony concerning the functioning of criminal organizations in the lucrative but illicit field of narcotics traffic. Our purpose was to learn the mechanics of bringing drugs into our communities as well as to determine the extent of addiction and the best means to contain it.

It was important to go to the source of narcotics. We started on the remote sparsely populated hills of Asia and Asia Minor where opium poppies are grown. We learn that most of the opium derivatives which come to this country originate in Turkey. By competent witnesses we learned how opium is harvested from the poppies and smuggled out of Turkey to Syria and Lebanon where it is converted to morphine base. French speaking Corsican underworld characters then take over and they bring much of the morphine base to the southern shores of France. In France it is further processed in clandestine laboratories so as to provide heroin. The Corsican racketeers have close connections with the Mafia in Italy and usually at this point the Mafia takes over custody of the heroin and manages its shipment by various subterfuges into Canada, Mexico, or New York.

Recently the Corsican racketeers have also established connections with French Canadian racketeers and have smuggled heroin into Canada where the French Canadian racketeers smuggle it into the United States and sell it to high level Cosa Nostra elements in the United States. Its ultimate destination is usually New York City where the greatest center of addiction in this country is located. The heroin is then cut several times and eventually reaches the unfortunate addict of which there are approximately 60,000 in the urban areas of this country.

It appears that the existing law pertaining to violations is functioning reasonably well although the traffic in cocaine is increasing and should be watched. Our enforcement officials have established good cooperation with their counterpart groups in other countries and in the U.N. However, problems remain.

The grossly excessive profit realized by the people who handle the illicit narcotics provides the inducement to engage in its handling. It is estimated that approximately $350 million a year is spent on narcotics at the street level in the United States. A kilogram of morphine base smuggled across the Syrian-Lebanon border for export to France costs approximately $700. This same kilogram after it is cut, processed, and transported to the retail market in the United States brings approximately $225,000. The markup is apparent. The subcommittee also learned of the many ingenious methods of smuggling narcotics into this country.

There is controversy about the most acceptable method of treating narcotic addicts. Some persons believe that addicts should be provided with dosages of heroin, either free or at low cost, by clinics and physicians. This system, generally called "ambulatory maintenance," allegedly would destroy the illicit narcotic traffic by eliminating the exorbitant profits that are its main attraction for organized crime.

The weight of medical opinion, represented by the American Medical Association and the National Research Council, is firmly opposed to the ambulatory maintenance approach. So is the chief law enforcement agency in the field, the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics. These authorities contend, with much evidence to sustain their views, that the ambulatory method would result in alarming increases in addiction throughout the Nation, since it is a well-established principle that liberal availability of narcotics tends to spread addiction.

A crucial consideration in the scientific study of the treatment of addiction is the tolerance factor, which is a physical and psychological drive that causes the addict to demand ever-increasing dosages of heroin in order to achieve the euphoria and physical release he craves. Experts are agreed that stable maintenance dosages of heroin fail to cope with the tolerance factor and the addict would seek added supplies from racketeers in an expanded illicit market. The proposal that the Government maintain an addict on drugs leading to physical and moral deterioration is not only contrary to the moral concepts of the American people but is basically repugnant and abhorrent.

The subcommittee heard extensive testimony concerning the proper treatment and rehabilitation of addicts and the desirability of additional legislation in this area, particularly concerning the possibility of civil commitment and supervised aftercare for addicts. We expect to report to the Senate on this matter in the near future.

TFX

This subcommittee maintains a continuing interest in the development of the TFX (tactical fighter experimental airplane), the contract for which was awarded to General Dynamics Corp. more than 2 years ago. The first research plane has been built and is being tested. There are serious questions whether the airplane will meet the original requirements of the Air Force and especially the Navy. There is evidence that the contemplated savings of the project will not materialize because of severe cost increases.

According to the testimony, the performance requirements of the Air Force and those of the Navy differ considerably. The Air Force requires a plane that can avoid enemy radar by flying at low altitude and supersonic speed to its target area. The Navy, on the other hand, requires a plane that can leave the carrier equipped with bulky radar equipment, reach a location at a given distance from the fleet and remain on station in order to detect any enemy action to which the plane could respond at long range by air-to-air missiles, thereby protecting the fleet. Weight is always a critical factor in aircraft design but is far more critical for the Navy because of the added difficulties incident to landing and taking off on the smaller and less stable space provided by a carrier.

Originally the program envisaged approximately 1,700 planes, of which 235 were intended for the Navy. Secretary Zuckert, in his testimony, estimated the total program cost at around $7 billion. The Air Force announced on May 26, 1964, that the estimated cost of the research and development program alone had reached $1.1 billion. Even though the $1.1 billion includes the cost of the proposed Navy missile system, as yet not disclosed, it is evident that the cost of the General Dynamics research and development program has already risen sharply above the company's firm proposal of $543.5 million, adjusted by the Air Force to $711.2 million. It can be expected that the production phase of the TFX program will undergo a proportionately sharp increase in total price above the General Dynamics estimated costs of $5,445 million, adjusted by the Air Force to $5,803 million.

The military group responsible for selecting the winner among competing designs was the Source Selection Board. Four times the Source Selection Board unanimously recommended the Boeing design. The first three times the Boeing recommendation was rejected at the secretarial level. The fourth time the Secretary of Defense overruled the recommendation of the Source Selection Board, the Air Council, and the Chiefs of Staff of the Air Force and Navy, and awarded the contract to General Dynamics. The Source Selection Board's recommendation of Boeing was on the basis of superiority of design. There was an added advantage in that Boeing proposed to do the research and development part for apprixamtely $100 million less. Boeing's estimated total for the entire program was over $400 million less than General Dynamics.

The TFX program is the largest aviation weapons system procurement in history. Its cost ordinarily would not be known to the taxpayers until well into the 1970's, at the end of the production program. In view of this, the chairman believes that the Congress should find out now, not 10 years from now, whether sound judgment was exercised by the Secretary of Defense in selecting the high bidder or whether waste, inefficiency and excessive costs or profits are involved.

This is an exacting inquiry of a complex subject that requires intensive investigation.

U.S. AID TO IRAN

As it was reported in my letter to your committee last year, this subcommittee received allegations from an Iranian national which were supported by documents he provided to the effect that U.S. aid funds to Iran were being diverted from their intended purpose to the benefit of private individuals, both American and Iranian. Testimony was received from this witness on two different occasions. Considerable preliminary investigative activity has taken place in this matter. We plan to follow up with hearings so as to have available testimony under oath. We anticipate that hearings into this subject will encompass an analysis of the aid funds to Iran and the good faith of the complaint to this subcommittee under oath by the principal witness as well as the authenticity of his supporting documents.

OTHER CURRENT MATTERS

Federally insured banking institutions

The subcommittee's attention has been directed to the substantial increase in the number of closed and financially unsound federally insured banking institutions during the past 2 years. The cause of the closing of these banks and savings and loan associations has been attributed to persons of unsavory character and principles acting in concert to gain control of the stock and management of the institution then causing its downfall. Once these groups gain control of the stock and management of the bank or savings and loan association, there followed a rapid deterioration of the assets of the institution and failure of the bank or savings and loan association.

The subcommittee will seek to determine whether it is necessary to strengthen regulations and laws pertaining to federally insured banks and federally insured savings and loan associations. This investigation will involve only banking institutions insured by agencies of the Federal Government.

Urban renewal

This subcommittee has received allegations concerning irregularities in many phases of the operation of the urban renewal program; that is, acquisition of property, demolition of existing structures, relocation of tenants, and preparation of property for resale to redevelopers. This subject matter is also in the preliminary stage and it would be premature to draw conclusions at this time. It is our plan to pursue this matter and if any constructive purpose is to be served we intend to conduct hearings and to report to the Senate.

Labor racketeering

As you know, one of the areas of jurisdiction of this subcommittee is improper activity in the labor or management field. At this time we are conducting a preliminary inquiry into allegations we received concerning labor racketeering in the New York area. These allegations in general involve exorbitant "featherbedding," extortion of payoffs and other improper conduct. This investigation is still in the preliminary stage and we have not yet proceeded far enough in this case to be able to predict with accuracy the possible outcome.

Medical supply systems

It has come to the attention of this subcommittee that there are four major medical supply systems within the Government. These systems have the responsibility to manage over $400 million in inventory. They are (1) the Defense Department, (2) the Veterans' Administration, (3) the General Services Administration, and (4) the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We have been informed that these four are operated in a manner so that each one is completely separate and distinct from the other. We have been informed that sometimes, while one system was procuring supplies, another of the systems had an excess of the same item and the Government was losing money because the supplies were deteriorating. It is estimated that supplies in the amount of about $18 to $30 million have deteriorated. Our efforts are being directed toward obtaining corrective action to avoid waste and inefficiency.

Procurement inquiry at Fort Monmouth

Numerous allegations have been received by this subcommittee concerning fraud and corruption in connection with the awarding of Government contracts by the U.S. Army at Fort Monmouth. The subcommittee is at present conducting inquiries into the activities of certain individuals representing companies receiving such contracts based on allegations of excessive gratuities and entertainment of individuals in responsible positions at Fort Monmouth. Further action to be taken will be determined when more facts are available.

Welfare and pension funds

Recent studies have shown an enormous increase in the size of union welfare and pension funds. The subcommittee has recently acquired information of situations where many millions of dollars have been placed in certain union welfare and pension funds which have little or no likelihood of ever being utilized for the purpose of paying benefits and pensions to the employees who are ostensibly the beneficiaries.

This situation arises particularly amongst the most needy and unskilled type of employee who has become a member of either an independent union or, in some cases, unions affiliated with large international organizations. Evidence has shown that the employee's term of employment is of very short duration with a rapid turnover of the labor force. This is particularly true among workers in light manufacturing industries such as leather workers, plastics, etc. The contributing employees often leave these jobs and the union and become employed in other industries. Due to the stringent pension vesting requirements, these members rarely receive any benefits or annuities.

Under these situations the funds continue to grow far beyond the needs of all who might reasonably be expected to benefit therefrom. In one situation, the relatively small unions which are the subject of this study have welfare and pension funds approaching $8 million, with few restrictions on the trustee who administers these funds. He had himself appointed for life and even has the power to appoint his successor. This is a capsulized version of a problem which faces this country nationwide. Today there is a total of approximately $65 billion in union welfare and pension funds. These funds are increasing at the rate of about $5 billion a year. This increase will tend to snowball.

It is vital for the protection of the individual worker, as well as for the economy of this Nation, that increased attention be paid to these welfare and pension funds and that they be sufficiently regulated to assure their availability for the intended beneficiaries. The subcommittee is actively engaged in this investigation and hopes to bring it to a point where it will hold hearings in the near future.

Reports

There were two reports issued during the course of this year by the subcommittee. The first was filed on March 31, 1964, and entitled "Pyramiding of Profits and Costs in the Missile Procurement Program." In this report the subcommittee provided the Senate and the public with the benefit of its arduous study of the extremely complex procurement of modern weapons systems.

Heretofore, in acquiring a weapons system, Defense officials would assign the entire task to a prime contractor. The contractor's profit was generally computed as a percentage of the overall task's estimated cost. Little regard was paid to the amount of work actually performed by the contractor—as opposed to the amount he subcontracted to other major subsystem manufacturers. As a result, the Government was often paying two or three or more separate profits for the same work on major subsystems. The total profit paid the prime contractor, when measured against the work he actually performed, was often found to be excessive.

Recommendations were made to the Department of Defense to relate profit more properly to the effort expended. As a result of our inquiry, significant changes were made to the Armed Services Procurement Regulations. When sufficient experience has been gained under the new method of profits computation, the subcommittee will again check to see whether the initial problem has been substantially corrected.

The second of the two reports issued by this subcommittee was filed September 30, 1964, and was entitled "The Department of Agriculture Handling of Pooled Cotton Allotments of Billie Sol Estes." This report described in some detail the cotton allotment problems incident to the Billie Sol Estes matter which received great public attention about 2 years ago. This inquiry revealed not only some very questionable activity on the part of Billie Sol Estes but also some improper activity on the part of Department of Agriculture personnel and, more important than either of these, a grave organizational problem within the Department. To the degree that we were able to determine these weaknesses, the subcommittee made every effort to present them to the Congress and to the public, as well as to the Department of Agriculture. Some rather detailed recommendations were made by the subcommittee to the Secretary of Agriculture. Many of these recommendations were already put into effect by the time the report was written. It is the feeling of the subcommittee that it would be highly unlikely to have a recurrence of a Billie Sol Estes incident.

CONCLUSION

I have been chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations for 10 years and for the 3-year period of its existence I was also chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. There is no valid way to reach an accurate analysis or an evaluation of our accomplishments during this time. For example, procurement practices corrected even 8 or 9 years ago still save millions of dollars each year. The unworthy officeholders or the corrupt labor leaders who were removed by virtue of our activities no longer make the decisions which served them well but were to the detriment of the public or to the labor union member. New laws passed make recurrences of many shady practices unlikely. I feel that these are our major areas of accomplishment. However, there are a few additional tangible developments which have stemmed from our hearings which in a small way might provide at least a partial basis for evaluation.

Taxes reclaimed

During these 10 years, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and the Select Labor Committee, while it functioned, developed information showing a tax loss in total amount of at least $29,096,336.46. This tax revenue is either in the process of recovery now or has been recovered. This is an average of about $3 million a year. In most instances our committee hearings constituted the initial information concerning these losses. I might note that these figures for each year are about seven times the amount we are asking in this year's proposed budget.

Of the figure I have provided you, $1,226,926.22 has already been collected from the taxpayers and the remaining amount is either in litigation in the Tax Court of the United States or awaiting further processing by the Internal Revenue Service. Illustrative of this type of activity was a case in which testimony was heard by the Select Labor Committee concerning a leading international labor union. The president of this union had failed to report to the Treasury Department approximately one-half of his income. As a result of this single disclosure in our hearings, an examination of this labor union leader's income tax records was undertaken for a 10-year period. This resulted in a recovery of $294,108.74 with an additional amount still to be collected of $58,285.67, making a total in this one case of $352,294.41.

In another case involving our inquiry into procurement practices by the military in clothing and textiles, there is still pending in the U.S. Tax Court a claim by the Internal Revenue Service for two leading contractors and their corporations for deficiency, penalties, and interest in the amount of $3,934,803.

Convictions

Sometimes during the course of our work we develop information showing violations of the law. Some of these violations are on the part of witnesses who appeared before us but there are also times when we develop information relating to persons who are not witnesses. We are not certain that we have all of the figures because they are difficult to assemble from all the levels of Federal and State courts. However, we do know that in the past 10 years 98 of the witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee were prosecuted in Federal and State courts, resulting in 134 indictments and 110 convictions involving prison sentences, fines, or both. Some of these were prosecuted for more than one offense which accounts for the difference between the numbers of persons and total indictments.

In addition to these, there were 92 convictions of persons concerning whom information was developed during committee investigations and who were prosecuted. These persons did not appear as witnesses, however, but were prosecuted for offenses concerning which testimony was adduced before the subcommittee. There is one statistic which I am unable to include here as a conviction because one Floyd Hayes was indicted but was murdered on June 11, 1964, before he could be brought to trial.

I have tried in this letter to describe the major facets of work handled by our subcommittee. There is a considerable amount of day-to-day work routinely handled by the subcommittee staff. For instance, almost daily reference is made by agencies of the Government to the subcommittee files which are by this time an irreplaceable reservoir of information on the subject matters handled by the subcommittee. During the course of any year, many complaints are registered with the subcommittee and all of them receive our careful attention.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 54) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided*, That, in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee thereof shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and, further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1966, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony, either orally or by sworn statement; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (7) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and, further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee: *Provided further*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

(b) For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized, in its or his or their discretion, as may be deemed advisable, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents.

SEC. 6. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $435,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EFFECTS OF LAWS PERTAINING TO PROPOSED REORGANIZATIONS IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 56) to provide funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to the proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I observe that Senate Resolution 56, Calendar No. 18, and Senate Resolution 58, Calendar No. 19, appear to refer to two subcommittees which operated as one subcommittee previously. In other words, there has been a division. I wonder why that was necessary, and whether it will entail the expenditure of more funds to conduct the same work that the original subcommittee carried on.

Mr. McCLELLAN. One subcommittee has been divided. That was the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organization. The subcommittee was headed by the distinguished former Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is now the Vice President. He was a member of the subcommittee. The functions of that subcommittee have been divided and the funds divided between them. The amount of funds sought has not been increased. The amount asked for these two subcommittees totals the same as that which was expended by the one subcommittee last year. The Senator may recall that the subcommittee has been enlarged and now made a major subcommittee. The committee felt that two subcommittees should be created, but at the same time held the expenditures down. Again, in the amount being requested, we are requiring both subcommittees to absorb the increase in pay with no larger amount being sought.

We are doing whatever we can to hold the expenditures down.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the only thing that concerns me is that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], who is chairman of one of the committees, stated that it may be necessary to request additional funds later in the session to increase the staff. I wonder whether the Senator is aware of that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am aware of it. That is occasioned by reason of the fact that President Johnson has indicated he is going to send down several reorganization plans. I do not know that that will occur. If it does, there may be occasion to increase the staff. That is a matter that will have to be passed on whenever the issue comes before us. They have had to absorb a $10,000 or $12,000 reduction from last year's operations.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. As I said, the fact that this committee is divided into two committees causes me to wonder whether that is not what has caused the Senator from Connecticut to state that he may need more funds.

If the committee were to be one committee, with an expenditure of $115,000, that might be sufficient money with which to carry on. But, by dividing the committee in this manner, it would seem to me that it gives cause for a larger expenditure of money.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope not. I do not believe that it will amount to very much of an increase. I have already assigned one member of the regular staff to assist him, with the view of holding down the expenditure and holding down the size of the staff.

I assure the Senator that in this case we are operating with an eye on economy. I have stated repeatedly to members of the committee that this committee—having the function of supervising, in effect, the expenditures of all agencies of the Government with a view of ascertaining the economy of our Government operation—should undertake to set an example. We are doing just that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, did the subcommittee investigate any phase of foreign aid?

Mr. McCLELLAN. We are going into that subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee is going to do it now, but did it do so before?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. The committee has done that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Alaska was a member of the old committee.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the subcommittee published a 472-page report written by me, with my legislative assistant, not a member of the committee staff. This report studied the foreign aid program in 10 eastern countries. That report has been so eagerly sought that a second printing was necessary.

We hope to make a similar study of the operations of foreign aid in five

Latin American countries which we have already visited.

With respect to the function of the subcommittee, the committee has asked for no additional funds. They will deal with the operations in foreign countries of 25 domestic agencies. The list is very impressive.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, are these studies made at the local level?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder if we could dispose of Senate Resolution 18 before we go into foreign aid?

Mr. GRUENING. They are related. These are the two subcommittees that were formed by the division of the former subcommittee into two parts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator state whether or not the studies that he contemplates will be made at the local level, without involving travel to the various countries?

Mr. GRUENING. Certainly. There will be no expenditure required beyond the $55,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I remember that the Senator did travel last year when he made his report. I read his report with interest. Does the Senator contemplate using any of these funds to travel in the countries on which he hopes to report?

Mr. GRUENING. If it should be necessary; but it may not be necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not see any provision for it. That is the reason that I asked the question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], who is absent today because of illness in his family. He would have made this statement had he been present.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Ribicoff

The Committee on Government Operations is charged under rule XXV of the Senate to consider proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government and to evaluate the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government. There is every indication that new interest and activity in executive branch reorganization will be generated by President Johnson. In his recent state of the Union message he said: "For Government to serve these goals it must be modern in structure, efficient in action, and ready for any emergency. I am currently reviewing the structure of the executive branch. I hope to reshape and reorganize it to meet more effectively the tasks of today."

And in his budget message the President told us: "We must reorganize and modernize the structure of the executive branch in order to focus responsibilities and increase efficiency."

To carry out his reorganization plans the President has already indicated his intention to—

First. Propose certain reorganizations which will constitute the initial and most urgent steps that he deems necessary to consolidate functions and strengthen coordination of related activities.

Second. Seek permanent reorganization authority to initiate improvements in Government organization, subject to the disapproval of the Congress.

Third. Submit legislation to establish a new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The legislative branch should be ready to cooperate with and assist the President in his reorganization efforts. As chairman of the new Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization I intend to rely heavily on the breadth of experience and know-how of the able and experienced full committee staff. At the same time I will invite the Nation's leading political scientists and public administration experts to work and consult with us in our work. At the same time we would work closely with experts in the executive branch on the various reorganization matters now under consideration.

The funds requested are small but I am sure adequate to do a worthwhile job that will result in increased efficiency in the executive branch with attendant savings of the taxpayer's dollar. Over one-third of the funds will be used to obtain the services of outstanding consultants and experts to assist the subcommittee and full committee.

This new assignment represents both opportunity and challenge. From the time I served in the House and throughout my tenure as Governor of Connecticut this problem of governmental organization and reorganization has been of great interest and deep concern to me. While serving as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare I became even more convinced that those of us involved in Government must pay more attention to the problems of proper organization of governmental functions. The people's business deserves to be conducted at the peak of efficiency and economy. That will be the subcommittee's guiding principle as it has been for the full committee under the able leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] and the ranking minority member, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]. I urge the Senate to approve Senate Resolution 56 as it was reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 56) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, and to consider reorganizations proposed therein.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $57,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

The resolution (S. Res. 58) to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to economy and efficiency of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the operation of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government, with a view to determining the economy and efficiency of such activities.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $57,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 36) to provide additional funds for Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter, under date of January 26, 1965, to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration the Senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan] be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1965.
Hon. B. Everett Jordan,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Reference is made to Senate Resolution 58, 89th Congress, 1st session, which was introduced in the Senate on my behalf on January 26, 1965, requesting funds for studies as to the operation of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government, with a view to determining the economy and efficiency of such activities.

Studies in this field have previously been handled by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Senate Government Operations Committee. By unanimous vote of the Committee on Government Operations, the work of this subcommittee will be divided between two subcommittees—a Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, of which I will be chairman, and a Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, of which Senator Abraham Ribicoff will be chairman.

The total authorized last year for the predecessor subcommittee in the 2d session of the 88th Congress was $115,000 which is the total amount requested for both of the two new subcommittees.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures would be acting to fulfill, with respect to the foreign operations of Federal agencies, that portion of rule XXV, rules of the Senate, reposing in the Senate Committee on Government Operations responsibility for studying "budget and accounting measures other than appropriations. * * *

"The operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

Due to the greatly expanded role of the United States in world affairs and its increasing responsibilities, more and more of what had hitherto been considered "domestic" Federal agencies are engaged in operations abroad and have personnel stationed and working on programs abroad.

As career Ambassador Ellis Briggs has stated:

"In addition to the propaganda, handout, and skulduggery agencies, all abundantly staffed, practically every executive department in Washington is now represented abroad. Many of the bureaus within departments, and even offices within bureaus, have established foreign operations. So have the commissions and boards and independent agencies.

"The list includes the Department of Commerce, whose Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is forever exhorting the State Department for bigger and better reports on the market for roller skates in Antofagasta; of Agriculture, whose long-handled spoon dips into so many foreign nooks and crannies that a computing machine could scarcely keep track of their operations; of Treasury, whose aforesaid Coast Guard is a relative newcomer abroad, compared to financial attachés and to the peripatetic agents of Customs, Internal Revenue, and Narcotics; of Justice, whose Immigration and Naturalization Service is trying to duplicate consular visa functions, and whose spooks from the Federal Bureau of Investigation adorn several foreign capitals; of Interior, which supplies minerals and petroleum attachés; and of Labor, with representatives in nearly every embassy, promoting trade union movements.

"The Tariff Commission, the Public Health Service, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Peace Corps * * * to compile a full roster of Washington agencies abroad would require months of research beside the Potomac. The offices mentioned are merely some of those with whose oversea operatives I myself have been regaled or afflicted during service as Ambassador to seven countries, plus two decades in the Foreign Service before my first ambassadorial appointment * * *.

"Today, almost everybody is playing diplomacy, and by permitting all these extraneous participants to invade the field, we have made it difficult to tell who has the ball, and even impossible at times to tell what team is defending what goal line. Everybody playing diplomacy is playing havoc with our international relations."

The intermeshing of the duties, functions and activities of the multitude of agencies operating in one foreign country or region is a difficult but vital task.

It would not be the function of this subcommittee to review foreign policy which is within the functions of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. In addition, a line of demarcation has been worked out between the operations of this subcommittee and those of the Subcommittee on National Security and International operations.

It would be the function of this subcommittee to study the operations of Federal agencies abroad and their interrelationships, pointing out whether any failure of these agencies is due to structural and organizational defects, overloaded work programs, imprudent administrative policies, wasteful administrative, budgetary and fiscal practices, and lack of coordination.

The proposed studies would naturally, be conducted in such a manner as not to duplicate in any way the work of either:

(a) other subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations; or

(b) other standing committees of the Senate.

The focus of the subcommittee would be on interagency coordination, cooperation, and economy and not on foreign policy as such.

An example of the type of study to be made by the subcommittee is that made the year before last of U.S. programs in 10 Middle East and African countries. This is a study which I personally made and was based on an on-the-scene examination of operations and interagency relationships in our foreign aid programs administered by the Department of State, including the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Service, the Peace Corps, and the Department of Defense. This study resulted in a 472-page printed report to the committee which has had wide circulation and has proved to be, from reports received, a valuable tool to students of interagency relations, as well as of our foreign aid programs. Copies of this study are enclosed.

During the past year, a similar on-the-scene study of the U.S. assistance programs in five Latin American countries—Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Chile—was made and a report on the programs in those countries is in preparation.

There are more than 22 so-called domestic Federal departments and agencies with programs abroad, many operated through separate divisions and offices in such departments and agencies. Attached are examples of only a few of the functions of some of these departments, and agencies in the foreign field.

This is in addition, of course, to the programs abroad administered by the Department of State, directly and through the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Service, the Export-Import Bank, the Inter-American Development Association, the International Development Bank, and others, the activities of which are clearly noted as being in the foreign field.

Not counting the programs administered by these latter agencies, the so-called domestic agencies are responsible for activities for which millions of dollars have been budgeted each year. The opportunities for waste, duplication, and lack of coordination are obvious. Therefore, there is ample reason to spend the small sum requested in this resolution in order to make sure that the taxpayer gets a dollar's worth of value for every dollar which is expended.

I hope this resolution receives favorable consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Cordially yours,
Ernest Gruening,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 36) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and to make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

Sec. 2. Pursuant to its authority under section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the committee is authorized to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, documents and to take such testimony on matters within its jurisdiction as it deems advisable.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so elected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $105,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 39) to study administrative practice and procedure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate briefly with respect to Senate Resolution 39. Under this resolution, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure would receive $150,000, an increase in $30,000 over last year.

This increase is to take care of the recent pay raise, plus funds to hire at least one additional specialist.

I would like to reiterate very briefly an explanation which was made to both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules; there are at least three pieces of legislation of considerable importance which should be processed by this subcommittee.

The first is an overhaul of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. It is this act which governs the operations of all of the regulatory bodies of the U.S. Government. It is generally conceded that the time and cost of proceedings before many of these bodies are excessive. Techniques have been proposed to improve this situation. These techniques will, of necessity, have to be drafted into the Administrative Procedure Act.

It is no exaggeration that the agencies which are governed by the Administrative Procedure Act regulate many, many billions of dollars of activities in the United States each year. Consider the regulatory activities of just a few of these agencies. The ICC, for example, handles over 10,000 cases per year dealing with all sorts of interstate transportation; or the Federal Power Commission, which regulates the generation and transmission of virtually all of the country's power. If the processes of such regulatory bodies could be improved and speeded up by as little as one-tenth of 1 percent, the amount of money spent in the legislative process to accomplish this end would be returned to the taxpayers, to industry, and to consumers, many, many times over.

In brief, if we can find ways to shorten the huge number of administrative proceedings, certainly millions of dollars will be saved annually.

A second subject matter with which the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure deals is the freedom of information legislation, which is of tremendous interest both to the public and to all news media. To put it mildly, it is a terribly complex and difficult subject. Last year, after a great deal of subcommittee and committee consideration, the Senate passed a bill (S. 1666) which, if enacted into law, would radically change and improve the rules relative to the availability of public information to the people.

The subject will be before the subcommittee this Congress, and I have been assured that considerable further effort will be spent to perfect a piece of legislation which can be enacted into law.

Third, the subcommittee has a piece of legislation with respect to the practice of lawyers before Federal agencies. This bill is of great interest to the American Bar Association and to all lawyers throughout the country.

In addition, this small subcommittee is investigating the broad subject of invasions of privacy by Government agencies. This is a very crucial, if difficult, investigation. This subject alone could easily take up the whole time and energy of the small staff of the subcommittee. It is because of the difficulty of this investigation that the subcommittee is asking, first, for a clarification of its jurisdiction to examine into the practices and procedures of all Government departments and agencies in their investigatory and law enforcement functions, and, second, a modest increase in funds. Senate Resolution 39 clarifies any doubt that the Committee on the Judiciary and its Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure is specifically authorized to examine into the practices and procedures of all Government departments and agencies in their law enforcement and investigatory functions, as well as their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions. If there are such practices and procedures which are unnecessary or unwarranted invasions of the privacy of either Government employees or American citizens as a whole, such invasions should be brought out into the open and, where they exist, we should consider remedial legislation. I certainly hope that all Government departments and agencies will cooperate with the subcommittee in this important investigation.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 39) was agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 39

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practices and procedures within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, investigatory, law enforcement, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 40) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask that this resolution be passed over temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the next one.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The resolution (S. Res. 43) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, togther with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $195,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO GOVERNMENT CHARTER, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 41) to consider matters pertaining to Government charter, holidays, and celebrations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 41

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEMS

The resolution (S. Res. 45) to study and examine the Federal judicial celebrations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis professional, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments and agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 44) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice that there were 1,002 private immigration and naturalization bills filed during the previous Congress, and that 450 were disposed of, including 295 which were reported favorably, and 155 which were definitely postponed.

Why were not the rest of them considered? Was it that they were not worthy of consideration?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, where there are administrative remedies, we do not pass the bill. The staff has to study the bill in order to determine whether there is an administrative remedy available.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why they were held over.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. I am informed that a number of them will be taken care of.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, they were all looked into?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unaimous consent to have an explanation printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 44 provides funds to the extent of $162,000 to maintain the standing Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization for the period beginning February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966.

The expenditure of funds under Senate Resolution 44 is made necessary by the continuing heavy workload of the subcommittee, which may be attributed to the large number of private immigration bills and adjustment of status cases which are referred to the subcommittee; the numerous general immigration and nationality bills referred to the subcommittee for action; and the innumerable routine items relating to immigration problems.

During the 88th Congress, these were referred to the subcommittee a total of 1,002 private immigration bills. Of this number 450 were disposed of, leaving 552 cases pending at the close of the 88th Congress. Many private bills are indefinitely postponed because the committee has a general policy of disapproving private bills in cases where an administrative remedy appears to be available. In this type of case, the subcommittee staff assists the Senator's office in working out the administrative remedy for the alien involved.

There were referred to the subcommittee 23 general immigration and naturalization bills during the 88th Congress, which were pending before the subcommittee at the time of the adjournment of the 88th Congress. Public hearings were held on the several bills to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. During the 4 days of hearings, testimony was received from congressional sponsors of the proposed legislation and from the Secretary of State. In addition, numerous statements were received for the record.

There are numerous instances under the immigration laws where the Attorney General is granted discretionary authority to waive certain provisions of the law, but in such cases he is required to submit detailed reports of his action to the Congress. During the 88th Congress, there were submitted to the Congress 7,849 such cases. All reports of the orders issued by the Attorney General are referred to the subcommittee where they are carefully checked to see that the discretionary action is being exercised in conformity with the intent of the Congress.

Under the immigration laws, the Attorney General is empowered to adjust the status of certain deportable aliens, certain aliens who entered the United States in a diplomatic or semidiplomatic status, and certain aliens in a refugee category, to that of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, subject to congressional approval. At the close of the 88th Congress, 938 such cases remained pending.

During the 88th Congress, there were referred to the subcommittee 6,411 complete and detailed statements in cases in which the Attorney General paroled into the United States certain refugee-escapees as authorized in section 1 of Public Law 86–648. Each such case must be carefully checked to see that this special parole authority is being exercised in conformity with the intent of the Congress. In addition, during the 88th Congress, there were referred to the subcommittee 8,836 reports in cases where the Attorney General had approved first preference petitions.

The subcommittee also has an extensive workload by referral items from Senators' offices and correspondence which cannot be statistically appraised.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 44) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $162,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY INVESTIGATION — RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 52) to investigate juvenile delinquency was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 52 be passed over temporarily.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

The resolution (S. Res. 47) to investigate national penitentiaries was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 48) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am wondering what has been done in this field by way of legislation recently.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I believe three bills were considered last years. Extensive hearings were held before that. The Senator will remember what occurred with respect to the committee work last year. We have reduced the staff by five and are asking for 15 percent less than we had last year. There is much work to be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason for my inquiry is that I recall that my colleague [Mr. LONG] stated he had presented a proposal and that no action was taken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Many bills come up on which no action is taken. They sometimes present perplexing problems and questions. If there is anything more complex and perplexing than the patent laws of the United States, I do not know what it is.

There was introduced the other day a measure that will necessitate consideration. In the course of the consideration of that proposed legislation, the issue the Senator from Louisiana raises will be determined, and I hope legislated upon permanently. The Senator is referring to patents resulting from expenditures by the Government in research.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the subcommittee has jurisdiction in that matter, and the subject will be studied?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. There is every intention that a bill will come out of the committee this year. I cannot guarantee that it will pass. There is a need for legislation in that area.

There is need for a measure to raise patent fees, because, in view of the rising costs and the economy in general, the Government is not recovering adequate fees for copyrights and patents in relation to the benefits that result therefrom. Of course, we all benefit from them, but there is need for a revision in the fees involved. I hope we shall be able to pass such a bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Arkansas inform the Senate what the process is after a subcommittee such as the Patents Subcommittee investigates a proposal as the one we are now discussing—fees, and the issue to which my colleague [Mr. LONG] has called attention? Does the committee as a whole study the question, or does the full committee accept the findings of the special committee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The full committee does not always depend upon the findings of a special or subcommittee. This is actually a subcommittee. The same process is involved here as is involved in any other committee. The subcommittee holds hearings. It proceeds to mark up a bill. It presents it to the full committee. The full committee reviews it and amends the bill to such extent as it desires. So the bill is revised and reported or rejected by the full committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. That same process holds true for all committees. Does the Senator not consider it a special committee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I consider it a subcommittee. I know a subcommittee could be considered a special committee assigned to do certain work, but it is actually a subcommittee. Some committees are special committees or select committees established by resolution. This is actually a subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Established by resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Established by resolution, yes; but it is a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. This committee would do exactly what a full committee would do under similar authority and jurisdiction. It is well known that full committees alone, such as the Appropriations Committee or any other full committee, cannot do the work as full committees. There must be subcommittees to do the work and make recommendations, upon which the full committee acts. It adopts the recommendations, or amends, and rejects or reports favorably those bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution (S. Res. 48).

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up Calendar No. 22, Senate Resolution 40.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 40) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to ask a few questions of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

I notice that there were 41 employees in the subcommittee last year, and it is proposed to reduce that number to 35.

Mr. HART. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the amount that is requested is much greater than the amount that was requested last year. In other words, with 41 employees, last year the amount provided was $512,000. This year, with 35 employees, the Senator is asking for $543,000.

Mr. HART. In addition to the $512,000 originally authorized last year, a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $28,500 was obtained. That gave us a total of $540,500 for the year. It is my impression that a few thousand dollars of that amount will be returned.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the Senator is asking for $543,000 with 35 employees, whereas last year there were 41 employees in the subcommittee, and yet it requires the same amount.

Mr. HART. This reflects, of course, the pay raise Congress authorized last summer. If we had applied it across the board and maintained the same number or employees we had last year, we would have been asking for $616,000. We are now asking for only $3,000 more than a year ago, notwithstanding the application of the pay raise. We do it by reducing the employees, six in number.

Mr. ELLENDER. In what category are those six employees? Are they clericals or specialists?

Mr. HART. As I recall, one only is a clerical; two are economists; two are investigators; and one is a lawyer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator hold hearings last year? If so, over what period of time?

Mr. HART. Yes; a number of hearings were conducted a year ago, totaling 33 days. We heard 96 witnesses. There were eight volumes of printed hearings.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was any legislation enacted as a result of the subcommittee's findings in the previous session?

Mr. HART. Not by the Senate. It is no secret that the subject matter considered by this subcommittee is somewhat controversial and very complex. The subcommittee recommended several bills. The full committee reported one of those, the professional sports bill. It did not move from the calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that quite a few of the committees have a special sum set aside for the purchase of magazine and newspaper subscriptions. Why is that necessary? Could those not be obtained from the Library of Congress, or from some other source, rather than have the Government pay for them?

Mr. HART. In the case of most publications, that would be true; but there are certain standard reference books and materials which it is our feeling almost of necessity must be at the elbow chiefly of the staff economist—that is, Standard & Poor's, for example. We believe in the necessity for trade regulation reports and supplements which arrive monthly.

Mr. ELLENDER. The situation is not peculiar to this committee. I did not bring it out before, but most committees have an amount set aside for the purpose of purchasing newspapers and other publications. I am wondering whether such materials could not be obtained from the source for which the Government has already paid, such as from the Library of Congress. I am sure that the Library of Congress has all the publications at hand of which the Senator from Michigan speaks.

Mr. HART. I am sure that any publication we obtain is available at the Library of Congress, but some of them would be available to us under a very restricted time limitation.

The point that the Senator from Louisiana is making is sound. I would indicate that in the budget we submitted this year we have reduced, I believe substantially, a number of areas; but we have not reduced it in the area to which the Senator from Louisiana makes reference—namely, publications.

I believe that we have demonstrated a desire to practice economy as well as preach it. In this area, I believe we would be penny wise and pound foolish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 40), was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $543,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund for the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CREATED BY THE FLOW OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES FROM COMMUNIST TYRANNY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 49), to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.

Mr. HART. This, I know, is a favorite subject of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees has been with us for a long time. It is just as bad as or perhaps worse than the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

I notice that we are increasing the amount, and that the subcommittee plans to concern itself with the problem of refugees in Asia—especially in South Vietnam and Laos. Why should we undertake to do that, I should like to know. Are we going to take care of them?

As I stated a while ago, we greatly assisted our friends across the seas, particularly in Europe. A bill was introduced under which we took on almost half a million refugees. We have been helping in the field for more than 20 years. When we were confronted with the refugee problem in Cuba some time ago, an effort was made to obtain some assistance. I was told about that effort before the Committee on Appropriations. But when we knocked at the door of our friends for their assistance, there was nobody home. We were told, "It is your baby; you take care of it."

I am wondering why we should go into a study of refugees in Asia. Are we to bring them into the United States, feed them and take care of them, as we have done in the case of so many other refugees in the past? Is that the purpose of the investigation?

Mr. HART. There is very real indication that a serious dislocation of persons is occurring in southeast Asia.

Mr. ELLENDER. Africa, also. I forgot to mention Africa. A refugee problem exists in Africa. Why should we interest ourselves in those problems? I should like to know that, if the Senator from Michigan would be explicit in informing the Senate.

Mr. HART. To be explicit, it happens to be the burden of a fortunate nation to be concerned with respect to men, women, and children wherever they are found. This does not mean that we should open the gates to everyone, but it clearly means that we cannot shut our minds to it by rejecting this kind of study and concern.

We can disagree with that contention, in good faith and in good temper, but out reaction, response, and attitude toward these people in the world does, indeed, intimately affect the judgment of the world with respect to us.

There is real indication that the Communists effectively use refugees to suit their selfish purposes. They make the war effort difficult—if such an effort is being engaged in—and in every area in the world refugees can be made to be a source of irritation, even to the overthrow of a government. This affects each of us intimately. It is a subject that has no constituency at home to which to account; but I believe it has a very broad appeal to the conscience of all.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can well understand the situation that developed in Western Europe, where hearings were held, and we more or less joined other nations in trying to do something about the problem of refugees in Western Europe.

In this case, however, we are delving into a program in Africa, in the Congo, where Africa is out of our sphere of influence, as I have stated before to my good friend the Senator from Michigan on the floor of the Senate; and for us to engage in a study of refugees in Asia means that we shall never get through. We do not have enough money.

I am wondering whether it will not lead us into spending more of our borrowed dollars, in order to assist these people. We usually go into those programs, notwithstanding the fact that when we make efforts to obtain assistance from our friends, to help us in the same field, we are kicked around; but we proceed to assist them all the same.

Mr. HART. I believe that history's long-term verdict will be that we acted responsibly in helping refugees, notwithstanding the fact that some of the beneficiaries kick us around. I believe that our long-term opportunity of survival and success will be influenced somewhat by the measure of our concern for people who are kicked around.

I hope very much that the Senate will approve the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure it will be approved. There is no doubt about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $102,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 52) to investigate juvenile delinquency.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that last year there were 27 persons on the payroll?

Mr. DODD. Eighteen.

Mr. ELLENDER. These were temporary employees as of June 30?

Mr. DODD. Yes; we had some consultants employed for a very short period of time in June, which increased the size of our staff; but it is now at the figure outlined in our budget, 18.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is asking for $220,000?

Mr. DODD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In contrast to what amount before?

Mr. DODD. One hundred and eighty-eight thousand dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. One hundred and eighty-eight thousand dollars. In addition, the Senator added $23,000 additional under the special resolution enacted during the early part of this year. What fields is the Senator covering now? As I stated some time ago, according to the report made by the Senator—juvenile delinquency has been on the increase throughout the Nation.

It increased by 8 percent since 1962, and arrests of persons under 18 by 11 percent. What good has come from this study? I would like to have the Senator explain that.

Mr. DODD. We still have the problem with us, as the Senator points out. The attitude that because the situation is getting worse we should do less would be the equivalent of saying that although we have spent billions of dollars in the fight against cancer we have not yet cured cancer; and, therefore, we should decrease instead of increase our efforts. I feel the need is for even greater efforts in this area.

Mr. ELLENDER. What has the subcommittee done which has in any manner stopped or had the effect of stopping juvenile delinquency? Certainly the Senator should be able to justify the existence of his subcommittee by showing that some good has come from it. Since the crime rate and juvenile delinquency have been increasing, I am wondering to what extent the studies that have been made by the subcommittee have tended to decrease juvenile delinquency.

Mr. DODD. If the subcommittee had done nothing else to contribute to the effort than the passage of the National Juvenile Delinquency Act, its existence would be fully justified.

It is one of the great steps forward that has been taken. The act was passed during the presidency of the late John Kennedy. The subcommittee had done a great deal of work on that bill. It took a long time to get it enacted into law.

The drug control bill was passed unanimously by the Senate. All one needs to do is read the newspapers every day to know what is involved in this situation. I wish to continue the fight. We must hold more hearings. I am confident that Congress will pass the bill. I am encouraged by what Chairman Oren Harris in the House said to me about this legislation.

We are trying to have the mail-order gun bill passed. I introduced that bill in August of 1963, before the tragedy in Dallas. That bill has been bogged down.

I believe the public wants that legislation passed into law. I believe it is our duty to try to get it passed.

We have also worked in the field of the black market adoption of children, which work was undertaken by the late Senator from Tennessee, Mr. Kefauver, and which I picked up after his death. We are continuing to work in the field of television and films. We are trying to persuade the TV and movie industries of the negative effects that crime and violence in the mass media have on children, and which we believe contributes toward the crime problem in this country.

We have already undertaken some studies in the pornographic literature field. That work will have to continue. If we abandon it I do not know where we shall end.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that some active work in this field is being done by the U.S. Children's Bureau, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Drugs, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Mr. DODD. Those agencies are all working in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. It seems to me there is a great deal of overlapping in this work, and that what the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency has done is merely to expose the evils that result, and has done very little about it. That is what I am complaining about.

Mr. DODD. I pointed out to the Senator what we have done from a legislative standpoint. That is about all we can do. We are continuing the fight, and it is a field in which accomplishments have been made.

I heard the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] say earlier that the crime condition in this country is something that we must face up to and do something about quickly. This is one way in which something can be done about it. I believe the work of this subcommittee is of great importance. I believe the people of the country feel so, too. I ask unanimous consent to put into the Record at this point a résumé of our major legislation and our plans for next year.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LEGISLATION RESULTING FROM SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS ACTED UPON BY THE SENATE IN 1964

S. 2628: On March 12, 1964, I introduced "The Psychotoxic Drug Control Act of 1964." It passed the Senate on August 15, 1964, and was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The bill is designed to regulate the handling of dangerous drugs, and particularly to keep them out of the hands of juveniles. It was endorsed by the President's Commission on Narcotics and recommended by President Johnson in his health message to the Congress on January 9, 1965.

S. 1975: On August 2, 1963, I introduced a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act, designed to restrict the purchase of mail-order weapons by juvenile delinquents, criminals, and emotionally disturbed persons who cannot be expected to handle weapons safely. It was referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce where extensive hearings were held in early 1964. The bill was not reported to the Senate despite tremendous public pressure.

S. 1541: On May 13, 1963, Senator Estes Kefauver and I introduced "the black market baby bill" to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption. Upon Senator Kefauver's death, I assumed the responsibility of conducting hearings on the bill in June of 1964, and piloted it through the Judiciary Committee. It passed the Senate on September 25, 1964.

REPORTS ISSUED IN 1964

Two special reports were issued in 1964, based on subcommittee investigations. One dealt with mail-order guns, and the other is a major report on television crime and violence. The mail-order gun report was published on August 7, 1964, and is a lengthly documentation of the 2½-year investigation which I directed of the interstate traffic in firearms. Two of the mail-order houses which I ordered my staff to pay particular attention to back in 1961, are the firms that sold Lee Harvey Oswald the weapons with which he murdered President Kennedy and Officer Tippit.

The television report was released on October 27, 1964, and represents a great deal of study by me and my staff. The recommendations made in this report, which I intend to implement this year, will go a long way toward removing content from the Nation's television screens that is harmful to our youth.

INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES CONDUCTED IN 1964 WHICH WILL BE CONTINUED AND EXPANDED IN 1965

1. A continuation of the narcotics and dangerous drug investigation: The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee has devoted a great deal of time to the study of the social effects on American youth of various stimulant and depression drugs. We have seen new developments in this field ranging from the increasing use of amphetamines and barbiturates to the habitual sniffing of glues and cements. We have seen drug abuse spread from hard-core slum areas to respectable middle class suburbs which surround our cities. We have studied the many approaches to the treatment and cure of addicts attempted in this country and we have drawn legislation which will enable the Bureau of Prisons to handle the treatment of Federal narcotic offenders more successfully. I plan to introduce these bills in the coming weeks.

2. The importation of surplus foreign military weapons: An outgrowth of our mail-order gun investigation is our current study of the flood of weapons, large and small, that are engulfing our country. During 1964, we subpenaed and have extensively studied the records of major gun importers, wholesalers, and retailers. We have consulted with the Department of State's Office of Munitions Control to help clarify the nature of this traffic. These efforts have revealed a startling traffic in not only small but heavy weapons as well. The shelling of the United Nations Building is one manifestation of this traffic. I hope to conduct hearings and recommend legislation to the Congress based on last year's efforts.

3. The investigation of illegal adoption practices: Extensive field investigations were conducted by members of the subcommittee staff during 1964. They formed the basis for the legislative hearings held in June, and the documentation needed to report the bill (S. 1541) to the Senate on September 24. I have reintroduced this legislation and will work toward its early passage.

4. A continuation of the study of the effects of crime and violence in television and motion pictures: One of the continuing projects of the committee has been an intensive study of the influences produced on youth behavior by our entertainment media. In 1961–62, I chaired a series of hearings concerning the harmful qualities of violence and brutality as portrayed on television. A report was compiled regarding this investigation. Before issuing the report, however, I felt it necessary to reevaluate television in 1964, to see if violence and brutality had been removed from the Nation's television screens as broadcasters promised they would do during the earlier hearings. This monitoring was conducted in early 1964, hearings were held in July, and an extensive report was issued in October. We are presently working on legislation that will strengthen efforts to remove crime and violence on our Nation's television screens.

5. A continuation of the investigation of the sale and distribution of pornographic literature: We increased our efforts in the area of the illegal distribution of pornographic materials through the mails. Some of the unbelievable practices of the mail order pornographers uncovered by the subcommittee during 1963 were surpassed by those uncovered in 1964. It was clear that this literature is not only dangerous in and of itself, but that the advertising of it is harmful because it often misrepresents perverse writings as scientific or educational material. The subcommittee worked with the Baltimore Criminal Justice Association and the Post Office Department on this problem. We have determined who some of the major dealers are and how they operate. I plan to conduct hearings early in this session of Congress on this subject.

6. A study of deficiencies in juvenile correctional institutions: As I pointed out in January 1964, "overcrowding, lack of adequate staff, lack of classification of offenders, lack of psychiatric care, and inferior physical plants are some of the now chronic deficiencies confronting institutions." The subcommittee took a preliminary look into these matters to determine how serious they are and to determine what changes have taken place and can take place in the institutional setting due to the recent expansion of probation and other noninstitutional delinquency control and treatment measures. Our initial findings are not pleasant to contemplate. More children than ever are in jails with hardened criminals. Children are being held in State institutions without having been charged with an offense or without due process. Horribly inadequate facilities and supervision have resulted in tragedies such as occurred in an Arizona jail on January 6 of this year, where four teenage boys who were being held for petty theft lost their lives due to negligence. The work done in 1964 on this subject will, hopefully, be expanded in the coming months.

Publications of the subcommittee are in great demand in all parts of the world. Requests come from educational institutions, courts, probation departments, and other interested agencies and individuals. The factual material, the opinions of experts, and the recommendations contained in these documents make them of great value to persons working on this problem.

The subcommittee members and staff have kept abreast of new developments in the delinquency field set forth by scientists in colleges, universities, private research organizations, and other governmental agencies.

The subcommittee has maintained contact and cooperation with such professional organizations in the crime control field as the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, and the American Correctional Association. It has gathered a storehouse of knowledge, research data, and records of legislative deliberations concerning juvenile delinquency and I am confident that the subcommittee has been effective in conveying to the American people the concern of Congress for the welfare of the youth of this land and in directing legislative effort to the solution of the perplexing problem of delinquency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 52) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from Febraury 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation, as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $220,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed, out of order, to the consideration of Calendar No. 43, Senate Resolution 75.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why does the Senator make that request?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I must return to a hearing of the Committee on Rules and Administration this afternoon. There are two resolutions on the calendar which pertain to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which I should like to have taken up at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 75) to authorize a study of the Standing Rules of the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I would like to take up this resolution now and, following it, Senate Resolution 53, because they pertain to the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I am chairman.

I have received the following letter from the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
January 27, 1965.

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR EVERETT: As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Standing Rules of the Senate, I have an immediate and important responsibility before me. Senate Resolution 6, Senate Resolution 8, and Senate Resolution 16, each dealing with Senate rules changes, have been referred to the Subcommittee on the Standing Rules of the Senate, with instructions to report back to the Senate by March 9, 1965.

Furthermore, at least 10 other items of business have been referred to the subcommittee, including several congressional reorganization bills. Several years ago, some hearings were held on this matter and now there has been increased interest as indicated by the cosponsorship by 53 Senators on 1 such bill.

In view of the facts I have listed, I feel that it is extremely necessary to staff this subcommittee with qualified personnel under the enclosed resolution. Staff members currently on the Rules Committee are heavily burdened with other matters and borrowing personnel from other sources has been unsatisfactory, in my opinion.

As you know, I have not been one to put on additional staff personnel unless it is absolutely necessary. In this case, I must have the staff I have indicated in order to carry out my responsibilities in the Senate.

Yours very sincerely,

CARL HAYDEN.

I concur in the views expressed in the letter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is this a new subcommittee?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No; it is not a new subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is the first time the Senator is asking for some money for this subcommittee?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. In the past 2 or 3 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. The subcommittee has not spent any money before?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Not on these particular matters, because personnel have been borrowed from other sources. Our committee is now overloaded, and we do not have anyone to lend. We are justified in asking for this amount. These employees will not serve any longer than necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does this include a study of the so-called Monroney proposal on the reorganization of Congress?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That would be included, along with other matters. Ten other items have been referred to the committee, which were carried over from last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the regular staff do aside from looking over these few resolutions?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I can answer that better if the Senator will come to our committee and stay there for 2 days.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has special help.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No; I have not.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is doing it with the regular committee staff; is that correct?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has special investigators.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We have three, and they have been borrowed from General Services. They are engaged on investigative work. They are not doing this type of work at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. How long would this subcommittee be in existence? How long would it take to do this work?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No longer than it will take for the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to dispose of the testimony, and for the committee to make a recommendation. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] can speak on that subject.

Mr. CANNON. The subcommittee presumably will continue in existence. However, as the Senator from North Carolina has stated previously, the work of the subcommittee has been light and it has been carried on by employees borrowed from other subcommittees.

At this time the volume of work in the subcommittee is such that, with the special studies, the staff available at the present time is not adequate to handle the job.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that three positions would be provided: One at $20,852 and two positions at $18,766 each. Have the people to fill those positions been employed?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No, they have not. They cannot be employed until the necessary money is voted. One would be counsel for the majority, the other counsel for the minority.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would have been the next question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 75) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the Standing Rules of the United States Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The Committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $87,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO MAKE EXPENDITURES AND TO EMPLOY TEMPORARY PERSONNEL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up out of order Senate Resolution No. 63, which is No. 53 on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 63) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 23, after the word "exceed" to insert "$150,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to:

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;
(2) corrupt practices;
(3) contested elections;
(4) credentials and qualifications;
(5) Federal elections generally; and
(6) Presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the resolution would authorize the necessary money to operate the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration. That subcommittee has been in existence for a number of years. The money which would be authorized is the same amount that the committee had available last year. An amount of $45,000, which the committee did not need, was turned back to the Treasury.

From the money available for that subcommittee we are now employing special counsel who is engaged in an investigation that we have had to undertake. We also must pay out of funds available to the subcommittee auditors whom we have obtained from the General Services Administration, because no money to carry on the Baker investigation was otherwise voted. We have not asked for money for that special purpose. We have been using money available to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under what authority?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The investigation involved campaign expenses. In addition, last year counsel went to Nevada to investigate an election problem of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. There was an observation of some other elections.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the question I was about to ask. There were not too many investigations which were related to actual elections.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Only two at election time, I believe.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Investigations resulting from elections last year were rather light. Normally we would not request the amount included in the resolution this year, even though it is the same amount of money that the committee requested last year, except that at the present time, as the Senator from North Carolina has said, we are carrying an additional load in view of the investigation currently underway. That investigation involves purported campaign funds, and we hope to finish the investigation very shortly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not heard any of the testimony in that case, but I am at a loss to understand how that investigation involves privileges and elections.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I believe I can explain that very quickly.

Mr. ELLENDER. It might be well if the Senator would do so for the RECORD.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I can tell the Senator very quickly.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would be well to have it in the RECORD.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I will put the explanation in the RECORD.

Mr. Reynolds testified that there was an irregularity in the bond issued to the McCloskey Co. He testified that approximately $35,000 of the premium was conveyed to Baker and later conveyed to the Democratic National Committee for campaign expenses. That is the testimony that we have been investigating. We are still doing so. We had to obtain special counsel in connection with the investigation. We borrowed employees from the General Services Administration. We had to transfer funds in that connection. We have not yet finished with the investigation. We did not ask for any additional money last year to carry on the investigation.

The Senator will remember that once the committee closed the investigation, and then reopened it in connection with the McCloskey issue. The committee had no money with which to continue the investigation, and we carried it on with the money available to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections because campaign expenses were involved. The investigation clearly falls under the jurisdiction of that subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Where has the committee obtained the remainder of the money necessary to carry on the investigation of Bobby Baker?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Prior to that time a special appropriation was available to carry out the authorization of the resolution. We had a $50,000 appropriation and a $75,000 appropriation. The committee did not spend all of that money, but turned back a part of it. After part was turned back, the committee could not get it back.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the committee is now continuing the investigation with funds available to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Since last fall we have; yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 23, it is proposed to insert "$150,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 63) as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The resolution (S. Res. 51) to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and considered proposed legislation affecting said Acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall reports its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $60,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 60) to authorize additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], inform me whether the number of employees would be the same number that the committee had in the past?

Mr. HILL. The same number.

Mr. ELLENDER. Those employees would be in addition to the regular professional staff?

Mr. HILL. They are, indeed. The number would be the same as that provided at the last two sessions of the Congress. At the last session, the committee saved approximately $40,000. I hope that we shall be able to do the same at the present session of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 60) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF MATTERS RELATING TO MIGRATORY LABOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 24) authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters relating to migratory labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thought the Migratory Labor Subcommittee had completed its work. The record shows that last year the subcommittee held no hearings. I am wondering why the subcommittee should be continued. I understand that the subcommittee staff may have cooperated with the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction over the subject of housing. I am wondering if the chairman of that subcommittee could tell us why the existence of the committee is necessary and what is hoped to be done in the future.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Louisiana realizes that in the past the subcommittee has been effective. The subcommittee has been in existence for 5 years, and a great deal of our legislative program has been enacted.

The Senate has passed measures dealing with public health, education, and other matters affecting the welfare of migratory farmworkers on two or three occasions. We had to pass and repass those bills because the House of Representatives did not get to them.

Last year a good part of our legislative program was enacted. Our hearings had developed the need over the years. Further hearings were not necessary. But a great deal of the work of the subcommittee, its chairman, and members of the subcommittee, went into the process of having incorporated in the Economic Opportunity Act provisions for day care for the youngsters, education for both the youngsters and their parents, a sanitation program; and, in addition, we have followed the progress of the Migrant Health Act, which was enacted 2 years ago, and which, for the first time, has brought about a national program systematically dealing with the heretofore overlooked health problems of migrant farm families who have been excluded from everything that we consider ordinary medical care, postnatal and prenatal care, immunization and all the rest.

I have received many telegrams from representatives of organizations who are familiar with our work, including the executive secretary of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor; Father Vizzard, of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference; the secretary of the National Child Labor Committee; and others, including the secretary for national affairs of the United Presbyterian Church. All of them say "well done" for the work that has been accomplished, but also say that we have a long way to go.

Some of the bills passed by the Senate, child labor, for example, have not yet been enacted. We still have problems about low wages paid throughout the country. We have the problem of stabilizing employment in a period when one of the foreign farm labor recruitment programs has been terminated by the Congress. Much does remain to be done. However, I deeply appreciate the thoughtful, kind words the Senator from Louisiana in saying that we have done much.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator's subcommittee has been instrumental in preventing the reenactment of the bracero law. I know he takes credit for that, and that is all right. But I am sure the telegrams he received from church organizations dealt with that subject, because the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] used the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor as a lever to assist in doing away with the bracero law.

I would be interested to learn the extent to which the committee takes credit for title 3(b) of Public Law 458, the so-called Economic Opportunity Act, or poverty bill. I thought that was handled by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The subcommittee is a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that bill was the responsibility of our full committee. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the full committee [Mr. Hill] will recall that I, as chairman of the subcommittee, urged the inclusion of these programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. The confusion arose from the fact that a while ago I asked the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] about the number of employees of the committee. I had forgotten that the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor was a part of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. When the Senator from Alabama answered a moment ago concerning the resolution asking for 10 additional employees, he did not include the number that is now being requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HILL. This is a subcommittee, but a subcommittee with its own resolution and its own staff and its own personnel.

Mr. ELLENDER. So in addition to the regular employees provided for in the Reorganization Act of 1946 and 16 special employees, we can add 9 emanating from the study of migratory labor?

Mr. HILL. The Subcommittee on Migratory Labor operates pretty independently, and has its own staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is contemplated for the future of this subcommittee? What is it proposed to do? I thought that if the Senate passed the poverty bill and certain other bills, although, as the Senator from New Jersey has said, they have not been passed by the House, they would fall within the province of the full committee, rather than the subcommittee. All the hearings have been held. Is it not within the function of the standing committee, to handle with any additional employees necessary?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I suggest to the Senator from Louisiana that that would be another approach to the unfinished problems in this important area of our economy; but whether it would be wise to increase the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, when there is an operating unit as a subcommittee, I would rather doubt. I should think it would be far more efficient to use the talent that has been recruited and has worked harder and more earnestly and with greater dedication than any number of other persons I have ever seen in public employment, than to recruit another group, having no experience. I think that would be unwise. I am speculating that the most beloved chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], would perhaps let the junior Senator from New Jersey continue until the work is completed, rather than to pile an additional burden on the senior Senator from Alabama, who has one of the heaviest legislative loads in the entire Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I believe that unquestionably wisdom would dictate that the Senator from New Jersey, in view of the outstanding, effective work he has done, should be permitted to go forward and continue the work.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am pleased that my speculation proved correct; and I am deeply grateful to the senior Senator from Alabama, who, as always, is even kinder than I could have hoped.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 24) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers, and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDIES AUTHORIZED FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next resolution will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 13) authorizing the continuation of certain studies and the initiation of others by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an explanation of the resolution, including the reason for the absence today of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service [Mr. Johnston].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Monroney

The distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the senior Senator from South Carolina, who is recovering from surgery, is unable to be present today. I am glad to report that his condition is excellent and that he is in good spirits and expects to be able to resume his duties in a matter of weeks. His colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and, I am sure, the whole Senate rejoice in his recovery and will welcome him back among us.

Senate Resolution 13 would authorize $100,000 for the use of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 1st session of the 89th Congress so that the committee's work may continue. This is an increase of $25,000 over the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 281 last year, an increase justified, in my view, by the salary increases authorized by the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964 and by the increased number of committee members. The committee is now composed of 12 members, instead of 9 as in the past.

Our committee exercises close surveillance over legislation affecting all Federal employees, including postal, of the executive branch—employees who draw some $16 billion a year in pay. These are the people who will be entrusted to build and administer the President's Great Society. Over the years, the committee has worked with a fine nonpartisan spirit to improve the Federal service by reporting to the Senate needed measures affecting every aspect of the civil and postal services. This covers a lot of territory.

For example, the committee—

Considers all aspects of the postal service and its 598,000 employees, including such problems as compensation, postal rates, rural-carrier allowances, the tug of war between costs and services for parcel post, the need for increased efficiency through mechanization on the one hand and the difficulty of automating postal processes on the other.

Responds to a heavy volume of correspondence from all over the country from people seeking information on legislation, inquiring about Federal employment, detailing employment problems, etc.

Maintains a running assessment of the civil service system, including pay rates, the retirement program, the administration of the Health Benefits Act of 1959, the life insurance program, and the merit system.

Adjustments, liberalizations, and other changes in existing law in these important areas of the Federal service are constantly being proposed by the administration, by members of the committee, by employee and retiree organizations, and by others.

The committee undertakes to conduct continuing studies of these matters, so that reasonable and just assessments of legislation can be made at the appropriate time. These studies, of course, are altered in emphasis as conditions change, but the basic work goes on.

I am advised that each year unspent funds are returned and that this procedure will continue. Approximately $7,500 of the $75,000 authorized last year remains unspent and will be returned. I have the assurance of the chairman that the committee's work this year will be continued with all possible efficiency and economy.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

(1) the postal service, with particular emphasis upon (a) the feasibility of greater use of modernized equipment and the development of more efficient processing techniques, (b) continuation of a study of parcel post as required by law with a view to insuring a reasonable cost-revenue balance and at the same time maintaining rates within an area commensurate with the basic purpose of the parcel-delivery system, (c) postal rates generally, and

(2) the civil service system, investigations and studies including (a) the merit system, (b) the civil service retirement system and the continually increasing unfunded liability of the retirement fund, along with a study of means by which the system can be improved, (c) the Federal health benefits program, taking into account the rising costs of hospitalization and other medical care, (d) Federal pay, including the practical effects of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964, (e) and the Federal employees life insurance program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The next resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 14) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ one additional assistant.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. **MONRONEY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an explanation of Senate Resolution 14.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONRONEY

Senate Resolution 14 would authorize the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to employ, until otherwise provided by law, an additional clerical assistant who would be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at a rate of compensation fixed by the chairman in accordance with Public Law 4, 80th Congress.

Since the 82d Congress, the committee has found that the six clerical assistants authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 have not been adequate to carry on the committee's work. The committee requires this additional clerical help so that it may respond comprehensively to the heavy volume of correspondence from civil service and postal employees throughout the Nation.

The amount of this correspondence increases year by year, so that the additional clerical assistant is still required and will continue to be needed into the foreseeable future.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, as I understand, the purpose of the resolution is to make permanent the position sought.

Mr. **MONRONEY**. It is recommended by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Ever since the passage of the Reorganization Act, it has been necessary to seek an additional assistant. It is now proposed to make the position permanent.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. I presume that other chairmen will follow suit. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will rush his proposed new Reorganization Act to passage, so that perhaps this practice can be stopped.

Mr. **MONRONEY**. The Senator from Louisiana is, I am sure, aware that the workload each committee carries today is far beyond the workload that existed when the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed. Therefore, it is time to take the steps required to enable committees to cope with their present workload.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 14) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided by law, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 32) to provide additional funds for the Select Committee on Small Business.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, this committee is proposing to enter a new field. It is stated that the Select Committee on Small Business will make a study of the Federal patent policies. We have just given money to a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to spend with respect to Federal patents. What is being done here?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey. The Senator's colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has been working in different areas on this committee, for, I understand, 3 years. The junior Senator from Louisiana is interested in the area. He has established himself as one of the Senate authorities in the whole area on patents.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, I understood, from asking questions heretofore, that the Subcommittee on Patents is dealing with that very problem. The committee has made studies of it. I also notice that we envision a study of franchise systems of distributing goods to small wholesalers and retailers. Would that not come within the province of the Committee on Commerce, rather than the Committee on Small Business? Or, are we adding this to keep people busy and spending this money in order to give the committee some work?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] likes to be busy. He is most knowledgeable in this field. I do not believe that there is any area with which the select committee deals which will not occasionally involve some reasonable overlapping. I do not believe it is inartistic at all. These committees can help each other, when they have employees experienced in certain study areas. This is not a legislative committee. It could be of help to any other legislative committee when the inquiry develops the need for legislative action.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, I point out again that this committee next year plans to investigate financial concentration and its effect on competition. It seems to me that that is in direct conflict with the activities of the committee headed by the Senator from Michigan, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

I wonder why we are broadening these subcommittees. Is it to find work to give to the people in order to keep the subcommittee alive?

It seems to me that the additional work that would be imposed on this subcommittee infringes on the work of at least three committees that have already been created and have been given money in order to make studies that this Senate committee proposes to do. To me, this is rank duplication.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 32) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and S. Res. 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the proper consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $140,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

NATURAL BEAUTY — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 78)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on natural beauty. This message has been read in the House of Representatives; and, without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without reading, and appropriately referred.

The message was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

For centuries Americans have drawn strength and inspiration from the beauty of our country. It would be a neglectful generation indeed, indifferent alike to the judgment of history and the command of principle, which failed to preserve and extend such a heritage for its descendants.

Yet the storm of modern change is threatening to blight and diminish, in a few decades, what has been cherished and protected for generations.

A growing population is swallowing up areas of natural beauty with its demands for living space, and is placing increased demand on our overburdened areas of recreation and pleasure.

The increasing tempo of urbanization and growth is already depriving many Americans of the right to live in decent surroundings. More of our people are crowding into cities and being cut off from nature. Cities themselves reach out into the countryside, destroying streams and trees and meadows as they go. A modern highway may wipe out the equivalent of a 50-acre park with every mile. And people move out from the city to get closer to nature only to find that nature has moved farther from them.

The modern technology, which has added much to our lives can also have a darker side. Its uncontrolled waste products are menacing the world we live in, our enjoyment, and our health. The air we breathe, our water, our soil and wildlife, are being blighted by the poisons and chemicals which are the byproducts of technology and industry. The skeletons of discarded cars litter the countryside. The same society which receives the rewards of technology, must, as a cooperating whole, take responsibility for control.

To deal with these new problems will require a new conservation. We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities. Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare but the dignity of man's spirit.

In this conservation the protection and enhancement of man's opportunity to be in contact with beauty must play a major role.

This means that beauty must not be just a holiday treat, but a part of our daily life. It means not just easy physical access, but equal social access for rich and poor, Negro and white, city dweller and farmer.

Beauty is not an easy thing to measure. It does not show up in the gross national product, in a weekly paycheck, or in profit-and-loss statements. But these things are not ends in themselves. They are a road to satisfaction and pleasure and the good life. Beauty makes its own direct contribution to these final ends. Therefore it is one of the most important components of our true national income, not to be left out simply because statisticians cannot calculate its worth.

And some things we do know. Association with beauty can enlarge man's imagination and revive his spirit. Ugliness can demean the people who live among it. What a citizen sees every day is his America. If it is attractive it adds to the quality of his life. If it is ugly it can degrade his existence.

Beauty has other immediate values. It adds to safety whether removing direct dangers to health or making highways less monotonous and dangerous. We also know that those who live in blighted and squalid conditions are more susceptible to anxieties and mental disease.

Ugliness is costly. It can be expensive to clean a soot-smeared building, or to build new areas of recreation when the old landscape could have been preserved far more cheaply.

Certainly no one would hazard a national definition of beauty. But we do know that nature is nearly always beautiful. We do, for the most part, know what is ugly. And we can introduce, into all our planning, our programs, our building and our growth, a conscious and active concern for the values of beauty. If we do this, then we can be successful in preserving a beautiful America.

There is much the Federal Government can do, through a range of specific programs, and as a force for public education. But a beautiful America will require the effort of Government at every level, of business, and of private groups. Above all it will require the concern and action of individual citizens, alert to danger, determined to improve the quality of their surroundings, resisting blight, demanding and building beauty for themselves and their children.

I am hopeful that we can summon such a national effort. For we have not chosen to have an ugly America. We have been careless, and often neglectful. But now that the danger is clear and the hour is late this people can place themselves in the path of a tide of blight which is often irreversible and always destructive.

The Congress and the executive branch have each produced conservation giants in the past. During the 88th Congress it was legislative executive teamwork that brought progress. It is this same kind of partnership that will insure our continued progress.

In that spirit as a beginning and stimulus I make the following proposals:

THE CITIES

Thomas Jefferson wrote that communities "should be planned with an eye to the effect made upon the human spirit by being continually surrounded with a maximum of beauty."

We have often sadly neglected this advice in the modern American city. Yet this is where most of our people live. It is where the character of our young is formed. It is where American civilization will be increasingly concentrated in years to come.

Such a challenge will not be met with a few more parks or playgrounds. It requires attention to the architecture of building, the structure of our roads, preservation of historical buildings and monuments, careful planning of new suburbs. A concern for the enhancement of beauty must infuse every aspect of the growth and development of metropolitan areas. It must be a principal responsibility of local government, supported by active and concerned citizens.

Federal assistance can be a valuable stimulus and help to such local efforts.

I have recommended a community extension program which will bring the resources of the university to focus on problems of the community just as they have long been concerned with our rural areas. Among other things, this program will help provide training and technical assistance to aid in making our communities more attractive and vital. In addition, under the Housing Act of 1964, grants will be made to States for training of local governmental employees needed for community development. I am recommending a 1965 supplemental appropriation to implement this program.

We now have two programs which can be of special help in creating areas of recreation and beauty for our metropolitan area population: the open space land program, and the land and water conservation fund.

I have already proposed full funding of the land and water conservation fund, and directed the Secretary of the Interior to give priority attention to serving the needs of our growing urban population.

The primary purpose of the open space program has been to help acquire and assure open spaces in urban areas. I propose a series of new matching grants for improving the natural beauty of urban open space.

The open space program should be adequately financed, and broadened by permitting grants to be made to help city governments acquire and clear areas to create small parks, squares, pedestrian malls, and playgrounds.

In addition I will request authority in this program for a matching program to cities for landscaping, installation of outdoor lights and benches, creating attractive cityscapes along roads and in business areas, and for other beautification purposes.

Our city parks have not, in many cases, realized their full potential as sources of pleasure and play. I recommend on a matching basis a series of Federal demonstration projects in city parks to use the best thought and action to show how the appearance of these parks can better serve the people of our towns and metropolitan areas.

All of these programs should be operated on the same matching formula to avoid unnecessary competition among programs and increase the possibility of cooperative effort. I will propose such a standard formula.

In a future message on the cities I will recommend other changes in our housing programs designed to strengthen the sense of community of which natural beauty is an important component.

In almost every part of the country citizens are rallying to save landmarks of beauty and history. The Government must also do its share to assist these local efforts which have an important national purpose. We will encourage and support the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, chartered by Congress in 1949. I shall propose legislation to authorize supplementary grants to help local authorities acquire, develop, and manage private properties for such purposes.

The Registry of National Historic Landmarks is a fine Federal program with virtually no Federal cost. I commend its work and the new wave of interest it has evoked in historical preservation.

THE COUNTRYSIDE

Our present system of parks, seashores and recreation areas—monuments to the dedication and labor of farsighted men—do not meet the needs of a growing population.

The full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund will be an important step in making this a parks-for-America decade.

I propose to use this fund to acquire lands needed to establish—

Assateague Island National Seashore, Md. and Va.

Tocks Island National Recreation Area, N.J. and Pa.

Cape Lookout National Seashore, N.C.

Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich.

Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.

Oregon Dunes National Seashore, Oreg.

Great Basin National Park, Nev.

Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Tex.

Spruce Knob, Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, W. Va.

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Mont. and Wyo.

Flaming Gorge National Recreation, Area, Utah.

Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, Calif.

In addition, I have requested the Secretary of the Interior, working with interested groups, to conduct a study on the desirability of establishing a Redwood National Park in California.

I will also recommend that we add prime outdoor recreation areas to our National Forest system, particularly in the populous East; and proceed on schedule with studies required to define and enlarge the Wilderness System established by the 88th Congress. We will also continue progress on our refuge system for migratory waterfowl.

Faulty strip and surface mining practices have left ugly scars which mar the beauty of the landscape in many of our States. I urge your strong support of the nationwide strip and surface mining study provided by the Appalachian regional legislation, which will furnish the factual basis for a fair and reasonable approach to the correction of these past errors.

I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture to work with State and local organizations in developing a cooperative program for improving the beauty of the privately owned rural lands which comprise three-fourths of the Nation's area. Much can be done within existing Department of Agriculture programs without adding to cost.

The 28 million acres of land presently held and used by our armed services is an important part of our public estate. Many thousands of these acres will soon become surplus to military needs. Much of this land has great potential for outdoor recreation, wildlife, and conservation uses consistent with military requirements. This potential must be realized through the fullest application of multiple-use principles. To this end I have directed the Secretaries of Defense and Interior to conduct a conservation inventory of all surplus lands.

HIGHWAYS

More than any country ours is an automobile society. For most Americans the automobile is a principal instrument of transportation, work, daily activity, recreation and pleasure. By making our roads highways to the enjoyment of nature and beauty we can greatly enrich the life of nearly all our people in city and countryside alike.

Our task is twofold.

First. To insure that roads themselves are not destructive of nature and natural beauty.

Second. To make our roads ways to recreation and pleasure.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to take a series of steps designed to meet this objective. This includes requiring landscaping on all Federal interstate primary and urban highways, encouraging the construction of rest and recreation areas along highways, and the preservation of natural beauty adjacent to highway rights-of-way.

Our present highway law permits the use of up to 3 percent of all Federal-aid funds to be used without matching for the preservation of natural beauty. This authority has not been used for the purpose intended by Congress. I will take steps, including recommended legislation if necessary, to make sure these funds are, in fact, used to enhance beauty along our highway system. This will dedicate substantial resources to this purpose.

I will also recommend that a portion of the funds now used for secondary roads be set aside in order to provide access to areas of rest and recreation and scenic beauty along our Nation's roads, and for rerouting or construction of highways for scenic or parkway purposes.

The Recreation Advisory Council is now completing a study of the role which scenic roads and parkways should play in meeting our highway and recreation needs. After receiving the report, I will make appropriate recommendations.

The authority for the existing program of outdoor advertising control expires on June 30, 1965, and its provisions have not been effective in achieving the desired goal. Accordingly, I will recommend legislation to insure effective control of billboards along our highways.

In addition, we need urgently to work toward the elimination or screening of unsightly, beauty-destroying junkyards and auto graveyards along our highways. To this end, I will also recommend necessary legislation to achieve effective control, including Federal assistance in appropriate cases where necessary.

I hope that, at all levels of government, our planners and builders will remember that highway beautification is more than a matter of planting trees or setting aside scenic areas. The roads themselves must reflect, in location and design, increased respect for the natural and social integrity and unity of the landscape and communities through which they pass.

RIVERS

Those who first settled this continent found much to marvel at. Nothing was a greater source of wonder and amazement than the power and majesty of American rivers. They occupy a central place in myth and legend, folklore and literature.

They were our first highways, and some remain among the most important. We have had to control their ravages, harness their power, and use their water to help make whole regions prosper.

Yet even this seemingly indestructible natural resource is in danger.

Through our pollution control programs we can do much to restore our rivers. We will continue to conserve the water and power for tomorrow's needs with well-planned reservoirs and power dams. But the time has also come to identify and preserve free flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers before growth and development make the beauty of the unspoiled waterway a memory.

To this end I will shortly send to the Congress a bill to establish a National Wild Rivers System.

THE POTOMAC

The river rich in history and memory which flows by our Nation's Capital should serve as a model of scenic and recreation values for the entire country. To meet this objective I am asking the Secretary of the Interior to review the Potomac River Basin development plan now under review by the Chief of Army Engineers, and to work with the affected States and local governments, the District of Columbia, and interested Federal agencies to prepare a program for my consideration.

A program must be devised which will—

(a) Clean up the river and keep it clean, so it can be used for boating, swimming, and fishing;

(b) Protect its natural beauties by the acquisition of scenic easements, zoning, or other measures;

(c) Provide adequate recreational facilities; and

(d) Complete the presently authorized George Washington Memorial Parkway on both banks.

I hope action here will stimulate and inspire similar efforts by States and local governments on other urban rivers and waterfronts, such as the Hudson in New York. They are potentially the greatest single source of pleasure for those who live in most of our metropolitan areas.

TRAILS

The forgotten outdoorsmen of today are those who like to walk, hike, ride horseback, or bicycle. For them we must have trails as well as highways. Nor should motor vehicles be permitted to tyrannize the more leisurely human traffic.

Old and young alike can participate. Our doctors recommend and encourage such activity for fitness and fun.

I am requesting, therefore, that the Secretary of the Interior work with his colleagues in the Federal Government and with State and local leaders and recommend to me a cooperative program to encourage a national system of trails, building up the more than hundred thousand miles of trails in our national forests and parks.

There are many new and exciting trail projects underway across the land. In Arizona, a county has arranged for miles of irrigation canal banks to be used by riders and hikers. In Illinois, an abandoned railroad right-of-way is being developed as a "prairie path." In Mexico utility rights-of-way are used as public trails.

As with so much of our quest for beauty and quality, each community has opportunity for action. We can and should have an abundance of trails for walking, cycling, and horseback riding, in and close to our cities. In the back country we need to copy the great Appalachian trail in all parts of America, and to make full use of rights-of-way and other public paths.

POLLUTION

One aspect of the advance of civilization is the evolution of responsibility for disposal of waste. Over many generations society gradually developed techniques for this purpose. State and local governments, landlords, and private citizens have been held responsible for insuring that sewage and garbage did not menace health or contaminate the environment.

In the last few decades entire new categories of waste have come to plague and menace the American scene. These are the technological wastes—the byproducts of growth, industry, agriculture, and science. We cannot wait for slow evolution over generations to deal with them.

Pollution is growing at a rapid rate. Some pollutants are known to be harmful to health, while the effect of others is uncertain and unknown. In some cases we can control pollution with a larger effort. For other forms of pollution we still do not have effective means of control.

Pollution destroys beauty and menaces health. It cuts down on efficiency, reduces property values, and raises taxes.

The longer we wait to act, the greater the dangers and the larger the problem.

Large-scale pollution of air and waterways is no respecter of political boundaries, and its effects extend far beyond those who cause it.

Air pollution is no longer confined to isolated places. This generation has altered the composition of the atmosphere on a global scale through radioactive materials and a steady increase in carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels. Entire regional airsheds, crop plant environments, and river basins are heavy with noxious materials. Motor vehicles and home heating plants, municipal dumps and factories continually hurl pollutants into the air we breathe. Each day almost 50,000 tons of unpleasant, and sometimes poisonous, sulfur dioxide are added to the atmosphere, and our automobiles produce almost 300,000 tons of other pollutants.

In Donora, Pa., in 1948, and New York City in 1953 serious illness and some deaths were produced by sharp increases in air pollution. In New Orleans, epidemic outbreaks of asthmatic attacks are associated with air pollutants. Three-fourths of the 8 million people in the Los Angeles area are annoyed by severe eye irritation much of the year. And our health authorities are increasingly concerned with the damaging effects of the continual breathing of polluted air by all our people in every city in the country.

In addition to its health effects, air pollution creates filth and gloom and depreciates property values of entire neighborhoods. The White House itself is being dirtied with soot from polluted air.

Every major river system is now polluted. Waterways that were once sources of pleasure and beauty and recreation are forbidden to human contact and objectionable to sight and smell. Furthermore, this pollution is costly, requiring expensive treatment for drinking water and inhibiting the operation and growth of industry.

In spite of the efforts and many accomplishments of the past, water pollution is spreading. And new kinds of problems are being added to the old:

Waterborne viruses, particularly hepatitis, are replacing typhoid fever as a significant health hazard.

Mass deaths of fish have occurred in rivers overburdened with wastes.

Some of our rivers contain chemicals which, in concentrated form, produce abnormalities in animals.

Last summer 2,600 square miles of Lake Erie—over a quarter of the entire lake—were almost without oxygen and unable to support life because of algae and plant growths, fed by pollution from cities and farms.

In many older cities storm drains and sanitary sewers are interconnected. As a result, mixtures of storm water and sanitary waste overflow during rains and discharge directly into streams, bypassing treatment works and causing heavy pollution.

In addition to our air and water we must, each and every day, dispose of a half billion pounds of solid waste. These wastes—from discarded cans to discarded automobiles—litter our country, harbor vermin, and menace our health. Inefficient and improper methods of disposal increase pollution of our air and streams.

Almost all these wastes and pollutions are the result of activities carried on for the benefit of man. A prime national goal must be an environment that is pleasing to the senses and healthy to live in.

Our Government is already doing much in this field. We have made significant progress. But more must be done.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY

I am directing the heads of all agencies to improve measures to abate pollution caused by direct agency operation, contracts, and cooperative agreements. Federal procurement practices must make sure that the Government equipment uses the most effective techniques for controlling pollution. The Administrator of General Services has already taken steps to assure that motor vehicles purchased by the Federal Government meet minimum standards of exhaust quality.

CLEAN WATER

Enforcement authority must be strengthened to provide positive controls over the discharge of pollutants into our interstate or navigable waters. I recommend enactment of legislation to—

Provide, through the setting of effective water quality standards, combined with a swift and effective enforcement procedure, a national program to prevent water pollution at its source rather than attempting to cure pollution after it occurs.

Increase project grant ceilings and provide additional incentives for multimunicipal projects under the waste treatment facilities construction program.

Increase the ceilings for grants to State water pollution control programs.

Provide a new research, and demonstration construction program leading to the solution of problems caused by the mixing of storm water runoff and sanitary wastes.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will undertake an intensive program to clean up the Nation's most polluted rivers. With the cooperation of States and cities—using the tools of regulation, grant, and incentives—we can bring the most serious problem of river pollution under control. We cannot afford to do less.

We will work with Canada to develop a pollution control program for the Great Lakes and other border waters.

Through an expanded program carried on by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Interior, we will continue to seek effective and economical methods for controlling pollution from acid mine drainage.

To improve the quality of our waters will require the fullest cooperation of our State and local government. Working together, we can and will preserve and increase one of our most valuable national resources—clean water.

CLEAN AIR

The enactment of the Clean Air Act in December of 1963 represented a long step forward in our ability to understand and control the difficult problem of air pollution. The 1966 budget request of $24 million is almost double the amount spent on air pollution programs in the year prior to its enactment.

In addition, the Clean Air Act should be improved to permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to investigate potential air pollution problems before pollution happens, rather than having to wait until the damage occurs, as is now the case, and to make recommendations leading to the prevention of such pollution.

One of the principal unchecked sources of air pollution is the automobile. I intend to institute discussions with industry officials and other interested groups leading to an effective elimination or substantial reduction of pollution from liquid fueled motor vehicles.

SOLID WASTES

Continuing technological progress and improvement in methods of manufacture, packaging, and marketing of consumer products has resulted in an ever mounting increase of discarded material. We need to seek better solutions to the disposal of these wastes. I recommend legislation to—

Assist the States in developing comprehensive programs for some forms of solid waste disposal.

Provide for research and demonstration projects leading to more effective methods for disposing of or salvaging solid wastes.

Launch a concentrated attack on the accumulation of junk cars by increasing research in the Department of the Interior leading to use of metal from scrap cars where promising leads already exist.

PESTICIDES

Pesticides may affect living organisms wherever they occur.

In order that we may better understand the effects of these compounds, I have included increased funds in the budget for use by the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare to increase their research efforts on pesticides so they can give special attention to the flow of pesticides through the environment; study the means by which pesticides break down and disappear in nature; and to keep a constant check on the level of pesticides in our water, air, soil, and food supply.

I am recommending additional funds for the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce contamination from toxic chemicals through intensified research, regulatory control, and educational programs.

The Secretary of Agriculture will soon submit legislation to tighten control over the manufacture and use of agricultural chemicals, including licensing and factory inspection of manufacturers, clearly placing the burden of proof of safety on the proponent of the chemical rather than on the Government.

RESEARCH RESOURCES

Our needs for new knowledge and increasing application of existing knowledge demand a greater supply of trained manpower and research resources.

A National Center for Environmental Health Sciences is being planned as a focal point for health research in this field. In addition, the 1966 budget includes funds for the establishment of university institutes to conduct research and training in environmental pollution problems.

Legislation recommended in my message on health has been introduced to increase Federal support for specialized research facilities of a national or regional character. This proposal, aimed at health research needs generally, would assist in the solution of environmental health problems and I urge its passage.

We need legislation to provide to the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior authority for grants for research in environmental pollution control in their areas of responsibility. I have asked the Secretary of Interior to submit legislation to eliminate the ceiling on pesticide research.

OTHER EFFORTS

In addition to these needed actions, other proposals are undergoing active study.

I have directed the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, with the appropriate departments, to study the use of economic incentives as a technique to stimulate pollution prevention and abatement, and to recommend actions or legislation, if needed.

I have instructed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology to explore the adequacy of the present organization of pollution control and research activities.

I have also asked the Director of the Office of Science and Technology and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to recommend the best way in which the Federal Government may direct efforts toward advancing our scientific understanding of natural plant and animal communities and their interaction with man and his activities.

The actions and proposals recommended in this message will take us a long way toward immediate reversal of the increase of pollutants in our environment. They will also give us time until new basic knowledge and trained manpower provide opportunities for more dramatic gains in the future.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

I intend to call a White House Conference on Natural Beauty to meet in mid-May of this year. Its Chairman will be Mr. Laurance Rockefeller.

It is my hope that this Conference will produce new ideas and approaches for enhancing the beauty of America. Its scope will not be restricted to Federal action. It will look for ways to help and encourage State and local government, institutions, and private citizens in their own efforts. It can serve as a focal point for the large campaign of public education which is needed to alert Americans to the danger to their natural heritage and to the need for action.

In addition to other subjects which this Conference will consider, I recommend the following subjects for discussion in depth:

Automobile junkyards: I am convinced that analysis of the technology and economics can help produce a creative solution to this vexing problem. The Bureau of Mines of the Interior Department can contribute technical advice to the Conference, as can the scrap industry and the steel industry.

Underground installation of utility transmission lines. Further research is badly needed to enable us to cope with this problem.

The greatest single force that shapes the American landscape is private economic development. Our taxation policies should not penalize or discourage conservation and the preservation of beauty.

Ways in which the Federal Government can, through information and technical assistance, help communities and States in their own programs of natural beauty.

The possibilities of a national tree planting program carried on by government at every level, and private groups and citizens.

CONCLUSION

In my 33 years of public life I have seen the American system move to conserve the natural and human resources of our land.

TVA transformed an entire region that was depressed. The rural electrification cooperatives brought electricity to lighten the burdens of rural America. We have seen the forests replanted by the CCC's, and watched Gifford Pinchot's sustained yield concept take hold on forestlands.

It is true that we have often been careless with our natural bounty. At times we have paid a heavy price for this neglect. But once our people were aroused to the danger, we have acted to preserve our resources for the enrichment of our country and the enjoyment of future generations.

The beauty of our land is a natural resource. Its preservation is linked to the inner prosperity of the human spirit.

The tradition of our past is equal to today's threat to that beauty. Our land will be attractive tomorrow only if we organize for action and rebuild and reclaim the beauty we inherited. Our stewardship will be judged by the foresight with which we carry out these programs. We must rescue our cities and countryside from blight with the same purpose and vigor with which, in other areas, we moved to save the forests and the soil.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1965.*

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 79)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on national wilderness preservation. This message has been read in the House of Representatives; and, without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without reading, and appropriately referred.

The message was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The wonder of nature is the treasure of America.

What we have in woods and forest, valley and stream, in the gorges and the mountains and the hills, we must not destroy. The precious legacy of preservation of beauty will be our gift to posterity.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said a long time ago that "in the woods is perpetual youth. Within these plantations of God a decorum and sanctity reign, a perennial festival is dressed, and the guest sees not how he should tire of them in a thousand years. In the woods we return to reason and faith."

Emerson would have been cheered and comforted by the establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System. On September 3, 1964, when I signed that law it brought into being the preservation for our time and for all time to come 9 million acres of this vast continent in their original and unchanging beauty and wonder.

The new law designated 54 national forest areas—9.1 million acres—as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, with special provisions for certain restricted commercial uses for a limited period. Included were all the wilderness, wild and canoe areas previously established by the Department of Agriculture.

Thirty-four national forest primitive areas—5.5 million acres—will be reviewed over a 10-year period for possible addition to the system. Also to be reviewed are all roadless areas of 5,000 acres or more in the national park system, as well as all such areas and roadless islands, regardless of size, in the national wildlife refuges and game ranges. None of the areas to be reviewed may be added to the system except as provided for by subsequent acts of Congress.

Only in our country have such positive measures been taken to preserve the wilderness adequately for its scenic and spiritual wealth. In the new conservation of this century, our concern is with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not only man's material welfare but the dignity of man himself.

The Congress can justly be proud of the contribution of foresight and prudent planning expressed by this measure to perpetuate our rare and rich natural heritage. Generations of Americans to come will enjoy a finer and more meaningful life because of these actions taken in these times.

It is now my privilege to send to the Congress today a report which, in accordance with the terms of the act last year, details the beginnings of our progress on a long road of "reason and faith."

I am confident that it is a road worth the travel and a journey we shall be proud to have pioneered.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1965.*

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT ON CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION OF NATURAL BEAUTY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the President on conservation and restoration of natural beauty, when laid before the Senate for reference, be simultaneously referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works for their consideration of such subject matters contained in the message as fall within their respective jurisdictions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, today the President of the United States transmitted to Congress his message on natural beauty. I commend him for it as a timely and significant guideline for the preservation and wise utilization of our Nation's natural resources.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I assure the Senate and the President that my committee will act with dispatch on those matters which fall within our jurisdiction.

Today our Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation is holding hearings on the bill to preserve the Indiana Dunes as a national lakeshore. Tomorrow we will meet to report to the Senate other resource legislation which is a part of the President's natural resources program. We intend to implement the goals set by the President as expeditiously and prudently as possible.

I know his timely message will prove of great help and inspiration to Congress and to all Americans.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, President Johnson's message on natural beauty strikes a responsive chord in the minds of all citizens who are concerned with the quality of American life today and in the future. The beauty of our seashores, fields, rivers, cities, and mountains must receive our constant attention and interest if we are to continue to enjoy their blessings.

President Johnson's reference to the development of urban rivers, including his specific reference to the Hudson, is particularly timely. Congressman OTTINGER has introduced a bill to make the Hudson River a National Scenic Riverway, and I intend to introduce that bill, with some slight variations, in the Senate. The importance of this from a conservation point of view is underscored by the fact that it is the first urban river conservation bill to have been developed. The creation of recreation areas on the Hudson and the preservation of its great scenic beauty are goals well worth achieving. The President has, hopefully, given the impetus which this conservation effort needs to succeed.

President Johnson's comments on water pollution are also of particular concern to the citizens of New York and the other States on the upper east coast. States in the upper half of the east coast have been plagued with a severe drought for the last 2 years. During the summer of 1964 the Hudson Valley suffered the most severe drought in 35 years. This drought has caused major economic distress to the citizens of New York and other States in the area. This water shortage has inconvenienced many citizens. It has led to water rationing, loss of business revenues, construction of emergency water lines to tap additional water sources, and a rise in the cost of water treatment when more brackish sources of water are tapped. Although this shortage has been caused by an unusual drought, it has brought home to the citizens the dangers in the pollution of our existing water resources. New Yorkers realize that we can no longer tolerate the pollution of our water resources if we are to fill our present and future water requirements.

The distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] has long recognized the dangers of pollution of our water resources. He recently introduced, for the Committee on Public Works, S. 4, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution

Act, and under his able floor leadership the Senate enacted this bill on January 28, 1965. Passage of S. 4 is a significant step in the battle to abate the pollution of our streams, ponds, lakes, and rivers. The creation of a Federal Water Pollution Administration provides focus for strong Federal action in the field of water pollution abatement. The increase in the size of Federal grants available for construction of sewage treatment plants makes it possible to meet the needs of the smaller and medium sized communities. Yet Senator MUSKIE recognizes that S. 4 does not solve the problem of water pollution. He stated at the time of passage of S. 4 that his Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution would consider further legislation this spring to aid those communities where the Federal Government cannot meet its share of the cost of sewage treatment plants under existing legislation. He also stated that his subcommittee would consider whether the Federal Government is providing sufficient funds to fulfill the obligations recognized under the Federal Water Pollution Act.

New York recognized the dangers of water pollution and the need to beautify our waterways. New York has developed a comprehensive plan to clean up the water of the State, to make the water resources of the State useful for drinking, industry, and recreation. This program is estimated to cost $1.7 billion over a period of 6 years. This program will vitally affect the 17.7 million citizens of New York as well as the 27.2 million citizens of our neighboring States. New York State needs $85 million each year from the Federal Government, under the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Act, to implement this program. Yet the existing authorization and the requested appropriation for fiscal year 1966, under the terms of the Federal Water Pollution Act, is only $100 million and this appropriation must meet the needs of all 50 States. The small- and medium-sized communities in New York State are anxious to eliminate the pollution of their waters. Under the terms of the Federal Water Pollution Act they could receive 30 percent of the cost of sewage treatment plants. They will not receive this amount unless we increase the funds available to implement this act.

The citizens of New York are asking that Congress make a careful examination to determine how we are to meet the problem of water pollution. I have received letters and telegrams voicing their concern from the mayors and citizens of many villages, towns, and cities throughout New York State, from Elmira Heights, Fulton, Geneva, Massena, Maybrook, Medina, Mountour Falls, New York City, Potsdam, Rochester, Salamanca and Tarrytown-on-Hudson. I look forward to the hearings of Senator MUSKIE's Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. I know that with his able leadership, his subcommittee will make this examination and recommend legislation that will insure an ample supply of pure water for present and future generations.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I cannot imagine a more timely and significant message with a direct bearing on the lives of American people than the one sent to the Congress today by President Johnson.

The President said urbanization and population growth are depriving Americans of the right to live in decent surroundings. These problems must be solved with affirmative actions.

Today, we are a nation of 192 million persons. By 1975, we shall have a population of around 240 million. By the year 2000, our population will have grown to 350 million.

With living conditions already severely crowded, and with open space unavailable in many places, think what Americans in the future will have as their legacy unless we act now to guard against the tragic misuse of our resources.

The President has accurately described our situation. We are desecrating our open spaces, debilitating our health by polluting our air and water, and needlessly spoiling much of the natural beauty yet left for enjoyment.

As was pointed out in the President's message, we have been happy to take advantage of the benefits of modern technology, but have refused to accept full responsibility for controlling the byproducts of that technology.

Americans in the 1960's no longer can accept such an anomalous situation. To do so would mean that we would be unwilling to confront problems that earnestly deserve solution.

In addition to calling to our attention the seriousness of the problems, the President has given us a blueprint that will require "a new conservation" if the problems are to be solved.

This concept calls for America to deal with the total relation between man and all the facets of his everyday world. The President's proposals go beyond the basic idea of conserving, protecting, and developing our resources; they call for creativity, restoration, imagination, and innovation.

I am confident that a large majority of Americans want action by the Federal Government, States, cities, and private endeavor, to make our country a safer and more beautiful place in which to live.

> Association with beauty can enlarge man's imagination and revive his spirit—

The President stated—

> while ugliness can demean the people who live among it.

These are words to call to mind as we press forward with speed and diligence to attain the objectives outlined in the President's natural beauty message.

Our lives, our homes, our communities, and our Nation can be made more livable and attractive if we heed the words our President wisely gave us today.

I enthusiastically endorse the President's message. I sincerely hope the worthy objectives outlined in that communication will become keystones in a new era of creative conservation.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, President Johnson is writing new history and it is important history. He has today submitted to the Congress a message on natural beauty.

This is unprecedented. When before in the history of our Nation has any President sent to the Congress a message on natural beauty?

It is a great message. It is of particular delight to those of us who consider ourselves, and are, conservationists. It is a message of great import. It deserves careful reading by all Americans who will benefit by the carrying out of the directives of this message, and will likewise have a responsibility and share to see that the multiple purposes and programs it envisages are fulfilled.

It is an inspiring message. It sounds a needed warning that America the beautiful is in danger of not remaining so. The President lists a great number of the blights and blots that impair and imperil our Nation's great and priceless heritage of natural beauty.

He refers to automobile junkyards, to the pollution of our air and waters, to the daily litter of half a billion pounds of waste, junk, trash which is disgorged on our countryside.

The President points to the need of eliminating these problems, and on the positive side of clearing and cleaning our air and waters, of creating parks and open spaces in our cities, of beautifying the landscape along our highways. In this connection, President Johnson refers to the expiration next June of the existing program of outdoor advertising control, and announces that he will recommend sound legislation to insure effective control of billboards. Relative to this, I am happy to report pridefully that this problem does not exist in my State of Alaska.

Twenty years ago, Alaska—then a territory—took steps to prevent the uglification—if I may coin that word—of the magnificent scenery along our highways. The 1945 legislature, following my recommendation, enacted legislation to forbid billboards along our Alaska roads, and a subsequent legislature strengthened its provisions.

The President refers to his recommendation of a university extension program which will bring the resources of the university to these problems of the community. I applaud his call upon our institutes of higher learning to participate in these far-reaching, necessary, and highly commendable programs. Alaska has a land-grant college—now a university—the University of Alaska, near Fairbanks, the Alaska Methodist University at Anchorage, and the Sheldon Jackson Junior College at Sitka. These will all, I am confident, be more than willing to be enlisted.

Indeed, we now have under construction at the University of Alaska a laboratory designed to watch over and combat water pollution in the 49th State. Its building is suitably designed to fulfill these objectives. If furnished with adequate funds, it will carry out its assignment.

What is vital is that the President's inspiring presentation be implemented by adequate appropriations to carry out these Presidential prescriptions. Regrettably, there is some evidence that the current budget proposals may, to a considerable degree, nullify the proposed objectives. I trust that this may prove to be not the case. The President's high purposes, revealed in his message on natural beauty, are too important not to be carried out.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, today we are a Nation on wheels. Few of us stop to think how much our contemporary life depends on intricate systems of transportation. Our highways are a blessing and a source of pride. However, the President's message on natural beauty has emphasized some important points which we have been overlooking. We must make sure that roads themselves are not destructive of nature and natural beauty, and we must strive to make our highways serve as access to recreation and pleasure.

I think that every new Federal-aid highway constructed in the future should be required to include built-in natural beauty. We need rest stops, scenic overlooks, recreation turnouts, and planned picnicking and camping sites accessible to the traveling public.

We have been too unimaginative in our road planning and construction. With only fractional increases in costs, America's highways can be recreationways through the countryside.

The early planning stages of highways and roads must be accomplished with a new awareness of the meaning of beauty and recreation activity to Americans. Parks and recreation areas must not be violated simply because they are already in public ownership. Recreation and pleasant living along our transportation system must come to have new significance and increased meaning.

President Johnson's proposals deserve our full support.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the White House Conference on Natural Beauty announced for mid-May of this year under the chairmanship of Laurance Rockefeller will be the first ever convened by a President on this subject.

The President's selection of Mr. Rockefeller as Chairman is indeed felicitous. Mr. Rockefeller served with distinction for 2½ years as Chairman of the truly significant Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. That Commission's thoughtful recommendations, submitted to the President and the Congress in 1962, have led to natural resource legislation of landmark proportions. Many of the recommendations of this Commission foreshadowed legislative proposals designed to establish, preserve or maintain the natural beauty of this land of ours. We anticipate that Mr. Rockefeller's contribution as Chairman of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty will be no less important or long lasting in its importance than has been the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The purposes of the May White House Conference are broad: The President charged it with no less task than that of producing new ideas and approaches for enhancing the beauty of America. He gave it charter for suggesting needed Federal action and State, local, and private efforts as well. We join with the President in his hope that the White House Conference on Natural Beauty will serve as focal point for the large campaign of public education which is needed to alert Americans to the danger to their natural heritage and to the need for action.

Certainly the items proposed on the agenda for discussion will provide stimulating, provocative and even controversial discussion. Automobile junkyards, for example. The President asked for analysis of the technology and economics which could help produce a creative solution to the problem of the eyesores which these establishments often pose. He asked that the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior and the scrap and steel industries contribute technical advice. It would be hard to imagine any other problem whose solution would contribute more and faster to the Nation's natural beauty.

The President also suggested underground installation of utility transmission lines, a move which we can assume will gain automatic support from a myriad of sources, as a fitting topic for the White House Conference on Natural Beauty. With all due respect to the President, this is not a profound idea. Rather it is a simple, rational solution to a condition which has become so everpresent that our senses are dulled; we almost do not see the poles and the wires until we venture on a vista where they are not present and realize how much we appreciate the unimpaired view.

Tax policies which can provide incentives for natural beauty may well be the agenda "sleeper" at the Conference. Taxation policies which encourage, rather than penalize, efforts to preserve natural beauty are certainly overdue. All of us can cite cases of beautiful farms which gave way to residential, industrial, or other developments because tax rates of an encroaching urban world made maintenance of the farm economically impossible. Golf courses which provided needed open space amidst urban congestion often have undergone the same fate when taxed beyond their power to live economically.

These and other items, such as information and technical assistance programs to help keep communities and States aware of ideas which will help them in their programs of natural beauty, should make a stimulating session of the coming White House Conference.

EXTENSION OF LIFE OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The resolution (S. Res. 12) to extend the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1966, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Aging established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through January 31, 1966.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems of older people, including but not limited to, problems of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, of obtaining care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

Sec. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

Sec. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized (1) to employ on a temporary basis from Februray 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants as it deems advisable: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (2) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $213,000 from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1966.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 37) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Armed Services, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 3, line 2, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,600" and insert "$2,100"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Common defense generally;

(2) The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally;

(3) Soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(4) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(5) Selective service;

(6) Size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

(7) Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(8) Ammunition depots;

(9) Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(10) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(11) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense;

(12) Areonautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 59) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$141,000" and insert "$129,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by subsection 1(g)(2)(D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–380, approved by the President on September 24, 1959.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $129,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this subcommittee has been growing like Topsy. It started in 1962 with $40,000. It is now asking for $129,000.

What is the purpose of enlarging the work of the committee?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the first year's budget began in September of that year. It was not for a full year. The second year's operation was a projection of this first year's operation, largely on the basis of a full current year; and the budget we have now requested reflects the increase in the salaries referred to earlier.

The amount of the request as presented to the Senate was $141,000. Before appearing before the Committee on Rules and Administration with this resolution, I went over the budget again and reduced it another $12,000. The amendment by the Committee on Rules and Administration will reflect that reduction, so that the resolution, as amended, will involve $129,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. The subcommittee had formerly asked for $141,000?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is correct. I cut the $141,000 to $129,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice that the budget justifies an additional editorial director, $15,554; an assistant director, almost $10,000; and special counsel for the minority, $20,000.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Senate staff is the same as we have had. There are no additions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the committee hold hearings last year?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is correct. The committee held hearings on several pieces of legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I wrote under date of January 27, 1965, to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 27, 1965.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing a copy of Senate Resolution 59, authorizing the continuance of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, which I reported from the Committee on Government Operations on January 26. It has the unanimous approval of the committee.

Recognizing the concern of the Congress with keeping expenditures at an absolute minimum, I have made a careful, item-by-item, reexamination of the proposed $141,000 budget and have cut the figure $12,000. This was accomplished by reducing the proposed number of staff members from ten to nine, a saving of $5,144.36, and reducing the administrative budget by $6,855.64. Although it will place some restrictions on the subcommittee, I am confident that, with prudent planning, a budget of $129,000 will permit us to properly discharge our duties.

Acting on authority of Senate Resolution 280, 88th Congress, 2d session, agreed to on February 10, 1964, the subcommittee has this past year engaged in both legislative and research activities. The resolution authorized us "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relations between the United States and the States and municipalities," and to evaluate the proposals made by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES, 88TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

The subcommittee held hearings last January on S. 2114, introduced by me on September 4, 1963. This bill provided for "periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government," and implemented the Advisory Commission's June 1961 report entitled, "Periodic Congressional Reassessment of Federal Grants-in-Aid to State and Local Governments." Thirty-nine other Senators ultimately joined in sponsoring the measure, which, together with the accompanying report (S. Rept. 1056) was approved by the subcommittee and subsequently by the parent committee. On June 19, 1964, it passed the Senate unanimously, was favorably reported by the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, but no further action was taken by the House Committee on Government Operations.

On January 23, 1964, the Senate unanimously passed S. 855, which "sought to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal loans or grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such loans or grants." Although this measure failed to pass the House, the principle set forth in the bill was adopted last year by the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as a direct result of the Senate hearings on the legislation. The Division now requires that applications for construction grants for waste treatment works be accompanied by the comments and recommendations of the official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency, where such exists, within whose area the assistance is to be provided.

During the second session of the 88th Congress, the subcommittee continued its exploration of S. 815, a bill providing for the "adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands in the several States used for Federal purposes." This measure was introduced earlier by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN as an administration bill at the request of the Attorney General. Extensive hearings were held by the subcommittee in August 1963 and two executive sessions were subsequently held on this somewhat controversial measure during 1964, but no final action was taken.

The question of the future disposition of Ellis Island has been a continuing responsibility of the subcommittee since its creation. At my invitation, various interested Members of Congress and Federal administrators participated in a conference on the subject in

September 1963. This meeting prompted renewed Interior Department interest in the island and ultimately led to a recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior, contained in "A Study Report on Ellis Island," prepared by the National Park Service for the subcommittee in June 1964, calling for the conversion of Ellis Island to a national historic site, dedicated to public park and recreational uses. A majority of the subcommittee subsequently approved a report recommending that the Secretary proceed under the act entitled "An act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance," approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666–668; 16 U.S.C. 4461–4467), and designate Ellis Island as a national historic site. The report is now pending before the parent committee.

RESEARCH EFFORTS, 88TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

To promote its understanding of contemporary Federal-State-local relations and to provide background information for its legislative endeavors, the subcommittee engaged in three types of research undertakings during the second session. These included (1) further efforts to gauge the attitudes and views of responsible officials at all levels of government and of other informed persons on crucial intergovernmental relations issues; (2) diverse ways of assessing the impact of urbanization on the traditional pattern of federalism; and (3) initial attempts to ascertain the role and effect of Federal grants-in-aid on contemporary intergovernmental relations.

In the first area of investigation, the staff went beyond its earlier study of "The Federal System as Seen by State and Local Officials," and prepared a second intergovernmental relations questionnaire which was distributed in March 1964 to Federal departments and agencies handling grant-in-aid programs. We are now in the process of analyzing responses to this inquiry and of preparing a study report.

As part of its continuing concern with the impact of urban area problems on the Federal system, the subcommittee issued a report in April 1964 on the nature and extent of urban research conducted under Federal auspices, prepared at our request by the Bureau of the Budget. This survey suggested that a more systematic and coordinated consideration of urban problems could be gained if there were a continuing inventory of urban research projects. In line with this suggestion, I corresponded with Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, pointing out that no one agency was responsible for cataloging Federal research projects and stressing the need for such an arrangement. As a result, the Science Information Exchange now includes urban research as a categorical sector in its holdings. This innovation, stemming from the subcommittee report, will help assure that projects are not duplicated and that similar or related research efforts are permanently recorded for use by interested individuals and agencies.

Indicative of the subcommittee's perennial concern for more effective coordination of joint Federal-local projects was the issuance in May 1964 of the Advisory Commission survey entitled "Impact of Federal Urban Development Programs on Local Government Organization and Planning." A few weeks later, pursuant to a July 1963 contract with the Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, the subcommittee distributed an expert analysis of the present condition of metropolitan planning in America. This study discusses many aspects of S. 855, as well as the more general problems relating to orderly metropolitan development. As its final urban research effort in the 88th Congress, and in response to numerous requests, the staff prepared and distributed in August 1964 a select bibliography entitled "Metropolitan America."

In an attempt to define the scope of its third field of research interest and to assist State and local officials, last year we distributed a "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments," prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This publication covers all forms of Federal aid in effect as of April 1, 1964. More than 40,000 copies were distributed, on request, to Members of Congress and to State and local officials.

The publications cited have greatly assisted us in our legislative deliberations, and there is considerable evidence that officials at all levels have found these research efforts of value.

LEGISLATIVE AGENDA, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Present plans and indications suggest a busy schedule for the subcommittee during the first session. A paramount legislative concern will be S. 561, the proposed "Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965" which I introduced on January 15 last. This measure is, I hope, the first of an annual series of measures designed to keep our Federal system abreast of rapidly changing times. The omnibus bill includes five titles:

Title I: Improved Administration of Grants-in-Aid to the States.

Title II: Periodic Congressional Review of Federal Grants-in-Aid to States and to Local Units of Government (a modification of S. 2114, 88th Cong.).

Title III: Permitting Federal Departments and Agencies To Provide Specialized or Technical Service to States and to Local Units of Government.

Title IV: Coordinated Intergovernmental Policy and Administration of Grants for Urban Development (contains S. 855, 88th Cong.).

Title V: Acquisition, Use, and Disposition of Land Within Urban Areas by Federal Agencies in Conformity With Land Utilization Programs of Affected Local Governments.

Most of the provisions of this complex bill grew out of studies of the subcommittee and recommendations by the Advisory Commission. This legislation will require extensive hearings and numerous executive sessions. As of this date, 33 other Senators have joined in cosponsoring the measure. Other proposed intergovernmental relations legislation, probably including another version of the adjustment of legislative jurisdiction measure, doubtless will be referred to us.

RESEARCH PROJECTS, 89TH CONG., 1ST SESS.

To supplement these legislative activities, the staff will continue its efforts in the realm of research and information, including (1) a broad-scale investigation of the record and the future role of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; (2) intensive efforts to gage the effects, and especially the economic impact, of Federal grants-in-aid on the States and their localities; and (3) a further probe of the views of responsible officials at all governmental levels on crucial intergovernmental relations questions.

Under the first, our subcommittee will join the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee this spring to sponsor joint hearings on the actual operations and record of the Advisory Commission's first 5 years. It is my hope that these proceedings will highlight the Commission's accomplishments as well as its shortcomings; moreover, since next year will mark the 10th anniversary of the submission to Congress of the final report of the U.S. Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (known as the Kestnbaum Commission, 1953–55), these hearings will, I hope, attempt to assess intergovernmental developments since 1935 and suggest the future course of American federalism. Present and past Commission members, in addition to numerous experts in the field of intergovernmental relations, will be among the witnesses.

As part of its continuing survey of the impact of Federal grants-in-aid on the Federal system, the subcommittee will sponsor at least four major undertakings during the coming year.

First, a supplement to our earlier "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments," is being prepared to cover those programs enacted by the 88th Congress after April 1, 1964.

Second, I have directed the staff to analyze the economic impact of Federal expenditures as that impact is distributed throughout the United States. The analysis is to determine the effects of Federal spending upon economic development within the States, in terms of population and personal income. The results will be invaluable as the basis for policy discussions on the role of grants as a part of total Federal expenditures.

Third, the staff will identify those States which undermatch—in other words, fail to spend enough of their own resources to get their full share of Federal grant funds in some programs. The amount of undermatching will be analyzed to assess the reasons for undermatching and to determine the impact of the equalization provisions in Federal legislation on State participation in these programs.

Fourth, to gage more properly the impact of Federal grants-in-aid on the structure and functions of State government, the subcommittee will schedule at least two field hearings during the coming year. This subject has not been explored in any great detail since the original Kestnbaum report of 1955.

Finally, in an attempt to further explore the effect of changes in our Federal system on Federal executive attitudes, the staff will continue to process the second questionnaire previously referred to. The final results of this survey of Federal administrative views will be published as a committee print some time this spring.

In order to achieve the purposes set forth in the attached resolution, an appropriation in the sum of $129,000 is requested.

Sincerely yours,

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this letter covers the activities of the committee in some detail. We held hearings last year in several areas of concern of some of the legislation that we dealt with in hearings, including S. 855, a bill to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal loans or grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such loans or grants. The Senate unanimously passed that bill on January 23, 1964.

The subcommittee also held hearings on S. 2114, a bill to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government. This bill was enacted unanimously by the Senate on June 19, 1964.

The subcommittee also held hearings on S. 815, a bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative juridiction exercised by the United States over lands in the several States used for Federal purposes.

This is a bill which the Senate passed twice before. Hearings had never been held previously. Last year, we held hearings in the hope that we could build a basis for favorable action, not only by the Senate, but also eventually by the House. We shall take that bill up again this year in the hope that we can retrocede legislative jurisdiction of these Federal enclaves to the States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is the committee doing anything in the field of having the States and the local governments carry more of a burden than they are now carrying, instead of letting Uncle Sam do all the work?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Louisiana will be interested in two studies that we are to undertake this year, which may be helpful in that connection.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be a fertile field.

Mr. MUSKIE. I agree. One of the responsibilities of the subcommittee is to investigate the possibilities of readjusting the responsibilities of the several levels of the Government. We have been working in this field with the advisory commission on intergovernmental relations. Much of the work of that commission and the work of the subcommittee has been directed toward making suggestions helpful to the local State and Federal Government in picking up a lot of the responsibilities.

One of the studies we want to undertake this year is to identify States which undermatch Federal funds and ascertain why they do not take advantage of Federal programs and why they undermatch funds under Federal programs, in the hope we can find answers for readjusting responsibilities for matching formulas applicable under various programs.

I invite the Senator's attention to a measure which was passed last year, which provided for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States which could have the salutary effects the Senator from Louisiana mentioned. That is included in an omnibus bill which has five titles.

Title I is designed to improve administration of grants-in-aid to the States.

Title II provides for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government—to which I have just referred.

The third title permits Federal departments and agencies to provide specialized or technical service to States and to local units of government on a reimbursable basis.

Title IV provides for coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration.

Title V provides for acquisition, use, and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies in conformity with land utilization programs of affected local governments.

What we are trying to do through this Intergovernmental Cooperation Act is relate a dynamic Federal system to the other two levels of government. It is important that all three levels of government discharge their responsibilities adequately. Perhaps if the lower two levels were doing so there would be less reason for the upper, or Federal, level to enter into these activities.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that much of that work could have application to bills we have already passed. Let us consider the Appalachia bill which the Senate just passed. In that bill we provided for assistance to States that are well able to take care of conditions that prevail there. The State of Virginia and the State of North Carolina, for example, are both wealthy States. I am confident they could take care of the little pockets of difficulty that exist in various areas of their States. I can well understand that States like West Virginia, which was dependent almost entirely on coal in many of its areas, pose special problems, and that necessarily there may be a need for a certain amount of assistance based on need. But we should not pass a bill to give aid to all of them, as will be the case under the Appalachia bill and many other bills the Senate has enacted. If the Government would give aid more on the basis of need, it might save the Federal Government many millions of dollars.

Mr. MUSKIE. Two of the pieces of legislation I have referred to might be helpful in dealing with the very problem the Senator from Louisiana has referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 59), as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 57) to study certain aspects of national security and international operation, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 21, after the word "for", to strike out "appointment;" and insert "appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee;"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills;

(3) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relationships between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(4) legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods, processes, and relationships.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 42) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$91,071.19" and insert "$91,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its activities and findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $91,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 46) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$431,119.14" and insert "$431,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $431,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice that as of June 30 of last year the number of employees was 25. I understand the number of positions will be increased to 28.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have no plans to increase the number of employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the justification indicates. If the Senator has no such plans, I shall not ask any further questions.

Mr. EASTLAND. The fact is that the committee has fewer employees than it had a year ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last June the committee had 25 employees. The present resolution increases the number to 28. That is what I want to ask the Senator about.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, if we decide that we need 28 employees, we shall employ the extra 3. I have no intention at this time to increase the number of employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the committee held many hearings during the past year?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. It has held hearings several times a week. It is broken down into work teams, and it has two or three teams working at the same time. It is one of the hardest working committees in the Senate.

Mr. President, the amount approved by the Committee on Rules for the work of the Subcommittee on Internal Security for the year just starting is $431,000. This is an increase of $71,000 above the amount authorized for the work of the subcommittee last year. But the budget of the subcommittee for the new year does not include any additional positions and the amount provided for operating expenses is the same amount made available last year. The increases in salaries reflected in the new budget are those provided for in the pay raise bill which became effective last July. Other increases represent the amounts needed for agency contributions to health insurance, the retirement fund, and the group life insurance program, under the new law.

Last year, after the pay raise bill had been passed, the Internal Security Subcommittee requested an additional $26,600 to take care of the pay raises which that law provided. This request was approved by the Committee on Rules and was approved by the Senate, but later was reconsidered on motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and so these extra funds did not become available. When it became apparent we would not have this extra money, everything that could be done to economize was done. We cancelled all plans for hearings outside of Washington, and we did not call into Washington for hearing any witnesses who would have had to have been paid witness fees. We put a freeze on filling any job vacancies. One staff member was placed on leave-without-pay status and loaned to another subcommittee.

As a result of all the economizing we were able to do, the subcommittee managed to finish out the year with a surplus of about $29,000. But the work of the subcommittee suffered in the making of these economies, and the program of hearings outside Washington which should have been held last year, but had to be postponed, are now being scheduled for late spring of this year, and thereafter. Also, if the committee is to perform its work properly, the vacancies in positions presently budgeted must be filled.

As many Senators know, the subcommittee has been holding hearings for the past 2 years in executive session as part of an intensive investigation of security in the Department of State. This series of hearings is virtually completed, we have more than 1½ million words of testimony, not counting exhibits, and the subcommittee has authorized the release of this testimony. A very substantial part of the burden of staff work for some months ahead will be the proper correlation and coordination of this testimony and its preparation for release. I feel sure that all Senators will want to cooperate in helping the committee get this job done as speedily as possible.

I hold in my hand the publications issued by the Internal Security Subcommittee during the year which ended January 31, 1965. I will not bother Senators with naming all these publications, unless that is requested. A full set of these publications and a list of them has been furnished to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

As my colleagues know, it is usually unwise to announce prospective hearings of an investigating committee too far in advance. I therefore ask my colleagues to be satisfied with my assurance that the Internal Security Subcommittee has projects laid out for the year ahead which are of substantial importance to the internal security of this country, and some of which will have to be abandoned if the amount approved by the Rules Committee as operating expenses for the Internal Security Subcommittee for the new fiscal year should be reduced.

I think it will be possible to turn back at least a little of this total at the end of the year; but because I am determined that this subcommittee shall never exceed its authorization, if the amount authorized is reduced I shall feel it necessary to make economies which will insure operations within the reduced amount, and I will say frankly that I do not know how this could be done for the year ahead without seriously hampering the work and the program of the subcommittee.

Therefore I ask the Senate to approve this resolution as reported from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that 12 reports were made by the committee, and that many of them originated from the Library of Congress. Others are simply printed transcripts from hearings. How are they handled in the subcommittee? Is it done by the editorial staff? There is a breakdown in that division which shows that the committee is spending $122,000 for an editorial director, research director, research assistant, assistant research director, research analyst, and two investigation analysts.

Am I to understand that the positions I have just mentioned are filled with personnel who obtain the studies from the Library of Congress, look them over, and prepare them for publication?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF THE STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 50) to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$33,000" and insert "$40,500"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $40,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 11) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Public Works, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment on page 2, line 11, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,600" and insert "$2,100"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, air pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development and economic growth.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 76), to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as to this committee, I notice that it has in its employ quite a number of lawyers. I notice that a $25,000 item has been set aside to hire the firm of Pike & Fisher of Washington on a contract, to modernize title 46 of the United States Code relating to the merchant marine, Coast Guard, customs, and admiralty.

I am wondering why it is necessary to employ a firm of lawyers to make this investigation when the committee seems to be well supplied with lawyers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a compilation and consolidation of the several statutes relating to the merchant marine is long overdue. The laws are scattered throughout the revised code, statutes at large and some are only available on tearsheets. They date back as far as 1798. It has long been the opinion of the Committee on Commerce that a consolidation would pay large dividends in saved research and lawyer's time. After attempting a variety of ways of achieving the consolidation, we have come to the belief that it can best and most economically be done by retaining professionals in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but the question I asked was why, inasmuch as the committee has so many lawyers on its staff, should it pay a fee of $25,000 to a law firm in Washington to do work which I believe could be done by lawyers already in the employ of the committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the reason why is that in the long run it would save money; otherwise, it would be necessary to employ additional legal staff on the committee itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the committee is asking for 29 positions, many of them lawyers. I believe the committee has a few lawyers on its regular committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true, but I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that this is a full committee with a multiplicity of duties, and it is asking for less money than some subcommittees do, which the Senator has brought to the attention of the Senate, and which the Senate has approved today.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee is asking for $442,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is not a small sum. It is quite a large sum. That is in addition to the $168,000 that goes to that committee yearly under the Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator knows that this committee has many responsibilities. Let me read one short paragraph from a 45-page letter the chairman of the committee the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] sent to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. It reads as follows:

> In its capacity as overseer of the great regulatory agencies, the committee must be alert to the consumer or merchant seeking protection against predatory practices or the businessmen afflicted by the arbitrary action of "big government." The Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board—each derives its legislative mandate through this committee, each is subject to continuing scrutiny by this committee, and each member must come before this committee, when nominated, to make certain that he will carry out the responsibilities of his office as Congress had directed. Hearings on such major nominations provide an excellent forum for close review of current agency policies and practices.

I am sure that the Senator knows of the great responsibilities which this committee bears. It seems to me that is is doing reasonably well within the confines of the amount requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;

(2) foreign commerce generally;

(3) maritime matters;

(4) interoceanic canals;

(5) transportation policy;

(6) domestic surface transportation, including piplines;

(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;

(8) Federal power matters;

(9) civil aeronautics;

(10) fisheries and wildlife;

(11) marine sciences; and

(12) Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $442,700, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

IMMIGRATION REFORM NEEDED NOW

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the second sentence of the Declaration of Independence contains the following words, "All men are created equal."

These five words say more about the principles behind the founding and growth of this great country of ours than any other five in the English language. These few words explain our insistence on justice for all; these few words are in the definition of freedom. Because of these words, great people from the world over have come to the United States and helped to make our greatness a lasting thing. Through wars, both civil and foreign, through peace, both firm and shaky, these few words have endured as our guiding light.

For the past 44 years, we have told people in many nations that we no longer practice what we preach; that we no longer believe in the words of our Declaration of Independence; that we have, in fact, betrayed the principles that have made this country the greatest in the world. We have been saying, in effect, that if we were born in northern and western Europe we are more equal than someone born in southern and eastern Europe; but if we were born in southeastern Europe we are, nevertheless, more equal than those born in Asia or Africa. This could not be further from the truth, and I believe that the time has come to reconcile our actions with our beliefs. It is time we take a serious look at our immigration policies and once and for all put an end to the discriminatory practices we have employed since 1921.

We are very fortunate to have before us a bill that will help to do exactly that. The bill, S. 500, was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. It is similar to the legislation urged by the late President Kennedy and given priority by President Johnson. In general, this piece of proposed legislation will do away with discrimination against applications for immigration visas on the grounds of national origin.

While the bill does not open the gates to all aliens applying for immigration, it does so drastically modify the present immigration regulations so as to do away with the injustice and waste created by our present regulations. While the present national quota on immigration of 158,361 will only be increased by less than 7,000, far more people will enter the United States, new citizens who can be of great service to the country.

The bill will take the total number of quota numbers and divide them into three classifications. The first classification will consist of 50 percent of the numbers. Persons falling into this classification will be those who in the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States will be "especially advantageous" to the country.

The second classification will be 30 percent of the total quota numbers and will be issued to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens who are not eligible for nonquota preference because they are over 21 years of age.

The third classification will consist of the remaining 20 percent of the quota numbers, with preference issued to spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of aliens admitted to this country for permanent residence; and, finally, to other miscellaneous applications for immigration.

There are two good aspects of the bill that are definitely worthy of mention. Under the proposed reforms, every country is limited to 10 percent of the quota numbers in each classification. If, after 10 months of the year, it is apparent that all the numbers in a given classification will not be used in the year, the 10-percent ban can be lifted to allow the full use of the quotas allocated. There is a great deal of wisdom in such a proposal. All too often, the quota numbers given an individual country under the present system are unused, but the visa applications in another country may far outnumber the quota numbers available. Under the proposed system, surplus quota numbers can be shifted to another country to meet particular demands, thus making it possible for deserving individuals to immigrate to the United States when otherwise they would be unable to do so. The 10-percent ban also prevents one country from monopolizing the quota numbers to the exclusion of other countries.

Under the proposed system, citizens from all countries would have equal opportunity to immigrate to this country regardless of the geographical location of their country. It seems to me that this system is only fair and right and is in keeping with the American tradition.

The other stipulation that makes S. 500 an outstanding bill is the clause that permits unused quota numbers in one classification to be transferred for use in the next lower classification. Again we see a provision that will eliminate the waste of quota numbers that exists under our present laws and makes the structure of the quota regulations far more flexible.

In summation, the administration bill will make it far more possible for highly qualified foreign citizens to immigrate to the United States, do away with our present discriminatory practices, and assure the fullest use of the quota numbers available. In addition, the refugee reform provisions in the bill will make it easier for people who are fleeing from tyranny to be welcomed to the United States as refugees.

All of us in the Senate have sponsored private bills for individuals wishing to immigrate to the United States and are fully aware of the great inequities of our present immigration laws. We are fully cognizant of the heartache and dashed hopes that surround most immigration cases with which we must deal. With full knowledge of the present inadequacies, I say the time has come to act.

The bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] will help to eliminate the hypocrisy of our position and let the world know that the United States is a country settled by immigrants, brought to greatness by immigrants, and is still a country that welcomes immigrants regardless of their national origin. Let us again say with pride, "all men are created equal."

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 500, I urge every Member of this body to give the bill his most careful consideration and join me in helping to pass this urgently needed legislation.

MATERIALS RESERVE AND STOCKPILE ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 28, which was reported today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 28) to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on this bill today, but it will be the pending business as soon as the morning hour is completed tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the tragic events in Vietnam over the weekend should give all Americans reason to pause and call for a reassessment of our position in South Vietnam.

It is, of course, difficult to have such reassessment until all the facts concerning the latest events have been made known. Hopefully they will, although judging by past experience on the manner in which the news from South Vietnam has been managed, it is doubtful whether the American public will be made privy to the full details of what is actually transpiring in Vietnam.

The past management of the news from Vietnam is well set out in a very comprehensive article by James A. Wechsler in the Progressive for February 1965 entitled "Vietnam: A Study in Deception."

Mr. Wechsler's judgment is:

> But whatever place the Vietnam involvement may occupy in our military annals, it has already become a classic case history in the uses—and misuses—of Government deception to sustain a course that deserved the fullest national awareness and debate.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wechsler's excellent article be printed in full in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, much of the news thus far released from South Vietnam, the Pentagon, and the White House raises many more questions than it answers.

The reasons for the tragic loss of American men killed and wounded in the Vietcong attack on Pleiku cannot be glossed over by Secretary McNamara saying:

> The fact is that the attack was carried out in the dead of night; it was a sneak attack. It's typical of guerrilla operations. It's the kind of attack that it's almost impossible to provide effective security against. I think it's the type of attack we must expect more of in this type of war.

The facts as published to date indicate a deplorable lack of effective security precautions. We are engaged in a war in South Vietnam—an undeclared war, to be sure—but a war in any event. The rules of war do not limit the fighting to the daylight hours between the hours of 9 to 5. Nor do the rules of the war require that the enemy give us a certain number of hours advance notice before attacking. That is true whether it is a conventional war or a guerrilla war. Secretary McNamara cannot gloss over the lack of security at Pleiku by attributing our losses to a "sneak" attack which we must expect because we are fighting a guerrilla war. Indeed Secretary McNamara's "sneak attack" characterization may well deserve the award of the silliest statement of the year, if not in the whole history of statements from the Pentagon. The warriors there well know that surprise is an essential concomitant of military action in war.

Apparently we have learned little about security since the destructive attack on the Bien Hoa airbase 2 months ago.

The time is long past due for a full scale inquiry into security precautions and the lack of them in South Vietnam. The people of the United States have a right to know why security precautions have been so lax as to permit hostile troops to come right into our compound and destroy our airplanes and kill and wound our men.

Another point deserving explanation is the oversimplification of the problem by Secretary McNamara in his news conference yesterday. The distinct impression was given that a group of North Vietnamese soldiers crept down the Ho Chi Minh trail in the dead of night, went through our defenses, killed and wounded our men, destroyed our airplanes, and returned to North Vietnam unscathed. With such a simple explanation, it then becomes easy to say that, tit for tat, we attacked North Vietnamese bases in southern North Vietnam. But things are not quite that simple, judging from later reports. Was this entirely a North Vietnamese raid—where were the Vietcong, whose supposedly friendly villages were used as the staging area for the attack? Was this entirely a North Vietnamese raid or was it the usual Vietcong raid, as at Bien Hoa, which again caught us with our britches down?

The basic fact remains that we have no business in South Vietnam. We cannot "advise" a war weary people such as the South Vietnamese how to fight when they have no desire to fight.

Let us suppose that we do escalate the war in South Vietnam by destroying all of North Vietnam and subjugating its people. We would still be left with South Vietnam where a civil war would still continue to rage. If then we militarily subjugated all of South Vietnam, where would the United States be? We would have two colonies, ruled by military might far into the future, with the hatred of the peoples of both colonies against the United States growing stronger by the day—and a ghastly necrology of young American lives lost and a staggering financial cost which will totally undo all of President Johnson's economy efforts.

We cannot instill love and respect and support in the people of South Vietnam for their government in Saigon by brute, military force.

I have said before and I say again: the war in South Vietnam should be brought to the conference table and the sooner that is done the better will be the U.S. stature not only in South Vietnam but in the entire free world.

The New York Times, this morning, said in its lead editorial:

> Each incident like Pleiku, each political crisis, each month that passes, increases the danger to us to southeast Asia and to the world. The strike at North Vietnam was understandable and justifiable as a tactical response in a war situation. It was not a substitute for a policy. There was an exchange of blows which left the Vietnamese situation in status quo. What the Johnson administration now has to explain is where we go from here.

The observations in the New York Times editorial were most cogent and I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial from today's New York Times be inserted in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There is also an interesting article in the New York Times this morning by Charles Mohr entitled "Questions on Air Strike—Explanations of Events Behind Action Leave a Number of Points Unresolved." Mr. Mohr raises questions about what happened in South Vietnam which the American people have a right to have answered. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mohr's article also be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 2.)

Exhibit 1

[From the Progressive, February 1965]

Vietnam: A Study in Deception

(By James A. Wechsler)

Diplomats and historians will one day offer their considered assessment of the war in Vietnam and the role of the United States in that conflict. The verdict, like so many postmortems, will hinge in large measure on how the story ends, and in the early days of January 1965, when these lines are written, the fog of uncertainty remains thick. If, for example, the conflict should terminate with the beginning of broad negotiations for an Asian detente and the initiation of meaningful discourse between Washington and Peiping, the American policymakers may emerge with larger distinction than now seems likely; it may well be argued in retrospect that only prolongation of the long, desperate stalemate paved the way for such an outcome. Other, far more ominous alternatives still confront us, including, of course, the most awesome peril that we will stumble into large-scale collision with Red China on this bleak terrain—surely the most intolerable example of "the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time."

But whatever place the Vietnam involvement may occupy in our military annals, it has already become a classic case-history in the uses—and misuses—of Government deception to sustain a course that deserved the fullest national awareness and debate. In fact, from Saigon to Washington, there has been a war within a war—a conflict between a small, gallant band of journalists who conceived it their first function to tell the country the truth, and certain elder statesmen of the press who had voluntarily assumed the role of advance men for influential voices in the Pentagon and the State Department.

If much of the country has suffered a sense of bewilderment and frustration over the Vietnam deadlock, it is not merely because our "illusion of omnipotence" has been shattered anew. It is because we have been subjected to an almost unsurpassed compound of misinformation and wishful thinking. This was not always the product of diabolical deceit; there have no doubt been many moments when some of the sources of befuddlement were merely articulating their own confusion or ignorance.

But the total effect has been scandalous. I do not happen to be one of those who lightly raise the cry of "managed news"; 2 years ago, in this magazine, I defended President Kennedy's resort to concealment in certain crucial hours preceding the Cuban confrontation. At the same time I also wrote that much of the press too often achieved maximum indignation over marginal issues and that it had been singularly lacking in outrage over the fashion in which the more diligent U.S. correspondents were being pushed around in South Vietnam. There has been mounting documentation of that story in the ensuing period; it is part of a larger saga of suppression and distortion in which eminent Americans have been no less guilty than Mme. Nhu and the minor Machiavellis who succeded her.

Reference to a most recent episode may be a proper prelude. On December 28, at a moment of new turmoil in the Saigon regime, two large New York newspapers (and no doubt many others throughout the Nation) carried almost identical headlines: "Great victory in South Vietnam." The phrase "great victory" was exactly the one jointly employed by United States and Vietnamese officials in describing the capture of a Vietcong headquarters and the killing of some 90 of the Communist troops. The ordinary citizen, unless he had been rendered cynical by a surfeit of similar great victories prematurely heralded, was clearly being invited to believe that the tide had turned dramatically.

Exactly 1 week after this inflated depiction of a small success came the dismal anticlimax. From Burgh Gia the United Press International reported that "a major defeat for the South Vietnamese Government's forces became apparent today as fighting subsided here after 6 days." 'Twas indeed a famous victory that preceded this debacle.

Yet on the same day that this gloomy acknowledgment arrived, Secretary of State Dean Rusk blandly announced on television that he remained serenely confident of the ultimate victory of the Vietnamese without any expansion of the conflict.

Meanwhile, President Johnson has on at least two occasions during this recent period of agonized paralysis chided the press for "speculation" about the possibility of expanding the war. I am entirely convinced that Mr. Johnson has resisted such proposals; but any newspaperman over 21 knows these stories were planted by men within his own administration—in the Pentagon and elsewhere—who have been pressing for such action, and who believed the publication of such dispatches might somehow force the President's hand. The existence of such a cabal should hardly be suppressed, or dismissed as journalistic fantasy.

In miniature these episodes were, one might say, the story of the war as it has been officially presented to the Nation: small triumphs, sharp reversals, and, most of all, sugary reassurances.

Thus, on April 6, 1962, Gen. Paul D. Harkins, chief of the U.S. military command in Saigon, was cheerfully observing that "Premier Ngo Dinh Diem has adopted two concepts of major importance in the struggle against the Communist guerrillas." The general said "the Vietnamese forces have seized the initiative" and that the Vietcong, having been rebuffed in "large attacks," had reverted to small units.

Early in July of the same year an Associated Press dispatch from Fort Leavenworth, Kans., based on interviews with U.S. officers recently returned from Vietnam, said they found military operations in South Vietnam "confused and ineffective."

This somber report evoked instant counterfire. Gen. George H. Decker, U.S. Army Chief of Staff, said such opinion did not "accurately reflect the opinions of responsible Army authorities in Washington or in the field." Simultaneously, according to an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, "Dean Rusk, in a TV interview, also denied that the Vietnam war was going badly."

On July 24, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, returning from a Pacific conference, said he was "encouraged over the progress of affairs in South Vietnam" but conceded that the struggle there might last "4 years." He said the South Vietnamese are "beginning to hit the Vietcong where it hurts most—in winning the people to the side of the Government," and added: "Our military assistance to Vietnam is paying off."

Now we arrive at May 1963. The Vietcong legions have stepped up their attacks. Senators Barry Goldwater and STUART SYMINGTON have joined in a call for U.S. air strikes against North Vietnam. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD (who has remained steadfastly sober throughout the Vietnam madness, and was one of the first to urge efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement) warns that such action would invite a larger version of Korea "paid for primarily with American lives."

Meanwhile, according to a dispatch to the New York Herald Tribune, "experts at the State and Defense Departments said the Vietcong were engaged in a desperate effort to recapture the initiative * * *."

In September occurred the painful Sylvester affair. Arthur Sylvester, formerly an able Washington correspondent and now Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of public relations, had accompanied McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor on a tour of inspection to Saigon. Within 24 hours of their arrival, Sylvester told correspondents that the war was "going well" and that the moment was "rapidly approaching where goals set will be reached relatively shortly." But not many days earlier President Kennedy had voiced concern that the war was being undermined by internal strife in the Diem regime. Moreover, correspondents on the scene presented statistics to Sylvester which disclosed that during the first half of 1963 there had been a decline in guerrilla casualties and loss of weapons and a corresponding increase in Government casualties.

Sylvester, a conscientious, thoughtful man who has had the unenviable mission of trying to speak coherently amid all the conflicting clamor, finally conceded that his previously optimistic briefings might have "tended to throw things out of focus." He said they were apparently viewed as "tending to suggest I was trying to plaster things over with a pretty look." In fact, he declared, he had merely been reporting what General Harkins had told McNamara.

By autumn of 1963 it became clear that all the effort invested in saving the face of the Diem regime had been a futile endeavor. Madame Nhu's frenetic attack on "U.S. junior officers" helped to hasten the day of the Diems' overthrow. By November, the coup d'etat—plainly promoted by Washington—had occurred.

In the aftermath of the coup, Max Frankel reported in the New York Times that the administration anticipated "greater progress in the war against the Communist guerrillas." He added:

"Administration leaders are confident that a new civilian government could quickly restore order in Saigon and turn its attentions back to the war effort. They believe the ouster of President Ngo Dinh Diem, of his brother and principal political adviser, Ngo Dinh Nhu, and of only a few of their principal adherents will bring an end to internal repression and recurrent political turmoil."

Gen. Dvong Van Minh, the new military ruler of South Vietnam, exuded positive thinking.

"We made this coup to win the war," he proclaimed in an interview. "We realize that the Diem regime had lost the confidence of the population, and you cannot win a war without the support of the population."

New songs of hope officially emanated from Saigon and Washington. In this as in other matters, there was essential continuity between the Kennedy and the Johnson administrations.

As 1963 drew to an end, General Harkins was reiterating his confidence that, by the end of 1965, the United States would be able to pull out most of its own forces and permit the Vietnamese to finish the mop-up operation. Defense Secretary McNamara had been persuaded to embrace Harkins' wistful forecast.

As usual there were contradictory sounds. Even as Harkins was reaffirming his prophesy, a Washington dispatch to the New York Times reported that "officials at the State Department are less inclined than in the past to place optimistic interpretations on day-by-day combat reports."

One year later, at the close of 1964, the cycle was sadly completed. After another year of feverish fluctuation in the statements of public officials and Vietnamese generals, a new coup had in effect taken place; the military had wiped out any semblance of constitutional rule and the United States found itself in the awkward position of imploring a restoration of the fragile status quo.

This bare outline of history is recited because is provides the essential background against which the journalistic war must be weighed.

The truth is that, almost from the moment of the U.S. commitment to defend South Vietnam, dedicated, responsible newspapermen began striving to break through the curtain of oversimplification. Those who did so quickly became the targets of Madame Nhu and her entourage; they also found themselves embroiled with U.S. officialdom and, in some cases, with their home offices and some of the pillars of the fourth estate.

The first clear portent was the ouster of Francois Sully of Newsweek. A veteran southeast Asia observer, he was guilty of lack of reverence for Mme. Nhu. Soon thereafter came the exiling of James Robinson of the National Broadcasting Co., for comparable heresy. Both episodes stirred far too little notice in the country.

They were not isolated incidents; they were symptomatic of an underlying tension between inquisitive newsmen and the Saigon Establishment (Vietnamese and American). David Halberstam, of the New York Times, writing recently in the magazine Commentary, summed it up this way:

"The job of reporters in Vietnam was to report the news, whether or not the news was good for America.

"To the ambassadors and generals, on the other hand, it was crucial that the news be good, and they regarded any other interpretation as defeatist and irresponsible."

Halberstam himself soon became a "controversial figure." He was one of the younger journalists who refused to accept the official versions; he was dismayed by the stream of military and political dignitaries who junketed to the area, went on conducted tours, and returned to the United States proclaiming that victory was on the horizon. Correspondents would read such stuff under Washington datelines, Halberstam noted, and then return to the field and "see the same tired old government tactics, the same hack political commanders in charge, the same waste of human resources."

To other troublemakers were Charles Mohr and Mort Perry of Time magazine. They, too, found little substance for the good news periodically being sponsored by those who were the makers or mouthpieces of official policy. But back in their home office there were men who professed to be able to see things more clearly. Time's press section carried a harsh diatribe (reportedly dictated by the managing editor) against Saigon reports who engaged in crusading—meaning that they tried to write what they saw, rather than what Saigon and Washington preferred to see in print.

Finally, Mohr and his colleague, in 1963, filed a comprehensive report which began: "The war in Vietnam is being lost." As redrafted in New York, it became a highly favorable estimate of the grand fighting spirit of the Vietnamese troops. They resigned.

Halberstam's experience with the New York Times was exactly the reverse; it is also a painful episode in the chronicles of the Kennedy administration. When Arthur Ochs Sulzburger, then the new publisher of the Times, paid a courtesy call on President Kennedy in the fall of 1963, the President asked whether there was any prospect of Halberstam's early transfer. He suggested that this able young man might have become "too involved" in the Saigon story. Sulzburger replied that the Times was entirely satisfied with his coverage, and canceled Halberstam's imminent vacation lest it be construed as a capitulation. The incident was not one of Mr. Kennedy's better moments; but it expressed a state of mind not confined to the White House.

At many moments of setback on the Vietnamese front, there has been a persistent tendency to make skeptical journalists the villains of the drama. Homer Bigart, who preceded Halberstam, suffered similar reproach.

Sadly enough, some of the most articulate spokesmen of this attack were themselves journalists who intermittently visited Saigon—Joseph Alsop, Frank Conniff, and Marguerite Higgins. At various intervals they reported that certain idealistic but untutored young men were offering a "defeatist" view of the war that was somehow infecting the atmosphere.

On the surface the theory seemed somewhat implausible since the circulation of the New York Times among the masses of Vietnamese peasants is limited. Perhaps the more serious contention was that the capricious, tender-spirited rulers of the land could be induced to larger effort if we maintained the pretense that they were giving their all and that their deeds were being crowned with daily success. Plainly this was the judgment of some U.S. emissaries there, but it should hardly have been used as a yardstick of journalistic virtue.

Regardless of how the story ends, events have abundantly and repeatedly vindicated the gloomy crusaders. Neither Diem nor the military claque that succeeded him has shown any capacity for effective popular leadership or for carrying out those reforms that might give the populace some sense that it had a true stake in the war.

Indeed, those who had led us to believe in 1963 that Halberstam and his associates were being unduly pessimistic were tacitly conceding, by the end of 1964, how right he had been. Led by Joseph Alsop, they were clamoring for large-scale U.S. intervention to rescue Saigon's chaotic regime. (The alternative, wrote Alsop, is "the most humiliating defeat" in our national history.) Surely that desperate predicament could not be attributed to any underestimation of Vietnamese strength voiced by the heretic correspondents.

It seems to me that the clearest clue to the agony of South Vietnam—and the point that the harassed journalists have been steadily trying to make—was contained in a dispatch from Robert Keatly, the Wall Street Journal's man in Saigon, published on June 15, 1964, which began:

"Long An province, just southwest of Saigon, is potentially a rich area. Its fertile land produces quantities of rice and fruit, and large numbers of the white Peking ducks so highly favored in Vietnamese cuisine are raised locally.

"But prosperity hasn't touched most of the province's 300,000 inhabitants. Many live on small plots of rented land and pay 50 percent or 75 percent of their crops to landlords. Most do without electricity and running water.

"A hired fieldhand earns 70 cents a day if he can work. Two young girls spend a long day weaving three fiber mats on a crude hand loom, dividing wages of only 50 cents between them."

Most American observers in South Vietnam, Keatly added, agreed the Saigon regime could wage effective military action against the Communists only if it wins the loyalty and confidence of the people of the Vietnamese countryside; it could do so only by providing dramatic improvements in drab, substandard living conditions. So far, he said, there was no sign of a new day; many decades of bungling, graft, and indifference in high places had created a profound skepticism about vigorous new programs such as those proclaimed by the new regime of General Khanh.

And time, he warned, was running out. "If these programs don't show measurable progress this year," a U.S. official was quoted as saying, "the whole war effort could be washed out from beneath us."

That was June 1964.

Certainly there has been an honorable American attempt, under both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, to convey the warnings to Saigon's elite. But the message has never been truly heard. Perhaps it might have been more audible if less time had been spent in seeking, between the intermittent moments of truth, to blur the hard facts of life.

I have never doubted President Johnson's (or Kennedy's) earnest desire to end this war on honorable terms, and to avoid reckless "escalation." Some of the mischievous propaganda circulated in various U.S. organs of the new pro-Chinese left is as unjust and as unrelated to reality as the monolithic mystique of the Muscovites of the 1930's. But neither do I believe there can be any sane solution if we are ourselves unwilling to confront unpleasant truth and to recognize that the game, as we have played it so far in Vietnam, may be nearly up. Beyond that, the lesson of these matters is that all of our psychological warfare, geared to promoting the notion that things are usually better than they seem, has singularly failed to deceive the enemy; it has merely augmented our own confusion, and delayed too long the airing of our real dilemma. Our bargaining position might have been far better 2 years ago if we had recognized what Halberstam and others attempted to tell us. It may be even worse a year from now if we continue the process of self-delusion and perpetuate the legend that time and providence are necessarily on our side.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Feb. 8, 1965]

TIT FOR TAT IN VIETNAM

The American position in the strike against North Vietnam has been stated clearly by President Johnson, Secretary McNamara, and Under Secretary Ball. It is that the Vietcong attack on Pleiku, with its bloody toll in American dead and wounded, represented a test of American political will and purpose, to which "we could not fail to respond." Washington emphasizes that the United States "does not strive to expand the war."

The difficulty is that Hanoi may now adopt exactly the same logic and treat the American strike as a challenge to its will and purpose. Peiping and Moscow, whose Premier Kosygin was in North Vietnam's capital at the time, may also take it as a provocation directed at them. Perhaps the very fact of Mr. Kosygin's presence was why Hanoi chose to make its raid. Yet, the retaliation that raid has brought makes it a matter of prestige for the Russians to help Hanoi. To that extent it tends to bring Russia and China into tactical partnership.

In Vietnam the United States is engaged in a war. In any war, attacks are made and men are killed and wounded. The other side is impelled to strike back even harder, and so try to discourage further attacks. The process, inescapably, is one of escalation. As such a war continues, it becomes bigger, costlier, more dangerous. Vietnam is proving no exception.

The average American will not question that if the Vietcong hits the Americans, our forces must hit back. But many will wonder why we are fighting a war on the other side of the globe for a people who permit our soldiers to be killed without lifting a warning voice. As in the attack at Bien Hoa airbase 2 months ago when so many American planes were destroyed, the Vietnamese villagers either collaborated with the Vietcong or refused to help the Americans and the Saigon Government.

Each incident like Pleiku, each political crisis, each month that passes, increases the danger to us, to southeast Asia, and to the world. The strike at North Vietnam was understandable and justifiable as a tactical response in a war situation. It was not a substitute for a policy. There was an exchange of blows which left the Vietnamese situation in status quo. What the Johnson administration now has to explain is where we go from here.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 8, 1965]

QUESTIONS ON AIR STRIKE—EXPLANATIONS OF EVENTS BEHIND ACTION LEAVE A NUMBER OF POINTS UNRESOLVED

(By Charles Mohr)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—The official explanations of the events surrounding the American air strike on North Vietnam have left a number of important questions unanswered.

The United States attacked in retaliation for the costly night raid on American troops and helicopters at Pleiku in central Vietnam by Communist guerrilla forces.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara expressed today the general opinion of the Johnson administration when he said of the attack on Pleiku that it was "quite clear this was a test of the will and challenge of purpose" of the United States and South Vietnam.

Government sources privy to the discussions that led to the U.S. attack say it was felt that North Vietnam had clearly directed and "made possible" the raid on Pleiku.

THE WEAPONS FACTOR

One question involves the weapons used by the attacking Vietcong unit. The heaviest were American-made 81-millimeter mortars.

American military advisers in Vietnam have long conceded that the majority of Vietcong weapons are American-made ones captured in battle from South Vietnamese forces.

The question is, therefore, that if the Vietcong unit at Pleiku was—as is so often the case—using captured weapons, would this sustain the argument that North Vietnam made possible this particular attack?

Administration sources also contend that the size and intensity of the attack indicated that it was a major blow carefully timed by Hanoi. Yet reports from the field indicate that a company—or less—of Vietcong troops took part in the bloody but brief encounter.

This is not a large Vietcong assault. Many are much larger, involving hundreds of attacking guerrillas.

There were American casualties, but the attack was not especially intense. On a number of occasions whole South Vietnamese infantry units up to company size have been wiped out by the Vietcong in night assaults.

Another factor advanced by Government sources is a belief that attacks launched the same night at Tuy Hoa and a group of villages near Nhatrang indicated, by the number and coordination of assaults in a single night, a pattern of overall direction, probably from Hanoi.

Since larger numbers of Vietcong attacks have taken place throughout South Vietnam on other nights, it is asked, Why would this be?

Secretary McNamara was asked at his news conference whether the perimeter defense of the installations at Pleiku had been deficient in view of the enemy success.

He said he did not believe "it would ever be possible to protect our forces against a sneak attack of that kind" and added that the mortars had been fired from a considerable distance and that clumps of foliage on the generally open plateau had offered cover.

Reports from Pleiku, however, later established that the Vietcong attackers had been able to crawl right onto the U.S. helicopter base to place explosive charges against barracks' walls and on the airstrip.

A question raised was whether South Vietnamese security troops were ignoring longstanding American advice to increase night patrolling.

Still another question puzzling to some in Washington is why all three attack carriers of the U.S. 7th Fleet were in the South China Sea near the Vietnamese coast at the same time.

The usual pattern is one of dispersal, with each carrier forming the nucleus of an attack force operating off different parts of east Asia.

EFFECT IS QUERIED

A further question was whether the air attacks on North Vietnam would weaken the Vietcong guerrillas tactically or strategically and prevent further Vietcong successes against American installations.

The administration contention clearly is that North Vietnam made possible the attack on Pleiku. But the questions about the incident grow out of the apparent fact that a small Vietcong unit, armed with captured weapons and protected by a lack of field intelligence on the part of the South Vietnamese Army, succeeded in creeping onto the American base and dealing a bloody blow.

Thus, the final question is how much of the responsibility for Pleiku can be held not just to Hanoi but to a failure to prosecute the antiguerrilla war in South Vietnam itself in a more vigorous and successful way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to reply—or rather to express myself briefly—with relation to what the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], I am told, has said about our situation in South Vietnam. Certainly, no one regrets the present situation more than I do. But it is very true and fundamental, in my opinion, that the prestige of the United States, the whole security of our country, and the whole future of our situation in the Far East depends upon our retaliating quickly and speedily when a U.S. compound is attacked and our men and our airplanes are destroyed. If we take that action lying down, our future in that whole area of the world will be affected adversely.

Without going into any lengthy discussion at the present time, I wish to say that I intend to support the President and the Secretary of Defense in any responsible decisions—and I say they all will be responsible decisions—to retaliate when situations like the present one arise.

What the final determination will be we cannot say at this time. I, for one, know only what the Secretary of Defense has said, and what I have read in the newspapers. It seems to me fundamental to state that we are in Vietnam, and must maintain our prestige and the strength of our forces there in order to preserve what we stand for. We cannot take an attack lying down and have men in the uniform of our country killed and wounded without letting our enemies know that anyone responsible for such action will meet with swift retaliation. That is what we have done in the present instance. I hope that we shall always retaliate and not allow our boys in uniform to be killed, and take it lying down. That is all I care to say at the present moment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for rising in support of the Johnson administration in his usual broadminded and bipartisan way when a serious question of foreign policy arises.

I suppose I am as discontented with the present situation in Vietnam as is the Senator from Massachusetts. I know perhaps less about the situation than does he as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. But I believe that this is no time to attack the present administration on the floor of the Senate before we have far more information about the background of the raids over the weekend and the retaliation which the President, in his capacity as the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, has ordered. I, for one, am prepared to give the administration the benefit of the doubt until I know far more about the situation than I know at the present time.

As the acting majority leader, I again thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his patriotic comments in support of what our President has done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has said. It seems to me fundamental that it is the only position we can honorably take at the present time.

CUBAN CRISIS COMPARED WITH VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in this morning's edition of the Washington Post appears an article by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Joseph Alsop, entitled "'We Can' Versus 'We Can't'," which I believe merits the attention of readers of the RECORD. I have a great respect for Mr. Alsop's opinions, particularly when they relate to the Far East.

However, in the course of his article Mr. Alsop refers to a ratio or a percentago of risk, that we may have weighed in the balance during the Cuban missile crisis.

My comment on this point is not "the rear view" to which he refers in his article, but rather is a comment I made at the very time of the Cuban missile crisis. I stated that I thought that President Kennedy was making the right decision, but I did not think that the possibility of a nuclear war, much less an all-out nuclear war, was very great.

The reason I made that statement then and the reason I repeat it now, is that I did not think Mr. Khrushchev was anywhere near committing suicide. It is unfortunate that Mr. Alsop's otherwise very splendid article should be possibly reduced in its value by an argument over the responsibilities. Nevertheless, I think that the possibilities should be discussed.

I do not agree with Mr. Alsop's view on this particular point, although I do agree with some of his other views.

In connection with this point, there is also an article in the February issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "We Must Stop Red China Now," containing a question-and-answer series involving Dr. William E. Griffith, an outstanding authority on communism. I believe that a reading of that article, coupled with Mr. Alsop's article, might do much to clear the air with respect to where we ought to be going in South Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the two articles to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 1965]

"WE CAN" VERSUS "WE CAN'T"

(By Joseph Alsop)

Not long after the Cuban missile crisis in October 1962, President Kennedy was reminiscing about this supreme event of his administration.

It all seemed easy enough, he remarked, after the Soviet bluff had been successfully called, but the trouble was no one could be sure, at the outset, that the Soviets really were bluffing.

He was asked what he had thought the odds were, at the outset, that the Soviets were not bluffing. He replied that he had thought the chance that the Soviets meant to go through to the end was somewhere between 1 in 3 and even odds.

It was a chilling thing to hear. For if the Soviets had not been bluffing, the Cuban missile crisis would almost certainly have ended in what the military theorists sweetly call a thermonuclear exchange. And the current Pentagon estimate of the cost to this country of a H-bomb attack is 110 million dead Americans.

In short, President Kennedy very sharply changed the course of history by consciously risking the destruction of 60 percent of the population of the United States when the risk was at least as high as 1 in 3 in his sober, carefully considered opinion. He was helped, no doubt, because he was also conscious that if he submitted to the threat of Soviet missiles in Cuba, most of the people whom he led and loved would never forgive such a surrender.

Every thinking person is grateful, today, for the dead President's willingness to run this fearful risk. Many are perhaps unaware of the Pentagon price tag above quoted. Many may believe, with the easy wisdom of the rear view, that the risk was not really "1 in 3."

But no thinking person can suppose there was no risk at all that the Kremlin would refuse to back down in October 1962. And no thinking person can suppose that the thing risked—an H-bomb attack—would have been anything but unimaginably awful. All the same, there is unanimity that Mr. Kennedy did right.

These facts provide the context in which to judge the sharp turn that events have taken in the last 48 hours. As these words are written, it is not known whether the President has merely ordered another demonstration, like the one after the trouble in the Gulf of Tonkin; or whether he has at last decided to do whatever may be needed to avert defeat in South Vietnam.

It is not known, in other words, whether he has finally decided to act upon the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and his Ambassador in Saigon, Gen. Maxwell Taylor. But whether this is another fruitless one-shot stunt, or whether the President now means business at last, it is worth fitting the reason for his long indecision into the context already provided above.

Previously he has rejected the Joint Chiefs' advice and has done less than Maxwell Taylor wanted done, even at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin, for a basically simple reason. When each successive plan for sterner action against the North Vietnamese aggressors has been presented to the President, he has asked for absolute guarantees that such action would not lead to "another Korea." And the guarantees have not been given, because they could not be given with honesty.

The memory of the proudest episode in this country's proud postwar history as burden-bearer of the free world has in fact paralyzed our highest councils instead of inspiring them.

The practical political reasons why this has happened—the narrow murmurings of Senator Richard Russell, the President's own memories of the opposition's squalid post-Korea behavior, and so on and on—hardly need emphasis.

What needs emphasis is the bizarre lunacy of the people who insist we can quite properly do what we did in October 1962 whereas we cannot again do what we did in Korea. The figures speak for themselves. In October 1962 President Kennedy took a substantial risk of 110 million casualties in this country. The Korean war was hard and cruel as well as proud, but it cost us, in dead and wounded, only 137,000 casualties.

Those men fell to defend all that had been defended and gained for their country by those who fell at Tarawa, Iwo Jima, Guadalcanal, and Saipan—who also numbered less than 300,000. Where then is our commonsense, that we shrink and fall back, and shrink and fall back until the lives of millions must again be risked?

We have waited overlong. With Kosygin at Hanoi, the danger is far greater than it was not so very long ago. But the choice is the same, and the figures are the same, and the price of failure is the same.

[From the Reader's Digest, February 1965]

We Must Stop Red China Now

An apprehensive shudder traveled through the free world last fall when Red China exploded its first nuclear device. Since then, the Chinese have become increasingly belligerent in sensitive areas around the globe. How should the United States and its allies respond to this new and menacing offensive? In this interview, conducted by the editors of the Reader's Digest, Dr. William E. Griffith, an outstanding authority on communism, offers a series of specific proposals designed to contain the strengthened Chinese influence. Dr. Griffith is director of the International Communism Project at the MIT Center for International Studies. He is also professor of Soviet diplomacy in the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, and author of "The Sino-Soviet Rift.")

Question. Dr. Griffith, what is the significance of Red China's explosion of a nuclear device?

Answer. To the Chinese people, and to many others throughout the world, the device is proof that Red China now has the essential element of becoming an independent power—atomic capacity. The political effect of this is already apparent. More and more people, even in India and Japan, are beginning to think that the wave of the future, at least in areas like southeast Asia, is not red, white and blue, but yellow.

China is the first underdeveloped country, the first Asian country and the first colored country that has produced an atomic bomb. There is no question that the Chinese are highly proud of this achievement and now realize that all the privations have not been in vain. If they don't have butter, at least they do have a very big gun.

From our point of view, the most alarming aspect is the type of device that was exploded. The official statement of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission indicates that the Chinese used uranium 235, very likely produced in a gaseous-diffusion plant. This is an enormously expensive operation, involving tremendous amounts of electric power, and it indicates that Chinese technology and engineering may be much more advanced than we had thought. Moreover, the fact that the Chinese have uranium 235 indicates that they will be able to get an H-bomb much more rapidly than had been thought—probably within 2 or 3 years.

For the present at least, one should think fundamentally of the Chinese nuclear device as a political advantage, rather than a military gain. Red China still lacks an effective delivery system for the A-bomb. There is no reason, however, to suppose that the Chinese cannot eventually develop one.

Question. Apart from the bomb, have the Chinese been doing well in extending their influence?

Answer. The Chinese are dizzy with success. They were the greatest winners from the fall of Khrushchev. In Asia the Chinese now have primary influence over the North Vietnamese. By supporting the North Koreans in the Korean war, they have won primary influence over North Korea, and the Russians have lost it. They have drawn Cambodia and Burma into their orbit. They defeated the Indians humiliatingly and disastrously in November 1962. They have isolated the Indians from all the other southeast Asian powers, which are now so frightened by Red China that they are in the process of trying to come to terms with Peiping. The Chinese have tremendous sway over the Indonesians. And Chinese influence even extends into Europe, for Albania is virtually a Chinese satellite.

Question. What do these successes mean in terms of China's role in world affairs?

Answer. The rise of Red China presents an entirely new situation in the world balance of power. China is a revolutionary power with global ambitions. It is determined to replace Moscow at the head of what the Chinese would consider a completely purified and revolutionary world Communist movement.

The Chinese think that the wave of victory which they are riding will engulf the underdeveloped countries, particularly those in the Southern Hemisphere, where people who are both poor and colored resent the wealthy white countries, including Russia. China counts on the frustrations, the weakness, and the fear of the colored peoples of the world to drive them into Peiping's control. That is why they are working so hard—and effectively—in Africa and Latin America.

Question. How, exactly, do the Chinese operate in these areas?

Answer. They have various weapons. Their first weapon is money—they are spending hundreds of millions of dollars a year on their worldwide operations. In Latin America the Chinese have encouraged Castro to support the guerrillas in Venezuela. They have allied with him in a struggle to win supremacy over Latin American communism and, in the process, to depose the pro-Soviet heads of the big Latin American Communist Parties—in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile. They do not have diplomatic missions in Latin America, but they frequently use their news agency offices—the New China News Agency—as their base for subversion and bribery.

The Chinese carry on an immense propaganda operation, not only with very extensive broadcasts, but also with an immense amount of literature. They publish their magazines and articles in about 15 languages and spread them around the world with no thought of cost. These things are very well done, and there is no question that they have some influence. At the University of Caracas in Venezuela, for example, you don't see Russian literature, you don't see American literature—you see Chinese literature, in impeccable Spanish. It is tailormade for the young, the radical, the violent, the dissatisfied, the frustrated.

In Africa, the Chinese think they have great chances, because they feel the future there holds more turmoil, more tribal and ethnic warfare, and more anarchy and chaos—the kind of violence which they have only to urge on. For this reason they have aided the revolutionaries in Zanzibar, the rebels in the Congo. They are trying to buy up, to influence and to give training and political and ideological direction to the dissatisfied, frustrated radicals in all countries of black Africa.

Question. China is doing all this, and yet, internally, it is a weak country?

Answer. Yes. This is the most remarkable aspect of its achievements. Not only is it a weak country with an enormous population growth, but it has probably become weaker in the last 5 years. China was hard hit when the Russians took back all their technical experts and stopped all economic aid in 1960. The stagnation of Chinese industry in the last 5 years is almost unparalleled in any Communist country. Furthermore, the Chinese ran into a series of very bad harvests. They've been buying the wheat surpluses of Canada and Australia for some years now; only in this way have they been able to keep going in the food sector.

One must remember, however, that throughout history China has always had immense problems arising from its tremendous population, from recurrent bad harvests and floods of its great rivers. The Communist government, if nothing else, has produced a degree of discipline which prevents wholesale catastrophe; even at the worst of the economic crisis in 1960–61, there was no mass starvation in China.

The Chinese seem for the present to be concentrating primarily on agriculture. Given their population problems, they probably can do little else. The population of China is estimated to be somewhere around 650 to 700 million, and estimates of the rate of population increase have ranged as high as 25 million a year. This explains their interest in southeast Asia, which is traditionally a great rice-producing area.

Question. Isn't it a paradox that a poor country has nevertheless become a great force on the world scene?

Answer. It does not take much money to run guerrilla wars. It is true that the Chinese are short of modern weapons, but guerrillas do not need many modern weapons. And you need very few guerrillas—as long as the population is not hostile.

The Chinese Communists are perfectly willing to take decades to defeat the West, just as it took them decades to conquer China. They think that time is on their side. Furthermore, they are now probably more confident than ever before that they can surmount their poverty, their economic and military weaknesses. They have endured everything the Russians could subject them to—boycott, withdrawal of all economic and military aid—and yet they have gone on to extend their influence.

Question. With the Chinese expanding in so many directions, where do you think we should start in turning them back?

Answer. In South Vietnam. The key question in American policy today—indeed, the key question in our containment of the entire problem of worldwide Chinese expansionism—is what we do in South Vietnam. If we stay there and show that we intend to contain North Vietnam and China, then we will have taken a big step in convincing the Chinese that their expansionist policies are dangerously reckless.

But if we are going to stay, we have got to adopt an entirely new policy. The problem is this: we do not want to be drawn into a land war on the continent of Asia, where we would be at a great disadvantage and the Chinese at a great advantage. On the other hand, we do have sea and air command, as the Gulf of Tonkin incident showed, and we should use this advantage.

Question. What specific military action do you propose?

Answer. We must put pressure on North Vietnam and China in terrain and by methods of our own choosing, where we are strong and they are weak. Specifically, this means guerrilla raids and air strikes on bases in North Vietnam, from which the war in South Vietnam is supplied and controlled.

The explosion of the Chinese nuclear device makes this policy imperative because we now have limited time. We should contain China before it has effective atomic and thermonuclear weapons. Later on, it will be much more difficult, and perhaps almost impossible, to contain China without risking atomic war.

Question. You don't believe, then, that this policy would involve us in an all-out war with Communist China?

Answer. No. Contrary to what many people in the United States think, the Chinese do not want a major war. They do not take high risks against us. Captured Chinese military documents clearly reveal that the Chinese are well aware of our thermonuclear capacity and also of our conventional military strength; they intend to take no risk that would unleash this power. The Chinese have not tried to invade the Nationalist-held islands of Quemoy and Matsu. They have not broken the truce in Korea, or gone into Laos; and they did not intervene in the Gulf of Tonkin.

The Chinese calculation is that they will be able to win throughout the world, gradually but surely, on the basis of guerrilla warfare. This strategy calls for subversion at such a slow pace that Peiping will never run the risk of escalation, to the point where our conventional and atomic power would come in. They think that we do not know how to meet this guerrilla challenge.

We have to make it quite clear to the Chinese that, to prevent them from conquering all of southeast Asia and eventually flooding into India and Japan, we are determined to do whatever is necessary.

Question. How can we make sure that this is clearly understood by the Chinese?

Answer. The only reason the Korean war started was that the North Koreans, and probably the Chinese as well, assumed that we did not intend to defend South Korea. Nothing is worse, particularly in this atomic age, than uncertainty. We must therefore draw very clear lines of action, then let it be known in no uncertain terms that we can and will enforce them. This is the difficulty now in South Vietnam; we have not made our position clear enough to the enemy.

What I propose is a series of private conversations with the North Vietnamese and the Chinese. We would make it clear that we do not intend to invade North Vietnam or China and that, on the other hand, we do not intend to let them invade South Vietnam. We would inform them of our intention to prevent this by military force, and point out that, as was the case in the Gulf of Tonkin, there is nothing they could do to prevent it. Then, on a graduated basis, we could carry out a program of guerrilla raids and, if necessary, air strikes, pausing after each one to give the Communists time for reflection.

Question. Do you think the war in South Vietnam can be won on this basis?

Answer. I think our situation there can be greatly improved. We would then be able to begin the other part of winning the war in South Vietnam: setting up a political and social system that could survive on its own—as, for example, in Malaysia. But we must remember that it took the British 10 years of fighting before they defeated a few thousand Communist guerrillas in the jungles of Malaya. Only then could they build up a stable and independent Malaysia.

It will be a long struggle for us in South Vietnam. Guerrilla war is always a longer and bloodier struggle than the kind of crisis that the Russians confronted us with in Berlin and in Cuba. We should expect neither easy nor rapid solutions, and the situation may very well get worse before it gets better.

Question. Why is this little, faraway country so important to us?

Answer. Because the United States cannot afford to have a major Communist expansionistic power in control of either the Asian or the European continent. This was our reason for stopping the Russians at the time of the Berlin blockade. By containing Russian imperialism, we not only stopped it but also set in motion its withdrawal—now far advanced—from Eastern Europe. By containing Chinese imperialism, we can also probably begin its eventual withdrawal from such places as North Korea and North Vietnam.

If we carry out guerrilla raids and air strikes against North Vietnam, as I propose, we can expect criticism from other countries at first. But eventually they will respect us all the more. Almost the whole world, you will remember, was opposed initially to what we did during the Cuban missile crisis. But as soon as it succeeded, everybody thought it was marvelous. The old adage still holds true: Nothing succeeds like success—and nothing fails like failure.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I applaud the President's most difficult but important and timely decision to retaliate, as he reportedly did, in our attacks on North Vietnam's bases following the aggression taken against our own Armed Forces and planes in South Vietnam. My only observation would be that I wish the same action had been taken following the attacks and destruction of our bombers on some of the bases in South Vietnam last fall. If such action had been taken then, we might not have had the attacks on our bases which occurred over the weekend. In any event, that was an action which I expressed the hope would be taken at the time. It was not taken, but it has been taken now, and I hope that it will succeed in convincing the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists that we mean to adhere to our national policy, which is to defend against Communist aggression the freedom of those governments which have asked us to do so. I think it is a right policy. I believe it would be most unfortunate, and would cost our Government a great amount of loss of prestige and respect if we should bend that policy. I trust that it will be implemented in full.

THE FARMERS' SHARE OF THE NATIONAL NET INCOME

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, for some time I have been viewing with increasing concern the failure of our Nation's farmers to receive a fair share of the national net income. This has been especially true since I came to the Senate 4 years ago to represent a great agricultural State.

During this time, administration spokesmen have proclaimed that our country has been on a rising tide of prosperity. This has been followed by the observation that net income per farm has been going up. Praise for the great efficiency of our farmers is always lavish. But such proclamations and such praise have worn thin in the face of the facts about the agricultural situation—facts which have been repeatedly overlooked instead of being squarely faced.

THE FACTS

The fact is that the number of farms has declined by 566,000 during the last 4 years.

The fact is that the number of farm family and hired workers has declined by 900,000 during the last 4 years.

The fact is that total farm population has declined by well over 2¼ million during the last 4 years.

The fact is that farm parity, which reflects the ratio between the prices farmers receive for their products and the prices of items they purchase, has consistently been below 81, the figure in December 1960, and is down to 75 today.

The fact is that costs of farm production increased more than $3 billion during the last 4 years.

The fact is that the indebtedness of the Nation's farmers increased by $12 billion during the last 4 years, from $26.2 billion to $38.3 billion.

The fact is that during the last 4 years total realized net farm income increased by $700 million; but this increase is in terms of inflated dollars, not real dollars. The real dollar increase, in terms of 1960 dollars, has amounted to $200 million, which is far below the increase enjoyed by other sectors of our economy.

THE STATEMENT IN THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

In his annual budget message to the Congress, dated January 25, 1965, the President stated that he would shortly make his recommendations to Congress to continue and improve our farm commodity programs and that he strongly believes that programs can be designed that will "bolster farm income." However, in the budget itself appear these ominous words:

> But in view of the market outlook for farm commodities at home and abroad, farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than about 1 million farm families, even with continued Government assistance.

This is followed by a recommended decrease of $387 million in farm price support, supply, purchase, and other farm income stabilization programs.

THE PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

On February 4, the President sent to Congress his farm message. No specifics were included. These will appear in the administration's proposed feed grains and other bills which are now being drafted and will soon be sent to Congress for introduction and committee hearings.

The objectives contained in his farm message are pretty much the same as those which have been set forth in previous administration farm bills:

> An abundance of food and fiber at reasonable and stable prices for the people of the United States.
>
> Effective use of our agricultural resources to promote the interests of the United States and world peace through trade and aid.
>
> A workable balance between supply and demand at lower costs to the Government.
>
> Opportunity for the efficient family farmer to earn parity of income from farming operations.
>
> Parity of opportunity for all rural people, including new opportunity for small farmers.

But the facts which I have earlier set forth demonstrate that nice-sounding objectives contained in previous farm messages and farm bills have not been matched by performance.

Also, instead of lowering costs to the Government, the costs have steadily mounted. Government program payments have risen from $693 million in 1960 to approximately $2 billion in 1964. Thus, instead of improved income from regular commercial sources, our farmers have had to look to the Government for an increase of well over $1 billion in payments to just about keep even with their real 1960 income.

The President has made some recommendations which I believe are significant:

First. Economic development of smaller and medium-sized communities to insure a healthy economic base for rural America. "I will soon make recommendations that will urge the Area Redevelopment Act be improved," he said. In 1963, I offered legislation which would have extended this act's coverage to rural counties which have lost substantial farm population. It was rejected by the administration's leadership in the Senate. I trust that they have had a change of heart now.

Second. Utilize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make the free market system work more effectively for the farmer. I agree, and I have consistently advocated a requirement that the Secretary of Agriculture not be permitted to sell CCC stocks—except when offset by equivalent purchases—for less than 120 percent of the current support price. His dumping practices in recent years, while saving some grain storage costs, have seriously depressed market prices for farmers.

Third. A long-term cropland adjustment program. I have, since coming to the Senate, consistently sponsored legislation for this purpose—with the proviso that the amount of land retired be limited within a community area to prevent disruptive effects on our smaller community businesses.

Fourth. Establishment of commodity stocks required as a reserve for national security, emergency relief, and domestic economic stabilization—such stocks to be insulated from the market and the costs thereof to be separated from the cost of farm price and income support programs.

I have been advocating such a step for years. It is foolish to talk about surpluses when we do not have our reserve requirements established. Once these have been established, then the stocks over and above them can properly be termed "surpluses."

These particular recommendations sound good, but I shall have to await the specifics before making a final judgment.

COSTS TO TAXPAYERS

I wish the President would have come out for a change in the budgeting for the major items which presently appear in the Department of Agriculture budget.

Too many superficial articles are being written which give the general taxpaying public the erroneous idea that all the money being spent in the USDA operations ends up in the pockets of our farmers. If the writers of these articles would take the trouble to visit our rural areas and to analyze the USDA budget, they would soon understand that less than half of these expenditures go to farmers.

For example, a recent study by the American Farm Bureau Federation shows that of the $21.3 billion cost of the food-for-peace program in the period since 1954, $6.9 billion went to farmers through the Commodity Credit Corporation; $4.5 billion went to other segments of our domestic economy; and $9.8 billion went to foreign aid. Still, the costs of running the Commodity Credit Corporation are all in the USDA budget, usually appearing as an item labeled "Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses" of CCC.

What should be done is to so arrange the budget as to place the costs of CCC operating losses in perspective, showing amounts chargeable to foreign aid, amounts chargeable to the school lunch program, amounts chargeable to the armed services and Veterans' Administration, and amounts chargeable to farmers.

If they understand the facts about agriculture and agricultural income, I do not believe the American taxpayer should or would complain about the costs to government needed to help provide a decent living for our farmers and their families. Throughout our history, the public has been abundantly supplied with food and raw materials for manufacturing, and prices of these goods have been low. Our agriculture has furnished large quantities of food for the relief of hunger in other countries. Last year only 19 percent of our disposable income was spent for food. Ten years ago it was 22 percent. Last year it was 30 percent in West Europe, 50 percent in Russia, and up to 90 percent in some of the underdeveloped countries. In short, our national farm policy has provided both abundance and rapid technical progress, which are of great value to the Nation. But it has failed to provide our farmers with rewards commensurate with hard work, managerial competence, initiative, and enterprise, in comparison with the rest of our economy.

Some of the Members of Congress from big cities would do well to realize that if our agricultural economy does not enjoy a fair share of the national net income, the market for goods manufactured in their districts will be depressed and there will be unemployment. When they shout "subsidy," let them look to Government programs which benefit the maritime industry, the transportation industry, and the defense industries. Also, studies by research economists at Iowa State University, Cornell University, Penn State University, and Oklahoma State University make it clear that without Government programs, net annual farm income would fall from $12 billion to $6 billion. Another way of looking at it is that by a public expenditure of $3 billion on crop acreage control, price support, and commodity storage programs, net farm income is $6 billion higher. This additional $6 billion in purchasing power for our farmers is being plowed back into our national economy, almost surely with some multiplier effect. It may be recalled that the administration argued that there would be a 2-to-1, 3-to-1, and even a 4-to-1 multiplier effect for each dollar spent as a result of the tax cut enacted last year. Although such arguments are difficult to prove, there is no reason to believe that the multiplier effect with respect to each dollar spent by our farmers is any less than in the case of the tax-cut dollars.

PLIGHT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Too few of our farmers are familiar with what has been happening to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Due to the negligence of the Congress, over $8 billion of its capital has been lost without being restored. It was this negligence which brought about the urgent deficiency appropriation of $1.6 billion which was recently rushed through the Congress. The table set forth below shows the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table prepared by me may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total capital in use (out of $14,500,000,000 authorized) as Dec. 31, 1964	$14, 180, 600, 000
Amount thereof "lost" as of June 30, 1964	—8, 166, 134, 000
Total	6, 014, 466, 000

Add fiscal 1965 appropriation to partially restore "lost" capital	$1,574,000,000
Available capital funds	[1] 7,588,466,000
Already committed to crop loans and inventory as of Dec. 31, 1964	[2] 7,413,322,889
Available for additional crop loans	175,143,111

[1] Compare this to commitments to loans and inventories of $8,192,620,000 on Feb. 1, 1964, and $8,465,384,000 on Feb. 1, 1963.

[2] See the following table:

Already committed	$7,413,322,889
Estimated losses from liquidations	—1,015,000,000
Available after liquidation	6,398,322,889
Available, as above, for additional loans and inventory	175,143,111
Deficiency appropriation to restore capital	1,600,000,000
Additional borrowing authorized for capital	319,400,000
Total available for CCC programs	8,592,866,000

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, the $8,166,134,000 "lost" represents losses by Commodity Credit Corporation through price support programs, with inventories being disposed of at less than cost, largely through the food-for-peace program. Of this total, $1,574 million was restored by the fiscal 1965 appropriation and $1,600 million has now been restored by the recent fiscal 1965 deficiency appropriation, leaving a total of almost $5 billion which Congress has neglected to restore. Of course this may help to make the spending budget appear lower, but the day of reckoning eventually arrives—as it did with the $1.6 billion deficiency appropriation and as it will with future deficiency appropriations.

RESEARCH FOR INDUSTRIAL USES

The distinguished editor of the editorial pages of the Des Moines Register, Lauren Soth, pointed out recently at the Fifth Annual Farm Policy Review Conference in Washington, D.C., that public expenditures in agricultural research and education have been steadily mounting, and that there has been "a fantastic outpouring" of new technology and investments in fertilizer, chemicals, machinery and other production goods. He observed:

> This surge of forces pushing agricultural production upward has hit the farm economy at the same time as a sudden change in the character of the demand for food.

It is his view that demand for quality protein foods is becoming inelastic, and this realization should temper optimistic forecasts that improved diets for low-income families will solve the imbalance between supply and demand.

It seems to me that there has been too much concentration on research on the production side and not enough on the consumption side—especially as far as the activities of the Government are concerned. There have been some truly amazing developments in industrial uses for some agricultural products. But what is needed is a crash program of research of this kind—one which I have long been advocating. I hope that the administration's leaders will finally heed this call. Indeed, if such a program is carried out, who can say that the requirements for our Nation's agriculture can be met by only 1 million farmers? I, for one, am not ready to accept this view of the President.

INCONSISTENT POLICIES

Both the administration and the Congress which it controls have heretofore followed inconsistent farm policies. We have seen legislation passed here which would bring thousands of more acres of farmland into production. When an amendment was offered, as I did, to prohibit the growing of crops declared by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus, it was rejected by the administration's leaders. Last year the administration's own cotton-wheat bill provided for retirement of over 1 million acres of cotton land from production at a cost of from $45 to $60 per acre, but with no cross compliance. Much of this acreage will be grown to soybeans and feed grains. At the same time, we have been paying out millions of dollars to retire cropland from production. Such inconsistent policies are not fair—either to the farmers or to the taxpayers.

INFLATION

There are two sides to the cost-price squeeze—one, the price side; the other, the cost side. Not enough attention has been given to the second. During the last 4 years, the deficit spending policies of the administration and a majority of the Members of Congress have run our Government $28 billion deeper into debt, and this has been accompanied by over $28 billion inflation. As the purchasing power of the dollar has been steadily going down, one cannot blame wage earners when they seek higher wages. Since all of their dollars are worth less, they need more dollars. All of this shows up in increased costs of farm production—up $3 billion in 4 years. But the farmer is the last one to receive an increase in the prices for his labors. And so the cost-price squeeze has become tighter. Farmers who wish to hold down their costs of production would do well to follow the record of their Members of Congress on deficit spending.

GRAIN PROGRAM

The President has advocated a continuation of the present voluntary wheat and feed grain programs "with improvements"; and he has come out for a long-range cropland adjustment program. All of us are awaiting the specifics with interest.

It might be well to make a few observations at this point. In seeking to raise net farm income, there are alternatives. We can have high price supports—even at 100 percent of parity, accompanied by rigid controls. This tends to aggravate our competitive position in the export market, and exports must be preserved and enhanced rather than diminished. It entails costly administration to enforce the controls. And it can result in forcing smaller farmers off the farms because their allotments are not sufficient to enable them to make a living even with higher support prices.

Another alternative is to have low price supports and few controls. This tends to build up surpluses and depress the market.

There are many alternatives that lie between, and these are the ones we have been following. Thus, there are voluntary programs which have attractive features built into them; but these are not so compelling as to literally force compliance, and some farmers find that they can do better by not coming into the program. When the features are compelling—either because of good effects from compliance or penalties for noncompliance, a program cannot be termed "voluntary." It is in this middle ground that most of the argument in Congress takes place.

I have not listed as an alternative "no price supports and no controls" because, in the face of the studies to which I previously referred, there are no Members of Congress I know of who would seriously consider it.

It seems to me that what is needed is a long-range cropland retirement program with competitive bidding, properly administered, accompanied by reasonable support prices which will not be so high as to cause disinterest in cropland retirement. I believe consideration should be given to some arrangement which will provide more incentive to the family farmer, whether operating as an individual, a partnership, or in corporate form, as distinguished from other types of farm arrangement. There are not only economic considerations but social values as well to be weighed in making our decisions.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON NATURAL BEAUTY

Mrs. **NEUBERGER**. Mr. President, with staccato-like impact, the President has been sending messages to Congress. And all of them are worthy of great consideration and great interest.

They have been coming so fast that I can hardly keep up with them, because there is so much in them that is of interest to me, such as the health programs, the farm program, and now the one on natural beauty and conservation.

I am sure each of us looks into each message to find that which is of particular interest to himself, and so I find in the message on conversation two points on which I should like to comment.

The one on preservation of our system of parks, seashores, and recreation areas is of especial interest to me, because I have been fighting a long time to get my own State of Oregon to see what its advantages are in this area and to take steps to preserve them.

Sometimes we who come from an area that is twice blessed with scenic beauties take them for granted, and it takes people in the more crowded urban areas of our country to make us appreciate the need for preservation of them.

The President spoke of our recreation areas as not meeting the needs of a growing population. He has proposed that a land and water conservation fund be used to acquire lands needed in "making this a parks-for-America decade." Among the projects specified under this fund was the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

I am pleased that the President saw fit to include in his natural beauty goals a dunes area that has been described as "the most beautiful and impressive coastal dunes in North America."

I wish also to recall for my colleagues that that bill was reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs last year and lay fallow on the Senate Calendar for weeks and weeks and weeks, and was still lying there at adjournment time. In farming, the principle in having land lay fallow is that the land is enriched. I am hoping very much that very soon an enriched bill on that subject will come forward.

The President's message on natural beauty devoted merited attention to the problems created by increasing use of pesticides in our society. It is apparent to many of us that we have too little information of the effects of various compounds used to control insects. Thus, we are pleased to hear the President's announcement that he has included increased funds in the budgets of the Department of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare for research into pesticides and their effects throughout our environment.

This research, as the President pointed out, includes study of the means by which pesticide compounds break down and disappear in nature, as well as constant checks on the level of pesticides in water, air, soil, and food supply.

Concurrently, and appropriately, the President is recommending additional funds for the Secretary of Agriculture to use in research, regulatory control, and education programs aimed at reducing contamination from toxic chemicals.

I anticipate that the Secretary of Agriculture will find a receptive Congress when he submits the legislation which the President mentioned to tighten controls over the manufacture and use of agricultural chemicals. This legislation will include licensing and factory inspection of manufacturers, thus clearly placing the burden of proof of safety on the proponent of the chemical, rather than on the Government. This is where it should have been all along.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 9, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8, 1965:

ENGRAVER IN THE MINT

Frank Gasparro, of Pennsylvania, to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Garth L. Mangum, of Utah, to be Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. For appointment:

To be senior surgeons

Dorothea B. Chapman
David B. Dolese

To be surgeons

James C. King
Edward A. Lichter
Robert E. G. Norton
Robert Van Hoek

To be senior assistant surgeons

Robert S. Adelstein
David E. Anderson
William R. Ayers
Howard R. Bagwell, Jr.
Murlyn D. Bellamy
Richard J. Betz
Arthur D. Bloom
George F. Borge
Frank R. Brand
Bobby C. Brown
William T. Butler
William Chin
James P. Comer
Michael L. Connell
Stephen G. Cronin
Paul T. Davidson
George B. De Blanc
Lionel H. De Montigny
Gregory G. Dimijian
John M. Dyer, Jr.
Blaise E. Favara
Michael M. Frank
Joseph F. Fraumeni, Jr.
Donald T. Fredrickson
Gary D. Friedman
Sandor A. Friedman
Harry L. Galloway
Elbert W. Goff
Harold L. Goldberg
Christian N. Hansen, Jr.
Henry R. Harris
James F. Jekel
Marvin A. Kirschner
Lawrence M. Klainer
Albert C. Kolbye, Jr.
Maurice G. Marcus
Bernard R. Marsh
Robert G. Martin
James D. Masterson
John D. Millar
Richard M. Morrow, Jr.
Donald L. Morton
Robert A. Nemiroff
Bernard A. Nigro
Daniel J. O'Connell
Charles T. O'Connor, Jr.
Lowell W. Perry
George E. Pickett
Donald T. Quick
Ronald R. Roberto
Harold S. Rosenberg
Wendell F. Rosse
Robert V. Russell
Joseph S. Safko
Larry D. Samuels
Arnold L. Schroeter
Gabriel H. Schwartz
Laurence R. Schweitzer
Michael Serber
George W. Seuffert
Bertrand N. Shaffer
Charles J. Smith
Michael B. Sporn
Arthur J. L. Strauss
Carl F. Szuter
Theodore W. Thoburn
Louis W. Tinnin
Richard B. Uhrich
Henry N. Wellman
Raymond P. Wood, II
Dorwen G. Wright
Richard Jay Wurtman
Richard D. Zonis

To be dental surgeons

C. Larry Crabtree
Stanely B. Heifetz
Francis J. Kendrick

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

David W. Bishop
Robert C. Faine
James H. Greene, Jr.
Edward Herzig
Sheldon G. Ivers
Wayne A. Jenkins
Larry K. Korn
Paul J. Loos
Horace E. Lyon
Richard P. Ribisl, Jr.
Jacob F. Schmitt
Robert J. Tadlock
Powell B. Trotter III
Henry J. Van Hassel
Jack A. Wallace
Richard G. Weaver

To be sanitary engineers

Paul H. Bedrosian
Richard W. Eldredge
Edgar A. Jeffrey
Roger D. Lee

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Vernon E. Andrews
Richard A. Coddington
Gary N. Dietrich
Dewayne E. Durst
Floyd L. Galpin
Pearce M. Klazer
Herbert F. Klein
Jeremiah R. Lynch
Ronald A. Popkin
Eric A. Seiffer

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Donald A. Anderson
Paul D. Eckrich
Clyde J. Dial
James T. Ellison, Jr.
Alan C. Foose
Hugh Neff Jenkins
Barry L. Johnson
Myron O. Knudson
Edwin C. Lippy
Russell C. LeGalbo
David A. Luoma
Donald J. Martin
James C. Meredith
Barry H. Reid
Milbourn L. Smith
Morris G. Tucker
James R. Vincent
George W. Williams
Donald T. Wruble
George K. Young, Jr.
Ralph K. Yukumoto

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

William R. McCoy
Dale A. Stevenson

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Loren D. Howe
Philip R. Hugill
William M. Mashburn

To be assistant pharmacists

Elmer W. Akin
Jean P. Davignon
Robert Brotman
Emil L. Cekada
Sydney P. Galloway
James C. Hughes
Richard M. King
Michael J. Kopcho

To be scientists

Nelms B. Boone
Vernon J. Fuller
John E. Nickols, Jr.
Charles H. Powell

To be sanitarians

David H. Flora
Samuel W. Hoover
Steadman M. Overman
Thomas J. Sharpe

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Victor L. Casper
Norman G. Edmisten
Alfred B. Kline, Jr.
Richard J. Van Tulnen

To be assistant sanitarians

Frederick Gene Headley
William E. Knestis

To be veterinary officer

Thomas P. Cameron

To be senior assistant veterinary officer

Amos E. Palmer

To be nurse officers

Catherine E. Berkheimer
Mary L. Mills

To be therapist

James C. Hufsey

To be senior assistant therapist

Riley B. Bingham

To be assistant therapist

William W. Murray

To be health services officers

Henry P. James
Rias H. Majors

To be senior assistant health services officers

Robert L. Booth
Charles L. Cox
Kenneth H. Falter
Clifton R. Gravelle
James M. Hardin
James D. Moore
Anthony Robert Polcari
Vincent J. Sodd
William H. Spillane
Charles T. Wilson
Wilbur E. Wright

To be assistant health services officers

Gregory J. Barone
Charles F. L. Brown, Jr.
Wayne G. Brown
Kenneth D. Howard
Thomas J. Keast
Ralph E. Shaping

II. For permanent promotions:

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Robert J. Feibusch
Ronald E. Gastineau

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Francis P. Barletta
Norman L. Dunfee

To be assistant pharmacist

Harry A. Bivens

To be senior assistant sanitarian

John J. Bolen

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Kenneth E. BeLieu, of Oregon, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, vice Paul Burgess Fay, Jr., resigned.

Graeme C. Bannerman, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice Kenneth E. BeLieu.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Lt. Gen. Henry W. Buse, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

John V. Smith
Clyde J. Van Arsdall, Jr.
Ernest E. Christensen
Reuben T. Whitaker
Walter H. Baumberger
Joseph B. Tibbets
Nels C. Johnson
Samuel R. Brown, Jr.
Richard B. Lynch
John N. Shaffer
John H. Maurer
Fred E. Bakutus
Eli T. Reich
Robert E. Riera
Turner F. Caldwell, Jr.
David Lambert
Horace V. Bird
Frank L. Pinney, Jr.
Donald G. Irvine
Marshall W. White
Francis D. Boyle
Mason B. Freeman
Rufus L. Taylor
Jackson D. Arnold
Joseph E. Rice

MEDICAL CORPS

Joseph L. Yon
Robert O. Canada, Jr.
Horace D. Warden

SUPPLY CORPS

Robert H. Northwood
Ira F. Haddock

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Harry N. Wallin

The following named Reserve officers for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Richard D. Adams

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Edward H. Gessner

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Adams, William C., Jr.
Arnold, Homer S.
Austin, Frank H., Jr.
*Bamberg, Paul G.
Barton, Robert K.
Bird, Edward W.
Blakey, Ernest A.
*Broaddus, Carl A., Jr.
Browne, Howard S., Jr.
Cales, Robert J.
*Cruft, George E.
*Drake, Robert M.
*Gillespy, Robert R., Jr.
*Golbranson, Frank L.
*Gundelfinger, Benjamin F.
Hines, Larry J.
*Hubbard, Hampton
Humes, James J.
Imburg, Jerome
*Kaufman, Paul
*McLean, Donald H.
Morris, David P., Jr.
Ostapowicz, Frank
*Peters, Earl R.
*Rohrs, Lloyd C.
Rupnik, Edward J.
Schulte, John H.
*Sebrechts, Paul H.
Snyder, William A.
*Stark, James E.
Workman, Robert D.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Aicken, John E.
*Allen, Cecil C.
Aull, Herbert H.
*Baldwin, Frank E.
Bates, Raymond H.
Bennett, Keith
Clement, Earl G.
Cohn, Murry
Creel, Clarence A.
Crosby, Philip
Dale, Oscar N.
*De Young, Warren R.
Farley, William B.
Foulkes, William O.
Gardner, Charles A.,
*Gaver, Harry L.
Geneste, Elmon A., Jr.
*Graham, Rupert E.
Haddock, William N.
Henn, Carl L., Jr.
*Hopkins, Warren G.
*Johannesen, William A.
*Johnson, Herbert L.
Jones, Russell A.
Lipscomb, John W., Jr.
Longnecker, Kenneth W.
*Maas, William C.
Maxwell, Lester G.
McClaren, Wesley J.
*McMorries, Edwin E.
McPike, Howard D.
*Miller, John D.
*Milliren, Howard C.
*Paulsen, William N.
*Penebaker, George W.
*Purviance, Raymond E., Jr.
Rivers, Vernon G.
Robinson, William J.
Schauffler, Robert A.
*Schoggen, Joe G.
Sigman, William E.
Simpson, Samuel R., Jr.
Smith, Bert E.
Smith, James A.
Stringer, Carl J., Jr.
*Sullivan, Raymond S.
*Walker, Woodrow T.
Wells, Robert A.
Whiteside, Charles E.
Woodfin, Kenneth L.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

*Below, Ralph W.
Carpenter, Malcolm A.
Casazza, David J.
Danielsen, John M.
*Fenning, Robert C.
Harrison, Robert M.
Heyl, Richard P.
Kelly, Joseph A.
Radcliffe, Robert W.
Sobel, Samuel
Swanson, Eugene S.
Wissing, John L.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bowman, Harlan L.
Daniels, John M.
Diberto, Edward T.
*Hayen, Charles L.
Krickenberger, Custer F., Jr.
Lalor, Foster M., Jr.
Marschall, Albert R.
*Minwegan, Arthur P.
Shepard, George R.
Wynne, Sydney J., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

*Alexander, Perry C.
*Batchelder, Richard M.
*Besbekos, George A.
Hawkins, Kenner F.
*Hoerman, Kirk C.
*Kennedy, William J.
Koester, Frederick W., III
Kohler, Milton C.
*Peachey, James B.
*Pentecost, John W.
*Quilter, Ward E., Jr.
*Rives, Robert G.
Selfridge, George D.
*Sharp, Ben C.
*Shaw, Jay D.
*Smith, Alan E.
*Smith, Roland C.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

*Bartolomei, Aldo
*Ferber, Charles W.
Morgan, Guy H.
*Petiprin, Floyd R.
Pflag, Solomon C.
Thompson, Lester K.
Vanlandingham, Emmett L., Jr.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

*Ackerman, Eugene B.
Ackley, Richard T.
*Agnew, Richard S.
*Allen, Richard P.
*Allison, Paul
*Allmann, Richard R.
*Ambrose, John E.
*Anderson, Robert G.
Andresen, Ronald N.
Andrews, Jack B.
*Andry, Walter G.
*Angleman, Cornell C.
Anthony, John D., Jr.
Archer, Martin D.
*Armstrong, Robert P.
*Arnold, Henry D.
*Arnold, William S. M.
Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.
*Aslund, Roland E.
Aumack, Robert F.
Austin, Fuller A.
*Awalt, Thomas Y., Jr.
*Axell, Charles L.
Ayres, William H., Jr.
*Baarstad, David E.
Bacheller, Frank E.
Backstrom, Robert I.
*Bading, Herman M.
*Baggett, Lee, Jr.
*Bailey, Henry G.
*Bailey, Richard T.
Bailey, William C.
*Baker, Norman K.
*Bare, Keith R.
Barkalow, Gerald H.
*Barker, Franklin H.
*Barker, Raymond H.
Barnard, Robert W.
Barnette, Curtis L.
Barrineau, Edwin
Barron, Joseph M.
Bates, George M.
*Baty, Edward M.
*Bauerlein, Leo P.
Bauernfeind, Joseph H.
*Baysinger, Reaves H., Jr.
*Beatty, William F.
Beck, Frederic E., Jr.
*Beeler, James W.
*Beesley, David L.
*Beesley, Howard L.
*Bell, James R.
*Bellar, Fred J., Jr.
*Belter, Robert H.
Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
*Bennett, Robert E.
Bennie, Ralph F.
*Berglund, Rex R.
Bergstrom, James H.
Berthier, Neil H.
Bigley, Thomas J.
Billings, Randall K.
Bircher, William B.
Blaha, Albert J.
*Blalock, David H., Jr.
Block, Peter F.
*Boeing, Charles E.
*Bloomfield, Rollin W.
*Bogart, Tudor M.
*Boggs, Gilbert A.
*Borlaug, Paul V.
*Born, Waldo L.
*Bortner, James A.
Boston, Leo
*Boyd, David S.
*Bradfield, James
Bradford, John W., Jr.
Bramley, Leslie G.
Branch, Alvin D.
Brand, Alvin
*Brandenburg, Delbert E.
Branson, John J., Jr.
Brick, John H.
Bristol, Edward R., Jr.
*Brook, William N., Jr.
*Brown, Charles O.
Brown, Charles D.
*Brown, James B.
Brown, James W.
Bruce, Forrest T.
*Bruck, Thomas J.
Brumbach, Lawrence E.
*Bryan, Paul E., Jr.
Buck, Roger L.
Burden, James D.
*Burnett, James C.
Burt, Alexander R., Jr.
*Bustard, Francis W.
*Buteau, Bernard L.
Byron, Herbert I.
Byron, John B.
Cady, John P., Jr.
Caglione, Joseph, Jr.
*Cahill, John W., Jr.
Caldwell, Ronald H.
*Cameron, Allan K., Jr.
Campbell, James S.
*Campbell, Richard B.
Canaan, Gerald C.
Carberry, James P., Jr.
Cariker, Jess L., Jr.
Carius, Robert W.
*Carlton, George A.
*Carpenter, Malcolm S.
Carr, William K.
*Carroll, John H., Jr.
*Carter, Earl L.
Carter, Frank R.
*Casey, Edward J., Jr.
Cassilly, Frank R.
*Catterlin, Samuel F.
Cawley, Thomas J.
Cedarburg, Owen L.
*Chadwick, Daniel
Chambers, John J.
Chanaud, Henry L.
Chapman, George T., Jr.
Choyce, Charles V.
*Christensen, Charles S., Jr.
Church, Clifford E., Jr.
*Clark, Fred P., Jr.
*Clark, Willard H., Jr.
*Clarkson, Charlie J., Jr.
Clemens, Porter E.
Cochran, James A.
*Coffman, Walter W.
*Cogdell, John B.
Cole, Charles W.
*Coleman, Frank S.
Coleman, Gerard G.
Colleary, John E., Jr.
Colvin, Robert D.
*Comstock, George F., Jr.
*Conkey, Carlton G.
Connolly, Robert D.
*Cook, Richard M.
*Coontz, Robert J.
Cooper, David L.
*Cooper, Stanley G.
*Cordray, Richard P.
*Cornett, Francis E.
*Cossaboom, William M., II
Costello, Daniel J.
Costello, Peter M., Jr.
*Coughlin, John T.
Covington, Gerald E.
*Cowhill, William J.
*Cowperthwaite, John K.
Cramblet, Frank
*Crangle, Richard H.
*Crawford, Donald H.
*Crosby, Howard S.
Crow, Edwin M.
Crowl, Otho W.
Cruse, Donald A.
Cunningham, Russell P., Jr.
*Dauber, Robert A.
*Daum, Theodore E.
Davey, Richard B.
Davidson, Harrison W., Jr.
Davidson, Richard S.
Davis, Allen B.
Davis, Jack W.
*Davis, Thomas E.
Day, Lawrence C.
*Debold, Joseph F.
*Dellinger, Chesley Y., Jr.
*Delozier, Richard G.
Demers, William H., II
Denmark, George T.
*Dennis, Edwin L., Jr.
*Dewey, William E.
*Dickens, Richard A.
*Diehl, William F.
Doak, Samuel L.
Doan, Richard C.
Draddy, John M.
Dreesen, Robert F.
Driscoll, Jerome M.
*Driscoll, William T., Jr.
Dufort, Emile J., Jr.
Duggan, Frederick F., Jr.
Duggan, Richard W., II
*Duncan, Richard D.
*Dunnan, Neville D.
Dunning, Frederick S., Jr.
Eagye, Thomas R., II
*East, George W.
Eckerd, George E.
Eckert, Earl J., Jr.
Edwards, Frederick A., Jr.

Elliott, James D.
*Ellison, Leroy S.
*Ellsworth, William A.
*Emerson, David F.
Emlet, Harold B.
Engel, Paul H.
*Engle, Raymond E.
*Epps, Charles W.
*Erikson, Warren W.
*Estes, Windom L.
*Fahland, Frank R.
*Falkenstein, Rudolph F.
Farrell, John B.
Farrell, John R.
*Farris, Frederick A.
Faulkenberry, Virgil T.
Feagin, Frederick K.
*Fears, Donald G.
*Featherston, Frank H.
*Feeney, Harold
*Fenno, Eric N.
Ferrucci, David E.
*Finley, Alden G.
*Finley, Hugh D.
*Fleming, Francis L., Jr.
*Fletcher, James L.
*Flynn, Richard E.
Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.
*Forbes, Donald K.
*Forster, William G.
Foster, James R.
*Foster, Raymond H.
*Foucht, Richard A.
Fox, Albert D.
Fox, Richard T.
*Fraasa, Donald G.
French, Robert D.
*Freytag, David R.
Friesen, Edwin J.
Frosio, Robert C.
Frudden, Mark P.
*Gaddis, George E.
*Garland, Earl E.
Garland, John C.
*Gates, David E.
Geist, Richard A.
Geitz, Kenneth L.
Gercken, Otto E.
Gibbons, Paul C., Jr.
*Giles, Claude F.
*Gilpin, Burton H.
Gire, Larold W.
Gobble, George F.
*Goewey, William I.
Goldbeck, Lewis H., Jr.
Goldman, Howard A.
*Goode, Martin
*Gooding, Niles R., Jr.
Goodwin, Edmund E.
*Greer, James C.
Gregory, George T.
Grigg, William H.
Grimm, William F.
*Groff, Bruce F.
Grosvenor, Alexander G. B.
Grunwald, Edward A.
Gureck, William A.
*Hage, Lealand P.
Hall, Berkeley W.
Halleland, Henry L.
Hamer, Robert R., Jr.
*Hamill, Jerome E.
*Hamilton, Donald C.
*Hamm, Warren C., Jr.
*Hanlon, Kevin
*Hanson, Carl T.
*Hardgrave, James B.
Hardy, Martin E.
*Harkness, Vinton O., Jr.
*Harris, John
Harris, Richard D.
Harris, Robert D., Jr.
*Hart, George L.
*Hartshorn, David L.
*Harty, Thomas G.
Haselton, Waring B., Jr.
Hawkins, Larry L.
*Hawkins, William H.
*Hayes, Stanley M.
Hays, Ronald J.
*Heerwagen, David D.
*Hegrat, Donald M.
*Heininger, Howard G., Jr.
*Hemann, John W.
Henderson, Stanley W.
*Henry, Martin H.
*Hickey, Charles F.
Hicks, Lawrence F.
Highberg, Roy W.
*Hill, Allen E.
*Hilscher, Carl C.
*Hirstein, Robert V.
Hoare, Robert E.
*Hofer, Frank N., Jr.
Hoffman, Robert D.
*Hofford, John L.
Hofstra, Edward J.
*Hofto, Leslie C.
*Hohn, Henry E.
*Holman, Rockwell
Holmes, John S.
*Hoover, Matthew V.
*Hopkins, Clifford D.
Hopkins, Mark, Jr.
*Horan, John E., Jr.
*Hornbeck, Donald R.
Hosemann, Leland J.
*Hotes, John L.
*Howell, Joe P., Jr.
*Hower, Floyd E., Jr.
*Hubbard, Donald
*Huff, Mahlon S.
Hughes, Frank W., Jr.
*Hughes, Ray S.
Hughes, Wayne L.
*Hugo, William P.
Hunsley, Lindel A., II
Hussmann, Harry L., III
Huth, Ralph L.
*Iredale, John P.
*Jacobssen, George E., Jr.
*Jarrell, Donald L.
Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.
*Jenista, James, Jr.
Jensen, Arlo J.
*Jensen, Donald L.
Jensen, Wayne L.
*Jepson, John A.
Johnson, Daniel C.
Johnson, Homer R.
*Johnson, Ian J.
Johnson, Merlin L.
*Johnson, Neal J.
Johnson, Phillip T.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Willard E.
*Johnston, Richard C.
Jones, Cecil B., Jr.
Jones, John P.
Jones, Ray P.
*Jones, Stanley W.
Jordan, Watt W., Jr.
*Kaiser, Robert D.
Kamrad, Joseph G.
*Kaufman, Norman L.
Kaufman, Richard F.
Kaune, James E.
*Kay, Howard N.
*Kays, Jack C.
*Kearney, John R.
*Keller, Robert G.
*Kelly, Ronald T.
Kelly, William P., Jr.
*Kempf, Cecil J.
Kennedy, James R., Jr
*Kernan, William H.
Ketchmark, Giles J.
Kidd, Owen A.
Kiehl, William A.
Kiker, Herbert W., Jr.
King, Robert A.
Kingsbury, Ben P.
Kirkhorn, Robert L.
Kirkpatrick, Darrell F.
*Kivlen, Alexander L.
*Kjeldgaard, Peter D.
*Klemm, Wilbur C.
Kluga, Norbert R.
*Knoizen, Arthur K.
Kolstad, Tom I.
Kost, John D., Jr.
*Kozman, Robert J.
*Kramer, George
Krantzman, Harry M.
Kraus, Rudolf L.
*Kreinberg, Alfred G.
Kremer, John L.
Kretchman, Frank C.
*Krohn, Stanley W.
*Laney, Edward V., Jr.
Lasell, Max H.
Lasley, William W.
*Lassen, William V.
*Lassiter, Will E.
Lawrence, Gregory E., Jr.
Lawrence, John V., Jr.
Lawrence, William P.
*Leary, Ramon W.
Ledew, Thomas A.
*Lee, Byron A.
Lehman, Donald A.
*Lemon, Robert T.
*Leser, John R.
Lester, Louis R., Jr.
Leue, David E.
*Lewis, Daniel A.
*Linder, James B.
Lintner, Richard W.
*Lisanby, James W.
Lockwood, Harold R.
*Lofton, Edgar K., Jr.
*Lombard, Richard L.
Long, Charles R.
*Longino, Hugh E., Jr.
Loomis, Aubrey K.
Lorfano, Joseph J., Jr.
Loux, Raymond E.
*Lovata, Albert F.
Lovelace, Robert H.
Lovell, James A., Jr.
*Lund, John D.
Lynam, Donald M.
Lyne, George C.
Lytle, James H.
MacDowell, Charles R.
MacKell, Richard A.
MacKenzie, John D.
Mackey, Robert R.
Madera, Harry P.
*Madison, Douglas W.
*Magee, Jack E.
Mahon, Richard B.
*Maier, Charles W., Jr.
Maire, Rex E.
*Majesky, John E.
Malloy, John E.
Mandeville, Robert C., Jr.
*Mann, Earl
Manning, Richard T.
*Mantz, Roy T.
Marcellus, Russell A.
Marlin, Hubert A.
Martin, Richard W.
Massa, Emiddio
Mathis, Paul J.
Matson, Willis A., II
Mauney, Thomas C.
*Mayer, Donald R.
*Mayer, Joseph C.
*Mayo, William H.
*McAnulty, Robert M., Jr.
McArthur, John C.
McArthy, Richard L.
*McAvenia, James F., Jr.
McClain, Kirby L., III
McClaran, Stephen W.
McClure, James R.
*McCoy, Joseph C., Jr.
McDonald, Robert P.
McFall, Albert D.
McGarrah, William E., Jr.
*McGinnis, Ted R.
*McGlaughlin, Thomas H.
*McIntyre, Andrew
McJunkin, Russell E., Jr.
*McKay, Robert B.
McKnight, Jesse E. Jr.
*McLoughlin, Howard T.
*McNaab, Joseph M.
McNally, John J., Jr.
*McNulty, Gerald
*McQuiston, Edward I., Jr.
*McVoy, James L.
*Mealy, Daniel N.
Meek, Donald B.
*Messner, James R.
*Michaud, Robert A.
Miguel, Theodore, Jr.
*Miller, Adair
*Miller, Raymond L.
Miller, Richard A.
*Miller, William A.
Mills, Joseph E.
*Minkkinen, Erikki O.
*Minnis, Marion L., Jr.
*Moberly, Arthur L.
Moberly, Richard O., Jr.
*Modeen, Donald O.
*Mohr, Charles H.
*Molzan, Edward W.
Montague, Lloyd L.
*Moore, Lundi A.
*Moore, Roderick B.
*Moore, William F.
*Moors, Donald E.
*Morin, Gene D.
*Morrison, Lewis E.
Morrissey, John N.
Muck, Floyd R.
Mull, Charles L., II
*Mulligan, James A., Jr.
Murphy, Frank M., Jr.
*Myatt, Bert, Jr.
Myer, George W.
Neander, Stanley B.
*Neiger, Ralph E.
Nelson, George G.
Nelson, Marvin D., Jr.
*Nelson, Robert L.
Netro, Robert J.
*Newark, Theodore E.
*Newman, Fred S.
Newman, James F.
*Nicholson, Richard E.
*Nicholson, Jerome E.
*Noble, Robert E.
Noble, Thomas I.
Nordan, Emile E.
*Norton, Curtis R., Jr.
Notz, Robert C.
Nussbaumer, John J.
*Nutt, Thomas O., Jr.
*Oakes, Raymond H.
*O'Brien, John W.
O'Brien, Charles J., Jr.
*O'Connor, Francis E.
*O'Donnell, George J., Jr.
O'Drain, John E.
*Odrobina, Stephen R.
*Ohlrich, Walter E., Jr.
O'Neill, Thomas F., Jr.
Orem, Charles A.
Otten, Henry E.
Ottensmeyer, Robert M.
*Page, George L.
Palmer, Gary H.
Palmquist, John R.
*Parce, James R.
*Parode, Harlan D.
Parrish, William I.
Pausner, Joseph J., Jr.
*Pearson, George R. M.
*Pelton, Eugene A.
Pelton, Robert L.
*Pennington, Otis G.
Pester, Fred J.
Peters, Ralph C., Jr.
*Petersen, Donald E.
Pettit, Royce E., Jr.
Pezzei, Engelbert G.
*Pfeiffer, King W.
Phillips, Charles T.
*Phillips, Edward G.
*Phillips, Lawrence E.
*Pickering, Richard C.
Pinzel, Lawrence E.
Platte, William A.
*Platzek, Eugene H.
*Polgar, Paul S.
Portnoy, Howard R.
*Potts, Bobby L.
*Pouliot, Jean R.
Powell, James R., Jr.
*Preston, Frank W.
Preston, Joseph M., Jr.
*Price, Byron
Pride, Alfred M.
Profilet, Leo T.
Pullar, Andrew, Jr.
*Purdy, Harlan R.
Putnam, Charles L.
Quaid, Marvin M., Jr.
Quigley, Donovan B.
Quinn, Jack Q.
Radcliffe, Roderick T.
*Ralston, John, Jr.
*Rasmussen, James P., Jr.
*Rau, William F.
*Reavis, Jackson B.
*Redmond, John G.
Reed, Robert K.
*Reed, Sherman C.
*Reichl, Charles J.
Resek, Lawrence H.
Reynolds, Kenneth C.
*Richards, William L., Jr.
*Ripley, Robert K.
*Risser, James B.
*Roberts, Gerald G.
*Robertson, John W.
*Robisch, Herbert E.
*Rockwell, Frank A.
*Rogers, Thomas S., Jr.
*Rosendahl, Edmund I
Rosenquist, Donald E.
*Ross, Thomas H.
Roth, Franklin H.
Rowe, John D.
*Rubey, Ervin B., Jr.
Ruble, Byron C.
Rulis, Robert A.
Rumble, Maurice W.
Rutledge, Howard E.
Ryan, John J., Jr.
Ryan, Philip J.
*Saari, Aimo, M.
*Sabalos, Nicholas
Sample, Richard J.
Sample, Robert J.
*Sampson, Jesse E.
*Sands, James W.
*Sandsberry, Jack C.
*Sargent, Herbert A.
Sattler, Donald C.
*Saunders, Stephen I., Jr.
Schaub, Robert L.
Schenker, Marvin L.
*Schied, Charles F.
Schneider, Arthur F.
Schoelen, Lawrence A.
Scholl, Kenneth C.
*Schroeder, Robert A.
Schultz, Jesse Z.
Schultz, Milton J., Jr.
*Schwab, Robert W.
*Scott, James H.
Scott, Melvin L.
*Scoville, Jack
Scribner, Henry I., Jr.
Scully, Donald G.
*Sebenius, Carl H., Jr.
*Selby, Donald E.
Shafer, Walter R.
*Shaffran, William S.
Shannon, Rickard W.
*Shartel, Howard A.
*Shaw, Fletcher H.
*Sheridan, William R.
Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.
*Shields, William B.
*Shipman, Junious E.
Shultz, Robert T.
*Siergiej, Edward S.
*Sims, Harvey K.
*Singer, Arnold N.
*Skalla, Derald Z.
*Skinner, Clifford A., Jr.
*Skinner, Glenn E., Jr.
*Skirm, George L., Jr.
Slankard, Max L.
*Sleeper, Sherwin J.
Smith, Jerome W.
*Smith, Maurice E.
*Smith, Robert F., Jr.
Smith, Thomas M.
Smith, William D.
*Smolinski, Joseph P., Jr.
*Snodgrass, Cornelius S., Jr.
*Snyder, Carl S., Jr.
*Snyder, Francis M.
Snyder, John C.
*Snyder, Roy D., Jr.
Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.
*Sorg, George A.
Southall, Walter E., Jr.
*Space, David J.
Sparks, Harold A., Jr.
Spayde, Keith C., Jr.
Speer, Paul H.
Speiser, Jack E.
*Spence, Benjamin E.
*Spencer, Ralph G.
Spiller, John H., Jr.
Springer, Roy M., Jr.
Stack, Richard A.
*Stapp, Aron L.
Steentofte, Eric H.
*Stephan, Charles R.
St. John, Alvin P.
St. Louis, Norman E.
*Stoddard, Clarence W., Jr.
*Stollenwerck, William M.
*Stolpe, Richard H.
Stone, Bruce G.
Storey, Joseph D.
*Streich, Paul R.
*Strobel, James W.
Stull, Donald
Sudhoff, Herbert A.
*Sullivan, Don M.
*Summers, Gilbert L.
*Sundt, Wilbur A.
Sutherland, Donald G.
Swadener, John R.
*Swanson, Charles A. L.
*Switzer, James R.
*Taylor, Leslie A., Jr.
Tebo, Ballard W.
Terrell, Fred W., Jr.
Thom, Norman R.
*Thomas, Earle V.
*Thomas, Robert L.
Thomas, Walter R.
*Thompson, James J.
Thompson, Robert C.
Thompson, William B., Jr.
Thorndike, Robert F.
Thorp, John H.

Thurston, Dick W.
*Tipton, Harold F., Jr.
Todd, Troy E.
*Todd, William E.
*Tolbert, Robert R.
Tollgaard, Elmer M.
*Touch, Ralph J.
Toy, Frank E.
*Traynor, Lawrence E.
Tregurtha, James D., Jr.
Trimble, Dan M.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
Tuomela, Clyde H.
Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.
*Twite, Martin J., Jr.
Tyson, James J., Jr.
*Underwood, Leland J.
*Valentine, Robert F.
VanKleeck, Justin L.
*Varner, Byron D.
*Varner, Eldon P., Jr.
*Vaughn, Robert E.
*Veit, William H.
Vines, Thomas E.
*Vogel, Oscar J., Jr.
Vollmer, Robert J.
*Vosseler, Warren P.
Wagner, Eugene R.
Wagner, Robert H.
*Wallace, David T.
*Wallace, Edwin S., Jr.
Wallace, Kenneth R.
*Waller, Alexander E., Jr.
Warwick, William B.
*Wasniewski, Emil F.
*Weatherly, Robert T.
*Webb, William H.
Weeks, Grady A.
Weymouth, Burton R.
Whaley, William S.
*Wheat, Newton L.
*White, Grover C., Jr.
*White, James A.
*White, Wendell A.
Whitehead, Richard T.
Whitley, Walter J.
Whitlock, Richard T.
Whitman, Donald L.
*Wholey, Lloyd C.
Wikeen, Donald B.
*Wilbur, Harley D.
*Wilder, Fred W.
Wilgus, Carlton L.
*Wilhite, Alan S.
Wilkins, James R., Jr.
*Wilkinson, Donald W.
Wille, James E.
Willi, Thomas A.
Williams, William A., III
*Willingham, William E., Jr.
Wilson, Alexander B.
Wilson, Joseph W.
*Winton, John R., Jr.
Wise, Gerald W.
Wiseman, Richard F.
*Wisenbaker, Eugene M.
*Wood, Peter W.
*Woodruff, Richard F.
*Woodworth, Charles M.
Woolcock, Thomas E.
Wooldridge, Edmund T., Jr.
*Worchesek, Robert R.
Wright, William B.
*Wuest, Carl I.
Wuethrich, Don L.
Wunderlich, Robert
*Wurzbacher, Robert T.
*Yowell, Grover M.
*Ziarnik, Walter P.
*Zink, Stewart T.
Zwolinski, Frank J.

MEDICAL CORPS

*Baxter, Donald L.
*Bennett, Wayland
Britton, Joseph F.
*Brodine, Charles E.
*Brown, Herbert R., Jr.
*Brown, Jacob V.
*Carson, William E.
*Cole, Buell C.
Coulter, James A.
*Davis, Richard G.
*Dean, Harold N.
*Dunn, Thomas S., Jr.
*Dutton, Bythel D.
*Easterday, Robert H.
*Fobes, Clark D.
Gable, Walter D.
*Garrison, Joseph S., III
Gass, Michael A., Jr.
*Gebhardt, Hellmut C.
*Getzen, Lindsay C.
Golden, Patrick E.
*Good, Daniel C.
Gorsuch, George E.
*Grote, Arthur J.
Gunning, Jean-Jacques
Hartney, Thomas C.
Hayes, James W.
*Hemness, Edwin M.
Hermann, Louis A.
*Hinds, Paul A.
Houk, Vernon N.
Jackson, Frederick E.
*James, Arthur D.
Knox, Paul R.
Kroncke, George M.
*Latham, Wilbur D.
Lawrie, James H.
Leblanc, Gilbert A.
*Lewis, Norman G.
McClard, Gerald J.
McDaniel, James W.
*McFadden, James A., Jr.
McMahon, Edmund B.
Meese, Ernest H.
Miller, George L.
Miller, Richard J.
Museles, Melvin
Nyirjesy, Istvan
Patterson, Frederick M.
Pischnotte, William O.
Pugh, Daniel E.
Rankin, Charles A., Jr.
*Reichardt, Kenneth H.
Robins, John C.
Ronis, Norman
Rosborough, James F., Jr.
Rotner, Melvin
Rucci, Eustine P.
*Sacher, Edward C.
Salisbury, Edward M.
Schefstad, Wilbur J.
Schmitz, Nicholas W.
Schrader, William A., Jr.
Schutt, Donald A.
*Scott, Daniel J., Jr.
Slemmons, Barton K.
*Spence, William F.
*Stevenson, Andrew W., Jr.
Thomas, Don F.
Thomas, Wendell C.
*Trettel, Raymond J.
*Turner, James E., Jr.
Valaske, Martin J.
*Valdivieso-Deltoro, Jorge R.
Vanhouten, Robert J.
Vasquez, Mario A.
Viele, Billy D.

*Vincent, John T.
Voss, Marlyn W.
*Welch, Elbert S.
*Wilson, George L.
*Wilson, James E., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Armstrong, George K.
Barber, Ray C.
*Bauer, Robert F.
*Beatty, Carl N.
*Bennett, William W.
*Blassic, Robert S.
*Brock, Leonard E.
*Brown, Robert M.
*Carpenter, Dan M.
*Cefalu, Dominic V.
*Cloutier, Norman L.
*Coons, William W.
*Daniel, James C.
*Dauchess, Edward G.
Davis, James B.
Donley, Harold C., Jr.
*Dughi, Carl M.
Dunham, Donald J., Jr.
Ely, William B., Jr.
*Emery, William M.
*Fischer, Carl R., Jr.
Foster, Paul L.
Francis, Evans J.
*Frelander, Wendell L.
*Fussell, Theodore J.
*Garibaldi, James J.
Gove, Jack E.
*Graham, Robert B.
Greenberg, Edwin G.
Halperin, George B.
Henderson, John M.
*Herndon, Paul C.
Hudson, Richard S.
*Hughes, Lowell T.
Jones, Burton H.
Katz, Samuel
*Killebrew, Thomas E.
*Kirkwood, "J" Scott
*Leonard, William N., Jr.
*Lynn, James W.
*Malerich, Francis J.
*Malone, Francis E.
Maynard, Frank T.
McClintock, Harry C.
*Mehaffey, Donald C.
*Mereness, Lyman T.
*Morris, Edwards M.
*Owens, Andrew J.
*Paul, Charles B., III
Peterman, Edward E.
*Piazza, Thomas J.
*Puleo, Joseph A.
*Riegle, Chester F.
Ringhausen, Robert L.
Rippert, Donald J.
*Roberts, Gerald E.
*Rolen, Loveman F.
Rudzinski, Anthony W.
*Sappanos, Louis M.
*Sauer, Charles A.
*Schmidt, Ben R.
*Smith, Charles W.
*Stubbs, Raymond C.
*Thurner, Alfred J.
Tveita, Raymond C.
Webb, Davis L.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

*Bergeur, John P. X.
Biffar, William J.
Canfield, Robert A.
*Clayton, Walter B., Jr.
*Condit, John C.
*Crawford, Jack V.
*Croston, Calvin J.
*Dimino, Joseph T.
*Ferreri, Peter J.
Fite, Mark E.
*Gardner, Calvin G.
*Gibbons, Martin F.
Grace, Patrick J.
*Gould, John D.
Hammond, Edward P.
Heath, Robert H.
Hitchens, Walter C.
*Hill, Rodger F.
*Holland, Harry W., Jr.
*Hollis, William F., Jr.
*Howard, William R.
*Hunter, Jackson D.
Ingebretson, Ervin D.
Jenkins, Charles L.
*Jones, Asa W.
Johnson, Paul A.
*Karras, Nick S.
*Kicklighter, Edward H.
*Kingsley, Donald F., Jr.
Lemaster, Donald C.
*McDonald, Leo J.
*Mole, Robert L.
*Moore, Withers M.
*Moye, Thomas E.
*Northrup, Clarence V.
*Otto, Albert J.
*Romantum, Peter P.
Rooney, Donald J.
Ryan, Joseph E.
*Stewart, Dell F., Jr.
Weir, Donald A.
Zeller, Kenneth P.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Anderson, Richard E.
*Bartley, Delmar A.
*Bourne, William A.
*Foley, Richard L.
Forehand, Paul W.
*Hendricks, Reinhold M.
Huffman, James I.
Jones, Robert L.
*Kimmick, Varne M.
*Phelps, Pharo A.
Sherman, George E.
*Vance, Robert C.
*Wagner, Walter R.
*Wagoner, Jack R.
*Whipple, Caryll R.
*White, Lawrence M.

DENTAL CORPS

*Abbott, Paul L.
Ainley, James E., Jr.
Anderson, John T.
*Bohacek, Joseph R.
Bowers, Gerald M.
Clarke, Homer
*Cowen, Charles E., Jr
*Demaree, Neil C.
*Elliott, James R.
*Fields, Robert E.
Flagg, Roger H.
Foster, Richard D.
*Freeburn, Harold E., Jr.
*Garman, Thomas A.
Gorman, Walter J.
Grandich, Russell A.
*Granger, Ronald G.
*Hays, James W.
Hegley, John H.
*Heinkel, Erwin J., Jr.
Hiatt, William R.
Hodson, Harold W.
*Hofflus, Edwin L.
Holmes, John B.
*Hylton, Roscoe J., Jr.
Johnson, Dean L.
Kelley, John P.
*Kelly, William P.
Klecinic, Edward P.
*Little, Earl E., Jr.
*McKean, Thomas W.
McKinnon, John A., Jr.
*McWhorter, Howard B.
*Moore, Frank B.
*Nolf, Robert S.
*Orrahood, Robert H.
Pebley, Harry C.
*Perand, Steven W.
Pinkley, Virgil A.
Pistocco, Louis R.
Prange, William H.
Reid, Albert F.
Ruliffson, Franklin R.
*Sazima, Henry J.
*Shreve, William B., Jr.
*Smith, Albert R.
*Spicer, Robert H.
Stanley, James H.
*Sydow, Paul J.
*Taylor, "B" Frank
Tenca, Joseph I.
Terry, Bill C.
*Thompson, Robert G
*Thomason, Robert R.
*Tow, Herman D., Jr.
*Webb, John J.
*Wescott, Maurice E.
Wilson, James M.
Wooden, Robert A.
Woodland, Everan C., Jr.
*Woody, Wilton G.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Barkley, Lucien E.
*Beam, Walter E., Jr.
Bergquist, Melvin D., Jr.
Boggs, Clifford W.
Carr, Charles A., Jr.
*Charles, John P.
Courtney, John C.
*Damato, Morris J.
Dempewolf, Eugene H.
Douglas, George P.
*Ervin, Francis A.
*Freeman, Noel L.
Gay, Laverne W.
Gehring, Jack H.
Goodrich, Neil E., Jr.
Harvey, Dallas C.
*Henry, Girton H.
*Huber, Godfrey S.
Jones, William H.
*Kaufman, Louis R.
*Keating, Katherine
Lacy, Dexter J.
Laedtke, Ralph H.
Lee, Raymond W.
*Levich, Calman
Marsh, William G., Jr.
*McGuire, Francis E.
McMahon, Talmadge G.
*McMichael, Allen E.
Miller, Edwin B.
Pruitt, John D.
Sanders, James M.
Schwab, Albert J.
*Sharp, Robert
Stiles, Thomas R.
*Still, Donald E.
Sykes, Stanley E.
*Testa, Michele J.
Tober, Theodore W.
Tully, John J., Jr.
Warner, Albert D.
*Wheeler, Thomas E.

NURSE CORPS

Burcham, Janice M.
Byrnes, Anna M.
*Dewar, Natalie M.
Eberhardt, Marie
Eberharter, Virginia M.
Ellis, Barbara
Pojeky, Ruth M.
Quillin, Rose M.
Schuh, Lorraine C.
Slate, Faye J.
Troskoski, Dolores
*Walker, Catherine S.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

*Abbott, Leonard J.
Abernathy, Kenneth L.
*Adams, John L.
Adams, Robert C.
*Ager, Snowden C.
*Albritton, Charles R.
*Alderson, Donald M., Jr.
*Alecxih, Donald A.
*Alexander, Howard W.
*Alexander, James W.
Allard, Frank A.
*Allen, Bill R.
Allen, Charles A.
Allen, Curtis R.
*Allen, Galen B.
*Allen, John C.
Allen, Richard O., Jr.
Allen, Scott
Allen, Walter S.
*Alligood, Bruce T., Jr.
Allison, William R., Jr.
Althouse, Arnold S.
*Anderson, Erns M.
*Anderson, George R.
Anderson, Howard R.
*Anderson, James C.
Anderson, Jerry P.
Anderson, Richard W.
Andrew, Charles A.
Andrews, Bobie
Androski, Frank N.
Angier, Edward H.
*Arthur, Glenn N., Jr.
Artuso, Michael A.
*Asher, Roy W.
*Ashford, James P.
*Astley, James F.
Atkins, Allan L.
Augustyniak, Edward J.
Austin, Robert F.
*Aven, Donald J.
*Awbrey, Roy D.
*Backstrom, Harley A.
Bacon, Robin L.
*Bader, Allen L.
*Baglioni, Victor A.
Bailey, Donald C., Jr.
Bailey, Robert B.
*Baird, Winfield S., Jr.
Baker, Floyd O.
*Baker, Richard L.
*Baker, Walter F.
*Baldauf, Laurence C., Jr.
*Baldry, George K.
*Baldwin, John A., Jr.
*Baleme, Leroy C.
Ball, George B., Jr.
Ball, John W.

*Ballinger, Robert M.
Balsamo, Leo J.
Bambo, Gregory B., Jr.
*Banbury, Floyd R.
Banks, Peter A.
*Bannon, John M.
Barker, Monroe W.
*Barling, Stephen D., Jr.
Barnes, James A.
Barnett, Charles E.
*Barr, John F.
*Barr, Ronald L.
Barr, Walter A.
Barrish, Paul D.
Barry, Richard E.
Bartholomew, James H.
Basham, Jerald D.
Bass, William H., III
Bassett, James S.
*Bastin, Carl A.
*Batdorf, Paul D.
Bate, Ronald D.
*Bates, Glenn D.
Battles, Roy E.
*Batzler, John R.
*Bauder, James R.
*Baumgartner, John P.
*Baxter, William J., Jr.
Beach, Milton D.
Beach, Robert R.
Beale, Glenn M.
*Beardslee, Ralph C., Jr.
*Beardsley, Jerry L.
Beaton, John M.
Beck, Liston C., Jr.
Beck, Richard E.
Beck, Richard J.
Bedow, Robert J.
Beecher, Ronald R.
Bell, Brewer
Bell, William F.
Beltz, Russell C.
*Benefiel, Oscar W., Jr.
Bennett, Charles F.
*Bennett, Joseph E.
*Bennett, Raymond "D"
Berger, Raymond E.
Bergstrom, Kenneth I.
*Bernard, George O.
*Berrier, John J., Jr.
*Bethany, Jesse E.
Beversdorf, Donald W.
Beyl, David D.
*Biegel, Herbert K.
Biggs, Robert R.
*Bigney, Russell E.
Bild, Norman C.
*Bilderback, John E.
*Billing, Clare B.
Bird, Ralph G.
*Birdsall, David M.
*Black, Cole
*Black, George E.
*Blackmar, Fredrik S.
*Blaine, Robert D.
*Blair, Peter S.
Blaker, Charles F.
Blanc, Garvey A.
Blanchard, Ralph W., Jr.
*Blandford, James R.
*Blenkhorn, James M., Jr.
Blevins, Deward C.
Bley, John E., Jr.
Bloom, Donald D.
*Blount, Donald W.
Blum, Brandon B.
*Blythe, Russell M.
Bonner, James E.
Borden, Archie D.
*Borden, Douglas H., Jr.
Borgardt, Elmer G.
*Boucher, Francis T.
*Boudreaux, Byron F.
Bovey, Paul E.
*Bower, Thomas E.
*Bowler, Peter P.
Boyd, Richard M.
*Boyd, Robert L.
*Bracken, Leonard A., Jr.
*Bradley, Bedford C.
*Brady, Frederick L., Jr.
*Brandau, James F.
*Braun, Carl T.
*Braun, Peter J.
Brecheen, John A.
Breeding, Leslie E.
Breland, Edgar A.
Brennan, John F., Jr.
Brennan, Richard J.
Brestle, Charles A.
*Brickson, Herbert O.
Briegel, Charles V.
Briggs, Braden R.
Brisbois, Marshall B.
Brooks, Charles G. W.
*Browder, Edward H.
Brown, Donald B.
Brown, Donald R.
*Brown Harold E.
Brown, Harold W.
*Brown, Isom L.
*Brown, Leo P.
Brown, Nicholas
*Brown, Robert C.
Brown, Robert E.
*Brubaker, Joseph D., Jr.
*Brunick, Gerard P.
*Buchanan, Auda E.
Buchsieb, Louis D.
*Buck, Wallace A.
*Bullard, Jerry L.
*Burch, William J.
*Burgess, Harold E., Jr
Burghardt, Louis, Jr.
Burke, Francis J.
*Burke, Thomas J., Jr.
Burkel, John F.
Burnham, Paul
Burrows, Donn T.
Bush, Ronald J.
Butler, Francis M., Jr.
*Butterfield, Frederick D.
*Buzzard, Robert D.
*Byrne, Joseph L.
*Cabanillas, Jose C., II
Caccivio, John D.
*Cajka, Anthony C.
Cameron, Robert W.
*Camp, John R.
*Campbell, Gerald D.
Campbell, Harry F., Jr.
*Campbell, Richard F.
*Campbell, Richard H.
Canada, Donald E.
*Cann, Thomas P.
*Carcaba, John H.
Cardoza, Henry
Carlin, Bernard T.
*Carlson, Don P.
*Carlson, Dudley L.
*Carlson, Leland J.
Carmichael, Eddie I.
Carpenter, Leamon F.
*Carr, James M., Jr.
Carroll, John T.
Carroll, Robert J.
*Carry, Allan H.
*Carson, Burton E., II
Carson, James T.
*Caruso, Amedeo B.
*Carver, Robert L.
*Caston, Terry G.
Cecelski, Arthur R.
Cedarcrans, Phillip N.
Cellar, Charles J., Jr.
Cernan, Eugene A.
Chaney, Marvin L.
Chang, Ming E.
*Channell, Ralph N.
*Chapman, Melvin E.
Chase, Henri B., III
*Chase, Warren P.
*Chenoweth, Ralph L.
Chester, Scott A.
Chilton, Holly H.
Chitty, Charles M., Jr.
*Chiz, Thaddeus F.
Chrisman, George F., Jr.
*Christensen, Howard E.
Christopher, Richard V.
Cichowitz, Edward J., Jr.
Claflin, Clarence C.
Clark, Arthur R., Jr.
Clark, Joseph E.
*Clark, Orris V.
*Clark, Robert E.
*Clark, Robert C.
Clark, William E., Jr.
*Clement, Carl C., Jr.
Clement, Leroy A.
*Cleveland, Gary M.
Click, Duane L.
*Cliff, Gene L.
Cloud, Bruce L.
Clower, Claude D.
*Coakley, Stephen A.
*Cobb, Emsley F.
*Cobb, George W.
Coffee, Ernest E.
*Coffey, Roger L.
Coggins, Joseph E.
Cole, Charles W., Jr.
Coleman, Douglas C.
*Coleman, Theodore L., Jr.
Coll, William A.
*Colley, Richard T.
Collier, Lacey A.
Colville, Robert E.
Collom, Frederick W., Jr.
Colohan, William J.
Colville, Robert E.
*Colvin, William P.
*Combs, Lawrence L.
Combs, Robert L.
*Comstock, Richard I.
*Conerty, Frank C.
Connell, Earl W.
Connell, Philip J.
Connelly, James H., Jr.
*Conway, James M.
Cook, John H., III
*Cook, Paul M.
Cooke, Vincent E.
Cookson, Robert H.
Coons, Henry A.
Cooper, Daniel L.
Cooper, Estill A., Jr.
*Cooper, James A.
Cooper, Ross E.
*Copeman, Thomas H., Jr.
*Cornett, Paul A.
Corsi, Joseph A.
Cothran, George E.
Cotsonas, John P.
*Coupe, Richard H.
Coupe, Walter E.
Covey, Edward J.
*Coward, Alton A., Jr.
*Cowles, Robert R.
Cox, Henry
Cozine, Kenneth, Jr.
Crafton, Robert W.
Craig, John E., Jr.
*Craig, Lee R.
Crain, Carroll O., Jr.
Crandall, Ira C.
Crater, George H., Jr.
*Craven, John F.
*Creech, Billy S.
*Creech, Worley Y., Jr.
*Creighton, Perry F., Jr.
Crouse, James U., Jr.
Crowder, Billy
Crowell, George T., Jr.
*Crowley, Barrett K.
*Crozier, Robert A.
Crudup, Everett H., Jr.
*Crummer, James F.
Cumming, Richard S., III
*Cummings, Joseph D.
*Currie, Raymond M.
Curry, Thomas H.
Cushing, Earl H.
Cutting, Curtis B.
Dage, Jerry D.
Dahill, Edward E., III
Dangelico, Donato
Daniels, Hal B.
Daniels, Nelson M.
Darnell, Jack
Daugherty, Donald N.
Daulton, James T.
Davies, Eugene L.
*Davis, George W., Jr.
*Davis, Harry L.
Davis, Norman E.
Davis, Robert G.
*Dawson, Albert L.
Dawson, Allan "J"
Day, Earl F.
Deangelo, Mark J.
Dearie, Cyril G.
Dearing, Paul W.
Decesare, Victor A.
Dechant, John A.
*Degroff, James L.
*Deisher, Richard J.
*Delano, George B.
*Delozier, James L.
Dennis, Mack O.
Dennison, James R.
Denunzio, Nicholas J.
*Devalois, Edwin W.
Deweese, Everette D.
Diloreto, Lucio
*Dingle, James W., Jr.
Disilvestro, Richard A.
Dixon, Jewel L., Jr.
*Dixon, Max W.
Dockery, Olan, L.
Doerr, Peter J.
Doherty, Richard S.
Domville, Compton N., Jr.
Donahue, Thomas E., Jr.
*Donovan, Ian E. M.
*Doonan, Robert J.
*Dopazo, Anthony J.
Dore, Stanley M., Jr.
Doremus, Robert B.
Dorow, William R.
Dorsey, James F., Jr.
*Dougherty, James M.
Dowd, Gregory P.
Downs, Eugene H.
*Doyle, Robert C.
Drake, Leon L.
Drewry, Dean T.
Duffie, Charles L.
*Duke, Louie C.
Dunbar, Fredric A.
Duncan, John G.
Dunleavy, Richard M.
Dunmire, Rance D.
*Dunn, Joseph J.
Dunnam, William L.
*Durbin, Robert H., Jr.
*Durgin, David A.
Dwyer, John L.
Eades, Thomas A.
Eason, William G.
Easterbrook, Charles W., Jr.
Eaton, Robert H.
Eck, Billy C.
*Eckels, Donald E.
Eckert, John D.
*Edberg, Walter O.
Edmunds, Donald C.
*Edson, Charles T.
Edwards, James C.
Edwards, Leslie R.
Edwards, William F.
Egerton, James W.
Ehret, James D.
Ehrman, Robert G.
*Elder, William N.
Elie, Gayle O.
Eller, James B.
*Elliott, Fredrick H.
Elwell, William D.
Elzey, Robert E.
*Emery, Robert E.
*Emery, Thomas R. M.
*Emmett, Joseph R.
English, Glenn A.
*Epple, Calvin C.
*Eppler, Billy M.
Erdei, Edward J.
*Erickson, Kenneth J.
Erie, Carl R.
*Eskew, John B.
Eskew, Perry R., Jr.
Estes, Edward D.
*Etcheson, Gerald R.
Etheredge, Teddy B.
Evans, Gene O.
*Evans, Irvin R.
*Evans, James J.
*Evans, Richard P.
Eversole, Fredrick L.
*Evrard, Leroy
*Exon, Roger M.
Eyler, Armand T., Jr.
Fairbanks, Wayne K.
*Fairchild, Joseph D.
Falkenstein, Timothy O.
*Fall, Robert H., III
Fare, Claude L.
*Farino, Francis J.
*Farley, Milton R.
*Farris, David E.
Farris, Gary F.
Fasanard, Michael F. Jr.
*Fassett, Harold S. Jr.
Fauth, Donald P.
*Feakes, George E., Jr.
Featherston, Rex W.
*Fegan, Joseph H.
Felkins, Charles G.
*Fend, Clarence E., Jr.
Fenton, Clayton J., Jr.
Fenzl, George J., Jr.
*Ferguson, Sam A.
Ferrarini, Richard L.
*Ferrier, Harry H.
Ferry, James M.
Fetzer, Norman C.
Fieser, Arnold K.
*Fillingane, Hulon P.
Fink, Siegfried A.
*Finke, Walter J. Jr.
Fiore, Adolph A.
Fischer, Robert J.
*Fisher, John C.
Fisher, Walter L., Jr.
*Fisk, Harold W.
Fitch, Edward S.
*Fitzgerald, John
Fitzgerald, Maurice D.
Fitzgerald, Ronald J.
Fitzsimmons, Harry S., Jr.
Fitzsimmons, Eugene W.
*Fix, Vernon H.
*Fladager, Myles E.
Flanary, Thomas N., II
*Flanigan, John E., Jr.
*Fleming, James T., Jr.
*Fleury, Clement E.
Flower, John R.
*Flowers, Walter R.
Flynn, William J.
*Foley, Harvey D.
Foltz, Donald S.
Fontanesi, Francis D.
Foote, Everett W.
*Foote, Theodore P.
Ford, Alvis S.
*Ford, Harold L.
Ford, John W.
Ford, Omar R.
*Ford, Wilbur S.
Forest, Robert E.
Fortenberry, Thomas N.
Foster, Charles R.
*Foster, Frank
*Fox, Evarts C., Jr.
*Francis, Nigel D.
Francis, Paul R.
Frank, Vernon E.
Franzen, Richard D.
Frazier, Donald L.
Fredrick, Russell E.
*French, Maynard D.
Frey, Charles W.
Friedrich, Thomas E.
Friichtenicht, Richard D.
Froehlich, Kenneth R.
Frokjer, Elmer H.
Fudala, Ernest M.
*Fueston, Vernon M., Jr.
Fuld, Charles L.
Fulford, John A.
Fuller, Fred R.
*Fuller, Milo W.
*Fullerton, Richard F.
Fullerton, Frank E.
*Fulton, Elbert M., Jr.
Fyles, Roderick A.
*Gallagher, John W.
*Gallagher, Patrick J.
Gallagher, Vincent E.
*Gammell, Clark M.
Garber, Cecil E.
*Gardner, Geoffrey L.
Garman, Glen E.
Garretson, Arthur S.
*Garrow, Jack A.
Garsoe, Norman D.
*Gasser, Thomas A.
Gates, Richard L.
*Geer, Richard G.
Gelke, John J.
Gergen, Philip W.
Gero, Richard L.
*Gerrity, William J.
Giacchino, Louie F.
Gibson, Clifford W.
Gilbert, Donald B.
Gilchrist, Craig G.
*Gildea, John F.
Gilfry, Mason C.
*Gill, Russell R.
*Gilmore, Kenneth D.
Gilpin, George W.
Gilreath, James E.
Glasgow, Billy R.
Glasson, William A., Jr.
*Goetz, Robert B.
Goewey, Lee E.
Golightly, Horace H., Jr.
Gonzalez, Robert N.
Goodall, Thomas A.
*Gooden, Milford I.
*Gooding, Charles L., Jr.
Gormley, Kenneth L.
*Gottfried, Howard L.
Gougar, Jack M.
*Graf, Howard F.
*Grafius, Guy A. B.
Graham, Miles T.
*Graham, Roger L.
Grandjean, Charles A.
*Granum, Roger B.
*Graue, Clifford R.
Gray, Robert K.

*Greathouse, Edwin A.
*Green, Ellis, F.
*Greene, James F., Jr.
*Greenhalgh, William T., Jr.
Greenshaw, Karl J., Jr.
*Grego, James M.
Gregory, Charles C., Jr.
*Gregory, Nelson B.
Grier, Thomas C., Jr.
Griffin, Robert F.
Griffin, Thomas J.
Groff, Peter J.
*Grothe, Henry J.
*Grundy, Charles D.
*Guerra, Albert H.
*Guidry, Rodney R.
*Guilday, Daniel S.
*Guille, Sherred L.
*Guimond, Gordon R.
*Gunther, Howard P.
*Hagee, Charles R.
Hagen, Jack
*Hague, John D.
Haines, Richard W.
Hall, Don L.
Hall, Roy V.
Hamel, Donald R.
Hamilt, Arthur
*Hamilton, David G.
*Hamilton, Harry D.
*Hamilton, Robert B.
Hamman, Kenneth A.
Hammon, Colin P.
*Hammond, Leroy L.
Hampton, Robert A.
*Haney, Norman L.
Hanley, William L., Jr.
Hansen, Lawrence W.
Hanson, Deroy L.
Hanson, Edwin E.
*Hanson, John I.
*Hanson, Robert P.
*Harden, Thad H.
Hardt, Hugo A.
Harney, George S.
*Harper, Norman W.
Harris, Homer D.
Harris, Robert H.
*Harter, John V.
Hartley, Donald H.
*Hartsaw, David R.
*Harvey, Neil L.
*Harvey, Richard M.
Hasch, Ralph H.
Hastings, Irving W., Jr.
Hatfield, Willis G.
Haupt, Elmer H., Jr.
*Hauser, Donald L.
Hayman, Douglass F., Jr.
Heath, Edmund W.
Hebert, Donald F.
*Heckman, Donald C.
Hedstrom, Carl W.
Hegar, Edwin J.
Heinz, Paul R.
Heitman, Milton H.
Helm, Ralph M.
*Henderson, Bobby G.
*Henderson, Raymond R.
*Henderson, Thomas F.
*Hendricks, George H.
Hennessey, John P.
Hennick, Raymond J.
Henry, George R.
*Henry, Jack A.
*Hepworth, Robert W.
Herring, Paul E.
Hess, Ronald K.
*Hettinger, Louis P.
*Hickey, John A.
*Hicks, Clarence A., Jr.
*Higgins, Leo A.
Hill, Richard L.
Hill, Rollin L.
*Hine, Raymond W.
*Hinger, Carl K.
*Hinton, Robert M.
Hobbs, Fermor W., III
Hodge, William R.
Hodgkinson, John T.
*Hoehne, Ralph L.
Hoff, Jack A.
*Hogg, Robert L.
Hoggatt, Gary L.
Hogue, Robert L.
*Holderness, Robert T., Jr.
Holland, John O.
Hollandsworth, Paul F., Jr.
*Holloway, Lowell J.
Holmes, Harry M.
*Honeycutt, Jackson H.
Honsinger, Vernon C.
Hood, Joseph W., Jr.
Hood, Warren W.
*Hoover, Harry A.
*Hoppenjans, Lawrence G.
*Horne, Hainyard L., Jr.
House, Wayne, Jr.
*Houston, Chester E.
Howard, Charles B.
*Howatt, Gerald J.
Howell, Walter J.
*Howells, David A.
Hoyes, Donald J.
Hubbell, Milford M.
*Hudson, Joe A.
*Huff, Ralph R.
Huff, Walter C., Jr.
*Hughes, John W.
Huhn, Samuel P.
Hullander, Robert A.
Humphreys, David W.
*Hunley, Charles C.
*Hunt, Herman L.
*Hunt, James H.
Hunt, Kirby P.
*Hunt, Richard L.
Hurd, Devon H.
Hutcheon, Wallace S., Jr.
Hutto, Charles H.
Hutton, James L.
Hyatt, Robert G.
Ishol, Lyle M.
*Ives, Clarence D.
Ivey, Ora F.
Jackson, Earl L., Jr.
*Jackson, Edward I.
*Jackson, Joe T., Jr.
*Janes, William E., Jr.
*Jansen, Alexander J.
*Janus, Anthony, Jr.
*Jardine, Edward F., Jr.
Jarwin, Raymond J.
*Jaudon, Johns P.
Jauss, Charles W.
*Jefferis, Lawrence R.
Jenista, George B.
*Jenkins, James R., Jr.
*Jenkins, John C.
Jeremiah, David E.
Johns, Alan D.
Johnson, Bobbie D.
Johnson, David R.
*Johnson, George L.
Johnson, Harrison A.
Johnson, Jerome L.
*Johnson, John R.
*Johnson, Lauren A.
*Johnson, Max R.
*Johnson, William J., Jr.
Johnston, Edward A.
Jones, Stanley W.
*Jordan, Arliss L.
*Jordan, Douglas S.
Jourden, Bud A., Jr.
*Judd, Robert G.
*Jumper, Eugene A., Jr.
Jumper, Vernon L.
*Jurgensen, Kenneth I.
*Kaiser, Donald S.
*Karlen, James H.
*Katzman, Marvin S.
Katzmann, Gerard H.
Kavanaugh, Michael W.
Kawalkowski, Leonard P.
*Kear, Donald
Keast, Paul H.
*Keener, Delbert V.
*Keil, Louis D.
*Keiser, Robert B.
*Keith, Clyde R.
*Kelly, Donald C.
Kelly, Gerald C.
Kelly, Theodore A.
Kelly, Thomas F.
Kemp, Ernest E.
*Kendra, Robert J.
*Kennedy, Calvin E.
Kennedy, Raymond J.
Kennedy, William F.
*Kennington, William A.
Keough, Edward P.
*Kerrigan, Robert J.
Ketchum, William H.
*Keys, Robert C.
*Kiefaber, Thomas G.
*Kilborn, Edgar L.
Kilgore, William H.
Kilpatrick, Paul G., Jr.
King, Ural W.
*Kingston, Edward A.
Kinney, Charles H.
*Kirby, Alexander G., Jr.
Kish, John T.
Klein, Harry L.
*Klugman, Dale R.
Knaus, Vincent L.
Knef, Andrew L.
*Knoth, Larence W., Sr.
*Koch, Richard J., Jr.
*Koehler, Robert L.
*Koester, Frederick H., Jr.
*Kohloff, Donald A.
*Kohn, Edwin R., Jr.
*Kolaras, Demosthenes N.
*Kopfman, Theodore F.
Kouns, Archie R.
Kralik, Simon C.
Krogh, David E.
*Kronzer, Joseph J., Jr.
*Krueger, Richard H.
Krueger, Richard G.
*Kucera, Ronald C.
Kuhn, Wendel S., Jr.
*Kuligowski, Theodore J.
Kulo, Thomas S.
*Kuplinski, Stanley J.
*Lachut, Herbert M.
*Lacklen, Albert J.
Lacy, William A.
*Laine, Leroy C.
*Lake, Clarence R.
*Lake, Rodney D.
*Lam, Chapman L.
*Lamers, John P.
Lamm, George E.
Lance, Jack R.
*Lane, Robert W.
*Langston, Thomas J.
Lanning, Richard J.
Lapham, Joseph G.
Larison, John D., Jr.
Larsen, Victor D.
*Larson, John P.
Lassetter, Keith M.
*Laughlin, Alvin T.
Laurance, James D.
*Lavallee, William F.
Lavelle, Thomas J.
*Lawniczak, George E., Jr.
*Lawrence, David
Lawrence, Donald W.
Lawson, Ramsay
*Laye, John E.
Leach, William J.
*Leaver, John M., Jr.
Leblanc, James B.
Lee, Dennis B.
*Lee, Leonard M.
Lees, Forrest A., Jr.
Lengel, Robert C.
*Leo, Leonard
*Leopold, Robert K.
Lester, Richard P., Jr.
*Lett, Raymond E.
Levy, Norman S.
Lewey, Ira D.
Lewinski, Roman R.
*Lighton, Paul G.
Lightsey, James L.
*Ligon, Richard R.
*Lilienthal, Donald H.
Lincoln, John R.
Lindquist, Donald E.
*Lindsey, Austin M.
*Linehan, Donald B.
Linehan, Timothy J., Jr.
*Lipford, William L.
*Lipster, Donald C.
*Liptak, Richard D.
Lloyd, David B.
*Locke, William J.
*Loeb, Gerald K.
*Long, John F.
Longley, William N.
*Looby, Robert J.
Loos, Donald G.
Loscavio, John M.
*Lotton, Donald E.
Loudon, Richard, S.
*Love, John J.
Lowe, William L.
*Lowery, Willis E.
*Lowrey, Clifford A.
Loynes, Louis A.
*Luitjens, Robert H.
*Lukomski, Fred J.
*Lull, Edward W.
*Lund, Eugene P.
Lund, John R.
Lundquist, Donald R.
*Lundy, Robert H.
*Lusk, Charles T.
Lybrand, Joe D.
*Lynch, Hugh F.
Lynch, John E., Jr.
Lynch, Robert B., Jr.
Macan, John J.
Macaskill, Everett, Jr.
MacCabe, Van L.
*MacDonald, John W.
MacDougall, Ronald R.
MacIntyre, Daniel G.
*Mack, John A.
*MacKenzie, Joseph D.
Mackin, Louis B., Jr.
*MacLean, Robert E.
MacQuarrie, Gary L.
Magarity, Roy L.
*Magee, Donald C.
Mahler, George B.
Majors, William T.
*Maloney, John J.
*Manheimer, Donald Z.
*Mann, John A.
*Manzo, Mike
*Manthorpe, William H. J.
*Marcoux, Louis H.
Mares, Ernest
*Markel, Douglas S.
*Marquis, Ronald A.
Marrion, Reginald T.
Marryott, Ronald F.
*Marsh, Lloyd P.
Martensen, Vincent F.
*Martin, Donald L.
*Martin, Donald
*Martin, George W.
*Martin, Harry C.
*Martineau, Roger J.
Mason, Stuart J., Jr.
Mater, Bernard E.
*Mathews, Richard L.
Matson, Bruce W.
Matt, George E., Jr.
Matthews, John B.
*Matthews, Mitchell D., Jr.
Mattson, John A.
*Matzner, Rudolph, Jr.
Mayer, Robert V.
McCabe, George J.
McCann, Joseph D.
McCarthy, Charles J., Jr.
McCarthy, John D.
*McCarthy, Philip R., Jr.
*McCartney, Faber W.
*McClellan, Gordon
McClenahan, Tom P.
*McClure, John S.
McCoy, Frank R., Jr.
*McCracken, David J.
*McCrimmon, Douglas R.
McCullough, "J P"
McCullough, Raymond K.
McDaniel, Eugene B.
*McDaniel, Peter W.
McDermitt, John G.
McDivatt, Ronald M.
McDonald, George W., Jr.
*McDonnell, John R.
McDonough, Owen E.
McFadden, John H., Jr.
McGahan, John P.
McGinnis, Denver E.
*McGonegal, Donal E.
*McHale, Edward B.
McHugh, John T.
McInerney, John C.
McIntire, William G. Jr.
McIntire, Wilton H.
*McIsaac, Alban T.
McKee, Frank R.
*McKee, John H., Jr.
McKenna, Charles E.
McKenzie, John H., Jr.
*McKeown, Thomas J., Jr.
McKinney, Gale A.
*McKenzie, Raymond C.
McKenzie, William E.
McKissock, Donald J.
*McKnight, Kent A.
*McLaren, Alfred S.
McLellan, Charles A.
*McLyman, Edward J. Jr.
McMillan, Edward W.
McNeely, James K.
McNeil, Charles H.
McNeil, Dale A.
*McNish, John E.
McRae, James F.
*McVoy, Robert P.
Mecaughey, Robert W.
Meintzer, William C., Jr.
*Mengle, Kenneth J.
Mercer, William C.
*Merritt, Robert S.
Meyer, "J. D."
Meyers, Roger A.
*Michael, Benjamin H.
Michaels, Danny J.
Middleton, Jerry T.
*Mieldazis, Richard J.
*Miesse, Walter T.
Mikeal, William S.
Mikitarian, Samson
Miles, Dewitt C., Jr.
*Miles, Robert W.
Miller, David W.
Miller, Donald R.
Miller, Forrest R., Jr.
Miller, James R.
Miller, James T.
Miller, John A.
*Miller, Justin A., Jr.
*Miller, Robert W.
Miller, Robert H.
*Miller, Ronald D.
*Miller, Russell C.
Miller, Walter W.
Miller, Wendell E.
*Milligan, Jack R.
*Minnich, Donald E.
Mirise, Kerry W.
Mixon, Richard I.
Moffitt, Vernon D.
Molloy, Arthur E.
Monahan, Edward P.
*Monroe, Henry L., Jr.
Montgomery, George C., Jr.
*Moody, Dewitt H.
*Moore, Gene R.
Moore, Paul M.
Moore, Robert E.
Moore, Robert W.
Moran, Thomas J.
Moravec, Henry J., Jr.
Morehouse, Bruce C.
*Morgan, John R.
Morris, Jesse B., Jr.
Morrison, Jon K.
*Mueller, Donald C.
*Multer, Richard P.
Munsey, William D.
Murphy, Warren T., Jr.
Murray, Darrell
Murray, Paul A.
*Murton, David B.
Musick, Wayne O.
*Myer, Charles W.
Myers, Charles E.
*Myers, Robert U.
Myers, Willie R.
Myers, William K., Jr.
*Narmi, Ronald E.
*Nash, Gordon C., Jr.
*Nash, Owen W.
Nations, Travis D.
Naylor, Olen E., Jr.
*Nelson, Roger E., Jr.
*Newbegin, Robert G., IV
Newman, Alvin S.
Newton, William P.
Nicholson, Herbert H. J.
Nicholson, Robert C.
Nielsen, Robert P.
*Nixon, Robert T.
Nofziger, Larry B.
Nolan, Walter E., Jr.
Norrington, Charles G.
Notargiacomo, Joseph M.
Nourse, George H.
Novarra, Francis J.
Nowak, Arthur A.
*Nyquist, John W.
*Oakes, Winslow B.
*O'Brien, Charles M., Jr.
O'Connor, William J.
O'Donnell, Daniel T.
*O'Donnell, John L.
*Oehlbeck, Edward W.
Ogden, John H.
O'Kelly, James R.
*Olliver, Charles P.
Oliver, Richard C.
Olliver, Ephe A.

*Olmstead, Stanley E.
*Olsen, Walter E.
Olson, Darryl D.
Olson, Dennis A.
*Olson, Ross S.
Onhaizer, Jerry E.
Opgrand, David A.
Orchard, Wayne J.
Ord, Donald C.
*Osborn, Lloyd C.
Osborn, Oakley E.
*Osher, Victor E., Jr.
*Ostlund, Ross G.
*O'Toole, Walter D. J.
*Overbay, William A.
*Owen, James V., Jr.
Oyler, Donald R.
Oyler, Jimmie D.
Pacalo, Nicholas
Palmer, William R.
Parker, Frank
Parks, Jack J., Jr.
Parrick, Carl R.
Pate, Homer W.
*Patterson, Joel D.
Patterson, James W., Jr.
Patterson, Ray A.
*Paul, Roy C.
*Payne, Thomas G.
Pearson, John
*Peckham, Daniel E.
Peeples, John M., Jr.
*Peirce, William B.
*Pendergast, Herbert C. Jr.
*Perez, Joseph F.
Periolat, John J.
Perry, Albert J.
*Perry, Gilbert R.
*Perry, Raymond
Person, Herbert F.
*Pesenti, Francis V.
*Peters, Richard A.
Peters, Vernon W.
Petersen, Seth J., Jr.
*Peterson, Fred C.
Peterson, John R.
Peterson, James F.
*Petranek, Vernon E.
*Petri, Gordon L.
Petrich, Horst A.
Pfister, William J.
Phillips, George L., Jr.
*Phillips, James C.
Phillips, Ronald M.
Phillips, Richard W.
Picciuolo, Stephen A. D.
Pinsoneault, Richard J.
Pitzen, John R.
Pizzo, Philip J.
*Platz,, Bruce W.
*Plumly, Charles M.
*Poissot, Marvin S.
Polinski, Andrew M.
Pollard, William A.
*Pollmann, Eugene L.
Ponder, Edward A.
*Poppa, Lawrence G.
*Porter, Allan A.
Potenti, John P. Jr.
*Potter, Thomas B., Jr.
Powell, Falvey C., Jr.
*Powell, John H.
Powell, William C.
*Powers, Edward F., Jr.
*Powers, John B.
*Pray, William L.
*Prentice, Gordon R.
Presley, Jack C.
Proctor, Robert C.
Proper, Vance D.
*Prosser, Rudolph J.
*Pruden, Neil S.
*Pugliese, William N.
Purdy, Dale C.
Pyle, Roger G.
Quinn, Robert N., Jr.
Rabuck, Leo V.
Radam, Robert L.
*Radler, David H.
Raney, Charles G.
Ransom, James P., II
*Rasmussen, Lloyd W.
*Rausch, Leonard M.
Ready, George E.
Rebello, Kenneth R.
Redhage, James L.
Redington, Jerome J.
*Reed, Calvin C.
Reed, Jesse L.
*Reed, Richard L.
Reed, William C.
*Rees, Malcolm C., Jr.
Reese, Russell R.
*Reid, Gerald F.
*Reise, Thomas L.
*Reitzel, Philip M.
Renner, Lorraine E.
*Rentz, William O. K.
*Reszetar, Stephen W.
Rettig, Godfrey A.
Revak, Paul A.
*Reynolds, David B.
*Reynolds, Keith A.
*Reynolds, Preston A.
*Rhodes, William K., Jr.
*Rice, Eugene M.
*Rice, Robert V.
Rice, Robert P.
Richardson, Fred D., Jr.
*Richey, Fredrick J.
Richmond, Bruce R.
*Ries, Ronald E.
Riley, Donald E.
*Rinard, Tommie F.
Ring, Stewart A.
Rinkel, Richard A.
Ritzmann, William H., Jr.
*Riviere, James P.
*Roberge, Francis D.
Roberts, Gerald R.
*Roberts, John W.
*Roberts, Lloyd C.
*Roberts, Wilson J.
Robins, John R.
Robinson, Clifford V.
Robinson, Robert E.
Roche, Peter A.
Rodgers, Joseph L.
Rodrigve, Gerard J.
Roehren, Robert R.
Roemer, Charles P.
*Rollins, Everet F., Jr.
*Rose, Russell L.
Ross, Scott K.
*Roth, James F.
*Roth, James A.
*Rouchon, Alvin A.
*Rowe, Kirk W.
Rowell, George W.
Ruland, Donald O.
*Rule, Robert R.
Rush, William H.
Ryan, Gerald F.
Rypel, Ronald J.
Saavedra, Robert
Sackett, Dean R., Jr.
Sadlowski, William E.
Sage, Robert A.
Salo, Lennart R.
Salo, Willard H.
Saltz, Newell J., Jr.
*Sample, Chester G.
*Samuelson, Charles R.
*Sanders, Carl H., Jr.
*Sanders, James D.
*Santivasci, John D.
Saunders, Richard E.
*Saunders, Wesley W.
Saurey, Russell M.
Savage, Jimmy R.
Saville, Robert E.
Saville, Terry D.
Scarborough, John R. L.
Scarfato, Thomas J.
Schade, Eric H., Jr.
Schaedel, Joseph A.
Schafer, Alfred E.
Schaffert, Richard W.
Scherer, Francis H.
*Schmidt, Edward A.
Schmitt, Robert W.
Schreadley, Richard L.
Schroeder, John H.
*Schultz, Earl E.
*Schultz, Thomas D.
*Schwartz, Robert J.
Schwatka, August O., Jr.
*Schwendeman, George C.
*Scoles, Albert J.
*Scott, Augustus E., Jr.
Scott, Charles H.
*Scott, Gary L.
*Scott, George W.
*Scott, MacGregor G.
Scott, Philip J.
*Scott, Ronald D.
Scott, Thomas P.
Scruggs, Richard M.
Seacat, Ralph L.
*Searight, Murland W.
*Seely, James M. G.
Seesholtz, John R.
*Segal, Robert B.
*Seibert, Markley R.
Selberg, John W.
Senden, Paul W.
*Sequeira, Frank E.
Sessions, Joseph W.
Shafer, Richard W.
*Shand, William F.
Shanley, Robert James
Shanley, Robert Joseph
*Shearin, John W.
Sheehan, John P.
Sheets, James R.
'Sheldon, Charles B.
Shelton, Woodrow W.
*Shepard, Rolf A.
*Shields, Dan G.
*Shine, Thomas, Jr.
Shipley, Carl N.
*Shulick, John Jr.
*Shumaker, Lawrence A.
Shupe, Gordon B.
Sigmond, Arie C. A.
Silberstein, George W.
*Siljestrom, Gordon F.
*Sill, John R.
*Simmering, Larry K.
*Simon, Roger O.
Simonic, Robert J
Simpson, George T. K.
Simpson, Jon D.
*Sineath, George E.
Sirch, Richard W. F.
Skelly, Arthur R.
Skelton, Wallace A.
Sleeman, Charles F.
Slingerland, Raymond D.
Smiley, Robert R., III
Smith, Arthur M.
Smith, Augustine J., Jr.
*Smith, Barton L.
Smith, Bradley G.
Smith, Carl C.
*Smith, Charles Ray
*Smith, Charles Robert
*Smith, Charles L.
*Smith, Darrel
*Smith, Donald A.
Smith, Edward G.
Smith, James A.
*Smith, John W.
Smith, Kenneth E.
Smith, Leo B.
Smith, Paul J.
*Smith, Robert L.
Smith, Ronald E.
Smith, Warren R.
*Smith, William D.
*Smith, William Carey, Jr.
Smith, William Cody
Snell, Robert L., Jr.
Snider, Donald M.
Snively, Arthur W.
*Snow, James R.
*Sommerville, William J., Jr.
Sorenson, Fred, Jr.
Soriano, Joseph R.
*Sousa, Manuel B., Jr.
Sousae, Jack F.
*Southall, Charles M.
Spann, Howard W.
*Speaker, William S., Jr.
Spencer, Barry W.
Spencer, Billy R.
Spencer, Charles H.
*Spisak, Thomas J.
Spitz, Gerald A.
Spivey, Franklin L.
Spoto, Victor S.
*Spry, Norman L.
*Stacy, Robert E.
Stalcup, Jimmie M.
Stallings, Arthur C., Jr.
*Stanford, Stanley A.
*Stanley, Herbert L.
*Steenstra, George A.
Steger, William H.
*Stehle, Leroy R.
Stennett, William A.
*Stephens, Francis L.
*Stephens, Gordon L.
Stephenson, Paul D.
*Stevens, James R.
*Stevens, William
Stevenson, Connelly D.
*Stewart, John E.
*Stickling, William R.
*Stoneback, Charles K.
Stophel, Joseph E.
*Stott, George W., Jr.
*Stouter, Leland R.
Stover, Richard C.
*Strange, Robert C.
*Streit, John B.
*Striffler, Willard C., Jr.
Stromeyer, Anthony J.
Strong, Henry H., Jr.
Strong, Paul L.
Stuart, Charles J., Jr.
*Stuart, Donald B.
*Stuntz, Harley L., III
Sullivan, Arthur H.
*Sullivan, Dennis J., Jr.
*Sullivan, Florence M.
Sullivan, William K.
Sumner, Donald M.
Sumrall, William H.
*Sutherland, Paul E., Jr.
Swan, William R.
Swanson, Harlan D., Jr.
*Switzer, Anton R.
*Sympson, William G. A., Jr.
*Sznyter, Edward W., Jr.
*Tallman, John M.
*Tansey, Eugene A.
Tapp, John B.
*Tarka, Thadeus
*Tarver, Charles A., Jr.
*Tassell, James E.
Taylor, James M.
*Taylor, John E.
Taylor, Lawrence H., Jr.
Taylor, Lewis H.
*Taylor, Patterson C.
Taylor, Robert C., Jr.
*Tennison, Raymond P.
Tettelbach, Fredrick M.
Thearle, William J.
Thoma, John C.
*Thomas, Spencer J.
*Thompson, Ernest T.
Thompson, Guy E.
*Thompson, Harry E.
Thompson, James M.
*Thompson, Raymond L.
Thompson, Russell N.
Thompson, William J.
*Thune, John R.
Tibbs, John C.
*Tice, George D., Jr.
Tietgen, Charles A., Jr.
Timberlake, David W.
*Tindall, Frederick W.
Tinker, Charles L.
Titus, Edward D., Jr.
*Todaro, Donald G.
Todd, James F.
Tomion, Jack W.
Toms, James E.
*Toney, Albert L., Jr.
*Toupin, Ernest J., Jr.
*Toutant, Donald J.
*Tracy, George W., II
*Tracy, William K.
Traylor, Harold K.
Treiber, Maurice L.
*Trelford, Wallace E.
*Trieschmann, George V.
*Trimble, Delmer
Truax, Hugh G.
*Tucker, James W.
*Tucker, John E.
Tunnell, John W.
*Turley, John W.
*Turner, Edmund L.
*Turner, Lee R. Jr.
Turner, Robert C.
Turner, Vernon K.
Turner, Warren D.
Turner, Wilson C.
*Turpel, Joseph F.
*Ullman, Robert W.
*Ulrich, John H.
*Underwood, Fred S.
Ustick, Richard C.
Vance, Walter N., III
VanGundy, Clarence D.
*VanKleeck, Loring E.
VanMetre, James M.
VanNorden, Gerald J.
Vanoy, William E.
*Vehorn, Raymond C.
Vestal, Leroy N.
Vickers, Wrencie
*Vilhauer, Levern T.
Villemaire, Grant J., Jr.
*Vinson, Howard E.
VonHendy, Richard D.
*Wade, Seaborn H., Jr.
Wages, Clarence J., Jr.
*Waggoner, Donald L.
Wagner, Harry A.
Waldron, Michael J.
*Waldrop, Clyde E.
Wales, George E.
*Walker, Eugene R.
*Walker, John A., Jr.
Wallace, Richard J.
*Wallin, Homer N., Jr.
*Walrod, David J.
*Walsh, Lawrence P.
Walter, Dale J.
*Walter, Joseph J.
Walters, James E.
Walters, Robert J.
Waltzer, Jacob
*Warburton, Thomas G.
Ward, John A.
Wardell, William L., Jr.
*Watson, George, Jr.
Watson, Lloyd C.
*Watson, Thomas P.
Watts, Jasper B.
*Ways, Raymond A.
Weaks, William G.
*Wear, Richard J.
*Weaver, John C.
Weber, Burtland B.
*Weber, Richard M.
*Weigand, David K.
*Weil, Calvin M.
*Weimorts, Robert F.
Weinfield, Richard M.
Weir, Richard W.
Weldon, Joseph D.
*Weller, James R.
*Wenzlau, Charles N., II
Werner, Marshall D.
*Wernimont, Donald J.
West, Arch T.
Westall, Kenneth W.
Westendorf, Donald R., Jr.
Westfall, Ronald C.
Whaley, Lloyd L.
Wheeler, James R.
White, Charles A.
*White, Marvin L.
*White, Trentwell M., Jr.
Whittaker, Robert L.
Whitten, Jimmie
Wichmann, William H.
Wicke, James O.
*Wickstrand, Don R.
Widen, Max W.
Widen, Richard D.
Wier, Ronald L.
Wiggins, Larry C.
*Wigley, Lawrence S.
Wilkinson, Thomas A. R.
Wilkinson, Wilfrid P., III
*Willett, John A., IV
*Willett, Richard S.
*Williams, David E.
Williams, Forrest R.
*Williams, Gerald G.
*Williams, Gordon R., Jr.
Williams, Richard E.
Willis, Clayton B.
*Willyard, Robert H.
Wilson, Billy J.
*Wilson, Derek W.
*Wilson, Gordon B.
*Wilson, John R., Jr.
Wilson, William E.
*Wilster, Gunnar F.
Windham, Paul M.
Windsor, Arthur D.
*Winiker, David R.
*Winn, John C., Jr.
Winslow, Myron S., Jr.
Winter, Richard A.
Wise, Anthony J., III
*Wittner, Carroll H. J.
*Wolfe, Glenn C.
Wolfe, Robert E.

Wolfe, William F.
*Wood, Albert A., Jr.
*Wood, David E.
Wood, Forrest H.
Wood, Joseph V.
Wood, Walter S.
Woodall, Elliott A.
*Woodcock, Henry P., Jr.
Woodlief, Frank L.
Woolam, John E.
Woolf, Wesley L.
*Woolnough, Robert M.
Word, Millard L.
Works, William W.
Wright, Harry W.
Wright, Marsh E.
Wright, Walter V.
Wyly, James R., Jr.
York, David A.
*York, Howard L.
*York, Willard B.
*Young, Clinton H.
Young, Howard I.
*Young, Leonard R.
Young, Philip M.
*Zadd, Charles J.
Zagortz, Leonard A., Jr.
Zaner, Aubrey B.
Zeman, Irving M.
Zerwas, Richard L.
Ziemer, Howard
*Zseleczky, Emil
Zwick, Stephen L.

MEDICAL CORPS

Akin, Richard W.
Amsler, Fred R., Jr.
Anastasi, Gaspar W.
Armstrong, Robert B.
Austin, Raymond F., Jr.
Baron, Ronald B.
Bellinger, Sidney B., Jr.
Bemus, Dean H.
Bently, Philip E.
Besecker, Joseph A.
Black, Paul L.
Bowers, Jack F.
Brickman, Jordan B.
Brodhead, Charles L., Jr.
Brough, James W.
Brown, Lawrence L., Jr.
Burnett, Leland L.
Capps, Julian H., II
Cardoso, Norman
Cavender, William F.
Cefalo, Robert C.
Chapman, Marvin J.
Choquette, Armand J., Jr.
Coleman, James D.
Colomb, Herman D.
Copman, Louis
Curry, Norvelle
Darby, Clement H., Jr.
Davies, Alfred R.
Davis, Gerald L.
Davis, Reginald M.
Davis, Robert W.
Daywitt, Robert L.
Dean, Clayton C.
Delisser, Robert B. M.
Deming, Howard R.
Desilverio, Robert V.
Dickson, Larry G.
Dixon, Homer L.
Dodgen, John C.
Dully, Frank E., Jr.
Eddington, William R.
Engelke, Harold A., Jr.
Epinette, Warren W.
Erde, Allan
Fackler, Martin L., Jr.
Feldman, Bernard H.
Fitch, Eldon E.
Flagg, Richard S.
Forsyth, Douglas H.
Fout, Larry R.
Gibson, Donald C.
Gilbert, Donald K.
Gode, Richard O.
Goldenberg, Mark T.
Goldstein, Elliott J.
Goldstein, Gordon I.
Gorman, Edward R.
Greenberg, Gerald M.
Griffin, Charles N., Jr.
Gypson, Ward G., Jr.
Hagan, Arthur D.
Hanauer, Franklin A.
Hanks, Gerald E.
Hardman, William M.
Harkins, Hugh H.
Hasselle, James E., III
Heck, Alan L.
Henderson, John A., III
Herman, Clifford M.
Holt, Donald E.
Horowitz, Benson J.
Howery, Stephen E.
Hunsaker, Darrell H.
Hunter, James G., Jr.
Huntsinger, Larry A.
James, David R., Sr.
James, Thomas P.
Jansen, Donald H.
Jerome, Raymond J.
Johnson, Richard F.
Jorgensen, Morton C., Jr.
Joyce, Thomas H., III
Julian, Sydney R., Jr.
Karnei, Robert F., Jr.
Kesler, Kelvin F.
Kettering, Donald L.
Kinney, Robert J.
Kurland, Howard D.
Lawlor, Eugene F., III
Leavitt, Aaron M.
Lesser, Robert M.
Liptzin, Myron B.
Little, Hunter L.
Lowsma, Henry B.
Lynch, William F., Jr.
McCabe, Michael J.
McGuigan, Patrick M., Jr.
Magenheimer, Richard J.
Marshall, Charles E.
Mayer, Paul D.
Meihoff, Walter E.
Middlekauff, Robert K.
Miller, Claude J.
Milton, John L.
Minser, Allen C.
Mullen, John C.
Murray, Wayne L.
Nataro, Joseph F.
Nelson, James R.
Noble, Richard F.
Noury, John P.
Noyes, Russell, Jr.
O'Bannon, Mose C., Jr.
O'Brien, John S.
O'Neill, Joseph J.
Pare, Norman G.
Pearce, Henry M.
Persky, Alan D.
Petway, Malcolm L.
Pfahl, Stannard B., Jr.
Phillips, Theodore L.
Pitkin, Roy M.
Plavcan, William G.
Poole, Edward K.
Pope, Herbert L.
Poundstone, Robert B.
Price, Albert C.
Pursch, Joseph A.
Raffaelly, Nicholas R.
Randels, Paul H.
Rappaport, Herbert I.
Raskind, Richard H.
Ratinov, Gerald
Rettig, Joshua
Roe, Robert D.
Romine, John S.
Root, Fayette C.
Routledge, James A.
Rowland, Thomas C., Jr.
Rumble, Wilson, B.
Rutland, Eugene D., Jr.
Ryan, Richard M.
Schrift, Alan R.
Schulaner, Frederic A.
Schwartz, Louis J.
Schwinn, Raymond L.
Sennett, Charlie O., Jr.
Sheff, Lawrence
Shute, Howard E.
Simmons, William W.
Sirois, Edward P.
Smith, John P.
Smith, William W.
Spielvogel, Arthur R.
Strand, Roy D.
Sturdevant, Frank M.
Sumner, Robert G.
Swanson, Ronald A.
Swisher, Louis B., Jr.
Taller, Stephen L.
Taylor, Leland H., G.
Thomas, David, F.
Thomas, Joseph J., Jr.
Thompson, Robert M.
Tope, Stephen L., Jr.
Tyler, Paul E.
Usselman, James A.
VanHove, Eugene D.
VanValkenburgh, Wood G.
Vollman, Don B., Jr.
Vorlichy, Loren N.
Walk, Donald R.
Walls, "W" "L"
Warmolts, John R.
Warrender, William F.
Webster, John B.
Weglarz, Stanley S.
Welsh, Robert L.
Wescott, John W.
Wiener, Leslie
Williams, Wilfred L.
Witt, Frederick J.
Wold, Sylvester M., Jr.
Woodall, Martin A.
Worthington, John J.
Young, Leonard
Zimble, James A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Andersen, Elif A.
Bedenbaugh, Jack R.
Bedford, Arthur G.
Bennett, Charles A., Jr.
Biddison, Ted A.
Bilka, Joseph L.
Blake, James F., Jr.
Bonnett, Herschel J.
Bosco, Clement, Jr.
Brookes, Jack E.
Brotherton, Curtis W.
Brown, Troy L.
Buehler, Cyril H.
Carlson, Verner R.
Causbie, Edgar S.
Chrisman, Alfred B.
Clamp, Robert W.
Clark, Davis L.
Coleman, Eugene V.
Collier, William G.
Damm, John A.
Daughtridge, Gerald R.
Davis, Robert W.
Dolloff, Robert H.
Douglass, Jerry B.
Ellis, Richard W.
England, Alfred I.
Fitzpatrick, Edmond J., Jr.
Flach, Lynn R.
Foreman, Clarence P., Jr.
Frampton, Robert T.
Fries, Paul A., Jr.
Fulks, Logan G.
Gaddis, Carl K.
Gallaher, James H.
Griffiths, Charles E.
Guss, Bernard L.
Hamilton, James W.
Hayes, Lester D., Jr.
Haynsworth, Hugh C., III
Henseler, Richard C.
Hinds, Duane E.
Hirschy, Henry E., Jr.
Holder, James R.
Holland, Ralph L.
Hummel, Don F.
Jantz, Jack L.
Jones, John M., Jr.
Kaiser, Robert A.
Killoran, Joel D.
Knoth, Robert L.
Kruse, William E.
Kunkle, John H.
Lampton, George H.
Lang, Robert D.
Leblanc, Joseph F., Jr.
Lemay, Jerome S.
Locke, Olive C.
Lovelace, Donald A.
Luther, James R., Jr.
Manley, Eugene T.
Mara, Ray A.
Martin, Winston L.
McFarland, Wayne B.
McInnis, William H.
McLaughlin, Richard B.
McSwain, Billy G.
Mead, George W., III
Mehrens, Arthur J., Jr.
Miller, David O.
Moe, Albert G.
Morgan, Richard E.
Moss, Stephen A.
Murphy, Joseph J.
Murray, Robert E.
Newcomb, Frank N.
O'Donnell, William P.
Olinger, Richard S.
O'Neil, James R.
Peck, Joe D.
Perkins, James O.
Pistolessi, Vincent J.
Powell, William M.
Rader, Farrell J.
Ranieri, Richard A. J.
Raymond, James A.
Reed, Dale H.
Robertson, David C.
Ruese, Edward F., II
Ruth, Richard A., IV
Ruth, Stephen R.
Schaaf, Alvin D., Jr.
Shaughnessy, John M.
Shumaker, Carl
Singer, David A.
Smith, Allen F.
Smith, Jack L.
Sojka, Casimir E.
Sorensen, Jackie R.
Stanton, James M.
Stok, Joseph W.
Stombaugh, William E.
Straw, Donald G.
Sullivan, Patrick D.
Sweet, Warren M.
Szwed, James A.
Tannone, Rocco J.
Tauriello, Frank S.
Taylor, Robert R.
Tokay, Ronald N.
Turcotte, William E.
Virden, Frank S.
Vogel, Carl P., Jr.
Walters, Robert A.
Webb, Carl R., Jr.
Webb, James R.
Webster, John C.
White, Donald B.
Whitman, Earl K.
Wildman, John E.
Willis, John J.
Wilson, Donald E.
Wilson, Richard F.
Wilson, Roger C.
Wright, Cary F.
Wright, Walter F., Jr.
Youngblood, Norbert V.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Alexander, Don C.
Benicek, Richard W.
Bray, William E.
Brink, Carl A.
Burke, Francis J.
Davis, Eugene B.
Dumas, John F.
Fallon, Edward F.
Fountain, David B.
Gately, Robert E.
Gaughan, Geoffrey E.
Henriksen, Veryle A.
Jerauld, Philip E.
Kandrac, Marcian J.
Kelly, Henry T.
Klapperich, Owen B.
Lecky, Hugh F., Jr.
MacCall, Harry F., III
McDermott, Thomas J.
Murphy, Michael A.
Olsen, Clifford A.
Parker, Joe H.
Parrish, Whitney W.
Patton, Darrell P.
Running, Paul H.
Sandvig, Edwin E.
Voth, Murray H.
Wendler, Herman F.
Westlund, Orville A.
Willson, William G.
Young, Robert J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, Walter I.
Andress, Hyneman M.
Ayers, Charles D.
Bair, William A.
Bradtmiller, Paul H.
Burton, Joseph T., Jr.
Busche, Robert E.
Cerreta, Ralph M., Jr.
Clark, Jerry L.
Collins, Allan W.
Crosson, William E.
Dickpeddie, John I.
Ford, James E.
Gibboney, Lloyd H.
Gillam, Harold R.
Glover, William F.
Grinke, Walton J.
Groff, James B.
Hauck, John W.
Kartalis, Andrew
Keppel, Henry E., Jr.
Kramer, Robert L.
Monnier, William F.
Myers, Russell, Jr.
Nicholls, William H., Jr.
Phenix, Robert P.
Popowich, Clyde V.
Ruff, Lowell H., Jr.
Schade, Robert A., Jr.
Schumann, James F.
Smith, Ralph A., III
Uber, Charles B.
Weir, James W., Jr.
Wilson, Robert B.

DENTAL CORPS

Anderson, John W. R.
Blank, Byron E.
Brose, Mark O.
Butler, William D.
Chapman, Thom H.
Connole, Peter W.
Crawford, John D.
Daughtry, Max B.
Devos, Brice J.
Eastwood, Gerald W.
Esposito, Richard A.
George, Chester L.
Gourley, James V.
Grisius, Richard J.
Guarnieri, Lewis J.
Hall, Daniel L.
Hansen, Duane A.
Harris, Ronald K.
Hart, Gerald L.
Hulse, Richard S.
Johnson, James I.
Kellner, Frank H.
Kennedy, Paul T.
Kimball, Kenneth R.
Kimpel, William A.
Lusk, Samuel S.
Lynch, Paul D.
Mason, Billie M.
McMurdock, Robert C., Jr.
Montgomery, Steve
Morse, Ronald P.
Muir, Theodore E.
Nissenson, Marvin
Osetek, Edward M.
Preece, Richard G.
Reese, Kay T.
Reisman, Paul J.
Rochford, Philip
Rogers, John D.
Rudolph, Jerome J.
Shoemaker, "O" "L"
Smith, David J.
Stepnick, Robert J.
Tracy, Norman H., Jr.
Trainor, John E.
Walkowiak, Gene J.
Weigel, Eugene J., Jr.
White, Warne H.
Williams, John P.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Barboo, Samuel H., Jr.
Breidenstein, Frederick W.
Coulson, Harold H.
Cox, Ray M.
Decesaris, Chester A.
Devane, James J.
Devine, Robert G.
Farnsworth, Elwood V.
Floan, Kenneth F.
Forrester, George G., Jr.
Fussell, Edsel M.
Gallagher, Thomas J.
Gans, Fred W., Jr.
Gertz, Robert M.
Hammel, James W.
Harvey, Billy D.
Hawkins, Kenneth L.
Herrin, James H.
Hinckley, Jane D.
Hunt, James A.
Jordan, Thurman O.
Kendrick, Allison N.
Ksenzak, Joseph F.
McGehee, Thomas L.
Neuman, Richard
Nichols, Lloyd B.

Paxton, Arthur W.
Pittington, Francis C.
Ramirez, Gale
Ruffin, Robert S.
Sims, John L.
Smith, Dewey L., Jr.
Stallings, Orlando
Tanner, Millard F.
Whitlock, William E.
Wilcox, James G.

NURSE CORPS

Barker, Elizabeth A.
Bartee, Bertie K.
Bates, Barbara A.
Brakus, Josephine D.
Brennan, Audrey M.
Brusetti, Eleanor A.
Burson, Doris A.
Butler, Phyllis A.
Carleton, Ethel R.
Clark, Doris E.
Cordell, Billie E.
Crowley, Mary N.
Decicco, Virginia A.
Dennis, Joan T.
Dentz, Roberta
Dunn, Dorothea J.
Duppong, Mary A.
Dyar, Norma G.
Effner, Dorothy J.
Elliott, Ruth L.
Elsass, Phyllis J.
Ewalt, Lois I.
Feimer, Irene K.
Fischer, Catherine B.
Fitzgerald, Helen M.
Gampper, Mary E.
Gendron, Marie M. T.
Gibson, Dixie L.
Green, Barbara J.
Guzman, Frances F.
Hadd, Janet
Hancock, Doris M.
Hart, Sarah E.
Hassell, June R.
Hinckley, Colleen
James, Lorene J.
Johnson, Patricia R.
Johnson, Virginia M.
Jones, Kathaleen R.
Joyce, Jane P.
Kelly, Wanda J.
King, Dorothy C.
Kingsbury, Barbara A.
Krisanda, Sylvia M.
Liberatore, Bertha M.
Lindsay, Magdalene A.
Liu, Myrtle F.
MacClelland, Doris C.
Mack, Beverly T.
Marble, Ella E.
Martin, Ruth S.
Mason, Ruth A.
McGuckin, Dorothy E.
McIntyre, Lora J.
Melcer, Marjorie I.
Merritt, Patricia A.
Millard, Arlys M.
Morton, Jo A.
Nelson, Marilyn V.
Nickerson, Lois E.
Nylin, Esther D.
Olson, Marilyn F.
Parker, Helen C.
Pearce, Doris
Perreault, Madelon M.
Pollard, Joann L.
Purcell, Ellin W.
Russell, Jean C.
Ruud, Donna R. E.
Schoonover, Dona J.
Shamblin, Elizabeth J.
Shaw, Joan S.
Sinski, Irene
Steinocher, Anne M.
Thomas, Barbara J.
Trudgeon, Joyce A.
Tudor, Betty L.
Walker, Marilyn J.
Wardell, Virginia M.
Watkins, Grace M.
Weiss, Jean C.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbitt, James B.
Abrell, Gary A.
Adamitis, Lawrence R.
Adams, Albert M.
Adams, Carl L.
Adams, John L., Jr.
Adams, Joseph H.
Adams, Paul A.
Adkins, James C., II.
Adler, Jay B.
Adolph, Herbert R.
Aeder, Marvin H.
Ainlay, Benjamin J.
Aisthorpe, John E.
Alafetich, Jack M.
Albert, Bruce W.
Alderete, Joe
Aldinger, Robert W.
Aldrich, Danny L.
Alemian, Haig S.
Alexander, Jan H.
Alexander, Edward H., Jr.
Alexander, Frank L.
Alexanderson, John L.
Alger, Don M.
Alka, Richard L.
Allen, Arnold C.
Allen, Benjamin E., Jr.
Allen, Dennis K.
Allen, Don S.
Allen, Edmond L.
Allen, John B., Jr.
Allen, Michael D.
Allen, Preston R.
Allen, Richard E.
Allen, William C., Jr.,
Allison, Warner L.
Allyn, Elwyn G.
Almasi, George R.
Alter, John W., Jr.
Alvarado, Robert J., Jr.
Amann, Robert A.
Ames, Laverne A.
*Ames, Richard E.
Andary, William A.
Andersen, Oliver, L.
Andersen, Robert T.
Andersen, William N.
Anderson, Bruce W.
Anderson, Buel L.
Anderson, Carleton, E.
Anderson, David H.
Anderson, Gerald D.
Anderson, Gary E.
Anderson, John L.
Anderson, Lonny D.
Anderson, Larry F.
Anderson, Norman A.
Anderson, Richard O.
Anderson, Thomas H.
Anderson, William W.
Andres, Eugen C., III.
Andress, William D., Jr.
Andrews, John W.
*Ansley, James H.
Appel, Richard R.
Appelgate, Terry B.
Ardell, John E., III.
Ardigo, Jerome R.
Ardleigh, Paul D.
Arianna, Edward A.
Armeda, Nick
Armitage, Norman C.
Armstrong, Melvin R.
Armstrong, Jesse W.
Armstrong, William E.
Arneth, Paul R.
*Arnett, James L., Jr.
Arnett, Ted A.
Arnett, William C.
Arnold, John C.
Asbell, William E.
Ash, Robert I.
Ashcraft, Ronald W.
Asher, Charles E.
Ashley, Andre B.
Ashurst, Charles F.
Astleford, Nathan L.
Athanas, Philip W.
Atkins, Thomas W.
Atwater, Robert B.
Atwood, Charles H.
Austin, Jimmy L.
Austin, Thomas F.
Austraw, James D.
Babb, David J.
*Babbitt, Thomas R.
*Bacanskas, Algirdas V.
Bacha, Michael
Bachechi, Charles G.
Bachman, Richard C., Jr.
Bachofen, Andrew W.
Backlund, Robert A.
Badgett, Robert S.
Bagley, Norris R.
Bagshaw, George F.
Bahn, Neal V.
Bailey, Albert E., Jr.
Bailey, Barney L.
Bailey, David L.
Bailey, Eugene R.
Bailey, Gerald M.
Bailey, Henry A., Jr.
Bailey, James G.
Bailey, James P., Jr.
Bailey, Thomas F.
Baillie, Frank A., Jr.
Baker, David C.
Baker, Deforest
Baker, John G., Jr.
Baker, Marvin C.
Baker, Robert E.
Baldwin, Joseph A.
Baldwin, William H.
Balish, Thomas
Ball, Jeffrey N.
Ballard, Douglas C.
Balog, Julius, Jr.
Balzer, Robert T.
Bandy, John I., Jr.
*Bannach, Leroy R.
*Bansemer, Ronald W.
Barden, William L.
Bardeschewski, Walter P.
Bardsley, Ralph L.
Barfield, Henry J., Jr.
Bark, Charles A., Jr.
Barker, Benjamin C., Jr.
Barker, Charles M.
Barker, James E.
*Barkley, Eppa B.
Barnes, James C., Jr.
Barnes, William G.
Barnett, Roger W.
Barr, Gary L.
Barr, Jon M.
Barr, Robert K., Jr.
Barr, Thomas H.
Barrett, Harold C.
Barrett, Robert W.
Barron, Robert W., Jr.
Barrs, James M.
Barry, Franklyn S., Jr.
Bartel, Roger R.
Bartholomew, Charles A.
Bartlett, Redmond J.
Barton, Keith M.
Barton, Max N.
Barton, William L.
Baskin, John W., Jr.
Bates, Arthur H.
Bates, Avery W.
Bates, Ronald L.
Batson, Jack E D, Jr.
Bauer, Douglas C.
Bauer, Kenneth H.
Bauhs, David J.
Baum, James F.
Baxter, Larry A.
Beach, Robert R.
Beane, Frank E., Jr.
Beane, James L.
Bearse, Laurence M.
Beatty, Troy, III
Beaulieu, Eugene L.
Bechard, Paul J.
Beck, Brian K.
Beck, Norman A., Jr.
Becker, Henry C., IV
Becker, Irving L.
Becker, Paul W.
Becker, Robert W.
Becker, Robert A.
Becton, Philip N., II
Beem, James N.
Beem, Perry A.
Beguin, Larry W.
Beha, William H., Jr.
Belden, David A.
Bell, James F., Jr.
Bell, James H.
Bell, Robert P.
Bell, Ronald K.
Bell, William D.
Belli, William J., Jr.
Bellino, Joseph M.
Benedict, Claude J.
Benedict, Joseph C.
Benevides, John M.
Benford, Eddie
Benne, Robert L.
Bennett, Andrew J.
Bennett, Charles W.
Bennett, Eugene A.
*Bennett, John F., Jr.
Bennett, Thomas G.
Bennett, Willett B., Jr.
Bennington, Richard D.
Benson, David A.
Benson, Donald C.
Benson, George M.
Benson, John T.
Benson, Louis R.
Benter, Harry W., Jr.
Bentley, David W.
Bently, Donald K.
Berger, Thomas J.
Bergman, Alfred O.
Bergo, John T.
Bergren, Charles M., Jr
Berkebile, Paul C., Jr.
Berkley, Joseph B., Jr.
Berndt, Philip G.
Bernier, Gerald A.
Berry, Charles L., Jr.
*Berry, Niles W.
Bertane, Louis G.
*Bertonneau, George A.
Berzins, Vincent M.
Best, Robert K.
Betts, Fred R.
Beverly, Lynwood A.
Bevington, Gary R.
Beyette, Thomas K.
*Bianco, John A.
Biba, Richard G.
Bibb, Irvin R.
Bickel, Michael D.
Bicknell, James E.
Bieber, Ralph W.
Bigelow, Grant L.
Bigley, Thomas L.
Bigsby, Charles F.
Bilbrey, Robert R., Sr.
Billington, John J.
Billmyer, George W., III
Bills, Leroy N.
Bina, Richard A.
Bishop, William R.
Bitonti, David F.
Bjorn, Karl T.
Black, Donald A.
Black, Herbert E.
Black, Herbert L.
Black, James D.
Black, Jerry H.
Black, John W.
Black, Norman T.
Blackburn, John O.
Blackinton, Charles H.
Blackmon, Thomas L.
Blackmon, William J.
Blaha, Douglas D.
Blair, Walter W.
Blake, Charles L., Jr.
Blaker, David G., Jr.
Blakeslee, Jay D.
Blanchard, Alan F.
Blanchet, Jean P.
Blank, Edward W.
Blankinship, John H.
Blann, John E., Jr.
Blatt, John W.
Bleakly, Edward W.
Bledsoe, John F.
Bledsoe, Robert D.
Blew, Robert E.
Bleyler, Peter A., Jr.
Blodgett, Verne E.
Blomgren, Harry L.
*Bloom, Norman C.
Bloomfield, James G.
Blundell, Thomas E.
Blunt, William G.
Bobb, Kenneth R.
Bockmann, Bruce R.
Bodenhorn, Harold F.
Bodiford, Larry J.
Bodley, Homer W.
Boes, Francis X., Jr.
Bogard, Burt, J., III.
Boggio, Peter G.
Bohn, David C.
Bohnstengel, Robert
Boles, James B.
Boley, Weldon E.
Bollenbach, Melvin W.
Bonham, Charlton H., III
Bonini, Charles J.
Booth, Albert J.
Booth, William D.
Borman, Carl E.
Bornholdt, Robert A.
Borst, George T.
Bosh, Ralph H.
Botsford, James E., Jr.
Boudov, Milton H.
Boufford, Francis W.
Bougdanos, Michael E.
Bounds, Thomas D., Jr.
Bourn, James S.
Bowen, Gerard T.
Bower, Johns H., Jr.
Bowers, John V.
Bowler, Lawrence S.
Bowman, Alfred E., Jr.
*Bowman, Lloyd
Boyd, James S.
Boyd, James A.
Boyer, John E.
Boyes, Edward T.
Boykin, Jack W.
Brabenec, Rudolph E.
Bradberry, Brent A.
Bradish, Steven D.
Bradley, Anthony A.
Bradley, Darryl E.
Bradley, Michael D.
Bradley, Michael L.
Bradley, William H.
Brady, Edward P.
Brady, John J.
Brady, William J.
Braendle, John E.
Bragg, Thomas P.
Bragonier, Reginald, Jr.
Brainard, Robert B.
Bramble, Dale H.
Branagan, Dewitt L.
Branch, Melvin B.
Branch, Thomas A., Jr.
Brane, Richard D.
Brannan, John J.
Branning, Delos J., Jr.
Brant, John H.
Bratten, Willard P. Jr.
Brauer, Gordon R.
Brayton, Gerald R.
Breece, James P.
Brennan, Donald P.
Brennan, Robert J.
Brennan, Thomas J.
Breslin, Michael J.
Brewer, William P.
Brewster, Thomas P.
Brierley, Roc M.
Briggs, Robert H.
Brinck, Thure R.
Briscoe, Robert B.
Britton, Junior E.
Brock, James D.
Brodeur, Kenneth D.
Brodie, William A.
Bronk, Deforest M.
Bronson, Lawson E.
Brookes, Edward A.
Brooks, Billy C.
Brooks, Charles E.
Brooks, Fran O.
Brooks, Kenneth M.
Brooks, Larry C.
Brooks, William T.
Broome, Warren W.
Broome, William A.
Brow, John J.
Brown, Barry L.
Brown, Charles D.
Brown, Frank M., Jr.
Brown, Gary G.
Brown, Hal G.
Brown, James P., Jr.
Brown, Joseph W. Jr.
Brown, Lawrence N.
Brown, Lorin W.
Brown, Michael T.
Brown, Michael J.
*Brown, Robert H.
*Brown, Thomas L.
Brownell, Eugene H.
Browske, George P.
Bruce, Sammie L.
Brueggeman, John L.
Bruess, Charles E.
Brugler, Louis W.
Brummersted, David A.
Brunner, Robert F.
Brunnworth, Rolland H.
Bruno, Marco J.
Brunstad, Harold B.
Bryan, Jon J.
Bryant, Joseph A.
Bubeck, Charles R.
*Buck, Duane E.
Buck, James L.
Buckhart, Norman C., Jr.
Buckley, Henry T., Jr.
Buckley, Peter M.
Buckley, William C.
Budrevich, John P.
Buker, John E.
Bullock, Craig A.
Bunch, Harold A., Jr.
Bunch, Robert M., Jr.
Bundy, John W.
Bunn, Paul C.
Bunnell, Robert T.
Burch, Tom A.
Burcroff, Richard T., Jr.

Burdon, Thomas S.
Burgard, Robert L.
*Burger, Joseph J.
*Burgess, Donald E.
Burgess, James M.
Burgess, Marshall L.
Burget, John E.
Burgett, Bernard E.
Burgett, James A.
Burke, David V., Jr.
Burke, Richard F. X.
Burke, Terence C.
Burn, Reed R.
Burnett, Paul D.
Burns, Herbert W.
Burns, John C.
Burns, Michael L.
Burris, Richard E.
Burry, John B., Jr.
Burton, John G.
Burton, William E.
Burtram, Roderick
Bush, Robert F., Jr.
Bussell, Robert P.
Butler, Hugh W.
Butler, Phillip N.
Butler, Vernon R.
Butler, Warner L.
Butrovich, Richard M.
*Butz, Will A.
Byerley, Ray M.
Byers, Larry J.
Bygler, Kenneth
Cable, Thomas J.
Cagle, Lonnie F.
Cahill, Joseph P.
Cain, Alan F.
Calame, Byron E.
*Callahan, James F.
Callahan, Joseph E.
Calvin, Robert B.
Cama, Raymond S.
Cameron, John B.
Campbell, Arlington F.
Campbell, Donald B.
Campbell, Frank W.
Campbell, John R.
Campbell, Richard C.
Campbell, Roy O.
*Campbell, Theodore R.
Cann, Howard G., Jr.
Cannistraro, Nicholas, Jr.
Cantrell, William A.
Cantus, Howard H.
Capone, Benjamin W.
Carden, Francis D., Jr.
Carden, James C.
Carder, William H.
Carey, Wallace D.
Carl, Hardy A.
Carl, Walter M.
Carleton, John D.
Carlin, Edwin J., Jr.
Carlson, Gary L.
Carlson, Ronald A.
Carmalt, Churchill, Jr.
Carnell, Thomas E.
Carnes, James E.
Carns, Neil S.
Carpenter, David E.
Carr, Paul B.
Carrell, Finis D.
Carroll, Charles C.
Carroll, Norman L.
Carson, Joe W.
Carter, Hughie S.
Carter, Paul A.
Carter, Robert J.
Caruso, Sam J.
Casavant, Douglas D.
Case, Jerry A.
Case, Thomas R.
Casey, Terry
Cassanova, Edgar G.
Cassel, Carl J.
Cassels, Bertrand B., Jr.
Casseri, Aldo J.
Castellano, William J.
Caswell, Walter R.
Cataldo, John
Catchings, Thomas J.
Catlett, William J., III
Cato, Eugene H.
Cattoor, James E.
Cavanaugh, William, III
Caviness, Robert J.
Champin, James F.
Champlain, John G.
Chance, Franklin B.
Chaney, William H.
Chapel, Gary M.
Chapman, Craig B.
Chapman, Thomas L.
Chappell, Bruce A.
Chappell, George C.
Chappell, Miles L., Jr.
Charette, Alfred A., Jr.
Chase, Malcolm W.
Chaskes, Gerald M.
Chasko, Gerald J.
Chastain, Kent R.
Chastain, Raymond T.
Chasteen, Jerry S.
Chatterton, Edward M.
Chavez, Richard A.
Cheaure, Alfred L.
Chervenic, Michael
Chesmore, Kenneth L.
Chessick, Anthony W.
Chilcoat, George R.
Child, James C.
Childers, George B.
Chinn, Donald M.
Chipchak, Robert F.
Chiras, Donald P.
Chittenden, Eldon F.
Chris, Harry J.
Christensen, Boake W.
Christenson, Denis P.
Christofferson, Eric
Chubboy, Louis M., Jr.
Chuhran, Patrick J.
Churchill, Bruce W.
Chwalek, Stanley W.
Ciesla, William P.
Cinal, Ronald M.
Clark, Frank E.
Clark, Frederick W.
Clark, Ira S.
Clark, Kenneth R.
Clark, Robert T.
Clark, Royall W.
*Clark, Vernon
Clark, Victor L.
Clark, William C. C.
Clark, William B.
Clarke, John C.
Clarke, Wiot L.
Claude, Henry L.
Claypool, Robert G.
Clayton, James M.
Clemens, Richard W.
Clements, David G.
Clements, Steven D.
Clendenon, Claude E.
Cleveland, Donald G.
Cliburn, Edwin H.
Clinton, Vernon L.
Clouse, Johnny L.
Cluever, Richard L.
Clyncke, Donald R.
Coates, Roger D.
Cochill, Thomas R., II
Cochrane, James E.
Coderre, Robert A.
Coen, Ira H., Jr.
Coffee, Desmond T.
Coffman, James C.
Coffman, Richard L.
Cogdill, David B.
Cogswell, Thomas M.
Cohen, Andrew M.
Cohen, Paul L.
Cohn, Peter S.
Coit, Russell C.
Colaw, Kenneth S.
Colby, George R.
Cole, Edward F., Jr.
Cole, Isaiah C.
Cole, Jasper F.
Cole, Kenneth R., Jr.
Coleman, Walter S.
Colle, John H., Jr.
Collins, James J.
Collins, Jerry C.
Collins, John J.
Collins, Leonard J.
Colman, Frederick A.
Colter, Philip G.
Coltrin, William A.
Colvert, Donald M.
Colvert, Lundy R.
Conant, John C.
Conboy, Alan J.
Condon, John R.
Connell, James G., Jr.
Connell, James J.
Connell, William C., Jr.
Conners, Joseph K.
Conwell, Douglas M.
Cook, Jeremy S.
Cook, Walter T.
Coonrod, Donald H.
Cooper, Richard W.
*Cooper, Robert W., Jr.
Cooper, William E.
Copes, Raymond F., III
Corbett, Rhodes T.
Corboy, Thomas S.
Cordes, Ronald P.
Corley, Charles E.
Cornie, Howard
Cosby, James G.
Costello, Robert G.
Cota, Charles D.
Cote, Roland F.
Cotner, David A.
Cotner, James D.
Cotter, Thomas J., Jr.
Coughlan, George R., III
Coullahan, James D., Jr.
Coulter, Lonnie B., Jr.
Covell, Michael A.
Covill, Donald P.
Cowen, Jack F., Jr.
Cowen, Wayne E.
Cowperthwaite, Franklin C.
Cox, Charles L., Jr.
Cox, James C.
Cozadd, Bennett A.
Crabbe, Douglas V., Jr.
Crabbs, Edward H., Jr.
Craft, James H.
Craig, Charles E.
Craig, Edward C.
Craig, Kenneth G.
Craighead, Philip E.
Craiglow, Leo H., Jr.
Cramer, Thomas H.
Crawford, Charles W.
Crawford, Gerald R.
Creek, Milton H.
Crevier, Stanley M.
Crismon, Frank S.
Criswell, Paul E.
Critchfield, Duncan G.
Croke, Lee P.
Cromwell, Dale G.
Cronkrite, Richard L.
Crooks, Peter H.
*Crowder, Rex C.
Cubbler, Roy W., Jr.
Culberson, William S.
Cullipher, John O.
Cunningham, William H.
Curran, Edward F.
Curran, Gary B.
Currey, James H.
Cyr, Charles R.
Dagdigian, Walter A.
Dahlgren, Larry J.
Dainoff, Marvin J.
Dale, Donald M.
Daly, Edward P.
Daly, Edward L.
Dalzell, Fredric S.
Dalzell, William J.
Damon, William E.
Danaher, Robert J.
Daniels, Richard F.
Danielson, Harvey
Dannaker, Robert P.
Danser, Richard G.
Darcy, John S.
Darrah, Paul F.
Darran, Walter W., Jr.
Darwin, John C.
Dascensio, Frank P.
Dasinger, William E.
Dattilo, Frank, III
Daugherty, Conrad W.
Dausch, William F.
Davidson, Barrett K.
Davidson, Roy M., Jr.
Davies, Robert L.
Davis, Carl "S"
Davis, Curtis C., Jr.
Davis, Leroy
Davis, Paul M.
Davis, Robert T., II
Davis, Walter M., Jr.
Davis, William R., Jr.
Davis, William H.
*Dawson, David L.
Day, Ronald L.
Dean, Arthur L., Jr.
Dean, David T.
Dean, Peter L.
Dean, Rodney J.
Dear, Jack B., II.
Deberry, John M.
Debuhr, Thomas R.
Decker, Alexander H.
Decker, Joel P. W.
Decoste, John W.
Decrona, Donald A.
Decrosta, Ernest L.
Degnon, Robb F.
Degraw, Edward J.
Deisinger, Robert A.
Delaney, John L.
Dell, William L.
Delorenzo, Joseph R.
Delvecchio, John R.
Demark, Ramon S.
Demarra, Gilbert J.
Demas, John G.
Dematteis, Louis R.
Deming, Robert L.
*Denike, Daniel J., Jr.
Denis, Robert R.
Denney, Charles R., Jr.
Dennison, Thomas W.
Dent, Marmaduke H., Jr.
Denton, Robert W.
Denton, William H.
Derby, Robert T.
Derose, Richard S.
Derry, Thomas L.
Dersham, Dayton L.
Desha, Ernest L.
Desrosiers, Arthur J., Jr.
Devine, Thomas A.
Devita, Alfred E.
Dewalt, Ralph F.
Dewhirst, George H.
Dewitt, Ward A.
Diamond, Quensel K.
Dibono, Paul, Jr.
Dick, Calvin R.
Dick, William J.
Dickerson, Roy E.
Dickey, Edwin H., Jr.
Dickey, Riley W., Jr.
Dickinson, Robert S.
Dickinson, Loyd E.
Dickson, James H.
Diekmann, Thomas W.
Diener, Edward M.
Dietz, David C.
Dietz, Eugene P.
Dighton, Anthony E., Jr.
Dille, George J.
Dillon, Christopher S.
Dillon, Cormac J.
Dillon, William A.
Diselrod, John E.
Dishman, Alfred E., Jr.
Disney, Charles
Ditmore, Kenneth J.
Dittmer, Kent W.
Dix, Paul G.
Dixner, John K.
Dixon, David B.
Dixon, Robert E.
Dizor, Carl A., Jr.
Dodge, Glenn C.
Dodson, Ola A.
Doeden, Jerry D.
Doherty, Donald P.
Dohner, David E.
Doll, Robert J.
Dolvin, Sheridan L.
Domaloan, Paul
Domville, Thomas W.
Donahue, John F.
Donaldson, John R.
Donaldson, David O.
Donham, Harry J., Jr.
Donicht, James D.
Donn, Alan H.
Donner, Neil "J"
Dooley, Dennis P. L.
Dooley, William J.
Dorfer, Jay P.
Dorsey, Robert M.
Dotson, Donald L.
Dotson, Robert K.
Dougherty, Dennis V.
Douglas, Carlysle A.
Douglas, William E.
Douglass, Thomas N.
Douwsma, Doward G.
Dowd, John F.
Dowell, Clifton A., III
Downing, Robert M.
Downs, Harold L.
Doyle, Michael
Drake, Charles A., III
Drake, David O.
Drake, Donald W.
Drake, Robert L.
Drake, William J., Jr.
Draper, Francis A.
Draper, Michael H.
Dreeszen, Lynn A.
Drews, Eugene O.
Drez, Hal J.
Driesen, Jeffrey M.
Driscoll, Allen A.
Driscoll, Joseph A.
Driver, Harry W.
Droghei, John W.
Drommond, John R.
Drumm, Gerald R.
Drummond, Richard C.
Drustrup, John M.
Dryden, William T.
Drylie, Herbert D., Jr.
Dubois, Denis R.
Dubois, Dorse H., II
Duchesne, Robert E.
Duff, Franklin D.
Duffee, Clarence L.
Duffy, Philip F.
Dugan, John A.
Dugan, John H.
Dugan, Timothy P., Jr.
Duhig, John H.
Duich, Stephen J.
Duke, Thomas E.
Dukes, Charles D.
Dulin, Robert O., Jr.
Dumont, Richard A.
Dunaway, Lawrence W.
Duncan, Floyd A.
Duncan, Glenn L.
Duncan, Hugh C.
Duncan, John D.
Duncan, Thomas J.
Dunkle, Robert A.
Dunn, Anthony T.
Dunn, Daniel R.
Dunn, Edward D., Jr.
Dunn, Gerald L.
Dunn, James A.
Dunn, Patrick H.
Dunn, Richard J.
Dunn, Willmatthis, Jr.
Dunsmoor, Earl W., Jr.
Durfee, Gerald A.
Durkee, Albert W.
Durkee, Leroy R.
Durren, Richard L.
Dusseau, William T.
Dutcher, Clinton E.
Dvornick, Eugene S.
Dwyer, David S.
Dyer, Arland R.
Dyer, Edward H., III
Dyer, Peter J.
Dyer, William J.
Early, George, Jr.
Easley, Charles E.
Eaton, Derek C.
Eaves, Jon M.
Eckert, Thomas R.
Eddins, Charles W.
Edelberg, Murray
Edson, Darrell W.
Edson, John H.
Edward, John B.
Edwards, David R.
Edwards, Ernest C.
Edwards, Harry M.
Edwards, William W., Jr.
Ehalt, Charles G.
Ehman, Lee H.
Ehrens, Gerald L.
Ehrmantraut, John W.
Eibert, "G" William
Eichhorn, Charles G.
Eisloeffel, Harold L.
Eitelman, Stephen D.
Ekse, Jon J.
Elbery, William F.
Elder, Howard A.
Eldridge, William R.
Elin, Richard A.
Elliott, Dawson L.
Elliott, Jon K.
Elliott, Phillip A.
Ellis, Donald D.
Ellis, Thomas S., III
Ellis, William C., Jr.
Ellis, Wright H.
Elrod, William F.
Elstad, Leif A.
Elston, Harold E.
Elworth, Raymond F.
Emch, Wesley G.
Emerson, John S.
Emmerich, William S.
Engel, Paul B., Jr.
Engle, Mitchell P.
English, Charles R.
English, Donald R., Jr.
Ennis, James D.
Ennis, Leslie G.
Erchul, Ronald A.
Erichson, Harry R.
Erickson, Donald C.
Eriksen, Neil O.
Eriksson, James L.
Erwin, Donald G.
Esau, Anthony C.
Esposito, Richard M.
Etheridge, Ray I.
Ettinger, Edward J., III
Etzler, Larry L.
Eubank, Carl L., Jr.
Evans, John C.
Evans, Richard L.

Eveland, Winsor G., Jr.
Everett, Sherley J.
Everman, Jerry D.
Ewald, Herman E.
Ewing, James L.
Ewing, John E., Jr.
*Eychaner, Robert L.
Faas, Robert H.
Fabie, John G.
Fagerland, David D.
Fagerness, John W.
Fagerson, Robert J.
Fair, Paul H.
Falco, James F.
Falk, Everett H.
Fallon, Donald R.
Fallows, Thomas E.
Farber, Frederick A.
Farley, David C.
Farley, Donald G., Jr.
*Farnan, George F.
Farnan, Robert L.
Farrell, Charles A., Jr.
Farrell, Wilson W.
Farrell, William J.
Farren, John J.
Fasano, Vincent P.
Faust, Charles E.
Feagans, John R.
Featherman, John A.
*Fedor, John D.
Feinberg, Irving B.
Feist, Eugene P.
Feld, Gerald A.
Feldmann, Lloyd J., Jr.
Felger, Daniel G.
Felhofer, Richard D.
Felton, Roger L.
Fenno, Ted P.
Ference, Robert J.
Fergerstrom, Gilbert C.
Ferguson, James M.
Ferguson, James L.
Ferrier, Donald R.
Ferrier, Thomas L.
Ferrill, William C., III
Ferris, Keith A.
Ferriso, Peter W.
Field, Edward J.
Fields, Marvin R
Fijack, Theodore, Jr.,
Filina, George F.
Filippini, Valentine R.
Finch, Paul F.
Finefrock, Michael M.
Fink, Walter C., III.
Finkelstein, Jimmie B.
Finnegan, Thomas J.
Finnes, Roger G.
Finotti, Donald G.
Finucane, James S.
Firebaugh, Millard S.
Fisher, David P.
Fisher, George G.
Fisher, Thomas M.
Fitch, Robert S.
Fitzgerald, Arthur G.
Fitzpatrick, Dominic A.
Fitzpatrick, Patrick C.
Fitzsimon, John P.
Flagg, Wilson F.
Flaherty, Charles F., Jr.
Flanagan, Alan B.
Flanagan, Timothy C.
Flasco, Joseph R.
Fleischauer, John F.
Fleming, Bernard M.
Fleming, Charles W.
Fleming, John M., Jr.
Flesher, Elbert E., Jr.
Flesner, Harold W.
Fletcher, Jim D.
Fletcher, Robert
Floreani, Richard J.
Flournoy, Robert A.
Floyd, Robert H.
Fluegel, Frederick K.
Flynn, Dermot A.
Flynn, James A.
Flynn, John J.
Foerster, Kent N.
Foglesong, Phillip "R"
Foley, Robert M.
Folse, Ronald L.
Folvig, John A.
Foord, Robert L.
Ford, Donald L.
Ford, James L.
Ford, James I.
Fordell, William D.
Forrest, "L" Albert, Jr.
*Forstner, Gerald
Foster, Claud A., Jr.
Foster, John H.
Foster, John C., Jr.
Foster, Kenneth M.
Foster, Paul B.
Foster, Peter J.
Foster, Thomas A.
Fox, Kenneth J., Jr.
Fox, William C.
Frame, Lee H., Jr.
Francis, Jere L.
Franck, Delbert E.
Frankenberg, Ernest
Franklin, Arthur H.
Frawley, William D.
Frazier, Lowell D.
*Fred, Robert H.
Frederick, John C.
Freeland, Stuart T.
Freeman, Joseph H., Jr.
Freeman, Robert F.
Freise, William A.
Freitag, Don M.
Freitas, John N.
Frelich, Alan W.
French, Dana P., Jr.
French, John L., Jr.
French, Stanley L.
Frew, John A.
Friedsam, Bruce A.
Friel, Joseph A., Jr.
Frodyma, John, Jr.
Fromholtz, Richard J.
Fromm, Robert D.
Frost, Edwin L., III
Frothingham, John C.
Fry, Michael S.
Frye, George A.
Fryer, Robert N., Jr.
Furey, Vincent E., Jr.
Furman, Dale F., Jr.
Furtaw, Francis A.
Fusco, Charles, Jr.
Fust, Arnold P.
Fuster, Alonso S.
Futch, Charles A.
Gaal, Robert L.
Gabriel, Edward M.
Gache, Marius A.
Gaedecke, Walter R.
Gaidsick, Howard W., Jr.
Galbraith, Elmer J., Jr.
*Galbreath, Christopher W.
Gallagher, James A.
Gallagher, Charles J., Jr.
Gallagher, Hugh P.
Gallamore, John C.
Galles, Harry L.
Galloway, Wesley T.
Gambacorta, Francis M., Jr.
Gander, John P., Jr.
Gantzer, William E.
Garden, Leon B.
Gardner, Joseph, III
Gardner, John M.
Garrett, Roger A.
Garrison, Robert L., Jr.
Garritson, Grant R.
Garvey, Daniel P.
Gastrock, Barry A.
Gauger, David E.
Gauntt, Gary D.
Gause, Gadsden S.
Gaylord, Reginald F., Jr.
Gee, Raymond A.
Geeding, Robert W.
Geffner, Donald F.
Gehrdes, Ernest E.
Gemmill, Theodore H.
George, James L.
Gerard, Charles J.
*Germany, Holmes B.
Geroux, John L.
Gerson, Benno M.
Gerstenschlager, Val
*Gertz, William J.
Gess, Richard L.
Gesswein, Paul S., Jr.
Geurts, James R.
Giambattista, Frank D., Jr.
Giauque, Larry L.
Gibb, Charles E.
Gibbs, Brian L.
Gibbs, "D" Clark
Gibby, George C.
*Gibney, William J., Jr.
Gibson, Walter R.
Gick, Robert P.
Gidley, Byron G.
Gidusko, John E.
Giefer, Thomas S.
Giersch, Albert E.
Gieselman, Edward W., III
Gilbert, William C.
Gilbertson, Eugene D.
Gilbody, Glenn D.
Gildner, Dan H.
Gildow, Hugh R.
Giles, Michael T.
Gill, Edward A.
Gill, Henry A., Jr.
Gill, Richard B.
Gill, Thomas E., II
Gillette, William L.
Gilmore, Thomas R.
Gimmel, Daniel G.
Gingras, Joel A.
Gingras, Robert J.
Ginsburg, Terry B.
Giuffreda, Robert N.
Glasgow, David E.
*Glasier, John M.
Glavis, George O.
Gleason, Thomas F.
Glivings, Rudolph
Glockler, Robert H.
Gloudemans, James R.
Glover, Douglas W.
Glover, Robert P.
Gnaedinger, Wallace R.
Gobel, Robert W.
Godard, Joel C., Jr.
Goebel, Clark E.
Goetsch, George R.
Goff, Ernest L.
Goggins, John J., Jr.
Goins, Philip A.
Goldsby, Elza E., Jr.
Goldstein, Steven N.
Gollahon, Gene R.
Gonding, Howard R., Jr.
Gonzales, Jon F.
Gonzalez, Ernest G.
Goodall, Roger A.
Goodin, William F.
Goodman, Gene L.
Goodman, Ronald M.
Goodson, Ralph E.
Goodwine, George E.
Goody, James W.
Gordon, Robert H.
Gore, Frederick E.
Gorena, Rolando R.
Gorgas, Chester W., Jr.
Gorman, Barry W.
Gorman, Francis X.
Goss, Robert W.
Gothie, Michael T.
Gowen, Victor F.
Gowers, Fred L.
Graham, David B.
Graham, Michael F.
Graham, Robert L.
Graham, Robert W., III
Grant, Daniel C.
Grant, Richard E.
Grant, Richard R.
Grant, Thomas W.
Grantham, Raymond B., Jr.
Graustein, Robert S.
Gray, David S.
Gray, Gary A.
Gray, George E.
Gray, Richard M.
Gray, William C.
Greaves, William P.
Grebe, Leslie E.
Green, Bobby F.
Green, Daniel L.
Green, Donald C.
Green, Eugene L.
Green, Thomas F., III
Greene, Paul E.
Greenwood, Lee S., II
Greer, Alan G.
Greer, Glynn R.
Greer, Maurice C.
Gregg, Benjamin M.
Gregg, Dwain G.
Gregg, John J.
Gregg, Michael C.
Gregor, John T.
Gregor, Richard A.
Gregory, Herbert W.
Grexton, Frederick T.
Griffin, Harold E.
Griffis, William W.
Grimes, Elmer R.
Grimes, Richard P., Jr.
Grinnell, Donald P.
Groff, Abram L., Jr.
Grogan, Michael B.
Gropper, Richard
Grosfils, Eric F.
Gross, John H.
Grubb, Robert G.
Grulkowski, Ray A.
Gruman, Loran D.
Grunert, John L.
Gudahl, Joel M.
Gudmunson, Charles E.
Guenter, Gordon E.
Guerra, Michael A.
Guertin, Gerald A.
Guest, Robert E.
Gulla, Ernest J.
*Gullaksen, Herbert E.
Gumbs, John L.
Gurnee, William T.
Gustafson, Kurt A.
Gustafson, Lawrence C.
Guthauser, Earl H.
Guthrie, John T.
Guthrie, Wallace N., Jr.
Haas, George H.
Hass, Julian F., Jr.
Haberle, Donald L.
Haberman, Alfred, Jr.
Hackett, Douglas M.
Haff, Edwin, W., Jr.
Hagen, Harley, Jr.
Hager, Searls, C.
Haggard, Alfred D.
Hahn, Carl G.
Hahn, Henry F., Jr.
Halasz, Franklin E.
Halenza, Hal R.
Haley, Barry L.
Hall, Franklin J.
Hall, Gene W.
Hall, Giles S., III
Hall, James G.
Hall, Leon E.
Hall, Michael J.
Hall, Richard H.
Hall, William M.
Hallcom, Terry
Halmark, John B.
Hallor, Albert E.
Halloran, Thomas F., Jr.
Haman, David B.
*Hambright, Thomas L.
Hamilton, Frederick W.
Hamilton, John "J," Jr.
Hamilton, Leonard A.
Hamilton, Ted A.
Hammerton, George A.
Hammond, Edwin S.
Hancock, John B.
Haney, Albert L.
Hanisch, Rudolf
Hannan, John L.
Hansen, Richard C.
Hansen, Robert R.
Hanson, Donald E.
Hanson, Gary R.
Hanson, Robert C.
Hanzel, Robert M.
Harbison, George O., Jr.
Harbour, James Q.
Harcos, Kermit A., Jr.
Harden, Harold E.
Harder, Henry L.
Hardesty, William H., III.
Hardison, Robert P., Jr.
Hardy, Richard M.
Harger, Burton P.
Harkess, Harold A.
Harless, Charles W.
*Harlett, John C.
Harman, Joseph H., II.
Harmon, Leland H.
Harmon, William R.
Harold, Douglas W., Jr.
Harper, Don S., Jr.
Harper, John N., Jr.
Harper, John E.
Harrell, Gary W.
Harrelson, Allan M.
Harriman, Robert B.
Harrington, James W.
Harrington, Frank H.
Harris, Charles T.
Harris, John W.
Harris, Robert W.
Hart, Robert M.
Hartman, Gary W.
Hartman, William A.
Harvey, Leo Q.
Harvey, William L.
Harvill, Jon D.
Harwi, William C.
Haselman, Eugene A.
Haskell, Thomas L.
Hassinger, William H.
Hastings, Richard W.
Hathaway, Clifford D.
Hauser, Robert F.
Hawk, Richard S.
Hawkins, Sharlett D.
Hawley, Raymond M.
Hay, John A.
Hayes, James H.
Haymond, Everett E.
Hayne, William J.
Haynes, Gordon L., Jr.
Hazard, Richard C.
Heal, Charles W., Jr.
*Heald, David B.
Heald, George F.
Healy, James B.
Healy, William J.
Hearne, William S.
Heath, John C.
Heaton, John E.
Heckler, William J., Jr.
Hehn, Benjamin F., III
Heidt, John H.
Heilmann, Irvin D.
Heimendinger, Kip W.
Heinz, William J.
Held, John R.
Held, Philip J.
Helland, Paul A. S.
*Helmann, Jack E.
Helmick, Albert T.
Helms, Hugh W.
Helton, William C.
*Hemmer, John K.
Henault, Edmund L.
Henderson, Jack D.
Henderson, Hugh C.
Henderson, Jimmy D.
Henderson, Henry P., Jr.
Henderson, Richard J.
Henderson, Loring R.
Henderson Lee H.
Hendren, Edward D.
Hendricks, Roy L.
Hendrickson, Donald R.
Henley, Douglas R.
*Henley, Willie D.
Hennessey, Raymond W.
Henning, Kenneth R.
Henriksen, Ronald D.
Henry, Guy H.
*Henry, James C., Jr.
Hensgen, Richard H.
Henson, Jarrell N.
Herker, Larry V.
Herlihy, Joseph P.
Herman, Bruce B.
Herrington, Albert O., Jr.
Herron, William
Hertzler, Gerald R.
Herzberg, Gary G.
Herzog, Raymond F.
Hesch, Arthur A., Jr.
Hesse, Francis L.
Hewgley, Richard W.
Hewitt, Fred L., III
Heyde, John W.
Hickey, Donald J.
Hicks, Gerald D.
Hicks, Jack A., Jr.
Hicks, William D., Jr.
Hiebert, Edwin G.
Higgins, James E.
Higgins, Richard F. J.
Higgins, Robert J.
Hight, Stuart L.
*Hightower, Roger W.
Hightower, Charles V.
Highwart, Ronald R.
Hill, Alan C.
*Hill, Arthur S., Jr.
Hill, Arthur J.
Hill, John D.
*Hill, Kenneth F.
Hill, Paul H., Jr.
Hill, Robert S., Jr.
Hill, Virgil L., Jr.
Hill, William J.
Hillhouse, William C.
Hillman, Albert S.
Hillyard, William F.
Hilt, George T.
Hilton, Washington C.
Hilty, David A.
Himelstein, David B.
Hinchey, Timothy K., Jr.
Hines, Thomas W., Jr.
Hinkel, Harold J.
Hinson, Albert E.

Hinson, Thomas P.
Hinton, Thomas E.
Hipper, Ira M.
Hitch, William L.
Hitchcock, William E., Jr.
Hixson, Richard M.
Hoadley, Garrick L.
Hoag, Robert W., II
Hobgood, William P.
Hockman, Robert E.
Hodde, James D.
Hodge, Henderson A., III
Hodge, Stephen A.
Hodges, Edward "A"
Hoernemann, Michael J.
Hoffman, Charles E., Jr.
Hoffman, David J.
Hoffman, George J.
Hoffman, Paul M.
Hoffman, Robert G.
Hoffman, Robert E.
Hofford, Robert F.
Hofmann, Clifford H.
Hohe, Joseph D.
Holben, Neil E.
Holbrook, Douglas P.
Holcomb, Ben H.
Holcomb, Charles C.
Holifield, Allison, J., Jr.
Holliday, James D.
Hollingsworth, Donald L.
Hollowell, David C.
Holly, Richard W.
Hollyfield, John S.
Holmes, David G.
Holmes, Ephraim P., Jr.
Holmes, Robert S. B., Jr.
Holmes, Stacy V.
Holt, Richard W., Jr.
Holt, Richard H.
Holum, Kenneth G.
Holzkamp, Rugen C.
Hommel, Thomas M.
Hood, "J" "V"
Hoog, Thomas W.
Hooker, Anthony S.
Hooker, Argie L.
Hoppe, Warren D. J.
Hopper, John F.
*Hornbeck, Arthur G.
Horne, Roderick M.
Horner, Monte L.
Horner, Ronald C.
Horrigan, John L.
Hortin, Robert D.
Horvatic, Thomas L.
Hoskins, Joe T.
Hotelling, Edward R.
Hottle, Charles J.
Houghton, David R.
*Houk, Donald R.
House, Steven H.
House, Thomas V.
Houtchens, Horace P.
Houton, Daniel J.
*Hover, Fred B.
Hovey, Cecil C.
Howard, Dennis C.
Howard, John R.
Howard, Richard B.
Howard, Robert M.
Howard, Robert S.
Howden, William B.
Howe, Franklin F., Jr.
Howe, Larry L.
Howlett, Frederick J.
Howse, Elwood D., Jr.
Howson, Richard I.
Hruska, James D.
Hubbard, George D., Jr.
Hubbard, Richard G.
Huber, Raymond J.
Huchko, William
Hudock, Charles J.
Hudock, Joseph A.
Huey, Victor B., Jr.
Huffman, George L., Jr.
Huffman, James W.
Huggard, Stephen F.
Hughes, John C.
Hughes, Melville P., II
Huke, George E.
Hulbert, Bruce W.
Hulme, Nelson D.
Hulse, Robert C.
Humphrey, Bernard W., Jr.
Humphrey, Robert W.
Humphrey, William B.
Hungarland, John D., Jr.
Hunter, William P.
Huntington, Dennis E.
Huntington, William H.
Hurley, David J.
Hutchens, Walter A.
Hutchins, Elmer S., Jr.
Huth, Vincent J.
Hutton, Kenneth L.
Huwe, Clarence T
Hux, Edgar D.
Hyatt, Charles S.
Hyland, Robert J.
Hyman, Leo T.
Iams, William O.
Ibach, James S
Ilao, Peter A.
Illingsworth, Fred H.
Ingalls, Melvin N., Jr.
Ingham, Curtis J.
Ingram, Richard F.
Innes, Henry E.
Ireland, Joseph J.
Isaacson, Robert T.
Isely, George R.
Jackson, David E.
Jackson, Donald R.
Jackson, Lewis L., Jr.
Jackson, Raymond
Jackson, Robert T., Jr.
Jackson, Ronald G.
Jackson, Samuel L.
Jackson, Warren B., Jr.
Jacobs, Richard B.
Jacobsen, James D.
Jacobsen, Ronald D.
Jacobsen, William H.
Jaggard, Joseph F.
Jahelka, George L.
James, Albert N.
James, Joseph F.
James, Robert F.
James, Ronald E.
Jamison, Joe R.
*Janak, Charles J.
Jantzen, Milton D.
Jaras, Thomas F.
Jarvis, Emory E.
Jarvis, Max G.
Jefferson, George R.
Jeffery, Samuel D.
Jegers, John J.
Jenkins, Faber D., Jr.
Jenkins, Frederick P.
Jenner, Richard C., Jr.
Jennett, Benjamin F.
Jennings, Benjamin F.
Jensen, James C.
Jensen, Jorn E.
Jensen, Lester P.
Jensen, Richard M.
Jerhoff, Joseph W.
Jewell, James P., Jr.
Jiron, Patrick G.
Johannes, Richard N.
Johansen, Roy D.
Johns, Constantine A.
*Johnson, Alfred E.
Johnson, Arthur L.
Johnson, Charles J.
Johnson, Charles R.
Johnson, Claire R.
Johnson, Dale G.
Johnson, Daryl D.
Johnson, Donald L.
Johnson, James F.
Johnson, Jesse H.
Johnson, Perry E. J.
Johnson, Ralph B., Jr.
Johnson, Rey W.
Johnson, Richard T.
Johnson, Roger W.
Johnson, Thomas B.
Johnson, Thomas F.
Johnson, Thomas A.
Johnson, William L., Jr.
Johnson, William P.
Johnston, Daniel F.
Johnston, Lowell T.
Jones, Charles W.
Jones, Daniel G.
Jones, David L.
Jones, Eldridge L., Jr.
Jones, Frank A., Jr.
Jones, Iver L.
Jones, Jack D.
Jones, James R.
Jones, Michael A.
Jones, Milton H.
Jones, Paul F.
Jones, Robert J.
Jones, Robert M.
Jones, Robert W.
Jones, Shelley K.
Jones, Stanley H.
Jones, Thomas P., Jr.
Jones, William C., Jr.
Jordan, Jonathan H.
Jordan, Robert L.
Jordan, Walker W.
Jorgensen, Jay K.
Joyce, Dennis P.
Joyner, James D.
Juda, Richard J.
Judson, William H.
Juhasz, Joseph B.
Julian, Franklin D.
Juliet, Paul H.
Junger, George A.
Kaempfer, Frederick W.
Kagan, Reuben
Kagay, Jerry A.
Kagel, Colin T.
Kalkus, Peter
Kallay, Thomas
Kallusch, Herbert W.
Kamperschroer, Glenn N.
Kane, George F.
Kanes, James C.
Kanicki, Joseph J.
Kaplan, Robert D.
Kaplon, Ronald K.
Kapocius, Algirdas K.
Karalius, Benedikt K.
Karcher, Bruce P.
Karcher, Victor A.
Karlsen, Gustav E.
Karr, James D.
Karst, Allen W.
Karwoski, Daniel A.
Kasales, Joseph A.
Kauffmann, Richard X., Jr.
Kavanagh, Joseph T.
Kavula, Robert F.
Kearley, Estel E.
Kee, Martin A.
Keech, Everett T.
Keefer, Thomas J.
Keeslar, Paul T.
Keffer, George M.
Kehl, David C.
Keith, Charles W.
Keith, Charles P.
Keith, Dennis G.
Keith, Kenton W.
Keller, Edward L.
Keller, Harold R.
Kelley, Gregory P.
Kelley, William P.
Kellner, Edward J.
Kelly, John J., Jr.
Kelly, Robert W.
Kelly, Robert F., Jr.
Kelly, Thomas E.
Kelly, Timothy M.
Kelso, Gerald K.
Kemmeter, James A.
Kemp, William R.
Kendra, Paul W., Jr.
Kendziorski, Gerald J.
Kenefick, Robert J.
Kennebeck, Donald F.
Kennedy, Jared P.
Kennedy, Jackson W. T.
Kennedy, James J.
Kennedy, Joseph T.
Kennedy, John J.
Kennedy, Michael J.
Kenney, Lawrence H.
Kent, Bennie R.
Kent, Joseph F.
Kenyon, Leonard D.
Keolanui, Gus L.
Kerley, John E.
*Kerr, Howard "J," Jr.
Kerr, James E.
Kerr, Jarvis J.
Kerr, Richard H.
Kettenring, Alfred W., Jr.
Khachatourian, Toros V.
Kibbe, Richard L., Jr.
Kiel, Joseph A.
Kiggins, William R., Jr.
Kiker, Jon D.
Kilpatrick, Arthur L.
Kimberling, Walter F.
Kinberg, Thomas R.
Kincaid, Teddy G.
King, Alfred E.
King, Charles E.
King, Harold W.
King, Herdic W., Jr.
King, Raymond D.
King, Robert N.
King, Walter, Jr.
King, Weston B.
Kinnard, Roger W.
Kinner, Edward B.
Kinney, Dennis M.
Kinney, Richard W., Jr.
Kinzie, Larry L.
Kirby, John R.
Kirchner, John
Kirk, Francis M., Jr.
Kirkbride, Richard J.
Kirkman, David C.
Kirkwood, William W.
Kirkland, John C.
Kisel, Jack C.
Kizer, Clyde R.
Klee, Charles W., Jr.
Klein, Richard E.
Klein, Roger L.
Kleinman, Michael
Klemp, Louis A., Jr.
Klich, Robert M.
Kliem, Arnold W.
Klimaszewski, Marcel P.
Klinck, Knowlton G., II
Kline, Robert L.
Klinger, David C.
Klingler, Peter J.
Klocek, Matthew W.
Klumpp, William F., II
Knabb, Kenneth K., Jr.
Knapp, Bobby L.
Knapp, Edwin J.
Knapp, Gerald A.
Knapp, Larry J.
Knaup, Charles W.
Knaus, James J.
Knepell, Thomas G. W.
Kneuer, Arthur E.
Knight, Daniel
Knight, Euodias F., Jr.
Knight, Ralph W., Jr.
Knight, Wilner B.
Knoblauch, Robert M.
Knoble, James B.
Knott, Harold A.
Knowles, Frank J., III
Knowles, Michael P.
Knox, Marshall W.
Knudson, Kenneth R.
Knutson, Dennis J.
Koch, Larry N.
Kodger, Herbert E.
Koehler, David J.
Koelling, Glen A.
Koerner, John G.
Koffarnus, Richard L.
Kogler, Robert A.
Kolb, William W.
Kollmeyer, Carl
Kolodzeij, John S.
Komarek, Jon P.
Komoroske, Alexander B., Jr.
Kondy, Paul E.
Koneval, Kenneth G.
*Kopp, Elmer M., Jr.
Koppmann, George G.
Kordalski, Robert E.
Korkolis, Anthony C.
Korsmo, Thomas B.
Kortkamp, Gary R.
Kouba, George E., Jr.
Kozlowski, Joseph F.
Kraft, James R.
Krall, John J.
Krall, Robert M.
Kramer, John F., Jr.
Kramer, Joseph P., III
Kramer, Wayne B.
Kratz, Ralph H.
Kraus, William A.
Krause, David R.
Krebs, Rodney A.
Kreisher, Burrell M.
Kreitner, Philip C.
Krenn, Roger W.
Kreusch, Bernard A.
Kreutziger, Kenneth M.
Krichbaum, Robert F.
Krick, Frederick H., Jr.
Kringel, John G.
Krivy, Albert
Kroner, Frank R., Jr.
Kronz, James C.
Krucke, Hans H.
Krueger, Ellison F.
Kudla, Eugene
Kuehl, Chester L., Jr.
Kuepker, Donald L.
Kuester, Arland W.
Kuhhirte, William F.
Kuhn, William A.
Kulesz, James J.
Kulik, Charles A.
Kumpf, Thomas L.
Kunz, James C.
Kupfer, John B.
*Kurz, Robert
Kyne, John M.
Laack, Dennis R.
Labonte, Alfred E.
Lacey, John S., Jr.
Lachance, Ralph R.
Lackey, James A.
Ladyman, Berlyn D.
Lagrange, George D.
Lahaszow, John S.
Lair, James A.
Lajoie, James R.
Lake, Donelson M., Jr.
Lamb, Dennis W.
Lamb, Stanton B.
*Lambach, Carl E.
Lambden, William J.
Lambert, Francis R.
Lambeth, Walter O., Jr.
Lamens, Martin L.
Lamey, Paul E.
Lammey, Alan S.
Lamont, Robert F.
Lampe, John F.
Lamporte, Richard A.
Lamura, Wayne R.
Landers, Edward L.
Landers, Fordyce R.
Landin, Luther L., Jr.
Lane, Glynn Q., Jr.
Lane, Howard F., Jr.
Langan, John J., Jr.
Lange, Dennis E.
Lange, Peter S.
Langher, Frank S., Jr.
Langley, Robert M.
Langlois, David R.
Langworthy, Theodore F.
Lantz, Rex E.
Lantz, Stephen P.
Lapean, James W.
Lapeter, Alfred, Jr.
Larison, Donald E.
Larkin, Terrance E.
Larsen, Paul J.
*Larson, Frank C.
Larson, Richard E.
Lash, Franklin B.
Lasko, Paul G.
Latimer, Stephen M.
Laughon, Lawrence E.
Lavigne, Harry E., Jr.
Law, James L.
Lawler, Edward J.
Lawlor, Francis J.
Lawlor, James J.
Lawrence, Gerald S.
*Lawrence, Richard W.
Lawson, Robert A., Jr.
Lawson, Roger W.
Lays, Richard P.
Layton, David R.
Lazzaretti, Anthony F.
Leach, Edward E.
Leach, Rudolph D.
Leardi, Paul L.
Leary, Thomas J.
Lebedeker, Michael D.
*Leblanc, Arsene, Jr.
Ledbetter, James L.
Ledgett, Ronald A.
Leduc, Donald E.
Lee, David C.
Lee, John H.
Lee, William J.
Lefevers, Jerry D.
Lehardy, Frank A., Jr.
Lehn, Joseph B.
Lejeune, Thomas E.
Leming, Billy J.
Lemmer, Karl F.
Lemoyne, Irve C.
Lenbergs, Harold E.
Leonard, Robert J.
Leonard, William J.
Leroy, John E.
Levin, Frederick W.
Lewandowski, Francis J., Jr.
Lewis, Richard T.
Lewis, William L.

Libuda, Thomas A.
*Liddle, Donald J.
Liles, Paul E.
Lillis, Jack W.
Limbaugh, John R.
Lindmark, Bruce W.
Lindsey, James M.
*Lindung, John R.
Linehan, Dennis R.
*Linehan, Jeffrey A.
Lingley, John R., Jr.
Litka, Adam L.
Livingston, Ira E.
Lloyd, Albert E., Jr.
Lloyd, Robert C.
Lockett, Joseph L., III
Locklear, Jackie R.
Locklin, Ralph H.
Lofgren, John M.
Loftus, John B., Jr.
Logan, "H" Edmund
Logan, James L., Jr.
Loggins, Philip R.
Lohringel, Manual M.
Long, Glenn U.
Long, James P.
Long, James L.
Long, Robert A.
Long, William C.
Longo, Andrew T.
Loomis, Michael F.
Loose, Ronald R.
Lopp, Roy G.
Lord, Norman C.
Lord, Ralph H., Jr.
Lound, Herbert D.
Love, Roger G.
Lowack, Frederick J.
Lowas, Emil P.
Lowe, Forrest D.
Lowe, Wilfred L.
Lowenthal, James H.
Loya, Eugene S.
Lubbs, Larry L.
Lucchesi, Lionel L.
Luckey, Robert D.
Ludena, Roy
Ludtke, David A.
Luellen, Lawrence H.
Lulchuk, Daniel
Lum, Ronald H. W.
Lund, Robert S.
Lundy, Aaron L., III
Luneberg, Richard C.
Luper, James A.
Lutz, Edward J., Jr.
Lutz, Larry G.
Lybrook, Charles W.
Lyman, Charles W., III
Lynch, Jerome P.
Lynch, Terrence P.
Lynch, Thomas W.
Lynn, Aubrey J., Jr.
Lynn, David D.
Lyons, Arvid F.
Lyons, Donald J.
McAfee, Harry M.
McAulay, Michael L.
McBride, James J.
McBurney, Robert M.
McCall, William D.
McCann, Wilford D.
McCarthy, Eugene J.
McCarthy, William P.
McCarton, Joseph F.
McCauley, Robert G.
McClain, Eugene P.
McClelland, Michael D.
McClennan, Thomas P.
McClernon, Thomas F., Jr.
McClintock, Raymond D.
McColgan, John F.
McConnel, John S.
McCormick, Francis E.
McCormick, Charles E., Jr.

McCornock, James M.
McCoy, Frank D.
*McCracken, Max D.
McCreary, Maurice L.
McCreedy, William H.
McCusker, Arthur E.
McCutcheon, Rob A.
McCutcheon, Thomas O.
McDade, Joseph S.
McDaniel, Douglas T.
McDaniel, Jackson L.
McDaniel, John R.
McDaniel, Lonnie W.
McDaniels, Joseph E.
McDermott, Henry D., Jr.
McDonald, James L.
McElhiney, Ivan G.
McElmurry, Joe A.
McElroy, Lowell R.
McErlean, Charles F., Jr.
McEwen, Laurence B., Jr.
*McFadden, Eugene J. M.
McFarland, Fred T.
McFillen, Roger L.
McGarry, John J.
McGee, James H.
McGee, Wyatt H.
McGinity, Frank J., Jr.
McGinley, Edward S., II
McGoldrick, Henry J.
McGoon, Douglas J.
McGovern, Lawrence E.
McGowan, Joseph H.
McGraw, Thomas M.
McGuigan, William M.
McGuire, James R.
*McGuire, Richard J.
McHugh, Thomas J.
McIntosh, Edward J.
McIntosh, Finley S.
McIntyre, James E.
McIntyre, Richard T.
McKay, John N.
McKellar, William J.
McKellips, Charles M.
McKeon, Thomas P.
McKeown, Ronald E.
McKinney, Donald L.
McKinnon, Paul J., Jr.
McLane, David J.
McLaren, David J.
McLaughlin, Charles F.
McLaurin, John C., Jr.
McLean, William T.
*McLeod, Samuel D., Jr.
McMahon, Bernard F., Jr.
McMahon, John P.
McMahon, Michael J.
McMichael, David L.
McMorrow, John P.
McMullen, Samuel R.
McNair, Morris L., Jr.
McNally, Eugene F.
McNamara, Ronan M.
McNease, Sollie, Jr.
McNeil, Frederic A., Jr.
McNeill, Robert D.
McNicholas, Thomas M., Jr.
McNiel, Charles S.
McNiff, Eugene E.
McOlgan, Jerry M.
McOmber, Frank L., Jr.
McPherson, Tommy E.

McQueen, Edgar G.
McQuoid, Frank, III
McStay, John E., Jr.
*McTighe, John T.
McWhinnie, Scott T.
McWhorter, Richard H.
McWilliams, John A.
McWilliams, Samuel E.
MacDonald, Kay L.
Mack, Jacob A., III
Mackay, William R., III
Mackey, Kennard E.
Macknis, Bernard A.
MacTavish, William A., II
Madden, Michael J.
Magann, Archie R.
Magee, George E., Jr.
Magee, Gerald T.
Magee, John E.
Magers, Francis D., Jr.
Maggio, Vincent A.
Magill, James, Jr.
Magnfelt, Robert W.
Magnuson, Theodore L.
Mahan, Robert G.
Maher, Thomas M., Jr.
Mailey, John J., Jr.
Maiorana, Mario
Majors, Robert C.
Makela, Toivo W.
Malla, Richard J.
Malopy, Lawrence R.
Mandrick, Eugene J.
Maneval, Lew A.
*Manlove, William W., Jr.
Mann, Arthur M., Jr.
Mann, David S.
Mann, John E.
Manning, Thomas P., Jr.
Mansfield, Gordon R.
Manzo, Anthony B.
March, Daniel P.
*Marechal, Andre
Marion, Allan R.
Marks, Bernard R.
Markworth, John A.
Marley, Percy F., Jr.
Marnane, Joseph P.
Marquis, Richard I.
Marrack, Richard M.
Marrone, James I.
Marsden, Edward G.
Marshall, Stephen E.
Martin, Edwin P.
Martin, Harold P.
Martin, Harold V.
Martin, Owen C., Jr.
Martin, Solomon G., Jr.
Martin, Virgil, Jr.
Martin, William G.
Marxen, Harry A.
Masat, Kenneth J.
Mason, Wesley R., III
Mason, William H.
Massey, Henry P., Jr.
Master, John D.
Matechak, John
Mathews, William M., Jr.
Matson, William V.
Matthes, Dickie R.
Matthews, James L.
Mattis, James B.
Matzelle, Raymond K.
Mau, Gary W.
Mauldin, Hugh E., Jr.
Mauldin, James E.
Maurer, James F., Jr.
Maurer, Thomas E.
May, Adrian C., Jr.
Maybach, Alfred A., Jr.
Mayer, Roderick L.
Mayo, Hoyt E.

Mays, George G.
Maytum, William D.
Mazzi, Arnold O.
Mazzocco, William E.
Mead, James M.
Meadows, James W.
Meaker, John P.
Mealey, Thomas H., Jr.
Mecon, William H., Jr.
Meek, John B., Jr.
Meese, Harry E.
*Mehelich, Jacob R.
Melendy, Harold R.
Melenyzer, George G.
Meline, Carl W.
Melissari, James J.
*Melton, Jack L.
Mensch, George H.
Mercado, Carlos E.
Merchant, John C.
Merlino, Emidio J.
Merriman, Thomas R.
Merrow, Cordon M.
Messman, Arthur R.
Metcalf, Robert E.
Metzler, Charles P., Jr.
Meyer, Donald R.
Meyer, Karl A., Jr.
Meyer, Michael P.
*Meyers, John J.
Micalchuck, David P.
Michael, Gene C.
Michaux, Richard W.
Mickel, John M.
Mickelsen, William E., Jr.
Middents, Paul W.
Middleton, David D.
Mikell, Bernard J.
Milacek, Emil C., Jr.
Miles, David L.
Millar, Dodd R.
Millar, Douglas P.
Millen, Thomas W.
Miller, Alan K.
Miller, Albert F.
Miller, Chip
Miller, Clarence A.
Miller, David N.
Miller, Donald G.
Miller, Donald E.
Miller, Hal M.
Miller, Henry E.
Miller, James M.
Miller, John B., III
Miller, Kenneth F.
Miller, Lee M.
Miller, Raymond P.
Miller, Stephen K.
Miller, Thomas L.
Mills, Duane A.
Mills, Melvin W.
Mills, William W.
Milotich, Alexander A.
Mimms, James L.
Minahan, Martin W.
Mings, William C.
Minnick, Thomas A.
Misclevitz, Dale L.
Mitchell, George, Jr.
Mitchell, George E.
Mitchell, James E.
Mitchell, James T.
Mitchell, Leo R.
Mitchell, Martin R.
Mitchell, Raymond A., Jr.
Mitchell, Richard F.
Mitchell, Thomas E.
Mitchell, Thomas W.
Mock, Sanford N.
Moe, Gerald L.
Moffatt, Walter S.
Moffett, Peter V.
Moir, Edwin L.
Moles, Gary A.
Moll, Corwin R.
Momm, John A.
*Mommsen, Durward B., Jr.

Moniot, James L.
Montali, Dennis
Monteleon, Victor J.
Montgomery, Robert A.
Moore, Daniel W., Jr.
Moore, Dennis J.
Moore, Dudley B., III
Moore, Jerry R.
Moore, John H.
Moore, Mark W.
Moore, Michael J.
Moore, Richard E.
Moore, Robert C., Jr.
Moore, Robert L.
Moore, Verne L.
Moran, David H., Jr.
Morency, David C.
Moreno, Ernest C.
Morgan, Henry V.
Morgan, Howard B.
Morgan, Kenneth S.
Morgan, Ottis N.
Morgan, Paul C.
Morgan, Richard A.
Moriarty, Donald G.
Morich, Petral
Morin, Thomas E.
Moroney, Brendan T.
Morong, George P.
Morosco, William J.
Morris, Charles H. O.
Morris, John W.
Morris, John K.
Morrison, Harlan L.
Morrison, Karl F.
Morrow, Frank A.
Morrow, George E.
Morss, Lester R.
Moses, Paul D.
Mosher, David E.
Mosher, Robert T.
Moss, Clarence D.
Moss, Theodore J., Jr.
Mosser, John H.
Mosteller, William L.
Mothershed, Roy W., Jr.
Motter, Norman K.
Mouns, Albert L.
Mount, Carl K., Jr.
Mowery, Gary W.
Moyer, Henry W., Jr.
Moynahan, Michael J.
Mueller, Joseph B.
Mueller, Richard P.
Mulford, Michael L.
Mulin, Charles F.
Mullarky, Jon I.
Mullen, James J.
Muller, Alan E.
Mulligan, Joseph I., Jr.
Mullins, William E.
Murphy, Arthur W., Jr.
Murphy, Daniel I., Jr.
Murphy, Dennis J., Jr.
Murphy, Edward R., Jr.
Murphy, Edward M.
Murphy, Eugene, R.
Murphy, Francis W.
Murphy, James J.
Murphy, John R.
Murphy, John K., III
Murphy, Patrick E.
Murphy, Terence M.
Murray, Charles E.
Murray, Hugh L.
Murray, James W., Jr.
Murray, Maurice T.
Murray, Smith W.
Murray, Tom R., II
Murray, William M.
Murtha, William P.
Myers, Charles K.
Myers, Dale M.
Myers, Elvyn L.
Myers, Thomas A.

Myers, William H.
Mylott, Barry
Naftali, Robert J.
Nagel, James R.
Nale, James F.
Naquin, John C.
Narciso, John A.
Nash, Spencer J.
*Nason, Robert S.
Naughton, Robert J.
Nay, Herbert L.
Naylor, Frank W., Jr.
Needham, William R.
Neibauer, James E.
Nelson, Bruce W.
Nelson, Bruce R.
Nelson, Edwin C.
Nelson, Edward J.
Nelson, James A.
Nelson, James M., Jr.
Nelson, Leonard M.
Nelson, Ronald J.
*Nelson, Thomas L.
Nelson, William J., Jr.
Nemes, Robert J.
Nersesian, Roy L.
Nesbitt, Donald L.
Neubauer, Ralph B.
Neumann, Edward M.
Newby, Richard E.
Newcomb, Milton E.
*Newman, Roger L.
Newman, William E.
Newmister, Ronald D.
Newton, Killraine, Jr.
Nicholas, James K.
Nicholas, Robert H.
Nichols, Christopher O.
Nichols, Dennis B.
Nichols, John R.
Nickens, Samuel L.
Nickerson, Peter G.
Nickson, Robert E.
Nielsen, Donald R.
Nixon, Philip A.
Noddin, Ernest M.
Noe, James E., II.
Nokleberg, Warren J.
Nolan, Charlie C., Jr.
Nolan, Donald E.
Nolan, James J., Jr.
Noland, William R.
Noll, James A.
Noonan, James F., Jr.
Noonan, William F.
Nordlund, Norman H.
Norfleet, Ashley C., II
Norman, Richard A.
Norris, Richard D.
North, Walter A.
Northington, William A., Jr.
Norton, Lafayette F.
Nosal, Clarence J.
Nowotny, Lionel J.
Nuccetelli, Joseph O.
Nuechterlein, Karl W.
Nunnelee, John R.
Nutt, James H.
Nyenhuis, Keith E.
Oakes, Dudley G.
Oakes, Fulton D., Jr.
*Oaks, Eugene W.
O'Berin, Frederick W.
O'Brien, Charles V., Jr.
O'Brien, Edward J., III
O'Brien, Jack W.
O'Brien, Keith G.
O'Brien, Patrick E.
O'Brien, William J., Jr.
O'Brion, John H., Jr.
O'Byrne, Michael E., Jr.
Ochel, Henry R.
O'Connell, Michael J.
O'Connor, Lawrence E.
O'Connor, William F.
Odea, Kenneth J.

Oherron, Frederick E., Jr.
Ohler, Herman
Ohlman, James P.
Ohnmeis, Patrick J.
Okon, Robert B.
Old, Harold E., Jr.
Oldham, Richard R.
Olds, Harry M.
Olivari, Robert J.
Oliver, Herndon A., III
Oliver, Richard L.
Oliver, Richard J.
Olsen, David A.
Olsen, George W.
Olsen, Richard A.
Olsen, Robert A.
Olson, Laverne C.
Olson, Waldemar M.
Olzinski, Stephen J.
O'Malley, Anthony V., Jr.
O'Malley, Denis J.
O'Mura, Lawrence H.
*O'Neil, Anthony M.
O'Neil, Stephen R.
*O'Neill, Daniel I.
O'Neill, Robert E.
Onorati, Roger P.
Oppenheimer, Philip J.
Ord, George D., Jr.
Ordway, Eugene C.
O'Rielly, Douglas B.
Orman, Charles L.
O'Rourke, William G.
Orr, Charles W., Jr.
Orr, Edwin W.
Ortega, Manuel, Jr.
Osborn, Dale W.
Osburn, William H.
Osgood, Jon L.
O'Shea, Joseph P.
Ostapovicz, Casimer F.
Osteen, Robert G., Jr.
Ostrander, Gary L.
Oswald, Wilfred H.
O'Toole, Walter J., Jr.
O'Toole, William A., III
Otten, Byron D.
Otten, Raymond E.
Ottinger, James F.
Oubre, Richard P.
Outlaw, Ronald A.
Overfield, Norbet W.
Oviatt, Gary A.
Owenby, James H.
*Owens, Edward L.
Owens, Vernon B., Jr.
Pack, Randall W.
Paddock, George R.
Padrick, Dean R.
Paff, Bart A.
Paflas, James E.
Page, Charles H.
Painter, Clarence M., Jr.
Paleologos, Nicholas C.
Palkovics, William J.
Palm, Peter E.
Palmatier, Robert D.
Palmer, Arthur H., III
Palmer, Dale M.
Palmer, James M., Jr.
Palmer, John G.
Palmer, Shirley R.
Palmerlee, Albert E.
Panayotoff, Theodore J.
Pannell, Clifton W.
Papandrea, Anthony R.
Pape, Brian V.
Pappas, Constantine J.
Parady, Ralph C.
Parham, Charles L.
Parker, Connie A.
Parker, David M.
Parker, James T.
Parkerson, George C.
*Parkhurst, James C.
Parnell, Charles E., Jr.
Parrish, Solomon A.
Parrish, Wiley B.
Parsley, William V.
Partington, James W.
Partlo, George R.
Partlow, Robert G.
Paschall, Richard P.
Paschall, Robert L.
Pass, Rosendo J.
Passarella, Anthony H.
Patacsil, Peter E.
Patterson, Donald F.
Patterson, Ronald G.
Patton, Kuemen B.
Patz, David J.
Paul, Ronald V.
Paulk, Cameron W.
Pauls, Francis E.
Paulsen, Carol
Paulson, Gaylord O.
Payne, George J.
Payne, Joseph C.
Payson, Harold, III
Peacock, Virgil N.
Peak, Claude F.
Pearl, Donald L.
Pearl, John M.
Pearson, John D.
Pearson, Raymond T.
Pearson, Warren F.
Peck, Bert L.
Pedisich, Paul E.
Peebles, Albert P.
Peironnet, Joseph W., Jr.
Pellegrino, Joseph F.
Pellerin, Martin U.
Pellett, David A.
Pelszynski, Stanley A.
Peltz, Harry, Jr.
Pemp, Joseph J., Jr.
Pence, John R.
Pence, Thomas H.
Pendleton, Edmund P., Jr.
Penn, Buddie J.
Penn, Elmer E.
Penrose, William D.
Peple, Edward C., Jr.
Perna, Gerald M.
Perreault, Joseph E.
*Perry, Eugene E.
Perry, Gilbert B., Jr.
Perry, "J" Stephen
Persell, Robert A., Jr.
Pestorius, Frederick M.
Peterman, David N.
Peters, Thomas E.
Petersen, Harold V.
Petersen, James D.
Petersen, Louis H.
Peterson, Alan E.
Peterson, Alan M.
Peterson, Carl J.
Peterson, Jon L.
Peterson, Paul D.
Peterson, Richard H.
Peterson, Ward G.
Pethia, David C.
Pethick, Donald R.
*Petitt, William E.
Petraitis, Walter F.
Petrucci, Richard J.
*Petruska, Robert T.
Pettyjohn, James R.
Pfau, Zeno J., Jr.
Pfeiffer, Edwin A.
Pfuhl, John W.
Phelan, Robert D.
Phillips, Henry C.
Phillips, Reed M.
Phinney, Hartley K., Jr.
Phipps, Claude R., Jr.
Piccolo, Joseph R., Jr.
Piche, James R.
Pickens, George C.
Pierce, Donald L.
Pierce, Marc V.
Pierce, Richard J.
Pietruszka, Walter A.
Pigeon, Norman B.
Pile, Ross E.
Pilmer, David F.
Pindell, Stuart M., Jr.
Pinnow, Douglas A.
Pirrmann, Robert A.
Pitcock, John A.
Plauche, Lurry J.
Plaugher, Charles E.
Playdon, George W., Jr.
Plowman, Gary L.
Poddick, William, Jr.,
Pogue, Francis C.
Pollak, Thomas G.
Poole, Richard J.
*Pope, Rex A.
Pope, William H.
Porter, George C.
Porter, Kennard L.
Porter, Richard T.
Porter, Robert L.
Porter, Stanley
Post, Jerry L.
Posthumus, Robert K.
Postlewaite, John C.
Pottorff, Ellis D.
Poulin, Norman R.
Poulsen, Carl E.
Powell, Don G.
Powell, Millard E.
Powell, Morrison, Jr.
Powell, Samuel H.
*Powers, Charles W.
Poythress, James H.
Precise, Elmer B., Jr.
Press, Charles G.
Preston, David J.
Preston, Gerry L.
Preston, Leonard H.
Preston, William J.
Price, Jere G.
Price, Lawrence H.
Price, Richard A.
Primmer, Stanley L.
Prindiville, Gerald D.
Pritchett, Gary L.
Pritt, Myron R.
Proctor, Hugh C., II.
Prost, Lee A.
Provine, John A.
Pruden, George B., Jr.
Prudhomme, John D.
Pruyn, Murry J.
Pugh, Rex A.
Pugh, Rollace A.
Pullen, Ellis M.
Pullinger, William A.
Purcell, James B.
Purcell, Raymond "R"
Pursley, Charles R.
*Pyatte, Devere, Jr.
Quarles, James M.
Quarterman, John M., Jr.
Quast, Philip M.
Quest, Donald O.
Quint, Simon R.
Rackett, Peter J.
Rackley, Clyde A.
Rado, Edward F.
Raiford, John F., Jr.
Raines, Edwin L.
Rambo, Rex H.
Rambo, Vinton A.
Ramsay, Ian W.
Randall, Edward J.
Randazzo, Salvatore J.
Randolph, William L.
Rasbeary, James A.
Rash, John R.
Rasmussen, Philip A.
Rastallis, Henry A.
Ratcliff, Robert N.
Rathbun, Warren A.
Rather, Gordon S., Jr.
Rattan, James D.
Raup, William J.
Rauth, James A.
Rawlings, Richard C., Jr.
Reagan, Daniel A.
Reaves, Curtis F.
Rebstock, John S., Jr.
Rechterman, Merlin E.
Rector, John M.
Redfern, Lavern
Reed, Abner D.
Reed, Andrew K.
Reed, Larry A.
Reed, Robert F.
Reese, Richard L.
Reeves, Howard S.
Regnier, Donald L.
Reichard, William E.
Reilly, George V., Jr.
Reilly, Thomas J.
Reimann, Ronald H.
Reinders, Glenn R.
Reller, Edwin P., Jr.
Replogle, Hugh B.
Repsher, Boyd F.
Resch, Anthony G.
Reust, Earl D.
Rexroad, Maurice "C", Jr.
Reynolds, Alan C.
Reynolds, Chester L.
Reynolds, Richard L.
Reynolds, Robert J.
Rhatigan, Joseph T., Jr.
Rhodes, Edwin O.
Rhodes, William D.
Rich, David R.
Richards, Alva G.
Richards, Jerry D.
Richards, Jack B.
Richardson, Henri A. R.
Richardson, James C., Jr.
Richardson, Frederick M.
Richardson, Glenn L.
*Richno, Carl E.
Ricketts, David L.
Ridenour, Norman H.
*Riedel, Richard
Riesgo, Ray "E"
Riley, John F.
Rimback, Arthur T.
Rimmer, George L.
Ring, Clifford V.
Ringelberg, John M.
Ringsven, Ronald A.
Rinn, Gregory F.
Rippin, Charles
*Ritchie, James D.
Rittenhouse, Lawren B., Jr.
Ritter, Don W.
Ritter, George P.
Rittgers, Harley M.
Ritzi, Richard A.
Riva, Jerry D.
Rivett, Stanley E.
Roach, Paul B.
Roark, James T.
Robbins, Christopher B.
Robbins, Evan S., Jr.
Roberts, Charles P.
Roberts, Donald L.
Roberts, John S., Jr.
Roberts, John C.
Roberts, Lawrence W.
Roberts, Willard G.
Robinson, Arnold
Robinson, John J.
Robinson, James E.
Robison, Gary L.
Roby, Joe L.
Roche, Terence S.
Rochells, Andrew J.
Rochez, Jerry
Rock, Paul R., Jr.
Rodenbeck, Peter B.
Rodgers, James C., Jr.
Rodgers, John M.
Rodriguez, William J.
Rodriguez, Alfonso B.
Rogel, Robert F.
Rogers, George R. W.
Rogers, James R.
Rogers, James C., Jr.
Rogers, Lewis Y.
Rogers, Paul D.
Rogers, Theodore F., Jr.
Rohdenburg, Kurt A.
*Rohles, Gerald B.
Rohlfs, Robert C.
Rolland, William F.
Roman, Stanley R.
Romine, Melvin M.
Rooney, Thomas F.
Rosdahl, Robert E.
Rose, Kenneth A.
Rose, Michael A.
Rose, Waldo B.
Rose, Walter C.
Rosenberger, Jerome C.
Rosengren, Neil B.
Rosenstein, James A.
Rosenthal, Joseph E.
Ross, Ralph
Ross, Robert J.
Ross, William A., II
Rossman, Raymond A.
Rostetter, Lawrence J.
Roth, David J.
Roth, Michael C.
Rothaug, Paul G., Jr.
Rothermel, Daniel K.
Rothert, William C.
Roton, Cyrus W.
Rottier, Jay A.
Rouze, Glen E.
Rowan, Peyton, Jr.
Rowand, Dale F.
Rowe, Arthur E., Jr.
Rowe, Drayton K.
Rowland, Charles E., Jr.
Rowley, Charles D.
Rowley, Thomas J., Jr.
Royston, William D. C.
Rubink, Duane M.
Rudnik, James R.
Rudolph, Ralph M.
Rush, Daniel L.
Rushing, Duncan B.
Russell, Leon B., Jr.
Russonello, William J.
Ryan, Charles E.
Ryan, Jerome J.
Ryan, Michael P.
Ryan, Stephen G.
Ryan, Thomas D.
*Rybarczyk, Anthony M.
Ryder, Clarke E.
Rykert, Harvey W.
Sager, Edward R.
Saintsing, Everette T.
Salda, Ronald E.
Salisbury, Herbert D.
Salisbury, Sherman C.
Salisbury, William R.
Salko, Andrew, III
Salopek, Raymond
Salvesen, Arne R.
Salveson, Dennis F.
Sammons, Charles E.
Sampson, Ronald L.
Sandefer, Howard L.
Sandell, Ormond H.
Sanders, Leslie A.
*Sandlin, John P.
Sands, Robert J.
Sanford, Walter H., III
Sapirie, Stephen A.
Sarepera, Hillar
Sass, Robert C.
Satterlee, Thomas M.
Satterwhite, William R.
Saunders, Eddie H.
Saupe, George F.
Sawyer, Willits H., III
Scarlett, Bernard
Schafer, Kenneth R.
Scharfenberg, Stephen A.
Scheinholtz, Frederick M.
Schiller, William E.
Schilling, Peter E.
Schiman, David K.
Schin, Robert P.
Schippel, Edwin L.
Schlanger, Lester M.
Schlegelmilch, Charles R.
Schlicht, Edward J.
Schlieman, Walter C., Jr.
Schmidt, Harold C.
Schmidt, Henry, Jr.
Schmidt, Leonard G.
Schmidt, Robert E.
Schmidt, Robert H.
Schmidt, William C., III
Schmidtke, Paul J.
*Schmitt, James H.
Schmitt, John A.
Schmitt, Louis A., Jr.
Schneider, Joseph E.
Schneider, Clinton D.
Schneider, James M.
Schneider, Michael J.
Schofield, Roger F., Sr.
Schooley, Larry C.
Schoonover, James L.
Schott, Norman G.
Schottle, Howard T.
Schraub, John D.
Schroeder, Kurt C.
Schroeder, Alfred H., Jr.
Schrope, John R.
Schubert, Gerald
Schule, Merle D.
Schulman, Richard D.
Schultz, Richard A.
Schwab, Thomas J.
Schwartz, Joseph R.
Schwellenbach, Edmund R.
Schwirtz, Henry J.
Sclichter, Edward F.
Scobee, Charles R., Jr.
Scoggin, Arthur H.
Scott, Barry R.
*Scott, Gordon E.
Scott, Leslie W.
Scott, Richard K.
Scott, Wilfred E.
Seacat, Robert R.
Seaman, Harold L.
Seanor, James E.
Seaward, Jerry Y.
Seay, Donald L.
Seeber, Lauren
Seelbach, Christopher R.
Seeley, Jimmie W.
Segerblom, Ronald L.
Segler, Marvin L.
Seif, Wendell D.
Sekula, T.
Selak, Robert D.
Selle, Paul F.
Sellgren, Charles A.
Sellman, Harold L.
Seneff, Gerald N.
Senkiw, Frank
Senn, John E.
Seraly, Guarino J.
Seufert, Robert J.
Seyfarth, Robert E.
Seymour, John G.
Shackelford, Voytle V.
Shaffer, Leslie V., II
Shaffer, Roger A.
Shannon, Richard H.
Shapiro, Jerome P.
Sharp, Robert F., Jr.

Sharps, Alfred R.
Shaughnessy, Robert X.
Shaw, Richard, Jr.
Shaw, Robert H., Jr.
Shea, Richard H.
Shealy, Edgar C., Jr.
Sheehan, Matthew F., Jr.
Sheffield, Donald H.
Shelpe, Quintin M.
Sheldon, Henry M., Jr.
Shelesky, Raymond J.
Shelton, Jon A.
Shepherd, Raymond T.
Shepherd, Terry A.
Sheppard, John R.
Sheppard, Morris E.
Sherer, Robert W.
Sheridan, Patrick M., Jr.
Sheridan, Robert E.
Sherman, Bradford C.
Sherrill, Forrest W., Jr.
Shew, James E., Jr.
Shields, Thomas A.
Shiller, Alfred T.
Shipp, Eugene H.
Shoemaker, William B., Jr.
Shoop, Donald A.
Shoop, Robin D., Jr.
Shortal, Terence M.
Shower, Albert J., Jr.
Shreve, Richard S., IV
Shreve, Robert L.
Shrum, John L.
Shubert, Ray C.
Shultz, Robert C.
Shupe, Robert D.
*Sibold, Robert D.
Sieder, Richard W.
Siegel, Jay M.
Siegel, John T.
Siegfried, Douglas S.
Sienicki, Edward F.
Silliman, Clark D.
Silvey, Frank J.
Simcox, Donald G.
Simmons, Charles H.
Simmons, Douglas W.
Simmons, George R.
Simmons, Roger B.
Simmons, Robert D.
Simmons, Vernon P.
Simon, Robert L.
Simonsen, Alfred E.
Simpson, Robert S.
Simpson, Robert M.
Sims, Marvin W.
Sinclair, Richard
Sinclair, Robert G.
Sinclair, Robert E.
Singer, Max D.
Sinker, Frederick K., Jr.
Sirmans, Vernon R.
Sisney, Philip L.
Skidmore, Frederick A., III
Skinner, William L.
Skirpan, Richard N.
Sklarin, Michael L.
Skok, William H.
Slatnick, Burton J.
Slattery, Donald J.
Slaughter, Gary L.
Slayton, Lacy B.
Sloan, Dean E.
Sluss, Charles S.
Smiley, William E.
Smillie, Roy E.
Smith, Alan E.
Smith, Carl K.
Smith, Charles T.
Smith, Don P.
Smith, Douglas B.
Smith, Eugene T.
Smith, Fred B., Jr.
Smith, George P.
Smith, Gerald L.
Smith, Glen W.
Smith, Harry A. P.
Smith, Jack R.
Smith, James R.
Smith, Jerome F., Jr.
Smith, Jerrold M.
Smith, John A.
Smith, John B.
Smith, Larry E.
Smith, Lawrence B.
Smith, Lynn H.
Smith, Owen R.
Smith, Peter N.
Smith, Randell C.
Smith, Reid H.
Smith, Richard C.
Smith, Richard
Smith, Robert C.
Smith, Robert W.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Robert L. B.
Smith, Ronald A.
Smith, Thomas E.
Smith, Vernon G.
Smith, Wayne J.
Smith, Wayne R.
Smith, Wilburn L.
Smith, William R., Jr.
Smrcina, Kurt L.
Smyth, Joseph P.
Snay, Francis E.
Snedeker, James T.
Snell, Alfred W.
Snider, Dale R.
Sniezek, James H.
Snotherly, Everrette V., Jr.
Snyder, Charles A.
Snyder, Derek A.
Snyder, Harold S., Jr.
Snyder, John H.
Snyder, Paul A.
Snyder, Wallace H.
Soltys, Robert S.
Sorensen, John D.
Sotka, Edward E.
Sottile, Benjamin J.
Spangenberg, Donald T., Jr.
Sparrow, Glen W.
Spaugy, Donald A.
Spears, Richard E.
Speck, John F.
Speers, Ronald T., Jr.
Speights, Robert M., Jr.
Spencer, Jerry S.
Spencer, Robert R.
Spiliotis, Harry C.
Spooner, Harold E.
Springstead, Roger B.
Sprouse, Donald H.
Sprouse, Haywood G.
Srite, David A.
Stack, Efird M.
Stackhouse, Charles D.
Stafford, David M.
Staggs, Havard L.
Stallos, George F.
Stalter, James E.
Standish, Allen J.
Stanley, Maurice D., Jr.
Stark, Edward C.
Stark, Marshall M.
Starnes, James H., Jr.
Starr, John B.
Stauffer, Donald W.
Stauts, Frank L.
Stave, John A.
Stavrides, Dean J.
Stearns, Richard C.
Steele, Bert L., Jr.
Steele, Boyden T.
Steerman, Charles E.
Stegman, Thomas
Stehman, Carl K., Jr.
Steiner, Morris W.
Steiner, Reece W.
Steinhauer, George P.
Steinkrauss, Joseph C.
Steinmann, John F.
Steinmehl, Lyle J.
Stengel, Richard D.
Stephan, Charles F.
Stephens, Albert H.
Stephenson, Michael D.
Stephenson, Max O.
Stephenson, Robert F.
Stepp, William E.
Stevens, Arthur F.
Stevens, David G., Jr.
Stevens, Jackie L.
Stevens, Jack O.
Stevens, Robert E.
Steward, Wayne E.
Stewart, Allen W.
Stewart, Charles L.
Stewart, Douglas R.
Stewart, Jesse J., Jr.
Stickney, Paul T.
Stimeling, Kenneth H., Jr.
Stimis, John G.
Stimmel, Carl J.
St. John, Audley G., Jr.
St. Laurent, Charles M.
Stokes, Clifford J.
Stone, Philip L.
Stoos, Gary E.
Storer, Arthur E.
Storey, Albert C.
Storm, Richard A.
Story, Douglas E.
Story, Edward R.
Stott, Gerald R.
Stover, Gene M.
Straight, William D.
*Strasser, Edward J., Jr.
Strickland, Richard J.
Strickland, Dale R.
Strimattis, Jonas V.
Strobach, Walter F.
*Stromberg, David P.
*Stroup, Harold D.
Strunk, Bernard.
Stryker, David H.
Stryker, Phillips C., Jr.
Stuart, George L.
Stuart, James E. B.
Stuart, Peter F.
*Stuart, Thomas E.
Stubbeman, David G.
Stubbs, Darryl A.
Styers, James D.
Suckow, Wayne W.
Sucsy, Leonard G.
Suffich, William J., Jr.
Sullivan, Albert W.
Sullivan, Dennis A.
Sullivan, Daniel J.
Sullivan, Robert F.
Sullivan, Raymond F., Jr.
Sumner, Warren K.
Sunderland, Richard K.
Sutelan, David K.
Sutherland, James B.
Svendsgaard, David J.
Swan, Donald H.
Swanson, Warren A.
Swanson, William E.
Sweeney, George H.
Sweet, James N.
Swift, James K.
Swift, Thomas L.
Swisher, Arra J., Jr.
Sydow, Kenneth R.
Sylvester, Richard D., Jr.
Syring, George R.
Taft, Richard P., Jr.
Tague, James R., Jr.
Talley, Donald L.
Tant, David M.
Tarman, Donald W.
Tate, Robert H.
Tatum, Luther I., Jr.
Taylor, Delbert J.
Taylor, Donald R.
Taylor, Edd D.
Taylor, Frank H.
Taylor, Herbert W., Jr.
Taylor, Joshua E.
Taylor, William K.
Teal, Robert G.
Teatzner, Arthur M.
Tebbetts, Allan E.
Teerling, John W.
Teeter, Ivan O.
Tegeder, Robert M.
Tellas, Robert F.
Temple, John S., Jr.
Temple, Van C., Jr.
Temte, Ragnar A.
Tenaglia, John L.
Terhune, Jack A.
Ternus, Robert A.
Terry, William E.
Tessier, George E., Jr.
Thacker, Jacob D.
Tharp, John A.
Theroux, George D.
Therrien, Edward L.
Thiel, Alphonse A., Jr.
Thiele, Gary F.
Thiele, William L., Jr.
Thienes, Harold A.
Thigpin, James C.
Thoelke, Richard E.
Thomas, Charles E.
Thomas, Charles J.
Thomas, Clyde K.
Thomas, David D.
Thomas, Donald K.
Thomas, Evan N.
Thomas, Haydn R.
Thomas, Philip M.
Thomas, Richard E.
Thomas, Russell J.
Thomas, Russell A.
Thomas, Thomas
Thomas, William C.
Thompson, David A.
Thompson, Eugene C.
Thompson, Gayle R.
Thompson, Gerald D.
Thompson, Giles M.
Thompson, Linwood H. Jr.
Thompson, Perry T., Jr.
Thompson, Robert L.
Thompson, William G.
Thomson, Alexander
Thomson, John A.
Thorell, Charles S.
Thorne, David E.
Thornley, Robert., Jr.
Thorsen, Harold J., III
Thorstad, Harvey L.
Thulin, James K.
Thweatt, Frank M., Jr.
Tibbetts, Phillip H.
Tierney, Thomas G.
Tillotson, Perry S.
Timm, David R.
Timmons, Joel W.
Tindal, Ralph L., II
Tingle, Walter W.
Tisler, Joseph W.
Tobin, Byron E., Jr.
Todd, Thomas D.
Todd, William D., Jr.
Toland, James C.
Tomlinson, Robert W.
Toner, David J.
Tonkin, Charles T., III
Toomey, Robert B.
*Torkelson, Thomas G
Torres, James D.
Tow, Jackie L.
Tower, Marvin D., Jr.
Townsend, Brooks G.
Townsend, John F.
Tozier, David K.
Traa, James R.
Tracy, Fred E.
Tracy, Philip E.
Trast, Philip A.
Travers, James M.
Treanor, Thomas S., Jr.
Tredick, William H.
Tretter, Thomas R.
Triggs, Frederick, III
Trinka, Anton J.
Triplett, Franklin I., Jr.
Triplett, Thomas T.
Trussell, Richard G.
Tucker, Thomas O.
Tulloch, Hugh B.
Tulodieski, John F., Jr.
Turner, Robert A.
Turner, Steven L., Jr.
Tweden, Wallace D.
Twohy, James F., III
Tyler, Max D.
Tyrrel, Norman L.
Tyus, Howard K.
Uehling, Gordon A., Jr.
Uffmann, George W.
Ulmer, Charles R.
Ulmer, James E.
Umberger, Paul J.
Underhill, Ross H.
Ungemach, Seibert A.
Unger, Raymond H., Jr
Unger, Verner B.
Upthegrove, John L.
Vachta, Warren H.
Vaira, Peter F., Jr.
Valentino, Carl R.
Valerio, John J.
Valiant, Vernon F.
Valimaki, Ronald E.
Van Artsdalen, John P.
*Vance, Benjamin L.
Vanderbilt, Gerald R.
Vanderwolf, Peter J.
Van Fleet, James L.
Vangeli, Francis J.
Van Metre, Robert B.
Vanort, Michael A.
Van Pelt, Sterley B., II
Van Sickle, Kenneth L.
Van Winkle, Daniel
Van Woert, John D.
Van Wormer, Kenneth W.
Van Zante, Jack S.
Varga, George
Varner, John W., Jr.
Vasiliades, Demetri A.
Vaughan, Bobby F.
Veith, Robert G.
Venable, Sam Y., Jr.
Venti, Paul C.
Vernot, George A.
Vester, James A., Jr.
Via, Charles J., Jr.
Vick, Harold D.
Vickers, Robert I.
Vickery, Walter R.
Victor, Edward G.
Vinson, Walter D.
Vision, Michael W.
Visted, Frank A.
Voccola, Robert J.
Voegtline, William A.
Vogel, Robert K.
Volwieder, Neil J.
Von Garlem, Thomas A.
Von Radesky, Charles W., II
Voss, Kenneth L.
Wacker, Gordon W.
Wade, Barton S.
Waer, Richard D.
Wager, Ralph B.
Waggoner, Mark H.
Wagner, James A.
Wagner, James L.
Walding, Francis R.
Waldorf, Kenneth W.
Waldron, James L.
Walker, Brian N.
Walker, Cecil E.
Walker, Henry E., Jr.
Walker, James R.
Walker, James F.
Walker, Jerrel E.
Walker, John A.
Walker, Jon W.
Walker, Marion E.
Walker, Robert O.
Walker, Ronnie H.
Wallace, John L. Jr.
Wallace, Stanley J.
Wallen, James D.
Wallis, Walter J.
Walsh, David M.
Walsh, Gerald W.
Walsh, James M.
Walsh, Joseph F.
Walsh, Kirk T.
Walsh, Raymond M.
Walsh, Robert J.
Walsh, Roger W.
Walters, Edward C.
Ward, Daniel C.
Ward, John D.
Ward, Norman J. Jr.
Ward, Thomas B.
Ward, William T.
Warp, Arthur J.
*Warras, Kenneth J.
Warren, John A.
Warren, Lloyd W.
Warren, Vance F.
Warriner, Reuel E. Jr.
Warrington, Robert G.
Wasserman, Robert
Waters, Robert C.
Watterson, Rodney K.
Wayne, Stephen J.
Weaver, Edward H.
Weaver, Gene L.
Webb, Jack K.
Webb, John T.
Webb, Manley S.
Webb, Robert E.
Webb, Robert T.
Webb, Walter G.,
Webb, Walter V.
Webber, Richard H.
Webster, James P., Jr.
Webster, John A.
Weeks, Charles E.
Weems, Jimmy R.
*Wehner, James R.
*Weiermann, Donald H.
Weiner, Earl D.
Weingardt, Rolf E.
Weintraub, Ralph H.
Weinwurm, Bruce A.
Weiser, Stephen J.
Weitgenant, Harold R.
Welch, John M.
Welch, Joseph F.
Welch, Robert H.
Welch, Stanley C.
Welch, William C., Jr.
Weller, Edward E.
Wells, Elwood G.
Wells, Richard P.
*Weltner, Frank V.
*Wemette, Richard O.
Wenborg, Douglas V.
Wentworth, David C.
Wentworth, Robert E.
Werst, Paul L.
West, Bernard H.
West, David P.
West, Frederick J.

*West, Gary G.
West, William A.
Westall, Michael K.
Westfall, Harvey J.
Westfall, Robert E.
Westlake, David G.
Wetherell, Charles E., Jr.
Whalen, Kevin
Whall, Raymond A., Jr.
Wharton, John W.
Wheaton, James H., Jr.
Wheeler, David S
Wheeler, Dennis F.
Wheeler, Donald O.
Wheelock, George H.
Whitaker, William D.
Whitcomb, Winfield J.
White, Arthur I., Jr.
White, Donald R.
White, Richard P.
White, Stephen D.
White, Walter E.
Whitham, David W.
Whiting, Clinton T.
Whitney, John W.
Whitney, Richard M., Jr.
Whitsett, John B.
*Whitton, Jon W.
Wicklund, Robert M.
Wiechec, Stanley J.
*Wier, Ward W.
Wiggins, Gilbert
Wilburn, Tom D.
Wilcox, Everett E.
Wilcox, Mack R.
Wileen, Gordon C.
Wilkes, Gilbert V., III
Wilkey, Larry J.
Wilkinson, Robert B., Jr.
Wilkinson, Chester H.
Willard, Gerald W.
Willetts, Leo J., Jr.
Williams, Charles B.
*Williams, David A.
Williams, Dudley D., III
Williams, David M.
Williams, Jack R.
Williams, John A.
Williams, James L.
Williams, Johnny M.
Williams, Kenneth H.
Williams, Norman M., Jr.
Williams, Rex.
Williams, Thomas B.
Williams, William D.
Williamson, Robert V.
Williamson, Thomas D., Jr.
Willimon, Henry P., Jr.
Willis, Irving E.
Willman, Carl E.
Wilmot, Frederick E.
Wilson, Charles R.
Wilson, David C.
Wilson, James K., Jr.
Wilson, Laurence W.
Wilson, Raymond J.
Wilson, Robert J.
Wilson, Robert B.
Wilson, Robert L.
Wilson, Robert C.
Wilson, Theodore J.
Wilson, William B.
Wiltamuth, Richard E.
Wimberley, Barry S.
Winant, Thomas C.
Windy, Ronald E.
Winetzki, Joseph A.
Winfree, Howard T.
Winkelseth, George J., Jr.
Winslow, Donald E.
Winstead, Shelby D.
Witte, Ernest R.
Witteveld, Christiaan D.
Wittmann, Bertrand R.
Woehl, Robert D.
Wolf, Gerald P.
Wolfe, Clarence H., Jr.
Wolfe, Ned C.
Wolfe, Russell
Wolfgang, Paul W., Jr.
Wolters, Dennis E.
Womack, Thomas F.
Wood, Bruce N.
Wood, Donovan M.
Wood, Gerald W.
Wood, James E., III
Wood, John R.
Wood, Jon S.
*Wood, Richard E.
Wood, Richard A.
Wood, Stacy B. C., Jr.
Woodburn, Ellis C.
Woodford, Duval S.
Woods, Carl R.
Woods, Charles R.
Woods, Robert J.
Woodward, Neil H.
Woodward, William J., Jr.
Woody, Joseph M.
Wooton, Ralph C.
Worrells, Albert M.
Worrilow, Robert B.
Worthington, George R.
Woychowski, Vincent C.
Wozniak, Joseph J.
Wraith, William A.
Wright, Alan F.
Wright, Benjamin W.
Wright, David W.
Wright, David J.
Wright, Edwin A.
Wright, Eugene
Wright, Jerry L.
Wright, Lawrence T.
Wrightnour, George B.
Wurzel, Leon
Wylie, Walter J.
Wyman, Richard E.
*Wyrick, David H.
Yaeger, Charles J., Jr.
Yarborough, Jerry O.
Yon, Charles L.
*York, Thomas A., Jr.
Yost, George W.
Yost, James A.
Youmans, George E.
Youmans, Richard W.
Young, Bruce C.
Young, Harry M.
Young, James L.
Young, Robert W., Jr.
Young, Stephen G.
Young, William M.
Youngblood, William W.
Youngwerth, Melvin C.
Yurt, George S.
Zack, Henry C.
Zalkan, Robert L.
Zally, George D.
Zaring, Kenneth N.
Zaruba, Robert J.
Zayauskas, Leo V.
Ziegler, Lewis E.
Zettler, Thomas R.
Zielinski, Raymond J., Jr.
Zilliox, Douglas J.
Zinn, Clyde D.
Zmyewski, Edward R.
*Zolman, Richard W.
Zuercher, Joyce D.

SUPPLY CORPS

Akers, John R.
Anderson, David K.
Anderson, Thomas
Andruss, Richard N.
Anttila, Robert M.
Aten, Raymond L.
Atkinson, Joseph M.
Bain, William D.
Barkholz, Henry A.
Barnes, Francis S.
Basham, Carmen L.
Bauer, James F.
Bean, John R.
Benner, Willard J.
Benson, Fred B., III.
Berger, Paul
Bianco, Thomas A., Jr.
Bird, Jon A.
Bishop, Harry S.
Blankenfeld, Emmitt E.
Blue, William A.
Boardman, Albert E.
Bober, John T.
Bodge, George R.
Bolin, James H.
Booth, Henry A., Jr.
Borer, William J.
Borglund, John W.
Boyer, Robert E.
Bratschi, Gilbert W.
Bryan, Edward L.
Buckalew, William O., Jr.
Burkley, Richard J.
Burks, Leroy
Butler, Wesley E.
Campbell, John A., Jr.
Carolan, Thomas R.
Carter, Albert L.
Caudle, Allen D., Jr.
Cavanaugh, Michael R.
Ceder, Loren R.
Chappell, Ralph L.
Chappell, Richard G.
Clark, Robert H.
Clemons, James T.
Coats, Gerald D.
Coffey, William A.
Coffman, John H.
Contreras, Paulino
Conway, James D.
Cook, Herman T.
Cooner, James J.
Corday, Earl F.
Cornelison, Charles H.
Cox, James H.
Cox, James T.
Crane, Wilborn G.
Craun, Alfred D.
Crawford, Patrick J.
Creek, James C.
Crepeau, George A., Jr.
Cullerton, Gerard M.
Cunningham, James T.
Cushway, Dave M.
Daeschner, William E.
Danna, Peter J., Jr.
Davis, John J.
Day, William M.
Dell, Jack V.
Demeester, Robert C.
Dickerson, Mars R.
Diener, Thomas E.
Divis, James A.
Draper, Walter S., IV
Drees, John M.
Driggers, Raymond L.
Duncan, Francis E.
Dunlap, Clarence C.
Edwards, David N.
Eldridge, Robert M.
Endt, Henry J., Jr.
Evans, Charles E.
Falconer, Douglas W.
Faust, John N., III
Fava, Ernest E.
Fenick, Robert W.
Fisher, Orville L., Jr.
Fitch, James B.
Flores, Ernest
Foltz, Ronald L.
Folsom, William B.
Ford, John E.
Frates, Norman O.
Fussell, Elbert R.
Fussell, John D., Jr.
Gabel, Robert J.
Gaines, James E.
Garrett, Kenneth E.
Gibbes, Elton L.
Gibson, Bobby L.
Gibson, Nelson M., Jr.
Gibson, Robert E.
Gile, Charles E.
Gilliland, Paul E.
Glass, William W.
Goldenson, Joseph T.
Gomez, Fabian J.
Graff, William J.
Gramins, Thomas R.
Griesmer, John V.
Grosskurth, Alfred C.
Growney, Kevin J.
Guerriero, Domenic P.
Haas, Willard M.
Haase, Larry L.
Hale, John A.
Hamby, John H., Jr.
Hamlett, Clyde J.
Hammond, William A.
Harsen, Sylvester K.
Hart, Donald L.
Haubert, Earl W., Jr.
Haynes, William M., Jr.
Heinemann, Ronald L.
Hellauer, James C.
Hensley, Norman W.
Herbert, Billy W.
Hillen, Lester B.
Hixson, James T.
Hollis, Dale E.
Honeycutt, William H.
Hoppe, Robert C.
Horhutz, Randolph J.
Howell, James P.
Jackson, Evander L.
Johnson, Jerry R.
Jones, Willard E.
Kaddis, Joseph A.
Kanzler, Donald L.
Kaylor, Keith D.
Keating, Kevin R.
Kendall, Leo P.
Kibler, Thomas C.
King, Wayne F.
Kreimer, Robert M.
Kueck, Clarence F.
Kuhns, Howard E.
Lake, Oriel
Lamade, John S.
Lamparter, Theodore A.
Lampman, Charles M., III
Lara, Harry L.
Larsen, James A.
Leamons, John B.
Lempka, Gerald A.
Leon, Albert
Levin, Michael R.
Liebler, Sarason D.
Lines, Donald P.
Lingenbrink, Robert A.
Littlefield, Belton J.
Looney, Richard G.
Loughran, Thomas G., Jr.
Love, Robert R.
Lovingood, Wendell W.
Luey, John D.
Luke, Charles P.
Lunn, James W.
Lynch, David R.
Lynch, Thomas J.
McCaughey, Robert A.
McCollough, Wesley L.
McCutchan, Robert D., Jr.
McDonald, Grant C.
McLaughlin, Robert J.
McQuade, John P., III
MacDonald, Alan R.
MacGregor, Bruce
Manley, Richard T.
Manning, Huey A.
Marks, David L.
Matalavage, Joseph A.
Matheny, Arthur L.
Mattox, Lewis E.
Maxon, Bruce E.
Mayfield, Lee M.
Mendez, Ramon E.
Meyer, Joseph, Jr.
Mielke, Kenneth W. R.
Miller, James E.
Miller, Robert E.
Mitchell, Clifton D.
Moore, Charles T.
Moore, Robert M.
Moran, Thomas A.
Morris, William R.
Morse, Gary A.
Mullin, Alexander G.
Mutchler, Jack R.
Nadal, Jaime B.
Nelson, Dennis C.
Nolan, John W.
Oberacker, Martin F.
O'Donnell, Jeremiah T.
O'Hare, Shamus J.
O'Strom, Byron R.
Otis, Richard E.
Palmgren, Rudolph T.
Pankey, Beverly S.
Paquette, Bernard A.
Payne, Billy I.
Perdue, Robert C., Jr.
Perkins, Robert D.
Phillips, Garth V.
Pitner, Wayne A.
Prescott, Gordon W.
Putney, Frederick B.
Quirk, Thomas M.
Ray, Neil A.
Rech, Charles L.
Reed, William H.
Revere, Russell B., Jr.
Rhoades, Bartlett R.
Rhodes, William D., Jr.
Rogers, Allan B.
Runey, Leroy J., Jr.
Rutter, Raymond L.
Sadler, David H.
Sardella, Leo J.
Sauvage, Harley P.
Savage, Horace J.
Schmitt, Edmund V.
Schroyer, Charles D.
Schryer, George A.
Scranton, Buel
Shahan, Robert R.
Shedd, John C.
Sheehan, Gene F.
Sherman, Huson B.
Simpson, Raese V.
Singleton, Harold L.
Singleton, Joseph E.
Smith, Charles E.
Smith, Francis G.
Smith, Leo L., Jr.
Smith, Wallace D.
Snyder, James R.
Stalker, Donald J.
Stegemann, John D.
Stewart, James R., Jr.
Stipe, Robert B.
Straw, Edward M.
Sullivan, Edward F.
Sullivan, Jeremiah M.
Sullivan, Joseph M.
Swan, Aubrey E.
Swirka, Edward D.
Tait, Clifford W., Jr.
Tapia, Phillip N.
Taylor, Lynn C.
Thomas, Watson W.
Totten, Randolph B., II
Traaen, Lloyd H.
Trubl, Charles V., III
Turner, David B.
Varner, Robert N.
Walker, Charles K.
Waller, James R.
Waller, Terry G.
Welborn, James H.
Wenz, Robert L.
Wheless, Willie R.
Wight, William H., Jr.
Wilcox, Harold E., Jr.
Wilkinson, Billy B.
Williams, Ronald B., Jr.
Wilson, Jack
Wingard, Bobby N.
Wolf, Carl G.
Wolstencroft, Fred, Jr.
Woodall, Marvin J.
Woody, Robert W.
Young, Everett B.
Young, Kirk M., Jr.
Yurkovic, Leonard S.
Zellmer, Darrel F.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bohula, Edwin V.
Brannan, Curtis W.
Collins, John M., III
Cory, Delbert J.
Cram, Norman L., Jr.
Crist, Richard A.
Dillon, Thomas J.
Kane, Brian E.
Lebeau, William H.
Pegnam, John W.
Supple, Colin E.
Walker, Benjamin R.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Armentrout, Harlan W.
Banta, Brent
Barnett, Arnold W.
Bates, Ronald G.
Bell, Bruce E.
Bell, Robert B., Jr.
Bilden, Richard P.
Block, Neil
Bookhardt, Edward L., Jr.
Bradfield, Phillip P.
Brennan, John P.
Bridges, Donald N.
Broecker, John G.
Brown, Gerald L.
Bryer, Robert L.
Calkin, David A.
Callahan, James F.
Callender, Gordon W., Jr.
Chiogioji, Melvin H.
Clarren, George
Colvin, Glenn E.
Coston, Vernie R.
Cramer, Max L.
Crumbley, Don C.
Cunningham, Robert B., Jr.
Davis, John M.

Daybell, Richard D.
Dickson, John A., III
Dixon, Philip G.
Doctor, Richard P.
Easton, Robert A.
Enderle, William R.
Faulk, John R.
Fermo, Louis, A., Jr.
Fitzgerald, Dennis J., Jr.
Ford, Ransom, Jr.
French, Richard G.
Garbe, Warren M.
Gilmore, Daniel R., Jr.
Greene, Robert W., III
Gross, John A.
Hall, William R.
Hartman, John P., II
Hettick, James R.
Higgins, Harold L.
Hofmann, Jack J.
Jahn, David E.
Jensen, Allen H.
Johnson, Thomas D.
Kasner, Jon B.
Kaufman, Carl E.
Kay, William H., Jr.
Kayton, Kenneth B.
Kunz, Joseph D.
Laufersweiler, William J., III
Lenz, Eugene C.
Ligon, Samuel B.
Lockhart, Allen C.
Lukey, John G.
Luzum, Gerald D.
Matthews, George R.
McKibben, Don R.
McManus, Brian, E.
Mergner, James T.
Moore, Richard S.
Moser, Barry A.
Murtaugh, Thomas D.
Nelson, John J.
Odom, Melton L.
Olsen, Allen N.
Opager, Ludwig H., Jr.
Parrish, James L., III
Partlow, George W.
Pensyl, "J" Dick
Power, Maurice S.
Redderson, Roy H.
Riffey, Alan K.
Roberts, Ray D.
Robinson, George S., Jr.
Roy, Richard E.
Rugless, James M.
Russell, William H.
Saffell, Charles R.
Sandrini, Louis M.
Schroeder, Robert F.
Seyb, Jerry C.
Shoemaker, Gig M.
Simons, Myron D.
Smith, John N.
Spear, John A.
Spratt, Robert R.
Stevens, Leo I., III
Stevens, Robert E.
Stewart, James E.
Theisen, Hilary M.
Thiel, Richard R.
Thurmond, Novis T.
Tisdale, James L.
VanVleck, Richard W.
Victor, Gary M.
Wadsworth, Robert W.
Wallace, Richard J.
Watkins, Jack W.
Watson, James P.
Webb, Douglas M.
Williams, Richard L.
Wilson, Joseph M.
Woll, Jerry D.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Behling, Daniel W.
Benedict, William H.
Bergner, John F., Jr.
Biesiadny, Lawrence L.
Bolton, Ronald R.
Bromann, William H., Jr.
Cassel, Dallas E.
Cerruti, Alfred S.
Chan, Robert S.
Christian, Elgin R.
Conley, Walter R.
Cottet, Laverne E. B.
Coxe, Robert F.
Culver, Judith V.
Dailey, George L.
Dasler, Adolph R.
Dauwalter, Mary A.
Dewhirst, James J.
Diebner, William E.
Dilley, Paul O.
Drozd, Joseph J., Jr.
Duckett, Jack
Dupes, James L.
Ebert, Alvin G.
Emma, Carleton W.
Faulkner, James A.
Fink, Francis A.
Funderburk, Lester R., Jr.
Garcia, Reinaldo
Garriss, Raeford E.
Goble, Joe E.
Gregory, Bert C., Jr.
Grothaus, Roger H.
Hempey, Ralph C.
Henson, Frank N.
Holiman, Frederick L.
Horrobin, Robert W.
Hoss, William F., Jr.
Houk, Marvin R.
Jenkins, Elmer E.
Kennedy, Patrick J.
Knight, John R.
Kozik, John R.
Laclair, Bernard W.
Langston, Ollen C.
Lewis, Eddie W., Jr.
Lind, Marvin D.
MacConnell, Thomas W.
McKelvy, Patsy L.
Meek, Artie E.
Meister, Janet L.
Pardon, Henry R.
Pate, Clyde T., Jr.
Pearson, Herbert D.
Peterson, Robert V.
Pickering, James C. L.
Poquis, Robert M.
Prelosky, Richard N.
Price, Hudson B.
Quick, James D.
Robinson, George W.
Rovario, Emile E.
Saine, Floyd D.
Sawyer, Albert L.
Scanlin, Patrick J.
Schoenmann, Donald L.
Scott, Shirley B.
Shurtleff, Howard P.
Siplon, Donald L.
Smith, Jack W.
Smith, Virginia L.
Smith, William L.
Soule, George I.
Stewart, Shannon D.
Stout, Forrest D.
Stringham, Stanley C.
Taylor, Berlin J.
Taylor, Hollis B.
Turbiville, Leslie H.
Turner, Eugene R.
Turner, John R.
Ulmer, James M.
Walsh, John P.
Warren, Phyllis I.
Williams, "D" "C"
Zentmyer, Robert K.

NURSE CORPS

Andrews, Paula J.
Auld, Barbara E.
Bartik, Joan M.
Batchellor, Patricia A.
Becktell, Beatrice D.
Bianchi, Elaine D.
Bogdanski, Mary A.
Boyd, Lennie S.
Caldwell, Margaret P.
Capochiano, Paula E.
Carroll, Maria K.
Conger, Carol M.
Covington, Norma A.
Dopke, Kathleen R.
Dotti, Dorothy A.
Drummond, Eleanor M.
Dykes, Margaret V.
Elam, Hattie R.
Fanelli, Joanne C.
Farrell, Helen L.
Ferrer, Patricia M.
Fleury, Phyllis J.
Fraser, Rosemary A.
Gadoury, Anne
Gillett, Jane L.
Griffiths, Marcia C.
Griffitts, Mary E.
Hannon, Mary M.
Harwood, Margaret A.
Harris, Rosie L.
Hess, Catherine P.
Hill, Doris N.
Huddle, Judith K.
Irving, Ann M.
Johnson, Mary T.
Lapi, Lillie
Lee, Mary A.
Leonard, Dorothy G.
Lipscomb, Carolyn J.
Luce, Mary P.
Lund, Carol A.
Magnano, Barbara L.
Martinson, Kay E.
McPeek, Sandra K.
Miller, Carolyn A.
Monaghan, Ellen A. M.
Moore, Barbara R.
Naltner, Mary M.
Nesbit, Jeannette O.
Nixdorf, Mary J.
O'Toole, Karen K.
Pawlak, Marcellene A.
Perkins, Joan M.
Phalen, Carla M.
Pritchard, Virginia L.
Prybys, Phyllis M.
Ressegule, Sally A.
Reynolds, Ann D.
Rockwood, Phyllis A.
Rude, Gail C.
Schroder, Beverly A.
Schultz, Cynthia A.
Soderlund, Joan M.
Speaker, Grace J.
Sullivan, Elisabeth M.
Swartwood, Judy A.
Tajchman, Irene J.
Teagle, Beverly E.
Thorsgaard, Agnes L. M.
Turner, Catherine E.
Turner, Virginia A.
Vanover, Mary E.
Wallick, Nancy L.
Willis, Jacquelyn S.

*Lt. Comdr. Allen L. Powell, III, for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Alvarez, Everett, Jr.
Banks, Martin L., III
Benshop, Edwin C.
*Bouchard, Michael L.
*Cameron, David D., Jr.
Chrans, Larry J.
Cooper, Francis J.
*Crippen, Robert L.
*Heck, Jerome R.
*Hinman, Kendall G., Jr.
Johnson, James R.
*Klein, Donald C.
*Koehler, Thomas C.
*Lawrence, Gary L.
*Lykins, Lidle L.
*McIntire, Lloyd G.
*McNamara, John J.
*Mineau, Thomas P.
*Nielsen, Harold R.
*O'Malley, Joseph P.
Patterson, Charles E.
Rime, Randolph G.
Root, Robert M.
*Schuetz, Laurence N.
*Searfoss, John V.
*Silseth, David F.
*Smith, Raleigh M.
Taylor, Gene P.
*Thompson, David S.
*Trotter, John H.
Trumbauer, David S.
*Turner, Alfred R., Jr.
*Vallin, Richard T.
*Werhan, Kenneth R.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Fahrenthold, Harvey K.
*Plein, Leonard A.
Ridings, James Jr.
*Wheeler, Lawrence D.
*Willett, Miles F. P.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Belson, Harold B.
MacCall, Bruce L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Brouillette, Donald
Fishel, David W.

NURSE CORPS

Miller, Barbara E.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

*Caskey, Lucy B.
*Lewis, Muriel J.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Lewis, Wilma E.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

*Barrett, Elizabeth M.
*Boss, Jo E.
*Dunham, Dixie L.
*Gerhart, Mary A.
*Haas, Joan M.
*Kunce, Genevieve D.
*Lewis, Nancy A.
*Mackie, Joan C.
*Penasack, Mary A.
*Quigley, Robin L. C.
Sarbaugh, Rachel J.
*Shultz, Phyllis L.
*Watkins, Joann E.
*Witt, Geraldine A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Maugans, Nellie K.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Binaghi, Joanne T.
Botzum, Diane
Catlin, June M.
Cooper, Barbara A.
Delarot, Anna M.
Derrough, Lois A.
Emmett, Virginia A.
Gallagher, Kathleen O.
Hazard, Roberta L.
Heustis, Rita J.
Hoag, Jean W.
Hurlbut, Bonny A.
James, Mary C.
Jones, Patricia
Pane, Marietta A.
Ragan, Mary E.
Ragozzine, Carolyn M.
Read, Bonnie J.
Rees, Ruth E.
Rindlaub, Beverly M.
Rouse, Kay E.
Rundle, Lynne E.
Staehlin, Marlene J.
Supler, Nancy A.
Watlington, Sarah J.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Austin, Michael G.
Bailey, Barney L.
Barr, Robert K., Jr.
Blocher, John M.
Brucato, Philip E.
Cantwell, Jerry P.
Carden, James D.
Clow, Wallace G., Jr.
Curry, John M.
Derf, Tad A.
Donaldson, John R.
Dorfer, Jay P.
Duncan, Marshall Y.
Durfee, Gerald A.
Everly, John H.
Greer, Glynn R.
Hester, Brabham M.
Knostman, Paul B.
Lacey, John S., Jr.
Lingan, Henry B., III
Lockett, Joseph L., III
McNair, Morris L., Jr.
Meston, Stanley S.
Moir, Weston G.
Moreladn, Richard J.
Mulkerrin, Joseph M.
O'Connell, Michael J.
O'Malley, Anthony V.
Parlier, August E., Jr.
Quast, Philip M.
Robinson, James E.
Sanders, Leslie A.
Sloan, Dean E.
Stauts, Frank L.
Vanderwolf, Peter J.
VanGorp, Dirick P.
Yurt, George S.

SUPPLY CORPS

Amman, Delos A.
Hill, Clark E.
Hollis, Dale E.
Lamparter, Theodore A., Jr.
Pugh, Richard C.
Rech, Charles L.
Thompson, Robert H.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Ringel, Duane A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Stewart, Ronald H.

NURSE CORPS

Pack, Valaine

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Lloyd P. Amborn
*Michael J. Anderson
*Gary E. Angerhofer
*Stephen J. Asher
*Michael E. Beckes
*Neil M Bickel
*Louis J. Boos
*Donald E. Borders
*David A. Boughan
*Francis X. Boylan, Jr.
*Albert R. Brittain, Jr.
*John R. Clarey
*Halbert R. Cliff
*John T. Cox
*Michael A. Cummings
*Donald W. Decoursey

*Snowden C. Dubois
*George F. Erwin
*John B. Foster, III
*Michael L. Gibson
*John O. Graves, III
*Donald H. Haight
*Alan E. Hardtarfer
*Hollis W. Harmon
*James K. Hayward
Donald R. Hess
*Philip Heidinger
*Donald R. Hillier
*David L. Holick
*Peter S. Houseknecht
*Ralph W. Hoyer
*Charles T. Key
*John M. Kozma
*Michael A. Krebs
*Paul G. Kruetzfeld
*William J. Leebern
*Michael J. Leite
Thomas L. Loosbrock
*Marvin J. Maciejewski
*Lee S. Mairs
*William R. Mansell
*Frederick T. Massey
*Thomas N. Mastin
*James D. Meier
*William P. Meyer
*Thomas E. Moran
*James L. Morse
*Dwight E. Nunn, Jr.
*Gaylord C. Olson, Jr.
*James G. O'Neill, III
*Richard S. Parodi
*Robert C. Parrott, Jr.
Dennis H. Peters
*John C. Redcross
*Roland L. Rogers
*Ronald N. Ruberg
*William L. Shumate
*Robert S. Slika
*David O. Smith
*"J" Palmer Smith
*Henry L. Sneed, III
*William G. Stanley
*Robert B. Stephenson
*Steven C. Sterry
*Wilbur "T" Stevens, Jr.
*Alfred H. Suhr
*Harley H. Swink
*Marcus K. Taylor
*William D. Tyson
*Thomas C. Vajda
*Donald E. Walker
*James D. Warfield
*William M. Wasson
*Howard V. West
*Woodrow O. Wilson, Jr.
*William H. Winkler
*John E. Wohlfiel
*Francis D. Wright, III

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Everett E. Fine
*James E. Graber
*Edward L. Keiser
*Ralph J. Kiernan
*William C. Kitch
*Robert J. Larson
*James R. McNabnay
*Robert D. Wiese
*George K. Wilson
*Clinton E. Wise

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

George T. Ankrum
Richard Boncal
George W. Clifford, Jr.
Theodore P. Connor
Roy H. Cook III
John E. Cranford
Charles L. Deitrick
James E. Folk
Norman C. Fowler
Darrow "A" "J" Frantz
Gordon F. Gilbert, Jr.
Darrel K. Hadley
Jon R. Holder
Robert Landry
Robert P. Maynard
Ray M. Messinger
Sperry Morton
Eugene G. Neely III
Gerald F. Ramsey
*James S. Rugowski
*David C. Rummler
John M. Solan
Gerald J. Soltas
Robert W. Stuckey
Barry G. Swanson
Jean A. Szymanski
Alan L. Teubner
Cecil J. Waylan
Thomas J. Will

Theodore R. Whatley (Naval Reserve officer) to be a lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Allan J. Adeeb
*Wayne E. Frazier
*William M. McDermott, Jr.
*Joseph S. Myers
*Elihu York

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Robert L. Daywitt
*James M. Lord
*Charles M. Louden
*Richard R. Shultz
*Robert G. Winans

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Peter B. Blanchard
*Elmer M. Cranton
*William D. Graham
*David W. Khoury
*Morgan P. Lloyd
*Frank S. Mancuso
*Robert C. Nuss
*Henry J. T. Sears

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard S. Bach
Donald W. Turner

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*James R. Campbell
*William C. McCallum

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Robert A. Atkinson
*Paul L. Brecker
*Don G. Garver
*Ronald E. Hillenbrand
*Edmund R. Moyes

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Charles M. Johnson
*William H. Rucker, Jr.
*John E. Trainor
*John T. Werning

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Kenneth F. Batenhorst
*Michael E. Boles
*David R. Calder
*Alan L. Coykendall
*Kenneth V. Fortman
*Joseph C. Kehoe
*John C. Lufkin
*Jay L. Luhtala
*Bob J. McFarland
*Joel R. Montalbano
*Thomas L. Moscarillo
*George W. Oatis, Jr.
*Jimmy R. Sconyers
*Maurice M. Smith
*Robert J. Thropp, Jr.
*Lorenzo S. Vazzana
*Raymond F. Young, Jr.

The following-named enlisted personnel to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Nicholas J. Clem
*Gene "F" Renfro
*James T. Dalton
*Francis S. Connors
*Austin E. Piatt
*Graham B. Spillman, Jr.
*Richard L. Boyle
*Frank "D" "R" Fisher
*Levi N. Hilling
*Adam T. Antonopoulos
*Charles R. Dekrey
*Norman G. Oglesby
*Richard A. Corley
*Richard J. Cota
*Francis L. Windholz
*Gordon L. Aringdale
*Richard H. Pilkington
*George A. Zink
*George H. Gregory
*John H. Sammons
*Richard A. Robinson
*Donald E. Chomiak
*Frederick A. Slipsager
*Walter R. Felt
*John E. McNamara, III
*William F. Mullins
*Kenneth L. Lashley
*Jerry D. Galbreath
*Howard E. Holcomb
*LeRoy J. Pepera
*Howard L. Skinner
*Jimmie C. Cook
*Lloyd D. Smith
*Robert M. Dotson
*Charles M. Butts
*Jack T. Lewis
*Samuel H. Ayers, Jr.
*John Wortendyke
*Franklin W. Carter
*Wesley B. Combs

*Ensign Francis J. Martorano, U.S. Navy, to be a permanent ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named enlisted personnel selected as alternates to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard H. Reysen
Leonard J. Hmel
Richard J. Hurder
Thomas P. Medlock
Douglas W. Franklin
Jack L. Rausch
James L. Smith
George F. Baker
Edwin J. Hays
William G. King

*Charles E. Moran, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent captain in the Medical Corps of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Edward P. Andersen
John N. Anderson
Stanley L. Bartley
Donald D. Bell
Anthony P. Belmont
William F. Bingham
Harold W. Blevins
Bruce R. Blome
John E. C. Bocker
William J. Boehmler
Roger W. Brassel
David A. Brian
William H. Brigance
Jim R. Browning
Robert A. Bullock
Horace E. Buzhardt
Dudley K. Campbell
Ted A. Cook
Wilton W. A. Cox
William G. Crawford
Samuel L. D'Amato, Jr.
Timothy J. Davis
Donald A. Deinlein
Wilbur F. Eich III
Jerry E. Enis
Thomas H. Fisher
William C. Flanagan, Jr.
George E. Fleming
John R. Fletcher
James R. Fowler
Robert L. Gingell
Barry Goldman
Edward F. Good
Dennis B. Goodman
Richard G. Grassy, Jr.
James A. Grimes
John M. Grollmus
Frank R. Gudas
John M. Harrelson III
James J. Houser
John K. Howe, Jr.
Francis D. Keenan, Jr.
R. R. Kenner
John L. Kitzmiller
Kevin B. Lake
Alan M. Larimer
Lewis H. Lipsius
Louis N. Ludington
Bruce A. Mallin
Edward C. Mattison
William E. McNally
Karl V. Metz, Jr.
David E. Miller
Richard Y. Mitsunaga
John F. Murphy
Clifford T. O'Connel
Benjamin C. Olliff, Jr.
James H. Oury
James H. Patterson, Jr.
William D. Shea
Ronald L. Smits
Robert H. Spratt
Richard D. Stevenson
Robert M. Taxman
Stephen C. Telatnik
David E. Ulmer
George G. Wells
James E. Wilkerson
Tom V. Willis, Jr.

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent warrant officers W–4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles W. Shelly
Martin H. Smith
Augustine T. Test
Coyte A. Wike

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent warrant officers W–3, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles P. Carpenter
Morris E. Carruthers
William J. Daniels
Donald H. Dignon
Leo G. Rouse
Stephen J. Scharschan

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent warrant officers W–2, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Lee R. Burnett
Jesse C. Dowdey, Jr.
Charles R. Edwards
Roy B. Martinez
William N. McKnight
Bob Oates, Jr.
Adam W. Reis
William Salamon
Paul Sha[illegible]er
Robert J. Youngdahl

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent warrant officers W–3, and temporary warrant officers W–4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Wesely J. Allard
Manuel J. Darouze
Alfred L. Doyle
Michael Fazio
Melvin W. Fetterman
Raymond J. Greene
Fred Harrison, Jr.
Bernard M. Holley
William J. Huttig
Vincent J. Ingleright
Leverne L. Klaas
James C. Lipe
Paul G. McCart
Billy B. McDonald
Dewitt T. McGuire
Carman Maccioli
Edsel McNeil
Jack E. Mittner

Seth J. Perry
Joseph D. Ramsey
Edmund V. Richcreek
Leo B. Roberts
Russell E. Rosenkoetter
John J. Schmidt
Burton A. Steele
Jack H. Walker

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent warrant officers W–2, and temporary warrant officers W–3, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John C. Abbott, Jr.
Frank Alves
Mike M. Angulo
Harrison W. Avery
Herbert H. Bishop
William B. Boardman
Norman G. Bonenberger
Harold D. Christie
William C. Corman
James F. Cranford
Raymond M. Dorcy
Walter E. Eggers
Albert W. Foster, Jr.
J. P. Garner
John E. Haffey
Joseph F. Heeney
James D. Hollis
Benjiman F. Inscoe
Byron W. Johnson
Donald R. Johnson
Marshall J, Lafleur
James M. McCraken
Philip C. Mazzara
Ray A. McNaught
Peter C. Morrissey, Jr.
Robert J. Nooman
William T. Northrop
William J. Page
Hans P. Petersen
Joseph M. Podbielski
Frederick J. Roehs
Robert C. Schrei
Philip R. Stagg
Joseph F. Stenstrom
Dale R. Stromstedt
James I. Wagoner, Jr.
Calvin K. Welch
Aaron H. R. Widermuth
Cheslaw Witoski

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles K. Ables
John F. Adinolfi
John M. Aiken
Gerard Anderson
Michael B. Anderson
William R. Andrews, Jr.
John P. Aymond, Jr.
Leslie W. Bailey, Jr.
Ross E. Bailey
James V. Barrios
Anthony J. Battista
Jon R. Bergquist
Leonard G. Bethards
Richard J. Blanchfield
William A. Blatter
Joseph H. Blichfeldt, III
Robert U. Bokelman
Paul D. Borchardt
Leslie W. Boyer, Jr.
William W. Bradish
Bruce K. Brahe
Jonathan C. Brooks
Paul C. Browne
Robert J. Brugger
Rodney E. Burdette
John J. Burke
John G. Burns
John W. Bush
Bert V. Calhoun
William B. Campbell
James R. Carpenter
John L. Carroll
Thomas A. Carter
Paul E. Caswell
John T. Chapman
Rodney R. Chastant, III
Edward E. Chipman
Jack L. Clark
Charles P. Cochran
Forrest L. Cole
Dennis A. Conroy
Kenneth E. Cook
Arnold B. Corbett
Arthur O. Cravets
Stephen M. Creal
James K. Croney
Michael Danchak
Terry S. Davenport
Henry D. Davis
Teddy M. Davis
Stephen M. Day
Leo. R. De Angelis
Richard J. Deichl
Thomas M. Donovan, Jr.
Thomas C. Downs
Stanley L. Dowson
Russell D. Eaton
Karl J. Ege
William F. Elder
Joseph E. Fluet, Jr.
John D. Forter
Laurence V. Friese
Richard E. Frye
Kenneth R. Furr
Jerald B. Gartman
Robert L. Gartner
John R. Geisel
David H. Gill
John P. Gillis, Jr.
Frank J. Gollatz
Thomas H. Griffith, Jr.
Chester D. Grigg
Ronald I. Harkless
Richard L. Harshman
Gary K. Hayes
Edward P. Heidenreiter
Harvey A. Heikel
Michael C. Henry
James E. Henshaw
Richard E. Holbein, Jr.
Albert A. Hubbard
Derald D. Hurlbert
Thomas H. Idema
Carlos J. Indest, III
Thomas R. Irvine
John M. Jeffries
Lawrence R. Johnson
Charlie R. Jones, Jr.
Joseph W. Jones, III
Phillip D. Jones
Pat D. Kaufmann
Ray R. Keiser, Jr.
John W. Keker
William E. Kelly
Laurence J. Kennedy
David E. Knop
James H. Knox
Joseph J. Kollar
Alan E. Krusinger
Scott R. Laidig
Alexander E. Lancaster Jr.
Raymond R. Lau
Peter E. Laux
Stephen P. Lawrence
Harry E. Lee, III
George S. Libey
Jimmy L. Lindsey
Gary F. Loveridge
John R. Lucas
Gary K. Lulfs
Christopher T. Mabley
Joseph F. Mahoney, Jr.
Edward C. Malmstrom
John C. Maloney, II
Edward P. Marecki, Jr.
Carl S. Matthews
Robert E. Mattingly
Thomas N. May
Robert W. Maynard
Thomas J. Meehan
Thomas H. Meeker
Fred J. Meier, Jr.
David T. Meinertz
Robert B. Meissner
Thomas H. Meurer
John P. Moe
Richard A. Mueller
James P. Murphy
John O. McAlear
James W. McDaniel
Gary W. McDowell
James R. McEvoy
James G. McGarry
David H. McMann
Frederick C. McQuigg
David K. Nehrling
John J. Nelson, Jr.
Geoffrey W. Norman
*John P. Pagan
Paul E. Pappas
William A. Parker
Darrel L. Pfeifer
Charles L. Pritchard
Thomas L. Reaves
Joseph M. Reber
David A. Richwine
Michael A. Robertson
James J. Sanchack
William J. Sandberg
Peter A. Schwartz
John E. Sharkey
Gordon W. Smith, Jr.
Steve R. Stegich III
Michael E. Stewart
David M. Stout
James M. Stoy
Howard L. Swain
Donald E. Swantkowski
Edward A. Taber III
Donald G. Taylor
Terry L. Thomson
Fredric M. Timm
Herschel M. Timmons, Jr.
Stanley J. Trachta
William A. Trader
William J. Upper
Herbert S. Upton
Victor R. Urbanski
Dennis R. Vandervoort
Gary R. Van Gysel
Laurence A. Walker
Matthew F. Walsh, Jr.
William H. Walton, Jr.
George F. Ward
Jimmie A. Warfield
Charles L. Weaver
Daniel L. Welker
Roger V. Wellbrook
Gary L. Williams
Neilson Wood, Jr.
John A. Woodhead III
Thomas R. Yanger
Earl W. Young II
Paul J. Zohlen

The following named (meritorious noncommissioned officer) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Spencer G. Bihler
John H. Blake
James C. Brown
James Chickneas
Leslie R. Conklin
Charles D. Cooksey
Earl G. Delrue
Gerald L. Dereberry
Edward C. Desaussure
Edwin Eggen
Frederick L. Gause
Jerry R. German
William H. Gornto
*Lyal V. Gustafson
Donald J. Hager
Jack E. Hawley
"T" Davison Hoffner
Richard A. Keyes
James L. Laney
Ronald R. Meints
William A. Milam
Thompson D. Neff
Robert G. Thomson
John W. Neubauer
Gene P. O'Neill
Richard M. Petroski
Jerry L. Robertson
John F. Rowe
Victor M. Rusterholtz
Jesse H. Terpstra, Jr.
Kent R. Tracy

The following named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Michael C. Abajian
Franklin C. Bacon, Jr.
Dean H. Bates
Michael C. Bell
Edward L. Bloxom
David N. Buckner
Raymond M. Burns
Wallace L. Campbell
William S. Campbell
James P. Cawley
Stephen E. Chupik
John A. Cooper
Thomas L. Czechowski
Curtis M. Davis
James R. Denton
John F. Depenbrock, Jr.
Daniel A. Doberstein
Dennis M. Dunagan
Donald H. Dutton
Barry A. Eklund
Lawrence G. Elder
Gary A. Fry
Peter M. Gans
John S. Gleason III
David S. Hackett
John C. Harwood
Thomas F. Higgins, Jr.
Robin T. Holcomb
Marvin T. Hopgood, Jr.
John T. Horvatich
Terry L. Howard
Thomas W. Hummel
Hobart G. Johnson
Russell A. Johnson
Thomas A. Kahl
Dixon W. Kelly III
Rodney C. Kicklighter
Robert W. Knight
Robert B. Liesegang
James L. M. Littler III
George M. Lohnes, Jr.
David L. McInturff
David P. Martin
Dirk T. Metzger
James J. Meyers, Jr.
Ronald C. Oates
Jerry M. Palmer
Allen D. Parker
Peter Pike, Jr.
Jack C. Provine
Frederick M. Rivers, Jr.
Robert S. Rix, Jr.
Charles H. Royer
Edward C. Schriber
Phillip C. Scoggin
Robert C. Shearer
Michael W. Smith
Del R. Vandiver
Richard H. Warnock
Clyde E. Woods

* Indicates interim appointment

The following named for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Raymond H. Ambrose
Nickolas J. Angelo
Clifford H. Armstrong
Glen A. Ballenger
Charles J. Brennan
Bernard V. Burchette
Maurice G. Cline
Charles R. Corriher
Jerry J. Cowart
Donald E. Davis
Ray Y. Davis
Frederick J. Donegan
John F. Dullaghan
Gordon E. Earley
Christian J. Eck, Jr.
Kenneth A. Fehr
Gerald T. Forehand
Donald G. Fichthorn
Harold C. Haase
John J. Hainsworth
Bobby L. Harbison
Francis W. Harding, Jr.
Ellis R. Harvey, Jr.
Francis G. Hershley
Mendle R. Hester
Vernon E. Innerarity
Clyde A. Jesse
Kenneth E. Johnson
Robert M. Keeley
Charles W. Kelly
James E. Lancaster
Glenn F. Legge
Granville T. Lemay
Byron J. Mulherin, Jr.
Paul McCoy
Robert G. Manion
William J. Max
John R. Miksad
William F. Mills
Donald H. Mosley
Jack D. McHugh
John K. Nagazyna
Walter O. Parr, Jr.
Charles G. Pierce, Sr.
Robert K. Riggs
Donald D. Schultz
Edward S. Skultety
Howard B. Sligar, Jr.
Arthur J. Taylor
Charles L. Taylor
William T. Vincent
Robert T. Warren
Francis A. Waters
William K. Wilsmann
John W. Winters, Jr.

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 8, 1965:

U.S. ARMY

The Army National Guard of the U.S. officer named herein for promotion as a Reserve Commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

Brig. Gen. Francis Stevens Greenlief, O1291268, to be major general.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Robert William Porter, Jr., O18048, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be general.

Lt. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18517, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj, Gen. Edgar Collins Doleman, O19131, U.S. Army, to be lieutenant general.

U.S. NAVY

Adm. James S. Russell, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade indicated, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233, to be admiral.

Vice Adm. John S. Thach, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving, to be admiral.

The following-named officer of the line of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles N. Paxton, to be rear admiral.

Vice Adm. William A. Schoech, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade indicated, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233, to be vice admiral.

Rear Adm. Ignatius J. Galantin, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving, to be vice admiral.

Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Robert M. Dean to be major, and ending Dennis C. Torrez to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 19, 1965.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Victor E. Delnore to be colonel, and ending Alfred J. Ziegler to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26, 1965.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning John W. Goar to be major, and ending Benjamin M. Huey to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 19, 1965.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Chilean Student Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my privilege to visit with a group of 15 students from Chile who are attending the University of Texas on a student exchange program. They spent 2 days in Washington, visiting our Capitol, the State Department, and other historic spots of interest in this area.

It was my pleasure to tell these young people that we here in the United States feel a special bond with the people of Chile. Their country, like ours, is a nation of immigrants—a melting pot of Spanish, German, Italian, French, Swiss, and other nationalities. Their idea of self-government closely parallels that of our country. Chile is as democratic as any Latin American country in the Western Hemisphere. Their President is elected in much the same way as ours. Their courts are established by law as are those of our country. Throughout their government—as with ours—there is a system of what we call checks and balances—separation of powers—a system unique to a true democracy.

While the economy of Chile is perhaps not as diversified as that of the United States, that country makes a substantial contribution to the world's economy by its large exportation of copper and nitrate.

The bonds of friendship between Chile and the United States have been strengthened by that country's participation in the Alliance for Progress program, created by the late President Kennedy, and in the Organization of American States. The meeting of the Foreign Ministers in July last year made the attitude of the countries of the Western Hemisphere entirely clear with respect to their position toward Cuba and Castroism.

This exchange program, which permits students from Chile to come to our country to live, to study, to get to know us better, further unites the young people of our two countries. These young people are the future leaders of the world. A deeper understanding through their personal contact cannot help but lighten the difficult task of leadership which lies before them.

It was both a privilege and an honor to be with these young people. I am particularly pleased to list the names of those students with whom I visited—and for whom I wish the very best in the years ahead.

The students who are participating in this program are: Ledy Aguero, Patti Cermanatti, Soledad Ranirez, Gaston Araya, Jose Corres, Julio Escheverria, Estenco Gonzales, Carlos Nieto, German Pequeno, Edwardo Ravani, and Ricardo Whiting. They were accompanied by Prof. Carlos Foreste, Mrs. Cindy Keever, and Dean Joe W. Neal.

Junior Legion Baseball Marks 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, the South Dakota State Legislature recently adopted a resolution requesting the Governor of South Dakota to designate the week of August 29, 1965, as Junior Legion Baseball Week.

We in South Dakota are extremely proud of the fact that nearly 40 years ago one of the most worthwhile youth programs of this Nation, the American Legion baseball program was founded in the great State of South Dakota.

Today, a marble monument stands at Milbank, S. Dak., as a dedication to the initiation of this fine American program. The program's years of existence can be explained best by a portion of that dedication: "A program of service to the youth of America."

South Dakota always has been a strong baseball State and our Legion baseball program has received fine support. This year, to mark the 40th anniversary of Legion baseball, the little world series will be played in South Dakota, the place of its birth.

The Sidney L. Smith Post 24 of the American Legion will host this year's series at Aberdeen. It will mark the bringing together of the Nation's finest junior Legion baseball teams and it will contribute to the physical, mental, and moral health of today's youth.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the South Dakota State Legislature is a fitting tribute to the value of this program. The little world series, the boys who will participate in the event, the sponsoring American Legion and all junior Legion baseball players merit the recognition and attention of not only the people of South Dakota but also of the Nation.

Zinc Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as we all know there is much time—too much time—spent at the beginning of a new Congress in the organizing of both bodies, their committees, and subcommittees. And while all this is going on, all too little legislation is moving ahead.

I refer specifically at this time to a matter that affects many industries and the continued growth of our economy, a problem that we examined last year and found worthy of passage only to have that effort nullified by the inaction of the other body and final adjournment.

The diecasters in my district, as well as others throughout the country, along with the steel and brass industries, are facing a critical zinc shortage estimated by the International Lead and Zinc Study Group to be 185,000 tons in 1965. The seasonal demands of the automotive, machinery, appliance, and construction industries are aggravating and will continue to aggravate this problem during the first half of the year.

The supply shortage we now face was postponed by the release last summer of 75,000 tons of zinc from the national stockpile. Furthermore, it would not be quite so bad today had the Senate acted on H.R. 12435 which waived the 6-month waiting period on an additional 50,000 tons.

Mr. Speaker, the producers and consumers agree in forecasting a supply deficit of approximately 185,000 tons for the current year. Legislation requesting immediate release of 150,000 tons of zinc from the national stockpile surplus of 1,500,000 tons has been introduced and is pending before the Committee on Armed Services.

There is no reason to slow down the economy while awaiting departmental reports. This matter should be expeditiously handled by the committee and brought before the Congress for consideration. The release of 150,000 tons of surplus zinc will supply immediate needs and replenish depleted stocks without disrupting normal trade channels. Such action will benefit producers, consumers, the Government, and the public, but only if action is taken now.

National Children's Dental Health Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the 20th century has rightly been called the age of miracles. People fortunate enough to be living in this era have been witnesses to and even participants in many of mankind's most remarkable advances: This is especially true in the field of health, including dental health. February 7 through 13 is a timely week in which to remind ourselves of this, since it is being celebrated throughout the country as the 17th National Children's Dental Health Week.

The science and art of dentistry has made giant strides in this century to minimize the pain, disfigurement, loss of productive time and cost arising from mankind's most prevalent affliction, dental disease. Our proper concern over the still appalling rate of dental disease should not blind us to this fact. The discovery of the great benefits of fluoridation, the increasing use of drug therapy in dental practice, the highspeed instruments to both reduce the discomfort of dental treatment and conserve the precious time of the dentist are all of relatively recent origin. Today we are on the threshold of new breakthroughs, perhaps even including a vaccine against tooth decay.

I am proud to say that the dental profession of the United States has long been the world leader in these progressive developments. In American dentistry, the members of the Pennsylvania Dental Association hold high place. This year, under the able direction of Dr. Walter F. Hrin, of Johnstown, president of the Pennsylvania Society of Dentistry for Children, the Pennsylvania group, together with parallel societies in all of the States, are making use of this week to tell the American people, especially the young, the story of dentistry, to recall to our minds the vital importance to dental health and the simple, routine procedures all of us should follow in order to achieve and maintain good dental health.

If the profession is to succeed in its efforts during this week and throughout the year, it needs the unified help of all of us. As it has often and truly been said, the health of our people is the nation's most valuable resource. The intimate relationship between dental health and general well-being is well-established and it seems to me that Children's Dental Health Week is a good time for all of us to keep in mind that our high rate of dental disease could be reduced drastically and swiftly if each individual would cooperate more closely than ever before with the profession both in regard to his own health and that of the youngsters in his family.

My sincere congratulations to the dentists and all others associated with that profession on the 17th National Children's Dental Health Week.

Tribute to Joseph Sunnen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to a great humanitarian—Joseph Sunnen of St. Louis.

Joseph Sunnen is an accomplished inventor and a successful industrialist. But more important, he is a benefactor of his fellow man. Long before the phrase became fashionable, Joseph Sunnen began a personal war on poverty.

Through the years he has selected for his stewardship those causes which have been neglected because they seemed too trivial or too unpopular.

For this reason he has devoted his life and his resources to create a public awareness of uncontrolled population growth. And he has been a pioneer in advancing the proposition that birth control is one answer to the poverty which afflicts mankind.

As a testament to Joseph Sunnen's contributions to the birth control field, the International Planned Parenthood Federation last year presented him with a citation commending "his perseverance in defying the forces of prejudice and ignorance which would deny the benefits of family planning to those who seek it."

The life of Joseph Sunnen reflects the virtues of American tradition—the legacy of Horatio Alger. It is a life of humble origin. The son of an impoverished coal miner, he was forced to leave school in the seventh grade to share the responsibility of supporting a family. Blessed with an inventive mind, he applied his mechanical genius to gain a prominent place in the industrial community.

His fortunes have been great because they were shared with the unfortunate. And for those who have been deprived of the right to control the size of their families through ignorance or indigence the name of Joseph Sunnen is especially meaningful.

Tens of thousands of migrant workers in California have learned his name because they were given free birth control materials. And long before the poverty-ridden reaches of Appalachia received wide public attention, Joseph Sunnen was attending to the needs of weary, frightened mothers. From the slums of Chicago to the ramshackle huts of Puerto Rico, the despair which accompanies unplanned parenthood is transformed each day into new hope. In some 35 countries around the world there are fewer hungry, half-naked children because Joseph Sunnen is spreading a gospel of social conscience.

Much remains to be done before controlled parenthood can be meaningful for millions around the world. But each day the personal realities of the population explosion become memories for a few more parents.

Perhaps the messianic zeal of Joseph Sunnen is best summed up by Poet Robert Frost:

> But I have promises to keep
> And miles to go before I sleep
> And miles to go before I sleep.

For those despondent parents, to whom childbirth can be no longer a blessing, we extend deepest gratitude to Joseph Sunnen. He has kept his promises well and we wish him Godspeed for the many miles ahead.

Tribute to the 40th Anniversary of Hialeah, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the unique features of the great State of Florida that the celebration of the 400th anniversary of one of its cities can occur at the same time as the observance of the 40th anniversary of another. Yet make no mistake about it, the 400th anniversary of St. Augustine will not be celebrated with any more enthusiasm than the 40th anniversary of that pearl of Dade County, the beautiful city of Hialeah.

Founded by one of America's aviation pioneers, Glenn Curtiss, and his friend, the western cattleman, James H. Bright, the city of Hialeah has become one of the best known places in the United States.

On his first trip to the South, Glenn Curtiss visited his Curtiss Flying School headquarters near Miami. Adjoining the school's flying field was the Bright ranch. Curtiss soon formed a friendship with James Bright which resulted in their partnership in a farseeing real estate venture.

Their first major project was a town designed as a playground for visitors and residents alike. For it, they chose a name of Seminole Indian origin. In Hialeah a large tract was set aside for the Miami Jockey Club, and there a luxurious clubhouse and the finest race track in the country was built.

In a full-page photographic spread on January 24, 1965, the New York Herald Tribune spoke as follows in a facetious way, justly noting Hialeah's beauty:

> Hialeah Race Course, a dozen miles from downtown Miami, stages the east coast's No. 1 winter race meeting. The 40 racing days at Hialeah, which run through March 3, coincide with "the season" in the Miami area. While it is as hard on the pocketbook as any other horse park, Hialeah always is easy on the eyes. When they look up from their racing forms, honest, upright horseplayers see fine horses, bright silks, palm trees, social notables, flamingos, flowers, much greenery—and many other honest, upright horseplayers, all dedicated to the proposition that it ought to be possible to pick a winner in every race.

As it celebrates during the week beginning February 7, 1965, the 40th anniversary of its founding, Hialeah and its citizens and officials can take pride in the city's growth and development. It has become much more than a playground, although satisfaction is naturally to be taken in the international fame of its recreational facilities that include among many others the renowned race course. The proclamation for this anniversary celebration recites some of the aspects of Hialeah's achievement as a city:

> Whereas the city of Hialeah was founded in 1925, and has grown to be the seventh largest city in the State of Florida, and the second largest city in Dade County, Fla.; and
>
> Whereas 40 years have passed since the city was duly chartered by an official act of the State Legislature of Florida; and
>
> Whereas the amazing growth of this city as an industrial center and residential community has been among the most rapid in the entire Nation; and
>
> Whereas the leaders of this community and each and every citizen can be justifiably proud of the city's development and progress;
>
> Now, therefore, I, Henry A. Milander, mayor of the city of Hialeah, do set aside the period, February 7 through February 13, 1965, for an official 40th anniversary celebration in the city of Hialeah, and in observance thereof I urge the residents of this city to take part in this celebration.

In the city of Hialeah there are 60 churches. There is an excellent newspaper, the Home News, a growing library supervised by Mrs. M. Harshbarger, and a magnificent public school system. The Aetna Artist Guild, organized in 1961 to encourage and promote art appreciation, is presided over by Mrs. Maria Valiante. The city's recreation department, with an annual budget of over $200,000, conducts classes in arts and crafts, and supervises dances for young people. On the teaching staffs of the public schools there are 9 art teachers, 5 speech and dramatics teachers, and 15 music teachers. Clearly, education and the arts are a major part of the life of the city of Hialeah.

Most important of all, among its citizens and its officials there is a highly developed sense of civic duty and civic pride. On this occasion of their 40th anniversary celebration I extend to them my most sincere congratulations and best wishes.

Philippine Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 30th anniversary of the adoption of the Philippine Constitution, a national holiday in the Philippine Islands.

It is indeed fitting that we in the House of Representatives take this opportunity to extend our congratulations to the Filipino people and to reaffirm the bonds of friendship and mutual cooperation which link our two countries.

The people of the United States have long had a warm regard for the people of the Philippines. We respect their aspirations for economic advancement and a better life for all. We recognize their achievements in building a society based on equality and social justice. We are proud that the Philippine people have chosen and maintained a constitution which is patterned after our own U.S. Constitution.

The Voice of America has prepared a special program for broadcast today which will convey directly to the people of the Philippines the commendations of the American people on this important anniversary occasion.

In my capacity as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific, I have made a statement for inclusion in this program. Among others contributing remarks to the Voice of America broadcast is the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Oscar Ledesma.

At this point, under permission granted, I include both statements and urge them to the attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT ON PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTION DAY FOR VOICE OF AMERICA BY HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1965

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to send a message of congratulations to the people of the Philippines on the 30th anniversary of the adoption of the Philippine Constitution.

The day on which a people choose a democratic constitution to be the instrument of their government is a momentous event. And when that constitution survives depression and war, occupation and devastation, it becomes a truly outstanding document of the rights of men.

So it has been with the Philippine Constitution, adopted on February 8, 1935, by 202 delegates of the Philippine people. Wise though they were, these men could not foresee the future of their country.

They could not know that only a few years later their beautiful land would be the scene of ruinous warfare.

They could not know that the Philippines would become an occupied land.

They could not foresee the ultimate victory over foreign tyranny and the ultimate nationhood which would be earned by their people.

Although the men who wrote the Philippine Constitution were not prophets, they were steeped in traditions of freedom and principles of liberty. They knew that government belongs to the people.

The founding fathers of the constitution believed in the inherent worth of all men and the right of citizens to justice before the law.

They structured the Philippine Constitution to reflect these deeply held beliefs. In doing so they created an instrument inflexible in its principles of liberty and justice, but resilient to the rigors of time and history.

We in the United States are particularly proud that the delegates to that convention 30 years ago saw fit to model the Philippine Constitution after our own U.S. Constitution.

There could be no greater tribute to our revered Constitution than the realization that it provided some of the inspiration for the constitution which governs the people of the Philippines.

Just as the American Constitution has become the world's oldest active Constitution so, too, the Philippine Constitution, having survived difficult years, will continue to prevail through future trials and tribulations.

While the constitutions of other nations have been born and have died, the Philippine Constitution—and the Republic which it created—have thrived and grown strong.

On this auspicious anniversary, therefore, on behalf of the people of the United States and myself, I extend greetings and best wishes to the people of the Philippines.

May your country continue to grow and prosper, and may our two nations continue to flourish together in a spirit of friendship and cooperation.

REMARKS OF PHILIPPINE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES OSCAR LEDESMA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTION REBROADCAST TO THE PHILIPPINES BY THE VOICE OF AMERICA, FEBRUARY 8, 1965, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Two days ago, my staff and I went to see Chief Justice and Mrs. Earl Warren off at the airport. Chief Justice Warren has been invited by the Philippine Constitution Association to participate in the 30th anniversary of the adoption of the Philippine Constitution.

I believe that I express the deep appreciation of the Philippine people for Chief Justice Warren's acceptance of the invitation. His participation is as much a reflection of what I feel is the mutual regard and esteem, which Americans and Filipinos have for each other as well as a testimony of their profound faith in the validity and enduring quality of the fundamental law.

I am pleased to be able to say a few words on this occasion. I speak from Washington, D.C., where as the representative of our country to the United States, I see how the basic provisions of the American Constitution, like ours, "entrench more firmly * * * the system of constitutional government," guarantees the rights and freedom of the people and assures the continuity of a regime of justice, liberty, and democracy in both our countries.

Thirty years ago, when the convention adopted the Philippine Constitution, that distinguished patriot and statesman, the late Claro M. Recto, who was its President, rightly declared that henceforth "the fatherland expects from its sons their unquestioning loyalty, and their unfaltering devotion," adding that "the cause of that sacrosanct ideal of liberty for which our heroes and martyrs gave of their blood and their lives compels us to move forward with unshaken faith in our destiny."

It is a tribute to the wisdom, the farsightedness, and the sense of history of the framers of our Constitution that this fundamental document, like a rock, has withstood the swirl of disturbance, the turmoil of subversion, and the violence of war. Because of its binding and unifying character, the Constitution, even as it has restrained the irrational impulses to which man is subject, has insured the orderly transfer of power from one administration to the next.

Because it has anticipated the weaknesses to which all regimes are subject and because it has foreseen the exigencies to which a nation is heir, our Constitution has trenchantly given expression to the idea that Filipinos constitute a free society where the people are sovereign; it has given articulation to the right of the individual. It delimits the excesses of irresponsible leadership and the naked and aggressive use of power by providing for a system of checks and balances among the three branches of government.

At this point, I recall what one scholar has said in this respect. "It is the duty of every citizen to defend the Constitution. Any violation of its provision is a blow to the regime of law and a step toward the institution of a rule of force with all its perils and uncertainties."

Framed 30 years ago, the Constitution effected the transformation of the Philippines from a Commonwealth to a Republic. It is a tribute to the thinking of the Delegates to the Convention, that they took into special account the historical experience of Filipinos, their struggle for freedom, their wish to live in dignity in a free society, their desire for national identity and unity. It is easy to see therefore why the Philippine Constitution underscores the development of our national patrimony, stresses the preservation and enhancement of our heritage, and instills in every Filipino the imperishable concepts of universal brotherhood, of international law, the defense of the state, and social justice. In its renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy it implicitly affirms its belief that men should live together in peace and harmony, cooperating with one another in order to protect their common interests and promote their welfare. It emphasizes the paramount duty of parents and the state to rear the Filipino youth in civic efficiency and teach them the imperatives of civic responsibility.

The provisions I have cited vitalize the democratic processes in our country; they serve as a constant reminder to us that while the free and open society we live in enables us to give the fullest play to our capabilities and an opportunity to develop our potential, it still is subject to the pressures and tensions that can lead to irresponsibility, to misery, to oppression, and to injustice.

We are fortunate that our political life, our social institutions, our feeling of national oneness and our belief in our destiny have suffered no radical and violent changes. The continuity and stability of our institutions are evident; we are quick to spot our mistakes and our errors and are ready to propose and institute remedies.

There remains only the important task of giving substance to our efforts dedicated to the economic progress of our people.

The Philippine Constitution, rooted as it is in the equalitarian concept, the freedom of man, and in representative government, lends itself easily to this objective of attaining economic progress.

Having achieved that economic growth that would give the Filipino assurance of security in his future and the future of his children, and extend to him what President Macapagal has called the good life, which is the rightful heritage of mankind, we will then be able to say that we have achieved the fullest measure of our independence, having been able then to equate political with economic freedom.

This, to my mind, is one way of evaluating the significance of the Constitution in our time.

Hon. J. Vaughan Gary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure a few days ago of attending a dinner held in Richmond, Va., in honor of my friend and predecessor in the Congress, the Honorable J. Vaughan Gary. One hundred of Mr. Gary's closest friends gathered to pay tribute to his many years of public service. Praise was showered upon Mr. Gary by the toastmaster, John J. Wicker; by Richard S. Reynolds, Jr., president of Reynolds Metal; and by old friends William T. Luck and Wilmer O'Flaherty. In the course of this well-deserved praise mention was made of earlier tributes to Mr. Gary by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon and Postmaster General Gronouski. As my measure of respect, and under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include those tributes by Secretary Dillon and Postmaster General Gronouski at this point in the RECORD:

Representative J. Vaughan Gary Cited for Distinguished Service

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon presented the Treasury's Distinguished Service Award to Congressman J. Vaughan Gary, Third District of Virginia, at a ceremony held at noon today at the Treasury Department.

The new Distinguished Service Award was established by Secretary Dillon last year as the Treasury's highest recognition which may be conferred on an individual citizen who is not an employee of the Department. The award is given "in recognition of distinguished public service."

Today marked the second time the award has been given, and the first time that it has been conferred on a Member of Congress.

After having been a Member of the House of Representatives from the 79th through the 88th Congresses, Congressman Gary did not seek reelection and is retiring from the public service. During seven of these Congresses, including the last five continuously, he has been chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of the Treasury and Post Office. He will return to the active practice of law on January 1, renewing his affiliation with the law firm of Shewmake, Gary, Gobbin, Blackwell, Elmore, and Belcher, in Richmond, Va.

Following is the text of Secretary Dillon's citation of Congressman Gary:

"As a Member of the House of Representatives, in the 79th to 88th Congresses, inclusive, and as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of the Treasury and Post Office during the 81st, 82d, and 84th through the 88th Congresses, Mr. Gary has made outstanding contributions to the public service.

"His leadership abilities and prestige in the Congress, his depth of understanding of this Department's programs, his penetrating analysis, and his skillful handling of the appropriations for the Treasury have provided the Department with financial resources to fulfill its mission in a most effective and economical manner.

"In addition to his exceptional legislative abilities, Mr. Gary has all of the fine personal qualities of a traditional Virginia gentleman. His every action reflects the highest personal integrity, a gentleness of manner, and consideration for the viewpoints of others. He is a true disciple of Jeffersonian principles.

"Mr. Gary has been an invaluable counselor to me as Secretary of the Treasury, and to my predecessors, in the conduct of the affairs of this Department. We shall sorely miss the benefit of his wise counsel and leadership in future Congresses. He is a most deserving recipient of the Treasury Department's Distinguished Service Award."

Address by John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General, at the Central Richmond Association Luncheon Honoring Congressman J. Vaughan Gary

Today, I have come to Richmond to set into motion the machinery for building a magnificent new city post office.

That in itself is a major event, for this structure, when completed, will be one of the most modern postal facilities in the world, designed specifically to meet the needs of your fine city. It will further enable us to provide your citizens and your business firms with the best possible service at the lowest possible cost.

I am sure I am echoing the sentiments of each of you here today when I say that this post office is long overdue. The main part of your present structure is more than half the age of our Nation—having been completed in 1858. As a landmark, I am sure it is a source of pride to the citizens of this historic city, but as a functional clearinghouse for ever-growing volumes of mail, it is woefully behind the times. Richmond is a vibrant, pulsating city, with its feet firmly planted in the 20th century, and its postal facilities must be no less up to date.

So I am happy to be the harbinger of yet another step toward modernization.

Having said that, however, I must confess that your new post office is not the only reason for my presence here today. My other prime objective is to pay tribute to one of the best friends the Post Office Department ever has had, and one of the most dedicated Congressman a constituency ever has elected—your own Congressman J. Vaughan Gary.

As you know, Congressman Gary today ends a distinguished career in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I can think of no more appropriate comment to make in connection with his retirement than to quote one of his own colleagues: "With him will go knowledge and experience that we will probably never live to see duplicated again." We in the postal service echo that sentiment.

The statistics of Vaughan Gary's career are familiar to all of you here today. Elected to Congress in 1945, his talents were soon recognized when he was named chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Treasury and Post Office Departments just 4 years later. In the intervening years he has come to be known as one of the leading spokesmen in the House for fiscal responsibility. And, as ranking Democrat on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, he capped his career during the past session of Congress by steering President Johnson's highly successful foreign aid bill through the House, in addition to his other pressing duties.

These tell the achievements of the man—but little of how he went about accomplishing them, or, for that matter, little about him personally. And that, I think is the most impressive story of all. I have not known Congressman Gary long, having met him when I took over as Postmaster General just 15 months ago, but I consider myself privileged to have known him at all.

First, let me preface my personal remarks about Mr. Gary by telling you that my opinion of the Congress has been drastically altered during my tenure of office in Washington. I think that from my old vantage point in Madison, Wis., I held much the same view of Congressmen as many American citizens: that they belong to a rather gentlemanly breed of public servants whose work is neither too hard nor too exacting. But I know now how wrong I was. To have seen the amount of work these men turn out under the most unimaginable pressures and responsibilities, to have gotten to know many of them and witnessed their personal devotion to the well-being of their country, has been one of the most educational experiences of my life. And I think that the highest tribute I can pay to Congressman Gary is to say that he represents the ideal of the best in our National Government. I don't say there are many to equal him, but I do say that most of them are cut from the same bolt of cloth.

I paid a courtesy call on Vaughan Gary shortly after assuming office in 1963 and, as former Tax Commissioner of Wisconsin, I was delighted to learn that he had served for 10 years as counsel and executive assistant of the Virginia Tax Board. Public finance is an experience not at all dissimilar to walking through a settlement of hostile Indians and I immediately felt I had found a kindred soul. Since he was the chairman of my subcommittee, I asked, out of deference, if he had any advice for a beginner in the postal field. A lesser man would have jumped at an opportunity like that. But Congressman Gary, in his wisdom, knew I would be much more receptive to advice when he was reviewing my budget request and refrained from speaking his mind. He replied, instead, that he only wanted to be helpful in any way he could. I have since come to realize fully the generosity and value of that offer.

It is no exaggeration to say that he has been one of the great experts on postal operations in the history of Congress—and he didn't get that way just by sitting in his chair, listening to a lot of testimony. He was a hard worker who always did his homework, and he saw to it that his subcommittee members did the same.

He, as much as any man, is responsible for the program of modern operational research and mechanization in the Post Office and, perhaps most important of all, he has been our friend and adviser, as well as our most constructive critic.

Any Cabinet officer who ever worked with him will tell you that Congressman Gary wielded one of the sharpest pruning knives in history. When he reported out an appropriations bill, you could be sure there was no fat on it. Of course, it was to be expected that honest differences of opinion would arise. But even on those occasions, he was always the perfect gentleman, making his cuts without inflicting undue pain. In fact, he is the only man I have ever known who could take a pound of flesh without spilling an ounce of blood.

And so I think it is important to remember, on the occasion of Vaughan Gary's retirement, that while the citizens of Richmond are losing a dedicated public servant, the entire Nation is losing a respected voice of prudence and progress. As I said at the outset, we may never see the likes of him again.

Finally, because the postal service has been so close to his heart, because he has contributed so much to its improvement, I would like to use this occasion to give one final progress report for his benefit.

Because of his vital interest in mechanization, I am certain that Congressman Gary will be pleased to learn that we have inaugurated our new program of vertical improved mail—or VIM service—in high-rise office buildings. For many years, we have been delivering mail in these buildings by hand, letter carriers going from floor to floor, from office to office.

We estimate there are more than 11,000 of these carriers—many of them spending their entire workday in a single building. Twenty-three of them are necessary to service the Empire State Building alone.

Now we have begun to convince builders to install a vertical conveyor system in their new high-rise structures which can be operated by a single postal employee in a basement mailroom. Each tenant has his own locked mail trays in which he receives his mail at various intervals throughout the day. The result is a tremendous savings to us in terms of man-hours and improved mail service throughout the building.

Earlier this month I inaugurated the first such system in Dallas, Tex., which will be part of a 34-floor office building in the center of town, and builders in many other cities are now following suit.

One of the areas of our service in which I have been most vitally interested during the past year has been that of parcel post. We have taken three major steps to improve this service.

First, we have inaugurated a program to reduce damage by conducting exhaustive surveys to determine the major causes of such damage and then by taking immediate steps to eliminate those causes.

Second, we have inaugurated a new program of pool casing. This is a system by which large mailers of parcels can presort their packages by sectional centers, pack them in large pool case containers and send each case directly to its area destination with the confidence that their parcels will arrive safely and swiftly.

And third, we are well into our program of scheduled delivery of parcel post in many areas throughout the United States. The key to this program is ZIP code which I will discuss in a moment. In brief, we are now able to guarantee next-day delivery of all ZIP coded packages within a given radius and you can imagine what a boon this is to mailers of perishable goods. We are looking forward to the day when we can put this system into operation in the Richmond area.

ZIP code, itself, of course, is the most important single postal innovation in this century. It is our answer to the most pressing problem of all—ever increasing mail volumes. I like to call this increase a mail explosion, which is taking place side-by-side our population explosion. In fact, it is more than that, because our mail volume is increasing at a higher rate than our population. It has now reached the tremendous total of 72 billion pieces a year—as much as the rest of the world's combined volume.

There are many facets to ZIP code. One is that it simplifies our sorting procedures and reduces the chances of error. Before ZIP code, there were thousands of sorting possibilities and it was obviously impossible for any human being to memorize them all. Under ZIP code, however, every letter will go to one of 566 sectional centers, according to the first three numbers of the code. In the near future, an optical scanner will further speed the process by "reading" the ZIP codes and sorting the letters automatically.

ZIP code is also a means by which we can improve upon our transportation and distribution procedures. And, because we can send mail directly to the 566 sectional centers, it allows us to eliminate several handlings along the way.

And finally, ZIP code is a means by which large mailers can use their automatic data processing equipment to sequence their mailing lists and then presort their mail according to sectional center destination. From the point of view of its total impact, this is the most important facet of all. Most people do not realize it, but 75 percent of all our mail is business mail. And when we reach the point where the majority of this mail isn't even unbagged until it reaches its destination area, then we will truly have solved the problem of the mail explosion. That day, I might add, may not be far off. At the present time, I am planning steps to require all large volume users of second and third class mail to presort and I am also planning to ask Congress to provide legislation to require the same of large first-class users. I think, in the long run, the American business community will be happy about these actions, because they will guarantee them speedier mail service and will help to hold rates down to a reasonable level.

And so, Congressman Gary, you are leaving us at the beginning of an exciting new era. Many of the plans which you helped us to inaugurate are just now beginning to bear fruit. Our performance during this past Christmas season, I believe, was proof of the pudding. If you remember what happened in Chicago last year, when the mail bags were stacked up in trucks from the main post office all the way up to the Merchandise Mart—and stayed there until after December 25—I think you can appreciate what we have managed to accomplish in 12 short months.

This year we handled even more mail and did it in record time. One of the ways by which we were able to accomplish this was with the addition of a new mechanized parcel post station in Southside Chicago, and I know it would have gladdened your heart to see all those new machines saving us money and speeding the mail. We probably wouldn't even have had those machines if it hadn't been for your insistence years ago.

But I think I should remind you, Mr. Gary, before you start thinking that you're going to miss all the excitement in Washington, that there is a bright side to your retirement: You won't have to be around when I go to Congress for a rate increase on second- and third-class mail next month. You can sit down here in your law office, watch the fireworks go off up north, and think of me dodging the brickbats. Come to think about it, being Postmaster General isn't much different from being State tax commissioner. I'm still in Apache Territory and the Indians are still on the warpath.

At least it will be peaceful here in Richmond—and you certainly deserve the change.

And I know that a few years from now, when the new post office is completed here, you will take great pride in the knowledge that you, more than any man, were responsible for it.

Closing of VA Hospital in Lincoln, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, last month the Director of the Veterans' Administration announced the closing of the veterans hospital in Lincoln, Nebr. I appreciate the concern of the administration to expend Federal funds wisely.

I do, however, question if the closing of the VA hospital in Lincoln, Nebr., will achieve the purpose of saving Federal funds.

I would like to point out that the closing of the VA hospital will in the long run cost the people of this Nation greater sums of money than will be saved. First, this hospital has been serving veterans for 34 years. The hospital has established a fine reputation among the veterans. We can never overlook the prime purpose of a veterans hospital—to bring adequate services to veterans close to their residences. We cannot overlook the tremendous positive psychological factor to veterans when assuring them of adequate medical care. The trust and confidence veterans have in a hospital is immeasurable and cannot always be stated in terms of dollars saved.

I seriously question whether closing the 280-bed hospital in Lincoln will provide the Lincoln, Nebr., area with maximum veterans' care. I have noted that a Nebraskan veteran was recently notified by the VA hospital in Omaha that since no beds were available, his name would be placed on a waiting list. It appears to me that if Omaha VA Hospital has already a waiting list with the Lincoln VA Hospital still in operation, the future appears dim indeed concerning maximum care of veterans in the eastern section of Nebraska. To close a well-staffed hospital in which veterans have great confidence and for which there may well be a need is not a wise savings of Federal funds.

Secondly, the Lincoln VA Hospital is a leader and pioneer in medicine in the Lincoln area. The hospital enjoys respect from the doctors of the Lincoln area, as testified by a leading Lincoln, Nebr., physician, Francis Newmayer, M.D. Numerous Lincoln doctors have served with distinction on the hospital staff. They have contributed their services to the hospital and have in return received much medical knowledge from the hospital. The Lincoln area doctors are proud of this hospital and consider it an honor to be called upon to serve as consultants in the hospital.

The Lincoln VA Hospital has in numerous incidences set the medical pace in the Lincoln area. It first introduced the use of the kidney machine in kidney surgery. It also introduced to Lincoln physicians the gastro camera. Right now it is yet one of the few hospitals in the country that has a gastro camera and trained personnel to operate it. This hospital was the first in the Lincoln area to successfully perform heart surgery in the replacement of a section of the aorta.

The team of doctors composed of VA hospital personnel and consulting Lincoln residence doctors is presently working extremely well, contributing toward medical progress in the Lincoln area.

The President's Great Society program has laid heavy stress upon health care for this Nation. I believe that in keeping with the President's goals the Lincoln VA Hospital can be utilized most effectively. This hospital could, in addition to serving veterans, serve as a health care center. Medical research could be continued and enhanced even to a greater degree. To discontinue the services of a Government hospital at a time when we are calling for an increase in medical care does not appear to me to be a savings of Federal funds.

The third reason for continuing the operation of the Lincoln VA Hospital is an academic one. The Lincoln VA Hospital has over the past decade served as a cooperation institution in the preparation of medical doctors, dentists, social workers, psychologists, and nurses. This hospital is used rather extensively by the University of Nebraska medical college and Creighton University medical college. The hospital has been used by these universities for medical field experiences for interns and pre-med students, for demonstration purposes, and for laboratory experiences.

Presently, the Lincoln VA Hospital has the only approved training program in orthopedic surgery in the State. It is also the only hospital in Nebraska cooperating with the University of Nebraska in the dentistry program of the university. Dr. Richard Bradley, a consulting dentist of the VA hospital and an instructor at the University of Nebraska feels that the closing of this hospital will severely affect the university's oral surgery program. This hospital provides the only opportunity for students to gain knowledge in oral dental surgery in Nebraska. I have received telegrams from the medical colleges at the University of Nebraska and Creighton University stating the need for the Lincoln VA Hospital in their medical programs, which I quote below as follows:

> Continuation of the Lincoln VA Hospital could significantly add to medical teaching potential of Nebraska.
>
> CECIL L. WITTSON, M.D.,
> *Dean, University of Nebraska, College of Medicine.*

> Hospital is part of the educational program of our medical school and has potential for increasing role in medical education.
>
> RICHARD L. EGAN, M.D.,
> *Dean, Creighton University, School of Medicine.*

As I mentioned, the academic quality of the medical curriculum of the University of Nebraska and Creighton University would be affected by the closing of the Lincoln VA Hospital. Such a setback of medical programs will in the long run cost the taxpayers of this Nation greatly.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the closing of the VA hospital in Lincoln would not result in as much Federal savings as one would believe. When one calculates the transfer of patients and staff to other hospitals, the savings are rather small. We have been told that 85 percent of the hospital operating budget goes for personnel. Since personnel will be given jobs in other hospitals, this would, in actuality, result in a 15 percent budget savings. When one further considers the numerous free hours donated by consulting doctors, the academic uses by the University of Nebraska and Creighton University, the medical progress initiated in Lincoln, and the confidence of veterans in this hospital, the 15 percent becomes rather insignificant as compared to medical progress that is being made in the Lincoln, Nebr., area through the Lincoln VA Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I have presented what I believe to be some rather strong reasons for continuing the program of the VA hospital in Lincoln, Nebr. One cannot always measure savings in terms of dollars and cents. We must look closely at the role an institution can play in leadership in a community. I believe that the Lincoln VA Hospital has demonstrated such leadership and that not to continue this institution would in the long run result in no savings of Federal funds.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at Governor's Conference on Agriculture, Louisville, Ky., February 3, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a 2-day Governor's conference on agriculture was called this week by the Governor of Kentucky, Hon. Edward T. Breathitt. Almost 1,000 farm and business leaders attended the conference in Louisville where on February 3, the main address was given by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. I found Secretary Freeman's speech to be excellent and I wish to commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT THE GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON AGRICULTURE, SHERATON HOTEL, LOUISVILLE, KY., FEBRUARY 3, 1965

Through most of the past week I was in Western Europe for conferences with Common Market officials and public appearances related to exports of American agricultural products.

I also met with food trade and farm organization representatives. And at a food exposition I had the opportunity to talk with some of the key buyers—housewives.

This trip in the interest of protecting and expanding foreign markets for agricultural products was not my first. Over the past 4 years I have been throughout the world, representing our farmers and food industry and Government, promoting increased utilization of American food and fiber. Similar oversea efforts have been made by other representatives of Federal and State governments, of the food industry, and of farm and commodity organizations.

These combined efforts have had excellent results. Our agricultural exports in 1964 climbed to over $6 billion—an all time high. They represented a fourth of the total of all U.S. exports. And Kentucky's share has an annual value in excess of $65 million.

Our agricultural economy, our total economy, and our balance of payments are better because the products of American farms are needed, and wanted, abroad.

Around the world there is obvious appreciation for our food. Yet in Europe, the Middle East, in Asia and in Africa, and in the Soviet bloc I have found interest in our food more than matched by admiration for American farmers.

All over this world the American farmer is looked upon as a maker of miracles. There's a reason why people in other lands picture the American farmer wearing a crown instead of a straw hat.

This is the reason: The era of abundance the United States knows is still a goal for most countries. In some it has not even achieved the status of a goal—it is still a dream. So all the world wants to know how our farmers created history's first era of abundance, and wants to know how they maintain it. So while the peoples of other lands listen with interest to the American food story told by our traveling salesmen, they pile question upon question as they seek more knowledge of the American farm story.

Perhaps there is an even better understanding abroad than here at home of the achievements of the American system of family farms, and that system's great contributions to the total welfare of our people.

I know this for sure: There is a highly publicized misunderstanding here at home of what our family farmers have accomplished, how they did it, how they can maintain it, and what the role of government has been and must be in the days ahead.

It is time to set the record straight.

Truth is the basic element in freedom—and if the people of this Nation and their elected representatives are to be free of either passion or prejudice in determining public policy in a vital area like food and agriculture, they must operate in an atmosphere of truth.

It is time to set the record straight * * * time to review and explain fundamental facts * * * and I am accepting your courtesy and hospitality—and your podium—to do it here and now.

It is time to quite calling success by the name of failure.

It is time to quit calling the most successful free enterprise productive system any society has ever known a relief-welfare state program.

It is time to quit equating a better life for one segment of our rural society with a lesser life for another, because such an equation downgrades our national sense of justice as well as the potential and the flexibility of our economy.

It is time to quit putting the labels of "pampered" or "subsidized" upon the backs of farm families who take hard risks, and work hard, and meet the demands of responsible citizenship. Those who cannot understand or appreciate their contributions should at least respect their dignity.

It is time to set the record straight, and here are basic facts:

The family farms of this Nation have created an abundance unparalleled in world history. Americans buy more of a greater variety of quality foods at less cost in terms of take-home pay than any other food buyers anywhere else in the world.

Since 1950 the cost of medical care has jumped 63 percent. Our consumers are paying 52 percent more for professional services than they did in 1950, and 38 percent more for transportation. Yet farm prices—the prices that farmers receive for what they sell—are lower now than in 1950. While Americans are paying 63 percent more for medical care, 52 percent more for professional services, and 38 percent more for transportation, our farmers are receiving 8 percent less for their products than they did 15 years ago.

What if the farmer were charging 63, or 52, or even 38 percent more? We would be eating less, and at the same time would be shifting money now being spent for the products of factories and for services into food.

Rather than the consumer-taxpayer subsidizing the farmer, the contrary is true.

In 1963, in testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture, I said that if the family farm is permitted to die "let the consumer beware." I repeat the warning, in all sincerity, in this year of 1965. It is the family farm system that enables our consumers to have it so good.

And there's more to this great production story.

In addition to providing all the foods our people want to buy, and can buy, our farms produce enough more to provide healthful diets for those who cannot pay at all or can pay only part of the cost. These consumers, through the school lunch and school milk and food stamp and direct distribution programs, receive $750 million worth of food each year.

The State of Kentucky is a pioneer in one of the most dynamic, and effective, of these efforts to wipe out diet deficiencies throughout our Nation—the food stamp program. Under this program low-income families have the opportunity to invest limited resources in better diets. Floyd County was one of the first eight counties in the country to try out the new food stamp approach, back in 1961. It was joined by Knott and Perry Counties in 1963. Since the summer of 1961, the food stamp program has been responsible for $4.4 million of new purchasing power in the three counties. Not only low-income families, but the entire economy of the area has benefited from this dignified, businesslike approach to utilization of our food abundance.

Just this week four additional counties—Breathitt, Johnson, Martin, and Owsley—adopted the food stamp program. Along with Tennessee, Kentucky is first in benefiting from the expansion of this effort authorized by the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

Kentucky's utilization of the food stamp program is a tribute to the vision and concern of Governor Breathitt, Economic Security Commissioner Powell and his staff, and your business and banking people who cooperate so well with the State administration and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Yet, we could not have moved nationally, or locally, into the food stamp program unless there had been an abundance of food. The foundations of this program are found on family farms.

In addition to enough food for those who can pay, and for those who can pay none or part of the cost, our farmers have been producing enough more to permit hard sales abroad at the rate of $4.5 billion a year, plus $1.76 billion worth a year to use as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy through our food-for-peace program.

Life is richer, fuller, and more promising for all Americans because of this tremendous production achievement. If you classify as a miracle something that had never been made to happen before in all the long history of men and farms, we have a miracle on our hands.

Anyone who can find error and wrongdoing in that achievement can, believe me, criticize motherhood, turn his back on the flag, kick a friendly dog, and slap a baby all at the same time.

But food supply is only part of the family farm story.

Our family farms are prime consumers.

They spend more than $29 billion a year on the goods and services related to agricultural production. They use more petroleum than any other industry. They take 6 percent of all the rubber consumed in the United States each year. They use 5 million tons of steel a year—a third as much as the automotive industry. They consume about 4 percent of the Nation's electric power.

Farmers spend another $12 billion a year on family living—for food, clothes, cars, furniture, medicine, and other products and services from town and city sources.

Farming employs 6.1 million workers, and 3 out of every 10 jobs in other employment are related to agriculture. Approximately 10 million Americans have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture. Manufacturers of food and related products alone employ nearly 2 million workers and have an annual payroll of around $9 million.

All Americans depend on the people of family farms as producers. A high proportion of American workers depend on them as consumers.

We should not—we cannot—underestimate the stake the Nation has in not only the continuation, but the strengthening, of this productive system.

We have been maintaining this free enterprise productive system through farmer-government cooperation in commodity programs—programs designed to adjust production to needs without waste of human or natural resources * * * programs designed to support prices received by farmers for many of the commodities they sell.

We couldn't have achieved the results we know without them. These programs will determine the future of efficient, commercial family farms and consequently are of critical importance to all Americans who benefit so much, in so many ways, from those farms.

It is these programs that are now under attack.

It is charged they are no longer necessary, or are too expensive, or are helping the wrong farmers, or are relief efforts no longer needed in an affluent society, or are a combination of all these.

Now, I am not a defender of the status quo in commodity programs. The mechanical methods of supply management and price support must be constantly adjusted. Those that are good can always be made better, those that are not responsive to changing needs and conditions must be updated. And we must be acutely conscious of cost.

But I do defend, and advance, the principle and purpose, and declare the success of these programs.

I want to make this clear:

1. These programs are essential to all Americans—to every area of the society—because all Americans reap substantial benefits from efficient commercial family farms.

2. If we abandon the principles of supply management and price support now, we shall sound the death knell of the family farm and bring an end to the era of abundance as we now know it.

3. While the goal of reducing the cost of commodity programs is a sound objective, one that can and must be achieved, we must constantly measure gains in government savings against possible economic and social losses to the whole of society. Efforts to cut costs must not be at the expense of parity of income for many thousands of farm families.

4. Commodity programs are not now, nor have they been under this administration, welfare programs. Commodity program expenditures are not a dole, they are an investment in good management of national resources.

5. Only a small number of farmers—about 5 percent of the total—are now earning incomes comparable to earnings in other segments of the economy where investments are similar. But even these farmers, independent nongovernment studies reveal, would experience a quick income loss of as much as 50 percent without the commodity programs. Actually, the larger family farms—those grossing $10,000 a year or more—would suffer most. Such a knockout blow for efficient farmers would be hard enough to shake the entire economy.

6. Creating new hazards for the efficient family farm will not ease the very real economic and social pain afflicting the families on small farms with inadequate productive resources. To do that would be applying

the wrong remedies to the wrong ailments in double dosage.

President Johnson put the current agricultural picture in proper perspective in his recent economic message to the Congress.

"Americans owe much to the efficiency of our farmers," the President said. "Their independent spirit and productive genius are the envy of the world. We must continue to assure them the opportunity to earn a fair reward for their efforts. I will transmit to the Congress recommendations for improving the effectiveness of our expenditures on price and income supports."

Then the President went on to say:

"Many small farmers cannot expect to earn good incomes from farming. But they—along with other rural Americans—will have an opportunity to share in the fruits of our society through faster economic growth, better education and training opportunities, and improved health and community facilities. We must extend the benefits of American prosperity to all our people, including those in rural America."

The President's comments show recognition of two distinct, yet related, areas for rural opportunity development—one in full-time farming based on adequate productive resources, the other in utilization of combined farm and nonfarm earning opportunities. The second calls for the creation of new job opportunities in the rural communities for those who wish to do something other than farm, or need jobs that will augment returns from farms which in themselves cannot become adequate income sources.

Efforts to make the two areas of opportunity development competitive for attention and resources will benefit neither. These efforts must complement one another—progress in one will enrich the other.

Commodity programs may mean 10 to 20 percent of net income to a small farmer, and are often indirectly helpful in other ways. But commodity programs alone will not meet their needs. They are, however, economic instruments vital to the very existence of the commercial family farm. As such they merit the continuing interest and support of city and countryside alike.

Governor Breathitt's commission on agriculture, and your Kentucky leadership associated with the commission in this conference, have sights set on a billion-dollar annual agricultural income for Kentucky. That would be an increase of between $300 and $400 million from the current annual level of gross returns from farming. That is a big jump, but you have launched your drive from a running start. Kentucky's farm income has been on the rise over the last 4 years, and preliminary figures show it was better in 1964 than in 1963. And the commodity programs I have been discussing tonight have had a role in your fine progress.

I am confident that you can reach, and even exceed, the billion-dollar goal you have set for yourself if—as a nation—we can reach our goal of parity of income for the efficient family farm.

I want to commend your outstanding Governor, and all of you, for not limiting your interest to commercial agriculture as you drive to reach the billion-dollar farm income goal. It is important and appropriate that new avenues of earning opportunity for those with limited farm resources and for nonfarm rural families should also get your attention.

I pledge you tonight the wholehearted cooperation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture on both fronts.

I have tried, at some risk of misunderstanding, to make myself crystal clear on two distinct aspects of our farm and rural development programs. On some occasions, when I have demonstrated my enthusiasm for the nonfarm and related aspects of rural areas development, I've been accused of abandoning the farmer. By the same token, my emphasis here on commodity programs in no way lessens my dedication to other opportunity-building efforts in rural America.

There is a place, a real need, for all of them.

But tonight I primarily want to be on record emphasizing how serious—even disastrous—it would be to turn backward from the commodity programs.

These programs were designed to improve earning opportunities for family farmers, and they're doing it, at the rate of a billion dollars a year more in net income than was earned in 1960.

These commodity programs were designed to bring supplies into better balance with demand and to move surpluses into consumption and in most areas—particularly feed grains and wheat—they're doing it.

The commodity programs were designed to provide consumers with an abundance of food at fair prices, and they're doing it.

And—most of all—they were designed to perpetuate the family farm system of agriculture and avoid the economic and social hazards attached to large corporate farming, and they're doing it.

The family farm, measured in terms of today's investment and production standards, is a growing rather than diminishing institution. Let us resolve to maintain appropriate incentives, so that American family farm free enterprise agriculture will continue to perform miracles for all the American people.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Reverend Robert F. Cochran, minister, Del Ray Baptist Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou hast called civil officials "ministers of God," and Thou hast commanded us to pray for "kings and for all in authority." We come today to obey Thee. Bless these honored men and women.

Give them physical strength equal to the terrific demands made upon them.

Give them wisdom to discern truth when error clamors to be embraced.

Give them courage to do what is right, whatever the consequences.

Give them the spirit of charity, however maligned and misunderstood they may be.

Give them the ability so to serve that when they face Thee, Thou wilt say to them, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

In the name of Jesus Christ, our Saviour and Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Upon request of Mr. **Mansfield**, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 8, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 66. An act to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced;

H.R. 647. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 947. An act to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved;

H.R. 948. An act to amend part II of the District of Columbia Code relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1007. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1064. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1065. An act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to provide exemptions for certain operations of the House of Representatives from the taxes imposed by that act and the District of Columbia Use Tax Act;

H.R. 1066. An act to amend section 11–1701 of the District of Columbia Code to increase the retirement salaries of certain retired judges;

H.R. 1699. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended;

H.R. 1700. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended; and

H.R. 3314. An act to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 66. An act to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced;

H.R. 647. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 947. An act to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved;

H.R. 948. An act to amend part II of the District of Columbia Code relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1007. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1064. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1065. An act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to provide exemptions for certain operations of the House of Representatives from the taxes imposed by that act and the District of Columbia Use Tax Act;

H.R. 1066. An act to amend section 11–1701 of the District of Columbia Code to increase the retirement salaries of certain retired judges;

H.R. 1699. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended;

H.R. 1700. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended; and

H.R. 3314. An act to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 3 minutes on statements made during the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON H.R. 3818

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 3818, to repeal the requirement for gold reserve certificates against deposits in Federal Reserve banks, during the adjournment of the Senate, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS, AND FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives, that committees be authorized to file reports, and that the Vice President and President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Working Capital Funds of Department of Defense

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on working capital funds of that Department, as of June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Naval Flight Pay

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on flight pay in that Department, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on ROTC Flight Instruction Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the ROTC flight instruction program of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Army Flight Instruction Program

A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Forces), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight instruction program, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress made in liquidating the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarterly period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Provision of War Risk Insurance and Certain Marine and Liability Insurance for the American Public

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Federal Plan for Meteorological Services and Supporting Research

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal plan for meteorological services and supporting research, fiscal year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Legislation Relating to District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Establishment of Working Capital Fund for Department of the Treasury

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Operation of the Trade Agreements Program

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operation of the trade agreements program, for the period July 1962–June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Disposal of Foreign Excess Property

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal of foreign excess property by that Department, during calendar year 1964; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Compilation of General Accounting Office Findings and Recommendations for Improving Government Operations

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on compilation of General Accounting Office findings and recommendations for improving Government operations, fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Accumulation of Excesses and Unnecessary Procurement of Missile Spare Parts at 3d U.S. Army Logistical Support Group Installations in Florida

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on accumulation of excesses and unnecessary procurement of missile spare parts because of supply management deficiencies at 3d U.S. Army Logistical Support Group installations in Florida, Department of the Army, dated February 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Anthracite Mine Water Control and Mine Sealing and Filling Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the anthracite mine water control and mine sealing and filling program, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Department of Labor

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during the year ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports of National Labor Relations Board

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report on Positions in Grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, for the Interstate Commerce Commission and Office of Economic Opportunity, during the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Authorize the Construction of a Dam Across the Savannah River and Duke Power Co. To Construct an Electric Generating Plant on the Savannah River

"Whereas Duke Power Co. announced plans more than 4 years ago to construct a giant 2-million-kilowatt steam electric generating plant on the Savannah River in Anderson County, S.C.; and

"Whereas in order to form a pool for condenser cooling water for such plant, it is necessary for Duke Power Co. to construct a low-level dam across the Savannah River; and

"Whereas construction of this steamplant would cost approximately $210 million and this plant would yield to Anderson County, S.C., and the Government of the United States, approximately $13,500,000 per year in tax revenue, in addition to many other tax and industrial benefits which would accrue to Anderson County and the surrounding area as a result of having this plant constructed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, That this body go on record once more as urging Duke Power Co. to proceed at the earliest possible date with the construction of this plant, and that the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to take such action as may be necessary, in order that such low-level dam may be constructed; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the president of the Duke Power Co., and to the following officers and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress: the Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives, each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina.

"Inez Watson
"Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Memorial 1

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning the apportionment of members of State legislatures

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that membership in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned according to population and has thus asserted Federal judicial authority over the basic structure of government in the various States; and

"Whereas this rule denies to the people of the respective States the right to establish their legislatures upon the same pattern of representation deemed advantageous for the Congress of the United States and provided by the Federal Constitution; and

"Whereas this action of the Supreme Court goes so far as to restrict the ability of the citizens of the respective States to designate the manner in which they shall be represented in their respective legislatures thereby depriving the people of their right to determine how they shall be governed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado, That the Senate of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would provide that (1) any State which has a bicameral legislature may utilize factors other than population in apportioning one house of its legislature if the plan of apportionment is specifically approved by vote of the electorate of the State; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"Robert L. Knous,
"President of the Senate.
"Mildred H. Cresswell,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Legislative Resolution 13

"Whereas it is estimated that the peak load of veterans' needs will be in from 5 to 7 years or around the year 1970. At that time, World War I veterans will be between 73 and 80 years of age, World War II veterans will average 50 years of age, and Korean war veterans will average 40 years of age; and

"Whereas the average daily patient load at the Lincoln Veterans Hospital has been 190 instead of 170 as quoted by the Veterans' Administration, and this does not include all the out-patients and pharmacy service; and

"Whereas nearly $1 million was spent in the years 1961 and 1962 to remodel the surgical wards; and

"Whereas there are 152,000 veterans in Nebraska, not taking into consideration the veterans living in Kansas, Iowa, Colorado, and South Dakota who are served by the Lincoln Veterans Hospital; and

"Whereas pensions and social security benefits are insufficient to take care of hospitalization of veterans, which means that many veterans and their wives can exist only; and

"Whereas emergency cases, especially of older veterans would have to be handled in local hospitals as transportation to either of the veterans hospitals located in Grand Island and Omaha, Nebr., would be dangerous to the veterans; outpatient care would cost many times what it now costs if patients would have to travel to Grand Island or Omaha, Nebr.; and

"Whereas many times it is difficult and nearly impossible to obtain rooms in local hospitals: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled:

"1. That the U.S. Veterans' Administration reconsider its ruling to close the Lincoln Veterans Hospital, and that an order be entered that the Lincoln Veterans Hospital continue to be maintained.

"2. That the clerk of the legislature be directed to send a suitable engrossed copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C., to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from Nebraska.

"Philip C. Sorensen,
"President of the Legislature.
"Hugo F. Srb,
"Clerk of the Legislature."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to take action necessary to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to permit mothers and older children in families in the aid to dependent children program to become employed to supplement their income without the reduction of ADC benefits because of earnings received from such employment

"Whereas the State of Colorado desires to encourage recipients of assistance under the aid to dependent children program to find gainful employment whenever this can be done without jeopardizing the care of children; and

"Whereas Colorado's financial position is such that combined Federal, State, and local grants under the program have been only 72 percent of the total needs of the recipients as determined by the State board of public welfare; and

"Whereas in an effort to allay hardship, Colorado desires to permit mothers and older children to earn the difference between the total amount paid and 100 percent of total needs of the family without having such earnings deducted from their allotments; and

"Whereas the Federal Government, acting through its Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has found this practice to be in conflict with current Federal law governing Federal financial participation in the aid to dependent children program; and

"Whereas it is considered highly desirable to provide aid to dependent children recipients with an incentive to seek employment whenever this can be done without jeopardizing the care of children; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress and the President of the United States are hereby respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to amend title IV of the Social Security Act so that mothers and children in families in the aid to dependent children program may be permitted to become employed and earn the difference

between the total amount granted in benefits under such program and 100 percent of their total needs without having such earnings deducted from such benefits; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"*President of the Senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"ALLEN DINES,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"EVELYN T. DAVIDSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take certain action in relation to social security benefits

"Whereas many New Jersey citizens in certain age brackets are now receiving social security benefits but are precluded from earning more than $1,200 annually without suffering reductions in their social security payments; and

"Whereas this $1,200 limitation on earnings has ceased to be a realistic figure in the light of increased living costs applicable to New Jersey citizens including those receiving social security and are therefore finding it extremely difficult to even attempt the meeting of these increased living costs: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the General Assembly concurring)*: That the New Jersey Legislature hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to provide for a substantial increase in the amount or amounts which may be earned by social security beneficiaries in order that they may meet increased living costs by their social security benefits plus what they may be able to earn in the outside employment; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and to the Members of the Congress representing the State of New Jersey in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

"HENRY H. PATTERSON,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

"RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, THE MONTANA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, THE U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT, AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES REQUESTING LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING THE MINTING OF SILVER DOLLARS

"Whereas silver dollars have been used as currency in Montana and other Western States for a number of years and have become part of the western tradition; and

"Whereas a shortage of said dollars developed during 1964; and

"Whereas through the efforts of the Montana delegation to the U.S. Congress, particularly the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, provision was made for the minting of silver dollars; and

"Whereas it now appears that said minting may not be carried through: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the U.S. Congress be requested to take such steps as may be necessary and proper to insure the minting and immediate availability of silver dollars; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the members of the Montana delegation of Congress, to the U.S. Treasurer, and to the President of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE RUTLAND HEIGHTS HOSPITAL AND THE MANCHESTER FACILITIES OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Massachusetts House of Representatives that the medical-surgical facilities of the Veterans' Administration located at Rutland Heights in the Commonwealth of Manchester, N.H., will be closed effective June 13 of the current year; and

"Whereas the closing of these facilities is in direct conflict with the general philosophy behind veterans' benefits in the United States as it has evolved over a long period of years and will result in derogation of veterans' benefits; and

"Whereas the removal of these hospitals will work a particular hardship on the veterans of the Commonwealth who have been so conveniently served at Rutland Heights and Manchester: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the veterans' facilities at Rutland Heights and Manchester; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States rescind the order providing for the closing of the medical-surgical facilities located at Rutland Heights and Manchester; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Surgeon General of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the Massachusetts House of Representatives; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT RUTLAND

"Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has proposed that the medical-surgical facilities of the Veterans' Administration located at Rutland be closed on June 13, 1965; and

"Whereas the closing of these facilities appears to be contrary to the philosophy of rendering maximum benefits to the veterans of the country whose timeless efforts and unselfish sacrifices should always be remembered: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to instruct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to rescind his directive ordering the closing of the veterans' facilities at Rutland; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Surgeon General of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE SUCH ACTION AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO REVOKE THE DIRECTIVE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORDERING THE CLOSING OF THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY

"Whereas the proposed closing of the Springfield Armory and the resulting unemployment of thousands of skilled workers will seriously affect the economy of the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas, in this era of rapid industrial expansion with the attendant problems of location, in which industry is seriously concerned about the relative business climate of the various States and the available supply of skilled labor, it seems to be contrary to good judgment to close a governmental facility which has contributed so immeasurably in the past to the quality and effectiveness of the weapons which enabled the country to protect itself in time of war and to assure it of adequate defense at all times; and

"Whereas the existence of the Springfield Armory, with its thousands of skilled workers, will be of vital importance in maintaining the position of the United States in the tense years ahead: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to instruct the Department of Defense to revoke its directive ordering the closing of the Springfield Armory; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE SUCH ACTION AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO REVOKE THE DIRECTIVE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORDERING THE CLOSING OF THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY

"Whereas, the proposed closing of the Springfield Armory and the resulting unemployment of thousands of skilled workers will seriously affect the economy of the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas, in this era of rapid industrial expansion with the attendant problems of location, in which industry is seriously concerned about the relative business climate of the various States and the available supply of skilled labor, it seems to be contrary to good judgment to close a governmental facility which has contributed so immeasurably in the past to the quality and effectiveness of the weapons which enabled the country to protect itself in time of war and to assure it of adequate defense at all times; and

"Whereas, the existence of the Springfield armory, with its thousands of skilled workers, will be of vital importance in maintaining the position of the United States in the tense years ahead: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to instruct the Department of Defense to revoke its directive ordering the closing of the Springfield Armory; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth, to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by Ophir Grange No. 767, relating to the national farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Resolutions adopted by the Seventh District Democratic Farmer Labor Central Committee, Lake Park, Minn., relating to the national farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A petition signed by Walter E. McNulty, and 220 other patients of the Sunmount Veterans' Administration Hospital, at Tupper Lake, N.Y., favoring the continued operation of that hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the mayor and council of the city of Fort Gaines, Ga., favoring the designation of the lake created by the Walter F. George lock and dam as "Lake Winston Churchill"; to the Committee on Public Works.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Record the text of House Concurrent Resolution No. 3, which has been adopted by the 4th session of the South Dakota State Legislature, together with a statement prepared by him relating thereto.

There being no objection, the statement and concurrent resolution were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Mundt

This resolution requests the Governor of the State of South Dakota to proclaim the week of August 29, 1965, as Junior Legion Baseball Week. We in South Dakota are proud that our State is the birthplace of Junior Legion baseball, which this year is observing its 40th anniversary.

The Little World Series, representing the Nation's best Junior Legion baseball teams, will be played in South Dakota this year. The proclamation of Junior Legion Baseball Week is a fitting tribute to all young men who participate in Junior Legion baseball and to the fine sponsorship of the American Legion.

House Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution requesting the Governor to proclaim the week of August 29, 1965, as Junior Legion Baseball Week

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

Whereas South Dakota is the birthplace of Junior Legion baseball; and

Whereas this is the 40th anniversary of the birth of Junior Legion baseball; and

Whereas the Little World Series, representing the Nation's best Junior Legion baseball teams, will be played in South Dakota in 1965; and

Whereas Junior Legion baseball contributed directly to the physical, mental, and moral health of today's young men; and

Whereas the Little World Series, the young men who will participate in the event, and all Junior Legion baseball players merit the recognition and attention of the people of the State of South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Governor proclaim the week of August 29, 1965 as Junior Legion Baseball Week; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of South Dakota to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF MULLINS PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, MULLINS, S.C.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution of commendation in behalf of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as approved by the Presbytery of Pee Dee of the Presbyterian Church in the United States on January 26, 1965. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this eloquent tribute expressing gratitude for and confidence in the services of this great American patriot be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Resolution Commending J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Submitted by the Mullins Presbyterian Church, Mullins, S.C.

Whereas the constitution of our church provides that lower courts may propose to higher courts measures as may be of common advantage to the whole church; and

Whereas our Lord Jesus Christ testifies: "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them." (Matthew 5: 17); and

Whereas He said: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Mark 12: 17); and

Whereas the Apostle Paul testifies; "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God." (Romans 12: 1); and

Whereas the Apostle Peter testifies: "Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution, whether it be to the emperor as supreme, or to governors as sent by him to punish those who do wrong and to praise those who do right. For it is God's will that by doing right you should put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. Live as freemen, yet without using your freedom as a pretext for evil; but live as servants of God. Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the emperor." (I Peter 2: 13–17); and

Whereas the system of law and government in the United States of America is not less worthy of our obedient citizenship than the Roman system of the first century; and

Whereas for a period of 40 years the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under its director, J. Edgar Hoover, has performed an incomparably excellent service to God and to our Nation in the faithful exercise of the investigative authority it has under our system of justice; and

Whereas Mr. Hoover has always employed a policy of thoroughness, strict impartiality, and careful observance of the human rights and constitutional rights of all citizens in the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

Whereas this consistently faithful service has immeasurably fostered and sustained the cause of justice in behalf of all of the citizens of our country: Therefore

Resolved, That the Presbytery of Pee Dee of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, hereby gives thanks to God and highly commends our fellow Presbyterian servant of our Lord Jesus Christ, J. Edgar Hoover, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for their faithful, impartial, and excellent service in the cause of justice; and

That this Presbytery propose to the general assembly of our church at its next meeting that that court endorse this resolution as a testimony that is of common advantage to our whole church and to the cause of justice in our Nation.

At the direction of the session, convened January 25, 1965.

Respectfully submitted.

The Mullins Presbyterian Church,
J. Melvin England,
Pastor.
A. M. Counts,
Clerk of Session.

RESOLUTION OF INDIANA BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Indiana Broadcasters Association, relating to the proposed granting of superpower by the Federal Communications Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of Indiana Broadcasters Association

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission is now considering the granting of power as high as 500,000 watts for the 12 remaining class I clear channel stations; and

Whereas seven radio stations that presently operate with the maximum of 50,000 watts have requested licenses to operate with as much as 750,000 watts; and

Whereas the granting of superpower of this order to these stations, or to any clear channel station, would give them a dominant voice in the radio medium in dissemination of news, information, and viewpoints, and an overall competitive advantage in coverage, listeners, and potential advertising revenues, etc.; and

Whereas this action would result in widespread interference with the signals of smaller stations, and in severe adverse impact on the income and local public service potential of smaller stations everywhere; and

Whereas under the existing radio allocations system which has provided diverse media in medium and smaller sized communities in all areas of the country, this action is unnecessary and unwarranted, even for purposes of emergency defense communications: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Indiana Broadcasters Association joins many other State associations, independent industry groups (Association of Broadcasting Standards, Daytime

Broadcaster's Association, etc.) in registering unconditional opposition to this proposed granting of "superpower" by the FCC; and, further be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all members of the Federal Communications Commission, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, to the Members of the Congress from the State of Indiana, and to any other appointed or elected officials or groups interested in this action.

Done at Indianapolis, Ind., Monday, February 1, 1965, by the board of directors, Indiana Broadcasters Association, Inc.

Wm. Thomas Hamilton,
President.

Attest:

William C. Fowler,
Secretary treasurer.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 301. A bill to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics (Rept. No. 60).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 490. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 61).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 794. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 62).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 60. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 63).

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 491. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 64).

REPORT ENTITLED "REFUGEES FROM COMMUNISM IN ASIA" (S. REPT. NO. 59)

Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Refuges From Communism in Asia," which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Donald W. Hoagland, of Colorado, to be Assistant Administrator for Development Finance and Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 1050. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to authorize administrative expenses for State plans for an additional fiscal year; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear on p. 2187 of the Congressional Record, Monday, Feb. 8, 1965.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1051. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide, as a substitute for the existing requirement of production before 1830, that antiques may be imported free of duty if they exceed 100 years of age at the time of importation; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. McGee, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1052. A bill to establish an Office of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to act as a central clearinghouse in Government for consumer complaints; to disseminate information to consumers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1053. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Bartlett):

S. 1054. A bill to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the exvessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1055. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of New York):

S. 1056. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System and to increase the mileage in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1057. A bill to authorize the use of excess Government-owned foreign currencies to finance the establishment abroad of binational foundations for educational and scientific purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. Jordan of Idaho):

S. 1058. A bill to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1059. A bill for the relief of Mary E. Gregory Levin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1060. A bill for the relief of Gregorio Martin Domingo, Demetria Dizon Domingo, Marion Dizon Domingo, and Ray Dizon Domingo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1061. A bill for the relief of Margarida Rodrigues da Silva; and

S. 1062. A bill for the relief of Missionia Arsin Varjabedian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1063. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain amounts paid by a taxpayer for tuition and fees in providing a higher education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1064. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself and Mr. Robertson):

S. 1065. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1066. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the disposal of surplus material in the national stockpile pursuant to section 203(j) thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 1067. A bill for the relief of Young Kyun Kim; and

S. 1068. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Starr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. Morse, and Mr. Douglas):

S. 1069. A bill to amend section 604 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to prohibit the use of funds made available under such act for payment for petroleum products at prices in excess of competitive market prices, or for the payment of barter agents' commissions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1070. A bill to encourage preservation of the financial solvency of the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Miller when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1071. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1072. A bill to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include all the Riverton reclamation project and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1073. A bill for the relief of Maria Franginisot;

S. 1074. A bill for the relief of Sang-Aroon Choopunta;

S. 1075. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Schulz;

S. 1076. A bill for the relief of Kurush Shahbaz;

S. 1077. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Alex Avestruz;

S. 1078. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Eliseo Cidre;

S. 1079. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Manuel S. Lina; and

S. 1080. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mustaffa Muharrem Aksoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of New York):

S.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution providing for appropriate Federal recognition of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

TO PROVIDE A SUITABLE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM FOR SENATE CHAMBER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted a resolution (S. Res. 80) to provide a suitable electrical public address system for Senate Chamber, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) to insure that debates of the Senate may be heard in all parts of the Senate Chamber and in the galleries thereof, the Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized and directed to take such action as may be required for the installation and operation within the Senate Chamber of a suitable electrical public address system, including a microphone placed at the desk of the Presiding Officer and at the desk of each Senator.

(b) To the extent authorized by law, the expenses incurred for the installation and operation of such public address system may be defrayed from the contingent fund of the Senate.

ANTIQUES WHICH MAY BE IMPORTED FREE OF DUTY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the duty-free importation of certain antiques made at least 100 years prior to date of entry.

The tariff schedules of the United States presently provide for duty-free entry of certain antiques made prior to the year 1830, and this bill would substitute for this criterion a requirement that such articles may be made at least 100 years prior to date of entry.

The antiques provision in the free list of each of the several tariff acts preceding the Tariff Act of 1930 provided a minimum age requirement of 100 years at the time of importation. In the Tariff Act of 1930, however, there were substituted for this provision three definite dates for duty-free classification, that is, production prior to the year 1701 for rugs and carpets; 1801 for violins, violas, violoncellos, and double basses; and 1830 for the other antiques included in paragraph 1811 of the act.

In 1959, paragraph 1811 was amended by Public Law 86–262 to provide for the free entry of ethnographic objects made in traditional aboriginal styles. Instead of establishing a fixed year cutoff date for such articles, however, it was provided that they could be entered duty free if made at least 50 years prior to date of entry.

In the case of antiques generally, it is preferable to provide a criterion based on a certain number of years of age rather than on production prior to a fixed date.

As previously indicated, this practice was followed consistently prior to the enactment of the Tariff Act of 1930 and has been utilized more recently in Public Law 86–262 with respect to the ethnographic articles included in this proposed legislation. While the 1830 cutoff date established in the 1930 act did, in effect, provide at the time of its enactment an age requirement of 100 years, the provision has grown progressively more restrictive in the succeeding years. To be entitled to duty-free entry today under this provision, for example, an antique would have to have been made more than 134 years ago.

This proposal would provide a minimum age criterion with respect to those articles classifiable under the other antique provisions in the description immediately proceeding item 766.20 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. Duty-free treatment would thus be extended to such antiques if they were made at least 100 years prior to date of entry. This bill is consistent with the original action of Congress in providing for the duty-free status of antiques.

Legislation of this nature would be in keeping with present international practice. The enactment of this proposal would establish uniformity between the tariff treatment of antiques by the United States and by most of our principal trading partners; for example, the Europeon Economic Community, the United Kingdom, Japan, et cetera. This would serve in a minor way to further the purposes of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

It is my information that the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, as well as the U.S. Tariff Commission interpose no objection to a proposal of this nature.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1051) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide, as a substitute for the existing requirement of production before 1830, that antiques may be imported free of duty if they exceed 100 years of age at the time of importation, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED OFFICE OF CONSUMERS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish an independent Office of Consumers, headed by a Consumers Counsel, on behalf of myself and Senators Douglas, Gruening, Hartke, Inouye, Kennedy of New York, McGee, McIntyre, Metcalf, Mondale, Morse, Nelson, Neuberger, Pastore, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, and Young of Ohio.

The legislative history of the bill, thus far, must make interesting study for any class in political science. This is the third time a recognizable form of the bill has been introduced in the Senate. Seventeen Senators join me in sponsoring it today. In the past—when Senator Kefauver introduced the bill—the number has run as high as 21. Yet—with the exception of 2 days of hearings graciously arranged by then-Senator Hubert Humphrey—no action has been taken on the bill.

Indeed it is a puzzle why a bill with such advance support does not fare better in our legislative mill.

As I introduce the bill today, knowing the trials awaiting it, I take heart from the wisdom expressed by Victor Hugo:

> There is one thing stronger than all the armies in the world and that is an idea whose time has come.

As I read the stirrings in our country today, I am most hopeful that this bill—which could not be enacted into law in 1959—or 1961—may this year have reached its date with destiny.

There is no doubt in my mind that the consumers of America want the services which an Office of Consumers would give them. Also, I suspect that many Senators who found the idea sterile in 1959 will give it more serious consideration today because of the new awareness all of us have of a consumer identification spreading throughout America.

My reaction to demand for this Office from consumers is, frankly, "Why shouldn't they have it?" In brief, this Office would be expected to look out for the economic interests of American consumers. This it would do by seeing that the consumer viewpoint is considered in formation of Government policies, by serving as a clearinghouse for consumer complaints and by disseminating information beneficial to consumers.

In other words, the Office would provide a representative for the special interest group known as consumers. Several other special interest groups already have separate agencies representing their views in government. The Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor—although seeking always to balance group concern with the public interest—business, farmers, and workers respectively. But 190 million-plus consumers have no agency of their own representing them directly.

This we propose to remedy with this bill.

Mr. President, I want to make clear that introduction of the bill is in no way a criticism of the work being done by Mrs. Esther Peterson, special assistant to the President for consumer affairs, or of the Consumers Advisory Council.

On the contrary, their record has been impressive. However, their major responsibility is to advise the President; and, in general, the responsibilities and authority are more limited than the Consumers Counsel would be under the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 48 hours so that other Senators may join in cosponsoring it. Also, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the requests of the Senator from Michigan are granted.

The bill (S. 1052) to establish an Office of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to act as a central clearinghouse in Government for consumer complaints; to disseminate information to consumers; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Consumers Act of 1965".

OFFICE OF CONSUMERS ESTABLISHED

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established within the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the Office of Consumers (referred to hereinafter as the "Office").

(b) The Office shall be headed by a Consumers Counsel (referred to hereinafter as the "Counsel"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for officers of the class named in section 303(C) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964.

(c) There shall be in the Office an Associate Consumers Counsel (referred to hereinafter as the "Associate Counsel") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for officers of the class named in section 303(D) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. The Associate Counsel shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Counsel shall prescribe. During the absence or disability of the Counsel, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Counsel, the Associate Counsel shall act as Counsel.

(d) No officer or employee of the Office may engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while serving as such. No individual may be appointed or serve as an officer or employee of the Office—

(1) while he holds legal title to, or beneficial equitable interest in, share capital (A) exceeding in market value $ in any corporation engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of goods or services affecting consumers, or (B) exceeding in market value $ in more than one such corporation; or

(2) if within years he has served as an officer or director of any such corporation.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COUNSEL

SEC. 3. (a) The Counsel shall be responsible for the exercise of all powers and the discharge of all duties of the Office, and shall have authority to direct and supervise all personnel and activities thereof.

(b) The Counsel is authorized, subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be required for the performance of the functions of the Office.

(c) The Counsel may promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the functions vested in him or in the Office, and he may delegate authority for the performance of any such function to any officer or employee under his direction and supervision.

(d) The Counsel shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Office, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

(e) The Counsel shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include a comprehensive statement of the activities and accomplishments of the Office during the preceding calendar year, and such recommendations for additional legislation as he may determine to be necessary or desirable to protect the economic interests of consumers within the United States.

FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE

SEC. 4. (a) It is the duty of the Office in the performance of its functions, to protect and promote the interests of the people of the United States as consumers of goods and services made available to them through the trade and commerce of the United States.

(b) The functions of the Office include the following:

(1) To present the viewpoint of consumers of goods and services within the United States in the formulation of policies of the Government;

(2) To represent the economic interests of consumers of the United States in proceedings before courts and regulatory agencies of the United States to the extent to which authorization therefor is provided by section 5 of this Act;

(3) To conduct annually a National Consumers' Conference, to be attended by experts on consumer education and by representatives of organizations engaged in fostering and protecting the interests of consumers of goods and services within the United States, for the purpose of obtaining information, recommendations, and suggestions necessary or desirable for the effective performance of other functions of the Office.

(4) To receive, assemble, evaluate, act upon, and disseminate information helpful to consumers of the United States in performing their economic function more efficiently, including information concerning commercial and trade practices adversely affecting their economic interests, as provided by section 6 of this Act; and

(5) To perform such other functions as may be prescribed by law.

REPRESENTATION OF CONSUMERS

SEC. 5. (a) Whenever there is pending before any regulatory agency of the United States (as defined by section 10 of this Act) any matter or proceeding which does not involve the adjudication of the alleged violation, by any individual or corporation named as a defendant or respondent therein, of any statute of the United States or any rule or regulation promulgated thereunder, and the Counsel finds that the determination of such matter or proceeding may affect substantially the economic interests of consumers within the United States, the Office shall be entitled as a matter of right to intervene in such matter or proceeding as a party to represent the public interest of consumers by filing with such agency a duly certified copy of the finding so made by the Counsel. Upon any such intervention, the Office, through any officer or employee designated by the Counsel for that purpose, shall present to such regulatory agency, in conformity with the rules of practice and procedure thereof, such evidence, briefs, and argument as it shall determine to be necessary for the effective protection of the economic interests of such consumers.

(b) Whenever—

(1) there is pending before any regulatory agency of the United States any matter or proceeding relating to the trade or commerce of the United States which does involve the adjudication of the alleged violation, by any individual or corporation named as a defendant or respondent therein, of any statute of the United States, or any rule or regulation promulgated thereunder, or

(2) there is pending before any district court of the United States any matter or proceeding involving the trade or commerce of the United States to which the United States or any regulatory agency of the United States is a party,

the Office upon its own motion may, and upon written request made by the officer or employee of the United States or such regulatory agency who is charged with the duty of presenting the case for the Government in that matter or proceeding shall, certify to such officer or employee all evidence and information in the possession of the Office relevant to that matter or proceeding.

(c) Whenever there is pending before any appellate court of the United States any matter or proceeding involving the review of—

(1) an order or determination made by any regulatory agency of the United States relating to the trade or commerce of the United States, or

(2) any judgment, decree, or order entered by a district court of the United States in any civil action involving the trade or commerce of the United States,

and the Counsel finds that the action taken by the appellate court upon such review may affect substantially the economic interests of consumers within the United States, the Office, subject to the rules of practice and procedure of such appellate court, may make application to the court for leave to file in such matter or proceeding a brief as amicus curiae, or to present to the court oral argument therein, or both, except that no such application may be filed by the Office without the consent of the Attorney General in any matter or proceeding (A) to which the United States or any regulatory agency of the United States is a party, or (B) in which the Attorney General has been granted leave to intervene on behalf of the United States or any regulatory agency of the United States. Upon the filing by the Office of such application, supported by a duly certified copy of the finding so made by the Counsel and such other showing as the court may require to demonstrate that the action taken upon such review may substantially affect the economic interests of consumers within the United States, the appellate court in its discretion may grant such application.

(d) The Counsel or any other attorney of the Office specially designated by the Counsel for that purpose, shall be entitled to enter an appearance on behalf of the Office before any court (except the United States Supreme Court) or regulatory agency of the United States, without other compliance with any requirement for admission to practice before such court or agency, for the purpose of making any application or taking any action which is authorized by subsection (a), (b), or (c) of this section.

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS AND INFORMATION

Sec. 6. (a) It shall be the duty of the Office to receive from consumers of the United States, and to evaluate, complaints concerning commercial and trade practices employed in the production, distribution, and furnishing of goods and services to or for the use of such consumers which may be detrimental to their economic interests.

(b) Upon receipt of any complaint disclosing the use of any commercial or trade practice detrimental to the economic interests of consumers within the United States by any producer, distributor, or supplier of goods or services, the Office may transmit to such producer, distributor, or supplier written notice as to the nature of the practice concerning which complaint has been made, and shall take such other action within the authority of the Office as may be appropriate to secure for the complainant relief from such practice. If effective action to secure such relief for the complainant cannot be taken by the Office under authority conferred upon it, such complaint shall be transmitted by the Office to the department or agency of the United States whose regulatory or other authority provides the most effective available means to secure such relief for the complainant. That department or agency shall then consider the complaint so transmitted, take such action thereon as that department or agency shall determine to be appropriate, and transmit to the complainant a written reply describing the action so taken or, if no action is taken upon such complaint, the reason for its inaction. A copy of each such reply shall be transmitted to the Office.

(c) Whenever the Office receives from any source any information disclosing a probable violation of (1) any law of the United States, (2) any rule, regulation, or order of any administrative officer or regulatory agency of the United States, or (3) any judgment, decree, or order of any court of the United States, relating to the trade or commerce of the United States, the Office shall transmit promptly, to the officer or agency charged with the duty of enforcing such law, rule, regulation, order, judgment, or decree, for appropriate action, such evidence and information as the Office may have concerning such probable violation. It shall be the continuing duty of the Office to ascertain the nature and extent of action taken with regard to probable violations so reported.

(d) The Office shall publish from time to time and disseminate to the public, in such manner and form as the Office may determine to be most effective, information concerning—

(1) the functions and duties of the Office; and

(2) problems encountered by consumers generally within the United States, including particular commercial and trade practices which are detrimental to the economic interests of such consumers.

SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS

Sec. 7. (a) It shall be the duty of the Office, in the public interest—

(1) to conduct surveys and investigations with respect to the following matters—

(A) the productive capacity for, and the production of, goods affecting consumers within the United States;

(B) the systems and mechanisms in use for the distribution of such goods, and the effects thereof;

(C) the levels of prices for goods and services affecting consumers, the factors entering into their establishment, and their reasonableness;

(D) the quality and suitability of goods affecting consumers, and the factors influencing the quality and suitability of such goods; and

(E) the degree to which the trade and commerce of the United States succeeds in satisfying consumer needs for goods and services; and

(2) to analyze and disseminate to the public information through such investigations and surveys.

(b) In the conduct of surveys and investigations on such matters, the Office shall have power—

(1) to gather from any corporation engaged in commerce having assets exceeding $5,000,000 in value, and to compile, information which in the opinion of the Counsel is necessary for an adequate investigation, survey, or analysis of the matters specified in section 7(a)(1);

(2) to require any such corporation, or any division or subsidiary thereof, to file with the Office in such form as it may prescribe annual or special, or both annual and special, reports or answers in writing to specific questions, furnishing to the Office such information as it may require with regard to the matters described in section 7(a)(1), which reports and answers shall be made under oath if so prescribed by the Office, and shall be filed with the Office within such reasonable period as it may prescribe; and

(3) except as provided by subsection (c), to make public from time to time such portions of the information obtained by it hereunder as it deems expedient in the public interest, and to provide for the publication of its reports in such manner and form as may be best adapted for public information and use.

(c) Information received by the Office concerning the cost of production or distribution of any product by any such corporation, or any division or subsidiary thereof, may be made public only in a form which does not disclose such information with respect to any particular corporation, or any division or subsidiary thereof.

(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Office to engage in any program of testing for the purpose of determining, as among the products of different producers, the relative merits or suitability of products of any class or type.

(e) For the purpose of conducting surveys and investigations under this Act, the Office shall have all powers which are conferred upon the Federal Trade Commission by section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to the conduct of investigations made by that Commission under that Act, except that the Office may not grant to any person any immunity from prosecution, penalty, or forfeiture in accordance with the provisions of that section without first obtaining the written consent of the Attorney General and serving upon such person a duly certified copy of any consent therefor granted by the Attorney General. The provisions of section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act shall apply to the act or omission of any person, partnership, or corporation with regard to any subpena, order, requirement, or information of the Office to the same extent, and with the same effect, as if such act or omission had occurred with regard to a like subpena, order, or requirement, or with reference to like information, of the Federal Trade Commission.

CONSULTING SERVICE AND COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 8. (a) In the performance of its functions, the Office is authorized to—

(1) procure by contract services as provided by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates of compensation not exceeding $70 per diem for the personal services of individuals;

(2) appoint such advisory committees as it may determine to be necessary for the effective performance of its functions;

(3) designate representatives to serve on such committees as the Office may determine to be necessary or desirable to maintain effective liaison with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, or any State, and with nongovernmental organizations, engaged in activities related to the functions of the Office; and

(4) use the services, personnel, and facilities of other Federal, State, and private agencies and instrumentalities with the consent of such agencies and instrumentalities, with or without reimbursement therefor.

(b) Upon request made by the Counsel, each department, agency, and instrumentality of the United States is authorized and directed—

(1) to make its services, personnel, and facilities available to the greatest practicable extent to the Office in the performance of its functions; and

(2) subject to provisions of law and regulations relating to the classification of information in the interest of national security, to furnish to the Office such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics as the Counsel may determine to be necessary for the performance of the functions of the Office.

SAVING PROVISION

Sec. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, modify, or impair any provision of the antitrust laws, or of any Act providing for the regulation of the trade or commerce of the United States, or to prevent or impair the administration or enforcement of any such provision of law.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 10. As used in this Act—

(a) The terms "commerce" and "corporation" have the meaning given to such terms by section 4 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44);

(b) The term "regulatory agency of the United States" includes the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Maritime Board, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the United States Tariff Commission, and any other board, commission, or other agency of the United States hereafter established which is charged with administrative or regulatory duties with respect to the trade or commerce of the United States.

(c) The term "antitrust law" includes—

(1) each provision of law defined as one of the antitrust laws by section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 12), commonly known as the Clayton Act;

(2) the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.);

(3) section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1936 (49 Stat. 1528; 15 U.S.C. 13a), commonly known as the Robinson-Patman Act; and

(4) any statute hereafter enacted by the Congress which prohibits or makes available to the United States any remedy with respect to, any restraint upon or monopolization of commerce, or any unfair trade practice or unfair method of competition in or affecting commerce.

(d) The term "State" includes any State, territory, or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office such sums as may be required to carry into effect the provisions of this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a memorandum relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1053) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and memorandum, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a bill, "to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard."

This proposal results from the requirements of Public Law 88-45 which provided that no funds could be appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels or aircraft or the construction of shore or offshore establishments unless the appropriation of such funds had been authorized by legislation enacted after December 31, 1963.

This is the second bill to be submitted since adoption of the authorization procedure. The format of the bill has been changed somewhat from the previous bill submitted in order to present the information in a more meaningful manner and to conform the bill more closely to the practice followed by the Department of Defense in the submission of its authorization bills.

The Department has previously noted its understanding of the intention of the authorization bill, Public Law 88-45, to apply to major facilities and major constructions and not to the individual specification and authorization of minor facilities. The bill submitted herewith departs to a slight extent from this understanding, principally because of doubts engendered last year by the separation of the acquisition, construction, and improvement program into two parts, one requiring authorization and the other requiring no authorization. Although the bill may go somewhat further than the literal requirements of Public Law 88-45, the Department feels that it is more appropriate to include all items of the acquisition, construction, and improvement program.

With respect to what may be referred to as minor items, the bill does not itemize the aids to navigation projects or the advanced planning projects for which comparatively minor sums are required. The inclusion of all the items under these general headings would have unduly lengthened the bill. It should be noted that the authorization for aircraft includes replacement of existing aircraft as well as augmentation aircraft to enable the establishment or enlargement of aviation units. Additionally, it includes associated spare parts and ground support equipment.

There is attached a memorandum listing in summary form the procurement and construction programs for which appropriations would be authorized by the proposed bill. In further support of this legislation, the cognizant legislative committees will be furnished detailed information with respect to each program for which fund authorization is being requested in a form identical to that being submitted in explanation and justification of the budget request. Additionally, the Department will be prepared to submit any other data that the committees or their staffs may require.

It would be appreciated if you would lay this proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

Memorandum: Summary of fiscal year 1966, U.S. Coast Guard program for procurement of vessels and aircraft and for construction of shore and offshore establishments

VESSELS	
For procurement, extension of service life, and increasing capability of vessels:	
(A) Procurement:	
Three high-endurance cutters to replace three large overage cutters	$45,000,000
Four medium-endurance cutters to replace four overage patrol vessels	15,000,000
Two inland tenders to replace two overage, obsolete tenders	1,400,000
One medium-endurance vessel to enforce U.S. laws and international treaties in Alaskan waters	3,750,000
One river tender to service aids to navigation on the Missouri River (see item C4 below for barge conversion and item 16 under construction for mooring)	687,000
Three small patrol cutters to improve search and rescue coverage in areas of increased boating activity	1,105,000
(B) Extension of service life:	
Improve icebreakers by improved habitability, modifications to engine rooms and control areas and installation of helicopter hangar on one icebreaker	1,125,000
Enlarge operations center on four 255' high-endurance cutters	400,000
Rehabilitate one 183' reserve training vessel	$150,000
(C) Increasing capability:	
Install oceanographic equipment on nine high-endurance cutters to permit participation in national oceanographic program	720,000
Install secure communications equipment on seven high-endurance cutters to provide communications compatibility with the Navy	1,739,000
Improve two seagoing tenders by the installation of bow thrusters to permit increased mission accomplishment under adverse weather conditions	200,000
Convert one barge for aids to navigation servicing to be assigned to a Missouri River pusher tender (see item (a)5 above for tender construction)	40,000
Total vessels	71,316,000
AIRCRAFT	
For procurement of aircraft:	
Five medium-range helicopters and associated ground support equipment to replace overage helicopters	3,070,000
Four long-range helicopters to replace four overage fixed-wing amphibious airplanes	6,010,000
One long-range airplane to replace one overage electronic survey airplane	2,615,000
Eight medium-range helicopters and associated ground support for improved search and rescue protection in areas not adequately covered and to support existing fleet	4,803,000
Total aircraft	16,498,000
CONSTRUCTION	
For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following:	
Atlantic Coast: Offshore light platform at New York Harbor entrance to replace lightship	2,100,000
Air Station, New Orleans, La.: Hangar construction	1,071,000
Alaska: Hangar fire protection at Air Station, Annette Island, and landing pads for helicopters at various locations	402,000
Saugerties, N.Y.: Wharf, buoy maintenance shed, and an engineering and administration building for light attendant station	260,000
Station, Boothbay Harbor, Maine: Pier, barracks, messing, and operations building, and public family quarters	419,000

Memorandum: Summary of fiscal year 1966, U.S. Coast Guard program for procurement of vessels and aircraft and for construction of shore and offshore establishments—Con.

CONSTRUCTION—continued

For establishment, etc.—Con.	
Station, Ocean City, Md.: Provide moorings	$166,000
Rio Vista, Calif.: Barracks and messing building, operations, and administration building and small boat pier for multipurpose Coast Guard station	525,000
Electronics Engineering Station, Wildwood, N.J.: Administration - Laboratory building and supply building	257,000
Southern California: Communications facilities improvement	500,000
Base, Galveston, Tex.: Pier for medium-endurance cutter	480,000
Base, South Portland, Maine: Barracks, messing, administration, and operations building	453,000
Grand Isle, La.: Loran-A station	781,000
Station, New Castle, N.H.: Barracks and administration building and public family quarters	325,000
Station, Ilwaco, Wash.: Moorings, barracks, messing, and administration building, and public family quarters	965,000
Station, Avon, N.J.: Barracks building and public family quarters	553,000
Florence, Nebr.: Moorings for river tender (see item (A)5 for tender construction)	19,000
Base, New Orleans, La.: Barracks building and an administration and operations building on leased premises with long-term lease	1,320,000
Air Station, Elizabeth City, N.C.: Barracks building and sewage disposal facility	2,860,000
Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii: Barracks building	529,000
Yard, Curtis Bay, Md.: Replace crane	320,000
Station, Corpus Christi, Tex.: Wharf extension for medium-endurance cutter	274,000
Recruit training center, Cape May, N.J.: Barracks building	950,000
Recruit training center, Alameda, Calif.: Galley and mess hall building	971,000
Academy, New London, Conn.: Develop waterfront and other improvements	1,700,000
Various locations: Aids to navigation projects including, where necessary, advance planning and acquisition of sites	2,036,000
Various locations: Advance planning, construction design, architectural services, and acquisition of sites in connection with public works projects not otherwise authorized by law	1,200,000
Total shore and offshore establishments	21,436,000

VOICE BY FISHERMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS IN EX-VESSEL SALE OF FISH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from the State of Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit fishermen's organizations a voice in the ex-vessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends.

This legislative proposal is similar to the bill, S. 1135, which I introduced in the last Congress. Hearings were held on this legislation but no final action was taken because of the congested condition of the calendar.

The bill is designed to establish a sound economic relationship between fishermen, vessel owners, fish dealers, and canners and thereby further the development of the U.S. fishing industry and interest of the consumer.

As a result of the antitrust actions and Federal Trade Commission rulings about 10 years ago, many fishermen today find themselves in a legal no-man's land when it comes to bargaining collectively with fish buyers and vessel operators over the conditions and price under which they will deliver their fish. This uncertainty has created enormous difficulties in the effort to reach just and timely determinations of the disputes that have arisen between those most directly concerned with our fishing industry and the welfare of our fishermen.

It must be understood that the employment relationships in the fishing industry present a unique system and do not fit into the general pattern of labor relations law. Fishermen who depend upon arrangements between vessel owners or skippers and dealers or canners are not employees of the buyers of the fish and therefore have been unable to bargain directly with them. The fishermen are considered employees of the vessel owners or skippers. In this situation they must therefore depend solely upon the vessel owners' or skippers' success in obtaining a good price for the catch because the fishermen's wages are based on the share or lay system, which, of course, makes the fishermen's wages directly dependent upon the fish prices paid by the buyers of the fish.

The approach to the problem posed in this legislation has been carefully considered and I believe represents a proposal which will provide an excellent basis for full hearings in which all parties concerned may express their interest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1054) to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the ex-vessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PRESERVATION OF ANSLEY WILCOX HOUSE IN BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site.

It was in the library of this home at 641 Delaware Avenue that Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President on September 14, 1901, following the assassination of President William McKinley and is one of five sites outside of the Nation's Capital where presidential oath has been administered.

The singular character of its association with the Presidency warrants the preservation of Ansley Wilcox House by the Federal Government as it markedly reminds us of the remarkable continuity of Government in the United States under even the most tragic circumstances.

There is danger that the Wilcox House will be demolished. It would be tragic indeed if action were not taken to preserve it. Not only the citizens of Buffalo, but also many State and national organizations are supporting this movement to save the Wilcox House. I urge Congress to take action and make it a national historical site.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1055) to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCLUSION OF ROUTE 17 IN NEW YORK INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill introduced on behalf of myself and my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], to permit the 235-mile stretch of Route 17 Expressway between Binghampton, N.Y., and Lake Erie, to be included in the Interstate Highway System. The bill would permit States that, on their own initiative, built toll roads, bridges, and tunnels which were included as part of the Interstate Highway System prior to the introduction of this legislation to designate other routes of equivalent mileage for inclusion in the Interstate Highway System.

Similar measures will be introduced in the House today by Representatives CHARLES GOODELL and HOWARD ROBISON of New York.

Mr. President, this has been a longstanding problem which we have faced in the State of New York because such a very large stretch of the New York Throughway was built before the passage of the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

The bill I am introducing today would require the Secretary of Commerce, upon application of the Governor of an interested State, to approve substitute mileage in the Interstate Highway System, equivalent to the number of miles of toll roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State which had been approved as a part of the Interstate Highway System prior to the effective date of this legislation. The Congress has continually failed to apportion substitute miles for the parts of the Interstate System constructed by the States without Federal participation and subsequently incorporated in the Interstate Highway System. This measure is intended to rectify the injustice imposed upon States that initiated construction of major Interstate Highway projects and spent their own funds for such projects.

The Highway Act of 1956 authorizes construction of 41,000 miles of unified interstate, modern highways for the entire Nation. The Federal share of the costs for this 41,000 miles was set at 90 percent of the cost of toll-free roads, with the State contributing 10 percent. The 41,000 miles of highway to be built were selected on the basis of an interstate highway map adopted in 1947. At that time, New York State, as well as other States, decided the most intelligent and forward-looking approach to the ever-increasing demands for improved high-speed highway travel required that it proceed with the construction of the throughway system and not wait for the appropriation of Federal funds.

By June 30, 1957, New York State had completed almost 500 miles of expressway construction, which constituted more than 40 percent of the State's 1,227-mile Interstate Highway allocation. Moreover, not only did the Federal Government fail to provide significant financial assistance for the construction of the New York Thruway, but also mileage allocated to the thruway was deducted from the State's total allocation of mileage in the Interstate Highway System.

Because of this inequitable situation the very important Route 17, or Southern Tier Expressway, extending from Lake Erie to Binghamton, has not been included by the Secretary of Commerce in the Interstate System and the construction so far carried out on the Southern Tier Expressway has not been reimbursed on a 90-to-10-percent basis as permitted under the Federal Interstate Highway System.

It certainly does not seem just that States such as New York should have to forfeit a portion of their Interstate Highway allocation because they were not able to wait, because of heavily pressing transportation needs, for the appropriated Federal funds, but proceeded on their own to construct a major highway system. Under this bill the Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to add approximately 495 miles of badly needed highways to the interstate routes in New York and important additional mileage in other States.

The State of New York is the second largest contributor to Federal highway use taxes, but ranks only sixth among States in total interstate mileage. There is no reason why New York State and many other States who have shown their initiative in constructing badly needed roads should be denied a fair share of Federal assistance in their highway programs. The increased interstate mileage which this bill would authorize would not only contribute to the overall national requirement but would provide needed employment and stimulation to the economy of the entire Northeast.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed at the end of my remarks and ask that the bill lie on the table until the conclusion of business on February 18 so that interested Senators may have an opportunity to cosponsor it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1056) to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System and to increase the mileage in the Interstate System introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SECTION 132: Designation of additional routes for Interstate System

"(a) In the case of each State having a toll road, bridge, or tunnel, the construction of which was completed after August 7, 1947, and which was approved by the Secretary as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways before the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall on application by the Governor of the State, approve as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways additional routes, in an amount of mileage equivalent to said toll roads, bridges, or tunnels, in accordance with section 103 of this title which does not exceed in length the number of miles of all such toll roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State. The total of all Federal funds payable under this title for all routes in a State approved under this subsection as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed the percentage of cost of construction established in accordance with section 120 (c) and (d) of title 23 of the United States Code, computed in accordance with House Document 301, Eighty-fifth Congress, minus (1) all other Federal expenditures made on account of such highway, bridge, or tunnel, and (2) any construction costs not eligible for Federal financial assistance under title 23 of the United States Code.

"(b) In the case of each State having a free road, bridge, or tunnel which is a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, the construction of which was completed after August 7, 1947, and before June 29, 1956, or which, on June 29, 1956, was either in actual use, or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957, the Secretary shall on application by the Governor of the State, approve additional routes in an amount of mileage equivalent to said free roads, bridges, or tunnels in the Interstate System in accordance with section 103 of this title and which does not exceed in length the number of miles of all such free roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State. The total of all Federal funds payable under this title for all routes in a State approved under this subsection as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed the percentage of cost of construction established in accordance with section 120 (c) and (d) of title 23 of the United States Code, computed in accordance with House Document 301, Eighty-fifth Congress, minus (1) all other Federal expenditures made on account of such highway, bridge, or tunnel, and (2) any construction costs not eligible for Federal financial assistance under title 23 of the United States Code."

SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "plus the total of all mileage approved as part of the Interstate System under section 132 of this title."

SEC. 3. The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"132. Designation of additional routes for Interstate System."

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator JAVITS in introducing this measure. Because New York took the initiative in constructing its throughway before the interstate program came along, it has over the years been denied full participation in that program. The bill which we introduce today would repair this inequity, with the result, in New York's case, that other expressways deserving Federal participation on a 90- to 10-percent basis like Route 17 in the southern tier of the State, would now get Federal aid in that proportion. I think it is time we ceased penalizing New York and other States which took steps to meet the Nation's highway transportation needs before funds were appropriated for the Interstate Highway System.

ESTABLISHMENT OF BINATIONAL EDUCATION FOUNDATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which, if enacted by the Congress and approved by the President, could go a considerable distance toward helping resolve two of this country's most difficult and urgent problems in the field of foreign relations. These are: First, the complicated question of putting to use the large amounts of nonconvertible foreign currencies owned by the United States; and, second, the virtually unlimited requirement for education as a precursor of economic and social advances among the underdeveloped countries.

The bill which I introduce today provides that a portion of American-owned foreign currencies, which now exceed $3 billion in value, may be used to establish private binational educational foundations in those countries where such currencies are excess to the current and foreseeable needs of the United States.

If this bill is enacted, it would be possible, at small cost to the American taxpayer, to create in many countries private foundations devoted to the public interest. Americans well know the magnificent contributions to our Nation's life, education, and culture that have resulted from the work of such private institutions as the Carnegie Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and others. This bill will permit the United States, in cooperation with countries which now or in the future may have excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies, to establish foundations which can make comparable contributions to the internal intellectual and cultural growth of these countries. It will enable the United States to convert foreign currencies to purposes which would enhance the dignity and capacities of individuals in those countries.

There is nothing in this bill which forces anyone to do anything. It states quite simply that out of the roughly $3 billion of such nonconvertible foreign currencies as we now own, not to exceed $1 billion worth may be used to create binational education foundations. For example, if country X in which the United States owns $200 million worth of such currencies wishes, in cooperation with the United States, to use these funds to create a foundation in its country, it may do so. There is to be no pressure pushing any nation into such an agreement, however. If it wishes, these currencies may continue to lie fallow in the nation's vaults.

But should a nation where these excess currencies exist desire to create a binational foundation and thus put these funds to a constructive use, this bill sets the simple guidelines for creation of such an institution.

Operating in the general pattern established by American private foundations, these binational foundations would be able to use the income from the capital provided them for scholarships and travel within their respective countries, for internal educational and cultural projects, for the construction of educational and scientific facilities, for the translation and publication of books and magazines, and for similar type activities not involving expenditures abroad.

This bill makes it clear that these foundations are to be privately controlled with governmental participation. There is to be a binational board of directors, half to be American citizens and half to be citizens of the country where the foundation operates. There may be not to exceed two government employees from each country, but representatives of governments, as such, will be in the minority.

For the initial 5-year period of operations, this bill requires that such staff as may be chosen by the binational board is to be headed by a chief executive officer who is knowledgeable concerning the operations of American private foundations. The sole purpose of this requirement is to help nations desiring to create binational foundations to develop patterns of operations similar to those which have been so effective in the United States.

Now a few words are necessary for the purpose of trying to clarify the complicated foreign currency situation which forms the setting for this proposal. Long after that situation changed profoundly, we in the Congress still tended to talk of "counterpart" and "funny money" without much, if any, differentiation between currencies. From time to time we continue to receive proposals from colleagues for spending such currencies—but unfortunately in countries where they do not exist in surplus, so that dollars are needed to fulfill such intentions.

The fact is that we have gone from one extreme to another during the space of about a decade. At the beginning of the 1950's, when most foreign currencies were nonconvertible, the proposals for employing them were so numerous that the appropriations process was invoked to establish a greater—if not excessive—control over their use. Once created, this method of control was constantly enlarged until, at the start of the 1960's, we had reached a position where there were very few means of utilizing local currencies without first securing appropriated dollars with which to purchase them.

But this process largely took place without much attention being paid to the changing foreign currency picture. Now we are in a situation where the restraints operate not only in the great majority of countries where we do not possess local currencies excess to normal U.S. needs, but also in those seven or eight countries where we currently hold surpluses ranging from relatively modest to enormous in size. For the most part, we just cannot employ those surpluses under present circumstances.

Most of these nonconvertible currencies which we have in such excess have been deposited to the account of the United States as a result of the sales of our food surpluses for local currencies, and of such currency repayment of past dollar loans for development. When these foreign currencies come into U.S. accounts they usually cannot be spent except in the country of origin. While the United States has been able to use some of these funds for the operating expenses of embassies and other local charges, in a few countries there are local currencies in amounts far beyond our foreseeable requirements. These sums are a potential asset if they can be used in the countries where they were generated without their having an inflationary impact in those areas. However, except on a hit or miss basis, we have not used these currencies which are accumulating at a rate of over $100 million per year. These American assets are not only wasting as they suffer from the erosion of inflation, but they are becoming a source of political embarrassment in a few nations. Already charges have been heard in some countries that the United States "owns" a substantial proportion of their national currency.

What this bill would do would be to put these funds to mutually beneficial use in the countries where they originated. In the process it would enable such countries as desire the establishment of these foundations to learn how privately controlled institutions can operate for the total good of the country. While there naturally are obstacles to this course of action, to a substantial degree they are of a bookkeeping character which a little ingenuity and leadership should easily overcome.

I have suggested that creation of binational education foundations would not cost the American taxpayer any money. This must be qualified by noting that the appropriation of not to exceed $1 million is authorized for administrative expenses that might arise in connection with negotiation of agreements for the creation of such foundations.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that I can think of no more useful foreign policy action which we might take at the present time than to make possible the establishment of such foundations abroad. Promoting education and development in the free world certainly is, or ought to be, one of our primary tasks in the highly volatile international scene which we now confront—and are likely to be facing for some years into the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1057) to authorize the use of excess government-owned foreign currencies to finance the establishment abroad of binational foundations for educational and scientific purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POINT-OF-ORIGIN LABELING

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in District of Columbia grocery stores, Idaho russet potatoes are currently being sold at 79 cents for a 5-pound bag. Russet potatoes from other parts of the country sell for 63 cents and a similar quantity of round, white potatoes for 57 cents.

Naturally this variance in price which prevails all over the eastern seaboard is no accident. It is a result of lava ash soil, high altitude, warm days, cool nights, and the uncommon skill of Idaho producers, all combined in the superior Idaho potato which deserves the premium price it commands.

But this raises a temptation to the packer and repacker: If he can sell potatoes from other States as Idaho's, he can make a considerably larger profit. Until tasted, one potato looks the same as another to the average consumer. The misrepresentation is achieved quite easily by changing labels.

And such flagrant misrepresentation is not the only temptation. Idaho producers spend a great deal of money each year, and are even considering an additional assessment on themselves, to advertise their product. An increasing number of packers are capitalizing upon this advertising and misrepresenting, by inference, that potatoes actually grown elsewhere come from the fields of Idaho. They try to make the word "Idaho" a designation of variety, rather than a place of origin, claiming that the term "Idaho potato" is like "Irish potato"—an entirely inappropriate analogy, as any horticulturist can verify. Potatoes are sold as "Idaho russet potatoes" or "Idaho-type potatoes" with no designation of where the potatoes were grown.

These two types of misrepresentation, explicit and implicit, flourish to such an extent that, while Idaho ships 40,000 carloads of potatoes each year, a total of 80,000 are being sold as "Idaho potatoes," reliable sources estimate.

Misrepresentation occurs in most vegetable terminals of the United States, a fact known to many retailers. Recently my wife verified this fact for about the fifth time when she asked a grocery store manager for Idaho potatoes.

"I can get you potatoes which say 'Idaho' on them, but I won't guarantee that they are," was his reply.

This year has been no exception and may well have increased the deceptive practice. In 1963, Idaho produced over 5 billion pounds of potatoes, or about 20 percent of the total U.S. production. Idaho again leads in price in 1964, the crop being valued by the Department of Agriculture at over $120 million. This has made the practice of misrepresentation all the more lucrative.

The Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, which prohibits explicit misrepresentation, is little help in curbing the practice. It is difficult to administer, both because of the ease with which points of origin can be concealed and the number of inspectors required. This would not be the case if packers and repackers were required to label sacks and boxes by points of origin. The legislation I am about to submit would make this possible.

I intend to introduce the complete text momentarily, but summarizing the bill is quite simple. It provides that when a quantity of potatoes is sent into the retail markets, it shall bear the name of the State where is was grown. Until then—as when it is diverted into processing, packaged, or shipped within the trade before being sent to retail—no markings designating point of origin are necessary.

The purpose of the bill is twofold.

First. It allows the consumer to be the judge of quality by providing him with the facts. Without protection of this sort from the Government, he is buying a modern version of the "pig in a poke," even when the poke is a clear plastic bag.

Second. The bill would encourage the production of quality potatoes and competition based on quality. At present, when the products of all States are, in effect, dumped into an indiscriminate mass, quality is discouraged. Appearance counts more than cooking properties; proximity to the markets counts more than palatability.

That is why I believe that growers in most parts of the country should want this bill. Every potato State has reason to be proud of its potatoes and, accordingly, could benefit.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] I introduce the point-of-origin labeling bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1058) to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Potato Labeling Act".

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "State" means the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "interstate commerce" means commerce between any State or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State or the District of Columbia but through any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia.

(c) The term "potatoes" means potatoes of any variety included in the species solanum tuberosum and which are in a state generally considered as perishable, but not including potatoes which have been processed by cooking, freezing, peeling, drying, or canning, or by any other means which changes them from their natural state into a prepared food.

(d) The term "container" means the immediate container in which otherwise unpackaged potatoes are contained, including but not limited to sacks, bags, trays, crates, boxes, barrels, bulk boxes, display cases, bins, bulk cars, or trucks. Such term also means the master container in which any immediate container or containers may be packed.

(e) The term "invoice" means any written itemized list of potatoes sold, offered for sale, shipped, delivered for shipment, or consigned for selling or shipment in interstate commerce.

(f) The term "dealer" means any individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation engaged in the buying or selling of potatoes in wholesale or jobbing quantities, but such term shall not include any individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation which purchases potatoes solely for selling at retail if the total purchases of all perishable agricultural commodities (as defined in the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, as amended) made by the individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation in the preceding calendar year did not exceed $90,000.

(g) The term "wholesale or jobbing quantities" means two thousand or more pounds of all types of potatoes purchased or sold by any dealer in any day.

(h) The term "to pack" or "packed" means the placing of potatoes into containers for the purpose of sale, shipment, or display.

(i) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture or his designee.

(j) The term "State of origin" means the State in which any potatoes subject to the labeling provisions of this Act were produced.

(k) The term "label" means a display of written, printed, or graphic matter upon or attached to any container of potatoes in such a manner as to be readily seen under ordinary conditions of purchase.

(l) The term "repacker" means any individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation engaged in the packing of potatoes in containers for shipment or delivery to any wholesale or retail outlet after such potatoes have been previously shipped or delivered in containers one or more times.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, it shall be unlawful for any dealer to—

(1) sell or offer for sale,

(2) ship or deliver for shipment,

(3) receive and having so received, sell, offer for sale, or deliver or offer for delivery, or

(4) consign for selling or shipment,

any quantity of potatoes, if such transaction is in interstate commerce or directly or indirectly affects interstate commerce, unless the container in which such potatoes are packed bears a label which clearly indicates, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary, the State of origin of the potatoes and the name and address of the packer or repacker, and unless the invoice for such potatoes clearly indicates the State of origin of the potatoes and the name and address of the packer or repacker.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any dealer to sell, offer for sale, ship, deliver for shipment, or consign for selling or shipment any quantity of potatoes in a container labeled with more than one State of origin.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any person to detach, alter, deface, or destroy, in whole or in part, or to do any other act with respect to any label required under the provisions of this Act to be affixed to a container in which potatoes are packed if such act may defeat the purpose of this Act.

(d) The provisions of this Act shall not apply with respect to—

(1) potatoes officially certified as seed potatoes and tagged or otherwise appropriately identified by the official State potato certifying agency of the State concerned or by any other certifying agency approved by the Secretary;

(2) potatoes which have been sold, offered for sale, shipped, delivered for shipment, or consigned for selling or shipment in interstate commerce and which, prior to being offered for sale at retail, are to be processed by cooking, freezing, drying, canning, or in some other manner so as to change them from their natural state; or

(3) the transfer or delivery of potatoes from the farm on which they are produced to a temporary storage facility or packing shed, if such temporary storage facility or packing shed is not outside the area (as defined by the Secretary) in which such potatoes are produced.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this Act—

(a) Officers and employees designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials to the person in custody of any potatoes subject to the provisions of this Act, are authorized, at reasonable times, to inspect such potatoes and the containers in which they are packed.

(b) Carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and persons selling, shipping, or receiving potatoes subject to the provisions of this Act shall, upon the request of an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee, at reasonable times, to have access to and to copy all records relating to potatoes subject to the provisions of this Act and the quantity, shippers, and consignee thereof; and it shall be unlawful for any such carrier or person to fail to permit such access to and copying of any record so requested. Evidence obtained under this subsection shall not be used in a criminal prosecution of the person from whom obtained. Carriers shall not be subject to the other provisions of this Act by reason of their receipt, carriage, holding, or delivery of potatoes in the usual course of business as carriers.

(c) Dealers shall, from time to time on request of the Secretary, report to the Secretary such information and keep such records as the Secretary finds to be necessary to enable him to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such information shall be reported and such records shall be kept in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe. For the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any report made or record kept, or of obtaining information required to be furnished in any report, but not so furnished, the Secretary is hereby authorized to examine such books, papers, records, accounts, correspondence, contracts, documents, and memorandums as he has reason to believe are relevant and are within the control of such dealer.

SEC. 5. Any person who violates any provision of this Act or any rule or regulation promulgated under authority of this Act shall upon conviction thereof be fined not less than $100 or more than $1,000 or be imprisoned for not more than ninety days, or both; but for the second and subsequent offenses the penalty shall be a fine of not less than $500 or more than $3,000, or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both such imprisonment and fine.

SEC. 6. (a) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown and subject to the provisions of rule 65 (a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to restrain violations of this Act.

(b) In any proceeding for criminal contempt for violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this section, which violation also constitutes a violation of this Act, trial shall be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury. Such trial shall be conducted in accordance with the practice and procedure applicable in the case of proceedings subject to the provisions of rule 42(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

(c) All criminal proceedings and all injunction proceedings for the enforcement, or to restrain violations, of this Act shall be by and in the name of the United States. Subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the United States in any district may run into any other district in any such proceeding.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 9. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, in the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the Idaho congressional delegation joined to introduce legislation which required all fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown. Our combined efforts to obtain enactment of that legislation were unsuccessful, primarily due to the adverse report of the Department of Agriculture. Since then, we, our staffs and representatives of the Idaho potato industry have worked unceasingly to perfect our bill to overcome these objections. We have met with officials from the Department of Agriculture and attempted, with considerable success, I believe, to draft a new bill which would be administratively workable. Today, joining with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], I rise to offer legislation which is the culmination of that effort.

The purpose of this bill is simple. It provides for the labeling of all potatoes so that the ultimate consumer may know with certainty the State of origin of the potatoes he buys. The reason for such legislation is equally uncomplicated and, to my mind and I should think to the minds of all, highly desirable. It is to protect the consumer so that he may know he is buying a quality potato if that is what he wishes.

We are fortunate in Idaho. We have been blessed with an ideal soil, an abundance of water, beneficial temperature, and a people willing to spend long hours working the land. We have combined all these attributes and have grown in the Snake River Valley a quality potato, the Idaho potato, a potato which our growers and shippers are proud to offer the consumer, for we have the satisfaction of knowing it is the best that they can obtain.

But with this eminence, a new threat has arisen, the imitators are plying the marketplace, offering inferior potatoes as Idahos. Just last November, a field representative of the Idaho Potato and Onion Commission traveling through an eastern State discovered two seperate instances where potatoes from States other than Idaho were being repackaged for retail sales in polyethylene bags bearing the copyrighted seal "Grown in Idaho." These cases have been turned over to the U.S. Department of Agriculture for enforcement action. But even more alarming is the strong rumor that a bag-printing firm in that State is promiscuously printing the copyrighted seal, "Grown in Idaho" on potato bags and selling them to any buyer for repacking any type of potato. Our representative has been denied admission to that plant on several occasions. During that time Idaho russet potatoes were retailing for 69 cents for 5 pounds as compared to 69 cents for 10 pounds of other potatoes. This situation is of such concern to the potato growers and shippers in my State, that our attorney general has personally visited with the attorney general of this eastern State to see what might be done to stop this practice.

The immediate effect of these misrepresentations is, of course, the present dilution and loss of the sale of the Idaho potato. But the long-term effect will be even more damaging and is of far greater concern to my people. It will eventually cause the consumer to lose confidence in the quality of our potato; a confidence which has taken years and countless amounts of money to build.

The potato growers of Idaho by proposing this bill are asking only that the buyer who wishes to purchase a quality potato can be sure it is an Idaho potato. The entire Idaho congressional delegation urges its early consideration by Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I made in introducing the first "State of Origin" potato-labeling bill in the 88th Congress be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JORDAN OF IDAHO, OCTOBER 17, 1963

The bill is of extreme importance to my State of Idaho. Our potatoes are known throughout the whole country as potatoes which are different from all others. Why is this true? Without going into great detail, I will explain as follows: The great potato fields of Idaho are, for the most part, in the Snake River Valley. There the soil is volcanic ash, rich in nitrogen. Until irrigation came to this section of the country, little was grown in this soil. Now, however, this is practically all potato country—Idaho potato country. And it is no fable that a potato of just as high a quality grown anywhere else in the country will not be like an Idaho potato.

When potatoes are planted, which I am sure many of you know, old potatoes are cut up so that each piece has at least one eye. These pieces with the eyes are then planted and the new potato plants will grow from them. You could literally take an Idaho russet, cut it up in pieces—each with an eye—and plant half of the pieces in the potato country in Idaho and the other half of the pieces back here in the East, and the plants that grow from the two different groups of pieces would produce potatoes which would taste differently. That would be true even if all other growing conditions were equal—cultivation, irrigation, and so forth. The substances in the soils would make the difference. A true Idaho potato cannot be grown anywhere but in the type soil that is found in the State of Idaho and in one county in the State of Oregon.

We in Idaho have capitalized on this one fact. Our success in past years with growing and merchandising Idaho russet potatoes has been the envy of all potato-producing areas. We have, through untiring efforts and the expenditure of innumerable dollars, produced and sold a quality potato, a premium potato, and a different potato—and it is known as an Idaho potato. Because of our belief in the quality of the potato we produce and market, we have consistently opposed legislation to provide acreage allotment controls for potatoes; we have consistently refused to sacrifice quality for quantity; and we have consistently put our faith in the demands and the preference of the consumer for a quality product.

But, although it has been the people of Idaho who have invested their time, money, and efforts into building up the reputation of the quality Idaho potato, people in other areas many times have benefited just as much from Idaho's efforts. That is because they in other areas sell their potatoes as "Idaho potatoes" when they are not.

Often this is the case. When you have a quality product, inferior imitations soon enter the marketplace. Some even lend greater credulity and strength to the quality product. But such has not been the case so far as the Idaho potato is concerned. In this situation, competition and imitation have taken the form of misrepresentations and fraud; and as a consequence, the Idaho potato market has suffered.

It is impossible to enter any market in this country today to buy an Idaho potato and be certain that you are getting an Idaho potato—even though the bag may be clearly marked, "Idaho," or, "grown in Idaho." Housewives do not like this; I do not like this; and most definitely the people of Idaho do not like this.

In the past years it has become common practice to put inferior potatoes grown elsewhere into plastic bags clearly marked that the potatoes were grown in Idaho. That increases the profit margin of the potatoes being sold. Some producer somewhere else in the country, by deceit and fraud, is reaping part of the benefits brought about by the hard work and the devotion to quality of the potato growers in the State of Idaho. In addition, such a misrepresentation has a twofold effect on my State's tubers—it degrades the high quality of our potatoes, and it cuts appreciably into the sales of our potatoes.

There are now laws on the statute books which do make some attempt to prohibit this misrepresentation. But for every bag, every potato that is found to be mislabeled, hundreds, even thousands more go undetected.

At the request of the Idaho potato industry, I gladly join in sponsoring with the senior Senator from Idaho this bill which will effectively outlaw such reprehensible practices. The purpose of the bill is simple: It requires only that all potatoes be labeled as to the State of origin. It is hoped that such labeling will totally eliminate any and all misrepresentations to the buying public.

This bill has the endorsement of the entire potato industry of Idaho, and has been thoroughly examined and approved by the Idaho Potato and Onion Commission. It is a bill which has been the subject of many meetings and of every possible consideration. Frankly, it also has the endorsement of most of the other major potato-producing States, for it is equally important to them that the potato industry as a whole should not fall into disrepute with the consuming public.

Since a new crop of quality Idaho potatoes will soon be harvested, it is my hope that this bill will receive the earliest possible consideration.

INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN AMOUNTS PAID BY A TAXPAYER FOR TUITION AND FEES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill, the purpose of which is to allow a deduction for certain amounts paid by a taxpayer for tuition and fees in providing a higher education for himself, his spouse and his dependents.

The measure, in the case of an individual, would allow as a deduction amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year to an institution of higher education for first, tuition and fees required for the attendance of the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent at such institution; and, second, fees required for courses of instruction in which the taxpayer, his spouse or a dependent is enrolled at such institution.

The measure provides certain limitations, namely, a deduction shall be allowed for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees with respect to any one individual only to the extent that such amounts do not exceed $600.

It is obvious that the battle for educational superiority has been on for some time. This is a battle which must be won by us if we and the free world are to continue to survive. There is no question in my mind but that if we all put our shoulders to the wheel we will win this battle.

One of the ways in which we can make a major contribution is to provide tax relief for parents sending their children to college. All of us know that increasing costs of living are placing a heavy burden on parents throughout the country who are exerting every effort to provide their children with a higher education. It is a backbreaking effort on the part of many of them. Some have already reached the point where they are no longer able to carry on this effort. As a result many deserving children having the mental capacity to attend a university or college find it necessary to seek employment and forgo this opportunity.

We have reached a point today where tax relief in this category is now both necessary and desirable because in encouraging parents to provide higher education for their children, we are making a great contribution to, and an investment in the security and future wellbeing of the United States. It is an investment which will pay off dividends now and continue to pay off dividends in the future. In addition, it is a means by which all of us can indirectly assist in winning the battle for educational superiority, a battle which must be won if we are to achieve supremacy in this area.

The proposed legislation is directly related to our overall program which must be undertaken in the field of education and basic research. The measure will most certainly make it easier for many parents in low income brackets to afford to give their children the benefit of higher education. The talents of many of these youths in the scientific and engineering field are presently being lost to the Nation at a time when it is most important to the national interest to encourage them to follow through in these fields of endeavor. We must utilize to the maximum degree the potential brain capacity of this Nation of ours if we are to effectively take our part in preserving and strengthening this great country and the free world.

Mr. President, I sincerely trust that this measure will be acted on promptly and favorably by this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1063) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain amounts paid by a taxpayer for tuition and fees in providing a higher education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SOURCES ACT OF 1949

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, last year, I sought to amend the bill, S. 2272, to give educational and health institutions the same chance to acquire stockpiled material, found surplus due to changed needs, that they have to acquire other surplus Federal property.

I did not reintroduce that amendment, on which a majority of my colleagues commented favorably in letters to me. Instead, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, under which surplus property, which cost more than $4.4 billion to acquire, has been turned over to educational and health institutions in all 50 States.

My amendment would extend the act, basic to a major program of Federal aid to educational and health institutions, to include material in our stockpiles hereafter declared surplus.

I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1066) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the disposal of surplus material in the national stockpile pursuant to section 203(j) thereof, introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any material contained in the national stockpile, established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98a–h), of any material heretofore or hereafter placed in the supplemental stockpile, established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), or any material heretofore or hereafter acquired pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 2061–2166), and which is determined to be no longer needed (as provided in the appropriate Act) for the purposes of the Act under which such material was acquired, or is otherwise determined to be available for disposal, shall be available for disposal as surplus property under subsection (j) of this section for the purposes described in paragraph (3) thereof. Disposal of any such material may not be made under any of the Acts referred to above if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has determined that such material is usable and necessary for disposal as surplus property under subsection (j) of this section for any purpose described in paragraph (3) thereof, or until the Secretary has determined that such material is not usable and necessary for disposal under subsection (j) for any such purpose. The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any material disposed of pursuant to section 3(d) or section 5 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98b(d) and 98d)."

(b) The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the third month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, before preparing my amendment during the 88th Congress, I looked for proof that surplus material in the national stockpile could indeed be useful to schools and hospitals now receiving Federal surplus property under the donable surplus property program. I also tried to determine the administrative problems which could result from an extension of the donable surplus property program and their bearing on the feasibility of such an extension.

My research shows that the donable surplus property program has been an unqualified success and offers a readily adaptable framework for expansion. In a letter to each Senator, as well as in a Senate speech on June 23, 1964, I itemized the benefits each State has received from the donable surplus program since 1946. I found that more than $4.4 billion worth of Federal aid to education and health institutions had been received by the various States through a program which is largely administered by the States.

My bill would expand this already successful program by including raw materials in the national stockpile found surplus to present needs. In an effort to find out just how effectively such raw materials could be used by schools and hospitals I worked with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, asking various education centers and hospitals to evaluate my proposal. In addition, I was advised by the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property. The consensus was that surplus raw materials could be used profitably by educational and health institutions. They would be especially valuable to small institutions operating on limited budgets. An extensive account of the response I received from these sources may be found in my remarks in the RECORD of September 29, 1964.

Much of the material in the stockpile, which can be offered these institutions only if my bill is passed, could be effectively used by colleges and universities. This is particularly important when a major, and increasing part of publicly financed research and development is going to so-called centers of academic excellence. I feel deeply that it would be in the national interest to help maintain existing centers and to develop more.

My investigation indicates that the administrative requirements of my proposal can be absorbed by the existing donable surplus program, thus maintaining maximum efficiency in the disposal of surplus raw materials. In my Senate speech of September 23, 1964, I cited a report from the Defense Supply Agency of the Department of Defense which states that the donation of surplus materials by the Defense Supply Agency takes 35 days less than sale of these materials by the General Services Administration.

Mr. President, approval of my bill would be in the public interest in education and health, in industry, and economic development. Public property, purchased with public funds to meet a public need, is worth much more to public institutions than it is to junk dealers. The donable surplus property program has provided our hard-pressed schools and hospitals with land and equipment they could not have afforded. It has helped to educate our youngsters and to care for the sick and injured. Modification of surplus equipment for classroom use has challenged the students and the teachers. The program has stimulated research in the national interest. In many cases, research has led to production contracts, profitable to the school and the surrounding business community. The program has created new markets—for experience has shown that a research program, begun with donated material, does not end when that material is gone. Rather, the institution goes into the open market and buys new material. The donable surplus property program has been an outstanding success. It should be extended to include material in the stockpile found to be surplus to need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several statements I made in the last Congress in support of this amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 23, 1964]

AMENDMENT OF MATERIALS RESERVE AND STOCKPILE ACT OF 1964 TO PROVIDE FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATIONAL AND HEALTH INSTITUTIONS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on April 24, I gave notice that I would seek to amend S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, to increase substantially a major program of Federal aid to our Nation's educational and health institutions.

The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has contributed greatly by reporting the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act, and has wisely handled that very complex situation.

However, my amendment would provide that material in the national stockpile, found to be surplus to present need, could be released only after it had been offered for donation to schools and hospitals under the donable surplus property program on the same basis as other Federal surplus property. The amendment has been redrafted, in order to conform to the bill as reported.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the language of the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"On page 30, line 5, immediately after 'paragraph 6', insert: 'and to the provisions of section 203(j),'."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, when he was Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming stated that the donable program is one of the most important aids to education in the United States. This was borne out by statements from educators from throughout the United States at a hearing held on April 3, 1962, by the Special Donable Property Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations.

From 1946 through June 30, 1963, this program has made personal and real property with a total acquisition cost of almost $4.4 billion available to public health and education institutions and civil defense organizations in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and Guam. I ask unanimous consent that a table, breaking down this total by States be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

TABLE I.—*Personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, 1946 through June 30, 1963* (*acquisition cost*)

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$3,477,310,878	$915,311,016	$4,392,621,894
Alabama	99,818,802	15,400,007	115,218,809
Alaska	7,754,128	3,268,815	11,022,943
Arizona	33,252,813	8,301,591	41,554,404
Arkansas	35,628,759	27,409,045	63,037,804
California	407,144,138	68,286,378	475,430,516
Colorado	39,194,478	11,725,401	50,919,879
Connecticut	47,758,107	2,625,234	50,383,341
Delaware	12,184,060	2,433,651	14,617,711
Florida	125,967,607	33,510,919	159,478,526
Georgia	103,383,062	18,793,859	122,176,921
Hawaii	16,685,074	3,249,817	19,934,891
Idaho	20,145,669	22,337,101	42,482,770
Illinois	124,395,205	22,746,571	147,141,776
Indiana	72.900.642	3,918,166	76,818,808
Iowa	33,274,957	2,587,699	35,862,656
Kansas	36,588,564	9,690,299	46,278,863
Kentucky	61,467,556	4,527,044	65,994,600
Louisiana	52,506,895	14,362,119	66,869,014
Maine	25,344,762	3,783,216	29,127,978
Maryland	77,816,053	3,941,416	81,757,469
Massachusetts	114,533,978	31,474,948	146,008,926
Michigan	91,137,556	22,839,485	113,977,041
Minnesota	46,765,289	45,685,075	92,450,364
Mississippi	66,524,484	43,780,694	110,305,178
Missouri	60,656,189	37,022,591	97,678,780
Montana	14,663,602	536,970	15,200,572
Nebraska	28,719,501	5,852,083	34,571,584
Nevada	$9,060,058	$2,323,156	$11,383,214
New Hampshire	14,228,548	-----	14,228,548
New Jersey	59,489,045	916,863	60,405,908
New Mexico	25,353,629	9,581,885	34,935,514
New York	222,944,345	83,556,857	306,501,202
North Carolina	100,610,986	20,875,476	121,486,462
North Dakota	9,099,328	1,189,524	10,288,852
Ohio	133,056,369	12,350,702	145,407,071
Oklahoma	68,371,360	70,316,650	138,688,010
Oregon	54,105,602	14,820,737	68,926,339
Pennsylvania	159,619,165	4,552,450	164,171,615
Rhode Island	21,145,402	359,143	21,504,545
South Carolina	58,978,550	10,018,847	68,997,397
South Dakota	15,121,099	2,083,534	17,204,633
Tennessee	81,261,005	9,784,191	91,045,196
Texas	170,915,831	150,304,155	321,219,986
Utah	46,372,665	4,731,829	51,104,494
Vermont	12,313,146	69,911	12,383,057
Virginia	102,107,948	19,794,080	121,902,028
Washington	96,484,384	20,747,262	117,231,646
West Virginia	41,968,614	2,357,157	44,325,771
Wisconsin	68,118,178	1,528,420	69,646,598
Wyoming	10,230,110	1,637,206	11,867,316
District of Columbia	20,671,109	456,234	21,127,343
Puerto Rico	19,424,317	854,705	20,279,022
Virgin Islands	47,655	3,848	51,503
American Samoa	500	-----	500
Guam	-----	6,000	6,000

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during the most recent year for which I have a report, that ended with June 30, 1961, exactly 4,530 health and 32,673 education institutions participated in the donable surplus property program. I ask unanimous consent to have that report, a State-by-State total furnished by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

"TABLE II.—*Institutions participating in donable surplus property program during the year ended June 30, 1961*

"States	Health	Education
National total	4,530	32,673
Alabama	82	1,274
Alaska	11	29
Arizona	32	750
Arkansas	63	490
California	268	1,901
Colorado	81	361
Connecticut	37	204
Delaware	10	60
District of Columbia	8	256
Florida	111	112
Georgia	397	3,354
Hawaii	23	258
Idaho	31	138
Illinois	354	1,803
Indiana	100	979
Iowa	88	559
Kansas	97	829
Kentucky	131	447
Louisiana	42	350
Maine	51	167
Maryland	56	284
Massachusetts	125	602
Michigan	123	767
Minnesota	79	637
Mississippi	80	554
Missouri	100	646
Montana	37	225
Nebraska	66	471
Nevada	(1)	(1)
New Hampshire	33	134
New Jersey	32	1,127
New Mexico	10	95
New York	150	1,974
North Carolina	117	1,025
North Dakota	40	364
Ohio	105	486
Oklahoma	91	1,122
Oregon	84	519
Pennsylvania	258	1,556
Puerto Rico	22	24
Rhode Island	26	147
South Carolina	70	1,070
South Dakota	48	210
Tennessee	151	237
Texas	164	1,466
Utah	29	66
Vermont	31	540
Virginia	24	145
Virgin Islands	(1)	(1)
Washington	130	539
West Virginia	48	93
Wisconsin	159	1,107
Wyoming	25	120

"[1] No report received."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the House subcommittee hearing of April 3, 1962, entitled "Evaluation of the Donable Surplus Property Program," includes testimony by Members of the Senate and the House and educators.

Among the latter were Dr. Alan S. Wilson, vice chancellor for administration, University of Hartford, Hartford, Conn., and Frank M. Brewster, director of vocational education, Norfolk County Schools, Norfolk, Va.

Because both made outstanding contributions to the record, I ask unanimous consent that their testimony before the subcommittee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF DR. ALAN S. WILSON, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD, HARTFORD, CONN.

"During the past 29 years I have held administrative positions in three different colleges and universities located in the Midwest and New England. During these years I have served as dean, college president, and now vice chancellor of the university. For the past 10 years, one of my responsibilities has been that of executive head of the Ward School of Electronics, a separate technical institute maintained by the University of Hartford.

"From a small beginning in 1952, the Ward School, aided by the indispensable help it received from Federal donable property, has equipped its laboratories and classrooms and has given instruction to approximately 5,000 young men who have been urgently needed to fill military and civilian jobs in the critical field of electronics. The graduates of the 2-year program of the Ward School are eagerly sought by the Atomic Energy Commission, our military establishments, and more than 150 business and industrial firms involved in defense and civilian work essential to the safety and well-being of our Nation. Among the companies seeking our graduates are the General Electric Corp., Westinghouse, General Dynamics, International Business Machines, Raytheon, and the United Aircraft Corp.

"From my position in the educational field I believe the value of surplus property the Federal Government has given schools and colleges cannot be overestimated. In a material sense this program has made it possible for us to develop technical education in our area to a point not possible with our limited financial resources.

"For instance, such equipment has enabled us to give laboratory demonstrations of the latest methods for using synchromechanisms, computer logic, and recording instruments for automatic processes. It means we are now able to provide more and better education for each classroom- and laboratory-hour than was before possible.

"In addition to the material assistance provided, surplus property has given our teaching staff a special challenge since almost none of the equipment could be used in the condition in which it was received. The result has been that our most able instructors have converted and redesigned surplus equipment to illustrate technical principles and while doing so have themselves been instructed.

"The case is parallel to that of a man who buys a readymade suit as opposed to the one who cuts the fabric and sews it together himself. This need, to reason out the practical applications of scientific theory, has helped our facility to improve themselves professionally. This would not have been the case if we could have afforded to purchase readymade equipment.

"As the defense effort makes use of the most advanced engineering principles, such equipment, when it is no longer serviceable to the Government, is still on a level with the most advanced practices in industry. The result is that we are able to prepare students who are trained in the latest techniques applicable to the armed services and industry.

"This has made it possible to reduce the cost of industrial training to students, parents, and the public, since our graduates have been exposed to the latest type of equipment which industry is presently using. This is especially true of electronics and automatic control devices. I may say this field is changing very rapidly, and we cannot hope to keep up with the new equipment we would need if this material was not made available to us under this program.

"Because the surplus property we receive usually requires expensive labor for conversion to make it applicable for industrial use, any return derived from its sale on the open market would be small in comparison to its value to American education. In the first place, purchasers would only be able and willing to pay a fraction of the cost of components simply because there would be a labor cost in disassembling and converting these components for resale. On the other hand, students can do this at no cost and learn while doing. Second, if such equipment should become more plentiful, the commercial market demand would diminish and the unit price for such materials in adequate supply would reduce even further the unit return to the Government.

"Perhaps the greatest value of all, however, is the intangible one, the feedback of technical knowledge through students and graduates into our industrial and military efforts. The need for technicians has been widely publicized. It would have been prohibitively expensive to have given our technical school graduates the practical experience which has made them so valuable to our defense effort without our having received these surplus materials.

"We know of at least one of our graduates who is the manager of a satellite tracking station; several who are employed in computer work at Cape Kennedy; another student who has contributed to the development of the latest jet engine; one who is an instructor on the Atlas engine; other students who have been employed directly upon graduation with CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) and the FAA (Federal Aviation Agency). One of our students solved a computer problem for the Ordnance Department and is now manager of a major military installation in Philadelphia.

"Perhaps the most spectacular evidence of the value of such training is the information, just received, that a Ward School graduate designed the communications system for the now famous satellite "Friendship 7" in which Col. John Glenn made his historic flight. This graduate has since been recruited from his industrial job to work for the Federal Government in an important defense capacity. You might also be interested to know that approximately 15 percent of the instructors in technical theory in the technical institutes of this country have been recommissioned and are teaching reservists how to apply this important technical knowledge to defense needs.

"The contribution of surplus Federal property, therefore, becomes not an expense to the people, in my judgment, but an investment in knowledge and an economical means for training youth for essential positions in our defense effort.

"The Ward School of Electronics is but one example of what can be done through the conversion of Federal surplus property into equipment necessary to improve the scientific and technical competence of the youth of our Nation. The faculty of this school is serving without remuneration as consultants to industry and the Federal Government on the conversion of donable property for educational and allied uses.

"We have made tentative plans for a summer workshop in 1963 to instruct high school science teachers, hospital administrators, and directors of civilian defense, how good Yankee ingenuity and effort can convert obsolete or discarded equipment to serve essential public needs. The continuance of the Ward School and hundreds of similar public and private technical institutes, junior and community colleges, could be seriously threatened if any change is made in present provisions for the distribution of Federal surplus property to schools for educational purposes.

"I should also like to say a brief word about other ways in which the University of Hartford has benefited from this program. To meet the increasing demand for education, this institution expanded from a junior college in 1947 to a senior college in 1950 and is now a fully accredited university serving more than 6,000 local students annually. In my judgment, this development would not have been possible without the donable materials this institution received, such as: used desks and chairs from abandoned military camps, tools, paint, a battered Marine truck, the first bit of rolling stock we ever had, badly shot up, but we were delighted to have it and used it for several years until it finally fell apart, bookcases, machine tools, tired typewriters, electronic gear, stuttering adding machines, and even surplus textbooks with which we augmented our then small library. Throughout this period this equipment had been heavily used both day and night, and now much has worn out for the second time. With imagination and the untiring effort of the faculty and students, similar items which are given to us are being converted into serviceable equipment each month to enable us to carry on our educational program. At first, this helped returning GI's, but now it is their children who are already reaching our doors in increasing numbers, who need this help.

"Frankly, we are proud of our record of converting to essential educational use obsolete materials which could no longer usefully serve their original purpose.

"As the one in charge of the financial operations of our institution, I know how desperately near the brink it and many of our fine accredited nonprofit colleges are today. What we have been able to save through building equipment from Government surplus has helped tremendously to pay faculty salaries. This program has given us scientific equipment in chemistry, physics, and biology laboratories, and also made possible the development of a good school of engineering which now serves 900 students from southwestern New England.

"In the decade ahead, higher education in America will be called upon to provide facilities for 7 million students, an increase of over 100 percent from today's number. This unprecedented pressure for education will sorely tax the facilities of public and private institutions alike. Speaking for higher education and especially for that part which I know best, the urban universities and community colleges, I feel that the continuation of present provisions for Federal donable surplus property would be one of the best and least costly ways in which the Federal Government could play a useful role in helping meet the ever-growing educational needs of America's youth.

"I say in all sincerity that every dollar in surplus property which the Federal Government contributes to institutions of higher education saves from $10 to $100 for these educational institutions and returns full value to the taxpayer for many years to come. In requesting this, we are not asking much from the Federal Government. Education is used to receiving, often all too willingly, castoffs of any kind which help it to better serve our youth.

"We sincerely hope that members of this committee, in your wisdom and understanding, will vigorously and unanimously oppose any effort to stop, or even to slow, this vital stream of indispensable material necessary to the support of the schools, colleges, hospitals, and civil defense agencies of our Nation."

"EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF FRANK M. BREWSTER, DIRECTOR OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, NORFOLK COUNTY SCHOOLS, NORFOLK, VA.

"Adjacent to three cities, Norfolk County is located in the southeast section of Virginia. Norfolk County schools have approximately 16,000 pupils in 21 schools. New schools are under construction for the growing school population.

"All schools are accredited by the cognizant accrediting agencies. Mr. Edwin W. Chittum is division superintendent.

"This school system takes an active part in utilizing donable surplus property.

"For effective utilization—

"1. The division superintendent and school board must be sympathetic to the donation program and provide funds, personnel, transportation, and moral support.

"2. Material must be available in usable quantities and distributeed to teachers as required.

"3. A designated person must promote use of materials by demonstrating or suggesting at least one use. Teachers often immediately see other uses and develop additional ideas.

"4. Materials utilized should be displayed to other teachers, principals, and supervisors.

"5. Materials should enhance or enrich the instructional program.

"There are many kinds of people, with varied intelligence, interests, abilities, and goals teaching in our public schools. Some of these people, when advised that surplus Government property is available, have one comment, 'Surplus property is junk.' That is the extent of their activity in any program using this material. As long as these people believe their own statements, it is junk and has little value. There is no convincing some of these people that the disconnected, cosmoline covered, stripped machine lathe can be activated by cleaning, wiring, and the addition of a few accessories to be a teaching tool that hundreds of boys may use in learning about properties of metal, methods of processing, and machine operation, because one teacher had sufficient interest and energy to reactivate this machine as a teaching tool.

"The cumbersome bat of blue styrofoam that the Navy Department procured for flotation material, has no place in a classroom. Who can use a piece of material 4 inches by 12 inches by 9 feet? Many can find no use for this bat that is taller than the ceiling. However, an art teacher makes Christmas tree ornaments, figurines, mobiles, bases for other media; a business education teacher directs her club in designing an emblem; a teacher of engineering drafting uses this styrofoam as a three dimensional media to portray parts of a machine for his students. A student becomes interested in this material, and he makes a sign for the department.

"In a special education class the teacher searches constantly for materials her handicapped children can use to coordinate hands and minds. Cutting and shaping this material is not difficult for these children.

"A homemaking teacher uses this styrofoam in teaching flower and dry arrangements.

"A printing student thinks that a block of this material is an excellent toolholder.

"As we use donable surplus property we find that donable property falls into one of three main categories.

"First, some items can be used for the purpose for which originally designed. There are no problems on how to use a typewriter, bandsaw, boxing gloves, or materials common to Federal agencies and schools.

"The second classification is similar to the first, but items may require modification, change, or major repairs. Required repairs to a printing calculator may be so extensive that it is not economically sound to recondition as a calculator. However, minor repairs may reactivate this business machine to serve as an adding machine and be adequate for the requirements of a particular school department. A motorized bomb carrier may be modified and adapted as a wrecker to move other vehicles.

"The bulk of the materials received in this program do not fall into either of the first two categories. The third group contains a great deal of the best instructional material.

"With these materials teacher ingenuity results in amazing uses and excellent teaching and learning. More and more of our teachers are actively participating in the program, as materials are made available and ideas are developed.

"Some of these items are: White jackets, cotton; window screens; ink in tubes; plastic pulleys; armature wire; cotton, unsterilized; food containers; driftpins; stadimeter; toothbrush racks; camouflage makeup kits; blankets, torn; flying suits, fleece lined; rangefinders; periscope; telescope; ground glass; sheet asbestos; boiler gages; red and green light bulbs; porthole glass; ski sticks; and plastic portion, light fixture."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the donable surplus property program is administered by the States, which are solely responsible for keeping records on the amount and kind of property going to each institution which requests it. As Senators will note from table I, Montana institutions have requested and received less property under this program than those in most other States. But Montana transfers represent a broad range which are typical of the operation of the program throughout the United States.

Among significant on-site real property transfers in Montana are the following:

"Montana State University acquired 242.9 acres of land with five buildings from the old Fort Missoula tract. This had a current appraised value of $117,800. The date of transfer was August 23, 1963.

"Missoula County High School received a transfer also from the old Fort Missoula tract, of 80 acres of land for use in its Smith-Hughes agricultural program. This property had a current appraised value of $80,000. The date of transfer was July 2, 1963.

"City of Harlem had transferred to it for health purposes, two tracts totaling 16.66 acres with an appraised value of $100. These two parcels of land were somewhat unique in that they consisted of an old railroad right-of-way which was used in the Fort Peck Dam construction. This particular right-of-way was graded high above the surrounding country and it enables employees of the Harlem Water Department to reach the city's pumping station on the Milk River in all kinds of weather. Previously, access to this station had been a problem in the winter because of snow and during the rainy season on account of mud and water in the river bottom. This transfer was made March 5, 1958.

"Trinity Hospital Association, a nonprofit association in Wolf Point, Mont., had transferred to it 9.55 acres, valued at $7,200. This property was transferred February 4, 1958. Since this tract was transferred, the association has constructed a very modern, brick hospital on the site.

"Western Montana Youth Guidance Center, Missoula, has received a tract of 6.03

acres of land from the old Fort Missoula area. On the tract are situated five buildings, one of which was the old post hospital. The hospital is being renovated and remodeled for use as a treatment center for mentally disturbed youth in the area.

"Elementary School District No. 27, Whitlash, received 11.9 acres of land. The site, a former U.S. customs station, consists of three buildings. One is used by the district for an elementary school, one is a teacherage, and the other is a garage. This transfer was made on October 16, 1957. The property had a current appraised value of $11,367.34."

Also from the Montana State Surplus Property Agency, I have the following report on some of the significant offsite transfers of buildings for health and education purposes, and of some Montana institutions that have received surplus property over the last few years:

"Following the completion of the Tiber Dam on the Marias River in north-central Montana, the following residential buildings were transferred to nearby school districts: Chester School District No. 33, two buildings; Galata School District No. 21, one building; Joplin District No. 29, one building; Liberty County Hospital, Chester, two buildings; Devon School District No. 19, seven buildings; Dutton School District No. 28, one building; Hingham School District No. 24, one building; Inverness School District No. 28, two buildings; Ledger School District No. 46, one building; Oilmont School District No. 33, three buildings; Power School District No. 30, two buildings; Sweetgrass School District No. 1, two buildings.

"These buildings were mostly two-bedroom, modern cottages. They have been relocated in the various communities indicated and in most cases are considered to be among the best houses in town. They have been used principally as residences for teachers. They have been a means of attracting professional people to these smaller towns. They are furnished to teachers and nurses at a nominal rental calculated only to take care of current maintenance.

"A similar group of transfers occurred as the Fort Peck Dam project has been cut back. The buildings listed below have been transferred for use as teacherages in the communities listed below: Hinsdale School District No. 7, one building; Nashua School District No. 13, one building; Saco School District No. 12, two buildings; Tampico School District No. 14, one building; Tiger Butte School District No. 3, one building; Wolfe Point School District No. 45, one building.

"These buildings are similar in size and construction to those transferred from the Tiber Dam project. They have been put into use for the same purpose except the transfer to Wolfe Point School District No. 45. In this case, the building transferred was a maintenance shop. This building is being used by the school district for teaching shopwork to high school students.

"Last spring following a fire at the Montana State Training School for Retarded Students, six quonset buildings having a total appraised value of $3,500 were transferred to that institution to take the place of some of the buildings which had been destroyed by the fire. These buildings were acquired from a school in Eltopia, Wash., which in turn had obtained them from the Hanford, Wash., project of the Atomic Energy Commission."

Typical donations of surplus property that have been made in recent years, include the following:

Big Sandy Public Schools: Bus, GMC, 1951, 30-passenger capacity. This school was unable to purchase a bus of this type. By contacting surplus property, we were able to secure this for them.

Butte Public Schools: Generator, 30 kilowatts, with diesel engine. This unit is being used to retrain unemployed workers at Butte.

East Helena Public School: Generator. This unit was acquired by the school district, for use in a fallout shelter built in the basement of the school. This school also received a deep well water pump to be used in the fallout shelter.

Lodge Grass Public School: Fire pump. Used in firefighting at the school.

Montana State College, mechanical engineering department: Seven engine lathes, two shapers, one milling machine, one 2½-inch drill press, one furnace, metal, 2,500° F.

Montana State College, service shop; Several trucks, three buses.

Montana State University: X-ray linear accelerator, forklift, firetruck, photo projection printer.

Northern Montana College: Eight 10-inch metal lathes.

Vocational Technical Division: One milling machine, one Caterpillar engine.

Powell County High School, Dead Lodge, Mont.: 10-inch metal lathe.

Roberts Public Schools: 10-foot metal lathe.

Shelby Public Schools: 10-foot metal lathe.

Western Montana College, Dillon, Mont.: Bus, dump truck.

Montana State Hospital, Warm Springs, Mont.: Crane, truck, laundry extractor, washing machine, 300-pound capacity.

Montana State Training School & Hospital, Boulder, Mont.: Bulldozer tractor-International Harvester, large air compressor, bus, White truck tractor, standby generator set.

St. James Hospital: Standby generator set.

Montana State Civil Defense: Several radio receivers and transmitters, many standby generator sets, two ambulances.

The significance of the existing program is evidenced by a report from a high school principal and a hospital administrator, both in Helena.

Following is a report from Mr. Giles Russell, principal of aeronautics and related trades at the Helena High School:

"The donable surplus property program as handled through the Montana State Department of Public Instruction has been a godsend to our school. We have been able to get equipment that would have been impossible through regular channels with the money that is available to us. The students have been able to work with actual equipment that we could not afford to buy outright, rather than be satisfied with charts, pictures, and descriptions. There is no comparison between the value of the two procedures.

"A few cases to bear out the above: In 1953 we secured a Stinson Voyager that was excess at the Forest Service. Every year since we acquired this plane, from 15 to 25 students have received flight instruction as far as solo in this plane. In addition, the powerplants and airframes classes have had actual experience in overhauling the engine, covering the wings and generally maintaining the plane in airworthy condition.

"Through acquisition of Heliarc equipment we are 4 to 5 years ahead in our welding program. Our machine shop is supplied with drills, drill presses, lathes, gear cutters and precision tools that we could not have hoped to purchase through regular channels.

"The SB2C-5 (Helldiver) airplane served us for some 10 years as a demonstrator for actual experience in hydraulics, in connection with a surplus auxiliary pump. Approximately 90 airframes and powerplants mechanics took their FAA practical examination on this plane.

"From nails used in our housebuilding program to jet engines and rocket engines the school has used surplus equipment to build up a more worthwhile program of instruction for our high school and post-high-school boys.

"We are very happy with the program as it is being handled in Montana."

In a report dated June 28, 1963, Administrator Bert Ericksen, of St. Peter's Hospital, wrote, in part, as follows:

"As in the past, we have taken advantage of the excellent equipment and supplies that Government surplus has to offer. We have purchased approximately $28,000 worth of equipment and supplies for $2,800. Without the equipment and supplies received from donable properties the cost to the patient would increase."

Mr. President, much of the material in the stockpile, which can be offered them only if my amendment is adopted, could be effectively used by colleges and universities. This is particularly important when a major, and increasing part of publicly financed research and development is going to so-called centers of academic excellence. I feel deeply that it would be in the national interest to help maintain existing centers and to develop more.

In April of this year, when the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Defense Procurement was preparing for hearings on "The Impact of Defense Procurement," the chairman, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] asked that a 1963 report presenting "Background Material on Economic Aspects of Military Procurement and Supply" be brought up to date. In that study, he was fortunate to have as staff consultant, Mr. Ray Ward, former staff director of the House Special Donable Property Subcommittee. Those of us who know, and have worked with Ray, respect him for his knowledge and his demonstrated ability in this area.

The updated study, dated April 1964, included the information that there has been widespread interest in negotiated contracts for experimental, developmental, test, and research work, which made up more than 19 percent of all negotiated contracts for the fiscal year 1963. These awards in themselves were not small change. They amounted to more than $6 billion. But they are only "seed corn" for production contracts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a breakdown of these awards be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"TABLE III. NET VALUE OF MILITARY PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, TEST, AND RESEARCH WORK, BY STATES AND REGIONS

"The breakdown of the value of these awards by States and District of Columbia shows (table 10):

Percent of total:	*Number of States*
40 to 45	1
10 to 15	0
5 to 10	4
4 to 5	2
3 to 4	1
2 to 3	4
1 to 2	4
0 to 1	35

"TABLE 10.—*Net value of military prime contract awards for experimental, developmental, test, and research work, fiscal year 1963*[1]

"[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Total		Schools and their affiliates		Other nonprofit institutions[2]		Business firms	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Total distributed by State	$6,198,903	100.0	$381,864	100.0	$172,217	100.0	$5,644,822	100.0
New England	487,409	7.9	123,217	32.3	1,551	.9	362,641	6.4
Maine	207	[3]	0	0	105	.1	102	[3]
New Hampshire	7,916	.1	685	.2	0	0	7,231	.1
Vermont	4,698	.1	130	[3]	0	0	4,568	.1
Massachusetts	364,996	5.9	117,772	30.8	554	.3	246,670	4.4
Rhode Island	6,124	.1	3,602	.9	16	[3]	2,502	[3]
Connecticut	103,468	1.7	1,028	.3	876	.5	101,564	1.8
Middle Atlantic	1,029,674	16.6	48,708	12.8	21,031	12.2	959,935	17.0
New York	386,953	6.2	32,941	8.6	11,069	6.4	342,943	6.1
New Jersey	387,530	6.3	3,944	1.0	390	.2	383,196	6.8
Pennsylvania	255,191	4.1	11,823	3.1	9,572	5.6	233,796	4.1
East North Central	314,794	5.1	51,343	13.4	6,106	3.5	257,345	4.6
Ohio	90,978	1.5	8,516	2.2	5,133	3.0	77,329	1.4
Indiana	28,732	.5	2,947	.8	0	0	25,785	.5
Illinois	57,991	.9	26,367	6.9	662	.4	30,962	.5
Michigan	72,758	1.2	11,689	3.1	66	[3]	61,003	1.1
Wisconsin	64,335	1.0	1,824	.5	245	.1	62,266	1.1
West North Central	102,766	1.7	3,954	1.0	3,333	1.9	95,479	1.7
Minnesota	58,639	.9	1,878	.5	666	.4	56,095	1.0
Iowa	4,058	.1	739	.2	0	0	3,319	.1
Missouri	16,346	.3	882	.2	2,618	1.5	12,846	.2
North Dakota	1,170	[3]	10	[3]	0	0	1,160	[3]
South Dakota	10,686	.2	25	[3]	0	0	10,661	.2
Nebraska	369	[3]	12	[3]	49	[3]	308	[3]
Kansas	11,498	.2	408	.1	0	0	11,090	.2
South Atlantic	581,360	9.4	82,890	21.7	29,103	16.9	469,367	8.3
Delaware	26,186	.4	204	.1	0	0	25,982	.4
Maryland	231,919	3.7	67,129	17.6	7,750	4.5	157,040	2.8
District of Columbia	36,212	.6	7,965	2.1	19,015	11.0	9,233	.2
Virginia	40,070	.6	1,246	.3	2,096	1.2	36,728	.6
West Virginia	31,587	.5	64	[3]	0	0	31,523	.6
North Carolina	40,847	.7	2,481	.6	20	[3]	38,346	.7
South Carolina	341	[3]	192	.1	0	0	149	[3]
Georgia	2,606	[3]	1,154	.3	187	.1	1,265	[3]
Florida	171,591	2.8	2,455	.6	35	[3]	169,101	3.0
South Central	208,588	3.4	9,202	2.4	7,589	4.4	191,797	3.4
Kentucky	998	[3]	376	.1	0	0	622	[3]
Tennessee	45,396	.7	699	.2	3,507	2.0	41,190	.7
Alabama	12,470	.2	453	.1	503	.3	11,514	.2
Mississippi	475	[3]	450	.1	25	[3]	0	0
Arkansas	689	[3]	23	[3]	0	0	666	[3]
Louisiana	1,340	[3]	654	.2	0	0	686	[3]
Oklahoma	5,958	.1	1,271	.3	72	[3]	4,615	.1
Texas	141,262	2.3	5,276	1.4	3,482	2.0	132,504	2.3
Mountain	566,224	9.1	10,985	2.9	4,999	2.9	550,240	9.7
Montana	3,101	.1	78	[3]	0	0	3,023	.1
Idaho	−49	[3]	51	[3]	−100	−.1	0	0
Wyoming	1,484	[3]	0	0	0	0	1,484	[3]
Colorado	254,346	4.1	3,452	.9	4,438	2.6	246,446	4.3
Utah	137,366	2.2	2,985	.8	0	0	134,381	3.4
Nevada	1,429	[3]	0	0	0	0	1,429	[3]
New Mexico	17,425	.3	3,692	1.0	641	.4	13,091	.2
Arizona	151,123	2.4	717	.2	30	[3]	150,386	2.7
Pacific	2,905,908	46.8	49,955	13.1	98,260	57.1	2,757,693	48.9
Washington	337,174	5.4	4,786	1.3	104	.1	332,284	5.9
Oregon	1,718	[3]	749	.2	0	0	969	[3]
California	2,567,016	41.4	44,420	11.6	98,156	57.0	2,424,440	42.9
Alaska and Hawaii	2,180	[3]	1,610	.4	245	.1	325	[3]
Alaska	1,559	[3]	1,255	.3	245	.1	59	[3]
Hawaii	621	[3]	355	.1	0	0	266	[3]

"[1] Contracts of $10,000 or more each. Includes contracts of Advanced Research Project Agency and other agencies of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

"[2] Includes contracts with other Government agencies.

"[3] Less than 0.05 percent.

"NOTE.—Percentages may not add to totals because of rounding.

"Source: OSD."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on August 1, 1962, the Special Donable Property Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on the "Donation of Surplus Personal Property to Educational Institutions." Printed as part of those hearings was an exchange of correspondence between the subcommittee chairman, Representative MONAGAN, of Connecticut, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Representative MONAGAN asked whether surplus stockpile material might be useful and needed for educational purposes. The reply was in the affirmative, and included examples of some of the material and their potential uses. I ask unanimous consent that this correspondence, as printed in the subcommittee hearings, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL DONABLE PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1962.

HON. IVAN NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the Symington subcommittee on the stockpile is considering the introduction of a bill which would permit the use of surplus stockpile materials in AID programs and also for Federal use. It is my understanding that many of the materials, especially metals, in the stockpile could well be used in certain of our educational institutions for various purposes.

The legal opinion from GSA is to the effect that surplus stockpile material is not donable under the provisions of section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. I would therefore appreciate your views as to whether or not it would be worthwhile to propose legislation to make some of the surplus stockpile material available for educational purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Donable Property.

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, July 26, 1962.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: On July 13 we replied to your letter of July 9 concerning the use of surplus stockpile materials as donable surplus property.

We have reviewed the situation with educational authorities to ascertain which items could be effectively utilized by schools, colleges, and universities. This review shows that selected materials could be used in instructional programs at different levels. Others might be used in special research and development activities in colleges and universities; still others might be used in the general plant maintenance and operation programs of schools and colleges. The table which follows gives illustrative examples of some of these materials and the potential uses for them in these areas.

Some illustrative examples of specific usages of these materials in the four areas are outlined below.

1. Laboratory instruction:

Mercury: Used in chemistry and physics laboratories for a number of purposes, such as the measurement of low atmospheric pressures, chemical reactions, and various laboratory instruments.

Quartz crystals: Used in physics laboratories for the generation and detection of high frequency and electromagnetic radiation.

2. Shop training:

Diamond dies: Useful in numerous types of grinding and cutting operations.

Shellac: Not only used in plant operation and maintenance (separate category above), but also in shop training (cabinets, boats, models, etc.).

3. Research:

Ruby: Basic ingredient in very new development of ruby masers which are extremely powerful beams of light, the numerous applications of which are still the subject of much research.

Selenium: One of elements used in doping crystals of germanium and silicon for producing semiconductors. These form basis of all types of transistors and junction devices.

4. Operation and maintenance of plants:

Feathers: A natural product, probably requiring no further processing, which should be useful to any institution responsible for housing programs.

5. Operation of hospitals and clinics:

Iodine: Useful not only in chemistry laboratory instruction (separate category above), but also, in more refined form, in hosptial treatment of wounds, etc.

The extent to which these materials could be used and the amounts which might be required cannot be predicted at this time for several reasons:

(a) The degree of refinement of the stockpile materials is not clearly indicated in the report available to us, making it difficult to determine if a particular material would be usable in the form in which it would be made available to the schools and colleges;

(b) Instructional programs, curriculums, and teaching methods of schools and colleges are undergoing extensive revisions at the present time; and

(c) Many of the research and development programs of colleges and universities are restricted or classified. Information on needed materials is available only from the directors of these activities. (This will take time.)

Since more specific information on the types and quantities of strategic materials which could be used by schools and colleges is advisable, we will continue our inquiries. However, on the basis of the information available, it is apparent that many of the items in the stockpile are needed in health and educational programs. We would suggest that they be made available for donation to eligible health and educational donees on the same basis as provided in present programs for other Federal surplus property.

Sincerely yours,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary.

Strategic material	Potential uses in—			
	Instructional program		Research program, colleges and universities	Plant operation and maintenance program
	Elementary and secondary schools	Colleges and universities		
Asbestos	X	X	X	X.
Copper	X	X	X	X.
Corundum	X		X	X.
Diamond dies	X		X	X.
Feathers and down				X.
Graphite	X	X	X	X.
Iodine	X	X	X	
Manganese dioxide	X	X	X	
Mercury	X	X	X	X.
Pyrethrum	X	X		
Ruby			X	
Selenium	X		X	
Shellac	X	X	X	X.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, material in the stockpile is being sought by educational institutions. Mercury is an example.

Last year, it appeared for a time that 52,000 flasks of mercury, each weighing some 76 pounds, and acquired at a total cost of more than $12.2 million, might be excess to need, and might be available under the donable surplus property program. Before it was finally decided to place that mercury in the stockpile, colleges, and universities in 35 States had applied for more than the total amount available.

Mr. President, adoption of my amendment would be in the public interest in education and health, in industry, and economic development. Public property, bought with public funds to meet a public need, is worth much more to public institutions than it is to junk dealers. The donable surplus property program has provided our hard-pressed schools and hospitals with land and equipment they could not have afforded. It has helped to educate our youngsters and to care for the sick and injured. Modification of surplus equipment for classroom use has challenged the students, and also the teachers, who thereby also were instructed. The program has stimulated research in the national interest. In many cases, research has led to production contracts, profitable to the school and the surrounding business community. The program has created new markets—for experience has shown that a research program, begun with donated material, does not end when that material is gone. Rather, the institution goes into the open market and buys new material. The donable surplus property program has been an outstanding success. It should be extended to include material in the stockpile found to be surplus to present need.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 23, 1964]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATIONAL AND HEALTH INSTITUTIONS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on April 24 and again on June 23, I gave notice that I would propose an amendment to S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964. My amendment would provide that material in the national stockpile, found to be surplus to present need, could be released only after it had been offered for donation to schools and hospitals under the donable surplus property program on the same basis as other Federal surplus property. This amendment would increase substantially a major program of Federal aid to our Nation's educational and health institutions.

On June 26, I wrote a letter to every Senator, explaining my amendment and outlining the extent to which that Senator's State had participated in the donable surplus property program. The response has been encouraging and a high level of interest in the donable property program has been evident on both sides of the aisle. I have been deeply grateful for the expressions of support for my amendment and I was especially happy that the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] has joined me in sponsoring the measure.

I had hoped for congressional action on my proposal this year. However, because of the heavy legislative workload in the Senate, it became apparent that the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act would not come up at this session. Still, I desire to acquaint the Senate more fully with the nature of my proposal. Therefore, for informational purposes, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. This bill will achieve the purposes of my original amendment. It provides that surplus stockpile material can be released only after it has been offered for donation to schools and hospitals under the donable surplus property program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled,* That (a) section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(p) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any material contained in the national stockpile, established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98a–h), or any material heretofore or hereafter placed in the supplemental stockpile, established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), or any material heretofore or hereafter acquired pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 2061–2166), and which is determined to be no longer needed (as provided in the appropriate Act) for the purposes of the Act under which such material was acquired, or is otherwise determined to be available for disposal, shall be available for disposal as surplus property under subsection (j) of this section for the purposes described in paragraph (3) thereof. Disposal of any such material may not be made under any of the Acts referred to above if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has determined that such material is usable and necessary for disposal as surplus property under subsection (j) of this section for any purpose described in paragraph (3) thereof, or until the Secretary has determined that such material is not usable and necessary for disposal under subsection (j) for any such purpose. The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any material disposed of pursuant to section 3 (d) or section 5 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98b(d) and 98d).'

"(b) The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the third month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, early in the next session, I plan to reintroduce this bill. It is my hope that my colleagues who have been so generous in their expressions of support for my original amendment will join me in cosponsoring this bill. In the beginning of the next session, I would like to invite all interested Senators to attend an excellent filmstrip program presented by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which explains the donable surplus property program. In the meantime, I shall be glad to answer any questions or requests for information on my proposal. Today, I should like to make public some of the results of my research.

In preparing the amendment, I felt it imperative to explore fully two main questions. First, would this extension of the donable surplus property program cause administrative delay in the disposal of stockpiled materials? Second, to what extent are surplus raw materials useful to and needed by the Nation's schools and hospitals?

It has always been my desire to provide for the maximum efficiency in the disposal of surplus raw materials. Therefore, I wanted to insure that my amendment would cause no administrative delay in the disposal of these materials. I wrote to the Defense Supply Agency of the Department of Defense to ask their expert advice on this matter. And I asked that Agency to compare the amount of time required to donate the material with the amount of time required by General Services Administration to sell property.

Capt. F. M. Lamkin answered for the Defense Supply Agency. He noted that:

"Under General Services regulations * * * the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is provided a 15-day period to determine whether property would be usable and necessary for educational, public health, or civil defense purposes, including research for any such purposes. An additional 40 days is provided under the General Services Administration regulations for the donees to remove the property approved for donation. Accordingly, a maximum of 55 days is required to complete the donation cycle."

If the donation cycle takes a maximum of 55 days—and officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have told me that the average cycle actually takes about 40 days—how does this time period compare with the time required to sell surplus material? Captain Lamkin notes that:

"Sales conducted by Department of Defense activities require an average of 90 days to complete."

And the answer to my question is given in the conclusion of the letter:

"You will note, therefore, that insofar as it is related to the disposal of Department of Defense surplus personal property, 35 additional days are required to dispose of property by sale than by donation."

Because Captain Lamkin's letter bears importantly on the administrative aspects of my proposal, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY,
Alexandria, Va., June 29, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Reference is made to your letter of June 22, 1964, wherein you requested information on the donation and sale of material.

The Department of Defense does not have any responsibility in the disposal of stockpile material, since this is assigned to the General Services Administration. Neither has the Department of Defense any experience in the sale of this material, since such sales are handled by the General Services Administration through its sales offices. However, this Agency can respond to the length of time required to effect final disposal of surplus personal property by donation versus disposal by sale to the general public.

Under General Services regulations (GSA reg. 1–I–V202.3 and 202.4) the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is provided a 15-day period to determine whether property would be usable and necessary for educational, public health, or civil defense purposes, including research for any such purposes. An additional 40 days is provided under the General Services Administration regulations for the donees to remove the property approved for donation. Accordingly, a maximum of 55 days is required to complete the donation cycle.

Sales conducted by Department of Defense activities require an average of 90 days to complete. This period is from the time the property is reported for sale until the end of the removal time permitted under the contract. You will note, therefore, that insofar as it is related to the disposal of Department of Defense surplus personal property, 35 additional days are required to dispose of property by sale than by donation.

I trust that the foregoing will be sufficient for your purposes.

Sincerely,

F. M. LAMKIN,
Captain, SC, U.S. Navy, Deputy Executive Director, Logistics Service.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, if donation of surplus materials takes 35 days less than sale of these materials, it is evident that my proposal would involve no administrative delay in the disposal of stockpile surplus. So the answer to the first question is clear. But what about the second question—are stockpiled raw materials really useful to schools and hospitals?

HEW officials have long felt that such raw materials would be useful to schools and hospitals throughout America. On August 1, 1962, the Special Donable Property Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on the "Donation of Surplus Personal Property to Educational Institutions." Printed as part of those hearings was an exchange of correspondence between the subcommittee chairman, Representative MONAGAN, of Connecticut, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Representative MONAGAN asked whether surplus stockpile material might be useful and needed for educational purposes. The reply was in the affirmative and included examples of some of the material and their potential uses. I ask unanimous consent that this correspondence, as printed in the hearings, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL DONABLE PROPERTY
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE
ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1962.

Hon. IVAN NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the Symington subcommittee on the stockpile is considering the introduction of a bill which would permit the use of surplus stockpile materials in AID programs and also for Federal use. It is my understanding that many of the materials, especially metals, in the stockpile could well be used in certain of our educational institutions for various purposes.

The legal opinion from GSA is to the effect that surplus stockpile material is not donable under the provisions of section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. I would therefore appreciate your views as to whether or not it would be worthwhile to propose legislation to make some of the surplus stockpile material available for educational purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Donable Property.

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, July 26, 1962.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: On July 13 we replied to your letter of July 9 concerning the use of surplus stockpile materials as donable surplus property.

We have reviewed the situation with educational authorities to ascertain which items could be effectively utilized by schools, colleges, and universities. This review shows that selected materials could be used in instructional programs at different levels. Others might be used in special research and development activities in colleges and universities; still others might be used in the general plant maintenance and operation programs of schools and colleges. The table which follows gives illustrative examples of some of these materials and the potential uses for them in these areas.

Some illustrative examples of specific usages of these materials in the four areas are outlined below:

1. Laboratory instruction:

Mercury: Used in chemistry and physics laboratories for a number of purposes, such as the measurement of low atmospheric pressures, chemical reactions, and various laboratory instruments.

Quartz crystals: Used in physics laboratories for the generation and detection of high frequency and electromagnetic radiation.

2. Shop training:

Diamond dies: Useful in numerous types of grinding and cutting operations.

Shellac: Not only used in plant operation and maintenance (separate category above), but also in shop training (cabinets, boats, models, etc.).

3. Research:

Ruby: Basic ingredient in very new development of ruby masers which are extremely powerful beams of light, the numerous applications of which are still the subject of much research.

Selenium: One of elements used in doping crystals of germanium and silicon for producing semiconductors. These form basis of all types of transistors and junction devices.

4. Operation and maintenance of plants:

Feathers: A natural product, probably requiring no further processing, which should be useful to any institution responsible for housing programs.

5. Operation of hospitals and clinics:

Iodine: Useful not only in chemistry laboratory instruction (separate category above), but also, in more refined form, in hospital treatment of wounds, etc.

The extent to which these materials could be used and the amounts which might be required cannot be predicted at this time for several reasons:

(a) The degree of refinement of the stockpile materials is not clearly indicated in the report available to us, making it difficult to determine if a particular material would be usable in the form in which it would be made available to the schools and colleges;

(b) Instructional programs, curriculums, and teaching methods of schools and colleges are undergoing extensive revisions at the present time; and

(c) Many of the research and development programs of colleges and universities are restricted or classified. Information on needed materials is available only from the directors of these activities. (This will take time.)

Since more specific information on the types and quantities of strategic materials which could be used by schools and colleges is advisable, we will continue our inquiries. However, on the basis of the information available, it is apparent that many of the items in the stockpile are needed in health and educational programs. We would suggest that they be made available for donation to eligible health and educational donees on the same basis as provided in present programs for other Federal surplus property.

Sincerely yours,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary.

Strategic material	Potential uses in—			
	Instructional program		Research program, colleges and universities	Plant operation and maintenance program
	Elementary and secondary schools	Colleges and universities		
Asbestos	X	X	X	X.
Copper	X	X	X	X.
Corundum	X		X	X.
Diamond dies	X		X	X.
Feathers and down				X.
Graphite	X	X	X	X.
Iodine	X	X	X	
Manganese dioxide	X	X	X	
Mercury	X	X	X	X.
Pyrethrum	X	X		
Ruby			X	
Selenium	X		X	
Shellac	X	X	X	X.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in preparing my original amendment I had the benefit of advice from scientists at the National Academy of Sciences. Robert W. Crozier, the Executive Director of the Materials Advisory Board of the National Academy, wrote me concerning my amendment. He points out:

"While it is improbable that a significant fraction of any stockpiled material would be disposed of in such a fashion, these materials would be of substantial value to schools and hospitals."

This is an important point. My proposal would not dispose of a sizable percentage of stockpiled materials. But the relatively small amount of material concerned would be of great value to schools and hospitals—especially those which have no contracts to enable them to purchase research materials easily. I have received many letters—which I shall have printed in the RECORD soon—from research institutions in areas which are not blessed with wealth. Mr. Crozier notes this when he says that "such a program would be of particular benefit to the smaller institutions."

I appreciate having the advice of the National Academy of Sciences and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Crozier's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL,
MATERIALS ADVISORY BOARD OF
THE DIVISION OF ENGINEERING
AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Your proposed amendment to S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, has been called to our attention. It is our understanding that this amendment provides that material in the national stockpile, found to be surplus to present need, could be released only after it had been offered for donation to schools and hospitals under the donable surplus property program.

While it is improbable that a significant fraction of any stockpiled material would be disposed of in such a fashion, these materials would be of substantial value to schools and hospitals. It is to be hoped that the ready availability of stockpiled material might stimulate research leading to new applications. Particularly needed, and now dormant, is research, and development of methods, for economically upgrading substandard material now in stockpile, an activity which might ensue if your amendment is adopted. Such a program would be of particular benefit to the smaller institutions who have no contacts to enable them to purchase research materials easily. To be of benefit, it is essential that the program be administered in a manner to provide quick delivery with a minimum of redtape.

We can see no technical objection to this proposal, but would expect schools, hospitals, and the country as a whole to benefit.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. CROZIER,
Executive Director.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in the near future, I will have printed in the RECORD the mail which I have received from educational institutions throughout the country. Universities, mining schools, high schools, and hospitals have outlined the ways in which they can use raw materials in educational programs. Adoption of my bill in 1965 will serve the public interest in education and health. In a time in our Nation's history when we are deeply concerned with the eradication of poverty, this proposal will make materials available to hard-pressed schools and hospitals which could not have been able to buy the precious raw materials. Since 1946 the donable surplus property program has made personal and real property with a total acquisition cost of almost $4.4 billion, available to schools and hospitals. Today the United States is committed as a nation to the development of fine research institutions in all areas of the country. It is therefore a logical and needed step to extend the donable property program to include material in the stockpile found to be surplus to present need. The Nation as a whole will be the gainer.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Missouri, who has rendered such outstanding service in preparing the legislation and holding hearings for the disposal of the stockpile.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able acting majority leader. To be frank, I did not know he was going to make this particular talk. What I have heard has been interesting. I look forward to reading it all in the RECORD.

I received the telegram urging us to return to Washington because there was much work to be done. I was here yesterday and am here today. There does not seem to be much business being transacted. I wonder if the acting majority leader could give notice as to what the plans are for voting this week.

Mr. METCALF. My task is merely to present this statement in the morning hour. As I understand, the majority leader, my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is now at a meeting from which may come the answer to some of the questions that the Senator from Missouri has asked. I shall leave it up to him to report on that matter later in the day.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am in the unfortunate predicament of trying to be in Washington and at home at the same time and would appreciate knowing something about the schedule.

Mr. METCALF. I wonder if the Senator from Missouri will withhold his request until after the morning hour. I am sure that my distinguished colleague, the majority leader, would be glad to respond to the question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no criticism on my part. I am requesting information. If it is not intended that there be a vote this week, I should like to get home.

Mr. METCALF. I have complete sympathy with the predicament of the Senator from Missouri. I hope that he does get back home so that he can return to Washington for the next 6 years.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is a kind and gracious statement appreciated especially because of my high regard for the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill referred to by the Senator from Montana will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3203) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the disposal of surplus material in the national stockpile pursuant to section 203(j) thereof, introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 29, 1964]

SURPLUS STOCKPILE MATERIALS AVAILABLE TO SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, recently I introduced a bill which would make surplus stockpile materials available to schools and hospitals, under the donable surplus property program. When I introduced the bill, I said that I wanted to determine exactly how schools and hospitals could make use of raw materials in teaching and research programs. In working with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have asked various educational centers and hospitals to evaluate my proposal and to give me an indication of the uses to which stockpiled materials might be put in their institutions.

I have also had the benefit of the advice of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property. The State agencies are the approved bodies through which surplus property has been donated to schools and hospitals under Public Law 152. Mr. Robert H. Arnold, the president of the National Association, has written to me concerning my proposal to extend the surplus property program. I shall insert his letter in the RECORD; but first I quote a part of it which may command special interest this year. Mr. Arnold wrote:

"By making the reserve and stockpile materials available for donation prior to sale, as provided for in your amendment, the beginning, and continuation of many health and educational programs could result. Too often new programs, especially in the field of research, are impossible because of the high commercial costs of materials like those in question. The costs of acquiring them through the donation program would be almost negligible."

In 1964, we have passed antipoverty legislation which marks a giant step in the struggle to extend economic opportunity to all our citizens. I hope that in 1965 many other Senators will join me in sponsoring a bill which will help research programs at schools and universities that are not wealthy enough to finance adequate research programs by themselves.

Some of the schools and colleges were notified of my amendment to S. 2272 by their State agency for surplus property. Also, I have written to schools of mining, in order to determine to what extent raw materials might be used in educational programs. I am happy to say that the response to my proposal has been deeply encouraging. The University of Alaska needs cadmium, lead, and mercury for scientific research. From the Department of Education of the State of Arkansas, I have learned that the Arkansas Vocational Technical School uses large quantities of raw materials. San Jose State College, in California, has need for copper, rubber, iodine, and tungsten.

The list goes on. The Colorado School of Mines, through its president, Orlo E. Childs, has expressed a strong interest in my proposal. The school uses lead in radiation laboratories for shielding purposes; and aluminum is used as a noncorrosive material in fume hoods. Also, asbestos sheeting is valuable as a lining for hoods and furnaces which are kept at high temperatures.

From the University of Florida, in Gainesville, I have received word that aluminum, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc are needed in a rapidly expanding graduate program. And the Dudley M. Hughes Vocational School, in Macon, Ga., has stated:

"The surplus property program for educational use is one of the best administered and most helpful services, with the least cost to the taxpayers, that is being furnished by any Federal agency at the present time."

The University of Illinois can make good use of copper and copper base alloys; and the University of Kansas has expressed special interest in acquiring copper, mercury, and nickel. Also, the University of Mississippi has been strongly supporting my proposal.

The Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy has written me a letter which is an excellent outline of ways in which a mining school can use raw materials from the national stockpile. The new Materials Research Center at the University of Missouri School of Mines will investigate the physical-chemical behavior of materials, for the purpose of developing materials with properties and reliability needed in our Nation's space and defense programs. For this center, stockpiled raw materials would be extremely useful. After reading this excellent letter, my opinion is that no better invesment can be made with our raw materials than to donate them to vital research programs at colleges and universities. The defense capability, the educational level, and the all-around vitality of the Nation will be increased. The research programs will be spread over more of the Nation than now is the case, and the less wealthy institutions will be able to breathe life into their struggling laboratories.

I hope all Senators will read the letters which I shall have printed in the RECORD. Hastings College, in Nebraska, has a constant need for mercury, copper, lead, and tin. The South Dakota School of Mines needs copper and manganese dioxide in its laboratory programs. From Tennessee, Austin Peay State College has expressed a desire to obtain lead, graphite, and cadmium for radioisotope work. The physics department at Midwestern University, in Texas, states that aluminum and zinc would be of "inestimable value." Finally, the State of Vermont, through its department of education, has stated that my proposal, if enacted, would "prove invaluable to science programs in all levels of Vermont's educational system."

I am grateful to the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property for notifying so many educational institutions of my proposal. And I deeply appreciate the enthusiastic response of the schools, hospitals, colleges, and universities throughout America. I think the extension of the donable surplus property program to include surplus raw materials will be logical and useful. In an age in which America as a nation is committed to the development of educational excellence, such an extension is really a necessity. This bill is very important to me; and I welcome the support of all Senators who in the past have been backers of the surplus property program, and who are interested in expanding it to meet present and future needs.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters and telegrams I have received on my proposal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 7, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Room 140, Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property is vitally interested in your amendment to Senate bill S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

As you are aware, the donation program, as approved under Public Law 152, 81st Congress, provides a method whereby surplus property no longer required by the Federal Government is distributed to and through approved State agencies for health, educational, and civil defense purposes.

Since its inception, the donation program has been of untold benefit to the schools, hospitals, and civil defense units throughout the 50 States. The origination and furtherance of many programs have resulted from donations of Federal surplus property, especially in the field of education.

By making the reserve and stockpile materials available for donation prior to sale, as provided for in your amendment, the beginning and continuation of many health and educational programs could result. Too often new programs, especially in the field of research, are impossible because of the high commercial costs of materials like those in question. The costs of acquiring them through the donation program would be almost negligible.

We further believe the commercial impact on producers and manufacturers of these materials would be far less if the property were donated rather than being sold.

The National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property wishes to go on record as supporting your amendment in every way possible. We know of its potential benefits to health and education throughout the United States.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. ARNOLD,
President, NASASP.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
July 21, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have just heard of your proposed amendment to the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964. I would like to point out that we, here at the University of Alaska, do have need, from time to time, for materials that are held on the present stockpile listings. Specifically for scientific research purposes are cadmium, lead and mercury. These metals are used in moderate quantities and would not affect the overall amounts greatly. However, if they would be made available on a donation basis, as certain surplus items are, it would save us purchasing them from Federal research and development moneys.

The lead is utilized as shielding for various AEC materials utilized in experimental work and the mercury has and will continue to be an important part of our vacuum systems in research laboratory procedures. The cadmium is utilized in chemical assay work in our marine science group to indicate to you some of the areas of utilization that are appropriate for such stockpile materials. I have not taken time to screen the whole campus on this matter but these are materials that I am aware of at present.

You efforts on our behalf are most appreciated.

Sincerely,

ALFRED H. GEORGE,
Assistant Comptroller for Research.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Pine Bluff, August 4, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Room 407, Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have been advised that you are prepared to offer an amendment to Senator SYMINGTON'S bill S. 2272 which would provide for donation of property in the Federal reserve stockpile prior to its disposal by sale.

I believe your amendment would greatly benefit education and would be to the best interest of the Nation as a whole.

The Arkansas Vocational Technical School of which I am director uses large quantities of raw material in our training program, and we could save the taxpayers of this State a considerable amount if we could receive some of the raw materials for our program through the Federal surplus property donation program.

Yours very truly,

ARKANSAS VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
LEON COKER, *Director.*

BRADLEY COUNTY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
Warren, Ark., August 4, 1964.

Re Senate bill 2272
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has come to my attention that you have submitted an amendment to the Material and Stockpile Act of 1964 with the captioned bill.

Please be assured that I wish you every success in your efforts to pass this bill.

Sincerely,

JOE CARMICAL,
Administrator.

SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE,
Magnolia, Ark., August 3, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Southern State College has benefited greatly from the surplus property it has received through the Arkansas State Department of Education. We appreciate your interest in acquiring additional surplus property for public institutions and your amendment to Senate bill S. 2272.

We sincerely hope that you will be able to get favorable action on this amendment as well as the bill itself.

Yours very truly,

IMON E. BRUCE,
President.

ARROYO GRANDE UNION,
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Arroyo Grande, Calif., July 24, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Montana,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It has come to my attention that the Federal Government is presently negotiating for the sale of certain stockpiled items to foreign countries. Some of the items under consideration for sale are the following: Asbestos, mercury, bismuth, aluminum, cadmium, copper, cartage and fibers, carborundum, feathers and down, iodine, lead, magnesium, graphite, nickel, shellac, rubber, silicone carbide, talcum, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

Of this partial list, to use one example alone, is the metal mercury which has great application and use for the teaching of science. If I seek to buy this item through ordinary sources the costs are prohibitive for a junior high school educational program. However, when made available through educational surplus this item alone improves the quality of the educational program in science and the savings for the purchase of mercury can be applied toward the purchase of books in such courses as mathematics, history, geography, etc. It would be possible to use many other examples from this limited list to demonstrate how the instructional program can be improved if these items are made available through educational surplus.

I urge your continued effort to make these items available for educational consumption out of Federal stockpiles rather than have these items sold on international markets.

Thank you for your work on behalf of the schools of America.

Respectfully,

DOUGLAS A. CAMPBELL.

RAVENSWOOD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Palo Alto, Calif., July 24, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Montana,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. LEE METCALF: Please be informed that we, a small public school district in northern California, do use and do need metals and materials that are occasionally released from the stockpile of strategic materials for consumption by public agencies.

We recommend the support of your proposed legislation in this matter.

Sincerely,

CRAIG A. SNASDELL,
Assistant Superintendent,
Business Services.

COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO,
San Mateo, Calif., July 24, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This school district, as well as other school districts, in my opinion have use for items such as aluminum, magnesium, copper, lead, graphite, tin, zinc, tungsten, and other materials that are on the strategic list now being considered for release to school districts.

I would like to state that I would support legislation to make these items available to schools. Such legislation would put these surplus materials to beneficial use and would provide savings to the school districts throughout the Nation.

Your support of this legislation will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

MATTEO V. FASANARO,
Business Manager.

CRESCENT UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Crescent City, Calif., July 24, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Montana,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We have just learned that many surplus items have sometimes been made available for sale rather than to educational agencies through the donation program.

Among these items are aluminum sheet, asbestos, bismuth, cadmium, copper, cordage and fiber, feathers and down material, graphite, iodine, lead, magnesium, nickel, rubber, shellac, silicon carbide, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

We recognize many of these items as being desirable for our educational programs. Inasmuch as our district has been able to acquire many things that otherwise we would have had to do without, and our program is better because of the many surplus items available to us, may we suggest that the donation program be given the opportunity of acquiring the above items, so that we can more economically meet our educational needs.

Very truly yours,

D. DEVAR FELSHAW,
District Superintendent.

SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE,
San Jose, Calif., July 24, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.:

We are in favor of your proposal to release stockpile materials for use in schools prior to outside sale.

For instance, we use considerable quantities of mercury, asbestos, copper, cordage, fibers, lead, rubber, shellac, silicons, and zinc. We use medium quantities of aluminum, carborundum, and tin; we use small quantities of graphite, iodine, magnesium, nickel, talc, and tungsten.

Our large engineering, science, industrial arts, and aeronautics instructional programs use most of the materials. Other instructional courses and plant operations use the materials in various quantities and in special projects.

We are a conscientious user of educational surplus property and would like to see you expand the program.

D.C. PETERSEN,
Purchasing Officer.

HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Hayward, Calif., July 28, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We are requesting your support of an amendment to Senate bill 2272 in which you are offering to make all surplus stockpile items available to schools prior to their being offered to commercial sources. We are particularly interested in items which are manufactured with ingredients including mercury, aluminum, and copper. These aforementioned items are in great demand by our school district and we feel that we would realize a large financial saving if we could be offered these items on a priority basis.

Thank you very much for any consideration which you may give us in this very important matter and we will certainly support your amendment in whatever way you feel we are able.

Respectfully,

H. MARSHALL HANSEN,
Business Manager.

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES,
Golden, Colo., July 21, 1964.

Senator METCALF,
The Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to express our gratitude to the Senators and committeemen who have been helpful in keeping the surplus property program on the very active basis which it has been extended to the schools and colleges of our country. We have had many and varied uses for the wonderful items that have been offered for our use. We would like to let you know that we have uses constantly in different ways for the following items:

Lead is used in our radiation labs for shielding sources. It is also used in many of our experiments in metallurgy and so forth.

Mercury is used in some application or another in nearly all of our labs, and we are constantly buying this item on the open market.

Aluminum in both the sheet and rod forms is used as a noncorrosive material in our fume hoods and in building a great deal of equipment where we have a high corrosive factor.

Copper in both the sheet and rod form is used throughout the labs in a great many ways.

Asbestos sheeting is used to line a few hoods and furnaces where high heat concentration burns out most other products of this type. We also use raw asbestos as an insulator for both heat and cold.

Pearl silicones are used as greases in our petroleum labs and in many other places throughout the school.

We have appreciated your help in the past on needs pertaining to surplus property and solicit your support in continuing the program in the future.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST E. WATERS,
Purchasing Agent.

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES,
Golden, Colo., August 3, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I read your letter of July 8 concerning possible donation of surplus property to schools and hospitals with considerable interest. Our faculty has indicated desire to secure some of the materials you mentioned for research purposes. I am attaching a statement containing some details concerning potential uses of certain of the materials. Other possibilities will certainly develop in the future.

You will note that, in addition to research, certain of the materials would be useful to us in student laboratories and in constructing apparatus for these laboratories. In fact, small amounts of most of these materials are always in demand for routine laboratory use.

I appreciate having this matter called to my attention. I hope that this answer will be helpful to you.

Very truly yours,
ORLO E. CHILDS,
President.

Copper: A minimum of 500 pounds to be used in the foundry program and to be used in construction of equipment for teaching and research.

Corundum: 2 pounds for experimental flotation studies.

Diamond dies: 2 sets suitable for use in laboratory equipment to reduce metal rods to metal wire of small diameter.

Graphite, iodine, and manganese dioxide: 5 pounds each for use as chemicals in experimental programs.

Mercury: 100 pounds to be used chiefly in pressure measuring instruments.

Ruby: Small quantity (possibly 100 grams) to be used for experimental purposes.

Selenium: 5 pounds of high purity selenium to be used in the study of selenium alloys with other metals.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA,
Gainesville, July 16, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senator from Montana,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: During the past several years the University of Florida has obtained through the Federal surplus property program, many important items of equipment. In one instance we were successful in obtaining at considerable savings, all of the major items of equipment needed to establish our campus laundry.

Greater emphasis is now being placed on our graduate programs and on sponsored research. These two areas of emphasis often require our laboratory technicians and metalworking craftsmen to fabricate parts and components of various sizes and shapes. These when assembled become laboratory and field test equipment that must perform under varied and extreme conditions of operation, weather, etc.

The above-described graduate and research program will require our obtaining varying amounts of the following materials: Aluminum, bismuth,[1] cadmium,[1] corundum,[1] copper, copper base alloys, graphite, lead, magnesium,[1] mercury,[1] nickel, rubber,[1] silicon carbide, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

If any of the above now in the strategic materials stockpile were offered to us through the Federal surplus property program, prior to sale to industry, considerable savings would be realized by the University of Florida.

Any assistance that you or your committee might be in obtaining the release of the above type of materials to the Federal surplus property program would be appreciated by all colleges and universities.

It is my hope that you and your committee will continue your outstanding work in making available to educational institutions numerous items of equipment surplus to the needs of our Federal Government.

Cordially yours,
J. WAYNE REITZ,
President.

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Tallahassee, July 15, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It is my understanding that you are sponsoring an amendment to the Material Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 which will permit the donable surplus property program for health and education institutions the opportunity to review and request materials declared excess to stockpile needs.

Such an amendment would be of tremendous value to educational institutions such as ours which have large basic research programs, and which also place great emphasis on teaching the physical sciences. Our research program is supported by machine shops on the campus that make the many intricate pieces of equipment required for experimental work. The need for lead, stainless steel, and aluminum is evident for such equipment. Our chemistry and biological sciences departments, both in teaching and research, have need for magnesium, antimony, mercury, iodine, and the like.

With the Government now placing great emphasis on assisting the universities in enlarging their teaching and academic facilities, the possibility of obtaining certain stock materials is most inviting.

Yours very truly,
R. K. SHAW,
Business Manager.

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI,
Coral Gables, Fla., July 17, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Information regarding your proposed amendment to the Strategic Stockpile Act has just reached us.

A canvas of the departments most likely to benefit from the amendment, engineering, physics, Institute of Marine Science and Chemistry, evoked a unanimous affirmative as to their needs for the materials concerned. These materials will greatly benefit general science education. Also in many cases the above-mentioned departments are constructing equipment and research apparatus under Government contracts which heretofore have supplied the funds to buy these materials, thus any materials received through your efforts will result in a direct saving to the Government.

Sincerely,
U. J. HISS,
Director of Property Control.

MERCER UNIVERSITY,
Macon, Ga., July 20, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It is my understanding that Senate bill, S. 2272, providing for the continuing stockpiling of certain critical materials by the Federal Government to insure their availability in case of emergency will have acted upon an amendment, designated as amendment No. 517, providing that the material cannot be disposed of under this subsection without it being offered for donation purposes prior to its sale. I am now told that some of our Senators feel that this material is of no use for educational and health purposes and therefore are not in favor of the amendment.

I thought, perhaps, it would be of value to you to know the approximate annual needs of Mercer University for materials covered under this subsection and I have requested our science departments to give me an indication, which I shall itemize for you as follows: Aluminum, 5 pounds; asbestos, 1 pound; bismuth, 2 pounds; cadmium, 1 pound; copper and copper base alloy, 5 pounds; graphite, 1 pound; iodine, 5 pounds; lead, 2 pounds; magnesium, 1 pound; mercury, 10 pounds; nickel, 1 pound; zinc, 5 pounds.

Mercer University, as you know, is a small liberal arts college of some 1,500 students and I am sure that our annual needs as indicated above for these materials would represent only a small percentage of the total needs of all institutions of higher learning in the United States. I trust that when this amendment comes before your committee, and before the Senate, that you will support it since it will be of significant value to all American higher education.

Yours very truly,
WILLIAM T. HAYWOOD,
Business Manager.

PIEDMONT COLLEGE,
Demorest, Ga., July 17, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Apparently there is some question about the usefulness of certain materials in educational programs. I am writing to assure you that our building and construction program has and would find the following stockpile items to be useful: Asbestos, lead, sheet cover, shellac, talc, feathers, and down.

Our superintendent of construction and maintenance, Mr. Wilton Duckett, joins with me and all of our staff in expressing appreciation for the many ways in which the commodities provided by Georgia State Agency for Surplus Property have strengthened the total program of education for the young people in Appalachia.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES E. WALTER.

DUDLEY M. HUGHES VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, BIBB COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Macon, Ga., July 20, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing in regard to amendment No. 517 to Senate bill S. 2272. This amendment is of vital interest to our vocational-technical training program in Georgia.

The surplus property program in Georgia is the major source of metals, machine shop "stock" and material for welding training. If we did not have this source of materials for these areas of training the cost of buying these materials on the open market would cause drastic curtailment of many of our training programs in the metalworking and welding fields.

All of the new metals developed have to be introduced to the technicians who are going to use them. All that we ask is that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be allowed to send his surplus property screeners and select whatever metals that we can use at such time that they might become available as surplus to the national stockpile.

It is my thinking that the surplus property program for educational use is one of the best administered and most helpful services with the least cost to the taxpayers that is being furnished by any Federal agency at the present time.

I wish that you could visit our school and see some of the fine uses that we are making of many types of property secured through this program.

We earnestly ask you to give all the support possible to the subject amendment and we assure you that this material will be utilized to the fullest extent in our school.

---

[1] Amount required is small.

Sincerely,

Raymonde M. Kelley,
Director, Vocational Education.

Attachment to Letter to Senator Lee Metcalf Dated July 20, 1964

Listed below are some materials that from time to time could be used in the 26 major training areas covered by Dudley M. Hughes Vocational-Technical School, Macon, Ga.: Aluminum, asbestos, bismuth, cadmium, copper and copper base alloy, cardage fibers, corundum, feathers and down, graphite, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, rubber, shellac, silicon carbide, talc, tungsten, and zinc.

Muscogee County School District,
Columbus, Ga., July 15, 1964.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: Muscogee County School District is interested in securing additional surplus materials from the Federal Government. Therefore, we are interested in amendment No. 517 to S. 2272.

This school system, along with others, cannot maintain required standards of operation without the benefit of surplus trucks, equipment, and other materials which have been available in the last several years. Some of the materials referred to as having been stockpiled, which could be available to public schools, are used and needed both in the maintenance plant and the instructional program. Reference is made specifically to aluminum, which is used in the industrial arts, vocational, and adult training programs. Aluminum in certain forms can be used in the maintenance of plant. Other materials can be used in similar fashion, particularly copper, copper base alloy, shellac, and other materials commonly used in training situations.

Your continued interest and support of the program to make these materials available to the public schools of this country is appreciated. We request that you do everything possible to help the schools obtain additional surplus property.

Nathan M. Patterson,
Assistant Superintendent
for Special Services.

University of Illinois,
Urbana, Ill., July 17, 1964.

Subject: Strategic materials stockpile.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: The University of Illinois participates in the Federal surplus property utilization program, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the State of Illinois, at the warehouse located in Springfield.

We have been advised that certain items which are of particular need to our research programs are stockpiled, and under consideration for release. The items which we would utilize to the most advantage are mercury, aluminum, copper, and copper base alloys.

Very truly yours,

D. L. Hartman,
Buyer.

The University of Kansas, Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Lawrence, Kans., August 3, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: It has come to my attention that a bill is pending which would provide for the release of certain strategic materials from stockpile. I believe that this has been referred to as the "Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964." I have also been informed concerning the proposed Metcalf amendment which would provide for making available many of these materials to schools and hospitals throughout the United States.

In speaking for the Department of Physics at the University of Kansas, I would say that this department would be extremely happy to receive material which would be available, especially aluminum, copper, mercury, and nickel. It would be my feeling that this department, as well as many similar departments over the country, would benefit greatly from the availability of these stockpiled items.

Respectfully yours,

G. M. McGonigle,
Laboratory Supervisor.

The University of Kansas, Department of Metallurgy and Materials Engineering,
Lawrence, Kans., July 29, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I have been informed that you propose to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 so that the material would become available to schools and hospitals.

Whether or not the materials would be useful depends upon the condition in which it is stored; whether ingot or finished sheet for metals, bulk or packaged for the nonmetals. If the materials were available in reasonable amounts, say in 100-pound units, our metallurgy department could use the following:

1. All of the metals for use in our metals casting laboratory and experimental alloy work.
2. Graphite, if in block form,. for crucibles and electric resistant heaters.
3. Rubber, if not crude, as vibration absorber pads in the laboratory mounting of machinery.
4. Nonmetallics (corrundum, asbestos, silicon carbide, and talc are usable in experimental ceramic compositional work).

We appear to have no use for feathers and down, iodine or cordage fibers.

Yours truly,

Maynard P. Bauleke,
Associate Professor.

Kansas State University,
Manhattan, Kans., July 30, 1964.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senator from Montana,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I support your efforts to make strategic materials from stockpile available to schools and hospitals prior to their general release. Such a provision would be most advantageous to certain of the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences of Kansas State University.

Our chemistry department uses large quantities of bismuth, cadminm, copper, and copper base alloys, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc for demonstration experiments in the teaching program of the department and for certain research purposes. Mercury in particular is used extensively. The department of physics also uses several hundred pounds of mercury each year in their instructional and research programs. The department of psychology uses considerable amounts of aluminum in various sizes for the construction of different pieces of equipment, particularly in some of their animal behavior studies.

I appreciate your concern for the needs of educational institutions.

Sincerely yours,

John Chalmers,
Dean.

Kansas State University,
Manhattan, Kans., July 22, 1694.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: It has come to my attention that the Materials Reserve and Stock Pile Act of 1964 may release strategic materials for use by educational institutions. I have conferred with the department heads in the college of engineering and find an enthusiastic response regarding the availability of such materials for our academic program.

Specifically, the Departments of Chemical, Civil, Electrical, Industrial, and Mechanical Engineering of Kansas State University would have need for the following surplus materials: Aluminum, bismuth, cadmium, copper, corundum, graphite, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

These materials would be used extensively, both in the instructional and the research programs, with a few of the applications listed as follows:

1. Thermal conductivity experiments; thermocouples.
2. Liquid metal heat transfer.
3. Hydraulic laboratory manometers.
4. Heat transfer under vacuum.
5. Plasma studies.
6. Investigations on engineering properties of materials.

I can assure you that this surplus material would be a significant contribution to our academic program, and that efficient use of it would be made by our engineering faculty.

Sincerely yours,

John W. Shupe,
(For Paul E. Russell, Dean.)

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Department of Education,
Frankfort, Ky., July 15, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: This letter is to express appreciation on behalf of a large number of colleges, technical schools, secondary schools, and hospitals in Kentucky for the effort you are making to allow strategic and critical materials now in stockpile to become available through the donation program.

One can assume that not all categories of material will be needed nor usable by such institutions; however, many can be used and would be of great value as well as withholding that portion off the market thus not disrupting our economy to that extent.

The donation program has been of inestimable value to the institutions in Kentucky as is attested to by the large number of communications and expressions we have received. To make such materials as shellac, aluminum, copper and copper alloys, mercury, graphite, etc., available will mean much in furthering our technical, science, and research programs that would otherwise be hampered if this class of material were not made available through this program.

We therefore urge you and the other members of your committee to "leave no stone unturned" in bringing about a successful conclusion.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. Williams,
Director, Division of Surplus Property.

The University of Mississippi,
University, Miss., July 18, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: We have learned that you wish to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide that when such materials are found to be surplus to present need, they be released only after being offered for donation to schools and hospitals under the donable surplus property program on the same basis as other Federal surplus property.

This would be an excellent thing to the institutions of higher learning and one that would aid these institutions considerably. We hope that you are successful with amending this act.

Very respectfully yours,

H. E. Haney,
Purchasing Agent.

The University of
Missouri at Rolla,
Rolla, Mo., July 20, 1964.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: This is in reference to your letter of July 8 regarding your proposed amendment of S. 2272. The university, like others devoted primarily or entirely to science and engineering training, has a continuing need for materials, both raw and finished, in both undergraduate instructional and graduate research programs. Our needs for any one material at any one time would, of course, be very small, but the purchase of all our materials requirements consumes a significant portion of our operating capital each fiscal year.

Our use of such materials, as listed in the second paragraph of your letter, may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. In research—the university is establishing a materials research center. Starting in September this facility will have a staff of four senior researchers in ceramics, metallurgy, physics, and chemistry and some five research assistants in various fields devoted to investigation of the physical-chemical behavior of materials for the purpose of developing materials with properties and reliability needed in our Nation's space and defense programs. The primary objective of the center will be; however, the training of engineers and scientists at the graduate level for materials research and development programs.

2. The undergraduate laboratories and graduate research in both science and engineering require a wide variety of materials. In particular metallurgical engineering uses a rather full spectrum of metals, both ferrous and nonferrous, in its laboratory course work. The mechanical engineering, mechanics, civil engineering, and chemical engineering employ a wide spectrum of both metallic and nonmetallic materials in undergraduate laboratories, as do the departments of physics and chemistry. Oxides and silicates are used in rather significant quantities in ceramic engineering.

Of the materials listed in paragraph 2 of your letter, we have need for all of those items during the academic year, with the possible exception of feathers. If some of our materials needs could be fulfilled on a donation basis from the materials in the national stockpile, these would be gratefully received, inasmuch as this would permit moneys currently expended for these needs to be used to develop further our instructional program.

On behalf of the university administration I wish to thank you for affording us an opportunity to express interest in your proposed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

T. J. Planje,
Director.

Montana School of Mines,
Butte, Mont., July 16, 1964.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: Your letter of July 8 regarding a possible amendment to S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, has arrived during Dr. Koch's absence from the campus. Because he expects to be absent for several days, I have contacted the associate director of our Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology and he has furnished the following information in answer to questions asked in your letter.

In answer to your question as to what ways this institution might use strategic materials listed in your letter, we are presuming that these materials are of commercial grade rather than crude ores or materials. If this is true, I do not believe that either the school of the bureau of mines and geology could use very much of most of the materials, and some of them would be of no use to us at all. Following is some indication of the use which might be made of the materials listed:

1. Asbestos: It may be that we could use small amounts for steel pipe insulation.
2. Copper: Small amounts might be used in metallurgical research.
3. Corundum: We have no use for corundum, as such, but do use small quantities of abrasive in manufactured forms such as wheels.
4. Diamond dies: These might possibly be used in metallurgical research.
5. Feathers: We have no use for this material.
6. Graphite: We would have no use for this material as Montana has graphite deposits which would be used on any research problems.
7. Iodine: This would be of no use to us.
8. Manganese dioxide: Small quantities might be used in metallurgical processes.
9. Mercury: Small quantities could be used in research.
10. Pyrethrum: We would have no use for this material.
11. Ruby: Probably all available supply could be used.
12. Selenium: This might be used in metallurgical research.
13. Shellac: This could be used by maintenance department.

I hope the above information will be of some help to you. As you can see, our need for any of these materials for research or instructional programs would be quite small.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Louise Hungerford,
Secretary to the President.

Hastings College,
Hastings, Nebr., July 15, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: We wish to advise you that we can use to good advantage critical materials as surplus for education.

We have a constant need for mercury, copper, lead, tin, zinc, and many other metals. We urge you to recommend that these surplus metals, and other materials be given to education. The surplus property program has been very vital to Hastings College. Please use your influence to support the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

Sincerely,

John T. Konzack,
Associate Professor, Math and Physics,
and Surplus Property Coordinator.

The University of Nebraska,
Lincoln, Nebr., July 15, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Avery J. Linn, director of the Nebraska State Agency for Surplus Property, has supplied the university with a list of materials and requested that we indicate those which would have the most use to the various departments.

After checking the users of such materials the following are found to be most in demand: Aluminum, asbestos, copper and copper base alloys, graphite, lead, mercury, nickel, rubber, silicon, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

The University of Nebraska has a very close working relationship with the surplus property program in this State and a great deal of pride is taken in the conscientious use of Government surplus.

This program has been of great value to many departments within the university, especially in agricultural and scientific research.

Very truly yours,

L. J. Legg,
Inventory Manager.

South Dakota School
of Mines, and Technology,
Rapid City, S. Dak., July 15, 1964.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: This is in reply to yours of July 8, 1964, relative to your intended amendment to S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

We have inquired in a number of departments regarding the question which you have asked. We would request and, if made available to us, use substantial amounts of several of the items which you enumerate. Specifically and on this first inquiry, they would be mercury, manganese dioxide, asbestos, and probably copper. They would be used for general laboratory purposes, for research, and for plant operation and maintenance. The principal use would be in research. In this activity, they would provide a very substantial assistance and I assure you we would appreciate it greatly.

I trust that this is the kind of information which you desire.

Very truly yours,

F. L. Partlo, *President.*

Bethel College,
McKenzie, Tenn., July 15, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: We understand that you have introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate in reference to the disposal of surplus stockpile materials. Such bill would offer these materials free to health and educational institutions before they were offered for public sale.

We believe that this is a good bill and that its provisions will be of no small benefit to the Nation's colleges. Although we do not know the entire list of stockpiled materials, we wish to suggest that such things as sheet aluminum, lead, zinc, and tin are used considerably in general maintenance as well as in the making of various scientific equipment. No doubt there are other materials such as iodine, other metals, and miscellaneous items that could be of value to chemistry, and physics, and engineering departments.

We hope that your bill will receive favorable action from the entire Congress and the President.

Sincerely yours,

George E. Rouse,
Head, Department of Physical Science.

Trevecca, Nazarene College,
Nashville, Tenn., July 15, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: We are pleased to learn of your proposed amendment to the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, which provides materials to educational institutions. The Science Department of Trevecca Nazarene College could certainly use the following materials: Aluminum, copper and copper base alloys, cordage fibers, iodine, lead, magesium, mercury, nickel, shellac, talc, and zinc.

Sincerely,

John W. Dix,
Chairman, Science Department.

The University of Tennessee,
Knoxville, Tenn., July 16, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: We at the University of Tennessee heartily endorse your efforts to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, making it possible for property in the stockpile to be given to health and educational institutions for use in research and instructional programs.

Like other similar universities, our institution has a need for many of the materials being reserved and stockpiled, and we believe it will serve in the public interest for the Government to assist us by filling such needs.

I am asking Mr. David Johnson of our department of mechanical and aerospace engineering to send you any further details he thinks will be of value to you in promoting the passage of your bill. Mr. Johnson coordinates the university's program of acquiring surplus properties, and he is cognizant of the value of this program.

Please be assured that your interest in strengthening the Nation's institutions of higher education is certainly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

A. D. Holt,
President.

Siena College,
Memphis, Tenn., July 20, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I am writing in regard to some materials which are a part of the stockpile of surplus property. Some of these things would be of great value to our biology and chemistry departments. Listed are the items which we would find most useful: Aluminum, asbestos, bismuth, cadmium, graphite, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, shellac, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

Thank you for your help in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

Sister Adrian Marie, O.P.,
Biology Instructor.

Lambuth College,
Jackson, Tenn., July 16, 1964.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I have heard that you have introduced a bill to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide that any property being released from stockpile be offered to health and education institutions by donation before it is sold.

On behalf of our college and other small colleges throughout the country I would like to express our sincere interest in this program and hope that you may succeed in getting the bill approved. I realize that we could not use all of the materials that might be offered, but am sure that such materials would be beneficial and give us a chance to get necessary materials that we do not have funds to purchase.

Sincerely,

J. R. Blanton,
Business Manager.

Houghton, Mich.,
July 20, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: Your amendment to S. 2272 would be most helpful in providing the quantities of strategic materials such as asbestos, aluminum, magnesium, and others for our undergraduate, graduate, research, and physical plant maintenance program.

Michigan Technological University,
Dr. R. L. Smith,
Coordinator of Research.
Prof. G. A. Hellman,
Director of Physical Plant.

Chattanooga, Tenn.,
July 20, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Chemistry, engineering, physics departments use the chemicals and metals which are now stored in Federal strategic materials stockpiles. University of Chattanooga would benefit greatly if these materials were donated to educational institutions.

Robert W. Fenix,
Comptroller,
University of Chattanooga.

Memphis State University,
Memphis, Tenn., July 16, 1964.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: Recently you introduced a bill in the Senate to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide for property being released from the governmental stockpile to be offered for donation to health and educational institutions throughout the Nation.

As chairman of the Department of Chemistry and Physics at Memphis State University, we have greatly benefited from surplus materials released to us to be used in instruction of young men and young women in chemistry and physics.

We are a fast growing metropolitan university whose enrollment has more than doubled during the past 5 years, and the anticipated enrollment for the fall of 1964 will exceed 10,000 students. The legislature of the State of Tennessee has not made adequate provision for the growth of the university and supplemental assistance is greatly needed. For this reason I am complimenting you for your interest in providing surplus materials for educational institutions and urge the passage of this act.

Gratefully,

J. W. Fox,
Chairman, Department of
Chemistry and Physics.

David Lipscomb College,
Nashville, Tenn., July 15, 1964.

Re strategic materials stockpile.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: It would be of great benefit in the teaching program of David Lipscomb College if the college could receive some of the materials being released from the strategic materials stockpile. In conference with the departments of science of the college, it has been determined that important use could be made of the following materials: Aluminum, bismuth, cadmium, copper and copper base alloys, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

I, therefore, sincerely hope that the bill you have introduced in the U.S. Senate to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 will pass, so that any property being released from the stockpile may be offered for donation to health and educational institutions before it is sold. This would be of great assistance to the science program of David Lipscomb College.

Sincerely yours,

Athens Clay Pullias.

Christian Brothers College,
Memphis, Tenn., July 16, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: In reference to the bill you are introducing to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide property to educational institutions by donation, I would like to encourage you. Many institutions could use the following materials for construction or direct laboratory use: Aluminum, bismuth, cadmium, copper and copper base alloys, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, rubber, shellac, tin, and zinc.

Sincerely yours,

Brother J. Edward, Ph D.,
Chairman, Chemistry Department.

Madison College,
Madison, Tenn., July 17, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I recently learned of your proposal to offer for donation to health and educational institutions before it is sold, any property being released from the Nation's stockpile of strategic materials. I think this is a fine idea, provided it can be implemented with a minimum of waste and cost to the taxpayer.

Depending on the physical form and/or minimum packaged quantity, Madison College could use asbestos, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, talc, tin, zinc, and possibly others.

Very truly yours,

Wiley C. Austin,
Head, Department of Chemistry.

Austin Peay State College,
Clarksville, Tenn., July 16, 1964.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: The bill which you introduced in the Senate to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 has very recently come to my attention. I should like to comment. Your amendment could be beneficial to any educational institution doing scientific research, and significantly beneficial to schools like Austin Peay State College which are in the early stages of research growth. Although modest research programs have recently been initiated by all of the natural science departments of the college, each department is operating without the basic stockroom supplies necessary for effective use of the time and talent of the faculty which we possess.

The people responsible for the research in our science departments have informed me that they are in general need of brass, copper, and aluminum stock, plus mercury, shellac, and glyptol. Specifically needed are lead, graphite, and cadmium for the radioisotope work. These are all materials which are constantly required in varying forms and quantities, yet their purchase in even moderate amounts is a serious drain on our limited financial resources. Your amendment would remove this drain and thus make available more funds for use in acquiring the specialized apparatus necessary for increased efficiency and sophistication in scientific investigations at Austin Peay State College.

I thank you for your interest in the welfare of science in higher education, and I shall send copies of this letter to your colleagues from Tennessee urging them to support your amendment.

Sincerely yours,

Joe Morgan,
President.

Sam Houston State
Teachers College,
Huntsville, Tex., July 16, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: We have noticed that you have introduced a bill in the Senate to make surplus national stockpile materials available to institutions. We are constantly in need of aluminum, asbestos, copper, lead, rubber, shellac, and tin. These materials could be used in our instructional program as well as maintenance and repair. We feel that passage of this bill would be of great benefit to this institution as well as other institutions of higher learning in this vicinity.

Yours very truly,
D. C. Holleman,
Comptroller.

Midwestern University,
Wichita Falls, Tex., July 16, 1964.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I have heard that you have introduced a bill in the Senate to make surplus materials from our national stockpile available for donation to educational and research programs in institutions of higher education. Because of the limited funds under which we operate and the fact that there is seldom a time when we are not in need bordering on the desperate for materials which may be available, I just want to express to you my appreciation for your thoughtfulness in getting this kind of bill before the legislators of this country. I sincerely hope that it does pass.

Some of the items which would be of inestimable value to us, if and when they may be available, are aluminum, copper, lead, tin, and zinc (particularly in sheets), which could be used in our physics department. Mercury would also be very useful for this department. This department offers a major and is in the process of considerable expansion. We are in short supply on much of this type of thing. Our chemistry department, as well, could use most of these materials. The geology department, which has shown an upswing in students in the last 2 years, could also make very valuable use of these items I have mentioned and kindred items. For example, shellac would be very useful for the finishing and protection of geological and biological specimens. Our biology department is constantly in need of asbestos, iodine, and the shellac which I have just mentioned.

I sincerely hope that any surplus which develops in our national stockpile can be made available to some of us who need it.

Once again, thank you for your efforts on behalf of higher education. I just wish for you every success in the handling of this bill.

Very sincerely yours,
Travis White,
President.

Lamar State College of Technology,
Beaumont, Tex., July 14, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: It has been brought to my attention that you have introduced in the Senate a bill amending the Material Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

As I understand, this amendment is to provide the excess material in the stockpile for institutions of higher learning. I would like to state that if these materials become available that Lamar State College of Technology can use aluminum, mercury, lead, shellac, and some of the other materials in this category.

This material has been used in our teaching field and also in connection with our research programs.

I wish to express my appreciation to you for your efforts in scheduling these excess materials for institutional needs.

Sincerely yours,
H. C. Galloway,
Comptroller.

Abilene Christian College,
Abilene, Tex., July 27, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: We understand there is a possibility of some reserve materials from the national reserve stockpile being made available to institutions of higher learning. Our science department and industrial arts department are interested in this matter and, of course, appreciate being able to acquire some of these items, especially the following: Aluminum, asbestos, copper and copper base alloys, corundum, graphite, lead, nickel, shellac, silicon, carbide, tin, and zinc.

We understand that you have introduced a bill making the donations of some of these items to colleges possible, and we appreciate very much your interest in our work.

Sincerely yours,
Lawrence L. Smith,
Bursar.

San Antonio College,
San Antonio, Tex., July 16, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: The information has come to me that you have introduced a bill in the Senate to make surplus national stockpile material available for donation to schools and colleges.

In the teaching of our sciences, especially chemistry, we do have constant need for aluminum, copper (wire and power), corundum, iodine, lead, magnesium (ribbon), mercury, silicon carbide, tin, and zinc. If your bill is passed making such materials available on a donation basis, it would be of help to educational institutions in their instructional and research programs.

On behalf of the administration and faculty of San Antonio College, may I thank you for your help in solving our problems.

Very truly yours,
Wayland P. Moody,
President.

State of Vermont,
Department of Education,
Montpelier, Vt., July 16, 1964.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I was recently informed that you have introduced an amendment to the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, which would provide that any such materials that are found to be surplus to present needs, be first offered for donation to schools and hospitals under the donable surplus property program.

As executive director of special services in the Vermont Department of Education I am in daily contact with local educators, therefore, I am in a position to know that your amendment, if passed, would prove invaluable to science programs in all levels of Vermont's educational system.

I hope your amendment receives enough support to insure its passage.

Sincerely yours,
Rupert J. Spencer,
Executive Director.

END AID PRACTICE OF PAYING RIGGED PRICES AT HEAVY COST TO AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, on behalf of Senators Morse and Douglas and myself, a bill to amend section 604 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the use of funds made available under such act for payment for petroleum products at prices in excess of competitive market prices, or for the payment of barter agents' commissions.

Last year, in the 88th Congress, I introduced a similar measure. It was in the form of an amendment to the foreign aid bill then under consideration. My amendment was passed by the Senate on August 10, 1964. But when the foreign aid bill went into conference to iron out House-Senate differences, my amendment failed to get the approval of the conferees. I believe this was because the House conferees had not had sufficient time to study the amendment.

The bill I am introducing today has two objectives:

First. To prohibit the Agency for International Development from purchasing oil for use in its program at higher than world competitive prices.

Second. To eliminate a precedent by which sellers to AID can insist upon payment of such business costs as barter agent's commission, other servicing charges, and disposal fees—in those cases where commodities furnished to a recipient country are procured through the barter of other commodities.

For the past 10 years or more, AID petroleum purchases have amounted to more than $100 million a year. Virtually all of these purchases, incidentally, have been from oversea sources and over 50 percent from foreign-owned companies. Thus, there has been a substantial drain on our balance of payments from these purchases alone.

Now, at what prices was this oil purchased?

Only about 2 percent of the purchases were for lubes and greases. This 2 percent was purchased from U.S. firms, from independent producers, and at competitive prices.

All the rest—98 percent—was purchased from seven international companies at posted prices which are 20 to 35 percent over world prices.

How can such artificially high prices be established?

This is how. The seven international companies have affiliated operations throughout the world. These companies can set practically any prices they wish on transactions with their own affiliates. Where taxes in a producing country are low, the oil company will set artificially high prices—20, 30, or even 40 percent higher than competitive market prices. With taxes lower, profits are, of course, higher—and the affiliate is willing to pay the posted prices because the profit goes into the same holding company.

For a long time the statement has been kicked around in international oil circles that "only fools and affiliates pay the posted price for Middle East oil."

This statement can accurately be expanded to read, "Only fools, affiliates and AID pay the posted price for Middle East oil."

It makes sense for the oil company to manipulate its bookkeeping in this profitmaking way.

But it makes no sense for AID to pay a price that is higher, sometimes much higher, than the world price.

This practice has cost American taxpayers millions of dollars.

Moreover, it has put us in the position abroad of not living up to the gospel of free enterprise that we preach. Surely, the noncompetitive, rigged, artificial prices countenanced by AID cannot qualify under our country's definition of free enterprise.

The first part of my bill would require AID to buy oil at prices established in competitive markets. This would permit independent producers to bid in the kind of competitive market for which the United States should be known.

The second part of my bill is designed to stop still another abuse in the AID-financed oil program.

One of the ways in which petroleum products are purchased by foreign countries with AID funds is through barter. For example, funds are used to purchase other commodities which can in turn be exchanged for oil and gas. According to rules issued for these arrangements, "No barter agent's commission may be paid by the suppliers of petroleum products." This is an incredible provision for the benefit of one industry.

Suppliers of other products customarily pay the servicing charges and disposal fees associated with their sales. These are normal business costs. But when AID finances barter transactions involving oil, it insists that the oil suppliers should not pay brokerage or selling costs. For example, a foreign country such as Turkey obtains AID funds for the purchase of agricultural products. Turkey trades these agricultural goods with a foreign-owned oil company such as Royal Dutch Shell.

And AID pays the brokerage fees.

Why should normal business procedures be overturned by a government order leading to additional Federal expenditures for the benefit of one industry?

This strange arrangement is obviously setting a precedent. If it is allowed to continue, we can expect producers of other commodities to ask AID for the same type of service that it is giving to oil companies.

My bill would put an end to practices followed by AID that boost the prices we pay for oil from 20 to 35 percent above competitive market prices.

It would also help to repair the damage abroad to our free enterprise image and restore our position in the world marketplace as a prudent trader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I have introduced be printed at this point in my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 1069) to amend section 604 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to prohibit the use of funds made available under such act for payment for petroleum products at prices in excess of competitive market prices, or for the payment of barter agents' commissions, introduced by Mr. Proxmire (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Amend section 604(b), which relates to maximum prices for commodities procured under the Act, by inserting "(1)" after the word "than" and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "or (2) in the case of petroleum or petroleum products, the price generally charged by the supplier in comparable export sales from the source country at the time of purchase. Clause (2) of the foregoing sentence shall not apply to the purchase price in sales under formal competitive bid procedures. The term 'comparable export sales' as used in such clause shall not include sales to affiliates."

(2) Amend section 604, which relates to procurement, by adding the following new subsection (e):

"(e) None of the funds made available under this Act shall be used to pay any barter agent's commission or other servicing charges or disposal fees in any case in which commodities or defense articles furnished to a recipient country are procured through the barter of other commodities or articles, and any such commission, charge, or fee shall be paid by the supplier of the commodities or defense articles so furnished or the recipient country."

DENIAL OF FOREIGN AID TO UNITED NATIONS MEMBERS MORE THAN 1 YEAR DELINQUENT IN ASSESSMENTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which I believe would, if enacted, do much to help solve the financial crisis in the United Nations as well as to make American taxpayers more receptive to a program of foreign aid. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1070) to encourage preservation of the financial solvency of the United Nations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Miller, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to encourage preservation of the financial solvency of the United Nations which is being threatened by the failure of some member nations to pay currently their assessments and/or contributions to the United Nations, no assistance shall be furnished under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or any other law authorizing assistance to foreign countries, to the government of any nation which is more than one year in arrears in its payment of any assessment by the United Nations for its regular budget or for peace and security operations, unless a report is first furnished by the President to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives setting forth his determination that such assistance should nevertheless be furnished, accompanied by the reasons for such determination, including the assurance, if any, given by the government concerned of paying (independently of such assistance) all such arrearages and placing its payments of such assessments on a current basis, or an explanation of the unusual and exceptional circumstances which make it economically incapable of giving such assurance.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the bill would deny American foreign aid to any member of the United Nations that is more than 1 year delinquent in its assessments.

It should be pointed out that this will be the fifth year in which I have introduced proposed legislation of this character.

I should like to note that on August 18, 1961, such a measure was rejected by a vote of 24 to 66; on April 5, 1962, it was rejected, 15 to 78; on November 12, 1963, it was rejected, 20 to 60; and on August 10, 1964, it was rejected, 25 to 52. Each time, the State Department and the administration floor leaders opposed the proposal.

But I hasten to add that had such opposition not been made and had this measure been enacted 4 years ago, or even 3 years ago, or even 2 years ago, or even last year, we would not now be having the difficulties presently shaking the very foundation of the world organization. Also, the State Department would not be wondering how the vote will go in the United Nations when the confrontation over the Soviet Union's right to vote occurs.

If the nations to which we have been furnishing aid would pay up, the Soviet Union and its satellites might well pay their delinquencies in order to save face at the bar of world opinion.

I do not know what solution will be reached in the United Nations to force delinquent nations to pay their just dues and assessments. I do know that the very existence of the United Nations is tied to the enforcement of article 19 of the Charter, which denies a vote in the General Assembly to nations that are 2 years or more in arrears on their assessments.

I hope that we will have the courage of our convictions and will stick to our demand for the enforcement of this article. As our Ambassador to the United Nations, Hon. Adlai Stevenson, said on January 26:

> We cannot have two rules for paying assessments for the expenses of the organization—one rule for most of the members, and another for a few. If the Assembly should ignore the charter with respect to some of its members, it will be in no position to enforce the charter impartially as to others, with all the consequences which will follow with respect to the mandatory or voluntary character of assessments.

The crisis becomes more and more acute as each day goes by. Until action is taken on enforcement of the charter relating to article 19—and I do not feel that any nation would pull out if it is enforced—there is no way to force members to pay anything, even this year, although those who believe in the U.N. certainly will do so regardless.

To underscore what is involved, I point out that as of January 1, 1965, total U.N. delinquencies amounted to $145,331,192.21. Since then and through February 1, this amount was reduced by nearly $16 million. Even so, the outstanding arrears amount to more than $129,500,000.

My bill would be a step to lessen this crisis. It would emphasize that we are so concerned that we will take necessary steps to cut off aid to those who would make a mockery of the world organization.

Fifty-one nations, to which we provided more than $2 billion in aid during fiscal year 1964, would be affected based on their delinquencies as of January 1, 1965. As of January 1, these 51 countries owed close to $50 million in back dues.

Parenthetically, it should be noted that since January 1, several of these 51 may have removed themselves from the provisions of my bill by paying up their delinquencies. Specifically, I am referring to Italy, which has come up with the dues since January 1. Although others have made some payments, they have not paid up the full amounts which would eliminate them from coverage of my bill.

My bill would permit an exception upon a determination of the President, but only after filing a report for so doing with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Speaker of the House. The report would have to include assurance by the affected government that it will pay its delinquencies and that it will place its payments on a current basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the delinquent nations, the total U.S. aid during fiscal year 1964, and the U.N. arrearages be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MILLER

Fifty-two nations to which the United States has furnished aid since 1946 are delinquent in one or more of their assessments to the United Nations.

Excluding Cuba, 51 of these countries received some type of assistance from the United States in fiscal year 1964. All 51 would be affected by the Miller amendment which provides that assistance will be withheld from any nation over 1 year delinquent in United Nations dues.

Countries which would be affected by Miller amendment

Country	Total U.S. aid, fiscal year 1964	U.N. arrearages		Country	Total U.S. aid, fiscal year 1964	U.N. arrearages	
		Calendar year 1963 and prior	For all years			Calendar year 1963 and prior	For all years
Afghanistan	$43,600,000	$76,228.00	$84,750.31	Mali	$3,300,000	$20,910.00	$24,259.00
Argentina	14,800,000	1,070,822.15	2,050,573.15	Mauritania	800,000	17,318.00	40,262.55
Belgium/Luxembourg	41,400,000	3,271,651.00	3,451,059.00	Mexico	108,700,000	1,228,888.00	1,354,965.00
Bolivia	80,700,000	87,380.00	125,407.00	Nepal	6,400,000	8,845.00	48,593.77
Brazil	401,500,000	930,749.50	1,954,266.00	Nicaragua	8,100,000	44,539.00	84,133.00
Central Africa Republic	1,100,000	3,240.00	8,845.00	Niger	2,400,000	29,214.50	38,470.50
Chad	200,000	9,516.23	49,261.23	Panama	18,200,000	43,335.50	50,150.50
Chile	142,900,000	342,116.00	593,496.00	Paraguay	9,500,000	79,571.00	119,320.00
China	183,800,000	11,208,993.00	15,723,665.00	Peru	120,100,000	158,577.78	175,614.78
Congo (Brazzaville)	2,900,000	8,845.00	48,594.00	Poland	15,000,000	3,665,051.00	4,322,387.50
Costa Rica	16,400,000	18,950.59	41,965.71	Portugal	17,200,000	188,277.00	221,105.00
Dahomey	1,200,000	3,644.81	34,225.57	Saudi Arabia	(1)	122,885.00	134,811.00
Dominican Republic	16,600,000	99,624.25	148,584.25	Senegal	6,200,000	30,014.00	79,699.00
Ecuador	30,800,000	6,855.84	55,638.72	Somalia	4,100,000	28,583.32	68,332.32
El Salvador	15,900,000	15,927.00	22,742.00	Spain	81,600,000	1,828,833.00	1,975,356.00
Ethiopia	19,200,000	11,059.00	19,578.00	Sudan	7,500,000	75,067.00	144,625.00
France	32,300,000	16,143,083.00	17,752,565.00	Syria	3,400,000	51,681.00	101,366.00
Guatemala	15,500,000	41,208.00	78,845.00	Thailand	81,600,000	12,962.00	35,384.00
Guinea	19,800,000	17,064.00	23,879.00	Togo	1,700,000	29,214.50	41,625.50
Haiti	3,700,000	81,379.50	119,964.50	Tunisia	47,600,000	11,059.00	19,578.00
Honduras	9,900,000	66,179.50	105,650.50	United Arab Republics	144,500,000	326,300.00	374,322.52
Iraq	24,600,000	96,502.00	184,179.00	Upper Volta	900,000	21,797.00	54,365.14
Italy	233,000,000	950,480.00	3,525,927.00	Uruguay	9,000,000	136,052.44	240,446.44
Jordan	58,800,000	76,617.00	83,432.00	Yemen	5,700,000	87,380.50	127,129.50
Laos	43,400,000	5,027.00	37,961.00	Yugoslavia	75,600,000	301,453.00	333,269.00
Lebanon	200,000	23,434.00	31,953.00				

[1] Military data classified.

Sources: "U.N. Secretariat, Statement on the Collection of Contributions as at Dec. 31, 1964"; "U.S. Oversea Loans and Grants, Fiscal Year 1964, AID, Sept. 4, 1964."

HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals by the Federal Government and by institutions receiving grants from the Federal Government.

Similar proposed legislation was introduced by me in the 87th and 88th Congresses. I am happy to note that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who cosponsored the original measure, and I have been joined by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I am particularly happy to find myself a cosponsor of this useful piece of proposed legislation with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], to whom we are all so much indebted for long service in this body.

The growing list of cosponsors is representative of an increasing awareness of the problems which this bill attacks and of the need for legislation to deal with these problems.

This is not a liberal or a conservative, a rightwing or a leftwing measure. It has broad ideological support. It has the support of all men, both liberal and conservative, who are concerned about the kind of record our civilization is making in caring for helpless, speechless, voteless animals who can form no pressure group or lobby of their own, but must rely entirely on the compassion of those who can speak out and can vote.

There are sound precedents for this bill. In 1876 Great Britain enacted a law licensing scientists who conduct experiments on animals, registering the places where the work is done, and making them open to inspection by qualified inspectors. This law provides for humane treatment of the animals and the humane design of experiments. It is not an antivivisection measure. The legislation in England has been an unqualified success for almost 90 years. There is no reason why similar proposed legislation in this country should not be equally successful.

These are, in sum, the principles upon which this bill is based. It is simple, workable legislation which could not hamper genuine research but which will, if enacted, have a most salutary effect on the care and use of thousands of animals which enter laboratories in our country each year.

Mr. President, my record in support of medical research and education speaks for itself. I would not introduce or support any measure to outlaw or curtail research which is responsibly and humanely conducted.

But I believe that there is no need for a country as idealistic in tradition, and as rich in resources as the United States to condone the suffering which great numbers of these animals undergo before they die. This needless suffering does nothing to advance science or human welfare. On the contrary, research performed on unhealthy animals accompanied by unnecessary pain contributes to scientific error, misleading data, wasted funds, confusion in scientific literature, and demoralization of laboratory personnel.

And yet opposition to this bill, conducted under the pretense of protecting legitimate research from redtape and government bureaucracy, has delayed action on the legislation. This opposition comes in large measure from the organizations which prey upon helpless animals for profit made by selling the animals to laboratories for research experiments.

These organizations often try to forestall action on this measure at the Federal level by stating that there are State anticruelty laws. The fact is that 12 States specifically exempt research done in scientific institutions from anticruelty statutes and that, in any event, the State anticruelty laws were not designed to deal with cruelty and neglect in laboratories.

Research in the biological sciences now receives more support from the U.S. Government than from any other source. This bill applies only to vertebrate animals used in experiments and tests by Federal agencies and by recipients of grants from the Federal Government. It is our responsibility no longer to condone needless suffering.

It is my hope that in this session of Congress hearings will be held in order to dispel some of the misunderstandings that have arisen on this subject.

Mr. President, I am heartened by the editorial support that this bill has received in the past from leading newspapers throughout the Nation. A New York Times editorial stated that the bill:

> Would insure decent treatment of laboratory animals, including adequate rest and exercise areas proper feeding and sanitation. Where subjected to painful tests, animals would be anesthetized—now not always the case. None of these is antivivisection legislation. Medical and scientific research must continue for man's health and benefit. But human carelessness and cruelty to animals are always present—and always unnecessary.

The Washington Post stated that the bill introduced last year is:

> A simple sensible bill to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the U.S. Government. It aims to do no more than to minimize needless, wanton suffering. It has been carefully drafted to avoid any impediment to rational scientific study; it is in no sense an antivivisection bill. It provides machinery for reporting and inspection designed to assure decent care of animals awaiting experimental treatment, anesthetization when this would not interfere with an experiment, and prompt dispatch of a dying animal to avoid unnecessary agony when the experiment has been completed.

The Philadelphia Inquirer has said:

> Legislation defining civilized standards for conducting research experiments and providing for inspection and enforcement is immediately desirable and should be approved without any further pointless delay.

The Christian Science Monitor editorialized some time ago:

> Members of Congress and their constituents may be tempted to think that, in the face of global upheavals and serious domestic crises bills relating to the treatment of animals are unimportant. It is a false premise. No matter involving the public conscience is even relatively unimportant, and the treatment of animals in experimental laboratories is a matter of public conscience. Man's inhumanity to man is not so separate from his inhumanity to animals that he can afford to ignore the latter. Mercy is indivisible.

Mr. President, I hope that in due course companion legislation will be introduced in the other body.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk until February 19 for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania is granted.

The bill (S. 1071) to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FEDERAL RECOGNITION OF BOWNE HOUSE IN FLUSHING, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] a joint resolution to provide for appropriate Federal recognition of the historical importance of the Bowne House in Flushing, Long Island. John Bowne, who built the house in 1661, played a significant role in the fight for religious tolerance.

Recognition of this beautiful home as a symbol of religious tolerance is particularly appropriate at this time when our Nation is so arduously seeking solutions to the problems of tolerance and understanding of minority groups on many fronts. It was a great honor and pleasure for me to have served in 1957 as honorary cochairman of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee for the Celebration of the 300th Anniversary of the Signing of the Flushing Remonstrance, and I am glad now to make this effort, along with my colleague, to honor properly this nationally important shrine and symbol of religious freedom.

The resolution was prepared with the cooperation of the Board of Trustees of the Bowne House Historical Society. The full text follows:

> Whereas, by the Flushing Remonstrance of 1657, the freeholders of Flushing in defiance of measures of religious persecution undertaken by Gov. Peter Stuyvesant, insisted on the right to have and enjoy liberty of conscience and to welcome in their homes "any sons of Adam among us"; and
>
> Whereas Bowne House was constructed in 1661 from timbers hand hewn by John Bowne who moved to Flushing in his determination to find a community and a home where he could worship God according to his convictions; and
>
> Whereas, despite the promise of religious liberty originally contained in the charter of the town of Flushing, John Bowne was arrested in 1662 and fined with a warning to abstain in future from religious meetings of the Society of Friends; and
>
> Whereas he was transported to Holland for further sentencing and offered such an eloquent plea for tolerance and liberty of conscience that he was released, the governing body of the Province declaring that "the conscience of men, at least, ought to remain free"; and
>
> Whereas the trial and acquittal of John Bowne is one of the landmarks of religious freedom in this Nation, comparable to the trial of John Peter Zenger in the history of freedom of the press, one of the stepping stones that led to the drafting of the Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution; and
>
> Whereas Bowne House, in which the prescribed religious meetings were held, was acquired by the Bowne House Historical Society in 1945 in celebration of the tercentenary of the community of Flushing, dedicated by Mayor Fiorello La Guardia on October 10, 1945, as a national shrine to religious freedom and tolerance, and opened to the public on Independence Day, 1947; and
>
> Whereas Bowne House today stands with much of its original construction and with contemporary furnishings intact and has been designated in the Journal of the American Institute of Architects as one of the 20 structures of national importance in New York City which should be preserved at all costs: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to provide, with the consent of the Bowne House Historical Society, for appropriate recognition by the Federal Government of the national historical and architectural significance of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) providing for appropriate Federal recognition of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y., introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, section 712(a)(1) of the Defense Production Act, as amended, provides that the Joint Committee on Defense Production shall be composed of 10 members, 5 of them members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and 5 of them members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The law provides that these five members from each of the communities are to be appointed by the chairman of the respective committee, three from the majority and two from the minority party.

During the 88th Congress the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production were Senators SPARKMAN, DOUGLAS, BENNETT, TOWER, and myself. These members have indicated to me their desire to continue to serve on the Joint Committee on Defense Production. Therefore, the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production will be Senators SPARKMAN, DOUGLAS, BENNETT, TOWER, and myself.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 201) to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 437) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, the name of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I also ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 438) to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators) on January 12, 1965, the name of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I further ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 624) to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption, the name of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to permit membership in one house of a State legislature composed of more than one house to be apportioned with the approval of the electorate upon a system other than that of equal representation, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of January 26, 1965:

S. 746. A bill to further insure due process in the administration of military justice in the Department of the Navy by establishing a Judge Advocate General's Corps in such Department: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 747. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by providing an independent forum to review and correct the military records of members and former members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, LONG of Missouri, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 749. A bill to insure to military personnel certain basic constitutional rights by prohibiting command influence in courts-martial cases and in certain nonjudicial proceedings, and for other purposes: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, LONG of Missouri, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 752. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, so as to provide additional constitutional protection in trials by courts-martial: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, LONG of Missouri, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 756. A bill to broaden the constitutional protection against double jeopardy in the case of military personnel: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 757. A bill to more effectively protect certain constitutional rights accorded military personnel: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, LONG of Missouri, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 759. A bill to afford military personnel due process in court-martial cases involving minor offenses, to insure the right of counsel in such cases, and for other purposes: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, LONG of Missouri, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Authority of January 27, 1965:

S. 763. A bill to extend the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to employees performing work in or related to agriculture: Mr. BENNETT.

Authority of January 28, 1965:

S. 820. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged: Senators ALLOTT, FANNIN, HICKENLOOPER, MUNDT, and SIMPSON.

Authority of February 1, 1965:

S. 934. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer a deduction from gross income for water assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies: Senators BENNETT, MUNDT, PEARSON, and TOWER.

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress relative to the extension of the West German statute of limitations affecting Nazi war criminals: Senators BURDICK, CASE, KENNEDY of New York, MONTOYA, PASTORE, SCOTT, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON S. 693—A BILL TO AMEND THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold a hearing on February 16, 1965, at 10 a.m. in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building on S. 693, a bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

The Senate last session passed an identical bill, and a companion bill has been introduced by Congressman CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Anyone who wishes to file a statement for the record should contact Mr. Darrell St. Claire, clerk of the committee.

SOME MEDITATIONS UPON INAUGURATION DAY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Morganton News-Herald carried an editorial by W. F. McIntosh, Jr., a member of the faculty of the Olive Hill High School in Morganton, entitled "In This Our Day and Time." In it, he recounted certain meditations which he had as he witnessed the inauguration of President Johnson.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed as follows:

IN THIS OUR DAY AND TIME

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The writer is a teacher and head football coach at Olive Hill High School and a correspondent for the News-Herald. While watching the inaugural parade Wednesday, it made him start thinking there is something wrong with a country in which its President has to ride in a bubbletop, bulletproof automobile. The results of his thinking produced this guest editorial.)

(By W. F. McIntosh, Jr.)

The world today reels and staggers like a drunk man. The peoples are disillusioned and stunned from facing grim facts, realities and catastrophes. We are living in a land of plenty. We have better homes, we are better fed, we walk and ride around dressed better than any other group of people in the world and the history of mankind, and we have a higher standard of living than any nation in the world.

We have a pretty sound educational program, and we are spending a tremendous amount of money to make it even better. We are loaded with charitable organizations, and we are erecting some very fine churches. Our church membership is at an alltime high, and church attendance is up.

There are many mechanical miracles and great scientific achievements. Yet, with all this prosperity and power, we find ourselves beset by fears, doubts, uncertainties, hate, and being nonbelievers. In this our day and time, we are disillusioned.

Our newspapers, television, and radio are forever revealing to us the many violent acts being committed by man. Some of them make you sick on the stomach.

It is a tragedy and reflection on our time when the President of these United States must take his oath of office in a bulletproof cage. Where have we failed? Is it in the home, church, school, or our Government? Many of us single out one of these institutions, while others include the four of them in their answers. Whatever the answer is, we just missed the boat somewhere. To tell the truth, we never even reached the docks.

President Lyndon Baines Johnson had good reasons to ask Americans to fulfill their heritage in his inaugural address. Many are somewhat disappointed over the fact that the President did not focus his attention on our foreign policies. We have many problems at home to clear up and solve.

In this complicated maze that we are facing, we so often forget to clean house. This is a good time for us to stop and make an inventory of our communities, States, and Nation. We have the know-how and resources to make America even greater.

It is time for us to unite our human resources and make America a real leader of the world. This starts on the individual level. We need to stand up for the great Christian heritage that is ours from consecrated mothers and fathers, consecrated ministers and lay leaders, and our forefathers, who now sleep in their graves. We have a heritage that they built, and it is our job to carry the torch further.

Where have we failed? So often our churches play the role of the taillight instead of the headlight. The church should be the No. 1 defender of Christianity. There is a very well known guide for the church to use in its defense—the Holy Bible.

The American home is more comfortable, but is falling down on its job in guiding the children to be alert and good citizens.

Educators should play a more vital and active role in shaping school policies and formulating the program of instruction. That old song about the school is supported by the taxpayers, therefore give them all the say-so is something for the birds. They should have some say-so, but not all.

These same taxpayers pay the doctors, lawyers, and dentists, and they pay more for these services, but they do not tell the doctor how to remove their tonsils, or the lawyers how to plead their cases, or the dentists how to pull that painful overdue tooth.

Educators should develop a sound and impressive educational program and stop waiting on the public to do their job. Our politicians could devote their thinkings to the welfare of the people, never forgetting to measure their lives and actions with that of Christ.

In this our day and time, we need to run lifting up Christ through this evil, frustrated and sinful world, leaving in our path an ever-burning light which will forever read as a signboard on the highway of time: "People of this day and time—gave themselves to Christ, in deed, song and life." When this comes to light, we will be able to see this Great Society on the New Frontier in this our day and time.

THE CUTTING EDGE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Charlotte News, of Charlotte, N.C., carried an editorial in its issue of January 28, 1965, entitled "The Cutting Edge," which makes some trenchant comments upon the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the regulations adopted by the executive branch of the Government for its implementation.

This editorial makes it manifest that the executive branch of the Government is doing exactly what I prophesied it would do if the Congress adopted title VI of the act in its final form. The executive branch of the Government is adopting regulations which go a bow shot beyond the act itself. Congress ought to write the laws which govern the American people and not attempt to transfer the legislative power to the agencies or departments of the executive branch of the Government as it did in title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed, as follows:

The Cutting Edge

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a little like an iceberg; the part that hurts you worst lies hidden below the surface.

Some of the cutting edge of that iceberg has been exposed lately and we have a suspicion that concern about the act is spreading and will continue to spread.

It now appears, for instance, that in order to continue to receive any Federal aid at all, school boards must sign a statement indicating that their schools are fully desegregated. Or produce a court order to desegregate if they are under one. Or present to the Commissioner of Education a plan for desegregation.

What this amounts to is that the vast majority of North Carolina's 170 school administrative units—all of which, we are told, receive some form of Federal aid—will have to satisfy the Commissioner of Education that they have a satisfactory plan to end all segregation in their schools. Or lose their school lunch program money and their vocational education money and whatever else.

Now the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not say all of this. Title VI simply says that programs offering Federal money can not be operated on a discriminatory basis. It directs the agencies and departments to "issue rules or regulations, to be approved by the President, to carry out the purposes of this title."

With this much to go on, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has done the rest. It has concocted the rule of choice that now confronts southern State and local school boards. Senator Sam Ervin figures that the meaning of title VI has been stretched mightily in the process. But it was done and, apparently, the President has approved, although somehow we cannot recall seeing bold headlines proclaiming any of this.

What does it all mean? For one thing, it seems to mean that the judgment of the Commissioner of Education is to be substituted for the judgment of the lower Federal courts on the crucial matter of whether a school administrative unit is complying with the Supreme Court's rulings. Whatever one thinks of the 1954 and 1955 decrees, they were firmly rooted in the idea that courts close to the affected localities would decide whether "deliberate speed" was being exercised.

Despite various enlargements of its original opinion, the Supreme Court has never abandoned this central idea. Even the Civil Rights Act of 1964—where it deals with school desegregation directly—does not stray from this approach. It does empower the Attorney General to file school desegregation suits in some instances, but even this highly dubious procedure is dependent upon the judgment of the lower Federal courts.

Now, in a stroke, in a section of the act that does not purport to deal with schools, judgment of the Commissioner of Education is substituted for the courts. It matters not that a hearing process is established for appeal of the Commissioner's decision. The simple fact is that an appointive official of the Federal Government has been given supervisory power over a matter so intimately affecting community life in so many subtle ways, across so broad a region of the country, that the courts have been wrestling with the resultant problems for a decade.

It is not a question of whether one favors desegregation of public schools. Desegregation of public schools has enjoyed the force of the law for a decade. It has taken place, to a greater or lesser degree, throughout the South. It has been supported by the Court and accelerated by Congress.

But now, after all this, the process is reduced to a simple matter of bureaucratic edict. Worse, Congress has made compliance with this bureaucratic edict an absolute criterion for participation in any Federal program, whether it be school lunches or the President's projected program for the educationally disadvantaged.

We do not think that it is wise to use Federal programs as bludgeons to try to achieve by fiat an overall solution to a problem that has been dealt with in the courts, locality by locality, individual problem by individual problem. We suspect there are many parts of the South that will simply turn down the Federal money rather than submit such questions to the judgment of the Commissioner of Education.

Who will be the winner, then? The children who do without the lunch money? The undereducated whites and Negroes of Mississippi who will do without programs designed to help them?

That is the worst thing about the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As Senator Sam Ervin keeps saying, it was written like the laws of the Emperor Caligula, in a hand so small that only the ruler could read it. Now, it seems, the law is being read aloud.

ROBERT T. KIRKWOOD, ARKANSAS TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the attention of the Members of this Chamber has frequently been directed in recent years toward the necessity of constantly improving our educational systems.

One obvious method of doing so is to attract more qualified people to the teaching profession, especially on the junior high school and senior high school levels. This can only be done by giving more recognition to our teachers, not only in a monetary way, but also by emphasizing the very constructive part they play in shaping the future lives of our citizens and, thus, our Nation.

Arkansas has extended such recognition to one of its teachers. He is Robert T. Kirkwood, head of the science department at Pine Bluff High School, Pine Bluff, Ark. The people of my State have honored Mr. Kirkwood by naming him "Arkansas Teacher of the Year."

Mr. Kirkwood has combined the best attributes of two professions—he is a Methodist minister in addition to being a teacher—with talent, personal diligence, and a positive attitude to earn for himself this signal honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record Mr. Kirkwood's philosophy of teaching.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Philosophy of Teaching

(By Robert T. Kirkwood)

My task is to lead each student to confront his universe and to equip him to enjoy and to benefit from the confrontation. I must first convince the student that the encounter is desirable, that the attainment of knowledge adds to life a dimension that cannot be gained in any other way. I must also convince the student that he may safely risk himself to the encounter. Learning may change his self, but the change will always be constructive, will always lead to the development of a larger self.

Before I can lead another individual to examine the universe in which he lives, I must engage actively in the same examination. I must continue to study all facets of life, not just the one subject matter area that I teach. If I am to convince students that involvement in life is a rewarding experience, I must listen to more music, read more books, examine more art, study more natural history, and seek to know more people.

As I encourage students to grow by learning I must be extremely careful that I do nothing to diminish anyone in his own eyes. Although a student may understand all mysteries and may have all knowledge, if he does not care for himself he is nothing.

Finally, I must be sure that each student learns that the acquisition of knowledge carries with it responsibilities. Because learning is a social activity, the one who learns has social responsibilities. Each must make what contribution he can for the benefit of all.

FORWARDING AND REFERRAL FEES BETWEEN LAW FIRMS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on January 28 I directed a letter to the New York Bar Association asking for a statement or an outline of the rules and practices which are laid down by the New York Bar Association covering the payment of forwarding or referral fees between law firms. I ask unanimous consent that my letter and a copy of the reply dated February 1, 1965, in which the Association of the Bar of the City of New York outlined the rules, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1965.

New York Bar Association,
New York City, N.Y.

Gentlemen: I would appreciate a statement or outline of the rules and practices which are laid down by the New York Bar Association covering the payment of referral or forwarding fees between law firms.

Is it a requirement that both parties must have participated in the legal services rendered in proportion to the division of the fees collected?

Yours sincerely,

John J. Williams.

The Association of the Bar,
of the City of New York,
New York, February 1, 1965.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: We have your inquiry asking whether this association has an outline of rules and practices governing the payment of referral or forwarding fees between law firms. This matter is covered by canon 34 of the Canons of Professional Ethics which reads as follows: "No division of fees for legal services is proper, except with another lawyer, based upon a division of service or responsibility."

These canons are enforced by the courts of this State and are interpreted by the committees on professional ethics of the State and local bar associations. The opinions of this association are collected in a volume published by the Columbia University Press which I am sure is in the Congressional Library.

If you have a specific situation in mind and wish to direct an inquiry as to that situation to our committee, they will furnish you with a written opinion on the statement of facts as you outline them. In giving the committee the factual situation you should not use the names of any individuals. The question should be stated in a hypothetical form in the manner of the opinion which I am enclosing.

Sincerely yours,

Paul B. DeWitt.

U.S. SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, last week each of us here in the Senate of the United States was treated to a brief fresh contact with curiosity, with eagerness, with faith in ideals—perhaps to the betterment of us all, perhaps to serve as renewed stimuli to us who must daily contend in the Washington arena. I refer to the visit to our offices of the outstanding high school leaders of each State who were brought here under the auspices of the William Randolph Hearst Foundation as participants in the third annual Senate youth program.

It has been my pleasure to serve for the past 2 years on the Senate advisory committee for the program, this year as cochairman with Senator Stuart Symington. As cochairman this year, I attended several functions with the students, and I wish to salute the young people of America who are so admirably represented by teenagers of the caliber of those I met during my tenure on the advisory committee. Here is a short history of the Senate youth program:

Some 4 years ago the late Senator Schoeppel from Kansas suggested that something be done to encourage our youth in the field of political science. He asked the cooperation of the William Randolph Hearst Foundation for ideas and support. That is all prolog, yet the program was actually started with a Senate Resolution 324 in the 87th Congress signed by Senators Mansfield, Dirksen, Humphrey, and Kuchel and continuing resolutions have been passed by this body for the last 3 years. In a sentence, the full meaning of the resolution was to establish a youth training program in cooperation with the Senate to help create a keener and better understanding of our political way of life. The resolution continued to state the program should include high school politically minded students bringing two students from each State of the Union and two from the District of Columbia for a week's internship at no cost to the Federal Government.

We fully appreciate that the William Randolph Hearst Foundation established a grant that has made this program possible for the past 3 years. The announcement of continuing support by the Hearst Foundation met with warm approval. The American Political Science Association has cooperated with the Hearst Foundation in developing the program for the project and it deserves sincere thanks from this entire body.

We are grateful indeed for the help of other Senators and members of the advisory committee, and we wish to include in the Record at this point the names of Senators and advisors who participated in the Senate youth program this year.

William Randolph Hearst Foundation, Ira P. Walsh, director.

Advisory committee cochairmen: Senator Len B. Jordan, Republican, of Idaho; Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, of Missouri.

Senator Howard W. Cannon, Democrat, of Nevada; Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York; Senator Gaylord Nelson, Democrat, of Wisconsin; Senator James B. Pearson, Republican, of Kansas; Senator Claiborne Pell, Democrat, of Rhode Island; Senator Winston L. Prouty, Republican, of Vermont; Senator Hugh Scott, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Senator Herman E. Talmadge, Democrat, of Georgia.

Advisory committee, ex officio: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, assistant majority leader; Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, assistant minority leader; Randolph A. Hearst, trustee, William Randolph Hearst Foundation; Evron M. Kirkpatrick, executive director, American Political Science Association; Gisela Lloyd, coordinator.

The armed services provided 21 fine young officers who served as escort officers during the entire week. We express our thanks to them and to the services they so ably represented. They are:

Escort Officers, Senate Youth Program, 1965

Ens. Jeannie J. Kuhns, U.S. Naval Reserve; Ens. Carol L. Kline, U.S. Naval Reserve; 1st Lt. Barbara Cesarz, U.S. Marine Corps; 2d Lt. Georgia A. Wise, U.S. Army; 1st Lt. Virginia M. Wood, U.S. Air Force; Ens. James H. Gipson, U.S. Naval Reserve; Lt. (J.G.) George E. Taylor, U.S. Naval Reserve; Ens. Raymond J. Kukulski, U.S. Naval Reserve; 1st Lt. Arnold R. Nelson, U.S. Marine Corps; 1st Lt. James E. Moore, U.S. Marine Corps; 1st Lt. John C. Cregan, U.S. Marine Corps; 1st Lt. Ives W. Neely, U.S. Marine Corps; 1st Lt. John D. Burkholder, U.S. Army; 1st Lt. Quentin W. Richardson, U.S. Army; 2d Lt. Davis E. Burbank III, U.S. Air Force; 2d Lt. Michael P. Berca, U.S. Air Force; 1st Lt. David Van Poznak, U.S. Air Force; 2d Lt. Wayne D. Meyer, U.S. Air Force; 1st Lt. Stanley C. Cure, U.S. Army;

Lt. Robert J. Steele, U.S. Navy, coordinating officer in charge of male escort officers.

First Lt. Jeanne A. Botwright, U.S. Marine Corps, coordinating officer in charge of female escort officers.

Those of us who took a close interest in this program will, I am sure, agree that this was one of the finest collections of young people ever assembled and I personally want to commend the students who represented my own State of Idaho, Jane Slaughter, Kimberly High School, and David H. Leroy of Lewiston High School.

As a working cochairman this year I took a more active interest than in the past 2 years, and I want to extend my appreciation and thanks to all those who worked so hard to make this program a success. I am sure my colleague and cochairman joins with me in conveying our special thanks, not only to Mr. Randolph A. Hearst, George Hearst and his charming wife, Rosalie, but to Ira P. Walsh who with our own Mary Daly of the Senate Rules Committee were really the prime movers in the success of this occasion.

With great pride I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a table showing the names and addresses of all the students who so ably represented their States and the youth of America, together with the names of the schools.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST FOUNDATION

U.S. Senate Youth Program, 1965

State	Name of student and school	City	Home address
Alabama	Eddie Byrd, Enterprise High School	Enterprise	402 Gibson St.
	Bobby Connor, Sidney Lanier High School	Montgomery	3303 Lexington Rd.
Alaska	Gordon Harang, Sitka High School	Sitka	Box 1074.
	Bonnie Thompson, Homer High School	Homer	Box 548.
Arizona	George Rauh, Tucson High School	Tucson	2247 La Mirada.
	Bob Charles Swan, Coronado High School	Scottsdale	7232 East Roosevelt.
Arkansas	Charles Russell Jackson, North Little Rock	North Little Rock	3514 Olive St.
	Thomas D. Wynne III, Fordyce High School	Fordyce	410 North Pine St.
California	Kathleen L. Halverson, San Lorenzo High School	San Lorenzo	15708 Via Corta.
	Michael Swafford, McFarland High School	McFarland	257 Cliffe St.
Colorado	Cheryl Ann Bonesteel, Julesburg High School	Julesburg	
	George Priest, Lakewood High School	Lakewood	2355 Brentwood.
Connecticut	George Draper Arthur IV, Avon Old Farms	Darien	Salem Straits.
	Charles George Tetro, Eastern High School	Bristol	88 Vantana Dr.
Delaware	James Allen Ellwanger, Georgetown High School	Georgetown	Rural free delivery No. 3 Box 210.
	Patricia Edler Mahoney, Henry C. Conrad	Wilmington	1 Champlain Ave.
District of Columbia	Sylvia J. Chin, Eastern High School	Washington	414 17th St., SE.
	Ronald M. Ellerbe, Calvin Coolidge High School	do	5374 Chillum NE.
Florida	Gerald Paul Hill, Winter Haven High School	Winter Haven	606 Avenue D SE.
	David Keith Maxwell, Leon High School	Tallahassee	2145 Trescott Dr.
Georgia	Warren Akin, Cartersville High School	Cartersville	95 Cassville Rd.
	John Campbell VI, Sandy Springs High School	Atlanta	4740 Huntley Dr.
Hawaii	Glen Toshio Hirabayashi, Waimea High School	Waimea	
	Patricia Rezents, Star of the Sea High School	Honolulu	244 Hawaii Loa St.
Idaho	David H. Leroy, Lewiston Senior High School	Lewiston	920 10th Ave.
	Jane Slaughter, Kimberly High School	Kimberly	Box 322.
Illinois	Larry R. Brieschke, West Leyden High School	North Lake	
	Eric Mulloy, Glenbard West High School	Glen Ellen	
Indiana	Matt M. Matlik, Arsenal Technical High School	Indianapolis	2827 Brookside Parkway.
	Michael L. Smith, Jefferson High School	Lafayette	2733 Torrengo.
Iowa	Christopher L. Davis, University High School	Iowa City	249 Magowan Ave.
	Karl Haglund, Washington Senior High School	Cedar Rapids	376 Park Terrace SE.
Kansas	Marilyn Moon, Augusta High School	Augusta	1917 Meadowlake Dr.
	Michael J. Penner, Newton Senior High School	Newton	408 West 3d.
Kentucky	Randall Scott McKenzie, Oldham County	La Grange	5th St.
	Kirk Woodward, J. M. Atherton High School	Louisville	535 Primrose Way.
Louisiana	John Otis Wilson Lavigne, Thibodaux High School	Thibodaux	400 Walnut St.
	Cynthia Ann Samuel, Louise S. McGehee	New Orleans	1225 Washington Ave.
Maine	Vicki Henderson, Skowhegan High School	Skowhegan	5 High St.
	John Pence, Scarborough	West Scarborough	Charles Circle.
Maryland	Robert Allen Carter, Perry Hall High School	Baltimore	4134 Brookfield Rd.
	Robert Shapiro, Baltimore City College	do	6104 Ivydene Ter.
Massachusetts	Maureen Buckley, St. Gregory's High School	Dorchester	15 Kenwood St.
	Scott Leonard, Chicopee Comprehensive High School	Westover Air Force Base	67 Bergstrom St.
Michigan	Randolph B. Schiffer, Wylie Groves High School	Birmingham	30665 Vernon Dr.
	Marla Tobias, University High School, Western Michigan University.	Kalamazoo	1415 Maple St.
Minnesota	Richard Krambeer, St. Agnes High School	St. Paul	1074 Seminary.
	James Carl Pellman, John F. Kennedy	Babbitt	Star Route.
Mississippi	Robert Adams Ivy, Jr., S. D. Lee Senior High School	Columbia	7th St. North.
	Claude Leroy Stuart, Jr., Greenville High School	Greenville	335 Cannon.
Missouri	Lloyd Jay Gildersleeve, Rock Port High School	Rock Port	Bluff St.
	William B. Wilson, Central High School	Cape Girardeau	Oak Lei Dr.
Montana	Richard Clarke Wise, Billings Senior High School	Billings	742 Grand Ave.
	Kathleen Clare Young, Great Falls High School	Great Falls	2717 Central Ave.
Nebraska	Michael Knaub, Lincoln	Lincoln	1032 3d St.
	Russell Welch, Westside High School	Omaha	1812 Robertson Dr.
Nevada	David J. Lyon, Moapa Valley High School	Overton	
	Stephen Nelson, Las Vegas High School	Las Vegas	2005 East St. Louis Ave.
New Hampshire	Doris C. Fortin, St. Anthony High School	Manchester	23 Plummer St.
	Paul Sullivan, St. Thomas Aquinas	Dover	8 Old Rochester Rd.
New Jersey	Joseph Culver, De Paul Diocesan High School	Kinnelon	Kinnelon Rd.
	Diane Jane Fuchs, Teaneck High School	Teaneck	131 Irvington Rd.
New Mexico	John Bannerman, Grants High School	Grants	1608 Chaco.
	Gay Gottshal, Hobbs High School	Hobbs	901 East Sanger.
New York	Faye DeSanto, Bishop McDonnel Memorial High School	Brooklyn	85 Hill St.
	Marc E. Miller, Jericho High School	Brookville, Long Island	17 Wenwood Dr.
North Carolina	Stuart Alan Albright, Frank L. Ashley	Gastonia	2526 Sheffield Dr.
	Judith Elaine Ellstrom, Grimsley Senior	Greensboro	108 Beverly Pl.
North Dakota	Douglas Crockett, Fargo High School	Fargo	1519 North Elm St.
	John Sims, Minot High School	Minot	
Ohio	Susan Klar, Madeira High School	Cincinnati	7331 Miami Hills Dr.
	Richard Vodra, Wooster High School	Wooster	715 Kieffer St.
Oklahoma	Lunetta Bennett, Putman City High School	Oklahoma City	1118 Fenwick.
	Robert Franklin, C. E. Donart High School	Stillwater	1607 North Washington
Oregon	Natalia Sina Garibian, Girls Polytechnic	Portland	713 Southeast 28th Ave.
	William E. Fiegenbaum III, Albany Union	Albany	1540 Jackson.
Pennsylvania	Warren Richard Baldys, Jr., Steelton-Highspire High School	Steelton	100 South Harrisburg.
	Steven Keller, Montoursville Area Joint	Montoursville	521 North Washington.
Rhode Island	James Aukerman, South Kingstown High School	Kingston	33 Chark Lane.
	Sally J. Bliss, Woonsocket High School	Woonsocket	279 Woodland Rd.
South Carolina	David Holman, Timmonsville High School	Timmonsville	Route 4.
	David Sweatt, William Moultrie High School	Mount Pleasant	120 Hibben St.
South Dakota	Wayne Arnold Keup, Watertown Senior High School	Watertown	1154 3d St. NW.
	Mary Weatherill, Yankton Senior High School	Yanktown	423 West 12th St.
Tennessee	John P. Mathiew, White Station High School	Memphis	4906 Gwynne Rd.
	James E. Vaughn, Monterey High School	Monterey	
Texas	Tyrone Joubert, Jack Yates Senior High School	Houston	4903 Bricker Rd.
	Larry McGinty, Navasota High School	Navasota	402 McAlpine St.
Utah	Richard Burt, Highland High School	Salt Lake City	2591 Lynwood Dr.
	Joseph Stirling Devinny, Hillcrest High School	do	6872 Brookhill Dr.
Vermont	Richard Stinchfield, Brattleboro Union High School	Brattleboro	
	Mary Wilson, Woodstock Union High School	Woodstock	Star Rd.
Virginia	Lucie B. Leavell, Lane High School	Charlottesville	1832 Wayside Pl.
	George C. Slusher, Andrew Lewis High School	Salem	420 Shanks St.
Washington	Lorene Jacobsen, Shoreline High School	Seattle	20075 10th NW.
	James Ralph Smethurst, Walla Walla High School	Walla Walla	112 Otis St.
West Virginia	Kerry Jarrell, Point Pleasant High School	Point Pleasant	406 22d St.
	Frank Williams, Dunbar High School	Dunbar	465 18th St.
Wisconsin	Robert Eccles, West High School	Madison	2 Roby Rd.
	Patrick J. Rash, Onalaska High School	Onalaska	Route 2, Box 320.
Wyoming	Kay Hoffman, Wheatland Senior High School	Wheatland	Box 917.
	John Whiston, Natrona County High School	Casper	2024 Lynwood Pl.

BRITAIN BANS CIGARETTE ADVERTISING ON TELEVISION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the British have done it again. Their Royal College of Physicians' report that cigarette smoking was a cause of lung cancer preceded our own Surgeon General's report by nearly 2 years. Now the British Minister of Health has just announced in the House of Commons that because of the danger of smoking to health, the Government has decided that the time has come to end the advertising of cigarettes on television.

Congress had an opportunity last session to at least recognize the role that advertising plays in the cigarette consumption pattern, but it sidestepped the responsibility. Members of the Senate will recall that the junior Senator from Oregon introduced a measure in the 88th Congress authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to include hazardous warning statements in all cigarette advertising. Although editorial comment and public opinion as reflected in my mail and national polls indicated overwhelming support for my bill, Congress harkened to the aromatic breezes from the tobacco States and took no action. The FTC, more sensitive to the public interest in this case, was therefore forced to act under its own less comprehensive authority.

It is encouraging to know that the Committee on Commerce, of which the senior Senator from Washington is chairman, will soon hold hearings on the Magnuson and Neuberger bills concerning cigarette hazardous warning statements. This latest move by the British Government, taken in light of their continued increase of lung cancer deaths, emphasizes the importance of immediate action by our Government, so that the health of our people might be protected.

I ask unanimous consent that the article announcing the British ban, published in the New York Times of February 9, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN BANS TV CIGARETTE ADS; CITES SMOKING'S PERIL TO HEALTH

(By James Feron)

LONDON, February 8.—The Government said today it would ban cigarette advertising on television "as soon as practicable" because of the danger of smoking to health.

The decision, announced in the House of Commons, came nearly 3 years after Britain's Royal College of Physicians reported that "cigarette smoking is a cause of lung cancer."

Last year, after a similar study, the U.S. Public Health Service said that the use of cigarettes contributed so substantially to the American death rate that "appropriate remedial action" was needed.

Kenneth Robinson, the Minister of Health, told the House that deaths from lung cancer continued to increase in Britain despite an intensive Government health education program.

"The Government has decided that the time has come to end the advertising of cigarettes on television," he said. The Minister added that measures against "other forms of cigarette advertising" were being considered.

The ban, which is expected to take effect in about 2 months, will cause considerable disruption in the 17 stations of the Independent Television Authority.

Cigarette advertising provides the equivalent of $15 million of the commercial network's annual income of $224 million and has been rising. It increased by about 30 percent between 1963 and 1964, partly because of higher rates.

Britain's older, state-supported network, the British Broadcasting Corp., will not be affected because it does not carry commercials. The BBC's income is derived from a use tax levied through the post office.

Today's decision had been under consideration since last October, when Labor came to power. The Conservative government had refused to ban cigarette advertising on television although it endorsed the Royal College report and started a program to warn against the dangers of smoking cigarettes.

Under the Television Act of 1964, the Government can stop the advertising of cigarettes on television by administrative action. An act of Parliament would be required, however, for similar bans against newspaper, magazine, billboard or store advertisements.

Italy is believed to be the only other country that has banned cigarette advertising in response to medical reports warning of the danger to health.

Although cigarette smoking dropped in Britain after the Royal College found that it caused 8 out of every 10 deaths from lung cancer, sales of cigarettes rose sharply afterward.

By the time the U.S. report was issued just over a year ago, cigarette sales in Britain were 5 percent higher than in 1962.

Both reports included among recommendations the curtailment of cigarette advertising. The British medical group called on the Government to "restrict" tobacco advertisements, while officials of the Public Health Service advised "control" of such advertising.

SELF-POLICING USED

The decision follows 3 years of Government efforts to dramatize the dangers of cigarette smoking and a similar period of self-policing by the tobacco and television companies.

A self-imposed ban against cigarette advertising during the late afternoon, when children's shows are on, was extended after the medical report to 9 p.m., by which time children would presumably have gone to bed.

In 1962 the Independent Television Authority and the tobacco industry decided to stop appealing to young people. They banned commercials that "greatly overemphasized the pleasure" to be obtained from smoking as well as those in which "conventional heroes of the young" were featured.

Also eliminated were the fashionable social settings that supported the impression that cigarette smoking was "a go-ahead habit or an essential part of the pleasure and excitement of modern living."

Commercials depicting romantic situations that "seemed to link the pleasure of such situations with the pleasures of smoking" were banned.

CODE MADE STRICTER

Last year the Independent Television Authority went further and amended its code of advertising standards to forbid cigarette companies from stating, suggesting, or implying that it was safer to smoke one brand or type of cigarette than another. This was to stop advertisements suggesting that filter-tipped brands were safer.

Lord Hill of Luton, the chairman of the ITA, who is a physician, said at that time:

"There is a relationship between cigarette smoking and cancer of the lung. The character of that relationship is not known. Therefore, there is no evidence to warrant a statement that cigarette tobacco in one form is safer than in another."

The Federal Trade Commission in Washington proposed last year that all cigarette advertisements carry prominent warnings of the possible fatal effects of smoking. The commission suspended action to give Congress time to consider the proposal.

British Government efforts have included a nationwide poster campaign and the sponsorship of films depicting the dangers of smoking. The BBC and independent companies have agreed to show these films in the near future.

The Government's announcement caused shares of tobacco and television companies to dip sharply on the stock exchange, although prices recovered somewhat by the close of business.

A spokesman for the independent television companies objected to "the singling out of one medium of advertising rather than tackling the matter at its source." The Tobacco Advisory Committee, representing the manufacturers, called the ban unjustified and said it would not solve the question of smoking and health.

A spokesman said that all cigarette advertising was brand advertising and that there was little or no evidence that this had increased the consumption of individual smokers.

Tobacco companies spend the equivalent of about $33 million each year on advertising, nearly half of it on television.

NO BAN FORESEEN IN UNITED STATES

The tobacco industry in the United States pondered the British Government's announcement yesterday that it would ban cigarette advertising on television and said little.

In general, however, the reaction in the industry and among leaders in television advertising and related fields was one of cautious optimism that such a ban could not be imposed here because of the differences in the two systems of government.

The Tobacco Institute called the action in London "unjustified and uncalled for." A statement by George V. Allen, president of the institute, said:

"Such restrictions on advertising will not help resolve questions about smoking. We are confident that the American people want a conscientious program to determine the scientific facts, which the tobacco industry is supporting."

The institute believes that it does not have the answers and is trying to find them. It does not believe that banning advertising resolves the question of smoking's effect on health.

ISSUE TERMED CONFUSED

George Huntington, president of the Television Bureau of Advertising, expressed similar opinions. He said that many people confused advertising and labeling and that he believed the smoking and health issue to be one of labeling.

In reiterating a statement made last fall to the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Huntington said that labeling involved such admonitions as "Avoid excessive use" or "Shake before using."

"Product restrictions," he said, "are not necessarily part of advertising."

The bureau, Mr. Huntington said, does not see how the U.S. Government can regulate any media as long as a product being advertised is legal. If the product itself were made illegal, or if the advertising were in poor taste, that would be another story, he said. Mr. Huntington added:

"The question here is where do you stop? Automobiles have killed millions of people. I can see someone becoming anti-automobile, and saying that the money spent on cars might better be going to life insurance.

"I think our whole system is based on the public being informed, and then making its own decision. And I think the public has been informed about smoking."

VOLUNTARY CODE FAVORED

Emerson Foote, a former advertising executive who is now chairman of the National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health, said he believed the British action concerned the freedom of the press.

Mr. Foote, a former chainsmoker who gave up smoking and "selling" cigarettes, said he did not favor a ban on cigarette advertising in the United States.

However, he said he favored a voluntary suspension of advertising by the tobacco companies and, failing that, a law requiring the placing of warnings in advertising copy and labels.

Mr. Foote said he found it encouraging that a major government had recognized "the major health hazards of smoking."

MEYNER REFUSES COMMENT

New Jersey's former Governor, Robert B. Meyner, who administers the tobacco industry's voluntary Cigarette Advertising Code, refused to comment on the British action.

Mr. Meyner said that he saw his role as "semijudicial" and that it was not his purpose to either increase or decrease cigarette smoking.

The former Governor reviews the industry's advertisements and works out changes. He has already eliminated any descriptions of filters other than by color and has halted claims that filters reduce nicotine and tar content.

The tobacco industry in the United States spent about $200 million last year in advertising cigarettes, about $135 million of that for television advertising.

BLACKLISTING OF MAGAZINE, ARIZONA HIGHWAYS, BY SOVIET UNION

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, in the New York Times of Sunday, February 7, datelined Moscow, there appeared an article written by Theodore Shabad which disclosed that Soviet authorities have blacklisted Arizona Highways magazine on grounds that it constitutes subversive propaganda. Among other things, the Soviet trade union newspaper, Trud, called Arizona Highways "provocative literature clearly intended to conduct hostile propaganda among the Soviet people."

Many Senators, I am sure, are familiar with Arizona Highways, which is published monthly by the Arizona State Highway Department to portray the many colorful and unique beauties of the Grand Canyon State. The magazine over the years has won a well-deserved reputation for the consistently high quality of its photography and design.

I feel certain that those who do know Arizona Highways will be as surprised as I am to learn that it could be considered subversive or provocative in any respect, even by Soviet standards. The judgment of subversive literature, like beauty, apparently lies in the eye of the viewer.

In any event, I commend the response of the Tucson Chamber of Commerce and the city of Tucson, who have wired the Soviet Ambassador what seems to me to be a gracious and sporting proposition.

The Soviet Union has been invited to select any three Russian travel writers and send them to Tucson for a complete tour of the State, so they may see for themselves that the scenes depicted in Arizona Highways are real. The Tucson chamber has offered to be host to the Soviet writers during their visit, and Trans World Airlines has offered to handle the transportation.

It is my sincere hope that the Soviet Government will accept this invitation and that our Government in turn will grant the necessary visitor permits without delay.

It is impossible to fake the kind of photography that appears in Arizona Highways, and I hope that a qualified delegation of Soviet writers will be fortunate enough to discover this for themselves. If they should be subverted during their tour, it would be only by the compelling attraction of such nonpolitical sights as the Grand Canyon, cactus in bloom, and the vivid colors of an Arizona sunset.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 7, 1965]

ARIZONA BOOKLET BANNED IN SOVIET—MAGAZINE CALLED SUBVERSIVE PROPAGANDA ON U.S. WAYS

(By Theodore Shabad)

MOSCOW, February 6.—A magazine identified by Soviet authorities as Arizona has been blacklisted here as subversive literature "propagandizing the American way of life."

Trud, the trade union newspaper, reported today that some unidentified Americans were rash enough some time ago to bring 200 copies with them when they visited the Soviet Union.

Trud said alert customs officers had confiscated the "provocative literature clearly intended to conduct hostile propaganda among the Soviet people." But the magazines were returned to their owners on their departure from the Soviet Union, the newspaper added.

BRIGHTLY ILLUSTRATED PERIODICAL

The airport incident was used by Trud as a peg for one of its periodic tirades against the U.S. Information Agency and others accused of engaging in ideological warfare against the Soviet Union.

The newspaper charged that subversive literature was being dropped from balloons, smuggled in by tourists and mailed to Soviet addresses and that it even accompanied industrial equipment purchased by Russians abroad.

Available reference books do not list a magazine titled Arizona. But there is a brightly illustrated periodical called Arizona Highways, a State publication designed to attract vacationers.

Because of its attractive appearance and wealthy content of Americana, Arizona Highways is understood to be among the publications widely distributed abroad by the U.S. Information Agency.

A U.S. embassy spokesman described the Trud article as the "sort of statement we encounter from time to time."

"We don't ascribe too much significance to it, nor do we let it bother us," he added.

According to Trud, "anti-Soviet literature" has been found in several shipments of equipment imported from the United States, France, Belgium, and West Germany.

"About 200 anti-Soviet books were sent to an artificial fiber plant at Ryazan together with imported equipment from West Germany," the paper said.

Most of the Trud article was a rehash of old material covering tourists who had been caught photographing poor-looking backyards instead of attractive fronts of buildings. Also mentioned were foreigners accused of slipping Western publications to Soviet citizens and U.S. exhibition guides charged with waging "pro-American anti-Soviet propaganda."

Harking back to the U.S. graphic arts exhibition that toured Soviet cities in the winter of 1963–64, Trud said it had been staffed with "experienced provocateurs from USIA and with natives of some socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, who for various reasons were now abroad."

The embassy spokesman branded the accusations against the guides as "nonsense."

"In selecting guides," he said, "USIA is naturally interested in language ability, which frequently results in the hiring of people of Eastern European background."

MAGAZINE NOT SENT TO SOVIET

WASHINGTON, February 6.—An official of the U.S. Information Agency confirmed today that the magazine Arizona Highways was one of many that it distributed to its reading rooms abroad. But he said it had not sent any to the Soviet Union.

"Any accusation that USIA engages in or has engaged in the training of tourists in the techniques of so-called ideological subversion is complete and utter nonsense," the official declared.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,
February 8, 1965.

Hon. PAUL FANNIN,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

The city of Tucson through its Mayor Lew Davis and Newsom Holesapple, president of the Tucson Chamber of Commerce, cordially invite you to send any three travel writers from the Soviet Union on a familiarization tour of Tucson and the entire State of Arizona. We promise to show them anything they suggest from Arizona Highways so that they themselves may see that the beauty portrayed therein is real and not "subversive propaganda" as suggested by the newspaper Trud. Trans World Airlines through its vice president, Gordon Gillmore, who presently is himself enjoying the scenic beauty of Tucson, Ariz., will arrange for transportation to the writers accepting this invitation and the Tucson Chamber of Commerce will host the writers while they are in Arizona. We urge you cordially to accept this invitation to see the Grand Canyon State of Arizona—the city of Tucson—the sunshine capital of the world.

TUCSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON PRESERVATION OF NATURAL BEAUTY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, while I was awaiting recognition—and I appreciate the kindness of the Chair in recognizing me—I was reading again the President's message, delivered to us yesterday, on the preservation of natural beauty. I only wish that everyone in this land could read carefully the words of the President. I am satisfied that history will note that it is one of the most eloquent appeals to the good sense and conscience of the American people that has ever been made by any President.

I hope that two or three generations down the road those who follow us will be able to say that Congress responded to this message appropriately and effectively.

FINANCIAL STATUS AND HOLDINGS OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement

I made in writing to Hon. Felton M. Johnston, Secretary of the Senate, regarding my financial status.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
February 1, 1965.

Hon. FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary of the Senate,
P–21 The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Early in 1959 I disclosed publicly my financial holdings by filing an itemized statement with you. I did this so that citizens of my State would be able to judge for themselves, in the following years of my service as their public servant in the U.S. Senate, whether or not there was any conflict of interest and whether or not at any time my statements and votes were actuated by selfish motives. You know the facts that I am the very first Member of either branch of the Congress to make such disclosure. In the course of campaign for election against Senator John W. Bricker in 1958, I promised I would do exactly this. Since 1959, I have written you each year completely disclosing my financial status and holdings. You have authority from me now, as before, to make these disclosures available to anyone interested. I feel the people of my State who have been good to me and placed me in this office of high responsibility are entitled to know the facts. They will be able to determine whether I am a U.S. Senator dedicated to serving my country in accord with my judgment and conscience or whether I am ever influenced by selfish motives. I say I have not been so influence and shall not be.

Here following is a complete statement of my financial holdings as of February 1, 1965:

I own U.S. Government bonds in excess of $30,000.

I own real estate valued at approximately $75,000 or somewhat more, including my Washington residence, equity in a residence in Florida, real estate in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, and 80 acres of unimproved land in Mississippi.

In addition I own the following shares of stock: 1,480 W. R. Grace & Co., 438 Mission Development; 400 Delta Airlines; 700 Lucky Stores; 1,100 Airport Parking Corp. of America, common stock, and $3,000 of debenture bonds of this corporation; 900 Sinclair Oil; 519 Radio Corp. of America; 523 Monsanto Chemical; 160 Atlantic Refining; 236 Robbins & Myers, Inc.; 300 Stauffer Chemical; 400 Martin Marietta; 300 Nopco Chemical; 200 General Fireproofing; 104 Clevite Corp.; 100 Canadian Pacific Railway; 300 South Puerto Rico Sugar; 100 Central Aguerre Sugar; 200 Pacific Northern Airlines; 100 International Packers; 88 British Petroleum; 100 United Fruit; 130 Ashland Oil; 100 South Puerto Rico Sugar (preferred); 100 Murphy Oil Corp.; 200 Federal Pacific Electric (preferred) and 100 Mead Corp. Total dividends received in 1964 by me, $9,147.31.

You will note that I am a stockholder in oil production corporations. Am frequently recipient of letters, accompanying dividends, from the president of these companies asking me to write my Congressman expressing opposition to any legislation to reduce the oil depletion allowance of 27½ percent. I have not disposed of these holdings and shall not do so as it is well known I have voted at every opportunity offered me against the depletion allowance of 27½ percent given to oil and gas production corporations. I have spoken out as Ohio Congressman at Large in past years and in the Senate and voted against the depletion allowance and expect to do so later this year and at every time the opportuntiy is offered. I consider such depletion allowance unfair to citizens generally and I will oppose it until it is either eliminated or greatly reduced.

In addition, I have a checking account with the Union Commerce Bank of Cleveland and a savings account with Riggs National Bank, Washington, D.C. The present deposits in these two accounts approximate $8,000.

Also, I own and drive a 1962 F–85 Oldsmobile, and also own an Oldsmobile 88, 1964 model.

Except for some current bills, I owe a balance on my income tax for 1964 which may approximate $4,000 and which I shall pay as soon as I am billed. I owe no unsecured loans whatever. I am not financially obligated to anyone. I do owe the Union Commerce Bank of Cleveland $122,000 on notes which are well secured by deposit of collateral. Also, I owe current real estate taxes and assessments.

Mr. Secretary, I attest that the foregoing is a true and correct statement of my financial situation.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN M. YOUNG.

CHEAPER TALK

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as a former telephone company employee, I have followed with great interest the advances made by the telephone company in the service that it provides to the people.

I am particularly pleased with the recent development of the reduction in long-distance telephone rates that went into effect the first of this month.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial of the Waterville, Maine, Sentinel, a truly excellent newspaper, of February 6, 1965, on this matter be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEAPER TALK

The new reduction in long-distance telephone rates, which went into effect February 1, is another milestone in the benefits of automation applied to a public service industry. Saturday and early evening calls from New York to San Francisco are now $1.50 station to station, and even less for calls on Sunday and those after 8 p.m. By contrast, the first such call back in 1915 cost $20.70.

This is the 21st reduction by the Bell System in long-distance rates in the past eight decades, and another round is due for business users by April 1. We enjoy needling this giant monopoly whenever the occasion arises. This time, however, it rates a pat on the back.

NEW NATIONAL MIGRATORY BIRD REFUGE IN OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, belatedly, but nevertheless emphatically, I want to commend the membership of the widely known Cedar Point Club and the North American Wildlife Foundation for jointly making it possible for the club's historic 2,300-acre property on the south shore of Lake Erie, valued at $1 million, to be turned over to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for wildlife conservation purposes.

The club members who transferred their shares in the property to the North American Wildlife Foundation, which in turn is transferring the property to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, include: Warren Bicknell, Jr., Elton Hoyt III, George M. Humphrey, G. W. Humphrey, R. L. Ireland, John Sherwin, Joseph H. Thompson, and John C. Virdin, all of Cleveland, and Milville H. Ireland and George H. Love, of Pittsburgh, Pa.

I commend these men for their keen interest and cooperation with the Federal Government in perpetuating and enlarging this haven for wildlife along the south shore of Lake Erie.

This most recent action by these benefactors will result in the establishment of more than 10,000 acres of marshland in northern Ohio to help perpetuate migratory waterfowl. The State of Ohio under State control already has 558 acres at Metzger Marsh, 2,130 acres at Magee Marsh and 71 acres at Crane Creek. The Ottawa National Wildlife Refuge is expected to encompass, when further land acquisition has been completed, 5,000 acres.

Consisting of a complex of natural marsh, intermingled with sloughs, some timber and cropland, the Cedar Point Club, situated about 7 miles east of Toledo, lies behind a barrier sand beach which fronts on Lake Erie. One of the last few natural areas that has escaped the onslaught of residential and industrial development, the club property is a widely known concentration point for mallards, black ducks, canvasbacks, redheads, and other waterfowl and shore and marsh birds. Further diking and development by the Federal Government will convert the area into an important unit of the national wildlife refuge system.

This public-spirited donation of wildlife land constitutes another progressive step in the preservation of wetlands so urgently needed to maintain North American waterfowl.

THE MARTINSBURG, W. VA., VA CENTER'S VALUE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a February 8 editorial by Mr. Paul B. Martin, editor of the Martinsburg, W. Va., Journal. Mr. Martin's editorial enumerates the payroll and other benefits to the city of Martinsburg, all of which accrue from the location of the Baker Veterans' Administration Center there. He also refers to the benefits derived by veterans, and he makes a cogent point with reference to the vast population area served by that facility.

I insert the editorial to apprise Senators of the intense interest on the part of Martinsburg citizens and myself in the Martinsburg VA Center and that all may be aware of the vital importance of the institution to the people of that community and the veterans throughout the area.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VA CENTER'S VALUE

The recent announcement of plans to close down a number of Veterans' Administration hospitals in various parts of the United States has brought home to us once again the great importance which the Baker Veterans' Administration Center here plays in the local economy both directly and indirectly.

Perhaps some of what we have to say here is a rehash of previous news and editorializing but we feel the facts are important enough to be kept in the minds of all of us all the time.

For the current fiscal year, the VA center here has a payroll of some $6,600,000 with approximately 1,000 persons employed. This is an average of $6,600 per employee and represents nearly 10 percent of Berkeley County's total personal income of $68 million.

This is only part of the story. Another $1,500,000 is spent by the local VA center in this community in purchases of various supplies.

Other economic items stemming directly from the VA center's location here are the considerable amounts of money spent in the community by the nearly 500 domiciliary members who are frequent visitors in Martinsburg. To this can be added the money spent by the thousands of friends and relatives of patients who come here each year to visit patients.

So much for the economic significance. What about service to the veterans themselves?

The patient load here, including domiciliary section members, averages nearly 1,200 at all times, these figures varying somewhat as patients are admitted and discharged.

Of this load 41 percent are West Virginians. Fifty-six percent come from such nearby States as Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia plus the District of Columbia.

The United States has always taken great pride in the respect and assistance it gives to the men and women who have been called upon in time of war to save our Nation. We have quite properly felt we owe them a debt of gratitude to the extent of special consideration in later life, particularly those who have service-connected disabilities.

On that basis we feel the Veterans' Administration should strategically locate its hospital facilities throughout the country to provide easy access for the ailing veteran. Admittedly, it might be more economical from the VA's standpoint to operate one, two, three or four huge centers in the United States and eliminate the remaining 160 hospitals but this is somewhat false economy in the overall picture.

While it would save the Government agency some money, it would increase the cost to the individual veteran needing medical or surgical treatment.

If the Veterans' Administration goes through with its present plans to close certain hospitals, particularly those in Bath, N.Y., and Clinton, Ohio, it will mean that the Martinsburg installation's domiciliary section will have as its closest neighbors Dayton, Ohio, to the west, Norfolk, Va., to the south and Togus, Maine, to the north. That is quite a vast population area to be served.

Because of both these vital local economic reasons and the service and convenience to the hundreds of thousands of veterans involved, we feel sure the Federal Government, regardless of some possible comparatively minor cost saving, would not be so heartless as to ever terminate the Martinsburg center.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. LYMAN L. LEMNITZER

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, several weeks ago on Sunday, January 17, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, supreme Allied commander, Europe, was awarded the Bernard Baruch Gold Medal for Peace by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In presenting the award, Mr. John A. Jenkins, commander in chief of the VFW of the United States, pointed out that this award is the highest within the power of the VFW to confer on any individual and that it is awarded infrequently and with great selectivity. He said:

> The responsibility which General Lemnitzer so ably discharges is of a magnitude and seriousness seldom equaled in history.

General Lemnitzer, in accepting the award, said that it was to him a special honor to be awarded a medal bearing the name of his esteemed friend, Bernard Baruch; and that the award had added significance to him as a military man because it was a medal for peace. He continued:

> Since NATO's establishment almost 16 years ago to halt the progressive extension of Communist domination over the countries of Europe, peace in the NATO area has been preserved; not 1 square inch of NATO territory has been lost to the Soviet bloc; and—thanks in no small measure to the security NATO has provided—widespread stability and growing prosperity in the NATO countries have been achieved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record the text of this eloquent salute to a great American soldier, as well as the text of General Lemnitzer's response to Mr. Jenkins.

There being no objection, the tribute and text were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Mr. John A. Jenkins

General Lemnitzer, your excellencies messrs. ambassadors, distinguished guests, comrades in arms, ladies and gentlemen, we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States are deeply grateful for the honor which you have accorded us by your presence here this evening.

One of the very pleasant duties of a national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is to present, on behalf of VFW awards which recognize outstanding contributions to our Nation and to the free world. This evening, therefore, is for me a happy occasion. We are assembled to confer on Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Supreme Allied Commander Europe, the Bernard Baruch Gold Medal for distinguished achievement to our Nation and the cause of freedom and peace. I am particularly glad that this high award is being presented in Paris, the Capital of France. Our two nations, France and the United States, have fought shoulder to shoulder in two great wars in defense of a common freedom.

As you are probably aware, the Bernard Baruch Gold Medal is the highest award which is within the power of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to confer on any individual. Accordingly, it is awarded infrequently and with great selectivity.

The United States and the free world are, indeed, fortunate that a man of General Lemnitzer's unusual qualifications holds the high position of trust as Supreme Allied Commander Europe. The responsibility which General Lemnitzer so ably discharges is of a magnitude and seriousness seldom equaled in history. But, as we well know, General Lemnitzer accepts these burdensome duties with calmness and confidence which inspire a similar determination and confidence for all those who share his belief in both the necessity and the ability of the free world to defend itself against unrelenting and cruel Communist aggression.

I would like to mention that we have long admired General Lemnitzer's personality and professional qualities. We knew him as a distinguished combat commander in World War II, as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of our Department of Defense. In each of these positions his contributions in the struggle against Communist aggression have been of historic importance.

It is in his present position as Supreme Allied Commander Europe that General Lemnitzer now performs a role of vital importance to all those who believe in freedom. We know full well that in spite of communism's soft words and sugary promises, the evil goals of Red aggression remain unchanged. The prime target of communism has been, and continues to be, the nations who have joined together in NATO. These nations represent a great, prosperous, and freedom-loving community of people. The enemy of freedom knows, and we must continue to realize, that NATO has stood, and still stands, as the key obstacle against the impositions of a cruel oppression on this beautiful, rich, and noble area of the world.

We are not impressed by the too frequently heard statement that NATO has done its job. But that job is not finished. It will never be finished until communism disappears and is replaced by a system guided, not by ruthless conquest and oppression, but by good will, by morality, and genuine peaceful intentions. The hard cold fact is communism has not disappeared. Its rulers have not abandoned their goals.

Thus, the armed forces of NATO, commanded by General Lemnitzer, are today manning the ramparts of freedom. We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars join with our friends throughout NATO in expressing gratitude that the defense of these ramparts is in such good hands as those of General Lemnitzer.

In recognizing General Lemnitzer's continuing contributions to security and peace in his high military position in NATO, this gives us also the opportunity to reaffirm our belief in and support of NATO. In so doing, we emphasize the fact that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, consisting of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, stands fully and unswervingly behind President Johnson's policy of supporting and strengthening NATO.

And now, a final note. We of the VFW believe that it is particularly appropriate to make this award to General Lemnitzer on the occasion of Benjamin Franklin's birthday. Benjamin Franklin, with deep wisdom, understood the aspirations, the beliefs, and the hopes that bound together the United States and our friends in France. He knew that these bonds of friendship must be kept strong through mutual trust and confidence. These he worked for unceasingly, and with exemplary success. In a quiet corner of the courtyard entrance to our U.S. Embassy here in Paris, there is a lifelike statue of Benjamin Franklin, our first Ambassador. He sits in quiet contemplation, as if asking how well we in our time are protecting our freedom and independence.

Because we have such leaders today as General Lemnitzer, doing what he is doing, for such noble purposes, I believe that if we are to answer this question we could say in all sincerity, "Mr. Franklin, we are continuing your work."

I trust, too, that you will understand that we are proud that General Lemnitzer is a comrade and life member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

General Lemnitzer, it is in recognition of your leadership in war, and your statesmanship in these times of imperiled peace, that it is my privilege to present to you the highest award of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Bernard Baruch Gold Medal.

Remarks by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer

In receiving from the Veterans of Foreign Wars the Baruch Gold Medal of Peace, I feel greatly honored indeed. I am particularly grateful for this memorable ceremony, and for the fact that Commander Jenkins, and other officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have come all the way from the United States to make this event possible.

This presentation was originally scheduled to take place at the VFW convention in Cleveland last summer, but my official duties prevented me from being away from my headquarters at that time. However, I feel especially privileged that, as matters turned out, this award ceremony is being linked with the observance of the birthday of that great American statesman, Benjamin Franklin. As a native Pennsylvanian, I have naturally esteemed him as one of the great men of my State. In particular, he is to be admired as an outstanding symbol, and one of the original architects, of the close associations prevailing for so many decades between France and the United States.

There are several major reasons why I particularly appreciate this award.

To begin with, of course, I consider it a great distinction to be given such recognition by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The patriotic service which membership in the VFW reflects and the extremely important role of the VFW as an organization both add greatly to the gratification I feel.

I am particularly honored also, to be awarded a medal bearing the name of Bernard Baruch. I have been privileged to have many personal associations with Mr. Baruch, especially when he was serving as the U.S. representative to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. I have always regarded a number of proposals he made while performing that function as being among the most incisive and clearsighted ever put forward.

Finally, as a military man, I feel great appreciation at being awarded a medal for peace. Although it is often overlooked, the primary function of military men—especially today—is to help preserve peace. I believe that no effort in history surpasses the success which has been achieved toward this end by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with which I am privileged to serve as the current Supreme Allied Commander Europe. Since NATO's establishment almost 16 years ago to halt the progressive extension of Communist domination over the countries of Europe, peace in the NATO area has been preserved; not one square inch of NATO territory has been lost to the Soviet bloc; and—thanks in no small measure to the security NATO has provided—widespread stability and growing prosperity in the NATO countries have been achieved.

Thus, it is as a representative of this important alliance as well as for whatever services I may have had the opportunity to render as an individual that, with a profound feeling of honor and appreciation, I accept the Veterans of Foreign Wars Baruch Gold Medal of Peace.

THE MANY CRISES OF THE SOVIET ECONOMY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last summer the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security brought out a carefully documented study entitled "The Many Crises of the Soviet Economy."

That this study hit the Soviet Government where it hurts has been apparent from the continuing attacks to which it is still subjected in the Soviet press and radio.

For example, on January 19, the Soviet publication, Krasnaya Zvezda, printed a lengthy article by Lt. Col. O. Ivanov under the caption "Senator DODD's 'Ignorance Barrier'." Colonel Ivanov in this article accused me of sensationalism, of inaccuracies, of insolence, and stupidity. But, remarkably enough, in the several thousand words of copy contained in his article, he made not a single effort to refute the carefully documented facts presented in "The Many Crises of the Soviet Economy."

Mr. President, because I believe that the subcommittee's study has particular pertinence to the current debate on East-West trade, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point both the text of my introduction to "The Many Crises of the Soviet Economy" and the text of Colonel Ivanov's attack on my presentation.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRISES IN THE SOVIET ECONOMY AND THE QUESTION OF EAST-WEST TRADE

(Introduction by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, vice chairman, Internal Security Subcommittee)

The purpose of this symposium is to make available certain background facts on the state of the Soviet economy, because this knowledge is essential to an intelligent consideration of the entire question of East-West trade, which is being debated with increasing fervor in the free world community. The symposium consists for the most part of previously unpublished studies, which the authors have made available to the subcommittee.

The simple fact that the Soviet economic system does not work and cannot work is at last beginning to win recognition.

Until quite recently, however, it was fashionable to believe that the Soviet economic system had a far higher growth rate than the free enterprise system, and to accept at face value, or near face value, the predictions that the Soviet would catch up with and surpass the United States before the close of the decade. This misreading was fed by the Soviet's early successes in space. It was simply taken for granted that these technological successes were characteristic of the general qualitative level of Soviet industry; whereas, in fact, these successes were achieved by concentrating in one narrow industrial section the best equipment and the finest technicians to be found in the Soviet Union. How uncharacteristic of Soviet industry "Sputnik" really was, is amply demonstrated by the documented facts presented in this study.

In his report to the 22d Party Congress, in October 1961, Khrushchev made this flamboyant announcement to the assembled delegates:

"In the very near future the Soviet Union will occupy such a position in the international grain market that the imperialist gentlemen will begin to feel how our agriculture is expanding."

Less than 2 years after this unfortunate prediction was made, the news broke that the Soviet Union was in the world market for all the grain she could buy.

Since that time there have been a number of excellent studies of the permanent crisis in Soviet agriculture. There have also been some studies and articles relating to the growing difficulties of Soviet industry, downgrading the roseate prophecies of Soviet economic growth that were so popular only a few years ago.

What is still not realized is the scope or gravity of the Soviet economic crisis. The fact is that the Soviet economy is afflicted by not one but many crises. In addition to the crisis in agriculture, there is the general crisis in industry; there is the special crisis in quality control; there is the raw material crisis resulting from the contraction of the Soviet raw materials base; there is the crisis in planning; and, above all and pervading everything, there is the crisis resulting from the lack of human incentive.

It is with a view to bringing together the available information on these various crises that the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security has compiled the studies contained in this volume.

These crises persist from year to year because they are inherent in the very nature of communism. Indeed, they appear to grow from year to year, in the manner of compound interest, because the damage wrought in one year in one sector of the economy finds expression in enhanced form in other sectors of the economy at a later date.

THE CRISIS IN SOVIET AGRICULTURE

Failures in the harvest of agricultural crops have been occurring almost every year in various parts of the Soviet Union. The areas most often afflicted by drought are the Volga region, the Urals, western Siberia, Kazakhstan, and portions of the North Caucasus. Drought, however, is only one small part of the explanation.

Faulty planning, colossal bureaucratic blunders, inadequate equipment, an inadequate fertilizer industry and, above all, the total lack of human incentive in the system of collectivized agriculture, have all played their part in the making of the present catastrophe.

The following are only a few of the many startling facts that have been documented in the studies reproduced in this volume:

1. In September 1953 Khrushchev made the first of many boasts about the state of Soviet agriculture. He said that it was "the best and most highly mechanized in the world," and that the country had adequate reserves of grain and a surplus for export. At that very time, cereal yields were below prewar level, while per capita output (in 1953) was only 412 kilograms, compared with 527 kilograms in 1913, the year before World War I.

2. In 1962, corn made up 28 percent of the entire area sown to grain crops. Of the 37.2 million hectares of corn, only 7 million hectares were harvested as grain, the remaining 30 million hectares being cut green for silage.

3. In 1961, 193,000 tractors were reported to be inactive because the requisite repair parts were not available. In the same year, 21,000 grain combines and 20,000 forage harvesters had not been repaired by harvest time because of a shortage of parts.

4. The Soviet chemical industry supplies agriculture with grossly inadequate quantities of fertilizer, herbicides, insecticides, and veterinary pharmaceuticals. The production of fertilizer per acre was less than one-quarter that in the United States and less than one-eighth that in West Germany. Soviet specialists estimate that each year about 20 percent of the country's production of field crops is lost to pests and diseases, and the value of these losses is put at about 6 billion rubles annually.

5. The deadening effect of the collectivized farm system is illustrated by—among other things—the many reports of heavy damage to state crops because the peasants do nothing to keep the weeds under control. In the Altai Krai, for example, it was reported that the fields were a sea of weeds, making it difficult to see the grain, because there were three to four times as much wild oats and thistles as there was grain.

6. Conversely, the importance of the incentive factor is underscored dramatically by the figures for the private sector of Soviet agriculture. Collective farm regulations permit every family on the farm to have a private plot of land not exceeding one-half hectare, one cow, one pig, and a handful of sheep, goats, and poultry. In 1961 these private plots accounted for 3.3 percent of all the land under cultivation in the U.S.S.R.

In that year the Soviet state received from this 3.3 percent of its farmland, 26 percent of all potato deliveries, 34 percent of all eggs, 15 percent of all wool, 14 percent of all meat and poultry, 7 percent of its green vegetables. Because the peasants sell much of the produce on the open market after making their deliveries to the state, these figures tell only a part of the story of the amazing success of private enterprise, to the extent that it is permitted to eixst, in Soviet agriculture.

THE CRISIS IN SOVIET INDUSTRY

The true facts about the crisis in Soviet industry, in planning, in transportation, and, above all, in quality control, are enough to stagger the imagination of anyone who has grown up in a free enterprise society.

Thus, we learn from the Soviet press that repair of existing machine tools occupies 3.5 times as many people as are actually employed in manufacturing new units; that electric motors, during their first year of life, spend 30 to 40 percent of their total working time undergoing repairs; that, at any given time, not less than 40 percent of all vehicles in the Soviet Union are idle, awaiting repairs.

The manner in which quality deficiencies in one industry lead to compounded difficulties in another industry was dramatically illustrated by an article in Izvestiya on May 5, 1964, dealing with the difficulties of the Kungur machinery plant. (The item is too recent to be covered by the studies of Soviet industry contained in this report.) The story as a whole is so preposterous that it seems like something out of the Mad Hatter's tea party.

The article said that, during the past 2 years, the Kungur plant had received from the Minsk transfer machine plant 24 pieces of complex equipment used in the machining of turbodrill rotors and stators. The total cost of these transfer machines exceeded 2 million rubles. But because of major designing and engineering defects, not a single one of the machines was operational. This, despite the fact that the Minsk plant has sent to the Kungur machinery plant 45 maintenance people who had spent 5,330 man-days, costing about 80,000 rubles, in an effort to eliminate bugs in their transfer machines. Because of these difficulties, the Kungur plant had fallen seriously behind in its own plan for the production of spare parts for oil drilling equipment.

This entire fantastic story is capped by a fitting conclusion. The article notes that the Minsk transfer machine plant, which produced the nonoperational machinery, is not only listed as having fulfilled the state plan, but is listed as a frontrunner in its industry and has received premiums for having surpassed its quota.

This is the state of Soviet industry and technology 46 years after the Russian revolution.

Another dramatic illustration of the progressive deterioration of quality and quality control in the Soviet Union is provided by an item on the television industry. In any normal civilized country, the general experience is that the quality curve of complex products rises from year to year as weaknesses are eliminated and design and methods of manufacture improve. In the Soviet Union the reverse is the case. Thus, a study of television failures during the guarantee period of 6 months after sale revealed that the quality of sets has been deteriorating. In 1960, the percentage of failures during the first 6 months attributable to defective tubes was 47 percent. In 1961 it was 52 percent. And in 1962 it rose to 61 percent.

The question may be asked how this picture of Soviet industry can be squared with the formidable military establishment which the Soviet Union is known to maintain. The Soviet military establishment is indeed impressively equipped, and it would be foolish to underestimate it. The industry which feeds this establishment has been built up, without regard to cost, by ruthlessly starving virtually every other sector of the Soviet economy. For example, the pathetic underdevelopment of the chemical industry as a whole—and especially the chemical fertilizer industry—is directly related to the overconcentration of capital and effort in the Soviet defense industry.

This industry commands the best equipment, has access to the highest quality materials available, and employs the best qualified technical personnel. High precision measuring equipment, to the limited extent in which it is available to Soviet industry, is concentrated in the factories feeding the defense establishment. Production standards are more rigorous in these factories and inspection procedures are the severest to be found in the Soviet Union.

With all of these advantages, the Soviet defense industries have been able to turn out small weapons and artillery and tanks of good design and apparently acceptable quality.

About the quality and reliability of their missiles, there are no hard facts that would enable us to pass judgment, although there is plenty of reason for believing that they lag considerably behind the United States in reliability. It would be difficult to make any other assumption in view of the fact that even in the considerably less sophisticated sphere of aircraft production, their defense industries, despite the many advantages they enjoy, have turned in a questionable performance. For example, Prime Minister Khrushchev himself, in his statement of December 13, 1963, before the Communist Party Central Committee, said that:

"Up until recently Soviet aviation industry has been manufacturing aircraft engines with a service life of 500 hours, while the British engines have a life of 2,200 to 2,500 hours."

In addition, there is the fact that the quality of Soviet electronic equipment is so low that the Soviets prefer to trust the safety of their TU–104 and IL–18 airliners to British-made navigation equipment, and that even a Czech-produced Mig 15 fighter which crashed in West Germany was equipped with West German electronic equipment.

To summarize:

Instead of catching up with the West, and becoming less dependent on it, Soviet industry seems to be lagging further and further behind the West and to be growing more dependent on it. This is so because the technological explosion of the past decade has made modern industry more dependent than ever on ultrahigh precision and on the instruments capable of assuring such precision, on rigid standards of quality control, on sophistication of design and painstaking workmanship. These are precisely the areas where the Soviet Union is weakest and where the Soviet system raises the greatest obstacles to progress.

THE CRISIS IN THE SOVIET RAW MATERIALS BASE

The crisis in Soviet industry has been aggravated by the growing crisis in the Soviet raw materials base. Copper, tin, nickel, and lead are among the critical metals now in extremely short supply.

This crisis is due in part to the progressive exhaustion of high-grade ore deposits. But it has been further aggravated by faulty or inadequate equipment, backward technology, lack of capital, uneconomic mining procedures, and bureaucratic bungling.

Only a few years ago, Communist Party orators used to boast that the Soviet Union has the largest reserves of minerals in the world. As if in reply to these party orators, A. V. Sidorenko, Chairman of the State Geological Committee in the U.S.S.R., has pointed out that the Soviet Union has dropped 4,000 mineral deposits from the list of "reserves" because they were too poor to mine. Moreover, the average quality of new mineral deposits discovered in the Soviet Union has been dropping rapidly, and most of them are being found in the remote areas where development costs are high.

In April 1963, the Moscow periodical Gornyy Zhurnal complained in these words:

"We cannot allow a ton of extracted polymetallic ore in the capitalist world to produce 90 to 250 kilograms of metal and bring in huge profits, while our ore produces only 40 to 85 kilograms of metal and great losses."

The low quality of Soviet iron ore, combined with the growing shortage of nickel, has resulted in a serious deterioration in the quality of steel used in the production of machinery and equipment. Thus, an official Soviet report points out that, whereas all the vital parts of automobile and truck engines should be made from cast iron having a maximum sulfur content of 0.02 percent, the Soviet metallurgical industry has been consistently delivering cast iron with a sulfur content of over 0.6 percent, or 30 times the prescribed maximum.

To compensate for the poorer quality of the iron and steel used, the Soviet technologists are obliged to make everything thicker and heavier and more cumbersome. But even then their equipment frequently breaks down.

The experience of those who have purchased heavy equipment from the Soviets because of its attractive price has not been a happy one. Thus, the Argentine State Petroleum Monopoly (YPF) in 1958 bought about $38 million worth of equipment from the Soviet Union. YPF was obligated to pay for deliveries even though its own experts rejected most of the equipment because, to quote La Prensa, it was "of limited use owing to its imperfect design and excessive weight and unfavorable comparison with similar equipment already in use in the oil wells." La Prensa said that the derricks and electrical equipment supplied by the Soviets were also "of excessive weight and of a design such as to require constant repair and maintenance."

A special committee set up to report on the situation quoted numerous findings by YPF engineers such as "gave worst possible results and have been withdrawn from service"; "of ancient design and rudimentary technique"; "inferior to machinery bought in the United States and other Western countries."

These are only a few of the many items of information on the state of the Soviet economy compiled in the studies contained in this report.

THE QUESTION OF EAST-WEST TRADE

I come back to the point that there can be no intelligent consideration of the question of East-West trade and, for that matter, there can be no intelligent negotiation with the Soviet, that does not take into account the state of the Soviet economy.

If the Soviet economy were healthy, if increased East-West trade were a matter of secondary importance to it, then obviously we could not pose conditions in discussing trade with the Communist bloc. But if the Soviets need such trade desperately, as the facts indicate they do, then this situation provides us with a leverage which should not be ignored.

Unfortunately, the debate on East-West trade has, by and large, been taking place without reference to these essential background facts. And as the debate goes on, the move toward greater trade with the Soviet bloc has been gathering momentum, with each passing month, within the countries of the Western alliance.

Chronologically, the turning point seems to have been the U.S. decision last October to sell $200 million worth of wheat to the Soviet Union, without conditions of any kind and on highly favorable terms. Shortly after this deal was concluded, our British allies announced that they planned to sell several thousand buses to Castro, in defiance of the restrictive trade policy favored by the United

States. On the heels of this, the French announced that they had contracted to sell several hundred locomotives to the Castro regime.

Announcements of new sales of industrial and chemical equipment to the Soviet Union and Communist bloc countries have come thick and fast. Our European allies seemed to have made up their minds that trade is good, that the existing restrictions are bad, and that the West must do everything in its power, both for political and economic reasons, to step up trade with the Communist countries. In an effort to promote such sales, our British allies have even abandoned the time-honored policy of limiting Soviet sales to short-term credit and have announced that they plan to grant long-term credits running to 10 and 15 years, for the purpose of hastening the expansion of such trade.

The entire structure of allied restrictions on trade with the Communist bloc, so painfully built up over the postwar years, now seems to be crumbling before our eyes.

Officially, the State Department has professed alarm over the attitude of our allies, in particular on the question of trade with Cuba. But the State Department's position vis-a-vis our allies has been weakened by our sale of wheat to the Soviet Union and by other evidences of ambiguity in our own policy. It is also weakened by the growing agitation in our own country for more trade with the Communist bloc.

Thus, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, toward the end of April, adopted a resolution calling for a less restrictive policy. On the same day, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization revealed that it planned to relax its embargo on sales of certain items to the Communist bloc. The American Bankers' Association has also adopted a resolution favoring increased East-West trade.

There are three discernible positions in the current debate on East-West trade.

The first position holds that all trade with the Communist bloc is a bad thing and only serves to strengthen the Communists at the expense of the free world. It holds that, by providing the Soviet Union with equipment they so desperately need, we are enabling the Soviet leaders to avoid a choice between guns and butter; that we are, in short, permitting Moscow to carry on its subversive operations and its armament program uninhibited, while satisfying, largely by imports, the needs of a growing consumer society.

The second position holds that increased trade constitutes the most effective method of easing cold war tensions. As one of our respected national columnists recently put it, "Trade is the best weapon of the true conservative, as the alternative to the ultimate weapon nobody wants to use, the weapon of war."

Our British allies have added another argument for this second position: that a well-fed Communist is apt to be less dangerous than a hungry Communist. Interestingly enough, however, the validity of this argument is not accepted by all those who favor increased East-West trade. Thus, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., former special assistant to the President, wrote in 1960, after an extensive trip through the Soviet Union:

"The unquestionable progress in the last half dozen years toward greater personal security and greater personal comfort may even have strengthened rather than weakened the dogmatic and ideological character of Soviet society."

The third position on East-West trade is an in-between position, which favors increased trade and even long-term credits to the Soviets under certain conditions.

In essence, this position boils down to the commonsense argument that, since the Soviets need our food surpluses and industrial equipment so desperately, since they want increased trade perhaps more than anything else, we should at least get something in exchange for selling them the things they want and for granting credit to them.

This position is shared by a remarkably broad spectrum of opinion. Thus, the renowned Soviet expert, Zbigniew K. Brzezinski of Columbia University, wrote in the Washington Post at the time of the wheat deal that we should at least have demanded the tearing down of the Berlin wall and other concessions on Berlin as the price of the deal. Professor Brzezinski is no anti-Soviet extremist. Indeed, he goes much farther than most people in his optimism over our future relations with the Soviets. He has even spoken of the possibility of a "grand reconciliation" between ourselves and the Soviet Union. But he accepts the essential fact that, if we present to the Soviets, on a platter, the trade and credits they so desperately require, we deprive ourselves of all bargaining power in our negotiations with them, and, in this sense, undercut the possibility of arriving at agreements designed to eliminate the true causes of world tension.

By and large, those who adhere to this in-between position have no illusions about Soviet intentions or about the Communist attitude toward East-West trade. They recall that Lenin once said:

"It is necessary to bribe capitalism with extra profit. Capitalism will get the extra profit—God with it [begone] with this extra profit—and we will get the basics [equipment] with the aid of which we will strengthen ourselves, and will finally get up on our feet and defeat it [capitalism]."

They also recall the statement attributed to Lenin that "when the time comes to hang the capitalists, they will compete with each other to sell us the hanging rope."

Those who hold this third position also have no illusions about the relative economic benefits that will accrue to the Western World on the one hand and the Soviet world on the other hand from increased East-West trade.

In terms of what it can contribute to American and Western prosperity, the potential benefits to be derived even from substantially increased trade with the Soviet bloc are so small as to be negligible.

In 1962 the United States exported $21.7 billion worth of produce, accounting for 3.7 percent of our gross national product. Of our total exports, approximately one-half of 1 percent went to the Soviet bloc. In short, we sold to the Communists approximately one five-thousandth of our gross national product. Even if we were to double or quadruple our trade with the Soviet bloc, it obviously is not going to have a very significant impact on our national prosperity.

Our Western European allies, who have been going in so eagerly for trade with the Soviets, are very little more dependent than we are on this trade for their national prosperity. Thus, West Germany, the leading exporter to the Soviet bloc, sold only 5.6 percent of its 1962 exports, amounting to $750 million, to the bloc. (It should perhaps be noted that less than a quarter of this trade was with the Soviet Union itself, while more than one-third of it consisted of interzonal trade with East Germany. The Germans feel that an argument can be made, in anticipation of ultimate reunification, for keeping the economies of East and West Germany interdependent and complementary.) Italy also sold to the bloc 5.6 percent of her total exports, amounting to $240 million. In the case of France, 4.3 percent of her exports of $405 million went to the bloc. In the case of the United Kingdom, sales to the bloc accounted for 3.6 percent of her total exports of $393 million.

From these figures it should be clear that the Western countries would not become bankrupt even if the Soviet market were to disappear overnight.

Even the total figures on East-West trade and potential East-West trade are no true indication of the profits to be derived from such trade. There is reason to believe that the Soviets are now scraping the bottom of their reserves of gold and foreign curency. For example, they have recently informed the Canadian Government that they wish to make part payment for their purchases of Canadian wheat with Soviet oil. If there is to be increased trade with the Soviet bloc, therefore, it is clear that such trading can be arranged only on the basis of long-term credits.

Recognizing this fact, the British are already considering the extension of 15-year credits to the Soveit Union to finance purchases of equipment in Great Britain. It remains to be seen whether these obligations will be met at the end of the specified period, or whether the Soviets will ask for one extension after another or, alternatively, offer to pay for their purchases with Soviet oil, which neither the United States nor Great Britain would be willing to accept.

There is a very good chance, therefore, that increased trade with the Soviet bloc, undertaken in the name of profit, will ultimately wind up as a direct subsidy to the Soviet Government or, at best, as a partial giveaway.

If the profits to be derived from trade with the Communist bloc are marginal, the importance to the West of the commodities which the Communist bloc sells us in return is even more limited. From the Communist bloc we get furs and caviar and hams and some semifinished goods. We also get oil, which is competing on an increasing scale with Western oil in the markets of the world. Only the tiniest fraction of our imports from the Communist bloc can be considered of cardinal importance.

On the Communist side, however, East-West trade, despite its apparently limited dollar volume, is not merely of critical importance: it may well be a matter of survival. The Communist bloc must have Western assistance not only in coping with its chronic agricultural crisis but it must also have such assistance to cope with the chronic deficiencies of its industries. Thus the Communists are constantly badgering the West for precision machinery for heavy and light industries; for equipment—and, indeed, for entire plants—for their chemical industries; for sheet steel and steel pipe; for electronic equipment, and so on.

Western exports to the Soviet bloc are important not so much because of their volume but because of the nature and quality of these exports.

When the Soviets shop for chemicals, they frequently shop for sample quantities, which they hope their industry will be able to reproduce, after analysis. Thus, last October there were two licenses for the amount of $1, each covering the shipment of samples of synthetic resins to the Soviet Union.

When the Soviets shop for equipment, they shop for the most sophisticated equipment available in the Western World. A single shipment of machinery valued at several million dollars may suffice to give them a priceless capability that they would have no way of developing on their own.

THE SALE OF MINIATURE BALL BEARING MACHINES: A CASE HISTORY

This fact was pointed up in a particularly dramatic way by an investigation conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security[1] in late 1960 and early 1961 into the proposed shipment of ultra-high-precision miniature ball bearing machines to the U.S.S.R.

The fact that these ball bearing machines were about to be shipped to the Soviet Union was brought to the attention of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security in December 1960. The export license had been approved by the Advisory Committee on Export Control. Both Secretary of Commerce Mueller and Secretary of Commerce Hodges, who succeeded him in January 1961, defended the decision on the grounds that the national interest would not be prejudiced; that it would, on the contrary, be served by the sale of these machines to the Soviet Union.

---

[1] See report of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, appendix, p. 69.

One of the first facts developed by the investigation was that the Defense Department had vigorously opposed the granting of the license because it considered the deal seriously prejudicial to our national security.

To obtain the expert opinion which the Department of Commerce had failed to obtain in granting the license, the subcommittee consulted 12 men recognized as top experts in the ball-bearing field. Their testimony established—

1. That the miniature bearings, produced with the help of the Bryant machines—which the Soviet sought—have application primarily in missile guidance systems, firing control systems, and other sophisticated defense hardware.

2. That there were 72 Bryant machines in operation in the United States; that all of the precision miniature bearings used by our Department of Defense were processed on these 72 machines; that 85 percent of the total output of miniature bearings went for military purposes.

3. That the Bryant machine was the only machine obtainable anywhere in the world capable of mass producing high precision miniature bearings; that Soviet industry had been seeking desperately to develop a comparable machine, but had not been able to master the problems involved.

4. That the possession of these machines would greatly accelerate Soviet mastery of the art of miniaturization and enhance the Communist military capability.

As one of the ball-bearing experts consulted by the subcommittee said in his report:

"Our manufacture of these small devices is no secret—even the manner is not difficult to determine—but the capability to do it well and economically has taken years to develop and it should not be sold to a potential adversary. * * * The situation is not one of selling our adversary a 'club'—but a machine which helps to produce better 'clubs' faster and cheaper."

Toward the end of February 1961, the subcommittee learned that the license for the export of the Bryant machines, which had been suspended in deference to its investigation, had been reinstated by the Commerce Department and the machines were in crates on the docks, ready for shipment. It was a situation that called for prompt action. It was decided to take the matter directly to President Kennedy. The President was shown the summary report of the committee. Since it was brief, he read it on the spot.

The shipment was called off that afternoon.

I think that this case history has importance because it illustrates the danger of overeagerness for East-West trade and the need for continuing care in the granting of export licenses, even if there should be an overall increase in East-West trade. If this could happen in the United States, then there is every reason to believe that there have been comparable lapses and perhaps much graver lapses in Western Europe, where there exists far less awareness than there does in the United States of the need for careful restrictions on the sale of sophisticated industrial equipment to the Soviet bloc.

THE NEED FOR A CONCERTED WESTERN POLICY

The problem of East-West trade requires a concerted policy on the part of the West. If East-West trade is treated by each nation as a matter for unilateral decision, not merely will the West deprive itself of its greatest single instrument of leverage in future negotiations with the Soviets, but the unlimited competition implicit in such a situation will create grave dangers to Western security.

American policy on East-West trade has suffered from inconsistencies from its beginning. The Battle Act of 1951, which was intended to restrict the flow of strategic goods to the Communist bloc, has never been properly enforced. In particular, there has been no serious effort to apply the provision of the act which calls for cutting off aid to countries which ship strategic goods to the bloc. Moreover, despite the amendment to the Export Control Act of 1962 and the existence of an extensive list of strategic goods which were barred from export to the Communist bloc, the licensing of shipments to the Soviet bloc has followed no intelligible pattern. The result has been that responsible agencies of Government have sometimes given their approval to the export of items capable of strengthening the Soviet military machine.

Nor has there been anything resembling unanimity in Western policy. Through CoCom[2] and the so-called CoCom list, many items and materials have theoretically been barred from shipment to the Soviets. But the CoCom list has been very unevenly applied by its member nations, with the result that the Soviets have, even in the past, received from our NATO partners many shipments that we would consider clearly strategic.

Because of the imperfect nature of the controls that heretofore existed, the Soviet Union was able to obtain, from the United States and from its allies, an amazing variety of machine tools, heavy industrial equipment, transportation equipment, pipeline, and even entire chemical and metallurgical plants.

But at least there were some controls. At least the Soviets were debarred from a fairly long list of critical items that were obviously of strategic importance.

Now the danger is that the barriers will come tumbling down, both here and abroad, and the Communists will be able to purchase even the most sophisticated strategic equipment, in the name of business and coexistence.

Even if we accept the trend toward increased trade with the Communist bloc as inevitable and perhaps desirable, it would clearly be to the advantage of the free world to concert its policy. This will only be done if the United States takes the initiative in convening, through NATO, an allied conference on East-West trade.

Such a conference would serve the purpose of putting the expansion of East-West trade on a rational basis. The expansion of the list of commodities in which trade might be carried on, would not be left to hazard or to the avarice of profit-hungry businessmen.

Conversely, the participating nations could agree on a list of strategic items that would remain barred for export to the Communist bloc, and could consider the establishment of a mechanism somewhat more effective than CoCom to enforce the ban on the sale of such commodities.

The conference could lay down general rules on the extension of credit.

It might wish to consider the problem of trading with the satellites in separate terms from the problem of trading with the Soviets. It might conceivably decide that, in the case of the satellites, trade should be used as a handmaiden of freedom, so that every show of national independence and every tangible increment in domestic freedom is rewarded by a further relaxation of trade and credit, while tendencies in the opposite direction are discouraged by restrictions on trade and credit.

But, above all, the conference should give consideration to the many-sided problem of relating East-West trade to Western diplomacy.

INCREASED EAST-WEST TRADE: AN HISTORIC DIPLOMATIC OPPORTUNITY

The Soviet economic crisis confronts us with an unprecedented opportunity to underscore the economic advantages of freedom, and the economic ineptitude of the Communist system. I hope we will take advantage of this opportunity.

But even more important, the Soviet economic crisis presents us with an historic diplomatic opportunity which, properly used, can make of East-West trade a true instrument for peace, stability, and prosperity.

In any honest diplomatic negotiations between equals, there must be some give and some take on both sides—not all give on one side and all take on the other side, as the Soviets would like to have it. Since we are not prepared to barter away the freedom of other peoples, the two things we have to offer in which the Communist bloc is supremely interested are increased trade and long-term credits. And since we are not particularly interested in more furs or caviar, the one thing the Soviets have to offer that would have serious meaning for us is a true abatement of the cold war.

Since the Soviets require our grain, our equipment, our raw materials, and our credits as a matter of the greatest urgency and perhaps even as a matter of survival, there is every reason to believe that a firm attitude on the part of the West will produce political concessions on the part of the Soviets.

The very least we can do is insist that, as a condition bailing the Soviets out of their manmade agricultural and industrial crises, the Soviets bring to a halt their subversive activities in this hemisphere and elsewhere. We might also insist that the Soviets respect the International Patent Convention and that they cease undercutting Western oil by selling oil at uneconomic prices. In return for certain specific concessions from the West in the realm of trade and credit, we might even ask that the Berlin wall be torn down and that the Soviets live up to their postwar agreements on the reunification of Germany through free elections.

Indeed, if Khrushchev really wants a reduction of tensions, there is no more effective measure he could take than to negotiate a package agreement with the West in which free elections in the captive nations, as prescribed by the Yalta Agreement, are exchanged for such concessions as a European security pact, partial disarmament, increased East-West trade, and generous long-term credits.

Khrushchev might resist such a far-reaching proposal today. But the time may come when a combination of such factors as top-level disagreement within the Kremlin, growing unrest in the satellites, increased economic difficulties at home, and growing concern over Red China, may cause Moscow to welcome such an initiative.

The possibilities before Western diplomacy are limitless if we are prepared to use our economic bargaining power as an instrument for the extension of freedom. Within such a framework, increased East-West trade could be a boon to all the peoples of the world.

Increased East-West trade, conversely, may turn out to be a curse if the West is foolish enough to give it to the Communist bloc on a platter, demanding nothing in return. The outcome of every diplomatic negotiation will be compromised in favor of the Soviets. The Soviets will be further emboldened, by the lack of conditions and by the impression of Western timidity, to step up their subversive activities, while enjoying the benefits of increased trade.

---

[2] Coordinating Committee for International Controls.

The whole structure and foundation of Communist power, which today threatens the world, would have been impossible without the equipment and technical assistance and direct aid the Kremlin has received from the West during the four and a half decades since the Bolshevik revolution. Let us hope that some future historian will not have to write that, by continuing to share the means of economic power with the Soviets without troubling to pose certain elementary political conditions, the great Western nations made themselves the instruments of their own destruction.

[From Krasnaya Zvezda, Jan. 19, 1965]

SENATOR DODD'S "IGNORANCE BARRIER"

(By Lt. Col. O. Ivanov)

A symposium on the Soviet economy was published in the United States last fall. It was not prepared by some private person (group) but by a completely official agency, namely one of the subcommittees of the Senate. Which? The same that has been called to stand guard over the internal security of the United States. The symposium was printed by a Government publisher—the U.S. Government Printing Office—and it was provided with a screaming title: "The Many Crises of the Soviet Economy."

Apparently anticipating that the sensational title may cause some doubts in the mind of a serious reader, the vice chairman of the subcommittee, Senator THOMAS DODD, "enriched" the brochure with a lengthy introduction in which he announced that this work is not an ordinary propaganda literature, but a quite original scientific inquiry.

The brochure in fact is quite "original" both in intent and in execution. The objective set forth by the authors is to finally solve the problem long occupying the minds of capitalist theoreticians and propagandists. Specifically it was to "prove" the superiority of capitalistic economic methods over those practiced under socialism. In which way? By analysis of data found in the Soviet press.

Carefully extracting from the Soviet press, the latter ranging from scientific journals to regional newspapers, all critical comments, all suggestions intended to correct the shortcomings in our economic work and by remaining obviously silent about our positive achievements, the authors of the symposium began screaming to the world: "Look what is going on over there? It is a real crisis."

Information on the need to improve the quality of some models of Soviet television sets caught their eye. At once (the following) profound conclusions: As much as television sets are related to electronics and electronics to rockets, it means that there are enough data to suggest that in terms of reliability Soviet rockets are inferior to American rockets.

Senator DODD should be enlightened by a Russian saying which recommends that the goat should look over his horns. Let this be done by Americans themselves, by President Johnson's adviser on space research, Dr. Edward K. Welsh. He stated, without beating around the bush, that with the flight of the three-seat spaceship Voskhod the Russians "again proved that they continue to play a leading role in the realm of space flights." Who doesn't understand that there is no better place than space to test the reliability of rockets and their electronic instrumentation.

Other conjectures about the scientific and technological lag of the U.S.S.R. are clearly refuted by the Americans themselves. The special adviser to the President of the United States on scientific and engineering matters, Donald Hornig, who visited not long ago the Soviet Union with a group of experts expressed a high opinion about the status of Soviet scientific and engineering thought and about the economy as a whole.

Soviet achievements are known to the world. We are proud of them, we do not hide the actually existing deficiencies, and we are not afraid to admit honestly and openly there are mistakes because we want to correct them. Such is the nature of the Socialist revolution. Such is the nature of the people occupied with the Communist, transformation of the society.

However, the authors of the anti-Soviet brochure, evidently, feel that they went too far. They cannot help seeing that in our times the scale in the economic competition between the two systems is inexorably tipping toward socialism. Because of it their joyous shouts about our "difficulties" intertwine a remorseful message on the necessity for the West in general and the United States in particular that the "survival of the free world" depends on how well it can counter the Soviet Union's "increasingly vigorous economic offensive."

Why was it necessary for the Senate subcommittee to compose the tale about the crises in the Soviet economy?

The matter is that the ruling circles in the United States up until now stubbornly hang onto the strategy of economic blockade of Socialist countries which, according to the authors, should "weaken" as much as possible the "potential enemy." Counter to the will and desires of Washington more and more Western countries are in process of expanding their business contacts with the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries. The brochure puts it as follows:

"British, West German, French, and Italian businessmen are in cutthroat competition. Buying is slow. Unemployment in some industries is rising. Along comes the Soviet Union with an offer to buy ships, pipes, metalworking equipment, whole fertilizer plants—all these commodities piling up for want of markets. The plum dangled before the West's nose is very tempting." This fact which the esteemed Senator does not want to understand, the business people in the West learned instinctively. They felt that the artificial trade restrictions are like a boomerang, hurting first of all the capitalists themselves.

Since many restrictive barriers gave way it became a fact that there are more business contacts between the West and the East. Logically it should be concluded that this means we should trade, we should conclude mutually advantageous treaties, and that we should throw away the remaining restrictions. Yet, Senator DODD has his own logic, the logic of a smart dealer, steeped up in a capitalistic business and political intrigues. His reasoning is as follows: Since trade is inescapable, let's extract from the Soviet Union some "political concessions."

What "concessions" does he want to obtain? Let's again cite the authors of the brochure.

"Since the Soviets require * * * our equipment, our raw materials, and our credits as a matter of the greatest urgency and perhaps even as a matter of survival, there is every reason to believe that a firm attitude on the part of the West will produce political concessions on the part of the Soviets." And the "very least" that they want from the Soviet Union is to stop supporting Cuba and an agreement to let West Germany swallow East Germany.

It is difficult to say of which there is more—insolence or stupidity. At one time international imperialism tried to use the same language while negotiating with the Soviet Union. Nothing came out of it. It became apparent that there are forces in the world more powerful than the cunning attempts of international capitalism. These life-giving forces of growing socialism are the forces of universal economic laws.

Facts are a stubborn thing. Yet these point out that the victorious advent of socialism cannot be halted by threats and by restrictive barriers. We would like to counsel Senator DODD. His nurtured "spreading of ignorance (falsehoods)" about the crises of the Soviet economy is obviously an unsuitable material for restoring the very old and the most noxious barrier between the West and East, the barrier of lies and slander.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT A. LEWIS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the text of an interview with Mr. Robert A. Lewis, a former resident of Connecticut, now a U.S. Foreign Service officer. Mr. Lewis recently returned from Korea, where he became famous as the "Flying Consul."

The consular district in which Mr. Lewis served included all the land south of the political demarcation line dividing the Korean peninsula. In this area there are approximately 10,000 American civilians and 50,000 American servicemen. In order to take care of the problems of these many American citizens and to protect U.S. life and property, Mr. Lewis learned to fly. Remarkably enough, he learned to fly in a private plane which had been purchased with green stamps contributed by women pilots in the United States, as a gesture of admiration for Captain Kim, the only licensed civilian woman aviatrix in Korea.

The story of Mr. Lewis' adventures as flying consul makes exciting reading. By his imagination, by his dedication to duty, and by his courage he has upheld the best traditions of the American Foreign Service.

The Foreign Service has every reason to be proud of Mr. Lewis; and his home State of Connecticut can perhaps be pardoned if it feels a particular sense of pride in the accomplishments of one of its own sons.

There being no objection, the text of the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"FLYING CONSUL" IN KOREA LEARNED TO FLY IN PLANE BOUGHT WITH GREEN STAMPS

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Foreign Service officer who became famous in Korea as the "Flying Consul" has returned home, revealing that he learned to fly in an airplane purchased with ordinary American green stamps.

Interviewed here after his recent return from a 3-year tour of duty as American consul in the Republic of Korea, Robert A. Lewis, 43, a native of New York and former resident of Connecticut, explained why he took to the air in the first place to accomplish his consular duties.

"There is only one U.S. consulate in the Republic of Korea," says Mr. Lewis. "The consular district, whose headquarters are at Seoul, includes all the land south of the armistice-established demarcation line dividing the Korean peninsula. Approximately 10,000 American civilians and 50,000 American servicemen reside in this area and many of them periodically require the assistance of the American consul. In order to protect U.S. lives, property, and other interests more efficiently throughout this large area, I learned to fly."

Finding an airplane and an instructor was not easy for Mr. Lewis, despite the presence of many military aircraft, both American and Korean. Private flying had not developed for the simple reason that it is an expensive hobby and few Koreans can afford it.

Lewis' problem was solved one day when a Captain Kim, a young woman and the only licensed civilian woman aviatrix in Korea, came to the American Embassy to obtain a visa to visit the United States. Somehow her story had captured the imaginations of a group of lady pilots in this country known as the "Ninety-Niners." These generous ladies organized a campaign to save green stamps in order to purchase a Piper Colt for presentation to Captain Kim. The latter came to New York last year to take possession of the plane, brought it back to Korea, and set about organizing a club to train other Korean lady pilots.

It was with this aircraft of Captain Kims that Mr. Lewis learned to fly. His instructor was a retired officer of the Korean Air Force.

Mr. Lewis had a spine-tingling experience on his first solo cross-country flight, which points up some of the difficulties still facing the Republic of Korea since the end of the Korean conflict in 1953. His planned cross-country flight was Seoul-Chunchon-Hoengsong-Seoul. His flight plan called for a 30-minute flight east of Seoul to Chunchon; then 15 minutes south to Hoengsong; and then back to Seoul. On the second day, flying south in the mountainous east cost area, he realized by his time in flight that he had missed Hoengsong. It was not possible to turn back since this would necessitate flying north and risking the possibility of crossing the demarcation line with Communist North Korea, which passes only 20 miles away from Seoul. The flight ended successfully, however, as Mr. Lewis recognized a fertilizer plant at Chungu and was then able to follow the Han River back to Seoul.

"My role as the 'Flying Consul' culminated in a final 10-day flying trip throughout the Republic of Korea in late September 1964," he says.

Renting another Piper Colt from a private company and piloting himself, Lewis flew through five provinces in the Republic of Korea to provide consular services to American civilians and servicemen and to Korean nationals in outlying areas. Stopping at major centers where any significant number of Americans resided, he performed 25 consular services and collected $63 in fees, in addition providing information on consular questions to 30 persons. Discussions were held with many members of the private American community on property and protection problems, and courtesy calls were made on four provincial governors, three mayors, and four U.S. military commanders.

"From a consular point of view the trip was very worthwhile," Lewis says. "There are many American missionaries in outlying areas devoting their lives to service in Korea, and this trip afforded them an opportunity to maintain a tie with the official community. Also, the consular services performed in the field represented a considerable saving in energy and man-hours for the recipients. The many private American citizens residing outside of Seoul, moreover, were pleased to see their consul active in this novel way."

The fact that he could fly opened new horizons for Consul Lewis, who believes that he has demonstrated with an airplane that Foreign Service officers with a willingness to sacrifice in this way from their own financial resources can obtain important returns for their work and their country.

Mr. Lewis, who prior to his Korean assignment had held Foreign Service posts in Cairo, Paris, Athens, and Le Havre, is currently assigned to the Department of State in Washington.

RETIREMENT OF DISTINGUISHED CHIEF ENGINEER OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the pressing problem of reliable, comfortable, fast, and safe mass transportation is one of widespread concern and its solution is vital to the growth of metropolitan areas across the land. As in the national capital area, numerous public and private bodies are seeking ways to end congestion and other costly consequences of inadequate facilities for speedy movement of large numbers of people daily.

An imaginative and energetic expert who has labored effectively in this field retires from a post in which he has exercised tremendous influence in conceiving an exciting program for meeting a desperate public need. Very largely as a result of his labors, early relief is in view for a region plagued by insufficient facilities to accommodate the heavy burden of commuters and other persons having occasion daily to travel to and from their places of employment, for business, and for pleasure.

The San Francisco Bay area rapid transit district noted the retirement February 1, of Keneth M. Hoover, one of the Nation's foremost experts, from the position of chief engineer which he has occupied since 1959.

In that capacity Mr. Hoover directed preliminary engineering for an ambitious 75-mile system to include aerial, surface, and subway transit operations, including a 6-mile underwater tube. Previously Mr. Hoover, who received his degree of bachelor of science in electrical engineering from South Dakota State College of Engineering in 1926, was connected with transit lines and agencies in several cities including Pittsburgh, Philadelphia-Camden, New York, and the National Capital region.

The retirement of this competent expert will be an unfortunate loss for the San Francisco authority but Mr. Hoover fortunately plans to continue his activity in the transit field as special consultant on technical problems. I am sure his continued availability as an adviser will be welcomed by planners and managements in many sections of the country.

ALASKA WATER TRANSPORTATION STUDY UNDERTAKEN

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last fall Commissioner George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission, visited the Pacific Northwest, and spoke at the meeting of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce and the port of Seattle on the observance of Seattle-Alaska Day, and later before the chamber of commerce in Anchorage, Alaska. Although Commissioner Hearn at that time had been a member of the Federal Maritime Commission for a period of only 3 months, he displayed an impressive understanding and appreciation of the transportation problems of Alaska. At the close of Commissioner Hearn's address in Anchorage, he pledged that the Federal Maritime Commission would immediately undertake a study of the entire Alaska trade. I have been advised that this pledge has been kept. The study is well underway, and full cooperation is being given by all interests concerned. We in Alaska look forward to the completion of this important undertaking.

I request that the addresses given by Mr. Hearn in Seattle and in Anchorage, on October 23 and 26, respectively, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Commissioner George H. Hearn, of Federal Maritime Commission, Before the Alaska and Maritime Division of the Chamber of Commerce and the Port of Seattle at Seattle, Wash., on October 23, 1964

I was pleased to receive your kind invitation to speak here today on the occasion of your observance of Seattle-Alaska Day.

This visit has afforded me my first opportunity to return to your great port since 1945 while serving aboard the U.S.S. *Iowa*. To return to your rugged and beautiful countryside is a most refreshing experience, to observe the operation of your port is an educational benefit, and by visiting with you who make this Northwest Gateway hum, I am convinced that your steady growth is more than a fortuitous circumstance and that the attainment of your continuing progress is assured.

As you may know, this opportunity to meet with you represents my first public expression since President Johnson appointed me as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission in late July. And while I have been "on board" so to speak, only 3 months, neither the steamship and its related industries nor the regulation of transportation are new to me.

As a recently appointed member of a fairly new regulatory agency, I would be less than frank to imply that I or we could offer a panacea for all the alleged shipping ills. However, to commence to regulate in accordance with the new Shipping Act is our obligation. However, we do not wish to overregulate but to blend all of our efforts, those of the shippers, forwarder, terminal operator, carrier and the Commission to advance American commerce throughout the world, and to insure an economically sound fleet ever ready for national defense. I think the words of President Johnson, spoken to me on the occasion of my swearing in, appropriately summarize our aims. The President said: "The maritime world is a highly competitive world. I very much want us all to do all we can to strengthen the thrust of this Nation's competitiveness, its competitiveness on the sealanes of the world's oceans." Now let us relate the Pacific Northwest and the Federal Maritime Commission to this mandate.

First, I would be remiss if I failed to observe the tremendous maritime growth of the port of Seattle. While Alaska remains as your principal customer, I am happy to note that cargoes leaving this port—some originating far to the east of this great State—are carried to the entire free world, that you have attracted the services of more than 90 steamship lines, and, very importantly, that you are continually engaged in projecting by enormous proportions the terminal facilities that grace Elliott Bay which are second to none.

I want to address myself in a few moments—and in some detail—to the Alaska trade. But before doing so, I would like in some degree to give you my impressions to date of the Commission's role in the scheme of transportation regulation.

The organic statutes that clothe us with regulatory authority, of course, are the Shipping Act and the Intercoastal Shipping Act. Each is limited to common carriers by water, and the latter, insofar as the Commission is concerned, relates to the offshore domestic trades—Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico, principally.

Under the Shipping Act, which has been kept up to date since its passage in 1916, in no small measure, by the sage and erudite stewardship of Senators Magnuson and

Bartlett together with their colleagues in the House, our jurisdiction extends to common carriers by water, terminal operators and freight forwarders. Freight forwarders, particularly important to shippers not at seaboard, now must be licensed. The licensing statute, together with the Commission's regulations in furtherance of that statute, insure that those shippers who avail themselves of the services of freight forwarders, are employing experts. And the experts are of demonstrated and bonded integrity whose services are offered at reasonable and nondiscriminatory rates and conditions. Before the licensing amendment to the act, forwarders merely had to register with the old Federal Maritime Board, and there were some 1,721 registered forwarders. Now with the licensing provision of the act that number has been reduced to about 800. The Commission, of course, met the heavy task of analyzing every license application and I am pleased to say that the backlog of license applications today does not exceed 30. This action has insured all that the forwarders now seeking to serve are dependable, hardworking firms attempting to make our waterborne commerce more productive.

As to terminal operators, I want you to know that there are about 400 entities throughout the United States engaging in this most necessary enterprise. The port of Seattle and the Northwest Marine Terminals Association, if I may say so, are enlightened examples of the important role played by terminals—serving both ship and cargo—in the scheme of our oceanborne commerce. In 1959, as all terminal men know, a question arose as to whether terminal leases—leases between persons subject to our jurisdiction relating to properties on which terminal operations are conducted—were subject to the filing and approval requirements of section 15. This interpretation was novel. Therefore, hundreds of leases overnight became subject to the onerous penalty of $1,000 per day fine merely because these leases were not filed with the Board. This inadvertently came about simply because the terminal operators were relying upon the policy then existing.

The Commission, early this year, brought this matter to the attention of the Congress, and through the efforts of Senator Magnuson, a moratorium was added to the Shipping Act. This moratorium resulted in the exoneration of the penalty provisions of the act provided they were promptly filed with the Commission for scrutiny and consequent approval, modification or disapproval. I want you to know that since that time—February 9, 1964—the Commission has reviewed over 1,500 lease agreements and has the modest backlog of only 40, and we anticipate that this backlog will be resolved within the next month.

Incidentally, as proof of my claim that we are not trying to be overregulators, I want to say that the vast majority of the lease agreements reviewed by the Commission since February were found not to be subject to the filing provisions of section 15, and therefore, did not require approval, disapproval or modification. Consequently, I think you will agree that our policy is not one of overreaching our authority.

In addition, we have been busy with respect to all the carriers in our foreign trades. Our obligations to these trades, though not quite as detailed as those regarding our domestic trades, are indeed broad.

Under the 1961 amendments to the Shipping Act, the Commission was charged with considering and judging the lawfulness of dual rate contracts in most of our foreign trades I am sure that I need not remind you that this undertaking was a substantial one. I believe the Commission can be proud of its accomplishments in this field. The result—to my way of thinking—has been a form of contract that ennobles that delicate balance of interests between shippers and carriers. The conference carriers have been afforded a contract system whereby they can discourage speculators from disrupting the trade, and shippers enjoy the protection of dual rate contracts, which, for the first time, afford them substantial rights. An important provision of the 1961 amendments, too, is the requirement that every carrier file his foreign rates, both inbound and outbound, with the Commission. For the first time all shippers can apprise themselves of the going transportation rate before they make a foreign sale. And by the way, armed with rate data previously unavailable to the Commission, we are examining the disparities between inbound and outbound movements in given trades, and, more importantly, disparities between freight rates from U.S. ports and from foreign ports to common trade markets.

I want to make it perfectly clear, however, that a rate disparity, in my opinion, is not unlawful, per se. There are, of course, many, many factors which go into the laid down cost of American goods in the foreign marketplace—and ocean freight although important is but one of them. But the mere existance of disparities, entitles American exporters to Commission scrutiny of them. They may be completely justifiable, but we would be remiss, once having noticed them, to summarily assume that they have no adverse effect upon our foreign commerce.

The shipping public has a right to expect rates and services that will enable them to compete in world markets. In those instances where there is an indication that such services are not being offered by those segments of the industry subject to our jurisdiction, you can expect that this Commission will do its duty.

This particular phase of our regulatory work, of course, is only in keeping with the objectives of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and this administration's continuing efforts to "sell American" and to overcome our balance-of-payments deficit.

Our foreign sales this year are expected to reach a new high—$24.7 billion worth of goods—an increase of more than $2 billion over 1963 alone. Under the aegis of this aggressive export program, the balance-of-payments deficit for the first 3 years of this administration, represented a decrease of 33 percent in the balance-of-payment structure over the preceding 3 years. In addition, our gold outflow has been cut by more than 80 percent since 1960. It has dropped from $1.7 billion in 1960 to less than $0.4 billion in 1963.

Accordingly, I am pleased to observe that nine "E's" for excellence have been bestowed upon Washington firms under the trade expansion program. My congratulations to you who have achieved this accolade.

Now, if I may, I want to revert to our domestic regulatory problems and particularly to the Seattle-Alaska trade. We are all aware of the unusual—almost complete—dependence of our 49th State upon water transportation. We are aware as well, of the Commission's regulatory responsibility respecting water transportation to and from Alaska. That responsibility is almost as complete, I dare say, as your Public Utility Commission's jurisdiction over gas and electric rates here in Seattle. While a carrier does not have to be "certificated" or "franchised" to enter the trade, he is protected by our cabotage laws from foreign competition. And once in the trade, he is required to treat without discrimination all who use his services and he must offer his services at rates which are just and reasonable. It is this rate responsibility which casts a weighty public trust upon the Commission. You who ship to Alaska are fortunate: three large carriers and many "supplemental" carriers, if I may borrow a phrase from my Civil Aeronautics Board days, compete for your cargoes.

Let's look at the rate situation. Just the other day, the Commission announced the termination of its formal investigation of the Alaskan rate structure. That case—docket No. 881—began in January 1960. During the pendency of that case changes of such magnitude have occurred that the record, I am advised, bears little resemblance to the trade as it exists today. Coastwise Line no longer serves the trade; single-factor joint rates, covering the combined services of water and rail carriers, are now permitted under Public Law 87–595 of August 1962, and such rates are filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Less expensive and more efficient cargo handling methods have been introduced into the trade. Alaska Steam is continuing its program of containerization, and only this year it converted two of its vessels to full van ships each capable of carrying 200 24-foot vans. I understand that this conversion alone will increase Alaska Steam's van lifting potential by 4,400 units per year.

Nor has Puget Sound Alaska Van Lines remained complacent. Whereas its modern barges were capable of carrying 24-foot vans exclusively when docket 881 was initiated, it has expanded its service to include railcar barges capable of lifting 30 to 42 rail cars per sailing. Also we have a new carrier on the scene—Sea Land—which operates two C–4 type vessels offering both a container and a break-bulk service. Consequently, competition for your cargo offerings is in the increase and that is a healthy omen.

In addition to these innovations dictated by managerial judgments—there are changed conditions wrought by the terrible earthquake in Alaska last March. While this tragedy's impact upon the Alaska trade is not yet completely ascertainable, we do know that the principal rail belt ports have been severely damaged and their efficiency terribly impaired. Consequently, we anticipate the movement of an increased volume of normal commercial freight plus the movement of new types of cargo to Alaska.

In light of these changes, the Commission has instructed the staff to undertake a detailed study of the rate structure and overall conditions of the trade. This study will be undertaken and concluded in the most thorough and most expeditious manner.

Now, it may be asked, why a staff study? Apart from the very real changes in the trade, the Commission on June 17, 1964, has put into effect its general order No. 11. After carriers have complied with the filing requirement of that order, the task of analyzing general rate levels, traffic projections, and individual commodity rates should be more scientific, less burdensome and less expensive, and—most importantly, less time consuming. Further, in view of Public Law 87–595, whereby single factor joint rates involving both a water carrier and a rail carrier may be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, our staff, in undertaking its study, has been instructed to consult with the ICC so that the report that is given to us will be as thorough as possible.

There is one point which I want to make perfectly clear. I have never been a subscriber to that school of thought which accepts regulation for regulation's sake. Last December, President Johnson in addressing himself to the heads of regulatory agencies directed them to reassess and to reevaluate the regulatory role. He challenged them, "to evaluate our sights, to measure our performance by quality rather than quantity; to concern ourselves with new areas of cooperation before we concern ourselves with new areas of control."

I am of the opinion that if a regulatory program cannot result in a tangible benefit—

less costly or more efficient service, increased exports and imports, in short the fostering of our public interest—regulation serves no useful purpose. But I do believe that the licensing and regulation of forwarders and their business practices, the concern over the practices of terminal operators, and most importantly, the continuing attention to steamship conferences operating in the foreign commerce of the United States are important activities. Our commerce includes not only steamship lines, and terminal operators and freight forwarders, but also shippers and consignees and consumers as well.

It is quite easy to say that shipping costs, and I include accessorial services, should be geared to a level whereby cargo is induced to move and whereby those offering the services are compensated for their investments, but it is an entirely different matter to apply that universal theory to the particular. Nevertheless, that, as I see it, is what the Commission is charged with, and that is what we are going to do.

In closing, I want to emphasize the mandate President Johnson gave me on July 22, 1964: "I think we are making some progress in increasing our trade. We are encouraged by the gains last year that we made and this year, but those of us who give some thought to these fields know that we must do a great deal more and we are going to. One place where more can be done is in improving the efficiency of the Maritime Commission, to cut through delays that impede the competitiveness of our shippers, and to make decisions fairly, justly, and most importantly, promptly."

Ladies and gentlemen, in taking the oath of office I am pledged to that task.

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER GEORGE H. HEARN OF FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AT ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, ON OCTOBER 26, 1964

I am very happy to be here today in the State of Alaska, and this splendid "All America City." Few cities have won this accolade, and I am sure that none is as young as yours—incorporated as recently as 1920. And none, certainly, has absorbed a population growth of from 3,000 just prior to World War II to more than 80,000 today.

After being here for only a short time, I must confess to being overwhelmed by the magnificence of the natural beauty of this State and by the warmth and dynamic spirit of your people. I wish that time permitted an opportunity to take advantage of your unexcelled hunting and fishing and enjoy, leisurely, the awesome beauty of your great State. Nevertheless, to be here with Senator BARTLETT and yourselves is a very worthwhile and pleasant experience.

Your phenomenal growth rate is no mere accident. And your continued progress, by leaps and bounds, in new as well as familiar fields should come as no surprise to anyone who has been here.

I have had occasion to visit your terminal on Knik Arm and I want to say that I have not seen a more up-to-date terminal facility anyplace in the United States. My hearty congratulations to you who had the foresight and determination to overcome many real obstacles in establishing the port of Anchorage. The heavy financial investment in this terminal by a city of this size is indeed a declaration of faith and self-confidence. Because the cargo-handling gear is so modern, vessel outturn time here is half that of most U.S. ports. And your utilization of icebreakers, proposed this year for the first time on a regular basis, is particularly laudable. Converting Anchorage from an 8- to a 12-month port will redound to the economic betterment of the entire Rail Belt area and consequently to the entire State.

Recently, the Alaska trade has been enhanced by the addition of Sea Land—a new carrier, and a carrier that serves this State directly through this port. Competition for Alaska's cargoes is on the increase, and that is a healthy sign. To my mind, it is a concrete expression that experienced businessmen have joined you in your declaration of faith by their substantial investments.

I have been a member of the Federal Maritime Commission for only 3 months and I want you to know that the Commission, although it is a small agency—and a comparatively new one—plays a very important role in the scheme of water transportation. And, neither the limitation of the size of our staff nor the magnitude of the task assigned will daunt us in carrying out our weighty responsibilities.

Our regulatory role, of course, is important to the steamship industry, to the terminal industry and to ocean freight forwarders. It is equally important to shippers and consignees. Because freight rates are reflected in the price of the goods bought by consumers, our role is of paramount importance. It is my view that consumers are especially referred to in that phrase which permeates the entire warp and woof of every every regulatory fabric. A familiar phrase which reads—"the public interest." And there is no group of consumers more aware of our regulatory responsibilities to them than you people here in Alaska. This is so, perhaps, because your economy so depends upon water transportation. But I would be somewhat remiss if I failed to acknowledge that your representatives in the Congress, particularly Senator BARTLETT, have been especially articulate in establishing and nurturing this consumer interest on your behalf.

All this, of course, leads me naturally into the ocean rate situation concerning Alaska. But before I get into that, I believe I should tell you generally about my impression of the Commission and its work.

Our administrative authority stems from the Shipping Act and the Intercoastal Shipping Act. The former, enacted in 1916, relates, in the main, to our foreign commerce and the overseeing of common carriers, particularly conferences of carriers in our foreign trades. Our authority in the foreign trades is not nearly as detailed or specific as is our authority in the offshore domestic trades. It is, nevertheless, weighty.

Our stewardship respecting our foreign commerce is not of grave concern to you. But I want you to know that this State, this port, and shippers and consignees here will become additionally involved with the Commission when your trade with foreign nations grows, as it must, as you harness your powers, tap your natural wealth, and devote your acumen to exporting as well as importing.

Now I want to get back to our regulatory authority in the domestic trades. The economy of this great State is tied directly to water transportation. A healthy economic environment in this State requires a most advanced and dependable ocean transportation system at rates which allow a reasonable return on prudent investment. Such a rate structure would result in the attainment of our equitable balance between shipper and carrier interests. This balance will insure that the prices ultimately paid by consumers for goods which originate in the lower 48 are not inordinately high because of water transportation costs.

Our authority over domestic rates is spelled out in the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933. Under that statute the Commission has the power to determine whether given rates are fair and reasonable and are therefore lawful. If not, we have the authority to determine what rates constitute just and reasonable maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum rates, and order them enforced. You will agree, I am sure, that we have ample authority to review rates—both the general level of rates and the level of individual rates—in your trade. We do not, however, have licensing authority to determine who may enter the trade.

Alaska, I believe, has attracted able and diverse entrepreneurs to this service. You have competitive services provided by the big three—Alaska Steamship Co., Puget Sound Alaska Van Lines, and Sea Land, and you have at your disposal a host of smaller carriers who serve a wide range of ports. Consequently, transportation services are improving, and we at the Commission intend to undertake the obligations of our office to insure that service to Alaska will benefit from the protection that Congress intended when it vested us with rate responsibility. This authority is almost as complete as the rate responsibility of commissions which regulate your electric companies.

Just a few days ago, and I am sure you are all aware of it, the Commission announced its decision in docket 881. That was an investigation into general increases in rates in the Alaskan trade—primarily the Seattle-Alaska trade. I did not participate in that proceeding since it commenced in January 1960 and was decided in mid-July of this year, prior to my becoming a member of the Federal Maritime Commission. I think it should be clearly understood that the record in docket 881 bears little relationship to the Alaska trade as it now exists.

Since 1960, changes of the first magnitude have occurred. Alaska Steam—identified with this great State for over 65 years—has prominently upgraded its service. It has changed from substantial break-bulk carrier to a container carrier. During the past it furthered its conversion program to accommodate an additional 4,400 units per year and, I understand, it intends to further modernize its service. Puget Sound Alaska Van Lines, too, is presently refining its already modern service to include railcar barges. These improvements, I sincerely hope, will result in cost savings which will ultimately be reflected in consumer costs here. The comparatively new service offered by Sea Land—a seasoned container carrier—calling directly here in Anchorage, with vessels appropriately named *Anchorage* and *Seattle*, should result, by these improved services, in economies that will benefit the consumers here in Alaska.

I understand further, that new methods of handling cargo—methods that are less expensive than heretofore—and more efficient than existed in 1960, have become commonplace. These innovations augur a healthier rate climate, and we look forward to tangible benefits from their use.

In addition, we now have the provisions of Public Law 87–595 of August 1962, which permit the filing with the Interstate Commerce Commission of single-factor joint rates covering both land and water carriers. The impact of that statutory provision on the trade has not yet been fully ascertained, but it is a factor that must be considered in making a sound judgment of the rate structure in the trade.

Your tragic experience of last Good Friday, of course, has affected both the trade and the rate picture, to say the least. However, because of your again exhibiting the determination that enabled you to carve out of a wilderness this great State, you have replaced worldwide sympathy and concern with deep admiration by your truly remarkable recovery.

There is a development within the Commission itself, which portends to a more scientific approach to rate analysis in the trade—and it applies to rate levels generally and to individual commodity rates. I refer, of course, to the Commission's General Order No. 11, promulgated only last June. Under that order, carriers in the domestic trades are required to file such information with the Commission that will enable us to analyze rate levels in an orderly, relatively inexpensive, and expeditious manner. Filings as a result of that order are not yet complete, but we are approaching the day when its fruit will be meaningful.

In view of all of these changes, our staff has been directed to conduct a study into the entire Alaska trade. My pledge to you today is that this undertaking will be undertaken promptly, thoroughly, and efficiently. In order to assure as thorough a study as possible, the active cooperation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the State of Alaska, and the Alaska Railroad will be sought.

In closing, I want you to know that I have always subscribed to that philosophy that "justice delayed is justice denied," and I am particularly mindful of President Johnson's admonition to me upon the occasion of my taking office, that decisions must be made "fairly, justly, and most importantly, promptly." Thank you very much.

MINERAL PRODUCTION IN ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, although the State of Alaska has long been known for its rich deposits of untapped minerals, only a disturbingly small part of this potential has ever been realized.

In recent years there have been attempts at cooperation between the Bureau of Mines of the U.S. Department of the Interior, the Department of Natural Resources of the Alaska Division of Mines and Minerals, and private industry. These efforts sometimes have resulted in successful exploration ventures; others have tested the potential of known deposits. The fact remains, however, that mineral production in Alaska has never equaled the potential which exploration efforts indicate is there.

Of course, there have been a few exceptions. The great gold discovery and exploitation of the early years of this century was the most noteworthy. Kennecott Copper's intensive mining of a deposit at McCarthy, Alaska, from the time of the First World War through the 1920's, was another. Then, in recent years, we have had the encouraging growth of oil exploration and discovery around the Cook Inlet Basin.

However, the overall picture remains a sad one. A recent report by the Mineral Resource Office of the Bureau of Mines, located at Juneau, Alaska, points up for all of us the pitiful state of the Alaska mining industry. The output of gold in 1964, so the report states, dropped to 62,500 ounces—$2.19 million. This amount is the smallest quantity produced in 70 years, with the exception of the World War II year of 1944.

The figures for coal production were lower in 1964 than in the previous year. Next year may see an even more substantial reduction in the amount of coal produced in Alaska, for the Department of Defense has recently announced its decision to convert its two large Anchorage installations, Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson, to natural gas, backed up by a standby oil-fired system.

Mercury production in 1964 amounted to 340 flasks. This was 10 percent of the 1958–62 average Alaska production of this much-needed metal.

Last year saw the closing of Alaska's only uranium mine for an indefinite time, because no market for the ore was available.

The encouraging announcement of a huge low-grade iron ore deposit on the Alaska peninsula 200 miles southwest of Anchorage was considerably dampened by the subsequent and unpublicized statement by company officials that the new deposit would not become an attractive source of new iron ore for another 10 or 15 years.

The recent Bureau of Mines report, entitled "Mineral Production in Alaska in 1964," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, indicates how great is this need in one of our 50 States.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINERAL PRODUCTION IN ALASKA IN 1964

The value of 1964 mineral production in Alaska reached an alltime high of $71 million, an increase of 5 percent over the previous record year of 1963 according to estimates of production compiled by the Bureau of Mines, U.S. Department of the Interior. Crude oil and natural gas from the Kenai Peninsula fields were again the leading mineral commodities, accounting for 50 percent of total value of production. Sand and gravel maintained second rank with a value of $23.3 million, a 6-percent increase over the 1963 figure. Both tonnage and value of coal declined somewhat from the 1963 levels. Output of gold dropped to 62,500 ounces ($2.19 million), the smallest physical quantity produced in 70 years with the exception of the World War II year of 1944.

Developments in the oil and gas industry again dominated the news in the minerals field. Shell Oil Co.'s rapid move to exploit its 1963 Middle Ground Shoal oil find, Pan American Petroleum Corp.'s oil discovery, also at Middle Ground Shoal, and increased exploration activity on the Arctic Slope featured the developments. Shell installed a huge drilling platform with 146-foot tubular legs in 90 feet of water at Middle Ground Shoal in Cook Inlet. Designed for year-round operations, the platform had 2 decks, quarters for 50 men, a 173-foot drilling tower and other support facilities. The tubular legs of the installation were designed to provide oil storage when the rig is in operation. The platform was to serve as a permanent drilling and production site for the Shell Middle Ground Shoal lease. Shell planned to drill 32 wells from the platform, with initial drilling scheduled to begin shortly after the start of the year. Standard Oil Co. of California and Richfield Oil Corp. were coventurers with Shell in the project.

Pan American brought in a major well with Middle Ground Shoal No. 4 in Cook Inlet about 3 miles north of the Shell find. Cumulative tests from eight zones in a 1,500-foot pay section showed 5,100 barrels per day. Skelly Oil Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., and Sinclair Oil Co. were participants with Pan American in the venture.

In other notable developments in petroleum, Shell Oil brought in North Cook Inlet No. 1 at a rate of 2,270 barrels per day of 53 degree gravity oil. The well was approximately 3 miles north-northeast of Pan American's Cook Inlet No. 1–A, also a producer. This confirmation of the Cook Inlet-State discovery and Pan American's confirmation of the Middle Ground Shoal discovery gave added strength to estimates that Cook Inlet would prove to be a major oil province. The two new fields and the Swanson River unit on the Kenai Peninsula were important additions to Alaska's economic resources.

TABLE 1.—*Preliminary estimate, mineral production in Alaska, 1964*

Mineral	Quantity	Value (thousands)
Coal (bituminous) thousand short tons	799	(1)
Gold troy ounces	62,500	$2,188
Mercury 76-pound flasks	340	104
Natural gas million cubic feet	5,982	1,610
Petroleum (crude) thousand 42-gallon barrels	11,030	33,880
Sand and gravel thousand short tons	21,000	23,300
Silver troy ounces	7,300	9
Value of items that cannot be disclosed: Coal, gem stones, platinum-group metals, uranium, stone, peat		9,931
Total		71,022

[1] Included with value of items that cannot be disclosed.

A gas well drilled 4 miles south of Point Barrow in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 to provide gas for residents of Barrow struck gas at 2,300 feet. Over a 12-hour test, the well produced sufficiently to supply both Government and civilian demand. Barrow Utilities, Inc., a native cooperative, was to handle distribution and sale of the gas; the utility borrowed from the Indian revolving fund to finance the project.

The oil and gas fields on the Kenai Peninsula came through the Good Friday earthquake with very little damage. The refinery at Nikiski and the 20-mile Kenai pipeline connecting it to the Swanson River field suffered only minor damage as did the 80-mile gas line connecting the Union Oil Co.-Marathon Oil Co. Kenai unit gas field to Anchorage. Storage and marketing facilities at Anchorage and other south-central points, however, were badly damaged. Union set its first estimate of damage at $4 million; Standard of California said its losses would run to several million. Both the Swanson River field and the Kenai unit were back to normal operations within a week of the Good Friday quake.

Both tonnage and value of sand and gravel increased over the 1963 figures. Average unit value per ton was $1.11 compared with $1.30 in 1963. The State department of highways, or its contractors, were by far the largest producers. Other important producers were the Alaska Railroad, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Among the larger commercial producers were Alaska Redi-Mix, S. S. Mullen, Inc., and Alaska Aggregate Corp. The effect of the Alaska earthquake was evident in sand and gravel figures. Some commercial producers more than doubled their 1963 results. The Alaska Railroad, hardhit by quake damage at Anchorage, Seward, and other points, reported 1.6 million short tons versus 60,000 in 1963.

Stone, also showing the effects of the quake, increased 3.2 times in physical volume and 2.6 times in value. Much of the material was used to overcome earthquake-caused subsidence that left large sections of the Seward highway and the Alaska Railroad below high tide. The Alaska Railroad, the department of highways, and the Corps of Engineers, or their contractors, were the leading producers.

Results in the coal industry were somewhat below the 1963 figures in both volume and value of product; unit value was slightly lower. As in past years, the military was the chief consumer of Alaska coals. Military contracts for fiscal 1965 totaled 638,000 tons compared with 650,000 for 1964. Usibelli Coal Mine, Inc., with 341,000 tons was again the leading contractor. Usibelli mined coal from the Nenana (Healy River) field. Evan Jones Coal Co. contracted to supply 262,000 tons from the Matanuska field. The company was the only contractor in the

Matanuska field. Other contractors, both in the Nenana field, were Vitro Minerals Corp., 25,000 tons and Yutan Construction Co., 10,000 tons. All Alaska coal was strip mined.

The future of the State's coal industry was clouded by the advent of natural gas into the bidding for military fuel contracts. A bid by Alaska Pipeline Co. to supply Kenai unit gas to Fort Richardson and Elmendorf Air Force Base on a 5-year contract was the lowest among coal, oil and gas bidders. The Department of Defense was studying the conversion of the bases from coal to gas at yearend.

Value of gold produced again dropped sharply. Shutdown of major dredging operation, in the Fairbanks district was largely responsible for the decrease. The 10-year record of Alaska gold production, from 1955 to 1964, showed an almost unbroken decline from 249,300 ounces valued at $8.7 million at the start to 62,500 ounces at $2.2 million for 1964. Production over this period was almost entirely from placer mines; Alaska had no significant lode mine production since World War II conditions forced the closing of the gold mines. In spite of the decline in the gold industry, however, there was some evidence of an awakening of interest in gold lodes. Lodes in the Chandalar, Fairbanks, and Willow Creek districts were under exploration, and examinations and prospecting in these and other districts were increased.

Office of Minerals Exploration (OME) approved an exploration contract with Bonanza Gold, Inc., of Spokane, Wash., for work on an iron magnetite deposit near the old Jumbo Basin copper mine on Hetta Inlet, Prince of Wales Island. Bonanza contracted for diamond drilling to probe the deposit at depth. In the Chandalar district, Little Squaw Mining Co. continued work on gold lodes with OME assistance. Trenching, roadbuilding, and airfield improvements to allow use of C-46 and C-82 type cargo planes were accomplished. Keystone Mines continued underground work on the Nordale group of gold lode claims in the Fairbanks district under an OME contract approved in 1963. Exploration work on a gold placer deposit at Van Curlers Bar on the Chena River 80 miles east of Fairbanks was completed with OME assistance. The operator did not indicate whether an operation was planned. An application was filed for an OME contract for work on a placer gold deposit on Dan Creek in the Nizina district. The applicant proposed to explore and evaluate buried bench placers adjacent to the stream placers of Dan Creek.

Goodnews Bay Mining Co. was again the only primary producer of platinum in the Nation. Dredging operations, conducted 10 miles south of Platinum in the extreme southwest Kuskokwim River region, also yielded appreciable quantities of other platinum-group metals. Physical volume of product increased moderately. Value of product increased significantly, reflecting higher prices for platinum and allied metals. The company did not release operating figures for publication.

Output and value of mercury continued at the depressed levels of 1963 when the Red Devil mine of Alaska Mines and Minerals, Inc., was shut down. The 1964 estimate of 340 flasks produced was less than 10 percent of the 1958–62 average when Red Devil was in full operation. The spectacular climb in mercury prices, to the neighborhood of $500 a flask, occurred too late in the season to have any significant effect on Alaska operations. Lessees at the Red Devil mine produced a small quantity of mercury, as did the operator of the Alice and Bessie mine and a lessee at the White Mountain deposit, among others. The production from White Mountain was an encouraging sign for this new mercury property.

Alaska's only producing uranium mine, the Ross-Adams deposit at Bokan Mountain, Prince of Wales Island, was shut down at midyear for an indefinite time because no market was available for the company's ore. Standard Metals, Inc., operator at Bokan Mountain, had been shipping to the Mexican Hat mill in southeastern Utah. Through the Atomic Energy Commission's stretchout of the uranium purchase program, and the subsequent change in ownership of the Mexican Hat mill, Standard Metals lost its market for the Alaska ore.

The chief interest in iron during the year centered around the discovery by Pan American Petroleum Corp., a subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, of a huge low-grade deposit at Chenik Mountain, 200 miles southwest of Anchorage where the Alaska Peninsula joins the mainland. In a press release to Governor Egan, the Tulsa office of Pan American announced that the deposit contained almost 1 billion tons of recoverable iron. The Pan American release described the discovery as in the top seven or eight iron deposits in the world and second only to the Minnesota deposits in North America. The company had a 40-man crew, transported and supplied by helicopter, staking the deposit in June and July. Some 480 claims covering 9,600 acres were filed by Pan American. Other groups were reported to have filed on more than 100 claims. In discussing the significance of the discovery, a company official pointed out that the deposit was within easy pipeline distance of the company's large shut-in gas reserves in Cook Inlet and was close to ice-free deep water. The ore was described as disseminated titaniferous magnetite containing 15 percent iron. With the advantages cited, it was thought that the new deposit might be an attractive source of new iron ore within 10 to 15 years. Coring, trenching, and cutting of samples for metallurgical testing were planned for the 1965 field season.

Kennecott Copper Corp. purchased the Ruby Creek copper deposit near Shungnak for a reported $3 million. Approximately 4,000 acres were involved in the purchase, made public early in 1964. Kennecott transferred operations at Ruby Creek from Bear Creek Mining Co., an exploration subsidiary, to the New Mines Division. Ruby Creek had been under exploration by Bear Creek Mining since 1957. A new camp and post office, known as Bornite, was being established at this site north of the Arctic Circle property. Kennecott planned to sink a shaft on the deposit and to explore laterally; should underground development confirm the results of surface diamond drilling, a 500-ton-per-day plant was to be built. The deposit was rated, subject to continuing future exploration, as a small to medium tonnage operation. At yearend the company had moved sinking supplies and equipment to Onion Portage, 6 to 8 miles below the mouth of the Ambler River on the Kobuk. The overland haul to Ruby Creek was slated for shortly after the first of the year.

In other activity in copper, Moneta Porcupine Mines, Ltd., of Vancouver and Toronto had a prospecting crew on a new copper discovery in the Maclaren-Denali area announced by the State Division of Mines and Minerals early in the year. The discovery was made by a geologist of the State Division of Mines and Minerals while mapping in the summer of 1963. Moneta accomplished geological work, trenching, and a small amount of diamond drilling. Further work was planned for the 1965 field season. Sunshine Mining Co., Dome Mines, Inc., and Tennessee Corp., were associated with Moneta in the venture.

The Federal Bureau of Mines continued its efforts toward obtaining, compiling, and disseminating information to aid and encourage the conservation and development of the natural resources of the State. Bureau engineers made field examinations and prepared reports on mineral deposits in various parts of the State. In southeastern Alaska reconnaissance examinations were made on beryllium showings on Gravina Island, in Glacier Basin, and in Sitklan Passage. Beryllium occurrences associated with rare earths in pegmatites were investigated in the Bokan Mountain area on Prince of Wales Island. Nickel-copper showings in the Bohemia Basin area on Yakobi Island were examined and sampled. A reconnaissance examination was made of iron-copper showings in the North Bradfield River area. Additional work was done on the Jingle-Jangle copper-zinc deposit near Sumdum.

In southcentral Alaska, copper deposits in the Rua Cove area on Knight Island, Prince William Sound, were examined. A reconnaissance examination was made of the Bailey copper prospect in the Willow Creek district near Palmer. The Bureau's coal laboratory at Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, continued to serve the military by supervising the sampling and testing of coals delivered to Alaska bases under military contracts.

In the Kuskokwim River region, mercury examinations were made in the Sleetmute area and on Cinnabar Creek on the Upper Holitna River. Deposits in the Nixon Fork area, 10 miles north of Medfra, were examined. Examinations in Interior Alaska included work on nickel-copper at Rainbow Mountain, near McCallum, and investigations of mercury at Livengood, antimony in the Sawtooth mountains, and ultrabasics (for nickel) in the Livengood area.

On the Seward Peninsula most of the Bureau's effort was spent on beryllium showings at Lost River and Camp Creek. Reconnaissance drilling was done to determine the grade and character of a potentially large deposit of beryllium-bearing fluorite discovered by the Geological Survey in 1962; representative samples of the highly refractive material were obtained for metallurgical research. In northwestern Alaska examination and sampling of the Kukpowruk River coal beds near Cape Beaufort continued. The Bureau's Juneau laboratories made analyses, five assays and other tests in support of Bureau field work, for other Government agencies, and for individual prospectors.

Studies of economic factors affecting the mineral industry of Alaska were continued. Annual statistics on production were compiled and released in the form of Mineral Yearbook chapters and area reports.

RAPID GROWTH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey, as the primary produce supplier for the great metropolitan areas of New York City and Philadelphia, has been aptly named the "Garden State." But New Jersey is also one of the greatest industrial States of the Union, and the State is continuing to grow at a dizzy rate.

Under the inspiring and dynamic leadership of our Governor, Richard J. Hughes, New Jersey's business outlook is brighter than ever. In the fourth quarter of 1964, a record 2,145,000 persons were employed in the State. In 1 year, employment has increased by over 30,000. In the past 5 years the industrial output of the State has increased by nearly $3 billion, an increase that ranked New Jersey third in the Nation. The net result of this expansion is a better standard of living for the citizens of the State. In the past 3 years, personal income has increased by nearly $3 billion, and continues to spiral.

To achieve such a fantastic record, a State needs leadership of the highest quality. Governor Hughes has given the State such leadership while he has been in office. New Jersey must consider itself fortunate to have as its Governor a man who is willing to contribute his all for the betterment of the State and all who live in it. Indeed, the Nation, too, is fortunate that Richard Hughes sits in the statehouse of New Jersey, for the industrial vitality of the State is felt nationwide.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech given before the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce by Governor Hughes. The speech sets forth the facts and figures behind the rapid growth of one of the Nation's greatest producing States.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY GOV. RICHARD J. HUGHES TO THE NEW JERSEY STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 28TH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, FEBRUARY 4, 1965

The fact that this is the 28th congressional dinner of the State chamber of commerce is tangible evidence that New Jersey business has always recognized the interrelationship of government and business. This recognition transcends the historic controversy—and it is a continuing argument—over the degree of government involvement in business. But with the development of this Nation—a development that is epitomized in the growth and transformation of New Jersey during the past 15 years—there has come a general recognition that effective government is essential to business and that good business is translated into good government.

These truths were brought home to me most clearly in the planning of my latest budget. Primarily because of our prospering economy, we were able to enrich our existing programs and to undertake a number of new programs that will have real meaning for all the people of our State. In turn, the current good health of business in New Jersey and in the Nation was founded on carefully determined governmental actions at the Federal level—the tax cut, wise credit management, and careful and continuous reshuffling of budget priorities. The longrun result was maintenance of the confidence and vigor of the business community which, in turn, spelled prosperity.

New Jersey, by any barometer, has been in the forefront of the national economic advance. In the fourth quarter of 1964, we enjoyed our most favorable employment situation since the Korean war, with payroll jobs at a record level of 2,145,000. In December, employment was up 30,000 over 1963. And we have been keeping pace with our expanding population. From 1961 to 1964, employment in New Jersey increased 110,000. While the most spectacular gains came in the growth areas of our increasingly automated economy—trade and services—we more than held our own in the goods-producing sector. Despite automation and despite cutbacks in electronics, aircraft construction, and shipbuilding because of defense spending changes, our factory employment has held roughly constant at some 800,000 over the past few years.

But the output record of New Jersey industry has risen dramatically. Value added by manufacture in New Jersey rose from $7.5 billion in 1958 to $10.3 billion in 1963. Among the major States, this 38-percent gain was exceeded only by California and Michigan.

This criterion is the true measure of business success. New Jersey's increasing productivity is a tribute to the management of its companies and to the capabilities of its labor force.

The economic vitality of New Jersey is evident in a number of other areas. We are building the physical facilities required by our citizens as well as our industry. In 1961, 45,000 new housing units were undertaken. In 1964, the total was 60,000. In 1961, the value of industrial building plans approved was $105 million. In 1964, the figure was $146 million.

Our business community finds a ready market in the great base of New Jersey's consumer purchasing power. From 1961 to 1964, personal income in New Jersey rose nearly $3 billion to a total of almost $20 billion.

While we can share a deep satisfaction in the dynamics of a great State, I think both business and government recognize that there are sectors of our population almost untouched by the gains of the past few years. We recognize further that in these areas there exists a great human potential which, if it is tapped, can mean further gains for all. Throughout the State, business has been more than a willing participant; it has been a leader, in establishing training programs to bring needed skills to our working force; it has cooperated in efforts to keep youngsters in school so they can equip themselves with the necessary tools to take a productive role in society; and, of course, business has been in the forefront of the great national effort to assure equal opportunity to all Americans.

Thus, enlightened business, as has enlightened labor, has involved itself in the great social questions of 20th-century America. To a large degree, because of that involvement, we need not look to the past for the golden age of America. We are living the golden age. I think we are all determined that New Jersey not by wishing it, but by considered action, shall assure a future that is even brighter.

This action relates directly to business. Business cannot expand; in fact, it cannot exist, without abundant water supply. I feel a deep sense of pride in our accomplishments in this area. Only recently, by an imaginative revision in the original concept of our Spruce Run-Round Valley water supply system, were we able to develop the equivalent of a second Round Valley Reservoir at no additional cost. This, combined with a number of smaller projects, either under State, regional, or private auspices, plus the immense potential of the water supply program of the Delaware River Basin Commission, assures New Jersey of more than sufficient water to support its industrial and residential development well into the 21st century. The significance of this fact is not lost on prospective business citizens of New Jersey.

Business cannot grow without adequate sewerage facilities. This year we are undertaking the State's first program to stimulate intermunicipal and regional sewerage construction activity. Despite our limited revenues, we have set aside a $5 million fund to help communities in planning and engineering these vitally needed facilities. This $5 million should generate $60 to $70 million a year in construction of these essential utilities.

New Jersey is blessed with an abundant supply of power. And our private utility companies are doing the job at costs that are ever more economical. By technological pioneering, they are providing another building stone for the New Jersey of the future. But this foundation can have little meaning without a good system of transportation. As you may know, by employing well-founded practices of business, we are implementing the major recommendations of a comprehensive management study of our highway department. The department is being reorganized with a new emphasis on construction, a revision of maintenance activity and with a decentralization of operating decisions. Commissioner Dwight Palmer, experienced administrator of great enterprises that he is, has moved swiftly to take advantage of the findings of this study.

Meanwhile, we have forged ahead in a number of other transportation areas. The Atlantic City Expressway, not even authorized by legislation 3 years ago, today is a reality. The Hudson Tubes, 3 years ago threatened with extinction, today are being transformed into the model of a modern rapid transit system with the solid financial underpinning of the Port of New York Authority. In June, PATH, will have the only fleet of completely air-conditioned rail rapid transit cars in America. Work on the Aldene plan to tie in the Jersey Central Railroad with the trans-Hudson facilities of the Pennsylvania Railroad is underway. In south Jersey, daily progress is being recorded in the development of the Kirkwood high-speed line. We will undertake with the Pennsylvania Railroad a program of State purchase of commuter cars. Hopefully, this will be the forerunner of a broad expansion for the benefit of our thousands of commuters on other lines.

In State government, we have another dramatic illustration of how government and business can work together for the benefit of all the people.

This is provided by the work of our international commerce section. As the world shrinks, business opportunities for Americans expand. And this, of course, means more jobs for New Jersey working people. Many of you have been receiving our regular bulletins on international trade leads by which our department of conservation and economic development seeks to match New Jersey's diverse manufacturing capabilities with the increasing volume of orders for American products from foreign nations. We are enjoying the full cooperation of the Federal Government and various international agencies in this effort and the volume of response from New Jersey businessmen is most encouraging to the State government. Soon, we will be publishing a directory of New Jersey manufacturers which will greatly facilitate our international trade efforts. In this area, in particular, government can be of direct service to business and thus can your tax dollars take on new meaning.

It is in the field of education that government can best make real the opportunity and promise of our future. Since 1958, enrollment in our publicly supported institutions of higher learning has risen by 250 percent. While growth in the next few years must be even more spectacular if we are to meet the just demands of our youth, I am confident that the people of New Jersey will do their duty. We are developing a great State university which, combined with the public colleges and outstanding private institutions, provides an academic and scientific environment that is enhancing New Jersey's already great attraction for research industry and for the allied fields of chemical and electronics manufacturing—all industries of the future. A year ago, New Jersey—the "medicine chest of the Nation"—was in the incongruous position of supporting no medical schools. Today, the State is operating or developing two medical schools and one dental college. Hopefully, the next few years will see the establishment of a third medical school to serve south Jersey.

We are at the threshold of great new developments in the creation of community colleges to serve the growing number of students who cannot afford to go away to college or who desire the post-high school training necessary for the increasingly specialized demands of our industry. This year, the State has set aside funds for its share of the construction of five such colleges. Under this same program, we are advancing plans for an aerospace institute at Pomona to take advantage of the nearby National Air Facilities Experimental Center. This development could be the forerunner of a great new industry in southern New Jersey.

Education is not only a factor in economic growth, but it represents the ennobling of the spirit; and thus it is bound up with the full development of man's cultural heritage. In Trenton we are completing an impressive new cultural center in the statehouse complex of buildings. I hope you all will avail yourselves of the opportunity next spring to visit our magnificent State library, museum, planetarium, and auditorium. These structures reflect the elevated spirit of a vibrant State.

And soon, in a picturesque setting of the Garden State Parkway in Monmouth County, N.J., will create a major center for creation and appreciation of the arts. Through an inspired interpretation of its public mandate, the New Jersey Highway Authority will build and operate this facility at no cost to the taxpayer. I think we will all feel a new sense of pride in New Jersey when the Garden State Arts Center takes its place alongside Tanglewood, Robin Hood Dell, the Hollywood Bowl, and other centers of American creativity.

This new facility is in keeping with the New Jersey tradition of Green Acres, a concept from which so many other States now are borrowing. In the past 3 years, we have made unparalleled acquisitions of open space to serve us as well as our children and grandchildren. But these acquisitions have been only a forerunner of broader developments of the next few years as our Green Acres program moves into high gear with what we hope will be increased participation by local communities and further supplements from Federal conservation agencies.

I have mentioned some of the achievements of the past few years and, more importantly, some of my hopes for our future. If this future is to involve broad accomplishment, however, there remain obstacles to be surmounted and solutions to be found.

While New Jersey has managed real progress with State government resources more limited than those of any other State, its future achievements must depend in large part on a solution to our revenue problems. For the sake of the local homeowner as well as the businessman, we cannot continue our heavy reliance on the local property tax. This reliance results in manifest inequities in which the very existence of certain types of business is threatened by property taxation.

We are living today with a temporary solution to a continuing property assessment question. That solution, of course, is chapter 51. Its operation is being studied closely by a Governor's advisory committee in which business is well represented. I am hopeful that the work of this committee, combined with new financial assistance by the State for local government, can bring equitable solutions that will do away with present uncertainties concerning business taxation and open the way to new business growth in New Jersey. I am convinced that the uncertain tax picture remains the only major obstacle to an era of unparalleled business development in New Jersey.

Not only in this area has New Jersey business stood shoulder to shoulder with government to seek solutions to mutual problems. With the cooperation of business, New Jersey has become a leader in the rehabilitation and employment of the handicapped. Our financial institutions are cooperating in increasing numbers in the State loan program for college students, thus making available new thousands of educational opportunities for deserving young people of our State. Businessmen have been mainstays of a varied group of State committees and boards ranging from the medical college board of trustees to groups studying pollution or safety, and thus have helped government better serve all the people. Only recently, your executive vice president, Al Acken, suggested that our consumer frauds bureau open regional offices to better protect our citizens against the unscrupulous fringe element that would prey on them. I have asked the attorney general to give his proposal serious study with a view toward early implementation.

I look forward to a continuing cooperation among business, government, labor, the professions and all the other structural elements of a progressive State. Together we have no problems that we cannot solve. And solve them we will, with equity and with a determination to leave to our children a State even better than the New Jersey we inherited.

RENEWING OUR CITIES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have just received a copy of what I consider a very worthwhile speech on urban renewal, delivered in my home city of Evansville by my friend Richard E. Meier. Dick Meier is, among other things, president of Evansville's Future, Inc. As such, he has been closely involved in the development of urban renewal in the city of Evansville.

If it were merely a speech about Evansville's urban renewal program, it would scarcely deserve the national attention which I believe it should receive. But Dick Meier has done a service in looking behind the projects to the philosophy of intergovernmental relations on which they rest. He notes the misconceptions of many in this area of vital importance for the continued growth and well-being of a nation becoming more and more urban. He points out that this is not a federally imposed program and that the States must legislate and the local communities must plan if the Federal funds are to be available. He notes what many have failed to note in the opposition to federally assisted urban renewal—namely, that the entire program is based soundly on local concern and local control.

Furthermore, his speech effectively refutes the fallacy that the job can be done in its great magnitude entirely by local and private resources. Even in the most successful examples of these, as he shows, the progress is slow and is achievable only in certain select cities, with their own unusually favorable circumstances.

Evansville, where I was mayor before coming to the Senate, is not an exception, but rather is a typical medium-sized American city. It is for that very reason that the local materials included in the speech are worthy of a national audience, rather than a merely parochial one.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Mr. Meier on January 21 be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URBAN RENEWAL—SOCIAL PLANNING OR DEMOCRATIC PROCESS?

(Speech by Richard E. Meier, chairman of the board of directors, Interstate Finance Corp. and president, Evansville's Future, Inc., at a meeting of the Downtown Kiwanis Club, Evansville, Ind.)

It was not until Martin Leich called to ask me if I would prepare a radio program to "tell the other side of the story"—that side which favors urban renewal—that I realized I had been tagged—by Martin, anyway—as a promoter and protagonist of the Federal and State urban renewal laws for our community. This labeling of me which Martin has indulged in is not a presumption on his part; he had good reason to believe I am in favor of urban renewal: As president of Evansville's Future, Inc., I have appeared before several Government hearing bodies and my testimony has been reported by the news media in support of the Welborn Baptist Hospital renewal as well as of the downtown Riverside renewal projects.

By and large, people are used to the idea that a lawyer can argue the case of his client without involving his own personal beliefs and convictions on the merits of his case; however, when a layman stands up to testify in favor of a cause or a specific proposal, we all assume he is expressing his own conclusions and his personal judgments. Thus, although my testimony was intended to declare the official position of Evansville's Future with respect to these two projects, my fellow citizens, without exception, have presumed that these official declarations are consistent with what I believe and recommend; and they are right—I do so believe and recommend.

In the necessarily brief time I have here to discuss this community problem it is not possible, of course, to enter into a comprehensive explanation of the conditions and public needs which brought about the urban renewal laws. Of one thing we should assure ourselves, however, whichever side of the matter we are on: Urban renewal laws did not come about by some "crackpot" or a few of them "pulling the wool over the eyes" of those Democrat and Republican legislators elected by us and who enacted these laws. So very few of us know any lawmakers except those we vote for and all too many of us do not know these well enough, if at all. Nevertheless, somebody, large constituents of citizens just like us, know every State or Federal legislator there is; and, without exception, all of them are very much like those you and I do know. So, we have every reason to assume that these lawmakers had concluded that there is a situation, a need, of sufficient proportion and importance to the general welfare of all citizens, to justify legislative action setting up authoritative bodies of citizens and granting them certain powers to initiate remedies and improvements.

A moment ago I said that the vast majority of us don't know hardly any lawmakers. And, for the most of us, people we don't know, we fear; we also imagine a lot of things about them, mostly bad. The same holds true for new ideas, new proposals, new plans, new ways of doing things—especially those that require each of us to make a personal decision, to take a position or to take some action. If its new and untried, we are afraid of it and suspect the motives of the individual or the group proposing this new thing.

Now, the newest thing about urban renewal is the name itself given to this series of laws. Around here in the tristate, "urban" is still a foreign word, even though the "traction line," which a few people insisted on calling the "sub-urban" railroad, has come and gone. If we use the word for "urban" that we understand, we find that we are talking about nothing new—"urban" is a fancy word for "city" or "town" as distinguished, not from the strange word "rural," but the opposite of city as we understand it hereabouts and which we call "the country."

To some lesser degree, we find the word "renewal" in the same fix of being strange to our minds and tongues. What is meant by "renewal" is to tear a portion or all of the houses and buildings down in an area of town and do them over or replace them. So, "urban renewal" is the idea of improving or replacing structures and facilities within a small defined area which has become rundown, neglected, and even abandoned.

Now, if it were possible for us to do as the American Indian was doing at the time the white man first "discovered" him on this continent—when his own tepee or that of his tribesmen became so filthy, rotten, and leaky as to be an untolerable nuisance to comfortable living, he moved on to a clean spot—we could easily solve our problem.

But now, in our world today, populated in number that project to doubling every 25 years, with homes and required business and factory establishments far beyond the Indian tepee in complexity, cost, and immobility, the rights and privileges of every citizen, including those who own or control land and building, and where his neighbor's "nose begins"—and the problems are entirely different. These rights can no longer be "absolute"—if they ever were—nor should the right to own and to use property be exercised without consideration to the rights of societies of people organized as they are for living in our cities and towns and communities.

The basic concept of a civilized society rests upon the organization of the lives and activities of the people in them, sufficient in scope and extent so as to make living together not only tolerable, but attractive, conducive to the attainment of personal goals and expressions while preserving the maximum of personal privacy and preference. If we are going to live together—and this is the only way life can be lived today—we must accept some discipline and some limits not only in our personal conduct and in our personal relations to every other person, but also in the uses to which we put that which we have paid for and own, whether this be a dog, a flock of chickens, an automobile, a factory and the smoke it makes, or a store and the street in front of it or the very houses in which we live. Moreover, these disciplines and limitations, imposed and accepted from time to time, cannot be frozen once for all time; they must be subject to the general welfare of all; that is, subject to change with changing needs and conditions.

So, I would like to introduce my first point: Urban renewal is as old as the so-called discovery and settlement of this North American Continent upon which the Republic of the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Canada were established.

While we conceive of this continent as being discovered by white explorers, we are prone to think of discovered as synonymous with created. The truth is, it was here all the time; it wasn't really discovered at all; what's more, it was, in fact, not only here but occupied—by the tribes of the North American Indians. The land and real estate we say we own, belonged to the Indians—they owned it. Upon its discovery the explorers from the European Continent and the settlers who followed in their wake proceeded upon a program of renewal. A unique few of them took the time and exercised the moral ethic of negotiating with the Indian aborigines for their land. But for the great mass of emigrants, the land was what we politely call appropriated from the Indians. In this instance appropriate meant dispossess; taken by force of arms, murder, or chicancery. Today no thought at all is given to the fact that, except for a few thousand acres, no man who claims to own land in North America has an absolute title to it.

Now, I will be among the foremost in the position that the general welfare of the peoples of all the world were served in the discovery, settlement and development of the Western Hemisphere. It was right, proper and imperative that the American Indian share his lands with the hordes of Europeans and ancient continentals who were seeking a better way of life, "lebensraum," greater opportunities for personal development and expression and greater freedom of thought, action and dialog. It is an irradicable blot upon our heritage, however, that our forebears did not exercise the wisdom and restraint, nor measure up to the ethical principles of the Judeo-Christian religions which they transplanted here and with which they sought to ameliorate their cruel and inhuman treatment of the American Indian. Instead of fair bargaining and exchange of goods and values, we robbed the Indian proprietors of their lands and then tried to make Christians out of them.

The point which I wish to make here is that if we believe it has been to the general welfare of the peoples of the world that the Indian proprietors of the North, Central and South Americas, were forced to accommodate the growing populace of the world with their longing and striving for a better place in which to live, we must concede that this essential principle for growth and development is just as relevant, just as essential today in established societies, concentrated for such growth and development in our cities, our business and manufacturing centers and our residential areas each with their changing needs, the inevitable deterioration, wear and obsolescence to which they are subject and which result in worn out and neglected facilities.

Fortunately for the present day possessors and proprietors of our lands, our organized societies through their agencies of Government treat them more humanely and with a greater degree of justice and equity then did their predecessors who wrested these lands from the aboriginal owners and proprietors whom they found here. For the lands that are affected by an urban renewal project must be evaluated by qualified appraisers and many conditions and considerations are imposed by these laws to keep the inconvenience and the costs incurred by the affected landowner to a minimum.

Now, let's next mull over an extract from the September 1960, Population Bulletin of the Population Reference Bureau, Inc.:

"In 1960 there were 61 cities in the world with a population of 1 million people or more.

"As late as 1900 there were only 10 such cities.

"Today 2 people out of every 10 live in cities of 20,000 or more.

"If the present trend continues—and there is no reason to suppose otherwise—almost half of the world's population will live in cities of 20,000 or more by the year 2000.

"By the year 2050, the figure will be 9 people out of 10.

"Will the shabby, decaying, smog-ridden cities of the industrial West be cleansed of the blight which has been accumulating since the industrial revolution began?

"As man increasingly becomes a city-born and city-bred creature, the problems of city living and city organization will intensify in complexity and embrace the planet. Drift and improvization cannot solve them."

There come times in history and in the creative development of our civilization, cultures, national and regional governments and in our communities when the welfare of all must take precedence over the private uses and control of the resources of the world, including the control and use of the lands. For centuries, now, we have recognized this necessity in our land title restrictions, zoning ordinances, public nuisance laws, etc.

I wonder how few of you have thought much about the rapidity with which the rural areas are being depopulated or where these people have gone. Where can they go? Obviously, only one place—to the cities. Couple this movement with the "population explosion" throughout the world; think of the exodus of hundreds of thousands of our colored citizens from the South into our northern urban centers; their increase in raw numbers to the extent that there remain in the South almost as many as were there before the exodus reached major proportions; the influx from Puerto Rico; the overnight disruption and dislocation that developed in the Miami, Fla., area during the Castro takeover in Cuba—and you have some serious thinking to do if you have any concern for the future of our Nation, its institutions of freedom, and our regard for the individual dignity of man.

I suspect that even less numerous are those who have much understanding of the significance of these population developments in terms of what they will do to the American way of life—a life which we so blandly take for granted, while indulging ourselves in the presumption that we will be able to pass it on to our posterity, unimpaired and unrestricted.

There is a great hue and cry these days that we are "losing our freedoms," that we are "going down the road to socialism"; but how many of these voices believe in what they are decrying—believe, that is, deeply enough to find out what the problems of the world are. Conditions have and are changing; yet, half-knowingly, we deceive ourselves into imagining they can be made fixed and unchanging. The world is going on down the road; for the most of us, we are no longer in the vanguard of world movement; events have leaped over us and, unless we quicken our pace sufficiently to catch up, we will not even have opportunity to wrestle with the problems these ever new situations create.

Indifference and ignorance in these matters are so extreme that experts who are directing their careers to solving some of the grave problems arising out of these galloping changes are in a state of mental desperation. Their efforts and warnings to arouse our urban centers out of their lethargy and lack of concern for a fate, that can be seen on every hand are going unheeded. One of these authorities writing in the July-August issue of the Harvard Business Review, raises the question, "Are We Committing Urban Suicide?"

The author, Dr. Leland Hazard, who is professor of industrial administration and law at Carnegie Institute of Technology and a director-consultant of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., has this to say: "If a person falls into rapid physical decay and does nothing about it, we wonder about his will to survive—the death wish, as Freud called it. But what about our cities? Does the death wish account for our passivity as slums rot and poverty poisons and renewal remedies are in too weak doses?"

What about Evansville—do we wish to die as a city? Sometimes I wonder; especially when I think about those owners and proprietors of real estate who act as though they believe that no matter what happens to the rest of Evansville—all of it could pass away—but not their property values; they are "bound to go up" they say. I almost said, "they think" but that would not be accurate—they're not thinking; they are but hoping that all of the rest of Evansville will do what they are unwilling to do, in the false hope that they might be right after all; that their values will go up so that they will reap an unearned reward.

In raising the question, "Are we committing urban suicide?" Professor Hazard says this is not such a farfetched supposition for, while we have dealt so ineffectively with the obvious obsolescence of our cities, two things are happening. In most of our cities slums are gaining ground over renewal and our cities are gaining population at accelerating rates beyond all previous experience. Pointing out that slum clearance is merely one phase of urban renewal—that even in Boston where some small progress has been made, the city officials have discovered that what was initially regarded as a "skirmish" to remove slums "has turned out to be a war for urban survival."

Evansville is not unique among cities of the Central Plains; it is 150 years old; many of its facilities are worn out, decrepit, obsolete and out of place; its inner core, the heart, is rotting and decaying and long since, wholesale abandonment by midcenter residenters has set in.

Dr. Hazard says: "If we face facts, we will see that despite all that has been written and done about urbanism, we suffer a rate of urban decay in excess of urban renewal—and this at the exact time in history when demands on our cities are at an alltime high and mounting to ever increasing heights."

He then goes on to say that if we are responding to a morbid instinct to commit urban suicide, it is "blinding us to the obvious necessity of making our cities fit for the surging humanity which looks to them for life and hope, it is an unconscious instinct (but) which, nevertheless, is fortified by well verbalized rationalization—couched in what someone has called 'good' reasons, but not 'real' reasons." The professor then goes on to examine the validity of four of these so-called "good" reasons, to determine to what extent they are "real."

The very first "good" reason discussed is the cost: We can't afford it. Dr. Hazard proceeds to then estimate how much it would cost and then agrees "the cost would be stupendous." But he counters with this challenge: "When the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor down did we ask what the cost of fighting back would be? When the late General MacArthur declared, 'I shall return,' did we ask 'what will the return trip cost?' No. Because we were protecting our freedom, our society, our form of government, our living space, against we knew not fully what interests. The Japanese gave our society a chance to die. We rejected the offer."

"Now," he continues, "urban rot, delinquency, crime, gangsterism, filth, disease, and degredation (and, we can now add mobs, rioting, racial violence, murder, and bombing) give our society a chance to die. We entertain the prospect." How, he asks, do we explain the incongruous inconsistency? It would seem that we are not adverse to committing national suicide—it's the method by which we are to die. War, no. Urban rot and rioting, yes. "And so we drag out the familiar platitudes such as 'It costs too much'; 'It is undemocratic'; 'It is contrary to human nature'." To these I can add, "We should do it ourselves." "If we accept Federal assistance we are promoting socialism." So, citing these as "good" reasons for doing nothing we are inviting the death we unconsciously seem to want.

But we must hurry on to enumerate the other three reasons cited by Dr. Hazard why we can't or shouldn't do anything about urban renewal. So, I quote him again, as follows:

"The second rationalization for preservation of the status quo—which means stagnation or worse for our cities—is the assumption that whites and nonwhites cannot live together as neighbors and friends whatever the community." "Until this assumption is gone," he states, "We shall not solve our city blight." In other words, what we are really saying is "I'd rather die first" and dying is what we are doing.

"We must face the fact," elaborates Dr. Hazard, "that the flight from the city, with all of its spice of variety and abundance of choices, to the banalities of suburbia has been from fear of desegregated city blocks and city schools. And that flight has delivered the older city into the hands of its victims." "What an irony," he declares, "that the white man should leave his culture in the hands of the men of color, in the hands of those he thinks unfit to be his neighbors." He flatly declares:

"I stand on my general proposition that if the older central city is to survive as a depository of our culture, we must admit nonwhites (who now make up so much more than half the world's population)—naturally, decently and according to economic and cultural abilities. They must be able to live anywhere, to go to school anywhere, and to work, worship and play anywhere. And we must do this, not because they are Negroes, but because they are human beings."

The third rationalization attacked by Dr. Hazard is our ingrained fear of ineffectual government; he calls it "our folk fear of potent government." "We cling," he declares, "to the county—township and local government as if our lives depend on the preservation of those ancient forms, inherited from feudal times." "Since when," he asks, "was a statesman, a poet, a musician, writer, sportsman, actor, or any grand figures—identified by his county, borough, or township? By his city? Yes. The spirit of America is in her cities. Moreover, to deal with urban obsolescence we will be obliged to plan, not by small sections within the city or even confined to the urban area itself, but large regions must be involved." He then states unequivocally that the Federal Government will be obliged to make regional planning a condition for Federal aid; so that the restrictions on traffic, without which no renewal is possible, can be enforced. "If this be treason," he concludes, "let those who have vested interests in the shame of our cities make the most of it."

For his last "good reason" why we can't renew our cities to provide decent and attractive living conditions for our people, Dr. Hazard holds up our national preoccupation with outer space: We must fly to the moon first—and that is very expensive. Here is what he says:

"Does anyone ask the cost of putting men on the moon and bringing them back by 1970? Some few have but largely they are ignored. Suppose instead we had decided to spend some of the billions now invested in space projects on research and development of ways and means to make our cities worthy of human beings. It is one thing to be prepared with the deterrent to nuclear warfare. No one objects to that. It is another thing to be first and first with everything in outer space whatever the cost."

"And as for our standing in the world," he concludes, "let us remember that blighted urbanism is a real global problem. The rush to the cities is worldwide. How could we gain an admiring and applauding world more effectively than by developing the techniques, the facilities, and the ideals by which masses of men all over the world can live and work and play with dignity and grace in their cities? The whole world would come to see us. None would fear or hate us for that. To be the nation which taught mankind the science and the art of city living—that would be greatest."

Do you agree with Dr. Hazard? Before you reach your conclusion, let me ask: "To use Federal tax money to fly to the moon—that's preserving 'the democratic, American way of life' "; while to authorize and accept Federal assistance and restrictions to make our cities fit to live in—that's socialism. Do you believe that? Let's all think about it, especially those who own blighted downtown and residential property here in Evansville.

The next thing I would like to do is to clear up and then to decently bury a misconception. This misconception has been widely scattered about and implanted in the minds of our citizens by the urban renewal detractors—those articulate opponents of this lawful device for saving our concentrations of city life in this country—and all over the world, for that matter.

This misconception is, in reality, a myth of unreality—and in some cases by insidious design—a hoax, consciously perpetrated by those who know better. This misconception, this hoax is the assertion that urban renewal programs are "Federal," that is that they are National Government programs. It is true that the basic underlying statutes from which urban renewal programs emanate, and which provide the Federal funds for assistance in initiating and pursuing the programs, are Federal laws. These laws also contain provisions granting certain powers to locally constituted authorities, restricting the uses to which these Federal funds may be put and setting out rules of procedure and safeguards to assure proper use and to protect the rights of affected citizens.

However, if nothing more than this had happened—that is, the adoption of the law—nothing would have happened. The next step that must be taken is enabling legislation by each of the States of the Union. Each State must pass a law permitting the use of the Federal law by locally franchised urban units of Government within that State, its cities and towns. However, when that is done, urban renewal is still not assured—nothing can happen as yet. There can be no urban renewal without local initiation.

Every urban renewal project in existence today has been locally initiated by duly appointed and elected local officials who, at the local level, decide to apply for and accept Federal assistance in order to defray a portion of the cost of the project. Moreover, these local projects are seldom undertaken without the continuing support and assistance of local citizen groups and organizations. Finally, as we have experienced here in Evansville, recourse to the courts remains available to any dissenters to determine if the Federal and State urban renewal laws are constitutional within the State; whether the plan is soundly conceived, not capricious; and for the purpose of determining values of the land in cases where the offering price for such land is unacceptable to the owners.

Please bear this in mind: Under no circumstances is an urban renewal project operated by Federal officials who suddenly and overnight and somehow mysteriously, appear on the local scene, institute a renewal program and, running amuck in the community, without responsibility or control of local elected officials, impose that program upon the community. In Evansville, as everywhere else in the Nation, our development commission is made up of local, responsible citizens, appointed by our own elective officials. The full-time director is an employee of the local commission; he is not a Federal man in any sense of the word; the Federal Government pays him nothing and has no jurisdiction over him. Now, with that charge laid to rest, let's get to something further.

There are a few cities in the Nation who have been able to undertake urban renewal programs on their own—without Federal subsidy. There is, of course, nothing wrong with this; indeed, it is to be preferred to Federal assistance—and the citizens of these communities are to be admired and congratulated. These examples of 100 percent local self-help, however, have been held up as uncontrovertible evidence that every community possesses sufficient resources to clean up its slums and its deteriorated central districts unassisted and to the extent sufficient to totally correct the deplorable conditions. The truth is that not even the federally assisted urban renewal concept comprehends such an undertaking, for the total job would far exceed the capacities of Federal and local governments combined—and private development will have to furnish the major share of the investment.

In a lead article appearing in the September 1964, issue of Nation's Business, the trade journal of the national chamber of commerce, two "success stories" are related to "prove urban problems can be solved on local level without Federal subsidies." Let's examine some of the facts of these two examples.

Both of them are in the economically vigorous, growing Southwest; and they are, in fact, in Texas. The cities cited are Dallas and Houston. The article frankly tells about the "towering headquarters of the petroleum industry in Houston—nearly a third of the Nation's refining capacity in the area." Turning to Dallas, mention is made of its "lofty banking and insurance buildings, first in the South in bank deposits (and) in the past decade adding more office space than any other U.S. city except New York." Then the article goes on to say that "growth and progress of these two expanding urban centers is not in the granite and gloss of their multimillion-dollar buildings"; even though "indicating major sources of economic activity in each community, these glistening new structures give impressive evidence of the growth of the Southwest."

Now if Evansville were fortunate enough to be the locale of a "towering headquarters of a national industry," like Houston, supplying "nearly a third of the Nation's capacity"; or were there housed in Evansville "lofty banking and insurance buildings," as in Dallas, "adding more office space" in the last 10 years "than any city in the United States except New York," Evansville, without doubt, would be more self-sufficient than it now is.

However, let us examine the "urban renewal" projects of these two "model" cities, as described in the article.

Houston has been able to rebuild half its downtown section since World War II. That's 20 years. Evansville has been at it for 6 years—give us another 14. Houston has seen about $150 million in construction just in major buildings downtown in the past decade with the prospect of about $400 million more being spent in the next several years. For Houston, a young metropolis of 1 million people, to have downtown building of $150 million in 10 years is not so startling. Some of Houston's building consists of local civic projects, like Evansville's own civic center. The downtown Houston project named in the article is Cullen Center. The local land for this was put together by an oil millionaire with his private funds. Cullen Center is to be a $125 million complex of office buildings, hotels, garages, apartment towers, and plazas. (It ain't yet.) As of now it consists of one $15 million office building, an adjoining garage, and the $6 million Hotel America. The whole project covers 12 acres.

Dallas' showpiece is known as "Main Place." Main Place is a proposed $120 million 10-acre project. It is to be an array of commercial recreational and cultural facilities. The first part of the project will be a 34-story office building with garage. (This first part ain't yet, either.) There is to follow the second and third phases of Main Place. Its developers hope that Main Place will serve as a catalyst for upgrading the whole neighborhood. Well, behind this dream of Main Place is 9 years of work inspired by the chairman/president of Texas Bank & Trust Co., who joined the Clint Murchison, Sr., interests in acquiring property, beginning in 1955.

There is also going in Houston a 32-acre slum clearance project; this plot is owned by two business executives who have the means to develop it. About 70 percent of the land has been acquired so far. Then in Dallas a 1,300-acre industrial district is being developed by the owners.

It is clear to me from reading the article that there are tremendous concentrations of private wealth in both of these cities, generated by economic growth of mammoth proportions and controlled by individuals and leaders who possess both the will and the means to undertake and carry through these projects. I have recited all of this not to demean what the citizens of these two cities have accomplished but to point up the great contrast between the conditions existing in these two great cities and a city like Evansville.

In Evansville, with one or two exceptions, our larger industries are not locally owned and headquartered here. The leadership and abilities of the top officials of these businesses are denied to us here. It is true, there are centers of landed wealth in Evansville, of much smaller dimensions than Houston and Dallas, controlled by local citizens who could undertake some private development. But this remains their decision and, to date, most of them are not to be found in the forefront of organized efforts for community improvement. On the other hand, as of now, there has been a marshaling of what financial means we have in our city which has accomplished a great deal by the private and, I have to say, the civic-motivated efforts of these realty holders. Our civic center is being put together by private capital and by uncompensated expenditures of time and talent. Our industrial foundation, likewise has in like manner brought new industry, helped existing industry to grow and to occupy new factory sites—all by private means.

Yet, with all of this done and accomplished, we have but to look about us in every corner of our city to realize—it is only a beginning; that we are not gaining on the deterioration; that, in fact, without more massive undertakings, we will lose the battle. Moreover, you have but to raise your eyes and view the plight of cities and towns throughout "this broad land of ours" to conclude that, not Houston and Dallas, but Evansville comes nearer being the norm of urban conditions in these United States. Evansville cannot emulate Dallas and Houston; neither can 95 out of every 100 city complexes on our continent.

In making its case, Nation's Business in its article quotes "the affable president of Lone Star Gas Co., Lester Potter" of Dallas, who declares, "as great as our Federal Government is, the problems of our cities are too complex and individually distinct to be directed from Washington." To this no responsible citizen would disagree. In fact, that is one of the principal premises of the urban renewal laws and regulations as I stated here earlier. Total rejection of these laws to avoid the contingency of direction from Washington, contributes nothing toward simplifying or solving the complex problems of our cities. While accepting Federal subsidies—if that is what is what we should call these Federal moneys—to initiate and complete projects of improvement and renewal undertaken at our own direction, planned and controlled by our own fellow citizens, gives every promise not only toward reduction of our problems of blight and deterioration, but also restoration to a state of economic health and prosperity, from which there will flow back to all levels of government increased tax revenues equal to, if not exceeding, the grants and loans extended to us in our times of need for assistance.

From time to time we, down in our corner of the State, have heard of the plans and progress of an all-local effort in urban renewal by our capital city of Indianapolis. Much has been made of the fact that the administration in that city has rejected Federal aid in dealing with the slum and blight problems of much of the central business and residential areas.

Nevertheless, just within the past few months, Indianapolis has found it expedient—no doubt, necessary—to reactivate its housing authority, for which it is presently seeking to employ an executive director. The city administration now plans to build federally assisted low-rent housing in order to be able to satisfactorily rehouse some of the 3,000 Negro families that are to be displaced by reason of the construction of an intercity expressway system. In addition, the president of the Indianapolis Redevelopment Commission and a city councilman of Indianapolis have announced intentions to seek amendments to present State legislation in the 1965 session to facilitate acceptance by the city of Federal financial assistance for their local urban renewal projects and programs. So our good fellow citizens at Indianapolis have awakened to the immensity of the problems facing all urban centers for more and better housing and renewal of central business areas. I am wondering if they have even entertained a passing thought of the residential requirements to house the tremendous increases of population that will be knocking at their doors only 10 years from now.

My last point is directed, principally, to the members of the redevelopment commissions and the city and county governmental bodies which are involved in urban renewal programs. While it is true that urban renewal is for people, just for that reason, people should not be run over roughshod in order to get done "what is good for them."

In a recent address Msgr. John Ryan, director of Urban Affairs for the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, stressed three essential principles to an effective urban renewal plan:

1. It must be originally a part of the democratic process.

2. To be meaningful it must be part of a comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area.

3. It must have a healthy and sincere respect for the human dignity of men.

To these three I would add a fourth principle: It is essential that all affected individuals, groups and agencies must be kept fully informed as the plan is developed and executed. These interested parties must be given time to, as we say, "figure out things"; to understand what is proposed and the succeeding steps that the plan involves in terms of time. The renewal commission cannot operate in an ivory tower and it must not display impatience and irritation to the point of antagonizing individuals and groups whose cooperation will be required. As Monsignor Ryan put it, "there must be an ongoing dialog between citizens' groups and planners." He urged "the personnel of urban renewal agencies (to) become keenly aware of and actively seek, the counsel of the citizenry" if they would avoid failure. These agencies, he says, must become the "voice of the community reflecting the opinions of a good proportion of the community." In short, the urban renewal commission members and employed personnel have the responsibility to work through community organizations in formulating goals and expressing needs. There will be conflicts of interest, as Monsignor Ryan points out; nevertheless, "the final discussions must not take place in 'rooms banned to the public' if the democratic process is to be served."

I think we will all agree with Monsignor Ryan that "spot" renewal will not get the job done—his second point. In Evansville we are quite familiar with the deplorable effects of "spot zoning." I believe that the three renewal plans underway in our city have been well conceived, are comprehensive in scope and substantially conform to the master plan of our metropolitan plan commission. For these reasons, they deserve our support; nevertheless, I believe the difficulties we have had in getting all three of them accepted stems from a deficient plan for fully informing and explaining the plans to the community, its organized groups, and those directly affected.

Let me emphasize one more time that, looking at what is immediately ahead, "cities are going to have more people than anybody." Cities already have many who are not properly housed and for whom the facilities around which urban centers cluster are inadequate and disappearing. These masses of people are not "going away"; on the contrary, their numbers will increase and their demands and expectations will mount. Property rights constitute one of the basic cornerstones of freedom. We had better remember, however, that the cornerstones of freedom were put in place by people. People have the ultimate power to kick over those stones or to discard them for others, even though by such acts their own enslavement ensues. "No man lives on an island"—certainly not in town, nor even in Evansville, Ind.

"EQUAL TIME"—ADDRESS BY CHAIRMAN OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, over a long period of time, there has been a great deal of discussion concerning the controversial section 315 of the Communications Act. I introduced and fought for the bill which was enacted, temporarily easing the restrictions, so that the famous Kennedy-Nixon debates were possible.

But that was only a limited and temporary alleviation of a situation which has continued to cause problems. Last week, I introduced a bill which would completely repeal section 315; and I hope the bill will secure sufficient support to achieve its passage.

Chairman E. William Henry, of the Federal Communications Commission, has given this situation a good deal of thought. On January 15, in a speech before the Commonwealth Club of California, he spoke at some length on the question. Although he does not favor the straight repeal which my bill would achieve, he had some most cogent comments to make.

Because of its importance for the information of Members in their consideration of section 315, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Chairman Henry be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY E. WILLIAM HENRY, CHAIRMAN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, BEFORE THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JANUARY 15, 1965[1]

Back in the days of Franklin Roosevelt, a fashionable girl's boarding school close to Washington was privileged to have a headmistress with a nationwide reputation for being competent, fair—and very strict. An acquaintance of mine then attending this school was the daughter of old friends of President and Mrs. Roosevelt. One afternoon she received an invitation to spend Saturday at the White House as the guest of its occupants. Excitedly, and eagerly she accepted.

About 3 p.m. that Saturday aftrnoon it began to snow heavily and at 5 o'clock showed no signs of letting up. At that point the headmistress received a call from a White House secretary requesting permission, on behalf of the President, for the young lady to remain overnight due to the weather conditions. The headmistress replied in her most polite, even-tempered tones that this was impossible since the rules required all students to be back on the premises by 9 p.m. sharp. The White House secretary absorbed that gentle rebuff in silence and asked the headmistress to hold on.

In a moment a familiar voice was heard on the telephone—none other than F.D.R. himself. In his jocular, most persuasive manner he explained that he had not had a chance to visit with the young student all day, that he very much wanted to do so, and that he would provide her with transportation back to school early the next morning. "Could she possibly spend the night with me at the White House," the President asked. The headmistress replied, "Mr. President, you have your rules for running the Government, and I have mine for running this school. I am sorry to disappoint you, but we can't make an exception—even in your case."

I often think of this story as I sit in my office contemplating FCC rules. My office is encased in one of those gray, monolithic structures which appear to have been built by the WPA, and poured from a mold used by the Greeks in the declining years of their glory. Our particular structure is shaped like a baroque hourglass, and after 2½ years of riding the same elevator, I still have to think twice before remembering which way to turn to go to my office. To many people our agency represents merely another faceless amorphous collection of Government employees who speak only federalese, and whose cerebral processes are confined to the strict interpretation of narrowly conceived rules to which they, like our headmistress, admit no exception.

However, appearances are deceiving, and inside the view is very different. We are located on Pennsylvania Avenue—midway between the White House and Capitol Hill—and it is sometimes noisier inside the Commission than on the street below at rush hour. We ponder and we debate. We often laugh—and sometimes feel like crying. We handle difficult questions of policy, and we try, I assure you, to be statesmen.

You know what a statesman is, of course. That's a fellow who stands upright due to equal pressure from all sides.

In short, we conduct public business and are thus an integral part of the democratic process of our Nation. In various ways the interests of the people—and recognition of our responsibility to them—penetrate our granite walls much as the morning sunshine floods a greenhouse.

As an example of something that recently penetrated our walls, let me quote two recent newspaper articles:

Item No. 1: The Washington Post, Sunday, January 10, 1965:

"Abraham Lincoln once told how it cost him 75 cents to run for Congress in 1846. (He said:)

" 'I made the canvass on my own horse; my entertainment, being at the house of friends, cost me nothing; and my only outlay was 75 cents for a barrel of cider, which some farmhands insisted I should treat to * * *.' "

Item No. 2: The Washington Evening Star, September 8, 1964:

"Representative Carl Elliott, of Alabama, 16 years in Congress and for the last 4 years a member of the powerful House Rules Committee, leaves office at the end of this session faced with the problem of raising $20,000 to pay outstanding campaign bills from his unsuccessful, statewide primary race this past June.

"His first primary race (16 years ago) cost $12,000, of which, he said recently, $7,500 was his own money."

These stories are signs of the times—not straws in the wind. They raise directly one of the most important and recurring problems facing our democracy—the cost of political campaigning. The FCC is directly involved in this question because of our responsibilities under the law with respect to political broadcasting.

Throughout the years in the field of broadcasting perhaps no single question has generated as much controversy and debate—both within the FCC and without—as section 315 of the Communications Act—that part of the law whose requirement has become a household word. I refer, of course, to its provision for "equal time."

This law touches several concepts of the utmost importance to a democratic society. So I want to consider with you today not just the equal time requirement, but also the tremendously high cost of political broadcast time, and the proper role of broadcasting in the political arena.

First of all, let's discuss the bedrock principle of section 315—equality.

How many common phrases bear witness to the depth of man's response to the idea of equality. "All men were created equal"—"equal justice under law"—"equal protection of the law"—"equal rights"—"equal opportunities."

How many phrases suggest our abhorrence for equality's opposite—"favoritism," "special interests," "special privilege," "discrimination."

The belief that political candidates should have equal opportunities to reach the public thus has an ancient and honorable lineage. And it is no wonder that the phrase "equal time" evokes such an immediate response in the American imagination.

The idea is simplicity itself, and is quickly understood. Each candidate is entitled to equal time to present his views. Wives have been known to use it against husbands, husbands against mothers-in-law; and at least one secretary I know has used it against her boss.

Yet this idea—the heart of section 315 of the Communications Act—is under heavy attack. For years, some broadcasters have opposed it, and sought its elimination from the law. Many newspapers—often as a reflex action—have castigated it. And a little over a month ago, the presidents of two television networks called, in separate speeches, for its repeal.

Robert Sarnoff of NBC called television journalism a "shackled giant" and the equal-time rule one of its most restricting shackles. In his view, "a law that requires a Government agency to direct the manner in which the public may be informed in an election campaign is inconsistent with the aims of democracy."

Frank Stanton of CBS was even more colorful. He called the equal-time rule "a discredited and unworkable legal relic of a generation ago," and said "it is section 315 that keeps our political methods a century behind our communications." Decrying the refusal of Congress to suspend the law during the 1964 campaign, he urged the electorate to speak out for its repeal "with such a loud and unmistakable demand that neither political stalling nor parliamentary juggling can silence or contradict it."

These are harsh words from men of good will and good faith. And we can be sure they will be joined by others in seeking to persuade the new Congress to take section 315 off the books. The banner that waves over their bandwagon is labeled "freedom"—freedom from undue restrictions, freedom to report the whole truth, freedom to bring 20th century communications into 20th century politics. This freedom, they say, cannot live with the rule of equality, and hence equality must go.

---

[1] Several portions of this address were omitted from the oral presentation due to time limitations.

Well, at the risk of being run over by this bandwagon, I would like to enlist today as an advocate of equality. For my fundamental response to them is rather like Andrew Jackson's instruction to his troops at the Battle of New Orleans: "Boys, elevate them guns a little lower."

Let's take a look at the law itself. Section 315 stems from a provision of the Radio Act of 1927. Its essential features have always been the same: first, a requirement that if a broadcaster permits a candidate to use his facilities, he must offer "equal opportunities" to all other legally qualified candidates for the same office; and second, a requirement that broadcasters refrain from censoring candidates who use their facilities.

In 1952, Congress found that a number of broadcasters were charging candidates more for the use of their facilities than they did commercial advertisers for the same amount of time. It therefore inserted a sentence prohibiting this kind of cost discrimination.

In 1959, Congress became concerned lest section 315—as interpreted by the FCC in the Lar Daly case—unduly disrupt brodcasters' legitimate journalistic functions. It added a provision exempting four kinds of news programs from the "equal-time" and "no censorship" requirements. At the same time, it expressly reminded broadcasters of their obligation—with or without section 315—to be fair—"to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance."

You will notice that Congress has thus attempted to draw a line between two different functions—on the one hand, a candidate's use of broadcast facilities solely for his own political purposes, and on the other, his appearance in various kinds of news programs to serve primarily the broadcaster's purposes.

Let me here emphasize that this distinction touches the heart of the controversy surrounding section 315.

At bottom, we have a struggle between opposing aspects of what politicial broadcasting is and should be.

To the broadcaster, political programing is journalism—the irreverent but legitimate daughter of the newspaper. In politicial programs the broadcaster seeks to explain the political news, and to select the times when the electorate will see the candidate, and when it will not.

To the candidate, however, the broadcasting medium is simply the extension of a platform, a town hall, a city park—a giant means for his personal communication with the electorate, made possible by modern technology. From this point of view the biggest fact on the horizon has nothing to do with journalism. It has to do with money. For the great bulk of political broadcasting in this country is created and paid for by candidates and their supporters, with broadcasters supplying time and facilities for a fee.

Broadcasting is often an extremely profitable enterprise, particularly the television industry. Stations in the top 50 markets average some $1,425,000 each year in pretax profits. These earnings represent some 36 percent of average gross revenue. Average return on investments differ widely, but some confidential statistics in our files would make all of you here today green with envy. Some stations earn two or three times their total initial investment in after tax, net profits each year.

Television time is a luxury item with a luxury price tag.

While the actual expense figures for the 1964 election are not yet in, it is estimated that $40 million may well have been spent for radio and television time alone, of which half was spent at the national level. And these funds—all these millions—come from political contributions by individuals such as yourself, which are nondeductible, "after tax" money.

One-half hour in prime time for a network nationwide broadcast costs a candidate about $60,000. One hour usually runs somewhere around $100,000.

In San Francisco, you have four commercial television stations—three affiliated with a network and one independently programed. What do you suppose it costs a candidate to buy a single 10-second prime time announcement on an affiliated station? $400. If he wants to economize, he may purchase 10 seconds on your independent station for only $225. For the same 10 seconds on one of the New York network stations he would pay about $1,250—or $125 per second. No wonder that the estimated costs for the last New York senatorial race are in the neighborhood of $4 million.

No wonder these money problems have been dubbed bucklash.

Consider also, for example, the Indiana candidates who want television coverage in the northwestern part of their State, and must buy Chicago audiences. Similarly, congressional candidates in the First District of California can rely on Eureka stations for televised access to the northern part of their district, but for coverage of other large counties—Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Marin—they must pay San Francisco prices.

The latest statistics indicate that at the national level the major parties spend somewhere between 35 and 40 percent of their campaign funds for television and radio, and while the proportion is less at the State and local levels, it is rising rapidly.

Reconsider, for a moment, Carl Elliott's race for the U.S. House of Representatives last fall, which I mentioned earlier today. Having spent more than $20,000 of his own money in 1962, he was faced in 1964 with an even tougher race. The night before election he found that the only way to counteract a piece of last minute opposition propaganda was to go on television. Time was of the essence—nothing else would do. It cost him $15,000, and he had to mortgage his automobile in the process. Next day the voters turned him out.

Carl Elliott knows first hand the truth of Will Rogers' comment that: "Politics has got so expensive that it takes lots of money to even get beat with."

The sad fact is that more than one candidate has mortgaged his house, hocked his car, and saddled his future with a crushing load of debt in order to pay for broadcasting time. And often the debtor ends up on the losing side—sometimes after years of service in high elective office. The tragedy for the individuals involved is serious. Its larger effects upon the country may be disastrous.

Think of the qualified people who never enter the race because they have heard of such tragedies or because they can't muster the initial resources. Think of the candidates who do enter, laden with political commitments to those who have bought support as they would a market commodity. Even a Nation committed to free enterprise should not overwhelmingly tempt a candidate to sell his political favors.

It was once a proud boast in this country that any mother's son might become President. We will never know how large a part that boast played in the American dream—the vision that drew millions to our shores. Over the years, however, something has happened to it. One hears it advanced—if at all—in a shamefaced or ironic manner. More and more one hears the opposite belief expressed—that only a rich man can hold our highest elective office.

We simply cannot afford a result so fundamentally at odds with all this country stands for.

I believe, therefore, that this Nation should reduce the cost of political broadcasting—the cost to candidates in terms of money, and the cost to the public in terms of prostituted patronage.

All right, say opponents of section 315. The way to reduce effectively the cost of political broadcasting is to repeal this law. Repeal, they say, will permit broadcasters to give more free time to major candidates, without having to give equal time to every would-be dogcatcher. Break the shackles, they repeat, and broadcasters will still be fair to all parties.

To this argument let me adopt Speaker Sam Rayburn's adage that "the most valuable phrase in the English language is 'just a minute.'"

Let's revert to fundamentals. Those who seek repeal of the equal-time rule are asking for a great deal more than the freedom to disregard frivolous candidates. In dealing with major candidates, they want the right to pick and choose, to broadcast some of their words but not all of them. They want the right to censor, and to treat candidates unequally.

There is nothing inherently sinister in this. What the advocates of repeal have in mind is journalism in the classic sense. They want to present, not the candidate's version of his campaign, but their version of it—not necessarily the candidate's view of the facts in the case, but their version of the truth as they see it. To do this, they must select, they must edit, they must pick and choose. Their guiding star must be their own news judgment. And the rule of equal time and no censorship—which makes so much sense when we think of the candidate on a broadcast platform—is anathema to their journalistic endeavor, whether there are 2 candidates or 20.

Let's consider what repeal would mean—both for paid time and for free time.

As we have seen, from the broadcaster's point of view, paid political broadcasting is simply a business. Moreover, however much free time may be donated in the future, this business will remain a large one. Politicians will still buy, and broadcasters will still sell.

With respect to paid political broadcasts, section 315 performs a valuable function. It ensures all legally qualified candidates the right to purchase equal amounts of time at the same rates and in comparable segments of the broadcast day. It requires that candidates be charged no more for time than advertisers would be charged for comparable purposes. And it makes certain the candidate's right to use the time he purchases as he sees fit, without interference or censorship by broadcasters.

A great many broadcasters agree. In a speech last April, Mr. Lawrence Rogers, president of Taft Broadcasting Co., made a statement well worth pondering. He said:

"It would be no problem at all for a small-town radio operator to be 'taken over' by a machine boss without section 315. In my own experience I have seen political machines deliberately try to buy all the time on the air for a given party or candidate, in order to freeze out the opposition. Section 315 protects the operator from such tactics. And it does so clearly and firmly."

Is there any reason to undermine these requirements? The basic complaint is that section 315 requires equal treatment for splinter groups and crackpot candidates. The blunt fact, however, is minority and fringe candidates almost never have the funds to pay for the kind of broadcasting done by the major parties. The fundamental attack on the requirement of equality simply does not apply to paid political broadcasting.

And now, what about free time? Free time includes not only the donation of a platform for use of the candidate as he sees fit. It likewise includes a wide variety of programs—interviews, press conferences, debates, discussions, etc. Such programs are sometimes outlets for candidates, sometimes vehicles for journalism, and often both at the same time.

In this situation, it is well to remember, one man's shackles are another man's freedoms. The repeal of section 315 would profoundly alter the conditions of political debate in this country. Do we want to give broadcasters the power to censor political debate? Do we really want to put broadcasters in a position to say to candidates, "If you want to reach the people through this medium, you must do so on our terms and in the way we think best"? I think not.

For what is at stake in a repeal is something much larger than the future of broadcast journalism. It goes to the very heart of the political process in America. And my doubts about the wisdom of the repeal of section 315 do not stem from a low estimate of the fairness and objectivity of broadcasters. They arise much more out of questions concerning the wisdom of placing that power in the hands of any single group of men.

When the original Radio Act of 1927 was under consideration, a Congressman from Texas proposed a provision which is the direct ancestor of section 315. On the floor of the House he said:

"The power of the press will not be comparable to that of broadcasting stations when the industry is fully developed. If the development continues as rapidly in the future as in the past, it will only be a few years before these broadcasting stations, if operated by chain stations, will simultaneously reach an audience of over half of our entire citizenship, and bring messages to the fireside of nearly every home in America. They can mold and crystallize sentiment as no agency in the past has been able to do. If the strong-arm of the law does not prevent monopoly ownership and make discrimination by such stations illegal, American thought and American politics will be largely at the mercy of those who operate these stations. For publicity is the most powerful weapon that can be wielded in a republic."

Let me note in passing that, for the founder of a discredited relic of bygone times, this gentleman displayed a good deal of foresight. We do not have monopoly ownership today in American broadcasting. But, in television ownership we have a high concentration of ownership. For practical purposes, three network organizations create or control the great bulk of all the programing appearing on American television screens. For purposes of national political campaigns, the decisions of one official at each network may be critical.

Consider these facts: The largest 50 television markets include almost three-quarters of all the television-equipped homes in the Nation. While those homes are served by 171 television stations, the stations are owned by only 75 separate owners. The largest 10 television markets include some 40 percent of the country's television homes. They are served by 42 stations with only 21 separate owners. Only 9 organizations own 30 of those stations. I repeat—9 organizations control three-quarters of the stations reaching 40 percent of America's television homes. Repeal section 315, let these nine agree to support one presidential candidate, and that candidate is halfway home.

When we speak of repealing the "equal time" and "no censorship" rules, therefore, we are talking about placing tremendous power in the hands of a relatively few people. One can have the greatest confidence in their character and integrity without wishing to place them under the strains and pressures that would arise—or to place candidates even more rigidly in the position of wooing their favors.

Moreover, complete neutrality and impartiality are neither possible nor desirable in any journalist, including a broadcaster. No one can edit or select without some point of view to guide him. Indeed, partisanship is the essence of journalism. "Throw the rascals out" is the watchword of the classic fighting editor. Harsh words and brash deeds uncover news—and sell newspapers.

What wave of the future do some of our broadcast journalists seek? Is it one that will be ridden by namby-pamby corporate vice presidents, unwilling to dirty their hands with the fighting issues of the day? And would these vice presidents, once freed from the "no censorship" requirement, be willing to allow candidates their usual bluntness and provocative remarks?

The proposal made by some that we replace section 315 with a general requirement of "fairness" in dealing with candidates seems to me even less acceptable. As I have noted, the Communications Act today imposes a general requirement that broadcasters be fair—that they allow reasonable opportunities for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance. The FCC has had considerable experience with the administration of this doctrine—enough to teach us that it will not do as a general set of ground rules for broadcasting in political campaigns absent section 315.

In the extraordinary pressure of a campaign, the broadcaster needs to know his obligations and the candidate needs to know his rights. Neither can wait for the resolution of numerous philosophical disputes or engage in extended investigations and discussions. Both must plan. And they cannot be constantly asking the FCC to resolve questions of what is "fair" and "reasonable" at the height of an intense campaign.

In any event, broadcasters now have, in substantial measure, the journalistic freedom for which they cry. In 1959 Congress exempted from the equal time rule newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and one-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events. These include such programs as "Issues and Answers," "Meet the Press," "Face the Nation," etc. They also include regularly scheduled programs of this kind originated by local stations for local candidates. The exemptions also take in local newscasts as well as Huntley and Brinkley, Walter Cronkite, Ron Cochran, and others. The list is long indeed.

These exemptions allow full freedom to journalize in regular newscasts and news interviews. The more broadcast time and effort that goes into journalism of this sort on a day-to-day, week-to-week basis, the more freedom a broadcaster has to journalize during elections—for more programs will thus fit the exempt categories. Those who provide expanded news coverage in ordinary times—local as well as network—will have expanded elbow room during campaigns.

Admittedly, these exemptions do not solve all problems raised by section 315. But one thing is certain. No system will work if its operators don't want it to work. The exemptions for news programing will not achieve what Congress intended unless broadcasters are willing to use them in the spirit in which they were designed.

We do not advance matters by trying to make section 315 the whipping boy for every real or imaginary problem that crops up during political campaigns. We cannot solve the basic problems of political broadcasting by thinking of them as a struggle between the forces of progressive journalism and a bunch of benighted politicians. Nor can we solve those problems by thinking of them as a fight to prevent nationwide thought control by diabolical broadcasters.

In short, we must reconcile liberty and equality with a generous portion of fraternity.

What we need is a serious, concentrated effort to face up to the specific problems that beset political broadcasting.

My basic position is reform rather than repeal. A sound program of reform, in my judgment, is represented by the following:

1. Leave section 315 unchanged with respect to paid political broadcasts.

In the field of paid political broadcasting, the requirements of "equal opportunities" and "no censorship" serve valid and important public purposes. So does the rule that politicians cannot be charged more than advertisers for the same kind of services. None of these requirements causes significant problems. All should be retained.

2. Require minimum votes or signatures for "equal opportunities" with respect to free time.

In the field of free political broadcasting, the situation is more complex. The existence of splinter groups and fringe candidates, combined with the "equal time" requirement, does restrain some broadcasters from granting all the free time to major candidates that they otherwise might—and the exemptions for news programing do not resolve this problem. But if it is unreasonable to require equal free time for all—major or minor—candidates, why not concentrate upon the source of the difficulty?

One reasonable proposal that has often been made is to require equal opportunities only for candidates of parties that polled a particular percentage of the vote—say 5 percent or more—in the last preceding election for the office in question. To handle major third parties that appear on the scene between elections, it has been suggested that we permit an alternative way of qualifying for equal opportunities—by filing a petition bearing the certified signatures of a minimal number of registered voters.

Of course, this proposal has limitations. The rare occasions on which a petition procedure might be necessary could pose some administrative problems. In addition, the proposal could not be applied to primary elections, to the nominating process generally, or perhaps to certain kinds of local, nonpartisan elections. It would certainly be a step, however, in the right direction.

Why shouldn't we apply such a proposal to all free political broadcasts that are not already exempt from the equal time rule? To a large extent, we would resolve the problem for fringe candidates without stripping from the major contenders for office the protections that section 315 now gives them.

3. Ensure some free time for minority parties and minority candidates.

Some sacrifice of the principle of equality is necessary if we are to progress at all in achieving other goals. No one who treasures free speech, however, can consent to a blanket silencing of minority voices—simply because they are, at a particular point in time, in the minority. Broadcasters have generally expressed their desire to give some free time to such candidates, if they are once relieved of the obligation to give them equal time. I believe that the great majority of broadcasters will do this. If they do not, there is ample protection for the lesser candidates in the general provisions of the Communications Act.

As I have indicated, broadcasters are now required generally to "afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance." In the limited sphere involved, I believe that the FCC can reasonably be expected to administer this matter under its fairness doctrine so as to assure reasonable treatment for minority candidates.

4. Require broadcasters to grant free time to major candidates—in an amount equal

to time sold—for use as the candidates see fit.

Resolving the problem of fringe candidates will help to produce more free political broadcasting. The television networks have demonstrated their eagerness to provide free time for the presidential race, if they can avoid the minority candidate problem. The fate of free time at the hands of other broadcasters and in other races, however, is much more doubtful.

In the 1962 senatorial campaigns, there were 28 States in which there were only two candidates and 8 States in which there were three or more. Stations which did not face the problem of minority candidates did not give appreciably more free time to senatorial candidates than stations which did have to consider minority candidates. Nor were there proportionately more stations giving free time to senatorial candidates in the States where there were no minority candidates.

The presidential campaign is unquestionably the most important and the most dramatic of all. But the problem of campaign costs is not limited to campaigns for the Presidency. In many respects, it is deeper—and its effects more to be feared—in campaigns for lesser offices. If we are seriously intent upon reducing the costs of political campaigning in this country, to secure more free time for the presidential campaign alone is merely to attack the top of the iceberg.

I would therefore advance a suggestion I first made some time ago—that we require a broadcaster to offer, at a minimum an equal amount of free time for each hour of time sold. Time would continue to be sold candidates individually; but when a major candidate purchased time an equal amount of free time would then be afforded for the use of all the qualifying major candidates in that race.

For example, suppose that candidates A, B, and C are contenders for the same office. Candidates A and B are major candidates; candidate C does not meet the 5-percent test. Candidate A buys a total of one-half hour of time from a particular broadcaster. The broadcaster would then be required to offer one-half hour to the major candidates in the race, so that A and B would each receive 15 minutes free. Each time any candidate purchased time, the same result would follow.

This plan has many benefits. It would assure all major candidates some free time. This time would be allocated equally among them, and could be used as they saw fit—for debates, discussions or separate broadcasts. The decision as to the total time, free and paid, to be devoted to any particular race would be left right where it should be—with the broadcaster. And the plan would apply, without a complicated formula, to a wide range of races.

This proposal would not apply, of course, to races where the proposal to eliminate fringe candidates from the "equal opportunities" provision is not feasible. Moreover, to avoid problems of last-minute changes in the plans of candidates and to give the broadcaster an opportunity to plan his schedule, we could insert a reasonable "cutoff" date, eliminating the free-time-for-paid-time requirement for, say, the last week in any campaign.

I recognize that the result would affect broadcasters earnings—particularly the smaller stations. So I think it reasonable to consider ways in which the general public might assume a portion of that burden. For the people have as great a stake here as the broadcaster.

One solution would be to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit broadcasters to deduct from their taxable income not only the out-of-pocket costs of free political broadcasts (which are now deductible) but some portion of the profits which are thereby sacrificed. The objection to this proposal lies in the complexities it would introduce into tax laws—both in the mere introduction of another special deduction, and in the calculation of its appropriate amount—at a time when great efforts are being made to simplify and streamline those laws. If these problems can be overcome, however, the proposal has, to my mind, great merit.

In summary, while we cannot afford to jettison the present law, neither can we afford to stand still. At stake here are the basic lines of communication between the citizen and those who seek the resonsibilities and power of public office—indeed, the very essence of a self-governing society.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CUTS SHOULD BE RECONSIDERED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, 188 years ago, Thomas Jefferson commented on the draft. He said:

> In Virginia a draft was ever the most unpopular and impracticable thing that could be attempted.

The year was 1777, and Jefferson was writing to his friend, John Adams.

Today, nearly 200 years later, men still are subject to the draft to serve in the Armed Forces of this land; and Jefferson's description of the draft is still valid. Apparently, we are stuck with this albatross, although I am hopeful that the Department of Defense study, due in April, as ordered by President Johnson, will point up the deficiencies of the system, and will contain suggestions for a realistic way of manning our Armed Forces by eliminating the draft and retaining our military forces at proper strength with volunteers.

The Government would be wise also to take a new look at its cold manner concerning its treatment of its veterans when a crisis has passed.

Nothing is too good for our veterans when we are at war; but that patriotic fervor dissipates quickly, and the veterans are forgotten. Rudyard Kipling immortalized this in his poem "Tommy", the last verse of which goes:

> For it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that,
>   An' "Chuck him out, the brute."
> But it's "Saviour of his Country"
>   When the guns begin to shoot.
> An' it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that,
>   An' anything you please;
> An' Tommy ain't a bloomin' fool—
>   You bet that Tommy sees.

The Veterans' Administration would "chuck" Tommy out, were the Congress of the United States to be docile. Perhaps the anger of Congress over the V.A. orders to close regional offices and veterans hospitals and domiciliaries surprised the Veterans' Administration. It should not have come as a surprise. We represent the veterans. We have not forgotten their service—nor shall we.

I first learned of the closing of the facilities on January 13; and I remember clearly the portion of the letter by the then Acting Administrator, Mr. W. J. Driver, which advised me that:

> A major benefit is the increased effectiveness and efficiency that result from greater productivity obtained by the consolidations without impairing the quality of service to veterans and their beneficiaries.

This is quite a promise and one which is puzzling, for it is not easy to understand how service can be more effective and efficient in my State of Alaska when the Veterans' Administration says it intends to reduce its staffing from 18 to 1 in its Juneau department of veterans' benefits. The one employee remaining will be the contact representative, and his responsibility will be as an information officer only.

I commented on this in my testimony before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

> So Alaska will no longer have VA staff members able to adjudicate claims and compensation requests and pension benefits. These responsibilities are to be transferred from Juneau to Seattle, Wash., a distance of 915 miles. Even with the advent of jet airplane service it becomes obvious that the added distance can only slow the service. So I remind the Veterans' Administration that good intentions, however noble, are no substitute for services.

The reduction of services in Alaska will include a salary saving of some $300,000 annually. When we are spending in excess of $2 million a day in South Vietnam, where the veterans of the future are being killed and maimed, surely this amount seems insignificant.

The action of the Veterans' Administration is, at best, unthinking. The savings envisioned on one front can but create new pockets of poverty on another; and the economic poverty it will create is not the single debilitating blow. Worse is the poverty of the spirit which must follow, as patients in veterans' hospitals now set to close, leave their friends and relatives, and move or are moved to distant places.

Separating a patient from his family can have disastrous results.

In my statement before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, which was looking into the proposed closing of the VA facilities, I commented on this and on two medical articles relative to this particular problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the full text of my statement before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee and a statement by Lincoln S. Tamraz, the national commander of the Amvets.

Mr. President, we are a Great Society. I cannot believe that a "Great Society" would "chuck" Tommy out.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Gruening Before Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Concerning the Announced Closure of the Veterans' Administration Regional Office in Juneau, Alaska

Mr. Chairman, veterans in this Nation may justifiably be proud of the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. I know of no other person who has done as much to make certain that the men and women who have served in the armed services of the United States of America receive fair treatment.

I have been pleased to support your tireless quest for the enactment of the cold war GI bill, a worthy fight and one I hope you will renew this Congress.

Now you again demonstrate why the veterans of this country have confidence in this committee. You have called this hearing to get the facts, to learn why the Veterans' Administration proposes to close 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries at the end of fiscal year 1965, saving taxpayers, according to the agency, the sum of $23.5 million in administrative or overhead costs.

The State of Alaska will be affected by the action for the Juneau regional office is to have its services severely curtailed and much of the work done within my State will be handled by the Seattle regional office if the proposed action of the Veterans' Administration is permitted.

In his letter of January 13, 1965, which I received the same day, the Acting Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. W. J. Driver, advises:

"A major benefit is the increased effectiveness and efficiency that result from greater productivity obtained by the consolidations without impairing the quality of service to veterans and their beneficiaries."

This is a promise of major proportions, one I hope which is not comparable to man's search for that pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

I am puzzled as to how the Veterans' Administration truly believes it can be more effective and efficient and in no sense impair the quality of service to veterans and their beneficiaries in Alaska—even as the agency reduces its staffing from 18 to 1 in its Juneau department of veterans benefits. The one employee remaining will be the contact representative and his responsibility will be as an information officer only.

So Alaska will no longer have VA staff members able to adjudicate claims and compensation requests and pension benefits. These responsibilities are to be transferred from Juneau to Seattle, Wash., a distance of 915 miles. Even with the advent of jet airplane service it becomes obvious that the added distance can only slow the service. So I remind the Veterans' Administration that good intentions, however noble, are no substitute for services.

The Veterans' Administration advises the Senate that its action of curtailment will save the taxpayers of the United States an estimated $23.5 million.

Is this saving worthwhile? Alaska does not have a veterans hospital so it cannot be closed at a later date.

The modest medical services available to the more than 25,000 veterans in the 49th State will continue, according to the Veterans' Administration. The department of medicine and surgery in Juneau will retain its present eight staff members. The limited medical service in Fairbanks where one individual works on a part-time daily basis to provide the service of a department of medicine and surgery will continue.

In Anchorage, three staff members will work in the department of veterans benefits.

But I am told informally that the reduction of services in Alaska will include a salary loss exceeding $300,000 annually. The amount may seem insignificant, but it means a great deal to those affected and to the economy of the area.

The Alaskan employees confronted with unemployment will, advises the Veterans' Administration, be offered employment in other States. If they accept a position in another State, the VA will pay moving expenses for the employee and his dependents.

Now, the offer of the VA to pay the expenses is desirable and proper. After all, the Veterans' Administration created the situation.

The Veterans' Administration has treated Alaska shabbily since statehood when it discontinued the care available to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities possible when Alaska was a territory. Despite the strenuous protests of the congressional delegation from Alaska and from Hawaii which experienced identical discrimination in this instance, the ruling was not reversed. Now the Veterans' Administration moves again—removing most of the modest services remaining.

I have received no letters from Alaskans applauding the decision. Rather, the protests have been many. And they continue to arrive in the mail, by wire, and by telephone. When Members of the Senate protested the action of the Veterans' Administration on January 15, 1965, in an extensive colloquy on the floor of the Senate, I said:

"I wish to associate myself with the very moving and eloquent remarks of both the senior Senator and the junior Senator from Montana. I share the rightful indignation which the senior Senator from Montana expressed in his voice. The same press release that wiped out the Miles City Hospital also wiped out the one remaining veterans installation in Alaska able to adjudicate claims. As soon as the facility in Juneau is closed, veterans in Alaska will have to travel 1,000 miles to obtain that service.

"They cannot very well walk that distance. They will have to expend their money for airplane fare.

"Mr. President, these decisions are unjust and unwise. I doubt whether they are sound economically.

"As soon as I heard of the pending proposed closing of veterans hospitals and regional offices, I called Mr. Driver, the newly appointed head of the Veterans' Administration, by phone. He was not in his office; but I protested strongly the elimination of Alaska's regional office at Juneau to the Deputy Administrator, and asked that Mr. Driver come to my office as soon as he could be located. He came later in the afternoon; and my colleague, Senator BARTLETT, and I presented as strongly as we could our opposition to this closure. He declined to budge, no doubt having orders from the Bureau of the Budget. It is my hope that pending the hearings which both the Senators from Montana and I have requested be held by the Veterans Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, headed by Senator YARBOROUGH, that the proposed closing of the Juneau office be held in abeyance and that no final decision be made until all the protests can be heard and the necessity for this action, performed in the name of economy, be fully evaluated.

"We have no veterans hospital in Alaska. It is nearly a thousand miles to Seattle, the nearest place for treatment in a veterans hospital.

"Alaska is an area larger than the large area served by the Miles City Hospital, which is ordered closed. It is an area larger than Montana, Wyoming, and the Dakotas. From now on, if this order stands, we shall have no facility in Alaska supplied by the Federal Government for the veterans. Fortunately, Alaska has its own State veterans organization, which I sponsored as Governor toward the end of World War II, and supported wholly by State funds. But that does not relieve the Federal Government of its responsibilities.

"I am hopeful that this investigation and the hearings will lead to a reversal of this policy."

Surely this Great Society retains the greatness of its heritage.

Surely the men and women who have fought to preserve our society deserve consideration. We are greater, in part, thanks to them.

I ask unanimous consent that there appear in this hearing record at the close of my remarks excerpts and in some cases the full text of protests I have received from individuals and groups in Alaska in protest to the action of the Veterans' Administration. They come from the Greater Fairbanks Area Citizens Committee; the Wrangell Chamber of Commerce; the department president of the American Legion Auxiliary, Sitka, Alaska; members of the South East District Democratic Party of Alaska; the Juneau Chamber of Commerce; the American Legion, Department of Alaska; Susitna Post 9365, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Wasilla; Commissioner of Labor Gil Johnson, Alaska Department of Labor; president of the Matanuska Valley Chamber of Commerce; and Dorman H. Baker Post No. 11, the American Legion, Fairbanks.

The action of the Veterans' Administration is at best unthinking. The saving envisioned on one front can but create new pockets of poverty on another.

How can we describe such poverty?

Is economic poverty the single debilitating blow? I fear not.

Worse is the poverty of the spirit which must follow as patients in veterans hospitals now set to close, leave their friends and relatives and move or are moved to distant places.

Two excellent articles on the psychological aspects of such actions appear in the Annuals of Internal Medicine No. 57 for October–December 1962 and in Mental Hygiene No. 38 for 1954. I ask permission that both be printed at the end of my statement.

The report on "Psychological Aspects of Stroke: Patient and Family" in the Annals of Internal Medicine finds that, "Relationships, patient to family to professional staff to community, should be encouraged and developed. The dangers of isolation are as great as those of paralysis."

The report on the role of the family in relation to the institutionalized mental patient appearing in Mental Hygiene describes at length the value of the family visit. I quote:

"Despite lack of response, the family must be encouraged to continue their visits, helping to reassure and motivate the patient to differentiate his environment. For nine visits he may not visibly respond to his family, but on the 10th visit he may be ready to talk with them, and the family must then be available to give him the support he needs.

"We have attempted to bring the role of the mental patient's family into the foreground as an essential consideration in therapeutic planning. It is our contention that there is a peculiar situation of anonymity arising from the institutionalization of the mental patient. We are not negating the importance of interpersonal relationships within the hospital walls, but we are contending that the patient's interpersonal relationships with his family are of special importance. The hospital, as such, is lifted from the mainstream of life and, for the patient who will recover, it is only a transition between a past and a future in the community. Therefore, no matter how successful the interpersonal relationships of the patient within the hospital, it is his link with the outside world that must be strengthened. The family embodies the 'normal' world of interpersonal relationships for the patient to which we hope to help him return."

Medical treatment alone cannot always be the sole cure when man is ill. The Veterans'

Administration would be wise to reexamine and to reevaluate its position that "a better quality of medical service for all will result from a great concentration of veteran patients in facilities so located as to supply the highest quality of medical treatment. * * *" I have just quoted the words of Mr. Driver, a man long associated with the Veterans' Administration. I urge him now to reconsider the contemplated action of the agency which may have unforeseen heartbreaking results.

Travel is expensive and not always possible. The value of human life has never been set so far as I know. Dare we permit a gamble such as that contemplated by the Veterans' Administration in its attempt to economize?

Statement by Lincoln S. Tamraz, Chicago, Ill., National Commander AMVETS on Closings of the Veterans' Administration Hospitals and Regional Offices, January 19, 1965

Washington, D.C.—AMVETS strongly recommends that the order closing 11 hospitals, 16 regional offices and 4 domiciliaries issued by the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration on January 13, 1965, be held in abeyance until the President and other responsible officials have the opportunity to review and appraise their relationship, place, and contribution to the objectives of the President's programs for the Great Society.

It has always been the conviction of Amvets that the Veterans' Administration should be the "one stop" agency for all matters relating to veterans and their care.

The statement by President Johnson on January 16, 1965, from Texas confirms Amvets position; when asked with regards to these closings, "Do you see any reassessment of these closings coming up or do you have any plans along that line?" The President replied, "That decision has been made by the Veterans Administrator. That is a matter for him. He is a career employee. That is not something that I am passing on from day to day, on these individual locations."

It is very apparent that in the present situation, considerable difficulty exists in placing the real responsibility for the decision behind the announced closings.

Interested Members of Congress have placed the responsibility upon the President. He has stated that the responsibility rests with the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. In one of his last appearances, the former Administrator, Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., before a House Finance Committee hearing fiscal year 1966 budget, there was every indication that the authority of the Administrator to make VA policies were being usurped by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and his staff, who are neither specially experienced in veterans' needs or programs and are not primarily answerable for their administration to America's veterans.

If there is an overriding responsibility for the closings, the authority that dictated them should be brought out in the open.

We believe that only shortsighted considerations of possible immediate savings dictated the orders to close. The many other conditions of service to veterans and the short- and long-range additional costs to other State and Federal agencies were apparently ignored.

It appears that the only purpose really being served by the order to close is to allow the Bureau of the Budget to centralize, automate and depersonalize control at the expense of the agency bearing the responsibility given to it by the law and the will of the Congress and the vast majority of Americans—the Veterans' Administration.

We listened to the President's state of the Union message for some word of the role of the veteran in the Great Society—we listened in vain.

If the aims and purposes of the great ideals are to be realized, it cannot be done without the support of veterans, nor should it be in any way accomplished at their expense.

Our veterans and their dependents comprise over 50 million Americans. It is unfortunately true that many of them, particularly the survivors of earlier wars and their dependents are on the bottom rung of the ladder, financially, socially, and physically.

The announced and possibly yet to be announced closings, and the elimination of services and facilities to the veterans and their dependents can only be to the detriment of the aims and projections stated by the President "to raise our people into the Great Society" in his message to Congress.

The relatively insignificant "so-called" savings of $23,500,000 in the fiscal year 1966 at the expense of the many services in so many widely separated places will make no real contribution to the President's social programs which are projected in billions of dollars annually.

The loss to the States, communities, and to the veterans will be immediate and irreparable. The creation and establishment of many of these facilities were years in the making. They will not be easily replaced.

The great evil of our present day is the depersonalization of almost every human activity. Some of this is unavoidable. It is no less deplorable for this reason. The removal or consolidation of existing facilities which will force our veterans to rely upon "mail-order" service can only be a step backward.

Computers and machine programers simply cannot replace the warm human and sympathetic service given by experienced dedicated people who have served the Veterans' Administration and the veteran.

There is no substitute for face-to-face relationship in the kind of human problems faced by our veterans and dependents in the vast accumulation of laws and regulations, instructions, and forms confronting those seeking benefits to which they are entitled.

We are particularly concerned to see veterans programs in any aspect, equated with social, welfare, or charity programs, administered by any other agency than the Veterans' Administration.

EDWARD REARDON

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, one of the ablest and nicest newspapermen in Washington has just decided to retire. I speak of the good friend of all of us in the New Jersey congressional delegation, Ed Reardon. He has been the Washington eyes and ears and the most pleasant voice of the Passaic Herald-News, in New Jersey. Through the years, he has impressed all of us with his hard working ways, his always affable and understanding manner, and his great loyalty to Congress as an institution. We in Congress have been fortunate to have had so many of his good years; and I wish him many more in his retirement.

CREDIT INFLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in a speech that I made in New York early last December, I stated:

> For the past 4 years, unquestionably, money has been abundantly available—fully adequate, if not more than adequate, to meet the needs of our expanding economy. Signs are mounting, however, that continued monetary expansion at the high rate of the recent past might be excessive in terms of our productive capacity. This could lead to inflationary pressures with undesirable consequences on our balance-of-payments position.

In the Wall Street Journal for February 8, 1965, Mr. George Shea presents a perceptive analysis that points up certain dangerous aspects of the current situation with respect to prices, productive capacity, and credit expansion, along the lines that I indicated.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from Mr. Shea's article printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance

* * * * *

> The steadiness of commodity prices beginning with 1958 has been remarkable. The average of all wholesale prices for that year was 100.4 percent of the 1957–59 average, and in January the figure had risen only to about 101 percent.

* * * * *

> In the same period bank credit has increased hugely. From the end of 1958 to the end of 1964 commercial bank credit—the total of loans and investments—has grown almost 50 percent or $90 billion. Moreover, out of the $90 billion gain for 6 years, $60 billion has come in the last 3 years.
>
> That there is a close connection between bank credit and commodity prices is pretty well established in economic theory.

* * * * *

> * * * the expansion in bank credit has been more rapid than the growth in economic activity. Bank credit in these last 3 years has grown 28 percent, while the value of the gross output of the Nation has increased only 22 percent. Furthermore, the gross output in physical terms has gone up only 15 percent.
>
> The rest of the 22-percent gain in value of output reflects so-called price increases, but these have been pretty well confined to the prices of human work, that is, salaries, wages, and professional and service pay. As we have seen, wholesale commodity prices as a group have not gone up, and it can also be shown that the increase of less than 5 percent which has occurred during the 3 years in retail costs reflects mostly higher costs for services.
>
> In any case, the question all this adds up to is where the excess in growth of credit over growth of production has gone. There is no clear answer to this, but it looks as if it has gone into keeping prices steady. Which in turn suggests that, without the extra credit expansion, prices would have fallen. That is, the steadiness of wholesale prices appears to conceal a form of inflation.

* * * * *

> The existence of this problem of the relation between credit and prices is emphasized at this time by the possibility that a somewhat less expansionary credit policy may be adopted by the Federal Reserve System. There is no sign so far of such a change; the latest week's banking figures suggested the same policy of "cautious ease" that has been followed in recent months is still in force.
>
> But the arguments for a change are strong because of the persistent deficit in the balance between U.S. outgoing and incoming payments of money. Washington at last seems to be on the verge of realizing that

such a deficit cannot go on forever and must be cured by traditional methods, including restraint upon credit expansion.

It is being argued in Washington, in preparation for such a possible switch, that it would restrict loans being made outside the country rather than inside it. However, it is difficult to believe that any such clean separation of the effects of restraint could be achieved. The foreign loans our bankers make are at substantially higher interest rates than the loans made here, and restraint on the volume of available U.S. credit would tend to raise rates in both markets. This would probably mean that new lending would be reduced at home as well as abroad.

To accomplish a substantial reduction in new lending, however, the credit policy would have to be altered quite a bit. The present policy of keeping the banking system's unencumbered reserves, available for making loans, in a narrow fixed range tells the banks in effect to go ahead and lend as much as they please.

That's because the moment the banks lend enough to pull their [excess] reserves down below the target range, the Reserve System replenishes the funds. The banks have the feeling there is always more to come if they start to use up what they've got. The only kind of policy that would really act as a rein would be * * * as loans are made * * * to avoid replenishing [reserves] fully.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MATERIALS RESERVE AND STOCKPILE ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 28) to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the able junior Senator from Iowa.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SUSPENDS OPERATIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a release from the Department of Agriculture, dated February 1965, relating to Commodity Credit Corporation's suspension of operations merits the attention of everyone.

I ask unanimous consent that this release, along with that portion of my statement appearing on pages 2264 and 2265 of the February 8 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, commencing at the bottom of the right-hand column of page 2264 and running over to the point immediately preceding the part of my statement labeled "Research for Industrial Uses," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release and partial statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation Suspends Operations

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 8, 1965.

The Commodity Credit Corporation today suspended disbursements involving borrowings until Congress restores capital which has been reduced through authorized program operations, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced.

The 88th Congress provided some restoration of capital with the understanding that an additional amount would be restored through a supplemental appropriation when the need became more definite. The President submitted a supplemental appropriation request to the Congress on January 19, 1965 (H. Doc. 59).

It was hoped that the "borrowing authorization" available to CCC would be adequate to provide for continuing operations until a supplemental appropriation could be enacted by the Congress. Both the House of Representatives and the Senate have acted on the supplemental appropriation request, but final action has been delayed due to differences concerning amendments added.

In the meantime, proceeds of sales of CCC commodities and other receipts have been smaller than disbursements, and the Corporation's borrowing power has been exhausted. Until the Corporation's borrowing power is restored, it will be possible to make payments only to the extent of cash receipts; these will be applied first to disbursements in transit and second to the most pressing of bills due.

Orders to stop disbursements have been sent to ASCS county offices, which make grain and a few cotton loans; to the private banks and other lending institutions that make cotton loans on behalf of CCC, to producers' associations which handle cotton, peanut, tobacco and naval stores price support; to the ASCS Commodity Offices which disburse money for cotton loans, for warehouse and transportation charges, and certain commodity purchases. This order will not affect disbursement of any sight drafts already issued.

It is hoped that the issues involved in final passage of the supplemental appropriation bill (S.J. Res. 234) will soon be resolved, and that regular operations may soon be resumed. In the meantime, farmers can hold their crops for later placement under price-support. With respect to dairy products, CCC will purchase from processors in accordance with the terms of the price support program, as soon as funds are available, products manufactured from milk produced during the period of suspension.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is capitalized at $100 million and has authority to borrow up to $14.5 billion. Normally, the Congress restores capital after losses are realized so that CCC is able to carry out its operations and stay within the authorized borrowing authority.

CCC finances price support, commodity stabilization, supply and foreign purchase, commodity export and other activities.

Partial Statement of Senator Miller

Total capital in use (out of $14,500,000,000 authorized) as Dec. 31, 1964	$14, 180, 600, 000
Amount thereof "lost" as of June 30, 1964	−8, 166, 134, 000
Total	6, 014, 466, 000
Add fiscal 1965 appropriation to partially restore "lost" capital	1, 574, 000, 000
Available capital funds	[1] 7, 588, 466, 000
Already committed to crop loans and inventory as of Dec. 31, 1964	[2] 7, 413, 322, 889
Available for additional crop loans	175, 143, 111

[1] Compare this to commitments to loans and inventories of $8,192,620,000 on Feb. 1, 1964, and $8,465,384,000 on Feb. 1, 1963.

[2] See the following table:

Already committed	$7, 413, 322, 889
Estimated losses from liquidations	−1, 015, 000, 000
Available after liquidations	6, 398, 322, 889
Available, as above, for additional loans and inventory	175, 143, 111
Deficiency appropriation to restore capital	1, 600, 000, 000
Additional borrowing authorized for capital	319, 400, 000
Total available for CCC programs	8, 592, 866, 000

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the $8,166,134,000 "lost" represents losses by Commodity Credit Corporation through price support programs, with inventories being disposed of at less than cost, largely through the food-for-peace program. Of this total, $1,574 million was restored by the fiscal 1965 appropriation and $1,600 million has now been restored by the recent fiscal 1965 deficiency appropriation, leaving a total of almost $5 billion which Congress has neglected to restore. Of course this may help to make the spending budget appear lower, but the day of reckoning eventually arrives—as it did with the $1.6 billion deficiency appropriation and as it will with future deficiency appropriations.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the statement was made in the release from the Department of Agriculture that normally Congress restores capital after losses are realized, so that the Commodity Credit Corporation is able to carry out its operations.

My statement points out that $5 billion has not been restored to the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I take issue with the statement that normally Congress does so. If Congress normally had done so, there would not be a $5 billion impairment of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

APPOINTMENT OF LAURANCE ROCKEFELLER AS CHAIRMAN OF WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NATURAL BEAUTY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with great pride I call attention to the fact that the President has announced that the chairman of the New York State

Council on Parks, Laurance Rockefeller, will be Chairman of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty. This Conference is to be held in mid-May.

We are very proud in New York of the fact that Laurance Rockefeller headed the Outdoor Resources Review Commission which projected the recreation needs of the American people to the year 2000. Many of the recommendations of that Commission, such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and establishment of the Fire Island National Seashore, were enacted by the 88th Congress. Others were requested by the President in his recommendations yesterday.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON NATURAL BEAUTY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in his message on natural beauty yesterday, President Johnson went to the heart of one of the most critical problems confronting modern man: the threat of manmade waste to our survival. In the air, on our land and in our waterways we have too often dumped the residue of our industry and our affluence without regard to its damage to ourselves and our posterity.

President Johnson has given us a message of inspiration and a program for action. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Public Works Committee I was particularly interested in his recommendations for preventing and abating pollution of the air and water. His suggestions were challenging, yet sensible, far-reaching, yet attainable.

The President emphasized the importance of the Clean Air Act of 1963 and stressed the need for additional action in preventing future pollution, in coping with the critical problem of automotive exhausts and in finding improved methods of disposing of solid wastes. Our subcommittee intends to hold hearings on these and other proposals during this session and to press for legislative action on improvements in the Clean Air Act.

In the field of water pollution control and abatement the President stressed those features of the Water Quality Act of 1965, S. 4, which the Senate passed on January 28. He stressed the importance of water quality standards, increased grants for sewage treatment projects, improved administration of the Federal water pollution control program and a research and development program to cope with the problem of storm and sanitary sewage. In addition he advocated an increase in grant ceilings for grants to State water pollution control programs and outlined administration plans to cope with the problem of pesticide pollution and Federal activities and operations which cause pollution.

The subcommittee intends to give intensive study to a number of these areas. We recognize the need to update and to improve our waste disposal and treatment grant program. We believe it is imperative that we accelerate our efforts to find improved techniques for treating organic and other wastes discharged by municipalities and industry. Field hearings will be conducted on these and other water pollution problems. In addition the subcommittee will conduct hearings on legislation dealing with pollution from Federal installations and nondegradable detergents.

Mr. President, pollution is a threat to the health, the emotional well-being and the social and economic welfare of America. President Johnson has emphasized the interdependence of these factors in improving the quality of life in these United States. His message is a call to action, for the Congress, for the Executive, for the States and for business and private persons in all parts of America. His was a message on natural beauty which reaches far beyond consideration of esthetics alone; it goes to the heart of our need to create a meaningful and healthful life for ourselves and our children.

MATERIALS RESERVE AND STOCKPILE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 28) to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, S. 28 has several objectives, but an oversimplified summary of its purpose, is that it is intended to improve the management and administration of the Government's stockpile of materials; and to facilitate orderly disposal of materials that the Government does not need. Such disposal would, of course, help us with our steadily mounting deficit.

CONSOLIDATION OF STOCKPILES

The Government now owns three major stockpiles of materials.

The first of these, the national stockpile, was accumulated to assure the availability, during a war or national emergency, of materials needed for defense that are normally supplied by foreign sources, at least in part.

The Defense Production Act inventory was acquired by the Government as an incidental result of encouraging the expansion of the production of certain materials following the outbreak of the Korean conflict.

So as to encourage expansion of productive capacity, and the development on new deposits, the Government, in certain instances, agreed to guarantee a stipulated price for designated quantities of production; and if this price were in excess of the market price at the time of production the Government nevertheless purchased the material at the agreed price.

The supplemental stockpile was acquired and is being acquired by the Government as a result of the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities.

The existence of three separate stockpiles, each of which is controlled by somewhat different law, has unnecessarily complicated the management of these stockpiles, and the disposal of materials not needed for defense purposes.

For example, disposals from the Defense Production Act inventory require no congressional approval. Disposals from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile can be made only with congressional approval, unless it is determined that the materials are obsolescent for use in time of war.

The bill consolidates the materials now in three stockpiles into two stockpiles.

The national stockpile would contain only those strategic and critical materials needed to meet current stockpile objectives.

The materials reserve inventory would contain those materials now held in the three existing stockpiles that are excess to stockpile objectives.

Materials acquired in the future under the Defense Production Act, or through the exchange of agricultural commodities, would also be placed in the materials reserve inventory, unless they are needed to meet objectives of the national stockpile.

DISPOSALS

As the statistics in the appendix to the committee report show, the acquisition cost of the materials on hand and on order for our stockpiles is more than $8.5 billion.

Only $3.3 billion of this cost relates to materials that are now needed to meet stockpile objectives. Therefore materials which cost more than $5.2 billion are surplus to our requirements; and each day that some of these materials which deteriorate are not sold, as example rubber, adds to the cost to the taxpayer.

Obviously, a sudden release of large quantities of these materials could seriously disrupt producers, or consumers, or allies of the United States or orderly marketing or some combination of these. It is important, though, that some progress be made in the liquidation of unneeded inventories, in a manner that will not be unduly disruptive.

This bill would permit disposal of surplus material without requiring congressional approval for each disposal, but it would retain for the Congress the right to disapprove proposed disposals in a manner similar to congressional action on reorganization plans or on changes in defense functions as provided by the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958.

Under the bill the executive branch could formulate disposal plans that had due regard for protecting, first, the United States against avoidable loss; second, producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets; and, third, the foreign relations of the United States.

Notice of a disposal under this plan would have to be transmitted to the Congress. If Congress took no action within 60 days of continuous session following submission of the notice, the disposal could be accomplished.

If within the 60-day period, either the House or the Senate Committee on Armed Services reported a resolution opposing the proposed sale, a new 40-day period would begin to run to permit consideration by the House to which such resolution was reported.

If either House adopted the resolution of disapproval, the disposal could not be accomplished.

If neither House adopted such a resolution after it had been reported, the disposal could be accomplished after the expiration of the 40-day period.

The committee is indebted to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] for suggesting this middle ground between requiring express congressional consent for each disposal and requiring enactment of a bill, presumably over a veto, all within a 60-day period, to negate a disposal.

S. 28 had its origin in the inquiry into the strategic and critical materials stockpiles of the United States that was conducted by the Stockpile Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

In the last Congress, the subcommittee recommended and the Committee on Armed Services unanimously approved S. 2272, a bill having substantially the same provisions as S. 28.

The letter from the Bureau of the Budget that is contained in the committee report shows that the executive branch favors the provisions of this bill although it is unenthusiastic about the retention of congressional power to disapprove a proposed disposal. Since disposal of surpluses from the national stockpile cannot be accomplished at this time without congressional approval, the committee considers that it is remarkable for the Congress to retain at least the authority to disapprove a disposal and that the compromise this bill represents has precedents in the reorganization plan procedures, and also in the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958.

I would like to summarize other principal provisions of the bill.

MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill places basic executive responsibility for stockpile management under the direction of the President.

The bill defines the term "strategic and critical material," and relates that definition to the kinds of national emergencies for which these materials can be stockpiled. The definition is phrased specifically to deny authority for stockpiling manufactured and fabricated forms of material such as steel beams, copper tubing, and aluminum sheets; and also such manufactured, or assembled items as locomotives, trucks, bridges, and housing.

Within 6 months after enactment of the bill, the President is to establish criteria for determining stockpile objectives. These would become effective upon the expiration of 60 days after notice of criteria had been submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress. Thereafter, the President is to make a determination of the form, quality, and quantity of each material to be placed in the stockpile. These determinations, which constitute the stockpile objectives, would become effective 30 days after the objectives have been sent to the appropriate committees of Congress.

As in the existing law, S. 28 provides for the transfer to the national stockpile of materials held by Government agencies or departments in quantities excess to the needs of that department or agency, provided the transfer would not cause the stockpile objective to be exceeded.

The bill also provides that the transfer of materials to the stockpile need not be made if it is determined that the material in question is needed to make up a critical deficiency in current industrial requirements. This determination would be made by the President.

The bill provides that the department or agency transferring excess materials to the stockpile will not be reimbursed except for the expenses of transfer; but this provision does not prevent reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation when materials are transferred from the CCC to the national stockpile, or the materials reserve inventory.

As under existing law, the bill provided that, so far as practical, stockpile purchases should be made from supplies of materials in excess of current industrial demands, and that purchases should comply with the Buy American Act.

A new provision prevents the Government from entering into a contract for the acquisition of any material if the quantity of the material to be acquired would result in the Government's inventory of the material in question being greater than the stockpile objective for it.

S. 28 provides that a 60-day notice must be given by publication, through the Federal Register and transmission of a report to the appropriate congressional committees before materials in the national stockpile may be refined, processed, or replaced through rotation.

S. 28 requires that all contracts made under the authority of the act shall be subject to renegotiation.

Section 106 of the Renegotiation Act, as amended, exempts from the provisions of the act contracts or subcontracts for the products of a mine or other minerals, or natural deposits, that have not been processed, refined, or treated beyond the first form or state suitable for industrial use; and also contracts or subcontracts for agricultural commodities in their raw or natural state.

This bill would eliminate these exemptions.

Since the stockpiling of materials by the Government is as much a preparedness measure as the production of arms, there appears no persuasive reason to exempt stockpile contracts.

MANAGEMENT OF MATERIALS RESERVE INVENTORY

Transfer of materials to the materials reserve inventory, and from the materials reserve inventory to the national stockpile would be accomplished without charge or reimbursement under the methods and procedures contained in the bill.

The bill provides that, whenever practicable, departments and agencies of the Government shall use materials from the reserve inventory, rather than purchasing materials from private sources. The General Services Administration would be reimbursed for any materials transferred for such use, the amount of reimbursement being the fair market value as determined by the Administrator of General Services.

The bill also authorizes the Administrator of GSA, at the direction of the President, to abandon, destroy, or donate to public bodies, materials in the inventory which have either no commercial value, or insufficient commercial value to justify the costs of care and handling.

The bill authorizes application of reserve inventory materials at fair market value for acquisition of materials required to meet current stockpile objectives.

The bill provides that any disposal of materials in the reserve inventory should be accomplished with due regard to protecting first, the United States against "avoidable loss"; second, producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets; and third, the foreign relations of the United States.

The bill also expresses an intent that any such disposals should be accomplished in a manner which will prevent materials from being acquired by Communist-controlled nations, directly or indirectly, if said material would not otherwise be available to these nations; and if their acquisition by these nations would be harmful to the security of the United States.

CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY

In several ways, S. 28 provides more congressional control than does current stockpile law.

One example is that Congress would have power to disapprove all sales of surplus materials from what are now three different stockpiles. In addition, under S. 28, Congress would have the opportunity to review the criteria to be considered in determining stockpile objectives, as well as the form, quality, and quantity of each strategic and critical material to be stockpiled. This participation is not provided for under the current law.

Under S. 28, Congress would review any decision to refine, process, or replace material in the national stockpile. Moreover, there is opportunity for Congress to review the classification of information relating to such materials. Neither of these reviews is provided for under existing law.

SECRECY

The committee believes pertinent information relating to the stockpile should be made public, and that excessive classification results in denying opportunity for informed consideration of what stockpile policies should be and how these policies are being administered. The bill provides, therefore, that information about the form, quantity, and quality of materials for the national stockpile, plus stockpile objectives, will normally be treated as public information, although there is provision for the President to classify information if he finds such classification to be necessary for national security. If he uses this exception, however, he must communicate the details of the finding to the Congress.

USE OF MATERIALS DURING EMERGENCY

Under existing law, materials in the national stockpile can be released only on the order of the President, when, in his judgment, such release is required for the common defense. S. 28 retains that provision.

In addition, however, the President could also release stockpile materials if there is a discontinuance or interruption of foreign sources of supply of a material that could cause a dislocation of the domestic economy, when the President determines that such dislocation would be a threat to the economy.

Before this authority for release could be involved, however, the President must also determine that said release would not involve any risk to national security.

RESEARCH

The bill retains existing provisions that provide for the Secretary of the Interior to undertake investigations of domestic ore and minerals in an effort to develop additional sources of supply, to devise new methods for the utilization of reserves, and to develop substitutes for ores and minerals not available in needed quantities. Similar authority is provided for the Secretary of Agriculture regarding agricultural materials.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND DISPOSITION OF RECEIPTS

The bill authorizes appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of the legislation and provides that reimbursements received from the sale or other disposal of materials under the bill shall be placed in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Special exemptions are provided where the funds from any sale may be used to pay the costs of rotation, refining, handling, and transportation, or of acquisition to meet stockpile objectives.

Mr. President, for the reasons presented above, and in an effort to place this stockpile program on a more businesslike basis, I urge approval of this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my able and distinguished friend from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator has called attention to the fact that we have approximately a $5 billion excess inventory, I understand, of so-called strategic materials, materials which were originally procured on that basis but for which we have no further use.

Under the bill, will there be a further addition to these stockpiles of any materials already in excess of our defense needs?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. The bill provides that no materials can be purchased unless necessary to provide for the requirements of the national stockpile.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was my understanding that there would be no further addition to the stockpiling of materials of which we already have an oversupply.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I congratulate the Senator from Missouri and his committee for bringing forth this bill. I believe that it is proper for Congress to provide an authority for the executive branch to proceed with the orderly liquidation of the excess stockpile. Surely, it must be achieved without disrupting our markets, but as I read the bill I believe that is adequately safeguarded, to protect domestic industries. At the same time, it seems to me that we cannot afford to keep this $5 billion excess inventory on hand when we have no use for it.

I am very much in favor of granting this authority. I would go further, and even give a little additional authority, as requested by the executive branch.

It may be that we would not have to wait the 60 days, or what could develop into 100 days, before disposing of the excess. However, I believe it to be an acceptable and reasonable compromise among those who wished all the authority to remain with Congress.

I enthusiastically support the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able friend, the Senator from Delaware, who has been following the stockpile question closely over the years, and who is an expert in this field. I greatly appreciate what he says.

Those who contest the relinquishing of some congressional authority do not realize that many materials, in vast quantities, are in the Defense Production Act stockpile. For the first time they now come under congressional control.

There is one reservation with respect to something I told the Senator from Delaware. I like to be accurate in facts with him, because he is an expert in facts. Under the provisions of the bill there can be bartering by the executive branch for agricultural products in return for metals and minerals held by other countries.

In that case there could be temporarily under the Commodity Credit Corporation, and permanently under the Supplemental Stockpile Act, additions of metals and minerals beyond what might be required by the national stockpile.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand; but it is also my understanding that that situation could only develop when we were trading one surplus commodity for another surplus commodity, which we thought could be acquired better under the long-term inventory.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes. It is understood—and there is colloquy to support this statement—that we will attempt not to barter in excess agricultural commodities for materials already in supply, or in potential supply, through mining facilities in this country. For example, we would rather barter for manganese and chromium than for, say, lead or zinc.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding. It is my understanding that we are supposed to barter agricultural commodities only if we cannot sell them for dollars or on more favorable terms.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Delaware very much, for his support.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the pending legislation represents the end product of a very long and tedious study on the part of the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator SYMINGTON, on his long, patient, and diligent work on this legislation. It has been a pleasure to work with him on this legislation, and he is to be commended for his untiring efforts in this neglected area.

Much has been said concerning the quantity and the quality of the strategic and critical material which has been stockpiled against a national emergency. The investigation conducted by the subcommittee disclosed transactions of questionable value to the Government and the acquisition of material far in excess of any foreseeable requirements.

The pending legislation is intended to protect against future occurrences of this type. S. 28 is designed to simplify acquisitions and disposals from the stockpile and consolidate the stockpiles as much as is feasible under the circumstances. The bill lays down more meaningful guidelines than are contained in present law. For example, it defines the types of national emergency for which stockpiling is authorized as: "(a) any period during which the United States is engaged in armed hostilities with a foreign nation; or (b) any period following a nuclear attack on the United States when such materials are required for the industrial and economic recovery of the United States."

One of the most desirable changes which this bill would bring about would be the full disclosure to Congress of stockpile objectives, levels, acquisitions, and disposals. One of the major difficulties of the present law is the lack of public knowledge of the objectives and acquisitions. Notification to Congress will not only provide for legislative oversight, but will mean that the public will be fully aware of just what is occurring in connection with our national stockpile reserves, except where security interests prevent full and free public disclosure. In this event, the information will still be made available to the appropriate committees of Congress under procedures that protect the classification.

One of the most perplexing problems with which the subcommittee had to deal was the question of a proper method of disposals. While everyone recognized the necessity of an orderly disposal program, there are also market considerations involved. Under no circumstances should Congress allow indiscriminate disposals which might tend to disrupt prevailing market prices and practices. In addition, the need was felt for an appropriate legislative oversight of disposals, but not to the extent of unduly hampering or impeding proposed disposals. With this in mind, the subcommittee adopted the language beginning on the bottom of page 14 and continuing through page 16. These provisions, suggested by myself, represent a reasonable middle ground between a requirement for affirmative congressional action on each disposal and a complete abdication of legislative responsibility over disposals.

It is my firm belief that S. 28, if administered properly, would provide the tools for more orderly and economic management of the stockpile program. I recommend its passage by the Senate.

I commend the able Senator from Missouri for his excellent service in connection with the proposed legislation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. He was not on the floor earlier when I previously took the liberty of thanking him for his fine compromise suggestion with respect to the congressional picture in this legislation. I mention again appreciation for his fine, constructive work in the months we worked together on this problem.

Except for a special investigation, when a chief counsel was appointed temporarily, along with two assistant counsels and some staff members, this stockpile matter has been handled by the regular staff of the Armed Services Committee.

In this connection, I am sure all members of the subcommittee want to thank an able and distinguished lawyer, Mr. Richmond Coburn, for his work as chief counsel for the committee. The cost of that special investigation has been met by money returned to the Government by some of those who previously furnished metals and materials to the Government under the Stockpile Act.

Except for that investigation, we were able to handle these problems in the fashion I have indicated, because of the work of the regular members of the Armed Services Committee's staff, and because of the outstanding work of the legislative assistant of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Fred Buzhardt. I would also express my appreciation, and the appreciation of the committee, for his efforts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Missouri for the fine work he has done in undertaking this long and arduous task.

The Senator will recall that the bill was reported by the Armed Services Committee last year but, because of the pressure of time, the Senate was unable to take it up during that period. I am delighted that the Senator held hearings and that the measure has now been reported unanimously by his subcommittee and unanimously by the Armed Services Committee, and that it is now before the Senate for consideration. Much credit should go to him and to his colleagues on the committee for the fine work which has been done on this particular measure, which is of vital importance not only to the defense of the Nation, but also to the welfare of the mining industry as a whole, if they would but see it.

The Senator may recall that a number of my colleagues in the Senate and I introduced legislation earlier this year seeking to bring about a loan of 100,000 short tons of copper from the stockpile to domestic producers for the purpose of filling in the gap until supply and demand met.

The Senator from Missouri has some other ideas, which concern the sale of copper from the stockpile to fulfill the same purpose.

Is my understanding correct that the Senator from Missouri, the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves intends to undertake, once the pending measure has been disposed of, to go into that question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the able majority leader has been constructive and helpful in this matter. The first next order of business of the subcommittee after the passage of this bill, will be an effort to handle the sale of 100,000 tons of surplus copper to the industry.

Industry wants this copper. The Government can sell it at a price favorable to the taxpayers so there is no reason why we cannot move it.

In the past, when material was loaned through diversion, the question arose as to who would absorb the profit, et cetera. Many people in my State would like to see this copper into industry as soon as possible.

I assure the able senior Senator from Montana that after this bill is passed, what he has suggested will be done as quickly as possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The assurance of the distinguished Senator from Missouri is enough for my colleague from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] and me, and I assume also for the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. What the Senator from Missouri has, in effect, said is that action will be taken on this particular commodity as soon as possible, after the bill is passed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Right; and I thank the majority leader for his support.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy. I congratulate him on the many hours that he has spent on the bill.

I come from a mining State, as does the majority leader. Mining is a very important industry in our State. Obviously we do not wish anything in a bill which could depress an already depressed industry. Based upon that assumption, I should like to ask certain questions which have come to me and which, for the record, I should like to have answered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be glad to try to answer any questions. I also come from a mining State, and believe my State is perhaps the largest producer of lead and zinc, and am in complete sympathy with the problems of the mining industry. Since we have been talking about copper, I point out that the fabricators of copper in Missouri have been consistently paying more than 60 cents a pound for copper on the gray market; whereas the producers' price is some 34 cents. Therefore, if we are to move some of the materials with which we are now concerned, in the interest of industry and at the same time the taxpayer, now is the time to do it.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator's statement leads into one of the questions that I desire to ask. I assume the Senator realizes that I have received a number of communications indicating that the General Services Administration would have the power to dispose of stockpiled material at below domestic market prices, thereby further depressing the market.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I invite the Senator's attention to page 13 of the bill, where there appears language inserted at the request of the industry. Item 13 is:

> (13) sell, at fair market value, materials in such inventory which are no longer required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The other last-minute change is the last item on page 19.

The language is as follows:

> (d) Wherever the term "fair market value" is used in this Act, it shall be construed to mean not less than the current domestic market price unless the President shall determine that such a construction is inconsistent with the purposes of this Act.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator for clearing up that point. I believe that that will be of substantial assistance in trying to explain the bill.

I should like to go a little further and ask the Senator if he can tell me what was in the minds of members of the committee when they said, "domestic market price, unless the President shall determine that such a construction is inconsistent with the purposes of this act." Obviously that language would give the President quite a few "outs."

Mr. SYMINGTON. In reply to the Senator from Colorado, I point out we rushed the committee report in order to expedite the wishes of industry. We received the printed report only today. I read from said report:

> The amendments are intended to allay any concern that excess materials might be applied and sold at prices that would be disruptive of orderly markets. The authority for the President to determine that the definition should not apply is intended to provide protection against artificial prices and frustration of the basic purposes of the legislation. This authority would also be conclusive when there is uncertainty or controversy over the current domestic market prices.

As the able Senator from Colorado knows, it is difficult to know exactly the exact market price of some materials at a precise time.

Years ago we found that the price of tin was determined by a gentleman appearing on a veranda in Singapore who said, "The price of tin today is so much"—without any quotations.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wondered whether the particular provision which the Senator read would take care of the gray market situation in copper, to which the Senator referred. Is that the type of situation in which the President would authorize the disposal of the material below the market price?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I cannot speak for the executive branch, but believe that the administration would be anxious to dispose of copper at the producers' price, which at the present time is far less than the gray market price.

It is 34 cents. Presumably the Government would feel that the producers were obligated in turn to dispose of the copper to the fabricators at that market price so that the fabricators, who might have estimated their cost on the basis of the producers' price would not suffer unusual loss.

The bill is clear that the President could not sell materials out of the stockpile without taking into account the position of industry and the economy. Therefore, I would add to the statement in report that inasmuch as the bill is primarily a bill having to do with the security of the United States, the President should be allowed under this proposed legislation to consider that factor when he makes decision.

Mr. DOMINICK. But the Senator would not anticipate that the price would be below the producers' price in that situation in any event.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would not anticipate it would happen in copper. But at times there might be great surpluses of material—hundreds of millions of dollars worth of a particular material—for which there would be no demand unless it were sold below a stated market price.

I am thinking of rubber. There was a day when synthetic rubber was inferior in quality to and more expensive than natural rubber. First the quality of synthetic was improved. Then the price was cut, finally to a point at which synthetic rubber competed favorably with natural rubber, for any use except heavy duty tires.

Recently industry has developed a synthetic rubber even better for heavy duty tires. Therefore there is no market for that natural rubber, unless it be sold at a reduced price.

I might add that originally this rubber was purchased to bolster the economies of certain foreign countries.

Based upon testimony before our subcommittee, whereas we still hold some 686 million of rubber in our stockpile, all other countries have sold every pound of rubber in their stockpiles. In cases like that I should think the executive branch would be justified in acting to move this rubber even below a quoted market price.

There are other cases. I can think of a relatively rare metal I would prefer not to identify. It is not produced in the State of Colorado or in my own State. It was purchased at prices as low as $16 and sold into the stockpile at prices as high as $60.

There is relatively little demand for that particular metal now. A great many millions of dollars worth of it is in stockpile. If it were sold, I am sure the price might fall. There must be discretion in the General Services Administration to determine whether or not they can sell below a set price on a material of this character. However, in the field of copper, for example, I am confident the President would desire to do little that would disrupt the market in any significant manner.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more on another point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I notice that the President would practically have control and discretion to determine what is or what is not a strategic and/or necessary material.

A few days ago I introduced a bill to set aside 500 million ounces of silver from Treasury stock and for defense purposes.

Am I to understand from the bill that Congress has no right so to legislate at this point, and that the only thing that could occur would be that the President must determine the amount and whether the material is strategic or critical?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am sure Congress has the right to pass any legislation it desires, also the right to repass legislation over an Executive veto.

The stockpile originated originally as the result of estimates by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to what their weapons, and so forth, requirements would be for national defense. That was then determined logistically by the Munitions Board in the Department of Defense, which thereupon submitted its decision to the National Security Resources Board, now the Office of Emergency Planning.

As a result of such decision, which also had to, in effect, be approved by various other departments, operating instructions were and are issued to the General Services Administration. The GSA then purchases said materials in the best interests of the Government.

If the silver in question were not essential for defense needs, it would not be a part of the national stockpile. This is strictly a national defense, national security act.

Mr. DOMINICK. As the Senator from Missouri knows, a rapid decline is occurring in the Treasury stock of silver. Consumption of silver in the United States is six times our production; consumption worldwide, by twice the production. We have a great need for silver in defensive weapons that we now have on hand, including those being built, such as the Polaris submarine.

If the consumption of silver continues at the present rate, even the Treasury indicates that we shall be completely out of the Treasury stock of silver by 1967. I believe the time will come sooner than that, which is the reason why I introduced the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Colorado knows much more about silver than I. From what he says, I should be inclined to support his bill to purchase silver. But unless a real need arose for silver for such uses as Polaris submarines, I think there would be question whether it came under this bill. In other words, there must be a need for it for the defense of the United States, as determined by the proper authorities. If there were such a need, silver would immediately come under the terms of this bill. To the best of my knowledge, there has never been any gold or silver stored in the national stockpile.

Mr. DOMINICK. This is a little different situation, because the Government already owns the silver. The silver is already in stock. I am trying to prevent the Government from selling it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the requirements of the Government are half what the Senator from Colorado says they are, from the standpoint of needing additional silver, I believe I can understand his strong apprehension concerning the sale of silver at this time, or at any time relatively soon.

Mr. DOMINICK. Silver is being sold every day on the redemption of silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes. The bullion goes out to industrial users all over the country. The Government's stock of silver is being drained. There is not enough silver for coinage. We shall probably have to demonitize our coins. I wish to make certain that the bill would not suddenly take from the hands of Congress the right to decide whether silver should be set aside, and allow the President to decide before taking any action.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. If the Senator will read the bill carefully, he will find that the President is required within 6 months after the bill is passed to give Congress the criteria as to what he believes is necessary.

I am sympathetic with the Senator's position, but honestly do not believe the question of silver is under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee of which I am chairman, a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who has been most helpful on this problem over the years. I express my deep appreciation to him.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves, I am glad to join in urging the approval of the pending bill. The distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has rendered a great service to our Nation and to every American taxpayer by his superb leadership in seeking the orderly disposal of huge surpluses held up in the national stockpile and no longer serving any useful purpose for our national security and welfare.

S. 28 represents the legislative recommendations that resulted from an inquiry into the strategic and critical materials stickpiles of the United States that was conducted by this subcommittee during 1962 and 1963. As the Senator from Missouri knows, I have had the privilege of serving on this subcommittee only since November 12, 1963, but my examination of the record of this study has convinced me that there is room for much improvement in the management and administration of these stockpiles.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], has already made a full explanation of the provisions of S. 28 and the changes it will produce in the stockpiles. Consequently, I shall not attempt to repeat the provisions of the bill in detail.

It is sufficient to state that the Government now owns several different stockpiles of materials that were accumulated for different purposes and are controlled by somewhat different laws. The quantity of materials in these stockpiles is greatly in excess of any predictable Government requirement. Some of the materials are urgently needed by private industry at this time. When the

Government owns excess materials valued at more than $5 billion, it seems highly desirable to encourage an orderly disposal of the surplus, not only to recapture as much of the Government's investment as possible, but to release materials that the Government does not require but are critically important to the continued smooth functioning of our economy.

The pending bill should improve stockpile management through consolidation and it should make disposals easier. At the same time, it protects against needless disruption of markets.

I also applaud the provisions subjecting stockpiling contracts to renegotiation and prohibiting contracts for the acquisition of strategic and critical materials if the quantity of the material to be acquired under such contract would cause the stockpile objective for the material to be exceeded.

As the subcommittee chairman has outlined, the bill retains for the Congress the power to disapprove proposed disposals, but no longer will the Congress have to act on each proposed disposal of excess materials from the national stockpile.

Mr. President, I highly commend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for rendering a real and needful public service, and other members of the subcommittee for their diligent efforts in prosecuting the stockpile inquiry and in formulating legislative recommendations to improve stockpile management. I strongly urge that the Senate approve the bill.

I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator for his statement. He is known in this body for courage and devotion to detail. I sum up my appreciation for his remarks by saying the bill as is would not have come before the Senate today if it had not been for the constructive suggestions of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first, I want to commend my distinguished colleague the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for the great amount of time and effort he has put into his investigation of the Federal Government's stockpiling activities.

The bill which the Senate is considering this afternoon, S. 28, will undoubtedly bring a great deal of order into what is now a chaotic, and often disgraceful, stockpiling situation.

One of the reasons I decided to take the floor and speak briefly is to pledge my support to prompt Senate approval of S. 28. A consolidation of the stockpiles and a reorganization of stockpiling procedures is needed and I expect that S. 28 can and will do the job.

The other reason for my desire to speak today is to have an opportunity to ask a question of the Senator from Missouri.

As he knows, I have introduced a bill to release 150,000 short tons of zinc from the Federal stockpiles. I am also a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, to release on a loan basis of 100,000 short tons of copper.

In the case of both of these metals, there is an acute need for prompt availability to American industry.

I am very frank to say that my interest rises from the need of the industry in my State which, as the Senator knows, to a very great extent involves the brass industry.

Since these emergency situations are not covered by the general stockpiling bill, I want to ask the Senior Senator from Missouri if he has plans to consider the zinc and copper bills soon so that they may be taken up by the Senate at an early date?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am glad to inform my able friend, the senior Senator from Connecticut, there was a colloquy with the majority leader with respect to copper prior to our having the good fortune to have the senior Senator from Connecticut appear in the Chamber.

I assured the Senator from Montana that we shall do our best to expedite the copper situation. I think the passage of this bill in turn makes it much easier to obtain copper, if it is in excess, as it is today, to what is needed by the Government.

I assure the Senator that we shall adopt the same policy with regard to lead and zinc.

The passage through Congress of this bill is a great step forward in obtaining those metals owned by the Government, in excess of Government demands, and which are in turn in demand by industry.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator for his statement. This means a good deal to industries in Connecticut which employ thousands of people. It is a critical situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The amendments were—On page 13, line 11, after the word "sell", to insert a comma and "at fair market value,", and on page 19, after line 7, to insert:

(d) Wherever the term "fair market value" is used in this Act, it shall be construed to mean not less than the current domestic market price unless the President shall determine that such a construction is inconsistent with the purposes of this Act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1965."

SEC. 2. (a) The President of the United States shall determine from time to time, as provided in this Act, the types and kinds of materials that are strategic and critical to the national security and defense of the United States. As used in this Act the term "strategic and critical material" means any natural or synthetic material, ore, or metal (1) which would be required to meet the national defense needs of the country during the following national emergencies:

(A) Any period during which the United States is engaged in armed hostilities with a foreign nation;

(B) Any period following a nuclear attack on the United States when such materials are required for the industrial and economic recovery of the United States; and

(2) which would not be readily available in sufficient quantities from domestic or other sources during such periods.

(b) The President shall determine from time to time the form, subject to the limitations prescribed in section 2(a) hereof, and the quality and quantity of each strategic and critical material which shall be acquired and held in an inventory for use in times of national emergency. Such inventory shall be known as the national stockpile. No determination made by the President under this section shall become effective until the expiration of thirty days after such determination has been communicated, in writing, to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(c) The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, and the Administrator of General Services shall advise the President with respect to which materials are strategic and critical and with respect to the form, quality, and quantity in which such materials should be acquired and held in the national stockpile.

(d) The quantity of any strategic and critical material which the President determines is to be acquired for the national stockpile shall be known as the "stockpile objective" for such material.

(e) In determining the stockpile objective for any strategic and critical material, the President shall take into consideration such factors as he deems appropriate, but shall specifically consider what the military requirements of the Nation will be during a national emergency (including the industrial requirements for national defense purposes), and shall consider and make appropriate allowance for any quantities of such material which can reasonably be expected to be available to this Nation from domestic and other sources during a national emergency. Any such allowance shall be based upon known facts and the best intelligence information available to the President for estimating the requirements for, and the probable availability of, such material during a national emergency. The President shall, within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, issue an order or regulation setting forth the criteria to be considered in determining the stockpile objectives for any strategic and critical material. The order or regulation issued by the President pursuant to the requirement of this subsection and any amendment to such order or regulation shall not become effective until the expiration of sixty days after such order, regulation, or amendment has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The President shall determine the probable nature and duration of any national emergency for which strategic and critical materials held in the national stockpile may be required.

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall direct the Administrator of General Services, without regard to section 302(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 252(c)) or section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5), to—

(1) make purchases of any strategic and critical material required to meet the stockpile objective prescribed under this Act for such material, which purchases shall be made (A) insofar as practicable from supplies and materials in excess of current industrial demand, and (B) in accordance with title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520; 41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.), but no contract for the acquisition of any strategic and critical material shall be entered into under this Act if the quantity of such material to be acquired by the Government under such contract would result in the acquisition by the Government of a quantity of such material in excess of the stockpile objective for such material. Such determination shall be made on the basis of the quantity of such material currently in the national stockpile, plus any

quantity of such material to be supplied under any contract previously entered into;

(2) provide for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and critical materials in the national stockpile;

(3) provide, when the Administrator determines such action to be appropriate to meet stockpile objectives, for the refining or processing of any strategic and critical material in the national stockpile when, under a stockpile objective redetermination made pursuant to section 2 hereof, such material is no longer required in its present form to meet stockpile objectives;

(4) provide, when the Administrator determines such action to be appropriate to meet stockpile objectives, for the refining or processing of strategic and critical materials either before or after their acquisition for the national stockpile; and

(5) provide for the rotation of any strategic and critical material in the national stockpile by replacing such material with new or fresh material, substantially the same in kind and value as the material being replaced, when such action is necessary to prevent deterioration or to accomplish a change in the storage locations of such materials. Any materials to be replaced hereunder shall be disposed of at their fair market value, and any funds received on account of the rotation of such materials shall be available for carrying out the purposes of this paragraph.

(b) The provisions of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, shall apply in the case of all contracts and subcontracts entered into under authority of this Act for the acquisition, storage, security, maintenance, refining, processing, replacement, or rotation of strategic and critical materials, and the provisions of section 106 of such Act, relating to exemptions, shall not be effective with respect to such contracts and subcontracts.

(c) No strategic or critical material acquired for the national stockpile shall be refined, processed, or replaced pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section until the expiration of a period of sixty days after publication in the Federal Register and submission by the Adminstrator of General Servces to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of a written report setting forth the general plan for such refining, processing, or replacing. The President shall submit to the Congress annually a written report of actions taken by him under this section, which report shall include a statement of foreign and domestic purchases and such other information pertinent to the administration of this section as will assist the Congress in evaluating such administration and in determining the need for amending such section.

Sec. 4. Information with respect to—

(1) materials which have been determined to be strategic and critical materials within the meaning of this Act;

(2) the form, quantity, and quality of such materials in the national stockpile; and

(3) the stockpile objectives for materials designated as strategic and critical materials shall be held to be and treated as public information unless the President shall make a specific finding (which shall be communicated to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives) that the classification of such information is necessary for the protection and security of the Nation.

Sec. 5. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, materials in the national stockpile may be released for use, sale, or other disposition only—

(1) on order of the President at any time when in his judgment such release is required for purposes of the common defense, or

(2) on order of any agency designated by the President, in time of war or during a national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this Act, or

(3) on order of the President when the discontinuance or interruption of a foreign source or sources of supply of a material will cause a dislocation of the United States economy which the President determines to be a threat to the industrial and economic security of the United States: *Provided*, That the President also determines that the release of such material from the national stockpile will not constitute an immediate risk to the United States ability to defend itself in a national emergency.

Sec. 6. (a) Whenever any department or agency of the Government holds any material which is currently designated a strategic and critical material within the meaning of this Act, and the head of such department or agency determines such material to be excess to the needs of that department or agency, such material shall be transferred to the national stockpile in accordance with such regulations as the Administrator of General Services shall prescribe. A material may be transferred to the national stockpile under this subsection only to the extent that the stockpile objective for the material is not exceeded. The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply with respect to (1) any quantity of a strategic and critical material that is necessary to make up a critical deficiency of the supply thereof for meeting the current requirements of industry as determined by the President, (2) any quantity of a strategic and critical material which constitutes contractor inventory if the department or agency concerned shall not have taken possession of such inventory, and (3) any quantity of a strategic and critical material which the Administrator of General Services determines is held in lots so small as to make the transfer thereof economically impractical.

(b) Except for any expenses incident to the physical transfer of any materials transferred pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, no charge shall be made against, and no reimbursement shall be made from, any funds made available for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 7. (a) There is hereby established an inventory to be known as the materials reserve inventory which shall be comprised of (1) materials in the custody of the Administrator of General Services which were heretofore or which are hereafter acquired pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061–2166), and (2) materials which are in, or but for this section would have been placed in, the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Any notes payable to the Secretary of the Treasury representing the acquisition costs of any materials transferred to and made a part of the materials reserve inventory pursuant to clause (1) above shall, together with any obligations for unpaid interest thereon, be canceled, and the aggregate amount of borrowing authority which may be outstanding at any one time under section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 shall be reduced in an amount equal to the amount of any notes so canceled. Any materials transferred to the materials reserve inventory under clauses (1) and (2) above shall be transferred without charge against or reimbursement from funds made available for carrying out this Act.

(b) The President shall direct the Administrator of General Services with respect to the materials reserve inventory to—

(1) transfer to such inventory without charge or reimbursement any materials in the national stockpile which exceed the stockpile objective determined or redetermined pursuant to section 2 of this Act;

(2) transfer to the national stockpile without charge or reimbursement any materials in the materials reserve inventory which are required to meet the stockpile objectives for such materials;

(3) exchange any materials in such inventory for materials in the national stockpile for the purpose of improving or maintaining the quality of or changing the location of materials in the national stockpile.

(4) commingle materials in the national stockpile with equivalent materials in the materials reserve inventory when the Administrator determines such action to be appropriate to accomplish the purposes of this Act;

(5) apply materials in such inventory at their fair market value toward payment of any costs incident to the refining, processing, or replacement of materials in the national stockpile when the Administrator determines such action to be appropriate to accomplish the purposes of this Act;

(6) apply, when the Administrator determines such action to be appropriate to accomplish the purposes of this Act, materials in such inventory at their fair market value toward (A) the payment of handling, transportation, and other costs incident to the rotation of materials in the national stockpile, and (B) the payment of the difference, if any, between the price received for the materials being replaced and the price of the replacement materials;

(7) provide for the storage, security, and maintenance of materials in such inventory;

(8) provide for the rotation of any materials in such inventory by replacing such materials with new or fresh materials, substantially the same in kind and value as the materials being replaced, when necessary to prevent deterioration or to accomplish a change in the storage location of materials, and utilize materials in such inventory as payment in kind at their fair market value, as determined by the Administrator, for the payment of handling, transportation, and other costs incident to such replacement and for payment of the difference, if any, between the fair market value of the materials being used for payment in kind and the price of the replacement materials;

(9) require, whenever practicable, that departments and agencies of the Government use materials from the materials reserve inventory in lieu of procuring such material from private sources;

(10) transfer any materials in such inventory to any department or agency of the Government for use by that department or agency when such use of such materials has been determined by the Administrator pursuant to clause (9) of this subsection to be practicable;

(11) abandon, destroy, or donate to public bodies materials in such inventory which have no commercial value or which do not have sufficient commercial value to justify the cost of further care and handling or making them suitable for transfer or sale;

(12) apply materials in such inventory at their fair market value toward the acquisition of strategic and critical materials required to meet current stockpile objectives when the Administrator determines such action to be appropriate to accomplish the purposes of this Act; and

(13) sell, at fair market value, materials in such inventory which are no longer required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The General Services Administration shall be reimbursed for any materials transferred pursuant to subsection (b) (10) of this section in an amount equal to the fair market value, as determined by the Administrator of General Services, of the materials so transferred.

(d) Any sale, exchange, or other disposal of materials made pursuant to subsection (b) (12) or (13) of this section shall be made with due regard for protecting (1) the United States against avoidable loss, (2) producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets, and (3) the foreign relations of the United States. Procedures shall be followed in disposing of any material under this Act which will, insofar as practicable, prevent the material being disposed of from being acquired, directly or indirectly, by Communist-controlled nations, if such material would not otherwise be available to such nations from other sources and the acquisition of such material by such nations would be detrimental to the national security of the United States. Any such sale shall be subject to the provisions of section 203(e), except paragraph (6), of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services may restrict disposals by publicly advertised competitive bids, or by negotiation of any quantity of materials to a particular class of potential purchasers or any segment thereof, including but not limited to domestic users, small business, holders of priority-rated orders, and domestic consumers, if he determines that such action is necessary to accomplish the purposes of section 7(d) (1), (2), or (3), hereof, or otherwise is necessary in the public interest in time of war and during any national emergency, or will promote the public health, safety, or national security, or is necessary to relieve a critical shortage in the domestic industry, or is in the best interest of the national economy.

(e) (1) No sale, exchange, or other disposal may be made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) (12) or (13) of this section until the later of the following: (A) the expiration of sixty calendar days following the date on which notice of the proposed sale has been published in the Federal Register, or (B) the expiration of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which written notice of the proposed sale has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives. Tne written notice required to be given said committees shall include a detailed explanation of the manner in which the proposed sale meets the criteria set out in section 7(d) of this Act. Such proposed sale may then be made after the expiration of such sixty-day period unless either of said committees, within that period, reports a resolution recommending that the proposed sale be disapproved by the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be. If either of such committees, within that period, reports a resolution and it is not adopted by the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, within the first forty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress from the date on which such resolution is reported, the proposed sale may be made on any day after the expiration of such forty-day period. For the purposes of this subsection, a session may be considered as not continuous only if broken by an adjournment of Congress sine die. However, in computing the period that Congress is in continuous session, days that the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are not counted.

(2)(A) For purposes of this section, any resolution reported to the Senate or the House of Representatives pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be treated for the purposes of consideration by either House in the same manner as a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan reported by a committee within the meaning of the Reorganization Act of 1949 as in effect on July 1, 1958 (5 U.S.C. 133z et seq.), and shall be governed by the provisions applicable to the consideration of any such resolution by either House of the Congress as provided by sections 205 and 206 of that Act.

(B) The provisions of this paragraph are enacted by the Congress—

(i) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(ii) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (as far as relating to the procedure in that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence, the development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its territories or insular possessions, which materials are determined pursuant to section 2 hereof to be strategic and critical and the quantities or grades of which are inadequate from known domestic sources in order to determine and develop domestic sources of supply, to devise new methods for the treatment and utilization of lower grade reserves, and to develop substitutes for such essential ores and mineral products, on public lands and on privately owned lands, with the consent of the owner, to explore and demonstrate the extent and quality of deposits of such minerals, including core drilling, trenching, test-pitting, shaft sinking, drifting, crosscutting, sampling, and metallurgical investigations and tests as may be necessary to determine the extent and quality of such deposits, the most suitable methods of mining and beneficiating them, and the cost at which the minerals or metals may be produced.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations of the feasibility of developing domestic sources of supplies of any agricultural material or for using agricultural commodities for the manufacture of any material determined pursuant to section 2 hereof to be strategic and critical or substitutes therefor.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 10. Except as otherwise provided herein, any funds hereafter received on account of sales or other dispositions of materials under the provisions of this Act shall be placed into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 11. (a) The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended (53 Stat. 811; 50 U.S.C. 98a–h), is hereby repealed. All materials held in the national stockpile under authority of such Act on the date of enactment of this Act shall, on such date, become a part of the national stockpile or the materials reserve inventory authorized under this Act.

(b) Any contract which was entered into under authority of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended, and which has not been fully executed on the date of enactment of this Act, shall be carried out by the Administrator of General Services in the same manner and to the same extent as if such Act had not been repealed, but any materials acquired pursuant to such contract shall become a part of the national stockpile.

(c) Any disposal plan authorized pursuant to the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended, and which has not been fully executed on the date of enactment of this Act, shall be carried out by the Administrator of General Services under authority of this Act, without regard to provisions of subsection (a) hereof.

(d) Wherever the term "fair market value" is used in this Act, it shall be construed to mean not less than the current domestic market price unless the President shall determine that such a construction is inconsistent with the purposes of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there are no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall address a series of inquiries to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri. First, I wish to point out the most constructive role which he has carried with respect to stockpiling. It is a matter of gratitude for all of us. In a real sense, the Senator has been the steward of the whole Senate on this very critical matter.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I appreciate deeply the remarks of the able senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have already acquainted the Senator with what I consider to be an important question in relation to this bill, namely, the possibility of the sale of excess stockpile materials by the executive branch to friendly foreign countries, particularly the NATO countries.

May I first ask the Senator: Have there been any significant sales of excess stockpile materials to such countries in recent years?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know of any particular situation of that character. I do know of some heavy barter transactions made with friendly nations. For example, 100,000 tons of lead were bartered for surplus agricultural commodities. In that case I believe the two chief beneficiaries were Australia and Canada. But, there is nothing in the bill, to the best of my knowledge, which would prevent the President from selling excess materials to foreign countries, including NATO countries.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is a provision in the bill which would authorize the Administrator to restrict this to a particular class of potential purchasers, or any segment thereof.

I gather that the senior Senator from Missouri feels that that provision would not prohibit sales to friendly countries.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; it would not. The possible danger to the domestic producers—and I believe with justification, as the senior Senator from New York knows, because in addition to being an outstanding lawyer, he has also had extensive business experience—would be that after the material is, in effect, dumped abroad, it could be brought back into this country at prices which would affect our own economy. That was one of the basic purposes behind that part of this legislation, to prevent such a possibility.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the real nub as to whether the material ought to be sold to foreign friendly countries or NATO countries involves the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. Offers of excess stockpile materials might induce some countries to create a domestic stockpile of their own.

The question would hinge on the flexibility of the friendly countries with regard to the price at which sales could be made, assuming we were given full protection against the return of the materials to this market, or its utilization in the world market in such a way as to depress prices, or in any other way which would be adverse to the general economy.

The committee report, as I see it, has made it clear that the term "fair market value" means not less than the current domestic market price. With respect to a number of commodities, there are world prices which may be less than the current domestic market price.

At the same time I notice that the committee has sought to give the President some degree of freedom of action by its provision that the President may—and I refer to the language on page 19, lines 8 to 12—determine that such construction—namely that "fair market value" means the current domestic price or above—is inconsistent with the purposes of this act.

In that connection, would it be considered one of the purposes of this act to dispose of, in a very constructive way, surpluses which were of no use to the United States in the stockpiling program?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe so. For the record, let me read briefly the purposes of the bill.

First, the bill is intended to provide more statutory guidance on the purposes for which materials would be stockpiled.

Second, provide for disclosure to Congress and the public pertinent information on the management of the stockpiles.

Third, revise and consolidate the laws relating to stockpile management.

Fourth, permit disposals of surplus material without requiring congressional action on each, while retaining for the Congress the power to disapprove proposed disposals.

Fifth, make contracts for furnishing materials to the stockpile subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended.

Then there is a paragraph under the explanation of the amendments in the report:

> The amendments are intended to allay any concern that excess materials might be applied and sold at prices that would be disruptive of orderly markets. The authority for the President to determine that the definition should not apply is intended to provide protection against artificial prices and frustration of the basic purposes of the legislation. This authority would also be conclusive when there is uncertainty or controversy over the current domestic market prices.

Mr. JAVITS. What I am envisioning is a situation in which certain NATO countries which hold large dollar credit balances could be persuaded to return some of these dollars to the United States in exchange for excess materials from our stockpile. To be arbitrary, let us assume that $1 billion could be involved in the purchase of excess materials by a NATO country which could serve as the basis of a stockpile within that NATO country. It would have the advantage of relieving some of the burden of our international payments and of strategically establishing a stockpile in a friendly NATO country, thus decentralizing the implications of the stockpile, and also freezing it in the hands of the country for which it would be a strategic reserve of a material which is surplus to us, but not to that country.

Under those circumstances, it might very well be that the world market price would be inconsistent with the domestic price of the particular material. The President, under suitable conditions and assuring against return of the material to the United States without approval of the United States, might have to negotiate a price which might be somewhat more than that related to the world price. There is a great amount of interest involved in doing that, if it could be done.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Based on what the Senator from New York has said provided the material sold did not later appear for sale or use in this country, without question the President could do it. I believe also that, under the terms of the bill, Congress would have a right to take a look at the transaction.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. That is why I was about to say that, in our legislative intent, it should be made clear that section 11(d) is not completely restrictive, because Congress could prevent a sale from happening, and Congress has given itself full protection. Surely it cannot be said that there is too much freedom of action allowed the Executive in this bill in view of the fact that future disposals will be subject to approval by the Congress.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator has in mind some of the conutries which have recently been selling dollars for gold, that they would obtain some of these materials instead of the gold, I surely would join with him, as I am also sure would other Senators.

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly what I had in mind. I wanted to be sure when we were giving ourselves greater freedom of action we would not be restricting ourselves under the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from New York. His remarks are most constructive. What he says in this overall connection has to do with something many Americans are thinking about.

Mr. JAVITS. I assure the Senator that I will join in any effort in that direction, and I know of no more effective ally than the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Many thanks. May I add one thought for the consideration of the able Senator. We have materials which are world materials, of which there is much world production. We would hope such materials were not sold at the world price to Europe, then shipped back to the United States. The Senator from New York understands that problem.

Mr. JAVITS. I do.

Mr. SYMINGTON. With the exception of that type of reservation, what he has said is both accurate and constructive.

We have discussed the subject of currency. I notice in the Sunday newspapers that whereas world trade increased from $48 billion in 1938 to $298 billion in 1964, since 1938 the increase in gold has been only from $25.9 billion to $39.9 billion.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question that we are being stretched on a new "cross of gold," probably more so than in the days of William Jennings Bryan; and unless we apply ourselves to finding a way in which the world credit mechanism can be used without being restricted by a completely artificial standard, we are going to be doing many things that are harmful. We have not yet found a way to base credit on production and resources, which is what we do domestically, but cannot seem to accomplish internationally. We face a great challenge. The international methods of payment cannot be met by a series of regressive actions which could very well touch off a real worldwide depression or recession.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his able contribution.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, on behalf of the copper users of my State, I commend the Senator from Missouri on the legislation which he has conceived, and steered to passage. I am glad to have supported this bill. Several factories in New York have been forced to curtail operations and furlough workers because of the copper shortage. S. 28, however, will allow all copper in excess of national stockpile needs to be transferred to the materials reserve inventory; and it directs that materials in that inventory, no longer needed to carry out the purposes of the act, be sold at fair market value. When enacted into law, this bill will allow the sale to domestic users of over 200,000 tons of copper—more than enough to solve the present problems of copper fabricators and users all over the country. Copper-using employers will thus be able to expand their operations, providing increased employment opportunity. The major impact in New York State will be felt in the Rome area.

The legislation, of course, includes appropriate safeguards against precipitous sale or other disposal of critical materials. I, was therefore, very pleased by Senator SYMINGTON's assurance to the majority leader that he would take whatever action is necessary to insure the speedy sale to the public of at least 100,000 tons of copper ingot.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 28) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I congratulate the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on the outstanding service he and his committee have rendered on the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1965, which has just been passed.

I am delighted that, in his colloquy with my colleague the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], and later in his statement to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], he said he and his committee were going to hold prompt hearings on the copper bill that my colleague [Mr. MANSFIELD] and others have introduced. I congratulate the Senator for his interest in the mining States.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator, a great expert in the mining field, for his kind remarks.

AID FOR THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the closing remarks on the bill (S. 28) which has just been passed, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] stated that we were now being stretched on a cross of gold.

The gold miners of the Nation have long been stretched on the cross of gold. Indeed they have been crucified. It is pertinent that the issue be raised at this time, as it has been raised before in several sessions of the Congress, and will be in the future, and we are engaged in other aspects of the gold problem.

This is not a partisan matter. The crucifixion has taken place equally under Republican and Democratic administrations. The gold miners of the Nation have been and are subject to unique discrimination—a strange paradox under our free enterprise system.

Alone among all the industries and activities of our society, this one industry is rigidly confined by Government fiat to a price established 30 years ago, and is compelled to sell only to the one agency which has imposed this strangulation; namely, the Federal Government.

As a result, this once great industry which was developed in the West in the great States of California and Colorado, and of course in Alaska, in South Dakota, and other Western States, is on the point of being extinguished, with the result that gold miners have been thrown out of work, as our Nation's gold supply steadily dwindles.

For several years, efforts have been made to find a remedy, which has always fallen afoul of the strange concept in the minds of those who control the Treasury Department—and this applies to Secretaries of the Treasury under both Republican and Democratic administrations—that any attempt to aid the gold miners would somehow have a disastrous effect on the monetary value of gold and on the dollar, although the varieties of legislation which have been introduced repeatedly, not only by me but also by others, in order to provide a remedy, have nothing whatever to do with the price of gold. The sponsors of the proposed legislation have repeatedly and emphatically disclaimed any attempt to tamper with the gold price and with the stability of the dollar. These attempts at legislation failing, efforts have been made repeatedly to urge Secretaries of the Treasury, whoever they were, in both Republican and Democratic administrations, if they could not subscribe to the proposed legislation, at least to come forward with an alternative which would prevent the gold miners from being permanently unemployed and this once great industry from vanishing from the American scene.

I invite the attention of the minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], to the fact that the gold mines of his State have virtually ceased operation. They have also virtually ceased operation in the State of Alaska and some time since in the State of Colorado. A few elsewhere are barely hanging on but must soon close unless relief is forthcoming.

It is unthinkable that successive administrations cannot come forward with a valid and reasonable proposal to prevent this unique discrimination—unique under our free enterprise system—and permit a once great industry, important to the economy—not important merely as a monetary standard but important increasingly in industry—to survive.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to avail myself of the opportunity to indicate my enthusiastic approval of the interest which the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is taking in this subject.

I come from a State which is known historically as a great gold-producing State. Everyone knows the story of the gold which came from the State of California to the Lincoln administration in time to save the Union from being cut in twain.

Today, the gold mines of my State are closed. It is a shame. It is an outrage. I would hope that perhaps two members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this year might proceed to hold appropriate hearings on the subject.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] who has on every occasion been a warm supporter and advocate of every kind of legislation that would attempt to bring back the gold mining industry.

I am hopeful that with his support, and the support of others similarly interested, we may be able at long last to secure some kind of constructive attitude from the Secretary of the Treasury, whoever he may be.

I confess to feeling not too hopeful, in view of this hitherto rigid, blind, nonpartisan, bipartisan refusal to face the facts. However, we shall continue our efforts, and by continuing them and refusing to consider ourselves beaten, I hope we may prevail.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—II

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in commenting yesterday on the tragic events in South Vietnam last weekend, I stated:

> Much of the news thus far released from South Vietnam, the Pentagon, and the White House raises many more questions than it answers.

News releases since then concerning the tragic assault on our base and airfield at Pleiku still continue to raise many questions and make the circumstances surrounding the attack "curiouser and curiouser."

Some of these questions were posed in Mr. Charles Mohr's column published in the New York Times yesterday, which was printed in the RECORD yesterday at the conclusion of my remarks.

One question posed by Mr. Mohr was:

> The question is, therefore, that if the Vietcong unit at Pleiku was—as is so often the case—using captured weapons, would this sustain the argument that North Vietnam made possible this particular attack?

Mr. Mohr also questioned the size and intensity of the attack. He stated:

> Administration sources also contend that the size and intensity of the attack indicated that it was a major blow carefully timed by Hanoi. Yet reports from the field indicate that a company—or less—of Vietcong troops took part in the bloody but brief encounter.

According to a further report published in today's New York Times and emanating from the Pentagon, the attacking force numbered only 100—1 Vietcong company.

I ask unanimous consent that this report as it was published in the New York Times this morning, entitled "U.S. Aides Praise Pleiku Defenders," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a further question raised by Mr. Mohr was—

> whether South Vietnamese security troops were ignoring long-standing American advice to increase night patrols.

According to the Times report, the—

> outermost perimeter defense was 2 to 2½ miles from the inner perimeter surrounding the compound with barbed wire.

Where were the patrols in this outermost perimeter defense area?

Still another question asked by Mr. Mohr—

> is why all three attack carriers of the U.S. 7th Fleet were in the South China Sea near the Vietnamese coast at the same time. The usual pattern is one of dispersal, with each carrier operating off different parts of east Asia.

The United States has suffered one Pearl Harbor. It cannot risk a second and the concentration of our carriers of the 7th Fleet in one area is an open invitation to surprise enemy attack.

The final question—

Posed by Mr. Mohr—

> is how much of the responsibility for Pleiku can be held not just to Hanoi, but to failure to prosecute the antiguerrilla war on South

Vietnam itself in a more vigorous and successful way.

It is good to know that separate investigations have been ordered by both South Vietnamese and United States authorities into why we were caught Sunday morning at Pleiku by surprise by only 100 Vietcong soldiers who succeeded in killing at least 8 American soldiers and wounding 126.

But it should be remembered that last October the American airfield at Bien Hoa was similarly caught in a surprise attack and we lost 5 jet bombers and had 22 jet bombers damaged. At that time also there was an investigation.

What steps were taken as a result of that investigation to tighten security around our bases? We have not been told, but obviously, in the light of what took place last Sunday morning, those steps were not effective.

In a cogent editorial in today's New York Times, the point is made that if—

> the Pentagon is to continue to order U.S. military personnel to Vietnam, it has the obligation to provide them with the best protection possible.

The editorial states:

> Certainly far better security than has been provided is possible, and has now become absolutely essential.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial from today's New York Times entitled "And Protecting U.S. Forces" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 2).

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, while these questions do raise serious doubts as to our preparedness to wage the war in Vietnam, there still remain the overriding questions as to our policy in waging war there in the first place.

Calling the war in Vietnam the "war that cannot be won on the ground where it is being fought," Mr. Walter Lippmann, in his column in the Washington Post this morning, pointed out:

> We have had a very clear demonstration of the strategic reality in Southeast Asia. The American Army at Pleiku was unable to protect itself against a comparatively small guerrilla attack, against a force estimated officially at about two squads and one platoon. The American forces got no warning of the attack from the Vietnamese people in the nearby hamlets where the raid was prepared. It got no protection from the Vietnamese security guards.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's column be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 3).

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, there is danger in Vietnam. There is danger in Vietnam to U.S. prestige in the whole free world. And that danger does not lie in submitting the dispute in Vietnam to an international settlement as I and others have repeatedly urged. The danger lies in continuing a fruitless military engagement that cannot be won on the field of battle, but can only be settled politically. The senseless slaughter of U.S. fighting men in South Vietnam should cease.

The dangers to the United States in the continued military stalemate in South Vietnam are pointed out this morning in an excellent editorial in the New York Times entitled "The Dangers in Vietnam." I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 4)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, certain portions of that editoral are worthy of special note.

The editorial states:

> The only sane way out is diplomatic, international, political, economic—not military. A solution will not be found by exchanging harder and harder blows. Surrender is out of the question and "victory" for either side is impossible.

This is what I have been saying and urging for several months now. We can presume that the government at Hanoi is not composed of fools. They have received the message contained in the air strike made from our fleet Sunday. They know that the planes from our carriers could have leveled Hanoi as quickly as they struck at the military bases in southern North Vietnam. They know that they would then be overrun by the Red Chinese ostensibly coming to their aid and that for years thereafter they would be dominated by Red China as they had been for 2,000 years in the past.

As the editorial in the New York Times concludes:

> Perhaps a new start can be made from an untried base—that Americans, Vietnamese, Chinese and Russians are all sensible human beings who are ready for peace in southeast Asia, or at least willing to consider it. There would be prices to pay, but there would be gains as well as losses. Diplomacy is surely not yet a lost art or a dead language.

Since all competent observers agree that the war in South Vietnam cannot be won militarily but only politically, let us seek every possible means without delay through every international diplomatic channel available to us to set those negotiations in motion without further delay.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1965]

U.S. AIDES PRAISE PLEIKU DEFENDERS—SAY FORCES DID GOOD JOB IN REACTING TO ATTACK

WASHINGTON, February 8.—Defense officials insisted today that the defense arrangements were good at U.S. installations in South Vietnam that were attacked yesterday.

The Vietcong guerrillas killed at least 8 Americans and wounded 126 in the grenade and mortar attack at Pleiku that precipitated the retaliatory bombings of North Vietnam.

The Communist guerrillas, penetrating to within 30 yards in one of the assaults, cut the barbed wire of the inner perimeters of a U.S. Army compound. They planted dynamite charges near aircraft on a nearby airfield.

But according to an official U.S. military assessment, a "good job" was done in protecting the area. Once the attack was underway, according to official reports, the U.S. forces retaliated "within seconds" and "with considerable professionalism and skill."

The statements followed some congressional criticism that security arrangements at the U.S. installations had been inadequate.

INVESTIGATIONS ORDERED

Nevertheless, Defense officials said that both United States and South Vietnamese military officials had undertaken separate investigations.

The investigations were said to be similar to one that followed the Vietcong mortar raid on the American airfield of Bienhoa, near Saigon, last October, when 5 jet bombers were destroyed and 22 were damaged.

The investigations at Pleiku were ordered to analyze what happened and to determine what, if anything, could be done to improve military security, a Defense official who had just returned from the scene said. He added, however:

"The security there represents the considered judgment of very professional and skilled officers and it's going to be difficult to improve upon it. It is important to tighten up, but improvements are hard to come by."

Defense officials gave additional details of the Pleiku attack and at the same time emphasized the professional skill of the attacking guerrillas.

ATTACK WELL COORDINATED

The attackers were well coordinated, according to the defense report. The mortar shelling of the compound and airfield were timed with the cutting of the barbed wire enclosure to start at 2 a.m., it was pointed out.

Defense officials said they were unaware of a report that half of the assigned South Vietnamese guards in the area were not at their posts. At the Pentagon it was said that the outermost perimeter defense was 2 to 2½ miles from the inner perimeter surrounding the compound with barbed wire.

Inside the barbed wire line both South Vietnamese and U.S. Army guards were stationed. At the compound a U.S. sentry was stationed between two South Vietnamese Army posts about 200 yards apart. This sentry was singled out for special praise.

It was he, officials said, who heard the Vietcong guerrillas, challenged them and was killed. His action alerted the troops in the compound, most of whom were asleep in their barracks.

But "within seconds," an investigating officer said, the American soldiers flung open windows and began firing at the attackers. There was "no indication of panic and no promiscuous firing of weapons," the officer reported.

REACTION WAS SWIFT

The reaction at both the compound and the airfield, where 9 helicopters were destroyed, 9 to 11 damaged and 6 light observer planes damaged, was speedy and effective, it was reported.

The Vietcong force, which poured about 60 rounds of mortar shells into the barracks area and selectively hit targets at the airfield—ignoring fuel supplies—apparently was relatively small. According to the latest report, about 100 men attacked the airfield, half of them assigned to the mortar batteries. "A dozen or two" were seen in the barracks area.

One Vietcong prisoner was taken, it was said. He was described as badly wounded and every effort was being made to save his life.

The size of the U.S. forces at Pleiku was not given here. The Vietcong attack appeared to be in company strength. Vietcong companies are estimated at 100, about half the size of a similar unit in the U.S. Army.

There is no reliable indication of Vietcong unit strengths, officials here stressed. Only for guidance to U.S. forces, the Vietcong units are estimated as: platoon, 25 men; company, 100; battalion, 450 to 700; and regiment, 900 to 1,100. No Vietcong units stronger than a regiment have been officially recognized.

By comparison, a U.S. Army platoon numbers 45, a company 200, a battalion 1,000, and a division 15,000. Brigades are composed of battalions and vary in strength. Any unit of two or more divisions would comprise a corps. South Vietnamese Army units are similarly organized.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1965]

PROTECTING U.S. FORCES

From a military no more than from a political point of view can the successful Vietcong attacks against U.S. bases in South Vietnam, which killed or wounded 134 Americans, be brushed away in cursory fashion.

At Pleiku, as at Bienhoa last November, Communist guerrillas easily evaded South Vietnamese security guards, and laid down mortar fire on airfields and barracks. A Communist patrol even penetrated the perimeter defense and attached demolition charges to a barracks. U.S. planes and helicopters, nicely lined up like "sitting ducks," were destroyed or damaged.

It is true, as Secretary McNamara said, that it will never be possible to provide complete security against raids and sneak attacks for all American installations in South Vietnam. But that statement is a useless generalization; there is never any such thing as complete security in any war.

Certainly far better security than has been provided is possible, and has now become absolutely essential. The Hawk missile battalion, now assigned to South Vietnam, merely complicates the problems of local security; the missiles—if they are to provide proper antiaircraft protection to airfields—must be widely dispersed on high ground normally well beyond the airfields' perimeters. There is no use sending missiles to South Vietnam if they are going to be blown up by saboteurs.

Local security for American installations can be tremendously strengthened by assumption of responsibility for local security of installations largely staffed or used by U.S. forces. If American-manned aircraft are going to operate from Vietnamese bases, the planes and their crews deserve protection. U.S. Army engineers or Navy Seabee battalions could build dispersal revetments for parked aircraft in South Vietnam, bunkers and shelters for personnel and sandbagged or protected barracks.

If the Pentagon is to continue to order U.S. military personnel to Vietnam, it has the obligation to provide them with the best protection possible.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 9, 1965]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE VIETNAMESE AFFAIR

(By Walter Lippmann)

It is hard to believe that the raid on the American installations in South Vietnam was not closely related to Prime Minister Kosygin's visit to North Vietnam. It is hard to believe, too, that Mr. Kosygin would have picked the day after his arrival in Hanoi to touch off the raid. He was in no position to help the Vietcong to carry out the raid nor to protect North Vietnam against American retaliation. It is most probable, therefore, that the affair was ordered and directed by men who intended to spoil Mr. Kosygin's mission in southeast Asia and to interfere with his role as a principal power in bringing about a negotiated settlement.

Most probably, therefore, the gambit was directed both against the Soviet Union and the United States, which happen to have a parallel interest in preventing a big war in eastern Asia and of containing the expansion of China. The administration is no doubt right in interpreting the raid on Pleiku as a test of American will. Had the United States refrained from retaliating, the Chinese and their supporters in Asia and elsewhere would have called it a demonstration that the United States is a paper tiger, and that therefore the Soviet policy of peaceable coexistence is unnecessary and absurd. The other side of the calculation was that if the United States reacted, as in fact it did react, it would demonstrate that in Asia the Soviet Union is a paper tiger unable to defend its clients.

From the Chinese point of view the gambit worked successfully. It showed, on the one hand, that the Americans are highly vulnerable on the ground in South Vietnam; it showed on the other hand that the Soviet Union has no power to protect east Asia against the United States.

Much depends on what lessons are drawn in Moscow, Peiping, and Hanoi, and Washington from the affair.

We have had a very clear demonstration of the strategic reality in southeast Asia. The American Army at Pleiku was unable to protect itself against a comparatively small guerrilla attack, against a force estimated officially at about two squads and one platoon. The American forces got no warning of the attack from the Vietnamese people in the nearby hamlets where the raid was prepared. It got no protection from the Vietnamese security guards. In fact, when asked at his Sunday press conference whether the United States could not protect its own forces in South Vietnam, Secretary McNamara replied that he did not "believe it will ever be possible—and I think when I say this I reflect the views of our Joint Chiefs—to protect our forces against sneak attacks of that kind." Sneak attacks is in this case another name for guerrilla warfare.

But that is only half of the lesson which was demonstrated this past weekend. The other part of the lesson is that the U.S. fleet, standing a hundred miles offshore, is capable of inflicting devastating and unrequited damage on the Asian mainland. There was no power in South Vietnam to protect our own forces or to retaliate. But at sea there exists an enormous American power which is quite independent of our forces on the mainland.

The peace of the world may depend on whether all of the powers concerned take the meaning of these lessons to heart.

For us, the meaning is that the commitment to participate in the land war in South Vietnam is an entanglement, is a hostage to fortune, which exposes us to defeats and humiliations. The best that the more convinced believers in the commitment can say is that if we stay there long enough and accept the losses which they regard as tolerable, the Chinese and North Vietnamese will eventually grow tired and become different. For myself, I would not count too much on American patience being greater than Chinese patience. It is less likely that the American people will wish to wash their hands of the whole business of containing China if they do not have to lose American soldiers week after week in a war that cannot be won on the ground where it is being fought.

The meaning of the affair must not be missed in Moscow, Peiping, and Hanoi. Let them remember that, reduced to its fundamentals, the situation is that the U.S. possesses paramount sea and air power in the far Pacific, and no one can count on such a degree of restraint in the use of that power that it will never be used. The United States is not a paper tiger. That phrase reflects the greatest delusion on which our adversaries could possibly gamble. The truth is that President Johnson profoundly desires to avoid war but his power to do that is not unlimited nor can he be counted on not to be provoked if the provocation is continual and cumulative.

There should be no mistake about this anywhere.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1965]

THE DANGERS IN VIETNAM

The Vietnamese situation has entered a new stage. The war will not be the same since the Vietcong attack on Pleiku and the reprisals against North Vietnam which continued yesterday. It seems axiomatic of this type of warfare that it either escalates or it stops. For the present, it is escalating and becoming more expensive in lives and more perilous every day.

Pleiku has once again proved, as Secretary McNamara said, that the American forces cannot protect themselves against this type of sneak attack. Its sequel served notice on Hanoi—and indirectly on Peiping and Moscow—that the United States will retaliate when Americans are attacked. The whole affair indicates forcibly that the long-recognized dynamism of the Vietnamese conflict has risen to a dangerous level.

Secretary McNamara says that the situation has not reached a crisis; but it has done so in the sense that the United States is becoming less and less able to restrict the conflict to minor proportions. The possible choices of action or inaction are being steadily whittled down. The United States is gradually approaching a point where it either goes on to a major engagement involving North Vietnam and Communist China, or it actively seeks a diplomatic solution, which amounts to a disengagement on reasonable and honorable terms.

President Johnson has in the past denied that the United States has any intention of carrying the war to North Vietnam. Yet he considered it necessary in the past few days to help the South Vietnamese raid North Vietnam twice. Since it is not to be expected that the Vietcong in South Vietnam will cease their attacks or their tactics, and since Peiping and Moscow are committed to help Hanoi, the dangers of the future are only too obvious.

The Americans working on the Vietnamese problem in Washington and Saigon must often feel as if the problems have a nightmarish or fourth dimensional quality. Western ideas, modes of thought, and methods do not function as it seems that they logically should. Mortars and bombs do speak a universal language; but they may ultimately lead to the unthinkable conclusions of a nuclear war.

The only sane way out is diplomatic, international, political, economic—not military. A solution will not be found by exchanging harder and harder blows. Surrender is out of the question and victory for either side is impossible.

Perhaps a new start can be made from an untried base—that Americans, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Russians are all sensible human beings who are ready for peace in southeast Asia, or at least willing to consider it. There would be prices to pay, but there would be gains as well as losses. Diplomacy is surely not yet a lost art or a dead language.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CONGRESS AND A NUCLEAR NAVY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR JACKSON

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague Senator JACKSON recently examined the case for a more rapid development of our nuclear powered naval forces in a penetrating article entitled "The Congress and a Nuclear Navy." The Senator has earned a well-deserved reputation for foresight in questions of national security and has often been in the position of urging necessary programs on a reluctant Defense Department.

I recommend this article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Navy magazine, October 1964]

THE CONGRESS AND A NUCLEAR NAVY

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman, Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and Member of the Senate Armed Services Committee)

Today the central issue for America is this: How can we best protect our national security, promote our economic well-being, and safeguard individual freedom?

In the light of history it is clear that our vital national interests depend on a certain imbalance of power favorable to the free peoples—an imbalance which will persuade those who might threaten aggression to cease and desist.

I strongly believe that America's current military posture is basically well designed to serve our foreign policy purposes; namely, to create power relationships which will discourage expansionist states from using force, or threatening its use, to pursue their goals. Essentially, our military policies and programs—together with those of our allies—are designed to deter the use of force not by an all-or-nothing brinkmanship, but by convincing an adversary that we can and will respond appropriately to his provocations, whatever they may be.

SHOULD EXPLOIT SEAPOWER

Today, we have a powerful and versatile military deterrent—and the American Government has acted to maintain its credibility, by giving evidence of a will to use our power—if necessary. In the confrontation over Cuba, when Khrushchev found that he might be starting something bigger than he was ready to risk, and when he discovered that our will was firm, he moved to get his missiles out. In the Gulf of Tonkin, we retaliated quickly—but with fitting restraint—against the unprovoked attack upon U.S. Navy ships in international waters. We gave clear evidence that we were no "paper tiger." In the process, the significance of seapower and the freedom of the seas was dramatically highlighted.

By and large, the United States has done a good job in recent years in building its military strength. The present danger is that we may not capitalize on certain clear advantages which we have won. I have particularly in mind our unexcelled seapower and our long lead in nuclear propulsion for naval vessels. We have advantages in this area shared by no other power. We should exploit these advantages in order to maintain a clear superiority in seapower over our adversaries.

Some of us in Congress have been concerned for a long time to develop a nuclear powered fleet as a strong support and resource in the conduct of American policy.

Today there are a whole series of potential trouble spots around the world which we can get to by way of the great waterways—if we will make the best possible use of our opportunities. And in this era of revolutionary change and sudden crisis time itself is a most precious factor. A nuclear fleet is sustained power at sea. With sufficient nuclear capability we can focus maximum naval power in a troubled area in quick time, and stay there as long as needed to restore stability and lend support to those who fight for freedom. Such a capability could mean the difference between a successful implementation of foreign policy objectives—or a failure. With it we could handle several crises simultaneously—and in these days crises never seem to come one at a time or in just one part of the world.

FLEXIBILITY AND CHOICE

Furthermore, a nuclear-powered fleet is a multipurpose weapon—providing both a strategic weapons system and a series of options in dealing with limited conflicts and the continuing problems of the cold war. This floating security system includes the following elements: Strategic weapons—the nuclear missile and the jet bomber; a moving airfield; airlift for ground troops; a floating base for Marines; and a formidable American presence which speaks with the language that no adversary can miss.

Such a multipurpose system offers us needed flexibility and a choice of means in pursuing our foreign policy purposes.

We are all aware of what our nuclear submarines can do. We are already well underway in the transformation of our submarine arm into a modern deterrent force. To date, we have authorized the building of 41 Polaris submarines and 45 attack submarines—all nuclear. It was appropriate that our first emphasis should have been in this area, for in the recent past our greatest need was to build as rapidly as we could, a highly invulnerable nuclear retaliatory force—one that could survive an enemy's surprise attack, and strike back with devastating effectiveness. I well remember going to the floor of the Senate in 1957 to argue for a greater effort and a higher priority for the submarine missile-launching system. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I joined with my committee colleagues to speed development of the Polaris program—and we are proud of the major contribution the Congress made in this historic effort.

Today, Polaris has taken its place as a formidable element in our strategic deterrent force, contributing to our vital lead over the Soviet Union in nuclear strike power.

THE LEISURELY DOD

But are we moving as fast as we should to develop a nuclear-powered surface fleet? I believe the answer to this question is "No."

I do not believe one can justify the very leisurely effort of the Defense Department in building nuclear-powered surface ships. Only three units have been completed, constituting the first all nuclear-powered task force, the carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach*, and the frigate *Bainbridge*. Only one other nuclear warship is under construction—a case where Congress upgraded to nuclear power status one of the conventional destroyer leaders requested in the 1962 submission. The Defense Department accepted the change, and the second nuclear-powered destroyer leader *Truxtun* was laid down June 17, 1963. However, no more nuclear surface warships have been programed for the future.

It is indisputable that nuclear propulsion provides significant military advantages for surface ships—just as it does for our submarines—notably the quantum jump in speed and mobility.

The nuclear ship can go anywhere in the world and do its assigned job—without logistic support. There is no concern for replenishing propulsion fuel.

The operational advantages in time of combat are self-evident.

BETTER AND BETTER CORES

A nuclear carrier is capable of not only sustaining its own requirements for a far longer period than a conventional carrier, but it can also provide support for conventional escort vessels.

Our technology is rapidly improving. Since the first nuclear aircraft carrier went to sea, reactor fuels have been developed which produce twice the power and last twice as long as the fuel used by the *Enterprise*. Our nuclear engineers are developing new nuclear fuel core designs that will provide nuclear energy to last the life of the ship. In the words of Vice Adm. John T. Hayward, former commander of the first nuclear task force and now commander of the antisubmarine warfare force of the Pacific Fleet:

"I have learned, often through bitter experience, that real improvements in our hardware are only made through building and evaluating in service. You don't even know your true problems, much less solve them, as long as you stay on the drawing board. Tremendous improvement has been made in nuclear propulsion plants in the past decade. In order to continue making improvements we must expand our building program for nuclear-powered ships."

The increased cost of nuclear power is not significant in relation to its military advantages. Our Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—after careful review—estimated that the total lifetime cost of the nuclear carrier with its aircraft is only about 3 percent more than the lifetime cost of the conventional carrier with its aircraft.

The practicability of nuclear power for surface ships has been graphically demonstrated by the successful operations of the *Enterprise* in the Cuban crisis and by the spectacular round-the-world cruise of history's first nuclear task force.

A PROTOTYPE FORCE

Today we have a prototype task force—and it has proved its worth and its reliability. What we need next are several operational task forces. We should program them in orderly fashion and start producing them promptly.

In the early years, Congress found it necessary to combat the reluctance within the Defense Department to use nuclear propulsion for submarines. Now history seems to be repeating itself—there is evidence of a marked reluctance with the Defense Establishment to use nuclear power for surface vessels.

It is no secret, of course, that faulty judgments by responsible Government officials may destroy a good project whose time has really come. No project is so good that it cannot be stalled or killed by overanalysis—or by unsound analysis.

After hearing Defense Department witnesses cite certain cost effectiveness comparisons to support their contention that the advantages of nuclear propulsion in surface warships are not particularly significant, our Joint Committee on Atomic Energy unanimously concluded that those Defense Department studies contain a fundamental weakness that negates their validity. As the unanimous, bipartisan Joint Committee report of December 1963 stated:

"The comparisons cited were based on the assumption that, in wartime, logistic support forces will be able to operate unhampered and without losses as they do in peacetime. The defect in this analysis is immediately apparent.

"We must plan for time of crisis. It is precisely in such situations that the superior mobility, maneuverability, and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force. It is fundamentally illogical and wasteful to fit our new first-line warships with powerplants that are, perhaps, already obsolete."

Well, Congress continues on the alert. We cannot let the Navy get committed to a future of planned obsolescence.

Our adversaries are acting to improve their capabilities over, under, and on the seas. The Soviet Union is seeking to gain control of strategic waterways as part of its long-range plan to dominate or neutralize vital channels of commerce from Gibraltar to Panama to southeast Asia.

Now is the time to capitalize on the great advantages which our lead in nuclear power development has given us. We have the knowhow. We have the resources. We have the example of how handsomely our bold action in the Polaris program has been rewarded.

A final word: The fact that the Congress has supplied much of the energy to build a nuclear Navy vindicates the wisdom of the Founding Fathers in establishing at the heart of our system of government the principle of congressional review—the duty of the Legislature to subject to its tests the judgment of those in positions of authority in the executive branch.

SOUTH VIETNAM—ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM P. BUNDY TO WASHINGTON, MO., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in an address delivered some 2 weeks ago to the Washington, Mo., Chamber of Commerce, our distinguished Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, the Honorable William P. Bundy, carefully reviewed the historical and political factors involved in South Vietnam and southeast Asia. His informative remarks will be helpful in evaluating and understanding the tragic course events have taken this week in South Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bundy's analysis of American policy in South Vietnam and southeast Asia be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN POLICY IN SOUTH VIETNAM AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

I would like to speak on the topic you have chosen—American policy in South Vietnam and southeast Asia—totally without regard to partisanship. That topic and the issues it raises concern all of us, as Americans.

I shall talk, if I may, to three related sets of questions:

I. How did we come to be in South Vietnam? How does what we are doing there relate to our wider purposes in the world, to our specific purposes in Asia, and, in a word, to our national interests?

II. What has been the course of events in Vietnam that has brought us to the present situation?

III. What are the key problems, and what can we do to help in solving them and in achieving our objectives?

I

The first question requires a look at history.

Even when the Far East was much more distant than it is today, we Americans had deep concern for developments there. Americans pioneered in trade and missionary effort with China and in opening up Japan to Western influence. In 1898 we became in a sense a colonial power in the Philippines, but began almost at once to prepare the way for independence and self-government there—an independence promised by act of Congress in 1936 and achieved on schedule in 1946. By the 1930's, we had wide interests of many types in the Far East, though only few direct contacts in southeast Asia apart from the individual Americans who had served over decades as political advisors to the independent Kingdom of Thailand.

Events then took a more ominous turn. We became aware that the ambitions of Japanese military leaders to dominate all of Asia were a threat not only to the specific interests of ourselves and other Western nations, but to the peace of the whole area and indeed of the world. China, in which we had taken a lead in dismantling the 19th century system of foreign special privileges, was progressively threatened and large parts overrun. We ourselves were finally attacked at Pearl Harbor and in the Philippines. We responded to aggression by conducting with our allies a major Pacific war that cost the United States alone 272,700 casualties and over a hundred billion dollars.

In the end Japanese militarism was defeated, and the way apparently cleared for an Asia of free and independent national states that would be progressively freed of colonialism, that need threaten neither each other nor neighboring states, and that could tackle in their own way the eternal problems of building political and economic structures that would satisfy the aspiration of their peoples.

That kind of Far East was a pretty good definition of our national interests then. It is equally valid today. We cared about the Far East, and we care today, because we know that what happens there—among peoples numbering 33 percent of the world's population, with great talent, past historic greatness, and capacity—is bound to make a crucial difference whether there will be the kind of world in which the common ideals of freedom can spread, nations live and work together without strife, and—most basic of all—we ourselves, in the long run, survive the kind of nation we are determined to be. Our basic stake in the Far East is our stake in a peaceful and secure world as distinct from a violent and chaotic one. But there were three great flaws in the 1945 picture after the defeat of Japan.

1. In China, a civil war had been raging since the 1920's between the Government, led by Chiang Kai-shek, and the Chinese Communist movement. After a brief and edgy truce during the war against Japan, that civil war was resumed in circumstances where the Government had been gravely weakened. We assisted that Government in every way possible. Mistakes may have been made, but in the last analysis mainland China could not have been saved from communism without the commitment of major U.S. ground and air forces to a second war on the Asian mainland. Faced with a concurrent threat from Soviet Russia against Europe and the Near East, we did not make—and perhaps could not then have made—that commitment. And there came to power on the mainland, in the fall of 1949, a Communist regime filled with hatred of the West, with the vision of a potential dominant role for China, but imbued above all with a primitive Communist idealogy in its most virulent and expansionist form.

2. In Korea, a divided country stood uneasily, half free and half Communist. With our military might sharply reduced after the war, as part of what may have been an inevitable slackening of effort, we withdrew our forces and reduced our economic aid before there was in existence a strong South Korean defensive capacity. With Soviet backing, North Korea attacked across the 38th parallel in June 1950. With the Soviets then absent from the U.N. Security Council, the U.N. was able to condemn the aggression and to mount a U.N. effort to assist South Korea. The United States played by far the greatest outside role in a conflict that brought 157,530 U.S. casualties, cost us at least $18 billion in direct expenses, and in the end, after Communist China had also intervened, restored an independent South Korea, although it left a unified and free Korea to be worked out in the future.

In retrospect, our action in Korea reflected three elements:

A recognition that aggression of any sort must be met early and head on, or it will have to be met later and in tougher circumstances. We had relearned the lessons of the 1930's—Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Rhineland, Czechoslovakia.

A recognition that a defense line in Asia, stated in terms of an island perimeter, did not adequately define our vital interests; that those vital interests could be affected by action on the mainland of Asia.

An understanding that, for the future, a power vacuum was an invitation to aggression, that there must be local political, economic, and military strength in being to make aggression unprofitable, but also that there must be a demonstrated willingness of major external power both to assist and to intervene if required.

3. In southeast Asia, finally, there was a third major flaw, the difficulty of liqudating colonial regimes and replacing them by new and stable independent governments. The Philippines became independent and with our help overcame the ravages of war and the Communist Huk rebellion. The British, too, who had likewise prepared India and Burma and made them independent, were in the process of doing the same in Malaya even as they joined with the Malayans in beating back a 12-year Communist subversive effort. Indonesia was less well prepared; it gained its independence, too, without support, but with scars that have continued to affect the otherwise natural and healthy development of Indonesian nationalism.

French Indochina was the toughest case. The French had thought in terms of a slow evolution to an eventual status within some French union of states, a concept too leisurely to fit the postwar mood of Asia. And militant Vietnamese nationalism had fallen to the leadership of dedicated Communists.

We all know the result. Even with substantial help from us, France was unable to defeat the Communist-led nationalist movement. Despite last-minute promises of independence, the struggle inevitably appeared as an attempt to preserve a colonial position. By 1954, it could only have been won, again, by a major U.S. military commitment, and perhaps not even then. The result was the settlement at Geneva. The accords reached there were almost certainly the best achievable, but they left a situation with many seeds of future trouble. Briefly:

1. North Vietnam was militantly Communist, and had developed during the war against the French an army well equipped and highly skilled in both conventional and subversive warfare. From the start, North Vietnam planned and expected to take over the south and in due course Laos and Cambodia, thinking that this would probably

happen by sheer decay under pressure, but prepared to resort to other means if needed.

2. South Vietnam had no effective or popular leadership to start with, was demoralized and unprepared for self-government, and had only the remnants of the Vietnamese military forces who had fought with the French. Under the accords, external military help was limited to a few hundred advisors. Apart from its natural self-sufficiency in food, South Vietnam had few assets that appeared to match those of the north in the struggle that was sure to come.

3. Cambodia was more hopeful in some respects, more remote from North Vietnam, with a leader in Prince Sihanouk, a strong historical tradition, and the freedom to accept external assistance as she saw fit. From the start Sihanouk insisted, with our full and continuing support, on a status of neutrality.

4. Laos, however, was less unified and was left under the accords with a built-in and legalized Communist presence, a disrupted and weak economy, and no military forces of significance.

Such was the situation President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles faced in 1954. Two things were clear—that in the absence of external help communism was virtually certain to take over the successor states of Indochina and to move to the borders of Thailand and perhaps beyond, and that with France no longer ready to act, at least in South Vietnam, no power other than the United States could move in to help fill the vacuum.

Their decision, expressed in a series of actions starting in late 1954, was to move in to help these countries. Besides South Vietnam and more modest efforts in Laos and Cambodia, substantial assistance was begun to Thailand.

The appropriations for these actions were voted by successive Congresses, and in 1954 the Senate likewise ratified the Southeast Asia Treaty, to which Thailand and the Philippines adhered along with the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, and Pakistan. Although not signers of the Treaty, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia could call on the SEATO members for help against aggression.

So a commitment was made, with the support of both political parties, that has guided our policy in southeast Asia for a decade now. It was not a commitment that envisaged a U.S. position of power in southeast Asia or U.S. military bases there. We threatened no one. Nor was it a commitment that substituted U.S. responsibility for the basic responsibility of the nations themselves for their own defense, political stability, and economic progress. It was a commitment to do what we could to help these nations attain and maintain the independence and security to which they were entitled—both for their own sake and because we recognized that, like South Korea, southeast Asia was a key area of the mainland of Asia. If it fell to Communist control, this would enormously add to the momentum and power of the expansionist Communist regimes in Commnuist China and North Vietnam, and thus to the threat to the whole free world position in the Pacific.

* * * * *

I have come at a statement of our policy in the Far East by the route of history, for policy is the fruit of history and experience, seldom of some abstract design from a drawing board. In essence, our policy derives from (1) the fact of the Communist nations of Asia and their policies; (2) the lessons of the 1930's and of Korea; (3) the logical extension of that fact and these lessons to what has happened in southeast Asia.

It is possible to define our total policy in Asia—as it has existed at least since 1954—in quite simple terms.

1. Our objectives are those of the free nations of the area—that they should develop as they see fit, in peace and without outside interference. We would hope that this development will be in the direction of increasingly democratic institutions, and that there will be continued and expanded ties of partnership and contact with ourselves and with the other nations of the free world. Yet we know that Asia will develop as the leaders and peoples of Asia wish it to develop, and we would not have it otherwise.

2. Asia confronts two central problems: The threat of Communist nations whose objective is domination and enslavement, and enormous economic and political problems that would exist in any case. If these two problems cannot be solved over time, the Asia of the future will be the breeding ground of ever more direct threats to our national interest and could be the source of a third world war.

3. To deal with these central problems, the free nations of the area need the help of the United States and of our major allies. Outnumbered in population and in military forces by the Communist nations as they are—by nearly 2 to 1 if you leave out India—the free nations of Asia cannot do the job alone. We cannot do it for them, but we have the resources and the military power to play a crucial role.

4. The peace and security of east and southeast Asia are indivisible. If the Communist powers succeed in aggression, they will be encouraged, free nations discouraged, and the inevitable process of evolution toward moderation within the Communist countries themselves postponed or perhaps prevented althogether. We have seen the dynamics of Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan checked and defeated, and the West Germany and Japan of today emerge as respected major nations of the world. Thanks to NATO, our handling of the Cuban crisis, and other actions, something like the same process may be underway with Soviet Russia today. Such a process of moderation will come eventually for the Communist nations of Asia if they are checked. It cannot come if they are not—and any loss of free nations makes the future task that much, and perhaps immensely, more difficult.

So much, then, for how we came to become involved in South Vietnam and how that involvement relates to our wider policies and purposes. In simple terms, a victory for the Communists in South Vietnam would inevitably make the neighboring states more susceptible to Communist pressure and more vulnerable to intensified subversion supported by military pressures. Aggression by wars of national liberation would gain enhanced prestige and power of intimidation throughout the world, and many threatened nations might well become less hopeful, less resilient, and their will to resist undermined. These are big stakes indeed.

II

Let us now wind the reel back to South Vietnam in 1954 and trace the course of events to the present.

From 1954 to 1959, great progress was made. In Ngo Dinh Diem, a stauchly nationalist and anti-Communist leader was found. Against all odds, including the opposition in 1954–55 of old-line military leaders and religious groups, he took hold. Under his rule the nationalist feeling of the newly formed country—which does differ to a significant degree from the north—was aroused, and it soon became and has remained clear that, whatever the extent of their attachment to particular governments in their own country, the great mass of the people of South Vietnam do not wish to be ruled by communism or from Hanoi.

On the economic and social front, education was vastly expanded, major land reforms carried out, and the economy grew at a rapid rate, far outstripping what was happening under the Communist yoke in the north. Instead of decaying and dropping by default into communism, South Vietnam was in a fair way toward becoming really able to stand on its own feet.

In all this, the United States played a major helping role. On the military side we helped to create a fairly decent army almost from scratch, with a normal military assistance advisory group of a few hundred men. That army was never big enough to threaten the north, nor was it meant to be; it may well have been too much oriented to conventional warfare and not to the handling of a sophisticated guerrilla aggression.

Then, beginning roughly in 1959, two trends got under way that are still today at the heart of the problem.

First, the Diem government, instead of steadily broadening its base and training key groups for responsibility, began to narrow it. More and more the regime became personal in character. Opposition parties, which had previously been active in relatively free elections, were driven underground, and there began a process of repression which, while never drastic by the standards we should apply to governments in new nations, much less by those of Communist countries, nevertheless alienated increasing numbers of the all-too-small pool of trained men capable of helping to govern effectively.

Second, Hanoi went on the march. Seeing itself thwarted in both South Vietnam and Laos, Hanoi began to send trained guerrillas into the south and increasing cadres to assist the Communist Pathet Lao forces in Laos. In South Vietnam there had been from the start thousands of agents and many pockets of Communist influence left behind in the division of Vietnam, and as early as 1957 a campaign of assassination of local officials had begun that tallies on the map almost exactly with the areas under strongest Communist control today. In 1959, such activity was stepped up, guerrilla units formed, and the real campaign got under way.

That campaign is sometimes referred to as a civil war. But let us not delude ourselves. Discontent there may have been, and local recruiting by the Vietcong, largely through intimidation. But the whole campaign would never have been possible without the direction, personnel, key materiel, and total support coming from Hanoi, and without too, the strong moral support, and key materiel when needed, provided by Peiping and, up to 1962 at least, by the Soviet Union. Thousands of highly trained men coming from the north, along with the crucial items of equipment and munitions—these have been from the start the mainspring of the Vietcong insurgency. This has been all along a Communist subversive aggression, in total violation of the Geneva Accords as well as general principles of international behavior.

Indeed the true nature of the struggle has been publicly stated many times by Hanoi itself, beginning with a 1960 Communist Party conference in North Vietnam which declared the policy of, as they put it, liberating the south.

By early 1961, South Vietnam was clearly in difficulty. President Johnson, then Vice President, visited the country in the spring, and we stepped up our military supplies and tried to turn our training emphasis increasingly to the guerrilla front. Then, in the fall of 1961, a series of key assassinations and raids on government centers brought South Vietnamese morale to a critical point. Something more was needed. President Kennedy considered and rejected the sending of U.S. combat units to fight the Vietcong.

Instead he responded to the request of the South Vietnamese Government for American military advisers with Vietnamese units, and for Americans to furnish helicopter and air transport lift, combat air training, communications, and in short every possible form of assistance short of combat units.

But the military effort was and is only one aspect of the struggle. The economic front was equally important, and a smaller but extraordinarily dedicated group of civilian Americans went into the dangerous countryside, unarmed and often unescorted, to help in the creation of the fortified hamlets that soon became, and remain, a key feature of strategy, and to bring to the villages the schools, fertilizer, wells, pigs, and other improvements that meant so much and would serve to show the Government's concern for its people.

The basic strategy adopted in early 1962 was sound, and was indeed in key respects the same as the strategy that prevailed against communism in Malaya, Greece, and the Philippines. It is a strategy that takes patience and local leadership, and that takes learning and experience as well. The Vietnamese and we are still learning and changing today, and will go on doing so.

Under the advisory concept, the American strength in South Vietnam rose to 12,000 by mid-1962 (eventually to the present 23,000), and with our help the South Vietnamese began to reverse the slow tide of growing Communist gains. By the spring of 1963, things seemed to be on the upswing, not only in the judgment of senior Americans but in that of experienced observers from third countries.

Yet the unhappy tendencies of the Diem government had persisted, despite all the quiet advice we could give in favor of reforms. The stubbornness and inflexibility which had been his great assets in the early days after 1954 had now become serious drawbacks. The Buddhist uprisings of the spring of 1963 brought the political situation to the forefront again. Now Buddhism as a religion is not nearly as dominant in South Vietnam as it is elsewhere in southeast Asia—Thailand, Laos, and Combodia. The adherents of Buddhism may not be even a majority of South Vietnamese, and there are significant Catholic and other groups as well as large numbers of adherents to older religious beliefs. Nonetheless, Buddhists are the most numerous faith, they are entitled to fair treatment, and they had some case against the Diem government for personal discrimination, though little, according to the findings of a United Nations Commission, for true religious persecution. But these grievances might have been met without serious trouble if they had not been fanned by a small group of leaders who were and are, in fact, politically motivated.

Unfortunately, the Diem government refused to compromise or to redress the areas of legitimate grievance, and in August sent the Army into the pagodas of Saigon and other cities, following up with a drastic campaign of suppression against students and a wide circle of political opponents. As a result, by late September—when I personally accompanied Secretary McNamara to Saigon—it was clear that Diem and his brother, Nhu, had aroused wide popular opposition and, perhaps most crucial, had alienated almost to the breaking point the key trained elements within the government structure itself, both civilian and military.

Although Ambassador Lodge continued to urge reforms that might still have saved the government, Diem did not respond, and on November 1, 1963, he was overthrown, he and Nhu—most unfortunately—killed, and a new military government installed by force.

No one could then tell whether the new government would be better. Clearly, it had to be military in the first instance, and the first military group, under General Minh, had considerable popular backing. Yet it was ineffective and tended to throw out the baby with the bath, replacing so many military and provincial officials that the way was opened for major Vietcong gains. Then in January of 1964 General Khanh took control in a bloodless coup. He showed ability on the military and economic front, but he, in turn, decided to turn over the government to civilian leaders to be selected by consultation among representatives of the key groups—the Buddhists, the Catholics, the military, labor, the religious sects, the various areas including the considerable body of refugees from the north, past political groupings, and so on.

The result has been a series of governmental revisions, while Saigon wrestled essentially with the same kind of problems that Diem faced and overcame in 1954, but in the far more difficult internal security crisis brought on by the Vietcong aggression, which has been slowly extending the areas of Communist control in the countryside, and the pace of guerrilla and terrorist activity, even to Saigon itself.

The political situation remains critical, and its resolution is central to turning the war around and restoring an independent and secure South Vietnam. That task must essentially be done by the Vietnamese people, under Vietnamese civilian and military leaders, all under a government that unites the divergent political interest groups and that gives orders that can be carried out.

The real point of the political history in South Vietnam is that it should cause us no amazement and no despair. Was it not 7 years between the end of the American Revolution and the making of a lasting Constitution, even for a new nation which had united to fight a war and had centuries of British evolution toward democratic self-government behind it? And how many new nations in the world today have found lasting stability in a decade, especially where there had been little preparation under colonialism, where the national historic tradition was remote, and above all where a violent aggressor was striking constantly at the very fabric of government? Take if you will one fact alone—that in the first 8 months of 1964 the Vietcong assassinated more than 400 local officials and kidnaped another 700—and try in your mind to project what an equivalent amount of gangsterism would do to government performance in this country, and then to project that effect, in turn, onto the situation in a country such as South Vietnam.

So this is a tough war, and the Vietnamese are a tough people to have stood up under it and to be holding their heads above water after 20 years of violence and uncertainty.

III

How should we now, then, approach this situation, as Americans?

Above all, we must stand firm and be patient. We never thought in 1961, or in 1954, that the task would be easy. North Vietnam had certain advantages:

Experience and sophistication in every aspect of subversion and political warfare;

Dedicated and fanatic agents who for the most part came from the south to fight the French and then returned to areas they knew well;

An open corridor through Laos to keep up the supply of guerrillas and supplies. In the past year, such infiltration has markedly increased, and has included for the first time significant numbers of indigenous North Vietnamese trained in North Vietnam in regular military units.

A numerical ratio of guerrilla forces to Government forces that is well below the ratios of 10 to 1 that have been found necessary for success in past guerrilla wars. There are today in South Vietnam perhaps 35,000 hardcore Vietcong fighters and another 60,000 to 80,000 local Vietcong forces, against roughly 400,000 military and paramilitary forces for the Government, or a ratio of about 4 to 1.

The internal political divisions and above all the inexperience in government of the south itself.

Yet the balance sheet is by no means all one-sided.

Our advisory effort, on all fronts, has done great things and, in the wide personal relationships involved, must stand almost unique in the history of relations between an Asian nation under fire and an outside Western nation.

Although there are from time to time signs of anti-American feeling, working relationships at all levels remain close and friendly.

With our help, the Government has been able to maintain economic stability and to move to help areas secured from the Vietcong.

Our military effort and our equipment, supplied to the Vietnamese, have largely offset the unfavorable numerical ratio favoring the Vietcong.

The Vietnamese military forces continue to fight well. Our own military men consider most of them as tough and brave as any in the world. Though there have been military reverses, there have also been significant victories—which sometimes do not make headlines. On the military front, the Vietcong is not capable of anything like a Dienbienphu.

Above all, the Vietnamese people are not voting with their feet or their hearts for communism.

As to our basic policy, the alternatives to our present course might be, on the one hand, to withdraw or to negotiate on some basis such as what is called neutralization, or, on the other hand, for the Vietnamese and ourselves to enlarge the war, bringing pressure to persuade Hanoi, by force, that the game they are playing is not worth it.

It is also suggested that the United Nations might be of help. There may emerge possibilities for a U.N. role, but it is not clear that the U.N., which has been unable to carry through commitments such as the Congo, would be able to act effectively to deal with this far more difficult situation in its present form. And this has been the public judgment of the U.N. Secretary General, Mr. U Thant.

As to the basic alternatives, so long as South Vietnam is ready to carry on the fight, withdrawal is unthinkable. A negotiation that produced a return to the essentials of the 1954 accords and thus an independent and secure South Vietnam would of course be an answer, indeed the answer. But negotiation would hardly be promising that admitted communism to South Vietnam, that did not get Hanoi out, or that exposed South Vietnam and perhaps other countries of the area to renewed Communist aggression at will, with only nebulous or remote guarantees.

As for enlarging our own actions, we cannot speak surely about the future—for the aggressors themselves share the responsibility for such eventualities. We have shown in the Gulf of Tonkin that we can act, and North Vietnam knows it, and knows its own weaknesses. But we seek no wider war, and we must not suppose that there are quick or easy answers in this direction.

The root of the problem, to repeat, is in South Vietnam. We must persist in our efforts there, with patience rather than petulance, coolness rather than recklessness, and with a continuing ability to separate the real from the merely wished for.

As a great power, we are now and will continue to find ourselves in situations where we simply do not have easy choices, where there simply are not immediate or ideal solutions available. We cannot then allow ourselves to yield to frustration, but must stick to the job, doing all we can and doing it better.

The national interests that have brought us into the Vietnam struggle are valid, and they do not become less so just because the going gets rought and the end is not yet in sight. President Johnson said in his state

> of the Union message: "Our goal is peace in southeast Asia. That will come only when aggressors leave their neighbors in peace. What is at stake is the cause of freedom. In that cause, we shall never be found wanting."

THE PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the President's farm message to the Congress last week was an excellent statement of the basic philosophy of this administration. It was an important first step in reassuring rural America that this administration wants to help the farm and small town economy achieve a level comparable to that of the more prosperous segments of our national life.

We in Missouri are particularly pleased at the President's assurances that the administration will support the continuation of the wheat and feed grain programs, and that recommendations will be made for their simplification. The prospect of simplification will be welcomed by Missouri farm people. Administration support for provisions making it possible to grow soybeans on acreage diverted from feed grains should also be helpful in strengthening farm income.

On cotton, Missouri producers will want to see the details not only on the special amendments proposed, but also will be particularly interested in the effect of the proposed "transfer of acreage allotments" on this crop.

We regret that the message did not cover current inequities in the distribution of individual cotton acreage allotments whereby some producers receive all the cotton acreage they want to plant through the release and reapportionment provision while others are forced to plant within their stringent basic allotments. In fairness to producers and to help control supplies and lower Government costs, this situation should be remedied.

The need for new and expanding markets for cotton in acute. In April of 1964 the Congress enacted legislation designed to maintain and expand both domestic and foreign markets for cotton. As a result, domestic markets were expanded. In fact, the experts now forecast that during the current marketing year, domestic cotton consumption will increase about 1 million bales.

This increase is due almost entirely to the new competitive price position of cotton in the domestic market.

Unfortunately, export sales for U.S. cotton this year are expected to be 1.5 million bales under those of the previous year. The loss will more than offset the gains we have made in the domestic market.

A further reduction in the national acreage allotment is unthinkable. Immediately it would signal foreign producers to increase their acreage to the disadvantage of our entire domestic cotton industry. Such a course would be extremely harmful to our total economy and most unfair to our cotton industry.

In passing legislation in 1956 providing for an export program to maintain a fair share of the world market for U.S. cotton, Congress recognized the fact that farmers in this country could not buy production goods and services on a protected market and sell their cotton at a world price. Congress also recognized that our Government had promoted cotton production in many parts of the world under the various foreign aid programs and that U.S. producers had been required to make the downward supply adjustment for the entire world.

As the President said in his farm message, we need to reduce the level of cotton stocks. A reduction in stocks could best be accomplished through an aggressive export sales program that would put our cotton on the world market in keeping with the word and spirit of section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, which states that "quantities of cotton shall be sold as will reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton."

Instead of the expected 4.2 million bales in exports this marketing year, our share should be in excess of 7 million bales.

A more aggressive administration of the 1956 act would have helped prevent the accumulation of the current surplus; and a more aggressive sales and export program now, including substitution of food and fiber for dollars in foreign aid, would help reduce the surplus.

In the spirit of the President's farm message, we hope that this Congress will be able to make some real, overall improvements in the farm programs. The time is long overdue for rural America to move ahead as a full partner in the most prosperous economy in the history of the world.

ANOTHER AMERICAN EMBASSY SUBJECTED TO ATTACK OF MOBISM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again an American Embassy has been subjected to a most reprehensible attack of mobism. This time the incident occurred in Moscow. It is another of the demonstrations of gross international incivility, many of which of late have been directed at U.S. establishments abroad.

Embassies are defenseless islands when a wave of mob hostility envelops them. They must depend upon local authority for their protection. Their absolute right to this protection has been established by centuries of civilized relations among governments and by universally recognized international law. When their immunity is violated, therefore, it is a disgrace. It is a reflection on the government which permits the violation even more, perhaps, than on the people who become directly involved in the demonstrations.

Those who permit or acquiesce in violent demonstrations should bear in mind that peace is much more dependent on the men and women who sit in embassies than on those who throw stones at them in the name of peace. It ought not to be too much to remind those who talk peace that there are no acceptable excuses for the failure to prevent the violation of embassies. At most, there can only be acceptable apologies. In the absence of a strict adherence to this basic principle, any talk of civilized conduct in the relations among nations is devoid of substance.

A PAY RAISE FOR MEN IN THEIR FIRST 2 YEARS OF MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, during the 88th Congress two pay increases were voted for members of the armed services. Those measures were Public Law 88–132, which went into effect in September 1963, and Public Law 88–422, which took effect in August 1964. The annual cost of those raises is $1.2 billion and $207 million, respectively. The larger bill provided an average increase in pay of about 16 percent. The other provided a $2.5 percent increase for all personnel with two or more years of service, and $8.5 percent for officers with less than 2 years' service. No two military pay increases have previously been spaced so closely together.

In spite of this apparent generosity, however, many of us who voted for these measures did so only on the assumption that half a loaf is better than none. Two bills were passed; but the question of adequate compensation for men and women in the Armed Forces is definitely unfinished business that must be dealt with by this Congress more successfully than by the last.

Even with the recent increases, military pay checks are still much too low to attract and retain an adequate number of qualified persons in the armed services. The two bills passed in the previous Congress were the first since 1958. In the same period of time, there have been five raises in civil service pay—in 1958, 1960, 1962, 1963, and 1964.

The fact is that military pay rates, even when allowances are made for the so-called fringe benefits of military service, have never kept pace with private and civil-service rates. Starting with 1958, the civil-service pay was higher, and has since gone up more often, and at a higher percentage. The ideal of perfect comparability may never be reached; but the gap must not be allowed to remain at its present size.

The problem is especially important for those of us, in both Houses of Congress, and on both sides of the aisle, who have been trying to discover a way to end the draft without causing a decline in military effectiveness. The Department of Defense is now conducting a major study of the possibility of abolishing the draft. The results of that study will be known during this session.

Many of us are convinced that the critical issue is pay, that the main obstacle to the maintenance of an all-volunteer military force is the inadequate pay and allowances which our service men and women now receive. To those of us who have been following this issue, the recent revelations of poverty and widespread moonlighting within the military services come as no surprise.

POVERTY IN THE SERVICES

A recent estimate revealed that as much as 40 percent of the naval personnel stationed in the Washington area have outside jobs; 32 percent of the marines in the Washington area are also moonlighting. Last summer, the Air Force released a report showing that 71,000 Air Force personnel have off-duty jobs, to supplement their income. About 950 of these are officers; the rest are enlisted men. The great majority of the enlisted men are in grades E-3, E-4, and E-5.

More alarming, however, was the fact that 5,000 Air Force personnel were receiving some form of relief benefits for the poor. The majority were receiving relief in the form of low-cost public housing. A few actually received food and clothing for their families. Most of those on relief are in the middle enlisted grades, whom the Air Force normally considers careermen.

The standard U.S. formula for poverty is an income of $1,500 a year or less, for single persons; and up to $3,000 a year, for a family of four. A total of 169,000 airmen come under this category. When adjustment is made for housing and rations, the hard core Air Force poverty pocket still amounts to a shocking 8,000 active duty personnel. These men are in the lower ranks; they have two or more dependents; and they have been in the service less than 2 years.

There is every reason to assume that the situation is about the same in the other services, because of the uniform system of pay and allowances. A Navy study shows that 100,000 men are below the poverty standard.

It is obvious that the present pay scales are inadequate, from top to bottom. But I call attention especially to the plight of those in their first 2 years of service.

The pay for enlisted men with less than 2 years' service has not been increased since 1952. The increases proposed last year by the Department of Defense called for no increase for officers or enlisted men. But the Senate Armed Services Committee inserted an 8.5-percent increase for officers with less than 2 years' service. This was certainly justified and long overdue, being the first increase in 12 years. The pay for grade O-1, second lieutenant or ensign, was raised from $222 a month to $241. This, of course, is gross pay before taxes. I do not think anyone will argue that these officers are being overpaid, or that we have been excessive in our concern for their welfare. Actually, we should regard this as only a modest first step toward a more effective pay schedule for those in the decisive early years of service.

Unfortunately, however, the act did not apply to enlisted personnel with less than 2 years of service. The pay of those in this category has still not been raised in 13 years. When it was raised, in 1952, the $3-a-month raise was the first since 1946. I believe there is no justifiable rationale for discriminating against enlisted men in this respect. The 1964 Department of Defense bill at least had the virtue of consistency, in not recommending a raise for either group, even as it again avoided this problem altogether.

In the big pay bill of 1963 the Department of Defense did recommend a 5-percent increase for those in the under-two-year category; but it was cut out in committee; and the Defense officials considered it so minor and insignificant, by their own admission in testimony last year before the House Armed Services Committee, that they made no effort at all to resist the cut. This indicates a lack of interest on the part of the Department of Defense that can only be corrected by Congress.

A HISTORY OF DISCRIMINATION

The following chart illustrates the sad history of discrimination against men in their first 2 years. The first six figures typify the enlisted man with more than 2 years of service—in this case, the E-5 with 10 years. The last three figures typify the enlisted man with less than 2 years of service—in this case, the new recruit.

Illustrative examples of monthly basic pay rates for military personnel

ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Pay grade	Years of service	June 1, 1942	July 1, 1946	Oct. 1, 1949	May 1, 1952	Apr. 1, 1955	June 1, 1958
E-9	28	------	------	------	------	------	$440.00
E-8	24	------	------	------	------	------	380.00
E-7	20	$179.40	$214.50	$264.60	$275.18	$304.20	350.00
E-6	15	142.50	168.75	213.15	221.68	249.60	275.00
E-5	10	110.40	132.25	176.40	183.46	210.60	240.00
E-4	5	81.90	105.00	132.30	137.59	159.90	170.00
E-3	1	66.00	90.00	95.55	99.37	99.37	99.37
E-2	1	54.00	80.00	82.50	85.80	85.80	85.80
E-1	0	50.00	75.00	75.00	78.00	78.00	78.00

Source: U.S. Congress, Senate, "Military Pay Increase," hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on H.R. 5555, 88th Cong., 1st sess., July 1963, pp. 50–51.

Since this chart was prepared, there have been two additional raises for those with more than 2 years of service, in both 1963 and 1964. Thus, for the E-5 with 10 years of service, the following laws have provided these new pay rates:

October 2, 1963 (Public Law 88–132), $265.

August 12, 1964 (Public Law 88–422), $271.50.

For the recruit, there has been no change. His entering pay is still $78 per month.

Thus, since 1942 the E-1 has received two increases, and the E-5 has received seven increases.

There is a strong built-in bias against change in this crucial area. When a change is suggested, such as the 8.5-percent increase for enlisted personnel, that I proposed last year, we are told that the costs would be exorbitant and that it would violate the long established philosophy of military compensation. In fact, the cost of this pay raise would have been only $81 million a year.

Last year, many members recognized the inconsistency of raising the pay of only one group. But we were in a hurry to get through the calendar and to adjourn before the impending campaign. A number of us reluctantly voted for the bill, after attempting to get it changed. We voted only with the firm intention of bringing up the matter as one of the top priority items in the new session.

As the matter now stands, the only way the pay of enlisted personnel with less than 2 years' service might be increased is for the cost of living to increase by 2 percent, based on the Consumer Price Index from the starting point of October 1, 1963, but only if a pay increase is requested by the Department of Defense. There is nothing automatic about it. This is merely a working formula, which may or may not be applied. Since the Consumer Price Index had gone up by only 1.2 percent at the time of the last pay measure, last summer, no increase in enlisted pay was requested. Senators will recall that the pay bill of 1963 included a provision for an automatic increase in retirement pensions for every 3-percent increase in the cost of living. In other words, retirees have their increase guaranteed by law; but personnel in the under-2-year enlisted category have no guarantee—only a rule of thumb that has no force or permanence. This is another form of discrimination, built into our military pay system, which has no conceivable justification.

This is not to suggest, however, that an automatic clause based on the cost of living would be sufficient. This is a sound system for retirement pay, but it would not go nearly far enough to bring the under-2-year enlisted rates up to an effective level. The average increase in the cost of living is slightly over 1 percent a year. At this rate, it would take about 6 or 7 years to reach a cumulative increase of 8.5 percent, which is the amount of the increase granted under-2-year officers by the last pay bill.

Furthermore, the increments would be so tiny as to be hardly noticeable. Each increase, coming every other year or so, would amount to around $3 a month. At the end of about 7 years, the pay for the Private E-2 grade would have gone from the present $85.80 to around $100. This inchworm system of pay increase would hardly suffice to bring the under-2-year category into a realistic relationship with the rest.

At the same time, the other rates would undoubtedly continue to rise at a much faster rate, and the discriminatory nature of the present scale would be perpetuated.

The category of the personnel with 2 years or less of service totals about 840,000 persons—more than one-quarter of the total number of active-duty personnel. This group, of course, is constantly changing; it is being perpetually renewed, and has no sense of continuity, and certainly no lobby. This has made it easier for the Government to discriminate against a large portion of our active-duty personnel in any given year.

INJUSTICE COMPOUNDED

On an individual basis, it means that the injustice of the draft is compounded. It is well known that the military manpower pool in the United States is vastly larger than our military needs. The military obligation is universal in theory only. In fact, the rules of eligibility have been regularly changed in a vain effort to reduce the size of the surplus. Thus, many are eligible; but more than 40 percent of all eligibles do not serve today; and as the baby boom expands, perhaps by 1967 two-thirds of all eligibles will not serve.

Those who do serve are subject to a discriminatory pay scale. The negative attitude toward military service by those who are called to duty is a perfectly understandable counterpart to the traditionally negative attitude taken by their Government toward those who are serving for the first 2 years: In recent months, 97 out of every 100 men drafted left service as soon as their tour was up. Any business run on this basis could not survive for very long.

Another group that is put at a serious disadvantage is made up of draftees or volunteers who get married during their first 2 years in the service, and of volunteers who are already married. The Air Force and the Marines do not accept married volunteers. It will be recalled that the majority of the Air Force personnel on relief are men in their first 2 years who have two or more dependents. The Department of Defense manpower officials take a very cavalier attitude toward these personnel. The attitude seems to be that by being married and in the service at the same time, they ask for financial trouble, and, therefore, deserve it.

Let me quote part of an Air Force memorandum on the subject of airmen on relief.

> It must be noted that whatever poverty may exist for these people is primarily a result of their own decision. Existing law does not contemplate that an enlisted man of the first four pay grades with under 4 years of service will be married. To this end, no quarters allowance is provided for these people and they are not entitled to housing. Upon a permanent change of station, their dependents are not recognized and the sponsor is not entitled to travel allowance for his dependents or movements of his household goods.

Thus, it would appear that the curious logic of the military regards the sanctity of existing law as more important than the welfare and retention of qualified personnel. Much as some may deplore the modern trend toward youthful marriages, I suggest that a military regulation that compels young men to remain single for 4 years is simply out of date and unrealistic. There is no way to know how many potential careerists have been lost as a result of this archaic practice. Instead of discouraging marriage, it probably has discouraged careers.

A recent letter sent to me by a woman in Beloit, Wis., makes this all too clear:

> We have a son 20 years old in the Air Force. Four days after he graduated from high school he enlisted. He did much studying on all the services and decided the Air Force was what he wanted. His letters were most interesting for he thought it was a wonderful life. Even the basic training which was really rough, he didn't complain about. He enlisted in June of 1963. Upon completion of his basic training he became an airman, third class. He immediately started studying and by October of 1963 he took and passed his test for airman, second class. (This doesn't mean, of course, that they get the promotion.) He again started studying and by May of 1964 passed his test for airman, first class. In October of 1964 he finally was promoted to airman, second class. When we asked what was next, he said, "Nothing now, for I can't go beyond airman, first in 4 years, and I still have over 2 years to go."
>
> The reason I'm mentioning this is that at the time of the increase in pay last year, one of the men in Washington said the reason they didn't give the boys with less than 2 years a raise was that promotions came very fast the first 2 years.
>
> We were most fortunate to have our son home with us for Christmas. He would make an excellent ad for the Air Force. He looked wonderful and said he never felt better. As we were having breakfast one morning I asked him, "After a year and a half in service, what do you think of it?" His reply was, "It's the greatest life in the world." So then I questioned him about the future. Was this what he would like to stay with and make it a career and this I think is sad, for he said, "Absolutely not. I want to get married some day and raise a family, and I certainly couldn't do it on a serviceman's pay."
>
> As an airman, second class he makes $99.37 a month. He pays $17 a month for his own insurance, plus income tax and social security deductions. While he was home we bought him new towels and washcloths, his were worn out and he has to buy his own. Also while he was home, I asked him why he didn't wear his uniform. He put it on and I understood why, for it hung on him like a sack and he couldn't afford to have it tailored.
>
> I want you to know one thing; this is not his complaint, but mine as a taxpayer. It seems a shame that so much money is spent training these boys and after 4 years they are done.

The letter ends:

> You might be interested to know that our son is now over in Vietnam.

POOR BY COMPARISON

We have often prided ourselves in the belief that our servicemen are the best paid in the world. But even this is no longer true when applied to the 840,000 enlisted men in their first 2 years of service. The American recruit receives $78 a month. During the first 2 years, the average recruit moves up in stages to $83.20, $85.80, and $99.37, for the private, first class. This is usually where he is at the end of 2 years. But the recruit from Canada starts from a base of $112. An entering trainee in the West German Bundeswehr gets the equivalent of $110, at current exchange rates.

Compare these pay rates with the average per capita income of each of these countries. In the United States, we ask the recruit to accept $78 a month, while the U.S. income averaged for each individual, figured for the period 1958–60, comes to about $2,250. Average family income is, of course, more. In Canada, not only is the recruit better off in absolute terms, but he is far better off in relative terms, for his $112 a month compares with an average per capita income, during the same period, of about $1,550. In Germany, the recruit's $110 a month looks very good, indeed, when compared with an average per capita income of about $850. Of course, many factors make it very difficult to compare basic pay with per capita income; but the general pattern is all too clear: Both on an absolute dollars-and-cents basis, and on a relative basis, when compared with the average individual income of the country, young men entering service in Canada and Germany are treated far better than our own young men are.

Apparently, these countries are not burdened by an unrealistic philosophy of pay such as ours, which insists that more than one-quarter of the active-duty personnel will be kept in a stagnant and inadequate pay category.

In the average year, 236,000 men at or below the E–3 level leave the service for reasons other than retirement. At the E–4 level, where the decision on a career is often made, 144,000 a year leave for reasons other than retirement.

The reasoning behind our traditional refusal to offer fair compensation to those in their first 2 years is not convincing to me. It has been argued that they are in a training status, and, therefore, do not merit higher pay until they are performing a useful function. But few firms follow such a policy. Moreover, the training is usually completed well within a year, and the individual has a year or more of regular duty before he becomes a first-class citizen; and even after that he is denied certain benefits for his dependents.

Another argument made in an attempt to justify putting these personnel in the lowest priority is that they are fulfilling an obligation, and consequently the country has no obligation to them. This, of course, does not apply at all to those who volunteer, and who otherwise would not have to serve—such as married men who are deferred from the draft. As we have said, the whole concept of universal obligation has, in fact, if not in theory, been abandoned in this country. Less than 60 percent actually serve. By retaining the myth of universal obligation we are put in the completely untenable position of saying that the few who happen to be drafted are fulfilling an obligation, while those who, for whatever reason, are not drafted, thereby have no obligation.

If an obligation exists, it is the other way around. It is the obligation of the Government to those who serve the Nation, whether they volunteer or are conscripted, whether they are in their 2d year or in their 20th year of service.

TO END EXPLOITATION

Patriotism has always been an important motivating force in causing Americans to serve their country. I trust it will always be such a motivating force.

However, all too often in recent years we have seen an unfortunate tendency to substitute compulsion and exploitation for free choice. The present draft laws are one form of compulsion. How much better it would be to reform our present system, so that those who wish to serve would serve—and would serve because they freely chose to do so; and how much fairer it would be if such men were offered a reasonable rate of pay which would reward them fairly for the service they perform for the country. As it is, we often exploit men of patriotism, by accepting their contribution with little acknowledgment and insufficient pay.

Today, it is becoming increasingly clear that the military draft can be ended without affecting our national security, if we can attract a fully voluntary military force. The key to attracting such a force is, of course, adequate pay. Is it any wonder we do not presently have such a force? How many men would be willing to volunteer for any job with entering pay of only $78 a month, as it is for men in service?

The truth is, as Kenneth Galbraith has said, the military draft is still "a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay."

I am not sure that if we offered the market rate of pay we could attract all the volunteers we need in order to meet our military requirements. But today we are drafting, on an average, less than 100,000 men a year. Another 500,000 or so volunteers from a total pool of almost 2 million. I think a substantial pay raise would help us get volunteers to replace the men we must conscript were we to eliminate the draft; and it would probably also help us obtain enough volunteers to replace those who now volunteer out of fear of the draft. To replace all of the men who now enter the service because they are drafted or because they fear the draft, would probably require offering incentives other than pay—such as better training, housing, and advanced educational programs.

A PAY RAISE FOR MEN IN THEIR FIRST 2 YEARS OF SERVICE

Nevertheless, I think we can take a long step toward testing how much pay has to do with volunteer rates, and how much it would cost were we to pay salaries attractive enough to eliminate the draft. The step we can take is also a long step toward equity for all those in service. I propose that we take this step and offer a pay raise for those in the first 2 years of service equivalent to the average pay raise all other ranks have had since the war.

The entering enlisted man has not had a pay raise during the 13 years since 1952. In 1952, he received a paltry raise of $3, increasing his pay from $75 to the present rate of $78 a month. Before 1952, his only raise came in 1946; and before that, his last raise was during the war, in 1942.

In the last 18 years since 1946, the entering enlisted man's starting pay, figured on a yearly rate, has risen a mere $36. When figured over the 18 years, this amounts to an average of about $2 a year; and this means that the increase each year since 1946 has averaged the pitiful amount of about 4 cents in starting weekly take-home pay.

Since the middle of the war, all ranks beyond those in the first 2 years have received raises amounting to about 133 percent of their wartime pay. Legislation which I shall introduce tomorrow would attempt to bring the pay of first 2-year men up the same amount, by starting with their wartime pay, and increasing it the same percentage as that for all other ranks.

An entering serviceman now receives $78 a month. If he reaches the grade of E–5 by the end of 2 years, he can receive up to $145. Under this proposal, the entering serviceman would receive $117. If he reached E–5 by the end of 2 years, he could receive $225 a month.

My staff has asked the Department of Defense to prepare a military basic pay scale that would give personnel with less than 2 years of service, for pay purposes, the same percentage increase that has been given to personnel with more than 2 years of service, beginning with 1942.

This bill would do much to correct the injustices present in the existing military pay scale. It would bring first 2-year men up to the same percentage increase that others have had since the war.

It would also involve some raises for those with over 2 years' service, so as to maintain regular step-by-step pay changes with increasing longevity and rank. Under existing law, a change in pay will also automatically involve some increases in reserve pay, retirement pay, social security, and other benefits for other ranks. The total cost of all changes will amount to $690 million annually.

Of course, other adjustments might well have to be made if this legislation is enacted; and I would be interested to hear suggestions as to how one might improve the pay scales I have proposed. Nevertheless, even though minor modifications of this proposal might well be in order, it is clear that the general principle is correct. Both as a matter of equity and as a modest, but essential, first step to test whether adequate pay will attract enough volunteers to allow us to end the draft, I urge enactment of a pay raise for men in their first 2 years of service.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter and explanatory materials sent to my staff by Mr. Joseph B. Glenn, consultant on these matters to the Department of Defense; and a bill which I propose to introduce tomorrow; also an article entitled "Moonlighting Marines," from the Journal of the Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the letter, explanatory material, bill, and article were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1965.

MR. GAR ALPEROVITZ,
Research Director, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALPEROVITZ: In accordance with your request, we have calculated a military basic pay scale that would give personnel with less than 2 years of service for pay purposes the same percentage increase that has been given to personnel with more than 2 years of service, beginning with the 1946 and ending with the 1964 increases.

The revised scale is attached in the form of a bill. Also attached are two statistical tables exhibiting and summarizing the effects of the revision, and a statement of the budgetary impact.

In some instances the revised rate for less than 2 years of service was greater than the existing rate for the same pay grade with more than 2 years of service. Wherever this occurred, the rates for more than 2 years of service have been increased by the minimum amount necessary to scale up to the first rate that was higher than the revised under-2 rate.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH B. GLENN,
Consultant.

OFFICE OF THE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
February 4, 1965, Washington, D.C.

MR. GAR ALPEROVITZ,
Research Director, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALPEROVITZ: In the military pay increases from 1946 to 1964, both inclusive, the basic pay rates for officers on active duty with 2 or more years of service for pay purposes were increased by 132 percent. The corresponding increase for enlisted personnel was 134.5 percent. (As a point of reference, civilian wages and salaries in the United States increased 203.2 percent from 1942 to 1963.) Accordingly, to obtain the revised basic pay scale the rates for less than 2 years of service in existence just prior to the 1946 increase were multiplied by 2.32 for officers and 2.345 for enlisted. The results were rounded to the nearest multiple of 30 cents in order that the daily rate would not involve a fraction of a cent.

When the revised rates are compared with the present rates for personnel with less than 2 years of service, the percentage increase is 42.8 percent for officers and 51.1 percent for enlisted.

Whenever the basic pay scale is increased, certain other items are increased automatically, as they are linked in the law to basic pay. For example, the reenlistment bonus for the first reenlistment is 1 month's basic pay for each year of the reenlisted term, except that those in E–1 receive only two-thirds of a month for each year. Thus, an increase in basic pay will increase the budget for the reenlistment bonus. Other items linked to basic pay are the payment for unused leave, severance pay, both medical and nonpromotion, Reserve adjustment pay, the employer contribution to social security, the death gratuity, and retired pay for those who retire after the new pay scale becomes effective. Also, a change in the basic pay scale applies automatically to Reserve personnel not on active duty but in a pay status. An increase in the O–1 rate with less than 2 years of service applies automatically to officer candidates and cadets, who are paid at one-half of that rate.

The basic pay scale applies also to the Public Health Service, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The estimated cost of the increase in basic pay for military personel on active duty is $571,358,000. The other linked items add $118,434,000, or 20.7 percent. This is about the usual percentage. As the pricing-out of the linked items is a long and involved task, it has been done only approximately here, but the final result should be accurate within a fraction of 1 percent.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH B. GLENN,
Consultant.

Number receiving an increase, annual cost, and average increase, Department of Defense

	Number receiving increase			Number receiving no increase	Annual cost (thousands)			Average increase [1]					
								Percent		Monthly		Annual	
	Total	Under 2	Over 2		Total	Under 2	Over 2	Under 2	Over 2	Under 2	Over 2	Under 2	Over 2
C/S	0	0	0	5	----------	----------	----------	0	0	0	0	0	0
O-10	0	0	0	32	----------	----------	----------	0	0	0	0	0	0
O-9	0	0	0	110	----------	----------	----------	0	0	0	0	0	0
O-8	0	0	0	495	----------	----------	----------	0	0	0	0	0	0
O-7	0	0	0	643	----------	----------	----------	0	0	0	0	0	0
O-6	6	0	6	15,365	$2	----------	$2	0	3.3	0	$25.20	0	$302.40
O-5	10	0	10	37,451	4	----------	4	0	4.8	0	32.10	0	385.20
O-4	122	10	112	56,162	52	$17	35	33.6	4.7	$145.80	26.52	1,749.60	318.24
O-3	3,269	2,527	742	102,974	3,546	3,348	198	31.2	4.9	110.40	22.20	1,324.80	266.40
O-2	23,775	4,861	18,914	31,976	15,198	6,142	9,056	37.4	10.4	105.30	39.90	1,263.60	478.80
O-1	43.833	37,113	6,720	7,061	52,306	47,564	4,742	44.3	19.1	106.80	58.80	1,281.60	705.60
W-4	12	0	12	3,354	9	0	9	0	12.6	0	60.25	0	723.00
W-3	4	2	2	4.623	4	3	1	41.3	13.0	135.60	54.00	1,627.20	648.00
W-2	206	7	199	4,793	55	10	45	41.2	4.9	118.50	19.01	1,422.00	228.12
W-1	213	81	132	2,559	145	107	38	46.1	7.6	109.80	24.18	1,317.60	290.16
Total officers	71,450	44,601	26,849	267,603	71,321	57,191	14,130	42.8	12.3	106.86	43.86	1,282.32	526.32
E-9	0	0	0	13,546	----------	----------	----------	0	0	0	0	0	0
E-8	0	0	0	33,795	----------	----------	----------	0	0	0	0	0	0
E-7	1,815	0	1,815	108,806	216	----------	216	0	3.1	0	9.87	0	118.44
E-6	3,395	0	3,395	227,889	342	----------	342	0	3.1	0	8.41	0	100.92
E-5	21,266	4,125	17,141	384,126	5,984	3,948	2,036	54.9	4.6	79.76	9.90	957.12	118.80
E-4	40,658	40,658	0	410,259	29,615	29,615	0	49.6	0	60.70	0	728.40	0
E-3	496,072	347,156	148,916	89,682	245,925	230,914	15,011	55.8	5.7	55.43	8.40	665.16	100.80
E-2	345,891	300,830	45,061	0	149,232	147,286	1,946	47.6	2.9	40.80	3.60	489.60	43.20
E-1 over 4 months	56,467	47,072	9,395	0	19,769	19,262	507	41.0	4.0	34.10	4.50	409.20	54.00
E-1 under 4 months	103,804	103,804	0	0	48,954	48,954	0	50.4	0	39.30	0	471.60	0
Total enlisted	1,069,368	843,645	225,723	1,268,103	500,037	479,979	20,058	51.1	4.9	47.41	7.41	568.92	88.92
Grand total	1,140,818	888,246	252,572	1,535,706	571,358	537,170	34,188	50.7	5.7	50.40	11.28	604.80	135.36

[1] For personnel receiving an increase.

S. —

A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are set forth in the following tables:

"Commissioned officers

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-10 [1]	$1,500.00	$1,500.90	$1,502.10	$1,503.00	$1,503.90	$1,504.80	$1,506.00	$1,506.90	$1,506.90	$1,614.30	$1,614.30	$1,722.00	$1,722.00	$1,829.70	$1,829.70
O-9	1,380.00	1,382.10	1,384.20	1,386.30	1,388.40	1,390.80	1,392.90	1,395.00	1,397.10	1,399.20	1,399.20	1,506.90	1,506.90	1,614.30	1,614.30
O-8	1,269.90	1,272.30	1,274.70	1,277.10	1,279.50	1,281.90	1,284.30	1,286.70	1,289.10	1,291.50	1,347.90	1,399.20	1,455.60	1,455.60	1,455.60
O-7	1,160.10	1,162.80	1,165.50	1,167.90	1,170.60	1,173.30	1,176.00	1,178.40	1,181.10	1,183.80	1,266.00	1,266.00	1,266.00	1,266.00	1,266.00
O-6	773.40	774.00	774.90	775.50	776.40	777.00	777.60	778.50	779.10	902.10	948.00	968.70	1,025.10	1,112.10	1,112.10
O-5	676.80	680.40	684.00	687.60	691.20	694.80	698.40	702.00	748.20	804.60	850.80	876.30	907.20	907.20	907.20
O-4	579.90	583.80	587.70	591.90	595.80	599.70	640.50	676.50	707.40	738.00	758.40	758.40	758.40	758.40	758.40
O-3 [2]	464.10	473.10	481.80	533.10	558.60	579.00	609.90	640.50	666.30	666.30	666.30	666.30	666.30	666.30	666.30
O-2 [2]	386.70	424.20	461.40	476.70	486.90	502.20	528.00	548.40	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70
O-1 [2]	348.00	366.30	384.30	384.30	410.10	425.40	440.70	456.00	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70

"[1] While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is $2,019.30 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title.

"[2] Does not apply to commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member.

"Commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205											
	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-3	$533.10	$558.60	$579.00	$609.90	$640.50	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30
O-2	476.70	486.90	502.20	528.00	548.40	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70
O-1	384.30	410.10	425.40	440.70	456.00	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70

"Warrant officers

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	$579.90	$581.40	$583.20	$584.70	$586.50	$588.00	$589.80	$591.30	$593.10	$594.60	$609.90	$630.30	$651.00	$702.00	$702.00
W-3	464.10	465.30	466.50	468.00	469.20	470.40	471.60	486.90	502.20	517.50	533.10	553.50	573.90	594.60	594.60
W-2	405.90	408.30	410.70	413.10	415.50	417.90	420.30	435.60	450.90	466.50	481.80	497.10	517.50	517.50	517.50
W-1	348.00	349.50	351.00	352.20	353.70	369.00	384.30	399.90	514.20	430.50	445.80	461.40	461.40	461.40	461.40

"Enlisted members

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	$445.80	$456.00	$466.50	$476.70	$486.90	$497.10	$522.90	$573.90	$573.90
E-8	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	$374.10	384.30	394.50	405.00	415.20	425.40	435.60	461.40	512.40	512.40
E-7	$323.70	$325.20	$326.70	$328.50	$330.00	331.50	333.00	343.50	358.80	369.00	379.20	384.30	410.10	461.40	461.40
E-6	267.30	269.70	272.10	274.50	276.90	287.10	297.30	312.60	322.80	333.00	338.40	338.40	338.40	338.40	338.40
E-5	225.00	225.30	225.60	235.80	251.10	261.30	271.50	282.00	287.10	287.10	287.10	287.10	287.10	287.10	287.10
E-4	183.00	184.50	194.70	210.00	220.50	220.50	220.50	220.50	220.50	220.50	220.50	220.50	220.50	220.50	220.50
E-3	154.80	156.90	159.00	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20
E-2	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60,"
E-1	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30"

Estimated cost of proposed increases in basic pay for personnel with less than 2 years of service [1] *(12 months)*

Active duty personnel:	
Basic pay	$571,358,000
Officer candidates:	
Basic pay	6,487,000
Social security	235,000
Reenlistment bonus, terminal leave, severance pay, death gratuity	5,000,000
Social security	20,000,000
Total, active duty	603,080,000
Reserve personnel:	
Basic pay	70,537,000
Social security	2,500,000
Total, reserve personnel	73,037,000
Retired personnel:	
Retirement occurring after effective date	25,000
Total, retired personnel	25,000
Total, Department of Defense	676,142,000
Coast Guard	10,000,000
Public Health Service	3,500,000
Coast and Geodetic Survey	150,000
Grand total	689,792,000

[1] Including personnel with more than 2 years of service when necessary to aline the scales.

[From the Journal of the Armed Forces, February 1965]

MOONLIGHTING MARINES OMINOUS SYMPTOM

The fact that thousands of Marine Corps officers and enlisted men must "moonlight" to make ends meet—the story is the same in all other services—is symptomatic of a sickness in military pay scales, according to Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr.

When Commandant Greene and the other JCS members appear before congressional committees during the weeks immediately ahead, they will be questioned closely on the "moonlighting" aspect of financial hardships and inequities being encountered by Armed Forces members.

A 6,300-man survey reveals that 23 percent of Marine Corps enlisted men—32 percent in the Washington area—are holding down outside jobs. The survey shows that this is true for 3 percent of officers.

"I do not know what the specific answer to the pay problem is," General Greene said in an interview, "but I view this data and other evidence as clear symptoms that something is seriously wrong. It's as if a patient had a fever of 104. The doctor might not know immediately the cause and treatment, but he surely knows that there is an illness which must be treated."

Commandant Greene noted that the problem of retaining skilled NCO technicians is becoming increasingly acute. "In some areas," he said, "we are forced to maintain our combat readiness with only 40 to 50 percent of our requirements."

As one possible solution to this NCO retention problem, General Greene is hopeful that support will grow for a variable skills reenlistment bonus. Under this proposal, previously advocated by Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg II, U.S. Navy (retired), former Chief of Naval Personnel, an enlisted man in a hard-skill area would receive a higher reenlistment bonus—perhaps as much as $6,000.

General Greene believes that such a program would bring with it considerable savings to the Government and would ease the manning problems in all services.

First cruise enlistments in the corps, General Greene reported, are "most satisfactory. We are able to meet our recruiting quotas, and the low attrition rate at our recruit depots indicates that we are getting good men."

The problem is, however, that the Marines are falling far short of meeting reenlistment quotas for these young men.

The corpswide target is a first cruise re-up rate of 23 to 24 percent. This compares with only a 15 to 18 percent rate achieved in recent months.

General Greene, who has taken a keen personal interest in the pay plight of his men, said that "moonlighting" is most prevalent among officers and NCO's, particularly the latter, who wish to send their children to college.

"I know of many cases," he said, "where topnotch NCO's who want very much to remain in the corps are leaving us to accept much higher pay in industry because they and their wives feel that such action is essential to provide adequately for their children. This hurts the most—to lose men who want to stay in the service."

In related areas of military morale, General Greene has been forceful in supporting Secretary McNamara's drive to obtain more military family housing. The Commandant also has urged action to improve medical care for all military people and their families, active and retired.

Lacking the staff resources of the other services, the Marines are not making any comprehensive report on specific actions to improve the military pay situation in the fighting forces, but are pursuing, at General Greene's direction, the task of compiling pertinent data that will be of great potential value to the Presidential pay panel and to congressional committees.

THE PRESIDENT'S GREAT MESSAGE ON NATURAL BEAUTY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on the remarkable natural beauty message the President sent to the Congress on Monday. I was necessarily absent yesterday, and so was not able to make my comments at that time.

The President's message is of historic importance. It brings recognition from the highest level of Government of the crucial importance of conservation as a national issue and of the need to meet the crisis head on.

As the New York Times editorialized this morning:

> The Nation once had clean and beautiful rivers but they are rarities today. The problem of impure air is as close as the next breath you take. It spares nothing and no one. Against these and other forms of ugliness, the President has now issued an inspiring order of battle.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, from the February 9 issue of the New York Times, be printed in full at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the growth of technology and the inevitable squeeze on our resources forced by population increase indeed demand a new conservation.

Fortunately, there is at last a widespread popular demand, as well, for wise conservation policy. Now most people have the leisure in which to enjoy the countryside, and the knowledge that our cities can be made places of beauty.

In this great message, the growing popular demand for wise policy has finally found a national voice. Only the President can bring together the scattered conservation programs and policies of our Government, and can provide a national perspective. The President's message covers at least four major departments of the Federal Government. It is an excellent start toward a united conservation policy.

The crucial importance of urban conservation is a key idea in the message. Not only clean air and clean water, but also ample green recreation areas, are necessary to truly civilized city life. We have begun to move in this area. The President pledges renewed and coordinated action.

His proposals for roadside beauty and investigation of new ways to utilize junked automobiles will find wide support.

His legislative proposals on water pollution received overwhelming Senate approval when Senate bill 4 was passed by a vote of 68 to 8.

Federal licensing and factory inspection authority for pesticide production are badly needed.

Those of us who have been fighting to save, for recreation, the clean, spectacular St. Croix River, on the Minnesota-Wisconsin boundary, are greatly encouraged by the President's proposals for the Potomac. It is just such a combination of Federal, State, and local action—of scenic easement, public access acquisition, and protective zoning—that our bill to establish a St. Croix National Scenic Waterway (S. 897) proposes. The differences between the two rivers make quick action on the bill I introduced, with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], all the more important.

On the Potomac, we face a multimillion-dollar cleanup job; but the St. Croix is the last really clean large river near a metropolitan area in the Midwest. Action now can preserve this river before it becomes fouled.

The proposal for a national system of hiking trails is especially close to my heart. I have introduced a bill (S. 622) to provide Federal recognition for the Appalachian Trail, from Maine to Georgia. I shall soon propose in Wisconsin a statewide system of hiking trails. The route for one trail, across the northern tier of Wisconsin counties, from Minnesota to Michigan, largely running through county, State, and national forest land, has already been marked out.

All of us in the conservation movement are looking forward eagerly to the White House conference in May. The selection of Laurance Rockefeller, the illustrious Chairman of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, as conference chairman is most welcome. The ORRRC report, as it is called, has become the indispensable tool of all those who work in the area of the new conservation. I am confident the conference will prove most valuable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post for Tuesday, February 9. The editorial entitled "The President's Great Message," expresses my thoughts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 9, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S GREAT MESSAGE

President Johnson's great congressional message on conservation no doubt will take its place among the state papers that have shaped and fixed national policy over decades and generations. It is a declaration of national purpose that surely will stir appropriate response in Congress, in State legislatures, and in the hearts of the American people.

We have already gone so far in the defacement of our environment that much of the task has become that of restoration, as the President points out. But it certainly is not beyond the means of our society to make beauty more than "just a holiday treat," but "a part of our daily life," to use the President's words.

Much of the President's message deals with programs already in being, but it serves a useful purpose to bring the references to them together and to relate them to each other in a way that binds them into a consistent national program.

The land acquisition program will enrich the life of every area of the country, and this region will be particularly pleased to have Assateague Island National Seashore included. Of equally great local interest is the reference to faulty strip and surface mining practices which may be expanded in our own vicinity if appropriate steps are not taken. The highway beautification program will touch every part of the country. The Presidential remarks on the Nation's great rivers will hearten citizens fighting to preserve the Hudson in New York, the St. Croix in Minnesota and Wisconsin, and other streams. The President surely is right in saying that the "time has also come to identify and preserve free flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers before growth and development make the beauty of the unspoiled waterway a memory." The President's proposals for the Potomac area will excite the interest of this whole region, and his objectives for this watershed are well put: "Clean up the river," "protect its natural beauties," "provide adequate recreational facilities," and "complete the presently authorized George Washington Memorial Parkway." It is to be hoped that the review to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior will have the same multifaceted approach, mingling all the many values of the stream and its watershed and not falling into the single purpose plans of the Army Engineers.

The message deals with air and water pollution in a comprehensive way and promises Federal progress toward remedial measures that have always had hard sledding on the Hill.

The White House Conference on Natural Beauty, which will meet next May, ought to be a great forum at which national sentiment can be assembled behind the Presidential purpose. Each of five specific areas of inquiry will arouse the enthusiasm of individual groups struggling alone to preserve some aspect of national beauty. It is good that the conference is to look into the problems of automobile junkyards, underground installation of utility transmission lines, the relation between taxation and conservation, Federal assistance to the States, and national tree planting programs.

The President has made an eloquent and moving appeal to the Nation to "rebuild and reclaim the beauty we inherited," and we hope that appeal will be heard and acted upon, in Congress, in State legislatures, and in local governments.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 9, 1965]

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL?

President Johnson's message on beauty, both natural and manmade, draws the issue sharply. Is this country going to be America the beautiful or God's own junkyard?

The outcome is in doubt. As of now, the United States is losing to the forces of ugliness. There are fewer good-looking new buildings being constructed in most cities than there are handsome old landmarks being torn down. The suburban sprawl produces vast groups of identical little houses which look as if they were all stamped out of a monstrous machine by a mindless idiot.

The Nation once had clean and beautiful rivers, but they are rarities today. The problem of impure air is as close as the next breath you take. It spares nothing and no one. Against these and other forms of ugliness, the President has now issued an inspiring order of battle.

Mr. Johnson proposes to continue and to extend in many useful ways the protection of woodlands, wildlife and natural beauty begun 60 years ago under Theodore Roosevelt. He also calls for "a new conservation" that will encompass our manmade urban environment. He is probably the first President to tell Americans they should "salvage the beauty and charm of our cities." The steps he urges in this direction are modest, but he has promised to recommend additional measures in a forthcoming message.

The central weakness in the national effort to combat ugliness is that the problems are so diverse and many sided. What is everybody's business too often becomes nobody's business. For that very reason, the most important fact about the President's message is that he sent it at all.

In so doing, he has provided the public with a proper sense of underlying coherence in the diffuse struggle to create beauty in our manmade environment and to defend it in our natural environment. By defining Government's responsibility, he stimulates a new awareness of the responsibilities of individuals and interest groups. The White House Conference on Natural Beauty which he has scheduled for May will also help in the long and arduous effort to rescue the physical appearance of this country from the mess that man has been making of it.

TOWARD ENDING RELIANCE ON THE MILITARY DRAFT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the defense message sent to Congress last month includes the news that this year the Department of Defense will go ahead with its special training enlistment program.

I welcome this news as an indication that ways are already being found to reduce our reliance on the inequitable and outmoded draft system. The special training enlistment program has as its purpose the physical and educational rehabilitation of men who fail in their first attempt to meet service requirements. It will aim to correct physical deficiencies in 6 months, thus qualifying many thousands of volunteers who otherwise would be turned down each year. According to the President's message, a pilot plan will involve about 10,000 men in 1965, and will establish "how many of these young men can be upgraded so as to qualify for service."

I hope that this program, after hitting several snags last year, will be given a full and fair trial. It is a sensible alternative to continuing to turn down men who want to be, and who can be, good soldiers, while arbitrarily interrupting the lives of thousands of others who view their time in the armed services as nothing more than a piece of bad luck.

This is only one method by which our military-manpower needs can be met in a more rational fashion. There are others which remain to be explored. An article by the Wall Street Journal's Pentagon reporter, William Beecher, published in the National Guardsman magazine for January 1965, concludes with the statement that the study will probably do away with the present draft system.

> The only obstacle—

He writes—

> is the added cost of raising pay and incentives enough to attract a volunteer force.

"The peacetime draft appears headed for an early retirement," begins Mr. Beecher's article; and his discussion of the alternatives is one of the most informative yet published. He points out that the special training enlistment program—STEP—is regarded by many in the Defense Department as an opportunity for not only saving considerable money over the long run, but also improving the morale of our Armed Forces.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Beecher's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Guardsman, January 1965]

Is the Draft Doomed?

(By William Beecher)

(NOTE.—William Beecher, Massachusetts born (Harvard 1955, M.S., Columbia 1956), served a 1956 active duty hitch as an ROTC produced second lieutenant, now is a captain in the U.S. Army Reserve. A newsman on the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, 1956–59, and with Fairchild Publications in Washington, 1959–60, he has been with the Wall Street Journal since 1960, covering the Defense Department beat.)

The peacetime draft appears headed for an early retirement. Although forced conscription into the Armed Forces of the United States dates back to the Civil War, it was not until the nonwar, nonpeace cold war period following the Korean conflict that the wartime draft was pressed into peacetime duty full time.

The draft, historically, never has been very popular. Army units had to be diverted from the battlefield in the Civil War to put down draft riots in New York City. In recent years, critics of the draft have been legion, and their strength seems to be growing. Their ranks include inductees plucked out of good jobs while buddies continue in civilian life, educators and businessmen upset about the unsettling effect on young men waiting for the ax to fall sometime between their 18th and 26th birthdays, mothers, sweethearts, and even venerable lawmakers in Washington.

The whole question managed to get caught up in the recent presidential campaign—with Republicans and Democrats eagerly straining to outdo each other in denouncing the draft.

The GOP candidate, Senator Barry Goldwater, charged the Johnson administration "uses the outmoded and unfair military draft system for social schemes as well as military objectives. Republicans will end this draft altogether, and as soon as possible, that I promise you."

The Defense Department immediately retorted that the draft is used only for "direct military needs" and added: "We are glad to know the Republican candidate agrees with the administration that the draft should be ended as soon as possible. The fact is that more than 4 months ago President Johnson directed a study to reach this result. The study will be completed in April."

President Johnson, of course, is not committed to ending the draft. He could, between the time he receives the Pentagon's recommendations and the expiration of the draft law, decide to keep things pretty much as they are, or reform them somewhat. No one in Washington, however, would be surprised if he kills the draft outright (or puts it into cold storage) after the law expires in June, 1967. The largest single obstacle: the immense cost anticipated for maintaining a wholly volunteer Defense Establishment of current proportions, reckoned by some to run several extra billions each year.

Just how many billions is to be determined. Since last spring a 30-man Pentagon task force working under William Gorham, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, and assisted by personnel from the Census Bureau, Selective Service Headquarters, the National Guard and the Reserves, and the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, has been laboring to come up with a series of options—together with price tags for each—that would allow the President to maintain a large standing Army backed by sizable Reserve forces over the next 10 years either without the draft, or with a substantially rejiggered conscription policy.

The group has reviewed all known literature on the question, has studied the experiences of Canada and Great Britain which no longer use conscription, and has conducted special surveys of thousands of men, in service and out, to determine their attitudes toward military service, why they joined, why they stayed in or left, what benefits would sufficiently sweeten active duty or Reserve service to attract and hold more men. (Meantime, it's been reported that Australia, which has let its Regular Forces dwindle to the vanishing point, is considering revival of the draft in light of Indonesian-Malaysian quarrels and the Red threat elsewhere in southeast Asia, which is uncomfortably close to home.—EDITOR.)

GIVEN TOP PRIORITY

The effort is a rather awesome one and has received top priority from the administration. For, since it's clear that America will have to keep a mammoth force under arms for the foreseeable future, many officials feel it's time that this force cease its heavy reliance on the increasingly criticized draft system.

The fire of critics has been directed for the most part at allegedly unfair draft deferment policies. Some claim the rich are favored because they can afford to stay in college and graduate schools beyond the maximum draft age of 26. Others assert the poor are favored because they tend to marry early and married men were added to the already large deferred list a couple of years ago by the late President Kennedy.

Actually, because of dwindling draft needs at the very time when the postwar baby boom is reaching age and industry is having trouble absorbing all the youngsters ready to join the job market, only roughly 10 percent of draft age young men are being inducted into the Army—the only service which today relies on conscription for part of its needs.

Many men join up (1) to choose the service of their liking, and (2) to determine the timing of their military duty. And this leads to still another reason for criticism of the draft: the 5-year period of uncertainty between registration at age 18 and average induction at 23 has a jarring effect on thousands of young men and their civilian career plans. (Statistics do not yet bear out the alarm, expressed at the time deferment was conferred on married men, that droves of youngsters would rush to the marriage bureau, perhaps prematurely, to avoid military service. In his own characteristically dry, Hoosier way, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, with more than twoscore years of draft experience behind his observation, had philosophized to a gathering of guardsmen: "Anybody that gets married to get out of service, it's probably just as well that you found out ahead of time.")

Already one step has been taken to relieve the uncertainty for some, at least. In the past, men registered for the draft at 18 but were not examined until they were called, often years later. Now all will be examined at registration time and told whether they qualify or not.

TASK FORCE SEEKS ANSWERS

But, in itself, that falls a great deal short of what is wanted and needed. In search of some answers to the many problems posed by the draft, the Pentagon task force has, in effect, been asked these basic questions: (1) Can the United States drop the draft? Under what circumstances? When? (2) If that cannot be done, what changes in the present draft system can be made to reduce inequities and decrease reliance on the draft by making military careers more desirable?

To compound the problem—as if it weren't difficult enough already—the task force was asked to project its thinking 10 years hence, whereas the Defense Department scarcely ventures beyond 5 years into the future in force level planning and weapons development programing. Thus the task force will come up with different programs for approximately the same total force level as at present—about 2,700,000 men on active duty and another million or so in the National Guard and Reserves. It will come up with alternative programs based on appreciably smaller—and larger—force mixes.

For one thing, an attempt will be made to further substitute civilian help in noncombat military assignments—such as more civilians in military kitchens, doing everything from cooking to KP.

One interesting phase of the study is an attempt to determine what would happen to the number of volunteers if the draft were dropped and military benefits—pay, housing, etc.—were left unchanged. The first-blush reaction is that the number of volunteers would decline markedly. Without the fear of the draft and without any special inducements beyond those now offered, men would be expected to stay away in droves.

Thus, there's almost universal agreement that many incentives would have to be added to make active and reserve duty more attractive.

Money is one obvious avenue being explored. Salaries can be boosted up and down the line to correspond more favorably with what's available in civilian life. There's even some thought to paying certain specialists more in military service than they could get outside, the thinking being that once the Government has invested tens of thousands of dollars into giving a man very special training—say in nuclear propulsion engineering—it would be cheaper to pay him enough to keep him rather than have to repeat this large training expenditure on a replacement.

Thought also is being given to substantial cash bonuses, both for enlistment and reenlistment.

The draft chief, himself, appears highly skeptical that more money would stimulate enlistments. Last fall, General Hershey told the National Guard Association of the United States that the Regular Forces hadn't been able to enlist as many men in any single month since the October 1963, pay raise, as they had in August before the raise.

But a lot of nonmonetary inducements are also being scrutinized. Thought is being given to a substantial expansion of the Army's so-called guaranteed training program for all the services. If a man scores high enough in preliminary tests he would be "guaranteed" to receive military training in one of three specialities, depending on the service's existing needs.

There is also a possibility of military-paid vocational training in top civilian trade schools, either before or during service. Thus if a man wanted to learn a difficult trade—as an electrician or plumber or aircraft mechanic—he could get the best education available, plus a lot of excellent on-the-job experience, by signing up with his local recruiter for such a program.

This could well be linked with a reserve program, so that if a man decided not to make a career of the service, he could pursue the same field in civilian life and fulfill his military obligation in a local National Guard or Reserve unit.

Another thought: a new version of the GI bill might be employed to attract men desirous of earning a full education after completing service.

More likely, however, would be a vast expansion of the so-called Holloway plan now used by the Navy for many of its commissioned officers. A carefully selected number of applicants are picked each year and given a 4-year education at a fine university of their choice; they thereafter are committed to serve 4 years of active service.

This approach, if broadened to cover all the services, would meet officer requirements unfilled by the service academies, it's generally thought. But either the GI bill or the 4-and-4 plan would be terribly expensive. The latter would have the benefit of attempting to keep men after their first hitch;

under the GI bill approach, lots of men would hardly be able to wait to get out so they could start their college educations.

If the draft is suddenly ditched, the impact soon would be felt by the Guard. At present many young men, with the draft breathing down their necks, take a short 4- to 10-month special Army tour in a military occupational specialty of their choice and then return to the hometown unit to finish their obligation while pursuing further education or starting their civilian career. Knowledgeable military planners feel that without the pressure of the draft, many of these men simply would skip military service.

Of course, if military life were made much more attractive to volunteers, there would be created a pool of men finishing one, two, or more tours who for some reason—perhaps a man's wife can't stand pulling up stakes every 3 or 4 years—would return to private life. These would be ripe for enlistment into the Reserve forces, if the inducements were made appealing enough. Better pay is being considered—though this likely would do no more than match improved active duty salary scales.

Handsome reenlistment bonuses of $300 for each 3-year tour, payable $100 a year, are being considered seriously for use in retaining men once they've joined the Reserves.

Thought also is being devoted to shorter tours—as short as the 3-month summer vacation—to teach men military basics, to be supplemented in subsequent Guard training.

GUARD INCLUDED IN ATTITUDE SURVEY

But to really tailor benefits to desires, the Pentagon is sponsoring a series of surveys of men, in and out of uniform, to get their views on the advantages and disadvantages of military life and what inducements might encourage them to make careers of active service or to stay in a Reserve force for 20 years or more.

Five surveys have been undertaken to canvass a representative sampling of men in the following categories: applicants for military service; officers, noncoms, and enlisted men on active duty; reservists; veterans, and men who for one reason or another never have had any military service.

All of the questionnaires, which run several pages each, seek to determine such basic information as age, education, family and community environment, and experience. Each also asks this key question: Which three of the following things would be most important to you in choosing a career?

(a) Chances for further training and learning job skills.

(b) Retirement plan, medical plan, fringe benefits.

(c) Chances for advancement.

(d) Steady, secure work.

(e) Interesting work.

(f) Pay.

(g) Highly respected job.

(h) Freedom to do job the way I think best.

(i) Chances to be a leader.

If the majority of those surveyed seemed most interested in pay, security, and fringe benefits, that would tell the Pentagon something rather meaningful in terms of the costly requirements for an all-volunteer Military Establishment. The answer would turn out a lot less expensive if many placed such things as leadership, advancement, and respect high on their lists.

Interestingly, after seeing how men would rank such job benefits, those on active duty also were asked to consider the civilian job they most likely would land if they left service, and asked to compare their military assignment with this possible job for each of these categories. Thus: Would pay be better or the same in each? How about chances for leadership, advancement?

The active duty questionnaire delves into detail about how many civilian jobs were held, how happy men were on their last job, how good a job they might reasonably expect to land and keep if they left service.

The one to applicants for service asked pointblank: If there had been no draft and you did not have any military obligation at all, do you think you would now be trying to enlist? If you now had a satisfactory job, would you be here?

The questionnaire to guardsmen and reservists seeks to find out the attitude of employers to their part-time military duty. (Do you get paid leave for 2-week training period?) It seeks to find out the time spent driving to and from drills and what aspects of Reserve activity are most bothersome. Perhaps most important is a question on which of the following would most influence the man to serve in a Reserve force:

(a) Increased drill pay.

(b) Promotion when eligible.

(c) Civilian education benefits.

(d) Shorter training hours.

(e) Less annual training.

(f) Improved training.

(g) If the man was convinced that his services were really needed.

(h) Increased retirement benefits.

(i) If given reenlistment bonus of $100 for each year of service.

Vets were asked why they first joined, whether they liked active duty, whether they found the experience valuable, whether they joined a Reserve unit. They also were asked whether they would be induced to join a Reserve unit: If drill pay was as much as or more than their daily civilian earnings? If they would get a $100 bonus each year? If they were promised training in something that would be useful in civilian life? Or, if they could get a commission?

Nonvets were asked a series of similar questions. If there were no draft, and you had no military obligation, they were asked, would you volunteer for active duty if: Military pay was the same as civilian pay? Much higher? You got a $1,000 enlistment bonus? The minimum tour for the service of your choice were 1 year shorter than at present? You were guaranteed training in a skill useful in civilian life? You were sent to a civilian school or college at Government expense before or during active service? You could qualify for officer's training?

Answers still were coming in on some of these surveys as this article was written. The Pentagon hopes to have collated all this material by the end of this month (January) so it can forward its recommendations to the White House on schedule.

"STEP" INITIATED

But even before any end-the-draft package is presented to the President, plans already are far along toward testing one new procedure that would tend to reduce reliance on the draft in the Army.

The new program is called the special training enlistment program (STEP) by its formulators and the "Moron Corps" by some detractors. Its aim is to provide corrective help to thousands of volunteers who otherwise would fail to meet the Army's standards because of physical or educational deficiencies.

Last year the Army had to draft 74,387 men to fill its requirements but turned down 94,825 volunteers because, for one of a variety of reasons, they didn't come up to snuff. The bulk of the rejectees failed to achieve high enough scores on intelligence-aptitude tests.

Under the STEP program a physical underweight will be fed an enriched diet designed to fill out his baggy pants, while a mental underweight will be fed a special educational fare designed to fill knowledge and comprehension gaps in his cranium.

The experimental effort is meant to come up with a technique for increasing the supply of volunteers to meet the lower aptitude enlisted man needs of the Armed Forces. Other programs, such as those mentioned above, would fill the higher aptitude enlisted man and officer corps requirements if the draft were dumped.

Originally the program was to have gotten underway this month (January) with the first batch of 250 substandard recruits descending on Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., for physical and mental building-up. According to the plan, during successive weeks and months the training operation would expand to take in as many as 11,700 recruits at a time, training a total of 60,000 men over the projected 3-year test period.

But in mid-October, the Senate and House Appropriations Committees decided that they had better take a close look at this controversial new program before it got underway. Since a supplemental appropriation will be needed for STEP, the Pentagon decided the better part of valor called for delaying the start of the program until it passed muster on Capitol Hill. At most, it's expected, this will mean only a brief delay.

PHYSICAL, MENTAL, REMEDIAL TRAINING

STEP is aimed at qualifying for service volunteers whose physical disabilities can be corrected in about 6 weeks or whose educational deficiencies can be overcome in 6 months.

Thus a man with bad teeth can expect extensive dental treatment; a man with a hernia, an operation; a man with an overweight problem, weeks of low-calorie dieting (the Army thinks it can slice off a pound a day for 6 weeks). If, after successful treatment, the recruit is otherwise qualified for regular military training, he will be shipped to some other training post to mix with other recruits.

A second and larger group of recruits will require more lengthy handling. These will be men who scored between 15 and 30 percent on the Armed Forces qualification test; in time of war the Army has taken enlistees scoring as low as 10 percent, but in peacetime it requires recruits to score 31 percent or higher. A man scoring 15 to 30 on this test is thought to have the equivalent of at least a sixth-grade education; in some cases he actually may have been graduated from high school or even college. (For example, Heavyweight Champion Cassius Clay, a high school grad, failed in two tries to pass the test after being drafted. Army psychologists, who witnessed the second attempt, say he was trying.)

For these men, the daily schedule should read something like this:

Up at 5 a.m. Clean-up, self and sleeping area; calisthenics; breakfast at 6 a.m.; police barracks area and work on personal equipment; classes from 7:30 until 11:30 a.m.; lunch: basic training, 12:30 to 4:30.

Because of the time taken from regular military work for nonmilitary classes, the recruits will spend 14 weeks in basic combat training instead of the usual 8 weeks.

Plans call for 1 civilian teacher for every 20 to 25 soldiers, comparing very favorably with civilian ratios. Classes will be in English grammar and reading comprehension, mathematics, basic science, and social studies. An effort will be made to thoroughly screen each student so that if a man is prepared for high-school-level English but only seventh-grade arithmetic, he will be placed in the proper classes reflecting these needs.

After 14 weeks of this combined military-civilian training, the recruits will be given a battery of seven Army aptitude tests designed to show which military specialty each man is best suited for. The men must score 90 points out of a possible 130 in each of 3 tests to be considered ready for advanced training, as for example to Fort Sill, Okla., to become cannoneers.

The rest will be either recycled through the 14-week program or sent on to special advanced training with supplemental classwork in areas where they have not yet come up to standard. The total training cycle is meant to take no more than 6 months, with successful graduates going on to serve the balance of their 3-year enlistments in Regular Army units throughout the world. They will wear no special insignia indicating their graduation from STEP.

Some Defense Department and Army officials are quite enthusiastic about the program. "Shouldn't we accept some responsibility to help people meet our standards instead of turning around and drafting people who don't want to come into the service?" asks one high official. "These men should be highly motivated and we expect them to make darn good soldiers."

Enthusiasts also suggest that such men are more likely than draftees to decide to make careers in the Army, saving considerable money now devoted to training replacements.

Critics within the military question whether a program which concentrates on the lower intellectual spectrum will in the long run be beneficial to the Army. Some also voice darkly the suspicion that the program might have been pushed as an adjunct to the President's highly publicized antipoverty program, and they question whether the Army is the proper vehicle for such a socioeconomic uplifting effort.

These are some of the questions which the congressional committees, doubtless, will want to pursue. But, if their qualms are laid to rest on such matters, they are expected to give their blessings to the experiment. And the first step in providing for a draftless military will have been taken.

THE VICE PRESIDENT DISCUSSES THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in his annual economic report to Congress, the President predicted that our 1965 gross national product will reach $660 billion. This will be the fifth consecutive year of substantial economic gains. As Vice President Humphrey has recently remarked, this is an achievement without peacetime precedent in the history of this Nation.

The Vice President recently discussed the state of the economy with both the Advertising Federation of America-Advertising Association of the West, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He was, in his own words, "exuberant." His speeches give us good reason for understanding his optimism about the future of the American economy. As usual, the Vice President presented his views with vigor, cogency, and great good humor.

I ask unanimous consent that the two speeches be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Vice President Humphrey to the Advertising Federation of America and the Advertising Association of the West, at a Luncheon on February 1, 1965

Greetings fellow advertisers.

Politicians, you know, have a lot in common with the advertising industry. We are both responsible for advertising campaigns directed toward the people of America—only we call ours "political education."

As part of these campaigns, we are always striving to develop a better product and expand our markets. And the marketing survey we conducted last November produced some very encouraging results.

"L.B.J. for the U.S.A." scored heavily in all age groups, with both sexes, and in all sections of the country. And we are confident that public acceptance of this product will continue for many seasons to come.

In sharing these experiences of the world of advertising, we—of the world of politics—appreciate fully the vital contribution of the advertising industry in building a better and more prosperous America.

We understand how the advertising industry provides an essential link between manufacturer and consumer—how you assist manufacturers to develop new markets and promote new products, thereby creating jobs, payrolls, and a higher gross national product. We understand how you bring to the attention of the American people an astounding array of useful products and services—ranging from automobiles to zithers.

In short, we understand how the advertising industry has always functioned as a full working partner in the American free enterprise economy—this system of production, distribution, and consumption which ranks as one of the most remarkable human achievements of all recorded history.

And, today the state of America's economy is good—very good indeed. In the words of President Lyndon B. Johnson in his Economic Report to the Congress "the state of our economy is excellent."

We are entering the fifth year of sustained growth and prosperity—the longest period of uninterrupted peacetime economic gains in the history of our country.

In the last year the gross national product has advanced from $584 billion in 1964 to $622 billion in 1964.

Industrial production has risen by 8 percent.

Additional jobs have been created for 1½ million persons in the last year.

Personal income has gone up 17½ percent in 4 years.

The average weekly wage in manufacturing stands at a record $106.55 a week—a gain of $3.89 from a year ago and $17.50 higher than it was 4 years ago.

President Johnson pointed out in his Economic Report that "the unparalleled economic achievements of these past 4 years have been founded on the imagination, prudence, and skill of our businessmen, workers, investors, farmers, and consumers."

But, he added, "since 1960 a new factor has emerged to invigorate private efforts. The vital margin of difference has come from Government policies which have sustained a steady, but noninflationary, growth of markets."

The President referred specifically to the tax cut of 1964. He pointed out that this cut was "the first time our Nation cut taxes for the declared purpose of speeding the advance of the private economy * * * and it was done in a period already prosperous by the standard tests."

"In short," the President said, "the tax cut was an expression of faith in the American economy."

This brief sentence sums up the economic credo of this administration—we have faith in the American economy and American business.

But it is not enough for Government to have faith in business. Business must also maintain faith in business.

The American businessman must continue to modernize his plant and operations, develop new products, improve old ones, seek new markets, and contribute to an ever-expanding gross national product.

And the advertising industry must continue to perform its essential role in this process of expansion and growth.

The hard facts of life are simply this: we cannot afford anything but a prosperous, booming America. We must have increased productivity, rising sales, increased employment, higher wages, and bigger profits. For we know that President Johnson's vision of a Great Society only has meaning in the context of an expanding economy where equal employment opportunity is a reality for every American.

And as President Johnson noted: "Our prosperity is widespread, but it is not complete. Our growth has been steady, but its permanence is not assured."

We must find jobs for 6 million potential workers in 1965. We must raise the living standards of the millions of Americans who are living in poverty or on the ragged edge of poverty. And we must open the doors of equal employment opportunity for the millions of Americans who have been denied a chance because of the color of their skin.

We must do this because it is morally right—because we are a humane people. But we must also do it because it is economically sound.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers reported this year that we lost up to $20 billion a year of potential production because of racial discrimination and poor educational opportunities.

This is shameful waste. And this administration is opposed to waste in all its forms.

The President has declared: "No longer will we tolerate widespread involuntary idleness, unnecessary human hardship and misery, the impoverishment of whole areas, the spoiling of our natural heritage, the human and physical ugliness of our cities, the ravages of the business cycle, or the arbitrary redistribution of purchasing power through inflation."

These goals are clearly within the reach of the American people. Our economy still possesses an enormous capacity to grow—and thereby to contribute toward achieving greater economic and social justice for every American.

And our economy—if we permit it to stagnate and flounder—also possesses the enormous capacity to foster domestic and foreign unrest, injustice, and even chaos.

America really has no choice. We have only the clear obligation to continue climbing those slopes of economic accomplishment leading to the summit of the Great Society.

Address by Vice President Humphrey to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, on February 3, 1965

On occasion I have been accused of excessive exuberance. I plead guilty to this charge. But today, speaking prudently—one might even say, conservatively—I will admit that I cannot discuss the American economy without becoming exuberant.

President Johnson's annual economic report to Congress last Thursday provides the documentation for my enthusiasm.

The President predicted that in 1965 our gross national product, already at a record high of $622 billion, will leap to about $660 billion, marking the fifth consecutive year of substantial economic gain. This is an achievement without peacetime precedent in the history of this Nation.

Corporate profits after taxes have risen for four straight years—from $19½ billion in the beginning of 1961 to nearly $32 billion at the end of 1964.

Meanwhile, the average weekly wage in manufacturing has risen to a record level of more than $106. More than 71 million Americans are employed and the rate of unemployment has dropped from 5.7 percent in 1963 to 5.0 at the end of 1964. Prices have remained relatively stable—with consumer prices rising only 1.2 percent a year since 1961, and wholesale prices no higher in 1964 than in 1960.

So much for the numbers. What do they mean?

They mean that our economic machine, fueled by initiative, propelled by our unique system of competitive enterprise, is on the move.

Economic historians will remember 1964 as the year of the tax cut—the year when

America consciously used the tools of fiscal policy to bolster our private economy—to bring more profits, higher wages, and more jobs to the people of this land. And never forget: this decision represented—above all else—a profound expression of faith in the strength and viability of our free enterprise system.

Our yearend balance sheet indicated dramatically that this faith had not been misplaced.

It is, therefore, not surprising that a lot of stereotypes are now biting the dust. A host of tired clichés are being routed by the resurgence of the American economy and the new era of constructive and cooperative relations between business, labor, and Government.

Remember the fearful picture once conjured up of big Government stifling business? Remember the two snarling ogres—one named capital, one labor—battling to the death for the fruits of prosperity?

Those characterizations are as irrelevant to our present-day situation as the rolltop desk, the green eyeshade, and the quill pen are to students of business administration.

This administration understands and appreciates the contribution of American industry. We salute you for your creativity and imagination, your readiness to grasp new technologies, your willingness to experiment, your commitment to research, your restless vigor, your * * * exuberance.

This administration recognizes that one of America's strongest claims upon the future is our ability to outdevelop, outproduce, and outsell the centrally controlled economies of certain other countries.

Friend and foe alike must acknowledge this basic truth: the performance of the American economy is one of the great success stories of modern times. And there are many chapters of this story still to be written.

In his historic economic report, President Johnson made this prediction: "With sound policy measures, we can look forward to uninterrupted and vigorous expansion in the year ahead." Today—in behalf of our President—I pledge that the resources of the Federal Government will be committed fully toward confirming the accuracy of this prediction.

In 1965, a reduction of an additional billion dollars in corporate income taxes; a $3 billion reduction in personal income taxes; and the reduction and elimination of certain excise taxes, eventually to reach $1.75 billion a year—all these will contribute to further economic expansion.

Your Government will continue to assist private industry in expanding oversea sales and industrial development. By supplementing and strengthening private sources of credit in areas where such action is needed, by offering tax incentives and acting as an investment partner in the vast new enterprises of space, communications, and atomic energy, your Government will demonstrate still further the realities of this working partnership.

But we understand fully that these ambitious goals cannot be achieved by Government alone, for—in the words of President Johnson—we live in a "basically private economy." And so we will be depending heavily upon the imagination, creativity, resourcefulness, and initiative of our businessmen, workers, investors, farmers, and consumers.

We call upon the astounding ability of the American businessman to invent, to organize, to produce, to distribute, and to put people to work as never before.

And we also ask for your cooperation—

In helping promote equal job opportunities for every American regardless of race, color, or creed.

In maintaining wage-price stability;

In controlling costs, increasing efficiency, and developing new markets at home and abroad; and

In expanding plant, equipment, and employment to capture—and contribute to—the opportunities of a rapidly growing economy.

We cannot stand still. We cannot be complacent. This is no time for self-satisfaction, for poverty, ignorance, and disease are still daily companions of millions of our fellow Americans.

In particular, we cannot accept the present rate of unemployment. We have, of course, made inroads on the percentage of joblessness during the past year—and we have provided jobs for an additional one and a half million workers.

But some 3.7 million of our citizens want work and cannot find it. For them, as well as for you, we must strive for rapid economic growth. Holding the line is not enough. Our average growth rate of 5 percent per year since 1961 is double the average rate of growth between 1953 and 1960, and we must strive to keep moving ahead.

Our balance-of-payment deficit is another area of continuing concern. During the years 1958–60 this deficit mounted to nearly $4 billion annually. And while the situation has greatly improved, it is still far from satisfactory.

But these are not Government problems—or business problems—or labor problems. These are American problems. And only a vibrant, zestful, and—yes—exuberant America can prove equal to these tasks.

The great promise of American life was well stated by Thomas Wolfe when he wrote: "To every man his chance, to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity; to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this is the promise of America."

In this spirit, let us become the newest of the new nations. Let us regain the revolutionary zeal of our forefathers—the unshakable faith that America will not only endure, but will prevail.

Let us join together—as Americans—in launching this Nation toward ever-expanding horizons of peace, prosperity and justice.

TOWARD SAFER CARS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on January 26, the General Services Administration published in the Federal Register proposed safety standards for automobiles, buses, and light trucks purchased by the Federal Government. It is estimated that 60,000 Federal vehicles will be affected, annually. These standards mark an important step in the effort to curtail the alarming rise in highway fatalities.

Among other things, the Government will require collapsible steering wheels; shoulder harness safety belt anchors; specific types of safety glass; smog-removing exhaust systems; standardized transmission controls, to avoid confusion; and uniform bumper heights. Legislation authorizing the drafting of such standards was passed in the last session of Congress.

These new Federal standards will lead to the production of a sizeable number of cars which will be safer than any cars on the road today. I hope they will be copied by individual States, which also buy a great number of cars.

But, most of all, I hope they demonstrate that we can write standards which will save lives. If we can do that for 60,000 or more publicly owned vehicles, why can we not do it for all vehicles?

A number of different approaches have been suggested. The first would be to extend the Federal standards to all automobiles. Beyond this, New York State Senator Edward Speno has introduced proposed legislation calling for development of a prototype of a safety car. This would give us the solid research background needed for further progress in this field. Some who have studied such suggested designs contend that the adoption of special safety features could save as many as 640,000 lives over the next 15 years.

Another approach would be by establishing a research board, created by the Federal Government, with authority to study and recommend automobile safety devices. This might build upon the present capacity of the GSA, or, perhaps, look to the Federal Aviation Administration as a possible model.

At one time the slightest mention of safety standards seemed to cause panic in the automobile industry. I can understand concern about ill-considered regulation; but the industry also must understand the nationwide concern over 48,000 automobile deaths in America in 1964—a 10-percent increase over the number the year before.

The whole Nation is shocked at American deaths in Vietnam. Yet in the State of Wisconsin alone, four times as many persons as the number we have lost in Vietnam were killed on the highways last year. We cannot ignore this crisis any longer.

I think the Senate will be interested in a summary of the GSA standards; so I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record.

I also ask unanimous consent that certain newspaper articles and editorials concerning this important matter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the summary, articles, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[General Services Administration, Federal Supply Service, 41 CFR Ch. 101]

Standard for Passenger Safety Devices for Automotive Vehicles Purchased by the Federal Government for Use by the Federal Government—Federal Standard No. 515

Notice is hereby given that the Federal standard set forth below in tentative form is proposed to be prescribed and published by the Administrator of General Services. The proposed standard is to be issued pursuant to Public Law 88–515, approved August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 696), and the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 377, as amended.

This proposed Federal standard has been developed through consultation with the automotive industry, technical societies, trade associations, the medical profession, and Government agencies. The Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, welcomes any written comments and suggestions pertaining to it. Such comments and suggestions should be submitted, in duplicate, to the Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C. 20405, within the period of 30 calendar days from the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

——— ———,

Acting Administrator of General Services.

Standards for passenger safety devices

RATING OF DEVICES FOR PASSENGER SAFETY ACCORDING TO VEHICLE APPLICATION

	Sedans	Buses	Carry-alls	Station wagons	Light trucks up to 10,000 pounds g.v.w.
Anchorages; seat-belt assemblies, passenger types	34	48	34	35	34
Outside rear view mirror	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Safety door latches, locks, and hinges	36	79	39	34	37
Safety glass	42	42	42	42	42
Impact absorbing steering wheel and column displacement	43	71	43	42	47
Dual operation of braking system	47	42	43	43	43
Anchorage of seats	47	50	49	45	57
Padded dash and visors	47	90	52	34	44
4-way flasher	47	54	45	54	52
Tire and safety rim	50	38	43	47	40
Backup lights	52	48	43	48	47
Sweep design of windshield wipers and washers	53	49	52	49	52
Standard gear quadrant (P R N D L)—Automatic transmission	58	86	62	55	59
Recessed dash instruments and knobs	60	78	53	57	57
Glare reduction surfaces—Dash and wipers	63	80	52	61	54
Exhaust emission control system	65	49	66	66	66
Standard bumper heights	79	87	77	76	85

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/1

Anchorage; Seat belt assemblies

Requires anchorages for lap and shoulder belts on all front seats.

Requires anchorages for lap belts only on rear seats.

Each lap belt anchorage to sustain 2,500 pounds.

Each shoulder belt anchorage to sustain a pull of 1,500 pounds.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/2

Padded dash and visors

Requires installation of energy absorbing material over dash and visors.

Requires visor mounting location to minimize head injury.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/3

Recessed dash instrument and control devices

Requires breakaway or receding controls if they project from dash.

Requires instrument bezels recede to level of panel surface under impact.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/4

Impact absorbing steering wheel and column displacement

Steering wheel assembly to develop no more than 2,500 pounds force when impacted by object weighing 75 pounds at 22 feet per second.

Steering column shall not be displaced rearward more than 8 inches on collision with barrier at 30 miles per hour.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/5

Safety door latches and hinges

Must withstand 2,500 pounds of longitudinal loading.

Must withstand 1,700 pounds of transverse loading when fully latched.

Must withstand 500 pounds of transverse loading in latch position.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/6

Anchorage of seats

Requires anchorage of seats and backs against forward and rearward loads.

SAE Standard applies only to front seats but this covers all.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/7

Four-way flasher

Provides warning by simultaneously flashing all turn signals.

Based upon new standards being developed by SAE.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/8

Safety glass

Applies the requirements of ASA Standards, ICC Regulations and National Education Association Standards to Government vehicles.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/9

Dual operation of brake system

Under failure of hydraulic system requires that unaffected brakes stop vehicle in reasonably straight line.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/10

Standard bumper heights

Sets static height to better insure bumper contact between vehicles.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/11

Standard gear quadrant (PRNDL)

Requires single quadrant arrangement for all automatic transmission reducing human error.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/12

Sweep design of windshield wipers—washers

Requires multispeed electric wipers.

Other requirements in accordance with SAE recommended practice.

Provides for windshield washer system.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/13

Glare reduction surface—instrument panel and windshield wipers

Provides for reduction of glare from all surfaces in operator's field of view.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/14

Exhaust emission control system

Incorporates the California test procedure and criteria.

In accordance with clean air act.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/15

Tires and safety rims

Requires that tires conform to Federal specification ZZ–T–381.

Requires that rims conform to the tire and rim association regulations.

In event of tire failure the rim will retain the tire.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/16

Backup lights

Requires rear white lights to be illuminated automatically when the vehicle is in reverse gear day or night.

FEDERAL STANDARD NO. 515/17

Outside rear view mirrors

Requires left outside rear view mirror for all vehicles.

Requires right outside rear view mirror for buses, station wagons, carryalls, and trucks.

Establishes certain limits on a location.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, Feb. 2, 1965]

BUILT-IN SAFETY

Although virtually all of the deaths and injuries on our highways are, in the final analysis, the results of human failure and error, many casualties could be prevented, or at least minimized, by more attention to safety in the construction of automobiles.

This is the view of Senator NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin. He says that the Federal Government could help save thousands of lives every year by establishing minimum safety standards for all automobiles.

The Federal Government, in fact, will soon require new safety standards for the more than 60,000 cars it buys every year: Collapsible steering wheels, shoulder harness safety belts, improved safety glass, smog removing exhaust systems, standardized transmission controls to avoid confusion, and uniform bumper heights.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

NELSON's position is supported by a research report from Wayne State University and the University of Michigan, presented this week to the congress of the Society of Automotive Engineers. The study, financed in part by auto companies as part of their continuing safety program, concluded that many lives could be saved by safer cars and highways. Many deaths, the researchers say, could be prevented by increased frame rigidity to keep persons from being hurled out of the car upon impact, by recessed softer instrument panels, by windshields which would yield when struck by a motorist's head. Even improving windshield wipers might save lives and prevent injuries, and some accidents would be avoided by making highways more skid resistant, they found.

The States need not wait for Federal action to take the initiative. A New York State senator has introduced legislation calling for development of a prototype of a "safety car." Some experts who have studied such suggested designs contend, according to Senator NELSON, that the adoption of special safety features could save as many as 640,000 lives over the next 15 years.

In Wisconsin, Governor Knowles has pledged his administration to a concerted attack on the State's traffic crisis. Any such program must include a serious effort to improve the safety of automobiles. If the Federal Government doesn't require minimum safety standards, the State of Wisconsin should.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1965]

DELINQUENCY IN DETROIT

Forty-eight thousand men, women, and children lost their lives in automobile accidents last year—nearly twice as many Americans as were killed in the entire Korean war.

The driver, the road, and the car all play a part in most accidents. While the structural makeup of today's automobile is safer in many respects than it used to be, the disturbing truth is that manufacturers have the technical knowledge to turn out much safer cars than are now generally produced. Yet safety features are often omitted because there is no profit in them, or there is no specific demand for them on the part of purchasers.

The usual automobile sales message stresses speed, power, and fast getaways, as if every city street or country road were a speedway. The industry develops more powerful engines all the time. With the power comes more speed, more danger and more deaths. The industry rarely, if ever, places emphasis on safety in driving and in the safe construction of the car advertised.

Admittedly, the sales appeal of safety in auto construction has been shown to be almost nil; but this very fact only emphasizes

the moral responsibility of the manufacturers to pay attention to safety even if the public won't.

Detroit is not alone in its delinquency. The rubber industry has allowed itself to be dictated to by Detroit, producing tires that are designed for fashion rather than safety. Safety is stressed in the advertising, but tires are not nearly as safe as they can be.

Even though the sales figures do not reflect it, there are at last some signs of governmental impatience with this situation. The Federal Trade Commission recently held hearings to determine whether it should establish minimum tire standards. The General Services Administration has set forth more stringent safety standards for the 9,500 cars it will purchase for the Federal Government next year. Several States are considering imposing safety requirements by law.

But more than piecemeal measures are needed. If the industry does not voluntarily begin building cars of maximum safety, the pressure will be strong to follow the suggestion of Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, for compulsory Federal legislation.

The industry has the obligation both to talk and to act on safety, in order to help bring the wanton slaughter on America's highways under control.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 27, 1965]

U.S AGENCY SPURS SAFETY IN AUTOS—IT SEEKS 17 NEW FEATURES IN CARS IT WILL BUY IN 1966

(By David R. Jones)

DETROIT, January 26.—The General Services Administration, the Government's purchasing agent, published today in the Federal Register a list of 17 safety features that it would like to see included in the new automobiles it buys.

This might appear at first glance to be merely another business deal between the Government agency and some of its big suppliers. Actually, however, its influence may eventually be felt by millions of new car buyers.

The agency's move is an important symptom of the mounting pressures on the Nation's automobile companies to build safer cars. Its significance, therefore, is not so much that it may lead to setting safety standards for Government-purchased cars, but that it is expected to hasten efforts by the Federal Government and the States to impose stricter safety standards on privately purchased autos.

The General Services Administration will allow 30 days for public comment on today's list of safety proposals, and then will settle down to select standards by June 30 for the 1967 models it will buy in 1966.

The GSA alone buys about 9,500 cars a year. Government sources estimated the total number of cars purchased at up to 60,000 annually.

Today's proposals were not as tough as the auto industry at first had feared. But they would require the industry to stretch somewhat and in some cases to establish new specifications for safety equipment.

The proposals, if finally adopted, would require the following:

Passenger harnesses, padded dash and visor, recessed instrument panel, impact-absorbing steering wheel and column that would not move more than 8 inches toward the driver in a 30-mile-an-hour crash against a barrier, and safety latches and hinges.

Also proposed were improved seat belt anchors, a device to flash tail lights simultaneously, safety glass, a dual braking system, standard bumper heights, standardized gear shifts, electric windshield wipers and washers, glare reduction surfaces, safety tires and rims, backup lights and an outside rear-view mirror.

Included was a provision for exhaust devices similar to those being adopted for all 1966 models in California. These are designed to control the more noxious exhaust fumes—hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and nitrogen oxides—that account for 65 percent of the air pollution from cars.

REQUIREMENTS OF STATES

New York and California already require blow-by devices. These control crankcase emission of solid and gaseous material blown past the piston rings. The latter accounts for the remaining 35 percent of the air pollution caused by automobiles.

Front seat belts are required by law in 21 States.

Some of the items proposed by the GSA are standard or optional equipment on current models.

The service agency's move was the latest step in a trend toward tougher safety standards for cars. The Federal Trade Commission, for instance, held 3 days of hearings in Washington earlier this month with an eye toward establishing safety standards for auto tires.

Congressional pressure for safer cars appears to be mounting. And moves are afoot in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and several other States to improve a variety of safety standards on automobiles.

MORE LAWS EXPECTED

"Our examination of the recent record of congressional entry into the motor vehicle arena suggests that we may expect more Federal motor vehicle laws, whether we like it or not," said Cornelius R. Gray, director of the American Automobile Association legal department in Washington.

"And the States are beginning to realize that if they don't step in and do something about it, the Federal Government will," he added.

John D. Scott, the services agency official in charge of working out the auto standards, said the manufacturers had indicated a fear "that State legislatures and everyone" would grasp the new standards and try to impose them for privately purchased cars.

Alex L. Haynes, executive engineer for vehicle safety at the Ford Motor Co. here, agreed that the industry was alert to a rising threat of safety legislation.

Mr. Haynes and other Detroit auto safety experts say that their products are far safer than they were a decade ago. They are unhappy about the prospect of restrictive legislation.

They say their experience has shown that the public unfortunately is apathetic about car safety. And they fear that legislation might force them to install costly devices that the public neither wants nor needs.

CRITICS URGE LEGISLATION

The industry already has impressive facilities for developing safer and more reliable cars, and there are scattered signs that it is responding to this pressure by turning more of its vast resources toward safety projects. But the industry's critics, who include engineers and physicians, say the automakers never will make significant progress unless they are forced by legislation.

"My estimate of the situation is that they're responding mostly to force, and as slowly as they can," remarked a leading Government safety expert who asked not to be named.

"There has been no other way to get the manufacturers to put these safety features in," said Dr. John D. States, an instructor at the University of Rochester School of Medicine and president-elect of the American Association for Automotive Medicine.

"We've told them," Dr. States said, that "the day was coming when they'd be forced to do it, and that they ought to agree to it without legislation. But they haven't. They say they simply can't sell cars like that."

FATALITY RATE RISING

The increasing pressure on the industry to build safer cars coincides with a climbing auto fatality rate, which last year rose to 5.7 deaths a hundred million miles of travel from a record low of 5.2 deaths in 1961.

This is the first time on record that the rate has risen 3 years in a row, reversing a trend that saw it fall almost steadily from 11.5 deaths a hundred million miles in 1944.

The U.S. auto fatality rate still is probably the lowest for any industrialized country, but the uptrend bothers safety experts because it is coming despite highway improvements and other efforts.

A record total of 48,000 Americans were killed and over 1.6 million were injured last year at an economic cost of about $8 billion, according to the National Safety Council.

Even if the rate for a million miles were cut to 4.8 deaths by 1970, a Ford official said, some 60,000 people would die on the roads then because of growing volume.

NO SOLID EXPLANATION

Statistics on the causes of auto accidents are still so unrealistic that nobody seems to have a solid explanation for the rate rise. Most authorities believe three factors—the car, the driver, and the highway—interact in most accidents.

There is no tendency to blame the rise on the vehicle alone, and even the industry's harshest critics concede that cars are safer than at any time in the past.

Most experts theorize that the fatality rate is rising because of the sheer increase in road volume, which has risen 47 percent since 1954. An arithmetic rise in the number of vehicles produces a geometric rise in the number of accident opportunities.

A contributing factor, most experts believe, is the growth in the number of drivers under age 20 and over age 65. These two age groups account for only 15 percent of the driving population but are involved in over 21 percent of all fatal accidents.

Nevertheless, the rising highway toll is prompting many legislators and other public officials to focus more attention on the automobile as a means of reducing death and injury.

The common complaint is that the industry has no planned program to build a significantly safer car but attacks the problem piecemeal, compromising safety when it conflicts with styling and economics.

INDUSTRY URGED TO LEAD

This happens, these critics contend, because the industry believes that price and appearance sell a car but that safety features do not.

These critics have little tendency to quarrel with the industry position that the public is apathetic about safety. But they say the industry should do more to promote safety equipment and alert the public to the need for it.

Most authorities agree that the industry has made some important strides in safety during the last 10 years. Since 1954 automakers have introduced the recessed hub steering wheel, designed to reduce chest injuries in a crash; dual headlights, which provide better visibility; and lower cars, which provide more resistance against rollover through a lower center of gravity.

Research showing that chances of a fatality were as great if the passenger were thrown out of the car during a crash has resulted in stronger door locks and seat belts.

Studies now show that the frequency of door openings has been cut in half and that seat belts are cutting serious injury and death rates by 35 to 40 percent.

Automakers have made major strides in the reliability of their vehicles, which has a safety aspect, and this is demonstrated by longer new car warranties.

One auto executive said that before 1955 a crash into an unmovable barrier at 10 to 15 miles an hour could kill the driver but that today the driver could survive a 25-to-30-mile-an-hour barrier impact.

Industry critics, however, contend that the survival level still is far too low and that the companies must do much more to build vehicles that can withstand crashes. The critics put forth scores of proposals, but the most important ones concerned ways to protect the passengers from serious injury once an accident occurs.

Robert A. Wolf, head of transportation research at the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, said the industry was long overdue in making needed improvements in such interior devices as steering assemblies, instrument panels and passenger restraining systems. Most experts agree that these are the priority needs.

"One has only to examine current model automobiles to find many flagrant examples of complete disregard for the most rudimentary principles of safety design," said Lawrence M. Patrick, a Wayne State University engineer prominent in crash research.

"Whether this is attributed to 'styling over safety,' public apathy toward safety, or lack of concrete specifications for safe design is immaterial—they are still unsafe," he added.

Mr. Wolf, whose Cornell organization has studied 60,000 accidents since 1953 and is the leading auto crash research group in the Nation said there was an urgent requirement to eliminate the dashboard in front of the right front seat so that a belted passenger could jackknife forward in an accident without hitting his head.

Providing this space and moving the windshield forward would be a significant improvement in automotive safety, he asserted. Further, he said, this would offer automakers a real opportunity to improve the value of seat belts.

"We're ready for a breakthrough and it would be a tragedy if the industry fails to recognize its opportunity," he added.

Mr. Wolf, and most other nonindustry experts, believe the steering assembly should be modified to prevent drivers from being impaled in head-on collisions.

He has urged the industry to design a steering column that will not move toward the driver during head-on impact and a steering wheel that would collapse toward the dash under body pressure rather than impale the driver.

Mr. Wolf—and again most other nonindustry experts—also are sold on the advantages of shoulder harnesses as a means of holding passengers from crashing into the windshield and dashboard or being thrown from the car in a crash.

He suggests the development of an integrated safety seat with added strength, a belt and harness device, and a high back that would prevent neck injuries in rear-end collisions.

TIRE STANDARDS URGED

There also have been rising complaints about the lack of standards for automobile tires. Legislation was introduced in both Houses of Congress last spring to establish tire standards, and the issue is being revived again this year.

The joint legislative committee on traffic safety and motor vehicles in New York has been trying to establish tire standards in that State, and a move is afoot to introduce similar legislation in Michigan and Pennsylvania.

Under this surge of legislative pressure, the Rubber Manufacturers Association last July introduced its own set of minimum tire standards. But officials in Pennsylvania and California have criticized them as inadequate, and Pennsylvania is calling for national tire standards while working for a State law.

This controversy led to this month's Federal Trade Commission hearings, and some national legislation may emerge.

Another safety criticism is that the braking leaves something to be desired. This comment was made by Lawrence Crooks, the consulting engineer who tests cars for Consumers Union, a nonprofit organization that publishes the monthly Consumer Reports.

FEARS FOR WOMEN'S SAFETY

"After repeated use at high speeds most brakes fade so badly that it is questionable whether a woman can exert enough pressure to stop the car safely," Mr. Crooks said.

Most engineers agree that automobiles handle more easily than ever before. But Mr. Crooks said that the industry often sacrificed good control for a soft suspension that gave a smoother ride. His organization often suggests heavy duty springs and shock absorbers to offset this.

The question of auto handling has been the root of a series of about 45 law suits involving the Chevrolet Corvair. The suits all regarding 1960 to 1963 models of the rear-engine General Motors Corp. car, generally allege that Corvair was "inherently dangerous" because 63 percent of the weight was concentrated over the rear end.

James A. Dumas, a partner in the Los Angeles law firm of Harner, Ford and Schlottman which is handling the suits, said the suits allege that the company was "negligent in the design, manufacturing, and engineering of the Corvair."

One suit, involving a Santa Barbara woman who sued GM and a dealer for $300,000 after losing her right arm when her Corvair tipped over in 1961, was settled last June for $70,000. The company, which made changes affecting handling in its 1964 and 1965 models, has denied all the charges.

Nelson Asks Standards

WASHINGTON, January 26.—Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, called today on the Federal Government to set minimum safety standards for all automobiles.

"The slightest mention of safety standards seems to cause panic in the automobile industry," he said.

"I can understand their concern about ill-considered regulation," he added. "But the industry also must understand the nationwide concern over 48,000 automobile deaths in America in 1964—a 10-percent increase over the year before."

Changing auto death rate

(Following is a table showing the recent rise in the death rate for each 100,000,000 vehicle-miles traveled:)

	Deaths	Vehicle-miles (billions)	Deaths for each 100,000,000 vehicle-miles
1934	36,101	216	16.7
1936	38,089	252	15.1
1938	32,582	271	12.0
1940	34,501	320	11.4
1942	28,309	267	10.6
1944	24,282	212	11.5
1946	33,411	341	9.8
1948	32,259	398	8.1
1950	34,763	458	7.6
1952	37,794	514	7.4
1954	35,586	561	6.3
1956	39,628	628	6.3
1958	36,981	665	5.6
1960	38,137	719	5.3
1962	40,804	768	5.3
1964	[1]48,000	[1]825	[1]5.7

[1] Estimated.

Source: National Safety Council.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 28, 1965]

Automen Defend Safety Record Despite Critics—They Find Fault With the Driver—Public Apathy Also Cited—Pressure From States Spurns the Industry

(By David R. Jones)

DETROIT, January 27.—The body of a 1965 Cadillac came shooting down a 100-foot track in a basement laboratory near here the other day and then slammed to an abrupt halt. An overall-clad dummy in the right front seat bolted forward as the vehicle stopped, sending his sightless head through the windshield with a shattering crash.

This grim experiment, conducted at the General Motors Proving Ground at Milford, simulated what can happen to an unbelted passenger if his Cadillac smashed into another car at a mere 15 miles an hour.

"The moral of the story," observed a General Motors official, "is to buckle up your seat belts."

This testing effort at General Motors is only part of a broad drive underway in the automobile industry to design safer cars. By studying results of tests such as this, as well as planned crashes between production automobiles, the automakers are striving to develop new and improved safety devices for their cars.

COMPLAINTS RISE

The industry's program of safety engineering seems to be getting new emphasis at a time when legislators and other public officials are leveling increasing criticism at the auto companies for not moving fast enough in this area.

Ford Motor Co., for instance, is pondering a new test sled similar to the one at GM and may even construct a safety building. GM itself has begun calling in an outside safety expert to meet with top management and stylists.

Nevertheless, complaints about the industry's attitude toward safety continue to rise. They contributed to a congressional decision last year to establish minimum safety standards for Government-purchased cars. And there is evidence in State legislatures and elsewhere of greater pressure for safety standards on private cars.

The General Services Administration, the Government's purchasing agent, yesterday published a list of 17 safety features it would like to see on the cars it buys in 1966.

PROBLEMS FORESEEN

The proposals, which will be put in final form after 30 days of public comment, were not as severe as the industry had feared. But they still could cause automakers some problems.

An official of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, which helped develop the proposals, says about half of the items already are available as standard equipment or options. The Government appears ready to accept Society of Automotive Engineers standards on the remainder, he said.

But some of the standards will be new. The industry is developing its first standard for an acceptable padded dashboard, for instance, and also for glare-reduction surfaces.

Sources say work remains to be done to produce a steering assembly that will meet Government purchase requirements. And since only American Motors Corp. and General Motors Cadillac Division offer dual brake systems, others will have to adjust to that.

Aside from the Government purchasing agency's action, there are signs that Congress is becoming increasingly concerned over auto safety. Since 1962 it has passed legislation setting standards for brake fluid and seat belts shipped in interstate transit. Both laws lack sufficient enforcement provisions, but they are indicative of the trend.

In New York State, Senator J. Speno, outgoing chairman of the joint legislative committee on traffic safety and motor vehicles, is pushing legislation on tire standards and is trying to raise $3 million from several States and the Federal Government to build a prototype car for safety research.

The Massachusetts Joint Legislative Committee on Highways and Motor Vehicles will hold hearings this week in Boston on American Automobile Association-backed bills that would require dual-brake systems on all new cars. The bills would also establish minimum safety standards for tires and brake linings, and set up a commission to draft a code of minimum auto safety standards.

ECONOMIC FACTOR

There is little belief, even within the industry, that automakers would have made seat belts standard equipment by now if several States had not enacted laws making them mandatory. The industry's critics use this as evidence that the companies do not pursue safety as they should.

"There are safety engineers within the industry who are just as dedicated as we are, but they aren't high enough in the industry," said one high Government safety man. "Top management really believes that they are putting out the safest car they can. The engineers don't, but top management does.

"If you talk to the safety engineers, you find that they have been working diligently," agrees a leading auto stylist. "They keep trying to do more and more. But the pressure can only be so great. Safety's position as an economic value and a sales value has to be weighed by management in terms of what it will do to sell vehicles. And they do not think it sells."

Critics contend that the subordination of safety shows up in little ways. They cite horn rings that catch on the driver's sleeve, the removal of wraparound taillights when styling dictates, the short shrift that safety receives at new car previews, and the industry's refusal to standardize passenger car instrument panels even though for a decade it has recommended standardized truck panels for "safety and convenience" and simplified production.

Particular criticism is leveled at the automakers for failing to adopt dual-braking systems, which permit two brakes to work even when the other two fail. American Motors and Cadillac offer these as standard equipment. Sources say the added cost is about $3 a car.

But the cost pressures are great, and money is not spent lightly.

"Detroit is probably the only place in the world where a 10-cent saving per tire looks like $3.5 million," says an official of McCreary Tire & Rubber. "If Ford can save 10 cents per tire, as compared with what Chevrolet is paying, the 10 cents can become a million dollars in a year's time."

The rising chorus of criticism infuriates automen, who contend that poor highway design and bad driving are the main reasons for accidents. They point out that independent studies indicate about half the people involved in fatal accidents have been drinking.

"We in the industry are disturbed at being the goat," trembles one auto executive. "The number of accidents caused by failure of the product are pretty damned small. We are the goats because we are the easiest to get at."

"We feel our cars are quite safe and quite reliable," says Harry F. Barr, vice president of the engineering staff for General Motors.

"We are not given any credit whatever for our real concern, technically, about the problem. The driver is most important, we feel. If the drivers do everything they should, there would not be accidents, would there?"

TWOFOLD DEFENSE

The basic defense the industry puts up against demands for faster safety improvements is twofold. First, it asserts that it knows more about the product than its critics, and that most of the proposed safety devices are either unproven or impractical. Second, it asserts that the public does not really want added safety measures, and that it is in no position to force them down a customer's throat.

Auto engineers say it still is unclear whether a collapsible steering wheel offers a driver better protection, for instance, and they think eliminating the right front dashboard might deal extra harm to an unbelted passenger.

Chrysler Corp. plans to offer a diagonal chest belt as an option this year, but other automakers question whether the devices are proven yet.

"So-called safety proposals are all too often made without any real justification or proof that they would be effective, acceptable to the public or economically justified," contends Ralph H. Isbrandt, vice president of automobile engineering and research for American Motors.

COMPLACENCY FEARED

Auto men note that statistically, an individual's chance of avoiding accidents is high. The good driver can expect an average of one fender accident every 5 years, a property damage accident of more than $25 every 13 years, and an injury or fatality every 46 years, figures Karl M. Richards, manager of field services for AMA.

Charles W. Prisk, Deputy Director of Highway Safety for the Bureau of Public Roads, says this lulls the public into complacency.

"You can drive for 2,000 years and not be killed, if you're the average driver," he says, "and who among us is going to drive for 2,000 years?"

The industry says it has solid evidence that people are not interested in safety features. American Motors made seat belts standard in 1950, but had to remove them because of customer complaints. Even today, studies indicate that only 35 to 50 percent of the people with belts use them.

Ford introduced a recessed hub steering wheel, a padded dashboard, and seat belts for its 1956 models and spent large sums advertising safety. But competitors were pushing "hot" cars, and Ford dropped the program when its sales began to slip.

Even since then, the industry has been shy—if not downright opposed—to promoting safety devices. "That altered, from that point to this, and for the foreseeable future, safety as a merchandising gimmick," says one auto executive.

"People don't like to be reminded that you can have a wreck in an automobile," observes another official. "It is not in our interest—it is not logical—to say 'If you get in a wreck, you're probably not going to be killed in this car'."

Herbert L. Misch, Ford's vice president of engineering and research, believes the best way to promote safety devices is to introduce them as optional equipment first. This serves "to educate the public and develop a market for it," he says, permitting eventual adoption on a mass basis.

Safety rarely shows its head in the industry's advertising. The four leading auto concerns spent a total of $282 million on advertising in 1963, according to Advertising Age, a trade publication. But the industry's outside efforts for safety research and promotion, channeled through AAA, totaled an estimated $2 million.

NO PUBLIC CLAMOR

"One dollar's worth of advertising has to produce one dollar's worth of profit to break even," explains Roy C. Haeusler, Chrysler's candid and respected automotive safety engineer.

"We know full well that advertising safety does not produce that return. We don't know if safety sells cars, but if we don't know we can't justify advertising money."

Few people dispute the industry's contention that the public is not clamoring for a safer car. The industry's critics know that carmakers would be happy to push safety if it sold cars.

"People are not knocking on the doors and saying, 'Give me a safe car and I'll buy it,'" says Dr. Huelke at the University of Michigan. "If they were they'd get it."

But the industry's critics argue that the public does not clamor for more safety simply because it trusts the industry and believes cars are safe. The industry had a moral responsibility, these people say, to do more to alert the public to the dangers involved and to install devices to make driving safer.

"I think the public cares," says Matthew C. Sielski, director of the AAA traffic engineering and safety department. "The public just doesn't know."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 31, 1965]

EJECTION IS BANE OF CAR DESIGN

(By Charles C. Cain)

DETROIT.—Automotive engineers give a lot of thought to improving an auto's performance, but their No. 1 project is an increase in auto safety. That conclusion was drawn from a study of papers presented at the recent Society of Automotive Engineers' annual congress and exposition here.

Representatives of two universities—Wayne State and Michigan—gave exhaustive reports on causes of auto injuries and other reports covered everything from the need for better windshield wipers to ways of making highways more skid resistant.

The University of Michigan report, presented by Donald F. Huelke and Paul W. Gikas of the university's medical school, showed that the biggest cause of traffic deaths was ejection from the vehicle on impact. They said that a study of 104 fatal accidents resulting in 136 deaths showed that the "majority of the victims could have survived by use of the simple seat belt."

A BUILT-IN RAPIER

The biggest killer of those not tossed out of a car on impact was the end of the steering column or the steering wheel proper. It took about 18 percent of the lives, compared with 38 percent who died when they were tossed out of the car.

Of drivers killed by contact with the steering mechanism, the report added, "the majority of these driver fatalities could not have been saved even with the seat belt or shoulder-harness restraint."

It added, "Other than death by ejection, the instrument panel was the leading cause of death of front-seat passengers, most of whom could have survived by using seat belts. Impacts to the door caused invasion of the passenger compartment and most occupants would have died even if restraints had been used."

The Michigan team suggested that to "decrease the number of fatal injuries from automobile accidents, future designs of automobile interiors must include adequate crash attenuation features."

In a further word of advice to auto makers, they said: "Instrument panels must be designed in terms of function as well as safety. Increased structural rigidity, it appears, need be placed on the side of the car, mostly about the doors, the frame, and possibly the roof."

A RESILIENT WINDSHIELD

Lawrence M. Patrick of Wayne's department of engineering mechanics told the

SAE: "One has only to examine current model automobiles to find many flagrant examples of complete disregard for the most rudimentary principles of safety design. Whether this is attributed to 'styling over safety,' public apathy toward safety or lack of concrete specifications for safe design is immaterial; they are still unsafe."

Patrick reported that much of his work, financed in large part by the auto companies as part of their safety campaign, has been devoted to efforts to lessen the danger from contact with windshields in auto accidents. He has worked with glass and plastic companies, too.

Safety experts know that injuries are less severe if the heads of accident victims striking the windshield do not penetrate it, he said, adding that the goal is to make an interlayer in the windshield more stretchable so that it will allow an impacting head to deform the windshield temporarily without piercing it.

Researchers feel that if they can develop a windshield glass which will prevent penetration of the head at speeds of 35 miles per hour or more, it should drastically reduce the number of such fatalities, he said.

A PROBLEM OF SLICKNESS

Jack H. Dillard of the Virginia Council of Highway Investigation and Research pointed out that the skid rate on highways varies with the type of materials used in construction, with weather conditions and with different types of programs for increasing skid resistance.

"Unfortunately, road surfaces with low skid resistance do exist," he said, adding that many highway agencies in the United States have manifested an interest in dealing with the problem of road surfaces that become slippery when wet.

Dillard said that studies are underway to find road compositions that will be more skid resistant.

Morgan W. Dawley, a Chrysler engineer, told the SAE: "Improving the performance of windshield wipers has been a major challenge to engineers. In recent years, the increased amount of turnpike driving and the desire to increase driver visibility further emphasized the need for improvement."

Dawley said that Chrysler developed a new airfoil-type wiper after "engineering studies showed that during turnpike driving, the air forces on the conventional wiper reduced the pressure of the wiper on the windshield, thereby leaving a partially wiped windshield which blurred or obstructed driver visibility."

TIRE SAFETY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it is becoming generally accepted that there are a great number of poorly made tires on the market today, and that they are directly contributing to the alarming rise in highway fatalities. The recent Federal Trade Commission hearings on automobile tire marketing practices have focused a great deal of attention on the problems of unsafe tires and confusion of tire nomenclature. The consumer not only has no way of knowing how safe his tires are, but he also has no meaningful standards by which to judge different brands of tires.

Evidence of increasing consumer concern is found in the quantity of mail my office receives daily. A very high percentage of this mail favors some kind of uniform minimum safety standards, and also a system of quality grading and labeling. I think the Senate will be interested in reading some of these letters, for they explain succinctly the utter frustration felt not only by the consumer, but also by independent tire dealers. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1965.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: I have noted with interest several articles in the newspapers recently which indicate that you are interested in the hearings pertaining to the safety of automobile tires.

I have had a personal experience which indicates quite clearly that the original factory-equipped tires on new ——— automobiles are not always adequate from the safety standpoint. In my own case, I had purchased a new car with the new two-ply so-called equivalent of four-ply tires. These tires later proved to be defective causing my wife and myself to be involved in a rather serious accident.

I obtained a complete engineering report from a tire engineer out of Detroit which indicated that the adhesion in the various strands making up the tire was defective and also that the load capacity of the size tire that was supplied with the new vehicle was not adequate for the job it was intended to do.

Further, I have had the experience at a later date, when obtaining a new ——— car, of being unable to buy safety tires such as the ——— or ——— even though I was perfectly willing to pay the additional cost involved.

I was in the unfortunate position of having to take my new car with the standard tires supplied and go to a tire dealer myself. I was then in a position of technically having to trade used tires to obtain the safety tires I felt I needed.

My personal experiences have led me to two specific conclusions:

1. The so-called standard firstline tire supplied with new automobiles is not adequate from a safety standpoint. A much better grade should be supplied to every new car buyer, even if the additional cost has to be included in the total amount of the purchase.

2. All manufacturers and dealers of new cars should be required to supply the public with the very best tire they are willing to pay for without any particular inconvenience. Further, the automobile industry should be made to encourage, by the means of the advertising media, the public's awareness of the safety factors or lack of safety factors involved in various tires.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

JANUARY 14, 1965.

Hon. GAYLORD A. NELSON,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: I am writing to you both as an individual tire dealer and as president of the ——— Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association. Our dealership was established in 1912 and I personally have been active in it since 1946, managing it for the last 12 years. I believe that I can speak about tires with a pretty fair amount of background and experience.

I feel that I know enough of the tire dealers around our State to be sure that I can express their views quite accurately. Individuals may vary in the intensity of their feelings, but we all have a very basic interest in our chosen profession and in anything that will affect it, for good or bad.

Nearly all tire dealers have long been desirous of seeing a cleaning up of our industry. Professional tire dealers who have grown up in the business want to sell their customers at a profit, of course, but they also want to sell their customers quality merchandise so that the customer will be satisfied and will return again and again to do business at the same dealership. Therefore, the real pros rarely sell a low-quality tire to a retail customer, despite the flood of low-priced advertising that would lead the consumer to believe the contrary. This same attitude does not usually apply to the discounter selling only the cheapies.

Much tire advertising is misleading—either claims of quality are false, since there are no standards upon which to base legitimate claims, or else savings are falsely portrayed in relation to list prices which have practically no real meaning. In either case the customer is being misled, often by large companies and by large stores whose reputation lends credibility to their statements. (In recent months we have seen some of the large tire companies change their approach to a more truthful one, so perhaps all the publicity is taking effect.)

Now, it can be argued that the consumer is the best quality control that can be put on a product, because if he is misled and does not receive the quality or performance he expected he will withdraw his patronage from the store and the eventual loser will be the merchant. This might be true of merchandise where public safety is not involved, but I would not think it would be valid in regard to items like tires and brake linings where the direct result of low quality is poor performance and possible failure at high speed, endangering the lives of the user and others on the same highway or freeway.

All of the above is not news to you, I am sure, or you would not be taking your time to encourage the establishment of meaningful tire quality standards. I merely want you to know that the National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, the ——— Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, and all of us here at ——— are behind your efforts and want to do what we can to help.

I don't suppose that any industry wants a lot of Government regulation and interference, whether on a Federal, State, or local level, but so far no other workable alternative has been offered. If the industry cannot regulate itself, someone will have to do it for them.

I believe that real tire standards should be set up. The manufacturers should have to mark or label their products in such a way that the consumer will know what he is buying. Tires which are not suitable for highway and freeway driving should not even be manufactured. Retreaders should not be allowed to retread casings which originally could not have passed the quality standards, and tires which have any repair more extensive than a simple puncture repair. Vehicles should be thoroughly inspected annually for any defects that will affect safety. This sort of inspection cannot be performed on the streets at voluntary check lanes, but would have to be done in a building where the car can be put on a hoist. I realize that this would be a costly procedure, but can any other be adequate?

Do you suppose it would be possible for tire dealers or engineers to inspect tires that appear to have caused accidents to determine as nearly as possible whether the tire really was the cause of the accident?

We tire dealers want to cooperate in your efforts toward highway safety. Just call on us for any help you need. We're with you, not against you.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

JANUARY 13, 1965.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: This morning on our local radio station's newsbroadcast, Newscaster Rex Davis told about a news item concerning the fact that you were trying to do something or bring to the attention of the public (and we hope the tire industry) the definite fact that tire defects have been causing a lot of automobile accidents.

I am writing this letter because of two recent experiences in this direction and it has bothered me considerably, because in all the years I have been driving, I have never had any tire difficulty before. I, and probably many women like me, have always thought our modern tires to be absolutely safe and have never given any thought to the kinds of defects that can occur other than a flat tire.

And since these experiences, I truly hope you will be able to bring this fact before the public and the industry and in this way stop one of the havocs causing these accidents or near accidents.

This past summer we bought a new car—I then decided to take our children and dog on a 500-mile trip to visit my husband's parents—with me as the only driver in the car. Very fortunately my husband was able to join us and drive us back home—for that is when the trouble started. As we were driving along, he noticed something wrong but couldn't discover the trouble until he stopped the car and looked at each of the tires. It apparently had developed a bulge—but it wasn't noticeable from the outer side—it had developed on the inner side. Of course, we hobbled to a gas station and by the time we found one (off the highway on a rutty road) the bulge (or I believe they call it a square tire—and as I understand it is the pulling away of the lining from the tire on the inside) had developed on both sides.

The point I am trying to make is, that if I had been driving back home with the four boys and dog, I don't think I would have realized what was causing the trouble and because the gas stations along this highway were off the road and since I had plenty of gas, I wouldn't have taken the time or really realized what the difficulty was and I would have had a blowout—and then who knows what the consequences would have been.

All right, we then could say it was one tire out of many—they are massed produced and you can always get a "lemon." But about 2 months later, the same thing happened on another tire. But of course, having had one experience, I knew what to do. And then a slow leak developed on still another tire but that was repairable.

Not only were we put to the extra expense of paying for a certain percentage of the new tires (as both had to be replaced) but frankly, now I'm very much afraid or rather most cautious about our tires.

I sincerely hope you will keep up your efforts in this direction. Having sons who are fast aproaching driving age, I shudder to think of an accident being caused by defective tires. I think the tire industry should give this matter serious consideration and if you want to use my letter in any way—just do so.

I think mass production is just fine but there should be either a better inspection system or some way for the industry to develop safer tires for the public.

Thank you for letting me find an outlet for the feelings I have had in this direction and I hope you will forgive the lengthiness of this letter.

Please keep up your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 4, 1965.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: As one of the largest consumer cooperatives in the United States, we wish to express our pleasure over learning at the FTC conference of your intent to introduce legislation to provide for (1) adequate minimum safety standards to protect consumers from inadequate tires, and (2) a system of grading and labeling so consumers can "compare one brand with another and clarify confusion in tire nomenclature."

The tire business at the moment is a jungle. We feel that in our co-op tire we have one of the best values on the market. However, it becomes extremely difficult to get this across since there are no comparable grades or standards between manufacturers. Thus, legislation such as you propose has long been overdue, and as one who sells tires we assure you of our fullest backing.

With best wishes, and good luck with your proposal.

Yours sincerely,

——— ———.

JANUARY 15, 1964.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Washington, D.C.,

DEAR SIR: In our Des Moines Register, January 14, there appeared an article written by Nick Kotz concerning tire standards and complaints against faulty tires and misleading advertising.

I am not sure that what I have to say comes exactly in that category, at any rate, there was some crooked work performed by someone along the line.

I bought a new———, from our local——— dealer a year ago last June. Since I had always had———tires on my cars, with perfect success since 1916, I asked them to take off the ones on there and put——— on. They demurred a little and said they would have to go out and buy them, but they did put them on. And I supposed they put on good quality as I asked for, and I had never heard of a two-ply tire at that time. However, I trusted this salesman 100 percent, since they had been in business here always, although I had not known him until I bought this car, but had known his mother in clubs.

Well, I went to California, alone, was gone from fore part of January until April 1. Everything went well until I was on my way home. I was leaving Alhambra when one tire was low—had it checked but they thought it was the valve and put in a new one. It stayed up fairly well until I got into Alamagordo, N. Mex. I had it checked and they said it was broken fabric from the inside, they looked at the others too and said they were all breaking from the inside and were the cheapest tire that ——— put out and two-ply. I had them pumped up and went on to Amarillo, Tex., next morning. When leaving there I had all of them checked again and they said I should have two new tires anyhow and really needed four—they had not looked at the spare yet.

They asked about my spare. I told them I had had no occasion to have it out and had not looked at it. I unloaded my full trunk and they took a look at it and stated that it was a used tire, in my new car. That was hard for me to believe but I looked at it and they measured the tread and I also looked inside the others which I had them take off to examine and the fabric was broken in all of them—three of them were two-ply and one was a four-ply. I immediately wrote the dealer here at home and had a letter after I returned. I went to see him and he denied all of it, although I had the station operator sign his name on my statement, saying that the spare was a used tire. Later on, I found out that the fellow who put these tires on is a used tire dealer and he no longer managed a ——— agency, nor do we now have one here. I also went to see him and he pretended not to remember.

I carried a Standard credit card but did pay for these tires by check or traveler's checks, $107, for which this dealer would not reimburse me even for the used spare, and after this ordeal, I wondered if all of the tires might have been used ones put on by this used-tire dealer and touched up with a new look. And I am not one to misjudge folks or be suspicious until given a reason.

I wrote the ——— company, the ——— company and tried to contact our salesman here ——— who sold me the car. None of them would do anything, except to say, that when the Mr. ——— of the ——— at Amarillo returned the tires I traded in, rather gave to him, when I bought the new ones, they would make it good. Never, has he, to my knowledge, made an effort to contact the Mr. ———, or if he has, he has not told me and has kept my statement with Mr. ——— signed statement on saying the spare was a used tire. I got hurt immediately after I returned home so was unable to make the trips to see as much about it as I would have otherwise.

I was in a bad sandstorm, ready to cross a desert, a long way from any city when these tires went bad—a risk, indeed of my life I would say, and wrote this home salesman to that effect. However, with all the safety talk and telling folks to buckle their seat belts and such, to put such tires as this on any car is certainly less safe than having no seat belt or insurance, and no one responsible seems to care.

You will note that I said I had been using this brand of tires since 1916, the year I learned to drive, and I was some 3 or 4 years past the voting age then, so if you care to figure you will about know my age, which I never talk about, and even though my age is considered old, I am young in spirit, have never had an accident caused by me, nor do I feel so apt that I think I couldn't have one. So, if you and Miss Peterson can get the manufacturers to improve on their tires so that they will be more safe, that should be good. And as to my bad luck, it would be too much to think or hope, that anyone would be enough concerned about honest dealers to try to make them come clean, and as I do not know the real culprit, I no longer take my car to this dealer, nor do I use the credit card I still have and could use, but do have another one I use. I don't like dishonesty either big or little. And I'm just a widow woman of no special importance.

While this may not be of any interest to you or Esther Peterson, if there is one word that will help for safety, I'm glad.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

SHIP POLLUTION OF GREAT LAKES AND OTHER NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Great Lakes provide the greatest freshwater resource on the American continent. Millions of Americans depend on these lakes for the drinking water necessary to survival. The lakes have an almost unlimited potential as a recreational resource.

Yet these lakes, once as clear as crystal, and safe for boaters and swimmers to drink from, are becoming progressively more and more polluted. These lakes may be the single most valuable resource of this Nation; yet today we are actually in the process of destroying that resource.

Pollution of the Great Lakes is a complicated problem. It is a problem that must be attacked on several fronts.

I am drafting legislation to attack just one phase of the problem—the pollution of the Great Lakes and its harbors and other navigable waters by ships, pleasure craft, and shore installations which service these vessels.

I shall present a brief sketch of this problem, and invite suggestions from the various Federal agencies, city health officers, port directors, and the shipping industry, as to how this problem can be corrected.

It is my intention to introduce proposed legislation to require all ships and pleasure craft which use the Great Lakes and other navigable waters to be equipped with federally approved facilities for the proper retention or treatment of sewage and other wastes. It is not my intention to work any hardship on the shipping or boatbuilding industries, or to cause firms or individuals serious economic losses through the outlawing of their present vessels. The proposed legislation could easily be drafted so as to allow a reasonable period of time for compliance.

Furthermore, I intend to sponsor legislation to centralize responsibility for the enforcement of antipollution laws on all navigable waters and to streamline the enforcement procedure.

Comments on these proposals from all interested and affected persons are invited and welcome. After studying these comments, appropriate legislation will be drafted and introduced in the Senate.

Meanwhile, study of other causes of pollution of the Great Lakes will be pursued; and I hope to introduce proposed legislation to meet these problems, as well.

THE PROBLEM

The pollution of harbor and navigable waters by Government ships, commercial ships, and barges of domestic and foreign ownership, and private pleasure boats is a growing problem. These vessels dump or spill human, galley, and wash-water waste, miscellaneous trash, oil waste, and various types of cargo. These pollutants create serious health hazards, and destroy the recreational value of beaches, shorelines, and waters. The control of such pollution is extremely difficult, because of the great variety of pollutants, mixing, dilution, and scattering of pollutants by water, and mobility and number of vessels.

An idea of the potential magnitude of this problem nationally may be gained from these recent Wisconsin ship and boat statistics. In 1963, 44,294 foreign and domestic commercial vessels of all sizes visited Wisconsin Great Lakes ports.

Wisconsin municipal port officials have commented to me on the problem and the need for Federal action, as follows:

> Dr. F. Urban, health commissioner, Green Bay: "In my opinion, the pollution of the Great Lakes and Great Lakes harbors by foreign vessels is a national problem. You can readily visualize the confusion which would result were each and every Great Lakes harbor to issue its own regulations."
>
> Dr. E. G. Stack, health commissioner, Superior: "We do everything in our power to prevent any and all vessels using our harbor from jettisoning undesirable debris in our waters. Regulations regarding this are, I fear, taken rather lightly by those in charge of said vessel. If we do not catch them in the act of discharging undesirable material we are at a loss to know whence any undesirable material may originate."
>
> Dr. E. R. Krumbiegel, commissioner of health, Milwaukee: "If a single community or a single State enacted legislation forbidding the present practice of discharge of sanitary waste from ships, the vessel's operators would probably choose other ports where such requirements were not enforced. The only practical solution to the problem is to enact Federal legislation relating to all ships of all nations."
>
> Mr. J. F. Sainsbury, port director, Green Bay: "We have been altogether too lenient with pleasure-boat owners, with municipalities, with industry and with shipping interests, hoping that the discussions which have been going on for years would eventually bring about the desired remedial measures."

And the Committee on Water Pollution, the principal antipollution enforcement agency of the State of Wisconsin, has stated:

> Laws and regulations pertaining to sewage-disposal facilities by commercial vessels operating interstate should be developed and be enforced by the Federal Government. In the case of pleasure boats or boats operating within the waters of a single State the enactment of laws and regulations should be a State responsibility as should be the enforcement of such laws and regulations.

GOVERNMENTS, AGENCIES, AND LAWS CONCERNED WITH THE PROBLEM

Vessel water pollution involves governments at all levels—international, Federal, State, and local. The Federal Government is involved principally with pollution of interstate and navigable waters by its own vessels, and by commercial vessels of foreign and domestic registry. State governments are concerned primarily with pollution by private pleasure craft, while local governments are involved with pollution of their harbor and marina waters by all types of vessels. At the Federal level, the work of at least six agencies, with authority under 12 laws, impinges on the control of vessel water pollution. The most important of these agencies are the Coast Guard, the Corps of Engineers, and the Public Health Service. They administer and enforce the Refuse Act of 1899, Oil Pollution Acts of 1924 and 1961, Public Health Service Act of 1944, Wreck Removal Act of 1899, and the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956.

WEAKNESSES AND GAPS IN FEDERAL LAWS

Despite the number of Federal agencies and laws available to control pollution by vessels, there remain many gaps and weaknesses in authority and coverage, and these pose serious obstacles to solution of the problem. Thus, most of these laws are not directed to pollution of water, as such, but to other purposes—namely, navigation, safety, and public health; and their usefulness for pollution control is, therefore, limited in one or more ways.

For example, the refuse and wreck removal acts are usually considered to apply only to situations in which navigation is impeded or adversely affected; the Oil Pollution Control Act of 1924 is confined to navigable coastal waters; the Public Health Service Act deals only with the interstate transmission of communicable disease; and the Water Pollution Control Act is very general in its coverage, and provides only for judicial enforcement. Problems of enforcement and administration of these laws arise between the Coast Guard, as the general enforcement agency for all maritime law, and the other agencies, particularly the Corps of Engineers, which administer the individual laws.

OTHER PROBLEMS

There are many other obstacles to solution of the problem of vessel pollution, in addition to the lack of adequate Federal law. For example, there is no central Federal agency for coordinating work and communication among Federal agencies and between the three levels of government; State vessel pollution laws are inadequate; local harbor and marina vessel pollution laws and regulations are inadequate; facilities for pollutant disposal at harbors and marinas are inadequate and expensive to install and maintain; problems of economic and technical feasibility of equipment for treating and holding pollutants on board vessels remain; and the cost of installing pollutant-control equipment on existing vessels is high.

WORK BEING DONE

The inadequacies of Federal law and the many other problems which interfere with gaining complete control of vessel pollution are being studied by Congress and various Federal agencies. Thus, a House subcommittee—the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power—held extensive hearings on pollution, in the summer of 1963, as did the Senate Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution Control, in the summer of 1964. The Coast Guard and the Public Health Service are issuing and revising various regulations which are useful in controlling pollution. Several interagency committees have been formed to work on the problem—such as the Committee on Water Pollution Caused by Accidents and Spills, and the Committee on Waste Disposal From Vessels. Finally, the Canadian-American International Joint Commission has been asked by these governments to undertake a study of the problem of vessel pollution on the Great Lakes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF MILWAUKEE,
HEALTH DEPARTMENT,
Milwaukee, Wis., October 16, 1964.

The Honorable GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NELSON: This is in response to your letter of October 9, 1964 relating to pollution of inland waters by ship.

The Milwaukee Health Department has, over a period of the past 4 years, carried out fairly extensive studies to determine the extent to which, and the manner in which pollution occurs of the waters of Milwaukee's harbor and the adjoining Lake Michigan bathing beaches. There are many sources of pollution here, some of which we have been successful in eliminating or alleviating.

The Milwaukee River and its tributaries are polluted, during periods of runoff, by sewage from sewer outfalls. The mouth of the river, where it empties into the harbor, is in close proximity to the termination of the effluent channel of the Jones Island Sewerage Treatment Plant. This, in turn, is only a short distance from Milwaukee's outer harbor's ship docks. As a result of currents, wind and wave action, the pollution emanating from the three sources is so mixed as to make it impossible to determine how much of the pollution arises from ships tied to the docks.

As you know, most of these ships are oceangoing vessels and, practically without exception, when the heads on these ships are flushed, the discharge occurs directly into the water. Meetings have been held with the municipal port director for the purpose of seeing whether the sanitary facilities of these ships could not be connected up with local sewer lines while the vessels are tied up at the docks. This appears to be impossible since the ships have not been equipped with sewage retention facilities, nor are the sewage lines on the ships laid out so that the sewage could be discharged at a single point or only a few points.

No one community can effectively deal with the type of problem outlined above. If a single community or a single State enacted legislation forbidding the present practice of discharge of sanitary waste from ships, the vessels' operators would probably choose other ports where such requirements were not enforced. The only practical solution to the problem is to enact Federal legislation relating to all ships of all nations. It would be impractical to enact legislation requiring fairly extensive alteration of present ships unless a reasonable leadtime for compliance was specified. I am not so much concerned with the question of whether this leadtime should be 10 or 20 years. The important thing is that we look to the future and attempt to enact legislation without unnecessary delay, which will lead to alleviation of the problem at some time in the reasonably foreseeable future.

I grow tired of the argument, which some set forth, that no action can be taken because oceangoing ships have traditionally been built in such a manner as to necessitate the discharge of sanitary waste directly into the water. It is true that even some of the newer ships have been constructed in this manner. The fact remains, however, that additional cost is involved in ship construction if sanitary-waste-holding facilities are included. No single shipping operator, however well-intentioned he may be, is going to have ships designed and built in the future which are primarily different, insofar as sanitary-waste-disposal facilities are concerned, from those constructed in the past, unless his competitors do likewise.

Although the shipping interests will undoubtedly oppose any legislation which would require them to install facilities to prevent water pollution by sanitary waste, they will reluctantly comply as long as the economic disadvantage associated with such a program is diversified over the entire industry. Dr. Abel Wolman, professor of sanitary engineering at Johns Hopkins University School of Public Health, has enunciated a principle which has been amply and repeatedly demonstrated in practice. It may be paraphrased as "Industry learns how to adapt to innovations while fighting them".

Respectfully yours,

E. R. KRUMBIEGEL, M.D.,
Commissioner of Health.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
STATE BOARD OF HEALTH,
Madison, Wis., January 20, 1965.

The Honorable GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: In keeping with information previously presented, the matter of a policy for control of pollution of surface waters by boats was discussed at a meeting of the Committee on Water Pollution on January 19. It was the opinion of the committee that laws and regulations pertaining to sewage disposal facilities by commercial vessels operating interstate should be developed and be enforced by the Federal Government. In the case of pleasure boats or boats operating within the waters of a single State the enactment of laws and regulations should be a State responsibility as should be the enforcement of such laws and regulations.

It is further suggested that as part of the enactment of suitable laws and regulations pertaining to interstate commercial vessels that it be made mandatory that prosecution of violations be undertaken by the appropriate U.S. attorney upon complaint of the Coast Guard, Agriculture Department, Army Corps of Engineers, Interior Department, and State water pollution or conservation agencies.

Sincerely yours,

O. J. MUEGGE, P.E.,
State Sanitary Engineer.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At 2 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

At 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair).

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we had previously contemplated an order of business for the remainder of the present week and for next week, but I understand now, because of various considerations that have arisen, that it is necessary to rearrange that schedule. So I make inquiry now of the distinguished majority leader as to how this will work out against the background of the Lincoln recess and the absence of a good many Senators, particularly on this side of the aisle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, it is true that there have been some slight rearrangements. It is anticipated that tomorrow the Senate will take up five or six bills which have been reported from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and possibly some nominations.

Instead of the Presidential inability bill coming up on the 17th of February, which is a week from tomorrow, it is the feeling of the leadership that when the gold cover bill is reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, it should be laid down on Thursday and made the pending business. It is planned to begin the consideration of that measure on Wednesday, February 17.

It will be followed by the Presidential inability bill; and that, in turn, will be followed by the Inter-American Development Bank bill.

In this way, all the reports and hearings will be available to all Senators. We believe, jointly, that this is the best way to conduct the business in relation to these bills, this week's business, and next week's projected business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 10, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 9, 1965:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

To be captains

Lorin F. Woodcock
Marvin T. Paulson
V. Ralph Sobieralski
Lorme G. Taylor

To be commanders

Robert C. Munson
Gerard E. Haraden
Kenneth A. MacDonald
Edwin K. McCaffrey
Richard H. Houlder

To be lieutenant commanders

Raymond L. Speer
James G. Grunwell
Renworth R. Floyd
Robert L. Sandquist
James S. Midgley
Billy M. Keltner
Melvin J. Umbach
Charles H. Nixon
J. Austin Yeager
John D. Bossler

To be lieutenants

Stephen Z. Bezuk
Richard H. Allbritton
Frank H. Branca
Edward R. Dohrman
Richard J. De Rycke
Allan Jenks
Ned C. Austin
James J. Lium
John W. Carpenter
Ronald K. Brewer
Charles G. Bufe
Jeffrey G. Carlen
David L. Des Jardins, Jr.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Gerald R. Schimke
John D. Boon III

To be ensigns

James M. Wintermyre
Karl W. Kieninger, Jr.
Karl S. Karinch
George C. Chappell
John P. Vandermeulen
Oliver R. MacIntosh, Jr.
Michael G. Kenny
Vincent Tabbone
William T. McMullen
Gary A. Eskelin
Theodore Wyzewski
Charles R. McIntyre
Edward M. Gelb
Kenneth F. Burke
Roger A. Moyer
Claude O. Phipps
Roger H. Kerley
Paul M. Hale
Irving Menessa
William M. Noble

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Mark 9: 24: *Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief.*

Let us pray:

O Thou God of all our days, and years, may our hearts expand with gratitude for Thy loving kindness and for the many blessings which Thou art continually bestowing upon us.

Encourage us with the glad assurance that no needed blessing wilt Thou withhold from us if we believe and do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with the Lord.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of the Congress may be blessed with a calm and courageous faith as they are challenged to face the desperate needs of our world that is being shaken by confusion and strife.

May we be confident that there are resources of divine strength on which we have not yet drawn and that we must continue to explore and seek to release those springs of splendor which Thy divine grace hast planted within the hearts of men and nations everywhere.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of Our Salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that, pursuant to Public Law 38, 75th Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Mr. MAGNUSON, appointed Mrs. NEUBERGER and Mr. MORTON members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 9355, designated Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. ALLOTT to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

The message also announced that, pursuant to Public Law 301, 78th Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Mr. MAGNUSON, appointed Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. PROUTY members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that Mr. MCCLELLAN had been appointed a conferee on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) entitled "Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes," in place of Mr. RUSSELL, excused.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS ON FEBRUARY 22

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, February 22, 1965, George Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the chair designates the gentleman from California, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the approval of the Journal on February 22, 1965.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during general debate today and tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

FEBRUARY 8, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As you know, pursuant to section 712(a)(2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (title 50, Appendix, United States Code, sec. 2162(a)(2)), it is the duty of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to suggest five members of the committee to be members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

I sincerely hope that the following members meet with your approval: WRIGHT PATMAN, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, WILLIAM A. BARRETT, WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, PAUL A. FINO.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Bates
Battin
Bell
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Celler
Clancy
Corbett
Corman
Davis, Wis.
Dickinson
Dyal
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Fisher
Giaimo
Gibbons
Goodell
Griffin
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hungate
Ichord
King, Calif.
Laird
Landrum
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Morton
O'Hara, Mich.
Pelly
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Scott
Shipley
Stalbaum
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tunney
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORICAL LANDMARKS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide to the entire District of Columbia those features in the present law that today apply almost exclusively to the Georgetown area of the District relating to the preservation of structures of historic and cultural importance.

This bill would amend the Old Georgetown Act to broaden its coverage to the whole of our Nation's Capital so as to preserve the all-too-few remaining buildings and areas of historic and cultural value—many of which are in imminent danger of obliteration. Legally speaking, there is precious little that can be done at this moment to halt such destruction.

Briefly, this bill would prevent the District of Columbia government from issuing a license—as they are now required to do—for the razing of any building in the District until the Fine Arts Commission has had an opportunity to investigate the property in question for its possible historic or cultural value and make whatever recommendations it deems necessary.

Laudably, the Fine Arts Commission in conjunction with the National Capital Planning Commission is currently in the process of compiling a list of District properties—both privately and publicly owned—of historic and cultural significance which, hopefully, would somehow be shielded from the bulldozer—but the question, legally, is how?

I am fully aware that this bill leaves several important questions largely unanswered—such as private property rights—but hopefully, it will generate more intensive activity to find the fair and proper formula for this complicated but immensely vital program.

A maximum effort to protect these invaluable landmarks is especially imperative today because at this crucial moment a feverish building program is very much in evidence throughout the District which if unselective and insensitive to naught but "business as usual" may well result in the indiscriminate leveling of our remaining architectural contacts with the past.

Washington, D.C., is a mecca for countless tourists—from home and abroad—who are seeking a more intimate contact with our precious heritage and can hardly be inspired by the glisteningly sanitary granite icehouses which are sprouting up all over our Federal City.

GOLD RESERVES AGAINST DEPOSIT LIABILITIES

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against H.R. 3818, a bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities, when it comes to the floor.

I shall do so knowing full well that the administration finds itself in an almost impossible situation with regard to its gold reserves—that it will have just about $1.5 billion in free gold with which to meet an estimated requirement this coming year of $1.75 billion.

My vote, Mr. Speaker, will be to protest the profligate pecuniary policies of this and past administrations which have brought about the present situation. Despite repeated warnings that these policies could not be continued without creating severe adverse effects, this administration continues to operate as though it had its own personal money tree growing on the White House lawn. I am concerned as to whether we are to have a great society or a great nation.

I have no doubts as to the outcome of the upcoming vote. My protest, however, will have been spread on the record.

THE LATE HUGH B. DWYER

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the city of El Paso, Tex., is mourning the death of a member of one of its pioneer families. The life of Hugh B. Dwyer, prominent and rising young attorney and son of Mr. and Mrs. James M. Dwyer, was cut short at the age of 32, due to a sudden illness. Mr. Dwyer was the descendant and namesake of Hugh Stephenson, pioneer El Paso settler who first came to the historic pass on the Rio Grande in 1824, 3 years before the first permanent settlement on the north side of the river, and while the area was still a part of the Republic of Mexico.

Hugh B. Dwyer was also the descendant of James Wiley Magoffin, pioneer of the Santa Fe Trail and the man who arranged for the peaceful cession of most of New Mexico during the Mexican War of 1846.

This ancestry has been important in the lives of the Dwyer family, who have been prominent in El Paso political and civic affairs since the turn of the century, and particularly prominent in promoting the aims of the Democratic Party, the party of the people.

Because of his historic ancestry and native interest in the past, present, and future of the city that was his home, Hugh B. Dwyer has played an important part in the affairs of the El Paso Historical Society and has aided in research into the rich history of our area. He was also president of the Philatelic Society. For these and many other services, and because his life has been an inspiration to his family and his associates, I take this opportunity to insert into the RECORD the deep respect of his city to the memory of Hugh B. Dwyer.

RESERVES AGAINST DEPOSITS IN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 193 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3818) to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 193 provides for the consideration of H.R. 3818, a bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities.

The resolution provides for an open rule with 4 hours of general debate.

Under the present requirements each Federal Reserve bank must maintain a reserve in gold certificates of at least 25 percent against the deposits it holds. H.R. 3818 would eliminate that requirement.

The Federal Reserve Act also requires the maintenance of a 25-percent gold certificate reserve against Federal Reserve notes. Gold reserves held against Federal Reserve notes would not be affected by H.R. 3818.

The present situation, Mr. Speaker, entails two potentially negative prospects. One, it could limit the monetary expansion necessary in our own continued growth and prosperity. The second is that it could handicap the United States in its international monetary dealings.

H.R. 3818 would bring about a revision in existing requirements that would better aline our gold reserves with present needs. Moreover, it is a limited step, confined solely to reserves relating to Federal Reserve deposits. It has no effect—and I reiterate—Mr. Speaker, on the gold cover of Federal Reserve notes and, therefore, it should give no cause for concern to many who feel that there should be some metal backing behind our basic currency.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 193.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman tell me precisely the reason for liberating approximately $5 billion in gold; what is the reason?

Mr. PEPPER. I think the reasons are plain and are pretty well known to the Congress and to the country. The expansion of our own currency requirements makes a continual demand upon our gold reserve. We know that it has been necessary to expand the amount of currency in circulation in recent years in order to accommodate the expanding economy of our country. With the present requirement of 25 percent gold certificates being held in reserve for the money that is in circulation, and as currency commitments continue there is a continual and increasing demand upon our gold reserve to supply the domestic needs of our economy.

Then, the able gentleman from Iowa knows that we have today many demands upon our gold stocks because of purchases of gold or the requirements that gold be sent abroad, as it were, under existing international monetary regulations and rules. So, the combination of the two makes necessary this provision that is suggested today, that we free about $4.8 billion worth of our gold certificates and make that gold available to our country in meeting the demands that come to us from abroad for our gold sales.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the second reason given was the present situation of our deficit in the international balance of payments?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; of course, it arises, generally speaking, out of the deficit in our balance of payments. But it is pointed out in the hearings by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board that within a year or 2 years if we had had no drain upon our gold supply from abroad it would be necessary to have done something like this in order to accommodate the expanding needs of our domestic economy, because today the reserve ratio is only a little over 27 percent and the legal requirement is 25 percent. That margin of a little over 2 percent would be pretty soon absorbed within a a year or 2 years by the expansion of our domestic economy and the requirement that more currency be put in circulation even if we had no demand from abroad.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is well aware of the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury to the effect that if he had his way there would be no gold backing of either deposits or notes.

Mr. PEPPER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The Secretary of the Treasury did not say that, according to the way I read his testimony before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. He said that according to economics alone it might not be necessary to have any gold cover for our currency, but we should take into account, as well as the economics of the matter, the psychology and the sentiment of the people, and the people would not be at ease if we withdrew all metal backing for our currency and, therefore, he did not advocate it.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida states that we are going to maintain gold deposits behind Federal Reserve notes.

Also that the expanding economy will create an additional demand for gold backing for new currency and also that the present balance of payments situation requires that we free this gold in order to make it available for foreign demands. Now, if we do not reverse the balance of payments situation and there is a continued demand for money backing, will it not be possible we could use all the gold we are making available if this legislation becomes law, and that we would be asked in the future to reduce the gold requirement from behind the Federal Reserve notes?

Mr. PEPPER. That does not necessarily follow. When you have a problem you sometimes have more than one way of meeting the problem. The freeing of some $5 billion of gold as proposed, adds this amount to the sum available to meet international demand. That is one proposal. The able gentleman is already aware of the fact that the President has indicated he will send to the Congress directly a message on this balance of payments matter. President Kennedy sent a message up here on the same subject in 1963. The President will very soon send to the Congress proposals to eliminate this balance-of-payments deficit.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I hope the gentleman is correct. During the last 2 years we have not seen a reversal of balance of payments in favor of the United States. I would like to ask the gentleman what he might envision as the possibility for the reversal of the balance of the payments situation?

Mr. PEPPER. I may say to the gentleman the figures I have—and I got them from the Treasury Department this mornnig—indicate the balance of payments deficit was $3.2 billion in 1963, and the deficit in 1964 was only $3 billion—$200 million lower in 1964 than in 1963.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Did we have an increase in the flow of gold from the United States during the last quarter of 1964?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. There was an increase in the ratio in the last quarter of 1964. The President will make recommendations to the Congress directly which will arrest that increase and bring about a decrease in our balance-of-payments deficit or, I believe, its elimination.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I would like to ask the gentleman this: We have at the present time a temporary provision for the freeing of gold against deposits. Why is it necessary, if we anticipate reversal of this trend, to go ahead and move into the area of permanent removal of this requirement?

Mr. PEPPER. The gentleman will recall I said a moment ago even if we had no drain on our gold supply from abroad within the next year or so, some of the estimates are about 1 year, the demand for the provision of gold backing for our Federal Reserve notes, due to our expanding economy, would bring the reserves that we have down to the legal requirement of 25 percent, so it would be necessary to do this that we are now proposing this year, or within 6 months, let us say, even if we had no demand at all from abroad. This is a prudent proposal on the part of the administration to meet this problem.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Assuming that we create a stabilization of our balance of payments, what will happen at a time when we can no longer maintain deposits required for currency when the issuance of new currency uses up the gold we are freeing today?

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, if we arrest this trend from abroad we will have reserves more than required for the support of our own currency, and at the rate we are using up our gold reserves to support our expanding currency it would take a long time to jeopardize an adequate reserve. During that time we may well be acquiring more gold from abroad under the present program we have.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I suggest we are going to have to do many things to meet the many problems that have been created. I hope the analysis of the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. The passage of this bill will provide adequate security, adequate safeguards, and adequate reserves both for our expanding economy needs and for any anticipated needs from abroad.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. A few weeks ago this country put up a very substantial part of a $3 billion so-called loan to prop up Britain's pound sterling. Here we are being asked to pull down $5 billion that is back of the currency of this country. It is more important to protect the integrity of the pound sterling than it is to protect the integrity of the American dollar?

Mr. PEPPER. The able gentleman is in error. This proposal does not relate to withdrawing the gold backing from the currency of our country. We were supporting the pound sterling in the proceeding to which the gentleman refers. Today we are proposing only to eliminate a requirement that presently exists, that the Federal Reserve bank keep a gold reserve to the extent of 25 percent of the reserves that our banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System have to keep up with the Federal Reserve System, which is largely a bookkeeping matter anyway.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Florida is certain we can rely on the British to come to our rescue when the dollar becomes a two-bit dollar, is he?

Mr. PEPPER. This bill is designed to see that the U.S. dollar remains the strongest currency in the world.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. The gentleman made reference to a statement that President Kennedy made in 1963 when he spoke to the Congress about the imbalance of gold going out of this country. My recollection is that he predicted there would be an improvement in the balance of payments of about $2 billion in the next 18 months. My recollection is that the balance of payments went down $2.6 billion in 1963, and also in 1964 $2.4 billion. Where has there been an improvement since President Kennedy gave that message to this House?

Mr. PEPPER. I pointed out that in 1963 our balance-of-payments deficit was about $3.2 billion and in 1964 was $3 billion, so there is some improvement in the situation, which causes loss of gold by us, and we anticipate there will be a further improvement when the message comes down from the President.

Mr. GURNEY. Is not that different from what the President predicted in his message in 1963?

Mr. PEPPER. One of the achievements of President Kennedy's program was a sharp reduction in the flotation of foreign securities in the domestic market in the United States. There has been an increase in capital outflow from banks. Among other things, that will no doubt have the attention of the President in his anticipated message.

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure the gentleman from Florida shares the concern of all Members of this House concerning this critical balance-of-payments problem. I hope President Johnson's forthcoming advice to the Congress will be better than his predecessor's was in 1963.

Mr. PEPPER. I think President Kennedy's advice to the Congress was borne out by subsequent events, and President Johnson's forthcoming message will show how we can solve this problem.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. If the gentleman will yield further, with respect to the statement of the gentleman that 25 percent of the deposits must be maintained in gold certificates, if we remove the gold deposit requirement, will it create a broader lending base for banks?

Mr. PEPPER. It would not have anything to do with that.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. As I understand it, the banks must keep 25 percent of their reserves in gold certificates. Now we are removing that. Would not we have a broader base if this restriction is removed?

Mr. PEPPER. Not necessarily.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does not this make possible a broader lending base?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think so. I do not think this measure will in any sense of the word affect the amount of credit outstanding. This is simply a case of not any longer requiring the Federal Reserve System to have gold certificates up to 25 percent of the deposits that the member banks have as reserves with the Federal Reserve System, which, as I said, is largely a matter of bookkeeping, anyway. The banks cannot get any gold certificates any more than any other depositor can get gold certificates for the deposit he has in a bank. It is largely a bookkeeping matter. It is felt that in the national interest these funds should no longer be earmarked for this purpose. The Federal Reserve System is a fully responsible agency. It has Government bonds and other assets behind it. This gold is just one of the assets of the Federal Reserve System. The full faith and credit and the assets of the Federal Reserve System are behind the obligation to repay the deposits of the member banks.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman's remarks are somewhat at variance with the remarks of Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, the other day. However, he did indicate that other policies of the Federal Reserve Board are maintained or could be followed so that this would not necessarily create an inflationary situation.

I do thank the gentleman from Florida for answering these questions. I believe he has made an excellent presentation of the problem and the issue to be voted on today.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my able friend and colleague, the gentleman from Idaho, very much. His questions reveal a commendable knowledge of the subject under discussion.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to my able friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does the gentleman have information as to whether or not there is enough gold being mined throughout the world to meet the expanding economy of the world?

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly do not subscribe to anybody's idea that the world can afford to go on the gold standard. I do not believe any major country can afford to go on a complete gold standard. So I just do not believe there is enough gold to accommodate the expanding trade and economy of the world. I answer that question on that basis.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Therefore in the normal course of events there would not be sufficient gold to meet the expanding economy of the world. Gradually we would of necessity have to go off the standard of having gold backing behind the Federal Reserve notes or even our currency; is that not so?

Mr. PEPPER. Possibly so. But the dollar today as an alternative to gold is the accepted currency throughout the world and this bill strengthens the dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has consumed 18 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of the utmost importance that is before us today. It deals with a subject that very few people understand. It has been brought to us hurriedly and sometimes I wonder why. Not long ago President Johnson was quoted as saying that there comes a time in the life of every individual when he must stop and reassess his position and think of where he has been and where he is going. Perhaps such a moment has arrived for the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was presented or reported very quickly. The fact of the matter is, hearings were called on it before the bill was even introduced. I also note that it was introduced by request. Hearings were held for a single day. Only two witnesses were called or heard—the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. The bill was reported after less than 4 hours of consideration.

The great committee of which I am a member, which has never been noted for its speed alone, somehow or other got into high gear and reported the bill in a single day with just two witnesses, perhaps a third who did say he supported the measure. I wonder why all the speed and all the hurry? I think it is a question that we should ask ourselves. Can it be that the cause of this tremendous outbreak of speed is the fact that we have lost over $300 million in gold from our reserves since January? Can it be that just last week or virtually during that week, we lost over $100 million in gold? Can that be the reason for this speed? Can it be because we are now hovering at the $15 billion mark when not too long ago we had far above $20 billion in gold?

What has happened? What is the situation? Do you not believe it is time for us to be honest and frank with ourselves and with the American people? We are scared, right here in the Congress about this matter. The banks of the United States are scared, too, whether they say so or not. The Treasury is frightened, because they have seen our gold supply dwindle away as a result of foolish policies we have made and followed throughout the years.

Perhaps right now is the moment to seek the plain, absolute truth—at least to realize within our own minds what is the truth.

Our troubles in the field of money, in the international field of gold, if we wish to call it that, started with a man named Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1934, when he decided to devalue the dollar and made gold worth $35 an ounce. Whether it was justified or not depends on an individual's viewpoint, but he embraced a new policy and a new program which had been submitted to him by a famous socialist of Great Britain, Lord Keynes.

We embarked upon a great spending program. Suddenly, we determined in our own minds, here in the Congress, here in America, and down in the Executive Mansion, that America was great enough and strong enough to feed, finance, and police the world. We embarked upon a program of spending more than we took in, a program of unbalanced budgets at home and huge expenditures overseas, in the determination that we would rebuild the world. Yes, it was felt that we could feed, finance, and police the rest of the world—that we were so strong and we were so prosperous we could do so. As a result, the balance of payments built up against us, and it has continued to do so.

So we get to a place where, in order to have the gold in our reserves to meet the obligations we have promised we would meet—to pay out gold in return for American currencies and securities held abroad, we face a shortage.

We have pledged ourselves to pay $26.5 billion to $27.5 billion. Seemingly, no one knows exactly how much. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, who knows more about finances than both Mr. Chase and Mr. Sanborn knew about coffee, told us before the Rules Committee that he did not know just how much gold could be demanded by foreign countries or how much gold we would have to put up to keep our pledges and our promises, but it was somewhere around $26 billion or $27 billion. The latest figure I have seen is $27.4 billion. We have, right now, some $15 billion, practically all of which has been pledged to support our currency and our deposits—yours and mine—belonging to the banks in which we have our assets, in the Federal Reserve banks.

What are we doing today? Let us be frank. Let us be honest. Let us seek the truth. What we are doing today is to whittle away a part of the gold support for our American money and American deposits in the banks of the Federal Reserve System.

What is the law today? I have not heard it mentioned this morning, but the law of the Nation requires every member bank in this country to keep on deposit with the Federal Reserve bank or banks a certain percentage of its assets. Those are assets which belong to you and me, in the banks in our hometowns, if you please. Behind that stands a guarantee of the U.S. Government that those deposits made with the Federal Reserve banks are backed by 25 percent of the deposits in gold, not less than 25 percent.

What are we proposing today? To take away that guarantee so there is no guarantee made to your local bank, or there will not be after this becomes law, that its deposits in the Federal Reserve bank, which are required of it by law and which it must make its deposits of your assets and your money, if you please, will be protected by the blanket of gold which stays behind these deposits.

Now, what will be the next step? Well, this is a very simple bill if you analyze it. It just strikes out a few words from the Federal Reserve Act, part of the paragraph after the word "notes." Strike out the remainder of the paragraph, according to the bill, which, of course, deals only with the gold support of the deposits of member banks in the Federal Reserve banks. However, all you have to do is just move up a few words the next time and strike out the words that say that there shall be this 25 percent gold reserve behind the Federal Reserve bank notes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Already it is being whispered and reported—and no one will say anything or make any definite promises as to what will be done in the future—that it will not be long until there will be other legislation in here. When I say "long" I mean 2 or 3 years from now. If we whittle away this gold reserve of $5 billion that will be available as a result of the enactment of this bill, it will not be long until new legislation will be in here to cut the gold support behind the Federal Reserve notes and behind our American currency to 10 or 15 percent. And we talk about the faith and credit of the United States of America. Our faith and credit depends on the value of the currency and what is behind it. That has been economic history and financial history throughout time and you cannot change it by whatever you may want to do here.

Now let me talk for just one more minute. Why are we here? Because we have foolishly—and I am not blaming any one administration—followed this idea that we can feed, finance, and police the world and can pour hundreds of millions, even billions of dollars, if you please, into foreign countries in the way of foreign aid, and can send our troops all over the world and pay and quarter them there, and can rebuild country after country and maintain those economies once they are rebuilt until they became competitors of ours. We have followed the idea that we can do all these things that in the end have been detrimental rather than helpful to the United States. Now the time has come to pay the piper and the bill. Oh, yes. You can trust the Federal Reserve banks. They will protect the Federal Reserve System. They will protect the deposits of the member banks. I have it on no lesser authority than the chairman of our great House Committee on Banking and Currency. He is confident that that great system, the Federal Reserve banks and the Federal Reserve System, will protect those deposits. But how long will it be before he will have legislation before us to destroy or curb the power and authority of the Federal Reserve banks?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. I will yield for a brief time.

Mr. JONAS. If there is no need to have this reserve to protect deposits, why was it ever put into the law in the first place?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, that is a good question, and it is a question that I hope somebody answers on this side. If it was not of any value or any worth to have all of these billions of dollars, better than $20 billion, in gold reserves, why on earth did we have it? Why have it all these years to stabilize our currency and make this the greatest nation on the face of the earth?

Why is it that other countries want our gold and have been able to obtain our gold if it means nothing, if it is just paper, as they say? Oh, yes, we have some peculiar ideas around here. I heard a man state in the well of this House not too many years ago that we ought not to worry about the debt, that we just owe the money to ourselves.

I heard another man state in the well of this House that the way to pay the bonus to American soldiers was to print paper money—just print it. That was not long ago. We have seen some peculiar legislation come before this House.

And here we are today, if you please, going to cover up, rake over, hide if we can, the mistakes of the past. We are going again to delude ourselves; we are going to refuse, if you please, to face issues and facts. We are not going to live within our income because that takes courage and willpower and sacrifice. We are not going to say to some of our neighbors overseas, "no longer will the gravy train stop at your place. We are going to have to look after the United States of America a little bit." Oh, we have not the courage to face these issues. So we are going to take the easy way out and evidently the only way out, as far as some people are concerned, and pass this legislation. It is the only way out, unless we do have the courage and the faith and the ability and the character to say that we are going to stop these things, as other countries have been forced to stop some of their practices. To stop these foolish practices, is to go on a sound basis, to practice a sound fiscal policy in this Government and abroad as well. We are going to start living within our income.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one other thing, if I may. You may hear that in argument today. It was made before the Committee on Rules. It was said by one of the witnesses there—and again I refer to the man who knows more about monetary affairs than anyone else in this House, and often I find it difficult to prove that he is wrong, because he is adroit and he argues well and is a great student. He told us that the real difficulty today was not so much in foreign aid expenditures, money that we spend overseas on our Military Establishment, and so forth; that it was really the fault of a half a dozen or so—and if I am wrong I stand corrected—international banking firms that have been milking this country of gold for the benefit of Europe. And the question was asked, if that is true, why has this not been called to the attention of the Congress in time to stop this terrible tragedy that is about to come upon us? Why has there not been legislation brought in by the great committee that is authorized to study these monetary problems? Why has not legislation been presented here to stop that and to protect, if you please, the Treasury of the United States and our gold reserves from the raids of these international pirates, as they may have been described? Have we failed in our obligation? If that is the answer we certainly have not met our responsibilities. Why not?

Mr. Speaker, I have brought up some of the other reasons why we are here today and, perhaps, we want to think about them.

Must we do this in such a great hurry? Is there no other answer? Should we not first have some evidence, if you please, as to just what has happened to us? We want to have an orderly economy. We want a sound fiscal policy at home and abroad. We want to stop this drain by living within our means here and abroad, and we must insist upon others doing likewise.

Mr. Speaker, have we the courage, have we the character, have we the ability to face the challenge of today or shall we go on with this particular step, just another step toward a complete devaluation of the American dollar, to the final collapse of a great republic called the United States of America?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the issue before us right now is whether or not this legislation is ready for debate and consideration on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I was very pleased to have the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] stress so emphatically the matter that it is not.

As one who has to be concerned with this area, primarily in the area of debt management, which is in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and also within the jurisdiction of the Joint Economic Committee where we have been holding fairly extensive hearings on this particular problem over a period of not just 1 year but several years, people on my side kept asking me, "Well, what is your position going to be?" I said, "Well, I have some ideas but frankly I want to come over and read the majority views and the minority views and then also refer to the hearings."

Let me advise the Members of the House that there is no way for anyone who wants to be a student of this matter to give any advice to the Members of the House. There are no working papers. There have been 4 hours of hearings. There was no opportunity to call the many experts on the other side of the issue to be heard who feel that there are other ways of moving in on this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. One of the two witnesses that appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency in support of this legislation was the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It was my understanding that Mr. Dillon was to leave the Capital within the next 30 to 60 days.

Does the gentleman from Missouri expect, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. Dillon's successor to come before your committee sometime between now and the end of the fiscal year with a request that we again increase the national debt limit so that we may borrow more money for our future generations to pay in order to finance our deficit arrangements that we have made both at home and abroad?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I would say to the gentleman I do expect that to happen, because the President in his budget message to the Congress and also in his Economic Report said that they are going to have to ask that the debt ceiling be increased and, this, again of course, is so that we can sell or pass out more Government bonds. I could not say that we in all instances sell them because through our debt-management system we have interwoven them inextricably with our monetary system.

Mr. Speaker, on page 40 of the very limited hearings I want the Members of the House to grasp this one little statement of Mr. Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System:

> In order to avoid any deflationary impact from this outflow, the Federal Reserve offset the effects of the decline in its gold certificate holdings by expanding its holdings of U.S. Government securities. In addition, the Federal Reserve further increased its Government security holdings in order to sustain an expansion of bank credit consistent with a growing economy and a relatively stable average of prices.

Indeed, in the Federal Reserve-Treasury accord of 1951, if anyone needed to have this point driven home, this interrelation between our debt securities and our monetary system was unmistakably established. The Federal Reserve told the Treasury it no longer was going to absorb the Government bonds at the interest rate that was set on them, which was unrealisic in respect to the market rate, they were going to have to go out and sell them in the market. This gets into the substantive aspects of the legislation before us at this time.

The gist of my remarks is to emphasize to the House that this matter has been poorly prepared for consideration, as serious as this is.

The hearings further reveal, on page 20:

> The President, in his economic report, has stressed the seriousness of the problem, and has unequivocally stated that "we must and will reduce and eliminate" the deficit.

There is not any question about the seriousness of this problem. This House is asked to act on this kind of homework, or lack thereof, by one of our great committees which is capable of doing good work.

The issue in this Congress is continually going to be whether this is a deliberative body, a study body where we try to exercise our judgment as best we can, based upon the expert testimony of those in the executive department, and these are good men, and others as well, or is this going to be a rubberstamp basis?

There is only one vote here, and that is to vote down the rule and ask the Committee on Banking and Currency to do its homework and then report it back so that we can have an intelligent debate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the issue before the House at the moment is whether or not this rule should be adopted, and whether we shall proceed to debate the bill, H.R. 3818, for 4 hours, and then have the House work its will with reference thereto.

I am tempted to say that when there is no substantive opposition to a bill it has been good practice to attack the committee reporting it. The fact of the matter is that this principle and this subject have been before the Congress for many years.

In 1961, 4 years ago, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency joined with me in introducing H.R. 6900, to remove the reserves from currency and from Federal Reserve bank deposits. The witnesses who were going to be called to testify at their request, were no less than the former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, the former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson, any number of outstanding bankers of the country, as well as the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon.

The hearings on that bill were withheld because it was considered psychologically bad timewise; that it might destroy confidence in the U.S. dollar. The bill before you now goes half way. It calls for the repeal of that provision of the Federal Reserve Act requiring gold reserves for deposits in Federal Reserve banks, not customers' deposits, as we know them in the commercial sense, but deposits made by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, the commercial banks of the country that are members of the System. It is a reserve against the deposits which they make with the Federal Reserve banks.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio who addressed you a few moments ago neatly dodged the question, what is the purpose of these reserves? He asked somebody on this side to answer that question. Surely he knows that there was no purpose for those reserves in 1913 when that provision was put into the act except psychological, and there is no purpose in continuing to require them today.

Let me quote to you an answer to the question as to what purpose these reserves serve. After a brief recital of the history of the Reserve Act and the reason for these reserves, Mr. Dillon stated as follows in the hearing before the committee, and I quote from page 13:

> Going further back, it is interesting to note that it was largely a psychological concern that in 1913 made the Congress put this requirement in. There is an interesting paragraph from a report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in the 63d Congress on H.R. 7837, which was the original bill which became, in 1913, the Federal Reserve Act, and the committee stated, "In a general way the committee believes that requirement of a fixed reserve is not a wise or desirable thing as viewed in the light of scientific banking principles. It believes, however, that in a country accustomed to fixed reserve requirements, the prescription of a minimum reserve may have a beneficial effect."
>
> Obviously, the committee was paying attention to the psychological side.

I would be glad to have any Member of the Congress tell us what purpose, if any, through all these years since 1913 the gold reserve against deposits by the commercial banks with the Federal Reserve banks has accomplished. Does anyone want to tell me? The answer is that you cannot, except that to say it has had a psychological reaction.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. In the past we have not reduced our gold reserves to the legal minimum requirement, so that it did not serve a technical purpose. However, one of the purposes of putting the gold backing behind these reserves is to be sure that we do not have the possibility of excessive and unwise monetary expansion in this Nation, that we do not depend on men alone to administer the monetary system of this country, that in fact we can be sure they are not irresponsible in the management of the monetary system.

Mr. MULTER. I think this body will recognize that the purpose was psychological. Mr. Dillon, in his statement to our committee, indicated very clearly that there is no need for this reserve and that there was no need for this reserve. No one can give us any reason for continuing this reserve. Since 1934 we have been off the gold standard in this country. No American citizen can own gold either here or abroad. When a domestic bank deposits money with a Federal Reserve bank all it can get back is the same kind of money. It is not necessary to have a gold reserve to insure that a bank will get back that which it would deposit in the first place.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If that is true, is it not a fact that in this same philosophy there should no longer be any needed reserve on the part of the commercial banks to secure their deposits? If it is psychological, what is the advantage of the psychology in this instance?

Mr. MULTER. In dealing with the deposits made with a commercial bank we are not dealing with psychology. We are dealing with its right to lend to customers. That was the basis of that provision. The reserve deposit by commercial banks was looked upon by some as a means of guaranteeing the liquidity of the banks. Everyone today agrees that that is not so. The reserve deposit with the Federal Reserve bank by the commercial bank is solely a means of restricting and controlling credit. It serves as a control on their right to lend out their money.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman from Ohio to yield to me in order to direct an inquiry to the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from New York has stated that there is no reason except psychological for having imposed the reserve requirement on deposits. I assume that you will say the same thing with respect to Federal Reserve notes?

Mr. MULTER. The answer today is, backed up by 30-odd years of experience, that the gold reserve for notes is unnecessary.

Mr. JONAS. Now the position of the gentleman from New York is not only that do we not need the reserve against deposits, but we do not even need it against Federal Reserve notes?

Mr. MULTER. That is correct. Although that is not the issue being presented by this bill or this resolution or rule that we are debating at this time.

Mr. JONAS. I understand. But if we do not need it and if there is no reason for it, why then did not the committee propose to eliminate the reserves altogether?

Mr. MULTER. Because Mr. Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and Mr. Dillon, the Secretary of the Treasury, have indicated that this is not the time to do it—again, psychologically—that there is no reason except the psychological reaction of the man in the street who does not understand these problems.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman. I am glad you said that—in other words, psychologically not only for the man in the street but for the man abroad?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. In other words, psychologically important for the man abroad who might have some concern over the value of our currency.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. Do you not think that same psychological reason applies against eliminating the reserves against the deposits?

Mr. MULTER. No, it would not apply.

Mr. JONAS. I am afraid the same concern will develop because the foreign creditor will take alarm if we begin tinkering with our currency or reducing the reserves.

Mr. MULTER. Let me explain. We allay the psychological reaction of the man abroad as well as the man in the street here by taking off the reserves for Federal Reserve deposits because thereby we immediately release almost $5 billion in gold which can be called upon by the foreign countries and foreign central banks if they want it in exchange for our U.S. dollars.

Mr. JONAS. Yes, but when that is exhausted we will then have to resort to the elimination of reserves against Federal Reserve notes.

Mr. MULTER. We are told that that would not happen for many, many years. With the situation as it is now, even with increased expansion of world trade and the demand for gold and the demand for money—if we do this now and release this $5 billion in gold reserves, it will take at least another 20 years before we have to again concern ourselves with the sufficiency of our gold to meet foreign demands. By that time I think the world will know that their confidence in the U.S. dollar was never misplaced.

Mr. JONAS. It did not take us 20 years to get in the trouble we are in now. Five years ago we did not face this problem. This problem has become acute during the last 5 years and we could all see it coming, that is, those of us who read the daily statement of the U.S. Treasury which has shown a constant and continuous diminution in the supply of gold in this country; is that not true?

Mr. MULTER. No, it is not. I would suggest that we adopt this rule which provides for the consideration of the bill and for 4 hours of general debate, and in that 4 hours of general debate we can enlarge upon and amplify all these arguments and give you the answers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, there is but one issue involved at this time before the House and that is whether or not we adopt the rule permitting 4 hours as a maximum time for debate on the bill which would authorize withdrawal of the gold certificate backing from the deposits of reserves of the member banks of the Federal Reserve System. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the metallic backing or gold certificate backing for the currency of this country. So it cannot be said with justification that in any way whatsoever what we are discussing and considering today will affect the soundness of the currency of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I add only that I am informed, since some comment has been made about the number of witnesses who appeared before our distinguished Committee on Banking and Currency, that before a similar committee in the other body, on yesterday, in addition to the able Secretary of the Treasury and the able Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in support of the resolution which we will debate today, there appeared the Honorable Everett Dirksen, the able minority leader in the other body; a representative of the American Bankers Association; the able Senator from New York, Mr. Javits; a representative of the Virginia Bankers Association, Mr. J. H. Wilkenson, Jr.; Mr. M. D. Worman, ex-vice president of the Virginia Bankers Association; and the president of the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co., representing the Committee for Economic Development, Mr. F. B. Wilde. This was an outstanding and representative group of witnesses for the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What does that have to do with the consideration of the bill in the House? What difference does it make how many witnesses there are on the other side of the Capitol? We do not have the benefit of their testimony.

Mr. PEPPER. If the able gentleman from Iowa is not influenced by those distinguished Americal political and financial leaders, he has a right to make such a choice.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman merely reading their names?

Mr. PEPPER. I read them, because they supported the bill to be considered and I believe they are men of great financial repute in the realm of finance or recognized political leaders in the United States, and that their opinions are worthy of consideration.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TALCOTT. Is it not true that also, in the other body, there will be some opposition witnesses to the bill?

Mr. PEPPER. I understand there were some opposition witnesses, yes. The able gentleman from California could have had some opposition witnesses heard before the House Banking and Currency Committee, I am sure, if there had been any, and he had requested that they be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING CERTAIN LEGISLATION RELATING TO RESERVES AGAINST DEPOSITS IN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3818) to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3818, with Mr. Boland in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said by the minority about the short hearings in the Committee on Banking and Currency in connection with H.R. 3818. But this bill has been under discussion for more than 4 years in the banking fraternity, in the business community, and in the Congress of the United States. There is nothing new about this legislation which has not been said time and time again, practically every week during the past 4 years—and longer. Moreover, the executive branch of the Government gave ample notice that such a bill would be proposed.

We did not rush in and introduce a bill and have hearings on it. We waited until the President made his report on the economy in his annual economic message. He recommended it, and only then was a bill introduced. We proceeded to hold hearings on the bill. This is no crisis, no situation which requires immediate attention, and it was not so handled in committee. We asked that witnesses who wanted to be heard make their wishes known to our committee. No one requested an opportunity to be heard. Not one. The members of our committee, three of whom oppose this bill, were asked to submit the names of any witnesses that they would like to be heard. Not one name was submitted. Obviously it is not the duty of a congressional committee to go out into the country, on the highways and byways and try to find somebody who will come in and oppose any particular bill before our committee. That is going too far and asking too much of us. The truth is, no opposition witness asked to be heard and none were heard. However, they would have been heard if they so wished. If they wanted to file a statement, permission would have been granted to them. But no one even asked to file a statement.

On our agenda last week we had several items. Incidentally, our committee made a good start last week, because, after 5 days of hearings, we reported out two major pieces of legislation. One of these was the gold bill and the other was the Inter-American Development Bank bill. Both of these bills were reported out in 5 days' time. I think that is a pretty good record.

We had Mr. Dillon, the Secretary of the Treasury, as our first witness on Monday of last week. We expected to have Mr. Martin, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, testify on the following day, Tuesday, but there was a conflict in scheduling with the other body. They insisted that Mr. Martin had promised to appear before their committee on Tuesday, so we allowed Mr. Martin to come up on Monday afternoon. We finished with Mr. Dillon in the morning and Mr. Martin was very glad to come up that afternoon, so we had what was equal to two days of hearings in one day. Is there anything wrong about that? Obviously not. Every member of our committee who desired to do so asked any question that he desired to ask. They were also given the opportunity to submit the names of witnesses to appear in opposition, but, as I say, not one name was presented.

Therefore, as to this business about not having adequate hearings, there is just absolutely nothing to it. It is just an excuse masquerading as an argument.

Now, I listened attentively to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] who is always a good, fluent talker, and he has some interesting statements to make. However, sometimes his views do not coincide with my version of the facts, and I would like to call his attention to just one or two. One was when he asked, "Now, why have such a rush on this bill?" He seeks to create a suspicion, a doubt, in the minds of Members because the bill was hurried through. Well, it has not been hurried through. I have told you the exact situation with reference to it, so you can see there was no hurry. We have taken plenty of time. There was no crisis. There was no reason to be in undue haste of any kind. We have proceeded with deliberation and with caution, and we have ample testimony here to sustain every position that we maintain.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] also said that our deficits have caused all this trouble. I just want to invite his attention to the fact that his administration, commencing in 1953, on January 20, and for 8 years thereafter, created a most dangerous situation for the United States of America. Immediately they undertook a high interest policy; that is, higher interest and higher interest all the time, until the results are—and I will not go into detail on it, although I would like to—that we have a national debt today of $40 billion more than the national debt would have been if the Eisenhower administration had kept the Roosevelt-Truman interest rate that they inherited on January 20, 1953.

Our national debt would be $40 billion less if they had kept those interest rates. And today, instead of paying $11 billion a year interest on the national debt—the second largest item in our budget, second only to national defense—if they had kept the Roosevelt-Truman interest rates, we would be paying only $6 billion a year annual interest rates, a saving of $5 billion a year. That has been built into our deficits and created an inflationary condition that has cost us lots of money and caused us a lot of trouble.

If they want to go into that I think they have some allegations to meet that they cannot successfully answer, because there is no answer to it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. CEDERBERG. To ask a question.

Mr. PATMAN. On this subject? Please ask it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I understand, after this administration came into power, it was going to revert back to what the gentleman calls a low-interest-rate policy.

Mr. PATMAN. It was impossible to do it immediately.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman claims that there was a high-interest-rate policy and this administration's policy is to lower interest rates.

Mr. PATMAN. It was impossible to do it quickly. We can try to do it. The President of the United States is saying to the people every day that high interest is ruinous to our economy. But you cannot automatically turn the wheels back and say we are going back to a former rate of interest overnight. It takes time.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Is it not a fact that the interest rates today under this administration are at least as high as, and in some cases higher, than they were under any other previous administration?

Mr. PATMAN. Interest rates are much too high because they were——

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman asked me a question and I demand the right to answer it. They were wound up over a period of 8 years. You cannot quickly unwind them. It takes time. But you will have to give the President of the United States credit for saying practically every day to Congress, "Watch out on these interest rates—too high and they will slow our progress. They will deny us adequate and proper growth." He is giving us notice all the time. That is one reason I am proud of the President, because he is doing that. He is doing everything he can to keep these interest rates from going up, and I hope eventually they will get lower and lower and lower. That is the goal, I am sure.

The Republican policy was a cruel policy. It left us with a $300 billion debt. If we cannot stop the trend we will have a $600 billion debt in the foreseeable future. Instead of paying $11 billion a year in annual interest, we will probably be paying $36 billion a year in annual interest.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. For the people who do not believe in any social programs and who want to spend the money for interest payments so it cannot be spent for social programs, that would be a wonderful step in the direction that they want to go. But such a policy destroys opportunities for the people of this Nation and slows our economic progress.

Mr. Chairman, one thing that we must say about the United States of America is that here we are with only 6 percent of the people of the world here. Notwithstanding that, under a democratic rule—I mean a democracy in a republic-type rule—as we have in this country, the people are in complete charge.

The Members of this House have the purse strings of this Nation. The people have the power to change every seat in this body every 2 years, if they want to. That is wonderful.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Not now. I am right in the middle of a statement.

So if the people see a certain trend they can change their Members of Congress. That is a wonderful thing. The people have complete control of this great Nation of ours. They have built up a country here that is the envy of all the countries of the world. We have 193 million people in the United States, people who are enjoying more comforts, more necessities and more of the luxuries of life than all the other 3 billion people in the world.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I think that is wonderful progress. The most retarding, devastating blow to that great progress, and continuing progress, was that 8 years of the Eisenhower administration's high interest rate policy that is now making us pay $5 billion a year in increased interest costs from here on out, and that substantially increased our national debt.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. What is that?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. For a question?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; for a question but not for a statement.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I will preface my question——

Mr. PATMAN. Ask the question now.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Why is it that the administration does not realize that they are going to have low interest rate policies? The Secretary of the Treasury told the Committee on Appropriations in a hearing that the interest rates on our debt were going up to about 4 percent. Evidently they have not gotten the word from you, that we are going to get into a low interest rate policy.

Mr. PATMAN. When was that statement?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Last week.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, he is a Republican Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Is the gentleman telling the country then that after the new Secretary of the Treasury comes in he is going to embark upon a lowering of the interest rate?

Mr. PATMAN. Not in a devastating way.

Mr. CEDERBERG. When is this going to start?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know, but this fellow Donald Cook, about whom they are talking to succeed Mr. Dillon, is an able man, and whatever he recommends will be good.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman saying on the floor of the House that Secretary of the Treasury Dillon who has served his administration as Secretary of the Treasury has not done a proper job and that he does not understand the problem?

Mr. PATMAN. From his standpoint he has done an excellent job—from his standpoint—but I do not agree with Secretary Dillon. He has one philosophy and I have another. He belongs to one school of thought; the hard money, high interest philosophy. I belong to the other school of thought; the school that believes in growth and opportunity and help.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Is the new Secretary going to subscribe to your policy or to the former policy?

Mr. PATMAN. He is under no obligation to subscribe to my policy. I am just a humble Member of this great body.

I do not even belong to the executive branch. He will be a member of the executive branch of our Government. He will be obligated to serve the President of the United States, and I know he will do a good job. The President will also do a good job.

Now, this national debt is too high in large part because of the high interest policy. I can show that if you had kept the interest rates as they were on January 20, 1953, and had not increased them, just the old Truman-Roosevelt interest rates, when bonds did not sell below par, we would not have this condition. Why, today our interest burden would be $5 billion less. There is $5 billion a year we are paying in excess interest costs on the debt caused by the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, and it will take many, many years to get over the harm that was caused during those 8 years.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: As I understand it, during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration the Secretary of the Treasury was a Texas Democrat?

Mr. PATMAN. He was a former Democrat.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. On the point the gentleman is making, the point was made that the high interest rate cost $40 billion, $5 billion a year in interest charges. If I figure that correctly it is 8 percent.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is confused about that. He is not confused about everything, but he is certainly confused about that. That involves interest rates not only on the $40 billion, but on the entire national debt.

Mr. BROCK. And that high interest rate has taken place since the advent of this administration?

Mr. PATMAN. You cannot change it quickly. That would be devastating and disruptive. The Republicans knew it would take a long time to change it. They put in their licks, and they put in good licks. They were playing for keeps. They were not thinking of building churches and schools and social and economic projects. They were thinking about getting and collecting interest, and were playing for keeps.

Mr. BROCK. Would not the gentleman agree the testimony before our committee brought to light if we were to maintain low interest rates the only method of accomplishing that purpose is for the Federal Reserve to buy all of the public bonds on the market, and you would extend the money supply substantially? We had many witnesses who agreed on that.

Mr. PATMAN. I urge the gentleman to stop repeating these things he has heard, doubtlessly on his side. They are absolutely untrue. There is no jurisdiction for that at all.

The interest rate for 12 years, from August 1939, when a special session of Congress was called because of the war situation in Europe, from that time for 12 years to 1951 interest rates never went beyond 2.5 percent; long-term interest rates, Government bond interest rates, never went beyond 2.5 percent, and not one bond ever sold below par—not one. Therefore, for 12 years, commencing with 10 or 12 million people unemployed, and with a devastating depression, and also having all kinds of inflationary tendencies, like spending a quarter of a billion dollars a day on the World War II battlefields—yet, during this time, the Federal Reserve acting in the people's interest under a good President, who was working for the people, Franklin D. Roosevelt—we kept those interest rates below 2.5 percent and protected the people's savings by paying them par for their bonds that were offered for sale. You cannot improve on that record, and you cannot deny it.

This means that if you had a Federal Reserve that would work with the people, with the administration, you could fix reasonable interest rates. The Federal Reserve can keep interest rates low by their great powers, as they have done in the past. Interest rates are manmade and can be controlled for everyone's benefit. We want to correct these Republicans from all these false notions they have, and protect the people from them. That is what we are doing here.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to ask my good friend if it is not true that the price of Government bonds was freed during the Truman administration; that is, Government bonds were not supported during the last part of the Truman administration.

Mr. PATMAN. No. There was a so-called accord when the Federal Reserve seceded from the Government.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. But that did not affect the price of Government bonds.

Mr. PATMAN. They would not dare exercise the authority they thought they had until the Republicans came in. They did not feel protected.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is that not when the interest rate went up?

Mr. PATMAN. No, the interest rate went up under the Republicans. The increase in the interest rate after that was practically nothing. They called it an accord.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. May we mention interest rates for just a moment?

Mr. PATMAN. Just ask a question.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Gold is the subject of the legislation we have before us. Is it not true that when the interest rate goes down capital flees to another market and gold follows it?

Mr. PATMAN. Not at all. If you carried that to its logical end, all the money would go to South America, where they could get 20 percent, or England, where they could get 7 percent. That is illogical reasoning.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is that not the effect?

Mr. PATMAN. No, it is not the effect at all. We have a 4-percent discount rate here. They have 7 percent in England. Not at all. In Germany and Switzerland the rates are much lower than ours, and money is not flowing out there and into South America and England, where they can get more. That is an illogical statement the gentleman is depending upon. It is untrue. It is not true.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The reason that is so is that West Germany became a large creditor nation, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. PATMAN. The bill before the House today, H.R. 3818, would do one thing. It would remove the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain a gold cover against their deposit liabilities to commercial banks. Under present law, each bank must maintain a reserve of 25 percent against such deposits. That is a carryover from an earlier time when dollars were in fact redeemable in gold. Do not overlook that. Since the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, which repealed the redemption clause, these requirements are no longer pertinent. They are no longer necessary.

Now the gentleman from Ohio asked the question and said he hopes somebody answers it. He asked the question: "Why was it that in the original Federal Reserve Act of 1913, there was a requirement that you have to have 35 percent gold behind the Federal Reserve deposits of member banks and 40 percent gold reserve behind Federal Reserve notes? Why was it," he said, "will somebody answer?" Well, I can answer very briefly and to the point. The answer is that at that time we were on the gold standard and anybody could take our currency and go to a bank and demand gold and get it. Therefore, we had to have a big gold reserve. Now you cannot do that—no one can demand gold in our country on their deposits. It is only the foreign central banks and not individuals or citizens of other countries, but only the foreign central banks that can demand gold from us. So there is a big difference. Now that is a complete answer to what the gentleman said. He was creating a lot of suspicion about what caused all of this. It is just that simple. Unfortunately, this requirement although it no longer fulfills its original purpose does involve hazards for the future.

Specifically, the rigid 25-percent requirement may prevent continuing expansion of the money supply that our economic growth calls for, and second, it can impede us in our international financial dealings.

The Federal Reserve Act also requires 25-percent gold certificate reserve against Federal Reserve notes being maintained.

You see it was reduced from the original act—35 percent for deposits, 40 percent for gold reserve notes to 25 percent across the board for deposits and Federal Reserve notes.

The passage of this bill would not change this requirement of the act in any way. The need for this legislation arises as the result of two economic factors—first, the continuing economic growth which calls for continuing noninflationary expansion of the money supply; and, second, the United States continuing adverse balance of payments.

At the end of 1964 our gold reserves were $15.1 billion excluding holdings of the exchange stabilization fund.

At that time there were $35.5 billion in Federal Reserve notes and $19.5 billion in deposits.

The notes required a gold reserve cover of $8.8 billion while the deposits required a cover of $4.9 billion. In total this amounts to $13.7 billion, leaving only $1.4 billion free for international exchange purposes and for future growth and domestic credit.

By eliminating the need for the gold cover behind deposits, H.R. 3818 would free $4.9 billion.

That is what we usually refer to as $5 billion—to be exact it is $4.9 billion.

Let me emphasize the cover behind the Federal Reserve notes would not be affected in any way by this bill.

Now the money that people are concerned about is the money they use in their everyday transactions. Like a Federal Reserve note, for example. Here is a Federal Reserve note that I hold in my hand. All money is equal money—U.S. notes, silver certificates, Federal Reserve notes. They are all equal in the law. You can use any of it to pay any debt. Even a penny can be so used. Even the person who owed a thousand dollars a month in alimony and paid it all in pennies had a right to do that under the law and if he wanted to do that he had a right to do so—and he did. You can pay any debt you have with any type of money.

So this Federal Reserve note that I am showing you now—that is what counts. That is what the people look at. Any time you take the gold from under that Federal Reserve note, you are going to disturb the people. You might have an adverse psychological effect. Therefore, we are not proposing to do that at all. We are not touching the gold that supports our money. We are not bothering it one bit, and not taking out one penny.

We are even making it stronger, by making $4.9 billion more available for this purpose. This will strengthen our money supply, so no one can legitimately claim it will weaken our money supply.

Currently, the ratio of Federal Reserve bank gold certificate holdings to deposits and notes is 27.5 percent, only 2.5 points above the legal minimum prescribed by law. Therefore, it is necessary that we have more flexibility, that we have more liquidity, by making more gold available.

How will we make it available without hurting our money? By taking it out from under deposits that do not need any gold, anyway.

Can a bank go to a Federal Reserve bank and get gold? Of course it cannot. Can an individual go to a Federal Reserve bank or a commercial bank and get gold? Of course he cannot. We do not use gold domestically. Therefore, it serves no purpose of any kind whatsoever.

We are not weakening our money system, but we are strengthening our money system by making available $4.9 billion more to strengthen our available money supply.

Normal growth of the domestic money supply which is necessary to assure high levels of economic activity would exhaust the free gold margin within a year or two. This problem, created by the continued growth of our economy and the necessary increase in the money supply to support this noninflationary growth, has been significantly accentuated by the fact that the United States has incurred deficits in its international balance of payments every year since 1949 with the sole exception of 1957. As a result, the United States has continually had to sell U.S. gold to foreign monetary authorities.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] made a misstatement. He said the commercial banks placed valuable assets of yours and mine in the Federal Reserve banks as part of the reserves. That is not true.

Do Members know from where the banks get their reserves upon which they can issue $10 for every $1 of reserves? By increasing at a rate of 10 to 1, they buy Government bonds, they buy tax exempt securities, and they can buy anything they wish. Do Members know from where they get those reserves? They do not cost one penny. They are created on the books by the Federal Reserve Banking System for the purpose of helping our entire economy.

I am all for that, if used in the people's interest and in the public interest. When it is used for the benefit of a few against the best interests of the whole Nation then we had better take a little look at it.

Mr. Chairman, in supporting this bill, I find myself for the first time in many, many moons on the same side as the Federal Reserve Board, the American Bankers Association, and most of the minority members of the Banking and Currency Committee. This is a novel situation, I will admit; and, I might add, one that I welcome, for it is important to maintain international confidence in the dollar, and the broad support for this bill shows that we are united behind this objective.

We must have a record vote on this bill; and show it is practically unanimous. Let the world know that we are working together as a team, and although there is a line dividing the Republican side and the Democratic side, on matters which so vitally affect the public interests as this, we are together working shoulder to shoulder.

The Secretary of the Treasury testified in favor of this legislation—and I will state he is a Republican Secretary of the Treasury—stressing that the normal growth requirements of our money supply alone would soon exhaust our free gold margin even without the outflow of any more gold.

Of course, the problem is accentuated by our international exchange deficit since 1949 which involved a drain on our gold supply. Both the Secretary of the Treasury and Chairman Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, have stressed the fact that we must maintain confidence in the availability of our gold to support the convertibility of the dollar internationally at a fixed price of $35 an ounce. This is vital not only to our own well-being but to that of the international financial system on which the free world relies.

The President called for this legislation in his economic report last month. I repeat here part of the President's statement, for nowhere is there a more concise and pointed expression of the need for this legislation:

> Clearly, we should place beyond any doubt the ability of the Federal Reserve to meet its responsibility for providing an adequate but not excessive volume of bank reserves.
>
> Clearly, we should place beyond any doubt our ability to use our gold to make good our pledge to maintain the gold value of the dollar at $35 an ounce with every resource at our command.
>
> I am requesting the Congress, therefore, to eliminate the arbitrary requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain a gold certificate reserve against their deposit liabilities.
>
> The desirability of prompt action does not arise from any sudden emergency. If required at any time in defense of the dollar, gold could and would be released from the present requirement under the provisions of existing law.
>
> But we should not permit a provision of law framed for the different circumstances of an earlier day to raise any questions about our ability to carry out effective and responsible monetary and credit policies for domestic prosperity, with stable prices; and for defense of the dollar abroad.

The President has also indicated that he will soon send recommendations for dealing with our balance-of-payments deficits. Clearly this problem has contributed to the need for this gold cover legislation. We cannot allow this international gold drain to continue. Corrective measures are necessary, and your Committee on Banking and Currency promises prompt and full consideration of the administration's recommendation on this issue.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I know of no reason why this proposed legislation should not be passed at once. The present restriction is no longer necessary and has not been necessary since 1934 when we went off the gold standard for domestic purposes. At the same time it may handicap this Nation in its domestic policies as well as in its international dealings. The House Committee on Banking and Currency, by an overwhelming vote, 25 to 3, reported this bill favorably and without amendment. I urge its immediate enactment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman when we were debating the rule in the House I engaged in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] during which I stated that it should have been obvious to prudent men that we were running into this difficulty as the flow of gold increased from this country in recent years. He said, as I recall it, that the record would not bear that out. I sent over to the office to get some figures, and I have before me the daily statement of the U.S. Treasury for January 23, 1961, which shows that at that time we had $17.5 billion worth of gold; but by January 22, 1962, we had lost $666 million of it and the amount on hand had gone down to $16.8 billion.

On January 23, 1963, we were down to $15.9 billion in gold, having lost during the preceding 12 months an additional $910 million in gold.

On January 22, 1964, we were down to $15 billion, having lost approximately another half billion during the preceding 12 months.

On January 22, 1965, our gold supply had gone down to $15.2 billion, we having lost $325 million in gold during the preceding 12 months.

These figures show that during the period from January 23, 1961, to January 22, 1965, we lost $2,317,470,337 in gold abroad.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman revise his figures to include 10 years back by years?

Mr. JONAS. I will let the gentleman from Texas put those figures in the Record. I do not have the figures with me prior to January 23, 1961. But that is a good starting point because it shows that during the last 4 years we have lost nearly $2½ billion in gold. The situation we face today should have been foreseen and effective steps taken long ago to slow down this alarming drainage of gold out of our country. Moreover, in my colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer], we were discussing recent events.

The following table shows this constant loss of gold during the last 4 years, all figures being taken from the daily statements of the U.S. Treasury for the dates listed:

Jan. 23, 1961	$17, 504, 955, 196
Jan. 22, 1962	16, 838, 839, 203
Jan. 23, 1963	15, 928, 074, 472
Jan. 22, 1964	15, 513, 047, 874
Jan. 22, 1965	15, 187, 484, 859

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that when we debated this extremely important measure which is critical to our country, and I think critical to our relationship with other countries, the debate would be relevant to the issue at hand. I am afraid we have wandered rather far afield. The fact of the matter is that we are really in trouble and must face up to it, whether we like it or not.

Under existing law, Federal Reserve banks are required to hold gold reserves of not less than 25 percent of their note and deposit liabilities. The relationship of their gold reserves to their note and deposit liabilities is expressed as a percentage ratio which is known as the reserve ratio. The reserve ratio declines when our gold holdings decline. The ratio also declines when Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities rise. When both forces are operative, the rate of decline in the ratio is accelerated. Both forces have been operative over the past 15 years.

The reserve ratio reached its postwar peak on September 21, 1949, when it stood at 57.5 percent. It since has declined to its alltime yearend low of 27.5 percent on December 31, 1964. During that period, Federal Reserve gold holdings declined $8.3 billion through sale of gold to foreign governments in partial settlement of our accumulating balance-of-payments deficits. During the same period, Federal Reserve notes and deposits increased by $14 billion to finance our expanding domestic economy. But under the 25-percent reserve requirement that $14 billion increase only required the earmarking of $3.5 billion free gold reserves to satisfy legal reserve requirements.

Thus over the 15 years our free gold reserves were reduced $8.3 billion by sale of gold to foreign governments and $3.5 billion by additional legal reserves to meet expanded domestic needs. Of this $11.8 billion decline in our free gold reserves, 70 percent was accounted for by sale of gold to foreign governments in partial settlement of balance of payments deficits. Therefore, continuing balance of payments deficits is the principal reason this legislation is before us today.

For years the United States has been running a persistent deficit in its balance of payments position with the outside world. Although enjoying a favorable balance in trade and sometimes this is confused with balance of payments, other financial relations with the world have resulted in a chronic net deficit position in our balance of payments position. The main items involved in our spending, lending, investing and giving away more dollars than we receive from the rest of the world are, U.S. military expenditures abroad, short- and long-term capital outflows, travel expenditures abroad, remittances, and pensions to persons abroad and economic aid. The deficits in our balance of payments has been met in part of outflows of gold and in part by increases in foreign holdings of short-term dollar claims. In the period from December 31, 1960 to October 31, 1964 our short-term liabilities to foreigners—excluding international institutions—increased from approximately $17.5 to $22.9 billion. Of this $22.9 billion, approximately $12.3 billion consisted of short term liabilities to foreign governments.

Under Treasury regulations based on the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 and other statutes, the United States stands ready to sell gold to foreign governments (including their central banks) but not to private foreign citizens directly. A decision of foreign governments to convert only 11 percent of their short-term dollar claims to gold would put a drain of $1.35 billion on our gold reserves. This would approximate the $1.38 billion excess or free gold reserves over statutory requirements held by the Federal Reserve on

December 31, 1964. Clearly, maintaining foreign confidence in the integrity of the dollar is of vital importance both for ourselves and for the free world which uses dollars side by side with gold as monetary reserves.

It is self-evident the Congress is facing the necessity of action on the gold reserve requirements of our monetary system. It should also be self-evident the Congress in other legislative actions must consider possible impact of its actions on our chronic and serious balance-of-payments problem as well as the necessity of maintaining inviolate confidence both at home and abroad in the integrity of the dollar.

This bill would remove the gold reserve requirement applicable to Federal Reserve deposits and thereby release approximately $5 billion of our gold stock from monetary restrictions. Some modification of gold reserve requirements is becoming a probable necessity. If the current rate continues we could be down to almost 25 percent at the end of December 1965. The free gold stock of the Federal Reserve at the start of this year would meet domestic and foreign needs only through 1965 based upon our experience over the past 4 years. But already this year our gold outflow has increased. We have had an outflow of $300 million so far this year against a net gold outflow in all of last year of only $125 million. The time could be close at hand when existing legal reserve requirements would restrict expansion of our domestic economy, unless recourse was had to the temporary suspension provisions of existing law.

There is little prospect of a net inflow of gold to ease the present tight position in which we find ourselves. If anything, the estimated $3 billion balance-of-payments deficit for last year with an indicated annual deficit rate of $6 billion in the last quarter of the year suggests we might experience considerable additional outflows of gold. Since foreign governments and central banks already hold about $12.7 billion of short-term dollar claims which they can draw down to obtain gold from us it would seem that we should have more than the $1.5 billion free gold we now have to meet possible additional foreign demands on our gold stock.

I am going to vote for this bill. I will do so somewhat reluctantly. I think we have a problem that must be met. This bill will buy time for us to get at the real cause of the problem, namely our continuing balance-of-payments deficits. This administration and this Congress must face up to that problem, beginning now. We simply cannot go on spending, lending, investing, and giving away to the rest of the world, year after year, more than our receipts from the rest of the world.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. First, permit me to congratulate the gentleman on his approach to this problem and, second, if I may, I would like to congratulate the membership of the House upon the serious attitude with which it has approached this matter. Personally I am one of those who I think are quite numerous in this body, judging by their general demeanor here today, who want to do the right thing about this, but who are concerned about this measure and its implications. We all recognize the danger of the continuous outflow of gold; but some of us seriously doubt that this measure is the answer.

Is this not another palliative? Are we getting any permanent relief? Or is there not another approach to this matter? I ask the gentleman from New Jersey this question in all seriousness. I am not trying to embarrass or harass him.

For instance, the balance-of-payment deficit is the result of three or four things, pretty largely. One of them, of course, is foreign aid, or giveaway, as some people term it. Another, possibly to a lesser degree, is the tourist trade. Then possibly one of the big factors is the foreign loan proposition.

I ask the gentleman if in his wisdom, and I am sure he knows much more about this problem than I do, and I therefore ask him this question, could not some approach be made to this matter whereby these things could be tightened up rather than run the risk that bothers me, and I know that bothers many others, of whether or not this is inflationary, without going into all of the reasons therefore.

Mr. WIDNALL. I do not think it needs to be inflationary. If the administration follows through with some drastic action in the balance-of-payments field it should not be inflationary, and I think the President will make some recommendations shortly.

If Congress follows through by approving the recommendations that will bring about a true balance of payments, then this will prove to be more than a palliative. If, on the other hand, nothing further is done, then this, I think, would be a useless gesture on the part of the Congress. There is a necessity for action at this time, and I think the opportunity should be given to the administration to make good on what it has indicated, through administration witnesses, it intends to do. Then we can face the future much better.

Mr. COLMER. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he is adopting this approach with reluctance, but with hope?

Mr. WIDNALL. That is true.

Mr. COLMER. I fear my friend's hope will not be realized. I am muchly concerned about its inflationary implications.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman on the approach he has taken in reference to this bill. I want to recall that the gentleman joined with me in 1961 in cosponsoring H.R. 6900, which sought to accomplish what this bill tries to do, and more. The gentleman will agree, I believe, that this bill is not going to solve the imbalance-in-payments problem. That must be left for other legislation. I think the gentleman will agree, will he not, that we can solve this imbalance-of-payments problem through arrangements with foreign countries?

Mr. WIDNALL. That is correct, but the particular effect of this bill is something that is quite different. The other action can be taken by some other means.

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman also agree that holding a gold reserve for deposits in the Federal Reserve banks actually serves no purpose except the psychological reaction?

Mr. WIDNALL. I think that it is important even beyond the psychological in instilling confidence in the people of the United States in the soundness of the dollar.

Mr. MULTER. When the gentleman from New Jersey talks about reducing our gold holdings, he is taking into account the fact that our contributions to the International Monetary Fund and other such organizations are capital contributions, and whereas the gold may have left the country we have not lost it. We still have our interest in that gold.

Mr. WIDNALL. That is not my interpretation of that.

Mr. MULTER. Has the United States lost that gold or has it merely transferred it to an asset in the International Bank?

Mr. WIDNALL. That is something I cannot measure. We have lost control of it.

Mr. MULTER. It may have gone out of the gold in this country but it is still part of the gold we have contributed to stabilize international currencies.

Mr. WIDNALL. As far as our own gold reserves in this country are concerned, we have no right to recall it.

Mr. MULTER. We have no right to recall it any more than we have the right to recall a capital contribution in a commercial bank.

Mr. WIDNALL. That is a different situation.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. In response to the question of the gentleman from New York, it is an obvious fact we have lost the gold or we would not be in this situation today. We have not only lost the gold but apparently have lost the confidence of at least some of the nations of the world in the soundness of our currency.

Mr. MULTER. We have not lost that gold.

Mr. JONAS. What are we worrying about, then?

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. The gentleman has said he is supporting this bill with much reluctance. I am sure many of the people on this side of the aisle are equally reluctant to go along with this recommendation. But the gentleman from New Jersey has said this will not be an inflationary action if we take proper action on the balance-of-payments situation, which the President will soon recommend.

Why is it that the executive branch has not already sent up to us these recommendations for action in this area? It certainly would be a lot easier for us to go along today, with more assurance and intelligence, if we had some idea of what this action is going to be. I am sure a lot of us would then have felt we were taking responsible action in supporting the gentleman from New Jersey as he has requested us to do.

Mr. WIDNALL. I wish I could answer for the Executive. I do not know what is in his mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, it is only with some reluctance that I support this bill. I say this not so much because I favor complete retention of the present gold cover requirements—I do not—but because I feel that what we are doing today is too simple an answer. Indeed, it is not an answer at all. It is merely a necessary stopgap measure to be implemented while we debate a broader policy.

When we lowered, in 1945, the required reserve ratio from 40 percent on notes and 35 percent on deposits to an across-the-board 25 percent on both notes and deposits, we took no further steps. At that time it was hardly necessary. With the close of the Second World War, great amounts of gold flowed here to pay for goods not obtainable elsewhere. So when I hear people say, "confidence in the dollar was not diminished by the 1945 reduction in reserve ratios, so it will not be diminished now," I have some very real doubts. The situations are vastly different. Today, the dollar—as well as our gold reserve—can anticipate further difficulties rather than the lush times of the late forties. In today's international financial picture, the partial reduction of the required gold reserve ratio can solve nothing in its own right. It can only buy time for U.S. policy.

In 1945, gold flowed to America from a prostrate world. Today, the world's claims on American gold exceed our supply. If some folly should cause us to keep the present gold reserve ratios, the continuing gold outflow will drive us to the brink of our ratio, and thus to the brink of deflation. Needless to say, we are going to change. We will change simply because we must. We have no real choice. The question is the degree to which we must modify our reserve requirement. There is no question that we must modify them. The only question is "how much?"

I, for one, do not favor too great a change. A severe change would disguise the very real need to get to the root of the matter, which is national and international money policy. It would also show the weakness of the dollar by indicating that instead of mobilizing our strength we are forced to buy time. Dropping the required gold reserve ratios altogether would, in my opinion, be foolish. It would expose the dollar's value to world opinion, and it would do so just as world opinion was given cause to doubt the dollar by our forced retreat from gold reserve ratios.

If there is anything I dislike about the position that we have been forced into, it is that we have been forced into it. Our backs are at the wall. We are not dealing from strength. The administration has walked into this one. Before we entered into this debate we should have presented a number of programs designed to show that we are also going to the root of the matter by taking positive action against our international imbalance of payments. Then we would have been dealing from a position of some strength. When I say "positive action" I am not referring to spiteful petty schemes like that to impose a head tax of $100 on trips to Europe—a type of thing wholly out of keeping with our aspirations to be not only a mighty, but a sophisticated and cosmopolitan world power. We should have on the agenda right now a meaningful string of proposals for bettering our international financial position.

I support this proposal to reduce the gold reserve on deposits. This will give us plenty of gold to use to keep well over the 25-percent ratio on notes alone at least for some time. We will be able to expand the currency when necessary. We will be able to support the dollar on the international scene. In short, we will buy time. If, however, we do not correct some of our basic difficulties the gold drain—which is starting up again after having eased off last year—we will be confronted with a similar crisis again.

We cannot count on reliable assistance from Europe. Our European allies may decide they want some of the gold which they have dollar claims on. The British are likely reliable but the continental powers are less tied to—or interested in the fate of—the dollar. The French, in particular, are prone to react to financial opportunity. There is no reason to think that the French Government would shrink from asserting the narrowest self-interest as far as French claims to American gold. At very least we cannot rely on them, or on other holders of dollar claims on our gold. Paris, in particular, but other capitals as well has long suffered from a psychological enmity toward the dollar, or rather its preeminence in the international money market.

Besides the probability of a continued gold drain—at least until such time as the administration mobilizes a real commitment to head off the international imbalance—we can expect that we will see a continued expansion of the currency here in America. This means, that as long as we retain a gold reserve requirement, we will be eating into our ratio from both sides. The gold supply will be shrinking and the amount of currency requiring gold backing will be expanding. So we must make a real effort to better our international position to minimize, or better yet reverse, the gold drain.

There are a number of ways that we can do this. First, we can reduce our foreign aid. But although perhaps a few million can be saved in this way, the shrinking foreign aid expenditure offers no real chance to remedy our payments imbalance. A more fruitful source of savings might be our oversea investment, as well as funds voted to dubious investments like the Inter-American Development Bank. If we crack down on long-term loans being made to foreign countries, we will ease one form of outflow which can bear no fruit for some time. Short-term loans will at least have money flowing back into the United States at a much earlier date. Besides cracking down on long-term loans—which can only worsen our payments imbalance in the immediate future—we should give real thought to raising interest rates here at home. This would attract investor's dollars to the United States. It would also, by slowing the economy a bit, shrink demand for foreign goods. This shrinkage would aid our trade balance.

I am a little disturbed that the President has seemingly barred the prospect of raising the interest rates. This may not prove necessary, but it certainly ought to be kept in mind. The President's comments on the interest rate seem to me to indicate an unfortunate propensity to infringe on the independence of the Federal Reserve Board. This independence is one of the bulwarks of our financial strength, both real and psychological, here and abroad. It helps maintain faith in our financial structure as not being something wholly subject to political whims of the moment. I am in favor of a managed currency in the sense that I favor the necessary Government controls being applied, but I am not in favor of a political currency.

Some other thoughts we might keep in mind with respect to our balance of payments are these: We ought to enter the international tourist competition far more vigorously than we are at the moment; and in this connection, we ought to establish a really meaningful Government tourist agency. This to me is the positive method of attack—court the tourist trade of the fact, prospering European nations that covet our gold. Lure their tourists to our shores with the vistas of affluence they have so long purported to look down on, but now seek to imitate. There is no reason why we cannot do this, and it would have very positive effects on our payments balance.

Another thought might be to orient our agricultural subsidy program toward commodities that can aid our balance-of-payments problem; that is, those that we now purchase abroad or those that we might sell abroad. I think there must be many things that a creative administration could propose, beyond a $100-head tax on trips to Europe which is unbefitting a great power.

Let me say again in closing: I favor the partial repeal of the gold cover because we have been backed into a corner where it is necessary. I favor it reluctantly, because it is the easy way out. I strongly urge that we not take the easy way out completely. We need to impose greater disciplines upon ourselves if a reiteration of this crisis is to be avoided. I urge the Congress to do this.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill not with reluctance but with enthusiasm. Whenever the American Bankers Association and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], agree, as they do, on a piece of legislation, it is bound to be good. This one will give us the needed elbowroom to keep our economy prosperous and strong at home. And abroad it will at least in part enable the giant power of the United States to be unfettered. Indeed, my only reservation on the bill is that it does not go the whole way and remove the gold cover entirely so as to free up not merely $5 billion of our gold but for full $15 billion of gold so that we can pursue an independent course in our foreign policy.

It was asked in the debate on the rule in the House why it was that an effort was not made to amend this bill so as to remove the cover not only on Federal Reserve deposits but on Federal Reserve notes as well. I think perhaps I can answer that. Believing as I do that the whole gold cover is an anachronism, I would have supported a bill to remove the entire gold cover. But I refrained from offering or supporting such an amendment in committee because it had been made clear that although the overwhelming majority of Republicans on the House Banking and Currency Committee supported the bill as presented to you today, equally all Republican members of the House Banking and Currency Committee would have opposed a complete removal of the gold cover. So in the interests of bringing here a bill which can command, as this does, bipartisan support, this motion was not made.

But, taking it as it is, I do believe that one-third of a loaf is better than none at all. And while I would have preferred to see $15 billion worth of gold freed for our international purposes, $5 billion does remove for some years to come the pressure we are now under.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. DENT. As a matter of curiosity, the gentleman says that he would favor removing the gold backing from all currency demands. Would that also in his opinion remove the gold backing from the foreign debt?

Mr. REUSS. No, it would not, because the gold of this country could then be marshaled for its proper purpose, namely: discouraging speculators and others who might like to raid our gold. If we have $15 billion, as we have, I think in this international poker game we would do well to make our gold possessions clear to all who are interested.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I am not disturbed over the gentleman's ability as a poker player, but I am disturbed over my lack of understanding of the problem. If the gentleman says this would remove the gold backing from domestic currency in every measure——

Mr. REUSS. On notes as well as deposits.

Mr. DENT. It would still not remove it from the foreign debt situation and foreign claims. How then would an American company expand overseas, because they would have nothing but unbacked dollars to spend and the foreign countries would not accept that?

Mr. REUSS. No. The very fact that we had made our gold supply fully available to foreign central banks and monetary authorities, the only people who can claim our gold, would give American business just that much more power to move anywhere in the world, confident that the dollars which it offered for the local currency which it needed to expand would command universal respect.

Mr. DENT. It would be backed by gold?

Mr. REUSS. It would be entirely backed by gold.

Mr. DENT. Then let us take, not a hypothetical case but a natural case. Studebaker manufactures all of its automobiles in Canada. It sells about 85 percent of them in the United States. Americans buying Studebaker cars in Europe can use this unbacked money with which to buy them and in many instances it would be in the form of checks drawn on unbacked—under this very bill—money that is now on deposit in the U.S. banks. But when Studebaker claimed its purchase price or selling price from the United States, the minute that they became possessors of the drafts on our banks they would then have gold backing, but the purchaser in the United States would not have?

Mr. REUSS. Oh, no. Studebaker might want to have gold backing, but since Studebaker is not the central bank of Canada or the Canadian Secretary of Finance, it would have no right whatsoever, in its Canadian hat, to draw on American gold. This is a privilege given under the Bretton Woods legislation of 1944 solely to central monetary institutions.

Mr. DENT. If the gentleman will yield further, would it not be possible for Studebaker to perform the same act I would perform if I were up there, by buying bonds of the Central Government which it would then claim against money that Studebaker collected in the United States and would revert to claims against U.S. gold?

Mr. REUSS. No, Studebaker would delude itself, because it would find that the gold which it thought it had was merely dross. The Canadian bonds it bought would not in any way give them a claim on gold.

Canada, incidentally, has the same rule with regard to its domestic dollars we have with regard to ours—that no citizen has a claim on gold.

Mr. DENT. If the gentleman will yield further, I only use Studebaker because I think its passage from the American scene as a manufacturer is more vivid in our minds. I could more easily have used Zenith or Castleton or any other company which is operating throughout the world and would be in the same position, because if De Gaulle wants gold, he will not allow American investments to be made in France without gold backing.

Mr. REUSS. This has been a refreshing exchange, but I would like to go on and emphasize if I may the very point that was made so well by the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] that, of course, our removal of the gold cover must be accompanied in the immediate future by vigorous steps or else we shall continue to expose ourselves to the kind of pressure now being practiced upon us by our European friends. In other words, unless we do this, we will have to continue under the pressure of our friends abroad.

France has been cashing in dollars for gold at the annual rate of $400 to $500 million a year in the past 3 years. It is now engaged in stepping up this rate to reduce the U.S. gold supply even more rapidly and thus to weaken the U.S. bargaining position for improvements in the international monetary system.

Needless to say, French ideas of reform of the system differ from ours in that they want to reduce rather than to maintain or to increase the world volume of liquidity. This reduction under French plans would take place mainly at the expense of the United States and the United Kingdom.

An equally unacceptable plan of going back to the old gold standard was made by General de Gaulle in his statement last week. Since this would require a collapse of reserves owned by all free world governments from around $70 billion to $40 billion, even French financial circles are reported to be divided in their reaction to their leader's proposal.

Mr. Chairman, just over the weekend we read that one of West Germany's leading financial experts, and a personal adviser to Chancellor Erhard, Dr. Hermann Abs, Chairman of the Deutschebank, is reported as urging the Bonn Government to follow De Gaulle's example and demand gold for part of her $1.6 billion holdings. According to Dr. Abs, this "might make the United States stop and think."

If we are to prevail against these pressures, we must eliminate our payments deficit forthwith.

This deficit is not at all due to our current trade and services transactions. On these, the latest figures—for the first three quarters of 1964—show that we are running an annual current surplus in excess of $8 billion, the highest since 1947. Nor is the deficit due to foreign aid or other Government transactions—these are lower than they have been for several years.

The main source of dollar loss, Mr. Chairman, is an accelerating rate of U.S. private capital outflows. Through the third quarter of 1964, private capital outflows were at a rate of $1.3 billion higher than in 1963, which itself set a record. Preliminary estimates for fourth quarter 1964 indicate that the increase in capital outflow was even worse in the final quarter of 1964. These outflows occurred despite the partial restrictions imposed by the interest equalization tax on portfolio investments in foreign countries.

I urge the administration to take immediate steps to curb this undesirable dollar drain. What is required is a penalty tax on increases in capital outflows. These take place mainly through banks, whether the outflow is long-term, direct capital, or a short-term investment.

Congress has vested the President with authority to extend the interest equalization tax to bank loans of a year or more in term. This additional authority, which was added in 1963 through the foresight of Senator GORE, is not now sufficient. Under present circumstances, application of the tax to 12-month loans will merely result in a shift to renewable 11-month loans, thus circumventing the intent of the Gore amendment.

I hope that the administration will come up with a plan to tax increases in bank credits of all maturities which result in private capital outflows. Such a tax should be high enough—2 to 3 percent on an annual basis—to discourage bank loans or transfers above a base period amount.

This proposal would have the additional advantage of preventing a new campaign to raise the general level of domestic interest rates. This perennial remedy, guaranteed to halt the forward movement of our economy, is again being advanced as a solution to our capital outflow problem. We cannot afford a "remedy" of this kind. We need not engage in deflationary moves if we will but put our minds to a way of increasing the cost of credit to foreign borrowers while keeping our domestic rates where they are today.

In seeking answers to our balance-of-payments problem, we have inadvertently encouraged friendly nations to be irresponsible. By going to them one by one, and usually at a technical level, for help on our balance of payments, we have permitted each partner to shrug off balance-of-payments deficits as somebody else's problem.

What we should do, instead, is to get all of our principal free world partners around the conference table at the same time—the Six of the Common Market, the Seven of EFTA, Canada, Japan. We should say to them, in effect: "You want us to eliminate our payments deficits, do you not? To achieve this, you do not want us to devalue the dollar, do you? Or to erect trade barriers against your goods? Or to forbid our tourists to visit you? Or to withdraw our troops that are on your shores to protect you, as well as ourselves? Or to tighten money at home and thus add to American unemployment, and perhaps bring about a recession that could torpedo all of us? If none of these methods is the solution, is not what is needed, then, some system of cutting down on capital movements from the United States to your shores—capital investments which bring about our deficit, and which many of you complain of as an unwanted U.S. intrusion? Come, let us reason together."

Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a way to end our payments deficit, and that the giant strength of the United States can then stand unfettered.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly support H.R. 3818, which would eliminate the requirement in the Federal Reserve Act that the Federal Reserve banks maintain 25 percent in gold certificates against deposits held by them.

I believe that some action is clearly necessary because of problems that the administration and our country presently face. We presently have on hand an estimated $15.1 billion in gold. As of December 31, 1964, Federal Reserve bank notes in circulation amounted to $35.3 billion and deposit liabilities amounted to $19.5 billion. The combined liability on notes and deposits required a gold certificate reserve of $13.7 billion. Our present gold supply then amounts to only a 27.5-percent reserve and only $1.4 billion of so-called "free gold" is available to meet foreign demands.

Mr. Chairman, two things stand out insofar as these figures are concerned. First, even in the absence of gold sales abroad, any reasonable estimate of the growth of our economy would surpass the ratio required by existing law, and would thus place a severe restraint upon such growth. Federal Reserve deposits and notes, which require gold reserves, have increased from a combined total of $22.9 billion in December of 1941, to $38.1 billion in December of 1944, during wartime deficit financing, and have since then climbed to a new total of $54.7 billion in December of 1964.

The second point that stands out, of course, is that our supply of gold has steadily decreased. If this decline should continue at the present rate, it is only a matter of months under present law until there is no free gold available to meet foreign demands. I believe the convertibility of dollars into gold at the rate of $35 an ounce is the key to the stability of our international monetary system. There is no question that if this convertibility were suspended, the results would be disastrous. If financial chaos did not prevail, then certainly a deflationary effect would be felt worldwide. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I intend to support H.R. 3818.

I am reluctant, however, for the following reasons:

First, because I, too, objected to the haste with which these hearings were held on a subject as important as the one before us. I so expressed myself to our chairman at the time he ordered the hearings closed.

Second, because I feel that a flat reduction in the reserves required on both deposits and notes would be a better solution to the problem than to remove the 25-percent requirement on deposits and let it remain on notes. I am certain that such a flat reduction—say to 15 percent—would be more honest with the American people and would free more gold than would H.R. 3818.

Third, because the present 25 percent requirement, or a lower percentage if such be the case, does, in fact, serve a useful purpose. Admittedly, it is an artificial limit very similar to the limit on our national debt. Nevertheless, however, the requirement of a gold reserve against deposits does serve as an ultimate check against excessive monetary expansion. It is a "brake" on those who would unduly expand our monetary system. In addition to its function as a "brake," the present 25-percent requirement on deposits, as well as notes, also serves as a stimulus to the administration to solve the problem of expenditures abroad. If the present 25-percent limit were not in effect, what sense of urgency would the administration feel toward the balance-of-payments problem at the present time? The answer is "none," and no one knows how perilously low our gold supply would fall before solutions to the problem would be forthcoming.

Fourth, because this bill, H.R. 3818, is brought to the floor at a time when the only other restraint on the expansion of our monetary system is under attack. I refer to the bills introduced by the chairman of our Banking and Currency Committee to revamp the Federal Reserve System and make it completely subservient to the administration in power. If the 25-percent requirement be removed, then the only thing we have to rely on is the integrity and good sense of the Federal Reserve authorities.

For all of these reasons I have considerable reluctance in supporting the present legislation. I have heard it said this afternoon that "it is a case of the chickens coming home to roost," and it is. The only comparable period in our history when our gold supply dwindled as rapidly was between December 31, 1941, and December 31, 1944, during a period of tremendous wartime deficit financing. The necessity for this bill clearly demonstrates the spending excesses in the past, as well as a lack of discipline which has permitted the situation to come about.

Despite all these things, Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for H.R. 3818 because I feel that failure to enact this bill or a comparable measures, which would continue the convertibility of dollars into gold at $35 an ounce, could well bring about international chaos in the financial world.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to this debate with an open mind, hoping to find justification to assist the Johnson administration out of its current dilemma. The dilemma, of course, is the position we find ourselves in because of the continuing drain on our gold reserves.

Much has been said about the reasons why the deficit in payments causes concern among a great segment of the American public. If I were to offer a frank analysis of the problem, I would suggest we are dealing with some very astute, shrewd, and hardheaded international bankers and political leaders.

In carefully reviewing the history of the international deficit payment problem, one can only conclude that those who stand firm win out in the long run. I point to General de Gaulle, of France, as the shining example of this concept. How many times in history have the people of France failed to advance under his leadership? Whenever a crisis arises, they call on him to lead the nation out of its current problem or dilemma and when you consider the fact that France was one of the countries of Europe faced with a complete rebuilding of its economy and governmental system, one would have to admit their recovery has been remarkable. As a matter of fact, when one considers the amount of gold reserves France has accumulated and the amount of claims against our own gold reserves, this recovery must be described as phenomenal.

With this in mind, it would appear that the time has come for the President of United States, the Congress, and the so-called power structure of this country to stand firm in demanding that our free world friends stand up and be counted with us in sharing the extraordinary burden of defense commitments throughout the world.

Testimony has been presented on this floor today to the effect that the Johnson administration has plans to present leading to the resolution of the balance-of-payments problem.

I need only remind the Members of this body to read the contents of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the debate on the increase of the national debt year after year—where promises have been made to hold the line on expenditures. We were asked to vote for a tax cut on the promise that the line would be held to minimize deficits in our budget. Yet, again we are faced with another deficit proposal for the coming year during so-called times of great prosperity.

This experience leaves me with little or no confidence in the announced intentions of this administration. I refuse to yield any further.

Enactment of this bill would constitute a dangerous disservice to the people of this Nation and could be expected to result in increased foreign demands for our gold. No guarantee against this possibility has been written into the bill.

The administration does not face up to the fundamental question of whether the relatively low ratio of our monetary gold stock to nongold money and deposits could properly be expected to correct itself if our currency were given the quality of integrity. The passage of this bill, in my judgment, will weaken our currency structure to the long-term detriment of our people and the country generally.

We should be working toward a monetary program that would give our dollar the quality of integrity to be respected throughout the world. This, in turn, could cause gold to be released from other countries and be exported to us.

As long as the international bankers and investors shop for investments where money can be backed by gold reserves because of their confidence in gold, it appears that we will have to be guided by this demand for integrity of currency.

A position of firmness when one knows he is right deserves the respect of his peers. It has worked for General de Gaulle to the benefit of France—I believe it is about time we try this time honored approach to international trade and investment practices.

This is not to say that I agree with everything Mr. de Gaulle advocates. As a matter of fact, we should insert as our first show of firmness, a demand that France pay us the $6 million still owing from World War I—particularly when he demands payment in gold for his claims.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in listening to the various colloquys relating to this legislation and would like to make my own position clear from the outset. I do not think we need to go back and criticize all previous administrations, for in all honesty no one is more culpable than the other. They are all equally culpable because the problem has been a problem since World War II. It has been a problem under every administration. I regret that in a couple of instances this debate has degenerated into a discussion of philosophical issues which do not relate to the bill itself. This is too important a matter to allow ourselves the opportunity to digress from the real problem which faces this Nation today. We are not dealing with a certain amount of gold bullion; we are dealing with the entire economic structure, the savings, and even the jobs of the American people.

Why do we have a gold backing? What is the problem with reference to this outflow of gold?

Basically, the law says our currency and our deposits in the Federal Reserve System must be backed by gold or gold certificates in the amount of 25 percent. The problem has arisen since World War II. It began with the Marshall plan in the latter part of the forties when we began our massive foreign aid programs, to aid war-torn countries. We dispensed massive amounts of dollars abroad enabling the recipients to purchase U.S. exports as well as those of other countries without settling adverse trade balances in gold. As recovery progressed in these countries the dollar gap gave way to dollar surpluses and some of these were converted to gold as countries boosted the gold reserves of their own monetary systems. Thus the previously favorable flow of gold was reversed.

Meanwhile, at home, Federal budget deficits continued as a force in expansion of our money supply. The gold reserve ratio began a persistent trend downward with the ratio dropping from its postwar high of 57.5 percent in September 21, 1949, to an alltime low of 27.5 percent on December 31, 1964.

Since gold inflow was the dominant factor in improvement of the gold reserve ratio to its postwar high, and its outflow was also the dominant factor in the subsequent deterioration of the gold reserve ratio to its present alltime low, it is pertinent to examine the potential of gold flow in the period ahead as it again could prove to be the dominant factor.

For years the United States has been running a persistent deficit in its balance-of-payments positions with the outside world. Although enjoying a favorable balance in trade, other financial relations with the world have resulted in a chronic net deficit position in our balance-of-payments position. The main items involved in our spending, lending, investing, and giving away more dollars than we receive from the rest of the world are U.S. military expenditures abroad, short- and long-term capital outflows, travel expenditures abroad, remittances and pensions to persons abroad, and economic aid.

That presents a pretty difficult problem; because you have a situation where it is almost impossible to cut down on military expenditures, for example in South Vietnam or even in Europe for NATO. At the same time it is very difficult to control the flow of credit, both short term and long term, outside this country because we never know what part of that credit is returning to this country. When an amount of money goes to France we do not know what happens to that money. It may be it is going to buy tractors or machine tools in the United States, and thereby not damage our payments position.

The problem does exist, however, that at the present time there are some $27 billion in short-term liabilities, of which $22.5 billion, approximately, is owned by foreign governments and private investors—in other words, other than international institutions. Under these circumstances, if the foreign governments would just convert 11 percent of their dollars into gold it would wipe out our total free gold supply of $1.376 billion. That is the reason why this legislation is a very unfortunate necessity. While the bill avoids the real problem, we still must maintain our willingness to meet in full our international obligations.

It seems that the main point today should be, What are we going to do about the situation as it exists? The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] raised the point that the maintenance of gold as a reserve behind currency or deposits has no justification other than psychological, and has introduced a bill to implement philosophy with concrete action. I should like to argue just lightly with this concept, for the reason for having gold reserves goes a little bit deeper than that. Theoretically it is true that the primary purpose of having gold is to act as a relative point of value from which you can exchange the currency of one nation for that of another, but in fact the reason we have it and the reason there is merit in present requirements is that the resultant close relationship between currency and gold has been a check against excessive monetary expansion. Theoretically we can do without a lot of things. Theoretically we do not need a written constitution, for we could live under the old common law, utilizing precedents tested by time. But the fact we have a constitution and the reason it has been of merit is that it has furnished certain guidelines for action, and, most importantly, it has protected this Nation from subjugation of the individual by excessive Government even though its proposals be well intentioned.

The same rationale can be used with gold. Obviously we do not have to have gold behind a significant segment of the economy such as the deposits of the Federal Reserve System, but it is true that having this reserve does preserve a certain set of guidelines which maintain the System against excesses and abuses by individuals or even administrations who have different ideas and philosophies. Obviously there are individuals who have different ideas about our system, ideas which conflict dramatically with currently accepted principles of economic and monetary policy. Thus, in somewhat the manner of any written law, gold reserves—which may in theory have little justification insofar as convertibility is concerned—can act to protect our citizens against excesses, whether caused by opportunism or ignorance.

There should be a second argument for this 25-percent reserve. That is, the declining margin of free gold has provided very strong inducement to the Nation and to our Government to do something to correct the basic problem. If we did not have the reserve, we might not be forced to face the problem. It is politically delicate, to say the least, for this administration to take the rather difficult belt-tightening measures that are required in order to maintain responsible action. If we did not have these reserves, we would have no sense of urgency in taking these actions.

As I said, I support this bill today simply because I think it is an obvious necessity in order that we meet our international obligations and avoid a panic and a run on gold. But more importantly, I think it is vitally important that this House recognize we are not today treating a disease—we are creating the symptom of a disease. I believe it is absolutely imperative that we act responsibly for a change and do something about our spending not only within the domestic economy but internationally.

I want to take these last few minutes to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin for suggesting something which I think may be an important step in the right direction. It is time we demanded that this Nation, for the first time in a long time, and its State Department, for the first time in a long time, have the integrity and the courage to go to our fellow free nations and insist that they participate in the world burden which we now carry. We must have a conference of leaders of the free world to the extent that we say—Gentleman, if we hang, all hang together, and there is no difference in the hurt. Let us individually at least try to assume a fair share of the burden.

If our Nation cannot accomplish this goal, I honestly do not believe that we can expand our exports to the extent that the problem will be solved. Exports and trade are subject neither to wish, whim, or fiat. They depend upon productivity, supply, and demand. For this reason it seems fair to say the only immediate steps that can be taken which will resolve the crisis are relief and assistance from other free nations through the sharing of the world burden we now carry.

I am very reluctant to support this bill, but I do say in all sincerity, I think the House at this juncture has no alternative.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to compliment my colleague on his very worthwhile and scholarly statement. Surely this House could do well to follow the suggestions that he has made.

Mr. Chairman, we are gathered here today in an effort to come up with a satisfactory prescription for the treatment of a diagnosed ailment in our monetary system. Unfortunately, we are being asked to treat the symptoms instead of the disease.

The patient, a Mr. Gold Reserve, is in the throes of a dilemma. Postwar monetary expansion has produced a gradual increase in the amount of gold required as a legal reserve. During the same period, U.S. gold holdings have declined steadily as a result of the persistent deficit in our international accounts. We now see that the two trends are on a collision course, to eventually meet at a point where either law or folly must give way. Today we are suggesting that the law give way, without adequately considering what to do about the folly.

Basically, the bill before us would eliminate the 25-percent gold reserve requirement for Federal Reserve deposits, thereby freeing up to $5 billion in gold for use in dealing with foreign interests who have legal claim to it. And with it goes a traditional safeguard of the American dollar in world affairs.

We are told that to make gold readily available, foreign demand for it will cease. This theory is naive. The opposite effect could well be the case.

What disturbs me most is why we are considering this bill at all, at this time. I cannot believe that there is such urgency that it could not wait for a few weeks until we know where we are going. This bill does not even mention what should be the prime consideration today, the worsening balance-of-payments deficit.

To make a decision that merely lowers the gold reserve requirements is no solution at all. It merely defers a crisis to a later date when the continuing balance-of-payments deficit once again catches up with the legal reserve, or in this case the lack of one. Today we are considering taking the easy way out. But it is also the risky way.

The action we are asked to take today should at least be postponed until we have the assurance of eliminating the balance-of-payments problem. The President has stated that he will have suggestions in this field within a few days or a few weeks. We need to see those suggestions before proceeding further.

It is conceivable that the White House actually is waiting to see what we do today; to see if the pressure for a more favorable balance of payments is removed by today's action. But to abandon the present reserve requirements, as stated in this bill, would tend to relieve the sense of urgency with which the international payments problem has been viewed, thereby resulting in the postponement of remedial action already overdue.

The only way that this bill can possibly work, and even then there are doubts, is for this country to do something about the balance-of-payments problem. It must come first, and remain foremost in our plans.

The committee report tells us that the present formula will restrict our domestic growth and prosperity and reduce confidence in the dollar abroad. I cannot buy that premise when the continued unfavorable balance of payments is the real culprit that causes lack of confidence. France and West Germany already are taunting us about that unfavorable balance. Those two countries have good reason to taunt us. They now have half of the gold holdings in industrial Europe. And industrial Europe now has more gold than we have.

Naturally we are all disturbed that the Nation's supply of gold has diminished to the smallest sum since March 29, 1939, now totaling only a little over $15 billion. But this low figure was not caused by the 25-percent gold reserve requirement, and the situation will not be cured by action to remove that requirement. Remember that the balance of international payments adverse to us is still running about $3 billion a year, so action taken by us must include serious consideration of the payments balance.

The committee report accompanying this bill acknowledges that action going beyond this bill may be necessary to correct our continuing balance-of-payments deficits. But the bill before us does absolutely nothing to correct the situation. The report says:

> Your committee awaits these recommendations [from the President] with great interest.

I would further suggest that all of us await those recommendations with interest. In fact, we should defer action on this bill until we have seen them.

Mr. BROCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, during the recent election the Nation was exposed to the gorgeous colors of the Great Society. "Come let's join hands together," we heard. "Let us trip hand in hand down the path toward the Great Society." "Put your faith in me and all your problems will be solved," we heard as a nation.

Now some of us were not fooled by this sales talk.

We were warning the people not to be hoodwinked by a carnival-like side show of sales talk.

One of the things we talked about was something called fiscal responsibility—to put it another way, we warned about the fiscal irresponsibility of the Democrat administration—the former New Frontier and present Great Society.

We pointed out that a day of reckoning was long overdue in our balance-of-payments problem—that this Nation was faced with a real crisis because it refused to face up to monetary discipline. We said the administration was like a boat drifting rudderless toward the whirlpool of international financial chaos.

Everyone knows what the problem is—a greater outflow of dollars than inflow, caused by four areas of spending, foreign aid, a huge defense establishment abroad, heavy American investment overseas and huge tourist spending, and one other thing, largely overlooked, an easy-come, easy-go, happy-go-lucky, spend-yourself-into-prosperity attitude of this administration.

When the New Frontier-Great Society took office, the balance-of-payments problem was a real one—a nagging worry, but not a crisis. Promises were made to do something about it.

Let us look at the record. In 1964 the balance-of-payments deficit was $2.6 billion; in 1963, $2.6 billion; in 1962, $2.2 billion; in 1961, $2.4 billion.

President Kennedy 2 years ago promised a $2 billion improvement in 18 months. What happened? Nothing.

Now what does the leader of the Great Society propose? It is to do away with part of our domestic gold reserve requirement to accommodate the gold demands of foreign nations.

The arguments on the Democrat side of the aisle are the same crisis type arguments we have heard in this House again and again, a good deal like the broken record, unless we take this action, the nations of the world will lose confidence in the dollar, and financial chaos may take place.

The administration argues that it is necessary to take this step. But, is it not also true, that it is necessary to balance foreign dollar dealings?

Is it not also true that unless we do, in a short time we will be back in the same precarious position again, with no gold cushion?

Is it not also true that we have absolutely no showing of good faith by this administration that it is willing to tackle the distasteful job of balancing our payments, but there is plenty of evidence that it is unwilling to cut down on foreign aid, that it is unwilling to slow up American investment dollars going abroad?

It is not true that this New Frontier-Great Society is committed to a policy of easy money?

The administration believes that you must have continual pump priming on the domestic scene, and foreign scene, to make things tick economically.

Is it not true that this Great Society wants to have its cake and eat it too? Must it always take the easy course, never facing up to the hard facts of economic life?

Why does President Johnson not come here with concrete proposals to solve this great crisis?

When he asks Congress to go along with shorting the American people of gold, why does he not propose a course of action to assure fast correction of this grave problem?

If this administration would get down to cases, and put its financial house in order, then some of us might feel more like supporting the administration on this bill. But what have the facts been? As I pointed out, over 2 years ago, President Kennedy, then the head of this administration, came to Congress, pointed out the danger of our dwindling gold balance, and promised to take action. He predicted that our balance would improve by $2 billion over the next 18 months. The facts are that our dollar balance was down $2.6 billion in the next 1 year alone. President Johnson has been in office well over a year and has done nothing about this very critical situation in which we find ourselves. In fact, in recent weeks the drain on our gold has accelerated to nearly twice the rate of last year.

To sum up in a nutshell, what are we doing here today, and what does the future hold?

Congress is being asked to abolish in part the gold reserve behind our money. This will solve nothing. It will tend to undermine confidence in our dollar.

There is only one cure for our gold problem. We must balance our foreign payments. We must exercise monetary discipline. We must stop our easy money policy, our wild spending habits, and when we do that, we will solve the problem and protect our dollar.

I intend to vote against this bill, for I think that this administration and its head, President Johnson, has not shown faith with this House and this Nation. I do not feel bound to support this obvious temporary expedient, simply postponing another evil day, another crisis, where there has been no proposals of any kind to correct this dangerous situation. The President is asking Congress to sign a blank check for more gold outflow. I will not be a party to this irresponsible fiscal policy.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation to limit the requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain a 25-percent gold cover against their deposit liabilities. This will free nearly $5 billion in gold and thereby give the Federal Reserve System and the U.S. Treasury the flexibility that they need to meet foreseeable future requirements of the domestic and international economy.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan bill. It was reported by your Committee on Banking and Currency by a vote of 25 to 3 with the Republican members voting by a 2-to-1 majority in favor of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is one word that explains why your committee brings this bill to the floor and why it is in this particular form. That word, Mr. Chairman, is confidence—confidence in the U.S. dollar—confidence abroad and confidence at home.

At the present time we must recognize that international confidence is the more crucial one.

It is my contention that abolition of the existing 25-percent gold cover requirement on bank deposits will bolster international confidence in the dollar. In the international field the people whose confidence in the dollar is most important to us are realistic, practical, and sophisticated people. They are aware that the United States has tremendous financial and economic resources. If we demonstrate to them that we know our own interests and have the will to mobilize our resources to serve such interests, our dollar will be respected. They will have confidence in it.

Complete, rather than partial, removal of the 25-percent gold cover plus a hard-nosed program for ending the balance-of-payments deficit would give the greatest degree of confidence internationally.

During our Banking and Currency Committee hearings last week, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, agreed with me when I suggested that part of the purpose of this legislation was to give us a few more years in which to come to grips with and solve the real problem—our balance-of-payments deficit, and development of a new and more flexible international monetary system.

This is important, because, as General de Gaulle recognizes, we do not have a balance-of-payments problem in the classical sense. We have a deficit only because we treat investments in valuable assets as pure expenditures without counting the value of the assets acquired. In other words, we treat foreign aid gifts the same as we do the acquisition by General Motors of a new factory in Europe.

However, this situation does give us a problem. It is a problem of liquidity. The possibility of our having difficulties in respect to liquidity might cause people to lose confidence in the dollar. Enactment of H.R. 3818 will express the unaltered and unalterable willingness of the United States to support the international convertibility of the dollar at the fixed price of $35 an ounce of gold which is vital not only to our own well-being, but also to that of the present system of international finance on which the free world relies.

But we must also be concerned, and your committee was concerned, about domestic confidence in the dollar. It is for this reason—this phychological reason and no other—that your committee recommends only the removal of the 25-percent cover on bank deposits and not on Federal Reserve notes.

If this bill is enacted, Members can go to their constituents, show them Federal Reserve notes, and say that the legal requirement for gold backing is just the same after the enactment of this bill as it was before the enactment of this bill.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Could the gentleman tell me what the advantage is now of maintaining gold backing for Federal Reserve notes and dropping the backing for deposits?

Mr. MOORHEAD. The main advantage for this choice is purely phychological. The persons concerned with the backing of deposits would be the commercial bankers who have their reserves with the Federal Reserve banks. The bankers understand gold and are not concerned phychologically by the enactment of this bill. Actually, the American bankers are supporting this bill in the other body.

However, we were not quite so sure about the man on the street. Therefore, so far as Federal Reserve notes which change hands are concerned, we did not change the legal requirement. It will be the same as it was before.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If we leave the gold cover or gold backing behind Federal Reserve notes, as the economy expands and more money is issued, is it not quite possible, in times to come, as the economy does grow, that the gold now on hand will be insufficient even to meet that 25-percent backing for the Federal Reserve notes.

Mr. MOORHEAD. This of course is possible. At one time the requirement that the Congress imposed was a 40-percent requirement. Then in 1946, we reduced it to the present 25 percent. Now we are asking for an adjustment of that.

However, we should also realize that these are long-term things. I believe the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System indicated that if the Congress would take this action, we would probably be in the clear for 10 years; at least, we would have that kind of leeway.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, if our balance-of-payments deficit is not soon corrected, is it not reasonable to assume that, not too far in the future, we will be required to remove the 25-percent backing for these Federal Reserve notes?

Mr. MOORHEAD. Again the testimony before our committee indicated we would have 10 years' grace, but I do not think we should use up those 10 years. Actually I think we should take steps immediately and promptly. The President is going to send up a message suggesting methods that we can use to correct our balance-of-payments problem, because we cannot continue a deficit of the magnitude that we have had since 1949 without running into serious difficulty.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then that brings me to this question: This being the case, am I correct in assuming that the Federal Reserve Board presently has the authority to remove the gold backing now required for Federal Reserve deposits and notes?

Mr. MOORHEAD. Under section 11 of the basic act for the Federal Reserve, which is set forth at page 51 of the hearings, the Board of Governors does have the right to remove this limitation on a temporary but unlimited recurring basis.

Mr. WAGGONNER. For 30 days at a time, which can be extended another 30 days?

Mr. MOORHEAD. Which can be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT].

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, there were three of us on the minority side of the Committee on Banking and Currency who opposed this bill in committee. Perhaps we were not affected enough psychologically or perhaps we had not lost confidence in the United States and its monetary system sufficiently to vote for this bill. I oppose the bill, with some trepidation, of course, partly, out of ignorance, because it has been told to us many times, once by a very famous international financier, Mr. Rothschild, who said that there were only two people in the whole world who understood international finance, one an obscure clerk in a French bank and one a director of the English National Bank. Yesterday in the Committee on Rules, I was more than pleased to credit the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the chairman of our Committee on Banking and Currency, as one who understood it.

However, this is one of the problems we are facing here. I think we members of the committee and we Members of the Congress and the public and the international bankers simply do not understand. It is very important that we understand these bills before we vote for them.

The three of us who opposed the bill in committee did so for different reasons. I suppose the reason why I objected was primarily procedural. We filed no committee report because the administration appeared to be rushing this proposition through without adequate consideration to avoid more public disturbance over the further deterioration of our financial structure and the monetary system. We do not want to contribute to that disturbance but on reflection we think we can best serve the Congress and the financial world and the public by a more complete discussion and debate.

If the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Rains were here today, he would probably say something to the effect that the plain fact and the unadulterated truth of the matter is that we are simply making our gold available to foreigners. Then we should ask the question, If we do not want our gold, why make it available to foreigners; or, if they want it so badly, why do we not want it?

Mr. Chairman, we often proudly proclaim the House of Representatives as "the greatest deliberative body in the world" or "the most nearly perfect parliamentary system ever devised by man." It is legislative, parliamentary, democratic, representative, and other things also. It seems to me that Congress, to maintain such a lofty and deserved reputation, must perform two essential functions. True, it must enable the majority, even a small majority, to "work its will." If a majority desires the passage of a certain bill, the bill should be passed, without unnecessary delay. Coordinately Congress must "guarantee to the minority an opportunity to be heard." Every idea originated in the mind of one man. Congress cheats the Nation of good ideas, and degrades itself, our Constitution, and our form of government if it does not perform both functions. For a few to say "our idea is perfect and therefore needs no discussion or debate" is the height of egotism and a dangerous step down the road to tyranny. Tyranny by the majority is no less tyranny. Stubbornness by a dissident minority after it has been fully heard is no less detrimental to our representative parliamentary system.

The better the idea, the better it can withstand critical examination and debate. Every law we pass affects every American and most of the people on earth, probably for all time. It behooves us to take the time, and use the parliamentary tools at our disposal, to be right.

The committees of the House are the backbone and the heartbeat of the Congress. The purpose, rules, and obligations of the House must be scrupulously honored in committee. Members should insist.

If this great parliamentary system is to survive, it must be vigilantly defended by every Member. Without a personal dedication by every Member to the preservation of our system, an overwhelming majority can destroy the system as easily and as certainly as a stubborn and unruly mob which rejects the rules and takes the law into its own hands.

Too many persons scream for the protection of the rights of the minority—when they are in the minority—but quickly ignore or disdain the rights of the minority when they obtain majority status. When the majority is largest, it should exercise the most restraint and grant the most consideration.

A brief chronology of the bill under debate is as follows: On January 27, 1965, late, the chairman circularized the Committee on Banking and Currency announcing a "hearing on gold cover legislation" to commence on the following Monday, February 1, 1965, at 10 a.m.

On January 28, in a supplemental committee notice, the chairman announced that the committee "will hold hearings on Monday and Tuesday, February 1 and 2, on legislation dealing with the removal of the gold cover." In this notice, it was stated that witnesses would include high administration officials, without naming such witnesses.

It was not until January 28, in the President's economic message to Congress, that the administration's gold cover legislation was revealed; and on this day the chairman introduced, by request, legislation in the House which became H.R. 3818.

On Saturday, January 30, the chairman rescheduled the hearings on gold cover to the morning and afternoon of February 1 as an accommodation to Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve System.

While it is quite true that the newspapers were giving extensive treatment to speculative reports surrounding prospective gold legislation throughout January, there was great uncertainty about the precise form of the administration's package, up to the day of the President's economic message to Congress, a scant 3 days before the hearings, 2 days of which constituted the weekend of January 30–31.

Moreover, while it was widely reported in mid-January that Treasury Secretary Dillon had met with certain Senators to discuss the gold situation, an experienced observer might still wonder whether these stories were, or were not, merely "trial balloons" testing public reaction on a very sensitive and emotional issue. In the January 8 New York

Times, the experienced financial writer, Edwin Dale, Jr., reported:

> The Johnson administration is near a decision to ask Congress to repeal all or part of the required 25-percent gold backing for the Nation's money supply.

One need only recall that throughout the summer and autumn of 1964 all leading newspapers reported that the Johnson administration similarly was near a decision to turn back to the States—without any strings attached—a certain percentage of total Federal tax revenues. This, however, was dropped from the administration's 1965 legislative program when opposition developed.

One might also recall that on January 7 France announced its decision to convert $150 million of dollar holdings to gold. It is conceivable that one might have interpreted the flurry of "gold cover" stories during the middle of January as an administration attempt to instill European confidence in the continued availability of gold for conversion of dollar holdings.

Another uncertainty concerning the hearings could be traced to 1961 when scheduled hearings on legislation to eliminate the entire gold cover were suddenly canceled when it became apparent to the Kennedy administration that public reaction was intense and generally adverse.

Other facts concerning the committee hearings on H.R. 3818 are as follows: The House met January 29 and February 1, 1965. Winston Churchill's funeral was January 30 and this absorbed the attention of almost everyone that day.

H.R. 3818 was first introduced on January 28, the day following the notice of the meeting called to consider the bill. The Committee on Banking and Currency was not fully organized when it began hearings on the bill. At the organizational meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency on January 29, 1965, the chairman, without previous notice to the minority, presented proposals for nine rules, many new to the committee, some giving increased authority to the chairman, and one permitting proxy voting. While considering proposals to implement the rules, the chairman, at 12:05 p.m., sustained a point of order that the House was in session and adjourned the meeting. No further meeting to complete the organization of the committee has been called. Subcommittees have not yet been approved.

On February 1, 1965, Secretary Dillon read a prepared 13-page statement favoring H.R. 3818. The minority had no prior access to his testimony. He responded to brief questions—testifying about 2 hours in total. Mr. Martin also read a prepared statement of 11 pages, to which the minority had no previous access, and then responded to questions for a total appearance of about 2 hours.

On February 1, at about 12:15 p.m., the hearing schedule was advanced from 2:30 to 2:00 p.m. to permit Mr. Dillon to return to answer questions not answered in the brief morning session.

Immediately following Mr. Martin's testimony, the chairman convened an executive session to vote out the bill favorably. In less than one-half hour, H.R. 3818, without amendment, was reported favorably, 25 to 3, including three affirmative proxies. This could not be considered a typical "railroad." It was more swift than any we have known. It started and finished way ahead of schedule with no stops along the way.

No adverse witnesses were called, invited, or heard. All testimony was jammed into about 4 hours in 1 day on which the House met. Only two witnesses testified for the bill.

This proposal is one of the most controversial and far reaching to be presented to this Congress.

In 1960, Senator Kennedy campaigned for President on a platform of reducing the imbalance-of-payments condition. Only weak, ineffectual efforts have been made to correct the condition. H.R. 3818 is another proposal, born of fear and nurtured by crises, detracting us from the real problem which needs immediate direct attention; namely, the "imbalance of payments" condition of the United States.

There can be little question that enactment of H.R. 3818 will weaken the integrity of our currency and monetary system both at home and abroad. Confidence, an important although indescribable factor in our currency and monetary system, will be weakened. H.R. 3818 is only a thinly disguised first step in eliminating all gold reserves and backing for our currency. It is obvious that effective means must be developed and pursued to reduce the imbalance-of-payments situation, but continued "window dressing" is not enough.

The correct solution will not be discovered by two witnesses crowded into 4 hours on 1 day before the committee was fully organized.

There was no need for such haste. The hasty consideration serves only to squelch opposition, prevent both sides from being heard, and to give the public some pause about the effectiveness of the proposal and the fairness of our committee system.

When the cause is worthy, adverse witnesses are more likely to fortify and strengthen the argument of the proponents. There should be no fear of full exposure. Quick, short, and early hearings with only two witnesses serve more to confuse and invite suspicion rather than to illuminate and persuade. Not holding a committee meeting would have been more fair and just as helpful. Only one view was presented. Other views—and there must be at least one other view or the gold cover would certainly have been removed years ago—remain unpresented. The committee, the Congress, and the American public have been denied the right to know; the minority has been deprived of its opportunity to be heard. No other alternative was presented, explored, or considered. Members are now required to research the subject for themselves. By such abbreviated, limited, and one-sided hearings, the majority does not properly or fairly perform its function or fulfill its obligation to the Congress and to the interested citizens. Four hour's debate on the floor of the House is neither a satisfactory substitute for proper and full committee deliberation nor an adequate presentation of the issues involved.

The other body has scheduled opposition witnesses. I am most reluctant to concede that the other body can perform its deliberative function more fairly and fully than we can in the House.

The time to utilize the expertise in this highly complicated field of international monetary science is during committee hearings. We have the system and machinery to gather the facts and to obtain the best judgments in the world. But we did not employ them. Now we must rely solely upon a brief record of two witnesses and the opinions of laymen on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This is one of the most technical, complicated, obtuse sciences known to man. We need the advice of the best experts available anywhere. We need at least two views to make a decision. We cannot make a sound decision today.

We should vote against this bill for procedural reasons alone. We are entitled to a complete presentation of all views by the committee. Until we do this, there is a greater crisis involving the deliberative processes of the House than any crisis involving our "gold cover."

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I just happen also to be one of those in the Committee on Banking and Currency who voted against hastily reporting this bill out of committee. I am, therefore, standing before this Congress to justify my vote in committee and as to why I today will not vote for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that many people here have in detail shown what the problem is which is facing this Nation. I do not feel that it will hurt for me to repeat it and I shall go over it just as rapidly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, what has brought about this condition? The thing that has brought it about is the international promise of the United States to buy back dollars in gold, thereby pledging its entire gold supply to meet international claims.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one might ask what are the international claims today? I have a figure—which by the way a number of my figures will be taken from newspaper and magazine articles generally which are reputable, in the absence of figures from the Treasury—for the end of the year. Livingstone in the Washington Post says that our international claims total $28.9 billion. What are they? The central foreign banks have $12.7 billion, other international banks including IMB, $5 billion, and private money holdings abroad $11.2 billion for a total of $28.9 billion.

You may ask how did this Nation get $28.9 billion in debt to foreigners? Because, as has been reiterated here, the ever-increasing and recurring unfavorable balance of payments today has put us in the hole in dollars to Europe to the tune of $28.9 billion.

What was the unfavorable balance of payments for the year 1964? I am using figures from the President's Economic Report. The United States exported last year the unbelievable sum of $36 billion. We only imported $28 billion, which gave us an $8 billion advantage. You might say that is wonderful for the United States, we are ahead $8 billion. But we are not ahead $8 billion. We went behind from $2 billion to $3 billion. Why? Because we sent abroad $10 billion for other purposes. What were these purposes? Foreign aid, $3.4 billion; private investment abroad, $5.6 billion; other transfers abroad by American citizens, $1 billion; making a total of U.S. payments abroad of $10 billion, which gives us as of January 11 an unfavorable balance of trade of $2 billion.

But you heard testimony today that at the end of the year the figures changed. They say it is $3 billion.

The United States has $15.675 billion of gold on hand. Why is that not available to everybody? Because 25 percent is reserved as a backing for Federal Reserve notes, and 25 percent for Federal Reserve bank deposits; that means $13.99 billion of the $15.675 billion in gold, which only leaves $1.376 billion, or approximately $1.4 billion in gold available for international settlements.

What is the plan of the administration to make some money available so that we can answer the people abroad? Take from the deposits of the Federal Reserve bank this 25-percent gold backing that they have enjoyed all these years. I say that is not a good thing for the country, and it is not necessary at this time to do.

What has happened since 1949? The flight of gold abroad has been, according to the testimony of Secretary Dillon, $8.4 billion. Also in addition demands for gold for reserve backing in this Nation went up $3.5 billion. That appears in the report of the majority. It says our gold reserves have gone down to $11.9 billion, and $8.4 billion has had to go abroad. We have had to keep $3.5 billion additional gold in this country because of increase in currency in circulation and the increase in deposits in the Federal Reserve. The increase in currency circulation required $3 billion. Federal Reserve bank deposits demanded $483 million. These deposits in the Federal Reserve banks since 1949 have only required new gold cover to the extent of $483 million. That is all the gold that has to be set aside to protect member bank deposits.

So, coming right down to it, this inflation in gold requirements we are talking about is not being caused by deposits in the Federal Reserve bank, it is being caused by the issuance of Federal Reserve notes and this unfavorable balance of payments abroad.

You have heard the question today: What will happen if we take the 25-percent gold backing away from Federal Reserve deposits? It has been said this is entirely psychological; that it has no foundation in fact for its existence. But that is not true.

Let me tell you this: If you remove this gold backing on Federal Reserve deposits you are unshackling the Federal Reserve Board. They have the power to raise or lower member bank deposits in Federal Reserve banks by raising or lowering the reserve requirements.

Think this through. Right now if the Federal Reserve Board wanted to raise the member bank deposits of the Federal Reserve banks by 1 percent, that would increase the deposits in the Federal Reserve banks by about $2 billion. That means the Federal Reserve Board would have to find $500 million of gold to back this increase in deposits. Conversely, today if the Federal Reserve Board wants to get more gold to make it available for international payments, all they have to do is lower the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks. The member banks would lower their reserves, and they could do it overnight by withdrawing their deposits in the Federal Reserve banks. So when the Federal Reserve Board sits around the table and ponders whether it shall raise or lower the reserves, they have to take into consideration the gold reserves of the United States. They cannot change the reserve requirements of member banks without reference to the gold supply of the country. So it is not essential to have this 25-percent backing for Federal Reserve bank deposits, as a brake on the Federal Reserve Board.

Right now you are trying to have State banks join the Federal Reserve System. When we passed the Federal Reserve Bank Act, every national bank had to join the System. There are 8,500 State banks. Only 1,500 have joined the Federal Reserve System. If I were to ask a State bank to join the System, I would say, "We will keep a reserve in the Federal Reserve bank back of your deposits by 25 percent in gold." If this bill passes, this gold backing will be removed.

The first asset on the balance sheet of the Federal Reserve banks of the United States is $15 billion worth of gold certificates, which represents the gold at Fort Knox. A State bank joining the Federal Reserve System or a U.S. national bank now a member of the Federal Reserve System, I would say that by reason of present law would have this gold available to them in the event that a money panic should occur. I know it will never occur. But if it does, we have the 25-percent gold reserve in the Federal Reserve available to the member banks.

So much for the argument that destroying the 25-percent coverage of the Federal Reserve bank deposits is purely psychological. I say that is made up of whole cloth and is absolutely not true. Suppose today we do not vote this bill. What can we do in this Nation to get us out of this dilemma? That is the question before us. If you will read Mr. Dillon's statement, he says there is no panic. Others will say there is a panic. The best thing to do to correct this situation, No. 1, is correct the unfavorable balance of payments. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] gave us some very wonderful suggestions. I will give you some: First, further limitations on investments by American companies abroad; second, drastically reduced foreign aid; third, endeavor to reduce defense spending abroad by encouraging other countries to assume a greater share of the burden; fourth, have the Treasury Department sell more and more short-term certificates each week at higher rates of interest so as to attract buyers at home so they will not be sending their money abroad; fifth, continue the tax of up to 15 percent on purchases by domestics of foreign securities and plug loopholes in the present law; sixth, insofar as practicable buy U.S. military supplies for use abroad in the United States; seventh, have the President invoke the authority he now has under the Gore amendment to extend the interest equalization tax to bank loans with maturities of 1 year or more; and eighth, deny gold redemption to surplus balance payment countries still restricting their money-capital markets.

I asked Secretary Dillon this morning—about a year ago he made a speech in Rome and he admonished foreign nations for not opening their markets to capital—about equity capital. Why? Because foreign companies are coming into the United States getting millions of dollars to run their companies abroad. But there are many countries today that will not permit the floating of equity capital for foreign firms. They should do it. If we do it in New York, you should be able to do it in Switzerland and most any other place.

In summary, I will say this. We have now an emergency clause in our law. We can, if we get short of gold, suspend gold payments for 30 days at first and then renew it for intervals of 15 days. We have done it three times before in our history since this law has been in effect. According to a statement of Mr. Martin last year in front of this committee, he wrote a letter in which he said the Board has exercised this authority of 11(c) to suspend reserve requirements on three separate occasions in the history of this Nation.

Here is what Mr. Martin said 1 year ago. He is talking a little different today. He says this in this letter:

> It seems reasonable to conclude that if this country's gold losses should continue to the point where the Reserve banks were unable to comply with the 25-percent statutory reserve requirement, there is ample authority under the present act to meet the situation without disrupting the economy or the international payments mechanism, and to provide time for Congress to consider legislative action.

In other words, 1 year ago Mr. Martin said the 30-day emergency gold suspension power renewable for 15-day intervals was adequate to take care of the situation at that time.

Here is another final statement:

> Only foreign central banks and foreign governments can demand our gold.

The only country that is demanding it today is, of course, France—a country that has had $9 billion in foreign aid and $6 billion in loans to them for World War I. They owe us $600 million from World War II and now they are cleverly coming into the market and trying to embarrass this country by demanding gold for dollars. France is the only country doing it. You take a little country bank with $3 million of assets and they have only $300,000 in cash on hand. They exist on confidence. The people of the community know they can come and get their money. But if everybody came in and wanted the $3 million, they would not be able to do it. The same thing in international payments. If the countries abroad would realize that we as a nation never intended that we would keep $29 million in gold on hand to meet all claims at once then even the $1.4 million in gold we have now would be plenty to meet reasonable demands if there is good will and international understanding and if they would realize that this Nation is one of the greatest nations in the world and will not welsh on its promises.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DEL CLAWSON].

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent here today that we are attempting to reduce the fever by tampering with the thermometer. This may well be one of the most important and vital pieces of legislation to come before the 89th Congress when future Congresses look back upon the road we travel today. Every member of the committee and both witnesses who appeared before us on February 1 attested to the grave significance of this bill in the monetary markets of the world, but more particularly did they stress the need for corrective action directed at the causes of the predicament in which we find ourselves, those mysterious causes being the policies that have created the imbalance of payments for the United States, resulting in the loss of our gold reserves. Time and again the testimony at the hearings from both Secretary Dillon and Mr. Martin revealed that this legislation would be unnecessary if our balance of payments had been corrected in the past few years as it was promised over 4 years ago during a presidential campaign. On October 31, 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy, campaigning for the Presidency of the United States and speaking in Philadelphia on the balance-of-payments subject recited five major reasons which, in his opinion, were responsible for the sharp reversal in our balance-of-payments position. Time will not permit a review of these reasons. He said:

> What then must we do? What would a new Democratic administration do to reverse the present downward trend in our balance of payments?

He then immediately proposed six policy points for correcting this alarming situation. He also quoted the U.S. Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund wherein he warned that "certain deficits of the size the United States is incurring cannot long be sustained." Through this six-point action program he claimed:

> By vigorous pursuit of these policies I believe that we can move toward an economy which is growing without inflation. And if we do, then American industry will also be in a better position to compete on the world market—increasing the volume of our exports, shifting the balance of payments, halting the drain on our gold reserves, and thus insuring the soundness of the dollar.

In his words the "soundness of the dollar" depended upon "halting the drain on our gold reserves." Today, 4½ years later, billions of gold reserves shorter, with a reduction of these reserves from that day in 1960 from 37.4 percent to the present dangerous level of slightly more than 27 percent, we are now told that the dollar is sound, that this legislation before us is needed in order to "buy time" so that the administration can devise policies that will reverse the balance-of-payments problem and eliminate the drain on our gold reserves.

Mr. Speaker, obviously we have been treating the symptom and not the disease all these years, and we are now urged to continue the treatment by lifting all restraint and let the patient carry on with unlimited palliatives and opiates until a cure can be found. In my humble opinion it makes plain commonsense to me that the patient must be constrained and that the gold reserve requirement is a discipline that must be maintained. Present statutory authority permits the Federal Reserve Board to deal with any emergency situation developing from a loss of gold reserves. Secretary Dillon stated the "need" for this legislation "does not arise from any sudden emergency or crisis." He also stated:

> There is clearly proof of the necessity for making some change, but you cannot prove the necessity for going all the way, even though it may be a logical thing to do on a scientific banking principle.

I suggest that the change should be immediate action to improve our imbalance of payments. Any time now we should receive a message from the President outlining a program for such action. I submit that, since we are not in an emergency that we seriously consider withholding passage of this legislation until these proposals are before us. The proposals are as interlocking as a jigsaw puzzle and I submit that the pieces will not add up to the correct picture until we have them all at hand so that each may be assigned its proper place.

The Federal Reserve can, without this legislation, continue to meet current foreign demands upon our gold reserves, not just with the remaining balance of free gold, but by exercising its prerogatives to suspend the reserve requirements. A suspension would very probably provide sufficient gold cover, with present gold stocks, to meet demands for several years, unless we should have, as some fear may happen, a "run on the bank" by those countries that now hold American dollars which can be converted into gold.

Dr. G. C. Wiegand, professor of economics, Southern Illinois University, stated:

> A point has been reached, where the dollar continues to perform its role as the key currency of the free world only with the help of Western Europe. The world is thus confronted with the absurd situation that the dollar depends for its formal convertibility upon the cooperation of the European central banks, whose currencies, in turn, rest upon the convertibility of the dollar. No bank examiner would consider a commercial bank "liquid" purely on the assurance of the bank president that his largest depositors are a number of corporations run by personal friends of his, who have informally promised him that they would not withdraw their deposits until the bank is able to get its house in order. And the bank examiner would be even more unhappy if he found that while the bank issued reassuring statements and relied on a multitude of more or less tricky check-kiting transactions to hide its liquidity—in the field of international finance one uses the more dignified and less obvious term "currency swaps"—it yet continued to pursue the same policies which had brought the bank into the difficult position in the first place.

Now, may I make this further observation that continued requirement of gold reserves would place the Federal Reserve and the Government in a position similar to that which has been found desirable for the commercial banks—the position of being required to manage affairs so as to stay within the bounds of a reserve ratio. The Federal Reserve has several options in dealing with their responsibilities under a restrictive reserve position. They could reduce the reserve ratios required of the member banks as stated earlier, so that the banks will be able to extend more credit if it is needed for future noninflationary economic growth.

Simultaneously, the dollar amount of bank reserves on deposit at the Federal Reserve banks would be reduced correspondingly by sale of some Federal Government securities now held by the Reserve banks. Moderate increases in interest rates would occur, with several benefits: Deterring the capital outflow which has contributed to foreign claims on the U.S. gold stock, curbing incipient inflation and thus preventing loss of competitive strength in export markets, and indicating to domestic and foreign observers that the strength of the dollar will be maintained by methods that have been proved effective throughout the history of the international gold standard. Accompanied with this must be a further reduction of some of the principal causes of the deficit in the balance of payments—foreign military and economic aid expenditures. The gold supply will be protected, and domestic debt requiring financing would be reduced by such measures. On February 1, recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, made this observation:

> It is interesting to realize that the chief sponsors of legislation to completely repeal the gold-cover requirement and thus release the money supply from any tie with gold are, for the most part, the same individuals who have attempted to destroy confidence in the independent Federal Reserve System. They are the same individuals who desire that Board members be, in effect, completely subject to political pressure. What a transfer of power that would provide for the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, if this legislation is passed today, the first step will be taken toward the elimination of gold cover for not only Federal Reserve deposits but also our currency, with the potential possibility of continuing down the road of developing fiat money in a completely political environment. The strength of the dollar today rests on the fact that we are the international bankers of the world and that we do honor our commitments to exchange gold for dollars upon demand. When the goose that laid the golden eggs is killed, where do we go?

In response to a question about the possibility of demonetizing gold by international agreement, Secretary Dillon replied, "I would doubt that, because the basic studies that have been made so far have reached agreement: that the present system, based on gold, has to be or should be the foundation of any future system; that it has worked very well; that there obviously are certain problems that one can foresee lying ahead; and that what is needed are improvements in the present system rather than to demolish it and set up an entirely different system. If you do not have some tie to gold, you would have to be tied to something, and the only something that you would think of is some value that will be internationally created, and that, therefore, would be over and above the national sovereignty of any one country."

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I am convinced that the committee has not met its obligation to the Members of the House in its function to hold hearings at which the entire subject matter has been thoroughly explored. Opposition witnesses should be heard. Perhaps other Members of this great legislative body are so sophisticated in the complexities of domestic and international finance that they can accept the work of a committee that has heard only one side of the question. On the other hand there may be Members of this House who do not understand the ramifications, the involved, entangled, and confusing manipulations of the money market. Even the so-called experts differ, and during the past few years the policies of the experts have failed to correct the balance-of-payments problem. The solution, then, must be something less than simple. I quickly confess my personal bewilderment.

At this juncture I urge the Members of the House to provide the committee with an opportunity to finish its job. Until other witnesses are heard and exhaustive consideration of all aspects of the subject is completed, I must follow the counsel of the unknown statesman who said, "When in doubt, vote 'no.'" Right now I am disturbed at the dilemma and confusion that surrounds this matter. The committee in the other body has just this morning heard several witnesses in opposition to the legislation before us. Can we do less than they? Can we tell you and the Nation that we have finished our work, when only half the job has been completed? I think not. I want to hear and study the alternative proposals of the opposition. You may hear statements to the effect that no witnesses came forward to offer adverse testimony. This is true. How could they without opportunity? The committee was notified on January 28 of hearings to be held the following Monday, February 1, and Tuesday, February 2. It was not known until the hearings were well under way that no opposition witnesses had been invited to appear. On Monday morning it was announced that the hearing scheduled for Tuesday would be moved up to Monday afternoon at 2 in order to accommodate the witness. In all fairness, I ask you, considering the speed with which these hearings were scheduled, how could expert witnesses be obtained over just one week end, when no prior warning had been provided that such hearings would be held?

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I will offer a straight motion to recommit. I appeal to Members of the House to support this motion and give the committee the opportunity to do its job. We are not so busy that we must rush through legislative hearings without a penetrating and accurate examination of the facts. This, as a member of the committee, I want to do, and I believe we owe it to our constituents, and in this case, to the entire world of nations because of the far-reaching effect this action will have upon the monetary policies of every nation, corporation, business, profession, and individual.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MIZE. As a freshman member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I wished to be careful about the way I voted on this matter on the floor today. Because we did not have any hearings from the opposition to the bill, I went to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee this morning and listened to some statements being made in opposition to this proposal. I wish to quote remarks made by Senator DOMINICK, because they are appropriate, I believe, to what the gentleman has said:

> I am well aware of the serious dilemma in which the administration finds itself, but frankly, it has only itself to blame and this proposal constitutes a lonely bandaid, not a cure:

He went on to say:

> At best it is a temporary expedient solving nothing and opening the way to substantial currency inflation;
>
> Rather than increasing confidence in the stability of the dollar as its most optimistic supporters predict, its effect could be precisely the opposite;
>
> It is an obvious first step toward a completely managed monetary system wherein gold will ultimately be removed from all internal currency making the value of the dollar thereafter subject to the arbitrary decisions of the fiscal managers, regardless of political party.

I believe that is important. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I thank the gentleman. His point is well taken and should be considered. This should have been testimony during the course of our hearings—the opposing point of view.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I wish to compliment the gentleman for his perceptive and succinct remarks. I believe they are timely and well taken.

If I may, I should like to make one statement. I have before me a document from the American Bankers Association, entitled "Gold Reserve Requirement—Should It Be Eliminated?" In conclusion, they say the best course of action seems to be to relax but not to remove the requirement.

In view of the statements made on the floor today, I believe it well to have this written into the RECORD.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure the gentleman from California must have seen this document, because I assume it was sent to all Members. It is a statement signed by 46 members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy. I do not know the men who signed this document but I recognize some of their names. I wonder if it came to the attention of the gentleman from California?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. This has come to my attention since, however, our hearings were closed. These economists and professors represent areas all the way from the University of Southern California in Los Angeles to New York University.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to read the first paragraph from this statement and ask the gentleman to comment on it and then to comment, if he will, on the qualifications of some of the economists. I know, as he has said, that this statement is signed by college professors and deans of colleges all around the country, but I had not known about the committee until I read this, and had wondered why some of them were not called as witnesses by the committee or whether the points they make in the statement were considered by the committee.

The first sentence of the opening paragraph is as follows:

> We, the undersigned, members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, oppose the reduction in, or removal of, our gold reserve requirements because such a procedure would mean a further weakening in the quality of our dollar.

Then they make some suggestions as to how to increase the integrity of the dollar. The statement includes also the following:

> A reduction in our gold reserve requirements constitutes a move toward a weaker currency. A repeal of these requirements would throw this Nation into a fiat money system, the weakest and most dangerous type of money known to man.

I wonder if the gentleman from California is sufficiently familiar with this statement to comment on it and make some observations concerning the qualifications of the people who signed it.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. From my cursory examination of the statement and also from my reading of the qualifications of these men as described by their titles at least, but without knowing the background of any of them individually, it appears to me that the men who are involved in this statement of 46 in opposition to this particular measure before us are men with qualifications, expert in their field, and certainly in a position to make what I would consider an intelligent, educated opinion about the type of legislation we are considering here today. It is unfortunate, in my opinion, we did not have some of these men before us during the course of the hearings. I think, had we been notified in plenty of time, we could have had these opposition witnesses and perhaps considered this bill more logically. We could then have brought to the House a bill knowing that we had done the job in the Banking and Currency Committee that should have been done before coming in with this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Speaking of financial experts there are a couple in Washington who are unemployed and who are apparently wizards in the field of finance. I speak in this case of Bobby Baker and Walter Jenkins. I wonder if anyone has thought of getting their help in this dilemma?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. They have had far more experience than I have. I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield for just a moment.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, does it not strike the gentleman as rather strange that neither this committee nor any one of those 46 economists asked permission to appear before our committee or submit any statement to our committee?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I do not think it is strange when we members of the committee did not know the hearings were going to be held until the weekend of Churchill's funeral.

Mr. MULTER. Why is it that neither the committee nor any of its members ever contacted me or anybody on the committee since 1961, when we first introduced a bill to do just what we are doing here?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Does the gentleman believe that these men were notified that the hearings were going to be held and had any knowledge that hearings were actually scheduled?

Mr. MULTER. I am certain that every last one of these gentlemen knew that the Congress has been contemplating, for at least 4 years, doing what we are asking to do here.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Contemplation is one thing and putting it on the books is something else. I doubt that these men were aware that hearings were going to be held.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the gentleman I should like to read one other paragraph in this statement for his comment:

> The present relatively low ratio of our monetary gold stock to our nongold dollars and the fears of other nations regarding the future value of our dollar arise from the profligate and reckless expansions of our nongold dollars and the widespread contentions that gold is an unimportant or unnecessary element in a good monetary system. To weaken still further the quality of our dollar is to make even more dangerous the position in which this Nation now finds itself.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I thank the gentleman. And in reply to one of the questions that has already been put there are members of this committee of 46, at least 1, who appeared today at the hearings held in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. So I am sure that they would have responded had they known that our hearings were scheduled or had they been invited.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened most attentively to all of the debate on this bill. We have heard much about what some say is the terrible situation we have gotten our country into that requires enactment of this bill. Some have offered remedies, good or bad, to correct it.

We have even heard some say that this bill is unnecessary.

But we have yet to hear one word as to the need of the reserve requirement the bill would repeal.

Not one single word has been uttered to indicate that a gold reserve for member bank deposits in the Federal Reserve banks can serve any purpose whatsoever.

One gentleman suggested that while the gold reserve is there, the member banks can always be sure they can withdraw their deposits from the Federal Reserve bank. How the gold reserve assures that, he does not and cannot say.

Since 1934 no citizen, no company, no domestic bank can withdraw any gold for a Federal Reserve bank.

These banks deposit currency, coins, and credits. That is all they can withdraw. No one can pretend anything else.

Let us not overlook that this record shows that our imbalance of payments practically disappears if we would keep our books on an accrual basis.

Finally, let me remind our colleagues that no foreigner, no foreign enterprise, may exchange dollars for our gold. That is a privilege reserved solely to foreign governments and to foreign government central banks.

By enacting this bill into law we will make available almost $5 billion in gold for redemption by foreign governments and foreign central banks of U.S. dollars. That does not mean the demands will be made for it. The knowledge that the gold is available will undoubtedly cause them not to make the demand.

We thus strengthen the dollar and world confidence in it as an international currency.

I urge the passage of H.R. 3818.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am voting against this measure since I feel it cannot help but undermine world confidence in our dollar. I also believe that rather than ease the pressure on our gold stock, it may produce additional pressure instead.

In addition I am especially disturbed that a bill of this complex nature and magnitude had to be rushed through the House with only brief hearings and without sufficient time for the general public to be aware of its possible impact. Evidently this typifies the steamroller technique which will be used throughout this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the handling of this bill and the undue haste with which it has been processed is, to my mind, poor and indefensible legislative procedure.

May I also point out that the U.S. dollar is the key to international monetary operations. Any loss of international confidence in the dollar would bring about an adverse economic atmosphere throughout the world. It is necessary that we hold a large gold stock and work zealously to maintain the preeminent position which the dollar has automatically achieved. This bill does not do what it pretends to do. Therefore, I join the fearful but hopelessly outnumbered minority in opposing this most questionable measure.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no additional request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3818

A bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 413), is further amended by striking out "reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 per centum against its deposits and".

SEC. 2. The eighteenth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 467), is further amended by substituting a period for the comma after the word "notes" and striking out the remainder of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3818) to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities, pursuant to House Resolution 193, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, approval of this bill would mark a dark day in the history of this Nation. It would be the first step in opening the door to complete dissipation of our gold supply which through the years has been a powerful factor in maintaining the integrity of the dollar in both domestic and international commerce and finance.

Approval of this bill means that no longer will bank deposits be backed by gold. It means that those who administer this Government will have $5 billion in gold to meet their spendthrift needs. When that is gone, I predict they will seek to liberate the $10 billion now dedicated to the support of Federal Reserve notes.

Instead of paring the Federal Government's spending budget to the bone; instead of wiping out the annual multibillion dollar deficits in the international balance of payments; instead of putting our financial house in order it is here proposed to adopt still another expedient and in the process further erode the integrity of the dollar.

Instead of discipline that requires an end to deficits and the installation of sound money management this legislation, if enacted, will take us further down the road to financial collapse through a flood of fiat money.

Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this bill.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. DEL CLAWSON, of California, moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3818 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 93, nays 289, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—93

Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Baldwin
Bates
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Callaway
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Frelinghuysen
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
MacGregor
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Nelsen
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Passman
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Utt
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalley
White, Idaho
Whitten
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—289

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Horton
Howard
Hull
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Purcell
Quie
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—51

Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Ayres
Baring
Battin
Bell
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Clancy
Corbett
Corman
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dowdy
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goodell
Griffin
Hagan, Ga.
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hungate
Ichord
King, Calif.
Laird
Landrum
Martin, Mass.
Mills
O'Brien
Pelly
Pucinski
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Schneebeli
Shipley
Scott
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Williams
Wilson, Bob

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Findley for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Pelly against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee, against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Gilbert against.

Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Walker of Mississippi for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Clancy for, with Mr. Mills against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Battin for, with Mr. King of California against.

Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Schneebeli.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Thomas of Wisconsin.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Corman.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Shipley.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Hardy.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 300, nays 82, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—300

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Purcell
Quie
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—82

Ashbrook
Baldwin
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Callaway
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Hutchinson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McCulloch
Macdonald
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Nelsen
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Passman
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Saylor
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Utt
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalley
White, Idaho
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—51

Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Ayres
Baring
Battin
Bell
Broomfield
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Clancy
Corbett
Corman
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goodell
Griffin
Hagan, Ga.
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hungate
Ichord
King, Calif.
Laird
Landrum
Martin, Mass.
Mills
O'Brien
Pelly
Pucinski
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Schneebeli
Scott
Shipley
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Williams
Wilson, Bob

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Pelly for, with Mr. Findley against.

Mr. Gibbons for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Clancy against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Curtis against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Hungate for, with Mr. Burton of Utah against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Battin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Schneebeli.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Mills.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Abernethy.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Evans of Colorado.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time so that I may ask the majority leader if he can inform us of the schedule for the remainder of the day and tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, it appears that we may have up tomorrow, and probably will have up tomorrow, the conference report or some other action with respect to the supplemental appropriation bill for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which undoubtedly will require the presence of Members and rollcall votes.

There is a possibility that if we can work it out and get an agreement, we might have some temporary resolution of this matter this evening.

I should like to advise Members that there are a number of bills, which I shall not take the time to read now but will ask to have printed in the Record, which have been unanimously reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which may be called up under unanimous-consent agreement tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is my understanding correct that the bills, which are from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, are identical with bills which were passed in the last session, and were unanimously reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service this year?

Mr. ALBERT. That is my understanding. Certainly, they were unanimously reported.

In addition, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, may call up under unanimous consent tomorrow, a bill which was unanimously reported by his committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the list of bills to which I have referred may be printed in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Bills To Be Brought Up by Unanimous Consent on Wednesday, February 10, 1965

(These bills were all reported out of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by unanimous consent.)

H.R. 158. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the Government of amounts due the Government in the settlement of claims under such act.

H.R. 1535. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases.

H.R. 1647. The Back Pay Act of 1965.

H.R. 1746. A bill to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

H.R. 1782. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contributions for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

H.R. 2594. A bill to clarify the application of certain annuity increase legislation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to take up tomorrow a special resolution providing additional money for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the majority leader asking for authority to bring up the conference report?

Mr. ALBERT. That is what we are talking about today. If we do not get this done this evening—and we may not be able to get to it this evening—we may be able to bring up tomorrow what is in the nature of a continuing resolution.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman is only asking permission to bring up what is the possibility of a continuing resolution for the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. That would be for tomorrow, and the gentleman is waiting to see whether we can take action on it tonight or at another time?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Would the Speaker put the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GROSS. Further reserving the right to object, did the gentleman say it would be in order at any time tomorrow, or does the gentleman mean from noon on?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes. While the House is in session tomorrow. And may I make the further unanimous-consent request that it may be in order to bring up the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, House Joint Resolution 234, in case it is filed?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do you mean to bring it up this evening?

Mr. ALBERT. No. Tomorrow. In case we cannot otherwise dispose of this matter and we do have the conference report back tomorrow. The conferees are going to meet tomorrow morning. I am only trying to make it in order for the conferees to call up the conference report on House Joint Resolution 234.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. There are about 40 Members going to the White House tonight. Did you intend to bring them up by bus?

Mr. ALBERT. I am going to the White House, too. I think this will be disposed of before that.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. What if there is a rollcall? How will they get here?

Mr. ALBERT. I do not think there will be a rollcall if you get unanimous-consent agreement. You have to get unanimous-consent agreement first.

Mr. GROSS. The unanimous consent you are now asking for goes to tomorrow and not today?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Then, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma repeat his request again?

Mr. ALBERT. I have made one request which I believe, has been agreed to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I do not believe the first unanimous-consent request was adopted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that, from the information received by the Chair, the first unanimous-consent request has not been agreed to. Will the gentleman repeat his first request?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to bring up a special resolution providing funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished majority leader, would this include funds under Public Law 480?

Mr. ALBERT. No, it would not.

Mr. RYAN. In other words, it would not relate to the question which was before the House yesterday.

Mr. ALBERT. It would not relate to that question at all.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma what is this bill? I thought it dealt with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. ALBERT. It does.

Mr. GROSS. What is the purpose of this?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has the floor.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the distinguished majority leader permit me to state what I understand would be included in the resolution?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, the resolution that would be brought up tomorrow as a continuing resolution would include a sum certain for temporary financing of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It would be a substantially lesser amount than was included in the bill that we passed on January 26.

Mr. ALBERT. The purpose of it would be for temporary operations only, in other words, only for a few days, not to exceed 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It would be just to get over the hump.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Until we return next week and the conference could resume its sitting and seek a resolution of the difficulties they are currently in. That would be the sole purpose of the limited authority.

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none. Will the gentleman state his second request?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, my second request is that it may be in order, if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations so desires, to call up a conference report, if it is filed, on House Joint Resolution 234.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman from Oklahoma yield further? The action we have taken here today does not preclude the possibility of us having brought up tonight the continuing resolution that would give temporary financing to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Is that right?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, we are only trying to take care of the different contingencies which face us. That is all.

NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, today, in introducing a bill to establish a National Humanities Foundation, I am joining over 80 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in the concept that the humanities and the arts require as much concern and emphasis as the sciences.

The purpose of this bill is to create a foundation that will foster increased studies in the fields of the humanities and the arts and that will support the achievement of excellence as the primary goal of those studies. The National Humanities Foundation will be concerned with language and literature, history and philosophy. It will cut across academic disciplines and bring together the knowledge of supposedly dissimilar fields. For example, there will be studies of the history of criticism, law, religion, and science. Study will be devoted to the theory of the arts, the creative and performing arts, and those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods.

This Nation has a preoccupation with the material and this preoccupation has led to significant advances in science. That new knowledge has led to equally important strides in technology and industry.

But, in the area of the humanities, we have not kept pace with these great scientific advances. Yet, man must learn to master his technology, or he will be mastered by it.

Too long we have ignored the enormous enrichment to human life of things that cannot be measured in feet or pounds. We have given only passing thought to beauty, knowledge for knowledge's sake, imagination and inspiration.

Here at the dawn of an age of mechanization and scientific advancement unequaled in history, it is beginning to dawn on us that the simple fact of having wealth and technical know-how demands that we have a wealth of learning and social know-how in order to use our material wherewithal to its maximum.

The creation of a National Humanities Foundation will take a monumental step toward achieving the goal of establishing the "mind" on an equal footing with "matter."

This bill would specifically establish a National Humanities Foundation very similar in concept and purpose to the National Science Foundation. It will provide loans and grants for educating and developing scholars, teachers, and artists. It will establish scholarships, graduate fellowships, and grants for research in the creative fields of the humanities. It will foster and improve library resources available to students and entire communities.

The Board of the National Humanities Foundation would consist of 20 members appointed for 6-year terms by the President from among the most distinguished scholars in America. In addition, the Board would have as ex officio members the Foundation Director, the Commissioner of Education, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chairman of the National Council of Arts. This Board will have the authority to carry out the purpose of the act.

This bill calls for an initial appropriation of $5 million for the fiscal year 1966 with the Congress determining the appropriation in succeeding years in light of the need. This is a very small request indeed when compared to the one-half billion dollar authorization for the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I have often been struck by the absolute faith we seem to have in science, particularly when compared with what little faith we seem to place in the vitality and imagination of the human mind and spirit. We are surprised to learn occasionally that science does not know something we had assumed was thoroughly studied years ago. But, at the same time, we are very rarely surprised at our ignorance about living peacefully together and utilizing to the fullest extent our talents and the opportunities to enrich our lives.

I do not criticize the scientist. In fact, I have found that among scientists today there is growing concern that people expect them to know all the answers when scientists are more acutely aware than others that all the answers do not lie in their domain.

The scientist is paving the way for more abundant leisure time, for example. But the scientist cannot tell us how to use that time to best enrich ourselves, our families, the communities in which we live, or our Nation. That is a problem we face and we must look to the social sciences, the humanities, and the arts for the solution.

I am most pleased to join with so many of my colleagues and with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, who introduced similar legislation in the 88th Congress as well as in this one. I believe they would all agree with an educator from my district, Dean Ralph Thompson, of Western Washington State College, that an educated man is not so much a man who "knows." Rather, "he is a man who learns."

There is much to learn and the National Humanities Foundation will help us begin the work.

LAND ACQUISITION POLICY

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Select Committee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Committee on Public Works published a report entitled "Study of Compensation and Assistance for Persons Affected by Real Property Acquisition in Federal and Federally Assisted Programs." This report, or study, is justifiably critical of the land acquisition policies of the Department of the Army. I am in agreement with this criticism and believe the report did not emphasize enough the harm that is being done by reason of the present land acquisition policies of the Corps of Army Engineers. In particular, I would like to point out that the present policy of negotiating for a price below corps approved appraisal prices is creating a general distrust for the Federal Government and is casting a cloud over the integrity of the Government in those areas where the Government is involved in the acquisition of land. To compound the offense, the Government absolutely refuses to tell the "forced" seller the appraisal they have arrived at. This is what happens under this ill-advised policy: After the completion of the transaction the seller is suspicious for he will always be left with the thought that perhaps he could have gotten more or that probably the appraisal was higher than that which he received. He has been forced to deal at arms length with a buyer who he considers all powerful and too big to buck.

The report to which I referred points out that the U.S. Army in 72 percent of the instances involved over a period of 3 years made initial offers which were less than the agency's approved appraisals and actually bought the land for less than the approved appraisal in 23 percent of the instances. Then, too, we must consider that under this negotiation policy the person who deserves most to be protected is the person who is the first victim of the system. The uneducated, those inexperienced in business, the old and the weary, the timid and the reticent—all of whom deserve the protection of the law and the workings of the law—these are the real victims for they are the first to say, "Yes, I will take your offer" and with them there is very little, if any, negotiation. But if we could forget this group—and we cannot—the policy is still one which is unsatisfactory to the citizen and the Government alike. The citizen has a basic desire to trust his Government and its processes. He wants to do this. But what we have been doing wears thin in a hurry and that cloud of doubt and suspicion forms quickly. The transaction is necessary if we are to continue our progressive ways, but this does not mean we should not exhaust every possible means to protect his rights and to gain his confidence. Every citizen deserves to be treated with dignity and deserves to deal with the Government in an atmosphere which is conducive to the promotion of mutual trust. It seems to me that every property owner should be entitled to know and should be entitled to reasonable information concerning a governmental agency's opinion of the value of his property. He should be entitled to receive an offer for his property at the full amount of the agency's approved appraisal. Any other policy penalizes the uninformed owner, and it makes the amount of compensation he receives dependent upon the aggressiveness of the owner rather than on the values of the property.

My files are replete with complaints from citizens who feel they have been cheated by the Government. It is true they can always resort to the courts but most of these people do not have the means nor do they have the desire to become embroiled in a legal battle with their Government. Nor should they have to do this. I am asking the Secretary of Defense to review this policy, and I am suggesting that a fairer and more equitable policy be adopted. Should this fail, I am prepared to offer and push for the passage of legislation which will clearly define the intent of Congress in this regard. Such legislation would prohibit current practices and call for a return to a reasonable and respected policy.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss plans for the erection of a memorial to the late Gen. John J. Pershing, concerning which I have introduced a bill, H.R. 17.

General Pershing, who was born and reared in the community of Laclede, Mo., in my congressional district, is in the very first rank of great military leaders who have served the United States in hours of peril. It seems to me there should be little argument as to the appropriateness of a memorial honoring General Pershing and testifying as to the achievements and the sacrifices of the men who served under him. I do not think there should be any dispute about

General Pershing's right to be memorialized in our Nation's Capital, which already is the site of memorials to many lesser figures.

Mr. Speaker, the subject of the Pershing Memorial has been before the Congress for 15 years. The Honorable Charles Potter, then a Senator from Michigan, introduced in the 84th Congress Senate Joint Resolution 95 directing the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans for a memorial and submit them to Congress. The plans were duly submitted and approved by the Fine Arts Commission, National Parks Commission, the District Government, and the Bureau of the Budget.

S. 3901, in the 86th Congress, was passed by the Senate on August 31, 1960, and referred to the House on the same date, but an early adjournment of Congress prevented a completed action.

I introduced bills in the succeeding Congresses providing authority to go forward with the erection of the memorial as planned. No action on any of these bills was taken.

Other Members of the House have expressed an interest. Among them has been Navy Capt. James E. Van Zandt, formerly a distinguished Member of the House from Pennsylvania—House Joint Resolution 527, 84th Congress.

Presently, Captain Van Zandt is chairman of the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Copies of two resolutions, passed by the last two national conventions of that great organization follow:

RESOLUTION NO. 225

(Resolution adopted at the 64th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held at Seattle, Wash., in August 1963)

Whereas the national organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in conjunction with the department of the District of Columbia, Veterans of Foreign Wars, is on record as endorsing a memorial to the late Commander in Chief of the American Expeditionary Forces of World War I; namely, Gen. John J. Pershing, and to those brave men who served under him; and

Whereas a site in the District of Columbia has been selected and dedicated for said memorial; and

Whereas plans have been approved by the Fine Arts Commission as to the style and nature of said memorial and all that remains for the completion of this fitting project is the passage of an enactment clause and appropriation by the Congress; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 64th national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we mandate and urge our National Officers to exert efforts to the end that Congress shall bring to completion the memorial to the Commander in Chief of the A.E.F.

RESOLUTION NO. 209

(Resolution adopted at the 65th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held at Cleveland, Ohio, in August 1964)

Whereas there has been dedicated and set apart the area of the plot of land situated across Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., from the Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C., for the Pershing Memorial: now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 65th national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we urge the District of Columbia Commissioners to urge Congress to appropriate sufficient funds for the erection of the Pershing Memorial on the plot opposite the Willard Hotel on 15th Street NW., and that prompt action be taken so that the Pershing Memorial will be erected and in place as early as possible.

It is respectfully urged that the Committee on House Administration take action in this session on this important legislation.

OFFICE OF CONSUMERS

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish an Office of Consumers. This bill is simultaneously being introduced in the other body by Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan. He is joined by 17 other Senators.

The primary purpose of this legislation is to provide, in the structure of the Federal Government, long-needed representation of the American people in their role as consumers. Existing Government departments, with few exceptions, represent the people in their capacity as producers. The citizen is represented within the Federal complex as a worker, or as a farmer, or as a businessman, as a taxpayer and as a recipient of various welfare programs. Yet for far too long, the American consumer has been the forgotten man in the organization of Government departments and agencies.

We must, of course, acknowledge the fine work of Mrs. Esther Peterson, special assistant to the President on consumer affairs. She has become the major Government spokesman for the consumer, and her efforts have been remarkable.

There are also, at present, many Federal programs designed to protect and promote the interest of the American consumer. Indeed, this goal was one of the basic reasons why Congress established the regulatory agencies. However, the representation of consumers has now become so fragmented among the many departments and agencies that authority is difficult to locate, and power almost impossible to exercise. Programs dealing with consumer protection have to be brought under one roof if they are to be effective.

We are all aware that major economic decisions are made through the interplay of highly organized, well financed private interest groups. Representatives of business, labor, agriculture, and other groups are organized into powerful lobbies with influence that cannot be ignored by the Federal Government in its formulation of economic policy. But what of the vast consumer public? Where is its influence? Everybody talks about the consumer, but who really represents him?

There are, of course, many fine private organizations that seek to promote the interests of consumers. But these organizations are handicapped by the lack of any single Government agency to process their needs and demands. Beyond this, however, private organizations have a difficult time mobilizing their constituencies. We are all consumers, but we tend to identify ourselves more directly with our vocation. As consumers, we operate independently; for taste and choice, we tell ourselves, is what distinguishes one from another. In our roles as farmers, manufacturers, distributors, and employees, however, experience has taught us that group action is essential to achieve desired economic and political goals. It is much harder for consumers to arrive at a common interest beyond trying to get greatest satisfaction for expenditure.

It is clear, however, that there are issues which should unite us as consumers. We should be united by inadequate information about goods and services. We should be united by misleading advertisements, by evidence of short weighting in food packaging. We should be united by price increases which have not taken into account the needs and resources of the consumer public. We should be united when regulatory agencies originally established to protect the consumer spend too much of their time adjudicating conflicting claims by rival producers. This situation is not entirely the fault of the regulatory agencies. Their agenda is often overburdened. And without any forceful presentation of the consumer position, the public interest quickly becomes a subject for rhetoric rather than representation.

We all too easily assume that our consumer interests will somehow be protected by the invisible hand of competition or the tug of war between organized producer and distributor groups. But it is increasingly clear that this is not the case.

Legislation must be provided, therefore, to help consumers help themselves. The goal is not to create an agency to tell the people what they want. It is to give the people an opportunity to tell us what they want.

An Office of Consumers would serve as a central clearinghouse for complaints from consumers who presently are baffled by not knowing where to turn. Centralization of existing programs will help relieve such confusion. For example, one of the central problems of consumer protection is insuring effective enforcement of existing law. Consumers often are unaware of what protection is already available under present legislation, hence litigation that is justified is often never initiated. An Office of Consumers would seek to inform the people of their rights and give them direction and advice for the prosecution of their needs and grievances.

The Office would also be empowered to provide a consumer information service similar to those in the Department of Agriculture and Commerce intended to aid farmers and businessmen in investment and purchasing decisions.

Yet another function of the Office would be consultation in the formulation of legislation. In this sense, Congress itself would be among the chief beneficiaries of the new Office. Time and again, in considering legislation, Congress needs an evaluation of that legislation's effect upon consumers. And after the legislation has been passed, Congress needs to know whether the ends sought for have been achieved, or whether further action is necessary. The Office would also be empowered to communicate consumer interests to the President prior to the formulation of the budget.

Increasingly, the citizen's role as a consumer is matching the importance of his role as producer. Last year, consumer purchases amounted to nearly two-thirds of our gross national product. It is time we acknowledged the changes that have taken place within our economy since we took it for granted that consumer needs an rights were automatically protected by market competition. We are in the midst of an organizational revolution wherein men express themselves through interest groups with power, influence, and access to centers of decisionmaking. No such representation is available to the American consumer. Too long he has been a victim of economic factors beyond his control. It is time that such victimization cease and that Congress make provisions for effective consumer representation in the structure of the Federal Government. In my judgment establishment of an Office of Consumers is long overdue and should occupy the highest priority on our legislative agenda.

HORTON BILL TO END POST OFFICE WORK MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to prohibit the use of measuring devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the postal service. This legislative proposal parallels a measure I sponsored in the 88th Congress.

Call it what you will—work measurement system, guidelines, and so forth—the measuring program of the Post Office Department works against postal employee morale and threatens initiative in the ranks of tens of thousands of dedicated postal clerks.

For a long time, I have hoped that the Post Office would eliminate this demoralizing system as the result of administrative action. To that end, I have urged the Postmaster General on numerous occasions, but to no avail.

Therefore, I feel it is again necessary for me to join many of my colleagues in pressing for legislative action that will forbid further use of individual work measurements in the postal service where their effect impairs efficient and economical operation.

On various inspection visits of the post offices which serve my home community of Rochester, N.Y., I have seen firsthand the undesirable effects of the work measurement program. Time and again, career postal workers have documented for me the problems brought about by a system that sacrifices accuracy for speed.

Postal clerks are subjected to constant tension throughout their work day. Using arbitrary standards that fail to accommodate variation resulting from mail thickness and packing practices, the work measurement system often imposes an impossible goal for postal workers.

Mr. Speaker, the employees of this Nation's postal service rank with our military in their desire to assure the sound future of America. I think it flies in the face of that dedication to subject them to harsh restrictions in their day-to-day performance.

Certainly, efficiency is necessary in the operation of the Post Office Department. No group more than the postal clerks of America realize this and seek to upgrade it at every step. So, let us look for standards and systems that place more credit on the ability and loyalty of the postal workers for it is there we will find the most efficient future for mail movement in this country.

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 27 of this year I announced that hearings on immigration legislation would start on February 16, 1965. That announcement was made after I had discussed the date with the gentleman from New York, Chairman CELLER, and he expressed no objection to that date.

Since that announcement, Chairman CELLER has scheduled hearings before the full Judiciary Committee on presidential inability, which causes a conflict with the date I had previously announced for the start of immigration hearings. It now appears those hearings by the full Judiciary Committee will continue through the week of February 15. In view of this development, hearings on immigration legislation will be delayed until hearings are completed on presidential inability. A definite date will be announced as soon as circumstances permit.

ARE 200,000 DOCTORS WRONG?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I returned this week from a meeting of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association at which AMA president, Dr. Donovan F. Ward, made a stirring enunciation of principles which every American should read.

Dr. Ward asks the question: "Are 200,000 doctors wrong?" And he answers: They certainly are—in assuming that the truth spoken to the people would overcome falsehoods.

Dr. Ward points out that only in the world of pressure politics and propaganda, where election votes are the coin of the realm, is the truth what you can make people believe and hope it is—a fact highlighted by the recent Gallup poll finding that 77 percent of the American people have an erroneous conception of the administration's so-called medicare bill. I commend Dr. Ward's remarks to the attention of the Members of this House:

ARE 200,000 DOCTORS WRONG?

(By Donovan F. Ward, M.D., president of the American Medical Association, delivered at the special convention of the American Medical Association House of Delegates, Pick-Congress Hotel, Chicago, February 6, 1965)

Are 200,000 doctors wrong?

I put the question, first, to the members of this house: Is it possible for an entire profession of dedicated men and women—engaged in all the arts, the sciences and the practices of merciful healing—to be so nearly of one mind about a matter affecting human health—and, at the same time, be wrong?

Is it possible, my colleagues in medicine, for us to go forth every day among 190 million Americans; to be with them in our offices, in their homes, in hospitals and clinics; to be with them at birth and death and the most critical moments of their lives—is it possible for all of us to be so close to all of them, all the time, in all these places—and still be wrong?

My answer—and do not be shocked—is "Yes," we have been wrong.

Oh, no—not wrong in our assessment of the King-Anderson bill which has so shamefully been misnamed "medicare"—not at all wrong in our steadfast opposition to this measure, nor in our exposing of it, page by page, for the cruel hoax that it is. No, in our opposition to this political creation called medicare—which has no medical care in it—we doctors have been professionally justified and morally right. Therefore, we will continue—and, in the time that remains for truth to take hold—we will intensify our efforts to advise the American people, yet again, that medicare is a lure—not a cure—for the problems of the aged, and that a genuine medical program is available.

But I did say we doctors have been wrong about something. In one important aspect of this crucial struggle which now approaches a climax in Congress, we made an erroneous assumption. We assumed, wrongly it appears, that the truth—spoken to the people—would overcome the lie in short order.

We made this assumption because that is what happens in the world of science and medicine. When the truth about a disease appears in the laboratory and is proved in clinical tests, that is the end of error. Among doctors and scientists, the known truth stands on its own; it needs no special pleading because the opposition simply drops away. In the world of medicine, the only ones who seek to gain from lies are quacks—and the American Medical Association has its ways of dealing with them, and of warning the public away. But, in that other world of pressure politics and propaganda—where election votes are the coin of the realm, and where the truth is what you can make people believe and hope it is—in that world, we doctors had something to learn, and we have learned it.

We have learned it the hard way—and late, but, hopefully, not too late.

We have learned that a false promise, if it is given a fancy name, can be kept alive year after year—in spite of the truth—if drummed and promoted constantly among the people.

Year after year, we have seen a piece of political quackery called medicare die in Congress, its promoters defeated by the sound judgment of the majority of the House Ways and Means Committee and by lack of support in our National Legislature. After each of those beatings, we thought medicare would not dare show its false face again. We were wrong—it came back during the next election.

In 1960, solidly supported by the doctors of this country, Congress passed the Kerr-Mills law, granting Federal funds to the States to expand their medical assistance to the aged programs and to develop new ones. This law made it quite possible for every State to offer to its needy elderly citizens substantial medical and hospital benefits—far in excess of the shallow benefits of medicare. Now, certainly, we doctors thought—the drums for government medicine will no longer boom the name of medicare into the ears of the elderly. Again, we were wrong. The drumbeating for medicare grew even louder, drowning out the word about Kerr-Mills, diverting the attention of those who need its benefits from the fact they are available increasingly throughout the country.

In the meantime, we doctors—on those occasions and through those channels which have grudgingly been made available to us—have gone before our patients, the American people, and tried to tell them the truth about medicare.

We have called it a deception, and publicly proved it, itemizing these as the reasons:

Medicare would cover only a miserly fraction of the total medical costs of someone who is really sick. It would provide only limited hospital benefits and some nursing home care in some nursing homes. For hospital outpatients, it would cover certain diagnostic tests, after the patient himself had paid the first $20. That is all. We have repeated—that is all there is to medicare. That is all.

The patient pays the entire cost of everything else.

Doctors and surgical care would not be provided by medicare. Necessary private nurses would not be provided. Drugs outside the hospital are not provided, and are even limited within the hospital. The patient pays for these things. That is medicare—a bed, and the sound of drums. When the bed time runs out, the Government runs out.

We doctors have charged—not only that medicare is a deception, but it is also a danger—and we have itemized our reasons:

It would impose Federal controls upon our hospitals, adding to their costs and burdens of administration, determining admissions and discharges of patients; and setting budgetary standards that have nothing to do with sickness. We know who suffers when a budget replaces medical judgment—our patients.

Medicare would endanger the relationship between the patient and his doctor by denying the doctor his full range of choices in treatment and also by institutionalizing that which is private.

And another danger—to the social security system itself—the economic protection for millions of Americans over 65. Raising social security taxes to cover the enormous and unpredictable costs of hospitalization for millions must certainly endanger the entire system.

And medicare also poses a serious danger to our healthy and rapidly growing system of private voluntary insurance plans which already cover more than 60 percent of all Americans over 65—providing doctor and medical benefits if they choose, as well as hospitalization.

All of these things we have cited to the American people to support our contention that the King-Anderson medicare scheme is a deception and a danger. We know that those who heard our arguments gave us heed. In October of last year, we noted that the Gallup public opinion polls had shown a steady decline in public support for medicare, dropping from a majority of 67 percent in favor of social security medicare in 1961 down to minority 44 percent during the election campaign that sent the present Congress to Washington.

In analyzing the results of the election and discussing the so-called mandate now claimed by the administration, another outstanding opinion-poll publisher, Samuel Lubell, made an exception of medicare from any such mandate. He said—and I quote: "My interviews * * * showed that details of the administration's proposal are not understood and that the opposition of voters rises when they learn how limited is the assistance that would be provided and what it would cost in tax increases."

So, we were right when we stated that the more people know the facts about medicare, the less they want it.

But we were wrong in our belief that the truth about medicare would spread rapidly enough to overcome the lie. We learned about the error in our assumption on the very day the new Congress met in Washington to receive as a first order of business the special White House message calling for the enactment of medicare. For on that very day, January 4, 1965, the latest Gallup public opinion poll on medicare was published. We read it with shock and amazement.

On the very day the administration rushed to the new Congress with its mandate and—in the name of the people—demanded the enactment of medicare as the first order of business—on that very day the Gallup poll revealed that 77 percent of the American public were mistaken in their understanding of what medicare is, or they just did not know.

I will quote from this amazing finding of the Gallup poll: "4 persons in 10 (40 percent) are mistaken in thinking that this program would cover the fees of doctors, surgeons, and dentists. Another 37 percent say they don't know, leaving only 23 percent who are correct in saying the program would not pay for these services—many people were unable to express an opinion on this question of whether the program would pay for all hospital or nursing bills."

I now ask this house of delegates another question—and I pray this same question will be put just as clearly to the House of Representatives in Washington. Can anyone honestly claim there is a mandate for medicare from the American people, when 77 percent of the people—three out of four—have a tragically mistaken understanding of its provisions, or honestly admit they do not know?

Are 200,000 doctors wrong in urging Congress to pause in the headlong rush to exercise a mandate that does not exist?

Can we be wrong in urging the many new Members of Congress, whose votes are already being counted on to swing the balance in favor of medicare—in urging them to first study the reasons why medicare has been defeated time and time again in previous Congresses? To do this before they begin their congressional careers with a vote they will live to regret, and will regret all the more because it would establish a permanent system they can never repeal, supported by a crushing tax that can only go up, and up.

Are 200,000 doctors wrong in urging the Congress to give serious consideration to the one measure now before it that offers genuine medical and hospital benefits to the needy aged? This is a bill authored neither by the Republican Party nor the Democratic Party. It is a bill with bipartisan parentage—the Herlong-Curtis eldercare bill, H.R. 3727. We urge Congress to compare, and the people to compare this bill with its genuine benefits and realistic financing—and with its provision allowing for administering a health program through health agencies of the States—to compare it feature by feature with medicare.

If the drums can be stilled long enough to make this comparison, it will be found that the Herlong-Curtis eldercare bill can cover not only the cost of hospital care and nursing homes for the aged, but also payment of physicians and surgical and drug costs which medicare would not do.

It will be found that the Herlong-Curtis eldercare program will be financed by Federal-State matching funds, expanding and strengthening the established Kerr-Mills law.

It takes into account the fact that nearly two-thirds of our elderly have already protected themselves against illness by private insurance policies—that old people do not want to become an added tax burden on their own children. But, medicare would bring into existence an enormous permanent mechanism imposing heavy additional taxes on all working people for all the years of their working lives so that everybody—the well-off as well as the poor, the proud as well as the humble, the cheaters as well as the deserving—would be taken into a compulsory Government system.

Are 200,000 doctors wrong in asking that careful study be given to the Herlong-Curtis eldercare bill, the only medical aid for the aged measure now before Congress that was drawn up in consultation with the medical profession?

We have heard wide praise for the eldercare bill. But, we have also heard some say it has come too late. Too late for what? Too late for a legislative priority list? Certainly, it is never too late to pass good legislation and defeat bad legislation. The one thing in this historic decision—the only thing—that may truly come too late, is regret.

Are the senior citizens of America dying by the millions, neglected and unattended, because a thing called medicare is not on the books at this moment?

Is an epidemic of disease threatening to wipe out this entire population? Are we in a national emergency of any kind?

If this were the case, would not the doctors of America be the first to urge action—regardless of cost—at once?

But this is not the time of any such emergency. This is a time for deep and careful deliberation.

The future health of the entire American people—including the elderly—is at stake.

Are 200,000 doctors wrong in pointing out that our senior citizens should have a health program that does not turn its back upon the views of private medicine? Can the objections of the doctors be considered an asset in drawing up a national health care program?

Are 200,000 doctors wrong when they insist that the American people do not have clamped down upon them, and upon their children, an irrevocable Government health care program that is not understood or it misunderstood by three-quarters of the people themselves?

I will ask you who sit in this highest house of medicine. I will ask those who sit in our Houses of Congress. I will ask our patients, the American people—are 200,000 doctors wrong?

VOTING RIGHTS FOR SELMA, ALA.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the chief targets of the past Federal civil rights bills has been the discriminatory system which has denied southern Negroes the right to register and vote. The first big test of the voting order began a little less than a month ago when Rev. Martin Luther King launched a massive Negro voter registration drive in Selma, Ala.

As everyone knows, the attempts have been blocked and finally over 2,000 Negroes, including Dr. King, have been jailed, and the efforts of others have been thwarted in many devious ways.

This matter which is taking place in Selma is of no great surprise to those of us who are acquainted with that area. It is a disappointment and a disturbing challenge to those who hoped that the voting sections of the 1964 civil rights bill and its predecessors would be respected in such areas. The NAACP and other civil rights organizations have begun legal suits against the continued denial of voting privileges but, as we all know, litigation of this type, unfortunately, is slow, and it is costly in many ways.

We believe that in order to avoid a repetition of the situation in Selma and in other similar places of the United States in addition to a better enforcement of statutes already on the books, further Federal measures are required. I think this was in the minds of those of us who went to Selma last Friday on a factfinding trip to look into this matter.

This was a bipartisan group. It included Congressmen BINGHAM, RESNICK, RYAN, SCHEUER, and DOW, all New York Democrats, and Congressman OGDEN REID, New York, Republican.

From California we had DON EDWARDS and JEFFERY COHELAN and KEN DYAL, and AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, all Democrats.

From Massachusetts, on the other side of the aisle, we had BRADFORD MORSE. We had also from the other side of the aisle Mr. MATHIAS, Republican, of Maryland.

From Michigan, in addition to myself, there was Congressmen VIVIAN and CONYERS. Congressman POWELL, of New York, was represented by his son and a member of his staff. He was unable to be present in person because of pressing business in Washington. We also had Dr. Nathaniel T. Tillman, from Congressman NIX' staff, who holds a degree of Ph. D. in political science.

This therefore was a bipartisan effort of Members from various parts of the country, many of whom do not have large percentages of Negroes in their district. Therefore I can truthfully say that we were motivated by principle.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it gives you a better understanding of the community when you know something about its complexion and history.

Selma, Ala., is located in Dallas County, which has one of the larger populations in that State. The population of that county is 57 percent Negro. However, out of the some 15,000 Negroes who are living in that county who are eligible by reason of age and residence only 325 are registered to vote, whereas out of the some 14,000 white people in that county 9,300 are registered to vote.

It is also interesting to note that this is where one of the last battles of the Civil War took place. It is also the birthplace of the White Citizens Council of the State of Alabama. It is an area where during the Reconstruction period two Negroes were elected to Congress. It is a typical sort of ante bellum community where Negroes are not even addressed as Miss or Mrs. or Mr., but are addressed by their first name, with all the implications pertaining thereto.

The adjoining counties are very similar to Dallas County. Wilcox County, for example, has a Negro population of 78 percent and not one Negro registered to vote. In Lowndes County, which is 81 percent Negro, not one Negro is registered to vote. In Perry County it is 66 percent Negro.

There are 19 of these counties which are generally referred to as the Black Belt counties of Alabama, and all of whom are better than 50 percent Negro in population.

Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of the Negro families in these 19 counties make less than $3,000 annually.

Sixty-seven percent of the Negroes in these counties have less than a sixth-grade education, whereas approximately 82 percent of the white people in these counties have a better education. So you can see that there is a vicious circle involving not only the deprivation of voting rights but a limitation which is obvious in the educational system and in the economic opportunities that prevail.

All of us agreed that the most damaging blow to voting opportunities in that area relate to literacy tests.

I would like to submit at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the application for registration and the questionnaire which is required in Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. The application has three parts as will be noted in the RECORD. The most interesting aspect of this very comprehensive form involves the technical questions that are asked having to do with interpretations of the Constitution.

The matter referred to is as follows:

APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION, QUESTIONNAIRE AND OATHS

PART I

(This is to be filled in by a member of the board of registrars or a duly authorized clerk of the board. If applicant is a married woman, she must state given name by which she is known, maiden surname, and married surname, which shall be recorded as her full name.)

Full name------------------------------.
Date of birth--------------. Sex---------.
Race-----------------.
Residence address--------------------------.
Mailing address----------------------------.
Voting place: Precinct-------. Ward-----.
District-------.
Length of residence: In State-----------.
County---------. Precinct, ward or district---------.

Are you a member of the Armed Forces?
---------.

Are you the wife of a member of the Armed Forces?---------.

Are you a college student?-------. If so, where-----------------------.

Have you ever been registered to vote in any other State or in any other county in Alabama?-------. If so, when and in what State and county and, if in Alabama, at what place did you vote in such county?--------.

Highest grade, 1 to 12, completed--------.
Where------------------------.

Years college completed-----------------.
Where------------------------.

PART II

(To be filled in by the applicant in the presence of the board of registrars without assistance.)

I, ---------------------------------, do hereby apply to the board of registrars of -------------------- county, State of Alabama, to register as an elector under the constitution and laws of the State of Alabama and do herewith submit my answers to the interrogatories propounded to me by the board.

------------------.
(Signature of Applicant.)

1. Are you a citizen of the United States? ---------.

2. Where were you born?-----------------.

3. If you are a naturalized citizen, give number appearing on your naturalization papers and date of issuance---------------.

4. Have you ever been married?-----------. If so, give the name, residence and place of birth of your husband or wife--------------. Are you divorced?----------.

5. List the places you have lived the past 5 years, giving town or county and State ------------.

6. Have you ever been known by any name other than the one appearing on this application?-----------------. If so, state what name------------------.

7. Are you employed? -----------. If so, state by whom. (If you are self-employed, state this.)--------------.

8. Give the address of your present place of employment----------------.

9. If, in the past 5 years, you have been employed by an employer other than your present employer, give name of all employers and cities and States in which you worked ---------------.

10. Has your name ever been stricken for any reason from any list of persons registered to vote?----------. If so, where, when, and why?-----------------------.

11. Have you previously applied for and been denied registration as a voter?--------. If so, when, and where---------------------.

12. Have you ever served in the Armed Forces?-----------. If so, give dates, branch of service, and serial number------------.

13. Have you ever been dishonorably discharged from military service?-------------.

14. Have you ever been declared legally insane?--------. If so, give details-----------.

15. Give names and addresses of two persons who know you and can verify the statements made above by you relative to your residence in this State, county and precinct, ward or district----------------.

16. Have you ever seen a copy of this registration application form before receiving this copy today?--------. If so, when and where?-----------------.

17. Have you ever been convicted of any offense or paid any fine for violation of the

law?---------- (yes or no). If so, give the following information concerning each fine or conviction; charge, in what court tried, fine imposed, sentence, and, if paroled, state when, and if pardoned, state when. (If fine is for traffic violation only, you need write below only the words "traffic violation only.")----------------

(Remainder of this form is to be filled out only as directed by an individual member of the board of registrars.)

PART III

Part III of this questionnaire shall consist of one of the forms which are insert part III as herein below set out. The insert shall be fastened to the questionnaire. The questions set out on the insert shall be answered according to the instructions therein set out. Each applicant shall demonstrate ability to read and write as required by the constitution of Alabama, as amended, and no person shall be considered to have completed this application, nor shall the name of any applicant be entered upon the list of registered voters of any county until after such inserted part III of the questionnaire has been satisfactorily completed and signed by the applicant.

Instruction "A"

Immediately after this insert has been selected, applicant shall turn it over and write on the back as instructed by the board member. The board member shall read aloud to the applicant, from a duplicate form of this insert part III, one or more of the excerpts from the Constitution which appear below, and the applicant shall write on the back hereof that part of the Constitution which is thus read to him. This shall be done before applicant completes any other part of the insert. Applicant is not to be allowed to copy, from the insert or elsewhere, that part of the Constitution which is read to him, but shall write the words read to the applicant by the Board member.

Instruction "B"

(After complying with instruction "A," applicant will complete remainder of insert. Applicant shall answer the following questions in writing and without assistance:)

1. Can a municipal governing body levy taxes? -----------

2. To veto a bill passed by Congress means that: ——— the Senate defeats it, ——— the President rejects it, ——— the court declares it unconstitutional.

3. Cases tried before a court are of two types, criminal and ----------------------

4. A member of the State House of Representatives cannot succeed himself. (True or false) ------------------------------

Excerpts From the Constitution

Part 1: The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided,* That no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Part 2: No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Part 3: Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed.

Part 4: The Congress shall have power: To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.

Instruction "C"

(After applicant has read, not aloud, the foregoing excerpts from the Constitution, he will answer the following questions in writing and without assistance:)

1. A proposed amendment to the Constitution must be ratified by---------of the States to be in effect.

2. Who has the power to declare war?---- --

3. "Due process of law" is required before depriving a U.S. citizen of any one of three things. Name them:--------------------------

4. In counting population to determine representation in the U.S. House of Representatives, what is the provision concerning Indians? ------------------------------------

I hereby certify that I have received no assistance in the completion of this citizenship and literacy test, that I was allowed the time I desired to complete it, and that I waive any right existing to demand a copy of same. (If for any reason the applicant does not wish to sign this, he must discuss the matter with the board of registrars.)

Signed: ---------------------
(Applicant)

PART IV—OATHS

STATE OF ALABAMA,
-----------COUNTY.

Before me,-----------a registrar in and for said county and State, personally appeared -----------an applicant for registration as an elector, who being first duly sworn deposes and says:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that the foregoing answers to the interrogatories are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I do further personally swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of the State of Alabama; that I do not believe in nor am I affiliated with any group or party which advocated or advocates the overthrow of the United States or the State of Alabama by unlawful means. I do further solemnly swear (or affirm) that in the matter of this application for registration I have spoken the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help me God."

----------------------- (Signature of Applicant)

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the----day of----------, 19-----.

--------------------- (Signature of Board Member)

Explanation and remarks

(Board members interviewing applicants may place here any special explanations, such as of residence status, or other remarks for purposes of clarification. If person is blind or is otherwise physically handicapped to such an extent that he cannot fill out this application form, the circumstances are to be recorded here, along with an explanation of the method used to determine if the person is, in fact, literate and can spell words and recognize those spelled to him, or can read large block letters and words in the case of persons with sight handicaps -----------

PART V—ACTION OF THE BOARD

STATE OF ALABAMA,
-------------------COUNTY.

The applicant, --------, appeared before the board of registrars for said State and county in a regular session and executed the foregoing application in the manner prescribed by law. The board, having further examined said applicant under oath, touching his qualifications under section 181, constitution of Alabama, as amended, and having fully considered the foregoing application for registration, questionnaire and oaths, adjudges said applicant entitled to be registered and he was duly registered this the --------day of--------------------, 19----.

Signed:--------------------
Chairman
-------------------- Member
-------------------- Member

(NOTE.—The act of actually determining an applicant entitled to be registered is judicial. A majority of the board must concur. A majority must be present. The power cannot be delegated. Each member must vote on each application. Not until this is done may a certificate be issued the applicant.)

The applicant, -----------, due to failure to meet the requirements of State law for registration as an elector, is hereby rejected on this the ---- day of ----------, 19---.

Signed: --------------------
Chairman
-------------------- Member
-------------------- Member

PART VI.—EXAMINATION OF SUPPORTING WITNESS

(The witness shall be placed under oath to tell the truth, the person administering the oath being a Board member or other person authorized to administer oaths and acting under the direction of the board.)

Name of witness -------------------------
Address --------------------------------
Place of voting -------------------------

"I have know the applicant ----------- ------------------ for ----------- years and --------- months and I have personal knowledge that his place of residence is --------- and that he has resided in the State of Alabama at least 1 year and in -------------- county for at least 6 months."

-------------------- Signature of Witness

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the ---- day of ----------, 19-----.

--------------------- (Person Administering Oath)

Date -----------

Mr. DIGGS. We found ample evidence, Mr. Speaker, that despite the fact that the same questions were offered to everyone who applied for voter registration, white people were helped or given the answers to the questions whereas Negroes did not have that advantage.

In the State of Alabama only 2 days a month are allocated for voter registration purposes, except in January when more days may be requested. This severely limits any kind of voter registration drive and, I am sure, strikes those of us who come from States where the voter registration rolls are open 5 days a week, 8 hours a day, to be a very peculiar system.

We also found evidence that white people were being given preferred places at the front of the line and Negroes were given places behind them. And because of the slow pace of registration, by the time the Negroes got up to the registrar, it was time for the voter registration to close, which meant they had to come back the next day. Of course, since there are only 2 days a month for the voter registration, if they missed those 2 days they would not be able to come back for the next 30 days. This process could be repeated again and again. If a person was standing in line and needed some relief or became hungry or thirsty and had to leave the line that person could not come back to the same place but would have to come back in at the end of the line. You can see that this kind of system is fraught with all kinds of limitations.

Our first stop in Selma was at the city jail. We were confronted by an uncomfortable-appearing mayor and a very belligerent city attorney. The mayor immediately began reading a prepared statement in which he said he did not want any outside help and did not need any help and just generally characterized us as a group of agitators despite the fact that we are Members of the Congress who certainly have a role to play in any matter relating to this subject.

However, the members of the Alabama delegation arranged later in the day a confrontation with the city and county officials. We certainly wish to thank them for their courtesies in arranging this meeting because we could not have met with these officials had it not been for the intervention of these distinguished Members of the House. The mediator of that conference was the gentleman from the 4th district of Alabama which includes Dallas County, Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. We had about a 2½-hour discussion with these various officials, which included the mayor, the sheriff, the board of registrars, the superintendent of education, the circuit judge, the probate judge, the city and county attorney, among others. They pointed out there were three areas in which there were problems over which they claimed they did not have any control.

First, was the State law which, as I pointed out, says that the registration rolls are only open 2 days a month. Second, they were operating with very limited quarters. Third, the type of applicants who appeared to try to qualify in many instances created problems.

They said that many people were discovered in the registration lines who were not residents of that county, or who were under age, or who were already registered to vote who had come back there through some kind of understanding, and there were those who were otherwise not qualified. They emphatically denied any ill treatment on their part. This was in direct dispute of allegations made by Negro citizens and their supporters in the registration effort. There are many examples of people who had been harassed, subjected to economic reprisals and other offenses with respect to their effort to register to vote.

Information which is also in the files of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which indicates that there has been in fact ill treatment of Negroes who have attempted to register to vote in that community and ill treatment of those people who have been attempting to help them to register to vote.

The city and county officials tried to make a considerable point of the alleged indifference of Negroes to the voting process. They stated they have sat in their offices on registration days when no Negro showed up to vote. In their mind this was an indication that Negroes were not really interested. They could not understand also why Negroes had come to register when the registration offices were not legally open.

We suggested to the mayor that communication between the races in the community was essential and urged him to appoint a biracial committee which we have seen work elsewhere. The mayor emphatically stated that he did not believe in biracial committees, that if outsiders would leave town things would return to normal. That is what we were afraid of, that things would return to normal and the status quo would be maintained.

We raised the question about Camp Selma, where so many people who had been arrested in connection with the demonstrations in this voter situation have been incarcerated. We were not able to get any information about the number of people who are there. We have taken depositions from people who describe conditions in that particular camp, and in certain other similar facilities in and around that area, which would turn the stomach of anyone who had any sense of justice.

As a matter of fact, everyone, even the newspapers, have been denied the right to find out from the authorities the true situation.

The city and county officials said if these demonstrations did not stop it might aggravate the lawless white element in the community and lead to violence, which Selma has avoided thus far. However, we surmised that the city and county officials were considerably concerned about racial friction frightening away some new industry which has recently been building plants in the Selma area.

The reception that we got from the Negroes in that area was just the opposite to the reception we received from these other people, which indicates we were welcomed by the people who have the problem. They were greatly lifted by the fact a delegation would come from Washington to try to help them. They were inspired by the racial complexion of our delegation. It encouraged them to keep fighting to attain their objective of being first-class citizens with the right to vote.

They also asked that some kind of investigation be conducted with respect to the prison compounds were the overflow of the arrested demonstrators are being kept.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, most of us came away from Selma with a feeling that some kind of new legislation is certainly justified with respect to this whole registration question. An alternative registration system by Federal authorities in those areas where local authorities or registrars are still not performing their duty or are obviously prejudiced in performing their duty is demanded.

I think that our observations there give support to measures which are designed to eliminate the poll tax in local elections, which still stand as a deterrent. Proposals to eliminate the kind of literacy tests that are obviously designed to hold down the Negro vote merit the attention of appropriate committees in this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, we think that we made a very constructive trip. We were enlightened by the experience and reinforced in our belief that legislative action should be taken during this present session.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks in the RECORD following my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] for his splendid report on our visit to Selma.

Mr. Speaker, at his news conference on February 4, President Johnson said:

> All Americans should be indignant when one American is denied the right to vote. The loss of that right to a single citizen undermines the freedom of every citizen.
>
> This is why all of us should be concerned with the efforts of our fellow Americans to register to vote in Alabama.
>
> The basic problem in Selma is the slow pace of voting registration for Negroes who are qualified to vote. We are using the tools of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in an effort to secure their right to vote. I hope that all Americans will join with me in expressing their concern over the loss of any American's right to vote. Nothing is more fundamental to American citizenship and to our freedom as a Nation and as a people.
>
> I intend to see that that right is secured for all of our citizens.

At the very moment the President was speaking, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., was in jail because civil rights legislation including the tools of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is not sufficient to secure the vote for all our citizens which was guaranteed by the 15th amendment in 1870. From his jail cell in Selma, Ala., Dr. King wrote:

> When the King of Norway participated in awarding the Nobel Peace Prize to me he surely did not think that in less than 60 days I would be in jail. He, and almost all world opinion, will be shocked because they are little aware of the unfinished business in the South.
>
> By jailing hundreds of Negroes, the city of Selma, Ala., has revealed the persisting ugliness of segregation to the Nation and the world. When the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed many decent Americans were lulled into complacency because they thought the day of difficult struggle was over.
>
> Why are we in jail? Have you ever been required to answer 100 questions on government, some abstruse even to a political science specialist, merely to vote? Have you ever stood in line with over a hundred others and after waiting an entire day seen less than 10 given the qualifying test?
>
> This is Selma, Ala. There are more Negroes in jail with me than there are on the voting rolls.
>
> But apart from voting rights, merely to be a person in Selma is not easy. When reporters asked Sheriff Clark if a woman defendant

> was married, he replied, "She's a nigger woman and she hasn't got a Miss or a Mrs. in front of her name."
>
> This is the United States of America in 1965. We are in jail simply because we cannot tolerate these conditions for ourselves or our Nation.

"There are more Negroes in jail with me than there are on the voting rolls." That statement alone is the strongest possible indictment. According to the opinion handed down by U.S. District Judge Daniel H. Thomas on February 4, 1965, at the time of the hearing on U.S. against Atkins et al., there were 335 Negroes registered in Dallas County. Some 2,600 Negroes had been jailed by February 4, and the number continues to mount.

Last week I visited Selma, Ala., with 14 other Members of Congress to get firsthand information about conditions in that strife-torn city and to investigate the denial of voting rights. Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., had telegraphed me from Selma city jail urging a personal visit because "events of the past month here in Selma have raised serious questions as to the adequacy of present voting rights legislation."

Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important that Members of Congress know and understand the civil rights struggle in the South. I have been to Georgia and Mississippi on similar missions, and I believe such factfinding trips aid in the cause of freedom. The freedom of every American is at stake when the Constitution is violated.

On February 4, 1965, U.S. District Judge Thomas said in his opinion:

> This court specifically finds that the defendants have deprived Negroes of the right to vote without distinction of race or color and such deprivations have been pursuant to a pattern and practice.

The statistics alone support the finding. According to the 1960 census, 57.6 percent of the population in Dallas County is Negro. Dallas County has a voting age population of 29,515; 14,400 are white, and 15,115 are Negro; 9,542 white citizens are registered, while 335 Negro citizens are registered. Approximately 63 percent of the white voting age population is registered as contrasted with less than 2 percent of the Negro voting age population. What is even more shocking is that in 1956 there were 275 Negroes registered. In 9 years the voting rolls increased by 60 Negro voters.

Statistics only tell part of the story. We know that Negroes are prevented from registering. We also know about the so-called literacy test which Dr. King says even Justice Warren would find difficult to pass. On February 4 U.S. District Court Judge Thomas enjoined the registrars of voters of Dallas County from administering the most complicated part of the test, which involved constitutional interpretation. This should eliminate part of the impediment to registration.

Mr. Speaker, Negro citizens of Selma and Dallas County refuse to accept passively the deprivation of their constitutional rights. They have demonstrated will, courage, and dignity. The result of their efforts to exercise their rights has been one of the most massive series of arrests in the Nation's history. To date, approximately 3,400 have been arrested.

While we were in Selma last Friday, more than 500 Negroes were arrested as they marched to the courthouse to urge that registrations be processed promptly. The sight of American citizens—many of them children and teenagers—being herded to detention camps should fill us with determination to take affirmative legislative action. When citizens who seek only the constitutional right to register and vote are subject to intimidation and arrest, it is clear that we have a long way to go before our Nation lives up to its constitutional commitments.

Meeting with our congressional delegation after his release from jail, Martin Luther King, Jr., said he was greatly heartened and encouraged that 15 Members of Congress took the interest to get a firsthand account of the situation. He outlined the frustrating experience of Negroes who attempt to register in the "black belt" counties of the South—the intimidation, the threats, the violence. Until there are Federal registrars empowered to register in local and State as well as Federal elections voters who are refused by local officials, Dr. King doubts that the southern Negro will fully achieve the franchise.

Congress has a direct responsibility. It is clear that further Federal legislation is needed in the crucial area of voting rights. I have introduced H.R. 2477 which provides that all citizens of the United States may vote in all elections without being required to take literacy tests. It outlaws all literacy tests as a qualification for voting in any election—State or Federal. Literacy tests, interpretation, and comprehension tests, tests designed to test reasoning ability or power of analysis are obstacles to the right and opportunity to vote which must be eliminated.

I have long believed that, if the southern Negro is to be able to fully exercise the right to vote, the Federal Government must be empowered to register Negroes in those areas where he is denied this right. In the 87th and the 88th Congresses I introduced legislation to accomplish this. Under my proposal when a finding has been made that persons in any locality have been deprived under color of law or by State action of the right to vote because of race, the Federal Government is empowered to appoint Federal enrollment officers. These Federal registrars would have the authority to register applicants for State and local elections as well as Federal elections. I am presently working with civil rights leaders to perfect this legislation and expect to reintroduce it soon. The enactment of such legislation will enable the Federal Government to take direct action to implement the Constitution in areas such as Selma, Ala. We must insure that the writ of the Constitution runs throughout the land. Voting registrar legislation is imperative.

Mr. Speaker, before our visit to Selma Mr. Roswell Falkenberry, publisher of the Selma Times-Journal urged that there be a congressional investigation on conditions in Selma. His request has been endorsed by the mayor of Selma, Joe Smitherson. Our distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] and other Members of the Alabama congressional delegation have recommended such a course and said they would welcome an official investigation of the situation in Selma.

The question of civil rights legislation is under the jurisdiction of the House Judiciary Committee. Therefore, in order to insure that many more Members know about the conditions in Selma and the need for voting rights legislation, I urge that a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee be appointed to make a first-hand investigation. Under House Resolution 19, the authorization resolution introduced this year by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that committee would be authorized to travel anywhere within the United States to investigate matters "relating to judicial proceedings and the administration of Federal courts and personnel thereof, including local courts in territories and possessions." The committee would also be authorized to travel and investigate matters "involving the operation and administration of Federal statutes, rules, and regulations relating to crime and criminal procedure." There is no doubt that the situation in Selma involves both the operations of the Federal courts and the Federal statutes relating to crime and criminal procedures.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in Selma is not unique but rather illustrative of many areas in the Southern States. For example, in Mississippi only 5 to 6 percent of the voting age Negro population is registered to vote. We also know that violence, intimidation, and brutal murder has been perpetrated against those seeking to exercise their franchise and those aiding others to exercise their constitutional rights. Selma has joined with other towns—Philadelphia, Birmingham, Albany, Oxford, Little Rock, Montgomery, and others which will forever stand as monuments to the courage and dignity of those fighting for the Constitution. Courageous people have led the way, but we cannot and must not allow them to stand alone. We must never remain silent or inactive in the face of racial injustice. This is true for all of us as individuals and as a nation. But as Congressmen we have a special responsibility in seeing that the rights set forth in the Constitution are protected and cherished. The trip to Selma was part of exercising this responsibility. We must now move forward with new legislation and new resolve.

CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations and my thanks to those Congressmen who went to Selma, Ala., to see for themselves the violence and brutality accompanying the recent efforts on the part of Negro citizens to assert their civil rights.

In the past several days I joined with more than 100 Members of this House to introduce resolutions condemning religious persecution in the Soviet Union. Such an expression of concern for our fellow man is well within the finest traditions of this Nation. For the shackling and the persecution of freemen, and we are all free under God, is always alarming and disturbing. It is especially alarming and disturbing when it occurs in our own land.

Last year we passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, one of the most comprehensive and far-reaching civil rights laws ever enacted by Congress. An entire section is devoted to voting rights. I was under the impression when I voted for this act that it contained adequate safeguards to insure the voting rights of all citizens regardless of race, religion, or national origin. Events in Selma, Ala., indicate otherwise. Recent events in Selma, Ala., indicate that you can register to vote if you are white. If you are Negro you stand in line all day or the chance to answer a literacy test designed to disqualify even well-educated persons. At the end of the day you can go home, unregistered, and if you are lucky, unbeaten. Many Negroes, including women, have not been so lucky.

The question, then, is twofold: First, are there deficiencies in the present civil rights law which prevent the complete exercise of the constitutional right to vote? Second, if the present civil rights law is adequate, why isn't it being enforced? We need to know the answers to those questions in order for Congress to act, either to correct any deficiencies in the law, or to see to it that it is properly enforced.

Once again, I commend the Members who took the time, the trouble, and the expense to travel to Selma, Ala., to witness the violations of civil rights that they are testifying to today. Through their efforts Congress will be in a better position to study the questions raised by the disturbances in Alabama.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the testimony of the witnesses that we interviewed in Selma, Ala., and I further ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] may extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, last week, upon the invitation of citizens of Selma, Ala., I went to that troubled city to observe conditions. The primary concern of these people at the current time and with which my trip dealt, are the electoral processes as operated in Dallas County, of which Selma is the county seat.

I sought to find some rational explanation as to why such difficulties have arisen over what appears to me to be the fairly simple and routine matter of registering to vote.

Most States, including my own, experience difficulties in creating enough interest in this basic factor in our democratic form of government. Huge registration drives, including house-to-house canvasses, market and street corner solicitations, and loudspeakers on the streets, attempt to reach even the most apathetic or disinterested potential voter.

Simultaneously, Dallas County in Alabama, along with a few other jurisdictions in some States, present the anomalous problem of people demanding the right to register as voters and being arrested for actions in connection therewith.

In addition, I was greatly surprised last week when some Members of Congress attempted to discourage our efforts to go to Alabama and observe conditions in Selma for ourselves. However, I was pleased to see that once we arrived we were treated with great courtesy by everyone.

I did not feel as though we were intruding, since I have always conceived of Members of Congress as representing our country as a whole, primarily, and own States and districts after that. If each of us confines his activities strictly to his own local interests, who in Congress is going to be looking after the national interests?

Likewise, I am unimpressed by the attempts to create the impression that it is outsiders who create the kind of civil strife now taking place in Selma, Ala. Too often, claims that the opposition is composed of outsiders who are professional agitators are merely a smokescreen to justify the failure to deal with anyone—locally or otherwise.

There are often very practical reasons why some outsiders must be involved in civil rights struggles in those areas of the United States where local pressures are so strong and traditions so fixed that local civil rights crusaders would face physical harm and all kinds of economic pressures.

In such a situation, it is difficult to find local lawyers to handle cases. The jobs of active participants would be endangered. Mortgages can be foreclosed. Businesses can be lost. Credit can be canceled. Continuing police intimidation and physical violence often result.

Nevertheless, it is not the outsiders, for the most part, who are the victims of oppression and violence as practiced in Dallas County, and it is these victims who are, today, courageously providing the leadership for change. And we are indeed fortunate that a responsible and spiritual leader such as Dr. Martin Luther King is providing the inspiration for these local leaders.

Try as one might to be fair and impartial, there are many things in Selma, Ala., that are difficult to rationalize.

How is it possible, for example, for a county in which the Negro population outnumbers the white to have neither a single Negro elected public official nor a single Negro public servant in a position of responsibility—such as a policeman.

How is it possible, in a county with this Negro majority in population, for avowed and outspoken segregationists who are opposed to the best interests of this majority, to get elected and reelected to public office without fail?

How can most States and counties survive and progress on simple registration qualifications when this jurisdiction finds it necessary to have registration standards much higher than those to be found almost anywhere else?

The answer is, of course, obvious, when one considers that this complex, easily manipulated form of registering is employed in order to continue to deny the majority of the population participation in the full rights and benefits but not the obligations and responsibilities identified with American citizenship.

Many people in a jurisdiction such as Selma—throughout the Nation, in fact—seem to be stunned by what appears to them to be a recent development, feeling that this is a sudden outburst of the Negro masses converging on them. They fail to see or understand that there has been a long, patient, evolutionary climb of a submerged people into the mid-20th century.

These people's mistake is in identifying and timing the Negro demands with their own rude awakening to change going on around them. And then to accuse the Negroes of wanting to move too fast.

I suppose it is difficult for some people to understand that in all of us there is a streak of human courage and a yearning to be free—and this is not of recent origin.

History during our time—including, as it does, bitter experiences with totalitarian governments—teaches us that those who value personal security above human dignity usually end up by losing both.

The right to vote is not an abstract theory. Exercise of this right has a close relationship with our daily lives. In addition, the constitutionality of this right to vote cannot be disputed. Legally, it does not have to be earned. From a practical standpoint, however, some men must fight to enjoy this right.

We live in changing times. There is a new Negro and a new South. The population of the South is being redistributed both internally and externally.

Since 1930 the South has become more urban. Its agricultural crops have been diversified, its farms have been electrified, and the number of industrial workers has almost doubled. It is no longer the land of mint juleps and sowbelly, but a network of vibrant and potentially great cities—from Richmond to El Paso.

And yet—despite these significant changes—the nonwhite population is in the same unfavorable position it has occupied for the past century.

This has contributed to the greatest mass movement of people in modern history.

Paradoxically, the South has contributed substantially to the population growth of the large cities of the North. Thus, every time a church bombing occurs in the South, some northern city gains more political strength.

At the same time, there are also many Negroes who are determined to remain and be a part of the new South. Significantly, these Negroes also recognize that this means they must have better schools and homes, better jobs and public facilities, improved race relations, and more economic development.

It is only natural, then, that they should also recognize the fact that the key to those necessities is political action. Political action is based on registration and voting.

Those who presently hold the reins of government recognize this same fact. They are holding on to the power they have always held—regardless of the method needed, in some cases, and regardless of the morality of their stand. They also feel that such a holding action for whatever length of time is possible will discourage those Negroes who are holding on so that they will migrate to other areas.

It is ironic, therefore, that the things that can move Alabama and other areas of the Deep South into the main orbit of prosperity fastest should be the things most vigorously opposed. These things include fair treatment for all, with a shoulder-to-shoulder approach to bring about economic growth and forward-looking representation in public office.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

First. There is no communication between the two opposing groups in Dallas County because self-government is a farce. More than half of the population has no elected spokesman to represent their viewpoint.

Informal citizens committees would be desirable at this time to ease tensions and to supplement local government as it is presently constituted.

Basically, this is no substitute for self-government where spokesmen are elected by fair and legal electoral processes.

Second. Recognition of the constitutional right of persons to register and vote should replace manipulative methods of granting or withholding this right as if it were a privilege to be arbitrarily awarded by current officeholders in order to protect their own positions. It is a basic responsibility of the legislative body of the State to provide effective machinery for accomplishing this is every county in the State. This, of course, implies the need to provide adequate facilities and personnel.

Certainly a successful way to avoid demonstrations and congestion at the courthouse is to provide several locations elsewhere where registration can be carried out. If necessary, the State legislature should make it possible to employ registrars in neighborhoods as is commonly done in many other places. Emphasis should be placed on making it more possible for people to vote—not preventing it—if our objective is to make democracy work.

Third. Efforts should be initiated to modify or repeal local laws that are clearly in conflict with constitutional guarantees—and to assure that the 1954 Supreme Court decision concerning school desegregation is implemented.

Encouragement under the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act must be given by those persons now in a position of authority to those persons now suffering educational deficiencies that restrict their opportunities.

These efforts—not tricky literacy tests—will achieve a higher rate of participation and literacy in voting.

Fourth. Federal law concerning registration is imperative to assure uniformity and protection of the right of these citizens of the United States to participate in self-government and the democratic process.

Alabama, including the city of Selma and Dallas County, can take the lead in bringing a new South to its fullest potential as a land of opportunity, as envisioned by its great people.

CONGRESSIONAL TRIP TO SELMA, ALA., FEBRUARY 5, 1965, EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY TAKEN AT FEDERAL BUILDING

(Mrs. Mary P. Foster, 1421 Union Street, Selma, Ala., 872-3267, age: 46, living in Selma 40 years)

We have to sign register before we can get a number. If we sign the register the sheriff will tell our boss and the boss will fire employees. They don't let many people register a day. The last day of registering they let six people register. They give us a very hard literacy test and it's real long. They make us stand in line and we can't talk. When the "drive" started, vouchers couldn't talk to applicant.

(NOTE.—Every applicant must have a registered voter to vouch for him.)

If people who receive social security checks and old age pension checks try to go to mass rallies they cut their checks off. One person I know that got her check cut off was Cadolia Smith. She lives at 1012 Weaver Street. Her phone number is 872-3534.

Tuesday morning we stood in courthouse trying to register and they pushed us with cattle prods and loaded us on the bus. After they arrested us they sent us to Camp Selden and we didn't have heat. Tuesday afternoon they sent us to Camden, Ala., camp on a cold bus, no heat in cell, and it was about a hundred feet long and 20 feet wide, about 55 women in the cell. This is where Negro prisoners are kept. No fire all winter, no smoking. They had wood floors with holes between planks. They gave us mattresses later and cotton blankets but they didn't give us enough. Women took turns to use blankets and every time one woman turned over she woke up everybody in the cell cause there was too many women in there.

They promised we could make a phone call when we got to the camp and I kept asking and asking if I could make a call cause I was spokesman for the group and finally he told us we couldn't make a call. Camden is in Wilcox County.

One woman got sick cause she was in a cold cell. They let us go Thursday. Tuesday night they gave us something like spaghetti and meatballs. Wednesday we staged a strike. Thursday I just had coffee. They gave everybody peas and cornbread. They wouldn't let us sing on the bus. They wouldn't let the men sing in cells either.

(Mrs. Amelia B. Boyington, 1315 Lapsey Street, Selma, Ala., 874-5635, lived in Selma 35 years)

I have been a registered voter for approximately 21 or 22 years. During that time, the only thing I had to do was to give my name, address, place of birth, date of birth, the time I have been in Selma and that I would uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

It is customary for every person who is trying to register to have a registered voter to vouch for them. That is the rule that I have been making for quite a long time. It happened in July that on the third Monday in July I went to the courthouse in order that I might vouch for some people. I noticed that we had a long line and quite a few people expecting me to vouch for them. I went to the side door. As I started through the side door, Mr. Clark asked where was I going and I told him I was going into the courthouse to vouch for some people. I went through. I stood in the hall—no place to sit. When I stood in the hall, one of the deputy men said you cannot stand there. You've got to go on the outside in the alley where the line extended, and I went into the alley, the sheriff came over there and said, "You stop talking to those people and get back in the courthouse."

As I went back in the courthouse, in the hallway, I said to this deputy, "You told me to go on the outside. The sheriff told me to go on the inside."

At the end of the hall of the courthouse you will find the probate judge's office. There are three or four seats on the outside for Negroes who want to see the judge. I was told to go back there and sit in one of those seats. I went back near probate judge's office, sat in a seat, and about the time I sat there for about 15 minutes, the sheriff on the outside said, "It's 12 o'clock. People are going home. You folk come back at 2 o'clock so that you might stand in line."

I sat there just a few minutes before someone came up. I don't know his name. He came in and said, "You get up and get out of the courthouse." He was an official. I said I was sent here to vouch for others. It was 12 o'clock then so I decided I would just sit there and be arrested. Then I went on to my office and at 2 o'clock I came back. I said to the deputy in the hall before I left, "I want you people to get together and decide where I'm supposed to stand or sit because I have to vouch for these people. They're expecting me to do that."

Then when I returned after 2 o'clock, I went to this particular deputy, and asked where I was supposed to be. He told me to go back and sit by the probate judge's office. I went back there and I sat down. I picked up a newspaper and when I started reading, Mr. Bernard Reynolds said to me (he is the probate judge), "Get out of here." I told him I was sent down here to sit until people get ready for me to vouch. He said, "I have charge of this courthouse. You get out of here. You are disturbing my court."

There was no one sitting there but me. I got up and said to the deputy, "You didn't get together. I thought you were going to find a place for me to stand." He said he was sorry.

I was there from 9 a.m., until 4 o'clock in order to vouch for these people.

(Margaret Jones Moore, 1414 Broad Street, Selma, Ala., 874-5228, age: 50)

All through the fight I have been the guinea pig. If it became necessary for anybody to stick their neck out, it seemed to have been me. In 1952, when I came back to Selma to live, I didn't bother too much about trying to vote or trying to register, but the next year I thought it was my duty. I had lived away for 12 years. I came down to register. I didn't get in on four occasions. Then after the return I came down at maybe 11 o'clock and got in, and over a period of 10 years I was able to get into the courtroom or into the registration office at least 12 times. The last time that I went in was July 5, 1963. I was so sure I didn't miss anything. I had been sure times before but this time I was especially sure that I didn't miss anything. When I didn't hear from them I became concerned and when I went back the next time and got in, I didn't hear from them, and I was sure I passed that time too. Then I went back to see the registrar one day. I said, "I have been any number of times and I have processed, but you have never notified me, and I would like to know something. I'm sure I passed." He said, "What is your name? You'll have to let me find out later on." I said all right, but he never notified me.

Question (CONYERS). What was his name?

Answer. Mr. Vick Atkins.

Question (COHELAN). Mrs. Moore, are you a schoolteacher?

Answer. Yes, I am.

Question. How long?

Answer. Twenty-sixth year.

Question. It took you how many years to register to vote?

Answer. Twelve.

Question. And you were disqualified on one occasion? You actually got in?

Answer. I got in about 10 or 12 times over the period of years.

Question. Who vouched for you, Mrs. Moore?

Answer. I really don't know the lady's name.

Question. But it was another registered voter?

Answer. No. I had 9 and she had 10, so she vouched for me.

Question. Did you have to pay your poll tax?

Answer. I'm over 45 so somebody told me I would have to pay $3, so I paid it.

Question. What's $3 for?

Answer. Back poll tax. If you're 45 and over you don't pay any more than $3.

Question (Hawkins). When you receive a number, that entitles you to register according to a number?

Answer. If they can get to you.

Question. If they don't get to you that day, is a number good for only 1 day?

Answer. You have to have a new number each day.

Question (Cohelan). Do you teach school in Selma?

Answer. R. B. Hudson High School. I am at present teaching 10th and 12th grades.

Question (Hawkins). Where did you graduate from?

Answer. I finished Talladega College, then went to Alabama State and to the University of Denver. I went to Knoxville College and to Tuskegee Institute, just taking short courses.

(Rev. M. S. Hasty, 812 Filpont Avenue, Selma, Ala., 874–4263, Occupation: Pastor)

I am a registered voter; since 1928 trying to help and vouch for others. I was able to get his wife registered 2 weeks ago. She registered before but failed on one question. Turned down. This time she did go through. I was a voucher for my wife, also for Mrs. Collin. She passed last year as registered voter, and the other day when Mrs. Boyington was arrested—20 minutes before she was arrested—I was ordered off the same steps. Said don't go in the courthouse. One of my members working there in the courthouse. I wanted to see him on business, and I asked permission to see him. They said you see him later in the day.

On Tuesday of this week I was there as committee. At board of registers were turned around just inside door. Told we couldn't see anyone; the office was closed. We also could call him at home if we like to, and "you have 2 minutes to clear the courthouse." Then we tried to talk, to prevail with him. Asked could he contact man for us. Then the leader of us continued to try to talk to him, and he said, "You're under arrest," and took a stick and pushed us out of the group, loaded us on the bus, and taken to Camp Selden. We were there approximately 6 hours, 5 or 6 hours, no water, had nothing but breakfast. Loaded us then to take us to Camden, Ala. There we were treated very nice, given supper. But the sleeping business—oh Lord—at my age rough with broken legs.

Question (Hawkins). How old are you?

Answer. Sixty-six.

Well, we don't have any cover or beds for you. Have about 15 or 16 mattresses. We will give them to the women. You rather give them to the ladies or divide them? We prefer ladies be first, and elders get one. There were 55 men. Tuesday night was sure enough cold, but they let us go in the hall and warm once or twice.

Wednesday we got news from over here. Said we were ordered to give you all peas without seasoning, cornbread, that's all. Some of the men in our group was treated mean. I was right on the second seat on the bus going there. The officer posse that was taking us down wasn't so very nice. The bus was overloaded. There wasn't standing room on the bus. We said, "We're doing this for freedom." He jumped up with his stick, unsnapped his gun, and got his stick in his hand. He said, "If you want to be hard, we can get hard too. Just depend on how you want us to treat you." Well, we weren't out for war. We hadn't done anything. I hadn't done anything but talk to a man.

(Mary Wesley, 33 Railroad Avenue, Selma, Ala., age 36. No phone)

I've been arrested twice. Been to Selma prison camp. The camp there was no place to sit. I was arrested in county jail. Stayed 4 days. Trusties beat on walls at night about 15 or 20 minutes. A pregnant woman in the group asked for milk. They wouldn't give it to her—not even water. Had to drink water from the commode. They gave us two meals a day, meals not prepared right. The pregnant lady couldn't get milk, orange juice, or sanitary water.

Question (Cohelan). What was the charge?

Answer. Unlawful assembly.

Question. Were you trying to register?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Have you ever tried to register before?

Answer. Since 1963.

Question. On each occasion you've been unable to do so—why?

Answer. They give you a number. When you get to your number the registration office is closed. That encourages you to come back. Well, every day you get there the registration office is full of whites. The next month you get a new number.

Question. Now, on the last occasion did you do anything that was unlawful or wrong while you were standing in line? Were you disorderly in any way?

Answer. No, I wasn't.

(Launsey West, 313 East George Washington Carver's Home, 874–6555)

I would like to say, in 1964 was my first experience with Sheriff Jim Clark. I think it was at the front of the Wilbur Theater. I had just gotten out of the hospital and my wife and I went down to get my boy. We, none of us, were in the movement. We only went to get him. While there, Jim Clark came up and started running and beating. After he pushed me and I wasn't able to run, he went after teenagers. He came back and I had walked half block and was waiting for the green light. He met me and said to get going. I said, "The red light is on." He said, "Get going," and he hit me on the back of the neck.

I'm also a veteran and I have been down on four occasions trying to get in the court house to become a registered voter. Only one time I got in, but I was escorted upstairs to Judge Hare's chambers.

Question. (Conyers). What branch of service did you serve in?

Answer. U.S. Navy.

Question. Overseas?

Answer. England, Africa, and Alaska.

Question. How many years?

Answer. Three years, 8 months, and 5 days.

Question. Honorable discharge?

Answer. Honorable discharge.

I was there the day he was pushing Mrs. Boyington. Of course, Mrs. Boyington was just standing there. When this first started I wasn't there. When the group that I was with walked up, we stopped and he walked away and he pushed Mrs. Boyington away with his hand in back of her coat like she was a rag doll. After, he gave us 3 minutes to disperse. No one moved. So he said, "If you don't disperse in 3 minutes you will be under arrest. We were arrested for unlawful assembly.

I also saw part of what happened to Mrs. Cooper. When it started I was not there. I got there in time to see Sheriff Jim Clark and three other deputies with Mrs. Cooper down. Sheriff Clark himself had a club across Mrs. Cooper's neck, and it was a disgraceful thing for a big man to pick on a woman like that. He's just the kind of man that scares the life out of you in a way. Truly saying from my heart, I would also like to say this.

I am a house painter by trade which I took up by GI bill of rights. I've taken it up for 18 or 19 years. Since participating in the movement, the sheriff and others know me so now I can't get any work. Last fella I did work for, he heard news that I have had it in this town as far as work is concerned.

Question (Cohelan). Mr. West, are you a registered voter?

Answer. No, sir.

Question. How frequently have you tried to register?

Answer. Four occasions—first time in 1963.

Question. First time? How many times in 1963 did you attempt to register?

Answer. Once.

Question. Did you take the examination?

Answer. Never got inside.

Question. What happened in 1964?

Answer. 1964 the same thing. Every time we go down there is a long line. This year's first Monday we marched down through the Alabama entrance in the back. Some of us got numbers but nobody was able to go in.

Question. Why didn't you try to register in 1962?

Answer. I was afraid. I had been warned by some older Negro citizens if you try you might be whipped.

Question. Well, then, why did you get courage in 1963?

Answer. Because I felt more stronger with others with me.

Question. Did you feel it was important to register?

Answer. Yes. I would like very much.

Question (Hawkins). You did get a number several times?

Answer. One time.

Question. Still couldn't register?

Answer. No, sir.

(Mr. Lee Grant Rivers, 607 Green Street, Selma, Ala.)

Last Wednesday I was arrested. I was at the head of the line and there was another feller behind me and they were arrested and carried to the jailhouse. When we got on the elevator, there were two deputies and they used cattle prods and stuck me in the jaw with the cattle prod and just everywhere they could. All on my hands. I tried to hold my hands in front of my face but I still felt misery in my left shoulder and all over my body.

Question (Conyers). Around your private parts of your body, abdomen?

Answer. Yes. And the man was behind me—he was 64 years old—and they stuck him in the temple and the blood flew. He has a bloody handkerchief in his pocket to show. His name is Joe Hagan.

Question (Cohelan). I take it that 607 Green Street is in Selma, Ala.?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How long have you lived in Selma?

Answer. Since I was about 15 years old.

Question. Practically all your life?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How old are you?

Answer. Forty-four years.

Question. Have you ever tried to register to vote before?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. What happened?

Answer. Well, I've never been able to get in the register office. They don't let over 13 a day pass. Most times when you get there it is that many white people all day.

Question. Did you exhibit any act of provocation? Were you doing anything that was unlawful or disorderly?

Answer. Not anything at all. You're under arrest and they just carried us on to jail.

Question. What do you believe you were arrested for?

Answer. I—what was the charge?—unlawful assembly. That's what I was arrested for.

Question. You have tried to register before?

Answer. Yes, all summer.

Question. What is your attitude about registering again?

Answer. I'll try as long as they have a registering office.

Question. Do you feel that you have been intimidated by what has happened? Does this frighten you from possibly going through that again?

Answer. It frightened me. I don't think if a person don't be afraid of Jim Clark he ain't got good sense. I'm just going anyway, and ask the Lord for strength and courage.

(Mrs. Anna Lee Cooper, 3115 Medley Avenue, Selma, Ala., came to Selma in 1962 after leaving when 15 years of age)

The first place I voted was in Kentucky. The next place I voted was in West Virginia, Logan, W. Va. The next place I voted was in Washington, Pa. The next place I voted was in Cleveland, Ohio. So I had to come back to Selma in 1962 to live with my 98-year-old mother and since then I have gone to try and register and become a registered voter. I went down in 1963, October 7. There was a registration day that was known as freedom Monday. I went down to register to vote, so I was standing in line. I was working at the Dunn Rest Home as a practical nurse. My employer came down and he looked in the line and he saw me. Employer, Mr. Charles Dunn, he had his supervisor to call a friend of mine and told her to tell me not to come in to work and that I was fired because he saw me in line.

Question (Conyers). How many have had similar experiences, being fired?

Answer. Two left after I was fired, Bessie Dickson and Miss Elisha Manuel working for Sloan.

Question (Cohelan). Why do you feel you were discharged?

Answer. I knew when he came up in the line and saw us. He fired me over the phone because I had someone to work in my place. He let Mrs. Collins come in. When we went down together and were standing together he let Mrs. Collins come in that Tuesday because he didn't have anyone to put in her place, but that Wednesday morning he fired her and stuck cattle prodder to her.

Question (Cohelan). You believe you were discharged because you were seen in the voting line?

Answer. Yes.

(Testimony of Reverend Anderson)

I should like to point out first of all as it relates to Mrs. Cooper. I was in the lines the morning that Mrs. Cooper had the difficulty with the sheriff. I was looking and the sheriff came down the line pushing people, get back off that sidewalk, get on, walk there and he pushed a number of persons before he came to Mrs. Cooper and most of them fell back something like that (showed how they were pushed). When he would shove them and push them and Mrs. Cooper had her back to the line and Mr. Clark took his hand and put it in her back and shoved her and she ran in the direction of an automobile showcase. She ran to keep from falling. Upon stopping, before she hit the wall, she turned back and that was where the difficulty developed. She just didn't take it. That's the size of it. I was looking at everything and when she turned back, I think Mrs. Cooper would have no objection to the truth, she just hit him. He in turn struck her back and then he proceeded to exercise his skillful brutality upon striking her repeatedly, and he was, someone caught hold to him. Two officers caught him and two officers caught Mrs. Cooper and they pulled them apart and, of course, Mrs. Cooper was angry. They had a scuffle and she hit him again. Then the officer wrestled Mrs. Cooper to the ground. Mr. Clark had already ordered officers to turn him aloose. He then ordered them to give him a stick. Officer handed Mr. Clark a stick, very long. He took the stick and jabbed her in her breast two or three times. Then these men sitting on her shoulders and legs and Mr. Clark straddled her body and he hauled back and cracked Mrs. Cooper in the face with a stick. I was looking (11 witnesses raised their hands agreeing to Reverend Anderson's statement).

Referring to intimidation of trying to get registered to vote, I think I have been there four or five times in succession and I've never succeeded in passing the test. I've been there I don't know how many times. I stood in line all day and just didn't get in. One Monday when we started back during the special drive, the very first day I was back in the courtyard with the people. Mr. Clark came to the door and dismissed us at 12 o'clock. They had issued numbers. At 12 o'clock they dismissed us and asked us to come back at 2 o'clock. I asked what would happen to people who had no numbers. They said they would proceed to try to get numbers as they have done heretofore. Some people said the office will be closed at 2 o'clock. Mr. Clark said, "go home."

At 2 o'clock we returned and he turned all the people away that didn't have a number. He said, "Those of you who have numbers can go in, those of you who have no numbers get out of here." The people said, "You said for us to come back." He said, "Maybe Anderson told you to come back." I said, "Didn't you tell these people to be here at 2 o'clock that you would let them back in?" He said, "No, I didn't." I said, "You said that, I was listening." He said, "You are a GD liar" and kept calling me GD liar. Mr. Clark was very angry. He said, "You got a number? Well you can get the H on in there but the rest of them can get out." I am not registered, I did get a number. Difficulties of getting a number heretofore was that sometimes before 9 o'clock there were white people already in line. They had received numbers and they decided they would give only so many numbers.

Question (Conyers). How long have you been trying to become a registered voter?

Answer. Since 1957.

Question. What kind of undergraduate education do you have?

Answer. Received undergraduate work at University of Pittsburgh.

(Ira Taylor, 9910 Valley Street, Selma Ala., 16 years of age)

Monday morning I got up and went to church, First Bethel Church. Marched to courthouse from First Bethel Church. They said go around the courthouse and stand there until the bus comes, the deputy said. We got on the bus and it took us to Camp Selma, carried us to armory first and then to Camp Selma. They asked them to sign paper, everyone said they didn't want to sign paper. After we didn't sign paper, Jim Clark said to get out and go on the bus. They treated us fine while at the armory.

Question. How many boys were with you?

Answer. Lots of people, about 14.

Question. Were they all from your church, boys from your church?

Answer. They were friends. At Camp Selma we got off the bus, walked inside building and they prodded me with a cattle prod on my leg once. They treated girls same as boys were treated with cattle prod. Men had sticks saying get in there boy.

Question. Did you obey the policemen?

Answer. Yes.

Question. All other boys and girls too?

Answer. Yes, we stayed there until night then went home.

(Addie Lilly, 1513 Silven Street, Selma, Ala.)

I have been living here most all of my life and I have been trying to become a registered voter since 1954. I have been intimidated in the line trying to get registered. At one time I asked one of the deputy sheriffs, this was at noon, to get a sandwich and the one that decided said yes, and on my return back to find my place in line was gone. One came from front door and he told me that you will have to go to the end of the line and I asked him why did I have to go to the end of the line, he said because you went out and I told him deputy over there told me I could go get a sandwich as long as I claim my place when I return. He said he had orders for me to go to the end of line. We went out and went to the end of the line which was three blocks long. Before I left I was fifth in line to the door from the registrar's office.

(Testimony of Mrs. Moore)

Lived in Selma, Ala., 22 years, registered in 1963. The line was very long, it was about 100°. I stood in line, when I got out of line I came back and one of the deputies with a big stick said if you don't get back to last end of line.

Question. (Scheuer). How long had you been in line up to that time?

Answer. From 9 till after 12 p.m. I stepped out of line. You couldn't get water in the courthouse. The bathroom in the courthouse was locked too. When I got back he ran me all the way back to the end of the line. I stood there until 4 o'clock. I still didn't get inside. I got two or three numbers.

Question. You were there from 9 in the morning till afternoon?

Answer. Yes.

Question. When you get the number and you get inside—over and over again you get a new number until you get to the door.

Answer. The last time I got inside registration office, there were three pages of literature for you to fill out. Then he takes you in a little room, he reads the question, and you write the answer. He reads so fast and he doesn't say his words right, he doesn't give you time to ask any questions. I filled the three pages out in the first office, but after I got in another room and he started reading so I kindly told him I wouldn't go through with that part. Just sign your name. So he asked me why, I really don't think it's necessary to go through all this just to register to vote. I returned paper and walked out.

Question. If the part of that registration process where he has asked you to go in the other room, is that was all cut out and all you had to do was to fill out the application?

Answer. Yes, it did.

Question. Would you have had any trouble?

Answer. The first form is just your name, address, name of place of birth, how long you've been here, whether you were in the military service.

Question. Under the court order that was issued last night they are now prohibited from asking this other question in the other room. All they can ask you to do is fill out that form, you remember that form?

Answer. Yes.

(Testimony of Mrs. Atline Taylor)

Arrested and put in the county jail.

Question. Why did they arrest you?

Answer. Because we tried to register.

Question. Where were you working?

Answer. I was working on Union Street as a housemaid. I was up there in jail so he just got his old maid back, I've been out of a job but I get a welfare check.

Question. And in your opinion you lost your job because you were attempting to register? Are you working now?

Answer. No.

Question. Had you worked before this time?

Answer. I had worked.

Question. You have held several jobs?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Have you had any trouble on any of the jobs before this?

Answer. No, just this job and while we were in jail one of the men told the clerk to hit us against the walls, and then they wouldn't give us water. We stayed in jail 4 days, had no water during this time. Drank water from commode.

Question. Were you given food?

Answer. Given food twice a day.

Question. Did you have mattresses?

Answer. We had mattresses and two or three sheets but no blankets, slept on stone floor.

Question. Were you in jail at the same time that Mrs. Moore was in jail?

Answer. No.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I wish most emphatically to express my complete accord with the purpose of the 15-member congressional delegation which visited Selma, Ala., with its findings, and with its compelling reasons for a trip made mandatory by the shocking situation in that city and Dallas County.

No one who has access to the Nation's press, no one at all familiar with voting practices in Alabama as they affect Negroes, will claim, for a single minute, that it is not imperative to take immediate steps to erase the ignominious abuses which constitute intolerable deprivations of Negro rights. No reasonable person will assert that it is not necessary for interested groups to bring every pressure upon the officials and people of Alabama, upon the Congress of the United States, and upon the executive branch of the Government to act now to correct and eliminate forever the outstanding abuses which result in the utter disregard of the constitutional rights of Negro citizens of the State of Alabama.

To say that the only trouble in Selma and Alabama is that caused by outside agitators is to give voice to an excuse that is wholly unacceptable to anyone who lays any claim to the ability to think rationally. To say that the white leaders of Selma and Alabama can clean their own houses is to mouth an empty promise in view of the facts. The simple truth is that, after 100 years, there is retrogression rather than progress.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now and the demand for full remedy comes not only from the Negroes of Alabama and the Nation, but also from the great multitude of white Americans, and, yes, even from the oppressed wherever situated in the world today.

Mr. Speaker, we must let Alabama know that justice, freedom, and equality of opportunity must have the same meaning in that State as they have in every other State which has given validity to those truths. We must let Alabama know and all America must recognize that, without further delay, the writ of justice must be executed.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, our congressional delegation went to Selma not officially to intervene, not to intrude, but simply to observe and inform ourselves about a seeming pattern of widespread noncompliance with Federal law and the national purpose regarding the rights of all Americans to register and vote. This problem has been of deep concern across the country.

What we found in Selma was a situation which indeed grows out of longstanding practices and some State legislation which have placed undue, and probably unconstitutional, restrictions on the Negro right to vote. We found a major organized protest against these restrictions on the part of the Negro community. We also found that a change in attitude in the white leadership is in the process of taking place in Selma.

Change will occur resulting from the organized protest, as well as from pending Federal suits concerning registration procedures in both Dallas County and the entire State of Alabama. Others of my colleagues who were with me in Selma have spoken today on the need for further Federal legislation to assure the right to register and vote for every single citizen of this country regardless of color or race. I will support such legislation. I hope that all of us will join in supporting Federal legislation assuring these basic rights of citizenship. New Federal laws governing registration and voting can bring about significant changes in communities like Selma. We cannot rest until every citizen has the right to vote without harassment. But at this moment—and most hearteningly in our view—change may also come from a new willingness which we perceive on the part of some local white officials, and local private citizens of good will, white as well as Negro, to bring about a real improvement in the social climate of Selma—change and progress not only in regard to registration and voting procedures, but also in regard to other important concerns.

Underlying the immediate issue of voter registration is a long-established failure of real communication between the Negro and white communities. I think that there are now signs that the white community is willing to establish that communication with the Negro community. Out of this can come an appreciation of one another as human beings and a fresh assessment of the needs of the total community.

The hope for Selma in our opinion is that constructive initiative will be seized by the moderate white leadership and that such a discourse will be started promptly.

I turn to my southern colleagues and say to you that I have learned a great lesson from visiting your community. I appreciate, as I never have before, that there appear to be regenerative forces at work in the South which may indeed move the South toward full compliance with our national consensus on civil rights for all Americans, as expressed by the executive, the judicial, and the legislative branches of the Federal Government.

I earnestly hope that North and South can join hands in solving the problems which are now plaguing the South, but which more importantly belong to the Nation as a whole.

From the days of the populist movement in the 19th century, the South has given its share of leadership to liberal goals and world peace in every area of endeavor except in race relations.

In my own judgment there is a great opportunity for my southern colleagues, who are uniquely able to bring a national viewpoint to bear on the local problems they understand so well, to join other leaders of the South in renewed sensitivity to the emerging regenerative forces that are at work in southern communities. These forces need support, both in Washington and in the statehouses of the South. I hope the day has passed when the voice of southern liberalism can be discounted before it is even heard. Much southern political leadership is still burdened with anachronistic thinking about the social and political forces which are moving in their own States and regions. At the same time, the positive southern forces for moderation are frequently underestimated in the North. The future of the South will be shaped by these forces and I hope they can be more realistically assessed not only by those of us who observe the South from afar but by those like our southern colleagues who lead the South.

We were greatly pleased to have our four colleagues from the State of Alabama join us in our meetings with the city officials of Selma and we are hopeful that they will play a constructive role in providing their leadership, their knowledge of local conditions, and their awareness of the national purpose, in giving encouragement to the newly emerging will of elected officials in Selma to recognize and help solve the grave problems which that community now faces.

It is our duty to make laws to insure the right to vote. It is up to the moderate white leadership in the South in cities such as Selma to make the citizenry understand that in the 20th century the Nation demands that all its citizens must have that vote, and must, indeed, have the right and the opportunity to participate fully and equally in the rich mainstream of American life. If this can be done we shall achieve far more than any legislation, however necessary and desirable, could contemplate.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, without communication there cannot be understanding—communication is vital in the Selma situation. Our delegation was advised that there is no biracial committee nor any intention to create one.

Here is a community of 15,000 Negro persons and 14,000 whites. It took our delegation the better part of the afternoon to obtain the admission that only some 325 Negroes were registered and some 9,300 whites. The discrepancy is apparent, for the registration figures tell the story far better than all of our discussion or testimonies of its citizens.

I join my colleagues who made the visit, in encouraging legislation which will obtain a communication procedure and a registration regulation which will enable all of her citizens to vote.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding at this time as I am one of those who is going to the White House and have to meet my daughter.

I want to congratulate the Members of Congress who showed the courage last week to go down to Selma. I have not seen so much courage displayed in a long time. I think it was a tremendous deed because it makes the people of America aware of the situation in Alabama, Mississippi, and those States.

Some time ago, before the beginning of this year's session I had a group from CORE visit me in my Boston office. CORE is the Congress of Racial Equality. At that time they spoke to me with regard to a matter that was going to come up, concerning the Mississippi Congressmen. I told them at that time I would be happy to look into that problem, to read their brief, and if they convinced me, I would go along with them. I made a study of their brief. They convinced me and I did go along with them.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a crying shame in this day and age that in order to register and vote in the State of Mississippi you must first notify the registrar of voters that you want to vote; secondly, you must make an application, and thirdly publish it in the newspapers for 1 week or 2 weeks, to see what the person's morality is, or to see what kind of individual he is. Then you return to the registrar and the registrar gives you an examination on any part of 295 amendments to the Mississippi constitution. Then you go back a week later and he tells you whether you have passed or you have failed. No reason is given for his decision.

That is wrong. I do not know the situation in Alabama, but I am happy to listen to these gentlemen who have taken time for this afternoon. But I do not have to go all the way to Selma to discover indifference with regard to the Negro problem. We have that indifference right within the Department of Defense. This is one of the matters that I discussed with CORE in my Boston office and I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Diggs] for giving me this opportunity to bring this up out of order from the discussion of the Selma case. This is what was brought to my attention. We discussed the situation in the Armed Forces of the United States and the problem of trying to get the Negro youth to enlist.

Mr. Speaker, here is a letter I have received from the Congress of Racial Equality:

> INDIFFERENCE
>
> February 4, 1965.
>
> Congressman Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Congressman O'Neill: We have just completed a survey of U.S. military recruitment literature and posters, and find that Negroes are almost totally ignored or excluded. White faces abound; officers, technical personnel, and service men and women are copiously illustrated—both at work and in recreation. But a Negro face is exceptionally rare.
>
> We collected at several recruiting centers in the Boston area recruitment folders of the four services. (See attached list of folders.) In the 36 folders we examined, there were 1,086 clearly identifiable faces. In 23 of the 36 folders there were no Negroes. Of the 1,086 individuals shown, only 23 were Negro.
>
> When we examined the 10 recruiting folders directed toward women, we found 254 clearly identifiable faces. In 9 of the 10 recruiting folders addressed to women no Negroes were shown. In the remaining one, we found two Negroes.
>
> Of the 23 Negroes portrayed, the bulk appear in background or secondary positions. Only one Negro appears in a position in which he is obviously superior in rank to a white.
>
> We believe that present military recruitment advertising is damaging to American society, and encourages the belief that the U.S. Government stands for the exclusion of Negroes. Honest, straightforward integration of recruitment advertising can make it a positive force both at home and overseas.
>
> First, such advertisement will attract more Negro recruits. This is especially important since unemployment among Negro youths approaches 25 percent.
>
> Second, it will bolster the morale of Negro servicemen. The absence of Negroes in recruitment literature says that even in the armed services the existence of Negroes as men is denied. Integrated advertisement will show the Negro serviceman that his country recognizes him with pride.
>
> Third, it will serve to educate the public, white and Negro, so that people will recognize Negroes as first-class Americans. Moreover, children of both races will see that the American military man, the hero, can be any color. And Negro children will learn, as none of their forbearers have been permitted to learn, that virtue, courage, and success belong to Negro as well as white Americans.
>
> Finally, we believe full integration of all the armed services recruitment advertising is a matter of justice. Negroes have fought for America since independence, and even before. They have fought and died in integrated and in segregated units. Justice to the dead and the living demands full recognition of Negroes at every opportunity—not as a questionable shadow in the background, but as a proud and prominent figure which every eye will see and respect.
>
> Congressman O'Neill, we urge you to make every effort to see that our military services carry out this policy immediately. The errors of the past cannot be undone, but those of the present and the future must be prevented. We are confident that you will do your best to inform appropriate officials of the necessity of a proud and honest integration policy which is promptly implemented.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> Alan Gartner,
> *Chairman, Boston CORE.*

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I concur and agree with the letter which has been sent to me and I intend to send a copy of it to Secretary of Defense McNamara. I hope he will take notice of this letter forthwith and correct this matter which needs immediate correction.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me at this point?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. I should like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'Neill] for bringing this grave injustice to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives. Also, while the gentleman from Massachusetts is standing in the well of the House, I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation and the appreciation of other Members of the House to him for his support and encouragement at the time of the challenge of the Mississippi delegation on the opening day of this session.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend our colleague from Michigan and other Members who have voiced deep and justified concern for the situation in Selma, Ala., which is typical of many other areas in our Nation where so many citizens are being denied the right to register in order to vote, a cardinal guarantee of the Constitution.

It is essential that the House concern itself with this situation. The firsthand report we have just heard certainly points out the need for further legislative correction in this area.

I am pleased to join in sponsoring legislation aimed at rectifying the glaring inequity which remains and which has been highlighted by the incidents in Selma.

I do not think that as elected Members of the House we can rest until these fundamental rights are there to be exercised in fact as well as in theory.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, President Johnson on February 4 truly spoke for the overwhelming majority of the American people when he said, "Nothing is more fundamental to our freedom than the right to vote. All Americans ought to be indignant when one American is denied the right to vote."

In Selma, Ala., this thesis is being challenged in lawless and cynical fashion by the Dallas County authorities who have conspired to prevent the voter registration of Negro-Americans. As of last Friday, 3,300 persons including Nobel Prize winner Martin Luther King, have been arrested for daring to protest this blatant attempt of these authorities to deprive Negro-Americans of what must be the inalienable right of the citizen of a democracy—the right to vote. Selma, seat of Dallas County, then has become the testing ground of this vital phase of civil rights. Here will be set a pattern which will govern all such situations.

We cannot evade, ignore, or avoid this issue so fundamental to our democratic concept of government by the people and for the people.

Already a Federal judge in Alabama has ordered Selma to speed up registration, and President Johnson has asked the Attorney General of the United States to consider the drafting of legislation that will end this discrimination against millions of Americans.

This, or other legislation to this end, will shortly come before the Congress; and I rise to urge that the Members of Congress, irrespective of party or sectional background, wholeheartedly support and quickly pass such legislation so that we may wipe out one more barrier to the full enjoyment of all civil rights by our Negro fellow Americans.

It is a great and rare privilege to sit in this House at a moment in history when we have it in our power to realize at long last the American dream of equality for all, regardless of race, creed, or color. Let us rise to this historic opportunity.

We are a deeply religious people with an abiding faith in justice and decency; and I am firmly convinced that the great majority of our people will welcome the wiping out of the poison of oppression and discrimination that has troubled our national conscience for these hundreds of years.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Selma, Ala., is intolerable. As long as there are Americans who are refused the right to vote, none of us in Congress and in the rest of the country can be satisfied with the operation of our democracy. In Selma, a group of willful men are denying American citizens their constitutional right to vote. The reactionary efforts of this disaffected few cannot in any way appear to represent the convictions and commitments of the many. Despite the apparent widespread compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, there still remain pockets of dissent and lawlessness. Selma is one of these.

The Congress should be prepared to pass legislation to facilitate equitable voter registration procedure. Clearly, the right to vote is as fundamental as the right to be served at a lunch counter. Both must be assured and protected by the full power of the law. The events in Selma should dramatize the need for Federal legislation in the protection of voter-registration rights.

The efforts of those Members who visited Selma deserve the support and praise of the House. The trip has clearly afforded the House an opportunity to receive direct information on the events in Selma. Such information should fortify our conviction that the actions of the Selma authorities represent a national blemish. Such actions cannot be allowed to continue or be repeated elsewhere in the country.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, all Americans have the inalienable right to vote; and when these rights are jeopardized, as a U.S. Congressman, as a citizen, and as a human being, I believe it is my duty to support and fight for the maintenance of these rights.

The privilege of voting should never be conditioned upon color, creed, or religion. When there is a blatant imposition of these prejudicial standards there is a resulting infringement on our Democratic system which by necessity affects all American citizens.

The importance of the lack of or the right to vote in the spectrum of rights and guarantees granted U.S. citizens is best illustrated by a portion of the Justice Department records. In McComb, Miss., from June to October 1964, there were 17 bombings of churches, homes, and businesses; 32 arrests; 9 beatings; and 4 church burnings as a result of voter registration and civil rights activity.

The civil rights laws and its inherent protections and guarantees are clear, and all devious means to circumvent this law of the land must and should be challenged.

Our civil rights law has its genesis and manifestations from a free society and the tactics in Selma, Ala., are reminiscent of events and manipulations by past and present totalitarian regimes.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS]. I regret deeply, due to longstanding commitments, I was not able to go to Selma with the congressional delegation last week, to make an on-the-spot observation of the situation there as it relates to denial of voting rights. I commend those of my colleagues who did make the trip. I commend them for this most informative report given here today. I share their concern about the denial of voting rights to substantial numbers of Selma citizens. This is an injustice that cannot be allowed to continue in a nation of self-governing freemen. Denial of the right to vote and in this case even of the right to register to vote is obviously a basic infringement of a citizen's right.

I should like to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] for his service as chairman of our Democratic Study Group Civil Rights Steering Committee. The gentleman from Michigan has given our group excellent and inspiring leadership.

I am very aware that the fight for human rights did not end with passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, for which I was one of the leading proponents in the House of Representatives. As a Member of the House and as a lawyer, it is my position that the continuing fight for human rights should be pressed energetically but always on grounds that are legally sound.

It is of first importance that existing laws be properly enforced. In the Civil Rights Act of 1964 we gave the executive tools to use to seek human rights. We should be sure that these tools are being fully used.

Thereafter, it may be necessary and advisable to introduce and work for enactment of new legislation. For example, I am now considering the introduction of legislation to further secure the right to vote, free from discrimination, through establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission.

I am also considering legislation which would provide for enforcement of the 14th amendment. I might point out that this is the method prescribed in the Constitution, for correcting the situation in Mississippi which came before this House at the opening of this session of the Congress.

I assure those of you who went to Alabama last week and came back to make this very productive report today that I stand with you in seeking action to remedy this evil.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this Wednesday, February 10, 1964, the House of Representatives passed the far-reaching Civil Rights Act which was designed to extend to all Americans the full blessings and responsibilities of citizenship. Recognizing that no right is more essential to citizenship in a democracy than the right to participate in the selection of its governing authorities title I of the act sought to strengthen the voting guarantees contained in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. In those laws the Congress had taken steps to guarantee to all citizens the right to vote without discrimination as to race or color. The persistent flagrant discrimination in many States made clear that the 1957 and 1960 laws were not sufficient to guarantee and enforce voting rights. The 1963 report of the Civil Rights Commission revealed the techniques on discrimination used against would be voters on racial grounds by voting officials, techniques which the Commission's statistics proved had been highly successful:

> In Mississippi, in 1962, 69 percent of white people of voting age were registered, while 1.1 percent of Negroes of voting age were registered. In eight southern States, in 1962—in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee—89 percent of white people of voting age were registered while 8.3 percent of Negroes of voting age were registered.

The 1964 act was designed to meet problems encountered in the operation and enforcement of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. Now we know that additional action must be taken and taken promptly. The events in Selma and other areas demonstrate beyond a shadow of a doubt that American citizens are still being subjected to humiliating and heartbreaking acts of discrimination in their efforts to exercise their right to register and vote. It is our duty to respond to their need, to assure them the full enjoyment of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

We cannot delay. As President Kennedy stated in his civil rights message of February 28, 1963, with regard to voting suit delays: "The legal maxim, 'Justice delayed is justice denied,' is dramatically applicable in these cases." There is no such thing as retroactive relief with respect to voting rights. We must act now to the end that Negro citizens will not continue to be degraded in Selma, Ala., and elsewhere.

The Nation observes this Friday the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator. What more fitting way to honor him, to prove our commitment to the principles for which he lived and died, than to enfranchise the disenfranchised. President Kennedy stated in his moving address to the Nation on June 11, 1963, on the admission of two Negro students to the University of Alabama—

> One hundred years of delay have passed since President Lincoln freed the slaves, yet their heirs, their grandsons, are not fully free. They are not yet freed from the bonds of injustice. They are not yet freed from social and economic oppression, and this Na-

tion, for all its hopes and all its boasts, will not be fully free until all its citizens are free.

The struggle to make all our citizens free was advanced, but not completed, by the enactment of the Civil Rights Act last year. In that, as in the acts of 1957 and 1960, Congress sought to insure speedy and effective remedies for the ills of voter discrimination. Those remedies have not been sufficient to prevent "the discriminatory application and administration of apparently nondiscriminatory laws in the words of the Civil Rights Commission. I am confident that the Congress will respond to the challenge epitomized by Selma, will comply with its duty under the 15th amendment of the Constitution to insure that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Diggs], for taking this time today so that there can be a full discussion of a vital problem that faces our country today, a problem which the 89th Congress must face up to.

We need legislation, and we need it now, to stop the wholesale deprivation of the right to vote based on race, now existing in many areas in the South. That the present statutes are inadequate is painfully clear. Although the Department of Justice has brought cases under their present authority, if we proceed as we have been, we are courting, not only trouble, but a loss of faith in the promises we made to correct the evils of second-class citizenship in this country. The children I saw in Selma last Friday should not have to go to jail to awaken us to our responsibilities to them.

In this year 1965 there are counties in the deep South where not a single Negro is registered; and there are many where less than 1 percent nonwhites are registered even though they constitute 50 percent or more of the population. Those few who have managed to pass registration tests which most Members of this learned body could not, have done so in fear of retribution to themselves and their family, and I regret to say, that promised retribution has become an ugly fact too often.

The rights of equality in education, in job opportunities, and in public accommodations are significant and important, and we have a long way to go in making them a reality. But we are moving, we are trying, in these areas. We are not trying hard enough in the most fundamental area of all—the right to vote. We need new legislative tools. The precise form that these new tools should take has yet to be determined, but let me suggest, in rough form, what I think they should be. First, we need the authority to register qualified applicants by Federal registrars wherever there is a pattern of discrimination and to conduct an election if necessary.

Second, poll taxes, complicated literacy or constitutional interpretation tests and other such devices must be eliminated.

Third, the right to vote must be protected not only in Federal elections but in all elections.

Fourth. State and local officials should be made specifically and personally liable for their actions, where they violate the Federal voting laws.

It was an honor and a pleasure to be a part of the distinguished group of Congressmen who went to Selma to get information at first hand. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Diggs], for arranging this time so that we could report to you, and for his able chairmanship in other ways as well.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the 15 Members of the House who made a factfinding trip to Selma, Ala., on February 5, I would like to add my voice to those calling for more vigorous enforcement of existing protections of the right to vote, and where necessary, new legislation to insure that this fundamental right is in fact guaranteed to all Americans.

While we were in Selma, we had meetings and discussions with Dr. Martin Luther King and his associates, with local officials, and with Negro residents of the community. There is no question that under existing practices and procedures the Negroes in Selma and all across what is commonly referred to as Alabama's black belt, are systematically and effectively being denied their legitimate and constitutional rights as citizens to register and vote.

In Dallas County, where Selma is located, the population is 57 percent Negro, yet less than 1 percent of the eligible Negroes are registered to vote.

In neighboring Wilcox County, Negroes represent 78 percent of the population, yet not one has ever voted.

Adjoining Lowndes County is 81 percent Negro but not one has ever voted there either.

Without the opportunity to vote, Selma's Negroes, and Wilcox' and Lowndes', are politically powerless. They cannot appeal to city or to county law enforcement officials, and although the Federal Government has attacked intimidation and discrimination in Dallas County in two voting suits, the progress has been painfully slow at best.

How could it be better, as a matter of fact, when in the State of Alabama only 2 days a month are allocated for voting registration. I am sure that this strikes most of us who come from States where the registration rolls are open 5 days a week, 8 hours a day, as rather strange and restrictive.

It is even more restrictive and discriminatory when we discover, as many Negroes of Selma told us personally, that they must stand in intolerably long lines; that they must wait not in the courthouse or on the street, but in an alley; that they must stand behind any white persons who may be registering to vote; that they are pushed, prodded and beaten by the local sheriff; that frequently they are jailed, often with very inadequate facilities, food, and care.

And when these indignities have been suffered, all too few even then are able to register.

We have, of course, accumulated too little experience under the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964 to know whether new and stronger legislation to protect and insure voting rights may be needed.

Our first emphasis, I believe, should be concentrated on the fullest and broadest enforcement of existing law. Very real questions can and should be raised, I think, as to whether we are getting the maximum possible impact out of the bill many of us labored so long and hard to enact last year.

For example, six demands that Negroes be permitted to register in Selma have been before the U.S. district judge, Daniel H. Thomas, since 1961. Last week, after nearly 4 years, Judge Thomas ordered a few of the admitted voting restrictions removed. But, under the act of 1964, some very knowledgeable constitutional lawyers argue persuasively that the Justice Department could have removed the voting restrictions as early as July 2.

Mr. Speaker, it may well be that we need new legislation to break down the remaining barriers to voting and full citizenship. In particular, we may need to provide a system of voter registration by Federal authorities when it is obvious, as in Selma, that this right is being denied, solely on the basis of race, by local authorities.

I respectfully urge the House Committee on the Judiciary, the Attorney General, and the President to give their immediate attention to this problem and by forceful administrative action, or new legislation, or both, to finally insure for all Americans the right to vote which is the cornerstone of our democracy.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bingham], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, believing that firsthand information is always valuable, I traveled to Selma, Ala., last week with 14 colleagues in a bipartisan congressional group.

Let me state at the outset that the experience confirmed my view that additional Federal legislation is needed—and needed at this session—to supplement the Civil Rights Acts of 1960 and 1964, if we in this country are to give reality to our professed ideal of allowing all our citizens of whatever color the priceless privilege of the franchise. Such legislation should provide that, where State and local officials are failing to carry out their obligation to permit the registration of all citizens in a nondiscriminatory and reasonably prompt manner, Federal registrars should be appointed for that purpose. In addition, it is imperative, whatever protection is extended to the right of Negroes to vote in Federal elections, protection should also be extended to their right to vote in State and local elections. The 14th and 15th amendments of the Constitution are in my view, broad enough to make it possible to achieve these objectives by Federal legislation.

During the course of our visit to Selma, our congressional delegation was treated with courtesy, particularly by Members of Congress from Alabama including our distinguished colleague, Mr. ANDREWS, of the Fourth District, which includes Selma. These gentlemen, at the request of our group, arranged for a lengthy meeting with the mayor, members of the board of registration, and other State and city officials concerned. Members of our group also met with Dr. Martin Luther King and some of his associates, with members of the Negro community, including a number of their leaders, and with other individuals.

The day before our arrival, Judge Thomas, of the Federal district court, had handed down a decision which fully sustained the position of the Negro community and of the Department of Justice that the registration process as carried on in Dallas County has shown a clear pattern of discrimination against, and illegal discouragment of Negroes. He found that only a tiny fraction of the Negroes who had applied for registration from 1962 to 1964 had been registered, whereas approximately three-quarters of the whites who applied during the same period had been registered. These findings were amply supported by the members of the Negro community we talked with and their accuracy was not challenged by the local officials, although the latter denied that there had been any intention to discriminate against Negroes.

The judge's order requires, among other things, that the registrars discontinue the use of a stiff test on questions of constitutional law which they had been using and that they register at least 100 applicants a day on registration days. The registrars advised us that they intended to comply with Judge Thomas' order. They predicted that, although under Alabama law they are limited to 2 registration days a month between now and July, they would be able to register all the qualified Negroes in Dallas County who might apply within the next 5 months.

Members of the Negro community on the other hand insisted that the pace of registration would fall far short of the need and they predicted that the harassment and delaying tactics of the past would continue. They deplored the fact that the order contained no injunction against the mass arrests that had been taking place. They told us that in their opinion the mass jailings, often under wretched conditions, represent a deliberate tactic of oppression and an effort to isolate the active participants in the civil right fight from the rest of the community.

The local officials characteristically blamed outside agitators for the trouble, and insisted that the demonstrations were not made in good faith and must be suppressed so as to maintain law and order and permit the community to return to normal. The trouble is, of course, that the normal pattern of life in Selma has been one of total segregation in schools, housing, and so forth, and has been one where most Negroes were discouraged from attempting to register by harassing tactics and fear of economic reprisals.

The normal situation, unhappily, has also been one where there has been no meaningful communication between the local officials and the leaders of the Negro community. It was significant—and discouraging—that the local officials indicated no awareness of the damage created by such lack of communication and told us that they did not agree to the setting up of a biracial committee, the type of committee which has been notably successful in other southern counties. It is to be hoped that the local officials will not remain adamant in this position.

It is also to be hoped that the Negro community in Selma will fully put to the test the announced intention of the local officials to obey Judge Thomas' order. If these officials proceed in good faith, and if the Negro leaders will make sure that at least 100 well-qualified Negroes apply for registration on registration days, at least a minimum of progress can be achieved in the coming months.

The good faith of the local officials should also be tested in regard to allowing all who wish to register to record that intention, so that, after July, those not processed can be registered by the Federal referee as the court order provides.

Although there may be ground for hoping that some slight improvement will be achieved in the situation in Dallas County itself, it is important to bear in mind that Dallas County is only one of many counties in Alabama and that in some of these no Negroes at all are on the registration rolls. It is, therefore, abundantly clear to me that there is need for further remedial legislation.

We cannot, in good conscience, sit by and force Negroes in each county in the South to demonstrate, undergo mass arrests and subject themselves to physical and economic distress to pry loose the chance to vote.

It is simply expecting the impossible to expect that the locally appointed registrars in a State such as Alabama will have the necessary decency and desire to be fair, the necessary skill, and—yes—the necessary courage to apply valid tests and procedures in a routine, expeditious manner so that Negroes will have the needed opportunity to register. Moreover, whatever protection of the right to vote is provided will not be adequate if it is limited to Federal elections alone. The right to share in electing State and local officials is essential to achieve the status in a community which flows from the exercise of the franchise.

In his state of the Union address, President Johnson said that his program for the Great Society includes the proposal that "we eliminate every remaining obstacle to the right and the opportunity to vote." He indicated that he would submit a special message on the subjects outlined within 6 weeks. I am hopeful, therefore, that we will shortly receive such a message on the further measures that are needed to assure the right to vote to all our citizens.

In the meantime, I hope that those individuals and organizations interested in achieving this goal will confer and arrive at a consensus as to the next steps which should be taken, both through legislation and through the process of constitutional amendment.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of this body to the recommendations made by a two-thirds majority of the Civil Rights Commission, as long ago as 1961. Those who joined in this recommendation were Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University; Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School; Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, and Hon. Spottswood W. Robinson III, presently a Federal judge. The recommendation, under the heading "Qualifications of Voters," read, at page 139 of the Commission's report on voting, as follows:

> Recommendation I: That Congress, acting under section 2 of the 15th amendment and sections 2 and 5 of the 14th amendment, (a) declare that voter qualifications other than age, residence, confinement, and conviction of a crime are susceptible of use, and have been used, to deny the right to vote on grounds of race and color; and (b) enact legislation providing that all citizens of the United States shall have a right to vote in Federal or State elections which shall not be denied or in any way abridged or interfered with by the United States or by any State for any cause except for inability to meet reasonable age or length-of-residence requirements uniformly applied to all persons within a State, legal confinement at the time of registration or election, or conviction of a felony; such right to vote to include the right to register or otherwise qualify to vote, and to have one's vote counted.

That recommendation, Mr. Speaker, is just as valid today as it was in 1961, and the need for such action is even more urgent.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the U.S. House of Representatives I had not expected to be delivering my first speech after only 1 month. But the recent events in Selma, Ala., have so dramatically illustrated the impossibility in many parts of America for qualified Negro Americans to register and vote that I feel impelled to discuss this issue on the floor of the House today.

As my colleagues know, I went with 14 other Members of the House to Selma last Friday to inquire into the problems there. For my part let me express my great personal gratitude to those 14 colleagues. As one who was active in the struggle for human dignity before being elected to the House, it was particularly gratifying that so many Congressmen, all with busy schedules, would join in this trip on such short notice. Just the fact that 15 U.S. Representatives would go to Selma was a significant declaration to the entire country that this Congress is not going to default in its duty to finally and definitely assure all Americans of the right to vote.

I would like to discuss the legal background of the Selma situation. When we met with the various city and county officials last Friday, their recurring theme was a pledge to faithfully abide by Judge Thomas' decision of only the night before. Surely it is only fair to look into recent history to see if this is a new situation. As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record."

The suit on which Judge Thomas handed down his decision Thursday afternoon is certainly not a new one since it was originally filed on April 13, 1961; nearly 4 years ago. Its history has been one of delays. Judicial consideration is often a very time consuming process.

After this long delay one cannot be surprised if the Dallas County Voters League wonders if their rights have finally been secured. History has repeatedly demonstrated that voter registration cases have usually required long and arduous labor before even partial success could be achieved. Also local officials never appear to lack the ingenuity nor the pretexts for devising new roadblocks. At each stage of the case when restrictions on the right to vote were struck down, the State and local governments have devised new restrictions.

Of course, there is the further problem of harassment by the local law enforcement and judicial officials and the community at large. It is not just recently that Sheriff Jim Clark has begun to interfere with American citizens claiming their right to vote. For a long time he has arrested Negro Americans striving to achieve their basic rights on such pretexts as vagrancy, breach of the peace, and lack of parade licenses. The Justice Department has filed five different cases since June 26, 1963, against the law enforcement and judicial officials of Dallas County, against private groups such as the Dallas County White Citizens Council, and against local businessmen for acts which "threaten, intimidate, and coerce Negro citizens so as to interfere with the rights of Negroes to register and vote and to use public accommodations on an equal basis with white persons."

Since all five of these attempts by the Federal Government to enforce the Federal civil rights laws have been delayed in the courts, it is no wonder that the local officials have continued to blatantly defy Federal authority. The Dallas County Courthouse where Sheriff Clark has so far continued to arrest hundreds of people protesting this intolerable situation is directly across the street from the Federal building. I noted with great interest that the local Federal Bureau of Investigation agents and the local U.S. attorney's staff can look directly out their window on Sheriff Clark's activities. Since present laws seems to offer little relief to these beleaguered Negro American citizens, they have had to take to the streets to implement their constitutional right to petition for a redress of grievances.

Mr. Speaker, before the congressional delegation left for Selma we stated our purpose—"to try to get a fair and honest picture from all sides of what the true situation is in Selma," and "We are going to Selma to learn and listen." I am proud of the fact that we did everything in our power to live up to that pledge of fairness. We met with the local elected officials, some of our Alabama colleagues, Dr. Martin Luther King, and many Negro Americans in Selma who have been fighting to secure their right to vote. We are all very appreciative of the courtesies extended to us.

For myself, I can say that Selma is no different nor worse than a great many other parts of the United States. There are countless areas throughout America where the rights to "life, liberty, and property," "the equal protection of the laws," and a "republican form of government"—rights all specifically guaranteed by the Federal Constitution to the State governments—are denied to Negro Americans because they are excluded from the vote. Both the State and local officials and the general community have joined in devising means, both blatant and devious, to contravene the orders of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the National Government which supposedly are absolute guarantees of the right to vote. In such a situation I can see no alternative but to have the Federal Government take a much more positive and specific role in guaranteeing the right to register and vote in all elections, including State and local elections, in all parts of America. I can see no other way for the Federal Government to assure that every American is finally assured of his inalienable rights.

Since coming to the Nation's Capital I have been disturbed by the repeated statements that Congress made a great step forward last year in the struggle for human dignity, but that now we must delay any further steps forward. Progress was certainly made last year. But surely this Government cannot relax if even one single American is arbitrarily denied that most basic right of all in a democracy—the right to vote. I was extremely heartened by President Johnson's pledge in his state of the Union address on the opening day of Congress in which he said:

> I propose that we eliminate every remaining obstacle to the right and opportunity to vote.

He stated further:

> In the next 6 weeks I will submit special messages with detailed proposals in each of these areas.

I most respectfully point out the President's deadline expires on this coming Monday, February 15, 1965. I look forward to seeing his proposal.

In the state of the Union address, President Johnson stated most eloquently, I believe, the attitude that characterized the beliefs of all of us who went to Selma, those who supported our going and, surely, of every Member of this body:

> Justice requires us to remember that when any citizen denies his fellow, saying "his color is not mine," or "his beliefs are strange and different," in that moment he betrays America, though his forebears created this Nation.

This was not my first trip to Selma. In the summer of 1963 I was in Selma during similar civil rights efforts. The change in Selma is great—unfortunately not due to any dramatic increases in the number of people who can vote but by the new determination of the Negro community not to wait any longer for the right to vote. This change in attitude is largely due to the wonderful work of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference which has been so effectively supported by the Legal Defense Fund, Inc., of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

I would like to share with my colleagues some of the conversations we had in Selma last Friday.

First with a 44-year-old man who has lived in Selma for 15 years:

> Question. You have tried to register before?
>
> Answer. Yes, all summer.
>
> Question. What is your attitude about registering again?
>
> Answer. I'll try as long as they have a registering office.
>
> Question. Do you feel that you have been intimidated by what has happened? Does it frighten you about possibly going through that again?
>
> Answer. It frightened me. I don't think if a person don't be afraid of Jim Clark he ain't got good sense. I'm just going to anyway and ask the Lord for strength and courage.

And then with a World War II Navy veteran:

> Question. Why didn't you try to register in 1962?
>
> Answer. I was afraid. I had been warned by some older Negro citizens if you try, you might be whipped.
>
> Question. Well then, why did you get courage in 1963?
>
> Answer. Because I felt more strong with others with me.
>
> Question. Did you feel it was important to register?
>
> Answer. Yes.

During this last week there have been some very good articles and editorials in the press about the Selma situation. Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD at this point a Washington Post editorial of Saturday, February 6, 1963:

TROUBLE IN ALABAMA

> Before condemning the Reverend Martin Luther King and his followers for breaking a law in Selma, Ala., one needs to consider the law that was broken and the reasons for breaking it. Dr. King and 263 adults were arrested on charges of parading without a permit. Whether the Selma ordinance requiring a permit for a parade is constitutionally valid—and whether the marchers were, in fact, parading or merely, as Dr. King put it, "walking down to the courthouse"—are matters which courts will have to decide. There is no doubt, however, that Dr. King deliberately defied duly constituted authority in Selma—a serious responsibility for any citizen.
>
> Dr. King is not a lawless or irresponsible man, and his defiance of authority in Selma was certainly not selfishly motivated or recklessly undertaken. He wants to enable Negroes to register and vote in Selma. It is

an indisputable fact that Alabama's voter-registration requirements are rigged to discriminate against Negroes; and in Selma particularly, difficult literacy tests and slow procedures have been employed by registrars to keep Negroes from exercising their rights as citizens.

It was against this pattern of discrimination that Dr. King was protesting. If the demonstration he led violated a local ordinance, it was, nevertheless, orderly, peaceful and dignified. No one can charge him with violence or rioting or endangering property rights or public safety in any way.

Is his conduct, then, morally justifiable? Is it right for a minister of religion to lead followers in such a defiance of duly constituted authority? We think so. We have no doubt that the Reverend Martin Luther King, released on bond yesterday from the Selma jail, is as much at peace with his conscience as Martin Luther himself was when he nailed his 95 Theses on the door of the castle church at Wittenberg 450 years ago in defiance of clerical and secular authority.

It is a social evil that Dr. King is attacking. And he is attacking it by the one method which has proved genuinely effective in recent years. His defiance of authority and his imprisonment focused the attention of Selma, Ala., and of the whole Nation, on the evil that persists in that southern city. It evoked the "indignation" which President Johnson expressed at his news conference on Thursday and which he said all Americans should feel "when one American is denied the right to vote."

If Dr. King has broken the law in Alabama, he has done it to make known the ancient pattern of lawbreaking which has taken place there. "If Negroes could vote," he declared, "there would be no oppressive poverty directed against Negroes, our children would not be crippled by segregated schools, and the whole community might live together in harmony." If Negroes could vote, in short, they could break the chains that bind them to misery; if they were given political responsibility, they could be held responsible for their own condition. If they could vote, they would have no need to demonstrate in demand of so basic a right. Denial of that right to vote has denied them their lawful remedy.

Alabama cannot silence Dr. King and his followers by putting them in prison. It can only make the echoes of their protest reverberate more resoundingly. Dr. King and his followers can be silenced only by giving them their rights as Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD at this point a New York Times article of Saturday, February 6, 1965:

NEGRO GOALS IN SELMA—DEMONSTRATIONS PROTEST A LONG HISTORY OF OPPRESSION, NOT JUST VOTING CURBS

(By John Herbers)

SELMA, ALA., February 5.—The old man was incredulous. As one who was brought up in the Deep South around the turn of the century, he doubted the propriety of Negroes making demands in the first place.

But there they were, a bunch of kids too young to vote, getting themselves arrested while demanding to see a registrar who they knew was not there about an issue that was being resolved in the courts anyway. "What do they want," the man asked in complete candor.

Many who have been sympathetic to the Negro movement have begun to ask the same thing.

In its broadest sense, the movement led by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in the Alabama "Black Belt" is not so much a protest against barriers to voting as it is an uprising against the oppression and injustices that have existed in communities like Selma since the black man was brought from Africa.

HOPE TO STIR CONSCIENCE

The maid who boycotted Miss Ann's kitchen for a week and the teenagers who stayed away from school understand this, even if the white man cannot. They do not know where the movement is taking them but they believe that, whatever the direction, they are headed for a better life.

The nonviolent movement as defined by Dr. King calls for civil disobedience by masses of the oppressed in order to bring to the surface the violence of the oppressor. The oppressed plague the oppressor by filling the jails and keeping him disturbed with harassing demonstrations.

"We're going to turn Selma upside down and inside out in order to make it right-side up," Dr. King said before he went to jail Monday.

According to the theory of nonviolence, the national conscience will be aroused, the local white man will be conscience-striken and the oppressed will gain a measure of freedom. In the past, the practical effect, however, has been that the white man, like Pharaoh, has promised the black man his freedom, not out of a change of heart but in order to get rid of the plague.

A SYMBOL OF OPPRESSION

Dr. King and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference carefully choose the cities where a large nonviolent movement was to be staged. Selma seemed a logical place because Negroes have been barred from voting since Reconstruction and because Dallas has a sheriff, James G. Clark, who is a symbol of oppression to Negroes.

There is a story around town that small Negro boys play a game called "Jim Clark and Negro"—"I'll be Jim Clark, you be the Negro. I'll hit you on the head, you fall down."

But even cities like Selma have become more sophisticated about race relations. A number of influential citizens in town decided they would do everything possible to avoid arresting Dr. King and his nonviolent army in the hope that they would become discouraged and go away. Pressure was put on Sheriff Clark to cooperate.

For a while the tactic of restraint worked. Dr. King's arrest was at least 2 weeks behind schedule, according to a blueprint his organization drew up before the first of the year.

Observers here detect something in the white law-enforcement officers, however, that compels the officers to confront the demonstrators. The officers always seem to these observers to be out in larger numbers than needed, in riot helmets, with an assortment of nightsticks, electric cattleprods and guns hanging from their belts like so many pendants.

Although he has been under a Federal court injunction, Sheriff Clark has always been on hand to direct the defense of the courthouse personally.

In the fourth week of the campaign, after considerable provocation, the Negroes succeeded in getting themselves arrested in large numbers. They filled up the jails and several work camps in the area.

President Johnson publicly commented on the situation. The white community began to feel the pressure. They feared the movement might spread throughout the Black Belt.

Then a Federal court handed down an order that should go a long way toward opening the registration books to Negroes. The registration board was ordered to stop using a literacy test set up by the State supreme court, to process at least 100 applications each day it sat, and to refrain from failing applicants on technicalities.

The initial reaction of civil rights leaders was not one of jubilation but of disappointment.

Some gave the impression that they were upset that the order came when it did. It was coming anyway, and they knew it. As it was, it had the effect of taking steam out of the campaign, which had been nurtured so carefully to maturity.

The object of the campaign, then, went beyond the issue of voting. "The thing is," said the Reverend Andrew Young, an assistant to Dr. King, "that the court order does nothing about Jim Clark."

What the Negroes had hoped for was more Federal pressure and increased harassment of the local white men until something more was done. Just what had never been defined.

Dr. King walked out of jail today and called for more demonstrations. This kind of campaign has aroused concern among whites that goes beyond reluctance to yield to change. It is that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was supposed to have taken the civil rights struggle out of the streets and into the courts.

In Selma, it is still in the streets.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am glad to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes when a northerner speaks of civil rights in the South, he is taken to task because it is well known that Negroes suffer from discrimination in the North. However that is social discrimination. In the North, Negroes lack social rights. But in some areas of the country they lack not only social rights, but civil rights also.

The law cannot restore social rights, but it can restore civil rights. That is why in this Chamber we can address ourselves to the lack of civil rights in certain areas.

So a number of us Congressmen went to Selma, Ala., on February 5. What did we find?

We found a city divided about equally between white and colored, about 15,000 of each and it is well understood that roughly 9,500 of the whites are registered to vote, but only 350 or so Negroes.

The city of Selma was divided by more than mere numbers of people of different races. It was divided by philosophy and outlook.

Through the courtesy of our congressional colleagues who represent the State of Alabama, we were enabled to obtain the thinking of the white community which contains all of Selma's officialdom. Through the help of a number of Negro leaders, we were able to find out the views and attitudes of their half of the community.

The white community was tense. While our group undertook to be impartial in our approach, I believe that the white officials were looking on our visit as a challenge to their order. To them, it well may be that we seemed to be saying, "You have been wrong in your way of life, and so were your fathers and grandfathers." This would be difficult for them to entertain. If right in my interpretation, I must have sympathy for their problem.

Unlike the white, the Negro community seemed relaxed and hopeful. These days are perhaps the first they can ever remember that contained any prospect of lifting their chains. They were philosophical about their hurts—and little anger. They asked the Lord "to communicate with Jim Clark" the sheriff.

High school youngsters told me that in the nights when they were held, they slept on the floor without blankets, girls on one side of the room and boys on the other.

Grownup Negroes said much the same, except that each was given a blanket. When arrested, they related that cattle prods were sometimes used against them. They were required to stand for as much as 3 hours while under arrest. Their pocketbooks were ransacked by the police and articles appropriated. They were prodded with police sticks, so they said.

While the foregoing is heresay, and I do not have signed depositions, nevertheless, I believe that much of it is true, because I overheard the Negro people telling one another the same things when I visited them at the Brown Chapel in Selma. Although neither side wants violence the danger of it always exists.

I suppose, that Selma authorities could ask, what else can we do to maintain law and order.

The answer is you have no alternative until you have granted the right to vote to all citizens of your community.

Finally, a convincing argument can be offered that what happens in Selma, in Alabama, and any place in the United States where civil rights are abridged, is my business and your business. The actions in Selma are darkening the image of our country abroad. They could be a reason for the uncommitted nations, the African nations, the nations that contain nearly 2 million colored people, and half of the world population, to recoil from friendship with the United States. Perhaps they will embrace an ideology hostile to ours.

Perhaps they will say that America is not the land of the free.

Perhaps they will say that what we call the free world is not free.

This is a problem not only for our generation, but it is one that may well sow discord which our children will have to face.

It does seem to be the business of all Americans to protect our image abroad and our historic promises of freedom at home.

If the task cannot be done in the cities and States, where civil rights are abridged, then it will have to be done by further Federal legislation. Many Congressmen will address themselves to this task. We will have recommendations ready if the civil rights to register and vote are not granted equally to all Americans everywhere.

HOLD YOUR HATS, KIDS, HERE WE GO AGAIN

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, several incredulous constituents of mine have sent me newspaper articles detailing the efforts by New Jersey of antipoverty bureaucrats to raise the per capita income level of the State. With the President's admonition to "reason together" firmly in mind, no doubt, these antipoverty administrators have reasoned together that the best place to start fighting their war would be in their own bank accounts. They have proceeded to budget themselves salaries that are higher than those being paid other officials on a State or local level.

For example, the director of the program is paid $25,000 a year, more than any State cabinet officer, and his assistant receives $19,000 a year, $3,000 more than the head of the department of motor vehicles. In Newark, antipoverty officials are complaining that they did not receive all of the $567,000 for salaries that included a director's salary of $23,000, which is more than a superior court judge earns. The deputy's salary of $18,000 would have been more than that paid a chief of police and the director of public works department. In Newark, out of 93 staff members, 26 would receive more than $10,000 apiece, if antipoverty officials had their way. And we are told by the State deputy director that these salaries are not out of line with those paid in other areas of the State.

With all this money, vacancies are nevertheless occurring in the State offices, as former employees move on to higher paying local jobs on the strength of their experience in a program that has yet to get off the ground for those truly in need. This is all being paid for out of Federal tax funds.

Now I recognize that the job of using an antipoverty official is a difficult one. For example, as the State director has pointed out, there is the problem of finding poverty. In one of my counties, officials of several towns declared poverty stricken were less than delighted at the designation, since their own statistics indicated nothing of the sort. Finding ways to spend all of that antipoverty money obviously takes a good deal of initiative. Perhaps these New Jersey officials will receive the recognition they deserve for discovering so quickly such willing recipients right in their own backyards.

The articles from the Hackensack, N.J. Record of January 27, 1965, and the Newark Evening News of February 3, 1965, follow:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Feb. 3, 1965]

PRUDENT CUTBACK

Some members of the board of trustees of the United Community Corp., the agency created to coordinate antipoverty programs in Newark, are unhappy because the Federal Government cut its budget.

UCC asked for $878,000 for its first year, including $567,000 for salaries. The Government pared this to $204,000, including $20,000 in local funds.

The complaining trustees blame politics for the drastic cutback and curtailment of Newark's war on poverty.

Not politics but prudence, it would seem, dictated the cutback. It suggested that even in Washington dollars are not unlimited. And what has been curtailed is not the city's war on poverty but a payroll in excess of half a million dollars for an organization not yet in business.

Included in the UCC budget was $23,000 a year for a project director and $18,000 for his assistant. Of 93 proposed staff members, 26 were down for $10,000 or more. And all of this was in addition to the payrolls of five projects, underway or planned, each headed by a director at $10,000 to $14,500.

How far out of line is the UCC salary scale becomes evident when the director's $23,000 and the assistant's $18,000 are compared with the $15,000 paid the city's director of public works and its chief of police, with the mayor's salary of $25,000, with the $22,500 paid superior court judges.

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, Jan. 27, 1965]

WAGES ARE FINE FOR ANTIPOVERTY: JERSEY STAFF DESIGNATED TO HELP NEEDY IS IN NO DANGER OF STARVATION

(By James F. Ahearn)

TRENTON.—New Jersey antipoverty staff workers have begun their mission close to home, by approving salaries for themselves regarded as lush by other State employees.

The director of the program, John C. Bullitt, draws $25,000 a year, more than any State cabinet officer. His deputy gets $19,000, or $3,000 more than the motor vehicles division director.

A check of payroll records yesterday turned up three more antipoverty positions paying $11,000 or better, and another two posts paying $9,500.

The salaries place no burden on the State budget, since the Federal government has put up the money to foot the bill.

Solid information and unfounded rumors about job opportunities in the new program have become a prime topic in statehouse scuttlebutt.

Some of the facts are:

1. Bernard Fulton, Jr., director of community assistance, is paid $16,500.

2. Paul Gary Tuerff until recently was paid $11,500 a year as chief of research and information. He quit to become director of the Atlantic City antipoverty program.

3. Rodney Mott was paid $11,000 a year as senior community field representative. He has been named director of the Monmouth County program.

4. Gregory Farrell has been getting $9,500 as senior community field representative. His appointment as director of the Trenton municipal program, at a salary of $12,500, was announced Sunday.

Bullitt commented ruefully at a news conference last week that the State office was turning into an incubator for local antipoverty executives.

A member of the office said applicants for the posts held by Tueriff, Mott, and Farrell were being interviewed.

The other $9,500 job is held by Mrs. Pauline Callahan, former Jill-of-all-trades with the now defunct tercentenary commission.

Two secretaries on the antipoverty staff are paid $6,874 and $6,366 respectively. These are not excessive salaries, but they are higher than the State average for such jobs.

Attention was drawn to the antipoverty pay scales last week with the disclosure that officials in Paterson were thinking of recommending a pay range of $17,000 to $20,000 a year for that city's antipoverty director.

Mayor Frank X. Graves' salary is $17,500. Sterns said the Paterson proposal was not out of line with salaries being paid elsewhere in the State.

DISASTER INSURANCE BILL

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today I am filing legislation calling for a study of the role of the Federal Government in the financing of assistance to victims of natural disasters. The bill provides for a review of existing insurance programs by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. That agency will then make its recommendations to the Congress.

In the past few months alone, many areas of our country have been subjected to severe natural disasters. Frequently, the greatest devastation is caused by the flooding of inhabited areas. Not only homes but industrial and business establishments have been destroyed by the thousands. Valuable possessions representing the life savings of our citizens have been irrevocably lost. For many, the prospect of trying to rebuild is insurmountable.

I know personally the losses that were experienced by many residents of my district as a result of hurricanes and accompanying tidal waves that have hit southeastern Massachusetts. In my memory major tropical storms struck this area in 1938, 1944, 1954, and 1955. In each of these years, there were extensive losses of life and property. Even when an insurer can be found—which is rarely—the cost of insuring against some of these losses is prohibitive.

In 1956, the staff of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee prepared a study on natural disasters in the United States. I have selected certain years from a table included in that study to give my colleagues an indication of the extent to which hurricanes can wreak havoc on human life and property:

	Estimated damage
1938 (600 lives lost)	$300, 245, 000
1944 (64 lives lost)	165, 010, 000
1954 (193 lives lost)	755, 472, 500
1955 (231 lives lost)	1, 776, 120, 000

I would remind my colleagues that these figures relate only to losses from tropical storms on the Atlantic and gulf coasts. Losses from other disasters such as tornadoes and earthquakes would multiply these figures many times.

In the 84th Congress a great deal of consideration was given to the problem of natural disaster insurance. The 85th Congress passed the Federal Flood Insurance Act (42 U.S.C. 2401), but there have never been any appropriations made to fund the program.

We are now in the 89th Congress and we still do not have an effective coordinated approach dealing with the problem. The Federal Government has been proceeding on an ad hoc basis, providing assistance when needed—frequently after the Congress, on an emergency basis, has enacted legislation to deal with the immediate disaster.

In my opinion, this problem has been left in limbo long enough. The Government, in cooperation with the private insurance industry, can surely find a way to protect these citizens. These two forces, working together, can I am sure, come up with a solution that will strengthen our free enterprise society and protect the Nation against the unforeseen ravaging of its resources by natural disasters.

NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE DEPLORES VA CUTBACKS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Senate of New Hampshire, like the New Hampshire House of Representatives, has formally protested the cutbacks in hospitals and regional offices which are planned by the Veterans' Administration. The impact of this harsh announcement on the community is well reflected in the State senate's resolution. As one who had the honor of serving in that body for 12 years, I know very well how well the senate reflects the feeling of the people at home. Our State legislators are, after all, closest to the people and are in the best position to know their sentiments and wishes. I am pleased to submit the senate's resolution for the RECORD, as I did recently with a similar resolution adopted by the New Hampshire House of Representatives, and to reiterate my own strong endorsement of this position taken now by both houses of the New Hampshire General Court:

RESOLUTION ON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has ordered and proposed in the near future to centralize veterans' services in Boston and for the purposes thereof to cutback such services at Manchester, N.H. and White River Junction, Vt.; and

Whereas such two places have been the only offices within our area where the veterans in the State of New Hampshire have received such services; and

Whereas it has been the inevitable result of such cutback and centralization that subsequently the area offices are phased out completely; and

Whereas if veterans in the State of New Hampshire are required to communicate or travel only to Boston to receive services, it would create a material hardship on them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the General Court of New Hampshire strongly protest and deplore this proposed action by the Veterans' Administration which can only result in poorer service and greater inconvenience to the veterans of this State, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the Veterans' Administration and to all of New Hampshire's Senators and Representatives in Congress.

DOROTHY GREEN,
Sponsor.
STEWART LAMPREY,
President of the Senate.
BENJAMIN F. GREER,
Clerk of the Senate.

CONTROL OF DANGEROUS DRUGS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, since the widespread abuse of dangerous drugs such as the barbiturates and amphetamines, popularly known as "goof balls" and "pep pills," has become a matter of growing alarm throughout the country, it is highly encouraging to note that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has now completed hearings on the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965.

As a sponsor since 1962 of legislation designed to prevent the wholesale movement of these dangerous drugs into the black market, and thence into the hands of vulnerable teenagers, I welcome this further evidence of the committee's determination to deal expeditiously with this very serious situation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the statement which I presented to the committee last week:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FLORENCE P. DWYER, OF NEW JERSEY, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN SUPPORT OF THE DRUG ABUSE CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to express my views to this committee on the urgent need to enact the legislation you are now considering, the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965.

As a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the chairman this year and as a sponsor of similar legislation in the 87th and 88th Congresses, I am deeply grateful that this committee has given to the drug control bill the high priority evidenced by these early hearings.

Almost daily, Mr. Chairman, and in almost any newspaper, we can read about the devastating effects of the easy availability of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other dangerous drugs—crimes of violence and depravity, widespread delinquency among the young, increased traffic accidents, the graduation into addiction to the hard narcotics, the ruined lives of countless individuals, the misery, and heartbreak and dislocation of innocent and helpless families.

The evidence is overwhelming. Local law enforcement agencies in my own State and in other highly populated areas of the country report an alarming spread in the abuse of the stimulant and depressant drugs, especially among teenagers and in middle and upper-middle-class neighborhoods where drug addiction previously has not been a major problem.

In reports to the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee in the Senate, the New York City Police Department said that dangerous drug arrests and drug seizures during the first 11 months of 1964 increased by as much as 393 percent in some categories over the same period in 1963; and the California attorney general cited a 75-percent increase in dangerous drug arrests from 1960 to 1963.

In the town of Seaside Heights, N.J., arrests for disorderly conduct, stimulated principally by dangerous drugs, increased 500 percent since 1960. Dangerous drug arrests in

Chicago increased by 65 percent from 1963 to 1964; in Baltimore by 60 percent. Arrests of teenagers in Los Angeles for misuse of amphetamines and barbiturates grew from 50 in 1958 to 321 in 1964. In the Oklahoma City area, a 6-month survey recently identified 2,500 pill takers as opposed to a few dozen narcotics addicts.

I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman. The facts and figures are extensive and depressing, but more than that they reveal an unmistakable and startling upward trend both in the rate of addiction and in the rate of crime and other antisocial behavior directly related to drug abuse—and among the groups in our population to which we like to look most hopefully.

Just as the nature and extent of the evil are known and acknowledged, so, too, is the reason why. You cannot have growing addiction to dangerous drugs unless those drugs are readily available. The Food and Drug Administration has estimated that about one-half of the approximately 10 billion amphetamines and barbiturates annually produced by legitimate manufacturers end up in the black market—and these figures presumably do not include other, equally dangerous, stimulant and depressant drugs nor drugs manufactured illegally.

Attracted by the immense profit potential of a racket where pills can be bought for one-tenth of a cent and resold for 10 to 25 cents apiece, organized criminal rings have begun to move into the illicit drug field in a big way, according to the FDA. As an example, Baltimore police broke up one major pill ring after a woman sold undercover agents 200,000 pills during a 7-month period. Nationally, this vicious racket is netting upward of $500 million a year.

How could this happen? Undoubtedly, there are many methods used to avoid the legal requirement that dangerous drugs be dispensed only by prescription. But one such method—the ridiculously easy direct purchase of wholesale quantities of the drugs by unlicensed, unregistered distributors—may help explain why the problem has become so severe.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, CBS television news inaugurated its factfinding unit with a report on the dangerous drug menace to demonstrate the frightening ease with which these drugs can be procured. The unit's producer-investigator formed a dummy company, rented a tiny office, printed a few letterheads, contacted 51 drug firms, placed orders for amphetamines and barbiturates with 19 of the companies, and received deliveries on 47 percent of the orders from companies in 8 States, none of which bothered to check on the legitimacy of the operation.

For a total cost of $600.28, this fly-by-night operation, which could be duplicated by anyone, obtained 1,075,000 pills valued on the black market at $250,000 to $500,000.

Another channel for illicit trade in the dangerous drugs is the export market, especially to Mexico. The pills, a significant amount of which are manufactured in the United States, are shipped legally to outlets in Mexican border towns and then resold for the purpose of being smuggled back into the United States for sale on the black market.

Counterfeiting has become a further source of illegal drugs. Counterfeiters, who require only a tablet-making or capsule-filling machine and a garage or empty warehouse to be in business, have become so accomplished that industry experts often find it nearly impossible to distinguish fakes from the genuine article.

In the face of this growing tide of illegal traffic in dangerous drugs, the drug industry and Federal, State, and local law-enforcement agencies have been virtually helpless in attempting to control the situation. Some individual drug companies have taken extraordinary precautions to prevent their products from getting into the black market, but they have been unable to control other, less responsible companies or to control effectively every step in the distribution process from manufacturer to consumer. While some States have strict licensing requirements, others do not. State and local authorities have little or no power to get to the sources of supply. And the Food and Drug Administration, under present law, possesses only very limited enforcement and inspection authority, especially when confronted with the difficulty of determining the origin of particular drugs and establishing whether they have been shipped in interstate commerce.

The present bill, Mr. Chairman, would help plug up these big holes in the regulatory scheme of things by means of which the illicit drug trade has been allowed to flourish, and it would provide the means for a concerted attack against the evil at all levels. The bill would require all manufacturers, compounders, and processors of the stimulant and depressant drugs to register with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to keep records of the quantities of the drugs they handle and the names of those from whom they receive the drugs and to whom they distribute them. Wholesalers, jobbers, distributors, carriers, and sellers of the drugs would also be required to keep such records. All such records would be available for inspection as would the facilities and establishments involved in the distribution of the drugs. Possession of the drugs by unauthorized persons would be prohibited.

The bill would also tighten regulations prohibiting the counterfeiting of drugs and would provide for more effective enforcement.

The penalties included in the bill are aimed especially at those who sell or otherwise supply dangerous drugs to persons under 18 years of age.

I find it particularly encouraging, Mr. Chairman, that there is almost unanimous agreement among those most concerned about the purposes and objectives of this legislation. While there are certain differences of opinion among members of the drug industry about the scope of the bill, these differences can certainly be resolved. Retail druggists, who expressed concern about recordkeeping and inspection requirements in previous versions of the legislation, will find that the present bill involves little more than an extension of existing requirements for maintaining records of prescriptions. Anything less than this would, I believe, seriously jeopardize the objectives of the bill.

As the committee knows, the legislation has also been endorsed by the President, who specifically requested approval of the measure in his health message, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other departments of the Government, by State and local law-enforcement agencies, and by individuals and organizations in the field of juvenile delinquency, among many others.

Before concluding this statement, Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to a problem which the committee's hearings have revealed with regard to the drugs covered by the bill. Although the bill automatically subjects to regulation the barbiturates and the amphetamines there are a number of other drugs which have similar properties and effects, which are known to be subject to the same abuse and to be equally dangerous, and which in some instances are directly competitive with the barbiturates and amphetamines. In the case of these nonbarbiturates and nonamphetamines, however, the provisions of the bill would not take effect automatically and could not become effective until the specified administrative procedures had been completed. In the meantime, manufacturers of the regulated drugs would be placed under a severe competitive disadvantage, and a known public health hazard would be permitted to continue unchecked.

I would hope that the committee, in considering the form in which the legislation may be reported, could agree on language covering all stimulant and depressant drugs which are substantially involved in drug abuse and make them subject to the bill's provisions in the same way and at the same time. It should be noted that the bill already provides a way of taking care of the converse problem, that of exempting those drugs which, even though they may technically qualify as barbiturates and amphetamines, contain so small an amount of the substance that the resultant compound is not subject to abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the committee's willingness to consider my views on this vital legislation, and I am grateful for the committee's determination to act expeditiously in meeting the grave threat to our Nation's welfare which is posed by the uncontrolled abuse of dangerous drugs.

SOLVING URBAN AREA PROBLEMS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in the February 8, 1965, issue of the Washington Daily News, Mr. Bruce Biossat, a well-known and nationally syndicated columnist, summarized the work of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in the crucial field of urban area problems.

As Mr. Biossat points out, the increasing concentration of our population in a relatively few huge urban complexes, with the difficult and interrelated problems which such urban complexes inevitably cause, may well be today's and tomorrow's most urgent national concern.

Congress has an important role, in cooperation with States and local communities, in attacking these problems in a coordinated and effective way. The Advisory Commission, on which I am privileged to represent the House together with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], has recommended ways in which all levels of government can achieve the desired coordination. I recommend Mr. Biossat's article to our colleagues, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include it herewith:

STATES CHART WAY TO RELIEVE URBAN AREAS

(By Bruce Biossat)

The 50 States have in hand some advisory proposals which are intended to help them set their urban areas on a better course.

The proposals are part of a suggested 1965 State legislative program advanced by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a permanent bipartisan body set up by Congress and made up of Governors, State legislators, county officials, mayors, Members of Congress and the U.S. executive branch.

Anything reasonably inventive in this field deserves a good look, since the country's major urban complexes are awash in difficulties that seem only to grow greater as the areas swell in size.

Soon 75 percent of the American people will be living in less than 200 of these complexes—and their problems simply have to top any responsible public agenda.

Furthermore, it is in these areas—and the States which legally are their masters—where the really big new spending is going on today.

In fiscal 1965 U.S., State, and local governments will be spending an estimated $75.2 billion in direct outlays, an increase of more than $5 billion over the $69.8 billion preliminary total for fiscal 1964. That figure in turn is $5 billion higher than 1963.

Just 10 years ago, total State-local expenditures came to but $33.7 billion, so they have more than doubled in a decade.

Today's staggering figures include a heavy tax for waste and confusion. Much urban growth is haphazard, uncoordinated, amounting nearly to self-strangulation.

With education needs bulking large, local-State government costs may double again in half a decade. There seems great point in reducing the tax for waste.

Here the Advisory Commission's proposals come into play.

They include several pieces of permissive legislation that would allow such matters as mass transportation, control of urban water supply and sewerage systems, and the securing and preserving of open spaces to be dealt with on a coordinated footing.

They would also authorize metropolitan study and area planning commissions, regulation of planning, zoning, and subdivision in land beyond corporate boundaries, and the setting up of so-called "metropolitan service corporations," which could perform a variety of areawide functions.

This last envisions an agency which could operate on a broad scale the way more limited traffic, housing, and other other authorities do today.

It is a severe testing time for those (Republicans particularly) who argue that things are done best at the State and local level. This would appear to be the moment, above all in history, for this notion to be demonstrated to the fullest.

Unquestionably the huge urban clusters are today's and tomorrow's battle areas. But enlistment in the combat goes hard.

Militant conservatives, while talking the State-local game, would much rather take a few dramatic swipes at the United Nations than try to coordinate a sewerage system.

CIVIL DEFENSE SHELTER LOCATOR SYSTEM

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Union County, N.J., Civil Defense-Disaster Control Organization, headed by Col. Charles J. Christian, coordinator, and Jack R. Karel, M.D., deputy coordinator, has just announced the development of what may be the first shelter locator system in the United States.

Developed by Arthur Guarriello, shelter coordinator of Union Township, which is located in the congressional district I am privileged to represent, the shelter locator system is designed to provide an up-to-date and systematic means of keeping track of present and potential shelter facilities and supplies. The value of such a system, as a way of maximizing the usefulness of a shelter system in the event of an emergency, is obvious.

Since this shelter locator system is, so far as is known, the first of its kind in the United States, I feel certain it will be of interest to many of our colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a description of the system, together with samples of the cards used in the system, which were just published in the February 1965 issue of the Minuteman, the newsletter of the Union County Civil Defense-Disaster Control Organization:

SHELTER LOCATOR SYSTEM

As the national fallout shelter program progresses in all counties throughout the United States, millions of dollars of shelter supplies are being stored in our process of preparedness. It is therefore incumbent upon all directors that an accurate and readily available record of all these supplies and shelter facilities be in the municipal civil defense office. Here in Union County we can foresee that in the very near future we will have $1 million of shelter supplies in emergency storage. Lack of essential shelter information in civil defense offices when needed would make shelter operations very difficult.

The Union County Civil Defense and Disaster Control presents, possibly for the first time in the United States, a shelter locator system developed by Arthur Guarriello, shelter coordinator of Union Township. All shelter information is placed on 3- by 5-inch filing cards except that shown on the inspection sheet and inventory record when a 4- by 6-inch card is used. Both sides of the latter is utilized. This card is taken to the shelter as necessary. Also, a large municipal map is used in the control center. Item F is a legal sized file. Location cards are in 10 colors to correspond with colored areas of municipal maps.

A. LICENSED ALPHABETIZED FACILITIES BY TYPE

1. Schools.
2. Public buildings.
3. Churches.
4. Industry and office buildings.
5. Hotel, restaurant, and recreation.
6. Apartments and multiple story buildings.
7. Private residences.

B. POSSIBLE SITES

1. New buildings under construction.
2. Buildings not surveyed or have not been inspected.
3. Other buildings disapproved and recommendations made for modification.

C. STANDARD LOCATION RECORD CARDS

1. Map and boundary designations: (a) Population, daytime, nighttime, number of spaces in area, number of stocked spaces in area.
2. Facility status: Facilities that are licensed and surveyed. Filed by facility number. Complete history of facility. Stocked or not stocked.
3. Facilities not approved and no potential.

D. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF STREETS

1. Map coordinates.
2. Standard location.

E. MUNICIPAL MAP WITH STANDARD LOCATION CODE AS DESIGNATED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

1. Subareas delineated.
2. Each area showing day and night population.
3. Stocked shelters.
4. Homes-shelters.
5. Shelters not officially approved.
6. Possible shelters.

F. FILE

1. By facility number—each containing all pertinent papers to a specific facility. Inspection sheet and inventory record.
2. By standard location—containing printouts.

Shelter locator system as presented, is now in operation in Union Township.

A

SCHOOLS

Name, location, and facility number	
Franklin	2600
Hamilton	2701
Union High	2702
Jefferson	2800
Connecticut Farms	3002
St. Michael's	3103
Kawameeh	3200
Washington	3400

B

Green Lane.
YM and YWHA.

C–1

Location 02600:

Starting at a point at Stuyvesant Avenue and Hillside Avenue east to the Elizabeth River; south on the river to the parkway; southeast on the parkway to the junction of Vauxhall Road; west on Vauxhall Road to Oakland Avenue to the junction of Stuyvesant Avenue; continue north on Stuyvesant Avenue to the Hillside line:

Daytime population	5460
Nighttime population	5500
Total spaces	235
Total stocked	235

C–3

Facility No. 02601: Stuyvesant Town, Manor Drive, Building No. 2.

PF factor: 1.

Capacity: 10.

C–2

Facility No. 02600: Franklin School, Lindy Terrace.

Capacity: 235. Tonnage: 2183. Cube: 248.

Item:	*Quantity*	*Voucher No.*
Biscuit	27	05375
Drum water	47	05375
Sanitation kit	5	05375
Medical kit A	4	05375

In order to add 945 spaces it would cost $5,670 for ventilating and $5,900 for auxiliary power.

D

Aberdeen Road: Map section 3–M, St. Loc. 00 27.

F FRONT

Inspection sheet and inventory record:
Facility number.
Facility address.
Facility name.
Person to be seen and telephone number.
Daytime population.
Nighttime population.
Number of approved spaces.
Number of nonapproved spaces.
PF factor.
Date shelter marked.
Date shelter licensed.
Date of inspection.
Condition of supplies.
Inventory of supplies.
Date facility stocked.
Sketch of shelter available.
Operational plan available.
Date water drums filled—on dunnage.
Date Radef equipment inspected.

F BACK

Inspection sheet and inventory record:
Shelter manager assigned.
Trained staff—position and number.
Potential increases of spaces.
Medical supplies kept from freezing.
FAMP supplies.
Radef kits in secure areas.

Other emergency equipment available.
Trapped water.
Telephone or jack in shelter.
Auxiliary power.
Emergency lighting.
Level of interest in program.
Remarks.
Date of pack and/or date of expiration should be noted.
Food pack.
Medical supplies.

REVISED PACIFIC NORTHWEST WATER PLAN

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for almost a century the States along the Colorado River, eight in number, have contested for the use of the sparse waters of this river. The contest between Arizona and California has been particularly fierce and has resulted in taking the differences between the States even to the U.S. Supreme Court. This is a historic week for those along the river, for it marks the first time that Members of Congress from both States and both sides of the aisle have introduced measures in the Congress dealing with the problem on which all agree. Yesterday, in the other body the bills were introduced there. Today they are being introduced in this body by Members from Arizona and by 32 Members from California. Of the latter, 22 are Democrats and 10 Republicans, representing about the same percentage of each parties' Congressmen. The nine California Republicans have joined with me on our side of the aisle to introduce these identical bills are: Representatives REINECKE, a colleague on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to which the bills will be referred, and Representatives UTT, BOB WILSON, LIPSCOMB, TEAGUE, SMITH, BELL, TALCOTT, and CLAWSON.

These bills result from an agreement reached at a meeting January 21, 1965, between the Secretary of the Interior, the Senators and Governors of Arizona and California, and several of their Congressmen. Their final language was drafted by representatives of the Interior Department and of the two States. It is approved by the Colorado River Board of California, on which are represented the Metropolitan Water District, the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, San Diego County Water Authority, Imperial Irrigation District, Coachella Valley County Water District, and Palo Verde Irrigation District, believe it is a good bill.

These are its essentials:

First. Investigation of importation projects: Title II authorizes investigations to find sources and plan projects for importation of at least 2.5 million acre-feet into the main stream in the lower basin, but does not authorize their construction. No particular sources are named. The Secretary is to make his report within 3 years.

Second. Protection of California's 4.4 million acre-feet in connection with authorization of the central Arizona project: Title III authorizes construction of the central Arizona project, but section 304 makes this subject to the protection for California that is proposed in the Kuchel bill, S. 294. Thus, if less than 7.5 million acre-feet is available, diversions for the central Arizona project must be so limited as to assure 4.4 million acre-feet for California's existing projects plus water, as well, for existing projects in Arizona and Nevada. This protection will only cease when works are completed which will permanently deliver at least 2.5 million acre-feet annually into the main stream, from sources which the President proclaims can supply this without adverse effect on the water supplies which are required in the States of origin, to satisfy their foreseeable needs. As importation of this quantity of 2.5 million, which offsets the 1.5 million acre-foot Mexican burden and 1 million acre-feet of evaporation losses, assures us, for all practical purposes, against any shortage in the 7.5 million, California is permanently protected against shortage in the 4.4 million, since the protection ends only when the need for it ends. This "cutoff" thus bears no resemblance to the 25-year "cutoff" of the protection of our 4.4 million which was proposed by Arizona last year, and which California water users rejected. That provision would have terminated the protection just when it is needed, if importation of water is delayed.

The imported water is to be made available at Colorado River costs, up to a total of 4.4 million acre-feet in California, 2.8 million in Arizona, 300,000 in Nevada.

If importations make more than 7.5 million acre-feet available, the excess is apportioned, as under the Supreme Court decree, one-half to California, one-half to Arizona and Nevada. This is important to the metropolitan water district. That district, being junior to 3.85 million acre-feet of California's agricultural priorities, would receive only 550,000 acre-feet if California should receive only 4.4 million. For the balance—662,000 acre-feet—of its total Colorado River contract supply—1.212 million—it must look to water available to California in excess of 4.4 million. The bill provides that this excess shall be charged for at actual cost, not at Colorado River prices.

Section 304(a), protecting the 4.4 million, is substantially the amendment drafted by Attorney General Mosk last year. Section 304(b), which continues this protection until 2.5 million annually is imported—the Kuchel formula—was drafted in collaboration with Attorney General Thomas Lynch, of California, and his staff.

Third. Construction of Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams: Title III also authorizes construction of Bridge and Marble Canyon dams and powerplants as "cash registers" to finance repayment of the cost of the whole project, including importation works, when authorized. The Bridge Canyon Dam will be a high dam, backing water about 13 miles into the Grand Canyon National Park. The act of February 26, 1919, 40 Stat. 1175, authorizes this, if it is done in aid of a reclamation project. But the bill requires the lake level to be held within a range of 10 feet in elevation, to the extent practicable. This will enable visitors by boat to see spectacular canyon scenery, now inaccessible, and avoid unsightly lowering of the lake. To avoid any implication that Marble Canyon Dam will be a diversion structure for the Kanab project—which this bill does not authorize—the bill prohibits diversion of water at Bridge or Marble Canyon Dams for use elsewhere. These provisions were asked by people primarily interested in scenic and recreation values. So also with provisions assuring protection of fish and wildlife along the river, including reservation of 84,000 acre-feet—outside California's share of water, however—for these purposes.

Fourth. Protection of areas of origin: Important provisions for protection of areas and States of origin appear in titles II and III. Thus, in section 201(a)(2) the Secretary is directed, in planning works to import water, to "make provision for adequate and equitable protection of the interests of the States and areas of origin, including assistance from the development fund established by title IV of this act, to the end that water supplies may be available for use therein adequate to satisfy their ultimate requirements at prices to users not adversely affected by the exportation of water to the Colorado River system." Section 304(b), which terminates the protection of California's 4.4 million acre-feet when the President proclaims that works capable of delivering annually 2.5 million acre-feet into the river have been completed, stipulates that the proclamation must state "that such sources are adequate, in the President's judgment, to supply such quantities without adverse effect upon the satisfaction of the foreseeable water requirements of any State from which such water is imported into the Colorado River system."

Fifth. Basin account: Title IV creates a basin account—development fund—into which will be paid revenues from Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, and also from Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams after those projects have paid out. Net revenues will be applied to repayment of the cost of the whole project, including the cost of the importation works, when later authorized.

Sixth. "Law of the river": Title V requires the Secretary to conform to the "law of the river," and if he does not do so, grants consent to suit by any affected State in the Supreme Court, joining the United States as a party.

In addition to the points made above:

Both S. 75, Senator HAYDEN's bill, and S. 294, Senator KUCHEL's bill, contained about six points in common: Both authorized the central Arizona project, Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, a basin account, a Regional Planning Commission, consent to suit against the United States, and investigation of the water supply and requirement in the lower basin.

But, in addition, S. 294 included the following provisions, which S. 75, did not, but which are carried over into the new bill:

Investigations of the water requirements are expanded to include the upper basin; the Secretary is instructed to plan to import not less than 2.5 million acre-feet; he is directed to recommend how much of the cost of this importation is to be allocated to the Mexican Water Treaty burden, and written off. Bridge Canyon Lake is to be held to fluctuations of 10 feet, to facilitate navigation by small boats up the spectacular canyons; diversions from Marble Canyon Dam, for other projects, are prohibited to reassure conservation interests that the Kanab project is not inferentially authorized. And, of course, S. 294 contained the protection for California's 4.4 million acre-feet, which S. 75 did not.

S. 294 contained one additional feature which California has reluctantly sacrificed: The conditional authorization of the construction of the importation works. This has been put aside for another day, after the Secretary submits the reports on his investigations.

EASING CREDIT STANDARDS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of February 5, 1965, carried an article detailing the rising concern of bankers over the increasing trend toward riskier loan policies. At a recent credit conference of the American Bankers Association, John J. Gorman Jr., of the Riggs National Bank stated:

> People are lulled by this kind of economy. They all figure: Who can make a mistake when things are going this well?

Riskier lending policies are showing up in lengthening maturities on loans, increasing financing of apartments and office buildings in what are already highly developed areas and loans made to people who are just going into business and have little or no experience.

To focus greater attention on this trend toward a deterioration in the quality of credit and the possible implications for the stability of the economy, I am including the Journal article in the RECORD at this point:

BANKERS WORRY ABOUT RISKIER LOAN TREND, BUT FEW PLAN TO TIGHTEN CREDIT STANDARDS

DALLAS.—Bankers are becoming increasingly concerned about the riskier loans some are making these days. But barring an economic downturn, few see any significant tightening of their credit standards, because intense competition among lenders stands in the way.

This was the summation of interviews with bankers from all parts of the country attending a credit conference here of the American Bankers Association. "People are lulled by this kind of economy," says John J. Gorman, Jr., a vice president of Riggs National Bank, Washington, D.C. "They all figure: Who can make a mistake when things are going this well?"

The lending competition, which bankers say is the fiercest ever, is coming not only from banks' traditional nonbanking rivals, such as insurance companies, finance concerns, and savings and loan associations, but increasingly from the proliferation of new banks and branches of existing banks pushing into the suburbs. New banks have been springing up at a record rate; the ABA says 312 were chartered last year, up from 285 in 1963.

TAKING FLYERS MORE OFTEN

"All this competition causes you to take a flyer more often," says Joseph J. Sbragia, senior vice president of First National Bank of Nevada, Reno.

As examples of riskier bank lending, bankers cite lengthening maturities on loans, increasing financing of apartments and office buildings in areas where there is already concern about overbuilding, and optimistic loans made to persons wanting to start businesses in which they have no experience.

"There's certainly more of an opportunity now to make marginal loans than I can remember at any time in the past," says Charles W. Coffield, president of First National Bank of Bowie, Tex. "Although we'd like to deny it, I think we're all making some of these marignal loans. The farther we get from the disaster of the 1930's, the more inclined we are to loosen up."

In a speech to the conference, K. A. Randall, director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and himself a former commercial banker, warned bankers that unsound lending practices were showing up in some banks. He criticized two lending attitudes. "In the first place," he said, "it's not sound banking to let credit standards be set by a competitive bank, or by a competitive nonbank institution. * * * In the second place, making credit on the basis that continued expansion in the economy, or in an industry, will cover unsound approaches, is a positive danger. No banker should count on the future to bail him out of risky situations."

BACKDROP OF RECENT CLOSINGS

The bankers gave their views against a backdrop of closings late last month of San Francisco National Bank and Brighton National Bank, Brighton, Colo., after they were declared insolvent by U.S. Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon. The closings, coupled with the less conservative lending policies banks have adopted, could shake public faith in the Nation's banking system, according to several bankers.

Bank executives generally believe, also, that the bank failures, which were attributed to a misuse of certificates of deposits, will lead generally to more careful handling of these certificates, especially by smaller banks that issue them. The certificates are receipts for funds deposited with a bank for a specified period.

"These closings mean there will be a pulling back in CD's," says Paul E. Belcher, senior vice president of First National Bank of Akron, Ohio. "More money will go into Government bills or commercial paper rather than into certificates of deposit. And buying of the certificates will be limited to those of the quality banks in the larger cities."

Bankers also noted that the ratio of deposits loaned out has risen sharply during the current business expansion. "Loan ratios are up to the point where they're getting uncomfortable," says Reno Odlin, chairman of Puget Sound National Bank, Tacoma, Wash., who is president of the ABA. "I'm concerned that we ought to be maintaining more liquidity for our depositors in case there's a drop in the economy."

THE THING TO DO

Richard M. Leisman, a former Federal banking examiner and currently senior vice president of Bank of Idaho, Boise, says that bank's loan ratio is about 65 percent. "I would have thought that high enough to be concerned when I first came to the bank 3½ years ago. But now it seems like the thing to do. I remember when no bank would consider 50 percent or even 45 percent a comfortable ratio."

Recent bank failures have prompted moves by two Senate committees in Washington to conduct investigations in the field, although neither inquiry is likely to result in public hearings soon. Chairman PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, of the House Banking Committee, also has charged that racketeers have taken over some banks lock, stock, and barrel. He said he hopes to supply particulars later.

Senator LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, proposed that the Senate Banking Committee, in its investigation, give particular attention to whether banks are maintaining sound credit policies.

There were indications at the ABA conference here that some banks are cutting back on higher risk loans. Voler L. Viles, a vice president of U.S. National Bank, San Diego, Calif., says that last October, "I started pulling in the strings, because we were simply lending too much." He says he began gradually cutting back in the maturities of real estate loans until loan applications started thinning out. "Most of our pressure to make riskier loans has come because of all the branches we've opened in the last year or so," Mr. Viles says. "These new branch managers are reaching for loans, so they can get some business on the books. If an office is crying for business, we might close one eye and take a marginal deal. But generally we're tightening up."

RESULTS OF A POLL OF ECONOMISTS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to some results of a recent survey conducted among 375 college and university economists by the Chase Manhattan Bank's Economic Research Division. In these days of increasing Federal involvement in the economy, it is both gratifying and significant that so many economists take positions on major public issues that deemphasize the role the Federal Government should play in meeting major policy problems.

For example, in response to the question "What is the major reason for our persistent high rate of unemployment?", the report states that "as many as 36 percent said structural problems alone currently constitute the major reason for high unemployment while only 19 percent held inadequate demand to be the major reason." This is in striking contrast to the position of administration economists.

When asked what they thought was the most practicable and effective way of speeding growth and improving economic efficiency, over 55 percent suggested either tax reductions or changes in tax structure, while less than 20 percent advocated increased Federal spending.

Most of those questioned expressed a widespread desire to rely heavily on free market forces. In line with this 12 percent advocated less Government control of business activity while only 1 percent advocate greater control.

Another interesting result in the survey was the slight majority of 52 percent which expressed a desire to see the antitrust laws apply to labor unions.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article describing the survey in the RECORD at this point:

CAMPUS ECONOMISTS COMMENT ON PUBLIC ISSUES

To discover what academic economists think about key public issues such as unemployment, tax cuts, and the war on poverty, the Chase Manhattan's Economic Research Division, for the second consecutive year, mailed questionnaires this December to 500 men and women teaching economics in colleges and universities across the Nation. Of those queried, exactly 375, or 75 percent, completed the form and returned it to us.

Here, in four parts, are the general conclusions taken from their replies: (1) Academic economists worry primarily about unemployment, inadequate growth, and poverty; (2) they show little concern about the possibility of inflationary pressures building up during 1965; (3) they favor further cuts in Federal taxes during the year ahead; and (4) they give widespread support to many of the economic and social innovations now being urged by Government, while at the same time they show considerable interest in preserving the role free market forces play in running the economy.

MOST PRESSING PROBLEMS

The first question asked was: "What do you consider the most pressing economic problem now facing the United States?" Of those who answered, 34 percent said unemployment; 23 percent said inadequate growth; and 17 percent cited poverty.

Many respondents also commented that in their opinion unemployment, slow growth, and poverty are simply different, though thoroughly tangled, aspects of the same problem. Many also remarked that measures designed to solve one problem will help solve the others.

Asked about the reasons for our persistent high unemployment rate, 37 percent replied that inadequate demand and structural problems—such as minimum-wage laws, lack of education, and so on—are equally important. However, almost as many, 36 percent, said structural problems alone currently constitute the major reason for high unemployment, while only 19 percent held inadequate demand alone to be the major reason.

INFLATION, TAXES, AND EFFICIENCY

As for the danger of inflation, 84 percent said they think it is unlikely to be a major problem during 1965. That a great many economists do not consider inflation an immediate threat also shows up in their thinking on tax cuts and on ways to promote economic growth and efficiency. To the question: "Do you favor further Federal tax cuts (beyond those already having legislative approval) during 1965?" over 75 percent said "Yes" with 55 percent of these opting in favor of excise tax cuts and 29 percent favoring further cuts in personal income taxes.

What is the most practicable and effective way of speeding growth and improving economic efficiency? Over 55 percent of all those in our sample suggested either tax reductions or changes in the tax structure while less than 20 percent advocated increased Federal spending.

ECONOMIC INNOVATIONS AND MARKET FORCES

The widespread support for some of the Government's economic programs and proposals showed up in the answers to several questions. Over 85 percent, for instance, said that in general they favor the Federal Government's war on poverty. A majority, although only a slim one, thought the approximately $800 million thus far appropriated for the program provides an adequate beginning. And to the question of how much an effective attack on poverty might cost over the next 10 years, the answers ranged from less than $2 billion to well over $100 billion with a median of from $10 to $15 billion.

Additional support for Government proposals was indicated by answers to the social security questions. More than 80 percent of the respondents voted for the system's expansion, and almost 75 percent of those who favored expansion also favored medicare as the first direction the added benefits should take.

But although strong backing was given some of the newer proposals for economic and social innovation, there is also apparently a widespread desire to rely heavily on free market forces. For example, in response to the inflation question, 77 percent of the economists polled preferred either general monetary or fiscal policies as the best way to contain inflationary pressures if they do develop, as against only 13 percent favoring either selective credit or price controls.

Asked about the most effective way of promoting economic growth and efficiency, 12 percent advocated less Government control of business activity while hardly anyone advocated more control. Also, the suggestion for a Federal system of compulsory arbitration to settle major labor disputes was rejected 74 percent to 26 percent. At the same time, a slight majority of 52 percent voiced a desire to see the Nation's antitrust laws apply to labor unions.

TECHNICAL NOTE

This survey is based on a probability sample drawn from the American Economic Association's 1964 Handbook. Of the 500 teachers asked to participate, exactly 375, representing colleges and universities in 47 States, filled out the questionnaire and returned it.

Owing to a lack of space, this report contains only 8 of the 15 questions posed. If you would like a copy of the complete results, just drop us a note requesting it.

Highlights from the Chase Manhattan Bank survey of college and university economists

	Percent
What do you consider the most pressing economic problem now facing the United States?	
Unemployment	34
Inadequate growth	23
Poverty	17
Balance-of-payments deficit	8
Inflation	5
Other	13
What is the major reason for our persistent high rate of unemployment?	
Inadequate demand and structural problems are equally important	37
Structural problems (e.g., minimum wage laws, lack of education, automation, etc.)	36
Inadequate aggregate demand	19
Other	8
Is inflation likely to be a major problem next year?	
No	84
Yes	16
If inflationary pressures do develop, how should they be contained?	
General monetary policy	47
General fiscal policy	30
Selective credit controls	7
Selective price controls	6
Other	10
Do you favor further Federal tax cuts (beyond those already having legislative approval) during 1965?	
Yes	76
No	24
If your answer is "yes," where do you think the emphasis should lie?	
Excise taxes	55
Personal income taxes	29
Corporate income taxes	16
What do you think is the most practicable and effective way of speeding growth and generally improving economic efficiency?	
Change in tax structure	34
Tax reductions	24
Increased Federal expenditures	19
Less Government control of business activity	12
More Government control of business activity	1
Other	10
Do you support the Federal Government's "war on poverty"?	
Yes	86
No	14
Do you think the approximately $800 million thus far appropriated will provide an adequate beginning?	
Yes	56
No	44
How much might an effective program require over the next 10 years? $10 to $15 billion (median). Where should the major emphasis of the program lie?	
Better education facilities for young people	57
Retraining of older workers	14
Reduced discrimination against minorities	14
Improved welfare system	5
Other	10
Do you think that benefits under the Federal social security system should be expanded?	
Yes	82
No	18
If your answer is "Yes" what is the first direction added benefits should take?	
Medicare	74
Increased pension benefits	19
Other	7
Do you think the Federal Government should set up a system of compulsory arbitration to settle major labor disputes?	
No	74
Yes	26
Should antitrust laws apply to labor unions?	
Yes	52
No	48

THE EXCHANGE VISITOR PROGRAM—A NEED FOR REVISION

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing three private bills and one public bill, all of which relate to the 2-year foreign residence requirement under the exchange visitor program.

Before I go into the details of my proposals, I want to make it clear that I agree with the basic philosophy of the exchange program; namely, that aliens come into this country as students to receive advanced training in a chosen field, and then are supposed to return to their countries with these new skills. This program is designed to uplift the quality of the various professions in the countries that participate. In my judgment, it would undermine the entire program if we were to become too liberal in allowing those who come into this country to remain, thereby depriving their countries of their talents.

In saying this, I do not mean to imply that I am in total agreement with things as they presently stand concerning this law. We can see, from the growing number of private bills being introduced—these bills requesting waivers of the 2-year foreign residence requirement—that others have some dissatisfaction with the operation of the program. This is the reason behind the bills that I am introducing today. I would like to share some of my thoughts about this matter with my colleagues at this time.

In legal terms, we view this program as a contract between the exchange visitor and the U.S. Government. In most cases it should be governed by the rules of strict interpretation such as we employ in the construction of contracts under contract law. At the same time, however, we must recall that we do not always apply the rules of strict construction, if by a change of circumstances, totally beyond the reasonable expectation of the parties when they entered into the contract, one party would be unjustly enriched at the expense of the other, or, one party would suffer a material detriment which could not have been anticipated. At this point relief could be effected by the rules of equity. Even in this instance, a case must be proved.

Much of the same reasoning can be applied to the exchange visitor program. The private bills which I am introducing reflect what I feel could be the application of this reasoning to the strict terms of the law requiring a residence outside the United States for a period of 2 years before one is eligible to apply for permanent residence visa. Indeed, some exceptions have been developed in two specific areas, one where the foreign residence requirement would create an extreme hardship on a citizen of this country or an alien here on a permanent resident visa, or second, where a governmental agency will sponsor the individual because of the need for him in that agency's work.

Two of the private bills that I am introducing are for the relief of Dr. Masashi Kawasaki and for the relief of Dr. Manuel Mendez—both of whom are medical doctors. Dr. Kawasaki is presently engaged in research and teaching at the Washington University School of Medicine, Department of Otolaryngology. The specific project he is engaged in is the substitution of a new larynx, the voice box for one which is removed from the patient in order to stem the tide of cancer of the throat. In order that such a transplant may ultimately become a successful operation, studies are presently being conducted on the interaction of deglutination—the act of swallowing—the physiological relationship between the upper and lower respiratory tracts, and the voice. These studies are being financed in part through grants of the National Institutes of Health, the American Cancer Society, and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This particular research is not being carried on in Canada, from where Dr. Kawasaki comes, nor is it being carried on elsewhere in the United States.

Dr. Mendez is presently engaged in research in psychiatry and care of mental patients at the St. Louis State Hospital for mental disease. Particularly he is engaged in research work on the institutionalized, chronic mentally ill, especially those of advanced age. This research is not very developed in our own country, let alone Mexico, from where Dr. Mendez hails. He also fills a very urgent need for doctors at the St. Louis State Hospital where, according to my last information, the doctor-patient ratio was 1 to 125.

These two cases illustrate one of the points that I would like to make about the present administration of the exchange visitor program, foreign residence requirement. Both of these men are engaged in work that is primarily being conducted in the United States and the success or failure of their specific projects depend to a great extent on them. Both of these cases illustrate situations where the alien became part of a team which is producing a breakthrough in the "scientific unknown" which will be of tremendous benefit to all mankind. Under the terms of the law, as strictly interpreted, after the expiration of 5 years in this country they should be returned to their countries regardless of the progress of their research. Due to the lack of facilities in these countries, this could easily spell the end to their research projects. This could be a substantial setback to mankind.

Furthermore, it is not the siphoning off of the cream of the crop of these countries as some may contend. Rather, it should be a great source of national pride as these particular people forge ahead in their scientific endeavors. It would be my suggestion that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization work out criteria to take into account the nature of the work that is being conducted by the exchange student, as well as the consequences to the successful completion of that work if the alien were to return to the country from which he came in order to fulfill a rigid requirement of the law.

A second class of case which needs committee investigation deals with the country from which the exchange visitor came. This class of case is illustrated by another private bill which I have introduced for the relief of Dr. Leo Hsueh. Dr. Hsueh is a native of China, and fled the Chinese mainland at the time of the Communist takeover in that country. Since that time Dr. Hsueh has been traveling throughout the world. He came to this country on the exchange visitor program from West Germany. He has no roots in West Germany, nor in any land to which he could return. Yet under the terms of the present law such persons, even though not required to return to their native land when they have a fear of political persecution, are required to serve out the foreign residence requirement. In such cases, the exchange student is permitted to go to any other cooperating country in the program.

It is with this in mind that I am introducing today an amendment to the exchange visitor laws to permit the waiver of the 2-year foreign residence requirement for those exchange students who cannot return to the country of their origin because of fear of persecution for their political beliefs. This would encompass the situation where, after the visitor has come to this country, the political structure of the country from which he came has so radically changed that it would be dangerous or impossible for him to return with any reasonable degree of personal safety. Since his native country could not benefit from his newly acquired skills, and he would have no roots in any other country, I do not feel that there would be any harm done to our program of exchange education to waive the foreign residence requirements in these situations, when their skills can be utilized in this country.

These two classes of cases, the one illustrated by Drs. Mendez and Kawasaki, the other illustrated by Dr. Hsueh, argue that there should be some developing of criteria by which the foreign residence requirement can be readily waived. Clearly, the number of private bills—and the attendant high cost of processing them, only to be tabled by the committee—demonstrate the need for the committee to develop guidelines which the Immigration and Naturalization service can utilize in these types of cases. A start was made in this direction during the last session, when Assistant Secretary of State Lucius Battle testified before the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee. It is my hope that the subcommittee will undertake to take a further look at the exchange visitor program during this session, with a view toward ending the present dilemma.

A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF DR. PETER K. LEKKAS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill in behalf of Dr. Peter K. Lekkas, a competently trained thoracic surgeon, who, because of the dilemma in the medical practice laws in Missouri, and their interrelationship with the laws relating to naturalization of foreign-born persons, finds himself doing the same job that he did when he first came to this country in 1954.

Dr. Lekkas' case is one that has its counterpart in many States of our country. Those States, such as Missouri, require that a person must be a citizen of the United States before he can be issued a certificate to practice medicine in the State or take the examination which is a prerequisite to the issuance of a medical certificate. Dr. Lekkas, not yet being a citizen, though having filed his declaration of intention to do so, finds that he is relegated to the job of "resident in general practice" at the St. Joseph Hospital in Kirkwood, Mo., a job which he held in 1954.

Since those first days in this country, Dr. Lekkas has served as an assistant resident in surgery at St. Luke's Hospital in St. Louis, as chief resident of that same hospital, and as a fellow in thoracic and cardiovascular surgery at Barnes Hospital, which is also in St. Louis. He has passed the examination of the Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates, and, in 1962 became a diplomat of the American Board of Surgery and the American Board of Thoracic Surgery.

This amounts to fairly formidable training that the doctor has had; yet he is unable to register with the Missouri State Medical Board because of his citizenship status.

This would be a matter which might properly be characterized as a State matter except that the time that Dr. Lekkas has spent here has not counted toward his required time for naturalization purposes due to the fact that he has been under the exchange visitor program. Dr. Lekkas has, in fact, spent nearly 10 years in this country, yet has several more years to go before he can complete the requirements of the law. It is for this reason that I am introducing a bill which would have the effect of holding that his time in the country will be considered in compliance with section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as it relates to residence and physical presence.

EUROPEAN NATIONS OWE US BILLIONS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Devine] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate today, when the House is debating the wisdom of legislation requested by the President, relating to our serious gold problems, to include in the Record, the column of Henry J. Taylor, entitled "European Nations Owe Us Billions."

This thought-provoking article should give some sobering thoughts to our foreign policymakers and those that insist on placating the international bankers.

The column follows:

Let's Collect: European Nations Owe Us Billions

(By Henry J. Taylor)

It's a dream world.

President Charles de Gaulle can draw gold and threaten our dollar because, on balance, we owe France more than France owes us.

What nonsense. Totally false. France is in hock to us for everything but Napoleon's cocked hat and the family silver. Until a more outrageous situation comes along this one will do.

We're to blame, nevertheless. The Internal Revenue Service slaps you in jail if you fail to pay your debt to our Government. But if you're a foreigner, oo-la-la, forget it.

This is the root of the trouble. The United States has always been a gleeful giver abroad but a very stupid collector.

Generation after generation of European government money men seem to put our debt collectors under an anesthetic. A few whiffs, a few banquets under crystal chandeliers, some parlez-vous about zis or zat, and the next thing you know our little lambs—wafted into some strange kind of inferiority complex—are dumping foreign nations' taxpayers' responsibilities smack in the lap of the American people.

In this naive yen to buy international goodwill we lose the respect of the Europeans as well as our money.

The price? It is colossal. Yet you never hear about it from Washington.

I have verified all figures in this article with the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and nothing here refers to America's $113 billion foreign aid—all free. I refer only to truly due obligations incurred by nations mostly now rich and loaded with gold.

France, for example, typifies just one of 20 countries owing us World War I debts which remain due and unpaid to this very day. The aggregate among the 20 exceeds $20 billion. But who would know it?

The French sum is $6.3 billion. It was many times higher than this but, guess what, France negotiated it down. Then in 1931 France said she couldn't pay that year's installment. Washington declared a 1-year moratorium.

Well, that was the end of that. Paris simply refused to resume payments. Our taxpayers have made up the difference. The French Government no longer carries these billions on official statements covering France's external debt.

In addition, while De Gaulle draws gold, France also has outstanding three loans arising from World War II. These total a tidy $592 million. The repayment rate? A mere $21.5 million last year, $22 million due this year and $22.6 in 1966, etc., on the first of these of which $409 million is owed.

Moreover, France also owes us $179 million still unpaid since 1945 on an Export-Import Bank loan, prepayments on which make the next installment not due until 1967.

Yet, sunk under this mountain of debt, De Gaulle is nevertheless free to take a $150 million bite out of our dwindling gold reserve in a single recent day.

In similar fashion Britain still owes us $9.1 billion in World War I debts that remain due and unpaid. Oh, no, France has no monopoly on the anesthesia.

Germany owes us nothing, which is what she gets for attacking the world and losing the war. She now holds more dollars in her reserve than any country in the world. But Germany—like France, Italy, Spain, Holland, and most European countries—feels uneasy about her dollar balances and has steadily increased her gold holdings relative to dollars.

European enthusiasm for President Johnson's proposal to free about $5 billion of the gold required to back our dollar is mighty, mighty understandable. It means the debtor nations, who now somehow call themselves creditors, can continue to get a piece of the U.S. pile.

If Mr. Johnson were so zealous in insisting on Europeans paying their debts as he is on changing the law to free our gold we would not have to ship a single ounce on balance and, in truth, the gold overflow could be reversed overnight.

Isn't there anything—anything, anything, anything—that can bring our officials out from under the ether? When, oh, when, will the American interest really be put forward in Washington?

THE NEED FOR A REVIEW OF LOCAL AIRLINE SERVICE POLICY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply aware of the need for local airline service throughout the country.

Local airline service is especially important to the smaller communities of this country which could benefit from the decentralization of industry. Manufacturers and industrialists, however, will not locate new or branch plants at cities where airline service is not available. Some cities seeking to attract the location of new branch plants have been told that the plant would be located at that city except for the fact that there is a pending Civil Aeronautics Board proceeding which could result in the loss of the city's local airline service.

Transportation services at the smaller communities are decreasing. Hundreds of passenger trains have been eliminated. Buses are concentrating on express runs and eliminating stops at the smaller intermediate points. While the Interstate Highway System offers a real advantage to the traveler who is willing to use his own automobile, commercial facilities have been reduced. In many small communities today the local airline service is the only usable commercial passenger transportation.

The elimination of local airline service on a broad scale does not appear to be in the public interest or in accordance with the objectives established by Congress in the Federal Aviation Act. The development of smaller communities in this Nation should not be discouraged.

A congressional review of Civil Aeronautics Board policy respecting local airline services is required if this country is to have a firm policy with respect to the needs of cities for local airline service. Without such a review, no city can be certain that its service will continue.

Mr. Speaker, it would be appropriate to hold hearings so that the voice of the public can be heard and the needs of the public for local airline service can be considered. Pending such review, at least the current level of local airline service should be maintained.

The resolution which I and many of my colleagues have introduced calls for a review of local airline service policies. I urge adoption of this proposal and the scheduling of early hearings in this session. Let us not allow time to run out on these communities which are so vital to rural America.

THE MISSILE GAP MYTH

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, one of the great myths of our time, one which changed the course of history and resulted in the outlay of millions upon millions of dollars in accelerated defense spending, was the widely publicized missile gap of 1960.

There can be no question that this missile gap scare, later proved unfounded, provoked fears, charges and countercharges that unjustly maligned the records of both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, and was one of the key issues in the defeat of Richard Nixon in the 1960 presidential election.

There were many other ramifications of the missile gap myth and, certainly, the time has come to set the record straight—to erase misconceptions and to place into proper perspective, once and for all, the facts and events surrounding the myth.

In this regard, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of my colleague a significant journalistic undertaking by one of the country's best reporters, Everett S. Allen, of the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass.

Mr. Allen has received national recognition for previous in-depth articles on important political, military, and scientific subjects, notably his award-winning series for the Associated Press on oceanography, which—more than any other single effort by the press—helped focus the Nation's attention on a threatening lag in our program of oceanographic research and development.

Like his thoughtful work on oceanography, Mr. Allen's four-part series on "The Missile Gap Myth" was distributed by Associated Press.

The series follows:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Jan. 26, 1965]

THE MISSILE GAP MYTH—I: FALSE FEAR OF SOVIET LEAD SHAPED COURSE OF HISTORY

(The missile gap scare of 1960, later proved unfounded, changed the course of history and affected the presidential election contest between John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon. This is the first of a four-part series in which Everett S. Allen, staff writer of the Standard-Times, traces the background and effect of the myth from Peenemunde to the Pentagon.)

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—Four years after its climax, the nonexistent "missile gap," born of unsubstantiated fear that the Russians were ahead of us, emerges as one of the most dramatically significant myths in American history. Although official opinions on the subject vary greatly, this is the unmistakable conclusion to be found in examining views of present and former military and civilian leaders of the Eisenhower-Kennedy-Johnson administrations, which have been made available to me during the last few months.

Initially, I asked Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, former adviser to President Kennedy and now dean of science of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, whether the Kennedy forces had knowingly exploited in the 1960 campaign a missile gap that did not exist.

Dr. Wiesner, who assisted the missile effort in major degree during both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, denied this. In reply, he suggested this story be written, and arranged for some of the interviews, in the belief it would constitute a public service through clarification of the historic events involved.

GAP NEVER EXISTED

I have talked with, or been given the authorized views of, more than a dozen persons whose positions offered them some firsthand knowledge of the events involved. As a result, I have concluded that, despite the fact there never was any such thing, the missile gap produced these results:

1. It stimulated a United States-U.S.S.R. missile race, in which the United States maintains a 4-to-1 lead as the result of a $17 billion program initiated by President Eisenhower and accelerated by President Kennedy.

2. Caused both nations to approximately double their missile arsenals so that, as advocates of gradual disarmament are quick to point out, our relative positions remain the same, despite the expenditure of billions. By early 1965, the Soviet Union will have 200 intercontinental missiles, double the number of a year earlier. By the same time, the United States will have 925 ICBM's, compared with 475 a year earlier.

3. Provoked nationwide fears that marred unjustly the records of both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations and provided one of the major issues that defeated Vice President Nixon and elected Senator Kennedy to the White House.

4. Damaged the U.S. worldwide image and scuttled an East-West summit conference between President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Khrushchev in Paris. U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers, who crashed in the U.S.S.R. in 1960, was looking for Russian missile sites; his flight was triggered by fears of the "gap."

5. Forced the United States to give priority to revolutionary, multi-million-dollar space vehicles designed to collect intelligence information behind the Iron Curtain.

6. Influenced new U.S. defense spending policies, now practiced by the Johnson administration and based on better intelligence. The new philosophy: Don't build a defense force for every possibility, but just to handle capably what the Soviets really have.

7. Taught the United States a costly, yet valuable lesson: Don't assume the Russians will do what seems sensible. The Soviets could, in fact, have created a missile gap. They chose not to and before long, were no longer able to.

The facts are that the Soviets never did achieve a 3 to 1 missile lead over us in 1960, as former Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy predicted. It is, frankly, more likely they never were more than three missiles ahead of us in this period, according to present Defense Department estimates, and perhaps not even that.

The Eisenhower administration was not delinquent in its preparedness program, as Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, and former Air Force Secretary, and others charged (and some Republicans in Government believed it, too), but was handicapped by lack of "hard" intelligence as to what the Russians were doing. Unable to give the public the highly classified and partly unevaluated information it did have, the Eisenhower officials were vulnerable to deepening criticism in 1960.

NO J.F.K. DECEIT

The Kennedy team was not deceitful when it claimed that a missile gap threatened this country during the campaign months of 1960 and announced, after the election, that it did not exist. The shift was due to more and better intelligence, and to the fact that Mr. Kennedy, as a campaigning Senator, was denied missile information possessed by the White House.

The missile gap scare came about because the U.S.S.R. in 1957 scored a sensational breakthrough in rocketry. It produced a successful long-range missile, the first the world ever had known, and U.S. experts assumed the Russians would lose no time in mass producing and deploying this weapon.

Two incidents in this historic drama, hitherto unpublished, illustrate poignantly the role of the psychological on both sides of the Iron Curtain in the development of the "missile gap" impact.

As Democratic candidate for President of the United States, Senator John F. Kennedy was barred in August 1960 from receiving a full-scale briefing on U.S.-U.S.S.R. missile strength at Strategic Air Command Headquarters in Omaha. The briefing had been promised to him by the Republican administration.

Former Senator Salinger, Democrat, of California, previously President Kennedy's press secretary, related that "we (the Kennedy campaign entourage) went to SAC Headquarters with the understanding that the Senator was to be fully briefed.

KENNEDY FRUSTRATION

"Apparently, the night before, there were orders from Washington that he was not to get a full briefing. The Senator was damned mad about it."

Mr. Kennedy's frustration stemmed from the fact the "missile gap" issue was going strong, especially in Washington, by the time he began to campaign.

Salinger recalled, "I can't say the orders (denying Kennedy a full briefing) came from President Eisenhower, but certainly from or via the Secretary of Defense (Thomas S. Gates, Jr.).

"That evening, we had dinner with General (Thomas S.) Power, commander in chief of SAC, (recently retired) and others. The Senator told me to tell whatever general was sitting next to me that he (Kennedy) was happy to learn in what good shape the Air Force was because it obviously would not need any more money in the next year.

"That was his way of communicating his displeasure."

When I questioned Salinger, he replied, "I don't know why the Pentagon order was given." Asked if it might have been for security reasons, he said "No." I suggested it might have been because U-2 spy plane information was involved, to which Kennedy, as a Senator, would not have been entitled. Salinger said, "No, it wasn't that kind of a briefing."

SYMINGTON'S VIEW

Denied facts of the "missile gap" in possession of the Eisenhower administration, Senator Kennedy was more inclined to listen to those advisers, including Symington, who felt it was a major issue. This stronger view of the "gap" was reflected in the Democratic platform of 1960, which charged that "before congressional committees (the GOP administration) has testified that the Communists will have a dangerous lead in ICBM's (intercontinental ballistic missiles) through 1963."

Senator Kennedy's determination to overcome that lead, of which he was convinced after the Omaha incident, was revealed in a statement he prepared in October 1960 for the

Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist. Mr. Kennedy was asked: "Where do you believe the difficulty lies in resolving the United States-U.S.S.R. conflict?"

The Massachusetts Senator replied, "Whether or not the Russians have ruled out the possibility of surprise attack, it is clear that in recent years, Moscow has used its missile * * * advantage as an instrument of blackmail, psychological warfare, and diplomacy. The Communist leaders may feel a certain reluctance to abandon this instrument so long as they feel the advantage is theirs."

Two months after the visit SAC headquarters and 5,000 miles away in Moscow, the full ramifications of the Omaha rebuke to the successful Democratic candidate were made clear to President Kennedy's advisers, Dr. Walt Rostow and Dr. Wiesner. Wiesner and Dr. Rostow, an MIT economics professor later appointed to Government by Kennedy and now Chairman of the State Department Policy Planning Council, were in Russia attending a Pugwash Conference of East-West scientists.

Soviet Deputy Minister Vasily V. Kuznetsov knew Dr. Wiesner on a first-name basis, an association dating from an international convention on safeguards against surprise attack in 1958.

Kuznetsov sent a staff member to contact Wiesner, asking if the latter would like to see him. Wiesner said "yes," and suggested Dr. Rostow come, too.

In his office in the Foreign Ministry, furnished with typical bureaucratic heaviness but brighter than most, Kuznetsov faced them. About 60, gray-haired, of athletic build and serious countenance, the Soviet Minister was friendly enough, but revealed a principal concern.

KREMLIN BOTHERED

He commented that he had become aware, from U.S. news coverage of Mr. Kennedy's campaign speeches, that the President was being pressed to double the Eisenhower administration's missile program.

The Soviet Union, said the Deputy Foreign Minister, was pleased that Mr. Kennedy had won the American election. It hoped to improve relations with the United States as a result of the change in administration.

But, he added, it was troubled by the militant nature of some of the Democratic campaign utterances.

There was certain irony in this exchange for Dr. Wiesner, for he had recommended consistently soft-pedaling the "missile gap" issue by the Kennedy campaigners. In so doing, his judgment was based on top-secret information acquired while contributing in major degree to the U.S. missile buildup since the early 1950's. He was convinced our position was better than many believed and that hammering for stepped-up weapons production would increase world tensions, rather than contribute to security.

Kuznetsov said he could understand, at least in part, the Kennedy campaign commitment to build a strong military force. But he pointed out that the Soviet Government also faced pressures from its military leadership and assuredly would not be able to resist them if the United States persisted in increasing greatly its missile strength.

KUZNETSOV NOT IMPRESSED

The visiting Americans attempted to reassure the Soviet minister. They emphasized that missiles were a more "secure" defense basis, since they did not embody most of the human-error fallibilities of a constantly-alerted, manned plane program. This, they suggested, ought to give the Soviets some comfort.

Kuznetsov, however, stood on his previous position. He also was not impressed by the argument that doubling U.S. missiles was purely defensive. In view of what we learned later about Soviet missile strength, or rather lack of it, his concern was understandable. In conclusion, the minister reiterated that if there were a major U.S. missile buildup, it would probably require his country to respond.

Thus the stage was set for a continuation of the highly competitive United States-U.S.S.R. missile race.

Other military and civilian leaders whose views have made possible the piecing together of this unique missile gap story from its beginnings include:

Allen Dulles, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, who stated, "By 1957, we began to get evidence of a rather major Soviet breakthrough. Intelligence, correctly, I think, indicated they were ahead; this was based in part on successful firings out of the total shots fired. Then Intelligence, and I think properly, sounded the alarm. There was at least a threatening missile gap in 1957. There was real substance to the threat; it did not materialize as we thought, but I believe if Intelligence had not reacted this way, a serious situation might have developed."

LAG IS MENTIONED

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, retired, former Army missile chief, declared, "Our missile need involved a lag, not a gap, since the former represents a tardy effort and can be closed. I didn't know what McNamara (Secretary of Defense) was talking about when he referred to a 'gap.' I think the lag still is serious in the anti-ICBM field. Mr. Kennedy understood the problem, however, and began to move on it."

Dr. Carl Kaysen, Harvard economics professor and former Kennedy White House adviser and National Security Council staff member, said, "I'm not imputing dishonesty, but by the summer of 1961, no detached informed man could have believed in the degree of Russian missile superiority in which the Air Force professed to believe."

Senator SYMINGTON's comment was that, "Each of us, the United States and the Soviet Union, now has such massive power that a full-scale nuclear exchange between the two nations lasting less than 1 hour could kill nearly 100 million Americans and more than 100 million Russians. We know this; so, certainly, do the Russians. Our intelligence in every area is getting better."

A Johnson Defense Department official, who declined to be identified, said, "There is a variation of opinion as to who is ahead in deployment and research on antiballistic missiles. I've always felt ours are at least up to theirs, maybe ahead. I see no gap here."

UNITED STATES LEADS 4 TO 1

Asserted Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commander, Air Force Systems Command and military "father" of the U.S. missile program: "Our present ICBM strength, as the Secretary of Defense (McNamara) has revealed is more than four times that of the Soviets * * * even the most optimistic predictions fell short of the actual (U.S.) progress that has been made in the last 10 years."

A State Department official, incumbent, who declined to be identified, gave his view of the situation: "The Iron Curtain is not as iron as it was: intelligence is better than it used to be. We went astray on the gap, lacking hard facts; we made an estimate on what would be a rational decision and they didn't make this decision. It still is hard to figure why they didn't produce and deploy their first-generation missile."

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Jan. 27, 1965]

The Missile Gap Myth—II: Postwar Lassitude Slowed U.S. Start

WASHINGTON, January 27.—At the moment, the United States has more than 800 fully armed ICBMs deployed on launchers, 600 of them Minutemen, almost all in "hardened" (underground, concrete) silos dispersed over a total area of more than 100,000 square miles, from New York State to California.

An accounting of how and why this technological miracle came about is the story of the nonexistent missile gap.

In May 1943, a former American OSS official in Switzerland to whom I talked, was told by an Austrian informer about "something shot into the sky" at Peenemunde, Germany. This may have been the first information we received on Germany's long-range missile called V–2 (vengeance weapon No. 2). Starting in September 1944, Hitler forces fired more than 1,000 of these 14-ton rockets with a range of approximately 180 miles. This was the first time in man's history that a long-range missile was successfully used in combat to transport explosives to a military target.

As the war neared an end, the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States, eager for knowledge of the V–2, acquired all of the German technical data and military devices they could. The Russians did particularly well, their army overrunning most of Germany's rocket production and assembly facilities.

EXPERTS JOIN UNITED STATES

The director of Germany's Peenemunde rocket center, Maj. Gen. Walter Dornberger, and Dr. Wernher von Braun, who worked on the V–2, surrendered to U.S. forces rather than be taken by Soviet troops. The Dornberger-von Braun team of 130 scientists and engineers, together with valuable documents, parts and scientific reports, arrived in the United States in the summer of 1945. But the sense of urgency that had characterized Peenemunde had evaporated; the war was over. The United States did not feel the need, or the desire, to establish a single high-priority missile program at that time.

However, Allen Dulles recalled that "by 1952–53, the missile situation in the Soviet Union became one of our major intelligence targets. Every effort was made to interview returning Germans whom the Russians had been able to hire because the former were starving.

"We developed a pretty well organized program to debrief returning Germans. Most of them had been employed around the Crimean and Black Sea areas. They were engaged in developing theory; I do not recall one who was in an actual testing area.

"Although the Russians had a long history in rocket work, they benefited greatly from German techniques with the short-range missile. You cannot say, however, that the Soviets acquired this weapon from the Germans, for the Russians have demonstrated a high degree of competence in the ICBM field."

GERMAN WARNING

General Dornberger at this time expressed the belief the Soviets were working on large rocket engines. Apparently, they were pumping what knowledge they could get out of their German employees, never letting them see what the Soviet program was, and then sending them home. Dornberger's warning was generally disregarded.

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner was first conscious of the missile in the summer of 1952. He recalled, "I heard a briefing by an Air Force officer, in which he described something that resembled the Empire State Building and estimated it would take the Soviets until 1965 to develop it, so that we need not be concerned for a long time."

This was a widely held view. There was considerable doubt about being able to miniaturize the nuclear weapon so it could be placed within the nose of a missile-type vehicle. (We learned, to our sorrow, that the Russians didn't wait to perfect miniaturization.) As the 1950's rolled on, missile discussion in the United States split into what Mr. Dulles called a "dichotomy of skeptics and believers."

Fortunately among the latter were Dr. John von Neumann of the Princeton University Institute for Advanced Studies and Trevor Gardner, who early in 1953, was appointed special assistant secretary for research and development for the Air Force. Gardner immediately addressed priority efforts to the missile.

RED DEFECTOR TALKS

Mr. Gardner heard disquieting things from the intelligence people about the Red ballistic missile. A Communist defector told us he thought he knew where the Russian test site was, and after a study by radar experts, the United States spent $5 million establishing a radar station in Turkey to monitor Soviet test firings.

It was Gardner who established the Strategic Missiles Evaluation Committee (which came to be known as the Teapot Committee); von Neumann was chairman, and Dr. Wiesner, one of its 11 members. The group spent a year in studies, listening to military leaders, scientists, and intelligence information, and by the winter of 1953, emerged fully convinced that we could build an ICBM in 4 to 6 years if we really tried, and that the Russians had a several-year lead on us, as well as a program exclusive of that assisted by German workers.

With the Rand Corp. (a nonprofit research and development group established by Gen. H. H. "Hap" Arnold of the Air Force in 1946), the Teapot Committee believed the Nation was in grave danger and called for an aggressive missile effort that President Eisenhower "backed to the hilt," in the words of one member.

NEW DETECTION METHODS

Laboratory experiments had convinced the Von Neumann committee that the next U.S. nuclear test series, in the summer of 1953 would produce (and it did) a much lighter bomb; if so, the payload, instead of being 10,000 to 12,000 pounds, need be only 3,000 to 4,000. This would negate the Air Force argument that a missile would be hard to build because it would have to contain a huge nuclear-fission bomb.

It is hard to monitor short-range missile firings such as the Russians were engaging in because the flight time is so brief. Accordingly, the Air Force was given chief responsibility for developing means of detection other than radar. This assignment was to result in development of a long-winged, black-painted spy plane called U-2. In the meantime, because Russia has a great land mass that earth-bound spies cannot get to, north and east of the Caspian Sea, she was able to carry out much of her testing work without danger of detection.

The radar screens in Turkey, which earlier had revealed principally elaborations of the V-2 weapon, now showed, in the words of a close observer, that the Russians were "firing bigger, heavier things."

"The manned bomber, in the days of Hiroshima and before had been tremendously effective," Gen. James M. Gavin recalled, "and some still had blind faith in it. But by the time of the middle fifties, I had been to Korea to study the war we almost lost—and historians may say we did lose it—and its 147,000 casualties.

"The Nike-Ajax (missile) system was beginning to appear; in my opinion, it neutralized the bomber's effective striking power.

WORRY OVER DEFENSE

"I began to worry about a defense against missiles such as these. If a supersword is created, then the next need is for a supershield, in this case, an anti-ICBM.

"By 1956, it was recommended to us that we go for an IRBM (medium-range missile) because we thought they had ICBM's (long-range missiles) and this was the best thing we could do in a hurry. I sensed that we were going to be behind, which we are. My concern was, and is, that if we ever got into this situation as a national fact of life, we could expect to be nibbled to death by the Russians at every confrontation, because they would know we couldn't retaliate early enough with an ICBM and that we didn't have an anti-ICBM to fire against a long-range missile. Something less than total war, with political aspects, could be devastating.

"I knew from the radar monitoring in Turkey what ranges their IRBM's were firing. At the time they were firing 750 miles, I knew we still were talking to our colonels in terms of a Russian 250-mile capability."

At this point, in July 1956, the U-2, an American aircraft that can take 4,000 pictures of a strip 125 miles wide and 2,174 miles long from a height of 60,000 to 70,000 feet, began to overfly the Soviet Union. The Air Force had developed something better than the radar screens in Turkey.

EXTRAORDINARY RESULTS

From these flights, in the words of Mr. Dulles, "we gained, rather quickly, extraordinary results from photographing their major base and the complex around it. After that, we were able to watch its development with reasonable accuracy. Other Air Force detection methods also were developed, permitting more accurate monitoring of test firings.

"However, when they were shooting only 3,000 miles, we felt they probably could shoot a greater distance, but that they were running out of land in the Kamchatka and Siberian areas, and probably could not monitor efficiently a longer shot."

The Gaither Committee, established by Eisenhower, was trying to decide when the Russians might be likely to have a large number of missiles. One former member commented to me, "The consensus was 1960, for an operational missile force. We thought it would take us 2 years longer, so we were at a serious disadvantage."

In the summer of 1957, a high-ranking Air Force general commented to Wiesner in the presence of a large group, "You're exaggerating this missile business. There will be no operational missile in my lifetime."

CIA ESTIMATES

"You're planning to retire soon?" Wiesner joked, but in recollection, he added, "We were really frightened. Partly, this was because we also overestimated the Soviet bomber force, since CIA estimates were based on Russian capacity to produce, rather than on any real knowledge of what they were doing.

"Our attitudes toward missiles represented extremes. The Army and Navy said the Russians did not have nulcear material. The Navy for many years refused to believe the Russians could produce nuclear material. But improving intelligence information forced us to recognize that the Soviet Union was producing more uranium per year than our military previously had conceded they could."

On August 26, 1957, a few days after the general (who is still on active duty) made his prediction, the Soviet news agency Tass announced launching of a long-range ballistic missile.

U.S. Intelligence replied, in the words of Mr. Dulles, by "sounding the alarm."

THREE MORE SHOTS

The Russians fired three more satellites between October 4, 1957, and May 11, 1958, the last being Sputnik III, weighing 2,926 pounds, contrasted with three of our shots that had payloads of only 31, 28, and 3.25 pounds.

A rocket vehicle capable of launching a heavy satellite is not precisely the same thing as having an ICBM, but military authorities conceded that when the Russians had solved problems of guidance, reentry, and production, they could reach anywhere in the United States with an ICBM launched from the Soviet Union.

"At this time," related Mr. Dulles, "we faced a problem one often has in Intelligence. They had produced and tested a long-range missile. Were they going to give it major emphasis? It was pretty large, awkward to handle. Would the Russians spend money to put it into production, or first try to produce a smaller, more efficient type with which they could create a more orderly missile program?"

Finding the Russian missile center was one thing; we could not locate evidence of ICBM deployment even though we searched over most of the U.S.S.R. The frustrating factor was that it should have been easy to spot a missile bigger than our Atlas, on a launching pad near the railhead that serviced it. There were those who argued that perhaps the Reds were not deploying the weapon, but the Air Force was inclined to believe we weren't looking in the right places for the right things.

UNITED STATES ACCEPTS WORST

It was accepted in the United States that nothing could stop the Russians from achieving an intercontinental missile with a 5,000-mile range.

Dr. von Braun was convinced that if we had kept up a stepped-up Peenemunde operation we could have had an ICBM by 1950. Obviously, if we could have had one that early, the Soviets certainly could have one 8 years later. Our national composure was not helped by a NATO intelligence study that stated the Soviets had ICBM's with nuclear warheads "in operational quantities." The report said Red missile forces numbered 200,000 men at approximately 100 bases.

At one point, we estimated the Russians could produce as many as 10,000 missiles in a year's time. (Present stockpiles indicate how ridiculous this figure was; the United States now is producing one Minuteman missile per day.) This estimate was based on an intelligence evaluation, in turn based upon Russian production capacity. Principally because of lack of information and because we thought missiles were easier to make than we now know they are, we accepted the grim picture of a massive, hard-driving Russian program far ahead of ours.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Times-Standard, Jan. 28, 1965]

THE MISSILE GAP—III: SEARCH FOR TRUTH LED TO U-2 FLIGHTS

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON, January 28—The year 1960 was the peak of the "missile gap" crisis. Gen. Thomas S. Power, then SAC chief, declared that with only 300 ballistic missiles the Soviets could virtually wipe out our entire nuclear strike capacity within 30 minutes. With great reluctance and under pressure from those responsible for U.S. defense planning and security, President Eisenhower finally authorized two U-2 flights specifically to look for deployed Soviet ICBM bases. One was the May 1 flight of Francis Gary Powers, who crashed and was captured. The other, possibly on April 9 since an examination of Russian publications reveals they confirmed a U-2 overflight on that date, reported to U.S. authorities the existence of two missile bases under construction in the northern area.

VARIANCE OF OPINION

The fact that no more ICBM bases were observed was as puzzling as it was encouraging, and constituted evidence variously interpreted. In retrospect, Allen Dulles commented, "I think we are not to be criticized for sounding the alarm in the 1957–58 period, although perhaps we should have readjusted our figures downward more quickly when it appeared the Russians were not going to deploy the weapon they had tested."

At the time, however, we weren't that sure. Senator Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, was among those disturbed by an apparent variance of official opinion and estimate. He declared, "Vice President Nixon reportedly has said the missile gap is not widening, but closing. If the statement was made, it is not true." In support, Mr. Symington quoted Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy who said Red superiority in ICBM's soon would amount to three times as many of these weapons as we had.

However, some concerned with the problem were beginning to sense a new perspective. Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner said, "In 1960, I would have said the Russians were deploying missiles and had a year or two lead, but were not building missiles fast enough to be dangerous."

With the admitted advantage of retrospect, a Defense Department official of the Johnson administration summed up the 1960 situation this way for me:

"My reconstruction of events was that officials of the Eisenhower administration were aware as of that moment (1960) that the Soviets did not have ICBM's in any substantial number and that, therefore, at that time, there was no gap.

ONLY A POSSIBILITY

"Intelligence estimates, however, predicted for some time later a situation in which the Soviets might have many more than we. This was seen as possible in 1961–62.

"This, however, was only a possibility. Whether it could happen was determined but unknown, because Soviet decisions would have had to be made previously. Their capabilities and intentions of an earlier time were unknown to us, and that was the difficulty.

"The gap, even if it were to occur, might not create a deterrent gap, that is, allow them to knock out enough of our retaliatory ability so that it would be reduced to an unacceptably low value. The evaluation, probably correct, was made that there would be no deterrent gap even if the Soviets carried out a program to their maximum capability because we already had started programs to prevent this from happening. Polaris was underway, and BMEWS (ballistic missile early warning system) had been started, so that if the Soviets fired a salvo, our SAC aircraft would be warned, could take off, and not be destroyed on the ground.

"But in the projection of knowledge, for example, attempting to project it from 1961 to 1963, it got fuzzy. The Eisenhower administration admitted this, perhaps not wanting to reveal how much intelligence it possessed; not all persons in the administration made a distinction between capabilities and actualities.

NO MENACING GAP

"Looking back, in terms of ICBM's, there never was a 'gap,' that is, they never could target more against us than we could against them. Maybe in 1960, there was a time when they had, say, three more or something, but never a large disparity even then; indeed, if there was a disparity, it was the other way."

But the Soviets did have many more midrange missiles which they could target against Europe and with which they threatened Britain at the time of the Suez crisis in 1956, so "in that sense," commented the Defense official, "there was a severe threat and maybe a gap, but not a gap that menaced the retaliatory capability in the United States.

"The Soviets tried cleverly to give the impression, based on their space exploits, which reflected a potentiality—this was evidence that they could have decided in 1957 to build enough missiles so there would have existed a gap in 1960–61—together with the actuality of medium-range missiles, they tried to confuse this total picture to indicate a threat against U.S. power.

"They were thus successful in contributing to the idea of a 'missile gap.'"

The great concern of the U.S. military, understandable since it is their job to assume the worst and to be prepared for it, coupled with the fact that the cautiously reevaluated newer intelligence was available to few persons in Government, tended to boost the "gap" to election-year prominence in 1960.

REPUBLICANS IRATE

Then came the election and the Kennedy administration, elected by a narrow margin, discovered that it had gone into the White House committed to rectify an Eisenhower error that hadn't been made. At a February 1961 press conference, Secretary of Defense McNamara told reporters there really was no missile gap. This admission naturally drew a storm of criticism from Republicans and others.

Actually, our assessment of the intelligence information in early 1961 still was not firm enough to lead everyone to support such a pronouncement as McNamara's. Dr. Wiesner commented, "At the beginning of the Kennedy administration, the estimates of Soviet missiles varied as much as 3 to 1. The Navy guessed they had 200 missiles; the Air Force, 600 to 800, and the CIA, 450. I spent a week going through the estimates, all based on the same intelligence information. Anyone could make his own decision."

Even McNamara recanted. In April of the same year, he told Congress, "there is presently a missile gap * * * there is evidence that a missile gap may exist up to and through 1963."

But to replace the U-2, the use of which had scuttled a summit conference and marred the U.S. image abroad, there came ino being a new information-collection vehicle described to me by an American scientist familiar with its work as certainly adequate compared to the spy plane.

NEW SPY SATELLITE

In 1961, the 4,100-pound Samos II was launched, completing an orbit of the earth every 98.2 minutes. The aim of this program is to produce pictures of military interest by starlight that will be equivalent to what the human eye would see at 100 feet in full daylight. The project is designed to relay detailed photos of the earth's terrain, and it is assumed the instrumentation of this highly classified craft includes infrared photographic equipment, high-resolution television cameras, and automatic cameras exposing large amounts of recoverable film. Our intelligence information was improved proportionately.

During 1963, the United States launched at least 35 military satellites. Virtually all related data is classified, but they included camera-equipped Samos reconnaissance craft; Midas, which when perfected, is expected to supply information on Soviet rocket launchings, and a pair of "watchdog" satellites planned to detect manmade nuclear explosions in space. These intelligence-gathering vehicles supplying both information and early warning, coupled with other information-gathering systems developed since 1960, go a long way toward insuring against such national uncertainty as characterized the missile gap.

Commenting on what the missile gap amounted to, and what it taught us as a nation, those whose views contributed in major degree to this article have a wide range of reaction.

Dr. Wiesner remarked, "President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara were courageous in admitting that things were not as they had thought. Some accused Mr. Kennedy of knowing all along, but this was never the case."

LEVEL STILL DEBATABLE

(Several persons whose views are incorporated in this article thought, and still feel, that the Eisenhower administration's level of armaments was adequate. Mr. Kennedy's defense advisers, however, called for roughly twice the force—a rise from a proposed ballistic missile force of 700 Minutemen without Polaris, to 1,900 including Polaris. It still is debatable which level is right.

(It is estimated the United States will add 800 Minuteman missiles to its arsenal in the 12-month period from mid-1964 to mid-1965, which will enable our missile program to be substantially completed during 1965.)

"In any event," Dr. Wiesner continued, "everyone now admits that we outnumber the Russians in missiles. Considering the fact of 3 to 5 years leadtime necessary to produce an operational missile, much of what we have today still is equipment designed or ordered by the Eisenhower administration. The facts themselves thus support the view that what the Eisenhower officials did was reasonable.

"If you want more weapons, buy more, but the level of force is debatable. Any Soviet response would take time, of course; only about now would we begin to see their reaction to our buildup, if there were something to see."

(A defense study by the British Institute of Strategic Studies on November 12 predicted that if the Soviet missile buildup continues, the gap between Western and Communist long-range striking power will be narrowed in 1965, principally because our missile production is expected to taper off, having reached its prescribed goals.)

WIESNER EXPLAINS

"What it amounts to," said Wiesner, "is that by the end of the Kennedy administration, most of us knew what we did not at the beginning of it. The whole issue of the gap was based on a positive knowledge that we had started several years behind the Russians, that they had tested a successful missile in 1957, plus our lack of understanding on how hard it is to go from an experimental missile to an operational force.

"The logical conclusion was that they would have a missile force before us. One must admit we were, at least potentially, in trouble, but it was never serious because of the slowness of the Soviet in bringing a clumsy missile into operation and because of the speed with which U.S. industry and science produced ours."

The view of the Johnson administration, as expressed to me by an official of the Defense Department, is equally interesting. He commented, "After the Kennedy administration came in, examination of intelligence estimates—new ones, as I recall—indicated there was not then a missile gap and need not be one in 1962–63, provided certain steps were taken. These included stepping up the Minuteman and Polaris programs and this was done, starting in February-March of 1961.

"As it turned out, the estimate of Soviet capabilities for deploying ICBM's in 1961 was lower than of 1960, but still was too high. In 1961–62, we realized that a statement made 2 years in advance was not intelligence, but a prediction, especially since, for some of the longer periods, the Soviets had not even made up their own minds. This is not extrapolation of physical facts, but an exercise in mindreading.

ACTION EVALUATED

"In the campaign of 1960, emphasis on the 'missile gap' by the Kennedy campaign did include statements saying this is what could happen. Action by President Kennedy in early 1961 prevented the possibility of a gap.

It is not clear whether this action was necessary, because the Soviets did not even build as many ICBM's as early 1961 Intelligence suggested they could. Maybe the Eisenhower administration would have taken the same steps. In any event, the Kennedy-McNamara action was, in fact, to take such steps.

"There has been some talk of a megaton gap (deliverable nuclear firepower measured in 1-million-ton units of TNT) but if one looks for evidence, it is not there and we would know soon enough to take appropriate measures, whether it was a new Soviet weapon system, or a large increase in missile or bomber forces, especially since we can benefit from the missile gap experience.

"We have consistently underestimated Soviet technical capabilities and overestimated their potential military strength.

"We can still be surprised certainly, but the thing that has struck me is that the road from conception to development to deployment to accumulation of a large weapon force in being involves a long time, maybe, in such a case as this, 10 years.

NO SURPRISE LIKELY

"They cannot go far along without our knowing it if we remain alert, and in the time it must take them, we, too, can take action.

"The Soviets did start down that technological line (creating missiles) before us. In 1954, we decided they had a 2-year lead; in the 10 years from 1952 to 1962, until they had a reasonable sized force, even though we started 2 years behind, we ended up ahead. Considering that background, the long time such actions take and the great potential of U.S. science and industry, a surprise that threatens our strategic force is not likely.

"As for their antiballistic missiles the Soviets may have made a different deployment decision than we did, but if so, they're sorry. I see no gap here, at least not one in which they have nonnegligible capability and we have no capability, nothing which would impair our retaliatory capability."

POLARIS STEPPED UP

Senator SYMINGTON commented, "There exists a more satisfactory basis, or so it seems, for estimating Soviet strength so far. There is little doubt the United States is in a superior position with regard to missiles and other weapons."

Mr. SYMINGTON directed attention to the fact that:

Since 1960, Polaris power has been increased by 50 percent and we have a 4 to 1 lead in this field over the Russians. Our Navy now has 256 Polaris missiles deployed in 16 submarines, and 25 more Polaris subs are under construction. Our Polaris missiles exceed their Soviet counterparts in range by a factor of 3 to 1, and all the firepower expended in World War II is less than half that of one Polaris submarine.

Our strategic alert forces now include 1,100 bombers, of which more than 500 are on 15-minute alert. (U.S. officials estimate the Soviet Union could, with difficulty, place slightly more than 100 heavy bombers over this country on a two-way mission; in addition, 150 Red medium bombers are capable of striking only Canada and the northwest corner of the United States.)

The "booster gap" seems to be reduced and we are able to deliver bigger payloads. When Titan III's development is completed, it will be a rocket of such tremendous power that it will be able to thrust into orbit around the earth satellites three times heavier than those that can be launched with our present generation of military space boosters.

The new missile, Minuteman II, now being developed, will be more than 8 times as effective against military targets as its predecessors.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Jan. 29, 1965]

THE MISSILE GAP MYTH—IV: LESSON SEEN: RED SECRECY BACKFIRED

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—In a sense, the rapid development of Minuteman and Polaris missiles came as a surprise to the men in charge of the critical program. "When we started the ICBM program in 1954," Gen. Bernard A. Schriever said in complimenting the Air Force and other U.S. efforts, "many of the requirements and deadlines seemed impossible.

"At that point, no one could have predicted the breakthrough in solid propellants that led to the development of the Minuteman and Polaris missiles.

"In the early 1950's, the ICBM concept was not viewed favorably at all. The need for the ballistic missile was not clear in a great many people's minds. There was a general feeling the Soviets did not have the technical or industrial ability to push a top-priority ICBM effort. Many felt strongly the ICBM was not feasible, or the most economical or efficient way to build an effective weapon system.

"We faced many real technical problems in the area of guidance and booster systems, we lacked facilities for design, test, evaluation, and production of ballistic missiles. We did not have a readymade force of skilled scientists, engineers, and technicians, and this meant we had to draw on colleges and universities, on the Air Force technical training program, and on industry, for the highly skilled people we needed.

ONE CLEAR LESSON

"One very clear lesson emerges from our ICBM experience and it is this: We cannot afford to rest on our past accomplishments."

Gen. James M. Gavin believes that, "In the missile lag, there is a great preoccupation with numbers which, I suppose, accounts for use of the word 'gap.' The important thing, however, is to make certain that through lack of imagination a lag is not created which the Soviets could exploit under an umbrella of fear. It was confrontation of fear that resolved Cuba; if we hadn't had missiles, we would have been in tough shape.

"I think the anti-ICBM lag is a year or two wider than we thought it would be at this time; we can close it, but it may be more than we had anticipated.

"It may be that the short-range missile is the real savior, being highly mobile, and giving the target little warning time, not even the 15 minutes that the ICBM's give. If, for example, in war between the United States and the U.S.S.R., the Soviets moved from their present bases of power, occupying West Germany or France, our Minuteman ICBM would not be useful, because we would be reluctant to bomb indiscriminately the homelands of our friends. In that case, the short-range, mobile missile would be of major help."

CAUTION IS NECESSARY

The State Department official, who was close to intelligence aspects of the missile gap situation, said, "If you theorize that the Russians didn't deploy their first missile because it was too big, consider that we deployed Atlas, and it was big, too. (Author's note: Actually, however, the Russian missile was two to three times larger than our Atlas. It was awkward to manage and difficult to protect.) They had this system working, It's surprising they didn't go on with it, because the bluff was a big temporary advantage. I would have thought they would have deployed 25 or 50 anyway, yet if there was any deployment, it must have been very small.

"I guess they could see simpler, cheaper systems coming down the line and at the same time, probably no danger that we would get something deployed. It wasn't a Russian change of heart, in any event; they eventually decided to deploy other systems and now have done so.

"It seems to me what we learned from the missile gap situation is that one has to be extremely cautious in assuming the other power will always do what seems sensible in our eyes. It seemed rational for them to deploy a first-generation missile, one they had produced and tested successfully. The world fear produced by what they had done was demonstrated graphically; it could be advertised by space exploration, letting people draw their own conclusions. It was logical to go ahead and exploit it. Amazingly, the Soviets didn't.

REDS FACE CHOICE, TOO

"You can't do all your planning on the maximum. The Tellers (Prof. Edward Teller, University of California, hydrogen-bomb pioneer) and Symingtons want to assume the Russians always will do everything within their capability. If we did assume that, all the gross national product would go into national defense. You can't defend on the maximum possibility; the Russian doesn't have enough to go around, either; he also has to make a choice, just as we do.

"However, even though one might have disagreed with the Symington view, the missile gap was basically a force for good, because from a position of unstable vulnerability it pushed us into a secure deterrent force. Even disarmers feel it essential that we do not give up the deterrent, because it lends stability to the world situation.

"Now, in addition to a strong deterrent, better intelligence gives us confidence that we know what the Soviets are doing in deployment and that they can't, therefore, suddenly show up one day with something that will knock out our deterrent."

Dr. Carl Kaysen, who was deputy to McGeorge Bundy, President Kennedy's adviser on national security affairs, related that: "By the middle of 1961, the weight of evidence was on the side of the agency people (in favor of reduced estimates of Soviet missile strength); the CIA figures showed sharply lowered figures, with some dissent from the Air Force."

QUESTIONS IN 1961

"In the fall of 1961, the first full Kennedy budget was under discussion. It was shaped by the Defense Department, the Budget Director's Office, and the White House staff before it was presented to the President. In this connection, the question of the McNamara missile program and Soviet strength estimates, much revised, arose."

(The administration made no official comment following McNamara's February 1961 announcement that there was no gap.)

Dr. Kaysen continued, "With these discussions, the question of the vanishing gap was really sharply focused. Our first discussion with the President was on Thanksgiving 1961 at Hyannis Port. By December, the Air Force view was in such a distinct minority that the issue was dead.

"For 6 or 7 months thereafter, at the lower levels, the CIA and Air Force were still hitting each other over the head, but by the finish of the budget talks, with the new figures, the missile gap, as an operational issue, was no longer interesting.

"My own opinion is very strongly that the criticism of the 'missile gap' in the 1960 campaign was honest, if erroneous, because Mr. Kennedy got information from Senators SYMINGTON and Johnson (Lyndon B. Johnson then was chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee and held numerous hearings on the 'missile gap'). I think there was good faith and a misunderstanding of facts. An unconscious desire of the Air Force to do a good job for itself also was a major element."

HISTORY OF MISTAKES

"We have a history of mistakes in estimating Soviet long-range striking capacity. We went through this same business on the bomber gap, projecting a growth that never occurred. In some sense, this is 'Monday morning quarterbacking,' but if we had been on the scene (Kennedy administration staff), I think we would not have made the 'missile gap' mistake. I'm speaking now not of the policy level, but of persons at the professional level, including the intelligence people.

"The Soviets always have spent proportionately lots more on defense, rather than on offense; we have done the opposite. This was clear enough by the late fifties, but instead of heeding it, we tried to figure what they would do if they were us.

"The trouble with all these fellows (who favored the higher Soviet missile estimates) is that they think in rather narrow military terms. I think of the Soviets much more on political terms. I think they believe in deterrents, not first-strike power. I believe they said to themselves, 'The United States doesn't know how many missiles we have deployed; we certainly scared the hell out of them.' This was political reinforcement."

SOVIETS CITE U.S. PANIC

(Examination of Soviet publications reveals that Russian writers Yermashow and Mikuson commented in 1960, "the reaction of American military circles to the launching of the Soviet sputnik is * * * panic * * * the successes of the Soviet Union in developing ICBM's means the United States no longer can count on the invulnerability of its territory.")

"The notion that you could have a technological surprise that would upset the military balance in a short time is highly unlikely. But the missile gap was part of that concept; the present anti-ballistic-missile wrangle also is part of the same notion," Dr. Kaysen said.

"The suggestion that the Reds could make an anti-missile-missile breakthrough of such proportions that we would be in danger because they would consider going to war seems exaggerated. Both sides have very destructive weapons, and a context in which a rational political leader would start a war deliberately is hard to imagine. Moreover, I find it hard to believe that a major new weapon of importance would not be big, expensive, and complicated; this means a long period of development and deployment.

"This is not to say that if they made a breakthrough they would not press politically; this is quite a different thing.

"A FINAL REASON

"One of the reasons for the missile gap, of course, was that the Russians appreciated the missile before we did. I think as far as nuclear war goes, they always operate on a deterrent theory. I think ours is a pseudo-deterrent theory, with an underground of first-strike philosophy, never explicitly or officially expressed, but there—not a theory that we would actually use it, but that we would have the capability, and employ it politically."

This article was not written in an effort to place blame, but to make clear what happened during an important interlude in U.S. history.

What we did was not stupid; we did the best we knew. It was prudent for Americans, lacking information, to react as they did. Recognizing what the facts were, however, ought to prevent us from reacting again as we did then.

There ought to be a lesson in this experience both for us and the Soviet Union. The basic purpose of Soviet secrecy is to buy military protection. If, as in the case of the missile gap, our lack of knowledge of what they are doing causes us to arm more, obviously Russian secrecy is defeating its own purpose.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART III

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of January 26, 1965, the third part of "New York City in Crisis."

This excellent series dramatizes the severe problems facing the greatest city in the world. The following installment concerns—as did part II—the urban renewal program in New York:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—WHEN URBAN RENEWAL GOES WRONG

(By Barry Gottehrer and Marshall Peck)

Even at its best, when the planning process flows smoothly, untouched by political pressures and indecision, urban renewal still claims its victims. As unfortunate as this may be, the greater good of a city, the clearing away of slums and blighted areas, decrees it and someone—usually the small businessman—frequently must suffer hardship out of necessity.

Unfortunately, in New York City, politics, indecision and haphazard planning have become disturbingly identifying symbols of more than a few urban-renewal projects. This is the story of one of them and the unnecessary hardships inflicted by a city government unable to make up its mind.

MOVE

Three years ago, when William Brady decided to move his retail tire business to larger quarters, he called his attorney. He had already found what appeared to be an ideal location—a spacious and reasonably priced garage-type building at 311 East 23d Street—but first, before he moved from 35th Street, he wanted to make sure the city had no urban-renewal plans for that block.

A longtime New Yorker, he had heard about what could happen to a businessman, particularly one without political connections, when the city's slum-clearance people went to work.

His lawyer, Louis Buck, reported back that there were indeed plans for an urban renewal project in the Bellevue Hospital area. But, according to plans approved by both the board of estimate and the city planning commission, the Bellevue South project was to run from 24th to 28th Streets and from First to Second Avenues. The building that Mr. Brady wanted to buy at 311 East 23d Street was not to be included in the project. And, at the time, according to Mr. Buck, he was told that there were no definite plans to extend or alter the boundaries of the project.

When research by the Title Guarantee Trust Co. confirmed the attorney's findings, Mr. Brady was delighted. It was even better than he had anticipated. Now not only was he going to move his Economy Tire Co. into a highly suitable building—with a business section in front and interior parking in the back—but he also was moving into an area that, because of the nearby urban renewal project, would be totally redeveloped and bring additional potential customers into the neighborhood.

SOLD

With these facts before him, Bill Brady closed the deal early in December of 1962 and, with a $25,000 down payment, took possession of the $250,000 property.

"It seemed ideal—the location, the building, the price—everything," he said. "I thought I had looked into everything."

He had, but, as he and thousands of other victims of urban renewal have learned, everything frequently isn't enough in New York. Bill Brady had failed to consider the inconsistencies, the haphazard planning, and the irregularities that have marked the administration of the city's urban renewal program since it was first set up.

Within months after he had bought the building, Mr. Brady learned that the board of estimate and the housing and redevelopment board, established in 1960 to strengthen and consolidate the city's urban renewal program, were giving serious thought to extending the boundaries of Bellevue South.

Under the new plan, the project would still run from First to Second Avenues, but it would also run from 23d to 30th Streets. Suddenly, Bill Brady found himself standing directly in the path of a Federal bulldozer officially named urban renewal but labeled human or Negro removal by its critics.

PLANNING

"Sure the boundaries for the Bellevue South project have changed many times, but that's the way planning works," says one city official connected with the program. "That's the way planning has to work. When people ask about the area, we tell them that 'Yes, as of this date, there is no plan for that block.' But we also are supposed to warn them that if they are on the outskirts of a proposed project the plans could always be changed. Hell, there are no guarantees about anything in this life. We can't guarantee that your building won't be burned down by an arsonist either."

This city official has a job to do—to clear out slums and bring in more low- and middle-income housing—but he is part of a system that is simply not geared to function for the benefit of the city's little people, those who need help most of all.

In the case of Bellevue South, residents and small businessmen have been treated to a baffling series of shifting boundaries to the north and to the south simply because city officials, after more than 10 years of planning and procrastination, have finally decided that the larger boundaries provide "a neater package."

The project itself officially dates back to April of 1954 when the mayor's committee on slum clearance, headed by Robert Moses, announced that low-rent, State-aided public housing might be coming between 26th and 30th Streets on the East Side.

Bellevue Hospital, the largest of the city's hospitals, had long been seeking low-cost housing in its neighborhood to accommodate some of its 6,600 employees and, when the city planning commission listed the area as "substandard and unsanitary" in December of 1954, wheels began to turn.

By June of 1956, when the slum clearance committee sought planning commission and board of estimate approval to proceed with planning for the project, the boundaries had been extended to cover from 23d to 30th Streets. The approval, however, came at a time when the slum clearance committee was under intensive fire for alleged irregularities in the city's urban renewal program—and, consequently, the project was temporarily shelved.

Yet on June 25, 1959, when the board of estimate authorized the slum clearance committee to apply for advanced planning funds, the project's boundaries now stretched from 24th to 28th Streets. In fact, as late as

April of 1961, the housing and redevelopment board (HRB) publicly discussed the project with these same boundaries.

NO SLUM

Though there was occasional mention in the city's newspapers about enlarging the boundaries again and an HRB report dated December 30, 1962 (which listed the boundaries from 23d to 30th Streets), it was not until July of 1963 that the planning commission approved the larger $60 million project and the HRB filed its formal report to Washington.

And what is even more incredible is that it was not until last September 10 that the board of estimate got around to approving the new Bellevue South project and adopted a resolution that the boundaries (24th to 28th Streets) set on June 25, 1959, more than 5 years before, should finally be amended to read from 23d to 30th Street.

Today, a small sign is fixed to the front window at 311 East 23d Street. It reads, "No Blight, No Slum" and, inside, Bill Brady and a half-dozen employees go about their business of selling tires. He had been offered $150,000 by the city for his property after being told that it was assessed for only $130,000.

Later, city officials discovered that Mr. Brady's 1964 city tax bill listed the assessed valuation at $170,000, $40,000 more than the recent assessment and $20,000 more than they had offered him. Yet, despite this apparent discrepancy, he has been offered no adjustment.

So Bill Brady has decided to sue and has hired Samuel Goldstein, an attorney who specializes in condemnation cases. If this case runs true to form, it will drag out for more than a year and, though he will probably recover some percentage of the money he feels he is legally entitled to, he must now share it with an attorney.

Some condemnation attorneys receive a minimum of 25 percent, but most work on a sliding scale, charging approximately 5 percent if the amount is near the assessed value, considerably more if the owner seeks what he considers payment in full for his investment, tangible and intangible. Mr. Brady expects to pay his attorney $20,000.

"It's taken me a while but I've finally learned that in this city you've got to look out for yourself," says Bill Brady. "I've fought this all the way and I can't fight any more. I've got to pick up the pieces and start again. I've got to take second best. I paid out $250,000 and it seems right that I should get it back. You know, they claimed I hadn't made a downpayment, came up here looking me over as if there was some funny business going on. Well I know what is right and what is wrong. But I've got to take what they say. They make it sound like it is the law."

RENTS

Until his suit is settled, he will continue to look for another location (he has had no luck so far) and continue to sell tires at 311 East 23d Street, a building he now rents from the city. The rent has been set at $1,360 a month but, because the city is using four offices above his garage as special quarters for the project administration and because he is still paying the gas and electric bill for the entire building, Mr. Brady has requested a reduction, which the city is now considering.

"The last decade has seen a complete shift from brick and mortar renewal to human renewal in this city," says Milton Mollen, the city's housing chief. "Despite its youth, great strides have been made in New York City under its renewal program. I think the people who criticize the program just don't know what they're talking about. Under our program, the people wind up in better housing and the businessmen are reimbursed."

These are noble sentiments, but, in the case of Bellevue South and other past projects, they are, at best, halftruths. To any one who spends a week or even a few hours talking to the residents and businessmen of the area, it would seem that New York's human renewal, at times, painfully ignores the human element. Just look at a cross section of the area's residents and businessmen:

Mario Sargenti, a crippled, 52-year-old importer of food delicacies, is a two-time victim of urban renewal. He had been forced out of the Chelsea area by a State-aided, low-income housing project in 1958 and had moved to East 24th Street in 1959.

He says he hired an attorney and an architect to check out urban renewal plans for the area.

He also says—and his lawyer concurs—that they were told by the city planning commission that there were no plans for 333 East 24th Street.

IMPOSSIBLE

The planning commission—and the HRB—both say that this is impossible, that there were plans for 24th Street to be included in the Bellevue South project at that time. They also say that they can't understand how it could possibly have happened.

"It just doesn't make sense," says Lloyd Kaplan, of the planning commission. "He should have been told. But, if he was told, it just doesn't make sense that he would still have bought the property."

Mr. Sargenti did buy the property, for $63,000, and says he spent an additional $40,000 to remodel it. The city appraisal for his property was only $68,000 and now he, too, is being forced to sue the city for money that his lawyer tells him is rightfully his.

"I don't know where I stand any more," says Mr. Sargenti. "I can't move until I get the money from the city. I can't do anything. The city doesn't care about me or any of the people down here. I've worked hard in this city. The city has let me down. Where do I go from here? What can I do? Start all over again—from scratch?"

WRONG

The City Textile Printing Corp., which employs 80 people, mostly in unskilled jobs, has been on East 27th Street for 18 years. "We can't stop what they're doing," says Irving Moskowitz, a company executive. "The city says it's all for progress and we don't have a leg to stand on. But there's another side to this. If they force all of us out of business, where are they going to get tax money from? The city complains about losing businesses and unskilled jobs and then they do this. Since we've been forced to move, we're now going to look for the most favorable spot—taxwise and laborwise." And, according to the company, the list of possible new sites does not include a single one in New York City.

George Baderian, 74, has owned the candy store at the corner of 23d Street since 1911 and lives above it, on the third floor with his three sons.

"It is wrong what they are doing to this neighborhood," he says. "The city is out for itself. It's not looking out for me. I spent my life here. You know what happens when a fish comes out of water. It dies. When I leave here, I die."

Duncan Campbell is a sheetmetal worker who emigrated with his wife and two children from Scotland 8 years ago. Today, he lives at 328 East 28th Street. His problem: he earns too much to move into the low-income Nathan Straus development nearby and too little to move into one of the middle-income buildings that are planned for the area.

"There have been five different men here looking and asking what we want to do," says Mrs. Campbell. "We've been doing fine until now. We've been working hard. It's almost as if we were going to be penalized for working hard. The city is killing initiative."

Irving Brender owns a drycleaning shop at the corner of 28th Street and Second Avenue. He and his mother bought the building in May of 1961. The city today has offered him $58,990 for his property. Outside the project area but only two blocks up the avenue, a building smaller than his own is on sale for $85,000. Mr. Brender cannot afford to buy this new building.

"I just happen to be in the way," he says. "I'm just going to get the least they want to give me."

Irving Feuer, part owner of the Peter Cooper Pharmacy on First Avenue near 24th Street, is hopeful that the department of relocation will move his store to a temporary location somewhere within the renewal area during the construction. For if the pharmacy is forced to close temporarily or move far out of the area temporarily, Mr. Feuer fears he may be out of business permanently.

COMPETITION

Another pharmacy has already rented quarters just up the block in New York Towers, a luxury apartment house just recently completed at 305 East 24th Street.

"We may be the old, established drugstore now," says Mr. Feuer, "but with a new drugstore up the street, how many customers are going to come back to us when we move back? That other store is hurting us already."

It is the new apartment house that really infuriates most of the area's longtime residents and businessmen. This house, where rents average between $70 and $75 a month per room, was put up in the last 3 years, even though its owners knew that the city already had urban renewal plans for the area and conceivably could decide at almost anytime that their project did not fit into the Bellevue South plans.

"Sure it was a risk," says Nelson Seitel, one of the six owners of the house, an attorney, and a former aid and commissioner of labor under Mayor Wagner. "We figured we could always move faster than the city."

By August of 1963, when the city planning commission held a hearing on a petition to utilize that site for a public housing project, the New York Towers people had already relocated all 122 tenants, cleared the land, and started excavation.

CONVINCER

Mr. Seitel, who represented his co-owners at the hearing, says he never discussed the apartment house with the mayor, and doubts whether his political connections helped him in any way. He insists that it was a Federal Housing Administration commitment of $50 a foot (the price the city would have to pay to acquire the cleared land) and the support of Federal Housing Administrator Robert Weaver, who said the Federal agency would not finance a public-housing project at that price, that ultimately convinced the city administration that the apartment house should stay.

Bellevue South residents and business men, far less successful in their attempts to save their homes and their livelihoods, insist, without proof, that Mr. Seitel's political connections were the determining factor.

Whatever the reason or reasons, the fact remains that a long shot paid off for Mr. Seitel and his partners—their house is now listed as part of the approved overall plan for Bellevue South—while several sure things have run out of the money for some other people, who never worked for the mayor.

"We found a good deal of support, almost as much as opposition, for the Bellevue South project," claims Milton Mollen.

What he means is that the residents and owners of the new apartment house, the directors and staff of the church and civic organizations, which will become part of the project, and the people of Bellevue Hospital, who one day will benefit from it, are all strongly in favor of the plan.

What he does not say is that there has been virtually no support from the people Bellevue South affects most—those who presently live and own businesses there.

PROBLEM

Perhaps the biggest problem here—and in almost every other urban renewal area—is the determination of what is and what is not a slum. To people who live and work in these 7 blocks (6,215 residents and 147 retail shops), this area is by no means a slum or seriously blighted. It needs rehabilitation, they agree, but it does not need a bulldozer.

But to the city and Bellevue Hospital, which remains the main force behind the project, the seven-block area is definitely a slum. Of the 2,224 dwelling units there, the HRB classified 1,632 as "dilapidated," 289 as "deteriorating," and only 303 as "sound."

Under present plans (Mr. Mollen says it will be a minimum of 5 years until the project is completed), the city intends to rehabilitate only 233 apartment units. In the place of the others, the city plans to put up 17 buildings with 2,260 apartments. Of these, only 210 will be public housing, with 85 percent of the others averaging between $24 and $33 a room.

Yet the dislocation of residents in the Bellevue South project area has been a lot less painful than it has been in other renewal areas. Although there is not enough public and low-income housing in the project, 267 apartments have been reserved in the recently completed Nathan Straus Houses, a low-income, public-housing project just outside Bellevue South between 27th and 28th Streets and 2d and 3d Avenues.

PROPOSAL

One proposal—put forward by the Bellevue South Tenants Association—called for the city to build housing for the people of Bellevue Hospital on highway and air rights over the East River Drive and suggested that the HRB rehabilitate rather than tear up the seven-block area. This proposal was presented at a city hall hearing and, despite loud and enthusiastic support, was quickly forgotten.

It is precisely this conflict between rehabilitation and bulldozing that cuts to the heart of urban renewal. Everybody agrees slums and blight are bad. It is the method of getting rid of them that disturbs many people and the city's haphazard planning that disturbs many more.

There will always be a basic conflict where urban renewal is concerned. The city government will always insist a project is for the greater good and the area's residents and small businessmen will invariably insist that it isn't. This conflict is not difficult to understand.

In many instances, these people have paid a price for progress that is truly necessary for the city's greater good. Yet, in the case of Bellevue South and other projects where haphazard planning, indecision, and politics have caused further and greater hardship on the area's residents and businessmen, the price for progress is too high. Here, the people have ceased to be victims of urban renewal. They have become instead victims of the city administration.

HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced President Johnson's suggested bill for home rule for the District of Columbia. The bill provides for an elected mayor, city council, and a nonvoting delegate to this body.

I have been a supporter and a worker for home rule for Washington ever since I came to the Congress. It is right. It is just. I do not see how we can continue to deny the residents of the District of Columbia the same rights and privileges of responsible citizenship that every other American enjoys.

The plain and simple truth is that this is not just a struggle for the right to vote. This is a fundamental part of the 20th-century struggle for freedom. How can this great Nation continue to urge self-determination for the captive nations of Europe, for the former colonial nations in Africa and Asia, when we still deny the residents of our own Capital City that same self-determination?

In his message to the Congress urging the enactment of home rule legislation President Johnson said:

> The restoration of home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia must no longer be delayed.

These are my sentiments. I believe that they are the sentiments of the majority of the Members of this House. I urge the chairman of the District Committee, our distinguished colleague from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], to refer this bill to a subcommittee as soon as possible so that hearings can be scheduled and a report on home rule legislation filed with the House without any undue delay.

GOLD COVER

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have supported the passage of H.R. 3818 to eliminate the requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain 25 percent in gold certificates against deposits. As pointed out in the debate, this bill will help eliminate any unnecessary questions or doubts about our ability to support sustained and healthy growth at home and to back our pledge to maintain a stable dollar. The bill has the support of our bankers and economists in general.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill must in no way defer immediate attention to the serious and urgent problem of gold flow abroad, so compellingly brought to our attention by the outflow the fourth quarter of last year. The White House has indicated that the President has this matter under study and will announce a revised program in the near future.

I am confident the President will take the steps necessary to meet this serious problem. The international prestige and economic power of the Nation are very much at stake, and here at home we certainly cannot have a Great Society without a sound dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time is at hand when we must recognize that some relatively severe, and at least in part, unpopular additional measures may be required to curb the flow of gold overseas.

Such measures as these may prove to be necessary:

A tax on bank loans to foreigners.

Increased tax on purchase of foreign securities.

Tax incentives to foreigners who invest dollars in the United States.

Tie AID dollars to purchase of U.S. goods.

A Federal tax on U.S. tourists going abroad.

Further reduction in duty-free allowance for returning tourists.

Further steps to encourage our international neighbors to visit the United States.

Insistence that our NATO allies foot a larger share of Western European defense costs.

Restrictions on the sales of non-U.S. goods at oversea post exchanges and commissaries.

Limitation of military aid to that involving military equipment produced in the United States.

A program of commercial aircraft and shipbuilding incentives to encourage users to purchase U.S.-made planes and ships.

Encouragement of U.S. firms making capital investments abroad to use local currency rather than U.S. dollars.

A program offering intensified governmental and private assistance in building export markets, helping the largest producers and small business as well.

The increased use of agricultural surpluses as the catalytic means of developing permanent demand for the purchase of U.S. farm products abroad.

BOY SCOUT WEEK IN AMERICA

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind this body that this is a national observance of Boy Scout Week in America. I believe this observance is especially significant because the theme is "Our American Heritage" and Boy Scouts all over this country are pausing to examine those strengths of our institutions which continue to contribute to the dynamic growth of our democratic way of life.

Permit me to make special mention of a group of Boy Scouts in my district in Connecticut. I refer to Troop 22 of St. Mary's Church in Greenwich. Their particular project is to study the Congress of the United States, to find out how it works and what it is contributing to the preservation and extension of our

American heritage. To assist this particular troop in this effort, I am giving copies of this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to members of the troop for their further study.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the 122 Members of the House of Representatives who have introduced resolutions condemning anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Undoubtedly many more Congressmen will join with us to voice their opposition to this vicious practice.

Prejudice, bigotry, and discrimination on the grounds of race, religion, or national origin, or on any other unreasonable grounds, are to be deplored wherever they occur, at home as well as abroad. Such irrational behavior may, in fact, never be completely eradicated from any society on this earth. But racial and religious persecution are particularly malevolent when they are supported officially or unofficially by the state.

Religious persecution is the policy of the Government of the Soviet Union. And not only Jews are being persecuted. Members of all religious faiths are suffering under the pressures being exerted by the Soviet police state, for the Soviet Union is opposed officially to all religion. That is why the resolution introduced by we 122 Members of Congress declares:

> It is the sense of the Congress that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned.

Yet, there is also evidence that the Soviet Union is using its official antireligious policies as a screen behind which Government officials can hide while practicing their traditional anti-Semitism. At any rate, the Jews are getting the brunt of Soviet official religious persecution. The Congress of the United States of America can do no less than take note of this unhappy fact.

Eyewitness accounts of Soviet anti-Semitism have been printed in numerous publications in this country. One of the most pungent accounts that I have seen appears in the February 4, 1965, issue of the Texas Jewish Post, as quoted in Jess Jawin's column. With unanimous consent, I am inserting the "Report on Russia" at this point in the RECORD:

JESS JAWIN

Recently we brought you a report on Germany and the need to extend the statute of limitations which the West German Government plans to allow to expire this coming May 8.

This week we've garnered a factual report from Soviet Russia. It concerns an eyewitness account from a man who has made several trips to Russia on cultural and other missions. Because we do not want to interfere with his freedom of action and entrance to the Soviet Union we are withholding his name.

This is his account:

"A recent visit to the Soviet Union has served to confirm the existence of serious problems and pressures on the organized Jewish community and on Jewish life generally. Americans who visited major cities were able to talk at length with qualified observers in the press and diplomatic corps and, to some degree, with Jews themselves. They found Jews eager to contact, but often apprehensive of the consequences. On more than one occasion, Jews spoke Yiddish, but switched to another language when they saw Russians watching or listening. The main synagogue in Moscow was filled on a typical Saturday morning, but most of those present were women and men past the retirement age. Saturday is a working day in the Soviet Union until 3 p.m. Men must therefore choose between their work and their religious duty. Few can afford the latter choice.

"The Soviet Union is of course opposed officially to all religion. But observation confirmed that this opposition is applied far more severely against the Jews than some other religions. Religious life at the center of the Armenian Christian Church in Echmiadzin, for example, was obviously flourishing, and enjoyed the uninhibited support and presence of the congregants. One journalist offered this formulation: Official antireligious policies provide a convenient screen behind which Soviet officials, particularly at lower levels, can indulge their traditional anti-Semitism. Yet, one found the Jews lively in their curiosity and open in their friendliness to American visitors. They clearly feel deep bonds linking them to American Jewry and welcome visitors to their services.

"It was possible to discuss with observers, the question of the usefulness of public organized protest and pressure in the United States against Soviet acts and policies which embody anti-Semitism or excessive pressure. These observers were unanimous and emphatic in stating that these activities are important and useful, and should be continued. This is not only because they expose and embarrass the Soviet Government on this issue, which is true, or that they stimulate the U.S. Government to greater awareness and responsiveness, which is also true; there is also the effect on the morale of the Jews in the Soviet Union. Lacking organized channels of communication, such as newspapers, they rely on the shortwave radio for much of their news of Jewish interest. Those who have radios tell others and news spreads. Kol Yisroel, the Israel radio, broadcasts in Yiddish and is heard in the Soviet Union. Accounts of American protests and expressions of sympathy with the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union plays a prominent part in these broadcasts, and—we are assured—does much to support and strengthen the morale and steadfastness of the Jews.

"Some American Jews have questioned these activities on the ground that they may be harmful to the cause of ultimately improving the lot and freedom of the Jews in the Soviet Union. These fears appear to be incorrectly based. It would seem from the conversations which recently took place in Moscow that American protests serve a positive purpose, and should be continued."

LET A JUST NATION PROVIDE HOSPITAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, an article in the AFL-CIO American Federationist, February 1965, by Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of the AFL-CIO Department of Social Security, may be of some help to the Members of this House in their consideration of the issues involved in legislation providing hospital care for the elderly under social security, and I include it here for that reason as part of my remarks:

[From the AFL-CIO American Federationist, February 1965]

THE FINAL PUSH TO WIN HOSPITAL CARE

(By Nelson H. Cruikshank)

"Let a just nation throw open * * * the city of promise * * * to the elderly, by providing hospital care under social security and by raising benefit payments to those struggling to maintain the dignity of their later years." So spoke the President of the United States in his state of the Union message to Congress on January 4, 1965.

This pledge of the President was greeted by the loudest and most prolonged applause of any part of his message. It is the intention of the AFL-CIO in the period ahead to see that this applause is turned into votes and a long-discussed bill turned from a topic of debate and strife into law.

Millions of people throughout the country, young and old, have been hopeful for several years that the passage of this legislation was imminent. Now at last these hopes may well be realized. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony Celebrezze told 1,500 cheering members of the National Council of Senior Citizens who came to Washington for the opening of Congress that "We're on the eve of victory in a good and noble humanitarian cause." Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, predicted the bill would be on the President's desk, ready for his signature by Easter.

While there are still many obstacles to overcome, the situation in Congress is vastly improved over any that hospital care legislation has ever faced before.

The massive victory of the Johnson-Humphrey ticket in the 1964 election was, and is widely acknowledged as being, a clear mandate for the speedy enactment of hospital care. The candidates for President and Vice President all expressed their positions strongly and clearly, for and against expanding social security to encompass health insurance. No proponent of health insurance on the Ways and Means Committee lost in the election. The three most adamant committee opponents were roundly defeated. While there has been much discussion about the meaning of various opinion polls on hospital care, the outcome of this poll—the only national poll not taken on a sampling basis—was clear: the people of this country want their social security system continued and they want it built on and expanded to include health benefits for the elderly.

The worst threat to old-age security today is the high cost of illness. People aged 65 and over get sick more often and for longer periods of time than the rest of the population. They need much more expensive hospital and posthospital care and they have much less money to meet the costs of illness. With hospital rates now up to $35 or $40 a day in many cities, these elderly people desperately need prepaid health insurance protection. And their families need the protection against the economic havoc and emotional destruction they now face when serious illness strikes at their older members. The general design of a workable remedy became clear beyond doubt in the 88th Congress—a national hospital insurance system based on social security principles for those over 65.

To make social security truly effective in reducing poverty, substantial increases in cash benefits are also necessary—for the retired, the disabled, and for widows and dependent children.

Legislation to meet these objectives has been introduced in this Congress by Senator ANDERSON and Representative CECIL R. KING, Democrat, of California. It is based, with minor modifications, on the Anderson-King bill which was considered by the last Congress and the Anderson-Gore amendment which passed the Senate last summer.

In the last session, a hospital care bill was defeated in conference committee. The bill that was before the Senate and House conferees provided for increased cash benefits as well as health benefits. A deadlock occurred when the House conferees took the position that no bill with hospital care was acceptable and the Senate conferees stuck by their position that no bill without hospital care was acceptable. In conference there are only two votes, one by the Senate managers and one by the House managers. Congressman WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, joined the two Republican House conferees to make a majority of three to two against the hospital care provisions.

The proponents of cash benefits in the social security measure without any hospital insurance in effect dared the proponents to hold up that bill, saying, you don't dare go into an election having turned down $7 a month cash benefits in a social security bill. But they did dare. They dared to do it because they didn't want to push the cost up to the point where the following year, if a hospital insurance bill would come up it could be said that all of the money had been spent on increased cash benefits and that no additional burden could be added. So the majority of the Senate conferees decided to hold it back and next time consider all the factors together: cash benefits and hospital insurance. This was a most courageous thing for a party leadership to do, with the backing of the White House, just going into a national election. That is why there was no bill last year. And that is why hospital care has a good chance this year.

The margin of support in the Senate was increased by the 1964 election over that which obtained in the last Congress. A change in the composition of the Ways and Means Committee, where only one vote was lacking last year, from 15 Democrats and 10 Republicans to 17 Democrat and 8 Republicans improves the prospects of favorable action by that key committee. It does not in itself assure victory.

In the composition of the House as a whole, the election substantially increased the number of proponents of health insurance through social security. For all practical purposes opponents of this measure have conceded that there has been a majority for passage on the House floor for a number of years, which is why they put forth so much effort to keep the bill from coming to a vote in the House.

The most significant change in the current Congress is in its structure. The Congress is becoming more responsive to the will of its Members and it is no longer so easy for a small power bloc to thwart the will of the majority of the Members and the apparent will of the majority of the American people.

THE AMA CAMPAIGN

Despite these encouraging developments, there is no indication that the enactment of hospital insurance for the aged will be achieved without a hard fight. During the period that the Congress prepares to consider this legislation and works out its details, the American Medical Association can be expected to spend $3.5 million in a new nationwide propaganda campaign seeking to delay enactment of the program.

The official decision to spend additional millions of dollars to continue to fight hospital care was made on December 2, 1964, by the AMA's ruling body—the 228-member house of delegates—meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla.

The strategy of this new multimillion dollar drive is based on the AMA's own analysis of the Goldwater campaign.

It runs like this: (1) A significant element in Goldwater's defeat was that both older people and younger people who look forward to retirement were led to believe that the election of Goldwater was a threat to the social security system; (2) it follows that large masses of both old and young will oppose anything that appears to threaten or weaken social security; and (3) to defeat hospital care it is only necessary to convince the public that it would bring about a breakdown in the social security system.

Therefore, the AMA campaign against hospital care should be a massive saturation campaign carried on by TV and all other available media to picture hospital care as a threat to social security solvency. The letters that would pour into Congress would not then be, so the strategy runs, from doctors, doctors' wives, nurses and others immediately subject to AMA brainwashing or job control, but from millions of citizens including many of the elderly themselves. If fear of social security bankruptcy could help defeat Goldwater, it also can be used to defeat hospital care, runs the strategy.

So the public can expect a massive campaign during the early weeks of the new Congress to present hospital care not as "socialized medicine"—that is passé—but as a threat to social security.

AFL–CIO members and their many friends, who have worked so long and so hard, who have written letters, sent telegrams, signed petitions, and even journed to Washington to make known their views on the issue should be prepared to withstand this latest propaganda barrage.

Many of the 54 State and territorial (constituent) societies of the AMA and nearly 2,000 county (component) societies have expressed considerable uneasiness to AMA headquarters in Chicago since President Johnson's landslide victory revealed a probable majority of at least 60 in support of hosptial care in the new House of Representatives.

In the spring of 1964, through the AMA-organized Operation Hometown, they had dug up the cold cash for TV, radio, newspaper and magazine ads seeking to pour scorn on the administration's proposed program. Practically every county society organized special committees aimed at enlisting allies, reaching the public through speakers' bureaus and materials distribution in doctors' offices, through direct contacts with Senators and Congressmen who were their patients and through the stimulation of congressional mail by members of their staffs and through supporting groups. These groups included insurance industry allies, chambers of commerce, manufacturers' groups, trade associations, etc.

The estimated cost of Operation Hometown activity has been put at over $3 million by the National Council of Senior Citizens, whose affiliated groups, located in nearly 2,000 communities throughout the Nation, have reported on this matter to their national headquarters.

Apparently not convinced that Operation Hometown, financed largely by the State and county societies, was doing the job it felt was needed, the AMA hierarchy—without approval of the house of delegates—decided on another program of its own, financed with AMA headquarters money, during the final week of the presidential campaign. The AMA ran TV spots over one of the major national networks and over clear channel stations. The AMA advertised in more than a 1,000 daily newspapers and thousands of weeklies in what was described as an educational program to boost the already existing Kerr-Mills law and to seek to confuse the public concerning the King-Anderson bill. The price tag on this program has been reported at over $2 million.

But the Kerr-Mills law does not operate in all States; its eligibility requirements differ from State to State and there is a wide difference in the benefits offered from one State to another. Medical societies in many States were embarrassed over the AMA-financed advertising which appeared under the sponsorship of their State and county societies. In Florida, J. Hal Stallings of Tampa, chairman of the State welfare board, said the ads were "selfishly inspired and definitely misleading." The matter was brought to the State welfare board's attention by many elderly applying for the advertised Kerr-Mills medicine which they found was actually nonexistent in their State.

The New Jersey State Medical Society, through its delegates to the Bal Harbour meeting, urged that any AMA program which was to be conducted on a national level first be presented to the individual component association for its approval. This resolution won a surprising number of supporters from other States which had criticism of AMA's "misleading" advertising campaign.

However, the committee on legislation and public relations rejected the complaints and urged the house of delegates to reject the New Jersey resolution, maintaining that its effect would be to "tie the hand of the board of trustees at critical times when action on a national level may be necessary."

The board of trustees compromised by inviting two representatives from each State medical society to a special meeting on December 13 in Chicago to discuss the new propaganda program to be launched immediately in the new year. The board—which does not need the house of delegates' approval on financial matters—had the house of delegates pass a special resolution in support. The resolution asked for "unequivocal support" because "a variety of techniques and media must be utilized to reach the public, Congress and special audiences effectively."

Significantly, these "delegates" were not to be elected by the State societies but handpicked by the AMA hierarchy. Any danger from "rebels" like those in New Jersey and Michigan and the District of Columbia thus was avoided.

A doctor who was present said the ruling conservative clique was completely in control of the meeting. He said no figures were announced by officials concerning the cost of the program because "the board of trustees considers the house of delegates gave a carte blanche to spend all the money that is necessary."

There were published reports from the house of delegates' meeting that the new propaganda blitz may cost as much as $3.5 million.

Nevertheless, the long campaign to win hospital care for the elderly has entered its final stage. The Nation recognizes the plight of 19 million aged citizens and a strong final push by labor and its allies promises to finally achieve a greater sense of security for the elderly and for their children as well.

THE PROPOSED HEALTH BENEFITS

The 1965 Anderson-King bill would provide the following health benefits to virtually all persons 65 years of age and over—nearly 19 million elderly:

1. Sixty days of hospital care with a deductible equal to the average cost of one day's hospitalization.

2. Post-hospital extended care (primarily skilled nursing home services) after transfer from a hospital, up to 60 days.

3. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services, as required, subject to a deductible amount equal to one-half the deductible for hospital care for all tests in a 30-day period.

4. Home health services, up to 240 visits during a calendar year, to include nursing care and therapy.

These benefits would be payable July 1, 1966, except for posthospital extended care which would be effective January 1, 1967. The Anderson-King bill would pay no doctors' bills.

All persons aged 65 and over are eligible—except employees of the United States (covered by the Federal employees health benefits program) and aliens with relatively short residence in the United States if these people are not insured under social security or railroad retirement. This will include, in 1966, 16 million aged persons eligible under social security, 600,000 aged persons eligible under railroad retirement and 2 million additional aged persons who are not eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits but who will be eligible for health benefits under the proposed change.

Administration of the health benefits would be by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the social security program. Hospitals could elect to be represented by a private organization (such as Blue Cross) to negotiate their contracts. The Secretary could also delegate to such organization the functions of receiving payments from the social security program.

Payments would be made to hospitals and other providers of services on a cost basis. The cost of hospital services would be based on semiprivate accommodations (two-, three-, or four-bed rooms).

CASH BENEFIT INCREASES

This year's King-Anderson bill also will provide a 7-percent benefit increase to the 20 million persons who are now social security beneficiaries, and to those who become beneficiaries in the future. The minimum primary benefit would thereby be increased from $40 per month at present to $42.80; the maximum from $127 to $135.90. The average primary benefit, which is currently about $77.50, would be increased to about $83. Benefit increases would be paid retroactively to January 1, 1964. If the law is enacted in June 1965, this would result in retroactive payments of about $750 million in the fall of 1965.

The maximum annual earnings on which taxes and benefits are computed would be increased from $4,800 to $5,600 a year, effective January 1, 1966. The maximum primary benefit would thereby be further increased to $149.90 and maximum benefit for a family would be increased from $254 at present to $312. Cash benefit increases also accrue to workers who receive tips, as tips would be covered for both tax and benefit computation.

FINANCING

Hospital care coverage for persons eligible under social security or railroad retirement would be financed by part of the income from an increase in social security and railroad retirement taxes paid by employers and employees which would be deposited in a special hospital insurance trust fund. Proposals have been made that would go further in separating the financing of hospital benefits from the financing of social security cash benefits. For example, the Social Security Advisory Council report released January 3, 1964, called for the establishment of a new tax, separate from the taxes in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and for the proceeds to be kept in a separate fund with no provision for transfer of any of the proceeds of the social security tax to the hospital insurance fund.

To the AFL–CIO and other advocates of hospital insurance through social security and railroad retirement, the chief advantage of financing through these systems lies in the fact that in these systems entitlement to benefits is recognized as a right and not dependent on proof of financial need. If ways can be found to assure to the elderly, including those who have already reached age 65, the right to benefits on this same basis, such proposals should receive sympathetic consideration by the AFL–CIO.

The new trust fund would be separate from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and from the Federal disability insurance trust fund and would be used only for the payment of health benefits and the administrative expense of the new program. Health benefits coverage for aged persons not covered by social security or railroad retirement would be financed from general revenues.

The increase in cash benefits and the hospital insurance program would be financed by increasing the annual earning base from $4,800 to $5,600, beginning with 1966, and by revising the social security tax rate schedule. The tax rate for both employer and employee would be increased from the presently scheduled rate of 4.125 percent for 1966–67 to 4.25 percent, and from the presently scheduled rate of 4.625 percent for 1968 and after to 5 percent in 1968–70 and 5.2 percent in 1971 and after. The tax rate for the self-employed would be increased proportionately from the presently scheduled rate.

THE INADEQUACY OF KERR-MILLS

Under the Kerr-Mills program of medical assistance for the indigent aged, enacted by the Congress in 1960, serious shortcomings and inadequacies have become evident. Only a fraction of the needy aged received assistance. MAA benefits depend less upon a person's need than upon the State where he happens to live when his need arises. Many States have been unable or unwilling to provide their share of funds, to set proper benefit standards and to set up the administrative machinery for the Kerr-Mills program.

Furthermore, the Kerr-Mills approach puts a premium on poverty and indigence. It does not help the retired person whose income is enough to keep him going under ordinary circumstances, but who cannot afford the cost of a serious illness and cannot afford private health insurance that will give him any genuine degree of protection against major health costs.

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE INSURANCE

In health insurance, as in many other fields, private and Government enterprise can be made to work together for the greater benefit of all. For example, social security pensions give basic retirement benefits which are supplemented by negotiated pension plans. Government, by relieving the voluntary system of a major part of the cost of health care for the elderly—the part the voluntary system is least able to handle—rather than destroying private health plans will enable them to grow and thrive.

Private insurance, in turn, can continue to experiment with new techniques and new benefits. It can develop coverage to supplement the basic hospital and related benefits for the aged provided through the hospital care program. It can seek to provide increasingly adequate protection to the bulk of the working population. In these ways, private insurance can fulfill its traditional role in our society.

The Anderson-King bill contains a provision to facilitate the development of supplementary private health plans by authorizing the creation of an association of private insurance carriers to sell approved policies on a nonprofit basis. Participating carriers would be exempt from antitrust laws.

There have been other proposals which would utilize private insurance in a totally different, and totally inappropriate, role. The most recent one of these was made in January by the American Medical Association. It seems doubtful whether the AMA's last-ditch effort at an affirmative proposal for a governmental mechanism to assist the aged in financing health costs will receive more than only the cursory attention it merits. Although so far the AMA has not supplied details of its proposal, the information contained in newspaper reports would indicate its program is based on a bill introduced some years ago by Congressman FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio. It would provide subsidies from State and Federal funds toward individually purchased health insurance for persons with incomes below a certain level. It is hard to believe that this type of proposal is meant to represent a serious alternative to social security health insurance for the following reasons:

1. States, which have in large part been unable to finance adequate programs under Kerr-Mills, cannot realistically be expected to raise the much larger sums which would be required for a program of this kind;

2. Benefits paid out through individually purchased private health insurance amount to as little as 40 to 50 percent of the premium dollar, resulting in a significant waste of public funds;

3. Unless there were to be the most stringent regulation of insurance companies, there would be no way to assure that those among the aged who would be the poorest risks would be able to obtain any insurance protection at all.

HEALTH SECURITY FOR EVERYONE

When the much-debated, much-studied, and much-needed piece of legislation is finally enacted, the beneficiaries will not be the elderly alone. All America will profit. As Dr. Benjamin Spock, the country's most famous baby doctor, put it—when we talk about hospital care, "We aren't just talking about old people. We're talking about ourselves and our friends, about the security and dignity we hope we'll all be allowed to hang onto when we're too old to work. And we're talking about our children, too."

Dr. Spock went on: "We worry for years about their innoculations and diseases, whether they're doing the best they can in school, whether we have enough money for their college education. When they're grown up, we still go on caring about how their jobs and their marriages are turning out."

In a perfect summary of the case for this legislation, Dr. Spock concluded: "What's the use of preparing our children so well for existence that they'll live 70 years happily—and then end up with 5 or 10 years of impoverishment and anxiety just because of an illness? Are we going to let ourselves be told we can't plan better than that? I just don't believe it."

Dr. Spock is right. We can plan better than that. President Johnson's signature on a bill providing hospital insurance for the Nation's elderly, and improved cash benefits as well, will be the proof.

OUR GOLD CRISIS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in opposition to the bill before us today, H.R. 3818, calling for removal of the gold backing of bank deposits, and which bill on February 1, with unusual speed, was passed by the House Banking and Currency Committee, after having heard but two witnesses.

Throughout the years many of us have been urging that prompt steps be taken to correct the unfavorable balance of payments, which has been such an important factor in the reduction of our gold reserves—including the tremendous flow of dollars through the foreign aid and military assistance programs around the world.

As one who has been interested in gold mining and the gold problem throughout the years, I am most distressed with the nonchalance with which this whole gold cover problem seems to be taken. I have urged, as have many of my colleagues, over the years and during several administrations, that proper remedial action be taken to halt the continued mounting of the payments deficit. I believe to remove the gold cover from the dollar is not a proper corrective measure. One cannot with a stroke of a pen erase the belief that has been held throughout history that a gold-backed currency is sound. I predict that if the gold cover is removed that the dollar will be weakened abroad and that our national economy will be impaired.

Also, I am deeply concerned over the plight of the domestic gold miner. By the stroke of a pen some 30 years ago, the price of gold was set at $35 an ounce. This action was taken as a depression measure when gold was selling at $20 an ounce. Since the depression days, costs of all commodities, including mining, have more than doubled but the price of gold has remained the same. Ever since the end of World War II many efforts have been made to increase the price of gold to its rightful height in the marketplace. Invariably these efforts were met by incantations by Government spokesmen, over and over again, that the currency of the free world would be tossed in chaos by any effort of the American Government to increase the price of gold for domestic producers. Even efforts to appease the money managers through offers to have bills declared legislative that the official U.S. Government price for gold would remain at $35 an ounce and that any higher prices paid for mining domestic gold would be considered a subsidy by the American Government to its domestic gold producers have failed. Such efforts have been counteracted by charges that this action would create a two-price system for gold and would be very upsetting to foreign bankers.

For these reasons, many proposals, and among them measures which I have sponsored, to increase the price of gold paid to the domestic producer have failed to win approval.

Successive administrations have been called upon time and again by chairmen of responsible congressional committees to put forth an alternative plan so that domestic gold mining could be restored. No such alternative has been forthcoming.

It seems incongruous to me that at a time when Soviet gold production has reached a new high that our own gold mine production has dropped to a relatively low peacetime level.

During the last session, there was some ray of hope when the Senate Interior Committee approved a measure which would have established an incentive program, based on the differences in costs of production, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior and which would have had as its sole purpose the stimulation of domestic gold production. This subsidy measure did not even mention price. It did not provide for any "two-price system" and it was so framed as to allay the fears that it would cause an upset in international currency transactions. It did not touch upon gold as a medium of international monetary exchange. It merely had as its objective the increasing of the output of gold within our borders.

This measure has again been offered in the Senate and I am planning to sponsor such a proposal in the House along with other of my colleagues from the areas in which gold has had a long and memorable history.

No doubt, these measures will again be opposed by the administration through the parroting of the same objections that we have heard over the years. Perhaps we will be told that the answer to our problem is the liberalization of exploration loans through the Department of the Interior.

While, of course, our mining men are interested in increasing their ore reserves, I say to you that most gold-mine operators are now primarily concerned with the problem of either operating at all or mining their reserves at a profit.

I think all of you should make every effort to secure the enactment of the proposal which I have outlined in an effort to restore, in some small degree, a vital and vigorous gold mining industry within the United States.

The gold dilemma which threatens our economy can be resolved by material reduction in U.S. oversea spending, principally for foreign aid.

As the gold reserve dwindles and confidence in the dollar wanes, the foreign clamor to buy gold with paper dollars will become a roar. The next expedient will be an effort to release, upon foreign demand, what remains of our gold reserve. It is utterly naive to believe, as do some high in Government circles, that if gold is readily available foreign demand will cease.

To restore confidence in the dollar it is imperative that excessive U.S. oversea spending, principally for foreign aid, be reduced so as to guarantee favorable balance of payments. This saving would facilitate a balance of payments. This saving would facilitate a balanced domestic budget which is also imperative. Reaction at home and abroad would be one of outward protest but inner respect. If the American people demand that the Congress balance Federal accounts, U.S. economy can be saved.

Oh, we have heard the line that the faith and credit of the United States are also behind that paper money. What good is faith and credit of a nation which, with the exception of a few years in the last 30-year period has never been able to live within its income, which is constantly going deeper and deeper into debt and which, at the same time, is cutting its taxes and thereby reducing its ability to pay that debt? Would anyone accept a promissory note of a neighbor who is continually living beyond his income and piling up debt after debt each year, and whose only security for that note is another of his notes? And yet, that is what the American people are being asked to accept.

Finally, I have another gripe that I might as well get off my chest. I am sick and tired of being told that we must toady to world opinion. If we know we are right we should not give a darn about world opinion. Yet we have received all kinds of insults from foreign peoples and we retaliate by giving them more money. Money which the American taxpayers are finding harder and harder to provide.

I tell you, gentlemen, these Washington Robin Hoods of the red ink have outrageously abused both our money and the public's good faith and now kiss off the whole crisis by saying, "It is not our fault."

We have spent and spent and borrowed and borrowed and now recently had to borrow again to pay for tax reductions.

Taxes have been levied to pay the cost of spending. Accordingly taxes have been the only restraint on Government spending and the only true pressure toward Government efficiency. Taxes were our only guarantee of national solvency. Now we must propose cutting down spending and lowering the taxes—or we are in deep trouble—yet—new programs involving billions of dollars are being planned for this session of Congress, and the usual "snow job" on the public is being staged in the face of the Treasury's defunct condition.

This whole preposterous mess of fiscal irresponsibility was completely predictive and avoidable but politicians using the people's money and the people's good faith have proposed so much that they have underrooted our American dollar while they have in turn drunk in the applause of the unsuspecting millions of American people.

Having run out of gold the proposal to change the law reserving the supply that backs our dollar is pure Washington pantomime—merely another rabbit in the political hat that solves nothing whatever.

It will leave our creditors cold and they will continue to convert their dollars into gold so long as our leaders fail to put America's financial house in order.

TESTIMONY OF DR. FRANCIS J. BROWN

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House Education and Labor Committee is driving through at a fantastically rapid pace a massive Federal aid to education bill. The scope of this bill requires that it be given thorough study, but instead steamroller tactics are being used.

Witnesses who in any way question or oppose the measure are given brusque and perfunctory treatment. All the propaganda weapons at the disposal of the administration are being fired at any opposition, and the public is receiving a completely one-sided description of the long-term effects of this legislation.

Dr. Francis J. Brown, professor of economics at DePaul University in Chicago and resident of South Holland, Ill., is the chairman of the board of directors of the National Association for Personal Rights in Education. Last week he testified before the Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee. Since he and other witnesses have not been given the proper attention a congressional committee should grant them, I am placing in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks his testimony before the subcommittee.

TESTIMONY OF DR. FRANCIS J. BROWN

The National Association for Personal Rights in Education (NAPRE) is an organization composed primarily of taxpaying parents interested in the study and advancement of the personal rights of parents and children in American education.

We speak on behalf of parents and children. We do not speak for any school or church or educational association. Nor have we designated any group to represent us or our children before this Congress in the matter of Federal education legislation.

In opening our analysis of the elementary and secondary education bill of 1965 (H.R. 2361 and H.R. 2362), we first express our appreciation to President Johnson for seeking to make the Federal education tax dollar available to every American child, but we respectfully submit that the present administration bill suffers fatal defects that make it unacceptable to a free citizenry.

As a background for this conclusion we discuss, first, educational philosophy, and second, the tax conditions under which the State public school system was established and now operates.

We start with the school. Every school, whether public or private, teaches two things: its academic content and its educational philosophy. Most people understand "academic content" to mean such subjects as reading, language, and science, but many are in the dark as to existence, nature, and influence of educational philosophies.

The educational philosophy of a school is the frame of reference within which the academic content is presented. It includes values on God, man, religion, morality, rights, duties, and other ultimates. It includes the influence of teachers, students, and textbooks. It includes the permeating influence of the life of the school as a social institution.

America's education problems would be simplified if all her families accepted the same educational philosophy, but the taxpayers of this pluralistic body politic believe that academic content should be taught respectively within nonsectarian (nondenominational), secularistic, and sectarian educational philosophies. A further complication is that for many Americans their educational philosophy is an integral part of their religious beliefs.

Turning to the education tax dollar, we see that, in the development of the State public school, the State used the commonly collected tax dollar not simply to teach academic content but also generally to support a nondenominational Protestant educational philosophy.

This arrangement violated the principle of separation of church and state for it was fundamentally a preferential alliance or rather establishment of a combination of Protestant forces with the State. This was a boon to the particular Protestants involved, for having assigned the schooling of their children to the State, they were able to release funds for other religious purposes.

This establishment also violated religious freedom, for it imposed a religious test as a condition for receiving a public benefit. To obtain tax-supported academic content for their children dissenters had to put them under the influence of an educational philosophy unacceptable to their individual religious conscience.

But the Protestant combination was riding high and used the ballot box to override the civil liberty of religious freedom. They voted public status and tax support for their essentially private school. Dissenting taxpayers seeking a fair share of the education tax dollar to teach academic content to their children were shouted down as subverters of religious freedom and the church-state principle. Even the noble fight of Jefferson to secure religious liberty in Virginia was distorted to justify the giving of a monopoly of the education tax dollar to the new Protestant State school.

Today the establishment is secularism. Speaking generally, if American parents wish their children to receive a share of the education tax dollar they must enroll them under the growing influence of the tax-supported educational philosophy of secularism.

Many confuse secularism with secular academic content. Many confuse it with neutrality in education. Many do not realize that secularism does much of its most effective work through silence. Thus, to teach academic content within a schooling atmosphere that ignores the significance of religion for living and learning is not to be neutral but rather to present a secularistic philosophy of education.

In any case secularism is the rising tide in American public education and enjoys a growing alliance with the State and Federal Governments that threatens to surpass any previous establishment in human history, if indeed it does not already do so. This establishment violates religious freedom and perverts the church-state principle.

But whether nonsectarian or secularistic, the State school system, while maintaining the pretense of offering a free public education to every American child, has continued to this day to deprive religious dissenters of their fair share of the commonly collected education tax dollar.

What is worse many State education authorities are pursuing such taxing and spending policies as to strip religious dissenters of the economic capacity to exercise a choice apart from compulsory but undesired State schools. Willfully or not, such State authorities are using the power to tax to weaken or destroy private education.

With this background we turn now to the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965." The haste with which these hearings have been called preclude a complete analysis today on this lengthy and complicated bill that has just come off the press, but we do offer some conclusions.

A first conclusion is that in its pertinent areas this bill gives monopoly control of the Federal education tax dollar and monopoly status in Federal law to the present unjust State system of education that now denies a fair share of the education tax dollar to millions of U.S. citizens.

A corollary conclusion is that, far from being a clever end run around the church-state issue, this bill violates both the establishment and the religious liberty clauses of the first amendment by its preferential support of nonsectarian and secularistic philosophies and by its denial of equal treatment to religious dissenters.

A third conclusion is that this bill is just another Federal aid to education bill almost exclusively for the State public schools. This is true despite the aid provisions for the children in nonpublic schools.

To illustrate this point, let us look, for example, at title I (title II of Public Law 874) which makes provision for $1 billion in education grants. Section 205(a)(1) provides for grants for the public schools. Section 205(a)(2) provides for grants for educational services and arrangements for children in nonpublic schools.

But there is no provision for determining or guaranteeing an equitable proportion between these grants. The State authorities can take the bulk of the $1 billion for their public schools, while offering only token benefits for the children in nonpublic schools and these only under the unilateral approval and control of the States. A further hindrance to equitable treatment is that the Federal tax dollar is being turned over to States which have established numerous devices to deprive these children of a fair share of the education tax dollar.

Some mention the supplementary education centers and services (title III) as beneficial to the children in nonpublic schools. But, apart from other objections, we believe that much of the money called for here might be better spent in giving direct academic aid to students. Would it not be more economical, for example, to give tuition grants to children to improve their present classroom performance rather than to build a new institution to give them remedial instruction?

Much is being made of the shared-time provisions. But the Congress should know that many parents feel outraged that the Federal Government would thus give a share of the Federal education tax to their children only if they remove them from the educational philosophy of their conscience for part of the academic day.

A fourth conclusion is that under this plan, especially when taken in conjunction with the recently expanded Impacted Areas Act and National Defense Education Act, the State schools will so overbalance private education that the latter will be weakened and in many cases collapse.

Have religious dissenters no personal rights or privileges as citizens of the United States? Have the children of the Nation no right to equal treatment under the Federal Constitution? Must religious dissenters now pay increasing Federal education taxes only to see them assigned to State authorities who now deny them the State education tax?

Why must citizens of the United States place their children within a State school as a condition for obtaining a share of the Federal education tax? Why must free citizens of the United States submit to having State officials with differing educational philosophies select library books and textbooks for their children (title III)?

We single out one particular indignity to the economically deprived children in nonpublic schools. These children, whose poverty is already aggravated by the denial of State education funds, are counted in determining the size of the grants going specifically to the local public schools but counted out when such grants are being given. This is indeed a strange way to treat poor children in a poverty program.

What makes the administration's pursuit of this present bill so tragic is that it now has such a golden opportunity to restore democracy and freedom of opportunity to American education. The States had a similar opportunity in the mid-19th century but muffed it miserably. It would indeed be a national disaster if in the mid-20th century the Federal Government would now go arm in arm with the States down the road to monolithic elementary and secondary education.

This is a time to rethink the fundamental relationships between government and the individual in the distribution of the commonly collected education tax dollar. This is a time to reexamine the present distribution of the tax dollar with respect to previous State and Federal education legislation. This matter is not as simple as it has been made out to be by those who have for now four and five generations enjoyed a virtual monopoly of the education tax dollar for the education of their children while depriving dissenters of a fair share thereof.

We do not dispute the privilege of some members of the body politic to have the State as the schoolteacher of their children, but a democracy should also provide an equitable share of the commonly collected education tax for those families which do not wish the hand of Government on the minds and hearts of their children.

We hold that if the Federal Government is to proceed with a general education bill, it should amend its proposals to include a junior GI bill of rights under which those students not attending State schools would receive an equitable individual tuition grant in the form of a voucher negotiable at an approved school of their free choice.

The highly successful GI bill of rights was such a program. May we point out that no program was less contentious, that none was freer of governmental control, and that none was more efficient in the use of the tax dollar. Perhaps this was so because, as an ideal program for education in a democracy, free citizens were given freedom of choice instead of being offered tax-supported educational benefits only through Government-developed programs and Government-sponsored educational philosophies.

Administration spokesmen claim that they have the votes to pass this present bill. Maybe they do, but at least we wish to write into the records of this Nation that free men came to this Congress to protest this bill in its present form and to lament the lost opportunity for establishing freedom in American education.

In closing, we again say that even though we are critical of the present bill, we wish to express our appreciation to President Johnson and as well to the distinguished members of this subcommittee and of Congress who are urging it in the sincere belief that it is a forward step in providing a fair share of the tax dollar to every American child.

A final word about the "Great Society." May we remind the Congress that no society can be great without freedom in education. May we remind America that she will never attain the fullness of her destined greatness until the day on which no American child is denied a share of either the State or Federal education tax because of his or her religious conscience.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, early in January the Veterans' Administration announced plans for closing 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries. As a Representative from the State of New York whose population includes some 2¼ million veterans and their dependents, I should like to protest the action that is being taken by the Veterans' Administration.

My State of New York has the second largest number of veterans of any State in the Nation and yet we are informed that three of its veterans hospitals and one of its domiciliaries are to be shut down in June of 1965 for reasons of "maximum operational efficiency and economy." It is my contention that efficiency and economy when promoted at the expense of such an intangible factor as human need are false efficiency and false economy.

How did the Veterans' Administration determine which of its facilities were to be eliminated? They have stated that such factors as obsolescence of physical plant and unduly high cost of modernization, difficulties in maintaining adequate staffing, generally low patient demands, and the capability of nearby VA hospitals to extend their service boundaries, were given consideration. Just for the record let us examine the patient load at each of the three hospitals that are to be closed in New York. As of December 31, 1963, in the hospital at Bath, out of a total of 273 available beds, all of them were occupied, and the estimate of patients to be treated in 1964 marked an increase over the preceding year. In Castle Point in December 1963, only 12 out of 258 beds were unused and the 1964 estimated patient load also shows an expected increase. In Sunmount there were 59 unused beds out of a total of 374, again with an expected increase in the average daily patient load for 1964. On the basis of these figures alone, it would be possible to question the assertion of low patient demand in the three hospitals in question. The 1964 total admissions for these 3 hospitals amount to almost 4,000 patients. Closing these hospitals would mean that 4,000 veterans must go outside their home area for hospitalization. And where are they to go? If I read my figures correctly, they are to go to hospitals which already have a substantial waiting list. In December 1963, the hospital at Canandaigua had a waiting list of 171, at Syracuse of 71, and at Northport of 1,701. These are the hospitals that are closest to those that are to be shut down. I find it hard to believe that transferring those present or prospective patients from the three hospitals that are to be closed to those others will result in a greater efficiency of operation and the provision of more services to the veterans themselves.

The Veterans' Administration is proud of the high quality of its medical care and its up-to-date modern facilities. In order to make sure that the quality of its medical care keeps pace with the advances of modern medicine, the Veterans' Administration prefers to concentrate its medical facilities in big city areas close to teaching hospitals. For the person who is unfortunate enough to live outside of one of these urbanized areas this does not mean denial of access to medical care but it does mean the distinct inconvenience of what can be considerable travel to the city where care is obtainable. This is a nation where one ought not be penalized for chosing to live in a certain place. Yet the veteran who lives within 10 miles of the nearest VA hospital has a decided advantage over the one who resides some 300 miles from the nearest veterans' facility. In the first place, for an emergency case, travel of long distance is a complete impossibility as it is for the seriously ill. Consequently many veterans who are eligible for VA-provided care will not be able to avail themselves of that care. Hospitalization in or near his hometown in other than VA-operated facilities would be too costly for the already indigent family. The closing of the veterans' hospitals may be called an economy move, but I challenge the true economy of a measure that puts so many of our veterans at so great a disadvantage. Surely we can do better on behalf of those who were so valiant in the service of their country.

Page 1 of the 1963 report of the Veterans' Administration defines the purpose of that Administration as existing to serve the men and women who have served their country in time of war. It is dedicated to giving them and their families and their dependent widows, orphans, and parents the best service possible under the law. The first of these services is to provide "a medical program equivalent to the finest in civilian practice." The Veterans' Administration has endeavored to keep this promise by building and improving existing hospitals and by recruiting the best possible personnel to staff them. But I fail to see how the closing of the three hospitals in New York State which last year served some 4,000 veterans who filled the available beds almost to capacity can contribute to the purpose of providing the best possible medical care. I cannot believe that these 4,000 patients believed that they received inadequate care because the hospitals they were occupying were "obsolete." Has the VA asked these patients what they thought of the care they received? I would like to have the data by which the Veterans' Administration determined that the hospitals it has selected to close are impractical and ineffective. Surely we have determined this morning that there does exist a distinct need for their services. I seriously question the ability of the remaining VA hospitals in this State to meet that need when their bed capacities have been almost fully occupied and where in some instances, there already is a substantial waiting list.

The closing of the 11 VA hospitals has been designated an economy move because it will save the Government some $23.5 million in operational costs. It seems to me that the decision to close these facilities was a hasty one. There are those who say that the hospitals that are to be eliminated were selected by computers. The computers appear to have left out the human factor or else this factor was not included amongst the data that the computer was to digest. Computer analyses can be useful, but they are not without their limitations. Consider the computer which was asked to determine which was preferable; a clock which ran thirty seconds slow each day or one that did not run at all. The computer chose that which did not run at all because it would give the exact time twice in 24 hours whereas the other clock would be correct only once in every 2,880 days. It would seem to me that a hospital in need of modernization is better than no hospital at all.

I wonder if the VA's computers in this instance considered the fact that the need for hospital beds is going to increase rather than decline as our veterans from World War II are approaching the age with a higher incidence of illness. I wonder if the computers considered the acknowledged medical benefits of having the patient's family within a distance that would make visiting possible. Did the computers calculate the expenses involved in relocating the hundreds of employees who would be out of jobs? Did the computers determine the severity of the economic blow that would be dealt to the communities by the closing of the hospitals?

The VA has said that it prefers to have its hospitals in urban centers where they can be attached to medical schools and where research activities may be carried on. I do not question the merits of medical research, but I do not see why it should preclude the possibility of adequate medical care in our more rural areas. The very existence of a VA hospital in some areas such as that in Miles City, Mont., has meant the presence of specially trained medical personnel there. With the closing of the hospital, these personnel must move on and Miles City and surrounding communities are left without the services of a radiologist or a pathologist.

This is a time when we have become aware of the need for more hospitals in our rural and suburban areas. Then why, at this time, are we closing 11 that already do exist? This is a time when President Johnson would have us care for our aged with a plan to meet their health needs in their declining years. Then why, at this time, are we doing away with hospitals that help provide this care? This is a time when we are preoccupied with unemployment, then why are we eliminating so many jobs? Are we so preoccupied with economy that we are forgetting the individuals who have been served by these hospitals and who have been served well? Mr. Chairman, I do not know the answers to these queries. Nor do I think that the reason given by the VA for closing down the facilities in question are substantiated by the evidence. With the rates of occupancy of the hospitals ranging from 76 to 95 percent, I do not comprehend the assertion of low patient demand. Let us keep these hospitals open until we have more substantial evidence that they are unnecessary and superfluous, until we make sure that their closing is in the true interests of the people they serve, and not just in the interest of that impersonal word "economy."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Gonzalez, for Tuesday through Thursday, February 16 to 18, inclusive, on account of official business.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Feighan, for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Gross, for 20 minutes, on Wednesday, February 10.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gurney) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Martin of Alabama, for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, February 10.

Mr. Buchanan, for 15 minutes, on Wednesday, February 10.

Mr. Glenn Andrews, for 15 minutes, on February 10.

Mr. Morse, for 30 minutes, on February 10.

Mr. Wolff (at the request of Mr. Conyers), for 30 minutes, on February 10; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Farbstein (at the request of Mr. Conyers), for 15 minutes, on today, and for 15 minutes, on February 10; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Joelson.

Mr. Fino.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gurney) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Wyatt.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Conyers) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Tenzer.

Mr. Powell.

Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Garmatz.

Mr. Udall.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 10, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

544. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

545. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report setting forth the financial condition of working capital funds at June 30, 1964, and the results of their operation for the fiscal year then ended, pursuant to section 405(c) of 10 U.S.C. 2208; to the Committee on Armed Services.

546. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings through procurement of operating supplies from General Services Administration sources by Martin-Marietta Corp., Denver Division, Colorado, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

547. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on accumulation of excesses and unnecessary procurement of missile spare parts because of supply management deficiencies at 3d U.S. Army Logistical Support Group Installations in Florida, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

548. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the activities of the Department relative to providing war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, and upon request for any department or agency of the United States, pursuant to title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

549. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to suspend duty on tropical hardwoods"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

550. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the 15th report of the Commission on the operation of the trade agreements program for the period July 1962 to June 1963, pursuant to section 402(b) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

551. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the Federal plan for meteorological services and supporting research, for fiscal year 1966, pursuant to Public Law 87-843; to the Committee on Appropriations.

552. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POOL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 158. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the Government of amounts due the Government in the settlement of claims under such act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3043. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 1535. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 1647. A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 1746. A bill to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 1782. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 2594. A bill to clarify the application of certain annuity increase legislation; without amendment (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4606. A bill to modify the flood control project for Four River Basins, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 4607. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon his wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 4608. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an increase in the amount for which a credit may be allowed against the Federal estate tax for estate taxes paid to States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4609. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny deduction for rent, taxes, or interest incurred for the use or occupancy of an industrial plant financed by tax-exempt obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4610. A bill to provide greater flexibility to States in the use of certain public health grants-in-aid; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 4611. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 4612. A bill to increase the authorization for the appropriation of funds to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 4613. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 7-percent benefit increase, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to liberalize the retirement test, and to provide minimum benefits for all individuals not otherwise entitled at age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 4614. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags, and to repeal the tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4615. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow aged 62 or over, or a widower, shall not lose entitlement to benefits by reason of remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 4616. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special amortization deduction for certain obsolete beet handling equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4617. A bill to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States, relating to the duties on woven cloth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4618. A bill to further secure the right to vote, free from discrimination on account of race or color, through the establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4619. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4620. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the manufacturers excise tax on entertainment equipment to alleviate the economic burden on consumers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 4621. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4622. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the waiver of the 2-year foreign residence requirement in the case of certain exchange visitors who cannot return to the country of their origin because of fear of persecution on account of political beliefs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 4623. A bill further amending the Reorganization Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 4624. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed as judges or justices of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4625. A bill to authorize the payment of night differential to postal field service employees on annual or sick leave who are on regular tours of duty for which night differential is paid; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4626. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 4627. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4628. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4629. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 4630. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the duty-free entry of certain hollow reinforcing bars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 4631. A bill to amend section 111 of title 23 of the United States Code to permit States to allow certain service facilities to be constructed or located on the rights-of-way of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 4633. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 4634. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4635. A bill to prohibit the use of measuring devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 4636. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future natural disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4637. A bill to extend the existing temporary suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk to the same classifications of yarn of silk containing manmade fibers, and to continue the suspension for an additional temporary period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 4638. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotional activities such as free or paid advertising; solicitation of cargoes; publication of ocean, rail, port, or motor carrier rate or service comparisons; or other activities that are actually or potentially disruptive to the flow of waterborne trade among ports in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 4639. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 4640. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4641. A bill authorizing modification of the Greers Ferry Dam and Reservoir, White River Basin, Ark., in the interest of recreational development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 4642. A bill to reduce the excise tax on club dues and fees from 20 percent to 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4643. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954 as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4644. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 4645. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the manufacturers excise tax shall not apply in the case of school buses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 4646. A bill to designate as "Lake Winston Churchill" the reservoir formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4647. A bill to amend section 6334 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from levy property necessary to satisfy the taxpayer's liabilities to his employees for wages and fringe benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 4648. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to transport stolen sheep or goats in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 4649. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 4650. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System and to increase the mileage in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4651. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 4652. A bill to establish an Office of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to act as a central clearinghouse in Government for consumer complaints; to disseminate information to consumers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (by request):

H.R. 4653. A bill to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of banking organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4654. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in order to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4655. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4656. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove all limitations upon the amount of the deduction allowed a taxpayer for medical, dental, and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4657. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of plays, operas, concerts, ballets, or other live dramatic or musical performances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4658. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4659. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon his wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 4660. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 4661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4662. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 4663. A bill to provide for the preservation of buildings in the Nation's Capital which are of historic and cultural importance, to provide that the Commission of Fine Arts shall report to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia regarding such buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 4664. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4665. A bill to amend section 615 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 4666. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 4667. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit the issuance of marketing orders for onions for canning or freezing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4668. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon his wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 4669. A bill to limit to 1 quart the amount of alcoholic beverages which may be admitted free of duty in the case of residents returning to the United States and to provide that the exemption shall apply only to alcoholic beverages accompanying adults; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 4670. A bill to limit to 1 quart the amount of alcoholic beverages which may be admitted free of duty in the case of residents returning to the United States and to provide that the exemption shall apply only to alcoholic beverages accompanying adults; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4671. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4672. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 4673. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 4674. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 4675. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4676. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 4677. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 4678. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 4679. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 4680. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 4681. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 4682. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4683. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4684. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4685. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 4686. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 4687. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 4688. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 4689. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4690. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4691. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4692. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4693. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 4694. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4695. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R 4696. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R 4697. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4698. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 4699. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 4700. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 4701. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 4702. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4703. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 4704. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4705. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 4706. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4707. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 4708. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $200,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Golden Circle national scenic parkway complex connecting the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the southern part of Utah with the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas situated in northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4709. A bill to amend the act providing books for the adult blind so as to make books also available to quadriplegics and the near blind; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4710. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon his wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 4711. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 4712. A bill to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include all the Riverton reclamation project and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 4713. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4714. A bill to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4715. A bill to provide that no preference shall be given by the Department of Defense in the procurement of certain foods; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.J. Res. 300. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 301. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.J. Res. 302. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 303. Joint resolution providing for appropriate Federal recognition of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.J. Res. 304. Joint resolution to extend foreign quotas and recapture fee provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended and thereby prevent a continuing loss of revenue to the U.S. Treasury; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.J. Res. 305. Joint resolution relating to the establishment of 1965 farm rice acreage allotments for certain producers and farms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution providing for appropriate Federal recognition of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.J. Res. 307. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.J. Res. 308. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BELL:

H. Con. Res. 280. Concurrent resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H. Con. Res. 281. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 282. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" at the dedication of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Res. 199. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H. Res. 200. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H. Res. 201. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Res. 202. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Res. 203. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H. Res. 204. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANNA:

H. Res. 205. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H. Res. 206. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. Res. 207. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 208. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 209. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H. Res. 210. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H. Res. 211. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 212. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. Res. 213. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MIZE:

H. Res. 214. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STANTON:

H. Res. 215. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROCK:

H. Res. 216. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 217. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H. Res. 218. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 219. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action by the House of Representatives on general appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider legislation for restoration of funds in the Department of the Interior's budget for the Columbia River Fishery Development program, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H. R. 4716. A bill for the relief of Oranzo De Bellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4717. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Browman and their children, Russel, Lesley, and Douglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4718. A bill for the relief of Edith Estella Rose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 4719. A bill for the relief of Josephine C. Rumley, administratrix of the estate of George S. Rumley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4720. A bill for the relief of Manuel Palmer-Mariscal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4721. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leo Hsueh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4722. A bill for the relief of Dr. Masashi Kawasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4723. A bill for the relief of Dr. Peter K. Lekkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4724. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel Mendez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4725. A bill for the relief of Fishel Weiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4726. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 4727. A bill for the relief of Khachik Tatian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4728. A bill for the relief of Mieczyslaw (Mitchell) Trybula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 4729. A bill for the relief of Anthony Rigas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4730. A bill for the relief of Kathleen Ismena Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 4731. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarita Bacolas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 4732. A bill for the relief of Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 4733. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Housley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4734. A bill for the relief of Safia Talibi Naz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 4735. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacobo Albo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4736. A bill for the relief of Larry Dale Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4737. A bill for the relief of Naeemuddin M. Siddiquie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4738. A bill for the relief of Antonio Pereira Damaso, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4739. A bill for the relief of Marciano Domingo Malapira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4740. A bill for the relief of Delfina Rosa Medeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 4741. A bill for the relief of Jadwiga Zuzanna Kobielusz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4742. A bill for the relief of Keun Tak Rim and his wife, Ju Hyun Rim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 4743. A bill for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4744. A bill for the relief of Mary H. Leon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4745. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Horopsima Tumacan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 4746. A bill for the relief of Grigoria Rempas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 4747. A bill for the relief of Deward E. Quarles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4748. A bill for the relief of Joseph M. Hepworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

95. Mr. CUNNINGHAM presented a petition of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, South Omaha 154 Aerie, South Omaha, Nebr., resolving that Congress be requested to enact legislation which will make it unlawful for employers to discriminate against employees or applicants for employment because of their age being between 40 and 65, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Underwithheld Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to introduce as cosponsor with my colleague, JAMES B. UTT, legislation designed to correct a wrong which inequities in last year's tax laws have created.

On April 15, millions of Americans will owe their Government substantially more than they expected. Because last year's tax cut bill dropped withholding below the actual tax rate, taxes were underwithheld to a larger degree than many Americans realized.

The underwithholding of taxes came about through passage of the bill in February and amendments which set up a two-stage drop in the tax rate, but a larger, one-stage drop in withholding.

Many of us warned at the time the bill was passed that this would present an unfair burden on the taxpayers this April. Now the time is at hand, and I feel that since the Government got millions of Americans into this mess, it is incumbent upon the Government to help ease the burden.

This can be done simply and effectively by allowing the tax difference on withholding to be spread over the next year. This will give the American taxpayer the opportunity to adjust withholding taxes during the remainder of 1965 to take care of the extra underwithholding he would be forced to "pay back" on April 15.

In essence, it would restore a two-stage withholding system to correspond with the two-stage tax cut we enacted last year.

There is, in addition to lessening the economic shock to the American household, a great stake for our national economy in this tax measure. The impact of millions of Americans going into debt to pay extra taxes cannot help but have a deleterious effect on the momentum of our economy. By cutting the amount of tax owed on April 15 this year, we will be assuring a continuance of purchasing power kept in the hands of consumers who control the direction and momentum of our business world.

I feel this is a good bill, a just bill, a necessary bill. I urge early action on this measure by the Congress.

Civil Service Annuities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced bills to provide, first, for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired civil service employees, and, second, for the increase by 10 percent of annuities under $3,000 and 5 percent of annuities over $3,000.

I firmly believe that retired civil service employees need a pension boost—and need it soon. The pressure is most severe upon those retirees with annuities under $3,000. In these inflationary years, annuities of under $3,000 do not go a long way. I sincerely urge the Congress to raise these levels and give these retirees the means for a better standard of living. The plight of other retirees—even though their annuities may be over $3,000—is also real, and deserving of aid.

I also feel that the Civil Service Retirement Act should be amended to provide for the recomputation of certain annuities; namely, those of persons who, upon retiring prior to October 11, 1962, elected a reduction in annuity to provide survivor benefits for a spouse, and those of spouses being paid survivor benefits. I am urging that these annuities be recomputed under the more equitable formula established on October 11, 1962, so that those persons retiring earlier, or their spouses, will no longer be discriminated against as regards the size of their annuities.

I urge this Congress to give serious and favorable consideration to this remedial legislation.

Anniversary of the Independence of Ceylon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, after more than four centuries as a colony of European powers, Ceylon became a sovereign state within the British Commonwealth on February 4, 1948. Last week the people of this small pear-shaped tropical island, just off the southern tip of India, celebrated the 17th anniversary of this historic occasion. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate His Excellency, the Governor-General of Ceylon, Sir William Gopallawa, the Prime Minister, Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, and His Excellency, the Ceylonese Ambassador to the United States, M. F. de S. Jayaratne.

Ceylon has always been an important connecting link in trade between the East and the West. Its tea, rubber, and precious gems have been an irresistible lure since the times of the sailing ships. Ceylon is also a major link in the world's air transport system and an important base in the world's network of communication.

Soon after it became independent, Ceylon sought membership in the United Nations, but was barred for 7 years by the veto of the Soviet Union. In December 1955 it finally became a member of the world organization. Ceylon is now an eager participant in the U.N. efforts for peace as well as in programs of the specialized agencies. It is also a charter member of the Colombo Plan which was organized in 1950 at a meeting in Ceylon's capital city of Colombo.

American-Ceylonese relations have always been friendly. Trade relations have been mutually satisfactory between the two countries, and there is increasing cultural exchange. The continued political and economic evolution of Ceylon as a free and independent democratic state is important to the United States.

Our country has made known to the people of Ceylon its sincere interest in their efforts to help themselves. In the 18th year of Ceylonese independence, this can best be done by helping them to increase their food and industrial production and to build their confidence in their ability to make economic and social progress through a democratic society.

United States Must Maintain Firm Stand on Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, according to some recent articles in the New York World-Telegram, Premier Eisaku Sato, after his return to Japan from his visit to the United States, insisted that as a neighbor, Japan cannot pursue a policy of enmity toward China. The articles say that in effect, Japan offers her friendship to Peiping, and proposed to be the honest broker between Peiping and the West.

When Prime Minister Sato met with President Johnson, he explored the question of Japan's trade with Communist China, and expressed the view that commerce should be separate from politics. Premier Sato also hoped to swing the United States in favor of his viewpoint that Red China should be brought into the U.N., and perhaps even receive diplomatic recognition. The point is not whether the Japanese should trade with the Reds—amounting to 2 percent of their foreign trade—the problem is that once Japan starts to succeed on this idea of exploration to soften the U.S. policy toward Peiping, they will exert their ways to move in and become more demanding; as the old saying goes: "If you give them an inch, they will try to gain a foot."

For Japan's own good as well as for the good of the free world, we should institute economic sanction to stop profiteering ships from going to the China mainland and to prevent the further strengthening of the Chinese Communists who aim at the destruction of the free world.

I take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that our President stood very firm and opposed the above-mentioned propositions of Premier Sato. I commend the President for making the rightful decision and I am confident he will have the strong support of the American people.

The Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who represent the States of Arizona and California this has been a historic day. It marks the end of many years of controversy and many long months of patient negotiation. Together we have gone before the House today and introduced legislation to provide for authorization of a Lower Colorado River Basin project.

The three Representatives from my State have just issued a joint news release reporting this event. I should like to call it to the attention of all my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, the news release follows:

CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Arizona's 3 House Members and 31 California Congressmen joined today in the introduction of a bill to construct the central Arizona project as part of a Lower Colorado River Basin project.

Following introduction of the bills the 34 sponsors joined in a letter requesting Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to obtain executive department reports and schedule hearings at the earliest possible time.

"We think chances of passage this year are excellent," said Representatives RHODES, SENNER, and UDALL in a joint release. "This action heralds a new era of cooperation in which we can begin to solve the critical water shortage of both Arizona and California."

The legislation declares it is the intention of Congress to make the Colorado an adequate supplier of water not only for existing projects and the central Arizona project but for other projects authorized in the future. The Secretary of Interior is ordered to undertake planning to this end.

Essence of the historic compromise:

1. California agrees to immediate construction of the central Arizona project and a southern Nevada project without insisting on construction of any lower basin works for California.

2. Arizona agrees that California, which must take a cut from its present 5.1-million acre-foot use to 4.4 million acre-feet, will be guaranteed a minimum of 4.4 million acre-feet until such time as an additional 2.5 million acre-feet can be developed for the basin.

3. Congress will declare its policy to provide the additional 2.5 million acre-feet and directs the Secretary of Interior within 3 years to determine how this water can be obtained by imports from other areas, desalinization, or a combination of these and other methods. He shall submit feasibility reports on specific projects to accomplish this goal.

Water engineers say that it will be approximately 25 years before Arizona might feel any pinch from the 4.4 million acre-foot guarantee to California. Moreover, California has an equal stake in finding the additional 2.5 million acre-feet of water, the Arizonans pointed out, because (1) its existing use will be cut some 0.7 million acre-feet by the compromise, and (2) within the next few years the growth of southern California will require far more water than the 5.1 million acre-feet now being used. Thus, both States will have a powerful incentive to provide new water. Furthermore, the compromise bill provides the machinery for eventually developing more than the 2.5 million acre-feet of new water which is to be the initial objective.

The united stand by the Arizonans with the large California delegation considerably brightens prospects for action in the current session of Congress. Senators from Arizona and California have indicated they will support the new bill if it passes the House.

The central Arizona project would include Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon dams, aqueducts to carry water from the Colorado to central and southern Arizona and Orme, Buttes, Hooker, and Charleston dams. Bridge and Marble would increase river storage capacity and generate power to help pay for the project.

This initial construction would cost about $1.5 billion during the next 10 years. More than 80 percent of this would be spent for construction in Arizona.

Negotiations on the joint bill involved not only Representatives and Senators from States involved but the Governors of Arizona and California and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

The Arizona House Members praised the spirit of statesmanship shown by California spokesmen during more than a year of negotiations.

Today's bill directs the Secretary of Interior to investigate alternative sources of water, including desalinization, weather modification, water renovation, and conservation measures. And he would plan works to import water into the basin from other areas. Provision is made for water exchange clauses to meet needs of shortage areas in Arizona outside the central Arizona project system.

The Arizonans said it is their understanding that the 2.5 million acre-feet to be made available before the California guarantee disappears may come from any source, provided such source is financed by Federal funds or by private or State funds from outside California. They said it is also their understanding that the time-honored principle of water exchange may be utilized in fulfilling this obligation. In other words, if the Federal Government were to build a plant on the Pacific coast to desalinate seawater, and the products of the plant were made available to the city of Los Angeles, the amount of water thus produced should go toward making up the 2.5 million acre-feet of new water in the Colorado Basin, they said.

Overall coordination of planning, priorities and construction in this effort to solve the region's critical water shortage is given to an advisory group to be known as the Colorado-Pacific Regional Water Commission. It would consist of a chairman appointed by the President, one member each from Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico and Utah, appointed by the respective Governors, and one member appointed by each of the Secretaries of Interior; Agriculture; Army; State; and Health, Education, and Welfare. Provision is made for employment of necessary staff.

Politics and the Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to notice a growing awareness on the part of businessmen on the desirability of their maintaining an active interest and participation in politics.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a book written by David J. Galligan, entitled "Politics and the Businessman." It performs a valuable public service in bringing home forcibly the expanding role of businessmen in the affairs of their community, State and Nation. Mr. Galligan is a New Jerseyite who has done outstanding work through the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce in promoting courses and seminars for businessmen in practical politics.

I do hope that Mr. Galligan's book will help dispel apathy and indifference on the part of some businessmen regarding their vital role in the Nation's political structure.

Amend the Export Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, inadvertently, there was omitted from the February 4, 1965, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement on H.R. 4362, introduced that day to amend the Export Control Act of 1949. To correct this error, I wish to call to my colleagues' attention the press release and statement issued that day on this subject:

> Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, today introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to arm the President with the power to prohibit American businessmen from furthering restrictive trade practices or boycotts imposed by a foreign country against other countries friendly to the United States.
>
> Joined by Congressmen CHARLES JOELSON, Democrat, of New Jersey; JONATHAN BINGHAM, Democrat, of New York; SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York; JOHN LINDSAY, Republican, of New York; and OGDEN REID, Republican, of New York, he called for an amendment of the Export Control Act of 1949 to declare "* * * it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States."
>
> ROOSEVELT, pointing out that American trade with the United Arab Republic would be closely scrutinized because of that country's long and bitter campaign against Israel, said, "America must not place its own and its friends' security in jeopardy by turning a blind eye upon Egyptian activity which causes tumult in the Near East or appears to diminish the position of our friends in that part of the world."
>
> ---
>
> STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES ROOSEVELT, DEMOCRAT, OF CALIFORNIA, CALLING FOR AMENDMENT OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949
>
> I am delighted to join with you and my four other colleagues in introducing bills to amend the Export Control Act of 1949, and I concur in the joint statement which you have released. However, I would add another compelling reason for the enactment of this legislation.
>
> While we must be diligent in preventing other nations from intruding into our affairs and imposing their will on American businessmen, we must be equally diligent in assuring that these same American businessmen do not engage in activities which either directly or indirectly aid the prosecution of restrictive trade practices or boycotts aimed at countries friendly to the United States.
>
> This possibility is particularly acute with regard to the long and bitter campaign waged by the United Arab Republic against Israel. We must not allow our foreign policy or the fulfillment of our international responsibilities to be undermined by even the most innocent cooperation between American businessmen and the United Arab Republic in its campaign against Israel.
>
> America must not place its own and its friends' security in jeopardy by turning a blind eye on any Egyptian activity which causes tumult in the Near East or appears to diminish the position of our friends in that part of the world.
>
> To the extent that such Egyptian activity is enhanced by the receipt of articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, from American businessmen, we must be prepared to not only control, but also to prohibit the flow of such goods and services to the United Arab Republic from this country.
>
> I firmly believe these bills properly arm our President to exercise such control, and thereby to protect our international posture.

Gold Reserve Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WENDELL WYATT
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I today voted in favor of the administration's position to eliminate the requirement that each Federal Reserve bank maintain a gold certificate reserve of at least 25 percent against its deposits. This vote I cast most reluctantly.

This is a most complex issue and one which few people in the world, including Congressmen, fully comprehend. It has been rushed through the House Banking and Currency Committee with such dispatch that it is impossible to believe that it has been adequately considered. Only two witnesses appeared before the committee. Likewise it was rushed through the House Rules Committee. The Senate committee is still taking testimony. The past fiscal policies of Democratic administrations have put this great Nation in most serious and desperate financial circumstances and the present administration has done nothing but to add to these problems.

During the long years of Democratic administrations beginning in 1932, we have had annual deficits piled on top of annual deficits. In fiscal 1965 we had a very substantial deficit and have a built-in virtually budgeted deficit for 1966 as the budget has been submitted by President Johnson. If in these 2 prosperous years we must continue to have deficits, I submit that there is little hope that we can chip away at the national debt. We have been continuously warned that we cannot continue to spend more than we take in.

Our balance-of-payments problem has been aggravated by the failure of this administration to take positive and aggressive action to halt this trend. The problem has been multiplied by our continued shipment of money in the aid of foreign governments, some of which are actively hostile to us. We have only yesterday seen the administration forces insist upon freedom for the President to offer additional millions of dollars to Egypt's Nasser.

In spite of repeated warnings that these policies could not be continued without severe effects, this administration continues blandly going its way, domestically and in the foreign field, spending money as if there were no end to it.

The Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board have both testified that the action taken today is essential to the interest of the United States of America. It is apparent that responsible private banking sources feel that in our present situation we have no choice but to remove the gold cover, or face real national disaster immediately.

As a responsible Member of Congress, I am doing what my conscience dictates to me to be responsible action. I do so reluctantly and desire to spread my remarks in the RECORD.

Aid to Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT TENZER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, my position with respect to aid to Egypt and other countries dedicated to a course of world aggression remains one of strong opposition. I joined my colleagues when we expressed this feeling as the sense of the Congress last week by voting to cut off shipments of surplus food to the United Arab Republic.

The question before the House yesterday, Monday, February 8, 1965, was not one of reaffirming this position or changing it. Rather, the question was whether the sense of the Congress should be expressed in a manner contrary to the traditional separation of power and responsibility in the sphere of foreign affairs. The amendment added by the other body is one acceptable to me as it was acceptable to a majority of the Members of the House.

I would not want to see the hands of the President tied because of our expression of opposition. It is more fitting to convey our feeling to the Chief Executive without impairing the flexible position required to negotiate with other countries. The other question before the House was whether to tie the hands of our committee going into conference on the bill.

Our feelings have been conveyed in a responsible manner. Let us hope that the United Arab Republic will understand its full meaning and significance.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted these words of the Psalmist: *God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.*

Let us pray:

God of infinite and infallible wisdom, may this moment of prayer be for us a time of clear and unclouded vision and may all our blind spots be removed.

Show us how we may develop and safeguard our country's material interests but, above all, how to protect and promote those values which are moral and spiritual.

Give us the understanding to see that history proves very conclusively that whole civilizations go down in confusion and chaos unless these values and virtues become regnant and potent in the life of mankind.

Grant that in seeking to minister to a turbulent and troubled world our minds and hearts may be tempered with that calm and steadfast spirit which finds its refuge and strength in Thee.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 28. An act to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is a member of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which handles private claims, and that seems to be incompatible with his service on the Private Calendar objectors' committee.

At his request he is being relieved of his assignment on the Private Calendar objectors' committee, and I have designated the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] to take his place.

RESIGNATION FROM JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SPEAKER MCCORMACK: As you know, I have recently relinquished my seat on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for a seat on the House Appropriations Committee. In an effort to render the best possible contribution to the Appropriations Committee, I have found it necessary to restrict other activities. For this reason I hope you will accept my resignation from the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration.

Kindest regards and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS G. MORRIS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 10(a), Public Law 474, 81st Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

INTERNATIONAL BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND OUR GOLD POSITION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 83)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

After a full review of our international balance of payments and our gold position, I can report to the Congress that—

The state of the dollar in the world today is strong—far stronger than 3 or 4 years ago.

To assure its continued and growing strength, however, we need to take new steps to speed our progress toward balance in our external payments.

The strength of our dollar is backed by—

The world's most productive and efficient economy, moving each year to new heights of output, employment, and income without inflation;

The world's largest supply of gold, fully pledged to honor this country's dollar obligations;

The world's strongest creditor position, based on $88 billion of public and private claims against foreigners, $37 billion greater than their claims against us; counting our private assets only, the margin is about $15 billion, and steadily growing;

The world's most favorable trade position, based on a rise in our exports by more than one-fourth in 4 years—a rise which has brought our commercial exports (excluding exports financed by the Government) to $22.2 billion and our commercial trade surplus to $3.6 billion.

Clearly, those who fear for the dollar are needlessly afraid. Those who hope for its weakness, hope in vain.

A country which exports far more than it imports and whose net asset position abroad is great and growing is not "living beyond its means."

The dollar is, and will remain, as good as gold, freely convertible at $35 an ounce.

That pledge is backed by our firm determination to bring an end to our balance-of-payments deficit.

Last year, our flows of dollars abroad—to pay for our imports and foreign travel, to finance our loans and investments abroad, and to meet our defense and aid obligations—still exceeded our dollar credits from foreigners by $3 billion. This represents steady improvement over the $3.6 billion deficit in 1962 and the $3.3 billion deficit in 1963. But our progress is too slow.

The world willingly uses our dollars as a safe and convenient medium of international exchange. The world's growing supply of dollars has played a vital role in the postwar growth of the free world's commerce and finance. But we cannot—and do not—assume that the world's willingness to hold dollars is unlimited.

On the basis of searching study of the major causes of our continued imbalance of payments, I therefore propose the following program:

First, to maintain and strengthen our checkrein on foreign use of U.S. capital markets, I ask the Congress—

To extend the interest equalization tax for 2 years beyond December 31, 1965;

To broaden its coverage to nonbank credit of 1- to 3-year maturity;

Second, to stem and reverse the swelling tide of U.S. bank loans abroad, I have used the authority available to me under the Gore amendment to the act to apply the interest equalization tax to bank loans of 1 year or more.

Third, to stop any excessive flow of funds to Canada under its special exemption from the equalization tax, I have sought and received firm assurance that the policies of the Canadian Government are and will be directed toward limiting such outflows to the maintenance of a stable level of Canada's foreign exchange reserves.

Fourth, to limit further the outflow of bank loans, I am asking the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in cooperation with the Secretary of the Treasury to enroll the banking community in a major effort to limit their lending abroad.

Fifth, to insure the effective cooperation of the banking community, I am requesting legislation to make voluntary cooperation by American bankers in support of our balance-of-payments efforts, under the Government's auspices, exempt from the antitrust laws wherever such cooperation is essential to the national interest.

Sixth, to reduce the outflow of business capital, I am directing the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury to enlist the leaders of American business in a national campaign to limit their direct investments abroad, their deposits in foreign banks, and their holding of foreign financial assets until their efforts—and those of all Americans—have restored balance in the country's international accounts.

Seventh, to minimize the foreign exchange cost of our defense and aid programs, I am directing the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of AID, and other officials immediately to step up their efforts to cut oversea dollar costs to the bone.

Eighth, to narrow our tourist gap, I encourage our friends from abroad, as well as our own citizens, to "See the U.S.A." and I request legislation further to limit the duty-free exemptions of American tourists returning to the United States.

Ninth, to earn more trade dollars, I am calling for a redoubling of our efforts to promote exports.

Finally, to draw more investment from abroad, I am requesting new tax legislation to increase the incentives for foreigners to invest in U.S. corporate securities.

These measures will deal with our payments deficit and protect the dollar in ways fully consistent with our obligations—

To sustain prosperity at home;

To maintain our defenses abroad;

To supply private and public funds to less developed countries to build both their strength and their freedom;

To avoid "beggar thy neighbor" restrictions on trade and work for a successful conclusion of the Kennedy round trade negotiations;

To work with our trading partners toward a more flexible world monetary system.

These actions should achieve a substantial reduction in our international deficit during 1965 and secure still further improvement in 1966.

WHERE WE STAND TODAY

Our deficit in 1964 was too large. And over half of it occurred in the final quarter of the year—partly because of special and temporary factors.

Yet this disturbing reversal of our progress should not blind us to the solid and significant advances we have made in the past 4 years.

The broad-based attack we launched 4 years ago—and intensified 18 months ago—has, in considerable part, hit its mark:

Tax cuts and other measures to increase output, stimulate cost-cutting investment, and hold prices steady have made U.S. products far more competitive in world markets. Combined with special export promotion efforts, these policies have—

Boosted our commercial exports by $4.7 billion, or 27 percent;

Pushed our commercial trade surplus to a new record of $3.6 billion—$800 million more than in 1960 and a gain of $1.3 billion over 1963.

Unrelenting efforts to cut the dollar drain of defense and foreign aid expenditures have, since 1960—

Reduced oversea dollar spending for aid by more than $400 million;

Reduced oversea military spending by more than $200 million—despite rising prices in the countries where our forces are stationed;

Increased military offset sales to foreign countries through the Department of Defense by $450 million and expanded sales of military equipment to foreign governments from commercial sources.

Successful policies for expansion both here and overseas have brought a rise by nearly $2 billion in profits and interest on our past foreign investments.

But these impressive gains totaling well over $3.5 billion did not correspondingly narrow our balance-of-payments deficit. They were largely offset by a $2.5 billion rise in the level of private capital outflow since 1960—and $2 billion of this rise occurred from 1963 to 1964:

The interest equalization tax successfully diminished American purchases of foreign securities from the peak rate of 1963. But new issues exempt from the tax—especially by Canada—kept these purchases nearly $500 million above the 1960 level.

Meanwhile, our banks met foreign demands for capital by adding almost $1 billion to their long-term loans abroad in 1964—$800 million above 1960 and $400 million above 1963.

Short-term capital outflows in the form of bank credits and corporate funds rose to an estimated $2 billion, well above the 1960 and 1963 outflows even though our money market rates were kept generally in line with those abroad.

Direct investment abroad by U.S. companies—very largely in Canada and Europe—rose by more than $400 million above 1960 levels and $200 million above 1963.

Moreover, travel and tourist spending abroad rose $600 milion from 1960 to 1964, while foreign travel outlays in the United States rose only $200 million.

The net impact of all these changes was to reduce our overall deficit by only $900 million—from $3.9 billion in 1960 to $3 billion last year.

To be sure, we have made more progress than these raw figures suggest. More than half of our 1964 deficit was financed by increased holdings of dollars by foreign citizens and by foreign private banks and businesses. Less than half of it had to be financed by the sale of gold or of dollars to foreign governments and central banks. It is only this official part that other countries count as the measure of their deficits.

If we measured our deficit their way, it would show—

In 1962, a deficit of $3.3 billion;

In 1963, a deficit of $2.3 billion; and

In 1964, a deficit of only $1.3 billion.

This way of measuring our deficit does not reduce our need for further action. But it gives another, and in many ways a better measure of our progress. It gives another and perhaps more realistic measure of how far we still have to go to attain balance. And it reflects the firm confidence of private individuals the world over in the dollar.

This confidence rests on the full convertibility of our dollars into gold—at the fixed price of $35 an ounce. Our gold reserve of $15 billion represents 35 percent of the free world's official gold reserves. To eliminate any possible doubts about its full availability I have asked the Congress to remove the outmoded gold cover requirement against Federal Reserve deposits. I am glad that the Congress is acting promptly on this recommendation.

As we move ahead to further measures to cope with our balance-of-payments problem, it is clear that we lead from strength. But to safeguard that strength, we must reinforce our programs to bring our external payments into balance and maintain full confidence in the dollar.

MEASURES TO REINFORCE OUR PROGRAMS

CAPITAL

I propose to take further steps to restrain our outflow of capital to the advanced industrial world. I do so reluctantly. The contribution of American capital to the world's growth and prosperity has been immense. But our balance-of-payments deficit leaves me no choice.

The interest equalization tax has effectively reduced the purchases of foreign securities by Americans since legislation was submitted to Congress in July 1963. At the same time, it has encouraged the broadening and deepening of capital markets in Europe—markets which can make a lasting contribution to the economic growth of the free world.

The tax is now scheduled to expire at the end of this year. But circumstances require that it remain in effect.

Therefore, I request the Congress to extend for 2 years the interest equalization tax on purchases by Americans of foreign securities.

Bank loans abroad with maturities over 1 year—not now covered by the tax—increased by more than one-third, or nearly $1 billion, in 1964. The bulk of this money went to other industrialized countries. Of this, only 15 percent served to finance U.S. exports.

In my judgment this outflow has reflected substitution for new security issues in an amount sufficient materially to impair the effectiveness of the interest equalization tax.

Acting, therefore, under the authority granted me by the Interest Equalization Tax Act, I have today imposed the tax on bank loans abroad with maturities of 1 year or more, with appropriate exemption for borrowers in developing countries.

If the tax did not apply to foreign credits made by nonbank lenders, it would discriminate against banks and invite an outflow of untaxed funds through nonbanking channels.

Therefore, I request the Congress to amend the interest equalization tax to impose it on extensions of nonbank credit of 1 year or more maturity, effective as of today.

Finally, and as soon as proper authorizations are prepared, I intend to exempt from the interest equalization tax purchases by U.S. residents of new securities issued or guaranteed by the Government of Japan, up to an aggregate amount of $100 million each year. Until now, an exemption for Japan under the interest equalization tax has not proved necessary. However, the application of the tax to bank loans of over 1 year will, in my judgment, create a sufficient threat to the international monetary system to justify a limited exemption.

These measures are designed to serve our balance-of-payments objectives without imposing direct controls on American business abroad. We seek to preserve the freedom of the marketplace. But we cannot succeed without the full cooperation of the business and financial community.

I hereby call on American businessmen and bankers to enter a constructive partnership with their Government to protect and strengthen the position of the dollar in the world today. In doing so, they will perform a major service to their Nation. And they will help assure a setting of economic prosperity at home and economic stability abroad in which to conduct their own business and financial operations.

Let me make clear that the Government does not wish to impede the financing of exports, or the day-to-day operation of American business abroad. But loans and investments which are not essential must be severely curtailed.

Specifically, I ask the bankers and businessmen of America to exercise voluntary restraint in lending money or making investments abroad in the developed countries. This request applies with special force to short-term loans and direct investments, that is, the capital outflows not covered by the interest equalization tax.

In connection with bank loans, I am asking the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to work closely with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Nation's banks to develop a program that will sharply limit the flow of bank loans abroad. I have directed the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to cooperate with the Federal Reserve and the Treasury in this undertaking.

To initiate this program, I am inviting a group of our leading bankers to meet with me, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in the near future.

Cooperation among competing banking interests could raise problems under the antitrust laws, and, if extended beyond measures essential to our balance-of-payments objectives, would damage our competitive system.

Therefore, I request the Congress to grant a statutory exemption from the antitrust laws to make possible the cooperation of American banks in support of our balance-of-payments objectives. I request, also, that the legislation require that this exemption be administered in ways which will not violate the principles of free competition.

Pending enactment of this legislation, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve will guide this program of voluntary restraint along lines which raise no antitrust problems.

In connection with short-term corporate lending and direct investment in advanced countries abroad, I am asking a group of our leading businessmen to meet with me and the Secretary of Commerce for a full discussion of the voluntary methods by which we can achieve the necessary results. The Secretary of Commerce will remain in close contact with the responsible corporate officials. He will request periodic reports as the basis for appraising their contribution to our balance-of-payments targets.

I have no doubt that American bankers and businessmen will respond to the Nation's need. With their cooperation, we can block the leakage of funds abroad, without blocking the vital flow of credit to American business.

I am confident that the Federal Reserve, in carrying out its responsibilities for monetary policy, will continue its efforts to maintain short-term rates of return in the American money market. The Treasury will fully cooperate. At the same time—and in view of the heavy flow of private savings into our capital markets—I expect the continuation of essential stability in interest rates.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES ABROAD

Since 1960, we have steadily reduced the dollar drain of our foreign aid program. We have steadily raised the percentage of AID dollars spent for U.S. goods and services—85 percent of new AID commitments are now spent within our borders. Until we master our balance-of-payments problem, AID officials will send no aid dollar abroad that can be sent instead in the form of U.S. goods and services.

The same rule will apply to our defense dollars. We have already made major progress in cutting the outflow of dollars for our defenses abroad—without impairing our strength or our defense commitment to the free world. I have directed the Secretary of Defense to intensify his program—

To shift defense buying from sources abroad to sources in the United States;

To reduce the staffs in oversea headquarters;

To streamline oversea support operations;

To work with our defense partners to increase their offset purchases of military equipment in the United States.

The Department of Defense has already conserved hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign exchange by such actions. But the Secretary assures me he can do more, while fully protecting our security interests and discharging our responsibilities.

FOREIGN TRAVEL

The growing interest of our citizens in foreign lands, and the steady rise in their incomes, have greatly increased American vacation travel abroad. Foreign travel should be encouraged when we can afford it, but not while our payments position remains urgent. Today, our encouragement must be directed to travel in the United States, both by our own citizens and by our friends from abroad.

I ask the tourist industry to strengthen and broaden the appeal of American vacations to foreign and domestic travelers, and I will support its efforts through the "See the U.S.A." program.

In order to cut the dollar outflows associated with foreign travel, I recommend that the Congress—

Pass legislation to reduce the duty exemption on foreign purchases by U.S. citizens returning from abroad to $50, based on the price actually paid;

Limit the exemption to goods which accompany the returning travelers.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN U.S. SECURITIES

A truly worldwide market for capital among industrialized nations requires a two-way flow of investments. In order to stimulate a greater inflow of capital from advanced industrial countries, the Secretary of the Treasury will shortly request legislation, generally along the lines recommended by a Presidential Task Force, to remove tax deterrents to foreign investment in U.S. corporate securities. This action will encourage—and will be reinforced by—the efforts of American business and finance to market U.S. stocks and bonds to foreign investors.

EXPORTS AND COMPETITION

Finally, and most important for the long pull, American business, labor, agriculture, and Government must work together to maintain stable costs and prices and strengthen our trade position in the world.

Essential to a strong competitive position is an expanding economy operating at or near capacity, yet holding costs and prices in check. Sharp reductions in income taxes—with more liberal depreciation allowances and special incentives for cost-cutting investment—have played a key role in creating such strength. Rising volume, rising productivity, and falling tax rates have enabled U.S. industry to hold the line on costs and prices while earning record profits and paying record wages.

As a result, U.S. prices and wage costs have remained more stable in recent years than those of any of our major competitors. The 27-percent rise in commercial exports since 1960—and especially the 15-percent rise in the past year—bear witness to our growing ability to compete in foreign markets. And the moderate rise in our imports demonstrates our growing ability to meet and beat foreign competition in our home markets.

But we must not take that ability for granted. Unwarranted price and wage increases could destroy it all too quickly. Unless American business and labor hew to the Government's price-wage guideposts, we will run grave risks of losing our competitive advantage.

Wage increases which exceed economy-wide productivity gains and price decisions which ignore falling unit costs—and there have been recent instances of both—do us all a disservice.

I call on all Americans to do their share in maintaining our generally excellent record of wage and price moderation. They will thereby strengthen their country both at home and abroad.

On a foundation of stable costs and prices, we will build an increasingly vigorous program of export expansion:

I urge the Congress to approve the $13 million budget request for our export expansion program in the next fiscal year.

We will step up our efforts to assure American industry sound and fully competitive export financing.

We will strive to eliminate such artificial barriers to U.S. exports as discriminatory freight rates on ocean traffic.

Policies for an expanding economy coupled with responsible price and wage decisions and special measures to convert our competitive advantage into greater exports—this is the combination that holds the key to a lasting solution of our balance-of-payments problem.

EVOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS SYSTEM

The measures I have proposed in this message will hasten our progress toward international balance without damage to our security abroad or our prosperity at home. But our international monetary responsibilities will not end with our deficit. Healthy growth of the free world economy requires orderly but continuing expansion of the world's monetary reserves.

During the past decade, our deficits have helped meet that need. The flow of deficit dollars into foreign central banks has made up about half of the increase in free world reserves. As we eliminate that flow, a shortage of reserves could emerge. We need to continue our work on the development of supplementary sources of reserves to head off that threat. And we need to perfect our mechanisms for making international credit available to countries suffering from balance-of-payments difficulties—on terms that will assure orderly correction of imbalances without forcing deflation on deficit countries or inflation on surplus countries.

To go back to a system based on gold alone—to the system which brought us all to disaster in the early 1930's—is not an answer the world will, or should, accept. Rather we must build on the system we now have, a system which has served the world well during the past 20 years.

We have already made an excellent start. Our short-term defenses against speculative crises have proved their strength and flexibility. The proposed increase in IMF quotas is a constructive forward step. Further, for some time we have been jointly exploring with our major trading partners how best to create new reserve assets that will be available if needed to supplement gold and dollars.

We must press forward with our studies and beyond, to action—evolving arrangements which will continue to meet the needs of a fast growing world economy. Unless we make timely progress, international monetary difficulties will exercise a stubborn and increasingly frustrating drag on our policies for prosperity and progress at home and throughout the world.

Let no one doubt it—

We will eliminate our international deficit.

We will maintain the dollar at full value.

Our instruments and our actions must be as strong as our resolve. That is why I have taken the additional steps, and am asking the Congress for the new legislation. These measures will focus our great economic strength more sharply on our payments problem.

This is a problem that involves us all—as workers, as businessmen, as bankers, and as Government officials.

I know that the Congress and the American public will respond in full measure to the challenge.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1965.*

EXTENSION OF THE INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include with my remarks an explanation of the bill H.R. 4750 which I have just introduced today carrying out that part of the President's recommendations dealing with amendments to the interest equalization tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to see the President's strong presentation of our international payments situation. It clearly points out that this country has enormous economic strength behind the dollar and intends to maintain the dollar as the preeminent currency in the world—tied to gold at the price of $35 an ounce.

The President's statement seems particularly useful in view of some of the adverse foreign comment about the role of the dollar that has appeared recently. There can be little doubt in anybody's mind but that the message evidences the determination of this country to keep the dollar strong.

The thing that impresses me about the President's statement is that it brings all sectors of our country into the effort to solve our balance-of-payments problem. It puts a very heavy responsibility on American business and finance to increase their net contribution toward correcting our balance-of-payments position, whether by increasing exports, restraining capital outflow or in other ways.

The fact that this is being done on a voluntary basis will itself give private businessmen more of an incentive to make the kind of showing that the President obviously expects. Also, the message puts a responsibility on every citizen who planned a foreign vacation to consider strongly deferring that vacation in the interest of reducing the dollar outflow. The message also indicates that the Government is willing to reduce its own expenditures abroad even further than has been done to date. Perhaps for the first time the entire American public will begin to feel a personal interest in solving this problem in ways the President has suggested—ways that involve no brake on our domestic prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, an explanation of H.R. 4750—which deals with amendments to the Interest Equalization Tax Act—follows at this point in the RECORD. I might point out that the Treasury Department has issued a detailed press release on this subject, which is available at the Treasury.

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 4750, THE PROPOSED INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX EXTENSION BILL

The accompanying interest equalization tax extension bill is proposed by the Treasury Department as an amendment to chapter 41 of the Internal Revenue Code (as added by Public Law 88–563, 88th Cong., 2d sess., enacted Sept. 2, 1964). This bill is designed to implement the administration's program, as announced by the President in his balance-of-payments message of February 10, 1965, to reduce the U.S. deficit in its balance of payments.

These amendments extend the tax for 2 additional years so that it will now expire December 31, 1967. Furthermore, the bill extends the scope of the tax to apply it to the acquisition by a U.S. person of a debt obligation of a foreign obligor with a period remaining to maturity of 1 year or more but less than 3 years at the time of its acquisition. Under present law, the tax applies only to the acquisition of such obligations with 3 years or more remaining to maturity (except that the President has authority under section 4931, which authority has been exercised, to apply the tax to certain loans by commercial banks with maturities of 1 year or more). Tax rates to be imposed on the acquisition of debt obligations with maturities of less than 3 years are provided, and technical conforming changes are made in related provisions.

The extension of the term of this tax for an additional 2 years is essential to continue the beneficial impact which its imposition has had on our balance of payments. At the same time, inclusion within the scope of the tax of the acquisition by any U.S. person of debt obligations with periods remaining to maturity of 1 to 3 years will have the effect of placing nonbank lenders on an equal footing with banks in that respect and forestall any shifting of medium-term credits from banks to nonbank lenders.

The provision in the bill imposing the tax on loans with maturities of 1 to 3 years will apply with respect to acquisitions made after February 10, 1965 (the date on which the President sent his message to Congress, announcing his augmented balance-of-payments program and his proposal with respect to these changes). This will prevent U.S. persons who have been put on notice with respect to the proposed changes from accelerating their acquisitions of foreign debt obligations in order to avoid the tax, since such an acceleration would aggravate the condition which these proposals are designed to cure. Provision is made, however, to exempt from these amendments acquisitions made pursuant to firm commitments existing on February 10, 1965.

The bill makes certain specific changes for the purpose of revising existing provisions of the Internal Revenue Code in accordance with the new proposed scope of the tax. These changes are as follows:

1. Imposition of tax: Section 2(a)(1) and section 2(b) of the bill amend section 4911 by imposing an interest-equalization tax on the acquisition of a debt obligation of a foreign obligor with a period remaining to maturity between 1 and 3 years, at the following rates:

If the period remaining to maturity is—	*The tax as a percentage of actual value, is—*
At least 1 year, but less than 1¼ years	1.05
At least 1¼ years, but less than 1½ years	1.30
At least 1½ years, but less than 1¾ years	1.50
At least 1¾ years, but less than 2¼ years	1.85
At least 2¼ years, but less than 2¾ years	2.30
At least 2¾ years, but less than 3 years	2.75

These amendments make no change in the rates of tax now contained in the statute. As a result, the 2.75-percent rate applicable to debt obligations with maturities of 2¾ years to 3 years will also apply to debt obligations with maturities of 3 years to less than 3½ years.

2. Extension of tax: Section 2(c) of the bill amends section 4911(d) to extend the termination date of the tax to December 31, 1967.

3. Insurance companies: Section 4914(e)(3) contains provisions permitting insurance companies to make tax-free acquisitions of foreign securities if they carry on foreign insurance business. The amount of such acquisitions is limited to 110 percent of an allowable reserve figure (fund of assets). The statute requires the designation into the fund at the close of the calendar year of certain obligations which could be acquired tax free, in order to prevent an unreasonably large gap from developing in the tax-free fund which could be filled with taxable securities. In order to properly draw the line at what constitutes a taxable or nontaxable purchase under the proposed amendments, section 2(a)(2) of the bill substitutes 1 year for 3 years in section 4914(e)(3)(D). A similar amendment is also suggested in section 4914(e)(3)(E)(ii) which now limits the right of an insurance company to designate debt obligations with a period to maturity of less than 3 years as part of its tax-free fund of assets. The suggested amendment is therefore necessary to avoid subjecting an insurance company to tax on acquisitions of debt obligations maturing in from 1 to 3 years although there was room for such obligations in the tax-free fund.

4. Period remaining to maturity of obligations payable on demand: Paragraph (4) of section 2(a) of the bill amends section 4920(a)(7)(B)(iv) to provide that the period remaining to maturity of any debt obligation which is payable on demand (including any bank deposit) shall be considered to be less than 1 year, rather than less than 3 years.

5. Effective date: As in the case of the interest equalization tax as originally proposed on July 18, 1963, it is necessary to provide that these proposed amendments shall be effective with respect to acquisitions made after February 10, 1965, the date these proposals were announced by the President. However, acquisitions made after February 10, 1965, pursuant to firm commitments entered into by the acquiring U.S. persons on or before February 10, 1965, should not be subject to the amended provisions. Consequently, section 2(d) of the bill sets forth certain circumstances in which the amendments will not apply to acquisitions made after February 10, 1965. For example, section 2(d)(2) of the bill provides that the amendments will not apply to an acquisition by a U.S. person (other than a commercial bank subject to tax pursuant to section 4931 of the Internal Revenue Code) of 2-year notes of a foreign obligor made in accordance with an agreement to acquire which, on or before February 10, 1965, the U.S. lender had approved and as to which it had sent to the foreign borrower written evidence of such approval (e.g., in the form of a commitment letter or draft purchase contract) which referred to the principal terms of agreement, provided that such agreement was subject only to the execution of formal documents and customary closing conditions, and contained all of the principal terms of the acquisition.

Section 2(d)(3) of the bill provides that the amendments are also inapplicable to an acquisition on or before April 12, 1965, of foreign debt obligations with respect to which there was in effect a registration statement which had been first filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on February 10, 1965, or within 90 days before that date, and with respect to which no amendment filed after February 10, 1965, and before the acquisition had the effect of increasing the aggregate face amount of the debt obligations covered by the registration statement. Finally, section 2(d)(4) of the bill provides that the amendments shall not apply to an acquisition of a debt obligation resulting from a foreclosure by a creditor pursuant to the terms of an instrument held by such creditor on February 10, 1965.

Section 2(d) of the bill also specifies that the conforming changes in section 4914(e)(3) made by section 2(a) (2) and (3) of the bill shall be effective after February 10, 1965, with respect to designations by insurance companies described in sections 4914(e)(3)(D) and 4914(e)(3)(E)(ii).

6. Returns: An amendment is proposed with respect to the filing of returns by U.S. persons making taxable acquisitions after February 10, 1965. Section 3 of the bill provides that U.S. persons shall report any tax liability which they may incur as a result of the adoption of these amendments on returns for the calendar quarter in which such amendments are enacted, or such later time as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulation.

THE PRESIDENT'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS MESSAGE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rostenkowski] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Jennings] be permitted to extend their remarks at that point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the President's balance-of-payments message, while indicating clearly that there is no emergency situation confronting us, points out that we must make more rapid progress toward a solution of our balance-of-payments problem.

It has been very helpful to have the problem placed in this perspective, particularly in view of considerable press comment in recent months here and abroad about the role of the dollar.

There is no doubt in my mind that the President's program with the full cooperation of private business will do the job.

Savings for our balance of payments that could come about through these measures can be very substantial.

The one thing that we will all note with particular gratification is that the measures will not interfere with the progress of the domestic economy. In fact, to the extent that capital which might have gone abroad is directed toward domestic uses, we may even get a stimulus to our economy as the result of the President's program.

The program also avoids any retrogression from our liberal trade policy. This is highly desirable at a time when we are engaged in negotiations with foreign governments designed to liberalize the free world trading pattern. The exercise of self-restraint by business firms in their capital outflows should actually be welcomed by those foreign countries who have been complaining about a threatened takeover of certain segments of their economy by American firms. Thus, the message should also receive a favorable reception by other countries.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's balance-of-payments message and the proposals he has made reflect a conviction which I also hold—that the dollar today is strong and stable.

Four years ago this was less apparent. Four years ago we faced a real crisis of confidence in the dollar.

The point I want to emphasize is that 4 years ago we faced and we met that crisis.

The present balance-of-payments situation is not comparable in the least, either in character or in magnitude to the situation 4 years ago.

As President Johnson said: "Those who fear for the dollar are needlessly afraid."

As President Johnson said: "Those who hope for its weakness, hope in vain."

For the truth is that in those 4 years we have taken measures which have immeasurably strengthened our international economic position. In those 4 years, we have maintained—as we will continue to maintain in the future—the pledge that the dollar is as good as gold.

The dollar would not today be the major reserve currency of the free world if other nations did not believe this.

I believe the President's proposals to meet the recent increase in capital outflow, both by legislation and by voluntary cooperation, will prove highly effective.

And I am sure the Congress will act swiftly in response to the President's message.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I was both pleased and heartened by President Johnson's message on the balance of payments. I am particularly pleased that he has put forward a long-range program. I think this is very important.

His program is not designed merely to cope with the short-term changes in our balance of payments which have become familiar to us over the last few years.

The new measures are based, as the previous ones have been, upon the firm conviction that there is nothing basically wrong with the dollar. I am thoroughly in agreement with this view.

The problems we have encountered in the balance-of-payments area since 1960 and before do not reflect an underlying fault in our international trade and payments system. Rather they reflect sudden disturbances in that system which we see in the fluctuations of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. Some of the rise in the deficit during the final quarter of 1964 falls in this category. While some of the measures which President Johnson is recommending are temporary, such as the extension of the interest equalization tax, his program is long range in outlook.

It is designed to cope with the immediate problem of the rise in our balance-of-payments deficit without disturbing in the slightest the proper functioning of the international monetary system.

For those reasons I am thoroughly in accord with the measures he has put forward in his message and look forward to speedy congressional action to implement them with legislation.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's balance-of-payments message keynotes a vital point in our efforts to correct our chronic imbalance in our international payments. It underlines the close relationship that must exist between American business and the Government's efforts to this end, and to put these efforts on a long range and enduring basis. I have no doubt but that the leaders in the banking and business world will step up their efforts in cooperation with the Government in line with the President's program.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I welcome President Johnson's message on the balance of payments. I am impressed with his proposals and it is my belief that the Congress will move swiftly to provide the necessary legislation.

There have long been doubts in some circles that it is impossible to improve our domestic and international economic positions at the same time. Our experience over the past 4 years has proved that these doubts are unfounded.

During that time our domestic economic progress has been virtually without equal in the history of our Nation. During that time we have also made solid and significant progress in improving our international balance-of-payments position.

President Johnson's measures are ones which do not interfere with the functioning of our free enterprise economy. To some, it would have seemed easy simply to raise interest rates in an effort to cope with the temporary pressures on our balance of payments which have recently developed. President Johnson, however, was wise enough to see that our continued economic strength at home is a vital factor in maintaining the great confidence and respect which the dollar enjoys throughout the free world.

By stressing voluntary cooperation, by carefully tailoring proposals to directly meet current problems, and by keeping in mind the outlook which has characterized his leadership, he has come forward with a program which I am sure will meet the problems without creating the slightest difficulty in our continued economic expansion at home.

For this reason, the President's proposals have my wholehearted support.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon Johnson has expressed extremely fine judgment in his balance-of-payments and gold position message to the Congress.

In this message the President exudes confidence in the fiscal soundness of our banking and currency situation, the prosperity and efficiency of our business community, the productivity and soundness of all facets of our trade and commerce, and the basic strength of this Nation's social and economic structure.

The President has outlined an excellent program to continue the progress that has been made over the past 4 years in improving our balance of payments. His message expresses complete confidence in the total strength and future growth of this Nation.

In the light of some of the questions that have been raised by the "doubting Thomases" in this Chamber during the debate on the gold cover question, it is my feeling that the President was wise in making such a forthright and positive statement on the strength of America at this time. I commend him for it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, as expected, the Democratic House leaders praised the President's balance-of-payments message to Congress.

I will say in all sincerity I can see little reason to be cheered by the President's proposals. The only new legislation recommended is the expression of the Interest Equalization Act to cover nonbank credit. The President also stated that he had imposed the tax on bank loans; authority he had not previously exercisd under the interest equalization tax.

No estimate at all was given as to the extent these measures would stop the outflow of dollars.

Now this single proposal covers only one area of the dangerous outflow of dollars—American investment abroad. The other areas are foreign aid spending, defense commitments, and tourist spending. No specific concrete proposals are made in these vital areas, which most certainly constitute the bulk of the outflow of dollars, and consequently of gold.

The only statement made on these matters by the President, is that he will urge the appropriate Government departments to be more frugal in their spending. That he will ask businessmen and tourists to cut down on their dollar spending abroad.

This is no solution at all to this threat to our gold and our money. The Congress and the Nation has a right to expect far more than this lick-and-a-promise treatment of wishful thinking.

The House passed the gold reserve bill yesterday, at least partly on the assurances by the Democratic leadership that the President and administration were prepared to take positive and effective steps to stop our unfavorable dollar balance of payments and demands on our dwindling gold supply.

This message today says little to reassure the Congress or the Nation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so be permitted to extend their remarks on the President's message at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ALLOWANCES TO DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES EVACUATED FROM DANGER AREAS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3043) to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to state that on yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services called this proposal up for committee attention. I trust the gentleman, Chairman RIVERS, will fully explain his bill, as I know he will and is capable of doing, to the membership of the House, informing them the Committee on Armed Services did give unanimous approval to this legislation which is both vital and necessary and which should be acted upon expeditiously. I hope the Members of the House will follow the suggestion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] for immediate adoption of this legislation as he proceeds to explain it to the membership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3043

A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The following new section is inserted after section 405:

"§ 405a. Travel and transportation allowances: evacuation allowances

"(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, when dependents of members of the uniformed services are ordered evacuated by competent authority, they may be authorized such allowances as the Secretary concerned determines necessary to offset the expenses incident to the evacuation. Allowances authorized by this section are in addition to those authorized by any other section of this title.

"(b) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, each member whose dependents are ordered evacuated by competent authority is entitled to have one motor vehicle owned by him and for his personal use, or the use of the dependents, transported at the expense of the United States to a designated place for the use of the dependents. When the dependents are permitted to rejoin the member, the vehicle may be transported at the expense of the United States to his permanent duty station."

(2) The analysis is amended by inserting the following new item:

"405a. Travel and transportation allowances: evacuation allowances."

(3) Section 407(a) is amended by inserting the words ", or whose dependents are ordered evacuated by competent authority" after the word "station".

(4) Section 407(b) is amended—

(A) by striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (1);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of clause (2) and inserting the word "; or" in place thereof; and

(C) by adding the following after clause (2);

"(3) the member's dependents are ordered evacuated by competent authority."

(5) Section 411(a) is amended by inserting the figure "405a," after the figure "405,".

(6) Section 1006 is amended—

(A) by adding the following sentence at the end of subsection (c): "The Secretary concerned or his designee may waive any right of recovery of not more than one month's basic pay advanced under this subsection if he finds that recovery of the advance would be against equity and good conscience or against the public interest."; and

(B) by adding at the end:

"(g) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, the dislocation allowance authorized by section 407 for a member of a uniformed service whose dependents are ordered evacuated may be paid in advance of the evacuation of the dependents and to the dependents designated by the member."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, after line 25, insert the following new language:

"SEC. 2. This Act becomes effective on February 1, 1965."

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the payment of per diem and dislocation allowances to the dependents of military personnel when such dependents are ordered evacuated from an oversea danger area to the United States. This situation currently applies in South Vietnam.

The reason for the bill is that last year when we had the Cyprus situation and earlier the Cuban situation, military dependents were ordered stateside and there was no provision of law to give them dislocation allowances or a per diem to meet the unusual expenses resulting from such an unexpected order to evacuate an oversea area.

This bill will correct that statutory deficiency. Legislation to accomplish this purpose was originally requested by the Department of Defense in 1964. However, the committee did not have an opportunity to consider it during the last session.

The current situation in southeast Asia and South Vietnam accented the importance of this legislation and therefore this is the first bill acted upon by the Committee on Armed Services this year.

Under existing law, if a dependent is ordered evacuated from a danger area and moves to another part of the world other than the United States, the Secretary is authorized to pay such dependent a per diem allowance. However, if the dependents are ordered evacuated to the United States there is no similar provision covering this contingency despite the fact that such dependents would be, under these circumstances, confronted with unusual and extraordinary expenses.

It should be noted at this point that there is not a similar deficiency in the law as it applies to dependents of civilian employees of the Federal Government ordered evacuated under the same circumstances. The law in this regard does provide sufficient authority to meet the unusual expenses resulting from such an evacuation.

This bill therefore will correct this deficiency by authorizing the Secretary of the Service concerned to provide a per diem payment to dependents ordered evacuated to the United States.

In addition, this bill would authorize the Secretary discretionary authority to waive up to 1 month's basic pay previously advanced to these dependents as a loan under section 1006 of title 37.

Also, the legislation would authorize the payment of 1 month's dislocation allowance, which as you know, amounts to 1 month's payment of basic allowance for quarters.

Finally, the legislation would permit the Secretary to ship a private vehicle of the dependents and military member to the temporary residence in the United States selected at the time of the evacuation.

In summary, in my view and that unanimously shared by the Committee on Armed Services, this legislation will simply place the dependents of military personnel in approximately the same position as their contemporaries who are dependents of civilian employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned Asia or southeast Asia, I do not remember which. Is this bill limited to personnel in Asia?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It takes in the whole world. However, this case in Asia points up the fact we did not have a law whereby if a national or a dependent of a military man is ordered back home there is no provision to pay for his expenses. This bill accomplishes that.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT COUNTERCLAIMS AGAINST AMOUNTS DUE FROM CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 158) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the Government of amounts due the Government in the settlement of claims under such act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 158

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 15 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2265), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission is authorized to take appropriate action on counterclaims filed by the Government as set off against amounts otherwise due and payable from the fund to the debtors concerned."

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 158 is reported unanimously from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It is identical to a bill of the 88th Congress, H.R. 5569, which also was reported unanimously and passed the House on the Consent Calendar. It was an official administration request.

This bill amends the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide specific legislative authority for setoffs to be made from annuity payments or from refunds that are made to former employees from the civil service retirement fund for the purpose of liquidating debts owed to the Government by the former employee.

It is recognized by judicial precedents that any amounts payable to a former employee of the Government may be applied in liquidation of an indebtedness of that former employee. While there is no specific provision in the Civil Service Retirement Act authorizing this procedure, it was followed quite regularly until 1956, when the Comptroller General held—on the basis of a court case—that the rule no longer should be applied in cases of the District of Columbia because the District of Columbia is a legal entity separate and distinct from the U.S. Government and, therefore, that the U.S. Government could not make setoffs requested by a separate legal entity, the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

This legislation will provide the specific legislative authority needed governmentwide, including the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

There is no additional cost involved; in fact, the bill constitutes an authority for the Government to recover moneys owed to it by former employees.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAZARDOUS DUTY PAY

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 1535) to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1535

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title VIII of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1131–1133), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 804. The Commission shall establish a schedule or schedules of pay differentials for irregular or intermittent duty involving unusual physical hardship or hazard. The appropriate differential shall be paid to any officer or employee to whom this Act applies for any period in which such officer or employee is subjected to physical hardship or hazard not usually involved in carrying out the duties of his position. Such pay differential—

"(1) shall not be applicable with respect to any officer or employee in any position the classification of which takes into account the degree of physical hardship or hazard involved in the performance of the duties thereof;

"(2) shall not exceed an amount equal to 25 per centum of the rate of basic compensation applicable with respect to such officer or employee; and

"(3) shall be paid under regulations which shall be prescribed by the Commission."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins more than one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1535 is reported unanimously by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It is identical to two bills—H.R. 2079 of the 87th Congress and H.R. 1159 of the 88th Congress—which received the unanimous approval of our committee and the House. It has the full approval of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget and its enactment is strongly urged by the administration.

The purpose of H.R. 1535 is to correct an inequity and to close a gap in existing law which discriminates against employees covered by the Classification Act with regard to hazardous duty pay. The bill authorizes the Civil Service Commission to establish pay differentials for Classification Act employees, similar to that now payable to certain other categories of Federal employees, for work performed under physical hardship or hazards not regularly involved in or required for the performance of the duties of the positions.

The bill limits the payment of hazardous duty compensation so that, first, it shall not be paid when the physical hardship or hazard was taken into account in classifying the employee's position; second, it shall be paid only for the actual period of time the employee is subject to the physical hardship or hazard; and third, the amount of pay shall not exceed 25 percent of the employee's basic compensation.

The Civil Service Commission has estimated that the cost of this legislation will be less than $100,000 annually.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BACK PAY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 1647) to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Back Pay Act of 1965".

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) "agency" means—

(A) each executive department of the Government of the United States;

(B) each agency or independent establishment in the executive branch of such Government;

(C) each corporation owned or controlled by such Government;

(D) the Administrative Office of the United States Courts;

(E) the Library of Congress;

(F) the General Accounting Office;

(G) the Government Printing Office; and

(H) the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 3. Each civilian officer or employee of an agency who, on the basis of an administrative determination or a timely appeal, is found, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, by appropriate authority under applicable law or regulation to have undergone an unjustified or unwarranted personnel action taken prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, which has resulted in the withdrawal or reduction of all or any part of the pay, allowances, or differentials of such officer or employee—

(1) shall be entitled, upon correction of such personnel action, to receive for the period for which such personnel action was in effect an amount commensurate with the amount of all or any part of the pay, allowances, or differentials, as applicable, which such officer or employee normally would have earned during such period if such personnel action had not occurred, less any amounts earned by him through other employment during such period; and

(2) for all purposes, shall be held and considered to have rendered service for such agency during such period, except that such officer or employee shall not be credited, by reason of the enactment of this Act, leave in an amount which would cause any amount of leave to his credit to exceed any maximum amount of such leave authorized for such officer or employee by law or regulation.

Sec. 4. The United States Civil Service Commission shall prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such regulations shall not be applicable with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority and its officers and employees.

Sec. 5. There are hereby repealed—

(1) section 6(b) of the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (5 U.S.C. 652(b)); and

(2) that part of the third proviso of the first section of the Act of August 26, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 22–1), which reads: ", and if so reinstated or restored shall be allowed compensation for all or any part of the period of such suspension or termination in an amount not to exceed the difference between the amount such person would normally have earned during the period of such suspension or termination, at the rate he was receiving on the date of suspension or termination, as appropriate, and the interim net earnings of such person".

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1647 is identical to H.R. 11753 of the 87th Congress and H.R. 4837 of the 88th Congress, both of which also received the unanimous approval of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the House. The legislation is an official administration request of the Civil Service Commission; it is considered a major legislative goal and it is the result of consultations with employee groups and agencies over a period of years.

H.R. 1647 will extend to all Federal employees on a more uniform and equitable basis the existing provisions of law that provide for restoring pay and other benefits to an employee which he may have lost because of an unjustified or unwarranted personnel action that was later corrected by appropriate authority. The bill is basically perfecting legislation. It takes the best elements of existing laws on the subject and consolidates them into one logical, equitable, and comprehensive authority to be applied after an erroneous or unwarranted personnel action is corrected. It does not create any new rights of tenure, review, or appeal for any employee. It requires only that when an employee is involved in an improper personnel action which is later corrected by appropriate authority, the employee be made "whole" financially for pay and other benefits which he may have lost.

A precise statement of the costs of this bill cannot be made without an extensive and costly Government-wide survey. However, no great number of new cases are expected since most adverse personnel actions involving backpay are already covered in some way by existing authorities. Whatever additional expenditures that might result, if any, do not really represent costs as such but represent pay and employment benefits that have been unjustly taken away from an employee and which equity requires be paid back to him as part of the corrective action taken in his case. The Civil Service Commission has already testified that a possible overall savings to the Government could result because the moneys expended as a result of private bills that are considered in every Congress in adverse personnel cases more than offset any increased expenditures that might arise under this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM "CHILD" UNDER RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 1746) to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1746

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1(j) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251(j)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The term 'child', for purposes of section 11, shall include an adopted child and a natural child, but shall not include a stepchild".

SEC. 2. The provisions under the heading "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85–844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1746 is reported unanimously from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It is identical to H.R. 3612 of the 88th Congress which also received the unanimous approval of our committee and the House. It is based on an official administration request.

The legislation will relieve a problem the Civil Service Commission has encountered in administering the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act dealing with the payment of lump-sum benefits.

In general, the Commission has followed the practice when lump-sum payments are made to the heirs of a decedent, of including all natural children, whether legitimate or not. However, this practice is frequently challenged in some States where illegitimate children are not entitled to inherit even from a natural parent.

This legislation is necessary in order to have uniformity and consistency and in order to avoid misunderstandings, appeals, and litigation. The bill defines a "child," for the purpose of lump-sum payments, as including an adopted child and a natural child but not including a stepchild. The stepchild is excluded because a stepchild, under most State laws, is not an heir or next of kin, and does not inherit from a stepparent except under the specific terms of a will.

No costs are involved in the legislation—in fact, there will be administrative savings in connection with the adjudication of claims and the elimination of litigation.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 1782) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1782

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 4(b) and 6(c) of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 850 and 851; 5 U.S.C. 3053(b) and 3055(c)) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 8(a) of such Act (74 Stat. 851; 5 U.S.C. 3057(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "In addition, the Government shall contribute annually and there shall be deposited in the Fund amounts for payment of expenses incurred by the Commission in administering this Act."

SEC. 3. Section 8(b) of such Act (74 Stat. 851; 5 U.S.C. 3057(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation for all payments on account of the health benefits plan negotiated under section 3 of this Act, for payment of the Government's contribution provided for by section 6(a) of this Act to agencies of the Government which administer a retirement system for civilian employees of the Government, and for payment of expenses within such limitations as may be specified annually in appropriation acts, incurred by the Commission in administering this Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1782 is reported unanimously from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It is identical to an official administration request of the Civil Service Commission in the last Congress, H.R. 3517, which was unanimously reported from our committee and passed the House without opposition. It is based on an official administration request.

This legislation will relieve a budgetary problem of the Civil Service Commission under the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act by eliminating the arbitrary 2-percent limitation of the Government's contribution for administrative expenses and providing, instead, that a limitation on administrative expenses be fixed annually in the appropriation acts.

The fixed 2-percent limitation on administrative expenses has proved to be too restrictive because, first, total annuitant participation in the program is only 60 percent whereas when the program was established it was anticipated there would be at least 95-percent participation; second, communicating with thousands of elderly people on a subject which is new and complicated to most of them has proved more costly than anticipated; and third, the program involves a closed group which can only decrease with the passage of time and, as a result, the Government's contribution will continue to decline. Temporary budgetary relief is now being provided by appropriation acts only with the understanding that permanent relief would be granted by substantive legislation.

No additional expenditure of funds is involved in this legislation.

CLARIFYING CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT PROVISIONS

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2594) to clarify the application of certain annuity increase legislation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of section 1(a) of the Act of June 25, 1958 (Public Law 85-465), and section 1101(a) of the Act of October 11, 1962 (Public Law 87-793), the words "entitled to receive an annuity" shall, from and after the respective effective dates (August 1, 1958, and January 1, 1963), of the annuity increases provided by such Acts, not include any person whose annuity commencing date occurs after the effective date of the annuity increase involved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2594 is reported unanimously from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It is identical to H.R. 8373 of the 88th Congress which received the unanimous approval of our committee and the House, based on an official administration request of the Civil Service Commission.

Enactment of this legislation is urgently needed in order to close a loophole in the Civil Service Retirement Act which, if unchanged, will leave the way open to the draining off of $65 million in benefits which the Congress never intended.

The bill reaffirms the original intention of the Congress as to the meaning of the words "entitled to receive an annuity" which were in the annuity increase laws enacted by the Congress in 1958 and in 1962. That intention is that the increases provided in annuities should go only to annuitants on the rolls at the time. The phrase, "entitled to receive an annuity," was added only to protect those who actually had a vested right to an annuity at the time but had not yet received a first check. The phrase most definitely did not intend, as a recent court of claims decision has held, that the annuity increases would eventually go to persons who left Government service with entitlement to a deferred annuity at some date in the distant future.

The civil service retirement fund is already heavily overburdened and enactment of this legislation is urgently needed to prevent an unwarranted raid upon it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statements of Mr. Beckworth, Mr. Pool, Mr. Udall, Mr. Daniels, and Mr. Henderson be inserted in the Record following the passage of whichever of the bills just passed to which their remarks may apply.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 14]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Bell
Betts
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Callaway
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Collier
Corbett
Corman
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Denton
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Fulton, Pa.
Giaimo
Gibbons
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Hagan, Ga.
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Johnson, Pa.
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Laird
Lindsay
Long, La.
McClory
McDowell
McMillan
Mackie
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Morton
Murray
Pelly
Pirnie
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Scott
Shipley
Smith, Calif.
Stalbaum
Sweeney
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes:

Conference Report (Rept. No. 36)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 3, and 4.

George Mahon,
Albert Thomas,
William H. Natcher,
Robert H. Michel,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Spessard L. Holland,
Carl Hayden,
Allen J. Ellender,
Lister Hill,
John O. Pastore,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 1—Reimbursement for net realized losses: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to agree to the Senate language prohibiting the closing of research stations and activities, amended to limit such prohibition to May 1, 1965.

Amendment No. 2—Reimbursement for net realized losses: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate earmarking funds for installation of equipment at the Metabolism and Radiation Laboratory, Fargo, North Dakota.

Amendment No. 3—Public Law 480: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment relating to sales of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic.

It is expected that the President will keep Congress currently advised of any actions taken in this connection.

Amendment No. 4—Veterans' Administration: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to agree to the Senate language prohibiting the closing and relocating of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, facilities, and services, amended to limit such prohibition to May 1, 1965.

George Mahon,
Albert Thomas,
William H. Natcher,
Robert H. Michel,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House for today.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of the House are vitally interested in the conference report now before us.

The House on January 26 passed House Joint Resolution 234, providing $1.6 billion for partial restoration of the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation which is required to support agricultural crops, the food-for-peace program, and other activities assigned to it by law.

Upon a motion to recommit the House agreed to language prohibiting the use of any of the funds therein appropriated to sell surplus food to Egypt, or more correctly, the United Arab Republic.

The other body approved $1.6 billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation but modified the House prohibition. Here on this table are a number of copies of a statement showing what the conferees are recommending; based on agreements reached with the Senate conferees. Anyone wishing a copy can get it here or from the other table. I will explain it, but it is very simple to see if Members will consult it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. On page 3 of House Joint Resolution 234 is the Senate language which states, in line 10, "and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest."

Will the gentleman explain to the House what affirmative action the President has to take to indicate to the Congress and to the American people that he has made such a determination?

Mr. MAHON. I would like to defer direct comment on that for a moment.

Let me say that when the conferees went to conference, I stated that the House conferees felt obligated, of course, to support the position of the House and the House bill. It soon became quite apparent that the conferees of the other body were adamant and would under no circumstances recede from the language which it had adopted as a substitute for the House language. So as a result of the give and take, and in view of the hard fact that we had to reach agreement so as to clear the legislation, we were virtually compelled to agree to the Senate language.

The Senate language is as follows:

> *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the sales agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest.

In the explanatory statement of the managers there is this language:

> It is expected that the President will keep Congress currently advised of any action taken in this connection.

So it is clearly the responsibility of the Executive to keep Congress advised as to any surplus food provided to the United Arab Republic under the existing agreement during the period from now until July 1, 1965.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. When it states that the President will keep the Congress advised, does that mean a written notice to the Speaker or the Vice President? If not, by what method will the President keep the Congress advised?

Mr. MAHON. I offer the observation that we should be provided, through the committees of the Congress, with the information. Certainly the leadership of the Congress should be provided with the information. This, of course, would include the gentleman from Michigan. I do not believe we will have any difficulty here. I want it to be perfectly clear that we expect to be advised. We did not change the language of the Senate amendment, but we did include the language in the statement of the managers to provide for such notification by the President.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, the President has to make an affirmative declaration or determination that the sale of surplus agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic is in the national interest. He then has to communicate that determination or declaration to the Congress and that will be made public in the usual course.

Mr. MAHON. I believe this is right. This is the same sort of procedure that was used during the Eisenhower administration when aid was provided to Yugoslavia. It has been done on various other occasions. In other words, we are raising a flag of caution in expressing this concern and reluctance to allow this aid to the United Arab Republic. But we are saying that in the light of the circumstances if the President determines this to be in the national interest, he is authorized to do so. It gives him the sole responsibility. I think under the circumstances this is about as good as we could do.

It is true that the United Arab Republic has not conducted itself appropriately and has not treated the United States with proper consideration in some matters in recent weeks and on some prior occasions. The United Arab Republic had the audacity to indicate to our Government that, after the expiration of the present agreement, which will be on June 30 next, it wanted to enter into new sales agreements for surplus foods. The disinclination that was rather firmly expressed by our Government to enter into further agreements as long as Nasser was conducting himself in the way that he had conducted himself precipitated this issue.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. In simple terms what the conferees have done is to strike down the language of the so-called Nasser amendment and bring a report back here in which you have agreed to accept two amendments by the other body which were not germane to the original bill. That boils it right down in plain simple language; does it not?

Mr. MAHON. What the conferees did was to modify the House language and agree to the Senate language to prohibit the sale of surplus commodities to the United Arab Republic—with the proviso, however, that if the President made an affirmative determination that sales under the existing agreement, which expires June 30, were in the national interest this could be done. And as the President of the United States who received a 15-million vote majority last November, surely we can trust him in this matter in view of the fact that he is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and President of the United States and must take the leadership in dealing with matters having to do with our international relations.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the Chairman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. For the sake of keeping the record straight, when the gentleman refers to sales under Public Law 480, the amendment was limited to sales under title I. We never did disturb whatever arrangement the President in his discretion might have had with respect to making agreements under other titles of that legislation. I believe the record ought to be clear that we confined it to title I sales.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

The conference report knocks out an amendment involving a laboratory in North Dakota. The Senate receded on that item.

With respect to research and research facilities in the Department of Agriculture, language had been added in the other body which would prohibit the closing of various research stations and research activities which the Department announced on December 31. In conference, it was agreed that no further action should be taken on these closings or other reductions in research prior to May 1, 1965.

The other body, in amendment No. 4, provided:

> No funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans' Administration shall be utilized for the purpose of implementing any order or directive of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the closing or relocating of any hospital or facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration or with respect to the withdrawing, transferring or reducing of services heretofore made available to veterans.

Here again, we made a minimum change in the Senate language. We agreed, after consultations, to insert language providing that no action shall be taken prior to May 1, 1965, to close out or to phase out facilities which had been slated for closing as publicly announced on January 13.

These matters will be taken up in separate motions after we have disposed of the conference report itself. The conference report, itself, includes only the language striking out amendment No. 2 relating to an installation in North Dakota. After we have adopted the conference report, we can then consider the language involving the agricultural research stations and the Veterans' Administration facilities.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I should like to ask the chairman if he will clarify for me exactly what the amendment pertaining to veterans' hospitals means? Does this mean that up until May 1, everything will go back to the situation existing at the time the original order to close these hospitals was issued? Will the hospitals again admit patients and proceed as before until Congress has an opportunity to further look into the whole matter? To say the least, the Congress should have some voice on a matter of such far-reaching importance to our veterans.

Mr. MAHON. We are assured that actions will not be taken to close or phase out these facilities prior to May 1. Some of the hospitals slated for closing had already stopped taking patients. They cannot restore patients who have been there but who have gone to other hospitals. But these hospitals will resume taking patients and will conduct business as usual, so I understand and have been assured, until May 1. Then whatever action is taken at that time will have to speak for itself.

Mr. ARENDS. In other words, they will go back into operation just as they were prior to the issuance of the order?

Mr. MAHON. That is my understanding.

Mr. ARENDS. I thought that yesterday afternoon that a perfectly reasonable and sound agreement had been reached; that this program would not be effectuated until the end of the fiscal year. They operate on a fiscal year basis. I do not understand why we should depart from it, and why we who appropriate funds for each fiscal year should not have full opportunity to consider this matter on that basis. Although one of the hospitals scheduled to be closed is in my district, I am not at the moment addressing myself to it or any of the others, but rather to the policy and procedure. Congress must be given full opportunity to thoroughly and exhaustively go into the whole matter.

I might say in passing this is the first time in the many years I have been in Congress that I knew we had conferees that were not appointed either by the Senate or the House.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. A moment ago the gentleman made reference to a 15-million-vote majority that President Johnson received and that this was the reason for trusting and giving him discretion to deal with the Nasser situation. In reading this mimeographed sheet which you have apparently prepared, I note that there are four amendments. If I am correct, it seems to me that amendment No. 1 concerning the closing of agricultural research facilities, and No. 2 on the same subject, and No. 4 on the closing of veterans' facilities are all an attempt by your committee and your conferees to limit the discretion of the President. I wonder what the dual standard is and why in these three cases you want to take away the President's discretion that you feel he merits because of his plurality and majority which he received in the last election.

Mr. MAHON. I merely want to note in passing that the President is entitled, in view of the fact that he is our Commander in Chief and our spokesman in foreign affairs, to our full confidence in the area of international affairs. It does not mean that he will always be right. We agreed in conference to the language which circumscribes the actions of the President to some extent on this question of food sales to Egypt.

We do not give anybody a blank check or abdicate our authority as Members of Congress, because we have confidence in the Congress. However, we had to have a meeting of the minds before we could have final action on this legislation, which is urgently needed because of the financial straits of the CCC.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. I think it should be pointed out that the three amendments the gentleman from Illinois referred to were not initiated by this House but came from the other body. So far as our own rules are concerned, they would not be germane here in the House.

Mr. MAHON. It is generally unwise to undertake to attach controversial and unrelated matters to emergency legislation of this type—to restore the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation, or otherwise. But the rules of the other body permitted the adding of these extraneous items and of course they were added. If we were to have an agreement, we had to have a meeting of the minds. So we did the best we could in achieving a meeting of the minds. I think that most Members of the House will be willing to go along with the action of their conferees.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You mentioned about the rules of the Senate providing for these extraneous things and that the rules of the House would prohibit us from doing that. What I would like to know is, is it going to be the policy of your committee to capitulate and accept all of these extraneous amendments of the Senate during the rest of this session, or would you favor trying to change the rules to avoid that and give this House an equal status with what the Senate has?

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman should answer his own question. We did not capitulate in this instance, so I hope we will be able not to capitulate in the future.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You have admitted that this is an extraneous, nongermane amendment that was put on in the Senate and which could not have been put on in the House.

Mr. MAHON. That is right. But it was added by the Senate and was before the conference for consideration. We had to get an agreement. That means give and take. We were importuned by many Members of the House to include the exact language of the Senate. We did not do that. I think we were fortunate to be able to work out an agreement which may be reasonably acceptable to the great majority, even though not totally acceptable to anybody.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In other words, you think that the Senate rules and the House rules are comparable as far as equity is concerned and that they give the Members the opportunity to express their wishes?

Mr. MAHON. The Senate rules, of course, are not the same as the House rules. But I must say that this is not the time, as I see it, to undertake to discuss the rules of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think under the rules of the House, even in the amended form it was supposed to have turned up, this thing could have been handled and voted on by the House as to its germaneness and whether or not it would be subject to a point of order. I have expressed my opinion on that before and I hope to continue to do so, and I hope that this House will soon rise to restore its dignity and responsibility and not be knuckling under to the other body.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. A moment ago we were talking about the Veterans' Administration facilities that are to be closed. I am led to believe by the chairman that he spoke with the full faith of the President when he said that these closings will be held in abeyance until May 1, to give such time to the proper committees of Congress to hold public hearings and thoroughly discuss these matters so that no precipitate action would be taken prior to that time, and so that our veterans and our people back home will have the opportunity to be heard. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. MAHON. I would like to say again that the good faith of the administration is involved here. The administration has agreed to suspend the closing, the phasing-out of these installations between now and May 1.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Until May 1; so that our people back home will have the opportunity to be heard on the record.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. But let us be utterly frank and say that the action by the House today with reference to May 1, does not mean that installations of the Department of Agriculture or the Veterans' Administration will not be closed. The same would be true if the date were June 30, as in the original Senate amendment. There is no way that I know of to compel an executive, regardless of his political faith, to spend money that he does not want to spend or to keep open installations which he is determined to close.

So it would be a cruel thing if the action taken by the House today were to be interpreted by Members of the House or interpreted by our constituents and friends at home as meaning that closings are off indefinitely and that things will proceed as before, or that there will be no modifications or change in the future. I think that needs to be made crystal clear at this point.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. This will give time for the people back home to be heard. What they want is their day in court.

Mr. MAHON. This agreement on a May 1 date affords that opportunity.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the very able chairman of the great Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our committee, as we have announced before, will hold as complete hearings as possible on this matter. We have already asked the administration to send someone up and tell us what our policy is going to be on Government hospitals in this country; whether one branch of the Government has a different policy than another branch. Our committee intends to hold these hearings and come up with some kind of affirmative action, if we can, and we are concerned about being faced with this deadline and putting this language into law.

Mr. MAHON. There will be no closing or suspension of any of these facilities, or phasing-out of any of these facilities, before May 1. The gentleman and his committee could bring in legislation to this body reflecting the view of his committee in the matter. But, in my opinion, there is no certain way of legislating an effective mandate to keep these installations open.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Does the gentleman have reason to believe that the administration will accept this language if we adopt it here today?

Mr. MAHON. I talked with the President this morning about the matter and he assured me that, while he regrets very much this delay—he says it will cost several million dollars additional—he wants to be cooperative with the Congress. He recognizes the responsibilities of the Congress and he indicates to me that he will go along with the will of the Congress on the date of May 1 and take no further action toward the closings in the meantime, I think this is fair and reasonable.

Further, Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that some are probably wedded to the June 30 date, which is the end of the fiscal year. The President will be just as free at the end of the fiscal year as he is on May 1 to implement any closing of installations that he might desire. There is, legislatively, no way that I know of to absolutely prevent the closing of installations that an executive is determined to close.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to take this opportunity to inform the Members of the House that our hearings will begin on February 18. We shall be glad to hear every Member who wants to be heard and we shall be glad to listen to anyone who desires to testify on this matter. Then we shall undertake whatever action is necessary and proper under the circumstances.

Mr. MAHON. Is the gentleman from Texas reasonably pleased with the action which has been taken today by the conferees?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I see it, if we do not adopt this, then they will go ahead closing them right now. But if we do adopt this we at least gain about 75 days. That is the way I interpret it.

Mr. MAHON. In which to consider the matter.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. In which to hold the hearings. But if we do not adopt it then the closings are taking place now. They are not taking in any more patients and evidently facilities are going down and down. If we adopt this, it gives the Congress at least 75 days in which to attempt to take affirmative action.

Mr. MAHON. It gives the Congress about 75 days in which to take action. As quick and decisive as we sometimes are in these bodies, we ought to be able to take some action in that time.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. My question is simply this: When you say "close on the 1st of May," does that mean you start the 1st of April getting everyone out and everything else out of the way so that the doors will be closed on the 1st of May, or begin the closings on that date, if other action is not taken?

Mr. MAHON. May I say to the gentlewoman from Ohio that the closing actions will not be implemented, according to the agreement which has been reached and according to the interpretation which I have of it, until May 1.

Mrs. BOLTON. If the gentleman will yield further, simply stated, I do not understand the meaning of the word "implemented." That is what I am asking. What is the meaning of it?

Mr. MAHON. They would not begin to turn them out on April 1 in order to close them on May 1. They would not begin vacating the facilities or closing them or limiting their operations until May 1.

Mrs. BOLTON. If the gentleman will yield further, there is no vacating of anything then until May 1?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I would like to add at this point that it is my understanding, when the chairman refers to suspension of further closings, that in an instance like our hospital at Dwight, Ill., where they have already made some move to implement the proposed closing, where the patient load has already dropped, conceivably by saying "suspend from here on," we have already been brought down to a 50-percent level.

Now, does it mean we continue on in that fashion until May 1 or does it mean, as I believe we agreed, that everything will be restored to full capacity until May 1? To me that means backing up if they took a step that is contrary to the best interests of what we feel necessary for the veteran?

Mr. MAHON. I would say they would be compelled under the agreement to resume the taking of patients in the hospitals.

Mr. MICHEL. Up to the full patient load?

Mr. MAHON. They would proceed as they have been operating.

Mr. MICHEL. What happens if they have already disposed of some of the people, attendants, and doctors?

Mr. MAHON. That is, of course, an administrative problem. I do not think we need to bother here about everything of that kind. They have to do the things as best they can and on as reasonable a basis as they can, and I believe they will.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. The gentleman realizes the difficulty today of consideration by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of this matter. As I understand it, all of the veterans' organizations are anxious to come and appear before the committee.

A great many representatives of people concerned with these hospitals want to come here. We can look forward to extended hearings. I think that can be taken for granted, and that will be confirmed by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The gentleman from Texas is a dear friend of mine and a very able, distinguished leader of this House for whom I have the greatest respect and affection. However, that does not obscure the keen disappointment that I feel because the conferees have not come up with a more feasible, practicable, and fairer solution to the very serious problems arising from the proposed closing of Veterans' Administration facilities.

I note that under the conferees agreement relating to the closing of these facilities, the language forbids action on the closing prior to May 1, 1965.

As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, I honestly do not believe that is sufficient time to give the House committee, or the committee of the other body, adequate opportunity to hear from those who desire to be heard on this matter and at the same time fully review and prepare appropriate legislation to be presented to the House, if that be indicated, as I think it would be.

Even the earlier agreement deferring the closings until the end of the fiscal year would leave all too little time for full consideration of the questions involved here which would have to do with proper hospitalization, care, and treatment of thousands and thousands of veterans.

The savings resulting from these closings are picayune as measured by the large amounts we are spending and the money we are giving away each year to other nations and to much less worthy causes than that of the veteran and his dear ones.

These closings, which strike at the very heart of the medical rehabilitation program, were undertaken by the Veterans' Administration without warning or advance notice, and without any effort to elicit the opinions and advice of congressional leaders and Members who are informed about the operations, results, and needs of the program.

I respectfully submit that the postponement until May 1, as worked out by the conferees, is an inadequate answer not only to those Members of Congress who have VA facilities in their States affected by the closing order, but also to our loyal veterans and to the many faithful employees who have so ably and efficiently staffed these facilities.

I earnestly hope that the amendment will not prevail and that the House will give our congressional committees on both sides of the Capitol adequate time to consider and act in these vital matters.

Mr. MAHON. It seems to me we have worked out a reasonably good compromise. Seventy-five days will give Congress time to consider and act.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the gentleman has brought to the floor of the House something very constructive in the way of an assurance with regard to these hospitals not being further reduced in capacity, and not being in any way damaged further during this time interval.

If the gentleman will permit I would like to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the hearings he proposes to begin on the 18th will not only go into the question of the reasons and justifications for the closing, but also go into the several bills that are pending before the committee, and the services within individual States, and to increase the beds that are already authorized for a veterans hospital.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I must inform the House the hearings that we hold will be on every bill that pertains to veterans' hospitals that are in our committee. In fact, we are going to go a little further; we are going to ask about the overall hospital situation, the switching of patients back and forth, where the Public Health Service, the military, and other hospitals are involved.

Mr. MAHON. I think the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will do a good job.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Has the gentleman any idea what the Senate will do so far as agreeing to the conference report that we are passing now? It might be a conjecture on his part, but I would like to know.

Mr. MAHON. I would feel uneasy in speculating about what the other body might do, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I hope that what I have to say at this time will be considered by all as no desire on my part to minimize in no way the affection, the esteem and good will which I have for the great Committee on Appropriations, and for its new chairman, who I think is one of the finest legislators it has been my privilege to serve with in the Congress.

However, I do wish to state my opposition to the conference committee report as it relates to amendment No. 4. We must consider the amendment as it comes from the other body, whether we like it or not. We are not judges of the procedures used by the Members of the other body.

The matter and the method by which it is brought before us is so very difficult to explain to our constituents. It seems to me that we should be very careful in protecting the integrity of this body and of the Congress generally.

I have two questions I would like to direct to my good friend, and a great chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The first question I should like to direct to the chairman of the committee is as follows: Has there been any request for additional money for the purpose of carrying on the responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration in the discharge of its duties, particularly in keeping open the hospitals during the remainder of fiscal 1965.

Mr. MAHON. From my present knowledge I would say no, but we have received in the last few days some supplemental requests for fiscal 1965. I have not had an opportunity to look at them, but I think they deal with such things as pay costs and so on, but nothing for medical care.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is my understanding that if there had been any deficiency they would have requested additional funds.

The statement has been made that $23 million will be saved by this action by the Executive. Is such saving of $23 million for the rest of this fiscal year, or annually for the ensuing fiscal years, by the action of closing down the hospitals and merging the regional offices involved?

Mr. MAHON. The annual savings are said to be in excess of $23 million for fiscal 1966. I would assume that would accrue every year.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is the way I understand it.

It has always been my understanding that when the Congress of the United States places its approval on an appropriation for a fiscal year and the agency charged with the administration thereof stays within its appropriation, then the Executive should permit the moneys to be spent in accordance with the approval made by the Congress and the Executive of such appropriation. What bothers me so much in this instance is this. May I in the beginning say that I am not at this time arguing the point of the veterans or others in their desire to have the hospitals remain open. Until I have evidence to the contrary I feel that the hospitals should remain open. I am here at this time, however to defend the principle of Government which says that once having made an authorization and an appropriation in conformity therewith by our action, and it having been approved by the Executive, we have a right to see to it that that policy first of authorization and secondly of appropriation continues until some valid and open argument can be made against it. In this particular instance the Executive has seen fit to go contrary to the wishes of Congress and the wishes that he himself expressed when he signed the appropriation bill. He made his recent decision, I am told, on the proposition that it is economically expedient at this time to close these hospitals. Maybe it is economically expedient. I do not know. But I think that in any case it is a matter that should come before the Appropriations Committee as that committee listens to the requests for funds for the coming fiscal year. I do not feel that we should at this time accept the order of the President closing the hospitals for the balance of this fiscal year. I see no difference between using the date of May 1 as against July 1. I know the pressure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is going to be up against if we go ahead with the Senate amendment—as the Senate proposed it or as the conference committee recommends. It is going to be tremendous. It is my position that the regular procedure of the Congress should be for the committee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to study the request made by the agency of the Government having jurisdiction. If justification can be made to continue the hospitals, then they or any of them should remain open. If these operations cannot be justified, their funds should be denied and the hospitals closed.

Mr. MAHON. This has been an area of discussion ever since the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Texas have been in Congress. Under the law all departments of the Government when they get the money appropriated may vary in certain instances as the year progresses. They may cancel certain operations or they may withhold the expenditure altogether. I remember this happening on occasion in the Roosevelt administration, the Truman administration, and in the Eisenhower administration. It is a good question and one that periodically gets ventilated. I know of no way to forever resolve that problem. But the gentleman poses a valid question: Why should the Executive not do with the money exactly what was intended when we appropriated the money? Generally speaking it does.

Of course, under the antideficiency law the Executive has the clear power to impound savings in appropriations arising from changed circumstances or greater efficiency of operations.

Mr. ASPINALL. In reply might I state this. This is not a decision which has been made by the local directors. This is a move from the top down. It comes from the Veterans' Administration and its regional offices and personnel. When I was home just this last weekend, I told my constituents that the director of the local hospital in Grand Junction had not told me in December when I visited the hospital, as I always do each year, of the prospective closing. He replied by letter which I received yesterday that there was a good reason he did not. He said he did not know about the closing of the hospital himself until 1 hour before the news broke on the radio announcing that the hospital was to be closed. Now I do not know just how one surveys a hospital to find out whether or not it is carrying on its activities as planned. However, it seems to me that Congress has not been kept advised, as it had a right to expect that it would be, in matters of such vital importance to it and the people whom they represent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is not the immediate question which is giving so many Members concern at this moment the question as to whether the executive branch by inserting the May 1 date in this bill cannot do in the interim that which the Congress does not intend that they should do?

Mr. ASPINALL. The proposition seems to resolve itself into this—the Executive can do as he pleases. In this instance the Executive can do it on the first of May whether the Congress wants him to do so or not. Just the same as the Executive apparently felt that he could do it on the first of March whether the Congress wished it or not. As far as the extra 60 or 75 days are concerned, it is not going to make it any easier for you and me. The fight shall continue. I intend, if possible, to see to it that a case is made for whatever may be the final action. It is my personal feeling that in this matter there is more involved than just dollars and cents. Most certainly agency ambitions are to be found—the desire for bigness as such, the present trend for living in metropolitan areas as compared to rural or less populous areas. No questions were asked when our veterans responded to their Nation's call for help as to whether they lived in country, town, or city. A loved one's trip to a hospital 200 to 300 miles distant can be expensive and difficult, too.

What we need is sufficient time for an inclusive and logical study of the whole matter.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question relating to amendment No. 4 to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

The question is this: If any Member of the House of Representatives detects action on the part of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration that such Administrator is violating either the letter or the spirit of this amendment, and so advises the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations be constrained to call a special meeting of our committee and ask the Administrator to come before this committee for the purpose of explaining his actions and answering such other questions as might be asked?

Mr. MAHON. I think we would give serious consideration to that. The Administrator has assured me he will cooperate fully in carrying out the agreement and I believe he will. But if there were valid complaints I think we would want to recognize the situation and deal with it.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I would certainly say in view of this language and in view of the fact that some 2 months would be proposed to cutoff the original language of the amendment proposed and adopted by the other body that the utmost good faith will be expected and required of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield so that I may ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There has been some discussion in the last 24 or 48 hours about the critical situation concerning the availability of funds in the Commodity Credit Corporation. I believe the last information conveyed to the House was to the effect that there were ample funds for 5 days or so. Is that the information that the gentleman from Texas has and would he give assurance to the House that this is the situation so that whatever happens to this bill we here in the House of Representatives will have taken the proper action?

Mr. MAHON. I would say that the Secretary of Agriculture and members of his staff assure us that they can cope with the fiscal emergency of CCC for a few more days. It is very difficult for them to do it, because the Commodity Credit Corporation is out of money and it can no longer provide support loans on agricultural commodities. But they tell me that if we can get this bill through in 4 or 5 days, the consequences will not be disastrous. The action we are taking today is with the full knowledge of Secretary Freeman, with whom I conferred today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And this information was given to the chairman this morning?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the distinguished minority leader that if there has been any good which has come from the current dock strike, I suspect this might be a part of it, because if there were no strike, then the Commodity Credit Corporation, with the ships untied in New York and other ports, would have to pay. They are foreclosed from doing so now because of that strike.

I should like to make it clear that although I signed the conference report, I did so only for the purpose of getting it out on the House floor so that Members could work their will, because without my signature on the report, we would not have been able to come to you. I signed it very reluctantly and with those reservations, knowing that the House would want an opportunity to work its will.

I have only one other comment on this matter of the grand savings which are to be made with respect to the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals. I hope Members will not become too exercised over the couple of million dollars supposedly involved, when the President, on the other hand, says it is perfectly proper for us to spend an additional $37 million to send grain and whatnot to the United Arab Republic. It seems rather ridiculous in the one case to use the "economy kick" and then turn around to double, triple, or quadruple the figure for some foreign country, rather than to make an expenditure in our own country.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pose one question to the chairman. I understood the distinguished chairman, in the colloquy with the distinguished minority leader, to indicate that the President must make an affirmative determination with regard to the national interest in respect to amendment No. 3 before approving the export of any agricultural commodity under title I of Public Law 480 to the United Arab Republic in fiscal year 1965. I also understood the gentleman to say he believed a clear flag of caution had been raised by the Congress. I understood him to mean that this touched on the question of the United Arab Republic's shipment of arms to the Congo, United Arab Republic intervention in the Yemen, and any threats to peace in the Near East flowing from recent Arab summit conferences; the formation of an Arab joint military command; proposed diversion of the headwaters of the Jordan River; and threats to the peace of the area generally. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. MAHON. I believe the gentleman has made a correct statement. I notice that the gentleman was quoted the other day as saying that he believed Mr. Nasser had "gotten the message." I hope so and I appreciate the gentleman's position.

Mr. REID of New York. I merely wish to add that I rise in support of amendment No. 3. I believe that the principle of flexibility for the President in the conduct of foreign affairs is vital and essential, and I intend to support it.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and who by all means should be heard in respect to these matters.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I did not sign this conference report. Since I was quite active in passing the House bill, I want to tell Members why. At the same time I want to say that the majority, who did sign the report, did the very best they could.

I might go further to say that in view of the acute situation facing the Commodity Credit Corporation, had it required my signature, doubtless I would have felt compelled to sign the report.

However, my purpose in not signing it is to maintain my own consistent position and to bring to you just what is involved in this situation. These are not matters that the President has gone through and selected as being wasteful. Involved in this is a directive from the executive department to cut expenditures and I understand the same applies to the Veterans' Administration. Your Department of Agriculture, instead of taking funds from the big operations where doubtlessly cuts might be made with a minimum of loss in results, picked small activities which were scattered throughout the United States which, while small in amounts and small in number, may be the only ones in that area and may be vital to a particular segment of agriculture. The Department, for example, has announced it is cutting out the following:

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1964.

REDUCTIONS IN RESEARCH

I. All research discontinued at 20 locations at a saving of $1,254,300 (92.9 man-years):

Place	Type of research	Funds	Man-years
Petersburg, Alaska	Fur animal research	$41,000	3.0
Glendale, Ariz	Poultry nutrition and physiological research.	59,500	4.8
Clarkedale, Ark	Weed control research	15,000	1.0
Fontana, Calif	Breeding and disease research on rabbits.	74,700	8.0
Pasadena, Calif	Forest trees research	28,000	1.0
Quincy, Fla	Biology and control of insects affecting shade-grown tobacco.	24,000	2.0
Fleming, Ga	Soil and water management practices for lower coastal plain and tidewater lands.	52,400	6.0
St. Anthony, Idaho	Dryland moisture conservation practices and tillage.	13,000	1.3
Bedford, Ind	Hardwood research	43,000	3.0
Bogalusa, La	Tung nut research	154,100	4.0
Huntley, Mont	Soil and fertilizer management	22,300	2.0
Durham, N.H	Clover disease and soil erosion research	44,500	2.0
New Lisbon, N.J	Cultural practices on pine-oak forests and watershed management research.	91,000	8.0
Albuquerque, N. Mex	Aerial methods of reseeding of rangelands.	50,000	1.0
Newell, S. Dak	Soil and water management, water resources, hydrology of stock ponds, beef cattle feeding and management.	165,800	11.0
Puyallup, Wash	Utilization research on berry and vegetable products.	37,300	3.0
Morgantown, W. Va	Watershed hydrology and watershed management.	14,000	1.0
Lancaster, Wis	Soil and water management practices	68,500	5.8
Wausau, Wis	Yield and quality of wood from maple trees.	50,000	4.0
Cheyenne, Wyo	Breeding of horticultural crops	206,200	21.0

II. Complete lines of research eliminated at 33 locations at a saving of $2,340,000 (171.1 man-years):

Place	Type of research	Funds	Man-years
Auburn, Ala	Bamboo culture	$7,100	1.0
Albany, Calif	Research to improve processing of sugarbeets.	164,500	10.0
	Composition and properties of various types and varieties of rice.	79,800	5.0
	Research on the composition of castor beans and their processing into meal and oil.	100,000	7.2
	New crops: Utilization studies on species of oilseeds having potential as economic replacement crops for those in surplus.	79,600	5.0
Davis, Calif	Castor bean breeding and diseases	52,900	2.0
Pasadena, Calif	Research to improve processing of sugarbeets.	4,900	-------
	Composition and properties of various types and varieties of rice.	2,800	-------
	Research on the composition of castor beans and their processing into meal and oil.	8,000	1.0
	New crops: Utilization studies on species of oilseeds having potential as economic replacement crops for those in surplus.	2,300	-------
Belle Glade, Fla	Harvesting, decorticating, and retting ramie, kenaf, and sansevieria.	220,300	19.0
Athens, Ga	Research equipment for controlled placement of fertilizer and seed.	18,000	1.0
Cairo, Ga	Tung research	32,900	4.0
	Culture, breeding, and disease research on sugar sorghum.	7,100	1.0
Experiment, Ga	Cordage fiber breeding and culture evaluation of new fiber crops.	$600	-------
	Research on sesame and sugar sorghum production and new introductions of castor beans.	4,300	1.0
Savannah, Ga	Bamboo culture	56,000	8.0
	Cordage fiber breeding and culture evaluation of new fiber crops.	600	-------
Tifton, Ga	Control of insects attacking rye	13,800	4.7
Peoria, Ill	Research on improved use of molasses	12,200	1.0
Hays, Kans	Soil moisture evaporation control related to rotations and tillage practices.	7,900	1.0
Houma, La	Research to improve processing of sugarcane.	49,400	3.0
New Orleans, La	do	168,700	11.0
	Composition and properties of various types and varieties of rice to guide milling and processing.	70,100	5.0
	Development of new and improved industrial products from tung oil.	93,400	6.0
	New crops: Utilization studies on species of oilseeds having promising potential as economic replacement crops for those in surplus.	128,900	9.0
Meridian, Miss	Culture, breeding, and disease research on sugar sorghum.	54,100	3.0
State College, Miss	House foundation problems on plastic clay subsoils.	5,000	-------
Mitchell, Nebr	Research on irrigation practices for corn, field beans, and alfalfa.	57,500	4.0
University Park, N. Mex.	Reclamation, nutritional and soil studies for irrigated land.	22,500	1.0
Geneva, N.Y	Research on control and methods of detecting European chafer and treatment of infested nursery stock.	21,500	2.9
Ithaca, N.Y	Research on breeding, feeding, and management of fur animals.	31,300	4.0
Raleigh, N.C	Evaluation of potential fiber crops	800	-------
Stillwater, Okla	Harvesting and farm handling of castor beans.	54,000	4.0
	Control of insects attacking rye	4,200	.2
Woodward, Okla	Water problems in dryland soils caused by soil compaction and management practices.	15,100	1.0
Philadelphia, Pa	Improved methods and new food products for maple and honey.	285,400	20.0
	New crops: Utilization studies on species of oilseeds having potential as replacement crops for those in surplus.	120,000	8.0
Upper Darby, Pa	Studies of forest fire occurrence and suppression methods to combat forest fire disasters.	10,000	1.0
Rapid City, S.C	Utilization of Black Hills ponderosa pine timber in forest products.	28,000	2.0
Brownsville, Tex	Breeding cotton varieties resistant to insects.	15,000	1.0
Bushland, Tex	Research equipment for controlled placement of fertilizer and seed.	44,000	3.0
College Station, Tex	Evaluation of potential fiber crops	1,500	.1
	Storage of sesame seed stocks, culture, and disease control.	59,500	3.0
Logan, Utah	Research on biology and control of insects affecting sugarbeets and vegetables.	14,000	1.0
Prosser, Wash	Utilization research on fruit and vegetable products.	48,900	3.0
Pullman, Wash	Research on infectious diseases of fur animals.	52,600	3.0
Madison, Wis	Research on breeding, feeding, physiology, and management of fur animals.	9,000	-------

III. Research eliminated at Beltsville and Hyattsville, Md., and in Washington, D.C., at a saving of $1,520,000 (104.8 man-years):

Type of research	Funds	Man-years
Fertilizer research	$492,800	33.0
Elimination of Clothing and Housing Research Division	550,400	40.0
Reduction of agricultural engineering research on housing	3,000	-------

Type of research	Funds	Man-years
Elimination of all food wholesaling and retailing research under marketing research	$224,700	18.0
Production research on fibers other than cotton	55,000	3.7
Research on bamboo production	500	
Fur animal research	25,600	1.0
Tung research	34,300	
Production research on sesame	2,600	
Research on castor beans	66,000	4.0
Rye research	21,800	1.1
Research on sugar sorghum	12,800	1.0
Agricultural engineering research on fertilizer and seed placement	30,500	3.0

IV. Elimination of livestock research conducted under cooperative agreement in 19 States, at a saving of $327,600:

Place	Type of research	Funds	Man-years
Davis, Calif	Bloat in cattle	$4,800	None
	Ornithosis in poultry	10,700	None
	Beef cattle research	7,200	None
Fort Collins, Colo	Mucosal disease of cattle	16,100	None
Storrs, Conn	Air sac disease of poultry	$16,100	None
Newark, Del	do	13,400	None
Urbana, Ill	Dairy cattle breeding research	9,900	None
Lafayette, Ind	Mucosal disease of cattle	21,500	None
	Dairy cattle breeding research	4,700	None
	Swine breeding research	4,200	None
College Park, Md	Bloat in cattle	6,500	None
Amherst, Mass	Air sac disease of poultry	13,400	None
East Lansing, Mich	Swine-breeding research	4,300	None
St. Paul, Minn	Ornithosis in poultry	6,500	None
	Air sac disease of poultry	10,700	None
	Beef cattle research	30,100	None
St. College, Miss	Bloat in cattle	4,800	None
Reno, Nev	Beef cattle research	4,600	None
Ithaca, N.Y	Bloat in cattle	9,700	None
	Air sac disease of poultry	15,600	None
Raleigh, N.C	Beef cattle nutrition research	2,100	None
Corvallis, Oreg	Ornithosis in poultry	8,600	None
Brookings, S. Dak	Swine-breeding research	4,200	None
College Station, Tex	Ornithosis in poultry	31,100	None
	Air sac disease of poultry	13,000	None
	Diary cattle breeding research	4,200	None
Blacksburg, Va	Air sac disease of poultry	13,400	None
	Beef cattle research	7,400	None
Madison, Wis	Bloat in cattle	7,700	None
	Dairy cattle breeding research	21,100	None

So it goes with many small projects which are very important to the areas in which they happen to be.

Let me say to you also there is another thing involved in this. You know, since I have been in the Congress the executive department has always tried to get the right to veto appropriation bills by item. That is what this amounts to. Remember that most of the time it is not your President making the selection. It is some fellow down the line in the Bureau of the Budget or in the Department of Agriculture who wants his way. I am sure that is where most of these items selected for elimination originated, just as sure as I stand here.

It is said that what they really want is to save some money. Last year it was the Committee on Appropriations, with your support, which cut the President's budget more than $4 billion. We held weeks of hearings in trying to meet the needs of our colleagues and their constituents all over the United States, working in close partnership and harmony with the Department of Agriculture. This I have done for 15 years as chairman of this Subcommittee on Agriculture. They do not have to advise our committee that they are cutting this out as they did here. The announcement to the public said, "We will save this much money in fiscal 1966." I was led to believe—perhaps I should not say it that way—at least I did not understand it that way—I thought I had been advised over the phone that these cuts would be made in this year's budget request for next year, where your committee would have a chance to consider these matters. Let me repeat again that here is a directive to the operating branch of the Department of Agriculture to eliminate this work and have it out of sight by April 20.

Your committee went to conference and in the conference yesterday we thought we had this matter worked out, and we signed the conference report as House and Senate Members who would have postponed these eliminations until the end of this fiscal year where, through our relations with the Department of Agriculture, we could sit down and and determine whether or not we needed to save some money in these areas, and whether it was wise to cut out 100 or so tiny projects which may not be major in the Nation, but which are very important to those areas and to the industry they serve, or whether we should curtail and restrict some of the big research operations in the big centers. This drive to have everything big and in the city sometimes comes from Federal employees. They like to see the bright lights. Some of these people in these veterans' institutions want to be where they can socialize with other folks in their profession. Not that a veterans' hospital in Idaho or Montana or other areas is not needed by the veterans, but it is a case of the professional people wanting to be somewhere else. I understand some of these are new hospitals, and are much bigger than the Hill-Burton hospitals which we sponsor.

I am not too familiar with that, but I am familiar with the efforts of the folks in the Bureau of the Budget through the years to have their right, through the President, to the item veto. That is what this is. That is a situation where they do not counsel with or even advise the committee and do not talk to the committee or give you a word as to why these things are eliminated, but they just simply announce that they are cut out. It is an item veto, and when it comes up before us connected with the Commodity Credit Corporation, on which so much in this country depends and which is bankrupt now, I say to my colleagues that our conferees had a tough job to face.

I do not have any criticism of my colleagues on this conference who signed the report, because they were faced with an absolute necessity. I want to be truthful. Had it taken my vote, I would have had to sign, too. If we in our relationship with the executive department cannot have an understanding that some of these things, if they come up, will be told to us so we can have a hearing and act of them, then certainly I cannot go for this kind of thing; I know last year the people who saved the money in the budget were the Members of Congress. That was more than some $4 billion below last year's request by the President.

I say to you that involved in this is the question of who is going to have the power to do what. Certainly the executive department cannot be made to spend a dime by us. On the other hand, the executive department cannot make the Congress appropriate a dime. That being true, what kind of fix would the country be in if each set out to show the other that they could not run them? We would be at a stalemate.

This has always been a partnership operation between the executive department and the Congress with understanding required on both sides, with action taken after the hearings which are conducted in great detail. Then we reach a common ground, which must have the President's signature. When it comes to the point where the executive cannot follow a course jointly agreed upon for at least 12 months we are in a bad way.

The action by the executive branch making this conference report necessary, might well have waited until the new fiscal year or at least until hearings could have been held. The course which has been followed I believe to be a step in the wrong direction. I truly hope that hereafter, we may return to a day of joint action, of common understanding. This feeling will lead to more savings in the long run, based upon full testimony.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with agriculture, in his statements concerning the false economy movement by the administration in the closing of certain research programs.

I particularly want to address myself to the strong desirability of continuing the research in the tung oil industry. This commodity is produced in a limited area of the continental United States. To be more specific, its production is confined to the Coastal Plains of the States of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana with a small production in the eastern portion of Texas. By far, the greatest production is in my own congressional district of Mississippi.

Tung oil is an oriental product. Its production for years was limited to Asia and particularly China. Because of its unique qualities and particularly as a drying oil, much of it is used in naval construction. For this reason the U.S. Government, as a result of its experience in World War I, when it was impossible to obtain this oil, initiated and encouraged its production in this country. Only about half of the tung oil consumed in this country is produced domestically. During the recent World War II the Government found itself again in short supply.

So strategic and necessary is this product that the Congress saw fit a number of years ago to add it to the list of agricultural commodities to receive a parity support price.

Since the tung tree is not native to this country, it has been necessary to carry on a research program in which the Government has been the major contributor.

Among the difficulties and problems on which research has been going on for several years and which is going on presently was the development of a tree which would withstand late frost. Much progress has been made in this area but there is still much to be done.

The sudden announcement, not by the Congress but by the administration, that this research, so essential to this infant industry, was to be summarily terminated came as a great shock to the producers of this necessary product. It is hard to believe that the administration would take such drastic action in this field under the guise of economy. This is especially true when we view the professed interest of the administration in its so-called war on poverty.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to illustrate this point. A number of years ago before the advent of tung, Pearl River County, Miss., was near the bottom of the economic ladder of the 82 counties in Mississippi. This was due to the fact that this county's economy was largely based on the production of timber and wood products. The timber had been cut from the land with the result that the sawmills no longer were able to offer labor and other opportunities. Then the enterprising people of that county, particularly the former sawmill operators such as Messrs. Crosby and Rowland, in an effort to rebuild the economy pioneered in the growing of tung. The result, after years of hard work and capital risk, was that the economy of the county continued to improve until today when Pearl River County is near the top of the economic ladder in my State—largely if not totally as a result of the production of tung oil. People from all over the United States have invested their money in this infant industry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask how inconsistent can we be. Here the administration with one hand proposes to spend billions of dollars in its so-called war on poverty while at the same time, with the other hand proposes to set back, if not in fact liquidate an infant industry, developed by private capital, which has been responsible for preventing a section of our people from becoming poverty stricken. I wonder if the President or those responsible for this cruel proposal realize how inconsistent they are. I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, and I beseech those responsible to take a new look at this proposal before permitting it to become final.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection and for the benefit of the RECORD I submit herewith a statement by the American Tung Oil Association on this vital and important question:

STATEMENT BY THE AMERICAN TUNG OIL ASSOCIATION ON BEHALF OF THE TUNG INDUSTRY ON TERMINATION OF ALL USDA TUNG RESEARCH, JANUARY 1965

The proposed termination of all USDA supported tung research came as a shock to the tung industry, and, in our opinion, would be a most unwise move on the part of the Department of Agriculture.

The Department of Agriculture has played an important part in the expansion of the tung industry from its beginning. Since 1958, more than 200 technical reports have been prepared by USDA staff members, and another 200 reports have been delivered to the tung industry on practical applications of the Department of Agriculture's research.

This need has not ended. Higher costs of living and increasing prices on labor and farm supplies make it necessary that the industry (1) cut cost of production; (2) increase the value of its commodity; or (3) decrease losses resulting from spring cold.

Research is the basis for growth; it is the true foundation of our Great Society. Remove research and you remove the stimulus that keeps our economy strong.

Taxation to run our country skims the top off from profits, and research puts the profits there to be skimmed.

Because of the importance of tung oil to our consuming industries and to national defense; because of the importance of the tung industry to the area where tung is grown; and because of the importance of the partially completed programs in both production and utilization research; the industry feels that termination of this research would be detrimental to the general good of the tung growing areas and our Nation in general.

I. IMPORTANCE OF TUNG OIL TO INDUSTRY AND TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Our Government, including the Department of Agriculture, encouraged the rapid growth of our industry during World War II, and all of the tung oil produced during the time of this war was taken over by the Government for strategic purposes.

The unique qualities of tung oil make it vital in many areas where substitutes cannot be found. The rapid dry and low water absorption of tung oil coatings, plus their exceptional durability, make them ideally suited to defense equipment and installations, and their use in this area is increasing. Because of this durability, tung oil coatings were selected as the base for intumescing, fire-retardant paints developed by the Southern Regional Research Laboratory, with the sponsorship of the U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Laboratories. These coatings will be used extensively by the Armed Forces, once their development is complete.

If our country is ever forced into another war, tung oil will again be a vital commodity in the war effort, and our Government cannot depend on any source of supply except the domestic industry. Our industry has never produced as much tung oil as is needed in this country.

II. IMPORTANCE OF TUNG OIL TO THE AREA WHERE IT IS GROWN

The tung industry was the best antipoverty measure that could come into the area which is now the Tung Belt, providing an agricultural crop for thousands of acres of land unsuited to other agricultural crops, and providing work for many thousands of laborers, both skilled and unskilled, most of whom would otherwise be dependent on public relief. Surplus labor is drawn from areas many miles from the Tung Belt, thus contributing to the economy of this entire area.

As an example, the largest tung growing county, Pearl River County, Miss., was at the very bottom of all Mississippi counties in per capita agricultural income in the early 1930's when tung was introduced. By the time the tung industry was firmly established in the county, it had raised per capita farm income to the point where the county was and still is in the top five counties in the State. The same relative situation exists throughout the whole domestic tung belt, including Florida and Louisiana.

There is every indication that the need for the tung industry will continue during coming years. The land is still not suited to other agricultural crops except pine and pastures. There is an abundance of land available for these two crops—land too low or too wet for the growing of tung. And at the same time both cattle and timber fluctuate greatly in value, making them unsound as the only basis for an area's agricultural economy. The tung industry has added substantially to the diversification of the area's agriculture.

III. IMPORTANCE OF TUNG PRODUCTION RESEARCH PROJECTS

In production research, there are four basic uncompleted projects, which are far enough along to show exceptional promise. These four are:

1. Breeding for a new variety of tree which will bloom late enough to escape spring cold;
2. Discovering a growth inhibitor which will hold back spring growth on present plantings, making the trees bloom late enough to escape spring cold;
3. Finding a practical way to control leaf spot, which reduces oil content in tung fruit;
4. Developing a coordinated system of harvesting and handling tung fruit.

The first two projects are set up to meet our greatest tung production problem—losses from spring cold. In the past 20 years, tung growers have lost 20 percent of their potential production because of spring cold and consumers have lost a lot of tung oil. The solution of this one problem would pay every year more than the Department of Agriculture is now putting into all tung research.

Progress has been made. Trees having some of the desired characteristics have been found and crosses and back-crosses have been planted and are being supervised by USDA personnel on land donated by growers, and at State experiment stations. However, several more generations of trees will be necessary to isolate the desired characteristics and to combine them into a single variety.

Over a hundred inhibitors have been tested, several which indicate that they may be valuable. But the results have been achieved in laboratory studies only and must be confirmed in the field.

Both of these projects need time. Stopping them now would not only waste all the work done up to this point, but would rob growers of the possible breakthrough that may come next year, or the next. Unless research in the development of a late blooming variety and growth inhibitors is continued, grower interest in replanting their old orchards no doubt will decline, and the economy of the area will be adversely affected.

Leaf spot is our second most important problem. During years when the fungus is bad, USDA tests prove that it costs the grower as much as $15 per ton of whole fruit—almost 25 percent loss to the growers. Tests are well underway to find the best means of controlling the disease—orchard sanitation, spraying, resistant trees, etc. Progress is being made here too but again, we need time.

The most rapid increase in grower costs is in the area of harvesting. A complete harvesting and handling system must be developed, including new methods of planting, ground preparation, harvesting, handling harvested fruit, field hulling, preparing fruit for the mill. The USDA has been working on this problem for several years, but their work in this area is far from complete.

IV. IMPORTANCE OF TUNG OIL UTILIZATION RESEARCH PROJECTS

While tung growers in the United States and Argentina finance tung utilization research amounting to 14 professional man-years annually through their own Pan American Tung Research and Development League, the importance of this area of research makes it necessary that the Southern Regional Research Laboratory continue their program to supplement the work done by the growers. There is a close coordination between the Pan American League and the SRRL to avoid duplication of effort.

The fire-retardant paint which is now undergoing improvement at the SRRL will save untold lives and property once it has been completed and approved. This project sponsored by the U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Laboratories must not be stopped until it is completed, for the saving in lives alone will make it worth however many dollars are put into its development.

Fundamental information on the composition of tung oil and its derivatives is quite limited at the present time. However, because of the unique chemical structure of tung oil, scientists are now beginning to recognize the tremendous contributions that can be made to science and human living through the study of tung derivatives.

SUMMARY

In the short span of 25 years, a crop with no previous horticultural history was developed into a profitable industry which filled the economic needs of an impoverished area of our country. This accomplishment was possible because of research by the Department of Agriculture and a willingness on the part of the grower to accept the recommendations of USDA personnel.

The potential of this crop has not been reached in this short period. Tung oil is not in surplus—there has never been enough oil produced in the United States to fill domestic needs.

If this proposed action were taken, the personnel now employed in tung research would no doubt be moved into areas where they are needed less than they are in their present positions. Most of them have spent their entire professional careers working on tung. Transferring them to other fields of interest would not save the Government any appreciable amount of money, and would decrease their value to agricultural research.

The value of this research to the tung industry is beyond question. The total elimination of this work would be a shock from which the industry might never recover. And the value of the tung industry to our Government, our consuming industries, the area where tung is grown, and to our general economy, is exceedingly greater than the small cost of this research.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to explain the parliamentary situation. We are about to vote on the conference report which deals only with amendment No. 2 relating to a laboratory item in North Dakota. The item is dropped. That is the conference report. After we have adopted the conference report we shall then give consideration to the agricultural research stations in one of the amendments; in another amendment we shall give consideration to the so-called Nasser matter; and then in another we shall give consideration to the veterans matter.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 1, line 13, insert: "*Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under Public Law 88–573, approved September 2, 1964, shall be used to formulate or administer a program to eliminate agricultural research stations or lines of research until after the Congress has considered and acted upon such plans for the elimination of research in its regular consideration of the research appropriation estimates for fiscal 1966."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: ":*Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under Public Law 88–573, approved September 2, 1964, shall be used prior to May 1, 1965, to formulate or administer a program to eliminate agricultural research stations or lines of research."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is self-explanatory. It is just a matter of inserting a date.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion. I oppose this motion because I do not believe the compromise wording agreed to by the conferees will have any meaningful effect on the actions of the Department of Agriculture in its projected closing of these research stations. We merely postpone these closing for 2½ months. We do not halt the closings until the Congress can have an opportunity to act on the whole matter, which is what the original Senate wording would have done.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned particularly with the projected closing of the Maple Products Laboratory at the Department's Eastern Regional Research Laboratory at Philadelphia. The closing of this Laboratory would be a heavy blow to the maple sugar and maple sirup industry which plays such a large part in the economy of New York State and the district which I have the honor to represent.

The Maple Products Laboratory is not in the category of laboratories in competition with other facilities doing the same work. This facility is unique in the country, perhaps in the world, with accomplishments to its credit that have given a substantial boost to the maple sirup producers from Maine to Minnesota and as far south as Virginia. Hundreds of farms in New York State are dependent upon maple products for cash incomes. These cannot increase or even be maintained without continuous research by capable scientists, such as those few in the Philadelphia Laboratory. They have advanced the processes of sap collecting and sirup making substantially, to the benefit of the producers. Their projects are aimed at the attainment of even more efficient procedures, and toward the production of higher quality products to delight all who relish the maple flavor on their pancakes.

New York State is, of course, one of the top producers of maple sirup and maple sugar. The action of the Department in closing this Laboratory will therefore have a very harmful effect on many many farmers who supplement their already limited incomes with maple production. This blow will be especially heavy in view of the already serious economic impact of the 1965 drought on dairy farmers in the same areas where most of the maple production takes place.

Similarly, the action of the Department in terminating the project on European chafer research will be costly and detrimental to the nursery industry in New York State.

This pest is known to exist in parts of New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Since 1940 New York State has been uisng funds in continuing research on this problem. The USDA research supplemented this, but there was no overlap and the cooperation has been excellent. The responsibility of the Federal Government in this research is long-range control over a pest that can be troublesome and costly. Experience has shown that as the pest spreads, more and more nurseries must come under regulation. For instance, when the European chafer is within one-half mile of any nursery, that nursery must be treated with a protective pesticide so as not to contaminate plants moving from one location to another and out of State. You can readily see the lack of tight control now can lead to ever-increasing expenditures by regulatory agencies of the Government and by private nurseries.

The purpose of the research at the agricultural experimental station at Geneva is to find better and more efficient ways of controlling the European chafer, thereby cutting down on long-range costs, both private and governmental. This is the real danger in the discontinuance of the research at Geneva—it is short-sighted economy. I feel that the research by the USDA at Geneva should continue. In the long run it will benefit New York and the nursery industry in New York. At the same time it will have beneficial effects on control of the pest in neighboring States and elsewhere in the country as well.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion. If, as I hope, the motion is defeated, I shall then move that the House recede from its position and concur in the original amendment No. 1 of the Senate.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 3: Page 3, line 1, strike out: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act" and insert: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 3, line 18, insert:
>
> "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION
>
> "No funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans' Administration shall be utilized for the purpose of implementing any order or directive of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the closing or relocating of any hospital or facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration or with respect to the withdrawing, transferring, or reducing of services heretofore made available to veterans."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:
>
> "No funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans' Administration shall be utilized prior to May 1, 1965, for the purpose of implementing any order or directive of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the closing or relocating of any hospital or facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration or with respect to the withdrawing, transferring, or reducing of services heretofore made available to veterans."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this matter was discussed somewhat during the consideration of the conference report. I think the issue has been thoroughly debated and made very clear.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have read with much regret the proposal of the Veterans' Administration to close 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals as well as certain regional offices of the Veterans' Administration.

I believe that such a course is shortsighted and constitutes false economy. I would like to serve notice that I intend to oppose such action in any way possible.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I will say that when we conclude the consideration of this matter I shall ask unanimous consent for all Members to revise and extend their remarks in connection with this conference report and these problems which are in disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, it is indeed with a great deal of reluctance that I take the floor this afternoon in opposition to the motion which has been offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon]. There are several reasons for my reluctance but primarily it is because of my great admiration for the gentleman from Texas as a gentleman and as a distinguished Member of this body, who has a record of service of which any man would be proud. Also, he is a neighbor of mine as his district in Texas joins the State of New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, another reason I am reluctant to do this is because I have just been assigned to the Committee on Appropriations of which the gentleman from Texas is chairman. He sits at the fountainhead of power of one of the most powerful committees in the Congress of the United States. Were it not that I knew of my own personal knowledge what a fair and just man the chairman of our committee is, I would probably not have the courage to get up here on this floor and try to defeat a motion of which he is the author.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], put his finger right on the real heart of this question. This does not just involve veterans' hospitals, my colleagues. This involves a fundamental issue of trust between the branches of the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to infer that the people in the executive branch of Government are any less sincere in their efforts and do not think they are right any more than I think that those of us in the legislative branch of Government have an exclusive monopoly on intelligence and sincere desire to do what is best for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we can keep any veterans' hospitals open or not. If this motion is voted down, which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] has pending at the desk—and I hope it will be—I intend to offer a preferential motion. Mr. Speaker, that the House recede in its disagreement with the Senate and concur in the language of the Senate in amendment No. 4. This would not do anything except change the date from May 1 to the date contained in the Senate language. This is the end of the fiscal year.

What does this do? This does not say that the hospitals and these offices are going to remain open. It only assures ample time for a fair and impartial hearing for these items to be heard on their merits, not just on whether or not it will save dollars. You can save dollars if you want to cut off aid to Vietnam. You can save $2 million a day. But who in Congress would be so ridiculous and absurd as to say that is the best way we should save dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what will be the final outcome of this issue. I know it will not be resolved here, and I doubt it will be resolved at the end of this fiscal year whether the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas prevails or whether we vote down his motion and accept a preferential motion accepting the Senate language.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I think the gentleman's position has merit for one reason; namely, it is unlikely this House will pass the appropriations bills, including the Veterans' Administration appropriations bill, prior to May 1. In other words, where would you get funds to do what the Senate has recommended? We will not have the opportunity through the regular appropriation bill because that will not be considered by this Congress by that time, so therefore, I think there is merit to the gentleman's position that we go to the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. MORRIS. I might point out to the Members, as I understand the present plan of closure, if nothing is done the actual mechanical locking of the doors, and transferring the patients and equipment out, begins on April 1 of this year. Under the compromise language it begins May 1.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the thing I want to emphasize has just been stated by the gentleman from New Mexico in a colloquy had with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends].

Mr. Speaker, I just want to emphasize again that this House should know what it is doing, if it does not already know, and that is that you will close these hospitals by this action. As was well pointed out you just as well might close them now as to let it go to May 1.

In other words, what you are saying, as the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished, able and courageous leader of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs [Mr. Teague] pointed out in a colloquy with his colleague from Texas, the other able, distinguished and courageous gentleman [Mr. Mahon], is that there will be an almost impossible hurdle erected here against any future action in the closing of these hospitals because there will not be an opportunity for further legislation by May 1.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point this out. I do not know the merits of each hospital, but I think the House ought to know what it is doing. I repeat, if you adopt the proposed amendment you are closing these hospitals.

I cannot refrain from again calling your attention to the fact that the rules of the House are not followed in the other body, and we make it permissible for them to put extraneous matter on our legislation that would be subject to a point of order in the House. Then when it comes back here our hands are tied, in that we have to take the bad in order to get the good. That is what happened when this bill went from the House to the Senate.

I have had a resolution pending in the Rules Committee for well over a year now that would stop that practice, but we have not been able to get it out of that committee. You are going to be confronted with this kind of situation until the rules are changed. My resolution simply provides that if an amendment offered on a House bill would be subject to a point of order in the House, then it would be subject to a point of order when it came back from the Senate after the Senate put it in. The adoption of my resolution would save you a lot of trouble. I just wanted to again point this out for your future consideration.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion. I believe the action of the Veterans' Administration in this connection is doing a particular hardship to New York State.

As I have already said earlier, the closing of three VA hospitals in New York State will do a grave disservice to our veterans, particularly in the rural areas. The closing of the domiciliary facilities at Bath, for example, will mean that elderly veterans will either have to be moved far outside their home community, thereby adding the factor of loneliness to complicate their cure, or else it will mean that these veterans are just dumped onto their home communities to become a charge to other agencies of the Government at the local level. In either case, there will be no real saving to the taxpayer and there will certainly be a grave impairment in the care being given to needy veterans.

The notion that veterans hospitals should be located only in large metropolitan areas puts veterans in rural areas at a serious and improper disadvantage. As one who has the honor to represent a rural area in this House, I am completely and unalterably opposed to this latest VA policy.

If this motion is defeated, Mr. Speaker, as I hope it will be, I plan to move that the House recede from its position and concur in the original Senate amendment No. 4.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Mexico deserves applause for his courage in refusing to concur with any compromise closing VA facilities on May 1. I should like to associate myself with his remarks.

Whether or not we agree with the procedures used by the other body, they have given us a chance to keep the issue of VA closings alive until July 1, the end of this fiscal year. If their rider is modified substantially by our conferees, we may be forced to go back to a situation in which Congress must accept the arbitrary decision of the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, or whomever is responsible for the order. Complete and thorough hearings should not be constrained by a May 1 deadline.

By prohibiting until July 1 any expenditure of funds for the purpose of closing VA facilities, the rider attached by the other body is the tool we need to get a fair hearing on the decision. It might change the status of this decision from irrevocable to a status more amenable to modification.

Let every Member who agrees our veterans should not suffer impaired or delayed service from the VA support the move by the gentleman from New Mexico and refuse to agree to the May 1 compromise date.

I hope the ayes and nays are ordered. Every Member should be on record on this issue. The veterans of America are watching the action of the House today.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to be recorded against amendment No. 4 because it gives us too short a time to adequately consider and take action to rectify the order for closing veterans' hospitals.

I am in favor of substituting a motion to recede from the conference position and concur with the language of the Senate amendment suspending action on the order until the end of the fiscal year, July 1, 1965.

The order to close these hospitals was made precipitously. No investigation was made. The Veterans' Administration has made generalizations about the lack of need for these facilities, their allegedly dilapidated condition, and inefficient operation, difficulties of obtaining staff for them, and so forth, but has supplied no solid facts on a hospital-by-hospital basis.

At Castle Point Hospital, at any rate, these generalizations are inapplicable. The hospital is a beautiful facility, in good condition and well maintained, financially efficient, with a good staff and no difficulty obtaining qualified help of all kinds.

Some 200 volunteers, undoubtedly unobtainable in our cities, help feed, clothe, entertain and care for the patients. There has always been as many applicants for use of the hospital as there was funds to permit admission. There seems no good reason for closing this facility and if this situation is typical, the order should be rescinded.

But, even if it were found that these hospitals, though in good condition, must be discontinued for veterans' use, they should not be closed precipitously. At a time when there is a desperate shortage of hospital beds in this country, when there are so many new hospital needs for narcotic care, mental patients, and so forth, it seems a crime to close good, operating facilities.

Orderly provision should be made for carrying on the work of these facilities through other programs if their use as veterans' hospitals must, indeed, be discontinued. At the present time the Veterans' Administration has ordered the immediate and absolute shutdown of these perfectly good facilities. If this order is permitted to stand, they will go to waste. That would be a great shame and an unnecessary and economic loss to the public.

The Congress should have time to study the situation of each hospital. It should be enabled to investigate the need for their continued use for veterans. If this need cannot be justified, adequate provision should be made for the transfer of new functions to them, and their veterans work should only be phased out as the other work is phased in. Otherwise useful facilities will be lost despite our need for them, and great disruptions will be caused to the communities in which these facilities are located.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this amendment No. 4, giving only 75 days to study and act on this problem, defeated. I urge my colleagues to vote the amendment down.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the allegation has been made that the Veterans' Administration hospitals that are being closed are in remote and inaccessible areas and that they are old and outdated. This simply is not the case with reference to the VA hospital in my hometown of McKinney, Tex.

The city of McKinney is a part of the metropolitan area of Dallas and is considerably closer in time to the Southwestern Medical School than is the city of Lisbon in which is located the Dallas Veterans' Administration hospital.

As recently as 1958, major repairs, installation of air conditioning and other modernization projects were made at the McKinney VA Hospital and the facility has at least 7 to 10 more years of life without any major repairs.

At the time of the closing directive, the McKinney VA Hospital, with a 271-bed capacity, had 279 patients in the hospital; also, 74 veterans were on the McKinney Hospital waiting list at the time, plus 345 in their CBOC followup program.

The only item at issue at this time is whether or not the Congress will knuckle under and allow the Veterans' Administration to close 11 badly needed veterans hospitals. Our elderly veterans need every VA hospital that we now have, and more. As a matter of fact, only today the Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member, passed out an administration request for $40 million for new civilian hospitals in the Appalachian region alone.

I hope that Members of this House will give an overwhelming vote in favor of the veterans of this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment. You are being urged to vote down the pending motion which stays the hand of the Veterans' Administration for some 75 days during which the Congress can take any further action it may desire to take with respect to veterans' facilities.

Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult for me to understand why a few of my colleagues in the House would want to vote down this motion to stay the hand of the Administrator for 75 days. Please bear in mind that this matter has been agreed to by the conferees. The representatives of the other body have agreed to the May 1 date. We have an assurance of a 75-day stay in the matter.

Do we want to gamble with the probability of reopening the conference by voting down this motion? Do we want to gamble and take that chance, when the conferees of the other body have said that they are agreeable to the approximately 75-day stay as provided in the motion now before us? Those of us who are interested in doing whatever we appropriately can do for our veterans and for these installations will be inclined to think twice before we undertake to vote down this proposal which gives this 75-day stay.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Would the chairman not agree that if the motion is voted down, it would then be in order to move that the House recede from its position and concur in the Senate amendment which blocks these closings without restriction as to time?

Mr. MAHON. But the modification to the Senate amendment has been agreed to in conference by the representatives of the other body and the Senate amendment as now modified is the result of a conference agreement. The date is May 1. The Senate amendment originally ran to the end of the fiscal year, June 30. So I do not see any practical alternative under all the circumstances.

Of course, we could vote the motion down. But in my opinion this would not be the thing to do. I sincerely trust that the Members of the House will vote to sustain our conferees in arranging for this 75-day stay.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, first, let me say that I am appreciative of the efforts of the conferees in obtaining this small grace period of at least 75 days before the Veterans' Administration wields the ax on various veterans installations around the Nation, but I hardly think that 75 days is sufficient time for the Congress to hold adequate hearings and make a proper investigation into this very serious matter and develop the necessary legislation to stop this unconscionable action by the Veterans' Administration.

The Congress has in good faith established these hospitals and VA centers on behalf of the veteran, recognizing his great service to this Nation, and this action by the administration breaks faith with the veteran and his family.

I, therefore, would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this House will vote down amendment No. 4 and support the privileged motion that will be offered by the gentleman from New Mexico to accept the original Senate amendment to this bill which would give the Congress an additional 60 days, totaling 135 days in all, to conduct this investigation. The few dollars that may be conserved by granting Congress this additional 60-day period are nominal, and the damage done to the veteran and his family and the resulting consequences thereof will far exceed any meager savings the administration may hope to achieve.

There are many, many other programs in which comparable savings could be realized instead of the VA program. For example, we could save some $37 million by refusing to send our tax-supported subsidized farm commodities to Mr. Nasser, of Egypt, but no, this administration apparently would rather help Mr. Nasser than the veterans of this country.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I hope this House will have the courage to vote down amendment No. 4 and accept instead the Senate version prohibiting the VA from further action until the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I want the very able chairman of the Appropriations Committee to know that I very much appreciate the difficult role that is his today in reporting to this body the conference report on this bill. Three wholly unrelated and vital subjects are at stake.

I oppose the administration position on amendment No. 1. I find it inconsistent to support the closing of the Rocky Mountain West's only horticultural station specializing in ornamental shrubbery and then support an administration position calling for beautifying America. I should like to believe in the latter. Therefore, I oppose the closing of the installation. My remarks at the outset of today's session in this House deal with the Cheyenne horticultural station. Administration arguments for economy fall flat, hollow, and insincere in light of the overall administration program.

I now join the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] in his opposition to amendment No. 4 to this report because I believe it is false economy. It actually appears to be blatant cynicism to hear talk of closing hospitals for economy on one hand and to appropriate in the tens of millions for hospital care for the aged, which we shall be called upon to do later in this session.

I believe this amendment should be defeated to at least give us time to hold hearings and make intelligent determinations, free from pressures so obvious here today.

I do not vote against my leadership lightly. I voiced my approval of the Nasser continued aid and voted for that amendment, amendment No. 3.

However, amendment No. 4 poses a conflict in the administration position and what in my opinion is the best interests of the veterans of Wyoming. Therefore, I shall vote against the administration and with the war veterans of Wyoming.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the proposed closing of several Veterans' Administration facilities in our State of New York is one of the most cruel and unwarranted actions our Government has undertaken in its many years of providing adequate care and rehabilitation programs for our deserving veterans.

As one of the richest nations in the world, which these veterans helped to preserve in two major struggles for survival—and those who are fighting today in Vietnam—are we going to tell them that we must cut down on their medical and rehabilitation facilities simply because it has been decreed that this is economically wise? Shame on us if we have reached a point where we must economize on the care of our veterans, yet at the same time we can afford to spread billions of dollars all over the globe with reckless abandon.

Not too many months ago, Congress enacted legislation to create an antipoverty program. This had my support, and I feel it has great potentialities.

Many veterans and their dependents, who will be affected if these Veterans' Administration facilities close, are in the poverty category now. The added burden that will be placed upon them, if we succumb to this heartless proposal, will only place them deeper in the throes of poverty, or put them there if they were not already in the poverty category.

We create legislation to combat poverty, and then we turn around and create poverty. This just does not make sense.

I shall cite a very recent example of what happened to a Buffalo veteran because of the scheduled closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary at Bath, N.Y. This 60-year-old veteran, an 8th Army veteran who served in Europe during World War II, has been unable to work at his trade as a painter because of lung and heart trouble. He applied to the Veterans' Administration for domiciliary care and his application was approved.

Because of the pending closing of the hospital and home for aged veterans at Bath, his application was forwarded to the VA domiciliary at Hampton, Va., where some of the 1,000 patients at Bath are supposed to be transferred when the Bath facilities are closed.

Below is the reply this 60-year-old veteran received from R. J. McDonnell, assistant chief of the registrar division at the VA Hampton center:

> Your application for domiciliary care, VA form 10–P–10, has been approved. However, since a bed is not available for your reception at this time, it is necessary to place your name on the waiting list. As soon as a bed is available, we shall notify you and furnish necessary instructions for reporting.
>
> You will not be entitled to travel at Government expense since you live beyond the area served by this center. If you require travel at Government expense, notify this office and your application will be transferred to a domiciliary closer to your home.

The veteran has justifiably complained, as follows:

> What do they expect me to do in the meantime, live on welfare? My pension checks of $225 a month stopped nearly a year ago.

This is only one of many cases in our area where the veteran will suffer if the operation of the Bath facilities is discontinued. Also, his family and dependents will suffer because of the additional expense of travel and inconvenience.

Over the years, Congress has provided generously for veterans benefits programs. It has done so as a clear mandate of a grateful nation. Our gratitude should not waver.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to join in an all-out effort to halt the closing of any Veterans' Administration facilities until a thorough investigation can be made. Wherever it is found, as a result of the investigation, that a definite need exists, the facilities should be allowed to continue to serve the veteran who served his country so well.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report just as I have opposed previous measures by which aid to Nasser's United Arab Republic has been continued. It did not make sense last year, and it makes even less sense today.

Further, I am amazed at the rationale of the majority party in arguing for this report. First, they say that the President must be given "Presidential discretion" to deal with Nasser and that the Congress should not tie his hands, particularly in view of his 15-million-vote majority in the last election. Then, in the same bill, they permit nongermane amendments to be attached by the Senate which "tie the President's hands" and reject the concept of "Presidential discretion" with respect to the closings of certain veteran hospitals and agricultural research facilities. If this is logical or consistent, I fail to see it.

Finally, this conference report is a prime example of the House's continued knuckling under to the Senate by accepting Senate amendments which are not germane and which would have been subject to a point of order had similar amendments been offered in the House. I would hope that some day this body would have the courage and good judgment to call a halt to this irresponsible procedure.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that the House of Representatives today approve the amendment to House Joint Resolution 234 to suspend the proposed closing of 31 veterans' installations including the domiciliary in Clinton, Iowa, until after May 1, 1965. This is substantially the relief I sought when I testified before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on January 22 and advocated that "the Veterans' Administration be required to suspend the operation of its dissolution order until after the committees of Congress have had the opportunity to make a full study of the situation."

During the period of time provided by this amendment I am confident that we can experience thorough review of the facts relevant to the closing order with each affected facility considered on an individual basis so as to fully determine the feasibility and responsibility of the proposed action of the Veterans' Administration in each situation.

The Clinton domiciliary was created in 1948 by specific order of Congress after full investigation of the premises by the appropriate congressional committees. Its plant has been kept continuously up to date, the last improvement having been completed in the last 60 days. It housed 615 veterans at the time the order to close was announced and has recently made emergency facilities available for local civil defense.

Since Congress created the installation in Clinton in furtherance of its avowed purpose to assure a basic level of protection for our veterans, it therefore seems reasonable that Congress be allowed to completely consider whether the purpose in originally establishing the facility will in no manner be unwisely frustrated by the proposed action of the Veterans' Administration.

I think this action by the House of Representatives is particularly appropriate and necessary at this time. The veterans' installations included in the January 13 order are already being affected, with employees being asked to file requests for change of employment and services not being extended to new applicants.

I believe this action will provide the appropriate forum to facilitate a proper investigation and review of this vital matter. It is important to insure that we make available a sensible program of medical attention throughout America for that group of citizens whose sacrifices throughout the world have made freedom available to all Americans.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the conference report for several reasons:

First, because it rejects the original House action regarding agricultural assistance to Nasser. For reasons I set forth clearly on Monday, I feel any retreat from the forthright and clear-cut position outlined originally by the House would be both inconsistent and contrary to our best interests.

Second, I am strongly in favor of the action in the Senate preventing the Department of Agriculture from closing its research stations. These closings would prove particularly detrimental to New York State, not only because of the termination of the chafer research program at the agricultural experimental station in Geneva, but because they would strike a severe blow to the maple sirup and maple sugar industry, which plays such a large part in the economy of our State and of my district, through the closing of the Maple Products Laboratory located at Philadelphia. In these closings, as in the closing of the veterans' hospitals, I believe that upstate New York has taken an unusually heavy blow, especially in the light of our economic and unemployment problems. The compromise wording offered by the conferees really only postpones the Department's decision, without giving any real opportunity for further action by Congress before these facilities are finally terminated. The Senate wording would have given us enough time to incorporate our collective judgment on these closings in the appropriations for next year.

Third, I oppose the conference report because the compromise adopted with regard to veterans' hospitals is also just a gesture and takes away the genuine leverage which the Senate wording would have given Congress in this important question. Under the Senate wording the whole subject of closing veterans' hospitals would have been held in abeyance until Congress had had an opportunity to examine the question and to make its own determination. I believe that the action of the VA in closing three hospitals in upstate New York is prejudicial to our State and prejudicial to rural areas and rural veterans.

I shall vote against the conference report.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the debate that has taken place concerning aid to Egypt, the question of Congress' proper role in the conduct of foreign policy once again has been raised. It is clear that the House of Representatives' original action severing aid to Egypt under Public Law 480 was only a prelude to a major congressional challenge of the entire structure of existing U.S. foreign aid programs. The 89th Congress must and will take a penetrating look at the operation and effectiveness of our foreign aid commitments; we have not only the right but the duty to do so.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I raise this point at this time because of growing public acceptance of the notion that Congress is not empowered under the Constitution either to shape or direct the Nation's foreign policy. This view has become widespread through the common assertion—made all too often by authorities who should know better—that the conduct of foreign policy is the exclusive constitutional prerogative and province of the executive branch.

This contention, as a result of repetition, has acquired the fine ring of learned authority. It has one fundamental weakness, however; it simply is not borne out by a reading of the Constitution.

The only constitutional reference to Executive conduct of foreign policy are contained in article II, sections 2 and 3.

Article II, section 2, declares that the President is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and that he shall "have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls."

Article II, section 3, refers in part to the President's duty to "receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers."

These references are the sum and substance of the President's powers to conduct foreign policy under the Constitution—these and nothing more. Far greater and more numerous powers in this area are constitutionally conferred on the Congress. If then the President in fact exercises wide authority in the foreign policy field, it is such authority as has been conferred by the Congress over the years. But there should be no misunderstanding at this late date that Congress has or could abdicate its powers and responsibility in this field.

Moreover, it should be noted that such constitutional powers to conduct foreign policy as are invested in the Executive—with the exception of the protocular duty to receive Ambassadors—are subject to approval by the Senate.

So much for the erroneous contention that the Constitution provides, in so many words, that "the executive branch shall be vested with the power to conduct foreign policy." No such phrase can be found, save in the imagination of those who would make the legislative branch a rubberstamp for the Executive in this vital area of Government policy.

But Congress, under the Constitution, is anything but a rubberstamp in its role as the ultimate decisionmaker on the direction and thrust of American foreign policy.

It is Congress, the legislative branch, that is empowered under article I, section 8, to "provide for the common Defence," to "borrow money on the credit of the United States," to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations," to "coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin," to "define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations," and most important of all foreign powers, the ultimate power to "declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water."

Additionally, it is Congress, the legislative branch, that is empowered under the same article I, section 8, to "lay and collect Duties, Imposts, and Excises," to "raise and support Armies," to "provide and maintain a Navy," and to "suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions."

Clearly, Congress retains the fundamental constitutional powers relating to the conduct of foreign policy. And although legislative provision for Executive conduct of foreign policy matters may be made, the Congress remains the ultimate constitutional repository for these powers—as much today as when the Constitution first became law of the land.

On this constitutional basis, then, and at this critical time for reexamination and reappraisal of our country's position in world affairs, the 89th Congress intends to act upon these foreign policy matters which affect our national interests.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman Morgan, pointed out to the House Foreign Affairs Committee last week, Congress will not continue to acquiesce to foreign aid expenditures on behalf of those countries whose own foreign policies are inimical to our national interests. Let there be no misunderstanding, then, regarding the Senate and House votes to complete our remaining commitment to Egypt under Public Law 480. By this vote the Congress is not relinquishing its power regarding the conduct of our country's foreign policy, nor do we endorse the providing of foreign aid funds to those contemptuous of our assistance. But in dealing with matters affecting our vital national interest, Congress must move carefully and on the basis of complete information. Therefore, the matter of proper congressional procedure—whether foreign policy should be set by means of a rider to an appropriations bill—was a determining factor in this vote.

The fundamental congressional reappraisal and adjustment of foreign aid programs will come with our deliberations over the foreign aid bill. And it is then that Congress' continuing power and duty to shape and direct foreign policy must be asserted in the national interest.

In this regard, Senator Dodd's recent proposal regarding suspension of foreign aid to countries acting against the national interest of the United States is a step toward commonsense handling of this critical problem.

This proposal will permit aid to be cut off in the case of countries committing acts injurious to U.S. interests—with the proviso that such aid will be restored only if and when the offending country takes satisfactory remedial action.

It is my intention to bring this proposal—which, I believe, represents the correct way to deal with challenges such as that posed by Nasser's Egypt—to the attention of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which is now considering the entire foreign aid program for the next fiscal year.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, we have an issue before us this afternoon that is both simple and complex. In its simplest terms the question is whether the VA domiciliaries and hospitals shall be closed in accordance with the Executive order. On this question my answer is an emphatic "No."

The closure is defended on the basis of economy. It is asserted that the move will save $23,500,000 and that the service to the veterans will not be diminished. But we have no proof. We have only the barefaced assertion of the conclusion. I have asked the administration for the facts—for the proof. Others have done likewise. No one to my knowledge has made any effort to prove the facts.

I have told the administration that if they can prove their case—savings and equivalent care—I would support the closure—and support it in my own district. But I am convinced they cannot do so. Certainly not with respect to the domiciliary at Camp White where indigent veterans are cared for well at a little over $6 a day. Where are the savings if these men go to nursing homes at $12 to $14 a day or to hospitals at $30 a day? Where are the savings or the equivalent care if they are turned out on welfare? It will cost as much or more for welfare for inferior care. Where are the savings in the abandonment of the capital assets—to be disposed of for pennies on the dollar? Where are the savings when we look at transportation costs? Where are the savings in closing the hospital beds we already have in the face of increased expenditures—requested by this administration for new hospital constrution and an expanded program of medical care for the Nation?

I can see that as medical care becomes more and more available to all our citizens and especially the elderly, there will be less and less reason for special facilities for special groups. But that time is not yet here.

And then there is the human element. The uprooting of men in their sixties and seventies—men on whom we once, twice, or more depended in time of need and now have only us on whom to depend. Democrats have always prided themselves on a humane approach to the problems of the Nation. Have we done it today?

The overtones of this question are extremely complex. They involve:

First. The question of nongermane amendments added in the Senate as pointed out by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer]. I agree that nongermane amendments added in the Senate should be subject to a point of order. I think it is the poorest of techniques and one well calculated to produce poor legislation to permit unrelated subjects to be coupled in the same bill. But this device is used and has been used by the administration only last year in the case of wheat and cotton. Today the administration may be hoisted on its own petard. While I support the abolition of this device, so long as it is used by others it may be used by all.

Second. The question of the item veto called to our attention by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten], and the eternal struggle between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government so eloquently spelled out by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall]. Grave constitutional issues are involved and adament positions taken by both branches can immobilize Government. Our system works because of cooperation and both the Legislature and the Executive are here to do the will of the people. Cooperation is called for—not recriminations, not pique, not chagrin, not stubbornness. We must reason quietly together, find the truth and the best course for our Nation to follow.

Today the veteran hospitals and domiciliaries will gain a brief reprieve from the executioner's ax. I intend to vote "No" on the conference committee's recommendation for a moratorium on closing until May 1 and I support the Senate amendment to defer closing until the end of the fiscal year when a new appropriation bill will give us a further legislative vehicle. There is no reason to suppose that the Senate will not support its own amendment. And if we do not proceed to deny funds for closing during the balance of the fiscal year, there may well be no hospitals and domiciliaries left for the Legislature to try to save. And I further support a rollcall on this issue so all may know my position.

But regardless of how much time we gain, in the additional time granted let us have full and complete hearings; let us get the facts, and let us be resolved in both branches of Government to be guided by these facts. Let us foreswear the question of supremacy and seek together the right solution.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORRIS. Is the vote a vote on the previous question?

The SPEAKER. The previous question has already been agreed to. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the Speaker. The question is on the motion with respect to amendment No. 4.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Aspinall) there were—ayes 157, noes 72.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks on the conference report and on the disagreeing votes, and I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state, so that Members may be advised, that the only business remaining will be a unanimous consent request by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'Neill]. The Chair understands that the leadership on both sides have cleared the bill involved. The Chair makes this statement so that Members may govern themselves accordingly.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 15

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he can give us some indication of the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, the only legislative busiwe are prepared to announce at this time for next week—and this is for Tuesday of next week, and we do expect to have a further announcement on Tuesday of next week with regard to the program for the later part of next week—consists of various resolutions from the Committee on Rules dealing in the main with travel, subpena, and investigative powers of legislative committees. One resolution, House Resolution 13, would create the Small Business Committee. The others dealing with travel, subpena, and investigative power are as follows:

House Resolution 84: Foreign Affairs Committee.

House Resolution 19: Judiciary.

House Resolution 44: District of Columbia.

House Resolution 68: Veterans' Affairs.

House Resolution 89: Agriculture.

House Resolution 104: Post Office and Civil Service.

House Resolution 35: Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

House Resolution 94: Education and Labor.

House Resolution 80: Interior and Insular Affairs.

House Resolution 112: Science and Astronautics.

House Resolution 118: Armed Services.

House Resolution 133: Banking and Currency.

These will not necessarily be called in the order in which they have been announced.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the majority leader.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY FILM ENTITLED "YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 282) expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" at the dedication of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in Boston, Mass.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> Whereas the city of Boston will dedicate its new Civic War Memorial Auditorium during the week beginning February 21, 1965; and
>
> Whereas this auditorium will be a living memorial to residents of Boston who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; and
>
> Whereas military, religious, and civic organizations will participate in appropriate memorial exercises: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film prepared by it on the late President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums", available for viewing at the dedication ceremonies of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in the city of Boston, Massachusetts, to be held during the week beginning February 21, 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOOD INSURANCE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the recent floods along the west coast and more recently the floods in Hawaii have pointedly shown the great need for a program of insurance against flood damages.

In Hawaii alone an estimated loss of over a million dollars will have to be borne by the individual property owners, many of whom will never fully recover in their remaining lifetime. Many of the owners of the 60 or more homes which were completely washed away or severely damaged saw their entire life's savings disintegrate in one unpredicted moment.

Why should this be so? One of the great attributes of an advanced society such as ours is continuity in security, as a group and as individual members of a group. The programs of President Johnson tending toward a great society would basically increase this area of security to all Americans.

Private insurance companies have contributed greatly to man's peace of mind by providing adequate coverage in life insurance and fire insurance. But they have failed miserably to provide insurance against flood damages and losses. The story appears to be the same throughout the country, as it was in Hawaii—no insurance coverage against floods.

The refusal or failure of private enterprise to enter this area of insurance is understandable. The risk is much too great. We cannot, however, continue to fail to provide for that segment of our citizenry who would be willing to purchase insurance against floods for their own security. Where private enterprise fails to provide, Government must do so.

It is on this basis that I am proposing legislation for Government insurance against flood damages to those who seek such insurance. I ask my colleagues to support me in providing a solution to an urgent and vexing problem faced by too many of our fellow Americans.

THE CHEYENNE HORTICULTURAL RESEARCH STATION

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being escorted through the Cheyenne Horticultural Research Station again 2 weeks ago and can report that it is one of the few garden spots in the entire Great Plains and the Rocky Mountains West, and is particularly one of the few places in the entire United States dedicated to the botanical research necessary for the continuation of testing the various types of trees for windbreaks and shelter-belt trees, shrub and flower species and other highly productive tree fruits for the high altitude sections of the Central, Great Plains, and Far West States.

In my opinion, is is a mistake for the Department of Agriculture to transfer some 25 botanists and scientists from the high plains of the great West to continue research in this field so vital to the West at laboratories located in Beltsville, Md., to land some 6,000 feet lower and conditions completely different from the Great Plains.

The proposed closing of the Department of Agriculture's Horticultural Research Station has set off a volley of protests that resounds throughout the central Great Plains and extends into comparable climatic zones.

The research advanced by this station has not only answered the historical demand for tree windbreaks, but it has paved the way to the introduction of numerous varieties of tomatoes, berries, flowers, and ornamental shrubs that have contributed substantially to material well-being of residents in every geographic area of our country.

The Cheyenne Horticultural Research Station, located at Cheyenne, Wyo., is situated at an altitude of 6,280 feet. The station consists of 2,200 acres, most of which is range. About 100 acres of comparatively level land are under irrigation with adequate water rights.

The station is the only station of its kind located in the Great Plains area and it has done an outstanding service in testing the degree of adaptation under the rather extreme conditions of this region.

The climate of the several arid western States is subject to severe conditions, including cold, dry winter winds, late spring freezes, and shallow alkaline soils. The entire Great Plains area is a naturally treeless plain with a semiarid climate. The annual rainfall ranges from 20 inches in the eastern area to 12 inches in the western.

This is mostly range country, comparatively windy and frequently visited by hail storms. It is more or less representative of a type of environment extending beyond the State boundaries.

Most well-known tree fruit varieties are not hardy in the Great Plains area and it is essential in order to grow fruit in this area to select varieties known to perform. The Cheyenne Horticultural Research Station provides this valuable service.

The crucial need for tree windbreaks, noted since the advent of the first permanent settlers a century ago, has been answered by the findings of researchers who have observed the tree culture of the Great Plains.

These earliest settlers had extensive areas from which to select homesites and generally located their homes near water of the region that afforded natural tree protection.

Later settlers, most of whom came to the region in homestead days, usually made their homes on dry land sites that were lacking the natural wooded vegetation. Many of these later immigrants transplanted small trees from the banks of river streams while others obtained seedling trees from commercial sources.

Little information was available concerning methods of tree culture on the barren areas of the Great Plains and consequently many early tree plantings were largely ineffective as windbreaks. These early plantings were made without the benefit of experimental research.

Much of the research that has made possible the effective progress in this field has been the result of experiments with the seven species of deciduous trees at the Cheyenne Horticultural Research Station, established by an act of Congress in 1928 for research on various plants, including shade, ornamental, and shelterbelt trees and shrubs.

The profound significance of this research is underlined by the fact that the horticulture station, in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture—"Technical Bulletin No. 1291, Agriculture Research Service, USDA," page 12—has some of the most difficult growing conditions to be found in the central Great Plains in regard to climate and soil.

The shelterbelt research area covered by the station includes approximately 150,000 square miles in South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, and Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, I have received letters from residents throughout this area, requesting a reconsideration of the decision to close the station.

I wish to quote Mr. Roderick W. Cummings of the Bristol Nurseries, Inc., of Bristol, Conn., who wrote me on January 22, 1965:

> Wyoming is a notably stern climatic area. Thus we have noted how many nursery catalogs from States or areas of stiff winter feature Cheyenne introductions. These include Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, upstate New York, even Ontario. Such sections are often hard put for plants beautiful and rugged enough to serve their gardens. The Cheyenne closing would certainly limit their choice of future material.
>
> With the proposed Great Society concept of such wonderful thoughts for improving our country, garden flowers can play a great part.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will help me in restoring the $206,000 appropriation to the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill for the continuation of this field station.

Its work is vital. Its work is necessary. It has made great contributions to the field of horticulture in the past 30 years.

In the catalogs of the Wayside Garden and many other fine nurseries of America, you will find listed varieties that have been groomed in the hardiness of the Cheyenne area, particularly in chrysanthemums.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the contributions to the economy of our Nation which are made at Cheyenne, Wyo., by the reduction of some 700 airmen and by the closing of the Veterans' Administration facility should be ample for one community to pay, without having to take the last spot of beauty and of research which has been set in its midst.

It would seem that this era of advancement toward the Great Society could more jealously guard this basic and established research project dedicated to beautification and productivity of the roadsides, flowerbeds, gardens, family farms and prairies of the Great Plains area.

President L. B. Johnson in his state of the Union address January 4, 1965, said:

> For over three centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage. In a fruitful new partnership with the States and cities the next decade should be a conservation milestone. We must make a massive effort to save the countryside and to establish as a green legacy for tomorrow.

I hope this station will be restored and ask my colleagues to join me in this worthwhile request.

IMMIGRATION LAWS NEED REVISION

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to revise the Nation's immigration statutes. It is a measure which I hope finds speedy enactment because in my judgment it will go a long way toward restoring our traditional attitude on a fundamental issue, an attitude which prevailed among countless generations of Americans who labored long and hard to make this country great.

That attitude didn't ask an immigrant from where he came or how he spelled his name. It was an attitude—a way of life—perhaps best summed up in these words with which we are all very familiar: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." And if it was found that an immigrant did—and could—indeed want to do something for his adopted country, he and his family were given an opportunity to carve for themselves a safe and secure place in the American community.

However, Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago this traditional American attitude was amended when discrimination was written into law. It became official policy to welcome immigrants who would help build the Nation—but only if they came from the "right" country or were of the "right" race or nationality.

Amended, too, was the traditional American attitude that an immigrant should be allowed to bring his family with him. Written into law were provisions which would make it extremely difficult for families to remain together and contribute as a unit to the national welfare.

The measure which I have introduced would erase discrimination from our immigration law and write into it a policy compatible with our historic traditions.

First, the bill would eliminate the present national origin quota system.

Under this blatantly discriminatory procedure the number of immigrants permitted to enter the United States each year from a given country is directly proportional to the number of people of similar national background who were living in the United States in 1920.

This provision is not only arbitrary and discriminatory. It is also at odds with the overall intent of the Walter-McCarren Immigration Act—to permit a specified number of immigrants to enter this country each year.

Under existing conditions the maximum number allowed to enter do not. They do not simply because many nations of northern Europe receive greater quota allowances than they desire to use. The act makes no provision for alloting heavy quota surpluses to those "non-Nordic" nations which have a much larger number of potential immigrants and a much smaller quota allowance. And because unused quota spaces cannot be reassigned a nation like Great Britain, with a quota of 65,000 persons annually, uses only about half its allowance. On the other hand, a country like Greece, with only 308 spaces a year, must go wanting.

Mr. Speaker, my proposal would abolish this discriminatory setup. It would put all available spaces into a quota pool, to be drawn upon as needed by various nations on a first-come first-served basis. The bill also declares that no area of the world shall receive more than 10 percent of the pool's total. This would prevent a large country from completely crowding out smaller areas. There would be no ethnic favoritism shown toward the nationals of one country over those of another. The measure, however, would provide for a gradual 5-year phaseout of the present system so as not to create rapid change without adequate time to adjust.

My bill would also remove the most blatantly discriminatory section in the present act, the infamous provision of the "Asian-Pacific triangle." Under this provision all citizens of Asian ancestry are placed into a single category, regardless of their place of birth. This category, representing almost all of Asia, is then limited to less than 2,000 spaces per year in the quota system, or less than 2 percent of the total.

Such provisions are not only a diplomatic handicap in our relations with such pro-Western Asian nations as Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia, but they are also provisions which are morally indefensible to a nation committed to the proposition that all men are created equal.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that like me most Members receive many letters each year from constituents who long to be reunited in America with parents who are still living abroad. Under present law, husbands, wives, and children of American citizens may enter the country on a nonquota immigrant basis. But for some unexplained reason parents of citizens are not given nonquota status. They must wait, often for many years, for a regular quota assignment.

My proposal would give to parents the same nonquota status now provided for other members of the immediate family. I think I speak for all Americans when I say that parents, regardless of the age of their children, are still full-fledged and loved members of the family circle.

Some opponents of immigration law revision charge that any change will open "the floodgates" to hordes of aliens and inundate the country with unemployables. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Presently, the authorized number of quota immigrants is 158,361. My proposal would increase this figure by less than 7,000 or an increase of less than 5 percent. This is certainly not a flood. It is hardly a ripple.

Nor will this bill open the country to unemployables. It specifically states that immigrants may qualify for first preference consideration if their services would be "especially advantageous" to the United States. The Attorney General must ascertain, upon consultation with proper Government agencies, that job openings do in fact exist in an individual specialist's particular field. My proposal would also continue an existing provision which requires the Attorney General to investigate a petitioner's job qualifications before determining his eligibility for first preference.

In this regard, the bill would establish an Immigration Board, composed of four Members of Congress and three appointed by the President, to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission of skilled specialists and workers whose services are needed by reason of labor shortages in this country. The Board would also study and consult with appropriate Government agencies on all facets of immigration policy.

In a recent editorial, Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal made this observation in analyzing proposed changes in our immigration laws:

> The quota system undeniably leads to a number of anomalies. It turns away qualified applicants from some countries while quotas from others go unused. It can refuse a highly trained and skilled Asian while admitting an unskilled European, which makes it understandably hard to convince the Asian our motives are untouched by prejudice. The imperfections of the system have fostered recurring avalanches of private congressional bills allowing specific individuals to enter the United States.
>
> A sensible alternative seems to be to put the emphasis on skills and relationships with U.S. citizens. The change would correct many of the present inequities and set up a more logical criterion for picking the applicants most likely to make the largest contributions to our society.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that legislation along the lines which I have discussed will receive speedy enactment by the Congress. Only then will we be able to read without hypocrisy the verse inscribed on the Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free;
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me;
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

GRAVE ERROR IN ADOPTING AMENDMENT TO CLAUSE 1 OF RULE XX

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think the events of the last 2 or 3 days have directed attention to and emphasized the grave error this House made on the opening day of this session in adopting an amendment to clause 1 of rule XX. I am referring to the amendment of that rule which stated:

> Any amendment of the Senate to any House bill shall be subject to the point of order that it shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, if, originating in the House, it would be subject to that point.

In this particular instance, I am referring to amendment No. 4, to House Joint Resolution 234, adopted in the Senate, which would place restrictions upon the Veterans' Administration. No one would contend that there is any relationship between this supplemental agriculture appropriation bill passed in the House, and the conduct of the affairs of the Veterans' Administration, regardless of what your position is with reference to the proposed VA amendment.

For years, this House has permitted the Senate to emasculate legislation originating in this body, by the addition of amendments which would be rejected in this body on a point of order that the amendments were not germane. We have sacrificed our dignity, we have acknowledged our inferiority, we have refused to recognize the inequity of the situation, and we have attempted to justify our action by the specious argument that all of this is necessary to maintain comity between the two branches of Congress. I for one am fed up with all of this foolishness, and I think it is time for the leadership of this House, on both sides of the aisle, to assert our rights, to regain our dignity, and to insist that we make the rules of the game apply with equal fairness to the Members of both bodies of Congress.

When House Joint Resolution 234 was sent back to this House with an amendment which was not germane and which would have been ruled out of order if it had been offered in the House, the opportunity should have been available for any Member of this House to have raised that point of order. The change made in rule XX on January 4, instead of improving, merely worsened a condition which has long existed and which should have been corrected years ago.

In closing, may I suggest that particularly the newer Members of this House might be interested in reading the very limited debate which took place on the amendments to the rules of the House which occurred on the opening day of this session, and which are recorded on pages 22 and 24 of the RECORD of January

4, 1965, when the gentleman from Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee pointed out some of the dangers and attempted, unsuccessfully I regret, to have debated this most important issue.

TO ESTABLISH A FAIRMINDED REPORT ON SELMA, ALA.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week several of the leading citizens of Selma, Ala., urged that a fairminded, objective, and duly constituted congressional committee visit their city to ascertain the true facts concerning racial turbulence that has taken place there in recent weeks.

In an effort to bring this request before the Congress, I introduced last week, along with my colleague from Alabama, Hon. GEORGE ANDREWS, a resolution providing for the establishment of a bipartisan joint congressional committee to investigate the causes of current racial tensions that presently exist in Selma.

The resolution in question was referred to the House Rules Committee, and on Monday both Congressman GEORGE ANDREWS and I appeared before the committee in support of the measure. Today the Rules Committee met but failed to act on the resolution, and I understand the votes necessary to bring this legislation to the floor of the House are not available.

It is most regrettable that the Rules Committee did not recognize in today's deliberations the need for a balanced, fairminded, congressional report on Selma's problems. Such guidance as Congress needs in these matters certainly cannot be given by self-appointed hit-and-run congressional investigators, who approach the situation in Selma with a preexisting bias.

DR. WALTER JOHNSON ANALYZES THE ELECTION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following article in the January issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists by Dr. Walter Johnson, eminent American historian and distinguished chairman of the History Department of the University of Chicago.

HAVE FAITH IN THE 20TH CENTURY

(By Walter Johnson)

"The most noteworthy Republican victories on Tuesday," declared Fred A. Young, the New York Republican State chairman, "were scored by soundly progressive Republicans who survived the deadly political backwash from the disastrous alternative course charted for our party since the San Francisco convention." And he added, "The Republican Party has paid a shattering price for that erratic deviation from our soundly moderate 20th century course."

The election was devastating for the Republican Party. Not only did the Johnson-Humphrey ticket carry the popular vote by a margin of 15,500,000, but the Republicans were left with the electorial vote of only Arizona, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Georgia. And across the country the Johnson landslide mowed down conservative and moderate Republicans alike.

The Democrats made a net gain of 38 seats in the House of Representatives (their margin will be 295 to 140) and added 2 to their already overwhelming margin in the Senate (it will be 68 to 32). The Johnson plurality of over 1 million votes in Ohio was too much for Robert Taft, Jr., to overcome and he went down by approximately 13,000 votes. Iowa lost 4 House Republican seats and held on to their fifth by less than 500 votes. Nine-term veteran conservative Katharine St. George was defeated in New York.

The Johnson sweep in that State also took control of the legislature away from the Republicans for the first time since 1934, and the speaker of the assembly and the senate leader were among the casualties. Some of th most telling defeats came at the State legislative level. In Michigan, Indiana (for the first time since 1936), Iowa, Utah, and Maine (for the first time in 50 years) the Democrats won control of both houses of the legislature. They also seized control of the house in Illinois, Colorado, and Pennsylvania and made major gains in such States as Wisconsin, Montana, North and South Dakota, Kansas, West Virginia, Ohio, Texas, North Carolina, and New Hampshire. With redistricting facing many States, the Democratic successes can lead to a reversal of small town and rural control of many legislatures. Moreover, the patronage of many State and local governments will now change hands and only add to the difficulties of rebuilding a Republican Party with real muscle.

All in all, everywhere except in the Deep South, the Democrats picked up strength in the Congress, the statehouses, and the county courthouses. But in Mississippi and South Carolina the Republicans won one Democratic house seat and gained five in Alabama. The party that began over 100 years ago as the party of the free States of the North and the opponent of the extension of slavery into the western territories won with Goldwater and Miller only the electoral vote of Dixiecrat States (and Arizona).

PRIVATE VERSUS GOVERNMENT POWER

While it is a commonplace to say that presidential elections are important, 1964 was not only important—it was extraordinary. Beginning near the turn of the 20th century, the American people had to adjust their ideas and traditions to the problems created by the vast expansion of industry and finance since 1865. At the same time, they had to attempt an adjustment to the new position of the Nation in world politics.

Equality of opportunity under freedom had long been the purpose of American life. (But the institution of slavery and the continued restrictions after 1865 on the freedom of the Negro were tragic denials of the American purpose.) By the nineties, the closing of the western frontier meant to many people that the limit of horizontal mobility had been reached. At the same time, the rapid growth of transportation, industry, and finance threatened to produce a situation where vertical mobility, as well, would be checked. The father of the muckrakers, Henry Demarest Lloyd, formerly an editor of the Chicago Tribune, warned in 1894 that the freedom of America had permitted the creation of great wealth and now the holders of the wealth threatened to destroy the freedom of the individual to rise under conditions of equality of opportunity.

When the crisis in both vertical and horizontal mobility was reached, Americans reacted with pragmatic experimentation. In the years from 1901 to 1917 and again in the thirties, reformers or liberals or progressives as they were variously called extended the power of government—Federal, State, and local—to meet the challenges posed by an immense concentration of private power. One hundred years before, in Jefferson's time, the liberal position had been to limit government or public power. The liberal spokesman, Thomas Jefferson, held that in the past governments had been tyrannical and had deprived people of freedom and equality of access to economic and political power. Opposing Jefferson was that able, vigorous spokesman of the Federalist Party, Alexander Hamilton, who spoke powerfully for the more conservative position. He advocated a more powerful Central Government than the Jeffersonian liberals would accept. When Jefferson came to power, however, most of the Hamiltonian measures were retained indicating that Jefferson was a pragmatist and that the bulk of Federalists and Jeffersonians were not as far apart as their campaign rhetoric might indicate.

It was not until the last decade of the 19th century that the American people had come to grips with the question of how the American purpose was faring. By this time, Americans were no longer able to turn their backs on the problem of power and escape to the wilderness. In cities and States across the land—and most notably in the Midwest and Far West—there arose a nonideological grassroots demand that Government curb monopoly, that Government protect human and natural resources from exploitation at the hands of those whom the Republican Roosevelt called the predatory wealthy, and that Government play a larger role in economic activity. The liberals of the progressive era—backed by the vast majority of the people—demanded that the power of Government be extended since these economic royalists had been destroying equality and curtailing freedom. Although there were a handful of radicals on the left who wanted to root up the American system, the liberals of the day were motivated by the desire of reforming the system in order to preserve it. What was needed, therefore, was a Government strong enough to restore the American purpose. But, by no means, in extending the power of Government did these liberals advocate the all-powerful State. They were seeking rather a balance between private and public power which had been upset by rapid economic changes in the late 19th century. Herbert Croly in "The Promise of American Life" (1909) analyzed the problem in an articulate fashion and proposed the strong Hamiltonian state suffused with Jeffersonian principles.

Whether one speaks of Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, or Franklin D. Roosevelt, these liberal reformers were trying to make the benefits of the new frontiers of industry and technology accessible to the mass of Americans. Theodore Roosevelt remarked that it was "our task * * * to strive for social and industrial justice. * * * If on this new continent we merely build another country of great but unjustly divided material prosperity, we shall have done nothing."

The Square Deal of the Republican Roosevelt and the New Freedom of Wilson launched the adjustment of democratic institutions to the needs of the industrial age. Building on these precedents, the Democratic Roosevelt in the perilous days of the great depression added to the quantity of social reform realized but he added little to the intellectual conceptions of the pre-World War I liberals. By World War II, the United States had come face to face with the problem of power. It had increased public power to hold in check the economic and political power of private wealth.

In this same period, although Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson stirred some awareness in the Nation of the role that the United States should play in world affairs, it was not until 1939 and after that a majority shook off cherished traditions of isolationism and made portentous decisions in world politics. Never before in American history had developments outside the borders of the Nation so dramatically influenced American decisions. Despite a restlessness over the new position of the Nation and, at times, a reluctance to part with older ways, the vast majority of the American people made the transition not without dignity. But a vocal minority of neoisolationists, including the radical right, continued to demand a foreign policy based on the assumption that there were no limits to American power. They insisted that it was unnecessary to pay attention to the views of the Nation's allies and those of the uncommitted nations. And they adopted the simplistic view that the Communist nations were a monolith. Some spoke in terms of preventive or preemptive war. And some spoke of the "liberation" of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain as though America alone possessed nuclear weapons. The neoisolationists attacked both Republican and Democratic Presidents. Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson were well aware of the illusory quality of American omnipotence.

Pivotal point of the reshaping of the role of government in the economy and the Nation in world decisions has been political leadership by the two major parties. It is true, however, that the Republican Presidents, except for Theodore Roosevelt, lagged behind the Democrats in leading the Nation in making these adjustments.

THE GOLDWATER CAPTURE

The Goldwater capture of the Republican Party was a direct challenge to the broad consensus that had been built between the two parties. Ordinarily, attacks on the consensus have come from such minor parties as the Know Nothings, the Populists, and the Dixiecrats and the Progressives of 1948, In the past such elements withdrew from the coalitions that form the two major parties and took to the hustings to advocate their position in shrill and simplistic phrases.

But in 1964 the Republican nominee led the attack. How, in view of the disaster that he was to bring the party in November, did he win the nomination? One of the oldest rules of politics is that you cannot beat "somebody with nobody." The opposition to the Arizona Senator could not agree on any one candidate around whom to rally. Gov. Nelson Rockefeller conducted a determined campaign and did an important service in challenging Goldwater's limited views on world affairs and his belief that the Social Security System should be made voluntary. But Rockefeller was too liberal for the mainstream of Republican feeling. Although Goldwater did not fare particularly well in the 17 States and the District of Columbia which held primaries, no other single candidate did either. And in California, where a determined band of true believers concentrated on turning out the vote for Goldwater in southern California, he won only 51.4 percent of the vote to Rockefeller's 48.6 percent. But this slim victory gave Goldwater the entire California delegation at an important psychological moment 6 weeks before the convention opened. In addition, in many States which selected their delegates by conventions, Goldwater supporters had long been at work. Goldwater, himself, as chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, had since 1958 made himself available for fundraising dinners across the country. His personality was appealing, and he had helped local party units raise funds while other possible nominees had not.

The disarray of the Goldwater opponents was made complete by General Eisenhower. He had long advocated that many candidates compete for the post, and he steadfastly refused to back anyone. This left the Rockefellers, the Romneys, the Scrantons, and others without the support of the most important Republican votegetter of all. (The general's refusal to assume a leadership role should not have been surprising since as President he had consistently refused to be the leader of his party—in fact he had tried to place an aura of moral sanctity about his unwillingness to function in this role of the President.) Eisenhower's role up to and at the San Francisco convention resulted in his becoming the Von Hindenburg of the Republican Party.

My colleague Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau has pointed out ("Goldwater: The Romantic Regression," Commentary, September 1964) that it is a myth that Goldwater imposed "an alien conservative philosophy" upon the Republicans. His philosophy of individualism, free enterprise, States rights, a weak Federal Government, a balanced budget, reduced taxes, victory over communism, American omnipotence abroad either through isolation or domination, Morgenthau observes, "moves indeed in the mainstream of Republican thought." While Dewey and Nixon did not share it, since as coldblooded operators they were not committed to any philosophy, they paid lipservice to it. But both Eisenhower and Taft shared it in 1952. Eisenhower's romanticism, however, as Morgenthau writes, "was mitigated by vagueness and rendered relatively innocuous by indolence and by a desire for domestic and international peace."

The cleavage between Goldwater and Republican tradition, however, came over the Senator's desire to implement his political philosophy with political action. "His immediate predecessors as leaders of the Republican Party, romantic though they might have been, were no fools. When their romantic philosophy came up against the hard facts of political life, it was the facts that won out," Morgenthau remarks. Although Goldwater's Republican opponents "bow to Goldwater's verbal picture of the lost paradise to be restored * * * in practical terms they are perfectly satisfied with the status quo. * * * Goldwater's determination to make things over in the image of his philosophy appears to them as a reckless interference with the status quo which they find highly satisfactory in view of their pragmatic interests." I would add that while most of Goldwater's Republican opponents bowed "to Goldwater's verbal picture of the lost paradise to be restored," such Senators as KUCHEL and JAVITS and Governors like Rockefeller and Romney did not.

It was not only, however, that pragmatic Republicans shuddered at Goldwater's activist romanticism, but the Senator and his supporters demanded complete surrender by other Republicans to his position. The contempt with which the more moderate Republicans were met when they attempted to amend the civil rights and world affairs planks of the platform—and the booing of Governor Rockefeller; the nomination of Congressman William Miller; the way Goldwater hailed extremism in his acceptance speech; and the takeover of the Republican National Committee by true believers was part of a snarling mood that indicated there was no longer any place in the high command of the party for those who were not Goldwater activists.

Historically, the presidential nominating conventions have served as compromising ground for the pluralistic forces that form the coalitions of the two major parties. Factions that lose out on the presidential nomination have been assuaged in the platform, the nomination of the vice-presidency, the speech of acceptance, and in the management of the forthcoming campaign. But not in 1964.

This was made amply clear throughout the campaign. Although Leonard Hall, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, and Ray Bliss, chairman of the Ohio Republican Party—and the most skilled manager in the party—were brought into the campaign, it was only to arrange schedules. They had nothing to say about the type of campaign Goldwater and Miller would conduct. Dean Burch, Goldwater's choice as national chairman, said: "When we brought them in, we didn't intend it as a conciliatory gesture toward moderates. We just wanted their experience." And when Denison Kitchel, Goldwater's campaign manager, was asked if he had any regrets about the campaign, he said that he had none. "We did it the way he wanted to do it. We're satisfied." (Chicago Daily News, Nov. 4, 1964.)

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

One of the legends put to rest on November 3 was that there would be wholesome defections in the North among traditional Democratic voters who resented the gains of Negroes toward full citizenship. The sizable percentage of the vote that Governor Wallace of Alabama, had received in the Wisconsin, Indiana, and Maryland primaries was cited as evidence. But primaries can be misleading because, unlike general elections, they are quite susceptible to being influenced by a single issue. (I recall that in the 1956 Florida primary the most important issue that seemed to emerge was whether Adlai Stevenson or Estes Kefauver could best curb the fruit fly.) In the November 3 election there was a complex range of issues, and it was President Johnson's adroit strategy to keep these before the public. Among those that he emphasized were prosperity, peace, and a responsible hand at the helm of Government and in control of nuclear weapons. And he laid heavy stress on the Great Society, which would bring advances in civil rights, attacks on poverty, more extensive Federal aid to education, and the extension of the social security system to include more adequate medical care for the aged. In all these issues, Goldwater by his own words—the Democrats and others had only to remind the voters—appeared as a radical threat to what had been achieved up to date or could be attained in the future. (For a nonpartisan analysis of what Goldwater's views actually were see Congressional Quarterly Special Report, "The Public Records of Barry M. Goldwater and William E. Miller," July 31, 1964.)

Moreover, President Johnson accentuated the need for unity—not the divisiveness of Goldwater—if the country were to achieve the Great Society. And he had behind him an extraordinary record of 11 months of accomplishment in the White House. When he assumed office after the assassination of President Kennedy, the Government was not unlike a house shattered by a tornado. Not only were John F. Kennedy's major legislative proposals hopelessly bogged down in Congress, but a number of executive agencies had not yet received their appropriations for the fiscal year that had begun the previous July 1. Lyndon B. Johnson took command with a sure hand, the appropriations were quickly forthcoming, and in the next few months he secured among other things the tax bill, the Civil Rights Act, and the antipoverty legislation. But this high skill in political leadership and legislative control led his Republican opponents to refer contemptuously to him as a "wheeler-dealer." As the election campaign exposed Senator Goldwater's inadequacy as a presidential figure, increasingly he staked his hope of winning on an attempt to destroy the character of President Johnson. Through innuendo, insinuation, hints, and smirks Goldwater and Miller treated the office of President "with utter vulgar disrespect," Walter Lippmann noted on October 27. "The character of the man who will continue to be President of the United States has been maligned by his rival in a manner which has hitherto been reserved for anonymous inciters of whispering campaigns."

Although President Johnson was unable to exalt the public in the manner of Franklin D. Roosevelt, he did make the choice between himself and Goldwater devastatingly clear. As Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT remarked (Saturday Review, Oct. 24):

"These, I think, are the basic issues in the current election campaign: In domestic affairs, whether we are to continue making organized efforts to resolve problems of education, employment, poverty, and race, or whether we are to abandon these efforts and let nature take its course for good or ill; and, in foreign affairs, whether we are to continue seeking ways of reducing the tensions of the cold war and thereby reducing the danger of nuclear war or whether we are to repudiate the policies of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson and lead the Nation on a crusade to destroy communism all over the world—a crusade that must take us again and again to the brink, and ultimately over the brink, of nuclear disaster."

The front lash of Republicans and independents added immeasurably to the President's sweeping victory. Only in the Deep South did racial prejudice bring Goldwater any substantial votes. There, his strength was greatest in the traditional Democratic rural and smalltown areas of the black belt, where Negroes have been prevented from voting. But he did not fare as well in urban areas, including Atlanta, where Eisenhower and Nixon had improved the Republican stance. Not only were the Republicans in the fifties receiving an increasing white vote in the cities, but in 1956, Ike received approximately 86 percent of the vote in predominantly Negro precincts and Nixon 4 years later held a reduced but comfortable majority. But here in 1964, as well as in other southern cities, Johnson received over 90 percent of the Negro ballots. And in northern cities where Nixon had won approximately 29 percent and Eisenhower 35 percent of the Negro vote, Goldwater reduced the Republicans to less than 10 percent of the vote.

A REAL REPUBLICAN

President Johnson's popular vote of some 42 million is attributable to no section, ethnic or racial group, or class or vocation. He was the choice of the East, the Midwest, the Mountain States, the west coast, and the Southwest. He emerged as the choice of farmers, industrial workers, urban dwellers, and suburbanites. As that shrewd observer of American voting behavior, Samuel Lubell, has written (Chicago Daily News, Nov. 9): "The famed New Deal coalition has been restored with a new vigor and unity."

President Johnson's 15.5 million popular vote plurality—Franklin D. Roosevelt defeated Alf M. Landon by 11 million—should bury another legend. I recall a number of passages at arms with the late Senator Robert A. Taft, who contended there were millions of Republicans who stayed home rather than vote for "me too" candidates like Wendell Willkie and Thomas E. Dewey. I disagreed then and contended that the Republicans in order to win the Presidency had to persuade a number of those who had favored and/or who had gained from New Deal reform measures, and who knew the responsible role the country had to play in world politics, to vote Republican. Any conservative who threatened to reverse the social and economic changes of the depression era and who supplied neoisolationist answers to world problems had no chance of winning. (The modern Republicanism of Eisenhower, after all, was a pragmatic acceptance of the New Deal and Truman's containment policies although the rhetoric might have sounded like the opposite.)

Senator Taft, however, was adamant. A "real Republican" could win. Well, in 1964, the pragmatic conservative was replaced by the activist-nihilist conservative—"a choice not an echo." The slogan "In your heart you know he's right" was answered by one voter, at least, as he waited in a long line to cast his ballot, "in our guts we know he's nuts." (New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 4).

I now find myself in the position of having William F. Buckley, Jr., agree with me. He wrote on November 7 that conservatives should "finally and forever, put aside that consoling dogma they have tucked under their pillows ever since Willkie was defeated in 1940, namely, that the Republicans had only to nominate a sure-enough conservative to guarantee a sweep, coast to coast." (Chicago Daily News.)

Not only did a real Republican lose by the largest popular vote plurality in American history, but the Democrats scored a net gain of 38 seats in the House of Representatives. Fifty-four Republican Representatives on June 17 signed the following statement. "We are convinced that the nomination of Senator Barry Goldwater will result in substantial increases in Republican membership in both Houses of Congress." Among the signers who went down to defeat were Bruce Alger (Texas), Ralph Beermann (Nebraska), Steven Derounian (New York), Ed Foreman (Texas), W. H. Harrison (Wyoming), Ben Jensen (Iowa), August Johansen (Michigan), Robert McLoskey (Illinois), John Pillion and Katherine St. George (New York), Don Short (North Dakota), M. G. Snyder (Kentucky), William Stinson and Jack Westland (Washington). And three other incumbents, who signed the statement but did not seek reelection, saw their districts go Democratic. Meanwhile, Republican moderates and liberals survived with only a small drop in number. Only 4 of the 34 incumbent Republican Representatives who were endorsed by Charles P. Taft's committee to support moderate Republicans were defeated.

It is important to note that 11 out of the 21 Republicans outside the South who were against the final passage of the Civil Rights Act were defeated. And, while all 14 southern Republicans opposed the law, 3 of them were defeated. But, at the same time, all the 12 southern Democrats who voted for the bill were reelected, with Representative Ross BASS winning the Senate seat from Tennessee formerly held by Estes Kefauver.

The conservative coalition of northern Republicans and conservative southern Democrats was seriously weakened by the northern Democratic gains. And the six conservative southern Democratic seats won by Republicans in Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia can only add to the increased influence of liberal northern Democrats in the Democratic caucus.

Meanwhile the Senate elections brought the Democrats a net gain of two. But the significant outcome was the reelection of all the liberal Democratic "class of 1958." (The one exception may be Senator HOWARD CANNON of Nevada, whose slight lead may be reversed in a recount.) Six years ago, when the Democrats won 13 seats from the Republicans, the Senate acquired a much more liberal orientation than the House of Representatives. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the leader of the liberal wing of the Texas Democratic Party, captured 56 percent of the vote; GALE MCGEE, whose Wyoming seat was considered immensely vulnerable, confronted an extremely conservative opponent and won by nearly 54 percent of the vote.

Without an impressive amount of ticket-splitting, many Republican Senate and governorship candidates would have been swamped by the Johnson-Humphrey landslide. In Massachusetts, John Volpe won the governorship by 50.5 percent while Johnson swept the State with 76.4 percent of the vote. And the Attorney General, Edward A. Brooke, who ignored Goldwater, won by a 750,000 margin, the largest for a Republican in the State's history. In Michigan while Johnson was winning with a 67.7 percent margin, Gov. George Romney, who had refused to endorse Goldwater, was reelected with 56.3 percent of the vote. And in Washington, Republican Daniel J. Evans, who had been for Nelson Rockefeller before the San Francisco convention, won the governorship with 60.1 percent of the vote while Johnson was winning 62.4 percent.

A number of defeated candidates ran well ahead of Goldwater. Robert Taft, Jr. ran 12.6 percentage points ahead of the Arizona Senator in Ohio but lost by approximately 13,000 votes. Senator Kenneth Keating ran 12.2 percentage points ahead of Goldwater in New York and Charles Percy in Illinois ran over 335,000 votes ahead of the top of the ticket but failed in his bid for the governorship.

THE AFTERMATH

Senator HUGH SCOTT, who squeaked through in Pennsylvania despite President Johnson's record-breaking plurality of well over a million and a quarter votes, demanded on November 10 that "southern scalawags" and "hardcore radical right elements" be removed from the leadership of the Republican Party. He aimed his fire at National Committee Chairman Dean Burch and Executive Director John A. Grenier, of Alabama. SCOTT charged that Grenier had conducted the campaign with no intention of winning but with the strong intention of ruling over the ruins. "We have no room in the Republican Party for urn carriers who would carry the ashes of the party in their personal possession," the Pennsylvanian stated.

Although Senator Goldwater announced on November 4 that the cause of conservatism had not been hurt by his candidacy since he had polled 26 million votes, others pointed out that the party that had lost in 1960 by 112,803 votes lost in 1964 by 15,500,000. But Denison Kitchel, Goldwater's campaign manager, was adamant: "We may have to wait for 4 years, but we're going to get this Government back where it belongs."

Republican Governors disagreed. (The Republicans made a net gain of 1 Governor, giving them 17 out of 50.) Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho, chairman of the Republican Governors' Association, announced: "In the face of the greatest disaster in the history of modern presidential elections, surviving leaders of our party have to regroup and revitalize the party machinery—and soon, if we are to fight again, and win." A few days later Richard Nixon declared that the Republican Party had to steer its "too far right" course back toward the "high center ground."

After the Republican Party made a disastrous decision at the San Francisco convention, the country demonstrated that extremism in the defense of 19th century attitudes was a political vice. Unlike the Harding voters in 1920, the voters in 1964 rejected the "return to normalcy." A more mature electorate clearly indicated its rejection of a return to a 19th century past—before world problems pressed on the Nation, before public power had had to be increased to cope with private power, and before big government was essential to deal with the problems created by rapid technological and scientific change.

When Senator Goldwater refused to concede the election during the evening of November 3, he told the reporters that he did not believe either in polls or in projections. And one might add—nor did he believe in the 20th century.

HORTON BILLS TO BLOCK AID TO NASSER AND SUKARNO

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two bills today. Both would prohibit further U.S. assistance to two foreign countries whose government chiefs are among the most notorious troublemakers known to history.

One bill is aimed at President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic, the other at President Sukarno of Indonesia.

I was very disappointed when we reversed ourselves earlier this week and went along with the Senate alteration of our original action blocking the sale of surplus farm goods to Nasser. Therefore, I now offer legislation that would amend the Foreign Assistance Act to prevent any further aid to Nasser and his Indonesian "partner in crime," Sukarno.

I think Americans are sick and tired of being insulted by the troublemaking heads of the United Arab Republic and Indonesia. We keep giving, only to get in return contempt and castigation.

Nasser openly has denounced our aid. Why then should we continue to pour it on him? He defies international law, foments trouble with his nation's neighbors and pillages U.S. property.

Similarly, Sukarno's increasing attacks on our ally, Malaysia, and renouncing of U.N. membership do not qualify Indonesia for any additional aid from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the repugnance which the American people feel toward any additional aid to Nasser, I include with my remarks the following letter I received setting forth the text of a resolution adopted by a group of distinguished constituents:

Temple Sinai of Rochester,
Rochester, N.Y., February 5, 1965.

Hon. Frank Horton,
U.S. Representative From New York, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The following resolution was passed by the Youth Group of Temple Sinai on January 31, 1965:

"Whereas the United States is providing the United Arab Republic with millions of dollars in aid; and

"Whereas the United Arab Republic uses some of this money to buy arms for use against nations friendly to the United States, such as the State of Israel; and

"Whereas the United Arab Republic accepts aid from the Communists and frequently sides with them in international disputes, thus playing the East against the West for their own benefit; and

"Whereas the United Arab Republic has allowed a U.S. Information Agency library to be burned down; and

"Whereas the United Arab Republic has told the United States to go jump in the lake: Be it

"*Resolved*, The Temple Sinai Youth Group opposes any further aid to the United Arab Republic as long as it continues its present policies."

Sincerely,

Susan Garner,
Secretary.

AN EASY-PAYMENT PLAN FOR TAX ARREARS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recognizing that many taxpayers are finding themselves in an unintended and most unfortunate financial trap created by the 1964 withholding rate, my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt], and I have introduced resolutions to provide an easy-payment plan for those in arrears as a consequence.

Millions of taxpayers are finding that their total tax bill for last year was not covered by payroll deductions. Others will be in for a shock when they get around to working on their returns. This situation is understandable, as the cut from 18 to 14 percent in withholding took place 2 months after the beginning of the tax year and fell short of averaging the expected 15 percent necessary to absorb the normal tax bill.

H.R. 4607 by the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt], and H.R. 4659 as introduced by myself, would permit such debts, which many of the taxpayers acquired without their actual knowledge to make up the difference, by spreading payments over the next year. No interest is to be charged.

In fairness to all, the Government must make it as easy as possible for everyone to meet this tax obligation, and my colleague and I feel our legislation is the most practical approach to the problem.

"COME LET US REASON TOGETHER"—OR ELSE—

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, we are given to believe that sweet reason is the byword of the Great Society. The President himself has given us the text: chapter 1, verse 18 of the Book of Isaiah, which begins "Come now, and let us reason together."

This is a good text and I wish the Great Society would put it into practice. The fact is, however, that it has not done so and shows no signs of doing so.

Instead, the word is passed down from on high draped with slogans and garnished with glowing phrases, and immediately all avenues to reason are closed. Every alternative suggestion is met with stony, sometimes bemused, silence. Opposition is trampled under by the Great Society's vast, unquestioning majorities in Congress, marching in compliant lockstep.

We have already seen this process working in many committees, as they work on Great Society programs, and we have seen it working on the floor.

In my own Committee on Public Works, the majority party has steadfastly refused to adopt even the slightest technical amendments to the Appalachia bill, no matter how justified and improving. This vast and fundamental legislation is to be accepted down to the last comma and period, unchanged and unquestioned just as it came from the Senate.

The text from Isaiah is a good one, all right, but it occurs to me that the real text of the Great Society comes from the two verses that follow. These read, you will recall:

> 19. If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land:
>
> 20. But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.

AMERICAN IDEALISM: ITS IMPACT ON A CHANGING WORLD

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 24, Mrs. Langen and I were privileged to attend the Cleveland Park Congregational Church in Washington on the occasion of the seventh annual service of worship in recognition of the Congress. This service is sponsored with the purpose of emphasizing the Judeo-Christian tradition in which America was established and of hearing a distinguished national lawmaker address himself to the implications of that tradition for the 20th century world.

The guest speaker is alternately chosen from our two major national parties. In previous years, the congregation and guests have heard governmental leaders such as the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman Ed Edmondson, the gentleman from Minnesota, Walter H. Judd, and the gentleman from Colorado, Byron Johnson, and Senators Barry Goldwater of Arizona and William Proxmire, of Wisconsin.

Assisting the Reverend James Clark Brown, minister, in this year's service were Cleveland Park Church members, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Walter H. Judd, and the Honorable William Slayton, U.S. Commissioner for

Urban Renewal. The principal address was delivered by our able colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, CLARK MACGREGOR. I am pleased to make available to all Members the text of his most challenging message:

AMERICAN IDEALISM: ITS IMPACT ON A CHANGING WORLD

(By Congressman CLARK MACGREGOR)

It is a high honor to respond to the invitation of your respected and admired minister, James Brown, and to participate in these services alongside such men of great distinction as Walter Judd and William Slayton. I am sure that I speak for all Members of the House and the Senate in expressing deep gratitude for your continuing interest in our endeavors and your prayers for our success. On this day, when the whole world mourns the death of honorary U.S. citizen Winston Churchill, I am particularly humbled by the task of giving adequate voice to thoughts on the occasion of your seventh annual service of worship in recognition of the Congress.

Today volumes are written and a multitude of speeches are given—all talking about government, its size, direction, and proper role in the scheme of things. But the most important thing to say about government is that it should be directed and infused by idealism. And in America this idealism is fundamentally religious in nature. We may think of this idealism as moral idealism and civic idealism and social idealism. It seeks out what is highest and best for humanity, it aspires to the finer achievements of life, it views material things and vocational pursuits as useful in proportion as they serve to promote the virtues of character and the deeds of goodness. The goal of our noblest thought and effort in government must be to work toward that perfected humanity in which the well-being of each individual in organic relation with all others will be achieved.

The first specification of our national culture, proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and given legal substance in the Constitution, is the premise or faith that man is a reasoning being, endowed by his Creator with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The terms of this creed have been recently subjected to much alleged interpretation, but not so long ago every American knew what they meant to him. And they were simple to understand, however difficult to attain. Life meant such security of person as can be achieved by human cooperation. Liberty meant permission from his kind to make choices as to his own conduct. Pursuit of happiness meant protection of what he has created or assembled or has had given to him so that he may use these goods as he wishes.

Implicit in this divine grant of privileges, each of which must depend upon human cooperation and forbearance, was understood to be the personal obligation of each man to extend to others similar privileges and to assist in their protection when thus extended. Fortified by the principles of Magna Carta as transferred to the Bill of Rights, this simple statement of the American's relation to society is what we started with in our country.

The measure of our present woe, perhaps more in foreign affairs than domestic, is the measure of our departure from this beginning.

We are perplexed and self-righteously angered by worsening problems abroad. Today we agonize over various solutions to the difficult problems in South Vietnam, where an increasing number of Americans are losing their lives, and we are spending $2 million a day. Do we openly confess our failure and withdraw? Do we seek to mask our frustration with attempts for a negotiated settlement? Do we continue as we have, with perhaps an accelerated attack on Communist supply lines? Do we bomb selected military targets in North Vietnam?

What about the heart of Africa? Should we continue supporting the government of Moise Tshombe in the Congo? Would we do better to try forcing him to take some of the Communist-backed rebels into his government on the dubious chance that such a coalition could bring peace with honor? Should we turn our backs on black Africa, proclaiming piously that affairs there are none of our business?

What about foreign aid? Does it make any sense at all to try and help people governed by Marxist dictatorships? Is $3⅓ billion a year a proper level? Our annual generosity in military aid and supporting assistance to a dozen countries bordering the Communist bloc amounts to more than $1½ billion. Almost $2 billion is the yearly measure of our altruism in long-term development loans, Alliance for Progress assistance, technical cooperation, and contributions to international organizations. Why is this concrete evidence of our humanitarian motives so often regarded with scorn and abuse?

It is not my purpose today to pronounce definitive answers to these and other questions, but to trace and examine the historic pattern of our perplexities. Perhaps we must finally understand that "economic man" is not true man. The world unrest is the sum of more than 2 billion personal unrests; and while it may in individuals arise partly in some subtle way from population pressures and hunger and fear and commercial warfare, surely there are other and deeper causes, and they are philosophical in nature. "Man does not live by bread alone." This we have forgotten. This we shall have to relearn.

First among the causes of personal unrest comes what I would call the decline of the absolutes. Truly the most recent phase of Western civilization's history is the latest and possibly the last phase of the Renaissance. The first great impact of classical civilization upon the European West was to undermine the authoritarian adaptations of eastern Mediterranean pantheism which had flowered into Christianity and had been preempted by the church. Pragmatism laid its ax to the tree of mystical revelation from the Supreme Absolute; and in time, by way of Machiavelli, Hegel, and Marx, pragmatism substituted for that majestic growth the new unnatural bramble bush called the totalitarian states. The sanctions of revealed religion have declined all over the world, in Africa and southeast Asia, as well as here at home and in the power centers of Peiping and Moscow. Even in the Mohammedan realms, perhaps the last great citadels of religious authoritarianism, the absolutes have lost stature by misalliances with expediency.

Deprived of an anthropomorphic deity, we turned to science worship—a deification of cause and effect. As an ethical pattern this substitution had much to commend it, for it went far to explain observed phenomena, just as did the early astronomy. But then, just as in astronomy came Galileo and his "Tuscan glass," came further information through the microscope and paleontology about the history of life, and Darwinism lost its absolute characteristics; just as in our own time the grandest hypotheses of inflexible cause and effect have, since Einstein, given way to less absolute doctrines based on laws of probability.

The process of image breaking once started, it spread rapidly to all absolutes of conduct and morality. Implemented with new and detailed knowledge of every sort, it undermined each dominant faith or prejudice in politics, business, art, and culture. For the ideal of man as a perfectible, reasoning being we set up an automaton, a puppet responding to conditioned reflexes.

Strangely enough our science worship, which at least embodied a rigorous ideal in its devotion to objectivity and verification, and might possibly have led the world to a new religious-like attitude if not to a true religion, could not be of much help. Individualism is the first requisite of any personal religion or philosophy. But the scientist was obliged to discard individual differences, and to spend his time and effort in the study of those characteristics in which one man is like all other men. As science began plying most of the Western World with ease-and-pleasure-producing gadgets, and was healing those lesions arising in our animal bodies, we lost sight of the fact that science could do nothing for the soul.

Western man appeared for a time not to care about the soul he had lost sight of. The British Navy kept the world at peace, and goods multiplied amazingly. But under the lash of two wars and a worldwide depression western man became sufficiently sore in body and chastened in spirit once more to search for a soul. The contrast between the miserable and the maimed, and the safe and the sated, aroused him and gave his long-neglected conscience a Cain complex. He finally realized that Cain had asked of God, "Am I my brother's keeper?" not to find out, but because in his heart Cain well knew that in very truth he was. And this latest searching of heart has, in the United States especially, destroyed another absolute: the modern god, progress.

What did progress mean? Some said material advancement. Others said progress is complexity wrought by division of labor. Simple to complex for the group; complex to simple for the individual. From a nation of self-sufficient pioneers to a nation of special and interdependent technicians each lost without the others. From yeoman farmer to nut-tightener on the assembly line.

Still others said progress is the greatest good for the greatest number. If good be defined as happiness, has our recent civilization achieved it for the greatest number?

On a cosmic scale we have never decided what progress is. Within our own civilization, we have acted as if it is getting more power than someone else. Progress is more money or Federal aid for Mudville, or for Jones & Co.

The traditional practices of early American life had interpreted progress as "the independent management by an individual of his own affairs upon his own responsibility." Rapid change, population pressures, the constant upsweep of the production curve—all these combined with unrestrained pragmatism to try to cross out the important words of this definition.

This was a tragedy of major proportions. The uniformity which mass production demanded was soon extended to our culture, and the same formulas of production applied to breakfast foods came to be applied to literature, drama, music, radio, television.

I hope this quick and abridged account of what ails us will be suggestive of what we must do to redeem ourselves. In a word, we have lost God; we have lost the religious feeling which alone can motivate a high ethical philosophy and thus bring into being integrated personalities.

We find today's world seemingly incapable of faith. We are in an era of tension or neurosis because science and skepticism have for many millions destroyed the sanctions of revealed religion; because science, in turn, has failed to provide any integrating substitute; because applied science, which has brought us things in great profusion, has apparently not made us more happy or more free; because our way of life has become so impersonally interdependent that individualism is in danger of extinction; and because we are still equalitarian enough in spirit to realize that we are truly not very equalitarian in fact. These "becauses" are mainly philosophical in their bearing and are, I believe, vastly more important than the flow of trade or the bickerings of the chancelleries and generals.

What is the cure for our disease? Is it more absolutism of state power? Statism has so far shown nothing in the way of self-realization to justify the enslavement of the individual, whether by the inhuman compulsions of the secret police or by the insidious purchase of compliance by government largesse or by the control of thought by slogan and cliche. Statism, group regimentation, subordination of reason to the amenities of expediency—they all run counter to most of our truly humane and benevolent aspirations; their fruits are apples of Sodom.

If not statism, then what? Speaking specifically of America, we must answer for ourselves many questions before we even seek a cure. For the most part we have not even started to ask the questions. Let me suggest a few. Do we mean what we say when we say we are devoted to individualism? If so, to what extent does the individualistic way of life depend upon a surplus of natural resources available to the average man for exploitation or enjoyment? Do we actually believe in equalitarian doctrines? If so, do we mean within our borders or for the whole world? Are Americans willing to sacrifice everything else, if necessary, for equalitarianism?

Is there any vital connection between what the individual apprehends as happiness and the material conditions surrounding him? What do we know about the relationship of intelligence to acceptance of so-called spiritual happiness as distinguished from happiness rooted in expanding cycles of enjoyment of things or of exhibitions of personal power over environment? How can states of being rather than states of consuming be made the goals of life?

Answers to questions such as these obviously have fundamental implications for all in government. To the first question my answer is yes, we are devoted to individualism; and it is so stated in the Declaration of Independence as an axiom or principle; namely, that among the unalienable rights of man are those to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. My first prescription for a cure of society's illness would, therefore, be a return to this first principle.

Perhaps if we set ourselves to reiterate in all ways open to us the American ideal of a self-disciplined, reasoning man directing his own course within the limits set by commonsense gregariousness, we shall do as much as can be done to bring back the faith and fire which made America once the best hope of earth. But we shall not do it if we think our wealth absolves us of the need of hard thought and persistent striving. The road is rough, and a generation apprenticed to ease and waste and indulgence may not follow it.

Above all, however, we must not assume that people throughout the world will find the easy road most appealing. We have much evidence among ourselves that this has not been true in those realms of knowledge in which our so-called progress has been most spectacular. The conquests of science have not been easy, yet they have challenged millions of our youth. The Peace Corpsman gets little opportunity to dance the frug or the swim in a modish discotheque, but the example of his service is being copied throughout the world.

While the more fortunate help the less favored materially, must we not also attend to the spiritual needs of man? "Americans are a religious people" affirmed our Supreme Court in one of the 1962 prayer decisions, a people whose public and governmental institutions presuppose the existence of a Supreme Being. Our reliance upon God must be an enduring absolute, measuring the quality of our entitlement to leadership in the world.

"All men are created equal * * * they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights * * * to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." These self-evident truths possess the same power in 1965 to shape the affairs of men as they did in 1776 to design the structure of a new, self-governing people. Let's not be apologetic about our convictions of the close relationship between our Christian faith and our institutions of government. As we struggle toward solutions to seemingly insoluble problems in foreign affairs, let us ask ourselves why we are not more successful. In serving the economic man, let us never neglect the spiritual man.

Perhaps each of us, as we approach the commemoration of Abraham Lincoln's birthday, might reflect upon this most moving message which a young Congressman from Illinois expressed as the great ideal of liberty among men: "Most governments have been based, practically, on the denial of the equal rights of men * * * ours began by affirming those rights. They will say, some men are too ignorant and vicious to share in government. Possibly so, say we, and by your system you would always keep them ignorant and vicious. We propose to give all a chance; and we expect the weak to grow stronger, the ignorant wiser, and all better and happier together. We made the experiment, and the fruit is before us. Look at it, think of it."

Could this be the absolute we need to guarantee that American idealism will make its desperately needed impact on a changing world?

THE 5-PERCENT MANUFACTURERS TAX ON HOUSEHOLD-TYPE HOT WATER HEATERS SHOULD BE REPEALED

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill calling for the repeal of the 5-percent manufacturer's tax on household-type hot water heaters because I feel that this tax can no longer be justified.

In the first place, the tax is one of those "temporary" wartime taxes designed not only to raise revenue but to curtail the use of steel, copper and other metals in products classified as luxurious and unnecessary for home use in emergencies. There is a question whether such a tax should have been applied in the first place, but since it was, it should have been repealed long before this.

To my knowledge, domestic water heaters are the only type of plumbing equipment that carry a manufacturer's tax. It is particularly unfair since it applies only to the family water heaters in the home and does not apply to heaters which supply hot water in hotels, apartments or other non-one-family dwellings.

Certainly the use of hot water today cannot be classified as a luxury. Every home depends upon it almost as much as food, clothing, and housing. An apartment dweller under the present system gets his hot water from equipment on which no tax has been paid while the equipment for the average homeowner either costs more because of the manufacturer's tax or the manufacturer is put at an unfair advantage.

The domestic water heater industry is a depressed industry. More than half of the plants have closed and more are in danger of being closed. Companies that operate in the red find it necessary to partially absorb the 5 percent Federal tax and operate further in the red. Some companies find it necessary to lay off workers and curtail their business. The amount of revenue gained from this tax is not sufficient to justify the problems created for this depressed industry.

Furthermore, it appears to me this tax on water heaters is a regressive tax, as it falls most heavily on families with low or modest incomes.

In the reappraisal of wartime excise taxes, I trust Congress will see fit to eliminate this unfair manufacturer's tax which has outlived its usefulness.

THE ARAB BOYCOTT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Arab war against Israel takes many forms: threats by Nasser and other Arab leaders promising to eliminate the Jewish state, blackmail of nations friendly to Israel, the stealing of Israel's waters, and even outright military attacks.

There is an additional weapon in the Arab arsenal which has not received as much public attention as it should. I am referring to the Arab trade boycott. The members of the Arab League have attempted to destroy Israel by economic strangulation. They have illegally blocked the Suez Canal to Israel shipping. They have closed their ports to planes and ships coming from Israel. They have established an iron curtain between themselves and Israel.

The failure of this policy is a matter of record. Israel's spectacular growth and development is well known. And the boycott has, in fact, spurred Israel to seek new markets and outlets for her goods to replace the markets of her immediate neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, we must not ignore the Arab harassment of American businessmen dealing with Israel.

For many years the Arabs have threatened to boycott American businessmen who invest in Israel or who maintain offices there. The central boycott office in Damascus, an arm of the Arab League, writes to the American businessman enclosing a questionnaire which requires him to list his investments, plants, offices, and other interests of all types in Israel. Frequently he will be required to sign demeaning statements disavowing any interest in or connection with Israel.

After passing this initial investigation, the businessman must then include with his invoice a certificate of origin, validated by the local chamber of commerce, stating that the goods are not of Israel origin. Finally, his bank must supply letters of credit which stipulate that none of the goods will be shipped in vessels flying the Israel flag, or owned by Israel nationals, or touching Israel ports, and that none of the goods consist of German reparations to Israel or contain material manufactured in Israel.

Many firms have courageously resisted this pressure. Business International reported in January 1964 that there were 164 U.S. firms on the Arab blacklist. But many American businessmen who have wanted to trade or invest in Israel have been deterred by Arab threats.

Our Government is on record against these practices and spokesmen have asserted that we neither recognize nor condone the boycott. But as Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS stated:

> As far as I know, no one in our Government has ever told an American businessman to throw the questionnaire away.

Mr. Speaker, that, in effect, is the purpose of the bill I have introduced today. It clearly states that it is our policy to oppose and condemn any trade boycotts directed against foreign countries with which we maintain friendly relations. It will prohibit the taking of any action, including the furnishing of information, which would further or support such boycotts. It will at last provide American businessmen with a shield and a weapon against the Arab's illegitimate trade war.

ALLOWING FARMERS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE 1965 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to allow farmers participating in the 1965 feed grain program to plant soybeans on diverted feed grain acreage.

This legislation is badly needed because, first, there is no surplus of soybeans but rather a shortage; second, our farmers should have the opportunity to increase their income by growing soybeans on diverted acreage; third, the Government would not have to pay full payments on diverted acreage planted to soybeans, which would result in a substantial saving to the Government; and fourth, the increased soybean exports would help counteract our Nation's serious gold outflow.

Under the present cotton program, the cotton farmer can plant soybeans on his diverted acres, but our feed grain growers are not given this opportunity. The diversion of cotton to soybeans has increased production in South Carolina, for instance, from the 1958–62 average of 9½ million bushels of soybeans to 15½ million bushels last year. And Arkansas, relatively new in the soybean field, has become a top producer of this nonsurplus product.

Interestingly enough, the Department of Agriculture admits they think we will soon need a billion bushels of beans a year—and we grew only 700 million bushels last year. We have no surplus as such, and it is conceivable that we could end up with a shortage.

As for our export market—here we are, holding down our soybean production while the hungry countries of the world are frantic to buy this product. As a matter of fact, we just made a large sale of soybeans to Russia, and it does not look as if the demand will diminish. And while we are holding back our potential, Communist China is capitalizing on our inability to supply this crop by quietly exporting their supply to Japan, one of our leading soybean customers.

It is too late now to do anything about planting soybeans on diverted acres this year under the wheat program, since all the winter wheat is already planted. But feed grain farmers in North Dakota should have the opportunity this year to plant soybeans on diverted acres under the 1965 program. Since the signup has already started and will continue until March 26, I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture for his immediate comments on my bill and also am urging the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture to act rapidly on it. If the committee will not consent to the fast and speedy action necessary to correct this inequity, I sincerely hope that the introduction of this bill will at least provide the groundwork for such an amendment to any feed grain or wheat program affecting the 1966 and later crops.

North Dakotans need more crop income. Soybeans have become a dependable cultivated crop in eastern North Dakota. This crop is the new leader in our Nation's exports—in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, soybeans brought into this country $680 million in cash.

I think it is only fair that our farmers participating in the feed grain program be allowed the opportunity to raise soybeans on their diverted acreage.

FLORIDA CROP ROT THROUGH SHORTAGE OF FARM LABORERS DIRECTLY ATTRIBUTED TO U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to protest the premature and unwise action taken by the Secretary of Labor in cutting off the flow of trained foreign laborers who, for 20 years, have been the mainstay of the harvest force for Florida's citrus and vegetable crops. I have already registered my protest to the Secretary of Labor in a letter which I will insert in the RECORD following my remarks. In this connection, I am also inserting a copy of a telegram sent Secretary Wirtz by Sheffield T. Abood, chairman of the board of the Area Development Council, Fort Pierce, Fla.

The result of this shortsighted action by the administration in cutting off the flow of trained foreign laborers, is action resulting in crop rot which might well surpass the effects of the most devastating freezes Florida's citrus industry has ever experienced.

Despite the tremendous unemployment that exists in this country, few domestic workers are willing to do this kind of work. Those that are willing have been hired. The industries involved and affected by this critical shortage of harvesters have, in good faith, financed the transportation to Florida of numerous laborers in the past and have cooperated with all agencies in trying to encourage domestic laborers to harvest these crops. It has been an exercise in futility.

In the 1963–64 season, for example, only 7 out of 225 workers stayed for the entire season. Most find the job offer attractive only as a way to get to Florida for the winter. Inadequate numbers show an interest in the first place.

The result is that unpicked crops are presently rotting on the ground. Millions of dollars worth of citrus, vegetables, and sugarcane are literally turning to garbage because of the inability to get men to harvest them.

The reason why domestic laborers will not pick fruit can best be summed up in one sentence: "Domestic workers prefer less menial jobs and can get them for the same pay."

Mr. Speaker, the inconsistent actions of this administration become more confusing daily. The President has announced that he wants a revision in the immigration laws with the goal of allowing more people from foreign lands to live and work in the United States. In this proposal, there is assurance from the administration that the domestic labor market will not be harmed.

But, the unemployment situation in the United States is used as justification for not allowing offshore labor to come into this country and pick Florida's crops. If there is any rhyme or reason to this, I must confess its logic escapes me.

To my mind, the administration is engaged in defective reasoning which will ultimately hurt, not only the fruit and citrus growers in Florida, but every consumer in every city throughout the United States who suddenly finds the price of his daily glass of orange juice and the cost of produce and fruit prohibitive.

One of the soundest proposals yet advanced to help alleviate this problem, aside from allowing offshore labor back into the country, was made by Mr. John W. Evins, president of the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association. He has suggested a classification of unemployed farmworkers in the same manner as unemployed industrial workers are classified. In this way, it might be possible to locate farmworkers willing to harvest crops when they are needed. I understand that Secretary Wirtz says that no useful purpose would be served by such classification, although why he is adverse to any approach that might help the fruit and citrus industry is not explained.

I am herewith inserting in the Record a copy of my letter to Secretary Wirtz; a copy of a wire to Secretary Wirtz from the chairman of the board of the Area Development Council; and a newspaper clipping from the February 4, 1965, issue of the Clearwater Sun which deals with this vital subject:

February 8, 1965.

Hon. W. Willard Wirtz,
Secretary of Labor,
U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I am enclosing copy of a telegram from Mr. Sheffield T. Abood, chairman of the board of the Area Development Council from Fort Pierce, Fla., adding his voice to the already resounding demand from the growers of Florida for relief from the labor shortage presently in existence, and demanding that there being no other labor available, additional offshore laborers be permitted to come into the country.

It is almost unbelievable that with unemployment as high as it is in this country no domestic workers are willing to do this kind of work, even though it pays quite well. And, furthermore, it is inexcusable that the Government has developed no programs to provide additional domestic help as needed.

These being the facts, this serious situation is further aggravated by the refusal of the Labor Department to provide, even on a temporary basis, for adequate offshore assistance.

Therefore, the direct responsibility for the inability of Florida growers to harvest their crops rests with your Department; and I demand, as one of many, that a solution be found inasmuch as the economy of this area is substantially crippled.

Sincerely,

William C. Cramer,
Member of Congress.

Fort Pierce, Fla.,
February 5, 1965.

Congressman William C. Cramer,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

(Copy of telegram sent Secretary of Labor Willard W. Wirtz.)

The decision on your part not to extend 1951 labor agreement for offshore labor to enter the United States was done in the best faith. We know your background reputation for being conscientious at all times.

Being connected with agriculture for over 30 years I feel eventually this will destroy initiative of the growers throughout the United States plus the fact that foreign countries in the last few years have tripled their acreage in produce and citrus. Agricultural labor costs in the United States including our offshore labor are already more than four times as much as the cost in foreign countries.

As you know picking citrus, tomatoes, beans, etc., is not for inexperienced people. Some of the people picking tomatoes, citrus, and vegetables have been doing this type of work since they were kids. You can destroy some crops of vegetables in one picking without experience.

A suggestion: Would it not be wise to permit limited offshore labor until other persons can be trained for this type of work? Some of our agricultural regulations are overdue for review and revision.

Furthermore would it not be more advantageous to limit import of competitive produce from foreign countries instead of handicapping our domestic growers by this complete cutoff of essential harvesting labor?

Sheffield T. Abood,
Chairman of the Board,
Area Development Council.

Florida Crops Rotting in Sun; Wirtz Blamed

Miami.—Millions of dollars worth of citrus, vegetables, and sugarcane are turning to garbage under the winter sun, and farm leaders say the cause is a labor shortage created by the Federal Government.

Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz has cut off the flow of trained foreign laborers, for 20 years the mainstay of the harvest force, and raised the minimum wage from 95 cents to $1.15.

The idea, Wirtz explained, was to "reduce and hopefully eliminate the use of foreign workers" by paying wages attractive to domestics. The Labor Department began a crash program to collect enough domestic labor to harvest the winter crops.

PLAN NOT WORKING

Agriculture spokesmen say the plan is not working because:

1. Industrious workers can earn more than $1.15 an hour under the longstanding piecerate system.

2. Domestic workers bound by lack of education or other circumstances to approximately the same wage bracket prefer less menial jobs and are able to get them.

Florida's commissioner of agriculture, Doyle Conner, said Labor Department officials have not acquainted themselves with Florida's problem.

"The cutoff is premature," said Conner. "While they are giving us promises, labor is not coming and the fruit is dropping off the trees."

Conner said domestic workers offered free transportation to Florida by the Government "get off the bus, look at the grove, and head for Miami."

MUST SEEK SOURCES

"All of us feel that we have an obligation to put forth every effort to utilize domestic labor," said Conner. "But if it is not available we must look to every other source."

Herman F. Steele, assistant general manager of Florida Citrus Mutual, a grower organization, says "the inability of citrus growers to move fruit from their groves while in marketable condition is causing a loss estimated at $4 to $6 million based on ontree values."

Steele said warm fall weather caused the crop to mature early and it is dropping off the trees and rotting on the ground.

INEPTNESS OF "STATE DEPARTMENT WAR" IN VIETNAM

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, someone needs to protest our conduct of the war in South Vietnam. Inasmuch as another of my constituents, Sp5c. Jesse H. Pyle, has been killed, I can remain silent no longer.

Although the administration claims there is no war, men are dying just as though there was a war. War materiel is being expended at a rate never attained except in war.

If a military organization had purposefully tried, it could hardly have made more mistakes than the United States has made in South Vietnam. Not one plan or program has been effective or successful and the U.S. position has been deteriorating for years. The disasters announced today indicate that a new low point has been reached.

The announcement in 1963 that we would pull out of South Vietnam by the end of 1965 was a grave mistake from a military standpoint. It practically invited the Communists to step up the war—and they did.

Our participation in masterminding the coup during which President Diem and others were murdered was a terrible political and tactical error. Although Diem may not then have been in a position to establish a democratic republic—with a two-party system in our image—he was the true leader of his country and our most helpful friend in very difficult times.

These and other incidents lend credence to the belief that State Department officials are planning and running the war—a task for which they have insufficient training, experience, or motivation. "People who have never been in a fistfight" are in charge of our effort in South Vietnam, is a common allegation.

Under the circumstances, we cannot win. We can bleed to death; we can bankrupt ourselves; but we cannot win by pursuing the course we now are following.

Inasmuch as I am not privy to the facts, information, and intelligence which is available at all times to the President, I would not be so presumptuous as to suggest another course. All any Member of Congress can do is blindly follow and support the President as the dirty, stinking, dying, costly war in South Vietnam continues to go from bad to worse. But anyone, with any militiary experience, should protest the flagrant negligence which time after time has cost us human lives, planes and other materiel.

Some time ago, at a U.S. airbase in South Vietnam, a dozen or more of our latest and best planes were totally destroyed on the ground by mortar fire and direct sabotage. It was incredible to most observers that the aircraft should have been so carelessly deployed—and unbelievably tragic that our security and protection were so poor that these planes were unnecessarily lost.

Again, 2 days ago, our airbase near Pleiku was attacked by mortars and direct sabotage with even greater loss of life and property. But for the truly heroic effort of one of my constituents, Sp5c. Jesse A. Pyle, whose own life was sacrificed, the casualties would have been many times greater.

It is one thing for men to die in battle for their country in the cause of freedom—but it is quite another matter for any man to die because of incompetence and negligence in the planning and running of a war.

Apparently the conditions in South Vietnam have deteriorated to the point that it now is a full-fledged war requiring the brains and experience of our best military men. The State Department officials can no longer cope with the situation. We can no longer continue along the unrealistic course they have charted. Loyalty to one's country and one's urgent yearning for peace should not silence one's protest against the unbelievable ineptness and outright negligence which characterize our conduct of the war in South Vietnam—costing us so dearly in lives, property, materiel, and morale.

LEGISLATION TO REPEAL MANUFACTURERS EXCISE TAX ON ELECTRIC, GAS, AND OIL HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to repeal the 5-percent manufacturers excise tax on electric, gas, and oil household appliances. This category of taxable items covers a wide range of products—from electric hand irons and small mixers to water heaters, dishwashing machines, and power mowers.

This excise tax was instituted during the Korean war in order to curtail consumer spending on household appliances, a purpose no longer necessary or desirable.

What is more, this is a regressive tax and places an unfair burden on low-income families. The higher cost of appliances cuts most deeply into the limited salaries of those who earn the least.

This is particularly true since household appliances, such as irons, water heaters, and clothes driers, are no longer a luxury for the few, but a standard purchase of the average household.

The amount of revenue raised by the tax is comparatively small. In fiscal year 1964 the manufacturers excise on 20 different kinds of household appliances raised only $77,576,000. This sum seems less significant when viewed against the adverse effects of the tax on the consumer, and the burden of bookkeeping and collecting it places upon the manufacturer and the Treasury Department. It is worth noting in this connection that the Treasury must maintain a special staff to determine what is and is not taxable under this category.

President Johnson has called for a thorough overhaul of our outdated excise tax structure. As an essential part of this review and revision of excise taxes, I urge the repeal of this manufacturers excise tax on household appliances.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PARTS IV AND V

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues parts IV and V of the recent series from the New York Herald Tribune on "New York City in Crisis." These two installments contain the views of the mayor of New York on the city's status and the views of some of the city's other citizens.

The two articles appeared in the Herald Tribune on January 27, 1965, and follow:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—THE MAYOR'S VIEW: A TOWN OF "THROBBING VITALITY"

(By Don Ross)

(This is the greatest city in the world, but for many of its 8 million citizens it is no longer the greatest place in which to live. Hundreds of these citizens—including Mayor Wagner—have responded to the deeply disturbing problems of a city in crisis, as reported by the Herald Tribune's special investigative team. The Tribune welcomes all responses, as the "New York City in Crisis" continues today, with the hope that out of criticism can come renewed civic creativity: whether in terms of individual action, a banding together of leading citizens, or a change in the pattern of municipal responsibility.)

Instead of being on the economic toboggan, as has been suggested, Mayor Wagner told a group of business leaders yesterday, New York City is "full of bright and cheering aspects" and is on the "upswing."

The mayor admitted that the city has serious problems and he said "We are working at all of them." As for some of them, he said, "I freely admit and frequently say that we must do more than we are doing.

"The central fact," the mayor said, "is that our economic indicators show a throbbing vitality, which augurs well for continued growth and progress."

Mr. Wagner spoke at the 28th Calvin Bullock Forum at 1 Wall Street. Calvin Bullock is an investment management firm specializing in mutual funds. Hugh Bullock, the son of the late Calvin Bullock, introduced the mayor.

The city, the Mayor said, "is in more vigorous, dynamic, and robust condition, both economically and socially, than any other great metropolis in the country or the world."

To drive his optimism home the mayor listed these "economic indicators":

1. In the 6-year period 1958–63, nine new jobs in private industry were created in the city for every eight jobs lost. The mayor admitted, however, that "substantial job losses, primarily in manufacturing" occurred during the period. Of the new jobs created 45,000 were in manufacturing in 169 different categories and the balance were in service occupations and office work.

2. In 1964 employment exceeded the totals in 1963 for each month from January through November, the latest month for which figures are available. In this time, unemployment fell by half a percentage point.

3. Department-store sales in the city were 9 percent greater in 1964 than 1963, according to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

4. Deposits in city savings banks increased by 10 percent last year over the year before. Total deposits of all banks and savings and loan associations in the city were almost $68 billion.

5. While the value of new building construction declined last year, the estimated construction cost of building plans filed in 1964—"the real indicator for the future"—increased more than 16 percent. These plans totaled $693.4 million as against $598.2 million in 1963.

6. New York's garment center is still the biggest in the world, producing 70 percent of the country's women's and children's clothing.

7. New York is the largest retail center in the Nation. Sales last year totaled $12.2 billion.

8. New York drew more tourists in 1964—14 million—than Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Montreal and Toronto combined. They spent more than $1 billion.

9. New York is the largest single manufacturing center in the Nation, producing more than 11 percent of the national total manufactures last year. Fifteen hundred new factory buildings have been constructed in the city in the last 10 years, and 33,000 manufacturers have a payroll of $5.3 billion.

10. More and more of the Nation's major corporations are moving their headquarters here. At present more than 27 percent of the top 500 firms in the country have their headquarters here.

11. One out of every seven persons employed in real estate and insurance in the country works in New York.

12. Ten of the Nation's 50 largest commercial banks have headquarters in New York. The New York banks have assets of $51.5 billion and hold nearly a quarter of all the industrial loans outstanding in the country.

13. The personal income of New York residents could buy all the goods sold in every department store in America.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CRISIS COMPLAINTS: A CIVIC RESPONSE

(By Barry Gottehrer)

For the last 6 months, Miss Thelma Burdict and Wilbert Tatum have been trying to set up a meeting with Mayor Wagner.

Miss Burdict, as chairman of the Cooper Square Community Development Committee and Businessmen's Association, and Mr. Tatum, as executive secretary, urgently wanted to discuss the changing plans for the long-delayed controversial urban renewal project in their area.

But the mayor, despite a promise from an aid and a continuing stream of calls and letters from Cooper Square area residents, never held the meeting.

Late Monday afternoon, the telephone rang in Miss Burdict's office at the Church of All Nations, of which she is director. The call was from Milton Mollen, head of the city's housing program. After more than 6 months, the mayor, according to his aid, would be delighted to meet with a group of Cooper Square residents and businessmen on Friday afternoon at city hall.

"We'd been trying for 6 months and he didn't call us until 6 p.m. on Monday," said Mr. Tatum. "Your series on New York did it. It's about time someone started stirring things up in this city."

PREMATURE

The controversy over Cooper Square dates back to its first listing as an urban-renewal project in 1959. At the time, the area's residents and businessmen had fought against plans to wipe out the admittedly deteriorating housing in the East Houston and Chrystie Street area and replace it with middle-income housing. They favored a public housing project, which they could afford, in the area. Finally, when the city planning commission voted approval for the low-rent, public housing project for the area, the residents thought they had won. When they learned that the mayor's executive committee on housing also reportedly favored the public housing project, they were sure they had won.

Their elation, however, was decidedly premature. Despite the actions of the planning commission and the reported action of the mayor and his housing experts, the board of estimate last November refused to authorize the use of the site for public housing.

The report persisted that local leaders had been granted the middle-income project (to be sponsored by the San Gennaro Society) in exchange for their support on the Lower Manhattan Expressway.

This is where the controversy has stood until Monday, with the area's residents unable to find out exactly what was going to happen.

Mr. Tatum was only one of several hundred New Yorkers who have responded by phone and by mail to the first 2 days of "New York City in Crisis," which started Monday in the Herald Tribune.

Angry, disturbed or afraid, yet all convinced that the city had let them down, these New Yorkers have pointed out dozens of examples of city negligence and indecision in which the citizens of this city have been victimized by its government.

These charges are currently being investigated by members of the Tribune's "New York City in Crisis" staff.

The charges so far touch on almost every area of municipal service—from disgust over the city's urban renewal program (in Bellevue South, on the upper West Side, in Brooklyn Bridge South, and in several others) to unsubstantiated charges of municipal graft and police corruption and negligence.

"Narcotics and crime are just tearing this apart," said one Brooklyn detective. "Why don't we do something about it? They talk about 50,000 narcotics addicts in Manhattan. That's a joke. There are that many in my precinct."

Other areas of repeated criticism include:

Overcrowded subways, unpaved highways, unprosecuted slumlords, the unchecked sale of alcohol to minors, high salaries of the mayor's top aids coupled with the city's worsening financial condition, the low caliber of many of the city's longtime personnel, the low state of public schools, the shortage of middle-income housing, the lack of adequate protection in the streets, the loss of businesses, city hospitals, and the ugliness of the city.

BLAME

With only two exceptions, the callers placed most of the blame for the city's problems at the feet of the mayor.

"A citizen begins to wonder if he has a democratic government when he gets assurances about one thing from city hall only to find out the next day or week that the assurances mean absolutely nothing," says Frederick Smedley, a member of community planning board No. 3 in Manhattan. "The time has come for the people of this city to get angry and stop accepting promises that mean nothing."

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 836, TO PROVIDE A REMEDY FOR PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged today to present to the Judiciary Committee the following statement supporting legislation to provide a remedy for what is a potentially disastrous situation. My remarks are directed toward a solution of the problem as suggested in my bill H.R. 836.

My statement follows:

Statement of Hon. Abraham J. Multer, of New York, Before the House Judiciary Committee in Support of H.R. 836, To Provide a Method for Determining Presidential Disability, and for Other Purposes, February 10, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to share with this distinguished committee my views on the formulation of legislation to secure continuity and stability of executive leadership in the event of presidential disability.

Mr. Chairman, ever since the Philadelphia Convention in 1787, many practitioners and students of government have been concerned about the ambiguity of one word in article II of our Constitution. Article II, section 1, clause 5 states, in part, that "in case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said Office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President. * * *"

The central word of concern in this clause is the word, "inability." The earliest concern about the meaning of the word was expressed at the Constitutional Convention, when delegate John Dickinson, of Delaware, contending that the word was "too vague," appropriately asked, "What is the extent of the term 'disability' and who is to be the judge of it?" Today—almost 178 years later—this committee meets to raise the same question and to attempt to resolve the same fundamental problems which it implies. The only difference is that, today, the urgency for a sound solution is made more manifest by reason of critical events in the American experience.

Let us take a look at some of these events. There are two of an especially "classical" nature. The first event evolved out of the circumstances in the aftermath of the shooting of President James A. Garfield. Garfield was cut down by an assassin's bullet on July 2, 1881, and lay stricken for a period of 80 days before death finally came on September 19. Shortly after Garfield was wounded, many in Government—including some of Garfield's Cabinet—urged Vice President Chester A. Arthur to assume the powers and duties of the Presidency; but these urgings sparked a controversy which centered on the question of whether the assumption of these responsibilities implied also the assumption of the office itself. Some held that if Arthur assumed these powers, he would in fact become President; and that Garfield would be unable to regain office if he subsequently recovered. Because of the allegedly doubtful legality of taking over the functions of the Presidency when the President was alive, plus the fear of creating the impression of being a usurper, Arthur refused to act.

Another event, with somewhat parallel circumstances and implications, took place in 1919–21 with the disability of Woodrow Wilson. During the last 18 months of his second administration, Wilson suffered two strokes and was left generally unable, physically and mentally, to discharge the functions of his office. Vice President Thomas R. Marshall was urged to assume the powers and duties of the office, but troubled by the same doubts that assailed Chester Arthur nearly 40 years before, he refused to act. Once again, the question loomed large: "Is the assumption of the powers and duties of the office of President tantamount to the assumption of the office itself?"

This vexatious question was raised once more in the last decade when President Eisenhower suffered illnesses in 1955, 1956, and 1957. I need not document the circumstances of these occasions, for we can all recall the danger that can be sensed when a President is incapacitated, particularly in the nuclear age.

After his last ailment, President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon made an agreement with respect to Presidential disability. This kind of understanding has been repeated in the two succeeding administrations. Such arrangements governing the transfer of power in the event of the unexpected raise serious questions of a constitutional nature which cry out for an answer in this matter of presidential disability. Article II of the Constitution is unmistakably clear in its intent: "* * * the Congress may by law provide for the case of * * * inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President should be elected." The Constitution does not tell us how to determine Presidential disability; nor does it tell us how to return the powers and duties of the office to the President after his disability. But this great document did make it incumbent upon future lawmakers to grapple with and solve this problem.

Let us therefore act with dispatch in this session of Congress. Let us act for two reasons: (1) So that there will be no question as to the exact nature of the transfer of power; and (2) so that the decision regarding this transfer will be judicious and circumspect.

I was delighted to see that the President, in a recent message to Congress, urged action in this matter of presidential disability by calling for a constitutional amendment. In this message, he stressed that, while "we are prepared for the possibility of a President's death, we are all but defenseless against the probability of a President's incapacity by injury, illness, senility or other affliction." I could not agree more with this observation. Reacting in the same way to this deficiency in our system of government, I introduced on January 4 of this session a bill—H.R. 836—to remedy this problem. I submit that this bill would give effect to the goals enunciated in the President's message, and I, therefore, urge its consideration.

Basically, H.R. 836 provides a method for determining presidential inability.

First, a simple majority of the House of Representatives would request the Senate, in the form of a resolution, to determine whether the President is unable to discharge his responsibilities. Upon adoption, the resolution would be forwarded to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who would immediately convene the Senate in special session for the purpose of determining whether the President was disabled.

Second, if two-thirds of the Senators present and voting determine that the President is unable to discharge his responsibilities, the Senate would, by a resolution of two-thirds of those present and voting, direct the Vice President to serve as acting President for the duration of the period that the President is disabled.

Implicit in this method of determination is the idea that the Vice President would act as President during the disability period; he would not be President. We could thus eliminate the problem faced by Vice Presidents Chester Arthur and Thomas Marshall, who feared that discharging the powers and duties of the Presidency implied irrevocable assumption of the office.

This bill also provides a solution to another question that has long been asked: How does the President go about regaining his office once he has recovered from his disability?

First, a majority of those present and voting in either House of Congress would adopt a resolution directing the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to convene a special session of the Senate. The purpose of this Senate session would be to consider revoking its previous determination of Presidential disability.

Second, if two-thirds of the Senators present and voting determine that the President is able to discharge his responsibilities, the Senate would declare, by a resolution adopted by two-thirds of those present and voting, that the powers and duties of the Office of the President are restored to the President.

Mr. Chairman, when an amendment to the Constitution is under discussion, utmost caution must be exercised with respect to its language and intent. This responsibility demands insight and foresight of a nature possessed by those who met in Philadelphia to draw up the law of the land many years ago.

I urge that the proposed amendment under consideration anticipate the needs of future generations. For this reason, I should like to point to another facet of H.R. 836, specifically that portion which deals with the disability of the Vice President, or any other individual acting as President.

Certainly, the Vice President is just as mortal a man as is the President. He is generally subject to the same illnesses which could afflict a President. Appropriate steps should therefore be taken to protect this Nation in the event of the disability of a Vice President, or any other individual who acts as President. In H.R. 836, I suggest that the methods of determining this disability and restoring the powers and duties of the Presidency be the same as those applying to the President.

Let us not be incomplete in our efforts to assure proper Presidential leadership. History warns us that since 1841 a total of eight Vice Presidents have had to assume the powers and duties of the Presidency after the death of the President. I strongly urge that we include in any constitutional amendment a provision governing the transfer of power to another who would act as President in the event that a Vice President becomes disabled while discharging the duties of the office.

The objective of H.R. 836 is unquestionably in accord with that enunciated in the President's recent message. Above all, however, I strongly recommend that pertinent and realistic improvements be made in this matter of disability. Without improvements we are a horse-and-buggy government in the jet age.

NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA ON FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, as a native of one of the outstanding tobacco-producing areas of our country, I have taken great pride in the fact that our tobacco program has always operated at a very minimum cost and at the same time has provided the tobacco grower and his family a fair return for their labor and investment.

Under existing law since 1940, the Secretary of Agriculture has annually on or before December 1, proclaimed a national marketing quota in pounds of Flue-cured tobacco for the following growing season and allotted the number of acres for the production of such poundage.

It is interesting to note that for the 1940 crop, the marketing quota proclaimed in poundage was 618 million pounds and that 758,210 acres were allotted for such production. That year the Flue-cured States produced 760 million pounds for an average yield of 1,025 pounds per acre. This was 142 million pounds in excess of the marketing quota.

The marketing quota in poundage proclaimed for the 1964 crop was 1,124,997,830 pounds, and 638,240 acres were allotted for such production. On this acreage allotment, which was 119,970 acres less than in 1940, we produced 1,383 million pounds of Flue-cured tobacco for an average yield of 2,203 pounds per acre. The 1964 yield was more than double that of 1940.

The fallacy of attempting to relate annual marketing quotas in pounds to an acreage control program becomes crystal clear in the experience of the last 10 years of our program. The acreage allotment for 1954 was 1,053,135 acres; allotment for 1964 was 638,240 acres. In spite of this 40-percent reduction in acreage, the 1964 crop of Flue-cured tobacco, in pounds, was larger than that produced in 1954. Ten percent of this acreage cut was for the 1964 crop, yet we produced more pounds than in 1963. During the 1-year period, the yield per acre increased 11½ percent.

The growers cannot be blamed for increasing their yields as their acreage is cut. The fault is with the system itself, and I believe it is now the feeling of the majority of our growers that some basic adjustment must be made in the program, if it is to survive.

There are many opinions on how to solve best the problem facing our tobacco program. For that reason, I have today introduced a bill, as a starting point, in an effort to bring stability to the tobacco program and to assure a fair return to our growers.

It is my strong belief that our growers should have an opportunity to make their own decision—at the ballot box—with respect to the type of program they believe would best fit their long-range needs. Legislation must be passed by the Congress for our growers to have an opportunity to express themselves by their vote in this important matter.

It should be clearly understood that if legislation is enacted in sufficient time to apply to the 1965 growing season and our Flue-cured growers approve the acreage-poundage proposal, then around 14.5 percent of the 19½-percent acreage reduction for 1965 would be restored for their 1965 crop.

Very probably, other Members of Congress representing their tobacco-growing areas will introduce legislation approaching this problem from other directions. We need and solicit the views of all affected.

I am confident that my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY of the House Agriculture Committee, who over the years has been a champion for tobacco growers and all forms of our Nation's agriculture, will be anxious to have the views of our growers and all segments of our tobacco industry.

We must move, and move rapidly, for early hearings on tobacco legislation, if the growers themselves are to have an opportunity to make a choice before planting their 1965 crop.

THE PROBLEM OF AN INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope and believe that the problem of unfavorable balance of trade can be solved without increasing the rate of interest. This is admittedly a problem because some American investors utilize their capital abroad to obtain higher interest rates.

However, raising the domestic interest rate would be soaking the individual or businessman who must borrow. It would not only be unfair to borrowers, but it could also damage our economy by drying up purchasing and expansion.

Before such a drastic step is taken, other ways of solving the balance-of-payments problem must be tried.

CONGRESSMAN GILBERT'S VOTER REGISTRATION BILL

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 I introduced H.R. 4427, to establish a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission. I am pleased to see that so many of my colleagues are sponsoring this or similar bills, which to me is very encouraging and indicates the chances for passage of meaningful legislation in this field.

The deplorable activities such as those currently practiced in Selma, Ala., to prevent Negro citizens from voting, sharply point up the need for legislative action. In spite of voting rights provisions of civil rights acts already passed by Congress, it is a well-known fact that discrimination on account of race exists in many parts of our country. Congress must take decisive, effective, and prompt action to remedy this situation.

I have asked the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on my bill as soon as possible.

My bill would establish a six-member, bipartisan Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission, empowered to appoint its own registrars to supervise registration when a pattern of racial discrimination has been discovered. The Commission would thus be free to bypass the courts, where voting suits in the past have been tied up for long periods of time. My bill would give the Commission jurisdiction over State as well as Federal elections. The provision setting up voting registrars in the 1964 Civil Rights Act has proven ineffective largely because of long delays in the courts. My bill would provide adequate means of appealing bad decisions of the Commission, but would make sure voting is not denied in the process.

My voter registration bill would also make a fourth-grade education sufficient evidence to exempt any would-be voter from taking a literacy test in State elections. My aim is to end, once and for all, the fradulent device of the literacy test to deprive a citizen of his right to vote. The States would be required to accept the decision of registrars appointed by the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, it is disgraceful that in our great democracy where a citizen is expected to pay his taxes, to serve in the military and make other contributions to his community and his country, he can—at the same time—be deprived of his right to vote. We send our military men to far corners of the earth to fight for the freedom of others, and we deny it in the form of the precious right to vote, to many of our own citizens.

I call on all of my colleagues in the House to think seriously about this situation, and to join me in taking whatever legislative action is necessary to secure the right to vote, free from discrimination on account of race and color.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today is an extremely important anniversary. One year ago today the House of Representatives first passed the 1964 civil rights bill. It took many months more before final enactment was achieved. The bill had to withstand a very long filibuster before the Senate was able to vote upon it and the bill could be returned to the House for final passage on July 2, 1964, nearly 5 months later.

The overwhelming vote the bill received a year ago today, 290 to 139, was crucial in achieving the approval of the Senate. That vote demonstrated the overwhelming support for the bill from both of the major parties and all the various areas of American life including the different religious and ethnic groups, labor and business, city and country, and all the different regions of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend those of my colleagues who were Members of the 88th Congress and who supported this bill. I want to especially commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the support they gave this measure. Republican support was not only essential in passing the civil rights bill, but also in achieving the national consensus so necessary for the law to have maximum effectiveness.

Had I been a Member of this body at that time, I would have considered it one of the great honors of my life to have been able to cast my vote for the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I am emphasizing this point so that no one could ever be mistaken about my feeling that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was a great step forward in guaranteeing equal rights to every American regardless of race. But this 89th Congress has its own responsibility not to delay in providing effective guarantees of "equal justice under law" for every American, regardless of race. As I mentioned yesterday afternoon when I reported on my recent trip to Selma, Ala., I feel very strongly that we need additional Federal civil rights legislation. There is no doubt that only Federal action can eliminate arbitrary and discriminatory obstacles to the right to vote. And we must do this at all levels of government: Federal, State, and local. The assassinations of President Kennedy, Medgar Evers, Michael Chaney, James Schwerner, and Andrew Goodman dramatically and so tragically illustrated the fact that the basic guarantees of "life, liberty, and property" are the jurisdictions of State and local government, not the National Government.

Surely the main point of the American experience is that democracy can ultimately be guaranteed only if all citizens are able to participate freely in the political process. Otherwise "the consent of the governed" becomes a mockery of American democracy instead of one of its proudest claims.

Mr. Speaker, finally may I again commend my colleagues who voted for the 1964 Civil Rights Act. I feel sure that we in the 89th Congress will be able to live up to the record set by the 88th Congress and also be a Congress that furthered the American dream of "liberty and justice for all."

NEW CHAIRMAN OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK OUTLINES ROSY FUTURE FOR SAVINGS AND LOANS

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased when President Johnson recently selected my good friend, John Horne, to be Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

You will recall the excellent job that he did while serving as Administrator of the Small Business Administration. It was under his guidance that the great strides were made in the small business investment company program.

Today I am including in the RECORD the first speech given by John Horne as the new Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. I am sure that all of us will be extremely interested in his remarks and suggestions because of the tremendous and positive impact savings and loan institutions have on the American economy.

SPEECH PREPARED BY JOHN E. HORNE FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 1, 1965

It is a privilege for me to address this Legislative Conference of the United States Savings and Loan League. I could add that it is an unexpected privilege because up until a very few weeks ago, as many of you know, I had expected to be in San Francisco at this time. A good deal of attention has been paid to President Johnson's ability to persuade others. I can assure you from experience that his fame in this regard is well deserved.

I

This legislative conference of your league is a most fitting occasion for my initial statement as Chairman of the Board. The work of this legislative conference is important, I believe, not only for the specific decisions and recommendations that it makes, but because its annual convocation is a symbol recognizing the ever changing nature of our Nation, our economy, and your industry.

The President, in his inaugural address, noted that "ours is a time of change—rapid and fantastic change." What is true of our Nation is equally pertinent to the subjects with which this conference deals. Neither your work nor that of the Board will ever be complete and finished. Our business and laws and regulations will never be fixed in immutable form. Some find this aggravating or upsetting. For those who will look, it is what the President referred to as "the excitement of becoming * * * always trying and always gaining."

This approach, this desire for improvement and advancement, has made possible the fruitful and full life most Americans enjoy today. From the oxcart to the jet, from the antiquated credit practices or no credit at all to the modern-day mortgage arrangements, from the isolated and relatively ineffective building and loan societies to the coordinated and powerful system you represent today, from little or no consultation with Members of Congress on legislative matters to informed and helpful trade associations such as your own—these and other developments testify to the changing nature of our life and to the worthwhileness of our efforts for progress.

Some other gains—partial gains—were achieved in the Housing Act of 1964. This conference and the league played a most helpful role in enabling the administration to obtain the enactment of that law. Its provisions contain much of interest and value for this industry and the public, and have kept the board active a good part of this fall and winter translating the new investment authority into implementing regulations.

I shall not take your time to make a list of all the new provisions, but I would like to make brief reference to two proposals recently published that deal with service corporations and urban renewal.

In the service corporation regulation the Board would give approval to investment by Federal associations in any general service corporations serving the entire industry, in the manner of New Jersey's Central Corp. of Savings and Loan Associations. At the same time, we recognize that there is possible an almost infinite variety of corporations of a more limited nature—more limited as to members or as to purpose. These the Board would consider, under the second paragraph of the regulation, on the basis of the specific facts involved. In either case, the statute imposes an overall investment ceiling for such purposes of 1 percent of assets.

The urban renewal regulation is designed to give Federal associations greater freedom and flexibility to participate in the preservation of the community centers in which so many of our institutions are located and from which they draw their sustenance. Here is an opportunity for an ever more vital role in a matter of the highest importance to the future not only of our society but of your institution itself. We will appreciate your constructive suggestions, and will be most interested in the use you make of this authority.

II

The Board will continue to support appropriate measures to enable the savings and loan industry to function effectively and properly as a part of the great network of financial institutions.

The Board will likewise continue to urge enactment of legislation that responds to changing pressures and developments within the savings and loan industry. In a time when a period of relative slack in residential construction imposes more severe strains on management judgment and more severely tests the soundness of lending decisions, some institutions may flounder. How to detect and act in such cases early enough and to take appropriate preventive measures, whether the institution be federally-chartered or State-chartered, is one of the most momentous problems confronting us at the Board. And I would suggest it confronts as well all of you who have tied your careers to the prestige and prosperity of this business.

At the close of the last session of Congress, the Board submitted a bill to amend section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act and section 407 of the National Housing Act, in order to permit study and comment on these particular approaches to a very real problem. I shall soon resubmit such legislation to the present Congress. The same is true of the bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, the holding company bill. This, too, was introduced in the last Congress to afford an opportunity for study and comment, and will be resubmitted to the present Congress. The Johnson administration last year approved such legislative proposals. It is only because there is now a new Congress that reintroduction is required.

I ask your earnest attention to the conditions and potentialities with which these bills are designed to deal, and I ask your support of their enactment into law. In certain situations, which I need not identify here, this legislation would have been most beneficial both to the corporation and the industry.

In July of last year the Board transmitted to Congress, on behalf of the administration, a bill to establish a system of Federal charters for mutual savings banks. This bill, like the others I have mentioned, will be resubmitted. In the long run, it could prove to be of the profoundest significance for the ultimate development or decline of this business. I do not believe that the savings and loan industry can continue to grow at the rate most of you have enjoyed for the past 10 or 15 years and still be largely confined to residential mortgage lending. There is a vast difference between voluntary specialization and rigid limitation, and I invite you to ponder what may be alternatives as you consider your attitude toward this bill.

III

There are other areas of possible legislation that we might discuss, but I should like to proceed to some consideration of the regulatory functions of the Board. The principle of change and evolution is every bit as valid on this somewhat less sweeping and well-publicized level.

Under the very able and energetic Chairman Joseph P. McMurray, the Board in the last few years has acted vigorously and comprehensively in a number of areas. A recital of all regulations proposed or adopted during Chairman McMurray's tenure would be both impressive and lengthy.

In the desire to clear the decks before Joe left, and to carry out title 9 of the Housing Act of 1964, the Board about doubled its normal pace in the last few weeks. I confess I feel a bit inundated at the moment.

I believe that a period of absorption and assessment may now well be in order. The regulations of the past few years have, in some instances such as the reserve regulation, tried to come to grips with the fundamentals of this business. I think we need to take stock of the changes we have made and the conditions we now confront. In the months immediately ahead, I do not anticipate any flow of regulations comparable in either volume or impact to that of the past 2 or 3 years.

As new problems arise, it may be necessary to adopt new regulations. One such possibility lies in the area of proxy regulation. A number of recent developments brought about by the final issuance of regulation F by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, by the settlement of certain litigation, and by certain court decisions within the past year, suggest that further attention to this subject should not be long deferred. Aside from that, I foresee regulatory action largely directed toward technical corrections and possible revisions of lending authority to the extent accumulated evidence indicates better techniques.

Thus, I think we should now concentrate on using effectively the new and revised regulations. Let's not dissipate our efforts on trying to get them rescinded, but rather let's work intelligently to improve them and to utilize their potential to bring about sounder operation and to build and retain an even better public image.

It will especially serve your purpose to pay careful attention to the soundness of assets, expense ratios, and reserve positions. The Board believes that institutions, in accord with the insurance statute, should accumulate satisfactory reserves to protect them from losses. The rather easy but erroneous assumption that the insurance corporation should carry the full load cannot be squared with the basic legislation or its history. The corporation is the last line of defense for the unusual or unexpected situation. Nor can the corporation function successfully unless the member associations recognize that their reserves are of necessity the first line of defense.

This period of self-assessment will permit us, I hope, to give some new thought and fresh evaluation to the role of regulations in this business, and to the priorities that should be followed by this agency.

Let me give you some illustrations of what I mean. A high percentage of the regulations for Federal associations constitute, in effect, a sort of mandatory manual of what is believed to be generally good lending procedure. It is not news to us, as I am sure it is not to you, that this approach makes for an intricate, and at times cumbersome, set of regulations. Should the emphasis go instead to an institution's capital strength and asset quality, with relatively few limitations for institutions whose position in those regards is satisfactory? This is an important question and the implications are many.

As to priorities, perhaps we should examine what a long-range economic forecast over the next few years would suggest will be the points of greatest stress for this business, and assess how those points might be buttressed in advance.

The time of the Board is a commodity too limited to expend freely on minor points and small needs; we must always strive to keep our attention focused on those things that are truly essential.

IV

While regulation may seem like the domain which the Board should cultivate exclusively, there are other areas that press upon us for attention. For example, we are compelled to take into account general economic conditions and, even more frequently, particular sectors and events. Financial institutions, no less than the Board, must now take into account the economy and public policy.

To illustrate this point, I remind you of the Board's efforts to develop policies among the several Federal home loan banks on advances that were more in accord with national economic needs and policies. The Board has also issued a policy statement to the banks suggesting the way rates on advances, time deposits, and capital stock are to be determined. It has become necessary that we coordinate our efforts with the Treasury to a greater extent than in the past, and that the banks endeavor to use their cash balances more efficiently and effectively. These steps were necessary in the interest of public needs and the continuing soundness and efficiency of the bank system.

These steps were also necessary to help meet the challenge and problems resulting from this industry having grown to be such a vital national economic force. To carry this point further, 10 years ago would it have mattered greatly to you if a central bank in another country changed its discount rate? Yet, when the Bank of England, on November 23 of last year, raised its rate, the impact on the savings and loan industry in the United States was immediate. The Federal Reserve banks raised their discount rate the next day. This will probably increase the cost of borrowing by the Federal home loan banks and will eventually find its way into the cost of advances. In addition, the changes in permissible rates on commercial bank savings and time deposits have altered the competitive environment.

True, the effect on savings flows to your institutions has not so far been great. Yet, the balance-of-payments problems of Great Britain have changed the environment we all face. We cannot ignore the rest of the world, let alone our domestic economy. Given the present size of the savings and loan industry, we have to be more aware of and receptive to changes in national policy. Success imposes obligations as well as granting rewards.

As economic and monetary policies are shaped, they cannot be tailored to exclude impacts on one industry, particularly if it is large and intertwined with the main elements of activity. This is an environment you should recognize as well as one of the facts we at the Board face today. No man is an island, nor is the area in which all of us here operate.

Another matter of surpassing importance to you is how well the economy fares. This can determine your success as much or more than your own skill. The events of recent years are eloquent testimony to the importance of economic growth. Since early 1961, the economy has been in the longest peacetime expansion since the 1933–37 recovery from the great depression. In a few months even this will be topped. The extent of the present expansion, measured from early 1961 to the end of 1964, is impressive:

Gross national product has risen by $133 billion or 27 percent.

Industrial production has gone up by 30 percent.

Personal income has risen by almost $100 billion or 23 percent.

Per capita disposable income has grown by 12½ percent when allowance is made for the small rise in consumer prices.

Savings accounts held by households at commercial banks and savings institutions are about 5 percent higher.

Retail sales have risen by 23 percent.

Residential nonfarm construction has been stepped up by $6 billion or 32 percent.

Private housing starts are 300,000 units above their low point despite some decline from the peak of late 1963.

Civilian employment has expanded by over 4 million and the unemployment rate has been reduced from a peak of 7 to 4.9 percent. Unemployment still needs to be reduced further, but the decline is notable in light of the unusually large growth in the labor force.

This economic expansion has been remarkably free of price inflation. The expansion has been marked by cautious and restrained business inventory policies and capital spending plans. These factors are helping to prolong the advance and to minimize the seriousness of any recession that may eventually occur.

Taxes on individuals and corporations have been reduced $11 billion annually.

Housing has been a surprising beneficiary of this economic expansion. Unlike previous economic expansions when home construction dropped early in the upswing, housing starts expanded vigorously for some time before reaching a peak in late 1963.

The maintenance of this expansion will depend in large measure on national economic policy, but business, labor, consumers, and your institutions as well as other financial organizations also have a contribution to make. No business, no labor organization, no consumer can ignore the effects of policies they adopt and choices that they make on the economy. A narrow, devil-may-care, self-interest approach by one group can damage all of us. Those who manage financial institutions bear a special trust. They must be on guard against credit practices and deposit promotion policies which are predicted on views that are optimistic in the extreme, or which tend to impair their assets unduly.

We must all look to the future as well as to the present. We know now, for example, that there are a few areas of housing shortage. This does not mean a cessation in homebuilding, but it does signal a plateau. The boundaries of this plateau are marked by a much less buoyant price structure, a greater degree of choice for the consumer, more need for careful appraisal and evaluation of builders' and capabilities, and increased risk to your institutions. This plateau is not likely to be everlasting. Our needs for housing will expand sharply by the end of this decade. But the potential expansion is not a guarantee of success. Only the well-managed institution that safeguards its soundness and efficiency may be able to derive the full measure of success from the coming upswing. Those who anticipate it by financing too far ahead of need may only be sideline observers when the real opportunity comes along.

One further aspect of the Board's role in the months ahead has to do with supervision.

We think that our supervisory techniques must be directed toward prompter identification of problems. We recognize that without timely examination reports there cannot be timely supervision. And timely supervision is the only truly effective supervision. This is simply recognition that prompt preventive supervision is essential.

I should like greater emphasis placed on the quality of performance. And I should also like to see much less time-consuming procedures employed by examiners in those institutions whose past record and current condition reflect a thoroughly sound institution, operating profitably and effectively under good management and prudent policy.

It is only fair to say, however, that some associations, few in number no doubt, may face more frequent and intensive examinations. We may also find it necessary to pursue test appraisals more intensively.

You have a right to expect us competently and effectively to meet our responsibilities. But I trust you will understand that our ability to do so depends in no small degree upon the industry itself. Even those of you, and there are many, whose operation is beyond reproach can be helpful. By complying quickly with examination and supervisory requests, you can free our staff to concentrate on the more difficult problems. By giving us your cooperation, you permit us to spend more time curing the emerging problems which, if left untended, result in irretrievable harm.

The industry should not feel uneasy about the supervisor or supervision. It should be confident and it should have reason to be confident that the supervisor is in reality one of the strongest guardians of the welfare of the industry. Here again, we need the help and support and cooperation of the industry since it as a whole has a stake, and a very big stake, in the success of supervisory efforts to restrain any unsound practices which may exist.

To summarize briefly, it is my hope that in the months immediately ahead this Board can:

1. Hold to the minimum the issuance of new regulations and utilize to the maximum both those already issued and those out on proposal;

2. Increase the effectiveness of our examination and supervisory efforts so as to prevent minor discrepancies from becoming major violations, and also to prevent the wrongdoings or misjudgments of a few from causing harm to the many;

3. Anticipate to some extent the changes the future is certain to bring and thus plan wisely the increasing part this industry rightly should play in the great American economy.

As I have discussed, in this broad way, my views on the directions in which this Board should go, I hope you have been struck, as I have been, by how many of our problems are joint problems and how many of our endeavors must, if they are to be effective, be joint endeavors.

I hope I will have, and I earnestly seek your farsighted cooperation in our undertakings.

In conclusion, let me assure you that I feel honored to hold this job. I know it imposes a deep responsibility. I am proud that President Johnson asked me to take it. Any regrets I may feel over giving up what perhaps might have been a less arduous and certainly a more financially attractive life elsewhere are of lesser importance when weighed against the challenges and responsibilities here.

It will be my aim to follow the advice of the President when he requested me to stay in Washington. He said he wanted this Board to make its decisions on the basis of what in our conscience seemed best for the public interest, and that it should be our tenet that what is good for the public will prove to be good for this industry.

I feel confident that the overwhelming majority of you subscribe to this thought. Let's follow this principle aggressively and together build an even greater industry, with an even higher public standing.

SELMA, ALA.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this past week four Members of the House from Alabama on the Republican side of the aisle visited the little town of Selma.

For those of you who had not heard of Selma until recently, it is a town with a proud history where the races have lived together in harmony for the past 100 years. Situated on a bluff overlooking the Alabama River, Selma has been a good town where hardworking, God-fearing people of both races have been happy to live and work and raise their families in the best traditions of the American way.

It has not been a Utopia. Selma has had its problems like any other community. Its population is divided between 15,000 Negroes and 14,000 whites. In spite of what you may have heard, Negroes have been registered in Selma, and Negroes have voted in Selma. I would like to remind you that the election laws by which the registrars were operating were not peculiar to Selma, but were State laws and could not be changed by local option.

The State registration laws have been before a Federal court since 1963, and the court handed down a decision easing the literacy test only last Thursday, February 4. Selma, like other communities in Alabama, immediately met the requirements of the court decision. Today there is no literacy test, merely a simple set of questions to establish the fact that the person seeking to register is a bona fide resident of the county and is of sound mind and is not a criminal.

The peace of Selma and the good relations between the races was shattered about 3 weeks ago. The people of the community have been held in a grip of turbulence created by outside agitators who, for their own self-seeking reasons, have spread unrest, flaunted the laws, both Federal and State, and have stirred up suspicion and mistrust between the Negro and the white races.

Our group of four Republican Congressmen worked night and day this past weekend in an effort to find a solution to the growing breach between our people. At the same time of our visit, another delegation composed of northern and western Democrats, appointed themselves as an unofficial committee to "look into so-called voter registration irregularities." Our two groups met in a daylong conference with city and county officials. In a real effort to be helpful, reasonable, and factual, every question that was asked by either group was answered by these officials with concerned objectivity.

I am sorry that several Republican Members from other sections of the country, including my colleague from Maryland and my colleague from New York, did not attend this conference and, as far as I know, interviewed only those who were instigating the demonstrations. I wish that they had availed themselves of the opportunity to at least listen to the other side of the story.

Of course I cannot tell you what conclusions the other group which did attend the conference brought away from Selma. I would hope that they saw in a clearer perspective the true conditions which confront a town—any town—whether Selma or New York, when it is faced with a calculated political opportunism that shows no respect for laws, that disregards the statutes of our land under a false guise of helping people to achieve rights they already have by law. It is a mark of anarchy when such unrestrained emotions are allowed to stop the orderly processes of law, to tie up business, to break the truancy laws of our schools and use children as pawns in stirring up bigotry. These self-styled evangelists use the same tactics as they move from place to place—Birmingham, Gadsden, Baton Rouge, Rochester, Chicago, New York.

How long, America, are we to submit to these gross indignities? Do you not have eyes to see that the patience of Americans throughout this land is wearing thin? Can you not realize that if we continue to condone lawlessness and anarchy that good people, sound Americans of all races are going to rise in righteous wrath which may wipe out all the painful progress we have made over the past century in our understanding of one another?

I speak today of Selma, the little historic, friendly town on the banks of the Alabama River. But Selma does not stand alone. Selma is but a symbol. There will be other Selmas. Yesterday it was Montgomery. Next week it will be Tuscaloosa. Next month it will be Gadsden, my hometown. After that, will it be your city? Will your courts be disrupted? Will your businesses be ground to a standstill? Will your young people be drawn from their classes by some promise of utopia or some threat of impending doom as they have been in towns where these apostles of lawlessness have plied their trade?

RIGHT TO VOTE SACRED

We speak of the right to vote for every citizen. I am in favor of that right to vote. I hold the right to vote a sacred right. I know that every Member of this body is in favor of that right. Let me tell you the right to vote is not the issue in Selma. The registrars of Dallas County have never denied that right to vote to any man or woman who is qualified by law to vote. And I repeat, the registrars of Dallas County did not write that law. It was a State law enacted by the people of Alabama and the registrars of Dallas County were bound by the law just as you and I are bound by our oath to preserve the Constitution and the laws of this land.

The civil rights law, passed by this Congress only last year, restated the right to vote. We of Alabama have tried, and are trying to abide by this law. Federal Judge Daniel Thomas, in Mobile, promulgated a ruling last Friday which further spells out voting regulations. The registrars of Dallas County expect to abide by his ruling, and have already set up machinery to implement it.

If you feel that the civil rights law you passed last year is inadequate, then by all means try to implement it, but let us not allow anarchy to disregard it. Let those who do not abide by the law be tried and convicted, but let us not allow our streets to become avenues of terror or a means of pressure at the will of an agitator who uses the Negro, and all other persons, to promote his own ambitions.

I quote one of our Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States who said recently:

> Justice cannot be administered, nor are the lives and safety of prisoners secure, where throngs of people clamor against the processes of justice right outside the courthouse or jailhouse doors. The streets are not now and never have been the proper place to administer justice. Use of the streets for such purposes has always proved disastrous to individual liberty in the long run, whatever fleeting benefits may have appeared to have been achieved.
>
> Those who encourage minority groups to believe that the U.S. Constitution and Federal laws give them the right to patrol and picket in the streets whenever they choose, in order to advance what they think to be a just and noble end, do no service to those minority groups, their cause, or their country.

Or as another distinguished Supreme Court Justice phrased it so eloquently:

> The rights of free speech and assembly, while fundamental in our society, still do not mean that everyone with opinions and beliefs to express may address a group at any public place and at any time. The Constitution's guarantee of liberty implies the existence of an organized society maintaining public order, without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of anarchy.

REGISTRATION NOT AN ISSUE

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the registration of Negroes is not an issue in Dallas County. At one time, several years ago and for many years in the past, this may have been an issue. It is regrettable that it ever was, but it had its inception in the excesses of a 100 years ago and in very marked social problems of another era. It is not an issue today and has not been for some time. Every Negro who is qualified and every white person who is qualified, is entitled to his right to vote, and the machinery has been set up to guarantee him that right.

Our people in Alabama, the people of Selma respect that right. Registrars in our counties, including Dallas County, have encouraged all persons, Negro and white, to register and to vote. They have advertised in the newspapers, setting forth the days and the hours of registration. The board of registrars in Dallas County sought and obtained from the State legislature permission to remain open an extra 10 days in January to encourage the registration of all citizens.

Now let us see, from the facts, if the real purpose of the Selma demonstrations is to gain the right to vote for Negroes. On the first 6 days of the extra 10 days allowed for registration, only a trickle of applicants showed up, and these were both Negro and white. Then on the seventh day, at a signal by the leader, a melange of humanity descended on the town and the courthouse. It would have been impossible for any community to handle such an overwhelming surge of applicants. I would like to remind you of the complaints made last year here in the District of Columbia because applications for registration were not processed fast enough. I would like to refer you to some of the articles which appeared in the Washington papers at that time. Yet, there were no congressional delegations charging that the voters of the district were being denied the right to vote. There were no masses of newspapermen, and radio and TV people to show the lines of applicants, there were no calls for action against the District Commissioners or the registrars. I merely remind you of this to point out that there is a double standard used when dealing with exact problems occurring in the North and in the South.

MOB ACTION

Among the hundreds of applicants descending upon the Dallas County Courthouse on the seventh day of registration were many who were already registered, many who had no desire to register, many who obviously were not of age to register, many who were not residents of Selma or Dallas County or indeed the State of Alabama. There were children taken out of school illegally to swell the ranks and who were delighted to sing and dance and the opportunity to get a day off from school. There were many who could neither read nor write and required more than a half hour merely to sign their names.

Under these circumstances, in a so-called effort to secure the "right to vote" these people and those who led them made a mockery of the ballot box, the registry office, and the court itself. There was so much mass confusion the judges were impelled to suspend the courts.

I ask you, my fairminded colleagues, how it is possible to register 1,500 or 2,000 people in 1 or 2 days? They could not do it in Selma, they could not do it in my town, nor in yours. They could not do it in Washington or New York or any place else and no one would expect them to. But there are those who demand that they do it in Selma.

Our investigation showed, and I am sure my northern and western colleagues who were in Selma will bear me out, the registrars of Selma were unfailingly courteous and cooperative, but the scene of wild confusion in the courthouse only added to their difficulties in getting the largest number possible registered in a short period. There was continuous shouting, yelling, singing, stomping, and organized cheer leading. Is there any one of you here today who would say that he could have served efficiently as a registrar in Selma under the conditions that prevailed there?

The record shows that the three-member board of registrars were equipped and capable of handling a reasonable number of applicants. The time necessary depends upon the ability of the applicants to complete even simple but essential forms. Experience has shown that a 3-member board can handle an average of 25 to 35 applicants daily. The appearance in line of more than 50 persons normally results in excess persons being turned away at the end of the day, whether they are white or Negro. In a statement to the press the board in Selma pointed out that while it had insufficient applicants to keep them busy on the first 6 days it was in session in January, more applicants than it could hope to handle congregated outside its doors on the seventh day in response to urging in the Negro community by a self-styled shepherd. In summary, the board's statement posed a question about whether Negroes were actually interested in registering to vote or rather in producing unfavorable publicity for Dallas County. All of those taking part in the demonstration who were legally qualified to vote and who were not already registered could have done so at any number of given times during the past year. But if they had applied at the regular times for registration in reasonable numbers, there would have been no fanfare, no invasion by the worldwide news media, no publicity for the self-anointed messiah of the Negro.

PLANNED FOR ARREST

It may interest you to know that before the Selma outbreak word was passed to the world of the massive campaign. Before he was ever jailed in Selma for breaking the law, the perpetrator of the violence had an ad prepared to run in the New York Times asking for funds to finance more demonstrations. Before he was jailed in Selma he had stationery printed giving his address as the Selma jail. He went to Selma with the set purpose of breaking the law so that he would be arrested. His love of publicity is above the sacredness of the laws of our land—not only the laws of Alabama, but of the whole Nation, the laws of your State.

Does he demand one law for his cause and his followers, and another law for the rest of America? Can America allow this, even if he demands it, and at the same time protect the liberties of all our people? I can only conclude that he does hold himself and his cause above the law and that he will destroy the law and the Nation unless his demands, all of his demands, are met in exactly the way he proposes them.

Let me show you he will never be satisfied. I quote from a news story in the Washington Post of yesterday, Tuesday, February 9:

> Negro leaders had asked last Friday that the Dallas County Voter Registration Board start taking names immediately of prospective voters so they would have priority when the board meets again next Monday to register those who can qualify.
>
> Board members complied with the request today, but Bevel said the Negro leaders and their followers would not sign the waiting list.

The entire article follows:

FIFTY-SEVEN ARRESTED IN SELMA DISORDER; MONTGOMERY MARCH SET FOR TODAY

(By Rex Thomas)

> SELMA, ALA., February 8.—Negroes boycotting a voter registration waiting list provided at their own request today demonstrated at the courthouse in Selma. Fifty-seven registration applicants and other demonstrators were arrested, including the Rev. James Bevel, one of the leaders in the civil rights struggle.
>
> Bevel, an associate of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was taken into custody by Sheriff James G. Clark when he refused to leave the courthouse and was shoved off the sidewalk.
>
> The Negro minister, a resident of Atlanta, was jabbed several times with a nightstick by one of the sheriff's deputies.
>
> Two white men identified as ministers were arrested in the line outside the courthouse. All 57 were charged with contempt of court.
>
> The 57 were taken before Judge James Hare, who fined them $50 each and sentenced them to 5 days in jail. They were all taken to the county jail.
>
> Negro leaders had asked last Friday that the Dallas County Voter Registration Board start taking names immediately of prospective voters so they would have priority when the board meets again next Monday to register those who can qualify.
>
> Board members complied with the request today, but Bevel said the Negro leaders and their followers would not sign the waiting list. He said it amounted to racial discrimination because white voters already registered did not have to follow that procedure.
>
> Despite the stand taken by the Negro leaders, 13 Negroes signed the waiting list before the board closed for lunch.
>
> Meanwhile, as the voter registration campaign demanding equal rights continued in Selma, similar drives spearheaded by Dr. King were developing in Montgomery.
>
> Montgomery Negroes will march to the courthouse Tuesday to seek registration, and county officials have promised to handle as many applications as physically possible. They have made available a courtroom adjoining the registration board's office in order to accommodate the expected throng of applicants.
>
> Dr. King will fly to Washington for a conference Tuesday with Vice President HUMPHREY and Attorney General-designate Nicholas Katzenbach to discuss possible new Federal voter legislation.
>
> The 1964 Nobel Peace Prize winner, who spent almost 5 days in jail in Selma last week, is scheduled to return here from Washington Tuesday night to again assume command of the campaign.

Mr. Speaker, this organizer of mob rule knows that a parade requires a permit whether the marchers are white or Negro or whether the parade is held in Selma or New York. But in his massive arrogance he defies the law whenever it suits his purpose. The law to him is for others to obey, not he or his flock.

A GREATER GUILT

He is guilty of a far greater crime. Not only did he defy the law himself, but he forced hundreds of children to do so. He called teenage demonstrators from their school, made them guilty of truancy and parading without a permit, and taught them to laugh and scoff and insult duly constituted officers of the law. Many of the young Negroes in the South who are being taught disrespect for the law, may someday make their homes in New York or Washington or Chicago or wherever you live. That is something for you who do not live in the South to think about. Many of these whose young minds have been warped by this anarchy will come to you without reverence for your laws or any laws and the violence in the streets we are witnessing today will be compounded manyfold. These children will be disciples of a rabble-rouser who has put on the sheep's clothing of nonviolence while he pits race against race, child against parent, man against law, and whose actions have repeatedly resulted in violence and injury and death.

I say to you that perhaps nowhere but in the South would mobs of Negro demonstrators have been endured so long with such patience. Nowhere than in the South is there greater genuine love and understanding between the two races. Nowhere but in the South do the people really care about the Negro as an individual and not just for his vote. Nowhere else will you find greater genuine mutual friendship existing between the two races.

Yet there are those who would have you believe that all the hatred. all the violence, all the race prejudice is in the South. Only in the South?

NORTHERN PATIENCE SHORT

Allow me to quote from a UPI dispatch datelined New York City at the same time the headlines were on Selma:

> A group of civil rights demonstrators battled Federal marshals with fists and feet today on the steps of Manhattan's Federal courthouse. The fight broke out when a flying wedge of demonstrators from the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee rushed the marshals and tried to get inside the building. Members of the group were dragged outside the courthouse halls by their heels yesterday after a 90-minute sitin. At least one deputy marshal was bleeding in the face where one of the demonstrators slugged him. All but one of the courthouse doors were then closed and locked so that no one could enter for legitimate business.

This was not Selma violence, mind you. This was New York violence. This is violence in the State of several of the Congressmen who came to Dallas County to look into our voting laws. I do not care to go to New York to look into their voting laws, for I know that these laws did not cause this violence. I understand their problem, and I tell them that 90 minutes is a long time to endure such mob rule; but Selma has been enduring it for 3 long weeks.

I have here another newspaper story from a New York newspaper, datelined Bronxville and written by Dave Hartley. The story deals with a strike against Lawrence Hospital in Bronxville to protest hiring policies affecting Negroes. I would like to quote just a sentence or two from this article:

> Several windows at Palmer Hall and the Bargain Box at the hospital that had been smashed by pickets last week are boarded up and have not been repaired. Ossie Davis, actor-playwright and a former Mount Vernon resident, led the line of pickets. Mr. Davis is cochairman of a citizens committee formed to support the striking hospital workers along with the Reverend Wyatt Tee Walker, of Yonkers, former assistant to the Reverend Martin Luther King. The picketers wore black arm bands "to symbolize the mourning of fairminded Americans for the absence of economic and social justice in the affluent and wealthy community of Bronxville."

The entire article follows:

MASS PICKETING DURING DEMONSTRATION AT LAWRENCE HOSPITAL

(By Dave Hartley)

> BRONXVILLE—The strike against Lawrence Hospital moved into its 18th day today after a mass demonstration by sign-carrying pickets Saturday.

VOLUNTEERS PITCH IN

Lawrence has been using volunteers, many from Bronxville, to replace the striking workers.

Twenty-two pickets have been arrested since the strike began.

The hospital obtained a temporary injunction against the union last week to stop pickets from interfering with the operation of the hospital. Contempt of court charges by the hospital against the union are awaiting a hearing in supreme court in White Plains.

Saturday began with an air of tension in Bronxville. Law enforcement officers began preparing as early as 11 a.m.

A handful of pickets marched back and forth in front of the hospital along Palmer and Parkway Avenues.

Several windows at Palmer Hall and the Bargain Box at the hospital that had been smashed by pickets last week are boarded up and have not been repaired.

Policemen from other communities were taken to a staging area behind Eastchester Police Headquarters about noon and sworn in as deputy sheriffs. Two buses rented by Bronxville Police Chief Thomas B. Mitchell and the sheriff's van were used to bring the men to a rear entrance of the Palmer Avenue Garage opposite the hospital in Bronxville.

A group of deputy sheriffs set up an outpost in the Bronxville railroad station. Police had expected some demonstrators to arrive by train about 2 p.m. from New York City.

Shortly after 2 p.m. the chartered buses carrying the pickets pulled up near the hospital.

ACTOR LEADS MARCHERS

Ossie Davis, actor-playwright and a former Mount Vernon resident, led the line of pickets. Mr. Davis is cochairman of a citizens committee formed to support the striking hospital workers along with the Rev. Wyatt Tee Walker of Yonkers, former assistant to the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King.

The picketers wore black armbands "to symbolize the mourning of fair-minded Americans for the absence of economic and social justice in the affluent and wealthy community of Bronxville."

Marshals—pickets who stationed themselves at intervals along the picket line to prevent disorder—wore white armbands.

A union spokesman said pickets would stay at the hospital "until the strike is won." He hinted at "bigger and better demonstrations" if the strike continued.

The union and police estimated the number of marchers at 475. Both Negro and white pickets marched on the line.

Groups represented included local 1199, the NAACP and CORE. Officers of Westchester units of the civil rights groups were among the pickets.

Some of the signs carried by picketers read: "When will Bronxville join the 20th century" and "Lawrence Hospital—20th century buildings, 19th century labor policy."

NEWS DISTORTED

I am not going to make a blanket indictment of the news media nor to charge wholesale distortion and misrepresentation in the news coverage of the Selma story. I say to you that there were distortions and deceit. I have many close friends in the news media and I have worked with members of the press harmoniously for many years, but I say that I was disturbed by many of the twisted accounts, of films that were edited out of context, of photographs that willfully misrepresented the truth.

I have here a photograph which I am sure all of you have seen as it was flashed around the world and played up in thousands of newspapers. The picture makes it appear that the Dallas County sheriff is clubbing a Negro woman as she lies on the ground. Indeed, the caption under this particular photo reads in part: "Dallas County Sheriff Jim Clark uses his billy club on Negro woman."

Now there is another photo taken an instant earlier, but which appeared in only a limited number of papers. This photo shows the club, not in the hands of the Sheriff but firmly in the grip of the woman. Investigation disclosed that the woman attacked the sheriff, shouting vile obscenities, she dug her nails deep into the neck of a deputy and then seizing the club of another deputy attempted to smash it down on the head of the sheriff. In the scuffle to get the club away from her, she was wrestled to the ground and the picture which was flashed around the world was snapped at the instant the sheriff was successful in pulling the club from the hands of his assailant. I charge, Mr. Speaker, that is distortion of the news.

Such distortion is shocking to me, and it should be shocking to you when we realize how all of us—North, East, South, or West—are at the mercy of irresponsible journalism. The very numbers of representatives of the news media which descended upon Selma like locusts was disturbing. They contributed to the confusion and became a part of the agitation and willingly or unknowingly became dupes of the propaganda hungry who could not exist unless nurtured and encouraged by the spotlight of notoriety.

WHAT THE FUTURE HOLDS

Now, let us sum up the situation in Selma and what the future portends for Alabama and for the entire United States if we succumb to rule by mob action.

The board of registrars of Selma are obeying the court order and the laws of the State of Alabama. There is no unreasonable literacy test now required. The board is open 2 days a month as the law states. If the Negroes have as their real objective registration, then let them allow Selma to return to normal, have them apply in reasonable numbers without demonstrations and without hordes of outsiders pouring into the city. If, then, it is shown that 2 days are not enough to take care of those who want to register, or if it is then shown that additional help is required in the registrar's office, these changes will be made. But Selma, like your own communities, will not act at the point of a gun or design its procedures at the demands of a mob.

Those of you who are dedicated to gaining full rights and privileges for the Negro, must you crucify the South in your zeal? Are we not one nation—one people? Is not the blood of men of the North, South, East, and West spread equally on the fields of Flanders, the battlegrounds of Germany, the distant islands of the Pacific, Korea, and jungles of Vietnam? I implore you to help put a stop to this second crucifixion of the South. Do not press upon our heads this crown of anguish. Say to America and to the world, there is no grievance in this free land of ours that is a fit object of redress by mob rule. Liberty and justice for all must remain the standard for America.

The South is now torn by the forces of special privilege—privilege to break the laws of the State and of the Nation. We here in Congress are cowards if we dare not speak up for the rightness of justice, dare not put our votes in the scales to weigh justice against political expediency, dare not be on the side of honor, duty, and country.

I urge the Congress of the United States, as the greatest lawmaking body in the world, to take action to remove this growing violence from America's streets, to return the making of laws to the hands of the lawmakers and the enforcement of laws to legally appointed officers of the law.

URGE BIPARTISAN INVESTIGATION

I urge the appointment of a bipartisan investigating committee as suggested by our colleague from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] to look into the full background and implications of this problem. This committee should be instructed to widely publicize its findings so that all the people of the Nation will have all the facts upon which to judge the South and those who are tearing it apart.

I also request at this time, that the President of the United States meet with the Republican delegation who visited Selma so that we may give him a full account of our findings and together find a proper solution to this mounting problem.

Time is short. The fuse is burning. America, this great land of liberty, built by the tireless and patient efforts of both our political parties and generations of God-fearing men and women of all races, creeds, and color, has many deep and complex problems. Again I say to you, Members of Congress, how long will the people you represent, many of them Negroes, who themselves want an end to this tidal wave of lawless demonstrations, how long will they wait for action from you with patience?

The Congress has shown courage and strength on many occasions when crisis threatened our land throughout our history. We are faced again with a time of decision, a time which calls for action to save America, action that is right regardless of political consequences or its effect upon the political fortunes of individuals. Let us together demand a determined and speedy end to the irresponsible actions of those who continue to ignore our laws. Only by such prompt and fearless action can we avoid a major domestic catastrophe in our time and restore peace and tranquillity to our cities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point the following newspaper articles: a news story from the Birmingham, Ala., Post-Herald of February 6, "U.S. Marshals Battle Demonstrators in New York," and two articles from the Selma Times-Journal of January 21, "Registrars Get 10 More Days During

January," and "Joint Declaration of the City and County Governing Bodies":

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post Herald, Feb. 6, 1965]

U.S. MARSHALS BATTLE DEMONSTRATORS IN NEW YORK

NEW YORK, February 5.—A group of civil rights demonstrators battled Federal marshals with fists and feet today on the steps of Manhattan's Federal courthouse.

The fight broke out when a flying wedge of demonstrators from the Student Nonviolent coordinating Committee (SNCC) rushed the marshals and tried to get inside the building.

Members of the group were dragged outside the courthouse halls by their heels yesterday after a 90-minute sit-in protesting arrests made in Selma, Ala., during the Negro voter registration drive.

At least one deputy marshal was bleeding in the face where one of the demonstrators slugged him. Several of the demonstrators received cuts and bruises in the headlong rush toward the courthouse door.

The group of six or seven demonstrators who rushed the dozen marshals were led by Marion Barry, a SNCC field secretary.

Their companions—about 60 of them—shouted and chanted "freedom now" and "I'd rather be in my grave than a slave."

All other doors to the Federal courthouse had been closed and locked.

To prevent a flanking attack the marshals hosed down the front steps with water that immediately formed into ice leaving only an 8-foot section of firm footing leading up the sweeping steps directly to the revolving door.

One of the demonstration leaders was seized and taken inside the building. He was not arrested and was released when the rest of the demonstrators dispersed at dark.

[From the Selma (Ala.) Times-Journal, Jan. 21, 1965]

REGISTRARS GET 10 MORE DAYS DURING JANUARY

The Dallas County Board of Registrars reported in a prepared press release today that it requested and obtained permission from the State to register voter applicants on 10 additional days during the month of January.

During the first 6 days it was in session, the board reported, it received a total of 35 voter registration applications. Twenty of that number were made by Negroes and 15 by white persons, the statement disclosed.

The 3-member board, depending upon the ability of applicants to complete necessary forms, can handle an average 25 to 35 applicants daily, its records show.

The appearance in the voter registration line of more than 50 persons normally results in excess persons being turned away at the end of the day because time does not permit the board to process them.

The board's press release pointed out that while it had insufficient applicants to keep them busy the first 6 days it was in session this month, more applicants than it could handle congregated outside its doors in response to urging in the Negro community by Dr. Martin Luther King.

In summary, the board's statement poses a question about whether Negroes actually are interested in registering to vote or in producing unfavorable publicity for the county.

The full text of the board's statement follows:

"No publicity has long been the policy of this board. However, we can now see no gainful purpose or remaining a victim of calculated publicity. Therefore, we offer you a signed statement, we believe the public needs and wants, provided you agree to take it as a quote and not out of context.

"For some time—a long time—there has been talk—much talk—about outsiders trying to organize and stir local Negroes to march.

"Now, as to voting, Alabama laws set aside the first and third Monday of January 1965, as days during which the Dallas County Board of Registrars is authorized to accept applications. The law further authorizes the board to apply for a few additional days. In view of the above and trying to give our citizens further opportunity to qualify, the board asked for and received authority for these days.

"Under date of December 24, 1964, said days of board meetings were published in the Selma Times-Journal.

"Now. What happened? On the 4th of January two Negroes and four white persons appeared and executed applications; on the 5th no Negroes but six whites; on the 6th four Negroes and one white; on the 12th four Negroes and two whites; on the 13th seven Negroes and one white.

"Then here, on the 18th, shows up a long line containing such great numbers until it surely was obvious to all no such number could hope to be processed in 1 day.

"Furthermore, a number of applicants having gained admittance to our office indicated clearly they did not want to be there. There, also, appeared several Negro would-be applicants who could not read and write.

"This board has made serious effort to be legally fair, courteous, and not—repeat not—to discriminate. Certainly we have operated within an atmosphere of justice as attested by court records.

"The first time the court paid very strong compliments to the defendants. But this did not seem to suit a certain individual as the decision was appealed to a higher court. We quote from that higher court as follows:

"If the responsibility of deciding this case were mine alone, I would go with the able district judge who summed up his estimate of the character of the service of the appellees by stating in his findings that 'the whole country (should)' be proud of the job now being done by the present Board of Registrars of Dallas County.'

"Therefore, we now must ask:

"1. What is it they want?

"2. Is it really the vote and good of our Negro citizen?

"3. Is it simply to sow discord and stir trouble?"

The statement was signed by V. B. Atkins, Sr., chairman; A. C. Allen and Joseph R. Bibb, members of the board of registrars.

[From the Selma (Ala.) Times-Journal]

JOINT DECLARATION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY GOVERNING BODIES

The City Council of the City of Selma and the Dallas County Court of County Revenues, recognizing the seriousness of the present situation in this community, do affirm unanimously our belief in law and order.

Each of us strenuously opposed passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, being mindful of the consequences to our community.

We are confident that the overwhelming majority of our citizens believe with us that law and order must prevail, and that there can be no other solution in this problem.

However strong the provocation, calmness and self-restraint by each of us is the greatest protection for all concerned in this time of crisis.

We sincerely and earnestly recommend this course to the whole community with the heartfelt conviction that it is the best course at this time for the entire city and county.

SIGNERS

Dallas County Court of County Revenues: John R. Traylor, Tom Martin, Jr., Seawell Jones, R. Furniss Ellis, B. A. Reynolds.

City Council of the City of Selma: Carl Morgan, Jr., Irby Moore, George Swift, Billy Driggers, Leon Gillis, Frank Skinner, Herman M. Blagg, Jr., R. E. Krebs, T. E. Phillips, M. M. Ellis, Luther P. Pepper.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the suggestions just made by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN]; and to reaffirm my support of the resolution brought earlier before this House by my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN]. Mr. SELDEN requested earlier that an official committee of this body be formed, this suggestion having been made to him and requested of this House by the editor of the newspaper in Selma, Ala., supported by the mayor of that city. That is, that an official committee be appointed to investigate the situation in Selma and in Dallas County and to ascertain the facts, so that the truth might be known to the Congress and be made known to the American people.

In lieu of such an official committee a group of Members of the House went unofficially to Selma, without authority from, or acting as agents of the House of Representatives or of the U.S. Government, to conduct their own investigation of the situation there.

Mr. Speaker, every American citizen has a right to travel anywhere in these United States. I further recognize the right of Members of this body to go to Selma, Ala., or anywhere else, for legislative purposes. I believe, as they have testified, they were received with due respect. While there, they met with pertinent public officials who gave them their time, answered their questions, and treated them with all courtesy, along with members of the Alabama delegation to the Congress. These gentlemen went in good faith to Selma, but I want to correct here an impression that has been created in cases by the press that this was some kind of official committee of this House, which it was not.

These Members went there for their own enlightenment and for their own purposes. The official committee has not yet been appointed. I urge that it be so appointed to conduct an impartial investigation of the situation there.

I think we can only understand the situation in Selma when we look at all of the facts. I came back with certain impressions, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to share with the Members of the House.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Would the gentleman support the suggestion which was made yesterday during our special order that the Judiciary Committee of the House conduct an investigation of the deprivation of voting rights in Selma, Ala.?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will support any impartial investigation; yes, sir.

Mr. RYAN. If the gentleman will yield further, would the gentleman and his colleagues urge the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], to hold such hearings?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would indeed welcome such hearings.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SELDEN. I might say that before introducing my resolution, which has been referred to, I went to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. Celler] with the request that a joint committee of members of the Judiciary Committee of the House and the Judiciary Committee of the Senate be appointed to go to Selma and make an impartial and fair investigation. He indicated to me that he did not under existing legislation have that authority.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the city of Selma is at this point a stage. It has been turned into a stage, according to a preconceived script that has been set down by Dr. Martin Luther King and his organization, a plan of action for Alabama and for the South.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Selma is a stage and now its public officials have been and are being used as props by people from the outside, outside agitators who have come to the city to organize and lead demonstrations, in certain cases demanding of public officials that they act in direct violation of the laws of our State. This was the case on the Friday we were there. A group demanded of registration officials that they open the office and register citizens on a day in which they were forbidden by State law to do so, demanding that which according to law could not be done.

Mr. Speaker, the leaders of certain organizations now active in Selma are not working toward a solution of problems there or toward registering people to vote in Dallas County. They are instead creating a stage, a drama in which they are casting themselves as the central characters, and using the people as their props.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express under these circumstances my commendation to both the people and the public officials of Dallas County and the city of Selma.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Along the line of your discussion, has there been any new issue raised in Selma during the recent weeks of demonstrations that was not already pending in the Federal courts?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman for his question. Indeed not. The demonstrations in Selma have served no purpose of securing rights or privileges of any person or group in Selma or anywhere else. Indeed, whatever relief might be needed or whatever changes should perhaps have been made were taking place through the action of the Congress and of the courts. The only changes which have occurred in Selma and in Dallas County have occurred as a result of the passage of legislation by the Congress of the United States or as a result of actions by the courts. These things were taking place before the demonstrations began and, indeed, the demonstrations had no effect on any of these things.

They served no legislative or judicial purpose, or any other observable purpose, toward securing rights or privileges for people in Selma or in America.

I thank the gentleman for spotlighting this fact which I think is rather important. Under these circumstances the public officials of Selma have conducted themselves with order, with restraint, and with great patience and forebearance. There have been no instances of any kind of mistreatment or brutality by the sheriff of Dallas County or any other law-enforcement officer in this county. To my knowledge, there was no evidence presented at any time of such violence or such mistreatment. I think the record needs to be clear, in that, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Martin] indicated, the press has presented a distorted picture. The law-enforcement officers have tried to keep the peace and enforce the law with patience and restraint in a very complex and difficult situation in which their efforts were perpetually thwarted over a long period of time.

The leadership of the Negro community in Dallas County has been taken out of the hands of local Negroes and taken over by Dr. Martin Luther King and others. The white community has in more than 2 years stayed out of the situation, and I think the people of Selma are thereby to be congratulated and commended for their restraint.

I am reconvinced that there has been a fair and impartial application of law, Federal, State, and local, in Selma and in Dallas County by its public officials. In this matter of rejection of persons seeking to vote, only recently have large numbers of Negro citizens sought to vote in Dallas County. The rejection rate for the armed services is comparable to that of those seeking to register to vote.

May I point out that the mechanics of registration in the State of Alabama are, in my opinion, too slow and, in my further opinion, should be changed so that the registration of citizens of both races might be facilitated. There is legislation, I believe, that will be brought before the Legislature of Alabama at its next regular session to facilitate the registration of American voters.

For example, as reported in articles in both Birmingham papers in the fall of 1964, long before the present demonstrations began in Selma, a distinguished legislator from Jefferson County, the Honorable John Hawkins, had composed a bill to speed up and facilitate the registration of voters in my own county in Alabama. Representative Hawkins' bill would require the board of registrars to visit each precinct of Jefferson County at least once a month to take registration to the people. In addition, it provides that at least once a month people should be registered from 4 to 10 in the evening to facilitate registration for those whose jobs would prevent them from registering during usual hours. It provides further for full-time registrars in Jefferson County. It was the thought of this distinguished and respected member of the Alabama House of Representatives that this bill, which will surely be passed in the regular session of the State legislature in May, would provide a pattern for Alabama counties. I, for one, wholeheartedly endorse Mr. Hawkins' plan and feel it to be good legislation.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that where there may be need for a change of law to speed up the process of registration and make it easier for all citizens and all racial groups to register in my State, but that effort should proceed through the due processes of law and not through demonstrations in the streets. The place in which to make this effort, the place where we refine our gold in this country, I believe to be rightfully in the State legislatures, in the Congress, and in the courts. I cannot believe that these problems can be solved in the streets, and I cannot believe that we can be traveling in a right direction by leading citizens, particularly young people, toward violating laws and defying authority in order to accomplish any purposes, however dear to their hearts.

I believe in the principle of local self-government in America. I have faith that the people of Dallas County and the sovereign State of Alabama will indeed proceed in obedience to Federal, State, and local law in this matter, and will work toward changing whatever State law needs to be changed to facilitate registration for voting in Alabama.

I believe that the people in our city and in this county will be impartially registered to vote, but I would say whatever change we need, let us seek it in the legislature, not in the streets.

Mr. Speaker, I am one who believes in liberty. I believe and would stand for the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for every citizen of the United States, regardless of race, creed, or color. God forbid that I should stand between any man and his God-given right to become what he can become, within the framework of his own ability and limitations. God forbid that I should stand between any man and his lawful liberty. Let there be liberty in fullest measure for every citizen, but liberty can only prosper where there is law. Only within the framework of law can liberty survive.

Therefore, to those who in my own State have been leading others in disobedience to law and in defiance of authority, both local and Federal, let there be liberty, but let us never forget that where there is liberty there must be law. Therefore, I would say, let us work toward the fulfillment of the American dream for all its people. Let us work in the courts, the Congress, the State legislatures, and the courthouse in Selma.

Ala., that there might be liberty for all of us, because there is retained in this land the law.

THE RIGHT TO REGISTER TO VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Glenn Andrews] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in the Selma story and other stories planned for San Francisco, Detroit, Chicago, and Philadelphia, by the Negro demonstrators, the question is whether all people regardless of color will have the right to register and vote or whether they have the right to be registered and be voted by agitators whenever the agitators choose.

Under the Federal court injunction governing registration from now on in Selma, all who wish to register and vote may, I feel, do so. This opportunity has long existed, and far too few have shown an interest.

COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. My resolution is identical with one introduced in the Senate on January 6 by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney]. Upward of 50 Members of the Senate are listed as cosponsors of the Monroney resolution.

This resolution is almost identical to the concurrent resolution sponsored in the 79th Congress by Senator LaFollette and the then Representative Monroney, which eventually led to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Almost 20 years have passed since that time and there is a widespread belief in Congress and in the country that the time has come for a fresh look at the machinery and methods of our national legislature.

Much good was accomplished by the Reform Act of 1946. It streamlined the congressional committee system, a structural change that has survived unchallenged until this day, except for the establishment of the new Science and Astronautics Committees in 1958 created to cope with the legislative problems of the space age. It provided for the expansion of congressional staff aids and led to striking gains in the staffing of the committees of Congress and of the Legislative Reference Service. It ought to strengthen the oversight function of Congress and was followed by an extraordinary increase in the conduct of congressional investigations. The 1946 act also aimed to strengthen congressional control of public expenditures, but its results in this area have proved disappointing. The lobbying title of the act has revealed a wealth of data concerning the extent and cost of group representation before Congress. But the lobby law admittedly suffers from loose draftsmanship and other defects which remain to be corrected.

But the task of congressional reorganization is far from finished. The LaFollette-Monroney committee of the 79th Congress was limited in its terms of reference and the 1946 act, after its passage by the Senate, was pruned in the House of Representatives and hence was marked by several significant omissions. Meanwhile, the operation of the 1946 act over the past 20 years has revealed some serious defects, while changing conditions have produced some new problems of internal organization and operation. Since 1946 two States have been added to the Union, there are 50 million more Americans, the space age has dawned, and the daily workload of the average Congressman has doubled.

Although the 1964 session of Congress was far more productive of legislative results than the 1963 session, I feel that this was due more to the change in the character of presidential leadership than to any real improvement in the structure and procedures of the Congress. We hear many criticisms of our machinery and methods not only from our own Members in both chambers and in both political parties, but also from political scientists, journalists and commentators, and civic groups like the American Assembly and the National Committee for an Effective Congress. I do not, by any means, subscribe to all the criticisms of the Congress that we read in the public prints. But I do agree that the time has come for a new look—a fresh study—of the organization and operation of our national legislature.

We hear it said, Mr. Speaker, that this body or the other body wastes valuable time in irrelevant debate and in oral roll calls. In his recent book "Congress: The Sapless Branch", the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Joseph S. Clark, attacks our procedures as "undemocratic and antiquated." In a Senate speech last September that consumed 42 pages of the Congressional Record, he set forth a full-length 27-point program for revision of the Senate rules. Other critics allege that, with hundred-billion-dollar annual budgets, Congress has really lost control of the purse strings. That we lag behind public opinion and are more conservative than the country. That we are too susceptible to group pressures in a pressure-group society. That we tend to subordinate national to local and sectional interests because we are locally elected and locally responsible. That we engage in dilatory tactics via the filibuster and the committee pigeonhole. That our investigating committees do not always treat witnesses fairly. That we lack party discipline and that the legislative process is subject to coalition control. That Congress suffers from a dispersion of leadership which is scattered among our elective leaders and among the chairmen of some 300 congressional committees of all types. These and other criticisms would be considered by the joint committee provided for in my resolution.

In a supporting statement made when he introduced his concurrent resolution, Senator Monroney said that "the American people expect the Congress to improve its performance. There is a strident and persistent demand for improved congressional practices. Congress needs," he said, "to remodel its legislative machinery." And he went on to list the areas of major importance which, in his opinion, require immediate attention:

First, congressional procedure for dealing with the Federal budget.

Second, committee operation.

Third, earlier adjournment or specified recess periods.

Fourth, reducing the individual Member's caseload.

In addition to these major changes, he also listed many minor changes which could be made to strengthen Congress and simplify its operation.

Mr. Speaker, in an age when representative government is on the defensive all around the world and when it has been eclipsed by dictatorships in many lands, I believe that we must take steps to strengthen our own institution. At a time when the initiative in policymaking seems to be shifting from Congress to the executive and the judiciary, we must be on guard to maintain the place of Congress in the constitutional scheme of checks and balances and we must adopt whatever changes are necessary to enable the Congress to perform its functions more effectively.

THE COMMON ACTION TO BRING PEACE TO VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolff] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, events of the past few days have literally swept the United States onto the first step of the escalator of war in Vietnam. We will continue upward unless we find a solution that will halt this inevitable hoist.

The importance of the war in Vietnam has reached the crucial point which demands immediate attention. Because of its importance, I have made two trips to South Vietnam within the last 9 months—first in June and again in November—to see for myself why we are there and what the possible alternatives are to solving this situation.

Of my own volition and at my own expense I witnessed the "twilight war" as near to war as you can get without actually participating. The information I have secured is firsthand—from Saigon, the serious political area, and from the provinces in the heartland of the vast serious fighting areas. I saw the residue of the Communists' weapons of murder, arson, sabotage, random bombings, and terror.

Let me at the outset, however, make it clear I do not believe we can afford to lose Vietnam. This has been indelibly written in the blood of 277 Americans who have died there. Every responsible individual with whom I spoke—I spoke with hundreds on both trips; and this goes for military, our State Department and other U.S. Government people, the Vietnamese, and most importantly, independent news personnel, for whom I have the utmost respect—all agreed it would do the cause of America and the rest of the free world irreparable harm if we either pulled out or were thrown out.

In 1954 when the Geneva accords halved Vietnam at the 17th parallel, creating the Communist regime of Ho Chi Minh in the north and the non-Communist state in the south, we recognized the importance then of southeast Asia to the free world. In September of the same year the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization was born. At that time, the U.S. commitment to do what it could to insure the peace, security, and independence of southeast Asia was made, and made with the support of both political parties. Thailand, the Philippines, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, and Pakistan joined in that commitment. Though not signers of the treaty, Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia were at liberty to call on SEATO for help against aggressions.

We are committed to Vietnam. In 1961 when Vietnam appealed to the United States to honor its unilateral declaration of 1954, President Kennedy responded without delay in support of Vietnam by sending more American advisers, arms, and aids. He said:

> The United States is determined to help Vietnam preserve its independence, protect its people against Communist assassins, and build a better life through economic growth.

A position first stated by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in 1954, that—

> The imposition on southeast Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Communist ally by whatever means would be a grave threat to the whole free community. The United States feels that that possibility should not be positively accepted but should be met by united action.

A position President Eisenhower in that same year supported by stating that—

> Aggression in * * * southeast Asia are threats to the whole free community to be met by united action.

And just last week President Johnson reaffirmed that position by saying the United States will be "as effective and efficient as we can in helping the people of South Vietnam resist aggression and preserve their freedom."

Vietnam has bared itself before the Vietcong, the North Vietnamese, and Red China in an attempt to succeed in becoming an independent free nation. It has thrust its strength forth relying on the commitment we have pledged, the free world has pledged.

Theirs is not just a civil war. When I first visited Vietnam last June, the majority of the equipment used by the Vietcong was captured U.S. materiel. When I returned 6 months later I was told that most of the equipment used by the Vietcong came from Red China. It is also known that some Red Chinese have been involved in field operations with the Vietcong.

This outside influence is underlined by one of the most important speeches made in recent decades on Communist strategy, presented in 1961 by then Chairman Khrushchev in his report on a party conference entitled "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement." Khrushchev stated:

> In modern conditions, the following categories of wars should be distinguished: world wars, local wars, liberation wars, and popular uprisings.

He eliminated world wars and local wars as too dangerous for any real advantage to the Communist cause. But he specifically acknowledged liberation wars in conjunction with Vietnam saying, "It is a sacred war. We recognize such wars."

Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin reaffirms and underscores that recognition by his presence in Hanoi now. His visit also reaffirms and underscores the fact that Vietnam's conflict is not just a civil one.

We have been alarmed at the aspect of Red China producing nuclear weapons, and well we should be. However, if Red China and Russia can achieve success by liberation wars, then there is no necessity for them to risk nuclear holocaust.

Where I traveled there was no nuclear holocaust, only the constant fear of terror, snipers, and guerrilla attack. In the midst of this liberation war I traveled by car on the only open road to Long An Province and Tan On—a road constantly under ambush of grenade and rifle attack—where military vehicles were constantly under fire. We drove 60 miles per hour to avoid attack.

I met with our military advisers whose constant companions are a rifle, a grenade hung from their belt and a .45 packed on their hip.

To learn more about this liberation war, I talked through interpreters with captured Vietcongs, I spent hours with American and European correspondents who have been in Vietnam 2 or more years. I interviewed Vietnamese Government leaders. I spoke with Ambassador Lodge and Ambassador Taylor. I was briefed by MACV—Military Assistance Commander Vietnam—and by their commanding officers. I spoke with Americans, Vietnamese ARVN field commanders, and village chiefs. I did not have time for the Cook's tour and ceremonial dances of the Montagnards normally arranged for visiting firemen.

The tour I took included suspenseful helicopter flights—in some of those that have made the headlines—"Two More U.S. Helicopters Shot Down Over Vietnam"—wearing a flak suit and sitting between gunners who gingerly fingered the trigger of their .50 calibers. We flew over roads that were too cut by mortars to get to inaccessible areas.

I was the first civilian to visit Bien Hoa Airfield after our B-57's were bombed out by the mortars of the Vietcong who zeroed in only about 100 yards from the perimeter of the airfield. At the time I was warned that we could expect future bombing of this sort. For there was no way to guarantee our protection against them. This was underlined only a few days ago in Pleiku.

I visited with some of the wounded who had felt the effect of our own shells fired from captured equipment by the Vietcong.

There is a war going on over there; it is a different war than what we know, as war. It has no course to run. There is no place to hide, not even in Saigon, where 2 days after I left, the restaurant where I had lunch was bombed and 40 people were wounded.

But war is hell and you can tolerate these things in a war zone. What we cannot tolerate is the continuance of this war.

Solutions have been proposed:

First. Withdrawal from Vietnam: This is totally unacceptable. It would mean rejecting the plea of the Vietnamese to help them remain a free and independent nation. It would evidence to the people of the free world the fact that America does not honor its commitments and many of the uncommitted nations of the world would fall into the Communist camp for lack of security. It would also vindicate the Communist theory of liberation wars, open the gateway into southeast Asia and precipitate the Domino theory—with each individual country falling one after the other, and not necessarily limiting itself to southeast Asia.

Second. Neutralization: If we should neutralize all of Vietnam as was done at the Geneva Conference, and the Communists would honor this neutralization, I would approve. However, they have proven they would not honor their commitments and will not permit the peoples of South Vietnam to remain neutral.

To paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, "I believe this Nation cannot endure permanently half slave and half free."

We have seen neutralization fail in Laos. Because they did not honor the neutralization of Laos by withdrawing their troops and equipment as the United States did, the Communists now have supply lines running through Laos from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. There continues to be turmoil in Laos. That is the Communist's idea of neutralization. We cannot accept the experience of Laos as an indication that Communist style neutralization will work.

Third. Nuclear intervention: This alternative has already been defeated at the polls in November by the mandate given President Johnson.

Fourth. Escalation of the conflict: A decisive military victory over the Vietcong or their supporters, the North Vietnamese and Red Chinese is out of the question unless we are prepared to pour into this "human quagmire" 2 million American youth to defeat the hundred thousand Vietcong now deployed. Victory over the Communists in Malaysia and the Philippines has outlined a course of action that demands a superiority of 20 to 1 over the guerrillas.

But this is hardly a solution since it would leave us naked against an enemy who stands poised to rape our freedom whenever we stand thus exposed.

Fifth. Continue to assist the South Vietnamese to bring about peace in their own country. All responsible American officials agree this is essential no matter what else be done.

I fully concur and also propose that something else be done. I propose that we meet this aggression with the kind of united action implied by the statements of the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations. My recommendation for this "united action" is the utilization of SEATO. Utilize other SEATO members, preferably Asians, in an effort to help terminate this war, in a climate they know well, in an area that affects their future and with their Asian neighbors whom they can better understand and with whom they can better communicate.

This is asking them to support a pledge they made 10 years ago in order that their part of the world may remain free and independent.

SEATO was organized for this purpose. Article II reads:

> In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

And this is followed up by article IV which states:

> Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area * * * would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional process. If, in the opinion of any of the parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence or any party is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense * * * it is understood that no action * * * shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam must be considered within the treaty area.

I quote these articles to emphasize this outstanding option available toward winning peace for South Vietnam:

> We're already aiding the Vietnamese in 1,001 ways. But let's not be satisfied when it might prove that the 1,002d way is the decisive one.

Those were the words of Ambassador Taylor upon his arrival in Saigon last July as the new U.S. Ambassador and those words are still applicable.

An option we have not utilized—to bring in a third flag, even fourth, fifth, and sixth—to include other nations of the southeast Asian community is my proposal.

The SEATO members are fully justified in any action to aid Vietnam. For in June 1962 a special report from the International Control Commission, a unit created by the Geneva Conference and composed of a Canadian, an Indian, and a Pole, presented evidence of Hanoi's subversive activities in South Vietnam and specifically found Hanoi guilty of violating the Geneva accords, also violating SEATO's article IV through "aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area."

In the past years and as recent as 1964 headlines have read: "SEATO Dead; Just Needs Proper Burial." My plan would resurrect SEATO and solidify it, as a working body, letting it function as a peacekeeping force for southeast Asia, as NATO has done for Europe.

Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs William P. Bundy—whom I met with only yesterday—has said:

> Policy is the fruit of history and experience. In essence, our policy derives from (1) the fact of the Communist nations of Asia and their policies; (2) the lessons of the 1930's and of Korea; (3) the logical extension of that fact and these lessons, to what has happened in southeast Asia.

We have learned from Malaya; we have learned from the Philippines, that Communist aggression can be overcome.

In the past year the war in Vietnam has worsened. Even in the past few days, direct attacks on American installations have occurred with greater intensity. Before this conflict is escalated into an earth-shaking struggle, let us call into action SEATO.

Even before the death of Diem, the political instability of South Vietnam has been a liability to the conflict and has resulted in a prolonging effort to bring about peace. Even in view of the political instability South Vietnam has progressed since 1954. It is because of this progress that the Vietcong and North Vietnamese—whose country has suffered serious economic reverses since 1954—no longer attempt to convert South Vietnamese with promises of a better life. It is not easy to stabilize a government within 1 year, 2 years, or even 10 years when, as in the case of South Vietnam, a country is constantly attacked from within, by covert aggression through guerrilla warfare as well as by border attack.

Too often, we look and we criticize, yet it took the United States 7 years after the American Revolution to finally write a Constitution and this was in an atmosphere of relative peace. Politically in Vietnam there is an urgency for patience.

To bring in their Asian neighbors, such as the Philippines, who have experienced the same battles and struggles for an independent and free nation would enable the Vietnamese to learn firsthand from people who can say, "I, too, have been through this; my people, too, have experienced these aggressions; my country, too, has been invaded."

Vietnam's greatest problem is lack of leadership. It has been said in the East nothing grows under a banyan tree—so it was under Diem. He would permit no leader to grow within and, therefore, today the leadership is a many-headed hydra.

The Vietnamese leaders who have survived the numerous coups recognize the need for a massive sociocivic operation in the country as well as a centralized political unit in the city.

This has been noticed by neighboring leaders.

Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Philippines, Cornelia T. Villareal, whose nation is a member of SEATO, has recognized the importance geographically and psychologically of the conflict in South Vietnam. He, too, suggests:

> Out of a collective effort of free peoples, and out of a struggle they share, can come the motivation and ultimately the resolve of the Vietnamese common masses to make their country survive in freedom.

Developments in the past few days have evinced the need for action. President Kennedy stated:

> Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

This we should at all times be prepared to follow. Kosygin's visit to Hanoi underlines the importance of settling this crisis before there is an escalation of war.

His trip accentuates the possibility this war may grow. Up until now, North Vietnam's air threat has been almost nil. Because of this fact we have been at an advantage in assisting the South Vietnamese to withstand the assaults on them. However, I am concerned now lest the Kosygin visit herald addition of Russian air power support to North Vietnam. Awareness of this possibility reveals an urgency as has never before existed to bring this conflict to a conclusion before an international crisis develops.

I ask that we, as a member, immediately call a meeting of SEATO, in order that action toward peace, rather than drifting toward peril, may result.

We cannot continue to let the situation deteriorate. I believe America must not only advise the Vietnamese in bringing about a peaceful conclusion to their struggle, but that we must also exercise leadership in bringing peace to Vietnam.

THE JENKINS FARCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star entitled "The Jenkins Farce."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it becomes completely clear that every effort is being made to permit Walter Jenkins to avoid giving testimony in a forum where Republicans would have a chance to ask penetrating questions and hope to obtain responsive answers.

Jenkins, it will be remembered, is the longtime aid and business manager to President Lyndon Johnson. He resigned his job at the White House last fall after his second arrest in the District of Columbia on morals charges.

The latest development in this bizarre case was the agreement yesterday by Democrat members on the Rules Committee of the other body that they would not authorize an independent psychiatrist to examine Jenkins. This on the claim that Jenkins might be harmed in some way if another psychiatrist talks to him.

Thus an interesting procedure is developing. Republican members of the committee will be permitted to submit questions along with Democrat members, but here is the sneaker: What kind of questions will get through the Democrat screen? Even if some tough questions are approved by the Democrats, there will still be the problem of getting full and complete answers, for this will not be a committee hearing, either public or executive.

If Jenkins had been questioned under oath a year ago, as he should have been, there would have been none of this problem with his so-called "illness" and his staff of personal psychiatrists.

This former No. 1 assistant to Lyndon Johnson has certainly been given soft and preferential treatment by the Democrat investigators. This is in strange and sharp contrast to the efforts to discredit and destroy Don Reynolds, the Maryland insurance broker, who has been willing to tell the committee under oath, in public hearings, of his associations with Bobby Baker, Walter Jenkins, Matthew McCloskey, and others.

Reynolds is subject to criticism, but he has been willing to come forward publicly and say he was wrong in some of his activities and in his financial dealings with the above-mentioned manipulators. He has been truthful in his testimony on the stereo set that was given to the Johnsons and on the payments for the unwanted television time on the Johnson family television station in Austin, Tex.

The testimony of Reynolds should be subjected to the same scrutiny and tests for credibility as applied to every other witness, but it appears that Committee Counsel McLendon is going far out of his way in an effort to discredit Reynolds.

If there was anything so wrong with Reynolds, why was Bobby Baker, the secretary to the Democrat majority in the Senate and Lyndon Johnson's protege, in all those business dealings with him?

If there was anything so wrong with Reynolds, why did Lyndon Johnson buy his life insurance through him, and why was Walter Jenkins dealing with him on this life insurance?

If there was anything so wrong with Reynolds, why did Matthew McCloskey go out of his way to give him the performance bond business on the District of Columbia Stadium?

It is shameful the way the former business associates of Reynolds are now trying to discredit and frighten him simply because he has been willing to testify rather than take the fifth amendment as did Bobby Baker and others.

It is shameful that the investigative agencies of the Federal Government would be used to try to frighten and coerce Reynolds. It is shameful that a committee of Congress would seek to discredit a cooperative witness while seeking to shield and protect those who have given incorrect and misleading information in the past.

I hope that the Congress and people of this country are aware of all the efforts to harass and punish Don Reynolds and others who have aggressively tried to force a real investigation of the Bobby Baker case.

I hope that the Congress and the people of this country are aware of the favoritism that has been shown to Walter Jenkins and is being shown to this individual in the most recent action by the Democrats.

If the alleged illness of Walter Jenkins is so serious, what is the explanation for the fact that he has been seen recently at gay parties on Capitol Hill and elsewhere in Washington? Or is it fear that if brought into a public hearing this favorite of the high and mighty, twice arrested on morals charges, would be another taker of the fifth amendment?

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I offer for printing in the RECORD as part of my remarks an excellent editorial from today's issue of the Washington Evening Star.

The Star properly labels the Senate Rules Committee's so-called investigation of Walter Jenkins as "an affront to the intelligence of the public," and it concludes by asking the question: "How stupid is the public supposed to be?"

The editorial follows:

THE JENKINS FARCE

The latest antic in the Senate Rules Committee's "investigation" of Walter Jenkins, former presidential aid, is an affront to the intelligence of the public.

Republican members of the committee have tried hard to find out what connection, if any, Jenkins had with an alleged kickback on the premium for a large life insurance policy sold by Don B. Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, to Lyndon B. Johnson when the latter was majority leader of the Senate. They also wanted to question him generally about his relationship with Bobby Baker. Reynolds testified he was pressured by Jenkins into buying useless advertising time on the L.B.J. network in Texas, and produced canceled checks to prove that he did buy the time. Jenkins gave a sworn statement to committee investigators denying "any knowledge of arrangements" for the purchase of the time. Whatever the precise meaning of this, the Democrats controlling the committee refused to call Jenkins so that he could be cross-examined. Apparently they have made no other effort to clear up this point.

Now, we are told, it is too late. Following Jenkins' arrest on a morals charge last fall, the committee did an about-face and issued a subpena calling upon him to appear and testify under oath. But Jenkins did not appear. Instead, his attorney and his psychiatrists showed up. The attorney is reported to have told the committee that Jenkins wanted to testify. But the psychiatrists raised all manner of objections. They said he might have to be carried away in an ambulance if put on the stand, that his health might be gravely injured, that it would be dangerous to have a committee-chosen psychiatrist examine him, and that there was no telling when, if ever, his condition would permit him to be questioned by the committee, even in closed session.

So now this remarkable committee has come up with a remarkable substitute. It will draft a list of written questions for Jenkins to answer, presumably with no threat to his health. But even here there is a catch. This list of questions will have to be approved by the Democratic majority, and this makes it virtually certain that there will not be even one searching question on it.

How stupid is the public supposed to be?

FARM REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Congressman FRANK CLARK and I, both Pennsylvania Democrats, have introduced new farm legislation to provide new and improved wheat, feed grain, and land conservation programs.

This new bill will, first, increase per family net farm income; second, reduce the surplus of wheat and feed grains; third, expand markets at home and abroad; and fourth, decrease the costs to the Federal Government of financing the current expensive farm programs.

I represent Pennsylvania's 21st District, which includes Westmoreland County, Mr. CLARK represents Pennsylvania's 25th District, which includes Butler, Beaver, and Lawrence Counties. These congressional districts include important dairy, livestock, wheat, and other agricultural areas of the State.

We western Pennsylvania Congressmen indicate that our proposal would eliminate acreage allotments on wheat, corn, and other feed grains, thus freeing farmers from these Government controls.

Beginning with the 1966 crop, wheat price supports would be set at the U.S. farm price equivalent to the average world market price during the three immediately preceding marketing years, but not less than 50 percent of parity.

Corn supports would be 90 percent of the average price received by farmers during the immediately preceding 3 years. Supports for other feed grains would be related to corn and would reflect feeding value.

The Pennsylvania Congressman said:

> Farmers would have the opportunity to make their own management decisions and to obtain prices for their commodities in the marketplace at levels higher than the price support loans.
>
> By diverting a portion of the cropland from the production of excess supplies of wheat, feed grains, and other commodities through a voluntary program of soil, water, forest and wildlife conservation, the current farm surpluses could be reduced and costs to the Government cut.
>
> Farmers would be free to participate and would not be penalized if they did not wish to cooperate. Under the current wheat and feed grain programs, farmers who do not cooperate have been penalized by having their prices depressed by the dumping of surplus Government stocks by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Our legislation would end this type of unfair Government dumping.
>
> Our western Pennsylvania farmers, through their own private organization, the Pennsylvania Farmers Association and its county organizations, have indicated that they want a minimum of Federal Government intervention in agriculture. We share that point of view and believe that our proposed legislation meets that test.

Three major farm programs—feed grains, wheat, and cotton—expire this year and must be extended, altered, or dropped. We asked farmers their choice of the two approaches most likely to be considered.

Farmers apparently want to move more toward a freer market. The survey was taken in late November and December. Questionnaires were mailed to farmers selected systematically throughout a list of 2 million farmers' names in 20 States coast to coast in the northern half of United States.

The major results in summary form: 6 out of 10—60 percent—of the farmers were in favor of moving more toward a freer market—34 percent voted to continue present programs, and the other 6 percent did not express an opinion. Smaller operators—under 220 acres—were more in favor of freer markets. Two-thirds of those under 220 acres wanted freer markets, versus 54 percent of those operating larger farms.

[Results in percent]

	Prefer freer market	Continue present plans	No opinion	Sample size
All farmers in 20 States	60	34	6	930
Farm organization members:				
Farm Bureau	67	27	6	371
Farmers Union	43	53	4	114
National Farmers Organization	36	56	8	59
National Grange	65	35	----------	40
Other	71	27	2	70
Corngrowers	62	33	5	670
Wheat raisers	63	30	7	397
Dairymen	62	33	5	393

Results by organization are above. Note that 43 percent of Farmers Union members favored freer market, as did 36 percent of NFO men.

Ohio and Michigan farmers were strongest in favor of free market—83 percent. Other States strongly preferring freer market were Kansas, 66 percent; New York, 67 percent; Pennsylvania, 69 percent.

Minnesota was the only State where farmers voted more for the present programs—53 percent—compared to 42 percent for freer market.

Crop producers leaned toward the freer market—about 6 out of 10 indicated this.

Larger dairymen—over 35 cows—were more in favor of the freer market than smaller ones.

Beef men and hog producers both voted for freer market at rate of 6 out of 10.

From these results it appears that the farmers want new legislation.

Congressman J. IRVING WHALLEY, Republican, and I, today protested to Secretary Orville Freeman and the White House the closing of the Maple Research Laboratory at Wyndmoor, Pa.

We pointed out that the amount entailed in keeping this very worthwhile and fruitful research work operating is small compared to the hundreds of millions of dollars being spent on research in almost every area of Government operations.

Congressman WHALLEY and I pointed out that maple syrup production is carried on in most of the States that comprise the area known as Appalachia.

The area where the two congressional districts join, known as the Somerset maple area, has benefited from the research work performed by this laboratory as well as the entire maple producing States from Maine to Minnesota and southward into Appalachia.

Our protest letter follows:

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We join the National Maple Syrup Council in protesting the reported closing of the maple research project at the Eastern Utilization Research and Development Center, 600 East Mermaid Lane, Wyndmoor, Pa.

We are hopeful that you will reconsider this action for the following reasons:

1. It is the only one of its kind in the Nation and serves the entire maple industry in 13 States stretching from Maine to Minnesota and southward into the Appalachians.

2. While forest service projects are concerned with maple sap up to the time it reaches the evaporator house, this laboratory follows through to the completed product.

3. Much of the experimental work on micro-organisms of tree, say and syrup must be done in a laboratory.

4. Maple production is beginning to hold its own. For the past 10 years it has decreased 40 percent but in the last 2 years it has leveled off and could well start an upswing.

The maple sugar industry has always been a family operation. This small but important industry needs continuous technological development. In good years our people are producing one and a half million gallons of syrup with a retail value of $12 million. A great percentage of our producers need this seasonal income for many are very close or under the income standard as set by the Poverty Study as being too low for the good of our Nation.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN H. DENT,
Twenty-first District, Pennsylvania.
J. IRVING WHALLEY,
Twelfth District, Pennsylvania.

STABILIZING LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, as you recall, I informed the House on January 19 of the background and basis of import legislation that I introduced that day along with 30 cosponsors on both sides of the aisle for the purpose of stabilizing the lead-zinc industry and at the same time providing for the national security by assuring a continuing supply of these vital materials. My bill (H.R. 3183) would also provide for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for industrial expansion and thereby aid the domestic economy.

Since January 19, additional cosponsors have introduced this legislation and we now have 32 members of this body supporting it. As I indicated when I introduced the bill, it is a bipartisan national effort.

I am pleased to advise the House that my good friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the former chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator ANDERSON, together with 24 additional Senators, introduced identical legislation in the other body on the same day that we introduced the bill in the House.

This past Friday, at the 68th Annual National Western Mining Conference sponsored by the Colorado Mining Association and affiliated organizations, held at Denver, Colo., one of the foremost leaders of the lead-zinc industry presented a thoughtful analysis of the legislation that we have sponsored for the establishment of flexible quotas for lead and zinc. The speaker was Lindsay F. Johnson, vice president of the New Jersey Zinc Co., and I commend his remarks to all interested in this legislation for the clarity of his analysis from the industry point of view.

Accordingly, pursuant to permission previously granted, I include the text of Mr. Johnson's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

FLEXIBLE QUOTAS FOR LEAD AND ZINC, WHY AND HOW

(Address by Lindsay F. Johnson, vice president, the New Jersey Zinc Co., before the National Western Mining Conference at Denver, Colo., February 5, 1965)

On January 19, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, introduced in the Senate of the 89th Congress Senate bill 564.

On the same day, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, introduced in the House of Representatives of the 89th Congress House bill 3183.

S. 564 and H.R. 3183 are identical bills. They embody what has come to be known as a flexible quota plan for lead and zinc.

The 89th Congress is the 4th Congress in which these two champions of the lead and zinc mining industry have attempted to find a legislative solution to the problems that beset that industry because of its relationship to production of lead and zinc in foreign countries. Similar bills were also sponsored by them in the 88th, 87th, and 86th Congresses.

Many of you will recall the long procession of appearances of proponents and opponents of these several bills before numerous committees of both the Senate and the House, as well as before the U.S. Tariff Commission.

In the past decade many, many man-hours have been spent in efforts to properly establish in the right places the need for correction of the situation and the best means by which this can be done.

Likewise, unfortunately, many hours have been spent by people who have gone to great lengths to sweep the problem under the rug, thereby attempting to demonstrate that there is no need, and, therefore, no solution is required.

Volumes of reports have been published, and in the course of all this the lead-zinc mining industry, no doubt, has established some sort of record for the number of appearances before Government committees and commissions, but certainly, if for nothing else, a record of unparalleled demonstration of perseverance.

However, some have counted this long course without any tangible result as disappointing. Others feel that the long and thus far unsuccessful campaign to penetrate the walls of resistance in the executive departments has been a waste of time. Some have expressed growing discouragement that reason will ever prevail. Others have described it as frustrating and a hopeless quest.

But there are some of us who feel differently about what has come out of the long and unrelenting effort and the point at which it has arrived today. We feel that a number of significant changes in thinking have come about by reason of public and private debate over the problem and the proposals for its effective solution. Because of these changes we believe that today one with an earnest desire to do so can consider the matter with a degree of sophistication that was not possible 6 or 8 years ago.

The legislation now before the Congress in S. 564 and H.R. 3183 is one of the results of the long course that has been followed. It is a refinement of earlier proposals that is without question a better and more workable solution. Accordingly, it seemed appropriate on this occasion to discuss the new 1965 version of the flexible quota bill to show why it is more than ever needed as an instrument to cement an expanding and healthy lead-zinc mining industry in our economy, to point out how it differs from earlier proposals, to forecast what it will do, to indicate the course it must now take and how it must be piloted through Government channels, and to suggest what those of you whose interests are so closely related to it can do to see it through.

As a prelude to discussion of those several points, I believe it will be of interest and of help in considering the bill and its likely effects if we take a look at its preamble. This reads as follows:

"A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes."

Permit me to repeat the main purposes expressed in that preamble, because they deserve careful consideration as reflections of the intent and belief of those who sponsor this bill.

First, to protect the domestic economy.

Second, to promote the general welfare.

Third, to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources.

It seems to me that those are commendable purposes of the highest order. Certainly, no one can argue against something that will protect the domestic economy.

In fact, the protection of our domestic economy is right now a subject of prime national importance. In his recent economic message, President Johnson gave a highly realistic appraisal of the current favorable state of the domestic economy, but, more significantly, he dealt with the necessity of maintaining and protecting this favorable state, expressed his intention of so doing, and put forth certain recommendations of steps to accomplish that goal.

I submit to you and respectfully to the President that the protection of the domestic economy can never be wholly accomplished by one action or by one stroke of the pen. It must be a combination and accumulation and a setting in of many things. The maintenance of a strong and healthy domestic lead-zinc mining industry can and will be one of those things.

We all know what happened to this industry a decade ago when there were no adequate protective measures to help it resist an onslaught of imports that all but wrecked it. A repetition of the gross adverse effect on the economies of mining companies and of the communities in which they operate, widespread unemployment in mining and smelting, and practical cessation of constructive forward planning and development most certainly would not be a situation calculated to contribute to the maintenance of a favorable state of the domestic economy. We all know that in the absence of a well conceived, equitable program of control such as the flexible quota plan such repetition can be forecast.

There is no question then that the situation that would follow from enactment of the Anderson-Aspinall legislation, namely, an avoidance of that repetition, would accomplish the stated purpose "to protect the domestic economy."

Likewise, it would seem very difficult for anyone logically to argue against something that would "promote the general welfare."

I have always assumed that the general welfare, when applied to the United States, means the welfare of all of the people of the United States.

It would seem that something that would encourage a number of people to put capital to work to provide means of finding, developing, and recovering important natural resources, with reasonable assurance that the capital would be profitably employed—something that would assure continuity of employment to a large number of skilled persons needed to bring those resources to a consumable point where even larger numbers of other persons convert them and incorporate them as essential components of other things that are needed and used by all the people—something that would do those things, particularly with respect to stability of employment and investment in the primary stages of natural resource recovery within our own borders, would most certainly be calculated to "promote the general welfare."

Now we come to the third, and perhaps most interesting, part of the preamble, that is, "to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources."

It is to be assumed that provision of an adequate supply of anything that is important in the production of essential goods contributes to the national defense, and this is a proposition to which we all should be dedicated. I would hope that we are, although I suspect that sometimes we are too trusting of some of our neighbors who ofttimes turn out to be fair weather friends.

However, let us assume we are all for promoting national defense and look to the most important part of this purpose, which is the recognition that the provision of adequate supplies of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States involves obtaining them from both domestic and foreign sources.

The dependence of the world's largest consuming market in the United States on imports of lead and zinc and the degree of this dependence under normal, subnormal, and abnormal conditions are well documented and well understood. It is a question of how much and in what form imports should be. It really boils down to a matter of whether the domestic economy and the national interest will better be served by a situation in which division between domestic and foreign sources will be on an equitable basis, perhaps even shaded somewhat in favor of domestic sources, which anywhere but 21st Street NW., Washington, D.C., would be reasonable, or in a situation loaded in favor of foreign producers, which is just what it would be in the absence of proper controls. The answer is obvious: The Anderson-Aspinall program of flexible quotas would provide such controls.

There can be no argument about the purposes for which the legislation is intended. These purposes are without question beneficial to all. But the important point to remember is that CLINTON ANDERSON and WAYNE ASPINALL do not propose legislation to accomplish such purposes unless they believe wholeheartedly that it will accomplish these purposes—nor do some 55 or 60 other Members of the Congress who have joined with them in their legislative proposals.

I urge you to remember this, and I commend it for consideration and remembrance to many whom we all know back in the halls of the State Department, the Commerce Department, and the Interior Department. I commend it most respectfully to our Chief Executive, who, above all, certainly knows how deeply his old colleagues feel when they go to bat for something they believe in.

Earlier in this discussion I suggested examination of the question of why the flexible quota plan is more needed now than ever before.

Not long ago I was astonished when a high-ranking official of one of the executive departments stated that, in view of the improved market situation in lead and zinc, he assumed no further efforts would be made in the 89th Congress toward enactment of a flexible quota plan. He, too, appeared to be equally astonished when told that these efforts certainly would be made and even intensified, because the need for such a plan is greater now than it ever has been.

His reaction was indicative of what we have come to recognize as short-range thinking, and this type of thinking on the part of many in our Government departments has been evident for a long time. Things have always been approached on the basis of expediency, apparently on the principle that when possible one should do nothing to aid the mining industry, and when one has to do something, the most expedient thing seems to be the best thing.

The mining business, as we all know, is a long-range business, and dealing with its problems requires long-range thinking, long-range planning, and long-range investment. It has become a part of the problem to try to instill this idea of long-range thinking in the right places.

We are at the point, however, where something has to be done. The absolute quotas established in 1958 are under examination by the U.S. Tariff Commission, with a report expected any day.

These absolute quotas never have been an effective instrument to meet the problems of the lead-zinc producing industry and of the consumers of lead and zinc in the United States. These absolute quotas were set too high in the beginning. They favored the foreign sources exporting to the United States. However, their main deficiency is that they are too high when things are not so good and too low when consumption, as now, is at a higher point and probably rising gradually.

The Tariff Commission is not examining the absolute quota plan for an appraisal of its effectiveness as an instrument for proper and reasonable control—but, as it has been directed to do, it is examining the proposition of whether conditions have changed sufficiently to warrant termination or relaxation of the absolute quotas. This again seems to reflect a short-range approach, based again on expediency of the moment.

It seems to me that the question at hand should not be: "Can we get along without quotas or with less restrictive quotas?"

Rather the question should be: "Since absolute quotas are too rigid and since some well-conceived, less rigid plan of import protection is needed when the long-range view is taken, what kind of plan will offer the best overall solution to this problem of nearly a decade?"

In the course of the Tariff Commission investigation ample evidence has been presented to show that the underlying conditions that caused the 1956–57 disaster in the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry have not changed. The evidence shows that it is entirely reasonable to forecast increased mine production preponderantly outside the United States that will be available at a rate exceeding the projected increase in consumption over the future years.

Those who are developing these additional resources outside the United States avowedly look to putting much of the additional quantity into the U.S. market. There is also ample evidence of plans, many of which are already underway, to expand conversion of ores to metal in the countries of origin on whom the U.S. custom smelters have long depended for raw material supplies. Likewise, there is an eye on the U.S. market for much of this expanded metal production.

It is probably true that under today's conditions the U.S. mining and smelting industry is not particularly affected by the amount of expansion abroad that has occurred to this time.

But it is abundantly clear that practically being ringed around by potential expansion of production in foreign countries that wants to find its way to our markets, if the United States is to maintain stability in its own mining and smelting industry, it is imperative that there be some means of determining how much of that production we can take in and in what form we can take it.

Now is the time for the United States to assert its position on the long-range aspects of this important problem. Because its position will have a great bearing on some of the plans and programs for expansion abroad, it can be fair to all concerned—domestic and foreign producers alike—only if the United States does state its position. These plans for expansion abroad undoubtedly will be different if it is apparent that the U.S. market can be plundered at will than they will be if it is apparent that our market must be shared with domestic producers, not only mines but smelters, on a fair and reasonable basis. The historical record shows that fair and reasonable participation in our market is not likely to be voluntary. It will have to be brought about by a compulsory course, and now is the time for our Government to write the script, with neither apology nor equivocation.

Now, as to how the 1965 flexible quota plan differs from previous proposals: I think I can best summarize this for you without getting into too much detail by quoting from the speech of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON on the occasion of introducing S. 564, on January 19, 1965, when he said:

"The Lead and Zinc Act of 1965 provides for flexible import quotas that will establish a basic quota equal to those now in effect but will permit increased imports in a direct ratio to increased domestic consumption. This serves as a relaxation and liberalization of the present quota plan—an objective of our trade policy—and certainly meets an expressed desire of those countries serving our markets.

"The initial quota allocations to specific countries conform to the current allocations, but the bill has provisions to transfer unused quota tonnage to a global quota that will be available to those countries having increasing amounts of material available for export. This will accommodate the changing conditions of mine and metal production around the world, with a minimum of negotiation on the part of our Government and our foreign friends."

These are the two main modifications; namely, with respect to the basic quota and the allocation of quotas among foreign countries. They are a direct result of taking into account criticisms of earlier proposals by some persons in one or the other of the executive departments who, seemingly, have an interest in our domestic well-being. We have looked upon this as constructive criticism, and we believe that the legislation in the form now proposed is a good instrument. Certainly, there cannot be much complaint about a plan that guarantees to foreign producers a minimum quota not less than has been enjoyed by them for several years and extends to them the opportunity to share right along with domestic producers in any increase in our consumption over the years. That seems to me to be exceptionally fair. I do not see how anyone taking a tolerant and reasonable look at the situation can object. It is my judgment that a flexible quota plan such as now proposed by Senator ANDERSON and his colleagues and Congressman ASPINALL and his colleagues not only will have a stabilizing effect on the lead-zinc industry in the United States, but also will have a favorable stabilizing effect on this industry outside the United States, because it will remove a great deal of speculation about the future, and it should enable certain important segments of the industry outside the United States to plan ahead with considerable assurance regarding their future participation in our market.

One of the more significant changes that have come about in the decade during which this problem has been debated is the greater cohesiveness of the entire mining and smelting industry on the matter. There was a time when many of us were just getting our feet wet in these matters, when great differences of opinion existed, mainly between those whose basic interest was mining and those whose basic interest was smelting. These differences unfortunately were seized upon by some people in the Congress and reflected in their attitude toward the problem. I am happy to say, however, that this significant change has now come about, and it is what enabled Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL to say, when he spoke on the subject on January 19, "This bill we are offering today has the support of all segments of the domestic lead and zinc industry—mines and smelters alike." And he goes on to say, with reference to the Congress, "This is a bipartisan national project in which we have representation from the North, East, and South, as well as the West."

What, then, do we need to enable this well-conceived system to operate?

There are evident circumstances surrounding us that make it good sense to recognize them and do something about them now so that we may assure ourselves of continuity of a strong, healthy domestic lead-zinc mining industry that will perpetuate itself if given encouragement and stability needed to do so.

It is apparent that the existing system of quotas should be replaced by a more workable and equitable system, and there seems to be agreement in many quarters that the flexible quota plan now proposed is the answer.

There appears to be a reasonably well unified approach to this problem by the entire lead-zinc mining and smelting industry.

There is unquestioned evidence of strong and well-considered support in the Congress of the United States.

With all this, then, what else is needed?

To put it very simply, what we need now to get flexible quotas in operation is to get some flexible, reasonable, forward thinking in the State Department, in the Interior Department, and in the Commerce Department. Here there has long been a history of resistance to any proposals for dealing with this problem on a long-range basis. Why? Many of us have been close to these departments on this matter for almost 10 years, and the thinking has been just as rigid as the absolute quotas. Why? We do not know why. We have never been given any answers other than those that have been veiled behind some mysterious thing referred to as somebody's policy. We begin to think that there is only canalized thinking that never gets out in the orbit of a long-range problem but which always comes back to the same old place, which seems to be one of a calculated impasse.

Certainly, one thing that is needed for us to go forward is some flexible thinking in the State Department, in the Interior Department, in the Commerce Department, and in other executive departments. We submit that some more flexible thinking should be stimulated by a new flexibility and a sense of realism that seems to prevail at the White House, and we are hopeful this will happen. When it does, there is little question that a more constructive approach in these matters will come about.

In the meantime, I urge those of you who have a vital interest in this problem to do all you can by letter, by wire, by visits to promote flexible and forward thinking back in Washington with respect to our long-range interest in mineral resources and particularly lead and zinc.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan (at the request of Mr. NIX), for Tuesday, February 16 through Thursday, February 18, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. NIX), for Tuesday, February 16 through Thursday, February 18, on account of official business.

Mr. WRIGHT (at the request of Mr. NIX), for Tuesday, February 16 through Thursday, February 18, on account of official business.

Mr. CAMERON (at the request of Mr. NIX), for Tuesday, February 16 through Thursday, February 18, on account of official business.

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. NIX), for Tuesday, February 16 through Thursday, February 18, on account of official business.

Mr. NIX, for Tuesday, February 16 through Thursday, February 18, on account of official business.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. NIX), for Tuesday, February 16 through Thursday, February 18, on account of official business.

Mr. SPRINGER (at the request of Mr. NIX), for Tuesday, February 16 through Thursday, February 18, on account of official business.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. NIX), for Tuesday, February 16 through Thursday, February 18, on account of official business.

Mr. BELL (at the request of Mr. NIX), for Tuesday, February 16 through Thursday, February 18, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GURNEY, for 1 hour, on February 17.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. WOLFF), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. FINO in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEOGH.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia.

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. MILLER in two instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. BURTON of California.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 28. An act to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 11, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

553. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of the National Capital Transportation Agency entitled, "Rail Rapid Transit for the Nation's Capital," together with a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

554. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 17, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Fort Pierce, Fla., authorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

555. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 9, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of Westerly, R.I., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

556. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2575(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the disposition of lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property under certain conditions"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

557. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into contracts with institutions under sectarian control for the care of patients, women, and children who are a responsibility of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

558. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct service roadways for public parking of motor vehicles on Connecticut Avenue NW."; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

559. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

560. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide that the Commissioners may accept or permit the acceptance of the performance by volunteers of services for and on behalf of the municipal government of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

561. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into joint contracts for supplies and services on behalf of the District of Columbia and for other political divisions and subdivisions in the National Capital region"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

562. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the questionable aspects of oral auction bidding for Federal timber sold at certain locations in the Pacific Northwest, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

563. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report of the Board covering fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 205 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

564. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. House Joint Resolution 234. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 36). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2998. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; without amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 35. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 80. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 94. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct certain studies and investigations coming within its committee; with amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 112. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to aeronautical and other scientific research and development and outer space; with amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 118. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; with amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 133. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct full and complete investigations and studies of all matters within its jurisdiction under the rules of the House or the laws of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 4749. A bill to amend the 1965 feed grain program to allow diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of soybeans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4750. A bill to provide a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY (by request):

H.R. 4751. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4752. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on household-type electric, gas, and oil appliances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 4753. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 4754. A bill to designate as "Lake Winston Churchill" the reservoir formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 4755. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4756. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4757. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training and home and business loan benefits to veterans with combat service in Vietnam and other combat areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4758. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to make uniform for all commodities, for which a marketing quota program is in effect, provisions for reducing farm acreage and producer allotments for falsely identifying, failing to account for disposition, filing a false acreage report, and for harvesting two crops of the same commodity produced on the same acreage in a calendar year; and to provide in the case of peanuts and tobacco for credit for penalties paid on marketings against penalties incurred for false identification of failure to account; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4759. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4760. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1954, to establish a National Advisory Council on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4761. A bill to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4762. A bill to regulate the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia other than as an incident to the practice of law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4763. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4764. A bill to repeal sections 132 (a)(b) and 409(a) of the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4765. A bill to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia; to provide for the election of the Delegate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4766. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4767. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4768. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4769. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow shall not prevent her from receiving widow's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4770. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow who has lost her entitlement to widow's insurance benefits by remarriage shall have such entitlement reinstated if the subsequent marriage terminates by the husband's death or by divorce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 4771. A bill to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4772. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the return of certain alien property interests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.R. 4773. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4774. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 4775. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of a water resource project to be constructed on Calispel Creek, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 4776. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 4777. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of eight additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 4778. A bill to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4779. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4780. A bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to adopt improved accounting procedures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4781. A bill to amend section 620(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to prohibit the furnishing of any further U.S. assistance to the United Arab Republic, including the training of United Arab Republic military personnel and police personnel at U.S. Government facilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4782. A bill to amend section 620(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to prohibit the furnishing of any further U.S. assistance to Indonesia, including the training of Indonesian military and police personnel at U.S. Government facilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 4783. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4784. A bill to provide for the distribution and viewing within the United States of the film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 4785. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on household type hot water heaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4787. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4788. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4789. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 4790. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an amount equal to the manufacturers excise tax on passenger automobiles shall be paid to persons who purchase such automobiles during periods of high unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4791. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of Panama Canal ship pilots; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 4792. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 4793. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 4794. A bill to protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4795. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4796. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4797. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4798. A bill to provide research, technical, and financial assistance with respect to the disposal of solid wastes to the several States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4799. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4800. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4801. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4802. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4803. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into joint contracts for supplies and services on behalf of the District of Columbia and for other political divisions and subdivisions in the National Capital region; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 4804. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 4805. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 4806. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4807. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 4808. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the method of paying the tax on playing cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 4809. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4810. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 4811. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 4812. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as not to exclude from the benefits provided by such act areas which include a structure of 12,500 or less acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 4813. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4814. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from the gross estate for the value of property passing to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4815. A bill to authorize the classification, segregation, lease, and sale of certain lands for agricultural use and to provide fair compensation for the present lessees thereof in the event of any deprivation of the improvements placed thereon by them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4816. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 4817. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of eight additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4818. A bill to adjust the tax rates on light sparkling wines in relation to those imposed on other wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 4819. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on passenger automobiles, passenger automobile trailers and semitrailers, and parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 4820. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain other expenses at institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 4821. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 4822. A bill to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 310. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 312. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.J. Res. 313. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no person may be a Member of Congress who has not, when elected or appointed, been an inhabitant for at least 1 year of the State from which he is chosen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 283. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that arrangements be made for viewing within the United States of a film entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 284. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 285. Concurrent resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film, "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Res. 220. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Res. 221. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 222. Resoluion amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to germaneness; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Res. 223. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Res. 224. Resolution favoring enactment by States of compulsory school attendance laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 225. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 226. Resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Res. 227. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 228. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to germaneness; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4823. A bill for the relief of Ewa Anna Maziarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4824. A bill for the relief of Pietro Mannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4825. A bill for the relief of Rosa Ochland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 4826. A bill for the relief of Harry A. Murray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4827. A bill providing for the extension of patent No. 2,451,594; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 4828. A bill for the relief of Miss Georgette Ysrael; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4829. A bill for the relief of Rev. Vito Francesco Brancatella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 4830. A bill for the relief of Agop Torkom Centoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 4831. A bill for the relief of Snehlata Mahendrakumar Mehta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 4832. A bill to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of St. Louis University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 4833. A bill to authorize Woodward & Lothrop, Inc., to use space under and over G Street NW., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 4834. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alberto Prats; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 4835. A bill for the relief of Au Pak Tuen, his wife, Au Taang Yen Na, and their children, Au Tim Kin, Au Yan Yan, and Au Oi Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 4836. A bill for the relief of Bainbridge Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4837. A bill for the relief of Carolina Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4838. A bill for the relief of Concetto Fruscella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 4839. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gerardo Pinto, and his wife, Rosalia Reale Pinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 4840. A bill for the relief of Sossik Tarverdi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 4841. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Marengo County, Ala.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4842. A bill for the relief of Librande P. Caltagirone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 4843. A bill for the relief of Zroubavel Beth Yacob; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 4844. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Parvaneh Moshfegh Rashti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

96. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Diana Kearny Powell, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of a resolution with reference to requesting Congress to impeach certain judges of U.S. courts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, under the all-embracing canopy of Thy goodness and mercy, we come as children in our Father's house.

In our deep concern for the Republic and for mankind everywhere, strengthen, we pray Thee, our grim resolve at any cost to push back the forces of darkness which threaten the dearly bought heritage of freedom.

These anxious days we remember gratefully the armed battalions of our youth who have inherited so sorry a world—the American boys in our uniform called to contend with the ruthless powers of tyranny. The cheerful courage of these knights of the treacherous land and trackless air, long leagues from home, in the face of deadly peril, shames our petty complaints and our magnified discomfitures here in their homeland and ours.

Give us, we pray, prophetic glimpses of the different earth we can construct after the pattern of Thy kingdom, if together we harness the sacrifices and the costly ingenuities of conflict to the service of Thy children everywhere on this spinning globe.

We ask it in the name of the One who declared that the field is the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 9, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Harold P. Smith, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral, when retired, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Tuesday, February 9, 1965,

The following message from the House of Representatives was received by the Secretary of the Senate on Tuesday, February 9, 1965:

That the House had passed the bill (H.R. 3818) to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and

Under the authority of the said order, the bill was considered as having been read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Tuesday, February 9, 1965, the following executive reports of a committee were submitted on February 9, 1965:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Attorney General; and

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Deputy Attorney General.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 3 minutes on statements made during the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KUCHEL, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Rules and Administration were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SENATOR THE HONORABLE SHANE D. PALTRIDGE, MINISTER FOR DEFENSE, AUSTRALIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a distinguished guest is present in the Chamber. I refer to Senator the Honorable Shane D. Paltridge, Minister for Defense for Australia, who comes to us with the best wishes of his country, and for whom we have high regard. Senator the Honorable Shane D. Paltridge has a long and distinguished record of service to his country. This service includes the following offices:

Senator for Western Australia in the Federal Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia since 1951.

Federal Minister for Shipping and Transport from 1954 to 1959.

Federal Minister for Civil Aviation from 1955 to 1964.

Federal Minister for Defense from 1964.

Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate from 1959 to 1964.

Leader of the Government in the Senate from 1964.

Senator the Honorable Shane D. Paltridge has served as a member of the Public Works Committee and the Public Accounts Committee in the Senate.

The Senate of the United States is honored by his presence in this Chamber.

It is my pleasure to introduce at this time Senator the Honorable Shane D. Paltridge, Minister for Defense for Australia. [Applause, Senators rising.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Legislation Relating to District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct service roadways for public parking of motor vehicles on Connecticut Avenue NW. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, construct, operate, and regulate a public off-street parking facility (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into joint contract for supplies and services on behalf of the District of Columbia and for other political divisions and subdivisions in the National Capital region (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the Commissioners may accept or permit the acceptance of the performance by volunteers of services for and on behalf of the municipal government of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into contracts with institutions under sectarian control for the care of patients, women, and children who are a responsibility of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1965

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Questionable Aspects of Oral Auction Bidding for Federal Timber Sold at Certain Locations in the Pacific Northwest

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on questionable aspects of oral auction bidding for Federal timber sold at certain locations in the Pacific Northwest, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture and Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, dated February 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 7 of the State of New Jersey

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to provide that no person shall be a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives who shall not, when elected, have been a resident of that State for which or from which he shall be chosen for at least 2 years prior to such election

Whereas it appears desirable to provide in the Constitution of the United States additional residential requirements for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the General Assembly concurring):

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to take such action as may be required to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to provide that no person shall be a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives who shall not, when elected, have been a resident of that State for which or from which he shall be chosen for at least 2 years prior to such election.

2. That the secretary of the senate cause a duly attested copy of this resolution to be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senators from New Jersey, and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States elected from New Jersey.

Attest:

Henry H. Patterson,
Secretary of the Senate.

GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENTS—H.R. 3818—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL AND OTHER VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 65)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill H.R. 3818, to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities, and I submit a report (No. 65) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with supplemental and other views be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 66)

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to report Senate Joint Resolution 1, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, together with the individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska].

I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the individual views, be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1081. A bill to protect the health and safety of the people of the District of Columbia and the welfare of their issue by requiring a laboratory test for syphilis before the issuance of a marriage license; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1082. A bill to amend section 379d(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to exempt from the requirements of such section wheat purchased for manufacturing or industrial purposes or for use in research; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1083. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the rate of duty on brooms made of broom corn; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1084. A bill for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1085. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, as amended, to increase the authorization for pesticide research by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1086. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zorich, Rosetta Amabile Zorich, and Fiorella Zorich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1087. A bill to authorize the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to establish minimum standards for the humane care and treatment of animals used in research; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 1088. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the method of paying the tax on playing cards; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1090. A bill for the relief of George R. Lore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Brewster):

S. 1091. A bill to provide a program of marine exploration and development of the resources of the Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bartlett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of New York):

S. 1092. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to make certain changes in the treatment works construction program under such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Morse):

S. 1093. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Morton, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Kuchel):

S. 1094. A bill making the birthday of Abraham Lincoln a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1095. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 1096. A bill for the relief of Ruth Ahlmann Jensen Tyge; and

S. 1097. A bill for the relief of Sonja Kirsten Hoj Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Church, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1098. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself, Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts):

S. 1099. A bill to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, relating to the duties on woven cloth; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Talmadge when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1100. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such spouse predeceases the person making the election; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1101. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in 79.184 acres located near Orangeburg, S.C., to Allen E. Dominick, the owner of such property; to the Comittee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 1102. A bill authorizing an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee for the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Prouty when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 1103. A bill for the relief of Kathryn Choi Ast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1104. A bill for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. Boggs):

S. 1105. A bill to establish a free guide service for the U.S. Capitol Building; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1106. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Denny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1107. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain additional types of compensation within the meaning of the term "basic salary" for the purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1108. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, in order to make permanent the authorization for certain payments under the provisions of such laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brewster when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1109. A bill to preserve and protect the constitutional rights of the mentally ill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 1110. A bill for the relief of G. Nguyen Tien Hung; and

S. 1111. A bill for the relief of Pola Bodenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Alfred Cabral da Rocha;

S. 1113. A bill for the relief of Emilio Maiorano, Lucia Maiorano, and Cosimo Maiorano, the minor children of a permanent resident; and

S. 1114. A bill for the relief of Giannino Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Fulbright):

S.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. Jordan of North Carolina):

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to provide for Bennett Place commemoration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

CREATION OF ROANOKE ISLAND MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. Jordan of North Carolina) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18); which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas the origin of this Nation was inspired by the timeless quest of man for a destiny commensurate with his potentialities; and

Whereas it was the grandeur of the Renaissance at high noon in England, immortalized by Shakespeare, Bacon, and Raleigh, which gave birth to the American dream; and

Whereas freedom sustained the vision and nourished the faith of those who dedicated themselves to England's greatness beyond the seas; and

Whereas this Nation began its trek across the centuries, founded upon the eternal principles of religious and political liberty, and derived its cultural heritage from a people imbued with the creative spirit of man; and

Whereas at Roanoke Island, North Carolina, in 1585, the first colonizing efforts of our Founding Fathers crystallized into prophetic achievement and made this spot the spiritual birthplace of the United States; and

Whereas it is appropriate that a nation should mark with honor the cradle of its nativity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States be requested to appoint a commission of five persons, to be known as the Roanoke Island Memorial Commission, whose duty it shall be to formulate a proposal which will enable this country to commemorate in a fitting manner the episode of its spiritual birth.

SEC. 2. That the Roanoke Island Memorial Commission be invited especially to study in what manner the religious, political, cultural, social, and economic life of Tudor England, which initiated the drama of English colonization on American soil, can be portrayed in its true historical significance and natal splendor for the instruction and inspiration of generations to come.

SEC. 3. That the Roanoke Island Memorial Commission be asked to report its findings and recommendations to the Congress of the United States in order that this body may take appropriate action to establish at Roanoke Island a memorial worthy of the enduring importance of this event, which led to the founding of the United States.

LABORATORY TEST FOR SYPHILIS BEFORE ISSUANCE OF MARRIAGE LICENSES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to protect the health and safety of the people of the District of Columbia and the welfare of their issue by requiring a laboratory test for syphilis before the issuance of a marriage license, and to eliminate all reference to color in connection with applications for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia.

The need for this legislation was brought to my attention by an editorial in the Washington Post for January 31, 1965. I request permission to insert the text of that editorial at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST REMEDY

The incidence of syphilis is notoriously high in Washington and probably rising. No doubt the city's health director, Dr. Grant, was correct when he recently said that the high rate is partly due to an unusually accurate reporting system here. But the reported figure is the second highest in the United States and eight times the national average.

The simplest possible remedy is also the most urgently necessary. Washington now has no blood test law. The city needs legislation requiring blood tests of all applicants for marriage licenses. This prerequisite is taken for granted wherever the standard procedures of health protection are enforced. Congress has spent enough time pointing fingers and moralizing. It is time for Congress to legislate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, 45 of the 50 States require a test for venereal disease before a marriage license may be obtained; 45 of the 50 States recognize that venereal disease is a public health problem of major proportions; 45 of our 50 States have taken action to detect and treat venereal disease at the time persons desire to marry. In my judgment this a minimal first step in any effective campaign to wipe out this scourge.

Mr. President, the District of Columbia has far and away the highest venereal disease rates of any jurisdiction in the country. The U.S. Public Health Service reports that in fiscal year 1962 some 260 cases of syphilis, 1,114 cases of gonorrhea and 36 cases of other venereal disease per 100,000 District of Columbia residents. At this rate, Mr. President, over 10,500 persons in the District of Columbia are infected with venereal disease.

I need not detail the consequences of venereal disease. It takes its toll in blindness, cardiovascular deterioration, insanity, and death.

But venereal disease is not only a personal tragedy, it is an acute social extravagance. The cure for syphilis is widely known, easy to administer, and inexpensive. Yet we continue to endure the social costs of venereal disease without recognizing the full financial implications.

The Public Health Service has estimated that in 1960 it cost us as a nation $55 million to provide institutional care to patients with syphilic psychosis and syphilic blindness. In 1960 we as a nation lost another $50 million in loss of income as a result of disability of our adult population prior to age 65.

We speak of waste, Mr. President. What greater waste can there be than to lose $100 million each year to a disease for which we have a cheap and easy cure.

Venereal disease rates are rising, Mr. President, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the Nation. It is high time that the District of Columbia joined 45 of the 50 States to require a simple blood test to detect venereal disease prior to marriage.

I note that a similar bill passed the other body earlier this week. I trust this matter will receive the prompt attention of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1081) to protect the health and safety of the people of the District of Columbia and the welfare of their issue by requiring a laboratory test for syphilis before the issuance of a marriage license, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

THE HUMANE ANIMAL CARE ACT OF 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, legislation is long overdue in the field of the humane treatment of laboratory animals. However, those who have pressed for higher standards of animal care—legislators, researchers, animal welfare officials, concerned private citizens—have discovered that common accord is as elusive as quicksilver. In past Congresses I have sponsored measures which I believed would do much to alleviate the unnecessary suffering which has and continues to take place in our laboratories. But to say that these earlier legislative attempts to attack the recognized problem have not met with enthusiastic support from all interested quarters would indeed be an understatement, even though I believe many of the criticisms of the bills unjustified and based very often on inaccurate information as to the language and intent of the measures. Medical researchers who use animals in their laboratories and government departments and agencies who sponsor such research through grant or contract have often been too quick to label any attempt to standardize and raise existent practices and facilities as posing a threat to basic research. But many individuals and organizations active in animal welfare work have been just as quick to shout "sell-out" and "meaningless" to any proposed statutes which did not spell out in specific detail rigid standards and procedures to be followed in all experimentation and testing involving animals. It is obvious that the opposition is so strong to the past efforts by myself and others to legislate in this area that continued agitation for the same measures would be futile.

Everyone is in agreement with the principle that laboratory animals should receive humane treatment. Differences arise in defining humane treatment and in how to establish a mechanism to guarantee such treatment. But the existence of these differences of outlook and priority ought not to be allowed to preclude any congressional action to provide humane treatment for the animals without hampering medical research for the benefit of the human race. Laboratory animals continue to be abused. I can no longer stand by and proclaim the evil of these abuses, while pressing for reforms which I realistically know are, rightly or wrongly, unacceptable at this time.

In the belief that some progress, even though minimal, is more in the interests of the animals and the research itself than continued stalemate, I submit for appropriate reference the Humane Animal Care Act of 1965. This bill authorizes the Surgeon General of the United States, in conformity with the statement of policy set forth in the act, to establish minimum standards for the humane care and treatment of animals used or intended for use in research. He is directed to consult with and solicit the views and recommendations of interested medical, veterinary science, and animal welfare organizations, the National Academy of Sciences, and representatives from all departments and agencies which conduct or support research involving the use of animals.

These minimum standards for animal housing, handling, and laboratory experiments will become effective at 2-year intervals beginning in January 1966 and will become fully effective in January 1974. The purpose of the gradual raising of the standards of animal care is to allow time for those companies, institutions, and Government agencies concerned with animal experimentation and testing opportunities to budget financial and human resources necessary to meet the standards. Beginning in 1966 no department or agency of the Federal Government will make any grant or enter into any contract involving the use of animals unless certification of compliance with the minimum standards then in effect is made by those seeking the grant or contract. Unlike some previous bills, there is no licensing provision in this act.

Another feature of the act is the establishment of a reference library or a clearinghouse of information on the use of animals in research. The library would contain the record of all animal research projects conducted by or for the Federal Government or performed under a Federal grant. An auxiliary purpose of the library would be to allow each Federal department or agency before authorizing the research to check the files of the clearinghouse for the purpose of determining whether or not similar or identical research had been conducted previously. Of course, this library would have no censorship functions. It would merely provide the granting or contracting authority with the background information as an aid to determining the efficacy of a proposal.

Another section of the act authorizes each department or agency which conducts or supports programs of research involving the use of animals to conduct research, training, and to disseminate information relating to the humane care and treatment of animals used in research. The purpose of this section is quite simple. The quality of humane treatment of animals is directly related to the quality of the training received by those handling them. Certainly, those Government agencies and departments closely concerned with animal research ought to be particularly sensitive to the need for trained animal care personnel, and this act would enable them to take a more active role in this area.

Mr. President, I know there are many Senators who share in the concern over the standards of our animal care in necessary medical and military research, and who have been disturbed with the failure of those most intimately connected with the problem to agree on a common approach. I have attempted, through the introduction of this act, to provide that common ground for initial minimal action.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill might lay on the table for cosponsors until February 18.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from Oregon, and will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1087) to authorize the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to establish minimum standards for the humane care and treatment of animals used in research, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Humane Animal Care Act of 1965".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Sec. 2. It is declared to be the policy of the United States that living vertebrate animals used for scientific experiments and tests shall be spared unnecessary pain and fear; that they shall be used only when no other feasible and satisfactory methods can be used to ascertain biological and scientific information for the cure of disease, alleviation of suffering, prolongation of life, the advancement of physiological knowledge, or for military requirements; and that all such animals shall be comfortably housed, well fed, and humanely handled.

Sec. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Surgeon General" means the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

(2) The term "research" means scientific research, experimentation, testing, or training of any kind.

(3) The term "animal" means any live vertebrate animal.

(4) The term "department or agency" means any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States.

Sec. 4. (a) The Surgeon General shall, in conformity with the statement of policy set forth in section 2 of this Act, establish minimum standards for the humane care and treatment of animals used or intended for use in research. In establishing such minimum standards the Surgeon General shall consult with and solicit the views and recommendations of interested medical, veterinary science, and animal welfare organizations, the National Academy of Sciences, and representatives from all departments and agencies which conduct or support research involving the use of animals.

(b) The minimum standards for the humane care and treatment of animals referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall be established by the Surgeon General as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, but such standards shall not become fully effective until January 1, 1974. The Surgeon General shall establish temporary minimum standards as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act which shall become effective on January 1, 1966; and, thereafter, at two-year intervals until January 1, 1974, he shall prescribe new and progressively higher temporary minimum standards which shall be effective for the period for which they are prescribed by the Surgeon General.

Sec. 5. No department or agency shall—

(1) make any grant to any person for research which involves the use of animals, or make any advance or payment under any such grant; or

(2) enter into any contract with any person to perform research which involves the use of animals,

unless such person certifies, in such manner as may be prescribed by the department or agency concerned, that such person will comply with the minimum standards of care and treatment for animals prescribed by the Surgeon General.

Sec. 6. Any department or agency which conducts research involving the use of animals shall comply with the standards of care and treatment prescribed by the Surgeon General; and any department or agency which makes grants for, or contracts for, research involving the use of animals shall determine, through the requirement of annual reports and on-site inspections, whether grant recipients and contractors are complying with the minimum standards of care and treatment prescribed by the Surgeon General.

Sec. 7. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed to establish within the National Institutes of Health a reference library containing detailed information with respect to research involving the use of animals. Such reference library shall maintain a record of all such research (1) conducted by a department or agency, (2) performed under a Federal grant, and (3) performed pursuant to a contract with the United States.

(b) Each department and agency shall, before conducting any research involving the use of animals and before making any grant or letting any contract which involves the use of animals, check the files of the reference library provided for under subsection (a) of this section for the purpose of determining whether similar or identical research has been previously conducted.

Sec. 8. Any department or agency which conducts or supports programs of research involving the use of animals is authorized to conduct research and training, and disseminate information relating to the humane care and treatment of animals used in research.

MARINE EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Senators Kennedy of New York, Pastore of Rhode Island, Ribicoff of Connecticut, and Brewster of Maryland, to provide a program of marine exploration and development of the resources of the Continental Shelf.

On June 10 of last year, the United States acquired under international law sovereign rights over the most extensive territory since the Louisiana Purchase. The United States obtained these exclusive rights over the resources of the Continental Shelf which extends from 10 to 300 miles beneath the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Bering Sea. These rights were secured at the time the Convention on the Continental Shelf adopted at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea came into force last summer. In recent years, startling discoveries have been made of rich and extensive mineral and other resources on the Continental Shelf. Under the Convention, the United States has sovereign rights on the Continental Shelf not only out to the traditional 200-meter-depth line but far beyond to the extent that this Nation is technologically capable of exploiting the shelf resources.

This bill recognizes the significance of these developments in international law and technology by establishing and announcing U.S. policy to undertake an accelerated program of exploration and economic development of the physical, chemical, geological, and biological resources of the Continental Shelf. For the purpose of executing this program the legislation establishes a Marine Exploration and Development Commission composed of five members—two members to be appointed by the President from private life, the Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense. The bill also provides for the appointment of an executive director. The Commission is given authority to appoint and fix the compensation of other officers and employees as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under the act.

The functions of the Commission are described in some detail in the legislation. The first function of the Commission is to formulate and execute a program of exploration and development of marine resources of the Continental Shelf and waters above the Continental Shelf. More specifically, this would include the identification, location, and economic development of mineral and biological resources of the Continental Shelf, the development of an engineering capability that will permit the exploration and development of these resources and the encouragement of marine exploration and development by scientific institutions and industries through the use of grants, loans, and other cost-sharing arrangements.

In order to carry out its functions, the Commission is authorized to enter into agreements with other Government agencies and with public and private scientific institutions or private enterprises for purposes of carrying out any activities authorized by the act. In many instances, the program of the Commission can be executed through existing agencies, primarily those agencies represented by the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense. In some instances it may be necessary for the Commission to undertake a project through the use of its own employees. At other times it may be desirable to contract with universities and other scientific institutions interested in the field. But I would like to emphasize that there exists today within the Government departments directly concerned a corps of qualified men capable of undertaking this essential program. Within the Department of Commerce, the Coast and Geodetic Survey has already underway a limited program on the Continental Shelf and the same is true with the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Navy has also undertaken work in this field. These departmental and agency efforts should be substantially increased under this legislation.

In addition to the capabilities of our own Government agencies, there is in the United States a reservoir of outstanding talent in our universities and other research institutions which can be used under this legislation on a contractual basis. Finally I would like to emphasize the importance of bringing American industry into this effort by the use of long-term loans, grants, and other cost sharing arrangements. The United States has developed over the period of the last 12 to 15 years a number of foreign and domestic programs under which economic development can be stimulated. Various measures have been used under our foreign aid program to encourage economic development in underdeveloped areas. Other programs have been formulated to assist the redevelopment of areas within the United States. At the present time, however, there is no program directed toward the economic development of our own Continental Shelf.

To carry out the purposes of the act and bring private institutions and industry into the effort, a marine exploration and development fund is established and made available to the Commission for making loans, grants, and other cost sharing arrangements with private institutions, universities, and private enterprises. The Commission is given broad authority in providing the terms for these arrangements with the requirement that the Commission give full weight to the benefits accruing to the Government from the activities. I would hope that the Commission would develop and use a broad range of economic incentives each tailored to meet the particular needs of the project undertaken. For example, a proposal could be entertained for a private company to undertake a survey of a specific resource on a cost sharing basis with the Commission and with the understanding that if the survey leads to an operation by the company the Government contribution to the cost of the survey will be repaid. It is recognized that the risks in the relatively new field of ocean engineering for example are substantial. It is also recognized that both the Government and private industry benefit from these developments. The blending of these interests into a program that will excite economic investment and thereby increase economic growth and employment should be the primary goal of the Commission in respect to this important aspect of the program. Initially the fund is authorized an appropriation of $100 million. In my opinion, this is a reasonably conservative figure which may require an increase in the future if the program is as successful as anticipated.

In addition to the marine exploration and development fund the legislation authorizes an annual appropriation not to exceed $50 million to enable the Commission to carry out its own programing and operational functions under the act. This money will be used to engage its own staff and to contract with existing agencies and with private institutions as may be necessary.

This program on the Continental Shelf, in my opinion, is long overdue. The Continental Shelf may be physically defined as the submerged portion of the continent which slopes gently seaward from the low water line to a point where a substantial break in grade occurs. The point of break defines the edge of the Continental Shelf and the steeper sloping bottom is identified as the continental slope. Traditionally the shelf is identified as the seabed and subsoil of the submarine area adjacent to the coast extending seaward to a point at which the superadjacent waters measure to a depth of 200 meters. On the basis of this measure the Continental Shelf extends from 10 to over 300 miles off the coast of the United States. For example, the shelf extends about 200 miles off Cape Cod, from 50 to 100 miles off the South Atlantic States, and from 50 to 200 miles into the Gulf of Mexico. The Continental Shelf in the Pacific extends off California and Washington States from 10 to 50 miles. The Continental Shelf off the State of Alaska is the most extensive, it being approximately the same size as the State of Alaska with the largest area lying beneath the Bering Sea.

I, however, would like to point out that under the Convention on the Continental Shelf which became effective last June the legal definition of the Continental Shelf is substantially expanded by the inclusion in the definition of Continental Shelf that the shelf extends beyond 200 meters in depth to where the depth of the superadjacent waters admits the exploitation of the natural resources of such areas. To my knowledge this is the first occasion in international law executed by international convention in which the extent of a nation's sovereign right to resources beyond its territorial waters is directly dependent upon the nation's technological capability to exploit the resource.

I understand that it may be possible for the United States to develop in the immediate future equipment that can operate at a depth of 2,000 meters. It is hoped that an engineering capability can be achieved under programs stimulated by this legislation so the United States will obtain under international law the exclusive right to exploit resources off our own coast to that depth. Although there may be a question as to whether the United States under the Continental Shelf Convention could legally homestead the mid-Atlantic ridge, there should be no doubt but that the present trend in this area of international law is to associate sovereign rights over resources with technological capacity to exploit them.

This prospect is very exciting since many resources are found at greater depths. The U.S. Continental Shelf extending into the Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico, and Pacific Ocean—excluding Alaska—comprises 300,000 square miles measured out to a depth of 200 meters. Measured to a depth of 2,000 meters, the area increases approximately 100 percent. The Continental Shelf measured out to a depth of 2,000 meters extends U.S. jurisdiction off the South Atlantic Coastal States for example from approximately 100 miles, as measured by the 200-meter line, to over 300 miles.

During recent years there have been numerous successful and unsuccessful attempts made toward the economic development of Continental Shelf resources. The very successful efforts of the petroleum industry are the most notable. However, there are others, not all as successful. Nodules on the Pacific Continental Shelf have been mined for phosphorus. Manganese and iron nodules found at more extensive depths have been a matter of industry attraction for several years. These nodules contain valuable nickel, copper, lead, and cobalt. What is most fascinating is that these nodules grow and represent in effect self-renewing mines.

I will not attempt here an exhaustive statement of the activities that are presently being undertaken to locate, explore, and develop Continental Shelf resources. I will only point out that a substantial effort has been recently undertaken to explore the mineral mining possibilities of the west coast of the United States. Diamond mining is being undertaken off the coast of southwest Africa. Iron and coal are being taken off the Continental Shelf of Japan; tin off the Malaysian Shelf. Magnesium and bromine are being extracted from the sea at Freeport, Tex.

But I would not care to extend the listing of recent marine resource developments any further without mentioning the possibilities for Alaska. As measured by the 100 fathoms line, about two-thirds of the U.S. Continental Shelf is off Alaska. It is my opinion that the Continental Shelf off Alaska will in the future be the source of extremely valuable mineral explorations. There has been a limited prospecting effort in the waters off Juneau and Nome, Alaska, in search of gold-bearing sands. We also know that there exists chromite bearing sands and iron rich sands on the Continental Shelf off Alaska. The importance of petroleum development out on the Continental Shelf in Alaska has been extremely important to the State and will be even more important, in my opinion, in the future.

This proposed legislation is directed at the development of all resources on and above the Continental Shelf, including fishery resources, Last year 95 percent of the total U.S. fishery catch by volume and 90 percent by value was taken from U.S. coastal and inland waters. At the same time, the fishery resources above the U.S. Continental Shelf was the target of over 1,500 foreign-flag fishing vessels with a catch capacity far exceeding our own effort. Actually, the U.S. catch has remained relatively constant in total volume during the past 30 years while imports have increased to a point that last year fishery imports exceeded domestic production. It is estimated, however, that the U.S. production could increase at least fourfold without any adverse effect on conservation. If this increase in fishery production is to develop in the near future, capital must be encouraged to engage in fishery exploration and the development of a new fishery engineering and technology. I hope this legislation will serve as the vital spark.

A Great Society cannot be blind to any potential resource development. The importance of the resources of the sea has been recognized by President Johnson particularly in respect to this administration's effort to produce fresh water from salt water at an economical cost. This is an excellent program. It is one that in my opinion should be expanded in recognition of the importance of developing all resources of the oceans which represents an area nine times greater than that of the moon. I sincerely hope that this legislative proposal will initiate a new national effort to develop the enormous resources that are awaiting exploration at the water's edge.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point and that the bill be left on the desk for a period of 10 days for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bill (S. 1091) to provide a program of marine exploration and development of the resources of the Continental Shelf, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1091

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Marine Exploration and Development Act."

Declaration of policy

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

The United States acquired under international law on June 10, 1964 sovereign rights to the exploration and development of resources of the continental shelf under the Convention on the Continental Shelf adopted at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. Pursuant to the internationally recognized and exclusive rights so secured, the United States assumes the responsibility of executing an accelerated program of exploration and development of the physical, chemical, geological, and biological resources of the continental shelf.

It is the policy of the United States to encourage private investment in the economic utilization of the marine resources of the continental shelf; to determine the benefits from use of these marine resources for increased investment and economic growth; to make available discoveries and information which may have value to United States industries and to Federal and State agencies concerned with missions on the continental shelf; to develop an engineering capability for operating on the continental shelf and to fashion and operate vehicles and equipment for use in the waters above the continental shelf.

Definitions

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "continental shelf" means the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to (a) the coast of continental United States to a depth of 200 meters or, beyond that limit, to where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of such areas, or (b) the seabed and subsoil of similar submarine areas adjacent to the coasts of islands which comprise United States territory.

(2) The term "Commission" means the Marine Exploration and Development Commission established under section 4.

Commission established

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Marine Exploration and Development Commission to be composed of five members as follows—

(1) Two members to be appointed from private life by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(2) The Secretary of Defense;

(3) The Secretary of the Interior; and

(4) The Secretary of Commerce.

One of the members appointed under clause (1) shall be designated by the President at the time of appointment as Chairman of the Commission. Each member specified in clauses (2), (3), or (4) may designate another officer of his department to serve on the Commission in his absence.

(b) Members of the Commission appointed under subsection (a)(1) shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per diem while engaged in the business of the Commission, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the service of the Federal Government who are employed intermittently. Members specified in subsection (a) (2), (3), and (4), including persons designated to serve in their absence, shall not receive compensation in addition to that to which they are otherwise entitled as officers or employees of the Government but shall be reimbursed for travel or other expenses incurred in carrying out the business of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall have an Executive Director, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Executive Director shall serve at the pleasure of the President and shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for Level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. Subject to the general supervision of the Commission, the Executive Director shall perform such of the functions conferred upon the Commission under this Act as the Commission shall prescribe.

(d) The Commission shall appoint and fix the compensation of such other officers and employees as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions. However, the Commission shall utilize the capacity of existing governmental agencies to the maximum extent consistent with the purposes of this Act. The Commission may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946, but at rates not exceeding $75 per diem for individuals.

Functions of the Commission

SEC. 5. It shall be the function of the Commission to formulate and carry out programs for purposes of exploration and development of the marine resources of the continental shelf and waters above the continental shelf. Such programs shall include but shall not be limited to the following:

(1) Marine exploration, expeditions and surveys necessary to describe the topography and to identify, locate and economically develop physical, chemical, geological and biological resources of the continental shelf;

(2) Cooperative expeditions for these purposes with other Federal agencies having missions on the continental shelf;

(3) Development of an engineering capability that will permit exploration and development of the continental shelf and superjacent waters;

(4) Fostering participation in marine exploration and economic development by scientific institutions and industry, through grants, loans, and cost sharing arrangements; and

(5) Providing for the widest practicable and appropriate dissemination of information concerning marine discoveries, development of instrumentation, equipment and facilities, and other information as the Commission may deem appropriate.

Powers of Commission

SEC. 6. In carrying out its functions under section 5, the Commission is authorized—

(1) To enter into agreements with other Government agencies for the carrying out by such agencies of any activities authorized by this Act, and for the reimbursement from appropriations made pursuant to section (8) (a) of expenses incurred by such agencies in carrying out such activities;

(2) To enter into agreements with public or private scientific institutions, or with private enterprises or individuals, for the carrying out of any activities authorized by this Act, and for the payment from appropriations made pursuant to section 8(a) of all or any portion of the expenses incurred by such institutions, enterprises, or individuals in carrying out such activities; and

(3) To make loans, grants, or other cost-sharing arrangements from the fund established under section 7 to public or private scientific institutions, or to business enterprises or individuals for the purpose of ena-

bling them to carry out activities to further the programs of the Commission.

Marine exploration and development fund

Sec. 7. There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury a marine exploration and development fund which shall be available to the Commission for making loans, grants, or other cost-sharing arrangements authorized by section 6(3). The fund shall consist of amounts appropriated thereto pursuant to section 8 together with amounts received as repayments of principal and payments of interest on such loans. In establishing terms for loans, grants, or other cost-sharing arrangements made from such fund, the Commission shall give due weight to the benefits inuring to the Government from the activities carried out with the proceeds of such loans.

Financing

Sec. 8. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $50,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under this Act.

(b) In addition to appropriations authorized by subsection (a), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the fund established by section 7 the sum of $100,000,000 to remain available until expended.

Dissemination of information

Sec. 9. The Commission shall make available to other interested Government agencies and, to the extent consistent with national security, to public and private institutions, business enterprises, and individuals any information obtained by the Commission in carrying out its functions under this Act.

Reports to Congress

Sec. 10. The Commission shall transmit to the Congress, at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, an annual report of its activities under this Act, together with such legislative recommendations as it may deem desirable.

AMENDMENT OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. Javits. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished occupant of the chair, my colleague from New York [Mr. Kennedy], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and to make certain changes in the treatment works construction program under such act. I point out that this is substantially the measure which we sought to introduce by amendment when the water pollution bill was before the Senate and upon whose contents the Senator in charge of the bill promised very graciously to hold hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1092) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to make certain changes in the treatment works construction program under such act, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of New York), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

ELIMINATION OF NATIONAL ORIGIN QUOTAS

Mr. Javits. Mr. President, for myself, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the immigration and nationality law. This morning I presented my views on this subject to the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table for additional cosponsors until the close of business on the 17th of February.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1093), to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, our national immigration policy has produced an incredible epic of broken lives, divided families, case after case of anguish, despair, and frustration. Surely the time has come to end the piecemeal approach to reform of this policy.

The administration bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], of which I am a cosponsor, is dedicated to the elimination of the discriminatory national origins quota system. I support this principle of S. 500 wholeheartedly. I believe, however, that since that bill provides for the elimination of discrimination in the Asia-Pacific triangle in the year following enactment, the abolition of the national origin quota system should be dealt with just as decisively, and not phased out over the 5-year period provided.

The bill I am introducing, therefore, provides for the elimination of the national origin quota system at the beginning of the first fiscal year after enactment, instead of permitting the discrimination to operate during the 5-year transition period proposed by the administration.

To replace the national origin quota system, my bill would transfer all former quota numbers to a reserve pool, and would permit pooling of unused quotas and their allocation to those on waiting lists on the basis of the existing statutory preference system, which is based primarily on skills and close relationships to U.S. citizens.

First priority on the first 50 percent would then be given to persons whose admission due to exceptional skill or training would be especially advantageous to the United States. First priority on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the first 50 percent not issued to skilled specialists, is given to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens. First priority on the remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the first 30 percent not taken by the first two classes, is given to spouses or children of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. The existing preference system permits any remaining portion to be issued to other qualified immigrants, such as brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of citizens of the United States. Under the existing immigration law, the preference provisions determine only priority between individual nationals of the same country. Under my bill, they would determine priority between nationals of different countries in the world. To prevent unfair benefits to applicants from one country, no more than 10 percent of the total quota numbers could be issued to any area.

The other principal features of my bill are:

First. It establishes a Board of Visa Appeals in the State Department to review questions involving the denial of visas and the application or meaning of State Department regulations applying to immigration.

Second. It establishes a statute of limitations whereby no alien may be deported by reason of conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings.

Third. It affords judicial review of citizenship questions and of both exclusion and deportation orders rather than of deportation orders only, and eases restrictions on review procedure.

Fourth. It would allow Cuban refugees to adjust their status to permanent residence without leaving the United States, as is now required for aliens from countries contiguous to the United States or from adjacent islands.

Fifth. It would afford nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens.

The bill I am introducing today is similar in many ways to the bills I introduced in January 1961 and July 1963 which incorporated and which presently includes, many of the recommendations recently set forth in President Johnson's immigration message. These include the pooling of unused quotas, the elimination of the discriminatory Asian-Pacific triangle provisions, abolition of discrimination against the newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere by providing nonquota status for immigrants from Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago and adjacent islands which may become independent countries, and the removal of restrictions on the immigration of refugees.

Under present laws our national immigration policy opens our national doors wide for many people who do not care to come in, and slams them in the faces of people who would cherish the opportunity to be U.S. citizens. Like most spite walls it is as harassing to those within as those without. It is so offensive to fairminded Americans, whom it is presumably designed to protect, that it has produced a flood of back-door finagling and occasional circumvention by Congress itself. Each week scores of families stream into congressional offices to appeal for help. Private immigration bills make up a major portion of our Federal legislation.

It has been a decade since our immigration wall was perpetuated by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, better known as the McCarran-Walter Act. Time and experience have more than dramatized the fact that, as its opponents contended 13 years ago, it is perhaps as unique a law as we have on our statute books. But these 13 years have also produced an atmosphere of political helplessness to exasperate even the most determined immigration reformers, so that today most as resigned to the now annual practice of settling for piecemeal revisions or temporary relief rather than an effective overhaul of our entire policy of immigration. The back-door methods Congress has used to cover up deficiencies in the basic law is the greatest proof of the law's inadequacies. Since the McCarran-Walter Act was enacted, Congress has passed special, short-term immigration and refugee legislation which has had the cumulative effect of admitting into the United States more than twice as many persons as permitted under the basic McCarran-Walter Act.

But even this piecemeal legislation has represented no relief to the thousands of American families with relatives in countries with heavily mortgaged and oversubscribed immigration quotas. This tragic situation is the result of that section of the McCarran-Walter Act which is admittedly based on national and racial discrimination—the national origins quota system, which remains today a target for Communst propaganda and making our effort to win over the uncommitted nations more difficult. It is based on the rejected racist assumption that people of one ethnic origin are superior socially and culturally to those of another. It was designed and is administered not to admit as many immigrants as we can readily absorb, but to exclude as many as possible.

The time has come to end this blot on our national image with meaningful reform of our immigration policies. I urge prompt congressional action in this field so that we can fashion an immigration policy of which the country can be proud, not ashamed.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for myself and Senators Dirksen, Morton, Cooper, Hartke, and Kuchel, I send to the desk a bill to make Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday.

While Lincoln was, in fact, the founder of my party, I want to point out that this bill has bipartisan sponsorship. This is fitting, for this great national hero belongs not only to one party or one group of our citizens, but to all Americans. He was the symbol of national unity at a time in our history when the very existence of our Nation was at stake. His leadership in that time of crisis, his wise and tolerant counsel and his personal sincere humanitarianism are as meaningful today as they were a century ago. His example inspires not only his countrymen, but free men—and those who would be free—throughout the world.

In April, we will mark the 100th anniversary of the death of this great man. It would be fitting, in this centennial year, not only to memorialize his death, but, even more important, to commemorate his life and renew our dedication to his ideals. So that this will be done annually, I ask prompt action on this measure to make Lincoln's birthday—February 12—a national holiday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1094) making the birthday of Abraham Lincoln a legal holiday, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE OF BASIC RATES OF PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the table for cosponsors until March 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 1095) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

THE NATIONAL RAILROAD FREIGHT CAR SUPPLY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to relieve the glaring shortage of railroad freight cars which annually inflicts hardship and severe monetary loss on the Nation's farm, mine, and lumber producers and processors.

It is most gratifying that many of my distinguished colleagues, quite familiar with the great need for constructive legislation in this area, have joined in sponsoring this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 1 week to afford an opportunity for other Senators who may wish to do so to cosponsor the bill.

It is common knowledge that since World War II we have had car shortages of varying duration and severity each year, shortages which have been particularly acute during the fall months when farmers seek to move much of their produce.

In its July 18, 1964, report to the Senate favoring the enactment of S. 1063, the Committee on Commerce warned that 1964 could be a year of very severe freight car shortages.

In September of last year, there was an average daily shortage of 4,887 freight cars, of which 2,776 were boxcars.

In October the average daily shortage increased to 10,703 cars, of which 7,497 were boxcars.

The daily average for November was 9,238 cars, of which 6,499 were boxcars, and in December, of the daily average of 2,873 cars 1,923 were boxcars.

The daily average shortage during that 4-month period which is so crucial to our economy was 6,926 cars, of which 4,671 were boxcars.

Shortages such as these drastically affect agricultural, and therefore, national prosperity; the employment of thousands of wage earners; food, fuel, and mineral supplies for our mills and factories, and trade and commerce, both domestic and foreign, in essential food products and manufactured commodities.

Western Washington and Pacific Northwest lumber and plywood mills were particularly hard hit by the worsening boxcar shortages which caused production cutbacks, and almost forced the closure of mills and layoffs of workers.

So aggravated and severe was the 1964 boxcar crisis, referred to earlier in my remarks, that the Interstate Commerce Commission was forced to put into effect emergency orders of an unprecedented type, and which might be considered freight car rationing.

These ICC orders required 10 eastern and Allegheny railroads to deliver a daily average of between 25 and 50 cars to 4 northwestern and 4 central western railroads to mitigate the severe 1964 boxcar crisis. These emergency orders did help to send back west badly needed boxcars for agricultural and lumber shipments.

These emergency measures, however, only partially served to relieve the situation.

And there is no hope, under existing law, for further relief.

The Interstate Commerce Commission in its June 18, 1964, report on railroad freight car supply found that in the 1963 crisis, in addition to severe and damaging shortages of boxcars to move agricultural products, there were shortages of gondola cars to haul bar and coil steel, carbonplate, and tinplate. The supply of cars to haul iron ore was very tight. Coal mine operators were forced to lose production in Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania because there were not adequate coal hopper cars available. Lumber shippers in the Pacific Northwest were unable to obtain an adequate supply of wide-door and double-door boxcars.

The plain facts are that fewer new freight cars are being built than are each week and month being retired from service, and most of our remaining rolling stock is far overage. The average freight car age is 19 years.

Because of this high average age, heavy retirements can be expected in the next few years. Despite the widely heralded railroad freight car building program during the last Congress, the total number of cars in the last 2 years has declined by nearly 60,000—a drop of 2,500 cars per month. Two-thirds of this decrease has occurred because of the heavy retirements of boxcars, the workhorse of the car fleet.

On January 1, 1965, the Nation's class I railroads had only a little more than 1,400,000 serviceable freight cars. At the high point of freight car ownership, January 1, 1926, this Nation had almost 2,500,000 freight cars.

As long as it is cheaper for a railroad to rent a car from another railroad than it is to own cars, the national car supply will dwindle. New railroad freight cars cost on an average about $15,000, and some specialized cars much more. A few railroads, however, have successfully refused to pay any more than $2 per day to rent these cars.

Because the railroads cannot agree among themselves on a rental rate adequate to keep our national car fleet from dropping year by year and month by month, I urge the enactment of this legislation. The object of this measure is not to penalize, but rather to provide an incentive to railroad management to build the freight cars essential to the Nation's needs. This measure grants authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix a rental rate which will provide just and reasonable compensation to freight car owners, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

Mr. President, enactment of this bill is urgent. It is the same bill as S. 1063 of the 88th Congress, except the 2-year limitation has been deleted.

Unless the decline in the number of freight cars is stemmed, even rationing of freight cars will not at the peak of this or next year's harvest prevent a crippling economic freight car shortage. We cannot stand idly by and watch economic strangulation of our industry, decline of our farm exports, and payroll layoffs due to a lack of freight cars to carry our Nation's goods.

Again, Mr. President, I call attention to those of my distinguished colleagues who are cosponsoring this bill, and to the opportunity other Senators will have to join with us on this proposed legislation during the coming week.

Present cosponsors are: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

I am sure that before the week is over, other Senators will join as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The bill (S. 1098) to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN TARIFF SCHEDULES RELATING TO DUTIES ON IMPORTED WOVEN CLOTH

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, I have today introduced a bill to correct certain errors and anomalies in the tariff schedules of the United States relating to the duties on imported woven cloth.

As we are all aware, the wool textile industry of the United States is faced with an import problem of enormous magnitude which President Johnson has expressed his determination to resolve. Three times in recent months the President has stated his conviction that imports of wool textiles and apparel must be kept at reasonable levels and that the domestic wool textile industry must be restored to good health.

Occasionally the domestic industry's import problems are compounded by the development of loopholes which enable wool cloth to be brought into the United States at rates of duty much lower than the inadequate rates regularly applicable to such cloth.

One such loophole now being exploited is on fabrics made of blends of wool and vegetable fiber other than cotton. Such fabrics, if in chief value of wool and valued not over $1.26⅔ per pound, are dutiable at 37½ cents per pound plus 60 percent ad valorem; but by blending a small amount—20 to 30 percent—of flax or ramie with inexpensive reprocessed wool, the resultant fabric is classifiable under the new tariff schedules as being in chief value of vegetable fiber other than cotton dutiable at only 10 percent ad valorem.

This loophole could not have arisen under the Tariff Act of 1930 because under that act the duty on the wool content of wool-vegetable fiber blends was assessed at the regular wool fabric rate and only the vegetable content was assessed at the vegetable fiber rate.

This loophole came to light last summer, after the tariff reclassification bill had passed the House. On behalf of the senior Senator from Utah and myself I proposed, and the Finance Committee and the Senate accepted, an amendment to the bill which would have closed this loophole. Unfortunately, for reasons totally unrelated to this provision, the tariff bill died with the adjournment of Congress.

The bill I am introducing today contains another provision which was incorporated in last year's tariff reclassification bill. This provision will assure that no fabric will be dutiable at a rate lower than would otherwise be applicable to it, solely because it has been ornamented or has had tucks taken in it. It corrects an anomalous situation under the new tariff schedules whereby a lower rate of duty on fabric can be obtained even by meaninglessly ornamenting it or meaninglessly putting tucks in it. Even before last year's tariff reclassification bill was developed, Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY of Massachusetts sponsored legislation dealing with this problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1099) to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, relating to the duties on woven cloth, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, in May of 1963 I introduced a bill to create a select joint committee of the House and Senate to review the question of home rule for the District of Columbia and to report back its views on what form self-government should take.

There are so many questions of such great importance in this area that I felt it was necessary to have before us a proposal embodying a precise form of government for the District.

Since 1947 Congress has annually been presented with dozens of bills on home rule, embodying dozens of approaches. Yet, at a point when we may be about to cede certain powers and duties to a new government for the District we have no firm position on how those powers should be relinquished and no definite idea of what style of local government should exercise those powers on their receipt.

Mr. President, at a meeting held by supporters of home rule among the citizens of the District, there was as much controversy over the form of government the District should have as there has been over the issue of home rule itself. Like so many things that come before us, many agree with the principle but are in total disagreement on methods.

Congress has such a stake in the determination of the questions posed by home rule that it would be a mistake for us to use the first bill to come before us as the sole vehicle for consideration. There ought to be a review by a congressional study group of all the home rule proposals so that the measure for our consideration would be a distillation of the best thinking in all the proposals.

It is Congress who is asked to relinquish the powers and duties of legislation over the District. It ought to be a bill patterned after the recommendations of a joint congressional study group which is the vehicle for determination of the question of home rule.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk and ask that it be printed and appropriately referred. Patterned after my earlier bill, it authorizes $50,000 for the creation of a joint congressional study group consisting of five Members each from the House and Senate. Of those five Members, no more than three are to be from the same party. It is essential that home rule receive bipartisan treatment.

This committee would be directed to study the problem of local self-government and come forward with a proposal for the form of government the District should have under a system of home rule. The committee would have only until August 1 of this year to report its findings.

To my way of thinking, nothing related to home rule is more important than that Congress, as a party with a deep and abiding interest not only in the welfare of the residents of the District of Columbia, but also in the future course of relations between their local government and the Federal Government, have a learned and knowledgeable position on such a major piece of legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1102) authorizing an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CREDITING OVERTIME AND HOLIDAY PAY TOWARD FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit Federal employees to have withheld from their pay for retirement purposes their appropriate share of compensation for overtime, night, holiday, and similar work.

Under the present Civil Service Retirement Act, only an employee's basic salary is subject to the 6½ percent payroll deduction; only the basic salary is used as a basis for retirement computations. Current law does not provide retirement credit for work in excess of the normal 40-hour tour of duty.

The bill I introduce today will expand the statutory definition of basic salary to include overtime and holiday pay. Such pay is a regular component of many Federal employees' salaries; since retirement pay should be related to the income received before retirement, this change is needed to prevent too wide a gap between the income received before and after retirement.

Over the years of an employee's career, this change would mean a slightly higher annuity based upon the additional contributions he makes resulting from work in these categories.

The individual who is required to spend hours over and above the normal work cycle or who must perform service on a less desirable shift is certainly performing work, just as he would under normal circumstances. Yet, under existing law, he may not add the value of his work to his retirement account.

Fundamentally, a staff retirement program is designed to permit employees to cease working after the required years of service and at the required age with a reasonable expectation of continuing income to maintain them during the later years of life. This bill is simply an extension of that principle to allow workers to acquire retirement credit for certain periods of work upon payment of their normal share of the retirement cost.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1107) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain additional types of compensation within the meaning of the term "basic salary" for the purposes of such act, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, 81ST CONGRESS, RELATING TO PERMANENCY OF AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, during the past 14 years, the program of school assistance to federally impacted areas, Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, has been responsible for providing urgently needed assistance to local school districts in all 50 States.

The major difficulty with this program has been the necessity for annual or biannual authorizations. Occasionally, this has led to program lapses. For example, when Public Law 815 expired on June 30, 1963, there was a lapse of 5 months before Congress overwhelmingly approved the program's extension. This situation has made it extremely difficult for local school authorities to plan effectively for the orderly development of their programs and facilities. It has also resulted in more costly and less efficient administration of the program.

While I have already indicated my strong support for the program of aid to elementary and secondary schools which has been proposed by the President, and which is now the subject of hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, this legislation does not contain any provision for impacted areas. I believe this program to be essential and I am introducing today legislation which would make school aid to federally impacted areas a permanent program, as well as remove certain inequities which have developed in its previous administration.

The bill eliminates a discriminatory provision in Public Law 874 by allowing large school districts—those with over 35,000 pupils in 1958—to qualify for assistance on the same basis as smaller school districts. At present, large school districts can qualify only if more than 6 percent of their pupil population are federally connected children. Smaller districts need only 3 percent to qualify. This bill provides a 3-percent qualification across the board for all school districts.

Public Law 815 is slightly liberalized. At present, school districts are eligible for funds under this program only if they have experienced an increase in federally connected children of at least 5 percent in the base year. This bill reduces the requirement to 3 percent, the same percentage requirement that would apply to Public Law 874.

Another discriminatory provision in the program is eliminated by permitting real property under the jurisdiction of the Post Office Department to be counted as "Federal property" for the purpose of the act. At present, many children of postal employees are not considered as federally connected children.

Mr. President, tomorrow morning I anticipate appearing before the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to propose that the contents of this bill be embodied as an amendment to S. 370. It is my understanding that this committee has already heard testimony from school administrators in favor of a continuance of the impacted areas program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1108) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, in order to make permanent the authorization for certain payments under the provisions of such laws, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROTECTION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE MENTALLY ILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to preserve and further protect the constitutional rights of American citizens subject to the criminal insanity procedures of the District of Columbia.

Under section 24-301(d) of the District of Columbia Code, it is mandatory for the court to commit to hospitals for confinement, persons acquitted of a criminal offense by reason of insanity. These procedures deny the defendant an opportunity to establish that his mental condition has improved since the date of the offense, that he is not a danger to society, or that confinement in a mental hospital is not the proper treatment for his mental condition.

To permit mandatory confinement in a mental hospital without providing the accused with an opportunity to be heard on the merits of the commitment deprives him of his liberty without due process of law, which is guaranteed all citizens under the Constitution.

The bill I introduce today modifies the mandatory commitment provision of the District of Columbia Code to allow the court to make an independent determination on the issue of whether the defendant should be committed to a mental institution. This determination would provide the defendant with an opportunity to be heard on this issue.

I want to emphasize in introducing this bill, that my interest in protecting the rights of the mentally ill in criminal procedures is twofold: first, to insure that the rights of the mentally ill are protected and, second, to protect society from persons who, by reason of their mental condition, may constitute a peril to the community.

BACKGROUND AND SUPPORTING REASONS FOR CHANGING THE MANDATORY COMMITMENT PROVISION

In conjunction with its extensive investigation of the constitutional rights of the mentally ill, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights conducted hearings on the civil aspects of mental illness on March 28, 29, and 30, 1961. These hearings were, of course, instrumental in the enactment of legislation in the last Congress—Public Law 88-597—to preserve and protect the constitutional rights of the mentally ill in the District of Columbia. During the hearings on civil matters, it was indicated that constitutional problems arise in criminal cases where the defendant's mental condition is at issue. Consequently, the subcommittee conducted further hearings on May 2, 4, and 5, 1961, on the constitutional issues related to criminal cases involving the mentally ill.

When *Durham* v. *U.S.*, 214 F. 2d 862 (D.C. Cir. 1954), was decided, it was discretionary with trial courts in the District of Columbia whether a defendant acquitted by reason of insanity would be committed to a mental institution. Judges were empowered, but not required, to commit the defendant to a mental institution. In response to a report of the Council of Law Enforcement of the District of Columbia, the discretionary commitment procedures were modified by Congress in 1955, so that commitment to a hospital was automatic and mandatory.

A number of witnesses appearing before the subcommittee, criticized the mandatory commitment provision because it was based on the questionable presumption that a verdict of not guilty because of insanity is equivalent to an affirmative finding that the defendant is insane at the time of the commitment proceeding. A verdict of not guilty by reason of insanity in the District of Columbia merely signifies that the issue of insanity was raised, and that the prosecution had failed to prove the sanity of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt. Therefore, the only fair inference from this verdict is that at the time the defendant committed the offense—which may have occurred as long as 6 months before the date of commitment—the defendant suffered from a mental disorder so severe that it is unreasonable to punish him. Since this presumption of continuing insanity is not based on an affirmative finding of the jury, but merely because the prosecution had failed to prove the defendant sane, it is unjustified and unreasonable to deprive the defendant of liberty and deny him an opportunity to be heard on the commitment issue.

Apart from the questionable presumption of continuing insanity, many witnesses stressed the difficulty of obtaining a release from a hospital after once being committed. The defendant who is indigent may be unable to retain independent legal and psychiatric assistance needed to prove his mental stability.

This difficulty is further complicated by the release provisions of section 24-310(e) of the District of Columbia Code, which provide that a person may be released if the superintendent of the hospital certifies: first, that such person has recovered his sanity; second, that, in the opinion of the superintendent, such person will not, in the reasonable future, be dangerous to himself or others; and third, in the opinion of the superintendent, the person is entitled to his unconditional release. After receipt of the hospital certificate the court may hold a hearing on the patient's sanity and must do so if the United States or the District of Columbia objects to the release.

It would appear inconsistent, moreover, to deny the defendant release until he can affirmatively establish his sanity when his initial insanity was never affirmatively established. Basic to this problem, of course, is the present situation in the District of Columbia where the prosecution has the burden of establishing the sanity of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt. As I have said on other occasions, insanity should be made an affirmative defense in the District of Columbia.

Several witnesses raised an additional objection to the mandatory commitment law; namely, that it deprived the trial judge, who may be the person best qualified to make the decision concerning the hospitalization of the defendant, from exercising any judgment on the commitment issue. It was stressed that judges have had much experience in dealing with persons accused of crime who are allegedly mentally ill. The judge has the opportunity to observe the demeanor of the defendant during the trial; he hears all of the testimony, both lay and psychiatric, bearing on the defendant's mental condition; and, finally, he has at his disposal psychiatric reports which may have been introduced during the course of the trial.

Mr. President, I would hope that hearings on this measure might also be an appropriate forum to examine other constitutional problems related to criminal cases where the defendant's mental condition is at issue. For example, the hearings could explore such questions as: whether insanity should be made an affirmative defense in the District of Columbia; and whether provision should be made to provide independent psychiatric assistance to indigents attempting to establish their sanity.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 10 days for the purpose of permitting others to cosponsor it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

The bill (S. 1109) to preserve and protect the constitutional rights of the mentally ill, introduced by Mr. ERVIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROFESSIONAL PHOTOGRAPHY WEEK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week." I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week," introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas professional photography is vital to the economy and welfare of our Nation, touching upon every aspect of this country's economic, scientific, industrial, and family life; and

Whereas 150,000 men and women are engaged in the practice of professional photography; and

Whereas a billion-dollar industry is generated and supported by the activities of the professional photographer; and

Whereas the work of the professional photographer is used by industry in product design, research, manufacture, the promotion of safety, training, purchasing, and sales; and

Whereas professional photography communicates and educates and illustrates in advertising, in our courts, on our farms; and

Whereas in our reach toward outer space, in our search of the oceans' depth, and in research in our hospitals and laboratories throughout the land the professional photographer serves the cause of science; and

Whereas the professional photographer records history for our edification today and the benefit of our posterity; and

Whereas professional photography as an art form has enriched the cultural life of America; and

Whereas professional photography continues in its traditional role of remembrance and recording those we love: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That as a tribute to the professional photographer and his many works and in recognition of the importance of professional photography in our life today and in America's future, the President is authorized to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 2 through May 8, 1965, as Professional Photography Week, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

BENNETT PLACE COMMEMORATION

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce on behalf of myself and my colleague, Senator JORDAN of North Carolina, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution, which is designed to request the President of the United States to remind the American people of the spirit of national unity that is symbolized by the Bennett Place, near the city of Durham, N.C., and to urge them to attend the commemorative ceremonies to be held there on April 24, 1965.

At the humble home place of James Bennett, two generals met to sign the surrender in the second and last major stage in the peacemaking process of the War Between the States. Gen. Joseph E. Johnston's signing of this Civil War surrender to Gen. William T. Sherman, undoubtedly saved countless lives on both sides of the lines and prevented further destruction. The terms agreed upon by these men were designed to restore the Southern States to the Federal Union under honorable conditions. The South considered the terms negotiated there to be a magnanimous effort by General Sherman to bring peace and restore unity with honor. The effort made at the Bennett Place to salve the Nation's wounds and produce unity have not only historic but human interests.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the legislative proposal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) to provide for Bennett Place commemoration, introduced by Mr. Ervin (for himself and Mr. Jordan of North Carolina), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas a profound spirit of unity among Americans underlies this Nation's greatness; and

Whereas a striking and memorable example of that spirit of unity pervaded the negotiations between General William T. Sherman and General Joseph E. Johnston when those opposing commanders in their search for peace met at the Bennett House, near the City of Durham, North Carolina, in April of 1865; and

Whereas through the diligent and unselfish labors of the Bennett Place Memorial Commission over long years, the Bennett House, together with its grounds and appurtenant buildings, has been carefully preserved and now comprises an official State Historic Site, administered by the State of North Carolina, so that the Bennett Place today stands as a permanent symbol of the Nation's unity; and

Whereas the people of North Carolina, imbued with the same sense of unity and concord that characterized the Johnston-Sherman Bennett Place conferences a century ago, and wishing to commemorate the Centennial of those conferences, will hold appropriate ceremonies at the Bennett Place, near the City of Durham, on April 24, 1965; and

Whereas the Governor of the State of North Carolina, the City of Durham, and Bennett Place Memorial Commission have invited the people of the United States to attend those ceremonies: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation, on or before April 1, 1965, reminding the American people of the spirit of national unity that is symbolized by the Bennett Place, near the City of Durham, North Carolina, and urging those who can do so to attend the commemorative ceremonies to be held by the people of North Carolina at the Bennett Place on April 24, 1965.

Sec. 2. Departments and agencies of the government of the United States, including the Civil War Centennial Commission, are hereby requested to cooperate with the Governor of the State of North Carolina, with other public officers and with governmental agencies of said State, and with the City of Durham, and the Bennett Place Memorial Commission in planning and carrying out the aforementioned commemorative ceremonies.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND OPPORTUNITIES IN THE NATION'S ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 23)

Mr. NELSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 370) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier this week I introduced S. 1019, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes, and asked that it remain at the desk to receive cosponsors until the middle of next week. I now ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the desk for further cosponsorship until February 24.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] be added as a cosponsor to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) to authorize and direct the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the marine and freshwater commercial fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, his name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 788) to designate the new Veterans' Administration Hospital in Washington, D.C., the Melvin J. Maas Memorial Hospital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' FACILITIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 969) to amend the title 38, United States Code, so as to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to give 6 months' advance public notice of the planned closing or relocation of any veterans' facility, and to provide for at least one veterans' service center in each State, and for other purposes, the names of Senators Prouty, Cotton, Jordan of Idaho, Burdick, McGovern, Murphy, Scott, Simpson, Cannon, Mundt, Miller, and McGee be listed as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 30, a measure to broaden the legislative authority of the Select Committee on Small Business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1037) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1034) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make and insure loans to certain public bodies and nonprofit associations for the acquisition, construction, improvement or extension of waste disposal and fuel distribution systems and other community services and to make construction grants with respect to certain water systems and waste disposal systems serving rural areas, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of January 26, 1965:

S. 753. A bill to implement the constitutional rights of military personnel by providing appellate review of certain administrative board decisions, and for other purposes: Senators Bayh, Fong, Johnston, and Williams of New Jersey.

Authority of February 2, 1965:

S. 948. A bill to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949: Senators Bible, Burdick, Cannon, Case, Clark, Douglas, Gruening, Hart, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Kennedy of New York, Kuchel, Magnuson, McCarthy, McGovern, Metcalf, Mondale, Morse, Moss, Nelson, Pastore, Pell, Prouty, Randolph, Ribicoff, Scott, Symington, Yarborough, and Young of Ohio.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce forthcoming hearings on constitutional amendments relating to the reapportionment of State legislatures. We have scheduled these hearings to begin at 10 a.m. on March 3, 4, 5, and 9, 10, 11, 1965, in room 318, Old Senate Office Building.

Due to the great amount of interest surrounding this question, we anticipate a great number of Senators and Congressmen will wish to make their opinions known on this matter. Therefore, we plan to confine the testimony given on the first day or so of these hearings to that testimony given by Members of Congress. Following the testimony of Senators and Representatives, we plan to receive the testimony of State officials and constitutional scholars and such other persons who indicate an interest.

The possibility may arise that it would be impossible or impractical to receive the testimony of each and every person or organization who is interested in giving testimony. I would therefore like to note that such other persons will be given an opportunity to submit their statements for the RECORD.

Persons who are interested in airing their views before the subcommittee should contact the staff of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments in room 419, OSOB, on extension 3018.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Text of ABC radio and television program "Issues and Answers," Sunday, February 7, 1965.

PUBLIC LAW 480 ASSISTANCE TO THE NASSER REGIME

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of Public Law 480 aid to the Nasser regime.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DODD

The Senate-House conferees have now reported in favor of and the House has approved the Senate amendment giving the President discretionary authority to provide continued Public Law 480 assistance to the Nasser regime.

And there is little reason to hope at this late moment that anything which I may say will alter the position the Senate has already taken on this question.

However, I consider it my duty, since I oppose the report of the conferees, to state my position for the RECORD.

The history of our times is replete with proof that the appeasement of imperialistic dictators leads only to disaster. This was true with Hitler; it was true with Stalin and his successors; and it has, in recent years, proved true in our dealings with Sukarno and with Nasser.

The debate in the House and Senate has established, I believe, that many Members of Congress, probably even a majority of them, are either opposed to continued aid to Nasser or else have very grave misgivings about it. But, despite its own feelings in opposition, Congress has almost completed voting to give the administration discretion to continue Public Law 480 shipments to the United Arab Republic if such shipments, in the administration's opinion, are in the national interest.

I want to make it emphatically clear that I did not oppose and do not now oppose giving this discretionary power to the President because of any lack of confidence. I consider President Johnson one of the greatest leaders our country has ever produced.

Indeed, I can think of no man among my political contemporaries in whom I repose greater confidence.

I am opposed to giving the President discretionary powers in handling Public Law 480 shipments to the United Arab Republic or any other country because I believe that there is a very important matter of constitutional principle involved in this issue.

The Constitution gives the President authority in the field of foreign relations. But it gives Congress the responsibility to pass on requests for authority and funds for foreign aid and for other executive programs.

Congress takes the testimony of administration officials, private citizens, and Members of Congress, weighs all the evidence carefully, and accepts or amends the administration's requests as its own judgment dictates.

In my opinion, Congress has every right, indeed it has a duty, to make a judgment on whether or not to cut off this aid to Nasser. And I believe Congress is abdicating its own responsibility and authority when it gives this or any other administration the discretionary right to overrule its own decisions in this area.

This is a position I have always taken. It is a position I held under the administration of President Eisenhower and under the administration of President Kennedy. And if I were to alter this position today, I would be doing violence to my conscience and to my basic beliefs.

Again I would like to outline briefly my compromise proposal, because I feel that it makes sense not merely in our dealings with Nasser, but in our present and future dealings with all neoimperialist dictators.

My proposal would have called for reducing Public Law 480 sales to Egypt by one-third or one-fourth of the average figure for the past 4 years. My proposal would also have held out the promise of a restoration of this cut if the Government of the United Arab Republic desists from further aggressive and subversive action in the coming year. And it would have warned of further cuts if, despite American friendship and assistance, Nasser continues to engage in aggressive and subversive activities directly against other countries in the area.

Such an amendment would have satisfied my view, and that of like-minded colleagues, that Congress should exercise fully its constitutional duties.

And at the same time, by leaving the way open either to a restoration of this aid or an additional cut in the future, it would have left room for the President to exercise his constitutional obligation to carry on the conduct of our foreign policy.

I said at the time I first proposed this, and I am still convinced, that only good can come from putting Nasser on notice that our patience is drawing to an end, that we shall still continue to offer him the hand of friendship, but that there will have to be some reciprocal action on his part if he is to continue receiving from the United States the assistance which is essential to the survival of his regime.

In this connection, I call the attention of my colleagues to the statement made on January 11 by Abdul Ghadir Owdeh, a defector from Nasser's secret police. Mr. Owdeh told newsmen in Tehran that President Nasser had been able to stay in power only because of the $1.5 billion in American aid he had received.

While Egyptians are starving, he said, the Nasser regime is selling U.S. food aid to get money for its military and subversive operations, including those in the Congo.

Mr. Owdeh also stated that the majority of Egyptians condemn the United States for supporting the tyrannical Nasser regime.

I have stated my position. At some time in the future I intend to return to this subject because it is my profound conviction that my position will be borne out by the course of events.

THE BIRTHDAY OF JOHN L. LEWIS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, February 12 is not only the birthday of Abraham Lincoln but also of one of the great living Americans, John L. Lewis, president emeritus of the United Mine Workers of America, who will be 85 years old on Friday.

During his 40 years as president of the union of America's coal miners, organized labor in the United States made unprecedented strides. His leadership led to formation of the CIO and has meant better wages and safer working conditions for virtually every wage earner in the United States. He has led through its golden years one great union in my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—the Mine Workers—and formed the other—the United Steelworkers of America.

It is also well to point out at this time that the great union, which he has headed over half of its proud and militant history, was 75 years old on January 25. Founded in Columbus, Ohio, in 1890, the name United Mine Workers has become synonymous with what is best in the American trade union movement.

And so, Mr. President, I am happy to take note of this occasion and to offer my wishes for a "happy birthday" to John L. Lewis and to his great union.

THE PRESIDENT'S CONSERVATION MESSAGE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on Monday, when President Johnson delivered his conservation message to Congress, he presented a bold and imaginative plan for restoration and preservation of the beauty in our environment. In lucid language, he outlined a program that has long been needed, and, I am sure, one which the people of America welcome.

I think a fine tribute to the President's magnificent message was the lead editorial in the Washington Post of Tuesday morning, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 9, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S GREAT MESSAGE

President Johnson's great congressional message on conservation no doubt will take its place among the state papers that have shaped and fixed national policy over decades and generations. It is a declaration of national purpose that surely will stir appropriate response in Congress, in State legislatures, and in the hearts of the American people.

We have already gone so far in the defacement of our environment that much of the task has become that of restoration, as the President points out. But it certainly is not beyond the means of our society to make beauty "more than "just a holiday treat," but "a part of our daily life," to use the President's words.

Much of the President's message deals with programs already in being, but it serves a useful purpose to bring the references to them together and to relate them to each other in a way that binds them into a consistent national program.

The land acquisition program will enrich the life of every area of the country and this region will be particularly pleased to have Assateague Island National Seashore included. Of equally great local interest is the reference to faulty strip and surface mining practices which may be expanded in our own vicinity if appropriate steps are not taken. The highway beautification program will touch every part of the country. The Presidential remarks on the Nation's great rivers will hearten citizens fighting to preserve the Hudson in New York, the St. Croix in Minnesota and Wisconsin, and other streams. The President surely is right in saying that the "time has also come to identify and preserve free flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers before growth and development make the beauty of the unspoiled waterway a memory." The President's proposals for the Potomac area will excite the interest of this whole region and his objectives for this watershed are well put: "Clean up the river," "protect its natural beauties," "provide adequate recreational facilities" and "complete the presently authorized George Washington Memorial Parkway." It is to be hoped that the review to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior will have the same multifaceted approach, mingling all the many values of the stream and its watershed and not falling into the single-purpose plans of the Army Engineers.

The message deals with air and water pollution in a comprehensive way and promises Federal progress toward remedial measures that have always had hard sledding on the Hill.

The White House Conference on Natural Beauty, which will meet next May, ought to be a great forum at which national sentiment can be assembled behind the Presidential purpose. Each of five specific areas of inquiry will arouse the enthusiasm of individual groups struggling alone to preserve some aspect of national beauty. It is good that the Conference is to look into the problems of automobile junkyards, underground installation of utility transmission lines, the relation between taxation and conservation, Federal assistance to the States and national tree planting programs.

The President has made an eloquent and moving appeal to the Nation to "rebuild and reclaim the beauty we inherited" and we hope that appeal will be heard and acted upon, in Congress, in State legislatures, and in local governments.

MATCHING GRANTS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at some time in the history of this Nation there was introduced into Federal funding procedures a concept which may threaten not only to widen the gap between the richer and poorer States, but also to destroy the local initiative it was meant to strengthen. I refer to the concept of the "matching grant."

Within the Federal agencies there are matching grants for improvement of airports, construction of sewers, building of libraries, purchase of scientific equipment, tuberculosis control, and many, many others.

As Perry Swisher, publisher of the Pocatello (Idaho) Intermountain, states:

> The principle behind matching programs is sound. When the locality has its own dollar stake in what's being done, then administration is almost automatically more effective, and local interest is higher.

The weakness of matching grants is, first, that the States able to benefit most are those whose financial position is such that they need Federal help least, whereas the States that need help the most are least able to obtain help. As an example: My State, Idaho, clearly recognizes its need for better public and university libraries. This year, Federal allocations totaling over $1 million have been set aside for Idaho, to be matched by local funds. Yet, as of this date, local institutions have been able to raise only enough money to match $71,000 of the $1 million.

Mr. Swisher in his column, reprinted in the Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune on January 28, takes the Kerr-Mills outlay as another case in point:

> Apparently their (the proponents of the Kerr-Mills bill) hopes are about to be disappointed. It is no oversimplification to say that the States best able to take advantage of Kerr-Mills were those with the greatest available revenue to match Federal money. With only a couple of exceptions, the wealthiest States made the greatest use of Kerr-Mills.

The second defect inherent in the matching-program concept is that, in attempting to multiply local revenue by the use of Federal funds, local government may overlook or put off expenditures of more critical local concern. The successful administrator is rapidly becoming the individual most knowledgeable about which Federal programs offer the most advantageous matching programs, rather than the one best understanding the unique problems and potentialities of the region in which he lives.

Mr. Swisher sounds a clear warning in his recent column, which is worthy of thoughtful attention by Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Some Areas Fail To Get Help Under Matching Plans

(By Perry Swisher)

Boise.—The Federal Government and the great private foundations have a blind spot in common. By trying to help those who help themselves—matching programs, they call this—they excluded from help those areas in which local government is either financially unable or culturally disinclined to get in on the action. [The principle behind matching programs is sound. When the locality affected has its own dollar stake in what's being done, then administration is almost automatically more effective, and local interest is higher.] But this generalization frequently falls down in application.

A case in point is the Federal Kerr-Mills outlay for medical care to the aged. Many of its proponents hoped to forestall Medicare via the Kerr-Mills route. Apparently their hopes are about to be disappointed. It is no oversimplification to say that the States best able to take advantage of Kerr-Mills were those with the greatest available revenue to match the Federal money. With only a couple of exceptions, the wealthiest States made the greatest use of Kerr-Mills.

The rest did not scrape up the necessary State money, either because it was too hard to raise the revenue or because the State governments were not sufficiently awake to the size of the problem.

If we compare per capita incomes, operating cost per capita and personal income, the Plains and Rocky Mountain States might be called lower middle class when placed on a socio-economic scale with the rest of the Nation. The eastern seaboard, the Ohio Valley, the Great Lakes and the Pacific Coast States rank above us in economic strength. Only the South falls below us.

Aside from the difficulty our legislatures face in matching dollars with a multitude of Federal programs, there is also a problem at the local and the personal level. Locked within these States are pockets of ambition, ingenuity, hope and ability that are isolated from the gorgeous goals of the great private foundations.

Sometimes it is State government that stands as a barrier between these local potentialities and the private sources of funds. Just as often it is the same anemia from which State government itself suffers: There is no significant amount of local capital to match the foundation's offer. And the lines of communication between the local "man with a plan" and the foundations are weak.

The capital requirements of new ventures can be immense. With the retreat of the physical frontier into pockets of wilderness, the day of individual innovation is largely past. New effort today requires complex organization after a costly marshaling of facts. One can no longer shout to an eager and unattached populace, "Lets go," and then proceed to move mountains. Society, the economy, is organized, committed, indebted, and living on a schedule that allows for innovation only from within organization. The elaborate interweaving stands against innovation from without.

If change cannot come through the channels of government and the private economy, it stands little chance of coming at all.

We who live where there are no great centers of wealth population or government will not—I earnestly hope—wait till we are another Appalachia. We cannot be heard as distinctly as once we were, a condition we should protest loudly and with the right words.

BUREAU OF THE MINT NOMINATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, today I have reported, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the nomination of Frank Gasparro, of Pennsylvania, to be Engraver in the mint of the United States at Philadelphia.

This appointment of a talented and experienced member of the staff of the mint is a tribute both to Mr. Gasparro and to the Treasury and the mint. I ask unanimous consent that a letter of recommendation from Miss Eva Adams, the Director of the Mint, and a biography of Mr. Gasparro be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

In reporting this nomination today, when the time-honored Assay Commission is meeting in Philadelphia, it is appropriate to pay a tribute to all the officials and employees of the Bureau of the Mint, including Miss Adams, the Director; Mr. Michael H. Sura, the Superintendent of the Philadelphia Mint; and Mrs. Fern V. Miller, Superintendent of the Denver Mint.

The Bureau of the Mint is doing an unbelievably effective job in turning out the billions of coins which are needed in order to end the current coin shortage, while maintaining the quality and beauty of the coins. Recent production figures are:

	Number of pieces (billions)	Face value (millions)
Calendar year 1963	3.6	$161.7
Calendar year 1964	5.57	351.2
January 1965	.598	45.9
January 1965, annual rate	7.2	951.7

There being no objection, the letter and the biography were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Treasury Department,
Washington, February 9, 1965.

Mr. Matthew Hale,
Chief of Staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Matt: Here are 15 copies of a biography of Frank Gasparro, whose name was sent to your committee for confirmation to be Chief Sculptor and Engraver of the U.S. Mint with offices at the Philadelphia Mint.

Also attached is a list of some of the work he has done while in the mint.

For several years past, Mr. Gilroy Roberts, who held the position of Chief Sculptor and Engraver since July 22, 1948, has been ill. During this time, Frank Gasparro handled the work of the Engraving Division for Mr. Roberts and carried out his own responsibilities as well.

Having had this fine experience as assistant sculptor and engraver, I can rest easy if Frank Gasparro is in charge of this division of the mint. As you may know, the Engraving Division has full responsibility for supplying both mints with dies which, under our crash program, is no small task. He is well liked by his fellow workers and acknowledgment of his confirmation would be a great boost in morale to the workers in the mint, as Frank Gasparro is not only a splendid artist, but also has the administrative ability to run his department. This combination is hard to find.

Thank you for whatever you may do to secure his prompt confirmation. As the Annual Assay Commission is meeting in Philadelphia tomorrow, February 10, word of the committee's approval of his nomination would make a happy event for the Assay Commission.

Most sincerely,

Eva Adams,
Director of the Mint.

Biography of Frank Gasparro

Frank Gasparro began his career in the U.S. Mint more than two decades ago as a junior engraver in his native Philadelphia. He entered the mint service at the age of 33, following approximately 19 years of study and research in sculpture and painting both in the United States and abroad.

Between 1924–29, while still in his teens, Gasparro had the unique experience of studying under Guiseppe Donato, who had in the first decade of the 20th century served as an assistant foreman to the internationally renowned sculptor Rodin.

As a student at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts in Philadelphia from 1928–31, Gasparro worked under sculptors and medallists Charles Grafly, Walker Hancock and Albert Laessle. Two Cresson scholarships, granted him by the academy during 1930–31, made possible valuable months of art research in Italy, England, France, Germany, and Sweden.

He launched his career as a freelance sculptor in 1932, working primarily in statuary art and commercial plaster models. He continued in this line of work with the Federal Art Administration, whose staff he joined in 1937. He returned to the ranks of the freelancer once again in 1941, but shortly thereafter entered the mint service.

At the Philadelphia Mint, Gasparro progressed from junior engraver to engraver's assistant, sculptor, and engraver, and finally in April 1962 to Assistant Chief Sculptor and Engraver. His work there has included portraiture, low and high relief medals and insignia designing. In addition to the numerous medals to his credit, is the reverse to the 1-cent coin, and the beautiful reverse of the Kennedy half. He has also worked with foreign coinage.

In 1955, he was presented a $1,000 award by the city of Philadelphia for submitting the winning design in the Philadelphia Medal of Honor contest. This past year he won the emblem contest sponsored by the Treasury Safety Council. His design was selected by the Council over 1,149 other entries submitted by 532 employees representing all 13 Treasury Bureaus.

Gasparro is currently a member of the fellowship board of directors of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, the Society of Medallists and the French Society of the Medal.

He is married and has one daughter Christina. The Gasparros currently reside at 216 Westwood Park Drive, Manoa, Pa.

In response to your request, there are listed below the works executed by Frank Gasparro for the U.S. Government since his association with the Bureau of the Mint in 1942:

1. List medals manufactured by the mint for sale to the public: President John F. Kennedy, reverse; President Dwight D. Eisenhower, first term, reverse; President Lyndon B. Johnson, first term, reverse; Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, reverse; Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, reverse; and Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, both sides.

2. Congressional gold medals: Dr. Thomas A. Dooley III, both sides; Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, obverse (portrait side); Sam Rayburn, obverse (portrait side); and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, both sides.

3. Medals prepared for the meeting of the Annual Assay Commission: 1949, reverse; 1950, obverse; 1951, reverse; 1952, reverse; 1963, reverse; and 1965, both sides.

4. Commemorative centennial medals authorized by act of Congress: Colorado Centennial, 1959, both sides; Pony Express (small), 1960, both sides; Pony Express (large), 1960, both sides; Kansas Centennial, 1961, obverse; West Virginia Centennial, 1963, reverse; Nevada Centennial, 1964, both sides; International Ladies Garment Workers Union, 1964, prepared designs; and Statue of Liberty series medals, 1965.

5. Appreciation medals for both President Dwight D. Eisenhower and President John F. Kennedy for presentation to dignitaries abroad.

6. Miscellaneous medals for Government agencies: Federal Security Agency medal, 1951, obverse; Federal Security Agency Service award emblem; Provost Marshal General badge, 1952; Coast Guard commendation medal, 1952; Department of Commerce medal, 1952; Department of Commerce emblem, 1952; Central Intelligence medal, 1953; Central Intelligence Star, 1953; and Central Intelligence distingushed medal, 1955.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, one of America's outstanding political scienists, Prof. Ralph Huitt, recently began a 2-year study of the legislative branch of the Federal Government. On Sunday, December 13, the Milwaukee Journal published a feature article on Professor Huitt's study and suggested improvement of the legislative branch of the Federal Government. The article was subsequently commended in letters to the Milwaukee Journal from the following distinguished Members and former Members of Congress: Representative Henry S. Reuss, Senator Peter H. Dominick, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, and former Representative Robert Taft, Jr. I commend to the attention of the membership not only the article by Professor Huitt, but also the comments made about it by these distinguished persons.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and the letters be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Dec. 13, 1964]

What Can We Do About Congress?

(Note.—A new drive to reform Congress, its rules and procedures is to start in the session opening January 3. The Democratic study group, a House liberal task force, has been planning strategy for the reform drive, it was revealed last week. Senator Monroney, Democrat, of Oklahoma, called November 25 for creation of a joint Senate-House committee to modernize the congressional machinery. In the longer and nonpartisan view, however, best hope for sound improvements in the legislative branch may lie in a 2-year study of Congress now getting under way, directed by Ralph K. Huitt, a University of Wisconsin professor of political science. The study, sponsored by the American Political Science Association and financed by the Carnegie Corp., may be the most comprehensive analysis of Congress ever made, certainly the most intensive study in nearly 20 years. It is appropriate that a Wisconsin man heads the study, for the last thorough reorganization of Congress came in 1946, through legislation written by the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., and Senator Monroney. The following article is the first published statement by the director of the present study on the aims and methods of the group of scholars he heads.)

(By Ralph K. Huitt)

Despite the remarkable performance of the 88th Congress, it is a fair bet that the 89th will be under heavy attack before it is very old. Congress is a favorite target for criticism, even from its own members. Why is this so? Partly because it is phychologically as well as politically a representative body. The President and the black robed judges walk apart from ordinary men wrapped in an aura of their high office. But Members of Congress are people like us; they mirror our strengths and weaknesses.

It is criticized also because what it does matters. It is a powerful political institution. Almost alone among the world's legislatures it has stood off the absolutism of the executive and remained the coordinate branch the Founding Fathers meant it to be.

NO MODELS FOR CONGRESS

Whatever the reasons, there is a substantial body of congressional criticism, much of which has been surprisingly consistent over two decades.

When, therefore, the Carnegie Corp. gave the Americal Political Association a grant of $230,000 to study Congress, many people assumed—and the temptation was great—the money would be spent telling Congress what it ought to do. Is that not, after all, the job of political science?

Two considerations argue against that approach. The first is that there is no "model" of a proper legislature to which men of good intention can repair. It is true that structure and procedures are important; they do affect outcomes. But how? No one can be sure. Men of political capacity with the backing of strong interest groups tend to control whatever structural arrangements there are and use them for their own purposes. This is the nature of politics.

The result is that "reforms" tend to have strange and unintended consequences. A good example is the reform of the speakership in 1910–11.

"Uncle Joe" Cannon had been a virtual dictator of the House of Representatives, using his considerable powers to set the will of the Republican majority at nought. A coalition of Democrats and insurgent Republicans finally staged a revolution and stripped him of autocratic powers.

What was the reform? Why, a Democratic Rules Committee was made strong. And who are the bad guys today? The Rules Committee, of course—and the "reform" advocated by good liberals is to return the powers of the Speaker.

The Rules Committee is a necessary and rational invention; some agency of the House must control the flow of bills on to the floor and set the conditions of debate. Central party leadership is indispensable and the Speaker should provide it. The relationship of committee to Speaker and the division of power between them is a proper subject for discussion. What is not possible is to make either the vessel of an immaculate public interest existing outside the stresses of politics.

A second consideration is that we do not know much about how Congress really works. There are volumes aplenty on the formal arrangements in Congress but not much on the actual behavior of the people who make them work.

Consider the criticisms and proposed reforms of Congress. There are much too many to list them in detail. It took 62 double column pages last summer for the Congressional Quarterly just to summarize them. Nevertheless they fall into some identifiable categories.

REFORMERS NEED FACTS

One deals with party leadership. Many critics of Congress would like to strengthen it so Congress might operate more like the disciplined lower House generally found now in parliamentary systems.

But what do we know about the work of the leadership as it exists now? The last book on the Speaker of the House of Representatives appeared more than half a century ago. There never has been a book on the floor leadership of either House—only an article or two.

What are the relations of the congressional party leadership with the President of the United States? With their coleaders, the chairmen of the committees? What practices should be strengthened, what weakened, to increase their influence? These are questions which should be answered because the answers will tell the reformers what they are up against.

There is similarly little knowledge about the operations of the standing committees, which we know are little legislatures of specialized jurisdiction. There are studies of individual committees at particular times, but no comprehensive or comparative study of all or most of them over time. Nor have we charted the patterns of their relationships with the administrative agencies which they are supposed to oversee.

Another set of proposals seeks to bring coherence to Congress' budgetary operations. Actually, "budgetary" is misleading, because it suggests an effort to relate expenditures to income. But this is what Congress does not do that reformers want it to do.

Spending is accomplished by passing a dozen or more bills which are prepared by committees—and their subcommittees—which make little effort to work with each other. Taxes are the work of House and Senate committees which do cooperate with each other but not with the spending committees.

The core of the suggested reforms would require these four committees to make a legislative budget, either through joint meetings or a joint committee of their leaders, and Congress to adopt it and live by it.

Just such a requirement was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—and it never worked at all. The provision is still law but no power in heaven or earth could enforce it, because it was enacted without any real consideration of the highly complicated practices in each committee which have evolved over the years and work in the main pretty well.

What is needed before the next try clearly is the most careful study of the political and institutional influences which bear on the taxing and spending process and the probable effect of alternative procedures.

ETHICS OF CONGRESSMEN

Many criticisms of Congress are directed at the conduct of individual Members which bring discredit on the institution.

Congressmen, like other people, break the law and are punished for it. But the real problem arises not from unlawful but unethical behavior.

Members often have interests outside Congress. They hold securities, they practice law, they make speeches and write for pay. They can and must do business with lobbyists, represent interests, and raise money for campaigns. They should and do make trips abroad to see the effects of American policy.

These activities and many more afford opportunities for abuse. The evidence suggests that most Congressmen resist temptation, but some obviously do not. The freewheeling behavior of a few tarnishes the institutional image and all share the blame.

But what should one suggest as a control? A code of ethics for Members of Congress probably would have no more effect in disciplining bad actors than such codes do in other professional groups.

The ultimate policeman over Congress is the voter, of course—but the policeman is often asleep. When public exposure regularly brings defeat at the polls there will be little to expose. That has been proved in England in this century. But when constituencies may return to Congress men under indictment and conviction, or even actually in jail, some Members of Congress understand the lesson and proceed accordingly.

What is needed is to put Congress in context. What explains why the society itself condones and perhaps even promotes irresponsible performance by public officials? Why, on the other hand, do some electors become more demanding and clean house, as the English—and the voters in some American cities and States—have done? These are the basic questions.

BETTER SCHEDULING

There are many suggestions made, often by Congressmen themselves, to make the congressional job easier and more efficient. Scheduling of legislation certainly could be improved; Congress generally wastes the spring and toils late into the fall. Like most people, Congressmen would do better with a vacation at the time other people are taking them. It would seem, however, that such matters should be left to Congress itself.

What then should a study of Congress do? What can and should professional political scientists do to help Congress to do its job more effectively and the public to assess that performance more fairly?

The answer would seem to be to fill in the gaps in our knowledge of congressional process with sophisticated analysis of as many crucial aspects of it as possible.

This suggests not one study but many studies, each carried out by a scholar already deeply immersed in the problem. The many studies become a study of Congress through continuous collaboration among the individuals involved in it, and through a final study attempting to synthesize the others and place them in perspective.

This is the way our APSA study of Congress is proceeding. A dozen young political scientists already have contracted to do parts of it, and at least a half dozen others will join them. Within a couple of years their work should produce the most comprehensive body of basic knowledge of congressional operations we have ever had.

But what about Congress itself, under attack from outside and inside as well, its most responsible Members deeply sensitive to criticism and wanting very much to serve the public well and enjoy its respect? Are the men in the white coats to stand aloof from the hurly-burly and refuse to take sides?

FREE TO CRITICIZE

Not at all. Each individual scholar will be free to criticize and propose as he pleases, even though he contradicts the suggestions of another scholar working on the study. But what the study will not do is adopt a list of "official" recommendations which inevitably would be taken as the point of view of the discipline itself. This is simple honesty. Political scientists are divided on what should be done about Congress, as they are on most subjects.

Moreover, it recognizes the basic truth that political scientists are not equipped to prescribe structures and procedures guaranteed to produce certain outcomes. The stakes in politics are increasingly large; politicians and their allies will struggle to get their way by whatever apparatus is provided. There are no organizational gimmicks which furnish shortcuts to wise policy.

The study of Congress, therefore, will try to do what professional scholars are trained to do: It will explain what it is and analyze alternatives to it. The individual studies should be invaluable staff papers for congressional committees or citizens' groups which want to make their own proposals for congressional reorganization.

ABOUT THE WRITER

The writer, Professor Huitt, is a man of many jobs and titles. Besides being director of the study of Congress and professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin, he is director of the Wisconsin Center for Education in Politics, Madison, as well as legislative representative in Washington of the president of the university. Huitt frequently spends two or three days a week in the National Capital. A native of Corsicana, Tex., with degrees from Southwestern University and the University of Texas, he was a destroyer escort officer in the Navy in World War II. He joined the University of Wisconsin faculty in 1949 and on a faculty fellowship of the Ford Foundation served in 1954 on the staff of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, Democratic leader. In 1958 he was legislative assistant to Senator Proxmire (Democrat of Wisconsin) and in 1960 was speech writer for Senator Johnson in his vice-presidential campaign. He did research on the legislative process in 1960–61 on a Rockefeller Foundation grant. He has served on the executive committee of the American Political Science Association and has written extensively for political science journals.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 13, 1965]

PROCEDURES IN CONGRESS

To the Journal: I commend the Journal and Prof. Ralph K. Huitt for the excellent article on reform of Congress in the December 13, editorial section. His view wisely encompasses all facets of congressional activities—rules and procedures, committee structures, budgetary practices and conflict of interest. He emphasizes the need for a much more thorough understanding of Congress than has ever before been achieved.

This approach promises to create a body of information which will be invaluable in reshaping Congress along more democratic lines. Meantime, there has been a more immediate answer to the question posed in the headline, "What Can We Do About Congress?" The House of Representatives adopted on January 4 the most important changes in its rules since the great reforms of 1909–11.

The Rules Committee was divested of its power to delay, dilute or defeat legislation by refusing to send it to the floor of the House for a vote. Now a bill can be brought up for action after the Rules Committee has sat on it for 21 days. The Rules Committee also was deprived of its power to block legislation by preventing a conference to resolve differences between the versions passed by the House and Senate. Now legislation can be sent to conference by a majority vote of the House. These are key reforms for which I have been working for years.

In the Senate, the fight against filibuster and other abuses is yet to be won. A number of us have introduced legislation for a Joint Congressional Committee on the Organization of Congress. This could lead to additional reforms, as a similar committee paved the way for the La Follette-Monroney reforms of 1946.

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
Fifth District, Wisconsin.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

FROM COLORADO SENATOR

To the Journal: Thank you for your recent article on congressional reform. I have just added my name as a cosponsor to a Senate Resolution which would establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. This resolution is almost identical to that introduced by Senator MONRONEY and the late Senator La Follette, which passed Congress in 1946 and resulted in the first reorganization of Congress in 60 years. We are hopeful that we may obtain early favorable action on this resolution, which could be a real step forward in congressional reform.

PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senator, Colorado.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

FROM HUBERT HUMPHREY

To the Journal: Thank you for Professor Huitt's article on the congressional studies project of the American Political Science Association. I have been following Professor Huitt's work and the work of the APSA with great interest. I am sure their studies will make a major contribution to better understanding of this remarkable legislative institution known as the U.S. Congress. I await their results with great interest.

HUBERT HUMPHREY.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

SEPARATION OF POWERS

To the Journal: I read with care your article by Professor Huitt and am interested to know a little more of this study. It seems to me the approach is an excellent one. Congress is indeed a most complicated body and there is all too little knowledge of its workings even among many of the Congressmen themselves.

As the article points out, it seems unlikely that anything other than minor changes can be made at the outset of this session and until a comprehensive study has been completed. It is an excellent idea that the studies involved not come up with a specific list of recommendations. For Congress itself seems certain to jealously guard the prerogative of suggesting and carrying out any changes that can be agreed upon.

Perhaps because of this it is important to have an unbiased report on current operations to work from, so that public opinion can play an important part in the final decisions arrived at.

It has long been my feeling that the 1910 congressional revolution has indeed outworn its usefulness and that the powers of the leaders in Congress in both parties must be expanded and party responsibility more clearly defined.

To do otherwise in a period in which the executive is constantly building up its power seems to me to threaten the separation of powers concept, which, I agree with Professor Huitt, is so vital and necessary to the working of our Government and to the ultimate protection of individual freedom for which we aim.

ROBERT TAFT, Jr.
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

THE UNITED STATES-CANADIAN AGREEMENT ON TRADE IN AUTOMOBILES AND PARTS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the newly negotiated agreement on United States-Canadian trade in automobiles and automotive parts has recently attracted considerable attention.

This agreement requires the enactment of legislation by Congress.

The Washington Post recently raised a number of very alarming questions about the agreement, and called upon Congress to approach it "in a spirit of unflinching criticism."

I have been concerned for a long time about the duty remission device which Canada was using to subsidize its automotive-parts manufacturers, at the expense of American firms, including some in the State of Wisconsin. I have had considerable correspondence over this matter with the Treasury Department and with concerned businessmen.

I share the concern expressed by the Washington Post about the details of this free trade agreement; and I hope other Members of the Congress will join in giving the proposal the closest possible scrutiny, in order to make certain that it truly works for the benefit of our two countries and the important businesses which are involved.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Washington Post editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 17, 1965]

FREE TRADE FOR WHOM?

President Johnson and Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson have reached an agreement to eliminate most of the tariffs in the automobile trade between Canada and the United States. A free trade compact, aimed at establishing a single and more efficient North American automotive market, has an instant appeal for proponents of a more liberal international order. But rhetoric can be treacherously misleading. The document to which signatures were affixed in Johnson City contains a number of unpleasant surprises. What is more, its success is contingent upon the fulfillment of a parallel agreement between the major U.S. automotive manufacturers and the Canadian Government, an agreement that is shrouded in secrecy.

In an effort to improve her balance of trade, Canada in 1963 instituted a plan under which Canadian-based auto manufacturers earn duty remissions on the parts which they import by increasing exports to the United States. This export subsidy scheme worked to the advantage of the major American auto makers, the Big Three that operate on both sides of the border. But the consequent shift of production in Canada inflicted injury upon those independent parts manufacturers who produce only in this country. Legal action was brought to compel the Treasury to levy countervailing duties against the Canadians, and an effort to avert a tariff war led to the proposed agreement.

The 3-year compact provides for a duty-free trade in automobiles and original parts that is limited to producers. Chrysler, Ford, and General Motors can trade freely with their Canadian subsidiaries, but the same privilege is not extended to the Canadian citizen who would take advantage of lower prices in the United States. Genuinely free trade in automobiles would confer solid benefits on consumers through lower prices. But the outcome is in doubt when the freedom is limited to producers.

There is no doubt at all that the compact is discriminatory. The Canadian Government is empowered to designate the manufacturers who would be eligible to engage in the duty-free trade with this country, thereby closing the free market to European and Japanese producers. These provisions clearly violate the spirit if not the letter of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, a fact that will be underscored by strong protests from the excluded countries.

Free trade would tend to concentrate auto production in this country, and to avert that development the Canadian Government has obtained assurances from the American producers that the output of their Canadian subsidiaries will be increased. The details are a secret, but it is understood that Canadian output will be boosted by $250 million over and above the current growth trend. And to seal the political bargain, the United Auto Workers have been assured of adjustment assistance for displaced workers on terms which are sensibly denied under the Trade Expansion Act.

Good intentions have hatched a scheme, tailored to the needs of the major manufacturers, that bears an ominous resemblance to the bilateral trade restrictions of the 1930's. Unless Congress approaches it in a spirit of unflinching criticism, free trade will again fall victim to the deadly embrace of its friends.

FORTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, February 16 will be the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. It is a day I like to draw attention to each year as a reminder to Americans to cherish and work for the freedom and independence that democracy has given us. There are few aspirations that are as enduring in men's hearts as freedom. But political liberty is hard to win and, once won, hard to protect.

I also choose to speak on Lithuanian Independence Day to send some assurance to the Lithuanian people that we in the United States have not forgotten or forgiven the violent assault on their nation by the Soviets in 1940. That compound crime: destruction of a legally constituted government, murder and imprisonment of thousands of innocent people, and forceful annexation by an alien regime, was a nightmare of barbarism which we can never forget.

The brave people of Lithuania still cherish a unique national heritage which the repressive uniformity of communism cannot stifle. There is no reason to believe that this courageous people's determination to be free has waned at all in 47 years.

At the time of the first World War, a great many Lithuanians came to our country, escaping czarist repression. They are among our best citizens. They have the courage and the strength that comes only from firm faith in God and His justness, and a conviction of their own destiny as freemen. This faith has bolstered the Lithuanian people throughout long, dark years when freedom has been no more real than a memory and a dream.

In the winter of 1918, Lithuanian independence was declared in the midst of a struggle to fend off Russian encroachment. That proclamation was a direct response to President Wilson's declaration of the principle of self-determination. Free Lithuania was recognized by the great powers and, in 1921, became a member of the League of Nations.

During the 20 years of independence that followed, the Lithuanian Nation demonstrated a fantastic determination to succeed. The Government maintained a stable currency and industry was developed with impressive success. Great strides were made in agriculture, land reform, transportation, education, and social welfare. The people of Lithuania benefited from one of the highest standards of living in Europe at the time.

Communist Russia, struggling with an unstable currency, rationed food and clothing and popular discontent, could not tolerate the vivid contrast. They decided to simply incorporate their successful neighbor. The Red army moved into Lithuania in June of 1940 and, since then, those noble people have suffered hardships and despair that we who live in freedom cannot imagine.

We in the United States have never recognized the Soviet annexation of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors. We continue to maintain diplomatic relations with their prewar governments which are now in exile. The policy of nonrecognition was originally established by President Roosevelt. It has been reaffirmed by each succeeding administration and by the Congress when it passed my Captive Nations Week Resolution in 1959.

We support the unquenchable longing for freedom of the Lithuanian people and, on this occasion, we join their families and friends here in America in looking forward to the day when independence will be restored and Lithuania will again be free.

WE ARE LEARNING TOO LITTLE, TOO SLOWLY, ABOUT FALLOUT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have two letters printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The first, addressed to Dr. Donald Chadwick, Chief of the Division of Radiological Health of the U.S. Public Health Service, was written by me on January 6; the second, Dr. Chadwick's reply, was written on January 28.

I asked Dr. Chadwick five specific questions concerning the surprisingly large and continuing buildup of radionuclides in the inland Arctic Eskimo, as well as in the Arctic wildlife and flora. This increasing contamination raises very serious questions of public policy, questions which in the manner of their resolution carry implications for each and every American citizen.

The questions raised by this contamination demand answers. The proliferation of atomic weapons has not ceased. The permanent suspension of atmospheric atomic weapons testing is not assured. Red China and France may be but the first of many nations to develop the capacity and the perverse will to pollute the winds with radioactive poisons. As has often been pointed out in the history of man, the human race has never yet invented a weapon which has not sooner or later been brought into play.

For the above reasons, it is vital that adequate research be undertaken and adequate thought be given to these questions: How much contamination must a population obtain before countermeasures are called into play? How closely must overall contamination levels in population groups be watched? It is to such questions as these that my continuing correspondence with Dr. Chadwick is directed.

Adequate solutions to these questions are yet to be found. I would not be surprised to find in the months ahead that increased amounts of time and money will be required for a stepped-up pursuit of these problems. Here and now I pledge to the Senate that in the Appropriations Committee and here on the Senate floor I will do all that is necessary to make sure that our Nation's radiological health studies receive all the funds and all the assistance they may require.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 6, 1965.

DONALD R. CHADWICK, M.D.,
Chief, Division of Radiological Health, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. CHADWICK: This is in further reply to your letters of October 16 and November 10, 1964.

I should like first of all, again, to thank you for your continuing deep interest and concern in the problems of judgment and safety raised by the increasing radioactive contamination of the Arctic food chain. Your work and that of the Division are appreciated not only by me but by all Alaskans.

As we both are so well aware, the cesium 137 body burdens of the Eskimos at Anaktuvuk Pass have tripled over the last 2 years. The level of cesium 137 borne by these people is three times what it was when I first spoke to the Senate about the problem. I said then, as I say now, "A grave and potentially dangerous situation exists in the Arctic regions of our Nation * * *. Practical action is needed and the Federal Government dare not duck its responsibility."

The average cesium 137 body burden levels at Anaktuvuk are now quite clearly above the so-called acceptable levels for populations as set forth in the radiation protection guide established by the Federal Radiation Council. The level considered to be acceptable for population groups by the Federal Radiation Council is almost three times greater than those set forth as acceptable by the National Council on Radiation Protection and the International Commission on Radiological Protection. By these latter criteria the Anaktuvuk levels are of even greater concern.

As I said to you in my letter of October 30, reputable scientists writing in the magazine Nuclear Information, a reputable journal, have predicted that "even without the resumption of atomic testing, cesium 137 levels in the bodies of Arctic people will continue to rise until 1968. Even without additional testing, it can be expected that maximum values in individuals will reach such levels as 3,500 nanocuries."

The October 1964, report of the Federal Radiation Council, page 21, paragraph 3.27, speaks of Arctic fallout problems: "Estimates of doses to individuals (living in Arctic villages) in 1964 based on these measurements range up to about 400 millirems. Depending upon the further fallout expected and the long-term retention in the food chain, this might correspond to 30-year doses ranging up to several rems." Thirty years of a dose of 400 millirems would produce a dose of 12 rem, which I should call more than several, and which is 2.4 times the acceptable permissible dose for population groups, almost equal to the level for acceptable individual exposure. To the radiation received from cesium 137 must be added the radiation from the other radionuclides. Certainly both strontium 90 and strontium 89 are also present in contaminating quantities in the Arctic food chain.

Your letter to me of November 10 points out that radioactivity levels in Alaska are only "slightly above normal" following the Chinese tests, whereas levels in the lower 48 were considerably higher. This is, of course, not really greatly reassuring. Fallout on the Arctic slope has always been significantly less than that of the lower 48 States. The hazard in the Arctic is caused by the longevity of the component parts of the Arctic food chain.

The half life of cesium and strontium is quite long. The life of Arctic mosses, sedges, and lichen is quite long. The caribou live to graze many seasons. Unlike the food chains of the more generous climate to the south, the Arctic food chain is long lived and it treasures the radioactivity which it sifts and saves from the air. As a result relatively minor increase of radioactivity in the air will produce significantly greater deposits in men in the Arctic than it will elsewhere.

This is why I was concerned by the Chinese tests. In your letter of October 16, written before the tests, you said, "We share your view that the Alaska situation is far more complex than has been anticipated and requires careful attention." This complexity can only have been increased by the entrance of Red China as a nuclear power, and the need for careful attention can now only be the greater.

For this reason I would appreciate having your answers to the following five questions. I know of course that some are not easy of answering, but I will appreciate whatever you can come up with.

1. Have any estimates been made of the overall radiation being absorbed from all sources, internal and external, by the villagers of Anaktuvuk? If not, would it be possible to give thought to the development of such an estimate?

2. Have any estimates been made as to what the end effect on the body burden of the Alaska Eskimo will be as the result of a single Chinese test series? And has any thought been given to the effects on the Arctic food chain and on the Arctic Eskimos of several years of consecutive test series?

3. A year ago in a meeting with you and other officials it was agreed upon that work would begin on the study and development of suitable countermeasures to be invoked when and if they should become necessary in the Arctic. What has been done on this? How

high do you now believe contamination levels will have to go before such countermeasures would be called for?

4. May I please, as soon as it is available, have a breakdown from your fiscal 1966 budget of what money is to be expended on your activities in Alaska and on your studies of the Arctic food chain?

5. Before the news of the Chinese tests, you told me, in your letter of October 16, that the division was giving consideration to the need, location, and cost of a laboratory in Alaska for the study of Arctic radiation. My interest in this project was heightened by the Chinese blast as yours was too, no doubt. Have decisions yet been reached on where to place and when to build this facility? Please let me know and I will do all that I possibly can to be of assistance to you in this effort.

The October 1964, Scientific American contains a most significant article by Jerome B. Wiesner and Herbert York, "National Security and the Nuclear Test Ban," which I have just now found time to read. I found one sentence rather alarming. The authors, scientific advisers to the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, say in their first paragraph, "Contamination of the atmosphere by fission products and by the secondary products of irradiation (notably the long-lived carbon 14) was approaching a level (nearly 10 percent of the natural background radiation) that alarmed many biologists."

Contamination of the Arctic food chain is today far, far higher than that.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1965.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: We appreciate your thoughtful letter of January 6, 1965, expressing continued concern about the environmental radiation problems in Alaska and requesting information on five specific questions. Our answers to these questions follow:

1. Have any estimates been made of the overall radiation being absorbed from all sources, internal and external, by the villagers of Anaktuvuk? If not, would it be possible to give thought to the development of such an estimate?

Answer. To our knowledge, no such total exposure estimates have been made. We are reviewing available information to determine what additional data are necessary to estimate the relative contributions from internal and external sources with reasonable accuracy.

2. Have any estimates been made as to what the end effect on the body burden of the Alaska Eskimo will be as the result of a single Chinese test series? And has any thought been given to the effects on the arctic food chain and on the arctic Eskimos of several years of consecutive tests?

Answer. In our opinion the Chinese test that has been announced will contribute relatively little to the total exposure of the Alaska population. We are giving considerable thought to what might be the effects of future testing on the Arctic food chain and those dependent on that chain. These effects would, of course, depend on the number, frequency, type, and magnitude of further tests by China or other nations. Estimates of the effects of further testing also would require much additional technical data in order to be able to relate fallout levels to exposures of population groups. We are seeking to obtain this additional information as rapidly as possible with the resources available to us.

3. A year ago in a meeting with you and other officials it was agreed that work would begin on the development and study of suitable countermeasures to be invoked when and if they should become necessary in the arctic. What has been done on this? How high do you now believe contamination levels will have to go before such countermeasures would be called for?

Answer: We have had consultations with staff members from the Arctic Health Research Center and Division of Indian Health, Public Health Service; Bureau of Indian Affairs and Fish and Wild Life Service, Department of Interior; and the Alaska State Department of Health and Welfare. Among the suggested cesium 137 countermeasures are the following:

(a) Substitution of reindeer meat for caribou meat if noncontaminated herds, or herds with significantly less contamination can be identified. (Based on the limited data secured from our expanded surveillance of reindeer herds, our tentative judgment is that this measure would not be effective because levels in reindeer are comparable to those in caribou.)

(b) Altering the period of maximum caribou kill to correspond with those periods when cesium 137 concentrations are at their lowest. Determining the feasibility of this measure would require careful, and probably long-term on-site investigations of: whether caribou carcasses stored in pits below the permafrost line could be carried over to the next season; the availability of caribou to the hunters during the critical period; and the impact on the socioeconomic patterns of the peoples concerned.

(c) Substitution of lower States beef for caribou meat. This also requires feasibility and socioeconomic, or cultural impact studies.

(d) The suggestion has been made that affected groups in Alaska could be evacuated and relocated in areas where food supplies are relatively free of cesium 137. Such a measure involves considerations far beyond the radioactivity levels to which the population groups are being exposed. Naturally, in any study of such a measure by the agencies having primary responsibility for the general welfare of arctic populations we will be glad to help in every way possible.

Decisions as to the level at which various proposed countermeasures against radiation exposure should be applied to any given population group depend on judgments as to the balance between the radiation risk and the total impact of the countermeasures intended to reduce the risk. At present we do not have sufficient information, particularly concerning countermeasures, to formulate such judgments. The FRC has, however, pointed out that the levels developed for source control of normal peacetime operations in the nuclear energy industry are not directly applicable in this type of situation.

4. May I please, as soon as it is available, have a breakdown from your fiscal 1966 budget of what money is to be expended in Alaska and on your studies of the arctic food chain?

Answer. Our adjusted appropriation for fiscal year 1965 is $19,688,000. This amount includes $119,000 originally budgeted for activities in Alaska, including the radiation surveillance network of air stations, pasteurized milk sampling, the institutional diet network station, and our original caribou sampling program. During this year we are reprograming an additional $30,000 to cover augmented reindeer and caribou sampling, human bone sampling for strontium 90 and cesium, additional analyses of native diets and some estimates of cesium body burdens in areas not presently being covered. This is supplemented by services from other agencies totaling approximately $34,000. The President's budget for fiscal year 1966 which has just been sent to Congress, includes the sum of $20,818,000 for radiological health. This permits a continuation of our fiscal year 1965 program levels, the additional funds being sufficient to cover mandatory costs, the expense involved in occupying new laboratory space in Las Vegas, and a modest increase in research grants.

5. Have decisions been reached as to where to place and when to build this facility (a proposed radiation laboratory facility in Alaska)?

Answer. At the time a radiological health facility in Alaska was first discussed the possibility of locating other Public Health Service environmental health facilities was also under consideration. As soon as reasonably firm plans for this more comprehensive approach have been developed our particular needs will be considered in this context. Any recommendations we make to our superiors will be conditioned also by the relative cost of analyzing environmental samples at an Alaska facility as compared to the cost of shipping such samples to our established regional radiological health laboratories.

Please be assured that we are continuing to devote attention and resources to this most complex situation.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD R. CHADWICK, M.D.,
Division of Radiological Health.

TRIBUTE TO THE POINT HOPE ESKIMOS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Point Hope, Alaska, Eskimo dancers who came to Washington for the inauguration, and entertained us in the inaugural parade.

With the help of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, seven Eskimos from Point Hope traveled 6,500 miles to attend the event. Only one of the seven had ever before been outside the State in which he was born.

The group was headed by John Oktollik, and included Jimmy Killigivuk, Patrick Attungana, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Kinneeveauk, and Mr. and Mrs. David Frankson. Mr. Frankson has served as Point Hope's postmaster for 36 years, and took his first leave from his position to come here.

These fine people appeared on the nationwide TV show "Today," where they had an opportunity to display their typical fur parkas. They also were favorites at a dance given for them and about 200 American Indians from several other States. All Episcopalians, they were given a special tour of Washington Cathedral, and found it somewhat different from St. Thomas' Mission, at Point Hope.

With them they brought, for presentation to the President, an elaborately carved ivory tusk showing a driver and sled dogs. This carving was an inauguration gift from the people of Point Hope to a man they greatly admire.

Mr. President, the delegation from Point Hope did a splendid job in representing our State at the inauguration. All Alaska is proud of them.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE CALENDAR

On motion by Mr. Mansfield, the following calendar measures were considered and acted upon as indicated, and excerpts from the reports were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DR. ROBERT HUTCHINGS GODDARD DAY

The bill (S. 301) to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds that rapid advances and developments in the fields of astronautics and related sciences are having an increasing impact on the daily lives of the people, the national security, and long-range human progress. It is therefore desirable and appropriate that steps be taken to promote greater public knowledge of the progress and achievement being brought about in these fields, and for that purpose to provide for special recognition and honor to Doctor Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics, and to designate and set aside a special day to honor his memory and his accomplishments.

Sec. 2. (a) The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in the fields of astronautics and related sciences by providing for appropriate ceremonies, meetings, and other activities on March 16 of each year, a day to be known and celebrated as Goddard Day in honor of the epochal achievements in these fields by the late Doctor Robert Hutchings Goddard.

(b) The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government and the public to participate in the ceremonies, meetings, and other activities held in observance of Goddard Day.

The excerpt from the report (No. 60), explaining the purposes of the bill, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide for the designation of March 16 of each year to be known and celebrated as Goddard Day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard.

STATEMENT

Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern-day rocketry, was born in Worcester, Mass., on October 5, 1882. There, in 1899, his inquiring mind led him to conceive the possibility of a spaceship which could fly from planet to planet. At the age of 17 he began to pursue a course of study and research which led him on March 16, 1926, to become the first to test and launch successfully a liquid-fuel rocket—the parent of all the Redstones and sputniks that will ever circle the earth. It is the anniversary of this event in Auburn, Mass., which would be commemorated March 16 of each year.

Dr. Goddard studied at Worcester Polytechnic Institute and Clark University in Worcester, Mass. While still an undergraduate he submitted several essays on his technical theories of rocketry, all of which were regarded as mere speculative nonsense—theories which today are being translated into reality on both American and Soviet drawing boards. Despite public ridicule—the nickname of "Moony" was given him when his efforts were revealed to the press—Dr. Goddard continued his research, financed by grants from Smithsonian Institution and later from the Guggenheim Foundation. In the early thirties he conducted further experimental tests near Roswell, N. Mex., with a loyal crew of assistants, and was the first man ever to launch a liquid-fuel rocket which attained a speed greater than sound. Other firsts followed.

The results of his research were made public, but the only people who expressed any particular interest were German scientists. His ideas, offered to the U.S. military in 1940, received only courteous inaction. Not until 1944 when the German V–2 rocket hit London, did this country realize what a mistake had been made. The V–2 rocket was patterned largely after Dr. Goddard's work. If we had had the vision and foresight to capitalize on Dr. Goddard's revolutionary inventions 30 years ago when they were developed, instead of ridiculing him, there is no question that we would have had an unbeatable lead in today's space race.

Dr. Goddard died in 1945 and only today are the important contributions which he made to the whole era of space being recognized. In 1959 Congress voted to award him posthumously a gold medal for his work, and this was presented to his widow in 1961 on the occasion of the dedication of the Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Md., in his name.

Dr. Robert Goddard may have been disappointed often, but he never became discouraged. He persevered despite serious obstacles which would have stopped a lesser man, for he was driven on by the dream he had had as a young man of spaceships flying through space. The fact that the U.S. Government has recently paid $1 million to Dr. Goddard's estate for infringement of his patents dating back to 1912, in the building of both today's rockets and the experimental X–2's and X–15's, emphasizes the basic foundations which Dr. Goddard laid for today's rocket industry.

The committee is of the opinion that this legislation has a meritorious purpose by calling public attention to the deeds of Dr. Goddard on March 16 of each year and the great contributions that he made to the Government by his scientific knowledge and studies.

Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of S. 301, without amendment.

MANSON UNIT, CHELAN DIVISION, CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, WASHINGTON

The bill (S. 490) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of supplying irrigation water for approximately five thousand eight hundred acres of land, undertaking the rehabilitation and betterment of works serving a major portion of these lands, conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and enhancement of recreation opportunities, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). The principal works of the unit shall consist of dams and related works for enlargement of Antilon Lake storage, related canals, conduits, and distribution systems, and works incidental to the rehabilitation of the existing irrigation system.

Sec. 2. Irrigation repayment contracts shall provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law. Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay during the repayment period shall be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Chief Joseph Dam project. The term "construction costs", as used herein, shall include any irrigation operation, maintenance, and replacement costs during the development period which the Secretary finds it proper to fund because they are beyond the ability of the irrigators to pay during that period. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Manson unit shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by the Secretary.

Sec. 3. The Secretary is authorized, as a part of the Manson unit, to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the unit area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to assign water and reservoir capacity to recreation and to provide for public use and enjoyment of unit lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other project purposes. The Secretary shall transfer lands acquired for the unit within exterior national forest boundaries to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as national forest, and jurisdiction of national forest lands within the unit shall remain with the Secretary of Agriculture for recreation and other national forest system purposes: *Provided,* That the lands and waters within the flow lines of any reservoir or otherwise needed or used for the operation of the project for other purposes shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior to the extent he determines to be necessary for such operation. The costs of the undertakings described in this section, including costs of investigation, planning, Federal operation and maintenance, and an appropriate share of joint costs of the unit, shall be nonreimbursable.

Sec. 4. Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife resources shall be considered as project costs and allocated as may be appropriate among other project functions.

Sec. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user on the Manson unit, Chelan division, for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the Manson unit, $12,400,000 (October 1959 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said unit.

The excerpt from the report (No. 61), explaining the purposes of the bill, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

PURPOSE OF BILL

S. 490, sponsored by the two Senators from Washington, Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON, provides for the improvement and enlargement of an existing irrigation district in central Washington devoted almost exclusively to apple production. The measure as reported is identical to S. 2533, 88th Congress, as approved by the Senate on June 25, 1964. The House did not act on this measure prior to adjournment.

The water collection and distribution system now serving the presently irrigated lands in the Manson unit is a composite of several privately financed developments, some of which were initiated more than a half century ago. The capacity of these facilities is no longer adequate, some of them consisting of aging wood stave pipes and flumes. Consequently, failures are frequent and maintenance is difficult and expensive. Witnesses testified at the hearing that "Manson is living on borrowed time." A major failure in the system would result not only in loss of a year's crop, but in the destruction of the orchards themselves. The overhaul, rehabilitation, and enlargement of the system is essential to the economy of the area, and the full amount of the cost is beyond the financial capacity of the Chelan County Reclamation District.

Completion of the works authorized in S. 490 will bring into being a fertile, highly productive area of 5,770 acres of irrigated orchard lands, farmed by small, independent farmers, raising crops that are not in surplus and that are marketed through established facilities.

The benefit-cost ratio is the unusually high one of 6.5 to 1.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

As stated, S. 490 provides for the rehabilitation of a wornout irrigation system, parts of which have been in use since 1908, and the addition of new lands to the unit to afford a larger operating base for payment for the project. The plan of development embraces the following:

Rehabilitation and enlargement of the 20-mile system for collection of water from the watersheds of seven creeks in the mountain region adjacent to the unit; enlargement of the storage reservoir, Antilon Lake, from 2,500 to 9,000 acre-feet by construction of one dam and enlargement of another; and rehabilitation and extension of the distribution system to continue service to 3,965 acres now irrigated, and to bring a full supply of irrigation water to an additional 1,525 acres of irrigable lands now receiving a partial supply or being dry farmed. An additional 280 acres of land with established water rights, some in Indian trust status, and some which would not be considered irrigable under reclamation standards, will continue to receive their water entitlements. A total of 5,770 acres will be served with irrigation water through the unit.

Through expansion of irrigated acreage the basis will be laid to develop 78 new irrigated farms on lands that are excellent for apple orchards. Rehabilitation of the existing system will permit uninterrupted service to continue on an economical basis to the existing farm units in the area, thus materially contributing to the economic stability of the county, which has been designated a redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act.

COSTS

Construction of the unit is expected to cost aproximately $12,363,000 and authorization for this amount, in language that has been standard in Bureau of Reclamation projects for 10 years, is provided in section 6 of S. 490. This cost is allocated among the purposes of the unit as follows:

Irrigation	$12, 220, 000
Fish and wildlife enhancement	143, 000
Total	12, 363, 000

Of the $12,220,000 allocated to irrigation, reimbursable without interest, the water users would repay $6,050,800. The balance of $6,169,200, which is beyond their ability to repay, would be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived from the marketing of power from the Chief Joseph Dam project.

Because orchards are slow to come into production the farmers whose lands are not now in orchards will require a 10-year development period for their farms before they begin to repay irrigation constuction costs. In fact, their revenues will be so low that they will not have the financial capacity to bear the entire costs of operation and maintenance during the development period. For that reason it is proposed to fund some $67,000 of operation and maintenance costs during the development period as an irrigation cost item for repayment during the ensuing 50-year repayment period. This practice has been followed in other similar situations, such as on the Greater Wenatchee division of the Chief Joseph Dam project (act of May 5, 1958 (72 Stat. 104)). Landowners whose lands are already in orchards will be permitted a 3-year development period to adjust their operations to the new project conditions.

KENNEWICK DIVISION EXTENSION, YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 794) to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 3, line 1, after "SEC. 3.", to strike out "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $5,500,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act." and insert "There are authorized to be appropriated for the new works associated with the Kennewick division extension $5,155,000 (October 1964 prices) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein, as shown by engineering cost indexes, and, in addition, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain the extension."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Insert the words "and Kennewick division extension", after the words "Kennewick division" in section 1 and add the following items to the principal units listed in said section: "Kiona siphon" and "Relift pumping plants".

(b) Insert at the end of section 3 the following: "Costs of the Kennewick division extension allocated to irrigation which are determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the water users' ability to repay within a fifty-six-year repayment period following a ten-year development period, to the extent they may be in excess of Yakima project net power revenues in that period after meeting the requirements specified in (1), (2), and (3) above shall be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration from the McNary Dam project: *Provided,* That section 5 of this Act shall not be applicable to the revenues derived from the McNary Dam project."

SEC. 2. No water shall be delivered to any water user on the Kennewick division extension for a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this authorizing Act for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for the new works associated with the Kennewick division extension $5,155,000 (October 1964 prices) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein, as shown by engineering cost indexes, and, in addition, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain the extension.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 62), explaining the purposes of the bill, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

The purpose of S. 794, which is sponsored by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON, is to bring an additional 6,300 acres of land under irrigation in the Yakima River Valley in the southern part of the State of Washington. This purpose would be attained through amendment to the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), the measure authorizing the parent Kennewick division of the Yakima project, to provide for construction, operation, and maintenance of the necessary additional works to the existing facilities of the Kennewick division. The presently proposed extension was contemplated in the construction of the existing facilities.

Almost all of the lands in the extension area are dry, supporting for the most part only sagebrush and native grasses used for livestock grazing and other uses are impracticable under present conditions. When irrigated, the land will be especially suitable for production of general row crops, and for specialty crops and fruits, such as grapes, sweet cherries, prunes, peaches, and apricots.

The project has an extremely high benefit-cost ratio in excess of 4 to 1.

S. 794 is substantially identical to S. 2630, 88th Congress, as approved by the Senate on June 23, 1964; final action was not taken in the House prior to adjournment. The only change is the wording of the appropriation authorization section, section 3, to conform to the standard language in Bureau of Reclamation project authorizations.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The existing Kennewick division serves approximately 19,000 acres of land. It is the most recent of the six operating divisions of the Yakima project. Section 6 of the 1948 authorization act provided for extra capacity in the division's main canal sufficient to irrigate approximately 7,000 acres over and above the lands in the division, and recognized the cost of the construction of such extra capacity as a deferred obligation.

The extension proposed in S. 794 would fully utilize this previously provided extra capacity, built at a cost of $341,000. Major new facilities would be a third pump at Chandler pumping plant, the mile-long Kiona siphon, six small relift pumping plants, 24 miles of canals and conduits, a lateral distribution system, and drainage facilities.

The average annual diversion requirement for the extension would be 31,500 acre-feet and would consist primarily of return flows from irrigated lands upstream, supplemented by natural flows of the Yakima River. In 1931, the Bureau of Reclamation obtained a permit from the State of Washington for the Kennewick Irrigation District to divert up to 1,600 cubic feet per second for irrigation and power purposes. This permit fully covers the diversions to the extension lands.

The Kennewick division extension is basically an irrigation development, but benefits to wildlife resources will also be realized. The Fish and Wildlife Service reports that irrigation of these lands will be beneficial to upland game birds. Opportunities to develop significant benefits to recreation, flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, or other purposes are not available.

COSTS

The total investment in the Kennewick division extension would be approximately $5,250,400 (January 1962 prices). This is made up of $4,720,000 in construction costs (January 1962 prices), $341,000 in deferred costs of the Kennewick division attributable to enlarged main canal capacity and assignable to the division extension, and the extension's pro rata share of storage costs of the Yakima project, $189,000.

Of the foregoing cost, $5,115,500 (October 1964 prices) is allocated to irrigation and $134,900 to fish and wildlife enhancement. The costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement would be nonreimbursable. Costs allocated to irrigation would be reimbursable without interest. The irrigators would return $1,914,640 or 37.4 percent of the costs allocated to irrigation. The $3,200,860 financial assistance required from power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration is from the McNary Dam project.

NEZ PERCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, IDAHO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 60) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 14, after the word "thousand", to strike out "one" and insert "five"; and at the top of page 5, to strike out:

Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $630,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to facilitate protection and provide interpretation of sites in the Nez Perce country of Idaho that have exceptional value in commemorating the history of the Nation.

Sec. 2. To implement this purpose the Secretary of the Interior may designate as the Nez Perce National Historical Park various component sites in Federal and non-Federal ownership relating to the early Nez Perce culture, the Lewis and Clark Expedition through the area, the fur trade, missionaries, gold mining, and logging, the Nez Perce war of 1877, and such other sites as he finds will depict the role of the Nez Perce country in the westward expansion of the Nation.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation or with donated funds such lands, or interests therein, and other property which in his judgment will further the purpose of this Act and he may purchase with appropriated funds land, or interests therein, required for the administration of the Nez Perce National Historical Park: *Provided,* That he may purchase no more than one thousand five hundred acres in fee, and no more than one thousand five hundred acres in scenic easements. The Nez Perce Tribe's governing body, if it so desires, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to sell, donate, or exchange tribal-owned lands held in trust needed to further the purpose of this Act.

Sec. 4. (a) Indian trust lands and sites in Federal ownership under the administrative jurisdiction of other Government agencies, not to exceed one thousand five hundred acres overall, may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion in the Nez Perce National Historical Park with the concurrence of the beneficial owner or agency having administrative responsibility therefor, but such designation shall effect no transfer of administrative control unless the administering agency consents thereto. The Secretary of the Interior may cooperate with the administering agency in research into and interpretation of the significance of the site and in providing desirable interpretive services and facilities and other facilities required for public access to and use and enjoyment of the site, and in conservation of the scenic and other resources thereof.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements with the owners of property which under the provisions of this Act may be designated for inclusion in Nez Perce National Historical Park as sites in non-Federal ownership, and he may assist in the preservation, renewal, and interpretation of the properties, provided the cooperative agreements shall contain, but not be limited to, provisions that: (1) the Secretary has right of access at all reasonable times to all public portions of the property for the purpose of conducting visitors through the property and interpreting it to the public, and (2) no changes or alterations shall be made in the properties, including buildings and grounds, without the written consent of the Secretary.

Sec. 5. When the Secretary of the Interior determines that he has acquired title to, or interest in, sufficient properties or determines that he has entered into appropriate cooperative agreements with owners of non-Federal properties, or any combination thereof including the designation of sites already in Federal ownership, he shall by publication in the Federal Register establish the Nez Perce National Historical Park and thereafter administer the Federal property under his administrative jurisdiction in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 6. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of the Interior may contract and make cooperative agreements with the State of Idaho, its political subdivisions or agencies, corporations, associations, the Nez Perce Tribe, or individuals, to protect, preserve, maintain, or operate any site, object, or property included within the Nez Perce National Historical Park, regardless as to whether title thereto is in the United States: *Provided,* That no contract or cooperative agreement shall be made or entered into which will obligate the general fund of the Treasury unless or until Congress has appropriated money for such purpose.

(b) To facilitate the interpretation of the Nez Perce country the Secretary is authorized to erect and maintain tablets or markers in accordance with the provisions contained in the Act approved August 21, 1935, entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes" (49 Stat. 666).

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $630,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is little more than a century and a half since President Jefferson dispatched Lewis and Clark to the Far West to seek a new route to the Pacific, and to explore the vast lands lying beyond the Mississippi. The journals of their hardships and travel still offer superb reading, for this has been called one of the greatest adventure stories of all time.

Journeying up the Missouri to its headwaters in what is now the State of Montana, the explorers met the Shoshone Indians, and obtained horses and a guide to cross the Bitterroots. They struggled over the great mountain rampart to emerge in what is now the north-central section of my State of Idaho. Sick and near starvation, they were met and welcomed by the Nez Perce Indians.

The Nez Perces gave them food, invited them to rest in their villages, and then showed them how to construct dugout canoes to make the final leg of their journey down the Clearwater, Snake, and Columbia Rivers. In 1805, Lewis and Clark planted the Stars and Stripes at the edge of the Pacific—giving the United States a solid claim, by virtue of its exploration, to the Oregon country.

Lewis and Clark wintered at Fort Clatsop, and returned upriver in the spring of 1806 to the Nez Perce country; they had left their horses with the Nez Perces, who returned them in good condition, and again made them welcome while the explorers waited for the snows to melt in the high mountain passes. The journals describe that stay in detail, and Lewis and Clark found the Nez Perces to be a highly moral, intelligent, and remarkable people, who remain so today. When the snow depths lessened, the explorers recrossed the mountains and journeyed back down the river to St. Louis—the end of one of the most significant odysseys in the annals of our country.

I recount this history because it has a direct bearing on the bill we now have under consideration, S. 60. It is a bill to create the Nez Perce National Historic Park in north central Idaho. Its prime purpose is to preserve and interpret the Lewis and Clark trek through the last vestiges of their presence, their old campgrounds, and a score of other sites that are significant in the winning of the West.

Indeed, in an area roughly bounded by the Clearwater River on the north and the Salmon River on the south, history concentrated its imprint. The fur traders followed Lewis and Clark. Henry Harmon Spalding, the Presbyterian who was a partner of the ill-fated Marcus Whitman in 1836, established one of the first missions to the Indians in the region. Spalding also brought in and used the first printing press in the Northwest.

In 1860, gold was discovered on the Nez Perce Indian Reservation, and thousands of miners converged on Idaho to bring the first major white settlements. Difficulties with the Indians caused pressure to be brought to place the gold-bearing lands outside the reservation, which was subsequently reduced in size. Not all the Indians signed the treaty, and some refused to go upon the reservation. Among the latter was the famed Chief Joseph of the Wallowa band of Nez Perces. Confronted with superior force, Joseph acquiesced, and was enroute to the reservation when a handful of braves attacked the settlers on the Salmon River. Thus commenced the Nez Perce War of 1877, when Indian warriors under Joseph and such chiefs as Looking Glass outmaneuvered and outfought the troops of the U.S. Army commanded by hard-bitten professional officers of the Civil War and the Western frontier. Some of the major battlegrounds of the war are in north central Idaho, to which the Indians finally fled after conducting a masterly retreat across sections of Montana, southern Idaho, Yellowstone Park, and Wyoming.

Joseph eventually surrendered at the Little Bear's Paw, a day's march from the safety of the Canadian border, with a speech which has been reprinted in every western history worthy of the name.

"Hear me, my Chiefs," Joseph said. "My heart is sick and sad," and concluded with: "From where the sun now stands, I will fight no more forever."

Besides the Idaho battlegrounds, which appear much as they were in Joseph's day, there are many other important historic sites: locales of Indian legends, buildings of old Fort Lapwai, the land claims of Mountain Man Billy Craig, the ancient Indian trail across the Lolo Pass and the Weis rockshelter, occupied more than 7,500 years ago.

Physical fragments of this valued historical area still exist, but are threatened with destruction by the erosion of time and progress.

This bill which my colleague [Mr. JORDAN] and I have sponsored, authorizing the creation of a Nez Perce National Historical Park, requires only a small acquisition of land. This is a new concept for a national park, since it correlates scattered sites under the supervision of the National Park Service, and provides for their administration through cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, State agencies, private individuals, or the Indian tribe. Not more than 1,500 acres of privately owned land would be acquired by the Federal Government, plus not more than 1,500 acres in scenic easements. The National Park Service would be responsible for interpreting the historical significance of the sites and for providing appropriate services to the public.

Three main centers, operated by the Park Service, would be located at the key main visitor entrances to the heartland of the Nez Perce country at Spalding, Kamiah, and White Bird.

I emphasize that—as the feasibility report eloquently points out—the Nez Perce country still possesses a high degree of historical integrity. I read from the report:

> Despite extensive farming in the uplands, intensive logging on the mountain slopes, and canyon walls, and the growth of towns and cities, the overall effect as one drives through the former lands of the Nez Perces is the impression, "This is how it was." The prairies are still open; vast armies of pines and firs still climb the hills; the grass-covered slopes still rise above basalt cliffs; the rivers and streams largely run clear and free. The country is so vast, so magnificent, and so lightly settled that the eye tends to glance over such recent developments as roads, railroads, mills, fences, towns, and spreading residential sections. This is still in essence, the Nez Perce country.

Department of the Interior, National Park, and State of Idaho officials, including the Governor, historians, and other specialists, have personally visited the area, and have voiced approval of the project. With an unusual display of unanimity, chambers of commerce, civic organizations, and newspapers in the area have wholeheartedly endorsed it.

I know I speak for the entire congressional delegation when I say we are wholeheartedly in support of this proposal, which would provide a new type of national park, and would preserve for the future, in a fitting way, these valuable and graphic reminders of our people's westering march.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the bill to designate the Nez Perce country in north Idaho as a national park, I am pleased to join my colleague Senator CHURCH in urging the Senate to consider this proposal favorably.

The purpose of this legislation is to preserve, commemorate, and interpret the history and culture of the Nez Perce Indian country. This bill is unique in some respects. The sites that are to be selected for designation are not located in a compact area. Some of these are in private ownership, some on Indian reservation lands, some owned by the State of Idaho and many are on Federal lands. The historical, scenic, and archeological sites while separated will be linked and managed through one administrative site. It covers an area reaching from the Wallowa Mountains of northeast Oregon to the Bitterroot Mountain Range on the boundary of Idaho and Montana and is roughly 200 miles long and 75 miles wide.

Archeological evidence indicates that man has roamed this stretch of beautiful terrain for at least 10,000 years. We have no recorded history of it until Lewis and Clark went through it on their magnificent expedition to the Pacific in 1805. Since then there have been significant activities which have a national interest. On the first visits of the white man they were astonished to find members of the Nez Perce Indian Tribe to be hospitable, intelligent, and handsome. They were skilled horsemen, wonderful hunters, and proud of their heritage. This visit was followed by fur traders, missionaries, miners, agriculturalists, and foresters. Each of these carved an interesting chapter in the history of the country.

I have lived most of my life in this country and fully appreciate its rugged beauty and national historical significance. I wish to have these sites preserved so future generations will have the opportunity to see it and study it as I have and to love it as I do.

The Federal Government now owns and manages more than 64 percent of the lands within Idaho's boundaries, so we wish to keep the acquisition of private lands by the Federal Government at a minimum. For this reason not more than 1,500 acres may be acquired by the Federal Government and the securing of scenic easements may not exceed 1,500 acres. Under this procedure only actual sites may be purchased. Scenic easements may be acquired to assure proper ascetic protection without unduly affecting the local tax base and the minimum of revenue-producing lands will be affected.

We are all aware of the impact that history plays in our lives. We are also trying to preserve recreational areas that will be needed in the future. In this bill we have an opportunity to preserve these historical sites and to offer recreational advantages on the same lands. If each Senator could visit and see firsthand this historic and beautiful country I am sure you would be equally enthusiastic in the preservation of these sites.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 63), explaining the purposes of the bill, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

THE HISTORICAL PARK

S. 60 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho. This park would commemorate, preserve, and interpret the rich and varied history of an area significant in the development of the American West. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, has recorded its support of the measure. The Advisory Board commended the proposal as an "imaginative new concept of historic perservation."

The concept described by the Advisory Board evolved from the opportunity found in the Nez Perce country to interpret the fascinating history of the region through a broad program of cooperation with the other Federal agencies, with the Nez Perce Tribe, with local and State governments, and historical associations. Except at the three principal sites, cooperative agreements rather than outright ownership of the land will assure interpretive integrity and a unity of concept for the sites comprising the park.

The Nez Perce National Historical Park would actually involve 22 separate sites in the northern Idaho "Panhandle" together with scenic easements around them—easements to prevent destruction of historic and scenic values by signs or incompatible developments.

Only the most significant 3 of the 22 sites would necessarily be in direct ownership and control of the National Park Service. The remaining 19 might remain in the ownership of the U.S. Forest Service, the State of Idaho, its political subdivisions, the Nez Perce Indian Tribe, or private individuals. However, the bill makes possible the utilization of the National Park Service's proficiency in the techniques of interpreting historic, scenic, and other outstanding features. This interpretive proficiency, gained during decades of experience in all types of areas, will be made available on a cooperative basis to the agencies administering these other sites.

The historic values involved include the early Nez Perce Indian culture, the tribe's "war" of 1877 with U.S. cavalry troops, the Lewis and Clark Expedition through the area early in the 19th century, subsequent fur trading, gold mining, logging, and missionary activity.

The Idaho area containing these 22 sites has an average north-south width of 60 miles and an average east-west length of 110 miles.

Archeological evidence has established that man has occupied this area of the Pacific Northwest for at least 10,000 years. But only after the famed Lewis and Clark Expedition of 1805 did the United States have any realistic concept of the area's existence, to say nothing of its impressive scenery and wealth of resources.

Capts. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark found the Nez Perce Indians to be a handsome, intelligent tribe that treated the whites with generous hospitality. Shortly after the explorers' visit, a party of overland Astorians arrived and established fur trading in the area. Christian missionaries and gold miners followed, and each group left its imprint on the land and its native Indian people.

The 1877 Nez Perce war resulted from the growing conflict between these normally peaceful Indians and the whites, whose exploitation of the region's resources brought increasingly restrictive treaties.

Three Indian youths, bent on avenging a slaying, killed four white settlers. Then they recruited other nontreaty Indians and launched a series of plundering raids. Gen. O. O. Howard, commander of the Department of the Columbia, dispatched 2 troops, about 100 men, of the 1st Cavalry under Capt. David Perry to White Bird Canyon. The Indians lay in ambush, and when they opened fire the first soldier to fall was a bugler. Reports indicate that a group of citizen volunteers panicked and bolted first. Then Perry's regulars turned and fled in headlong retreat. The Nez Perce warriors had scored a smashing victory, killing 34 soldiers while only 2 or 3 warriors were wounded.

Pursuit of the Indians and other skirmishes followed through the summer and into the autumn of 1877. In October hostilities came to an end. Many of the great fighting chiefs had been slain. Other Nez Perce had fled into Canada. Only about 1,000 remained on the reservation from which the white man had removed choice lands and hunting grounds.

At the site of that opening battle of the Nez Perce war, White Bird Canyon, 3 miles northeast of the town of White Bird in Idaho County, about 940 acres would be acquired in fee and developed as one of the three principal areas in the Nez Perce National Historical Park. Also, scenic easements on 1,140 acres nearby would be acquired. Most of the land is now unimproved and in private ownership, utilized for grazing and crops. At the White Bird site, the National Park Service would erect a small interpretive center and a few museum exhibits.

The principal interpretive center for visitors to the historical park would be at Spalding, some 80 road miles north of the White Bird site, in Nez Perce County at the junction of U.S. Highways 12 and 95, and the confluence of Lapwai Creek and the Clearwater River.

The Spalding site was seen by the Lewis and Clark Expedition in 1805. Some 33 years later, the Reverend Henry Spalding established a mission among the Nez Perce here, calling the place Lapwai. In the 1860's and 1870's it was the site of the Nez Perce Indian Agency and today it contains the small village of Spalding with some 200 inhabitants.

About 122 acres, including Spalding Memorial State Park, would be acquired in fee here to serve as the main contact point and administrative headquarters. Scenic easements on another 50 acres could be obtained. Ownership is now in the State, the Nez Perce Tribe, and private individuals. The tribe maintains a cemetery here, containing the graves of Henry Spalding and his wife, Eliza, who taught the Indians school subjects and homemaking.

The third area proposed for acquisition is the East Kamiah site, some 58 miles southeast of Spalding in Idaho County. This area has been occupied by the Nez Perce since prehistoric times and it contains the "Heart of the Monster," a low, stony hill which according to Indian mythology was involved in the tribe's creation.

Here the National Park Service proposes to acquire 103 acres in fee and to construct a small interpretive center. The property acquired at the East Kamiah site would also include a small house reputedly occupied in the mid-1800's by Susan and Kate McBeth, devoted and renowned missionaries to the Nez Perce. On 41 additional acres, scenic easements would be acquired. Ownership of this acreage is now in private individuals, the Presbyterian Church and possibly the Nez Perce Tribe.

To sum up, at the three sites identified, studies indicate that 1,165 acres in fee and 1,231 acres in scenic easements should be acquired. The reported bill as amended authorizes acquisition of 1,500 acres in fee and 1,500 acres in scenic easements.

The 19 sites proposed for cooperative interpretation, but not for acquisition, are as follows:

Coyote's Fishnet and Ant and Yellow Jacket, two areas intimately related to Nez Perce religion and mythology.

Fort Lapwai, Cottonwood, Camas Prairie, and Clearwater Battlefield, four areas relating to the Nez Perce war of 1877.

St. Joseph's Mission, the first Presbyterian Indian church, East Kamiah and the Asa Smith Mission, three sites significant to missionary activities among the Nez Perce.

Lolo Trail, Lolo Pass, Long Camp, Weippe Prairie, and Canoe Camp, five sites extending southwestward from the Montana-Idaho border, all of importance to the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

The Northern Idaho Indian Agency, Craig Donation Land Claim, Pierce, and Log Drive, four sites where evidences of early activities of the white explorers and settlers can be discerned and interpreted.

Weis Rockshelter, an archeological site where strata reveal nearly continuous human occupancy from about 5500 B.C. to about A.D. 1400.

It is believed that the story of the Nez Perce country—as it relates both to the Indians themselves and to the activities of white men here during the 19th century—is one that merits telling. This goal can be accomplished, at relatively minor expense, by establishing a historical park as provided in S. 60. Through minimal land acquisition, scenic easements and cooperative agreements and by erection of interpretative exhibits and markers, and removal of nonsignificant structures, it will be possible to display in northern Idaho an important period in our Nation's history and heritage.

Essentially, this would be a park of great historical interest. Nonetheless, it is also an exciting country of great scenic beauty offering unusual outdoor recreational opportunities. The countryside, remaining much as it was in frontier days, would be enjoyed by all visitors.

The committee joins with the administrative agencies in recommending enactment of S. 60.

BIGHORN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 491) to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "Area", to strike out "LNPMW-010-BC, June 1963" and insert "LNPMW-O10A-BC, November 1964"; in line 18, after the word "area.", to insert "The Secretary is authorized to acquire, by any of the above methods, not to exceed ten acres of land or interests therein outside of the boundaries of the area in the vicinity of Lovell, Wyoming, for development and use, pursuant to such special regulations as he may promulgate, as a visitor contact station and administrative site."; on page 3, line 2, after the word "jurisdiction,", to strike out "not needed for other Federal programs"; in line 13, after the word "of", to insert "the tribal mountain lands or any other"; in line 23, after the word "operate", to strike out the comma and "at no expense to the United States,"; on page 5, line 5, after the word "Act.", to strike out "Appropriate user fees may be collected notwithstanding any limitation on such authority by any provision of law."; in line 15, after the word "and", to strike out "enjoyment" and insert "enjoyment, and except that nothing in this section shall impair the rights under other law of the Crow Tribe and its members to hunt and fish on lands of the Crow Tribe that are included in the recreation area, or the rights of the members of the Crow Tribe to hunt and fish under section 2(d) of the Act of July 15, 1958,", and on page 6, line 2, after the word "than", to strike out "$320,000" and insert "$355,000"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 491

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the proposed Yellowtail Reservoir and lands adjacent thereto in the States of Wyoming and Montana by the people of the United States and for preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment of such lands and waters, there is hereby established the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area to comprise the area generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Proposed Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area", LNPMW-010A-BC, November 1964, which is on file in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(b) As soon as practicable after approval of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description of the boundaries of the area which shall encompass, to the extent practicable, the lands and waters shown on the drawing referred to in subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary may subsequently make adjustments in the boundary of the area, subject to the provisions of subsection 2(b) of this Act, by publication of an amended description in the Federal Register.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the area. The Secretary is authorized to acquire, by any of the above methods, not to exceed ten acres of land or interests therein outside of the boundaries of the area in the vicinity of Lovell, Wyoming, for development and use, pursuant to such special regulations as he may promulgate, as a visitor contact station and administrative site. In the exercise of his exchange authority the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the area and convey in exchange therefor any federally owned property under his jurisdiction, which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Property so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. Any property or interest therein owned by the State of Montana or the State of Wyoming or any political subdivision thereof within the recreation area may be acquired only with the concurrence of the owner.

(b) No part of the tribal mountain lands or any other lands of the Crow Indian Tribe of Montana shall be included within the recreation area unless requested by the council of the tribe. The Indian lands so included may be developed and administered in accordance with the laws and rules applicable to the recreation area, subject to any limitations specified by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary.

(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of any other law, the Crow Indian Tribe shall be permitted to develop and operate water-based recreational facilities, including landing ramps, boathouses, and fishing facilities, along that part of the shoreline of Yellowtail Reservoir which is adjacent to lands comprising the Crow Indian Reservation. Any such part so developed shall be administered in accordance with the laws and rules applicable to the recreation area, subject to any limitations specified by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary. Any revenues resulting from the operation of such facilities may be retained by the Crow Indian Tribe.

(2) As used in this subsection, the term "shoreline" means that land which borders both Yellowtail Reservoir and the exterior boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, together with that part of the reservoir necessary to the development of the facilities referred to in this subsection.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary shall coordinate administration of the recreation area with the other purposes of the Yellowtail Reservoir project so that it will in his judgment best provide (1) for public outdoor recreation benefits, (2) for conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, and other values contributing to public enjoyment, and (3) for management, utilization, and disposal of renewable natural resources in a manner that promotes, or is compatible with, and does not significantly impair, public recreation and conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, or other values contributing to public enjoyment.

(b) In the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 4. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the recreation area in accordance with the appropriate laws of the States of Montana or Wyoming to the extent applicable, except that the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment, and except that nothing in this section shall impair the rights under other law of the Crow Tribe and its members to hunt and fish on lands of the Crow Tribe that are included in the recreation area, or the rights of the members of the Crow Tribe to hunt and fish under section 2(d) of the Act of July 15, 1958. Except in emergencies, and regulations of the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be put into effect only after consultation with the Montana Fish and Game Department or the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission.

Sec. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $355,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 64), explaining the purposes of the bill, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

THE PROJECT

The bill would set aside some 63,300 acres along the Big Horn River above Yellowtail Dam as a unit of the national park system. The proposed national recreation area in south-central Montana and north-central Wyoming would include the spectacular Big Horn Canyon and would cover about one-third of the 195-mile shoreline created by the reservoir backed up behind the Yellowtail Dam, scheduled for completion by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1966.

The proposed area has outstanding scenic and recreation values. It straddles the Montana-Wyoming border. The river runs through the Big Horn Canyon, a narrow precipitous gorge 47 miles long, with walls rising from 800 to 2,200 feet above the river. On these walls are the strata of various geological periods dating back for millions of years.

In addition to the impressive scenery and geology presented here there are sites of significant archeological and historical interest. The Smithsonian Institution is studying a narrow strip of land running the length of the canyon, on which has been found evidence of habitation by an unknow prehistoric tribe. Near the damsite are the remains of Fort C. F. Smith, an Army infantry post established in 1866 to protect travelers on the Bozeman Trail from the Sioux and Cheyenne Indians. The area also has immense possibilities for development of facilities for boating, camping, hiking, horseback riding, pack trips, swimming, fishing, and possibly winter sports. The reservoir behind Yellowtail Dam also will provide a safe water highway into what was formally an almost inaccessible region.

The proposed Big Horn Canyon national recreation area is situated in one of our Nation's major vacation lands. It is only 110 miles east of our oldest and largest national park, Yellowstone, which last year attracted 1,872,500 visits. It is near well traveled vacation routes, such as U.S. Highways 87 and 212, and Interstate 90, now under construction, to the north and east. Wyoming State Highway 14 will also provide access to the area from the south.

Since this is the only proposed reservoir national recreation area in the Missouri River Basin, it would serve the water-oriented recreation needs of thousands of people from the Rocky Mountain region and the Great Plains.

For example, about 177,000 persons reside within a 100-mile radius of either end of the Yellowtail Reservoir. Assuming initial recreational developments are in operation, the Park Service estimates that by 1970, use of the proposed recreational area by these local residents will amount to some 154,000 visitor-days per year. In addition, the Park Service estimates that annual use by people from other parts of the country will amount to 406,000 visitor-days so that total usage by 1970 would be 560,000 visitor-days per year.

From the standpoint of economy, all but about one-ninth of the land involved is already in Federal ownership. Within the area, more than 29,200 acres are being acquired by the Bureau of Reclamation for dam and reservoir purposes. Of the remainder, almost 27,000 acres are in the Federal land reserve. There are some 719 acres of Montana State lands, which under our bill could only be acquired with the concurrence of the State. Some 4,760 acres are privately owned. The Park Service estimates cost of acquiring this land at $355,000 based on the experience of the Bureau of Reclamation with land acquisition at Yellowtail Dam. It is the studied view of the sponsors of S. 491 that this unique area should be established, and blocked out at this time, with development to come as appropriations are made available and on a priority list with comparable areas.

This view is shared by the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department's National Park Service and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The latter agency has documented the finding that the proposed Big Horn Canyon national recreation area meets the criteria for recreation areas.

Both the Subcommittee on Public Lands and the full Interior and Insular Affairs Committee unanimously endorse the early enactment of this bill.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on Monday, February 8, 1965, President Johnson sent to Congress the White House message on natural beauty. In this historical policy statement, he outlined a program for the beautification of America that will change the face of our Nation. In the part devoted to "the countryside," President Johnson proposed to acquire lands to establish 12 named parks, seashores and recreation areas. Today the Senate has passed (S. 491) the bill authorizing the first of these, the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area. The promptness with which this legislation has been considered is a tribute to the foresight of the Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the junior Senator from Washington, Senator Jackson, and the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Nevada, Senator Bible. Both are true friends of conservation and dedicated supporters of preservation of our natural resources.

Mr. President, I am proud that the Senate has today approved the first of the new additions to the National Park System urged by President Johnson day before yesterday in his message on natural beauty.

Creation of the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area, urged by the Senators from Montana and Wyoming, would make a significant contribution toward the wise management, orderly development and highest possible use of our natural resources. It will help meet the mounting need for water based recreation and broaden the base of the economy in two great States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the votes by which the bills were passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RECESS UNTIL 12:45 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 12:45 p.m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At 12:10 p.m. the Senate took a recess until 12:45 p.m.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair).

MELVIN J. MAAS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has introduced a bill, S. 788, to designate the new Veterans' Administration hospital in Washington, D.C., the Melvin J. Maas Memorial Hospital.

Mr. Maas served with great honor in Congress, representing the Fourth District of Minnesota, which I represented for 10 years. From there, Mr. Maas went on to serve the Nation as an officer in the U.S. Marine Corps in World War II. Although afflicted by blindness in the years since the war, he continued to be a great public servant and a great inspiration to all who worked with him and came to know him.

THE NEED FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE FOR SENATORS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I rise to address myself for a few moments to a question uppermost in the minds of Senators; namely, How shall we modernize Congress, and update the machinery of democracy?

Let me stress that while we worry about the machinery, we are overlooking our greatest opportunity of all—and perhaps our greatest need—and that is to enrich the content and strengthen the framework of the philosophy within which we operate in the beginning.

It has often been noted in history that those who conquered the world often have done so either with armies or with ideas; and more often than not, the men with ideas have defeated the men with armies.

In our momentary obsession with our military power—which is indispensable—I trust that we are not about to forfeit to the future and to the course of the history of our times, the realm of ideas and the depth and strength of philosophy in general.

As we look at the world around us, the rate of change is both frightening and exciting. Even in the realm of human knowledge, we are told that man has doubled his fund of knowledge in the past 15 to 20 years.

What impact does this have on our own course and upon the direction in which we seek to go?

Today, more nations have acquired independence within the past few years than the total of all nations in history heretofore. This in itself has great implications for the base of our policy and the target of our aim.

Likewise, human expectations have multiplied manifold in large areas of the world. Peoples who once enjoyed only a so-called colonial existence have discovered, through one development or another, that they have been cheated for hundreds, and in some cases even thousands, of years. For better or for worse, those peoples now strive through every shortcut available to them, in good judgment and in bad, to make up for that lost time.

Not many months ago, the leaders of our country were addressing themselves to one central question: What is America's national purpose, and where are we heading?

The fact that they felt compelled to take a new reading was something of a confession that this is the kind of consideration which too long has been neglected.

It further emphasizes that we need something more than machinery, that we must update something more than mere facts on the great issues of our times, that we need the kind of experience in this body and in all responsible governmental units which will provide an underpinning of the knowledge of where we are heading, and why.

Some time ago, I had a fascinating conversation with a retired American diplomat.

I asked him how he was enjoying his new retirement. He said, "I never had it so good. I am having a wonderfully exciting time."

My next query was, "What are you doing?"

He said, "I am reading books. While I was in the Foreign Service for over 25 years I kept a list of books that I wished to read and which I should have read, but could not because of routine housekeeping chores. Now I am reading those books, but the tragedy of our times is that I am reading those books at a time when I cannot do anything about them, when the great substantive enrichment which those books would make to my philosophy leaves me nothing, in my present position, that could have a direct application or impact on the course of the events of our time."

He continued, "Look at you." And he pointed a finger at me, a former academic "You were raised reading books in a climate that was fostered in the pursuit of knowledge."

He further stated, "What do you do now? You are in the Senate of the United States, with only time to make quick decisions to vote on a bill up or down, and with almost no time to read and reflect." He said, "In a way, your position and mine have been reversed, and at a time when that reversal lessens the contributions of both of us."

Mr. President, what my friend was really saying was that one of the great blind spots in this body is the absence of an opportunity, an incentive, or a drive on the part of Senators to sit and think, to read and reflect.

It is for that purpose that today I am sending a letter to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who has submitted a resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to begin an assessment of our reorganizational needs, containing my proposal for a senatorial sabbatical.

In the realm of big business, we find that the idea of a sabbatical to foster original, exciting, individual thinking, is more and more coming into practice. We find in the accademic world the longstanding tradition of granting to a professor, often every 6 or 7 years, the right to take sabbatical leave so that he may enrich his own philosophy for his academic background.

In the academic world we used to say that on a sabbatical we would read and think ourselves full and then come back home and write and teach ourselves empty. This is indeed a parallel that might well be applied to this so-called greatest deliberative body in the world. I say "so-called" because it is open to question whether we possess the depth of the opportunity for deliberation rather than the mere voting and carrying on of housekeeping chores—a sort of high level public kitchen police, in which many Members of this body have engaged themselves.

I am mindful, Mr. President, of the many problems that a Senate sabbatical would pose.

Where would a Senator go on a sabbatical? I believe that question is of little importance. Perhaps to a mountain top. Perhaps to a lonely isle. Perhaps he would hide out abroad ship, where there were no telephones. There are many places to which a Senator could go in quest of ideas and the challenge of the difference of opinion.

How long would he be gone? Once again, I think that is one of the minutiae of detail. Would he be gone for 3 months, 6 months, a year?

Within the framework of the material requirements of service in the Senate, we could arrive at a reasonable contributive formula.

Who would be eligible? Any Member of this body on either side of the aisle should be eligible. He should be eligible once in every 6-year term after the first term. I would suspect that the problems of a newly elected Senator in getting started in the Senate and in the affairs of the Nation's Capital would be a time and energy consuming undertaking. I can testify to that from my own experience.

After one term each Member of this body should be eligible to one sabbatical per term. That sabbatical should be rotated to make sure that an excessive number of Senators were not absent at the same time. Perhaps the number could range from half a dozen to 10 at any given moment.

What would happen to their votes? That, again, is one of those troublesome housekeeping questions that must be answered. Perhaps we could guarantee that the votes of such Senators on the critical issues of the time could be paired live with Senators present in the Senate and not on leave, or we could arrange that Senators on sabbatical leave be permitted to cast their votes. I am mindful that that contradicts existing habit or custom or rule in the Senate. However, it would not be the first time in the history of man that we have had to change rules, difficult as that has been in the Senate. That is a secondary consideration, rather than a primary one.

There are some further considerations.

What would happen if Senators abused the privilege? What happens—to borrow a phrase used in the communications media—to Members who go on so-called junkets? That privilege has been abused in a very few cases. We need not propose a sabbatical to invite that kind of abuse. It should not be permitted, as an excuse, to cloud the basic issue that a senatorial sabbatical brings to the fore.

I suppose the most troublesome issue that such a proposal as a senatorial sabbatical really would represent would be, What about the constituency back home? What are the people at home going to think?

Senators know that at the beginning the public would oppose it. Some of them would resent it. They would look upon it as some kind of freeloading "gimmick" that Members of Congress had thought up to escape work.

The measure should be considered on its merit and its worth. If we can persuade ourselves that it has importance, that its adoption is essential in the light of the times in which we live, it becomes of the greatest importance to all of us to help to acquaint the public and our constituency and all others interested with the need for this kind of approach.

There would be those who would remind us that this year we expect to conclude the session by the 31st of July. I quickly insert the thought that 6 years ago I started pounding my desk in behalf of a summer recess, so that the younger Members of this body could enjoy spending a little time with their children. In 6 years my own children have not been back to their home State. There are other Members of this body, more statesmanlike, who would nonetheless be pleased to say that they wish they could go home to spend some time with their grandchildren.

This idea has been shot down again and again with the promise that we would get out early in the session and by the expression of the hope that this year will be different.

This time we must face up to the hard fact that we would not only not get out early, but that there is real reason to feel that the Senate should not get out early, because of the uncertainties and the crises around the world and because of the kind of decisions that could be made by the men in Moscow or Peiping or Indonesia, and that we really cannot be masters in a vacuum and in control of our own calendar or schedule.

Only when the Members of this body come to understand that having the Senate remain in session the year around is a necessity and obligation, will we get down to a more realistic effort to try to pace the business of this body and to try the kind of leadership that can come from all the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I have sent this day to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who has had a great deal to do, both earlier and now, with the reorganization of the Senate, be printed intact following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1965.

Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: As you are author of Senate Joint Resolution 2, to establish a joint committee to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress, I am writing to you to suggest consideration of an idea which I believe is essential to the continued progress and success of our form of government. It is clear that we must take measures to insure that our chief legislative body, the Congress, keeps pace with the world which it must lead. And so we rightly attempt, as you are so ably doing now, to devise the means to update the Congress. What I propose is a means to update the Congressmen.

My proposal is a system that will give to the Members of the Senate the time to assess this world and our place in it—time to read and reflect. In other words, a sabbatical from the day-to-day obligations of the Senate which, in our modern world, so impinge upon our time that we are unable to pause to take stock of ourselves and the goals we pursue. Indeed, it is one of the chronic complaints of Members of this body that they do not have time to think and to study. Our lives are a continual rush through a never-ending series of crises and decisions with each day serving to prepare only for the day that follows.

This proposal is not made to suggest that we find more time to become experts in those fields which attract us professionally. We have our staffs and unlimited access to a field of experts who can assist us to obtain the specific knowledge about matters fiscal, agricultural, economic, or military. What I seek is time to think about what has been facetiously called the big picture. In the history of mankind, our leaders, those who have changed the course of history, are those men who either commanded armies or those who commanded ideas. And most often the former fell before the onslaughts of the latter. It is my firm belief that progress cannot be made if the Nation's leaders are not given the time to think, the time to develop ideas. I should hope that having had this time their worth to the Nation and their achievements in this Chamber would be increased manifold.

Where would a Senator on leave go? What would he be expected to do? That should be up to him, perhaps to a mountain top, to a lonely island, or preferably to the environs of one of the great seats of learning in our own country or abroad. But there should be no deadlines to meet.

While many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle share my impatience with the restrictions of our concentration to the immediacies of business, most also express the common misgivings that this situation is incurable, that the constituents would rebel at the thought of their elected representative taking a sabbatical which would produce nothing concrete in action and, in their discontent, provide him with a sabbatical of a more permanent nature. I would be the first to say. that while I am strongly urging this concept for your consideration in the future deliberations on the functions of the Congress, I am completely mindful of the many pitfalls in the way of the ratification of this proposal. Undoubtedly, there are a certain number of individuals who would abuse the privilege and waste the time. But these are the same people who today abuse the privilege and honor of being the people's representatives in the Congress. They comprise a very small minority of the Senate membership. And there are the more practical problems of implementation—when should this sabbatical be taken, how long should it last, what about votes taken in the Senator's absence? To start the discussion I might suggest that a sabbatical be taken once in every 6-year term after the first one, for a period of 3 to 6 months. What would happen to a Senator's votes on critical issues is a matter which would be more difficult to resolve. One of two possibilities readily come to mind. Either the votes of Senators on sabbatical could be counted in absentia or they could be paired live.

Obviously, it would be important to limit the number of Senators on leave at any one time, perhaps 6 to 10. And I would further suggest that the Member be barred from constant attendance in his home State during that time lest he succumb to the temptation to mend his political fences.

These are obstacles of a rather large scale which make the pursuit of this goal difficult before it is begun. But none of these obstacles imply that the problem is thereby reduced, that the times do not require men of new vision and clear goals. A sabbatical, I believe, is one way to provide the basis for leadership. In the academic world, which I once inhabited, we talked of reading ourselves full and then writing ourselves empty as the means of distilling knowledge and ideas and then sharing them with our fellow men. Should we not have equal time as legislators to read and think ourselves full and then work out the resultant accumulation in the public interest? Surely the Nation that can aim for the moon, that can resolve the modern breakthroughs in knowledge and technique that have remade our world can put its talents to the task of ironing out the minutia of daily life to make it possible for the men and women who are running the biggest operation in the world and who are making decisions upon which rest the fate of the world to find the time to use God's gift of intellect to form a better perspective on our world and our future.

I will close this letter with an account of a conversation I recently had with a distinguished member of our Foreign Service, just retired after a quarter century of administering the foreign policy of our Nation. He remarked that he had been too busy during all those years to do much reading but had kept a list of books, which totaled 54, that he wanted to read when he had the time. "Now I have the time," he said, "and I am enjoying myself immensely, but these are the books that were important to my generation and now I am no longer in a position to do much with the ideas I receive." His role and my role—from the university to the Senate—were both reversed. When we had the time to read and reflect, as an academic, I was in no position to do much about it. But now as a Member of the Senate, when it is possible to make some small contribution to the course of the history of our time, we too often find only the time to shoot from the hip.

Man has always distinguished himself from other animals by his ability to think, to reason, to plan, to view not only the realities of the present but the portents of the future, the abstractions of a universe whose very nature is change. This supreme gift of God should not be misused or the potential we possess for progress ignored. I sincerely hope that in the deliberations which are soon to come on the organization and activities of the Congress of the United States that you will present this idea and help it to receive consideration by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

Sincerely,

GALE MCGEE.

INTERNATIONAL BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 83)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on international balance of payments. The message has already been read in the House of Representatives; and, without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the message was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

After a full review of our international balance of payments and our gold position, I can report to the Congress that:

The state of the dollar in the world today is strong—far stronger than 3 or 4 years ago.

To assure its continued and growing strength, however, we need to take new steps to speed our progress toward balance in our external payments.

The strength of our dollar is backed by—

The world's most productive and efficient economy, moving each year to new heights of output, employment, and income without inflation;

The world's largest supply of gold, fully pledged to honor this country's dollar obligations;

The world's strongest creditor position, based on $88 billion of public and private claims against foreigners, $37 billion greater than their claims against us; counting our private assets only, the margin is about $15 billion, and steadily growing;

The world's most favorable trade position, based on a rise in our exports by more than one-fourth in 4 years—a rise which has brought our commercial exports—excluding exports financed by the Government—to $22.2 billion and our commercial trade surplus to $3.6 billion.

Clearly, those who fear for the dollar are needlessly afraid. Those who hope for its weakness, hope in vain.

A country which exports far more than it imports and whose net asset position abroad is great and growing is not "living beyond its means."

The dollar is, and will remain, as good as gold, freely convertible at $35 an ounce.

That pledge is backed by our firm determination to bring an end to our balance-of-payments deficit.

Last year, our flows of dollars abroad—to pay for our imports and foreign travel, to finance our loans and investments abroad, and to meet our defense and aid obligations—still exceeded our dollar credits from foreigners by $3 billion. This represents steady improvement over the $3.6 billion deficit in 1962 and the $3.3 billion deficit in 1963. But our progress is too slow.

The world willingly uses our dollars as a safe and convenient medium of international exchange. The world's growing supply of dollars has played a vital role in the postwar growth of the free world's commerce and finance. But we cannot—and do not—assume that the world's willingness to hold dollars is unlimited.

On the basis of searching study of the major causes of our continued imbalance of payments, I therefore propose the following program:

First, to maintain and strengthen our checkrein on foreign use of U.S. capital markets, I ask the Congress—

To extend the interest equalization tax for 2 years beyond December 31, 1965;

To broaden its coverage to nonbank credit of 1- to 3-year maturity;

Second, to stem and reverse the swelling tide of U.S. bank loans abroad, I have used the authority available to me under the Gore amendment to the act to apply the interest equalization tax to bank loans of 1 year or more.

Third, to stop any excessive flow of funds to Canada under its special exemption from the equalization tax, I have sought and received firm assurance that the policies of the Canadian Government are and will be directed toward limiting such outflows to the maintenance of a stable level of Canada's foreign exchange reserves.

Fourth, to limit further the outflow of bank loans, I am asking the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in cooperation with the Secretary of the Treasury to enroll the banking community in a major effort to limit their lending abroad.

Fifth, to insure the effective cooperation of the banking community, I am requesting legislation to make voluntary cooperation by American bankers in support of our balance-of-payments efforts, under the Government's auspices, exempt from the antitrust laws wherever such cooperation is essential to the national interest.

Sixth, to reduce the outflow of business capital, I am directing the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury to enlist the leaders of American business in a national campaign to limit their direct investments abroad, their deposits in foreign banks, and their holding of foreign financial assets until their efforts—and those of all Americans—have restored balance in the country's international accounts.

Seventh, to minimize the foreign exchange costs of our defense and aid programs, I am directing the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of AID, and other officials immediately to step up their efforts to cut oversea dollar costs to the bone.

Eighth, to narrow our tourist gap, I encourage our friends from abroad, as well as our own citizens, to "See the U.S.A."; and I request legislation further to limit the duty-free exemptions of American tourists returning to the United States.

Ninth, to earn more trade dollars, I am calling for a redoubling of our efforts to promote exports.

Finally, to draw more investment from abroad, I am requesting new tax legislation to increase the incentives for foreigners to invest in U.S. corporate securities.

These measures will deal with our payments deficit and protect the dollar in ways fully consistent with our obligations—

To sustain prosperity at home;

To maintain our defenses abroad;

To supply private and public funds to less developed countries to build both their strength and their freedom;

To avoid "beggar thy neighbor" restrictions on trade and work for a successful conclusion of the Kennedy round trade negotiations; and

To work with our trading partners toward a more flexible world monetary system.

These actions should achieve a substantial reduction in our international deficit during 1965, and secure still further improvement in 1966.

WHERE WE STAND TODAY

Our deficit in 1964 was too large. And over half of it occurred in the final quarter of the year—partly because of special and temporary factors.

Yet this disturbing reversal of our progress should not blind us to the solid and significant advances we have made in the past 4 years.

The broad-based attack we launched 4 years ago—and intensified 18 months ago—has in considerable part hit its mark:

Tax cuts and other measures to increase output, stimulate cost-cutting investment, and hold prices steady have made U.S. products far more competitive in world markets. Combined with special export promotion efforts, these policies have—

Boosted our commercial exports by $4.7 billion, or 27 percent;

Pushed our commercial trade surplus to a new record of $3.6 billion—$800 million more than in 1960, and a gain of $1.3 billion over 1963.

Unrelenting efforts to cut the dollar drain of defense and foreign aid expenditures have, since 1960—

Reduced oversea dollar spending for aid by more than $400 million;

Reduced oversea military spending by more than $200 million (despite rising prices in the countries where our forces are stationed);

Increased military offset sales to foreign countries through the Department of Defense by $450 million, and expanded sales of military equipment to foreign governments from commercial sources.

Successful policies for expansion both here and overseas have brought a rise by nearly $2 billion in profits and interest on our past foreign investments.

But these impressive gains totaling well over $3.5 billion did not correspondingly narrow our balance-of-payments deficit. They were largely offset by a $2.5 billion rise in the level of private capital outflow since 1960—and $2 billion of this rise occurred from 1963 to 1964:

The interest equalization tax successfully diminished American purchases of foreign securities from the peak rate of 1963. But new issues exempt from the tax—especially by Canada—kept these purchases nearly $500 million above the 1960 level.

Meanwhile, our banks met foreign demands for capital by adding almost $1 billion to their long-term loans abroad in 1964—$800 million above 1960 and $400 million above 1963.

Short-term capital outflows in the form of bank credits and corporate funds rose to an estimated $2 billion, well above the 1960 and 1963 outflows even though our money-market rates were kept generally in line with those abroad.

Direct investment abroad by U.S. companies—very largely in Canada and Europe—rose by more than $400 million above 1960 levels, and $200 million above 1963.

Moreover, travel and tourist spending abroad rose $600 million from 1960 to 1964, while foreign travel outlays in the United States rose only $200 million.

The net impact of all these changes was to reduce our overall deficit by only $900 million—from $3.9 billion in 1960 to $3 billion last year.

To be sure, we have made more progress than these raw figures suggest. More than half of our 1964 deficit was financed by increased holdings of dollars by foreign citizens and by foreign private banks and businesses. Less than half of it had to be financed by the sale of gold or of dollars to foreign governments and central banks. It is only this "official" part that other countries count as the measure of their deficits.

If we measured our deficit their way, it would show—

In 1962, a deficit of $3.3 billion;

In 1963, a deficit of $2.3 billion; and

In 1964, a deficit of only $1.3 billion.

This way of measuring our deficit does not reduce our need for further action. But it gives another, and in many ways a better measure of our progress. It gives another and perhaps more realistic measure of how far we still have to go to attain balance. And it reflects the firm confidence of private individuals the world over in the dollar.

This confidence rests on the full convertibility of our dollars into gold—at the fixed price of $35 an ounce. Our gold reserve of $15 billion represents 35 percent of the free world's official gold reserves. To eliminate any possible doubts about its full availability I have asked the Congress to remove the outmoded gold cover requirement against Federal Reserve deposits. I am glad that the Congress is acting promptly on this recommendation.

As we move ahead to further measures to cope with our balance-of-payments problem, it is clear that we lead from strength. But to safeguard that strength, we must reinforce our programs to bring our external payments into balance and maintain full confidence in the dollar.

MEASURES TO REINFORCE OUR PROGRAMS

CAPITAL

I propose to take further steps to restrain our outflow of capital to the advanced industrial world. I do so reluctantly. The contribution of American capital to the world's growth and prosperity has been immense. But our balance-of-payments deficit leaves me no choice.

The interest equalization tax has effectively reduced the purchases of foreign securities by Americans since legislation was submitted to Congress in July 1963. At the same time, it has encouraged the broadening and deepening of capital markets in Europe—markets which can make a lasting contribution to the economic growth of the free world.

The tax is now scheduled to expire at the end of this year. But circumstances require that it remain in effect.

Therefore, I request the Congress to extend for 2 years the interest equalization tax on purchases by Americans of foreign securities.

Bank loans abroad with maturities over 1 year—not now covered by the tax—increased by more than one-third, or nearly $1 billion, in 1964. The bulk of this money went to other industrialized countries. Of this, only 15 percent served to finance U.S. exports.

In my judgment this outflow has reflected substitution for new security issues in an amount sufficient materially to impair the effectiveness of the interest equalization tax.

Acting, therefore, under the authority granted me by the Interest Equalization Tax Act, I have today imposed the tax on bank loans abroad with maturities of 1 year or more, with appropriate exemption for borrowers in developing countries.

If the tax did not apply to foreign credits made by nonbank lenders, it would discriminate against banks and invite an outflow of untaxed funds through nonbanking channels.

Therefore, I request the Congress to amend the interest equalization tax to impose it on extensions of nonbank credit of 1 year or more maturity, effective as of today.

Finally, and as soon as proper authorizations are prepared, I intend to exempt from the interest equalization tax purchases by U.S. residents of new securities issued or guaranteed by the Government of Japan, up to an aggregate amount of $100 million each year. Until now, an exemption for Japan under the interest equalization tax has not proved necessary. However, the application of the tax to bank loans of over 1 year will, in my judgment, create a sufficient threat to the international monetary system to justify a limited exemption.

These measures are designed to serve our balance-of-payments objectives without imposing direct controls on American business abroad. We seek to preserve the freedom of the marketplace. But we cannot succeed without the full cooperation of the business and financial community.

I hereby call on American businessmen and bankers to enter a constructive partnership with their Government to protect and strengthen the position of the dollar in the world today. In doing so, they will perform a major service to their Nation. And they will help assure a setting of economic prosperity at home and economic stability abroad in which to conduct their own business and financial operations.

Let me make clear that the Government does not wish to impede the financing of exports, or the day-to-day operation of American business abroad. But loans and investments which are not essential must be severely curtailed.

Specifically, I ask the bankers and businessmen of America to exercise voluntary restraint in lending money or making investments abroad in the developed countries. This request applies with special force to short-term loans and direct investments; that is, the capital outflows not covered by the interest equalization tax.

In connection with bank loans, I am asking the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to work closely with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Nation's banks to develop a program that will sharply limit the flow of bank loans abroad. I have directed the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to cooperate with the Federal Reserve and the Treasury in this undertaking.

To initiate this program, I am inviting a group of our leading bankers to meet with me, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in the near future.

Cooperation among competing banking interests could raise problems under the antitrust laws, and, if extended beyond measures essential to our balance-of-payments objectives, would damage our competitive system.

Therefore, I request the Congress to grant a statutory exemption from the antitrust laws to make possible the cooperation of American banks in support of our balance-of-payments objectives. I request, also, that the legislation require that this exemption be administered in ways which will not violate the principles of free competition.

Pending enactment of this legislation, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve will guide this program of voluntary restraint along lines which raise no antitrust problems.

In connection with short-term corporate lending and direct investment in advanced countries abroad, I am asking a group of our leading businessmen to meet with me and the Secretary of Commerce for a full discussion of the voluntary methods by which we can achieve the necessary results. The Secretary of Commerce will remain in close contact with the responsible corporate officials. He will request periodic reports as the basis for appraising their contribution to our balance-of-payments targets.

I have no doubt that American bankers and businessmen will respond to the Nation's need. With their cooperation, we can block the leakage of funds abroad, without blocking the vital flow of credit to American business.

I am confident that the Federal Reserve, in carrying out its responsibilities for monetary policy, will continue its efforts to maintain short-term rates of return in the American money market. The Treasury will fully cooperate. At the same time—and in view of the heavy flow of private savings into our capital markets—I expect the continuation of essential stability in interest rates.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES ABROAD

Since 1960, we have steadily reduced the dollar drain of our foreign aid program. We have steadily raised the percentage of AID dollars spent for U.S. goods and services—85 percent of new AID commitments are now spent within our borders. Until we master our balance-of-payments problem, AID officials will send no aid dollars abroad that can be sent instead in the form of U.S. goods and services.

The same rule will apply to our defense dollars. We have already made major progress in cutting the outflow of dollars for our defenses abroad—without impairing our strength or our defense commitment to the free world. I have directed the Secretary of Defense to intensify his program—

To shift defense buying from sources abroad to sources in the United States;

To reduce the staffs in oversea headquarters;

To streamline oversea support operations;

To work with our defense partners to increase their offset purchases of military equipment in the United States.

The Department of Defense has already conserved hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign exchange by such actions. But the Secretary assures me he can do more, while fully protecting our security interests and discharging our responsibilities.

FOREIGN TRAVEL

The growing interest of our citizens in foreign lands, and the steady rise in their incomes, have greatly increased American vacation travel abroad. Foreign travel should be encouraged when we can afford it, but not while our payments position remains urgent. Today, our encouragement must be directed to travel in the United States, both by our own citizens and by our friends from abroad.

I ask the tourist industry to strengthen and broaden the appeal of American vacations to foreign and domestic travelers, and I will support its efforts through the "See the U.S.A." program.

In order to cut the dollar outflows associated with foreign travel, I recommend that the Congress—

Pass legislation to reduce the duty exemption on foreign purchases by U.S. citizens returning from abroad to $50, based on the price actually paid;

Limit the exemption to goods which accompany the returning travelers.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN U.S. SECURITIES

A truly worldwide market for capital among industrialized nations requires a two-way flow of investments. In order to stimulate a greater inflow of capital from advanced industrial countries, the Secretary of the Treasury will shortly request legislation, generally along the lines recommended by a Presidential task force, to remove tax deterrents to foreign investment in U.S. corporate securities. This action will encourage—and will be reinforced by—the efforts of American business and finance to market U.S. stocks and bonds to foreign investors.

EXPORTS AND COMPETITION

Finally, and most important for the long pull, American business, labor, agriculture, and Government must work together to maintain stable costs and prices and strengthen our trade position in the world.

Essential to a strong competitive position is an expanding economy operating at or near capacity, yet holding costs and prices in check. Sharp reductions in income taxes—with more liberal depreciation allowances and special incentives for cost-cutting investment—have played a key role in creating such strength. Rising volume, rising productivity, and falling tax rates have enabled U.S. industry to hold the line on costs and prices while earning record profits and paying record wages.

As a result, U.S. prices and wage costs have remained more stable in recent years than those of any of our major competitors. The 27-percent rise in commercial exports since 1960—and especially the 15-percent rise in the past year—bear witness to our growing ability to compete in foreign markets. And the moderate rise in our imports demonstrates our growing ability to meet and beat foreign competition in our home markets.

But we must not take that ability for granted. Unwarranted price and wage increases could destroy it all too quickly. Unless American business and labor hew to the Government's price-wage guideposts, we will run grave risks of losing our competitive advantage.

Wage increases which exceed economy-wide productivity gains and price decisions which ignore falling unit costs—and there have been recent instances of both—do us all a disservice.

I call on all Americans to do their share in maintaining our generally excellent record of wage and price moderation. They will thereby strengthen their country both at home and abroad.

On a foundation of stable costs and prices, we will build an increasingly vigorous program of export expansion:

I urge the Congress to approve the $13 million budget request for our export expansion program in the next fiscal year.

We will step up our efforts to assure American industry sound and fully competitive export financing.

We will strive to eliminate such artificial barriers to U.S. exports as discriminatory freight rates on ocean traffic.

Policies for an expanding economy coupled with responsible price and wage decisions and special measures to convert our competitive advantage into greater exports—this is the combination that holds the key to a lasting solution of our balance-of-payments problem.

EVOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS SYSTEM

The measures I have proposed in this message will hasten our progress toward international balance without damage to our security abroad or our prosperity at home. But our international monetary responsibilities will not end with our deficit. Healthy growth of the free world economy requires orderly but continuing expansion of the world's monetary reserves.

During the past decade, our deficits have helped meet that need. The flow of deficit dollars into foreign central banks has made up about half of the increase in free world reserves. As we eliminate that flow, a shortage of reserves could emerge. We need to continue our work on the development of supplementary sources of reserves to head off that threat. And we need to perfect our mechanisms for making international credit available to countries suffering from balance-of-payments difficulties—on terms that will assure orderly correction of imbalances without forcing deflation on deficit countries or inflation on surplus countries.

To go back to a system based on gold alone—to the system which brought us all to disaster in the early 1930's—is not an answer the world will, or should, accept. Rather we must build on the system we now have, a system which has served the world well during the past 20 years.

We have already made an excellent start. Our short-term defenses against speculative crises have proved their strength and flexibility. The proposed increase in IMF quotas is a constructive forward step. Further, for some time we have been jointly exploring with our major trading partners how best to create new reserve assets that will be available if needed to supplement gold and dollars.

We must press forward with our studies and beyond, to action—evolving arrangements which will continue to meet the needs of a fast growing world economy. Unless we make timely progress, international monetary difficulties will exercise a stubborn and increasingly frustrating drag on our policies for prosperity and progress at home and throughout the world.

Let no one doubt it—

We will eliminate our international deficit; and

We will maintain the dollar at full value.

Our instruments and our actions must be as strong as our resolve. That is why I have taken the additional steps, and am asking the Congress for the new legislation. These measures will focus our great economic strength more sharply on our payments problem.

This is a problem that involves us all—as workers, as businessmen, as bankers, and as Government officials.

I know that the Congress and the American public will respond in full measure to the challenge.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1965.*

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am impressed by the fact that President Johnson's message on the balance of payments is not designed merely to meet the short-term changes in our balance of payments which we have seen in the last few years.

It is clear that President Johnson has based his new measures, as the previous ones have been, upon the firm conviction that there is nothing basically wrong with the dollar. I thoroughly agree.

The problems we have encountered in the balance-of-payments area since 1960 and before do not reflect an underlying fault in our international trade and payments system. Rather they reflect sudden disturbances in that system which we see in the fluctuations of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. While some of the measures which President Johnson is recommending are temporary, his program overall is long range in outlook.

It is designed to meet the immediate problem of the rise in our balance-of-payments deficit without disturbing in the slightest the proper functioning of the international monetary system.

For those reasons I am thoroughly in accord with the measures he has put forward in his message and look forward to speedy congressional action.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I welcome President Johnson's message on the balance of payments. I am impressed with his proposals. It is my belief that the Congress will move swiftly to enact the necessary legislation.

There have long been doubts in some circles that it is possible to improve our domestic and international economic positions at the same time. Our experience over the past 4 years has proved that these doubts are unfounded.

During that time our domestic economic progress has been virtually without equal in the history of our Nation. During that time we have also made solid and significant progress in improving our international balance-of-payments position.

President Johnson's measures are of the kind which do not interfere with, but instead respect and preserve, the functioning of our free enterprise economy. To some, it would have seemed easy simply to raise interest rates—and thus to dampen economic progress at home—in an effort to cope with the temporary pressures on our balance of payments which have recently developed. President Johnson, however, was wise enough to see that our continued economic strength at home is a vital factor in maintaining the great confidence and respect which the dollar embodies throughout the free world.

By stressing voluntary cooperation, by carefully tailoring proposals to meet directly current problems, he has come forward with a program which I am sure will meet the problems confronting us without creating the slightest difficulty in our continued economic expansion at home.

For this reason, the President's proposals have my wholehearted support.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am glad that in today's message the President has recognized the need for a concerted effort to reduce, if we cannot wipe out, our deficit in the balance of international payments.

As chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I will cooperate by giving early attention to the parts of the President's corrective program which affect banking.

But I doubt that the steps he has proposed in attempting to check the flow of U.S. bank loans abroad, to practice strict economy in our own military spending abroad, and to further limit the amount of duty-free goods American tourists may bring home, will cure the situation, so long as we disburse around the world large sums in foreign aid, in the Public Law 480 food program, and in the construction of expensive military bases overseas.

A House colleague in whom I have great confidence informs me that the aggregate figure for foreign aid in the fiscal year 1965 may exceed $7 billion. That would include present items in the regular foreign aid bill, food for peace costing $1 billion or more, and foreign military construction.

When we consider all the channels, public and private, by which American dollars go abroad, we wind up with an outgo that exceeds by $3 billion plus the $6 billion we get for our exports.

We have had deficits in our balance of payments almost continuously for 15 years. The lone exception was 1957, when we enjoyed a temporary surplus of $500 million.

The following year, we fell back into the deficit column; and we have remained there since. The drain on our gold supply is merely the evidence of the more serious problem—namely, the lavish distribution of dollars in excess of our exports.

The Banking and Currency Committee today voted to report the bill, requested by the administration, to make about $5 billion more of our gold supply available, to strengthen the value of the dollar abroad; but nearly every witness on that bill conceded that this is only a stopgap and a futile gesture unless we promptly take other steps to cure the disease of sending abroad more dollars than we get back for exports.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, President Johnson's balance-of-payments message and the steps the Treasury and other Federal agencies will take strongly emphasize the fact that today the dollar is strong and stable.

Four years ago we faced a crisis of confidence in regard to the dollar. We faced that crisis, and we met it.

Today, while the balance-of-payments situation is not comparable, either in character or in magnitude, to the situation we faced 4 years ago, nevertheless it is real; and positive steps to meet it are being taken.

President Johnson said:

> Those who fear for the dollar are needlessly afraid. Those who hope for its weakness, hope in vain.

Over the past 4 years, we have taken measures which have immeasurably strengthened our international economic position. Today the dollar would not be the major reserve currency of the free world if other nations did not believe this.

I am sure Congress will act swiftly in response to the President's message.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to join with other Senators in tribute to the President's message on our balance-of-payments problem.

We have received today another in a series of Presidential communications. Without exception these messages have been carefully prepared, dispassionate analyses of the critical issues which face this Nation.

With each bold recitation of the facts have come equally bold recommendations for dealing with these facts. Today's message is no exception. It is a model in clarity and in prescription. It should go far in helping us to understand that aspect of our economy which is least understood, in helping us to solve that problem whose solution is most critical and most baffling.

I am particularly pleased with the President's determination to solve the problem of the balance-of-payments deficit and the gold outflow through the encouragement and expansion of international trade. Maryland industry and the port of Baltimore stand ready to assist this effort in every possible way. In fact, representatives from industry and the port are constantly engaged in negotiations aimed at increasing commerce with our partners overseas.

The program outlined by President Johnson in his balance-of-payments message avoids any retrogression from a liberal trade policy. This is highly desirable when we are engaged in efforts to liberalize the free world trading pattern.

Some foreign countries have been complaining about a threatened takeover of certain segments of their economy by American firms. The exercise of self-restraint by our business firms in their capital outflows should be welcomed by them. Thus, the message should receive a favorable reception by other countries, even as it strengthens our own capacity to reduce deficits in international payments.

Measures to tighten the outflow of American dollars in foreign aid and to encourage our European and Asian friends to visit the United States as tourists will also have my hearty support. I have always urged the most careful review of our foreign assistance program to insure that it was serving the long-term economic as well as defensive interests of the United States. We cannot afford wasteful overlapping, inefficient administration, or ineffective expenditures.

Last year, I joined the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in the introduction of proposed legislation aimed at a revision of outmoded antitrust laws which may stifle our economy. I congratulate the President on his recommendation that certain exceptions be made to these laws in the interest of our continued economic stability and growth.

All of the President's recommendations will, I am sure, receive the most painstaking study by the committees of Congress. I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the leader and the many distinguished chairmen of committees for the speed with which they have begun the consideration of important legislation this year.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Frank Gasparro, of Pennsylvania, to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald W. Hoagland, of Colorado, to be Assistant Administrator for Development Finance and Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Attorney General.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the confirmation of the nomination of Nicholas deB. Katzenbach to be Attorney General?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on that question I ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the confirmation of the nomination of Nicholas deB. Katzenbach to be Attorney General?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I take this occasion to say a few words concerning the nomination of Nicholas Katzenbach.

I think that a man of extraordinary ability and energy has been selected by the President to fill this most important position. On the basis of the record which he has achieved as Deputy Attorney General, he well merits this promotion, this advancement.

We know that he will do his job with dispatch and honesty, and that he will carry out the legislative intent of all the laws which come within the purview of his responsibility.

We wish him well and are delighted that his nomination to be Attorney General of the United States has been confirmed on this day by such an overwhelming majority.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is a privilege for the Senate to confirm the nomination by the President of the United States of Nicholas Katzenbach to be his Attorney General, and commend Attorney General Katzenbach for the capability, courage, and courtesy with which he has adorned his labors in the Department of Justice through these years.

A reasoned prosecutor—he knows what it is to be a prisoner—a prisoner in war camps where books were easier to come by than food.

An author—with obligations to Princeton, Yale, and Oxford, he knows how to organize his thinking.

An administrator—he knows how to organize the application of the law in troubled times and places.

A family man—he expresses that extra element of responsibility and continuity in our Great Society.

This nomination is one of advancement for merit. I shall not term it service beyond the call of duty, for General Katzenbach knows no limitation of loyalty to his office and his opportunity as well as his responsibility to make this a better America for all of us.

To the new Deputy Attorney General, I extend my felicitations to the son of an old friend—Justice Tom C. Clark. Ramsey Clark brings both the halo and the challenge of an honored name to higher office. This son of Texas is soldier, scholar, able advocate in his own right—and our country is the beneficiary of one born to the traditions of public service.

This is a great hour of recognition of character and competence. I am just as grateful as a citizen as I am proud as a Senator to know that democracy's eternal quest for justice and tranquility will continue to have two such allies as Nicholas Katzenbach and Ramsey Clark.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island in what he has said about the nomination of Mr. Clark. I think that he and Mr. Katzenbach will make a great team. The country will be better off because of their joint activities. Certainly Mr. Clark well merits this honor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in connection with the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Katzenbach to be Attorney General, which has just taken place, I point out that there is in the record of the hearings on the nomination an exchange of questions and answers—questions which I was unable to ask because of the fact that my plane did not land in Washington on Monday morning, but it required 4 hours to land at Dulles Airport. I submitted questions to the new Attorney General, questions with respect to the activities of the Department of Justice at Selma, Ala., and the Attorney General answered them.

It is my deep conviction—and that is why I supported the nomination of the Attorney General—that the Attorney General intends to carry out in the Department the policy of vigorous and prompt enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the other civil rights acts on the statute books of the United States.

It is extremely difficult for people throughout the United States to understand how there can be hundreds upon hundreds of arrests of Negroes in Selma, Ala., who are seeking the basic American privilege to register and vote, when no Negroes have as yet been registered, and when only a handful have even had their applications received and processed.

I understand, and the country understands, because it has not been living in a dream world, the strong feeling that exists against allowing Negroes to vote in the so-called black counties of the South, of which Dallas County in Alabama is one. We understand only too well the depth of feeling on that subject there, wrong as it is, and contrary to the Constitution as it is. But the whole impact of what we have done in this Congress during the last 8 years, since 1957, culminating in the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, shows that the overwhelming majority sentiment of the United States is that the Office of the Attorney General, representing the United States, shall be utilized for the purpose of taking every action at all possible under the law to guarantee these people their voting rights and to restrain excessive police actions, the use of police clubs, and other intimidating methods, and also to restrain authorities from mass arrests not based upon the law or upon adequate probable cause.

No one knows better than I, having been a practicing lawyer for so many years, the great lag that exists between the law and its enforcement. But what we ask, and what I believe the people of Selma, Ala., and the people of the United States have a right to ask, is that every force of the majesty of the country to support the law be employed.

There are some practical questions. Does the Attorney General of the United States have an adequate staff for this purpose? If he does not have an adequate staff for this purpose, it is his duty to ask Congress to supply that staff to him.

If the Attorney General lacks the powers in respect to the redress of this dangerous and grievous situation, it is his duty to ask Congress for additional powers.

If the President believes—and I think he has every right to believe—that the ordinary processes of registration of voters cannot be followed at Selma, Ala., because arbitrary literacy tests and other practices under the guise of maintaining public law and order inhibit the opportunity of thousands of Americans who wish to do so to register to vote, it is the duty of the President to ask Congress for appropriate legislation on that score, whether that legislation be for registrars actually to register voters or whether it be for some other power on the part of the United States.

So long as a single indication exists—and it certainly exists now—that the law is not adequate to deal with the situation that has arisen in Selma, I believe we have the right to demand that the President, with the utmost celerity, ask for that law which, in his judgment, will be adequate, or at least under which a better effort can be made than is being made now.

The fact is that this is a dangerous and unsatisfactory situation. I do not feel the sense of urgency on the part of the Department of Justice that we should feel under these circumstances. Nonetheless, because I respect Mr. Katzenbach and believe he diligently and honestly wishes to enforce the law, as he showed when he was Deputy Attorney General, and as he has shown since he became Acting Attorney General, I have supported the confirmation of his nomination to be Attorney General. But this gives us the right to demand an increase in the scope and intensity of the activities that are called for from an Attorney General with the present civil rights laws on the books, and with the rights of Americans to register and vote in a particular place in a particular State, apparently being flagrantly disregarded and abused.

So I ask the Attorney General, supported by the President of the United States, for two things: First, give the highest priority of vigorous legal action to the effort to restrain excessive police activity, unlawful arrests, and the various other methods that are being used to frustrate the right to vote and the right to register to vote on the part of thousands of Negroes in Dallas County, Ala.

Second, if there is any deficiency in the amount of money or the amount of personnel available to the Department of Justice to perform this function, it is the duty of the Attorney General to seek to repair that lack immediately and on a specialized emergency basis by asking Congress for the necessary money and the necessary personnel.

If the President feels—and there are reports, we understand, that he does so feel—that additional laws are required because the situation is so serious, the additional laws should be asked for, and should be asked for promptly, on the highest priority.

The leading question in this country remains, as it has for some time, whether we have made good the guarantees of the Constitution to the millions of Americans who are Negroes. We should seek no gratitude or special thanks in respect to our strong interest in this matter, because for too long those rights have been frustrated.

If manmade problems stand in the way, problems either of staff or money or enforcement authority or of the necessary law, there is a way to repair that situation and repair it promptly. Accordingly, I urge upon the Attorney General, whose nomination has now been confirmed, that he take this action without a moment's delay because, in my judgment, a subject of the highest priority and responsibility is before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next nomination will be stated.

DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am indeed happy to speak in favor of the Senate approving the nomination of Ramsey Clark for the position of Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. Clark is a man of great ability and integrity. He has served in the Department of Justice since 1961 as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division and is thoroughly familiar with the procedures of that Department. His work has thrown him in direct contact with the offices of the various U.S. attorneys throughout the Nation, with whom as Deputy Attorney General he will be expected to be in rather constant contact.

As a lawyer, he is especially qualified for this high office, having received his college and legal education at the University of Texas and the University of Chicago, and having practiced law with distinction in Dallas, Tex., for 10 years.

To my mind, it is most appropriate that those men in high positions in the Department of Justice be men who are familiar with the problems and procedures of the private practice of law.

Mr. Clark is the son of the esteemed Justice Tom Clark of the Supreme Court. In many ways, he is following in the footsteps of his distinguished father who served as Assistant Attorney General and as Attorney General before going to the Supreme Court. In this regard, it is also significant to note that Ramsey Clark is presently the national president of the Federal Bar Association, a very high honor among attorneys. His father was also national president of the Federal Bar Association when he was Assistant Attorney General.

I trust that the Senate will approve Mr. Clark's nomination. I am sure that he will serve the Government and the people of this great Nation with sincerity and with distinction.

It is also my further hope that he continues to follow in the footsteps of his most able and distinguished father.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Ramsey Clark to be Deputy Attorney General?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations in the Department of Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 474 of the 81st Congress, appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] as a member of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration.

THE 232D ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF STATE OF GEORGIA AS THE 13TH ORIGINAL COLONY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate today to one of the great events of the history of our country, and particularly of the history of the sovereign State of Georgia.

On Friday, February 12, my State will mark the observance of "Georgia Day," in commemoration of the 232d anniversary of the founding of the State of Georgia as the 13th Original Colony.

James Edward Oglethorpe founded the Colony of Georgia on February 12 in 1733. Six years later hostility between England and Spain burst into open warfare. Oglethorpe's later victory against the Spanish in the Battle of Bloody Marsh at St. Simons Island decisively established the American colonists' continental supremacy. For his work in building up Georgia defenses and routing the Spanish landing forces at Bloody Marsh, Oglethorpe received letters of appreciation from the Governors of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina.

It is also noteworthy that from the founding of the Colony of Georgia grew the great city of Savannah, the first planned city in America.

I join all Georgians in celebrating the State's 232d birthday and share with my fellow Georgians a high degree of pride in the State's glorious history.

U.S. COASTAL FISHERY RESOURCES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARTLETT BEFORE NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on January 26, in San Francisco, Senator E. L. BARTLETT, a member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, made an address before the National Canners Association entitled "The Conservation of U.S. Coastal Fishery Resources." This statement on U.S. fishery policy has been widely acclaimed. It emphasizes that the United States must take whatever action is required to conserve and protect the fishery resources upon which we depend. I was pleased to note that Senator BARTLETT emphasized the contribution that could be made by an international conference and stressed that many jurisdictional disputes over the use of fishery resources might be resolved through such an international meeting. This is a proposal that I have been advocating for several years and one that I think is essential if we are to protect our interests in the ocean resources.

Mr. President, I ask that Senator BARTLETT's speech be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSERVATION OF U.S. COASTAL FISHERY RESOURCES

(Address by Senator E. L. BARTLETT at National Canners Association meeting in San Francisco on Tuesday, January 26, 1965)

In January of last year, the chief executive of our host State, Gov. Pat Brown, convened here in California a conference on the subject: "California and the World Ocean." During that 1964 fisheries conference a very vivid and dramatic picture of the recent, rapid expansion of California fishing companies into the worldwide scene was presented by the president of the Van Camp Foundation, Wilbert McCloud Chapman. Mr. Chapman predicted that there were only six or seven countries in the world that would produce in 1964 more fish from the world ocean than the total produced by firms headquartered in California.

This dynamic effort follows a proud tradition. California has long been a leading State in the production of fish and our host city by the sea has built a reputation of preparing and serving the delicacies of the sea in the most splendid fashion. I am sure you share my pleasure in being in San Francisco.

The January 1964 conference on "California and the World Ocean" covered many fishery problems. The accent and emphasis, however, was on increasing the world fishery catch and the more extensive utilization of world fishery resources, which is the problem of major concern to any dynamic fishing industry. We in Congress have also been concerned with this problem recently. Both the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 and the Fishing Fleet Improvement Act of 1964 were enacted in an effort to improve and expand the U.S. catch. Congress, during the past 2 years, appropriated substantial funds for research in the development of more efficient fishing gear such as a new midwater trawl and a commercially-acceptable fish protein concentrate.

But the underutilization of the world's fishery resources, we must remember, is a very old problem. Since man was first hungry, the sea has offered food to meet his needs—food that was not enjoyed or utilized because man lacked the mechanical and technical knowledge to separate great quantities of the resource from the water. The ancient problem of underutilization is still with us. But this problem is being solved and being solved very rapidly. It is primarily a problem of technology. It is one that can be solved by the application of science. We all know that since the Second World War, the world catch of fish has been increasing at over 6 percent per year, which means it has doubled about every 12 years. If the problem of underutilization were the only problem of the U.S. fisheries, I would say that we would be secure in no more than 20 to 40 years. When the underutilization problem is considered in a broad time perspective, I think we can agree that the problem has been with us for centuries, that its possibility of solution is now imminent and that in the wake of the answer to the technological problem of underutilization, arises a new and more difficult and complex political and social problem—that being the one of intelligently conserving the world fishery resources, and more specifically, conserving U.S. coastal fishery resources from overexploitation.

I hasten to add my acknowledgment that conservation can be a deceptive word. You know, and I do too, much havoc has been brought, inequity continued, and economic waste encouraged—all under the banner of conservation. With conservation as a goal, many men of good intentions have retarded needed economic development and have insisted on preserving resources untapped and unused which were required to meet the human needs of a community or nation. But we should not allow these exceptions to cloud the legitimate goals of conservation in maintaining productivity.

There is another reason I would like to discuss conservation problems. Traditionally, governments have assumed, and I think necessarily assumed, the dominant role in the conservation of resources and have taken a secondary role in meeting the problems of technological development and economic utilization of resources. The nature of my work in Washington, therefore, suggests that I should talk about conservation and leave technological problems to others.

The United States is, of course, interested in the conservation of fishery resources throughout the world. But I think we should be most immediately and primarily concerned with the conservation of those fishery resources we now harvest or most likely will want to use in the future.

In 1963 the total U.S. catch was valued at $375 million. About $340 million or over, 90 percent of the total catch in terms of value and 95 percent in terms of tonnage, was taken from our inland and coastal waters. The balance, or about $35 million, was taken by the U.S. distant water fleet fishing primarily off the west coast of Central and South America for tuna and off the east coast of Mexico for shrimp. These figures rather strongly suggest that the United States is primarily a coastal fishery nation and I will first consider the conservation problems of this fishery.

It is acknowledged that some of the most extensive fishery resources in the world are located in U.S. coastal waters. In my opinion, the significance and potential of our coastal fishery resources has not been fully appreciated. It is important to remember that the world fishing effort is concentrated today in waters over the Continental Shelf located within the Tropic and Temperate Zones. The measurement of the U.S. coastline within these zones exceeds 10,000 miles. Only Indonesia, Australia and Russia have comparable or more extensive coastlines similarly measured. The other 111 nations either have substantially less or no coastline.

I am sure that for this group, it is repetitious to point out that last summer there were 1,500 Russian and Japanese fishing vessels in U.S. coastal waters and this represents a substantial segment of the two largest distant water fishing fleets in the world. It is hard to face the fact that the United States would have to build fishing vessels at the maximum rate of construction authorized by the 1964 Fleet Improvement Act through the close of this century before we would be able to place in our own coastal waters a fleet of U.S. fishing vessels comparable in tonnage to the foreign-flag fishing fleets operating in our coastal waters at the present time. The concern should be whether we can conserve a sufficiently substantial coastal fishery resource for the future to encourage the necessary investment in a modern, high-seas fishing fleet.

Of the total U.S. coastal catch of $340 million in 1963, about $70 million was taken from resources over which the United States has jurisdiction either by virtue of the resource residing within our inland and territorial waters or pursuant to the 1958 convention on the Continental Shelf. These resources principally include oysters, clams, and crabs. Having U.S. jurisdiction over the fishery resources substantially solves the conservation problem, in my opinion, by making the subject a domestic problem with clear State responsibility and authority to conserve rather than an international problem to be approached by negotiations with many nations, each with different economic and political problems and different ideas on conservation. When the United States extends its jurisdiction over coastal fisheries to 12 miles, the United States will acquire effective jurisdiction over other resources, principally the important shrimp resource in the Gulf of Mexico and the menhaden resource in the coastal waters along the South Atlantic and Gulf Coast States. Although both of those resources are found at times beyond the 12-mile limit, the best evidence suggests that substantial, if not absolute, protection from foreign exploitation will occur when the United States moves to a 12-mile fishery zone. The total catch of these two resources amounted to $90 million in 1963.

In summary, this means that approximately half of the U.S. coastal catch in terms of value is, or at least in my opinion shortly will be, from fishery resources within the jurisdiction of the United States. The remaining 50 percent of the coastal catch plus the distant water fishery catch is from stocks of fish at present beyond the unilateral control of the United States and that can be conserved only through treaty arrangements.

The United States has several treaties with Canada regarding the conservation of the Great Lakes fisheries and Pacific coast salmon and halibut, but the two major multilateral fishery treaties relating to our coastal fisheries are the International North Pacific Fishery Convention and the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries.

The North Pacific Convention attempts to solve with Canada and Japan the conservation and jurisdiction problems over Pacific salmon and halibut. Although the present treaty is broad enough to include other stocks, it has not been so used. This treaty is in the process of renegotiations. Its future is uncertain, but if a renegotiation is possible, the treaty will likely be restricted to the problems arising from these two resources. The U.S. landed value of the salmon and halibut catch in 1963 was approximately $60 million.

The North Atlantic Convention includes 13 nations and deals with all fishery resources of the North Atlantic with principal attention given to haddock, flounder, whiting, cod, ocean perch, and herring. The 1963 U.S. catch of these resources totaled approximately $40 million. North Atlantic lobster and scallops are also important coastal fishery resources with an annual catch value of about $25 million. Some question has been raised as to whether these resources which exist on the shelf may be protected under the 1958 International Convention on the Continental Shelf.

I know of no immediate fishery conservation problem facing any segment of the distant water fleet other than the serious problem confronting yellow-fin tuna off the west coast of Central and South America. In 1963 the value of the yellowfin catch was $25 million. In anticipation of the conservation problem facing the resource, the United States initiated and has become a party with four other nations to a conservation treaty covering tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific. In this context, I should mention that the United States is a member of the International Whaling Convention, although today we are not extensively engaged in the fishery.

It can, therefore, be said that the United States is primarily a coastal fishing nation, the United States has or soon will have jurisdiction over approximately half of the coastal fishery resources from which the present catch is taken and that the conservation of the other fishery resources upon which we presently depend requires international agreement. It has been pointed out that international machinery is already established to meet the conservation needs of the fishery resource of the North Atlantic, of North Pacific halibut and salmon, and of tropical tuna, which are the dominant fisheries over which we have no unilateral jurisdiction and upon which we depend.

But there are two problem areas which I would like to point out. First, each of our major multilateral agreements for regional fishery conservation is in serious difficulty and, secondly, there is no international machinery to assure the conservation of certain tremendous potential fisheries in the North Pacific Ocean.

In respect to the problems of the three major international fishing conventions—namely, those dealing with the North Pacific halibut and salmon, the North Atlantic fisheries and the tropical tuna—I will not attempt to analyze each in any great detail. As you know, Mr. William C. Herrington, special assistant to the Under Secretary of State for Fisheries and Wildlife, is with us and will be more informative. I would remind you that the scientists of the Tropical Tuna Commission over 3 years ago determined that the yellow-fin tuna resource was being overfished. To date, however, no regulations to conserve the resource have been placed into effect. And I have heard no one express confidence that any effective conservation regulations under the convention could be expected in the near future.

The International North Pacific Convention has been operating with substantial success for almost 12 years. Much improvement should be made particularly in respect to the protection of the Bristol Bay red salmon run. However, treaty renegotiation has been agonizing. Three difficult and long meetings have been held by Japan, Canada, and the United States. Some, but limited, progress has been made and the future of this treaty is definitely uncertain.

The North Atlantic Convention includes 13 nations. The number of nations involved alone makes it extremely difficult to expect prompt action and an alert response could be essential to the conservation of such fishery resource as haddock if a major shift of effort is made by nations with large, modern fishing fleets. The Atlantic Convention has been plagued by delays. Commission proposals to conserve groundfish and flounder have been pending over 3 years. Serious enforcement problems have arisen without any satisfactory solutions found. Although the Commission has a rather wide range of forms of regulations that may be applied, only mesh size regulations have been adopted. No serious attempt has been made to deal with the problem of excessive fishing effort.

I will not trouble you with the absolute failure of the Whaling Convention to meet the problem of the destruction of the Antarctic whale.

The adequacy of these international approaches to conservation must be reconsidered. We need to continue to give leadership in actively pursuing the protection of the U.S. interest in the conservation of those fishery resources. We must acknowledge that the present multilateral approaches are not effective. Something more positive and even a radical departure from the present approach may be necessary for the future.

It is clear that something more is needed immediately to protect our interest in the exposed fishery resources of the North Pacific and Bering Sea, which is principally the ground and shrimp fisheries. In recent years, the Russians and Japanese took substantial quantities of shrimp, flounder, ocean perch, sablefish, cod, and pollack in the water above the Alaska Continental Shelf. It is reliably and conservatively estimated that these six fishery resources alone have a potential annual catch value in excess of $200 million or over half the value of the present total U.S. catch. The volume of the foreign catch in the North Pacific and Bering Sea by specie is unknown. In 1963 the U.S. catch from the same six North Pacific fishery resources was about 100 million pounds valued at about $8 million. These resources are important to us today and, in my opinion, these resources plus North Pacific Ocean hake, herring, and others will be of significant value within the next 10 to 20 years.

These resources have a tremendous potential. It is estimated that the potential annual catch of shrimp off Alaska exceeds 1 billion pounds (approximately five times the present gulf coast shrimp catch); the potential annual catch of flounder is 1.5 billion pounds; ocean perch, 300 million pounds; cod and pollack, 140 million pounds; and sablefish, 100 million pounds. In addition to these six stocks of fish which the Japanese and Russians are presently fishing, there is an annual potential catch of herring of 1.2 billion pounds, hake of 700 million pounds, and primarily off California a potential anchovy and sardine annual catch of 500 million pounds each. As I mentioned, there is no international mechanism in existence to help conserve these resources.

Although these resources are abundant when one looks at the total resource from California to the Bering Sea, there is evidence that certain stocks particularly those in the Bering Sea may be already threatened. I refer specifically to the fact that the eastern Bering Sea catch of flounder by Japan 10 years ago was 18 million pounds, that the combined Japanese and Russian catch was about 1.2 billion pounds in 1961, and that the catch figure for 1963 indicated a reduction to about 200 million pounds. This sharp drop in catch was probably due to a heavy depletion of the resource. In any event, it is clear that there has recently occurred off the Alaska coast in the eastern Bering Sea one of the most rapid expansions of ground fisheries in the world. Russian and Japanese fishing fleets are now being moved to the Gulf of Alaska.

In addition to the ground fishery problem, I am seriously concerned with the condition of the shrimp fishery in the Bering Sea which has also been heavily harvested by Russia and Japan. We know little about the Russian catch, but we do know that Japan took well over 75 million pounds of shrimp in the Bering Sea in 1963. In tonnage this Japanese catch alone, without estimating the heavy Russian catch, represents one-third of the U.S. gulf and Atlantic shrimp catch for the same year.

The most promising prospect for the conservation of these resources is the 1958 Geneva Fisheries Convention which the United States and 16 other nations have ratified. Six other nations must ratify before it comes into force. The convention provides that the coastal state has a predominate interest in the conservation of its coastal fishery resources. This is not absolute ownership or jurisdiction over the resource—but it provides a means of conserving the resource with the coastal state playing the dominant role by being given authority to promulgate unilaterally conservation measures based on scientific findings when prompt and adequate conservation action cannot be taken through agreement with the foreign nations fishing off the coastal state, regardless of whether the coastal state is itself engaged in the fishery at the time. Differences that cannot be settled by agreement, are open to compulsory arbitration, with the coastal states' regulations remaining in effect until final settlement. Many of the principles announced unilaterally in the Truman Proclamation on Fishing in 1945 are found in the 1958 Geneva Fisheries Convention.

Major fishing nations such as the United States, Australia, United Kingdom, and Portugal have ratified the convention. Important coastal fishing countries from Africa and South America are members, including the Union of South Africa, Nigeria, Colombia and Venezuela. But neither Russia nor Japan, the two nations imposing the North Pacific threat, have ratified. Russia did indicate during the 1958 United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea a general agreement with the principle advanced by the Fishery Convention but would not accept the compulsory arbitration provisions. I understand from reliable sources that important fishery interests in Japan have now had second thoughts about the Fishery Convention and are seriously considering proposing that their Government become a party.

The U.S. position on the question of whether the Fishery Convention applies to a nonparty nation will most likely be the same as it was in regard to the application of the Continental Shelf Convention to nations that have not ratified that convention. Last year the United States notified Japan that since the Continental Shelf Convention received the vote of 57 nations in favor and only 3 against at the United Nations Conference in 1958 and had come into force, the provisions of the convention represented developing international law applicable to Japan. Although Japan had not become a party and denied being subject to the terms of the convention, the United States was able to impose through agreement needed regulations on the Japanese king crab fishing effort in the Bering Sea. Since there was an overwhelming vote in favor of the Fishing Convention of 45 nations in favor and only 1 nation against, I expect that the U.S. position toward nations which have not become a party to the Fishery Convention to be that the convention, when in force, will represent developing international law and will be applicable to all nations. There is no question but that the provisions of the convention will be judicially recognized as international law and applicable to all nations when a more substantial number of nations have joined or a number of more substantial nations have ratified.

I would, therefore suggest, and suggest rather strongly, that the Department of State actively and directly encourage other nations to become parties to the 1958 Geneva Fisheries Convention. The additional six nations should be brought into the convention as soon as possible. When the Fishery Convention is brought into effect, and I would hope that this could be accomplished sometime this year, an international meeting or conference of member nations and other nations concerned, such as Japan and Russia if these nations have not become members at that time, could be very helpful. Holding such an international conference would help attract attention to the world fishery conservation problem and encourage additional nations to join the convention. The meeting would give an opportunity for member nations to discuss common problems such as how the convention should be interpreted as applying to nations that are not a party to the convention. Agreement on this matter will be important. The conference could also discuss profitably the extent and availability of scientific information necessary to implement any fishery conservation regime. Since the United States has had very valuable experience in obtaining the types of information upon which fishery conservation programs must be based, I would anticipate that the United States could offer a major contribution to the conference.

In anticipation of the 1958 Geneva Fisheries Convention coming into force, I will propose legislation this year to increase substantially research funds to study the conservation problems of North Pacific resources now being harvested primarily by Japan and Russia. We have learned from the Bering Sea halibut problem that ignorance is disaster. With the necessary resource information, the United States will be prepared to take immediate action under the 1958 convention. I would like to mention, in reference to this, the amendment that Senator MAGNUSON and I proposed to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The amendment gives the President the power to increase duties on the imports of fishery products from nations which refuse to meet or to negotiate in good faith international agreements on the conservation of fishery resources. This provision may be useful in encouraging nations to meet and discuss fishery conservation under the 1958 Fisheries Convention.

I sincerely hope that the implementation of the 1958 Fisheries Convention will be adequate to meet the needs of conserving these important resources of the North Pacific. If the United States finds no cooperation in this effort, it will be necessary, in my opinion, to search out a more direct and effective manner of conserving the resources. This I am personally willing to do even if it means proposing an extension of U.S. jurisdiction over the resources.

So it is. We live in perilous days, and troubled times. But we have the capacity to smooth away those troubles, remove some of the perils which confront us. We need only the energy and the foresight. If we address ourselves resolutely and with firmness to the task, the future will be brighter than the past has been. We have a high obligation here, and a clear and present duty. What we seek to do, and what we achieve, will affect the material welfare of only a comparative handful of Americans. There are not many engaged in the taking and processing of fish. Even so, however few their numbers may be, they are entitled to have placed around them the Nation's collective and protective arm. And what we do to stabilize the fishing industry, what we do in delineating and certifying the broad principles of national interest and concern will be for the benefit of all Americans. Time wastes away; we do not have a world of time to waste. We must address ourselves to the proposition and the problem aggressively, and soon. Let us so determine. Let us so act.

SILENCE WILL NOT HELP SOVIET JEWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for some time there has been increasing evidence of growing anti-Jewish activities in the Soviet Union. All over the world, freemen concerned about this ominous campaign have spoken out, as I have done many times here in the Senate, and in public, against the measures which deny Soviet Jews their religious and cultural rights, and allow political, social, and economic measures against Jews.

In connection with this protest, the Congregation Zichron Ephraim in New York City has been active in arousing the conscience of the public to the plight of Soviet Jewry. On January 17, the congregation sponsored a protest meeting at its temple, 163 East 67th Street, New York City, at which a number of distinguished speeches were delivered which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks delivered at this meeting by Arthur Schneier, rabbi of the Congregation Zichron Ephraim and Label A. Katz, president of International B'nai B'rith; as well as a message from the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York State. Because of illness, I was unable to attend this protest meeting, but Mr. John Trubin of New York, read my remarks; I also ask unanimous consent to have these remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPEAL OF CONSCIENCE ON BEHALF OF SOVIET JEWRY

(By Rabbi Arthur Schneier, January 17, 1965, at Congregation Zichron Ephraim)

Standing on this historic pulpit in this very sanctuary on the solemn and awesome day of Rosh Hashanah, I heard the clarion call of the shofar. In the piercing, haunting wail I heard the anguished cry of Soviet Jewry, the cry of our brethren, bereft of freedom, denied opportunity, deprived of religious and cultural privileges. As I heard the plaintive notes of the shofar, I discerned a call, indeed a challenge, addressed to me: How can you, who have personally experienced the Nazi holocaust, whose family members perished in the furnaces of Auschwitz, remain silent in the face of another injustice, the spiritual and cultural extinction of the second largest Jewish community in the world? On that day, a resolution was born that I, that we, will not remain silent. The world has paid the price of silence. In World War II humanity paid with 20 million souls for not taking a stand during the early days of Jewish persecution.

Yet, the same kind of indifference prevails in the plight of Soviet Jewry. Governments are not agitated about it; leaders do not speak up about it. It has not become the rallying cry of the libertarian movements, it has not been made a priority problem of the U.N. It has not become what it must be, a major irritant of the world's conscience.

How can our generation, having witnessed the unparalleled decimation of a great segment of the Jewish body, remain silent? How dare we ignore the Soviet cultural and spiritual genocide of our people? Shall we repeat the same mistake? Shall we be guilty of abandonment, twice within one generation?

In this house of God, we want to make it abundantly clear that this gathering is not to pass judgment on the political or economic philosophy of life of the Soviet Union. We are not concerned with adding fuel to the cold war. We have no military scores to settle. We are gathered here to remember 3 million who depend on our voice, 3 million flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood. Ours is simply, clearly the voice of religious conscience; the voice of our stricken brethren calls to us in human terms, religious terms, in cultural terms. We speak as the voice of religious conscience.

In the accents of our hallowed faith, in the echo of our great redeemer Moses—allow our people to serve God with dignity and freedom (Exodus 9: 13). Permit them to worship freely, to teach their children God's law, to enter God's covenant, to rest peacefully on consecrated ground. And if for whatever reason this request cannot be granted within the boundaries of the Soviet Union—then we say to the Soviet Government—"let my people go." Let them live or let them leave!

It is all too easy to ignore or forget or shunt aside those who are utterly captive, utterly voiceless, and defenseless. We then must give them voice. We must rise to their defense. We must awaken the conscience of the world.

I therefore issue an appeal to all Catholic and Protestant religious leaders of our country to join in setting up a united front with the Jewish community for the purpose of appealing to the Soviet Government to restore religious liberty and freedom of cultural expression to the 3 million Jews of that country. A powerful coalition of bipartisan religious bodies in the United States will prove to be irresistible in awakening the spiritual dynamics of the American people to the gravity of the danger confronting Soviet Jewry. If the moral voice of the leaders of all the major faiths is not employed to stop these inhuman and discriminatory conditions, the very survival of 3 million human beings will be jeopardized in terms of religious continuity, spiritual development, and cultural progress.

Heartened by the support I have received from Americans of all denominations and walks of life in issuing the appeal of conscience, I plead for the establishment of a permanent national committee of distinguished Americans of all faiths to carry on a vigorous and unrelenting campaign to prevent the Soviet Government from pursuing policies which will ultimately terminate in a program of Jewish spiritual liquidation.

Even on their death march to the crematoria, men, women, and children proclaimed their faith, fearlessly chanted I believe with perfect faith. Despite the cultural and spiritual strangulation, many of our brethren in the Soviet cling dearly to their belief, to their commitment, to God and His law. We must sustain their faith, we must assure them that they are not forgotten.

In every generation tyrants sought to destroy us. Their methods may have been different, but their aim was the same. They succeeded in destroying the physical bodies, but they could never crush the human spirit. In the words of the poet Garrison:

Know this, O man! Whate'er thy earthly fate,
God never made a tyrant nor a slave,
Woe then to those who dare to desecrate
His glorious image—for all He gave
Eternal rights, which none may violate,
And by a mighty hand the oppressed He yet shall save.

—WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

REMARKS BY RABBI SCHNEIER AT THE DEDICATION OF BRONZE PLAQUE

"Hear the cry of the oppressed" (Psalms 102: 21)—the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. It is our destiny to remind the world of the trials and tribulations confronting the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. Let this plaque speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. Let them not feel abandoned or forgotten. Let it be a symbol of solidarity between us enjoying freedom and our brethren who are bereft of religious liberty. Let it be a reminder that any oppression oppresses us all.

This plaque will remain as a living monument to awaken the moral conscience of the entire civilized world, of the tragic plight of the 3 million. Day by day, hour by hour, it will serve as a reminder to the injustice committed. Let each one of us carry back to our respective communities the cry of the oppressed. Let our houses of worship throughout this blessed land "hear the cry of the oppressed" and lead the way to arouse the conscience of the world to the plight of the 3 million. We cannot rest, we must not rest. We will not rest until justice is done.

Although this plaque is made of bronze, it is made only to weather a temporary storm that besets our people. We have faith that the rulers of Soviet Russia will realize their tragic mistake and restore full religious and cultural freedom to the 3 million. We pray for the day in the very near future when together with our neighbors from the Soviet mission we will join in the removal of this plaque for on that day justice will have been done.

REMARKS OF LABEL A. KATZ, PRESIDENT OF INTERNATONAL B'NAI B'RITH, DELIVERED AT PROTEST MEETING ON SOVIET JEWRY, CONGREGATION ZICHRON EPHRAIM, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 17, 1965

I join with you this morning in this sacred house of worship, to speak in behalf of the second largest Jewish community in the world, trapped in silence. A Jewish community that numbers approximately 3 million of our fellow Jews. Second only to the Jewish community in the United States which numbers some 5½ million Jews, and larger than the Jewish community in the State of Israel, which numbers some 2¼ million Jews.

Our generation has been one which has seen Jewish life in perhaps its most destructive aspect. We were mute witnesses to the decimation of 6 million of our fellow Jews during the Nazi holocaust. We failed to raise our voices as we should have and the moral conscience of the world was silent. A generation that witnessed that cataclysm in Jewish life is determined that on this occasion, when 3 million of our fellow Jews are confronted with cultural, religious and educational genocide, that we will not remain silent.

That we will raise our voices not only in the Jewish community, but in the non-Jewish community as well. In the halls of government and in the halls of the United Nations, crying out to the world for them to add their voices to our protests.

For what is happening in the Soviet Union, we find what was once a thriving, flourishing Jewish community today literally being asphyxiated and suffocated. Being denied every expression of Jewish life. And its cultural, artistic, religious and educational sense. We find a disappearance of every evidence of the Yiddish newspaper, of the Yiddish theater, Jewish educational institutions, and today, in the Soviet Union, to serve 3 million Jews, there are 97 synagogues.

We find other factors making their impression upon the Soviet scene. For the first time in the history of this regime, in the Soviet Union, capital punishment was introduced for those found guilty of economic crimes. A vast majority found guilty and so identified in the press of the Soviet Union were Jews.

And last year there was exposed the publication, "Judaism Without Embellishment," by Kichko, published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. It was so vitriolic, it was so anti-Semitic, that the ideological commission itself finally had to issue a partial retraction.

Then we found issued by the State Publishing House another publication, by Mayatzky, "Contemporary Judaism and Zionism" in which it depicted the Jews as being antisocial, antigovernment, anticountry; as an agent of the CIA of the United States, and as a tool of imperialism.

Contrary to the constitution of the U.S.S.R., which prohibits this kind of activity, we find a uniform and universal failure to implement the law, and to bring those responsible for the writing, for the publication of this kind of material, failure to bring them to justice. And thereby to encourage the publication of this kind of material, which can only incite hatred and discrimination against the Jew. And only seek to separate him from his fellow Soviet citizens.

So we, as American citizens, are determined to raise our voices in protest or determined to appeal to the conscience of the world, to the leadership of the free world, to the leaders of our own Government, that they may express the concern of the entire United States about this treatment of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union.

We would expect of the leadership of the United States that in appropriate form and measure it convey its concern in this problem to the leadership of the Soviet Union.

We also expect that the U.N., that in the Commission on Human Rights, that it, too, concern itself with the denial and the deprivation of these rights. That in keeping with the constitution of the Soviet Union, which guarantees to all nationality groups the right to practice and adhere to its own teaching, and in keeping with the universal declaration of human rights of the U.N. that it insists that it be implemented.

We are mindful of an old teaching of our people—"every Jew is responsible for the welfare of every other Jew." And in keeping with the principle, we shall raise our voices and cry out in moral tones for the restoration, for the full restoration of the cultural, religious, and educational rights of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. And finally in keeping with the universal declaration of human rights, insist that any citizen and every citizen of every country have the right to leave his country of origin and go and visit and live in any other country.

REMARKS OF SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS, DELIVERED JANUARY 17, 1965, BY JOHN TRUBIN, ESQ., AT THE PROTEST MEETING ON SOVIET JEWRY SPONSORED BY CONGREGATION ZICHRON EPHRAIM AT 163 EAST 67TH STREET, NEW YORK

Silence will not help Soviet Jews.

The continuing charges of anti-Jewish activities in the Soviet Union should be investigated by the appropriate commissions of the United Nations, the organization established to protect the human rights of people the world over. The U.N. Subcommission for the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities should have the opportunity to examine firsthand charges of anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R.

The suggestion was made in Geneva this week by Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee. It is a good one, for anti-Jewish activities by government action and policy in the U.S.S.R. have been going on for a long time, contrary to the laws of man, the U.N. Charter, and to international morality.

We should explore all possibilities of beaming the spotlight of public disclosure on such acts wherever they occur. Individuals, groups, and yes, governments in all areas of the free world must continue to give voice to their indignation over anti-Jewish activities. The Hitler madness is all too recent—so is the Stalin "doctor's plot"—not to warn us to speak out in time.

There are about 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union and they constitute the second largest Jewish community in the world. They are recognized as a nationality, but they are not given the same rights accorded other recognized nationalities in the U.S.S.R. They are denied communities throughout the world. But in spite of more than 40 years of persecution and near persecution, government pressures and restrictions designed to discourage religious identification, almost 2½ million in the U.S.S.R., in the 1959 census declared themselves to be Jews.

In spite of Soviet claims of religious freedom and denials of the existence of anti-Semitism because it is a violation of Soviet law, there is ample and grim evidence that the Soviet Government is singling Jews out as a group for discriminatory restrictions and extreme punishment. Jews and the Jewish religion suffer greater limitations and prohibitions at the hands of the Kremlin than any other religious groups in the Soviet Union.

Synagogue buildings and seminaries have been padlocked, Jewish cemeteries have been arbitrarily shut down, and ritual supplies—including matzoth—needed for religious worship cannot be obtained. No Hebrew Bibles or calendars are printed, and prayer books are irreplaceable. Means for training rabbis and community workers are inadequate or nonexistent, and unlike other religious groups Jews are not permitted to establish national organizations. Jewish cultural life has been stifled and the once flourishing Yiddish language literature in books, theater, periodicals, and newspapers has virtually been wiped out.

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union is very sensitive to charges of anti-Semitism and prides itself on the law which makes it a criminal offense. But when 89 out of 163 persons sentenced to death for alleged "black marketing" or economic crimes, are publicly identified as Jews and held up for ridicule, contempt and caricature in the official Soviet press; and when a blatantly anti-Semitic book containing caricatures on the Nazi pattern is published under the title "Judaism" by one Kichko and thousands of copies are officially distributed, then it is time to expose the false Soviet claim that there is no anti-Semitism under communism and to denounce the hypocrisy behind the Kremlin's denials of anti-Jewish actions. The crude hatemongerings of the Kichko book was even too much for the Communist parties in France, Italy, and the United States to swallow and they protested and the intensity of protest from all parts of the world finally persuaded Soviet authorities to suppress the book.

From time to time Soviet leaders have insisted that Soviet treatment of religious minorities is an internal matter and that protests constitute interference in the Soviet Union's domestic affairs. But similar disclaimers by Russia and other nations in earlier periods in our history did not deter the United States from protesting the persecution of Jews or other minority groups.

Since 1840 the United States, while recognizing the principle of nonintervention in the international affairs of another state, has nevertheless, protested the persecution of oppressed minorities by foreign governments and has justified these protests in the name of moral duty toward humanity. This policy has remained valid to this day.

This is no time for silence on the part of American Jewry. Each great wave of indignation will serve to ultimately alleviate, and will help to prevent aggravation of the plight of the Jewish in the Soviet Union. Each protest, whether by individuals, organizations, or by the free nations of the world acting independently or through the United Nations, will serve to make the Kremlin realize how sterile and harmful to its own prestige is its anti-Jewish policy.

MESSAGE OF GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Rabbi ARTHUR SCHNEIER,
Congregation Zichron Ephraim,
New York, N.Y.:

I am certain I speak for the people of New York State in saying that we are distressed at the treatment meted out to men and women of the Jewish faith living in the Soviet Union. The persecution of the Jews is so utterly without reason, that we are as astounded as we are shocked. May your protest prove effective within the shortest possible time.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, racial and religious persecution everywhere must be a matter of concern to us all. Especially is this so where the victims are of a group to whom we owe a special debt—the survivors of the anti-Semitic persecutions of the last generation. And especially is this so where it is demonstrated that our concern can make a difference—that the would-be persecutors listen to our protests.

The Soviet Union now persecutes Jews. But the Soviet Union is mindful of world opinion, especially U.S. opinion. It is therefore our responsibility to make our protests heard—and to continue them until the Soviet Union changes its policy. To help fulfill that responsibility, dozens of distinguished Americans, including Senators Bayh, Javits, Ribicoff, Scott, and myself, joined recently in the "Appeal of Conscience" to the Soviet Government. A public meeting was held at Congregation Zichron Ephraim in New York, on January 17, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the appeal, with its signers; the remarks of the meeting of Judge Benjamin Gassman, president of the congregation; a message from the Vice President of the United States; and remarks by Mayor Robert Wagner and myself be inserted in the Record as further evidence of our concern with the persecuted Jews of the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the appeal message and remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 14, 1965]

An Appeal of Conscience

"The position of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union is a matter of deep and continuing concern to me, to this administration and to the millions of thoughtful people throughout the United States * * *. It is my hope that citizens and organizations of all faiths will join in an overwhelming expression of moral concern for the Jews of the Soviet Union." President Lyndon B. Johnson, October 28, 1964.

In the name of humanity, we urge the Soviet Government to end all discrimination against its Jewish community.

We appeal for the restoration of the following religious and cultural rights to the Jews in the Soviet Union:

The free functioning of synagogues should be permitted and central institutions to serve the religious needs of Soviet Jewry should be established.

Jewish education in all its forms, including the training of rabbis, should be allowed.

Obstacles to the performance of sacred rites, such as religious burial and circumcision. should be removed.

The publication of Hebrew Bibles, prayer books and religious texts and the production of religious articles, such as prayer shawls, phylacteries, and mezuzoth, should be permitted.

The reestablishment of Jewish cultural institutions enabling Jewish artists in the theater, music, and literature to develop Jewish culture in the Yiddish and Hebrew languages.

Permission to Jews separated from their families to leave the U.S.S.R. so that they may be reunited with them in other countries.

Religious and cultural ties with Jewish communities outside the U.S.S.R., official exchange visits and religious pilgrimages to the Holy Land should be permitted.

The anti-Jewish character that so strongly colors the official campaign against economic crimes should be eliminated.

We cannot remain silent so long as justice is not done.

A public meeting sponsored by Congregation Zichron Ephraim will take place 11 a.m. Sunday, January 17, at the congregation, 163 East 67th Street, opposite the Soviet mission to the U.N.

Speakers are Senator Jacob K. Javits; Senator Robert F. Kennedy; Mayor Robert F. Wagner; Label A. Katz, president, B'nai B'rith; Rabbi Arthur Schneier.

If you wish to join your voice in this important effort, write to Congregation Zichron Ephraim which is sponsoring this appeal as a public service.

Dr. Markus Barth, professor of Theology, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary; Hon. Birch Bayh, U.S. Senator, Indiana; Hon. Abraham D. Beame, comptroller, City of New York; Saul Bellow, novelist, playwright; David Berdon; Adolf A. Berle, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of State and Ambassador to Brazil; Harry Berse; Theodore Bikel, artist; Benjamin J. Brody; Bernard Brownstein; David Callahan, editor, Commonweal; I. J. Caplan; James B. Carey, president, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers; Hon Edward F. Cavanagh, deputy mayor, City of New York; Arthur A. Cohen, theologian and author; Isidore M. Cohen; Wayne H. Cowan, managing editor, Christianity & Crisis.

Rev. Eugene K. Culhane, S.J., managing editor, America; Israel Cummings; Joseph E. Cunneen, editor-in-chief, Cross Currents; Samuel H. Daroff; Nathan Ehrlich; Jason Epstein, editor; Dr. Louis Finkelstein, chancellor, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America; Jules Feiffer, writer and cartoonist; David Field; William B. Fischberg; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, minister emeritus, Riverside Church; Irving Freezer; Abel E. Garner; Hon. Abraham N. Geller, justice, Supreme Court, State of New York; Julius H. Gewirtz; Judge Benjamin Gassman, president, Congregation Zichron Ephraim; Prof. Nahum N. Glatzer, department of Judaic studies, Brandeis University.

Dr. Nelson Glueck, president, Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion; Justice Arthur Goldberg, Associate Justice, U.S. Supreme Court; Kyle E. Haseldon, managing editor, the Christian Century; Samuel Hausman; Nat Hentoff, columnist and critic; Dr. Richard Hofstadter, DeWitt Clinton, professor of American history, Columbia University; Louis Hollander, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO; Michael Hyams; Hon. Jacob K. Javits, U.S. Senator, New York; Philip Johnson, architect; Hon Louis I. Kaplan, judge, Civil Court of New York; Alfred Kazin, author and critic; Label A. Katz, president, International B'nai B'rith.

Edward M. Keating, editor and publisher, Ramparts; Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, U.S. Senator, New York; Emil Koenig; Dr. James Kritzeck, professor, department of oriental studies, Princeton University; Maj. Gen. Melvin L. Krulewitch, chairman, New York State Athletic Commission; Nathan Leder; Irving Leeman; Hon. Louis J. Lefkowitz, attorney general, State of New York; Herman Levin; Maurice Levin; Leo Levy; Hon Stanley H. Lowell, chairman, Commission on Human Rights, City of New York; Hon. Charles Marks, justice, Supreme Court, State of New York; Rev. Clement J. McNaspy, S.J., editor, America; Charles Mayer; David Meister; Rev. Thomas Merton, author; Arthur Miller, playwright.

Henry Minskoff; Jerome Minskoff; Myron A. Minskoff; Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, professor emeritus, Union Theological Seminary; Norman Podhoretz, editor, Commentary; Jacob S. Potofsky, general president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Dr. Emanuel Rackman, assistant to the president, Yeshiva University; Dr. David H. C. Read, minister, Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church; Hon. Abraham Ribicoff, U.S. Senator, Connecticut; Edward Rice, Jr., editor, Jubilee; Herman A. Rosenberg; Hon. William F. Ryan, Member, U.S. Congress; Joseph Sandler; Murray D. Sandler; Dore Schary, president, Anti-Defamation League; Michael Schimmel; Alfred Schlossberg; Rabbi Arthur Schneier, rabbi, Congregation Zichron Ephraim.

Hon. Hugh Scott, U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania; Karl Shapiro, poet; Joseph Shapiro; S. M. Shor; Hon. Charles H. Silver, executive assistant for education and industrial development to mayor of City of New York; Hon. Edward S. Silver, surrogate, Kings County, N.Y.; Edward S. Skillin, editor, Commonweal; Spyros P. Skouras; Louis Sloate; Bishop Stephen G. Spottswood, chairman, board of directors, NAACP; Max Steinberg; Dewey D. Stone; Charles Taubman; Frank Taylor, publisher, Avon Books; Nathan Trotzky; Louis Untermeyer, author; Hon. Robert F. Wagner, mayor, City of New York; Col. Irvin Waldman; Emil Weitzner.

Remarks of Judge Benjamin Gassman, President, Congregation Zichron Ephraim, at Protest Meeting Against Treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union

The purpose of this meeting is to appeal to the Soviet leaders to restore religious and cultural rights to Jews in that country; to permit the maintenance and the development of seminaries for the training of rabbis; to allow synagogues to remain open and to function without hindrance, and, in general, to permit the Jewish community in Russia to live a full religious and cultural life.

Within the past 4 weeks, we concluded the reading of the Book of Genesis, which speaks of the creation of the world. We find that until God created man, all other things were created by divine fiat. "And God said: 'Let there be light. Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters. Let the earth bring forth the living creature place. Let the earth bring forth the grass, the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit. Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth. Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind.' "

However, when it came to the creation of man, God said: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. So God created man in His own image." There was none of that automatic creation by fiat. Man represents the handiwork of God. Thus man has a little of the Godly spirit within him, which entitles him to dignity and rights, which no man or group of men have the right to take away.

Yet, the Soviet leaders, renouncing God, assumed the right to prevent man from communing with God. Three million Jews within the Soviet Union are told that they cannot pray to God, that they cannot enjoy the religious and cultural freedom which God has given to them. By dictatorial act, the Soviet leaders began systematically to starve the Jewish culture, to crush their spirit and, to sever their ties with their fellow Jews the world over.

Jewish youth are denied the most meager opportunities to learn and to transmit their Jewish heritage to future generations.

This morning, from this pulpit, you will hear the voices of men who are prominent in government, as well as in the religious life of our country. At the conclusion of this meeting, a resolution of protest will be offered and I hope that each one of you will approve it. Thus you will let your voices be heard not only in the Russian Mission across the street. but also across the Atlantic and the thousands of miles across Europe, within the very Kremlin walls.

This is the time to speak out, lest we repeat the crime which the world committed of remaining silent when the Nazis began the extermination of the Jewish people.

Present on this pulpit this morning are Jews and Christians. Though unlike in origin, we are alike in destiny. As John Donne so aptly stated, centuries ago: "No man is an island; each man is a part of the continent. If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less. Every man's death diminishes me, for I am involved in mankind, and know not for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

We should now know that whenever one people is persecuted, all people are ultimately persecuted. Whenever one religion suffers, all religions suffer. When one minority dies, the bell begins to toll for humanity. When religion is proscribed in one land, the bell begins to toll for civilization.

It should be crystal clear that the relentless attack upon the Jews is the prelude to the inevitable attack upon the Christians. Dictators will not be satisfied until they can have a world free of all religion, because they know that tyranny can never be secure if humanity remains true to religion.

Let the free world stand on guard. Let us proclaim that on this question, Jews, and Christians alike, are determined that the bell of antireligion shall not toll in any part of the world.

It is in this spirit that we meet here today. We are encouraged by the presence, upon this pulpit, of our two U.S. Senators, our distinguished mayor of our great city, and many other illustrious men, who will add their voices to ours. Because of the eminent positions each of them holds in government, what they will say here will impress the Soviet leaders, and will serve notice upon them that the Jews in Russia do not stand alone and deserted; that they have friends, who will do all within their power to redress the great wrong which is being done to them.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 15, 1965.

Rabbi ARTHUR SCHNEIER,
Congregation Zichron Ephraim,
New York, N.Y.:

I am deeply distressed at the treatment of Soviet Jewry by the Soviet Government. I have asked Americans in the past and will continue to do so, to raise their voices in protest. I believe that if we continue to raise our voices, we will be heard, and that the actions of religious and racial discrimination will be lifted. We must continue until they are.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT PROTEST MEETING AGAINST TREATMENT OF JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Rabbi Schneier, it is a privilege to join with you and with the members of your congregation—and with the citizens of our city, of all faiths, who have braved the first great snow of the winter season to come here to protest the senseless and ruthless persecution of 3 million men, women and children behind the Iron Curtain.

We are gathered today in this great house of worship, to bear witness to the outrage of the people of this city for the indignity practiced on millions of our fellow human beings who are being prevented from following the commandments of their ancient faith and are being persecuted for adhering to their sacred rituals. They are being hounded because they try to live by the light of their consciences and the teachings of the prophets.

In the face of what is going on behind the Iron Curtain, with the complicity of the rulers of Soviet Russia, we here cannot remain silent. The plight of the Jews living in the Soviet Union wrenches at our hearts. Many of those now being persecuted in Soviet Russia lived through the nightmare of Nazi rule, only now to experience a resumption of the terror.

The Soviet persecution is different from the Nazi persecution, but it is also the same. It is the same with respect to its intolerance and to its hatred of spiritual ano religious practices which do not conform to Soviet doctrine. It is an attempt to deprive an entire people of their dignity—the dignity derived from their religious convictions, and their practice of religious worship.

We do not say that the Soviet Union has a monopoly on persecution. There are other places in the world where men, women, and children live in fear and suffer the repression of their faith and their freedom of worship. And there are persecutions of other kinds, too. There is darkness in many parts of the world. But nowhere is that darkness more tragic than in the Soviet Union. And for no people is that darkness more heartrending than for those of Jewish faith who have endured persecutions for thousands of years, and never more tragically than in this century.

Hence, in this city of 8 million free Americans gathered from every corner of the globe, we have a right to join in protesting the persecution of Jews behind the Iron Curtain. As we believe in freedom, we must uphold its causes and denounce its repression.

By our presence here today, we affirm our solidarity with our fellow human beings in Russia. We keep faith with them by assembling here today, and we keep faith with our traditions. We believe in freedom of religion, and not only for Americans but for all people everywhere. We refuse to let religious persecution go unrecognized. Persecution of Jews has an especially tragic overtone, whether by the Nazis in Germany or by the Communists in Russia.

The Jewish population of the Soviet Union is very small—just a little more than 1 percent. Yet the fact is that almost 60 percent of all those sentenced to death in Russia for so-called economic crimes in the last recorded year have been Jews. In the Soviet State of Ukraine, the Jewish population is 2 percent. Yet 90 percent of those sentenced to death for these so-called economic crimes have been Jews. These figures are eloquent in themselves; they need no embellishment.

This meeting today and others of a similar nature in which I have participated over the past several months have helped to mobilize public opinion, Jewish and non-Jewish, in protest against the indignities and sufferings visited upon the Jews of the Soviet Union. We must press ahead with these protests, despite all restraints which are suggested. We are sensitive to the importance of promoting peace in the world and of avoiding unjustified provocation. But this does not mean that we may not and should not protest with all our strength and vigor at persecution wherever it happens.

Last October, I spoke at another rally on this same subject in this same neighborhood. In the course of my remarks on that occasion, I referred to a wise observation from the Talmud—that a man who tolerates an evil act is as guilty as the man who perpetrates that act.

Let none of us be found guilty. Let each of us find the time and the energy to speak out against persecution. Let us condemn those who persecute and let us join together to send the word across the distant oceans that as long as one man is persecuted and deprived of the right to worship freely, all of us are endangered in our rights, too. We must never cease to protest man's inhumanity to man.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, CONGREGATION ZICHRON EPHRAIM, SUNDAY, JANUARY 17, 1965

History records the great Sir Moses Montefiore as the first foreigner to protest to the Russian Government on behalf of persecuted Russian Jewry. He traveled to Russia to do so in 1846.

Today, after 119 years, we must still meet to protest the treatment of Jews in Russia. Today, more than 50 years after Nicholas II distributed the infamous "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," the Russian Government continues to distribute vicious anti-Semitic propaganda.

On the first day of Passover in 1891, a Russian Government closed the synagogue and expelled all Jews from Moscow. For the Passovers of the 1960's, a Russian Government forbids the baking of matzoh. When a despotic tsar wanted to divert attention of his subjects from their wretchedness in 1911, he accused Jews of ritual murder. When his successors sought the same end in the 1960's, they accused Jews of economic subversion.

It is therefore clear that we meet today to write but one of many chapters—in a book whose length is a disgrace to humanity. It is not the first chapter. But we must make it the last. I come to say that there is hope that if we fulfill our responsibilities to the 2 million Jews of the Soviet Union, we may see in our time an end to this sorry story of persecution.

For the Soviet Union listens. The Soviet leaders may deny that persecution exists; they may call their accusers liars; but they will not, they cannot, defy the conscience of an outraged world.

In 1960, for example, Nikita Khrushchev was asked in Vienna why the Soviet Union denied exit permits to Jews wishing to join their relatives in Israel. His answer was to deny that any such citizen of the Soviet Union had applied for such a permit. He could not admit before the world that his government would abridge this fundamental human right. Instead, he tried to deny the facts of the accusations. The same course has been followed many times before the United Nations—for example, when the Soviet delegation to a Human Rights Subcommission would not vote against, but only abstained from, a resolution proclaiming the right of emigration for all people.

These episodes demonstrate the opportunity for our brothers in the Soviet Union—and the challenges before us here.

If the full facts are brought to light; if the story of Soviet anti-Semitism is broadcast again and again throughout the world, made so clear that its true existence cannot be denied; then, in my judgment, the Soviet Government will be forced to reverse its policy. It has been forced to do so several times already.

After the first group of economic show trials aroused universal condemnation from the civilized world, a further set, which might have involved several hundred persons, was canceled. After worldwide publicity exposed the pettiness of a Soviet protest that Israeli diplomats had distributed religious calendars, the printing and sale of these calendars was permitted last fall.

These are isolated incidents. The easing of particular restrictions does not alter the fact that the Jews of the Soviet Union are subject to persecutions and violations of human dignity that are beyond the capabilities of language to denounce. But these incidents demonstrate that our protests are heard. They prove that we do not meet in vain, that our presence here is not an idle gesture.

The Soviet Union must answer to us. And hopefully it must answer as well to Russians who believe in freedom and justice.

The young Russian poet, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, wrote of the notorious Babi Yar:

"I am each old man that was slaughtered here
I am each child that was slaughtered here.
Nothing in me can forget this.
Let the "International" sound out joyously
When the last anti-Semite on earth will be buried."

He read this to thousands of young people in a public square in Moscow despite brutal police efforts to disperse them. The great composer Shostakovich set his words to music—and the music was played.

I do not offer these episodes, of course, as evidence that we can relax our concern. Indeed, our effort must be redoubled.

For if this meeting can offer the slightest hope, the slightest encouragement, to the Jews of the Soviet Union, our effort will have been repaid. If every petition, every representation to the Soviet Government can allow some matzoh to be baked again, or 10 more students to be admitted to the rabbinate, our effort will have been repaid.

If all the United Nations speeches and resolutions, and all the newspaper articles, force the Soviets to allow a hundred families to be reunited, then our efforts will have been repaid.

And they will be repaid, although they will have just begun. The building across the street is there because the Soviet Government wants to impress the world with its way of life. The plaque you raise today will help to tell the world about the Jewish way of life in the Soviet Union. It will bear silent but terrible witness to that way of life, day and night, month after month, year upon year, until it is no longer needed.

In the end we must prevail. I say "we" must prevail because your cause is mine, just as the cause of your Russian brothers is yours. I cannot say why better than it was said in 1905, when 6,000 signed the declaration of Jewish citizens to the Czar: "We demand civil equality and equal submission to general laws as men who, despite everything, are conscious of their human dignity. * * * We do not expect these rights to be bestowed upon us as an act of grace and magnanimity or because of some political expediency, but as a matter of honor and justice."

For that honor and justice we must all stand—and we must all work.

FRED ELLSWORTH

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, last month, death came to Fred Ellsworth, of Lawrence, Kans.—"Mr. K.U." to his thousands of friends in Kansas and to untold numbers of the University of Kansas alumni. All felt a personal loss, and will truly miss a great champion of the University of Kansas.

It seems inadequate to merely say that he was a good and kind man who did his job with complete loyalty. His services as the alumni secretary for our State university brought untold rewards to so many of the people of our State.

His son, Robert Ellsworth, now serves as a distinguished Member of Congress, and his public service reveals the rich heritage he received from his father.

Mr. President, I ask unamimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Topeka Daily Capital, of January 13, 1965; and also an article from the Kansas City Times, of January 14, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Topeka Daily Capital, Jan. 13, 1965]

DEVOTED KANSAS UNIVERSITY SERVANT

The death of Fred Ellsworth—"Mr. K.U." to thousands of University of Kansas alumni—is a personal loss to all Jayhawkers. To them Fred Ellsworth represented pride in their alma mater, and Fred was fiercely proud of everything about the university.

As Kansas University Chancellor W. Clarke Wescoe once observed: "More than faculty or chancellors, to thousands of alumni and friends Fred Ellsworth is the University of Kansas."

This devoted man was, as usual, humble on learning in 1962 that Kansas University's largest men's dormitory would be known as Fred Ellsworth Hall. Yet this recognition which he so richly deserved only served to emphasize his innate modesty.

For 39 years, as Kansas University alumni secretary, Fred Ellsworth traveled up and down Kansas and across the Nation, cementing firmly the ties of Jayhawker graduates and their alma mater. He had taken the job in 1924 when the Kansas University student body numbered only 4,000. Through the years he watched the numbers on Mount Oread and the Kansas University School of Medicine grow to 13,000.

Fred managed to build up the alumni association from 2,700 members in 1924 to 16,500 before he retired. He was known in college circles as an outstanding man in alumni relations.

Shortly before his death he was awarded a medal for distinguished service to education by the Alumni Federation of Columbia University. He was one of 23 men and women so honored for their "eminent leadership in the field of alumni relations."

Thus the farm boy from Pleasanton, whose student days at Kansas University were interrupted while he served in the 35th Division in World War I, was to find his life's work at the institution from which he graduated in 1922. His indefatigable quest for the betterment of Kansas University can be seen today in many places. Besides the fine dormitory that bears his name, the World War II Campanile and Drive are other monuments to Fred Ellsworth's love for the university, for it was a project that was achieved largely through his efforts. He played an important role, too, in the completion of the Kansas Union and Memorial Stadium, both World War I memorials.

Undergraduates on the campus knew Fred Ellsworth as a friend and counselor, as did the graduates whose careers took them far from Lawrence. For those coming back to the campus to plan for class reunions, meeting with Fred was a stimulating experience.

Some may have wondered how, year after year, he could so enthusiastically go through the same routine with different classes, but he steered them toward an enjoyable program that earned him many thanks from the returning grads.

At football games, Fred sometimes appeared wearing a Texas hat, gift of Kansas University alumni living in Houston. He prized the hat highly and responded goodnaturedly to friends who called him "Sheriff" when he wore it.

When Kansas University celebrates its centennial in 1966, it will be regretted by all Jayhawkers that Fred Ellsworth will not be on the campus to aid the project for which he had been counsel since his retirement.

But the pages of Jayhawk history are the richer for Fred Ellsworth's loyalty and devotion.

The name of "Mr. K.U.," will live on in the memories of those who knew him and in the accomplishments of the young Jayhawkers of the future.

[From the Kansas City Times, Jan. 14, 1965]

FRED ELLSWORTH IS EULOGIZED AT KANSAS UNIVERSITY—RITES FOR THE LATE ALUMNI SECRETARY ARE ATTENDED BY CROWD OF 800—INFLUENCE OVER 40 YEARS—PASTOR SAYS HE GAVE SPIRIT AND DIRECTION TO MANY BY HIS FRIENDLINESS

(By Ray Morgan)

Lawrence, Kans.—Fred Ellsworth, secretary emeritus of the University of Kansas Alumni Association who died Monday, was eulogized as "Mr. K.U." in funeral services here yesterday. The rites were attended by more than 800 persons, including Gov. William Avery.

The Reverend Paul R. Davis, minister of the Plymouth Congregational Church said that Ellsworth, 69, had been a continuing influence in building a larger university under four chancellors and through nearly 40 years of service.

CITED BY ALUMNI

Mr. Davis read a citation from the Kansas University alumni board to Ellsworth which said, in part:

"In the continuing growth and change and evolution of the university, through booms, depressions, wars, and in all kinds of political and economic environments, there has remained that one constant factor that bound all together, giving them direction and purpose, not alone for the problems of the moment but for those of the distant future that so few men are able to envision. That was Fred Ellsworth."

From all walks of life the hundreds of mourners came to pay a final tribute to Ellsworth, the father of Representative Robert Ellsworth, Third District Member of Congress from Lawrence. There were politicians, educators, university staff members, bankers, newspapermen, and many others who had been his friends.

SERVED FOUR CHANCELLORS

The Congregational minister in whose church the services were held pointed out that Ellsworth had served in his capacity under four chancellors, Dr. Ernest Hiram Lindley, Dr. Deane V. Mallott, Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, and Dr. W. Clarke Wescoe.

"If there was ever a man who deserved to be called 'Mr. K.U.' it was Fred Ellsworth," Mr. Davis said. "The University of Kansas is a much greater university because of the life of Fred Ellsworth."

He said some indication of the tremendous service of Ellsworth was that during his years of service the Kansas University alumni association had grown from a membership of 2,700 to more than 18,500.

"His influence is apparent to the eye as today one walks across the Kansas University campus," the minister said. "Although he was one of many, he was a guiding force in contributing to the construction of the World War II memorial campanile and drive, the Kansas Union, Memorial Stadium, and Fred Ellsworth Hall."

BUILT ALUMNI GROUP

The latter is a dormitory named in his honor. Mr. Davis also pointed out that the University of Kansas had become the second university in the Nation from the standpoint of the percentage of graduates who were members of the alumni association.

"He touched the lives of many students and most alumni because he made their lives and their concerns his own," the minister said. "He liked people. He took time to listen to them. He exerted the effort to understand them, he allowed what they said to influence his decisions."

Mr. Davis said one key to the effectiveness of Ellsworth was his warmth, while another was his influence in the lives of students.

"During the lean, depression years when jobs were scarce, he guided many students to employment," he said. "How many men in prominent positions today owe their start to Fred Ellsworth."

Mr. Davis said Ellsworth had recently been honored by Columbia University with a gold medal for his service to education at Kansas University. He said Ellsworth had guided the university alumni magazine to a position of award-winning excellence.

MALOTT IS PRESENT

Former Chancellor Malott, now president emeritus of Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., was among the mourners. Representing the board of regents were Ray Evans, of Fairway; Arthur H. Cromb, of Mission Hills; Henry Bubb, of Topeka, and Clyde Reed, retiring member and Parsons publisher.

Political figures in addition to Governor Avery were Lt. Gov. John Crutcher and Senator Reynolds Shultz, State senator from Douglas County. Among the newspaper publishers were Oscar Stauffer and Stanley Stauffer, of Topeka, Herbert Meyer, of Independence, and Dolph Simmons, of Lawrence.

Ellsworth is survived also by his wife, another son, Stephen Ellsworth, Stamford, Conn., and a sister, Miss Maude Ellsworth, of Lawrence.

Burial was in Oakhill Cemetery in Lawrence.

SEATTLE BUSINESS LEADERS SPONSOR EQUAL EMPLOYMENT FAIR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Seattle industry and business welcomes members of minority groups to its employment rolls.

Manfacturing, retail, transportation, and utility companies recently joined in a job fair with exhibits demonstrating employment opportunities for all persons who may qualify for them, and registering potential applicants.

Described by the Wall Street Journal as part of the Seattle chamber's program to translate equal employment policies into actual practice, the weekend fair attracted approximately 2,500 visitors, of whom 1,200 filled out registration forms.

The Seattle chamber is to be commended for this fine civic enterprise. It is more than a people-to-people program with which we are familiar, excellent as that is. This is a people-to-jobs program. No community program that I can envision holds a greater potential for improving both human relations and our economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Wall Street Journal of January 29, titled "Business-Backed Fair in Seattle Aims To Open More Jobs to Negroes," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Business-Backed Fair in Seattle Aims To Open More Jobs to Negroes—Airline, Store Exhibits Depict Opportunities—Show Sponsor Is the Chamber of Commerce

(By Donald A. Moffitt)

Seattle.—Seattle boosters, their civic pride bolstered by their first World's Fair in 1962, held a less spectacular—yet far more unusual—kind of fair last weekend.

It took place in a well-scuffed high school gymnasium. Instead of presenting mechanical marvels, this fair attracted its throngs with modest exhibits that depicted various jobs offered in the Seattle area. Most of the visitors were not prosperous tourists but local Negroes anxious to find work. The fair's aim was to recruit members of minority groups by convincing them that Seattle employers were willing to hire them.

Perhaps the most surprising aspect of the fair was its sponsorship: Not the Urban League, nor the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, nor the Congress on Racial Equality, but the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. It represented only the most recent attempt by the chamber to translate equal employment policies into actual practice.

Though individual businessmen have been in the forefront among advocates of nondiscriminatory hiring practices, business associations have not yet been nearly as prominent in this controversial field. Consequently, business groups across the land will be watching closely to see how the Seattle chamber fares in its efforts.

Seattle's job-finding effort for Negroes comes at a time when the city is none too flush with jobs. Unemployment, though down from a 6.8 percent level a year ago, is still 6.1 percent, well above the national average. Joblessness among Negroes here, who make up about 5 percent of the city's population, runs about double that for whites, officials say.

A BROAD RECRUITING PROGRAM

It is too soon to tell how many Negroes will land jobs as a result of visiting the fair, but the broader recruiting program of which it is a part has already had some success. An "employment opportunity center" opened by the chamber 3 months ago and staffed by top-level personnel executives from member firms working as volunteers, has referred about 500 people, mostly Negroes, to potential employers. There is no procedure for checking the outcome of these referrals, but officials can name about 50 individuals known to have obtained jobs, many of them the first of their race hired for some lines of work by certain firms in Seattle.

For example, Ronald L. Hampton, a 23-year-old veteran, is the first Seattle-area Negro to enter Union Oil Co. training to become a dealer; he will sell gasoline and other car products to filling station operators. "He has fit in extremely well, and he's doing a fine job," says Howard R. Webb, manager of personnel and training for Union Oil's Northwest division.

Chamber officials are cheered by the response to last weekend's fair. It lured some 2,500 visitors, of whom about 1,200 filled out registration forms in hopes of future employment. No actual applications were taken but the registrations will be used to help match qualified applicants with job openings that occur. They also will be used to identify Negroes who, with special training, can qualify for certain jobs.

Fair visitors were attracted by a wide range of exhibits, United Air Lines' booth showed photos of smiling white and Negro girls studying in stewardess training classes, being pinned with their "wings" at graduation ceremonies and relaxing in resort swimming pools. Seven of the airline's 2,200 stewardesses are Negroes and five more are in training. Bon Marche, a local retail chain, showed Negroes working as receptionists, recordkeepers and key punch operators.

BIG COMPANIES EXHIBIT

Altogether, 37 exhibitors were on hand to describe occupations as diverse as police work, engineering, and management training. They included such well known firms as Boeing Co., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Honeywell, Inc., Kaiser Gypsum Co., J. C. Penney Co., Washington Natural Gas Co., and Puget Sound Power & Light Co.

Though some Negro leaders dispute this, the chamber of commerce says its program isn't a response to specific pressures from civil rights groups. "It just makes good sense to utilize human resources and to respond to what obviously is a national movement toward equal opportunity," says William Adams II, an Alabama-born former newspaperman who is executive vice president of the local chamber.

"This is a landmark sort of program," says Rex D. Jones, associate director of the Seattle Urban League. "Business here is committed to equal hiring both in policy and in practice." The Urban League and the local NAACP chapter are working with the chamber in its work force integration effort.

Individual Negroes are convinced the effort is proving effective. Mrs. Juanita Adams, recently hired as an executive secretary in the regional headquarters of New York Life Insurance Co., says: "The first thing they told me was, "We're not going to hire you just because you're a Negro. If we hire you, it's because we think you're better qualified than others." Mrs. Adams was hired at a $78-a-week salary last year. Since then, she has received two merit raises that brought her salary to $100 a week. The pay increases demonstrated, she says, that the company wasn't just seeking token integration.

Leaders of the local CORE chapter are among those who insist the chamber program came about because of pressures such as boycotts and demonstrations last year. "We called attention to the disparity between the proportion of Negroes in the population and the proportion of jobs they have in business," claims Walter R. Hundley, local CORE director. CORE figures about 1,200 more of Seattle's 28,000 Negroes should be employed in downtown jobs to erase the disparity. Employers refuse to aim for specific figures, though, because they say they can't legally set racial quotas.

Even so, the usually militant CORE is willing to give the chamber effort the benefit of any doubt. A 6-month deadline CORE set last year for businessmen to hire the additional Negroes expires February 1; but Mr. Hundley says the group isn't going ahead with direct action. He comments: "We want to observe the results of the job fair to see what effect it has on employment. We're not ready to say 'bravo, well done'—but they've made a good beginning."

Neither chamber officials nor local businessmen contend their integration effort goes more than part way toward narrowing gaps between Negro and white employment opportunities. Says a retailer taking an active part in the program: "You can have a hundred fairs that won't do as much good as some actual training for jobs." Eavesdropping on conversations between personnel men and fair visitors illustrates some of the problems. A chubby young woman inquires about typing jobs, though she obviously hasn't mastered the skill. "I can type letters fine," she explains, "but I have a lot of trouble with typing numbers."

Though nothing definite has been worked out, chamber officials currently are thinking of ways to institute some training courses for Negroes in Seattle.

The Seattle job fair isn't the first such effort in the Nation. Last year the Chicago Association of Commerce & Industry helped organize two fairs for Negroes and other minority groups. At the request of two community groups, one in a South Side Negro neighborhood, the other on the North Side, the association lined up employers willing to install exhibits.

The purpose of the Chicago fairs was to explain to high school youngsters and jobless Chicagoans just what sort of work went on at the firms and what kind of schooling was needed to obtain jobs. A few of the companies took the opportunity to do some incidental recruiting. An association official says, for example, that Inland Steel Co. eventually hired about 50 applicants recruited at the South Side fair.

THE PORTSMOUTH, N.H., NAVY YARD

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, today I received a copy of an open letter to the President and the Secretary of Defense from the Portsmouth, N.H., Council, Navy League of the United States, relating to the decision to phase out the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard over a 10-year period.

I am impressed with the dispassionate and well-reasoned arguments advanced by the council for retention of this yard in our defense arsenal; and I may say that I concur fully in the conclusion that it is in the national interest to retain the skilled personnel and superior facilities we now have at our disposal in this fine public yard.

This is a matter of pressing concern, not only to the residents of New Hampshire, but also to the entire Nation, and I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES,
PORTSMOUTH, N.H., COUNCIL,
February 10, 1965.

To the COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE ARMED FORCES, PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
To the SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

PREAMBLE

HONORABLE SIRS: The Navy League of the United States was founded in 1902 as a nonpartisan body, in no way directly or indirectly connected with party politics. The object and purpose of the Navy League is to support a strong national defense, and to disseminate public information which will lead to a strong Navy consistent with the needs of national defense.

The Portsmouth, N.H., Council of the Navy League was established in 1959 as a local council of the Navy League of the United States. It consists of a membership of approximately 115 people who reside in the southern part of Maine and the southeastern part of New Hampshire.

PURPOSE OF THIS OPEN LETTER

The Portsmouth, N.H., council now takes a public stand on the Secretary of Defense order to phase out, over a 10-year period, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. It is emphasized at this time that no action was taken and no public stand made by the Portsmouth, N.H., council during the period of the official investigation of all the Nation's naval shipyards, including the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. The reason for no action during the period of investigation is fundamental in that the Portsmouth, N.H., council should not in any way interfere with such an investigation.

The recommendations by the Secretary of Defense have recently been issued and it is our duty in this respect to state our position in opposition to these recommendations. It is understood we cannot comment in detail on the Secretary of Defense recommendations because the report has not been made public.

OUR VIEWPOINT

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has an outstanding history and has served in the construction, maintenance and repair of submarines since the first combat use of submarines during World War I.

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is a Government installation which has proven nuclear capability, has constructed and repaired Polaris submarines, and is the one Government naval shipyard on the east coast fully qualified for this purpose.

A private shipyard can select or decline work orders for construction or repairs as requested by the Government but the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is fully and immediately responsive to the desires and orders of the President of the United States and his subordinates in the Defense Department.

In addition, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has always led submarine design, research and development.

OUR CONCLUSIONS

The following are reasons, apart from its trained manpower, for keeping the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in continued existence to support our submarine Navy:

1. The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has four building ways, each of which is under complete cover, including overhead cover, against the elements, with each of the four building ways able to take or construct a Polaris submarine. The matter of such total cover in the submarine construction is important to building ships of the requisite quality at the lowest cost. No other submarine yard has four completely covered building ways.

2. There are presently three graving docks, two of which are capable for taking Polaris nuclear submarines.

3. There are 41 Polaris submarines and there must be repair facilities for these Polaris nuclear submarines.

4. It cannot be sufficiently stressed that private shipyards operate at the decision of the individual corporation and do not operate at the desire of the President of the United States. This is a vital distinction in that the Government shipyard does operate at the desire of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. This significance is that the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is the only submarine yard on the east coast with full Polaris submarine capability which is immediately responsive to the Commander in Chief.

5. We recognize that it would be possible to duplicate the resources including facilities and trained personnel of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, but in our opinion it would take many years and would be unavoidably expensive and would substitute the possibility of capability in the indefinite future for existing, already paid for, capability at Portsmouth. We also recognize that an examination of costs in the short term may indicate somewhat higher costs in a Government naval shipyard; in the long term, however, there should be maintained a Government shipyard in order to maintain a competitive cost basis with private yards, thereby reducing the costs of the private yards. Indeed, the origin of the Government shipyard resulted from and was based upon the high cost of the private yard; there must be recognized this important factor of having competition from the Government shipyard in order to keep down the cost of the private shipyard. Therefore, this becomes a long term factor with the long term economy in favor of keeping the Government shipyard in competition.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that the fully capable, fully paid for Portsmouth Naval Shipyard should be maintained to provide the responsiveness to the needs of the Commander in Chief in support of the national defense and for long term lowest costs in this defense effort.

Respectfully submitted.

PORTSMOUTH, N.H., COUNCIL OF THE NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES.
CARL A. JOHNSON, *President.*
WILLIAM F. HARRINGTON, *Secretary.*
By direction of its officers and directors.
FEBRUARY 10, 1965.

WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, every age produces men to whom the public opinion of the times awards the title "Great Man." The judgment of history is sometimes harsher than the judgment of one's contemporaries. History destroys some idols, just as sometimes it raises to the pedestal of greatness men who were overlooked while they lived.

But a few times in history the mantle of immortality has clung tenaciously to the rare persons whose deeds during their own lifetime have been such that men living with them have known, with unmistakable clarity of vision, that the history of the world would have been different if these men had not come their way.

Our age has known such a man. His name is Winston Churchill.

The people of Texas, as do all the people of the United States, feel his passing from us as a personal loss.

As I stated in the Senate on January 26:

> Winston Churchill was the most eloquent orator ever produced by the English-speaking people.

He was a 20th century Prince Valiant of mankind who put a torch aflame in many lands and on many seas. Valor mourned when Winston Churchill died.

So great was the impact of Winston Churchill's life that the most experienced writers have difficulty finding words with which to describe his life, his genius, and his service. In attempting to describe him, the ablest editorial writers of Texas have used such terms as "titan of history," "giant on history's stage," "a great man passes," "taps for the noblest Briton," "Winston Churchill, symbol of man's struggle to remain free," "genius was Churchill's armor," "illustrious life," and "no tribute adequate."

I ask unanimous consent that some of the editorials which have been published in Texas newspapers since his death be printed in the RECORD, as enumerated:

"Sir Winston Churchill," from the Corpus Christi Caller of January 25, 1965.

"Churchill: Titan of History," from the Houston Chronicle of January 25, 1965.

"Giant on History's Stage," from the Dallas Times Herald of January 25, 1965.

"Churchill," from the San Antonio Light of January 25, 1965.

"Sir Winston Churchill," from the Beaumont Enterprise of January 25, 1965.

"Winston Churchill," from the Dallas Morning News of January 25, 1965.

"Churchill: 1874–1965," from the El Paso Herald-Post of January 25, 1965.

"A Great Man Passes," from the El Paso Times of January 25, 1965.

"Taps for the Noblest Briton," from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of January 25, 1965.

"Winston Churchill, Symbol of Man's Struggle To Remain Free," from the Houston Post of January 25, 1965.

"Genius Was Churchill's Armor in One of World's Great Crises," from the San Antonio Express of January 25, 1965.

"An Illustrious Life," from the Wichita Falls Record-News of January 25, 1965.

"No Tribute Adequate," from the Wichita Falls Times of January 25, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Corpus Christi Caller, Jan. 25, 1965]

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Through its long, proud history England has had many a rendezvous with destiny. At each critical period in its history the British have had the peculiar genius of producing leadership to match the hour. One of the greatest in this distinguished assembly was Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill.

He has left an indelible impress on the history of the 20th century. Seldom, if ever, have there been combined in one individual so many conspicuous features of greatness in so many fields. He was a soldier, his nation's first sailor, war correspondent, historian, matchless orator, diplomat, and statesman.

As First Lord of the Admiralty in 1914, Churchill, on his own responsibility, mobilized the British Navy in 1914, making it ready for the beginning of World War I, which soon followed.

Throughout the thirties he warned of the gathering storm. In his "While England Slept," published in 1936 occurred one of his most famous passages:

"I have watched this famous island descending incontinently, fecklessly, the stairway which leads to a dark gulf. It is a fine broad stairway at the beginning, but after a bit the carpet ends. A little farther on there are only flagstones, and a little farther on still these break beneath the feet."

Throughout the phony war of 1939–40 on the western front, Churchill continued to sound the alarm with no visible effect. But when Germany invaded the Low Countries on May 10, 1940, Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain resigned and Churchill became Prime Minister.

He set the tone of his wartime stewardship of the British Commonwealth of Nations in his opening speech as Prime Minister to the House of Commons.

"I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat," he said.

He promised but one goal:

"Victory—victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory however long and hard the road may be."

Here was the leader for which Britain had been searching. It may not be an exaggeration, as C. P. Snow once wrote, that Churchill was the only one who could have fired the imagination of the British people and brought them willingly, even eagerly, to their finest hour.

Sir Winston, because his mother was an American, felt at home during his frequent visits here. Probably no Britisher in history has been so admired and loved by the American people. The feeling was suggested in this passage from Time magazine upon his visit to the United States in 1952: "The old man puffed into sight like a venerable battlewagon steaming up over the horizon. First a smudge of smoke, then the long cigar, then the familiar, stoop-shouldered hulk that a generation had come to know as the silhouette of greatness. Prime Minister Winston Churchill scowled as he emerged from the *Queen Mary*."

He has left many splendid memories which we of this generation can be grateful for sharing. For words alone cannot really measure the extent of his greatness. We are left without adequate words, much in the manner of a concluding couplet of one of Shakespeare's sonnets: "For we who behold thee in these present days have eyes to wonder, but lack tongues to praise."

[From the Houston Chronicle, Jan. 25, 1965]

CHURCHILL: TITAN OF HISTORY

Rarely does the world see the like of Sir Winston Churchill.

Even his political opponents, and he had many, conceded he was a great man. By general consent he was one of the most significant figures of this age. Asked who was the greatest man of the century, probably more people would say Churchill than any other. To some he was one of the titans of all history.

Sir Winston's life was, like so many others, a history of success and failure, of triumph and tragedy—but always with grandeur.

The majesty of the man was shown as a—

Soldier: As a lieutenant in the Boer War he was captured—but he made a spectacular and heroic escape.

Sailor: As a still youthful Lord of the Admiralty, he made the boldly imaginative attempt to break through the Turkish straits to Russia, only to meet disaster and disgrace. Later a report vindicated him, and there are observers who claim that a little more effort behind the Gallipoli campaign would have brought success and shortened the First World War.

Prophet: When Germany began rearming under Hitler he warned time and again that the Nazis were planning aggression, but Britain slept on.

Politician: First a conservative, then a liberal, finally a conservative for good and all. He met criticism for changing parties, but was too great a man to be considered at any time a mere opportunist.

Prime Minister: Certainly one of the greatest in British history.

Leader of men: If one of his characteristics stood out above all others, it was his capacity for leadership. This capacity stemmed, no doubt, in part from his impulsive, emotional and poetic qualities of mind and character. He had in phenomenal measure the ability to inspire courage and determination, to make men rise above fear, lassitude and selfishness, to see the faint promise of ultimate victory ahead at a moment when bare survival seemed unlikely. This quality was linked with and largely dependent upon his mastery of the spoken and written word.

As an orator, Churchill was at his superlative best. Many of his phrases never will be forgotten:

"I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat" (accepting the prime ministry).

"We shall go on to the end. * * *We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills, we shall never surrender. * * *" (When France was falling and the British forces were being evacuated from Dunkirk.)

"Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few" (tribute to the Royal Air Force).

"From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent" (speech at Fulton, Mo.; in March 1946, which awakened millions of Americans out of their dream of Soviet cooperation for a better world).

Churchill wrote more than a score of books, including his six-volume "History of World War II" and his four-volume "History of the English-Speaking People." He was one of the fine writers of our age.

No public figure of his time compared with him in facility for using the English language in majestic and stirring fashion.

Churchill had yet another talent in no mean measure. He was a more than competent painter.

Almost to the end of his life, he served in Parliament. When he retired last September after 60 years as a member of the House of Commons, tributes were worldwide.

And, finally, he had a tremendous capacity for enjoying life. His taste for a good cigar and for a glass of brandy never flagged.

The tragedy of Churchill was that in victory he met defeat. Doubly so.

Scarcely had he led his beloved country to the triumph in war, which so long seemed impossible to attain, than the voters repudiated him and his party in 1945. The Conservatives lost the next general election in 1950 by a narrow margin. Then in 1951, Churchill at 76 attained his lifelong ambition to lead his party to victory. (The first time he became Prime Minister he was called upon by the King when Neville Chamberlain resigned.)

Churchill's other defeat in victory was not personal. He once protested that he did not become Prime Minister to preside over the dissolution of the empire he loved so long and so well; but he and other Prime Ministers were forced by the current of history to do just that. The larger colonial possessions became independent, although many remained connected with the Commonwealth. And Churchill, who fought the Fuzzy-Wuzzies under Kitchener at Omdurman, lived to see, and participate in, the end of the far-flung empire.

Churchill, some might say, was born outside his time. He might have been more at home in the lusty, expansive Elizabethan era or at the time when his ancestor, the first Duke of Marlborough, served his country so well at Blenheim. Possibly so. But he could not have been a more devoted and effective leader of his country than he was at the moment his destiny called him to leadership.

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Jan. 25, 1965]

GIANT ON HISTORY'S STAGE

Had he lived in another age, one where the ambitions of a man could be matched with armies and nations, he might have been a Napoleon or an Alexander the Great.

But it was ironic that Winston Churchill, a singular man who demanded personal, undivided power, lived and grew famous at a time and through his acts which saved democracy, that form of government which demands that power be spread through the many.

His career was long, his fame was relatively brief. But he seemed created for the period that he dominated, as though he had been waiting out the 40 years or more of his adult life to assume his part on the world's stage. Once on that stage, he had no superiors and few rivals for personal magnitude.

It was the individual's last capture of history. Even as his gigantic figure was standing tall and overshadowing his world, history was destroying the significance of the individual and mixing heroes and heroics alike into the gray tempers of contemporary anonymity. Today, in war, there could be no Winston Churchill rising through the flames to singlehandedly guide a nation and a cause. Our future worlds will be guided, even saved, by faceless men whose careers are lived behind a wall of technical namelessness.

But once he arrived there, Winston Churchill was not content to let history make a course for him. From being the tribal leader who called on Britons for blood, sweat, and tears to save their island, he emerged into the awesome status of a world symbol. He became the dike behind which the free world faced a tide of ruthless, powerful destruction, who with pen and phrase gave freedom its vocabulary.

He moved in majesty, while flaunting his personal whims and idiosyncracies with indifference to his image. He was just the man for his epochal years, and after he had written history with deeds, he turned and wrote it with a fluent pen, to assure his memory that it would be noted for the purposes he deemed important. As a leader and as a historian, he was above the considerations of modesty.

With his death the world loses the final of its wartime monuments. The Winston Churchill of history left us long before. As a retired statesman, Churchill kept a comparatively closed mouth, seldom loosing the arrows of scorn or the shafts of satire with which he annihilated his political foes of another era. He seemed content to let the world's awe settle about him like his old age, paying little attention to either. It was mildly amusing that his greatest public notice, in his last decade, came from his picture painting. The warrior at rest should touch not the sword nor turn an ear to the sounds of battle.

And now he is gone, and a part of legend, myth, and ballad goes with him.

[From the San Antonio Light, Jan. 25, 1965]

CHURCHILL

The great man is dead. With him has died a part of the 20th century.

Sir Winston Churchill was a towering figure of our age, a unique man who grasped and molded history as few before him.

Those fortunate enough to have lived during his day can treasure this knowledge: They are contemporaries of one who ranks with such titans as Caesar, Napoleon, and George Washington.

Who of us will ever forget how Churchill rumbled defiance when Britain stood alone during World War II? Who of us has not thrilled to the rolling resonance of his words?

His brandy, his cigars, and famed V sign became his unmistakable hallmark and he relished them as one who loved life and his fellow man.

We are proud that his mother was an American and that he accepted honorary American citizenship, the sole individual so honored in this century.

Soldier, journalist, statesman, and historian—he was all of these in a manner seldom equaled. Yet he was more than any of them.

He was the embodiment of a stubborn determination to preserve honor, decency, and dignity in the affairs of men. For him, civilization and all it implied, built up over the centuries, was sacred.

A giant is gone from our midst.

[From the Beaumont Enterprise, Jan. 25, 1965]

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

The great old heart of Winston Churchill has run down.

And with the stillness, a little in all of us was assigned to eternal sleep.

No man in this century so completely belonged to the world, so challenged and charmed the human race, as did this energetic Englishman.

For almost three-quarters of a century, his monumental talents have had a hand in shaping the course of history.

When he spoke of freedom, he spoke for those in chains everywhere.

When he berated tyranny, he tenderly imparted strength to the downtrodden in every corner of God's green earth.

When he cried out against appeasement, his words were the wisdom of ages.

When he breathed new life into the British nation in the dark days of World War II, he inspired and strengthened us all.

His brilliant writing, his masterful painting, his unequaled command of the English language: They are for the hearts and minds and souls of men and women and children in every land.

Not everyone agreed with Sir Winston's political philosophies and governmental methods. He was not always every inch a statesman.

Still, he was so richly the embodiment of spiritual virility and so deeply understanding of the virtuous and villainous ways of man alike, his very failings met a minimum of condemnation as an appreciative civilization acquired greater understanding of his qualities of leadership and the forces that made his remarkable person click.

He believed that greatness could not be a stagnant quality. Growth in every dimension was a daily challenge and a daily goal. To him, building a brick wall was a creative accomplishment of worth and wonder.

Even in dark and disappointing days of his career, Sir Winston must have found the world a wonderful place. Not one for half measures, he drank long and satisfyingly at the fountains of life.

For the blessings thus enjoyed, he shared every talent that he possessed with a world that will grow still more appreciative as the years go by.

Men wanted to be like Winston Churchill, and for all the fallacies in human beings' sense of values, we consider this a shining monument to the remarkable star performer in the 20th-century drama of war and peace.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Jan. 25, 1965]

WINSTON CHURCHILL

At a critical point in the Battle of Britain, Winston Churchill paid his famous tribute to the courageous men who had given their lives that others might retain their liberty. "Never in the field of human conflict," he said, "was so much owed by so many to so few."

At his death, all free men everywhere should acknowledge the same debt to the one man, Churchill, who, perhaps, did more than any other of his time to serve the cause of liberty with unparalleled courage and heroic endeavor.

Born 90 years ago at Blenheim Palace, Churchill was an early student of war, politics, and statecraft. Before the turn of the century he had fought with expeditionary forces in India, Africa, and Cuba. While serving as a war correspondent, he was taken prisoner by the Boers, but escaped. Two decades later he was back in the trenches of France during World War I.

These early experiences helped mold the courage and foresight of the man who, in his finest hour, kept Hitler's legions out of London, Moscow, and Washington, and not long after helped to stall the march of Stalin's troops across Europe. Long before the Sarajevo incident, he anticipated the Kaiser's onslaught. Far in advance of the invasion of Poland he recognized and spoke out against the menace of Hitler. And in April 1946, while it was still fashionable to hail Russia as a peace-loving nation and ally of the West, he warned the free world of the threat of Communist imperialism. His greatness was not only in personal courage and leadership but in a foresight of incredible accuracy.

It was a tragedy that his foresight was not always recognized, his warnings not always heeded. In 1938, after Chamberlain appeased Hitler at Munich and promised "peace in our time," Churchill told the House of Commons: "You were given the choice between war and dishonor. You chose dishonor and you will have war."

Finally, when it was almost too late, the crisis he tried to avert was dropped in Churchill's lap. With France, Belgium, and Holland overrun and England standing alone in 1940, the new Prime Minister vowed: "We shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be. We shall fight on the beaches. We shall fight on the landing grounds. We shall fight on the fields and in the streets. We shall fight in the hills. We shall never surrender."

This was the indomitable spirit that enabled Winston Churchill to crystallize the national will at moments of crisis—indeed to stiffen the backbones of free men everywhere in the fight against tyranny—and to turn the tide of history. Such raw courage was his trademark, as much as the outsized cigar and the V for victory sign.

As long as freedom and courage survive, the spirit that made Churchill the most heroic figure of the century will endure. Now his work is done, but wherever a free man lives this noble life will be remembered and will be embedded in the chronicles of high aspiration.

[From the El Paso Herald-Post, Jan. 25, 1965]

CHURCHILL: 1874–1965

The world will never be quite the same again. The death of Sir Winston Churchill leaves a void that is filled only rarely. He was a very great man, a lovable man, a very human man whose sense of humor was on a par with his sense of greatness.

In the darkest days of World War II, Sir Winston's sense of wit never diminished. His statesmanship was enhanced by his ability to laugh, even at himself, and to demolish his enemies with ridicule.

He was a man who worked and played and lived in the grand style—in great days of modern history. As one of his wartime associates said, with pride, even his mistakes were great ones.

Western civilization owes survival to him more than any other man. By sheer willpower, plus an indomitable determination to wring "Corporal Schicklgruber" Hitler's neck, he rallied the world from near defeat to go on to victory with his unforgettable word: "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat."

It is difficult not to be sentimental about "good ole Winnie" as his fellow countrymen called him. But Churchill was a sentimentalist—in the grand manner, too.

He never was more emotional than when he first addressed a joint session of the American Congress—less than 3 years after Pearl Harbor. Tears came to his eyes as he wished that his American-born mother could have seen him that day. But in a flash the chuckle was back when he thanked Congress in is best Victorian manner for inviting him to address it:

"I cannot help reflecting that if my father had been American and my mother British, instead of the other way round, I might have got here (in Congress) on my own."

Churchill was an Englishman's Englishman. But he belonged to the free world—as a statesman, world strategist, historian, orator, raconteur, gourmet, animal lover, grammarian, amateur painter—even bricklayer. He was an ardent dabbler in everything of interest in life. Of all descriptive words that might be placed beside his name, he preferred to be looked upon as a Victorian—a relic of the heroic days when the British realm spread around the world and the widowed Queen wore the imperial crown.

True to his heritage, he never reconciled himself to the dismantling of the empire. Long after it was certain the tide was running out, he stoutly proclaimed he had not become the King's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the empire. He didn't; he was out of office when India and and Burma gained independence.

And at the age of 88, when he was made an honorary citizen of the United States, he showed that he had not given up his lifelong fight to preserve Britain as a great and noble power. Thanking President Kennedy for the latest of many honors, Churchill wrote as the former Prime Minister of a "great sovereign state," and added:

"I say 'great sovereign state' with design and emphasis, for I reject the view that Britain and the Commonwealth should now be relegated to a tame and minor role in the world * * * let no man underrate our energies, our potentialities and our abiding power for good."

Churchill's literary contributions alone would have served to perpetuate his name. His monumental histories of both world wars and of the English speaking peoples are an eloquent record of his country and his times.

But he rose to unmatched oratorical heights in the speeches he made in the House of Commons in the war when about all he had to fight with were words. Kennedy recognized this in signing the honorary citizenship proclamation with this appropriate metaphor:

"In the dark days and darker nights when Britain stood alone—and most men, save Englishmen, despaired of England's life—he mobilized the English language and sent it into battle. The incandescent quality of his words illuminated the courage of his countrymen."

For ages to come, free men will turn to Churchill's wartime speeches for inspiration to carry on the struggle against tyranny.

It was in England's darkest hour after Dunkirk—one Churchill turned into her finest hour—that this rolypoly man with a cherubic face, a cigar and a V-sign, and little more than cricket bats for weapons, defiantly told Hitler:

"We shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be; we shall fight on the beaches; we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and on the streets, we shall fight in the hills—we shall never surrender."

He wasn't bluffing. He was a man of great personal courage—dauntless and fearless—at his best when the odds against him were greatest. He never hesitated to stand alone for what he considered right.

Even in old age, he never flinched. Asked in 1949 on his 75th birthday if he had any fear of death, he replied:

"I am ready to meet my Maker. Whether my Maker is prepared for the great ordeal of meeting me is another matter."

[From the El Paso Times, Jan. 25, 1965]

A Great Man Passes

Sir Winston Churchill, who, some insist, was the greatest Englishman who ever lived, was taken by death Sunday following an illness which seized him January 15.

Sir Winston, like all great men, had his critics, but none could possibly dispute the fact he held England together during the trying days of World War II and that he was the greatest English leader of our period.

Sir Winston's "blood, tears, and sweat" slogan will go down in history as one of the most effective rallying calls ever recorded. He had a knack for coining slogans, something few men have ever had. His "Iron Curtain" pronouncement took hold and is still applied when referring to the dividing line between East and West in Europe.

Sir Winston was a warrior and he was respected as such by friend and foe. He was a rock. He did not know what the words "quit" or "surrender" meant. They simply were not in his vocabulary.

As a youth Churchill entered Harrow, where his conspicuous lack of success at his studies seemingly justified his father's decision to enter him on an army career. In 1893 he entered the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, where he applied himself seriously to his work, passing out (graduating) in 1894, eighth in a class of 150. In 1895, the year of his father's death, Churchill entered the Fourth Hussars.

That was the beginning of a long and brilliant career, both as a military man and as a journalist.

Sir Winston's mother was an American, the former Jeanette Jerome, of New York. Therefore, every American takes pride in the fact that great man was half American. He was respected so much in this country that he was made an honorary American citizen by act of Congress.

A grateful England and a sympathetic world today mourn the passing of a man who made history.

Sir Winston Churchill, in death, will receive more words over world television and radio and in world newspapers than any man who has died in many, many years. His importance and history demand such treatment.

The Times prefers to look upon Sir Winston as the greatest man who lived during our time. In England, he did not have a country of vast resources and great manpower. But he kept a people together when they were reeling from the sledgehammer blows of Nazi Germany.

Truly, a most unusual man has been claimed by death.

May he rest in peace.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Jan. 25, 1965]

Taps for the Noblest Briton

Someone has defined courage as "the fixed resolve not to quit." Sir Winston Churchill had this dogged determination to an almost unparalleled degree, and it is a lucky thing for his countrymen and for the free world that he did. For it was the resolve of this pudgy, jaunty, witty, eloquent, and stubborn Briton that unquestionably changed the history of the world. By the sheer force of it he rallied his nation to the steadfast resistance that turned the tide in World War II.

It was as the magnificent leader in war that he will be best remembered, for in that role he rendered priceless service to the cause of human liberty. Free men on every continent owe—and readily acknowledge—a great debt to him in that respect. The people of the United States proudly made him an honorary American citizen, a distinction accorded only one other person in history, the Frenchman Lafayette.

Sir Winston, in a career that surpassed that of most men even in longevity, had other claims to fame. He was a soldier, statesman, orator, literary man and—in his later years—painter of more than insignificant skill. In any of the things that involved heart, mind, tongue, and spirit, he seemed to stand a little apart—and above—the other men of his era. And with it all, he was a rare human being, full of the quirks and foibles which, more than his greatness, endeared him to people.

He was the last of the great figures of World War II, on either side of the struggle in which he rose to such heights. Now the man who has been called "the noblest Briton" is dead.

Of his performance in steeling his country's resolve at its time of greatest peril, Sir Winston himself said: "It was given to me to express what was in the hearts of the British people. * * * It was the nation and the race living all around the globe that had the lion's heart. I had the luck to be called on to give the roar."

The roar he gave at that time and on other occasions in his career will be heard down the corridors of history.

[From the Houston Post, Jan. 25, 1965]

Winston Churchill, Symbol of Man's Struggle To Remain Free

Almost anything that can be said at the passing of one of the great men of history is inadequate. And never was this truer than in the case of Sir Winston Spencer Churchill.

As a leader in the never-ending struggle of mankind to achieve and preserve freedom, and as a man, he epitomized and personified many of the attributes of British character that are admired and respected universally.

He was a product of the period in which his country reached the zenith of its power and influence. And at a time when his homeland faced its supreme challenge and test, literally that of physical survival.

His moments of maximum greatness were also Britain's greatest. At that critical point in the history of the Western World, he was Britain. He towered above his countrymen like a giant with his tremendous energy and drive, his remarkable capacity to lead and to inspire, and his stubborn refusal to accept either defeat or despair, even under the severest blows of fate and adversity.

Most of all, in those wartime years, Winston Churchill became a symbol, not only for Britain but for all the free world, of a determination to win at any cost. His hatred of tyranny was implacable and unyielding.

But symbol and great leader that he was, it was his personality that made the deepest imprint upon the history of his times and, in time, endeared him to all lovers of freedom.

Bernard Baruch once said of him that he was "that rarest of persons—a civilized man."

And the British historian, Arnold Toynbee, wrote of him at the time he stepped down from leadership of his country: "Sir Winston Churchill has retired from being Prime Minister of the United Kingdom; but there is one thing from which he can never retire, and that is from being himself."

And he never did—until the day of his death.

Churchill was, in a very truthful sense, a unique individual. There was certainly nobody else quite like him during all of the 90 years that he lived. There very possibly was none before, and there may never be again.

He will be remembered for many things—most of all, the imperishable page which he helped his country write in the history of mankind's effort to keep the torch of liberty aflame. But he also will be remembered as a man, for his eloquence, for his unusual mastery of, and his skill in the use of the English language, both written and spoken, and for his ability to inspire others to heroic action and a determination equal to his own.

Millions still alive will never forget his distinctive voice as it rolled over the airwaves in some of the most memorable statements ever to be uttered in the English tongue. It may be untrue to say that he won the war with words, but his words contributed mightily to victory, just as his mind contributed to the plans and strategy that led to an Allied military triumph.

It frequently has been true historically that, in times of great crisis in human events, a man whose capacities have not been fully appreciated before is at hand or soon appears on the scene who is adequate to the great demands of the hour.

Such a man was Sir Winston Churchill in World War II. Most of the great figures of that period are gone. So now is Churchill. He may or may not have been greatest of them all but, he will never be forgotten so long as there are freemen who are willing to fight for their freedom.

[From the San Antonio Express, Jan. 25, 1965]

Genius Was Churchill's Armor in One of World's Great Crises

Death of Winston Churchill merely confirms what we all knew all along: man is mortal and frail but capable of astounding achievement.

Sir Winston's death is not really a universal loss except that we who knew his greatness know now that his days on earth have been used—and he used them very well. He was an uncommon man. He had an analytical sense of history and he appreciated more fully than some the roles that had to be played. When his time came to take the center of the stage, he knew what to do.

Indomitable became the word most used to describe this durable old man who looked like an impish cherub. Eloquence cloaked him in a masculine, daring way. He could write with incisive clarity and he could speak with authority and confidence that rumbled from his rugged frame like thunder punctuated by gentle flashes of lightning wit that was deadly for all its twinkle.

Much of Sir Winston's career was spent jousting with political leaders and had only slightly more brilliance than some of his contemporaries, but when he was thrust into the office of Prime Minister of Great Britain at the onset of World War II, his exhortations to courage and sacrifice stamped him with unquestioned greatness.

Churchill lived to know the esteem he earned. He didn't accomplish all he might have. For example, he—among the world leaders at the time—warned that communism couldn't be trusted. He was beaten by Labor and turned out of office.

The old man with the big cigar is gone but his influence and the fortitude he demonstrated against massive odds in the early days of World War II made him a legend in his lifetime. Time will only enhance that legend and Sir Winston's death merely removes the author of one of the really great careers of history.

[From the Wichita Falls Record News, Jan. 25, 1965]

AN ILLUSTRIOUS LIFE

Most men live their lives on a plain. A few may accomplish deeds outstanding enough to place them on the hills or mountains among their fellows. Still fewer—a mere handful a century—reach Everest heights during their time on earth.

Such a one was Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, whose death at 90 brings to a close one of the longest, richest, and most significant lives ever lived by any man.

Churchill's adult life spanned all the way from the Battle of Khartoum, which he witnessed (and which to us today seems like something out of medieval history), to the launching of a space probe to Mars.

A soldier and correspondent in his early manhood, Churchill by birth and talent was destined to find his career in government. Yet it was not until 1940, at an age when most men would be thinking of retirement, that his greatest days began.

It was Hitler's boast that he was Germany and Germany was Hitler, but truly, in those dark days of the Battle of Britain, Winston Churchill was Britain—to the world and to his own people.

It was "Winne"—with his always present cigar in one hand, the other making the "V" sign of victory—scrambling over the rubble of what was once a London building, or following behind troops training in the field, or inspecting the landing beaches in Normandy, or—at last—inspecting Hitler's death bunker in Berlin.

Churchill in his long life knew almost every measure of success and fame which any man could reasonably hope for—as well as the ignominy of military blunders and political exile that would have broken a lesser man.

He received as many honors as any man could reasonably expect from a grateful and admiring world. But if the list of his titles and honors is long, the list of his accomplishments is longer.

Statesman, painter, Noble Prize-winning historian, he enriched our lives and language with his memorable speeches. To find his equal in the ability to stir men's souls with words, one must go back at least as far as Lincoln, perhaps to Pericles of Athens 2,300 years ago.

And if men walk this earth 23 centuries hence, and still praise greatness, they will know the name of Winston Churchill.

[From the Witchita Falls Times, Jan. 26, 1965]

NO TRIBUTE ADEQUATE

No man's place in history can be more secure than that of Sir Winston Churchill.

No tribute, by the same token, is quite adequate to the man "Winnie" was.

Churchill gave, and the world extracted, all that could come from any individual called to his position of high trust and responsibility.

The fate of the free world for many months rested upon his burdened shoulders, but he was equal to the challenge.

Churchill was mortal, as all men are. It was at an age considered elderly when he became Prime Minister of Great Britain early in World War II, and he jousted the scythe successfully for another quarter of a century.

Friend and foe alike had the greatest respect for his talents, even if affection was reserved only for those in the former circle.

There was the bridge of kinship linking Great Britain and the United States in Sir Winston Churchill. Had he not been a blood cousin of Uncle Sam's people, however, he would have won relationship by the heartfelt admiration and gratitude Americans felt for him.

Churchill gave of himself as unstintingly as he demanded that others give.

Churchill redefined in the 20th century the standards by which greatness can be measured. One has only to list the attributes of his life to get the yardstick of values by which eminence can be judged.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

At 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PELL in the chair).

THE GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENT AND THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent to the Congress a very able and courageous message dealing with the deficit in our balance of payments. This is a very excellent complement to his request for a decrease in the gold-cover requirement which he made some days ago, upon which yesterday the House acted affirmatively by an overwhelming vote, and which the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency approved this morning.

I. THE GOLD PROBLEM

Several days ago on the floor of this body I outlined the situation which we faced so far as the gold-cover requirement is concerned. I pointed out that as of the end of December we had a total gold-certificate reserve in this country of $15.1 billion, but that $13.6 billion of that amount was locked up as a 25-percent reserve against $35.3 billion of Federal Reserve notes and $19.5 billion of deposits of member banks in the Federal Reserve System.

I pointed out, in what I attempted to make a graphic demonstration, that one cannot get gold for Federal Reserve notes. No one has been able to do so since 1933. No bank can withdraw its deposits from the Federal Reserve System and receive gold for such deposits. Indeed, it would be directly against its economic interests were it able to do so.

Therefore, so far as present law is concerned $13.6 billion of gold was unnecessarily locked up, as of the end of December. That left us with a balance of only $1.4 billion with which to meet the only demands which can be made upon American gold; namely, the demands of foreign governments or monetary authorities to have dollar balances redeemed in gold.

I pointed out that the volume of those foreign claims was very great. At the end of November 1964, $12.7 billion was in the hands of foreign governments and foreign central banks. We are pledged to redeem these claims in gold, upon demand. Another $11.2 billion was held privately, and could easily be transferred to foreign central banks. Any such transfer would add to the claims of foreign central banks against our gold reserve.

Those two items combined make a total of $23.9 billion.

In addition, international and regional organizations, other than the International Monetary Fund, held dollar balances of $1.7 billion. It is estimated that foreign holdings of American bonds and notes amounted to $2.5 billion, and their holdings of American currency to $1 billion.

We thus have an actual or potential liability of $29 billion, which we could be asked to redeem in gold, whereas we had only $1.4 billion of gold, under present legislation, with which to redeem these sums at the end of 1964 without emergency action by the Federal Reserve.

Our "free" gold reserve for meeting the international claims upon the dollar, the only monetary function left for gold at present, is therefore woefully inadequate—only about 5 percent of actual or potential obligations.

With the withdrawals of gold in January and early February, it is probable that the "free" gold reserve still in the hands of our authorities does not now exceed $1.2 billion, down from the $1.4 billion figure which I gave for the end of December.

PRESIDENT ACTED WISELY

Therefore the President acted very wisely in recommending the removal of the gold cover requirement on the deposits of $19.5 billion of member banks and others in the Federal Reserve System. Such action would free approximately $4.9 billion, raising our "free" gold reserve against international claims to almost precisely $6 billion.

I had hoped that the President would go even further and remove the gold cover requirement against the $35.3 billion of Federal Reserve notes as well as on deposits, so that the full force of our gold reserve could be used for the one purpose for which it can be used, namely, to meet our international obligations.

But perhaps the President was politically wise in not doing so, because there is much irrational thought upon this subject. There is a sort of mystic belief in the gold standard, even though what we have today is not actually a pure gold standard.

I am reminded of a passage in "Alice in Wonderland," in which the Cheshire cat disappeared from the tree and left only its smile behind. A gold reserve requirement had reality and substance as long as gold circulated as money and convertibility of notes into gold had to be protected. But gold no longer circulates as money, and the gold reserve requirement is therefore like the smile of the Cheshire cat, when the Cheshire cat itself has disappeared. Or, to use another analogy, Senators may remember the story of the miser who gave his apprentice a piece of cheese every morning to go with his bread. Then he thought he could economize, so he removed the piece of cheese, put it under glass, and permitted his apprentice to rub the bread on the glass, so that he would get the illusion that he was getting cheese from underneath the glass. That is about the way the domestic reserve requirement for gold operates, so far as internal claims against the dollar are concerned. It encourages the illusion that our people can obtain gold, but in reality they cannot. Ultimately, I hope that a greater degree of commonsense will penetrate the mind of the American public on this subject.

I tried to demonstrate this recently by giving $35 to one of the clerks at the desk and asking him to redeem the $35 in gold either at the Treasury or at the Federal Reserve Board. This pained the administrative officials of the Senate, and they requested me not to put that onus upon them. So I sent one of my own assistants to both the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board. Of course, as we knew, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board refused to give gold for the Federal Reserve notes, saying they were prohibited by law from doing so. At an appropriate time, I shall place their letters in the RECORD.

While the President has not taken the full step, he has taken a very vigorous step by proposing legislation that would put $6 billion of gold behind potential claims against our foreign dollar liabilities. He deserves congratulations for the courage with which he has acted. I hope there will be few dissenting votes on the question of eliminating the gold cover requirement on deposits with the Federal Reserve System when the bill comes before the Senate for a vote.

II. PRESIDENT FACES BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Today the President has faced the problem which underlies the question of the gold cover requirement; namely, the deficit in the balance of payments. I have been watching this situation for some time. According to my figures, which I believe are correct, the deficit in the balance of payments from 1958 through 1964—7 years—has amounted to $21,300 million. It is this large cumulative deficit in the balance of payments that has caused the threat to the international stability of the dollar. Where has this deficit in the balance of payments come from? It has not come from any unfavorable balance of trade. Quite the contrary. We have consistently exported more goods, more physical commodities, than we have imported. Indeed, in 1963 the balance of exports over imports amounted to about $5 billion. Exports were $21.9 billion; imports were $16.9 billion. Indeed, in the 19 years from 1946 to 1965, we exported $81 billion more of goods than we imported.

HIGHLY FAVORABLE BALANCE OF TRADE

The President has given us in his report figures to indicate that we had a large trade surplus during 1964, although the figures have not yet been officially published. He says that for 1964 the surplus in commodities excluding exports financed by the Government, amounted to $3,600 million. I wish to emphasize this basic strength. Those who say that our trouble lies in the alleged fact that the prices of our commodities are so high that they cannot be sold abroad are mistaken. We have consistently been able to sell abroad, and we are becoming increasingly able to do so.

NO U.S. INFLATION

People talk loosely about inflation in this country. If they will examine the statistics on prices, published in the Economic Indicators for January, they will find that prices of commodities at wholesale have remained virtually stable ever since 1958. The index on page 27 of the January Indicators shows that, taking the average for 1957–59 as 100, the index for all commodities on January 19, 1965, was only 101, an increase of only 1 percent over a course of 7 years.

Actually, the United States has the most stable price level of any country in the world. France, which has proclaimed itself, since the coming of General de Gaulle to power as a stable money country, has experienced, according to IMF statistics, an increase in its price level of approximately 20 percent.

West Germany, which prides itself upon its price stability and occasionally lectures us on the ground that we do not have stable prices, has had, according to IMF data, an increase in prices of 7 percent.

We have been able to hold our prices relatively steady in the face of advancing prices in the rest of the world, and this factor has contributed to our increasingly favorable balance of trade. In other words, we have been able to sell abroad because of advancing prices more than we could ordinarily have sold, and the increased cost abroad has diminished, relatively, the imports into this country. This is a beacon of hope for the long run.

So let it be realized, once and for all, that the so-called unfavorable balance of payments did not arise from any unfavorable balance of commodity shipments. Neither did it arise from any unfavorable balance of services, because adding together the interest and profits upon capital invested abroad and other service items, I find that in 1963 there was a favorable balance of approximately $500 million on services. If we take the combined balance of trade and services for 1963, we had a favorable balance of $5.5 billion.

III. PROBLEM IS AID, MILITARY SUPPORT, AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT ABROAD

The problem then is where the unfavorable balance comes from in transforming a favorable balance of $5.5 billion on commodities and services into an unfavorable balance of payments of $3 billion in 1964 and $2,600 million for 1963. It comes primarily from three major items. The first is foreign economic assistance; the second is military spending abroad; and the third is the continued investment of capital abroad by American investors and American companies which require expenditures abroad. These expenditures then give rise to dollar claims of foreigners against the United States.

In 1963, the foreign economic assistance—grants and loans made by our Government—was approximately $4.5 billion; net military expenditures abroad were $1.9 billion; and the net outflow of private capital abroad that year amounted to $4.2 billion. This represents combined expenditures amounting to $10.6 billion, or approximately $5.1 billion more than our surplus in goods and services. It may be said that some items under each of these groups can be altered or give rise to offsetting receipts elsewhere in our accounts. I have presented only a general picture.

IV. PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

The President has moved very courageously now in trying to reduce the unfavorable balance of payments. I shall speak very briefly about some of the proposals which he is making for legislation, for administrative action, and for voluntary action by Americans.

He proposes that the interest equalization tax, which otherwise would have expired at the end of this year, should be continued for 2 more years. I hope that this will be done.

It is perfectly true that continued investments of capital ultimately—and I emphasize the word ultimately—more than come back to the United States in profits and interest. But this is a long-range effect on the balance of payments. The immediate effect of continued fresh capital exports is to create additional dollar claims against us and our gold reserves.

When this bill was before Congress last year, the very able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and I supported the bill in its main form. But we stressed that we believed there were loopholes in the bill which would permit long-term loans to be made by private banks which were outside the mandatory powers of the tax, but which could be used by the banks—I shall not say to circumvent—to avoid the tax of 1 percent which, in effect, was levied upon the yields of bonds and stocks.

The Treasury Department was not very helpful in dealing with this matter. They somewhat played it down. But the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was able to devise a provision giving discretionary power to the President to apply this measure to long-term loans made by banks. As it turned out, our forebodings were correct.

During the latter part of the year 1964, large loans were made by banks to foreign countries, principally Japan. These loans were then, in all probability, invested in these foreign countries in capital goods, spent for raw materials, or utilized in other ways. But they increased the deficit in the balance of payments above the earlier estimates. Capital outflows are primarily responsible for the fact that the ultimate result for 1964 was not as favorable as the Treasury Department had forecast earlier in the year. The Treasury Department had earlier held out hopes that the deficit in balance of payments would be reduced to $2 billion.

We all remember the highly optimistic statements which were made. But in the last quarter of the year, a deluge of loans was made abroad, which created new claims against the dollar. This caused the balance-of-payments deficits to be not $2 billion, but at least $3 billion. And the final figures are not yet in.

TIMELY USE OF GORE AMENDMENT

The President, under the act of last year, was given discretionary power to apply the 1-percent yield tax, which was roughly the difference between earnings in this country and earnings abroad, to bank loans of one year or more. The President now acts—as of today. And, while the results years from now may not be favorable—and probably will not be favorable—his act is timely in meeting the needs of the present situation.

Some relief has been given to Japan. Japan will be able to get at least $100 million a year free from the interest equalization tax. We were very kind to Canada in not applying the interest equalization tax to her. But apparently some kind of agreement has been arrived at between our Government and the Canadian Government under which the Canadian Government will limit Canada's demands on the American capital markets.

V. DECREASE CAPITAL FLOW ABROAD

There is a certain degree of contradictory pleading by foreign governments. On the one hand, foreign governments attack the United States for acquiring a larger share of industry ownership abroad. General de Gaulle was very caustic on this subject in his speech of a few days ago. That is their reaction when they talk to the public. On the other hand, they rather like to have that American capital increase their employment and their productive capacity. So, they are divided selves, and subject to political and economic schizophrenia. We shall try to assist them in becoming more integrated personalities by diminishing the flow of capital abroad.

Let me repeat that this is only a short-time measure. We ultimately want a world which will be free for capital movements and we want it to abide by ethical standards of labor and international dealings. In the long run, we want this international flow. I regard it as necessary.

VI. ECONOMIES IN FOREIGN AID AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The President has given instructions to the administrators of AID and to the Defense Department that they are to reduce our expenditures abroad. New economies will be sought in the administration of AID and our military programs abroad. Furthermore, a still larger portion of the commodities which we furnish under the defense and aid programs will in the future come from the United States, and not be purchased abroad.

I think this is an excellent proposal and should be applied to the continent of Europe and particularly to purchases in France.

The President proposes to cut from $100 to $50 the amount of foreign goods which tourists may bring back to this country duty free. This should perhaps reduce the balance-of-payments strain by something over $100 million. The new duty-free allowance is to be based on the prices actually paid, rather than, as in the past, on wholesale prices.

DISCRIMINATORY OCEAN FREIGHT RATES

There is one feature of the President's message which may escape attention, but which I think is extremely important. The President pledges that this country "will strive to eliminate such artificial barriers to U.S. exports as discriminatory freight rates on ocean traffic."

The Joint Economic Committee, which I recently chaired, learned in 1963 that ocean freight rates on commodities going out of this country are much higher than the rates for the same commodities coming into the country. These disparities exist even though the goods are carried on the same ship, between the same ports. These discrepancies are enormous, both on the Atlantic trade routes and the Pacific. Moreover, our exports to Latin America and to the developing countries are subjected to much higher shipping rates than are exports from Europe and Japan to these countries. I want to pay tribute to Mr. Thomas Boggs, of the Joint Economic Committee staff, for his fine work upon this subject.

One reason for this discrimination is that the rates are controlled by shipping conferences in which American ships are in a minority and in which foreign shipping lines, by majority vote, are able to impose this rate system. The American lines prefer to follow conference-established rates than compete.

We have found, in pursuing this subject for a year and a half, that we have met—with some honorable exceptions—stubborn opposition both from steamship lines and foreign governments. We have been trying to learn the facts on which decisions of the international conferences are based, so that the public of the world can see the reasons for the discrimination practiced against American shipping, and therefore against American exports. Foreign countries refuse to permit us to learn the facts. I dislike to say this, but Great Britain has been one of the worst offenders in this respect. I am glad we have received the support of President Johnson in this cause, just as the aid of President Kennedy had been assured. It is a long road, but the importance of this problem needs to be understood.

VII. MODERATE PROPOSALS

The President has been most moderate in the measures which he has proposed. Some have advocated a limitation on the amount of money which American tourists may spend abroad. This amounts to nearly $2 billion a year. In 1963 our tourists abroad spent $2.1 billion, and foreign tourists in this country spent a little over $900 million. There was a net deficit of $1.6 billion in the travel account after taking into account payments and receipts for transportation.

The President proposes no provision for a limitation on the amount American tourists may spend abroad in his message, but he does make a plea that, as a matter of patriotism, Americans should try to see America first.

I realize the attractions of foreign travel. I think it has helped to make America a less insular country. One enjoys the great art treasures of the Louvre, of the Uffizi, of the British Museum and the National Gallery in London, of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. Those are inspiring places of esthetic pleasure, but I hope, for a time, until we pull out of this difficulty, that we can reduce foreign travel, and taste some of the beauties of travel in the United States.

VIII. INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS SYSTEM

In the concluding page of his message, the President emphasized that, just as the balance of payments underlies the problem of the gold cover requirement, so the balance of payments underlies the problem of the international payments system and to some degree vice versa.

There are some significant facts that need to be known. In the years since 1953 the volume of international trade has almost precisely doubled—world exports have risen from $74 billion to approximately $150 billion. The volume of international transactions has doubled, but the supply of monetary gold reserves has increased from only $34.3 billion to $40.5 billion, or by 18 percent.

So if we had had a pure international gold standard in which only gold could be used to settle international deficits, we would have had an inadequate supply, and this would have compelled a fall in price levels, with disastrous consequences to the economy, not merely of the United States, but of the world.

Voices are being raised for a return to the pure international gold standard, instead of the present international gold exchange standard. General de Gaulle made such a statement earlier in the week. Mr. Jacques Rueff has advocated it in France.

(At this point Mr. Bass took the chair as presiding officer.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yesterday some witnesses appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to urge a return to the pure international gold standard. This is going to become an issue before the country and before the world. Let me point out that what has enabled international trade to operate without a fall in prices during the past

10 years has been the fact that international balances can be settled not merely by gold, but also by claims upon the dollar and upon the pound. In other words, the addition of the dollar and the pound to gold as international reserve media has created a gold exchange and not merely a gold standard. Through our deficits in the balance of payments of $21 billion during the past 7 or 8 years, we have created the increase in international reserves which was necessary to keep pace with the growth in international transactions.

Let me give the figures on the world's foreign exchange holdings.

In 1953, they amounted to $17 billion.

In 1964, third quarter, they amounted to $25.6 billion—an increase of $8 billion, or 50 percent.

It has been the increase in foreign exchange holdings—almost entirely dollars, pounds only to a limited degree—which has enabled the international circulating medium to keep some reasonable relationship with the increase in trade. In other words, it has been only the deficit in the American balance of payments which has enabled the international monetary system to operate. I believe that fact should be made known to General de Gaulle.

We have allowed ourselves to be placed in a difficult position in order that the world volume of trade could take place without a disastrous fall in the price level.

The American economy has been nailed upon a cross—not upon a cross of gold but upon the cross of the gold exchange standard. We have borne this burden in the interest of international monetary stability.

It ill behooves the leaders of foreign states to revile the United States because they hold more claims against us than they otherwise would have done.

As we reduce our unfavorable balance of payments, we reduce other countries' accumulation of international reserves. In establishing greater financial stability for ourselves, we throw some of the burden of responsibility upon other nations.

I am a believer in the Sermon on the Mount. It has a much greater area of application in private life than we normally give to it, and I believe that it has a considerable zone of application in foreign relations.

But we cannot expect any nation to be held year after year to this burden and then to be reviled and attacked because it bears that burden. There is a limit to the number of times a nation can be expected to turn the other cheek.

MODERATE AND CAUTIOUS MESSAGE

The President has been cautious and much calmer than I would have been in his comments on the international situation. There are no words reviling General de Gaulle. There is no threat of reprisals. There is a plea for international cooperation.

The President is much more gentle than I believe I would have been were I, by some strange quirk of fate, in his place; but it is sometimes possible for legislators to say things which Presidents and chiefs of state cannot say.

As a legislator, I say that if runs were staged on the dollar, even though we will shortly have a "free" reserve of $6 billion, we would be justified in reprisals.

I note with concern that not only is France withdrawing gold, but Spain is also withdrawing gold without saying anything about it.

The President concludes by asserting that we must develop a new international system of payments. This is absolutely necessary. As the volume of dollars which we contribute to form a part of the international currency no longer increases or even diminishes, if world trade is to expand—as we hope it will—it will be necessary to find some alternative means for increasing world liquidity. Perhaps the French will volunteer to make the franc a supplementary currency. Possibly the Germans will volunteer to do so with the mark. But I notice that the head of the Deutsche Bank, Dr. Abs, is urging the German Government to convert some of the German dollar reserves into gold. Possibly Italy will join. Possibly Japan will join. Their proposals should be carefully considered.

DE GAULLE PROPOSES CALAMITY

But if we were to follow General de Gaulle and eliminate all foreign exchange at the present time by turning it into gold, we would write down the volume of international currency from $66 billion to $40 billion. This would produce a calamitous decline in world prices, create a worldwide depression, and vastly increase unemployment and produce domestic instability in every country in the Western World.

General de Gaulle is a brave man and a great military and political leader. But, as a monetary expert and promoter of international cooperation, I would rate him at about zero.

Perhaps if General de Gaulle had served in the Senate, he might better have appreciated the gentle words of President Johnson. In any event, I commend the President, as our Chief of State, for the delicacy with which he has handled foreign governments. He deserves great praise. I hope that behind his soft words, polite manner, and the velvet glove, the European countries may gain some idea of the disposition of the Legislature of the United States to be a bit more vigorous in defense of American interests.

SUPPLEMENTARY INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY

What kind of supplementary international currency there should be, I certainly cannot say. Mr. Robert Triffin has proposed a system that would create an international bank similar to the Federal Reserve banks, and which would create demand deposits as the volume of trade expanded. There is a great deal of merit to the suggestion. We should also, however, beware of the danger that adoption of the suggestion might be accompanied by such a great expansion of credit as to result in inflation.

Let me make it clear that I am as much opposed to inflation and an appreciable increase in the price level as I am opposed to deflation and an appreciable decrease in the price level.

In 1951, I was credited with being responsible for the Treasury-Federal Reserve Board accord, which removed from the Federal Reserve System the obligation to purchase unlimited quantities of Government bonds in order to freeze the interest rate at a noncompetitive low level.

I certainly had something to do with it, and I do not disavow that responsibility. I would be happy to do it again if it were necessary.

In recent years the Federal Reserve has tended to err in the other direction, being too strict in the expansion of credit. So we wish to avoid both of these situations. There is the danger, in producing a monetary system somewhat divorced from a metallic base, of an excessive creation of credit and an excessive rise in prices. This must be guarded against.

One possibility would be to have an international reserve system, just as we have a national reserve system. Other nations could join in such a system. They would have to be willing at times to run a deficit in their balance of payments. We cannot be the only country in the world to have a deficit in the balance of payments. It is self-defeating for every country to strive for a surplus. This is something that General de Gaulle, Dr. Abs, and the head of the bank of the Netherlands, should take to heart. If every country has a surplus, where are the deficits coming from to meet those surpluses?

There are new vistas which open up ahead of us. I hope we can consider this subject rationally. There is a tendency not to do so.

The other day when I advocated the repeal of the gold cover requirement for both notes and Federal Reserve deposits, I received a letter from a constituent in which the writer said, "Anyone who advocates the removal of the gold cover is either a traitor or a fool. Which are you?"

I replied that that did not leave me much choice. I do not believe I am either.

We want to defend the dollar internationally, and free our gold reserves from domestic requirements which no longer serve a useful purpose so that our gold is fully available to serve in the international sphere. I want to reduce our deficit in the balance of payments. I want to help make an improvement upon our present international monetary system through a new medium of exchange or in other ways. I hope we can induce the other countries to make some contribution to the cause of stability, and not throw the entire burden upon the United States. We want to defend the dollar.

I shall be very glad to support the President in his efforts to convince others, and I shall also be ready to give him the weapons which he can use to induce cooperation should his blandishments not work as well with General de Gaulle and others as they have in the past on the floor of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3818, the so-called Gold Cover Act, so that it may be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3818) to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of laying the bill before the Senate at this time and making it the pending business is to keep our word with the Senate. There will be no debate or consideration of this bill—although any Senator who wishes to do so may speak on it, of course—until a week from today, February 17, when the Senate will return from its recess. The bill will be the pending business at that time, and we shall then enter into the debate in a vigorous fashion.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUGGESTED REFORMS IN THE MARITIME SUBSIDY PROGRAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for almost 2 years the Joint Economic Committee has been investigating discriminatory ocean freight rates and their effects on the balance of payments. The committee issued a report based on irrefutable evidence to the effect that U.S. exports were being assessed an unfair penalty as a result of freight rates charged by steamship lines and associations of lines for ocean transportation. On our major trade routes, rates on American exports were far higher than rates on comparable American imports, even though the goods moved between the same ports on the same ships. Members of the Joint Economic Committee have been encouraging the Federal Maritime Commission, the Maritime Administration, and the steamship industry to correct this situation. I point out that today President Johnson has indicated his wholehearted support for the committee's actions. In his balance-of-payments message, he emphasizes:

> We will strive to eliminate such artificial barriers to U.S. exports as discriminatory freight rates on ocean traffic.

He included this recommendation under the general heading "Exports and Competition," and he pointed out that this precise area is most important for the longrun solutions to our balance-of-payments problems.

I request consent to have printed in the RECORD, Mr. President, a speech delivered yesterday, in New Orleans, La., by Nicholas Johnson, the Maritime Administrator. Mr. Johnson suggests many reforms of the current maritime subsidy program, all of which deserve lengthy consideration by Congress. Mr. Johnson is to be highly commended for suggesting basic changes in our maritime subsidy program. A recommendation of this type has not previously been made by a Maritime Administrator since enactment of the original 1936 Subsidy Act.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN PARTNERSHIP: THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

(Speech by Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce)

Problems of modernization in the transportation industry are among the most exciting and potentially rewarding facing the United States today; and, of course, I think that those confronting the maritime industry present many of the most fascinating challenges of all.

The shipping industry has only recently commenced to be attuned to modernizing and mechanizing the fleet. And now, when the pace of technological advance has picked up, we discover that modernization is not alone a question of technology. It is a search for new perspectives.

This search has been an exciting one for me, for I have been seeking the ideas, experience and judgment of those who know the shipping business and of the laboring men who serve it. It has, I think, been exciting for the industry as well. We have stumbled over a few myths and misunderstandings, and found new truths.

Some of our problems remind me of the fellow who joined the Navy and found himself on a training ship. When he lost his hat overboard one day, he was told he would have to pay for it. He protested, and said, "Suppose I had borrowed a jeep and it had been stolen, would I have to pay for that?" The supply officer patiently explained that in the service one paid for all the Government property lost. "My Lord," gasped the boot, "now I understand why captains go down with their ships."

This story has a special point for Americans, for as a nation we do have to pay for our ships, and although in doing so there is not yet any question of going down with our ships, our problems have certainly diminished our stature as a maritime nation.

These are serious problems, for the merchant marine is an essential part of our economy and of our whole national life.

We are the world's largest trading nation, supplying some 315 million tons of imports and exports each year—99 percent of which go by ship.

Nearly 6 out of every 100 workers in this country make their living on farms and factories providing goods for export. Last year America's 3.5 million farm families produced and sold over 1.6 billion bushels of grain for export. Most of the major cities of the United States, and scores of others, are ports. One ton of general cargo handled in a port generates between $15 and $20 for the economy of the surrounding area—close to $1 billion per year in our port communities.

The shipping industry generates about $1.5 billion of gross national product, and pays about $75 million in Federal and local taxes; its workers pay over $80 million in personal income taxes. It provides employment for about 200,000 men, including longshoremen.

The merchant ships under our control are vital elements in our power as a trading nation. We must have a strong voice in international shipping circles, and maintain an impact on world shipping rates. Our national security, in wars both hot and cold, requires the availability of U.S.-flag merchant ships for many support services. Our shipping policies affect virtually every Department in our Federal Government in some way.

It is plain, therefore, that any serious diminution in our merchant seapower is a matter of grave national concern.

In part, it is a problem which can be met by American shippers simply understanding the benefits—to them and to our Nation—of shipping on American vessels. Our liner service is better than any in the world, and yet offers rates as low as on foreign ships.

Because the merchant marine is an essential part of our economy, very early in our national life there was created a uniquely American partnership of industry and Government, a partnership whose goal was to create and maintain an American merchant marine. In times of crisis that partnership has produced miracles—like the 50 million gross tons of ships built during World War II. But even in times of calm the need continues.

As one partner, it is my job to report to you the facts, problems, and alternative solutions—for solutions there are. It is our job together to make the choices that will rebuild our fleet—for rebuild we must. All my energies are presently committed to that end.

A few figures will suggest the depth and immediacy of our problem. Our foreign trade liner fleet is composed of some 315 subsidized and about 100 unsubsidized liner ships. The subsidized ships are as fast and modern as any in the world, and although there have been some alterations in the original replacement schedule, the fleet nevertheless is being renewed.

Of the 100 unsubsidized ships, however, all but 5 date from World War II. Yet no provision has been made for the replacement of this fleet. Unless we alter course, these 100 ships will disappear from the American-flag merchant marine over the next 5 to 10 years.

To grant applications for operating subsidy on these old ships would require an additional subsidy of about $50 million per year. To replace them under present programs would cost the Government on the order of an additional $600 million.

We are not faced with an easy choice. Look at the result if we do not replace these ships. In 1963 the total amount of Government-sponsored cargo moving on American liner ships was about 7.2 million tons. Without the unsubsidized liners all of this cargo will have to go on the subsidized ships, and the percentage of purely commercial cargo on these ships will then decline to at most 40 percent. What would be left of our purely commercial merchant marine?

If we look at the dry bulk segment of our fleet, the situation is even more serious. We now carry about 5 percent of our total dry bulk trade: wheat, coal, iron ore, etc. In the next 20 years the amount of dry bulk cargo in the international trade of the United States will leap from 140 million to 380 million tons. Meanwhile, our capacity to carry that trade will decline from today's small 7.8 million tons to a puny 3.9 million tons—about 1 percent of the total.

The tramp fleet is composed of about 130 vessels. Only seven of these ships were built since World War II. They are inadequately maintained. An American in India recently wrote to me that some were in such dreadful condition he was ashamed to see them flying the American flag. Last month off the coast of Florida one simply sank. Over the next 5 or 10 years the rest of this fleet will be unable to meet class requirements—or will just break down forever in some foreign port.

Today we are paying $80 million a year in subsidy through cargo preference freight-rate differentials to perpetuate this fleet. There presently exists no program to replace it. To put 100 modern dry bulk carriers under operating subsidy probably would cost the taxpayers on the order of $30 to $40 million a year in operating subsidy. To build them in American yards probably would cost the Government an additional $400 to $500 million.

I will not burden you with more figures on the decline of our fleet. The same sad story could be told about our domestic fleet. But it must be plain by now that our problems are acute: our fleet is growing smaller and more expensive.

There is an almost unavoidable human tendency to act as my daughter did the other day when she and a friend were deciding who would ride the friend's new bicycle first. Finally my daughter suggested, "Let's take turns. You have it today." The friend agreed, and began to walk away with the bike. "Wait," my daughter said, "Now we are playing it's yesterday."

In many ways we are playing it is yesterday: boasting of our fleet even as it sinks.

Let us for a moment play that it is tomorrow. What alternatives remain open for America?

It is appropriate to begin with our shipbuilding industry, for although little understood, many of the problems of the merchant fleet can be traced back to policies regarding the yards.

The Maritime Administration's Office of Ship Construction is the largest in the agency, administering $100 million in subsidy for shipyards each year.

The need for a shipyard subsidy derives from the statutory requirement that all subsidized ships in the U.S. merchant marine must be built in American shipyards. It costs more than twice as much to build a ship in the United States. The Government pays the excess over world market price. Without the build-American requirement, however, shipowners would be free to build where they choose and would not require $1 of construction subsidy.

The United States is the only major maritime Nation in the world to require all of its subsidized commercial ships to be built at home. Under Russia's massive merchant fleet expansion program only 30 percent of the new ships are being constructed in the Soviet Union. Norwegian shipowners build over 80 percent of their ships abroad.

Nor is any other American transportation industry required to purchase its equipment in this country. Other American businessmen may purchase and operate in the United States airplanes, locomotives, automobiles, trucks, and pipeline which were manufactured abroad.

What have been the reasons for our shipbuilding policy?

Under ordinary conceptions of American free enterprise and world trade our shipyards would have gone out of the merchant ship business. Why have we prevented this happening? The experience in the First and Second World Wars was that a substantial shipbuilding capacity was required. During World War II, for example, we built over 5,600 vessels at a cost of more than $15 billion. That experience is still fresh in our minds.

But do similar needs exist today? A great deal has changed since 1945—in both war and transportation. Perhaps today's needs are centered more on a fleet in being, quickly responsive to emergency needs, and less on long-term shipbuilding capability. In any event, the magnitude of the need for shipbuilding capability ought not to be confused with the magnitude of the need for ships. They are significantly different needs. For example, it could be that both civilian and military requirements would suggest a larger fleet than we presently possess, even though the present level of shipbuilding capability were sufficient for emergency needs. The lack of relationship between ships and shipyards is further emphasized by the existence of our national defense reserve fleets, which provide for immediate expansion of the fleet without any new building at all.

In fact, the relationship between the shipping subsidy and the shipyard subsidy is no more inevitable than that between the farm subsidy and a subsidy for the farm tractor industry.

What does the maritime shipyard subsidy mean to American shipyard workers and owners?

The total Government-sponsored input into Navy and private shipyards in this country runs to about $3 billion each year—mostly new construction and repair for the Navy. Thus, subsidized commercial shipbuilding represents less than 7 percent of the total. And of the 21 American private yards capable of constructing merchant vessels, only 5 are participating in subsidized shipbuilding. For example, America's largest yard, Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co., which employs 19,500 man and presently has $511 million of work under contract, has not built a subsidized merchant ship for 2 years, and appears to have no plans to do so. Even among the five yards which are doing subsidized commercial work, an average of 50 percent of their income is generated by the Navy.

Not only is the statutory restriction prohibiting subsidized shipowners from purchasing ships abroad doing little for the plight of the American shipyards, but it has had a devastating impact on the growth of our merchant marine.

Our total merchant fleet has decreased from 3,421 ships in 1949 to 2,529 today. Even after discounting the decrease resulting from the sale or scrapping of war-built ships, our active commercial fleet has declined by 25 percent during the same years.

Why it this so? It is in part because the build-American requirement means in practice that once the annual shipbuilding subsidy has been spent, no more ships will be built. Unless the Congress were to provide an unlimited appropriation for subsidizing American shipyards, the size of the fleet inevitably will be a function of the construction appropriation. And the cost of American construction is so high—over double world rates—that the restriction has been severe.

Few Americans realize how severe our ship replacement needs are today. The 15 subsidized companies have a contractual obligation to replace their 317 ships. If the ships had been replaced at the end of their statutory 20-year lives, the operators would have built an additional 80 to 90 ships by now. In addition, the 100 unsubsidized liners have applied for subsidy—and subsidized replacement. Our domestic fleet, 192 dry cargo and passenger ships in 1949, has dwindled to but 93 ships today (excluding tankers). Our 120 tramp ships require replacement, and applications for 9 new bulk carriers are pending before the Maritime Subsidy Board. Thus, hundreds of ships are required simply to hold our own. Expansion would require more than that.

Nor does there appear to be much prospect for the costs of ship construction being reduced. American shipyards are relatively among the least competitive, by European standards, of all U.S. industries. A study of 44 major American industries, using productivity in the United Kingdom as a base, revealed that many were 300 to 500 percent more productive than their foreign competitors—a difference fully adequate to offset higher wage costs. By this standard, our shipyards were ranked 44th—about equally as productive as the foreign competition. Today our yards charge about 220 percent of foreign ship prices, and yet reap relatively low profits. American shipyard owners are good businessmen, and shipyard workers are as efficient as any others. But shipbuilding is not readily adaptable to automation (about 750,000 man-hours may go into a ship), and with the relatively few ships each year, and the 21 yards operating at only 42 percent capacity, there is little incentive for extensive capital improvements.

These are some of the basic facts. What are our alternatives?

1. We could continue the status quo: require all subsidized merchant ships to be built in American yards and appropriate enough money to replace our fleet at the present level of 16 to 18 ships per year. We thus accept the fleet's continued decline, and at a faster rate than today because of the bloc obsolescence of the war-built ships.

2. We could continue the build-American requirement but increase the appropriation well beyond the present $100 million level.

3. Finally, we could determine our national security or other needs for shipbuilding capacity, and spend sufficient money in addition to naval construction to insure that this capacity is maintained. Beyond that the fleet could be expanded to its economic limits by permitting American shipowners to purchase ships wherever they wish.

This third alternative, of course, carries with it an impact on the American shipyard workers. While the dimensions of the impact are far from inconsequential, they must be viewed in perspective. It is a fact that there are about 100,000 shipyard workers. It is also a fact, however, that all of the subsidized merchant shipbuilding put together creates no more than 7,600 jobs. So that the dimensions of this particular problem relate to 7,600 jobs—to which serious consideration must be given. Finally, preservation of these jobs may result in the loss of an even greater number of shipboard jobs if present policies continue.

That these are difficult decisions makes them no less inevitable.

How about our bulk fleet? I spoke a few moments ago about our diminishing dry bulk capacity in contrast to the enormous growth of this element of our trade. Upon closer examination the inadequacy is even more disturbing. For example, in 1965 we will export about 45 million long tons of coal. We now possess only four aging ore carriers built in the first 4 years following World War II. By 1975 our coal exports will have jumped to 72 million long tons, and—if present policies continue unchanged—not a single ore carrier will be built to carry that coal.

There have been a number of suggestions that an extension of the cargo preference principle is the answer to the problems of the dry bulk fleet. For example, quotas for American-flag carriage of ore imports have been suggested. Yet I think the experience of the past decade raises serious questions about this conclusion.

In 1954 a series of temporary and individual cargo preference requirements finally culminated in the adoption of Public Law 664—a permanent, general cargo preference statute requiring that 50 percent of Government-sponsored cargo be shipped in American ships. The Senate and House Committee reports make it clear that the cargo preference principle was chosen as a means of implementing the objective of carrying a substantial portion of our foreign commerce in American ships.

Considerable controversy surrounded this legislation, and in 1956 the Secretary of Commerce, at the request of the President, reviewed the situation. His report supported the cargo preference principle. It pointed out that early fears the legislation would produce restrictive shipping legislation in other countries had no foundation; it countered the argument that cargo preference was undesirable as an indirect subsidy on the grounds that it was, quite plainly, a direct subsidy; and finally, the report speculated that the permanence of the Public Law 664 legislation would provide an incentive for the construction of a modern and efficient dry bulk fleet.

Unfortunately, our experience since that report has not borne out the predictions of its authors. Since 1956, 15 countries have adopted restrictive shipping legislation, and most of the maritime world points to U.S. practice as the cause. Whatever may be said regarding the futility of such laws for the countries in question, and their impact on American trade, it seems clear they are not in the best interests of American shipping. As a subsidy, direct or indirect, cargo proference has been a miserable failure: not a single new tramp ship has been built since 1956, and the cost of keeping the old ones in existence climbs higher and higher. A converted 10,000 deadweight ton Liberty employed in the grain trade costs the taxpayers about $700,000 in freight-rate differential payments annually. By contrast, our most modern liner ships, with 40 percent more carrying capacity and twice the speed, require an average of only $500,000 per year; this means an equivalent shipping capability at 25 percent of the subsidy cost.

Here, too, the American people are faced with a number of alternatives:

1. Present programs could be continued—at least so long as there is an agricultural surplus disposal program. The result would be a steady rise in subsidy cost as these vessels become increasingly inefficient, followed by a rapid decrease in the cost as the subsidy disappears with the ships.

2. The tramp fleet could be eliminated more quickly by simply eliminating the cargo preference program.

3. Cargo preference could be continued, but supplemented with construction subsidy for replacement ships. Because the present production of 100 tramp ships easily could be matched with only 22 modern dry bulkers, however, any meaningful dry-cargo fleet cannot be hitched alone to the cargo preference grain trade. The future of the dry-bulk fleet, like the rest of our merchant marine, necessarily depends upon the capacity to compete for commercial cargoes. Moreover, adding construction subsidy on to the existing cargo preference system would provide subsidy without any provision for mandatory ship replacement, for reserve funds, for recapture, or for any of the other safeguards of the public interest built into the 1936 act.

4. Cargo preference could be eliminated gradually, no faster than some form of direct operating subsidy is substituted for it, making it possible for these ships to compete for commercial cargoes at world rates. Dry bulkers are more simple ships than liners, and proposals have been made to construct, for example, a 30,000-ton ship for as little as $9 million, and operate it with a small crew and only $300,000 to $400,000 in annual operating subsidy. In order to give you some idea of what these figures mean, if the present $80 million per year spent on cargo preference freight-rate differentials were all paid in operating subsidy to such new ships, we could maintain about 200 modern dry-bulk carriers, with a total capacity about 8 times our present dry-bulk fleet. Even with reduced crews on highly mechanized ships it is obvious where the greatest long-term job opportunity is to be found.

Necessarily, in making these choices the number of competing interests is too great to satisfy everyone completely. In discussing various new ideas with members of the industry, I sometimes feel like the fellow whose wife bought him two ties for Christmas, one red and one green. He expressed delight with both, and when she appeared skeptical about the genuineness of his feelings, he put on the red one to prove it. "What's the matter," she said, "don't you like the green one?"

This kind of reaction is especially common in discussions about our passenger ships.

American operators have 13 remaining passenger ships, staffed with crews ranging from 260 to 1,000. In 1965 these ships will absorb almost one-quarter of the total money available for operating subsidy—about $46 million. And if they are expensive to run, they are even more expensive to build. The Government's share of replacing the SS *United States* today, for example, could run to about $100 million. Like any other major investment, the benefits derived from these ships—to the industry and to the Government—deserve the closest examination. The arithmetic is striking.

In 1962 the then 15 passenger ships produced a loss, before subsidy, of about $44 million. The subsidy amounted to $48.7 million, or more than 10 times the after-subsidy profits for the 15 ships. In 1963, financial results were little better. The subsidy bill was nine times the companies' profits after subsidy. Eight of the fifteen ships lost money even after subsidy, and two others did little better than break even.

By contrast, comparable figures for general cargo ships show a subsidy bill only two or three times profits after subsidy. For the companies operating both passenger and general cargo ships, the gross revenue from cargo operations was three times that for passenger operations, and profits after subsidy were more than seven times as high.

It is not surprising that shipowners have shown little inclination to replace their passenger ships.

Nor do the passenger-ship operators have much hope for improved profits. The productivity of cargo ships has increased in recent years. But 73 percent of the crew on a passenger ship are stewards, cooks, and waiters—and mechanization can do little to increase their productivity. Indeed, it is this personal service which tends to attract those relatively few people who travel by ship rather than air.

Even if passenger ships are not a profitable business for the owners or the government, it is often argued that they are of great benefit to us as a nation. If so, they are surely worth the investment. But what are these alleged benefits?

How about their balance-of-payments contribution? In 1963, the net balance-of-payments contribution of U.S.-flag passenger ships was about $47 million. Since we spent about $46.3 million in subsidy to secure that saving, you can see that it was bought rather dearly. By contrast, in 1962 the international commercial airline industry contributed $128 million to our balance of payments from passenger fares alone—and without the necessity of any contribution from the taxpayers. Or compare the like figures for general-cargo ships. In 1963 the net balance-of-payments impact of the 285 subsidized cargo ships was about $204 million—at a subsidy cost of approximately $135 million. Thus, even by standards of return on shipping subsidy, the balance-of-payments impact of $1 of subsidy spent on a cargo liner is almost double the impact of a dollar spent on a passenger ship.

Prestige is also said to be a benefit of passenger ships. Of course, prestige is an elusive thing. Our present operating subsidy expenditures for passenger ships would support close to 100 modern liner ships, which might well do more for our prestige around the world than a few passenger ships known to be highly unprofitable.

Moreover, two important reasons for having a merchant marine—trading leverage and stability of freight rates—are virtually unaffected by passenger ships.

Finally, there is national defense. Historically, passenger ships have played a major role in our defense efforts. During World War II, for example, most of our troops were transported in ships which once sailed as commercial vessels. By the time of the Korean hostilities, however, the situation had changed and only one passenger ship was removed from commercial service for troop carrying to the war zone. Three small passenger ships under construction were transferred to MSTS but were fitted primarily as passenger ships for military dependents. All other troops were carried by MSTS troop carriers or by air.

Our defense needs today still call for a passenger ship capability. But the development of new aircraft, like the C-141 and the recently announced 600-passenger plane, is eroding the justification for heavy Government investment in constructing and maintaining commercial passenger ships.

To some extent modern cargo liners could be converted to effective troopships if necessary. Even commercial passenger ships must be converted to troop-carrying conditions—increasing their troop-lift capacity sevenfold. But this takes time, and insofar as we still need conventional passenger ships it might better safeguard our national security if the conversion were done in advance, and the ships preserved in the reserve fleet in a high degree of readiness—at about one-tenth the present annual cost.

But all of this analysis really adds little to the stark economic reality that American businessmen have little desire to build and operate passenger ships at a loss. Unless some presently unforeseeable change comes about some 5,500 jobs will disappear from these ships over the next 10 years irrespective of how the Government feels about the wisdom of this $50 million subsidy account.

The question before us is not whether the 5,500 jobs will be affected, but whether any ships and jobs will be substituted in their place.

Of the 5,500 men on passenger ships about 4,000, or 73 percent, are stewards who can find ready transferability of their skills in the hotel and restaurant trades. But what of the 1,500 deck and engine men? Their jobs are not as easily transferable. If the $42 million passenger ship subsidy were used for cargo liners—even the most highly mechanized now imaginable—we would need about 3,000 men to operate them. The road to true job opportunity seems clear.

Finally, I want to say a few words about two aspects of our present system of paying operating subsidy.

First, the trade route idea.

At the present time the Maritime Administration has designated 30 trade routes and 3 services as essential to the foreign trade of the United States. A subsidized shipping company wishing to move from one trade route to another is required by law to undergo a long and arduous public hearing, effectively eliminating its ability to respond rapidly to competitive pressures. In addition, an operator's activities on any particular trade route—the frequency of sailing and the ports at which his ships call—are all subject to the approval of the Maritime Administration.

Many questions are called to mind. Is it not strange to have this high degree of protectionism for American operators against only a small part of their competition? For U.S. trade route restrictions obviously do not affect the foreign companies carrying about 70 percent of our liner cargo. What is the impact of these restrictions on the behavior of American shipping companies? What are the supposed benefits of the system, and how real are they?

It is usually urged that the trade routes underlie the service concept of the 1936 act, and that they serve to prevent cutthroat competition. Each of these assertions requires close examination.

As for the first, to my knowledge there is not a single American operator serving a trade route because he was ordered to do so by the Maritime Administration. In each case the operator requested permission to serve that route because there was cargo to be carried. Look, for example, at the number of foreign companies, which may come and go much as they please, serving small ports on regular schedules because the existence of cargo makes it profitable for them to do so. Look at the American companies providing regular service to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico for the same reason. There is no reason to expect that American companies in foreign trade would act very differently even if not bound by the strictures of the trade route concept.

And if there is not sufficient cargo to justify shipping services at all, I doubt very much whether the framers of the 1936 act intended that American companies be compelled to service ports at a loss to themselves as well as the taxpayers. For example, if it is cheaper to ship cargo by barge from a smaller to a larger port and then out by ship, that is probably the way the cargo ought to move. That is the basic principle underlying the new Lykes Sea Barge Clipper concept.

I doubt, therefore, if a relaxation of the present rigorous trade-route requirements would undermine adequate service for American shippers—quite the contrary.

Many shipowners have told me that the tortuous procedures necessary to gain permission to operate on a different trade route, even for a short time, have forced them to forgo many attractive commercial opportunities—to the benefit of the merchant fleets of other nations. This reminds me of the story about the Cape Cod garbage collector, whose weekly charge was 25 cents. One newcomer, seeking to do a little better, asked for his monthly rate. "$1.50," was the reply. When the newcomer inquired why the monthly rate should be so much higher than four times the weekly rate, the old man replied, "The extry is for bein' tied down." I rather suspect that we may be paying "extry" for tying down our shipowners, too.

We turn, then, to the question of cutthroat competition. Whenever I hear that term, I am reminded of a story an old Texan used to tell me about the general store in the small town where he grew up. The store had a monopoly for many years, but as the town grew it began to attract new business, and in due course a competitor opened his doors across the street from the general store. The old proprietor began to bemoan his fate to the town at large, and one young man, recently back from a freshman economics course at the local college said, "But sir, isn't that just competition?" "Oh no," he replied, "it's worse than competition." Some shipowners have expressed similar sentiments to me, explaining that they have competition now, and that relaxing trade-route restrictions would be worse.

Since trade-route restrictions have no impact on the activities of foreign shipping companies, the danger arising from a relaxation of the trade routes must be seen to come from the competition of other American shipping companies. Some shipowners feel that a new American company will come on the route and take one-half of the American cargo, putting them both out of business.

But, by and large, an established steamship company will tend to stay on its old routes, since it is costly and time-consuming to develop new trade relations. Moreover, such a company will consider carefully whether it can make a sufficient dent in the foreign market on a new trade route. With such high capital costs, few shipping companies would be foolhardy enough to enter a wholly new competitive environment solely with the idea of taking away from a pre-existing American company most of its established business.

Moreover, shipping conferences will tend to act as a moderating force. For example, foreign-flag companies would seem to be in much the same position vis-a-vis each other as would American companies in the event of a relaxation of trade route restrictions. Yet there have not been a series of protracted rate wars.

There is, of course, a perfectly legitimate basis for fearing the activities of an irresponsible raider, an operator with no interest in establishing any sort of trade relations, whose sole aim is to skim off the cream of the trade at the peak of the season with exceptionally low rates. But this problem can be solved without abandoning the whole idea of trade route flexibility. There would seem to be no reason why a procedure could not be designed to sift the serious competitor from the fly-by-night.

The present rigid system prevents companies from taking advantage of fluctuations in world trade. And to the extent that it is an effective shield against competition, it tends to insulate the companies on the trade route from the salutary effects of competition. Finally, the present system puts into the hands of the Government too much of the question whether a shipowner will change trade routes.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about what has come to be called an incentive operating subsidy. I have spoken about this issue at length in the past, and there is no reason to belabor it here. But there is one common misconception which I would like to clear up.

A number of people have told me of their impression that the incentive subsidy is an economy measure—that we will somehow end up with a lower subsidy bill. Nothing could be further from the truth. An incentive subsidy may result in increased productivity, higher profits and wages, and relatively less need for subsidy. But whatever the needs for subsidy may be they must be met if the industry is to continue. No one argues with that basic truth.

I think that $380 million is a substantial sum and, as Maritime Administrator, I feel an obligation to insure that it is spent in the most productive way possible. If it is being spent under a system which could be improved, then that standard has not been met. If it is producing one less ship than it could, and I remain silent, I am not doing my job.

In the shipping business, like most others, profits may be increased by cutting costs or increasing revenues. But operators have little incentive to reduce subsidizable costs under the present system, for the Government will simply pay them less in subsidy. This puts a responsibility on the Government alone to maximize the public's return from its subsidy bill. Often Government is forced to take positions which segments of labor and management find objectionable. But under the present system it is inevitable.

On the other side of the profit picture, one of the chief means for most businesses to increase the utilization of their capacity is by reducing rates.

The conference system, however, precludes this. It would seem obvious then that the system could be substantially improved, especially by providing some meaningful incentive to management and labor to cut costs—removing the Government from the process.

As I see it, and as I hope you do, as well, there are many alternatives open to the American merchant marine. Each of our problems has at least one solution. Some require the expenditure of much larger sums of money; others seem to spell the continued decline of the fleet. Still others seem to promise more shipping capability at a relatively lower cost—even though perhaps pointing the way to larger total expenditures.

The American merchant marine is at the crossroads. Basic decisions must be made. They must be made by you, and every American concerned about our trade and economic growth. We cannot hope to make every decision exactly right, but when the alternatives are clear before the people their record is pretty good.

The problem is worthy of our effort.

WILLIAM J. CROCKETT AND THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, William J. Crockett, the present Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, has been doing an excellent job in the Department of State in his field of administration, the very necessary art of making the complicated simple and trying to get the job done.

I have known, liked, and admired Bill Crockett a good many years, and believe that his work and contributions to our Government are of very high caliber, indeed.

In this connection, he recently made a speech to the American Foreign Service Association, outlining what the Foreign Service is now. His words are refreshing, realistic, and reasonable; and I believe they will prove of interest to my colleagues.

Moreover, I take this opportunity to praise Bill Crockett and to pay just tribute to him for the developments in the Foreign Service under Secretary Rusk. He has helped to rekindle a new spirit within the ranks of our embassy and consular staffs abroad. He has done much to achieve maximum use of manpower and to provide for the growth of the individual.

Much of the credit for the improvements in security, housing, communications, and the physical conditions and operational requirements are due him and are the result of his vision and guidance.

It is both because of what he has done and what he has said that I request permission to have the text of Mr. Crockett's address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOREIGN SERVICE THAT COULD BE

(By William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration)

I have given much time and thought to the Foreign Service—what it is, how it got that way, and what it must become. I would like to share with you today some personal reflections and convictions about this truly great institution of ours—the Foreign Service.

Ours is an old Service steeped in all of the significant events that have been a part of the history of our country.

Ours is a proud Service not only because of our historic past, but because of the vital part we shall play in our country's future.

I sincerely believe ours is the best Foreign Service—quite capable of meeting the challenges that face our country.

One reason the Service is what it is today is our heritage of greatness.

From the past come our traditions of loyalty and heroism; traditions of excellence and professionalism; traditions of devotion and public service.

These great traditions not only serve as benchmarks—but they are a part of the historic lore that is so essential to the ongoing esprit of our corps.

A senior Senator recently paid us a great tribute when he likened the Foreign Service to the Supreme Court as an institution of public service.

For all of this, and more, we are forever indebted to our retired officers.

They built the Service. We need their continued interest and hope for their constant support.

I hope that July 1 of each year will become our "anniversary homecoming day" for the Service—for those who have retired as well as for those who are on active duty. We are working now on such a program for next July.

We have a ceremony on the eighth floor each Thursday for officers who are retiring from the Service. I invite all of you retired officers to join us in saying goodbye and Godspeed to our retiring colleagues.

It has been a part of our historic past that each senior officer has felt and assumed a responsibility for the future of the Service. There are many things that the State Department as an institution can do and has done for the good of the Service—training, housing, allowances, schools, medical facilities, rest and recuperation—and sometimes it even has provided home-leave funds.

However, our profession, like judgment, can't be learned in school for it can't be taught in school. It, like the crafts of old, must be imparted, from master craftsman to apprentice, in the heat of a real situation.

Each senior officer not only has a substantive job to do, but he also must be a teacher and counselor of young officers.

Only you can demonstrate to younger colleagues the importance of intuition and instinct, as well as the insight and understanding that are a part of your judgments and professionalism. Only you can demonstrate and impart the qualities of leadership that will make today's youth tomorrow's leaders.

Just the other day an ambassador recounted with pride the success of many officers who had served apprenticeships under him. This is our tradition.

Our present and our future will be secure so long as each of us takes the time and makes the effort to teach people as well as to work and judge them.

A third heritage which I hope we won't lose sight of is the individual officer's conviction that his excellence and his success are primarily his responsibility.

Again the institution—the State Department—should give career guidance, and educational opportunity and scientifically tailored assignments and all the other paraphernalia of modern management techniques in support of our common struggle for excellence. But, today as it was yesterday, the basic responsibility for growth rests with the individual.

Young officers in particular should keep in mind that every job in the Foreign Service offers opportunity and challenge. They have only to seek them. The shortcomings of our institutional programs, direction, and organization, cannot excuse an officer's lack of personal initiative for making the most of every opportunity.

Each officer is responsible for his own professional improvement, and for his personal conduct. Each must decide what he wants and what he is willing to give of himself in order to achieve our objectives in the Service.

But it is of the future that I wish to speak today—"The Foreign Service That Could Be."

The framers of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 had a vision of greatness for the Foreign Service. They, like the framers of our Constitution, enunciated fundamental principles for achieving greatness.

Like the Constitution, the act does not establish a rigid procedure for reaching those high objectives. And wisely so, because the methods for attaining the goals will change, while the goals will remain unchanged.

We must accept the idea of change if the Service is to be as great as the expectations of those who created it.

What should the Service be in order to meet the future? Specifically I don't know. I don't know whether it should be bell-shaped, or an inverted pyramid; I don't know whether it should be composed of generalists or specialists. But this much I do know. It must be large enough, and diverse enough, and good enough to fulfill the Nation's needs.

And I also know that in order to do this we must keep pace with change—with the new frontiers of knowledge—science, space technology, development economics, and others, for all these things will play a part in our problems of the future. We must, as Loy Henderson once said, be dynamic in a dynamic era.

Our challenge then is to recognize the changes we must face and then find the means and adopt the methods to become the Service that could be.

The Foreign Service could be more fully understood by the American public.

We have begun to tell America about this great Service of ours—to build the public support we all would like. Under our community services program, Foreign Service officers and their wives visit their hometowns and make themselves known in their own communities. They use their home leave to speak before service and church groups, social organizations, and on television and radio. This has produced hundreds of hours of free TV and radio time and much of favorable newspaper treatment of our Service. Our officers and their families have enjoyed their participation in this program and have opened the eyes of many Americans who have learned about us for the first time.

President Johnson once said "The failure to communicate to our own people the success of American efforts abroad is, in no small part, responsible for many of the difficulties in maintaining support for our international policies and programs."

If the people of America can be made to understand that the Foreign Service is made up of people like themselves, like their own friends and neighbors, they will have a greater confidence in the Service and in the State Department.

These are forward steps but there are also backward steps. We build and we tear down.

I am distressed and disturbed by what I read and hear about us.

By the very nature of our responsibilities, we can't avoid being the center of public debate and controversy. The kitchen is hot and we like it that way.

But must we, as a Service, add fuel to the fire?

Can we gain the respect of the Nation if we don't respect ourselves? Can we gain public understanding and support if we cast doubt upon each other?

We bewail and deplore our poor congressional image, or lack of constituency and our bad press. But why should this surprise us when much of what is said and what is written about us comes from what we say and what we write about ourselves? Are we really the overstuffed—overstaffed—overstymied State Department and the highest paid third-rate Service in the world?

Does this actually represent your evaluation of the Service? It doesn't represent mine. I believe that we are the best Foreign Service in the world and we are getting better all the time. Our standards of conduct are high. Our security standards are high. Our professional standards are high. Our esprit is high. Let's talk and write this way.

The framers of the 1946 act emphasized that ours should be an American Foreign Service.

Through our recruitment process and our college relations program, we interest the finest and best young men and women of America in the Foreign Service. They come from every section of the country and from every ethnic background. They come from more than 400 universities and colleges located in every State of the Union.

But starting with typical Americans to represent us abroad is only part of the story. Our people must remain American.

The framers of the act of 1946 stated that "Foreign Service officers should be brought back home throughout their careers as often as possible to renew their knowledge of developments in the United States and their feeling for the American way of life."

The first responsibility of every person going abroad, President Kennedy once stated, is to represent America to a foreign land, not that foreign land to America.

The Wriston program has accomplished much for the Service—it has enriched and enlarged it. But if I were asked to cite the major benefit from it, I would say that it provided the opportunity for all officers to serve regular tours of duty in Washington. Not only has this enabled us to participate deeply in foreign policy formulation and execution, but it has enabled us as Foreign Service officers to gain renewed appreciation and understanding of our own country. A Washington tour of duty has become a regular and important part of the Service.

The job of ably and fully representing America abroad is an awesome responsibility, and an occasional Washington assignment does not guarantee preparation for the task. Far from it. But it can be a truly enriching experience.

All of us must take full advantage of our time here to deepen our understanding; add to our knowledge and to renew our feeling of the American way of life so that we can interpret it faithfully.

A high Government official after an extensive tour of hardship posts in 1961 said: "Permit me to throw another spadeful of earth on the dead image of our Foreign Service people as striped pants, high style bureaucrats ping-ponging from one cocktail party to another. These are not ugly Americans. These are wash-and-wear people, working with their sleeves rolled up and working hard to faithfully represent America."

We do not need or want apologists for America in the Foreign Service. We need advocates.

Another tenet of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 holds that we are to be a Foreign Service of the United States. We are not just a small diplomatic elite—this idea was laid to rest over 40 years ago with the passage of the Rogers Act. We are not just the Foreign Service of the State Department. We are the Foreign Service of the United States.

The Commercial Service and the Agricultural Attaché Service were included in the act of 1946, and the framers stated: "This professional instrument must be flexible and responsive to the constantly changing needs of Government."

The integration of USIA officers into the Service is faithful to this principle. This step will enable our Foreign Service to assume the relatively new, but the well-defined, discipline of public affairs that has become so vital in the conduct of our foreign policy. Bringing these officers into the Service will endanger no one who is willing to work and is able to compete.

It is in the best tradition of the act of 1946. But this first step of USIA integration should not be our last.

The Foreign Service can be broad enough to encompass personnel needs of other U.S. agencies with oversea responsibilities. The Foreign Service of the United States is the Service that we can be.

Another concept in the act is that we become a highly professional service:

"The concept of a professional service should remain paramount," the framers said. But they didn't stop there. They also said, "The promotion system must insure the rapid advancement of men of ability to positions of responsibility and the elimination of men who have reached their ceilings of performance."

We should bear in mind that no one came into the Service with a promise of personal security. The most he was ever promised was a fair and objective judgment of his own excellence in comparison with the officers of his own class. He came in with the full knowledge that the competition would be tough and that selection out would face him if he was unable to keep pace. No man needs to be bad to be selected out. But a man must be good to remain.

Competition is the core of excellence.

This tough standard of competitive excellence must prevail above all other considerations at all levels of the Service if the professional standards of the Service are to continually move upward. There should be no shelves, no pastures, no rest homes in the Foreign Service.

But there is also another indispensable ingredient in the formula for excellence—conduct.

Excellence embraces both professionalism and conduct.

Therefore, we can tolerate nothing but the highest standards of personal conduct. As Secretary Rusk has said, "There is no profession outside the ministry itself which places a higher demand upon its people than the Foreign Service. But high as these standards are, and as unrelated as they may be to the normal requirements about us, they are not too high for the tremendous responsibilities our officers carry in the national interest. As we push our standards of professionalism and personal conduct ever higher, the esprit de corps will also go higher. For all good men like to be judged by high standards."

And so I ask your continued understanding and support of our efforts to apply these high standards to the Service. It is not an easy task, this burden of conscience, but it becomes easier for us all to understand and to accept when we apply but one criterion to all cases alike, the criterion of excellence.

The framers of the act wisely foresaw that the Foreign Service would require many specialists of many disciplines. Therefore, they provided for a Foreign Service Reserve and a Foreign Service Staff Corps as integral parts of the Foreign Service.

We expect people serving in these parts of the Service to have full and satisfying careers in these parts of the Service with opportunities for getting ahead in their own specialties. And although their precepts for tenure and service will be somewhat different, they, too, are a part of our great expectations for the Service that can be.

No career service can remain vital and alive without some intake of talent from the outside. No career service can provide all of the new disciplines it will need to keep up with the changing world. Nor can we always match the varied experiences that men outside the Service acquire. This should not be discouraging to us; it should be our challenge.

This was recognized in 1946 when the framers said that outstanding men should be able to join the permanent Service at ranks commensurate with their age and qualifications. When we find exceptionally able men and women outside the Service with the talents and disciplines we need, we should not wait until they apply for entry; we should aggressively bring them into the Service.

It matters little once these new people are in the Service, how they came in—whether by competitive selection at FSO-8 or by lateral entry. The important point is that once they are in, the Service will have improved itself. In the past 4 years, our integration program has brought 42 officers into the Service—not enough to endanger the career principle—or enough to enrich it.

Our lateral entry program is but another means of achieving an ever higher professional excellence for the Service—the Service we can become.

I am convinced that we have nothing to fear from anything or from anyone if we support our own principles of professionalism and excellence.

There is no body of public servants anywhere in Government that can equal us as a great reservoir of dedicated, disciplined talent, ready and able to serve the President and the Nation.

Public groups that have been associated with us—public members of our selection boards, advisory panels, noncareer ambassadors, and departmental officers—have supported and defended us.

As a Service we have not failed, but have we fully succeeded?

Professional as we are, are we professional enough?

Disciplined as we are, do selfishness and personal interest still exist?

Competitive as we are, are our standards high enough?

The important jobs of foreign affairs, at home and abroad, will not be ours by regulation or bureaucratic fiat. But they can and will be ours, in abundant measure, if by excellence we earn them.

And therein lies our continued challenge.

We can disagree about methods; we can argue over style; we can suffer disruption and delay but we must never doubt—we must always support—the great principles of our Service, the Service that could be, the Service that must be.

THE NEED TO INCREASE OUR EXPORTS OF BEEF

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on February 4, 1965, I, as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, announced that our committee will hold hearings on the subject of beef exports. The purpose of this inquiry will be to identify ways in which industry and Government, working together, can promote the export of American beef and beef products to the developing markets of the world. One of the things that we plan to look into is the disparity between the ocean freight rates from the United States to Europe and those from other nations to Europe. It would seem that this disparity in ocean freight rates constitutes one barrier to increasing exports of American beef.

I am happy to say that the effort by my committee is not the only effort being made to increase our exports of beef. For the past year, the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture and the American Meat Institute have jointly carried on a pilot project in Western Europe designed to promote the consumption of American-type beef. I understand that this pilot project has met with some success and that the contract under which it is carried on is soon to be renewed.

In addition, on the day that I announced our Small Business Committee hearings, a story appeared in the Mobile Register of Mobile, Ala., under the byline of Mr. Ed Lee, one of the fine reporters of that paper, reporting that more than 1,900 head of cattle were being shipped by rail from Montgomery to Mobile, Ala., where they were to be loaded aboard the SS *Salanat* at our Alabama State docks for shipment to Italy. This shipment is reportedly a trial shipment, and, according to the article, if everything goes well, live cattle may become a regular cargo moving through the port of Mobile in my State.

Mr. President, I want to commend all of these who had a part in making possible this trial shipment from my State to the Italian beef market. With this spirit of cooperation, I am confident that those of us in Government and in industry who are working to develop these new markets for American beef will meet with much success.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article from the Mobile Register of February 4 on this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

First Cattle Shipment To Leave Mobile Today

(By Ed Lee)

More than 1,900 head of cattle left Montgomery by rail Wednesday night for Mobile and they are to be loaded aboard the SS *Salanat* at the Alabama State docks this morning for shipment to west Italy.

Paul A. Boulo, Mobile foreign freight forwarder, said this will be the first full shipload of live cattle to be exported through this port. He said the feeder steers are to be slaughtered for food at their final destination. They average 600 pounds each.

This reportedly is a trial shipment, and if everything goes well, live cattle may be a regular cargo moving through this port.

Boulo said striking longshoremen agreed to load the animals when they arrive in Mobile this morning.

George Dixon, president of Local 1410, International Longshoremen's Association, said his men will load the animals. He said the loading was approved by both district and international officials "because the live animals would be in danger if they were kept in the rail cars for too long a period."

LOADING CATTLE

Plans call for loading the cattle here at 8 a.m. at pier 5. They are to move directly from the railroad cars, up ramps, into the hold of the ship.

The vessel was recently used in South American cattle shipping and is specially outfitted for handling the live animals, which have to be fed and watered during the voyage, expected to take 11 to 15 days.

According to the local freight forwarder, the animals will be fed and watered daily. For the voyage, the ship is being loaded with 275 tons of hay to be used as feed, 40 tons of straw, to be used as bedding for the animals, and 2,500 tons of water.

There will be several of the animals to a stall. A special crew is also aboard for the care of the cargo. This includes 14 cattlehandlers and 8 of the ship's crewmen, along with a foreman. These 23 men will include a veterinarian. All are from Argentina. In addition, there will be a veterinarian from Italy to accompany the shipment.

Alabama State Docks Director Houston H. Feaster said there is a possibility more Alabama cattle will be moved through here to other countries. He said a number of agencies are working to establish markets for the animals, and such markets should greatly benefit the State's cattle industry.

COMMUNIST AFFILIATIONS OF REPRESENTATIVES OF FREEDOM PARTY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on February 3 I made a speech in the Senate in which I outlined the Communist affiliations of a number of attorneys who were in Mississippi representing the so-called Freedom Party. I promised that as more and more names were revealed, I would inform the Senate as to their records.

I am informed that at Greenwood today in deposition hearings the Freedom Party was represented by Benjamin Margolis.

This man, Benjamin Margolis, is an oldtime Communist and one of the deadliest men in the Communist Party.

In addition, in Indianola, Miss., the party was attempting to cause a strike, the Freedom Party is also attempting to cause a strike in the Ludlow Manufacturing Co. and attempting to array race against race. In that town are two well-known Communists, Herschel M. Kaminsky and Maynard J. Omerberg.

Maynard J. Omerberg has been a member of the National Lawyers Guild which has been since 1945 cited as subversive and communistic by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He attended the California Labor School in the late 1940's. This organization has already been cited as subversive by the California Committee on Un-American Activities. He was also a member of the Civil Rights Congress and acted as its counsel in the early 1950's. The Civil Rights Congress has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General. He was also a member of the Los Angeles Chapter of the International Workers Order, which has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General. He also served as counsel for the Los Angeles Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, which is affiliated with the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, which has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

In 1950, Omerberg was one of the attorneys who submitted an amicus curiae brief to the U.S. Court of Appeals in behalf of the Communist Party leaders convicted under the Smith Act. Omerberg's law office is located at 6290 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles.

Herschel M. Kaminsky attended the Communist World Youth Festival in Vienna, July 1959. This organization has been cited as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In early 1961, he joined the pro-Castro Minnesota Fair Play for Cuba Committee. In the last 2 or 3 years, Kaminsky has become closely associated with the Socialist Workers Party, Minneapolis. The Socialist Workers Party has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General. It is known as a Trotskyish organization. In 1963, Kaminsky was appointed as associate editor of the quarterly magazine, Studies on the Left, a pro-Communist magazine.

Benjamin Margolis has been identified as a Communist before the House Committee on Un-American Activities by nine different witnesses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the long Communist record of Benjamin Margolis, which shows that he is the enemy of everything American.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENJAMIN MARGOLIS

BACKGROUND

Margolis was born April 23, 1910, at Brooklyn, N.Y. He is active in the practice of law in room 709, Strong Building, 112 West 9th Street, Los Angeles. His home address is 5786 Valley Oak Drive, Los Angeles.

ACTIVITIES

Anita Edith Bell Schneider appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HCUA) July 5 and 6, 1955. She identified herself as a member of the Communist Party during the years 1951 through 1954. She identified Benjamin Margolis as a Communist Party attorney.

During House Committee on Un-American Activities hearings held April, May, and June, 1955, at San Diego, Calif., Margolis apeared as counsel for five persons who declined to answer questions regarding the Communist Party on constituional grounds.

The Daily People's World, a west coast Communist publication, on March 11, 1954, noted that Ben Margolis was to be a speaker at a public meeting of the Civil Rights Congress March 18, 1954.

The Civil Rights Congress has been designated by the Attorney General under Executive Order 10450.

On January 21, 1952, Charles Daggett testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Daggett stated that during 1945 he attended Communist Party meetings in the home of Ben Margolis.

On January 25, 1952, William G. Israel testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Israel said he was a member of the lawyers branch of the Los Angeles County Communist Party during the period March 1946 to March 1947. Israel said that Margolis was a member of this branch, that he attended meetings of this branch at Margolis' home. Israel described Margolis as the leader of the Communist Party attorneys in Los Angeles.

On January 25, 1952, Marburg Yerkes appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He said he had been a member of the lawyers branch of the Los Angeles County Communist Party from 1946 until 1948 or 1949. He identified Margolis as a member of the lawyers branch, Los Angeles County Communist Party, who was a member at the time Yerkes left the Communist Party. Yerkes testified that he was advised by Margolis that Margolis' law firm represented the Communist Party in Los Angeles.

On January 25, 1952, Milton S. Tyre appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Tyre identified a deposition he had given previously. The deposition notes that Tyre was a member of the Communist Party during the years 1943 to 1949 and that Ben Margolis was a member of the Communist Party attached to the Communist Party lawyers group at the time Tyre dropped out of the Communist Party.

On October 2, 1952, Paul Marion appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Marion said he was a member of the radio branch of the Communist Party from early 1946 to early 1948. Marion said that sometime during this period Margolis attended a closed Communist Party meeting at the home of Alvin Hammer.

The Los Angeles Mirror of August 27, 1952, carried an item headed "Probe Calls Legal Sheath of 14 Reds," and says in part, "Angrily declaring I'll fry in Hell before they get any information out of me about my clients, Attorney Ben Margolis was subpoenaed to appear before the House Committee on Un-American Activities at hearings that begin on September 29. I will not take the left position that my 14 clients took when they were asked about other persons who have been Communist Party members. I will point out that as an attorney I cannot and will not make a stool pigeon of myself."

Margolis appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities September 30, 1952. His testimony was extremely vitriolic. He said he hated the House Committee on Un-American Activities since he hated tyranny since his birth. The chairman of the committee advised him of his contemptuous attitude and Margolis replied that he had "nothing but contempt for the committee." He declined to answer any questions concerning his Communist Party membership because:

1. It would degrade him.
2. It was an attempt to invade his rights and association of freedom.
3. That the House Committee on Un-American Activities intended to destroy the sovereignty of the American people and that it violated the 1st, 3d, 9th, and 10th amendments of the Constitution.

The annual report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for the year 1952 reflects that Ben Margolis was identified as a Communist by the following nine persons before that committee on the dates indicated:

Milton S. Tyre, December 14, 1951.
George Glass, January 21, 1952.
Charles Daggett, January 21, 1952.
Paul Marion, October 2, 1952.
Harold Ashe, September 17, 1951.
Edward Dmytryk, April 25, 1951.
David Aaron, January 23, 1952.
Marburg Yerkes, January 24, 1952.
William G. Israel, January 25, 1952.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the establishment of so-called new political parties is an old tactic of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. The Communist Party recognizes that it can make no headway with candidates under its own label. Therefore, it creates substitutes, such as the American Labor Party and the Peoples Party in New York State; the Progressive Party was created in 1948 by the Communist Party under the more seeming label; and now the Freedom Party in Mississippi has been created in another attempt at political deception.

Mr. President, the sovereign State of Mississippi is being invaded by the Communist Party, who desire to take it over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Bass in the chair). The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(a), Public Law 474, 81st Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Udall of Arizona as a member of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the joint resolution and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 4 to the joint resolution and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the conference report on House Joint Resolution 234, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, be considered at this time.

Mr. PROUTY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. There has just been a quorum call.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before the conference report is taken up, let me explain to the Senate this situation:

The conferees reached agreement about noon. At that time two of the minority conferees, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], were out of the city, delivering Lincoln Day addresses in Boston and Texas, respectively. Communications were difficult, and no consent could be obtained from them for appending their signatures to the conference report. By reason of that fact, the only minority member of the conference who was present, the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], preferred to withhold his signature.

I am told by the Senator from North Dakota that he has since received directions from both of the Senators absent from the conference, Senator Saltonstall and Senator Mundt, to append their signatures to the conference report, and that he himself also wishes to append his signature.

I ask unanimous consent at this time, before the consideration of the conference report, that consent be given for appending those three signatures to the report, for the reasons stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and I are agreeable to signing the report now, with the understanding, however, that no steps whatever will be taken to close any of the veterans installations until after the May 1 deadline. This is the understanding that was reached in committee, as the Senator from Florida stated.

It was difficult to communicate with the two Senators who are absent. However, they are agreeable to the report and wish to sign it, and so do I.

I do not believe the Veterans' Administration can prove any economy whatever in the case of many of the closings, particularly with reference to the Miles City hospital. One comparatively new, modern hospital, operating at low cost, cannot be closed, and new hospitals built, while trying to prove to the people of the United States, particularly the veterans, that any money is being saved.

With this understanding, I should now like to have our names entered as approving the conference report.

The list of managers on the part of the Senate whose names were authorized to appear on the conference report is as follows: the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Holland], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young], and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt].

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. Not only did the conferees have the understanding, as stated by the Senator from North Dakota, that no steps whatever would be taken toward the closing of veterans hospitals prior to May 1, if the amendment in the conference report were adopted, but we also had the President's assurance that that would be the case.

Mr. President, I ask that I may be allowed now to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am familiar, generally, with what has taken place in the conference. That can be ventilated in due course. I know that signatures were withheld with respect to the action taken by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] who was the author of the veterans amendment. He is out of the city. I tried to cover that base to see what could be done with respect to a time limit on which the conferees and the President would agree.

At first, it was contended that nothing should be done until the end of the fiscal year, June 30. The conferees finally brought the date forward to May 15. But the President thought that that time was too long, said he had some administrative chores that had to be done in connection with his program, and was rather reluctant to settle for anything later than the 1st of May.

In consequence of that discussion with the President this morning, I called the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall]. He said that if that were agreeable to Senator Mundt, he would agree. I talked with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and he, too, concurred in the May 1 date.

I communicated with Senator Mundt at the Kansas City Airport and told him exactly what the situation was.

With the understanding stated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] about keeping the situation in status quo until May 1, and until a committee can examine into the situation, he was willing to concur. So I am free now to say that he has concurred in the May 1 date.

I believe that takes care of the situation in the absence of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In expressing the understanding that the terms of the report require that the hospitals remain in status quo until May 1, does the Senator mean the status that existed prior to the issuance of the order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not certain about that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Upon the basis of information given to us by Mr. Driver, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, no equipment of any kind has been moved and no hospitals or offices have been closed. The only action that had been taken was that new patients had not been accepted at the various hospitals; but if action to suspend the closings were taken as recommended by the conference committee, new patients would immediately begin to be accepted, and the operations of hospitals and offices, already provided for by adequate appropriations, would continue. That is my understanding of the situation. As I recall, the able Senator from North Dakota was present and heard the Administrator's statement. If he has any information to amplify my statement, I should be happy to have him state it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is exactly the understanding I had.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. I visited the hospital at Lincoln, Nebr., which is covered by this order. Two or three wards had no patients in them. I talked with one doctor who had left the service.

I hold in my hand an Associated Press report published in the Grand Island, Nebr., Independent of February 3, 1965. It reads as follows:

> HOSPITAL EMPLOYEES GOING TO OMAHA
>
> OMAHA.—Twenty employees of the Lincoln Veterans Hospital will be transferred to the Omaha VA Hospital Wednesday. Included will be eight nurses, eight nursing aids, one licensed practical nurse, and three clerical employees. The Lincoln hospital is scheduled to be closed June 30.
>
> William A. Strange, assistant director, said the Omaha hospital has a waiting list of 71, but the list should begin to disappear by the end of next week. The Omaha hospital has reactivated a 42-bed ward.

Now, to continue, he, as of this time, mentioned that the veterans hospital at Lincoln will operate under very reduced conditions and shortage of personnel. If, on the other hand, it is the intent that they be restored to where they were before the order was issued, I am sure that they can continue to do the very fine job that they have been doing.

We are faced with a situation in Nebraska in which we have three veterans hospitals. There is one at Omaha, one at Grand Island, and another at Lincoln.

I visited the hospital at Lincoln the other day. The surgical ward has been entirely rebuilt. It is new. There is one of the finest and best laboratories to be found anywhere. I visited the X-ray section. They have $87,000 of new X-ray machines that have not been used for more than a year.

As of January 12, if they were to fill the hospitals at Omaha and Grand Island to capacity, there would still be no place to put the 151 patients who are in Lincoln hospital. That is to say nothing of the future needs. It is admitted that insofar as World War II and the Korean war veterans are concerned, the need for hospital beds will continue to increase for the next 15 years and will not reach its peak until 1980.

Is it the understanding of the Senator that the commitment on the part of the administration and Mr. Driver, as well as the language contained herein, that with all of these hospitals, they will have available the equipment, personnel, and services that were available prior to the order? Will those facilities and personnel be available under this measure until May 1?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I can do no more than reiterate what I have already said. There was no discussion of any individual facility. We had a general discussion with the Administrator regarding general procedures. This meeting was attended by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House [Mr. MAHON], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the distinguished leader of the House [Mr. ALBERT], and myself. The Administrator spoke to the group. This was not at the conference proper, but a separate meeting. I had asked the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to sit in with me on the matter. The Administrator stated to us just what I have already said to the Senate, that there would be no phasing out prior to the date that would be fixed.

At that time we were talking about the writing of a letter. But the President has since handled this by giving Mr. MAHON and me his personal assurance—which was then written into the amendment which will be before the Senate when the conference report is presented—fixing the date of May 1.

There were to be no phasing out and no closings prior to May 1. Mr. Driver also stated that no physical equipment of any kind had been removed, and that the only thing that had been done was to not accept any patients from the date of the closing of certain hospitals which had been already closed.

The Administrator stated that in those cases the applications for admissions would immediately begin to be recognized, and that the beds vacated heretofore by reason of their not accepting new patients would, of course, be filled from time to time.

I do nct suppose that there is any way Mr. Driver could give us assurance that every one of the beds would be filled. But I believe I have stated the matter as clearly as I could, based on my information. I am sure that the Senator from North Dakota remembers it just as I do. I think he has already so stated.

The President called me this morning, deploring the breakdown in communications on yesterday—about which I shall speak very briefly later. He stated that if May 1 were agreed upon, he would give me personal assurance, which I could give to the conferees, that no phasing out or closings would take place prior to May 1. The President also called Mr. MAHON, as Mr. MAHON told us in conference. He gave Mr. MAHON the same assurance.

As to whether people can be assigned elsewhere—in view of the fact that no patients are being received at a certain hospital—and then be sent back to the former hospital as new patients are received, I can give no assurance on that. But I assume, of course, that that would be the case. They cannot accept patients in a hospital without personnel to take care of them.

I am sure that this is a good faith matter. Mr. Driver gave us his personal assurance, and the President likewise gave us his assurance, that the agencies concerned would cooperate to the fullest extent with the committees of the House and the Senate in the hearings that are to be held between now and May 1, in an effort to make all facts available. Of course, the committees will allow an opportunity for affected citizens, as well as Senators and Representatives who are affected, to be heard.

I know of no way whereby a clearer understanding could be reached, unless the date of July 1, which we were attempting to get in the conference report yesterday, had been agreed upon.

As to that, I shall have something to say when I make the report for the conferees. But I feel that we went a long way toward upholding the hands of those who favored the VA amendment, whether or not we approved that amendment in the Chamber.

As chairman of the conferees for the Senate, I went to an extreme length, and I am sure that was the case generally.

I feel rather good about the fact that we have made this disposition of the matter, even though we could not get everything that we had hoped to obtain.

I am glad that we shall have the $1,600 million for the CCC to continue its operations. It has discontinued its operations.

I am glad that the other features of the joint resolution, which I shall briefly comment on, have been settled one way or the other.

I think it is the best settlement that could have been reached. I would not have signed the agreement if I had not thought so. Apparently our good Republican friends have come to the same conclusion. They have, as I understand from the Senator from North Dakota, appended their signatures to the conference report.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator, as well as the other members of the conference committee for the good work that they have done in this regard.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield now to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I did not get a satisfactory answer to the question that was raised by the Senator from Nebraska. Patients have been moved out. It has been announced that the patients will be moved out. The question concerns whether they are going to be moved out. The answer is that they are going to be moved out. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The information given to us was that none of the patients have been moved out, but no new patients have been admitted since the closing date. They have been sent elsewhere.

My information came directly from the Administrator and in the presence of those whom I have named. I have already recited it somewhat. We were informed that nobody had been moved out, no equipment has been moved out, and no hospitals had been closed. We had assurance not only that there would be no phasing out or closing up but also that the date was finally fixed as May 1. Likewise the new applications are to be recognized and the new patients admitted to these hospitals which would now continue to be operated.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I want the able Senator from North Dakota to be recognized, but I should like to say that I had a conversation with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I think he would be a little surprised to know that the discussion was about the 30-day notice and that the other was no longer in the agreement. We discussed this matter with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I was on the telephone at the time the Senator from North Dakota was speaking on the telephone. When the Senator says he agreed to the May 1 date, he may have thought we meant May 15, but I assumed that the other parts of the proposed agreement would be carried out. I do not believe they are.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot say what was done about the other agreement. This date of May 1 applies equally to the proposed closings of the agricultural research stations. I intend to hold those hearings immediately. I do not know what course will be followed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, but I am sure he too will comply with the understanding of all concerned that this matter will move forward expeditiously.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator says that nobody is to be moved. I assume that is correct. But the head of the Veterans' Administration flew someone down to Fort Bayard Hospital to tag the pieces of equipment to be moved out of there. Are those tags to be taken off or left?

Mr. HOLLAND. I assume they would be taken off. That matter did not come up in our discussion yesterday with the Administrator. I knew nothing of it until I had a conversation with the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] shortly before noon today and I did not have an opportunity since then to raise that question with him. I will certainly insist on those tags being removed.

Mr. ANDERSON. All of us appreciate the fine way in which the Senator from Florida has sustained the position of the Senate. I compliment him on it, and am glad. But the agreement is not explicit on the point many of us would like to have seen raised.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure that the conference report could not have included everything that sponsors of the amendments would like to have obtained. The same is true of those of us who sponsored the research amendment, of which I was a principal author. But we felt that we had received a substantial concession. We did feel we could live with the date of May 1. Otherwise I would not have signed the report. Evidently the Republican members of the conference came to the same conclusion, because the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has advised me, and has since advised the Senate, that all three conferees from the Republican side of the Senate desire that their names be appended to the report.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. My understanding was that patients are going to stay down in the hospital at Lincoln, Nebr., and that new patients would now be accepted. I assume that, in order to take care of these patients, they would have to move back the nurses and other employees necessary to take care of those veterans.

I want to commend the Senator from Florida, who has defended the Senate's position just as strongly as though he was a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I have exactly the same view on the matter of personnel. If personnel have been diverted because patients have not been there, that is temporary, and if new patients are admitted in those hospitals, then certainly the personnel, either the same personnel or other adequate personnel to take care of the present patients already there as well as new patients, will have to be brought back to those facilities.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Does this conference report also cover the regional office which it was planned to move out of Juneau?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. We have been given that assurance with respect to the conference report which has already been adopted in the House, as well as the assurance of the President. There has been an agreement that there will be no phasing out or discontinuance until May 1 or thereafter, and that applies equally to veterans hospitals and regional offices and other facilities which were proposed to have been closed.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BASS. I want to commend the Senator from Florida and the other members of the conference for working out these unrelated problems in an attempt to bring about a solution. It is most urgent that the conference report be adopted without delay. As a matter of fact, tobacco sales were discontinued in Tennessee and Kentucky because of lack of funds in the Commodity Credit Corporation. So I hope the Senate can immediately take up the conference report so our farm programs can go forward without hesitation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the other members of the conference, I now submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965 for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wonder if my able friend from Florida will give me his attention? Our distinguished colleague from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] desires a live quorum to be instituted. I wonder if my friend from Florida might consider having a live quorum before he explains the conference report in detail.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want the conference report to be made the pending business.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report is the pending business before the Senate.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I agreed to a termination of the last quorum call, which I wanted to be live, in order to accommodate the majority leader. He suggested that immediately afterward I could ask for another quorum call. I intend to ask for the yeas and nays on this conference report. I think more Senators should be on the floor before the conference report is presented.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the conference report has an important provision with respect to the question of whether food should go to the United Arab Republic and Nasser. I continue to feel strongly that we should have gone the way of the House—namely, to cut off the possibility of further shipments under the present agreement—nonetheless, the Senate went the other way, and there is no use rehashing that issue now. However, I note with great interest that the conference report contains the following:

> It is expected that the President will keep the Congress currently advised of any action taken in this connection.

I ask the Senator from Florida, the Senator in charge of the conference report, to please confirm to the Senate whether this means specifically that the President will keep Congress currently advised any time he exercises the authority proposed to be given to him under the amendment. If he certifies that in the national interest shipments should continue to be made, will the President advise the Congress as to the reasons for such certification?

Mr. HOLLAND. First, the words cited by the Senator from New York are not in the conference report. They are in the report of the managers of the House. They were included after discussion between the House and Senate conferees. The Senate conferees were strong for their inclusion, and we were glad that they were included.

There is no provision for certification. We understand that the conferees are serving notice on the Chief Executive that Congress expects to be informed step by step, if further steps are taken in connection with the outstanding sales agreement under title I of Public Law 480, with the United Arab Republic.

Mr. JAVITS. It does specifically refer to the authority of the President, notwithstanding the restriction in the amendment, does it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It refers to the action of the President—if he takes any—in determining that it is in the national interest to fulfill all or any part of the remaining part of the 3-year contract—which has less than 5 months yet to go. If the President determines that any part or all of it should be fulfilled, in the national interest, we understand that we have served notice on him that we expect to be advised from time to time of any such determination.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Florida has taken a fiduciary position with respect to the views of Senators upon various matters. Would the Senator feel that this particular provision in the report of the House managers would entitle the Senate committee to question the proper authorities as to the basis upon which the President had made his determination?

Mr. HOLLAND. I could not state that categorically. The chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. MAHON, raised this question. He discussed it directly with the President, as we understood, and he wished to insert this language, to state in effect, that we were expecting that kind of treatment. We were glad to approve it. It is in the report by reason of the approval of the conferees on both sides, although there is no such report on the Senate side, as the Senator from New York knows.

Mr. JAVITS. Much as I opposed the original provision, I feel that this is most helpful. I thought the RECORD should spell out exactly what was the intention, which the Senator has now done.

Another question: With respect to the Veterans' Administration provision barring the closing of hospitals, or even threatening moves in that direction, up to May 1, the Senator made it clear that it had reference to certain named hospitals to which Senators had referred in debate.

I gather—and I am sure the Senator from Florida can properly confirm this—that there is no restriction on the applicability of this particular provision to any one veterans' hospital, or more, in any State, but that it applies to all the hospitals which received notice of intention to close.

There are three hospitals in New York State which received this notice. New York State is hardest hit. They would be included, I gather, with all the other hospitals to which this closing notice would apply?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New York is correct. No attempt was meant to name any hospital, or regional facilities, or other offices of the Veterans' Administration. This provision is applied to all facilities of the Veterans' Administration proposed by the Administrator, Mr. Driver, to be closed by the announcement of January 13.

It applies no further than that. It applies equally to those now threatened with annihilation—if I may use the word—by the announced intention of the Administrator.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it fair to say that this provision not only stays the "guillotine," but also is intended to give an opportunity for review of the facts and circumstances which many Senators and Representatives have submitted to the Veterans' Administration, some of which were acknowledged to be new, and not previously considered?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that full opportunity would be given by this provision to Senators and to Representatives, also to veterans' organizations, and to citizens of the communities affected, to appear and to be heard, so that a full picture could be made of the importance of continued maintenance, or abandonment, of a particular facility.

Mr. JAVITS. My last question is: There is nothing implied in this report, is there, which would prevent Congress from imposing some new or supplemental restriction after May 1? I gather we have not undertaken an implied deal by which we are going to go along with the Chief Executive from now on. I assume that this language means exactly what it says—namely, "May 1"—from then on we are to be as much free agents as the Chief Executive.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there is no thought of relinquishing any jurisdiction of Congress nor of assuming any jurisdiction of the executive department, except to impose the necessity of delay in the proposed action between now and May 1.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before I make an explanation of the conference report, I have an understanding with the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I may yield to him so that he may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that a live quorum will be developed. I yield to him with that understanding.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to the Senator from Florida. I suggest the absence of a quorum. It will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 18 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of Senators, I shall not require more than a few minutes to outline the details of the conference report. Then I shall be very glad to answer any questions that may be asked.

I wish to advise the Senate of the action taken by the conference committee to reconcile the differences between the House version and the Senate version of the joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. As the joint resolution passed the Senate, it contained four amendments. Senate amendment No. 3 would strike out the House language in regard to the shipment of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic, pursuant to the sales agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended.

The conference agreed to the Senate amendment to the House language in regard to that provision, but under the rules of the other body, amendment No. 3 and other amendments are reported in technical disagreement, and after adoption in the House, and they have been adopted, they will be reported to the Senate separately after adoption of the conference report.

I have discussed amendment No. 3 first because the conference agreement on that amendment is the same as the Senate version.

In regard to the amendments dealing with agricultural research, the conference committee has agreed to an amendment to Senate amendment No. 1 pertaining to the elimination of research stations and lines of research announced by the Secretary of Agriculture on December 31, 1964. Senate amendment

No. 1, as amended, provides that no action will be taken to eliminate or to phase out any of the agricultural research stations or lines of research enumerated in the Secretary's announcement of December 31, 1964, until after next May 1, 1965.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, I expect to conduct special hearings on this matter, and with the consent of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations, if necessary, I will undertake, prior to next May 1, to make certain that these hearings are completed and the Secretary is advised of our findings and recommendations.

INFORMATION REQUESTED OF THE SECRETARY

In order to facilitate consideration by the subcommittee, I expect that the Secretary of Agriculture will furnish promptly much more specific details than were supplied in his press release of last December 31, in which he merely announced some general criteria which had been used by the Department in arriving at the decision to eliminate certain research activities.

As I stated on February 3, when the Senate was debating the joint resolution, it is my belief that the committee should be specifically apprised as to how the criteria referred to in the Secretary's press release of December 31 are to be applied to the various research stations and related lines of research covered in his announcement.

As previously stated, I do not want the Secretary of Agriculture to regard the action of the committee as any deterrent to discourage him from making proposals for economy; but I am sure that most Members of the Senate share the belief that in regard to agricultural research activities—most of which is of a long-term nature—such reductions should be presented in the normal fashion as a part of the annual budget presentation for the ensuing fiscal year.

I expect that hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture will see fit to follow the normal budgetary procedures and will justify in some detail any proposals to eliminate or curtail agricultural research.

In order to facilitate the compilation of basic information needed by the committee, so that it may be in a position to consider, and to act upon, and then to advise the Secretary of Agriculture as to its conclusions in regard to the elimination of agricultural research, I request that the Secretary see to it that the committee is promptly provided with the additional data to which I referred in connection with my presentation of the joint resolution before the Senate on February 3.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from my statement of February 3, which appears on page 1893 of the Congressional Record, be printed at this point in the Record and be considered as part of the general directions to the Secretary as to the type of information requested by this committee.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESEARCH INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE

The committee should be promptly advised as to the original purpose for the establishment of these lines of research and research stations; the accomplishments of such research activity if any; the problems which need further investigation, a summary description of current investigations and their objectives; the economic importance of the research investigations by activities or by commodity; whether the research is directed to and results in research findings of regional or local significance; and in cases of local significance, whether the State or States involved plan to continue their research activity. Finally, any other additional pertinent data, such as the economic importance of the affected commodity, should be promptly assembled and furnished to the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senate also receded from amendment No. 2, which would have authorized the alterations necessary to install temporary humidity control equipment for the Metabolism and Radiation Laboratory at Fargo, N. Dak. The Senate receded from its amendment without prejudice in regard to that amendment. I think I should say that we expect to handle this item at a better time, procedurally. The conferees are not against the amendment.

Mr. President, before proceeding to a discussion of the amendments reported in disagreement, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, what was the motion?

Mr. HOLLAND. That the conference report be agreed to, so that the Senate may then consider the amendments reported in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House Joint Resolution 234, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the resolution (H.J. Res. 234) entitled "Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "*Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under Public Law 88–573, approved September 2, 1964, shall be used prior to May 1, 1965, to formulate or administer a program to eliminate agricultural research stations or lines of research."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "No funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans Administration shall be utilized prior to May 1, 1965 for the purpose of implementing any order or directive of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the closing or relocating of any hospital or facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration or with respect to the withdrawing, transferring or reducing of services heretofore made available to veterans."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that amendment No. 1 in disagreement, already adopted by the House, be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the resolution (H. J. Res. 234) entitled "Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the revised amendment No. 1 has not been read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "*Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under Public Law 88–573, approved September 2, 1964, shall be used prior to May 1, 1965, to formulate or administer a program to eliminate agricultural research stations or lines of research."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question a division has been requested.

Mr. HOLLAND. The conferees favor the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 1. (Putting the question.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, apparently, Senators did not hear the amendment as read. I think the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] intended to discuss this amendment. I ask that the amendment be reread and that it may then be discussed briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be reread.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "*Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under Public Law 88–573, approved September 2, 1964, shall be used prior to May 1, 1965, to formulate or administer a program to eliminate agricultural research stations or lines of research."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this amendment means that as to research proposed to be eliminated and the lines of research proposed to be eliminated in the announcement of the Secretary dated December 31, 1964, no money now appropriated can be used, either for the phasing out or for the actual closing, until after next May 1.

I have already announced to the Senate that as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, I expect to begin hearings at an early date. We have given some instructions in the RECORD to the Secretary of Agriculture as to the kind of information we want.

We shall, of course, give public notice, so that Senators, Representatives, commodity groups, and citizens who wish to be heard may appear and be heard. Similar action will undoubtedly be taken in the other body. These questions on research activities are all to be heard shortly, so that if Congress wishes to take an affirmative position on the subject, or on any part relating to any particular one of the stations or lines of research, it will have time to do so.

In discussions with the President, Representative MAHON, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, and I, as chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate, have been advised by the President that he believes this is all right. He will approve it and will see to it that there is no phasing out or closing until the matter can be fully heard and acted upon, if necessary, prior to May 1. That is the purport of the amendment. I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 1. On this question, a division has been requested.

On a division, the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 1 was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "No funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans' Administration shall be utilized prior to May 1, 1965, for the purpose of implementing any order or directive of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the closing or relocating of any hospital or facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration or with respect to the withdrawing, transferring, or reducing of services heretofore made available to veterans."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 4.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before discussing that amendment, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as to Senate amendment No. 3, which was reported in technical disagreement to the House, and accepted by the House in its action on the conference report—that is a Public Law 480 amendment—I understand that that was adopted when the conference report was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the presiding officer. That leaves only Senate amendment No. 4 to be acted upon. I understood that the distinguished Senator from Vermont wished to be heard on that amendment after it was reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been reported.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, last week by an overwhelming vote, the Senate expressed a very strong conviction that no veterans installation should be closed anywhere in this country.

We find today that under the conference report, an additional 75 days of grace are given to the conferees. This means, in my judgment, absolutely nothing. It means there will be 75 days within which the Veterans' Administration will be making feverish efforts to close 32 or 33 veterans' installations in the country. But, be assured that this is only the beginning. Many others, which are not included in this list, are scheduled for closing later on in a drastic reduction of services.

I understand that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Driver, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, appeared before the conferees. Both agreed, at one point at least, to submit a letter indicating that no action would be taken prior to July 1.

I believe Mr. Freeman actually submitted such a letter later. Mr. Driver was in the process of preparing one, but was finally notified by someone in the executive branch that it would not be acceptable to the President.

In the past, Mr. Driver has been the whipping boy in this situation. We must now recognize that the President of the United States must assume full responsibility for whatever action is taken to close the veterans hospitals.

I was present in the House of Representatives briefly this afternoon. In response to a question by a Representative, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations said that a few days' delay would make no difference insofar as the Commodity Credit Corporation was concerned.

My original intention was to move that the Senate insist on its amendments and ask for another conference. That was not possible. We did not have the votes to do it.

But, it seems to me that any of us who vote in favor of the conference report, or of this particular amendment, are saying in effect to the veterans of the United States, "Despite our wishes to the contrary, the President of the United States insists that we close these installations. We have no alternative other than to go along."

Obviously, we cannot expect that appropriation bills will be ready for consideration by Congress before May 1. An amendment similar to that contained in the joint resolution might be incorporated in an appropriation bill, but this will be impossible prior to May 1.

We have no chance whatsoever to stop the Veterans' Administration from commencing this program on May 1. We may be certain that it will be pretty well completed by July 1. Once these installations are closed, obviously they will not be opened again. And, no one would suggest that they be.

Perhaps the action of the Veterans' Administration has raised a serious constitutional question. I assume that when the representatives of the Veterans' Administration appeared before the Committee on Appropriations to ask for funds for certain specific purposes, included among those purposes was no proposal to close these installations. But the President gave his approval to the appropriations scheduled for the Veterans' Administration.

Obviously if he were opposed to it, he would have vetoed it. So here we are. In effect, we are saying here and now by this vote that we are going to permit the closing of the veterans' installations throughout this country and make veterans travel hundreds and sometimes thousands of miles to find a hospital bed.

Some veteran may die because there is no hospital near enough to take care of an emergency situation. I do not want that on my conscience. That is why I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I dare say there is no Senator who is more deeply interested in the Veterans' Administration problem than I.

I believe the distinguished senior Senator from Florida has done the best he possibly could to give us an opportunity to have our request heard before our own committees so that if the arguments are on our side—and I assure the Senator that so far as Miles City is concerned, the arguments are on our side—we shall have a chance. I do not believe that voting against this amendment means that we are an enemy of the veterans. I will stake my record against that of anyone insofar as veterans' affairs are concerned.

This is a chance for us to get out of a situation which, if we do not take it, may well mean the end of all veterans' hospitals, domiciliaries, and the like.

I would hope that we would uphold our committee, which has upheld the action of the Senate despite the individual feelings of some of the members, to the end that we can pass this conference report. I do not care too much about the CCC funds in this report, because a delay would not do much damage. But I do care about the veterans and the care which we promised them.

I most certainly care about the Veterans' Administration facility at Miles City. I am not being parochial in my view. There is not an argument that will hold up so far as Miles City is concerned.

I repeat that I have as much interest in this matter as has any other Senator, if not more than most. I am willing to go along with the committee. I think it has tried to protect our interest, and it has given us a chance, within a certain period of time, to make our case.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Florida.

As the Senator knows, I have sat in the hearings of the Veterans Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare concerning this problem.

I have heard the very distinguished majority leader give his testimony before the committee. I have heard the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] give his testimony. We have had extensive cross-examination of the Administrator. The senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] have been present. The senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has presented a statement. It has been an extensive hearing. The problem that we see, and that I object to as the ranking Republican member of that subcommittee at the moment, is that the Administrator has taken the position that regardless of the facts that we bring out with respect to the particular hospitals that may be involved, he, or someone else in the administration, has made a policy decision that, come hell or high water, the hospitals are to be closed.

I should like to know whether the Senator, in the course of his discussion with the Director of Veterans' Affairs during this conference, was able to obtain any indication from Mr. Driver as to whether he was willing to review this problem in an effort to determine whether or not a change in his policy decision might be made on an individual basis.

If we do not have such assurance, we shall have to enact some kind of mandatory legislation. We shall have to do it soon if we are to take care of any remote areas, such as Miles City, Mont., or Grand Junction, Colo.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my first statement would be that, as I view this amendment, it would lay a proper predicate for the enactment of mandatory legislation mentioned by the Senator, in the event Congress should feel that mandatory legislation was required.

I do not believe that any predicate now exists for the enactment of any such mandatory legislation.

On the second question, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was with me—he is not in the Chamber at the moment, but he is somewhere near—at the conference with Mr. Driver, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, and with Secretary Freeman from the Department of Agriculture. I cannot say that Mr. Driver made any statement that was in the words, or even in the substance, mentioned by the Senator from Colorado; but I think I should relate the whole course of negotiations, because mention has been made of them by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Day before yesterday, realizing that this whole measure was in a rough form, I went to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and he called in the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and a representative of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I was not present at their conference. I suggested that I felt that, instead of the absolute stoppage of any closing of either regional offices or hospitals, which was attempted by the original wording of the amendment, which I thought was unfortunate, some approach should be taken similar to the wording that was put in the agricultural research amendment, which was simply a holding up of the final decision until hearings could be completed and actions taken. When we got to a final answer from these gentlemen, realizing our great trouble, I understood they felt July 1 would be a date which would make very sure that all the preliminary hearings or substantive legislation that might be required could be completed.

I took up that matter with the liaison branch of the White House. I understood from that source that that course was thoroughly acceptable to the White House. I so reported to the conferees. We proceeded yesterday, on the basis of what I thought was a firm understanding, to request letters from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, holding the matter in complete abeyance as to the phasing out and the closing out until July 1.

Such a letter was furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture. After some checking—and I do not know what checking he did with the White House—the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs came down. I did not consult him. He came down after being contacted by someone in the White House, and had the conference with us which I related a few minutes ago. We agreed on the form of his letter. He went over to the House wing of the Capitol, along with the majority leader, and reduced the understanding to a letter similar to the one which had been delivered by Secretary Freeman.

While he was phrasing that letter, or having it typed, and prior to delivery of it, he received a call from the President himself, as he told us later, asking him not to deliver the letter.

Later the Secretary of Agriculture called Mr. MAHON and called me, and asked that his letter be returned, stating that this was at the direction of the President.

Obviously, since we took no final action and were awaiting Mr. Driver's letter—we had gotten to the point where the members of the conference committee had signed the conference report—it then became evident that there had been a lack of liaison at the White House. I do not care to comment on that, because I realize that the President, with South Vietnam and other matters on his mind, cannot be approached all the time by the liaison officers who contact the two Houses of Congress.

At any rate, the President saw fit not to follow the course that had been indicated in the previous contacts with the liaison officers. I have no criticism to make of that, because I realize the critical nature of international affairs. At any rate, the conference was not concluded.

This morning the President called me, and I understand he also called Chairman MAHON of the Appropriations Committee of the House, and said he was perfectly willing to have the Senate and House examine into the closings, was perfectly willing to have the appropriate committees investigate the matter, and was perfectly willing to have the heads of the agencies cooperate, but he felt that July 1 would be too late for him to make plans for the next fiscal year. He suggested first an earlier date, and then later May 1, as the date which he felt should be agreed upon. I reported that fact to the conference committee, and Chairman MAHON also reported the same way.

We would much have preferred to have the date of July 1. At the same time we realize that there is more involved than one branch of the Government. We propose to fulfill our obligations, notwithstanding the fact that I did not support the amendment affecting the Veterans' Administration on the floor, since it was inappropriate at the time. But I fought for it in every way I could, and I am sure every other member of the conference committee will state that that was the case.

It finally appeared to all of us—and there was a difference of opinion among the conferees on our side as well as the conferees on the House side—that perhaps May 1 was the best date that could be worked out with assurance, or virtual assurance, of the House adopting the amendment, and we hoped for adoption of the amendment in the Senate.

We were careful in the conference, to say that we could not speak for all Members in the Senate on the Veterans' Administration amendment. At the same time, we had conferred with some of them. I believe they felt that was the best that could be done. We were also bolstered by the assurance from the President, given directly to both Mr. MAHON and myself, that if this arrangement were made, no phasing out or closing would be undertaken until after May 1. This date would put it up to the Senate and the House to hurry with their hearings and to take such action as they might see fit to take, prior to May 1, 1965.

That is the best date that could be agreed upon. Since the House was receding on the Public Law 480 amendment, and since the leaders on the House side were agreeing with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]—I am sorry he is not present at the moment—and the Senator from Florida, that we would, at a later date, again recommend to Congress the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota.

It was for those reasons that the conference report was filed. At the time of signing the conference report, which was about noon today, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] was in Texas. I have heard someone else say that he is now in Kansas City, making Lincoln Day speeches. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is in Boston on the same kind of mission. The details were so reported to me that we could not get any specific dates from either of them for the signing of the report by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who was the only minority conferee present at that time.

Later, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] had direct authorizations from the Senator from South Dakota, and from the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], to sign their names to the report; and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] then indicated that he would like to sign it, also. He had withheld his signature earlier, not because he did not believe it was the best that we could do, but because he wished to protect the absent Senators.

Therefore, at the beginning of the hearing, 13 of those signatures have been appended to the report from both bodies indicating that they agree with the Speaker, that this is the best conference report that we could possibly hope to bring, and the best results that can be accomplished. If that were not the case, I would not be recommending it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. The hearings have been extremely interesting in many other ways. This leads me to another question: Originally a release issued by the Veterans' Administration stated that the closing moves would save the taxpayers $23.5 million. Cross-examination of the Veterans' Administrator indicated clearly that the closings would not save the taxpayer one nickel, that exactly what the Veterans' Administration was going to do was to take the money which would be used in maintaining these hospitals to maintain different hospitals in different areas. It will ask for a higher budget than it had before.

It became apparent, during the process of the examination, that what the Veterans' Administration was doing was raising the policy conclusion that the area of facilities for veterans should be shifted from where they were to different areas, and that the more remote areas were going to have no facilities left at all, and that they were to be centralized in urban areas.

It strikes me that if this has been made a policy matter, it should be made crystal clear for the record that I, as a Senator—and many other Senators—object to it. There will be no savings to the taxpayer, as the administration has propagandized all over the country, and it will be centralizing instead of trying to decentralize so that it can provide adequate service to veterans.

Was there any consideration on the merits of the taxpayer position made during the Senator's conference with Mr. Driver, or was it only on the date situation?

Mr. HOLLAND. There was some discussion on that subject, but we felt that the able committee on which the Senator from Colorado is the ranking minority member was the appropriate committee to make a study of this matter and report.

Likewise, we feel that the Subcommittee on Appropriations headed by the able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]—and I happen to be a member of that subcommittee—is a similar appropriate committee to go into the problem.

Although I cannot speak for the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I am just as sure as I can be that he will expedite the hearings on this matter, because he knows it is a matter of great importance to the Senator from Colorado, to me and to other Senators.

I believe that when a clear picture is developed from the hearings, it is quite possible the results will then justify a changing of the listing of the facilities and the hospitals to be closed.

I have been through these closing problems before. In Florida, a few years ago, the Veterans' Administration moved a facility from Miami—the home of my able junior colleague—to St. Petersburg, one of the two regional offices in Florida. We did not like it. We made known our dislike, but we did not try to stop it, however, and it was subsequently done. It has worked out well. There are some regional closings involved in the program which I suspect will work equally well.

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe that is probably true.

Mr. HOLLAND. There were five regional offices in Texas, and it was proposed to reduce them to two. The President is a Texan. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House is also a Texan. I heard from both of them that that was the case.

There are other facilities and some hospitals where the Senator from Colorado and other Senators may find it difficult to protest promptly against any proposed change; but I am as sure as that I am standing here that there will be cases in which a change in objective will have to be made after all the facts are in.

I have no right to decide in advance. I cannot speak for Mr. Driver. I cannot speak for the President. All I can say is that I believe they are reasonable men; and I believe, as does the Senator from Colorado, that there will be cases in which it will clearly appear, when the facts are all in, that the proposed closing would be unfortunate and a mistake, but I could not give him any assurance that such would be the case.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate that.

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as I am concerned, the hearings on the research stations for agriculture—I know more about that subject than I do about the Veterans' Administration hospitals—I am just as sure as I am of standing here that the same results will be accomplished in that field, although I believe that some of the stations proposed to be closed have already carried out the purpose for which they were established.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, no one could have done a better job than my dear friend, the Senator from Florida, and the other conferees. I believe that they made the best of a bad case.

I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet; but I venture to suggest that come July 1 many, if not all, of the installations will be in the process of being closed, if not already closed, with many more to follow in the months and years to come.

I wish the veterans of my State to know that I am bitterly opposed to this whole program. Therefore, I feel that I have no alternative other than to vote "nay" on the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Vermont. The language in this bill means absolutely nothing. It means less than nothing when we recall the past history. There is no language that guarantees how these hospitals are to be examined and whether or not they are to be continued as they were prior to the Administrator's decision to close them. The conduct of the Majority Leader, Mr. MANSFIELD, in this matter has been commendable and exemplary but I think he has misjudged what the amendment means. He says it will give us a chance to have our cases heard. I do not think it guarantees that at all. We have been trying for a long time to have some of the cases for these hospitals heard, and the Veterans' Administration absolutely refuses to hear them. There is no language in this amendment to suggest that they should be heard.

I want to touch on this point because it was a part of the agreement that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] had in mind when he withdrew his objections to the revised provision being written into the bill. I was the coauthor with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] on his resolution and I was, therefore, extremely anxious that he be consulted and his wishes made known.

In a telephone conversation with him today, in the office of the Majority Leader, in which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] participated, we talked about this matter. I suggested to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] that this question could be cleared up properly in satisfactory fashion because we could require that the hearings be held in 30 days.

The Senator said, "Will they be finished?"

I said, "Yes, they can be held and finished in 30 days."

It was on that basis that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] agreed to advance the date from June 30 to June 1 and he finally agreed that if we were being extremely pushed, we might advance the date to May 15. He hoped we would hold to June 1 but he was agreeable to May 15 if we knew that hearings would be held within 30 days to show the condition at these hospitals and what their closing would mean to the veterans. He never contemplated in his talk with me that the amendment, as now before us, would not require the holding of hearings and would not require that patients be admitted again to these hospitals.

There is not a word in this amendment about hearings. Mr. Driver can do as he pleases. What he has been pleased to do is to ignore congressional delegations and pay no attention to them whatever. He pays no attention to veterans' organizations, either. He says, "I am going to close this place," and that is all there is to it. Therefore, I do not believe that his mind will be influenced by language as innocuous as this language.

I am not trying to be critical of the Senator from Florida, but I suggest that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has some rights in this matter, too. I do not believe I presented to him the point that they were going to violate what I regard as an existing cardinal principle and have some hearings for 30 days. The Senator from Florida knows what took place.

When we had our discussions with Senator MUNDT, the head of the Veterans' Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture were going to write letters. What happened to force them to withdraw the letters, one of which had already been delivered?

When the able Senator from Florida first approached the majority leader—and I believe I am correct in saying this—there was discussion of this matter. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. The closings will be made and it will be said that there was no commitment that they would stay open. The date originally discussed was July 1. Now it has been made May 1. That is a change of 60 days in the wrong direction. That is why I say the Senator from Vermont is probably correct, that this statement means absolutely nothing. I hope hearings will be held on it. A great many people resist what the Veterans' Administration head has said would be done.

If the head of the Veterans' Administration is correct in his contention that the only way to handle these hospitals is to centralize them and build them bigger, why does he not suggest that we stop the building of the Hill-Burton hospitals? Why does he not suggest that the Government build one great big hospital at Bethesda with thousands and thousands of beds and close all the support for Hill-Burton hospitals and the construction of new ones all over the country? No one would propose that, of course, because the Hill-Burton hospitals are popular and are of real service to the country. The people of my State would not favor the closing down of funds under the Hill-Burton law for the new hospitals or new additions to hospitals and they would not favor transporting people across the country to new and huge Hill-Burton hospitals. What about the veteran who lives near an existing veterans' hospital and who has lived there for a long while and who is perfectly satisfied with the service he is receiving? It is entirely possible that a new hospital can be built with better facilities and a lower per capita cost but this veteran does not want to travel across the country.

In the New Mexico case dealing with Fort Bayard, we asked a panel of doctors to visit the hospital and see if it was a modern hospital, adequately taking care of veterans. Do you suppose the head of the Veterans' Administration paid any attention to the panel? Of course, he did not. He is not interested in how good these hospitals are or how adequately they serve the veteran. To do so would destroy the whole basis for his decision.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The distinguished Senator is making a very important point. The Veterans' Administration is bound to close many hospitals which have and continue to satisfy many veterans. At the same time the Veterans' Administration urged the Bureau of the Budget to approve $112 million for construction of new hospitals and domiciliary facilities. The veterans themselves are not complaining about the hospitals. It is the personnel within the VA who want to move to the big cities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, of course, that is correct. The movies are better in the big cities, and the golf courses are better around the big cities. We have had an indication of what would happen to the veterans that are now being taken care of at Fort Bayard in New Mexico. The Veterans' Administration plans to move to San Antonio, when a new building is built there at a cost of about $20 million. Why should that be done, if the veteran in New Mexico is satisfied with the service he is getting at Fort Bayard? Why should he go from Silver City, N. Mex., for example, to San Antonio, Tex.? Why should he be forced to travel a distance that is as far as the distance from New York to Chicago?

If it were proposed to close the veterans' facilities in Chicago and make all the veterans go to New York, we would hear some wild outcries. Apparently it is all right to do this in the Southwest because people there are apparently accustomed to traveling long distances.

It is all right to close one down in Montana and to close one down in Colorado. There is a good hospital in Colorado.

May 1 will come and go, and not one of these hospitals will remain open. Every one of them will be closed by May 1. I am sure the decision has been reached.

Many of us had hoped that we would at least have an opportunity to plead our case.

We have heard a good deal about civil rights. Mr. President, is there such a thing as veterans' rights? Do not their representatives in Congress have a right to go to the Veterans' Administration and object to the closing of veterans' facilities and to present the information they have and show what is wrong with the Veterans' Administration's decision?

Mr. President, the decision to close these hospitals was taken by someone sitting in Washington who may never have seen the hospital.

May 1 will come and we will find that hearings have not been held. May 1 will come and we shall find that not one of the hospitals has remained in use. They will move everything out of Fort Bayard.

They have been putting tags on pieces of equipment to tell where they are going. The veteran now will say, "I cannot stay here. They are moving out the X-ray machine; they are moving out the operating table." The tag tells where it is going and the veteran knows that the hospital is to be closed. What good is it to tell the veteran they are going to wait until May 1 to close the hospital when the medical and surgical units, which he knows and uses, will be tagged to be moved somewhere else?

We are worried because a man has been checking the William Beaumont Hospital in El Paso, an Army hospital, to see if 50 beds can be prepared there to take care of veterans. That, of course, is designed to frighten the veteran in New Mexico and I think it is being done in contradiction of the law.

I realize that we cannot do anything about it. The able Senator from Florida has done a fine job in representing a viewpoint with which he may not be in full sympathy. I commend him for it. I regret that we find ourselves in a situation in which nothing will be done. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is right; nothing will take place.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as we vote today on the question of whether or not we should follow the recommendation to close several important Veterans' Administration facilities throughout the country, I suggest that we should pause a minute to recognize that the pressure for such closings might well have resulted from the cheap attacks mounted on Federal spending by those politicians who found it personally expedient in their brand of campaign politics.

I suggest that those who engaged in these tactics take a long, hard look at their conscience as they now vote to prevent these closings. Those of us who did not participate in the campaign to exaggerate and discredit the true nature of Federal expenditures and their purposes can vote today in clear conscience.

I, for one, feel strongly that the veterans' facilities should be compelled to remain open as a just and deserved service and convenience to the veteran. I believe this is something that we can and must afford.

The political demagogs who only a few months ago were clamoring for economy at all costs are now hoist on their own petard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 4.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the question on agreeing to conference committee amendment, as already adopted in the House?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PROUTY. A "nay" vote means a vote in opposition to the May 1 basis which has been approved by the conferees; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot interpret legislation.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 9, as follows:

[No. 19 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Cooper
Curtis
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—9

Aiken
Boggs
Carlson
Cotton
Fannin
Javits
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty

NOT VOTING—29

Allott
Bartlett
Bennett
Clark
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Fong
Gore
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Inouye
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McCarthy
McGovern
Miller
Morse
Mundt
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Tydings

So the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 4 was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 4 was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that that motion be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CRISIS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we all grieve the news that more American lives have been lost in South Vietnam. The President bears a heavy burden of decision. The seal of his office is an American eagle, clutching a bundle of arrows in one claw and an olive branch in the other. The judicious use of both the arrows and the olive branch represents our best hope of avoiding a widening war in Asia.

Our retaliatory blows should make it clear to Hanoi and Peiping that we will not quit under fire, nor withdraw, nor submit to Communist coercion. We can strike back by air and sea, from floating bases which are beyond Communist reach, and inflict heavy punishment upon them. Ours is not a position of weakness.

Therefore, it would behoove the Communists to desist, and to explore with us, and the other nations concerned, a way to an honorable settlement in southeast Asia—one which will guarantee both the neutrality and the independence of South Vietnam.

PAUL KITCHIN RETURNS TO NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in each Congress there are a number of changes among the Members and the various committee staffs which cause each of us to feel a little less whole because of their absence. During the early days of this Congress, I have felt keenly the departure of a good friend and talented lawyer—the Honorable A. Paul Kitchin, a distinguished former Member of Congress, who has served the Senate so effectively as chief counsel of the Revision and Codification Subcommittee.

Paul Kitchin brought to the subcommittee a vast reservoir of experience. He is a competent and dedicated public official who has made an invaluable contribution to the Nation. I am sorry that I shall no longer have the daily benefit of his wise counsel, but I am delighted to know that the people of North Carolina will regain a fine citizen and attorney. He will carry to the people of North Carolina the experience and wisdom gained from more than 20 years of public service, and I am sure they will benefit from it. I am certain that my colleagues here join me in wishing for him and his lovely wife much happiness as they return to their home in Wadesboro.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the administration's education bill, which provides aid to parochial students by allowing them to use public school textbooks and public facilities on a shared time basis, is evidence of the increasing demands from religious institutions for access to the Federal Treasury. Because of the precedent established by such cases as *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447, an ordinary taxpayer is generally precluded from contesting the constitutionality of these Federal expenditures to sectarian schools on the grounds that he does not possess sufficient standing to bring suit. As a consequence, a taxpayer whose rights guaranteed by the first amendment are actually violated may be without a judicial remedy.

The administration's bill makes it imperative that Congress establish legal procedures to determine whether this indirect aid to religious institutions conflicts with the mandate of the first amendment, which provides that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

The Washington Post for February 9 contained an editorial which takes an analogous position. The writer stated that it is important for the education bill to "contain a clause facilitating judicial review, so that courts may challenge and veto any practice which oversteps constitutional boundaries." In continuing, the writer expressed a sentiment with which I am in complete agreement.

> Vital as education is to the national welfare—

He said—

> it would be a travesty and a tragedy if the wall of separation between church and state were destroyed by a Federal aid to education program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial of February 9, entitled "Support for the Schools," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUPPORT FOR THE SCHOOLS

For 20 years, Federal aid to education has been wrecked in Congress after Congress either on the Scylla of segregation or the Charybdis of church affiliation. Time and again, Congressman Adam Clayton Powell has added to a Federal aid bill his rider forbidding the allocation of funds to any school district discriminating among pupils on grounds of race; passage of the rider assured defeat of the bill. Similarly, strong differences of opinion regarding the extension of Federal aid to parochial as well as public schools have produced a succession of legislative stalemates.

There are high hopes that the current Federal-aid measure can escape these twin disasters. The situation has changed significantly. In the first place, Congress has, in effect, written the Powell amendment into the Civil Rights Act; there is now no need to prohibit the allocation of Federal funds to segregated schools, because the prohibition has become a matter of law. The religious issue is not quite so clearly settled. But the Supreme Court decisions in the prayer and Bible-reading cases have placed the issue in a new light. As we read these decisions, they hold that the first amendment precludes religious observances or indoctrination in tax-supported primary or secondary schools. Religious schools could not, therefore, accept Federal financial grants without abandoning their essential basis for existence.

President Johnson's current Federal-aid proposal seeks to compromise the religious issue without vitiating any constitutional principle. A compromise, by definition, is a settlement by which contending parties derive benefits sufficient to make the settlement acceptable. This seems to have been accomplished by the President's bill. Catholic leaders who felt strongly that earlier versions of Federal aid were unjust to their faith in excluding aid to parochial schools now seem inclined to support the current measure. And some, although by no means all, who insisted that any aid to parochial schools would be both unwise and unconstitutional, now acquiesce in the President's solution.

The solution gives aid to children indiscriminately, without giving direct aid to parochial schools. It does this, in the main, by utilization of certain community facilities on a shared time basis and by making available to children in private schools textbooks and related materials approved for use in public schools, with a proviso that they should not be employed for sectarian instruction or religious worship.

These are real benefits, and there should be no blinking at the fact. They make it easier and less costly for Catholic parents to send their children to parochial schools, or for any other parents to send their children to religiously oriented private schools, and to this extent they may be considered a governmental support of religion.

Several thoughtful and conscientious witnesses appearing before the House Committee on Education and Labor have opposed these features of the bill as constitutionally invalid and, as one put it, fatal to the integrity of our independent, secular public school system. We think these objections deserve the most careful consideration. Perhaps they can be overcome by more precise draftsmanship. The textbook provision in particular should be subjected to exacting debate.

We continue, however, to favor enactment of the bill. Determination of its constitutionality can be finally achieved only through specific application of its provisions. And these will be different in different places, for the measure affords a good deal of latitude to local community agencies. If the bill becomes law, shared time will be implemented one way in Wilkes-Barre, another way in Terre Haute, and the courts will have to decide what is permissible and what is impermissible by the traditional process of judicial inclusion and exclusion.

For this reason, we believe it imperative that the bill contain a clause facilitating judicial review, so that courts may challenge and veto any practice which oversteps constitutional boundaries. Vital as education is to the national welfare, it would be a travesty and a tragedy if the wall of separation between church and state were destroyed by a Federal-aid-to-education program.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, each year thousands of tourists, mostly schoolchildren, visit our Nation's Capital. During this visit these students tour the FBI, the Smithsonian Institution, the White House, and other places of interest, as well as the Capitol building itself. All of these public buildings are available in most instances with guide services free of charge except the Capitol.

Visitors who wish a tour of our Nation's Capitol are charged 25 cents each, and schoolchildren are charged 15 cents each.

I asked the Library of Congress to do some research as to the guide service that is provided in other capitol buildings throughout the world. It appears that in practically all of the major capitols of the world there is no admission fee.

It is true that at some of the foreign capitols guide service is not always provided, but in most instances free guide service is available to visitors. In none of the countries which the Library of Congress checked—France, Italy, the Soviet Union, West Germany, Canada, Great Britain, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile—were there any admission charges.

In my opinion a nation as prosperous as the United States of America can afford to give to its visitors, mostly schoolchildren, free guide service. In order to correct this present situation I am today introducing a bill, the purpose of which is to authorize the employment under the Civil Service rules of an adequate number of professional guides to take care of the guests of our Nation's Capitol.

Surely, the U.S. Government is not so desperate financially that it has to levy a 15 cent toll on the schoolchildren who visit the U.S. Capitol to observe democracy in action.

I ask unanimous consent that a report covering the guide service of the numerous capitols throughout the world, as compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Library of Congress,
Legislative Reference Service,
Washington, D.C.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The following information was received from various sources with regard to their practice of showing visitors through their capitol buildings:

FRANCE

France charges no admission fee to enter its Parliament. However, one must get permission from the Secretary of Parliament before he can be admitted. This is best accomplished through the good offices of a member of the French Parliament. There is no guide service, but a man at the front desk will gladly answer pertinent questions.

ITALY

Italy is in a rather unique situation. Its Parliament building is controlled by the municipal government of Rome. Nevertheless, this setup does not markedly alter their practice of guide service. There is no admission fee, but one must have a special pass. A foreign visitor may obtain such a pass upon the recommendation of his respective Embassy. There is no guide service per se, but a guard accompanies all tourists, and he will attempt to answer questions and explain about the building.

SOVIET UNION

The Soviet Union likewise imposes no entrance fee upon tourists desiring to see the Kremlin. All the buildings are open to the public every day. No special arrangements for gaining admittance need be made for any of the buildings except the Oruzhanaya Palata. It, too, is open to the general public, but there is generally such a long time of people waiting to get in that it would be wise to arrange for a special tour. The regular guides speak in Russian, but one can obtain an interpreter through Intourist for whatever period is desired.

WEST GERMANY

West Germany charges no admission fee and provides free guide service for those parts of the Bundeshaus which are open to the public. The guide service is operated by the Bundestag administration.

CANADA

Canada also charges no admission fee, and provides free guide service through its Houses of Parliament in Ottawa.

GREAT BRITAIN

Great Britain charges no admission fee, but provides no free Government-operated guide service. Foreign tourists may obtain passes to see Parliament in session by contacting either a Member of Parliament or their respective Embassy. The Houses of Parliament are open to the public on Saturdays and on certain holidays, when Parliament is not meeting.

MEXICO

National Palace: Permission to tour building can be obtained anytime from the Intendente del Palacio whose office is in the palace. The Government provides guides to conduct visitors through apartments. A tip of 2.50 pesos (20 cents) per guide is suggested. One or two pesos for the employee of the palace. (Terry's Guide to Mexico, 1948.)

ARGENTINA

According to Mr. Mathe, first secretary of the Embassy in Washington, there is no formal guide service, nor is there an admission charge to the Edificio del Congreso.

CHILE

There is no formal guide service, nor is there an admission charge to the Edificio del Congreso.

BARRY A. SKLAR,
JOHN S. GOSNELL,
Foreign Affairs Division.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SENATE SINCE JANUARY 4

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, prior to the brief recess honoring Lincoln's birthday, let us review what we have been able to accomplish so far since January 4. Our first major piece of legislation was the passage of S. 4, the Water Pollution Control Act of 1965, establishing water quality standards and authorizing $80 million in new grants to help the States and localities, which was so capably handled by Senator MUSKIE and Senator BOGGS. Immediately following passage of this bill, the Senate under the capable leadership of Senators RANDOLPH, MCNAMARA, and COOPER passed the $1,092.4 million aid to Appalachia bill.

Under the capable guidance of Senator LONG of Louisiana and Senator SMATHERS, the Senate passed and sent to the House the bill implementing the International Coffee Agreement ratified by the Senate on May 21, 1963.

Under the management of Senator MCCLELLAN, the Senate passed a bill creating a Joint Committee on the Budget and under the guidance of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, Senator SPARKMAN, a bill extending aid to distressed homeowners who have found structural defects in properties purchased with GI mortgage loans. Senator HILL successfully steered through a bill authorizing cancellation of student loans of up to 50 percent if the physician or dentist practices in shortage areas.

With a great assist from Senators WILLIAMS of New Jersey and ROBERTSON, the Senate has sent to the House a bill to help provide for relief from future flood and earthquake disasters.

Thanks to Senator SYMINGTON, the Senate on Tuesday sent the stockpile management and disposal bill to the House with the expectation of early action.

Action has just been completed on bills establishing the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in Montana and Wyoming, designating Nez Perce National Historical Park in Idaho, construction of the Manson unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project and the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, both in Washington State.

In addition to the above, the Senate and the House has completed action on the $1.6 billion agricultural supplemental allowing the President final discretion in shipping surplus food to Egypt and delaying, until May 1, the planned closing of 11 VA hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and a 17-regional-office merger. Credit for the success of this measures goes to Senators HOLLAND, as chairman, HAYDEN, MCCLELLAN, HILL, PASTORE, ANDERSON, METCALF, SALTONSTALL, YOUNG of North Dakota, DIRKSEN, and MUNDT.

The Senate has confirmed 9,079 of the President's nominations for various and sundry posts in the Federal structure, including those of VA Administrator Driver, Attorney General Katzenbach, and Deputy Attorney General Clark.

In the immediate future, we can look for action on the so-called gold cover bill on February 17, an amendment to the Constitution on presidential succession on February 18, a bill increasing our authorization to the Inter-American Development Bank on February 19, and following these, authorization for the Disarmament Agency, at least one of the education bills, and health bills including the regional medical complex for cancer and heart.

The Legislative and Executive Calendars are clear and clean.

APPEARANCE OF SENATOR MANSFIELD ON CBS PROGRAM "MEET THE PRESS," JANUARY 3, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the eve of the opening of the 89th Congress, I appeared on the TV program, "Meet the Press." Mr. Lawrence Spivak, permanent panel member; John Morris, of the New York Times; Ron Nessen, of NBC; and Alan Otten, of the Wall Street Journal, were the interrogators. Ned Brooks served as moderator.

The program is, as the Senate knows, entirely unrehearsed. It consisted in this instance of my spontaneous responses to questions on a range of international and domestic issues which appeared significant to these able and distinguished correspondents at the beginning of the year. Some of these issues have gained and some have lost significance in the little more than a month that we have been in session. Either way, I should like my initial outlook for the year, as expressed on this program, to be generally available, and I ask unanimous consent that the transcript be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO. PRESENTS "MEET THE PRESS," AMERICA'S PRESS CONFERENCE OF THE AIR, JANUARY 3, 1965

Produced by Lawrence E. Spivak.

Guest: Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, Senate majority leader.

Panel: John Morris, the New York Times; Ron Nessen, NBC News; Alan Otten, Wall Street Journal; Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent panel member.

Moderator: Ned Brooks.

Mr. BROOKS. Tomorrow is the opening day of Congress and our guest today on "Meet the Press" is Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the majority leader of the U.S. Senate. Senator MANSFIELD has been a member of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee for 12 years. He is recognized as one of the best informed men in the Senate on southeast Asia. We will have the first question now from Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the "Meet the Press" panel.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator MANSFIELD, from time to time there were reports that you were unhappy about your job as majority leader. They tell me that you are pretty certain to be reelected. Is there any chance that you won't accept the job?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not if it is offered to me.

Mr. SPIVAK. Many people believe that the majority leader's job is to get the President's program through the Senate. How do you look on that job?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think over the past 4 years we have been fairly successful. Last year as a matter of fact the President sent down 51 recommendations. The Senate passed them all, and those which were not passed by the House or lost in conference we hope to take up shortly after we convene this year.

Mr. SPIVAK. Where you and the President have a difference of opinion, what happens then?

Senator MANSFIELD. We never have had yet, but if such a time comes, of course I would naturally go to the President, and we would talk it out.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, there is a contest on for Senate majority whip among Senators LONG, PASTORE, and MONRONEY.

Why is the position of Senate whip so important that three leading Senators are seeking it?

Senator MANSFIELD. You have got me there.

Mr. SPIVAK. Is it an important job?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, it is a hard job. It takes a lot of work and time, and whoever does get the job is going to put in a lot of time on the floor and have to play a very important part in the business of the Senate.

Mr. SPIVAK. Does it make any difference to you which of the three gets the job?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not in the least. They are all good men, and any of the other 64 remaining Democratic Senators I could get along with, too.

Mr. SPIVAK. Would you be just as satisfied if anyone else in the Senate got that job?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SPIVAK. It would make no difference to you who in the Senate was elected whip?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not in the least, because they are all good men on the Democratic side—and the Republican side—and I can get along with any of them, and together, if I am reelected leader, we will be able to carry out the Senate's business.

Mr. SPIVAK. There have been some people who insist that Senator LONG ought not to be Senate whip because he has opposed so much of the President's program in the past. Do you see anything to that argument.

Senator MANSFIELD. I would say that Senators LONG, PASTORE, or MONRONEY would do a good job in behalf of the administration and would be a credit to the party.

Mr. SPIVAK. One more thing on the whip, Senator. It has been reported in the New York Times, I think, the other day, that although you refused to take sides in the contest for whip, among the three Senators, it is believed that you favor Senator MONRONEY. Is there any truth—is that report correct?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, Mr. Spivak. I appreciate the way you put the question, but again I must say, as far as I am concerned, they are all good men. They would all do a good job, and whichever one of them gets it will be perfectly satisfactory with me.

Mr. OTTEN. Senator, there has been increasing criticism from influential Senators of both parties of U.S. policy in Vietnam, and you yourself have called for considering neutralization of the whole southeast Asia area. Do you foresee a major Senate debate in the early days of the session on our policy in southeast Asia?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, I do, and I think it will be a good thing because there is an increasing amount of questioning concerning what is going on out there. Personally I fully support what the President has done and is now doing, because I feel that we cannot withdraw. I feel just as strongly that we cannot carry the war into North Vietnam because if you carry the consequences of that action to its ultimate conclusion, it means war with Communist China, and a situation will be created which will be worse than it was in Korea. But I believe like President Kennedy that we should never fear to negotiate and never negotiate from fear, and there is nothing wrong in trying to find a solution to a problem which is becoming insoluble and which is causing a great deal of discussion throughout the country at the present time and will cause more in the Congress in the days ahead.

Mr. Otten. How do you get at negotiation when the war is going so badly? What inducement is there for the North Vietnamese to negotiate when they are doing so well?

Senator Mansfield. At the moment none, but I recall some months ago De Gaulle, whom I admire very much, came forth with a suggestion concerning the possibility of neutralization for all of southeast Asia. Our automatic reaction was no, as it seems to be to so many of De Gaulle's suggestions. I think we ought to look into all these matters, not be afraid to talk anywhere, any time, to anyone, about this important area and do it with the proposition in mind that we are in Vietnam to help the legal government there—and what it is at the moment no one knows—to maintain its freedom and to bring security to that country.

Mr. Otten. Do you agree with Senator Church's idea that the United Nations might be called on to supervise the neutralization of the area? Is that a possibility?

Senator Mansfield. If they could perform a function there, I think it ought to be given every consideration, yes.

Mr. Morris. Senator Mansfield, President Johnson will sketch his legislative program for the first year of the Great Society in the state of the Union message Monday night. I think it is generally known that his first priority will be medical care for the aged and that he also wants to expand the war on poverty, that he wants an expanded education program, that he wants the Appalachian aid program, and he wants to reduce excise taxes. There is nothing new in any of this. It has been kicked around for some time. What is new, if anything, in the offing as far as legislation is concerned?

Senator Mansfield. So far as I know nothing, but what I do see is a continuation of the policies which were formulated during the past 4 years and even beyond that, so that they can be accentuated and extended in the field of education, in the field of water pollution, in the field of the Appalachia poverty region and in the field of health care and excise taxes, among other things. I would also expect that the conservation program which was inaugurated during the past years would be pushed considerably.

Mr. Morris. How is the Great Society different from the New Frontier, or the Fair Deal, or the New Deal or the Square Deal?

Senator Mansfield. As I see it, it would be just an extension because President Johnson learned a lot during the times of the depression and the period of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and what he is doing is carrying on the policies which were inaugurated then, carried forward under Truman and Kennedy and accentuated to some degree by Johnson himself during this past year.

Mr. Morris. Senator, the Democrats have a 2-to-1 majority in both the Senate and the House. Wouldn't it seem logical that this might be a good time to try to get some far-reaching, innovating type of legislation through to form a Great Society, if that is what we are after?

Senator Mansfield. No, I wouldn't think so because I think you can do it on the basis of the foundations which have been laid. I think that the President is going to hew pretty much to the middle of the road which the American people seem to want. He has outlined his program fairly well although he has not as yet dealt in specifics. I would assume that the gradual extension and expansion of these programs already in effect is what will be done.

Mr. Nessen. Senator, isn't the foreign aid bill going to be even more seriously in trouble this year than ever before because American libraries have been burned and embassies attacked and the United States generally spoken of with contempt in many foreign countries?

Senator Mansfield. I think it is going to be in just as much trouble this year as it has been in previous years, and that has been plenty. I think also, as long as you have mentioned the fact about the burning of these libraries, and by implication, anyway, the statements made by some of these chiefs of state in Asia and Africa, that we ought to take a pretty close look at the foreign aid program and recognize that this might not be a bad time for a reassessment or a reevaluation of it.

Mr. Nessen. Do you mean we should consider cutting off aid to some of these countries that have treated us this way?

Senator Mansfield. When they tell us to "go jump into the Red Sea" or "go to hell," I think, yes.

Mr. Nessen. In other words, we should consider cutting off aid to what countries—Egypt, Indonesia?

Senator Mansfield. Those countries the chiefs of which have made those declarations about us and who have not controlled their people—who are the recipients of the aid—in the burning of American libraries or in the dispatching of arms for example to places like the Congo at the present time.

Mr. Nessen. What countries would those be? What countries do you favor cutting off aid to?

Senator Mansfield. We will discuss that when we get to the aid program.

Mr. Nessen. Do you agree with Senator Fulbright that the aid bill ought to be divided up to consider military and economic aid separately?

Senator Mansfield. I certainly do. I don't think I would want to go as far as Senator Fulbright who wants it broken down into 8 parts, I believe, but I do think the economic and the military ought to be separated and the military assistance program ought to go before the Armed Services Committee. I would point out that under title IV of the foreign aid bill, during this past year, it is so open-ended that you can offer any kind of an amendment and it is germane. That is where Senator Dirksen and I, for example, offered our amendment having to do with reapportionment in the foreign aid bill.

Mr. Nessen. But if you do separate the two then won't economic aid be in even more trouble because it has always ridden in on the military aid coattails, so to speak?

Senator Mansfield. No. As a matter of fact, I think it would be in less trouble because people seem to think all the aid is economic, and they are not aware of the fact in my opinion that a great deal of it is the military.

Mr. Spivak. Senator Mansfield, the American people have been told over and over again by the press that the administration isn't telling them the truth about South Vietnam——

Senator Mansfield. The administration is telling them the truth.

Mr. Spivak. You say that the administration is telling them the truth?

Senator Mansfield. Yes.

Mr. Spivak. Do you mind telling us what the truth is? Are we as close to catastrophe as some commentators and some columnists have been saying?

Senator Mansfield. It depends on what columnist or commentator you have reference to. Some want us to go all the way to the Sino-Soviet border. Others want us to pull out entirely and create a great overall Asian area. I would say that the press on the whole has carried a pretty accurate account of events over there. I have no fault to find with the press reports from Vietnam, and I think that the President has been most frank in his discussions with the American people, and he has had a number of meetings with the bipartisan leadership—12 or 13—most of which disscuss such things as Vietnam and the like.

Mr. Spivak. I am talking about the situation, there. How serious is the situation there? Is there any danger that we may have to withdraw altogether? Are we close to disastrous defeat?

Senator Mansfield. No, I do not see that possibility at the moment. The situation is delicate, difficult, and dangerous. There is this matter of deciding which is the legal government there because while Huong and Suu are still in power, the Higher Council has been removed, because of the third or fourth coup since the downfall of Diem. We are not at all certain what the position of General Khanh is at the moment, and what we are doing now, I think, is paying for the mistake of getting rid of Diem when we did.

Mr. Spivak. Is it your belief that we can win in South Vietnam or simply that we can hold on, indefinitely?

Senator Mansfield. To win in South Vietnam is to insure the integrity and the independence of South Vietnam, and I think that can be done if there is time. Whether or not there is time remains to be seen.

Mr. Spivak. Senator, on the Congo you have said it is primarily an African problem and the United States ought not to become more deeply involved there.

Senator Mansfield. That is correct.

Mr. Spivak. What would you do at this point, withdraw all aid and support from Tshombe?

Senator Mansfield. We cannot at the moment do that, but I would say that the responsibility primarily should fall on the European countries which used to be the owners of the colonies, which existed prior to independence. Unfortunately, too many of these countries are having difficulties internally over such matters as tribalism, religious difficulties, and the like, and they do not seem to have achieved the maturity which goes with independence and the responsibility which that job entails. Therefore, I would say that we should not become involved in the African continent—and I have said that as long ago as 4 years, because I think we are involved too much, in too many places, in too many parts of the world. At the present time we have mutual security agreements with something on the order of 42 countries, and if we were called upon to comply with more than one of them at any one time, I think we would be in great difficulty.

Mr. Spivak. Suppose the Russians and the Chinese and the Algerians and the Egyptians continue to work against Tshombe, and Europe doesn't assume its obligations, what do we do, abandon them?

Senator Mansfield. I would say if it came to that, let the Africans take care of the situation themselves. Let the Chinese and the Russians fight it out among themselves for control, and I think they will be in worse trouble if they do than anybody is at that moment.

Mr. Spivak. You would withdraw entirely, then?

Senator Mansfield. Economic aid, assistance of that sort, fine, but I certainly would not send in American troops nor would I send in American military assistance except in limited quantities and only for the most urgent of reasons.

Mr. Otten. With the heavy Democratic majorities in both Houses, do you think there is a danger that this will become a rubber-stamp Congress giving the President just everything he wants, or do you think there will be fights?

Senator MANSFIELD. There will be fights. This will not be a rubberstamp Congress. There was no rubberstamp Congress under Eisenhower, under Kennedy, or under Johnson since he assumed the Presidency. After all, these Senators, the Members of the Congress, are men of mature judgment. They have to make their own decisions. They will do what they think is right, and there will be differences, naturally.

Mr. OTTEN. Can you spot, yet, the major areas where the Congress will probably differ with the President?

Senator MANSFIELD. At the moment, no.

Mr. OTTEN. Do you know what will be the first major bill to pass the Senate? Can you tell that yet?

Senator MANSFIELD. It is our intention to call up the Appalachia bill at the earliest opportunity. We think hearings should be very brief. This bill will pass the Senate overwhelmingly, and it shouldn't take much time to do that. Then we hope to take up such matters as water pollution and the like. We can't touch excise taxes or health care until the appropriate action has been taken by the House in those measures.

Mr. OTTEN. Do you expect that this Congress will repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, which permits State right-to-work laws?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think that it should, but I doubt that it will.

Mr. OTTEN. You don't think the Senate will vote for it, or the House—where will the problem be?

Senator MANSFIELD. I am doubtful at the moment whether it would come to a vote in the Senate and whether or not it would pass, I don't know.

Mr. MORRIS. It is reported that the President does not intend to propose repeal of this provision despite the fact that it was a major plank in the Democratic platform. At least he doesn't plan to propose it this year. Why is that? Do you agree with that decision?

Senator MANSFIELD. You will have to ask the President about that, I don't know.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you agree with the decision? Should it be postponed and why?

Senator MANSFIELD. He has to make his own decisions as to what he intends to do with the promises made in the Democratic platform.

Mr. MORRIS. What I was trying to get at, should we have the legislation this year, or should we wait until next year or wait——

Senator MANSFIELD. We ought to have the legislation, I think, at the soonest date possible, but I am doubtful that we will get it this year.

Mr. MORRIS. With regard to the general program, are there any particular reasons for taking a cautious approach in presenting a large program? Is it possible that Senator Goldwater's showing in the South, for example, will possibly cause southerners to defect more than usual from the administration's support?

Senator MANSFIELD. No; on the contrary, I think that those we have lost we will have returning pretty soon.

Mr. NESSEN. Senator, you have deplored today and in the past the overthrow of the Diem regime in Vietnam, and you have spoken as if the United States was responsible for that. Was that the case?

Senator MANSFIELD. That I do not know, but I do know this, that for 9 years Ngo Dinh Diem did maintain a certain amount of stability and a certain degree of civilian control which has been lacking since, and in my opinion he was the only man capable of bringing order out of chaos in South Vietnam and stability out of the peril which faces it today.

Mr. NESSEN. But did the CIA or any other agency of the United States condone or help the overthrow of Diem?

Senator MANSFIELD. That I couldn't say because I don't know.

Mr. NESSEN. The fact is he has now been ousted and assassinated and since then there has been a series of coups. What does the United States do now to form a stable government?

Senator MANSFIELD. It really isn't the responsibility of the United States to form a stable government. After all, this is a Vietnamese problem. They should have the ability to form the kind of government which could best succeed in bringing the people together after 20 years or more of war. All we can do is give them assistance, if asked, but certainly we cannot force them, or tell them, or order them what to do, nor should we.

Mr. NESSEN. But we can't win the war unless there is a stable government, isn't that right?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct, and there is no stable government at the present time, but I wouldn't say "we" can't win the war. If the war is going to be won, it is going to be won by the Vietnamese themselves, not by the Americans.

Mr. NESSEN. Are we close to a situation where perhaps a neutralist will gain control in Saigon and will ask the United States to break off its aid and to get out?

Senator MANSFIELD. I have read reports to that effect in the press. I have no knowledge that that is true.

Mr. NESSEN. You have, today, Senator, suggested that perhaps General de Gaulle's idea of a neutralized southeast Asia might be the way out of this, but have the Communists ever lived up to a neutralization agreement in that area? Our policy out there is based on their breaking of all the past agreements to neutralize Laos and Indochina.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is true, but then there are exceptions to every rule, and I would point out that what De Gaulle suggested was in generalities, not in specifics, that it applied to all of southeast Asia and that perhaps a proposal of this nature, if it is valid, would offer some hope for the future. If it doesn't, then we could throw it out the window.

Mr. NESSEN. And what would we have to do then, if they broke a neutralization agreement?

Senator MANSFIELD. We have had agreements before. The Geneva agreements for example, having to do with all of Indochina in 1954, I believe. The Geneva agreement having to do with Laos in 1962, and so far as the guarantors are concerned, I would say that a reasonable degree of acceptance has been upheld.

Mr. NESSEN. Senator, isn't it true that we actually have bombed a bit north of the border or else at least have helped the South Vietnamese carry on attacks on North Vietnam?

Senator MANSFIELD. To the best of my personal knowledge, I do not know. I have read reports to that effect in the press. That matter has never been discussed with the leadership, so I cannot give you a definite answer.

Mr. BROOKS. Gentlemen, we have about 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator MANSFIELD, each Congress seems to have some "must" legislation. Does this one have some "must" legislation, in your judgment?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes. The leftover bills which the Senate passed last year but were not carried through to completion: the Appalachian bill, the excise tax reduction, health insurance, and legislation having to do with education on a broadened basis and conservation.

Mr. SPIVAK. The President seems to be working awfully hard to keep his budget around the $100 billion figure or below it. Do you see much possibility that it will be kept there?

Senator MANSFIELD. If it can be done, Lyndon Johnson will do it.

Mr. SPIVAK. How much chance do you think there would be of getting through this Congress the kind of proposal that the Americans for Democratic Action really advise, and that is, a budget of $110 to $115 billion?

Senator MANSFIELD. No chance whatsoever.

Mr. OTTEN. Do you think that HUBERT HUMPHREY as Vice President will be able to play a very large role in the strategy and tactics of the Senate, more than just presiding over the sessions?

Senator MANSFIELD. The Vice-President-elect is a member of the executive branch. We will seek his advice and counsel, and we will be glad to have it. We think he can do a great deal of good for the President among Senators, and we will value his counsel.

Mr. OTTEN. But you would not assign him any sort of role within your own deliberations?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not at the moment; no.

Mr. OTTEN. Such as you once tried with Vice President Johnson?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, but when Vice President Johnson assumed those roles it was only on a sort of pro forma basis.

Mr. MORRIS. You said a few minutes ago, Senator, that any one of the 68 Democratic Senators would be—67, not counting yourself—would be satisfactory as a whip, who is your No. 1 assistant and who will work with you.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. That covers everyone, people from the South, North, East, and West—Senator EASTLAND, for example?

Senator MANSFIELD. Every single Democrat.

Mr. MORRIS. Every single one.

Mr. NESSEN. Senator, will there be any civil rights legislation proposed in this Congress?

Senator MANSFIELD. No. I do not know of any that will be or should be proposed.

Mr. NESSEN. Will there be an effort to change the rule to make it easier to cut off a filibuster?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think there will be. Whether or not it will be successful remains to be seen.

Mr. OTTEN. Will Senator ROBERT KENNEDY of New York have any special influence as a brother of a former President?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, he will just be 1 Senator among 100.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator MONRONEY evidently is planning to try to get some reforms once again in the Senate. Do you personally feel that there are some important reforms that must come?

Senator MANSFIELD. I certainly do, and I approve of MIKE MONRONEY's proposals 100 percent.

Mr. BROOKS. I am sorry to interrupt, but I see that our time is up. Thank you very much, Senator MANSFIELD, for being with us on "Meet the Press."

GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3818) to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 3818.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the so-called gold cover bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is correct.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 11, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1965:

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Harold P. Smith, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral, when retired, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10, 1965:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Donald W. Hoagland, Colorado, to be Assistant Administrator for Development Finance and Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Attorney General.

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Deputy Attorney General.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 5, 1965, was designated Southwestern University Day in Texas by proclamation by Gov. John Connally.

Southwestern University was established as such in 1843. It traces its beginning to the establishment of Rutersville University, the first institution of higher education in Texas, which was established in 1840 at Rutersville by a pioneer Methodist minister, Martin Ruter.

This university is affiliated with the Methodist church. When the present charter was issued the privileges of graduates of Southwestern University were granted to the graduates of the Methodist schools preceding Southwestern. The charter was set on February 5, 1840.

Southwestern University has served the youth of Texas and the country continuously for 125 years. It has been located in Georgetown, Tex., since 1873.

The liberal arts college, outstanding in its field, has been referred to as the "mother of higher education in Texas" because of the many remarkable young men and women who have passed through its doors to achieve prominent success in their chosen fields.

Among its graduates, to mention a few, are at least two U.S. Senators, five bishops of the Methodist church, seven college presidents, two justices of the Supreme Court of Texas, one chief judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, several Federal judges, and many distinguished doctors, ministers, attorneys, businessmen, and educators.

In proportion to enrollment Southwestern ranks in the upper 2 percent of all colleges in the number of graduates listed in "Who's Who in America."

It has been my privilege to visit this campus many times, and I am personally acquainted with many of the faculty for whom I have the highest regard. Always the visitor is made to feel at home; always the visitor is impressed with feeling that here the finest of education in the liberal arts is offered; that here a deep sense of history permeates the faculty and student body.

Southwestern University is a most unusual and unique school, and one that not only survived some rough years but is now destined to become one of the largest educational institutions under Methodism in the southwestern part of the United States.

All Texans are proud to join in the recognition of this occasion. All will forever be indebted to Southwestern University for the contribution it has made to the educational, cultural, and religious life in our State.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko (1746–1817)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Tadeusz Kosciuszko was one of the gallant and brave soldiers of fortune who was always willing to go anywhere and serve under any banner for the good cause of freedom and liberty. This gifted son of a well-to-do Polish peasant family was destined to be a soldier of rare distinction. He was born on February 12—the birthday of our own President Lincoln—219 years ago. He lost his father when he was 13 years old, but his yearning for education led him to the Royal School at Warsaw in 1765. He graduated from that school in 1769 with the rank of captain and earned a scholarship to France where he entered the famous military school at Mezieres, specializing in artillery and engineering. In 1776 he was in Paris, and there be heard of the American Revolution. That stirred his imagination and his restless soul. At once he saw his chance for action in a good cause, and with borrowed money he sailed for America, arriving in Philadelphia in August of that same year.

On his arrival he applied for military service, and of course was admitted. First he was employed to draw up plans for the fortifications of the Delaware River. The successful completion of these plans earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army. In the spring of next year he joined the Northern Army at Ticonderoga, and there he advised on the fortifications of Fort Defiance. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently he saw action at Charleston, S.C., and was one of the first Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British.

In recognition of his signal services for the cause of the Revolution he was made a brigadier general on October 13, 1783. A year later he returned to Poland, hoping to serve there for the Polish cause. In 1789 he was made a major general in the Polish Army, and for many years continued to lead his unfortunate Polish compatriots in their hopeless fight against forbidding odds. He was sadly disappointed in his gallant attempts. Heart broken, he ended his career in exile in Switzerland. On his 219th birthday, we do homage to his memory.

Fino Seeks 10-Percent Across-the-Board Rise in Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced my bill calling for a 10-percent across-the-board rise in social security benefits.

As the costs of living continue to rise, it becomes more and more important to raise social security payments to realistic minimums. Our senior citizens are being starved in the name of economy.

We are told every day by the administration and news media that we are in a period of unparalleled financial prosperity. Surely we are rich enough to provide large enough social security payments that the prosperity we enjoy is not marred by the poverty of our dependent senior citizens. It seems to me that a 10-percent across-the-board rise in social security payments is more than overdue.

I trust that the Ways and Means Committee will give serious and favorable consideration to this humantarian piece of legislation.

Government Island, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in my Eighth Congressional District of California, is a very important Coast Guard facility; namely, Government Island. Government Island has been the site of Federal agency activities since 1917 when the U.S. Shipping Board used the island as a construction center for World War I concrete ships. In 1922 the Shipping Board transferred its holdings to the U.S. Department of Agriculture which in turn placed the land in the hands of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. The latter department still maintains a depot on the island.

The Coast Guard came to the island in 1926 and established a base using the wharf and some of the office space of the Bureau of Roads. In September 1931, the Coast Guard acquired 15 acres of land from the Department of Commerce to establish a permanent base.

Today this base consists of the entire 67 acre island, 49 buildings, wharfage for 3 major cutters and numerous small craft, and is the only Coast Guard training center in the western part of the United States. Staffed by 34 officers and 258 men, one of the important missions of this base is to serve as a Coast Guard training facility.

A function of the training operation is a marching unit, which consists of a band, color guard, and honor guard all under the supervision of Lt. (jg) G. C. Kornish.

The commanding officer of this training center, Capt. O. D. Weed, Jr., has recently told me that between August 1, 1963, and November 11, 1964, the marching unit has appeared at 88 performances, 43 of which were competitive parades. In these 43 parades the units have won 73 trophies, 59 of which were first-place honors. Eighty-one percent of the trophies were first-place awards.

In reality this unit is quite unique among military drill teams. Most drill teams consist of select, experienced servicemen using light-weight drill rifles. The Coast Guard group is an all-recruit team of men with only a few weeks to less than 3 months of military training. They also use the standard 9-pound M–1 rifle, which weighs 11 pounds with bayonet attached.

The band is normally comprised of 20 recruits, chosen from the recruit battalion, who have had prior experience with high school or college bands, and an additional 10 seamen apprentices who played with the band while undergoing recruit training, and who have been selected to continue for an additional 6 months. There are no rated musicians playing in the band.

All practice must be performed after normal training hours.

The honor guard is under the direction of Howard G. Ischar, petty officer in charge. The band director is Dallas N. Archibald, MU–P1. The drum major of the band is Lynn T. Crisler, SN.

We, in northern California, are very proud of the fine achievements of this marching unit. I am confident that its high standards of excellence and fine performance make the Government Island Coast Guard Band, color guard, and honor guard among the finest in the Nation.

Issues and Answers—ABC Radio and Television Program With Senator Dirksen as Guest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the Issues and Answers program on ABC Radio and Television, Sunday, February 7, 1965, on which I was the guest.

There being no objection, the text of the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUES AND ANSWERS, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1965

(Guest: Senator EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, Senate minority leader; interviewed by John Scali, ABC diplomatic correspondent, and Keith McBee, ABC Capitol Hill correspondent)

The ANNOUNCER. Senate minority leader, EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, here are the issues:

Do you approve of the American air attacks against North Vietnam?

Can we win the fight against the Communists in southeast Asia?

Is President Johnson handling General de Gaulle correctly?

Now for the answers from the dominant voice of the Senate Republicans, Senator EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois.

To interview Senator DIRKSEN, ABC Capitol Hill correspondent, Keith McBee, and ABC diplomatic correspondent, John Scali.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, welcome to "Issues and Answers."

Senator DIRKSEN. Thank you.

Mr. SCALI. Was the Republican leadership consulted by the President in advance of our decision to retaliate against North Vietnam and what do you think of the decision?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, they were consulted. If by "Republican leadership" you mean the Republican leader in the House and the Republican leader of the Senate. The Speaker was also consulted and likewise the majority leader in the Senate, so there was consultation as to the exact situation that developed, why it developed, and what they hoped they might do to meet the situation.

Mr. SCALI. Well, do you approve of the decision?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, I think I do, knowing all the facts. First it must be remembered there was a holiday in Vietnam, and in Vietminh, also, meaning the northern half of that area. And when the holiday was over in the light of the fact that the new Soviet leader, Mr. Kosygin, was out there, there came this attack. It was a complete surprise, of course. It was not anticipated although I suppose they are prepared, generally speaking, for whatever attacks may come, knowing that it is guerrilla warfare and that they strike without any advance notice. And in response to it, something had to be done and action was taken.

Mr. McBEE. Senator, as in the case of the Tonkin Gulf attacks of last summer will this action by the President necessitate Senate approval or House approval?

Senator DIRKSEN. Now that we are there and in the light of the resolution that we passed some time back, I believe, in his authority as Commander in Chief and other authority that the President is amply weaponed with all the necessary authority to take what action must be taken.

Mr. McBEE. The old resolution holds up still?

Senator DIRKSEN. That is right. And then of course I think he relies in part—and rightly so—upon the understanding that was had back in 1953 or 1954, after Dienbienphu fell and we had to determine after the Geneva Conference what we would do with respect to Vietnam, the preservation of a stable government out there and the preservation of a government at all against outside attack, meaning, of course, the Communist attack.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, I know, because you are vitally interested in this development, that you have been in touch with the White House not only before but since. What do you know about the results of the attacks?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, I would have to give you a general answer, of course. I am pretty sure, based upon conversations, and a conversation with the President no later than this day—in fact, early this day—that immediate action was taken. Secondly, that it was deemed to be adequate, insofar as results are known, so that no time was lost in meeting this situation.

Mr. McBEE. Senator, John here broke a pretty good story the other night. He said that he had ascertained the Russians were thinking about supplying the North Vietnamese with the same kind of antiaircraft rockets that they had given Castro. Do you think that this action, especially with Mr. Kosygin in Hanoi, might deter them from such an action?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, that, of course, is in the speculative field. Obviously I do not know. The Russians may do it. They may send them to China and let the Red Chinese do it. Assuming, of course, they are on speaking terms, and they must be, since Kosygin did stop off and have a visit with the Red leaders of China. But whether rockets have been moved in is a matter I can't say, unless I had knowledge. That knowledge presently I do not have.

Mr. SCALI. The fact that Premier Kosygin was visiting Hanoi at the time must have been an important factor in the decision on whether to strike at this time in retaliation. What is your understanding of this, Senator?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, actually without having knowledge and perhaps no understanding, I have a fairly clear idea of what this must add up to because if Mr. Kosygin had first visited with the Red Chinese leaders before he went to Hanoi and possibly Hai Phong also in that upper area, and then the holiday came over, they had the dinner for Kosygin and then the attack comes, obviously they are waiting to see what the reaction from South Vietnam and the United States is going to be.

Now if I were sitting there musing and speculating on the subject I might come to the conclusion, if there were no reaction at all that perhaps we were getting ready to pull out, or we were not wanting to take a chance on a deeper intervention by the Chinese and by the Soviet Union, and I think as a speculative matter it is highly important, and if I had to make the determination, I would have made exactly the same determination, namely to retaliate and to be sure that it was adequate retaliation.

Mr. McBEE. The time is good then, and we surprised them?

Senator DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. SCALI. You think, then, there was no alternative, in view of what the provocation was?

Senator DIRKSEN. Not unless you want all of the Orient to suddenly feel that we have lost face, and you would want the whole wide world to feel that either we were so weak or so disinclined that we would not take any action.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, after we attacked the gunboat bases following the Gulf of Tonkin incident, the Chinese and the North Vietnamese did not themselves retaliate against these attacks. What do you think the outlook is now, is it riskier than it was previously?

Senator DIRKSEN. Of course—there I go out on a limb, in other words. It is a wholly speculative answer.

Mr. SCALI. Right.

Senator DIRKSEN. You cannot tell, there is no basis for any surmise as to what they might do. They might believe that we are really serious about this business and this may be the end of it for a while except these little sorties across the border in order to keep the guerrilla warfare steamed up.

Mr. McBEE. Senator, is not this beginning to take the shape of a policy? We have this long war of attrition in Vietnam which we are attempting to win on the ground and yet periodically when a political crises especially looms, then we strike, as in the case of Tonkin and as in the case of the attacks today. Do you think this is our long-standing, long-range policy?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, it is our policy as of the moment because, first, let me say we have three choices: We can do what we are doing at the present time and we can give, if they assault us. We could move across that parallel with everything we have got. Who knows what kind of retaliation it will invite. And third, we could pull out if we so desired. But my own notion about pulling out is that we forsake the southern end of our outside Pacific perimeter which runs from Korea to Vietnam, and if that is done, why your flank is turned, military speaking, and then what happens to Guam and to the trustee islands and to the Philippines out in the Pacific, because you are going to have to maintain that flank, whether or no.

Mr McBEE. Well, not to belabor the point but doesn't it appear that we maintain the ground war until hopefully ultimate victory but occasionally we have to bring them up short?

Senator DIRKSEN. Right. Of course our first job out there, if we can get it done, is to establish some kind of political stability. That is one of the real problems in Vietnam today. It hasn't worked out too well as yet, what with the fall of three or four governments since the Diem government. Now then we have to work at it because unless you have stability you have exactly nothing. At the same time you have got to maintain a military posture out there in order to support that government and to defend it and throw a shield around it against these constant and almost uninterrupted attacks from the north.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, do you think there was any alternative to this attack on our part? Do you think that silence or doing nothing would have been completely misunderstood?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, the alternative, as you know, when interpreted in the Orient, is actually not an alternative at all for us because unless you stand your ground, unless you meet the attacks that are made—and this was a serious attack it is my understanding now, the latest report which may not have actually gotten out as yet, is that there were over a hundred who were wounded in addition to those who were killed. Well, this is a pretty serious attack.

Mr. McBEE. We agree on that, but I must interrupt for just a moment. In just a moment we will be back with more issues.

(Announcements.)

Mr. McBEE. Senator DIRKSEN, so far as you know do all of our military leaders concur with the military action in Vietnam today?

Senator DIRKSEN. I am reasonably sure, and it is based upon an inquiry that I made, that they do concur unanimously, and that goes for General Taylor and it goes for General Westmoreland as well, who are on the ground.

Mr. McBEE. Well, General Taylor all along has favored some sort of escalation of the war. I assume this is along the lines of his suggestion to the White House.

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, and I think what action has taken place is quite in line with any suggestion that Taylor made.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, do you expect the President will call the joint congressional leaders to the White House in the next few days to discuss this and give them the latest information?

Senator DIRKSEN. Without actually knowing, I would say it is entirely impossible, now, knowing the President and having sat across from him in that Senate Chamber for many years, fought, bled, and died together oftentimes——

Mr. SCALI. Do you mean possible? I thought you said "impossible."

Senator DIRKSEN. No. I was going to say having fought, bled, and died together up there a good many times, I know what his attachment is to the Congress and how anxious he is to have the people's elected representatives know all the time what is going on, so, on the basis of his penchant for having these leadership meetings when there is a serious problem before the country, I would guess that before too long there will be a leadership meeting.

Mr. McBEE. Senator, what is the point of crisis that leaves you in a completely bipartisan position? In 1962 in the Cuban missile crisis you said to President Kennedy "You take care of the Nation, I will take care of the Republicans." In matters of emergency like this, you depart party and become the Senate leader who will back the administration——

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, let me put it on a broader ground. We have always taken the position that we are entitled to be informed as to what is going on abroad where we are involved, and we are entitled to have a chance to offer any suggestion, any substitutes, any alternatives that come to mind. But when that chance has been afforded and the time comes to make a hard decision, we feel that we have got to conjoin because this is a hostile world full of fever and this country cannot afford to show a disunited face to the world and in consequence we have invariably pursued that line.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, on both occasions when we have struck across the border and hit military targets in North Vietnam, we have announced that it was in specific retaliation for Communist attacks against American forces.

How do you stand generally, sir, on the idea of additional strikes into North Vietnam, not necessarily in specific retaliation but as a means of bringing home to the Communists that we are not going to pull out and that if they continue this policy of infiltration it will risk a bigger war?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, first let's be clear that what happened, now, is strictly a retaliatory move and does not contemplate going any further than that. Now that is a matter of broad policy as to whether or not you go beyond retaliation and strike, let us say, the industrial area of Hanoi and Hai Phong. It is not for me to say. It is a decision for the President and the National Security Council. But I think at all times they are fully aware that you might get retaliation in reply, and who knows to what extent, and in what volume that may come, and how deeply we could become involved with Red China and for that matter the Soviet Union if she proposes to supply weapons to Red China and then in turn to North Vietnam?

Mr. SCALI. Do you think as conditions are developing there a total victory for the side of freedom is possible?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, patience is a virtue, you know, where guerrilla warfare is involved. Look how long it took the British. Was it 13 years in Malaysia, before final freedom eventuated and even now the British are out there in larger numbers and have to defend it. So if you are trying to save the freedom, liberty, the stability, and the form of government of a country like Vietnam with 11 or 12 million people, you have got to summon a lot of patience. And it is evidenced, of course, by the fact that since this all began after the Geneva undertaking in 1954, we have had 54,000 of our American advisers in and out. That is a rather euphemistic term, as you know, when you talk about advisers, but that is the fact. And so there may be as many as 23,000 or 24,000 at the present time. You have to summon up all the patience in the book in dealing with a situation of that kind.

Mr. McBEE. Senator, there was loose talk before this program that politics might creep into our little discussion.

Recently you have undergone an election not of your making. A great many pundits and columnists have said that the real Republican leadership in your party, which is not enjoying some disarray at this moment, falls upon you, and you yourself have said in announcing the GOP Coordinating Committee some weeks ago that the elected Republican is the Republican leader.

Don't you feel, sir, that the mantle of Republican leadership indeed rests upon your shoulders at this time?

Senator DIRKSEN. I am not so sure about that. Let us say it rests on a number of shoulders. But there is this fact: You have 172 Republican Senators and Congressmen serving in this, the 89th Congress. Now they come here with the suffrage of the people. And consequently they are entitled to and they do go on the record with respect to all questions of policy, both domestic and foreign. They couldn't escape a kind of leadership if they wanted to because here it is. And they must go on the record and that record is a part of the scroll of the Republican Party for all the country and particularly the voters to see in 1966 when we go back to the polls in the bielection.

Now we try to coordinate all this. The Governors are elected, too. To be sure their principal orbit is the State domain and the State problems but no less they have an interest in national affairs. That would be true of those who have been candidates for the Presidency, or who have been President of the United States. Eisenhower and Landon, and in the candidate field Goldwater, Nixon, and Dewey. Consequently they like to be heard and they have been leaders of the party.

Now if you coordinate all that and get the necessary task forces, together with the implementing personnel, and base that on the national committee and then, of course, lay it before your elected Congressmen and Senators, you have a pretty cohesive force where you have a sharing of the leadership.

Mr. McBee. But Senator, in front of all this hydra is a voice and that is the Senate minority leader, isn't it?

Senator Dirksen. Don't derogate it all to the Senate minority leader. There is a very distinguished House minority leader, too, Jerry Ford, of Michigan, and a very capable leader indeed, I must say. So maybe we are the funnels and maybe the joint leadership meetings which we try to contrive, every week, if possible, is the forum where these things have to be beaten out and then, of course, given to you at the press conferences that follow.

Mr. Scali. Senator, do you think much progress has been made in changing the image of the Republican Party that is presented to the people? The reason I ask that question is that some critics and indeed some members of the Republican Party felt that perhaps Senator Goldwater presented too conservative an image and this was a factor in the election defeat.

Senator Dirksen. Well, you know I don't get fired up, particularly, about this question of images. I have always said that the record has to be the image, and everybody contributes to it. Because an image is an amorphous and composite thing. So we try to build the image by what we do because that is the thing that ultimately counts.

We had some difficulties in the late unpleasantness of 1964, if I can refer to it in that fashion, and I think too often, of course, what one man may have said, even as an aside or even to a reporter, too often was dramatized and made to appear that that was a party position when as a matter of fact it wasn't.

Take for instance TVA. Actually what was disclosed in the press didn't come from our candidate. Never said it in that fashion at all. It was speculating. But it didn't go for the rest of the party. I was here when TVA was established. I was against it to begin with. You are not so naive, after more than 30 years in Washington. You know very well you couldn't dislodge TVA if you wanted to. But just think of the impact of such a statement upon those who are wedded to the idea of public power. And if I went on, I would have the whole campaign laid out for you right like now.

Mr. Scali. Senator, if we could just get into the international area a bit more, as you well know, General de Gaulle let the United States have it in two specific areas this week (a) he attacked the dollar as a medium of exchange and he suggested a conference to put the United Nations back on the track, in his view, by including Red China in some kind of discussion.

How do you stand on those proposals?

Senator Dirksen. Well, first of all it would appear to me that De Gaulle's gold proposals meet no favor anywhere with those who are expert in that field. Goodness knows I am no monetary expert. I was here when we passed the Gold Reserve Act in 1934. As I recall, I voted against it. They said at that time there were 13 people in this country who knew all about money and I wasn't one of them. So I played trump and I voted against it. But just look at this picture today. We have about four or five gold mines more or less. We have one that is a real producer. Tell me where in the world are you going to get the gold for gold cover for deposits in the Federal Reserve System and for the Federal Reserve notes? It is not fair. And we have to depend on the dollar. And thank goodness that the rest of the world clings to that dollar because that is the best piece of money there is in the world today.

Mr. McBee. General de Gaulle pretty much must have anticipated the reaction to his suggestion. Why do you think he likes to tweak our nose?

Senator Dirksen. I am not sure whether that is just an inborn characteristic, whether it was meant, of course, to gain some publicity—although why should a man of the stature of Charles de Gaulle have to resort to those things in order to get publicity? He doesn't have to. All he would have to do is to set foot outside the palace and they are ready to take his photograph and hang on every word. And I am glad it is that way. But these little shots in the dark may fire his imagination a little bit, but it hasn't perturbed or caused any rumblings in the financial chancelleries of the world, fortunately.

Mr. McBee. Thank you, sir. In just a moment we will be back with more "Issues and Answers."

(Announcement.)

Mr. Scali. Senator, the Communists are claiming that they shot down some of the American planes that attacked these installations. From your conversations what do you know about our losses?

Senator Dirksen. Well, it is entirely possible, and the lowest picture as I got it this morning is a good deal larger than it was last night when I got these reports. It indicates, of course, the dimension of this action over there and that they are playing for keeps.

Mr. Scali. Well, we are, too?

Senator Dirksen. Oh, indeed we have to.

Mr. Scali. Well, Senator, how do you go on this business of perhaps introducing American fighting troops if necessary in order to win the war?

Senator Dirksen. Well, what are these advisers doing if they are not advising and giving necessary training to fighting people? Because that is our real role over there. The Vietnamese picture and the Vietnamese Army has to be kept in the very middle of this situation all the time, and our best operation of course is to give them the best weapons possible and the best kind of training in order to meet this jungle and guerrilla warfare.

Mr. McBee. Senator Dirksen, we have not run out of subjects certainly but out of time. Thank you very much for being with us on "Issues and Answers."

The Announcer. Our guest this week has been Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican of Illinois, Senate minority leader. He was interviewed by ABC Diplomatic Correspondent John Scali and ABC Capital Hill Correspondent Keith McBee.

Next week at this same time "Issues and Answers" will bring you the leading ladies of the United Nations, with U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Mrs. Marietta Tree, Nicaraguan Ambassador to the United Nations, Senora Hope des Somosa, and the Liberian Ambassador to the United Nations, Mrs. Angieu Elizabeth Brooks. We hope you will be with us.

Threat Posed to Our Gold Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I take issue with the President's rose-colored picture of our national financial position. The threat posed to our gold reserves by France and possibly Germany is very real. The gold drain will probably get worse, not better. Yet here we have the President, shrinking from the tough measures needed to keep dollars at home. He proposes the expansion of the interest equalization tax. He proposes a piddling cutback in the amount of goods tourists can bring back into the United States. The rest of his proposals are based on "effort" and "cooperation." To match his rosy picture, he has proposed a lackadaisical policy, which does not have nearly enough teeth in it.

I urge specifically that the following measures be considered: Higher interest rates in the United States to attract foreign capital and brake U.S. demand for foreign goods; a multimillion-dollar crash program to attract far larger tourist crowds to the United States; greater participation by our allies in sharing costs of U.S. oversea defense facilities; a cutback of U.S. participation in oversea development loan setups like the Inter-American Development Bank, which programs are tantamount to foreign aid. These are tough measures—the situation is a tough situation. The President has not faced up to the true depth of the challenge.

Address by Hon. Douglas Dillon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Hon. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the 16th annual dinner of the Brooklyn division of the Jewish National Fund, held at the Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N.Y., on Sunday, January 31, 1965:

Remarks by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury

I am indeed happy to be with you tonight—at the invitation of my good friend Congressman Eugene Keogh—and to join in celebrating the continued success of the Jewish National Fund in its great and humanitarian work of transforming barren wastes of land in Israel, into places green with trees, where abundant crops can grow, and where men can settle and work and thrive.

The fruits of your good work are indeed impressive. Since 1948, when the State of Israel came into being, more than 100,000 acres of land have—through the efforts of your organization—been cleared, drained, and prepared for cultivation. Over 70 million trees have been planted to protect the soil from erosion and to enrich the landscape. More than 1,700 kilometers of roads have been laid through terrain that is both mountainous and rocky. Today three-quarters of a million people live on land leased by the Jewish National Fund.

You have begun a program to reclaim the barren and unsettled north central portion of Israel and bring it within the mainstream of Israel's growing economy. More particularly, this, the Brooklyn division of the JNF, is engaged in a $2 million project—Kiryat Brooklyn—to reclaim land next to the Jordanian border in the north central portion of Israel. I am sure that not long after its completion 3 years from now, Kiryat Brooklyn, peopled with thousands of settlers, rich in cultivated acreage and fruit trees, will more than fulfill your hopes and justify your efforts. It will serve as a living testimonial to the excellent support the work of the Jewish National Fund has always received from its Brooklyn division—particularly under the leadership of such men as State Senator William Rosenblatt, your division president; Mr. Isaiah O. Zucker and Mr. Morris Putter, the cochairman of the Kiryat Brooklyn project; and Mr. Henry Solomon, the chairman of the board of the Brooklyn division.

Your efforts, therefore, have done much and will do more to help the State of Israel grow and prosper. I know that you are justly proud of your success—for it has not been easy and the obstacles have been many. The late President Kennedy once stated—and I quote—that:

"Just as our own West has sustained progress against the impacts of serious farm depressions, crop failures, credit crises, and droughts, so, too, Israel has had to exist on narrow margins of survival, in a constant climate of hostility and outside danger. Yet it has endured and its integrity remains unimpaired, and this success can be in a large measure attributed to the Jewish National Fund."

It is indeed fitting that the JNF is now honoring our great President's memory through the establishment of the John F. Kennedy Peace Forest near Jerusalem.

Private efforts by citizen's groups such as yours have been accompanied by our Government's efforts to help the people of Israel build a free and prosperous country. To speak only of one current matter involving my own Treasury Department, delegations from the United States and Israel reached agreement last October on the substantive provisions of an income tax treaty to promote trade between the two countries and to encourage U.S. private investment in Israel. This treaty provides, among other things, that the United States will grant to its taxpayers who invest in qualified enterprises in Israel a tax credit equal to 7 percent of their capital investments in those enterprises. In other respects as well, this treaty—which will shortly, we hope, be ready for signature by both Governments and then for final approval by the U.S. Senate and the Israel Parliament—should serve as a decided spur to greater American private investment, and thus greater economic growth, in Israel.

I am hopeful that 1965 will see the formal signature and ratification of that treaty by both countries. I know that the year will bring continued success to your efforts to give new life to barren earth in Israel.

Here at home, 1965 promises to be among the most fruitful in our history—a year in which we make new beginnings toward reclaiming barren or blighted aspects in our own national life, toward creating that America of social well-being that we have long dreamed of and left too long unrealized, toward the building of that Great Society to which President Johnson has summoned the Nation anew.

We have in recent decades met and mastered crises and challenges upon whose resolution rested our future as a Nation and the fate of the world. The great depression, the Second World War, the cold war—these have been all-encompassing problems whose solution has required our alert and undivided attention, our utmost energies, and all our resources. But while, in certain crucial respects, the times are now more dangerous than ever—for today we live always under the shadow of a nuclear cloud, as the Cuban missile crisis taught us not so long ago—they are also more calm.

For we have learned to live with the cold war, and to accept the burdens and pressures our Nation must bear as the leader of the free world. We have largely accomplished our freely chosen task of helping rebuild and rejuvenate a Europe ravaged by war, and we can expect that in the future Europe will assume more of the burden of helping the underdeveloped countries of the world pursue their own destinies in freedom and economic well-being.

And at home we are just completing our fourth year of sustained economic upsurge—the longest period of peacetime growth in our history. Since the start of the sixties, our total national output—measured in constant dollars—has grown by more than one-fifth. Jobs and incomes, profits and investment have reached new highs with almost monotonous regularity. And we have shielded these gains from the blight of inflation by maintaining a record of price stability unexcelled anywhere in the world.

To be sure, no one imagines that we have conquered the business cycle, either for the time being or for all time. Nor can we claim to have solved all our economic problems, for we still have many. But we have learned over the past 4 years that recession is not inevitable, and we have come to a new confidence in our ability to keep the American economy moving in all kinds of weather. In short, we stand on economic ground firm enough for us to turn our attention—far more than ever before in our history—to mounting a concentrated, reasoned and vigorous attack upon some of the acute social problems too long obscured or ignored in the life of our land.

Never have our prospects for success in that venture been brighter. For not only have we an abundance of technical, social, and economic resources, but we have arrived, I think, at a new national resolve to translate good intentions into practical and effective action. We have arrived at a new understanding that in efforts of this kind success does not, and cannot, come all at once, but comes slowly, often grudgingly, and over long periods of time. In a word, we have arrived at a new and dynamic realism in our approach to the social problems confronting us—and, in so doing, we have abandoned any resort to sweeping, impractical panaceas as either substitutes for action or excuses for inaction. As President Johnson's proposals well demonstrate, we have discovered that to be bold, we need not be rash—that to be practical or prudent, we need not be timid.

The list of problems in our society is long. But in any such list, the three most crucial problems—those which underly and encompass all the rest—are poverty, prejudice, and ignorance.

In launching the war on poverty and in leading the struggle for adoption of the Civil Rights Act last year, President Johnson helped awaken and arm the conscience of the Nation against poverty and prejudice as never before. All of us, I think, are becoming more acutely aware of how impossible it is to insulate ourselves behind a wall of unconcern—for in such matters, as events have taught us, unconcern is complicity, and to ignore the injustices of poverty and prejudice is to condone them.

As our moral vision is becoming sharper and clearer, and our conscience more aroused, we are also beginning to see how deep and pervading is the injury of poverty and prejudice to our national life. We are beginning to understand how these evils rend, not only the moral and social fabric of our society, but its economic fabric as well. We are beginning to become aware of how these evils impoverish the lives of all of us economically as well as morally.

Thirty-five million Americans—one out of every five citizens of the world's wealthiest nation—live in poverty. They not only fail to share adequately in the abundance enjoyed by the large majority of Americans, but they cannot contribute to our Nation's life and growth as fully as other Americans. To put it purely in terms of dollars and cents: Two-thirds of our poor families have an average income of $2,000 or less. If this could be raised just beyond $3,000—just over the poverty line—their total annual income would be $7 billion higher. As they spent this money in the local grocery or clothing store, and the local storeowner in his turn spent this money, and the money was thus spent and respent throughout the economy, it would lift the Nation's total annual output by an estimated $14 billion a year—with all the extra jobs, incomes, and profits that would mean.

On economic, therefore, as well as human grounds, poverty exacts from all of us a considerable price. And so does racial prejudice. Almost half of our nonwhite population lives in poverty, as compared with 16 percent of our white population. Unemployment figures tell much the same story. Last year, for example, nonwhite workers had more than twice the unemployment rate of white workers.

Prejudice and poverty mean only limited educational opportunities for Negroes and others. Because of limited educational opportunities and the color line drawn at far too many employment doors, Negroes and others find themselves largely shunted off to lower paying semiskilled and unskilled jobs. And then, for the children of these Americans, begins the same vicious cycle in which their parents were caught; for prejudice and poverty will deprive them, too, of their full educational opportunities, and prejudice and inadequate education will limit them to low-paying jobs. And caught in this vicious cycle as well is the Nation's economy—for discrimination, as President Johnson has said, costs this Nation nearly $20 billion a year, with all the jobs and incomes, profits and investment, and untold opportunities, that amount would mean.

In a report issued at the beginning of this month, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith said:

"At the very threshold of the Great Society looms a stubborn obstacle—the residue of prejudice left by the long years of human slavery and segregation. * * * What law can do to outlaw discrimination, the bipartisan Civil Rights Act of 1964 has largely done. * * * But the urgent task now is to translate the law into realization. To that end it must be effectively enforced; it must be supplemented by enlightened community practices and attitudes."

For, as the report goes on to say, "the demands of equality of opportunity are not quite satisfied when the law opens the door and says, 'All may now enter,' if some are made to carry on their backs the burden of inherited poverty and educational deprivation."

In any effort to wipe out poverty and prejudice, there is no greater obstacle than ignorance—no greater ally than education. Two-thirds of those families whose breadwinner has had 8 years or less of schooling live in poverty. Unemployment among young people in the 18 to 24 age group with an eighth grade education or less is close to 20 percent—more than three times the unemployment average for the Nation as a whole. Yet, to cite statistics such as these—as if the story they tell were not stark enough—is barely to suggest how huge and critical is the educational challenge that confronts the Nation today. For the costs of education are rising, and our educational resources—at all levels—are already sorely overburdened at a time when our young people are reaching school age in enormous numbers and our society more and more demands skilled and trained talent.

We are moving vigorously to meet this challenge. Already President Johnson has signed legislation giving education in the United States its largest forward stride since land-grant colleges were established almost a century ago. And in his education message just 3 weeks ago he presented a program that, more perhaps than any in our history, would hasten that day in our land when ability to learn, rather than ability to pay, will be the sole standard of educational opportunity—when every child will have the opportunity, in the President's words, "to get as much education as he has the ability to take."

The tasks, then, ahead of us are great, and so are the opportunities. Never has the vision of that Great Society President Johnson has portrayed had better prospect of approaching so near to achievement. But how near it approached to achievement must depend not upon the efforts of Government alone, but also upon the united efforts of private citizens, of States and localities, upon the personal efforts of every American, to help reclaim those aspects of our national life laid waste by poverty, prejudice, ignorance, and all other sources of needless human suffering.

Thus can we replenish the wellsprings of our country's greatness, and give new life to our land as the place beyond all others where men and men's hopes can flourish in all freedom and dignity and justice.

Congressman Bob Sikes' Address to the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association, Atlanta, Ga., February 3, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very interesting address delivered by my good friend and colleague, ROBERT SIKES, of Florida, to the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association. This address was delivered in Atlanta, Ga., on February 3, 1965, and was well received by those present and widely reported by the Atlanta news media.

Even though the illustrious gentleman and outstanding Congressman BOB SIKES represents the fine State of Florida in our national Congress, it is with pride that I remind the Members of the House that he is a native of Sylvester, Worth County, Ga., which is located in the Second District of Georgia, the district which I so proudly represent in this body.

The address follows:

CONGRESSMAN BOB SIKES, ADDRESS TO THE SOUTHERN PULPWOOD CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, ATLANTA, GA., FEBRUARY 3, 1965

The Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association has an enviable opportunity to be one of the prime movers in the great story of the emerging industrial South. You are the producers of the raw material and the processors of some of our principal industrial products. You reach into virtually every community in the South. You are the principal economic support for a great many of these communities. Yours is one of the most important industries that we have.

I have enjoyed personal association and warm friendship with many of you. I know your people; I know your industry; I know something of your problems. So, I welcome this opportunity to talk with you about the present and the future of the pulpwood industry in light of existing and proposed legislation.

In the 88th Congress a series of measures were enacted which will have a far-reaching effect upon conservation and upon your industry. These were the Wilderness Act, the Land and Water Conservation Act, the Accelerated Public Works Act, and the Economic Opportunity Act, or antipoverty program. They will have an effect on forestry in general, on timber resource management, and specifically on your activities in the pulp and paper industry. They earned for the 88th Congress the term, "Conservation Congress." There is some good in all of these laws and some bad in most of them, but they are now law.

You can anticipate that there will be a prompt followup by the agencies of Government on all the tasks initiated by the new programs—the creation and expansion of the national wilderness system, the program of recreation land and water acquisition and development, and the Job Corps program. For years to come, Congress will be passing on the recommendations of the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior, and much will be done administratively. Congress will have no voice other than through control of appropriations.

The Wilderness Act will have little direct influence on us here in the South. Under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Forest Service plans to acquire land in the South primarily for recreation purposes. It should be pointed out that the act does not create additional Federal authority for the purchase of land. There are those who would seek wholesale purchases of forest land under this new legislation. But Congress must be consulted and Congress, in this field, generally can be expected to go slow.

There will be some impact on your activities as the result of the Job Corps provisions of the poverty program. I was an enthusiastic supporter of the old Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, and subsequently I sponsored Youth Conservation Corps bills. My enthusiasm for this program was lessened when it was presented to Congress as a part of the antipoverty program last year for I could envision what might happen if half wild Harlem youths were moved to the South to work in youth camps. Nevertheless, there are important needs in Federal forest, park, and natural resources development which conservation centers can help to meet. If they are properly administered and if discipline is maintained, they will serve as useful purpose.

Now, let's pass on to the area of new legislation. A major administration bill is the Appalachian Regional Development Act. This measure can be helpful to the forest industry. It can also mean overcontrol. In addition to providing for management of Appalachia's water resources, and the development of a broader transportation system in the region, the bill has a specific provision related to Appalachia's timber resources. Section 204 authorizes the establishment of private, nonprofit timber development organizations (TDO's) organized and operated under State law. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to provide technical assistance to these organizations and through a loan program, provide up to one-half of their initial capital requirements. Obviously, this could become a wide open program, and care must be exercised to keep program sponsors from going overboard.

The Forest Service plans to step up all of its programs in the Appalachia area.

A number of proposed new national recreation areas have been submitted to Congress for its approval, and there will be others. A national recreation area can be established only by act of Congress. Although such an area will be administered primarily for recreation, compatible utilization of other resources is to be permitted. Thus, there would be no wholesale locking up of the timber resource from future use and management.

Congress is becoming more aware of and sensitive to the growing demand for outdoor recreation opportunities. For example, this Congress will consider again a bill to coordinate recreation uses around Federal multiple purpose water resource projects. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson indicated that he would soon submit to Congress a Wild Rivers bill. There will be proposals to establish the Allegheny Parkway in North Carolina and Georgia. I have introduced a bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to permit local public groups to acquire lands for recreational development under rural redevelopment programs. This is intended to provide additional recreational opportunities in those areas where they now are limited.

Bills will be considered which in essence extend the soil bank program. However, I think that Congress is going to take a long look at the justification for a continuation of these programs.

Other proposed legislation of interest to you includes bills directed at a growing problem stemming from the misuse or overuse of pesticides. Some problem areas which will be treated will be the coordination of pesticide use by Federal agencies, research on the prevention of pesticide injury to fish and wildlife, establishment of standards for pesticides, control of related water pollution, and grants to the States for pesticide control.

In about 3½ years, Congress will receive the report of the Public Land Law Review Commission, established in the last Congress. The Commission will be engaged in a review of the policies applicable to the use, management, and disposition of the public domain lands of the United States. This will touch on problems and policies of forest management in public domains directly affecting you and affecting Government ownership of large holdings.

Another study affecting timberland would deal with strip mine reclamation. A bill has been reintroduced authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to study strip and surface mine operations to determine the best way to attain restoration of desolate spoil banks with trees and grasses.

The problem of water pollution is slated for further consideration by Congress. The Water Quality Act, which, in the last Congress passed the Senate and was reported by the House Public Works Committee, has again passed the Senate. The legislation would establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The bill includes procedures for the establishment of water quality standards applicable to interstate waters, and it provides for strengthening the enforcement measures of the Water Pollution Control Act. Water pollution is a growing problem. Historically, control measures have largely been left in the hands of the States. Efforts to tighten control and place it in Federal hands are gaining strength.

I think it almost certain there will be additional Federal regulation on the use of water and over water and air pollution. We must face the fact that in a nation growing like ours, some of this is necessary. It can be administered with a minimum of interference if that is what Congress and the people insist upon.

I am painting with a broad brush. I have not even mentioned some of the things in which you are most directly interested, and, of course, I intend to do so.

There probably are three principal bugaboos which are of paramount concern to your members. One of these is the withdrawal of the 12-man exemption for logging and forestry. This would bring the pulpwood producers under the wage-hour law.

The Secretary of Labor made a specific point in his endorsement of the proposed fair labor standards amendments in 1964 to urge repeal of 13(a)(15) which exempts small logging operations involving not more than 12 employees from the act's minimum wage and overtime provisions. The bill will be reintroduced and there will be a vigorous effort by the Department of Labor, the Labor Committees of Congress, and the unions, to expand the wage-hour law to include these workers.

The timber and pulpwood industries have been particularly concerned with this exemption. Attacks have been made upon it over the last several years, and each year the attacks are intensified. Operators state that if the 12-man exemption were removed small sawmill operators and a very high percentage of the pulpwood producers in the Southeast would find compliance with the wage-hour laws so difficult that most of them would be forced out of business. Obviously, a great many unskilled and semiskilled workers who now make good wages would become unemployed.

Last year as an entering wedge a proposal was made to require the producer to certify at the time he put his wood on the yard that it was produced at rates not less than the minimum wage without regard to overtime. This was successfully resisted, but it will be back.

If the 12-man exemption is removed, those producers who benefit by it would obviously be required to put a crew leader into the woods with each crew to keep the records required by the Wage-Hour Act. This, of course, would add to the financial difficulties of the producers. The principal sponsor of these changes know nothing of timber and pulpwood, or of southern industry—and couldn't care less.

Another is a rewording of the capital gains taxes on timber sales. The timber industry would stand only to lose by repeal or modification of the provision. With increasing taxes, it is growing constantly more difficult to own timber land and an adverse revision of the capital gains tax structure would probably make it impossible. As you know, this is under the jurisdiction of the House Ways and Means Committee which has taken a realistic approach in their studies of the problem. I am glad to state that the chairman of that committee assures me they expect to continue to look realistically at the problem.

A third is the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This section upholds the right-to-work laws which are existent in many States. I do not consider it properly within the purview of the Federal Government to strike down State constitutions by legislative acts of the Federal Congress. As I recall it, there are 20 States, including my own, having such laws. But, if it happens, and if the courts uphold it—the latter almost a foregone conclusion—it can be anticipated that your employees would soon be subject to compulsory union status.

There will be emphasis in some quarters on extending coverage of the wage-hours law to presently exempt employees—principally in the service industries. There is pressure to increase the minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.50 or even $2 per hour. There is also talk of reducing the maximum hours to be worked without overtime from 40 hours a week to as low as 32 hours per week. Shortening the workweek presents obvious problems to industries which work on a 7-day-a-week basis. There are some industries which find it more costly to shut a plant down than to continue working the 40 hours per week, but reducing the workweek below 40 hours could bring unbearable hardship.

Of these only the capital gains question is dormant. There will be vigorous effort from the Department of Labor and in the committees of Congress to bring about the enactment of the other two.

There are other possible fields of legislation. There has been discussion of subsidizing and price fixing of timber crops. I see little likelihood of this.

There is a question among your members about extensions in the timber price reporting program. This is a matter to be worked out through your own group and the various agencies of State and Federal governments which have an interest in it. Your representatives in Congress can be helpful by serving as intermediaries. No further legislation is indicated.

On January 22, the Secretary of Commerce proposed to reconstitute the American Lumber Standards Committee. There is a 30-day period during which public comment will be received. After this, departmental action will be taken. You know the pros and cons of this action better than I, but you cannot ignore it.

Generally, the legislation which concerns you stems from the agencies of government. Quite obviously there is in prospect a full and far-reaching set of legislative proposals. Some will help you; some will hurt you; some could put you out of business.

Now let's be very candid with each other.

You asked me to project the future of legislation affecting your industry.

Where did I go for my information?

I went to the committees of Congress and to the departments of government.

Why didn't I come to you?

Certainly, no one is more expert in this field. You have to be expert to stay in it and to pay the bills. But you are not the people who are making policy.

Policy should be a team effort. It should be developed by industry, labor, and government. It is not. Policy, more and more, is government devised and government directed. The power of industry to influence policy is shrinking. So is that of Congress. In your field, you are fortunate in that one agency with which you deal, the Forest Service, is dedicated to the conservation of natural resources, recognizes your problems, and in the main cooperates with you toward sound objectives. But other agencies with which you deal are going to tighten the restrictions under which you operate every time they have an opportunity.

It is significant that most of my projections to you today on legislation came from agencies of government—not from the committees of Congress. Some of the committees of Congress had no firm program to offer, not even for 1965. Now, I know it is early in the year. This is a new Congress and a new administration, but the fact remains that little by little Congress is ceasing to devlop policy. There should be a continuing program of policy development in congressional committees. These committees are permanent except for a few changes in personnel at the bottom of the list. There is always a carryover of congressional committee staff members. There should be constant analysis and programing of legislative needs, but frequently there is not. Each year is considered sufficient unto itself. Each year most committees react to the urgency of the moment.

Some people say that Congress is dying on the vine. The Constitution vested great power in the Congress as an independent member of the great triumvirate of government. But year after year, I see Congress relinquish bits and pieces of its power to the President—and year after year it allows the Supreme Court to usurp other powers. Just last year the Senate failed to follow House leadership and strike down the Supreme Court's takeover of legislative apportionment processes. This year the House stripped its Rules Committe of virtually all power—and gave that power to the Speaker. Since the Speaker supports administration policies, this is about the same as giving it to the President. The Rules Committee has been a highly important balance wheel. It exercised restraint on some wild committee actions in past years.

Yet, the Congress is the only voice the people have in Government. Despite this fact, it is constantly under attack. It is always open season on the Congress. It is well to remember when the voice of Congress is stilled or muted, it is your voice in Government that is lost.

You can perform no greater service than to help to strengthen that voice. You can strengthen it by working with the Congress to develop the programs which your industry needs. You can't do this by waiting to react for or against programs which Government develops. Some Government programs are good. Others are as wild as a March hare. Whether good or bad, it is getting to be a one-way street. There should be cooperative development between you, the people who work for you, the people who legislate for you, and the people who administer your programs.

The writers of the Constitution did not intend Congressmen to become errand boys, but the exactitudes of the job are such that it is very easy for them to do just that. You can help your Congressman raise his job to the high level at which it was constituted, and he will welcome your help. He knows he should be first a legislator, an equal partner in the Government of the United States.

When you undertake to participate realistically in developing policy, you will sometimes find yourselves spinning your wheels. From your standpoint, the legislative outlook now may be much less than favorable. A topheavy liberal majority in Congress has solid control of both branches. Committees have been reorganized with liberals in command. Unquestionably, the new Congress can get out of hand. Elected in the main on L.B.J.'s coattails, there is only his restraining hand to keep it in balance.

The President can get virtually anything he wants from Congress. The bigger problem will be to keep Congress from passing more than he wants. Those of us who pursue a middle-of-the-road course very definitely have our work cut out for us if the legislative program is to be kept in reason. At this point, the 89th Congress looks like the most liberal one in history. Regrettably, the small slap at Nasser doesn't indicate a trend toward conservation. It was because of Jewish resentment at the Arabs, reflected in votes from U.S. districts with large Jewish communities.

But remember, pendulums always swing back. You have to start somewhere to be ready when the downward swing begins. If history repeats, the next Congress will be less liberal than this one. Your program should not wait for the next election. It should be a part of the next election.

Remember too, as your program is developed, the Nation is not going to stand still. People who want something from Government will find a way to express themselves. It is not enough just to want to be left alone. There is no way to be left alone in the complex modern world in which we live. You have to fight for your place in the sun or you won't have one. There is no better example of this than in your own fight to retain the 12-man exemption, and the present capital gains tax procedure. These have been of such extreme importance to you that you have placed their preservation among your principal objectives. Significantly, there are good supporting reasons. As a result, you have been successful. But the battle isn't over—it will be a continuing one.

This, then, indicates that a policy of opposition is not sufficient in today's world. It has to be a forward-moving policy and a sound one if it is to survive the conflicting pressures it will encounter. But you have to get in the swim.

I told the Florida Chapter of AMA some years ago their organization was getting nowhere with a policy of just plain opposition to medicare. There was a time when they could have taken the ball and scored on some realistic health alternative program which would adequately help the needy. Now, it is too late. Their voice is now scarcely heard in the centers of government.

No, opposition isn't enough. There has to be a logical program. That doesn't mean your program has to outspend the Government's program. It must be a workable program which is sufficiently progressive to offer Congress an alternative and to attract support. It should be a compendium of the views of industry, labor, Congress, and government. It must reflect a cross section of viewpoints, or it will be labeled a parochial approach. That means some give and take. You won't be able to dominate, and that you already know, but you can avoid being dominated.

Expressed very simply, it is most important that sound, constructive programs of information be directed both to Congress and to the people so that they may have access to comprehensive information on which to make intelligent decisions based on fact. Everybody else is doing this—some of them very effectively.

I have covered a wide area. I have discussed many things. We are entering what may be a period of great change. The responsibilities of the citizen to his country and tc his government have not changed. Our country and our Government are no better or no worse than the people who make it up. It may very well be true that at no time in the history of mankind has it been more important for people who love and cherish the true blessings of democracy to determine to protect those blessings. You, more than most, can help.

Perhaps it is best expressed in a thing called patriotism—belief in America. Some people think patriotism is going out of style in this country—along with prayer in the schools. To many, the Fourth of July is just another day when they don't have to work.

I recall a night some months ago in Washington at a typical Washington banquet with too many speeches and too much smoke in the air. The hour was late and the guests were tired. Then as a final event, a Navy choral team appeared, and in song and word they told the story of America—of its humble beginning as a haven for the oppressed and a land of opportunity for all. They told how people who believed in this country and who loved it, worked for it, fought for it, and died for it, to make it the great land that we have inherited.

And when they had finished, that great crowd was no longer tired or bored. They were thrilled and electrified at a glimpse of a thing called patriotism; it is the lifeblood of any land. If we keep, truly keep, our patriotism throughout this land, we will not lose its traditions or its greatness. Let's not lose our patriotism; let's not lose our belief in America for this is indeed a decade of challenge. It may be a challenge for the survival of our Nation.

Hon. Joaquin "Mike" Elizalde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and sorrow that I learned of the passing of one of the greatest friends the United States ever had, and I am proud to say also one of my closest friends, the Honorable Joaquin Elizalde. "Mike" as he was affectionately known to his many friends, was the first Ambassador of the Philippines to the United States and served in that capacity from 1946 to 1952. Prior to that time however, he was Resident Commissioner of the Philippines from 1938 to 1944.

I got to know Mike when I first came to Washington in 1946 and was assigned to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I knew of no man who fought for his people, nor was a more firm defender of his people than Mike Elizalde. By the same token he was a most kind and considerate and compassionate man.

My thoughts are with his widow and children at this time but I am sure they will be sustained by the memory of a truly great man who will long be remembered in the history of his country.

Handy-Dandy Little Suicide Kits and Do-It-Yourself Instruments of Mental Illness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, in the Congressional Record beginning at page 1341, I described the need for far-reaching changes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, as proposed in H.R. 1235, an omnibus bill to rewrite the 27-year-old law.

Today, I had the opportunity to appear before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to testify on one phase of this broad subject, the control of traffic in barbiturates, amphetamines, and related habit-forming stimulant or depressant drugs. Under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable Oren Harris, the committee has been holding extremely interesting hearings on H.R. 2, Chairman Harris' bill to deal with the problem of bootlegging and illicit distribution of the so-called pep pills and goofballs and bennies and other nonnarcotic dangerous drugs.

PLEA FOR EXPANDED HEARINGS

In my testimony, I cited the provisions of section 6 of H.R. 1235 as being, in a number of major respects, more effective than H.R. 2 in meeting the problem of these dangerous drugs. But my statement went beyond that to urge that the hearings on H.R. 2 be expanded for the purpose of going into the entire Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and rewriting all of its obsolete sections and adding new sections to meet new circumstances.

Because of the widespread interest among consumers and among consumer-minded Members of the House in the issues I discussed in my statement in the Congressional Record on January 26, I think there will be general interest in my statement today on section 6 of this bill, as follows:

A Serious Gap in Our Laws—But Just One of Many

(Testimony by Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan before House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on legislation to tighten controls over habit-forming depressant and stimulant drugs, Wednesday, February 10, 1965)

Chairman Harris and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you this morning. The legislation you are considering is of vital importance—vital in the literal sense that our lives are in danger from the continued widespread illicit traffic in barbiturates, amphetamines, and the related central nervous system depressant or stimulant drugs. We know that many of the head-on crashes on our superhighways—where a car or truck will suddenly careen across the median strip and plow into a car going the other direction, wiping out entire families—can be attributed to more than just fatigue on the part of one of the drivers. As the work of the Food and Drug Administration has demonstrated, illicit sales of the so-called pep pills at highway stops are so common that the use of such drugs constitutes a real and present danger to everyone who ventures out on a highway.

The barbiturates and the amphetamines serve very useful medical purposes when properly used, and nothing in this legislation, of course, would interfere with the doctor's freedom of action in prescribing such drugs or with the patient's opportunity to buy them through legitimate channels. But when the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration testified—as he did before this committee—that probably one-half of the 9 billion doses of barbiturates and amphetamines manufactured in this country in 1962 ended up on the bootleg market, then, Mr. Chairman, we are compelled by our responsibilities as Members of Congress to wipe out this bootlegging of pills which are major causes of highway homicide, which also serve as handy-dandy little suicide kits, and do-it-yourself instruments of mental illness and delinquency among youth.

Of course, you are not going to wipe out all traffic in instruments of homicide and suicide and crime no matter what kind of legislation you pass, but I want to point out—before someone raises the question of firearms regulation and we get into a long and emotional controversy on a completely different issue—there is nothing in the first amendment about the right of the public to buy any kind of poison they want to. In fact, we have many laws—including the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—which severely restrict the manufacture, distribution and sale, of unsafe products in commerce, and we have other laws which prohibit the illegal possession of narcotics regardless of whether they moved in interstate commerce.

We must stop the illegal traffic in nonnarcotic drugs which are frequent substitutes for narcotics and which when abused are habit forming and dangerous not just to the user but to the public. The legislation before you will go far toward accomplishing that purpose. It prohibits unauthorized possession of the pills, permits surveillance of all stages of production and distribution, and establishes criminal penalties for violators, particularly for sales to youths.

STRONGER PROVISIONS IN H.R. 1235

Commissioner Larrick pointed out in his testimony certain changes which he would recommend in H.R. 2, the bill introduced by Chairman Harris. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that one of the sections of H.R. 1235, my omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, contains all of the provisions of H.R. 2 on control of the dangerous and habit-forming depressant and stimulant drugs, and, in the respects cited by the Food and Drug Administration, also contains language covering most of the points raised by Mr. Larrick.

For instance, my bill permits seizure of any drugs for which there are not proper records as required under the proposed law. There are safeguards in the bill to protect legitimate manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, of course, but the burden of proof would be placed upon them to prove legal ownership of any drugs for which they failed to keep proper records. Under such tight restrictions, I cannot imagine half of the annual production of 9 billion doses disappearing out of legitimate trade channels.

H.R. 2 would extend to Food and Drug officials the right to carry firearms under certain circumstances in the administration of this new section of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. H.R. 1235 would go further, as Commissioner Larrick urged, and give such officials the powers not only to execute and serve arrest warrants, and execute seizure by process issued pursuant to libel, but also to—

(a) Make arrests without warrant for offenses under this legislation "if the offense is committed in the officer's or employee's presence or if he has probable cause to believe that the person so arrested has committed, or is committing, such offenses";

(b) Make, prior to institution of libel proceedings, "seizure of drugs, containers, or conveyances if such drugs, containers or conveyances are, or if he has reasonable grounds to believe that they are, subject to seizure and condemnation" under the law, provided however that libel proceedings be instituted immediately thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, these are very strong powers, but they are not excessive; they are similar to the powers now held by alcohol tax agents and by narcotic agents. In the case of habit-forming dangerous drugs so widely bootlegged, we are dealing with criminal syndicates and hoodlums. Without such powers, the evidence can quickly disappear before warrants and libels can be issued.

FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT NEEDS MAJOR OVERHAUL

My purpose in coming here this morning is not just to suggest the substitution of the stronger provisions of section 6 of H.R. 1235 for H.R. 2, as a tighter bill and more inclusive in fighting bootlegging of these dangerous drugs. I am even more brash than that.

Mr. Chairman, I first introduced this barbiturate-amphetamine control legislation more than 4 years ago, so I am very anxious to see such legislation become law. I know that the chairman of the committee has also been a sponsor of such legislation for a number of years. But we both recognize—and I hope all of the members of the committee also recognize—that the situation with regard to these dangerous mind-affecting drugs, while very serious, is only one of a whole series of important problems which now exist in the administration of effective food, drug, and cosmetic regulation.

We have put a lot of blowout patches on the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 over the years, but the act itself needs a major overhaul. Instead, we have usually taken up one issue at a time, one Congress at a time. In 1954, we passed the bill on pesticides, but nothing was done on cosmetics, or on food additives, or about other glaring gaps in the law. In 1958, we passed a Food Additives Act, but again did nothing about cosmetics safety, or any of the other deficiencies in the act. In 1960, when the lipstick makers came rushing in for help, we quickly passed the Color Additives Act, requiring that all coloring matter in foods, drugs, or cosmetics (except hair dye colors) be proved safe before being used, but to this day we have done not a single thing to assure the pretesting for safety of any other ingredient in cosmetics. In 1962, under circumstances I do not have to recall for this committee—which worked a legislative miracle in getting the legislation through under tremendous difficulties—we closed the major loopholes in the clearance of prescription drugs following the thalidomide disclosures, but once again we did nothing about cosmetics, or barbiturates and amphetamines, or therapeutic devices or any of the other major loopholes in the basic act which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of FDA have repeatedly deplored. I included these things in my omnibus bill as long ago as 1961. The chairman of this committee also proposed many of these things in legislation he also introduced in the 87th Congress.

I introduced an omnibus bill in 1961 after having introduced separate bills on cosmetics in four previous Congresses, when I became convinced we were proceeding too slowly by taking up only one phase of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in each 2-year term of Congress. This is our basic consumer protection statute. It is 27 years old. Many provisions of it are obsolete. Some sections were bad 27 years ago, and are worse today. Yet we have approached this vast problem a nibble at a time, a Congress at a time, even conceding that some of the acts which you have sponsored in these past 10 years, Mr. Chairman, have been very important and very sizable bites indeed. But we haven't ever done since 1938 the kind of job done by this committee 27 years ago—that is, take a good, hard look at the entire act on foods, drugs, and cosmetics, and weed out the obsolete portions and replace them with effective provisions which truly protect the consumer in today's economy rather than that of 27 years ago, when technology and marketing were far different.

MAY BE ONLY CHANCE TO AMEND ACT IN THIS CONGRESS

In my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26, I spelled out these necessary and long-overdue changes, as called for in H.R. 1235. In that statement, I went into detail on all of the provisions of my omnibus bill, and the reasons why the health and safety of the public, and the interests of all consumers, require passage of an omnibus bill such as H.R. 1235, rather than another piecemeal approach as in H.R. 2.

My plea is this: Please extend the scope of these hearings to include all phases of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act requiring improvement and amendment. You have made a fine, early start in this Congress on a most important aspect of the problem. But I am fearful that if we pass H.R. 2 by itself, that may be the only part of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act we can get to in this Congress. For I am mindful of the heavy legislative responsibilities of this committee in so many other fields—transportation, aviation, natural gas, power, the Public Health Service program, railroad retirement, communications, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the other regulatory agencies, and the fact that once you put this one aspect of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act behind you, the press of hearings on other issues may make it impossible to go back to this subject. At the pace which has been followed in the past, it may be years before we can complete action on such major loopholes in the law as those applying to:

1. Therapeutic devices, which can be marketed today without proof of safety and without proof of effectiveness and which, in many instances, are tools for the victimization of the elderly and sick, as Senator WILLIAMS' Committee on the Aging reported just last week.

2. Cosmetics, which can also be marketed without prior clearance for safety, except insofar as the coloring matter is concerned (and in the case of hair dyes, the colors can be virulently dangerous just so long as the label points out they may not be safe for some people to use).

3. Worthless dietary foods, another major source of defrauding the elderly and ill.

4. Factory inspection for foods, nonprescription drugs and cosmetics—the same loopholes in these fields which we closed for prescription drugs in the Kefauver-Harris Act of 1962.

5. Deceptive labeling and packaging: The public is really becoming aroused over the tricks which can be perpetrated under present law. I firmly believe that if we do not solve this problem through the noncontroversial features of section 2 of H.R. 1235, you will soon be faced with tremendous demand for much more stringent regulation.

6. Cautionary labeling of foods, drugs, and cosmetics—now exempt under the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act so that no information need be supplied on possible dangerous uses or misapplications, or on first aid steps to be followed in case of mishap or accidental ingestion, particularly by children.

There are many other changes in the basic Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 called for by H.R. 1235, including a proposed ban on interstate commerce in flavored or sweetened aspirin, a major cause of accidental poisoning of children under 5. In extending my remarks, I will list all of these provisions. But for right now, I fervently ask that you expand your hearings on H.R. 2 to include all phases of the act, and give our consumers the first real top-to-bottom review in 27 years of the many deficiencies in this statute.

H.R. 3784

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, in late 1964, after the adjournment of the 88th Congress, three witnesses were summoned before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in secret session. They were called because of their efforts in 1963 to persuade the State Department and the Attorney General to grant an entry permit to Professor Yasui, a Japanese law professor, who had applied for—and subsequently received—permission to come to the United States on a speaking tour. The alleged purpose of the subcommittee was the investigation of the enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, particularly the provision (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(3)) which empowers the Secretary of State and the Attorney General in their discretion to authorize the admission of aliens who might otherwise be inadmissible. These three witnesses were two women, Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen, leaders, respectively, of the Women Strike for Peace and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and Russell Nixon, general manager of the National Guardian, a weekly newspaper which was the chief sponsor of Professor Yasui's speaking tour.

The role these witnesses played in connection with the admission of Professor Yasui amounted to nothing more than the exercise of their constitutional rights as American citizens to appear before an authorized representative of the State Department to express their views on a matter pending before the State Department. It is clear that there was nothing that these witnesses could tell the subcommittee that was of legitimate concern either to the committee or to Congress.

The jurisdiction of the House Un-American Activities Committee covers only subversive and un-American propaganda activities and the past operations of the committee have given rise to the widespread impression that witnesses summoned before the committee have necessarily engaged in some subversive or un-American activities. The witnesses, accordingly, were concerned that their appearance before the committee in secret session would reflect upon them and give rise to unwarranted inferences that they had been engaged in some nefarious practice. They were concerned also that inaccurate and damaging versions of what occurred in secret session could be reported and that the witnesses would not have an opportunity to spread upon the public record what actually occurred and what they actually said. For these reasons the witnesses requested that they be heard in open session.

Their position was based on the language of rule **XI**, paragraph 26(g) of the House of Representatives Rules which provide that public hearings shall be the normal rule for hearings conducted by standing committees as supplemented by subsection (m) of this paragraph and by rule IV of the rules of procedures of the Committee on Un-American Activities. These latter provisions set out the conditions for holding executive sessions; namely, where the evidence at a public hearing would either endanger national security—rule IV of the Committee on Un-American Activities—or where it would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate anyone—subparagraph (m) of rule XI, paragraph 26 of the House rules. It was plain that the testimony of these witnesses would neither endanger the national security nor defame, degrade, or incriminate anyone. On the contrary, the witnesses properly took the position that their appearance in secret session would impair their reputations and only a public hearing could effectively protect them. Nevertheless, the subcommittee, two of whose members were lameduck Congressmen, rejected the witnesses' request that their testimony be taken in public session and instead recommended that the witnesses be cited for contempt. Thereafter, the full committee, which included three lameduck members, voted to approve this recommendation and forwarded it to the Speaker, asking him to certify the case to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia in accordance with the provisions of title 2, United States Code, section 194. The Speaker, on the basis of a ruling by the Parliamentarian, held that he had no discretion or judgment in the matter and was required under the statute to certify the recommendation without regard to his own private or official view on the matter. The Department of Justice has since had an indictment returned against these witnesses charging them with contempt of Congress.

The train of events described above raises the following questions which require the attention of the full House:

First. The crime of contempt of Congress is in essence a crime of a political nature. When the statute upon which the prosecution rests was first enacted back in 1857 many of the Members of both the Senate and the House voiced considerable misgivings about granting this power because of the possibilities of its abuse and the fact that it could be used by politically minded Congressmen to persecute witnesses for other than legitimate purposes. One of the safeguards provided was that a committee could not itself cite for contempt but its actions would have to be reviewed by the full House. Thus the rights of witnesses could be protected by the full House which has supervisory authority over any particular committee and can check any possible abuse of the contempt power of any committee.

As stated by Dean Griswold of Harvard Law School:

> The power of investigation is a power which is solely attributable to the collective body, the House of Representatives or the Senate.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Since the power exercised by a committee or a subcommittee, or a subcommittee of one, is the power of the House or Senate itself, responsibility for that power and its exercise rests not on the committee or the subcommittee of one or more, but upon the House or Senate, itself, acting, of course, by a majority vote of its Members. Griswold Per Legem Terrae, 14 Federal Bar Journal (1954) 21, 27–28.

The crime punished by title 2, United States Code, section 192, is the crime of contempt of Congress and there is no crime of contempt of a committee of Congress. Thus the House as a whole bears the responsibility for any prosecution under the statute and by the same token must take the blame and the onus for any action taken in its name. If there is protest or criticism of the action taken by the subcommittee, the criticism falls upon the whole House in whose name the prosecution is initiated.

Third. The refusal to answer questions of a congressional committee can be constitutionally punished only when the refusal "obstruct(s) the performance of the duties of the legislature," *Jurney* v. *McCracken*, 294 U.S. 125, 148. There are several reasons why the conduct of these witnesses cannot be found to have frustrated the duties of the House.

(A) Witnesses are required to appear before and answer questions of a legislative committee only when their testimony is necessary in aid of a legitimate legislative purpose. *Sinclair* v. *United States*, 279 U.S. 263; *Watkins* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 178. What important matter was pending before the House in December of last year that made the testimony of these witnesses so imperative as to justify their being cited for contempt? And why the haste? Why could not the matter have been put off until the convening of the new Congress, and with it the reorganization of the committee with new members to replace those not elected at the polls?

(B) If the testimony of these witnesses was so important as to justify their prosecution for contempt, why would not the subcommittee hear the testimony in public? The rules provide that committees should hold hearings in public except under circumstances which were not present here. In the light of the past history of the committee, the witnesses had adequate justification for their objections to testifying in secret. The committee has provided no factual basis for its insistence that the witnesses testify in secret.

(C) The stated subject matter under investigation was not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities. All matters relating to immigration are vested in the jurisdiction of the House Judiciary Committee, and specifically its Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization; rule II, paragraph 12(b) of the House rules. And under the terms of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, 2 U.S.C. 190d, the House Judiciary Committee is charged with the responsibility of watching over the execution of the Immigration and Nationality Act by the executive branch. Accordingly, questions arising from the administration of that act, and its proposed revision or amendment, did not fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Indeed, under the provisions of 8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(6), the Attorney General submitted to Congress a detailed report of his action in admitting Professor Yasui. And, as provided by the Legislative Reorganization Act, this report was sent for study to the House Judiciary Committee, not the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Fourth. The subcommittee hearing, the citation for contempt by the full committee, and the certification by the Speaker all took place in the last three weeks in December while Congress was not in session. Congress, accordingly, was not afforded the opportunity to review as a body the actions of the committee, to judge whether the matter properly belonged within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities and to determine whether in any event these three witnesses should be punished because of their objection to testifying before the committee in a star chamber proceeding. The Speaker's certification added nothing to the committee's report, for the Speaker was advised by the Parliamentarian that he had no discretion in the matter and was required to send the matter to the U.S. attorney for prosecution, regardless of his own private or official judgment on the question.

In view of the circumstances underlying the citation, it is entirely appropriate and indeed imperative that the House review the matter now. The purpose of a contempt prosecution is to vindicate the authority of a House of Congress and not of a particular committee. It is only reasonable to insist that no one be prosecuted unless Congress as a body has determined that the prosecution is essential to vindicate its authority and that the conduct of the witnesses has frustrated its legislative process. As stated in a recent editorial in the Washington Post—December 28, page A10:

> Ordinarily, if the House of Representatives were in session, it would have a chance to protect itself against this sort of abuse of power wielded in its name.

However, the fact that the committee took advantage of the recess should not prevent the Congress from acting now. Since the onus of the committee's action falls upon the House as a whole, the House is entitled to an opportunity to deliberate upon and judge the matter.

Fifth. The case calls for review by the House for other reasons as well. Probably no other committee of Congress would have acted as did the Committee on Un-American Activities here by rushing through a citation for contempt in the closing days of the life of the 88th Congress. It is a fair inference from the manner in which the committee conducted itself that the action was taken not to vindicate a congressional need to secure information for a legitimate legislative purpose but rather because the committee disapproved of the action of these witnesses in exercising their constitutional rights in petitioning the Government to permit Professor Yasui to enter the country. The committee apparently believes that it was wrong to permit Professor Yasui to come into and address audiences in this country. It may have been annoyed by the fact that the State Department and the Attorney General agreed with these private citizens and not with the committee—we presume that the State Department and the Attorney General were not endorsing the views of Professor Yasui but were instead endorsing the traditional American view that American citizens have the right to hear and discuss any lawful ideas.

The fact is that the Immigration and Nationality Act was properly administered by these agencies, and that the appropriate congressional committee had no objection to the manner in which the act was applied. Obviously the admission of Professor Yasui called for no corrective legislation or action by Congress.

Disapproval, disagreement, and/or annoyance with the actions of these three witnesses and the Departments of Justice and State in connection with the Yasui visit to our country certainly do not provide any proper basis for Un-American Activities Committee's action in this case. And it appears to me that nothing more or less than this is involved in this contempt citation.

There is no reason for Congress as a whole to condone this conduct or even worse to permit its authority and its power to be employed in this unwarranted fashion.

For these reasons, I have introduced H.R. 3784 which has been referred to the House Judiciary Committee. The bill has two purposes: First, it provides that in the future no prosecution for contempt will be authorized unless the whole House approves of the action, thus preventing abuse of the congressional contempt power by any committee of the House, and, second, to vacate the injustice arising from the action taken in the closing days of the 88th Congress against these three witnesses. Certainly if witnesses are to be prosecuted for contempt, it should only be as the result of a vote of the whole House, not just nine Members, three of whom did not even return to Congress. I ask all of my colleagues to study this matter and to support H.R. 3784.

The National Medal of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, along with several of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I had the honor of being at the White House on February 8, 1965, for the presentation of the National Medal of Science to distinguished recipients of this honor for the year 1964.

The National Medal of Science was established by the 86th Congress to be awarded by the President to individuals "who in his judgment are deserving of special recognition by reason of their outstanding contributions to knowledge in the physical, biological, mathematical, or engineering sciences." The awards are made on the basis of recommendations received from the President's Committee on the National Medal of Science. The members of the President's Committee are: Dr. Frank Brink, Jr., chairman of the Rockefeller Institute; Prof. Hans A. Bethe of Cornell University; Dean Gordon S. Brown, School of Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Prof. Herbert E. Carter of the University of Illinois; Dean Kenneth E. Clark, College of Arts and Science, University of Rochester; Dr. Sterling B. Hendricks of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; Dr. J. Herbert Hollomon, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and and Technology; Dean Frederick C. Lindvall, division of engineering, California Institute of Technology; Dr. Walsh McDermott of the Cornell Medical Center; Prof. Roger Revelle of the Harvard School of Public Health; Prof. Frederick Seitz, president of the National Academy of Sciences; and Prof. Albert W. Tucker of Princeton University.

In 1962 Theodore von Karman was the first recipient of the medal and in 1963 President Johnson awarded the National Medal of Science to Luis W. Alvarez, Vannevar Bush, John R. Pierce, Cornelis B. van Niel, and Norbert Wiener.

The 1964 honorees are Roger Adams, Othmar H. Ammann, Theodosius Dobzhansky, Charles S. Draper, Solomon Lefschetz, Neal E. Miller, Martson Morse, Marshall W. Nirenberg, Julian Schwinger, Harold C. Urey, and Robert B. Woodward. Their biographical sketches follow:

Biographical Sketches of 1964 Honorees

Dr. Roger Adams was born in Boston, Mass., in 1889 and studied at Harvard University, receiving his A.B. in 1910, and his Ph. D. in 1912 from that institution. Since 1916 he has been associated with the University of Illinois where he is presently a professor of chemistry, emeritus. Dr. Adams has received innumerable honors including the American Chemical Society's Willard Gibbs Medal in 1936 and its Priestly Medal in 1946. Since the period of the First World War he has been a leading figure in organic chemistry and during most of that period he was the one recognized leader in the field. He earned this place of honor not only because of his numerous and distinguished contributions to organic chemistry but also for his devotion to science and scientists active in the field. Dr. Adams' citation reads: "For superb contributions as a scientist, teacher, and imaginative leader in furthering the constructive interaction of academic and industrial scientists."

Dr. Othmar Herman Ammann was born in Schaffhausen, Switzerland, in 1879 and received his formal education at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology. He is presently a consulting engineer and partner in the firm Ammann & Whitney in New York City. Dr. Ammann's professional career spans nearly 60 years and is permanently recorded in the great bridges whose beauty and utility are the product of his bold and imaginative design. Such bridges include the Queensboro Bridge, Goethals Bridge, and George Washington Bridge. His latest and greatest achievement is the Verrazano Bridge in New York which had opened late in November. In all of his work Dr. Ammann has been responsive to the needs of the community and sensitive to aesthetic value as well as function. Dr. Ammann's citation reads: "For a half century of distinguished leadership in the design of great bridges which combine beauty and utility with bold engineering concept and method."

Dr. Theodosius Dobzhansky was born in Nemirov, Russia, in 1900. He received his diplomate degree from the University of Kiev in 1921, following which he was associated with the University of Kiev and the University of Leningrad. In 1927 he came to the United States, becoming a naturalized citizen in 1937. Since 1927 he has been a member of the faculty at the California Institute of Technology, Columbia University, and is now a professor and member of the Rockefeller Institute in New York City. For a period of nearly 50 years Dr. Dobzhansky has been probably the world leader in experimental population genetics and its application to the problem of evolution. Dr. Dobzhansky's citation reads: "For fundamental studies of the genetic determinants of organ evolution and for penetrating analysis of the genetic and cultural evolution of man."

Dr. Charles Stark Draper was born in Windsor, Mo., in 1901 and received his B.A. degree in psychology from Stanford University in 1919. Since 1922 he has been associated with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and has three degrees from MIT—a B.S. in 1926, an M.A. in 1928, and an Sc. D. in physics in 1938. He is currently head of the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics and has been the director since 1939 of the MIT Instrumentation Laboratory, a laboratory which has been devoted to devising guidance, navigation, and control systems for airplanes, missiles, ships, satellites, and spacecraft. At the present time, developments made under Dr. Draper's supervision are in wide use by both the Air Force and Navy. Dr. Draper is also responsible for an extended curriculum of courses in the fields of instrument engineering and fire control.

Dr. Draper's citation reads: "For innumerable imaginative engineering achievements which met urgent national needs of instrumentation, control, and guidance in aeronautics and astronautics."

Dr. Solomon Lefschetz was born in Moscow, Russia, in 1884 and received his early training in engineering in Paris. Coming to this country shortly after the turn of the century, Dr. Lefschetz was awarded his Ph. D. degree from Clark University in 1911 and was subsequently a member of the faculty at the University of Nebraska and the University of Kansas. In 1924 he joined the faculty at Princeton University where he is professor emeritus of mathematics. He has also directed research in mathematics at the Research Institute for Advanced Studies and now heads a research group at Brown University. Dr. Lefschetz opened up the field of algebraic topology which he and his students have pushed to the forefront of current spectacular progress in pure mathematics He has done outstanding work in algebraic geometry and in more recent years has directed research in the applied area of nonlinear differential equations. Dr. Lefschetz's citation reads: "For indomitable leadership in developing mathematics and training mathematicians, for fundamental publications in algebraic geometry and topology, and for stimulating needed research in nonlinear control processes."

Dr. Neal Elgar Miller was born in Milwaukee, Wis., in 1909 and received his B.S. degree from the University of Washington, his M.A. degree from Stanford University and his Ph. D. degree from Yale in 1935. He is presently Angell professor of psychology at Yale. Dr. Miller is primarily known for his work which has resulted in a greatly improved understanding of motivational factors as they influence learning and behavior. His early contributions to the understanding of frustration and aggression, and motivation and learning are classics. In more recent years Dr. Miller has been interested in the field of motivation from the physiological standpoint and has developed new techniques of intracranial stimulation and chemical injection to study the role which certain centers of the brain play in affecting responses to different reinforcements. Dr. Miller's citation reads: "For sustained and imaginative research on principles of learning and motivation and illuminating behavioral analysis of the effects of direct electrical stimulation of the brain."

Dr. Marston Morse was born in Waterville, Maine, in 1892 and received his early education at Colby College. In 1915 he was awarded an M.A. degree from Harvard and in 1917 his Ph. D. from that same institution. Dr. Morse subsequently served on the staffs of Cornell University and Brown University before returning to Harvard in 1926. In 1935 he accepted a professorship at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N.J., where he has remained until the present time. Dr. Morse is well known for his work in topology and today some of the world's ablest young mathematicians are refining and extending theories developed by him, as a basic part of the new field of differential topology. Dr. Morse's citation reads: "For extraordinary achievement in creating analytic theories in the large, for statesmanship in the world of mathematics, and for distinguished service to his country in war and peace."

Dr. Marshall Warren Nirenberg was born in New York City in 1927 and received his undergraduate and early graduate training at the University of Florida. In 1957 he received his Ph. D. from the University of Michigan and since that time has been associated with the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. Presently he is research chemist and head, Section of Biochemical Genetics in the Laboratory of Clinical Biochemistry at the National Heart Institute. Dr. Nirenberg's work has made possible direct experimental evaluation of the chemical processes of the genetic code. This work has illuminated the way in which genetic information is coded into the nucleic acids and used to direct the incorporation of specific amino acids into proteins. Dr. Nirenberg's citation reads: "For studies of the genetic control of protein synthesis and, in particular, for deciphering the chemical code relating nucleic acid structures to protein structures."

Dr. Julian Schwinger was born in New York City in 1918 and received his B.A. degree in 1936 and Ph. D. in 1939 from Columbia University. He has been associated with the University of California, Purdue University, and during the World War II was a member of the staff of the radiation laboratory at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Since 1945 he has been at Harvard becoming a professor of physics there in 1947. Dr. Schwinger's main work has been involved in fundamental problems of field theory and particle physics. He has given the most thorough foundation to modern field theory and is now active in finding new principles for bringing order into the multitude of fundamental particles. Dr. Schwinger has also contributed to other fields of physics including scattering theory and electrodynamics. Dr. Schwinger's citation reads: "For profound work on the fundamental problems of quantum field theory, and for many brilliant contributions to and lucid expositions of nuclear physics and electrodynamics."

Dr. Harold Clayton Urey was born in Walkerton, Ind., in 1893 and received his B.S. degree from the University of Montana in 1917, and his Ph. D. in chemistry from the University of California in 1923. In 1929 Dr. Urey became associated with Columbia University and it was while there that he developed techniques which led him to the discovery of the heavy isotope of hydrogen, called deuterium. For this discovery Dr. Urey received the Nobel Prize in 1934. After World War II he became interested in the study of the earth and solar system and has contributed greatly to the science of planetary and meteoritic chemistry. In 1945 he joined the chemistry department at the University of Chicago, and since 1958 has been professor at large, University of California (San Diego). By measuring the ratio of oxygen isotopes in fossil shells, Dr. Urey has been able to determine the temperatures of ancient seas. He has applied his knowledge of physical chemistry and chemical thermodynamics to elucidate the birth and early history of the earth, moon, planets, and meteorites of our solar system and to determine the conditions under which life could have originated on earth. Dr. Urey's citation reads: "For outstanding contributions to our understanding of the origin and evolution of the solar system and the origin of life on earth and for pioneering work in the application of isotopes to the determination of the temperatures of ancient oceans."

Dr. Robert Burns Woodward was born in 1917 in Boston, Mass., and received his B.S. degree from Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1936 and his Ph. D. from that same institution in 1937. Since that time he has been associated with Harvard University where he is presently Donner professor of science. Dr. Woodward's research has resulted in the introduction of a new approach to the synthesis of important natural substances such as cholesterol, cortisone, and most recently, chlorophyll. He has combined theory with a vast practical knowledge of organic reactions and structures to form a basis for rational synthetic planning and his work has brought him innumerable awards and honors. Dr. Woodward's citation reads: "For an imaginative new approach to the synthesis of complex organic molecules and, especially, for brilliant syntheses of strychnine, reserpine, lysergic acid, and chlorophyll."

At the ceremony in the East Room of the White House, President Lyndon B. Johnson was introduced by Dr. Frederick Seitz, President of the National Academy of Sciences. Dr. Seitz' introductory remarks and those of our President follow:

Dr. Seitz. Thank you, Dr. Hornig. In 1959, the Congress of the United States established the National Medal of Science for creative achievement and leadership in science.

They indicated that the awards were to be given in four specific areas: mathematical, biological, physical, and engineering sciences. They also specified that the Awards Committee was to be created by the President of the United States, as composed in his judgment.

The Awards Committee is now in its fourth year. In these 4 years it has given the awards on two previous occasions. In the first year, 1 award was given; in the second, 7; and on this occasion it is the honor of the Committee to give 11 awards. I should state that the maximum number permitted in the original law is 20.

I had the honor to be chairman of the first Awards Committee, and Dr. Frank Brink should have been with you today. But as Dr. Hornig stated, factors beyond his control kept him from occupying this position at this time.

The Committee looks into many sources in selecting the award. It examines professional recommendations, recommendations of the great societies and academies of our country and, of course, seeks the opinions of outstanding individuals.

We shall now have the honor of hearing from the President of the United States. Mr. President.

The President. Thank you, Doctor. This house is greatly honored today by the presence of this brilliant company.

All the Nation is honored by these distinguished men on whom we come to confer our highest award for their work—the National Medal of Science.

As explorers, discoverers and teachers, these 11 Americans have enlarged the horizons of our times and we are very proud to recognize the contributions they have made with their useful lives.

In a broader sense, our recognition of them is acknowledgment of our pride in and our respect for the role and works of all our community of science in America.

Within the lifetime of us all, it has been widely held that America could apply the knowledge and concepts of science in other lands—but that we could not replenish the knowledge or enlarge the understanding of ourselves.

Today, I think that view has changed somewhat.

We have attained positions of world leadership in most branches of science. Our science is marked by quality as well as quantity. Over the past 10 years, one-half of the Nobel Prizes in chemistry, physics, and medicine have been awarded to Americans. The work of those receiving the Medals of Science speaks further of the quality of our science.

So today, we are challenged in science—as in all aspects of our society—to preserve these standards of high quality and pursue excellence as our goals.

Toward that end, we are striving to strengthen our foundations in physical science, in biological science, and in medical science. It is our hope—and our purpose—to create more and better scientific centers of excellence in the universities of our Nation. We are determined to make certain, also, that talented students in all parts of the country have opportunities to develop and utilize their talents more fully.

This is real seed time for our society—a time when we must go into new fields and go into old ones, to sow the seed for the harvest of a finer life by generations who come after us.

The effort we make to support and to sustain and to advance our science is vital to the success of this Nation's purposes. The challenge is great—but we accept it and we shall meet it, to the fullest degree.

Our objects today remain the same as when an early resident of this House said that "the main objects of all science are the freedom and happiness of man."

Science in America has done much to provide us with the health and the happiness and the hopefulness we enjoy. But we are proud and grateful that the benefits of our science serve not our ends alone. Whether in the keeping of peace or the exploration of space, whether to study the seas or combating of disease and poverty and ignorance, the cause of our science is the cause of all mankind.

As Thomas Jefferson once wrote to a friend in another land, "The field of knowledge is the common property of mankind, and any discoveries we can make in it will be for the benefit of yours and every other nation, as well as our own."

So this morning as we honor our outstanding men of science, let all the world understand that science in America is—and shall remain—dedicated to mankind's freedom, and mankind's justice and peace and not to mankind's oppression or enslavement or destruction.

Now let the citations be read for the 1964 awards of the National Medal of Science.

Thank you all for coming here and letting me enjoy seeing you.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Father, before Thy ever blazing throne, we ask no luster of our own. Yea, rather, we bow in the dust of abject failure, asking that Thou wilt grant us the cleansing grace of penitence.

Through the gates that are swinging on ancient hinges, we glimpse revealing new vistas of a fairer world where humanity will at last be free from the blood-rusted chains which have debased and degraded those who also are Thy children.

Empower us to lay aside the weight of every selfish prejudice and the sins of covetousness that do so easily beset us, and with glad and eager feet to march with the armies that go to free, not to bind—to develop, not to rule—to cooperate, not to dominate, until the knowledge of the Lord, who is no respecter of persons, will cover the earth as the waters now cover the sea. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BAYH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 10, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 158. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the Government of amounts due the Government in the settlement of claims under such act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1535. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases;

H.R. 1647. An act to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1746. An act to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act;

H.R. 1782. An act to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act;

H.R. 2594. An act to clarify the application of certain annuity increase legislation; and

H.R. 3043. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 282) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" at the dedication of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in Boston, Mass., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 158. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the Government of amounts due the Government in the settlement of claims under such act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1535. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases;

H.R. 1647. An act to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1746. An act to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act;

H.R. 1782. An act to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act; and

H.R. 2594. An act to clarify the application of certain annuity increase legislation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3043. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made in the morning hour be confined to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the Senate session today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15; AND THEN IMMEDIATE ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business today the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock a.m. Monday, February 15; that immediately after convening on that day the Presiding Officer shall, without the transaction of any business or debate, declare the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, February 17.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF SENATOR PEARSON TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under an order of January 24, 1901, the Chair appoints the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] to read Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, February 22.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Commerce.

"Senate Joint Memorial 3 of the Legislature of the State of Idaho

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, the Honorable President of the United States, the Honorable Secretary of Commerce of the United States and to the Honorable Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 38th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas it is reported that railroad and trucking freight rates, relating to interstate shipment and transporting of foodstuffs, raw materials, farm produce, farm equipment, and implements, vehicles, and all other consumer items, in the northwestern States of Idaho, Montana, and Washington are 100 percent to 150 percent greater than related freight rates in the remaining several States of the United States; and

"Whereas the higher freight rates are inequitable in relation to the current rates in the remaining several States and work a great and unnecessary hardship upon the farmer, retail merchant, producers, consumers, and general citizenry of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Interstate Commerce Commission should institute an orderly and exhaustive investigation into any inequities existing between the freight rates touching the States of Idaho, Montana, and Washington, as related to the remaining several States, that subsequent legislation, implementing their findings and removing from the citizenry of the States of Idaho, Montana, and Washington the economic hardships now existing as a direct result of the higher and unnecessary freight rates, be proposed in the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session,* (*the Senate and House of Representatives concurring*), That the Congress and the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of Commerce of the United States and the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to the investigation of existing inequities of freight rates in the northwestern States of Idaho, Montana, and Washington; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the speaker of the House and to the president of the Senate of the State of Washington and the State of Montana, and that these States are hereby urged to take similar action in their respective legislative bodies.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 25th day of January 1965.

"W. E. Drevbow,
"*President of the Senate.*

"This senate joint memorial was adopted of the house of representatives on the 26th day of January 1965.

"Pete T. Cenarrusa,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"Arthur Wilson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

By Mr. CLARK:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania

"Considerations of humanity and justice compel the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to register this protest against the wrongs and sufferings of Soviet Jewry.

"We call upon the Soviet Union:

"To declare its policy of eradicating anti-Semitism through government and party; to eliminate discrimination against Jews in all areas of Soviet public life; to end all propaganda campaigns which use anti-Semitic stereotypes, implied or overt; and to halt the discriminatory application of maximum penalties, including the death sentence, against Jews for alleged economic crimes.

"To permit the practice of Judaism, synagogue worship, the training of rabbinical students in religious seminaries, the publication and distribution of prayer books, and the production and distribution of religious articles, kosher foods, and matzohs.

"To permit the organization of a nationwide federation of synagogues and to sanction the association of such a federation with organizations of coreligionists abroad.

"To permit Jews to make religious pilgrimages to the Holy places in Israel, and permit free emigration for those who wish to leave the U.S.S.R.

"To end the suppression of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union by permitting writers and other Jewish intellectuals to express themselves in the Yiddish language through books, periodicals, newspapers, and the theater.

"We also call upon the United States and the United Nations to exert every influence with the Soviet Union to bring about full equality and security for Soviet Jewry: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the U.S. Senators from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State and the Soviet Ambassador to the United States.

"Attest:

"Robert K. Hamilton,
"*Speaker.*
"Anthony J. Petrosky,
"*Chief Clerk.*"

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 805. A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank (Rept. No. 67).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. Holland):

S. 1115. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1116. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $100,000 with which to make a survey of a Lake Tahoe Parkway in the States of Nevada and California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. Tydings):

S. 1117. A bill to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. Morse, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Brewster):

S. 1118. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1119. A bill for the relief of Julio Dumas, and his wife, Josephine Dumas; and

S. 1120. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ortelio Rodriguez Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1121. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1122. A bill to establish a U.S. Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1123. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit the widow of an insured individual to become entitled to widow's insurance benefits prior to attainment of age 62, if such widow is under a disability which began before her husband died;

S. 1124. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit child's insurance benefits to continue after age 18 in the case of certain children who are full-time students after attaining such age; and

S. 1125. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Fong, Mr. Jackson, Mr. McGee, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Hartke, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, and Mr. Randolph):

S. 1126. A bill to amend the emergency loan authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize such loans in areas where credit is not otherwise available because of serious economic conditions for farmers or ranchers; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUSKIE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 1127. A bill for the relief of Ines Maria Fonseca Litto; and

S. 1128. A bill for the relief of Simon Der Simonian, his wife, Hossannah Der Simonian, and their children, Knel Sebouh Der Simonian, Rebecca Der Simonian, Haroutune Der Simonian, and Nishan Der Simonian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 1129. A bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PELL (for Mr. PASTORE):

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of April in each year as National Record Keeping Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

SUPPRESSION OF FREEDOM IN THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. PELL (for Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) relating to the suppression of freedom in the Baltic States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. PELL (for Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio), which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS LIMITATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself, and my senior colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], a bill to increase to $2,400 per annum the limitation on earnings of recipients of old-age insurance benefits.

The Social Security Act now requires that benefits be withheld from a beneficiary under the age of 72 at the rate of $1 in benefits for each $2 of annual earnings between $1,200 and $1,700 and $1 in benefits for each dollar of annual earnings about $1,700. This penalty upon self-reliance makes it difficult or impossible for social security recipients to supplement their benefits, which, in most cases, are totally inadequate to meet the financial needs of an elderly individual and his dependents.

There were a number of developments during the 88th Congress that showed the strong desire of Members of Congress and their constituents that this earnings limitation be liberalized.

First. There were a large number of bills introduced in both the Senate and House to bring about this result.

Second. The Senate Special Committee on Aging endorsed a recommendation for such liberalization as part of its report on "Increasing Employment Opportunities for the Elderly."

Third. The Senate itself amended H.R. 11865, the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1964, to further ease this restriction, before sending that measure to conference. Unfortunately, the conferees could not come to agreement and, as we all know, the measure was not enacted in the last session of the Congress.

Of course, there are great differences between the needs of social security recipients aged 65 to 72 for income supplementation and between their desires, willingness, and need to work. But there are millions of them for whom enforced idleness means boredom, feelings of uselessness and futility, and bad mental and physical health, not to mention the excruciating financial problems visited upon them. Enactment of the bill which I am introducing would thus make a substantial contribution not only to the financial well-being of older Americans but also to their physical and mental health and to their morale and general outlook on life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1115) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SURVEY OF A LAKE TAHOE PARKWAY IN NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for an appropriation not to exceed $100,000 with which to make a survey of a Lake Tahoe Parkway in the States of Nevada and California, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation is directed at answering a vital need in one of the beautiful scenic areas of our Nation—the need to help preserve for this generation and those of the future the vast grandeur of Lake Tahoe. This Sierra lake is an inspiration of mountain splendor astride the Nevada-California border. But the advance of commercial development threatens to destroy the very qualities which make the name Lake Tahoe synonymous with beauty. This situation injects a note of urgency into this legislation and into other efforts to keep Lake Tahoe largely an unspoiled wilderness lake. It is already too late along some stretches of the magnificent shoreline. I consider it urgent to make certain this statement will never apply to all of Lake Tahoe.

Only a few days ago, in his message to Congress, President Johnson called for a program to increase the beauty of our Nation. As he put it:

> For over three centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage.

I submit that the bill I have introduced today strikes a chord with the proposals of the President's message. A study of a national parkway for Lake Tahoe is but an initial step in the overall program to protect this prized scenic heritage, but I believe it is an important step. As one active supporter phrased it to me, we are fast running out of unspoiled Edens, and if we lose Lake Tahoe, we will never have one like it again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1116) to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $100,000 with which to make a survey of a Lake Tahoe Parkway in the States of Nevada and California, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce for appropriate reference proposed legislation submitted to Congress by the President of the United States to authorize the construction of a rapid transit system for the Nation's Capital. Joining as a cosponsor is the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], whose own State of Maryland has a vital role in this transportation problem.

The President has given the bill a strong endorsement and has requested that it be acted on favorably by Congress.

I believe strongly that an efficient, balanced transportation system is needed for the Nation's Capital area to meet its main purpose—service to the public. The President's recommendations provide a working basis for Congress to consider the Washington area's increasingly critical transportation problem. I believe the bill is needed and that there is every reason why it should be passed this session. Mass transportation in the National Capital region has held the attention of the Senate during the last four administrations. The problem is a visible one each day and each of us is a part of it.

I am advised that the bill meets the major objections that were raised with respect to the rapid transit bill that was transmitted to the Congress in 1963. First, the bill incorporates the labor protective provisions of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1954 and thus assures that labor will be protected in Washington just as will be done nationally. Second, the system will be publicly owned but privately operated by management contract. The management contract will free the Government of the need for involvement in the day-to-day management of the rapid transit system, while at the same time assuring that there will be strict public control over fares, profits, and other key aspects of the operation. The management contract also insures that maximum use will continue to be made of private enterprise in the conduct of public transportation service in Washington. Third, the financing formula has been revised so as to lessen substantially the Federal Government's financial investment. The construction of the $430 million rapid transit system will require a Federal grant contribution of $100 million—less than 25 percent of the construction cost.

The rapid transit system the bill would authorize is urgently needed. The National Capital region is the third fastest-growing metropolitan area in the country. Its downtown area is flooded with automobiles and their numbers grow daily. In the morning peak hour today, some 80,000 automobiles are in the downtown area, and the streets are all but impassable.

Unless a rapid transit system is added to our highway network, it is estimated that 25 percent more automobiles will pour into the downtown area in the next 15 years. Congestion will be, if possible, even worse than it is today.

There is no other answer to this problem than to accompany the construction of planned highways in the region with the construction of a rapid transit system. That is what Congress intended when it passed legislation 4 years ago authorizing preparation of a rapid transit plan. The bill I am introducing will authorize the construction of a modern rapid system that will incorporate the latest technology available and will speed thousands of people into the Nation's capital every day free of surface congestion. I believe, with the President, that it deserves favorable treatment.

Certainly, what Congress does—and I hope it may be done this year—will determine the capital area's transportation and traffic pattern for the next 50 years or more. A solution has already been delayed too long. Therefore, I am hopeful that a cooperative attitude toward a common goal will prevail.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter submitting the formal National Capital Transportation Agency report, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1117) to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960, introduced by Mr. Bible (for himself and Mr. Tydings), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The letter presented by Mr. Bible is as follows:

The White House,
February 10, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I am transmitting to the Congress herewith, with my approval, a report submitted to me by the National Capital Transportation Agency on February 1, 1965, entitled "Rail Rapid Transit for the Nation's Capital," and a proposed bill which would authorize the Agency to proceed with the transit development program described in that report. In preparing the proposed bill I have given full consideration to improvements that have been suggested to earlier bills.

The problem of mass transportation in the Washington area is critical. It is also a problem in which the Federal Government has a unique interest and responsibility. As Congress found in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, an improved transportation system for this area "is essential for the continued and effective performance of the functions of the Government of the United States, for the welfare of the District of Columbia, for the orderly growth and development of the National Capital region, and for the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital."

There is widespread agreement that a high-speed and high-capacity rail transit system operating over separate rights-of-way through the more densely populated sections of the Washington Metropolitan area provides the most promising approach to a long-range solution. Such a system will preserve the beauty, the dignity, and the historic and monumental character of our Capital City. It will exercise a desirable influence on the pattern of growth of the metropolitan area. And such a system is vital if we are to achieve the goal of a balanced transportation system for the area. The highway network now proposed for the area is predicated on an adequate rail transit system.

The report and proposed bill which I am transmitting provide for a system which will furnish the Washington area greatly improved transit service and which can later be expanded to the total system eventually needed. The National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 authorized the negotiation of an interstate compact under which the District would join with Maryland and Virginia in creating an appropriate organization to develop a total system for the area. My hope remains firm that such a compact organization can be brought into being at an early date. In the meantime, however, work on the present proposals can and should go forward without delay.

The Agency estimates, based on engineering studies carried on over the past 5 years, that to construct and equip the system which it proposes will cost $431 million, excluding interest costs. The proposed bill authorizes the appropriation of $150 million—$100 million by the Federal Government and $50 million by the District. With these grants, system revenues will be sufficient to provide for both operating expenses and the balance of the capital costs. The grants will also supply all the funds needed for construction until near the end of fiscal year 1968. By that time I hope that there will be a suitable regional compact agency which can assume the responsibility for issuance and sale of the revenue bonds needed to meet the remainder of the cost. If such a compact agency is not timely created, I will be prepared to present alternative recommendations in time for the Congress to give full consideration to the course to be pursued.

The National Capital area should no longer be denied the forms of urban transportation which are vital to its welfare. The proposed program is an appropriate beginning—indeed, a long step toward the total transportation needs of the area. I hope that the Congress will give prompt and favorable consideration to the legislation which is needed to get the program under way.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference proposed legislation submitted to Congress by President Johnson for the establishment of self-government for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Already joining as cosponsors of the bill are four members of the Committee on the District of Columbia: the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], a champion of the home rule cause here for many years; the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], an ardent home rule advocate; the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], whose fight for the causes of democracy in the Nation's Capital is well known; and the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], whom we expect to be one of the bulwarks for handling key legislation for the Nation's Capital City during this Congress.

The distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], a home rule proponent both while serving in the House of Representatives and as a Member of this body, has also joined as a cosponsor.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 1 week to permit other interested Senators to join as cosponsors. I sincerely hope that other Senators will join and thereby give added emphasis to a keystone to our democratic government—the right of the governed to elect those who govern.

Mr. President, legislation to establish self-government for the District of Columbia is not new to the Senate. Since 1949, the 81st, 82d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses have seen the Senate pass home rule bills. Some may call our long efforts "an exercise in futility," but negative thinking never accomplishes positive results.

The President of the United States is an active supporter of this legislation, which will grant, as he says, "the fundamental American right of self-government." His active support should provide invaluable impetus to this cause.

Principally, the bill provides for:

First, a locally elected mayor, a 15-member legislative council, elected by wards, and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives.

Second, a specific formula for annual payment by the Federal Government of its share of the expenses of the District government. As the President stated in a message to the Congress, the formula is "designed to reflect the amount the Federal Government is to pay toward the general governmental expenses of the District if it were a taxable entity."

Third, full protection of the Federal interest by—

First, specific retention by Congress of its full legislative powers over the District, including the origination of legislation or modification or repeal of enactments by the local council.

Second, authority for the President to veto any act of the locally elected council.

The District council would be given local legislative authority including taxing and borrowing power subject to certain restrictions and to the obvious overriding and constitutionally granted power of the Congress to repeal, amend, or initiate local legislation and to modify or revoke the charter itself.

As a practical matter, this delegation of authority would relieve a busy Congress year after year of the task of legislating housekeeping and municipal matters for the city.

In my years as a member and as chairman of the Committee for the District of Columbia, I believe I have learned something about this great city, whose problems are multiplied by the inability of the local residents to govern themselves.

Washington, D.C., has two distinct roles. First and foremost, it is the seat of our Federal Government, a symbol of our great Republic, reflecting the spirit, history, and personality of our country.

Second, Washington is a great American city, with all the problems increasing as they are, that New York City, Chicago, or Los Angeles has. The influx of record populations into urban centers, such as Washington, and the accompanying social upheavals that flow from this urbanization, are dramatic evidences of increasingly critical situations.

It is my best judgment that the District of Columbia cannot continue to meet its growing needs by the present system of halfway government where all of its housekeeping and municipal legislative problems are weighed on the national scale by a Congress whose concern should not be focused on the city's daily activity but on those of the Nation and the world.

I am not wedded to any rigid concept of home rule for the District. However, I believe that a Congress which seeks to help the world solve its ills is capable of bending itself to fashion some form of self-government for the three-quarters of a million people who live here.

Four months ago, Washington's voters went to the polls for the first time to vote for the President and Vice President. The Nation's Capital City deserves the full measure of democracy that self-government would bring.

Today, 87 cents out of every dollar of the $350 million annual District of Columbia budget are taxes paid by local residents who have no voice in how their dollars are either collected or spent. Taxation without representation ended for Colonial America 185 years ago. The time is overdue for it to end at the seat of that American Government.

Mr. President, it is my intention to schedule hearings on this bill the first week of March. I ask unanimous consent that the President's message submitting his home rule proposal to the Congress, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The message from the President presented by Mr. BIBLE is as follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING A DRAFT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION ENTITLED "A BILL TO PROVIDE AN ELECTED MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL, AND NONVOTING DELEGATE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"

To the Congress of the United States:

The restoration of home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia must no longer be delayed.

Our Federal, State, and local governments rest on the principle of democratic representation—the people elect those who govern them. We cherish the credo declared by our forefathers: No taxation without representation. We know full well that men and women give the most of themselves when they are permitted to attack problems which directly affect them.

Yet the citizens of the District of Columbia, at the very seat of the Government created by our Constitution, have no vote in the government of their city. They are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship while denied one of its basic rights. No major capital in the free world is in a comparable condition of disenfranchisement.

The denial of home rule to the District creates serious practical difficulties. The District is the ninth largest city in the United States—more populous than 11 of the States. Its government must handle the same problems which press with increasing urgency on the legislative, executive, and judicial arms of city governments throughout the Nation, and it must perform as well many of the functions of State and county governments. Under the present system, these duties fall upon busy Members of the Senate and the House who—in addition to their congressional responsibilities—must serve as State representatives, county supervisors, and city councilmen for Washington.

Self-government for the District would not be an innovation. It is a return to the views of the Founding Fathers and to the practice of the early days of the Nation. James Madison wrote in the Federalist that the inhabitants of the Nation's Capital "* * * will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them; * * *."

Such a "municipal legislature" was established in 1802 under President Jefferson. It was strengthened in 1812 under President Madison, and in 1820, under President Monroe, it was enlarged to include an elected mayor.

Had it not been for the tragedy of the Civil War, local government would have continued. In 1871 the people of the District, deep in the problems of the reconstruction period and urgently needing a program of public works, acquiesced in a change to a territorial form of government under which they lost the right to elect their chief executive. The program of public works was badly executed and the territorial government was soon in virtual bankruptcy. In 1874 Congress withdrew the voting franchise entirely and substituted a commission form of government. The intent was to make the change temporary—a receivership which would be replaced by self-government as soon as the fiscal affairs of the city were on a sound basis. But this "receivership" has now lingered on for 90 years.

There is a fundamental Federal interest in the National Capital. The Constitution wisely delegates to the Congress supreme legislative power over "the seat of the Government of the United States." The Congress can, however, delegate to a municipal legislature all the powers necessary for local self-government, and at the same time preserve fully its ultimate power and the interests of the Federal Government.

The District of Columbia Charter Act which I am transmitting to the Congress today will relieve the Congress, to the maximum practical extent of detailed legislative direction of District affairs while retaining essential control in the Congress. The bill—

(1) creates a representative local government for the District;

(2) provides a link between the Congress and the local government in the form of an elected delegate to the House of Representatives; and

(3) preserves intact the powers of the Congress and the President by—

(a) an express provision that the Congress is in no way deprived of its power to legislate for the District, and may repeal or modify any act of the local council,

(b) a provision for an absolute veto by the President of any act of the local council, and

(c) provisions for supervision of the fiscal affairs of the District by the General Accounting Office.

Home rule for the District has been unfinished business for far too long a time. Presidents of both parties—Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—have urged it. Measures to provide it were passed by the Senate in the 81st, 82d, 84th, and 86th Congresses.

The people of the District are ready and eager to join fully in the democratic process. In the presidential election of 1964, more than 90 percent of the registered voters went to the polls.

I urge the Congress to approve at the earliest possible date the legislation which will grant them the fundamental American right of self-government.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1965.*

ESTABLISHING A FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the United States is suffering from a policy gap in the transportation field. The gap exists because there is a difference between what is and what could be; in other words, there is a difference between the separate policies of the individual modes of transportation and the constructive policies which could exist if a unified approach were sought.

To close this gap, I am reintroducing my bill which would establish a Department of Transportation at Cabinet level—for the first time centering in the executive branch of the Federal Government the responsibility for formulating transportation policy. It is my hope that such a department—free from regulatory functions—would concentrate on promulgating a balanced, coordinated, and forward-looking transportation policy for the country.

In a message to Congress, the late President Kennedy had this to say of national transportation policy:

> If action is not taken to establish a transportation policy consistent with the new demands upon the economy, we face serious problems of dislocation and deterioration in both the transportation industry and the economic life of the Nation which it affects. I urge that action be taken to establish such a policy.

The late President spoke of the ideal which we should pursue, but the history of transportation has led us in the opposite direction. Rather than coordination, we have been beset with fragmentation. As each new mode of transportation sprang up, its problems were solved piecemeal with little or no regard to national patterns and needs.

As a result, the various modes have limped along on a patchwork of rules and regulations. Some forms are regulated—some are not. Some are subsidized and, again, some are not. One form of transportation may be promoted effectively, while another gets routine treatment. The competition for the tax dollar is vigorous. There are also inequalities in the size and kinds of subsidies granted to the different carriers.

In no way do these policies assure the preservation and promotion of the basic advantages of each of the carriers, which should be our main objective. Instead, our efforts to achieve this objective are hampered by changing technology, expanding but uncoordinated Federal financial aid, and often conflicting regulatory policies.

Each year the Government pours billions of dollars into the construction of highway and airport construction, into air navigation, river and harbor development, and the maintenance of port facilities. The airlines and the merchant marine get hundreds of millions more in subsidies.

Few, if any, of these Federal programs help the railroads. In fact, some of these programs, such as the improvement of river channels, often place the railroads at a competitive disadvantage, forcing them to lower their rates.

Over the years, a variety of Federal agencies have sprung up to administer or—in the case of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to regulate the various segments of the transportation industry. These agencies operate independently of one another. And not only do they administer or regulate their industries, many also serve as their chief advocate and promoter.

The need, therefore, is to harmonize this chorus into a single voice representing the best interests of all forms of transportation, and the best interests of the taxpayer. A Department of Transportation could accomplish this by pulling all nonregulatory functions under one roof, by representing the general interest rather than special interests.

Such a department would have the responsibility for devising broad policy to bring about balance and cohesion in transportation—airways, waterways, railroads, and so forth. The improvement of railroad service, expansion of the Federal highway system, Government competition with private carriers, tax relief for the railroads, the fate of the merchant marine—all of these problems would come within the purview of such a department.

Not only would the department work on the problems of today, but it would especially concern itself with the future. Part of its duty, for example, might be to determine the role of the supersonic and hypersonic jets in the whole scheme of transportation. Certainly it would want to examine the advantages or disadvantages of the proposed 200-mile-an-hour railroad.

A Department of Transportation also would take over the "odd job" activities of the regulatory agencies. Thus, the ICC would no longer need to administer railroad loan and safety programs as it presently does. The Civil Aeronautics Board would not have to concern itself with discovering new types of subsidies for air carriers; it would leave this job to the new Secretary of Transportation.

As a final measure, I would give the Department Cabinet-level status. Under present arrangements, the problems of transportation are vested in an Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation in the Department of Commerce. Much valuable work undoubtedly had been done by this office, but as a practical matter such an individual does not carry the prestige necessary to marshal national support to accomplish his goals.

A Secretary of Transportation would not be as far removed from the President, would undoubtedly have his ear, and could move ahead with the support and guidance of the Chief Executive. Such a position would simplify the enormous tasks before the new Secretary.

Mr. President, I think it is important that this bill be given the greatest consideration. If the transportation problems which beset the Nation are to be unraveled, then we must have broad policy which will make the best use of our resources. The answer, as I see it, could come from a Department of Transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1122) to establish a U.S. Department of Transportation, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT FOR DISABLED WIDOWS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I offer three bills to amend title II of the Social Security Act, each of which will correct inequities in the present law and provide small groups with most helpful and needed additional assistance.

The first of these is a small group of women who are left widowed by the death of a husband covered under social security, but who are themselves disabled and thus unable to earn a living. Such an amendment is one of the recommendations of the Advisory Council on Social Security in its report transmitted under date of January 1, 1965. Calculations provided there, in a table on page 84, show that the cost of such a benefit would amount to the very small sum of 0.05 percent of taxable payroll, or 5 cents per $100.

I request unanimous permission, Mr. President, to insert at this point the statement of the Advisory Council to be found on page 66 of the report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISABLED WIDOWS

The disabled widow of an insured worker, if she became disabled before her husband's death or before her youngest child became 18, or within a limited period after either of these events, should be entitled to widow's benefits regardless of her age.

The Council believes that the disabled widow, like the widow who is aged 62 or over or the widow who has a child of the deceased worker in her care, needs benefits when her husband dies. The Council therefore recommends that benefits be paid to the widow so disabled that she cannot work—provided, however, that she was disabled at the time of her husband's death or before her youngest child reached age 18, or within a limited period after either of these events.

The widows who would be protected are those who, when their husbands die, suffer a loss of support and who, because they are disabled themselves, have no opportunity to work and thus to substitute their own earnings for that loss of support On the other hand, the Council does not believe it would be in keeping with the purpose of the program to pay widow's benefits on account of disability to a woman whose disability occurred after she could have reasonably been expected to have worked long enough to earn disability insurance benefits in her own right. For example, it would not seem of high priority to pay widow's benefits to a widow who was, say, 30 years old and childless when her husband died and who did not become disabled until many years later. Such a widow would most likely have gone to work and earned disability protection in her own right, and, if she had not worked after she was widowed, it would seem unreasonable to pay her a benefit on the grounds that a physical or mental impairment that developed later in life was preventing her from working.

A theoretical case can also be made, perhaps, for providing benefits for other disabled dependents (almost all of them would be disabled wives who are under age 62) of retired or disabled workers. However, it cannot be assumed that younger wives of older retired men and wives of disabled men look to employment for support to anywhere near the extent that widows do. Thus extending the group of disabled dependents to include wives would result in the payment of benefits in many cases where the couple had not experienced any loss of earned income as a result of the disability of the wife. Considering this fact, the Council believes that additional information is needed to determine whether it would be desirable to pay benefits to disabled wives as well as widows.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would like to include, also, a letter on this topic which I have recently received from a constituent. Although she is herself a widow, unable to find other work than babysitting, her concern is for a friend who is completely disabled. This letter adds the human dimension to an abstract recommendation. I hope Members will pay heed and support this amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVANSVILLE, IND.,
January 22, 1965.

HON. VANCE HARTKE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HON. HARTKE: I am pleading with you, as our Senator, to seek a revisal of so-

> cial security, to take care of widows under the age of 62, disabled or totally disabled to earn a living, and left without security for their welfare.
>
> Social security is set up to take care of young widows left with dependents and older mothers of dependents, but not widows left unable to earn a living.
>
> I have a friend, Thelma Baker, age 47, Nashville, Tenn. She has thrombophlebitis. Through a number of operations, and a prolonged time, she has had all her upper phalanges amputated, as well as her two great toes, and at the present time, has to have one of her second toes amputated immediately.
>
> Mrs. Baker's husband, Thomas Franklin Baker, age 62, died suddenly, January 3. She went to social security, and with her handicap, was told she could only get the $255 applied on his funeral; isn't that great for a person in her condition. Senator, she needs help now not at 62. More than likely she won't need anything from us at 62.
>
> Social security is OK. But not set up right to take care of the public in general.
>
> I am a widow, age 56, but God has given me good health and I have no comments personally, but knowing this lady's condition, brings the matter more to my attention. I can't get a job, all I can do is babysit, but thank God I am able to go.
>
> Even if I have to be put on the shelf, put the age limit where I can get something out of it. But make an effort to see that us widows in this great United States, that are absolute invalids, are taken care of under benefits for mother and child care. Do something for us to show that you are interested.
>
> Senator I voted for you, and am for you, and hope God is good to you and us, that your term is very successful, and with God's help and our encouragement, you are guided to make the right decisions for the good of all of us.
>
> May God guide you, we selected you, you do your best, we will be proud of you.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Mrs. Louise Fox.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1123) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit the widow of an insured individual to become entitled to widow's insurance benefits prior to attainment of age 62, if such widow is under a disability which began before her husband died, introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONTINUING CHILD'S BENEFITS TO AGE 22

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a second bill which I am submitting today would provide an extension of child's benefits under social security from the age of 18, when they now expire, to the age of 22, provided the child is attending school between those ages.

Such an amendment was passed by both the House and the Senate in 1964, but it does not appear as a part of S. 1, which we will soon be considering.

Such an amendment has the support of the Advisory Council on Social Security, which points out that the age of 18 was not unreasonable when the benefits were first provided by the 1939 amendments, on the theory that at that age a child might be expected to become self-supporting. But now education beyond high school is an increasing necessity, and the period of reasonable dependency is lengthening.

At present, Mr. President, among the 2,951,000 child beneficiaries there are many who are in great need of such assistance beyond the age of 18 if they are to continue their schooling. The number who would become immediately eligible, having passed their 18th birthday, is estimated at 285,000, of whom there are an estimated 6,900 in my own State of Indiana. I request unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have included in the Record at the close of these remarks a table prepared by the Social Security Administration under date of October 5, 1964, showing the State-by-State breakdown of the numbers who would be affected.

The cost of the amendment is estimated, according to a table on page 84 of the Advisory Council report, at 0.09 percent for the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and 0.01 percent for the disability insurance trust fund, for a total cost of one-tenth of 1 percent on taxable payroll, or 10 cents for $100.

Each Member, I am sure, could cite letters from constituents asking for this kind of assistance so that a dependent child can be maintained in higher education. I would like to cite a paragraph from such a letter which came to me under date of January 27. It personalizes the problem to have it stated in terms of one specific family and one specific child. The mother writes:

> I am a widow of 6 years and have a daughter in her freshman year at Indiana University. When she reached 18 years old, our social security payments stopped. I will not be 62 until next August and just cannot find employment at my age. My daughter wishes to go to college 3 more years after this and does work during the summer months, but, of course, that is not sufficient to put her through school. Could you please do something to rush the social security law into effect so she and a lot of other students would receive payments while attending college?

Mr. President, in addition to the table mentioned earlier, I ask unanimous consent for inclusion also of the section dealing with this recommendation by the Social Security Advisory Council, as it appears on pages 64 and 65 of their report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the table and excerpt will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1124) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit child's insurance benefits to continue after age 18 in the case of certain children who are full-time students after attaining such age introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The table and excerpt presented by Mr. Hartke are as follows:

Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance

Estimated number of children who would become immediately eligible for monthly benefits under the proposal to pay benefits to children between the ages of 18 up to age 22 who are in regular full-time school attendance, by State, September 30, 1965:

	Number of children
Alabama	7, 400
Alaska	400
American Samoa	(1)
Arizona	3, 200
Arkansas	4, 100
California	22, 800
Colorado	3, 000
Connecticut	2, 700
Delaware	500
District of Columbia	900
Florida	8, 600
Georgia	7, 900
Guam	(1)
Hawaii	1, 000
Idaho	1, 200
Illinois	12, 500
Indiana	6, 900
Iowa	3, 400
Kansas	2, 800
Kentucky	7, 300
Louisiana	6, 200
Maine	1, 600
Maryland	3, 500
Massachusetts	5, 900
Michigan	11, 100
Minnesota	4, 700
Mississippi	5, 400
Missouri	6, 600
Montana	1, 300
Nebraska	1, 700
Nevada	500
New Hampshire	800
New Jersey	6, 800
New Mexico	2, 400
New York	19, 400
North Carolina	8, 900
North Dakota	1, 000
Ohio	13, 700
Oklahoma	3, 800
Oregon	3, 100
Pennsylvania	15, 100
Puerto Rico	9, 000
Rhode Island	1, 000
South Carolina	5, 100
South Dakota	1, 000
Tennessee	7, 000
Texas	15, 200
Utah	1, 400
Vermont	600
Virgin Islands	100
Virginia	6, 700
Washington	4, 200
West Virginia	5, 300
Wisconsin	5, 400
Wyoming	600
Residing abroad	2, 300
Total	285, 000

[1] Less than 50.

Source: Courtesy Social Security Administration, Division of the Actuary—Baltimore, Oct. 5, 1964.

[From p. 64, Report of the Advisory Council]

4. CHILDREN OVER AGE 18 ATTENDING SCHOOL

Benefits should be payable to a child until he reaches age 22, provided the child is attending school between ages 18 and 22

Benefits under the social security program should be paid to a child as long as it is reasonable to assume that he is dependent on his family. Under the present law, child's insurance benefits (except for a disabled child) are payable only until age 18, presumably on the theory (not an unreasonable one at the time that benefits were first provided for children by the 1939 amendments) that by age 18 a child can be expected to support himself.[1] With the growing importance of education in modern life it is becoming increasingly clear that this is not a reasonable expectation. Today, at least some education beyond high school is rapidly becoming part of our general level of living and will increasingly be necessary because of rapid technological advancement and the growth in the number of professional, technical, and other jobs requiring higher levels of education. As a consequence, the period of dependency of children has been lengthening.

There is precedent in other Federal programs for paying benefits to children after they reach the age of 18 while they are in school. The civil service retirement program generally pays benefits up to the end of the academic year in which the student reaches age 21. Under three veterans' programs—the dependency and indemnity compensation program, the non-service-connected death pension program, and the war orphans education assistance program—a child may get benefits after he reaches age 18 while he is attending school. Under an amendment enacted in 1964 to the program of aid to families with dependent children the Federal matching share in assistance payments may be continued up to age 21 where a child is attending a high school or a vocational school.

The Council does not recommend that mothers' benefits be made payable to a mother where the only child getting benefits is age 18 or over and is getting benefits on the basis of being a student. Benefits are paid to a wife or widow under age 62 who has a child in her care if she does not have earnings from work above specified limits, in recognition of her need to stay at home to care for the child. Where the only child is age 18 or over there is not the same reason to pay mothers' benefits, since there is no need for the mother to stay home to care for the child.

An amendment similar to that recommended by the Council, to continue social security benefits after a child reaches age 18 when the child is still in school, was passed by both Houses of Congress in 1964 but failed to become law because the conference committee was unable to agree on other provisions in the omnibus bill.

REMARRIAGE OF WIDOWS OVER 62 WITHOUT LOSS OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently a problem has come to light concerned with the results under Social Security regulations stemming from the remarriage of widows over 62 and receiving widows' benefits. This was rather poignantly noted in an Associated Press dispatch from Miami, Fla., under date of January 11, headlined by the Washington Post, "Thousands of Aged 'Living in Sin' Fear Benefit Loss if They Marry." The article cited the president of the Florida Council for Senior Citizens as saying that "thousands of old people are living together out of wedlock in the Miami area because marriage would mean loss of social security payments."

I have checked with the Social Security Administration, Mr. President, and I find that an amendment to the law to preserve the previous benefit rights of these widows would be statistically a "costless" benefit. The reason is that the social security actuarial figures are based on the assumption that a widow over 62 will remain a widow until her death, and so the calculation of cost for her benefits is made on that basis and the sum provided at present to continue those payments for life.

Yet in actual practice, whereas the widow receives 82½ percent of her deceased husband's primary account, if she remarries she becomes eligible to receive only 50 percent of her new husband's primary benefit. This is not only a deterrent to marriage between the elderly who desire the comfort of a new companionship in their declining years, but it is actually a stimulus to what the headline calls in quotes, "living in sin." The same article, incidentally, quotes clergymen who have tried to give comfort to the troubled minds of those who have adopted this course but who are morally troubled by it, no matter how platonic their relationship.

The highly respected Protestant journal, Christian Century, in its weekly "Pen-ultimate" column for February 3, also took note of this situation in a tongue-in-cheek presentation of a "Form of Solemnization of Living Together," concluding with the ritual after the exchange of pledges in this parody of a wedding service, "Then shall the man and the woman exchange keys to each other's safety deposit boxes," and the admonition:

> I now announce that you may begin living together, with all rights and privileges attendant thereto, including the right to lobby for change in social security legislation and the right to continue criticizing the adjustability and flexibility of moral standards in the younger generation. Now let us cut the cake.

I sincerely trust that my bill, which is identical to H.R. 2465 introduced in the House by Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, may be enacted and that these elderly people may indeed "cut the cake" at official wedding ceremonies.

I request unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the two articles to which I have referred may appear at the end of these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1125) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The articles presented by Mr. HARTKE are as follows:

Thousands of Aged "Living in Sin" Fear Benefit Loss if They Marry

MIAMI, FLA., January 11.—The president of the Florida Council for Senior Citizens says thousands of old people are living together out of wedlock in the Miami area because marriage would mean loss of social security payments.

And Mayor Melvin Richard, of Miami Beach, wants the law changed so these couples can marry.

Max Friedson, head of the Senior Citizens Council, said the law is forcing these old people "to live in sin—or what they think is sin."

The problem, he said, is so pressing that one rabbi has agreed to give unofficial blessing to such unions.

"Many couples even come to me for moral comfort," Friedson said, "and I give it to them."

When a woman outlives her husband, she gets part of his social security only as long as she stays single. She loses the money on remarriage, on the theory that her new husband is responsible for her support.

A retired man living on $85 a month cannot afford the theory.

Richard wrote U.S. Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball asking if the law could be changed to permit widows over 65 to continue receiving benefits through their former husbands.

"This would solve the problem immediately," Richard said. "Of course, it might mean disaster to the social security system. That's what I have to find out."

The Reverend Benjamin Schumacker, president of the State Council of Aging, said he always tries to comfort the old couples who come to him.

"There's always somebody around to shake his Victorian head," Mr. Schumacker said, "but I see no moral religious problem.

"It's platonic. When I see them hold hands while they listen to a sermon, I don't feel any sin is committed in the church."

Henry Gillman, secretary of the Florida Senior Citizens League of Voters, says the sin is committed by "a society that causes them to do something wrong."

The Form of Solemnization of Living Together

At the day and time appointed for solemnization of living together, the persons to live together shall come into the living together service center with their friends and neighbors; and there standing together, the man on the right hand, and the woman on the left, the senior citizens' service center senior member shall say:

Dearly beloved, we are gathered together here in the sight of these witnesses and out of the sight of the social security administrators, to permit the living together of this man and this woman in a relatively honorable estate, instituted by Florida senior citizens, signifying the practical exigencies of life betwixt and between the social security checks and the understandable desire for human companionship which estate has been honored by the long tradition of common law and is to be held honorable among all; and therefore is not by any to be approached lightly. Into this estate these two persons present come now to be regularized. If any man, other than a government employee, can show just cause why they may not undertake to live together, let him now speak, or else hereafter for ever hold his peace.

And also speaking unto the persons who are to begin living together, he shall say: "I require and charge you both, that if the social security laws are changed to permit the woman to receive her share of her monthly income as widow's benefit despite her remarriage in the eventide of life, ye will present the certificate for living together at the county clerk's office in exchange for a marriage license and will then report to a justice of the peace or a minister of the Gospel to be joined in holy matrimony."

He shall then say to the man: "(Name.) Wilt thou have this woman to be thy living-together partner, to live together after the manner of our agreement this day, in the estate of living togetherness? Wilt thou love her, comfort her, honor, and keep her in sickness and in health until legislation is passed which would permit you to marry?"

---

[1] Under the 1939 provision, benefits could not be paid to a child over 16 for any month in which he was not regularly attending school unless school attendance was not feasible; the school attendance requirement was repealed in 1946.

The man shall answer: "I will."

Then shall the senior member say unto the woman: "(Name.) Wilt thou have this man to be thy living-together partner, to live together after the manner of your agreement this day, in the estate of living togetherness? Wilt thou love him, comfort him, honor, and keep him in sickness and in health, and wilt thou share thy social security widow's benefits with him until that day when ye can share such benefits in holy wedlock?"

The woman shall answer: "I will."

Then shall the senior member say: "Who endorseth this action?"

Then shall all senior citizens say: "We."

Then shall the man and the woman exchange keys to each other's safety deposit boxes. Then the senior member shall say: "I now announce that you may begin living together, with all rights and privileges attendant thereto, including the right to lobby for change in social security legislation and the right to continue criticizing the adjustability and flexibility of moral standards in the younger generation. Now let us cut the cake."

LOANS TO FARMERS OR RANCHERS SUFFERING BECAUSE OF SERIOUS ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the loan authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to authorize Farmers Home Administration emergency loans for areas where credit is not otherwise available because of serious economic conditions.

This legislation can serve as a valuable aid to agricultural groups throughout the Nation. Apple farmers in Washington, cattle ranchers in the West, potato farmers in Maine as well as other agricultural groups would receive consideration for loans when prices to the producer are below his costs of production.

At present, prices for Maine potatoes are at a relatively high level. The provisions of this legislation would not apply. However, if potato prices become depressed, the mechanism would be there to assist the farmer in his time of financial peril.

The Farmers Home Administration in Maine and throughout the Nation has done an excellent job in meeting the credit needs of the small farmer, but the administration needs this additional too. The lending authority provided in this legislation is essential if our Nation's pressing agricultural credit needs are to be met.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1126) to amend the emergency loan authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize such loans in areas where credit is not otherwise available because of serious economic conditions for farmers or ranchers, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senators from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. YOUNG], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Ohio [Mr LAUSCHE] on the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Soviet Union has occupied, by force of arms, the countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and deprived such countries of their independence; and

Whereas an unparalleled system of political oppression and tyranny has been established in such countries; and

Whereas by deportations and dispersion of the native population to the wastes of Siberia, and by mass colonization, the Soviet Union threatens complete extermination of these peoples; and

Whereas despite such treatment, the spirit of the citizens of such countries is not broken and they remain overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and

Whereas the desire of the citizens of such countries for national freedom remains unabated; and

Whereas the United States of America has never recognized the occupation of the Baltic States and their incorporation into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the former free governments of these countries; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the suppression of freedom in the Baltic States, and a resolution declaring that—

(a) the Soviet Union shall withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the Baltic States;

(b) the Soviet Union shall return all citizens of the Baltic States to their homelands from places of deportation in Siberia, and dispersion in prisons and slave labor camps;

(c) persons guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States be punished; and

(d) the United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the direct supervision of the United Nations to establish as quickly as possible legal democratic government for those countries.

STATEMENT OF MR. LAUSCHE

I am proud to join with my colleagues in Congress and with the American people in celebrating the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence. In our country on our own Independence Day, the Fourth of July, grateful citizens proclaim their faith in America and their loyalty to it, through speeches, parades, and fireworks. Independence Day is a day of celebration and a day when Americans can step back and look with pride at the accomplishments of their country.

In Lithuania today, however, there is no joyous celebrating of independence. There will be no meaningful speeches, because there is no such thing as freedom of speech. There will be no parades, because it is unlawful for citizens to come together for purposes not sanctioned by the State. There will be no fireworks displays, because fireworks are too closely associated with weapons that could be used against the regime.

There will be no celebration at all of Lithuanian Independence Day in Lithuania, because Lithuania is no longer independent. Instead of a day of gay festivities, this day serves as a sad reminder to Lithuanians and freedom-loving people all over the earth of the tyrannical enslavement of peoples seeking no more than to secure their freedom from foreign domination and to maintain their national identity. Twenty-five years ago the Soviet Union swallowed the three Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Since that time, it has done everything in its power to disperse the Lithuanian people and to stamp out any spark of Lithuanian independence.

For centuries Lithuania was a powerful kingdom in eastern Europe. She was a bulwark of defense against the barbarian hordes from the East and a champion in the advance of Christianity. Then Lithuania fell victim to the advances of the czarist empire during the partitions of Poland in the late 18th century. Although the fires of liberty smoldered, they burst into flame only after the First World War. On February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared herself independent, and stood ready to take her place in the councils of the independent nations of the world. Then indeed there was celebration for Lithuanians stood on the threshold of a bright future under their own free, democratic government.

For the next 22 years this nation prospered. They rebuilt their war-ravaged country, revived their national institutions, and enacted many progressive social and economic measures.

On June 15, 1940, however, Soviet Russia, in direct violation of treaty agreements, put an end to Lithuanian independence and occupied the country and the other Baltic States. In successive acts of depredation, the Soviets, Nazi Germany, and again the Soviet Union decimated the people of Lithuania in one of the grimmest chapters in modern history.

Today Lithuania exists only as the Lithuanian S.S.R. Her resources have been exploited, her people enslaved or deported. But hope is not dead. Lithuanian patriotism has lived through occupation in the past, and it does and will continue to live in the future. In time, when the cancer of foreign domination has disappeared, Lithuanians will look back at this moment and extoll the courage and bravery of their fellow countrymen in preserving the culture and heritage of Lithuania. Someday, as surely as the sun rises, Lithuanians and the other Baltic peoples will again be celebrating their independence. It is our sincere hope that day is not far off. But hope alone is not enough.

I believe that we Americans can do something positive to speed that day. I believe we should take the lead in placing the plight of the Baltic States and the suppression of their freedom before the United Nations. The United Nations should demand the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from the Baltic States, the return of all citizens of the Baltic States who have been deported, the punishment of persons guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States, and free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the supervision of the United Nations.

Such action by the United Nations would, at the very least, serve as the most effective notice possible that the plight of these countries has not been forgotten by the world community. And the pressure of world public opinion, expressed in this way, could bring about steps toward the achievement of independence. Accordingly, I am today reintroducing, for appropriate referral, a concurrent resolution which I first introduced nearly 2 years ago. It requests the President of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to bring this matter before the United Nations and spells out the points I have mentioned. It seems to me that all of us who celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day and the independence days of the other Baltic States will wish to support prompt action by the Congress on this matter.

ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT THAT FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS MAINTAIN CERTAIN RESERVES IN GOLD CERTIFICATES AGAINST DEPOSIT LIABILITIES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 24)

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 3818) to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STRENGTHENING AND IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND OPPORTUNITIES IN THE NATION'S ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 25)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 370) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, 81ST CONGRESS, RELATING TO PERMANENCY OF AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1108) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, in order to make permanent the authorization for certain payments under the provisions of such laws, and for other purposes, which I introduced on February 10, lie on the table until the close of business February 19 so that other Senators may join me in sponsoring this legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC ACT OF 1965—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 2, 1965, the names of Mr. Clark, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kennedy of New York, and Mr. Tower were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 944) to provide for expanded research in the oceans and the Great Lakes, to establish a National Oceanographic Council, and for others purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and other Senators) on February 2, 1965.

NOTICE OF HEARING RELATING TO RULE XXII

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and other interested persons that the Senate Subcommittee on the Standing Rules has scheduled hearings on Senate Resolution 6, Senate Resolution 8, and Senate Resolution 16, resolutions dealing with changes in rule XXII, limitation on debate. The hearings will be held on February 23 and March 1 in room 301, Old Senate Office Building, starting at 10 a.m.

Any Senator or other person wishing to testify at the hearing should notify the staff director, Kent Watkins, room 133, Senate Office Building, extension 2235, in order to be scheduled as a witness.

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on Thursday morning, February 4, the 13th consecutive annual prayer breakfast was held. The breakfast was attended by the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, Members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, members of the diplomatic corps, Governors of various States, and members of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Also there were present over 70 presidents of national and international labor unions, over 100 of our outstanding Nation's leaders in the field of industry and business, the chancellors and the presidents from a select number of universities and colleges, and men of distinction from the courts, communications, and every other phase of our economic life.

We have found this event to be very meaningful, not only to those of us who gather at the breakfast but also to the millions of citizens across this Nation.

The growth of the prayer breakfast movement during these past 13 years has been remarkable. As a result of this breakfast, practically every Governor in the United States holds an annual Governor's prayer breakfast in his own State capital with the leaders of that State. And literally hundreds of smaller regular groups are meeting to foster faith and freedom in this land and around the world.

Prayer groups now meet regularly in the National Canadian Parliament, the House of Commons in London, Tokyo, Paris, Madrid, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Ethiopia, and other places.

There is a growing appreciation for the values gained when leaders meet in the spirit of prayer, recognizing that our ultimate hope and trust is in our God.

The annual event grew out of the inspiration that has been received in the prayer breakfast groups which meet weekly in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

New prayer groups which meet weekly are being organized among businessmen, civic officials, secretaries, clerks, housewives, college and university students. This should be most encouraging to all of us for it can do much to strengthen the spiritual character of our great Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a copy of program and proceedings:

There being no objection, the program and proceedings were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST PROGRAM

At 8 a.m., hymn: "Sweet Hour of Prayer," U.S. Army Chorus.

Presiding: The Honorable Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator.

Invocation: Lt. Gen. M. H. Silverthorn, U.S.M.C., retired.

Breakfast.

Remarks: Senator Frank Carlson.

Scripture: The Honorable Horace R. Kornegay, representing the House breakfast prayer group, will read from the Old Testament.

The Honorable Everett Jordan, representing the Senate breakfast prayer group, will read from the New Testament.

Prayer of intercession: Dr. Abraham Vereide, founder of ICL.

Remarks: The Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Solo: Tony Fontane.

Message: Lt. Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

The President of the United States.

Benediction: Dr. Richard Halverson, associate executive director, International Christian Leadership.

Closing hymn: "Sweet Hour of Prayer": U.S. Army Chorus.

Senator Carlson. The invocation will be given by General Silverthorn, U.S.M.C. (retired).

General Silverthorn. May we bow our heads in prayer.

Our heavenly Father, we come before Thee with thankful hearts. We thank Thee for our Christian heritage, for Thy guidance to those who founded our country, for the opportunities afforded us in this land of freedom, and for the glowing lamp of Thy word and the gift of Thy Son, Jesus Christ.

Father, Thou knowest our innermost thoughts. Cleanse our minds and hearts of all thoughts that are unworthy of Thee. Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go and lift us above unrighteous anger and mistrust.

Especially do we pray, our Father, for Thy blessing on the President of the United States. May our country, under his leadership, be a shining light of wisdom in Thy work. Fortify him and all others in authority with the armor of Thy righteousness.

Father, as Thou didst tell Thy people centuries ago to humble themselves, to pray, to seek Thy face and to turn from their evil ways, so reveal to us here assembled this very hour the means of drawing nigh to Thee so that we may avail ourselves of Thy divine power.

Almighty God, teach all of us to be humble. Challenge us to dedicate ourselves to the honor and glory of Thy name so that we may faithfully represent Thee today, tomorrow and forever.

This we pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Senator Carlson. At this time, I want to present the host for this occasion. An outstanding citizen and a great Christian layman. This is the eighth year that he has been host to this outstanding Presidential prayer breakfast.

BILL JONES (of Los Angeles, Calif.). Mr. Chairman, prayer has played a significant part in my life, and I feel perfectly at home here. The reason I'm sure that Jesus Christ changes a life is because He changed mine, and in answer to a prayer 12 years ago, after being an alcoholic for 15 years, ruining my home, my friends, and everything, He put a new light into me and I've experienced this miracle in my own life.

Out of this light came a new perspective such as I've never known, under which discouragements and failures have the significance of God's method of maturing and giving a greater capacity. I found that my lot in life has been much more significant. I know that when I come to the point of wanting something I can't afford, I pray that God will take the desire away, and in that way I'm not stuck with the payments.

I've found that the more I give, the less I want. I knew there was something there that was beyond description: The more I give, the less I want.

I've found that God has taken things out of my life through prayer that permits me to enjoy that which, I'm sure, He intended—and that is my relationship with my wife, the respect of my children, the love and concern of my community, and my particular place in God's purpose—having come under His plan.

And I keep thinking: What shall it profit a man if he gained every ambition he has—and lose his wife and his children and their respect?

Mr. President, every day our five children and my wife and I, we gather and we pray. And we pray for you because, having tasted of the significance of prayer, we know that it's significant in your life, and we know that God knows your needs and that He's going to meet them in a much more significant way if we are constantly in prayer for you. And that's our partnership.

And Mr. Vice President, to add your name specifically to our morning prayer has really been a pleasure, and we sure pray God's virtuous blessings upon you.

Thank you very much.

Senator CARLSON. The Scripture lesson will be read by representatives of the House prayer breakfast group and the Senate prayer breakfast group. Reading from the Old Testament will be the Honorable HORACE R. KORNEGAY, from North Carolina, and reading from the New Testament will be the Honorable EVERETT JORDAN, Senator from North Carolina.

Representative KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker of the House, distinguished guests, I bring you greetings from the House prayer breakfast group—a group of the Members of the House which meet regularly every Thursday morning in the Capitol for breakfast. It's the one time and the one place during the course of a busy week where we Members of the House can gather in quiet meditation and prayer, where there is no division, no controversy, no dispute and no quarrel. For regardless of party, State, or sections of the country from which we come, there is a genuine acceptance of each other and a common understanding of the purpose for which we gather.

And that purpose is to recognize and give thanks to Him who created us and for His bountiful blessings and the sacred privilege which He has given us to serve Him and all of mankind.

I shall read the first Psalm:

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of the sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord and in His law doth he meditate day and night.

"And he shall be like the tree planted by the rivers of water that bringeth forth his fruit in his season. His leaf also shall not wither and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.

"The ungodly are not so, but are like the chaff which the wind driveth away. Therefore the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous, for the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, but the way of the ungodly shall perish."

Senator JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, and distinguished guests, when I first became a Member of the Senate I was invited, I think, the first week I arrived, to become a member of the Senate breakfast prayer group which I accepted and which I have enjoyed and which I have gotten a great deal of benefit and satisfaction out of.

It is my pleasure and privilege this morning to bring you greetings from the senatorial prayer breakfast group, and to wish that we can continue on these breakfasts here as we have in the last 13 years.

I've been to seven of them and get more pleasure out of them every time I come to one.

I shall now read portions from the sixth chapter of Matthew and the seventh chapter of Matthew:

"No man can serve two masters for either he will hate the one and love the other or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

"If God so clothe the grass of the field, which is today and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?

"But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

"Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.

"If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him?

"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

Senator CARLSON. At this time we are going to have the prayer of intercession which will be led by a truly great Christian patriarch, a founder of the ICL and its present executive secretary, Dr. Abraham Vereide.

PRAYER OF INTERCESSION BY DR. ABRAHAM VEREIDE

Somebody in this room that most of us, maybe, have not been aware of—He is here. And I suggest that we stand and address ourselves to Him.

Lord God, Almighty, help us to pray. We are in such great need of Thee for ourselves individually, for our Nation and for the world.

We remember today our leadership over in the Far East, our representatives around the world, how they are linked with us here.

And as we stand together here before Thee, O living God, to whom all men are accountable, we thank Thee that we can come presenting those who are our elected or appointed leaders to give Thee thanks.

Lord God, we thank Thee.

And now together we humbly pray Thee, once again, that the spirit of wisdom, of understanding, of love, and of power may rest upon our President in his tremendous responsibilities as our Chief Executive, upon our Vice President and all these leaders in their various capacities, and upon this great Nation, that we may learn to live together in understanding and cooperation for Thy sake, for the sake of the country as a whole and for the sake of the world that keep their eyes on us.

Grant us, O God, grace to repent and to be converted, that our sins may be forgiven and blotted out and that we in Thy presence may learn to live in humility and in harmony with a daring faith and in mutual appreciation.

Thank you, Lord God, for hearing us. And may now Thy peace fill our hearts, Thy joy, Thy love shed abroad by Thy holy spirit, and we thank Thee, Lord, that Thou wilt do it for Christ's sake.

Amen.

Senator CARLSON. This morning we are privileged to have with us a great parliamentarian, a dedicated public servant, a Christian layman and a very personal friend of mine. It's a pleasure to present the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK.

ADDRESS OF HOUSE SPEAKER JOHN M'CORMACK

Representative and Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK. Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Senator CARLSON, reverend clergy, and distinguished public officials and distinguished gentlemen in all walks of human activity, the one area in which we can all be in agreement today is that the Presidential prayer breakfast comes clearly within the atmosphere of being a divine institution. For it is as godly as prayer itself, and yet it occurs under this impressive hospitality.

And because it brings us together under circumstances of good will and friendship and the breaking of bread, it creates an atmosphere for the better transaction now and in the months and years ahead to come of the business of our country and of the free world and of mankind in general.

For we are embarked on what may well—very well be the greatest legislative and leadership adventure of the 20th century. Those of us present and others hold in our hands a destiny upon which history itself hangs in the balance. It is important that we should not only work together, legislate together, commune together, in an understanding manner; equally important, but representing in our own life and in the life of our country what the meaning and significance of understanding minds are and can produce, that we should breakfast and dine together and thus on every level of human endeavor get to know each other for the best results in the management of the affairs of mankind.

It has well been said of the President of the United States that his political style is based upon the saying of Isaiah, the prophet, and I quote: "'Come now, and let us reason together,' saith the Lord."

The greatest and most lasting achievements of men and nations are brought about in this way—not by force in the exercise of arbitrary power, necessary at times for self-preservation, not by pretense and indirection, but by friendly discussion and persuasion.

The ecumenical spirit abroad—and this breakfast started 13 years ago, which is an ecumenical spirit—the ecumenical spirit abroad today in this land and all over the world is, I fervently believe, a manifestation of the spirit of God. In this spirit, people of differing religious beliefs are meeting, filled with devotion to God and with good will toward one another, to discuss both the differences and the similarities of their religious beliefs and customs and to join wholeheartedly in prayer, thereby extending areas of agreement—and, as a result, reducing areas of misunderstanding.

Whatever the differences of our faiths and traditions, we gain in moral strength and spiritual grace from meeting together, as we do today, in the love of God and in human fellowship to pray for the good of our country and for mankind.

It is for these reasons that I like to think of the institution of the Presidential prayer breakfast as an institution of the highest moral order of human betterment; to those like President Johnson who are warm of heart and eager for achievement, whose leadership is dedicated to the unity of our Government in the eyes of the world, it is more than just a meeting at breakfast—it is the relaxed, but sincere, expression in the home atmosphere of a dedication to the great task for the coming year.

For we have the leadership in the President, we have the will, we have the understanding and the independence in you and I as legislators and Governors and all other public officials and businessmen and everyone throughout our country, and we have, as we know, the approbation of a divine providence.

Senator CARLSON. At this time we are to be favored with a solo by one of our Nation's outstanding television and recording artists, Tony Fontane.

(Tony Fontane sings "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," and "The Old Rugged Cross.")

Senator CARLSON. This morning we're honored to have as our guest speaker a great soldier, a great statesman, and a Christian layman. I could dwell at length on his outstanding military service, from graduation at West Point until the very present time. One thing I would like to mention is that he's a survivor of the Bataan death march and was a prisoner of the Japanese from 1942 to 1945. He has received many decorations for outstanding and meritorious service, not only from our own Nation, but from foreign countries. And, of course, coming as I do from Kansas, naturally I feel one of his most important assignments was Commandant of the U.S. Army Command and Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

The Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. Harold K. Johnson.

ADDRESS BY CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY, GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON

General JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Justice Clark, distinguished guests, I suspect that I share with you the single question that is passing through most of your minds at the stage: What in the world is this Johnson doing up here this morning?

And I don't believe that it is because I happen to share the same name as my Commander in Chief, but because, like our President, I believe in the power and the glory and the strengths of Almighty God.

I believe that each of us can draw strength to do the things that are expected of us by believing firmly and fiercely in one God and His Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

And I want to tell you a story. Twenty years and 52 days ago this morning I sat huddled at the bottom of the ladder that led into a baggage hold with 487 other Americans on a Japanese prison ship named the *Orioko Maru*. We were under attack by American aircraft. The armed ship was putting up a desperate defense. An occasional shell whistled around the metal sides of the hatch leading into that baggage hold and some men were struck.

I bowed my head and prayed, and in the course of my prayer said: "Lord, I am ready if you want me." And I knew a great peace.

Ten days later on Christmas Eve there were 187 Americans in and on a single small freight car that was part of a trainload making its way across the plains of central Luzon toward a rendezvous with another Japanese prison ship in Lingayan Gulf in the northern Philippines.

Men's thoughts turned to God and to the birth date of our Saviour. A few feeble voices were raised in a croaking attempt at a Christmas carol. And there was a small measure of comfort in that group.

Twenty-two days later another ship made its way slowly out of a harbor at what was then Takao and is now Kaosiung, Formosa, still en route to Japan. Each evening, after darkness had settled over a stark and dreary cargo hold filled with a decrepit bunch of men, a strong voice was raised in a corner of the hold, and a Catholic priest asked for God's mercy and God's blessing for that group of men.

As the voyage neared its end, 2 weeks later, that voice, having grown more feeble with each passing night, was finally stilled in death. God had taken one of His children.

Fourteen years and two months ago on a lonely road just southeast of Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea, a road that was deserted except for a small handful of American defenders, a lonely commander was deeply troubled by the threat of the men that he was charged with safeguarding. Could he do the job that was his to do and still give his men a fighting chance to survive? And out of the still of the night, as if from a great distance, came God's voice saying, "Be strong, have no fear, I am with you."

And in the years that have since passed by I continue to turn to God, both in my infrequent hours of accomplishment or achievement to thank Him and in my more frequent hours of tribulation to seek His help.

In short, I am here because I believe. I am sure that you are here because you believe. And my belief has been nourished by a homely story that, perhaps, many of you know, entitled, "One Solitary Life," which was written by an author whose name is not known.

And I quote:

"Here is a man who was born in an obscure village, the child of a peasant woman. He grew up in another obscure village. He worked in a carpenter shop until he was 30, and then he was an itinerant preacher. He never wrote a book; he never held an office; he never went to college; he never put his foot inside a big city; he never traveled 200 miles from the place where he was born. He never did one of the things that usually accompany greatness. He had no credentials but himself. He had nothing to cope with this world except the naked power of his divine manhood.

"While still a young man, the tide of popular opinion turned against him. His friends ran away. One of them denied him. He was turned over to his enemies. He went through the mockery of a trial. He was nailed to a cross between two thieves. His executioners gambled for the only piece of property he had while he was on this earth while he was dying, and that was his coat.

"When he was dead, he was taken down and laid in a borrowed grave through the pity of a friend."

And I continue to quote:

"Nineteen wide centuries have come and gone. And today He is the centerpiece of the human race and the leader of the column of progress.

"I am far within the mark when I say that all the armies that ever marched and all the navies that ever were built and all the parliaments that ever sat and all the kings that ever reigned put together have not affected the life of man upon this earth as powerfully as has that one solitary life."

That's the end of the quote.

In the light of that man's "solitary life," each of us must wonder and ask what he can do to make this world better. Each of us wants to know what he can do to make our country stronger, greater, and in the image described in various places in the Holy Bible.

My own search for an answer has found and still finds encouragement in these words from Phillips' translation of First Corinthians, the 12th chapter and verses 4 through 11. And I quote:

"Men have different gifts, but it is the same Lord who is served. God works through different men in different ways, but it is the same God who achieves His purposes through them all. Each man is given his gift by the spirit that he may make the most of it. One man's gift by the spirit is to speak with wisdom, another's, to speak with knowledge. The same spirit gives to another man faith, to another the ability to heal, to another the power to do great deeds. The same spirit gives to another man the gift of preaching the word of God, to another the ability to discriminate in spiritual matters, to another speech in different tongues, and to yet another the power to interpret the tongues.

"Placing all these gifts is the operation of the same spirit who distributes to each individual man as he wills."

And that's the end of that particular quotation.

Then to deepen the meaning of these words, we can turn to the 12th chapter of Romans and the 3d through the 8th verses.

And again I quote from Phillips:

"As your spiritual teacher I give this piece of advice to each one of you: Don't cherish exaggerated ideas of yourself or your importance, but try to have a sane estimate of your capabilities by the light of the faith that God has given to you all. For just as you have many members in one physical body and those members differ in their functions, so we, though many in number, compose one body in Christ and are all members of one another.

"Through the grace of God we have different gifts. If our gift is preaching, let us preach to the limit of our vision. If it is serving others, let us concentrate on our service. If it is teaching, let us give all we have to our teaching. And if our gift be the stimulating of faith in others, let us set ourselves to it.

"Let the man who is called to give, give freely. Let the man who wields authority think of his responsibility. And let the man who feels sympathy for his fellows act cheerfully."

And that's the end of that quotation.

And, finally, there is a guide for each of us in the 16th verse of the 5th chapter of Matthew:

"Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

Senator CARLSON. I have a wire from Dr. Billy Graham which reads:

WIRE, DR. BILLY GRAHAM

"Greetings from Hawaii, where I'm speaking this morning at the Governor's prayer breakfast and praying that you will have the greatest prayer breakfast in history.

"Please assure President Johnson, as he leads the Nation at this critical period of history, that he has my daily prayers. And God bless you all."

And it's signed: "Billy Graham."

Senator CARLSON. It is a high honor and a great privilege to present the President of the United States.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Senator CARLSON, reverend clergy, Vice President HUMPHREY, Speaker MCCORMACK, Justice Clark, members of the Cabinet, Mr. Minority Leader of the House, distinguished guests, Governors, ladies, and gentlemen, I'm very grateful for the opportunity to participate again in an occasion which has already come to be a very valued place in the life of Washington, our Capital City, and in the lives of so many of us who must labor here.

In our history it has been popular to regard with skepticism the private motives of public men and never more than when they participate in meetings such as this.

I'm sure such skepticism has been deserved by some. But I am more certain that only the unknowing and the unthinking would challenge today the motives that bring our public officials together on occasions like this for prayer and meditation.

In these times, more than any other, the public life is a lonely life. The burden of every vote, of every decision, of every act and, yes, even of every utterance is too great to be shared and much too great to be borne alone.

I find for myself, as I know men and women throughout this great Government of ours also find, a sustaining strength from the moments of prayer, whether we assemble together or whether we pray silently alone.

What has become a tradition and practice in our times is actually one of the oldest public traditions of our national life.

Long ago when this country was struggling to come into being, there arose at the Constitutional Convention a discussion and a debate about holding prayers before each session at that Convention. The great Benjamin Franklin spoke up to speak his views, and I believe it's appropriate and timely this morning to repeat and to endorse those words now.

Dr. Franklin told the framers of our Constitution, and I quote him:

"Without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests. Our projects will be confounded and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages.

"And what is worse," Dr. Franklin went ahead to add, "mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance despair of establishing government by human wisdom and leave it to chance and to war and to conquest."

Today, in our times, the responsibilities and the burdens imposed upon each of us are great and frightening and growing.

On us—on each of us—on our decisions that we individually and collectively make, rests the hope of mankind throughout the world for a world that is not left to chance or not left to war or not left to conquest.

I think that we could find no more appropriate way to begin our day, today, and our duties in this hour, than to pray for, as we are taught, "Except the Lord build this house, they labor in vain that build it."

Senator CARLSON. We will all stand and the benediction will be pronounced by Dr. Richard Halverson, associate executive director of International Christian Leadership.

BENEDICTION

Dr. HALVERSON. The Lord bless thee and keep thee. The Lord make His face to shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon thee and give thee His peace, now and in the life everlasting. Amen.

(The U.S. Army Chorus sings "America.")

VIEWS OF SENATOR MANSFIELD ON THE CRISIS IN VIETNAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader is unable to be present in the Senate today. He requested me to insert in the RECORD on his behalf a brief statement on an aspect of the Vietnamese situation. I consider his statement of such import and find myself in such wholehearted agreement with his thoughts, I shall read it into the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

There are reports that the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom may no longer regard as operative their responsibilities as cochairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference. It is to be hoped that these reports are inaccurate but if they are not, that these two powers would reconsider their position, and resume their responsibility with a view to a constructive surveillance of the serious situation in southeast Asia.

The 1954 Geneva Conference, despite its shortcomings, did help to bring several years of relative order out of the then chaotic and unstable situation in Indochina. It shut off, for the time, what had become a bloody war in the Indochinese peninsula and what was tending in the direction of a massive war in Asia.

The 1954 conferees may or may not have a contribution to make in the current deepening crisis in Vietnam. But in the light of the danger of that crisis to peace in Asia and, ultimately to world peace, it would appear desirable not to foreclose that channel of possible amelioration of the difficulties. The need is to keep open doors, not to shut them. That applies not only to the Geneva Conference of 1954 but to the Geneva Conference of 1961, to the United Nations and to every routine or special avenue of diplomatic communication. It would be helpful, therefore, if the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom did not regard as at an end their responsibilities as cochairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference. Indeed, the responsibilities of all nations to contribute whatever they can to a just peace may be evaded but they cannot be lifted.

Mr. President, I completely support these views of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and believe that the suggestion he puts forward is an excellent and positive one. Having accompanied the Senator on a Presidential factfinding mission to Vietnam in 1962, I find myself possessed of an immense regard of his judgment and consider him in view of his many years' exposure to travel in and study of the Far East, the best informed member of our body on this part of the world. To my mind, his thoughts have great merit.

We are presently engaged in a war that appears as if it can only be won either by massive commitment of American soldiers ashore or by permitting escalation into nuclear warfare. I query whether our vital interests in that part of the world are equal to these alternatives. Nor, do I believe, can we pull out at this time.

Accordingly, I believe we must continue to hold on, seeking to arrive at a point where we can honorably negotiate a reasonable, solid, and forceful agreement that meets the interests of the Geneva powers, of ourselves, and, most important, of the Vietnamese people.

I also would strongly hope, too, that more of our SEATO Asiatic allies might see fit to help the South Vietnamese. So far, only the United States is playing a role in this regard and there are other countries closer to Vietnam with even more vital stakes at issue that should be more than carrying the load with us.

Finally, I wish to emphasize that at this time of decision and self-examination, I think it would be a great mistake if we withdrew from our present position, leaving a vacuum. To my mind we have no alternative but to show our determination and hold on as we are, seeking and probing for some reasonably solid and acceptable agreement.

AID FOR PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at this time, when the President's education program is being discussed, I think it is most important that we keep in perspective the real objective of us all—the better education of our Nation's children. All else that eventually results, the increase in college attendance, an increase in the number of our professional people, an increase in our country's gross national product, an enhancement of our general literacy, an increase in the relative strength in the world, all must build from this base of better education for all our children. Unless this base is there, preparation for jobs and careers, motivation to go on to college, and for all to take on increased responsibility in our Nation and world will fall short.

And when it comes to educating all our children, I mean all, not a portion, of our children. In this regard, I believe children in our parochial and private schools are just as important as children in our public schools; that they will play just as important a role in our Nation's life as those in our public schools. I think that much serious attention should be devoted to ways of improving their education as well.

As a Senator from Rhode Island, with 29 percent of our children in grade school attending parochial or private schools, I have a particularly deep concern with this matter.

In this connection, I believe that President Johnson has developed a very fine solution to the perennial problem of aid to nonpublic schools by his concentration upon the problems of the children themselves, as opposed to those of the schools. Much clearer thinking is needed on this whole problem, and, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks an interesting article by Carl N. Degler that appeared in the New York Times Magazine section on Sunday, January 31, 1965.

I do not necessarily believe this article may fully answer everyone's questions on this important issue. Nor do I believe that the situation rightly is not an issue. But, also, is it not time we stimulated discussion and thinking on it? I believe there is a fair and just solution in favor of assistance to the child in the private school.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

AID FOR PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS—A QUESTION OF EDUCATION, NOT RELIGION

(By Carl N. Degler)

It is time that Americans face the question of Federal aid to parochial schools. If we truly believe in the national goal to improve education for all we should stop our shifting and squirming and try looking at the problem realistically. With good will, understanding, and leadership from the national administration the conflicting views can be harmoniously resolved.

Although the question of Federal aid to private schools affects secular as well as religious schools, the issue centers upon the Roman Catholic parochial schools. They educate the preponderance of non-public-school children and when the issue is resolved for them, it will be resolved also for Lutheran, Jewish, Episcopalian, and secular private schools as well. Therefore, in what follows, the parochial schools are used as the example, though what is advocated for them applies to all others.

The issue, it should be stressed, is not a partisan religious one. Indeed, as one who was raised a Protestant, I hold no brief for parochial schools nor for the virtues of religious as opposed to secular education. The case for Federal aid to private education, it seems to me, is pragmatic and secular.

The starting point of all discussions on the question is the simple fact that almost 6 million American schoolchildren—about one in seven—are educated in private schools, more than 90 percent of which are operated by the Roman Catholic Church. The proportion in some States is considerably higher. Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Hampshire, for example, have almost a quarter of their children in private schools; Rhode Island counts 29 percent and Wisconsin 27 percent. In cities like Pittsburgh, New York, and Chicago, the proportion of children in Roman Catholic schools alone is between 30 and 40 percent.

From the standpoint of numbers alone, Roman Catholic schools are functioning as quasi-public institutions. The immediate question is: As public education is steadily improved with more funds, better equipment, and higher pay for teachers, can the parochial schools match that improvement? The answer seems to be no.

Ever since the late 1950's, the parochial schools have been growing fast, considerably faster than the public schools. Between 1940 and 1963, the number of pupils in parochial schools jumped 129 percent, as compared with a 53-percent rise in the public schools.

Needless to say, this rapid growth has been a tremendous drain upon the financial resources of the parishes and dioceses, which support the schools. Stiff tuition charges are now common for parochial schools, and they continue to go up. A recent survey of 136 diocesan high schools showed that two-thirds had raised tuition since 1955; 90 of them charged $100 or more a year. These charges, of course, are in addition to general contributions by the parishioners.

At the same time, one of the principal financial advantages of parochial schools has been waning. Because so many of the parochial schools have been traditionally staffed by nuns, instructional costs have been considerably lower than in public schools. But as the parochial schools have multiplied, the number of available nuns has not kept pace. In 1945, nuns outnumbered lay teachers in parochial schools 13 to 1; in 1959, the ratio was 3 to 1; by 1970 it is estimated that the number of lay teachers will be double that of nuns.

In itself such a reversal means a tremendous increase in costs. A nun's subsistence and allowance runs between $650 and $1,250 a year, while lay teachers in parochial schools are paid an average of $3,400. Heavy as the increase in costs will be as the shift from teaching nuns to lay teachers is made, it will get considerably heavier as the parochial schools try to staff their schools with the best lay teachers. The present average pay of the lay teacher is considerably below the average of $5,200 for public school teachers. Moreover, few of the parochial schools provide fringe benefits like pensions, which are taken for granted by public school teachers.

In short, the quality of teaching is endangered in the parochial schools, if it has not been reduced already. As the situation now stands, parochial teachers are working under tremendous handicaps, with class sizes far above the average for public schools. Class rolls of 50 or 60 students are common and ones of 90 are not unknown. The average class size in the public schools is 26. Although the educationally optimum number of students in a class is certainly debatable, it is safe to say that quality of education must be inferior, all other things being equal, when classes reach such size.

Two points in President Johnson's recent congressional message on education would provide some oblique Federal aid to parochial schools. One calls for $100 million of grants for library and textbooks for public and private schools. The other calls for $100 million for the creation of supplementary education centers at which public school systems would allow parochial school children to use some of their facilities and attend some of their classes on a shared-time basis.

Revolutionary as these proposals may be considered by some, they are inadequate on both financial and constitutional grounds. Neither lifts much of the financial burden under which the parochial schools now stagger. Moreover, two States (New York and Iowa) have already indicated that shared time violates State constitutional bans on aid to religious schools. Other States, with similar explicit prohibitions in their constitutions, will undoubtedly arrive at the same conclusion in short order. In sum, the need for Federal aid to private schools in general, and parochial schools in particular, remains as crucial as ever.

To one not immediately involved with parochial education, the present crisis undoubtedly appears unfortunate, but outside his concern. He may simply shrug his shoulders, remarking that Catholic children should go to public schools. But this attitude is surely as socially shortsighted as it is insensitive. The enormous rise in parochial school enrollment in itself attests to the strong interest of many parents in religious education.

(Some critics have argued that this increased attendance is actually a result of a desire to escape racially integrated public schools, but the number of such cases is really negligible. The argument certainly does not apply at all in southern cities like New Orleans or Charleston, or in the South as a whole, where parochial schools have led the region in desegregation. Indeed, one could make a good argument that in many communities, North and South, the parochial school is more socially, as well as more racially, heterogeneous than the pubic schools simply because of the larger districts from which the parochial schools draw their students.)

The fact is that several million future citizens are going to continue to be educated in parochial schools, regardless of what others of us may think about their merits or demerits. In such circumstances, no one who is alert to the central role that education plays in our increasingly technical society can afford to be indifferent to the quality of parochial schools. What kind of improvement in job opportunities and in the technical skills of our people can be achieved when one-seventh of the children are left behind in inferior schools? One does not have to be a Catholic to be alarmed at such shortsightedness—he has to consult no more than his own self-interest.

There is a further social reason for including parochial schools in Federal aid to education. Unfortunately, in the debate over this question, some overzealous Catholics have muddied the waters. They assert that those parents who send their children to parochial schools are taxed doubly for education: once for public schools and again for parochial schools.

Legally, of course, the argument is specious. No law requires Catholic parents to pay for parochial schools or denies their children access to public schools. But if the argument lacks legal substance, it carries moral force. Catholic-school parents do in fact pay more for education than non-Catholics—and, in doing so, they actually save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Because of this, non-Catholics who smugly invoke the doctrine of separation of church and state are no more disinterested interpreters of the principle than are Catholics. The question of Federal aid to parochial schools needs recognition of the Catholic contribution and the national good, not slogan trading.

Nor does it mitigate the Catholic parents' sense of financial burden to recall that the doctrine of separation of church and state in America as it pertains to education grew up pragmatically and not as a result of an abstract principle. Many know that all public education in America began as Protestant education, becoming secular only when Catholics, in the early 19th century, protested and demanded a share of the school funds to open their own schools. The Catholics failed to get the funds, but America got secular public schools. The point is that rigid, automatic adherence to an absolute interpretation of the doctrine of separation is a real source of social division.

To achieve the social harmony necessary for any healthy society some recognition of Catholic problems in education needs to be made by the rest of Americans. For too long, non-Catholic Americans have viewed the Roman Catholic Church as something more (or less, according to some) than a religion. Many Protestants still see it as simply concentrated power, something to be feared and fought.

Today, however, Catholics constitute a quarter of the population. The first Catholic President is as memorable for his sophisticated style as the first Catholic presidential candidate is remembered for his lack of it. Indeed, it is the new power and prominence of Catholics that constitutes the dynamite in the school issue.

To meet every plea for recognition of the Catholic parents' problem with the automatic response of separation of church and state can only drive Catholics to an unwise use of their power. One adamantine response begets another. The result is social division and, ultimately, national stagnation. Social amity requires that all Americans, not just Catholics, assume part of the burden of the parochial schools' pursuit of educational excellence.

The emphasis here is on understanding, not on right. It should be clear that no private school has a right to public aid. Some unthinking advocates of such aid, it is true, have argued that the constitutional doctrine of freedom of religion implies that the state must support church schools, else they are being denied their rights under the first amendment.

Such a contention is nonsense. Freedom of economic enterprise does not mean that all businesses must be kept afloat by the state. But, if the public good demands it, the Government may support certain enterprises, as it does the merchant marine and farming. That is a matter to be decided by public debate, not adjudicated according to immutable principles. Similarly, private education may be—indeed, should be—assisted by the Federal Government though not as a right.

But, it will be objected, the case is different in regard to education, where social need is not the only consideration. What of the constitutional doctrine of separation of church and state? Does not the Constitution prohibit any kind of support for religion, even for the schools? Actually, as I have been implying, the constitutional restrictions are less rigid than some opponents of Federal aid to parochial schools would have us believe.

Despite the decidedly pragmatic nature of their culture, Americans like to think that the separation of church and state in the United States is strict. Even John F. Kennedy fell into this cliche when, during the 1960 campaign, he spoke of believing in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute.

In truth, it has been neither absolute nor consistent. From the very first administration, Congress has provided for chaplains out of public funds, and the President has proclaimed days of thanksgiving. The Constitution itself recognizes Sunday, the Christian

Sabbath, as a day of rest. To this day, at the service academies, attendance at chapel is compulsory. And, above all, both the Federal and State Governments continue to support religion through tax exemptions of church property that run into hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

The one unbreachable tenet, and rightly so, has been that the Government may not support any religion or church directly. And this no advocate of Federal aid to parochial schools suggests. Nor is it an argument against Federal aid to religious schools to say it would be an opening wedge to direct support of religion. For more than 150 years, in one form or another, indirect aid has been given without breaching the essential principle; there is no reason why the effect would be any different now.

The Supreme Court has recognized that the doctrine of separation is not absolute. In 1930, in the case of *Cochran* v. *Louisiana*, the Court set forth its first major interpretation of the meaning of separation as applied to schools. The case concerned a Louisiana law that had provided for State-supplied textbooks for private schools, including parochial, as well as for public schools. When the law was challenged by a taxpayer on the ground that public money was being spent for a private purpose, the Court rejected the argument, asserting that the books served a public purpose, namely the education of the children.

Admittedly, the Court conceded, providing textbooks indirectly aided religious institutions, but that was not the intention of the State; hence, the law was not contrary to the constitutional prohibitions. Today several States provide free textbooks to private schools.

The principle of benefit to the child was also the basis of the Court's reasoning in the Everson decision in 1947, which permitted the use of public funds to pay for the transportation of children to a parochial school. A year later, in the McCollum case, the Court outlawed an Illinois practice of allowing religious classes, under the released-time program, to be held in public school buildings. Here the aid to the child was in support of religious teaching only.

Thus, the Court drew a line between those acts of Government that aid religion directly and those which aid religion only indirectly while pursuing a broader social purpose. Presumably, the child-benefit principle, as long as it does not support religious teaching as such, is capable of extension beyond textbooks and buses.

In fact, it has already been applied, though the Supreme Court has not considered the constitutionality of any of the applications. The best known instance, of course, has been the GI bill of rights, passed at the end of the Second World War to aid veterans education. Catholic colleges and universities received funds, through their students, along with secular institutions. Even veterans studying for the ministry and priesthood could call upon the law for benefits.

Parochial schools participate today in State and Federal school-lunch programs. Shared-time programs, endorsed in the President's message and already in operation in some cities, also constitute an application of the child-benefit doctrine. Purists may argue, as they have in regard to public buses being used by parochial school children, that any such services, by saving money for religious institutions, constitute a violation of absolute separation. But neither the American people nor the Supreme Court have been purists in the past in this regard; certainly there is no reason to begin now.

There is also evidence that many Americans are becoming aware of the need for some kind of accommodation on the issue. In 1961, the Gallup Poll reported that 57 percent of the population wanted no Federal funds to go to parochial schools. But by early 1963, 49 percent favored including parochial schools in any Federal aid, while only 44 percent were opposed. (The remainder were undecided.)

With the child-benefit doctrine available in constitutional interpretation and with public recognition of the need for Federal aid to all schools increasing, the time seems propitious for the Johnson administration to take the final step. What precise form Federal aid should take is, of course, a matter to be decided in the public forum.

Obviously it should not include any direct support of religious instruction. Probably the most useful form it could take would be financial grants for augmenting salaries of teachers of secular subjects, for laboratory equipment, for new classroom construction and for outfitting libraries. The amount might well be in proportion to the total educational appropriation of the parochial schools, and be distributed on a per capita basis.

The expenditure of the funds would probably be most efficiently overseen by the U.S. Office of Education, but congressional concern about Federal control might well cause this function to be placed in the hands of State departments of education. Regardless of the level of Government that undertakes the supervision of the expenditures, though, it should be understood that with a grant of money goes the right to see that it is used as intended.

Moreover, since this aid is a matter of policy and not of right, the amount granted to any individual private school would be considerably less than the full cost of operation. Thus public schools would remain the principal recipients of public funds—indeed, the only recipients on the local and State levels. There would, therefore, be no need to fear that the public schools would be superceded either in money or in public attention by the private or parochial schools.

To bring the issue explicity before the Nation will undoubtedly arouse heated discussion and perhaps even some latent fears and ancient animosities. But the question is too important to be weakly evaded and too urgent to be merely palliated. Of all recent President, Lyndon Johnson, with his proved powers of public and private persuasion, is eminently fitted for the task of public education and leadership that the subject demands.

Certainly the Great Society he dreams of and the mutual understanding among Americans he cherishes deserve no less. Moreover, once the thorny issue is faced and Congress has acted, the effect may well be as socially healing as the passage of the Civil Rights Act has proved to be for another threat to national amity and social progress.

A SPEEDY RECOVERY FOR SENATOR RUSSELL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we are all deeply distressed over the illness of the senior Senator from Georgia, and I know that I can speak for other Members of the Senate when I say that his presence is greatly missed on the floor of this body.

I would like to join with his loved ones, his host of friends and associates, his colleagues here in the Senate, and indeed all Georgians in wishing Senator RUSSELL a full and speedy recovery.

Mr. President, there appeared in the February 9 issue of the Atlanta Constitution an editorial expressing concern over Senator RUSSELL's illness, and the hope that he soon will be back at his desk in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SPEEDY RECOVERY

The illness of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL is a matter of deep concern and distress to all Georgians. He has served his State and his Nation well, and deservedly has been cited as the most effective of all Senators. His illness at a time of international crisis reminds us of his all-important role as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, in which capacity he has been instrumental in keeping the Nation strong.

The Constitution joins with all Georgians in extending best wishes to the Senator for a speedy recovery. We trust that within a few days he will be back in his accustomed place on the Senate floor.

FREEDOM'S RESPONSIBILITIES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMATHERS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on January 26 the able and distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] delivered a thought-provoking address before the Miami Woman's Club. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Florida has a great interest in foreign affairs. The address deals specifically with the situation that presently exists in southeast Asia. I believe it will be of great interest to all Senators and all readers of the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GEORGE A. SMATHERS BEFORE MIAMI WOMAN'S CLUB, JANUARY 26, 1965

I congratulate you on selecting the theme for this 65th year as "Freedom's Responsibilities." For it implies an awareness on your part, not universally shared, that freedom is not free, and perhaps uniquely in our generation of human history, the cause of freedom can slowly rise or swiftly ebb, depending upon how we "the people" discharge the responsibilities it entails.

Here in the United States freedom is making great strides under a government that recognizes that it derives all of its powers from the consent of the governed. We are moving forward in giant efforts to push back the frontiers of literacy, of health, and of economic and spiritual opportunity. Plato said: "Governments reflect human nature; states are not made out of stone nor wood, but of the character of their citizens." Judged against this platonic standard, I foresee a continuing strive toward excellence in our own society, driven along by the character of a responsible citizenry.

However, as we pursue our own vital interests at home, we cannot be unmindful of the plight and conditions of those who inhabit this earth with us. In the past 40 years, freedom's responsibilities have fallen upon the United States to defend and to extend.

This is not a role we sought nor even wanted. But it is one which wisdom compelled us to take after absorbing the lessons of 20th century history.

Twice in my lifetime, America has watched from the sidelines as the world became embroiled in a global war; and twice the challenge to our own survival forced us, finally to take up arms, and twice we and our allies thought that total victory and peace had been achieved.

Out of these experiences we have learned two lessons—lessons that have guided this Nation's international policies since 1945. First, we learned that the costs of war inevitably exceed its rewards. Second, we learned that the maintenance of peace requires eternal vigilance, and more: It requires patience, perseverance, a willingness to be involved with other nations with whom we share common interests, and an understanding that our own freedom is inexorably entwined with the cause of freemen in every part of the world.

That is why we have made commitments to various nations of the world, and that is why 52 cents of every one of our tax dollars is spent to maintain a Military Establishment second to none.

As President Johnson said in his state of the Union address: "Our hand is out, in a gesture of friendship, but our guard must remain up." And that's the way it must remain so long as the Communist system in any country is dedicated to the destruction of individual freedom and the total domination of the world.

However, a proper understanding of the communistic system, and its evolution in various countries, is indispensable to a rational response to the challenge it poses.

Until 1948, communism could best be described as a monolithic gargantua, whose policies were dictated from Stalinist Russia, and whose purposes were identical in every Communist state. In 1948, however, two developments in the Communist world precipitated a disunity within its orbit of influence and made it imperative for the United States to have a flexible policy toward the various Communist nations. I have reference to the Mao Tse Tung victory over Chiang Kai-shek's forces in China, on the one hand, and the breakaway of Tito's Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc on the other.

In recent years, China has maintained that it, and not the Soviet Union, is the exponent of "pure" Marxian-Leninist communism. Its position in this regard was enhanced by the death of Stalin in 1953, and the subsequent de-Stalinization campaign within the Soviet Union. Loyal to its claim, Peiping is today, in the words of Columnist William S. White "headquarters for the most poisonous agents for war and aggression, the most noxiously infectious core of trouble for the West in all the world."

She is dedicated to the spread of communism by the violent overthrow of democratic systems of government. That vast nation, once our ally and friend, has forced the United States to defend the Korean peninsula in the third most bloody battle in all of our hisory. It has forcefully taken over the Himalayan nation of Tibet. It has violated the borders of neutral India. It has fomented revolution among the newly independent nations of Africa and it is greatly responsible for the recent violence in the Congo. And it is now earnestly and energetically seeking to infiltrate and dominate all of southeast Asia.

In 1835, Alexis de Tocqueville wrote in his book, entitled "Democracy in America," that "it is [no longer possible] for men to remain strangers to each other, or to be ignorant of the events which are taking place in any corner of the globe." De Tocqueville's words, written 130 years ago, could not have more applicability than they do in 1965. For today the importunities of history have constrained the United States to commit 25,000 military advisers, and to suffer the loss thus far of 247 of those American advisers, in the remote and backward nation of South Vietnam, 15,000 miles from our shores.

All of that area of the world has long been an area of conflict and unrest. For nearly 100 years prior to the Second World War, the French occupied what was then known as French Indochina, consisting of the nations we know today as Cambodia, Laos, and North and South Vietnam. Japan occupied these territories during World War II from 1941 to 1945, and thereafter, the French, largely with U.S. assistance, sought to reclaim Indochina for itself. But the Indochinese people, having developed some nationalistic feelings, rebelled and the result was the disastrous defeat for the French at Dienbienphu in 1954. They lost over 25,000 men.

A conference was called at Geneva in that year and an accord was reached among 14 nations including China, U.S.S.R., but not the United States of America, whereby North Vietnam remained in Communist hands, and South Vietnam, under Premier Diem, was supposedly guaranteed its independence.

But it soon became apparent that the independence of South Vietnam was being threatened by Communist North Vietnam, urged on and abetted by the Peiping regime. John Foster Dulles, our then Secretary of State, persuaded President Eisenhower to intervene, first with our economic assistance and later with military aid and a small number of advisers. Thus began the long struggle that continues today.

Notwithstanding policy statements issued from time to time by the State Department, I think it is accurate to say that South Vietnam, in and of itself, is of no military consequence to our Nation's strategic defenses. The United States has an impervious line of defenses in the Pacific, stretching from Alaska down through Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, and Formosa. We have SAC forces always on the alert on the island of Guam; our 7th Fleet is in command of the far Pacific, the South China Sea, and the Formosan Straits. We are in South Vietnam, not to aid in our own immediate defense, but as the result of a considered conclusion of the needs of the free world to check the advance of Chinese communism in southeast Asia.

If South Vietnam were to fall into Communist hands, it would precipitate the demise of freedom in all the nations of southeast Asia. Malaysia, Burma, Thailand, would inevitably fall behind the Bamboo Curtain. Cambodia which is today playing both sides of the fence would be sucked into the Communist morass. It appears that President Sukarno has Indonesia already headed straight for the Communist camp. It is not entirely unlikely that, with southeast Asia in its grasp, the next moves of Communist aggression would be into the Philippines, New Guinea, New Zealand, and perhaps even the Australian Continent. More than a billion people, people who are now free and want to remain free, would have fallen under the domination of Communist China. Her strategic position in the world would then be immensely more formidable, and her drive for world domination more aggressive and determined than ever. If that unhappy day should come, America would once again be forced to wage a great battle for survival, and while our capability for total destruction is such that we would win, it would be a victory that would leave, in the words of President Kennedy, "survivors who would envy the dead."

However, amidst this panorama of gloom, there are two facts that immensely weigh in our favor. First, while the Chinese Communists have exploded a primitive nuclear device, they do not presently have, nor will they have for perhaps another 10 years, a capability with which to wage nuclear war. Secondly, the Soviet Union, which does have such a capability, capitulated to the fearsome ultimatum of President Kennedy's in October 1962, and they withdrew their nuclear missiles from the island of Cuba. In the perilous calculations that one must make in this nuclear age, it is reasonable to believe that, having refused to risk total nuclear war over Cuba, the Soviet Union would demonstrate equal, if not greater, reluctance over triggering such a catastrophe in southeast Asia for the primary benefit of her now restive and critical ally, who perhaps in the near future, might well be her mortal enemy, Red China.

The question of what course this Nation should now pursue in South Vietnam must be resolved with a full understanding of what is at stake for America and for the cause of freedom both now and in the future.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate have raised their voices incessantly for an immediate and complete withdrawal of all American forces from South Vietnam. Parenthetically, no one is more personally concerned about our involvement in that area of the world than Rosemary and I, for our son, John, is a naval officer aboard a destroyer operating in those very troubled waters.

But I believe that a policy of withdrawal is diametrically opposed to the long-range vital interests of the United States, especially at this time when the advantages would all accrue to the Vietcong and their ally, the Chinese People's Republic.

In the past several months, we have heard other public figures go the other way—100 percent, and say that the United States should not restrain its awesome military might; that we should unleash our forces against the Communist Vietcong rebels. In their view, the United States should not refrain from using even tactical nuclear weapons, not only in South Vietnam, but in North Vietnam, or wherever the enemy hides or supplies itself. The advocates of this bold action by the United States are not concerned if their course should precipitate a war with Red China or even the Soviet Union. It is their view that we should flight them now and get it over with.

I doubt not the patriotism nor good intentions of these people but I do believe that these well-meaning persons have let their impatience outstrip their reason.

The last time that President Johnson visited with General MacArthur, the general urged the President never to commit this Nation to fight a major land war in Asia. We could not win without using our nuclear power and by using it, we challenge the Communists of the Soviet Union as they have never before been challenged, and no man can with certainty predict their response. Six weeks ago the Soviet Union reaffirmed its commitment for aid to its Communist allies.

I do not believe that we should either precipitously pull out of South Vietnam and thereby surrender it and southeast Asia to the Communists, nor that we should initiate a greater war than that now needed to stop the Communist incursions through South Vietnam.

I think that the policy this country is following at the present time is the wisest course for incurring the independence of southeast Asia. While conditions in that country remain admittedly grave, still there are some hopeful signs that our objectives can and will be achieved.

There is beginning to come into evidence among the South Vietnamese people the determination to resist the forces of communism similar to that which caused them to fight so stubbornly against the French after the end of World War II. It is also evident that under the direction of our military advisers, the Vietnamese Army is now developing a military capability which, in the forseeable future, should make these forces superior to that of the Vietcong.

As they recognize the growing threat that communism poses to their own safety and freedom other nations of Asia are beginning to join forces with the South Vietnamese. New Zealand and Australia have dispatched men and supplies; the Philippines and South Korea have offered to send troops, and there is a welding of thought and forces throughout free Asia; intent upon putting a stop to Communist aggression on South Vietnam. Of course, there remains a very volatile political situation.

Victory over communism in South Vietnam cannot be won unless and until the South Vietnamese Government is stabilized. The political problems of that country are almost too complex for anyone to fully grasp.

Not only must the Buddhists, the Catholics, and the military, reach some accord; but there are more than 60 political parties which have varying degrees of power and influence. And this is in a country where the meaning of "democracy" is virtually unknown. Today the most we can hope for is a degree of stability adequate to unite the people under the common umbrella of a desire for freedom from Communist slavery. General Taylor believes he is finally achieving that.

The fact is that with a stable government, with a superior indigenous military force, and with technical help from the United States and the signators to the Geneva Treaty, the South Vietnamese can win their battle for independence, and a respect for their borders—and this is the course we are now pursuing in this changing and fluid world.

Developments in other areas of the world seem to indicate that time is on our side. There are encouraging signs that some governments, while still calling themselves Communist, are less intent upon world domination than they are upon their own national interests. A case in point is Yugoslavia, which broke with the Soviet bloc in 1948, settled its differences with Italy over Trieste, and stopped the use of its country as a springboard of Communist conspiracy against Greece. Yugoslavia continues to move toward the Western World.

Other nations of Eastern Europe, such as Rumania, Poland, and Hungary, nations whose traditions and whose culture have been historically tied to the Western World, are making some progress toward meeting the basic needs of their people, and the more they get and learn and hear, the more they are making overtures to the free world.

Here again, America must employ a high level of wisdom in its international diplomacy. While the winds of change blow all around us, we cannot adhere to an inflexible, rigid foreign policy.

It is essential that we encourage these nations to advance toward the freedoms they once enjoyed. Merely because we abhor anything called Communist, we must not smother all glimmers of hope that freedom may once again be asserting itself in Eastern Europe.

For we have come to the time when the outlook for militant worldwide communism is no longer bright; when the Soviet Union is doing some soul searching of its own, and has even begun to experiment with our profit motivated, capitalistic type of economy. Most of the nations of the world are becoming more and more concerned about their own vital interests and are less and less enamoured of alliances with worldwide conspiracies.

Nowhere is this retreat of militant communism more apparent than in Latin America today. As paradoxical as it may seem, this happy development has been fostered in no small measure by the experience of communism on the island of Cuba.

Castro's brand of communism has backfired in Latin America.

Unlike the situation in South Vietnam, where the advances of communism are posing a military threat to all the countries of southeast Asia, Fidel Castro has failed in his efforts to export communism into the other Latin American Republics. He tried but he failed in Venezuela—in the Dominican Republic, in Argentina, and in Chile. As a matter of fact, he is even failing to establish a successful beachhead of communism in Cuba itself.

Far from being a showcase of success for the Communist system in Latin America, Cuba, is today, for all the world to see, communism's dismal failure and Fidel Castro's days are numbered.

His downfall is going to come from an uprising within the Cuban Army. There is already growing military unrest, and I would not be surprised to see a coup overthrowing him at any time.

As an encouragement to defectors within Castro's military, I would again urge the establishment of a Cuban government-in-exile. Such a move will encourage the enemies of Castro within his army and will hurry along the inevitable collapse of his government. Then, hopefully, Cuba will once again be free.

These are some of the areas around the world where the responsibilities of freedom weigh heavily upon this Nation of ours.

For, whether we like it or not, the United States of America is the leader in the battle for freedom.

In this role, we must have virtually a 360° vision for we must be mindful of what is going on all around us. The fight for freedom today is total, worldwide, and final.

Today we face a serious challenge in South Vietnam.

Events in Africa are uncertain and could get worse.

In the Middle East, the dissensions between the Jews and the Arabs could erupt into war at any time.

There are, however, areas of the world that offer encouragement and hope. As I said in Latin America and there are encouraging signs that things are looking better in Eastern Europe. And, even in Russia itself, we continue to see small but significant and increasing developments that may portend some further relaxation of world tensions.

But free men and women must remember that there are no pat nor easy solutions to any of these complex, ever-changing problems; that no one certain thing can be done to bring about the millenium and that no one can be certain that he alone has the answer.

The responsibility of freedom is to love and cherish it, to work at it, to be willing to sacrifice, even one's life, if need be, to protect and defend it.

This is the creed and the spirit that has made our land what it is today.

With that same devotion, with that same degree of faith in our country and in ourselves, and with divine guidance from above, we will most surely prevail.

ANTIPOVERTY

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the antipoverty program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. I also ask unanimous consent that several insertions be included in the RECORD immediately following the statement of the Senator from Kentucky. These include Mr. Walker's letter and enclosure, a telegram from Mr. Sparks, and newspaper items from the Lexington Leader, the Louisville Courier-Journal, and the Louisville Times.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORTON

Last year when the antipoverty bill was before the Senate, proponents argued that one aspect of the program offered an effective attack against our great national problem of the school dropout and unemployed youth. While I am as concerned over this educational, social, and economic problem as anyone, certain aspects of the proposal convinced me that a division of administration among various Federal agencies could lead to divisiveness working against commendable objectives. This was one of the reasons I was compelled to vote against the bill in the Senate.

Recent developments in Kentucky have confirmed my feeling that bureaucratic decisions could undercut the program and render it ineffective. Several communities in the Commonwealth had laid the groundwork for establishing National Youth Corps projects under the work training program provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Procedures had been established, pupils had been enrolled, and the communities were set to go ahead.

However, early enthusiasm and hope have been reduced to discouragement by the Department of Labor judgment that these young men and women must be paid a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour. Kentucky School Superintendent Harry Sparks reports that several approved projects have now been withdrawn. Other projects, although submitted but not approved, also will have to be withdrawn.

Paducah and Louisville, Ky., are two of the areas affected by Labor's preposterous decision, which appears to contradict the law as far as National Youth Corps wage rates are concerned. Section 113(a)(5) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 states that rates of pay "will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee." The Commonwealth of Kentucky is seeking a more favorable wage ruling from the Department of Labor, and I concur that a more realistic wage rate is fully justified.

Mr. Newman Walker, superintendent of schools in Paducah, has summarized his community's experience under the program in a rather lengthy letter. I am sure that many of my colleagues have received this letter. If not, I commend it to your attention.

PADUCAH PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Paducah, Ky., February 3, 1965.

Hon. THRUSTON MORTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The following letter sent by the Paducah, Ky., Board of Education to other school administrators and boards of education describes the recent experience that we have had in attempting to take advantage of the recently passed Economic Opportunity Act. It sets forth certain facts which show that our efforts to make this program work as intended by the Congress have been blocked by representatives from organized labor. We do not believe that those responsible for this obstructionism are familiar with circumstances which affect the majority of participating school systems throughout the Nation.

If after reading this letter you believe that this policy should be changed, we would greatly appreciate your expressing your opinion to the appropriate Labor Department officials. Should you desire additional information, please do not hesitate to make inquiry. We will appreciate any help that you can give us in this matter.

Sincerely,

NEWMAN WALKER,
Superintendent for Paducah Board of Education, Paducah Independent School District, Paducah, Ky.

PADUCAH PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Paducah, Ky., February 1, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I would like to seek your help in a matter which has become of great concern to school officials of Paducah, Ky., and other Southern and Midwestern States. As you probably know, the recently passed Economic Opportunity Act under section 1–B provides for a work-study program for in-school youth who appear to be potential dropouts due to lack of financial resources.

With the help of advice and materials from the Federal Government, the officials of the Paducah School System drafted a proposal for such a project and submitted it to the office of the National Youth Corps last October. Later, a Mr. Melvin Rogow of the National Youth Corps office in Washington flew to Paducah to tell us that our proposal had been given tentative approval and to assist us with some final revisions to bring the proposal up to date with the latest NYC policies. This was done and the Paducah work-study plan was resubmitted in final form on November 16, 1964.

The Paducah proposal contained the following provisions concerning pay rates for student enrollees:

"It is planned to pay all students holding any of the above specified positions an initial hourly wage rate of 75 cents. At the end of each school semester a 10 cent hourly wage increase would be given to those students whose work had been evaluated as completely satisfactory. However, in no case will the total hourly wage rate exceed 100 percent of the starting wage rate for inexperienced workers or 80 percent of the salary scale for adults employed in similar types of positions outside the program."

The above provision met with the approval of Mr. Rogow and seemed to be in accordance with the directions sent out by the National Youth Corps in their 10–2 guide which had been drafted to aid school systems in working up proposals. The following quotation is taken from the National Youth Corps 10–2 guide under section 7 entitled "Enrollee Wages and Conditions of Employment":

"The act requires that enrollee wages and conditions of employment be 'appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee.' In general, enrollee wages should be a little below the prevailing entry rates for inexperienced workers in similar occupations."

In another National Youth Corps guide, the following paragraph is found:

"Rates of pay and other conditions of employment must be appropriate and reasonable in view of such factors as the type of work performed, in level of skill involved, and the locality where the project is situated. For new enrollees, rates of pay are set somewhat below, such as at 80 percent, of the rate paid to beginner workers in the same or similar occupations in the project area. Pay rates may be raised as enrollees make suitable progress in the project, up to the full rate of beginner workers in the occupation involved."

It should be obvious from the above quoted materials that the Paducah proposal met precisely the standards set up by the Economic Opportunity Act and the directives of the National Youth Corps which were provided Paducah in both written and oral form.

On November 24, 1964, the superintendent of schools at Paducah received a telegram from Mr. Jack Howard, National Youth Corps Director. It is quoted here:

"We are pleased to tell you that President Johnson announced today that your work-training project under the National Youth Corps of the U.S. Department of Labor will be among the first to be established. We are notifying your Governor. Our field representative will be in touch with you within the next few days to work out final details.

"JACK HOWARD."

We had also been told by National Youth Corps representatives that since the project would soon be approved, we could proceed with the selection of pupils, job assignments, and establishment of administrative machinery so that the program could get underway soon after January 1, as the project proposal and budget had specified. This was done. The fact that the Paducah proposal had been approved for this project was announced to the press by National Youth Corps officials; and since it was the first in Kentucky to be approved, it naturally attracted considerable attention. Information concerning details of the already approved project was released to the press, including student wage rates. The State Department of Education of Kentucky mimeographed the Paducah proposal and sent it to every school system in the State to be used as a guide.

After 5 weeks had passed since the telegram of approval had been received and no additional information had been sent by the National Youth Corps, the superintendent of schools at Paducah called the National Youth Corps Office to make inquiry. He learned then that pressure from organized labor on the Secretary of Labor had caused a restructuring of policy concerning enrollee wage rates. The superintendent was informed that none of the already approved projects which did not provide for a minimum of $1.25 per hour for student enrollee wages were being made operational. He was told that if Paducah was willing to pay this amount, the contracts would be forwarded immediately.

After this rather ridiculous reversal of Federal policy was discussed with the Paducah Board of Education, the following conclusions were reached:

1. That since the salary of many of our custodians, cafeteria workers, and school secretaries who would be responsible for supervising the work of student enrollees is slightly less or not much more than $1.25 per hour, it would be impossible for us to accept this revised student wage scale. The implications are obvious. We would be happy if it were within the school system's financial resources to raise the salaries of adults working in these positions so that $1.25 for unskilled student help would not be excessive in comparison. However, this is not the case. The financial plight of our schools is well understood. It would appear that an attempt is being made to raise the Nation's minimum wage rate by using this program as a wedge. It is not the business of the Paducah Board of Education to support or oppose such a movement, and neither will the Paducah Board of Education be made the fuse for igniting an explosion of labor-management dissension.

2. We believe that to pay $1.25 per hour to students in Paducah for the extremely unskilled type of work being performed under this project would create a very poor attitude among them. Their sense of values would be distorted since prevailing wage rates in the area for this type of work are much lower. The "something-for-nothing philosophy" which has given certain other Federal programs a black eye would again be prevalent. A survey of the wage rates paid in Paducah for a number of relatively unskilled type occupations is listed here to support the above statements. These wage rates apply to adults as well as to part-time students who might be thus employed.

Average hourly wage rate of various service industries, adults and teenagers

Restaurant workers	$0.75.
Laundry workers	$0.75 to $1.
Hospitals (beginning kitchen help)	$0.75 to $1.
Food markets	$0.85 to $1.15.
Theaters	$0.75 to $1.
Variety stores	$0.75.
Department stores	$0.75 to $1.
Drive-ins (carhops)	$0.75.
Babysitters	$0.50 to $0.75.
Service station attendents	$0.75.
Newspaper carriers	$0.75.

If the school system were to begin paying youngsters $1.25 an hour under this program, it would have a very disturbing effect on employment conditions in the community and surrounding areas. This fact is supported by testimony from small businessmen who are operating competitively on a very small margin of profit and who would have difficulty staying in business if their wage rates were suddenly forced upward.

3. It has been learned that a work-study proposals submitted by Murray State College of Murray, Ky. (located only 40 miles from Paducah), under title 1–C of the Opportunity Act has been approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the basis of an hourly student wage rate of 70 cents. That it is proper for one Federal department to approve a program which pays college students 70 cents per hour and for another Federal department to insist that high school students receive $1.25 per hour is an example of the most exotic logic that has yet been produced by a Government bureau. The Paducah Board of Education does not believe that, when these facts become generally known, the American people will be able to appreciate such glaring inconsistency.

4. We feel that the Paducah school system has been grossly abused by the Department of Labor in this matter. The Department gave official approval to our proposal, including the wage rates provided in it, and then announced this fact to the public and press. It was only after this had been done that the Department apparently substituted its own wage level directive, the provisions of which appear to be contradictory to the intent of the Economic Opportunity Act as passed by Congress. If our board of education had known originally that the minimum hourly wage rate would be $1.25 instead of 75 cents, then it could have made a decision as to whether or not to submit a project for approval with that condition in mind. However, this was not the case. The Paducah school system finds itself in the position of having been widely praised for its early and sincere entry into the antipoverty war and then publicly embarrassed by an after-the-fact policy change which makes it impossible for Paducah to participate. The people of the Paducah area are now asking why this project, which could have provided so much help to so many students, has not been started after having already been approved by the Federal Government. The Paducah Board of Education has no alternative but to answer these people with the facts. Over 100 students already signed up for the project will have to be told that the help promised to them will not be forthcoming. The many projects being planned in Kentucky and elsewhere which used the Paducah proposal as a guide will have to be revised or dropped entirely.

For these and other reasons, the Paducah Board of Education wishes to voice its strongest protests and objections to this wage rate decision by the Secretary of Labor. We realize that this contradictory policy action has been provoked by great pressure from other sources. It seems to us, however, that this antipoverty program was designed for higher purposes than to be used as a political football. We feel sufficiently strong in our viewpoint that it is our intention to make our views widely known at every opportunity.

In talking with numbers of local school officials and community leaders in this part of the country, we have found unanimous agreement that this portion of the Opportunity Act will never get off the ground unless the Department of Labor has the courage to take a realistic position concerning the student wage rate policy. It seems tragic that large sections of the Nation will be unable to benefit from this part of the antipoverty program because of the absurd inflexibility of labor leaders and the political acquiescence of the Department of Labor.

The Paducah Board of Education is no enemy of organized labor. However, it does question the wisdom of labor's stand on this issue—a position which seems willing to sacrifice the future work capabilities of thousands of youth who may drop out of high school without the financial assistance that these programs would provide.

It is our hope that the original purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act will not be forgotten by the President and Congress as a result of political infighting between special interest groups. Swift corrective action is needed if the bitterness already developing over this obstructive decision does not spread and nullify the potential good of the program.

The Paducah Board of Education has set forth these facts concerning its experiences with the Economic Opportunity Act for your information. If you believe, as we do, that something should be done to enable all school districts to participate in and benefit from this program, we would appreciate hearing from you and receiving your support in making these views known to appropriate Government officials.

Sincerely,

NEWMAN WALKER,
Superintendent for Paducah Board of Education, Paducah Independent School District.

FRANKFORT, KY.,
February 3, 1965.

Re wage rates to be paid to pupils under Economic Opportunity Act.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Department of Labor has ruled that school districts must pay pupils $1.25 per hour while working on jobs under the work training project (title 1B) of the Economic Opportunity Act. Several schools, with proposals already approved, had had to withdraw their projects. Many other schools, whose projects have been submitted, will have to withdraw them if the ruling requiring $1.25 an hour wage is enforced.

Many of the job assignments of pupils will be supervised by permanent employees of the school district. The permanent employees receive less than $1.25 per hour. This would create an impossible situation in our school districts, that of having a pupil worker receiving more pay than his supervisor.

Section 113A, paragraph 5, states: "The rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee."

It is my opinion that the ruling by the Department of Labor is contrary to this section of the law.

The Department of Education has had high hopes for the work training (title 1B) part of the Economic Opportunity Act. We believe, rightly used, it can be a part of the answer to our "dropout" problem.

We strongly urge that you help us get a more favorable ruling on the required wage the pupils must receive.

HARRY M. SPARKS,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Feb. 4, 1965]

SPARKS URGES LOWER WAGES FOR TRAINEES—CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TOLD $1.25-AN-HOUR RATE RUINS KENTUCKY PROGRAM

(By Bill Neikirk)

FRANKFORT, KY.—Superintendent of Public Instruction Harry Sparks called upon Kentucky's congressional delegation yesterday to seek a lower wage rate for students who participate in the Antipoverty Act work-training programs.

Sparks indicated in a letter to the State's U.S. Senators and Representatives that a ruling by the U.S. Labor Department requiring a $1.25-an-hour wage rate under the program would wreck it in Kentucky.

"Several schools with proposals already approved have had to withdraw their projects," Sparks said.

"Many other schools whose projects have been submitted will have to withdraw them if a ruling requiring $1.25 an hour is enforced."

GRANTS MADE TO SCHOOLS

Under the Antipoverty Act, grants are made to school districts to pay students participating in work-training programs.

Sparks said many of the pupils' school assignments "will be supervised by permanent employees of the school districts. The permanent employees receive less than $1.25 an hour in many instances.

"This would create an impossible situation in our school districts—having a pupil worker receiving more pay than his supervisor."

POLICY SPELLED OUT

Sparks said one section of the Antipoverty Act says that "the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in light of such factors as the work performed, geographic regions and the proficiency of the employee."

He said that the Labor Department's ruling for a flat $1.25-an-hour wage rate "in my opinion * * * is contrary to this section of the law.

"The Kentucky Department of Education has had high hopes for the work-training program under the act," he said.

"We believe rightfully used it can be part of the answer to our dropout problem. We strongly urge that you help us get a more favorable ruling on the required wage."

James Melton, assistant superintendent of public instruction, estimated that 80 school districts in Kentucky have submitted proposals for participation in the work-training phase of the Antipoverty Act.

He said many are contemplating withdrawal unless there is a favorable decision from the Labor Department.

The Jefferson County Board of Education has already withdrawn from the program on the basis of this ruling, he said. [It finds] "itself in the position of having been widely praised for its early and sincere entry into the war on poverty and then publicly embarrassed by an after-the-fact policy change which makes it impossible for Paducah to participate in the school dropout program."

The local minimum wage scale is 75 cents an hour, and school authorities said the Labor Department's new $1.25 scale for student workers would "have a very disturbing effect on employment conditions in the community and surrounding areas."

Copies of the letter are being distributed to educational and civic leaders throughout Kentucky, and the State's congressional delegation. It criticizes both Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and President Johnson for backing labor's stand on the minimum wage.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, Jan. 26, 1965]

PAY SCALE FOR STUDENTS MAY SCUTTLE SCHOOL JOB PLAN

(By Ward Sinclair)

A Federal antipoverty program in Jefferson County schools appears to be scuttled because the Indians would make more than the chiefs.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps project for needy students would pay higher wages than the persons who would supervise them now receive.

School Superintendent Richard van Hoose recommended last night that the Jefferson County Board of Education withdraw from the program on those grounds.

The county had applied for some $475,000 in Federal antipoverty funds to hire needy students over 16 as part-time employees in the schools. The program is designed primarily to keep them from leaving school because of financial problems.

WAS RAISED ONCE

The city school system, which also has made application to participate in the program, indicated that it, too, might have some second thoughts in light of last night's county action.

Van Hoose said the program, as originally proposed, provided that the students receive 75 cents an hour.

"Then they told us that was too low and so we submitted the project to provide for $1 an hour," he said.

The Department of Labor said last week that participating students would have to be paid $1.25 an hour—the Federal minimum wage.

But, said Van Hoose, some of the school system's regular clerical and custodial people who would work with the youths are not now making that much.

"It would cost us $72,000 to bring those wages up to the minimum," he said.

School employees are exempted from the Federal wage law since they are employed by a governmental agency not involved in interstate commerce.

In the Youth Corps project, the youths' wages would be paid by the Federal Government.

EXPECTED 1,500 JOBS

The county will have to withdraw its application unless the Federal Government revises the $1.25 requirement downward, Van Hoose said. The board agreed.

James E. Farmer, assistant superintendent for instruction, said that Donald C. Schumacher, a Red Cross worker from Michigan who was hired to administer the program here, will become a teacher in the system instead.

School officials estimated that 1,500 youths would have participated in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in the county.

The Louisville school system also has applied for participation for an estimated 500 students.

Charles Patterson, who is coordinating the program in the city schools, said the understanding was that the city students would be paid $1 per hour.

He said, however, that in light of the country's action last night, the city would have another look at the program. He said there are some regular employees in the city schools who make less than $1.25 an hour.

[From the Lexington Leader, Feb. 3, 1965]

MINIMUM WAGE FOR TRAINEES THREAT TO YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM

The Department of Labor recently announced that young people enrolled in the National Youth Corps, a part of the Federal antipoverty program, would have to be paid at least $1.25 an hour. This decision was made by the Department of Labor at the urging of the AFL–CIO, whose president, George Meany, had argued that the trainees should not receive less than the Federal minimum wage.

By bowing to the union demand, the Department of Labor may very well have signed the death warrant for the Youth Corps, even before it gets into full swing. The Youth Corps, just now starting with centers in 23 States, is expected to enroll thousands of boys and girls between 16 and 21 years of age, providing them with jobs so they can stay in school and with training so they can have better employment opportunities.

The temporary jobs these young people will hold must be found largely in community-service enterprises, such as hospitals, libraries, and playgrounds, and are supposed to include work which otherwise would not be performed. The idea originally was that the boys and girls, largely untrained for any sort of jobs, would receive token wages, since they could not qualify for regular pay rates.

Under the new Labor Department ruling, made at the demand of the AFL–CIO, it is doubtful if jobs can be found for many of the unskilled young people. Employers simply are not going to pay untrained boys and girls that much.

Once more the labor unions have demonstrated that they would rather see people idle than allow them to work for less than a specified wage. And once more the Department of Labor has made plain that it ought to be renamed the Department of Union Labor.

LINCOLN VERSUS LENIN—A CONTRAST

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, tomorrow our Nation will again observe the birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln, a great former President and a great humanitarian.

The magazine "This Week," published by the Washington Sunday Star in its issue of February 7, 1965, contains an excellent article entitled "Lincoln Versus Lenin," written by Robert Kazmayer. Mr. Kazmayer, a publisher, lecturer, and world traveler, recently returned from a trip to Russia, where a visit to Lenin's tomb inspired the following thoughts, which I shall read into the Record. These are Mr. Kazmayer's words:

> I thought of the contrast between the two. You go down into the darkness in Lenin's tomb. At the Lincoln Memorial you ascend the steps in the light. You look down on Lenin; you raise your eyes to Lincoln. I don't want to be melodramatic about this thing, but there is a contrast between those two leaders, Lenin and Lincoln. Lenin spent his whole life setting class against class. Abraham Lincoln said, "You can't help the poor by attempting to destroy the rich. You can't raise up the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer."
>
> Lenin said, "One would like to caress the masses, but one doesn't dare: like a dog they will turn and bite." Abraham Lincoln said, "God must have loved the common people; he made so many of them."
>
> Lenin said, "This is a fight to the end, to their extinction"—and yours and mine and all who will not bow to the hammer and sickle. Abraham Lincoln said, "With malice toward none; with charity for all."
>
> Lenin said, "There's nothing right or wrong in the world, there's nothing false or true, except as it furthers the revolution." That's dialetical materialism for you. Abraham Lincoln said, "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

Mr. President, I thought those words were most appropriate to be read as we begin the observance of Lincoln's birthday anniversary.

THE SHORTAGE OF COPPER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the shortage of copper—a metal basic in peace and war—continues to pose a threat to our Nation.

It has become so acute that, according to quotations on the London market, the price jumped 6½ cents per pound today. This morning's price was 63.66 cents a pound.

The previous record high was 64.64 cents on December 11, 1964. That was prior to introduction by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and other Senators, including myself, of legislation to loan 100,000 tons of copper from the national stockpile to domestic producers.

After the introduction and subsequent discussion of that legislation, the price of copper broke, dropping to 40.9 cents on January 19. Since then, it has climbed to 63.66 cents, an increase of 22.8 cents a pound in the past 23 days.

This morning's edition of the Wall Street Journal gives the background for the increase in the following words:

> Demand for spot supplies of copper at London has been stimulated by failure of workers at the Mount Isa Mine in Australia to return to their jobs and by the cutting off of shipments from the United States by the dock strike. Dealers said spot supplies of copper in London and in Europe were "very tight."

I have been advised that from 15,000 to 20,000 tons of blister copper from Chile are in Atlantic seaports waiting to be unloaded after the dock strike is settled. This blister copper is converted into electrolytic copper in Perth Amboy, N.J., and Baltimore, Md. Some of it is for domestic consumption, some for shipment abroad.

The situation is so acute that refineries in both these industrial cities have practically exhausted their supplies and soon will be forced to shut down.

I have discussed our loan proposal with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington]. Senator Mansfield and I have been advised that there will be early hearings on proposals to sell or loan copper to our mining industry.

An article in the American Metal Market of Wednesday, February 10, included the following paragraph:

> While he did not flatly say so, it was apparent that Senator Mansfield was withdrawing his proposal that the Government lend 100,000 tons of copper to industry to be repaid in metal within 1 year.

Mr. President, neither Senator Mansfield nor I propose to withdraw that proposal. "As far as I am concerned, my position has not changed one bit since the bill was introduced," the office of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] told the Wall Street Journal yesterday.

He and I are firmly convinced of the importance of stability in this basic industry. Approval of our bill will prevent repetition of the 1955–56 boom and bust cycle.

Price stabilization, resulting from this legislation, will protect copper's place in our economy and also will be in the interest of the consumer. Without this legislation, the price of copper may be expected to continue to rise—to the point where competitive materials will move in and capture a part of the market which will never return to copper. This price increase also will be passed on to the consumer.

The copper, loaned under our legislation, will be returned to the stockpile by domestic producers as a result of a gradual increase in production, which will be maintained to the benefit of producers, the union labor they employ and the mining centers which serve them. In addition, it is our feeling that those who borrow this copper should be charged a reasonable interest rate, which could, perhaps, take the form of the return of 2 or 3 percent more copper to the stockpile than they borrowed.

Mr. President, when hearings have been held on these proposals, I am sure the loan program will be found to be in the public interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 296 be printed at this point in the Record together with the names of the cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 296), ordered to be printed in the Record, together with the names of the cosponsors, is as follows:

S. 296

In the Senate of the United States, January 7, 1965; Mr. Mansfield (for himself, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

A bill to authorize the temporary release of one hundred thousand short tons of copper from the national stockpile

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to avoid serious economic dislocation and instability in the domestic market for copper, the Administrator of General Services is authorized, notwithstanding any limitation or requirement in the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act with respect to the disposition of materials acquired thereunder, or in any other provision of law, to release not to exceed one hundred thousand short tons of copper now held in the national stockpile. The disposition herein authorized shall be made to domestic producers of copper under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. One of the terms and conditions applicable to such disposition shall be that any producer receiving such copper shall agree to restore to the national stockpile an amount and grade of copper at least equivalent to that received (1) not later than one year after the receipt thereof, or (2), in the event of an emergency, as determined by the President, not later than sixty days after notice thereof.

STALEMATE POLICY HAS ITS VALUES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article by the distinguished columnist Richard Wilson, entitled "Stalemate Policy Has Its Value," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 10.

I recommend this article to my fellow Senators for I feel it is most informative and perceptive. It logically and briefly explains the values of the policy which this Nation has been following over the past decade and the very sound reason why we have to follow such a policy. It also points out the benefits that have been derived from that policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STALEMATE POLICY HAS ITS VALUE

(By Richard Wilson)

With the passage of a little time, crisis-ridden U.S. officials realized that nothing was changed by the air retaliation in Vietnam. The problem remained the same—to get in deeper or to begin to get out.

All major aspects of the dilemma are very large and long range. One ground attack will not drive Americans out of Vietnam. One or two air attacks will not lessen the Communist Chinese determination to rule all southeast Asia and push the United States back to the Philippines and beyond.

This is the real issue. The difference between those who would pull back and those who would stay put is in the evaluation of whether or not a fallback would have any material effect on the U.S. strategic position in the world.

The local military action in Vietnam has postponed further discussion of a negotiated settlement but the history of events there suggests that it will arise again.

It is the contention of Henry Cabot Lodge, former Ambassador, that a stalemate has in fact been reached in Vietnam. During this stalemate he hopes that a government can be organized and maintained that will have true national aspirations equal to standing against the Chinese Reds.

He, and others, are talking in very long-range terms that imply the U.S. commitment in South Vietnam might last for decades more.

The concept of stalemate is not brushed aside by U.S. officials as something to be shunned. That is, in fact, what happened in Korea and has continued now for 10 years. Stalemate is the condition that exists, and has existed for 20 years, between the Republic of China and the Chinese People's Republic.

Stalemate is certainly regarded as better than defeat. It is very costly to us in Korea, on Formosa and in southeast Asia, but the alternative in the end might be more expensive. As is now being demonstrated in Formosa, the cost can decline and a nation can be built where none existed before.

Stalemate is hard to live with besides being expensive. It is hard to maintain and defend politically in a country where winning ranks so high in the mortality scale. Failing to win is a ready-made political issue for the party out of power. But Dwight Eisenhower survived it in Korea after failing to win caused discontent with the Truman administration.

Responsible officials are not so certain as Lodge, whose responsibility is at an end, that a stalemate does exist. They have noted that in the last year infiltration of South Vietnam from the north has doubled. But the policy being pursued points toward the creation of a stalemate, whatever President Johnson may call it.

Every military response to Vietcong attack by U.S. forces is limited to fit the situation and we are not driving north nor are the South Vietnamese. The President often reminds his advisers that the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur advised him never to get bogged down in a land war in Asia. A war had yet to be won by air action alone.

By taking the stand we have in Asia since World War II we have prevented the complete domination of East Asia by the Communists and preserved a climate in which Japan and the Philippines could grow and prosper. If we had not stood firm all of Korea would be Communist, Chiang Kai-shek would not exist, southeast Asia would be under Chinese domination and Japan and the Philippines would be in the shadow of a Peiping government stronger than it is today.

There is much to be said, therefore, for the policy of creating and maintaining a stalemate. However unsavory the word, this has been the main line of our policy since the end of World War II, not only in Asia but at the testing point in Berlin. The confrontation and stalemate at the dividing line between Western and Eastern Europe held the line until the Western nations could recover and become more prosperous than ever before.

Also, we created a stalemate in Greece and at Trieste. A neutral if not entirely independent Austria emerged. Stalemate in Asia could have the further advantage of driving a wedge between the Soviet Union and Communist China. We have much to gain from the policy and the Johnson doctrine of limited response helps to promote it.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, FILE REPORTS, AND SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session until February 17, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

ENGRAVER IN THE U.S. MINT

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will state the nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Gasparro, of Pennsylvania, to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRIBUTE TO LATE GREAT FEDERAL JURIST, ALBERT LEE STEPHENS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a deep feeling of sadness recently was felt by the legal profession in California and, indeed, throughout the Western States with news of the death, at the age of 90, of retired Federal Judge Albert Lee Stephens.

Over a career of 44 years as a jurist, Judge Stephens evidenced the finest qualities looked for in a person who sits on the bench—honesty, perspicacity, wisdom, courtesy, and understanding. In addition, while steadfastly and uncompromisingly expounding principles of equity and justice in which he believed, Judge Stephens was known as a warm human being motivated by sympathy and tolerance.

The judicial career of this learned judge covered service on both State and Federal courts, following several years in law enforcement as Los Angeles city attorney. After rising to the position of presiding justice of the California District Court of Appeals, he was appointed to the Federal district court by President Franklin Roosevelt and shortly elevated to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, on which he eventually became the presiding judge.

In his capacity as Federal jurist, Judge Stephens was an outstanding exponent of civil rights in the broadest sense. Among his opinions was one restoring citizenship to Japanese-Americans who had been incarcerated in wartime evacuation centers. In another proceeding, while concurring in the constitutionality of the wartime removal orders, Judge Stephens heatedly denounced the treatment of those Americans of Japanese descent who were summarily uprooted and transferred to the relocation camps. In another signal opinion, he delivered the ruling of his court that school segregation for children of Mexican descent was unconstitutional, 7 years before the Supreme Court's landmark decision on this practice.

Judge Stephens was a native of Indiana and a veritable child pioneer, going West at the age of 10 with his parents in a covered-wagon train.

In his role as public official, jurist, and dedicated citizen, Judge Stephens was uniformly respected. His passing is a great loss to his State and to our Nation.

PURPORTED SAVINGS TO BE MADE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BUDGET

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the release of the budget for fiscal 1966 confirmed the fact that this administration is doing everything possible to conserve the taxpayer's dollar and yet provide the necessary services that should come from an efficient and compassionate government. The line between efficiency at the expense of extravagance and efficiency at the expense of the future is a hard line to draw in undertakings as large and as complex as those of the Federal Government. By and large, I believe the new budget draws these lines fairly and well. However, Mr. President, I must take exception to some of the purported savings to be made in the Department of Agriculture. Unfortunately, in some instances, these savings seem to be a clear example of being "penny wise and pound foolish." We are saving money in this decade at the expense of future decades of farmers and consumers. I certainly hope that the agreement reached here yesterday will permit a reexamination of some of the alleged savings so that the long-term interests of our agriculture economy will not be unduly restricted.

Certainly, the agriculture budget represents a choice target. It is big and it is complex and there are many—farmers and nonfarmers alike—who cry for the end to these programs, perhaps because they do not understand them.

Others of my colleagues have already mentioned the fact that one of the real and most serious consequences of the cutbacks in some of the support programs will be to further restrict the income of the smaller farmers and drive more and more of them off the farm and into our cities. It is obvious that one of the first considerations of any program curtailment should be that it not create unnecessary hardship or contradict Government programs in other areas. It makes little sense to be fighting poverty on one hand and creating it on the other.

The cutbacks on some of these support programs will be felt almost immediately as some of our small farmers and ranchers who have been skirting the edge of insolvency are pushed over the brink. But there will also be long-range detriments as bad, if not worse, than the immediate situation. Included in the reductions planned by the Department of Agriculture are the closing of 20 research stations, the elimination of 100 research projects, and a cut of from $15 to $20 million in funds for Soil Conservation Service technicians at the local level. Mr. President, these actions are perilously close to a reckless disregard for the demands of the future to save a few dollars today—in other words, "penny wise and pound foolish." These research stations that are being closed have done substantial and pioneering work to help the farmers in the area in which they are located to better deal with the problems of climate, soil, and crops that often are unique to the region in which they are located. Such is the case, Mr. President, for the horticultural station at Cheyenne, Wyo., which has been marked for extinction.

Wyoming has some serious agricultural problems that make it difficult for even the most dedicated and the most scientific farmer or rancher to gain a living from the soil. Their difficulties have been lessened in many instances by the work of the horticultural station. The work this station has performed in the search for crops that will grow well in Wyoming's high altitude and mature early to succeed in Wyoming's short growing season is outstanding. And this work brings not only benefits to the individual farmers but is an investment in the agricultural future. No one can say what the discoveries and investigations made at this station or any of the other 19 scheduled for shutdown may produce that could bring about a drastic and beneficial change in our agriculture.

Mr. President, one of the factors that has made this Nation great is our continued striving toward self-improvement. In every object of human endeavor someone has asked, "How does it work?" and "How can it be made to work better?" Many of our national heroes have been men who have questioned the adequacy of their contemporary physical world and set out to make it better or men who were not content to accept the unknown as something that should remain unknown. And at this time—in the face of the space age with its population explosion—we should not turn our backs on any effort to increase man's efficiency and the sum of his knowledge.

Another effort marked for the budget ax is the work—or at least part of it—being done by the Soil Conservation Service. Mr. President, the work of a Soil Conservation Service technician is twofold. He is a trained scientist and technician who assists the farmer to plan his operations and to till his fields in such a manner as to make the best possible use of the potential of his land, while at the same time conserving one of our most priceless heritages—our soil.

Almost every child's geography book contains statistics about how many million carloads of fertile soil washes each year into the Gulf of Mexico. And no discussion of the great depression is complete without an allusion to the Dust Bowl and the havoc worked on a great segment of American agriculture through its failure to properly use the soil. Again, Mr. President, we see a proposed cutback in services which—while seeking immediate gains for the present—are in equal measure seeking to prepare us to meet the future and prevent a recurrence of the dust bowls, floods, and erosion that have occurred too often in our agricultural history.

Mr. President, these suggestions put forward today are for the preservation of agricultural programs that I believe to be in the Nation's best interest. I would also like to suggest a positive action in the reform of an existing agricultural service which would have the effect of greatly strengthening our farm economy and the position of the family farm in our total agricultural economy.

No problem is more acute for our farmers than the problem of credit. For rural people who cannot get credit from private lenders, the Farmers Home Administration is the only available source.

Only credit can open the door to agriculture for the young man who wants to get in. Only credit can help the small farmer enlarge his farm to efficient and economical size. Only credit can help the farmer adjust his operations to take advantage of other farm programs, new techniques, new machinery, and new research.

The supervised credit services of Farmers Home Administration has contributed mightily to farm family agriculture in my State of Wyoming—

Recognizing the expanding needs for credit by farmers and other rural people, FHA made loans totaling $10.4 million in 1964—a 239-percent increase above the 1960 level.

Late last year, FHA loaned $520,000 to the Platte County Grazing Association, an organization of 23 farm and ranch families. The loan and private contributions permitted these families to purchase a 36,000 acre ranch and develop it as a grazing area. Now 23 farm families have adequate and efficient operations in an area where previously they had little or no opportunity for expansion.

One large ranch using mostly hired help is now replaced by 23 families, adding to the county tax base, adding to the community income. The loan will be repaid in full and with interest within 40 years.

In January of this year, FHA made five individual farm ownership loans totaling $273,500 to five Wyoming farmers to purchase 1,646 acres of irrigated land owned by a corporation, and operated by hired labor.

Now five small landowners have been able to expand to economical and profitable size. The stability of that rural community has been enhanced and its economy increased by the additional purchasing power of those five farm families.

These are not unusual or isolated examples of the kind of service FHA is performing. These are typical of what is going on all over rural America.

But there still exists a serious credit gap in agriculture that is closing the door to many young people who want to get in or to enlarge their operations.

The problem is this: The widening gap between the high-market price of farm real estate and the normal value of farm land based on its earning capacity. Current farm credit lending policies are based on earning capacity values—not on market values.

In recent years, the market price of farm real estate has risen steadily under the competitive pressure of land speculators, individual and corporate land investors who enjoy a favorable tax writeoff, and by locally established farmers with good credit resources who are willing to pay a premium for an extra package of land adjacent to their own holdings in order to make use of expensive farm equipment or merely for investment and speculation.

The young farmer with little or no capital resource is therefore unable to buy farm land that comes on the market for the simple reason that he does not have the cash to pay the difference between the normal price and the market price even if Farmers Home Administration or any other lender is able to make a loan for the full normal value of the farm.

As a result, the young and able farmer wanting to get into agriculture is denied the opportunity. Too much of the land put on the market by reiring farmers is bought up by absentee owners, the corporation farmer, or the doctor, lawyer, or other briefcase farmer whose principal crop is a tax writeoff—farms get larger and larger—family farms get fewer and fewer.

This problem will become more acute as time goes on. The 1959 Census showed that some 17 percent of all farmers in this country were 65 years or older. An additional 22 percent were 55 to 64 years of age. By 1970, nearly half of all our farmers will be over 55 years. This situation is as true in Wyoming as it is elsewhere.

To anyone studying this problem there is one inevitable and logical conclusion: that this credit gap must be closed and closed soon if we are to preserve and maintain farm family agriculture.

One simple and effective way to do this is to adjust the credit policies of Farmers Home Administration to:

Enable FHA to loan the full fair market value to qualified applicants.

Enable terms of such loans to permit repayment first on that portion of the loan representing the true earning capacity value of the farm over a period of years and not to exceed 40 years.

Enable that portion of the loan representing the difference between the true earning capacity value and the market value to be deferred and noninterest bearing until the unpaid principal balance on the entire loan is reduced to a size not exceeding the earning capacity of the property.

I believe this kind of credit policy would be sound and is necessary. Price-support payments, commodity allotments, land retirement payments, and favorable tax writeoffs are substantially subsidizing and encouraging absentee landownership and causing excessive land prices.

If we are to halt the trend in loss of farm families, if we are to reverse the alarming migration of rural people to urban slums, if we are to reopen the door to farm family agriculture to deserving and qualified young farmers, then we need this kind of expanded farm ownership credit policy in the Farmers Home Administration.

This expansion of credit could do much to reverse the trend of the corporation farm. At the beginning of my remarks, I noted that the effects of some of these proposed budget cuts would be to create poverty on one hand while fighting it on the other.

Rather than adopt this completely shortsighted approach, Mr. President, we would do well to support existing programs which strengthen the family farm and the future of family farming and to initiate new programs which will secure the necessary progress needed to assure continued growth and development in our agricultural economy.

A LOOK AT VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the pressure of events in Vietnam in the last few days is prompting prudent Americans to take a penetrating look at the defense posture of the United States in southeast Asia, and more broadly, throughout the Pacific.

We cannot forget that the interests of the United States in the Pacific are such that we cannot remain indifferent to events which might alter the balance of power in that area. This is so because the United States is a Pacific Ocean power. Nor is this simply a boastful statement. It is, instead, an ineluctable fact of history and of geography. Two of our 50 States—Alaska and Hawaii—are thrust out into the Pacific Ocean. Our great Western States look out toward the Pacific. The American flag flies over names immortalized during the Second World War: Guam, Wake, Midway. And the United States administers in the western Pacific the trust territories of the Marshalls, the Carolines, and the Marianas. Nor does this exhaust the list, for there is also an American presence in American Samoa, in the Howland-Baker-Jarvis group and on Johnston and still other islands in the Pacific.

A thought-provoking assessment of the situation in Vietnam has been made by Prof. James D. Atkinson, of Georgetown University, in the February 3 issue of the Washington Report of the American Security Council.

Professor Atkinson's remarks were prepared prior to the sudden upsurge of military actions in Vietnam during the past week. Thus, they were given without the benefit of knowledge of the Vietcong attacks against our Pleiku installation and the American billet at Qui Nhon, which resulted in death and injuries to many Americans. They were prepared prior to U.S.S.R. Premier Alexei N. Kosygin's visit to Hanoi, where, following the American retaliatory air raids on Dong Hoi, the question has been dramatically reopened as to whether Russia would back Hanoi against U.S. attacks.

Perhaps, as some predict, the intensified fighting which erupted on February 6 will subside to the level of the cold war in South Vietnam. Perhaps, as others have forecasted, the Communist forces have now embarked on a determined escalation of military efforts.

Regardless, the changed situation is being used by elements both within the United States and abroad as a renewed opportunity to urge that the United States undertake negotiations to withdraw from Vietnam. Should it not be used, more prudently, to determine now, in advance of further tests of our will, or probing actions, whether we shall continue merely to counter or react to thrusts determined to be taken by Communist forces in accordance with their best interests as to time, place, character, and magnitude?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the interesting, incisive, and provocative analysis of the situation in Vietnam by Dr. Atkinson.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

None So Quick

There has been a mounting campaign to get the United States out of South Vietnam. Many reasons are given for this position. For example, we are told that the people in South Vietnam are fainthearted in the fight against the Communist Vietcong. Yet these supposedly fainthearted people have been enduring casualties measured in the thousands every year, and for many years, in defending themselves against communism.

In the vast area that is washed by the waters of the Pacific Ocean, the United States is fortunate thus far to have many stanch friends. These friends have indicated their friendship by joining with us in defensive treaties for the maintenance of peace in the Pacific Ocean area. Thus we participated with Australia and New Zealand in the ANZUS treaty. Australia, New Zealand, the Republic of the Philippines, and Thailand (Britain, France, and Pakistan are participants but are not in the Pacific) joined with us in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, SEATO. South Vietnam came under the protection of SEATO in accordance with article IV of the treaty. We have mutual defense treaties with Japan, Nationalist China, and South Korea. Thus the measures which we take or fail to take in Vietnam will produce a political and psychological fallout extending far beyond that strife-torn country.

OTHER TAKEOVER EFFORTS STARTED

Some of the far-reaching effects which might result if there were an American policy of appeasement in Vietnam have already been foreshadowed. This is because U.S. policy has sometimes appeared to be hesitant and unsure. Thus during the last days of December 1964 a clandestine Communist radio station run by the Thailand independence movement began broadcasting propaganda against the present pro-American Government of Thailand. There has been a fresh outbreak of the Communist Hukbalahap guerrillas in the Philippines. Since the long-drawn-out Huk revolutionary activity in that country which peaked in the early 1950's was supported by the Chinese Communists, it is likely that the current terrorist operations of the Huks are once again being stimulated by the Red Chinese. If this upsurge in revolutionary action by the Communists in southeast Asia is taking place as a result of what the Communists interpret as our lethargy in that part of the world, one may well ask what the effect would be if we were to embark on a policy of appeasement in South Vietnam.

The Chinese Communists are attempting to change the balance of power in the Pacific. Their appetite is insatiable. Earlier it was Korea. Then it was Tibet and later an incursion into India. But now and for the past decade it has also been a drive into southeast Asia. And always accompanying this revolutionary advance in the Pacific has been Chinese Communist mischiefmaking in Africa and in Latin America. Almost daily the press reports details of the Chinese Communist support of the Communist guerrillas in the Congo. And no longer ago than October 26, 1964, our good Latin American neighbor, Colombia, reported that Communist-sponsored guerrillas in that country were equipped with arms supplied by Communist China and Cuba. In short, Chinese Communist revolutionary activity is in conflict with American interests not only in the Pacific but elsewhere. American withdrawal from South Vietnam will no more appease the Red Chinese ambitions than would our withdrawal across the Pacific to Hawaii. Rather, it would stimulate them to further conquests and so might well trigger an all-out war.

The Soviet Union is giving propaganda and political warfare support to the Chinese Communist efforts in Vietnam. The official Soviet news agency Tass announced December 30, 1964, that a permanent office of the Vietnamese National Liberation Front would be opened in Moscow. On January 5, 1965, the official Communist Party newspaper Pravda printed an aggressive letter to Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to North Vietnam's Foreign Minister. Said Gromyko: "The Soviet Union supports resolutely the just national liberation struggle of the people of South Vietnam against the armed intervention of American imperialism and the antipopular regime of Saigon. The Soviet Government demands that the United States stop all interference in the affairs of South Vietnam, that it withdraw its troops."

There are many public indications that the Soviet Union is in close touch with the Communist Vietcong. For example, on a Moscow radio broadcast of January 14, 1965, Lieutenant Colonel Leontyev of the Soviet armed forces said: "The battle at Bin Ghia made it clear that the South Vietnamese guerrilla forces can now take on big engagements, engagements involving several battalions on either side." It has since been reported that units of battalion size have been brought into the South Vietnamese fighting from North Vietnam. From all of this it would seem not only that the Vietcong is committing large units to the fighting, but also that the Soviet Union is becoming encouraged to take a more belligerent tone by what it believes to be signs of American vacillation in southeast Asia.

THE CHOICES

What options, then, has the United States with reference to our policy in South Vietnam? In blunt terms it would appear that we have two options: To go or to stay.

The policy of going is sometimes called a policy of neutralization. This would mean the formation of a government in South Vietnam in which the Communists or pro-Communists would participate. Sooner or later—and, if past experience with coalition governments is a guide, it would be sooner—the Communists would dominate the government. Reduced to its essentials the policy of neutralization is a policy of scuttle and run, a policy of appeasement. Both on grounds of morality and of self-interest, it should be rejected.

But why should we stay in Vietnam? The answer to this question is really the answer to another question. And that is why we are in Vietnam.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POSITION

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson answered this question. Said the President: "We are there, first, because a friendly nation has asked us to help against Communist aggression. Ten years ago our President pledged our help. Three Presidents have supported that pledge. We will not break it. Second, our own security is tied to the peace of Asia. Twice in one generation we have had to fight against aggression in the Far East. To ignore aggression now would only increase the danger of a larger war."

Both Radio Moscow and Communist North Vietnam Radio Hanoi have commented somewhat impudently on the President's speech. Said Radio Moscow on January 7: "Once again he repeated the wornout lines that American Armed Forces are in South Vietnam to give help and safeguard U.S. security in South Vietnam." And Radio Hanoi on January 9 said: "In his state of the Union address to the U.S. Congress on January 4, Johnson once again disclosed U.S. stubbornness in continuing its aggressive plot in South Vietnam. Johnson brazenly stated that the United States would stay in South Vietnam."

But President Johnson's words are not "worn out." His words reflect the verdict of history on the policy of appeasement. A firm policy in Vietnam today is the best guarantee of avoiding a general war tomorrow. How much might not have England—and the world—been spared had the appeasers of the 1930's listened to the advice of Sir Winston Churchill. Militarily, Communist China is still a "paper tiger"—less powerful than Hitler's Nazis in the early 1930's. Today Communist China's challenge in the Pacific can be met without excessive risk. But the peril to freedom in the Pacific will continue to rise with each year if we refuse to face up to this challenge.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

If we stay in South Vietnam what can we do to improve the situation? The following steps would start us in the right direction: (1) Increased interdiction of Communist supply routes into South Vietnam and such related measures as might be required. (2) Recognition that Vietnam is a theater of military operations by the appointment of a military officer rather than a diplomatic officer as chief of the country team of U.S. personnel there. The protection of the people from Vietcong terrorism is a prerequisite before any semblance of stability can be achieved and this is essentially a military operation. Appointment of a military officer as head of the country team would be in accord with the priority of requirements in what is unquestionably an area of combat operations. (3) The establishment of a naval quarantine on North Vietnam as an aggressor against the peace of southeast Asia. The pressures on the present land supply routes by such a naval quarantine on North Vietnam will not be fully effective for several years. Precisely because of this, however, a naval quarantine would signal to our friends throughout the Pacific—and no less importantly to Communist China—the long-range determination of the United States to stop Chinese Communist aggression. The display of such firmness would be a psychopolitical act which would go far toward enlisting support for U.S. policy not in the Pacific alone but throughout the world.

A decision to stay in Vietnam is not the easy way out for the short run. Quite the contrary, it will mean an intensification of the long and hard struggle. It is to be expected in our political system that questions will continue to be raised about the wisdom of continuing to meet, indeed, even of having accepted the challenge in Vietnam. But viewed in a larger context, Vietnam is but a testing ground. Our resolve there is the measure of our will elsewhere. An American withdrawal from Vietnam would inevitably be followed by a withdrawal from other parts of the world in which it is said that we are "overextended." In such a context is Vietnam any more untenable than Berlin?

These words from "The Book of Proverbs" are helpful in evaluating the attitude of many toward our friends in South Vietnam: "None so quick to find pretexts, as he that would break with a friend; he is in fault continually."

Dr. James D. Atkinson,
International Politics Editor.

WEST VIRGINIAN ON THE ICC

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senate last year confirmed the appointment of Mrs. Virginia Mae Brown, a West Virginian, to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Mrs. Brown was 1 of 50 women recommended by President Johnson to serve in various high Federal offices. As one who spoke in support of confirmation of her nomination at that time, I am pleased to note that recognition of her work as a member of the Commission has been made by the Wall Street Journal in a news story on February 1 and in an editorial on just last Monday. I ask unanimous consent to have these items placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal,
Feb. 1, 1965]

Mrs. Brown, Adding Female Touch to ICC, Tongue-Lashes Majority on Shielding Rails

Washington.—Virginia Mae Brown, the attractive brunette President Johnson picked to bring the woman's touch to the Interstate Commerce Commission, gave her male colleagues a tongue lashing.

"The majority's fear of the forces of competition (in transportation) is unwararnted," she said. The prospects "frighten me not." The ICC's all-male majority is so concerned with protecting railroads from themselves that it is ignoring the public, Mrs. Brown maintained. "Are shippers orphans under the Interstate Commerce Act?" asked the trim mother of two.

Then, with language seldom if ever before heard in the staid old ICC, she declared: "It is well known that there are several ways to kill a cat. Drowning appears to be the most favored. The majority * * * waters the facts and drowns the case."

The case at issue wasn't very big. The Monon Railroad wanted to extend its tracks slightly at Michigan City, Ind., and in Jefferson County, Ky., near Louisville, in order to set up a route for moving coal to steel mills in the Chicago area and, by Great Lakes ships, to other mills.

But Mrs. Brown wasn't alone in feeling the case involved important matters of principle. Four other commissioners also dissented from the majority's decision to reject Monon's application.

REFLECTS JOHNSON POLICY

The charges leveled by Mrs. Brown, and reflected in the considerably less vigorous dissents of the other four, are the sort that have been voiced in recent years by some—usually professorial types—outside the Commission. ICC insiders on occasion have denied vigorously that the agency has tried harder to protect the railroads from competition than to encourage rival services and innovations that shippers want.

Mrs. Brown's dissent was interesting, too, because, as President Johnson's sole appointee to the ICC thus far, she was reflecting and seemed to be elaborating on the administration's transport policy. The late President Kennedy began a drive to loosen ICC control over rail rates, and Mr. Johnson has endorsed the principle of greater reliance on competition. The ICC opposed the Kennedy approach. It is waiting to see the details of Mr. Johnson's legislative package before taking a stand on it.

To Mrs. Brown, the Monon case seemed classic in terms of what the ICC's role should be. Monon proposed an innovation in coal transport, combining barge movement with an "integral train" that would shuttle between Louisville and Michigan City. Kentucky and West Virginia coal would be moved down the Ohio and other rivers, by bargeline, to a rail transfer facility Monon planned to build near Louisville, then shuttled up to a proposed rail-marine terminal at Michigan City. American Commercial Barge Lines supported Monon's application, as did a number of coal shippers, such as Inland Steel Co. It was opposed by a number of coal-hauling railroads, including the Chesapeake & Ohio, the Norfolk & Western, the Pennsylvania, and the Illinois Central.

JUDGMENT OF THE REGULATORS

To the ICC majority, the Monon proposal offered no "inherent advantage over existing service." Thus, the majority said: "It would necessarily follow that the construction of superfluous lines and facilities not needed to insure adequate service to the public should not be authorized, and existing carriers should not be required to face unnecessary competition." Anyway, the majority added, railroad tracks cost money "and if operations are not successful, only scrap is left." Monon's proposal wasn't "prudent," it concluded.

Mrs. Brown accused the majority of substituting "the judgment of the regulators" for that of "the marketplace." She said: "What the majority really has determined here is that no reliance can be placed on the forces of competition." Monon, she said, isn't worried its investment might wind up as scrap, so "should the commission be afraid?"

"Carried to their logical conclusion, the standards applied here would constitute such a straitjacket that any hope for modern, progressive innovations in surface transportation would disappear," Mrs. Brown said.

ICC Chairman Charles Webb, in his separate dissent, said he shared Mrs. Brown's thoughts on innovation. He also charged that the decision gives all-rail movements of coal "unwarranted protection from the competition of barge-rail and barge-rail-lake routes."

Dissenters Laurence Walrath, Kenneth Tuggle, and Paul Tierney joined in asserting that "an oversupply of coal transportation does not equate an overabundance of service available to shippers."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 8, 1965]

NEVER UNDERESTIMATE THE POWER

Though the Interstate Commerce Commission was set up to protect competition in transportation, it sometimes seems more eager to protect competitors from competition. So it's encouraging to read that the ICC's only lady member is trying to push the agency back on the proper regulatory track.

Virginia Mae Brown, named to the panel in 1964, began her shoving in a case involving the Monon Railroad. The Monon wanted to extend its tracks slightly in order to set up a combined rail-water route for moving coal to steel mills in the Chicago area.

The ICC's majority rejected the proposal. Ruling that the rail-water plan offered no "inherent advantage over existing service," it said the step would not be "prudent" for the Monon. Even if it was prudent, the majority decided other railroads should not have to face "unnecessary" competition.

"The majority's fear of tne forces of competition," declared Mrs. Brown in her searing dissent, "is unwarranted." The prospects "frighten me not." Whether the majority thought the rail-water service was a prudent idea or not, she went on to say, lots of shippers apparently liked it, since they argued for approval of the plan. "Are shippers orphans under the Interstate Commerce Act?" the lady inquired.

In much the same way, the ICC's fear of change—almost any change—often has delayed introduction of more competitive rate schedules and new types of equipment and service, such as piggybacking. In the effort to preserve competitors instead of competition, the agency can thus endanger both.

At this late date, Mrs. Brown faces quite a task getting the agency to see the light, but she is certainly giving her male colleagues some powerful competition in the art of commonsense.

JERRY MILAN REGULI

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in the Nation there appears to be widespread concern about the ability of today's youth to take the reins of leadership which eventually they will inherit.

I do not share this concern, Mr. President. For one thing, those of us now in positions of authority are considering programs designed to give to all American boys and girls the maximum education they need in order to supplement their God-given capabilities.

For another thing, among the vast majority of our youth there continues the indomitable American spirit to make the most of life—not only for self-interest, but also for the interests of their fellow men.

I wish to tell the Senate the story of an Indiana boy. It is a somber story, but an inspiring one. It should serve to keep bright the flame of confidence in our young people that most of us harbor, and to kindle the flame among those who have doubts.

It is the story of Jerry Milan Reguli, of Franklin, Ind.

Jerry's father died when the boy was 5 years old. The boy grew up in a home in which there was love—love of family and love of God. At one time, he wanted to become a minister. When he was 13, Jerry planted an acre of tomatoes on his grandmother's farm. With the profits he earned from farming, he took out a mortgage on a house. He rented the home, to help pay off the mortgage; but he protected his investment with mortgage insurance.

At 15, Jerry prepared for a church program a brief essay on what education meant to him. I ask unanimous consent that the essay, as it appeared in the November 11, 1964, issue of the Franklin, Ind., Daily Journal, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT EDUCATION MEANS TO ME

(By Jerry Milan Reguli)

As we grow in childhood there comes a time for our parents to send us off to school. In the beginning I believe this is why and probably the only reason for us going to school. But there comes a time in our own lives when we ask why? What does this mean to me?

I believe to go to school is to get an education. Through education we get a good view of what life is really like. The purpose of life is to matter, to be productive, to have it make some difference that we lived at all. Through education we see clearly the qualities that make life what it is, and therefore strive to obtain these qualities. School offers a combination of things favorable for the purpose of developing my capabilities. Going to school and learning all I can about different vocations helps me to decide what I would like to do most in life. Then, when I choose my vocation I will take further schooling to increase my knowledge so I will be more able to serve God and my fellow man.

"I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. What I can do, I ought to do; and what I ought to do, by God's grace I will do."

With this knowledge we realize the importance of God to us and through education we realize even more the awe-inspiring wonders of the creation of life.

Education makes us realize our own ignorance, instilling in us a desire to increase our knowledge. It offers faith in the present and the future. Education offers us the opportunity to understand ourselves and our neighbors, enabling us to find our place in society and suggesting a means through which we can contribute to society.

Education offers insight to the path of a rich full life of happiness.

Happiness in the ancient noble sense means self fulfillment and is given to those who use to the fullest whatever talent God bestowed upon them. I believe school trains me to use my talents to their fullest and instills in me a faith in myself that I am capable. Future success and satisfaction often depend upon an education and upon education rests the rich heritage of human life. So as Mark Twain wrote: "Let us endeavor to live, that when we come to die, even the undertaker will be sorry."

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, among other things, Jerry said on that day, in church:

> The purpose of life is to matter, to be productive, to have it make some difference that we lived at all. Through education, we see clearly the qualities that make life what it is, and therefore strive to obtain these qualities * * *. Education makes us realize our own ignorance, instilling in us a desire to increase our knowledge. It offers faith in the present and the future. Education offers us the opportunity to understand ourselves and our neighbors, enabling us to find our place in society and suggesting a means through which we can contribute to society.

Such simple eloquence from a 15-year-old boy. Then Jerry concluded on a tragically prophetic note:

> Future success and satisfaction often depend upon an education, and upon education rests the rich heritage of human life. So as Mark Twain wrote: "Let us endeavor to live, that when we come to die, even the undertaker will be sorry."

A little more than a year after Jerry Reguli spoke these words, he became a victim of leukemia. A few months ago, at the age of 16, Jerry Reguli died.

I wrote to Jerry's mother, and asked her permission to include her late son's essay in the RECORD, where it can serve as an inspiration to all who read it. She granted permission; and she told me that shortly before his illness and death, Jerry had decided to study agriculture at Purdue University; and he talked of going to underdeveloped nations, to teach farming skills. His own farming skills and his good business sense enabled Jerry to leave an estate of $7,000 when he died at 16.

Perhaps the greatest legacy any of us can leave, though, is that our lives were meaningful and, as Jerry said, that our existence contributed something to our fellow men. For the answer to whether this goal is achieved, each man must look into his own heart and mind and soul. I pray that each of us is pleased with what he finds.

I know that Jerry Reguli must have been.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MIDDLE INCOME HOUSING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a remarkable effort in the middle income housing field which has been carried out under New York State's Mitchell Lama program plan I have previously proposed in housing bills.

I have long believed in and proposed a Federal program parallel to the Mitchell Lama program which would include a Federal limited profit mortgage corportation, financed by tax-free bonds issued on the money market, to underwrite limited-profit middle-income housing at a cost within the reach of families earning between $5,000 and $8,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the details of this successful project in New York, as published in a New York Times article of February 10, 1965, entitled "Big Cooperative To Rise in Bronx," may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1965]

A 15,500-APARTMENT CO-OP TO RISE IN BRONX

(By Thomas W. Ennis)

A cooperative housing development with 15,500 apartments will be built on a 300-acre tract in the Baychester area of the northeast Bronx.

It will be financed with a $263 million mortgage loan provided by the State under its Mitchell-Lama middle-income housing program.

The development, tentatively named Co-op City, will have a population estimated to total 55,000 to 60,000 persons. Its sponsor is the United Housing Foundation, a nonprofit organization that has built a number of large housing cooperatives for middle-income families here.

The buildings will be of reinforced concrete faced with brick and many of the apartments will have terraces.

The site is bounded by the Hutchinson River Parkway, the New England Thruway and the Hutchinson River. The Freedomland amusement park has occupied under lease a 150-acre section of the tract. The operators of Freedomland, which is in bankruptcy, are attempting to stay in business by moving to an adjacent site of 30 acres.

Officials of the United Housing Foundation say Co-op City will be the world's largest apartment development. At present, they believe, the largest is the 12,280-family Parkcester apartment community on East Tremont Avenue in the Bronx, owned by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

Details of Co-op City were given yesterday by Governor Rockefeller at a press conference in the Commodore Hotel. The meeting was also attended by Mayor Wagner; Milton Mollen, the city's new coordinator of Housing and Development; James W. Gaynor, commissioner of the State's division of housing and community renewal, and officials of the United Housing Foundation.

Initial construction of the co-op is expected to get underway this fall and take 5 years to reach completion. There will be 39 apartment structures, 24 to 35 stories high. Land will be provided by the sponsors for four elementary and two junior high schools, a community center, a shopping center, and a recreation area. Herman J. Jessor is the co-op's architect.

The architect's plan envisions the greatest possible amount of open and unencumbered land area, and he hopes to achieve this by putting undergroud 80 percent of the parking space for 10,550 automobiles. The co-op will have its own central air conditioning plant.

Except for Freedomland's buildings the 300-acre tract is almost vacant, so the family and business relocation problem is negligible.

Buyers of the apartments will make downpayments of about $450 a room—the apartments will have one to three bedrooms—and pay monthly carrying charges of $22 to $23 a room. The downpayments will be the buyers' share of the development's construction cost of about $285 million.

The one-bedroom apartments will have about 900 square feet of living area, the two-bedroom units 1,180 square feet and the three-bedroom apartments 1,500 square feet.

The low carrying charges compared with rentals in nongovernment aided buildings are possible because of the long-term, low-interest mortgage financing the State will provide through the issue of tax-exempt State bonds. Also helping are a 50 percent realty tax abatement the city will grant the completed co-op development.

The city now gets $500,000 yearly in property from the 300-acre tract. It anticipates an annual tax revenue of $5.5 million from the co-op.

The United Housing Foundation has contracted to buy the 300-acre tract from the National Development Corp. for about $15 million.

The real estate development concern of Webb & Knapp, Inc., is reported to be the major stockholder in National Development, and Webb & Knapp is said to control the Freedomland amusement park through Freedomland, Inc. The latter is a subsidiary of the International Recreation Corp., in which Webb & Knapp is reported to own the controlling interest.

Neither William Zeckendorf Sr., chairman of Webb & Knapp, nor William Zeckendorf Jr., the company's president would comment yesterday on the sale of the Bronx tract.

Freedomland opened in 1960 and has always had financial troubles. Last September its operators filed a bankruptcy petition in Federal court, and said they would like to reduce the amusement park's area to 30 acres to help reduce expenses.

Stanley B. Hendler, a lawyer for the Freedomland interests, said yesterday that it was questionable whether enough financial problems could be settled in time to permit the amusement park to reopen this year.

The tract is about a mile from the Dyre Avenue station of the Seventh Avenue line of the IRT, and about the same distance from the Pelham Bay station of the IRT's Lexington Avenue line. Buses run between the subway stops in the vicinity of the tract.

The United Housing Foundation is headed by Abraham E. Kazan, pioneer in the low- and middle-income cooperative housing movement here. He is recuperating from an illness in California, and was represented at the news conference by Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Mr. Potofsky is a member of the United Housing Foundation's board. Amalgamated's pension fund has helped finance some cooperatives sponsored by the foundation.

The foundation, whose headquarters are at 465 Grand Street, recently completed Rochdale Village, a 5,860-family co-op on the site of the old Jamaica Race Track in the Baisley Park section of Queens. Rochdale Village was also built with mortgage funds provided by the State.

PRESIDENT SHOULD EXPLAIN U.S. OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I heard with the greatest interest the statement of the majority leader today on the grave crisis in Vietnam. It is extraordinary how the views of men, separately arrived at, meet in the face of a grave crisis to which they address themselves.

It seems to me the time has come for Senators to state their position when the President of the United States is taking on an awful responsibility in the grave decisions which he is making, and which could very well, as during the Cuban crisis, expose the United States and the whole world to the terrible scourge of a broadscale war.

I believe it is our duty, therefore, as responsible men, having an especial relation to foreign policy through our constitutional powers, to express ourselves on this subject.

I feel I must express support of our country's policy in retaliating against the staging areas and military installations in North Vietnam, which supported and planned the actions which resulted and are resulting in such tragic casualties for United States and Vietnamese personnel. What has been done was necessary to demonstrate that we will not tolerate overt aggression in South Vietnam by the North Vietnamese and their allies without determined reaction.

But this reaction by the United States is no substitute for a policy. The American people are worried; they are wondering whether we have a policy in Vietnam as well as the will to carry it through. Americans are also worried whether or not a majority of the Vietnamese people still have the will to resist Communist aggression, or want our aid in their resistance. Americans want to know why so few of our allies have come to help in South Vietnam, grateful as we are to those who have. Americans want to know what is the real meaning of the Japanese bid to mediate in the South Vietnamese struggle; what can be the role of India, Thailand, and other Asian countries under Communist Chinese threat; and what is the proper role of Great Britain, which is now helping Malaysia, and of President de Gaulle's France. From those who counsel negotiation, Americans want to know: Negotiate with whom and about what?

The statement by the majority leader expressing the hope that Great Britain and the Soviet Union will exercise their prerogatives as cochairman of the commission appointed under the Geneva accord of 1954 is a very sound one. I express my own hope and feeling that they will. But that, too, is not the policy of the United States. Only one man can make the foreign policy of the United States, and that is the President, subject, at most, to approval in some form by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Accordingly, Mr. President—and this is a parallel to the very fine statement made by the majority leader—I feel the time has come for the President of the United States to address the Nation, and address it promptly, in the most considered way, and state to the people of the United States and the world the U.S. policy and objective in South Vietnam.

For there is nothing in the U.S. position which is inconsistent with every effort to find an honorable solution to the struggle. The assertion of American will to carry on the fight against communism and our determination to maintain our aid to the South Vietnamese, so long as they wish it and show a will to resist, may in time bring an end to this grave conflict from which South Vietnam may emerge in peace and independence. Yet, while we continue to help the South Vietnamese, we should continue to explore every means, whether by conference or direct negotiation or through the United Nations good offices, to resolve the conflict. There is really no profound confrontation between those Senators who feel that the war should be extended—no Senator is foolish or reckless in this matter—and those who feel that we should negotiate. Certainly we are ready to negotiate, or to see that South Vietnam negotiates, under properly controlled conditions, in an attempt to settle the conflict there. But it takes two to negotiate; both sides must be receptive to the idea, and a solution cannot be made at the expense of the people of South Vietnam.

The United States is present in Vietnam in pursuance of a policy we have maintained since the settlement which eliminated the French presence in Indochina in 1954—namely, that we would not allow the South Vietnamese people to be overwhelmed by Communist aggression and subversion so long as they had the will to resist and sought our aid. Unless we are convinced that the majority of the South Vietnamese people no longer wish to continue their struggle against the Communists or to have U.S. assistance for that purpose, we cannot desert them.

The war in Vietnam must be considered also in relation to Communist plans to expand their domination over south and southeast Asia. Vietnam is the active front at the moment, but the struggle is being waged to resist the Communist advance into the whole of Asia and the Pacific. Should the balance tip strongly in favor of the Communists in Vietnam, the rest of this vast region—including not only the smaller countries of Thailand, Malaysia, Ceylon, Burma, South Korea, and Taiwan, but also the larger nations of Japan, India, Pakistan, and the Philippines—would be under dire threat and in serious jeopardy, and Australia and New Zealand would be in a gravely exposed position. Such towering events could change the whole balance of forces in the world against us and in favor of communism.

The American people must be clearly informed that at the heart of the problem lies a question of proportion. For casualties are a matter of heartbreak to each of us; yet we must match the incidence of these tragic losses to the infinitely greater losses of American lives which could be incurred if the position of the free world was radically altered by the capture of large parts of south and southeast Asia for communism.

In the free world, we do not operate in the dark. A great country states what its policy is in the greatest moment of crisis. I do not doubt that this is no new idea to the President of the United States, and that he is fully prepared to undertake this task. But there is a question of timing, and in my judgment the time should be now. With the situation deteriorating daily in South Vietnam, the President should speak promptly, for only the President can speak with authority.

Our people want to know what the position of the United States is. They want the President to make a firm declaration of policy, to tell us how we propose to continue, so all the world can read and understand. Then he will find, as President Kennedy found in the Cuban crisis, that all of us, without regard to party, will rally to his side, and there will be the unity which has always been forthcoming to Presidents when such crises have faced the country.

UPPER PENINSULA PROGRESS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, again I call attention to the economic needs and aspirations of Michigan's magnificant Upper Peninsula.

The Upper Peninsula Committee for Area Progress—UPCAP—a most constructive local group representative of the counties in the area, long has been working to develop the potential of the region.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release announcing the latest of these forward steps which offer promise of a better future.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPCAP ANNOUNCES NEW SAWMILL AT L'ANSE

David O. Farrand, industrial development specialist for the Upper Peninsula Committee for Area Progress (UPCAP), announced the completion of the $100,000 financing of the new Leo Erickson & Son Sawmill at L'Anse, Mich. This was accomplished by UPCAP with the participation and cooperation of the Commercial Bank of L'Anse, the Superior National Bank of Hancock, and the Small Business Administration.

The new mill is equipped with a modern debarker and loader and the chipper will be installed in February. This will provide two carloads of chips per day. Erickson, who has been in the lumber business for 20 years, also has a sawmill operating in Skanee.

The new mill will employ a total of 27 more men as sawmill workers and loggers which will double the present work force. Erickson has contracts with several nationally known wood-product companies and is highly regarded as an experienced sawmill operator.

The Commercial Bank at L'Anse will act as servicing agent in the financing arrangements. Farrand expressed his gratitude for the excellent cooperation of the two banks and the Small Business Administration for their assistance in this project.

PROBLEMS OF LAKE SUPERIOR COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent, factual account of the problems plaguing the commercial fishermen of Lake Superior. Similar conditions face those of the other Great Lakes.

This material, made available to me by the Lake Superior Commercial Fishermen's Association and the Michigan Fish Producers' Association, documents the reasons why disaster aid is needed by this industry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAKE SUPERIOR RESOURCE DISASTER

The economic depression in the Lake Superior commercial fishing industry continues to worsen and the resource on which the industry depends, to deteriorate. The current situation constitutes a commercial fishery failure due to a resource disaster within the meaning of section 4(b) of Public Law 88–309.

The principal contributing factor to the present economic depression of the industry was the near extinction of the Lake Superior lake trout population due to sea lamprey predation. The effect of this debacle on the industry was succinctly pointed out by Dr. Ralph Hile and his associates (Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior), in a paper, "Status of the Lake Trout Fishery in Lake Superior," published in the 1950 transactions of the American Fisheries Society (vol. 80):

"The fisheries of Lake Superior are so constituted that the disappearance of the lake trout would mean an end to the fishing industry as it has existed in the past. In support of this statement, it may be pointed out that during the 5 years 1945–49 the lake trout, although contributing only 14 to 20 percent of the total production in the U.S. waters of Lake Superior, brought such high prices as to account for 51 to 60 percent of the total value of the catch. Not only would the disappearance of the lake trout entail the loss of more than half of the cash income of Lake Superior fishermen; it would force discontinuation of much of the fishing now carried on for the capture of lake herring (*Leucichthys artedi*), the principal species from the standpoint of production (72 to 77 percent of the take in 1945–49, but, because of the low price, only 20 to 32 percent of the value). The great bulk of the lake herring catch is taken within the space of a few weeks in late November and early December. At other times of the season, fishing is directed largely toward the capture of the lake trout. With that species gone, therefore, operations during much of the season would have to be discontinued. It is to be questioned whether many fishermen could afford to maintain their boats, houses, and equipment for the short-term fishery for the cheap lake herring. In all probability most of them would be forced to abandon fishing altogether and turn to other means of livelihood. At best, fishing for lake herring would become small scale and casual, with most of the present high production lost.

"The continuation of fishing for lake whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformis*), the third important fish in Lake Superior (4 to 7 percent of the catch and 12 to 23 percent of the value in 1945–49) might be possible for a time in the local areas in which the species is abundant, but even this fishery would be handicapped by the loss of the lake trout ordinarily captured along with the whitefish. Furthermore, experiences in Lakes Huron and Michigan have demonstrated that the whitefish is in no sense immune to attacks by the sea lamprey and that predation on the whitefish increases as the lake trout becomes less plentiful.

"In Lake Superior, therefore, we face the prospect of losing the greater part of the present production of fish—a production that normally falls between 15 and 20 million pounds. This loss is not inconsiderable at a period when the maintenance of food production bids fair to become a question of national importance. Furthermore, the effects of the loss on the economies of the many local communities that depend primarily on the fisheries would be disastrous."

The predictions made 15 years ago by Dr. Hile and his associates have come to pass. The value of the Lake Superior catch is now about half of what it was during the period described above. Whereas, lake trout and whitefish made up 24 percent of the catch and 75 percent of the value in 1950–54, by 1955–59 these species were contributing only 15 percent of the catch and 59 percent of the value. In 1960–63, these choice species contributed only 5 percent to the catch, but provided 31 percent of the dollar return to industry. Although the income of the industry has been halved during the past 15 years, the average annual catch has remained close to the 1950–54 level (14.2 million pounds—1950–54; 13.8 million pounds—1955–59; 13.3 million pounds—1960–63), primarily due to a shift of fishing effort to lower value species such as chubs and smelt.

Year	Choice species				Low-value species				All species	
	Pounds (thousands)	Percent	Dollars (thousands)	Percent	Pounds (thousands)	Percent	Dollars (thousands)	Percent	Pounds (thousands)	Dollars (thousands)
1950–54	3,448	24	1,463 (0.42)	75	10,776	76	499 (0.05)	25	14,224	1,962 (0.14)
1955–59	2,078	15	1,024 (0.49)	59	11,699	85	720 (0.06)	41	13,777	1,744 (0.13)
1960–63	658	5	361 (0.55)	31	12,654	95	805 (0.06)	69	13,312	1,166 (0.09)

A clearer understanding of the present situation in the Lake Superior fisheries is described below.

Lake trout: Lake Superior was closed to commercial fishing for lake trout in June 1962. Whereas the commercial fishing industry landed over 3.2 million pounds of lake trout valued at almost $1¼ million in 1950, by 1961 the catch had declined to one-third of a million pounds, a 1,000-percent decrease. The economic impact of the near extinction of the lake trout population due to sea lamprey predation requires no further elaboration. The success of United States and Canadian scientists in eradicating the dreaded sea lamprey in Lake Superior, coupled with the success evident in rehabilitating the lake trout, offers a ray of hope to the depressed Lake Superior industry. Prospects look good for early resumption of limited commercial fishing for lake trout. However, the excellent fishing which the industry enjoyed pre-1950 is still a number of years away.

Whitefish: The only other money fish available to the fishermen is the whitefish. During the past 15 years, this species contributed as much as a million pounds per year valued at around one-half million dollars. The catch started to decline as lamprey abundance increased and hovered around 200,000 to 300,000 pounds annually until the last year or two when a small increase in catch was noted. Some further improvement in the whitefish stocks may be expected now that the lamprey is under control.

Lake herring: The principal species from the standpoint of production is the lake herring. This is a highly seasonal late fall and early winter fishery. Over the past 15 years, the lake herring has contributed between 8 to 12 million pounds annually to the U.S. catch. This is roughly 70 percent of the total production and 46 percent of the total dollar return to the Lake Superior fishery. This species has shown some decline in the last 2 years. Few small fish are evident in the catch. The predominance of larger, older fish is indicative of some change that is effecting the ability of this species to reproduce. This could be due to competition from the alewife (a recent invader to Lake Superior) or to some subtle environmental change. In the last few years, lake herring have not appeared in traditional areas of good production such as Duluth and Bayfield. The amount of fishing effort to catch a given quantity of this species has increased. The industry has been forced to actively search of concentrations of herring. The recent unexplained shortage of herring has everyone worried and the failure of the run to materialize in 1964 has forced the fishermen to take another look at whether they should continue in business.

Chubs: This species has become increasingly important in the Lake Superior catch since the lake trout failure. Whereas only 29,000 pounds of chubs was landed in 1950, the catch in 1963 was almost 1.6 million pounds. Since 1958, the catch of this species has been in excess of 1 million pounds annually. Chubs now contribute about 13 percent of the total poundage and over one-fifth of the total value of the industry. Prospects do not look good for further expansion of the chub fishery using traditional gear. However, some new gear can be developed for exploitation of the abundant chub.

Smelt: This species is extremely plentiful. Smelt was relatively insignificant in the landings until recently. The catch has increased markedly since 1959, with almost 1½ million pounds landed in 1963. Most of the catch is currently used for animal food. Fishermen lack experience and gear for capture of this abundant species.

In summary, the current fishery situation in Lake Superior, along with the present economic plight of the Lake Superior industry, warrants the use of resource disaster funds to provide immediate help to the industry. Without some immediate help, the remnant Lake Superior industry will be hard pressed to survive until the lake trout come back.

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has submitted its sixth annual report to the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Members will recall that this Commission was established by Congress in 1959, for the following basic purposes:

First, to bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments, for consideration of common problems;

Second, to provide a forum for discussion of the administration of Federal grant programs;

Third, to give critical attention to the conditions and controls involved in the administration of Federal grant programs;

Fourth, to make available technical assistance to the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government, in the review of proposed legislation, to determine its overall effect on the Federal system;

Fifth, to encourage discussion and study at an early stage of emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation;

Sixth, to recommend, within the framework of the Constitution, the most desirable allocation of governmental functions, responsibilities, and revenues among the several levels of government; and

Seventh, to recommend methods of coordinating and simplifying tax laws and administrative practices, to achieve a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the levels of government and to reduce the burden of compliance for taxpayers.

The Advisory Commission is composed of representatives of the public and of each level of government. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and I have served on the Commission since its establishment. On the House side, Representative FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, and the original sponsor of the bill creating the Commission, and Representative DWYER, of New Jersey, are also charter members. The other House Member is Representative KEOGH, of New York.

In addition to the six Members from Congress, the Commission has four from the executive branch: the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, the HEW Secretary, and the HHFA Administrator. Other members include four Governors, four mayors, three State legislative leaders, and three elected county officials. The public is represented by three members, one of whom is the Commission's Chairman.

A year has elapsed since the submission of the Commission's fifth annual report; and it is appropriate that the Senate be apprised of the Commission's activities during the past 12 months.

Mr. Frank Bane, of Virginia, Chairman of the Commission, continues to provide his invaluable leadership; while Mr. William G. Colman, its executive director, skillfully supervises the activities of the 23-member professional and clerical staff.

During 1964, general meetings of the Commission were held in January, May, and September; and this year, in January. The following major reports requiring implementation were adopted during the course of these sessions:

First. "The Role of Equalization in Federal Grants." This study explores the present degree of equalization, and considers the extent to which Federal grants should recognize the comparative ability of State and local governments to finance their share of grants from their own resources.

Second. "Impact of Federal Urban Development Programs on Local Government Organization and Planning." This report asks—

> To what exent do urban financial aids promote the creation of special districts or otherwise affect the structure of local government, and to what exent do they employ performance standards requiring coordination of federally aided projects with local comprehensive development plans and decisionmaking?

Third. "Statutory and Administrative Controls Associated With Federal Grants for Public Assistance." The use of public assistance grants is reviewed, and current issues are discussed in this document.

Fourth. "The Problem of Special Districts in American Government." This study explores how special districts affect the organization and functions of general-purpose governments, and makes recommendations designed to strengthen multipurpose units of local government.

Fifth. "The Intergovernmental Aspects of Documentary Taxes." Tax overlapping of documentary taxes is examined in this report.

Sixth, "State-Federal Overlapping in Cigarette Taxes." This study concludes that the goal of maximum tax enforcement with minimum administrative costs can be achieved with increased coordination and simplification of tax laws.

Seventh, "Metropolitan Fiscal and Economic Disparities: Implications for Intergovernmental Relations in Central Cities and Suburbs." This valuable report is slated for distribution in the near future.

Three informational publications also provide useful data to officials at all levels of government:

First, "Tax Overlapping in the United States, 1964." This report updates an earlier study, and documents the principal taxes levied by more than one level of government.

Second, "State Technical Assistance on Local Debt Management." This study was prepared in 1964, and is due for release this month.

Third, "1965 State Legislative Program of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations." This publication contains the Commission's proposed legislative program for State government consideration.

Senators will be interested in what has occurred as a result of these and earlier reports, as well as of other activities. Since it is a continuing body, the Commission is not satisfied with merely drafting studies and making recommendations. Its members are anxious to see their recommendations put into effect, and have devoted a significant share of their energies to stimulating and encouraging the adoption of its recommendations at the relevant levels of government. Many Federal-State-local problems treated in ACIR reports were covered by legislation that came before the last Congress. These include:

First, in the report, "Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas," the Commission suggested that the coordination of Federal programs providing financial assistance for physical facilities within metropolitan areas be improved. It recommended that applications for certain Federal grants-in-aid be reviewed and commented upon by an areawide planning agency, prior to final consideration by the Federal agency concerned. Bills implementing this recommendation—S. 3363 and H.R. 11799—were introduced in the 2d session of the 87th Congress; but no action was taken. In the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I reintroduced a similar measure—S. 855; and Representatives Florence Dwyer and Albert Rains introduced companion bills in the House—H.R. 1910 and H.R. 2168, respectively. In the spring of 1963, the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations held hearings on S. 855. After six executive sessions, the subcommittee reported an amended bill to the Senate Government Operations Committee, which approved the bill for floor action. It passed the Senate last January, but died in the House. On January 15 of this year, I introduced the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965. Title IV of the bill contains an areawide planning provision similar to S. 855.

Second, to implement the Commission's recommendation for increased flexibility at the State level in the handling of certain public-health grants, and to provide for uniform apportionment and matching formulas for such grants, the following bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 88th Congress: H.R. 2487, by Representative Dwyer; H.R. 6185, by Representative Fountain; and S. 1051, by Senator Muskie. No action was taken in either House. On February 8 this year, I once again introduced proposed legislation—S. 1023—to implement this recommendation. Cosponsors include Senators Bartlett, Ervin, McCarthy, McGee, Moss, Mundt, Pearson, Prouty, Randolph, and Williams of New Jersey. In the House, Representative Fountain introduced a companion measure—H.R. 4610—on February 9.

Third, in 1962 a Commission report on intergovernmental responsibilities for water supply and sewage disposal in metropolitan areas recommended that the Federal Water Pollution Control Act be amended; first, to increase the ceiling for sewage treatment grants for a single project from $600,000 to $1 million; second, to authorize a ceiling of $4 million, instead of $2,400,000, for combined sewage treatment projects serving several communities; and third, to authorize a 10-percent Federal financial incentive for those treatment works, consistent with a comprehensive areawide plan for urban development. In the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I introduced S. 649, to carry out these and other objectives; and Representative Blatnik sponsored a companion measure—H.R. 3166—in the House. My bill included a number of other legislative proposals, dealing with Federal enforcement power, additional grants, and organizational matters, on which the Commission took no position. The bill passed the Senate in October 1963, but did not come to a vote in the House. On January 6 of this year, I introduced S. 4, which resembled S. 649 in most of its provisions. Similar proposed legislation—H.R. 3988—was introduced in the House, again by Representative Blatnik, on February 1. Hearings were held on S. 4; and on January 28 the Senate passed it by a vote of 68 to 8.

In the same 1962 report, the Commission advised amending the public facility loan program so as to: first, remove population ceilings, and permit joint action by communities in meeting water and sewer needs; second, tighten eligibility requirements for the use of wells and septic tanks under the FHA mortgage insurance program; and third, provide insurance for site preparation and development costs of water and sewer lines and systems. The provisions of this recommendation were considered as amendments to the housing bill of 1964, but were defeated in committee. Similar proposed legislation to implement these Commission proposals will soon be introduced.

Fourth, in 1961 the Commission adopted a report dealing with State and local taxation of privately owned property located in Federal areas. The Commission recommended that Federal agencies be authorized to retrocede to State governments existing Federal legislative jurisdiction with respect to various lands and properties. It also endorsed a similar legislative proposal which had been developed earlier by the Senate Government Operations Committee staff, with the cooperation of the Justice Department. The latter proposal implemented recommendations outlined in the 1956–57 report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States—two volumes, part I, April 1956; part II, June 1957. As a followup, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] introduced S. 815 in February 1963, at the request of the Attorney General of the United States. Identical bills were introduced in the House—H.R. 4068, by Representative Schwengel; and H.R. 4433, by Representative Dawson. Hearings on S. 815 were held by my subcommittee; and the bill was discussed in subsequent executive sessions, but no further action was taken. This year, similar measures have already been introduced—S. 1007, by Senator McClellan, which Senator Bennett and I are cosponsoring; and H.R. 278, by Representative Bennett, of Florida.

Fifth, in its report, "Periodic Congressional Reassessment of Federal Grants-in-Aid to State and Local Governments," the Commission recommended the establishment of a systematic procedure for continuing congressional review of all

Federal grant-in-aid programs. Specifically, it proposed the enactment of legislation to subject future grant programs to an automatic termination provision. Such legislation would also require that, prior to program termination, appropriate congressional committees would undertake a comprehensive review of affected programs, and would report to Congress their findings and recommendations. To implement this recommendation, I introduced S. 2114 in the last Congress. Hearings were held, and the bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent, but failed to come to a vote in the House. Provisions similar to S. 2114 are included in title II of the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965.

Sixth, three identical measures—H.R. 5039, H.R. 6206, and H.R. 6207—to coordinate Federal and State inheritance and estate taxes, were introduced. These bills were based upon a Commission report entitled "Coordination of State and Federal Inheritance, Estate and Gift Taxes." The National Government and all but one of the States levy inheritance taxes. To eliminate such overlapping, the Commission recommended that a tax credit be given to individuals paying the State tax. No action was taken on the House bills.

Seventh, H.R. 10412 was introduced; it would implement an Advisory Commission recommendation to deny certain deductions, for Federal income tax purposes, to companies which use facilities constructed with funds from tax-exempt municipal bonds when they also purchase such bonds. No action was taken.

Finally, one ACIR recommendation did become law. In the housing amendments of 1964 is a provision which allows counties, regardless of population, to be eligible for receipt of Federal planning-assistance grants, and removes any restrictions on joint projects undertaken by two or more local governments.

At the State level, Commission recommendations met with greater success. Each year, model laws are drafted for State consideration. The recommendations touch on many areas—some procedural, others substantive in nature. The Commission can justly be proud of its record in our State capitols. The 43 States that have implemented one or more Commission recommendations during the past 2 years are making strides toward improved Federal-State-local relations. Seven States, it should be noted, enacted four or more such proposals.

Much work remains, however. The Commission has not enjoyed many congressional victories. While many of its recommendations have resulted in proposed Federal legislation, only one became law during the 88th Congress. More times than not, the executive branch has halfheartedly supported ACIR proposals; and Congress, in turn, has failed to guide Commission-inspired bills to final enactment. I hope the record will be better this year.

The Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee plans to devote much of its time this year to consideration of Commission recommendations and to an appraisal of the Commission's functions and operations in its 5 years of existence.

Hearings are planned on the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965 (S. 561). This bill is a byproduct of close cooperation by the Senate and House subcommittees and the Commission. It has 37 cosponsors, and commands wide bipartisan support.

In late spring, the Senate and House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittees plan to conduct joint hearings, to bring before Congress the 5-year record of the Commission's achievements, and to explore its strengths and weaknesses. The broader question concerning present trends in intergovernmental relations and possible future developments will also be explored. This phase of the inquiry will provide the basis for a more penetrating assessment of the Advisory Commission's proper role in our overall endeavor to improve Federal-State-local relations.

THE NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment No. 23 to S. 370; my remarks to the Subcommitte on Education, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and an article describing the Cardozo project in urban teaching, on which my proposal for a National Teacher Corps is based, be printed in the RECORD.

The article is written by Larry Cuban, one of the two experienced teachers who lead the project.

There being no objection, the amendment, the remarks, and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 63, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

"TITLE VI—NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

"Statement of purpose

"SEC. 601. The purpose of this title is to establish a National Teacher Corps composed of qualified but inexperienced elementary and secondary school teacher-trainees and experienced elementary and secondary school teachers to be assigned in teams to (1) provide teaching assistance to local educational agencies having in their schools unusually large numbers of children from low-income families and (2) provide teachers training in the field to such teacher-trainees.

"Authorization

"SEC. 602. In order to carry out the purpose of this title, the Commissioner is authorized to—

"(1) provide initial periods of not to exceed three months of training to teacher-trainees who can qualify as elementary or secondary school teachers for the purposes of this title but have little or no teaching experience, and thereafter provide to such teacher-trainees not to exceed two academic years of training and experience teaching in the elementary or secondary schools of local educational agencies selected for the purposes of this title;

"(2) provide such training and experience under the guidance and instruction of an experienced teacher employed by the Commissioner for such purpose;

"(3) make arrangements with local educational agencies having in their elementary and secondary schools unusually large numbers of children from low-income families, under which a team consisting of an experienced teacher and a number of teacher-trainees will be furnished to each such agency, without charge to such agency, to teach in the elementary or secondary schools of such agency, but with time available for a training program established by the Commissioner for such trainees to be carried out in addition to teaching duties; and

"(4) contract with institutions of higher education to provide the training authorized in clause (1) and such training as the Commissioner determines necessary for experienced teachers who will guide and instruct teams of teacher-trainees pursuant to this title.

"Experienced teachers

"SEC. 603. The Commissioner shall employ experienced teachers to guide and instruct teacher-trainees pursuant to this title in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, and provide such teachers with necessary training while so employed.

"Teacher-trainees

"SEC. 604. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, a teacher-trainee under this title shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(b) Such teacher-trainees shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and of title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), and any service performed by an individual as a teacher-trainee shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States.

"(c)(1) Such teacher-trainees shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection the term 'performance of duty' in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a teacher-trainee—

"(A) while on authorized leave; or

"(B) While absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Commissioner.

"(d) Such teacher-trainees shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

"(e) Such a teacher-trainee shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by the local educational agency for teaching full-time in the same school and grade as such trainee is or will be teaching in as part of his training, and he shall receive such compensation while receiving initial training pursuant to section 602(1). Such teacher-trainee shall also be reimbursed for necessary travel expenses for himself and his dependents.

"Appropriation authorization

"SEC. 605. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title $40,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

"On page 63, line 6, strike out 'Title VI' and insert in lieu thereof 'Title VII.'

"On page 63, line 8, strike out 'and V' and insert in lieu thereof 'V and VI.'

"Beginning on page 63, redesignate sections 601 through 605 as sections 701 through 705, respectively."

A NATIONAL TEACHERS CORPS

(A statement submitted to the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

The committee has before it amendment No. 23 to S. 370, the primary and secondary education bill. The amendment would establish a National Teachers Corps to recruit bright young people to teach in the Nation's most depressed school districts.

The amendment seeks to fill what I think is a serious omission in the bill—the absence of provisions related to recruitment and development of teachers.

This proposal aims at dramatizing the ideal of domestic service, and would offer young men and women an opportunity to begin to teach in difficult and challenging situations at home as the Peace Corps has done abroad.

The proposal is complementary to the basic legislation before us. The Teacher Corps would develop skilled and mature teachers at the same time it begins to meet the educational problems of our most deprived schools.

The Peace Corps is an extraordinary success overseas because of the practical idealism of America's young people. We should use that same idealism on our most pressing domestic crisis—education in our depressed neighborhoods.

The Teacher Corps is not an experimental idea. It has been demonstrated successfully in a 2-year test run at Cardozo High School in a poor area of Washington, D.C.

Like the Cardozo "Project in Urban Teaching" the National Teaching Corps would consist of both volunteers and experienced teachers.

Volunteers would be rigorously screened. They would be trained intensively for 3 months and then sent in small groups, with an experienced teacher, for 2 years of teaching and further training into school districts that requested them.

Under this proposal, volunteers would be paid at the beginning salary level for a full-time teacher in the school system at which they worked. Experienced teachers would be on the staff of the National Teachers Corps.

In the schools both the volunteers and the experienced teachers would teach three-fourths of a normal teaching load. Seminars in teaching method and curriculum development would occupy the rest of the time.

Wherever possible, the Corps would operate in connection with a university that would provide both training and advanced subject matter for the volunteers.

In the Washington, D.C., Cardozo program a group of 10 returned Peace Corps volunteers and 2 experienced teachers began the project in urban education over 1 year ago. It is funded by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

The results of the demonstration have been praised by the volunteers, nearly all of whom plan to continue in teaching, by teachers at the school and by the school administration. This year the number of volunteers in the program has been expanded to 16.

The proposed bill would cost approximately $40 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1. Judging by the Cardozo experience this would be enough for a Corps of roughly 1,000 experienced teachers and 5,000 volunteers.

The amendment presents a sound, tested, very badly needed program. The volunteers, the schools, all of us stand to gain.

Perhaps the ultimate benefit of this program is that it would hopefully attract bright young people into the teaching profession who might not otherwise go into teaching.

Those who complete the Cardozo program earn a master of arts in teaching degree from Howard University. It might be wise to include an opportunity for similar professional advancement in the National Teaching Corps. This possibility should be further explored.

[From Social Education, the official journal of the National Council for the Social Studies, December 1964]

THE CARDOZO PEACE CORPS PROJECT: EXPERIMENT IN URBAN EDUCATION

(By Larry Cuban)

Much has been written of late about the urban school. Catch phrases such as "slum schools," "culturally deprived," "middle-class value structure" testify to the growing jargon that dots essays and articles. Urban education is good copy. And it's about time. Today one of every three children in major cities is underprivileged; by 1970 it is estimated that one of every two will be disadvantaged. Consider also the grim list of urban school afflictions: Too few effective teachers, antiquated curricula, insufficient materials, and "stone fortress" schools. Finally, add the explosive issue of de facto segregation, and the awesome complexity of urban education becomes evident.

Recommendations to solve the proliferating problems of the inner-city school run from total overhaul to piecemeal remodeling. To some people complete integration is the solution; unless there is integration, according to one New York boycott leader, the public schools will have had their day. Others urge rehabilitation. Saturate the slum school with more money, more teachers, and more materials. Initiate more experimental programs. Make the school a functioning part of the community. Thus the controversy over solutions seems deceptively simple: Will firming up and experimenting with segregated schools result in quality education, or will colored children sitting next to white children guarantee both an equal education? While rank and file Negroes, according to a recent Newsweek poll, overwhelmingly believe their children will do infinitely better work in integrated schools, James Conant of Harvard, Calvin Gross, superintendent of New York schools, and others stress upgrading the slum school.

But this controversy may become irrelevant. If the present trend in some urban areas continues, then the question of integrated schools will be relegated to moot debate in graduate education courses. Witness Washington, D.C. The Negro school population has risen from 60 percent in 1954 to over 85 percent in 1964. Integration is a meaningless issue here. In New York, Manhattan schools are over 75 percent Negro and Puerto Rican. The New York School Board's integration plan affected only a handful of segregated schools. The hard-core ghetto schools of Harlem were unaffected by Princeton plans, permissive zoning, or other proposals. The pattern of growth in other cities indicates more ghettos, more segregation—not less. The prognosis is indeed dim. Increased demands for integration will result in more whites packing up and leaving the city. How ironical that agitation for integrated schools results in more segregation.

Controversy exists, fundamentally, since education is believed to be one important lever to uplift the impoverished into affluence. If education is inferior, then available jobs are restricted; low-paying jobs mean substandard housing. This cycle of poverty and discrimination, encrusted by tradition and prejudice, has existed for centuries.

To break this cycle attacks have been mounted in all three areas, especially in jobs and housing. Yet it has been precisely residential segregation and discriminatory employment that have proved impervious to integrationist efforts. Suburbs remain lily-white; slum lords continue to ignore housing complaints. Though some headway has been made in skilled and managerial positions, it is still token employment. Thus, rent strikes and fair employment commissions indicate progress but, in reality, they are only successful skirmishes—not total victories.

Pragmatically, then, the arena of combat against poverty and discrimination must be the urban schoolroom—by default. If this is true, what of an urban school system that is predominately Negro or approaching that condition? Can quality schools in the ghetto break the cycle? There are many who say no. They argue that the community must be changed before the school can effect change. The environment is such, they say, that any reforms initiated within the school will be lost in the morass of ignorance and poverty that exists within a community. How can the school really alter customs and values of a slum? These environmentalists, unfortunately, have ignored what schools have done for millions of immigrants in earlier American slums and also what AID and other U.S. oversea agencies are doing in villages and barrios around the world. To expect an instant middle class is foolish. Family, friends, and neighborhood determine to a great extent values and behavior and circumscribe the effectiveness of the school. This is not to say that urban schools have not changed youngsters. Allison Davis of the University of Chicago has shown that in one generation Negro youth's IQ's have risen. Also in the 1950's more Negro draftees passed Selective Service education tests than whites from 12 Southern States. The Higher Horizon pilot project, criticisms notwithstanding, has lifted aspirations and broadened perspectives. St. Louis' Banneker program demonstrated similar results. Given proper staff and funds, schools can act as regenerative agents for both the individual and the community.

Of course, the school cannot manufacture jobs or decent housing. Pressure must continue in those areas also. But the schools can provide urban youth with the skills necessary for adjustment into American society. To question, as some do, whether urban youth should adjust to middle-class values is irrelevant. The overriding concern of the deprived is to get in—meaning the barbecue pit, the power mower, the dishwasher. To condemn this desire as crass materialism or shoddy conformity is a more pernicious form of paternalism than that practiced by a white southerner speaking about his "Nigras." Once the urban youth has the material prosperity television promises every American as his birthright, then let him debate the esoteric questions of conformity and bourgeois values. Let's equip him with the skills necessary to make choices.

At this point, we face the big question. Can quality schools exist in the ghetto? Much of what James Baldwin has to say about Harlem schools is tragically true for many other urban schools. To be exposed to teachers who don't care, much less teach, and to curriculums that don't matter predictably results in boredom, resentment, and frustration. A recent White House Panel on Educational Research and Development frankly stated, "by all known criteria the majority of urban slum schools are failures." But it is not a lost cause. Good slum schools do exist.

Fundamentally, a school is as strong as its staff is competent and committed. What the urban school needs, then, is more Mark Hopkins and less logs; teachers who can "connect up" with urban youngsters. Yet there are those who say that since only the brave will teach in these schools—and there are not enough brave ones to go around—teacher-proof materials such as films, records, programed learning units, must be developed and utilized.

Unfortunately, there is no such thing as teacher-proof curriculum materials, materials that a Socrates or a Joe Smith could teach with equally as well. Anyone with classroom experience can testify that printed materials, mechanical devices, or what-have-you come alive or die depending upon the particular teacher. Students can digest reams of facts from programed learning units; but without the interplay of ideas, the use of these facts, can learning be meaningful? These devices are extremely useful aids, but aids only. This is especially true for the inner-city school where cumulative neglect and deprivation require teachers who care, teachers who understand differences in values and motivation, and teachers who like to teach. Enough has been said of the incompetents and hacks who staff urban schools. That scandal continues. Not enough, however, has been said about the core of teachers in every one of these schools who are committed and teach well—year in and year out. Thousands more like them are needed.

Can inner-city schools attract talented individuals? Or will only the martyr and the brave choose to teach deprived youth? One Philadelphia administrator wants teachers who can be "dedicated as a clergyman, selfless as a family doctor, sensitive as an artist, skillful as a master craftsman, ready as a good parent to understand, to sacrifice, to serve, to support, to forgive." If we can recruit such individuals, fine. But urban schools need those who are less than angels too. Can the challenge be broadened to include others? I think so. What gives me hope are the programs in operation at Hunter College, Queens College, Yeshiva University in New York, and a modest experiment being carried on in a Washington, D.C., high school.

Funded by the President's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency, the Cardozo Peace Corps project in urban teaching aims to attract and train teachers for urban schools who can "connect up" with inner-city youth through the development of meaningful curriculum materials. The project operates on two levels of curriculum: creating teaching materials for the student, and constructing a course of study for teacher trainees. But why the Peace Corps? One assumption underlying the whole project was that a sense of commitment, a desire to serve, flexibility, understanding, and energy found within many Peace Corps volunteers, and so necessary for quality teaching, would be effective within the urban school setting. Last year Cardozo High School was the testing ground for that assumption.

Cardozo is a 4-year high school of 2,000 students, of whom less than 10 are white. The faculty ranges from a core of dedicated, competent teachers down to the usual number of timeservers. Though the school serves a population including middle-income professionals—white and blue collar workers—it is primarily a low-income area. Characterized as a "slum" school (a term bitterly resented by faculty and students), Cardozo has had a difficult job fighting this and other characterizations, primarily because the school is located in an area that supports such stereotypes. For example, while 13 percent of the city's population lives in the Cardozo district, 22 percent of the city's juvenile delinquents come from the area. Four out of ten youths in the area are not living with both parents. More than 3 out of every 10 live births in the district are illegitimate. Over 20 percent of the people in the area are on public assistance. Piling on more grim statistics will accomplish little; these few testify to the multiplicity of ills that afflict the community.

For Cardozo High School, the Peace Corps project offers no panaceas, no instant success; it cannot solve the problems in Cardozo and schools like it across the country. It can, however, come to grips with the problem of upgrading urban schools in all-Negro areas, chart directions, and suggest alternatives.

Let me describe the general framework of the program and how it operates.[1] Ten former Peace Corps volunteers, two master teachers, a curriculum coordinator and evaluator comprise the staff. The principal of the school is director of the project. The interns—four in English, four in history, one each in math and biology—teach two classes each under the supervision of the master teachers who also have two classes. In this way, the theoretical is wedded to the practical and, more importantly, the classroom becomes a virtual laboratory. For example, a master teacher may criticize an intern's lesson; the intern disagrees. Either the criticism or the disagreement can be erased when the experienced teacher tries to demonstrate the particular point in his class. The payoff for criticism is immediate. Continuous conferences throughout the day over students, materials, or crises generate an atmosphere that encourages learning. In such a situation there is feedback, a continuing dialogue.

Contrast this with the traditional student-teacher experience. Assigned to an experienced teacher (more often than not a senior faculty member desirous of a few periods off), the first few weeks are spent in observation. Does he know what to observe? After getting his feet wet with a few lessons, the student-teacher is thrown in head first. From there on until the last few weeks of the term, the supervising teacher will occasionally poke his head in the door, smile, and gladly leave. Conferences, if any, rarely rise above the trivia of teaching.

Meanwhile, back at the university, the director of student teaching will hold sessions to explore problems common to the student-teachers. Seldom do these rise above griping. Basically this experience, save for a few enlightened universities, is repeated throughout the Nation's teacher-training institutions. And when the recently graduated teacher is thrust into the urban school, totally unprepared, totally unsupported, the results are predictable. I do not think the picture is overdrawn. Probably the most tragic aspect of traditional student teaching is that this training experience is considered the strongest part of the program.

The master teacher-intern relationship in the Cardozo project tries to avoid the pitfalls of traditional teacher training. According to the interns, this relationship is a main strength of the program. One intern put it this way:

"One area of our work that is particularly exciting is the direct confrontation with our master teachers about teaching. These sessions have been helpful to me as a teacher because they have been helpful to me as a person. The most important contribution my master teacher has made to my teaching is not just her specific ideas of lesson material or classroom techniques, although these are important, but rather her insistence that the most important thing that had to happen was growth in personal areas that dealt with my conception of myself as a teacher and my feelings about my students."

Part of the laboratory setting is experimentation with materials. Cardozo offered ample opportunity to experiment. At the beginning of the 1963–64 school year, more than half the students in the school did not have a book in at least one of their subjects. Library facilities were inadequate; there are less than 75 books for all of American history and about the same number for ancient, medieval, and modern European history combined. Thus, textbooks for all of the intern's students or reliance upon library resources were out of the question. Forced to innovate by circumstances and by example—the master teachers did not use texts in their classes—they relied upon paperbacks and a duplicating machine.

In history, the rationale was to teach a course as relevant and as interesting as possible to urban youth. The four interns began the arduous job of creating lessons day by day. In effect, the interns began to write their own texts. Mistakes, lapses, and failures resulted, but the raw material of creative teaching—experimentation—fostered an approach to teaching among the interns that will last long after they leave Cardozo. These lessons, called "readings"—duplicated for the students on a ditto machine—offered a variety of materials to the students. Primary and secondary sources, poetry, fiction provided a rich vein of material for students. Some examples: a lesson on the six-shooter from Walter Webb's Great Plains to illustrate frontier inventiveness; excerpts from Genesis and Babylonian myths to demonstrate cultural diffusion; Thucydides' description of the Plague during the Peloponnesian War to capture the flavor of fifth-century Athens. Or take a lesson on the Boston massacre. The standard text version is known to most schoolboys. One intern took the diary of a Boston merchant, aggressively anti-British, who described the event. Comparing the account with the facts, the class saw how the merchant had employed emotion-laden words ("bloody murder," "massacre," etc.). The reading became a lesson in word evaluation. Another teacher approached the same lesson from the viewpoint of one of the participants, Crispus Attucks. Few students realized Attucks was a Negro. A discussion developed around the question: How much of a commitment should a Negro have toward a society that degrades him? The use of Attucks was not accidental. The study of the Negro in American history, according to the interns, is one meaningful way of "connecting-up" with their students. Meaningful in that the study of the Negro may generate pride and respect for one's self within Negro youth or, better yet, offer insights into the contemporary Negro's position in America. If so, then the effort is worthwhile.

One intern completed a unit on slavery by asking his class to write an essay on the "Hangovers of Slavery"; that is, how did two and a half centuries of oppression mark a people? Though good grammar and spelling were spotty, the essays showed a depth of understanding and insight into the Negro's present-day status that were profound. Thus the past and present become inextricably intertwined in the teaching of history.

The four interns in English did not have to type as much of their materials on ditto masters, for they had available to them the entire world of paperback books. Whether they typed their material or used paperbacks, they, like the history interns, felt traditional texts were inadequate.

Paperbacks have been selected primarily to get youngsters to like reading, on the assumption, which experience seems to support, that many so-called poor readers are simply bored or inexperienced. Most students can read and read well if engaged with what they are reading. In order to involve youngsters the interns chose books that viewed the problems of adolescents, such as "The Catcher in the Rye," "Separate Peace," "Lonliness of the Long Distance Runner," or that examined the effects of physical and spiritual confinement on humans—"Diary of Anne Frank," "Raisin in the Sun," or that presented Negro literature within the larger framework of American literature—"Black Boy, Native Son," the essays of James Baldwin.

---

[1] This year the Cardozo project has 16 interns. Twelve are at Cardozo; four are at Bannecker Junior High School, adjacent to Cardozo. The staff of the project is comprised of two curriculum coordinators who function also as master teachers, and four affiliate teachers from the regular faculties of Cardozo and Banneker who assist in supervision of the interns. The two principals of Cardozo and Banneker share responsibility for direction of the project.

Of course, all students were not reached. It is well to remember that teaching has its limitations too. But enthusiatic response by many students indicates some contact. If fiction didn't, poetry might. The response of one intern's class to Don Marquis' "Archy and Mehitabel" points to the necessity for experimentation with nontraditional materials and nontraditional methods. The combination, then, of sensitivity and understanding with the intelligent use of subject matter comprised the project's approach toward curriculum materials.

If this laboratory setting for curriculum experimentation and teacher-training was one step in the making of a teacher, another took place after school 3 days a week. Three seminars a week, meeting in Cardozo, have been devoted to providing the theoretical and philosophical context for what happens in class. Seminars also constitute the link with Howard University from which the master of arts in teaching degree will be earned by the interns.

One seminar, taught by a professor of sociology from Howard, concentrates on the relationship between the urban condition and the school. What is the city like? How did it get that way? In what ways does the school mirror the community? Inevitably discussions must take into account the anatomy of racial minorities and race relations. Another seminar, entitled "The Humanities," approaches teaching, the adolescent, and the city through the eyes of artists, philosophers, and teachers. What insights about youth can be obtained from John Knowles' "Separate Peace"? Charles Dickens' "Great Expectations"? Richard Wright's "Native Son"? William Golding's "Lord of the Flies"? Would Rousseau's suggestions in "Emile" work at Cardozo? Finally, there is a seminar on psychological disciplines. Led by an experienced psychologist, the behavior of youth in general and urban youngsters in particular are examined through case studies presented by interns.

Three points should be noted about these seminars:

1. All discussion is firmly grounded in the day-to-day experiences of the interns. Examples from the classroom are raised to support or rebut a point. Hard core realism pervades most discussions.

2. Each seminar is enriched through visiting consultants: Psychologist Martin Deutsch' work with preschoolers, David Riesman's opinions of what the urban school should be like, and Martin Mayer's views of the inner city school function.. Local resource people have also been tapped.

3. There is no traditional history of education, educational psychology, or philosophy of education course. Instead the principles of each form the fabric of the three seminars and have greater significance since they are filtered through the intern's daily classroom experiences. More importantly, these courses are not studied in isolation; there is continual interplay of their concepts in the seminars. Take Plato as an example. We discussed his philosophical rationale for tracking as found in the "Republic" and compared it to track programs in operation in Washington. Another seminar explored the psychological implications of tracking and the following afternoon the social-class bias of tracking was discussed. Therefore, what appears to be cut-and-dried, when seen from the point of view of other disciplines takes on greater significance.

Very briefly, in fact, too briefly, I have described the implementation of the Cardozo Peace Corps project's two aims. Needless to say, we have had difficulties. A short examination of two problems we have encountered might suggest to projects of a similar nature means of avoiding them.

Faculty-project relations: Knowing full well that change generates conflict, we expected a certain amount of resistance. To some of the faculty we were a welcome addition that would decrease the class load of all teachers. (Class sizes the first 3 months of 1963–64 averaged 40–50, including the interns.) To other teachers, the existence of the project represented either a threat to their security or a direct slap at their competency. After all, some teachers reasoned, we must be doing a poor job if the project is here. This inaccurate rationalizing was not confronted in September and continued to fester through the school year. Orientation of faculty to project was through announcements at meetings. No accomplishment—little knowledge, more resentment. A planned, cooperative orientation session and continuing meeting, we have learned, are crucial in reducing friction to a residual minimum. There were, however, a handful of faculty members who affiliated with the project through seminars and served as bridges to the rest of the teachers. And, of course, our clannishness didn't help matters. The elan, esprit, and cohesiveness of the group, while a decided strength in giving necessary support to one another, was simultaneously critized by faculty members as excessive. What to do? Sacrifice the abortive nature of the group and atomize the project, and you risk isolation and alienation, twin occupational hazards of urban schoolteachers. Can you compromise on solidarity? I don't know.

Proper school administration: The project has operated with the cooperation of the Washington school system. Our first year we enjoyed a great deal of autonomy. This was a mixed blessing. Not fully of the system, yet not completely separate, relations with central administration were at times strained. There is little doubt that the sympathy and full support of the Superintendent is essential. This year the project will be responsible to the Superintendent. Time will tell if this is an improvement.

Naturally, other problems existed. Some were peculiar to federally financed projects, others were common to any group of individuals gathered together for a single purpose. We believe they have been weathered. If so, can an estimate of the project's success be made?

It would be tempting to agree with Henry Adams and say that the teacher influences eternity, that his effect is everlasting. Thus, it would be impossible to measure whether interns have connected, since the impact of teacher upon student may not be realized for years. But more evidence is necessary.

So far, student response to the interns has been warm and enthusiastic. But this has limited validity as a tool of measurement. If success is measured in terms of attracting and keeping former Peace Corps volunteers in urban teaching, then we have been successful. Eight are teaching at Cardozo and in nearby schools. If success is measured by the support we have generated, then the encouragement and aid we have received from the Peace Corps in recruitment, and the additional grant of money we have received from the President's Commission stand as evidence. Probably, in the last analysis, the success of our project stands or falls on how well each intern teaches. And this is as it should be. With de facto teaching, not mass-produced certificated de jure teachers, schools might begin to deliver on the promise of an education for all youth.

SALUTE TO JOHN LLEWELLYN LEWIS AND THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA ON 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DISTINGUISHED PRESIDENT EMERITUS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Americans are cognizant of the important role of John Llewellyn Lewis both to the labor movement and the free enterprise system. His life was a parallel between the advancement of the Nation and the progress of the United Mine Workers of America in particular and organized labor in general. Tomorrow, February 12, is the birthday of the distinguished president emeritus of the UMWA and world renowned spokesman for a hardy element of the free world work force.

John L. Lewis, has devoted most of his life to the coal miners of this country. He was a symbol of strength to them because he fought the tough, difficult battles in proving that labor and management can operate under the free enterprise system realistically in an era of rapid and sweeping change.

The coal miners' hourly wages are the highest in the scale for industrial workers. Pensions, welfare benefits, and improved living conditions for the miners and their families—these were the goals for which John L. Lewis worked with significant success. And even in retirement he is still helping to develop ways to ease the burden of the workingman. On February 1 of this year the retirement age for coal miners was lowered to 55 by the trustees of the United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund. The man most responsible for this innovation was Mr. Lewis, one of the trustees.

Over a 40-year span John L. Lewis served as president of the UMWA. His tireless efforts made the coal industry one of the few in the world capable of exporting its end product in competition with coal of other nations. Mr. Lewis realistically favored mechanization of mines and increasing productivity because they resulted in the cost of coal remaining virtually stable in a highly competitive fuels and energy market.

Mr. President, West Virginia knows the John L. Lewis story as do few other States. More than 30 years ago, he began an era of new hope for the coal miners of the Mountain State. At the start of the New Deal period, he reorganized the mineworkers' union in our State and in so doing made of it a vital force in overcoming depression in the mining communities.

Controversies of the past are forgotten when we assess the statesmanship and the contributions of this dedicated man to our history. In 1959, John L. Lewis received the recognition of the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia when selected as the "Adopted Son of the Year." And in 1957, West Virginia University bestowed an honorary doctor of laws degree upon John L. Lewis. The citation read as follows:

> John Llewellyn Lewis, you have worked diligently and successfully to improve the safety conditions and the economic welfare

of the miners of West Virginia and elsewhere. You have maintained that only a healthy industry could provide for its workers those conditions of employment which are compatible with the dignity and welfare of its employees. Under your leadership, the mineworkers have cooperated in the introduction of mining machinery and methods which have improved the conditions of labor, made American mines the most efficient and productive in the world, provided the foundation for the economic welfare of West Virginia among other States, and established a firm base for the industrial development which is a great source of strength to the free world.

An interesting sidelight to this honorary degree is recounted. Mr. Lewis had established a policy of generally refusing offers of colleges and universities to honor him. It was a surprise when he accepted the degree from West Virginia University. But Mr. Lewis had a reason, his friends say. He felt it apropos that the university which had refused to allow him to hold organizational meetings of the UMWA on its campus in the 1930's was honoring him in the 1950's.

John L. Lewis was a humanitarian. Thanks to his philosophy and constant efforts, the United Mine Workers of America are great crusaders in the fight to aid the unemployed.

In his senior years, John L. Lewis has been honored universally for his contributions to the economy of our Nation.

It is a privilege to join in honoring John Llewellyn Lewis on this eve of his 85th birthday.

Mr. President, at this point I request unanimous consent to have inserted with my remarks in the Record a tribute to the 75th anniversary of the United Mine Workers of America and its peerless leader for more than half of that period. I refer to, and ask unanimous consent to have printed an article by Rex Lauck, assistant editor of the United Mine Workers Journal, captioned "Four Decades of History."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Four Decades of History

(By Rex Lauck)

For more than half of its 75 years the United Mine Workers of America were led by one of the giants of the 20th century, John L. Lewis. His leadership of the union covered 40 years—from 1920 to 1960—but his influence on its affairs began before 1920 and still continues.

As a young man he was a legislative representative for district 12. He moved to Indianapolis, then the union's headquarters, in 1917, and before becoming international president acted as business manager for the Journal, international statistician, and vice president.

He has now retired as president but is still chief executive officer and chairman of the board of trustees of the UMWA welfare and retirement fund.

During his early prepresidential years with the union among the things he accomplished was formation of the Journal as we know it today. In an important action after his retirement, only last week, the welfare fund announced that requirements for pension eligibility would be relaxed and benefits raised to $85 a month.

In 1919 as acting president of the Union he led the coal miners of the United States in a nationwide strike which resulted in a 27-percent pay increase, the largest in industrial history. After his election as UMWA President in 1920, he led the union through 40 years of turbulence and battles but, most important of all, 40 years of accomplishment.

John L. Lewis and the UMWA had their ups and downs, and in the 1920's the union virtually disappeared in many areas. Large coal mines operated nonunion and good union miners were forced to seek employment in other industries or scab. But John L. Lewis and his associates, after years of legislative effort, were successful in having the Federal Government officially recognize labor's right to organize. This was written into the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, section 7–A of which became widely heralded as labor's magna charta. It was not only that, it was John L. Lewis' brainchild.

Within 90 days of enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act, coal miners of the United States were organized with the exception of steel companies' captive mines. The miners' leader realized that coal miners employed by steel companies could not be organized until the steelworkers themselves were union members. Thus it was Lewis' concern for coal miners that led to the formation of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The story of the CIO and the organization of workers in mass industries was the Nation's most dramatic story of the 1930's. Under Lewis' leadership coal miners traveled all over the Nation teaching the principles of unionism to steelworkers, automobile workers, rubber workers, and farmworkers. Almost overnight the men and women who had slaved at substandard wages in those and other industries were unionized. It was an organizing drive unique in American history. Five million men and women became members of labor unions for the first time in their lives. There is nothing to compare with it before or since.

During the 1940's, John L. Lewis and the coal miners stood alone against the heavy hand of the Federal Government which imposed a wage squeeze on workers but allowed profiteering by industry. He and the miners were vilified, castigated, cursed and damned, but they stood firm and eventually won their battle for higher wages and public recognition of the fact that their occupation was as hazardous as that of the men who were fighting in the Armed Forces.

During the late 1940's, the union again backed Lewis to the hilt when he was fighting the operators over the principle of what is now the welfare fund.

The welfare fund as we know it today became a reality only after 4 years of court battle with the operators, plus several national work stoppages. The international union was fined twice—in 1946 and 1948—and John L. Lewis was also fined personally for contempt of court. The judge in these cases said that the coal miners went on strike with a "wink code or nod" from Lewis. This was untrue simply because the coal miners did not need even a wink to understand what their president was doing and what they needed to do to support him.

NO NATIONAL DISPUTES SINCE 1950

Since 1950 there has not been a national strike in the coal industry. John L. Lewis and his successors—Tom Kennedy and Tony Boyle—have negotiated excellent contracts with the industry without the necessity for public fanfare and scare headlines over strike deadlines.

The decade since 1950 also saw formation of National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., at the suggestion of Mr. Lewis. This organization is made up of representatives of the union, the coal industry, coal-carrying railroads, mine equipment manufacturers, and electric utility companies. It speaks with what Mr. Lewis called one voice on matters of common policy that will benefit the coal industry and its employees.

If there is one common denominator in the unparalleled career of America's greatest labor leader it was his determination to better the lot of the men who toil in America's coal mines. It was this that led him toward formation of the CIO, establishment of the greatest welfare fund in the world, seemingly endless battles with Presidents of the United States, and the constant and unremitting fight for coal mine safety.

John L. Lewis was the leader of America's coal miners for four decades. He was their strength but he is the first to say that they were his strength and that without the united backing of those brave and hardy men he would have accomplished little or nothing.

The Lewis years will never be forgotten by working men and women of this country. The unparalleled intellect was at their service night and day. The deep resonant voice and eloquent tongue of one of the two or three great orators of this century always spoke in behalf of the poor and downtrodden.

He said it best himself when addressing the 1930 convention of coal miners in Indianapolis. The unmistakable voice echoed through Tomlinson Hall when he roared:

"I have never faltered or failed to present the cause or plead the case of the mineworkers of this country. I have pleaded your case from the pulpit and the public platform; in joint conferences with the operators of this country; before the bar of State legislatures; in the councils of the President's Cabinet; and in the public press of this Nation—not in the quavering tones of a feeble mendicant asking alms, but in the thundering voice of the captain of a mighty host, demanding the rights to which freemen are entitled."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

"YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"—FILM ON LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 282, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 282) that it is the sense of Congress that the U.S. Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film prepared by it on the late President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," available for viewing at the dedication ceremonies of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in Boston, Mass., to be held during the week beginning February 21, 1965.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Do I correctly understand that this is a "one shot" affair for release at these ceremonies?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. It has been cleared with Republican Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, and the accompanying preamble was agreed to as follows:

Whereas the city of Boston will dedicate its new Civic War Memorial Auditorium during the week beginning February 21, 1965; and

Whereas this auditorium will be a living memorial to residents of Boston who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas military, religious, and civic organizations will participate in appropriate memorial exercises: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film prepared by it on the late President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums", available for viewing at the dedication ceremonies of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in the city of Boston, Massachusetts, to be held during the week beginning February 21, 1965.

LET US CONTINUE OUR SEARCH FOR PEACE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the search for peace, "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate." Since 1954, we have been involved against our will in South Vietnam. Three Presidents, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, have properly determined that were the Communists to take over southeast Asia then the Philippines and South Korea would probably be next and, in time, the outer western defenses of the free world might well be Australia, New Zealand, and Hawaii.

We sorrow over the deaths of American soldiers on this frontier of freedom in South Vietnam. We should take pride in the vast retaliatory blows which make it crystal clear to the Communist dictators of Red China and the Soviet Union that Americans will never quit under fire, nor retreat from southeast Asia, nor submit to Communist aggression.

The retaliation against North Vietnamese military installations was the best insurance against spreading the war. The Vietcong Communists will go to the limit unless the punishment we inflict makes the price too high. We must not leave the Communists in doubt of the consequences should they persist in trying to widen the war in South Vietnam. Communist dictators understand the language of force and power.

Furthermore, they know that our planes can strike by air and sea from our carriers' floating bases, invulnerable to devastating Communist retaliation. We are superior in power in missiles, on land, sea, and in the air, to all nations of the world combined.

History, over a thousand years, teaches that we must not and we need not send in land forces on the Asiatic mainland into Red China. The huge masses of the Soviet Union and Red China, where life is valued so cheaply, would overwhelm us on land as, over the centuries, they have swallowed up other invaders. Ours is, and must continue to be in this grim period, a nation superior in missile power, in the air, on the sea, and under the sea.

The elephant cannot fight the eagle nor the whale. Now is the time to invite the Soviet Union, Red China, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, and our allies of the free world, to a conference at Geneva.

Austria was neutralized and has remained neutral. This was done by agreement entered into by the nations of the free world and the Soviet Union. Laos was neutralized in a similar manner, and open warfare has been avoided there. The Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was ratified and its provisions have not been violated by the Communists.

Let us try to secure commitments from the Communists of North Vietnam and of Red China to leave their neighbors in South Vietnam alone. Let us secure ratification of the Soviet Union and other nations to this commitment. Then, after that ratification has been consummated—if it is consummated—we then may withdraw our forces and leave to the United Nations the task of maintaining peace in southeast Asia.

ATROCIOUS EXCISE TAXES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, excise taxes are, in reality, sales taxes. These obnoxious taxes burden most those who have least. They violate the sound principle of just taxation, that taxes should be levied according to ability to pay.

Most excise taxes were placed on the American people by Congress in World War II as necessary fundraising measures for the war effort. They were referred to as wartime, or temporary taxes. Experience has shown that there seems to be nothing more permanent in this world than a temporary tax.

I have long been opposed to the continuation of these wartime tax measures and have on numerous occasions urged their repeal. I did so as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in the 81st Congress when I served as Congressman at Large from Ohio. My very first speech in the Senate, early in 1959, was in opposition to the continuation of excise taxes, particularly the tax on telephone users for local and long distance telephone calls.

During the last 4 years, some progress has been made toward eliminating some of the more obnoxious of these taxes. However, most of these atrocious taxes remain to harass and burden average citizens.

I was delighted when President Johnson pledged to seek the end of the 10-percent retail tax on jewelry, furs, toilet articles, cosmetics and luggage, handbags and other leather goods, and on other consumer items. I am hopeful that this legislative recommendation will be enacted into law by the time or before imposition of these taxes expires next June 30. Not only will this relieve the tax burden on American taxpayers, but it also should act as a spur to the economy. During the last Congress, we enacted the largest income tax cut in the history of the Nation. As a result, our economy has boomed and Americans are better off economically than ever before. American business, industry, and workers on our farms and in our factories are prospering as never before, as a result of the tax cut which gave such impetus to buying on the part of the consumers of the country. Now is the time for us to undertake the next logical phase of tax reform—the removal of discriminatory and burdensome excise taxes.

Many of the goods presently taxed by these sales or excise taxes were originally classified as "luxury" items. Times change. What was yesterday's luxury is today's necessity. Ask any man if his after-shave lotion is a luxury. Ask any businessman if his luggage or briefcase is a luxury. Ask any woman if she can get along without her handbag, or lipstick, or other cosmetics. Is it realistic in this day and age to term household appliances, television sets, light bulbs, fishing poles, and inexpensive cameras luxuries? Will anyone assert that air travel on commercial planes is a luxury? I believe that no one would make that claim. When does jewelry become a luxury? If an alarm clock is not a luxury, is an inexpensive wristwatch a luxury?

The average working man and woman usually spends all of his or her earnings on the necessities of life. Since many of them are now classified as "luxury" items and taxed, these Americans pay the maximum percentage of their income in excise or sales taxes. Individuals in better circumstances pay a much lesser percentage of their income for such taxes. Inasmuch as some excise taxes are necessary for our good "Uncle" to operate efficiently, I am not opposed to sumptuary taxes on alcohol and cigarettes or on tobacco which have been imposed for many years, and which bring in sizable revenues to our Government. However, I am definitely opposed to the regressive taxes on necessities, which lay the heaviest burden on the poorest people.

Mr. President, in addition to the tax cuts recommended by the President, I fervently hope that the extremely obnoxious excise taxes of 10 percent on telephone calls and 5 percent on air travel will be repealed this year. Admittedly, telephone service is a public utility service. However, other public utilities—water, electricity, and gas—do not suffer by the imposition of such a discriminatory tax. The telephone companies are not the actual sufferers from the imposition of this tax. The burden is passed on to citizens who use telephones—and this means practically every citizen in the land. Telephone service today is certainly a household as well as a business necessity. It cannot be placed in the same category as liquor, wine, beer, cigarettes, and other products on which there is justification for an excise tax. I have not observed that drinking liquor and smoking cigars and cigarettes has been abated by reason of the additional cost caused by excise taxes on smoking and drinking assessed over the years.

There are more than 44 million telephone users in the Nation whose average excise tax last year was more than $20 a customer. When Congress imposed and increased the communications excise tax to discourage civilian use of an essential service during World War II and to raise funds for the war effort, no one contemplated the continued existence of this tax more than 20 years later. In 1963 the people of Ohio paid the Federal Government over $43 million for the privilege of using their telephones. In that same year in the entire Nation $855 million was levied on this so-called luxury. If our citizens had this money to spend as they had wished, it would be a valuable addition to our economy.

Today, 20 years after World War II, this tax is still on the statute books. Year after year the Congress continues it for 1 more year. We go through the motions of extending the tax for 1 year, apparently holding out what has become a false promise to citizens that each year will be the last year of this regressive tax. I hope that this year we shall fulfill this promise. After June 30 these regressive excise or sales taxes should no longer plague us.

The 5-percent tax on air transportation is only half as obnoxious as the telephone excise tax. However, travel by air is no longer a luxury. In most instances it is a necessity. It is just about the only means of public transportation between many of our cities and in many rural areas and in some States, such as Alaska, it is practically the only means of transportation. Twenty or twenty-five years ago air travel might have been considered a luxury in many instances, but today there are few who would question the fact that it is a necessity for millions of Americans. It is unconscionable to continue to levy the tax on this necessity.

Mr. President, I fervently hope that by the beginning of the next fiscal year—by July 1—we shall have enacted into law the recommendations of the President for the repeal of certain excise taxes and shall at the same time repeal the excise taxes on telephone users and on air travel. To collect these taxes is to reach into the pockets of the taxpayers surreptitiously. By abolishing them we shall not only be relieving millions of taxpayers of an unfair tax burden; we shall at the same time be relieving our economy of a heavy tax load and enabling it to continue to grow and expand for the welfare of all citizens. These atrocious excise taxes should be swept out of existence and be buried unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

THE PRESIDENT'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS MESSAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President's balance-of-payments message recommendations may temporarily reduce the imbalance, but they are definitely short-term measures which could hurt us materially by restricting the role of the United States as banker to the world. It would have been much better to move immediately into the effort to revise the international monetary system, utilizing our position as leader in that system—a position which is secure.

I am encouraged that the President recognized the principle of voluntary cooperation in dealing with the outflows caused by bank loans and that he is requesting exemption from the antitrust laws wherever such cooperation is essential in the national interest. This approach was embodied in my substitute for the interest equalization tax which I introduced in the Senate on July 1, 1964, which would have authorized the President to devise a voluntary program to restrict the sale of new foreign securities to U.S. persons, devised by a Committee on Capital Issues appointed from among the financial community and working under guidelines established by the Treasury Department. My proposal also provided exemption from the antitrust laws for any act which taken to put the voluntary program into effect and was found by the President to be in the national interest.

This proposal and the realistic partial exemption of Japan, with which we do such an enormous amount of trade, are the most hopeful parts of an otherwise uninspired approach to one of our greatest international economic opportunities as well as problems.

NEW HAVEN RAILROAD AND COMMUTER PROBLEMS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, nearly 5 weeks ago the Senators from the four States through which the New Haven Railroad runs met with representatives of some of the Governors and of the relevant Federal agencies to discuss the New Haven's problems. The consensus of that meeting was that while the Federal Government can be helpful in evolving a longrun overall plan for the operation of the New Haven's passenger services and the operation of other commuter services in the New York City metropolitan area, the initiative for keeping the New Haven's passenger services in operation until such a longrun plan can be effected should come from the States and local governments involved.

Although, in my judgment, the problem is not insurmountable, the States and local governments have not stepped into the breach. Assuming that efforts to reach a longrun solution proceed as quickly as they should, the need is only for a cash input sufficient to keep the New Haven above water for another 18 months to 2 years. Experts estimate that the total financial contribution required would be about $12 million, a figure which is less than 2 percent of the amount spent annually by the four States for construction and maintenance of their highways.

By the end of the 18-month to 2-year period, if an order for new commuter car equipment has been placed at an early enough date, it should be possible to begin running the passenger operation on a relatively modernized basis. I would hope, therefore, that the Governors of the four States will now sit down together, possibly joined by the trustees of the railroad, to evolve a cooperative approach to keep the passenger service running during the interim period. Such cooperation is, in fact, essential, for, in my judgment, it is unreasonable to expect any substantial new program of assistance from the Federal Government, which has already poured over $28 million of its taxpayers' money into the New Haven, while the States have done relatively little by comparison. It should not be difficult for such a meeting to be convened. I trust that the Governor of New York would take the lead in arranging it, since New York has a major involvement in the problem. Once the Governors do reach some agreement, it would certainly make sense for them to call on the Federal Government for its guidance and active help in helping them arrive at the ultimate long-range plan.

It is this effort to meet the immediate and pressing problems of the New Haven that has not been forthcoming. The only immediate aid that has been offered locally is the $400,000 each from Westchester County and Connecticut for maintenance of equipment. This might have been realistic had new equipment been ordered 2 years ago and put into operation by now, but as it is, it is wholly inadequate. The New Haven commuter and passenger service will go under shortly unless far more aid is forthcoming to help through the difficult period ahead. What is needed is both the cash aid which I have mentioned and an immediate way to get the new commuter cars which the New Haven must have if it is to be ready to be part of a long-range approach in 18 months to 2 years. The plan of Governors Rockefeller and Dempsey recognizes the latter need, but it relies to an unrealistic extent on Federal aid, given the present dimensions of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. I hope that more extensive and creative local initiative will emerge to insure that thousands of commuters can continue to get to and from work each day.

By contrast, recent developments concerning the long-range situation show that there is some creative thought going on about the future of the New Haven and the other commuter railroads in the New York City metropolitan area.

For example, Democratic State Senator Berking and Republican Assemblyman Gioffre have introduced bills to create a New York Transportation Agency which would have the task of and the funds for making a comprehensive plan to meet the longrun transportation needs of the New York City area, and would have the power to contract to keep these roads running, should that become necessary. These legislators are also sponsoring a bill for a commuter transportation authority which would have power to issue revenue bonds. This combination of bills gives some hope for a basic State solution to the problem, bringing modernized equipment and the most advanced concepts of commuter service into play to run the commuter lines on the most efficient basis possible. I might add that the Berking-Gioffre bills also provide for a realistic short-range State cash contribution as well.

A second encouraging development was Senator CASE's call for cooperation between New Jersey and New York to achieve the same goals which are sought for New York in the Berking-Gioffre local approach. The Federal Government can be helpful in this regard through the Pell bill (S. 348) which I and others are cosponsoring, or a modification thereof to include New Jersey. This bill would allow the States to enter into a compact for the purpose of interstate achievement of long-range commuter goals. Informal cooperation among States having agencies such as the one contemplated for New York by the Berking-Gioffre approach is of course possible without the formal signing of an interstate compact, but the Federal aid and recognition envisaged by the Pell bill would be extremely helpful in facilitating such cooperation.

A major virtue of all of these developments is that they recognize the problem as extending far beyond the New Haven—the New York Central, the Jersey Central, the Long Island, and the Erie-Lackawanna all have problems requiring a longrun solution.

I think that what we need now is a public dialog on the form of our longrun approach. Most people who have thought about the matter agree that some form of interstate cooperation is required, but many questions remain. Should there be one super agency to oversee all passenger and commuter service in the New England-New York-New Jersey area, or should the New York metropolitan area commuter problem be dealt with separately, leaving the long-haul New Haven passenger service and the Boston area commuter service to be dealt with as a different entity? Should the agency or agencies involved actually be in the railroad business, or should they have some arrangement with a private carrier or carriers? If the latter, should the arrangement be by way of subsidy or should the governmental entity own the lines and lease out their operation? What should be the nature of the commuter service? Are we really talking about the extension of what is known as rapid transit to what are now commuter railroads? What is the future of the highway as a part of the commuting picture?

All of these questions must be answered if we are to move ahead to develop a modern, efficient, workable system of commuter transportation. Meanwhile, however, the disintegration of the New Haven countinues to proceed. The crisis has generated some sensible thinking about the longrun commuter needs, but it has still not generated sufficient State and local interest to keep the commuter service running until a long-range plan can be effectuated.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we are all aware of the serious problems facing the United States in regard to its monetary and fiscal relations with other nations, to which the President has directed attention in his message on our international balance-of-payments problem and our gold position.

I wish to speak out today as forcefully as I am able on one of the factors which has caused our difficulty. I want to call attention to the unfair and inequitable attack on our gold reserves and on our dollar, at least verbally, in the recent news conference of the President of France and in the actions of his nation and others with reference to the debts they owe the United States.

As of June 30, 1964, the worldwide total of indebtedness to the United States by other nations stood at $16,595,088,000, exclusive of indebtedness still carried on our books from World War I. That sum, including both principal and matured interest, is even greater—$20,363,660,000.

Let us for the moment ignore this World War I figure. The items included in the more than sixteen and a half billion dollars otherwise owed us includes sums for lend-lease, surplus property, export-import loans, mutual security, and foreign aid, the Euratom program, agriculture loans, and food-for-peace debts, United Nations loans and bond purchases—a comprehensive sum.

I have no quarrel with the extending of such loans and aids in most instances. I would like to think, as would all freedom- and peace-loving Americans that they have served the purpose for which they were intended. According to the statements issued by the heads of these countries which we have helped so generously, they point with pride, even with a bit of aggrievance to their strong financial position as, for example, let us consider the French Republic, which is one of the largest debtor nations among the more than 75 countries owing us sums—according to the latest published annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury—ranging from $1 million up to the more than $4 billion chargeable to the United Kingdom.

Twice we have sent our American boys as well as our dollars to fight on French soil. American blood was spilled in the soggy trenches of no man's land nearly 50 years ago, and our boys died on the beaches and in the hedgerows of Normandy, 20 years ago. Nothing could repay us for that priceless expenditure of young lives, which were admittedly lost in a cause larger than that of France alone. But we could, and we should, at least insist that France and those other nations in the same debtor relationship to the United States, should cooperate in helping us to meet our balance-of-payments and gold-reserve problems rather than aggravating them.

In short, I would say, let them pay their debts before drawing down our gold reserves. If our dollar was good enough for them at the time it was loaned, it is still good enough with which they can pay their debt. Let me remind General de Gaulle of some of the facts.

The World War I debt of France to the United States on June 30, 1964, amounted to $6,455,700,000. But leaving out of account that huge sum, at the end of fiscal 1963 France owed us another $853 million. Yet in that same year, she was by far the heaviest recipient of gold from the U.S. Treasury, drawing $518 million.

The New York Times of January 4 said in a UPI dispatch:

> France is converting a growing share of her foreign currency reserves into gold in a drive to make the nation's finances independent of the U.S. dollar, financial sources said today * * * (as) part of President de Gaulle's plans to assert France's independence from Washington in all fields.

Mr. President, part of our problem would be solved if the nations who are indebted to us were to use the dollars they have accumulated to help settle that debt. It is true that long-term arrangements are in effect for repayments, except for the disputed World War I situation. It is true that by and large the schedule is being kept by most nations. But nevertheless, in view of all the loans and assistance we have given around the world, it is most disturbing when our debtors aggravate and increase our problems instead of alleviating them by the manner in which they treat the American dollar, which has been their economic salvation in the past and upon which their present prosperity is based. It is time to defend the dollar.

I think at least that is the belief of the people in my own State of Indiana. They have to pay their obligations and debts. It is high time that those in France who are talking as they are today should start doing likewise.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the majority leader asked me to state for the record that it is his expectation that when the Senate reassembles on Wednesday next, it will immediately get down to business. The pending business is the removal of the gold cover on deposit in the Federal Reserve Bank. Consideration of that bill will be the first order of business. A number of amendments will be offered to the bill. The majority leader expects that votes will be taken on those amendments and on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I hope that all the Members will read the committee report on H.R. 3818, pertaining to gold reserve requirements, before we take that bill up this coming Wednesday.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. If that bill is disposed of on Wednesday, as he believes it will be, he then expects to proceed with the consideration of the constitutional amendment which was offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, and which, briefly, provides for succession to the offices of President and Vice President in the event that there is an absence, and attendant problems. That constitutional amendment should come before the Senate on Thursday. It is expected that there will be votes on it.

On Friday it is the intention of the majority leader to bring up for consideration the extension of the Inter-American Development Bank. The majority leader expects votes on that measure.

Therefore, the majority leader desired to have it in the RECORD and advise all Senators of his expectations so that they might be present. He hopes that all Senators will be present, because there will be votes.

TIME FOR DECISION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the January 23, 1965, issue of the San Francisco Examiner, the splendid and moving remarks of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, on his receipt of the Sword of Loyola Award in Chicago, are reprinted in full. Mr. Hoover's contribution to America, her freedom, and her security extends over a long lifetime under seven American Presidents. He occupies a unique and respected position among all his fellow ciitzens. Scientific detection of crime, responsible techniques in the procedures of law enforcement, to which the Federal Bureau of Investigation is dedicated, is well known. Mr. Hoover has a deep concern that if our country is to deal effectively with all elements of terror and lawlessness which have infected some parts of our society, "we badly need a moral reawakening in every home in our Nation."

If every family in this land were to recognize its civic responsibilities and stand up with courage against all forms of illegality, the strength of our country would be immeasurably enhanced. I commend Mr. Hoover's thoughtful comments to Senators and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Jan. 23, 1965]

TIME FOR A DECISION: A PLEA BY FBI CHIEF

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

To every man and every nation there comes a time when decisions must be made about grave problems. Further delay in seeking solutions can bring disaster. That time has come for the United States.

The moment has arrived when we must face realistically the startling fact that since 1958 crime in this country has increased five times faster than our population growth. Serious crimes—murder, forcible rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, automobile theft—have mounted steadily since the end of World War II.

In 1951 these crimes for the first time topped the 1 million mark, and more than 2¼ million serious crimes were reported in 1963.

Even more ominous is the fact that this terrifying spiral in crime has come about through a growing wave of youthful criminality across the Nation. Last year for the 15th consecutive year crimes involving our young people increased over the previous year. For all serious crimes committed in the United States in 1963, youthful offenders were responsible for a staggering 72 percent of the total arrests for these crimes.

RETURN TO GOD

What a grim and unhappy commentary on the moral climate of this great Nation. The moral strength of our Nation has decreased alarmingly. We must return to the teachings of God if we are to cure this sickness.

These shocking statistics together with the public's apparent indifference to them are indicative of the false morality we are tolerating today. It is a false code which is based on the worship of things of man's own creation. It is as imperfect and feeble as man himself.

However captivating to the senses, this type of moral climate cannot give support nor the strength which is so vital to our national survival. This breakdown in our moral standards can only render us impotent as a people and as a nation.

Law and order are the foundations upon which successful government must stand. Without law and order, society will destroy itself.

We must never forget that government cannot favor one group or one special interest over its duty to protect the rights of all citizens. We must constantly guard government against the pressure groups which would crush the rights of others under heel in order to achieve their own ends.

LAW OF LAND

The law of the land is above any individual. All must abide by it. If we shortcut the law, we play a dangerous game which can only result in total defeat for all of us because if we destroy our system of government by law, we destroy our only means of achieving a stable society.

It is a great misfortune that the zealots or pressure groups always think with their emotions, seldom with reason. They have no compunction in carping, lying, and exaggerating with the fiercest passion. They cry "liberty" when they really mean "license."

Justice has nothing to do with expediency. It has nothing to do with temporary standards. We cannot, and will not, permit the FBI to be used to superimpose the aims of those who would sacrifice the very foundations on which our Government rests.

I take humble pride in emphatically stating that as long as I am Director of the FBI, it will continue to maintain its high and impartial standards of investigation despite the hostile opinions of its detractors. Furthermore, the FBI will continue to be objective in its investigations and will stay within the bounds of its authorized jurisdiction regardless of pressure groups which seek to use the FBI to attain their own selfish aims to the detriment of our people as a whole.

LEAST RESISTANCE

Unfortunately and too often humanity, if left to itself, moves along the line of least resistance. That is the reason we make such slow progress, and why we are prone to wait for pathfinders to blaze the way for us to follow. Each of us hopes that beyond the despair and darkness of today there is something better in store for tomorrow. It will be tragic if nothing but hope is brought to bear on the problem of crime in the United States today.

We must have men and women with ideals, with faith and hope and determination who will transmute noble purpose into accomplished action. If we are to reverse the crime picture in this country, we must make a sustained effort to stir the complacent ones to awareness.

We mollycoddle young criminals and release unreformed hoodlums to prey anew on society. The bleeding hearts, particularly among the judiciary, are so concerned for young criminals that they become indifferent to the rights of law-abiding citizens.

We must have judges with courage and a high sense of their duty to protect the public and to adequately penalize criminals if we are to stop the spread of serious and dangerous crimes against society.

REALISTIC VIEW

We must adopt a most realistic attitude toward this critical problem. We have tried the lenient approach and it has failed.

It is the fashion among many to sneer at ideals, to flout them with derisive jeers as the insubstantial dreams of the naive, and to scornfully prophesy that most men will abandon their ideals as useless encumbrances in the race for wealth and fame. The cynics are too often right, but the fault is not with the ideal—remember that. A worthwhile ideal may be difficult, but it is never impossible of attainment.

I believe in the omnipotence of the human spirit. Man has repeatedly shown that he can both make and master circumstances. It will take this type of determination on the part of the majority of our people if we are to halt increasing numbers of our young people from swelling the crime statistics columns each year. We badly need a moral reawakening in every home in our Nation.

The voices of temperance, logic and decency must speak out. Terrorism cannot be tolerated in a free society. Hate, terror and lawlessness are not the American way.

I trust you will give consideration to my remarks and not dismiss them as typical of the traditional age-old lament about the moral climate of one's native land. We are courting disaster if we do not soon take some positive action against the growing moral deterioration in this land.

GRIEVOUS TREND

It is a grievous trend which is being steadily reflected in the attitude of contempt which many of our people have for the values which made this Nation great.

Today, patriotism seems to be out of style. Those who express their love of country are often looked upon as paranoiac patriots or rightwing extremists.

Let me quote from an article which appeared in a recent issue of a student publication of one of our midwestern colleges. Entitled "Nix Patriotism," this article stated, "Patriotism is an emotion that is marked by ignorance, stupidity, prejudice, autism, fear, and hostility."

We can only pray that this undesirable trend which is evidenced among students in all too many of our colleges and universities can be reversed before it is too late.

This attitude can be seen in the widespread public indifference concerning the real threat of world communism. The philosophy of communism flourishes best in an environment where personal responsibility and self-discipline have been undermined by immorality, materialism and expediency.

Its duplicity is difficult for young Americans to comprehend. If our young citizens turn an objective, analytical searchlight on this ideology and its organizational arms, they will understand communism for what it is—a materialistic, godless dogma dedicated to world domination.

IDEALS DESTROYED

When man places himself above the law and bases his decisions on his own selfish interests, he aids the Communists' relentless efforts to destroy the ideals of our civilization. He contributes heavily to reducing life to the code of the jungle, by making it easier for communism to spread its deadly doctrines, terror and the brutalization of man. What Ignatius Loyola taught, communism seeks to destroy.

The man who has no objective values by which he judges his actions—who allows his passions to run wild, unchecked by a moral standard of what is right—that man is surely risking the loss of his immortal soul.

Faith in man cannot exist without faith in God. Faith in God takes root and grows strong only when it is expressed in service and good works.

It seems we are never converted in mass to any genuine reform in society, science, religion, morals, or government. There must be a beginning and the time is now.

AT CROSSROADS

America stands at the crossroads of destiny. It is a common destiny in which we shall all finally stand or fall together. Though we contest with utter vigor for the prevalence of whatever attitudes and policies may possess our souls, may we ever remember that we finally must be all for one and one for all against the vicissitudes of fortune—and perhaps against the world.

We are still capable of producing leaders who have the power to move, quicken and transform their environment, and to awaken an answering thrill of appreciation and support in us who read or hear of the struggles and achievements.

I sincerely hope the "Sword of Loyola" will mark the beginning of a new and enlightened era in the United States.

Man is blessed with the liberty to choose between opposing factors, between action and inaction, between good and evil, between God and the devil. Surely our immediate situation requires an endeavor by man to raise himself above ordinary standards to a higher degree of achievement.

As Americans, we should learn to trust God, to know His teachings, and to live in His ways.

This is truly a time for decision.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock a.m. on Monday, February 15.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 15, 1965, at 9 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 11, 1965:

U.S. MINT

Frank Gasparro, of Pennsylvania, to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Meyer H. Leifer, Congregation Emunath Israel, New York City, offered the following prayer:

אבינו שבשמים

Our Heavenly Father, we seek Thy blessing and guidance in these serious and soul-stirring times, when freedom-loving America which is founded upon liberty and justice for all, is being threatened by the onslaught of godless, ruthless, and unprincipled aggressors.

While we must develop superior military might, we must also be filled with Thy Holy Spirit to preserve the superiority of our democratic way of living.

Bless Thou, O Lord, our glorious land of liberty, our leaders, the President of our United States, and the Representatives. Endow them with understanding to guide America to continue to be a citadel of freedom and ray of light and hope to all those who are now living in darkness.

Hasten the day when universal peace will prevail throughout the world with freedom and justice for all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 60. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes;

S. 301. An act to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics;

S. 490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 491. An act to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; and

S. 794. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 10, Public Law 474, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. FANNIN to be a member of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration.

UNITED STATES v. RUSSELL NIXON AND OTHERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

The Chair, in his official capacity as Speaker of this House, has been served with a subpena duces tecum, issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, commanding him to appear in the said court to testify in the case of the United States of America against Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson, and Donna Allen on the 18th day of March 1965.

Under the precedents of the House, the Chair is unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. The Chair therefore submits the matter for the consideration of this body. The Clerk will read a copy of the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* RUSSELL NIXON, DAGMAR WILSON, DONNA ALLEN—CRIMINAL No. 1170-64, 1171-64, 1172-64

To Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Room H-206, Capitol:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., in the city of Washington, D.C., on the 18th day of March 1965, at 9:30 a.m., to testify in the case of *United States* v. *Nixon, Wilson, and Allen* and bring with you the documents listed in the attached schedule A.

This subpena is issued upon application of the defendants, February 9, 1965, David Rein, attorney for defendants, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.
By GERALD C. DAVIS,
Deputy Clerk.

SCHEDULE A

1. A copy of the opinion submitted to the Speaker by the Parliamentarian with respect to his authority or discretion to certify to the U.S. attorney in accordance with title 2, United States Code, section 194, the statements of fact made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to the three defendants named in the subpena.
2. A copy of the written certifications of these statements of fact made by the Speaker to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read a copy of a letter which the Chair has sent to the Attorney General in connection with this matter:

FEBRUARY 11, 1965.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
The Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I did on last evening, February 10, accept service in the case of *United States of America* v. *Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen,* from Deputy U.S. Marshal Morina. I have asked the deputy marshal to present this summons and letter to you so that you may proceed in accordance with the law.

Sincerely,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT
MARINE AND FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1965: Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland; Hon. ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina; Hon. JAMES R. GROVER, Jr., of New York.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT
MARINE AND FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1965: Hon. THOMAS N. DOWNING, of Virginia; Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York; Hon. CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

GOVERNMENTWIDE COORDINATION OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. On July 18, 1963, the House approved H.R. 5171, to provide the necessary operational machinery for governmentwide coordination of automatic data processing equipment. Approval of this measure would have made it possible for the executive to acquire and utilize this highly useful but costly equipment on the most economical, businesslike basis. Final action was not taken on this measure before the close of the 88th Congress. The proposal I introduce today is identical to H.R. 5171 except for several clarifying amendments.

Traditionally, the House has endeavored to improve the economy and efficiency of Government operations at all levels. And, we know of the President's interest. Only recently in his state of the Union address he called for a Federal Government "moderate in structure, efficient in action, and ready for any emergency." Last May, in a Cabinet meeting, the President was more specific. At that time he told the heads of our various departments:

> I want all reports made by the General Accounting Office and any congressional committee to be given prompt and thorough and careful attention. Honest mistakes can be forgiven, but it is hard to forgive failures to examine and tighten agency procedures to guard against a recurrence of an error that is uncovered by the GAO or by a congressional committee.

This legislation is the type of proposal to which the President referred in his frank discussion with his executive leaders. This proposal is strongly recommended by the Comptroller General. During the past 7 years he has submitted more than 60 audit reports to Congress fully documenting grave deficiencies in Government management of automatic data processing equipment. These support his long-standing recommendation that acquisition and utilization of ADP equipment be coordinated on a governmentwide basis.

Through approval of this legislation we will have within our grasp savings in tax funds of such magnitude as to noticeably affect the annual Federal budget in future years. In May 1963, in hearings on H.R. 5171, the Comptroller General, who for many years has followed the development of automatic data processing, predicted that Government usage of this equipment would continue to increase for an indefinite period—an increase more in a geometric rather than an arithmetic progression. In an article on automation appearing in the January 25, 1965, Newsweek, the author points out that this explosive growth is not limited to the Federal Government:

> Last year, corporations like IBM, RCA, Sperry Rand, General Electric, Honeywell, and National Cash Register sold or leased about $2 billion worth of this electronic marvel. There are now more than 20,000 general purpose computers in operation—a two-thirds increase in less than 2 years—and about 10,000 more are already on order.

In May 1963, the Comptroller General also predicted that ADP costs must soon be considered as an annual fixed charge against the Government which could not be reduced—comparable to the interest on the national debt. To appreciate the sums involved, one has only to consider that there are approximately 2,000 ADP systems in use in Government departments and agencies with annual operating costs exceeding $1 billion. Many of the larger of these systems sell for millions of dollars or lease at rates in excess of $50,000 a month for a one-shift operation. In ADP management, even the smallest mistake can be extremely wasteful.

In May 1963, testifying on H.R. 5171, the Comptroller General further suggested that adoption of a businesslike, Government-wide coordination system, as provided in this legislation, would result in savings of substantially more than $100 million a year. He added that this estimate was conservative.

This estimated savings of more than $100 million a year was based upon an authoritative study of benefits that would accrue to the Government through the purchase rather than the lease of 523 representative systems after an initial 5-year period during which the savings would amount to about $148 million. Were the Comptroller General to testify today, with the benefit of additional data developed during the last 2 years, I am sure his estimate of potential savings would be even more formidable.

First, there are far more than 523 systems involved. Last year, there were approximately 1,700 systems. This year, as I pointed out, we are talking in terms of approximately 2,000 ADP systems in use in Government.

Second, the Comptroller General's $100 million a year estimate did not reflect the substantial savings which can result from increasing the utilization of presently held equipment. Round-the-clock, three-shift usage is generally considered as an optimum and, in most instances, a reasonable goal. The latest estimates indicate that Government ADP utilization falls far short of this goal.

Third, the Comptroller General's $100 million a year estimate did not consider that vast array of ADP equipment acquired at the expense of the taxpayers and located in the plants and facilities of defense and other contractors. No reliable Government-wide inventory of this equipment has been made. The best informed officials suggest that the total of these contractor-held systems at least equals the number of systems used in house in Government. Other estimates place the total of contractor-held equipment as high as twice the number of systems used in house in Government.

Thus the savings in tax funds from this legislation are not limited to $100 million annually, but as time passes will involve ever-increasing sums many times this amount. With billions in tax funds invested in ADP and with use of this equipment expected to increase indefinitely, we must provide the Government with the most efficient and effective management that can be devised without compromising agency equipment application or use.

Turning to the substance of the problem, the Comptroller General has performed almost 100 reviews of Government ADP activities. Some 60 of these have resulted in highly critical reports to Congress. Of these, four have been comprehensive evaluations of Government-wide ADP management problems.

In the first of these comprehensive reports, issued in June 1958, he pointed out that there was no single agency of Government responsible for directing and coordinating continuing developments in automatic data processing. He emphasized that his principal recommendation was the need to establish an effective coordinated program of joint effort in the Government. Subsequent to that report, the Bureau of the Budget endeavored to improve Government ADP management, but these efforts relied upon an agency-by-agency approach.

In a second comprehensive report submitted to Congress in December 1960, the Comptroller General renewed this recommendation for Government-wide coordination in ADP management. And, some 3 years later, in March 1963, he advised Congress in a third comprehensive report that no significant progress had been made toward achieving an effective, coordinated mechanism in the Federal Government to obtain optimum utilization and economical acquisition of ADP equipment.

In April 1964, the Comptroller General, in a fourth comprehensive report, acknowledged some improvements but cautioned that only limited gains could be expected from the Government's uncoordinated approach. He again emphasized his recommendation for a Government-wide coordination system, as provided in this legislation.

The lack of a Government-wide coordinated approach has been the principal basis for the Comptroller General's continuing criticism. Most of the costly deficiencies reported to Congress during the past 7 years either stem directly from a lack of Government-wide coordination in the utilization and acquisition of equipment, or could be readily cured by this broader approach.

Low utilization of available equipment is a chronic problem throughout the Government. As previously discussed, significant savings could be achieved by a mere increase in the use of equipment the Government now has, in lieu of the acquisition of additional systems. Experience during the past 7 years demonstrates that satisfactory utilization of equipment through sharing multi-agency use, and interagency transfer cannot be obtained without active Government-wide coordination.

An obvious necessity in any effective management program is the availability of up-to-date, accurate, detailed inventory information. No such inventory is in existence today. But, under this legislation, GSA would maintain an inventory of Government ADP equipment as well as prospective requirements and other related information either necessary or desirable for management, technical, or policy making purposes. This inventory, of course, would be maintained on an adequate ADP system. The information from it would give GSA, the Bureau of the Budget, user agencies, and the Congress the basic facts essential to the development and maintenance and maintenance of an effective Government-wide ADP program. This information would also be available to ADP manufacturers on a routine basis affording them a better opportunity to compete for Government business on a cost and quality basis.

With this detailed information, GSA would have an effective means of increasing Federal utilization to an optimum level. GSA could routinely match new requirements with existing capacity through sharing—including the use of communications systems as this new technique continues to develop—multiple use and transfers. The central ADP revolving fund authorized in this legislation would afford GSA an effective means to fund the sharing and joint use of equipment. Agencies would prorate the cost on a time-use basis. Systems could also be speedily transferred from one agency to another simply by making an adjustment in the billing rates of the agencies involved.

The Government's ADP procurement system is also inadequate under the present agency-by-agency approach. Little if any real advantage is obtained, considering that the Government is the largest ADP user in the world. First, as previously emphasized, you cannot reliably determine additional equipment needs until equipment on hand is used to an optimum extent. Then, as outlined in the Comptroller General's report of March 6, 1963, authoritative evaluations must be made as to the comparative benefits to the Government on lease versus purchase. These evaluations cannot be made on an agency-by-agency basis. They must reflect the projected economic life of the equipment to the Government as a whole and not solely to the initial procuring or user agency, as has been the practice in the past.

And, having decided that additional equipment is needed and that it should be leased or purchased, the Government must then be in the best possible position to obtain the most favorable purchase or lease prices, including volume discounts. This requires development of a single purchaser concept. This in turn requires use of a capital revolving fund and the overall Government-wide coordinating authority authorized in this legislation.

Under this approach, GSA would not become a Government ADP czar. GSA would not interpose itself between the manufacturer and the user agency except in the execution of lease, purchase, or maintenance contracts. As is now the case, each user agency would determine its own ADP requirements and these requirements would be provided, assuming that the Congress has appropriated adequate funds to the agency to cover annual rental of the system to be paid into the revolving fund and assuming the Bureau of the Budget, the President, or Congress does not specifically disapprove the user agency plans.

The bill I introduce today contains an amendment expressly reserving the right of user agencies to establish their own individual requirements. The amendment also guarantees any user agency the right to appeal from any decision GSA might make which the agency considers compromises its management responsibilities or adversely affects its operations.

The bill also contains appropriate exceptions necessary for reasons of security and defense and to allow deviations from the procedure when necessary for economy or efficiency. It is not the intent of this legislation that any specialized scientific or specially designed military ADP system components be included within the confines of this coordination procedure. The ADP of concern are the general purpose systems, which I understand comprise about 90 percent of the ADP equipment in the Government's possession.

An amendment is also included delineating the technical functions of the Commerce Department's Bureau of Standards. The Bureau of Standards would offer scientific and technical advisory and consulting services to agencies generally and to the Administrator of General Services in the operational management of this Government-wide ADP coordination program. In addition, the amendment provides for the submission of recommendations to the President relating to the establishment of uniform Federal standards for ADP equipment, techniques, and computer languages. The amendment authorizes the necessary research to fulfill these responsibilities.

Any research the Bureau performed would neither duplicate nor interfere with the research of user agencies. The Bureau of Standards would supplement agency research efforts when necessary to meet Government-wide requirements for the services stated in this legislation.

The subcommittee on Government activities, of which I am chairman, will shortly announce the date of hearings on this legislation.

JOHN L. LEWIS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, long after Members of this Congress have passed into the oblivion of history, the man whose 85th birthday is being observed tomorrow will continue to be honored for his leadership in America's 20th century industrial progress. John L. Lewis' position in the labor movement has already been firmly and permanently established, but only with the passing of years will his overall contributions come to be thoroughly recognized and appreciated.

Those of us who were brought up in the coal region have been fortunate in being so close to the scenes where—through the efforts of Mr. Lewis—the miner has experienced a transformation from a hollow, neglected existence into a respected and vital place in the community. But the reputation of this outstanding humanitarian is by no means confined to mining areas. Wherever coal is mentioned, John L. Lewis comes to mind. Whenever an article on coal is published, the name is certain to appear.

As succeeding generations pass along, the dominating personality of John L. Lewis will be looked upon not only as the spark behind the renaissance of the coal miner, but also as the answer to management-labor problems that plagued the country for half a century and more.

It was in 1950 that a new era in management-labor relations came about when Mr. Lewis sat down in quiet discussion with a representative of coal operators after every other approach to agreement had been exhausted. Out of that meeting came a program universally accepted as an ideal solution to the strife and hostility that could be anticipated when one man invested in capital equipment and another was employed by him. Since that time mine owners and mine workers have walked together along the road to a better life.

In wishing you a happy birthday, Mr. Lewis, America thanks you for past accomplishments as well as for the advantages that will accrue to our country in the future through your indomitable and incomparable foresight.

HORTON BILL HELPS TAXPAYERS HURT BY UNDERWITHHOLDING

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill earlier this week to benefit taxpayers facing higher tax bills. The legislation covers those who, despite the overall tax cut, will owe additional taxes as the result of withholding rate reduction exceeding the reduced tax rate.

The problem faces millions of Americans as the result of the tax reduction legislation enacted by Congress last year. The new withholding rate of 14 percent was made effective for almost all of 1964 while the tax lowering was made effective in two steps with only the first portion applying to 1964 income.

Many of my constituents are registering strong complaints with me because of the financial pinch they face at no fault of their own.

To ease the strain on those taxpayers who went ahead and spent the extra money made available by the withholding drop—as they were urged to do in behalf of the national economy—I have introduced a bill to let them spread their extra payments over the next year.

Under my proposal, a taxpayer could defer paying only the part of his income taxes that are additional because of the reduced withholding rate. Full payment would be required by April 15, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the intense interest of my constituents in his tax inequity prompted me to discuss the issue in my weekly television news commentary which is broadcast exclusively by WROC-TV—channel 8—in Rochester, N.Y. For its additional expression of my feelings on this matter, I include the text of this commentary with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The opening reference is to Tom Decker, the station's news director and the gentleman whose newscasts carry my commentaries.

The text follows:

> Thanks, Tom.
>
> April 15 will soon be here and that means income tax time. This year, many taxpayers are going to get a shock when they discover that their withholding is not enough to cover the tax they owe.
>
> This comes about because of the withholding reductions that were put into effect a year ago when the income tax cut was passed by Congress. Before the cut, withholding was 18 percent. The tax bill dropped it to 14 percent.
>
> This would have been all right, except the tax cut only became partially effective in 1964. Thus, wages were underwithheld, and millions of people now face unexpected tax bills.
>
> To help out, I introduced a bill this week to let taxpayers spread their extra payments over the next year. I am working hard to get the bill considered and I hope the administration can be persuaded to approve it so that we can relieve the financial bind so many taxpayers are facing at no fault of their own.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I note in the RECORD where one of the subcommittees of the House Committee on the Judiciary has reported favorably to the full committee a bill, H.R. 970, to require the establishment on the basis of the 19th and subsequent decennial censuses of congressional districts. It goes on to set forth how those districts shall be established.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that some persons may be misled by thinking that the Judiciary Committee is taking some action on what I believe is the most important issue before this Congress and the Nation today, and one which requires immediate attention. H.R. 970 does little, if anything, to counteract or offset the devastating danger which faces most of the 50 States because of the "one-man, one-vote" decision of the Supreme Court.

While the Judiciary Committee's chairman has elected to consider legislation which would not take effect for some 6 to 8 years from now, rather than to consider some of the numerous bills which have been introduced, and which are designed to meet the emergency created by the irreconcilable decision of the Supreme Court which is causing most of our State legislatures to consider reapportionment of not only congressional districts but also the senatorial and legislative districts within their States, it seems to me that this Congress should take immediate action to counteract the Supreme Court's position. The subcommittee did amend the bill to provide for its effectiveness in the 90th Congress.

I am referring to proposed legislation, such as House Joint Resolution 64, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable RICHARD ICHORD, a former speaker of the Missouri House of Representatives. His resolution is one of several measures introduced by other Members of this House which would provide for a constitutional amendment, the wording of which has been approved by the Council of State Governments, and which I understand is receiving favorable consideration in many State legislatures, where the leadership recognizes the imperativeness of taking some action now, and without delay.

The proposed amendment to the Constitution is quite simple, and actually spells out what I believe most persons thought was provided in the Constitution, when it states:

> Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

This merely means that we would apply tne same criteria to the selection of members of one house of the State legislature that is now applied to the Senate of the United States. What most of us fear, and I think with justification as long as we have a Supreme Court composed of individuals who would usurp the powers of the legislative branch of our Government, is that if the recent decision of the Supreme Court is permitted to stand, it will be only a matter of time until the Supreme Court will declare unconstitutional the present representative composition of the U.S. Senate. Certainly the Supreme Court cannot accept as consistent a position which establishes one criteria for representation in State legislatures, and permits such a wide disparity of representation by U.S. Senators. From the smug position which some Members of the other body have taken, it would seem they do not realize they will be the next target, when they will be "sitting ducks."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Supreme Court was entirely wrong, and that the Members of the other body who seem to be in concurrence with the Supreme Court decision will wake up someday to find they are going to be the targets of that decision, unless at this session of this Congress we take some action to correct the grievous action of the Supreme Court.

ARM-TWISTING PROBE BROADENS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carried an article by the syndicated columnists Evans and Novak commenting rather extensively on the fundraising activities of the treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. Reference is made in the article to an investigation by the FBI into the illegal solicitation of campaign funds in the Rural Electrification Administration. I was advised by letter from the Justice Department last week that the FBI had been called into the case, and I must say that I am pleased that this investigating agency is going into this sordid matter.

A complete and thorough investigation such as we would expect from the FBI will, I hope, restore the status of our Federal civil service to the nonpartisan status which is supposedly guaranteed to it by the Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act.

I include at this point in my remarks the letter which I received from the Justice Department and the Evans and Novak article from the Washington Post:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1965.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSEN: This will reply to your letter of January 12, 1965, with which you enclosed a copy of a letter to you from the Assistant General Counsel of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, referring to an investigation of alleged violations of the Hatch

Act in the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

We have requested the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate the facts in this matter following which a determination will be made whether any violations of Federal criminal statutes relating to the solicitation of political contributions by Federal employees have occurred which would warrant prosecution. You are undoubtedly aware that in addition to possible criminal violations there are also involved possible administrative penalties, the imposition of which is within the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission and the employing agency.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Acting Attorney General.

The Mysterious Mr. Maguire

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The shadowy and shrouded world of Richard Maguire, gray eminence of the Democratic Party, is being opened up a bit by nosy outsiders.

As treasurer of the Democratic National Committee, Maguire is scarcely known even by name, to rank-and-file Democrats. Yet, as one of the most ingenious and insistent fundraisers in American political history, Dick Maguire is a law unto himself at Democratic national headquarters. He is easily the most powerful man in the national party structure.

Consequently, it is of particular interest that Maguire's fundraising exploits have attracted the attention of Washington's most aggressive seeker after sin. Maguire may not know it, but his office is now the subject of private investigation by Senator John Williams, the Delaware chicken farmer with an unequaled collection of political scalps.

Maguire does not relish attention from Williams or anybody else. Alone among national political figures, he refuses to talk to the press. The records of his office are barred from the public. Even duly elected members of the Democratic National Committee hesitate to pry into Maguire's fundraising activities.

However, the veil of secrecy is being nudged aside. The FBI is investigating charges that civil servants in the Rural Electrification Administration were illegally solicited to purchase tickets to last year's Democratic fundraising gala.

If this generates a grand jury investigation, the charges might extend far beyond the REA. Civil servants throughout the Government would love to tell all about being pressured by their Democratic superiors under the Maguire regime.

More significant is the area in which Senator Williams privately concerns himself: Maguire's sale of advertising space in the $10 a copy program of the 1964 Democratic National Convention.

Sale of program ads (usually by the host committee) to defray national convention costs is nothing new. But Maguire added a new twist. The Democratic National Committee took over ad sales, charging $15,000 a page—triple the previous charge.

Who paid that price for ads in a limited-circulation publication?

Maguire fired off heavyhanded solicitations to a wide spectrum of businessmen, heavily studded with Government contractors.

The result was phenomenal: A $15 million take, according to the Democratic National Committee.

But Federal law bars corporations from making contributions to political parties. Purchase of the ads would be legal only if the money were used (as the Democrats claimed) solely to defray convention costs. If any of the money were used to finance the 1964 campaign, officials at the Democratic National Committee would be criminally liable.

National committee spokesmen assert that not 1 cent of the $1.5 million helped finance the campaign. But they supply no detailed audit. Nor is such an audit available for public inspection. And, as ever, Maguire is silent.

There is still another aspect to this. Although political contributions cannot be claimed as tax deductions, advertising costs are deductible as a legitimate business expense. Hence, as permitted by existing law, the $15,000 a page advertising costs—a thinly disguised gift to the Democratic Party—can be deducted from taxable income.

This amounts to Uncle Sam's subsidizing the Democratic Party in a way Congress never intended. If permitted, it is a practice likely to grow within both parties. For this reason, Senator Williams is asking the Internal Revenue Service just how much the program ads will cost the Government in lost taxes.

Nor does this begin to exhaust the questions that could be asked of Maguire.

What about the President's Club, a Maguire innovation whereby fat cats can pay $1,000 a year and rub elbows with the great—even the President—at exclusive cocktail parties? How many members belong? Who are they? Why aren't all their names reported to the Federal Government as campaign givers?

To the cynic it might seem unlikely that a Democratic-controlled administration and Congress would press Maguire and Company for answers to these questions. But John Williams' plodding inquisitiveness sometimes has a way of making strange things happen.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is most reassuring to note that the present administration has subscribed to suggestions that I and others on this side of the aisle have long proferred. I am referring to the now-popular idea of reducing or eliminating certain unneeded and unwarranted excise taxes. I have incorporated these suggestions in the form of bills on a number of occasions during prior Congresses.

Today I am again submitting a bill for the elimination or reduction of certain excise taxes, and it is my hope that it will be given serious consideration by this Congress.

It calls for the elimination of the list of retail excises such as jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage, handbags and wallets, and also calls for the elimination of excises on telephone service and the reduction and eventual elimination of excises on passenger cars and parts.

HIGHWAY FUND TO BENEFIT

One aspect of my bill represents a distinct departure from other suggestions we have heard of late. The excise taxes on automobiles would be immediately reduced from 10 to 5 percent, and the tax on automotive parts and accessories would be reduced from 8 to 4 percent. The remaining amounts collected from the sale of passenger cars and parts, amounting to over a billion dollars a year, would be earmarked to the highway trust fund. Costs of the Interstate Highway program are running higher than expected, and my bill would keep that fund solvent, in addition to offering immediate relief to the Nation's drivers. Then, when the Interstate System is completed in 1972, the remaining half of the present car and parts tax would be removed. I consider this important, since the car cannot be considered a luxury item and must not be treated as such by our antiquated tax system.

This bill also would eliminate the levy placed against the Nation's communications systems, which is passed on to the consumer. The average household would save an annual amount in excess of 1 month's telephone bill, and the saving to the companies in line, long-distance, and other services, would mean additional savings to the public and greater expansion opportunities for the companies. Like the automobile, a telephone is a necessity in the 20th century, and wartime taxes that were intended to temporarily curtail the use of communications services should be eliminated.

The retail section of this bill calls for the elimination of excise taxes on such commodities as toilet preparations, luggage, handbags, wallets, jewelry, and furs. Not only will the elimination of these excises put more usable money into the mainstream of the national economy, but it will finally relieve the merchants of America of the cumbersome chore of acting as tax collectors for the Federal Government.

It is hoped that early and favorable consideration will be made of this proposal.

THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the war in South Vietnam rages on. Information filtering through to the public indicates a rapidly deteriorating situation. I say filtering through because there is, and has been, a cloak of secrecy thrown around American military and political operations in that area.

The President has ordered military strikes against the staging areas in North Vietnam in reprisal for attacks against our positions in the south. These air strikes have brought on Communist reprisals and it appears that many more Americans were killed in a raid today. Senator Goldwater recommended retaliation against Communist sanctuaries in North Vietnam and for this he was labeled "trigger happy," a "warmonger," "irresponsible," and "a man dedicated to starting a nuclear war." No such leftwing charges have been leveled against

President Johnson, and I think the country in general does and will support the President in any military measure aimed at victory.

The present situation in Vietnam could well escalate into a major and even a nuclear war, if the Chinese Communists pour troops into Vietnam as they did in Korea, and if they are given possession of nuclear warheads by Russia. There is as much reason to believe that Russia will supply nuclear warheads to the Vietcong as there was to supply such warheads to Communist Castro.

The present situation could have been avoided by a responsible administration and a responsible Secretary of Defense. We backed into it through a series of blunders which should not have been made even by a cadet at West Point. I submit some persuasive data:

During the Eisenhower years, from 1954 to 1960 inclusive, this country had no more than 785 military advisers in South Vietnam, and, slowly but surely, with the help and cooperation of President Diem, we were winning the war. In 1961, immediately following the Bay of Pigs fiasco, the war began to escalate and we had 2,000 military men in Vietnam in 1961, 11,000 in 1962, 15,500 in 1963, 18,000 in 1964, and 23,000 by the beginning of 1965.

During the Eisenhower period, not one American boy was killed in Vietnam, but, following the Bay of Pigs, the slaughter began. That dark day in American history was a great turning point for Communist advances. In the eyes of the Asians, we immediately became a paper tiger. To the rest of the world, we said, in fact, that we would not fight Communists 90 miles off our shore. Not only would we not fight them, but the administration agreed to protect Communist Castro from invasion by any country in the Western Hemisphere, and your Navy has been patrolling the water in the Caribbean to prevent any strike or sabotage against Castro.

The erection of the Berlin wall commenced shortly after the Bay of Pigs. We completely failed to capitalize on the Russian-Red Chinese breach, and now the war in South Vietnam has driven them together again. Our State Department mistook the tactical flexibility of the Communist conspiracy for a mellowing of Russian intent to subvert the world, when in truth they have never veered from the goal of total conquest.

In Washington, as well as in many capitals of the world, there is talk of a negotiated peace. This is the pattern we followed in China when Chiang Kai-shek had to leave the mainland and 600 million Chinese fell prey to communism. This is the pattern we followed in Korea, and there has not been a moment of peace since that negotiation. This is the pattern we followed in Laos, and it fell to communism. Under the pattern set by the State Department, so, also, will all of southeast Asia fall to the Communists.

Failure to have total victory, at any cost, will surrender all of southeast Asia to the Communists and close the Indian Ocean to the British Fleet, leaving Australia as a sitting duck for Communist conquest. So, also, will Malaysia fall, and the next step will be the Philippines, and we will have to withdraw our defenses to Hawaii, or even to our own west coast.

HUDSON HIGHLANDS NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been assured by the administration that the President, in encouraging efforts by State and local governments to take action similar to that he proposed for the Potomac River in his national beauty message, was in no way negating the possibility of cooperative Federal action.

Thus, the administration was not in any way ruling out its support for my bill, H.R. 3012, to create a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway, which in fact is presently under study by it.

On the contrary, I have received encouragement from every quarter for this legislation. I have every reason to believe that the Department of the Interior will report favorably on it and that hearings will be held on it at this session. Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY will introduce it in the Senate.

I am extremely gratified and encouraged that the President singled out the Hudson River for specific mention of needed attention in his message. I would be the first to agree that State and local governments must take the primary burden of action to protect their natural resources, rivers, and riverways.

The long neglect of rivers and riverways by the State and local governments, however, has resulted in the despoliation of these resources which abound today. Our potentially most beautiful rivers, like the Hudson, are open sewers, their banks littered with garbage and debris. In my opinion, some sort of Federal stimulant is required to induce State and local governments to take effective action. This is particularly appropriate with respect to our great interstate rivers like the Hudson.

I have every reason to believe that my Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway bill will be successful.

I am pleased, too, with the administration's position on the Consolidated Edison proposed powerplant in Cornwall and with its emphasis on placing future powerlines underground.

LIFE TENURE FOR THE JUDGE OF THE U.S. COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago the Congress brought into being the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Our purpose in doing so was to reestablish the American public's confidence in the system of military justice and to guarantee to our servicemen, caught up in the law's toils, as fair a trial as could be had in any court of the United States. Two years ago the Committee on Armed Services reviewed the history of operations under that code, and the contribution to those operations made by the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, the supreme court of the military services. In its report, the committee declared:

> Through its opinions, the system of military justice contemplated by the Congress in the uniform code is perfected and explained by the court. Its insistence upon high professional performance by all legal personnel involved in trials by courts-martial, and upon strict compliance with the provisions of the uniform code, has resulted in the elimination of many of the justified grounds for the complaints lodged against the earlier procedures. These results have not only restored to a large extent public confidence in the court-martial system, but have won the support of the Military Establishment as well.

Many of the Members will recall that when we first considered the establishment of this court we provided that the judges would serve during good behavior. The other body, however, modified this by setting a fixed term of years as the judges' tenure, for the evident purpose of providing a period of probation during which we could determine in the crucible of experience the efficacy of our work. Satisfied that the uniform code, under the administration of dedicated, mature and judicious minds, could accomplish our purpose without sacrificing any of our essential needs, we agreed to provide a testing or probationary period.

But, Mr. Speaker, that period of probation is at an end. Two years ago, by a 4 to 1 majority, this House restored the original provision for tenure during good behavior, because we found that both the code and the court has passed every test to which reasonable men can subject them.

The pressures of other business, however, prevented consideration of the measure by the other body before the 88th Congress passed into history.

I am now submitting that proposal again. In so doing, I am fully aware of the reasons advanced by the Committee on Armed Services and relied on by this House as justification for the restoration of life tenure. With each of these indisputably valid reasons, I am in full accord. But I believe the time has come to express the most fundamental, yet simple, reasons of all:

The Court of Military Appeals is a legislative tribunal. It is established for the exclusive purpose of overseeing trials by court-martial under standards fixed by the Congress. During its existence of approximately 14 years, it has established an enviable record among the courts of this land, in the eyes of the members of the bar generally, and in the minds of servicemen and women as well. Indeed, it has won the accolades of the Military Establishment. Nothing about this court, as a judicial tribunal, is third-rate. It is, in every sense, a first-rate court, and its judges should be treated no differently than judges of the other courts of the United States.

To this end, Mr. Chairman, I am again submitting an amendment to the uniform code designed to restore our original provision for life tenure for these judges, and trust we will speedily enact it into law.

MAILING OF DIVIDEND STATEMENTS FOR BENEFIT OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last month many thousands of institutions spent millions of dollars helping the Internal Revenue Service collect taxes on the dividends they paid out to their depositors and account holders. I am referring to the information return required by the Revenue Act of 1962. Under this act, each payor of dividends or interest of $10 or more is required to mail to each of the persons receiving this amount of money a notice of the amount paid. This is the second year in which this expense requirement has been incurred by small businesses, banks, savings institutions, and other corporations. A substantial part of this expense is the postage required to send the information to millions of individuals.

In a time of the so-called profit squeeze, when the expenses of doing business are rising for nearly every type of business institution, this added burden has been costly. It has to be paid by them; not to develop their business in any way, not to help them make money for their savers or investors, but to help the Government collect income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides that the mailing costs of these millions of information returns to receivers of dividends and interest be paid by the U.S. Treasury which in turn would reimburse the Post Office Department for the postage costs.

I feel that the Congress would be doing the fair and equitable thing to relieve the private financial institutions of this country from a part of the cost of this tax-collecting job. Even with this partial relief, there is still considerable expense involved, since the time of their employees, the stationery costs, and like factors of in-the-office expense would still have to be paid by them. Let us have the job paid for—at least in part—by the Government department which benefits from the service.

The first results of the workings of this law, the spotting by tax collectors of dividends and interest payments not hitherto reported, are reportedly good. The Treasury is the sole beneficiary of this work of the financial institutions in helping it collect taxes; the system is apparently past the experimental stage and that means it will stay in force. I am convinced that payment by the Treasury for this tax-collecting job, at least in part, is appropriate. It should be provided by Congress before another year rolls around and additional millions of dollars for postage are expended by these institutions in order to comply with the law.

I would like to point out that this is an expense which will not decrease in any foreseeable period. We are in a growing economy. We are trying to keep it growing. Every account added to a savings institution, every new stockholder a corporation acquires will add to the postage burden so that every person is reminded of the dividends or interest of $10 or more he has received, and to tell the U.S. Treasury that he has received it. I propose that we relieve this unfair burden now by enacting legislation to permit postage-free mail by payor institutions in the mailing of form 1099's, the information returns required by our revenue laws for the benefit of the Internal Revenue Service in its collection job.

THE BIRTHDAY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln's Birthday has been an important day to Americans for many years. But, in 1965, it is a particularly significant occasion.

We are now 100 years removed from the death of this great President who died because of his dedication to the American ideals of human freedom and dignity. And we are just 1 year removed from the similarly tragic and violent killing of another great President who worked so hard to translate these same ideals into reality.

Both men fought the evils of bigotry and inequality. Both men won great victories in the continuing battle to make all Americans equal before the law. And both men left a great legacy of unfinished tasks to future generations of Americans.

As we celebrate the anniversary of Lincoln's birth, we must renew our determination to make the American dream, of which Lincoln has become one of the finest symbols, a reality for all. One of the most important actions we could take in this connection would be to eliminate the unjust and discriminatory sections of our immigration laws.

Last year Congress took long needed action to insure that no American will be treated as a second-class citizen because of race. Let us this year take similar action to insure that no group of Americans will feel like second-class citizens because of national origin.

Legislation to accomplish this goal has been asked by President Johnson and is now pending before this body. There could be no finer tribute to the heritage of Lincoln than swift passage of a new immigration law.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART VI

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues part VI of the New York Herald Tribune series on "New York City in Crisis." This installment deals with the huge loss of middle-class families in New York City due to the poor housing situation and appeared in the Herald Tribune on January 27, 1965.

The article follows:

CITY EXODUS TO SUBURBS

(By Barry Gottehrer and Marshall Peck)

The only piece of furniture in the living room of Paul and Sondra Levine's split-level home in Merrick, Long Island, is a $1,000 grand piano. The piano is a gift from Sondra's parents. Since buying the $25,000 home in April of 1963, the Levines have been forced to move extremely slowly.

Yet, after nearly 2 years of partially furnished rooms and severe financial problems, the Levines have no thoughts of returning to New York City. Like thousands and thousands of other New Yorkers, the Levines have learned that the city no longer has any place for a middle-income family.

"We're city people, we always have been," says Paul Levine. "Three years ago when we decided to move because we needed more room, we had no idea of moving out of the city. But we gave up the fight. The way it adds up, the city alienates people in our circumstances. It's getting harder and harder for people such as ourselves, middle-income with children, to stay in the city."

Paul Levine is a promising young accountant, and he and his wife, both college graduates, have three children. They are precisely the kind of family a healthy city needs to attract and to keep. Yet, after 9 months of searching for a suitable apartment in Manhattan, Queens, Brooklyn and the Bronx, the Levines gave up—and joined the ranks of the 800,000 middle-class whites who have deserted the city for the suburbs since 1950.

They are all victims of the city's indifference, the high cost of adequate housing and the low state of public education. And their defection to the suburbs—into financial problems and the commuter mess which directly affected their future and the future of the city—is a bold example of New York's failure.

"We must do something to keep our young middle class, says Mayor Robert F. Wagner. It is obvious * * * that a great many young families would stay in the city if apartments were larger and less expensive, if schools were better, if the streets and parks were safer, and if the public transportation were less painful. Yet just where the city starts to solve its multiple housing, education, safety and transportation problems staggers the imagination of the mayor and anyone else who would like to replace him.

A PIMPLE ON CITY'S FACE

According to one city official, the loss of the middle class is only a pimple on the face of the city, a serious one yet no more than a pimple. Before the city can hope to eliminate the pimple, it must first locate, then treat, and finally wipe out the infection that is causing it.

"We must get to the basic sickness," says Julius C. C. Edelstein, the mayor's chief aid. "That is exactly what we are trying to do right now in New York. There are no easy solutions when the problems are this great."

Yet while the city struggles in search of the big answers, as Mr. Edelstein believes, or merely sleeps, as a great many others believe, more and more young middle class New York whites are leaving or giving serious thought to leaving. At one recent Christmas party of 36 middle-class New Yorkers, 18 already had left the city, 12 were thinking about it, and only 6 seemed content in Manhattan, and 2 of these are bachelors.

Depending on the family, it is the problems of housing or education that generally force the decision to desert. In the case of Paul and Sondra Levine, it happened to be a combination of the two.

Paul Levine, a 31-year-old graduate of Brooklyn College, earns slightly more than $10,000 a year as a certified public accountant with Siminoff, Peyser, and Citrin, a mid-Manhattan accounting firm.

Married in June 1958, he and his wife first moved into a 3½-room, $110-a-month apartment in Jackson Heights. When their second child was born 3 years later, they decided to move into a larger apartment in the same building, paying $135 a month for two bedrooms. But, even with two bedrooms, the walls, as they are in most new buildings, were paper-thin and the rooms were tiny—and it wasn't long before they decided to look for a still larger apartment.

"Besides there just wasn't any place for the children to play," says Sondra Levine, a graduate of NYU and a former public school teacher. "They had to be taken down by elevator and there really was no place to take them. No park nearby."

Commuting was also a problem. Driving was immediately eliminated as a means of Paul's getting to work. In the first place, Sondra needed the car to shop. In the second, traffic on the Long Island highways is unbearable and parking in New York is too expensive (from $1.50 to $3) on a regular basis.

THE NIGHTMARE AT RUSH HOUR

Though the ride on the IRT Flushing line took only 25 minutes, passengers were backed up in the hundreds waiting to push their way into the station each morning and then jammed like sardines for the trip to work. For anyone forced to travel during rush hours—and Paul Levine was—transportation was a nightmare.

"It's pretty damned bad when you arrive at a subway station in the morning and can't even get in," says Paul. "They've been building big apartments in Queens, but the city hasn't alleviated the transportation system there. This is a typical lack of city planning."

When the Levines started looking for a larger apartment, they went about it systematically. They felt they could afford to pay $200 a month rent and, with two children already and a third on the way, they felt they needed a minimum of three bedrooms. What they found during their 9 months of searching was depressing.

In Manhattan, the new apartments were out of the question—with most one-bedrooms starting at $170—and the older, larger and more reasonably priced apartments, particularly those on the upper West Side, are nearly impossible to find. And parking, they soon discovered, starts at $15 a month and goes considerably higher.

Several times they bought Sunday newspapers on Saturday night to get a head start, only to find a long waiting list of people at the advertised apartments by the time they got there early Sunday morning.

Though they did not want to live in some projects and, because of their income, did not qualify to live in some others, they learned that it is nearly impossible to get into the better ones. At Stuyvesant Town, attractive three-bedroom apartments rent from $169 to $186 a month. Yet, when vacancies do occur (and this is seldom), the three-bedroom apartments are immediately rented to other Stuyvesant Town residents who are seeking larger quarters. As it is, there is presently a waiting list of more than 400 families for one- and two-bedroom apartments in this project.

At Parkchester, a development in the Bronx, where the rents and the apartments are both smaller, the waiting list is even larger and longer.

In Queens and Brooklyn, rents for what the Levines wanted started at $230 a month. And in many places, they discovered that landlords advertised three-bedroom apartments without mentioning that the third bedroom was the size of a large closet.

The closest the Levines came to settling in New York came when they left a $50 deposit on a convertible three-bedroom cooperative (the dining room could be turned into the third bedroom). The buying price was $3,500, more than they had anticipated spending, but the rent, $190 a month, was within their budget.

It looked like a good buy until Paul Levine, an accountant, who is more exact about his finances than most people, studied it further.

In the first place, he discovered parking facilities were extremely limited.

In the second, he learned the same builders were putting up a noncooperative apartment house right across the street from the two co-ops.

"I found they were offering concessions to get people into the other place—sign a lease and get 3 months' free occupancy," says Paul Levine. "It appeared to me that it might become a buyer's market and then what would happen to my equity in the co-op? If a buyer's market developed for rents in the neighborhood, the value of my apartment would drop and eventually the area would become less desirable. Where would my equity be?"

Housing was clearly the primary reason for the Levines' decision to leave the city, but education was a close second. Sondra Levine had taught at PS 170 in Harlem several years before and it gave her an impression of the public school system that she will never forget.

"The first day of school I was told that all I was expected to do my first year was keep my children quiet—not teach them," she says. "I was told that was all I had to worry about, keeping the classes in order, nothing else. Really, all we were expected to do was to get the children to walk through the halls more or less quietly. If we could do that, we had succeeded. I kept my pupils quiet."

Though both Levines feel that Queens schools are superior to those elsewhere in the city, they are both opposed to busing. If they hadn't moved to Merrick, their daughter, Karen, would be starting in the Queens public school system this fall, with the possibility of attending a paired school. In Merrick, Karen will be bused to school but, her father adds, "to the nearest neighborhood school."

"This busing is not right," says Paul Levine. "I am for integrated education because of the greater interests that a variety of backgrounds brings to all children. But I'm against busing children from one place to another. There's something repugnant about it. Why should parents who have worked hard to move into a neighborhood, to assure their children of good schools nearby, have to see their children carted off to a school farther away? It's not right for the parents and it's certainly not right for the children. I think education in New York is going downhill."

Because of their limited income, the Levines did not give serious thought to private schools. Lewis Zacks, a successful, 33-year-old commercial artist who earns approximately $15,000 a year, has. The Zacks and their two young sons live in one of the large, old and usually unavailable apartments on the upper West Side of Manhattan. Theirs became available 3 years ago. "It's simple," says Lew Zacks. "My wife just told every doorman and super within 30 blocks that we were interested in a 3-bedroom apartment and would take care of them."

HOW TO GET AN APARTMENT

Within a month, the Zacks received a phone call, the super at 55 West End Avenue. (he is no longer there) received a $100 check for cash and the couple moved into a 5½-room, $210-a-month apartment.

That was 3 years ago. Today, the Zacks' elder son, Daniel, who will be 6 next week, is ready to enter school next fall. For the past 3 years, he has been attending a nursery school. For the past 2 years, he and his mother, Irene, an attractive 29-year-old who works 5 mornings a week for a talent manager, have been making the rounds of Manhattan's private schools.

Private schools have become a big business in New York during the last decade. As public schools have fallen in the middle-class favor (the elementary schools in the Bronx and Manhattan are now more than 60-percent Negro and Puerto Rican), the city's private schools have grown in number, exclusiveness and price. Horace Mann, one of the city's better private schools, delights in telling its elder graduates that, with few exceptions, they would have extreme difficulty in gaining entrance today.

There are more than 60 accredited private schools in Manhattan (most in the $1,200-a-year price range) and, after eliminating those with social and religious restrictions, the Zacks applied to six schools.

Though they haven't heard from any of the schools yet, the Zacks have just about given up hope. At the Trinity School, Daniel, a bright youngster, was given a 20-minute intelligence test and a 15-minute personal interview to try and draw him out.

"What do you like to do?" the interviewer asked.

"Swim," answered Daniel.

"How far can you swim?" he asked.

"I don't know," answered the youngster.

"We have a pool downstairs," said the interviewer. "How far do you think you could swim in it?"

"How big is the pool?" answered Daniel. That brought the interview to an end.

Though the Zackses have not yet experienced it, they have been told by friends that several private schools now go so far as to mail out announcements of their building funds before reaching a decision on an applicant. "It may surprise you at first," says one father, "but after you've been through it with one kid, you know that they can afford to be selective. Maybe you don't have to buy your way in, but let's say a contribution doesn't hurt."

If Daniel Zacks is not accepted into a top private school, his parents have decided to send him to P.S. 9, a brandnew school that will open this fall. It is a 10-minute walk from the Zacks' apartment, but, because of the neighborhood's side streets (which have grown increasingly dangerous in the past 5 years) and the traffic (he will have to cross Broadway to get to and from school), someone will have to take him to school and pick him up each day.

"We've given this considerable thought and we've decided that we do not want to leave Manhattan," says Irene Zacks. "My husband likes living close to work and we like being near the park, the museums, the stores, and our friends. We're going to stay and try to fight it. But if the schools are as bad as some people say, we don't have much choice. You begin to wonder if the city is even willing to meet you halfway. We're going to try—that's all. But it's not easy being optimistic."

SUBURBIA HAS DRAWBACKS, TOO

What the Levines have already learned and the Zackses fear about suburbia is that there is no truly idyllic existence for the young middle class. What they're getting into isn't always that much better than what they're fleeing. The schools may be better in suburbia, but the transportation is an extreme and worsening problem and the cost of owning a home tends to overwhelm the young middle-class family, stripping them of their privacy and their savings.

For Paul Levine, the move to suburbia has meant far more than a partially furnished living room and extremely limited spending power. He is now a commuter, who must drive a few miles to the Freeport station each morning (her parents bought them a compact car which Sondra Levine uses as a second car) and then ride a minimum of 40 minutes by train into the city.

In the year and a half he has lived in Merrick, the monthly fare on the Long Island Railroad has already jumped from $34.85 a month to $37.55 and, according to current estimates, will probably climb considerably higher.

Compared to the jammed highways, the Long Island is a rare treat for Paul—a seat each way and a bridge game most mornings. Yet he also has found it less dependable—so much so that he has made a practice of leaving a half-hour early each morning to insure arriving at his appointments on time.

But to Paul and the 200,000 others, depending on the Long Island, the New York Central, or the New Haven to get them to their offices each weekday, the irregularities of the service are only an inconvenience.

What troubles them—and threatens their entire investment in suburbia—is the shaky and uncertain future of all the commuter lines. Should the lines fold or be forced to seriously curtail their commuter service, 200,000 New Yorkers would suddenly find themselves without means of transportation to and from work.

They obviously can't drive because the roads are already overflowing with cars. How else are they going to get to work?

Yet, compared to the problems that concern the middle-class family determined to remain in the city, the problems of suburbia seem far less overpowering. The commuter problem is indeed critical but most people feel it can be solved by increased Federal funds and new controls. The problems of the city are not that easily resolved.

"You've either got to have a lot of money and not care about anything but the pollution and the dirty streets and the architecture or have no money and become wards of the city," says one young lawyer. "Otherwise the city doesn't give a damn about you."

Though the mayor and the city administration repeatedly announce that they do give a damn about New York's young middle class, their record clearly indicates that they obviously don't care enough. It may be only a pimple but, if the middle class keeps deserting the city, Manhattan will be left with only the very rich and the indigent and unskilled nonwhites. It is a vicious cycle, but a start—to keep the young middle class from moving elsewhere—must be made somewhere.

THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF VIRGINIA UNION UNIVERSITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to extend my congratulations to Virginia Union University on the occasion of its 100th birthday. Virginia Union is an accredited liberal arts college and graduate school of religion in my congressional district at Richmond, Va. Tomorrow, in activities throughout the day, this fine institution will mark a century of educational work with a progressive look toward the future.

Following a founders' day convocation address by Dr. Horace Mann Bond, who is dean of the School of Education of Atlanta University, Virginia Union President Dr. Thomas Howard Henderson will discuss with alumni and friends at a founders' day luncheon the university's challenging and imaginative development program.

Dr. W. H. Johnson, a Philadelphia physician who is president of the Virginia Union Alumni Association, and Dr. John L. S. Holloman, Jr., a New York physician who is president of the school's board of trustees, are leading the drive for funds to carry out Union's first major expansion in 65 years.

Virginia Union was founded in 1865 by the American Baptist Home Mission Society under the names of Richmond Theological Institute for Freedmen and Wayland Seminary. These schools united in 1899. In 1932 Hartshorn Memorial College was made a part of the university and in 1964 Storer College of Harpers Ferry, W. Va., was added to the educational complex.

The university is a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the University Center in Virginia, an associated member of the American Association of Theological Schools, and a member of the Association of American Colleges, the American Council on Education, and the United Negro College Fund.

In recognition of the Virginia Union centennial, I would like to include the following brief history and background of the school:

> Virginia Union University is an accredited, coeducational, liberal arts college and graduate school of religion which resulted from the merger in 1899 of two institutions which had been established in 1865 by the American Baptist Home Mission Societies. It is independent of governmental support, deriving its church support from Baptists and other support from alumni, philanthropists, and the United Negro College Fund, a fundraising federation of more than 30 accredited private institutions.
>
> The focus of the university is on the development of strong religious convictions and commitments but insists on rigorous intellectual discipline. The basic rule of the university is that students must deport themselves at all times as ladies or gentlemen and Christian citizens. As a Christian institution, the university family includes alumni, students, and teachers from many denominations, both sexes, and several countries and racial or ethnic groups.
>
> As a liberal arts college the university emphasizes well-rounded intellectual development but, in facing the economic realities of its typical student, attempts to insure that each graduate is prepared either for some vocation or professional school. Because the university is zealous of maintaining a high standing in the educational world, it seeks to enroll and to send out only those who give promise of intellectual and spiritual leadership Its program assumes that its graduates will pursue higher academic and professional degrees, and it takes pride in the high proportion of its alumni who hold earned doctorates.
>
> The university is located on a spacious 55-acre campus in the heart of Richmond, a historic city whose cultural resources, commercial establishments, and fine religious and educational institutions offer unusual broadening advantages. Approximately half the Virginia Union students are from homes in the Richmond area.
>
> With a current enrollment of 1,100, the university is planning for an enrollment of 1,500 in the next 10 years. Two new residence halls, a student union, and a science-language building are planned for the immediate future. The second phase of the centennial development program includes plans for a fine arts building and a larger auditorium.

VA PROGRAMS MUST BE EFFECTIVELY ADMINISTERED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill (H.R. 4856) to provide for the continued operation of certain Veterans' Administration offices, and that records relating to beneficiaries of veterans programs be kept within the several States in order that VA programs affecting such beneficiaries can be economically and effectively administered.

My bill seeks to provide long-term relief to the several States, including Delaware, which, under the recently promulgated VA order, will lose VA offices now providing substantial and direct advice and assistance in the administration of programs for veterans who are residents of such States.

It should be obvious to Federal budget and VA officials that certain records must be maintained in the several States in order to economically and effectively administer VA programs, and that such records must remain within the States until they are determined to be obsolete and are earmarked for removal to central VA storage space.

The Congress declared long ago that there shall be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans of any war and to that end

Congress directed the Secretary of Labor to assign to each of the States a veterans employment representative. As a result, each State has a veterans employment representative and his responsibilities encompass the veterans resident in each State.

In response to my own protests to the VA on this VA order, I was informed that the consolidation of the Wilmington, Del., office, and others, is based on the Administration's desire to streamline VA administrative arrangements at the regional level, thereby effecting certain economies.

I am convinced that the VA's hastily conceived and promulgated order will, if put into operation, grievously impair the administration of VA programs and services to veterans and their beneficiaries. Now is the time to prevent this happening.

The closing of VA offices, and the transferring of records, is not conducive to effective and efficient VA administration. In the case of the Wilmington, Del., VA office, for instance, a smaller staff will be retained, while the records necessary and essential to efficient administration of VA programs will be transferred to Philadelphia.

The economies and improvement of efficiency which such a transfer of essential records may bring about, while claimed, have yet to be proven to me. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee will begin hearings on this matter on February 18, and so it is clear that the claimed economies, and improvement of efficiency, have not been proven to others as well.

If the present course is continued it can reasonably be expected that it will be only a matter of time, and probably only a short time at that, when these standby staffs in the State VA offices will be reduced to one receptionist with a telephone and a typewriter, and a timetable showing when the next bus, train, or airplane leaves for the consolidated VA office in some distant city. The receptionists will not be able to offer direct assistance and advice to needy resident veterans based upon immediate access to applicable files and records, because the applicable files and records will be hundreds of miles away.

I hope that any colleague of mine from either party interested in cosponsoring my bill will feel free to do so, and I include its text here as part of my remarks for the information of all of the Members of this House.

H.R. 4856

A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the continued operation of certain Veterans' Administration offices and that records relating to beneficiaries under that title be kept within the State of their residence in order that programs affecting such beneficiaries can be most economically and effectively administered

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 230(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall continue to operate each Veterans' Administration office that was in being on January 1, 1965."

SEC. 2. (a) Subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3305. WHERE CERTAIN RECORDS MUST BE KEPT.

"No records of the Veterans' Administration relating to veterans or other persons entitled to or receiving benefits under this title in any State, which were kept within such State on January 1, 1965, shall be transferred outside of such State, unless for storage by reason of obsolescence."

(b) The analysis of subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"3305. Where certain records must be kept."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SAYLOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GROSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ST. ONGE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 60. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 301. An act to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 491. An act to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 794. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that commitee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 15, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

565. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report indicating the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

566. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to continue the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

567. A letter from the Assistance Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

568. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

569. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

570. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the transfer of funds to the construction of facilities appropriation, pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1965 (78 Stat. 310, 311); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

571. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the transfer of funds to the construction of facilities appropriation, pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1965 (78 Stat. 310, 311); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 4845. A bill to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4846. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the benefits payable thereunder shall be exempt from all taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4847. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefit payable thereunder to $75; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 4848. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, so as to authorize the free use of the mails in making reports required by law of certain payments to others; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4850. A bill to provide life tenure for the judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4851. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 4852. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territory of Guam shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the treatment of certain sets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 4854. A bill to provide research, technical, and financial assistance with respect to the disposal of solid wastes to the several States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers' excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags, to reduce and eventually repeal the manufacturers' excise taxes on passenger automobiles and automotive parts and accessories (with the proceeds going in the meanwhile to the highway trust fund), and to repeal the tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4856. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the continued operation of certain Veterans' Administration offices and that records relating to beneficiaries under that title be kept within the State of their residence in order that programs affecting such beneficiaries can be most economically and effectively administered; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4857. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 4858. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the anniversary of the birth of the late Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.J. Res. 314. Joint resolution relative to Bennett Place commemoration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that a State having a bicameral legislature may apportion membership in one House of the legislature on other than population basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs being requested to rescind his decision to close the Alaska regional office; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 4859. A bill for the relief of Lawrence E. Gardner, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 4860. A bill for the relief of Loi Sing Yip, his wife Szeto Pik Shun Yip, and their minor son Koon Ying Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4861. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Boulder County, Colo., to W. F. Stover; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

97. Mr. OLSEN of Montana presented a petition of the Missoula County United Veterans Council resolving against the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Miles City, Mont., which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Boy Scout Anniversary Week is a most stimulating experience. Seeing the throngs of rugged and enthusiastic youngsters in uniform around Capitol Hill always instills a new confidence in the future of our country. The way things have been going in this old world for the past quarter of a century might ordinarily shake the assurance of those who must inherit the job of carrying on, but hope will rise and mankind in general will enjoy a better life if the philosophy of the Boy Scouts of America is extended and accepted through a greater part of the universe.

No creed can have a higher purpose when it is based on service to God, to country, and to fellow man. From its inception more than half a century ago, the Boy Scout organization has dedicated itself to the teaching of love of God, patriotism, courage, understanding of and consideration for others, and self-reliance. By encouraging youths to achieve excellence in whatever careers their character and ability enable them to qualify, the Scouts have produced outstanding individuals in every field of endeavor.

As one whose love of nature has steadfastly grown from my first memory of walking through the woods with my father, I have a particular admiration for the Scouting programs which, by the simple expedient of experience, acquaint these boys with the wondrous gifts our Creator bestowed when he designed forests and mountains and trickling streams, then topped them all with an astronomical arrangement through which heat and energy is provided and stored by day and a magical and brilliant showpiece is unveiled at sundown. To tramp through the woods not only makes for healthy bodies; it develops moral fiber by nurturing an appreciation for the accomplishments of the pioneers who hewed the path that led to the miracle that is today's America.

With the progress that brings more leisure time, hiking and campouts should be encouraged wherever possible. They are infinitely more beneficial to physical and mental development than a young man will find at a soda counter, on a street corner, or behind the wheel of an automobile.

Finally, Mr. Speaker as Scouting principles and activities are practiced elsewhere on the globe, there springs a new hope that our prayers for world freedom and peace may be answered. Annual world jamborees enable young people from across the seas to meet and to know American Scouts and what they stand for. With Scouting available in more and more countries, we may have at last come upon the golden key that will unlock the barriers that divide nationalities and foment disorder among men. If, peradventure, lads brought up under Communist rule have adequate opportunity to become better acquainted with their counterparts in the free world, they may eventually come to recognize and accept the Scout's tenet of duty to God regardless of the atheistic teachings to which they are subjected at home.

It is an honor to honor the Boy Scouts of America.

Miss Inez Tatascore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I advise Members of the House and their employees of the passing of Miss Inez Tatascore on February 4.

Miss Tatascore was for 18 years an employee of the House of Representatives, ably serving as secretary to my predecessor, the Honorable Sterling Cole. She returned to her home in Ithaca, N.Y., in 1953 to take employment there and has lived there since that time.

Miss Tatascore joined Congressman Cole's staff in 1935 shortly after he was first elected to Congress. Prior to that time, she had been a Tompkins County, N.Y., county court stenographer and secretary to the late County Judge Willard M. Kent. At the time of her death, she was confidential secretary to the Honorable Harold E. Simpson, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

Miss Tatascore had long been active in Republican circles and, in 1952, was an alternate delegate to the Republican National Convention in Chicago. She was a past secretary, treasurer, and vice president of the Young Republican Club of Ithaca and for many years has been a member of the Republican County Committee of Tompkins County.

I know that Miss Tatascore's many friends in Washington and in the State of New York will mourn her passing. She was an extremely able staff member to Congressman Cole and to the constituents of his congressional district as well as being of considerable help to me in recent years. She will be much missed by all who knew her.

Commemorative Stamp in Honor of Dr. Luther H. Gulick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick, pioneer and leader in the field of physical education.

I am informed that several national organizations are backing my proposal to issue such a stamp on the anniversary of Dr. Gulick's birthday, which occurs on December 4, 1965. My bill does not call for any specific denomination or design. The denomination and design are to be determined by the Postmaster General.

Dr. Gulick's leadership in the fields of education and recreation have undoubtedly influenced the lives of millions of young Americans across the Nation. Perhaps more than any one man, he was a pioneer in the development of organizations devoted to helping American youth become healthy and responsible citizens. The following are some biographical facts about him taken from the Dictionary of American Biography:

Luther Halsey Gulick was born in Honolulu, Hawaii, December 4, 1865, of missionary parents. He studied at Oberlin College, but illness forced him to quit school. In 1885 he enrolled at the Sargent School for Physical Training, Cambridge, Mass., and the following year he entered the Medical College of the University of the City of New York and received his M.D. degree in 1889.

Handicapped by heart trouble and severe headaches, Gulick became interested in physical education and hygiene. He organized the physical training course at the YMCA Training School, Springfield, Mass., and served as its director until 1903. He originated the triangle as the emblem of the YMCA denoting the physical, social, and spiritual aims of the organization. Sport enthusiasts will be interested to know that Dr. Gulick, in collaboration with one of his students James Naismith, devised the game of basketball.

Dr. Gulick held many leading posts in various organizations devoted to physical education. For a period of 16 years, from 1887 to 1903, he was secretary for the physical training department of the YMCA International Committee; he was principal of the Pratt Institute High School, Brooklyn, N.Y., from 1900 to 1903; director of physical training in the New York City public schools from 1903 to 1906, during which time he reorganized the physical education activities and instruction in hygiene, and established the Public Schools Athletic League.

Dr. Gulick also organized the child hygiene department of the Russell Sage Foundation and served as its director from 1907 to 1913, when failing health forced him to relinquish the post. Later, however, he and his wife organized the Camp Fire Girls movement. The last 5 years of his life were devoted to writing and lecturing on his favorite subjects, physical education and hygiene, seeking in this way to spread general knowledge among the people on these subjects.

Among the many offices he held were the following: chairman of the Physical Training Lecture Committee of the St. Louis Exposition, 1904; member of the American Olympic Games Committee, 1906 and 1908; delegate to the Second International Congress on School Hygiene, London, 1907; lecturer on hygiene, New York University, 1906–09; consultant, New York Hospital for Deformities and Joint Diseases, 1907; president of the American Physical Education Association, 1903–06; secretary, American School Hygiene Association, 1907; president, Public Schools Physical Training Society, 1905–08; president, Playground Association of America, 1906–09.

He also was a prolific writer in his specialized fields, serving as editor of "Physical Education," "American Physical Education Review," and others. Among his published works were, "Physical Measurements and How They Are Used," 1889; "Physical Education by Muscular Exercise," 1904; "The Efficient Life," 1907; "Mind and Work," 1908, and others.

Although in ill health, one of his last acts was to accept a call from the National War Council in the fall of 1917 to undertake a survey in France of the rapidly growing work of the YMCA with the American Expeditionary Forces there. His report on the kind of men needed and the training they were to receive helped improve the service of the YMCA to the American troops in France. His book "The Dynamic of Manhood," published in 1917, was based on his experiences and observations in France during that period.

Upon his return from France, Dr. Gulick retired to his camp in the Maine woods where he died on August 13, 1918, at the age of 53. His pioneering efforts in the fields of physical education and hygiene should now be recognized through the isuance of a commemorative stamp on the occasion of the anniversary of the 100th anniversary of his birth.

Newsletter to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith a copy of volume 2, issue No. 1 of my newsletter to constituents, which will be mailed next week. The newsletter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1965.

WASHINGTON, D.C.—As the Representative in the U.S. Congress for our 13th Congressional District of Illinois during the 88th Congress (1963-64), I prepared and mailed periodic reports on the work of the Congress, the conduct of the Federal Government, and my efforts as your Congressman. Because of the favorable response to these communications, I will continue these reports during the 1965-66 sessions of Congress to inform interested residents (these reports are available to anyone in the 13th District on request) of some of the activities of the Federal Government which I feel are of special interest, and to present a discussion of important measures before Congress and the viewpoints of your Representative.

In addition, it is hoped that these reports will encourage you to voice your views on the national problems affecting the future and well-being of our Nation, or to seek assistance from your Congressman, your link with the Federal Government, on problems relating to the Federal Government. For a prompt response to any communication, whether written or by phone, please use the above Washington, D.C., address. The 13th District office in Winnetka, which is open during congressional recesses, is not equipped to handle congressional business. These reports are financed by contributions from residents of the 13th District and by me, and are mailed under the "frank," a Member's mailing privilege under his responsibility to keep his constituents informed.

THE 89TH CONGRESS BEGINS

While there is no crystal ball to predict the future, the President's state of the Union message and budget proposals, coupled with the overwhelming Democrat control (more than 2 to 1) in both Houses of Congress, lead any reasonable man to the conclusion that a majority of the administration's numerous requests will become law. Already, Presidential messages have been sent to Congress on health (and also the closing of the veterans' hospitals), education (raising the many difficult questions of church-state relationship), immigration, foreign aid, national defense, Presidential succession, home rule for the District of Columbia, farm policy, conservation of natural and human resources, to mention but a few. Additional messages are being received almost daily, and the committees of the Congress are beginning hearings, debate, and discussion on these and other matters.

Vietnam, the Bobby Baker scandal, the Congo, an expanded war on poverty, repeal of section 14B of the Taft-Hartley law, civil rights, excise taxes, transportation, urban redevelopment, air and water pollution, and legislative reorganization will unquestionably continue to be debated and possibly acted upon by the 89th Congress, as the Nation weighs the meaning of President Johnson's frequently used phrase, "the Great Society."

Obviously, many of the goals are commendable. However, under the Constitution, the Congress has the responsibility to legislate—to propose, examine, and shape any programs devised to achieve these goals. To fulfill this responsibility, the Congress has an obligation to act as the truly great deliberative body it is credited with being, and not as a mere rubberstamp. All proposals should be evaluated for their intrinsic merit, their cost, and their relationship to our system of government. It is my conviction that we have a Great Society. It is our task as Americans to strengthen and improve it, and vigorously prevent its destruction or deterioration.

CHANGES IN LEADERSHIP

The first official act of each new Congress, after the swearing in of the Members, is to organize the House and Senate and select party leadership. This process is usually accomplished without controversy, but this year opening day was the culmination of many weeks of campaigning by candidates for the post of Senate Democrat whip to replace newly elected Vice President HUMPHREY, and for the position of House Republican leader.

On the Senate side, after a stiff fight, the unbelievable happened. Fresh from an overwhelming presidential and Senate victory (68 Democrats to 32 Republicans), the Senate Democrats, with the support of many so-called liberal Democrats, elected as their new whip, Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, who last year opposed and filibustered against the Civil Rights Act and who also voted against the limited nuclear test ban treaty, two of the major issues in the 1964 campaign. House Democrats also elected their whip from among those who had opposed the civil rights bill of 1964—Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana. Illinois' distinguished Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN was unanimously reelected to guide Senate Republicans as minority leader.

On the House side, Illinois senior Congressman, LESLIE ARENDS, was reelected to the important post of minority whip with the solid support of our Illinois GOP delegation, and Congressman MEL LAIRD, of Wisconsin, was elected chairman of the Republican conference. Congressman GERALD FORD, of Michigan, was elected minority leader of the House replacing highly respected Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana. The following excerpts from Representative FORD's statement on announcing his candidacy for the leadership post contain some of my reasons for supporting FORD:

"In the past 33 years there has been but one 2-year period in which the Republican Party has controlled both the White House and the Congress at the same time. We have come to a point in history where fine citizens of all political faiths all over the country are gravely concerned about the very survival of the two-party system. We must begin a new chapter with new ideas, new spirit, and new leadership.

"The vitality of the two-party system, and indeed the strength of our form of government, will be severely tested in the months ahead. How our Republican minority conducts itself during the next 2 years will be crucial in determining the future of our party and the two-party system. Every Republican Congressman, charged with this heavy responsibility, wants our party to be dynamic and positive. We can become the majority party only if we in the House effectively represent and promote the best hopes and aspirations of the American people for themselves and for their country.

"We have within our Republican ranks a great wealth of talent, energy, and dedication. When properly channeled and utilized to the fullest, this talent will promote and communicate the image of a fighting, forward-looking party seeking responsible and constructive solutions to national problems. By finding ways to better utilize these impressive talents through new techniques and bold leadership, by a willingness to try new ideas, by leading rather than simply reacting, we can and we must develop the respect and the support of the American people. I am convinced that meaningful changes must be made now for the benefit of our Republican Party and the preservation of our two-party system."

At the request of Representative FORD, I have been serving on the GOP conference committee called the Quie committee on organization and structure of the Republicans in the House. Many of the recommendations of our committee have already been adopted and implemented with additional recommendations to be forthcoming in the hope that these changes will help to make our party a more effective instrument for government.

NEW COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

I have been named again to the Science and Astronautics (Space) Committee of the House. This committee has jurisdiction over National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs involving more than $5 billion annually or approximately 5 percent of the Federal budget, as well as astronautical and scientific research and development, the Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, and science scholarships. Committee membership is 31—21 Democrats and 10 Republicans.

Also, I have been appointed to the Committee on Government Operations, the chief investigating committee of the House, which has broad jurisdiction over almost all activities of Government and includes consideration of reorganization plans affecting the executive branch, acting on General Accounting Office reports on misuse of public funds, and studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member. This 34-man committee is composed of 23 Democrats and 11 Republicans. My work on this committee will include service on the Moss Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information and also service as the ranking Republican on the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.

SEATING OF THE MISSISSIPPI CONGRESSMEN

The first major issue before the new Congress was the question of seating the Mississippi congressional delegation. There is little question but that residents of some areas of this Nation, despite the 1964 Civil Rights Act, are being systematically denied their constitutional right to vote because they are Negroes. However, to have opposed seating all elected Mississippi Congressmen, without a hearing or an investigation, and thereby deny a State its representation in Congress, would have been unreasonable and would have established a dangerous precedent. For this reason and others, I supported the position taken by both the Democrat and Republican leadership favoring the seating of the Mississippi delegation.

However, because of my strong conviction that no citizen should be denied, because of the color of his skin, his right to vote, I have urged an investigation of the denial of the right to vote and in addition have cosponsored a bill (H.R. 4556) which would provide for Federal action where a pattern or practice of racial discrimination in voter registrations is demonstrated. Whether or not the Democrat-controlled Congress will permit hearings to be held on this proposal remains to be seen. Hopefully they will move expeditiously to assure that all Americans are permitted to exercise this precious right.

HOUSE RULE CHANGES

Regrettably, many reports of the controversy concerning rules changes were grossly oversimplified and misleading. The Democrats, with a more than 2-to-1 control of the House (295 Democrats to 140 Republicans) met a few days before this vote was taken and agreed to three rules changes: (a) a 21-day rule on reporting legislation to the House for action at the request of the Speaker; (b) permitting a bill to be sent to conference regardless of objection; and (c) prohibiting the delaying tactic of demanding the reading of an engrossed copy of a bill before the final vote.

Republicans decided to offer additional rule changes, including (a) equal time for the minority in debating conference reports—now all time is controlled by the majority; (b) an opportunity for minority members to include their views in the printed House-Senate conference reports; and (c) increased minority staffing on committees.

The Democrats moved to cut off debate to deny the Republicans an opportunity to offer their proposed changes. The only vote that was taken was on the previous question; namely, whether or not to cut off debate. I voted "no." The vote was yeas 224, nays 201. Yet this vote was reported as being for or against the rule changes.

The fact is that a majority of the Republicans planned to support a majority of the changes being offered by the Democrats, but did not have an opportunity to vote on them because of the steamroller tactics. The early days of this session have given many cause to recall Alexis de Tocqueville's warning about the dangers of a "tyranny of the majority."

U.S. AID TO NASSER

For some years, the United States has been giving aid and assistance of various types to the United Arab Republic. Last year I spoke and voted against continued assistance to Nasser under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, because of my conviction that our aid was enabling and, in fact, encouraging Nasser to reallocate his resources, conduct a trade agreement with the U.S.S.R. to build up a modern war machine, continue the Yemen war, and create unrest in the Middle East in direct opposition to announced U.S. foreign policy goals. At that time, we lost, and aid to Nasser was continued.

This year I again spoke out, in early January, urging termination of our aid to Nasser under Public Law 480. If anything, the arguments against continuing such aid are even stronger today when one considers Nasser's continued aggressions and his assistance to the rebels in the Congo. President Johnson, however, seems determined to continue this aid and in requesting "Presidential discretion" to deal with the matter, asked for additional funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation to finance this aid. In an attempt to assure passage of the measure, the bill was called up with great haste, and, regrettably, I was away from Washington participating in a series of seminars. However, to the shock of the administration, an amendment to the appropriation bill was passed denying further aid to Nasser. In the Senate, a similar amendment was rejected, thus forcing the bill to a House-Senate conference.

On February 8, a motion was offered to instruct the House conferees to uphold the House ban on Public Law 480 aid to Nasser. I supported this motion, but Presidential pressure was apparently sufficient to switch a number of votes, and, regrettably, the final vote was yeas 165, nays 241. And so closes the book on another year of U.S. aid to Nasser of millions of your tax dollars. One would think that if so many Members so readily recognize the impact of Presidential pressures on them that they would switch their votes, that they would also recognize the distinct possibility that similar administration pressures on Nasser might have an equally significant impact.

OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO THE 13TH DISTRICT

A fine American and dedicated public servant recently returned to private life, and, with his departure the veterans of this Nation lost the services of an able and effective friend. Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., of Winnetka, was appointed in 1961 by the late President John F. Kennedy, to serve as Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. He has spent the past 4 years in his Nation's service demonstrating the wisdom of that appointment. We regret his departure from Washington, but welcome him back to the 13th District.

Our 13th District, possibly for the first time in recent history, is now represented in the official U.S. Marine Corps Band. Sgt. John B. Richardson, of Wilmette, Ill., a skilled musician, was selected to join this top unit late last year, and since coming to Washington, D.C., has performed at numerous official functions, including the recent inauguration ceremonies.

I am gratified to report that the GOP Members of Congress elected in 1962 have selected me to serve as chairman of the 88th club here in Washington. There is a great deal that our Republican minority, although small in numbers, can do to help assure that Government truly serves the people, and we look forward to a challenging year ahead.

Competitive nominations for appointments to West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy were announced by my office last month. Final selections are now being made by the respective academies and should be announced late in April. My selections were based solely on merit and the keen competition for the openings available resulted in an unusually high caliber of nominee. Applications for appointments to the U.S. service academies' classes commencing in the summer of 1966 are now being received in my Washington office.

RADIO "REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON"

My weekly radio reports on the work of the Congress are back on the air. Programs thus far this year have included discussions of the various proposals for health care for the aged, the question of the seating of the Mississippi delegation, the House rules changes, and a visit with Bruce Ladd, a resident of Arlington Heights who is in Washington, D.C., with the highly regarded congressional fellowship program sponsored by the American Political Science Association. These weekly reports on topics of current interest are broadcast as a public service by the following Illinois stations:

WEAW–AM, Evanston (1330 kilocycles): Fridays at 2:45 p.m.

WEAW–FM, Evanston (105 megacycles): Fridays at 8:45 p. m.

WNWC–FM, Arlington Heights (92.7 megacycles): Fridays at 6:45 p.m.

WNTH–FM, Winnetka (88.1 megacycles): Wednesdays at 5:15 p.m.

In addition, Congressman ROBERT McCLORY, of Lake County, Ill., and I participate in a weekly public service broadcast by WEEF, of Highland Park (AM 1430 kilocycles and FM 103.1 megacycles).

A PERSONAL NOTE

Two years ago last month, as I began my service as your Representative in Congress, I took the oath of office and assumed the responsibilities of this high post. As I repeated those words last month, I reaffirmed my pledge to represent every resident of our 13th District, and our Nation, energetically, responsibly, with dedication, and to the fullest of my capabilities. As the Congress considers the major national and international issues, your counsel is invited. I, in turn, shall continue to endeavor to keep you informed through periodic newsletters, radio reports, frequent visits back to Illinois, and personal correspondence. I'll look forward to hearing from you.

OATH OF OFFICE OF MEMBER OF CONGRESS

"I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

DONALD RUMSFELD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted these words from Hebrews 4: 16: *Let us therefore come boldly to the throne of grace that we may find grace in time of need.*

Let us pray.

Almighty God, whose divine laws are the only foundation stones for a better world, give us a vital and vivid sense of these laws in our personal and national life.

Inspire us during these days of crises with a clearer understanding of Thy supreme sovereignty which alone can supplant those moods of anxiety and doubt which so frequently mar our peace of mind.

Grant that we may go forth in the days of this week with a new accent of faith in Thee as we confront perilous conditions and circumstances which are far beyond our finite wisdom and strength.

In all our struggles with the adversary may our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress be guided and sustained by a glorious faith which will enable them to carry on in confidence and power.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 11, 1965, was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 282. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" at the dedication of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in Boston, Mass.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on February 16–17. I am advised that this has been cleared with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PATMAN PAYS TRIBUTE TO LADY BIRD JOHNSON FOR HER INSPIRING AND HISTORICALLY IMPORTANT INTERVIEW WITH U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT—SUBJECT: "WAYS TO BEAUTIFY AMERICA"

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an interview of Mrs. L. B. Johnson appearing in the U.S. News & World Report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Patman's Switch was the tiny community in Cass County, Tex., where I was born. About 25 miles away, near Karnack, Tex., on the same little railroad a long generation later, in the beautiful piney woods of east Texas one of America's great women was born.

I am speaking of a beautiful woman, in thought as well as appearance, Lady Bird Johnson, who comes from the congressional district that I have been proud to represent for 36 years.

Showing great wisdom, the editors of U.S. News & World Report chose to interview Lady Bird Johnson on a subject of vital interest to this and coming generations of Americans. She is head of a committee designed to figure out ways and means of eradicating the ugliness of our cities and our countryside.

Who can deny that the task is anything other than a gigantic one, for in our haste to build this great Nation, we have not always shown the need for orderly and artistic progress. We have demeaned the bounty and beauty of nature all too often. We have made of some of our cities somber concentrations of dirt and untidiness, and of ramshackle structures.

In the countryside, we have cemeteries for old cars that are also cemeteries for the hopes of many who have wanted a beautiful countryside instead. And whole sections of our cities have buildings that look as though they were put together by architects whose design called for old piano boxes and tin cans only.

To all this, Lady Bird Johnson says, "Let's stop this absurdity. America, the beautiful must not be alone a song. It must be a reality."

I, therefore, consider it a great honor to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD her interview, "Ways To Beautify America," appearing in the February 22 issue of U.S. News & World Report:

WAYS TO BEAUTIFY AMERICA—EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH THE FIRST LADY

(A developing drive to beautify America has a strong ally in Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. The First Lady feels keenly the time is here to eradicate ugliness from cities and countryside. Her own first goal: to make the Nation's Capital a showcase and model. Her committee on Washington held its first meeting February 11. What are Mrs. Johnson's ideas for lifting the face of America? Is there a role for individuals, families, organizations, as well as government? You'll find her answers to these and many other questions in this interview with members of the staff of "U.S. News & World Report." The interview took place in the White House.)

Question. Mrs. Johnson, is beauty in a nation necessarily expensive? Do you have in mind some simple things that can help beautify a community or a countryside?

Answer. Of course, beauty in this sense covers a great range—all the way from tearing out and replanning the core of a city, such as they've done so magnificently in Hartford, Conn., to the smaller things that help. I'm referring to undertakings by garden clubs, or Girl Scout groups, or citizens' associations in a community.

My mail is just gloriously full these days of these undertakings—of people who write to tell what they are doing in their own neighborhoods or areas.

A lady from Wenatchee, Wash., for example, wrote to tell me how her garden club of 75 members has transformed a bank of weeds at the edge of town into a background of greenery, with bright flowers and picnic tables—it is a place, as she put it, that now "bids the traveler 'stop.' "

Question. Is there a lot of that sort of thing?

Answer. Judging by my mail, there is. There is a great interest in beautifying the landscape. It seems to me to represent a basic hunger, or yearning, that has spread throughout the whole country.

People write to tell what they are doing—like that converted weed bank I mentioned.

Another letter tells how the town was struck by elm blight that was destroying elms around the town square. So they got a tree-planting program going which consisted of the chamber of commerce paying for half a tree and a citizen paying for the other half.

They bought trees at a lower price because they were planted by the high school agriculture classes rather than nurseries. They replaced 47 trees. And by the time they were replaced, at least 80 people had worked earnestly on the program, and you know this is going to be a matter of pride, a feeling that "this is our square, these are our trees, our project, and we want to keep it up."

Question. So beautifying America doesn't necessarily have to be a high-cost undertaking——

Answer. Not all of it. I think it is a matter of harnessing the taste, the desire, and to get going on it.

Question. Do you think all these activities should be coordinated in some way?

Answer. Well, certainly, encouraged and made aware that they are appreciated. I don't know about coordination. I think there is a lot of strength in the fact that it is an individual, local, grassroots feeling. Areas have their individual charm, and it would be a gray day if we set one standard for the whole Nation, don't you think?

Question. Do you feel, Mrs. Johnson, that beauty has a real, tangible value?

Answer. What is tangible and what is intangible? A quick answer would be, "Yes, it's tangible," when you realize that tourism is the third largest industry in the United States. And what makes tourism? People go to see a beautiful area; this is a large factor in it. So you can say there is a dollars-and-cents element involved. Americans spend $27 billion a year traveling in their own country.

But there is more. You know, when you get past 50 you may get to reminiscing about what you have done, what you remember, what was really worthwhile.

What surfaces with me? What do I remember? Little pictures like this, a beautiful oasis in my life: 3 or 4 days in a summer that my husband and our two children spent with another couple and their four children on a sandy, rather quiet beach, walking along with the sand coming up between your toes, watching the wind in the reeds among the sand dunes. Just sitting with the glorious rhythm of the waves coming in can be the most relaxing thing in the world, or watching the children build sand castles, and the excitement of finding rare seashells, or, once, a green glass ball from some fisherman's net an ocean away.

Those were days that are worth very much to me, but I suppose it is perhaps in an intangible way.

And then there was a period during the war when I raised a quite remarkable garden, about 30 by 30, in the backyard of my little house here in Washington. I had tomatoes, English peas, black-eyed peas, and so on.

And then around the edges I always had easy-growing flowers like zinnias and peonies. There is something remarkably more beautiful about flowers that you yourself have planted, and divided, and cared for, than any other flowers. It reminds one that the creation of beauty is a happy experience. I loved that time.

In summary, the things worth remembering in a lifetime are often, with me, associated with beauty.

Question. Do you feel that creating beauty is something that each individual American family can do?

Answer. I surely do. And it adds to one's sense of self-respect and joy.

This gets back to your question of whether it must be expensive. In this area, it need not be.

I think of my own yard at the ranch. The wisteria I got as a cutting from Mrs. Bailey, who sold us eggs. The chrysanthemum came from Mrs. Weinheimer, who runs the store. She also gave me the lovely coral vine. And a local builder's wife gave me the start of the white daisies.

The simple, neighborly trading of cuttings and bedding plants and seeds is not to be discounted for its value to a community.

Question. We were talking about individual families. Is it possible for such activity to be transferred to a community—that beautification projects can be catching?

Answer. You've just used a phrase that I find repeated in letter after letter: "Gardening is catching," or, "Fixing up the neighborhood is catching." People say such things over and over. I think there's nothing like a showcase. It says, "Look what can be done. Look what has been done." And people respond.

Question. Is there an antipoverty element here in making the slums less ugly places to live?

Answer. I would say so. And one of the very interesting avenues of approach is the fact that a large part of today's unemployed are youths with low levels of skills. Maintenance of parks and streets and simple gardening—these things do not require tremendous training or skill. So, certainly, a good combination is to offer employment to young people in the maintenance of parks and on town projects.

Question. Is the implication here that, perhaps, if some of these youngsters worked at making parks beautiful by day, they wouldn't be so busy making them unsafe at night?

Answer. That's an excellent point. You come across interesting observations along this line.

I told you about replanting the trees in one town square. The man who talked about that said that the fact people had helped plant those trees and helped pay for them gave them such a spirit of love and ownership that the community, obviously, was going to take good care of them.

Question. Do you feel then, Mrs. Johnson, that there is more to the beautification program than beauty for beauty's sake?

Answer. Yes. You see, ugliness is so grim. A little beauty, something that is lovely, I think, can help create harmony which will lessen tensions. Some of our problems of crime and juvenile delinquency and mental health are fed by ugliness.

And then there is a story I came across about an area in Baltimore—a slum area—where they tore out the old buildings and put in some open-space park, plus housing.

Very wisely, and looking to the future, the schools in the area launched an education program in trees and shrubs. The children were taught their names, how to tend them, and what they could mean. For weeks before the trees were planted, the lower grades drew pictures of trees. That brought about a change in the feeling in the community, with the result that there has been no vandalism at all involving the trees and flowers. The people are very proud of them. Not one act of vandalism occurred.

Question. Do you feel the schools, then, have a role in teaching children of the beauty and the love of nature?

Answer. I certainly think so, because I just think I am more alive if I know that the gnarled old tree I see, with so much character, is a live oak, probably 300 years old, and that the one with the lovely crimson color in the fall is a Spanish oak, and that one with the feathery foliage is mesquite.

In the land that I live in, I like to know what's what.

Question. Mrs. Johnson, in your travels is it your impression that countries in Europe, say, are more or less beautiful than America?

Answer. My travels in Europe have been more people-seeing than landscape-seeing, so I honestly can't say I know a great deal about it. I do believe I sense in many places a greater reverence for the land because they have less of it.

As a country, we've always had the feeling that we could just go on farther west and open up new areas. But we've come to the end of that now.

WASTING NATURAL ASSETS

Question. Is it likely that Americans, in their eagerness to develop economically, have squandered some of the beauty assets of the country?

Answer. Oh, I'm sure we have. Forests are an outstanding example. And I think of certain industrial practices that do violence to the landscape, such as strip mining, and stone quarries, and dumping of industrial waste into rivers. But, of course, the land must serve the people. The question is: Could we, by planning, avoid the ravaging of the lands around us?

And I must remember the change within my own lifetime. Soil conservation is so magnificently evident when you fly over this country. You cannot miss the revived interest in the protection of forests, the planting of grasses, the general conservation of soil. In these things you see the hopes, the possibility of success in the future.

Question. The President has suggested that the national highway program be used to encourage the planting of wildflowers. Were you responsible for that suggestion?

Answer. I expect that my great love of getting home in April to see the wildflowers along the Texas highways—I suppose, just by osmosis, some of that got through to him.

You know, driving for pleasure is the No. 1 American recreation. We are a nation of people who use automobiles. And so, to make the highways more beautiful would certainly add a lot to our pleasure in living.

I am particularly proud of the Texas highways, perhaps because I know more about them than I do other States. For about 30 years, we have had a wildflower-seed-planting program there which has really made it a glorious experience to drive across the State between about the middle of March and June. The roadsides are a carpet of color if there has been rain.

The scattering of wildflower seeds along the highways, the rights-of-way, is something on which the Highway Department of Texas has done a great job. The best-known kinds, I suppose, are the bluebonnets and the Indian paintbrush, the Indian blanket—then there is wild verbena, the wild phlox, and all sorts of wild, prickly poppies.

BILLBOARD VERSUS BEAUTY

Question. Should there be a national law that would control billboards, so people could see all these flowers?

Answer. Well, it's a big industry. It's private enterprise. I do think, though, that public feeling is going to bring about regulation, so that you don't have a solid diet of billboards on all the roads.

Question. What about these so-called "neon jungles" along highways?

Answer. I think the pressure of public approval—or disapproval—and examples of good taste will be the major thing in the reduction of those.

Question. Are you saying that good taste can be good business?

Answer. Oh, indeed so. You've noticed in traveling about the country, I'm sure, how many cities now are either planting trees along business streets or putting small trees in tubs, with ivy and hardy flowers around the base.

Question. Returning to highways for a moment: Is there anything that can be done about the auto graveyards, the heaps of old cars that one sees almost everywhere?

Answer. One of the things that's most frequently mentioned—and certainly seems to be the quickest answer—is to shield them with trees and shrubs.

Another thing is the "Prolerizing" plants that squash those old cars flat as a pancake. But there are only 4 of those plants in the whole Nation, and there are about 5 million automobiles being junked each year now.

Still another suggestion is a sort of "burial tax" that you would pay when you bought a new car. It would be used to dispose of an old car.

But the screening and planting seems to be the quickest answer—that and the enforcement of existing zoning regulations.

Question. Is that something for the States or the Federal Government to do?

Answer. I'm not wise enough to know what the modus operandi should be. But I do know that there is enough public interest in the matter so that we are on the way to getting something started. There's been a considerable manifestation of interest in my mail from people who operate these automobile-wrecking yards—they are coming up with their own ideas, and many of them want to be helpful.

Question. Can you give us some more examples of simple things that can be done to help restore the Nation's beauty?

Answer. Many suggestions have been made on things that can be done to parking lots to make them more attractive. One is the planting of a few well-spaced trees, thereby adding some shade and greenery and losing only a few parking spaces. And there are proposals to screen parking lots with hedges or perforated cement walls.

Garden clubs have done things along this line—not in just one town, but in many. I think of an example in which the city operated a municipal parking lot. And the local garden club went to the city officials and said, "All right, we will plant the parking lot if the city will maintain it." That has been done. These people are proving that a parking lot doesn't necessarily have to be an eyesore.

There are other things that can be done. I especially like an episode that took place back in Texas. This concerned Mrs. Herbert Marcus, a woman who had contributed to every cultural and artistic facet of her city for more than seven decades. On her 80th birthday, the community wanted to honor her with a dinner of appreciation—one of these affairs where they usually present the honored person with a silver service, or a portrait, or something.

Well, instead of that, her children and some of her good friends gave her 1 mile of flowering crabapple trees—1,500 of them—along a much-used freeway. It is a great honor to her, and it is a thing of beauty for everyone who travels that way.

After I came across that instance, I found it was not alone by any means. I keep on hearing of people who have given public trees in honor of a dear one, or as a token of esteem and appreciation to a schoolteacher or city official with a long record of service.

A classic example, to me, is Mrs. Albert Lasker in New York, and the things she has done.

Question. In what way?

Answer. She is one of those daring people, in the gentlest sort of way. In about 1943 she started making great donations of chrysanthemums to the city of New York in memory of her mother, the city to plant them in a place of its own choosing.

But after about 10 years she became convinced that masses of flowers ought to be planted where masses of people would see them. And so she gave 20 blocks of tulips and daffodils to be planted in the center of Park Avenue. It has since been taken over as a city project.

She met a lot of disbelievers at first who didn't think those tulips could survive the air pollution. But they have. Now she says the taxi drivers are among her best friends, because they get so many fares driving people around to see the tulips.

I always try to get on Park Avenue to see the change of the seasons of flowers there.

NEW ENGLAND IN AUTUMN

Question. What other things of beauty have caught your eye as you travel about America?

Answer. An unforgettable thing is to go to New England in the autumn and to fly over those gold and crimson and scarlet hills and valleys, dotted with lakes and enough green in it to serve as a foil. The trees reach like torches to the sky. I love driving through New England. It is breathtaking.

And we already mentioned Hartford—the way they took the core of the city and demolished ugliness and replaced it with simple beauty. That's a thing of beauty of a very urban and very modern type.

Then, a lovely piece of preservation of the old city is in Dover, Del.—its wonderful village green, a lovely expanse of grass with its tree-shaded streets and old houses. You almost feel as though Thomas Jefferson might come strolling past.

You know, it was Thomas Jefferson who said, "Communities should be planned with an eye to the effect made upon the human spirit by being continuously surrounded with a maximum of beauty."

Question. Are these things best done as community projects?

Answer. They can be community projects—or a group such as a garden club, service club, or youth organization.

Last summer I went to the little town of Eastport, Maine. The quickest look shows you that this is a town with serious problems of unemployment—boarded-up stores along the main streets, a sort of gray appearance to the area. And then, suddenly, you come upon a miniature mall—a splash of brilliant yellow calendulas around a flagpole right in the heart of the town.

Well, this had been undertaken by the local Girl Scout troop. It was their project and they were all lined up there to meet us, just as proud as punch—and well they could be, because they had lifted a brilliant flag of defiance in the face of decay.

And I recall another example of what an individual can do. We were in Akron, Ohio, passing several blocks of sad, paint-peeled houses that were destined to be torn down to make way for an industrial park. At the end of the block there was one house—no better than the others—where the lady had simply a mass of bright orange and red and yellow zinnias in the front yard. I felt like going in and taking off my hat to her.

Also, of course, there are things that cities can do—and do on their own. Take the wisdom of Portland, Oreg., which is the City of Roses. In the parks and areas administered by the city, when they prune their roses and camellias they let the public know that the cuttings are available, free. As a result, many, many yards bloom with those lovely roses and camellias, and it is a matter of civic pride.

Along this line, I think of the example that has been set by Governor Connally in my own State.

Question. What is that?

Answer. I found out about it when I stood in line with him one time. About the 30th time somebody looked up at him smilingly and said, "I got your bluebonnet seeds." I said, "John, what are they talking about?"

Well, it turned out that he sends out a mailing of 50,000 seeds each year to people, with a message on the back of it, a picture of himself and of a field of bluebonnets, and instructions for planting the seeds. I think it is good to make people aware of something that makes Texas beautiful.

You were asking me earlier what an individual can do about beautifying the country. Well, he can be a catalyst, on a big or little scale. Mrs. Lasker has been a catalyst on a big scale. Mrs. Marcus certainly caused things to happen on a sizable scale.

But we have had a lot of communication with the wife of a policeman who lives in an area where, I would say, the incomes are probably in the $5,000 or $6,000 bracket. She has worked just in her block on a paint-up, clean-up, plant-a-windowbox campaign.

Her achievement is not be overlooked. She had literally gone around her neighborhood and said, "Let's all get out on Saturday. Can you bring a shovel? Can you contribute a bag of cement?" Many of them could contribute nothing but their time.

At first it was just a cleanup. Then it graduated to planting the yards. And it became contagious: You know, you feel a bit ashamed if your neighbor has raked his leaves and you haven't raked your own. This is a thing that caught on through that woman's effort and determination.

PLANS FOR WASHINGTON

Question. Mrs. Johnson, you have organized a committee on beautifying Washington. Can you tell us some of the things that can be done here?

Answer. In Washington, you start with a gorgeous city—L'Enfant [Pierre l'Enfant, original planner of Washington] gave us about 200 years of lead time. We have so much beauty here.

Look at the Mall, for example, that stretches from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial. It's impressive—surrounded by marble buildings and monuments—but its heart lies empty. It could have more life in it, more color. There could be benches to make it more attractive to people—a place of beauty to rest in, and to admire—a great place where people gather, in the sense of Europe's great places, such as the Place de la Concorde in Paris, the Spanish Steps in Rome, the Piazza San Marco in Venice.

Washington has a good deal of good, green planting, but masses of color would be a joy.

Question. Is it your idea to make Washington the center of your beautification activities?

Answer. If you are interested in something, you've got to choose a spot in which to try to express your interest. For the citizen who wants to help, what better place to begin than where you live? Washington is dear to the heart of all America. What could be more appropriate than the National Capital? This city belongs to everybody.

Question. What are some of the things that can be done?

Answer. I believe the Federal Government could do more to set an example. Uncle Sam owns so much of the real estate in Washington. And I think more could be done by the various departments and agencies to respond to the need for beauty. If the planners of many Federal buildings set aside a small portion of their budget for additional planting and upkeep, it could lift the tenor of the town.

On the community level, as you drive about Washington, I'm sure you've noticed the city is dotted with little squares and triangles caused by the layout of the streets. Many of them are almost bare, clean of any shred of life. They are quite drab.

There is an evident desire and interest on the part of neighborhoods to just take over these areas and care for them. Of course, they may belong to the National Park Service, or some other branch of the Government, so there may be red-tape hurdles to cross. There is a need for somebody who can say "Yes" or "No" to such citizen desires—and say it quickly, while enthusiasm is high.

Question. Do you feel there is a need for a Department of Beauty in the Federal Government?

Answer. I don't think so. I would just hope that every single branch of Government—every branch that buys or plants—would insist on the best design possible and would keep in mind natural beauty.

Question. Mrs. Johnson, if you had a priority list of ugly things you would want America to be rid of, what would it be?

Answer. I think that we could make automobile graveyards less of an ugly blotch on the landscape. That could be done by planting and screening, and by the regulation of their location.

Then, too, cities have turned their backs on their rivers, and the waterfronts have become rundown, decaying areas. Riverfronts are a great potential source of beauty, and could become more of a focal center for scenic attraction. Recently, many cities have started renovating and beautifying their riverfronts.

Third on the list, I would hope to see attention put on the entrances to cities. It is a glorious experience to drive into Washington along the George Washington Memorial Parkway. That is a noble entrance to a noble city.

There is a similar entrance into my city of Austin. As you come in from the west over the brow of a hill, you look down on the city with its pink granite capitol—you just glow with pride.

But entrances to cities are likely to be drab and gray—or gaudy. A city often turns its worst face to the public. I think this is a field where there is room for marked improvement, but it takes a lot of leadtime in planning.

Question. Do you expect the country to be prettier in 10 years?

Answer. I surely think it can be. I think conservation of beautiful views, of lovely stands of trees, and an accent on not only protecting what you have but bringing back something that has been vandalized and destroyed in part—I think that can be achieved.

You asked earlier whether there are any tangible benefits of beauty. I think you can certainly prove that there are. But I don't think we should forget the intangible ones.

In a country founded, in part, by a man who was daring enough to say that we were devoted to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—he ranked the pursuit of happiness right up there at the top. And beauty and happiness are certainly inextricably tied together.

I am proud that this administration has accepted the commitment to make our cities and country more beautiful for all the people. The President's conservation message got such a tremendous response that you just know this is a yearning of people, and it is something that they think they can do, and want to do.

Question. Do you think this may be one of those instances where the American public has been ahead of its leaders—has been waiting for some leadership to get things started?

Answer. I do think that is so. I think the time is ripe—the time is now—to take advantage of this yeasty, bubbling desire to beautify our cities and our countryside. I hope all Americans will join in this effort.

TELEPHONE INSTALLATIONS IN THE RAYBURN BUILDING

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, before long some of us are going to begin moving into the new building, and it looks as though we may have some problems in connection with the telephone systems that will be available or installed. In my new office there will be needed a different type of installation from that which I have in my office now. So, in order to try to find out what was available, I had my secretary contact the telephone company to see what system might be installed. He was advised that the Clerk of the House, Mr. Roberts, had ordered the room which contains the equipment available to be locked up. Accordingly I tried to get Mr. Roberts on the phone this morning to inquire where I might determine what is available. I talked to Mr. Guthrie. Mr. Guthrie said that Mr. Roberts was not in and he would not be on the floor when the House convened. So I asked him when I might be able to see him, and he said, "I do not know, but I will have to ask him when he can be contacted."

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to know what telephone service is available to the

Members when we move into the new building. The Clerk ought to advise us—not try to conceal this information. He ought to be a helpful employee of the House, and the employees of his office ought to be helpful too. And when Mr. Roberts cannot be on the job, he ought to see that someone is in charge who is competent, not arrogant, and who wants to be helpful—not an obstructionist.

EXCLUSIVE TERRITORIAL FRANCHISES THAT DO NOT VIOLATE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced H.R. 4862, a bill to provide that exclusive territorial franchises do not violate our antitrust laws under certain limited circumstances.

What is the meaning of a territorial franchise? To insure the availability of a brand or product so that it is always within easy access to the preponderant majority of potential consumers, the manufacturers of a brand or product designate a distributor within a specified territory—region, State, trading area or any other geographical subdivision—upon whom the responsibility rests to fortify the market potential of the product. It has been demonstrated that such maximum exposure virtually assures greater consumer acceptance.

Such a method of operation has long been a feature of the American marketing and merchandising system. As mass production gained momentum and modern technology became instrumental in producing prodigious quantities of products, the need arose for a corollary service—mass distribution. Indeed, if an adequate, nationwide mass distribution system did not exist, our efficient mass production system would become clogged.

It has been shown that notwithstanding the enormous annual expenditures on advertising, this huge investment yields tangible benefits only when the advertised products are assured the maximum number of outlets provided by the unexcelled American distribution system.

Our Nation's distribution system is, of course, second to none. Contributing to this accomplishment is the franchise system under which a distributor, having a stake in the success of the brand or product entrusted to him, accelerates its movement and thereby substantially increases its sale.

This vehicle of distribution is of particular benefit and urgency to the less affluent manufacturer whose financial resources do not permit the luxury of unlimited appropriations for advertising purposes. He, to a much greater extent than his more favorably circumstanced competitor, is in need of the proven services of his franchised distributor.

It is the avowed purpose of H.R. 4862 to clarify the legitimate role that this system plays in our economy.

GOLD RESERVE BILL

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks I made on the floor of the House on last Tuesday, February 9, in discussing the so-called gold reserve bill, H.R. 3818, I would like to quote the following paragraph which appeared on the front page of the Wall Street Journal of Friday, February 12, as follows:

> Monetary gold stocks of the United States fell $150 million in the week ended Wednesday. This brought the Nation's gold reserve down to $14,938 million, lowest since March 8, 1939. Compared with a total drain of $450,300,000 so far this year, there was a decline of only $125 million in all 1964.

LABOR DEPARTMENT URGES CHRISTMAS CARDS TO BAIT DOMESTIC FARM HELP

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Members of this body are informed that the Department of Labor has come up with an answer to a perplexing problem brought about by the expiration of Public Law 78.

The problem is how will the producers of our Nation's food secure domestic help willing to do the crop harvesting work formerly performed by Mexicans and other foreign workers.

The answer given by the Department of Labor is that our farmers might send prospective domestic workers Christmas cards, to make them feel wanted.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the advice of no less a personage than the Chief of Research and Wage Activities, Farm Labor Service, U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentlewoman suppose, in view of the emergency that exists, that it would be helpful if the farmers were to send out St. Patrick's Day greetings?

Mrs. MAY. I think that they had better send St. Patrick's Day greetings, because the harvest season is coming up soon, and if they do not get this domestic labor they will never be able to get the crops picked and processed. In this event the farmers would not be able to buy Christmas cards for themselves much less for prospective farm laborers come next Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, although I have referred to the speech concerning this Christmas card advice with some levity, I assure my colleagues that I consider this a very serious situation. Farm labor problems are now plaguing practically all States which are major producers of perishable crops. Quite naturally this was the main subject of discussion at the 58th Annual Convention of the National Canners Association which took place the first of this month, February, in San Francisco. Several hundred of the Nation's leading producers and processors attended this convention, all of them seriously concerned about the situation and quite naturally expecting all speakers at their convention to comment on it with reasonable understanding and intelligence.

Following the meeting a constituent of mine sent me a copy of the Produce News which carried an article written by a man who had covered the convention and heard the speeches. Here is a quote from that article:

> William J. Haltigan, Chief of Research and Wage Activities, Farm Labor Service, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, told the Canners: "The days of the bracero program are gone and the days of other foreign worker programs are numbered."
>
> He said the labor needs of U.S. agriculture must be met through employment of domestic workers.
>
> Shock and disbelief ran through the audience of several hundred of the Nation's food processors when the representative of the Department of Labor answered a question as to how domestic workers might be attracted to farm jobs with the comment that employers must induce workers who are chronically unemployed to accept farm jobs by "making them feel wanted." Asked how this might be achieved, he suggested that employers might try to send such workers Christmas cards and do other little things to establish identification with the workers.

You can be sure that there was shock and disbelief on my part, too, when I read the above quote from this publication's report of what was said at the convention by a representative of our Government in a high level position. The problem of obtaining sufficient agricultural labor to harvest 1965 crops is not a partisan question. I am sure that many of my colleagues in the majority party become just as worried as I do when spokesmen for this administration speak irresponsibly and thereby contribute to a lack of faith among our American citizens that Government agencies charged with important responsibilities have little or no understanding of the problem that we are earnestly trying to solve.

I know that American farmers have always voiced suspicion that the Department of Labor did not really understand their agricultural labor problem—but this is the first time in my recollection that a representative of the Department deliberately set out to prove that their suspicions were well founded.

Also appearing on the program with Mr. Haltigan were spokesmen from various areas of agricultural interest in the United States. They stressed the serious consequences that will follow if present policies of the U.S. Department of Labor are not reversed. I certainly hope Mr. Haltigan stayed around to listen to these speeches and here are some quotes from them as reported in The Produce News:

Max D. Reeder, general manager of operations for H. J. Heinz Co., said: "The substitution of machines for people poses a multitude of problems. The degree of mechanization varies with the crop, and crops most easily mechanized have already been mechanized. The mechanization of fruits and vegetables in most cases will require a change in plant or tree type as well as modern engineering design. Thus, most fruit and vegetable mechanizations are long-term projects."

G. C. Henry, representing California Packing Corp., pointed out that the policy of the U.S. Department of Labor to oppose the use of supplemental foreign workers in agriculture in the face of chronic labor shortages throughout the United States is entirely different from the attitude of government leaders in Europe, where the exchange of labor between nations has been encouraged to permit the expansion of agricultural industries to meet consumer food requirements.

DON'T WANT FARM JOBS

He noted that the Labor Department's estimate that nearly 4 million people are unemployed in the United States does not justify any presumption that these people will be willing to work in farm jobs. Breaking down the labor agency's own figures relating to unemployed, Mr. Henry explained that less than one-half of 1 percent of the labor force might conceivably be available for agricultural work. However, he further pointed out that these temporarily unemployed industrial workers are unlikely to join the migrant labor stream and thus rural farming areas can expect no success in attracting unemployed industrial workers from metropolitan areas.

Speaking for Florida agricultural interests was W. H. Anderson, Jr., assistant general manager of the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association. He said: "Growers in much of the Nation will soon be faced with a decision to plant as much seed as they did a year ago, to cut back their planting operations or to not plant at all."

MADE ON INDIVIDUAL BASIS

He said growers' decisions on these questions will be made on an individual basis and will be based "upon their respective judgments as to how this Government will respond to their plea for fair and reasonable treatment."

"The lack of any encouragement from the Secretary of Labor or from the White House," he said, "or assurance by our Government that it will indeed be sympathetic and responsive to the needs of our industry will no doubt be the determining factor as each individual producer decides his future role as a food producer in this Nation."

Mr. Anderson pointed out that the Nation "never has as much as a weeks supply of fresh fruits and vegetables en route from the producer to the market and available to the consumer."

He said: "Growers' decisions as to their future operations will be reflected in a very short time in every grocery store across the Nation. The responsibility will rest in the hands of a few officials in Washington."

The labor question aired before the canners convention came on the heels of a scandal that broke in California last week, when the director of the California State Department of Employment fired three managers of the employment service offices, demoted a fourth and suspended 10 other employees on charges that they had falsified placement records relating to their success in filling farm labor jobs in California.

Albert B. Tieburg, agency director, said the exposé of fictitious placements means that he "could never base a decision on the historical records of these offices."

According to the results of an investigation conducted by the State employment agency, personnel in the agency's local offices that were investigated had greatly exaggerated the numbers of workers supposedly placed in farm jobs. In one instance alone, Mr. Tieburg admitted that the phony placements detected by the investigating team ran to 50 single-spaced typewritten pages. Other employment service offices are being investigated as a result of the agency's findings.

LED TO WRONG CONCLUSION

California State Senator Vernon Sturgeon, from San Luis Obispo, charged that the falsified job placement records had led some officials to an improper conclusion as to whether adequate workers were available to replace Mexican workers that were recently ordered out of the United States by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz.

It was stated that the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security gave the California Employment Agency $47 million in 1963–64 and raised this to $52,600,000 in 1964–65, partly on the basis of its supposed placement achievements.

ITEM VETO WOULD CUT EXPENSES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, now is the time in the expanding economy and prosperity in the land, that we should cut out waste and inefficiency in Government and find positive ways toward eliminating the chronic deficit the country is running.

It is no wonder that fiscal experts, along with France's General de Gaulle, question the strength of our dollar, with the United States building on its $318 billion debt, which will jump in fiscal 1966 because of the planned $5 billion deficit by the Government.

We need to go slow on spending, and as one Congressman, I plan to cut expenses where possible until concrete plans are developed to reduce the national debt. One way to cut unnecessary expenditures would be to adopt my proposed constitutional amendment, House Joint Resolution 35, to provide the President with the power for an item-by-item veto of appropriations bills.

Another way to help our fiscal policy is to demand that foreign nations pay their debts to the United States. A major debtor is France. General de Gaulle should be required to pay the $6.5 billion debt owed for World War I and the $800 billion owed for World War II loans before we allow him to further drain our gold supply.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS TO THOSE WHO REMARRY AFTER AGE 62

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to change the social security law so that persons who wish to remarry after age 62 will not lose their present social security benefits. The Family Service Association, Inc., of Tampa, Fla., has been conducting a 3-year study, under the Ford Foundation, on "Services to the Aging." Their study has revealed the plight of many older persons who, because they were both lonely and compatible, wanted to marry, but could not afford to do so if they lost some of their social security benefits. The Family Service Association, from their firsthand knowledge of the situation facing many in my area, has urged that corrective legislation be enacted.

Under present law for example, a widow now receives 82½ percent of her husband's earned social security benefits, but if she remarries, she would lose those benefits, and she might not become entitled to new ones. If she does become entitled to social security benefits due to her second marriage, they might be considerably smaller than the former benefits.

I have spoken with an official of the Social Security Administration and am told that the cost factor would be negligible to put this amendment to the social security law into effect. This is because social security actuarial figures are based on the assumption that a widow over 62 will remain a widow until her death, and so the calculation of cost for her benefits is made on that basis and the sum provided at present to continue those payments for life.

It is a pleasure to join with other colleagues who have introduced similar legislation, urging that the social security law be changed so that persons past 62 who wish to remarry will not be penalized, but will be able to retain social security benefits to which they are entitled.

THE 145TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, 145 years ago in the town of Adams, Mass., Susan B. Anthony was born. I sincerely doubt that anyone who may have noted the event thought that the newly born baby was destined one day, not only to be added to the rollcall of American greats, but was destined to change the very Constitution itself.

To her, above all others, the women of America owe the political rights they possess. It was through her efforts that today they can exercise the most precious right that any citizen of a republic can possess—the right to vote. Yet she was more than a campaigner for women sufferage. Ida Harper wrote:

> Every girl who now enjoys a college education; every woman who has a chance of earning an honest living in whatever sphere she chooses, every wife who is protected by any law in the possession of her person and

property; every mother who is blessed with the custody and control of her own children; owes these sacred privileges to Susan B. Anthony. We do not underestimate the splendid services of other pioneers or their successors, but it is Susan B. Anthony's name that stands, and always will stand as the everlasting symbol of women's emancipation.

Mr. Speaker, not only do we Americans owe her our gratitude, but peoples everywhere are in her debt. Her cause did not die with her. The battles she fought so valiantly—and so often alone—are still being fought: in the Middle East, in the Far East, in Africa, and even in these United States. They shall continue to be fought until peoples everywhere enjoy equal rights and opportunities regardless of their caste or position in life, the color of their skins, or their sex.

Mr. Speaker, the principles that Susan B. Anthony stood for are still being advanced and battled for today in these very Halls. On this the anniversary of her birth let us each here and throughout this land rededicate ourselves to those principles—and ask, as she did, "not praise, but justice."

I should like at this point, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD an article by Mr. Bulkeley which appeared in the Berkshire Eagle on August 26, 1964, entitled "A Little Girl Who Remembered":

A LITTLE GIRL WHO REMEMBERED

(By Morgan Bulkeley)

MOUNT WASHINGTON.—Susan B. Anthony often recalled her Berkshire girlhood, though it was only the first 6 years of her 86. Many years after moving to New York State she wrote of the family burial of her mother's fourth child: "I can remember walking across a stubble field with grandfather, barefoot; grandfather's lifting me up and carrying me, so that I saw the little box put into the ground." This happened in the valley east of old Saddleback when Susan was less than 3 years old.

There, in South Adams at Bowen's Corners on the Savoy Road, Daniel Anthony, of six generations of Quaker stock, built a two-story, twin-chimney, clapboard house for his Baptist bride, Lucy Read. In 1820 in that house, which still stands as foursquare as the 13th, 14th, and 15th and 19th amendments, Susan Brownell Anthony was born.

Two years later, pioneering on a new frontier that became the industrial revolution in New England, Daniel Anthony built the first cotton textile mill in North Berkshire. By formal contract with his father-in-law, he agreed to use only as much water from Tophet Brook "as will run through a hole 6 inches in diameter." Without capital but with skillful hands and Yankee ingenuity, he parlayed the power from that almost dry brook into a career and a modest fortune.

Susan vividly remembered his log mill that the neighbors at first laughed at. It was 30 by 40 feet, 3½ stories high, with a marvelous overshot waterwheel reaching to the third floor. Inside, 26 looms hummed as one under the guidance of Vermont farm girls lured to Adams by the unheard-of wages of $3 a week for working 6 days from 6 to 6.

But if those hours were long in those days, hours at home could be longer. Susan never forgot her mother's daily drudgery, interrupted only by the bearing of eight children. Her mother danced for the last time on her wedding night while Quaker Daniel watched. Henceforth it was soft cradle songs for this woman who had longed to go into an open field at the foot of Greylock and sing at the top of her lovely voice. Susan remembered her silence.

Household tasks, arduous enough in days of manual labor, were doubly hard on a woman whose husband was away all day tinkering with his mill. She cooked and baked, washed and ironed, spun, wove and dyed, made and mended clothing, preserved fruits and vegetables, cured meat, pressed cheese, boiled soap, dipped candles; in short in a hundred ways kept house. Meanwhile she boarded as many as 11 of her husband's millhands at one time. A large amount of the outdoor farm work fell upon her also, and it was she who carried water to the house from a spring at the foot of the pasture. Susan remembered her slavery. Not until the year the family moved away could they afford the luxury of the services of a 13-year-old girl in the house.

As soon as they could use their hands, the three oldest Anthony girls learned that a woman was virtually a slave. Precious few were the moments of playing in the attic with rag dolls while rain thrummed on the roof, invariably they would be called to the kitchen for some fragrant task like cutting and stringing apple rings to dry. Sometimes they stole sunny moments on the front steps, spelling the words that "Uncle Sam Bowen" shouted across the Savoy Road from his tavern porch. The precocious Susan, who learned to read at three, could never remember whether whisky had an "e," nor could she forget the woe in the word women. Her life became a bequest from one silent, slaving mother, but it was to be dedicated to all the American women of the future.

The causes she advanced were many. Always in some way they involved the emancipation of women. She worked for a New York State Temperance Society, for woman suffrage, for the anti-slavery movement, for coeducation of the sexes, and for legal and economic independence for women.

On November 5, 1872, at 7 a.m., she became the first American woman to vote in a presidential election. Later she was arrested for it. Nevertheless the vote counted, probably more than any single vote before or since; for it started a national avalanche.

At her death in 1906, women's franchise was still controversial. Finally in 1920, the Susan B. Anthony amendment was ratified, and 26 million women of voting age were franchised. In 1956, 50 years ago after her death, women for the first time voted in equal numbers with men. It all started at Bowen's Corners in Berkshire.

THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL: HOW IT CAME ABOUT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 12, 1965, marked the birthday of our 16th President of this great Nation—Lincoln, the railsplitter; Lincoln the man; Lincoln the emancipator; Lincoln the judge; and Lincoln the President.

Abraham Lincoln, father of the Republican Party and defender of the oppressed will be revered forever in the hearts and minds of all Americans. He was noted for his understanding, his humble manner, his wit, and his deep concern for all humanity. In the heart of Abraham Lincoln, there were no prejudices—only love and a deep sense of dedication to his fellow man.

The memory of this great man will always be present in our Nation, especially when one stands before the Lincoln Memorial here in the Nation's Capital. It serves to continually remind us of the many virtues he possessed. More importantly, it reminds us that he was the preserver of this great Union and in his own words:

> I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time save slavery, I do not agree with them.

We could all take a page out of Lincoln's book in these times of peril and reflect for a moment upon those words.

The Lincoln Memorial, the shrine of our American heritage, was designed and sculptured by Daniel Chester French, who lived and worked in Stockbridge, Mass., which I am proud to represent in the Congress. His studio is located in an area which is rich in culture, being the former home of such great literary giants as Nathaniel Hawthorne; Herman Melville; Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and Edith Wharton, to mention only a few. In addition, it is the present home of the noted illustrator, Norman Rockwell; the summer home of the Boston Symphony, Tanglewood, and other forms of art too numerous to mention.

The studio of Daniel Chester French is still open to the public during the summer months, and in it is the model of the Lincoln statue. Mrs. William Penn Cresson, daughter of Mr. French, maintains this studio.

Mr. Speaker, I commend your attention to the article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on February 7, 1965, which was written by one of my constituents, Mr. John G. W. Mahanna, formerly a writer with the Berkshire Eagle and now associated with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Mr. Mahanna is a noted authority on the works of Daniel Chester French. His article follows:

THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL: HOW IT CAME ABOUT

(By John G. W. Mahanna)

Strength, power, and tension of the Great Emancipator all are reflected in the statue of the seated Abraham Lincoln in the memorial here, but few know that his right hand is a replica of the hand of the sculptor Daniel Chester French.

Although Lincoln lived in a period when photography was coming into its own, Mr. French was not satisfied with what he found in his research among the original collection of Brady and Gardner photographs. For weeks the sculptor studied Lincoln's physiognomy in the photographs. He examined Douglas Volk's life casts of Lincoln's hands in the Smithsonian Institution. These offered no solution.

Mr. French was determined to put into the whole figure a relaxed character, but at the same time he wanted to portray Lincoln as a mighty and fearless man. Lincoln's hands, Mr. French felt, held the answer.

Dissatisfied with all he had found in his research, the sculptor decided his own right hand might solve the problem. He went into his casting room in his studio in Stockbridge, Mass., anointed his own hand with oil and had one of his workmen cast it in plaster. The next day he had a plaster replica of this hand in exactly the position he needed for the statue. The right hand was to hang over the arm of the curule chair and the cast was made in that position.

MANY PORTRAYED LINCOLN

Mr. French spent 8 years working on the statue of Lincoln in his western Massachusetts studio. He spent many sleepless nights trying to figure out how best to portray Lincoln. Practically every American sculptor of prominence had tried his hand at the job. Some had failed. Many had produced capable works. A very few had excelled.

Lincoln had been depicted in every possible and impossible pose—on foot, on horseback, seated, and enthroned, dying, and dead. He had been represented as praying, speaking, thinking, pleading, and as Lincoln the railsplitter, Lincoln the man, Lincoln the emancipator, Lincoln the judge, Lincoln the President. He had been shown in majestic solitude, in forlorn loneliness, with his Cabinet, with his generals, with his friend the Negro. He had been visualized as the hungry boy thirsting for knowledge, stretched out on a cabin floor with shingle and charcoal. He had been seen as the country storekeeper, the itinerant attorney, but in so many of these capacities Lincoln was only laying the foundation of his unique career.

Mr. French was seeing him as Lincoln the President, the statesman and the preserver of the Union. The statue, Mr. French felt, should have the calm of the best Greeks and still retain the intense personality of the subject.

The idea of a memorial to Lincoln had first been projected in 1867 but it was not revived very seriously until 1911 when Congress appropriated nearly $3 millions for a building, a statue, and a site to place them on.

DECIDED ON CHAIR

John Hay, Lincoln's secretary and later Secretary of State, voiced his hope that the memorial to Lincoln should stand in line with the Washington Monument and the Capitol—the main axis of the L'Enfant plan of Washington.

The Fine Arts Commission finally decided that the memorial should be built in Potomac Park and chose Henry Bacon to become the architect and Mr. French to design the statue of Lincoln.

Mr. Bacon and Mr. French were both in agreement that the site demanded a seated figure, largely because of the many vertical notes of the columns of the memorial. Another vertical note, they felt, would be lost by repetition.

In keeping with a classic building, the armchair of the 1860's was out of the question and the curule chair was decided upon. The pose in such a chair, Mr. French felt, would bring out the largeness and breadth of Lincoln. The figure and the chair would become a spacious and integrated whole. It would have, at the same time, relaxation and solidity.

SCULPTOR RECEIVED $88,000

Mr. French, who was paid $88,000 for his seated statue of Lincoln, returned to his Stockbridge studio after many conferences with Bacon and began working on his figure of Lincoln, making clay sketch after clay sketch. When he finally became satisfied with a model, he made a sketch 7 to 8 inches in height, then another 3 to 4 feet high and finally the third which rose to 8 feet. These original casts are now part of the collection of Mr. French's works on display in his studio, which now is maintained by his daughter, Mrs. William Penn Cresson.

Eight years after he began working on the statue, Mr. French took the 8-foot plaster model to Washington to be tried out in the memorial. The small figure looked like a pygmy against its background of Indiana limestone, so the sculptor returned home and continued his experiments.

Huge photographic prints were made of the Lincoln statue. One was 18 feet in height and another 20 feet high. Mounted on beaverboard, the two large pictures looked real. Mr. French took them to Washington, where backed by 2- by 4-inch joists, they were set in the memorial. Workmen shifted them around in various locations—far back against the wall, pulled out 15 feet from the wall. They were viewed from the entrance, from between the columns, and from the steps. Finally it was decided to make the statue 19 feet in height with an 11-foot pedestal.

Entrusted with the task of cutting the marble for the seated Lincoln were the Piccirilli brothers, Italian artisans in New York. The Piccirillis and Mr. French held many conferences before they started cutting the figure from 28 separate blocks of Georgia marble. No such blocks of marble could be found without imperfections. Then, too, there was the problem of transporting them. The sections, some with curved surfaces, would not be fitted until they were put in place at the memorial. The work was done so well that unless one know where to look, he would hardly be able to find the seams.

CRITIC WROTE INSCRIPTION

The idea of an inscription over the statue of Lincoln was at first put aside because there were some who thought there should be no words except Lincoln's in the memorial.

After the statue was put in place, the space above Lincoln's head called for something to be inscribed. The architect, Mr. Bacon, called upon his close friend, Royall Cortissoz, art critic of the New York Herald Tribune, to write an inscription.

He wrote these words:

"In this temple as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever."

Mr. Cortissoz' words were cut into the wall over Lincoln's head. On the side walls, behind the columns, were cut Jules Guerin's murals and Lincoln's two great speeches—the Second Inaugural and the Gettysburg Address.

A crowd estimated at 200,000 gathered for the dedication of the Lincoln Memorial on Memorial Day, 1922. Chief Justice Taft had decreed that the ceremonies be kept simple. They were. He gave a brief account of the labors of the Fine Arts Commission.

HARDING QUOTED LINCOLN

President Harding, in accepting the memorial for the people, laid particular stress upon Lincoln's steadfastness under criticism, declaring:

"No leader ever was more unsparingly criticized or more bitterly assailed. He was lashed by angry tongues and ridiculed in press and speech until he drank from as bitter a cup as was ever put to human lips, but his faith was unshaken and his patience never exhausted."

Quoting Lincoln, President Harding recalled these words when the storm of criticism against him was at its height:

"If I were trying to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the best I know how, the very best I can; and I mean to keep on doing it to the end. If the end brings me out all right, that which is said against me will not amount to anything. If the end brings me out all wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference."

As the program drew to a close, Edwin Markham read his poem to Lincoln. Its concluding stanza which dramatically described Lincoln's death is also appropriate today to President Kennedy, whose grave beneath the shadow of the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery, like the Lincoln Memorial, is in line with the main axis of the L'Enfant plan of the District of Columbia.

It says:

"And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

FEBRUARY 12 ALSO 219TH BIRTHDAY OF TADEUSZ KOSCIUSZKO

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 12, the birthday of Lincoln, was also the 219th anniversary of the birth of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the great Polish hero who made such an outstanding contribution to the American revolution. As an American of Polish descent, I take particular pride in briefly recalling to the Members of the House the highlights of his unusual career in the cause of freedom both here in America and in his native Poland.

Inspired by a strong love of liberty, Kosciuszko came to America from Europe on borrowed money in order to help in our struggle for independence. His brilliant work in the planning and construction of fortifications for the Delaware River, Fort Defiance, and West Point, as well as his courageous service in a number of battles earned him the rank of brigadier general in the American Revolutionary Army.

Following our war for independence, Kosciuszko returned to Poland and served in his homeland as a leader in the unsuccessful insurrection against the Russian invaders. He came back to the United States after being released from a Russian prison and received land and money which had been awarded to him by the Congress in appreciation for his services to our country. Kosciuszko again returned to Poland in 1798 but never saw his own country regain its independence.

The memory of Kosciuszko's brilliant and heroic career will continue to be an inspiration to freedom-loving people everywhere. But the U.S. debt to him will never be repaid until we can develop a foreign policy which will help restore freedom to Poland, one of the countries betrayed at the infamous Yalta Conference in 1945. In fact, the freedom of enslaved peoples everywhere must be our goal not only for their sake, but because our own freedom will not be secure so long as Communist tyranny prevails in the world.

LEGISLATION FOR RELIEF OF OLD ORDER AMISH

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 18 I reintroduced my bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for individuals who are opposed to participation in such system on grounds of religious belief.

This legislation, H.R. 2963, is directed particularly for the relief of the Old Order Amish, who find participation in the social security system in conflict with their belief in the providence and care of God to meet future needs and their belief in their duty to provide for the care of their aged and needy members themselves. Members of this faith live in 19 States but number fewer than 20,000 adults.

In accordance with the American tradition of respecting the rights of religious minorities, there should be no objection to this legislation. Under present law, the Old Order Amish are subject to seizure of their property by the Federal Government to obtain funds for their social security payments.

Furthermore, the principle under which American citizens are exempted from military induction when they object on religious grounds should certainly apply to this instance of exemption from taxation for religious reasons. The Treasury Department has stated that it does not see any constitutional objection to such an exemption from the social security tax, citing the free exercise clause of the first amendment to the Constitution as the basis for this determination.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this nonpartisan legislation be given the consideration it deserves as soon as possible in this session of Congress so that this religious group may be allowed freedom from participation in a program which violates their religious beliefs. I know that all Americans would approve of the fairness and justice of such an action by the Congress.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF YALTA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 20th anniversary of the signing of the infamous Yalta Pact, which gave so many concessions to Communist Russia and enabled Stalin to enslave millions of people of central and eastern Europe and Asia.

Twenty years ago—February 11, 1945—an agreement was signed by President Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Joseph Stalin. It will go down in history as one fateful word: "Yalta."

The evil ghost of Yalta hovers over the haunted world. The authors of Yalta placed Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic, Balkan nations, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, and China with North Korea in Red bondage. The sins of Yalta have brought upon us the threat of world war III.

Soviet Russia is the menace to world peace as a direct result of the great sellout in Crimea on February 11, 1945.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include in the Record at this point an article which appeared in the February 6 edition of the Polish American of Chicago, Ill., by Columnist Harry E. Dembkowski.

Yalta Revisited

(By Harry E. Dembkowski)

A health resort in the Russian Crimea, located on the shores of the Black Sea, Yalta was the scene of a conference of the big three Allied Powers in February of 1945, during World War II. This month marks the 20th anniversary of that conference. But in Washington, D.C., among our officials in the mighty councils of Government, it is a silent anniversary. Scarcely is a murmur being heard of it. Where are the parades, speeches, and fanfare? The anniversary is being ignored. The U.S. Government—which has sought to forget about Yalta almost since its occurrence—does not wish to be reminded of it. But the reasons which cause our Government to forget, are the very same reasons which cry out for its reexamination—lest we forget.

At Yalta—the second of the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin meetings the first being at Teheran, a year before—many problems were discussed, mainly in regard to winning the war. The Polish question was but one of many items on the agenda. Roosevelt and, to a lesser extent, Churchill, were still convinced that, if they would only be agreeable and make concessions to Stalin, the Soviet Union would be peaceful and cooperative in the postwar world. Roosevelt was particularly eager to have Russian participation in the United Nations.

As a result Roosevelt and Churchill were willing to sacrifice the interests of Poland—along with many other interests—for the possible cooperation of a totalitarian, communistic regime, which already had a record of broken treaties and agreements.

Specifically, Roosevelt and Churchill agreed to yet another partition of Poland in which, without the consent of either the Polish Government or the people, nearly one-half of the country was given to Russia. This agreement was objectionable on many grounds.

It was illegal: A violation of the 1921 Treaty of Riga in which Russia had recognized her borders with Poland.

It was immoral: a violation of the principles of democracy and self-determination—as embodied, for instance, in the much heralded Atlantic Charter of 1941.

It is true, of course, that some German territory was given to Poland in partial compensation for the Russia theft—but it is also true that this compensation has never been officially recognized by the United States, although the Russian acquisition of eastern Poland was almost immediately recognized.

"Yalta" is more than a town or a conference or a simple event in history. Of all which has happened in this century, it is perhaps—with the exception of the German invasion and occupation—most highly symbolic of that bitter gall which the Poles have been forced to taste. For it was at Yalta that the United States—once believed to be the citadel of international justice and morality—became copartner to one of the most cynical and perverse diplomatic deals in recent memory.

Yalta is symbolic of the ultimate irresponsibility of power politics when the rights of smaller nations are overlooked by the great powers in their reckless pursuit of higher worldwide objectives.

Yalta is the most profane blot upon American diplomacy and honor yet encountered in its history.

And what has Western civilization reaped? The false policies pursued during and following World War II—of which Yalta is but one instance—have yielded a most poisonous harvest—the cold war—as well as the ghastly specter of a possible war of universal annihilation. All of which should surprise no one. For the price of perfidy is always high.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to rehash the tragic past but to call attention at this time to the anniversary of Yalta in order to forewarn the administration not to enter into any new agreements with the Soviet Union during the forthcoming exchange of visits between President Johnson and whoever is the Soviet dictator at that time.

The tragic lessons of the past should prepare us well. May I especially point out that over the years responsible Members of the Congress have been continually critical of the after effects of the Yalta Conference and have repeatedly called it to the attention of the State Department so as to avoid future Yaltas.

The aftermath of the Yalta agreement is seen today in many areas. Millions of Americans believe that the Yalta agreement should be denounced and declared not valid. All unilateral actions undertaken by Stalin under the cloak of that most unfortunate result of personal diplomacy should be declared illegal. Only a complete and unhesitating renunciation of the Yalta agreement by the Congress and the executive branch of our Government could restore American prestige in Europe and Asia.

DEDUCTIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, higher education certainly is recognized as the key to the future. I am sure all agree that our young people must be encouraged to prepare for tomorrow, and their parents must be given additional consideration in their efforts to provide for the further training of their children. That is why I am today introducing a bill to allow taxpayers to deduct some expenses for higher education on their personal income tax forms.

My bill would allow deductions for tuition, fees and books, and would be available to either the parents or the student himself if he pays or contributes to his own education at a college or other institution of higher learning. This bill would provide tax relief where it does the most good, on the local level. A dollar's worth of tax reduction buys a full dollar's worth of education without experiencing the shrinking effect of traveling here to Washington and back to the local community.

My tax deduction bill is not intended as a substitute for any other form of aid to higher education. Current loan and scholarship programs, particularly those to help families in greatest financial need, must be continued. My proposal is intended to help the millions of families with limited incomes who cannot stand the staggering burden of educating their children at costs that run as high as $3,000 per student each year. They deserve a deduction on their income tax forms just as much as a taxpayer who claims medical expenses or casualty losses.

My bill also contains a sliding income scale, whereby the families with lower incomes will receive increased benefits in the form of deductions for the expenses paid toward higher education than those with the highest incomes.

Parents in America know the value of an education and sincerely want to adequately prepare their children for the future. We must explore every avenue in an effort to make sure that no student misses out because of financial considerations. My bill will be an important step in that direction.

It is hoped that the Congress will seriously consider and pass some form of tax deduction or credit for higher education during this session of the 89th Congress.

THE DEPRESSED RURAL ECONOMY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Committee of the Independent Bankers Association, meeting recently in Washington, has issued a frightening position paper on the depressed rural economy, and it should be made mandatory reading in the Great Society.

The committee finds that "country bank loans to farmers are dangerously close to deterioration." The committee warns that "the time approaches when banks will have to terminate credit availability to thousands of farmers in rural America. This will force liquidation of numerous farm units and subsequently the destruction of thousands of rural businesses that serve farmers."

The committee points out that some 30 percent of the U.S. population lives in rural communities of 2,500 and under and on surrounding farms.

This report confirms, of course, what many of us have been trying desperately to get across to a sleepy, unaware public in the hope of obtaining corrective action—such as a halt of the disastrous practice of Commodity Credit Corporation feed-grain dumping.

This unwise practice has constantly depressed the market and the traditional concept of support prices has been destroyed. What originally was intended was a floor below which farm prices would not fall. But under the practice of CCC, the floor has become the ceiling, driving farm net income to its lowest level since depression years. The parity ratio of farm income now stands at 74 percent.

Giant corporate farm operators have been able to buy CCC feed stocks at below cost of production, setting up poultry, beef producing factories, and so forth, in competition with the livestock farm, existing on fixed high costs.

I request the inclusion of the IBA position paper at this point in my remarks:

IBA POSITION ON THE DEPRESSED RURAL ECONOMY

A specter is haunting the rural banks of the United States.

It is the ghost of the 1930's, when more than 10,000 banks collapsed, most of them in rural areas.

If the disaster of the thirties seems remote in these soaring sixties, remember that the lengthening shadow of the great depression went unnoticed as America danced its way through the roaring twenties. Then the big credit bubble burst and gaiety turned to despair on an October Friday in 1929.

Depressions have always had their beginning at a peak of prosperity, and they always are farm led and farm fed.

It is now apparent that the mistakes of the twenties are being repeated. Commercial banks are loaned up to historically high levels in ratio to available deposits. The easy money of the sixties has made us a seemingly affluent society and we are now reaching for the Great Society.

But those who see a bright future for America apparently are not aware of a new shadow that has crept over the horizon. The most significant feature of the American economy today is this: rural banks cannot much longer continue to supply the credit needs of rural America. Since 1951, farmers have been using credit as a substitute for earned income because of depressed agricultural raw material prices.

With the inception of its agricultural research program 3½ years ago, the Independent Bankers Association has warned repeatedly that such credit could not continue indefinitely. The association has urged that action be taken to revive the economy of rural America before the point of no return was reached, but the downward drift has been allowed to continue.

The association now finds it necessary to caution its member banks to be concerned with the quality of their loanable assets. Country bank loans to farmers are dangerously close to deterioration.

The IBA is not alone in its concern.

At the recent convention of the American Bankers Association, the ABA urged a retreat from easy credit. In a convention resolution the ABA said "It is difficult to find justification for the degree of ease which now prevails in credit markets."

Insurance companies and large as well as small lenders are voicing the same caution. Similar experiences are being reported by the Production Credit Associations and by the Farmers Home Administration. It has been said that unless corrective action is taken soon, the FHA will one day be known as the graveyard for bankrupt farm loans.

Firsthand experience of bankers throughout rural America shows farmers holding assets of uncertain value which appear to support bank loans as collateral. The farm borrower continues to demonstrate excellent integrity. But his house falls in when his integrity and assets are measured against the profit entry on his operating statement. There just isn't enough left to make a dent in his debts.

In case after case, depreciation transfers are completely used up in paying operating expenses or providing food, clothing, and other bare essentials for the farm family.

Rural bankers believe we have been building our economic future on a weak foundation. Our facade of prosperity has been achieved at the expense of the producers of agricultural raw materials.

We have not constructed true economic wealth at all, but a will-o'-the-wisp prosperity in which some segments of the economy have been fattened by feeding upon another. Since the land represents the beginning point of our country's wealth, such prosperity can only be temporary. It will eventually fall of its own weight.

In the absence of adequate profits in agriculture, essential to reduction of ever-increasing debt, the time approaches when banks will have to terminate credit availability to thousands of farmers in rural America. This will force liquidation of numerous farm units and subsequently the destruction of thousands of rural businesses that serve farmers.

One result will be the loss of a market for an important portion of our total output of goods and services. This indicates a cutback in industrial production and an increase in unemployment. Whatever gains can be made through the administration's antipoverty program will be more than canceled out by the inability of the rural population to earn a living.

And remember—some 30 percent of the U.S. population lives in rural communities of 2,500 and under, and on the farms surrounding them.

Because net farm income has declined while the income of other segments of the economy has soared to record levels, the farmer has been caught in a cost-price squeeze. The result has been a drop of more than 3 million in agricultural employment since 1949. This would seem to have been the source of a large percentage of the total unemployment today. It is now contributing more to the poverty of the Nation than any other single factor.

In the face of this, the prevailing economic philosophy calls for the elimination of 2½ million additional farmers. These would not just be the "little inefficient farmers." They would be a broad category of farmers—large and small alike.

We have apparently overlooked the most obvious answer to the unemployment problem. An expanded rural economy would slow down the outmigration of farmers. It would create an expanded rural labor force, both on the farm and in the rural communities.

Government figures show that the largest pocket of poverty in America today is in the rural areas.

The farmer is in a state of economic depression because he is not getting a fair price for his production. That is, farm raw material prices are not in balance with the prices of other segments of the economy.

The situation has occurred not because of any inexorable laws of economics, but because important political and business interests have served to gain from maintaining farm raw material prices at depressed levels.

Our profit-starved rural economy has been dependent on massive doses of credit every year since 1953. This credit will one day have to be repaid. When we do this we will deprive the market in some future years of the income necessary to consume our annual production at a profitable price level.

The farmer has been using credit to keep his head above water. His borrowing always is in anticipation of future profits, but the sad fact remains that repayment often is made from liquidation of assets accumulated in prior years.

There is a limit to the amount of credit that is available in the United States. Expanded credit cannot much longer serve as a substitute for adequate earnings in agriculture.

Ten thousand banks collapsed between 1931 and 1934 because of the necessity for rural bankers to withdraw loanable funds from agriculture. The reason the bankers were compelled to collect farm loans at an accelerated pace was severe underpayment for agricultural raw material production.

To prevent a repetition of this catastrophe, we recommend that the Federal Government give the same attention to farm prices that it has given to civil rights, the war on poverty, tax reduction and other priority measures.

If farm prices are restored to relative balance with the rest of the economy, we can achieve a huge bonus of output and income by making full use of all of our resources and raw material, human and financial. We can provide full employment, full plant capacity, balance the budget and commence retirement of the national debt.

ANNUAL REPORT COVERING U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY FOR THE YEAR 1963—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 88)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the International Atomic Energy Agency Participation Act, the seventh annual report covering U.S. participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency for the year 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 15, 1965.*

ANNUAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964 OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 89)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the annual report for fiscal year 1964 of the National Science Foundation as required by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

At the end of the war the advance of science was a source of pervading pessimism in our land—and around the world. There were fears that the onrush of man's knowledge would outrun man's wisdom and speed humanity toward its own extinction. With the establishment of the National Science Foundation, we committed ourselves to the development of peaceful science, and now our times are marked and moved by an optimism and hopefulness rare in all the history of mankind.

At its source much of our optimism flows from the confidence which both the advance and application of scientific knowledge permits. As science has provided us with new insights into man's antecedents, so science also has unlocked for us new visions of man's possibilities. Science has given us new knowledge of matter and of living things, a better understanding of natural processes, new and unexpected glimpses into what we can achieve in the future. The power over nature which science is giving our generation permits us to look forward with hope toward the solution of many age-old problems, if we apply results of the scientific advance well and wisely.

In the gains and change of these postwar years, American science has played a central role. Science has flourished in America as never before. While human knowledge has never known—and must never know—national boundaries, it is a fact that our Nation's resources, stability, and political purposes have permitted American science to benefit the world to an extent unique in modern times.

A vital factor in our achievements has been our national effort toward understanding, anticipating, and supporting the creative force and constructive ends of science dedicated to peace, not conquest—to elevating human life, not oppressing it. This responsible approach toward science has come broadly, throughout our society, but a key role has been taken by the Federal Government.

While possessed of no special gift of foresight, the Federal Government has taken a forward-looking role, exercising both desirable initiative and appropriate self-restraint. Support for science has come from the Government without thought of making science subservient to the Government. The virtually undisputed leadership held by America today in the realm of science and technology is a conspicuously visible testament to the greater compatibility a free society affords to the spirit of free inquiry.

If balance has been approached in our overall support of our free science, credit is abundantly due the unheralded and frequently underestimated role of the National Science Foundation. Under its first Director, Dr. Alan T. Waterman, and now under the outstanding leadership of Dr. Leland Haworth, whose first annual report I am transmitting, the Foundation has fulfilled many times over the intent and hopes of the Congress which established it at the beginning of the last decade.

Close and understanding accord between science and public affairs is an imperative for free societies today. As I am so acutely aware, no national policy or purpose of the United States is unaffected by the present state or prospective scope of our scientific knowledge.

We look to it—

For the technology and industry which will supply us with new products and new jobs to meet our needs.

For the health programs which will eventually conquer disease and disability.

For the purposeful and useful exploration of the seas around us and the space above us.

And, most especially, for the guidance that will permit us to proceed with greater security and greater confidence toward our goals of peace and justice in a free world.

As no other force has contributed more materially to our effective pursuit of happiness in America, so it is true that no other force is now requiring of us the more careful examination and reexamination of the workings, values, and aspirations of our society. Science is changing many of the very premises on which our greatly successful American society has been built over the past two centuries. If we are to strive toward our society's continuing success and further greatness, we must not merely commit ourselves to its support—we must involve ourselves in seeking to understand the profound changes which it promises.

For all that has been wrought in this land, we must understand that these are the infant years of a new age—not the aging days of an old era.

Our wisdom must be always the equal of our knowledge and information. For that reason, I commend to you this report from the National Science Foundation, created and supported by the Congress, and encourage your unchanging steadfastness in support of what is required to assure America's continuing leadership in the science and technology of our times.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 15, 1965.*

GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 87)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The past year has seen important advances in the program to develop a global communications satellite system. The first launch of a commercial satellite is to take place in the early months of this year.

Through the initiative of the United States an international joint venture has been established. Under the law I have designated the Communications Satellite Corp. as the U.S. participant. The corporation is to be the manager on behalf of all participants.

The corporation has now been financed, has constituted its first board of directors to replace the original incorporators and has moved forward with its program. All agencies of the Government with responsibilities under the act have made important and faithful contributions with the sympathetic assistance of the congressional committees concerned.

The new and extraordinary satellite telecommunications medium bringing peoples around the globe into closer relationship is nearer to fulfillment, heralding a new day in world communications.

As required by section 404(a) of the Communications Satellite Act, I herewith transmit to the Congress a report on the national program for development and application of the communications satellite technology to the services of mankind.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 15, 1965*.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 86)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Nation's Capital should be a city in which every American can take justifiable pride, for the District of Columbia is more than a city—it is the seat of the Federal Government and the home of our most meaningful national shrines.

Our Founding Fathers not only planned a great nation but a great capital city for that nation. Their foresight and dedication—and the patient work of generations of Americans—have built a beautiful and inspiring National Capital. But for cities, as for men, there is no standing still. We progress or we fall back. This administration will not fail in the stewardship vested in it for the Nation's Capital. It is dedicated to enhancing and preserving the beauty and dignity of our Capital and to the improvement of the lives of its citizens.

There is much to be done. The programs that I propose envision immediate as well as long-range changes and improvements. We must continue and strengthen our efforts and more effectively marshal our resources to achieve the goals of an even better city. Every American must always be able to point to his Nation's Capital as a living expression of the highest ideals of democratic government.

I

Home rule: The most significant requirement, and one which can be accomplished immediately, is the restoration to the citizens of the District of Columbia of the direction and control of their own local affairs. I have already set out my recommendations in this respect in a message to the Congress proposing the necessary legislation.

II

Municipal services: The Federal Government, until home rule has been achieved, and the District government thereafter, must attack the deficiencies in programs which now exist. Those deficiencies which follow are only the most important and the most urgent.

A. Education: No more important responsibility rests on any local government than the provision of adequate educational facilities for its younger citizens. No need is more urgent than that of providing for all boys and girls the opportunity to secure the highest and best education of which they are capable.

First. The public school system of the District, which already has many achievements to its credit, must become one of the great school systems in the Nation.

Curriculums and teaching methods must reflect the best experience available in the United States, particularly as it is related to young people who come to the schools from disadvantaged circumstances at home. The most highly qualified teachers must be recruited, and teachers in temporary category reduced to a minimum. More supporting personnel, particularly counselors, are needed. No child should lack adequate textbooks and no school should lack either an adequate library or a trained librarian. Vocational education must be more closely related to the demands of the modern world, as well as to the opportunities for further training which will be afforded by the community college. Improvements can be made in the training of the physically and mentally handicapped which will enable many more to achieve full or partial self-sufficiency.

The physical plant, within a decade at most, should be made adequate. New buildings should continue the principles of modern school design now being pursued. More immediately, there must be adequate space for every child, including, needless to say, those whom improved facilities, improved educational measures, and improved economic conditions will prevent becoming dropouts. The Capital of the richest nation on earth cannot tolerate part-time classes, classes in makeshift rooms, and classes so large that instruction becomes difficult or impossible.

Second. A committee of nationally recognized educators, after careful examination of the District's situation, has recommended that the District should establish immediately a community college and a college of liberal arts and sciences, under a Board of Higher Education. The former institution would provide a 2-year program, including both the first 2 years of college work and advanced technical training in a variety of subprofessional skills. The latter, which would absorb the present District of Columbia Teachers College, would emphasize teacher training but would also provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, growing as the need developed. These two institutions should be brought into being without delay. I will shortly recommend to the Congress the necessary legislation.

Third. The District should participate in the residential vocational school program authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Such a school can demonstrate the advantages of combining the most modern vocational education with the healthy and stimulating living environment now missing from the lives of many District children. It is my hope that plans for a school will be made immediately with the help of the Commissioner of Education.

B. Health and welfare: The public health effort in the District has been impressive in recent years, and the momentum must be continued. Health is essential to the productivity and financial independence of individuals, and to a sound economy. Adequate programs to prevent disease and disability, to combat mental retardation, to reduce preventable deaths, especially among infants, and to provide medical care and related services to those unable to pay for them, are essential District needs.

The reconstruction and enlargement of District of Columbia General Hospital now underway will ease the congestion there, but urgent need exists for the establishment of community health centers in several parts of the city, to bring health services closer to the people for whom they are designed. These centers, by including the facilities needed for comprehensive community-based mental health services, will also bring the District to the forefront in carrying out both the present national mental health program and the additional programs which I have recently recommended.

Improvements in physical plant must be matched by increased availability of services. We know now that denial of preventive services, based on unrealistic standards of medical indigency, are not measures of economy, but rather guarantees of increasing costs of social services later on. The provision of prenatal care is a classic example. Children's Hospital, which by reason of its specialized facilities for the young is unique, and stands among the best in its field in the United States, must be put on a sound financial basis.

A proper welfare program must not only be tightly administered and free of cheating and fraud, but also must insure that those in actual need of aid are provided for in a manner and at a level consistent with decency and humanity. Not only is this in the American tradition, but it is also prudent. Inadequate programs inadequately staffed exact a price we cannot afford to pay, in delinquency, crime, disease, broken homes and broken lives. Nor can we ignore the added costs of institutional care for the children and the elderly from families whose resources, tenuous at best in many cases, collapse and are lost in extremes of poverty. Further District participation in the programs made possible by the 1961 and 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act should no longer be delayed.

C. Public safety: The District has not been spared in the general increase in crime now being experienced throughout the United States. The impairment of the security of person and property, and the mounting rates of juvenile crime, are matters of major concern.

The problems run deep, and will not yield to quick and easy answers. We must not weaken our resolve to identify and eliminate the causes of criminal activity. This is the thrust of the District's program to combat juvenile delinquency in the Cardozo area—a program which must be extended as needed throughout the District as rapidly as its component parts can be evaluated. This is an important aspect of the program to combat poverty, and of the programs for improvement in education, health, welfare, housing, and recreation.

All these are vital, but they are not enough. Crime will not wait while we pull it up by the roots. We must have a fair and effective system of law enforcement to deal with those who break our laws. We have given too low a priority to our methods and institutions of law enforcement—our police, our criminal courts, and our correctional agencies. This neglect must not continue, and the District should be the first to remedy it.

The police are our front line, both offensive and defensive, in the fight against crime. We ask the policeman to fit our principles to hard realities, to make our rules just in their operation, to apply our laws to an infinite variety of human situations. Because he represents the law to the great majority of our people, we ask him to impart respect for law in his every act. As the representative of government whom we send out in the streets, we impose on him a job of social aid and accommodation as many-sided as government itself.

To do all of these things well, the policeman must be a man of high caliber attracted to police work by sufficiently strong incentives, and trained beyond anything we have heretofore thought necessary. The police department must have a closer working relationship with the social agencies of the community, for their problems and objectives are so often connected or concurrent. There is a great need for all people to learn about, to understand, and to assist the policeman in his work.

The courts have traditionally been the symbol and the guardian of our cherished freedoms, but local criminal courts are so overloaded that their image is tarnished, their functioning impeded, and their effectiveness weakened. More courts and judges is one answer, but need not be the only one. Full-scale court proceedings might be eliminated for minor offenses which could be handled by administrative arrangements under close judicial supervision. Certain types of offenders might be referred directly to social agencies for non-judicial treatment. Some conduct which we now label criminal might better be removed from the criminal system and dealt with more effectively and appropriately elsewhere. Every possibility must be explored.

Correctional agencies charged with responsibility for those who have been found guilty of a criminal offense face enormously complex problems. Some of the time-honored methods are proving to be inadequate. Many new ideas are being developed and applied, with still uncertain results. We cannot wait until they are certain. We should put to work in the District the most promising attempts to cure the maladjustments which lead to crime. We cannot tolerate an endless, self-defeating cycle of imprisonment, release and reimprisonment which fails to alter undesirable attitudes and behavior. We must especially find ways to help the first offender avoid a continuing career of crime.

These needs are urgent, and our responses in the District will aid and encourage efforts throughout the Nation. It will not do merely to attempt minor changes; the problem is too big and too important to the community. We must seek the broadest and most imaginative improvements in the entire legal and social structure of our criminal law and its administration. To do this, I shall establish a commission which will concern itself specifically with crime and law enforcement in the District. It will enlist the best advice and assistance available, both in and out of the Federal Government, and will work closely with the national panel to be created shortly. Our goal must be no less than the planning and establishment in the District of a model system which will best achieve fair and effective law enforcement.

There are, in addition, opportunities for immediate action. Some control of firearms within the District is urgently needed. Legislation providing for the registration of pistols, which is an appropriate first step, will shortly be transmitted to the Congress by the Commissioners. The police department should be enlarged, as I have recommended in the District's budget. Moreover, it should be afforded authority and funds to pay for overtime work, and to employ clerical and other workers to permit officers to use their police training to full advantage. Both would increase its effective strength.

D. Recreation: The District has not yet caught up with the needs of its citizens—either young or old—for facilities which permit them to relax and to play. Some areas of the city lack these facilities, particularly areas where incomes are low, and where residents are generally lacking in the resources to enable them to take advantage of recreational facilities elsewhere. The goal must be an adequate system of recreational facilities throughout the District within the next decade.

The John F. Kennedy playground, largely equipped by private citizens, demonstrates not only the possibilities but also the enthusiastic response of the community to adequate play space. Equally desirable facilities should be provided in other parts of the District, particularly in areas now inadequately served.

E. Housing and urban renewal: The District, in common with other American cities, suffers badly from a major shortage of housing adequate for its lower income groups. Public housing is being supplied for low-income families displaced by public projects; but nonpriority families and large families even with priority are afforded little relief. More public housing is an urgent necessity. Devices such as the housing of large families in individual houses by means of rent subsidies must be continued and expanded. New solutions must be developed and applied.

Equally important are measures to secure decent housing for the families whose incomes are high enough to make them ineligible for public housing, but who cannot find decent, safe, and sanitary private accommodations at prices or rents they can afford. There must be more vigorous efforts in the District, both public, and private, to take advantage of all the programs now available under the national housing laws.

The District's urban renewal program must make a major effort in the years ahead to provide decent housing for low- and moderate-income families. The rehabilitation and renewal project now underway in Northwest Urban Renewal Area Project No. 1 may well offer an approach which can provide experience for similar projects elsewhere. There must be vigorous and prompt enforcement of the housing code, particularly in those areas where continuing deterioration may escalate into irrecoverable slums. Too little effort has been exerted to assure that violations are detected and corrected promptly. Both tenants and landlords must be made aware of their responsibilities as well as their rights.

Urban renewal powers must be made available to the District, as they are to other cities, to aid in the development of blighted commercial areas. They are particularly needed in the central city, where the demonstrated interest of the business community insures a fruitful cooperation between public and private efforts.

There is need, too, for a reorganization of the urban renewal and public housing machinery of the District, in order that it may be more responsive to the District's multiple needs. Immediate attention must be given to changes which will focus appropriate responsibility, and commensurate authority, in the District's Board of Commissioners. Some delays are inherent in major urban projects, and no doubt this has been particularly true during the early years of the urban renewal program, but we can no longer afford or tolerate such delays.

F. Poverty: The District can and should be a leader and an example to the Nation in the attack on poverty. Already there is a bold beginning, coordinated by the United Planning Organization, and using the combined resources of the Federal and District Governments and generous aid from both the Ford and the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundations. But the war on poverty is not to be won in one cataclysmic battle. It is more a war of attrition, in which there must be no letup of effort. The District must continue to provide training, counseling, employment services, and other aid on a coordinated and more intensive basis to those who are now unemployed or so underemployed that they cannot provide support for their families. It must have a minimum wage law expanded to cover men, as well as women and children. It must provide the educational help and other aids which will insure that the next generation, the potential welfare clients of the 1970's and 1980's, meet the challenge of our new technology and become self-supporting. We must break the cycle of poverty and dependency. It can be done. It will, in the long run, be far less expensive than any other course.

III

The District and the National Capital region: The District of Columbia is no longer the largest element of the Washington metropolitan region, either in number of residents or in area. Increasingly, the problems of the District blend into and become a part of regional problems. Transportation, water, air pollution, sewage and waste disposal, fire and police protection, recreation, employment, and economic development are only a partial list of matters in which neither the District nor any other part of the area can proceed behind its own jurisdictional curtains.

A. Transportation: The most critical of the regional development needs is transportation. Washington is now the only major capital in the Western World lacking a rail rapid transit system. There is urgent need to begin the construction of such a system—largely within the District at the beginning, but eventually extending into the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia. I have already transmitted to the Congress proposed authorizing legislation.

The highway program, both within and without the District, must likewise not be allowed to lag. The cooperative efforts of District and Federal agencies through the Policy Advisory Committee to review some elements of the program should be continued. Construction should proceed as rapidly as funds can be made available.

B. Regional development: I have already indicated my hopes that the Potomac River will become a model of beauty and usefulness for the Capital and the Nation. There are, however, many other problems of the Washington metropolitan area for which long-range metropolitan solutions are necessary. The interest of the Federal Government in the best development of the region is manifest, and its cooperation in resolving regional problems is essential. We must encourage and facilitate local efforts to create effective organs of regional cooperation. In addition, the Federal Government must utilize its own policies and programs to assist the region to develop in a way which will maximize the efficiency and economy of Federal Government operations, and which will permit this region to exemplify to the United States and to the world the best in regional cooperation and metropolitan growth.

IV

Washington as a national capital: The District, as the Nation's Capital, must meet the special requirements imposed on the capital city of a great nation. We are committed to preserving and enhancing the great avenues, the great museums and galleries, the great sweep of the Mall.

Legislation is being prepared in connection with the proposals to transform Pennsylvania Avenue from its present shabby state to a new dignity and grandeur. As long as blight and ugliness disfigure any part of this historic link between the Capitol and the White House, it cannot suitably serve as the main ceremonial avenue of the Nation, either to American citizens or to visitors from abroad. The proposal need not be undertaken at once in all of its aspects, but every aid and encouragement should be given to further study and refinement of its details and to the establishment of the creative partnership of Government and private enterprise needed to convert the avenue into a thoroughfare worthy of the Nation's pride.

There are other areas where needed improvements can also be accelerated. The Washington Monument can be given the setting it deserves as soon as the development of the freeway from the Roosevelt Bridge to the 14th Street Bridge, and the 9th and 14th Street underpasses of the Mall permit the elimination of the 15th Street traffic from near the base of the monument. The temporary buildings which huddled at its base are already gone, and the plans to improve its immediate surroundings must be pushed forward.

The Lincoln Memorial, long throttled by a circle of heavy automobile traffic, can be freed of its noose as soon as the freeway running beneath its grounds permits the area facing the Reflecting Pool and the monument to be reserved for the visitor on foot. The memorial will not achieve its proper setting, however, until the remaining obsolete and temporary buildings on Constitution Avenue are eliminated.

There are many other projects. Temporary buildings on public space throughout the monument area must be removed. There is need to carry forward the plans to develop the potential of the Mall, so that it may be a place of life and beauty, of pleasure and relaxation. There is need for a visitors' center which will provide perspective and understanding regarding the Federal Government to the myriad students and tourists who come to Washington to see and learn.

There is also urgent need to proceed with the improvement of the central business district in a way which permits full coordination with the progress on Pennsylvania Avenue. The full potential of Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capitol to the Anacostia River as a major entranceway to the city has not been realized. There is the development of Washington's waterfront in connection with the new aquarium. There is the need to identify landmark buildings and places, and to work out means by which to encourage their preservation.

The District presents both a challenge and an opportunity. Here we have natural beauty as well as buildings of historic and architectural value. The great sweep of the Potomac River, Rock Creek Park, and the ring of parks where the old Civil War forts stood make the District a city in a park. In its heart the grandeur of the Mall, the many circles and squares, and the great street trees carry natural beauty to everyone.

Today there is new awareness of our urban environment. We can, if we will, make the District the symbol of the best of our aspirations. We can make it a city in which our citizens will live in comfort and safety, and with pride, and in which commerce and industry will flourish. We can make it a capital which its millions of visitors will admire. All this we must do. I am sure the Congress will join me in accepting the challenge.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 15, 1965.*

PROPOSED ADJUSTMENT OF WITHHOLDING TAXES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, millions of American taxpayers are shocked to find themselves owing the Federal Government a great deal more income tax for 1964 than they had expected.

This is a debt few of them anticipated and that many are not financially prepared to meet without serious economic hardship.

Because income taxes were underwithheld by the Government last year, through confusion and conflict in the administration's tax rate bill, taxpayers now must pay the penalty for the Government's carelessness in setting up a two-stage drop in the tax rate, while allowing a larger, one-stage drop in withholding. Many of us cautioned that payroll deductions would not be large enough, but no steps were taken to correct the inequity and taxpayers were urged to spend their bigger take-home paychecks. The onus is on the Government, not the unsuspecting taxpayer.

Only last week, Congressman UTT introduced legislation to spread payments due on April 15 over the next year so that taxpayers will not feel such a heavy impact at this time. Economic problems on the family level are quickly reflected in the national economy, and I fear the repercussions that mass borrowing and depletion of personal savings accounts could have. I am therefore cosponsoring a bill to give taxpayers a chance to adjust withholding taxes so that the time for payment of one-half of the 1964 withholding deficiency will be April 15, 1966. By adjusting withholding taxes during the balance of 1965, it would, in effect, restore a two-stage withholding system to correspond with the two-stage tax reduction.

Because April 15 is drawing near, and because taxpayers are being urged to file returns early, I hope that the House will take remedial action just as quickly as possible.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a week of great significance in the history of Lithuania. Not only do we commemorate the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania, but this week also marks the 714th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state and the 712th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian kingdom.

As we again pause to honor the Lithuanian Independence Day, it is sad that the peoples of that country have little to celebrate. The people of Lithuania and the other Baltic States have now been under the control of the Soviet Union for almost 25 years.

I have today reintroduced a concurrent resolution requesting the President to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations so that these peoples might once again enjoy the freedom they hold so dear. While these thoughts are still fresh in our minds, I urge the Congress to adopt this measure as soon as possible. The peoples of the Baltic States have already lived too long as captives.

SIXTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE" IN HAVANA HARBOR, CUBA

The SPEAKER. Under special orders heretofore entered into, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the U.S. battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor in Cuba. It is an anniversary that veterans of the war with Spain, which was triggered by the blowing up of the *Maine*, observed during the years with appropriate memorial services for the *Maine's* heroic dead, numbering 266.

Ninety-two veterans of the war with Spain were elected by their constituents to the Congress of the United States. When I came to the House of Representatives in 1949, I was one of four Spanish War veterans then serving in the House. Today, I am the last veteran of that war of 67 years ago in this or the other body. This has been the case for a number of years.

Deeply I have felt that this circumstance of survival has placed upon me a responsibility. In respect and affection for my comrades who are gone, I feel that to the utmost of my ability I should continue, as long as I am here, to be a sort of spokesman for the spirit of 1898.

The spirit of 1898 was a precious expression of pure patriotism, something that was in the nostrils and the hearts and the souls of American men and women near the turn of the century. It was the spirit of a people responding to the call of the destiny ahead, a spirit that with the succession of events it influenced, truly, can be said to have turned the course of history.

Every year of my congressional tenure I have been granted a special order on February 15 or the date closest thereto if on February 15 the House were not in session. I appreciate that as a veteran of a war fought 67 years ago I cannot continue this practice for too many years. I earnestly suggest that after this last Spanish War veteran is gone, members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars might wish to continue the observance on the floor of this Chamber of the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*.

It will be remembered, of course, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was founded by the oversea veterans of the Spanish-American War, sailors who had served in the Atlantic and the Pacific, soldiers who had fought in Cuba, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and in China during the Boxer uprising.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point an editorial from the February 11, 1965, issue of the Stars and Stripes, the National Tribune:

SINKING OF THE "MAINE"

> The passage of 67 years has dimmed in the minds of most Americans the historic event that took place in Havana Harbor, Cuba, on February 15, 1898.
>
> Few Americans alive today can recall the mysterious attack upon the battleship *Maine* as it lay at anchor off Havana. The explosion which rent the battleship with the loss of 266 officers and men out of a complement of 354 was a major disaster and it brought the United States into direct conflict with the Spanish Empire.
>
> The sinking of the *Maine* awakened the conscience of this Nation and immediately there arose an insistent demand from millions of Americans that we go to war with Spain. Inevitably this decision was made and history records the splendid accomplishments of the last completely volunteer army made up largely of American boys in their teens. More than 6,000 American youths died in action or from deadly tropical diseases. In addition the lifespan of many more thousands was curtailed because of the hardships endured during the campaigns in the tropical areas.
>
> The plight of the Cuban people particularly had been deteriorating for a number of years under the dominance of the Kingdom of Spain.
>
> Only 90 miles from our shore, this country had not only taken official notice of the sad status of our neighbors but the American people themselves viewed the situation with some alarm. Thus it was an easy matter to step into conflict in an endeavor to gain freedom for the Cuban people.
>
> While some historians have seen fit to minimize the war itself and its afterward effects, it is a historic fact that the successful conclusion of this warfare brought to America untold immediate wealth. Victory made possible the Panama Canal, brought ultimate success over the dreaded plague of yellow fever and opened up broad vistas of world commerce. It can be unequivocably stated that the lessons learned during this conflict laid the foundation for victory in both World Wars.
>
> Now the ranks of the survivors of this conflict grow thinner each year. Their average age is well over 83, but they can take pride and comfort in the fact that they played a vital role in the making of America as we know it today.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, in observing the 67th anniversary date of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor, which triggered the involvement of the United States in a major military action against a foreign power on foreign soil and in defense of freedom on this continent. As the House knows, the gentleman from Illinois was himself a member of the Army of over 18,000 Regulars and volunteers who fought in Cuba in 1898. He served with the 33d Volunteer Infantry of Michigan under General Duffield. He is the lone Member of the House at this time to have experienced the rigors of the Cuban campaign. He has shared with us his recollections of the battles and events of that epic period in our history. Through him we have come to know the spirit of liberation and abiding belief in free government which inspired these courageous men who fought under circumstances rarely suffered in modern warfare—shortages of munitions and equipment, food, and medical supplies.

He has transmitted to us their determination to aid the suppressed Cuban peoples suffering under the yoke of Spanish rule. He has opened our eyes to the deeds of bravery and self-sacrifice commissioned by the troops, and the military genius of strategist Maj. Gen. William R. Shafter who commanded the Army in Cuba, of Gen. Leonard Wood, of division commanders Lawton and Kent, and brigade commanders Chaffee, Hawkins, Ludlow and Duffield, all names lettered in gold on the rosters of our military heroes.

These were the forces which, together with our strong naval forces under Commodore George Dewey, occupied not only Cuba but Puerto Rico, the Pacific island of Guam in the Marianas, the harbor of Manila Bay in the Philippines and which were indirectly responsible for the annexation of Hawaii which had been seeking union with the United States since 1893. The peace treaty provided for full title to the Philippines, cession of Guam and Puerto Rico and Spain's relinquishing of sovereignty over Cuba.

These new bases in the Pacific, a boon to American trade in the Orient and helpful in offsetting the effects of then recently acquired European bases in that area, were slated to have even greater significance in the outcome of a world war decades later.

This American victory gave the United States strategic supremacy in the Caribbean area, involved it in the problems of the Far East, spurred the growth of our Navy, and paved the way for the opening of the Panama Canal. Destiny, we know now, at this point in our history, had called the United States to a leading role in world affairs. Henceforth, America turned her gaze outward and, building upon the base provided by her leadership in Cuba, commenced a new role on the world stage.

It is scarcely any wonder that our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, treasures his memories of those momentous days when our country laid aside the things of her youth, and took up the burdens and glories of world leadership. He sees these events both from the personal and the broader national and international view. He knows the hundreds of human sacrifices, great and small, which made possible our emergence as a world power. He knows that we have accepted these sacrifices and perhaps acknowledged them and compensated them too little.

It is a privilege to pay tribute to him personally and to his comrades of his early years to whom we owe a debt beyond accounting.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to join my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, in paying tribute today to that wondrous breed of men who fought for America on a purely voluntary basis during the Spanish-American War. I believe the gentleman is the only Member of Congress serving in the 89th Congress who fought in that war during 1898.

It was 67 years ago today, Mr. Speaker, that the tragic event occurred. On a peaceful Sunday evening at Havana Harbor in Cuba, 266 Americans lost their lives when the great Battleship *Maine* was torn apart by a terrific explosion. The sinking of the *Maine* caused America to forget her sectionalist problems and bound her together in a tremendous wave of patriotism. When President McKinley asked for 125,000 volunteers, more than 1 million offered their services. Overnight, "Remember the *Maine*" became the battlecry of all America.

Although the war was short in duration, the insurrectionist movement across the Pacific in the Philippines caused the injury or death to many Americans long after the 10-month war was technically over.

Mr. Speaker, should you ask a member of today's younger generation what he or she knows about the Spanish-American War, you would probably hear the reply that it was started with the sinking of the Battleship *Maine*. But, beyond that, you would not receive much information. Like my friend from Illinois, this to me is a tragedy. I recently picked up a copy of a sixth-grade history text and was astonished to note that only three short paragraphs covered the entire war. When you consider that it was the Spanish-American War that started this great Nation on its climb to the position of world prominence which she enjoys today, this is certainly a paradox. I am hopeful that the historians who look back upon the events of 1898 will soon put them into their rightful and proper perspective.

This is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that our colleague has reserved this hour today. It is, I am sure, the reason he has spoken on this topic each and every year he has been a Member of this august body. And it is the reason I join in his cause. It is a just and honest one and I am certain he shall meet success.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, February 15, 1965, marks the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor, a naval disaster that plunged the United States into the Spanish-American War under the popular slogan "Remember the *Maine*."

That war grew out of the Cuban insurrection against Spanish rule that began in February 1865, an insurrection fought ruthlessly and ferociously by both sides. Pressures for American intervention were resisted by President Cleveland, and his successor, President McKinley, followed the same course during the beginning of his administration. A settlement seemed in prospect when the destruction of the *Maine* led to great anti-Spanish feeling in the United States. On April 11, 1898, the President sent Congress a message asking for authority to end the civil war in Cuba. On April 19, Congress passed resolutions recognizing the independence of Cuba, demanding that Spain withdraw from the island, and authorizing the President to use the Armed Forces for these purposes; another resolution disclaimed any American intention of annexing Cuba. On April 25, Congress declared that a state of war had existed from April 21.

A midshipman rescued from the *Maine* later became an admiral. Writing of the sinking of the *Maine* in his memoirs, Adm. W. T. Cluverius recounted:

> Shortly after three bells, I finished my letter. As I rose from my desk, I heard a sharp sound * * *. Immediately there followed a terrifying explosion.

The explosion that sank the *Maine* led to a war which diplomatic historians consider to be the beginning of the emergence of the United States as a world power.

The Spanish-American War was fought by volunteers. Over 5,000 died, many more from disease than in battle. The average age of veterans of that war is now in the eighties. There are very few of them left. To them, and to the memory of their comrades of long ago, we say that we still "Remember the *Maine*."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in this period of world crisis, when once again the forces of tyranny are on the move, and once again the cause of freedom hangs in the balance, it is well to remember that in many times past ominous crises have given way to victory.

At the close of our great and tragic Civil War, we found our Nation rent apart and all but devastated. That is to say, we were, to all intents and purposes, a thoroughly divided people, with little hope of ever again acting as a united nation.

Throughout the world it was widely believed that our country was weakened by warfare to such an extent that no nation had reason to respect us as a force in international politics. Acting on this belief, the agents of royal Spain saw fit to prey upon our rights in the Caribbean Sea. In November 1873, news reached us of the capture of an American ship, the *Virginius*, by Spanish authorities, off the coast of Cuba. On November 12, confirmation arrived that Captain Fry of the *Virginius* and 36 members of his crew had been executed by a Spanish firing squad, on a charge of "piracy."

Enraged by the enormity of this atrocious act, a great many Americans clamored for war; but moderation prevailed. In time, on a basis of negotiation, the *Virginius* and her survivors were repatriated to the United States.

The belief persisted abroad that we were two nations, North and South, and that we consequently dared not undertake a fight in behalf of our principles. In keeping with this belief, Spanish abuses continued.

Indeed the battle cry, "Remember the *Maine*," is only one of many rallying cries we have had in the history of our country, and tyrants will find in the future as well that fight we will in the cause of justice and freedom.

For some time the United States suffered in patient forbearance—throughout the 1870's, through the eighties—while meanwhile conditions worsened in the Caribbean. Then it happened—the stroke that could not be ignored; the blow we could not overlook.

On the afternoon of February 15, 1898, the second-class American battleship *Maine* lay moored in Havana harbor, officially protected by the powers of Spanish authority. Then, at 9:40 that night, two explosions rocked the harbor, throwing parts of the *Maine* 200 feet in the air. Two officers and 258 members of the crew were killed by the blast. Suddenly, American patience was exhausted; overnight we were at war.

As it turned out on that occasion, the United States was not in fact a divided nation, but whole and sound, capable of fighting effectively under one flag. In short time we swept the enemy before us, at one and the same moment driving Spain from the ranks of the powerful and donning the mantle of world leadership ourselves—a mantle we wear to this very day.

The lesson is clear, I think, for all to see. That we, the people of the United States, will tolerate only just so long the force of those concerned primarily with power. Ours is a cause established on principle, and we are convinced that in every test of strength between principle and sheer force, principle is stronger. On that belief we have built this, our great nation, and are dedicated to helping others to do the same.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding and I thank him for once again taking the floor to call to the attention of this body the historic importance of February 15 in the history of our Nation. No person could be a finer spokesman for the spirit of 1898 than my good friend, our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. In my judgment he has been a living embodiment of that spirit and has reflected that spirit throughout his outstanding service as a Member of this body and in the service of his country which preceded his time in Congress.

I will certainly undertake in every way within my power to be present at any time that he takes the floor to observe this day. I feel that the spirit of patriotism is kindled anew in the hearts of all of us each time the gentleman from Illinois speaks on this occasion.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am very deeply grateful to my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I will be happy to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should also like to commend the gentleman from Illinois for bringing to the attention of the country again this fateful day of 67 years ago and compliment him for what he has done here in the House to keep us reminded of the war in which he participated.

As the gentleman knows, I have the honor to represent here in the House the congressional district of his Commander in Chief of those days, William McKinley, who served in this House as a Member from Ohio before becoming President of the United States. I am sure that President McKinley would greatly appreciate what the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has done here today and in the past. For that reason I rise to pay my compliments to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio. May I add here that in my opinion there has been no nobler character in American history than that of President McKinley; a deeply religious man and a great American. I am proud that as a boy just turning 16 I responded to President McKinley's call to go to foreign fields and take up the destiny of America.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, several generations of Americans have but a dim memory of the Spanish-American War. The Congress is reminded each year by our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, of facts concerning this historical occasion which are not recorded in the history books.

Sixty-seven years have passed since that memorable event which took place in Havana Harbor on February 15, 1898, the sinking of the Battleship *Maine*. The newspapers of that day recorded it as a mysterious attack upon the great battleship as it lay at anchor off Havana. The dynamiting of the *Maine* by the enemy killed 266 officers and men and this major disaster brought the United States into war with the Spanish Empire.

History has recorded in many volumes the splendid accomplishments of the last completely volunteer army made up largely of American boys under 21 years of age. Over 6,000 American youths died in action or from deadly tropical disease. The lifespan of thousands more was curtailed because of the hardships endured during the battles in the disease-infested tropical areas.

In winning the great victory, the United States served notice on the world that our Nation was a champion for liberty and when its flag was attacked it would fight not only to preserve our honor but to also help gain freedom for the people of an enslaved neighbor nation.

The Spanish-American War victory started America on its road to eventual leadership of the nations all over the world, and gave to the people of America an international status both through trade and prestige which eventually brought prosperity and untold success to the people of our land. The victory made possible the U.S. construction of the Panama Canal and also brought scientific medical discoveries against yellow fever and many more disease plagues which have relieved world humanity of untold suffering and death. There is no doubt but what the Spanish-American War victory laid the foundation for our victory in both World War I and World War II.

The ranks of the heroes of the Spanish-American War are growing thinner as the years and months pass. Very few veterans of that conflict are alive today and their average age is around 85 years.

The Members wish to commend our colleague, the only Spanish-American War veteran in our ranks in Congress, BARRATT O'HARA, for keeping alive this annual tribute to the leaders and participants in that great conflict of over 60 years ago.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my word of commendation of the gentleman from Illinois for bringing again to the attention of this House and the country the stirring days of 1898. On this anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* I think it behooves all of us to look back to those days and to remember the people who were heroic in their deeds and who dreamed dreams which we have seen come to fruition.

As a Representative of the State of Arizona I am particularly pleased to be able to share with the gentleman from Illinois my respects on this occasion because, as the gentleman will remember, many of the Roughriders were recruited from the State of Arizona. One of the most famous was Bucky O'Neal who led one of the companies of Roughriders and even at that time was one of the most famous lawmen of all time, having been a frontier sheriff whose name was famous in the Territory of Arizona.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is an occasion on which all States of the Union may take justifiable pride in remembering the exploits, the deeds, not only of their own sons but the sons of their sister States, in that war of 1898.

So, I hope, Mr. Speaker, and I know it will be so, that the gentleman from Illinois will be here for many years to bring forth the memories which we now bring forth on this day. I certainly wish for him and all of his fellow veterans of the Spanish-American War the very best of everything in the days to come.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Arizona and I might remark that in 1914 when I was touring the country for the commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, I visited Phoenix and one of the great meetings we had was with the fellow veterans in Phoenix. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, in Havana Harbor. That tragic event led to the war with Spain and started a chain reaction that led to freedom for Cuba and eventual independence for the Philippines. It also marked the first time that uniformed Americans served overseas.

In rising to speak on this occasion, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Illinois for arranging the time today to observe this historic anniversary. He is the last remaining veteran of the Spanish-American War in the Congress and is one of the few surviving founders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Our esteemed colleague has maintained a constant interest in Latin America, and while he has long served as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, he has at the same time given service as the active, energetic, ranking majority member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

I thank my friend and colleague for reminding us of the sinking of the *Maine* and all the subsequent events which are called to mind when we think of Cuba and developments there. It is sad to realize that the people of Cuba have again lost their freedom—this time to a dictator from within, aided and supported by international communism. On this anniversary it is timely and fitting that we rededicate ourselves to the use of every effort to eliminate Communist domination from this hemisphere.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the U.S. battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor.

This is a time to pay tribute to the 226 Americans who lost their lives in this tragic event that triggered our war with Spain in 1898.

Today we count Spain among our friends in the struggle for international peace, while Cuba is ruled by a dictator whose sympathies are with our enemies. On this anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine,* our Nation looks to the time, and it will come, when the freedom-loving people of Cuba will again enjoy the privileges of liberty and the rights of self-government. We do this in the name of the Americans who served and died in the Spanish-American War.

On this anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine,* we extend our compliments and express our gratitude to the surviving veterans of the Spanish-American War and especially, to an outstanding one of them, a gallant, courageous, and beloved colleague and friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Events of the past few years have focused new international attention upon Cuba. Once again the dignity of man and the future of free political institutions are at stake on that embattled island. We must not forget the *Maine* or Cuba, nor will we drop our guard against the dangerous influences which have come to our hemisphere with the rise of Castro in Cuba. In this time of difficulty, our hearts will be lifted up by the memories of those gallant boys of 1898.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the U.S. battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor, with the loss of 260 officers and men. The news of the frightful tragedy startled the world. It led to the Spanish-American War and started the United States on the road to world power.

The sympathy of our countrymen had gone out to the Cubans in their long struggle for liberty. Numbered among their military leaders were Maximo Gomez and Antonio Maceo, men of bravery and patriotism unexcelled in the annals of any nation. José Marti, the apostle of liberty, belongs in the company of Jefferson, Bolivar, Lincoln, and Juarez. Today, in Cuba, these heroic defenders of liberty have been replaced by men like Fidel Castro, and the world is poorer because of that change.

In 1895 the revolt in Cuba had flared up again after more than a decade of relative tranquillity. As the situation became worse, Fitzhugh Lee, the U.S. Consul-General at Havana, appealed for support in the form of a naval force to insure the protection of U.S. citizens in Cuba.

On the morning of January 25, 1898, the Spanish authorities having been notified of her visit, the *Maine,* Capt. Charles Sigsbee, steamed into Havana harbor and was moored to a buoy 500 yards off the arsenal. The Spanish officials acted with punctilious courtesy and the social amenities between American and Spanish officials proceeded according to naval protocol. No unusual incident took place until 9:40 p.m. on the night of February 15, when two terrific explosions threw parts of the *Maine* 200 feet in the air. The forward half of the ship was reduced to a mass of twisted steel; the after part slowly sank.

Immediately after the sinking of the *Maine* a board of inquiry was convened by the American Government and a similar one by the Government of Spain. In 1912, when the wreck was raised from the floor of Havana Harbor, a board of officers of the Navy made a further investigation. Opinions of experts have differed, and the cause of the explosion has never been conclusively established. It remains one of the unsolved mysteries of our time.

Whatever the cause of the appalling catastrophe may have been, its effect is clear. News of the disaster produced great excitement in the United States, and some newspapers accused the Spaniards. National feeling about the difficulties in Cuba crystallized in the slogan: "Remember the *Maine.*" Relations between Spain and the United States, already strained by the indignation of the American people over the treatment and abuse of the Cubans by the Spanish Government, reached the breaking point. The events that followed culminated in a declaration of war on April 25, 1898.

The war that followed taught us the danger of unpreparedness. It taught us lessons in sanitation and disease control which probably saved the lives of thousands in World Wars I and II. It helped to heal the wounds of the Civil War and cemented North and South into one great people under one glorious flag. In the War with Spain the people of this country, as always before and since, displayed a unity and a patriotism scarcely matched in the history of the world.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine,* I join with my colleagues in honoring the Spanish-American War veterans. In consequence of that war, tyranny was smashed in the Caribbean, and, until a few years ago, democracy prevailed. In a sense all this resulted from the sinking of a single ship, the American battleship *Maine.*

The cost of victory was high, for more than 5,000 American lives were lost, but then, as now, Americans have never hesitated to give their lives for the cause of freedom.

So today let us make clear to the Castroites that the words "Remember the *Maine*" are as important as they were in 1898.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* reminds us that this body is honored to have as one of its Members, the gentleman from Illinois, BARRATT O'HARA, the last surviving Spanish-American War veteran in Congress, who not only served his country in this war, but also in World War I. BARRATT O'HARA has always had an intense interest in our neighbors to the south. As a boy, he accompanied an American expedition which was marking a route through Nicaragua for an interoceanic canal. He also went with a Smithsonian Institution party exploring the jungles of Central America and was with a U.S. expedition sent to help settle a boundary dispute between Nicaragua and Costa Rica. At the age of 15, BARRATT O'HARA, then a sophomore in high school, enlisted in the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry and landed in Cuba only a few days after Teddy Roosevelt and his Rough Riders. He participated in the seige of Santiago de Cuba and later was decorated by the Republic of Cuba for services rendered to the people of Cuba during their war for independence.

Since then, BARRATT O'HARA, has spent a lifetime in distinguished service to his country and the cause of peace. He is currently the chairman of an important Foreign Affairs subcommittee and a strong supporter of administration foreign policy. I have noticed something special about the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. He never views world problems in a narrow political or economic sense. He believes that the humanitarian aspect is of much greater significance and, for this I salute him.

Mr. Speaker, we often talk about the "spirit of '76" in regard to America's role in world leadership. Well, there is also the "spirit of '98," another milestone in the fight for freedom. BARRATT O'HARA symbolizes that spirit, Mr. Speaker, and I take this occasion to wish him many more long years of service in behalf of his country and the free world.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is our privilege to join here today in paying tribute to those who fought in the Spanish-American War.

The part that all the brave participants were to play in this brief but fierce conflict was triggered by the sinking of the battleship *Maine,* in Manila Harbor, on this day—67 years ago. This event, which is sometimes called "The Pearl Harbor of 1898," was to set off a sequence of engagements which culminated in the Battle of San Juan Hill, and on the 1st day of July 1898 we see that courageous and robust young American, Theodore Roosevelt, storming up the heights of San Juan hill, spurring his men on.

It was this land action, in support of our blockade of Santiago Harbor that accomplished the destruction of Spanish aggression and virtually brought about the end of the Spanish-American War. To those young Americans who laid down life before it had hardly begun, to the Rough Riders and their intrepid young leader as they stormed the ridges of San Juan Hill to pave the way to victory, and to all our brave men who served our great country in the Spanish-American War, we pay tribute.

But in honoring those who spread the account of this conflict, which brought the United States to its rightful place as a true champion of liberty, across the pages of history in the indelible ink of their bravery, we would be indeed remiss if we failed to honor our own. We have among us a distinguished gentleman whose own brave life reads like the most imaginative of adventure stories. I speak of that distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA.

To say that truth is stranger than fiction is understating BARRATT O'HARA's adventurous life. His brave experiences took him through that rugged segment of American history, the "authors" of which we honor today. At the brave young age of 15 years, he landed in

Cuba 3 days after Teddy Roosevelt and his Rough Riders had blazed the trail of freedom up San Juan Hill and for his participation in the siege of Santiago our colleague was awarded the Order of Military Merit in White, by the Republic of Cuba, for services rendered to the Cuban people in their struggle for independence from Spanish rule.

Each of us here knows of the incredible bravery and excitement with which BARRATT O'HARA's life unfolded, and as our colleague in this great body he represents to us not only all that is the best and the brave in service to our country and to his fellow man during times of stress, but he has distinguished himself among us for his long and devoted service as a Member of the Congress of the United States. To this brave man we pay tribute, and by the honor we pay him as a symbol of all that is great and good in our American determination to protect and preserve freedom among all peoples, we also do honor to those who served—as did BARRATT O'HARA—in that bloody conflict, the Spanish-American War.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is natural and right that our distinguished and beloved colleague from Illinois is leading the ceremony being observed today—commemorating the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine.*

BARRATT O'HARA showed his great patriotism, courage, and love of freedom when he was only 15 years old. He was then a sophomore in high school and enlisted in the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry.

Landing in Cuba 3 days after "Teddy" Roosevelt and his famous "Rough Riders," he took part in the siege of Santiago de Cuba.

Later he received the Order of Military Merit in White by the Republic of Cuba for his skill and valor in Cuba's battle for independence. This remarkable, versatile, and unforgettable man also served the United States in World War I.

So when BARRATT O'HARA takes the floor today to speak on the Spanish-American War, he speaks with knowledge, experience and authority. He knows the horrors of war—but he also knows of the challenge and responsibilities of peace.

When the battleship *Maine* sank in Havana Harbor in 1898, that mysterious and tragic event affected many American families, some in Middlesex County, N.J., where a few survivors of that war live today, including a few in my home town of Perth Amboy. Despite their advanced years, these grand Spanish-American War veterans are still proud, tough and unconquerable.

Three American sailors from New Brunswick, N.J., lost their lives in the explosion of that now historic battleship. They were: Frederick L. Jernee, William H. Robinson and John H. Viegler.

To honor their service and memory, a monument was erected and later dedicated on May 30, 1899. For years it graced the courthouse area in New Brunswick, reminding the thousands who passed of the sailors' sacrifices. It remained there until Middlesex County built its new courthouse. A plaque was later placed in Buccleugh Park containing a simple but eloquent tribute.

On the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine,* let us remember the bitter and tragic and costly lesson that we seem to forget—until perfidy strikes again—as it did in 1941:

That a nation enjoying the serenity and security of peace should always be aware of the dangers of treachery.

And that the best deterrent to attack—surreptitious or open—is a strong, courageous and vigilant defense.

Let us hope—and make sure—that our strength remains great, that our courage remains indomitable, and that our vigilance remains constant and alert, to protect and defend the people and land we love so well.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join my beloved colleague, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, in commemorating today the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor, the event which started our war with Spain in 1898. As a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I am especially interested in participating in the observance of this important episode in our history because the Spanish-American War Veterans, who were the first uniformed Americans to serve overseas, were the founders of the VFW.

In 1898 the United States, motivated by the highest principles, fought successfully to free the Cuban people from Spanish control, and it is, therefore, especially tragic that we now find the Cubans under Communist domination. In contrast to the Spanish-American War, we witnessed, in the early days of the Kennedy administration, the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion, which resulted in such an inglorious defeat for Cuban and American forces attempting to restore independence and freedom to the Cuban people.

May I take this opportunity to commend my colleague BARRETT O'HARA, the only Spanish-American War veteran still serving in the Congress and one of the founders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, whose outstanding service in the House of Representatives and dedication to his responsibilities in the Foreign Affairs Committee are a source of inspiration to all of us.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the sinking of the *Maine* and the ensuing war with Spain marked the emergence of the United States as a world power.

Brief though it was, the Spanish-American War offered the opportunity for a demonstration of American military and naval might over a 10,000-mile arc from Cuba's San Juan hill to Manila Bay.

Hitherto concerned principally with its own problems, the American Republic, at the turn of the century, had projected itself, for better or worse, as a force to be reckoned with in world affairs.

Within our own borders the war of 1898 was a unifying force. Once more men from North and South fought under the same flag. The 4th Illinois Volunteer Infantry, made up of several National Guard companies recruited in central Illinois, served in Cuba under the command of Maj. Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, who also had been a general in the Civil War, on the Confederate side.

At the time thousands of American youth doubtlessly looked upon the war with Spain as a glorious military adventure with the idealistic aim of freeing the Cuban people from a tyrannical rule, rather than as a turning point in American foreign policy.

No military draft was needed for this war. Volunteers rallied to the cause in every town and hamlet, echoing the battle cry, "Remember the *Maine.*" Some, like our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] even falsified their age to join the colors. Leaving high school in Benton Harbor, Mich., at the age of 15, he landed in Cuba just 3 days after Teddy Roosevelt and his Rough Riders.

Sixty-seven years have passed since the sinking of the *Maine* in Havana Harbor on February 15, 1898. Once again a tyrannical power has established itself on that island 90 miles off the shore of the United States, backed up by international communism, a much more formidable foe than the decadent Spanish monarchy against which we fought almost seven decades ago.

Each generation in our history has been called upon to make sacrifices in the cause of the freedoms we hold so dear. It is appropriate for us here today to honor those who carried our banner in the Spanish-American War. This is also a good opportunity to pause and remember that freedom's job is never done. We have young men who right now are carrying on the struggle in the jungles and in the skies of Vietnam.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor. Far too little attention has been paid to the war with Spain that resulted from this tragic event and to the heroic men who fought it.

I am proud to join my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], who is, as we all know, the last remaining veteran of this conflict serving in Congress, in observing this anniversary.

The Spanish-Amrican War was a turning point in American history. It marked America's coming of age as a world power dedicated to the preservation of freedom around the globe.

The immediate result of our victory was the liberation of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines from oppressive colonial rule.

But the ultimate significance of the war extends far beyond even this. It established a permanent American presence in the Pacific committed to the defense of human dignity and liberty.

All of this was accomplished by a force of American fighting men composed entirely of volunteers—soldiers who, in spite of hurried training, insufficient supplies and equipment, and inadequate protection against tropical diseases, won a series of brilliant victories on land and sea.

The service these men rendered their country—indeed the cause of freedom everywhere—could never have been adequately repaid. But to our national shame, never in the history of this country has any army or its soldiers been so carelessly treated.

None of the veterans benefits which we have come to regard as the just due of American soldiers were provided for the veterans of the war with Spain. They were mustered out without bonus or separation pay. They were given no educational or vocational training rights. They were brought under no pension system until 1933, and they were not even provided with hospital care for service-connected disabilities until some 24 years after the end of the conflict.

The fact that many of these wrongs were ultimately corrected was due in large measure to the efforts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, an organization which was founded by veterans of the war with Spain. Their campaign to obtain justice for the veterans of this war has made a significant contribution to the welfare of the veterans of all our conflicts.

So, this February 15 is not only an anniversary of a great national loss; it also marks the beginning of the modern era in American life. It serves as a reminder of how much we owe to our young men in uniform.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate today a mournful anniversary of an event which brought this Nation into war. We celebrate as well, the valiant and brave spirit of the men who undertook to defend our flag in that conflict.

It began with the sudden explosion on board a battleship, and the American people then took up the battlecry: "Remember the *Maine.*" To those who served, and especially to our gallant colleague from Illinois, we owe our tributes this day.

I sought to recall, when I was considering this memorial, the story of that battleship, and so I asked and received this following brief account, of an hour we must all have studied:

THE 67TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LOSS OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

The U.S. battleship *Maine* left the fleet at Key West on January 25, 1898, and proceeded to Havana, Cuba. The *Maine*, rated as a battleship of the second class, carried four 10-inch guns, two in the forward and two in the after turret. six 6-inch guns, and a number of 6- and 1-pounders. Her commander was Capt. C. D. Sigsbee, and there were 328 men on her rolls in addition to a regular complement of officers.

The night of February 15, 1898, was hot and sultry. The *Maine* had swung around to an unusual position at the buoy to which she had been assigned by the Spanish port officials; she had happened to take the position she would have adopted had there been an intention to shell the harbor forts. Such was never her intention.

The usual routine was observed. The chief engineer reported his department secure; the various petty officers reported their storerooms secure. Eight o'clock lights and galley fires were reported out, and the ship's lieutenant commander reported to the captain that everything was secure. At 9, the officer of the deck mustered the watch, and made sure the men knew their stations in the event of an alarm. The captain was writing in his cabin. Most of the men were asleep.

At 40 minutes past 9 o'clock, the battleship *Maine*, exploding, rose up out of Havana Harbor in a burst of fire and smoke. The detonation shook Havana from one side to another. A rain of debris and the bodies of dead and wounded men fell back into the waters of the bay. Two hundred and fifty-four lives were lost that night, seven of the wounded later died, and many more of the wounded were crippled for life.

A Member of this House shortly afterward spoke thus of them: "No foe had ever challenged them. The world can never know how brave they were. They never knew defeat; they never shall. Meanwhile a patient and patriotic people, enlightened by the lessons of our history, remembering the woes of war, both to the vanquished and victorious, are ready for the truth and ready for their duty."

Now, as then, Americans "Remember the *Maine.*"

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my able and good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for again taking note of this special anniversary occasion.

I believe it was President Kennedy who said that a knowledge of the past prepares us for the crisis of the present and the challenge of the future. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, founded, as the gentleman has said, by the Spanish War Veterans, has contributed beyond measure to the strength and security of these beloved United States and to the promotion among our people of a high sense of patriotism and devotion to national duty.

So I take pleasure in joining in this public note of the good work of the Spanish War Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and of the gentleman from Illinois in taking the leadership in bringing this to the attention of the House and the country. I felicitate the gentleman and wish him the continued privilege.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today, in the midst of international turmoil, we pause to recall another moment, immediately preceding the turn of the century, when our Nation, then as now, stood face to face with both violence and destiny.

Just as we, today, view with shock and alarm the aggressive and destructive policies of Red China and the Vietcong, so, 67 years ago, Americans were shocked and alarmed by the outrageous policies of royal Spain. From the close of the Civil War through the 1870's, 1880's, and 1890's, Spanish and American shipping engaged in the fiercest kind of commercial rivalry. Moreover, from 1868 to 1878 the Spanish Government endeavored, unsuccessfully, to put down rebellion on the island of Cuba, knowing full well, as they did so, that the American people wanted Cuba to be free. Consequently, when the war for Cuban independence was revived, in 1895, the Spanish authorities regarded the United States as a party to the act, in spirit if not in deed.

With all this in the background, the American Government endeavored, nonetheless, to keep the peace with Spain and, in January, 1898, the second-class battleship *Maine* was ordered from Key West to Havana on a friendly visit. For 3 weeks the ship lay moored in Havana Harbor. Then, on February 15, at 9:40 p.m., two explosions rocked the harbor, and the *Maine* was blown sky high. Two hundred and sixty Americans gave their lives in the tragedy, and virtually the next moment, the United States and Spain were at war.

The sinking of the battleship *Maine* set in motion a series of events which catapulted this Nation to the front rank of world power. It immediately resulted in war with Spain, thereby testing for the first time the mettle of American men in battle on foreign soil, fighting a wholly different variety of manifest destiny.

The consequences of that war are still with us. And the bravery and sense of adventure which characterized our troop forces in that war form a memorable part of our national heritage.

With the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, it is appropriate that we contemplate this period in American life, the turn of the century, for I think it is full of meaning and pregnant with lessons which today yearns for a closer hearing.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, 67 years ago tonight, on February 15, 1898, at 9:40 p.m., 266 American servicemen lost their lives in defense of freedom when the battleship *Maine* was blown up in Cuba's Havana Harbor.

Sixty-seven years ago—this was before most of the Members of this great body were even born. To most Americans today, unfortunately, this event is nothing but a dimly recollected passage in a high school American history book, an event which caused a war that was over in less than 3 months. Names like Capt. Charles Sigsbee, Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, Chickamauga and San Juan Hill stir vague memories, perhaps, but bring no feelings of pride, or anger, or grief.

But 67 years ago, "Remember the *Maine*" was the rallying cry of a nation, battle cry of an army, the victory cry of freedom. It was the "Remember the Alamo" of earlier years, the "Remember Pearl Harbor" of later years. Five weeks after the *Maine* was sunk, the President issued a call for 125,000 volunteers. More than 1 million took up this call to arms, and answered. And these men were volunteers—they served longer than the boys of World War I, and at one-half the pay. Their death losses were, percentagewise, six times those of the World War I soldiers. They received none of the insurance benefits, separation pay or pensions that subsequent veterans have received. And these men volunteered, remember, in the days before there was a compulsory draft law. They were poorly fed and poorly equipped and poorly organized. Yet these men, representing this country, never lost a battle, never suffered a reverse, never retreated once. This war has gone down in history as a relatively "minor and easy" one, because we won so quickly. But gentlemen, we were fighting Spain—a nation that at that time was considered to be one of the four great national powers of the world.

And indeed, our victory there resulted in more than an assurance of continued peace and freedom in the Western Hemisphere. It mended the rift caused by the Civil War. Once more American boys, both northern and southern, were united in a cause, fighting side-by-side in defense of liberty. And the victory paved the way for the construction of the Panama Canal, which every nation has since benefited from. We let the rest of the world know that the United States of America was now a power to be reckoned with, a power that would not idly stand by while a strong nation oppressed a weaker one. And now, 67 years later, the world still knows this, for many of our boys still lie in faraway places like Guam and Okinawa and France, and across the Potomac in Arlington, boys who like those back in 1898, died preserving the rights of other peace-loving nations, and other freedom-loving peoples. The lessons we learned in the Spanish-American War saved the life of many an American soldier in World Wars I and II.

So, as we drift off to sleep tonight, gentlemen, let us remember that ours is a better America today, a stronger America today, and ours is a better world today, a more peaceful and free world today, because of the brave battles of a brave country 67 years ago, and let us say a prayer for those 266 men who died on the battleship *Maine*.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 67 years ago in the spring of 1898, Americans trooped off to war. They went into that war with a slogan "Remember the *Maine*" ringing from their lips.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we mark the 67th anniversary of the tragic event that gave birth to that phrase. While moored in the waters of Havana Harbor, the battleship *Maine* was rocked by an explosion and sunk and the United States was plunged into a war with Spain.

That February 15, Mr. Speaker, was a tragic and fateful day for the sinking of the *Maine* was an act of destruction and death.

A naval court of inquiry convened by Rear Adm. Montgomery Sicard found:

> The destruction of the *Maine* occurred at 9:40 p.m. on the 15th day of February, 1898, in the harbor of Havana, Cuba, she being at the time moored to the same buoy to which she had been taken upon her arrival. There were two explosions of a distinctly different character, with a very short but distinct interval between them, and the forward part of the ship was lifted to a marked degree at the time of the first explosion. The first explosion was more in the nature of a report like that of a gun while the second explosion was more open, prolonged, and of greater volume. This second explosion was, in the opinion of the court, caused by the partial explosion of two or more of the forward magazines of the *Maine*.
>
> The court finds that the loss of the *Maine* on the occasion named was not in any respect due to fault or negligence on the part of the officers or members of the crew of said vessel. In the opinion of the court, the *Maine* was destroyed by the explosion of a submarine mine, which caused the partial explosion of two or more of the forward magazines. The court has been unable to obtain evidence fixing the responsibility for the destruction of the *Maine* upon any person or persons.

The Spanish Government had a different opinion. On March 22, 1898, its naval board of inquiry found:

> That the important facts connected with the explosion in its external appearance at every moment of its duration having been described by witnesses, and the absence of all circumstances which necessarily accompany the explosion of a torpedo having been proved by these witnesses and experts, it can only be honestly asserted that the catastrophe was due to internal causes.

The list of the *Maine* dead covers three pages printed in very small type. On that tragic night 67 years ago, 254 lives were lost, 7 wounded men died a short time later, and many of the wounded suffered from the effects of their injuries for the rest of their lives.

Spanish-American War Veterans have traditionally observed February 15 with appropriate ceremonies. They have cause for great pride in their own completely voluntary service. There was no draft in their war. Since serving their country so well as patriotic young men, their ranks have grown thin.

Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of the loss of the *Maine*, we salute the veterans of the Spanish-American War and pay our tribute to the memory of their comrades.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, 67 years ago today the Nation was horrified by the news that the *Maine* had been sunk in Havana Harbor. On a peaceful Tuesday evening the great battleship was torn apart by a terrific explosion that cost the lives of 260 officers and men.

The *Maine*, a second-class battleship built at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, was launched on November 18, 1890, and commissioned on September 17, 1895. Although she was small compared to modern warships, in her day the *Maine* was formidable. She was 324 feet long and 57 feet at the beam, and had a displacement of 6,650 tons. Her armament consisted of four 10-inch guns, six 6-inch breech-loading rifles, seven 6-pounder rapid-fire guns, eight 1-pounders, and four Gatling machineguns. In addition, she had tubes for four torpedoes.

Hostilities had broken out again in Cuba in 1895 after a decade of relative tranquillity. As the situation grew steadily worse, the American people were moved by a deep sympathy for the Cubans who were engaged in a long struggle for liberty. On January 24, 1898, the *Maine* was ordered to Havana, ostensibly "to resume the friendly naval visits at Cuban ports." The actual purpose was to protect U.S. citizens who might be endangered by the increasing friction between the United States and Spain.

At 11 a.m. on January 25, the *Maine* steamed in past Morro Castle. The customary salutes were fired and the *Maine* proceeded into the harbor and dropped anchor where the harbormaster directed. A trained investigator might have detected an undercurrent of feeling, but official calls were made and the social amenities were observed. For 3 weeks no untoward incident occurred.

Then, at 9:40 p.m. on February 15, two explosions threw parts of the ship 200 feet in the air and illuminated the whole harbor.

Reports of the disaster were received in the United States with consternation. Accusations against the Spaniards were freely expressed in certain American newspapers. Most Americans held Spain responsible, although the evidence was never sufficient to fix the blame officially. Some 2 months later came the Spanish-American War which was to mark the collapse of the Spanish Empire and the emergence of the United States as a world power.

Referring to the slogan, "Remember the *Maine*," Captain Sigsbee, the commander of the ship, later had this to say:

> Therefore I conceive the motto, "Remember the *Maine*" used as a war cry would not have been justifiable. Improperly applied, the motto * * * savors too much of revenge * * * but it may be used in an entirely worthy sense. During the recent war with Spain about 75 men were killed and wounded in the U.S. Navy. Only 17 were killed. On board the *Maine* 252 men were killed outright and 8 died later—nearly 15 times as many as were killed in the U.S. Navy by the Spanish land and naval forces during the entire war. In the way that the men of the *Maine* died and suffered there was enough of the heroic to provide a sound foundation for the motto, "Remember the *Maine*."

It is in this way that we, in our observance here today, seek to "Remember the *Maine*."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 67 years ago these headlines flashed across my home State of New York, "*Maine* Blown to Atoms in Havana Harbor: Over 100 of Her Crew Killed. Three-million-dollar Battleship Destroyed by a Terrific and Mysterious Explosion While Her Men Are Sleeping."

Today, on the anniversary of this disaster, we remember that it was this news which ignited the sympathies of the American people and which pushes a long series of events toward a climax. On April 25, 1898, the United States declared war against Spain and the Spanish-American War began. And it began, said President McKinley, "in the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests."

The actual cause of the destruction of the *Maine* remains now as it was then a mystery. No conclusive proof has ever been produced which could definitely fix the blame in the tragedy. But in 1898, as the news spread that 260 American officers and crewmen had lost their lives and as some newspapers freely accused Spanish agents of responsibility, public opinion, already in strong and open sympathy with Cuban patriots, crystallized into the slogan: "Remember the *Maine*."

For years, the Cuban people had sought to throw off Spanish misrule and oppression. They had engaged in a heroic but unsuccessful effort for independence between 1868 and 1878, the Ten Years' War. During that revolution the American people, though strongly sympathetic to the Cuban cause, had only given expressions of support.

But in 1895, when revolution broke out anew against the continuing corruption of the Spanish administration, the people of the United States showed increasing alarm. From the beginning, the struggle in Cuba took on aspects of ferocity that horrified Americans. Vivid accounts were reported to the public in a theretofore unprecedented era of journalistic coverage.

The extreme methods of coercion used by Gen. Valeriano Weyler—or "Butcher" Weyler, as he soon came to be called by the press—were well known. Americans watched helplessly as he, in an attempt to stamp out the Cuban guerrilla forces, ordered the entire civilian population of certain areas confined to concentration camps. There, they died by the thousands, victims of disease, malnutrition, and atrocities.

Against this background, it is not surprising that when the battleship *Maine* exploded a white-hot wave of anger gripped the American people. Within a few short months, 1 million of the young men of this country had volunteered to fight side by side with the Cuban patriots until the despotism of Spain could be removed from that island.

There are some who seek to detract from the American contribution to the Cuban cause, but, as an editorial from the Havana Post of 1959 states:

> There can be no successful mutilation of the history of Cuban and U.S. allied cooperation in the war of independence. * * * One has only to see those names on the bronze plaques on San Juan Hill, just outside Santiago, to know the extent of the aid given the cause by the United States.
>
> On those plaques, one finds inscribed the names of Americans from every State of the Union who gave for the cause of Cuba the most that any man can give for any cause. They gave their lives.

Today, we pay tribute to the idealistic and courageous young men who fought for and gave their lives for the freedom and independence of a neighboring people. We pay special tribute, also to the valor and the patience of the Cuban people who have found it necessary to struggle almost continually over the years for their liberties.

And today, a black cloud is again heavy over this beautiful Caribbean island. Its people again know the horrors of tyranny. Again, they are showing courage and heroism in their struggle against it. Today, as we remember the *Maine* of 67 years ago, let us also remember the present.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout our history, America has responded to acts of aggression with a special courage, decisiveness and will to succeed which have become legendary in the annals of the defense of liberty.

Regardless of the strength of our opponents, those who have challenged us have been defeated or deterred. We have often succeeded in making allies of former enemies; individuals and governments wise enough to join in the ancient and enduring struggle for peace and liberty.

America, itself, symbolizes many things to the people of the earth. Of all these symbols, perhaps our greatest strength lies in our ability to sustain countless irresponsible acts and errors of statesmanship with patience and prevailing wisdom. However, foolishly unmindful of our determination to defend our freedom, other nations have on occasion misjudged our patience for cowardice and indecision.

Such an error in judgment led Spain into believing we would not defend our interests in the Carribbean. On February 15, 1898, the Battleship *Maine* was sunk in Havana Harbor. And before the world had time to digest the news, the United States had reacted swiftly, surely and with great strength. Our war with Spain involved some of the bloodiest and most individually gallant sacrifices in our history, yet they were in our American tradition and, in the end, our just cause prevailed.

Although some 67 years have passed, we have continued to demonstrate our strength and our determination never to yield when the price is the loss of liberty for ourselves or our allies. Those in other nations who would wish us ill had best be reminded of our willingness to bear any burden to secure liberty for all those men who seek it and who will join in fighting alongside us to obtain it.

The men who fought at San Juan Hill, at Bunker Hill, at Pork Chop Hill earned us the right to live in peace with one another and the world. We would do them a grave injustice if we failed in our historic defense of the self-determination all men seek in their hearts.

On this 67th anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, it is an honor to stand with my colleagues and fellow citizens in commemorating the heroism and the love of justice which have made our country the bulwark of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the event we commemorate today, the explosion of the battleship *Maine* off the Havana Harbor in 1898, signaled the emergence of the United States as a world power. When our young men joined hands in common struggle with the valiant Cuban patriots to throw off the despotism of Spain, this country demonstrated a new sense of national conscience.

While our Government had been foremost in recognizing the independence of Spain's other colonies in the Americas and had backed them further by the Monroe Doctrine, we had never before taken up arms on behalf of another country's freedom.

The Spanish-American War grew out of deplorable conditions in Cuba that seemed intolerable to an aroused popular sentiment in the United States. Spanish misgovernment and oppression had given rise to numerous revolts which had made little headway in relieving Cuban ills.

The "reconcentration" policy of the Spanish commander, resorted to in 1896 to surpress rebellion, left thousands of prisoners to perish behind barbed wire and armed guard. Within the next 2 years, 200,000 people or, roughly, one-eighth of the total Cuban population, had been wiped out by famine, disease, and atrocity.

The American journalists did exaggerate in their releases to the public in terms of what has been called the new "yellow press." But the real sufferings of the rebels would have been horrible enough in any case to arouse deep sympathies among Americans. And, moreover, they were the sufferings of a neighbor.

Then on a Tuesday, February 15, 1898, two explosions illuminated the Havana Harbor, and the second-class battleship *Maine*, moored on a friendly visit, was reduced to a twisted hulk.

Two hundred and sixty American officers and crewmen lost their lives, most to be buried in the Colon Cemetery of Havana. Without doubt the catastrophe stirred up national feelings, and the excitement and the pent-up resentment toward the Spaniards solidified into the cry: "Remember the *Maine*."

With the declaration of war on April 29, President McKinley called for 125,000 volunteers. More than 1 million offered their services. They fought with valor and heroism in the face of the most adverse conditions, yet they were the most poorly treated of all our defenders. The enlisted man's pay was $13 a month. Still, idealistic young men were willing to give their lives, and 11,000 paid the supreme price.

We went into war by land and sea in Cuba. On the other side of the world, Admiral Dewey destroyed the Spanish Fleet in the Battle of Manila Bay, inside the guns of Corregidor. By the war's end, United States had proven herself to be a powerful adversary and a country destined for leadership.

We give special honor to the 260 men who lost their lives in the destruction of the *Maine*, but we also pay tribute to all veterans of the Spanish-American War, to those in this country and to the valiant men of Cuba who gained independence for the island. They were men who fought with deep convictions and love of liberty.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] in commemorating the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor, a tragedy which resulted in the Spanish-American War. It is particularly fitting that Mr. O'HARA should be granted this special order since he is the sole Spanish-American War veteran still serving in the Congress.

Each year the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* is celebrated by the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Wisconsin. Mr. Morris G. Oesterreich, past national commander of the United Spanish War Veterans and commander of the Wisconsin department, has for many years devoted his time and efforts to arranging this program. It is just one of the many worthy endeavors on behalf of veterans to which Mr. Oesterreich has energetically and fruitfully contributed.

This year he arranged for the program to be held at the Schlitz Brown Bottle in Milwaukee, facilities made available through the courtesy of Mr. Robert Uihlein, president of the Schlitz Brewing Co.

The principal speaker was Capt. Bernard A. Thielges, professor of naval science at Marquette University, Milwaukee. Because of the pertinence of Captain Thielges' remarks to this 67th anniversary commemoration, with consent, I insert the speech at this point in the RECORD and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

THE 67TH ANNUAL "MAINE" DAY MEMORIAL SERVICE

Mr. Oesterreich, United Spanish War Veterans, friends, it is always a pleasure, a privilege, and an honor to be a participant at your various military and civic patriotic functions to pay tribute to the many brave Americans, living and dead, who have played such an heroic role in forming our great American heritage. I feel, however, that Mr. Oesterreich has misled me somewhat, as he indicated that the average age of the Spanish-American War veteran was now 86 years. After having had the privilege to meet many of you on previous occasions, and seeing you again here today, young as ever, I have concluded that Mr. Oesterreich has ample qualification for the Liars Club; and in this regard, perhaps you all belong. In any event, from the looks of you gentlemen I don't believe that I would relish the thought of defending San Juan Hill even today from an advance of men of your proven character, vitality, and patriotism.

Today, February 15, 1965, marks the 67th annual remembrance of the sinking of the U.S. battleship *Maine* in the harbor of Havana, Cuba. Let us reminisce for a moment and go back to those trying days of history. I am sure that to many of you the recollections will be quite vivid.

In January of the year 1898 there were serious riots and demonstrations against Spanish authority throughout Cuba. The American consul general, Fitzhugh Lee, cabled to Washington his doubts whether the Spanish officials could control the situation, together with the suggestion that it might be necessary to send warships for the protection of American citizens and property. The Washington authorities acted hastily and immediately dispatched the battleship *Maine,* under Captain Sigsbee, to Havana where she appeared on January 25, and was conducted to a mooring buoy by harbor officials. Her arrival caused great excitement among the populace; her reception by the Spanish authorities was a cold one.

While lying quietly at her moorings on the night of February 15 with no preliminary circumstances to excite the least alarm or suspicion, at 2145 hours the *Maine* was suddenly blown up and sunk with the loss of 266 men out of the ship's complement of 353. The report of the naval court of inquiry then convened, and fully substantiated in 1911 when the ship was refloated, showed that the disaster had resulted from a heavy external explosion, as by a mine, which drove the bowplates inward with probable subsequent explosion of the forward magazines. The incident precipitated the most acute tensions in the already strained political relations between Spain and the United States. The cry "Remember the *Maine*" raised by the American press and people became a powerful incentive to war. Ultimately, effective April 21, 1898, war was declared as existing between the United States and Spain.

Many of you gentlemen here today, from first hand experience, recall the events to follow. On the night of the 30th of May Comdr. George Dewey opened actual hostilities when he boldly sailed into Manila harbor in search of combat with the Spanish fleet. This daring act is more fully appreciated upon realization of the dangers and uncertainty that Dewey and his men faced. The harbor entrance off Corregidor, Manila, and Cavite were reported heavily fortified; the channel entrance reported mined, and the Spanish fleet lay in waiting under the protection of all this. Dewey was 7,000 miles from his nearest friendly port to which he could turn in the event of mishap or damage. Yet, in spite of all these obstacles and uncertainties, Dewey carried the offensive and sought the enemy. At 0540 hours of the morning of the 1st of May Dewey issued to his flagship captain his now famous order "You may fire when you are ready Gridley." Fire was rapid, the smoke was thick and pungent, the action was intense. By noon of this day, after five firing runs and after closing to 2,000 yards range, the destruction of the Spanish fleet was utterly complete.

Do you recall the great jubilation with which the news of Dewey's victory was received at home? Perhaps many of you have retained the news clippings and articles of this great event. The great lift of morale it gave our own people and forces was the exact reverse to the demoralizing effect the news had on the Spanish. Consider the opposing thoughts of Admiral Sampson while on blockade patrol off Cuba, and of the Spanish Admiral Cervera when, while en route to Cuba, he was advised of the complete annihilation of the Spanish Far Eastern Squadron.

Half around the globe the spotlight turned to events off Cuba. On the 29th of April Spanish Admiral Cervera sailed from the Cape Verde Islands with what was to be the first contingent of the Spanish fleet. Where was he headed? Where would he strike? Up and down the Atlantic coast the cry rose for protection from a possible strike by the Spanish fleet. Demands for more guns, more ships, more troops came from the coastal cities. The arrival of Admiral Cervera in Santiago de Cuba on the morning of the 19th of May greatly eased the tension along the Atlantic coastline.

The U.S. fleet, under its capable commander, Admiral Sampson, was spoiling for battle with the enemy. On the 1st of June a close-in semicircular blockade was set up by Sampson's fleet off Santiago de Cuba. Troops were landed under General Shafter between the 22d and 26th of June, and by the 2d of July, after heavy fighting ashore, the city's fall was imminent. Admiral Cervera was ordered to depart the harbor even though such action was certain to lead to his destruction. On the morning of the 3d of July Admiral Cervera led his ships from the safety of Santiago's harbor into the path of the ready guns of Admiral Sampson. Within the day the Spanish fleet was no more—victory was complete.

Today we look back on the Spanish-American War as not much of a contest. It spanned an extremely short period of time, from the 21st of April, 1898, until the 13th of August, 1898, barely 4 months. Casualties were extremely light on both sides as major wars are measured, and forces committed were very small. However, at the time it was destined to be a long, bitter, and bloody struggle. Spain was considered a powerful nation with a quarter of a million men under arms, truly an impressive army for the times. Her navy was impressive. Although our own Navy was fairly well established, our Army was a bare 28,000 men. This was a pitifully small force to stand against the grand monarchy of Spain. Prominent military minds of Europe prophesied a stalement, "a long desultory war." Hong Kong papers dwelt at great length on the strength of the opposing forces, and considered Manila Harbor, with its heavy fortifications, mines, and the Spanish fleet within, to be impregnable. At the Hong Kong Club none would take a chance on betting on the American squadron—even with heavy odds offered. On the eve of the departure of the American squadron from Hong Kong, when a British regiment entertained a group of American officers, it is said that the comment freely expressed by the British was "a fine set of fellows, but unhappily we shall never see them again." Throughout the world the general opinion held that the Spanish Navy would be victorious.

Here again, as in more recent years, our adversaries did not consider the will, the energy, and the patriotism of the American people—men like you here today. Every man who participated in the war with Spain was a volunteer. Our total men under arms quickly built up to a total of 392,000, of whom, regretfully, only about 15,000 are living yet today. State militia responded promptly and with high patriotic spirit to the call to arms. The 1st Naval Battalion, New York, reported to duty fully armed and equipped within 6 hours of notification. Others, both Army and Navy, were equally as responsive. Overlooked, too, in weighing the forces of battle was the deplorable condition of the Spanish ships and material, and the indifferent training of her personnel. What a contrast, that Admiral Cervera's largest ship proceeded to war lacking her heaviest guns and that he was required to tow his destroyers across the Atlantic to make battle; yet the *Oregon* made a record voyage from Pacific to Atlantic (66 days—11.6 knots) ready for battle on arrival.

Isn't it great to sit around in such a pleasant atmosphere as this and reminisce—or to hold a bull session, if you prefer—over the events of our past in which we have played some small part? Yet, in so doing, we must be ever careful that we do not fall into the pitiful trap of becoming wedded to the past. For we are living in the present, not yesterday, and are preparing for a future of great mystery and excitement. In this preparation for the future, we must draw from the bank of knowledge and lessons of past history; for wise is he who can benefit from his own experiences and the mistakes of others without himself having to make these same costly errors at the risk of his business, his family, his life or his country.

The lesson which stands out so vividly from the Spanish-American conflict, as it so often does in such crises, is that of preparedness—in material—in training—and in the motivation of the will of the people of this great Nation to remain free. By all bets Spain was ultimately to win this war. Yet by cold statistics, how could she, considering the deplorable condition of her state of readiness? As opposed, American standards of readiness, energy and general efficiency were immeasurably greater as regards both material and personnel. As pertaining to the Navy, this was possible only because of the unconquerable spirit of its officers in the dark years of material degeneration after the Civil War, and because of some farsighted political leaders who had the wisdom to provide for the new Navy—a Navy of steam, not sail; and a Navy of armor and guns, not tinder and rifles. Today as never before this same farsightedness and boldness is required, as we must once again turn aside the outmoded tools of the past for a new Navy under missiles, rockets, and nuclear power.

Again we are faced with crises. Today, as in 1898, Cuba is once again under foreign domination. Throughout the past several months most of you have seen pictures and movies of angry mobs demonstrating against our country; pictures of American planes and pilots exhibited in the streets throughout several Communist countries; pictures of stage and street plays depicting the warmongering imperialistic American. You who have seen these pictures surely could not fail to observe a bitter hatred of the American—of you and me.

Fellow veterans, if we are to remain free and to help our friends to remain free—we must remain prepared. Just as many of you maintain sufficient force in your homes for protection of family and property (be it a gun or a bulldog); just as we must maintain and give our fullest support to our fine police forces to protect and make safe our streets, parks, cities and Nation for all decent people; so too must we maintain a ready and alert Military Establishment second to none. As a part of our great Military Establishment, your Navy still remains our first line of defense. It stands ever ready, wherever needed, whenever needed, capable of bringing to bear the number of forces required to do the task at hand—be it the show of the flag or the sting of a rocket. Your Navy can roam the globe without requiring permission from anyone and can show the flag from the Far East to the Mediterranean as no rocket or missile can do. As a Navy man, speaking for your Navy in particular, it must be strong, it must be ready, it must be "new." For, as stated by Gen. George Washington—whom I am sure you all hold in high esteem—"whatever efforts are made by land armies, the Navy must have the deciding vote."

Fellow veterans, this is our lesson of your day—as since proved over and over again—in the arena of strength and preparedness it does pay to keep up with the Joneses if we are to remain free. In the words of the late President Kennedy, "only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be used." If these weapons, then, never are used we will have made a fitting tribute of lasting peace to you gentlemen here today, to your friends and to mine, who have given so much that our country and all the world might be free.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is our privilege to join on February 15 in paying tribute to those who fought in the Spanish-American War.

The part that all the brave participants were to play in this brief but fierce conflict was triggered by the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, in Manila Harbor, on this day, February 15, 67 years ago. This event, which is sometimes referred to as "the Pearl Harbor of 1898" was to set off a sequence of engagements which culminated in the Battle of San Juan Hill, and on the first day of July 1898 we see that courageous and robust young American, Theodore Roosevelt, storming the heights of San Juan Hill, spurring his men on.

It was this land action, in support of our blockade of Santiago Harbor that accomplished the destruction of Spanish aggression and virtually brought about the end of the Spanish-American War. To those young Americans who laid down life before it was hardly begun for them, to the Rough Riders and their intrepid young leader as they stormed the ridges of San Juan Hill to pave the way to victory, and to all our brave men who served our great country in the Spanish-American War, we pay tribute.

But in honoring those who spread the account of this conflict, which brought the United States to its rightful place as a true champion of liberty, across the pages of history in the indelible ink of their bravery, we would be indeed remiss if we failed to honor a hero in our midst. We have among us a distinguished gentleman whose own brave life reads like the most imaginative and challenging of adventure stories. I speak of that distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA.

To say that truth is stranger than fiction is understating BARRATT O'HARA's adventurous life. His brave experiences took him through that rugged segment of American history, the "authors" of which we honor today. At the brave young age of 15 years, he landed in Cuba—3 days after Teddy Roosevelt and his Rough Riders had blazed the trail of freedom up San Juan Hill and for his participation in the seige of Santiago our colleague was awarded the Order of Military Merit in White, by the Republic of Cuba, for services rendered to the Cuban people in their struggle for independence from Spanish rule.

Each of us here knows of the incredible bravery and excitement with which BARRATT O'HARA's life has unfolded, and as our colleague in this great body he represents to us not only all that is the best and bravest in service to our country and to his fellow man during times of stress, but he has distinguished himself among us for his long and devoted service as a Member of the Congress of the United States. To this brave man we pay tribute, and by the honor we pay him as a symbol of all that is great and good in our American determination to protect and preserve freedom among all peoples, we also do honor to those who served—as did BARRATT O'HARA—in that bloody conflict, the Spanish-American War.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at 9:40 o'clock this evening a few Americans will recall that 67 years ago Havana Harbor was the scene of death and destruction. We remember the *Maine*. It is entirely fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we recall that incident today, 67 years later.

The American battleship—second class—U.S.S. *Maine*, a gleaming 6,682-ton vessel, was commissioned in 1895. Three years after launching she was ordered to proceed from Key West, Fla. to Havana Harbor, under the command of Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee. Although the visit was termed a "friendly one," it was obvious the *Maine* was to represent American strength in the harbor, and to help Americans in Cuba in event their safety was in question. The Spanish authorities in Cuba protested, but the *Maine* made her way into the harbor where she lay moored to a buoy, just 500 yards from a Spanish arsenal.

Tension between the Spaniards and the Americans was running high, especially following the *Maine's* arrival, but it was not until the night of February 15, 1898, 9:40 in the evening to be exact, these tensions broke into violence. Two explosions ripped the American vessel—the first a dull, muted one, and the second, perhaps a magazine on board below the main deck and forward, a violent more powerful one.

Within seconds the powerful battleship was a twisted mass of steel. Indeed, the two explosions had sent parts of the ship, and even men and parts of bodies as high as 200 feet into the air. The explosions rendered the forecastle unrecognizable. The explosions were so great that watertight integrity perhaps could not help. In any event, the aft began to sink.

Mr. Speaker, naval disasters are always appalling and tragic with losses of human life. The cataclysm of the *Maine* was particularly dreadful, as 260 officers and men were later buried in Colon Cemetery, Havana. Had the entire crew been on board that night, the number of dead and maimed undoubtedly would have been much higher.

Both Spanish and American authorities began an investigation of this tragedy, emphasizing major concern as to the cause of both explosions. Instead of clearing the air, investigations merely served to cloud one of the most frustrating mysteries of a warlike act. Spanish investigators found the explosions to be caused by spontaneous combustion, probably in the coal bunkers, which in turn, sent fire rushing to forward magazines. American investigators decided the first explosion was an external blast, which in turn ignited forward magazines. Neither investigation was conclusive.

Regardless of these indecisive answers, Mr. Speaker, sinking of the *Maine* caused furor in this country. Anti-Spanish feeling ran high. Certain newspapers freely and openly made accusations against the Spanish, and the whole incident was soon reduced to the well-known slogan: "Remember the *Maine*."

In 1911, U.S. Army Engineers sealed off the after section of the vessel, and after building a cofferdam around the hulk, raised what was left of the ship, and floated it out to sea. During the raising of the twisted vessel, 66 more bodies were found. The remains of these American sailors were buried in Arlington National Cemetery. Also during the removal, American engineers and marine experts made an additional investigation, published in 1912. The report basically repeating earlier American findings, stated in part:

> This [exterior explosion] resulted in igniting and exploding the contents of the 6-inch reserve magazine, A–14–M, said contents including a large quantity of black powder. The more or less complete explosion of the contents of the remaining forward magazine followed.

Although the American experts had evidence that the bottom of the ship was bent up and inward, European experts maintained the initial explosion came from within. For practical and technical purposes, the first explosion is still a mystery.

Somewhere on the high seas, on March 16, 1912, with guns booming, and sailors standing silently at attention, the U.S.S. *Maine* was sunk, her flags flying. We remember the *Maine*, and she, a ship who was only 3 years old and joined a long list of Navy ships and men whose contributions are now legend.

Mr. Speaker, I always feel an awareness of the Spanish-American War, not only because I, as many Americans, realize that Cuba is again not free, but also because my father served our country in that conflict.

I do not want to close my discussion of this 67th anniversary of the destruction of the *Maine*, without calling to the attention of this body, that there is only one Member in the 89th Congress who took part in that war, and he is a Member of the House of Representatives. I refer, of course, to our colleague and my good friend, Representative BARRATT

O'HARA, from the Illinois Second Congressional District.

Mr. O'HARA was born at St. Joseph, Mich., April 28, 1882, and before he was 15 years old, he had enough excitement and adventure to last many men a lifetime. He had, for example, as a boy been on several expeditions of a dangerous nature to the hinterlands and jungles of Latin America. But this was not enough for BARRATT O'HARA. At the age of 15, while a sophomore in high school, he joined the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and was in Cuba only 3 days after "Teddy" Roosevelt's Rough Riders arrived. He was in a number of engagements, and participated in the siege of Santiago. He was decorated by the Cuban Government for his part in their war of liberation.

I am very pleased and proud today to join my distinguished colleague from Illinois in saluting this Nation's remembrance of the *Maine* and of those men who lost their lives while in the service of our Nation. I am particularly proud to pay a special tribute to the gentleman from Illinois for his service then and his service now.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today's observance of the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* has special significance for the people of the State of Maine, the State whose name the *Maine* bore with such honor.

The battleship *Maine* visited Portland, Maine, on November 25, 1895. An official visit aboard ship was first made by members of the staff of the Governor of Maine. The battleship's commander then paid a ceremonial visit in Portland to Maine's Governor and Portland's mayor. The next day the Governor, the mayor, and a citizens committee were received aboard the *Maine* with appropriate honors.

The *Maine* was open to the public throughout the day, and hundreds of citizens of Portland along with many Maine residents from other parts of the States visited her. On the evening of November 26 the commander and his officers attended a banquet given in their honor by the city of Portland. Amid all these ceremonies and festivities, who could have foretold the fate of the *Maine*? Who could have foreseen her watery grave in Havana Harbor with so many of her crew yet aboard, but dead in the service of their country?

A few short years after the visit to Portland, the battleship *Maine* cleared Key West, Fla., on her last voyage. On February 15, 1898, the *Maine* was blown up in an appalling catastrophe which brought upon this country the tragedy of war. News of the disaster was communicated to the Secretary of the Navy in a dispatch which read:

> *Maine* blew up in Havana Harbor at 9:40 tonight and destroyed. Many wounded and doubtless more killed or drowned.

As she has in all our wars, the State of Maine responded energetically and quickly to the call to arms in the Spanish-American War. Maine furnished a regiment of infantry, four batteries of heavy artillery, and a signal corps. This signal corps took a brave part in the Santiago campaign. The infantry regiment, encamped at Chickamauga, suffered badly from illness; it was about to be moved to Puerto Rico when peace was declared.

Many Maine men enlisted in the Regular Army and Navy, and the Volunteer Naval Reserve associations of Portland and Bath were mustered into Federal service. The full details of the raising of Maine's volunteer quota during the Spanish-American War are to be found in the 1899 message of Governor Powers.

In that message, the Governor of Maine noted:

> At this time, when we sorely needed men, the University of Maine sent us more than 40 splendid volunteers, familiar with military tactics and drill, who enlisted as privates. It was a timely and much-needed aid. It encouraged others. It was an act that the State should not forget.

There was apprehension that the coast of Maine might be attacked by Spanish gunboats.

> There was considerable anxiety in some of the towns and cities along the coast.

Wrote the Governor:

> They feared that they might be attacked by gunboats or cruisers of the Spanish Navy * * *. I was convinced, after a careful examination, that the only real and effective defense for our coast towns was to establish batteries and mines, and to obtain, from the United States, cruisers to sail along the shores, and in conjunction with our delegation in Congress we succeeded in obtaining two cruisers, and having the coast very generally and effectually fortified.

The State of Maine does indeed remember the battleship *Maine*. Also remembered are the volunteers of that conflict, a war in which no draft act was needed to man our Army and Navy. To the surviving veterans of the Spanish-American War, and to the descendants of those Spanish War veterans who are no longer with us, all patriotic Americans today extend their praise and best wishes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM AND AMERICAN DEFENSE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAWKINS). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the past week has served to bring home forcefully the hard and bitter truth that our country is engaged in war in Vietnam.

It has been apparent for some time that our Government's stake in the savage struggle in Vietnam is a major one, with more than 23,000 American officers and men engaged in assisting the forces of South Vietnam, at a daily cost in excess of $2 million.

On February 6, Vietcong guerrilla forces entered an American air base at Pleiku and blasted planes, helicopters, and barracks on the base, leaving 8 of our enlisted men dead and more than 125 wounded.

The following day, the President of the United States ordered an air strike against military targets in North Vietnam, and fighter-bombers from three of our carriers were involved in action more than 50 miles north of the 17th parallel, which divides North and South Vietnam.

The President proceeded to order the withdrawal of 1,800 American dependents from Vietnam, and declared on behalf of our Government:

> We have no choice now but to clear the decks and make absolutely clear our continued determination to back South Vietnam in its fight to maintain its independence.

In the days which have followed that presidential announcement, Vietcong forces have engaged in another savage attack upon quarters occupied by American forces, inflicting heavy casualties and bringing the total number of Americans dead by Vietcong action to nearly 300.

In response to the enemy attack of February 9, 160 planes of the United States and South Vietnam joined in the largest aerial attack of the long conflict, striking at a series of supply depots and military barracks north of the 17th parallel.

The scope of the massive air strike on February 10, in which more than 100 planes from American carriers at sea joined fighter-bombers of the American Air Force and those of South Vietnam, spoke far more effectively than mere words of this Nation's "continued determination."

HOMEFRONT QUESTIONS

In the wake of an unquestioned escalation of military action during the past week, many Americans were asking searching questions—both publicly and privately—concerning the course of the war.

With regard to the central aim of our presence in Vietnam, the President has left no room for reasonable doubt. He has said publicly that he considers it "essential" to American interests to defeat the Communist aggression against South Vietnam. He has declared his conviction that our failure there "would convince every nation in south Asia that it must now bow to Communist terms to survive."

Notwithstanding these strong words, with their clear commitment of U.S. prestige as declared by the Nation's Chief Executive, the charge is now heard in more than one quarter that the extent and validity of that commitment remain uncertain and ill-defined.

In the New York Times for Sunday, February 14, 1965, both Arthur Krock and James Reston have voiced their protest over White House failure to "make things clear" and to advise of "plans to meet whatever contingencies may arise from the new U.S. policy of immediate and increasingly powerful military reprisal."

Mr. Krock and Mr. Reston were chiefly concerned with the absence of information and knowledge at home concerning the depth and breadth of our Vietnam commitment.

Other competent observers, however, have been even more concerned about the effect of uncertainty in the Communist world.

Writing in the Washington Post for February 14, 1965, Donald S. Zagoria—in an article entitled, "Communists Doubt Our Will in Vietnam"—reported as follows:

> The Communists have long believed that the United States would not have the patience or will to stick out the war and recent statements by influential Americans calling for negotiation and/or withdrawal almost certainly increased their optimism. They have all along eagerly seized on any American statements urging negotiation and withdrawal. In the past 6 months, several prominent American Senators, columnists, and newspapers have called for negotiations and, in the absence of a clear-cut policy, rumors developed that the administration was in favor of negotiation.
>
> All this doubtless strongly reinforced the Communist belief that victory in South Vietnam was close at hand.

In the opinion of Mr. Zagoria, "two bombing attacks will not suffice" as sufficient pressure "to bring a reluctant Ho Chi Minh to the conference table."

> They will not so easily give up at the conference table what they have fought so hard and so long on the battlefield to achieve, and at a time when final victory seems near—

Mr. Zagoria concludes.

A member of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs and the author of "The Sino-Soviet Conflict, 1956-61," Mr. Zagoria has impressive credentials as a commentator on Communist thinking. His conclusion that the Communists question our will and determination in Vietnam may well provide the key to understanding of Vietcong policy.

Mr. Roscoe Drummond, also writing in the Washington Post on February 14, shares the view that American policy statements "have not persuaded the Asian Communists the United States really believes that turning back the aggression against South Vietnam is essential. Or that we intend to do whatever is necessary to see that this aggression will not be defeated."

> The reason is—

Writes Mr. Drummond—

> that actions, not words, make policy believable to the enemy. Our actions in Vietnam have not equaled our words. We have treated this war as though winning it were essential to South Vietnam but not essential to the United States. We have for the most part permitted North Vietnam to practice aggression and enjoy immunity. Secretary Rusk once gave a somber cease-and-desist-or-else warning. When it was not heeded, we did nothing.

Up until the last week, Mr. Speaker, that was more or less the situation, and the plain truth about the impression which we had created in Asia concerning our policy in Vietnam. We were sending thousands of men, and spending millions of dollars, but we were not convincing the Communists of our intention to do everything necessary to defeat aggression in Vietnam.

CHANGE IN DIRECTION

Now, in the words of Mr. Drummond, "something more is being done."

We have undoubtedly convinced the Communists in North Vietnam of our intention and readiness to hit, and hit very hard indeed, when American military forces in Vietnam are attacked directly by the Vietcong. We have made it very clear that North Vietnam is not a privileged sanctuary, and we have demonstrated that our forces are not afraid to cross the 17th parallel.

Without question, we have also impressed the Communists of Asia with the quality and effectiveness of American air forces—both land and sea-based—and of the rising quality and effectiveness of the air force of South Vietnam.

Finally, and notwithstanding some critics, President Johnson has undoubtedly rallied the support of an overwhelming majority of his fellow citizens in support of his policies of the past week.

In the Congress, leaders of both parties have spoken out strongly in support of the air strikes on North Vietnam.

In the press, editorial comment across the Nation has generally approved, and most have agreed with the Seattle Times that the President "has the overwhelming support of the American people."

Even Mr. Reston, in his largely critical column, declared that "very few people here question the necessity for a limited expansion of the war by U.S. bombers into Communist territory."

And yet, while there is general agreement that the situation in Vietnam has entered a radically new phase, I have not found a single authority who believes the bombing attacks of last week will result in early conclusion of the long and bloody conflict—either by military victory or the conference table.

On the contrary, Mr. Zagoria is emphatic in the belief that "persistent and heavy pressure" must be brought to bear against the North, and offers the view that "positive incentives"—both economic and diplomatic—should also be offered as an alternative to widespread destruction in North Vietnam.

Mr. Drummond is convinced that we must make it clear that we are prepared to participate in joint air strikes with the forces of South Vietnam in response to Vietcong attacks upon Vietnamese forces, as well as in response to attacks upon Americans. Such a willingness is indispensable to our relations with South Vietnam, and would make even more clear our determination to halt Communist aggression in that country.

The Drummond view on this last point is shared by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, writing from on the scene in Saigon, who say our relationship with Vietnamese forces in the field is at stake in the decision to use our planes to counterattacks upon the forces of South Vietnam.

Unless our "forward strategy" of the past week is "continued and intensified," in the view of these Saigon observers, "disappointment, then disillusion" can be predicted among our allies.

THE UNANSWERED QUESTION

Were the dramatic and effective air strikes of last week in Vietnam merely a measured response to intensified attacks by the Communists, or did they signal the beginning of a new forward strategy aimed at a real change in the course of the war?

It may well be that the answer to both of these questions is "Yes," and that days to follow will establish that measured response in itself is a forward strategy in Vietnam.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his impressive television report to the Nation, described our air strikes as convincing evidence of our "will and purpose" in Vietnam. No American listening and watching was left in doubt as to the Secretary's personal sincerity or determination.

And yet—on the evidence now before us—there is doubt of our will and purpose in Vietnam.

There is obviously doubt in Hanoi, where the North Vietnamese continue to direct the forces of aggression south of the 17th parallel.

There is obviously doubt in Peiping, where the Chinese Reds speak ominously of open intervention in Vietnam, and where troops are reported massing along the border.

Here in the United States, there is some doubt also—as evidenced by the chorus of critical questioning over the weekend, and the clamor from peace-at-any-price quarters for immediate negotiation or withdrawal.

It is not my purpose, as a relatively junior Member of this body, to substitute my personal judgment for that of either the President or any member of his Cabinet.

No man in America is as well qualified as President Johnson to lead our Nation during this critical period of the world's history, and no President in our history has been surrounded by abler men in his Cabinet.

I have every confidence that our President will soon put to a final and decisive end the doubts and questions concerning our policy in Vietnam.

I have every confidence that the coming weeks will demonstrate, beyond any question, the American will and purpose to halt aggression in Vietnam are neither qualified by timidity at home nor discouraged by bluster abroad.

I have every confidence that our President and our Armed Forces in Vietnam and Asia will continue to command the warm and wholehearted support and trust of the American people and their representatives in Congress.

TWO CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS

In the spirit of constructive support of the President, I would like to conclude these remarks with two brief proposals—both of which, in my judgment, would help in a substantial way to terminate all doubts regarding our will and purpose in Vietnam.

Both suggestions are based upon the conviction that Red China and Soviet Russia—the two dominant Communist powers, and both of them major land powers—are more impressed by military manpower than any other factor. The military writings of both of these nations abundantly support this view.

In my judgment, this Government should immediately suspend all further action to reduce our military manpower under the policies announced by Secretary McNamara in November of 1964. Regardless of what is done with reference to the basis involved, the manpower should be retained—whether in the Reserves, the National Guard or the Regular Forces. This is no time to engage in economy releases of trained military personnel.

Second, the Armed Forces should hold "for the duration of the emergency" all personnel now being released by reason of termination of enlistment or "time in rank"—seeking whatever Executive or legislative authority may be necessary for such action.

These two steps would help beyond measure to convince the Communists that we mean business in Vietnam—and that we are prepared to do what is necessary to protect the cause of freedom and American interests in Asia.

FEBRUARY 12, 1965.

HON. ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Along with millions of Americans, I have applauded your announced determination to hold the line against communism in Vietnam and southeast Asia, and agree wholeheartedly with your recent statement on television that "our will and purpose are being tested" in that area. I thoroughly agree that the United States must take every necessary step to hold our ground there, and to make clear and unmistakable the firmness of our will and purpose in the face of increased Communist aggressiveness in Vietnam.

In view of the increasingly serious situation in Vietnam, I strongly urge you to suspend immediately any further Pentagon action to reduce in any way our military forces. So long as the present situation prevails, we should do all in our power to hold in a position of readiness all able-bodied members of our Armed Forces, in either the Regular Establishment or in Reserve and National Guard units.

Department of Defense estimates supplied to the House Committee on Armed Services show a manpower reduction of 150,000 will result upon merger of the Army Reserve and Army National Guard. Additional reductions are scheduled in Air Force manpower.

The purpose of this letter is not to plead the case of any particular base or unit—and the importance of an Air Force Reserve Group scheduled to be abolished in my own district, at Davis Field in Muskogee, cannot be dismissed from my own thinking—but my major and overriding concern at this time does not involve any particular base or organizational unit. I am principally concerned as a Member of Congress with the reduction in ready manpower now in progress under orders issued by your office, and the impact of that reduction in manpower upon our position in southeast Asia.

You have eloquently stated that the United States intends to show North Vietnam and the world its determination to stand firm and do everything necessary to protect our interest in that area. Surely it must seem inconsistent with that purpose, to any observer, to continue at this time with steps to reduce our pool of trained fighting men—thousands of men who stand ready to back our Regular military forces in the event of an enlargement of the conflict in Vietnam.

Notwithstanding your announced objectives of economy and overall improvement in defense readiness, it is unlikely that the Asiatic mind—or any mind behind the Iron Curtain—will view any reduction in armed forces as a move toward strength and firmness.

I sincerely believe it is strategically, logically, and psychologically wrong to take any further action at this time which indicates any curtailment of strength or gives any impression of reduction of effort or withdrawal.

Facing the greatest challenge to our free world leadership since the Communist march into South Korea, this Nation should give evidence at home as well as in southeast Asia of our determination and intention to meet the Communist threat and employ every resource at our command.

In that spirit I believe your decision to retain all present military forces—Regular, Reserve, and Guard included—at a maximum state of readiness so long as the present situation continues in Vietnam, would contribute in a very positive way to the maintenance of our position there. I feel certain it would also convince millions of Americans, who are today confused by the news of a drastic increase in the March draft call as contrasted with the release of Reservists across the country, that we mean business in every sense of the word in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

ED EDMONDSON,
Member of Congress.

TAX CREDITS FOR CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide a tax credit for amounts paid on account of tuition fees and similar educational expenses at a level above the 12th grade.

I first introduced a similar bill (H.R. 12771) in the 87th Congress. I reintroduced that bill (H.R. 49) in the 88th Congress.

The bill introduced today provides a different formula for computing the credit. The amount of the credit is 75 percent of the first $200, 25 percent of the next $300, and 10 percent of the next $1,000 expended for tuition fees, books, and supplies for a student at an institution of higher education. Maximum credit is $325.

The purpose of the bill is to encourage educational aid, not only for members of the taxpayer's immediate family, but also to other deserving students. To the extent that the needs of our students can be met by private initiative, we conserve Federal and State revenues.

The allowance of this tax credit will also relieve the pressure on scholarship funds to the extent that the tax credit can provide for tuition and related expenses. The more limited funds available for scholarships can be directed to those most deserving and most in need of additional financial aid.

Our educational system, free from Government control, is one of our greatest national assets. It is essential to encourage the expansion of that system, and to make its benefits available to the greatest number of people. This bill will aid in the attainment of that objective.

DEDICATION OF THE ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON MEMORIAL WING OF THE ALLEGHANY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAWKINS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, 1964, an impressive ceremony was held in Sparta, N.C., a small but thriving community in the Blue Ridge Mountains of northwestern North Carolina. The occasion was the dedication of the Robert Lee Doughton memorial wing of the Alleghany Memorial Hospital.

Robert Lee Doughton—1863–1954—legislator, farmer, businessman, humanitarian, and dedicated public servant, represented the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina, from January 1911 to January 1953. His remarkable record of legislative achievement spanned more than a generation. For the last 18 years of his service in Washington, he was chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. His leadership of that great committee spanned a period of service longer than that held by any other man in American history.

In today's world, men think of retirement and enjoying a life of leisure at the normal retirement age of 65. Yet Congressman Doughton, unusual man that he was, took on new challenges in the twilight of his life and led the Congress in writing great and landmark legislation.

Mr. Doughton served his native State and Nation with distinction. A grateful and appreciative State, eager to erect an appropriate memorial for this giant of a man and the great service he rendered, made plans for such a memorial.

In 1961, the North Carolina General Assembly authorized the Governor of North Carolina to appoint a commission to plan for and to create a fitting memorial to Mr. Doughton. The act is as follows:

S.B. 444

[Session Laws, 1961—ch. 1079]

CHAPTER 1079

An act to authorize the Governor to appoint a commission to erect a fitting memorial to the late Robert Lee Doughton, former State senator and long-time Member of Congress, and to appropriate the sum of $25,000 to aid in bearing the expense of erecting the memorial

Whereas the late Robert Lee Doughton was born at Laurel Springs, N.C., on November 7, 1863, receiving his education in the public schools of Laurel Springs and Sparta, N.C.; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton was appointed as a member of the Board of Agriculture of the State of North Carolina in 1903, serving with distinction until he was elected to the State senate from the 35th district in 1908, after which time he devoted his energy and talents as director of the State prison from 1909 to 1911; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton was elected from the Ninth District to serve in the 62d session of Congress and was reelected for succeeding terms by large majorities with the results being that he served his district, State, and Nation from the 62d to the 82d sessions of Congress, both inclusive, in a manner unexcelled by any other public servant; and

Whereas while serving as a Member of Congress, he was nominated chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means during the 73d to the 79th sessions of Congress, both inclusive, being reinstated to that most important post during the 81st Congress, a position which he held longer than any other man in the history of the Government, still finding time, however, to serve as alternating Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton rendered distinguished service to the public life of the State and Nation through his fine, well-balanced personality, his ability to study public problems without regard to the pressures of interested groups and reach a solution in the best interest of the entire State and Nation, always with the highest degree of intellectual honesty; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton has served as a leader in the moral, religious, and civic life of the State, always conducting himself by the book of his chosen church; making his citizenship a thing of fine obligation, following no guide but integrity into the political forum; and

Whereas the general assembly is of the opinion that a fitting memorial should be erected as a memorial to his long and distinguished record as a public spirited citizen and servant of this State and Nation: Now, therefore,

The General Assembly of North Carolina do enact:

SECTION 1. The Governor of North Carolina is authorized to appoint a commission to be known as "The Robert Lee Doughton Memorial Commission" and to consist of 25 members. It shall be the duty of this commission to erect a suitable and fitting memorial in the town of Laurel Springs or at some appropriate site in the vicinity of said town.

SEC. 2. There is hereby appropriated from the general fund to the commission created by this act the sum of $25,000 which shall be expended by the commission in the erection of the memorial herein referred to.

SEC. 3. The members of the commission created by this act shall serve without any pay or expense allowances of any kind.

SEC. 4. The commission created by this act shall have authority to accept or reject donations from private individuals or corporations to be expended for the purposes herein set forth.

SEC. 5. All laws and clauses of laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. This act shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 21st day of June 1961.

In November of 1961, Governor Terry Sanford appointed 25 well-known citizens of North Carolina as members of the Robert Lee Doughton Memorial Commission. Those appointed are as follows:

[Ch. 1079, Session Laws, 1961]

THE ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Membership: 25 members.

Term: At will of the Governor.

C. A. Cannon, chairman, Kannapolis, November 14, 1961, Cabarrus County.

Fred W. Morrison, vice chairman, Shelby and Washington, November 14, 1961, Cleveland County.

Mrs. R. S. Ferguson, Taylorsville, November 14, 1961, Alexander County.

J. Harry Miller, Stony Point, November 14, 1961, Alexander County.

A. Vance Choate, Sparta, November 14, 1961, Alleghany County.

J. Kemp Doughton, Sparta, November 14, 1961, Alleghany County.

R. Austin Jones, West Jefferson, November 14, 1961, Ashe County.

Wm. B. Austin, Jefferson, November 14, 1961, Ashe County.

Mrs. Stella Anderson, West Jefferson, November 14, 1961, Ashe County.

M. Smoot Lyles, Concord, November 14, 1961, Cabarrus County.

Harold Coffey, Lenoir, November 14, 1961, Caldwell County.

Dennis S. Cook, Lenoir, November 14, 1961, Caldwell County.

Mrs. Margaret B. Moore, Lenoir, November 14, 1961, Caldwell County.

J. Gordon Bush, Lenoir, November 14, 1961, Caldwell County.

Dr. J. Sam Holbrook, Statesville, November 14, 1961, Iredell County.

Senator James V. Johnson, Statesville, November 14, 1961, Iredell County.

Joe Knox, Mooresville, November 14, 1961, Iredell County.

James A. Graham, Raleigh, November 14, 1961, Rowan County.

John Kesler, Salisbury, November 14, 1961, Rowan County.

Walter Woodson, Sr., Salisbury, November 14, 1961, Rowan County.

Leslie M. Weisiger, Salisbury, November 14, 1961, Rowan County.

Mrs. E. G. Harwood, Albemarle, November 14, 1961, Stanly County.

W. H. Morrow, Albemarle, November 14, 1961, Stanly County.

Gordon H. Winkler, Boone, November 14, 1961, Watauga County.

Robert C. Rivers, Boone, November 14, 1961, Watauga County.

Dwight W. Quinn, secretary, Kannapolis.

Under the able leadership of its chairman, another distinguished North Carolinian, Mr. C. A. Cannon, of Concord, N.C., the commission began to implement its appointed task. After appropriate investigation and planning, the commission adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the legislature of 1961 created the Robert Lee Doughton Memorial Commission and charged it with the duty and responsibility of erecting an appropriate memorial to the late Robert Lee Doughton, former State Senator and long-time Member of Congress, appropriating for this purpose the sum of $25,000; and

Whereas said commission has been duly appointed by the Governor and organized as provided by law; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton served the State and the Nation with great distinction, making an outstanding contribution to sound business principles in government, especially as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the National House of Representatives; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton throughout his long public career stood for the highest moral and ethical principles; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton, although rising to positions of great trust and power, never lost touch with the people he served, maintaining always a democratic faith in the wisdom of the electorate, remaining at all times their good friend and counselor, their devoted and loyal Representative; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton in both public and private life was a man of great faith, of firm spiritual convictions, which was expressed in his devotion to the church of his choice, and in the deep sympathy and compassion that he always had for his fellow man; and

Whereas other memorials have been erected to the memory of Mr. Doughton, (1) a bust of Robert Lee Doughton on the courthouse lawn in Sparta, Alleghany County; (2) a plaque dedicated to the memory of Robert Lee Doughton in Doughton Park; and

Whereas there now exists in the town of Sparta, which is located in the vicinity of Mr. Doughton's birthplace at Laurel Springs, a splendid hospital now known as the Alleghany County Memorial Hospital, which although it is now rendering great service to the community, is in need of funds for expansion, so that it may render still greater service to the people of Alleghany County; and

Whereas we are informed and believe that the trustees of the Alleghany County Memorial Hospital would welcome the suggestion that their expanded hospital facilities be "The Robert Lee Doughton Memorial Division": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That:

SECTION 1. The Robert Lee Doughton Memorial Commission is of the opinion that in view of the character of the two memorials above mentioned, the long distinguished life of public service of Robert Lee Doughton, now be best memorialized by an institution devoted to humanitarian service (rather than a monument in marble or bronze), a living memorial which will continue through the years to serve the sick and minister to the afflicted, particularly those residing in the region which was always known to him.

SEC. 2. In furtherance of this objective, it is the desire and purpose of this commission to donate the said $25,000, appropriated by the general assembly to the Alleghany County Memorial Hospital, located in Sparta.

SEC. 3. The executive committee of the Robert Lee Doughton Memorial Commission is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with the Alleghany County Memorial Hospital in taking the final necessary steps for the completion of this matter.

SEC. 4. The above donation will be given to the Alleghany County Memorial Hospital for their expansion program on the condition that the Hill-Burton funds and local funds are forthcoming and meet the required amount.

Planning for the new hospital wing began immediately. The Robert L. Doughton Memorial Commission worked in close harmony with the trustees of the Alleghany County Hospital. These trustees are:

R. F. Crouse, chairman, Sparta, N.C.

Edwin Duncan, vice chairman, Sparta, N.C.

D. F. Sturdivant, executive committee, Sparta, N.C.

Amos Wagoner, Jr., executive committee, Sparta, N.C.

J. C. Gambill, executive committee, Independence, Va.

Edd Pugh, Laurel Springs, N.C.

Isom Wagoner, Sparta, N.C.

J. K. Doughton, Sparta, N.C.

Fred Weaver, Piney Creek, N.C.

Mrs. Cristine Gallaher, Post Office Box 3082, Winston-Salem, N.C.

Miss Pearl Fields, Sparta, N.C.

Homer Edwards, Sparta, N.C.
Edd Darr, Sparta, N.C.
Cleve Nichols, Sparta, N.C.
Bill Halsey, Sparta, N.C.
Ernest Edwards, Sparta, N.C.
A. B. Richardson, hospital administrator.

Working in harmony toward the creation of the living memorial which would provide in Alleghany County the kind of humanitarian service of which Congressman Doughton would have been proud, a fine new facility was brought into being.

One November 20, 1964, the culmination of all the planning and dedicated work of the Doughton Memorial Commission was realized as the new hospital wing was dedicated at Sparta. The program for that occasion was as follows:

Program for Dedication and Unveiling Plaque

Presiding: C. A. Cannon, chairman, Robert Lee Doughton Memorial Commission.

Invocation: Rev. Lewis Williams, pastor, Sparta Baptist Church.

Opening remarks: C. A. Cannon.

Introduction of Mr. Mills: James T. Broyhill, Congressman, Ninth District, North Carolina.

Tribute to Robert Lee Doughton: Hon. Wilbur Mills, U.S. Congressman from Arkansas, chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means.

Presentation: C. A. Cannon.

Unveiling: James Horton Doughton, grandson of Robert Lee Doughton.

Acceptance: R. Floyd Crouse, chairman, Alleghany Hospital board of trustees.

Unveiling highway historical marker for Robert Lee Doughton

Remarks: Dr. Christopher Crittenden, director, State of North Carolina Department of Archives and History.

Unveiling: Virginia Pou Doughton, granddaughter of Robert Lee Doughton.

Closing remarks: C. A. Cannon.

Benediction: Rev. Lewis Williams.

This was, indeed, a proud moment for all North Carolinians as they honored a native son whose contributions to this Nation have been so manifold. Congressmen Roy Taylor and Horace Kornegay were present to represent the North Carolina congressional delegation. Other distinguished guests included: Agnew Bahnson and Bill Henderson of the North Carolina Medical Care Commission; Henry Kendell, head of the North Carolina Employment Security Commission; Dr. Wilburt Davison, former dean of Duke Medical School; Marshall Pickens, director of the Duke Endowment; Mrs. Louise Broyhill, wife of the Congressman; Judge John McLaughlin, who authorized the legislation that established the Doughton Memorial Commission; Judge Johnson J. Hayes; W. H. Ruffin, president of Erwin Mills; Ralph Howland and Dick Chatham of Chatham Manufacturing Co.; Carl McGraw of Charlotte, president of First Union National Bank; Mr. and Mrs. Robert G. Hayes of Concord and Banner Elk.

It was my great privilege on that occasion to introduce the distinguished speaker, Congressman Wilbur Mills, of Arkansas, the present chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Certainly, in my opinion, Congressman Mills carries on the outstanding tradition of integrity and dedication which has been so notable in so many of our Ways and Means Committee chairmen—the same tradition which Congressman Doughton upheld so brilliantly. Congressman Mills' remarks on that occasion, I believe, deserve the attention of the Congress, particularly since there are those among us who worked with Congressman Doughton and respected his memory as a man and as a great legislator. They are as follows:

Remarks of Congressman Wilbur D. Mills at the Dedication of the Robert Lee Doughton Memorial Wing of the Alleghany County Memorial Hospital, Sparta, N.C., November 20, 1964

Mr. Cannon, Jim Broyhill, relatives and friends of Chairman Robert Lee Doughton, one of the greatest honors that has ever come to me was the invitation to speak today at the dedication of this very appropriate memorial to Mr. Doughton. I have never known any man in the Congress of the United States for whom I had greater respect and to whom I owe any greater debt than Mr. Doughton.

One of the most fortunate things that has ever happened to me was to be privileged to serve under Mr. Doughton's chairmanship on the Committee on Ways and Means. Long before I came to Congress I was his great admirer. He had long since won his place in the history of this Nation. His service in the Congress started before and continued longer than every other sitting Member, except one, when he retired after 1952.

Any one of many landmark pieces of legislation which bear his name earned him a permanent place in the Halls of Congress. Of the many measures which he authored, the one that has had the greatest impact on the people of the country was the Social Security Act, of which Mr. Doughton was the father. If he had done nothing else in his 42 years in the Congress, this alone would have been a landmark which few Members could ever equal. The social security program was already on the books when I came to Congress in 1939. I am certain there is not a one of you in this audience who either has not benefited yourself or who does not have a parent or some other relative who has benefited from this work of Mr. Doughton. There are 20 million people in the country today drawing social security benefits who owe a debt of gratitude to the man whom we honor today. Under this program of Mr. Doughton, $15.4 billion was paid last year in social security insurance benefits. In addition to these benefits, many millions of persons, and particularly aged persons, who in the old days were often sent to county poorhouses are now able to stay in their own homes or with their own families and live in dignity through cash payments under the public assistance programs which are also a part of this program which bears Mr. Doughton's name. I point out these facts simply to prove the point that even before I came to Congress in 1939, Mr. Doughton had long since earned a place in the history of the country and in the hearts of our people.

It was my very great privilege to serve in the Congress for 14 years with Mr. Doughton before his retirement at the end of the 82d Congress on January 3, 1953. The most rewarding service that I, or in my humble opinion, any man in the Congress may have is that on the Committee on Ways and Means. It was my good fortune to have become a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in October of 1942. At this point, Mr. Doughton had already been chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for nearly 10 years. The opportunity which I had to know, work with, and serve under him I consider to be the greatest and most rewarding experience I have ever had.

He was one of the most considerate and thoughtful men I have ever worked with. He was most understanding and patient with me as a new member of the committee, and he became my adviser and close personal friend. I am very proud that I became his protege. He attained greatness, but retained his humility. He was consulted by and advised with Presidents, Secretaries of departments, and other top officials throughout Government.

His stamp is emblazoned in 42 years of the history of this country during some of its most trying times. This included World War I, World War II, the Korean war, the depression of the thirties, and the turbulent twenties. When Mr. Doughton became chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1933, in which position—among his many other responsibilities—he had the responsibility for raising the tax revenues to finance the operations of Government, expenditures were just over $4½ billion a year and Federal revenues were just under $2 billion a year. At that time, the public debt was $22½ billion. When Mr. Doughton retired in 1952, the depression, the war, and just the growth of our country had been such that the Federal Government was spending over $65 billion a year and taking in a little better than $61 billion a year. The public debt had reached $259 billion. The responsibility, which was borne in Congress primarily by Mr. Doughton, for raising this sum of money during these years was one that would test the intelligence, patience, and sanity of any man. Yet, through his understanding of Government and his grasp of fiscal affairs, and above all through his good judgment and commonsense approach, he authored legislation which raised taxes to finance Government operations in these trying times while still maintaining the fiscal solvency of our great Nation. He did this under pressures from all segments of Government and the taxpaying public, which required a clear head and an even, steady hand. This responsibility of Mr. Doughton's required courage, statesmanship, a thorough knowledge of Government finances, and above all, commonsense and good judgment.

There were few men in the Congress who could have handled this responsibility. It was indeed fortunate for the country that it had Mr. Doughton in the Congress and in this position. His long congressional experience, dating from 1911 and lasting for 42 years, equipped him, along with his native intelligence, to handle this awesome responsibility in such a way that we were able to lick the depression and finance so much of World War II.

Just Mr. Doughton's tenure in the Congress alone was historymaking. The first Congress met in 1789, and Mr. Doughton retired at the end of the 82d Congress in 1952. In the 164 years up until that time, Mr. Doughton had served a little better than one-fourth of these years in the Congress. This alone is impressive enough, but as you here today know, his public service in North Carolina began in 1903, which adds 8 more years to his total public service.

Before going to Congress, he was a member of the State board of agriculture and the State prison board. In 1908 he was elected to the State senate. This followed an already successful career as a merchant and farmer, and in later years he added a successful career in still another field—banking. Such lengthy public service and successful careers in three separate businesses almost staggers the imagination.

Today is the first time that it has been my good fortune to be in Mr. Doughton's own county. The beauty of this county and the hospitality of its people gives me further insight into Mr. Doughton. I have never seen a man who loved his home, his county, and his State more than Mr. Doughton. I can truly understand why. As you know, he was a magnificent specimen of a man, and indeed a product of these beautiful and rugged mountains.

I am sure that Mr. Doughton's friends and neighbors who are here today could better testify to his greatness and to his achievements than I. Among the many living monuments that come to mind is the scenic parkway which runs through this county. There is no other country in the world that can boast of such a magnificent highway and there is no monument which can better represent any man than this monument represents Mr. Doughton. This highway has already given millions of Americans the pleasures of enjoying the scenic beauty of the countryside along its route and made them more thankful to be living in this great land of ours.

I must say that I feel very much at home here, because my own State of Arkansas is very similar in many respects to North Carolina. We too have magnificent hill country and hospitable people such as you have here.

The dedication of this wing of the Alleghany County Memorial Hospital to the memory of Mr. Doughton is a most appropriate living memorial to him. I can well imagine that, had he known that his county and his State would honor his memory, he would have picked this very means as a proper memorial. It is just another living monument which will keep current in all of our minds the fact that a great man passed this way.

In Washington, there were many affectionate and respectful terms used in referring to Mr. Doughton. He was known as "Farmer Bob," "Uncle Bob," and "Muley Doughton." Each one in its own way is a most apt description of this great man.

Certainly he earned the name "Farmer Bob," because he was a product of these mountains and like many of you here, he first made his living from the soil. I sometimes suspect that for many in Washington who had occasion to ask Mr. Doughton for an appointment, which was always granted to whoever may have been requesting it—be he a man of the soil, the most influential banker in the country, or a President—the term "Farmer Bob" had a somewhat different meaning, because it often happens that he would set such appointments at 6 or 6:30 in the morning, long before many were even awake. This alone gives an indication of the diligence and long and hard work which Mr. Doughton devoted to his country.

"Uncle Bob" was a term of love, affection, and honor. It described his humility and the esteem in which his neighbors here in North Carolina and those of us who were privileged to serve with him in the Congress held him.

The term "Muley Doughton" again adequately describes the character of this great man, not in the sense that he was stubborn but in the sense that he would differ with Presidents, Secretaries of the Treasury, and his own colleagues in the Congress, yet he would differ in a very fair, honest and straightforward way on the merits of the propositions under consideration. It also indicates that although he would hear anyone out, he was never willing to compromise his principles for anyone. In the position of responsibility which he held, which required due deliberation and analysis of the proposals which he handled, the term "Muley" meant that Mr. Doughton had to be convinced that the proposals were in the best interests of the people and of the country generally before he would advance them.

I have mentioned some of the more important and tangible living landmarks left by Mr. Doughton. A detailed listing of all of these landmarks would consume a considerable amount of time. The very fact that he served longer as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means than any other man in history—17 years—through some of the most trying times in the history of our country meant that he was the author of innumerable laws which would run for pages simply to list them without further description.

In addition to all major legislation dealing with taxes and social security, during the time he was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means many other laws involving millions and billions of dollars and the welfare of the country bore his name.

In this category one thinks of the legislation involving the renegotiation of defense contracts, under which after the contracts were completed, it was provided that any excessive profits should be recaptured by the Government. Also in this category belongs legislation establishing unemployment compensation, legislation setting up the war bonds program, legislation establishing the interest the Government paid on the public debt, legislation which set the pattern for the world trade of the United States which has been followed—with minor changes—since Mr. Doughton handled the original legislation in 1934, legislation involving the control of narcotics, and legislation which helped us to recover from the depression of the thirties.

In all the history of our country, no man has handled legislation of more importance and which had a greater effect on the lives of each and every American than Mr. Doughton. Although much of this legislation would appear to have of a routine sort, the very fact that it dealt with our daily lives means that only a man of the caliber of Mr. Doughton could have handled proposals in such a way as to accomplish the job and yet at the same time bring about a minimum interference with our daily lives and well-being in the case of some and be of fair and equitable benefit to all recipients in the case of others.

Physically, Mr. Doughton was a big man in outward appearance. More importantly, inwardly he was a big man. He had a big heart; he had a big soul; he was deeply religious, and he had a great compassion for his country and its people. He was understanding, kind, friendly, and congenial with persons in all walks of life. He bore his greatness with humility. He served his country in the Congress with utmost distinction and capability under seven Presidents and under nine Speakers of the House of Representatives.

One of his greatest assets was the simplicity of his life and his humility. He combined with his native intelligence a firmness of purpose and a dedication to the people of the country in a career of public service which few men will ever equal. He was truly one of our country's most distinguished and beloved citizens.

It is most fitting, therefore, that a hospital wing where service to so many will be rendered should be dedicated to one who spent a lifetime in rendering service to his fellow man.

As this active and living monument to Congressman Doughton begins its work in the service of humanity, I believe we would be remiss if we in North Carolina failed to express appreciation to all of those who worked so tirelessly to create this lasting tribute. Our gratitude goes especially to Mr. C. A. Cannon, whose effective and devoted efforts as chairman of the memorial commission have meant so much in the realization of this long dream for the people of Alleghany County.

WOULD INCREASED PAYMENT FOR OVERTIME WORK REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague, Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND of the Second District of New Hampshire, has done us all a service by summarizing in brief and cogent form the problems associated with double pay for overtime proposal. The Johnson administration apparently still carries this proposal as one of its primary objectives. Before entering upon this new intrusion by Government, let us all analyze its ramifications.

Congressman JAMES CLEVELAND has exhibited his usual incisive understanding of an attractively labeled proposal. The impact upon skilled workers, small businessmen, and the consumer of requiring double penalty pay for overtime is likely to be extensive. We are all grateful to our colleague, Congressman JAMES CLEVELAND for contributing his superb analysis of this proposed legislation in the American Legion magazine for February 1965. I commend to the attention of all Members the article that follows:

WOULD INCREASED PAYMENT FOR OVERTIME WORK REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT?

(By Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican of New Hampshire)

The proposal for double-pay penalties for overtime would not reduce unemployment. Instead, it would penalize labor—in job opportunities, in earning power, and in living costs.

Proponents argue that such legislation would create more jobs because industry would hire additional workers rather than pay penalty rates for overtime.

In reality, this proposal would create more unemployment. While the Secretary of Labor says that the equivalent number of new jobs represented by workers now working overtime is over 900,000, he does not recognize that there are not available skilled men able to fill these positions full time. In fact, there is now a shortage of workers in many industries paying overtime rates.

Limited in plant space and equipment, many industries might be required to work overtime regardless of the penalty. This would create no new jobs.

The overtime penalty would aggravate unemployment by increasing the pressures to seek labor-saving methods in production. Rather than paying increased penalty rates or taking on inefficient or untrained personnel, industry would accelerate the introduction of automation.

If industries eliminate overtime, more moonlighting would occur. Those workers deprived of their usual overtime will seek other outside jobs. To make the same money, they will have to work longer on their second job, thereby decreasing their efficiency on both jobs, and taking some of the newly created jobs.

Workers now receiving doubletime pay, when cut off from extra income, would demand wage hikes to compensate for lost income; this demand for higher wages would be felt by all industries.

One of my chief objections to this proposal, besides the fact that it would not accomplish its objective, is its positive potential for harm to small business. Large industries, with their vast capital resources, might learn to live with this proposal. For the small businessman, however, this proposal could mean extinction. This is typical of many proposals by big government. Big business and big unions can find ways to get along with the bureaucrats' bright ideas. But for the small businessman this is not always so.

Further, some industries would have to pass on a portion of the increased costs of operation to the American consumer. A higher cost of living would provide a double penalty on the worker who already has lost part of his salary..

This "make-work, spread-work" proposal could create more unemployment, while at the same time having an inflationary effect on prices. It would hurt the competitiveness of industry, indeed put some small businesses into bankruptcy, and restrict their ability to grow and employ more workers.

More Government regulation of issues best left to free bargaining between labor and management is not the proper approach. The cure for unemployment lies in sustaining a high rate of economic activity and fostering small business and new business, along with expanded education and retraining programs to give the unskilled new opportunities to find employment. The cure does not lie with artificially created jobs, which in the final analysis will strangle business and further investment and employment opportunities.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOAQUIN MIGUEL ELIZALDE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the class of 1937 lost an illustrious member last Tuesday night when the Honorable Joaquin Miguel Elizalde passed away.

"Mike," as he was widely and affectionately known by his countless number of friends in the Congress and throughout the United States, served with us as a Delegate from the Philippines all through the war.

When independence was granted his beloved country, in recognition of his outstanding and distinguished service, the honor to serve as its first Ambassador to the United States was bestowed on Mike. He later served as secretary of state of the Philippines and for the last several years served in the United Nations as a delegate from the Philippines. Few men have had such a long and brilliant career in diplomatic circles.

Needless to say, our colleague was an outstanding man in every respect. He was truly a great, loyal, and stanch friend of the United States and resided here continuously except when called upon to serve his country in some foreign post.

Mike lived on a farm, which he called Moreland Farms, in Adamstown, Md.—located about 45 miles from the District of Columbia—with his lovely and devoted wife, Susana, and his two youngest children, Maria Theresa and Juan Miguel. For the past 7 or 8 months his health had been steadily failing. He was laid to rest Thursday at St. Joseph's Cemetery, Carrollton Manor, Md.

His host of friends will miss him greatly. All of us join his wife, his children, and the other members of his family in their great loss. We share their grief and sorrow and extend to each our heartfelt sympathy. There is comfort in the fact that he has left much here to his many friends—the warm and abiding memory of a fine and dedicated man.

ON AMENDING THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 4359, legislation which would strengthen American resistance to boycott procedures which other nations impose in order to injure friendly foreign countries.

The legislation is an amendment to the Export Control Act of 1949 and declares it to be the policy of the United States to oppose "restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States."

This legislation would prohibit:

> The taking of any actions, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements, by domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, from the United States which have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

This legislation will enable American firms to reject the demands of the Arab States that they divulge information to take other action which might further or support their boycott against Israel.

It should be clear that if the Arab States can prosecute their trade boycott against Israel, by threatening to retaliate against American businessmen who do not comply, other nations may take similiar action and American businessmen may find themselves caught in many international crossfires.

Businessmen should refuse to become involved in these practices and this legislation will, I think, go far to prevent other nations from intruding into our affairs and imposing their will on American businessmen.

The Arab economic boycott seeks to blacklist firms doing business with Israel. It is a bald attempt to intimidate American industry and this attempt must be met and defeated.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. O'Neal of Georgia, for the week beginning February 15, 1965, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Edmondson, for 25 minutes, today.

Mr. Curtis (at the request of Mr. Gross), for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, February 16, 1965.

Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Wolff (at the request of Mr. Edmondson), for 30 minutes, on February 17, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Tenzer.

Mr. Bennett.

Mr. McCarthy and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Edmondson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McFall.

Mr. Grabowski.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

Mr. Pucinski.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

> H.J. Res. 234. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 16, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

572. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 81-686; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

573. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, trans-

mitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the Chief of Police to expend funds for the prevention and detection of crime under his certificate, approved by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

574. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the establishment of a school of nursing within the District of Columbia General Hospital, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

575. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

576. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting a copy of the annual report of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 15 of Public Law 79-592; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

577. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Office of Coal Research for calendar year 1964, pursuant to Public Law 86-599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

578. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend sections 3731 and 1404 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to appeals by the United States from decisions sustaining motions to suppress evidence"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

579. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide for a jury commission for each U.S. district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

580. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

581. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report listing certain required information with respect to contracts made by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under 10 U.S.C. 2304(a) (11) and (16), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(e); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 44. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 141. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations within the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4862. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to define and limit the term unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce and to provide that exclusive territorial franchises, under limited circumstances, shall not be deemed such method, act or practice, nor a restraint of trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4863. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4864. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to correct certain inequities with respect to promotions of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 4866. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4867. A bill to amend section 4242 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4868. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the age requirements for entitlement to wife's insurance benefits and widow's insurance benefits, and to eliminate the provisions which reduce benefits in certain cases where the recipient becomes entitled thereto before attaining age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4869. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of commutation fares paid by an individual in traveling to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4871. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 4872. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 4873. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System and to increase the mileage in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 4874. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4875. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 4876. A bill to amend section 620(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to prohibit the furnishing of any further U.S. assistance to Indonesia, including the training of Indonesian military and police personnel at U.S. Government facilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4877. A bill to amend section 620(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to prohibit the furnishing of any further U.S. assistance to the United Arab Republic, including the training of United Arab Republic military personnel and police personnel at U.S. Government facilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4878. A bill to provide research, technical, and financial assistance with respect to the disposal of solid wastes to the several States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUOT:

H.R. 4879. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4880. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a survey of Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River in New Hampshire and Maine, in the interest of navigation and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4881. A bill to provide a percentage deduction for certain expenses paid for the higher education of the taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 4882. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia and to supplement the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia in order to provide for the indemnification of persons sustaining injuries or damages as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by financially irresponsible persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 4883. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital being constructed in the District of Columbia as the Melvin J. Maas Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 4884. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon his wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4885. A bill to establish a 2-year period during which certain decorations may be awarded for acts or service performed during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4886. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 4887. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, with respect to the manner of allotting funds among the States for construction of undergraduate academic facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4888. A bill to authorize mortgage insurance and loans to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine or dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4889. A bill to amend section 5051(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4890. A bill to provide cost-of-living allowances for judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska or Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 4891. A bill to provide that the Administrator of General Services shall convey certain property of the United States to Laramie County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4892. A bill to provide that the Administrator of General Services shall convey certain property of the United States to the city of Casper, Wyo.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4893. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to separate the operating authority provisions of foreign direct and foreign indirect air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4894. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to separate the operating authority provisions of foreign direct and foreign indirect air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 4895. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make urban planning grants thereunder for the provision of planning assistance to Indian reservations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4896. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4897. A bill to provide that the lack of any economically or commercially feasible method of extracting, mining, or producing of any otherwise valuable deposit, claimed and located as provided in these statutes, shall not be a ground for the denial of a patent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4898. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Hualapai Reservation in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4899. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the San Carlos Apache Reservation in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4900. A bill to provide for the construction and improvement of certain roads on the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4901. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4902. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Yavapai Reservation in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4903. A bill to incorporate the Young Engineers and Scientists of America, for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4904. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to access to and exit from certain portions of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 4905. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the Federal Government to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4906. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that expenses paid in connection with the adoption of a child shall be treated as medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 4908. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 4909. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deduction from the monthly insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 4910. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to extend foreign quotas and recapture fee provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and thereby prevent a continuing loss of revenue to the U.S. Treasury; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 316. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.J. Res. 317. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.J. Res. 318. Joint resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 319. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to modernize, coordinate, and foster passenger rail transportation within the area of such States and authorizing the multistate authority to request the President of the United States to enter into negotiations with the Government of Mexico to secure its participation with such authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 320. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to bring certain matters involving Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia before the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H. Con. Res. 287. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 229. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 230. Resolution authorizing the printing of the prayers offered by the Chaplain of the House of Representatives at the opening of the daily sessions of the House during the 87th and 88th Congresses; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 231. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the responsibilities of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 232. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 44; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana requesting an amendment to the Constitution that a State having a bicameral legislature may apportion membership in one house of the legislature on other than a population basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting early consideration for approval and authorization of the appropriation of funds for the Fremont Dam, Reservoir, and other facilities of the Teton Basin reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the provision of funds in the 1966 fiscal year budget of the Department of the Interior to carry out the additional Columbia Basin project construction for irrigation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting early consideration of the investigation of existing inequities of freight rates in the Northwestern States of Idaho, Montana, and Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that no person shall be a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives who shall not, when elected, have been a resident of that State for which or from which he shall be chosen for at least 2 years prior to such election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States proposing and amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to apportionment of one house of State bicameral legislatures and of membership of governing bodies of subordinate units of the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to taking appropriate action for the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring the late Senator William E. Borah; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to authorizing the construction of a dam across the Savannah River and Duke Power Co. to construct an electric generating plant on the Savannah River; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4911. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Jack F. Orend; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 4912. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonia Subias Val; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4913. A bill for the relief of Yung Tsai Chow and Quan Teresa Chow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4914. A bill for the relief of Carlo Zangrilli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4915. A bill for the relief of Miss Amalia Salvaterra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 4916. A bill for the relief of Lt. Gary L. Wachter, U.S. Navy, and others, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4917. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Giovanna Mezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4918. A bill for the relief of Chai Tuk Myung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4919. A bill for the relief of Nuwart Melikyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 4920. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Garrido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Vilma DeAngelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 4922. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Pellerito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4923. A bill for the relief of Aurora Matessich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4924. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Pepe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4925. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Zammitti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 4926. A bill for the relief of Enzo (Enzio) Perotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 4927. A bill for the relief of Basilias Paprigopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4928. A bill for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 4929. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luz R. Guzman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4930. A bill for the relief of the estate of Notah Tayah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4931. A bill for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4932. A bill for the relief of Lt. James D. Guyle, U.S. Navy, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4933. A bill for the relief of Lidia Lipari Rizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

98. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Delbert J. McQuaide, Bellefonte, Pa., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to supporting House Joint Resolution 1 relative to a constitutional amendment regarding succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency in case of their disability or inability to serve in their respective offices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

99. Also, petition of city council, Eastlake, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to the proposed closing of certain veterans' hospital facilities by the Government of the United States, and declaring an emergency in connection therewith; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

◆

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1965

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate, under previous order, will now adjourn to Wednesday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1965

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 3½ seconds a.m.), the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, February 17, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Franklin D. Roosevelt Institute Fitting Memorial to Former President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, we have been reminded lately of the honors which go to great men after their death. In Great Britain, Sir Winston Churchill was honored last month with the pomp, circumstance, affection, and grief due the "Man of the Century." While the British honored this great man with ceremony upon his death, they have fittingly paid respect to him with a living memorial which will help to mold perhaps another Churchill. The memorial is the Churchill College, which opened last Easter at Cambridge University.

Since the 81st Congress I have introduced legislation to provide for a Government service school, and in the 89th Congress, on the opening day of the session, I again reintroduced a bill, H.R. 276, to provide for the establishment of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Institute, to be a graduate school for advanced studies in American Government. This institute would be for selected individuals of outstanding ability to pursue advanced studies in American political theory, methods, and institutions in preparation for public service with the Government of the United States.

This school might be established at one of our great universities, as was done in the Churchill College at Cambridge. This is no new idea. Graduate studies in government service have been the bulwark of stable European governments for centuries. With many critics of Government crying for better personnel in the Federal service, it would appear H.R. 276 is an answer to these critics, and fulfills an acknowledged need by our Federal Government. The Roosevelt Institute seems to me to be a more fitting tribute to our 32d President than the proposed 20th century "stonehenge" or any other static memorial.

An editorial from a recent edition of the Washington Post reads in part as follows:

CHURCHILL COLLEGE

It is a mark of superiority in ceremonial matters that the British have honored Sir Winston Churchill as he himself would have wished it—with memorial observances of impressive dignity culminating in a burial in a modest churchyard near Blenheim Palace, the great Englishman's ancestral home. As a lasting memorial to his achievement, the British are contemplating no vast and pretentious marble temple. Instead, the statesman's memorial will be Churchill College, which opened last Easter at Cambridge University.

If a living and useful memorial is appropriate to the greatest Englishman of his time, shouldn't Americans benefit from the example?

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring attention to an event of 47 years ago which the people of Lithuania would celebrate—if they could.

This is the 47th anniversary of their independence which was declared on February 16, 1918, at the close of World War I. But they are unable to celebrate this great event in their national history because of the imposition of another dictatorship some 22 years later.

Due to their control now by the Soviet Union, they are unable to continue annual celebrations of their brief liberty. So I would like to take this opportunity to speak in their behalf.

All wars cause death and destruction, misery and misfortune to millions of innocent and helpless people. The last war spread all these evils on a scale unprecedented and unknown. Unfortunately that war did something else, even more heartrending than earlier wars had done: some one hundred million peoples were deprived of their freedom and independence in Europe alone. That was a stunning and alarming shock from which the free world has not fully recovered, for when the fighting stopped in Europe, many nations which had regained their freedom and independence at the end of the First World War found themselves caught behind the onrushing Red army. They were imprisoned in their homeland under Kremlin-imposed Communist dictatorships. The Lithuanian people were among those thus sadly imprisoned behind the Soviet Iron Curtain.

These people had lived under alien regimes before, and had known hardships and suffering under foreign rule. They had endured the czarist Russian regime for more than 100 years before they regained their freedom and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. For a little more than two decades, during the interwar years, they toiled, sweated, and earned their living under their own free and independent government. Annually they celebrated their national holiday, their independence day with due solemnity and decorum. They were content with their lot, and happy for the peace they were enjoying during those years. Unfortunately in the fall of 1939, after the outbreak of the last war, everything seemed to take a bad turn, which soon proved disastrous and tragic for them. Early in 1940 Lithuania was attacked and overrun by the Red army. Then in mid-July of that year it was made part of the Soviet Union.

Today there is no occasion to celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day there. The Lithuanian people are not allowed to celebrate it. Having been robbed of all their freedoms, they are totally subdued under the unrelenting Communist rule there. Under present international conditions and changing world tensions, we would be inspiring them with false hopes to assert that soon a way will be found to free them from their unhappy status. The least—and unfortunately the most—I can wish them on the 47th anniversary of their independence day is courage, fortitude, and patience.

First Anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, February 10, 1965, marked the first anniversary of passage by the House of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is fitting and appropriate that we at this time reappraise and strengthen our commitment to insure every citizen, those rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

Passage of the Civil Rights Act was a historic action. It was the answer of a forward-looking Congress to the urgent cries of an aroused citizenry. On July 4, 1964, I issued the following statement:

> My opinions on civil rights come from the very depths of my own religious belief and conviction * * * that there is one God that created us all. My opinions stem from a firm commitment to America's political tradition "that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."
>
> We have come a long way since the days of tyranny and slavery, but our country, though mighty in the councils of the nations of the world, is not yet a perfect union. So long as the rights of a single citizen are denied or taken from him without due process of law, then the perfect union envisioned by the Founding Fathers is still merely an ideal, and the rights of all of us are in jeopardy.
>
> When the people resort to lawlessness, when State and local officials fail to maintain law and order, when they fail to protect the rights of citizens, the Federal Government must meet these responsibilities quickly and forcefully.
>
> The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is now the law of the land. It represents an important breakthrough in overcoming the barriers on the road minority groups are destined to travel toward full freedom in America. Effective and meaningful implementation of the law depends upon the elimination of fear, bigotry, and hatred through education and understanding.
>
> These are not times for men of good will and conscience to remain silent. We must stand up and be counted. We must become involved to preserve the human rights of all citizens, the guarantee of which, by our Constitution, has made America great.
>
> The law of the land must be resepcted and upheld for America to remain great. To paraphrase Senator HUMPHREY, let us move out of the shadow of States rights and move into the sunshine of human rights.
>
> We must all work together to guarantee the rights of all.

Mr. Speaker, that statement is as applicable today as it was then, for now we must look ahead and provide additional safeguards for citizens not yet treated as our Constitution and morality dictate.

Because of a change in the travel schedule which conflicted with my observance of the Sabbath on Saturday, I was unable to accompany those of my colleagues who went to Selma, Ala., last week, as originally planned. Their reports and those of the mass media indicate that additional congressional action is needed—action to provide new safeguards to protect our most basic and fundamental right—the right to vote.

Obstacles have been erected to prevent registration in more than one American community for the sole purpose of denying the right to vote to certain of our citizens. It is apparent that the breakthrough of 1964, while it changed the law, did not change the hearts and minds of some men. Therefore, Federal legislation must be enacted to remove the obstacles to registration for every eligible citizen to exercise the right to vote.

We have a stake in the maintenance of the United States as the leader of the free world—a world which is constantly being challenged by the world of slavery behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—and from an island only 90 miles from our shores.

How can we hope for democratic practices in other lands while we do not effectively practice them in our own country.

Just as there are no degrees of honesty, there can be no silence—there can be no hedging—there can be no watering down.

Democracy will thrive only if we remain alert to the acts of those who threaten it. In 1964, the Members of Congress joined in bipartisan support of the Civil Rights Act. I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to again demonstrate their awareness and concern and to implement the Civil Rights Act by passing appropriate legislation dealing with the specific problems of registration and voting.

Georgia Day—February 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the attention of this representative body to one of the great events in our national history of 232 years ago.

The second week of February brings a day which should be honored not only by all Georgians, but the rest of our Nation—Georgia Day, February 12—for it was through the victory and tenacity of James Edward Oglethorpe and the Georgia Colonists that English supremacy was established in the southeast, a key victory for civilization.

When Oglethorpe founded Georgia February 12, 1733, and laid out its first city, Savannah, it was the first step toward proving the worth of this military buffer colony which would stop the Spanish attacks on all the Colonies. The defeat of the Spanish by Oglethorpe and the Georgians at Bloody Marsh was a decisive battle for American continental supremacy—decisive for Spain as two decades later the Plains of Abraham proved for France, or Yorktown two decades later yet for Britain.

Following this victory, the Governors of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina addressed letters of congratulations and thanks to General Oglethorpe, showing their appreciation of the widespread results and benefits.

Many "firsts" for our Nation have originated at Savannah—the first planned city in America—and in Georgia through the years, but the important first step which was the basis for all was the venturing into the debatable land and founding on this date the Georgia Colony. All the English-speaking peoples and the free world of English laws can rejoice and boast of February 12—the Founding Day of Georgia—the day we celebrate, the 232d birthday of the State.

VFW Auxiliary Initiates Two Fine Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives two new programs instituted this year by the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

One program is designed for high school and college students; the other is for the members of the organization itself.

Under the leadership of Mrs. Marie A. Klugow, national president, of Tracy, Calif., a new annual Americanism award competition for students between the ages of 16 and 19 years has been instituted.

In an effort to encourage youth of America and to stimulate their ideals into the truest meaning of patriotism and good citizenship, the contest will offer a total of $2,000 in cash and three gold medals for the three top national winners. Citations will be given to 10 other participants.

It is open to all students between 16 and 19 who attend a private, parochial, public high school or college. Each entrant must fill out an application to be obtained through the local auxiliary and submit in writing not more than 300 words on the subject, "In Education Rests the Future of America."

The recipient of an award will be selected on the basis of his or her keen sense of purpose and worthiness as an individual. Applicants must show genuine interest in family, community, national and world affairs, display a sense of responsibility, truthfulness and loyalty and ability to present new ideas with sincerity.

All applications are to be returned completed to the local auxiliary by March 15, 1965. The local winner will be entered in district competition, the district winner in State competition. The application winning first place in each State will be entered in the national contest. National awards are: first, $1,250 cash and a gold medal; second, $500 cash and a gold medal; third, $250 cash and a gold medal, and 10 citations for honorable mention. State and local award winners will receive additional auxiliary prizes which vary with the community.

National award winners will be announced at the 1965 national convention of the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Chicago.

The second program initiated by Mrs. Klugow is not a contest. In a sense, however, there is an individual prize for every participant.

Mrs. Klugow, who is one of the outstanding citizens of my congressional district, has prepared a code for women which she has invited every member of the auxiliary to sign. The code is as follows:

> I promise to continue to show my reverence for God and to respect the freedom of all Americans to worship God.
>
> I promise to speak out against violation of the Constitution of the United States of America.
>
> I promise to show my love of my country on every possible occasion, including respect for the American flag and the national anthem.
>
> I promise to exercise my right to vote in local, State, and national elections.
>
> I promise to work for the improvement of my community and give my support to honesty and thrift in civic matters.
>
> I promise to do my part to help lift the burdens of ignorance, disease, and poverty, especially through active support of sensible programs in education and vocational training.
>
> I promise to uphold moral standards and to be especially concerned for the morals of children and young people.
>
> I promise to be available wherever I can be of help in advising and guiding young people.
>
> I promise to shun all forms of entertainment which advocate loose morals or belittle either religion or American principles of government.
>
> I promise to show those qualities of gentleness, compassion, and kindness with which womanhood has been traditionally associated.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I can speak for every Member of the Congress in expressing appreciation to the Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for taking these steps to bring about increased love of country and to place emphasis on fine personal values.

Sokol Physical Fitness Commemorative Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today Postmaster General Gronouski presided over the unveiling of a special stamp issued by the U.S. Post Office to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Sokol movement in America.

Significantly, it was during the delivery of Mr. Gronouski's inspiring speech at this dedication ceremony that President Johnson, at another function in the White House, announced the formal appointment of Mr. Gronouski as Postmaster General for the next 4 years.

President Johnson is to be commended for his excellent choice. Mr. Gronouski has brought to his office a depth of understanding and a talent for administration which has helped in large measure to streamline and improve every branch of the postal service. His record will be hard to match in future years and I am particularly pleased we will have the benefit of his leadership for the next 4 years.

Mr. Gronouski's recognition of the great contribution made by the Sokol movement in this country is perhaps best manifested by his awareness of the tremendous cultural heritage which was brought to America by the various Slavic groups that have fostered the goal of physical fitness through the Sokol movement. Issuance of this commemorative stamp was of particular joy to the Czechs, Slavs, the Poles, and all the other Americans of Slavic background who participated so enthusiastically in this great Sokol movement.

I am happy today to include Mr. Gronouski's speech at the colorful ceremony during which the special stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Sokol movement was unveiled. Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL JOHN A. GRONOUSKI AT THE DEDICATION OF SOKOL-PHYSICAL FITNESS COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP, DEPARTMENT AUDITORIUM, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 15, 1965

This is the day you have been awaiting, and I share your pride in the postage stamp we are issuing today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Sokol movement in America.

That so many of you are present from all parts of the country is indeed a high tribute to the Sokol movement, and speaks well for the unity among your groups and for the cooperation within the Sokol Centennial Commemorative Stamp Committee.

You have my very best wishes for a successful and memorable centennial observance. I certainly hope that my schedule will permit me someday to attend one of your great physical fitness exhibitions.

We can take pride in the fact that Sokol and Falcon organizations were among the very first in the United States to combine programs of physical fitness with cultural enrichment. Democracy needs both to survive.

The fact is that America is just beginning to wake up and face this problem. As a people, we have grown soft. The easy life has resulted in flabby muscles—and I do not exempt myself from that description.

This is the age of the pushbutton—not the pushup. Too many of us prefer to sit in an easy chair and watch a sport on TV rather than to participate in one. Even the exercise we used to get in brushing our teeth or carving a roast can now be avoided. There are electric toothbrushes and carving knives, to make life easier. And to travel any distance greater than 4 blocks, we seem to need an automobile rather than the old-fashioned shank's mare.

Fortunately, there has been a rekindling of interest in physical fitness. Much of this new interest has been generated by the President's Council on Physical Fitness. Stan Musial serves as Special Consultant to the President in this area.

He and his small staff, operating with a limited budget, have literally worked wonders in awakening America to the need for improved physical fitness programs. I'd like to quote briefly from the encouraging progress report Mr. Musial made to President Johnson:

"In 1961–62, only 47 percent of the Nation's high school juniors and seniors took part in physical-activity programs. Eighty-four percent participated in 1963–64.

"Eighty percent of the parochial schools now provide physical education instruction for most of their pupils, as compared to only 40 percent in 1960–61."

That's progress.

Perhaps some day soon, the rest of America will catch up with the Sokols and Falcons.

The Sokol physical fitness commemorative postage stamp we are issuing today should be an occasion, I think, to look back on—and pay tribute to—the men and women of the past who made the Sokol movement great. It is their postage stamp, too. These were your forebears of two or perhaps three generations ago who came to America determined to establish new lives for themselves and for their children. They came to the new land to be free—free from poverty, free from intolerance, free from persecution. Their dream was America, the land of liberty and justice.

It is unfortunate—but true—that immigrants from the Slavic countries were not greeted with open hands in those days. For in many parts of America there was a widespread feeling that in order to be a real American it was necessary for your ancestors to have arrived on the *Mayflower*. Or at the very least, to have fought in the Revolutionary War. And there was something almost sinister about a man who wanted to be an American but who had a name that was long and unpronounceable—by Anglo-Saxon standards.

Times have changed. And it was our ancestors who helped cause them to change. For by their very actions, their hard labor, their loyalty and dedication to the new land, they showed themselves to be good Americans in the finest traditions. In community service, in religious participation, in political responsibility these men and women demonstrated that they knew the meaning of democracy. And when it was necessary to fight to protect democracy, they fought and fought gallantly.

Those of you in this audience with grey hair will agree with me, I believe, that within our memories there has been remarkable progress in erasing the prejudices and discrimination our ancestors faced.

But in spite of great—almost revolutionary—progress we have made in the area of human relations, there are still men with distorted minds who base their opinions of a fellow American on what is his race, what is his creed, what is his country of origin? I appeal to you to use the strength of your organizations to join President Johnson in his crusade against all traces of discrimination.

Let me only mention one area which I know is the great and vital interest of all of you. For much too long we condoned immigration laws that set up archaic and discriminatory quotas based on the obsolete concept of superiority of certain races and of people from certain geographical regions. As the result, two-thirds of the total immigration quota goes to nations that never use all of this quota. In other countries, the would-be immigrant must wait interminably, until his quota number comes up.

In his state of the Union message, the President made the reform of our immigration laws one of his top priority legislative programs. And, in his recent message to Congress, Mr. Johnson called for a new immigration law based on principles which reflect our American traditions of fair play, and I ask you—who know the problems so well—to support fully this legislation.

Under this proposed law, immigrants who are close relatives of American citizens would receive preference in entering the United States. Parents of American citizens could join their children here without waiting for a quota number.

Another aspect of the proposed law would admit immigrants on the basis of their special skills and knowledge. It would bring to America new scientists, scholars, engineers, doctors, technicians, and skilled workers—all of whom would soon contribute to our national advancement.

In urging Congress to pass this vastly improved immigration law, President Johnson said: "Let a just Nation throw open to them the city of promise: * * * to those in other lands that are seeking the promise of America, through an immigration law based on the work a man can do and not where he was born or how he spells his name."

The Great Society can use the talents of such men and women from across the sea.

I don't know how many postage stamp collectors we have in the audience today, but to those of you who are not collectors I'd like to make it clear that every organization or person who wants a new stamp doesn't get one. Each year, we receive about 3,000 requests for new stamps. We issue only about 15 a year. So only events of highest national significance can be commemorated on new postage stamps. Sokol meets this test.

The Sokol stamp was designed by Norman Todhunter, an art director for a New York advertising agency, and a member of our Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee. This committee is composed of experts in art, history, philately, and printing who advise me on the subject matter and design of proposed new stamps. This 5-cent stamp is based on a bronze statue of a discus thrower which stands near the State Department building here in Washington. One hundred and twenty million stamps will be printed in black and red on white paper.

And I am going to see to it that an elderly man, a former member of your movement, now living in Poland receives a souvenir of this occasion.

For I think he is with us today in spirit. I'd like to tell you the story.

A short time after I announced that there was to be a Sokol postage stamp, I received a long and heartwarming letter from Poland written by a man who is 76 years old. He had read about the stamp in his newspaper and was naturally excited over this honor to Sokol. Many years ago, he had lived in New York and was a member of the Polish Falcons there, and he confided to me that these were the most fascinating years of his life.

He asked me to deliver a message to you, and I now quote from his letter: "Be exemplary citizens of the country which so generously gave you all of the blessings of a free man. Let your children know about the glorious past, as well as the sufferings of the country of your proud origin. The cross we have to carry isn't unbearable, because our spirit is immortal."

I commend you today not only for your excellence in physical fitness but also for the spiritual values inherent in your movement. Thank you.

The Need for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding speech on the desperate need for conservation of our natural resources that the Honorable GAYLORD NELSON, distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, recently delivered before the State Bar Association of Wisconsin.

One of the situations Senator NELSON pointed to was the serious pollution problem in the Great Lakes. He made special note of the pollution problem in Lake Erie, which borders the district I represent.

The speech follows:

AMERICA'S LAST CHANCE

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

A great new surge of interest in the conservation of natural resources is making itself felt in our country. The outstanding development was President Johnson's message to the Congress on natural beauty. This gave us what we have long needed—the leadership and inspiration of the President to summon all of America to save something of the land of beauty handed down to us by our forefathers.

The President's commitment of his administration to the cause of conservation comes on the heels of a number of other encouraging developments. The last session of Congress, which enacted the land and water conservation fund, the Wilderness Act, the Clean Air Act, and many related measures, is being justly hailed as the conservation Congress, the session with the greatest achievement in this field since the days of Theodore Roosevelt.

The newspapers, the magazines, and the television industry have discovered conservation as a subject with broad popular appeal, and they are giving it attention it has not had for a long, long time. This reawakening of the Nation to what Secretary Udall has called the quiet crisis was helped greatly by the late President Kennedy's decision in the fall of 1963 to make a nationwide tour devoted entirely to the urgent problems of natural resources.

I welcome these heartening developments. They are long overdue and are of priceless value. They give us a new chance to save our land.

But I want to warn you that this may be our last chance.

I want to warn you that this fight to save our beautiful land is very nearly lost now, and America the beautiful could simply become a kind of a natural ruins, like Greece, which would be remembered throughout history for what it once was.

Just take a look at our vanishing America, the land which I am sure was once the most beautiful on earth and the most richly endowed with natural blessings.

We have destroyed our rivers, whose clear blue waters once delighted swimmers and fishermen, fish and wildlife. Every major river system in America is now polluted. Waterways that once were sources of pleasure and beauty and recreation are now forbidden to human contact and objectionable to sight and smell.

We have plundered our forests. Much of our State and local tax problem in Wisconsin today is caused by the fact that we ravaged our northland, recklessly consumed its one good crop, ruined its soil, and even altered its climate—leaving it almost destroyed for those to whom we sold it as a land of opportunity.

We are strip mining our mountains, ripping the earth to pieces with shovels as big as houses which spread ugliness, erosion, and siltation on a scale undreamed of a few years ago, and once the coal is gone the land lies barren and ruined for any purpose.

We are overpopulating and overdeveloping our public parks, turning many of these last refuges of cool, green beauty into sylvan slums. We are utterly failing in our obligation to add new park space, even though our population will double by the year 2000.

We are bulldozing away most of the green spots and open spaces in our cities, for highways and interchanges and parking lots and other forms of progress.

We are pushing heavy industry into the last sanctums of natural beauty, up the beautiful river valleys in quest of sparkling water to cool our hydroelectric turbines.

We are blighting the landscape with junkyards, with buildings deliberately designed to shock the eye, and with monstrous, electrified billboards which wage war with one another in the battle to catch the eye of the passing citizen.

We are planning a highway through the California redwoods.

We are building a steel mill in the Lake Michigan sand dunes.

We are considering a barge canal through scenic Lake Champlain, to attract oil tankers.

We are damming our trout streams, filling in our swamps, cutting down our trees, poisoning our birds, and suffocating our fish.

We are planning to turn the Grand Canyon of the Colorado into a reservoir.

Worst of all, we are destroying our sources of fresh water—the very basis of life itself—and the source of much of our scenic beauty and our recreational pleasure. Once it seemed that we could destroy only the water in our rivers, but now we are organized, and mechanized, and automated, and now we are embarked on a systematic campaign to destroy the greatest source of fresh water on the face of the earth—the Great Lakes themselves.

At this point people are inclined to say, "That's an exaggeration," but let me assure you that I am telling you only a tiny fraction of the problem.

A dull, gray tide of pollution is moving through our Great Lakes, following the path of human progress. I wish I had the time to describe it to you in all its shocking detail but I can mention only a few highlights, based on studies by the U.S. Public Health Service and our own State department of resource development.

The Great Lakes are becoming progressively more polluted every year—first of all, by community sewage systems which dump raw sewage into the lake; secondly by industries which dump lethal chemicals, and third by ships which dump almost every form of waste directly into the lakes.

This has been going on for more than 50 years, with mounting seriousness, but we paid little attention because we thought these lakes were so vast that even Americans could not destroy them. Now we are finding out otherwise. It turns out that the lakes are even more likely to be permanently ruined than the rivers, because they cannot purge themselves of pollutants as rivers can in time of high water runoff.

The southern tip of Lake Michigan is turning into a cesspool. Three steel plants, three oil refineries, several communities, and thousands of ships are pouring out pollutants at an astonishing rate—human waste, industrial acids, and iron slag. A Federal study shows that the organism which is the principal food for the finer grades of fish has practically disappeared, and trash fish have taken over. The study shows that pollution on the lake bottom in this area is practically irreversible.

In November 1963, 10,000 gulls and loons died along the south and west shores of Lake Michigan in this area.

Closer to home, two of the city of Milwaukee's four beaches were closed completely from 1959 through 1962, and intermittently after that, and the other two have been closed intermittently since 1959.

The Fox, Oconto, Peshtigo, and Menominee Rivers are seriously polluted. Green Bay itself is badly polluted at its southern end, largely by the pulp and paper industry but also by waste from canneries, milk processing plants, oil, tars, chemicals, and various other manufacturing byproducts. Green Bay looks from the map like a summer resort city. But its beaches have been closed by pollution for 25 years. The tide of pollution is steadily advancing up the Green Bay shoreline, toward our multimillion-dollar recreation area in Door County.

We live in the midst of this, but are we aware of the seriousness of it?

Over 250 American and Canadian cities use the Great Lakes for their public water supply. Fourteen million people—60 percent of the Americans living in the Great Lakes basin—depend upon the lakes for their water. They draw off 3.3 billion gallons a day for public use and 22 billion gallons for industrial use, using and reusing the water every day.

In Wisconsin 27 communities draw water from Lake Michigan—and many of these same cities dump sewage back into it.

In Milwaukee, 300,000 people are served by storm and sanitary sewers which are interconnected. During heavy rains, 252 sewer outfalls of the intercepting sewers discharge raw sewage into the Milwaukee, Menomonee and Kinnickinnic Rivers which flow into the harbor and then into Lake Michigan. The Milwaukee sewage treatment plant also bypasses sewage directly into the Milwaukee River during heavy runoff. Another combined storm and sanitary sewer discharges directly into Lake Michigan during heavy runoff.

If we want an example of where we are going, we need only look at Lake Erie. Our great American system has had more time to work on this lake. It is the dumping ground for the sewage outflow from Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Erie, and Buffalo. Among other things, it receives 2½ million tons of silt a year. Some people think it will eventually just fill up. But before it does, life will cease to exist in its waters. Studies show that the percentage of chlorides in Lake Erie—which closely reflects municipal sewage pollution—is 230 percent higher than in 1900. The water also shows an amazing concentration of calcium, sodium, potassium, and sulfate compounds. It is no longer simply water. It is a chemical tank.

Last summer, 2,600 square miles of Lake Erie—over one-quarter of the entire lake—were almost without oxygen and unable to support life because of algae and plant growth, fed by pollution from cities and industries.

Can you conceive of a human failure more enormous than the systematic destruction of a magnificent fresh water lake such as Lake Erie?

But don't feel too bad. American optimism is equal to a defeat of such a magnitude. It turns out that the Corps of Engineers is now planning to build a whole new lake—even bigger than Lake Erie—in Alaska.

And in our typical American way, we are prepared to do this despite the cost—in dollars or in natural resources or anything else. The new lake in Alaska would be created by building a dam 530 feet high. It would create a lake 280 miles long and 80 miles wide. The Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, after studying the proposal, said:

"Nowhere in the history of water development in North America have the fish and wildlife losses anticipated to result from a single project been so overwhelming."

In addition to costing $1,300 million, this project would reduce the annual salmon catch by at least 200,000 fish a year; destroy 2,400,000 acres of duck breeding habitat, destroy the range for 5,000 moose, and eliminate the habitat used by animals which provide 7 percent of the total Alaskan fur harvest.

But, of course, it is argued that that is the price of progress.

Well, this is our record. This is what we have done with the beautiful land given to us by our forefathers. This is how we have held in trust for the future our beautiful woods and waters and wildlife. This is how we have repaid the land which has given us the highest standard of living on earth.

Now that I have told of the defeats, let me tell of some of the hints of victory which now seem possible—now that our Nation seems to be rousing itself for one last chance at saving its heritage in the out of doors.

With bipartisan support, we have launched a fine program in Wisconsin to acquire the recreational resources we need for the future and to save some of the scenery and even some of the swamps to provide food and shelter for wildlife and to preserve some of the natural landscape as God created it.

With the Nation's conscience aroused and with the support of the Secretary of the Interior we seem to have an excellent chance to save the beautiful St. Croix River and its wild tributary, the Namekagon, as one of our first national scenic waterway projects and as an example to be followed in other wild river legislation.

Making up for our default of recent years, we are moving ahead with several excellent national park proposals, and I have high hopes that we can rally the united support we need to bring Wisconsin a national recreation area in the Apostle Islands in the next 3 to 5 years.

We have just passed a bill in the Senate to centralize the water pollution fight in an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

With the President's leadership we have hopes of controlling pesticides, helping cities build more parks, screen our junkyards, save some of our highway landscapes, clean up the foul Potomac, and build some hiking trails for the forgotten outdoorsmen—those who simply like to walk.

In the President's words, we can now make a "massive effort to save the countryside as a green legacy for tomorrow."

I hope every public official, every businessman, every bird watcher and deer hunter and ice fisherman and plain citizen, will join in this massive effort.

I hope we will each assume our responsibilities as citizens and stop our own littering and defacing of the landscape. I hope we will realize that when we take something out of our bank of natural resources we have to put something back in.

I hope our people will participate in the educational programs which are needed to spread the story of the conservation crisis far and wide. I hope they will support the legislation needed to save our land—good zoning and sanitation ordinances, reasonable regulation of industries to protect the public interest, sensible restraints on billboard construction, a significant investment in buying land and water resources for the enrichment of life in the future.

Most of all, I ask of all Americans a simple recognition of a fact of life.

We can't have everything. Our land cannot be used up and still be the land of our childhood.

The great resources of America—the soil, the timber, the minerals, the wildlife—have sustained us for hundred of years. But now we have got to think about sustaining them. The frontier is gone. If we destroy these rivers and lakes, if we plunder these forests and rip up these mountainsides and foul this air and water, there will be no new green paradise awaiting us over the horizon. If we don't save the America we have today, I don't think we will have another chance.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend John Pauperas, Zion Lutheran Lithuanian Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, of whom is all rule and authority in the world, we bow our heads this day of the 47th anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania, thanking Thee for the precious gift of freedom which this country with Thine help could enjoy, recognizing the responsibilities placed upon all of us by Thy word: "Unto whom much is given, of him shall be much required."

Help us to share our unnumbered blessings with those who are in need and are suffering wherever they may be. Give encouragement to the suppressed and deprived of liberties and national freedom. Center the vision of this country and of all nations for a deep appreciation for the blessings which are shared in a land where freedom and liberties are preserved.

Keep us spiritually strong to contribute to uphold the faith for freedom of those who are tested being themselves deprived of those liberties we cherish in this country.

May the Holy Spirit fill us with determination to dedicate ourselves to promote that righteousness which exalts a nation. Encourage us to testify boldly to Thy compassion, and fortify us to resist evil. Support the international meetings designed to avoid war and preserve peace with justice.

We ask Thee, Ruler of individuals and of nations, to guide the President and the Congress of the United States. Endow them with wisdom and courage to do that which pleases Thee.

Continue, O Lord, our God, to bless this country with God-fearing statesmen who, guided by Thy word, will spurn every compromise with powers seeking to abolish faith in Thee and are hurting the cause of justice and peace.

We command this country and all the peoples and nations fearing Thy holy name into Thine sustaining power through Jesus, our never failing helper and Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader, if he can give us any information as to any further legislative matters this week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois, and pursuant to the announcement made last week that there would be a further announcement of legislative business, tomorrow H.R. 2998, the Arms Control and Disarmament Act will be programed; and on Thursday, H.R. 45, the Inter-American Development Bank Act, will be called up.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to notify the House that I have a special order today for 1 hour at which time I am going to discuss the problem of health care for the aged which has been under consideration and remains under consideration in the Committee on Ways and Means.

INVESTIGATION AND STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I expect to call up a number of resolutions providing authority for committees to subpena witnesses and hold investigations.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 35) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 35

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations and studies into matters within its jurisdiction including the following:

(1) Policies with respect to competition among the various modes of transportation, whether rail, air, motor, water, or pipeline; measures for increased safety; adequacy of the national transportation system for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; and the administration by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the statutes which it administers;

(2) Policies with respect to the promotion of the development of civil aviation; measures for increased safety; restrictions which impede the free flow of air commerce; promotion of travel and tourism; routes, rates, accounts, and subsidy payments; airport construction, hazards of adjacency to airports, and condemnation of airspace, aircraft, and airline liability; aircraft research and development, and market for American aircraft; air navigational aids and traffic control; and the administration by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency of the statutes which they administer;

(3) Allocation of radio spectrum; pay television; ownership, control, and operations of communications and related facilities; policies with respect to competition among various modes of communication, including voice and record communications and data processing; policies with respect to governmental communications systems; coordination of communication policies both domestic and foreign; impact of foreign operations, international agreements, and international organizations on domestic and foreign communications; technical developments in the communications field; and the administration by the Federal Communications Commission and the Director of Telecommunications Management of statutes which they administer;

(4) Adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure and regulatory provisions of the various Securities Acts; and the administration of the Securities and Exchange Commission of the statutes which it administers;

(5) Adequacy of petroleum, natural gas, and electric energy resources for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; adequacy, promotion, regulation, and safety of the facilities for extraction or generation, transmission, and distribution of such resources; development of synthetic liquid fuel processes; regulation of security issues of and control of natural gas pipeline companies; and the administration by the Federal Power Commission of the statutes which it administers;

(6) Advertising, fair competition, and labeling; and the administration by the Fed-

eral Trade Commission of the statutes which it administers;

(7) Research in weather, including air pollution and smog, and artificially induced weather; and the operations of the Weather Bureau;

(8) Effects of inflation upon benefits provided under railroad retirement and railroad unemployment programs; and inequities in provisions of statutes relating thereto, with comparison of benefits under the social security system; and the operations of the Railroad Retirement Board, the National Mediation Board, and the National Railroad Adjustment Board.

(9) Adequacy of medical facilities, medical personnel, and medical teaching and training facilities; research into human diseases; provisions for medical care; efficient and effective quarantine; protection to users against incorrectly labeled and deleterious foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices; and other matters relating to public health; and the operations of the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration.

(10) Disposition of funds arising from the operation of the Trading With the Enemy Act; and the operations of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission;

(11) Current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges; current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternative source materials;

(12) Increase in traffic accidents on the streets and highways of the United States during recent years; factors responsible for such increase, the resulting deaths, personal injuries, and economic losses; and measures for increased safety on the highways.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 5, after line 15, add the following paragraphs:

"Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriate funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

"Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and inquire at this time whether he has any desire to consume any time on this particular resolution?

Mr. SMITH of California. No time on this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 80 pertaining to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 80

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may make investigations and studies as required in connection with bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to it, and, more specifically or in addition thereto, in connection with the following matters within its jurisdiction:

(1) (a) The status, progress, and administration of irrigation, reclamation, and other water resources development programs of the Department of the Interior and of other agencies insofar as the latter affect the work of the Department of the Interior with respect to such programs, including (i) policies and procedures relating to such programs, (ii) projects previously authorized, (iii) projects proposed for authorization and construction, and (iv) developments under the Small Reclamation Projects Act and the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act; (b) compacts relating to the apportionment of interstate waters; (c) the application to Federal agencies and activities of State laws governing the control, appropriation, and distribution of water; and (d) the saline water research and development program.

(2) (a) The administration and operation of the mining and mineral leasing laws, including those which govern the development, utilization, and conservation of oil, gas, and associated resources of the public and other Federal lands; (b) mineral resources of the public lands and mining interests generally, including the conditions, problems, and needs of the mining and minerals industries; (c) mineral resources surveys and the exploration, development, production, and conservation of mineral resources; (d) research facilities needed to improve the position of the domestic mining and minerals industries; (e) capability of mining schools to support research facilities and assure domestic industry of a continuing source of technical talent; (f) proposed long-range domestic minerals programs, including availability of domestic minerals to fulfill all domestic requirements; (g) impact upon domestic mining industries caused by the transfer or disposal of excess and surplus Government-owned metals and minerals; and (h) the effects upon domestic mining industries resulting from the world metal situation and the means available to the Government to permit domestic mining industries to compete favorably in domestic and world markets, including cooperation with established international organizations.

(3) (a) The status, progress, and administration of the national park system and its units, including national seashores, national riverways, and national recreation areas, and of other recreational developments on public domain lands or reservations created out of the public domain and on areas under the jurisdiction of or affecting the Department of the Interior; (b) national outdoor recreation plans and the administration of the land and water conservation fund; and (c) national cemeteries.

(4) (a) The administration and operation of the laws governing the development, utilization, and conservation of the surface and subsurface resources of public lands administered by the Department of the Interior, of forest reserves created out of the public domain and of areas of the Outer Continental Shelf; (b) administration and operation of the National Wilderness Preservation Act; and (c) the withdrawal or restriction on use of public domain or Outer Continental Shelf lands, including reservations created out of the public domain, by military and nonmilitary agencies of the Government from normal operation of the public land and mining laws, and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

(5) (a) The administration of Indian affairs by agencies of the Government participating therein, the programs and policies of those agencies, the adequacy of existing Indian legislation, and the effectiveness with which it is being administered and with which moneys available to carry out its purposes are being used; (b) the release of Indian tribes and bands from Federal supervision, preparation therefor, and the effects thereof; (c) the availability to Indians of health, education, and welfare services and the extent to which they are receiving the full benefit of Federal programs in these areas; (d) the utilization of tribal land and other resources, with particular attention to the means of developing the skill and aptitudes required for such utilization; and (e) the study and analysis of treaties and other written agreements between recognized Indian tribes, nations, or bands and the United States.

(6) The status, progress, and administration of the territories and insular possessions of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, including particularly the status of Puerto Rico and revision of the Commonwealth Act of 1952; the operation and administration of the Revised Virgin Islands Organic Act of

1954, the Virgin Islands Corporation Act of 1949, and Guam Organic Act of 1950, all as amended; local conditions bearing upon and the provisions to be included in organic Acts for American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the extension of various laws of the United States to American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the granting of citizenship to residents of American Samoa; problems concerning the civilian population of the Ryukyu Islands; and national interests in Antarctica.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of making such investigations and studies, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit, hold hearings, and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States as the nature of the investigation of study requires, and be represented at any meeting called by an established international organization to consider matters that affect the areas of jurisdiction of the committee; may do so not only during the session but also during periods of recess and adjournment; and may require, by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 6, delete lines 11 to 15, inclusive, with the exception of the word "*Provided*," in line 11, delete line 16 through the word "Budget;" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964;".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith] desires to consume any time on this particular resolution, I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish simply to say in this connection on this particular committee I think the language of subsection (b), line 21 of page 3, is a new and desirable field in which this committee would like to operate. That represents the only change from such authorization of 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we support the resolution and urge its adoption.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS COMING WITHIN ITS COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 94 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 94

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 4, 1965, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete study and investigation relating to all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 14, add the following paragraph:

"Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, not withstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Education and Labor for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, there have been complaints about the expenditure of foreign funds that are in foreign countries to the credit of the United States without authority of the Congress. The amendment to this resolution provides that no Member traveling without authority of the Congress shall be entitled to use counterpart funds in other countries.

I know of no objection to this bill.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this means, I assume, that if counterpart funds are spent by members of the committee traveling in foreign countries they must be reported through the processes required by the House?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes. That is provided by law.

Mr. GROSS. But they can spend counterpart funds?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any counterpart funds in Puerto Rico?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not aware of where the counterpart funds are. They are stuck around in a lot of pockets, but I do not know where.

Mr. GROSS. I just wondered if there are any in Puerto Rico.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 112 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 112

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters in or related to the fields of astronautical research and development (including resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities), outer space (including exploration and control thereof, and air and space law), and other scientific research and development (including international scientific cooperation) coming within the jurisdiction of such committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act within or without the United States, during the present Congress, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member designated by him may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its studies, investigations, and inquiries, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, lines 4 to 9, inclusive, delete (1) and insert the following: "That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964;".

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the committee amendment which has just been read, and which probably no one was able to hear because of the conversation and confusion in the Chamber, provides that in the use of counterpart funds where they are authorized to be used the rate of subsistence and use of the funds therefor is subject to the same restrictions provided for in the Mutual Security Act, which is the uniform subsistence allowance now provided for the use of counterpart funds.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, this morning the United States took another giant stride in the exploration of space. At 9:37 a.m. a Saturn rocket—this is the one designed to carry our people into orbit and to the moon—with its 1,500,000 pounds of thrust, lifted off the launch pad at Cape Kennedy, Fla., on a mission to place in orbit around the earth the Pegasus satellite.

This was the eighth launch of the Saturn rocket out of eight attempts, a truly outstanding scientific and engineering accomplishment of the men of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and of the many contractors who worked so long and hard to make this event a success.

The Pegasus satellite, which will orbit the earth about 97 minutes, is expected to range in altitude from 310 to 465 statute miles and is inclined 31.7 degrees to the equator.

It will, by means of large panels extended out to 96 by 14 feet and having more than 2,400 square feet of instrumented surface, sweep space to detect and report collision with meteoroids and other minute particles.

I am sure the Members will be excited to learn that this is a textbook shot. The latest information I have is that all launch systems worked perfectly.

The satellite has been deployed, and its internal systems are functioning at peak efficiency.

It is my understanding that later this afternoon I will receive confirmation of the receipt of the first data transmitted from the satellite to earth.

For me, this great accomplishment is very satisfying.

It is another validation, along the long hard road of technical decisions over the past 6 years or more, of the many critical choices that had to be made by the leaders of our space program.

This is another factor contributing to the increased confidence we should have in the rightness of the course we have been following in exploring space.

I may say that the gratifying success of the Saturn booster has been matched in other programs as well.

I need only point to the Tiros weather satellite.

Nine have been launched out of nine attempts.

I think we have every right to be proud of our space team on this day of outstanding achievement.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California's yielding to me. I should also like to comment on the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], with regard to the remarkable space exploit that has taken place. I join with him in particular pride because that exploratory satellite has been produced and is the brain child of a Maryland corporation, the Fairchild Hiller Corp., which is making a great contribution to the space program of America.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER. I am very happy this is so. I just want to say that the space effort is distributed far and wide in this country. We are happy to use the best brains of the country, be they North, South, East, or West, in putting up these satellites.

Mr. MATHIAS. I agree with the gentleman. The Fairchild Hiller Corp. has major installations in Hagerstown and Rockville in my district in Maryland. I have been personally familiar with the great effort that both management and the highly skilled men and women of this company have exerted to excel in the field of space technology. Their achievement today justifies both their own hard work and the confidence that we all have in them.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I would like specifically to call the attention of the membership to the language in this resolution on page 3 which is new amended language.

My understanding is that this came about last year because this particular language was placed in the mutual security bill. So the committees that have been authorized here or will be authorized to do foreign travel—the Space Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, and, I believe, Interstate and Foreign Commerce—those will have language that should be used in these particular measures in the future. Of the committees not authorized, as time will go on, they will have special projects and probably are going to come before the Rules Committee and ask for special authority to go to some particular place. I would suggest that you look at this language and keep it in mind because you will want that language if you are given specific authorization.

Mr. Speaker, I approve of the legislation and urge its adoption.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION OF PROCUREMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 118) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 118

Resolved, That effective from January 4, 1965, the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the procurement, use, and disposition of material, equipment, supplies, and services, and the acquisition, use, and disposition of real property, by or within the Department of Defense;

(2) relating to the military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense;

(3) involving the laws, regulations, and directives administered by or within the Department of Defense;

(4) involving the use of appropriated and nonappropriated funds by or within the Department of Defense;

(5) relating to scientific research and development in support of the armed services; and

(6) all other matters within the legislative jurisdiction conferred by law or the Rules of the House of Representatives upon the Committee on Armed Services.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, after line 3, add the following: "Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

"Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amendment thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 133) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 133

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the committee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to all matters falling within the jurisdiction of the committee under rule XI(4) of the Rules of the House of Representatives or any law of the United States.

The committee may report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it considers advisable, during the present Congress.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any of its subcommittees is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States (including its Commonwealths and possessions), or outside the United States in connection with matters involving international organizations, international finance, balance of payments problems, export control matters or operation of the Export-Import Bank, whether the House has recessed or has adjourned; to hold such hearings and require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof designated by him, may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 7, delete the words "or outside the United States".

On an additional page numbered "3", show the following paragraph:

"Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Banking and Currency for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 141) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 141

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof designated by the chairman may make investigations into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In the United States and Canada, public works projects either authorized or proposed to be authorized relating to flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, waterpower, navigation, water pollution control, public buildings and grounds, as well as roads and highways.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States and Canada, whether the House has recessed or adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction, wherever held within the United States and Canada.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

Funds authorized for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Public Works for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CREATING A SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 13) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 13

Resolved, That, effective January 4, 1965, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of thirteen Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of small business; (2) the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business to determine whether such laws and their administration adequately serve the needs of small business; (3) whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business; and (4) to study and investigate problems of small business enterprises generally, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation: *Provided*, That the committee shall not invade any subject matter under active investigation by any standing committee of the House.

Sec. 3. The committee may from time to time submit to the House such reports as it deems advisable and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House has recessed or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as the committee deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee, or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Sec. 5. The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking of evidence including sworn testimony.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution on behalf of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 2, strike out the word "thirteen" and insert the word "fifteen."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 3, strike out "or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee, or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member." and insert "or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or members."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, after line 12, insert "Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754(b) of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad.

"For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the calendar year 1965 a sum not in excess of $250,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to committee amendment: On page 3, strike out lines 22, 23, and 24.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some considerable controversy between the Committee on Rules and various legislative committees and select committees in regard to the authorization of funds for the use of the committee. We thought in the Committee on Rules, after discussing this matter at some length, that there ought to be some limitation by way of authorization on the funds that were being used by these various and sundry committees. We proceeded to do just that. The chairmen of the various committees felt that the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on House Administration felt that they should have the authority both to authorize and to appropriate funds, which seemed to us a little unusual.

Well, we did not think in the Committee on Rules, after mature consideration, that this matter was of great enough importance to cause a big ruckus in the House amongst the Committee on Rules and the chairmen of the legislative committees. After some consideration and one or two votes on the subject, our Committee on Rules voted to strike out the committee amendments that limited the funds that these committees should spend. We did not do this without some consideration. I do not think there is any hard feeling left about it, because after all, we did recede from our previous position. We did obtain the figures in regard to the amount of the expenditures and how these expenditures had increased over the years for these select committees and all of the standing committees. I have the figures with regard to this here. We went back to the 83d Congress to see how much we had been spending for various and sundry investigations all over the face of the earth, with the exception of the North and South Poles, I think, and we found in the 83d Congress that there was a little over $2 million expended for that purpose.

Now, year by year this figure has gone up, and I am just going to give you these figures because maybe the Committee on House Administration in the light of the great increase in what this business of investigation is costing, might feel it is appropriate to run a little closer watch on how much money is being spent here, yonder, and the other place, and they might reduce it some. For that reason I am making this statement.

In the 83d Congress there were $2,689,000 spent on the subject of investigations. All of this is in addition to the staff that each standing committee is allowed, which is quite an elaborate staff, as you all know. This is in addition to that.

In the 84th Congress the figure went up to $3.5 million. In the 85th Congress the expenditure went up to $4,784,000. In the 86th Congress it went up to $5,797,000. In the 87th Congress it went up to $6,724,000. Now, in the 88th Congress, that is, the last Congress, this expenditure went up to $8,112,000. In other words, it has gone up $1 million a year. The budgets that I have seen and that are proposed indicate it is going to go up some more this year.

We have had a great many lectures on balancing the budget. The President has told us that we ought to decrease expenses wherever it was necessary. We thought we were doing a useful job and I still think so. I think we are spending too much money on staff for investigations. Some committees are noted for their large expenditures. We have one committee that has spent over $1 million a year for additional staff to conduct investigations.

Mr. Speaker, we have withdrawn from this and I thought it desirable at least to make this explanation. We have no apology to make for what we did, but in the light of the position taken by the chairmen of the various committees we felt that the matter should be dropped for the time being and just express the hope that somewhere along the line somebody may pay a little attention to the amount of expenditures for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, that is all the statement I have to make on the subect; and at this time I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statements made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith]. This is a select committee which we have to reorganize as soon as possible because otherwise the members of the staff will not get paid. They will not be paid until such time as we do pass the resolution.

I hope to be reappointed to this Select Committee on Small Business and if so at the first meeting I intend to bring up the subject of investigation of foundations. I think the committee has done a very, very fine job in many fields. I think the staff is doing excellent work. But I think we have reached the point now where this investigation of foundations is going too far. I want to make these remarks part of the Record at this time, but from here on I shall make my remarks in the committee itself where it can be discussed in executive session.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by stating to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Small Business that I hope we can wind up this foundations investigation and not keep it going ad infinitum. I hope we can do that in this session of the Congress.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and also the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], for the very kind way and fair manner in which they have treated this committee and for the consideration of the amendments that have been proposed. These amendments have my approval and have been approved by other members of the committee.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was curious about the language on page 3 which says that local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or employees traveling abroad. Is there a provision also in the resolution which would make such U.S.-owned currencies available?

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this language is restrictive language in connection with committees that are not basically authorized to travel abroad. If the gentleman has checked the resolution that we passed with reference to the Committee on Foreign Affairs he will find language in there which is identical with the language in the Mutual Security Act passed last year which is required language covering the amount of money going abroad. The Small Business Committee is not authorized to travel abroad. They would have to come to the Committee on Rules and get special authority of the House if they had any problem abroad that they wished to investigate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Am I correct in assuming the gentleman is not opposing the continuation of the foundation's study during the 89th Congress? He merely expresses the hope that we can wind it up entirely during this 89th Congress?

Mr. SMITH of California. I would say to the gentleman that basically that is probably a reasonably fair statement. But I will have more to say about this in the committee.

I want the gentleman from Texas to know that I shall have more to say about this when we organize. It depends upon how far we are going. If we are going to go back and get all kinds of records as far back as 1942, 1943, or 1944, we will have a problem. If the foundations are bad, I want to have them investigated thoroughly, I say this to the gentleman from Texas, and I shall cooperate in every way possible. But I do not think we ought to pester some of these good foundations and get all of their records, more records and more records.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, the one thing I wanted to make plain is the fact that the gentleman is not opposed to it for the 89th Congress? He just expresses the hope that it will be finished during the 89th Congress?

Mr. SMITH of California. I certainly do.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Do I understand the gentleman correctly when he says it is the intention of the Rules Committee that only those committees not authorized oversea travel be required to use American dollars in their travels overseas, but those committees which desire to travel overseas can come before the Rules Committee and get this authority and then expend counterpart funds?

Mr. SMITH of California. That is the language, I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana. But on the first statement which the gentleman made I do not think that is quite the requirement, that you have to use American money, I do not believe that is true. The Appropriations Committee does, but on this particular language it is awfully difficult for me to explain what that language really means. But, the intention as I understand it was to cover all those that are authorized to go abroad will go under the same language which was placed in the mutual security bill last year. Those not authorized to go abroad in their investigative tasks are confined to this language, unless they ask to go abroad and then they are granted funds. Then, the other language will go in.

I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Rules for a further explanation of the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that does require a little explanation. It was the thought of the Committee on Rules that a committee, either a legislative committee or a special committee, has authority to make an investigation and travel abroad for that purpose, if they are duly authorized under a resolution, then we would want to use the counterpart funds wherever they are available in foreign countries. But if someone goes to Europe, whether it is a group or a single Member of Congress, and has no legislative authority to travel abroad in behalf of the Congress, then he should not use counterpart funds, and from where he gets the money is his business.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the gentleman from California will yield further, if I understand the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules correctly, this limitation only applies to those committees where a committee member travels without legislative authority?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman from California will yield further to me, yes; without a resolution authorizing foreign travel.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I might say that there are one or two other committees, like the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Appropriations, which have special funds for that purpose.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that no member of the House Small Business Committee has traveled abroad on funds provided by this committee. We did not use funds for this purpose last year and we do not intend to use them for this purpose during this Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that no one was pointing any finger to any particular committee.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Wherein you say, "the funds authorized for expenses incurred for these activities within the United States," would that in any way bar the using of money in Puerto Rico or any of our possessions?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Puerto Rico is under the domination of the United States.

Mr. DENT. And for the purposes of this act is considered a proper expenditure.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I suppose so.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. First, let me say I am very much in favor of what the gentleman is saying. The question is this: Would the use of these counterpart funds assist us in our balance-of-payments situation? I think it would. I was wondering whether the use of counterpart funds would assist us in a small way in our balance-of-payments problem. I think it would, but I am not too clear. Did the gentleman go into that at all?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As I understand the balance-of-payments situation anything that takes dollars out of this country and sends them to another country hurts the balance-of-payments situation. Anything that takes dollars out of other countries and brings them to this country assists us.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it is a little more complicated because these are in effect credits. I do not know that it creates balance of payments before these funds are spent. That was the one thing that was not clear in my mind in trying to think the matter through.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not sure I understand what the gentleman has in mind. If he means counterpart funds, of course, they have no direct effect themselves upon balance of payments.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that would be true, using that in lieu of actual money that would come from the United States, which would certainly hurt us. I think this would to that extent benefit us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Having liberated $5 billion in gold, I understand that the junketing Members of Congress would carry gold over there to get around this.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, gold is not used as currency in this country.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with a question raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], concerning an investigation by the Small Business Committee into foundations, I do not want anything that I say to be construed as being a concurrence in what has been said heretofore. The gentleman from Texas asked the gentleman from California if he had any objection to his continuing that investigation in the 89th Congress.

I just want to say that I objected to it having ever been considered or started; I think the gentleman ought to have concluded it, and I do not think he ought to go any further with it. The Small Business Committee was never created for that purpose. It has been engaged in a very elaborate investigation of things that had nothing in the world to do with small business, in my judgment.

As a matter of fact, I am informed that the Treasury Department under direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, which committee has jurisdiction over this subject, has conducted a long, a thorough, and a complete examination of the subject of "Foundations," an examination which, in my judgment, was very badly needed for a long time. They have now reported to the Committee on Ways and Means, and that committee, I hope, is about to make its own investigation which will result in correction of the many evils that were being engaged in by these foundations that were set up, some of them for the purpose of dodging or evading or avoiding taxes.

I merely make that statement because I think it is a subject that needs consideration, but I do not like to see one committee assuming the functions of another committee that is doing the job, and that is authorized to do it.

I thought I should make this statement for the benefit of the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. May I say to the gentleman and assure Members of the House that the committee has made a most worthwhile investigation; that we have reported to the Congress; that our committee has turned the reports over to the Internal Revenue Service and to the Congress. The Internal Revenue Service has commended the work of the committee in this area.

The Committee on Ways and Means will take it from here, and doubtless there will be some legislation following the investigation and report by the House Committee on Small Business on the subject of lax practices by some foundations.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then you have completed your investigation?

Mr. EVINS. The Subcommittee on Foundations has made no recommendations. We have merely made an investigation. We have the facts available, we have reported to the Congress, although there are no recommendations contained in the report. As recommendations have been made, the job is not really completed, and we certainly hope to finish the matter this year. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia that our committee hopes to conclude this matter during this Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That was not my hope. My hope was that you would go back to small business and let the Ways and Means Committee do its own work.

Mr. EVINS. We have conferred with the Ways and Means Committee, and they said they did not have the staff or the time to pursue the matter. They concurred in the Small Business Committee conducting the investigation. I again assure the gentleman that I am in agreement with him that this work should be completed during this Congress.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House resolution 13, 89th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct Studies and Investigations of the Problems of Small Business, the following Members of the House: Mr. Evins, of Tennessee, chairman; Mr. Patman, of Texas; Mr. Multer, of New York; Mr. Steed, of Oklahoma; Mr. Roosevelt, of California; Mr. Kluczynski, of Illinois; Mr. Dingell, of Michigan; Mr. Smith, of Iowa; Mr. Weltner, of Georgia; Mr. Moore, of West Virginia; Mr. Smith, of California; Mr. Harvey, of Indiana; Mr. Conte, of Massachusetts; Mr. Broyhill, of North Carolina; Mr. Horton, of New York.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 19 and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 4, 1965, the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies relating to the following matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, namely—

(1) relating to the administration and operation of general immigration and nationality laws and the resettlement of refugees, including such activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which affect immigration in the United States; or involving violation of the immigration laws of the United States through abuse of private relief legislation;

(2) involving claims, both public and private, against the United States;

(3) involving the operation and administration of national penal institutions, including personnel and inmates therein;

(4) relating to judicial proceedings and the administration of Federal courts and personnel thereof, including local courts in territories and possessions;

(5) relating to the operation and administration of the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act; and

(6) involving the operation and administration of Federal statutes, rules and regulations relating to crime and criminal procedure; and

(7) involving the operation and administration of the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act; and *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 18, change the period to a semicolon and add the word "and" and add another subsection as follows: "(8) relating to State taxation of interstate commerce."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the second committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 22, insert: "For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the calendar year 1965 a sum not in excess of $250,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned about the deprivation of voting rights. We are faced with an intolerable situation in Mississippi and now in Selma, Ala. I certainly believe legislation in this area is essential.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary what plans the committee has to hold hearings and to recommend further legislation to insure the right of all American citizens to vote.

Mr. CELLER. I am sure the gentleman will agree that reasoning and reasonable men deplore some of these excesses that we read about in certain sections of the country and view with alarm some of the mischief that is going on. I think it is incumbent upon the Committee on the Judiciary which has full and ample legislative power to address itself to this matter. I assure the gentleman that the Committee on the Judiciary will take hold of this situation and most expeditiously endeavor to formulate legislation that might meet these various issues developing in the South.

It might be interesting for the gentleman to know that I have been in touch with the office of the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, in particular, and his civil rights division. They are very much disturbed over the matter and they are working on suggested legislation. I hope to have a report from the Department of Justice momentarily. There are quite a number of bills that have been offered, and I think it is incumbent upon the Committee on the Judiciary to act upon them. I can assure the gentleman that that action will be expeditious.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I certainly do hope and urge that there be immediate legislation in the area of voting rights which I believe should include the abolition of literacy and constitutional interpretation tests and, secondly, the establishment of a system of Federal registrars to register voters where there has been a deprivation of voting rights. State and local, as well as Federal elections must be covered. This can be accomplished by legislation under the 14th and 15th amendments without any constitutional amendment. Also section 2 of the 14th amendment, providing for the reduction in the basis of representation in Congress when the right to vote is denied or abridged, has never been enforced, and it should be. Congress has a direct responsibility to insure the franchise for all Americans.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether it was the first committee amendment on page 2, line 19, that was withdrawn or the second committee amendment on page 3, line 22 or whether both amendments were withdrawn by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The first committee amendment on page 2 was agreed to and the amendment on page 3 is the amendment that was withdrawn.

Mr. HALL. The amendment on page 2 was agreed to?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct, and the amendment on page 3 was withdrawn.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask the gentleman to yield in order to make an inquiry as to the language on page 2, paragraph (8) with reference to the amendment relating to State taxation of interstate commerce. If the gentleman understands what that means, I would like to know.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who proposed the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. The reason I ask the question is that we have been requested to go into certain matters having to do with interstate commerce insofar as taxation in the railroad industry is concerned. We had that problem last year. The committee had been looking into this problem and, consequently, we did not pursue it. But at a later time, I did talk to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], about it and apparently he took the position at that time that your committee could not pursue the matter. We had legislation on the subject. We were in a crossfire, so to speak, and hardly knew just what to do about it. We did hold a brief hearing on the legislation that was introduced and referred to our committee.

I am merely trying to get the jurisdictional situation straightened out, so I will know what to expect.

Mr. CELLER. We have acted under Public Law 272 of the 86th Congress. That was a result of conferences had with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Mr. BYRD, of the Finance Committee of the Senate, and myself. I believe we did consult the gentleman, also. You may not recall.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I believe we had one or two meetings with the Ways and Means Committee, your committee and my committee, to discuss the matter.

Mr. CELLER. They all sort of dumped it, if I may use that colloquial expression, into our laps. We did not seek it.

Senator BYRD, in particular, wanted the Judiciary Committee to handle it.

I cleared with all committees. We have been working under the aegis of the very able gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. ED WILLIS, since the 86th Congress. The report will be ready shortly, and recommendations for legislation will be made. They probably will be referred to the gentleman's committee or to my committee; I do not know which. I assure the gentleman that there will be no deliberate overlapping of any jurisdiction.

Mr. HARRIS. I assume that under this arrangement, carrying out the spirit of the authorization language as well as the letter, should we receive proposed legislation and should it be referred to our committee, we could appropriately wait until the gentleman's committee has completed whatever study it will make on the subject.

Mr. CELLER. We have that in mind. I assure the gentleman that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] also has that in mind. If this is a matter before the gentleman's committee, I assure him that we would relinquish jurisdiction. In fact, we would not have jurisdiction, but he would have it. We will work in closest harmony in every respect.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly, I wish to cooperate with the gentleman, but I did not wish to get involved in the dilemma faced the last time, when we were in it and not in it. I wish to be sure how to handle it this time.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 233, Report No. 49), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2998) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 234, Report No. 50), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 45) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATION AND STUDY BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 44) and ask for its immediate consideration; and, pending that, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I withdraw the amendment printed on page 3, lines 4, 5, and 6.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following:

(1) The organization, management, operation, and administration of any department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia; and

(2) The organization, management, operation, and administration of any independent agency or instrumentality of government operating solely in the District of Columbia.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on the District of Columbia for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: on page 1, line 2, after the word "authorized", strike out the words "and directed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 68 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following programs of benefits for veterans and their dependents and survivors:

(1) The programs of compensation and pension;

(2) The programs of hospitalization, domiciliary care, nursing home care, medical and dental care and treatment, and furnishing of prosthetic appliances;

(3) The insurance and indemnity programs;

(4) The housing and business loan programs, and the program of furnishing assistance for the acquisition of specially adapted housing;

(5) The programs of education and training (including vocational rehabilitation); and

(6) The furnishing of burial allowances; with a view to determining whether or not such programs are being conducted economically, efficiently, in the best interests of the Government and the beneficiaries of such programs, and in such a manner as to avoid the misuse of Government funds; whether or not such programs adequately serve the needs and protect the welfare of the beneficiaries of such programs; and whether changes in the law or in the administration and operation of the programs either will lead to greater efficiency and economy or will make such programs more adequately serve the needs of the beneficiaries of such programs.

The committee is also authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine—

(1) the extent to which appeals for charitable contributions are made to the American people, or segments thereof, in the name of American veterans by appealing to the desire of the American people to assist such veterans and their survivors or dependents;

(2) whether an undue proportion of such charitable contributions is used to meet the expenses of conducting such appeals and for other administrative expenses rather than for providing services for or benefits to veterans;

(3) whether any of such appeals are fraudulent in nature;

(4) whether additional supervision of the fundraising activities conducted by organizations chartered by Act of Congress in the name of veterans is necessary or desirable; and

(5) the existence of any other abuses connected with charitable appeals made in the name of veterans.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary, except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any members designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754(b) of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 84 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the oversea operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy;

(2) relating to the carrying out of programs and operations authorized by the Mutual Security Act and to other laws and measures to promote the foreign policy of the United States;

(3) relating to activities and programs of international organizations in which the United States participates;

(4) relating to the effectiveness of United States programs of assistance and information; and

(5) relating to legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, within or without the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by any agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. SMITH of California (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 89 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 4, 1965, the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make studies and investigations into the following matters:

(1) The restoration and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products; the disposal of agricultural surpluses pursuant to Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and the use of the foreign currencies accruing therefrom; and the effect of the European Common Market and other regional economic agreements upon United States agriculture;

(2) All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954;

(3) All matters relating to the development, use, and administration of the national forests, including but not limited to development of a sound program for general public use of the national forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained-yield timber management, and study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies;

(4) Price spreads between producers and consumers;

(5) The formulation and development of improved price support and regulatory programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection, grading, and marketing of such commodities; and the effect of trading in futures contracts for such commodities;

(6) The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees;

(7) The development of upstream watershed projects authorized by Public Law 156, Eighty-third Congress, and the administration and development of watershed programs pursuant to Public Law 566, Eighty-third Congress, as amended; and the development of land use programs pursuant to titles I and IV of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962;

(8) All other matters within the jurisdiction of the committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any members thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at any time during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, after line 3, add the following paragraphs:

"Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

"For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the calendar year 1965 a sum not in excess of $75,000."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 4, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEST GERMANY BOWS TO BLACKMAIL

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn that the West German Government permitted itself to be intimidated by a would-be Hitler in reversing its policy of furnishing Israel with the balance of armaments as per their agreement.

It seems as though the Bonn government is experiencing a good deal of difficulty in cleansing itself of the stench of Auschwitz. I view with alarm the trend of the German Government in yielding to Nazi-minded advice. First we find the Nazi scientist aiding Egypt in building terrible weapons of destruction directed against Israel. Then it allows its statute of limitations against Nazi murderers to expire, and now it refuses to honor its arms agreement with Israel.

The guts of what was once a great power in Europe are turning to sawdust. By submitting to Nasser, the Germans are exposing their Achilles heel, leaving themselves wide open to international blackmail. Shame.

I offer an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of Monday, February 15:

BOWING TO BLACKMAIL

Both as a political and symbolic matter, West Germany's decision to cancel arms shipments to Israel is highly unfortunate. President Nasser had threatened to recognize East Germany if Bonn did not terminate an arms agreement with Israel. With inglorious alacrity, West Germany collapsed before this blackmail threat and put herself in the wrong with a nation that above all others deserves sympathetic consideration from Germany.

The amount of money involved was relatively modest. West Germany has never officially disclosed her arms agreement with Israel, but the total amount is believed to be $60 million and it is estimated that 80 percent of the deliveries have already been made. But if the amount was small, the principle was large.

In diplomacy as in common crime, blackmailers have an insatiable thirst. Mr. Nasser was able to dictate Bonn's foreign policy by a verbal threat and by inviting Walter Ulbricht, head of the East German regime, to Cairo for a visit. Having surrendered once, West Germany may be asked to take other steps adverse to Israel in order to prevent possible recognition of East Germany.

As a symbolic matter, Bonn's position is an unhappy one. It may be that West Germany has done much to provide material compensation for wartime atrocities, and no doubt Bonn cannot be expected to condition every aspect of its foreign policy to the memory of a haunted past. Still, it is true that Germany is tailoring her policies to the demand of an Egyptian dictator who has sworn to destroy the nation of Israel. Such is the truth, no matter how it is rationalized in Germany.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, last week I voted for the amendment which would prohibit the Public Law 480 expenditures of $37 million for surplus agricultural commodities to go to the United Arab Republic. I voted against such expenditures, not because I am opposed to giving surplus food to the impoverished, hungry people of the United Arab Republic, for the contrary is true. But I voted as I did because I am opposed to expanding the prestige and world position of United Arab Republic's dictator, Gambal Abdel Nasser. His actions do not justify any confidence in the possibility that he seeks to build peace and stability in the Middle East, nor is there any indication that he wants to associate himself and his country with the United States in its efforts to build world peace. The long list of his activities in opposition to our policies was thoroughly discussed in the debate and needs no repetition at this time.

I do not believe there is any question but that the final vote on that amendment was considered a triumph for Nasser. Now comes news of another victory for him with the surrender by the West German Government to his demand that it cancel its contract to furnish weapons and defense materiel to Israel. This occurrence marks the latest example of Nasser's skill as a dealer in pressure politics. It marks a significant loss, as well, in the prestige of the West German Government.

Mr. Speaker, peace is on a see-saw in the Middle East. As Nasser is inflated by the surrender to his demands by other governments, the prospects for peace go down correspondingly. Each of his triumphs increases the tensions in the Middle East and one wonders, Mr. Speaker, what his new claims will be.

We have learned time and again that dictators cannot be satisfied; that their demands are endless. We must stop inflating Nasser.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I attach an article which appeared in the New York Times of February 16, 1965:

Bonn's Mideast Muddle

The West Germans have made an almost incredible mess of the linked issues of arms to Israel and relations with Egypt. As a result, President Nasser has been greatly strengthened; tensions in the already tense Middle East have risen; West German relations with Israel, which had improved so greatly in recent years, have again sunk to a low of bitterness and anger; and Communist East Germany, Bonn's enemy, achieves a triumph.

It may have been an error on Chancellor Adenauer's part to make the $80 million arms agreement with Israel in 1960, but, once made, there was no excuse not to go through with it. Israel's perennially dangerous position, surrounded as she is by Arab nations determined to destroy her, meant that she needed arms to sustain what Prime Minister Eshkol of Israel yesterday called "a balance of deterrence." However, the arms could have been obtained elsewhere.

Another basic error has been Bonn's persistence in the "Hallstein Doctrine" of not dealing with any nation that recognizes East Germany. This has proved to be more of a nuisance in recent years than an asset, and it has by no means been strictly honored.

President Nasser all along demanded that Germany cease her arms shipments to Israel, but he got nowhere until he had the bold idea of inviting East Germany's President Ulbricht to Egypt as a state guest. Bonn objected that this was de facto recognition and made the egregious error of trying to buy off Mr. Nasser by halting the arms shipments to Israel. This crude maneuver had no effect on the Egyptians. President Ulbricht is going to Cairo anyway, and he will get red-carpet treatment.

Now Germany threatens to cutoff economic aid to Egypt if the Ulbricht visit is carried out. Such aid amounted to nearly $200 million during the first 5-year plan. However, President Nasser has proved in the past that he is allergic to dictation based on aid.

Meanwhile, supplies of Russian arms to Egypt and the other Arab countries have been increasing. The Israelis have a right to be profoundly disturbed as well as angry by the loss of the remainder of the arms—some $20 million worth—which they expected from Germany.

The whole affair has been an ignominious defeat for West Germany, but it has also raised the danger level in the Middle East. Southeast Asia and the Congo are not the only parts of the world where war is possible.

DICTATORS CANNOT BE APPEASED

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, editorials throughout the country are commenting upon the fact that the little dictator on the Nile has frightened West Germany.

The world long since should have learned that dictators cannot be appeased.

Because of Nasser's threat to recognize East Germany, the Bonn government in West Germany has now broken her solemn agreement with the State of Israel and has announced that she will sell no more arms to the State of Israel. Israel will get along without these arms, but West Germany cannot get along without the respect of the free world which she is now losing.

What is worse for West Germany is that even Nasser shows his total lack of respect and even his contempt for West Germany. Having exacted a promise from West Germany to break its solemn obligation, the little dictator now goes right ahead with all of his plans to play footsie with East Germany.

Blackmail, whether private or international, is criminal, and those who submit to it become parties to the crime.

POSITIVE STEPS TO PREVENT CRIME AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, we have talked too long with too little action about the basic problems of crime and juvenile delinquency, gnawing at the very basic roots of our Nation's moral and ethical fiber. Today I am introducing three bills which I believe will help to halt crime, delinquency, violence in the streets, and adult apathy in their tracks. We must take at least these positive steps to reduce crime in America.

The President, in his state of the Union message, challenged Congress to do something about this, and my bills will alert the American people to what Federal Bureau of Investigation Director, J. Edgar Hoover, says "is an urgent need for community leadership to get behind local law enforcement officials by lending their influence and undivided support to police efforts to control and prevent crime."

The greatest need in American life today is a "safe society," and no one will dispute this. The facts about the crime rate are at our fingertips: Crime in the United States increased 13 percent during the first 9 months of 1964 when compared to the same period in 1963.

Legislation by the Congress, quickly acted upon, can stem this tide.

My bills propose to:

First. Call for a White House Conference on Crime Prevention and Juvenile Delinquency.

This conference would be made up of Federal and local officials, representatives of colleges, institutions, and organizations interested in this problem. It would discuss methods of preventing crime and delinquency, including the basic problem of youth employment; adult apathy to crime as was witnessed by the recent incident where neighbors of the late Kitty Genovese ignored her repeated cries for help, which left her dead of multiple stab wounds on her doorstep, and the growing group defiance of law and order leading to mob violence. National attention would be focused on this conference and, I am certain, constructive legislation and administrative recommendations would be made.

Second. Establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime.

This Commission would recognize that crime, particularly in its organized aspects, has become increasingly a matter of vital concern to the Nation. The Commission would be composed of seven members, five to be named by the President, and two would be ex officio members, the Attorney General and the Director of the FBI. The Commission would make a full, complete, and continuing study of investigation in the several elements of interstate crime and be adequately staffed to carry on these studies and investigations.

Third. Provide grants for college level instruction in modern methods of crime detection, control, and prevention.

This would complement the FBI's National Academy, and make such instruction available for a much larger number of officers than is now possible. Further, grants to the National Institutes of Health and other research institutions would be made to determine the causes and cures for various types of criminal behavior.

The prime responsibility in the prevention of crime and juvenile delinquency, which costs the country annually $27 billion, rests with the local and State Governments, but it is a national responsibility, too, in that each American must personally become interested in the complete eradication of crime. My legislation would provide the vehicles for bringing national attention to this problem of making for a safe society.

It is important to understand the criminal mind, and how to cure it. It is important to discover crimes and to prevent them; and this legislation I have introduced will serve us in all these fields.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call to the attention of the House a problem of serious concern to every citizen of the United States. A full-page advertisement in the Washington Post on February 3, 1965, took the form of an open letter to the President of the United States urging the Chief Executive to abolish completely existing controls on the importation of foreign residual fuel oil.

Although this arbitrary action was urged upon the President in the interest of "free and open competition," the advertisement was signed and paid for by organizations which would profit financially by continued and increased importation of a foreign dump product. By an odd coincidence, many of these advocates of "free and open competition" for the fuel industry enjoy substantial tariff protection for their own industries. They are, in fact, among the Nation's fiercest enemies of foreign competition when their own prosperity is threatened by excessive importation of competing products. In other words, they want the coal industry to compete under conditions which they reject for themselves.

Any group in America has the right to exploit its partisan interests in an open letter to the President of the United States. Unfortunately, the letter on residual oil went far beyond the permissible limits of bias and partisanship. The fact is that every major contention advanced in this flamboyant advertisement was based on erroneous data. As already shown, the advocates of unrestricted importation of foreign residual oil are not believers in "free and open competition" as they claim. Their assertion that oil controls have impaired our international relations, particularly with our good friends of Latin America, is just so much propaganda without a particle of evidence to sustain it. Their major contention, in the economic field, that controls have artificially increased the price of residual fuel oil is 100 percent inaccurate. On the contrary, the cost per barrel has decreased nearly one-third since quotas were established in 1959.

However, putting aside the minute and the exaggeration of enthusiastic partisans, I respectfully call attention to a few basic observations about an economic struggle which, thus far, has had a shattering impact upon the coal producing industry on the eastern part of the United States. In the interest of fair play, I ask the Members of the House, and the American people to bear these facts in mind:

First. The coal industry is obliged to compete against foreign residual oil for the expanding east coast public utilities and manufacturing fuel market under conditions which violate every principle of fair play and fair competition.

Second. Even the Nation's strongest, largest, and most efficient industries would be seriously hurt if they were compelled to compete in their primary market under similar conditions to those imposed on the coal industry.

Third. Foreign residual oil is being dumped on the domestic market under marketing practices which the American Government and American industry have long since rejected as unfair in the foreign marketing of our own surplus products.

In considering this question of residual oil, the first key word is "foreign" and the second key word is "waste." Upon completion of the refining process, domestic oil companies have some residual oil left. They could, if they wished, outproduce foreign refiners in this field. But the existence of residual oil is proof positive that there has been waste and inefficiency in the cracking process and for that reason domestic oil companies are trying to refine away all residual oil. This is in keeping with their stated purpose to make the American oil industry the most efficient on the face of the globe.

Yet, while domestic producers are doing their utmost to refine away residual oil, foreign producers are actually being encouraged to increase their output of this uneconomic product and I am distressed to have to observe that some interests in our own country would like to make the U.S. Government an accomplice in the process. Quite obviously, there is no point in railing against the inefficiency of the oil companies of Venezuela and the Netherlands East Indies when the greatest fuel market in the world has been opened for their competition at whatever price the traffic will bear.

Consider, for a moment, the devastating affects of what has happened in the past few years. Voluntary controls on imports were tried in 1957, and abandoned in 1959 in favor of mandatory controls. Since then, the quotas have been increased several times. As a result, the current price of foreign residual oil is now nearly one dollar a barrel less than it was in 1957, or a price decline of nearly one-third. Not even the most rabid proponent of unlimited importations would contend that this price drop was caused by augmented efficiency in production. The foreign producers simply decreed an unprecedented cut in prices to obstruct competition. Because residual oil is a waste product, they can charge about any price and make a profit.

The coal-mining industry in the United States has been extremely hard hit by a number of unfavorable economic factors over the past few decades. Yet, due to the sensible and sincere cooperation of mineworkers and mineowners, the industry has done a magnificent job of pulling itself up by its own bootstraps. Over the past few years, the price of coal at the mine has declined more than 60 cents a ton, a decline due entirely to increased efficiency in production. But no industry in the United States could compete against a foreign competitor able to slash prices by one-third over the same period of time. No industry in the United States should be compelled to give this outrageously unfair advantage to a foreign competitor.

The Secretary of the Interior must soon decide whether present quotas on the importation of foreign residual oil shall be extended for another year at existing levels, substantially reduced, or removed entirely as advocated by those who have a financial interest in their removal. The adoption of the latter course would not only bring chaos to the east coast fuel market—it would deal another catastrophic blow to the coal-mining industry.

Mr. W. A. "Tony" Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, recently estimated that already 55,000 miners in the Appalachian region have lost their jobs through competition from foreign residual oil—lost their jobs because of the large-scale importation of a foreign waste product which our own domestic oil industry believes is so uneconomical it should be eliminated entirely. If quotas are again increased, thousands of additional miners will be thrown out of employment—and coal-hauling railroads will be equally adversely affected.

The coal-mining industry is not asking for favoritism or preferential treatment. It is asking simply for fairplay. It is demanding—and justly so—relief from a form of foreign competition, based on arbitrary pricing, which would play havoc with the Nation's soundest industries. The coal-mining industry should have equality of treatment with other industries.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I strongly feel that the Secretary of the Interior should establish reasonable and fair quota limitations upon the importation of foreign residual fuel oil. Following the March 10 hearings before the Secretary of the Interior, I believe that the evidence will clearly show that our own Government should correct this injustice which is now imposed upon one of America's most basic industries.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of publicity and comment surrounding the introduction of a series of House resolutions including House Resolution 205 which shows myself as author. It appears from the furor that has ensued that certain parties, including but not limited to the press, have seen this action as an intracommittee feud in the Banking and Currency Committee. I do not view it as such.

Mr. Speaker, I have in the past and do now hold a strong and firm conviction that the field of housing is a very important sector of the American economy and of American life. This field, therefore, is entitled to a substantial and respectful attention in this House.

I would be surprised if any Member of the body would disagree with the observation that under the able leadership of Albert Rains the Subcommittee on Housing has served the national interest in housing admirably and well. To accomplish this service has required a substantial assured budget and a highly competent staff. The House of Representatives and housing in the United States lost a stalwart champion and an articulate and informed leader when Congressman Rains retired. It was my pleasure and privilege to discuss the future of the subcommittee with Chairman Rains before he left this House. It was his expressed hope and expectation that the subcommittee would continue to merit the financial support of this great body and that the activities of the subcommittee would be continued without diminution or erosion. There resides in the subcommittee a rich legacy of staff and a strong membership of able and experienced legislators. The field of housing will require legislative study, concern, and action this session. The subcommittee, as now constituted, is capable of providing all that is required if properly supported with funding and staff.

There is little to be gained in arguing about the form this support takes so long as the substance is assured and delivered. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have told my constituents in one of the fastest building sections in the Nation that I do not intend to be idle in the face of any demonstrated threat to the committee's ability to respond to the needs for housing legislation. I would be shocked and disturbed if any Member, chairman or otherwise, would act in any way to substantially impair this body's ability to so respond. The form taken to express the support, encouragement, and assistance called for concerns me very little. The substance of such an expression concerns me a great deal.

In discussing this matter with my colleagues on the committee this was the position I had hoped to convey. This position did not require, at this time, the introduction of a resolution. In the discussions it now appears that I had, in fact, given tacit consent to have such a resolution introduced. I readily take upon myself such criticism as may be justified for having so represented myself. I want this body to be clear that in requesting, as I will request, that House Resolution 205 be tabled, I do not thereby extend to any other person any blame or criticism. So far as I can judge all parties concerned have acted honorably in pursuing their best judgment in the matter herein discussed. I trust that all will accord my present move the same kind assessment. My own failure was in misunderstanding the intelligence made available to me and in poorly articulating the intelligence I was communicating to others. My belief is that the matter is somewhat distorted and expanded beyond the place justified and that the tempest will soon be tracked to the teapot.

ADDRESS OF MAJORITY LEADER CARL ALBERT AT B'NAI ZION DINNER

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech made by the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, in New York City.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the 57th annual dinner of B'nai Zion was held at the New York Hilton Hotel on Sunday, February 14, 1965.

B'nai Zion is the oldest American Zionist fraternal organization in this country. It is devoted to Americanism, Zionism, and fraternalism.

Once again it was my distinct honor to act as chairman of the dinner. In that capacity it was my pleasure to read to the audience a noteworthy message from our President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

The toastmaster was the honorary chairman of the Jewish National Fund, Dr. Harris J. Levine. The invocation was delivered by Rabbi William Berkowitz, the spiritual leader of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun.

There were brief greetings from the national president of the organization, Edward Sharf, and the Israeli Minister to the United States, the Honorable Mordechai Gazit. The dean of the House of Representatives, our good friend and colleague, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, in a beautiful introduction presented to the assemblage our very able and distinguished majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT.

In his inimitable and able manner, Congressman ALBERT delivered a most timely address, worthy of the attention of all. I am pleased to set it forth as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN ALBERT

It is a special pleasure to be here with you tonight. This distinguished and large assembly by its very presence demonstrates in sentimental and practical terms its wholehearted support for the objectives of this dinner honoring the memory of our late beloved and martyred President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I am proud to have a part in this undertaking which embraces two great projects: The planting of the John F. Kennedy Peace Forest, symbolizing the bonds of friendship between the United States and Israel, and the Kennedy Evaluation and Diagnostic Center for Retarded Children near Jerusalem. This center also recognizes the enormous contributions of the entire Kennedy family to the rehabilitation of retarded children.

The late President Kennedy's abiding friendship for the Jewish people and for the cause of an independent and secure State of Israel is a matter of historic record.

It is a signal honor for me to be able to address the leaders and members of the very same organization which President—then Senator—Kennedy addressed on your silver anniversary in February 1958.

In that address he gave voice to the aspirations of free people everywhere for peace in the Middle East. In that address he dispelled a prevalent myth about that troubled area. I quote from his speech:

"This myth—with which you are all too familiar—is the assertion that it is Zionism which has been the unsettling and fevered infection in the Middle East, the belief that without Israel there would somehow be a natural harmony throughout the Middle East and the Arab world. Quite apart from the values and hopes which the State of Israel enshrines—and the past injuries which it redeems—it twists reality to suggest that it is the democratic tendency of Israel which has injected discord and dissension into the Near East. Even by the coldest calculations, the removal of Israel would not alter the basic crisis in the area. For, if there is any lesson which the melancholy events of the last 2 years and more have taught us, it is that, though Arab states are generally united in opposition to Israel, their political unities do not rise above this negative position. The basic rivalries within the Arab world, the quarrels over boundaries, the tensions involved in lifting their economies from stagnation, the cross pressures of nationalism—all of these factors would still be there, even if there were no Israel."

In 1959 Mrs. Albert and I visited all parts of the State of Israel. We saw the exciting and dynamic transformations taking place daily in that land—the expansion of agricultural and industrial technology—the rapid growth of science and culture, all moving at a pace unequaled anywhere in the world in any period of the world's history. Here literally the deserts were beginning to bloom. More than that, wherever we went in Israel we could feel the very pulse beat of a determined people—a people who will never surrender and never die.

We came away from Israel convinced that at no time since the American revolution has such a dynamic and resolute spirit been manifested among a people. No people any where any time ever had a more righteous claim to their land, their liberty, and their independence. It is a claim which all decent nations must not only recognize but insure. Israel is a great beachhead of democracy in an area where democracy has seldom thrived. Here indeed is an oasis of democracy in what, in too many places, is a desert of lingering feudalism.

Israel is a democracy. It is right and logical that we as a democratic Nation were the first to recognize a government with which we share many experiences, many ideals, and many aims. Israel is both an ancient and a contemporary nation sharing many of the characteristics of our relatively youthful country. For instance, our two countries have in common the epic of mass immigration. Like America, Israel has absorbed hundreds of thousands of newcomers. Like America, Israel is a blend of many immigrant traditions, tongues, and experiences which furnish the nucleus of a culture both unified and distinctive. Like America, Israel has created unity out of diversity. Like the American pioneer, her people have toiled and sacrificed to transform the wilderness into productive land.

But there is another reason why Israel's story has won the admiration and support of Americans. The Israelis, like the first Americans, have lived under great hardship. Our forefathers had to struggle against hostile circumstances, human and physical. The Israelis, too, are denied the blessings of peace. They must work and live on the alert, constantly on the defensive; they never can be sure what lies across from them in space, ahead of them in time.

We in Washington are conscious of Israel's continuing jeopardy. We are constantly searching for effective action which will ultimately bring the Arabs and Israelis together in peace.

President Kennedy had great plans to undertake initiatives to bring peace to this area of the world. He spoke of this frequently during his presidential campaign in 1960. After taking office as President, he studied the problems, discussed the remedies, and formulated plans. It is a sad page of history that he was to meet disappointment on his way.

His fears for the security of Israel were in fact heightened in the face of the introduction into Egypt of new weapons from the Communist bloc, including heavy bombers which offered a threat to Israel's defenses.

And so in 1962, Mr. Kennedy made an important decision. He ordered a survey of the defense situation in the Middle East. After careful study, he concluded that the Egyptian bombers were fast and powerful enough to penetrate Israel's defenses and that it was necessary to provide Israel with an answer. That conclusion led to the decision to permit Israel to purchase the Hawk, the defensive ground-to-air missile which is the only real answer to the supersonic bomber.

President Kennedy was by nature a builder—a man of positive and creative instincts and philosophy. He was also a realist. While he recognized the futility of an arms race, and its vast subtractions from the sources which might have been plowed into development of the new nation, he realized too, that the failing hope of a peaceful solution made it imperative to take steps to make Israel itself strong enough to deter attack, and to make it clear that the great powers would act to avert any outbreak of hostilities. On May 8, 1963, President Kennedy told the press that the United States was opposed to the use of force, or the threat of force in the Near East, and that this Nation would take action through the United Nations or on its own to halt aggression.

That commitment on the part of the United States is essential to the preservation of the peace in the Near East. In the final analysis that peace is dependent upon a strong United States and the maintenance in our favor of the balance of power between the East and the West.

This policy of the Kennedy administration was supported by our then Vice President Lyndon Baines Johnson and has been reaffirmed since he took office as President.

Many of you here tonight will recall that President Johnson referred to this policy when he appeared before you at a function similar to this some 3 years ago. At that time he said, "The works of peace are global works. This administration will work for peace in the Middle East as it works for progress in Africa, for social justice in Latin America, for freedom, accord, mutual trust—these are the vistas beyond the cold war which give meaning to our present struggle and which sustain the sacrifices we must be prepared to make."

President Johnson many times and on many occasions has elaborated upon and reiterated that theme.

When Prime Minister Levi Eshkol visited the White House in 1964 the President restated U.S. support of the territorial integrity and political independence of all countries in the Near East. The President is fully aware of Israel's difficulties in maintaining the integrity of her geographic boundaries and her political freedom. He is completely committed to the cause of peace and freedom in Israel and the Near East.

The President has recently received a strong assist in his mission toward peace and freedom for Israel from the Congress. A recent and impressive example of that support was demonstrated only a few days ago when most of the members of the New York congressional delegation, under the leadership of the beloved dean of the House, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, joined in rebuking the Arab Republic but, at the same time, confirmed the President's constitutional responsibility to direct foreign policy. This vote of confidence in President Johnson, I assure you, was not misplaced. The President and the leadership of the House appreciated their support.

In my judgment the commitments of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to support the territorial integrity and political independence of the countries of the Near East also have the support of the overwhelming majority of the people of this country. This policy also has the support of the U.S. Congress. This is no place for partisan zeal, but as a Democrat and as a matter of making the record complete and clear, I can assure you it has the support of the Democratic Party. Last August I had the privilege of presiding over the hearings of the committee on resolutions and platform at the Democratic convention in Atlantic City.

An important pledge in the party platform, and one which received broad support during our hearings, committed our party to continue the fight for the territorial integrity of every nation and the prevention of a military imbalance. This administration, beyond any question, is dedicated to the implementation of this platform promise to the State of Israel.

The people of this country support the President's policy. The public consensus on Israel in this country is highly favorable. The public sympathizes with Israel. The bonds created by our mutual experiences in forming a free and democratic government, in overcoming obstacles, cause a flow of friendship between our two nations.

Before closing, I must mention two additional important developments in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations—one was to let the nations of the Near East know that we favor constructive and legitimate water development programs. The other was the plan to help Israel desalt water through the use of nuclear energy. It was, indeed, in this very city less than a year ago that President Johnson announced the cooperative effort between our country and the State of Israel to desalinize water, a project which is now well on the way to fruition.

In retrospect it is clear that we have passed through a most significant period in United States-Israel relations during the last 4 years. Our two democracies have come closer together. We have achieved a better understanding. We have joined in a mutual and strong resolve to work for peace in the Near East.

You in B'Nai Zion, who have worked for the establishment of Israel, may take great satisfaction and pride in the attainment of your historic objective. But I know, and you know, that the task is not yet finished. Israel has not yet won the peace. It is the responsibility of every friend of Israel to help make sure that no aggression is committed in the area from any source.

We look forward to the time when Israel and her neighbors will live in peace. It will be an hour for rejoicing for the people of Israel, and for her many friends throughout the world. It will be a great day for democracy everywhere, for an Israel at peace will be able to make an expanding contribution to the progress and development of the free world.

An Israel at peace will contribute toward the preservation of democratic institutions everywhere and to the emergence of a vast, new, and great society among all men.

AMA'S REVERSAL

Mr. **KREBS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KREBS**. Mr. Speaker, those of us who support the social security approach to hospital care for the elderly often have a difficult time of keeping up with the inconsistent strategy of this program's critics. In the following editorial the Newark Evening News, of February 9, 1965, has done an effective job of pinning down the American Medical Association's latest approach for what it is—"an extraordinary reversal of policy." I recommend this well written editorial to my colleagues in the House:

AMA'S REVERSAL

Leaders of the American Medical Association have pledged its financial resources in an effort to defeat the Johnson administration's hospital insurance program with the AMA's own "eldercare" plan.

Every effort in the last dozen years to put medical care for the elderly under social security has been blocked by the AMA on its premise that such a program opened the door to socialized medicine. Yet "eldercare" which the association offers in place of the administration's program is more socialistic than anything proposed by any administrative program.

Under "eldercare" the Kerr-Mills State-administered plans would be expanded by subsidizing private health insurance programs with general Federal and State tax funds. The AMA plan would provide services of physicians and surgeons and drugs, in addition to the hospitalization, nursing home care, and diagnostic services proposed in the administration's King-Anderson bill.

But whereas "eldercare" would be financed by State and Federal funds, at a cost not even estimated by the AMA, the administration's program would be supported through an additional social security tax. In short, the AMA plan not only opens the door, but welcomes its own brand of socialized medicine. In view of the AMA's former position, "eldercare" represents an extraordinary reversal of policy.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. **STALBAUM**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that yesterday President Johnson announced his intention to reappoint Mr. John A. Gronouski as Postmaster General of the United States.

Mr. Gronouski has been an excellent Postmaster General. His success in that job is no surprise to his fellow Wisconsin residents, particularly to those of us who worked with him in State government.

I had the pleasure of working closely with Mr. Gronouski when he was tax commissioner of the State of Wisconsin and when I was State senator. We worked through many crucial periods. And we worked John Gronouski hard.

I found that John Gronouski was an unusual man—Ph. D. with a practical bent. Here was a man you could look in the eye and ask for an honest answer—and get it. As a legislator I could rely on Mr. Gronouski, the administrator. And we in the legislative branch are deeply reliant on efficient administrators.

The problems of our democracy are manifold. And some of the greatest problems—those of everyday education and welfare—lie at the feet of State governments. In Wisconsin in a 2-year period we increased our school enrollments by thousands. We built the equivalent of a new university each year. To meet these obligations required money. The job of raising that money falls in the lap of the State legislature. We relied on John Gronouski for guidance in doing our job. Never once did he fail us. He sat in the hot seat as State tax commissioner and never squirmed. And my job as legislator was made that much easier.

In Mr. Gronouski's 16 months as Postmaster General, he has looked the Department's problems straight in the eye and offered solutions. The Department today has a new atmosphere. There is a climate of cooperation between the administration and labor and between the administration and business. Let me quote to you from the February 8 issue of Advertising Age: "The present Post Office management has displayed flexibility that has generally been missing in the past."

Mr. Gronouski moved ahead with new programs designed to accommodate a public that is mailing 2 billion more pieces of mail each year. Public acceptance of the ZIP code program has been far ahead of anticipation, as the public has learned that ZIP will get things done. Indeed, some 49,000 firms of mail users are in the process of converting their mailing list files to ZIP code. Soon to be introduced is the optical scanner, the Department will make another breakthrough in its long series of mechanization improvements that are being introduced to handle the mail explosion.

Parcel post has been revitalized. Mr. Gronouski has realized that many mailers have turned to private carriers for their parcel post.

And the programs continue. Now he has advocated the elimination of the Postal Savings System which has outgrown its usefulness and is no longer a bargain with its 2-percent interest rate. Further, he has called for a new concept of mail transportation, using the fastest means possible. This could result in the elimination of airmail as a class.

The aim is overnight delivery of all first-class mail in any part of the country.

These are the very proud accomplishments and realistic aims of an able administrator.

So it is with confidence that I now, as Congressman, look forward to working with Postmaster General John Gronouski for 4 years. We in Wisconsin are proud of Mr. Gronouski. We in Congress are fortunate that we have an able administrator running our largest agency.

REAPPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL GRONOUSKI

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join my esteemed colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. Stalbaum] in his commendation of President Johnson for the reappointment of the Hon. John A. Gronouski, Jr. as Postmaster General of the United States.

During the months which he has served as Postmaster General, Mr. Gronouski has distinguished himself by his devotion to duty, his willingness to tackle difficult problems head on and his efforts to make the Post Office Department as efficient as possible.

A newspaper reporter once characterized Mr. Gronouski as being something like the pipe he usually has clenched in his teeth: "casual, but with a fire that causes smoke."

The description is an apt one, as anyone who has followed the career of Mr. Gronouski in Washington is aware. His manner is informal and easygoing, but he has a flintlike intellect that strikes fire when confronted by facts and statistics.

Although the smoke of controversy has sometimes hung over his words and deeds, the Postmaster General has won general respect for his grasp of his job and his accomplishments in modernizing the postal service.

We in Wisconsin are proud of our native son, John Gronouski, and are very pleased that President Johnson has renominated him for a full Presidential term. We know he will continue to reflect credit upon himself, his family, the State of Wisconsin.

At this point I wish to read an article on Postmaster General Gronouski which appeared in this morning's New York Times:

Outspoken Postal Chief: John Austin Gronouski, Jr.

The Postmaster General of the United States is a bulky, pipe-smoking extrovert who has disproved the adage that if a man speaks his mind frankly he won't get very far in life or in politics. John Austin Gronouski, Jr., who was 45 years old last October 26, has been an outspoken partisan Democrat all his adult life. Part of his reward was his Cabinet appointment 2 years ago by President Kennedy, an appointment that was renewed yesterday by President Johnson.

When the former college professor got word of his selection in 1963 he did not hesitate to acknowledge that he did not know his ZIP code and sometimes forgot to mail letters for his wife.

He said that the closest he had come to Post Office Department operations was licking stamps for John F. Kennedy's campaign in the bitter Wisconsin primary of 1960 and later in the general election.

In Washington he is acknowledged as a capable administrator of the sprawling postal operations. He arrives at his office in the Department's limousine between 9 and 10 a.m. and unless he has a social engagement in the evening, stays until 7:30 or 8 at night.

A PAYCHECK ERROR

He is an informal type who is equally at home in smoke-filled academic seminars or smoke-filled political parleys. He is absentminded about such matters as getting his hair cut and has been known to work shoeless and in shirtsleeves in his Pennsylvania Avenue office.

Mr. Gronouski, the first Polish-American to receive a Cabinet appointment, was born in Dunbar, a hamlet of 106 people in northeastern Wisconsin. He explains the "U" rather than the traditional "W" in his last name by saying that his father had once received a paycheck made out that way and decided to change his name rather than waste the time correcting the error.

He grew up in Oshkosh, where his father taught high school physics, and was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1942. He flew 24 missions as an Eighth Air Force navigator in World War II and now diplomatically declines to say whether any of them were directed at Poland.

Once he bailed out over the English Channel and survived even though his parachute was on up side down. "I've been lucky all my life," he says.

He received his master's degree from the university in Madison in 1947, and, while writing his doctoral dissertation on "Valuation of Railroads for Ad Valorem Tax Purposes" taught economics and statistics for 2 years at the University of Maine and 3 years at Roosevelt University in Chicago. He received his Ph. D. degree in 1955 and taught public finances and banking at Wayne State University in Detroit until 1958.

In 1959 he won a civil service examination as research director of the Wisconsin State Tax Department and in the same year was named a tax commissioner by Gov. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. He held that post until his Cabinet appointment.

HELPED PARTY IN STATE

Although he has never run for public office, Mr. Gronouski played a leading role in the resurgence of the State's Democratic Party that began when Senator William Proxmire was elected in 1957 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

His advice was often sought, and frequently followed, by Mr. Nelson, Gov. John W. Reynolds, and Patrick J. Lucey, former Democratic State chairman.

In last year's campaign he spent his weekends corralling the Polish-American vote for President Johnson. His command of Polish, which he has learned through intensive courses since he went to Washington, was an acknowledged help.

Mr. Gronouski and his wife, the former Mary Louise Metz of Madison, whom he married in 1949, live in a modest, two-story white brick house near Chevy Chase Circle, Washington. Their two daughters, Stacy, 12, and Julie Kay, 9, attend public schools.

The Gronouskis appear frequently at social events in the Capital. The Postmaster General drinks Scotch at parties; with friends he likes to put his feet up and drink beer. Except for an occasional dip in a swimming pool, the extent of his athletic exertions has been checkers.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the 16th of February 1965, marks the 47th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania: on this date in 1918, the Lithuanian people regained their status as an independent and free member of the world's community of nations after centuries of occupation and oppression.

Although it was an important bulwark of Christianity against the invasions from the east during the Middle Ages, as well as a buffer protecting the eastern Slavic people from German invasions from the west, its independence was short lived. Its more powerful neighbors, the Russians, the Germans, and the Poles all wished to have control over the strategically located little state. It was, as a result, incorporated into the Polish monarchy in the 14th century. This union lasted for over 400 years. Then, in the third partition of Poland in 1795, Lithuania was incorporated into Russia, and came under the domination of the czars.

Subjected to a policy designed to eradicate their national existence, the Lithuanians expressed their opposition by staging a number of uprisings and rebellions. Determined to retain their separate identity, culture, and religion, they worked and waited for the opportunity to once again declare themselves free men. And, in the aftermath of World War I, when both Russian and German troops had left, the Lithuanian Council announced the independence of the Lithuanian Republic.

For some two decades thereafter, the Lithuanians were able to govern themselves. They established a democratic state, with a professed adherence to the ideals for which we ourselves continue to strive. It was, however, not their fortune to be able to retain the benefits of freedom and independence. Once again, its more powerful and rapacious neighbors began to interfere in its affairs. They made claims upon the territory, and finally, during World War II, subjected it to the vicissitudes of armed occupation, this time by Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia.

The last 25 years have seen Lithuania incorporated once again into the Russian Empire—this time as a fictitious 14th constituent republic of the Soviet Union. Consequently, on this day, we cannot really celebrate, in the traditional sense of the word, the independence of this people. Rather, we mark the date: in recognition of the determination of a brave people for independence, and in the hope that having once succeeded against all adversity, they shall once again be victorious.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join in commemorating the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. For the sons and daughters of Lithuania and for Americans, it is a day of sad remembrance, but, it is also a day, in which free people stand giving voice and strength to the aspirations of a captive nation.

Some 3 million Lithuanians now live in their historic homeland on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea. These people have known mankind's cruelest torture. They have suffered the agonies of hunger and poverty, the savagery of war, and the brutality of oppression. In their long fight for freedom and justice, the hearts of the Lithuanian people have touched the deepest of sorrow.

Beginning in the 18th century Lithuania, which had developed a distinctive and progressive culture, first fell prey to Russian invasion. For 120 years its people lived under the domination of Russia, and yet never once during this period did the spirit of freedom falter. At the cost of blood and the intensification of military control, the Lithuanian people revolted five times against the ruthless despotism of the Russian czars. It was in retaliation for one of these latter revolts that Lithuanian prayer books were forbidden amongst a religious people for 40 years.

By the time of World War I, the nation of Lithuania, inflamed with national aspirations met with enthusiasm the proclamation by President Woodrow Wilson of the principle of self-determination. On February 16, 1918, while under German occupation, the Lithuanian people in Vilnius courageously proclaimed their independence and right to a free life.

Today, once again, Lithuania is darkened under the shadow of foreign military might. The people of Lithuania whose heritage has maintained the cause of freedom and liberty for centuries are the enslaved victims of Soviet postwar aggression. On this anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania, let us therefore reaffirm our responsibility to a gallant people, and let us ring the message of hope to all who are held in bondage.

In this 89th Congress I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 138 requesting that the President of the United States initiate action in the United Nations calling for first, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; second, the return of all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons and slave camps in the Soviet Union; and third, the supervision by the United Nations of free elections in the Baltic States. May passage of this resolution be the first step in ridding the Baltic States from the yoke of communism. House Concurrent Resolution 138 follows:

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a national unity and freedom of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this national unification of the free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, the Baltic nations, having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries, are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for national independence and freedom; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas no just peace and security can be achieved in the world while these and other nations remain enslaved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets—

(a) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(b) to return all Baltic deportees from Siberia, prisons and slave camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision.

REMOVAL OF EXCISE TAX ON PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to remove the 10-percent excise tax from passenger automobiles retroactive to this date regardless of when this bill passes. Some people have already said to me, "The automobile companies are making money. Why remove that tax and help them?" The removal of this tax will result in a reduced price of the automobiles to the consumer: first, the automobile manufacturers have assured the Ways and Means Committee that they would pass the tax reduction to the consumer; second, the Federal Government requires the manufacturers to publish the price of automobiles. The purchaser of a new automobile, therefore, can check to determine whether or not he has received the reduction. This is not true of any other item sold. Only automobile manufacturers are required to publish their prices. On any other item from which the excise tax is removed, it is true that the consumer cannot police the removal and will not actually know whether he received the reduction or whether the seller merely increased his margin of profit. There is less danger, therefore, of the consumer failing to benefit from an automobile excise tax reduction than from any other excise tax reduction.

The excise tax cut on automobiles will inure to the benefit of those families making less than $7,500 per year, who purchase two-thirds of all automobiles.

Some have suggested that the purchaser of a new automobile who trades in a car will not realize the full tax reduction because the amount he receives for the trade-in will be lowered by the amount of the excise tax that he would have paid on the new car. This, of course, is a used-car dealer's argument, made to protect existing stock. Carried to its logical conclusion it would mean that a manufacturer could never give a meaningful reduction to the purchasers of automobiles. In fact, the purchaser of an automobile who trades in a car may not realize in the first trade-in the full $225 average excise tax reduction, but he will realize a very meaningful percentage of it. The purchaser of a new car without a trade-in will get the full reduction. The purchaser of a used car, because used cars are competitive with new cars, will get a meaningful reduction. The estimated growth in the gross national product from the automobile excise tax removal will be approximately $5 billion the first year. The spur to the economy will be meaningful.

An automobile excise tax removal, because it will be passed on to a consumer and will stimulate the economy, will not, however, be inflationary. A total removal of all excise taxes, including those on passenger cars passed on to the consumer will push down the cost-of-living index.

More than any other item, automobiles, their use, their price, their design, affects the American economy and American life. Approximately one person in every six gainfully employed today is employed because of American automobiles—either directly or indirectly. The removal of this tax, therefore, on cars, would be a vast benefit to the entire economy.

There are some who feel that the excise tax should merely be transferred to the highway trust fund for the building of highways. This argument fails to consider that historically an earmarked tax is practically never repealed. In the case of automobiles, therefore, it would mean that approximately $225 per car would be built into the price. There is a second argument, however, the tax on passenger automobiles could never conceivably be considered a user's tax. First, it is not levied on a per-mile basis; but, secondly, and much more importantly, the use of an automobile inures economically at least as much to the benefit of the sellers of all other items as it does to the benefit of the manufacturers of automobiles. Consider your neighborhood shopping center that parks 10,000 cars and then tell me who benefits most, or in what degree, from the use of cars.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the economy, I urge the speedy enactment of the excise tax cut and I particularly urge that the tax on passenger automobiles be terminated, retroactive to this date.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, I believe it is fitting and proper to introduce the House concurrent resolution which I first offered on July 16, 1963. Its adoption would have Congress call on the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation.

Conscious of the fact that the sense and contents of this resolution constitute the first step in the supremely humanitarian task of liberating the Lithuanians and the other Baltic peoples from Communist totalitarian tyranny, I strongly urge its implementation.

Some 3 million gallant Lithuanians have always fought courageously for the preservation of personal and national freedom in their homeland of northeastern Europe.

Centuries ago there on the eastern shore of the Baltic they founded their own kingdom and lived in peace with their neighbors, the Estonians and the Latvians. At one time their kingdom was strong and became a real force in all Eastern Europe. Late in the 14th century the Lithuanian kingdom was united with the kingdom of Poland by the marriage of the sovereigns of the two kingdoms, and this union continued until the final partition of Poland in 1795. By that partition most of Poland, and with it Lithuania became part of the Russian Empire. Thenceforth Lithuania was a Russian province for more than 120 years, until the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917. That gave the Lithuanians the golden opportunity to free themselves. This they did on February 16, 1918, by proclaiming their independence and by establishing the Lithuanian Republic.

The birth of that Republic 47 years ago ushered in a new era in Lithuanian modern history, and a happy period in their national life. But the Lithuanians were to enjoy their freedom for only a brief period of the interwar years. Even so, in that relatively short time, they rebuilt war-ravaged country instituted their own democratic form of government, and reestablished many of the Lithuanian national institutions. But the gathering of the storm in 1939 cast a dark shadow over their liberated country, and that proved fatal to their freedom. First the Kremlin imposed upon the Lithuanian Government a so-called mutual assistance pact. Then in June of 1940 the country was occupied by the Red Army, and in July it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Thus ended the short span freedom and independence in Lithuania.

Even though Lithuanian liberty, in this century lasted for only 22 years, it was long enough that Lithuanians today are willing to die for the restoration of freedom to their homeland in the rest of this century and beyond.

I appeal to my fellow Americans to understand and undertake the cause which is heard in the heartbeat of every Lithuanian. The Lithuanians have none of the freedoms which we consider the birthright of all peoples. Under such oppressed conditions they do not have the freedom to observe their national holiday, the Lithuanian Independence Day. But all freedom-loving Lithuanians in the free world, and especially Americans of Lithuanian descent, observe the anniversary of that event with due solemnity and hope for the future.

Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian struggle is America's struggle for just as Russia robbed Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, of their national independence, international communism now threatens this Nation with the same fate.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to announce to my colleagues in the House that these sentiments express the feelings of thousands of my constituents in Rochester, N.Y. Just last weekend, I was privileged to address a Lithuanian Independence Day observance conducted in Rochester by the local chapter of the Lithuanian American Council. My good friend and an arch champion of freedom for the enslaved peoples of the world, Peter Norkelunas, had invited me to this impressive gathering of patriots.

I told my constituents assembled for this rededication to the principles of liberty and their restoration to Lithuania and the other Eastern European nations where the boot of communism has blotted them out that the United States must be the leader of the free world family of nations in securing human rights wherever they are denied. We in America owe our moral encouragement to the anti-Communist commitment of these brave people. They deserve our wholehearted support as they fight to free themselves from Soviet tyranny.

HORTON CRITICAL OF WEST GERMAN SURRENDER TO NASSER

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I share the sense of disbelief and disappointment expressed by many of my colleagues concerning the action of the West German Government suspending further shipment of military materials to Israel.

The forces of freedom have been losing a great deal of ground in this sensitive world area of late, and I am not at all pleased by prospects for the future.

I think the United States must take a positive stance in protest against Bonn's capitulation to Nasser's blackmail threat. It hardly seems the shaky status already apparent in relations between West Germany and the United Arab Republic could be changed for the worse were Nasser to afford recognition of the Communist regime in East Germany. Consequently, even if Nasser carries out his threat, our investment of interest is harmed more by the loss to Israel of the arms she needs to maintain a defensive deterrent.

After the sorry spectacle, the Israeli people might well ask themselves with regard to the Bonn blunder, "With friends like that, who needs enemies?" At least, Nasser's intent is clear. He is out to destroy the democracy that flowers in Israel. But, Bonn's intentions have been masked, and not until Nasser became noisy did this absence of an honest commitment to helping Israel fight this destructive design.

It is not too late for West Germany to redeem itself. In fact, the Bonn government could go even a step further than we in the United States have been willing to take. West Germany can and should halt aid to Nasser, not Israel. It should act in accord with the original action of this House in cutting off further surplus food shipments to Nasser—an action which was changed over my vote of opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is looked to for leadership. We can manifest it in this case by showing our concern for the nation of Israel, freedom's finest friend in the Near East, in appealing to the West German Government to reconsider and rescind its dangerous decision.

A BILL PROVIDING JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS OF HEW

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, despite the provision for judicial review in at least 12 other Federal programs, including the 1965 version of the King-Anderson bill, there is no provision in the Social Security Act permitting States to have administrative decisions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare reviewed by the courts to determine their reasonableness or conformity with the intent of Congress. The need for such a procedure has been called to my attention by the Federal-State Relations Committee of the Governors Conference, the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, the National Association of Counties, and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I am introducing legislation today which, by correcting this omission, will help to promote cooperative federalism in the field of social security grant programs.

All of the bipartisan associations mentioned above are on record in favor of legislation of this kind, and I am sure that after Congress studies the matter, it will concur in the recommendation of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations that the Congress amend the Social Security Act to give the States the right of appeal to the U.S. court of appeals—for the circuit in which the State is located—from the administrative decisions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding the conformity of State plans under the public assistance titles of the act.

My bill, which is an improved version of legislation that I originally introduced 2 years ago, does just that. I and members of my staff, working closely with the Council of State Governments and with the National Association of Counties, have carefully considered certain objections by HEW to the original bill and, hopefully, made a satisfactory adjustment of all the Department's valid contentions. There is neither a lack of precedent for judicial review nor a lack of desire for it on the part of the States; with bipartisan support this bill, which protects the rights of the States and in no way interferes with the administrative efficiency of the Department, will soon be enacted.

No one is claiming that the States have been badly treated at the hands of HEW, but there is room for improvement. The existing arrangements by which the States have no recourse beyond the decision of the Secretary puts them in a subordinate position to the Department and, moreover, tends to stifle State initiative for fear anything new may be declared out of conformity with the act and result in the impairment of ongoing programs. The experiences of New York, North Carolina, Michigan, Indiana, and other States point to the need for more formal arrangements through which aggrieved States may receive a judicial determination of their disagreements with the Department.

In brief, my bill provides time limitation within which the Secretary will make a determination as to whether a State plan or similar proposal conforms to the act. If, after reconsideration by the Secretary, the State is still dissatisfied with the decision it may appeal to the appropriate court of appeals. Any amendment of a State plan which is required by law may be treated in the same way or subjected to declaratory judgment proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act, at the option of the State. A finding by the Secretary that in the administration of a program there is a failure to comply with the applicable laws shall be subject to judicial review. Any State which has amended its plan for participation in a program, or which is proposing such an amendment, may by declaratory judgment proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act secure a determination as to the effect of such amendment on the State's continued participation in the program. The Secretary's authority to cut off funds is not diminished but if he determines that his initial findings are incorrect he shall certify restitution to the State.

OUR BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM AND FOREIGN AID

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the Members and particularly the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs the article of Columnist Walter Lippmann relating to the balance-of-payments problem, now being called the gold problem, of the United States. Although the article plays down the adverse effect of the foreign aid program on our balance-of-payments problem, the fact still remains that since World War II over $100 billion has gone abroad through our innumerable foreign aid programs. The recent tying of a portion of foreign aid to the purchase of American goods only softens the adverse effect of the program on our balance-of-payments problem—it does not avoid the crushing force of its blow.

Now is the time for the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to read again the report of the late President Kennedy's Clay Committee. Is it not time to pare down the foreign aid program to a billion dollars as recommended by this distinguished committee? No one can deny, as stated by General Clay, that a "lot of money has been wasted." The fat of the program, I submit, is still too heavy to carry. Our adverse balance-of-payments plight demands that we put the program on an economy diet.

I include the following article by Walter Lippmann.

OUR DOLLAR DEBT ABROAD

(By Walter Lippmann)

The gold problem which now confronts this country is another facet of the change in our world position as the postwar era has come to an end. During the two World Wars we accumulated a very large part of the gold stocks of the world: the gold came here to pay for the munitions and the goods which the United States alone was able to supply.

When the Second World War was over, foreign countries had run out of gold and usable assets to pay for reconstruction and recovery. There was, as it was then called, a dollar gap. The U.S. financed the recovery and defense of the Western World by enacting the Marshall plan, by providing defense through NATO, and by making very considerable expenditures abroad to assist development in backward countries. The dollars we gave and lent for those purposes filled the dollar gap.

This was a noble and enlightened policy, and it has been very successful. However, it reached a turning point about the end of 1957. The postwar dollar gap had been closed for the major industrial countries, and foreigners and foreign governments began to accumulate dollars instead of buying American goods. Less than half of these dollars were cashed in for gold which resulted in the building up of gold reserves abroad. Between 1957 and 1965 we paid out some $8 billion in gold. But $12 billion accumulated in that time by foreigners were not cashed for gold. These dollars were, of course, foreign debts owed by the United States. They have now reached a total of some $28 billion.

From a banking point of view, there is nothing extraordinary about this. All banks have larger liabilities than they can cash out at once. But in the last 3 months of 1964, there was a sudden and sharp increase in the dollars going abroad as compared with our receipts from abroad. As the world's main substitute for a central banker, we are now faced with the fundamental problem of any banker, which is to keep his depositors convinced that they have nothing to gain, and perhaps something to lose, by demanding cash and starting a run on the bank.

In his skillfully balanced message, the President has told foreigners who hold dollars that we regard these dollars as debts of honor on which we shall pay gold if that is what they want. At the same time, he has told the American people at home that as this Government intends to honor its debts, it must and it will stop increasing those debts, and that it means to move resolutely toward a balance in our international payments.

The President has made a solemn guarantee to the outer world and has announced a decision, the validity of which no one here at home disputes. Are the guarantee and the promise made by the decision credible?

The guarantee to foreign holders of dollars is entirely credible because the assets of the United States in gold and property which is as good as gold far exceed our dollar liabilities. We still have very large stocks of gold. We have large drawing rights at the International Monetary Fund. We have a surplus stockpile of basic raw materials which can be sold in the world market and is probably worth at least $5 billion. Our foreign assets abroad, the stocks, investments, the real estate we own, are said to be worth something like $88 billion. With this material reserve, the guarantee to pay cash for our debts cannot really be questioned.

As regards the decision to balance our international payments so as not to increase the debts we owe abroad, there can be no doubt that the Government can do this if it is determined to do so. It must be remembered abroad that the American deficit does not arise because the United States cannot afford to buy the food, the raw materials, the goods and the services that our people need. We earn more than enough to pay for all of these things. We are now selling $6 billion more goods and services than we buy abroad.

When we break down our deficit, it is seen to be due principally to the fact that American investment abroad, whether direct or through the purchase of securities, or through bank loans, has been greatly in excess (last year by some $4 billion) of what foreigners invested in the United States. It is true that we spend many billions abroad on our Armed Forces and on foreign aid. But it is inaccurate and merely confuses the issue to suppose that the deficit is due to foreign aid or military expenditure abroad. About 85 percent of the money spent for foreign aid is tied to the purchase of American goods. The military outpayments, which reflect national policy, are in part at least offset by the purchase in the United States of military supplies by foreign governments.

It is therefore American private investment abroad which will have to be reduced. The President, characteristically and quite wisely, is beginning by an appeal to businessmen and bankers for voluntary cooperation. But if there are important noncooperators, he will have to turn to legal compulsion.

Toward the end of his message the President took note of the fact that his defense of the dollar will by its very success confront the rest of the world with an urgent problem. It is the problem of a monetary reform which will provide sufficient international liquidity and bank reserves. As the President says in his message, "the flow of dollars abroad into the central banks has made up about half of the increase in free world reserves," and that increase will be cut off when our payments are balanced. This will create new problems, for our dollars, circulating abroad "as good as gold," have masked the hard fact that there is not enough gold in existence to meet the monetary requirements of the major trading countries of the world. A means of payment to supplement gold and dollars must therefore be devised.

The President has now committed this country to international monetary reform.

YEAR 1965 BUDGET EXPANDS WELFARE STATE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the fact that President Johnson has managed to hold administrative budget requests for fiscal 1966 below the $100 billion mark should not obscure the fact that the budget contains more and broader proposals for expanding the welfare state than any budget since the Truman administrative budget of 1950.

The First National City Bank's economic letter of February 1965 points out that estimated budget receipts and expenditures for 1966 are underestimates since:

> As financial blueprints of the "Great Society," they contain many fiscal devices to minimize reported spending, while providing many opportunities for future expansion.

For the administrative budget alone, expenditures will total $99.7 billion and receipts $94.4 billion. On the more comprehensive cash budget basis spending is projected at $127.4 billion and receipts at $123.5 billion, leaving a deficit of $3.9 billion. Despite attempts to economize, the President is offering a budget which represents a new high in Federal spending.

As a major indicator of the expenditure trend, the amount of new spending authority requested of Congress is higher this year than ever before. As the letter says:

> New obligational authority—appropriations and other congressional authorizations for Federal spending commonly referred to as NOA in the budget comes to $112.4 billion, including $6 billion put in as supplementary requests for fiscal 1965. This is a sharp rise from NOA levels of recent years, which have been close to the $100 billion mark. Moreover, the "planned deficit" of $5.3 billion is the sixth straight year of red ink in the administrative budget.

Included in the cash budget are social security payments, which raise questions of the widest import this year. Cash benefits are expected to rise by 7 percent beginning July 1, 1965, and the administration hopes to initiate a program of hospital benefits the following year. To finance the increased benefits, social security taxes will increase sharply, expanding the taxable wage base from $4,800 to $5,600 per worker and increasing the combined employer-employee tax rate from the present 7½ to 8½ percent in 1966 to 10 percent in 1968 and 10.4 percent in 1971. In a large number of cases, therefore, workers with several dependents are soon going to be paying more in social security taxes than in individual income taxes.

It is paramount that expenditures be limited by eliminating low-priority programs which offer few benefits for the costs involved. In addition, we must give high priority to a study of the economic effects of the growing payroll tax, which may eventually become so large as to serve as an economic impediment to job creation and also as an incentive to more rapid introduction of labor-saving devices.

Under unanimous consent I wish to include the First National City Bank monthly economic letter for February 1965 in the RECORD at this point:

THE $127 BILLION BUDGET

That President Johnson is again holding administrative budget requests below the $100 billion mark captured the headlines when he submitted his fiscal 1966 budget proposals to Congress on January 25. This gesture of fiscal conservatism, however, should not distract attention from the fact that the budget contains the broadest proposals for expanding the welfare state since the fiscal 1950 budget during the Truman administration. Indeed, while most of the Truman proposals died in Congress, it is widely conceded that the bulk of President Johnson's plans will win approval.

Expenditures in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965 are estimated at $99.7 billion and receipts at $94.4 billion, leaving a deficit of $5.3 billion. The under $100 billion figure, however, is misleading since it is based on the narrow administrative budget, which considerably understates the fiscal impact of Government. On the more comprehensive "cash budget" basis—which includes social security and other Government activities outside the regular budget—spending next year is projected at $127.4 billion and receipts at $123.5 billion, indicating a deficit of $3.9 billion. On this basis, expenditures will rise by $6 billion or about 5 percent.

Both sets of figures are undoubtedly underestimates of spending in the coming year. As financial blueprints of the "Great Society," they contain many fiscal devices to minimize reported spending, while providing many opportunities for future expansion of spending programs. Indeed, while President Johnson has submitted an economy-size package bearing a minimum list price, Congress may well take advantage of the optional features to raise the spending total above the $100 billion mark before the session is over.

Summary of Federal finances

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal 1964 actual	Fiscal 1965		Fiscal 1966 estimate
		Original estimate	New estimate	
Administrative budget:				
Expenditures	97.7	97.9	97.5	99.7
Receipts	89.5	93.0	91.2	94.4
Deficit (−) or surplus (+)	−8.2	−4.9	−6.3	−5.3
Cash budget:				
Cash payments	120.3	122.7	121.4	127.4
Cash receipts	115.5	119.7	117.4	123.5
Deficit (−) or surplus (+)	−4.8	−2.9	−4.0	−3.9
National income budget:				
Expenditures	118.5	121.5	121.0	127.0
Receipts	114.7	118.8	116.0	121.0
Deficit (−) or surplus (+)	−3.9	−2.8	−5.0	−6.0

NEITHER EXTRAVAGANT NOR MISERLY

Because of the built-in flexibility, the new document is not as susceptible of easy classification as last year's economy budget, which won widespread approval because of the emphasis placed on spending restraint, combined with massive income tax cuts. The accent this year has shifted to increased spending on domestic welfare programs, together with a moderate cut in excise taxes.

In his budget message, the President described his fiscal plans as neither "extravagant" nor "miserly," but designed to promote our economic growth and national strength. Nevertheless, while many elements of his program are similar to past proposals, enactment of the major items would result in the first major expansion of Federal welfare activities since the New Deal era of the midthirties. The principal proposals are:

Provide hospital benefits under social security and a 7-percent increase in cash benefits.

Reduce excise taxes by $1¾ billion.

Give Federal aid to education on a broad scale.

Quadruple spending for the war on poverty.

Establish regional medical centers to fight major killing and crippling diseases.

Initiate a massive program to uplift the Appalachian region.

Opinions may differ on the priority for these and other programs on the Great Society agenda. But there can be no doubt that the financial cost will be substantial. Advocates of new programs in such areas as hospital care and education make no secret of the fact they will seek to expand them once they become law. When it comes to paying the bill, however, working people may be in for a rude shock. On January 1, 1966, for example, social security taxes will be raised by more than $4 billion a year as the first step to meet costs of increased benefits.

As the President has pointed out, making a budget involves "hard decisions and difficult choices." While expenditures are being increased on the domestic welfare side, spending for defense, space, and atomic energy are either leveling out or drifting downward. At the same time, economies are being sought through revision of programs, as in the case of farm price supports and merchant marine subsidies, or through user charges, as in the case of commercial airlines, trucks, and inland waterways. The President also promised to renew his efforts to cut costs and raise productivity in the Federal Establishment.

Despite these economizing efforts, the curve of Federal spending is headed sharply higher. A sensitive indicator of the expenditure trend is the amount of spending authority requested of Congress. New obligational authority—appropriations and other congressional authorizations for Federal spending, commonly referred to as NOA—in the budget comes to $112.4 billion, including $6 billion put in as supplementary requests for fiscal 1965. This is a sharp rise from the NOA levels of the recent years, which have been close to the $100 billion mark. Moreover, the "planned deficit" of $5.3 billion is the sixth straight year of red ink in the administrative budget.

In weighing the current impact of Federal spending on the economy, however, economists favor the "national income" budget, which shows Federal income and outgo on an accrual basis. The "planned deficit" for fiscal 1966 by this measure is $6 billion. But the deficit is certain to be much higher during the half year starting July 1, 1965, when both the excise tax cuts and the increase in social security payments are slated to take effect. Clearly, a great deal of fiscal stimulus is planned for the second half of the year. Moreover, press reports from Capitol Hill indicate that Congress may deepen the slash in excise taxes beyond the administration's request of $1¾ billion to as much as $4 billion. Under the administration's plan, social security payments are expected to go up by more than a $1 billion annual rate at midyear (with payments retroactive to January 1), but payroll taxes will go up by some $4 billion a year on January 1, 1966, to finance enlarged benefits and the proposed hospital care plan to start on July 1, 1966.

Federal expenditures by major function, fiscal year 1966

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal 1966 estimated	Change from—	
		Fiscal 1965 estimated	Fiscal 1964 actual
National defense	$51,578	−$582	−$2,603
International affairs and Finance	3,984	−59	+297
Total, Defense	55,562	−641	−2,306
Space Research and Technology	5,100	+200	+929
Agriculture	3,944	−533	−1,616
Natural resources	2,601	−44	+213
Commerce and transportation	2,804	−568	−198
Housing and community development	10	+290	+90
Health, labor, and welfare	8,328	+2,120	+2,853
Education	2,663	+1,154	+1,324
Veterans benefits and services	4,623	−760	−869
Interest	11,594	+308	+829
General government	2,462	+45	+182
Total, nondefense	44,219	+2,212	+3,737
Allowances:			
Appalachia	107	+104	+107
Contingencies	400	+300	+400
Less: Interfund transactions	600	−233	−64
Total, budget expenditures	99,687	+2,206	+2,003
Trust fund expenditures (including Government-sponsored enterprises)	32,898	+3,853	+4,013
Less: Intragovernmental transactions, etc	5,188	+54	−1,049
Total, cash outlays	127,398	+6,005	+7,066

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

LEVELING OUT IN DEFENSE AND SPACE

Of all the major spending proposals, the least controversial are likely to be in the defense area, where expenditures are being cut $582 million to $51.6 billion. This total, moreover, is $2.6 billion below the 1964 figure. A powerful military posture, the perceptible relaxation in relations with Russia, and the economizing efforts of Defense Secretary McNamara are contributing to the decline in outlays. In a period of revolutionary changes in weapons technology, President Johnson's military spending philosophy—expressed in his defense message last month—deserves wide support:

Outmoded weapons must be replaced by new ones.

Obsolete equipment and installations must be eliminated.

Costly duplication of effort must be eliminated.

New weapons provided for in the budget are an improved version of the Polaris missile, a new air-to-ground attack missile, the F-111 (formerly TFX) fighter plane and the SR-71 intercontinental reconnaisance plane unveiled last year. Development will continue on the Nike X antimissile system and work will be started on the C-5A—a giant transport airplane that may also become a commercial airliner with twice the capacity of present jetliners. On the other hand, cost savings of some $4.8 billion a year are projected by 1966 from levels 3 years earlier.

Outlays for atomic energy are also headed lower for the second straight year, reflecting the test ban treaty and other attempts to control the buildup of nuclear arms. After a rapid climb, expenditures for the space program are slated to rise by only $200 million to $5.1 billion in the coming year. While proceeding with its man-on-the-moon project for 1970, the Space Administration is also seeking funds to start development of an unmanned spacecraft to explore Mars in 1971.

The actual trend of the international affairs and finance category—which encompasses our foreign aid and trade activities—is confused by the complicated bookkeeping employed. Though net spending is shown as declining slightly, this may well be more apparent than real.

GROWTH IN EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Sharing the spotlight on the domestic side are the sharp increases projected for education, social security, and the war on poverty. New obligational authority of $4.1 billion is being requested for education; actual spending in the coming year is estimated at $2.7 billion, up more than 75 percent from the current year. The largest part of the increase will come in a request for grants to elementary and high school districts calculated on a formula based on numbers of pupils from poor families. It has been estimated that some 85 percent of school districts across the Nation would qualify for grants. Other programs would benefit private and parochial school students as well as public school pupils.

The biggest single increase in the whole budget comes under the omnibus heading of Health, Labor, and Welfare, with spending slated to rise by $2.1 billion to $8.3 billion in fiscal 1966. Including a downpayment on the proposed regional medical centers, spending for health services and research is slated to rise by $400 million to $2.2 billion. Labor and manpower development programs will continue their steady expansion of recent years, while public assistance payments are expected to rise by half a billion. As mentioned earlier, outlays for the war on poverty are slated to quadruple to $1.3 billion.

Though not included in the administrative budget, the social security system will involve questions of the widest import this year. The administration is proposing to raise cash benefits by 7 percent beginning July 1, 1965, and to initiate a program of hospital benefits to begin a year later. Meanwhile, to pay for the increased benefits—on top of commitments arising from the maturing of the system—social security taxes are to be raised sharply. This would involve expanding the taxable wage base from $4,800 to $5,600 per worker and increasing the combined employer-employee tax rate from the present 7¼ to 8½ percent in 1966, to 10 percent in 1968 and to 10.4 percent in 1971. In many cases, therefore, workers with several dependents will sooner or later be paying more in social security taxes than in individual income taxes. Moreover, the proposed program would provide only hospital and nursing care costs and not the cost of physicians' fees and drugs as many people have assumed from the heated discussions of "Medicare."

TAXES AND THE GREAT SOCIETY

In his state of the Union message last month, the President said that the Great Society would not "flower spontaneously from swelling riches and surging power." But he also admitted that "It will not be the gift of Government or the creation of Presidents."

What should be no less clear is that the Great Society cannot be built without a strong, rapidly growing private economy. This means that further efforts must be made to reform our tax system to provide greater incentives for people to work and create—for their own benefit as well as for the common interest. Even nominally Socialist governments abroad are reforming their revenue systems to get away from excessive reliance on income and payroll taxes that discourage people from seeking or offering work.

With further restructuring of our tax system in mind, therefore, Congress should not go beyond the $1¾ billion excise reduction proposed by the administration. Meanwhile, expenditures should be limited by eliminating low-priority spending programs that offer few benefits for the costs involved. Consideration should also be given to the possible need for altering the payroll tax underpinning the social security system, which may in time come to weigh too heavily on active workers and employers in our productive organization.

The continuing goal should be further reductions in individual and corporate income tax rates, combined with simplifying reforms. The new budget document amply confirms the benefits gained from last year's $14 billion tax cut. Releasing the tax brakes has resulted in such an economic upsurge that Federal revenues from individual and corporate income taxes are continuing to rise without interruption: from $72.2 billion in fiscal 1964 to $72.6 billion in 1965 and an estimated $75.8 billion in fiscal 1966. This is a success story that needs to be repeated.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE: A VICTIM OF SOVIET IMPERIALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject following my remarks today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today as we commemorate the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we pay tribute to a great and gallant people. Lithuanians are a people who have suffered much, but they are also a people who have achieved much. Western civilization is the richer for Lithuania and on this occasion we express our gratitude for its rich and meaningful contributions. Certainly, the United States is a more abundant nation for having received within its massive population this truly gifted and hardworking people.

In commemorating Lithuanian independence we as Members of Congress have the opportunity to convey the feelings of our people for the oppressed people of Lithuania. But, on the other hand, we can use this opportunity to convey also to the people of the world the nature of Soviet imperialism; and it is on this subject of imperialism that I wish to say a few words.

Soviet imperialism is the challenge of the 20th century.

Soviet imperialism is a challenge for you; it is a challenge for me; it is a challenge for all people who seek nothing more in this world than to live in peace.

Ever since the day when the Communists seized power in Russia, they and their followers throughout the world have with brazen disregard for the truth charged Western democracies with "imperialism."

We of the West were the "warmongers;" we were the "imperialists;" we were the "oppressors" of mankind, the curse of humanity, the antichrist, so to speak, of the modern age.

And the Communists? They were, according to their twisted thinking, the evangels of peace, prosperity, and democracy; they were the hope of civilization, and indeed, the wave of the future.

The Communists have never ceased to stress their claim to be the real saviours of mankind. In every corner of the earth the Soviets have hammered away at this propaganda fiction. They have spent billions of dollars for this purpose and have, furthermore, charged their militant, obscurantist followers with the duty as Communists to preach their gospel of hatred and deception.

It is a shocking spectacle, indeed, to behold that many peoples of the world have actually been taken in by their cleverly calculated untruths.

Unfortunately, these naive people, for naive is what they are—these people have not heard the truth of Soviet imperialism. They have not heard that the Communist gospel is not one of mankind's redemption, but of mankind's enslavement. Theirs is a gospel that is death for humanity. It brings no hope to the miserable; it lights no way to happiness and prosperity; it opens up no doors to a new life for mankind; its record is one of failure in human effort and depression of the human spirit; for in the accoutrements of every Communist are the chains of tyranny and suppression.

But how many peoples in Asia and Africa who have fallen victims to Soviet propaganda know this?

How many of them have heard of the fate of Lithuania and her sister Baltic States?

How many have heard of the reign of terror that the Soviets have visited upon Eastern Europe?

How many of them know the truth of the Soviet Union's inhumanity toward man?

The truth of Soviet imperialism must reach those peoples. They must know the true story of Lithuania. They must know the unhappy events that befell that once free and prosperous nation. They must know that it was the Soviet Union which willfully and wantonly destroyed the independence of this free national republic.

During the interwar period when Lithuania was a free and independent nation, the Soviet Union and the Lithuanian Government were bound by a series of treaties which recognized one fundamental and vital principle in the conduct of international affairs, and that principle was this: The Soviet Union pledged that it would respect the territorial integrity and the national independence of Lithuania.

In the peace treaty between both nations, in the nonaggression pact, and in numerous other instruments negotiated between the Lithuanian and Soviet Governments, this principle was given a prominent place. And yet, despite these repeated pledges of fidelity, despite Soviet reassurances in the Mutual Assistance Treaty of 1939—a treaty which was imposed upon Lithuania in violation of other treaties and required the stationing of Soviet troops on Lithuanian soil—despite all these assurances, the Soviet Union broke this pledge when in June 1940 Soviet armed forces invaded Lithuania.

The history of Lithuania that followed is a familiar story to all Americans: incorporation into the U.S.S.R. as a republic; mass deportations; total terror; and attempted destruction of the nation as a whole by forced sovietization. This is the same general pattern of Communist oppression we have seen duplicated in one way or another throughout Eastern Europe, in China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and in Cuba.

Such has been the "enlightened" rule of the Soviet oppressors.

On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence all the free world should take a moment and consider the fate of this unfortunate country.

Here is a clear case of Communist aggression.

Here is a clear case of national oppression on a vast scale.

Here is a clear case of Soviet imperialism that gives proof to the lie of Soviet propaganda.

This, in brief, is the message that Lithuanian independence conveys to the outer world.

This is the message—a message of tyranny, oppression, inhumanity—that we bring to the free world when we pause for these few moments to pay tribute to Lithuania.

I join with all of you here today in commemorating this anniversary of a great and heroic people. Lithuanians deserved a far better fate than their subjugation to Moscow. But, I know as indeed all of you know that, however oppressive may be the burdens of Soviet domination, however grim may be the prospects for happiness in the future, however distressing may be their trials and tribulations, the people of Lithuania will resist; they will survive as a nation; they will live on; they will preserve the glorious idea of nationhood that is Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, as an extension to my remarks today I would like to include a copy of a letter sent by the Honorable George W. Ball, Acting Secretary of State, dated February 7, 1965, to the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 7, 1965.

Mr. JOSEPH KAJECKAS,
Chargé d'Affaires ad Interim of Lithuania.

DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES: On the occasion of the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's National Day I am pleased to express to you the sincere good wishes of the Government and people of the United States.

Nearly 25 years have elapsed since the sovereign Lithuanian nation lost its national independence in the wake of the illegal annexation by the Soviet Union. But the indomitable spirit of the Lithuanian people and their yearning to live in freedom and independence have not been dimmed throughout these years.

In recognition of the right of a free people to national self-determination, the U.S. Government has firmly and consistently stood by its declared policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. The United States thereby not only accords recognition to the Lithuanian people's devotion to the cause of freedom and national independence, but expresses its confidence that this cause will ultimately prevail.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. BALL,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for taking this time so we might pause to remember this important day in the history of Lithuania and in the cause of freedom.

Forty-seven years ago the courageous people of Lithuania won their independence and for a little more than two decades they shared a place with the freemen of the world. In 1940 their freedom was ruthlessly taken from them by the tyranny of Joseph Stalin, but their love for freedom could not be extinguished. Nor shall we who are fortunate to retain our freedom forget our friends of Lithuania because they lost theirs. We shall continue to reserve for them their rightful place in the free world.

But remembering is not enough. Paying tribute to those brave Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain is not enough. Nor is paying tribute to the Lithuanian Americans who have and continue to contribute so much to our society enough. Much more needs to be done. That is why I have joined my colleagues in introducing legislation to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations—a committee that would focus year-round attention on developing and pursuing policies that will help regain independence for the peoples of all captive nations.

I have also introduced legislation urging the President to bring the plight of the Baltic States before the United Nations requesting that the Soviet Union withdraw their troops and return all Baltic exiles from Siberia to their homeland. This legislation would also call for free elections under United Nations supervision in Lithuania and the other Baltic States.

A few days ago I had the pleasure to attend a celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day in my hometown of Amsterdam, N.Y. The enthusiasm of the people, the beautiful costumes, and the warmth of the occasion could not help but make everyone there, whether of Lithuanian extraction or not, feel a part of their heritage and feel honored to share with them the cause for the freedom of their relatives and loved ones in Lithuania.

So it is with a special pride that I join in the pledge, which all freemen must share, that we continue to fight to preserve and expand our freedom—realizing that if we are to be truly free the people of Lithuania, as well as all men, must fill their place in the family of independent nations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we should pause today to commemorate an event that occurred 47 years ago in the homeland of a valiant Baltic people, one whose sufferings since the early part of World War II mark one of the grimmest chapters of modern history.

On February 16, 1918, following more than a century of oppression under czarist Russia, Lithuania was at last able to proclaim its independence. For 22 brief but memorable years, marked by great progress, the Lithuanian people breathed the exhilarating air of national independence. But this period of freedom was brought to a close in June 1940 as the Soviet Union, faced by an expanding Nazi Germany, violated its agreements with Lithuania and occupied the country, along with its sister Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia. But despite the destruction of Nazi Germany, the Baltic States still remain under tight Soviet control today.

For those of us who have never had to live under occupation by a totalitarian power, it is difficult to comprehend fully the enormity of the depredations suffered by the people of Lithuania in that most catastrophic period beginning in 1940. The flights of families before the Communist and Nazi invading armies, the retributions and the vengeance of oppressors against patriotic resistance, the losses under air attack, the mass deportations, the mass executions, the sacrifices of Lithuanian freedom fighters struggling against impossible odds—these and a thousand cruel injustices were all heaped upon one small people.

Just think, Mr. Speaker, what some of these statistics mean in a little country of only about 3 million inhabitants:

Some 45,000 Lithuanians deported, many of them never to be heard of again, during the initial period of Soviet rule in Lithuania in 1940 and 1941.

About 200,000 including almost the entire Jewish population of Lithuania, exterminated during the period of Nazi occupation from June 1941 through July 1944.

About 80,000 Lithuanians fleeing to Western zones of Germany as the advancing Soviet armies again approached Lithuania in July of 1944.

Some 60,000 Lithuanians found by the Soviets in Eastern Germany and sent to Siberia.

About 1,700 Lithuanians executed by the Communists following mass trials, many because of their activity in the Lithuanian underground and their opposition to Soviet rule.

Nearly 145,000 Lithuanians deported by the Communists in 1945 and 1946.

Nearly 12,000 resistance fighters killed, according to the statement in February 1949 of a Communist official in Lithuania, who admitted that the struggle against Lithuanian resistance was still continuing.

About 60,000 Lithuanians deported in March 1949 following passive resistance by the farm population to the collectivization of agriculture.

These figures do not of course begin to tell the whole story, but they do, I believe, make one thing painfully clear: After these and other population shifts and mass killings, there can hardly be an adult Lithuanian who has not felt the Nazi- or Soviet-caused loss of loved ones, through separation or death. The harrowing example of Lithuania since 1940 is an appalling human tragedy, deeply felt by the million Americans of Lithuanian extraction, and directly experienced by the thousands of Lithuanians who have come to this country since World War II.

Such an experience would have broken the spirit of any people less stanchly patriotic than the Lithuanians. The world can never undo the suffering which has been the lot of this brave little land, but we can work for the day when Lithuanians are again free to join in the celebration of independence day on their native soil.

It is gratifying to me that our Government has never recognized the Soviets' incorporation of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add my hopes and prayers to those expressed today that Lithuanian independence will be restored in the shortest possible time.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, Lithuanians everywhere are celebrating the 47th anniversary of their independence.

In 1918, Lithuania shook off 120 years of czarist rule and became a free self-governing land. But the light of freedom in this small and proud nation was snuffed out in 1940 when she was trampled upon by the heel of Communist Russia.

During her 22 short years of freedom, Lithuania's accomplishments were outstanding. In the field of education, the number of her primary schools nearly quadrupled; over 100 secondary schools were built; and over 4,000 advanced students enrolled in the University of Kaunas. Culturally, every city in Lithuania of more than 5,000 people supported opera seasons and gave all an opportunity to hear the world's greatest artists and operas. Industry and commerce soared, and nearly everyone with any ambition had his own home or farm.

This, briefly, is what freedom wrought in 22 years for the Lithuanian people.

Today, they are again suffering under the cruel hardships of Russian imperialism. But we can be sure from the past history of the Lithuanian people that, although they may be persecuted and their land devastated, their courage and spirit lives on. Their devotion to freedom is indestructible. Recalling Lithuania's past heroic history, we can understand why she will and must with our help and the help of God regain her freedom.

On this day, the 47th anniversary of their independence, we extend our message of hope to the people of Lithuania, and once again renew our vow to persevere in working for the independence of their homeland. May we pray that divine providence will speed the day of destruction of Communist tyranny in Lithuania so its people may again enjoy liberty and peace, and she can take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. **BURKE**. Mr. Speaker, the people of Lithuania have suffered many long years of foreign oppression. Today they remain under the yoke of Soviet imperialism, incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Forty-seven years ago the Lithuanian people achieved independence after 120 years of czarist domination followed by a brief period of occupation by the Germans during World War I. No sooner had the Germans evacuated than the newly formed Red army invaded and installed a puppet government. But in 1920 the Communists were driven out by Lithuanian and Polish forces.

In the treaty between independent Lithuania and Russia, the Soviets renounced for all time any claim of sovereignty over Lithuania. Through the benefit of hindsight we now know all too well that the Communists will not hesitate to violate any solemn agreement in order to bring more and more people and territory under their control.

But at that time, the Lithuanian people had every reason to look forward to a much deserved era of national development in freedom and self-respect. The enlightened leaders of Lithuania established a progressive constitutional democracy, recognized by the major nations of the world.

But troubles continued to plague this tiny nation surrounded on all sides by more powerful neighbors determined to destroy Lithuanian independence, in spite of her desire to remain neutral, and the fact that she threatened no one. In March of 1939 the Nazis delivered an ultimatum, demanding the city of Memel, which was yielded.

When the Nazis and the Soviets concluded their agreement, the Communists were then given a free hand to take over Lithuania, in spite of the earlier treaty and a subsequent nonaggression pact signed in 1926. The Soviets occupied Lithuania in 1940 and absorbed it into the Soviet Union.

The pattern of World War II was repeated; Lithuania suffered under the wartime occupation of the Nazis and then the return of the Red army. The tiny nation was exploited economically, and many of its citizens were liquidated and deported.

In spite of these unending series of disasters the Lithuanians have never relinquished their love of freedom, their desire for independence. All attempts to extinguish the Lithuanian spirit of liberty will fail, as they have in the past.

Mr. **ST GERMAIN**. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians form one of the oldest national groups in Europe. Centuries ago, late in the Middle Ages, they established an independent state in northeastern Europe, on the eastern shore of the Baltic. They had their glorious days but in modern times fate has not been kind to them. Toward the end of the 18th century the country became part of the Russian Empire, and Lithuanians its discontented subjects. These liberty-loving and independent-minded people were never reconciled to the czarist regime, and during the First World War when that regime was shattered, Lithuanians saw their dream come true. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their national independence and set up their own democratic form of government. Soon that government was duly recognized by other sovereign states, and Lithuania was admitted into the community of free and independent nations. In the course of two decades, during the interwar years, industrious and energetic Lithuanians made their homeland a prosperous, progressive and happy land in which everyone was enjoying full political, economic, and religious freedom.

All this was suddenly transformed very early in the last war when they were robbed of their freedom. In mid-1940 Lithuania was annexed to the Soviet Union. Since then these stouthearted souls have been suffering under alien tyranny and have been longing for their freedom. On the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day we all hope for their freedom from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. Speaker, national ideals and national goals vary greatly among different nations, depending on their economic, social, and cultural status, on the geographic location of their countries, on their human and natural resources, and also on the political maturity of their respective peoples, and especially of their leaders. And there are no limits to the number of ways by which such ideals may be realized, such goals may be attained. But for the realization and attainment of any, or all national ideals and goals there is one categorical prerequisite, one indispensable condition: nations and peoples aiming to attain certain great goals must have the freedom to develop the maximum capabilities of their citizens in many spheres of productive and creative activity. That makes the difference between conditions in free societies, and those prevailing in closed and rigidly regimented and practically enslaved societies and, that itself marks and distinguishes individualist, independent-minded peoples from those downtrodden and oppressed under tyrannical regimes.

The Lithuanian people had their goals and ideals, and they had been working for their realization when late in the 18th century they were robbed of their freedom, thus bringing to a halt all their efforts to that end. After suffering under Russia's czarist regime for more than 100 years, they then attained their goal by proclaiming their independence on February 16, 1918. That day marked the most glorious event in Lithuanian modern history. But they did not enjoy their freedom for long. At first it seemed that Hitler's Nazis were threatening Lithuania's independence, but after the outbreak of the last war, it was the Red army of the Soviet Union that treacherously robbed Lithuanians of their freedom and then enslaved them under communism. Today they are still suffering under Communist tyranny. The significance of the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day is to keep alive the spirit of freedom and independence among the Lithuanian people and inspire them with some hope for their eventual freedom. I will gladly do my best to do everything possible to see these people attain their national goal, their independence.

Mr. **IRWIN**. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of pride and sorrow. Pride, because it was on February 16, 47 years ago, that the people of Lithuania, after a history scarred by oppression, threw off the yoke of tyranny and proclaimed their independence. And sorrow, because freedom had but a short day in Lithuania.

In 1940 this tiny Baltic State was caught between the menacing pincers of the Soviet Union on one side and Nazi Germany on the other. It was Lithuania's fate to fall under the heel of both tyrants. The Russian Bolsheviks marched in that year, and except for a 3-year occupation by Hitler, have kept Lithuania under Communist rule ever since.

Though their liberty has been cruelly snuffed out, we must never turn our backs on these courageous people who have paid the heavy price of living under Communist oppression.

While they no longer are free to live their own lives in dignity, to enjoy their own culture, to pursue their own political, economic, and social institutions, they have never lost their hope for a free future.

Let us, therefore, on this day pledge that their cause will not be forgotten as long as they are not free.

As the late President Kennedy once said in a memorable speech:

> Together we must work to strengthen the spirit of those Europeans who are not free to reestablish their old ties to freedom and the West, so that their desire for liberty and sense of nationhood will survive for future expression. We ask those who would be our adversaries to understand that in our relations with them, we will not bargain one nation's interest against another's and that the commitment to the cause of freedom is common to us all.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. Although the Lithuanian independence was short lived, it remains the hope of liberty-loving peoples throughout the world that there will come a day when the people of Lithuania will be released from the yoke of Soviet Communist power.

In our annual observance here, we give encouragement to a gallant little nation which has been officially silenced temporarily, but whose leaders in exile have won our admiration and are deserving of our encouragement in their continuing fight to regain their human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as their properties and business enterprises which have been confiscated.

In my experience in public service, both in Connecticut and in the Congress, and in my work with the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have worked with many Americans of Lithuanian origin, and with many Lithuanians in America and in Europe, and I have become convinced of the sincerity of their purpose and the strength of their desire for freedom. Truly, they are suppressed and oppressed, but so long as the flame of freedom burns before them they will not succumb totally to Soviet enslavement.

With permission to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include a letter received by me this week from the Most Reverend V. J. Brizgys, of 2701 West 68th Street, Chicago, Ill., 60629, the bishop of Kaunas, Lithuania.

In the words of Bishop Brizgys:

> The cross which the Lithuanian nation and country is bearing is an onerous one. The nation does not stop yearning for freedom. In spirit it is wholeheartedly with the free world.

The letter follows:

February 11, 1965.

Representative J. S. Monagan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: It has always been my great honor and pleasure to express at least a brief note of thanks, appreciation and respect to those friends of Lithuania who, on February 16—the Independence Day of Lithuania—affirm their friendship and sympathy to the Lithuanian nation. Inasmuch, as I shall not be in the United States on February 16 of this year, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation in advance to all who will remember Lithuania on her Independence Day.

I also would like to share with you the most recent news from Lithuania. The Russian occupation forces have not softened. Forcible Russification continues. Greater pressure upon teachers, officials, and judges, to be propagandists for godless atheism, is stressed. Those practicing their faith are constantly persecuted. Lithuanian youth is still being drafted for labor in Siberia. Including survivors of the first mass deportations, these new transportees comprise approximately 130,000 forcibly exiled from their homeland.

The cross which the Lithuanian nation and country is bearing is an onerous one. The nation does not stop yearning for freedom. In spirit it is wholeheartedly with the free world. It hopes that by its own efforts and the aid of its good friends it will realize freedom and justice in the near future. They have no desire to be a slave of Moscow, but long to be a member of the family of free nations of the world.

In the name of the Lithuanian nation allow me to thank all of you who support its hopes and actively seek to bring them to reality.

Faithfully yours,
Most Rev. V. J. Brizgys.

I also wish to include, with your permission Mr. Speaker, a letter from Mr. Leonard Valiukas, chairman of the Board of Directors of the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States. Mr. Valiukas makes reference in his letter to House Concurrent Resolution 99 which I have filed in behalf of the peoples of the Baltic States—Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

In further recognition of the esteem in which we hold these gallant people, I include a copy of Mr. Valiukas' letter, and the text of House Concurrent Resolution 99:

Americans for Congressional
Action To Free the Baltic States,
Los Angeles, February 8, 1965.

Hon. John S. Monagan,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Representative: Needless to say, I am very grateful to you for your concurrent resolution, concerning the Baltic States, that you recently introduced in the 89th Congress. I can assure you that Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and all other freedom-loving Americans will always remember you for the aforesaid brave and excellent action taken by you in the U.S. Congress.

As you know, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and their friends in all parts of our country will mark three important anniversaries next week. They will be observing the 714th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State; they will mark the 712th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian kingdom, when Mindaugas the Great was crowned as the first King of the Lithuanian empire; and they will remember the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

The U.S. Congress will mark the above anniversaries next week. I kindly ask you to take part in the commemoration of the Lithuanian Independence Day in the U.S. Congress next week by making some remarks and urging your colleagues to pass your concurrent resolution. If it is possible, please insert this resolution in the Congressional Record so that all of your colleagues would be able to familiarize themselves with this very important legislation.

Thank you.

With personal kindest regards.

Sincerely,
Leonard Valiukas,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

House Concurrent Resolution 99

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion, at appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world public opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that again this year, as in past two decades and more, Lithuanian independence day has to be celebrated outside the country itself by Lithuanians and their friends in all parts of the free world. This has been so because the Communist masters of Lithuania, while at times going through the motion of appearing to relax their tight and inflexible rule there, have never even thought of allowing any such celebration by the Lithuanians themselves. And the Lithuanians, fully aware of the dire consequences which would befall them if they committed any such treasonable act, dare not observe the anniversary of their independence day, except in strictest secrecy. They cherish, of course, the significance and meaning of their independence as fervently as ever. And we in the free world, desirous of echoing their patriotic spirit and of their undying love for freedom, gladly observe their independence day, the Lithuanian independence day.

What is more significant in this connection we in this great Republic, joining hands with our loyal and patriotic citizens of Lithuanian ancestry, have vowed to celebrate Lithuanian national holidays until their liberation from Communist tyranny. Unfortunately we are not in position to say when that will be possible, and we shall be misleading our good friends if we try to inspire them with undue hope prematurely. On the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence day they all may rest assured that the people and the Government will continue to do everything within their power to bring about the freedom of Lithuanians in their homeland.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

This is a glorious day in the annals of Lithuanian history; for it was upon this day that freedom and independence once again became a reality for all the peoples of Lithuania.

During the interwar period of 1918–39, Lithuanians exercised their newly won independence in a manner which they felt best could insure their nation's interest. In general, Lithuanian life flourished, politically, economically, culturally and in the realm of religion. Political relations were established with nations of the world, and Lithuanians assumed their obligations to world society in a manner befitting a respected and enlightened people.

In many ways one can speak of this interwar period of 20 years as a new "golden age" for Lithuania.

But, one of the great misfortunes of modern history was that this age, so beneficial to the welfare of all Lithuanians, came to an end with the coming of World War II.

Within a very short time Soviet military forces conquered Lithuania and her sister Baltic States. The freedom and independence that Lithuania cherished now came to an abrupt end. Never again were Lithuanians able to enjoy their natural right of self-determination.

These are the simple tragic facts:

Lithuania is today a captive nation.

Lithuania enjoys neither freedom nor independence.

Lithuania's destiny is determined not by its own people but solely by the Soviet rulers in Moscow.

On this day of commemoration it is fitting that we pay tribute to heroic Lithuania. It is also fitting, I believe, that we of the free world contemplate this nation's recent history and draw what lessons we can from its unfortunate experience.

First of all, the Lithuanian experience teaches us the durability of the Soviet ideological commitment to conquer other nations of the world.

Soviet Russia has no just claim upon Lithuania. Here is a nation whose national existence has been historically separate from Russia's. They share no common roots. Lithuania's cultural and religious heritage derive from the West and not from the East. Whatever relationship existed during the modern era, except for the interwar period, had been one of the conqueror toward the conquered. In every respect—politically, culturally, linguistically, socially, economically, and religiously—Lithuania is a nation foreign to the traditions of Russia. Yet, the Soviets conquered Lithuania, and the driving force that brought about this conquest was the singularly motivated ideological commitment to expand communism and conquer the world.

This is one lesson that we can learn from the Lithuanian experience.

It is a lesson we ought never to forget.

Another lesson for us to draw from the history of the Lithuanian conquest is that of the methods used by the Soviets to advance the goals of communism.

The conquest of Lithuania was carried out by the armed forces of the Soviet Union. Without provocation and thus without just cause, the Soviets first imposed their will on the Lithuanians by compelling them to accept a humiliating agreement, requiring partial Soviet military occupation, and then within a few short months launched a large-scale military invasion conquering the entire country.

What followed the military conquest of Lithuania is consistent with the Soviet behavior in Eastern Europe at the end of the war.

Rigged elections took place in which a one-slate choice was presented to the people. Through terror and intimidation these Lithuanian people were forced to cast their near 100 percent vote for the Ccmmunists or those doing their bidding. Forthwith a new government was established that called upon the Soviet Union to take Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. as a constituent republic. From then on, the process of direct Sovietization took place. All political opposition was destroyed or silenced through murder, deportation, or intimidation. The Soviet state structure was imposed upon the country and the Soviet Constitution adopted. All cultural and religious activities were reordered to serve the ends of communism. Ironclad demands of Socialist realism were imposed upon the nation's cultural life, and any hopes for continuing a separate national culture were totally destroyed. From then on, Lithuanians were forced to shed their own national identity and take on that of Soviet Russia. Religious institutions and religious beliefs suffered from the most overpowering forms of discrimination. Society as a whole was made to conform to the rigid requirements of communism wherein every aspect of social life was ordered according to the tenets of Marxism-Leninism. In a similar manner the Lithuanian economy was thoroughly communized, and all the economic resources of the nation were brought under the total control of the Soviet state.

In a word, Lithuania became a conquered colony of the Soviet Union.

This is what has happened to Lithuania; this is the genuine tragedy that has befallen its peoples. Theirs is a tragedy that we of the West must look upon with anguish, but it is also a tragedy from which we can learn vital lessons in dealing with the Communists, lessons that can guide us in these dangerous days of cold war.

Let us, therefore, never forget this lamentable tragedy of Lithuania.

Let us always hold before mankind her lessons for the free, if freedom is to be maintained.

On this occasion of the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence let us rededicate ourselves to the principles of universal freedom. Let all of us raise our voices in a common expression of hope that the people of Lithuania will one day share the blessings of liberty and that they will one day gain for themselves the natural right of self-determination.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, each year on February 16 Lithuanians in America and the free world observe the occasion of Lithuania's anniversary of independence—a condition that no longer exists today. Their countrymen are held captive behind the Iron Curtain.

The history of Lithuania is one of growth, development, oppression, of independence, and domination. For many centuries Lithuania was a part of a powerful kingdom in the whole of Eastern Europe. In the late 16th century this kingdom was united with that of the Poles. This union lasted for 200 years. At the end of the 18th century, Poland was partitioned and ceased to exist. Lithuania, sharing a similar fate, became part of the Russian Empire.

For more than 100 years the Lithuanians fought czarist oppression and worked vigorously to keep the national spirit breathing. It was during World War I that the Lithuanians proclaimed the birth of the Lithuanian Republic on February 16, 1918.

Their much sought after independence and freedom lasted for two decades and during this time the nation flourished economically and culturally. The Second World War became imminent and the Lithuanian Republic was geographically fated for it was juxtaposition to Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. The Soviet Union occupied the country and in July of 1940, Lithuania was dissolved into the Soviet Union.

The tragedy of this nation is a page of history—not the prologue of the Communist doctrine. The body of man can be held in bondage but his spirit is immune to chains that enslave his body—awkward in oppression, graceful in freedom.

Let us today reassure these physically bonded members of the family of man that we in America and the free world are enslaved when one member is denied the freedom of expression, of hope, of peace.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in observing the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania. Today marks my 30th consecutive year in the participation of the observance of the independence of Lithuania.

Lithuania has had not only a glorious, but a tragic history extending back to the 11th century.

Lithuania's history is divided into five major periods; namely, the period as a grand duchy from 1316 to 1572; then as a grand duchy when it was united with the Kingdom of Poland 1572–1795; and when Lithuania was occupied by Germany and Russia in 1795 to 1915; and as a Republic from 1918 to 1940; and at present as a component Soviet of the U.S.S.R. since 1940. The Gediminus dynasty began in 1316 as the rulers of the grand duchy of Lithuania. With the death of Sigismund Augustus in 1572 the dynasty which had ruled Lithuania for 2½ centuries became extinct.

By the terms of the Union of Lublin, the grand duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland were united, but they each remained sovereign states as equal partners in a confederation or a commonwealth, with one ruler. In 1573, Henry of Valois, son of Catherine de Medici and the Duke of Anjo, was elected King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania. This arrangement endured for over 200 years until the third and final partition by Austria, Germany, and Russia in 1795, of Poland and Lithuania.

The period of 120 years during which the major portion of Lithuania remained under Russian occupation was characterized by the constant efforts on the part of the Lithuanians to regain their right to direct their own political, cultural, and economic destinies. Following the revolts, 1831 and 1863, the tsarist government attempted to replace the Lithuanian language and culture with Russian, but the Lithuanians resisted these attempts and remained faithful to their religion, language, and traditions. This policy was abandoned by Russia in 1905.

That portion of Lithuania which fell under German control was treated better by being allowed to maintain their language and customs. But with the rise of Bismarck in 1860 this policy was changed to one of Germanization of the people of Lithuania.

Russia's domination of Lithuania ended in 1915 during World War I when German armies overran Lithuania. In 1917 the German Government authorized the Lithuanians to hold a congress with a membership of 200 delegates. The congress recommended an independent Lithuania with its capitol to be at Vilnius, and elected a council made up of 20 members. On February 16, 1918, the council proclaimed an independent Lithuania based on democratic principles. Independence was not yet a reality, however, as soon as the German troops evacuated Vilnius on January 15, 1919, the Red Army entered the city and installed a Communist government. The next year the Red Army was driven out by the Polish Army led by Marshal Pilsudski, and Lithuanian fighting units.

Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, recognizing it as an independent nation, and renounced forever all rights of sovereignty.

Under a provisional constitution, Antanas Smetona was elected the first President of Lithuania. The Constitution accorded freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. Mr. Smetona was President from 1919 to 1920, and from 1926 to 1940.

During the period of independence, great emphasis was placed on improving agriculture, the primary occupation of the Lithuanians. A land reform program was instituted with the result that Lithuania became a nation of small farmers. In addition, industrialization progressed. In 1913 Lithuania had only 151 industrial plants with 6,600 employees, while in 1939 there were over 1,600 plants employing 33,000 workers.

Lithuania also made progress in social legislation, with a labor control law, the introduction of the 8-hour day, and various other social measures. Great progress was made in education, whereas there were only 1,173 grammar schools in 1930, in 1939 there were 2,328. The number of secondary schools increased from 40 in 1920 to 123 in 1927. In 1938 the University of Vytautas the Great had a student body of over 3,000. In addition, Lithuania literature flourished. Writers found inspiration in the national folklore of Lithuania, and achievements were made in opera and music.

In World War II, Lithuania was one of the first countries to experience the aggression of both Hitler and the Soviet Union. On June 15, 1940, the Soviets demanded formation of a friendly government and occupied the country. In July 1940 a rigid election produced a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. On August 3, 1940, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow. When the tide of the war turned against Germany, Lithuania returned not to independence but to Soviet domination.

When the Soviets retook the country in 1944, some 80,000 Lithuanians fled to Western Germany. Another 60,000 were found in Eastern Germany and deported to Siberia. During 1945 and 1946 an additional 145,000 Lithuanians were deported. Still another massive deportation occurred when some 60,000 Lithuanians were deported in March 1949.

It is reported that since Stalin's death that about one-third of those deported have been permitted to return home. Most of the others, it is believed, perished in the meantime.

In reference to U.S. policy toward Lithuania, the United States recognized the independent Lithuanian Government on July 27, 1922, and it has never recognized the nation's incorporation into the Soviet Union. It continues to maintain diplomatic relations with the representative of the former independent government, which has a legation in Washington.

The Lithuanian World Congress, meeting in August of 1958 under the auspices of the American Lithuanian community, adopted a unanimous resolution declaring that "Lithuanians continue to fiercely resist the alien rule of the Soviet Union" and asserting "that Lithuanians have not accepted and never will accept Soviet slavery." The resolution called upon the free nations to "reaffirm on every suitable occasion the inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people to national independence and individual freedom." It asked that the free nations "not to be party to any agreement or treaty that would confirm or prolong the subordination of the formerly Lithuanian state."

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and a Member of the 89th Congress, I subscribe to the resolution and pledge adherence thereto.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1918, was the Independence Day of the freedom-loving people of Lithuania. Unfortunately, the independence won with such hardihood 47 years ago was temporarily extinguished a little more than 2 decades later when the land which has produced so many fine American citizens was overcome, in turn, by Nazi Germany and Red Russia.

The spirit that eventually will reestablish liberty for the Lithuanians burned bright in that tragic period and all patriotic Americans should be happy to know, still burns bright today. It may be predicted that the spirit eventually will prevail and the Lithuanian people will once again be free to mingle with their brothers who love liberty and abhor dictatorship.

In many parts of the United States this spirit has been celebrated as this anniversary approached by many who honor the belief in liberty that inspired George Washington and others of our forefathers. As an example, one of the rallies in my own great State was held in Detroit's Cobo Hall, with the dignitaries of the region participating, just last Sunday.

In paying tribute to this heroic people we pay tribute to our own patriots and all everywhere who keep lighted the lamp of liberty in defiance of tyranny.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today is Lithuanian Independence Day, and I am proud to be able to take part in our observance of the occasion.

To the Lithuanian people, who have enjoyed freedom for only two decades since the late 18th century, independence day stands out in their turbulent history as the brightest landmark. It symbolizes the realization of many of their national ideals. They feel they are missing part of their heritage if they do not, or are not allowed, to celebrate their independence day.

The Lithuanians are not alone in harboring such intense feelings about their independence day celebration; a similar feeling is shared by other people who find themselves in a similar predicament. But today, Mr. Speaker, we single out the significance of Lithuanian Independence Day, because it was 47 years ago today they proclaimed their freedom and independence.

That was almost half a century ago, and since then the world they knew has undergone tremendous changes. Their Lithuanian Republic was lost during World War II. If nothing more, we should assure the Lithuanian people on the 47th anniversary of their independence that we shall not forget their cause and that we share their hopes that one day they will again be able to proclaim their freedom and independence.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 47th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence in 1918. After more than a century of Russian domination, and repeated attempts by the Russians to replace the Lithuanian culture with their own, the Lithuanian people gave historic proof that their cherished way of life and their intense love of freedom could never be destroyed. In July 1920 Russia recognized Lithuania as an independent nation and renounced all rights of sovereignty. In 1921 Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations.

Unfortunately, just as the First World War resulted in Lithuania's independence, the Second World War brought a return of Russian domination. Ignoring a treaty of nonaggression which it had signed with Lithuania in 1926, as well as its recognition of Lithuanian independence, the Soviet Union forced a mutual assistance treaty upon Lithuania in 1939 and in 1940 declared Lithuania to be a constitutent republic of the U.S.S.R. Freedom once again was lost to the Lithuanian people except as an inspiring memory and a goal to be regained.

Today the Soviet leaders are continuing in the footsteps of the czars in trying to make the Soviet language and culture prevail over those of the Lithuanians. Many Russian colonists have been moved into Lithuania, and they make little effort to learn Lithuanian although the Lithuanians must learn Russian. Moreover the Soviets make every effort to replace the deep religious beliefs of the Lithuanians with their own militant atheism.

It is my hope that our observance of the anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence in 1918 will provide a ray of hope to the Lithuanians who deplore the Communist system and long to live in freedom once again. I join with the many Americans of Lithuanian descent, who have contributed so much to our own country, in restating that the plight of Lithuania has not been forgotten. I join with all Americans in renewing our determination to maintain and strengthen freedom around the globe.

Mr. **FOGARTY**. Mr. Speaker, once again, on this historic occasion, I join with my colleagues here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to mark the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania and to pay deserved tribute to the founders of that Republic.

It was on February 16, 1918, that the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence—an independence which we all know was destined to be short lived. After only 22 years of existence this valiant nation was overrun by the Red tidal wave and since then the usual communistic pattern of acute, cruel suffering of her people has continued.

Any attempt to recite in detail the many highlights of Lithuania's great history would certainly be beyond my ability. The story has been told and retold. The valiant deeds of Lithuanian men and women of the past have been repeated over and over again—particularly those deeds of fathers and mothers who have kept alive the fire of freedom which was Lithuania's first love. So also the deeds of children who refused to let Lithuania die in spite of the most concerted efforts in history to destroy all trace of a nation and a people.

The contribution of the Lithuanians in America and their descendants gives us some idea of the national vitality of that country. It is an indication that confidence and faith in Lithuania's future is well placed. The distinctive culture, the deep-rooted traditions, and the rich folklore of the Lithuanian people have greatly enriched our own country. Their contribution has been magnificent and I am proud that so many of them are citizens of my State of Rhode Island.

To the many persons of Lithuanian descent and origin I extend my congratulations on this—the anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. On this day, of so much significance to all Lithuanians, I join my hopes with theirs that their mother country may soon be delivered from its present domination and become again a free and independent nation.

And on this day of such significance I can think of no more direct contribution I can make to the cause of peace than to reintroduce the concurrent resolution which I submitted to the previous Congress. This resolution provides that the Senate and the House of Representatives request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and asks that the United Nations request the Soviets to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. It also urges the United Nations to request that the Soviets return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union. It further provides that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the people of the Baltic States.

I am pleased to reintroduce this resolution and I hope that it receives the speedy concurrence of both Houses of this Congress.

Mr. **ANNUNZIO**. Mr. Speaker, today Americans of Lithuanian descent commemorate the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. But there is no celebration in the homeland, except perhaps secretly; for Lithuania has fallen a victim to the expansive thrust of Soviet Russian imperialism.

Throughout their long history as an industrious and peace-loving people, the Lithuanians have suffered many cruel persecutions of their culture and endured many ruthless attacks upon their independence. But their burning desire to live their lives in liberty and freedom has never faltered.

The anniversary we celebrate today marks the reemergence of an independent Lithuanian nation whose history stretches back over many centuries. The Lithuanian people made their first appearance on the stage of history long before the arrival of Christianity in the area of the Baltic Sea.

By the Middle Ages, the Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe. They were able to check the German drive to the east for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and the Tartars. They furnished a power and government behind which the eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Muscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with human freedoms unknown in neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration and played their part in the general development of European civilization.

Finally, however, their country was overwhelmed by superior numbers and lost its independence. Nevertheless, the spirit of the people did not die and since 1794 there has not been a single generation of Lithuanians that did not take up arms in a desperate effort to recover their lost liberty.

In 1918, the Lithuanians achieved this goal and, once again, their country was free. It played its part in the League of Nations. It worked for the well-being of its citizens, and the remarkable progress that was made during 22 years was gratifying to all progressive people. The way seemed open for the nation to move modestly and steadily on the path of progress along with the other peoples of Europe and the world.

Then came the catastrophe. In World War II, Lithuania was ravaged by the totalitarian forces of the right and of the left, by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. With the end of the war, the country was left to the mercies of the Communist aggressors. Under the iron heel of Communist despotism, her population is being decimated, her citizens are being deported and executed, and total annihilation menaces the entire nation.

The situation is a disgrace to Christendom. It is a black spot on the conscience of humanity and makes a travesty of those principles which the democratic countries entered the war to vindicate.

We join them in prayer that God, in His infinite wisdom, may speed the day of deliverance from Communist tyranny and that their beloved country may be restored to its rightful place of honor in the family of free nations.

Mr. **DELANEY**. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the valiant people of Lithuania on the 47th anniversary of their independence. This was a goal for which the Lithuanians had been striving throughout a long period of Russian domination.

During its 22-year period of independence, this Baltic State adopted a constitution which guaranteed the people freedom of speech, religion, and assembly. In addition, great strides were made in improving agriculture; industrialization progressed; Lithuanian literature flourished; and achievements were made in opera and music.

In 1940, however, the Russians, in violation of a peace treaty, declared Lithuania a constituent Republic of the U.S.S.R. Since that time, the Lithuanians have been denied their sovereign rights as a free people; many thousands have been deported to Siberia; and thousands have been brutally murdered. Despite these hardships and atrocities, these courageous people have never given up the fight for the freedom that once was theirs.

So today, on this solemn occasion, let us hope that their valor will soon have its just reward in liberty.

Mr. **O'NEILL** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if one looks at a new map of the world he will find no international boundaries delineating the area on the earth's surface once known as Lithuania. One will unsuccessfully search the census tomes of Europe for a recent statistical description of the Lithuanian peoples. Newspapers carry no dateline from Lithuania. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States recognizes the independent State of Lithuania, but in the world of real politic 1965, news from Lithuania is actually Russian news, Lithuanian population statistics are now incorporated into Russian census figures, and the border of Lithuania is the Russian border.

How this anomaly of international politics came about is an integral part of today's commemoration ceremony. The country known as Lithuania came into existence shortly after 1200 and by the end of the 15th century the little country was not only well-known but highly respected throughout Europe. A royal marriage in 1385 and a treaty of 1569 brought Lithuania and Poland into a union which lasted for about 300 years. During the partitions of Poland at the end of the 18th century, Lithuania was incorporated into tzarist Russia where it remained until after the First World War.

While the people of Lithuania had long dreamed of regaining their independence it was not until World War I and the Russian Bolshevik Revolution that this dream had a chance to materialize. By the middle of February 1918 a Lithuanian state council proclaimed the country free and independent. The following month, March 1918, the Russo-German Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was signed and the Germans recognized Lithuania de jure. In the years following, the Lithuanian people, not experienced with self-rule, tried to build a new government out of the ashes of their history. In the early months and years of this new struggle the little country was invaded by and had to fight with the Poles, the Russians, and the Germans.

In 1920 the new Communist Government in Russia signed a treaty with Lithuania in which it stated:

> Russia without any prejudice recognizes the self-rule and independence of the State of Lithuania with all the juridical consequences * * * and for all time renounces with good will all the sovereignty rights of Russia, which it has had in regard to the Lithuanian nation or territory.

How could anyone know the mockery Stalin would make of this international promise on June 15, 1940, when Russian troops occupied the country. Exactly 1 month later, on July 14 and 15, the Russians showed an incredible scorn for democratic institutions by forcing the people of the country to vote in a rigged election, and then announcing the results before the polls closed by telling the world that more than 99 percent of the people had voted. The following day the new assembly without a vote being taken, asked the Soviet Union to accept Lithuania as the 14th state in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The date was July 21, 1940.

During World War II Lithuania was occupied by the Germans for almost 3 years. The brutal control of the Fascists was only a continuation of the Communist regime. At the end of the war Lithuania was reoccupied by the Russians. The U.S. Government does not recognize the incorporation of the Lithuanian state into the U.S.S.R.

Whether Lithuania will regain its independence will be decided by the future events of world history and the destiny of Russian communism.

Mr. **FALLON.** Mr. Speaker, on this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we pay homage to the courageous people of Lithuania, who have kept alive the flame of liberty despite 2½ decades of subjugation and oppression. Lithuania rightfully took its place among the independent nations of the world on February 16, 1918, when the people proclaimed their independence.

For more than a century Lithuania had suffered under the tyrannical rule of the czars; and the Russian revolutions of 1917 provided an opportunity to announce the realization of an age-old dream. This dream, however, turned into a nightmare 22 years later as Lithuania was swallowed up by the octopus of international communism.

Up to this very day the subjugation of Lithuania continues. Through mass deportations of Lithuanian patriots and their replacement by Russian immigrants the Soviet Union has attempted to stamp out forever any trace of a free and independent Lithuania. The citizens of this courageous nation have never faltered in their burning desire for freedom and independence and will continue their fight to become once again a free and sovereign state.

To this day the United States has refused to recognize the absorption of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. Like other freedom-loving people the world over, we believe that every man and every country has the inalienable right of liberty. We as Americans look with admiration at the inspiring example of resistance and determination shown by the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain, and once again denounce the Soviet Union for its failure to atone for its brutality and outright imperialism under Stalin.

We need only look at the contributions of the Lithuanians in America to give us some idea of the national vitality of that country. It is an indication that the confidence and faith in Lithuania's future has been well placed.

The regime imposed on Lithuania has violated everything which freemen hold dear. That it has not been a complete success in its endeavor is due only to the strong, inborn love the Lithuanian people have for the cherished principle of national independence.

The soul of Lithuania lives today. It lives in the hearts of Lithuanian patriots still enslaved in their homeland. It lives in the minds of Lithuanians all over the globe. The soul of Lithuanian freedom in fact lives in the hearts and minds of freedom-loving people everywhere, and we would be untrue to our American heritage if we did not do everything in our power to sustain and encourage it.

Today Lithuania is fighting for the same cause as all other freedom-loving peoples. Her people want only to live in their own country under their own government. On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join with my colleagues in Congress and with the American people in the fervent hope that in the near future Lithuania will be allowed to take its rightful place among the free nations of the earth.

Mr. **DANIELS.** Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago the ancient nation of Lithuania proclaimed her independence. The history of the Lithuanian people is an epic story of heroism and suffering in their attempts to assert their sovereignty. The Lithuanians are a proud and highly civilized people who have fought in the past for their independence and will continue to struggle now and in the future until they have reattained this goal.

On February 16, 1918, still under German occupation and confronted with the new menace of bolshevism, the Lithuanian National Council unanimously adopted a declaration calling for the reestablishment of an independent Lithuanian state on a democratic basis. It was not long, however, before the newborn state was invaded by the Russian army. In a series of heroic battles, Lithuanian patriots were able to defeat the Bolshevik invaders and hurl them back across their ancient frontiers.

For the next 22 years, the Soviet Government protested to the world its sincere support of Lithuanian independence and of the independence of other small European nations. Yet in the summer of 1940, faced by an expanding Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union violated its solemn agreements and occupied Lithuania. The Communist police state established at that time has endured till now, interrupted only by the period of Nazi occupation in World War II.

No people has suffered more severely under Soviet occupation than has the people of Lithuania. It is estimated that in the late forties when Stalin's colonialists were consolidating their power, fully 10 percent of the population of Lithuania was arrested by the Soviet secret police and transported to the slave labor camps of Siberia in cattle cars.

Today, the Soviet system has extended into every aspect of Lithuanian life. All means of transportation have been placed in the hands of Soviet officials, and collectivization of agriculture has been forced upon the peasants. In this strongly religious country, repressive measures have been taken against the church including the closing down of seminaries and the systematic liquidation of spiritual leaders.

Lithuania is now a member republic in the Soviet Union. However, Lithuanian affairs in the Supreme Soviet in Moscow are entrusted mostly to Russian agents and Communists nominated by Moscow. Only 50 percent of them are of Lithuanian nationality, and these have been chosen for propaganda reasons to disguise the Russification drive and the Soviet colonial rule in Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Lithuania have suffered much, but even the weight of the Iron Curtain has not crushed their hopes of freedom nor extinguished the torch of liberty that burns within their hearts. Lithuanians are in the forefront of the battle for national self-determination and the American people will never forget their example of bravery and courage. We hope and pray that someday the people of Lithuania will again be able to enjoy the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and again be allowed to assume their rightful place among the independent nations of the world.

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI.** Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 47th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. It is well that we mark this date, for it is a reminder that no matter how rapacious or despotic a government may be, it can never destroy or expunge the desire of a courageous people to regain liberties of which they have once been deprived.

Annexed to the Russian Empire in 1795 during the third partition of Poland, the Lithuanian people expressed their desire for independence throughout the 19th century by a series of revolts against the government of the czars. In a desperate move to quench the Lithuanian spirit and resolve, a policy of Russification was attempted. But, so strong and determined were the Lithuanians to retain their religion, their language, and their traditions, that even the czarist regime was forced to abandon its policy. In the aftermath of the First World War, this indomitable people succeeded in creating a state, democratic in principle and practice.

For two decades, the new state fared well. Then, in the chaos of the prewar period, its larger neighbors subjected it to pressures and extortion it alone could not withstand. By 1940, the Soviet Union had forced Lithuania to grant airbases, installed a puppet government, and finally, occupied and incorporated it into the Soviet Union. Since that time, 25 years ago, the Lithuanians have not known any freedom.

The fact that the Lithuanians were once one of the major bulwarks of civilized Europe against the incursions of Asian hordes made them aware of the preciousness of their liberties and national identity. With a courage and will forged out of adversity, they never ceased to fight for their aspirations, their freedom, and their country. They were successful once before. And, we are convinced that, though once again under an inhuman despotism, their valiant struggle will also once again be rewarded. We share the hope and the desire of the Lithuanians to one day become again a free, independent member of world's community of nations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, all peoples are great in their own ways; the gallant and stouthearted Lithuanians have been great as fighters and warriors for their freedom and independence. Having lost these precious possessions late in the 18th century, for more than 100 years they struggled ceaselessly to regain them. Then, toward the end of the First World War when the chain of czarist autocracy which had held them in bondage was shattered, they asserted their freedom and proclaimed their national independence on February 16, 1918. Thenceforth, for a little more than two decades, until the eve of the outbreak of the last war, they lived and labored happily in their homeland. In that relatively short time they rebuilt their wartorn country, instituted their own democratic form of government, and reestablished many of the age-old Lithuanian institutions. Then the gathering of storms in 1939 cast a black shadow over Lithuania, and it was not long before the Lithuanians became prisoners there under the Soviet regime.

Since the fateful year of 1940 these unhappy people have been robbed of their freedom, and have been suffering under alien tyrants. Particularly since the end of the last war Communist totalitarian tyranny imposed upon them has been tightened by the Kremlin. On the 47th anniversary observance of their independence day we all hope and pray for their deliverance from their heartless oppressors.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, today has a special significance for nearly 1 million Americans of Lithuanian origin who will observe the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence of their mother country.

After more than a century of Russian domination, Lithuania declared its independence on February 16, 1918. In celebrating this anniversary we give sad recognition to the fact that the independence of the brave Lithuanian people was of but short duration. For over two decades, Lithuania thrived as an independent country, guaranteeing its citizens the rights for which they had struggled so long. Much progress was made in education and social legislation. Literature, music, and the arts flourished. In 1940, this tide of progress was reversed with the beginning of a new era in Russian domination.

The Soviet dictators ignored the pledge they had made 20 years earlier to renounce forever all rights to sovereignty over Lithuania, first by forcing a mutual assistance treaty upon them, then by occupying the country, and finally, by incorporating Lithuania into the Soviet Union. Many Lithuanians fled the country. To those who remained, freedom is still only a dream.

I have taken the floor to voice my praise for the Lithuanian Americans who refuse to accept the relegation of the land of their fathers, with its seven centuries of history, to the past. While hope for eventual restoration of liberty and independence may now seem dim, the prospect of liberation from communism will always remain a growing possibility as long as the people of Lithuanian ancestry remember and hold precious and dear their great heritage. This is particularly true of those Lithuanians who have now become Americans.

I salute them and I assure them of my strongest personal support in seeking the achievement of their aims.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is being celebrated. It is a day of which the Lithuanian people can well be proud. At the same time, it is a period of deep sorrow and regret for these same brave people who have suffered so much and so long under the domination of communism.

The Lithuanian nation, once a kingdom in its own right, and a leader in the cultures and arts of the world for some 700 years, has just reason to be proud of its heritage and background.

In marking this anniversary, we, as citizens of the free world, marvel at the faith and courage of these people who have taken enslavement and bondage with heads held high. Their firm conviction of eventual independence and return to sovereignty and self-determination, is indeed a lesson to us. Their actions give us further reason to assist them in attaining their goal.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the people of this great Republic have always held Lithuanians in high esteem. Having known them quite intimately in our midst as hard-working, industrious, loyal, and patriotic citizens we have always appreciated their share in the making and shaping of our free and democratic way of life. So we were overjoyed when Lithuanians in their homeland attained their freedom toward the end of World War I. We watched them with keen interest while they rebuilt their country, established a democratic form of government, and began to enjoy the blessings of their free institutions. In the course of a relatively short time they succeeded in making Lithuania a viable state, a happy abode for its deserving inhabitants. Unfortunately, however, they were not allowed to enjoy their freedom for long. Toward the end of the 1930's as the cloud of war thickened over the horizon, their prospects for continued freedom fell under a shadow. And their worst apprehension about their freedom came true, when the Red army invaded Lithuania, occupied it, and then made it part of the Soviet Union in mid-1940.

Thus came to an end the Lithuanian Republic, two decades after its birth. And all friends of Lithuanians were saddened by their tragic fate. Just as we had shared their joy in the birth of their Republic in 1918, so when it was treacherously annihilated by the Red army, we in this country shared their grief and sorrow. Of course neither then, nor now, have we been in position to aid them effectively so as to have them regain their freedom, but our wholehearted sympathy has been with them. During World War II they were brought under the equally detestable Nazi regime for a while, but toward the end of that war, Communists returned with furor and terror, and they have been overlords there for over 20 years.

Though Lithuania has now become part of the Soviet Union, and thus sealed off from the free world, we are constantly informed of the fate of its people there by our patriotic citizens of Lithuanian descent. Without compromising their loyalty and patriotism to this great republic in any way, they have been very active in enlisting our sympathy for the righteous and sacred cause of the Lithuanian people. In this they are helping to preserve the cause of free peoples everywhere. Today, on the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, I join them in wishing freedom and independence to the Lithuanians.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, wars are generally considered the curse of humanity, because they bring death to innocent people and immeasurable human misery and property destruction. Some people consider revolutions just as bad and dangerous to humanity. But in both cases there are some exceptions. The Russian revolution of 1917, at least initially, seemed to have ushered in a new era for those suffering under czarist Russia's oppressive autocracy. By that revolution many hitherto suppressed nationalities found their freedom and salvation, and nearly all of them proclaimed their independence soon after that world-rocking event. Lithuanian independence was thus a child of the Russian revolution of 1917.

Since the late 18th century, Lithuania had been part of the Russian Empire; and for more than 100 years, Lithuanians had to endure the heavy yoke of Russia's stern and autocratic rule. The

Russian officials during this long period did all in their power to eradicate and uproot all signs and symbols of Lithuanian nationalism. All national celebrations were proscribed; the study and the use of the Lithuanian language was discouraged; any showing of Lithuanian national traits and feelings were viewed with suspicion, and those displaying any sign of independence were closely watched, often facing imprisonment. Yet despite these stern and stringent measures, the Lithuanians retained their national feeling and sensitivity. They venerated their national traditions, clung steadfastly to their national ideals, and longed for their independence. The revolution of 1917 offered them the golden opportunity to attain their goal, to proclaim their independence.

This they did on February 16, 1918, 47 years ago. For the enjoyment of their freedom they worked ceaselessly and tirelessly; and in the course of some two decades, during the interwar years, they rebuilt their ruined and war-ravaged country, making it a model of prosperous and progressive democracy. There they were quite content with their lot and were doing their best to safeguard their long-cherished and newly won freedom. Then came the Second World War, and with it began the most tragic period in Lithuanian history. In the course of its first year that war literally swallowed independent and free Lithuania, and made it, much against the wishes and desires of helpless Lithuanians, part of the Soviet Union.

Since 1940, except for that dark period of World War II when they were under the Nazis, Lithuanians have been oppressed by the Communist regime in the Kremlin. However, even under such conditions of despair, Lithuanians fervently cherish the hope that someday, freedom and independence may come once again to their beloved homeland.

On the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, we join them in their prayers for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am, inneed honored to participate in this, the 47th anniversary commemorating the independence of the Lithuanian nation. At that time the people of Lithuania launched the greatest and most successful program for self-government and self-determination of any nation in world history.

This declaration of Lithuanian independence was one of the great milestones in the history of a liberty loving people whose struggle for self-government continued over centuries. From the 16th century on, Lithuania was almost in a constant battle against aggressive neighbors, but never gave up hope to preserve the Lithuanian tradition. During 120 years of Russian domination, no less than five distinct major revolts took place in Lithuania. Back in the early 1800's, Czar Nicholas the First invoked a sweeping policy to Russify Lithuania. Repressive measures were taken against all forms of Lithuanian culture, literature, language, schools, religion, and governmental offices. In 1863 and 1864, another revolt took place which failed after a struggle of 18 months. Another revolution in 1905 brought fresh hopes for independence, but failed. During World War I, the German armies overran the country and remained there until the end of the war. During this time, uprising, negotiations, and minor rebellions did not cease.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council unanimously adopted a declaration calling for the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania on a democratic basis, with Vilna as the capital and the severance of all political ties which link it with other nations. This declaration became Lithuania's proclamation of independence.

After the evacuation of Lithuania by Germany in November and December 1918, Russian troops arrived at the border of Lithuania and again made an effort to subjugate the nation. The last battle with the Red army was fought late in 1919 which culminated in a peace treaty signed July 12, 1920.

On September 22, 1921, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations, thus Lithuania became a nation with international power. The permanent constitution was adopted August 1, 1922. It was an instrument which followed the blueprint of western democracy. The nation of Lithuania was an independent democratic republic; the people were accorded the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and assembly; the constitution guaranteed freedom of religion; the Lithuanian Government instituted land reform; industrial production proceeded to ascend; neglected railroads were rebuilt and transportation improvement was inaugurated throughout the land; social legislation and education were expanded and it did not take long before the new independent democracy was functioning with the precision of nations much older. The Lithuanian people proved, during the period of time from their declaration of independence up until the Hitler-Stalin menace devastated Europe, that its people could give the world a practical example of true democracy in action. During the period from 1920 to 1939, the Lithuanian Government entered into peace treaties, nonaggression pacts and mutual assistance agreements with all nations including the Soviet Union. By reason of typical and well known Communist duplicity and treachery, every one of these agreements was discarded and nullified by Russia when they saw the opportunity was ripe to enslave the Lithuanian people.

I will not take up the time in these remarks to repeat the treachery, mass murders, prison incarcerations, and tortures that the Soviets inflicted upon the brave and liberty loving people of Lithuania. This history is vividly set out in the summary and final report of the Committee on Communist Aggression filed December 31, 1954. I, as a Member of Congress, served on this committee and we held hearings in America and Europe. Members of Congress and the American public should read that report and learn from former leaders of Lithuania and other witnesses who were victims of Soviet treachery what Communist tyranny can inflict on innocent human beings. This report also reveals facts containing similar inhuman aggression upon other captive nations now under the Kremlin iron heel. The basic findings, conclusions, and recommendations set out on pages 3 to 9 of that report will startle millions of people throughout the free world when they learn of the true facts concerning the Communist conspiracy.

Over the last 12 years since the report of our Communist-investigating committee, we have sent out hundreds of thousands of copies of our reports to nations, people, and organizations all over the world. Hardly a week passes but what we receive letters asking for copies of the report revealing the great work done by our congressional committee exposing communism in its naked guilt.

Lithuania, along with other captive countries and all free nations, must keep up the fight against Communist aggression and expansion and the day will eventually come when freedom will be restored to Lithuania and other captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I incorporate with my remarks a letter which I have received from the most Reverend Brizgys of 2701 West 68th Street, Chicago, Ill.:

FEBRUARY 11, 1965.

Representative R. J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has always been my great honor and pleasure to express at least a brief note of thanks, appreciation, and respect to those friends of Lithuania who, on February 16—the independence day of Lithuania—affirm their friendship and sympathy to the Lithuanian nation. Inasmuch, as I shall not be in the United States on February 16 of this year, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation in advance to all who will remember Lithuania on her independence day.

I also would like to share with you the most recent news from Lithuania. The Russian occupation forces have not softened. Forcible Russification continues. Greater pressure upon teachers, officials, and judges, to be propagandists for godless atheism, is stressed. Those practicing their faith are constantly persecuted. Lithuanian youth is still being drafted for labor in Siberia. Including survivors of the first mass deportations, these new transportees comprise approximately 130,000 forcibly exiled from their homeland.

The cross which the Lithuanian nation and country is bearing is an onerous one. The nation does not stop yearning for freedom. In spirit it is wholeheartedly with the free world. It hopes that by its own efforts and the aid of its good friends it will realize freedom and justice in the near future. They have no desire to be a slave to Moscow, but long to be a member of the family of free nations of the world.

In the name of the Lithuanian nation allow me to thank all of you who support its hopes and actively seek to bring them to reality.

Faithfully yours,
Most Rev. V. BRIZGYS.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, each year on February 16 we commemorate the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. This year we celebrate the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. On February 16, 1918, a congress of Lithuanian delegates proclaimed the country's independence. A democratic government based on individual liberties was set up, and for the next two decades Lithuania flourished as an independent nation. The creative arts were encouraged, and the world became richer through Lithuania's contributions to music and literature. National folklore was revived. The standard of living of the Lithuanian people was substantially improved by enlightened educational and social policies.

But Lithuania's period of progress was unfortunately brief, for the Second World War brought national tragedy to the Lithuanian people. In spite of the fact that they had pledged in a 1920 peace treaty to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty over Lithuania, the Soviets occupied Lithuania in June of 1940 and had incorporated Lithuania in the U.S.S.R. by autumn. Thus democracy and freedom were brutally ended, and Lithuania was tragically enslaved. Thousands of citizens were deported, and many others were tyrannized and threatened. Individual liberties and national independence were crushed.

One thing was not destroyed: the desire of the Lithuanians to regain liberty and democracy and their steadfast faith that one day they would again be free. Their own historical past has taught them that a conqueror cannot retain control forever. Lithuania is an old nation, known to history since 1009. During the medieval period, threats from abroad brought together the principalities into which it was divided, and in 1253 Lithuania was united under a single king. Lithuania was a powerful state in Europe during the Middle Ages, with boundaries to the east which extended into what is now the Byelorussian S.S.R. and the Russian S.S.R. It acted as a buffer against the Mongols in the east and the Germans in the west, and played an important role in the development of European civilization.

Then, in 1795 Lithuania was annexed by Russia, and the tolerant, enlightened policies of the Lithuanian rulers were replaced by the repressive policies of the Russian czars. Although the Lithuanians were unable to regain independence until the First World War, czarist Russification policy was unsuccessful. Lithuania then, as now, remained faithful to its language, religion, and tradition.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has known both independence and subjugation, freedom and repression, glory and tragedy. History has shown that the spirit of the Lithuanian people is indomitable. On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we commend the Lithuanian people for their courage.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago today, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people declared their independence. This was a goal for which they had been striving ever since they had fallen under Russian domination in 1795.

It was not the first time, however, that the Lithuanian people had known independence. Indeed, the Lithuanian nation has been known to history since as long ago as 1009, when the name of Lithuania was first mentioned in a Latin text. For two centuries, Lithuania remained divided into many independent principalities. Following the conclusion of two important peace pacts in 1219 and in 1236, the Lithuanian principalities were united under the single rule of King Mindaugus. In 1251, Mindaugas was baptized a Christian, and 2 years later he was crowned King of a united Lithuania by a delegate of Pope Innocent IV. Thus 714 years ago this year Lithuania became united under Christian rule and 712 years ago this year Lithuania was recognized as a member of the European family of nations by the papacy.

Mr. Speaker, for several centuries the history of the Lithuanian people was glorious. At one time, the domains of the nation stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea. For centuries, the Lithuanians held back the Germans in their drive from the west and protected Europe against the Mongols and the Tartars pushing from the east. Indeed, the Lithuanian kingdom of the late Middle Ages had a powerful and stable government which sheltered the eastern Slavs and provided them with a freedom that was unknown in the less-developed lands further to the east.

The reign of Vytautas the Great, from 1392 to 1430, is especially celebrated in Lithuanian history. During this period, commerce was fostered, roads were carved out of the countryside, churches were built, education was promoted, and ties between Lithuania and Western Europe were increased. The high level of Lithuanian culture continued after the reign of Vytautas and became renowned throughout Europe. It is interesting to note in this respect that the Lithuanian language is one of the oldest spoken languages in Europe and is closely related to ancient Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin.

As early as the 16th century, the Lithuanian nation was forced to begin to seek ways to counter the growing threat from the Russians to the east. After having lost several eastern provinces to Muscovy, the Lithuanians in 1569 reluctantly agreed to conclude a political union with the equally threatened Poland. Lithuania still retained, however, a separate government, with its own treasury, armed forces, and law courts. Despite external threats and losses of territory, Lithuania's prodigious cultural development continued in the 16th century. Thus in 1529, a Lithuanian code of laws was enacted. In 1557, important measures of agrarian reform were applied. The first book in the Lithuanian language was published in 1547.

The union with Poland insured Lithuanian security for only a short time. Russian aggrandizement at the expense of Lithuania continued for the next century and a half. It culminated in the infamous partitions of Lithuania and Poland of 1772, 1793, and of 1795. For the next 120 years, Lithuania formed a part of the Russian empire. Lithuanian patriotism did not die out, however. The Lithuanian people periodically revolted against their Russian rulers. They fiercely resisted Russian attempts to impose the Russian language, to suppress the Lithuanian press and to force the Lithuanians to follow Eastern Orthodox rites instead of the rites of the Roman Catholic Church. The peasantry was especially active in resisting the Russians. Lithuanian emigrees to America actively supported the Lithuanian cause. In short, Lithuanians were determined to regain their independence. Following 3 years of suffering under German occupation, their opportunity came in the last year of World War I.

Mr. Speaker, for 22 short years, Lithuanians enjoyed their regained independence. Their accomplishments during that period were immense. A far-reaching land reform program was carried out which turned Lithuania into a nation of small, independent and increasingly prosperous farms. Although agricultural progress was stressed, industry was not ignored. In 1913, Lithuania had only 151 industrial establishments with 6,603 employees; in 1939, there were 16,131 enterprises employing some 33,000 workers. Progressive social legislation was introduced. The number of schools doubled. And above all, Lithuanian culture, freed of the shackles imposed by the Russians, flourished once more.

Following the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact of 1939, history cruelly began to repeat itself for the Lithuanians. Free Lithuania was first swallowed by the new and vicious imperialists of the Soviet Union. It was then occupied by the Nazi armies. It was reoccupied by Soviet armies in 1944. The Soviet Union has remained ever since. Mr. Speaker, the policies of the Russian czars toward the Lithuanian people were cruel and oppressive. They have been exceeded in every respect by those of Lithuania's Soviet masters.

Lithuanians have been deported by hundreds of thousands to remote regions of the Soviet Union where many of them have died. By tens of thousands they have been summarily executed whether they resisted Soviet policies or not. The land of once proud Lithuanian farmers has been subjected to forced collectivization. The Lithuanian Church has been forced virtually to close its doors. Russian colonists have exploited Lithuanian industry. Lithuanian culture is again being suppressed and the Russian language forced upon the Lithuanian people. Lithuania has been almost completely deprived of contact with the Western World.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union has turned the nation of Lithuania into a vast prison. Today we pause to lament the loss of Lithuanian independence and the subjection of a proud nation with a glorious history and a rich culture to the cruelest of tyrannies. We also pause to mark a day that is engraved in the memories of all Lithuanians, and to hope that the not too distant future will bring them another such day.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, once again, in this 20th year since the end of World War II, we are compelled to observe that the three small but proud Baltic States remain under the military domination and political control of the Soviet Union, without having yet had an opportunity to set up new free governments and conduct free elections.

The Baltic States, which emerged from foreign sovereignty near the close of World War I, were swallowed up again as World War II approached. During the heat and fury of war, we and other Western nations were promised by the Soviet Government that the Baltic States would be given a fair and free chance to choose for themselves the nature of their postwar political structure. This chance has in fact not been given; the solemn promise has not been redeemed.

We commemorate today the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Lithuanian Republic of 1918. This republic had a short life but we would be most unwise—and so would those who ravaged her—to think that Lithuania cannot rise again.

The history of Lithuania as a sovereign nation is seven centuries old. It has been an empire in Eastern Europe. Its tradition is, however, clearly that of the West. It is a land in which the words freedom and democracy are understood as we understand them.

We have often in this House expressed our sympathy for the present condition of the peoples of the Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—as well as for other peoples still under Soviet control after two decades. Many of us have sponsored resolutions, in repeated sessions of the Congress, declaring our support of the Government's refusal to acknowledge foreign control of the Baltic States to be legitimate and permanent, or justified by law or de facto penetration.

We owe it to Americans of Lithuanian origin or ancestry—brave people and freedom-loving people—to express our sympathy again for the present circumstances of their fatherland. We owe what we owe to all peoples who love liberty and who have, to the best of their ability, kept the faith.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the appropriate committees of the Congress will consider the advisability of renewing a formal expression of our concern for the independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic States; of our concern that in the final settlements of the war now two decades gone, the pledge of respect for their self-determination will be honored.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the valiant people of Lithuania on this, their national independence day.

At the close of World War I, the Lithuanian people, long suppressed by czarist tyranny, were overjoyed by President Wilson's proclamation of the principle of self-determination for all people.

On February 16, 1918, independence was proclaimed and recognition was extended by all the great powers. For 22 years this nation lived and prospered in freedom. Then came the fall of Paris in June 1940. Within a few days the Soviet Union delivered its ultimatum in keeping with the terms of the notorious Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of 1939, and demanded the surrender of Lithuania.

From that day forward the Communists embarked upon a campaign to make Lithuania over in the Soviet image. The hallmarks of Communist oppression followed. Collectivization of the farms, religious persecution, denial of free speech, assembly, and private property.

The United States openly denounced this illegal occupation and every American administration since has continued the policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet puppet regimes. I trust my Government will never alter that policy.

The conquest of Lithuania is a sad but true reminder that freedom is in constant danger. So long as international communism professes world domination we must be vigilant. We join the Lithuanians in celebrating this independence day and pledge our efforts to hasten the day when freedom returns to the people of Lithuania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago today the nation of Lithuania declared herself independent. For the next 22 years the people of Lithuania progressed and prospered as their centuries-old dream of independence came true. This dream was shattered in the summer of 1940 when Lithuania was occupied by Soviet troops and soon was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Lithuania may have been wiped off the map as an independent nation by this act of Soviet imperialism, but it has not been wiped out of the hearts and minds of Lithuanians and friends of freedom. Today in Lithuania, there will be no tears of pride and patriotism at the sight of the Lithuanian flag. Rather, there will be tears of rage and frustration, for the flag of Lithuania is now the hammer and sickle. Lithuanians will not stand at attention and sing their national anthem, because their national anthem has been turned into a dirge for a country suppressed by Soviet tyranny. We can be sure, however, that today Lithuanians will pause, silently, and dedicate themselves anew in their never-ending battle for liberty.

Mr. Speaker, we need not have asked for whom the bell tolled when Lithuania lost her cherished liberty, for it tolled for freedom-loving people all over the world. It tolled for America, the bastion of freedom and democracy, for whenever freemen are enslaved, no American can be completely at rest. We would be remiss in our responsibilities as the leaders of the free world if we did not do all we can to honor and to support the resolve of the brave people of Lithuania. I am confident that America shares with me the respect which I feel for the people of Lithuania and my confidence that in the end, right will prevail and Lithuania will once again be free.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the continued subjugation and enslavement of Lithuania by the Soviet Union is one of the greatest tragedies of the 20th century. Forty-seven years ago, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania took her long-awaited step toward independence. Lithuanians looked to the future with hope and with infinite confidence in their abilities to govern themselves and to guide their own destiny. Today Lithuania is reduced to an enslaved nation, a nation devoured and stripped of its identity by the onslaughts of the Soviet Union. Where once there was freedom, hope, and progress, there is now oppression, tyranny, and injustice.

During its 22 years of independence, Lithuania thrived as only a free and sovereign nation can. A permanent constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922. This constitution accorded freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. Great emphasis was placed on improving agriculture, for farming is the primary occupation of the Lithuanians. A land reform program was instituted, with the result that Lithuania became a nation of small farmers. By 1939, there were 335,720 farming units, raising a variety of grains, potatoes, sugarbeets, livestock, and poultry.

Industrialization also progressed in independent Lithuania with an increase from 151 industrial establishments with 6,603 employees in 1913, to 1,131 enterprises employing 33,000 in 1939. At the same time, Lithuania made progress in social legislation, with a labor control law, the introduction of the 8-hour day, and various other social measures.

The arts in Lithuania also flourished. Writers found inspiration in the national folklore of their country, and achievements were made in opera and other forms of music. All in all, Lithuania was taking rapid strides in becoming one of the most progressive and dynamic nations in Europe.

This progress came to an abrupt halt when the Soviet Union marched her troops into Lithuania and instituted a regime so cruel and heinous as to defy the imagination. Lithuanians were murdered, tortured, and deported on an enormous scale. It is estimated that on the night of June 14, 1941, some 30,000 members of the Lithuanian intelligentsia were deported to Siberia, many never to be heard of again.

It is imperative that we in America never forget the tragedy of Lithuania. Indeed there are over 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent who cannot disassociate themselves from the plight of their brothers across the sea. Lithuanian immigrants came to the United States as early as 1688, when it is recorded that they landed at New Amsterdam. Lithuanians make up substantial percentages of the population of my own State of Pennsylvania and of California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, these Americans of Lithuanian descent have not forgotten the true meaning of Lithuanian Independence Day, and we as a nation have not forgotten. Lithuania will once again be free. We must do everything in our power to hasten that day.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 every year, we join with 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in observing the Lithuanian Independence Day. This year marks the 47th anniversary of the independence proclaimed by the people of their fatherland. It is worth while interrupting the ordinary business of the House at this moment to commemorate this event by honoring their strong courage and ideals, great devotion to the dignity and freedom of individual man and the tenacious hope that the long-lost independence they once enjoyed will be restored.

Lithuania has been known to history since the early 11th century—an old nation with its glorious 700-year-old cultural and national tradition. The country has a strategic location in northeastern Europe facing the Baltic Sea and abundant natural wealth which has been just enough to motivate foreign aggression against so small a country. During the third partition of Poland in the 18th century, this nation came under the tyrannical yoke of Russia which lasted from 1795 to 1915—over 120 years.

At the end of the First World War, defeat of Germany coupled with the Russian revolution furnished to the freedom-yearning Lithuanians a long-sought opportunity of independence. Thus, on February 16, 1918, 47 years ago this week, the Lithuanian Council in their capital Vilnius proclaimed an independent state based on democratic principles. Failing to enslave Lithuania, Russia signed a peace treaty on July 12, 1920, which accorded full recognition as an independent state and forever renounced all sovereign rights over the Lithuanian people and their territory. On September 22, 1921, this tiny nation was admitted to the League of Nations. During her short-lived independence, this small but vigorous and progressive republic grew, prospered, and became a full-fledged member of the international community.

All this came to an end when the Red army forcibly set up a government friendly to the Soviets and occupied the young republic on June 15, 1940, in contravention of a Soviet-Lithuanian nonaggression treaty concluded in 1926. On August 3, 1940, through a phony election, Lithuania was declared by the Kremlin a constituent republic of the Communist Russia. With the outbreak of the war in 1941 came the German invasion, and as the defeated German Army retreated in July 1944, the Red army again marched into Lithuania bringing a new flood of evil totalitarian tyranny and more ferocious terrorism and oppression. The United States recognized an independent Lithuania on July 27, 1922, and refused to recognize the Soviet occupation on July 23, 1940.

Such has been a tragic and trying story of this gallant and proud people, but we have no reason to believe that the soul of a spirited nation has been conquered. They have neither lost nor weakened the inalienable right to hope and struggle for their freedom and independence. The soul of this oppressed people continues to live through the darkness of Communist enslavement, radiating the light of freedom which will never be extinguished by any means.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues at this time in expressing my sentiments regarding Lithuanian Independence Day. The independent state of Lithuania was recently among the smaller countries of Europe, but it was not always a tiny Baltic nation. Lithuania first appeared as an organized political entity some 800 years ago. The Lithuanians and Latvians of the 20th century are the survivors and descendants of one of the eastern branches of the Indo-European family. In medieval times, the Lithuanian kings ruled most of what is now Russia. After four centuries of union with the Poles, Lithuania fell to the czar of Russia when Poland was dismembered by the three great Eastern powers of the time. There then followed a dark period in the history of the great Lithuanian people when they were so humiliated by suppression by the Russian Government that even the name of Lithuania was denied a place among the nations of the world.

National liberation came in the final year of World War I. Today, February 16, is the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence of this proud nation. For 22 years, Lithuania was an independent nation which stood high in world esteem, even though these years were filled with threats and deprivations. Then, they fell once again under domination by a foreign power, this time that of the Soviets. Even so, the United States of America has never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and we continue to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the free Republic of Lithuania.

This is the story of the Lithuanians—blood brothers with us in their love of freedom. These are a people whose glorious past and renascence, under peculiarly moving conditions, are an earnest of great future achievement in all constructive activities. The American people, so devoted to the preservation of the ideals of liberty and freedom and human dignity, must become better acquainted with the story of Lithuania. We must understand better the contributions which a people, in spite of various and tremendous obstacles entirely beyond their control, have attempted to make and have made toward the advancement of civilization and the increase of happier relations among the members of that family of nations with which the Creator has blessed this world. I entreat all within this Chamber not to forget this republic that was first to fall to the Soviet Bolsheviks. The proud people of suffering Lithuania command our respect and support.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, today I join with the people of Lithuania and those of Lithuanian descent to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day.

For those of us who have lived our lives in freedom, it is difficult to imagine the hardships endured by the Lithuanian people in their valiant efforts to preserve their liberty and national independence. In commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day, we hope to keep alive the determination of all who cherish freedom that Lithuania may once again become a free and independent nation.

The one encouraging aspect of this sad situation is that even under the most discouraging conditions, Lithuanians have not given up their love for freedom and their right to independence. On the anniversary of their independence we wish them forbearance and fortitude in their struggle against tyranny.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, during the nine Congresses of which I have been a Member, the plight of the valiant people of Lithuania has increasingly troubled me. For, though the cruel barbarisms of the Stalinist era may have given way to more subtle methods of rule, this long oppressed people still suffer under Communist domination. As a U.S. delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, I had an opportunity not long ago to observe closely the delegates from the Soviet Union, the country which ruthlessly stamped out Lithuania's independence in 1940. Neither in their words nor in their voting could I find evidence of humanitarian concern for people, or for freedom.

Not yet, Mr. Speaker, is there evidence in the whole realm of Soviet conduct of simple recognition of the right of people to choose their own form of government, to live their lives as they themselves determine. And yet, as surely as I know the sun must rise, I know the people of Lithuania will once again achieve the national indepedence they established 47 years ago. I am proud to join this tribute to them in the firm conviction that our own renewed resolve and dedication will help to hasten that day.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join with Lithuanians and freedom-loving people the world over in marking the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Few peoples have withstood more sustained efforts to eradicate their national identity than the Lithuanians.

Lithuania is a small Baltic nation which throughout the past has been surrounded by large, ambitious neighbors with little regard for the rights or frontiers of Lithuania. This country's history has been one of constant invasion and occupation by foreign powers, yet none of her conquerors has been able to extinguish the patriotism of Lithuanians. After 22 years of independence, Lithuania fell before the advance of an imperialistic foe. Soviet Russia incorporated Lithuania into the Soviet Union in 1940 and even the pretext of independence has vanished.

The Soviet rulers recognized the strength and tenacity of Lithuanian nationalism and took drastic steps to wipe out every vestige of Lithuanian culture, heritage, and religion. Under Stalin, attempts were made to eliminate all Baltic national minorities by massive deportation. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians were uprooted from their homeland and sent to the wastes of Siberia. Thousands of Russians have moved into Lithuanian in an obvious attempt to change once and for all its character and nationality. This is truly one of the great tragedies of our time.

That Stalinist Russia had to resort to terror and torture to implement its policy in Lithuania is an everlasting tribute to the bravery and fortitude of Lithuanian patriots. The soul of Lithuania will not die, because Lithuanians will not let it die. Tyranny and injustice will not prevail because brave men will not let them prevail. At this moment Lithuania is part of the Soviet Union not out of choice, but because of an army of occupation and a history of rigged elections.

The day will come, Mr. Speaker, when Lithuanians will be freed from the yoke of foreign domination once and for all. We who are fortunate enough to live in the United States can do much to hasten the day when Lithuanians will be able to breathe the air of a free nation and live the lives of freemen.

We must continue to bring the subjugation and exploitation of Lithuania to the attention of all freedom-loving people. We must continue to be a source of truth and inspiration to the people of Lithuania through our radio broadcasts. Finally, we must not let the fate of Lithuania become the fate of any other nation. We must show by word and deed that America still stands for freedom and democracy and that tyranny and imperialism have no place in our world today.

Lithuanians have suffered much in their righteous cause, and suffer yet. Mr. Speaker, we pray for the day when her independence will be restored to her and when her people will be released from bondage.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanian Americans are today commemorating the 47th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. The people of Lithuania, under the harsh yoke of Soviet communism, cannot observe this independence day, but it is fitting that we in this country pause and salute a people whose courage and firm faith have survived great adversities. It is sad that another year must witness their desperate frustrations as they are denied the right of self-government.

Lithuania, one of the oldest and most respected nations in the history of the world, has a noble tradition of fine culture; they are an industrious people deserving far better than servitude to Moscow. The ancient Lithuanian statehood dates back to A.D. 1200. Their freedom was lost in 1795 and not regained until 1918. From 1918 until 1940 Lithuania enjoyed freedom. In that short period of time Lithuania had a notable and respected place among the world of nations. Then in 1940 the Soviet Union discarded treaty obligations and invaded this small country and the two other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia. They were compelled to become a part of the Soviet Republic. In the years since, the people have endured oppression, slavery and exile. Lithuania is a victim of Russian greed, for there is no compatibility between the Lithuanian system of freedom developed between 1918 and 1940, and the Soviet dictatorial system of today.

Lithuanians have contributed so much to the culture and welfare of Europe, and Lithuanian-Americans have made great contributions to our country. Lithuanian-Americans are especially concerned over the tragic plight of their brethren in Lithuania. They remember with pride the glorious years of independence and they look forward to the founding of a new Lithuanian democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the sponsors of a resolution to provide for the formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, as a means of symbolizing to all our determination never to forget the captive nations, their sacrifices and struggles for freedom. I hope Congress will approve this resolution; it would be an effective way of putting Russia on notice that America is unalterably opposed to Communist colonization.

I am happy to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives to once again salute the courageous people of Lithuania and assure them of our friendship and offer them our encouragement. If this reaffirmation of our friendship for the Lithuanian people accomplishes nothing else, I hope it will signal anew America's rejection of tyranny in any form and our allegiance to government by self-determination, not meaningless existence under Communist tyranny.

It is the duty of freemen everywhere to maintain an unflagging interest in the fate of Lithuania and the other enslaved nations, and to persevere in the long struggle to achieve a world in which free people can live together in peace.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today is the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Throughout the Middle Ages, Lithuania was an embattled kingdom fighting for its freedom. Despite repeated invasion and occupation, Lithuania developed rich customs and a strong sense of national identity. That identity was acknowledged by the framers of the Versailles Treaty led by Woodrow Wilson. On February 16, 1918, Lithuania became an independent state. The League of Nations was commissioned to be the guarantor of national self-determination for a people so often oppressed by foreign powers.

Yet after only 22 years, Lithuania lost its cherished independence to the Soviet Union. Now, as has been the case for most of Lithuanian history, the country is occupied, ruled from abroad, and denied its freedom.

There are strong reasons why America should champion the cause of Lithuania. During the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, many Lithuanians sought the dream of American life and emigrated to this country. Their contribution to the United States was and continues to be substantial. And though all citizens of Lithuanian background are fully assimilated into our ways, their customs still thrive as a reminder of this country's rich immigrant legacy.

So it is with many other countries now behind the Iron Curtain. Our commitment to Lithuania may thus symbolize our refusal to accept an Eastern Europe in bondage. On this day celebrating Lithuanian independency, we should renew that commitment.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I join today, the 47th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, with freedom-loving men everywhere in saluting the bravery and perseverance of the people of this tiny Baltic nation.

In the short period between 1918, when Lithuania declared her independence, and the start of World War II, when the Soviet Union reannexed the struggling nation by force, Lithuania successfully established a democratic and progressive state and made impressive gains in every area of her national life. These years of growth and prosperity as a free state bore witness to the courage and resourcefulness of Lithuania's people, qualities testified to since by their determination to resist Soviet tyranny. The Lithuanian's refusal to submit to Soviet Russia's efforts at "Russification"—an attempt to absorb Lithuania totally into the Soviet Union by eradicating her national language and culture—strongly support this suffering nation's claim to national identity and independence.

We in the United States respect this claim and have refused to recognize the Soviet Union's incorporation of Lithuania. It is fitting today that we reaffirm our conviction that Lithuania must again enjoy the status of a sovereign state, and that her brave people again know the liberty and national independence they have so painfully suffered for and so well earned.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I join most humbly with my colleagues in paying tribute to the spirit of freedom held in the hearts of Lithuanian people everywhere. This day marks the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania, a land still under the yoke of the Soviets.

The people of Lithuanian descent who now live in this greatest of free countries are marking this day with sadness in their hearts for their loved ones and friends who remain in Lithuania. Yet they rejoice at the thought that someday the Russian domination and subjugation of Lithuania will end; that once more this Baltic nation will know freedom.

As we rise to join in the salutes to the people .of Lithuania, I would like to call attention to a letter I received from the Most Reverend V. J. Brizgys of Chicago. I believe it is very significant at this time.

FEBRUARY 11, 1965.

Representative G. CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has always been my great honor and pleasure to express at least a brief note of thanks, appreciation, and respect to those friends of Lithuania who, on February 16—the independence day of Lithuania—affirm their friendship and sympathy to the Lithuanian nation. Inasmuch as I shall not be in the United States on February 16 of this year, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation in advance to all who will remember Lithuania on her independence day.

I also would like to share with you the most recent news from Lithuania. The Russian occupation forces have not softened. Forcible Russification continues. Greater pressure upon teachers, officials, and judges, to be propagandists for godless atheism, is stressed. Those practicing their faith are constantly persecuted. Lithuanian youth is still being drafted for labor in Siberia. Including survivors of the first mass deportations, these new transportees comprise approximately 130,000 forcibly exiled from their homeland.

The cross which the Lithuanian nation and country is bearing is an onerous one. The nation does not stop yearning for freedom. In spirit it is wholeheartedly with the free world. It hopes that by its own efforts and the aid of its good friends it will realize freedom and justice in the near future. They have no desire to be a slave of Moscow, but long to be a member of the family of free nations of the world.

In the name of the Lithuanian nation allow me to thank all of you who support its hopes and actively seek to bring them to reality.

Faithfully yours,

V. J. BRIZGYS.

In the past I have had the honor to introduce and sponsor legislation which would put this nation firmly on record as to our desires and for these captive nations. Today I am introducing a House concurrent resolution which spells out the history of the Communist invasion and occupation of the Baltic States.

There is a call for action by this Congress, a request that the President bring up the Baltic States question in the United Nations with the following actions as our goal:

First, withdrawal of Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls.

Second, return of all Baltic exiles from Siberian prisons, labor camps, or elsewhere.

Third, free elections under U.N. supervision.

I think these are minimum and reasonable objectives. Certainly they are ones that we as the leader of the free world should support.

There can be no peace, no peaceful coexistence with communism. Let us all pray that the people of Lithuania and all occupied nations will again be free.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, people of Lithuanian extraction from throughout central and southern Ohio are gathering today at Holy Cross Hall in Dayton, in observance of Republic of Lithuania Day. On this occasion I sent a greeting to the group and wish to commend it to my colleagues in the House:

GREETING TO THE FEDERATION OF LITHUANIAN AMERICAN R.C. SOCIETIES ON THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY

As February 16 comes again it is a day mixed with solemn contemplation and joyful thanksgiving.

We are sorrowful, first, because we know this day marks the passing of a dream we once held possible. It marks the anniversary of the day you—as a proud people—could call your native land your own, where men could labor to build a lasting domicile for family and nation. These dreams are now only a memory fading with the passing of the ages.

But, secondly, it is also a day of joyful hope and thanksgiving. For it is on this day we honor the spirit of independence which, though brooding now like a sleeping giant, can reawaken and set men's hearts afire by the eternal truth that man once blessed with freedom, will tolerate no other way of life.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. This memorable anniversary has been observed year in and year out by the Lithuanian people, and by all Americans of Lithuanian descent. In this manner, they have kept a spark of hope burning in their hearts—the hope that the day will soon come when the independent Republic of Lithuania will once again assume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It is only fitting that we, the Congress of the United States, pause for a moment in our deliberations and express our admiration for the stanch faith and undaunted courage of the Lithuanian people who have been suffering so greatly under the ruthless Soviet occupation, but who, in spite of this totalitarian oppression, have maintained their spirit and their devotion to the principles of freedom and democracy.

Let us, on this occasion, bolster their hopes in the eventual realization of their aspiration to resume their existence as an independent Republic. The conscience of the free world will not be at rest until liberty and justice shall reign over the lands which are today enveloped by the dark clouds of Communist totalitarianism. To this end, we shall continue to devote our efforts.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the first identity of what has been known as Lithuania can be traced to the 10th century, but it was not until about 1225 that the various tribes that roamed the countryside were united in what might be described as a state. From that time through the Middle Ages and into the 15th century, Lithuania was a proud country, inhabited by proud and peaceful people, and respected by other nations of Europe.

Because of a marriage in 1385 between Duke Jagello of Lithuania and Poland's Queen Jadwiga, and the resulting union of Lublin in 1569, the histories of Poland and Lithuania were immeasurably intertwined for more than three centuries, with final incorporation into czarist Russia at the end of the 18th century. The Lithuanians were never happy about their intimacy with Poland, but under czarist Russia their very existence and identity was at stake.

Freedom appeared on the horizon in 1917. While the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks were fighting in Russia, national Lithuanian groups throughout the world reminded each other independence was finally in sight. Finally on February 16, 1918 the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian nation proclaimed the freedom and independence of the country.

By 1920 German and Russian troops had left the country, and the industrious Lithuanian people set about the task of building a modern state. In 1939 war clouds cast a deep shadow over Europe, and under pressure of Russia, the little independent country signed a "mutual assistance pact" with the Soviets on October 10, 1939. On the face of it the pact seemed innocent enough. Among other things, the Soviets were granted land in Lithuania to establish airbases. Less than a year later, in June of 1940 while Germany was attacking France, the Russians occupied the countries of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia on the grounds that their national security was at stake.

About a month later, in July 1940, one of the most insidious events in Lithuanian history took place when the Russians held forced "elections." In true Communist fashion there was one ticket. In spite of the fact there was a penalty for not voting and that many Lithuanians posted blank ballots, the Soviets announced to the world that more than 99 percent of the people voted in the election. Indeed, the results of the election were announced in London by the Russians, 24 hours before the polls closed.

Within a week the new assembly met, and without ever taking a vote, the assembly requested in the name of the Lithuanian people to be incorporated into the U.S.S.R. The Supreme Soviet Council accepted the request and Lithuania became the 14th Republic in the U.S.S.R.

Almost a year to the day later, June 24, 1941, German soldiers drove the Russians out of the country, and thus Communist domination was replaced by Fascist domination. Lithuania was in ruins, and to make matters worse, the Germans refused every request of the Lithuanians to set up some kind of government to restore order. Instead, the Germans incorporated Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and White Ukraine under a Nazi civil administration which lasted 3 years.

With the spirit of freedom still alive in the hearts of the people, the resistance movement to Nazi control grew in great proportion.

The suppression by the Fascists was only the beginning, not the end, of national suffering, for in July 1944 the Russians pushed the Germans out of the country, and reestablished Communist control. The once peaceful country was in ruins and chaos. As the Russians entered the country 200,000 Lithuanians tried to leave their country. As the Germans pulled back they destroyed property, murdered Jews, executed prisoners, and 350,000 Lithuanians were either deported to Germany or fled to Germany to escape the Russians.

On July 13, 1944, the Russians proclaimed they had "liberated" the Lithuanian people, when in fact one master had been replaced by another. Lithuanians caught between the two masters were murdered.

Since that fateful summer in 1944 when the allies began to see a glimmer of victory in the war in Europe, the Lithuanians have been silenced.

But what of the future? Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the future of a free and independent Lithuania is not bright—never hopeless—but not bright. The United States has never recognized the farcical incorporation of this country into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Let us hope the Lithuanian people will face this burden until such day they will once again join the community of free nations.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, almost a half century has passed since the restoration of the independence of Lithuania. Thus, we cannot forget that the Lithuanians, once a free people, are no longer free. Lithuanian-Americans observe proudly in their hearts the heritage of freedom. They will not, as we will not, discard both the heritage and the hope that Lithuania will be free before too many anniversaries have passed.

Let it not be said that we have forgotten. We shall nourish that hope and keep it green, fresh, and growing so that hope becomes a promise and the promise a reality.

I join with all free men in admiration of the bravery of the Lithuanian people who have not abandoned their hope.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1965, is not a happy day for the people of Lithuania and for the Lithuanian-Americans living here.

On that day in 1918, after a century and a half of foreign rule, Lithuania became an independent nation. The National Council at Vilnius declared Lithuania to be a free and independent republic and created a provisional government to hold national elections. On this important day the rebirth of the Lithuanian nation occurred. The long years under the yoke of foreign oppressors had not diminished the Lithuanian love for freedom and independence.

A short time after the declaration of independence, troops from the Bolshevik government of Russia waited on the borders of Lithuania for the withdrawal of the Kaiser's armies. When the German troops left, the Red forces invaded the newly independent nation and forced the provisional government to move from Vilnius to Kaunas where a national army was organized. In a pitched battle the national army of Lithuania soundly defeated the Red forces. As a result of this defeat, the Soviet Government renounced sovereignty over Lithuania.

All the major powers recognized Lithuania as a free and independent nation. Democratic elections were held and distinguished leaders fervently guided the new nation in world affairs. Shortly thereafter, Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations where it was respected and where it exercised significant leadership.

From 1920 to 1940, economic and social progress was very noticeable. The land reform program gave land to thousands of families. New agricultural techniques provided the people with bumper crops. Sufficient food was produced to feed not only the people of the nation but enough left over for export.

Industrial plants grew like mushrooms. Transportation and communications systems were expanded. Social legislation brought health, education, and welfare benefits within the reach of everyone. This was the situation in Lithuania for two decades. Then the Nazi armies were on the move and World War II began.

Under the pretext of protection, the Soviet Union forced Lithuania to capitulate to the entry of thousands of troops into Lithuania, despite every attempt of cooperation made by the Lithuanians. Once the massive Russian Army was in Lithuania, no resistance was allowed and free elections were never again permitted. Lithuania became a victim to be exploited for the benefit of the Soviets; a pattern which has since become sadly familiar in many other countries.

All over the world, Lithuanians are gathering, at this time, to renew their vows to work for the independence of their homeland. I hope the day is not far away when Lithuania may be restored as a free and independent republic among the other nations of the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1965, is the 47th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It was on this day 47 years ago that the Lithuanian people, soon to be followed by the people of Estonia and Latvia, proclaimed their independence after more than a century of czarist rule. But after only 22 years of liberty, marked by great progress, they were again subjugated by Soviet tyranny. Lithuania was, in fact, the first victim of Stalin's infamous pact with Hitler that touched off World War II and ultimately resulted in the enslavement of all of Eastern Europe.

Today Lithuania, along with her Baltic neighbors Latvia and Estonia, are supposedly equal republics within the Soviet Union. Some time ago when the subjugation and sovietization of Lithuania were at their height, the following sentence appeared in an official Soviet publication: "Everything is new, everything is joyous and majestic. The country is continually moving forward. The Soviet system, the people's power, has brought happiness to every Lithuanian patriot." This is indeed a gross travesty of the truth. Lithuanian patriots were arrested, tortured, executed, and deported as communism was spread by force throughout their land. Lithuanians only wished to be left in peace to pursue their own independent course in the world, but they were, instead, subjected to the tyrannical control of international communism.

The history of Lithuania is one of continual invasion and occupation by foreign powers. It is an everlasting tribute to the strength and character of the Lithuanian people that through all these vicissitudes they have preserved and maintained a colorful and unique culture, history, and language. On February 16, 1918, when Lithuanians were finally able to assert their independence, they established a democratic form of government; and there was an immediate resurgence of national pride and a prompt expansion of her free institutions.

During the long periods of foreign domination the devout and dedicated people of Lithuania had persevered in their resistance to tyranny and faithfully preserved the heritage of faith and freedom. The history and tradition of Lithuanian independence is a living thing and a blessed thing. It has not been crushed in the past and it will not be crushed by the present Soviet regime, no matter what their tactics.

Our own country was founded on the principles of freedom and self-determination; and we cannot, with a clear conscience, turn our backs on the plight of the enslaved people of Lithuania. Appreciating our own blessings as citizens of the United States we should not permit a day to pass without thinking and planning and praying for the time when Lithuania will be freed from Communist tyranny. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed honored to take part in the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting that we should today join the Lithuanian-Americans in their observance of the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania and I want to commend the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for reserving this special hour in the House.

The people of Lithuania have a noble heritage and their struggle for freedom has furnished hope and inspiration to the democratic aspirations of many small nations. That is why we should particularly remember, as we pay tribute to the gallant spirit of free Lithuania and the noble heritage of our citizens of Lithuanian descent who have done so much in helping to make this country great, that cruel fate has afflicted the Lithuanian nation with the yoke of tyranny and oppression.

This oppression encompasses many formerly free lands and many noble peoples. On this day commemorating Lithuanian independence, let us not forget these and other victims from other once free nations who suffer from aggression, exploitation, and brutal tyranny.

Instead, in hailing the contributions and sacrifices of the Lithuanian people, let Americans everywhere pledge their belief and determination to fight for international order, honor, and decency. Let it also be known on this day of Lithuanian independence that the American Congress, reflecting the wishes and sentiments of the American people, reaffirms principles of liberty, justice, freedom, human honor, and decency.

As I have stated many times in this House, Mr. Speaker, there can be no lasting peace so long as Red imperialism continues to hold men in bondage in denial of their God-given rights. If we and the rest of the free world continue our efforts for peace and freedom, the day will come when Lithuania and all other subject nations may rejoice in the blessings of freedom and governments of their

The time has come for this Nation to stand firm and resolute. On this great day of Lithuanian independence let us serve notice to the Soviet and the people of the world just where we stand on the great issues of freedom, honor, decency, and peace and in acknowledging the great contributions of our citizens of Lithuanian origin, let us send to the afflicted Lithuanian people the strong assurance that their friends in America will remain with them in their adversities and that the Congress of the United States extends the hand of friendship and the warm, sincere pledge of devoted helpfulness to their great cause of human liberty.

In so doing, Mr. Speaker, this Nation will be serving notice to the whole world that we stand firm and resolute on the adoption of an affirmative policy to discharge in full measure our obligation to stand by and sustain the Lithuanian people and oppressed peoples everywhere in their hopes for liberation and deliverance from tyranny.

Long live free Lithuania. May that great land and inspired peoples soon regain the great liberties they cherish.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to pay tribute to the brave Lithuanian people on the significant occasion of the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. This week also marks the 714th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State and the 712th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Kingdom when

Mindaugas the Great was crowned as the first King of the Lithuanian Empire.

As these two latter events indicate, the Lithuanians form one of the oldest ethnic groups in northeastern Europe. Their known history goes back to at least 1,000 years in their homeland on the eastern shore of the Baltic. There they have lived during all that time; during most of the millennium they have had to struggle for the maintenance of their freedom and independence.

At one time during the late Middle Ages their kingdom was one of the most powerful states in all eastern Europe. Late in the 14th century the Lithuanian king married Poland's reigning queen and thus came into being the union of the two kingdoms. As a junior partner in this union, Lithuania was not always satisfied, but nevertheless remained faithful to the union. Late in the 18th century when czarist Russia annexed most of Poland, Lithuania went with it and became part of the Russian empire. For more than 120 years these helpless souls had no choice but to bear the oppressive yoke of the czars. Alone they were unable to free themselves, and in the absence of effective aid from other quarters, they put up with all the suffering that was their unhappy lot.

At the end of the First World War the czarist Russian regime was no more and the Russian empire was broken up. Then the Lithuanian saw their real chance to free themselves. As a matter of fact, even before the end of that war, on February 16, 1918, they had proclaimed their independence and had established their own government. This important event proved a turning point in the modern history of Lithuania, and seemed to usher in a new and happy era. From then on for a little more than two decades, Lithuanians worked feverishly to make their ruined and ravaged country a safe haven for themselves. Considering the relatively short time they had, they did remarkably well. In due time Lithuania became a respected member of the world community of free and sovereign states. But this happy interlude of independence did not last beyond the second decade of the interwar years, and soon after the outbreak of the last war in 1939 Lithuania's freedom became a casualty of that war.

In the fall of 1939 the Lithuanian Government was compelled by the Soviet Union to sign a mutual assistance pact; then early in 1940 Lithuania was attacked by the Red army and occupied. And finally in July of 1940 the country was made part of the Soviet Union. Since then, unhappy Lithuanians have been denied freedom in their homeland. They have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny and unfortunately there seem to be no signs of easing Communist rule over Lithuania. Fortunately, however, these stouthearted people have not given up hope for their freedom, and on the 47th anniversary of their independence day let us all hope that they will attain their goal in freedom.

I am pleased to sponsor in this Congress, as I did in the 88th Congress, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States. I urge our colleagues to support this legislation and help to keep alive the gallant spirit of the Lithuanian people. The text of House Concurrent Resolution 68 follows:

> Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and
>
> Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and
>
> Whereas the Baltic people, Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians, under Communist control were and still are overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and
>
> Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and
>
> Whereas the select committee of the House of Representatives created by H. Res. 346 of the Eighty-third Congress, to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and
>
> Whereas the United States of America has never recognized the occupation of the Baltic States and their incorporation into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the former Governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and
>
> Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets—
>
> (1) To withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;
>
> (2) To return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation declared itself independent. This was a goal for which the Lithuanian people had been striving throughout a long period of Russian domination—1795–1915—followed by German occupation during the First World War.

Few nations strove harder or waited longer for independence than did Lithuania. For over two decades Lithuania prospered and grew under its newly won independence. Then in the summer of 1940, the Soviets demanded immediate formation of a "friendly" government and occupied the country. A rigged election was held to produce a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. On August 3, at this "request," Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow. Since that fateful day, Lithuania has seen her land exploited, her people executed and deported, and her independence ground under the heel of Communist terror.

The resistance of the Lithuanians to this Soviet aggression has been nothing short of heroic. This courageous nation has had a long history of fighting off aggressors, and it is this tradition which has been one of the underlying strengths of the resistance to Soviet tyranny. Lithuania has been known to history since 1009, when it was a nation divided into many principalities. Threats from abroad were an important factor in bringing the principalities together into a united state. By the 14th century the boundaries of Lithuania extended into what is now the Byelorussian S.S.R. and the Russian S.F.S.R. In the year 1387, Lithuania was officially proclaimed a Christian state.

One scholar, Clarence Manning, has described Lithuania's role in the Middle Ages as follows:

> The Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe during the Middle Ages. They were able to check the German drive to the East for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and Tartars. They furnished a power and a government behind which the Eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Moscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has a culture, a language, and a heritage that any nation would be proud to claim as its own. It is wrong, terribly wrong, that these people are not allowed to follow their own independent path in life. To judge from the past, however, it is evident that the spirit of courage and liberty which strongly inspires Lithuanians was not broken in the 120 years of Russian occupation; it has not been broken by the present Communist regime; and it will not be broken in the future. On this 47th celebration of their independence, we congratulate Lithuanians on their glorious history as a nation—and offer our sincere hope that Lithuania will again take her rightful place in the ranks of the sovereign states of the world.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues here in commemorating the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

For the unfortunate time being there is no longer, in Lithuania, any of the four freedoms, the freedoms for which the democracies of the world struggled so long and so patiently during the last war and for which their thousands of heroes died or became disabled.

Although we mourn over her present plight there is no cause for surrendering to despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has demonstrated that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumph of any oppressor.

The Christian faith, which, in 1399, defeated the Tartar invasion and saved all Europe from barbarism, is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship. Deep in the heart of every Lithuanian there is an everlasting passion for liberty and freedom which never dies.

Lithuania lives. Lithuania lives in the hearts of her sons and daughters who have survived brutal persecution. Lithuania lives in the hearts of liberty-loving folk the world over. Lithuania lives in her great literature, her splendid history and great traditions, her songs and dances, the deep religious faith of her people, and in their burning devotion to the land of their ancestry.

Lithuania will not perish as long as ideals of freedom and justice and righteousness prevail. Lithuania cannot be destroyed by perfidy and brutality and tyranny.

There will always be a Lithuania—a Lithuania in the hearts of men, a Lithuania in the culture of the peoples, a Lithuania in the history of the world's struggle for freedom, and in due time a Lithuania at the conference table of the world's great family of nations.

For cruel enslavement of a people as devoted to freedom as the Lithuanians, as true to their faith as they, as implacable in their will to escape tyranny as they, is finally impossible. Even so bestial a despotism as Russia will fall of its own evil ways, its dependence upon force and injustice for its power and rule. "The mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small" and however coarse and base the grist, the meal will be justice and truth and honor.

When all the terrible tyranny of her alien conquerors has been exhausted Lithuania will survive and Lithuania will still be living for there is no power that can forever enslave a people who are determined to be free.

Let us then renew our pledges to perseveringly work for the freedom of Lithuania and let us unite in our prayers that the Almighty will see fit to speed that freedom day.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is again time for us in the free world to pay tribute to the independence movement of the Lithuanian people. Forty-seven years ago a proud and independent Lithuania gained freedom from foreign domination when her larger neighbors collapsed in World War I.

The Lithuanians' natural desire for a sense of national identity and independence had never died in the more than 400-year period that the tiny nation had been absorbed, first by Poland, then by Russia.

Enlightened Lithuanian leaders established a progressive constitutional democracy. But the new state could not avoid the great power ambitions that kept Europe in a constant state of turmoil during the period between the two wars. The seeds of democracy fell into troubled soil.

The czarist grip that had been broken in 1917 was only to be replaced 23 years later by a far more potent form of tyranny. The Communists, true to their hatred of independence, absorbed Lithuania into the Soviet Union after making a cynical pact with the Nazis. Next followed a period of Nazi tyranny, followed again by Soviet oppression.

Those of us who enjoy the freedom to pursue our own national independence realize that the spirit of liberty will never disappear among the Lithuanian people. We share their hopes and dreams as the world moves inexorably toward tolerance and diversity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is a remarkable tribute to the indomitability of the human spirit that more than seven centuries of history have not stilled the cry for independence and freedom by the Lithuanian people.

Today we commemorate the 714th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state, the 712th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian kingdom, and the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania in 1918.

These have not been 700 peaceful and happy years. They have been years of torment, turmoil, and trouble for the Lithuanian people. Yet, despite the hardship, these people have stood fast in their defense of freedom.

We all know of the outstanding contributions that have been made to our culture and society by people of Lithuanian ancestry. Today we join with them in commemorating these historic events and express once more our hope that the people of Lithuania will again one day live in peace and justice.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is a most appropriate time for us to be reminded that freedom can never be taken for granted. It is something to be guarded and protected and promoted throughout the world. For our own freedom would not long survive in a world enslaved.

The tiny nation of Lithuania was absorbed into the Soviet Union at the point of a bayonet. All that they had accomplished during their brief period of independence was lost. No longer were they to enjoy the fruits of their own labor. No longer could they elect the people they desired to lead them. No longer did they have the opportunity to develop a society upon the native talents and aspirations of their own kind.

During the Middle Ages Lithuania was strong and independent. She played an important part in the development of European civilization. Her people benefited from a progressive educational system. They enjoyed more personal liberties than peoples in neighboring states. It is tragic that they were not permitted to develop in freedom.

What a contrast to our own birth as a Nation. In 1795 our own infant Nation had an entire continent to explore, settle, and develop. There was no great power at our border waiting to take advantage of any weakness.

In 1795 Lithuania's long period of freedom in association with Poland was brutally ended when Poland was carved up among three greedy neighbors, with Lithuania falling under the domination of czarist Russia.

Russia held sway until forced out by the Germans in 1915. When the new Communist regime in Moscow attempted to regain control of Lithuania they were driven out by Lithuanian and Polish forces. The gallant little nation had withstood the first test of its newly won independence.

But Europe was in turmoil between the two World Wars and Lithuania's neighbors, though defeated in the war, were determined to swallow any nation too small to resist. Soviet Russia, with the agreement of Nazi Germany, incorporated Lithuania into its own totalitarian regime.

This sad history of oppression has not quenched the desire for freedom and national self-determination of the Lithuanian people. We salute them on the 47th anniversary of their independence and dedicate ourselves again to the promotion of freedom for all peoples of the world.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, I introduced a concurrent resolution requesting the President to instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to raise the question of the Baltic States before the United Nations in an effort to obtain early liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation.

Unfortunately, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to whom the resolution was referred for consideration, never took any action on it. I am now reintroducing it in the hope that we may be able to get action on this measure.

Two more years have passed since then, and now we are observing the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. On this day we join with the nearly 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in commemorating the restoration of Lithuania's national independence 47 years ago and to pray for its early liberation from Communist oppression.

Lithuania's history dates back over a period of more than 700 years. Although a small state, it has made lasting contributions to Western culture and civilization over the centuries. On February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania was established and it lasted as a free and sovereign state until June 15, 1940, when the Soviet Union seized the country of more than 3 million people by force of arms and has subjugated it ever since.

During the past quarter of a century the people of Lithuania have been subject to a continuous Soviet reign of terror, ruthless exploitation, destruction of Lithuanian institutions and culture, persecution of religion, and forced exile to Siberia for many Lithuanians. If any free nation of the Western World or any so-called neutralist nation flirting with communism really wishes to know what happens to a people which has the misfortune to fall under the yoke of Communist imperialism, they have but to look at Lithuania. Here is one of the oldest nations in Europe which is gradually being ground to destruction by a power which cannot tolerate small nations and their cultures.

My resolution proposes that the United Nations make the following four requests of the Soviet Union:

First. Withdraw all Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Second. Return all Baltic exiles from Siberian and other slave-labor camps.

Third. Permit the United Nations to conduct free elections in the three Baltic States.

Fourth. Punish those guilty of crimes against the Baltic peoples.

The situation has not changed in the last 2 years and these four requests are still timely and urgent, if the Baltic peoples are to be saved from total annihilation. It is for this reason that I am reintroducing my resolution and urging the committee to schedule early hearings so that the matter can be given wide public attention.

On this day of observance of Lithuania's independence, which has become a sad day in the history of the Lithuanian people, I extend my sincere wishes to all Lithuanian-Americans for the early redemption of their ancestral homeland from Communist domination. We urge them to maintain utmost courage and hope for the future, and may they live to see a free and prosperous Lithuanian people restored on its ancient soil in our lifetime.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, on this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, two indisputable facts ought to be clearly borne in mind. In the first place, we must never forget that Lithuania was once a free and independent nation-state; and, secondly, that Lithuania has been the victim of brutal Communist aggression.

From 1918 to 1940 Lithuania enjoyed the international status of an independent nation-state; world powers, great and small, recognized Lithuania and carried on normal diplomatic relations with her. Lithuanian statesmen, actively participating in international relations, concluded diplomatic engagements with many nations of the world. Lithuania, moreover, played a part of some importance in advancing the cause of world peace by its work as a member of the League of Nations and as a member of other international organizations devoted to the purposes of peace.

On the domestic scene, Lithuanians built a strong and vigorous economic and social order. In cultural achievements they made many significant advances; and in the religious realm, all Lithuanians were free to seek in their own way their religious destiny.

However, Lithuanian independence came to an end in June 1940, when the Soviet Union dispatched its army across the borders, occupied the country, and annexed it to the U.S.S.R. That the Soviet Union was guilty of aggression is unquestioned. By their unwarranted and brutal military invasion, the Soviets had willfully destroyed every contractual engagement concluded between the U.S.S.R. and Lithuania. It is significant to note that in all of these political engagements, the Soviet Union acknowledged and reaffirmed the national independence and territorial integrity of Lithuania. With utter disregard of their pledged word, the Soviets destroyed the Lithuanian Republic.

On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, the free world is reminded once again of the great misfortune that has befallen these people. This anniversary should be a reminder to all free peoples of Communist treachery, especially now when observers generally hold that a detente has been established in Soviet-American relations.

To Lithuanians everywhere, America extends its warmest felicitations, and along with other nations of the free world, expresses the hope that the Communist tyranny they now endure will, in the course of time, dissolve, and the spirit of Lithuania once again be free.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting and proper for democracy's great representative body, the U.S. House of Representatives, to recall the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I say fitting and proper for this body, because to millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain, freedom and democracy are often synonymous with the American House of Representatives.

I realize that all our words, tributes, and remembrances will not undo the generations of suffering of the Lithuanian people, and I further realize that our words today will not give the Soviets, the present masters of Lithuania, a change of heart. The value of our comments today is that of recognition and hope.

We recognize first of all that Lithuania is not free. These people have not forgotten, and neither should we forget. The priceless freedom we have, and take for granted, in this country is made more dear when we recall the history of Lithuania. For centuries the Lithuanian people were under czarist domination. When Russia was split by the Communist revolution and civil war in 1917, the sovereign Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia saw their chance for freedom, and on February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared itself a republic based on democratic institutions.

The people of this valiant little country set about the task of governing themselves and restoring their country to the high state of international prestige they once enjoyed. When the war clouds spread over Europe in 1939 and 1940, Lithuania's powerful neighbor, who has never been known for respecting human rights and democratic institutions, moved in and occupied the country. For 3 years during World War II Lithuania was occupied not by Communist masters, but by Fascist masters. After the war Russia again occupied the country, and announced to the world they had "liberated" the Lithuanians from the Germans.

The United States formally recognized the new nation of Lithuania on July 27, 1922, and I am proud to say, has never given any recognition to the incorporation of that land into the U.S.S.R. Lithuania has never accepted such forcible annexation with the Soviet Union, and the love of liberty has not been smothered by the cruel tactics of the Communists. The plight of that little country is tragic indeed and we sympathize with her. We shall never forget the destruction of human life, the genocide, that was perpetrated upon the Lithuanians by the atheistic Communists and Fascists.

We Americans know and understand the stouthearted Lithuanians. We all appreciate their good character, their love of God, their industry, and their special talents, because so many of them live in America where they have made a very substantial contribution to our country and its culture and have become good citizens of their adopted country. They are worthy of our admiration and esteem.

It is appropriate that we remember the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. By doing so we give expression to our compassion for our fellow human beings and at the same time help to keep the fires burning for idealism of democracy and freedom in Lithuania and in the world.

I join my colleagues in our fervent wish that, though the skies of Lithuania be now dark, the light of freedom will in the not-too-distant future break through and the sun will shine upon that nation and that these sturdy Baltic people will regain their rightful status as a member of the community of free nations.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the battlefronts of freedom are many. In recent months and weeks we have been giving our anxious attention to the situation in South Vietnam. Since 1948, we have stood firm in the defense of West Berlin and its residents. Between 1950 and 1953, the blood of our young men was shed in Korea, and we continue to man defenses in South Korea today. During the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, we repelled an ominous threat to this hemisphere; our policies continue to reflect our implacable hostility toward the subversive Castro regime. For years we have shared our resources with the less fortunate nations of the world in order to help them achieve economic well-being and political stability. Our young people, through the Peace Corps, are sharing their skills and ideals in many foreign lands.

Today, we pause to remember another battlefront of freedom—the small land of Lithuania. Our occasion is the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence—an anniversary that cannot be observed openly and with rejoicing in Lithuania today. For an independent and free Lithuania does not exist today. Lithuania has been forcibly made a part of the Soviet Union. The yoke of imperial Russia was thrown off in 1918 only to be replaced a little more than 20 years later by the more fearful yoke of an empire-hungry Soviet regime. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians have been executed, deported, exiled, and imprisoned. Their only crime was to value the ideals and freedom of their native land. The land of Lithuanians has been subjected to forced collectivization. Their church and their cultural institutions have been trampled upon. Their coast and cities have been invaded by Soviet soldiers and the merchants of economic exploitation.

We learn, however, from the few Westerners who have managed to visit Lithuania that the Lithuanians have not forgotten their former freedom. Their spirit is unconquered. Their hate for the foreign occupier is unyielding. This is why I say that Lithuania is one of the battlefronts of freedom today. We must not forget that their hopes and our hopes are closely linked. The moments we have set aside to observe Lithuanian Independence Day are meaningful for Lithuanians living behind the Iron Curtain and for Americans of

Lithuanian descent; they are meaningful for all Americans.

Mr. **FEIGHAN**. Mr. Speaker, this day provides us with a most appropriate occasion to pay well-deserved tribute to the people of Lithuania for their unfaltering attachment to freedom. The goal of national independence was won by the people of Lithuania 47 years ago today. They employed that era of personal liberty and national independence to regain for ancient Lithuania its full place in the family of nations. During that happy period relations between Lithuania and the United States prospered and grew into a lasting bond of friendship.

But the national independence of our proven and cherished friend, Lithuania, was shattered by the armed forces of Imperial Soviet Russia in the early days of World War II. We are reminded that the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of 1939, which united communism and nazism in common purpose, was the evil instrument which brought an end to Lithuanian national independence. Nor can we forget that the only remaining partner to that international conspiracy, Soviet Russia, now threatens the independence of all sovereign nations.

We observe this day in the House of Representatives as a deliberate means of restating our support for Lithuanian national independence. As a nation we have not recognized the illegal annexation of Lithuania by imperial Russia. I trust we shall never excuse or recognize that act of infamy. Our position should remain as it is today—stanch defenders of the right of the people of Lithuania to their national independence. Remaining firm in that position we shall see the day when independence is restored to an ancient, honored, and peaceful nation.

Mrs. **DWYER**. Mr. Speaker, the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, affords us an important opportunity to reflect upon the purpose of this annual occasion. By commemorating this anniversary, we are honoring not only our fellow Americans of Lithuanian decent but all Americans, regardless of their national heritage, who share the same love of freedom and liberty which has moved Lithuanians everywhere to see their homeland free again.

Freedom is not an accidental quality, to be awarded or withdrawn arbitrarily or capriciously. It belongs, by the very nature with which Almighty God has endowed mankind, to every individual human being. Governments are required by the moral law to respect this freedom and to rule their countries in such a way as to give full scope to the growth and development, in freedom, of the capacities and talents of their people. Governments which deny freedom and which subject their people to the burdens of tyranny violate the law of God and invite the condemnation of the free world.

Freedom has another characteristic, Mr. Speaker. It flourishes only where those who enjoy it take it seriously and strive to protect it and strengthen it and extend its benefits to others. It withers and dies where it is taken for granted, where apathy and disinterest reign, where it is used and exploited only to serve a selfish purpose.

In Lithuania, however, freedom did not wither away. It was stolen. Lithuanians were deprived of their freedom by force of arms. And that condition has been perpetuated by a foreign-supported despotism in gross violation of international law and of the God-given rights of man.

Lithuanians, nevertheless, have not capitulated to tyranny. They have not surrendered. At great sacrifice, they have continued to resist oppression. And in their determination to be free again, to establish once more an independent, truly Lithuanian Government, they have the wholehearted support of their fellow Lithuanians in America and of all Americans who cherish our Nation's heritage.

In proportion to population, Mr. Speaker, few if any, of the countries of the world have contributed so importantly to the growth and development and strength of the United States as has this small Baltic State.

As one who represents a congressional district which includes among its residents a substantial number of people of Lithuanian ancestry, I speak from personal knowledge that Union County, N.J., is a better place in which to live because of their presence as our neighbors and fellow citizens.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we shall not abandon Lithuania, nor forget her sister states of Latvia and Estonia. We who represent our people in the Congress of the United States are proud to rededicate ourselves to the noble objective of the independence of the Baltic States and the freedom of people everywhere.

As a part of my remarks on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the text of resolutions adopted unanimously by members of the Lithuanian American Council of Linden, N.J., on February 7, 1965.

The resolution follows:

Whereas 47 years ago, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was formally declared a free and independent state by the Council of Lithuania; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania enjoyed an independent existence until occupied by the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940, and to this day the country and its people are suffering under the tyrannical yoke of communism; and

Whereas contrary to the false pretense of standing for complete freedom and independence of all nations, demanding an end to all forms of colonialism—the Soviet Union continues to occupy and rule Lithuania and other captive European nations; and

Whereas the Americans of Lithuanian descent hope that Lithuania will again regain the rights of freedom and liberty as a sovereign nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That all Americans of Lithuanian descent are determined and united to uphold the efforts of the Lithuanian people to regain their independence and freedom; and

Resolved, That it is our hope that the representatives of our Government will firmly continue to maintain the policy of nonrecognition of the incorporation by force of Lithuania in the Soviet Union; and

Resolved, That in advancement of the program for world peace and freedom special emphasis be laid upon the necessity to hasten the liberation of the captive people of the Baltic States; and further be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Adlai Stevenson; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE and the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS; to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable FLORENCE P. DWYER and to the Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

VLADAS TURSA,
President.
STASYS VAICIUNAS,
Secretary.
MARGARITA SAMATAS,
Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives today in reaffirming our resolution urging the freedom of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

These gallant nations have endured the yoke of communism for too long. They deserve the right to self-determination and to personal liberty for their citizens. Our recognition of their condition gives notice before the world that America rejects and repudiates Soviet imperialism wherever it is manifested.

Mr. Voldemars Korsts, special assistant to the President of the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States, recently sent me a memorandum defining in precise and unequivocal terms the present plight of the Baltic States. Mr. Korsts and this distinguished committee urge the United States to seek a redress of these grievances before the United Nations.

I have joined with many of my distinguished colleagues in introducing a concurrent resolution to request the President to ask that this entire question be brought before the United Nations. It is my hope this resolution will be acted upon favorably by the House and Senate in the near future. Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and all the countries now forced to live under Communist domination deserve to have their case presented in the open forum of the world.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Korsts stirring memorandum follows:

THE BALTIC STATES—ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA—HAVE A RIGHT TO BE FREE AND INDEPENDENT

World War II brought an end to fascism, which preached superiority of some nations and races, and at the same time enslaved others. A United Nations doctrine was then brought to life; it promised liberty and freedom to all nations. The United Nations, however, made the mistake of not following it up. The Communists were allowed a free hand, resulting in the loss of many free nations behind the Iron Curtain. Thus did the Soviet Union—and, later, China—become colonial powers.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were the first victims of communism during World War II. Those three Baltic nations have inhabited the Baltic region for thousands of years. They had rejoiced in their freedom and independence, and were democratic and peace-loving peoples, with an old and valuable cultural heritage all their own.

In June of 1940 they were invaded and occupied by Soviet armed forces. Duly elected and popular governments were deprived of their constitutional rights and the leaders of democratic forces arrested and often summarily executed. Moscow-appointed emissaries set up puppet governments, which carried out any and all orders from above. What followed then was a shocking line of Communist secret police terror, and the series of deportations undertaken by the Soviets in 1941. The fact that in June of that year more than 200,000 persons—out of less than 6 million—were deported to slave labor camps is well known, as are the many postwar deportations. Since then other nationals have been settled in the Baltic region, with the clear goal of erasing the original inhabitants from history.

Living under heavy terror, the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been robbed of the usual constitutional rights: the freedom of speech, assembly, and the practicing of religion. Even when conditions improve temporarily in Russia, they do not change in the Baltic States. Practically, they are enslaved. Despite all this, their desire for freedom has not been crushed. They are waiting silently and grimly for the promises of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Charter to be fulfilled. They are desperate, because they know that, unless help is coming they will be scattered and destroyed.

We must help the Baltic peoples rid themselves of the Communist regimes in their countries.

The outright annexations of the territories of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union should be openly discussed and a demand should be made for the prompt reestablishing of their rights. The people of these countries are as fully entitled to their rights of self-determination as are the peoples of Africa, Asia, and the Americas: if some colonies are freed, why not all?

The Government of the United States has refused to recognize the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. Every President since 1940 has reaffirmed this; yet, at the same time we must recognize that very little has been done to liberate the Baltic peoples. What we are talking about here is not a question of the right of self-rule of these nations, since this has been established beyond any doubt. The question is rather one of a practicable method for restoring their independence. The select committee of the House of Representatives (83d Cong.) to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, after holding 50 public hearings, during which the testimony of 335 persons was taken, made a number of recommendations. The committee stated that our moves should be guided by "the moral and political principles of the American Declaration of Independence." The present generation of Americans, the committee suggested, should recognize that the bonds which many Americans have with the enslaved nations are a great asset to the struggle against communism and that the Communist danger should be abolished and stopped during the present generation. The only hope of avoiding a new world war, according to the committee, lies in a "bold, positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world."

To this we might add that such an approach would prevent a Communist takeover of more and more nations with an ultimate danger of the same fate to this country.

The work of the committee has been recognized and many concurrent resolutions, calling for freedom for the captive peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, have been presented to the Senate and the House. Such resolutions have requested the President of the United States to bring the question of the Baltic States before the United Nations, to ask a ruling for:

1. The withdrawal of all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and control from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

2. The return of all Baltic exiles from Siberia and other parts of the Soviet Union, where they have been deported by force or by the so-called voluntary work assignments.

3. The conduct of free elections in the three countries, under direct supervision of the United Nations.

Let us show the courage to call the Communists to order, since theirs are the only real colonial empires left.

Today and not tomorrow is the time to do this. The suffering and subjugation of any nation must spur us to action. By maintaining the rights of others to be free, we confirm our own unyielding will to survive in freedom and in peace.

Therefore we urge you to act for the course of freedom and introduce and support such resolutions. The United Nations Charter provides the legal framework; the history and the heritage of the United States provides the courage and incentive; the brutally enslaved Baltic nations provide the reason for such action. The passage of resolutions calling for the restorement of independence of the Baltic States would be an important step not only for the freedom of these victims of communism, but a ray of hope for all captive peoples and a foundation for lasting peace with justice and honor.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, few nations of the world have been forced to live longer under the heels of tyrants than Lithuania. For more than a century, her people were suppressed by the czars of Russia.

When Lithuania was finally freed on February 16, 1918, her people proved that they could achieve far more in the way of human progress in a short space of time than any comparable small nation the world has known.

Even in the tragically brief span of 22 years, the Lithuanian people were able to establish a growing economy, build a sound education system, and provide hitherto unknown opportunities for themselves and their neighbors.

Lithuania set an example for the free world. But when the Soviet Union sent its forces into the country in 1940, under the guise of protecting it from Nazi Germany, the struggle for a genuinely democratic society was brought to an end.

The Soviet Union asked the world to believe, then, that its occupation was only temporary. That, as the world has seen, was a lie.

Today, as it has for the past quarter of a century, Lithuania lives with the yoke of an alien government about her neck. Her people, whose spirit had flourished in freedom, have proved time and time again that their thirst for liberty is undiminished.

The United States has very prudently withheld recognition of the Soviet takeover of Lithuania. This country and all its people join freemen everywhere in the fervent prayer that one day liberty will be restored to the proud land of Lithuania.

I consider it a high honor to join with my distinguished colleague and fellow Pennsylvanian, Congressman FLOOD, in paying tribute to this tragically suppressed small nation and its people.

Here in America we have been fortunate in having many Lithuanians as naturalized citizens. They have come here, not merely to escape tyranny and dictatorship, but to contribute their own vitality and spirit and skills to the building of this great Nation.

I am proud of the contributions Americans of Lithuanian ancestry have made to my own district and I join with them in commemorating the independence of the land their fathers once called their own.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I deem it an honor and a grave responsibility to join my colleagues today in observing the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence Day.

As freemen, and as Members of the greatest legislative body in the world, we can speak out and we must speak out on the tragedy which has, for so long, pressed down on the peoples of Lithuania.

In a world where the fate of small nations is often decided by forces over which they have no control, Lithuania is a prime example of how a small, independent nation can be crushed by tyranny. More than once, in the course of its history, Lithuania has been occupied by foreign tyrants. This history began in A.D. 1009, nearly 500 years before the discovery of America. One must hope that a people of such character and sustenance, a people who in their 22 years of freedom during this century adopted a democratic form of government, must in the end prevail.

The late Winston Churchill once wrote:

> Laws, just or unjust, may govern men's actions. Tyrannies may restrain or regulate their words. The machinery of propaganda may pack their minds with falsehoods. But the soul of man thus held in trance, or frozen in a long night, can be awakened by a spark coming from God knows where. People in bondage need not despair.

By paying tribute to Lithuania today, we are sustained by its history and its many achievements. And we help sustain the people of Lithuania in their hopes for ultimate deliverance.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the 16th of February it has become customary in this House of Representatives to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania and to their nation that had on this day won its independence.

It is fitting that we should commemorate this occasion, because we Americans should never become so taken up with the busy affairs of our national and international life that we cannot take at least a moment to pay our respects to a heroic people. In so doing we keep alive the idea that Lithuania was an independent country and that it was a victim of Soviet treachery. But we also keep alive within our own national tradition the supreme ideal of our commitment to self-determination for all peoples.

During the interwar period Lithuania had been an established, viable nation-state. Diplomatic relations had been established with other nations of the world, and in the League of Nations, Lithuania had done her part in maintaining world peace. In internal matters the Lithuanians had created a vigorous economic order. The social aspects of Lithuanian life were commendable, and culturally the nation flourished. And, of course, politically the Lithuanians charted their own destiny as they saw fit.

The point to make here is simply this: Lithuanians had proved their capacity to rule their own nation; they had won the respect and admiration of the world; they had a right to be proud of their achievements as a nation. This being true, what rationalization can there be for the Soviet conquest other than its compulsive drive to expand the borders of communism. This is a thought we must all bear in mind during these days of so-called peaceful coexistence.

To the Lithuanian people here in the United States, in Western Europe, and in their own homeland, I, threfore, extend my warmest congratulations on this their day of national commemoration. May they be given the inner strength to bear their oppression manfully, and let me say that we all look forward to that day when the principle of self-determination will be a respected universal principle for all mankind.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanian Independence Day is the most significant Lithuanian national holiday. It symbolizes the culmination of their long and ceaseless struggle, often against forbidding odds, for their national goal. Its annual celebration signifies that, even though more than two decades ago Lithuanians lost their independence and have been living under the worst of tyrannies, they still cling to their ideals, freedom, and independence. Naturally, one of the best and perhaps the most effective way to keep the spirit of freedom alive among the Lithuanians is by observing and celebrating their independence day.

On February 16, 1918, as the Lithuanian people asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence, they saw the dawn of a new, brighter, and better day for them; in their freedom a new era of peace and joy was ushered in for them in their homeland. And they felt that it was up to them to make the very best of the opportunity thus offered to them, proving to their friends that they were worthy of the reward, of their national independence. Today the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day evokes memories of joy and happiness, of peace and prosperity that was the lot of Lithuania during the interwar years, until all that was ruined and they were robbed of their freedom by the greedy men in the Kremlin. On the observance of the anniversary of that historic event we are fully aware that for more than two decades Lithuanians have not known freedom. But we are heartened by the fact that they fervently cherish and nurse their love for freedom and independence.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, during this crucial period when the free world is engaged in a supreme effort to prevent the spread of world communism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, we often tend to forget those courageous peoples in parts of Europe who have lost this struggle and have succumbed to the forces of oppression and tyranny.

Included in this assemblage of conquered nations are the gallant Lithuanians who celebrated their 47th anniversary of independence on February 16. This independence was unfortunately short lived, lasting only 22 years.

The independent Lithuania was created as a sovereign state at the termination of the first world holocaust of this century and was crushed at the beginning of the second major world conflict.

The stoic Lithuanians, however, were not defeated in spirit nor in their resolve to regain their independence. For over 125 years prior to their initial independence, they had suffered almost virtual slavery at the hands of several European powers but their desire, during this time, for freedom continuously prevailed. On June 23, 1941, these courageous people staged a revolution and declared themselves sovereign. They were, however, ignored and were occupied by the Nazis for 2 years until in the summer of 1944, they were once again occupied by Soviet troops and oppression. The Soviet powers then attempted a semblance of legitimacy by their typical ruse in proclaiming Lithuania to be a component republic of the Soviet Union.

The free world, however, can easily see through this sham and is fully cognizant of the deep and continuing desire of the Lithuanians to once again become a free and sovereign state and to take their rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians only desire to live in peace and freedom and to pursue, once again, the process of nation-building that was so ruthlessly suppressed. These are industrious and hard working people who, if given the opportunity, could build a strong and prosperous nation.

Thus, as I am honored to join with other Americans and all freedom loving people in celebrating the independence of Lithuania. Let us reaffirm our determination to work for that day when the Lithuanians, as well as all enslaved peoples in the other Baltic and Eastern European states, may throw off the yoke of tyranny and once again live as free men and women, enjoying the freedom which they so richly deserve and working side by side with all free nations to create a better and more prosperous world.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, independence day celebrations have different significance to different countries. The meanings such celebrations embody and the messages they convey vary greatly. Those fortunate peoples who have seldom had to struggle for their freedom in their homeland do not generally celebrate their independence days. Others who have taken their freedom for granted and have a rather vague idea about its meaning and significance celebrate it in a perfunctory manner and let it go at that. But with certain peoples it is a different, serious, and solemn matter; for them it is their national holiday, and as such they celebrate it with due solemnity and proper decorum. This is particularly so with peoples who in the past had their freedom and enjoyed national independence, but through some freakish turn of fortune, they had lost their independence and had become subjects of foreign overlords in their homelands, and then once more they regained their independence. To them the celebrations of independence days seem to be of immense significance. This is true in the case of the Lithuanian peoples.

As the result of the Russian revolution of 1917 Lithuanians attained their national goal by proclaiming their independence on February 16, 1918, and then set up the Lithuanian Republic. Then for about 22 years they toiled, and enjoyed their freedom, and of course celebrated annually their independence day in their independent country. Since the outbreak of the last war, however, everything went wrong as far as small states in Eastern Europe were concerned, and then began the Lithuanian tragedy Very early in the war they lost their independence and were enslaved by the Soviet agents. Thus for more than 25 years these people have been deprived of their most elementary rights, their freedom, and today they are suffering under Communist tyranny. On the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence day we all hope and pray for their freedom.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. On that day in 1918, the hopes and aspirations of over four centuries were realized. That the spirit of the Lithuanian people had not flagged long before is a remarkable tribute to their indomitable will and their craving for freedom and self-determination. That they demonstrated, after 120 years of alien rule, a great capacity for democratic government, for cultural achievement, and for responsibility in world affairs, makes it all the more painful to find their nation once more subjected to foreign tyranny.

One might wonder at the apparent viability of the Lithuanian people, brutalized as they are by the Soviet Union; it might be reasoned that this suppression would be unbearable galling because Lithuania has a traditional reverence for political and religious freedom. However, let no man be deluded by the absence of a bloody revolution since the country's annexation by Russia in 1940. History shows that Lithuanian nationalism has not always manifested itself in armed revolts. For instance, in the 16th century, recognizing the common threat from the east, the Lithuanians reluctantly concluded a political union with Poland. However, they were careful to retain their own government, having its own treasury, armed forces, and law courts. And the distinct and rich Lithuanian culture was carefully preserved, and actually enjoyed its greatest development during the political amalgamation with Poland. True, this courageous people revolted often against czarist oppressors, in the full knowledge that if unsuccessful they would experience even greater cruelty and reprisals. But the Lithuanians have an unusual capacity for passive resistance, and it is this quality which sustains them now, and in which the Kremlin can find no solace or comfort.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED: KING-ANDERSON OFFERS LITTLE AND AT A HEAVY COST—HERLONG-CURTIS ELDERCARE HELPS THE AGED WITH HIGH MEDICAL EXPENSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced H.R. 3728 a couple of weeks ago I was asked by television newcasters whether this was designed to defeat medicare. I replied that I did not know what "medicare" was, other than a label, and that I was not interested in beating anything. I was interested in solving the remaining problems that need solution in the field of health care for the aged, and I thought H.R. 3728 would accomplish this result.

LET'S TELL THE TRUTH

It seems the order of the day to have bills labeled "truth in." There is the "truth-in-lending" bill, the "truth-in-packaging" bill. I think we need truth in labeling bills because there is so much untruth in the labels used today, beginning with the two "truth in" bills I have mentioned.

Now, what is medicare? What is the King-Anderson bill, King-Anderson No. 1 version, or King-Anderson No. 10 version now before the Ways and Means Committee?

Is the Ways and Means Committee which began meeting on January 27—and is still meeting to consider the King-Anderson bill—studying something or is it merely passing time? If it is studying something, what is it studying? If it is not studying something, why does it not just vote out "medicare," or this latest version of the King-Anderson bill? There are ample votes for the label.

The answer is, there are serious difficulties involved in getting at the problems in health care for the aged, not the least of which are identifying honestly what the problems are and what they are not. H.R. 1, the latest administration-sponsored version of the King-Anderson bill, is 150 pages long. What do these pages reveal, just words or problems?

RUBBERSTAMP

The basic issue involved in the Ways and Means deliberations on the problem of health care for the aged is not this social problem, important as it may be. The basic issue involved is whether Congress is to live up to the concept of being a study and deliberative body or is to be merely a rubberstamp to pass out legislation which the executive branch of the Government has decided is good for the people. Is Congress job to look beneath the label of proposals to be certain that what is in the bottle has been properly described on the label? As I put it to the newscasters, are the contents under the pretty label sarsaparilla, colored water, or poison?

Is the process of legislation merely to be one where the President decides what is good for the people and then, with his ability to utilize the news media, to develop popular support for this program, through attractive labeling, packaging, and advertising, thus forcing the program through the Congress? This is what increasingly is going on. Congress has been all too often pictured as a body of obstructionists, not students, unconcerned about the welfare of the people; as a body which must be pressured to do the right thing for the people. This is particularly the label given to the so-called conservatives in the Congress.

Now, are conservatives students, interested in the people and in solving social problems, or are they truly merely obstructionists living in the past, hoping for the good old days to return, and out of touch with modern reality? I am a conservative so, of course, I resent this as a false label.

If the news media had in the past or would now report the testimony and cross examination of the witnesses now appearing before the Ways and Means Committee on health care for the aged, the public would have some basis to make up their own minds on whether we have been or are now studying, or twiddling our thumbs. It is fairly easy to determine whether the questions posed by the committee members are important or merely time consuming. If the news media would report the problems as they are raised, studied and being debated, many people in the general public with knowledge in specific areas could assist us in coming up with better answers. As it is, the public can contribute little or nothing to the solution of the problems, nor can many Members of the Congress who are equally in the dark do much to help those of us in the committee.

THE DILEMMA—HIGH TAXES AND LOW BENEFITS

Two problems face the administration as it seeks to press through H.R. 1, and these two problems clearly reveal themselves to be two horns going in opposite directions, a dilemma.

I asked Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen, if he and his associates had been in conference with the President's Council of Economic Advisers and the economists in the Treasury Department about the economic impact that might result if we were to increase the payroll tax from a $4,800 base to a $5,600 base and raise the rate to where, in 1972, it would be well over 10 percent of payroll, probably 11 percent. He answered:

> Indeed we have, Congressman CURTIS, we have been in rather constant conference with them during the months of November and December on this matter. This is one reason we have cut back on the benefits in the bill.

Cut back, I might state, on the benefits in the bill which was in conference between the House and the Senate at the time the Congress adjourned last year. This is one horn of the dilemma.

A PUBLIC OUTCRY

Two Congressmen representing big city areas who are committed to voting out the label, whatever is in the package—and, incidentally, who attend practically none of the Ways and Means sessions—have said to me, "We are really going to catch it when H.R. 1 becomes law because the people think there are great benefits in the bill for them. When they find out the benefits are so limited and that they will get little or nothing, they will blame us."

NOT COVERED—THE COSTLY ILLNESS

This is true, the benefits in the bill are strictly limited to people over 65 and they will cover, on an average, less than 25 percent of the medical expenses of a person over 65 experiencing a costly illness. The real problem for people over 65 is what we call catastrophic medical illness. Indeed, the problem for all families is not the average medical expenses a year—this average for people over 65 runs about $350 to $360—but the prolonged illness which runs into thousands of dollars of expense. H.R. 1 limits its benefits to 60 days in the hospital because—the Health, Education, and Welfare Department spokesmen say—only 3 to 5 percent of people over 65 stay in the hospital beyond 60 days. My rejoinder is, but these are the very ones who have the major problem. These are the cases that anyone can recite, and you yourselves recite them, that create the social problem. A catastrophic illness can break even a family of fairly well to do resources. H.R. 1 does nothing for these people—they are to be taken care of by Kerr-Mills and our present welfare programs even if H.R. 1 becomes law.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM? WHAT ARE THE REMEDIES?

The problems of health care for the aged largely arise because of the success, not the failure or inadequacy, of the health care system in our society. Our people are living 10 to 15 years longer than was anticipated at the time of their birth. The problem is an economic problem, not a medical problem. Medically the problem could be solved, by just not advancing any further in developing drugs, medical equipment, surgical techniques, medical knowledge; leveling off on our medical progress until our economies catch up with us. Or, just go back 30 years to the state of medical knowledge then. People would not have to finance an extra 10 to 15 years of life. It is important to point this out, because there are arguments advanced that the United States is behind the times because it is the only developed economy in the world which does not have a comprehensive governmental program for taking care of the medical costs of its people. This is true but, on the other hand, the United States, aside from having a topnotch health care system probably the best in the world, is the Mecca for the medical scholar. This is where the scientific breakthroughs into the unknown are occurring. I argue that it is not by accident that innovation occurs where freedom exists and that it is damped where the benevolent but deadening hand of the powerful central political mechanism has been permitted to intervene.

If the problem is economic, what is its solution? I have argued that the solution lies in a three-pronged thrust on the part of all our society, not just the governmental sector. First, it lies in having available adequate low-cost facilities for our older population. There still are not sufficient safe, healthy, modern, economic, and therefore, low-cost nursing homes and other type living quarters for people over 65. I say still because, in 1960, I was able to have enacted into law an FHA guarantee program for the construction of private nursing homes which met these criteria. I tried to persuade lending institutions to lend money to have these facilities built, only to be told that these were "single purpose structures," which they are, but I argued "a purpose which will be with us for decades to come." Failing in my appeal to the private sector, I sought to utilize the political mechanism to accomplish what I thought was needed to meet this important aspect of the social problem. I am happy to report that since the bill has become law we have built approximately 100,000 new nursing home beds and now most of this building is being done without the governmental guarantee because the private lenders have seen that this is a good economic and social investment. The rate of building new nursing home beds is probably now close to 50,000 a year. In 1957 the average member of the American Nursing Home Association operated only 18 beds. 1964 data shows the average member now has a facility averaging 91 beds. I might add, I got little, or no help, in this matter from the HEW officials. I am happy to state, however, the Forand bill of 1960, which did not cover nursing home benefits, was amended with HEW approval to include them, and the subsequent versions of medicare, King-Anderson No. 1 through No. 10, have included this important area.

Second. We still need more people with nursing and medical skills, particularly of the "home care" variety, the Visiting Nurse technique. Much is being done in the private sector, but not enough. Since 1917, we have had a Federal aid to vocational education program—woefully obsolete, I might add, because its main thrust was to train people in agricultural skills. Through recent legislation, a number of interested Congressmen and myself were able to extend the vocational education program to include training for practical nursing. Again, I am happy to report, the more recent versions of medicare include provisions for home care treatment. The conservatives do have their impact from time to time.

Third. We still need a wider coverage of health insurance, with better quality and variety. Primarily we need more catastrophic health insurance to take care of the major medical expenses which is a dangerous risk to which all families are subject. We also should further concentrate on prepaid health insurance—that is, health insurance the premiums for which are prepaid during the working years so that at the time of retirement this matter is largely out of the person's budget.

NOT INSURANCE

H.R. 1 does not provide prepaid health insurance, and those who claim it does are putting a false label on their product. Prepaid insurance of any sort requires creating a fund into which these prepaid funds go. This fund should be invested. There is no fund created by H.R. 1. The term "prepayment" is sometimes used to describe ordinary term health insurance—it means you prepay against the risk that you may have a medical bill in that year. This is not true prepayment. Furthermore, H.R. 1 does not even have that kind of prepayment. Under H.R. 1, persons will pay a payroll tax during their working years but will gain no benefits until they reach the age of 65. Their "insurance" then will not be paid for by the funds they have been paying in, because those "funds" will have already been paid out; but—hopefully—their "insurance" will be paid with the payroll taxes that the next generation will then be currently paying. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare makes no bones about this. This is not insurance as the the general public understands insurance, the contracting for and the quality of which is regulated strictly by the 50 State insurance commissioners. It is social-insurance, and the hyphen must always be used to keep the label honest. This "social-insurance" depends for its actuarial soundness on its being compulsory and its proponents argue that it must also be practically universal in the society. It can be compulsory only through utilizing the powers of Government, and yet one generation cannot, under our form of government, or, indeed, from any practical standpoint, bind another generation. Thirty years from now a Congress representing the constituency of that day could decide not to pursue such a program further, and there would be no funds to pay for the health costs of those then over 65. The only reasons it needs to be practically universal, however, is to avoid the unfavorable contrast it would experience as the result of programs in the private sector.

RAPID INSURANCE GROWTH

To further the development of true health insurance programs three things must still be pushed.

First. Private insurance companies must continue the overall rapid pace of the past decade of covering people over 65 with health insurance. Ten years ago only 25 percent of our older people had any health insurance. Today over 60 percent of people over 65 are covered. This is at an even faster rate than the rapid rate of coverage of people under 65. Ten years ago 60 percent of people under 65 were covered; in 1963 the figure was over 79 percent. The 1964 figure will be close to 82 percent. The present momentum will keep the 60-percent figure of those over 65 rising, because over 80 percent of those now reaching 65 are covered by health insurance and those passing on are from groups with less than 30 percent coverage. The HEW officials, always on the negative side of progress in this field, ignore the progress but when presented with it respond by saying, "But the coverage is limited and inadequate," or that the rate of increased coverage might taper off. I daresay as we come close to a 100-percent coverage the rate will level out. They are correct however, in suggesting further improvement is needed in adequacy of coverage; however, again they ignore the progress and the innovation which is bound to produce further great progress in the adequacy of the coverage. The best test of adequacy of coverage is to be found in the annual figures of the amount of dollars health insurance companies have paid out in benefits. Ten years ago it was a little over $1 billion. Today the figure is $7 billion. In other words, not only have more people been covered by health insurance at an increasing rate, the quality and extent of their coverage has been increasing at an even more rapid rate.

Second. Catastrophic health insurance, which is increasingly becoming available on the market, must be further developed. Mainly, we must tell people that it exists. Here the negative approach of the government officials of HEW has been particularly obstructive, because not only have they failed to help in spreading the glad tidings, they have hampered its spreading. Many health insurance policies on the market now cover medical costs of $15,000 and more, if a person wants it, on a comprehensive basis for all age groups. However, the cost of catastrophic health insurance is very reasonable. One carrier's premiums range from $100 to $140 a year, depending on the deductible feature. This insurance can be sold for this low premium because, although the case of the lingering and costly illness is a constant dread to almost all of us, the incidence of it occurring is remote. This is the high-cost-low-incidence-type risk which lends itself well to the insurance principle. Actually lingering illnesses are more prolonged when experienced by people under 65 than people over 65 because of their greater overall resiliency. Furthermore, people over 65 seldom have dependents like people under 65. Catastrophic health insurance, however, is needed by all age groups—those over 65 as well as those under 65.

Third. The greatest area for further movement, however, is in the prepaid insurance field. I refer to true prepaid insurance where the premiums for the years after 65 are paid for during the working years, say from 20 to 65. The additional premium cost to pay for the future premiums can be low for three reasons: First, it is 10 to 15 years of premium paid for over a period of 45 years; second, not all people in the group will reach 65, so all who do reach that age gain from the actuarial tables. The people who do not reach 65, of course, have had the protection that they might; and, third, the prepaid moneys are invested in the living economy and over a period of 45 years. The return on this investment, largely in equities, compounded, will take care of two-thirds of the cost of the premiums. The great limitation on prepaid insurance of any sort, health or retirement, is the unfortunate record of governments generally in controlling inflation—keeping the purchasing power of the dollar constant. However, proper investment of the funds in equities can minimize the incidence of inflation. By correcting our Federal income tax laws, so we do not tax this inflation as if it were a capital gain, which, in truth, it is not, we could improve this protective investment device.

The Government can never offer true prepaid insurance because prepaid insurance presupposes creating a fund which is invested as I have described. Government can only invest in what is really a sterile investment, Government bonds, not in equities, not in real estate, not in the living and growing economy. Government bonds, we must remember, are primarily the result of military expenditures, current not capital expenditures, necessary, but economically sterile, preserving wealth but not promoting economic growth and, so, not able to share in it.

In 1962, I was able to bring about the passage of a law which moved prepaid health insurance forward considerably. This law permits our labor-management pension plans to include health insurance for the beneficiaries in their plans without losing their Federal corporate income tax exemption. There are over $75 billion in the reserve funds of these plans now, invested largely in equities, for the benefit of 25 million employees. The recent autoworkers contracts include health insurance for the retirement years of their workers. The funds to back up this contractual commitment are derived from the principle of prepayment and investment.

H.R. 1 will badly damage, if not actually destroy, the development of prepaid health insurance. In the autoworkers contracts are provisions for abandoning this progress and relying upon H.R. 1 if it becomes law.

IN THE MEANTIME

In the meantime, to try to solve the problem of those people who have been born too soon, as it were, to gain the benefits of the innovation which is coming about so rapidly and which will soon close the gap, in complete coverage of our people with health insurance, two major programs have been instituted.

First. The various Connecticut 65 plans which offer health insurance, primarily of the catastrophic type, to people over 65 without a medical examination and permit no cancellation. Twenty States have moved to suspend the antitrust laws so the private insurance companies can pool to make available to their older people this type of protection. However, even though the premiums for these policies run around $120 for the catastrophic part, there are some people who have difficulty meeting the premium; there are others who do not know about the availability of these programs or are not in an area where they can take advantage of them.

I think it is essential to pin one point down firmly if we can to permit no further equivocation, if we are to understand the problem that faces us.

ZEALOTS HURT U.S. IMAGE

All people in need in this country are provided for and this includes, of course, people over 65. They are provided for under the welfare programs. Therefore, in the discussions of what we might do in the field of health care for the aged, we are not talking about people who are not provided for. There are none. We are talking about how we can improve the programs we now have for them and for the entire society. In an attempt to dispel some of the demagoguery that has grown up around this subject of health care for the aged, I have stated that I know of no one in our society, rich or poor, young or old, who is not receiving adequate health care. If anyone knows of a person over 65—I have said over and over again—please call the matter to my attention, because there has been a mistake or an oversight, and I can direct that person to a program which will take care of him or her. Furthermore, by looking at the program on a specific case basis, we can find some true areas where improvement is needed. I first issued this public challenge many years ago, and I have repeated it often, and I repeat it now. There have been no takers. Certainly, we know this is true because whenever a case does occur, through error or ignorance, it hits the front pages of our newspaper immediately, as it should. However, I might point out that people abroad do not know this to be the truth and the demagogs, in their zeal to promote their pet theories to solve social problems, which in most instances study reveals they have failed to identify and to analyze properly, have badly hurt our image abroad. By promoting this false picture of need and neglect in the United States they have to some degree discouraged the leaders of backward societies where 90 percent of their people are in abject need to follow the path of freedom and hard work which lies at the base of our system to obtain a better life and to adopt the Communist philosophy of deadening individual initiative and so lessening the total work performed in the society.

TAKE CARE OF THOSE IN NEED

Yes, the question has been rather, how can we improve the programs we presently have for the people over 65 who did not have the programs that are coming into existence, available to them during their earning years? In coming up with an answer, we developed what is known as the Kerr-Mills Act. Note the attack on Kerr-Mills by those who seek to promote the King-Anderson bill; gone is the pretense that conservatives have no programs—the attack is against this affirmative program, and it has been vicious, untrue and unfair. Now, what does Kerr-Mills do? Does it require a demeaning needs test to qualify? Kerr-Mills does require a needs test, because it is an expansion of the old-age assistance program which, like all Government welfare programs, is financed by general revenue and, therefore, must have a means test. Is it not remarkable that the attack on "means test" per se which exist in all our welfare programs—housing, aid to dependent children, veterans, Appalachia, or whatever—has been confined to the means test in Kerr-Mills? Actually, the basic thrust of the Kerr-Mills Act is to liberalize the means test which already exist in the old-age assistance programs. The theory behind the MAA program of the Kerr-Mills Act is this: We know people over 65 who are in need, who are "on relief," are being taken care of. However, we also surmise that there are some older families not on relief, who if they experience a major medical bill might have to go on relief. They might be forced to cash in their savings, even cut in on their pensions or have to sell their homes. We do not want this to have to happen, we want to keep them off relief, for humane reasons and also to save the Government money. So Kerr-Mills says, in effect, to the States, you can say to these people, "If you experience a major medical expense you can bring in these bills and we will pay them all, not just 25 percent of them, if that is what is necessary, so you will not have to cash in your savings or sell your home or to go on relief."

ADMINISTRATION ATTACKS

The administration has throughout denigrated and minimized the impact of Kerr-Mills. The cries even as late as last year were that the States were not implementing Kerr-Mills, although little work was done by these same people to encourage the use and development of Kerr-Mills. This cry is little heard today, 1965, because now all but eight States—regretfully including Missouri—have implemented the MAA program of Kerr-Mills. The States adopted this program, I might add, at twice the rate—36 States in 4 years—they adopted the "medical vendor program"—36 States in 8 years—which was the great reform of old-age assistance program in 1950, and now in force in all 50 States.

THE HERLONG-CURTIS APPROACH

My new bill, H.R. 3728, supported by the AMA and other groups interested in solving the still existing problems in health care for the aged, seeks to carry the Kerr-Mills principle one step further. It says: "Let us get health matters out of the welfare departments and put them in the health departments of the States, if we can. Let the health officials handle medical problems of the people not on relief but whom medical costs otherwise might force on relief." My bill would permit health insurance policies to be purchased for older people who cannot afford the premiums. Do not wait until the costs of a catastrophic illness hits them. Under my proposal, the States with Federal matching funds, would finance all or part of the cost of health insurance policies for the elderly depending on their income, and those with higher incomes could purchase the policies. Taxpayers would be permitted a full tax deduction for out-of-pocket expenses for medical care and for health insurance premiums. Deductions also are provided for supplying health insurance or medical care for aged dependents.

BASIC DANGER OF KING-ANDERSON

The dangers of H.R. 1, aside from the fact that it fails to properly identify the problems of the older people and so fails to relate its benefits to their problems, are serious and many of them are incorrigible.

First, by overselling its benefits in order to promote its passage, great damage is likely to occur by people dropping their present health insurance programs thinking that now they are covered. Furthermore, there is going to be a very difficult problem on the part of the health insurance companies and pension plan managers in restructuring their present extensive and usually comprehensive programs to fit in with the obsolete approach taken in H.R. 1. The thrust of health insurance today is toward comprehensive policies, that is, policies that do not require the beneficiary to single out what is a drug charge, what is a hospital charge, what is a doctor's charge, and so forth, if it is a medical cost, the insurance policy covers it. H.R. 1 goes backward many years to what are largely obsolete-type policies by separating out that which is hospital charges from all other medical charges, drug bills, doctor's fees—indeed, all but hospital charges are excluded from the bill.

Second, we have a serious problem in increased health insurance premiums resulting from what is called overinsurance, people who are covered by two or three health policies collecting the same medical costs more than once. These people make money out of it and, in effect, raise the cost of the premiums that other people have to pay; these people make money out of going to the hospital, even for a rest. In all other insurance fields it is against the law and public policy to overinsure and, if a person is overinsured, it is unlawful for him to collect more than the amount of the insurable risk he has experienced. To illustrate the point, in fire insurance it was found that overinsurance encouraged arson—a person owning a $15,000 building insured it with three different companies for a total of $45,000. Such a person could make $30,000 by burning the building down except for the State laws which now say, under these circumstances the three insurance companies must prorate their payments and together pay no more in total than the insurable risk, the true value of the building. This problem of overinsurance becomes important in considering H.R. 1, because the promoters of H.R. 1 are talking about the benefits provided "as being the base upon which our people will build their health insurance, like social security has become the base for retirement programs." This is a false presentation based upon a failure to distinguish between annuities and insurance against a risk. Of course, one wants his annuity, unlike insuring against a risk, to be as high as possible. Insurance against a risk must be limited to what the insurable risk amounts to, the actual costs a person experiences if he gets sick or has an accident. Once a person is covered by comprehensive medical insurance, he does not have to be covered twice; indeed, it should be clearly against public policy if he were to be overinsured and covered twice. Incidentally, there is loss-of-income health insurance too, but this also should be limited to what a person's actual wages or salary would have been if he had been well and able to work.

IMPACT OF HIGHER PAYROLL LEVY

Third, I have merely alluded to but not discussed the economic consequences of increasing the payroll tax beyond a certain level. There are two areas of concern.

First. What the payroll tax does, if too high, to the prices of goods and services we sell in competition with people abroad. It was this aspect which seemed to concern the President's economic advisers the most. It is a matter of serious concern, but not as serious, in my mind, as the second problem.

Second. What the payroll tax does to the incident of unemployment through the encouragement it gives to further rapid automation—replacing manpower with machines—replacing labor with capital. I think in the long run automation is a blessing for all of us, but there is no escaping the fact that in the short range it creates unemployment and dislocation of people. Men lose their jobs through obsolescence and they have to learn the new skills for which the automation creates a demand at the same time it is destroying jobs. Innovation can be so rapid that we have difficulty to cope with the problems it creates. If we are not attuned to meet the problems it creates, its damage can outweigh its benefits. The problems of health care for the aged today have resulted, to a large degree, as I have pointed out from rapid advancement which we were not prepared to meet fully. People are living 10 to 15 years longer and, as a result, new economic problems have been created.

The administration spokesmen said that the President's economic advisers did not think the problem of the payroll tax vis-a-vis unemployment was a serious one. This is understandable on their part. For 4 years the administration has treated the unemployment problem as one resulting from the lack of aggregate demand and not one primarily the result of rapid automation, and the unemployment rate is still 5 percent—the poorest record for any recovery period of the four World War II recessions. At the same time we see this inadequate concern and treatment of the problems of unemployment on the part of the administration, we still see our economy slowed down, on the employment side because of a shortage of skills—especially in the service field in which education and health predominate—a shortage of nurses, doctors, and teachers, to be specific. The payroll tax is increasingly becoming a factor of importance in encouraging further replacement of manpower with machines. The payroll tax is not levied on a machine. It is only applied to human beings. There is no question that the saving of 10 percent of wage costs is a further encouragment to buying a machine and laying off men. The total payroll tax already is 10 percent of payroll because not only is the social security system based upon the payroll tax, so is the unemployment insurance system and, in actual effect, the workmen's compensation system.

REGRESSIVE TAX

Furthermore, the payroll tax is probably the most regressive tax we have on our books. It taxes only the lowest portion of the income earned from salaries and wages. All income from interest, dividends, capital gains, oil royalties, and so forth is excluded from the payroll tax. The payroll tax rate, unlike the personal income tax rate, is the same for everyone—the $5,600 wage earner and the $2,000 wage earner. There are no personal exemptions to the payroll tax for dependents—a bachelor pays no more and no less than a man with a wife and five children.

Some large corporations have quietly moved over to support this new payroll tax increase upon which H.R. 1 is to be financed. Why? I suggest because, under pension plans for which they are paying, or will be, as they adopt the new health care prepaid insurance programs, like in the United Auto Workers' recent contracts, the health costs of their retirees is paid for through the corporate income tax—money put into pension plans is a deductible item from the corporate income tax. If they can shift the cost of these health insurance programs from the corporate income tax to the payroll tax, they feel it is to their advantage. I disagree with both their social and their economic theories, but not their logic. It is difficult to understand how national labor leaders can advocate such a policy or why they wish to remove this item from the agenda subject to collectively bargaining.

FREEZES PROGRESS

The greatest danger of H.R. 1, however, lies in what it does to innovation upon which the future of health care for all of us is based. The 150 pages of H.R. 1 are largely taken up with setting out the methods and the guidelines under which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is to enter into the contracts with the hospitals and other purveyors of medical services.

H.R. 1 starts out with a statement proclaiming that nothing in this bill shall permit the Federal Government to interfere with the free operation of the hospitals or the right of a person to the doctor of his choice. These are brave words, but they are meaningless because the rest of the bill is taken up with just how this interference is to be handled.

It should be made quite clear that I am not saying the authors and the promoters of H.R. 1 do not sincerely wish to have this freedom remain, but it is to say that they have muddled their thinking. Let me put it upon the positive basis which the authors of H.R. 1 will accept. They believe it is necessary to improve the standards presently existing in our 7,000 hospitals throughout the country, not to mention the standards of nursing homes and home care services. They see in this bill a practical method of improving these standards.

They are right on both counts. First, the standards need improving. I trust our society never reaches the point where this is not true because, if we did, it would mean that we were complacent and that we had stopped innovation. Second, at any given time we can stop research and development to freeze on the best design research and development up to that point can give us. In military weaponry, as well as in private manufacturing, this is always the crucial question—when do we stop research and development to freeze on design so we can go into mass production? If one freezes too soon, one ends up with quantity with some sacrifice to quality. If one freezes too late—vis-a-vis an enemy—one might have the superior quality—as Nazi Germany did with the V-2 weapons—but insufficient quantity, and possibly at the sacrifice of collateral developments.

So it is true we can use the Federal political mechanism at any time to cash in on the great research and development which is going on in the field of health, to freeze on a national design. I am certain that at most any time, whether the field be health care for the aged or what, we can improve any system in our society by doing so. Yes, for 5 years perhaps, we gain the benefit—but what happens for the next 10 years, or for the next 20 years, the progress of which depends so much on the research and development of today? The price we pay comes from cutting down on innovation and it is entirely too high a price in peacetime. It is a price we should pay only when, for reasons of crisis, we have to go to what we call a crash program.

When there is no enemy breathing down our backs—or competitor in automobiles—we do well to move cautiously in any freezing of design to obtain mass production or establishing national standards to gain a momentary increase in national quality. Proper observance will give us steady progress and can prevent crises which result in costly crash programs. There is enough progress made in a dynamic marketplace where new ideas are proven to be right and more ideas are proven to be wrong, toward adopting improvements in standards, without calling upon the political mechanism of the society to step in to make the judgments. Justice Brandeis observed that we have 48 laboratories—there are now 50—to test out new ideas in the field of political science, and we should use them. I point out that actually we have 100,000 laboratories—there are that many taxing units in our society, each headed by its own directors or executive officer, whether it be in a school district, a sewer district, a county or municipal government—where ideas in the field of political science are constantly being tested. We should use them, and certainly I want us to use the millions of business laboratories in the field of economics—and the 200 million consumers who cast their economic ballots in the marketplace, all of which 7,000 hospitals are a part.

The officials of HEW have said to me, "But presently the hospitals make arrangements with Blue Cross in respect to the fees the hospitals charge and the services for which they expect to be paid. What is the difference between the present procedures in the marketplace which you approve and those which H.R. 1 sets up, of having the Government perform this function, particularly if the Government uses the Blue Cross organization?" Well, the obvious answer is partly hidden in semantics. Just what is Blue Cross? The Blue Cross organization consists of 80 independent regional boards, each negotiating with the hospitals in its region on these matters. The hospital boards and the Blue Cross boards are therefore on a more or less equal status.

Furthermore, in these same geographical regions are private insurance companies competitors in considerable degree of the Blue Cross boards who are engaged in a similar process of conducting a constant dialog with the hospital boards. On the fee they charge and the services they rendered, what would a hospital in St. Louis, Mo., let alone a little hospital in Douglas, Mich., do when it came up against the great Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, an arm of the Federal Government, in disagreement on a cost item or type of service, particularly a new one it had developed? H.R. 1 perhaps contemplates the use of the Blue Cross, but not the 80 Blue Cross boards. Interrogation in the Ways and Means Committee reveals the plan to be to utilize the rather recent national Blue Cross structure which was set up to handle some national contracts like the United Steelworkers which have recently been entered into.

FEDERAL CONTROL

The test to apply throughout the 150 pages of H.R. 1, is whether the ultimate control is not vested in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington regardless of the intermediate mechanisms established. Where there is an honest difference of opinion between a hospital board and the HEW, how is the final determination made? There is no question that the ultimate decision rests in the political government in Washington. The final decision almost has to be vested there. The Congress is dealing with taxpayers' funds and it must be certain that these funds are being spent according to certain specific criteria. If the criteria are too vague, we create government by men, not laws. If too specific, we produce a straitjacket. Either result—government by men or a straitjacket, or really anything in between, is destructive to innovation.

We gain further insight when we take a specific cost item presently in dispute and already subjected to debate in the committee. Run this item of dispute through the mechanisms established in H.R. 1 and we gain some insight of the problems we are creating.

Presently many hospitals have an overcharge for part of the cost of teaching, research and development, bad debts, and for that part of the charity patients cost not taken care of by the Government welfare and community chest programs, which they prorate to the paying beds. Under H.R. 1, none of these items, prorated or otherwise, can be charged to the patients over 65 for payment. The HEW argument is that with H.R. 1, there will no longer be any charity patients over 65 or bad debts. Accordingly, this program under H.R. 1 will improve the financial position of the hospitals in respect to these items.

In theory, this sounds sensible. When applied to the actual situation it is not. For years studies presented to the Ways and Means Committee from all sections of the country showed that the best paying group by age, as far as medical bills were concerned, by a considerable margin, were the people over 65. Of course, these statistical studies did not conform to the program that the administration was trying to sell the public, based, as it was, on the assumption that people over 65 were in a relatively poor fiscal position. These data, accordingly, have remained in the published hearings of the Ways and Means Committee, unnoticed and their import disregarded. However, in looking into the situation of the hospitals which have charity patients we find—I am now quoting the statistics of a specific hospital which I believe is fairly typical—only 5 percent of its charity beds are occupied by people over 65, while 13 percent of its paying beds are occupied by people over 65. In other words, H.R. 1 will absorb the cost of the 5 percent of the charity beds but will deny to the hospital the prerogative of passing on, on a pro rata basis, part of the costs of the 95 percent charity patients who are under age 65 to the 13 percent pay beds occupied by people over 65. The hospital's point is that they have to be certain that their pay beds are filled with people to whom they can pass on this prorated overload. Under H.R. 1, these people would probably not be persons over 65. Unless this disagreement is resolved in accordance with the true situation, H.R. 1 could actually result in discrimination against people over 65 in many of our hospitals.

This is only an illustration to demonstrate the kind of honest disagreements that can develop between individual hospitals and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, over accounting systems, social values, health values, teaching values, values in research, and development. It does not require much imagination to see what mischief this will cause in a field which is so dynamic and so full of change as is the field of health care, particularly institutional care such as provided by hospitals and nursing homes.

The American Hospital Association in its recent testimony provided the committee with a figure which, more than any other I have seen, dramatizes the tremendous progress that has gone on in the field of institutional health care, particularly hospital health care, in recent years, and, at the same time, explains some of the reasons for the high cost of hospitals which will continue to go up if there is continuing progress in American health care. Fifteen years ago, the testimony reveals, the new hospitals being built had 60 percent of their space set aside for beds and 40 percent for laboratories, operating rooms, and so forth. Today 15 percent of the space of newly designed hospitals is for beds and 85 percent is for the laboratories, and so forth.

GIVE THE PEOPLE A CHOICE

This is no time, I would argue, to freeze on design in either the field of health care or health insurance. This is the time, as always, to continually capitalize on the progress that has been made and to spread the benefits more widely, but this must be done with great care, through calm study and understanding lest the very process of innovation be damaged. We are engaged in our society in producing a bigger pie so that the pieces for all of us will be bigger. If we are diverted from this work by those who wish to spend their time seeing whether Joe has a bigger piece then James, then I submit both Joe and James are going to end up with smaller pieces than they otherwise would have, though I do not doubt the smaller pieces might be more equal. Perhaps we are reaching the stage where we can apply the solution many parents have found to be feasible among children to stop the squabbles over who is going to get the biggest piece. Let whoever is arguing over the biggest piece be permitted to cut the pie, and then let the others get first choice of the piece he wishes.

Let those who wish to establish Government programs to perform services for the people only be permitted to do so, if the people themselves have the choice of which program they prefer—that which the Government provides or that which they can obtain for themselves in the private sector.

It is anomalous that in retirement programs the Federal Government as an employer has given its employees a private retirement system which is quite adequate and does not force them into the compulsory social security retirement system, yet it forbids any private employer or group of private employees to have this kind of choice. Under H.R. 1 the Federal Government would do the same in the field of health care, letting its employees escape the payroll tax, but continue instead the superior health insurance system they presently have.

SHODDY, COMPULSORY

I think it is little short of tragic when the Federal Government seeks to use its vast powers to force people to accept a service which many of us are convinced is shoddy, out of date, and deleterious to society itself, and bases the fiscal soundness of this service on the fact that it is compulsory. Why not at least permit the people to have their choice of which piece of pie they think is the bigger?

IS POWER REALLY RECLAMATION'S PAYING PARTNER? OR HOMINY DOMINY SAT ON THE WALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the interesting opportunity to reply to perhaps one of the most inept statements I have ever seen coming out of a supposedly responsible Government bureau. This opportunity presented itself as a result of a statement I made before the annual convention of the National Reclamation Association in Palm Springs, Calif., last November. The thesis of my remarks was, "Is Power Really Reclamation's Paying Partner?" In attendance at that meeting was the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Floyd E. Dominy. Several weeks later the Commissioner wrote a letter to the National Reclamation Association president, Mr. Hugh A. Shamberger, which purported to be his rebuttal of my statement. The Commissioner also took the liberty of sending copies of his letter to all of the National Reclamation Association board of directors and to all members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on which I have the privilege of serving as ranking minority member.

As I sat alone in the quietness of my office one evening carefully reading the Commissioner's letter, I could not help but be reminded of the quotation from Voltaire who once wrote:

> I have never made but one prayer to God, a very short one: "O Lord, make my enemies ridiculous." And God granted it.

Commissioner Dominy's attempted rebuttal certainly seemed to fit this response.

Another, and seemingly unrelated, thought also kept running through my mind, reminding me of a simple little nursery rhyme which we all learned at our mother's knee. But the rhyme came out something like this:

Hominy Dominy sat on the wall.
Hominy Dominy had a great fall.
And all Udall's horses and all Udall's men,
Couldn't put Hominy Dominy together again.

The more I read the Commissioner's feeble attempts at rebuttal, I realized that in fairness, Mr. Shamberger and the conscientious reclamationists who make up the board of directors of the National Reclamation Association deserved a clarification of the facts in this matter. So, last week I sent Mr. Shamberger a letter in which I pointed out that it was not my intention to prolong this exchange with Commissioner Dominy but I was taking this opportunity of availing myself of the debater's traditional prerogative—the affirmative has the surrebuttal. Furthermore, since the Commissioner feels some Members of the House of Representatives will be interested in his remarks, I am sure the entire House will also be interested in them along with my reply.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the record may be complete on this matter, I insert at this point in my remarks the text of my original statement before the National Reclamation Association convention in Palm Springs, Calif., on November 12, 1964, entitled "Is Power Really Reclamation's Paying Partner?"

IS POWER REALLY RECLAMATION'S PAYING PARTNER?

The reclamation program in the Western States is in serious trouble; and, in part, it is of your own making. I realize this is fully recognized by your own organization because of expressions of concern received by me and other Members of Congress in recent months.

It should not be necessary to tell you that reclamation has been and should continue to be a vital factor in the growth and prosperity of our Nation. It is not my purpose here today to preach to you or to criticize some of your activities but rather to discuss and evaluate some of the ways the reclamation program has gone wrong. You know as well as I that the Federal reclamation program was begun over a half a century ago for the primary purpose of reclaiming the arid, barren lands of the West in order to make them productive. For many years the program continued along those lines and was well received by the general populace and the elected representatives in Washington. However, there is now substantial opinion in both political parties, in the House of Representatives and the Senate that irrigation—the basic justification of reclamation projects—has been subordinated to other purposes in too many situations.

In the past few years particularly, the policies and programs of the career employees of the Bureau of Reclamation have wandered so far afield from the basic goal that it seems reclamation has become of only incidental importance. The present officials of the Bureau of Reclamation have become so preoccupied with efforts to develop unnecessary hydroelectric power projects and Federal power transmission grids that their thinking has become as arid and barren as the western lands they were formerly charged with reclaiming. As a result of this attitude and effort and other unfortunate policies, there is a serious danger of sincere reclamation proposals falling into disrepute with Members of Congress.

Unfortunately, the farmers dependent upon irrigation have permitted this situation to develop and continue through ignorance or selfishness or complacency. I know too many of you too well to think you are ignorant of the facts or are selfish concerning the future of the program. For this reason, I can only conclude that complacency is the basic cause of your inactivity in this vital area. This is not the time for complacency or inactivity, this is the time for positive and constructive action if you have any hope of reclaiming the reclamation program from the forces which are striving mightily to subvert honest irrigation needs for their selfish goal of using water projects to develop Federal electric power for power's sake.

This subversion of irrigation has proceeded to such a point, in fact, that at a hearing earlier this year before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee one of my colleagues from the eastern part of the United States suggested the Bureau of Reclamation change its name to the Bureau of Federal Power. For this reason, I repeat a positive action program is necessary by all dedicated irrigators to reclaim the reclamation program for its original purpose before it's too late.

In all fairness it should be admitted that this shift in emphasis in the Federal program has been so skillfully handled that many people cannot be blamed for not being aware of it. In the beginning reclamation projects were planned for the basic purpose of irrigation. But it was soon recognized that the energy of water falling over the dam could be converted into hydroelectric power where economically feasible. It was clearly understood, however, that hydroelectric power was to be an incidental function. The program really began going astray when the Federal power advocates began selling the Congress and the irrigators a bill of goods claiming that power was really the "paying partner" or the cash register in the reclamation movement. Let's take just a moment to look more closely at this claim that hydroelectric power is a paying partner. There is strong evidence that in many instances power has become a burden on other project purposes, particularly irrigation.

The Bureau of Reclamation, in a report issued last January, entitled, "Power Systems, Average Rate and Repayment Studies," lists 25 existing Bureau projects with power facilities which have cost about $9.8 billion. Almost half of this cost has been allocated to irrigation, and power revenues supposedly will repay nearly two-thirds of the irrigation allocation.

However, a considerable number of these projects are in serious financial trouble. For example, the Missouri River Basin project is a clear example of the plight in which reclamation finds itself. A good part of reclamation's difficulties in the Missouri Basin can be traced directly to the power pricing policy adopted there.

The Bureau of Reclamation's study I just mentioned, shows a cost of $2.8 billion for the Missouri Basin irrigation facilities, and assumes that $2.2 billion—practically all—of this cost will be repaid from power revenues.

Seven out of nine units of the project have allocations above $500 per acre for irrigation costs to be repaid from power revenues. The allocations for repayment from power revenue range as high as $1,243 per acre for the Almira unit. The total per-acre costs for the Almira unit are $1,446.

But what is the actual situation?

An audit by the General Accounting Office in 1960 found that the power operations of the Missouri River Basin project had accumulated a deficit of $51 million from annual losses going back to 1954.

The Comptroller General reported that at the existing power rates it will not be until the year 2027—63 years from now—that repayment of the non-interest-bearing construction cost subsidy to irrigation will even begin. Full repayment is not expected until almost the turn of the 22d century.

How can it be truthfully claimed that power is a paying partner of irrigation when it isn't even paying its own way? It may also be asked with candor whether the power facilities at the Missouri River Dams will even be capable of operating at the time when repayment of the irrigation features is supposed to begin.

This is a clear example of what is allowed to happen when Federal power is produced and marketed for its own sake at an unrealistically low "postage stamp" rate rather than being used as a paying partner for irrigation and other project purposes. If this power were intended to be incidental and to be a paying partner, the price would have to be increased substantially to assure repayment of project costs on time.

In an effort to correct this situation, the Congress earlier this year added a proviso in the new Missouri River Basin authorization bill requiring that any new unit of the project be authorized or reauthorized before any funds may be spent on it. In addition, the Department of the Interior has also taken some steps to correct this unhappy situation.

The emphasis in the Missouri Basin seems to have been on extending transmission lines and selling power to preference customers, who already were being served from other sources. It may not be of direct concern to the National Reclamation Association that these customers have been lured by low rates away from their previous suppliers. But it should be of great concern to you that this Missouri Basin power was priced at less than its market value to make that possible, while the project deficit has increased year by year, and the schedule of repayments of irrigation features has been steadily extended into the far distant future.

The interrelationship of power and irrigation has also been distorted in areas served by the Bonneville Power Administration. There you find a glaring example of obsession with unrealistically low power rates while irrigation is pushed into the background. And I need not point out that as a result of the passage of the Northwest regional preference bill during the recent session of Congress, preference customers of BPA now include industrial plants and private power companies.

You all know BPA has been operating at a loss. Its annual operating deficit has been highly publicized. An audit by the Comptroller General showed that in 6 years through 1963, the total deficit from its power operations reached more than $50 million and it is expected to rise to nearly $60 million by 1965. Certainly power cannot be called a paying partner of irrigation in the Pacific Northwest so long as this situation continues.

One of the reasons for the deficits of these basin developments is the construction of added units with higher power costs than the original development without a corresponding adjustment in power rates. Naturally this practice dilutes earnings and extends the payout schedule. How could it do otherwise? The inevitable result is a reduction in the ability of the power units in the project as a whole to repay irrigation costs.

In the Columbia Basin power system the installed generating capacity in 1950 was just under 2 million kilowatts, and the cost of power generation and transmission was 1.39 mills per kilowatt-hour. What was the situation 11 years later? In 1961 generating capacity had tripled to more than 6 million kilowatts. The cost of generation and transmission also rose. In fact, it more than doubled, to 2.86 mills. In place of a net profit from power at the 2-mill Bonneville sales rate, which has remained unchanged for a quarter of a century, there was a net loss of $14 million in 1961.

This is why I say that reclamation has come under a cloud. The story has been repeated too often. The power operations of the Rio Grande project have been losing money in every year since 1951.

It is highly doubtful that the Colorado-Big Thompson project power will ever become the paying partner of irrigation.

A glaring example of the problem before us may be cited to dramatize what has happened to reclamation and why it is falling into disrepute—the proposed Burns Creek project in Idaho.

First an attempt was made to obtain authorization for this project as a reclamation project—which it was not. Then, when its sponsors failed before the Interior Committee, they went to the Public Works Committee, where an attempt was made to justify it as a flood control project—which it was not. But this effort also failed.

When this project was being considered by the House Interior Committee, it was shown that although the power produced at Burns Creek standing alone would be very costly, it would be marketed at a price substantially below its cost of production. This unusual result would be accomplished by combining Burns Creek power with that from a good reclamation project—which I supported—Palisades Dam. All of the power would be sold at rates yielding an average of about 3.7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

For the power facilities of the Burns Creek project to pay out in 50 years, the resulting power would have to sell for an average of at least 4.88 mills per kilowatt-hour. Nevertheless, the Department of the Interior told our committee that power from Burns Creek would be marketed at the same rate as the power from Palisades Dam. This would mean that on the average it would be sold at about 1.18 mills per kilowatt-hour less than its cost of production.

This kind of financial juggling proved to me that the Burns Creek project actually would be detrimental to reclamation, to the water users, and to the taxpayers. The Palisades project standing alone without Burns Creek would repay all of its reimbursable costs by 1988, and by the year 2006 a surplus of $22,245,333 would be built up from earnings of Palisades. Under existing law, this would go to the Treasury, and, should Congress so desire, it would be available to finance additional reclamation projects, the cost of which might be beyond the financial capacity of water users.

But should Burns Creek and Palisades market their power at the Palisades rate, then all of the reimbursable costs of the two projects would not be recovered until the end of year 2006. Thus, $22,245,333 would be diverted from the Treasury to subsidize the users of Burns Creek power.

This is the sort of radical departure from the normally accepted principle of Federal reclamation policy that prevents power from being the paying partner of reclamation.

Although Burns Creek has not been authorized, there is an example right here in California of another project that was authorized and is now in existence despite an indisputable showing that its power features, if developed by the Federal Government, would be a financial hindrance, not a help, to further water development in the State. This project is the Trinity unit of the Central Valley project.

The debate on Trinity in the Congress deteriorated into who should build the power facilities, the Federal Government or the local utility company. The interest of reclamation once again was ignored, as it so often has been in the past. Preference customers more interested in a vested claim on the electric power succeeded in making Trinity an all-Federal project.

Today the Trinity power, costing at least 7½ mills to generate, is being sold to them at the Central Valley project "postage stamp" rate of 4½ mills, a loss of 3 mills or more for each kilowatt-hour sold.

The evidence presented at our committee hearing made it clear that construction of the Trinity River project with Federal power facilities, as has been done, would take about $146 million out of the Central Valley project bank account. The CVP enabling act says power shall be generated and sold "as a means of financially aiding and assisting" the irrigation or water features of the project.

Does the power from the Trinity unit honestly aid and assist water development?

Obviously it does not. Year by year this power is depleting the CVP surplus, leaving less money for irrigation rather than more.

But, this is not the end of the story. There is now still another proposal for another addition to the Central Valley project which promises similar harm to power's ability to continue as a paying partner of reclamation. This is the Auburn unit. It was reported out of committee but was not passed in the recent session. However, it will undoubtedly be urged again next year.

Another part of this problem is exemplified by the recently authorized Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie between the Bonneville Power Administration, California, and Arizona. An appropriation of $45 million was made to start this project, which will involve an estimated expenditure by the Federal Government of $300 million as its share in this joint undertaking with local public and private utilities. But, only rarely was a question raised in defense of reclamation, concerning the possible effect on reclamation projects in California, Arizona, or Nevada.

For example, have any reclamationists considered the fact that a portion of the costs of the intertie will be included as a part of the cost of the Central Valley project? Do they know that $2.3 million, which was included in this year's public works appropriation bill will be a part of the Central Valley project's budget? Or that a still larger figure can be attributed this year to region No. 3 of the Bureau of Reclamation?

Do they know that the Federal portion of this four-line intertie will add over $100 million to the Interior Department's budget requests in future years for the Bureau of Reclamation?

Do they realize that more than $57 million was appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal 1965 for transmission lines and related facilities? This represents more than 17 percent of all reclamation funds appropriated this past year. And, if other power features were added, such as switchyard, penstocks, generators, and so forth, as well as the share of the cost of major structures such as dams that are allocated to power, then power's share of the total Federal budget would be much, much greater.

You have to ask yourself, "Is this good for reclamation?" A little soul searching should leave no doubt about it. It cannot possibly be. Power isn't the problem in the reclamation States. The problem is water. When power can be produced economically enough to reduce the cost of water, it is an assist to reclamation. When the reverse is true, it is a liability and should be carefully avoided.

The continued submission to Congress of projects like these is one of the reasons I say that the entire reclamation program is in jeopardy. If the rising animosity toward reclamation in the nonreclamation States which reflects itself in Congress is to be allayed, everyone interested in the matter should concern himself, and now, with the policy used in the pricing of power from new reclamation projects.

Of course, it cannot be sold above the cost of power from alternate sources in the same area; but, it certainly could be sold at no lesser price. This alternate price figure is used in determining the cost-benefit ratio of the project. Why should it not be used in the actual payout of the facility?

Congress should include a provision in any future authorizing legislation stating that power from projects is not to be sold at less than the actual cost of its production. If actual cost is above alternative costs in the area, then Congress should know that authorization of a project with power facilities will be a drain on other reclamation purposes.

But, let us not be mislead into believing that only the Federal power aspect of the reclamation program needs changing. I think there are also some improvements necessary in the method of considering irrigation costs in Federal projects. One of the first such improvements might be enactment of legislation to clarify the amortization of the irrigation portion of multiple-purpose hydro developments to ease the burden on the already overburdened Nation's taxpayers.

When the reclamation program first began, irrigators who benefited directly were required to repay the total allocated costs in a 10-year period without interest. But, through a series of subsequent acts of Congress, they now repay only a small portion of the irrigation cost allocation—still without interest—in 50 years plus a 10 year development period. The remainder—and usually this is by far the larger portion of the irrigation allocation—is repaid from power revenues and still this is without interest. Frequently the anticipated revenues from irrigation are not adequate to repay the cost allocated to irrigation.

The so-called Collbran formula, developed in 1952 for the Collbran reclamation project in Colorado, is in part responsible for this situation. The formula provides that construction costs allocated to irrigation but beyond the ability of the water users to repay be liquidated from power revenues after the costs allocated to power have been repaid. This might be considered as a balloon payment at the end where nothing is paid on the principle for 50 years and then a large or a balloon payment is made at the end to payoff the irrigation allocation.

The relative unfairness of this arrangement was recognized as far back as 1955 by the Second Hoover Commission which stated in the Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power:

"The currently proposed Collbran formula, under which the part of the cost of a project allocated to power would be paid off within a 50-year period and then payments made to retire the interest-free investment in the project, should be examined with care. Under certain conditions its application may result in a large subsidy being imposed on the taxpayer, but the objectionable feature, to the task group, is the long delay in a return on a portion of the Federal investment. Too much can happen in a 50-year period, if all are to be treated fairly, to defer payment on a project whose eventual cost is very likely to be underestimated at the time of authorization."

This type of subsidy is not only unfair to the general taxpaying public but it is also unfair to the vast majority of the Nation's irrigators. It may be noted in the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1963 that there are over 33 million acres in this country under irrigation. While, at the same time, there is a little more than 3 million acres under irrigation from Federal reclamation projects. In other words, over 90 percent of the irrigated land of the United States is being provided by hard-working farmers using their own initiative and relying on non-Federal methods of meeting their problem while paying the full cost of their obligation.

Before some Federal bureaucrat attempts to challenge my use of national irrigated acres data since the Federal reclamation program applies only to the West, let me say that over two-thirds of the Nation's irrigated land is located in the West. So, even considering only those western acres, it is still grossly unfair to the seven farmers doing it on their own as compared with the one farmer who is depending on the Federal Government.

To correct this inequity, I think the repayment formula for Federal water projects should be changed in such a way as to require that the irrigation allocation beyond the ability of water users to repay should be concurrently amortized with the power costs. This could be done by making incremental payments annually to the retirement of both elements of cost.

Furthermore, there can be little justification in my mind for the continuation of the policy of charging no interest on the portion of the irrigation costs which is repaid from power revenues. It is all right for the Federal Government to charge no interest to the water users for the small part of the allocation which they must repay. But, I propose that the repayment formula be further changed to require an interest charge be placed on the amount of the irrigation cost allocation of any Federal water project that must be repaid from power revenues. This interest change should be identical with the rate of interest applied to the power portion of the project.

There is one final problem I would like to discuss with you. At present, there are almost 30 Federal agencies dealing with various aspects of water resources developments. This is a large number of agencies; and, undoubtedly, there is much overlapping with many millions of dollars of wasteful expenditures resulting. Without a doubt there is a tremendous room for improving the administrative organization in this important field of Government activity; but I realize, as I know you do, that there is no easy solution.

There are various types of Federal activity in the water resources field. For example, the gathering of basic information about water resources such as is done by the Geological Survey. The planning of water resources projects is done by such agencies as the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. Construction of water resources projects under contract or by direct force account is also done both by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Federal Power Commission also gets in the act by its authority to license hydroelectric projects on navigable waters.

If all of the water resources agencies were combined in one of the regular executive departments, this would mean that the regulatory functions of the Federal Power Commission would be placed in that executive agency. I, for one, would not necessarily wish to propose that solution.

The difficulties of consolidating all the Federal water agencies are further illustrated by the problem of determining what basic law would govern the single agency. For instance, should the 160-acre limitation applicable to projects of the Bureau of Reclamation be extended to water projects of other agencies?

I cite these various problems merely to indicate some of the difficulties which would be involved in any proposal for consolidating water resources agencies. This does not mean, however, that nothing should be done. I feel that it is imperative for the Congress to give careful consideration to an attempt to bring order out of chaos and establish the most efficient and economical organization possible out of this Nation's farflung water resources agencies.

Personally, I am ready to accept the challenge of this problem by suggesting the extension of the reclamation type of activities to all 50 States in the Union. This new agency would have the exclusive jurisdiction over the planning and construction of hydroelectric developments and an entirely new body of law should be written to regulate its activities. This would be a difficult assignment; but, with a little bit of initiative and imagination, it can be done.

Yes, my friends, the reclamation program is in serious trouble. I have tried to point out some of the reasons for this situation, and in a small way some of the possible solutions to the problems. These solutions, I am the first to admit, will involve controversy. But, is the National Reclamation Association going to stand on the sidelines and say it does not want to become involved—it wants to avoid controversy? To take such an attitude toward the damaging trend that I have described will only serve to harm the movement you have fostered so long, with such notable benefit to the development of the West.

You should not be afraid of getting into a fight in which the best interests of reclamation are at stake. Nor should you allow yourselves to be used for purposes which do not further the basic needs of reclamation, but instead are aimed at achievement of an ideological goal no matter what the cost.

This is your program—this is your problem. Unless you take a more positive and creative attitude toward finding solutions to this problem, some future historian will look back and say that "Rarely have those who had so much to lose done so little to prevent it." The choice is yours.

Mr. Speaker, my recent letter to Mr. Shamberger was designed to respond seriatim to the various statements made by Commissioner Dominy. For this reason and to make a reading of both statements more comprehensive, I will insert my own comments after the various statements of the Commissioner. Now for Hominy Dominy's letter and my comments. He began:

> U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
> *Washington, D.C., December 11, 1964.*
> Mr. HUGH A. SHAMBERGER,
> *President, National Reclamation Association, Carson City, Nev.*
>
> DEAR MR. SHAMBERGER: As I promised during the recent convention of the National Reclamation Association, I have reviewed the remarks by Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, to the convention and offer the following comments.
>
> In his address, Mr. SAYLOR repeated his prior assaults on power aspects of the Federal reclamation program. His general theme was that irrigation and reclamation are being subordinated to power. His premise seems to be that hydroelectric power as a function of water resource development is economically, financially, and politically adverse to the continuing welfare of the reclamation program. Curiously, he subsequently advances what he terms a solution to the problem, which involves inclusion of hydroelectric power.

I pointed out to Mr. Shamberger that in his letter Commissioner Dominy attempted to summarize my statements and, with the exception of the premise which he tries to establish for me, his reporting is generally accurate. I did not base my remarks on a view that "hydroelectric power as a function of water resource development is economically, financially, and politically adverse to the continuing welfare of the reclamation program." Such a premise would be contrary to my basic beliefs and to what I said. I made no such statement in my remarks, and I resent the inference left by the Commissioner. This distortion is a good example of what seems to be a complete failure to understand or recognize the problem. My basic premise was, and still is, that where hydropower is included as a function of any reclamation project, this power should be sold under prices and conditions which will help repay for the overall project and thereby assist the reclamation functions of the project and help pay the cost of water users. This is what I said to the National Reclamation Association Convention, and I repeat it now. The power pricing policies of Mr. Dominy's Bureau of Reclamation simply will not stand up under this premise.

Mr. Dominy went on to say:

> In support of his premise, Mr. SAYLOR makes three principal points: (1) Annual revenues from power production do not equal or exceed annual costs, (2) inclusion of new high-cost hydroelectric power facilities with existing low-cost facilities postpones availability or irrigation assistance, and (3) our policy of retiring interest-bearing debt prior to the non-interest-bearing portion is poor business.
>
> In making these points, he cites the Missouri River Basin project, the proposed Burns Creek addition of the southern Idaho system, and the dispute which took place over the addition of the Trinity River development of the Central Valley project.
>
> In addition, Mr. SAYLOR asserts that it is bad to have many agencies involved in this field, the reclamation program itself is too restrictive, and it is bad to have reclamation restricted geographically.
>
> I am in full agreement with two of Mr. SAYLOR's conclusions. I have often said that the present hodgepodge of Federal laws and congressional committee jurisdictions creates competitive chaos in the water development field. I would much favor the elimination of overlapping and duplicating functions among agencies. I also would be much in favor of expanding the reclamation program to all 50 States. This would pose some problems in the handling of the reclamation fund, but these are not insurmountable.

The Commissioner's letter sets forth what he calls three principal points in support of the imagined premise which he attempts to establish for me. These three points involve questions of inadequate power revenues, adding of high-cost power facilities which postpone irrigation assistance, and retirement of interest-bearing debt first. These are points I made, the first two of which he evidently concedes, but they are still not the basis for my views. He also properly refers to my concern about the large number of Federal agencies in the water resources development field and the restriction of the reclamation program to the Western States. He seems to agree with both these points.

Accordingly, I am very much pleased to learn through these communications that the Commissioner agrees with at least four of the five points I made in Palm Springs. However, he seems to reach a different conclusion—which is really the fifth point—as to whether the conditions cited are beneficial to irrigation or are "poor business," as he describes it. I only wish he had admitted these facts publicly at the National Reclamation Association convention so they could have made their own decisions concerning whether the conditions now existing contribute to, or detract from, the advance of a sound and vigorous reclamation program.

Now, with reference to the detailed comments in Commissioner Dominy's letter, I would like to discuss them seriatim. Since he seems to agree there is need for improvement in the administrative structure of the Federal water resource development program and there is a need for extension of the basic reclamation program to the 50 States, he makes no rebuttal on these two points. But, the Commissioner continued:

> I do not agree with Mr. Saylor's other conclusions. As long as the Federal policy is to develop western lands for irrigation and as long as the Federal policy is to require repayment without interest on the Federal funds used to develop the irrigation aspects of Federal projects, then there must be a way that these costs can be repaid. The development of hydroelectric power is one function of a multipurpose project which meets this need.

My letter to Mr. Shamberger commented on this point by pointing out that Mr. Dominy, however, does not agree with my other conclusions and advances a theory that as long as the Federal policy is to develop western lands for irrigation and to require repayment without interest of irrigation costs, there must be a way these costs can be repaid.

I am glad he puts the finger on Federal reclamation policy exactly where it belongs—on development of western lands for irrigation. Furthermore, that same Federal policy requires repayment of funds without interest expended to provide these facilities. It is assumed that repayment means a tangible return of moneys within periods which have some relation to the present worth of such returns. But, from this statement on, the conclusion he reaches seems rather specious and childish. It is typical of the "Never, Never Land" thinking that no matter what novel work someone proposes be built, it will be economically and financially feasible and justified. If this were true, we would be living in a dream world. Unfortunately, we are living in a much more pragmatic world. Many proposals conceived by Federal planners are not financially feasible and costs exceed amounts beneficiaries receive and are willing and able to pay. Just because the Federal Government has adopted a policy of developing western lands for irrigation does not mean that all costs of projects conceived by reclamation planners can be repaid in full. It is a complete nonsequitur.

The Commissioner said:

> Consequently, we would not consider a proposed water development plan to have been well considered unless hydroelectric power benefits are considered along with all other water uses. Actually, it would be wasteful and we would be subject to criticism for wasting the publicly owned natural resources if we did not consider the place of power in any multiple-purpose project.

The development of hydroelectric power is one function of a multiple-purpose project which can be made to provide financial assistance for irrigation. Generally, however, this is not the case. Experience has shown that rates set for power by Government marketing agencies have been far from adequate to accomplish this purpose. They have often placed a burden on the project rather than assisting irrigation. Because of this widespread record, one can reach no other conclusion than that the policies applied in formulating and establishing such power rates generally were aimed at purposes other than securing maximum financial assistance to repayment of irrigation costs. Not even magical accounting and fanciful cost allocations can produce revenues to help reimburse irrigation costs from power systems that cannot support themselves. I strongly favor establishment of Federal power rates which can honestly aid in the development of economically justified irrigation.

Commissioner Dominy's comment on the need to consider hydroelectric power as one of the purposes of multiple-purpose water resource development is no rebuttal of anything I have said. If planning is to be comprehensive, and I am convinced that it should, all purposes should be considered. There is, however, a major question as to whether our mutual objective of making the best use of the Nation's resources can and will be achieved if the methods and procedures now used by the Bureau of Reclamation in justifying, building, and operating irrigation projects are continued. It is about time some commonsense was introduced into the standards, policies, and procedures used in these programs so that we do not further commit our resources to proposals which are not only uneconomic, inefficient, and unfeasible financially, but also not in the best long-range interests of our country.

Mr. Dominy's letter picks up with the following point:

> The statutes governing the reclamation program are evolutionary in character. At the present time these laws do not prescribe absolutely uniform standards among projects for the return of reimbursable costs. There has been, however, a trend requiring that all costs allocated to commercial power be repaid at interest within 50 years from the time power facilities become revenue producing and that costs allocated to irrigation be repaid within 50 years plus permissible development period after the associated irrigation facilities become benefit producing.
>
> We are required to submit to the Congress in connection with our proposals for authorization of projects a showing of how we expect these reimbursable costs to be returned. The committees of Congress have insisted upon schedules showing how we would expect to accomplish repayment. Normally for projects involving hydroelectric power development these schedules and the accompanying testimony and reports of the Bureau have shown that in the early years of the project's life the annual revenues will be less than the annual costs. But as the project becomes operative and income rises, the annual revenues will exceed the annual costs and not only make up the deficit but in addition accomplish full repayment. It is our practice that to the extent annual costs exceed annual revenues in the early years the difference is added to the unpaid balance and becomes part of the interest bearing capital investment.

While it is true that statutes governing the reclamation program are evolutionary in character, conflicting forces have been operating in this field. There has been a trend, as the Commissioner indicates, toward firming the requirement that all costs allocated to commercial power be repaid with interest within 50 years and that irrigation costs be repaid without interest within 50 years plus a permissible development period where applicable. But, all too often, Federal power systems are not meeting this test and new proposals to dilute and liberalize these basic requirements in one way or another are continually being advanced. In several instances the reverse of what he states has actually happened. In fact, his letter is contradictory in itself. First, he states that normally revenues in the early years of a project's life are less than costs and during the later years revenues exceed costs to make up the deficit. This just has not happened in the Bonneville Power Administration area, for example; and I doubt that there are many places, if any, where this is happening.

The Commissioner then turned his attention to the Missouri River Basin:

> The Bureau and the committees of Congress alike have realized for a number of years that the Missouri River Basin project was having financial difficulties due to increased construction and operation costs, adverse runoff conditions, changes in national policy, and other factors. Mr. SAYLOR recognizes that some steps have been taken to rectify these problems, but he did not choose to emphasize the major affirmative actions that have been taken by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department. He could have told the National Reclamation Association that the Secretary of the Interior has publicly announced his intention to promulgate a suitable increase in the rates for firm commercial power and that actions of this character can hardly be called a preoccupation with power for power's sake.

To refer back to Hominy Dominy's letter, I wrote that now we look at the repayment difficulties in the Missouri River Basin which the Commissioner admits the Bureau and committees of Congress alike have recognized. Maybe I should have mentioned in Palm Springs, as he suggested, the steps he proposed to take in an attempt to present a better and more pleasing facade for the payout of this project. Maybe I should have told the National Reclamation Association convention that he planned in his new payout requirements to reduce—as of June 30, 1964—the rate of interest on all Corps of Engineers power investment costs in the Missouri River Basin from 3 to 2½ percent, even though yields on long-term Federal bonds—the real cost of money—had risen to 4¼ percent. At the same time, he proposes to continue the interest rate on Bureau of Reclamation power investments at 3 percent.

Why this favoritism for Corps of Engineers' projects? Is Corps of Engineers' money, which comes from exactly the same source through exactly the same procedure, actually cheaper money? Is the Bureau of Reclamation power any better? Does either rate of interest come anywhere near what the real cost of money is to the United States?

In testimony and reports by the Department of the Interior and other Federal agencies in 1963 on S. 283, a bill which would amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act, it was stated that the interest rates should be determined on the basis of average market yields of long-term obligations of the United States. This would mean a rate for cost of money in 1964 of more than 4 percent. The General Counsel of the Treasury said that use of coupon interest rates as proposed in S. 283 "would reflect an average of Treasury borrowing over many years in the past, including the artificially low rates during the World War," and "to the extent that this coupon rate is lower than the rate reflecting market yields, a Federal subsidy is involved." The Treasury witness referred to the report of the President's Committee on Federal Credit Programs, dated February 11, 1963, which recommended use of market yields to measure the cost of Treasury borrowing and urged, that where subsidies are necessary, the subsidy element be explicitly recognized and disclosed. President Kennedy, in releasing the report, directed all agencies to be guided by it. Evidently this directive was not carried out in the proposed revision of the Missouri River Basin payout.

The latest GAO report on the Missouri River Basin presents a very lucid picture of operations on this project. In the "Summary of Findings and Recommendations" it says:

> In recent years the estimated period of time required to repay the Treasury reimbursable construction costs from power revenues of the Missouri River Basin project has been increased significantly. As a result, no repayment of the non-interest-bearing construction cost subsidy to irrigation is expected to be made until fiscal year 2027 and full repayment of reimbursable construction costs is not expected to be completed until fiscal year 2093. In addition, Bureau of Reclamation studies show that at June 30, 1959, no net repayment of construction costs had been made from power revenues of the Missouri River Basin project.
>
> Existing legislation does not fix a specific period of time for repayment of reimbursable construction costs. In our opinion the Federal water resources development program could be more effectively administered if the Congress enacted legislation to provide policies and criteria for repayment of reimbursable construction costs of the Missouri River Basin project.

I went on to point out to Mr. Shamberger that in a report dated June 30, 1961, a special panel of consultants to the Bureau of the Budget recommended that the interest rate to be used in economic analysis should be in the area of 4 to 5 percent. This was at a time when yields on long-term Government bonds were 3.9 percent. I recognize that this recommendation had to do with the formulation and evaluation of projects; but, if the assumptions are valid for such purposes, they are equally appropriate for the operation and administration of this project.

I also might point out that Commissioner Dominy proposed that repayment of the irrigation share of the joint costs be deferred until the distant future when the specific irrigation facilities would supposedly be repaid from what may very well be on the basis of experience to date nonexistent surplus power revenues. In his payout study he properly indicated this was a major departure from the statutory requirements for the Colorado River storage project, for example, where all the cost of multiple-purpose storage reservoirs allocated to irrigation must be returned in 50 years. Why one region should be favored over another is not quite clear. If special subsidies are needed and justified for the Missouri River Basin development, then they should be specifically set forth and authorized by the Congress.

In his payout study the Commissioner proposed a one-fourth mill per kilowatt-hour increase in rates for eastern division marketable firm commercial power, but I have seen or heard nothing more about this token adjustment. Maybe it was intended as a temporary palliative never to be activated and used only to help gloss over the basic problem.

There are a number of other points in his 1963 Missouri River Basin payout study on which extensive comments could be made, but I will not go into all of them. The impressions the study left—that cost allocation by the separable-costs-remaining-benefits method and inclusion of interest during construction are new factors being included in the payout computation—is a complete deception. These factors have been used at least since 1954 in Missouri River Basin payout computations as indicated in his report, and have been the policy of the interagency committees at least since the late 1940's. Also, while the report states that part of the payout problem in the Missouri River Basin is adverse water supply conditions, this may be a common rather than a rare occurrence and what we well expect on the basis of long-range averages. I am not so sure that those who predicted in the 1940's that Reclamation's estimates of average annual flow in this river were overly optimistic might not have been right. Reclamation has overestimated waterflow in other rivers in order to present a more favorable picture of payout than really could be expected. The same situation may well be present in the Missouri.

In short, the Missouri River Basin project is in financial trouble today because Mr. Dominy is today selling power from units of the project below its cost. For every kilowatt he sells from this project, the project loses money. The project is in financial trouble not because the Congress included hydropower as a functional part, but because the Bureau is pricing this power below its cost.

I am not alone in my impressions as to the chaos that exists in the Missouri River Basin project, or to my questioning whether power is really a paying partner. For example, the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, in a speech on November 16, 1964, at Bismarck, N. Dak., said:

> I doubt if many of you realize the extent of the criticism of the entire reclamation program as a result of problems caused by hasty and politically inspired actions, or the burdens placed upon those of us who are responsible for justifying the reclamation program in the Congress.
>
> Development of the Missouri River Basin project as a single entity permits the use of power revenues to assist in paying irrigation costs. This is a sound conservation principle to which I thoroughly subscribe and which I have always supported. However, power revenues cannot assist irrigation development when power can't even pay its own way. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 11, 1965, pp. 479–483.)

I could not have made the point more succinctly. The reclamation mess is public knowledge all around the country. Even the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—who is the right arm of the President on program matters and is intimately familiar with agency activities—raised serious questions in an article in the January 9, 1965, Saturday Review of Literature—reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 7, 1965, pages 395–397—as to whether the reclamation program has been adequately adjusted to meet current needs. I hope he is not just whistling in the wind, and that his actions in future budgets will not only reflect this concern, but also indicate what steps he will take to remedy the situation.

> Mr. SAYLOR dwells at some length on the effect of adding high-cost power projects to a going system. He considers this practice unreasonable. Such an operation is standard practice in almost every business that has a multitude of component factors resulting in one product which in turn is sold at one rate. Senator FRANK CHURCH of Idaho, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some time ago and in connection with the Burns Creek project, cited the case of an owner of a fleet of taxicabs. Senator CHURCH pointed out rightly that the owner of the fleet did not charge for taxi service in accordance with the cost of the operation of a particular cab but rather made a uniform charge based upon the average cost of all his cabs. Actually, of course, it is the regulatory agency that finally sets the rate that cabs may charge, but the average cost is actually what is taken into account. All power utilities, be they investor-owned or publicly owned, follow this pattern. Consequently, it is difficult to understand why the Bureau of Reclamation should be criticized for following that which is common practice in industry. You can easily visualize the confusion were we to attempt to charge the multitude of customers power rates different for each powerplant in the system.

The Commissioner holds that the adding of higher cost projects is a good practice followed by industry. I would like to have someone explain to me how a power system which is losing money in the early years of its existence can actually keep the same rates, add higher cost plants, and still improve payout without juggling the accounts. A clear distinction must be made between a so-called high-cost plant and a high cost per unit of output. The claim that it is the practice of power utilities to add high-cost new projects to a system is not borne out by the facts. Rather, the existing practice and possibilities of adding new, larger, but more efficient plants to reduce costs is explained in detail in the recently issued national power survey of the Federal Power Commission. This report emphasizes the necessity that new plants have lower unit costs in order to bring down power rates. This fact explains why the electric power companies' rates have shown a consistently downward trend over the years even though other price levels have concurrently increased. The letter continues:

> Power marketing in the Columbia River Basin area is not within the administrative purview of the Bureau of Reclamation, although revenues are obtained from this source to aid irrigation repayment. We will not discuss Mr. SAYLOR's reference to financial aspects of Federal power in that area other than to say that extensive studies are being made by the Bonneville Power Administration to determine whether existing rates are adequate to assure repayment of all reimbursable power costs within the legally imposed time limits and to contribute revenues for financial assistance as required to meet scheduled irrigation needs.

The Commissioner's letter said he would refrain from discussing the status of the Bonneville Power Administration payout except to mention that extensive studies are being made "to determine whether existing rates are adequate to assure repayment of all reimbursable power costs within the legally imposed time limits and to contribute revenues for financial assistance as required to meet scheduled irrigation needs." Studies on this subject have been underway for two decades; and, yet, for 7 straight years the deficits increased until 1964. Then, through use of what must have been answers to certain letters to Santa Claus, the amount of annual costs allocated to power was reduced by merely shifting a substantial portion of the cost to nonreimbursable navigation purposes and through other accounting subterfuge. In its annual report to the Congress in 1964, the General Accounting Office made the following comment on BPA payout:

> The proposed reports contain our opinion that the financial statements, which were prepared by the Bonneville Power Administration, do not present fairly the financial position and results of operations of the integrated power system. Our opinion was based on the fact that firm cost allocations had not been made for 9 of 12 projects in operation, the cost of generating project construction work in progress was omitted from the statement of financial condition, generating costs were not disclosed, and the effect of changes in accounting practices and the amounts to be repaid from power revenues were not properly disclosed.

Here the General Accounting Office says that the financial reports of a Government agency do not "fairly" reflect its financial position or operations. What an indictment of the operations of a Federal agency. How long would such conditions be permitted to exist for any non-Federal organization? Its officials would be promptly held to account for such situations.

In addition, is this not an excellent example of exactly the reverse of what the Commissioner said happens? Here the income during the early years of operation of low-cost, efficient plants created a surplus which was rapidly dissipated when new, more expensive, less efficient plants were added and no corresponding increase in rates was instituted.

Hominy Dominy continues:

> Mr. SAYLOR cites the proposed Burns Creek project at some length. He reports accurately, as far as he goes, the repayment relationship between the Palisades project and the Burns Creek project. He fails to point out, however, that the annual revenues from power would be almost doubled by adding Burns Creek to the Palisades project, and that by extending the revenue accumulation period of the combined Palisades and Burns Creek projects beyond the year 2006 to the year 2028, the initial effect of Burns Creek in reducing temporarily the amount of power revenues available for financial assistance would be offset. Thereafter, the revenue accumulation which would be available for financial assistance to irrigation projects would be greater by over $1,100,000 annually with Burns Creek project in the system than without it. This in itself counteracts the contention of Mr. SAYLOR as to the power-mindedness of the Bureau of Reclamation. Our objective is multiple-purpose utilization of our water resources, with consumptive use on farms and in cities of prime concern. But we cannot divorce these purposes and functions from hydroelectric power in large-scale projects.

I told Mr. Shamberger that I am glad to learn also that I reported accurately the repayment relationship between the Palisades project and the Burns Creek project. Sure, annual revenues might be doubled if Burns Creek was added to the Palisades system; but what would happen to annual costs—they would more than double. This cannot result in other than a detriment to payout and a reduction in the amount available for irrigation assistance. The Commissioner argues that revenues after payout of the two projects in the year 2028 would be greater, but the present worth of that money is peanuts. Furthermore, he overlooks the large amount of net income that would be realized after Palisades alone is paid out.

It seems to me that it should not take much of a mathematician, economist, or financier to show that a project—Palisades—which would produce more than $22 million surplus revenues between payout in 1988 and the year 2006, together with the net earnings from 2006 to 2028—and some estimates indicate this latter period to be 31 years, not 22 years—is worth much more than a larger project which might produce $1.1 million more revenues annually after the year 2028. If the net earnings from Palisades were invested in Government bonds at the present 4 percent interest in the year 2006, and thereafter, they would be worth tens of millions of dollars in the year 2028 and would provide revenues double the surplus annual revenues of $1.1 million which he claims from the combination project. If we really want to provide financial assistance to irrigation, let us do it in an aboveboard fashion and in a way which is perfectly clear and obvious and not by some sleight-of-hand manner which produces a fake and wrong answer.

My objective also is the same as that of Commissioner Dominy, "multiple-purpose utilization of our water resources with consumptive use on farms and cities of prime concern. But, we cannot divorce these purposes and functions from hydroelectric power in large-scale projects." But, we are not going to get it by embarking upon a course of constructing facilities which reduce and dissipate our ability to secure maximum economic development as the Burns Creek project obviously would.

NRA is, and should be, interested only in the dollar contribution the sale of power makes to the water features of any given project and not in whether the purchaser of the power is cooperative A, power company B, or municipality C.

Mr. Dominy continues:

> The issue involved in the Trinity River division to which Mr. SAYLOR refers was whether or not the specific hydroelectric power facilities would be constructed and operated by the Federal Government or by an investor-owned private utility in a contractual relationship with the Bureau of Reclamation. The decision for Federal construction of the facilities was made by the Congress. The authorizing legislation for the Trinity River division directed the Secretary of the Interior to continue to conclusion negotiations with non-Federal agencies on proposals to purchase falling water and to report the results of such negotiations and his recommendations thereon. In February 1957, the Bureau of Reclamation reported on the offer of a private company to purchase falling water and then Secretary Seaton, in his report to the Congress later that month, recommended acceptance of the company's offer.
>
> The Congress, however, did not pass legislation which would have authorized and directed the Secretary to enter into contracts as proposed by the private utility. Since the Congress had so declared its disapproval of the sale of falling water, appropriation of funds was made by the same Congress for construction of federally owned power facilities. The Congress itself thus dictated the course of action followed. Regardless of the merits of Federal versus private construction of the Trinity power facilities, Congressman SAYLOR used this case to support his main theme of Bureau of Reclamation dereliction in supporting irrigation interests whereas the Congress actually made the decision.
>
> Quite aside from the politics of the Trinity River division, it should be remembered that the development is designed to import almost 1 million acre-feet of water into the Sacramento River Basin for eventual irrigation and municipal and industrial use throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. Moreover, the division will contribute a substantial block of pumping power for use in distributing the water southward and otherwise fulfill all of the promise that classic hydroelectric power development affords to the irrigation purpose. Revenue from the hydroelectric powerplants helps make this possible.

Mr. Speaker, in my letter to Mr. Shamberger, I said that Commissioner Dominy's comments, placing the blame for the Trinity River division power facilities on the Congress, came with rather poor grace. Even though various proposals for Trinity have been made for several decades, who—other than the Bureau of Reclamation—conceived, designed, and made the finding of feasibility on the project in 1952 upon which the Trinity authorizing legislation was based? Who—other than the Bureau of Reclamation—recommended in 1952 that it build the entire project including the much discussed power facilities? Granted, the 1955 congressional authorization for this project directed the Secretary of the Interior to continue negotiations with non-Federal agencies for the purchase of falling water and to report to the Congress subsequently did not concur in Secretary Seaton's recommendation for acceptance of the company's offer. The Congress only reverted back to what the Bureau of Reclamation initially recommended in 1952.

Furthermore, the issue in the Trinity project to which Mr. Dominy stated I referred is not the issue I raised in my Palm Springs statement. My point was not—and I repeat "not"—as he claims, "whether or not the specified hydroelectric power facilities would be constructed and operated by the Federal Government or by an investor-owned private utility in a contractual relationship with the Bureau of Reclamation." This issue had nothing to do with the question I was raising; namely, whether the power facilities—no matter who built them—would help to provide additional financial assistance to irrigation in the Central Valley project. While it is true that Congress authorized Federal construction of the Trinity project, it did not direct the Bureau of Reclamation to market power at rates which would lose millions of dollars that would otherwise be available to irrigation. The Bureau sets the rates not the Congress.

I was very much interested in the Commissioner's claim that the Trinity River division fulfills "all of the promise that classic hydroelectric power development affords to the irrigation purpose" and the "revenue from the hydroelectric powerplants helps make this possible," since power sold at present rates from the "classic hydroelectric project" has resulted in a substantial reduction in the Central Valley fund and has proved—as Secretary Seaton warned—to be "a drag and a drain" on reclamation. Secretary Seaton said the cost of Federal power from this project would be between 7½ and 9 mills per kilowatt-hour. CVP rates result in about 4½ mills per kilowatt-hour. So the difference between 7½ mills cost and 4½ mills selling price is 3 mills lost—not a paying partner, but a sponging partner. I can only restate my complete agreement with my distinguished colleague from Colorado, the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who said, "power revenues cannot assist irrigation development when power cannot even pay its own way." Even the Bureau of Reclamation cannot create surplus power revenues where there are none because the project is operating at a loss.

Commissioner Dominy really went out on a limb when he said:

> We have been unable to reconstruct the computations by which Mr. Saylor arrived at the conclusion that the Bureau's appropriations for transmission lines and facilities amounted to more than $57 million in fiscal year 1965. Regardless of the accuracy of that particular computation, however, it must be recognized that use of such statistics in any 1 year could be highly misleading, since our activities cover many types of construction. From 1 year to another the proportion of the funds expended may vary widely as these funds are expended on dams, powerplants, tunnels, canals, transmission lines, distribution systems, and many other forms of construction. One or two large contracts devoted to any specific purpose can materially affect the distribution of Reclamation's funds for the year of maximum earnings under those contracts.

I could not resist the opportunity to tell Mr. Shamberger that it should not have been too difficult for the Bureau of Reclamation staff to reconstruct the amount of $57 million I said was appropriated for transmission lines and related facilities in fiscal year 1965 since this figure was developed from a press release from the Department of the Interior. In the Colorado River storage project and the Missouri River Basin alone more than $40 million was provided. When the amounts for the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, and the Central Valley, Parker-Davis and other project transmission line and substation appropriations are added, I am sure the total $57 million will be substantiated. Really, this figure is beside the point. The really key issue, however, is whether construction of Federal transmission lines are going to add to or take from the power revenues which will be available for reclamation. Whenever the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior advocate Federal construction of any transmission line, it seems to me NRA should be ready to ask not who is going to buy the power but for how much.

The Commissioner's letter continues:

> The only way to make meaningful the type of comparison Mr. SAYLOR attempted is to base it upon the distribution of costs for completed projects. We have analyzed the allocations of estimated total construction costs on projects included in our fiscal year 1965 construction program. Of these costs, 32 percent are allocated to power, including in addition to transmission facilities all the powerplants, turbines, generators, penstocks, and other specific power costs, and a share of the costs of dams, reservoirs, and other joint works. The fact that about one-third of the cost of these projects is allocated to power is not insidious as Mr. SAYLOR im-

> plies. On the contrary, the contribution of the power function to the financial feasibility of the irrigation function is paramount. In this group of projects it is expected that one-half of the cost allocated to irrigation will be repaid from power revenues. If such financial assistance were not available, hundreds of thousands of acres of productive lands on these projects could not have been irrigated. Without the assistance of power revenues, the reclamation program would not now enjoy its unique position among Federal agencies of being over 90 percent reimbursable and the enormous productive capacity of reclamation lands could have been realized only by outright subsidy from the taxpayers of the Nation running into billions of dollars.
>
> This dramatically illustrates the basic wisdom of the body of reclamation law and of the administration of the program which provides for comprehensive, multiple-purpose development of the Nation's water and land resources into a balanced, flexible, long-range plan for increasing every phase of the regional and national economy.

I told Mr. Shamberger I realized such figures for any one year may be misleading; but the trend is clear. In a statement by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Kenneth Holum during House hearings on the public works appropriation bill for 1965, it was stated that in 1963 "only about 33 percent of construction appropriations—for the Bureau of Reclamation—are for irrigation whereas 44 percent are for power. In other words, for every $3 spent for irrigation in 1963, there were $4 spent for power. This seems to be representative of recent years. So, neither is 1965 an unusual year. I ask, how can a program which spends 33 percent more money for power than it does for irrigation—particularly where most of such new power facilities create a burden rather than an assist on project payout—be called essentially a reclamation effort? Furthermore, while 90 percent of the reclamation program is supposed to be reimbursable, as the Commissioner indicates, the instances where payout has been made on schedule, without moratoriums or adjustment, are unique and infinitesimal.

There have been and still are outright subsidies from the taxpayers of the Nation running into billions of dollars, when the waiver of interest over extended periods is recognized. My criticism is not of the straight interest subsidy on justified irrigation projects; but of first, the rathole power projects which are leeches on power revenues, eating up income which could otherwise be effectively used to help repay irrigation costs, and second, the deceptive bookkeeping and reporting that is being done on many of these projects.

Mr. Dominy's letter goes on:

> Mr. SAYLOR implies that the recently approved and initiated intertie plan through which surplus Columbia River Basin power will be delivered to markets in California and elsewhere in the Southwest will somehow or other hurt the Central Valley project and perhaps other irrigation projects elsewhere. He cites the fact that the Central Valley project budget request was used in fiscal year 1964 for initial appropriations as an indication that irrigators in the Central Valley will be required to underwrite or subsidize the intertie. A similar but untruthful reference is also made to the Bureau's region No. 3. These inferences are completely unwarranted. Central Valley project was granted funds in prior years for study and construction purposes by the Congress as a simple matter of administrative convenience. Costs incurred through use of the funds have been transferred out of the Central Valley project accounts.
>
> Future budget requests will be presented for the intertie as a specific item, and accounting and repayment administration of these facilities will be conducted as a separate accounting entity. Studies presented to the Congress earlier this year left no doubt that this activity will be completely self-liquidating. Thereafter surplus revenues conservatively estimated at $114 million will have accumulated by the 75th year of operation. These revenues could well be made available as a source of financial assistance to reclamation projects in California, Arizona, and Nevada at the discretion of the Congress. These possibilities were brought out in the appropriation hearings.

I was very much interested in Mr. Dominy's statement that costs of the intertie have been transferred out of the Central Valley project. I would be interested in knowing, and I think the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees on the Congress should examine very carefully, where these costs have flown and what is the authority for the new accounting.

The Commissioner gets more defensive by saying:

> Early in his presentation, Congressman SAYLOR accused us of wandering from our policies and programs: "* * * the career employees of the Bureau of Reclamation have wandered so far afield from the basic goal that it seems reclamation has become only of incidental importance." The policies, principles, and objectives of water resources development have undergone tremendous change since the reclamation program was initiated in 1902. We do not live in the past nor in a static or stagnant economy. To cling inflexibly to the past would be the death-knell of a progressive program. Rather than wandering from our policy and goals, we have been taking, and are constantly taking with the concurrence of the Congress, steps to keep apace with basic change occurring in our entire national life, and particularly in the field of natural resource conservation and use.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly for change where it is for the better. If there is any place in government where some new, sound, constructive thinking is needed and long overdue, it seems to me it is in the Bureau of Reclamation. The basic western settlement objective of the reclamation program has been largely achieved and is in need of modernization. Arrangements that have been repeatedly proven unsatisfactory should not be perpetuated but should be rejected or abandoned. Our limited natural resources should not be committed to purposes which may not prove to be in the best long-range interests of the Nation as a whole. We need broader and more objective thinking as to what is the best for all the people.

The last paragraph reads:

> The Bureau of Reclamation appreciates the opportunity to present its views to your organization.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> FLOYD E. DOMINY,
> *Commissioner.*

Thus ended Commissioner Dominy's letter. I concluded my letter to Mr. Shamberger assuring him that in every reclamation project that comes before the Interior Committee in the future, I am going to insist that Commissioner Dominy's Bureau of Reclamation tell us just how much it will cost to produce the power and how much they are going to sell it for. I will try to write into every reclamation project authorization act a specific provision requiring that the Bureau of Reclamation fix a power rate which will guarantee that reclamation will receive financial assistance from power revenues. I will continue to do my best to make power truly a "paying partner" not a "sponging partner." I then told Mr. Shamberger I hope the National Reclamation Association will give its support.

Mr. Speaker, this whole question of Federal power marketing agencies setting artificially low rates for hydroelectric power regardless of the legal requirements is one to which the Congress can and must address itself. The repayment debacle in the Missouri River Basin is not the exception, it is the rule and is being repeated ad nauseam in other Federal projects. The Congress has displayed remarkable patience and tolerance in waiting for the power marketing agencies to clean up their own houses, but this patience should have reached the breaking point. Therefore, I am suggesting to the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that a special subcommittee be appointed to conduct a detailed study of this entire problem and report back to the full committee with specific recommendations for corrective action.

The adverse effects of Federal power not being a paying partner of reclamation does not apply only to the Western States. Since the Congress has assumed responsibility for assisting in the reclamation program, tax dollars collected from all over the Nation are being required to finance the program. My own constituents in Pennsylvania contribute heavily to aid their countrymen in the West, so they have a vital stake in whether the Federal power marketing agencies are fulfilling their responsibilities for making power a paying partner. This also holds true for the constituencies of every Member of this House. I do not believe we are keeping faith with those we represent and with honest reclamationists when we permit subsidized electric power users to sap the revenues from necessary water resource developments.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I will not rest in my determination to get the reclamation program back on the right track, and I call upon all my colleagues to join me in this resolve.

EVALUATION OF CONTRIBUTION OF EXISTING RECLAMATION AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS IN ALLEVIATION OF PROPERTY DAMAGE AND LOSS OF LIFE

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Record for January 14, I inserted the text of my letter to President Johnson calling for an evaluation of the contribution of existing reclamation and flood control projects in the alleviation of property damage and loss of life during the recent Northwest flood. I have been encouraged by preliminary responses to this request wherein Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineer estimates indicate individual projects preventing damages equal to or exceeding their costs of construction. This and other background information and study has led me to make further requests of the President. In view of major new considerations raised by this unprecedented flood and a reappraisal of our Federal responsibility, I have recommended first, an immediate speedup in watershed and river basin planning and feasibility study efforts; second, reconsideration of the cost allocation criteria for water control works applicable to flood control; and, third, a greatly accelerated and expanded national program of water resource development.

Finally, I have called for the President's direct leadership in the development and conservation of our great land and water resources. This I regard as urgently needed, for we need bold new plans to cut through the conflicts and inconsistencies of existing resource programs in order to face up to the mushrooming requirements of the Great Society.

The following is the full text of my letter to President Johnson:

February 11, 1965.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Your concern for the plight of the disaster victims of the recent west coast flood is known and appreciated.

You will be interested in knowing that tragic as the losses have been, the threat of a recurrence of another major runoff this winter or spring is a real possibility.

While the action taken by the Federal Government on the immediate problem has been in many instances most praiseworthy, there have been many areas of indecision and inaction that have marred the record. In a separate letter which I have signed jointly with Senator Morse, some of these shortcomings have been called to your attention.

As to the long-range problem, I have given serious study to an appraisal of our Federal responsibility to meet the major new considerations raised by this unprecedented flood and recommend to you the following actions:

First, I urge an immediate speedup in feasibility studies for watershed and river basin planning programs in the Pacific Northwest and throughout the Nation.

Second, I urge an immediate review of the criteria of feasibility and cost allocation for water projects, taking into full account the fact that the recent floods completely demolished the "highest flood of record" concept. This review should also encompass the criteria for the allocation of existing reservoir space and management as well as those pertinent to allocations at initial construction.

Third, I urge an accelerated schedule of project construction in those areas where recent floods have pointed up the complete inadequacy or lack of water control facilities. In this regard, engineers now admit that it is well within the range of possibility that should the same conditions that caused the recent floods recur throughout the Columbia River Basin the resulting disaster could be far beyond anything anticipated in present assumptions.

Finally, your leadership is greatly needed in the development and conservation of our great land and water resources. We need bold new plans to cut through the conflicts and inconsistencies of existing resource programs and face up to the mushrooming requirements of the Great Society.

I urge your immediate consideration of these matters that are of such vital concern to the future of our great Nation, and am available to you at any time for whatever help I can be in the furtherance of our mutual interests in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Al Ullman,
Member of Congress.

AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record a concurrent resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Senate and General Assembly on January 18 and February 8, 1965, respectively, recommending an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to provide that no person shall be a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives who shall not when elected have been a resident of that State for 2 years prior to election to office.

This resolution is an expression of thinking representative of my State of New Jersey, and I am hopeful that other States will take similar action to convey the feeling of America's citizens in this matter:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, State of New Jersey

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to provide that no person shall be a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives who shall not, when elected, have been a resident of that State for which or from which he shall be chosen for at least 2 years prior to such election

(Introduced January 18, 1965, by Senator Sandman, without reference)

Whereas it appears desirable to provide in the Constitution of the United States additional residential requirements for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the General Assembly concurring):

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to take such action as may be required to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to provide that no person shall be a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives who shall not, when elected, have been a resident of that State for which or from which he shall be chosen for at least 2 years prior to such election.

2. That the secretary of the senate cause a duly attested copy of this resolution to be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senators from New Jersey, and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States elected from New Jersey.

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of resolution adopted by the New Jersey Legislature.

Henry H. Patterson,
Secretary of the Senate.

THE IMPORTANCE OF STRONGER WATER POLLUTION LAWS

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Howard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the frightening thought that future generations of our people might not even have enough clean water to drink let alone enjoy such activities as swimming and fishing has prompted me to introduce a bill today which will provide tighter government control in the area of water pollution.

The vital importance of waging a war against such water pollution was brought out by President Lyndon B. Johnson in his state of the Union message. He summoned all of us to help beautify America and end the poisoning of our rivers.

I am introducing this bill only 2 days before the House Public Works Committee opens its hearings on water pollution. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman John A. Blatnik, will chair those hearings. Because of his role in fighting water pollution, Mr. Blatnik has been dubbed by colleagues in Congress as "Mr. Water Pollution Control." I would like to pay further tribute to Mr. Blatnik's important cause by introducing a water pollution bill which is similar to his.

Unfortunately, the people of this Nation take their supply of unpolluted water for granted. It does not just happen. Water pollution does not stand still and without stronger Federal enforcement and control in the area of water pollution we face the very grim prospect of losing that battle.

As grave as it is in the Nation, water pollution is even a more serious problem in the central New Jersey area. In addition to being situated on the Atlantic Ocean, we have numerous other rivers, bays, and lakes in this region. As suburban dwellings increase, they produce an ever-increasing pollution problem.

FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the fate of the many captive nations now under the thumb of international communism becomes an increasingly important issue each day, for each day the Communists try to extend their power further. None of us can rest until these captive peoples have gained the freedom to select their own governments and to enjoy the blessings of liberty. So today, on this 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania, I extend a prayer that the Lithuanian people will soon be liberated from their present captivity and will again be a free and independent people.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following resolutions adopted by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey on February 13, 1965, and by the Lithuanian-Americans of Kearny and Harrison, N.J., on February 14, 1965:

Whereas this year also marks the 25th year of Soviet occupation and subjugation of Lithuania and oppression and exploitation of Lithuanians residing in their homeland; and

Whereas during this past quarter of a century the Soviets have continuously strived to obtain recognition by the free world of their forcible seizure and annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia; and

Whereas our brother and sister Lithuanians in Lithuania are suffering under constant Soviet pressures to denationalize them and to russify and sovietize their country and their children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to firmly restate and vigorously promote in all diplomatic dealings with the Kremlin, as well as in the United Nations and elsewhere, the restoration of the freedom and independence of Lithuania;

2. To ask the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to urge the special committee of the United Nations dealing with the liquidation of colonialism "in all its forms and implications" to investigate the Soviet colonialism in Lithuania;

3. To urge that Radio Free Europe extend its programing by including broadcasts in the Lithuanian language;

4. To assure the Lithuanian people presently suffering under Soviet occupation of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—total freedom and independence;

5. To support the policy of the U.S. Government, aimed at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and enduring peace, based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to governments of their own choosing within their own free and independent homelands; and

6. That we send this resolution to the President of the United States and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, our U.S. Senators and Members of Congress, and to the press.

Valentinas Melinis,
Chairman.
Albin S. Treciokas,
Secretary.

We, Lithuanian-Americans of Kearny and Harrison, N.J., who are solemnly met here on this 14th day of February 1965, in Our Lady of Sorrows Lithuanian R.C. Church auditorium, Kearny, N.J., and who are loyal American citizens of Lithuanian origin, together with other American friends and sympathizers, have unanimously adopted the following resolution for consideration by the President of the United States of America.

RESOLUTION ON THE OCCASION OF THE 47TH COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence, her forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union, and her transformation into a Soviet colonial possession;

Recalling the stand taken by the both great political parties of our country as expressed in their electoral platforms of 1964;

Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration to Lithuania of a free exercise of the right to self-determination and of the respect for human rights and fundamental freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State and the Congress of the United States firmly to restate and vigorously to promote in diplomatic dealings with the Kremlin, as well as in the United Nations and elsewhere, the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania;

2. To ask the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to urge the Special Committee of the United Nations dealing with the liquidation of colonialism "in all its forms and implications," to investigate the Soviet colonialism in Lithuania;

3. To urge that the Free Europe Radio extend its program by including broadcasts in the Lithuanian language;

4. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and freedom; and

5. To support the policy of the U.S. Government, aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace, based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to governments of their own choice.

Rev. John Scharnus,
Pastor of Our Lady of Sorrows Lithuanian R.C. Church, Kearny, N.J.
Peter W. Velevas,
Councilman, Kearny, N.J.
John J. Salvest,
Attorney at Law of New Jersey.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART VII

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues, part VII of the excellent series of articles appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on "New York City in Crisis."

The following installment is from the January 28, 1965, edition of the Tribune and describes conditions in Harlem:

Harlem Dread: Leaders' Flight, Growing Decay

(By Barry Gottehrer and Claude Lewis)

(This is the greatest city in the world, but to an increasing number of its citizens it is no longer the greatest place in which to live. Hundreds of these citizens have been telephoning and writing to the Herald Tribune since the investigative series "New York City in Crisis" began Monday. The tenor of their responses suggests that there is a hope that out of criticism can come renewed civic creativity, a meaningful reform that can permit people like the Alexander Jameses—whose story is told in today's article—to return to the city and live meaningful, satisfying lives.)

Godfred Cambridge, the talented Negro comedian, frequently tells the story of a Negro who, after years of struggling against prejudice and indifference, finally decides to break out of Harlem and move to the suburbs.

"Once this guy sees a few trees, some grass, and a clean street," the comedian says, "he becomes so white he has to take Negro lessons in order to communicate with his own brother he left behind in Harlem."

It is a funny story—one that invariably draws laughter from both whites and Negroes—but it is also a meaningful one. And at the heart of its meaning is a truth that threatens to turn Harlem's already troubled present into a nightmarish future.

Because of the city government's past indifference, present inadequacy, and future uncertainty in dealing with the worsening problems of Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, and its other ghettos, New York City's Negro middle class seems on the verge of giving up.

In increasing numbers, its members are deserting the slums that poison the mind as well as the body, the inferior schools, the rat-infested tenements, the prejudice and the corruption for suburbia—and, unfortunately in a great many instances, a whole new set of problems. Yet, to almost every single one of the 233,000 Negroes who live in central Harlem and to many of the 856,000 others, who live elsewhere in the city, a few trees, a few blades of grass, and a clean street would offer an immediate improvement.

"What was the point of remaining in the city when they made it so obvious that we weren't wanted?" asks Alexander James Jr., an electrical engineer who left the city for Middletown, N.J., last year. "There wasn't one sign, one indication that we were desirable citizens—and believe me, we looked. Somehow, it's not enough just to be tolerated."

Alexander James, Jr. is not a racist and he is not an outspoken civil rights leader. He is simply a 31-year-old New Yorker who learned that because he was Negro and because he wasn't rich he had to look elsewhere for a good life for himself and his family.

"Housing in Harlem is bad and the educational system is about the worst in the city," he says. "There's not much to keep the middle-income families in Harlem. The environment isn't generally conducive to high aspirations. That's the main reason people are moving away. I think it would be great if many more stayed, including myself, and worked for the good of the community, but we must consider our kids."

City hall officials and civic leaders constantly express concern over the loss of 800,000 middle-class whites and the influx of more than 800,000 Negroes and Puerto Ricans since 1950. They should be concerned. These are both critical problems—the loss of the productive young marrieds and the influx of the unskilled and semiskilled.

Yet these problems are, in a sense, certainly no more critical than the city's inability to keep the Negro middle class from fleeing New York. For without them—the doctors and the dentists, the teachers and the engineers—Harlem will be left with only the troubled people, who can't help themselves, and the politicians, who, in many cases, don't really want to help them either.

Even the respected leaders of the city's Negro community rarely live in Harlem any more. Representative Adam Clayton Powell divides his time between Puerto Rico, Washington, and Europe. Prof. Kenneth Clark lives in Hastings on Hudson, N.Y. James Farmer lives in lower Manhattan. Whitney Young lives in New Rochelle. And Roy Wilkins lives in Queens.

To them—and the thousands of others who can afford to escape—Harlem might be an interesting place to visit but, they know, they'd never want to live there.

Never was the absence of a middle class so obvious as during the riots last summer. There were absentee leaders, there were rioters, there were looters, there were opportunists, and there were the little people with little or no communication among them.

The middle class, people intelligent enough to deal with the leaders, yet still not alien to the rioters and the little people, were sorely missed.

Where were they?

For the most part, they were in the suburbs or, unfortunately, like Ralph Ellison's "Invisible Man," taken to hiding as the easiest escape from the ugly reality in the streets outside.

"Sure I feel guilty—damn guilty," says one Negro journalist who moved to the suburbs 2 years ago. "But the real guilt is the city's. They're responsible for the slums, not me. Take yourself. You're white. What would you do if you were Negro? Would you want your family to live in Harlem?"

Take a good look at central Harlem—3½ square miles that spew out south to 110th Street, east to Third Avenue, northeast to the Harlem River, and west to the parks bordering St. Nicholas, Morningside and Manhattan Avenues and house 233,000 Negroes, 8,000 Puerto Ricans and nearly 1 million rats—and the answer for anyone who can afford better would have to be a firm "no."

It's not that Harlem doesn't have any decent people or any decent housing. It has both. But the decent housing is, almost entirely, limited to a group of relatively high-rent apartment houses (Lenox Terrace, for example, charges $40 a room) and even these are insufficient. And the decent people are, for the most part, either unmarried and don't care or care deeply but aren't important enough to bring about radical change.

And what makes the present situation particularly depressing is that the decay, disorganization and dissatisfaction that envelopes the buildings and the people of Harlem today are not merely signs of the sixties. Back in the late thirties, when Fiorello La Guardia swept in as mayor under a reform movement and long before the massive Puerto Rican influx further complicated the problem, Harlem was a troubled area—one in which the physical plant and the people were both in desperate need of help.

Today, despite the city's efforts to rid New York of slums, and 15 years and more than $2.19 billion of urban renewal, the city's worst slum remains and, according to the people who can afford to leave and to those who can't, Harlem is worse than it ever was before.

"You can't just go in there and tear down all the buildings at one time," says Julius C. C. Edelstein, executive assistant to the mayor. "Where are you going to put all the people while you're rebuilding the area?"

So far—even in the face of the national war on poverty—the city, handicapped by limited funds and stymied by uncertainty, has done very little to prevent the increasing deterioration.

Why do people leave?

In the first place, there is almost no place to live. Of the 87,369 housing units in central Harlem, nearly half were built at the turn of the century and 90 percent were built before 1930. Eleven percent of the apartments are classified as "dilapidated" and 33 percent of the others as "deteriorating."

Overcrowded, inadequately heated and ventilated, with unsanitary toilet, kitchen and water facilities, a great many of these apartments have become breeding places for disease, rats, and crime. Particularly distressing and disturbing to parents is the area's infant mortality rate, judged by many doctors to be the best single index for measuring a community's health. In central Harlem, the infant mortality rate has been and continues to be shocking—nearly double the rate of the entire city (45.2 per 1,000 live births).

Alexander James, who grew up in the ghettos of Harlem and Brooklyn, knew he wanted to live elsewhere—almost anywhere else—when he returned from the Army in 1955. Despite a fairly stable home life (only half of the area's youths of 17 and under live with both parents, compared with 83 percent for the entire city), Alexander James knew what slum conditions could do. He had already seen too many of his teenage friends succumb to narcotics and crime.

"When I lived on Eighth Avenue and 114th Street, I could look out into the backyard and see any number of boys using drugs," he says. "And a lot of my friends got involved with the police for snatching pocketbooks and holding up people. In Harlem almost every kind of crime takes place. After a while you don't even think about it because it's always there, all around you. I lived in ghettos most of my early life and the one thing that they have in common is that they never seem to change."

Even though he worked nights for the transit authority (he was going to school during the day) and his wife was a practical nurse, it was not easy finding a suitable apartment. It rarely is for a Negro.

In Negro neighborhoods, residents are victimized by slumlords. In predominantly white neighborhoods, Negroes are victimized by prejudice.

During a 5-week period in the fall of 1955, Mrs. James answered 10 classified ads for apartments in the Tremont area of the Bronx. In several instances, it was obvious that she had been turned down only because she was a Negro. Frequently the landlord would tell her that the apartment had just been rented. And when the place hadn't been rented, the landlord would claim that the newspaper had made a typographical error and that the rent wasn't really $65 a month but $110—or some other figure far out of her price range.

Now Dorothy James could have filed a complaint with the State commission against discrimination (renamed the State commission on human rights in 1962) and, after considerable redtape and considerable embarrassment, perhaps even won admittance into one of the houses. But like most people, the Jameses didn't want trouble, redtape, and embarrassment—they just wanted an apartment outside a slum.

The 11th ad she answered paid off handsomely—for the landlord. She found a small four-room apartment at 734 East 181st Street for only $52.90 a month—plus an "initiation fee" of $925 for which she received no receipt.

"Every Negro family in that newly integrated area had to pay a similar fee," Mrs. James recalls. "We were just beginning our life together and we didn't want to start out in a slum. So for being Negro we had to pay an extra $925. What we didn't know, of course, was that the only reason they let us into the neighborhood was because the place was already on the way down."

When more and more Negroes and Puerto Ricans began pouring into the area, the houses, the stores, and just about everything else seemed to go into a startling decline.

"It wasn't that the new residents tore them up but the whites moved out and all the services we enjoyed when we first moved in just deteriorated," she says. "I mean little things. Like they didn't clean the hallways as often as they did when the whites lived there. They stopped having quality food in the stores and they were not as courteous any more. Within a couple of years we realized that we had only exchanged a bad slum for a better one."

In 1961, when Alexander James graduated with honors from City College and went to work for Bell Laboratories in Manhattan, he and his wife, unhappy with their slum surroundings and crowded with two children in their small apartment, decided to move to a better community.

"Even though we could afford to live in the best apartment houses in Harlem, we never considered moving back," he says. "We were thinking of Westchester or Long Island. Then when I received word that I was going to be transferred to Bell's new plant in Holmdel, N.J., we welcomed the chance to leave the city. Harlem was definitely out of the question."

The factors that made it out of the question for the Jameses—and for thousands of other middle-class Negro families—all stem from the failure of the city, its people, and its government in comprehending and treating the disease of the slums. In addition to Harlem's decaying physical plant and infant-mortality rate, the Jameses also considered:

Education: The school system in central Harlem is so ineffectual that Negro students are already on the average of 1 year behind in word knowledge, reading comprehension and arithmetic by the time they reach the third grade, nearly 2 years behind by the time they reach the sixth and 2½ by the time they reach the eighth. And the dropout rate—from both academic and vocational high schools—is consistently above 50 percent.

"They have not been teaching the children of Harlem to read for 25 years," says Negro leader Bayard Rustin, "and they are still not teaching him to read now."

Crime: Violence and personal disorganization seem to be everywhere with little or no respect for the police who are viewed by many as part of all the corruption, the numbers, the gambling, the narcotics, and the prostitution that thrive seemingly unchecked in the area.

The area's juvenile delinquency rate is double the rate of the city, its habitual narcotics-user rate is from three to eight times greater, and its homicide rate is six times greater. And central Harlem's venereal disease rate for those under 21 is more than six times greater (110.3 cases per 10,000 compared to 17.2).

Employment: The median income is $3,480 (compared to $5,130 for whites) with half the families earning less than $4,000 (compared to 25 percent for the city) and 17 percent earning less than $2,000. Only 1 in 25 (compared to 4 in 25 for all the city) earns more than $10,000.

Thirty-eight percent of the males hold unskilled jobs (26 percent for the city) and, despite approximately 1,617 business establishments in central Harlem, only 4 percent of the area's Negroes are managers and proprietors. For most Negroes, there is no opportunity at all for honest work in Harlem. Only 7 percent work at home or close enough to walk to work (compared to 17 percent for all of Manhattan).

Indifference: Despite the riots and the massive protests that followed, Harlem's residents realize they have won little from the city government—either in deeds or in understanding. To many, it seemed incredible but typical when the police department considered reassigning Lt. Thomas Gilligan, whose slaying of a Negro boy had triggered the riots, from Manhattan to Bedford-Stuyvesant, one of the city's two major Negro ghettos.

To city hall and "Whitey" downtown, these may seem to be relatively minor problems or, perhaps, symptoms of a greater ill—to be filed away at least until the weather turns warm again and forces the people of Harlem back into the streets.

But to the people of Harlem, these problems—and the city's inability to do anything to solve them—are of transcendent importance and growing increasingly more critical every day.

One of the Negroes who has not yet left for the suburbs is a 36-year-old lawyer named George Donald Covington who has been in Harlem since 1955. "There's a job to be done here," he says. "If every Negro moves away, who's going to help the little guy help himself? We have got to bring law and order to Harlem. We've got to make our young people respect the law and we've got to make the law respect our young people.

"Harlem isn't hopeless you know. But there is so much bitterness and anger here that it's hard to reach the people. They're angry over the little things. A Negro cannot give up nor can he ignore his people."

Mr. Covington's commitment is genuine but unusual. His law practice has been centered around Harlem for more than 7 years now and, between him and his architect wife, the Covingtons reportedly earn nearly $20,000 a year. This enables him to escape the inadequate housing (by living in an old but well-kept, 6½-room, $123-a-month apartment on 149th Street) and send his son to the Emerson School, a $1,200-a-year private school on West 96th Street.

"I think more Negroes would stay and help see this thing through if the city gave them any reason at all to stay," he says. "But it doesn't. The problems of Harlem schools, like the problems of Harlem crime and Harlem housing and Harlem employment and Harlem opportunity, are all excessive because the city doesn't care enough to do its very best. And since the city doesn't care, neither do the people. Actually, it makes more sense to leave than to stay. The Negro is insulted everywhere he turns."

Civil rights leaders tend to agree with Mr. Covington. They have always had friendly relations with Mayor Wagner and, particularly in the aftermath of last summer's rioting, had little trouble in seeing him. Prodding the mayor into positive action has been another matter, however.

"You can spend 2 hours talking to him and come away thinking what a nice man he is," says one civil rights leader. "Then, when you get around to figuring out exactly what you've gained, you suddenly realize that he's given you nothing at all."

It is precisely this lack of responsive leadership in city hall—coupled with the increasing decay and the spreading blight—that has driven Alexander James and his wife and thousands of other Negroes out of the city. Today, earning slightly more than $10,000 a year and living in a still partially furnished $21,000 home as one of two Negro families in an otherwise all-white community, the Jameses have apparently been lost for good.

Their new life is far from ideal. Though not rent poor, there are economic hardships. They sorely need a second car but cannot afford to buy one.

Though normally friendly people, they have made friends slowly in the community.

Though they have been exposed to prejudice before, their two children had not. Their 7-year-old son is still troubled about being called "Swanee River" and "Chocolate Bar" by some of his classmates and told that "all Negroes carry knives and are bad."

"When we first moved here I was sorry because of the loneliness," says Mrs. James. "But now, every time I go to Harlem, I'm glad to get back home. We think New York has the potential to be a great place to live—even for Negroes. But it certainly isn't now and who knows if it ever will be?"

The Jameses have not yet found the need to take "Negro lessons" and probably never will. They are simply two people the city and the city's Negro community could ill afford to lose. And what makes their desertion and the desertion of so many others so tragic is that the city did absolutely nothing to keep them here.

APPOINTMENT OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of the Honorable John A. Gronouski for another term as Postmaster General was most pleasing to many of us. It has been my opportunity and privilege to work with General Gronouski on so many problems in connection with his Department. There is an article in the New York Times of February 16 entitled, "Gronouski Named to Another Term," together with another article, "Outspoken Postal Chief," which are most interesting, and read as follows:

Gronouski Named to Another Term—Under 1872 Law, Postal Head Serves a Specified Time

WASHINGTON, February 15.—The Cabinet hat on Postmaster General John A. Gronouski's head can lie easy for the next 4 years.

The White House announced today that President Johnson would nominate Mr. Gronouski for a full Presidential term.

Under a curious law enacted in 1872, the Postmaster General is the only one of the 10 Cabinet members who serves during the term of the President who names him and for 1 month thereafter, and then must be renominated.

Mr. Gronouski was appointed in 1963 by President Kennedy to succeed J. Edward Day, and continued in office under Mr. Johnson. Under the 1872 law, his term had 5 days to run.

This odd little historical quirk resulted from the Tenure of Office Act that Congress passed March 2, 1867, over Andrew Johnson's veto.

The act was intended to limit the President's powers. It provided that the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, Navy, Interior, the Attorney General, and the Postmaster General hold their offices during the term of the President by whom they were appointed and for 1 month thereafter. The President could not remove officials without the approval of the Senate.

DISREGARDED ACT

Andrew Johnson disregarded the act and dismissed Lincoln's and his obstreperous Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton, who insisted on merciless treatment of the vanquished South. This was one of the grounds for the impeachment proceedings brought against Johnson. Conviction failed by one vote of the two-thirds necessary.

Meantime, the provision of the Tenure of Office Act applying to Cabinet officers had been repealed a month before.

Post Office researchers discovered today that during the 1-year life of the act, a board of commissioners had worked out a new draft of the Postal Code to consolidate statutes relating to the Post Office Department.

That draft picked up the wording of the act, which said, "The term of the Postmaster General shall be for and during the term of the President by whom he is appointed, and for 1 month thereafter, unless sooner removed."

The new Postal Code, wording intact, was adopted as law on June 8, 1872, and there it has remained ever since.

"Somebody goofed," said a Post Office spokesman today. "Of course, whether it was a mistake or whether they wanted to limit the term of the Postmaster General is anybody's guess."

Mr. Gronouski must now await the likely confirmation of the Senate.

Outspoken Postal Chief: John Austin Gronouski, Jr.

The Postmaster General of the United States is a bulky, pipe-smoking extrovert who has disproved the adage that if a man speaks his mind frankly he won't get very far in life or in politics. John Austin Gronouski, Jr., who was 45 years old last October 26, has been an outspoken partisan Democrat all his adult life. Part of his reward was his Cabinet appointment 2 years ago by President Kennedy, an appointment that was renewed yesterday by President Johnson.

When the former college professor got word of his selection in 1963 he did not hesitate to acknowledge that he did not know his ZIP code and sometimes forgot to mail letters for his wife.

He said that the closest he had come to Post Office Department operations was licking stamps for John F. Kennedy's campaign in the bitter Wisconsin primary of 1960 and later in the general election.

In Washington he is acknowledged as a capable administrator of the sprawling postal operations. He arrives at his office in the Department's limousine between 9 and 10 a.m. and, unless he has a social engagement in the evening, stays until 7:30 or 8 at night.

A PAYCHECK ERROR

He is an informal type who is equally at home in smoke-filled academic seminars or smoke-filled political parleys. He is absentminded about such matters as getting his hair cut and has been known to work shoeless and in shirtsleeves in his Pennsylvania Avenue office.

Mr. Gronouski, the first Polish-American to receive a Cabinet appointment, was born in Dunbar, a hamlet of 106 people in northeastern Wisconsin. He explains the "U" rather than the traditional "W" in his last name by saying that his father had once received a paycheck made out that way and decided to change his name rather than waste the time correcting the error.

He grew up in Oshkosh where his father taught high school physics, and was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1942. He flew 24 missions as an 8th Air Force navigator in World War II and now diplomatically declines to say whether any of them were directed at Poland.

Once he bailed out over the English Channel and survived even though his parachute was on up side down. "I've been lucky all my life," he says.

He received his master's degree from the university in Madison in 1947, and, while writing his doctoral dissertation on "Valuation of Railroads for Ad Valorem Tax Purposes," taught economics and statistics for 2 years at the University of Maine and 3 years at Roosevelt University in Chicago. He received his Ph. D. degree in 1955 and taught public finances and banking at Wayne State University in Detroit until 1958.

In 1959 he won a civil service examination as research director of the Wisconsin State Tax Department and in the same year was named a tax commissioner by Gov. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. He held that post until his Cabinet appointment.

HELPED PARTY IN STATE

Although he has never run for public office, Mr. Gronouski played a leading role in the resurgence of the State's Democratic Party that began when Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE was elected in 1957 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

His advice was often sought, and frequently followed, by Mr. Nelson, Gov. John W. Reynolds, and Patrick J. Lucey, former Democratic State chairman.

In last year's campaign he spent his weekends corralling the Polish-American vote for President Johnson. His command of Polish, which he has learned through intensive courses since he went to Washington, was an acknowledged help.

Mr. Gronouski and his wife, the former Mary Louise Metz, of Madison, whom he married in 1949, live in a modest, two-story white brick house near Chevy Chase Circle, Washington. Their two daughters, Stacy, 12, and Julie Kay, 9, attend public schools.

The Gronouskis appear frequently at social events in the Capital. The Postmaster General drinks scotch at parties; with friends he likes to put his feet up and drink beer. Except for an occasional dip in a swimming pool, the extent of his athletic exertions has been checkers.

NAT (KING) COLE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, 13 days ago, I rose to pay tribute to a leading citizen of the 12th Illinois District whose death had left a vacant place against the sky. The Reverend Edward J. Coles, long-time spiritual leader in North Chicago, Ill., had passed on. I noted that missing from among his mourning family was a son—Nat "King" Cole, whose voice had made him internationally known in the world of entertainment.

Following my tribute here, I was one of the thousands who passed through the streets of North Chicago on February 7, 1965, and marked the city's flags flying at half-mast in respect to the lost leader. I was one of the hundreds who crowded into Shiloh Baptist Church, Waukegan, to hear and share in the expressions of respect, admiration and deep affection for Rev. Edward J. Coles.

Yesterday, Nat "King" Cole joined his parents—the father who had preceded him just 2 short weeks ago and the mother who went ahead in 1955. His rich talent, his winsome personality, his exemplary life as a husband and father had endeared Nat "King" Cole so much that his final illness affected thousands. The staff of the hospital where his last days were spent reported an influx of mail and messages far beyond anything they had previously experienced. A half-million people had responded to the daily bulletins on radio and television or the columnists' stories of his illness and his postoperative progress. And when the end came, the story of his death crowded the news of a grim war off the front pages of some of the world's most influential newspapers.

There may be no flags at half-mast in North Chicago today, but there are aching hearts and fresh memories as we mourn for the beloved son of a beloved father. Perhaps there is an added voice to the "heavenly choir" of which poets speak, for somewhere Nat "King" Cole sings on.

TESTING THE ALLEGED GOOD WILL OF THE COMMUNIST LEADERS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, again we hear throughout the land the chant that under the new leadership in the Soviet Union, the cold war is thawing. Communism is weakening its hold on its satellites and we are all getting closer together.

Today I am introducing a resolution which will put to the test the alleged good will of the Communist leaders. It would direct our representatives in the United Nations to bring before that world body the question of holding free elections in what has been termed the "captive nations."

These nations are Communist not by choice, but by force. They are not their own masters, but servants of the Kremlin. Their leaders are not self-chosen, but are puppets of Moscow. Their people are not free, but slaves beholden to a party which seeks to eliminate individuality. They do not have countries, they have subdivisions of the Communist Party.

These people have a history of pride in self and country. The world's music, literature, and history is enriched by the stirring works of these people, many of them refugees from the tyranny and abuse of communism.

Text of my bill follows:

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Albania, Cuba, and others by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over the aforesaid countries by force of arms; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the liberation question of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Albania, Cuba, and others before the United Nations and ask the United Nations to request the Soviets—

(1) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the aforesaid countries;

(2) to return all exiles and prisoners from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in these countries under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against these nations.

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has made a great show of seeking self-determination in the Congo. Apparently, only the so-called emerging nations have caught the interest of the U.N. in the field of self-determination. What about some of the oldest, most nationalist peoples, whose nations were entities many years ago, but who have recently lost their freedom and national purpose when taken over by the Communists?

The Soviet Union has avoided the question of free elections in these nations. Why? Because the leaders in the Kremlin know that when men who seek freedom have the opportunity, they vote for freedom. Communism cannot convince. Communism rules by threat, fear, blackmail, force, and brutality.

A resolution seeking free elections for the captive nations should have the unqualified support of the new nations of the world who have entered the U.N. as free, self-determined countries. It should have the support of our allies, who have granted freedom to many former colonies, and who live in freedom themselves. In short, such a resolution should have the support of all but the purely Communist bloc.

If communism is the choice of the people of these captive nations, Red leaders have little to fear by holding free elections. The fact that they do not is testimony to the fact that they fear the outcome. Full discussion of the status of these nations would be beneficial. As the free world leader, the United States has the obligation to demand that the U.N. discuss this problem.

With new leadership in the Kremlin, with renewed claims of softening behind the Iron Curtain, now is the time to bring to the fore the question of allowing people in the captive nations to vote their minds. I am hopeful that my colleagues will agree with me, and will help secure approval for my resolution.

SELMA INSCRIBES NOTE OF REASON IN HISTORY TEXT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of Americans make sensible and logical conclusions on important public issues when they have the benefit of all the relevant facts. With regard to recent events in Selma, Ala., the relevant facts have not all been readily available for many Americans. With this in mind, I want to share with my colleagues a newspaper article which appeared January 31, 1965, in the Montgomery Advertiser. I urge its consideration:

CITY WRONGED: SELMA INSCRIBES NOTE OF REASON IN HISTORY TEXT

(By Don F. Wasson)

History is an image projected upon a screen through the telescope of time, which merges people, places, and events so that the reader gets the entire picture at one time.

Fifty, one hundred, or two hundred years from now, the events, places, and people of today will be but a paragraph in the history books and for all the toil, sweat, and tears expended by the generations of our time on earth, a paragraph is about all they will rate.

In the supercolossal, wide screen, livid color drama now being acted out by today's cast of characters and called civil rights the name of one place called Selma might never appear in the finished product. It might well end on the cutting room floor, because the production will be long enough as it is.

But it would seem that if historians of the future were looking for a focal point upon which to base their postmortem conclusion as to who was right and who was wrong, what exactly did happen and what did not, then Selma, Ala., can offer a case study in the entire problem of the United States versus the people.

A DETERMINATION TO OBEY LAW

In Selma, you have a people who, nurtured on traditions as old as Selma itself, have resisted change with all their hearts and souls. They are a people who are conservative in their thoughts and actions and the forcible disruption of their traditions by an all-powerful Government has been a bitter pill to swallow.

But with determination, after last year's turmoil and strife, people in Selma had come to the conclusion that they would obey the law as best they could.

Mayor Joe Smitherman and Chief of Police Wilson Baker are the men who must lead the people through this difficult transition. As Baker told a civic club meeting recently: "This administration feels that it has a responsibility to lead Selma in dignity through the maze of legal transition resulting from the passage of the Civil Rights Act."

AN UNREASONABLE ATTITUDE

It appeared that the transition was going peaceably until early in January when Martin Luther King, spokesman for a large segment of the Negro population, decided, in all his infinite wisdom, that Selma needed to be prodded into more rapid action in racial matters. So King, the prophet from Oslo, came into Selma and agitated the multitude. Full of ideas on how to get Negroes to register to vote, he marched them upon the courthouse and here is where the unreasonable attitude of the racial agitators comes into sharp focus.

The Dallas County Board of Registrars had requested, and had received approval of the State, to register voters for 10 additional days in January. Normally the board meets twice a month, on the first and third Mondays to accept voter applications. Records show that it can handle from 25 to 35 voter applicants at 1 day's session.

But Martin Luther King sends 150 or more down to the courthouse to register and they come back again, and again.

IN 6 DAYS, 35 APPEARED

Now any resident of Dallas County had ample reason to know that the voter registration time had been extended, but on the first 6 days the board was in session, only 35 prospective voters showed up. Of these, 20 were Negroes. These 20 Negroes received the applications without fuss, and, as far as can be determined, were registered.

So, with 4 days left, Martin Luther King herds his flock down to the courthouse. It seems that anyone with sense enough to pass the voter requirements would know that a three-man board couldn't register that many people in 4 days, even if they were all qualified.

Some of Martin Luther King's flock, once inside the registrar's office, indicated that they didn't really want to be there. There also appeared several Negroes who could neither read nor write.

REGISTERING, OR AGITATING?

So it would appear that King and his cohorts in CORE, SNICK, and other racial groups weren't really so interested in registering Negroes as voters as they were in agitating.

It seems from here that historians who write of our day and time are going to be lenient of the good people of Selma, and other southern cities who tried to do right but that they will be pretty rough on King and his cohorts whose goals always appear to be self-aggrandizement and agitation—keeping their reputations alive—as it were.

Selma's mention in the history books might well read: "In one city in Alabama, Selma in Dallas County, the white people tried to meet the demands of the times as dictated by the Federal courts with reasonableness, but it was not allowed by the racial agitators."

THE INVADING HORDE

And in passing, we might also condemn a large segment of the national press, those publications who feed on sensationalism and half-truths, for sending into Selma a horde of semiliterate newsmen who, without feeling for the hard-working and God-fearing people, send back stories which distort the facts or, worse, disregard the facts completely.

You can read in countless publications how the great and noble King was punched in the face in Selma, Ala., without ever reading that the man who punched the Negro leader was not a Selman. Was not, in fact, a native Alabamian.

You can read how a law officer subdued a Negro woman who was standing in the voter line without ever knowing that she shouted obscenities at him beforehand. You can read how a law officer insisted that the Negroes use a certain door to enter the courthouse without ever seeing an explanation that a crowd of this size would completely block the main entrance and put a stop to normal business conducted in other courthouse offices.

BEATNIKS, UNLIMITED

Many of these so-called newsmen turn up at every scene of racial unrest. A good many of them seem to have been swept from the expresso houses and their knowledge of the history and traditions of the South is totally nonexistent. Yet they come down dressed in unpressed clothes and superior attitudes and sniff around for trouble. They see King get hit and this is all they need. The wires to New York and other centers of culture are kept hot with their unmitigated trash, their half-truths, and fabrications.

We have warred with the northern and liberal press before and we shall again. But the indictment of history shall weigh far more heavily upon the heads of these publishers than it shall upon the good people of Selma.

These good people are to be commended for their forebearance under circumstances no outsider can ever fully appreciate. And we say to them, "Hold fast to reason, for it surely shall prevail in the light of history."

CLEVELAND BILL TO PROTECT FULL SERVICE TO VETERANS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation in an effort to restore order in the handling of the Veterans' Administration and insure that full service to our veterans is maintained throughout the country.

This bill would require that at least one veterans service center be located in each State and that the Veterans' Administration must give at least 180 days' notice to the public and the Congress before closing, reducing, or relocating any of its hospitals or other service centers. It also provides that public hearings must be held when requested by veterans in each congressional district where changes of this sort are proposed.

This legislation is in direct response to the shocking mishandling by the Veterans' Administration of its recent proposal to reduce, eliminate, or relocate a variety of hospitals and regional offices across the country. These plans were drafted, completed, and announced without any notice to Congress or any prior consultation. Although done in the name of economy, no economy has been satisfactorily demonstrated. In fact, this year's Federal budget request from the Veterans' Administration for the next fiscal year carries requests for new hospital facilities costing an estimated total of $113 million, or about five times the amount the VA claims will be saved by the closings and reductions it has announced.

The provision that each State have a veterans' service center is simply to insure that services will not be pulled into the great urban centers in the name of efficiency and economy. The planned curtailment of VA regional offices serving New Hampshire, those in White River Junction, Vt., and Manchester, N.H., and the consequent expansion of the VA office in Boston, cannot but harm those veterans who live far from Boston. This applies especially to those who are sick, old, and poor. From most of our areas, there is not even passenger train service to Boston. Indeed, such passenger service as we do have in New Hampshire is now threatened by extinction in proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Although my immediate concern is for fair treatment of veterans, there is a deeper issue involved. That is the disturbing trend toward centralization in this country that, in my opinion, directly threatens our freedom. The centralization of political power in Washington continues unabated. Local and State governments are being bypassed by new Federal programs. Small States, small communities, small businesses, and individuals are being bypassed. As Government gets ever bigger, it becomes increasingly difficult for the individual to assert his rights, and only big power groups are able to have their voice heard. If, for no other reason than this, I feel it is imperative that Congress reassert our basic conviction and belief that the small communities and small States are still important and their voice still entitled to respectful attention.

My bill would make certain that each State would have at least one veterans' service center and would make certain that full service is readily available so long as there are veterans needing them.

This country made a commitment to our veterans years ago—a commitment that must be honored. We must not allow it to be whittled away by an autocratic bureaucracy. It is clearly necessary for Congress to step into this situation and do so promptly. I take this opportunity to ask for speedy consideration of this bill in committee and on the floor of the House.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the unenviable lot of the Lithuanian people in their own homeland for more than two decades has been to exist under an oppressive and arbitrary Communist dictatorship.

These people had known the callous cruelty of Russia's czarist regime for more than 100 years, but during that time they had found it possible at times to defy and flout the authority of their overlords, and if they found it difficult to endure the czarist yoke, then they could easily emigrate to another country. Thousands and perhaps tens of thousands of Lithuanians left their homes and settled in other countries, many of them coming to these United States.

Early in 1918, the Lithuanians were freed from the czarist autocracy and proclaimed their independence. On February 16 of that year they founded their republic. For a little more than two decades, during the interwar years, they worked, lived, and enjoyed their freedom there. And then in the course of a few months after the outbreak of World War II, they found their freedom and independence threatened. Their country fell under attack by the Red army, was occupied, and eventually made part of the Soviet Union in mid-1940.

The catastrophe that had fallen to Lithuania was not unique, for a number of other independent nations had also been robbed of their freedom by the Red army, but the Lithuanians had the misfortune of being among the Kremlin's early victims. Since then they have been sealed off in their homeland, behind the Iron Curtain, and there they do not even have the freedom of movement, the freedom to get away from their oppressors. On the 47th anniversary of their independence day let us all pray for their deliverance from Communist dictatorial tyranny.

As we mark their independence day today, I ask the Members of Congress to act favorably upon legislation which would bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations and resolve that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

I have introduced such a measure, House Concurrent Resolution 26, the text of which is as follows:

> Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia, by legal or democratic processes; and
>
> Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia by force of arms; and
>
> Whereas the Baltic people, Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians, under Communist control were and still are overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and
>
> Whereas Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and
>
> Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic: Now therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets (a) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, (b) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps.
>
> Sec. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia under its supervision.

FREEDOM FOR COSSACKIA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Don Cossacks declared their independence, but these valiant people were subjugated by the Red armies, as were the Kuban Cossacks who proclaimed their freedom on May 5, 1918, in the second step toward the creation of Cossackia.

The concept of an independent Cossack nation is an old one which can be found in the history of the 18th century. It is a subject which is deserving of considerable study by Americans interested in the national groups now forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The Cossacks, whose traditions of self-government and nationalism are well known, were among the most courageous fighters against Russian imperialism. In one of the greatest tragedies of postwar history, the whole Cossack military force, along with wives and children, was massacred by the Russians. Thus, the Cossack nation has been partly annihilated by Soviet might, but the brave Cossacks who survive are still defiant of Communist attempts to obliterate them as a separate people.

It is just such examples of imperialist totalitarian slavery as the cruel treatment inflicted on the Cossacks by the Soviet Union that make it so imperative that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be established in this session of Congress to assemble and publicize the truth about the captive nations. In this way we in the Congress can give concrete evidence of our vigorous support of freedom for Cossackia and other captive peoples who are now the victims of the international Communist conspiracy.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 47th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, that brave nation which has suffered under Russian domination for so many years but whose people have never ceased to strive for freedom.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people, after 123 years of occupation by czarist Russian forces, declared their independence and instituted a democratic republic which flourished for 22 years before they were again cruelly oppressed by the Communists and Lithuania was made part of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress should take positive action to show the courageous people of Lithuania that we support their yearning for independence. Again this session I have introduced a resolution requesting the President of the United States to instruct our Ambassador to the United Nations to place the Baltic States question on the U.N. agenda and to have the United Nations request the Soviets to withdraw their troops and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. This resolution would also call upon the U.N. to conduct and supervise free elections in these three Baltic nations so that the historic principle of self-determination of peoples would be legitimately applied there. I urge this this resolution be acted upon during this session.

Another meaningful action which could be taken by the House of Representatives would be the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. This would be an effective instrument to expose to the world the hypocrisy of Soviet colonialism and tyranny and to mobilize world opinion in support of the aspirations of the captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, I join the Lithuanians who persevere in their determination to regain their liberty, the Lithuanian-Americans who are so active in the fine work of the anti-Communist exile groups from the captive nations, and the many supporters of Lithuanian freedom in observing this anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It is my fervent hope that the Lithuanians' desire for freedom will soon become a reality.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1965, we celebrate the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence. We mark this date in the Halls of Congress because the people of Lithuania are not free to celebrate it. We mark it because there is a living link between the United States and Lithuania formed by the many Americans who immigrated here, or whose forefathers immigrated here, from that Baltic nation. Finally, we mark it to remind all peoples stifling under Communist domination that they have not been forgotten by the free world and to fortify their hope that they will someday live in freedom again.

For a century and a half prior to its declaration of independence on February 16, 1918, Lithuania had been subjugated to Russia. During this era the czars attempted to replace the Lithuanian language and culture with those of Russia, but the Lithuanian people steadfastly resisted. They never forgot the joys of freedom nor lost sight of their goal of regaining their freedom. We can be confident that the Lithuanian people have not changed and the new period of domination by Russia, which began in 1940, has not extinguished their determination to live as freemen.

The Lithuanian people have a long and noble history from which they can draw strength and inspiration in these dark days when they must endure the tribulation of Communist rule. They can trace their lineage back to the Middle Ages when they established a powerful and independent state. They can remember the happy days between the two world Wars when Lithuania was a member of the League of Nations and its sovereignty was recognized even by the Soviet Union. They can take pride in their distinctive folklore, culture, and language which no foreign rule can destroy.

In conclusion, I wish to join in marking the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day. May the Lithuanian people, through their contacts with our people of Lithuanian background and through the continued strengthening of freedom throughout the world, maintain their faith in freedom throughout the dismal period that they cannot practice it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 16, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: Desiring to be temporarily absent from my office, I hereby designate John A. Roberts, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III, of the House.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Feighan (at the request of Mr. Rosenthal), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Saylor, for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Denton and to include a speech by Senator Hartke.

Mr. Multer.

Mr. Helstoski in two instances.

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Collier.

Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Stanton.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hutchinson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Bell.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. McDade.

Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Dague.

Mrs. Reid of Illinois.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Rosenthal) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cohelan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 17, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

582. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war, and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to Public Law 83–163; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

583. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

584. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations under section 203(j); and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions under section 203(k), pursuant to section 203(o) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

585. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application for a loan by the Nevada Irrigation District of Grass Valley, Calif., under the Small Reclamation Projects Act, pursuant to section 4(c) of the act (71 Stat. 48); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

586. A letter from the chairman of the board, Communications Satellite Corp., transmitting a report of the Communications Satellite Corp. for calendar year 1964, pursuant to section 404(b) of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

587. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation relative to the claim of the port of Portland, Oreg., against the United States, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 236; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

588. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report for calendar year 1964 relative to the advisory committees which assist the Secretary in carrying out any of his functions under the Social Security Act, and pursuant to Public Law 87–543; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 2208. A bill to modify the flood control project on the Scioto River, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 4606. A bill to modify the flood control project for Four River Basins, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 48. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 233. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2998, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 234. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 45, a bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4934. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotional activities such as free or paid advertising; solicitation of cargoes; publication of ocean, rail, port, or motor carrier rate or service comparisons; or other activities that are actually or potentially disruptive to the flow of waterborne trade among ports in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 4935. A bill to provide that dependent parents may be covered by a health benefits plan under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction, for income tax purposes, based on expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the higher education of his children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4937. A bill to provide Federal assistance for programs of research and experimentation in crime prevention and detection, and for the training of law enforcement personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4938. A bill to establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 4939. A bill to provide that amounts paid for music program service shall be exempt from the Federal excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4940. A bill to provide research, technical and financial assistance with respect to the disposal of solid wastes to the several States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4941. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4942. A bill to establish a free guide service for the U.S. Capitol Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4943. A bill to protect postal patrons from obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 4944. A bill relating to the status of volunteer fire companies for purposes of liability for Federal income taxes and for certain Federal excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4945. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to give the States the right of appeal from certain administrative decisions made in connection with grant programs under such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4946. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to permit the use of foreign currencies accruing from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities in foreign countries having a Communist government to be used to make farm improvement loans to private enterprise farmers in those countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4947. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children through the 12th grade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4948. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer with adjusted gross income of $7,500 or less a deduction for the expenses of tuition and certain other fees and charges paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4949. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an insured individual 50 years of age or older shall be eligible for old-age insurance benefits if he loses his job (and cannot obtain another one that is comparable) by reason of automation, relocation, reduction, or other causes beyond his control; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4950. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 4951. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4952. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to eliminate literacy tests as a qualification for voting in any election, to facilitate voting registration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 4953. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4954. A bill to designate the Allegheny River Dam and Reservoir on the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as the Kinzua Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 4955. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the accounts of nonresident aliens not engaged in business in the United States to provide parity of treatment for deposits with persons carrying on the banking business and savings accounts with domestic building and loan associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4956. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 4958. A bill to permit the State of Pennsylvania to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for State and local firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 4959. A bill to amend the Hatch Political Activities Act with respect to the political activities of certain Federal and State employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 4960. A bill to establish a land use study; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4961. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 4962. A bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the establishment of an Aircraft Noise and Pollution Control Service within the Federal Aviation Agency and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4963. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 4964. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4965. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4966. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4967. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 4968. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 4969. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 4970. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 4971. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 4972. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 4973. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4974. A bill to amend section 4001 of title 38, United States Code, to prescribe qualifications for members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4975. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that any 5-year level premium term plan policy of national service life insurance shall be deemed paid when premiums paid in, less dividends, equal the amount of the policy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4976. A bill to increase from $600 to $750 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 4977. A bill relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 4978. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize additional funds to be available exclusively for disaster loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4979. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon his wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 4980. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4981. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 321. Joint resolution to provide for a White House conference on crime prevention and juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 322. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 323. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify its provisions insofar as they relate to the making of laws permitting the free exercise of religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.J. Res. 325. Joint resolution to designate Monday, October 4, 1965, as Free Enterprise Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 326. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Con. Res. 288. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Con. Res. 289. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to present before the United Nations the question of the enslavement of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia with a view to obtaining their independence and the return of their peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RACE:

H. Con. Res. 292. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 293. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H. Con. Res. 294. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. Con. Res. 295. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to obtaining the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 296. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 235. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 1st session of the 89th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H. Res. 236. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. Res. 237. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 112; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 238. Resolution expressing the sense of the House against the persecution of persons by Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

45. Mr. OLSEN of Montana presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana requesting the amendment of 34 Statutes at Large 1416, codified as title 45, United States Code, section 62, relating to the hours which employees of railroads may be required to work, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4982. A bill for the relief of Rammurt Mishra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 4983. A bill for the relief of Jose Augusto Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4984. A bill for the relief of Rodamandi Kokolis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4985. A bill for the relief of Leonidas Athanasakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 4986. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abdulrahman Nagi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4987. A bill for the relief of Jose Edmundo Bentencourt Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4988. A bill for the relief of Theodore Panagiotacopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4989. A bill to award a Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to the late Stewart Holland; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 4990. A bill for the relief of Francisco Campos-Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4991. A bill for the relief of Rubena Unice Richards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4992. A bill for the relief of Vito Giammona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4993. A bill for the relief of Lem Buck You, Lem Soo Ying, and Lem Stanley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4994. A bill for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 4995. A bill for the relief of Muhammad Sarwar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 4996. A bill for the relief of Hristos Papadopoulos (also known as Christos Papadopoulos); to the Committee of the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4997. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lacertosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4998. A bill for the relief of Frances von Wedel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4999. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Leo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5000. A bill for the relief of Ermy Spence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5001. A bill for the relief of Goldford Eleaza Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5002. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy (Wong) Wolff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 5003. A bill for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5004. A bill for the relief of Joseph Benrubi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5005. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Priscila Padin Kilgour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 5006. A bill for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5007. A bill for the relief of Arley L. Beem, aviation electrician's mate chief, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5008. A bill for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5009. A bill for the relief of Horace H. Easterday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5010. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Jorge Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5011. A bill for the relief of Mirjana Tomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the flow of history, esteem is due less to nations with abundant military power and rich in material goods, than to those which struggle courageously and determinedly for their own and others' rights to freedom and to a better future. And it is especially today, when the Soviet-imposed Red regimes are holding millions in slavery and openly seeking to impose their colonial rule on other nations, that the freedom struggle of the small Lithuanian nation acquires particular meaning.

It was in 1918 that Lithuanian independence was achieved. Yet freedom had but a short day in Lithuania: In 1940 the country was again seized by the Russian Bolsheviks, underwent a 3-year occupation by Hitler, and has remained in the Soviet colonial prison camp ever since. On the day Lithuania's freedom was throttled, the population again girded itself for a long period of resistance.

The freedom fight has cost the Lithuanian people many lives, but at the same time it has strengthened their determination to uphold their national culture and traditions, and to insist on their right to choose their own political, economic, and social institutions. By its cultural values, its faith, and its world view, Lithuania continues to belong to the West and exemplifies Western man's readiness to defend spiritual freedom, the principles of democracy, and fundamental human rights.

The Lithuanian resistance did not falter during the first Soviet Russian occupation, nor did it falter when the Russians were replaced by the Nazis in June 1941. The strength of the Lithuanian people, so courageously displayed during the German occupation, is as evident today when once again they find themselves the victims of Russian oppression.

The late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, believed, as I do, that Lithuania's freedom is the concern of all humanity.

He expressed this more eloquently than I might when he said:

> Together we must work to strengthen the spirit of those Europeans who are not free, to reestablish their old ties to freedom and the West, so that their desire for liberty and sense of nationhood will survive for future expression. We ask those who would be our adversaries to understand that in our relations with them we will not bargain one nation's interest against another's and that the commitment to the cause of freedom is common to us all.
>
> All of us * * * must be faithful to our conviction that peace in Europe can never be complete until everywhere in Europe men can choose, in peace and freedom, how their countries shall be governed * * *.

Kosciuszko and Lincoln—Fighters for Freedom and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 we celebrated the 219th anniversary of a great Polish fighter and advocate for liberty and human rights, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a stranger to this country, inspired by a fervent love of freedom and liberty, came here on borrowed money to offer his services to our new Nation in the American Revolution to help gain our freedom and independence. His brilliant service in the American Revolutionary Army caught the attention of George Washington, who placed him in charge of the building of the West Point fortifications. There a monument stands erected to his memory by the American youth as a tribute to his leadership and heroism.

Upon returning to Poland in 1792, he led a tiny, but inspired, army in its heroic resistance against the Russian tyrant. Upon the unsuccessful termination of that insurrection he again came to the United States, which he called his second country, and for which he declared his love and affection.

By a strange and historic coincidence the 12th day of February is also the anniversary of the birth of another great citizen of the world, Abraham Lincoln.

Though they were born nearly a century apart, though one was a Pole and the other an American, one a soldier, and the other a statesman, they had many characteristics in common which would place them in the same category in the annals of American history.

Both of them had a fervent love for freedom and the ideals of democracy. Kosciuszko fought to give birth to this great Nation of ours and Lincoln made every effort during his time to keep it intact. Both contributed richly to make this Nation great. Both believed in the dignity of man. Both of them dedicated their lives to free men from oppression.

This Nation, and the world today, is sorely in need of the inspiration and leadership of great men like Kosciuszko and Lincoln.

In Lincoln's day half of our Nation was enslaved. Today half of the world is enslaved, and the fate of our entire civilization is at stake.

Our great American Nation has never shirked its responsibilities. It has never given in to a tyrant or aggressor, and, God grant it, will not do so today.

I hope we bear in mind that while we here enjoy the blessings of freedom, the native land of Kosciuszko, who fought and sacrificed to make our land free, still suffers together with the lands of many other peoples under the yoke of tyranny.

In honor of the memory of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, therefore, and in order to preserve for our children that freedom here which we hold so dearly, let us dedicate ourselves to a firm determination to make this country and the entire world safe for democracy, the democracy for which Kosciuszko and Lincoln fought so bravely.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on this day commemorating the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we pay tribute to a nation that has lost the most precious possession a nation-state can hold; namely, its freedom.

During the interwar period, Lithuania took its place proudly in the family of nations. It established diplomatic relations with the nations of the world. It was an active member of the League of Nations. In every way, Lithuania sought to fulfill its obligations to international society as an independent nation-state.

The same can be said for internal Lithuanian affairs. Lithuania had prospered economically, culturally, and socially. Lithuanians could be justly proud of their national achievements during this period.

The point I am trying to make is simply this: By every objective criterion Lithuania proved her capacity to play a fit and honorable role in international life; Lithuania had fulfilled all the requirements humanity expects of a modern state. The Soviet conquest of Lithuania was, therefore, as senseless as it was cruel. There was no justification for this horrendous act of inhumanity and the oppression that has existed in the country since that time. The rationale for the Soviet conquest stems from a deep-rooted Soviet ideological commitment to expand communism. For this reason, the fate of Lithuania is a warning to all men of the free world who cherish their liberty.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian independence I add my voice with all others in praising the fortitude and perserverance, the nobility and resolve of the long-suffering Lithuanian people. And to them I extend my warmest congratulations on this their day of national dedication and express the hope that freedom will one day be theirs.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of World War I many oppressed national groups regained their independence. The Lithuanian people, one of the three Baltic nationalities suffering under czarist Russian rule, declared their independence on February 16, 1918.

The Lithuanians have a distinct place in the history of northeastern Europe. They are the most numerous of the three Baltic peoples and they have always been sturdy defenders of liberty. Although they have borne the heavy yoke of the Russian Government for more than a century, they have managed always to keep their love of liberty and their patriotism alive.

Both in the attainment of their Lithuanian independence and in its maintenance during more than two decades, I am happy to say, the United States made important contributions. The Lithuanians received great encouragement from the famous 14 points of our late President Wilson. It was a source of inspiration for them to know that their struggle for independence had the support of the people and Government of this great Republic.

In 1918 when the Lithuanian people earned their freedom they and their friends everywhere thought that their servitude and misery under alien rule had come to an end. This brave people who had struggled against Teutonic Knights in the 13th and 14th centuries, against their Polish overlords through the next four centuries, and finally against the regime of the Russian czars for more than 100 years, had at last broken the chains of their bondage. A new day had dawned for them, and a new promising life began for them as a nation. During the 20-odd years of their independence, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuanians were quite content with their lot. Since the outbreak of the last war fate has been unkind to them.

Early in that war they lost their freedom and independence. Lithuania was attacked and occupied by the Red Army early in 1940, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Then during the war it was overrun by the Nazis and held by them for some 2 years. Toward the end of the war Communist Russians returned and they have been there for more than 20 years. They have been treating Lithuanians more cruelly, and have imposed upon them a harsher regime than did the Russian czars, and today the Lithuanians are oppressed under Communist totalitarian tyranny in their homeland. Although they are not allowed to celebrate their national holiday there, we as their friends and sympathizers, observe the anniversary of Lithuanian independence and thus echo their patriotic sentiments.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, in 1918, after more than 125 years of virtual slavery, a nation was reborn on the distant shores of the Baltic Sea. That nation was Lithuania. Today we celebrate that memorable day, 47 years ago, when independence came once again to these people in Lithuania, but even as we celebrate her independence, she is no longer free. We speak, here today on the floor of Congress, of the greatness of Lithuania, but her own people in that land which is no longer independent, can only whisper the message of freedom to their children so that the dream of independence may someday come alive.

Two and a half centuries before Columbus discovered America, Lithuania was a united kingdom under King Mindaugas. She was a great power, indeed one of the greatest powers, in eastern Europe until the 16th century, when Poland and Lithuania were joined by marriage under a Lithuanian King. Her history from that moment was inevitably tied to the history of Poland. In the 18th century, when Poland lost her independence, Lithuania became another state that lay under the power of the czar. For more than a century Lithuanians fought desperately to keep their own civilization alive. For more than a century Lithuanians prepared for the moment when they would be free again. In 1918 that moment came and on February 16 of that year Lithuania again joined the roster of the nations of the world. For just over 20 years Lithuania worked and grew as a bastion of freedom and culture in the north of Europe. Then in 1940 a cynical alliance was formed between nazism and communism and the troops of Stalin trampled Lithuanian freedom into the dust as they marched across the land. A year later the unholy alliance between Hitler and Stalin had dissolved and Lithuania was occupied by Nazi troops as they marched eastward. Three years later the same Nazi troops were driven from the land and Stalin once more occupied this country.

The late Winston Churchill, in one of his memorable speeches, spoke of an Iron Curtain that had fallen in eastern Europe from the Baltic in the north to the Adriatic in the south. Lithuania is the Baltic end of that Iron Curtain. The United States has never recognized the seizure of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. It seems to me, however, that something more than stirring words are right and proper at this time. We have a delegation at the United Nations. We have watched that delegation listen to the Soviet delegates, who have made long and pious speeches about the imperialism of the West. It is time, I think, that we start talking about the imperialism of the East. If a whole new world of African nations are shouting a great cry for freedom, then let them join America in crying for freedom for another small country—Lithuania. It is time, Mr. Speaker, for Adlai Stevenson to bring the freedom of Lithuania as a formal issue before the United Nations so that the newly emerging nations of the world may see not only who are the true imperialists of the 20th century, but, indeed who are the slave masters.

I am proud, today, to join my voice with my colleagues to commemorate the independence of Lithuania. I will be even more proud if this administration will take our words from this national tribunal and will bring them before the international tribunal of the United Nations so that out of this may come, once again, a Lithuania that is free to grow in greatness in the future as she has grown in greatness in the past.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are faced by the threat of war with the Communists in southeast Asia, it is easy to forget about the silent struggle being waged against the tyranny of communism in other countries. February 16 marks Lithuanian Independence Day. It is a day which should not be overlooked, because the people of Lithuania need our support and we have much to learn from them.

For many years the Lithuanian people have been forced to submit to the oppressive rule of the Russians. Thousands who resisted were quickly rounded up and liquidated. Russian soldiers still abound in the country, and the Communist political apparatus controls every facet of Lithuanian life. The moment there is a flicker of opposition the power of the whole Soviet Union is brought to bear to destroy it.

In spite of the tyranny under which they live, the brave men and women of Lithuania have not given up the hope of regaining their freedom. We have freedom. We know how it enriches our lives and gives purpose to everything we do.

On this important day, let us make it clear that we stand by the Lithuanian people and that we are making every effort to check the spread of Communist imperialism. Together we will actively work for the day when people everywhere will be able to choose their own way of life.

House Concurrent Resolution 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Unfortunately, there cannot be a true celebration of this independence day by Lithuania since she is still under the domination of the Soviet Union, which took that brave nation by force of arms on June 15, 1940. From that date her people have been enslaved and her lands overrun by leaders of a philosophy which seeks to destroy her heritage of freedom and peace.

We look forward to the day when Lithuania can again take her place among the free nations of the world. To help speed that end, it was my pleasure to introduce again in this Congress House Concurrent Resolution 40, which follows in its entirety:

[89th Cong., 1st sess.]

H. CON. RES. 40

In the House of Representatives, January 4, 1965; Mr. RHODES of Arizona submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, on the other hand, the Baltic nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the free Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas no real peace and security can be achieved in the world while Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia remain enslaved by the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as he may deem appropriate to bring before the United Nations the question of Soviet action in the Baltic States for the purpose of urging the United Nations to request that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—

(1) withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(2) return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union.

SEC. 2. The United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. On this date in 1918 Lithuanians were finally able to achieve their longstanding goal of independence. Although the history of Lithuania includes a long series of subjugations by foreign powers, these foreign rulers have never succeeded in breaking the spirit of the Lithuanian people. Whether occupied by German, Polish, Swedish, or Russian forces, Lithuanians have remained faithful to their culture, their history, and their church.

Today this small but valiant country is once again a victim of the curse of foreign domination. In August 1940, Lithuania's 22-year-old independence was completely crushed when the country was taken into the U.S.S.R. as the 14th Soviet Republic. On June 23, 1941, the day after Nazi Germany attacked Russia, Lithuanians again manifested their desire for independence by staging a revolution and again declaring themselves sovereign. The invading Germans ignored the claims of independence and went on to institute a reign of terror and repression. Finally, in the summer of 1944 Lithuania was once more occupied by Soviet troops and reestablished as a component republic of the Soviet Union. Soviet repression and subjugation of Lithuanian national independence continue to this day.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a tragic history. Lithuania is a small nation whose people wish only to live in peace in their own country according to their own principles and traditions. They have not been allowed to do so. The Soviet aggressors have abolished all independent Lithuanian agencies and institutions and dissolved political, religious, cultural, social, and economic organizations. This transformation was accomplished through the use of force, against the will of the citizens of Lithuania. The Lithuanian people have bravely resisted the occupation and sovietization of their nation. Stalinist Russia, however, resorted to terror, deportations, mass arrests, and executions. Using these ruthless methods, Soviet authorities finally overcame armed Lithuanian resistance. Resistance to the regime still exists, however, and will continue to exist until the restoration of freedom and independence.

The hearts of freedom-loving people everywhere go out to the enslaved people of Lithuania. Long ago our own great nation fought to throw off the chains of foreign domination and we would be untrue to our heritage as Americans if we did not express our earnest hope and prayer that someday Lithuanians, too, will be privileged to live free lives in an independent country. Centuries of foreign domination have not destroyed the Lithuanian people or their desire to be free, and Soviet Russia will be no more successful. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with all Americans on this anniversary of Lithuania's independence in the hope that a free and independent Lithuania may be soon realized.

James F. McCloud Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, recently a high honor was bestowed on one of my constituents, Mr. James F. McCloud of Oakland, Calif.

"For his most valuable services for the promotion of the work of the church and Catholic Apostleship in Argentina," Mr. McCloud was awarded the title of knight commander in the civil division of the Order of St. Gregory the Great by Pope Paul VI.

Antonio Cardinal Caggiano, head of the Catholic Church in Argentina, decorated Mr. McCloud at a ceremony in Buenos Aires on January 7, 1965, which was witnessed by Mrs. McCloud and their four children. It is significant to note that this is the first time this award has been made in Argentina since its inception in 1831 by Pope Gregory XVII.

Such awards of high distinction, however, are not new to this engineering graduate of the 1941 class of Stanford University. Just last month, Mr. McCloud was named Argentina's Executive of the Year. He is the first U.S. businessman ever to achieve such recognition.

The award was bestowed upon Mr. McCloud, who is president of Industrias Kaiser Argentina—IKA—by the El Economista newspaper. Engineer McCloud was cited as "a prototype of the modern executive: young, resolute, possessing a large amount of sensibility, through this entire attitude a need to act is visible, to put into action a creative imagination of notable fertility."

Mr. McCloud, a veteran of 23 years with the Henry J. Kaiser organization, was commended for "his relevant activities and uncommon effort of achievement closely related to the fact that 1964 has been for IKA a truly brilliant year." He was selected for the honor over a large and highly qualified group of candidates.

These two recent awards recognize years of accomplishment by this American businessman who has done much to demonstrate to Latin Americans the rewards of enlightened capitalism and democratic action.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in bringing Mr. McCloud's achievements to the attention of our colleagues.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. WYDLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence our hearts go out to the persecuted Lithuanian people. On this occasion I would like to focus attention upon one phase of the persecution which they have endured since the forced annexation of their country by the Soviet Union during the war—and that is the persecution of religion. Since the Red army occupied Lithuania in a ruthless and calculating manner the Soviet authorities have persistently carried on a campaign to destroy religion, to wipe out every manifestation of it, and to transplant in its stead the atheistic, materialistic philosophy of communism.

Lithuania, a nation rich in religious traditions, prior to the Soviet annexation was largely Roman Catholic with over 80 percent of the population of nearly 3 million adhering to that faith. The remainder was comprised of Lithuanians professing the Lutheran, Jewish, and Greek Orthodox religions. Mindful of the need for a strong religious foundation to insure the moral and ethical vitality of the nation, the Lithuanian people had the wisdom to establish constitutional conditions conducive to the growth of a vigorous religious outlook. In independent Lithuania freedom of religion was guaranteed by the Constitution. Religious groups were free to propagate their faith, conduct religious services, maintain places of public worship, and administer educational institutions. In 1927, a concordat was concluded with the Vatican in which Lithuania established diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

Such was the wholesome religious atmosphere in Lithuania in the period following her declaration of independence. Such was the religious character of the Lithuanian nation. By constitutional guarantee, freedom of religion prevailed. In every way the practice of religion and its development within the nation were encouraged. Thus, the Lithuanian people were grounded in a strong and virile religious and moral ethic.

The Soviet conquests of Lithuania in 1940 and again in 1944 have threatened the heart and core of Lithuanian religious life. As a consequence of the corroding processes of Sovietization the soul of the Lithuanian nation has been exposed to the gravest peril.

Bishop Vincentas Brizgys, the former Roman Catholic bishop of Kaunas and resident of Chicago, has given a vivid account of the extent to which religion is persecuted within so-called Soviet Lithuania. On June 25, 1940, 10 days after the first Soviet occupation of Lithuania, Moscow abrogated the concordat with Rome, and the Papal Nuncio was ordered to leave the country by August 25. Thus the Lithuanian link with the Vatican was broken and the Catholic Church was isolated. Shortly thereafter, Bishop Brizgys stated, all private hospitals, schools, kindergartens, charitable institutions, orphanages, and the like were seized and the personnel arrested by Soviet authorities. Furthermore, the religious press was suppressed within the first week of the occupation; and religious books and other printed matter were banned or destroyed. All seminaries were seized, and monasteries taken over. All bishops and chancery staffs were expelled from their residences. A drive commenced on the observance of religious feast days. And then on April 25, 1941, the teaching of religion was absolutely forbidden throughout the entire nation.

Probably the most ruthless measure taken by the Soviet authorities in their antireligious drive was the attempt to liquidate the clergy. According to Bishop Brizgys, 150 Roman Catholic priests were arrested in Lithuania during the first Soviet occupation. Within 1 year 16 were killed and 6 have since been missing without a trace of their whereabouts. The remainder were liberated by the Lithuanian partisans when the Russo-German war began in June 1941.

When in 1944 Lithuania was again forcibly brought into the Soviet Union, the Soviet military authorities displayed some toleration of religion while the war continued. After the war, however, antireligious measures were again imposed with the same thoroughness and brutality as they were during the first occupation. Bishop Brizgys declared that during the first 2 years after the war 4 Lithuanian Catholic bishops and 89 Lithuanian priests were arrested, and subsequently many additional priests were arrested.

With unrelenting determination the Soviets have continued and even accelerated the process of sovietization in Lithuania. Nor has the Communist attack been solely centered upon the largest religious group, the Roman Catholics. Communism is uniformly hostile in theory and practice to all religions. Only for tactical reasons does it sometimes differentiate between Protestants, Catholics, Jews, or members of the Orthodox church. In Lithuania all religious groups have felt the heavy hand of the Soviet oppressor.

On this 47th anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence we of the free world ought to reflect for a moment upon this time of troubles which has come upon the Lithuanian people.

The Lithuanians are a people in jeopardy; they are a people fighting for their identity as a nation; they are a people struggling to keep alive even a spark of their religious spirit.

To this great people, let us, therefore, extend our hand in a symbolic gesture of everlasting friendship; let us raise our voices with those who like ourselves seek justice for the oppressed; and let us join with all the free peoples of the world in prayerful supplication that the soul of Lithuania shall always remain unconquered by its ruthless oppressors.

Lithuanian Independence: Its Meaning for Us in the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 14, 1965, the Lithuanian-Americans of Greater New York gathered at Webster Hall, New York City, to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Lithuanian nation.

It was my great privilege to address this group of approximately 1,200 of our Lithuanian friends and to express my hope to them that their fatherland, Lithuania, will once again be free and independent.

In accordance with permission granted to me to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my speech made to this group and to include a resolution which was adopted by the Lithuanian-American Council of Greater New York at the gathering.

It is my hope that we can give this resolution strong support and to obtain for the Lithuanian people the freedom and independence they so richly deserve.

The remarks made by me and the resolution adopted follow:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE: ITS MEANING FOR US IN THE COLD WAR

It is indeed a great privilege and a pleasure to participate in this gathering as we commemorate the 47th anniversary of restoration of independence to Lithuania. I have enjoyed so much the personal contacts with so many of you, that I wanted particularly to be with you today.

The 47th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence occurs at a time when our Nation is embarking on a new era and under new leadership. Let us hope that it will prove to be an era of freedom for all peace-loving nations, including the enslaved nations suffering under the domination of communism and communistic tyranny.

It is easy for peoples such as ourselves to forget the tragedies that have befallen this heroic little country. Caught up in the maelstrom of unfolding history as we are today, pressed on all sides by problems in international and national affairs, and indeed concerned as we must be with the difficult tasks of pursuing life in this very complex modern era, all contribute to an attitude of mind that tends to regard the events of yesteryear a concern only for historians.

But this ought not to be the case.

History has lessons for contemporary man, and for us who have taken on such heavy burdens in protecting our interests and those of the free world against communism, the tragedy of Lithuania has a profound and meaningful lesson.

In these next few moments I want to analyze some of the propositions and assumptions that many Americans have today concerning communism and the Soviet Union, and then drawing from the experience of Lithuania, I would like to relate these propositions and assumptions to the reality of recent Lithuanian history.

In our day we hear a great deal about the Soviet concept of "peaceful coexistence." In a veritable outpouring of statements from Moscow, Soviet leaders have assured the Western World that "peaceful coexistence" is the main line of their policy. In a word, they want to live in peace with us, so they say.

Underlying this concept of peaceful coexistence is the assumption, first of all, that the Soviets are trustworthy.

But can they be trusted to keep their word?

We have ample evidence from our own relations with the Soviets to test this assumption. They had pledged in the 1933 agreements on recognition, for example, not to conduct espionage or carry on propaganda activities in the United States. But, history has proven the emptiness of this pledge.

But, what about Lithuania?

Perhaps one of the most significant reliability tests of the Soviet pledged word came with the Soviet invasion and absorption of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. From the early days of the 1920's through the late 1930's the Soviets had concluded numerous agreements with Lithuania in which they solemnly pledged that they would respect the territorial integrity of the nation and respect also its national independence. Yet, despite their pledged word, the Soviets imposed the Mutual Assistance Pact upon Lithuania in the fall of 1939 and with the passing of only a few months invaded and finally absorbed Lithuania into the Soviet Union. This act of treachery was done with utter disregard of the Soviet pledged word, pledges solemnly made in negotiated treaties.

Thus, in this tragic instance we have a classic case study of Soviet disregard of treaty obligations when the politics of a situation or the ideological impulses to expand communism require that those obligations be ignored.

The idea of Soviet ideology and its impact on international relations is also relevant to the Lithuanian experience. In this present climate of artificially inspired "peaceful coexistence" we have been told by some of our most prominent people that ideology has no meaning whatever for the Soviets. These persons argue that we Americans should look at the Soviets in terms of traditional behavior of nation-states—that is, we should disregard the ideological ingredient of Soviet power.

Well, my friends, what can the case of Lithuania tell us on this point?

Had Communist ideology any relevance to Soviet conquest of this territory nation?

Was the conquest of Lithuania a military thrust designed to satisfy deep-rooted ideological Soviet impulses to expand communism?

I would argue for the case that ideology is indeed a substantial factor in estimating the full dimension of Soviet power. It is a factor that one can ignore at his peril.

Here are the facts.

Lithuania was an independent country. Before winning its independence during World War I, it had been for over a century a part of the Russian Empire. Nevertheless, Lithuania has its own historic past. Lithuanians are a non-Slavic people; their historical experience is rooted in Western rather than Russian civilization; and their culture is similarly Western oriented. In a word, Lithuania is a country totally foreign to Russia. The full span of their history has been marked by an absence of Russian ties, except that of a conquered nation.

Moreover, in 1939, the critical year for all Europe and the world, Lithuania had pledged itself to a policy of neutrality in the fast developing world crisis. It did not act in any manner that could give encouragement to or cause the dissatisfaction of any of the leading contending European powers. Lithuanian policy was directed toward one goal: national survival.

Thus, Lithuania was no threat to the Soviet Union. It provided no cause for alarm in Moscow.

Given these factors, therefore—that is, the lack of historical affinity and the declared national policy of neutrality—how then can one explain the Soviet conquest of that country, Lithuania, and its sister republics?

I frankly do not think that it can be explained in any other way than a manifestation of the Soviet desire to satisfy those deep-seated ideological impulses with the Soviet system and its leaders to expand the domain of communism.

The Soviet leaders and the Communist Party elite are totally committed to the ideology of communism, and their ideology demands of its adherents the continuing expansion of communism's boundaries until at last the ideology itself embraces the whole of mankind.

We should be reminded of this highly important fact today as we search for world peace, as indeed we must. World peace depends upon our ability to reach some sort of agreement, written or unwritten, with the Soviet Union on the futility of thermonuclear war. In so doing, we must ever be wary of the ideological dimension of the Soviet commitment in world affairs. We fail to do so at our peril.

Another assumption that seems to underlay the attitudes of many in their dealings with the Soviet Union is the belief that through the forces of modernity that are at work in the Soviet Union a type of liberalism has taken root and is beginning to assert itself in a way that is permitting a better and more tolerable life for the Soviet people.

Let us test this assumption against the reality of the Lithuanian experience.

There is, of course, no political freedom in Lithuania. Today, the people of Lithuania do not enjoy the freedom and liberty they once knew. Hopes for an evolving democracy in that country were dashed with the Soviet conquest. Today, Lithuania is firmly held within the grip of Soviet totalitarianism. Politically, Lithuania has been forced to take on the structure that exists throughout the entire Soviet Union. The Communist Party in Lithuania is the real source of power, as indeed it is in the other Soviet Republics. The Government itself is nothing more than a convenient administrative facade of constitutional federalism. Lithuanian Communist leaders hold absolute power over the nation, and the Soviet Communist leaders, in turn, hold absolute power over them. But, the people of Lithuania have demonstrated their devotion to freedom, liberty, and justice by not recognizing the Communist occupation of Lithuania.

I pay my humble tribute to the valiant fighters for freedom of Lithuania.

The same can be said for the economic and cultural areas of Lithuanian society. The Communist Party, through its monopoly on all sources of power within the state, orders the life of Lithuanians to suit its particular purposes and those of Moscow. There is no freedom of choice in the cultural realm. Here, Lithuanian writers, poets, and composers must conform to the deadly rubrics of "Socialist realism" that require art not for art's sake, but for the propagation of Communist power. As a result, there can be no flowering of Lithuanian culture as had been during the years of independence.

To repeat, Lithuania is held fast in the grip of Soviet totalitarianism.

Where then is there a possibility for a growing spirit of liberalism or democracy?

I would argue that such a possibility does not exist so long as the Communist monopoly of political power remains. There can be no evolution of this regime into a more tolerable system until vital principles can be taken into account. One of these vital principles is the necessity of dissent, and it is precisely this principle, so important to genuine democracy and liberalism, that is absent in Soviet Lithuania and indeed in the entire Soviet Union.

I seriously question, therefore, this assumption of an improving Soviet society which will produce a qualified form of liberalism. And to those who find merit in this view, I say, "Look to Lithuania."

Yet, there is still another proposition that we Americans hold in our views on foreign policy that has relevance to the Lithuanian experience, and it is based upon our general attitude of the nature of man. We as a people are optimistic. We have a penchant for looking at the brighter side of things.

Let these words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt be a constant reminder to all of us. "It is stated that Lithuania has lost her independence. It is a mistake to say so. Lithuania has not lost her independence. Lithuania's independence has only been temporarily put aside. Time will come and Lithuania will be free again."

We have great expectations that things will work out in the future, that man is ever progressing toward a new day of freedom and human perfection, and that we as a people will provide the motive power for those who seek freedom. We have, in a word, confidence in the future.

On this occasion, we are reminded that the Russian Communists cannot stop or forbid this program, or similar events that are being held in the United States and throughout the free countries in honor and respect to Lithuania.

We Americans know that this Nation has a generous heart and has always welcomed and assisted exiles and refugees. The goal of the present administration is to nourish independence, to build self-respect, and to breed trust among all nations.

Because this Nation fought for its own independence, it encourages independence for others. However, some of the descendants of the peoples of the enslaved countries appear to be worried about the development of an American policy toward the liberation of these captive nations.

The Democratic Party, at its national convention held in Atlantic City just this past year adopted the following language with respect to enslaved and captive nations. Let me quote the language of that portion of the Democratic platform—"We will encourage by all peaceful means the growing independence of the captive peoples living under communism and hasten the day that Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and the other captive nations will achieve full freedom and self-determination."

Let me say to you, that as long as I am a Member of Congress, I shall do whatever I can to bring this declaration to its fulfillment so that these enslaved and captive people can live as God meant them to—free and independent.

In our daily tasks in trying to find our way through the intricate maze of foreign affairs in search of our national interest we can again look to the case of Lithuania and to her people for an example of courage, perseverance, and confidence. Even though Lithuania has been a conquered country for the past 25 years, still the Lithuanian people maintain an abiding hope that the future will reward them for the oppression they now so nobly bear. The Soviets have not been able to stamp out their desire for freedom and independence. Condemnation of Lithuanians for their so-called bourgeois nationalism, an ever recurring event in Soviet Lithuania today, testifies to the virility of these people and their dedication to the principles and spirit of national independence. When the Soviets complain vigorously about the continued resistance, so-called survivals of the past and call for a more vigorous antireligious campaign in Lithuania, they expose to the world the truth of Lithuanian attachment to the faith and national culture of their fathers, notwithstanding the extraordinary attempts by Soviet oppressors to destroy these vital sources of national life.

Lithuanians are a people in adversity; and yet far from succumbing to the tyranny of the Soviet Union, they have maintained the integrity of their nation and the inviolability of their national soul. This is a great tribute to the Lithuanian people; and for us in the free world it is an example to which we can point and one from which we ourselves can draw inspiration for the future.

On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence it is fitting that we gather here and pay tribute to these gallant and heroic people. On this day we should rededicate ourselves to the spirit of freedom which united the Lithuanian people with the peoples of the world. We know that the Lithuanians will continue to resist the despotism thrust upon them. Their courage, their perseverance, and their loyalty to the historic tradition of their nation will defeat the guns and tanks of their oppressors.

It is also fitting that we reflect upon the virtues and draw from their national experience what inspiration and example we ourselves can use in these trying days.

We should rededicate ourselves to those fundamental principles of freedom and democracy that have lain at the roots of our American heritage for here, in the last analysis, is our supreme glory and the sublime hope of all men for liberty and justice.

Lithuania must be saved, and her independence must be restored and the dignity of the Lithuanian nation must be preserved. On the anniversary of their independence day our prayers are with them that their freedom will not be long in becoming a reality.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN RALLY ON FEBRUARY 14, 1965

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, citizens and permanent residents of the United States, gathered on February 14 of this year of grace 1965 at Webster Hall, New York, N.Y., to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the restoration of the Lithuanian independent state,

Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence, her forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union, and her transformation into a Soviet colonial possession;

Recalling the stand taken by both the great political parties of our country as expressed in their electoral platforms of 1964:

Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration to Lithuania of a free exercise of the right to self-determination and for the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

Resolve,

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States, firmly to restate and vigorously to promote in diplomatic dealings with the Kremlin, as well as in the United Nations and elsewhere, the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania;
2. To ask the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations dealing with the liquidation of colonialism "in all its forms and implications" to investigate the Soviet colonialism in Lithuania;
3. To urge that the Free Europe Radio extend its broadcast to include the Lithuanian language;
4. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and freedom;
5. To urge the American Lithuanians to support the policy of the U.S. Government, aiming at the liberation of the Soviet captive nations, and to renew their dedication to the struggle for Lithuania's freedom and independence.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK,
ANTANAS SKERYS, *President*.
VIDA RIBOKAS, *Secretary*.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as we observe the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence to Lithuania we are also reminded of the disposition that has kept these brave people from the full realization of their rightful place as a free and independent nation.

Lithuania represents a civilization that was old when the United States came into being and we must shamefacedly confess our selfish preoccupation at the time the Communist colossus moved in to stifle their freedom. And all the while we were fighting a war to stem the Nazi onrush, we were collaborating with an equally ruthless juggernaut that has overrun her weaker neighbors. Added to this is the sad admission that it has become officially taboo to criticize these destroyers of freedom since it might upset the nice balance of peaceful coexistence.

What utter absurdity. How can we preach freedom for all peoples at the very moment we see communistic colonialism flourishing around the world? And we do have a vital stake in Lithuanian independence since our own freedom is only strong when it is predicated on the freedom of all other sovereign peoples. Let us, then, make it our firm policy to refuse to lend our aid to, or indeed traffic with, any nation that keeps its so-called satellites in thralldom.

Our Foreign Policies and Our Entanglements in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have entered in the Congressional Record, and to call the attention of my colleagues to, a speech by Indiana's senior Senator, the Honorable R. Vance Hartke.

In his address, delivered before the Jacobi Society on February 6, Senator Hartke offers a deep insight and a profound analysis of our foreign policies and of our entanglements in southeast Asia.

The speech **follows:**

Statement by Senator Vance Hartke at the Jacobi Society Dinner, Statler Hilton, Washington, D.C., February 6, 1965

In 1945 President Roosevelt said: "The mere conquest of our enemies is not enough. We must go on to do all in our power to conquer the doubt and fears, the ignorance and the greed which made this horror possible."

It is in this context that I would like to discuss with you tonight the American role in a seething world, a world in which we have been forced to take the leadership.

Often in recorded history destiny knocks at the door with an iron clang. In our own short time as a nation, history has come to our door 3 times—once when we faced the impossible odds of the British power as we sought our own freedom; a 2d time when President Lincoln sought 75,000 volunteers to preserve the Union; and now in the 20th century when destiny has knocked almost constantly. Through involvement in world affairs brought on by our own success and by the ever-shrinking size of the globe, we have had to take up the task of defending the free world and the very concepts of the Judeo-Christian civilization.

The immediate question is not whether we are to become embroiled in a full-scale major nuclear war which could be the Armageddon of the Bible. Rather, it is a question of what our policies should be to bring lasting peace, freedom, political self-determination, economic development, and personal dignity to the world.

As always, the long-range idealistic goals of our Nation are threatened by an enemy. Alined against us now is international communism. I agree with President Theodore Roosevelt when he said: "We Americans have many problems to solve, many threatening evils to fight and many deeds to do. If—as we hope and believe—we have the wisdom, the strength, the courage, and the virtue to do them, we must face facts as they are. We must not surrender ourselves to a foolish optimism nor succumb to a timid and ignoble pessimism. Our Nation is the one among all nations of the earth which holds in its hands the fate of the coming years * * *. I believe firmly that we shall succeed."

I am subscribing to the goal of victory for us—for the free world.

In the early years of the Communist international conspiracy, the strategy was to operate from within a country and to promote revolution. The world Communist foreign policy has, in the last 15 years, turned to so-called wars of liberation, while from Moscow have come efforts toward peaceful coexistence.

Thus the Soviet Union has been able to take its seat in peaceful international relations while at the same time appealing to the have-not nations of the world, principally in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The posture of peaceful coexistence has served to allay fears of the neutrals, and to weaken the Western bloc. The so-called wars of liberation have taken a greater toll because we have not always known how to cope with them. Sometimes, we have made serious mistakes with long-term consequences. Sometimes we have vacillated until we were misunderstood or misinterpreted.

The difficulty is compounded because emerging people in newly independent countries see us less in the light of our own Revolution for freedom than they do as allies of those they regard as colonial imperialists.

We must expose the Communists—Russian and Chinese—as the true imperialists they are. And we must learn to distinguish between the ferment of people seeking freedom and the right to control their own destinies free of despotism on the one hand, and the revolutions and infiltrations inspired by Moscow and Peiping on the other.

I see little to distinguish the Soviet brand of communism from the Chinese brand. Any competition between the two—in Asia or anywhere else on the globe—can be of little encouragement to us now or in the foreseeable future because it is a competition of deviousness.

The synthesis of our final goals and those of the Communists—as well as this competition of deviousness—is in southeast Asia. At this moment, we are pouring men, material, and money into a place few Americans had heard of a few years ago, in order to meet a commitment to self-determination, to individual freedom, to economic development, and to our own long-term self-interest. On the other side are the Communists.

The active fighters are Asians trained and promoted by the Chinese Reds. Yet, their competitors in deviousness and duplicity are also at work. Russian Premier Alexi Kosygin has gone to Hanoi to show that the Soviet Union also is alined against us.

While we are not alone in Vietnam, having been joined by other SEATO nations including Australia, we are the chief supporters of a South Vietnam that is torn internally.

Since 1954 we have poured nearly $4 billion into South Vietnam in military and economic aid. That amounts to more than $266 for each of the 15 million South Vietnamese. Our aid figure today amounts to about $2 million a day. We have some 21,000 U.S. troops in that beleaguered land. Two hundred Americans have died there and additional hundreds have spilled their blood. More than 125 ships and airplanes of the 7th Fleet are committed to the waters around this peninsula.

How did all this happen? What are we doing in Vietnam?

For a hundred years before World War II, Indochina was a colony of France, ruled by a colonial governor but with representation in the French Assembly. During the war, the Japanese moved in, but when France tried to return, the colonial peoples of the region—which included the present Laos, Cambodia, and both Vietnams—revolted for independence. Nationalist groups wanted permanent independence; Communist-organized groups saw this as the first step toward delivering the whole peninsula into the Communist camp. But all were united on getting rid of the French.

The Communists were strongest in the area that is now North Vietnam, which is closest to mainland China, from which Chiank Kai-shek had been driven in 1949. In Laos, another Communist force, the Pathet Lao, controlled a large area in the northern part of the country. With outside aid, it seemed very possible that the Communists would achieve dominance.

At the same time, since the revolt against France included not only local Communists but other groups who sought democratic independence, the United States could not intervene on behalf of France without violating our principles of support of colonial people seeking freedom. But John Foster Dulles warned Russia and China against trying to pick up the pieces, even before the French defeat.

Settlement after the fall of the French came in an international conference at Geneva, where on June 21, 1954, agreements were signed to draw a cease-fire line across Vietnam. The northern half became the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, built around Ho Chi Minh's Communist forces, with 17 million people to South Vietnam's 14 million, and with the bulk of the industrial areas. The compromise was supposed to prevent civil war, and provided for a permanent settlement after an all-Vietnam election in July 1956. The situation was very much a parallel to that which created North and South Korea.

Most observers in 1954 felt that Laos and South Vietnam would have a short life, perhaps no more than 6 months, before the Communists took them over. Ngo Dien Diem had become the Premier of South Vietnam 2 weeks before the Geneva agreement. Our problem was to decide whether we should keep hands off, which was the French position, based on belief that it was impossible to save Indochina from the Communists. The other alternative was to give support to Diem, a stanch anti-Communist who had spent many years in the United States.

U.S. advisers and experts were divided. Those who urged help to Diem included Senators Mike Mansfield and John F. Kennedy, who believed Diem could save his country with our help. In September of 1954 the southeast Asia treaty organization came into being, and SEATO was persuaded by Dulles to give Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam guarantees against invasion from North Vietnam. Once the decision was made, we were committed. We could not withdraw. Many say we still cannot without loss of "face."

For 3 years things were relatively quiet. Convinced they could not open direct attack, the Communists reverted to slow infiltration and buildup, especially in Laos. Diem took in nearly 900,000 Vietnamese from the north under a treaty provision which allowed exchange, but only a few left the south. In October 1955, the playboy king, Bao Dai, was ousted and Diem became President of the Republic of South Vietnam. By 1961 South Vietnam had a per capita income of $110. North Vietnam had only $70 per person of income. Food production in the north was off 10 percent per capita. In the south, it was up 20 percent.

Part of the credit for the buildup in South Vietnam was clearly ours as we helped train and equip the armies against an expected invasion from the north.

The Chinese, meanwhile, were not to quit. Nor was Russia to fail to exploit the situation.

Infiltration by guerrillas was stepped up from North Vietnam by Chinese Reds while the Soviets fomented trouble in Indonesia and other nearby areas.

Russia sought to paint us as imperialists bent on imposing the white man's rule on

Asians and, just this week, has agreed to supply airplanes to North Vietnam.

There is, of course, great and selfish interest, especially by Red China, apart from embarrassing us. Peiping has compelling reasons for coveting all the countries to the south. Southeast Asia would complement China, which is overpopulated and underfed. Southeast Asia grows more food than it needs. Thailand, for instance, normally is the fourth largest grain exporter in the world.

Of interest to both China and Russia, are these impressive figures on southeast Asia—production of 85 percent of the world's natural rubber, 55 percent of its tin and much of the oil in the Far East.

Future industrial and military power rides on the outcome of the wars on the peninsula of southeast Asia, the former Indochina, now North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Control of the area would place Communists astride sea and air lanes between Indian and Pacific Oceans, between Far East and South Asia.

Should Vietnam fall to communism, Malaysia, Thailand, Burma, and India could soon become victims of aggression. Eventually, Australia could become the target even as it was of the Japanese during World War II.

Ever since the beginning of the guerrilla warfare the United States has been committed by its treaty obligations and by the theory of prior administrations that the rest of the countries will fall should South Vietnam and Laos fall to the Communists. The so-called domino theory.

The true beginnings of this struggle are hard to ferret out. Perhaps, as some say, they go back to our policy in China after World War II. Perhaps, as others say, the policy laid down in Korea of allowing the enemy to escape beyond a certain line is at fault. Perhaps, we have gone too far. Perhaps we have gone not far enough.

Perhaps our negotiated peace in Korea is interpreted as a pattern proving that we do not honor our commitments or that we are a paper tiger.

Perhaps the agreement our Government gave to the neutralist government of Laos is a pattern.

Small wonder, then, that responsible officials of our Government are calling for withdrawal while others are calling for extending the war into North Vietnam and for the bombing of Hanoi and guerrilla supply lines.

Small wonder that the Vietnamese people on our side of the line wonder where we stand.

We have, in our zest to see our allies win, supported successive governments that do not have any popular base to which we say we are committed. And we have, at the same time, declined to extend the war or allow it to be extended. Perhaps both can be justified, in the short term goal of keeping South Vietnam free from communism without touching off the trigger of an atomic war. But these facts and our own conflicting statements about the extent to which we are committed with manpower cause confusion in Vietnam. Remember that we increased our force to some 21,000 from 12,000 at about the time we said we were going to bring 1,000 home. Remember that we have had three Ambassadors in 4 years.

So, while four members of the President's Cabinet offered to replace Henry Cabot Lodge, indicating the importance our Government gives to Vietnam, there is ample cause for wondering in southeast Asia how we intend to reinforce this feeling of importance.

We can wonder, then, whether Sukarno of Indonesia might be less anti-American if he understood what we are doing and where we are headed. Indeed, would he be telling us to keep our aid if he knew we honor our commitments and are steadfastly proceeding to a goal?

Let me pause a minute to emphasize my own contempt for Mr. Sukarno's attitude and that of Nasser and any others who tell us to jump in the lake.

I have been a supporter of economic and military aid for our allies as a matter of decency, good will, and self-interest. I have supported recent cuts in foreign aid. And I am probably the principal advocate in the Senate of others sharing in the problem of helping underdeveloped countries as well as the principal advocate of private enterprise assistance. Thus, I proposed that NATO countries get into the aid business. And for similar reasons I proposed the new businessmen's peace corps and tax credits for companies that extend their business into underdeveloped countries.

But just as consistent has been my insistence that our aid should neither go to our enemies or to those who bait us and tell us to jump in the lake. I have opposed sending food to Yugoslavia and Poland when they were closely alined with our enemies.

Now I oppose sending food to Indonesia and Egypt and I am the author of a bill to deny all aid to aggressors. My bill predates the recent action by the House to deny food shipments to Egypt because Nasser has seemed to support and—even foment—anti-American actions in his country.

Nasser told America to jump in a lake because he thinks he has us where he wants us.

The Middle East is a powder keg of proportions as great or greater than southeast Asia. Communism, neo-Nazism, age-old rivalries and poverty seethe and ferment in the sands and valleys of the Biblical world. In the background lie trade routes, chemicals, cotton, and oil.

Nasser is at once a stabilizing force and disruptive force. He holds the Arabs together, perhaps preventing all-out war. Yet, he rants and raves against us, against Israel and against our allies. He aids the enemies of peace and freedom in the Congo. He gets arms from the Russians and scientific brains from former German Nazis. He has received economic aid from us and food for peace. He has stood by while our buildings were burned and stoned. And then he told us to keep our aid.

As in Asia, it may be that our long-forgotten policies have caused this mess. It may be that we were too concerned over a latent threat to end our oil concessions. It may be that we were too hasty to stop the British and French from taking the Suez Canal and to stop the Israelis from cleaning out the Sinai Peninsula.

Nevertheless, America has never taken the kind of slap from a head of government that Nasser has accorded us.

The collective frustration of America found expression the other day in the House of Representatives when Congressmen wrote into an appropriations bill a provision that no more food was to be sent to Nasser.

Why, Congressmen and other Americans asked, should we force nations to take our aid when their leaders have told us to keep it? Congress truly was expressing frustrations of Americans.

The authoritative William S. White wrote in his column of January 29:

"It would be a great mistake to suppose that partisan malice was a primary or even major Republican consideration here, just as it would be to suppose that the whole thing sprang from a desire to please American Jews. And other particular friends of Israel.

"Any notion that our foreign policy in the Middle East is run with special tenderness for Jewish feelings is one of the special idiocies of our time.

"The truth is that this Government through the greater part of three administrations has been exceedingly kind to Nasser's Egypt and, in the process, perforce, far from altogether kind to the Israelis, whom he persistently threatens to destroy * * *.

"The truth also is that, while the Israelis are essentially on our side, Nasser consistently plays the international Communist game."

We Americans are slow to anger. We do not simply enter battles with the Communist aggressors for the joy of fighting.

Never in the history of the world has there been affluence such as we in America enjoy today. Never in the history of the world have the storehouses of grain and treasure been opened so fully so long to so many.

Yet we are resented and suspected. Even our benevolence is resented and rejected.

At the same time, courage and determination have earned us respect and friendship in our hours of trial. When President Kennedy blew the whistle on Russia and Cuba during the missile crisis, we won new respect throughout the world both for our President and our Nation. Every Latin American country, including those that had flirted previously with Castro, backed us up. In Africa the Russians were denied use of a landing strip they had financed. The leader of that country told me a few weeks later that landing had been denied because we were right in our dispute with Cuba and they respected our determination and would not let the Russians interfere with our prosecution of our grievance.

A clear statement by our President, backed with the necessary force, earned us respect and new allies during the Cuban crisis.

I believe this has again become necessary in all our foreign affairs, including the Middle East and Far East.

The President has properly been described by both administration spokesmen and other responsible people as the sole architect of our foreign policy. It is, then, clearly his responsibility to spell that policy out in all its ramifications.

Just this week, a man from Indiana was in my office asking: "What is our foreign policy? What are we doing in Vietnam? In Egypt and the whole Middle East? What happened to the tremendous mandate won by Lyndon Johnson last November?"

I replied that the President had laid out a magnificent program for a better life for all Americans, for ridding our Nation of disease and poverty, for greater dignity of the individual and for paring other expenses to the bone. This was use of the mandate.

But my constituent asked again, "Why then does he not lay down an equally imaginative program for winning the cold war? For meeting the goals in the world?"

I explained to my constituent—and I now explain to you—the President's background. He was probably the greatest majority leader in the history of our land. He led by welding divergent elements and interests in the Senate into an effective coalition.

It was natural, then, that as President, he would again lead by bringing divergent elements together. The technique has become known as leading through consensus. It has worked effectively with domestic programs and it resulted in the overwhelming victory of November 3. Leadership by consensus cannot be applied to foreign policy.

Yet, the President can and must use the reservoir of good will obtained through his amazing consensus at home to lead us and direct us abroad. As my constituent correctly pointed out, President Johnson enjoys unparalleled popularity among the people of America and a tremendous mandate to lead. Our country has, likewise, a reservoir of good will similar to that which we found available to us in the Cuban crisis when unknown allies leaped to our side.

President Johnson must dip into both these reservoirs and use them to point the way. He must clearly enunciate his goals and how he intends to reach them. In this way, and only in this way, will he obtain the support he needs to bring us the eventual victory.

The President should and must tell America, first, and the rest of the world what our posture is; what our aims are; what our interests and commitments are; how we intend to meet these commitments. We must know where we are going and what we are going to do in Vietnam. We need to know how the President plans to handle Nasser and Sukarno and others who may tell us off. He must tell Americans how they must serve the cause of freedom and peace.

America has both power and mercy. It has, in recent months, demonstrated both.

Yet, vacillation and indecision can be confused with weakness. Discussion of alternatives in Vietnam can, in the absence of clear policy, from the architect of policy, be mistaken for strife.

The time has come for us to be both American and Churchillian in our approach to these problems and to their eventual solution.

The President is more than capable of this role of leadership with strength and determination. He must now map out the road ahead, tell us what vehicles to use and then lead us up the road.

This is essential to American leadership in a hostile world.

We in America have the maturity, the moral fiber, the brains, the courage, the wealth and the power to carry out a policy of honesty, integrity, and devotion to peace and freedom.

Ultimately we shall triumph. We shall win a lasting victory for lasting peace, honor, and freedom.

We shall win it with a great President who clearly defines the role of each and all of us and who will lead us to the victory.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it was 47 years ago today that the Lithanian people, who had lived for centuries under alien rule, proclaimed their independence and proceeded with the vigor that is characteristic of these people to improve and promote their social and economic welfare. Their efforts won the admiration of the free world and served as an example of what freemen can do.

With great sorrow we recall that the independence of this nation did not endure for long. The invasion of Red army forces in 1940 brought unparalleled oppression, persecution, and tyranny and the forceful incorporation of the republic into the U.S.S.R.

The plight of the Lithuanian people—and, indeed, of all people who have been forcibly enslaved—should be of concern to all who cherish freedom. In commemorating this day of Lithuanian independence, we pay tribute to the courage of these people and their undying faith in eventual release. Their strength of character and their devotion to the high ideals of mankind will certainly prevail and will again bring them the freedom they so richly deserve.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today marks another anniversary for a small but gallant nation—another anniversary observed in sadness. Forty-seven years ago, on February 16, the courageous people of Lithuania won their independence and for 22 years enjoyed a happy, free, and democratic way of life. Now this independence is only a memory, but it remains a cherished dream for millions of Lithuanians now behind the Iron Curtain and for their countrymen in America and throughout the world.

It is a privilege to join with my colleagues in the House in paying well-deserved tribute to the valiant people of Lithuania on this occasion, for as long as we here in America have the will to remember and to care, their hopes for liberation will be kept alive. I am confident that the people of Lithuania will one day regain their freedom, for they are a nation of Christian traditions with the faith to persevere. But we in the free world must give them the encouragement to continue the fight. We must continue to support their cause and do what we can to aid in winning back their national identity and independence. We can let them know that America still stands devoted, as they do, to the principles of justice and the right of self-determination.

All who cherish freedom in the world have a common interest, and likewise we share a common threat. Lithuanian Independence Day, therefore, should be for Americans a day of prayerful reflection and renewed dedication. In this regard, I personally am today introducing a House concurrent resolution calling on the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to take certain action in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

I know the people of my district join me in saluting the wonderful people of Lithuania and also in expressing the hope that soon, February 16 will once again be truly a day of independence for them and for all captive nations now behind the Iron Curtain. It will then be a happy day for all of us.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my respects today to the people of Lithuania on this the 47th anniversary of the restoration of their independence in 1918.

Unfortunately, that independence has once again succumbed to the advance of Russian tyranny. Lithuania has not known freedom since the early days of World War II. But I am confident that Lithuania's day of freedom will come again. The unflagging determination of Lithuanian-Americans throughout this country to keep the plight of Lithuania before the eyes of the world convinces me that freedom and Lithuania can never long be strangers.

Let us all join with Lithuanian-Americans in today making our own recommitments to the cause of freedom everywhere.